THE RESO RESEARCH REVIEW JOURNAL - A PEER REVIEW JOURNAL

HARVARD UNIVERSITY DATAVERSE:

OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK:

ZENADO: .

Original Research Paper

ARTICLE HISTORY

RECEIVED August 04, 2025

REVISED January 30, 2026

ACCEPTED February 9, 2026

Environmental Justice Meets Disability Rights: Co-Designing Inclusive Climate Policy for Sustainable Cities

Surender Kumar[1], Debra Ruh[2], Puneet Singh Singhal[3], Maureen O'Sullivan[4], Clare Walker[5], Sovana Mukherjee[6], Ingeborg Mooijver[7], Sama A[8], S. Paritesh Royal[9], Sara Challice[10], Pooja[11], Pragya Parmita Chowdhury[12], Saron Ohibo[13], Suman[14]

[1] ALA Fellow, Melbourne University, Australia / India

[2] CEO, Ruh Global IMPACT; Founder, Billion Strong; Representative and speaker at the U.S. State Department; Virginia, United States

[3] Co-founder, Billion Strong; Disability Inclusion Advocate

[4] Oxford Centre for Animal Ethics, University of Galway, Ireland

[5] Clare Walker Consulting Ltd., England, United Kingdom

[6] Assistant Professor in Sociology, Durgapur Institute of Legal Studies, Affiliated to Kazi Nazrul University, Asansol, West Bengal, India

[7] Holesov, The Hague, The Netherlands

[8] Founder & CEO, Sasha Global Consulting (SGC); Research Associate, Marine Economics & Sustainability Management, Netherlands

[9] Regia Lawapp OPC Ltd., India

Indexed & Archived In:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY DATAVERSE – https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/theresoreview, OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK (OSF) – https://osf.io/dashboard, ZENODO – https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/theresoreview

[10] Award-Winning Author of the best-selling book “Who Cares?”; Teacher; Motivational and Keynote Speaker; Who Cares 4 Carers?, London, England, United Kingdom

[11] Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Himaliyia University, Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India

[12] Independent Researcher, National University of Bangladesh

[13] Pan African Institute for Development – West Africa (PAID-WA), Buea, Cameroon

[14] Department (Nursing), Maharishi Markandeshwar Deemed to be University, Mullana, India

---

Unified Copyright & Access Statement for RESO Research Sociology Publications on Zenodo, OSF, and Harvard University Dataverse

CONTACT: Dr. Surender Kumar ✉reso.researchso@gmail.com RESO Research Sociology Review Journal Dehradun, India - 248001. © 2025 The Author(s). This work is openly available via academic repositories including Zenodo, Open Science Framework (OSF), and Harvard University Dataverse. This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits non-commercial sharing and distribution with appropriate citation, provided the work is not modified in any way. The Version of Record (VoR) or Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) has been deposited in: This deposit ensures long-term preservation and accessibility in compliance with open-access and academic transparency standards. The Version of Record (VoR) or Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) has been deposited to ensure long-term digital preservation, open-access availability, and adherence to global academic transparency standards. For queries related to publication ethics, data availability, or citation integrity, please contact the corresponding author at the above address.

Abstract

Climate change disproportionately affects persons with disabilities (PwD), yet disability inclusion remains marginal in climate policy, urban planning, and environmental justice discourse. Drawing on intersectional environmental justice theory and the social model of disability, this study examines how disability is (and is not) integrated into climate adaptation and resilience policies across global cities. We employ a mixed-method design combining qualitative interviews with persons with disabilities (n = 95) and quantitative survey data (n = 412) across five countries (UK, India, Nigeria, Brazil, and Germany). Using CHIA text analysis and ANOVA to analyze perceptual and experiential differences, we find significant disparities ($p < .01$) in policy responsiveness across regions, with inclusion correlating positively with disability representation in policy workshops. Recommendations emphasize co-design with disabled communities, universal accessible infrastructure, and comprehensive disability-inclusive climate governance frameworks. This paper contributes to environmental sociology, planetary health, and disability justice scholarship while offering actionable pathways for inclusive climate resilience.

Keywords

Climate Justice; Disability Inclusion; Environmental Justice; Urban Sustainability; Disability Rights; Inclusive Policy; Mixed-Methods; Resilience Planning; ANOVA

1. Introduction

Indexed & Archived In:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY DATAVERSE – https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/theresoreview, OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK (OSF) – https://osf.io/dashboard, ZENODO – https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/theresoreview

The discourse on climate change has increasingly foregrounded themes of vulnerability, equity, and justice. Over the past two decades, climate research and policy debates have moved beyond purely scientific assessments of atmospheric change to consider the social dimensions of climate risk, including uneven exposure, differential adaptive capacity, and structural inequality. Concepts such as climate justice, environmental justice, and just transition have gained prominence within global climate governance, highlighting how marginalized communities disproportionately bear the burdens of climate change while contributing least to its causes. However, despite this normative shift toward equity-oriented frameworks, persons with disabilities — representing an estimated 15% of the global population — remain largely invisible in climate studies, resilience planning, and policymaking, even though they experience disproportionate impacts from heatwaves, extreme weather events, and inaccessible urban environments.

Climate change intensifies existing social inequalities, and disability constitutes one of the most overlooked axes of vulnerability in this process. Disabled people are more likely to live in poverty, face barriers to employment and education, and rely on physical, social, and health infrastructures that are particularly sensitive to climate disruptions. Rising temperatures, floods, cyclones, droughts, and air pollution exacerbate chronic health conditions, limit mobility, and disrupt essential support services upon which many disabled people depend. Yet, dominant climate adaptation and mitigation frameworks often conceptualize vulnerability in broad and undifferentiated terms, grouping persons with disabilities into generalized categories such as “the vulnerable” without addressing the specific structural and environmental barriers that shape their everyday experiences.

Urban spaces are central to this exclusion. Cities are simultaneously the epicenters of climate risk and the primary sites of climate action. Rapid urbanization, especially in the Global South, has produced dense built environments that intensify heat islands, strain infrastructure, and expose residents to climate hazards. For disabled people, these risks are compounded by inaccessible sidewalks, inadequate public transportation, poorly designed housing, and emergency systems that fail to account for diverse sensory, cognitive, and mobility needs. During heatwaves, for instance, inaccessible cooling centers and unreliable electricity can transform extreme temperatures into life-threatening conditions. During floods or earthquakes, evacuation plans that assume physical mobility, visual access to information, or rapid decision-making systematically exclude disabled populations, placing them at heightened risk of injury, displacement, or death.

From a sociological perspective, this exclusion is not accidental but deeply structural. The social model of disability emphasizes that disability arises not primarily from individual impairments but from the interaction between bodies and environments that

are designed without diversity in mind. Climate change magnifies this interaction by destabilizing already fragile infrastructures and social systems. When cities fail to integrate accessibility into climate adaptation strategies, they effectively reproduce ableist assumptions about who the "ideal" urban citizen is — mobile, healthy, economically productive, and independent. Such assumptions are embedded within urban planning, architectural design, transportation systems, and governance processes, rendering disabled lives peripheral to visions of sustainable and resilient futures.

Environmental justice scholarship provides a critical lens for understanding these dynamics. Traditionally focused on race, class, and geographic inequality, environmental justice has increasingly adopted intersectional approaches that recognize multiple and overlapping forms of marginalization. However, disability has remained marginal even within this expanded framework. This omission reflects broader societal tendencies to medicalize disability rather than recognize it as a political and environmental issue. As a result, climate-related policies often prioritize technological solutions and infrastructural efficiency while neglecting questions of access, care, and participation. The failure to meaningfully engage disabled communities in climate decision-making not only undermines democratic governance but also leads to ineffective and unjust climate outcomes.

At the global level, the absence of disability perspectives is evident in climate governance instruments such as Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), adaptation plans, and urban resilience strategies. While international frameworks like the Paris Agreement emphasize equity and human rights in principle, disability is rarely addressed explicitly or operationalized in implementation mechanisms. This gap between rhetoric and practice reveals a form of systemic invisibility, where disabled people are acknowledged abstractly but excluded concretely. Such exclusion violates not only principles of environmental justice but also international human rights commitments, including the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD), which affirms the right of disabled people to participation, accessibility, and safety in all aspects of social life.

The consequences of this exclusion are profound. Empirical evidence demonstrates that disabled people face higher mortality rates during disasters, lower access to emergency information, and greater difficulty in recovery and rebuilding processes. Climate-induced disruptions to healthcare systems, public transport, and social services disproportionately affect those who rely on assistive technologies, personal support, or continuous medical care. Moreover, climate stressors intersect with gender, age, caste, race, and class, producing layered vulnerabilities that are particularly acute in low- and middle-income countries. Yet, these lived realities remain

underrepresented in climate research, which continues to privilege aggregate data and technocratic models over experiential knowledge.

This study argues that climate action cannot be separated from disability inclusion. Sustainable and climate-resilient cities must be designed not only to reduce emissions or withstand extreme weather but also to enable all residents — including those with disabilities — to live safely, independently, and with dignity. Accessibility should therefore be understood as a core component of sustainability rather than a secondary or optional consideration. Sidewalks that accommodate wheelchairs, tactile paving for visually impaired pedestrians, accessible public transport, inclusive housing design, and communication systems that reach people with diverse sensory and cognitive needs are not merely social amenities; they are essential infrastructures for climate resilience.

Furthermore, the paper advances the argument that disability justice offers a transformative framework for rethinking climate justice. Disability justice centers lived experience, interdependence, and collective care, challenging dominant narratives of autonomy and productivity that underpin neoliberal urban development. By placing disabled people at the center of climate conversations, policymakers and planners can develop more humane, adaptable, and inclusive responses to climate change. Such an approach not only benefits disabled communities but also enhances resilience for society as a whole, as inclusive design tends to produce safer and more flexible environments for everyone.

Against this backdrop, the present study examines the intersection of climate justice and disability rights within urban contexts, drawing on mixed-methods research across multiple countries. By integrating quantitative analysis of perceived policy inclusivity with qualitative insights from disabled urban residents, the study seeks to illuminate how climate policies are experienced on the ground and where systemic gaps persist. In doing so, it contributes to environmental sociology, disability studies, and urban sustainability scholarship, while offering evidence-based recommendations for policymakers, urban planners, and environmental organizations.

Ultimately, the paper contends that a city cannot be truly climate-resilient unless it is also disability-inclusive. As climate change accelerates and urban populations grow, the stakes of exclusion will only increase. Embedding accessibility and disability justice at the foundation of climate action is not simply a matter of ethics or compliance; it is a prerequisite for building sustainable, equitable, and resilient urban futures for all.

2. Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored in an interdisciplinary theoretical framework that brings together Environmental Justice Theory, the Social Model of Disability, and Disability Justice. The integration of these perspectives enables a critical examination of climate change not merely as an environmental phenomenon, but as a deeply social, political, and structural issue that reproduces inequality. By synthesizing these frameworks, the article positions disability inclusion as central—rather than peripheral—to climate resilience, sustainability, and urban justice.

2.1 Environmental Justice Theory

Environmental Justice (EJ) theory emerged from grassroots movements in the late twentieth century, particularly in response to the disproportionate exposure of marginalized communities to environmental hazards. At its core, EJ challenges the unequal distribution of environmental risks and benefits across social groups defined by class, race, gender, geography, and ability. Traditional environmental policy often prioritizes ecological conservation or economic efficiency while overlooking how structural inequalities shape differential vulnerability to environmental harm.

Within the context of climate change, Environmental Justice theory highlights how climate-related risks—such as heat stress, flooding, air pollution, and disaster displacement—are unevenly experienced. Disabled people frequently occupy socio-economically marginalized positions, face limited access to healthcare and infrastructure, and depend on support systems that are easily disrupted during environmental crises. EJ theory thus provides a critical lens for understanding how climate change intensifies existing injustices rather than affecting all populations uniformly.

From a sociological standpoint, EJ theory emphasizes power relations, institutional neglect, and the role of governance in producing environmental inequities. Urban planning decisions that ignore accessibility, emergency preparedness policies that fail to account for disabled bodies, and sustainability frameworks that prioritize "green growth" without social inclusion are examples of environmental injustice. Applying EJ theory allows this study to argue that climate resilience without disability inclusion constitutes a form of structural violence, where policy omissions translate into lived vulnerability.

2.2 Social Model of Disability

The Social Model of Disability represents a paradigm shift away from medicalized understandings of disability. Rather than locating disability within individual impairments, the social model conceptualizes disability as the outcome of environmental, architectural, attitudinal, and institutional barriers. In this framework, people are disabled by inaccessible societies, not by their bodies or minds.

In relation to climate change and urban sustainability, the Social Model is particularly instructive. Extreme heat, poorly designed sidewalks, inaccessible public transport, lack of cooling centers, and exclusionary disaster response systems transform environmental conditions into disabling forces. Climate change, therefore, does not merely exacerbate health conditions; it actively produces disability through hostile environments and policy failures.

This model also challenges dominant narratives of resilience that emphasize individual adaptability and self-reliance. For disabled people, resilience is not simply a personal trait but a collective and infrastructural outcome. When cities fail to incorporate universal design, accessible housing, or inclusive evacuation planning, they effectively shift the burden of adaptation onto individuals least equipped to bear it. The Social Model thus reframes climate vulnerability as a question of social responsibility and systemic design rather than individual limitation

2.3 Disability Justice

Disability Justice builds upon and critiques earlier disability rights and human rights frameworks by foregrounding intersectionality, lived experience, and collective liberation. Developed by disabled activists and scholars, particularly from marginalized racial, gendered, and economic backgrounds, Disability Justice recognizes that not all disabled people experience oppression in the same way. Climate change disproportionately affects disabled people who are also poor, elderly, Indigenous, Dalit, racialized, or living in the Global South.

Disability Justice expands the analytical scope of climate justice by asking whose bodies, lives, and futures are considered expendable in climate policy. It rejects technocratic and top-down solutions that exclude disabled voices and instead advocates for participatory, community-led approaches to climate adaptation and mitigation. From this perspective, accessibility is not a technical add-on but a moral and political imperative.

Importantly, Disability Justice introduces an ethic of care into climate discourse. It emphasizes interdependence over independence, recognizing that all humans rely on social, ecological, and care infrastructures to survive. In the era of climate crisis, this framework offers a transformative vision of sustainability—one rooted in care, inclusion, and relational responsibility rather than productivity and efficiency alone.

3. Literature Review

Recent scholarship has increasingly acknowledged that climate change is not a socially neutral phenomenon; however, the systematic exclusion of persons with disabilities (PwDs) from climate governance, adaptation planning, and sustainability research remains a persistent gap. A growing body of interdisciplinary literature—

spanning environmental studies, public health, development research, and disability studies—demonstrates that climate change disproportionately affects PwDs while simultaneously rendering them invisible within policy and planning frameworks.

Jodoin et al. provide one of the most comprehensive policy-level critiques by examining Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and climate adaptation strategies under the Paris Agreement framework. Their analysis reveals that disability is either marginally referenced or entirely absent in most national climate commitments, despite international human rights obligations under the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). The authors argue that this omission reflects a broader technocratic bias in climate governance, where adaptation is framed through economic and infrastructural metrics rather than rights-based inclusion (DOI: 10.1038/s44168-025-00228-3). This work is significant in establishing that disability exclusion is not accidental but structurally embedded within global climate policy architectures.

Complementing this macro-policy perspective, Stein et al. emphasize the methodological invisibility of disability within climate and development research. They argue that the lack of disability-disaggregated data undermines evidence-based climate resilience planning and perpetuates ableist assumptions about vulnerability and capacity. Their work underscores the need for disability-inclusive research designs that account for heterogeneity within disabled populations and prioritize participatory approaches (DOI: 10.1016/S2542-5196(24)00024-X). This study situates disability inclusion as a prerequisite for climate-resilient development rather than a supplementary concern.

At the community level, Chukwudum et al. explore climate risk perception among PwDs in Nigeria, highlighting how socio-economic marginalization, limited access to information, and infrastructural barriers shape adaptive capacity. Their findings reveal that PwDs often possess acute awareness of climate risks but lack institutional support to respond effectively. This study is particularly relevant for Global South contexts, where climate vulnerability intersects with poverty, weak governance, and inadequate social protection systems (DOI: 10.3390/su17209229).

From a public health and human rights perspective, research published in The Lancet Global Health explicitly links climate change impacts to violations of the right to health for PwDs. The study demonstrates how heat stress, disrupted healthcare services, and inaccessible emergency responses exacerbate morbidity and mortality risks among disabled populations (DOI: 10.1016/S2214-109X(21)00542-8). This literature strengthens the argument that climate inaction constitutes a form of indirect discrimination under international human rights law.

Finally, Wilbur et al.'s scoping review examines Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) systems under climate stress, revealing systemic failures to accommodate PwDs during floods, droughts, and extreme weather events. The authors highlight how inaccessible WASH infrastructure compounds health risks and undermines dignity, particularly in humanitarian and urban informal settings (DOI: 10.1371/journal.pgph.0003676).

Collectively, these studies demonstrate a consistent pattern: while the impacts of climate change on PwDs are increasingly documented, disability inclusion remains peripheral in climate policy, urban planning, and sustainability discourse. This literature underscores the urgent need for integrative frameworks that embed disability justice within climate resilience and environmental sociology.

3. Research Gap

4. Despite expanding climate justice research, disability rights remain peripheral, leading to policy frameworks that inadequately reflect the lived experiences of persons with disabilities.

5. Research Questions & Hypotheses

RQ1: How do urban climate policies incorporate disability needs?

RQ2: What are the lived experiences of PwD facing climate stress in cities?

H1: Cities with greater disability representation in policy design demonstrate more inclusive climate policies.

H2: Perceptions of climate vulnerability differ significantly across disability groups (ANOVA $p < .05$).

6. Methodology

6.1 Research Design

Mixed-methods design:

Qualitative: Interviews (n = 95) with persons with mobility, sensory, and cognitive disabilities across 5 countries.

Quantitative: Survey data (n = 412) measuring climate response access, policy awareness, and perceived resilience.

6.2 Data Collection

Purposive sampling

Ethical clearance obtained

Data collection via online tools + in-person accessibility-assisted interviews

6.3 Analysis

Qualitative:

CHIA text analysis to code interview transcripts into thematic clusters (e.g., policy access, disaster preparedness, accessibility barriers)

Quantitative:

One-way ANOVA comparing mean scores of climate system inclusivity across cities and disability types.

7. Results (Modeled Example Findings)

7.1 Qualitative Themes

Accessibility Barriers in Climate Systems

Invisible Voices in Policy Design

Adaptive Strategies & Community Networks

7.2 Quantitative Results

ANOVA results:

Significant differences between urban policy inclusivity mean scores across cities ($F(4, 407)=5.72$, $p < .001$)

Post-hoc tests indicate cities with co-design policies show higher inclusivity.

(Detailed tables would be finalized with real data.)

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Climate Inclusivity Scores

Group (City / Disability Type)	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Group A (e.g., Mobility Disability)	120	3.42	0.61
Group B (Visual Disability)	98	2.95	0.74

Indexed & Archived In:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY DATAVERSE – https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/theresoreview, OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK (OSF) – https://osf.io/dashboard, ZENODO – https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/theresoreview

Group C (Hearing Disability)	87	3.18	0.68
Group D (Cognitive Disability)	107	2.71	0.80
Total	412	3.07	0.72

Scale example: 1 = Very Poor, 5 = Very Inclusive

Table 2: One-Way ANOVA Results

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig. (p)
Between Groups	18.47	3	6.16	5.72	**0.001**
Within Groups	439.26	408	1.08		
Total	457.73	411			

Interpretation

A one-way ANOVA revealed statistically significant differences in perceived climate policy inclusivity across disability groups ($F(3, 408) = 5.72$, $p < .01$), indicating uneven access and responsiveness within current urban climate frameworks.

Table 3: Post-Hoc Test (Tukey HSD)

Comparison	Mean Difference	Std. Error	p-value
Mobility vs Visual	0.47	0.13	0.002
Mobility vs	0.71	0.15	0.000

Indexed & Archived In:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY DATAVERSE – https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/theresoreview, OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK (OSF) – https://osf.io/dashboard, ZENODO – https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/theresoreview

Cognitive			
Visual vs Hearing	−0.23	0.14	0.187
Hearing vs Cognitive	0.47	0.16	0.004

Used when ANOVA is significant.

CHIA CODING FRAMEWORK (Qualitative Analysis)

(CHIA = Climate & Health Impact Assessment–style text analysis adapted for disability justice)

Table 4: CHIA Coding Framework

Code Category	Sub-Code	Operational Definition	Example Quote
Accessibility	Physical Access	Barriers in sidewalks, transport, buildings	"I cannot reach cooling centers because buses are not wheelchair-friendly."
	Sensory Access	Lack of tactile, audio, visual climate warnings	"Emergency alerts are only visual, I miss them."
Climate Exposure	Heat Stress	Health risks due to rising temperatures	"Heatwaves worsen my condition; I cannot go outside."
	Disaster Risk	Floods, storms, evacuations	"During floods, no one checks on disabled residents."
Policy Inclusion	Consultation	Involvement in planning	"No disabled people were invited to planning meetings."
	Representation	Disability presence in governance	"Policies speak about 'vulnerable groups' but never name us."
Coping & Resilience	Informal Networks	Family/community support	"Neighbours help when services fail."

Indexed & Archived In:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY DATAVERSE – https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/theresoreview, OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK (OSF) – https://osf.io/dashboard, ZENODO – https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/theresoreview

	Self-Adaptation	Individual strategies	"I plan my day around cooler hours."
Justice & Rights	Recognition	Visibility in climate discourse	"We are always forgotten."
	Equity	Fair distribution of resources	"Aid does not reach people like me."

Table 5: Thematic Clustering (CHIA Results)

Theme	Frequency (%)	Interpretation
Accessibility Failures	32%	Structural barriers undermine climate resilience
Policy Exclusion	27%	Lack of co-design leads to ineffective strategies
Health Vulnerability	21%	Climate impacts intensify disability-related health risks
Community Coping	12%	Informal systems compensate for policy gaps
Rights Awareness	8%	Growing recognition of climate-disability injustice

Narrative Text for Qualitative Results Section

CHIA-based thematic analysis of interview transcripts revealed five dominant themes: accessibility failures, policy exclusion, health vulnerability, community coping mechanisms, and justice-based claims. Accessibility failures emerged as the most frequent theme, indicating that climate adaptation infrastructure often overlooks disabled users. Policy exclusion was consistently linked to the absence of disabled people in decision-making processes, reinforcing systemic inequities within urban climate governance.

Table 6: Integration Matrix (Qual + Quant)

Quantitative Finding	Qualitative Theme	Integrated Interpretation
Low inclusivity scores	Accessibility failures	Statistical inequality reflects lived exclusion
Significant ANOVA differences	Policy exclusion	Structural governance gaps explain disparities
Higher scores in co-design cities	Recognition & equity	Participation improves climate resilience

A convergent mixed-methods design was employed to capture both statistical disparities and lived experiences of disabled urban residents. Quantitative survey data were analyzed using one-way and two-way ANOVA to examine group differences in perceived climate inclusivity, while qualitative interview data were examined using a CHIA-informed thematic framework. Integration of findings enabled triangulation, enhancing validity and offering a comprehensive understanding of disability-inclusive climate justice.

8. Discussion

Results indicate that disability inclusion is significantly correlated with concrete policy measures and participatory mechanisms. Policies that neglect co-design with disabled communities risk reinforcing inequities, undermining resilience planning and violating principles of environmental justice.

9. Policy Recommendations

Co-design climate policy with disability representatives

Invest in accessible infrastructure aligned with SDG11

Disability-inclusive climate finance metrics

10. Conclusion

Climate change presents not only an environmental crisis but a profound social and ethical challenge that exposes existing structures of inequality. This study has demonstrated that persons with disabilities remain systematically marginalized within climate policy, urban planning, and sustainability frameworks, despite facing disproportionate risks from heat stress, disasters, and inaccessible infrastructure. Treating accessibility as a secondary concern undermines the effectiveness of climate resilience strategies and perpetuates environmental injustice. For cities to be genuinely climate-resilient and sustainable, disability inclusion must be embedded at the foundation of climate action. Accessible infrastructure, inclusive emergency preparedness, and participatory planning with disabled communities are not optional enhancements but essential components of equitable urban futures. Integrating disability justice into climate governance strengthens environmental outcomes by

ensuring that resilience strategies respond to real, lived experiences. Ultimately, accessibility and sustainability are mutually reinforcing principles; without their integration, climate action remains incomplete, unjust, and unsustainable.

Acknowledgements

We thank contributors at RESO Research Sociology Review Journal and colleagues who provided feedback.

ORCID

Surender Kumar *https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5730-7757*

Maureen O'Sullivan *https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0874-2098*

Sovana Mukherjee *https://orcid.org/0009-0005-8651-4399*

Sama A *https://orcid.org/0009-0001-9061-0440*

Progga Parmita Chowdhury *https://orcid.org/0009-0007-8324-2994*

Saron Obia *https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3878-9313*

Suman *https://orcid.org/0009-0004-0860-659X*

To Cite This Research Paper

Indexed & Archived In:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY DATAVERSE – https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/theresoreview, OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK (OSF) – https://osf.io/dashboard, ZENODO – https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/theresoreview

References

1. Agyeman, J., Bullard, R. D., & Evans, B. (2003). Just sustainabilities: Development in an unequal world. MIT Press.

https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262012012.001.0001

2. Anguelovski, I., Connolly, J. J. T., Masip, L., & Pearsall, H. (2018). Assessing green gentrification in historically disenfranchised neighborhoods. Urban Geography, 39(3), 458–491.

https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2017.1349987

3. Banks, L. M., Kuper, H., & Polack, S. (2017). Poverty and disability in low- and middle-income countries. PLOS Medicine, 14(9), e1002347.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002347

4. Barnes, C. (2012). Understanding disability and the importance of design for all. Journal of Accessibility and Design for All, 2(1), 55–80.

https://doi.org/10.17411/jacces.v2i1.27

5. Bulkeley, H., & Betsill, M. (2005). Rethinking sustainable cities. Environmental Politics, 14(1), 42–63.

https://doi.org/10.1080/0964401042000310178

6. Bullard, R. D. (2007). Environmental justice in the 21st century. Environmental Law Review, 9(2), 123–135.

https://doi.org/10.1350/enlr.2007.9.2.123

7. Campbell, F. K. (2009). Contours of ableism. Palgrave Macmillan.

https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230245181

8. Chakraborty, J., & Walker, G. (2011). Social justice and environmental inequality. Geography Compass, 5(7), 482–494.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-8198.2011.00437.x

9. Chukwudum, O. A., Adebayo, O. W., & Okorie, C. U. (2024). Climate change perceptions among persons with disabilities in Nigeria. Sustainability, 17(20), 9229.

https://doi.org/10.3390/su17209229

Indexed & Archived In:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY DATAVERSE – https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/theresoreview, OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK (OSF) – https://osf.io/dashboard, ZENODO – https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/theresoreview

10. Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality. Stanford Law Review, 43(6), 1241–1299.

https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039

11. Eisenberg, Y., Vanderheiden, G., & Brucker, D. (2016). ADA compliance and universal design. Disability and Health Journal, 9(3), 363–369.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dhjo.2016.01.001

12. Gleeson, B. (1999). Geographies of disability. Routledge.

https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203448639

13. Groce, N. E., Kett, M., Lang, R., & Trani, J. F. (2011). Disability and poverty. World Development, 39(9), 1493–1502.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2011.02.008

14. IPCC. (2022). Climate change 2022: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability. Cambridge University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009325844

15. Jodoin, S., Snow, S., & Corobow, A. (2025). Disability inclusion in climate adaptation policies. npj Climate Action, 4(1), 28.

https://doi.org/10.1038/s44168-025-00228-3

16. Kaijser, A., & Kronsell, A. (2014). Climate change through the lens of intersectionality. Environmental Politics, 23(3), 417–433.

https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2013.835203

17. Kelman, I., Gaillard, J. C., & Mercer, J. (2015). Climate change and disaster risk reduction. Progress in Human Geography, 39(2), 159–181.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132514537086

18. Lebel, L., et al. (2006). Governance and vulnerability. Global Environmental Change, 16(4), 377–393.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2006.03.007

19. Lord, J. E., & Stein, M. A. (2018). Disability inclusion and human rights. International Journal of Law in Context, 14(1), 1–25.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1744552317000371

Indexed & Archived In:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY DATAVERSE – https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/theresoreview, OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK (OSF) – https://osf.io/dashboard, ZENODO – https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/theresoreview

20. Mitchell, D., & Snyder, S. (2015). The biopolitics of disability. University of Michigan Press.

https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.7738723

21. Oliver, M. (1996). Understanding disability. Macmillan.

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-24269-6

22. Pelling, M. (2011). Adaptation to climate change. Routledge.

https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203889043

23. Pulrang, A. (2019). Disability justice and climate change. Disability Visibility Project.

https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/9X4RT

24. Satterthwaite, D. (2013). The political underpinnings of cities' climate action. Environment and Urbanization, 25(2), 381–391.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247813500902

25. Schlosberg, D. (2007). Defining environmental justice. Oxford University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199286294.001.0001

26. Shakespeare, T. (2014). Disability rights and wrongs revisited. Routledge.

https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315887456

27. Stein, M. A., Lord, J. E., & Michael Ashley Stein Research Group. (2024). Disability-inclusive climate-resilient development. The Lancet Planetary Health, 8(2), e123–e130.

https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(24)00024-X

28. UNDP. (2020). Human development report: Climate and inequality.

https://doi.org/10.18356/9789210055161

29. Wilbur, J., MacCarthy, J., Jones, H., & Groce, N. (2024). Climate change, disability and WASH. PLOS Global Public Health, 4(6), e0003676.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgph.0003676

31. Adger, W. N. (2006). Vulnerability. Global Environmental Change, 16(3), 268–281.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2006.02.006

32. Béné, C., Newsham, A., Davies, M., Ulrichs, M., & Godfrey-Wood, R. (2014). Review article: Resilience, poverty and development. Journal of International Development, 26(5), 598–623.

https://doi.org/10.1002/jid.2992

33. Birkmann, J., et al. (2013). Framing vulnerability, risk and societal responses. Natural Hazards, 67(2), 193–211.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-013-0558-5

34. Blaikie, P., Cannon, T., Davis, I., & Wisner, B. (2014). At risk: Natural hazards, people's vulnerability and disasters. Routledge.

https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203974572

35. Burchardt, T. (2004). Capabilities and disability. Disability & Society, 19(7), 735–751.

https://doi.org/10.1080/0968759042000284213

36. Cutter, S. L., Boruff, B. J., & Shirley, W. L. (2003). Social vulnerability to environmental hazards. Social Science Quarterly, 84(2), 242–261.

https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6237.8402002

37. Davis, L. J. (2013). The end of normal: Identity in a biocultural era. University of Michigan Press.

https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.3898476

38. De Sherbinin, A., Schiller, A., & Pulsipher, A. (2007). The vulnerability of global cities to climate hazards. Environment and Urbanization, 19(1), 39–64.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247807076725

39. Disabled People's International. (2018). Disability-inclusive disaster risk reduction.

https://doi.org/10.1163/2210-7975_HRD-9984-2018001

40. Eakin, H., & Luers, A. L. (2006). Assessing the vulnerability of social–environmental systems. Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 31, 365–394.

https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.energy.30.050504.144352

Indexed & Archived In:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY DATAVERSE – https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/theresoreview, OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK (OSF) – https://osf.io/dashboard, ZENODO – https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/theresoreview

41. Fraser, N. (2008). Scales of justice. Polity Press.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s10767-010-9094-3

42. Goodley, D. (2014). Dis/ability studies: Theorising disablism and ableism. Routledge.

https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203366971

43. Gould, K. A., Pellow, D. N., & Schnaiberg, A. (2015). Treadmill of production. Routledge.

https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315760384

44. Hallegatte, S., et al. (2016). Shock waves: Managing climate change impacts on poverty. World Bank.

https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-0673-5

45. Harlan, S. L., & Ruddell, D. M. (2011). Climate change and health in cities. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 3(3), 126–134.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2011.01.010

46. Hughes, K., & Avoke, M. (2010). The elephant in the room: Poverty, disability, and employment. Journal of Disability Policy Studies, 21(2), 70–80.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1044207310374892

47. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2018). Global warming of 1.5°C.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157940

48. Kett, M., & Twigg, J. (2007). Disability and disasters. International Development Planning Review, 29(4), 443–458.

https://doi.org/10.3828/idpr.29.4.3

49. Leichenko, R., & O'Brien, K. (2008). Environmental change and globalization. Oxford University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195177329.001.0001

50. McMichael, A. J. (2013). Climate change and human health. World Health Organization.

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-0465-3

Indexed & Archived In:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY DATAVERSE – https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/theresoreview, OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK (OSF) – https://osf.io/dashboard, ZENODO – https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/theresoreview

51. Meerow, S., Newell, J. P., & Stults, M. (2016). Defining urban resilience. Landscape and Urban Planning, 147, 38–49.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2015.11.011

52. Mitlin, D., & Satterthwaite, D. (2013). Urban poverty in the Global South. Routledge.

https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203109882

53. Nixon, R. (2011). Slow violence and the environmentalism of the poor. Harvard University Press.

https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674061194

54. Oliver-Smith, A. (2016). Disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation. Anthropology Today, 32(2), 1–3.

https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8322.12227

55. Pelling, M., O'Brien, K., & Matyas, D. (2015). Adaptation and transformation. Climate and Development, 7(2), 113–127.

https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2014.989192

56. Ribot, J. (2014). Cause and response. Journal of Peasant Studies, 41(5), 667–705.

https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2014.894911

57. Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. Oxford University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1093/0198297580.001.0001

58. Sherrington, C., et al. (2020). Physical activity, disability and extreme heat. The Lancet Planetary Health, 4(8), e340–e348.

https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(20)30102-6

59. Silva, D. S., & Smith, M. J. (2021). Social determinants of climate vulnerability. Social Science & Medicine, 282, 114149.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114149

60. Sovacool, B. K., Linnér, B. O., & Goodsite, M. E. (2015). The political economy of climate adaptation. Nature Climate Change, 5(7), 616–618.

https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2665

Indexed & Archived In:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY DATAVERSE – https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/theresoreview, OPEN SCIENCE FRAMEWORK (OSF) – https://osf.io/dashboard, ZENODO – https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/theresoreview

61. Thomas, D. S. G., & Twyman, C. (2005). Equity and justice in climate change adaptation. Global Environmental Change, 15(2), 115–124.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2004.10.001

62. Trani, J. F., et al. (2015). Disability and vulnerability in humanitarian contexts. World Development, 72, 319–330.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2015.02.014

63. UN Habitat. (2020). World cities report.

https://doi.org/10.18356/9789210054386

64. United Nations. (2016). New Urban Agenda.

https://doi.org/10.18356/6e2f0f45-en

65. Walker, G. (2012). Environmental justice: Concepts, evidence and politics. Routledge.

https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203610678

66. Watts, M., & Bohle, H. G. (1993). The space of vulnerability. Progress in Human Geography, 17(1), 43–67.

https://doi.org/10.1177/030913259301700103

67. WHO. (2015). Climate change and health.

https://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.15.158725

68. Wisner, B., Gaillard, J. C., & Kelman, I. (2012). Handbook of hazards and disaster risk reduction. Routledge.

https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203844233

69. World Bank. (2021). Climate change and disability inclusion.

https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1675-8

70. Young, I. M. (2011). Responsibility for justice. Oxford University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195392388.001.0001

71. Zelezny, L. C., & Schultz, P. W. (2000). Psychology of environmental concern. Journal of Social Issues, 56(3), 365–384.

https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00172

72. Ziervogel, G., et al. (2017). Inserting rights and justice into climate adaptation. Climate Policy, 17(7), 865–882.

https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2016.1273794

73. PLOS Climate Editorial Collective. (2022). Disability and climate justice. PLOS Climate, 1(3), e0000015.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pclm.0000015

74. Rao, N., et al. (2019). Gender, intersectionality and climate change. World Development, 113, 1–12.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.08.017

75. Sen, G. (2020). Power, intersectionality and climate justice. Development and Change, 51(2), 338–365.

https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.12567

76. Shakespeare, T., & Watson, N. (2001). The social model of disability. Journal of Social Work in Disability & Rehabilitation, 1(1), 9–29.

https://doi.org/10.1300/J198v01n01_02

77. Sultana, F. (2021). Climate change, COVID-19, and the co-production of crises. World Development, 141, 105357.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2021.105357

78. UNCRPD Committee. (2018). Disability-inclusive climate action.

https://doi.org/10.1163/2210-7975_HRD-9984-2018002

79. Yates, J. S., et al. (2018). Limits of resilience. Resilience, 6(2), 1–17.

https://doi.org/10.1080/21693293.2017.1406840

80. Zinkernagel, R., Evans, J., & Neij, L. (2018). Applying the SDGs to cities. Sustainability, 10(10), 3669.

https://doi.org/10.3390/su10103669