



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CURRENT ACADEMIC TRENDS IN MULTIDISCIPLINARY

Refereed Journal

Open Access Journal

Peer Reviewed Journal

Cultural Diversity and Culturally Competent Rehabilitation: A Narrative Review

Pavol Balaj

Department of Rehabilitation and Physiotherapy, St. Elizabeth University of Health and Social Work, Bratislava, Slovakia

Corresponding Author: * Pavol Balaj

ABSTRACT

As societies across the world grow increasingly multicultural through migration, urbanisation and internal mobility, rehabilitation services face mounting pressure to deliver care that responds to the linguistic, ethnic and sociocultural realities of the people they serve. This narrative review synthesises current scholarship on cultural diversity and cultural competence within the rehabilitation disciplines, including physiotherapy, occupational therapy, speech and language pathology, audiology and psychosocial rehabilitation. It examines how cultural background shapes help-seeking behaviour, therapeutic engagement and functional outcomes; identifies the principal barriers and facilitators to culturally competent practice; and appraises strategies such as culturally adapted assessment, workforce diversification, professional interpreting and organisational accountability. The review argues that cultural competence is best understood not as a fixed individual attribute but as a continuous, structural and relational commitment, and that cultural and clinical competence are complementary rather than competing goals. Particular attention is given to the implications of India's own internal diversity for rehabilitation education and service design. The paper closes by outlining priorities for research and practice.

Manuscript Information

- ISSN No: XXXX-XXXX
- Received: 05-06-2026
- Accepted: 13-07-2026
- Published: 30-08-2026
- IJCRM:1(2); 2026: 18-21
- ©2026, All Rights Reserved
- Plagiarism Checked: Yes
- Peer Review Process: Yes
- Paper type: Review

How to Cite

Balaj P. Cultural diversity and culturally competent rehabilitation: a narrative review. Int. J. Current Acad. Trend. Multi. 2026;1(2):18-21

Access this Article Online



www.ijcatmjournals.com

KEYWORDS: cultural competence; cultural humility; rehabilitation; health disparities; diversity; physiotherapy; occupational therapy; health equity.

1. INTRODUCTION

Rehabilitation occupies a distinctive place within the health system. Its purpose is not the resolution of an acute episode but the restoration, maintenance or optimisation of function and participation across weeks, months and often years. Because rehabilitation unfolds over extended timeframes, depends heavily on communication and shared goal-setting, and frequently reaches into the home and family life of the person receiving care, it is unusually sensitive to the cultural context in which it is delivered. What counts as a meaningful goal, an acceptable therapeutic activity, a legitimate expression of pain, or an appropriate role for family members is shaped by culture as much as by clinical need.

At the same time, the populations that rehabilitation professionals serve are more diverse than ever. International migration, the movement of refugees, internal rural-to-urban migration and the coexistence of many linguistic and religious communities within a single nation mean that practitioners routinely work with people whose backgrounds differ substantially from their own. This diversity is not a peripheral concern; it bears directly on whether services are accessed, whether interventions are adhered to, and whether outcomes are equitable.

The concept of cultural competence emerged as one response to persistent evidence that ethnic and cultural minorities experience poorer access to, and poorer outcomes from, health services than majority populations [1,2]. Yet the concept has also attracted critique for being treated as a checklist of knowledge about 'other' groups rather than as a reflective and structural practice. This review surveys the state of knowledge on cultural diversity and cultural competence as they apply specifically to rehabilitation, drawing together conceptual frameworks, empirical findings and critical perspectives, and considers what these mean for practice in India and comparable multicultural settings.

2. Conceptualising Culture and Cultural Competence

Culture is often reduced, in clinical discourse, to ethnicity or nationality. A more useful understanding treats culture as the shared and contested systems of meaning, value and practice through which people interpret health, illness, the body and care. On this view, culture is dynamic rather than fixed, internally varied rather than uniform, and shaped by intersecting factors such as language, religion, socioeconomic position, gender, migration history and physical ability. Two people from the same nominal group may hold very different beliefs, and a person's cultural identity may shift over time through acculturation.

Cultural competence has been influentially defined as the capacity of individuals and systems to work effectively across cultural contexts, requiring congruent attitudes, knowledge and skills at both the practitioner and the organisational level [1,2]. Betancourt and colleagues framed cultural competence as a practical strategy for addressing racial and ethnic disparities, locating its levers at the organisational, structural and clinical levels rather than in individual goodwill alone [1].

The field has since generated a family of related but distinct concepts. Cultural humility reframes the goal from mastery of

other cultures to a lifelong stance of self-reflection, redressing power imbalances and accountable partnership with communities [3]. Cultural safety, developed in indigenous health contexts, shifts the focus further still: it is the recipient of care, not the professional, who judges whether an encounter was safe, and the emphasis falls squarely on equity and the critique of provider bias [4]. These formulations respond to a recurring worry that competence framed as knowledge acquisition can slide into stereotyping. Taken together, they suggest that effective practice combines humility, safety and structural awareness rather than the memorisation of cultural 'facts'.

3. How Cultural Diversity Shapes Rehabilitation

The influence of culture on rehabilitation operates through several interlocking channels. The first is the explanatory model of illness — the framework through which a person understands the cause, mechanism, expected course and appropriate treatment of their condition [5]. A stroke, a spinal injury or a developmental difference may be interpreted through biomedical, spiritual, moral or fatalistic lenses, and these interpretations shape whether rehabilitation is sought, how it is understood, and which goals are considered worthwhile.

The second channel is communication. Rehabilitation is unusually language-dependent: it relies on explanation, negotiation, instruction, feedback and the collaborative setting of goals. Where practitioner and patient do not share a language, or share it only partially, the risk of misunderstanding, reduced adherence and diminished trust rises sharply [6]. Communication difficulties are consistently identified among the most significant barriers to effective rehabilitation for minority populations.

A third channel concerns the role of the family and the value placed on independence. Many rehabilitation frameworks treat individual independence as the paramount goal. Yet in cultural contexts that emphasise interdependence and collective caregiving, an intervention oriented solely towards independent self-care may be experienced as culturally dissonant, and family members may expect a central, active role in decision-making and daily care. Beliefs about the body, disability, stigma and the acceptability of particular therapeutic activities further modulate engagement. For immigrants and refugees, these factors are compounded by the challenge of navigating an unfamiliar health system, limited social support and the stresses of acculturation [6].

4. Evidence of Disparities in Rehabilitation

Disparities in rehabilitation are commonly described along three dimensions: access to services, the quality of care received, and the outcomes achieved. Minority and immigrant populations frequently show lower utilisation of rehabilitation services relative to need, encounter services that are poorly matched to their linguistic and cultural circumstances, and report unmet needs that majority populations do not experience to the same degree [1,2,6].

In psychosocial and mental health rehabilitation in particular, the recognition of ethnic and racial disparities has not translated

smoothly into culturally responsive interventions. Sociocultural factors are often inadequately integrated into assessment and treatment planning, so that the expectations, needs and goals of culturally diverse service users are imperfectly understood and addressed. Discrimination — whether overt or embedded in the assumptions of services — adds a further layer, eroding trust and discouraging engagement. These patterns underline that disparities are not merely a matter of individual practitioner attitudes but are produced and sustained at the level of services and systems.

5. Barriers and Facilitators to Culturally Competent Rehabilitation

A scoping review of cultural competence across audiology, speech-language pathology, physiotherapy and occupational therapy offers a useful map of the terrain, having screened several thousand citations to characterise the field [6]. Its findings are echoed across the wider literature. The most frequently reported barriers are language discordance and the absence of adequate interpreting; limited cultural knowledge and unexamined bias among practitioners; insufficient training and preparation; a workforce that does not reflect the diversity of the communities served; and organisational or systemic constraints such as time pressure and inflexible service models. Facilitators mirror these barriers. They include cultural awareness among practitioners and within services; clear explanation of how the health system works, which is especially valuable for newcomers; the availability of trained interpreters; culturally adapted assessment tools; and a workforce whose composition and preparation allow cultural difference to be met with confidence rather than avoidance. A recurring observation is that the patient and caregiver perspective remains under-represented in the evidence base, so that services are often designed around what practitioners assume rather than what recipients report [6].

6. Strategies and Interventions

Several concrete strategies have been advanced to strengthen culturally competent rehabilitation. The first is the cultural and linguistic adaptation of assessment instruments. Tools developed and validated in one cultural setting cannot be assumed to be valid in another; rigorous adaptation, addressing conceptual, semantic and functional equivalence rather than literal translation alone, is required if assessment of need is to be accurate for diverse populations.

A second strategy is the integration of culturally informed approaches into treatment itself. In physiotherapy, for example, a pilot randomised trial explored the incorporation of culturally tailored elements into the assessment and management of chronic pain for a culturally and linguistically diverse population, illustrating that cultural adaptation can be built into intervention design rather than confined to the margins [7].

A third strategy concerns the workforce. Diversifying the rehabilitation workforce, and equipping practitioners of all backgrounds with reflective skills, expands the collective capacity of a service to respond to difference. Training programmes are the most common intervention, and reviews of such programmes suggest they can improve practitioner

knowledge, attitudes and skills [8]. However, the same body of evidence cautions that training focused only on individual competence, without accompanying change at the organisational level, has limited effect on the disparities in access and outcome that motivated it in the first place. This has prompted calls to move beyond competence framed as an individual attribute towards organisational accountability, system redesign and equity-oriented transformation.

7. Reconciling Cultural and Clinical Competence

A productive strand of the literature argues that cultural competence and clinical competence should not be set against one another. Rather than treating attention to culture as an optional supplement to 'real' clinical work, this perspective holds that the systematic assessment of sociocultural issues is itself a component of sound clinical practice. Understanding a person's explanatory model, communication needs, family context and social circumstances improves the accuracy of assessment, the relevance of goals and the likelihood of adherence — all of which are ordinary clinical concerns. On this reading, improving sociocultural assessment enhances, rather than dilutes, clinical competence, and the two are best pursued together.

8. Implications for the Indian and Multicultural Context

Much of the cultural competence literature has developed in North American, European and Australasian settings, where the diversity in question is largely a product of international migration. India presents a different but equally consequential configuration of diversity. Within a single country, rehabilitation professionals work across dozens of major languages and hundreds of dialects, multiple religious traditions, wide urban-rural and socioeconomic gradients, caste and community distinctions, and substantial tribal and indigenous populations. The Lancet Commission on Culture and Health emphasised that culture is a fundamental and neglected determinant of health worldwide, a point that applies with particular force in such a plural society [9].

For Indian rehabilitation, cultural competence is therefore not chiefly about serving foreign-born minorities but about bridging internal diversity: the physiotherapist working across linguistic lines within a state, the occupational therapist negotiating gendered expectations around activity and participation, the speech-language pathologist adapting assessment to a child's home language. Curricula developed in line with contemporary educational reforms have an opportunity to embed cultural humility, reflective practice and community engagement as core competencies rather than as add-ons. Equally, the cultural safety framework's insistence that equity be judged by the recipient of care offers a valuable corrective to any assumption that the practitioner's perspective is neutral [4].

9. Conclusion and Future Directions

Cultural diversity is a defining feature of the populations that rehabilitation serves, and it shapes access, engagement and outcomes through explanatory models, communication, family roles and beliefs about the body and disability. The evidence

indicates that culturally competent rehabilitation improves the relevance and effectiveness of care, but that competence conceived narrowly — as knowledge about groups, delivered through one-off training — is insufficient. The more durable gains come from combining reflective individual practice with humility and safety, culturally adapted assessment and intervention, a diverse and well-prepared workforce, and organisational structures that hold services accountable for equity.

Future work should prioritise the perspectives of patients and caregivers, which remain under-represented; the rigorous adaptation and validation of assessment tools for specific linguistic and cultural communities; and the evaluation of organisational and system-level interventions rather than practitioner training alone. In diverse societies such as India, situating this agenda within local realities of language, religion, caste and geography — rather than importing frameworks wholesale — will be essential if rehabilitation is to serve all populations equitably

10. Kirmayer LJ. Rethinking cultural competence. *Transcult Psychiatry*. 2012;49(2):149–64

REFERENCES

1. Betancourt JR, Green AR, Carrillo JE, Ananeh-Firempong O 2nd. Defining cultural competence: a practical framework for addressing racial/ethnic disparities in health and health care. *Public Health Rep*. 2003;118(4):293-302.
2. Cross TL, Bazron BJ, Dennis KW, Isaacs MR. Towards a culturally competent system of care. Washington (DC): Georgetown University Child Development Center; 1989.
3. Tervalon M, Murray-García J. Cultural humility versus cultural competence: a critical distinction in defining physician training outcomes in multicultural education. *J Health Care Poor Underserved*. 1998;9(2):117-125.
4. Curtis E, Jones R, Tipene-Leach D, Walker C, Loring B, Paine SJ, et al. Why cultural safety rather than cultural competency is required to achieve health equity: a literature review and recommended definition. *Int J Equity Health*. 2019;18(1):174.
5. Kleinman A, Eisenberg L, Good B. Culture, illness, and care: clinical lessons from anthropologic and cross-cultural research. *Ann Intern Med*. 1978;88(2):251-258.
6. Grandpierre V, Milloy V, Sikora L, Fitzpatrick E, Thomas R, Potter B. Barriers and facilitators to cultural competence in rehabilitation services: a scoping review. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2018;18(1):23.
7. Brady B, Veljanova I, Schabrun S, et al. Integrating culturally informed approaches into physiotherapy assessment and treatment of chronic pain: a pilot randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Open*. 2018;8(7):e021999.
8. Truong M, Paradies Y, Priest N. Interventions to improve cultural competency in healthcare: a systematic review of reviews. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2014;14:99.
9. Napier AD, Ancarno C, Butler B, Calabrese J, Chater A, Chatterjee H, et al. Culture and health. *Lancet*. 2014;384(9954):1607–39.