1 Experienced inclusion and recognition amongst people with

2 spinal cord injury: A comparative study in Norway, The

3 Netherlands, and Australia

- 4
- 5 Annelie Schedin Leiulfsrud_{1,2¶*}, Kristian Bernhof Ellinggard_{1¶}, Marcel W.M. Post_{3-4&}, Mohit Arora_{5-6&},
- 6 Håkon Leiulfsrudı
- 7 Department of Spinal Cord Injuries St Olav University Hospital, Trondheim, Norway.
- 8 2 Department of Neuro Medicine and Movement Science, Norwegian University of Science and
 9 Technology, Trondheim, Norway.
- Centre of Excellence for Rehabilitation Medicine, UMC Brain Center, University Medical Centre
 Utrecht, Utrecht University and De Hoogstraat Rehabilitation, Utrecht, The Netherlands.
- 4 University Medical Centre Groningen, University of Groningen, Centre for RehabilitationGroningen, The Netherlands.
- ⁵ John Walsh Centre for Rehabilitation Research, Northern Sydney Local Health District, St Leonards, New South Wales, Australia
- 15 Leonards, New South Wales, Australia.16
- 6 School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of Sydney, Sydney,
 New South Wales, Australia.
- 19
- 2021 *Corresponding author
- 22
- 23 E-mail: <u>annelie.s.leiulfsrud@ntnu.no</u>
- 24
- 25 These authors contributed equally to this work
- 26 &These authors also contributed equally to this work
- 27
- 28
- 29

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

30 Abstract

31 Background

32 The aim of this article is to study inclusion and recognition experienced amongst people with a

33 Spinal Cord Injury (SCI) in Norway, The Netherlands, and Australia. This is approached both from

34 the perspectives of an interest in the impact of mobility limitations versus social attitudes, and from

35 a consideration of differences between societies.

36 Methods

37 The data derive from the core questionnaire of International Spinal Cord Injury Community Survey

38 with extended national modules on the attitudes and values of respondents from Norway, The

39 Netherlands, and Australia. The data gathered in 2017-18 include 2'450 participants aged 18 years

40 or older. The data are analysed and presented with descriptive statistics and OLS regression

41 analyses. In order to explore our main questions, we run regression controlling for country effects in

42 addition exploring within country effects.

43 **Results**

Mobility limitations are a substantially weaker predictor of self-perceived inclusion and recognition than experiences of negative attitudes towards disabled people. Stereotypical attitudes and norms in society are shown to have various impacts on inclusion in the three countries. The Norwegian respondents report overall better results on inclusion and recognition than respondents in Australia and The Netherlands, illustrating the importance of national contexts.

49 Conclusions

50 Challenges associated with inclusion, recognition, and respect after SCI need to be defined in a

51 language broader than mobility limitations and stereotypical attitudes towards people with an SCI.

52 The main road to both inclusion and recognition in society is primarily linked to job and

53 educational status, in addition to family and friends. The results are of particular interest as

54 measures to support reintegration into society, including a strengthening of labour market

55 integration programs.

56

57 Introduction

This article aims to study inclusion and recognition experienced amongst people with a Spinal Cord Injury (SCI) in Norway, The Netherlands, and Australia. In particular, we probe the relative impact of 1) mobility limitations and 2) negative societal attitudes about disabled people and how study participants experience inclusion and recognition. In addition, the cross-national research design enables us to study national, as well as more general features of social inclusion and social recognition.

64 In this article we introduce two types of constraints with a potential impact on self-perceived 65 inclusion and recognition. The *first* type of constraint is mobility limitations. Mobility limitations 66 may hamper moving around and access to public and private buildings but is also linked to individual identity management and performance [1-3]. Since use of a wheelchair or other highly 67 68 visible mobility aids in public may represent a social stigma or sign of disability and exclusion [2,4] 69 it may be wise to distinguish between wheelchair users and those able to walk with or without 70 visible markers, such as crutches or canes. This is also an assumption in congruence with previous 71 research from The Netherlands, showing significant associations between categories of greater 72 mobility level (using an electric wheelchair, using a manual wheelchair, walking with aids or walking without aids) with higher levels of overall level of well-being [5]. The second type of 73 74 constraint found in the disability literature stresses more general negative societal attitudes towards 75 disabled people in society as a strong predictor of social exclusion [6]. The two constraints lead us 76 to an assumption that mobility constraints directly (constraint 1) or indirectly through negative 77 attitudes in society (constraint 2) lead to a diminished sense of social inclusion. To learn more about 78 how these constraints are linked to perceptions of being an active and valuable member of society

may help us to gain a better understanding of how the social mechanisms at play impact individualand collective perceptions of inclusion and recognition in different societies.

81

82 Mobility constraints as a marker and potential obstacle to social trust

83 and social inclusion

84 Mobility limitations as an inclusion factor in traditional rehabilitation literature tend to be described 85 in negative terms of a need of help, powerlessness, life space limitations and associated with bodily impairment [7]. This is also shown in the description of those who are wheelchair-bound but 86 87 supplemented with a distinction between active wheelchair users as more empowered and socially 88 included, and passive wheelchair users as more depowered and socially excluded [7]. British 89 disability researchers, Sapey, Stewart and Donaldsen [8], departing from a social model analysis of 90 disablement, have described the wheelchair as both a liberator and an obstacle preventing full 91 participation. The participation limitations in the British study [8] are both illustrated by the nature 92 of the physical environment, and of perceived negative attitudes. Both of these studies are good 93 illustrations of different narratives and problem foci associated with being wheelchair-bound, but 94 none of them problematises potential differences between different types of mobility limitations -95 including distinctions between those able to move around more or less independently and those 96 fully dependent on others. Nor does it differentiate between those who sit in a manual wheelchair 97 and those in an electric wheelchair.

The first distinction is of potential interest as it is linked to a narrative concerning those able to move around more or less independently and those fully dependent on others. The second distinction is of interest as it may differentiate between those who can manage with their own will and body powers to get around, and those who are more dependent in terms of assistance. These aspects of mobility limitations are of interest as they relate to how people with a physical disability perceive themselves, believe others are experiencing them, or answer to questions of social trust in others, and society more broadly.

105

106 The relevance of societal factors in explaining social trust and social

107 inclusion

108 In contrast to much of previous research on social trust, social policy, and welfare or disability 109 policy with an emphasis on more systemic features of society, our approach is to look more closely 110 into social inclusion as "lived experience", i.e., adopting a focus on experiences of inclusion and 111 recognition in everyday life interactions with other people and in society. Our focus on social recognition struggles and empowerment is in line with a growing body of research with a focus on 112 113 social recognition as the basis of social order and inclusion in society [9-10]. From this perspective, 114 being recognised by others opens the door to participating fully and being included in society. 115 Conversely, lack of recognition by others may be seen as a form of asymmetrical power relations and an essential component of the process of social marginalisation and social exclusion [9, 11]. 116 117 Social recognition of others is not *a priori* a matter of positive or negative attitudes, and as 118 illustrated by a study by Bollier et al. [12] in Australia in which a substantial part of respondents 119 end up answering, "I don't know" on attitudes towards people with a disability. This is both a reply 120 that may be interpreted as genuine uncertainty or fear of being ideologically biased; it is also a way 121 of answering, revealing that social recognition potentially can be partial, ambiguous, or 122 contradictory.

123 The theories of Honneth and Fraser [9, 11] depart from an interest in individuals as well as 124 the institutions and social fabric of society. This is also of importance in a comparative study of 125 how perceptions of oneself and others as well as the social climate for disabled people are played 126 out in different societies. For our purpose, bringing societal factors into the analysis of experienced 127 mobility contraints may also been seen as an important mediator.

128

129 Inclusion and social trust in a comparative perspective

130 On paper, Norway, The Netherlands, and Australia share several similarities that may play out in an analysis of perceptions of inclusion amongst people with SCI. All three societies are based on 131 132 overall high levels of social trust in fellow citizens, institutions, and society; social trust is generally 133 used as a proxy for high levels of social cohesion and social inclusion in society [13] All three 134 societies have well-developed social security systems in terms of health, pensions, and 135 unemployment [14-16]. The employment and relative poverty rates for people with a disability and 136 the threshold for receiving disability-related benefits are, however, substantially worse in Australia 137 than in either The Netherlands or Norway [17]. This may suggest a harsher social and economic 138 climate in Australia for disabled people if we restrict it to official social policy systems. 139 Both Australia and The Netherlands are characterized by more restricted and individualised 140 eligibility for social benefits than in a less strict and more generous eligibility for social benefits in 141 Norway -i.e., differences that potentially may trigger discontent or satisfaction in how people perceive themselves as fully included and recognised or excluded and mis-recognised in society 142 [18]. Both Norway and Australia are heavily work-centered in their welfare and social policy 143 144 (aiming for full employment) whereas The Netherlands focuses on a policy of social inclusion 145 based on a more generic public rhetoric of participation in society with an emphasis on people's 146 well-being and community building [19].

147 To what extent and how potential differences in the organisation of public welfare 148 provisions and the official rhetoric of inclusion correspond to differences in subjective experiences 149 of inclusion for disabled people in daily life, however, is a more open question. National 150 representative panel data from Australia in 2018 (N=2,061, response rate = 71%) lend support to commonly held views of disabled people as easier to take advantage of, exploit, or treat badly, but 151 152 also of an uncertainty as to how to act in an appropriate way towards disabled people. Even if this 153 study reveals explicit or implicit negative stereotypical attitudes, and disempowerment, such as low expectations towards disabled people, it is equally interesting to note that 78% were unsure how to 154 155 act towards disabled people, and that 42% agreed that people tend to ignore disabled people [12].

In line with Low and Pistaferri [18] we expect to find national differences in perceptions of inclusion/recognition between Norway on the one hand, and Australia and The Netherlands on the other hand, due to differences in disability and welfare systems and social policy. It may also be the case that more systemic features of society are only loosely associated with how people with an SCI perceive their inclusion and recognition in their own lives and as citizens. Sources of inclusion, and social recognition of a more informal kind (family, friends, and community) may play a significant role here.

Strictly speaking, our data do not fully cover the concept of social recognition, but focus on whether the respondents feel that they are treated with respect. Even if respect and recognition may differ theoretically in a larger philosophical discussion [9], there is also a substantial empirical overlap between being valued as a significant person and being respected as a member of society [20]. This provides the rationale for treating respect received from others as a measure of social recognition in this article.

169

170 **Research questions**

171 RQ 1: To what extent are mobility limitations related to experiences of social inclusion/social172 recognition?

173 RQ 2: To what extent are mobility limitations an important determinant of whether people with an

174 SCI feel included/socially recognised mediated by negative societal attitudes towards disabled

175 people?

176 RQ 3: To what extent are differences in experiences of social inclusion/social recognition explained177 by country of residence?

178

179 The research questions are addressed with a focus on both factors explaining perceptions of

180 inclusion and recognition, and factors explained by differences between societies.

182 Hypotheses

183 Main Hypothesis: (1) Mobility limitations are related to experienced social inclusion and social

- 184 recognition; (2) the association between mobility limitations and experienced social inclusion/social
- recognition is mediated by attitudes towards disabled people in society; (3) Levels of social
- 186 inclusion and recognition factors associated with them vary across societies. These mechanism are
- 187 presented schematically in Fig. 1:

188 Fig 1. Schematic presentation of theoretichal mechanisms.

189 The model presents the theoretichal mechanisms in which level of mobility might affect social 190 inclusion and recognition. The level of mobility of the respondent with SCI might have a direct

191 effect on perceived levels of social inclusion and recognition. This relationship might be moderated

192 by different confounders. The relationship might also be mediated by the experienced level of

193 attitudes towards people with disabilities.

194

195 Material and methods

196 **Data sources and sample**

197 This study utilised data from the International Spinal Cord Injury (InSCI) Community Survey. The 198 data derived from the core questionnaire with an extended national module on the attitudes and 199 values of respondents from Norway, The Netherlands, and Australia [21-22]. The InSCI survey was 200 conducted in Norway 19/10/2017 to 31/08/2018, in the Netherlands 01/01/2018 to 31/10/2018 and 201 in Australia 01/03/2018 to 31/01/2019. The study embraced persons with SCI (traumatic or 202 nontraumatic), aged 18 years or older, living in a community, and able to respond to one of the 203 available language alternatives in which the 125-item questionnaire was made available. In 204 Norway, potential participants were identified from the medical files of the three specialised SCI 205 rehabilitation centres in the country (Oslo, Trondheim, and Bergen) who had completed their first 206 rehabilitation in 2000-2016. This included 1,446 eligible persons and 611 respondents (response

207	rate 42%). In The Netherlands, potential participants were identified from the medical files of three
208	specialised rehabilitation centres in different parts of the country (Rotterdam, Utrecht, and
209	Groningen). Random samples were drawn from the pools of all former patients in each centre. A
210	total of 847 individuals were invited, and 260 (33%) participated in the study. In Australia, the data
211	were based on specialised SCI clinical services/units, not-for-profit community organisations, and
212	one government insurance agency in the states of New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia,
213	and Victoria with specialised spinal cord services. A total of 5,925 were invited, and 1,579
214	participated in the study (i.e., a response rate of 27%).

215

216 **Ethics statement**

The data collected in Norway, the Netherlands and Australia are all in compliance with national laws and regulatory approvals by Institutional Review Boards or Ethics Committees. All methods were performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. In Norway and the Netherlands, the participants provided their written informed consent by completing the survey (online or paper/pencil). In Australia implied consent was obtained from all participants by completing the survey questionnaire.

223 The Ethical Committees who approved the study were: Regionale komiteer for medisinsk og

224 helsefaglig forskningsetikk (Regional committees for medical and health research ethics) in Norway

225 (Reference number 2016/1184), Medish Ethische Toetsingscommisie (Medical Research Ethical

226 Committee) in Utrecht, the Netherlands (Reference number 17/539) and Northern Sydney Local

Health District, Australia (RESP/16/344).

228

229 Sample description

The analytic sample consisted of 2,450 respondents. The Australian sample [23] consisted of over twice as many respondents as the Norwegian and the Dutch sample combined. Thus, the values of the total sample were significantly affected by the Australian sample. We took this into account, however, by either running the models separately for each of the three countries or applying the countries as dummy variables.

235

236 **Dependent variables**

237 Both social inclusion and social recognition are elusive concepts difficult to measure and 238 operationalise. To best capture the different nuances, we utilized two variables that were thought to measure inclusion and recognition, respectivley. The first dependent variable Inclusion asks the 239 respondents "Do you feel included when you are with other people?" on a scale from 1 as not at all, 240 241 up to 5 as *completely*. The proportion who do not feel included (1-2) was higher for The Netherlands (12%) and Australia (13%) respondents than in Norway (5%). The Netherlands and 242 243 Australia followed each other to some extent in the distribution, whilst the Norwegians had more 244 respondents placed higher up on the scale. For Norway, almost half of the sample (48.7%) felt completely included in the company of others, compared to one-third in The Netherlands (33.3%) 245 246 and Australia (31.8%).

In order to measure the extent to which the respondents feel recognised, we apply the 247 248 Recognition scale, which ask "do you feel that people treat you with respect?". Here, the 249 respondents place themselves on a scale from 1 to 7 where 1 is not at all and 7 is a great deal. 250 We observed a similar pattern for recognition as we did with how people felt included. 41.5% of Norwegian respondents reported that they got a great deal of respect (value 7), compared 251 252 to 13.3% in The Netherlands and 28.1% in Australia. As seen in Table 1 and Table S1, most of the respondents in all three societies felt that they were included and recognised by others, but with a 253 254 significantly higher proportion in Norway (8:10) than in The Netherlands and Australia (6:10).

255

257 Table 1. Descriptive statistics displaying the dependent variables and the main explanatory

258 variables. a

Norway	The Netherlands	Australia	Total
(n=517)	(n=236)	(n=1,374)	(N=2,127)
4.25 (0.90)	3.85 (1.08)	3.79 (1.11)	3.91 (1.08)
6.09 (1.00)	5.52 (1.13)	5.59 (1.32)	5.70 (1.25)
10%	17%	26%	21%
17%	31%	35%	30%
28%	26%	20%	23%
45%	26%	20%	26%
82%	73%	72%	74%
18%	27%	28%	26%
	Norway (n= 517) 4.25 (0.90) 6.09 (1.00) 10% 17% 28% 45% 82% 18%	Norway (n= 517)The Netherlands (n= 236) $4.25 (0.90)$ $3.85 (1.08)$ $5.09 (1.00)$ $5.52 (1.13)$ 10% 17% 31% 10% 26% 45% 26% 82% 73% 18%	Norway (n= 517)The Netherlands (n= 236)Australia (n= 1,374) $4.25 (0.90)$ $3.85 (1.08)$ $3.79 (1.11)$ $6.09 (1.00)$ $5.52 (1.13)$ $5.59 (1.32)$ 10% 17% 26% 17% 31% 35% 28% 26% 20% 45% 26% 20% 82% 73% 72% 18% 27% 28%

a. The number of respondents for each country (Norway, The Netherlands, and Australia) and the
total number of respondents. The mean and standard deviation are presented for both of the
dependent variables and percentages for each of the levels of mobility and perceived social
attitudes.

263

264 Explanatory variables

265 Independence in mobility

266 Mobility limitations were divided into four different categories. The first category included

267 respondents who were completely dependent on help from others or use an electric wheelchair.

268 Respondents in the second category were those using a manual wheelchair. Those in the third and

269 fourth category could walk moderate distances with help from walking aids. Half of the respondents

in this study were dependent on a wheelchair (21% electric wheelchair users vs. 30% manual

271 wheelchair users), one out of four (23%) could walk short distances with walking aids, and one out 272 of four (26%) were able to walk short distances without walking aids. The proportion of 273 participants depending on wheelchair use was substantially higher in Australia (60%) than in The 274 Netherlands (38%) and Norway (27.5), and conversely lower for people able to walk (with or 275 without walking aids) in Australia (40%) than in The Netherlands (62%) and Norway (72.5%). 276

Negative attitudes towards people with a disability in society 277

278 People with SCI are exposed to various external influences or environmental factors in daily life. A

279 question on social attitudes was included in the survey regarding these environmental factors,

namely "Thinking about the last 4 weeks, please rate how much these environmental factors have 280

influenced your participation in society." Participants rated this item on a scale of 4, where 1 = Not 281

282 applicable, 2 = No influence, 3 = Made my life a little harder, and <math>4 = Made my life a lot harder.

These four categories were recoded as a dichotomous variable coded as "0" if not applicable or no 283

284 influence, and "1" if societal attitudes have made life a little harder or a lot harder. Two to three out

285 of ten feel that negative attitudes towards disabled people have made life more difficult for them

286 (18% in Norway, 26% in The Netherlands, and 28% in Australia).

287

288 **Control variables**

As control variables, we included gender, age group (based on age at the time of interview), level of 289 290 education, and job status. Female was coded as 1, male was coded as 0. Age was a categorical 291 variable. The level of education was coded as "0" with elementary schooling; "1" with completed 292 secondary education; "2" with completed university, whether they went on to graduate study or not. 293 The final control variable measured whether the respondents had been in remunerative work during 294 the previous seven days (no=0, yes=1). Thus, respondents who were still enrolled in school, retired, or for some reason unemployed were categorised/classified as not in paid work. 295

We run two regressions utilising *ordinary least square regression*. The first explored the relative impact of mobility limitations on experiences of social inclusion/social recognition (research question 1) and its impact after controlling for negative societal attitudes towards disabled persons (research question 2). The second focused on experiences of social inclusion and recognition explained by country of residence.

301

302 **Results**

303 The results presented in Figure 2 lend limited and uneven support for mobility limitation as a factor

304 explaining experiences of social inclusion/social recognition (cf. research question 1).

305 Fig 2. Plot comparing regression coefficients on the dependent variables included and

306 Recogniced controlling for countries.

307 The plot is based on Table S2. It shows regression coefficients on the effect on the 308 experience of being included and the experience of recognition. The figure included the reference 309 category for each dummy set (reference categories are: completely dependent of wheelchair or 310 using an electric wheelchair, male, low education, not paid work, no influence/applicable, and The 311 Netherlands).

The relative impact of negative societal attitudes towards disabled people is overall a much stronger predictor of how people with an SCI experience social inclusion/social recognition (cf. research question 2).

Walking without walking aids and age may have a positive effect on feelings of being included in company with others but disappear as an effect as soon as we control for negative attitudes towards people with a disability. Recognition, however, appears to be a more complex case where those walking without walking aids report less respect from others than those dependent on a wheelchair. Figure 2 also suggests that women with an SCI more often feel accorded respect than men, and those who are older more often feel accorded respect than those of a younger age. The results in figure 2 show that recognition is strongly linked to higher education and being

employed. It also reveals that Norwegian respondents report overall better results on inclusion andrecognition than respondents in Australia and The Netherlands.

324 With regard to the mediation effects of social attitudes, the results are mixed. Environmental 325 factors of social attitudes have a negative and significant effect on both inclusion and recognition. 326 Inclusion of social attitudes affects the p-value of the main explanatory variable of mobility, going 327 from significant to not significant. This suggests that there might be som mediating effect of social 328 attitudes on the relationship between mobility and inclusion. In terms of recognition, walking 329 without aids becomes significant and negative in relation to the being completely dependent on an 330 electric wheelchair. However, since the relationship between mobility and recognition did not have 331 a significant association prior to the inclusion of social attitudes, we cannot show a potential 332 mediation effect in our study. Figure 3 and Figure 4 presents the coefficient plots for both inclusion and recognition for each of the three countries. 333

334

Fig 3. Regression coefficients. Dependent variable: Inclusion. The plot is based on Table S3. It
shows regression coefficients on the effect on the experience of being included for The Netherlands,
Norway, and Australia. The figure includes the reference category for each dummy set (reference
categories are: completely dependent of wheelchair or using an electric wheelchair, male, low
education, not paid work, no influence/applicable, and The Netherlands).

Fig 4. Regression coefficients. Dependent variable: Recognition. The plot is based on Table S3.
It shows regression coefficients on the effect on the experience of recognition for The Netherlands,
Norway, and Australia. The figure includes the reference category for each dummy set (reference
categories are: completely dependent of wheelchair or using an electric wheelchair, male, low
education, not paid work, no influence/applicable, and The Netherlands).

Our initial hypothesis that mobility limitations may impact experiences of social
inclusion/social recognition received some support in The Netherlands where both manual
wheelchair users and those walking without walking aids reported higher levels of social inclusion

and social recognition. An impact on social recognition of walking without walking aids was also
found in Australia, albeit as a negative factor. This hypothesis received no support in the Norwegian
data.

For both Norway and Australia, it was observed that the participants' sense of inclusion is heavily dependent on their status as employed or not. In The Netherlands it is primarily gender, in addition to mobility status, not employment, that explains differences in how people with an SCI perceive their inclusion in society.

355 In Norway, it was observed that gender, age, and education play a role in how the 356 respondents report being recognised by others, whereas gender disappears after introducing 357 negative attitudes towards disabled people in society. In The Netherlands, recognition is primarily 358 associated with mobility status, age, and education, after controlling for negative attitudes towards 359 disabled people. In both Norway and The Netherlands having a high education compared to lower education is positively associated with recognition. This is, however, not the case in the Australian 360 361 sample. In addition to mobility status, and paid work, older people in Australia were more often 362 report that they felt socially recognised than people of a younger age. Interestingly, walking without 363 aids in the Australian sample, negatively associated with recognition compared to being completely 364 dependent, having a different effect compared to The Netherlands.

In summary, these results show that both explanations departing from impairment and mobility constraints (i.e., constraints typically represented in the rehabilitation literature) and discrimination towards disabled people in society are robust factors in explaining social inclusion and social recognition. At the same time, we also find a more complex picture than initially expected.

370

371 **Discussion**

We initially started out with a hypothesis (H1) that mobility limitations are related to self-perceived
experienced social inclusion and social recognition (see also research question 1). This was based

374 on an interest in how physical mobility constraints impact social participation with a focus on both perceptions on individual inclusion and social recognition from other people. It was also based on 375 376 an interest in whether it is physical mobility, or the symbolic signs associated with a disability that 377 matter most in how people with a physical impairment perceive themselves. We find some support 378 in both the Dutch and the Australian data that walking without walking aids may have an impact on 379 social recognition, albeit in opposite directions from those depending on an electric wheelchair. 380 Whereas no visible signs of a prototypical impairment may be an asset, signaling "normality" and 381 "sameness"- i.e., no deviance in public, it may also represent a challenge. This is particularly so if 382 we depart from a social recognition perspective, where an initial impairment is less visible and 383 obvious, and therefore potentially mis-recognised as a constraint and personal challenge in the 384 public sphere. This is also personal challenges that has been described in previous studies in other 385 minor groups, including minor stroke [24], chronic fatigue [25] and pain [26].

It is also interesting to observe that the cultural marker in The Netherlands is not necessary between wheelchair users and those able to walk without walking aids but associated with mobility status (where both those able to walk and those sitting in a manual wheelchair more often report that they are socially recognised than in those in an electric wheelchair). The weak correlations between mobility status and social recognition are also an illustration of a factor highly dependent on society, culture, and attempts to strive for a culture of "normality" and a discourse of disability [27].

We expected to find an empirical correlation between mobility limitations and individual perceptions of inclusion/social recognition mediated by negative attitudes towards people with a disability (H2). Even if this hypothesis receives some support in The Netherlands and Australia, the overall strongest predictor of both social inclusion and social recognition is negative attitudes towards disabled people. Our answer to research question 2 is accordingly that negative encounters of a personal or more generic kind towards disabled people are essential in any study of social inclusion and social recognition. This is also a result in line with a broad range of disability research

[3, 6] and more general literature on social recognition as a key to understand social inclusion [11,
9, 28]. The main difference of the approach taken in this article from what may be found in the
literature above is that we focus upon experiences of inclusion and recognition based on extensive
quantitative data from people with an SCI rather than more general domains of participation and
inclusion in society.

405 We expected to find differences in how people with an SCI experienced social inclusion and 406 social recognition across the three societies (cf. H3, and research question 3). This was based 407 mainly on more general assumptions of societal traits found in social welfare and social policy 408 literature where both Australia and The Netherlands typically (and in line with Canada, the United 409 Kingdom, and the USA) are described as more liberal, consumer-, and market- oriented in their 410 approach towards disability and health. In contrast to both Australia and The Netherlands we 411 initially expected to find overall better results in terms of inclusion, recognition, and negative reporting of discrimination of people with a disability in Norway. This was also an idea based on 412 our knowledge of differences in means testing of disability aid and welfare services, potentially 413 414 associated with more stigma in both Australia and The Netherlands than in more comprehensive 415 unconditional means testing programs in Norway. The data lend some support for a fit between type 416 of society and how people with a disability perceive their inclusion and recognition as persons in a 417 society, where Norway ends up with overall better results than either Australia or The Netherlands. 418 It is nonetheless difficult to interpret individual behavior as a response to differences in welfare 419 social policy and disability policy without considering alternative sources of inclusion and 420 recognition that may compensate for institutional and more systemic limitations and constraints. 421 Norway may on paper be more disability-friendly based on its commitment to personalised

services but does not necessarily score as well on social capital in the community and assistance
from family and friends. Australia scores overall surprisingly low on disability-friendly measures in
an OECD context [17] but may also have the relative advantage of a more community- and familybased model of inclusion. The Netherlands has overall higher scores on disability-friendly measures

426 in an OECD context than in Australia [18] but its differences in terms of mobility status and the 427 significance of prototypical disability markers mark it out as taking a distinct path from Norway and 428 Australia. To what extent this may be explained by a more pronounced disability discourse based 429 on individual identity management and performativity [2, 3]) or moral imperatives associated with 430 inclusion and expectations to strengthen the well-being of those with disabilities [19] remains to be 431 researched. This is also a question of more general interest as the results for The Netherlands in 432 contrast to both Norway and Australia, show a weak link to social inclusion and social recognition 433 via employment as the main road to both inclusion and recognition in society.

434

435 Study Limitations

436 The study was limited in size, and with an uneven response rate. Ideally, we would have liked to have included more countries and countries representing a broader range of health and welfare 437 438 systems. All data are based on self-reporting, not allowing for full validation of the data used. As 439 noted, the differences in the final sample within each country produced some limitations concerning 440 the comparability between the three countries. Whilst Norway and The Netherlands, to some extent, 441 consisted of a similar sample, the Australian sample differed slightly. For instance, a higher share of 442 the respondents in the Australian sample had a complete level of SCI compared to the Norwegian 443 sample. In addition, the average time since the onset of SCI was twice as high in Australian, again, 444 compared to the Norwegian sample. Taken together, these variations could lead to biased results.

The measures used are proxies for the concepts we wanted to measure. The question about being treated with respect by others may be regarded as a more individualised construct than social recognition, which is a broader sociological category also including the social bonds and the solidarity that constitutes groups, communities, and society. Our use of *respect*, however, is primarily framed in sociological language as our focus is on social and societal factors impacting how people with a disability perceive themselves in different societies.

451 Conclusions

Our departure in this article differs from the approaches taken in previous literature in several respects. First, the article highlights and problematises the nexus between mobility limitations in everyday life and perceptions of inclusion and social recognition. Second, we did not restrict our research to one society but examined how this nexus is played out in three distinct societies, with data from Norway, The Netherlands, and Australia.

457 Our results lend some support to a general assumption that a focus on mobility limitations 458 may have an impact on how people with an SCI perceive themselves, including whether they 459 consider themselves included and fully recognised by others in society. This is, however, a rather 460 limited focus if we compare it to the challenges people with an SCI face when it comes to negative 461 attitudes and stereotypical attitudes in Norway, The Netherlands, and Australia. In line with this, it 462 is obvious that both people with an SCI and their relative's post-SCI must cope with and adjust to 463 the challenges associated with disability in society.

The article confirms that there are significant physical barriers and obstacles for people with 464 465 an SCI in all three nations to move around due to the degree of impairment, i.e., problems 466 traditionally addressed in disability and equal access policy, and in a vocabulary of accessible, 467 usable and universal design (see also United Nations – Article 9 on Accessibility as a mechanism to 468 secure social inclusion in the UN Convention of Human rights for people with a disability [29]). 469 At the same time, we find an even stronger social and cultural dimension linked to societal factors in attitudes linked to social recognition and perception of Self and Others. This may not 470 471 come as a big surprise but is interesting as it must be read considering different welfare regimes and 472 national policy contexts, and ways to handle disability in social policy and practice. It is also of 473 interest, as we move from a broader societal context to an interest in actors and social interactions 474 between people. Once we bring in the social interaction and social space, we also observe that mobility limitations are not just a matter of physical constraints, but also a question of how a 475 476 wheelchair or mobility aids, associated with different sets of cultural stereotypes, can function.

477 Rather than being an asset, our results suggest that an SCI without the necessary stereotypical
478 attributes (read dependent on a wheelchair) may be an obstacle in terms of being fully recognised as
479 a person.

In a context of recognition, and social inclusion in society, people with a disability are not just of interest as individuals or a group, but also in terms of their social roles and resources. This is particularly important in an inquiry about social recognition. Societal roles linked to work and employment, and resources such as educational capital, are to a high extent status markers and social distinctions of importance how individuals see and perceive themselves, and how they are seen and perceived by others [9, 20].

486 The results support previous research that both higher education and employment are 487 essential in how people with an SCI perceive themselves and are perceived by others [27]. The 488 results also lend support to a picture where women with an SCI more often feel accorded respect 489 than men, and those older more often feel accorded respect than those of a younger age. This fits 490 rather well with a theoretical understanding of social recognition as norm structures and systems 491 that are more heavily embedded in the cultural discourse for men compared to women, and amongst 492 younger compared to elderly. People age 50+ have also in previous SCI research in Norway been 493 found to be more prone to say that they feel that they have done their societal duty as citizens based 494 on their previous work careers and track records [27].

The results lend some support to identifying commonalities across societies, but also to specifying national differences with respect to the importance of employment and higher education as social status and social recognition markers/distinctions. The results from The Netherlands are of particular interest as they appear to support a narrative of inclusion and recognition via a general idea of social participation and capability, in contrast to more conventional status markers as higher education and employment in Norway and Australia.

501 More research is needed to fully understand the interplay between self-perceived 502 experiences of being included and recognised by others, and a more generalised recognition of

503 people with a disability in society. Our results are, nonetheless, a strong reminder that health 504 professionals in charge of the rehabilitation of people with an SCI must pay more attention to 505 societal factors and social barriers associated with disability. We also found confirmation of the 506 notion that it is not necessarily mobility limitations that are the main challenge in everyday life, but 507 rather the stereotypical attitudes and norms people encounter. Stereotypical attitudes and norms in 508 society are also shown to have diverse impacts on recognition in the three countries. 509 Attitudes (personal as well as more generalised attitudes) are not in themselves a mirror of 510 how people behave or act. Attitudes interpreted as prevailing value systems in societies, may also 511 be of a more ambivalent and contradictory nature (in support of official hegemonic norms, yet 512 ambivalent or not fully considered as in the case of public attitudes towards disabled people [12]. 513 Nonetheless, we argue that an international comparative survey addressed to disabled people is 514 crucial for our understanding of commonalities and variations in how social recognition is lived and 515 perceived for people with a spinal cord injury.

516

517 **References**

518	1. Ridolfo H, Ward BW. Mobility impairment at the construction of identity. First
519	Forum Press. Boulder, Co; 2013.

520

- 521 2. Grue J. The social meaning of disability: a reflection on categorisation, stigma and
 522 identity. Social Health and Illness. 2016; 38(6): 957–964.
- 523 <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9566.12417</u>
- 524
- 525 3. Darling RB. Disability and identity Negotiating self in a changing society. Lynn
 526 Rienner Publishers. Boulder. Co; 2019.

527

528 **4.** Cahill SE, Eggleston R. Reconsidering the stigma of physical disability,

529		Wheelchair Use and Public Kindness. The Sociological Quarterly. 2016; 36(4): 681–698.
530		https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1995.tb00460.x
531		
532	5.	Osterthun R, Postma K, van den Berg RHJ, Stolwijk J, Tepper M, Post MWM. Hoe ervaren
533		mensen met verschillende mobiliteit na een dwarslaesie hun gezondheid, functioneren en
534		welbevinden? [Associations between mobility level and levels of health, functioning and
535		well-being]. Ned Tijdschr Revalidatiegeneeskd 2021; 43(2): 32-36.
536		https://www.revalidatie.nl/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/NTR-2021-2.pdf
537		
538	6.	Oliver M, Barnes C. Back to the future: the world report on disability.
539		Disability and Society. 2012; 27(4): 575–579.
540		https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2012.686781
541		
542	7.	Schirghuber J, Schrems B. Being wheelchair-bound and being bedridden: Two
543		concept analyses. Nursing Open. 2023;10(4): 2075-2087. https://doi.org/10.1002/nop2.1455
544		
545	8.	Sapey B, Stewart J, Donaldsen G. Increases in wheelchair use and perceptions
546		of disablement. Disability and Society. 2005; 20(5): 489-505.
547		http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09687590500156162
548		
549	9.	Honneth A. Recognition and justice: Outline of a plural theory of justice". Acta
550		Sociologia. 2004; 47(4): 351–364. https://doi.org/10.1177/0001699304048668
551		
552	10.	Ricouer P. The Course of Recognition. Cambride. Havard University Press; 2007.
553		
554	11.	Fraser N. Rethinking recognition. New Left Review; 2003; 3: 107-120.

555		
556	12. Bollier AM, Sutherland G, Krnjacki L, Kasidis V, Katsikis G,	
557	Ozge J, et. al. Attitudes Matter: Findings from a national survey	
558	of community attitudes toward people with disability in Australia. Centre of Resear	ch
559	Excellence in Disability and Health. The University of Melbourne. 2021. doi:	
560	https://doi.org/10.26188/15176013	
561		
562	13. OECD. Trust in government (indicator). 2022 doi: 10.1787/1de9675e-en. Availabl	e from:
563	https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/b407f99c-	
564	en/index.html?itemId=/content/publication/b407f99c-en	
565		
566	14. Esping-Andersen G. The three worlds of welfare capitalism. Princeton, New	
567	York: Princeton University Press; 1990.	
568		
569	15. Headey B, Goodin RE, Muffels R, Dirven HJ. Welfare Over Time: Three	
570	Worlds of Welfare Capitalism in Panel Perspective. Journal of Public Policy. 1997;	17(3):
571	329-359. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00008576	
572		
573	16. Aspalter C. Different Worlds of Welfare Capitalism: Australia, the United	
574	States, the United Kingdom, Sweden, Germany, Italy, Hong Kong, and Singapore.	
575	Australian National University Discussion Paper. 2010, December. (80). Available	at
576	SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1725128	
577		

578 17. OECD. Sickness, disability, and work. Breaking the barriers. Norway, Switzerland

579		and Polen. Paris. OECD. 2010. Available from: https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-
580		migration-health/sickness-disability-and-work-breaking-the-barriers_9789264088856-
581		en#page1
582		
583	18 .	Low H, Pistaferri L. Disability Insurance and the Dynamics of the Incentive
584		Insurance Trade-Off. American Economic Review. 2015; 105(10): 2986–3029.
585		DOI: 10.1257/aer.20110108
586		
587	19.	Freitas MJ, Dassen J, Louali S, Sniekers M, Van Lieshout C, Wevers C.
588		Inclusive Society and Social Work: The Netherlands. In: Bundschuh S, M.J
589		Freitas MJ, Bartroli CP, Žganec N. (eds) Ambivalences of Inclusion in Society
590		and Social Work. European Social Work Education and Practice. Springer, Cham; 2021
591		
592	20 .	Sayer A. Class, Moral Worth and Recognition. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi.
593		SAGE Publications; 2005.
594		
595	21.	Gross-Hemmi MH, Post MWM, Ehrmann C, Fekete C, Hasnan N, Middleton JW, et. al.
596		Study protocol of the international Spinal Cord Injury (InSCI) Community Survey.
597		American Journal of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. 2017; 96(2): 523-534.
598		https://doi.org/10.1097/phm.00000000000647
599		
600	22.	Fekete C, Brach M, Ehrmann C, Post MWM, InSCI, Stucki G,
601		et. al. Cohort Profile of the International Spinal Cord Injury Community Survey
602		Implemented in 22 Countries. Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. 2020;
603		101:12103–2111. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2020.01.022

605	23. Middleton JW, Arora M, Kifley A, Geraghty T, Borg SJ, Marshall R, et.al. Australian arm
606	of the International Spinal Cord Injury (Aus-InSCI) community survey: 1. population-based
607	design, methodology and cohort profile. Spinal Cord. 2023 Mar;61(3):194-203.
608	https://doi.org/10.1038/s41393-022-00850-6
609	
610	24. Zheng Z, Song R, Zhao Y, Lv H, Wang Y, Yu C. 2023. An investigation of the
611	stigma and the factors influencing it in the rehabilitation of young and middle-aged stroke
612	patients – a cross-sectional study. BMC Neurology 23: 139. <u>https://doi.org/10.1186/s12883-</u>
613	<u>023-03189-4</u>
614	
615	25. Froehlich L, Hattesohl DB, Cotler J, Jason LA, Scheibenbogen C, Behrends U.
616	Causal attributions and perceived stigma for myalgic encephalomyelitis/ chronic fatigue
617	syndrome. Journal of Health Psychology. 2022; 27(10): 2291-2304.
618	https://doi.org/10.1177/13591053211027631
619	
620	26. De Ruddere L, Craig KD. Understanding stigma and chronica pain: a-state-of
621	the-art review. Pain. 2016; 157(8): 1607-1610.
622	https://doi.org/10.1097/j.pain.000000000000012
623	
624	27. Leiulfsrud AS. Exploring Persons With a Spinal Cord Injury Participation in
625	Society: The Paradoxes of the Participation Dimension in the International
626	Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF). Doctoral Thesis NTNU
627	2016:324.Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway. ISBN:
628	978-82-326-1987-0
629	
630	28. Gimmler A. Recognition: Conceptualization and context. In: Leiulfsrud H,

(21	C - 1, 11, D	$(\mathbf{E}_{1}) \mathbf{O}_{2}$		A	·	D +	D11.	2010
n 1	Soninero P		ncents in	ACTION I	eiden	BOSTON	Brill	701X
0.51	bonnoorgi	(Lus). Co	neepts m		Jonaon,	Doston.	Dim,	2010.

632

- 633 **29**. United Nations Article 9. Accessibility.
- 634 Available from:
- 635 https://social.desa.un.org/issues/disability/crpd/article-9-accessibility
- 636

637 Supporting information

638 S1 Table. Results on the questions on "social inclusion" and "people respect" in Norway, The
 639 Netherlands and Australia.

640

641 **S2 Table. Regression effect on perceived inclusion and recognition.** Controlling for country.

642643 S3 Table. Regression table for the effect on perceived inclusion and recognition for Norway,

644 The Netherlands, and Australia.





Figure 2



Figure 3



Figure 4