Chapter 3
Diversity at Workplace and in Education

Tanmoy Bhattacharya

Abstract There is a potential conflict between the value of diversity at workplace —a concept touted and encouraged since the mid-1990s in America among private business/corporates—and the findings of the rights-based disability movement, namely (i) a person with disability (PwD) does not need charity, and (ii) disability is not a spectacle. A PwD represents in some sense the "spectacle of diversity" to an extreme in the mainstream unconscious imagination: if a prospective employer encourages hiring an employee with disability solely for the reason of diversity, then there is a problem. However, there ought to be some value to a practical implementation of a policy; i.e., if an organization wishes to implement a policy that encourages diversity in the workplace/institution, it ought to be considered an affirmative action. This is equally true of any possible future attempt at designing an instrument to 'implement' a theoretical perspective, be it from within the humanities or the social sciences; that is, actually hiring/admitting people as per a policy requirement may eventually lead to designing of an "instrument" or a set of algorithms, or a programme, to follow in cases of any such implementations. Nonetheless, designing instruments can address some of the issues which are often projected as problems which differentiate the social sciences from the humanities, since it has been argued that "designing" or "instrumentation" per se leads to a mechanistic world where human values are neglected—a bone of contention between the humanities and social sciences. A return to humanistic studies seems to be the only sure way of arriving at the truth. This is true in education as well as in employment, where the mere reportage of managers'/teachers' or employees'/students' satisfaction over employing PwDs and ignoring the axis of domination to investigate such status of employment, i.e. whether the person was employed/admitted "only" because of his/her disability to add to the so-called spectacle for the institute or whether because the organization truly believed in doing a good thing like diversity, does not constitute an analysis. This chapter thus critically examines the construction of diversity at workplace and in education with a view to comprehending the underlying notions.

T. Bhattacharya (✉)
Centre for Advanced Studies in Linguistics, University of Delhi, New Delhi, India
e-mail: tanmoy1@gmail.com

3.1 Setting the Theoretical Background

3.1.1 Introduction

Diversity is a good thing. Or is it? This is the debate that launches the main idea in this chapter. If disabled persons[1] are hired in a public or private sector company or admitted in a regular school, but are either kept at lower rungs of the office hierarchy, or removed periodically from regular schools, then disability is simply a spectacle. A disabled person represents in some sense the "spectacle of diversity" to an extreme in the mainstream unconscious imagination. So, if a prospective employer encourages hiring a person with disability (PwD) solely for the reason of diversity from such a perspective, then there is a problem.

However, it is not easy to sort this problem out. One, there ought to be some value to a practical implementation of a policy; i.e. designing an instrument that makes available a way of implementing a policy is a good thing—the instrument here being increased diversity at workplaces and institutions. In the realm of education, diversity has been shown to play a significant role by providing people an opportunity to interact in a meaningful way with individuals from diverse backgrounds, and the benefits that accrue from such exposure better prepare them to exist in a multicultural society. There is enough literature showing that diversity in the classroom and the curriculum adds to the quality of the educational experience for students and educators (Rudenstine, 2001).

However, typically "diversity" in either education or workplace refers to diversity in ethnicity and race. Persons with disabilities are marginalized once again and are not included in discussions on diversity, though it is clearly "one of many areas in which true equality requires not identical treatment, but rather differential treatment in order to accommodate differential social needs" (Kymlicka, 1992: 113). Throughout history, disabled persons have experienced similar attitudinal and architectural barriers in the society. Although "disability" can refer to a wide range and degree of physical and/or mental impairments and any social categorization on that basis is thus problematic, one can perceive the recognition of disability culture from the perspective of the social status of individual members of a group as full partners in social interactions; that is, the common thread running through persons with disabilities is the participation disparity they experience, which is often a result

---

[1]In this chapter, I deliberately switch between a person-first and a disability-first terminology, making in fact the claim that the tyranny of choosing one or the other must be overcome. Apart from the respective histories of the struggles, these different usages are also partly linguistic, as English being a subject–verb–object, and prepositional language allows nominal expressions with a prepositional phrase within it, such as "X with Y", which may not be allowed in a verb-final, postpositional language like most Indian languages.

of institutionalized cultural practices. This particular view with regard to disabled persons is advocated by Danermark and Gellerstedt (2010) on the basis of the status model of recognition proposed by Fraser (2000). Fraser is primarily interested in a view of social justice that is rooted in redistribution (of resources) and recognition, where "parity of participation" is considered to be the normative. She is thus able to integrate socio-economic as well as cultural injustices, where "remedies to socio-economic injustice would be redistribution of resources, while remedies to cultural injustice would be recognition" (Danermark and Gellerstedt, 2010: 343). Social status in this model is therefore tied to participation parity as a norm.

A mere reportage of managers'/teachers' or employees'/students' satisfaction over employing/being employed or admitting/being admitted disabled persons and ignoring the axis of domination to investigate such status (with respect to the reason for inclusion being mere "spectacle" or a genuine belief in diversity) is undesirable. If there was a way to "measure" (un)favourable reasons for the presence of disabled persons at workplace and institutions, then a truer picture might emerge. In short, in order to create an instrument that ensures diversity at workplace and institutions, we need to generate another instrument to "measure" the true characterization of diversity.

"Measuring" of course is a much-maligned word in the context of humanistic studies, but not always so in social sciences, which nonetheless is wrecked by the famous absence of the "subject" or its preference of structural systems over the human subject or agency; the "narrative turn" across social sciences (Plummer, 2001: 11) is a critique of this absence of agency. At the same time, if we go by Biklen's (2005: 3) comment that disability is not "knowable in any definitively objective sense … [it] can be studied and discussed, but it is not knowable as a truth. It must always be interpreted", then a return to humanistic studies seems to be the only sure way of understanding disability. In other words, studying disability seems to highlight a possible tension between the issue of the missing subject in the context of social sciences and the need for "measuring" in the context of humanistic studies. How do we resolve this tension?[2] I will come back to this question after a brief and relevant detour.

3.1.2 Centring Disability as Knowledge Empowerment

In this section, I will develop and outline my thesis of "centring disability" with respect to sign language, which I claim informs and augments our understanding of

---

[2]Although this question formed the background for the talk on which the present chapter is based (Bhattacharya, 2012), the question and the answer became clearer in my mind from another question posed by the (late) Prof. Jasodhara Bagchi present in the audience, whose untimely passing (in January 2015) has caused a lot of grief among the intelligentsia in the country; I wish to express my gratitude to her for asking the most relevant question that the chapter raises, which was, how is reducing the distance between humanities and social sciences an instance of centring disability?

language as such—the basis of much of human nature itself. On the face of it, it sounds like a rather tall claim, but I will show that not only is there a precedence for such a framework, but in fact, this might be the only desirable way to move forward for knowledge development and, specific to the concerns of this chapter, in thinking about disability.

To re-emphasize the title of the section further, by the phrase "centring disability", I mean the strategy of locating disability at the centre of studying other phenomena such as modernity (McCagg and Siegelbaum, 1989; Radford, 1994) or medicine (Zborowski, 1960; Gilman, 1985; Morris, 1991) and thereby obtaining an enlightened perspective on these other phenomena; this, I call the empowerment of knowledge in general. Although according to Linton (1998) the studies above do not exactly centre disability, Radford (1994: 22, emphasis in original), studying intellectual disability, says the following which defines what I mean by centring disability: "[M]odernity is a lens through which we can see that our culture has not only marginalized people with an intellectual disability, *it has also marginalized the study of intellectual disability as a phenomenon*".

A striking example of centring disability can be read into Keller's (1985) account of Nobel laureate but much neglected cytogeneticist Barbara McClintock's work on transposition. McClintock's philosophy can be understood from what she has to say about research in general and her own research on transposition in corn kernels in particular:

> If the material tells you, 'It may be this,' allow that. Don't turn it aside and call it an exception, an aberration, a contaminant…. That's what's happened all the way along the line with so many good clues. … The important thing is to develop the capacity to see one kernel of maize that is different, and make that understandable. If something doesn't fit, there's a reason, and you find out what it is (quoted in Keller, 1985: 163, 1995).

McClintock's world view begins and rests with difference. Instead of viewing the world as constituted by dichotomy, in this view, difference gives rise to a radical reorganization of the world around us that finally resolves into multiplicity. The kernels of corn that did not appear to fit in revealed a larger world of multidimensional order irreducible to a single law.

My thesis of "centring disability" with respect to sign language is based on a conspicuous character of sign languages—the *multi-modal* nature of the language that achieves the impossible task of uttering two words at the same time in terms of a spoken language equivalent. Sound, as we know, is embedded in time; we can only utter $Word_3$ after $Word_2$ after $Word_1$, and so on. Sign language, on the other hand, being a visual language, makes use of both space and time to produce language. For example, producing a certain handshape for asking a question does not by itself mean a question unless also accompanied by facial expression or non-manual marking, like a raised eyebrow in this case. Producing a question with just a handshape will be taken as being inarticulate. In this example, thus, only the simultaneous production of handshape and raised eyebrow can be a meaningful question.

However, a more striking example of multi-modality of sign languages comes from the frequent employment of what is known as classifier constructions in sign

languages. These are a set of handshape units that represent noun classes and/or characterizing spatial relations and motion events. However, a unique property of these classifiers is the non-dominant hand representing yet another classifier at the same time as the dominant hand. For example, if the dominant hand represents the classifier unit for a "vehicle", the non-dominant one might at the same time represent the classifier unit for a "tree". Furthermore, not only are the two handshapes meaningful, but the locations articulated by the hand(s) signify the space to represent the event. On top of this, different types of movements of the two hands within the signing space indicate existence, location, or motion (Supalla, 1986), a complexity that is beyond any known spoken language.

This multi-modal property of sign languages opens up dimensions otherwise invisible in spoken languages. Centring sign language in language studies can thus enable us to look at language—the pure representation of the human mind—in a new light (Bhattacharya and Hidam, 2011). Thus, the fact that more than one modality can be active simultaneously in sign language may indicate that "order" in spoken language may be an epiphenomenon. In sign language, a sign can co-occur with non-manual marking, mouthing, torso tilt, head tilt, etc., whereas in case of speech, each unit of sound must be produced at a time, generating a linear order of sounds, or words. It is, as if speech is tied to the time axis only because of the physical limitation of speech but not of sign.

As it so happens, a certain view of the evolution of language, namely the "non-evolutionary" view (which denies a gradual evolution of language), in fact, derives the consequence that linear order is irrelevant. The non-evolutionary view of language evolution (Hauser et al., 2002), or the *exaptation thesis*, is focussed towards the emergence of language as an internalized event that is optimally designed with respect to the communication between different components of the faculty of language. This internalized, language-as-thought object is externalized as speech much later in the evolutionary history of humans, when early humans migrating out of Africa realized that the new sensation arising out of the coming together of sound and meaning is also shared by other humans. Thus, speech came about as secondary, as an epiphenomenon of the prior internalized language-as-thought object. As has been pointed out above, the one-sound-at-a-time physical limitation of speech inflicts an order on speech, for example $Word_1$ preceding $Word_2$ preceding $Word_3$. Order, then, in this analysis, seems to be a property of speech but not language. This realization, independently arrived at by considering a particular theory of language evolution, matches with the actual realities of sign language, where the notion of order is highly complicated, and overlapping modalities are the norm.

In terms of practice, this implies that if adequate services are provided in the classroom with D/deaf[3] students in terms of teaching through sign language,

---

[3]As per convention, "Deaf" signifies deaf people who share a language (sign langauge) and cultural values which are distinct from the hearing society, whereas "deaf" denotes the audiological condition of deafness.

acquisition of this medium of communication will open up such an enriching experience for the hearing student that it may radically alter their understanding of the world around them. In this perspective, an inclusive education will transform the lives of the so-called non-disabled majority students in immeasurable ways.

In a recent book, Ghai (2015) repeatedly talks about the struggle between disabled persons and their diagnosis of disability by medical professionals. Diagnosis as a structural instrument is used culturally—in the sense of a shared system of labelling, explanation, and evaluation—to define disability and in many cases malign and devalue the disabled individual. As Ghai (2015: 77–78) notes, "it [diagnosis] can also lead to disrespectful and dehumanizing treatment, and a severe restriction of opportunities". However, Ghai considers diagnosis as a double-edged sword since unless there is diagnosis, access to services is not possible. Medical diagnosis therefore actively promotes medicalization of disability. However, if we locate disability as the site of our epistemology, then the perspective gained from understanding the role of diagnosis in disability will inform our general perspective on the role of diagnosis in various other domains, which at least cuts across gender and age, be it gynaecological or palliative care or dementia.

In terms of the questions raised at the end of the introductory section (*How do we resolve this tension?*), I imply in the discussion below that bridging the gap between the humanities and the social sciences is yet another example of centring disability.

3.1.3   Methodology: Humanities or Social Sciences?

I will show that these two problems/tensions referred to in the first section are related and a resolution of one may lead to the resolution of the other. That is, the tension between encouraging diversity and using diversity as a marker of spectacle, on the one hand, and one between the famous lament for the lack of agency and "measuring", on the other, may constitute two sides of the same coin, the latter more appropriately identified as the well-known tension between the humanities and the social sciences. To elaborate further, in the social sciences, it has been pointed out (Plummer, 2001, for example) time and again that the discipline has moved away from the subject. Instead of the human subject, social science lent itself too willingly to what Giddens (1986) calls *structuration*—the preference of system over agency. A similar tradition developed too in psychology and anthropology, from Skinner's behaviourism and Lacan's structuralism to the structural anthropology of Lévi-Strauss. It is the chasm between looking inside, exploring, feeling and imagining, and recording externals, measuring, generalizing, and theorizing; one "falls in love", and the other "observes love" (Plummer, 2001: 8). So much so that Lévi-Strauss (1966: 247) in fact announced the death of the subject thus: "the final goal of human sciences is not to constitute *hu*man, but to dissolve him *or her*" (the matter in italics added).

3.1.3.1 A Return to "Design"

The lament for subjectlessness in the social sciences was meant to reignite an appeal for a return to the narrative, thus bringing the two disciplines of social sciences and humanities closer to each other. The technique that is mentioned most often in this regard is different versions of reflexive or biographical *life story* projects, successfully employed in sociology and anthropology. However, there is another approach to the whole concern for bringing the two (i.e. humanities and social sciences) together; I will term this as a *return to design*. Let me explain.

If bringing the subject back in the social sciences is one way of bringing the two disciplines closer by changing the way social sciences are studied, then there must exist another approach—a push from the other direction, namely changing humanistic, interpretive studies in a way so that the two disciplines are brought closer. The push, I claim, can be achieved through a return to design in the humanities, or bringing back the much-hated concepts such as quantification and measuring within the perimeters of the humanities, in simplistic terms, *instrumentalizing* the humanities. But *what* and *how* do we measure?

The interesting and recent work on computational social science (see Lazer et al., 2009) that emphasizes personal reality mining through quantification of massive data is a step in this direction.

3.1.3.2 Social Capital

In order to understand the background to the theory of social capital, a somewhat forgotten past of sociology needs to be re-emphasized. When Coser (1978: 311) expresses the sentiment that "it seems no exaggeration to say that for roughly twenty years, from the First World War to the mid-1930s, the history of sociology in America can largely be written as history of the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago", it only adds to the well-documented fact of the launching of sociology and ethnography in the 1920s Chicago, now famously identified as the Chicago School.

The distinct "Chicago voice" became synonymous with the methodology that urged the researcher to avoid chasing abstract systemic patterns instead of "the detailed, the particular, and the experiential" (Plummer, 2001: 114). According to Plummer, this further led to the importance of the need for a dual concern with the subjective and the objective that brought out the inevitability of a perspective, and not the Grand Absolute. It is no surprise therefore that the Chicago voice spoke of the marginal and the underdog. My interpretation is that the early Chicago school interests in the marginal and the underdog made a conscious political statement in addition to its anti-categorial (anti-Aristotelian) view of the world. In a way, the Chicago School sociologists were claiming this to be the nature of the society, and by talking about the marginal and the underdog, there was an attempt at integrating the marginal. It was a challenge to the then dominant positivism and social

determinism, to existing social conditions and policies, and represented a dramatic epistemological, ontological, and normative shift (Thomas, 1983).

The normative of the Chicago School was to remove the conception of pathology from the description of culture: "Instead of pathology, the ideas of natural variation, cultural diversity, and normative deviation gradually emerged" (Matza, 1969: 44). Surprisingly, though, and rather tellingly for our present concerns, the deep interest in the marginal was also marked by a dilemma that led to some kind of social reformism, where deviant behaviours were considered "correctable"—this necessarily leads to a medicalized view. However, pitted against this dilemma, the contemporary ethnographic research is ironically only outwardly liberal, being sympathetic to deviants, but practising a rather uncritical methodology deriving a style of ethnography that is "subjectivist, superficial, and above all, devoid of the original critical programme of social concern that once guided the Chicago school" (Thomas, 1983: 483).

Ethnography as a method, however, was critiqued heavily on the grounds of it being qualitative, based more on little more than romantic tales, relying on subjective viewpoints arrived at through idle, unplanned observations, and due to its lack of predictability, it could not be deemed scientific. Consequently, there is no way to distinguish "good" from "bad" ethnographic research (Thomas, 1983: 477). Some of the criticism of the Chicago School, especially on its lack of scientific spirit and quantification, began early, as in Lundberg (1926) and Stouffer (1930); others can be found in Davis (1981) and Snodgrass (1976).

Against this background, Putnam's (2000) notion of social capital marks an important shift in focus, within Western political theory, away from either the state or citizen to the civic space in between. This notion also highlights the need for quantification within the humanities for the analysis of community, by evaluating large amount of collected data of individual behaviour and opinion. Social capital, according to Putnam, unlike the popular notion of "community", is "quantifiable". The quantifiability helps bridge the gap between more "scientifically" oriented disciplines of social science (like economics) and the more culturally bound study of politics, society, and community, within the social sciences.

Putnam (2000: 9) defines social capital as the "connections among individuals—social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them" that ultimately "enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives". In this view, community becomes a repository of a common "civic culture", which unites citizens in a sphere distinct from the liberal state. The focus is largely on the *amount* of social connectedness rather than a detailed analysis of the *nature* of any past or present connections (Arneil, 2006).

However, this is a functional theory of social capital; that is, it works in an instrumental way, as a free-flowing and functional means of exchange either in the past or the present. Bourdieu (1986), on the other hand, focuses on networks and resources rather than trust and shared norms. Social capital is thus built up or accumulated over time in particular ways. This in turn implies that the opportunities for social capital accumulation are not equally open to all. That is, it cannot

ameliorate the power hierarchies of the past. The functional view on the other hand encourages certain erasure of multicultural commitments to diversity and difference.

Thus, a more appropriate and context-specific measure of social capital must be found. Within the context of developing countries in general, informal rather than formal networks have been found to be more profuse and relevant. For example, the suggestion made in this chapter that a measure of social capital may provide us tools to understand diversity better may be harvested in a more appropriate manner if both structural and cognitive aspects of social capital are considered. Let us discuss an example in this connection.

Within this framework, Kudlick's (2001) comparison of the objectives of two organizations within the blind community, namely the American Blind People's Higher Education and General Improvement Association (ABPHEGIA), the membership of which consisted largely of blind people, and the American Association of Workers for the Blind (AAWB), made up largely of sighted professionals, attains importance. A study of their two respective magazines—*The Problem* and *The Outlook for the Blind*—indicates a shift in purpose in the second half of the twentieth century, from service to advocacy.

Thus, the advocacy-driven interactive space mitigated by organizations of disabled persons constitutes the social capital as the *what* of measure indicated in the earlier section. The *how* of measuring may require a reconsideration along the lines hinted above, where more informal aspects of social capital, which are also contextually richer, are more meaningful. Beliefs that people hold about their possible interactions with others in particular situations provide a networking pattern, which is a better indication of collective action in a marginalized sector than people's membership in a particular organization. Arneil (2006: 4), based on Coleman (1990), too states that social capital is "the set of resources that inhere in family relations and in community organizations".

Of course, not all activities may be considered as contextually specific measures of social capital. Activities may thus more or less indicate individual behaviour patterns; that is, there are activities that people typically undertake collectively or at least with other persons for mutual benefit. However, such a cognitive criterion based on norms, values and beliefs that people share but are facilitated by structural criteria such as social networks and roles, will strengthen the structural and cognitive aspects of social capital (Krishna and Uphoff, 1999). For example, the following may form a typical set of informal and relational social capital envisaged here:

– The extent of belief and expectation of students or workers with disability about their institution being an equal opportunity provider, structurally, academically, workspace-wise (cognitive);
– The kind of access the student/worker with disability would consider essential (cognitive);
– Situations where resolving crisis involving such students or workers are concerned (structural); and
– Situations of students/workers with disability during natural disasters or other emergencies (structural).

This is only an indicative list of criteria that can be "measured" as markers of social capital[4] and thus have the potential to contribute to identifying true diversity and distinguish it from diversity as a spectacle. However, the suitability of any of these or other indicators will depend on actual field-based studies that may reveal patterns of informal networking that influence and impact the lives of disabled persons.

3.2   The Empirical Evidence

3.2.1   Disability at the Workplace and in Educational Institutions

I now present empirical evidence of the true nature of diversity as practised and imagined at the workplace and in educational institutions. I mentioned earlier that the true nature of diversity can be understood if we have an instrument to measure job satisfaction at workplace and a sense of belonging in regular institutions. Both job satisfaction and sense of belonging, without an axis of domination, can also contribute positively towards a repository constituting the social capital of a group or community. Therefore, an instrument needs to be designed to measure such social capital of a group of disabled persons (at work and in educational institutes). We will see here that the rhetoric of diversity coming from both the state parties and private concerns actually discourages diversity.

3.2.1.1   A Typology of Employment

The National Policy for Persons with Disabilities (2006) (NPPD) and previous work in this domain (e.g. Mitra and Sambamoorthi, 2006) more or less identify the following five types of employment for disabled persons:

Government establishments: Reservation in various ministries/departments against identified posts for groups A, B, C, and D[5] jobs in the government sectors (central as well as states) is 3.07, 4.41, 3.76, and 3.18 % respectively as mentioned in NPPD (2006), Article II(c)(i). In public sector undertakings (PSUs),

---

[4]This list has been constructed roughly on the basis of Krishna and Uphoff's (1999) six questions in their study (p. 27).

[5]As per The Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965, classification of jobs broadly correspond to rank, status, and degree of responsibilities: Group A carries administrative and executive responsibilities, Group B is middle management level, Group C is supervisory, operative, and clerical work, and Group D involves routine duties. They are further differentiated in terms of pay scales, which are as follows: Group A Rs. 13,500 and above, Group B between Rs. 9000 and 13,500, Group C between Rs. 4000 and 9000, and Group D for below Rs. 4000.

the reservation status in groups A, B, C, and D is 2.78, 8.54, 5.04, and 6.75 %, respectively. The PwD Act, 1995,[6] provides for 3 % reservation in employment in the establishments of the Government of India and PSUs against identified posts which stand at 1900 after the revision in 2001.[7]

Private sector: "The appropriate Governments and the local authorities shall, within the limits of their economic capacity and development, provide incentives to employers both in public and private sectors to ensure that at least five per cent of their work force is composed of persons with disabilities" (Article 41 of the PwD Act, 1995, based on Article 41 of the Constitution of India[8]). The NPPD (2006) also recommends that proactive measures such as incentives, awards, and tax exemptions will be taken up to encourage the employment of disabled persons in the private sector.

Self-employment: Given that only a small percentage of the workforce is in the organized sector, self-employment of persons with disabilities is promoted (as per the NPPD, 2006). This is done through vocational education and management training. Further, the existing system of providing loans on softer terms from the NHFDC (National Handicapped Finance and Development Corporation, India) will be improved to make it easily accessible. The Indian government encourages self-employment by providing incentives, tax concessions, exemptions from duties, preferential treatment for procurement of goods and services by the government from the enterprises of disabled persons, etc. Priority in financial support is given to self-help groups formed by persons with disabilities.

3.2.1.2 Assistance Through Vocational Training

Rungta reported in 2004 that India had not ratified convention C159 of the ILO, entitled "Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment (Disabled Persons) Convention, 1983"; unfortunately, that remains to be the case, India is not among the 83 countries who have ratified the convention up till now.[9] However, NPPD (2006) provides for rehabilitative measures through vocational training in both education and employment. Assistance (up to 90 %) is provided through the Indian government to organizations providing training to PwDs. The Ministry of Labour through

---

[6]The Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995.

[7]This figure changed to 9975 by 2006–2007 as per a World Bank report (O'Keefe, 2009), which stated that the share of vacancies filled by PwDs in ministries and departments of the government was 0.37 out of 3.54 % identified posts for PwDs.

[8]Constitution of India, Article 41. Right to work, to education, and to public assistance in certain cases—The state shall, within the limits of its economic capacity and development, make effective provision for securing the right to work, to education, and to public assistance in cases of unemployment, old age, sickness, and disablement, and in other cases of undeserved want.

[9]From http://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:11300:0::NO:11300:P11300_INSTRUMENT_ID:312304 (accessed on 26 May 2016).

DGE&T (Directorate General of Employment and Training) runs 17 vocational rehabilitation centres (VRC), free of cost with stipendiary provisions wherever needed. Apart from NPPD 2006, the government initiated a scheme—"Scheme for providing Employment to Persons with Disabilities in the Private Sector Incentives to the Employers"—in 2008 which covers any employee with disability earning more than Rs. 25,000 per month, including their contribution to provident fund.[10]

3.2.1.3 Employment Through Poverty Alleviation

Through various schemes of poverty alleviation,[11] the government undertakes to fulfil 3 % reservation for disabled persons in both rural and urban areas. However, except for SJSRY, which is run at urban level and has achieved assistance for self-employment to 5 % disabled persons, the others schemes (run in rural centres) have level of assistance varying from 0.02 to 0.96 %, which is much lower than the targeted 3 %.

3.2.1.4 Promises of the Private Sector

The International Labour Organization (ILO), Geneva, in 2010 published the CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility) profiles (ILO, 2010) of 25 companies which describes how companies address hiring and retention, products and services, and CSR from the perspective of disability. Out of the 25 companies, at least 13 of them have offices in India: Accor, Cisco, Dow, Ernst & Young, Honda Motor, IBM, Marks & Spencer, Microsoft, MphasiS, Nokia, Samsung Electro-Mechanics, Sony, and Wipro.

Here is an excerpt from the blurb of the company called MphasiS (situated in Bangalore, India):

> … We are committed to being an equal opportunity employer, and encourage employment of otherwise qualified persons with disabilities. We have recruited over 320 persons with disabilities in various capacities across BPO, Applications, ITO and Corporate Support towers. …[12]

Furthermore, the government constituted a committee of experts including representatives from the corporate sector which identified 1065 jobs[13] at various

---

[10]Accessed from: http://www.disabilityaffairs.gov.in/content/page/incentive-scheme1.php.

[11]Some of these schemes are as follows: Swarnajayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY), Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY), Jawahar Gramin Samriddhi Yojana (JGSY), and Swarn Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana (SJSRY). The details of all such schemes can be found at http://www.indianyojana.com/.

[12]From: http://www.mphasis.com/csr_comm_initiative.html (accessed on 26 May 2016).

[13]From press release of the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment dated 13 August 2003, accessed from http://pib.nic.in/archive/releases98/lyr2003/raug2003/13082003/r1308200313.html.

levels. These figures give a rosy picture where the government, public,[14] and private sectors seem to be too willing to welcome disabled persons at workplace. But is it really so?

3.2.1.5 The Census and Other Figures

According to the 2011 Census, the workforce participation rate of persons with disabilities is as low as 36.34 % (constituting 26.04 % of main workers and 10.30 % of marginal workers); that is, a total of 97, 44,386 disabled persons are employed out of a total of 26,810,557 disabled persons.[15] This figure does not compare too badly with, and in fact is higher than, the 29.94 % rate of participation in the workforce among the general population. However, it constitutes only 2.68 % (a rise from 1.87 % in 2001) of total workforce, which is a sad reflection since even by governmental estimates 2.21 % of the total population of India is disabled, a low workforce rate of participation reflects higher levels of unemployment among disabled persons.

A well-known survey conducted in 1999 by NCPEDP (National Centre for Promotion of Employment for Disabled People) (NCPEDP, 1999) exposes an even grimmer reality, namely that the rate of workforce participation of disabled persons is as follows: public sector: 0.54 %; private sector: 0.28 %; and multinationals: 0.05 %. Unfortunately, these data have not been updated since the NCPEDP survey.

This is one way of viewing the state of employment among disabled persons. However, there is another way, which involves examining the various levels of work that employed disabled persons are engaged in.

3.2.1.6 Levels of Work

As indicated earlier, the Government of India set up a committee of experts to identify private sector jobs at various levels. This committee identified 120 executive/management/supervisor level jobs and 945 skilled/semi-skilled/unskilled level jobs in the private sector; this indicates an eightfold variation between the two broad levels. This is similar to the study in Kaye (2009) which reported a tenfold variation from 1.8 % among advertising, promotion, and PR managers to 19.7 % among dishwashers in the USA. In a more recent study (Ali et al., 2011), this variation between the levels showed up even among the unemployed. They reported that while 16.7 % of the unemployed non-disabled population worked as a

---

[14]The difference between public and government sector is a subtle one; a public sector undertaking is a company where 51 % or more of share capital is held by government, whereas a government company is where 100 % share capital is held by the government.

[15]These and all other figures are calculated from total disabled population figures in Census of India 2011, accessed from http://www.censusindia.gov.in/2011census/population_enumeration.html.

Table 3.1 NCO 2004 classification of levels of work and their associated qualifications

Level I	Up to 10 years of formal education and/or informal skills
Level II	11–13 years of formal education
Level III	14–15 years of formal education
Level IV	More than 15 years of formal education

Source NCO (2004: 17)

Table 3.2 NCO 2004 classification of types of work

Legislators, senior officials, and managers	None
Professionals	Level IV
Associate professionals	Level III
Clerks	Level II
Service workers and shop and market sales workers	Level II
Skilled agricultural and fishery workers	Level II
Craft and related trade workers	Level II
Plant and machine operators and assemblers	Level II
Elementary occupations	Level I

Source NCO (2004: 18)

Table 3.3 Census of India 2001 figures for disabled workforce across levels

Groups	Types of work	Number of disabled persons	Percentage within disabled workforce
Group I	Managers and professionals	3,372,242	44.62
Group II	Associate professionals	183,247	2.42
Group III	Other	4,000,560	52.94

professional in their most recent job, the figure was 7.74 % across all disabilities for among the disabled population. However, in services, the respective figures are 21.5 and 34.9 %, showing a clear difference in level of the most recent job held by a (non-)disabled person.

Looking at governmental jobs, the levels of work are dictated by the National Classification of Occupation (NCO, 2004: 17), which identifies four levels (see Table 3.1). The NCO (2004: 18) further associates types of work with specific levels (Table 3.2).

If we take the first two as one group (Group I), namely the executive level, and third as the second group (Group II) and the rest as the other (Group III), we obtain some figures from Census of India 2001 (Table 3.3), which is a computation of different levels of work, according to NCO (2004), culled from bigger set of data for types of work in 2001. Interestingly, these data, in terms of levels of work, were not computed for the latest census (2011).

However, if we also look at the percentage of the total workforce on India, then a dismal picture emerges as only 0.83 % disabled persons out of the total working

population of India are employed at Group I, 0.04 % at Group II, and 0.99 % at Group III. Thus, a clear case can be made that disabled workers at the top level still constitute a very low figure—only 0.83 % of the total working population. However, within the disabled working population, the percentage is high, namely 44.62 %, though the majority of disabled workers are employed at the lowest level, namely Group III.

3.2.1.7 Characterization of Workers

We see above that both the census figures and level of work perspectives provide a dismal picture of the rate of participation of disabled persons in the workforce and their levels. There is yet another aspect to it, namely the characterization of disabled workers as perceived by employers. Does that paint a dismal picture too?

Within the American tradition at least since Shafer et al. (1988), and most vocally in Kregel (1999), personal qualities such as productive, dedicated, responsible, reliability, inclusion in workplace culture, attendance, arriving to work, and returning from breaks on time have been stressed positively with regard to disabled workers. Although speed, quality, and independence are consistently rated as low, overall rating for work performance is quite high; that is, workers' performance in its entirety is considered satisfactory.

Even in the ILO (2010: 1) report, one business case for outlining the reason for hiring disabled persons is as follows: "People with disabilities make good, dependable employees. Many cases document comparable productivity, lower accident rates and higher job retention rates between employees with disabilities and a company's general workforce".

Further: "Hiring people with disabilities can contribute to the overall diversity, creativity and workplace morale and enhance a company's image among its staff, in the community and among customers".

However, against this rosy picture and good intentions, a close and careful reading of the existent literature reveals a world quite different, a world that in fact accounts for the massive fall (21.1 %) in employment among disabled persons in the USA in the period 1989–2000—the high period of the Americans with Disability Act (ADA), 1990; for valid reasons, therefore, this trend is identified as the anti-ADA backlash (Burkhauser et al., 2001). It was further revealed in a survey conducted in 2010 by Kessler Foundation and National Organization on Disability[16] that only 29 % of the companies had any disability policy or programme compared to 66 % in 1995. There are many reasons that were proffered for this so-called backlash, namely, that in the initial years of ADA, companies were merely complying, high recession in the country during the 1990s, employers' uncertainties over absenteeism, lesser productivity, accommodation, increase in

---

[16]Survey of Employment of American with Disabilities (2010).

health care cost incurred by a disabled employee, fear of legality, as well as the inability to find suitably qualified disabled employees.

Even in Shafer et al. (1988) and other works, it was noted that among the positive qualities of disabled workers were included the following as well: willingness to respond to employer supervision, accepting authority, loyalty to the company, and respect for authority. In other words, among the various other positive qualities, disabled workers are preferred because they are peaceful enough not to demand their rights or raise voice against mistreatment at workplace. However, Parent et al. (1996) report that disabled workers demand better jobs, increased earnings, changes in schedules and duties, promotion, career advancement, like any other group of workers.

In an interesting study, Kaye et al. (2011), using the method of structured projective questioning to remove social desirability bias, found over 80 % respondents agreeing to assign cost of accommodations, lack of awareness, and fear of legal liability as the top three reasons for employers not hiring and retaining disabled persons. A careful reading of this study also reveals a stunning fact (though not noted in the chapter) that whatever suggestions that are made in terms of practical or policy strategies for improving hiring and retention of disabled workers by employers and trainers (all non-disabled) are in fact, either external or systemic, absolving the employer of any accountability or responsibility in this regard. For example, in their Tables 4 and 5 (p. 532), practical strategies and policy strategies, respectively, are suggested, and responses sought. Among the findings, the ones that rank higher often contain suggestions such as external resources to get guidance on disability and accommodation requests, a government programme to pay for or subsidize reasonable accommodation for workers with disabilities, someone to come in and help solve disability- and accommodation-related issues without cost to the employer, an external mediation service, etc. In short, the suggestions have been designed to *fit in* the disabled person rather than any attempt to change the ethos of the workplace.

In summary, in spite of the rhetoric from both the state and private concerns, the reality in the workplace and the difference in the levels of work and characterization of workers indicate that there is no true diversity; in other words, as far as workplace is concerned, diversity is not welcome.

3.2.2 Disability and Educational Institutions

As per the census figures of 2001, the number of children across age groups and across disability attending school is not a major departure from the relevant figures with respect to the general population and is therefore comparable. For example, there is a steady increase in the number of children attending school from age 5 to age 12, a 507.7 % increase compared to a 330.22 % increase among the general population. Similarly as in the general case, there is a gradual fall from age 12 till age 17 which is 67.85 % as compared to 68.57 % in the general case. Finally, a

Table 3.4 Comparison of enrolment numbers at age 5 and age 19 across disabilities

Age	Disability	Persons
05	Mental	3473
19	Mental	3410
05	Hearing	2196
19	Hearing	2487
05	Speech	5876
19	Speech	5085
05	Visual	39,282
19	Visual	33,516
05	Locomotor	11,046
19	Locomotor	29,875
05	General	5,210,610
19	General	4,163,063

Source Culled from Census 2001, accessed from: censusindia. gov.in

sudden increase at age 18 (33.98 %) and a huge drop at age 19 (54.06 %) are noticed, again, as in the case of general children where the trend is a 25.18 % increase at age 18 followed by 52.80 % drop at age 19.

The somewhat erratic but nonetheless noticeable downward trend till age 17 is because the transition to upper primary and secondary is bad for all, especially wherever primary and upper primary classes are held in separate schools. Children with disabilities also have to face transition issues besides coping issues of the curriculum, etc. In this regard, note that the final figures across disability show hardly any increase between ages 5 and 19 (see Table 3.4).

For various reasons, there is a greater number of identification, followed by labelling, for locomotor disability than any other, and a combined average of enrolled children at age 19 is a false reflection of a more optimistic picture than it actually is. A truer picture emerges if we look at the percentage of disabled children not attending schools which ranges from a high 71.74 % for mental disability to a moderate 42.68 % for visual disability, which is still quite high as compared to the general class of children.

The percentage of total disabled and general population attending school at these ages (18/19) are 28.17/28.67 and 31.85/31.22 %, respectively, for disabled and general children. However, it must be pointed out that exactly like in the case of rate of participation in the workforce (see Sect. 3.2.1.5), on average, disabled children constitute a mere 1.63 % of general children going to school, which is way lower than the percentage of disabled population. Interestingly enough, Census 2011 completely bypassed the measure of enrolment of disabled children; thus, unlike in 2001, there is no table titled "Disabled population by type of disability, age and sex

for India for Attending Educational Institute" in 2011; therefore, there is no census update for the enrolment figures for children with disability.[17]

3.2.2.1 Special Education/School

In an earlier work (Bhattacharya, 2010a), I have shown that the more modern the policies are with regard to education of disabled children, the rhetoric and metaphor of special schools attain more significance. That is, although not an integral part of the National Policy on Education (NPE) 1968, NPE 1986 onwards—for example, the Programme of Action (POA) 1992,[18] Person with Disabilities Act (PwD) 1995 —special education/schools attain prominence, so much so that in POA 1992, the largest section is devoted to "Education in Special Schools".

I further show (in Bhattacharya, 2010b) that segregation as a political practice was already well established and therefore offered itself readily to act as an instrument for the promotion of special education during Enlightenment in the eighteenth century in Europe, especially in France where under the influence of Enlightenment, social concerns, dignity, and self-respect attained more importance than questions about God; the ideas of Enlightenment were "germane to the development of special education" (Winzer, 1993: 4). The connection between segregation and special education is nowhere more prominently spotlighted than in the case of education of African American children in the USA. This clearly stated in Allen (2010: 37):

> … America's historical suppression of people of African descent through slavery, limited citizenship, and government sanctioned segregation serves as a noteworthy prologue to the unique educational plight of African Americans today.

He further points out that laws in many "Southern states prohibited the teaching of Blacks [sic] to read and write through statutes created within their states" (p. 38). As a result of this pre-existing model of segregation, by the early twentieth century, special education classes were disproportionately comprised of African America children. Blanchett (2006: 25) notes that special education is the "new legalized form of structural segregation and racism".

I would claim that within the Indian context, this connection between segregation and special education is shown by five factors: (i) segregationist practices in women's education, 1948–1949 University Education Commission; (ii) consistent use of integration as the operative term; (iii) emphasis on special education (e.g. B. Ed., Special Education, of the Rehabilitation Council of India); (iv) home-based education, distance education; and (v) directly encouraging the role of NGOs in imparting special education as a sign of evading state responsibilities.

---

[17]However, there is some data available in the form of an update of the enrolment number of disabled children in the Annual Reports of the MHRD; see discussion in Sect. 3.2.2.2.

[18]POA 1992 refers to a revised version of POA 1986, the latter designed to implement successfully the National Policy on Education, 1986.

The University Education Commission of 1948–1949 (Ministry of Education, 1962), which included eminent learned men such as Sarvepalli Radhakishnan and Zakir Husain, the two former presidents of India, carefully prepared a document that laid out in detail, among other things, the future of women's education in India. Many insightful declarations, like the following, can be found in that report:

> There cannot be an educated people without educated women. If general education had to be limited to men or to women, that opportunity should be given to women, for then it would most surely be passed on to the next generation. (p. 343)

Alongside such sentiments, one can, however, also find statements like the following which (in)directly contribute to an emergent idea of "special" courses for women:

> The greatest profession of women is, and probably will continue to be, that of home maker. (p. 345)

> A well-ordered home helps to make well-ordered men. … Probably there would be no quicker way to raise the general standard of economy and efficiency in Indian life than to make women interested and competent in the efficient, economical and convenient planning and management of their homes. (p. 346)

Special courses that are justified for women are home economics, nursing, teaching (primary and secondary schools), and the fine arts as the desirable vocations for women. This "redirection of interest" (p. 349) for women's education to less valued courses, I believe, would have considerably reduced their career opportunities and therefore economic independence. This in turn results in "segregation" if the latter is understood as involving "the separation of socially defined groups in space" (Massey et al., 2009: 74).

Furthermore, as pointed out in Bhattacharya (2010a: 19), as we move from NPE 1968 to POA 1992 and PwD 1995, the concept of "integration" and not "inclusion" takes over, along with the progressive emergence of the prominence of special schools in these policies and acts. It was also pointed (p. 19) that although the Comprehensive Action Plan of the Inclusion in Education of Children and Youth with Disability (IECYD), 2005, does address some of these concerns, it in turn gives rise to a new monster by the name of home-based and distance education for children/youth with disabilities, which directly encourages spatial segregation of PwDs by confining them to home. In addition, in the domain of designing assistive devices or special teaching material for training purposes, for that matter, for setting up teachers' training institutes, the PwD 1995 Act clearly considers non-governmental organizations as potential agents of change, thereby indirectly evading state responsibilities (Articles 28 and 29 of Chapter V).

The above discussion highlights the transformation from special education to special schools, a change from an educational philosophy with roots into European Enlightenment, to a segregated space. The representation *education* to *schools* in this context is highly significant as noted by Erevelles (2005). The change from *services* to *place* took place to maintain the "demands for conformity and

rationality" (Erevelles, 2005: 72, quoted in Ferri, 2008: 418). Ferri (2008) expresses similar concerns when she comments that we label students rather than classroom practices (or teachers) as deficient, disordered, disabled.

One can thus realize that as in the case of workforce participation (concluded above at the end of Sect. 3.2.1.7), there is no true diversity in education of children with disabilities as the instrument of special education via special schools clearly marks out a separate space for those children.

3.2.2.2 Inclusion

Against this background of the segregationist view of special *education* (converted in practice to special *schools*), the idea of inclusion was posed as an antidote. Within the context of India, the only policy so far that actually mentions the word "inclusion" in the title of the policy is IECYD, or Inclusion in Education of Children and Youth with Disability, that was proposed by the Ministry of Human Resources and Development, Government of India, in 2005. This policy had a successful precursor, IEDC (Integrated Education for Disabled Children) scheme launched in 1974. However, by 1997, IEDC was being merged with other educational schemes such as SSA (Sarva Siksha Aviyan) and DPEP (District Primary Education Programme) [(Education of Children with Special Needs (ECSN), 2006: 6]. By 2002, this amalgamated scheme, aimed at providing educational opportunities for children with disabilities, to facilitate their achievements and retention, was extended to 41,875 schools, with more than 1,33,000 disabled children in 27 states and 4 Union territories (ECSN, 2006: 7). As per the 2005–2006 Annual Report of the MHRD on school education and literacy, the total number of disabled children enrolled was 15.85 lakh which represents almost 77 % of the nearly 20.14 lakh disabled children identified (Annual Report 2005–06: 75). The figures for 2013–2014 and 2014–2015, respectively, are 21.74 and 25.03 lakhs of children with special needs enrolled in schools, showing expected increase from 2005 to 2006 figures above.

However, IEDC was formally replaced by a new scheme under the name of Inclusive Education for Disabled at Secondary Stage (IEDSS) in 2009 to provide assistance for inclusive education of disabled children in classes IX–XII (Annual Report, 2013–14: 45), whereas primary education of disabled children falls under the purview of the SSA via its emphasis on inclusive education (ibid.: 187). Table 3.5 shows the enrolment figures from 2009 to 2015 (based on Annual Report 2013–14: 189 and from the MHRD, IEDSS site[19]):

Although the above table shows a steady and expected increase (barring 2011–2013) in enrolment figures for CWSN, the figures for children out of school and dropouts need to be also considered for assessing any programme of inclusive education. The National Sample Survey figures show that disabled children

---

[19]http://mhrd.gov.in/iedss (accessed May 2016).

Table 3.5 Children with special needs (CWSN) covered/approved to be covered under IEDSS 2009–2010 to 2014–2015

Year	CWSN covered/approved
2009–10	76,242
2010–11	146,292
2011–12	138,586
2012–13	81,207
2013–14	170,349[a]
2014–15	211,393

[a]There is a discrepancy in this figure between the MHRD Website figure (the one given here) and the one in the Annual Report (2013–14: 189), which is 123,356

constitute the highest percentage of 28.07 % among the out of school children, whereas the figure for all children out of school is 2.97 % (NSS,[20] 2014: 9). Unfortunately, the dropout rates (from classes IX–XII) are available only for 4 states as only 5 states returned any data out of which the figures for Nagaland are only available for 2011–2012. The figures for 2011–2012 for the other 4 states, namely Haryana, Odisha, Tamil Nadu, and Andaman and Nicobar Islands, all show a percentage increase from 2010 to 2011 in the range of 209 % for Haryana to 8.27 % for Tamil Nadu.[21]

Thus, both the out of school and the dropout figures of disabled children paint a much grimmer picture of the success of inclusive education policies of the government.

3.2.2.3 The True Nature of Inclusion

In spite of the argument in favour of inclusion in terms of the enrolment figures in Table 3.5, as pointed out towards the end of the previous section, the reality at the ground level is rather different. Often, it is some form of integration that the school practices which goes by the name of inclusion. Even the Centre for the Study of Inclusive Education (CSIE), well-known for its aggressive advocacy for inclusive education in the UK, accepts in its charter that some children with special educational needs can spend part of their time outside the ordinary classroom:

> Time spent out of the ordinary classroom for appropriate individual or group work on a part-time basis is not segregation. Neither is removal for therapy or because of disruption, provided it is time-limited, for a specified purpose…. Any time-out from the ordinary classroom should not affect a student's right to full membership of the mainstream (Thomas and Vaughn, 2004: 137, quoted in Norwich, 2008: 137).

Furthermore, as Norwich (2008) shows, based on an international study conducted across three countries, the most common resolution preferred by 132 policy

---

[20]National Sample Survey Estimation of Out-of-School Children in the Age 6–13 in India. Draft Report, 2014.

[21]These calculations are based on NCERT (2013).

makers and teachers for the placement dilemma for children with severe disabilities was a balance between included and separated provisions and a recognition of a reduced but persistent role of special schools.

Also, as noted in Bhattacharya (2010a), in terms of personal and social characteristics, experiences of deaf students in mainstream schools/classes have been found to be less positive than in deaf schools or separate classes. Similar results were obtained for self-esteem, measured in the Piers-Harris self-esteem scale.[22] In fact, one study (Murphy and Newlon, 1987) found post-secondary deaf students to be significantly lonelier than hearing students in mainstream classes. In general, for deaf students, the social environment of special schools and separate classes appear to be more positive than mainstream or general education classes.

These points argue for a mixed mode model where difference is preferably neutralized to achieve a certain unwritten, tacit equilibrium in the classroom. Inclusion here becomes what Hodkinson (2012: 7) terms, following Žižek (2009: 116), "part of a no-part"; in effect, it disfavours diversity and includes disabled persons merely as a spectacle since such inclusion is often restricted to the social sphere such as assemblies and mealtimes.

3.3   Conclusion: Diversity, not Inclusion, Is the Key

With respect to both participation in workforce and being included in regular schools, we have seen above that in spite of the rhetoric to the contrary, participation of disabled persons remains a mere Žižekian *part of a no-part*; that is, although they are included in the ambit of the organization or institution, they are not really included in activities that *they* would like to participate in. Thus, disabled persons are either not truly absorbed in an organization or are taken in through a school-within-school model.

In this connection, it is relevant to remember an important distinction that has been made (Fraser, 2000; Taylor, 1994) between *inclusion* as the notion that everybody is the same regardless of race, gender, disability, or sexual orientation and *recognition*, that demands a change in the basic norms by which a society is governed. Inclusion, in this view, leads to assimilation within the dominant culture at the cost of denial of other cultures[23]: "exclusion and assimilation are two sides of

---

[22]Pier-Harris Children's self-concept scale (Piers and Harris, 1969) is a widely used measure for children's self-esteem; it contains 80 statements about the self to which the child responds "yes" or "no". Out of these total scores are calculated which decide negative or positive values of self-esteem.

[23]However, in Bhattacharya (2014), I make the claim for the notion of "integrative difference" (ID) as the key to true inclusion, a position that accommodates, rather than contrasts, the present view. ID is shown to operate through a process of constant negotiation of the centre of knowledge in a curriculum whereby a disability centric knowledge system can be generated, empowering the disabled child in the classroom.

the same story" (Arneil, 2006: 21). Justice, therefore, requires the recognition of difference and the protection of cultural diversity. Thus, striving for identity may involve advocacy for inclusion through equality of treatment, or diversity and difference through preservation of difference; but it is only the latter that ensures preservation of rights of disabled persons.

The shift from service to advocacy, which clearly marks the beginning of the disability rights movement both in India and elsewhere, is a change that indicates recognition of diversity. This recognition, according to the proposals made in this chapter, is able to generate non-functional social capital (see Sect. 3.1.3.2) that can be "measured" and "quantified" for necessary interpretation through the lens of the disability experience. This instrumentalization of an interpretive concept like disability will afford a better understanding of the true nature of diversity that can address current imbalances at workplace and in institutions for disabled persons.

References

Ali, M., Schur, L., & Blanck, P. (2011). What types of jobs do people with disabilities want? *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation, 21*, 199–210.

Allen, A. G. (2010). *A critical race theory analysis of the disproportionate representation of Blacks and males participating in Florida's special education programmes* (Doctoral dissertation). Boca Raton, FL: Florida Atlantic University.

Arneil, B. (2006). *Diverse communities: The problem with social capital*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bhattacharya, T. (2010a). Re-examining issues of inclusion in education. *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLV(16):18–25.

Bhattacharya, T. (2010b). *Education of students with disabilities: An evaluation of the Indian educational policies*. Paper presented at the international EDICT 2010 (enabling access to education through ICT) conference.

Bhattacharya, T. (2012). *Diversity at workplace and in education*. Paper presented at interrogating disability: Theory and practice conference held at the Institute of Development Studies Kolkata, September 27–29.

Bhattacharya, T. (2014). *Are we all alike: Questioning the pathologies of the normate*. Paper presented at the inequalities in India conference at the University of Delhi, 27–29 November.

Bhattacharya, T., & Hidam, G. S. (2011). Space-machine. In *Proceedings of Episteme 4, international conference to review research on science, technology and mathematics education*. Mumbai: Homi Bhaba Centre for Science.

Biklen, D. (2005). *Autism and the myth of the person alone*. New York: New York University Press.

Blanchett, W. (2006). Disproportional representation of African America students in special education: Acknowledging the role of White privilege and racism. *Educational Researcher, 35*(6), 24–28.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Slough: Greenwood Press.

Burkhauser, R. V., Daly, M. C., & Houtenville, A. J. (2001). How working age people with disabilities fared over the 1990s business cycle. In P. Budetti, R. V. Burkhauser, J. Gregory, & H. A. Hunt (Eds.), *Ensuring health and income security for an aging workforce* (pp. 291–346). Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Coleman, J. S. (1990). *Foundations of social theory*. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.

Coser, L. (1978). American trends. In T. Bottomore, & P. Nisbet (Eds.), *A history of biography studies*, 6(1), 85–94.

Danermark, B., & Gellerstedt, C. (2010). Social justice: Redistribution and recognition—A non-reductionist perspective on disability. *Disability and Society, 19*(4), 339–353.

Davis, J. (1981). *Sociological construction of deviance: Perspectives and issues in the Field*. Dubuqu: William C. Brown.

EdCIL (India) Ltd., & SRI. (2014). *National sample survey estimation of out-of-school children in the age 6–13 in India, Draft Report*.

Erevelles, N. (2005). Rewriting critical pedagogy from the periphery. In S. Gabel (Ed.), *Disability studies in education: Readings in theory and method* (pp. 65–83). New York: Peter Lang.

Ferri, B. A. (2008). Doing a (dis)service: Reimagining special education from a disability studies perspective. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *The handbook of social justice in education*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Fraser, N. (2000). Rethinking recognition. *New Left Review, 3*, 107–120.

Ghai, A. (2015). *Rethinking disability in India*. New Delhi: Routledge.

Giddens, A. (1986). *The constitution of society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gilman, S. L. (1985). *Difference and pathology: Stereotypes of sexuality, race, and madness*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Hauser, M. D., Chomsky, N., & Fitch, T. W. (2002). The faculty of language: What is it, who has it, and how did it evolve? *Science, 298*, 1569–1579.

Hodkinson, A. (2012). Illusionary inclusion—What went wrong with New Labour's landmark educational policy? *British Journal of Special Education, 39*(1), 4–11.

ILO. (2010). *Disability in the workplace: Company practices* (Working Paper No 3). Geneva: Bureau for Employers' Activities and Skills and Employability Department.

Kaye, H. S., Jans, L. H., & Jones, E. C. (2011). Why don't employers hire and retain workers with disabilities? *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation, 21*, 526–536.

Kaye, S. H. (2009). Stuck at the bottom rung: Occupational characteristics of workers with disability. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation, 19*, 115–128.

Keller, E. F. (1985/1995). *Reflections on gender and science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Kregel, J. (1999). Why it pays to hire workers with developmental disabilities. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities, 14*(3), 130–139.

Krishna, A., & Uphoff, N. (1999). Mapping and measuring social capital: A conceptual and empirical study of collective action for conserving and developing watersheds in Rajasthan, India. *Social capital initiative* (Working Paper No. 13). Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Kudlick, C. J. (2001). The outlook of the problem and the problem with the Outlook. In P. Longmore & L. Umansky (Eds.), *The new disability history: American perspectives* (pp. 187–213). New York: New York University Press.

Kymlicka, W. (1992). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lazer, D., Pentland, A., Adamic, L., Aral, S., Barabási, A.-L., Brewer, D., et al. (2009). Computational social science. *Science, 323*, 721–723.

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1966). *The savage mind*. London: Weidenfeld.

Linton, S. (1998). *Claiming disability: Knowledge and identity*. New York and London: New York University Press.

Lundberg, G. A. (1926). Case work and the statistical method. *Social Forces, 5*, 61–65.

Massey, D. S., Rothwell, J., & Domina, T. (2009). The changing bases of segregation in the United States. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 626*, 74–90.

Matza, D. (1969). *Becoming deviant*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

McCagg, W. O., & Siegelbaum, L. (1989). Introduction. In *The disabled in the Soviet Union: Past and present, theory and practice*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Ministry of Education. (1962). *Report of the University Education Commission* (December 1948–August 1949), Publication No. 606. New Delhi: Government of India.

Mitra, S., & Sambamoorthi, U. (2006). Employment of PWDs: Evidence from the National Sample Survey. *Economic and Political Weekly*, January 21; 41(3), 199–203.

Morris, D. B. (1991). *The culture of pain*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Murphy, J., & Newlon, B. (1987). Loneliness and the mainstreamed hearing-impaired college student. *American Annals of the Deaf, 132*, 21–25.

NCERT. (2013). *Evaluation of the implementation of the scheme IEDSS in India*. New Delhi: NCERT.

NCPEDP. (1999). *Employment practices of the corporate sector*. Delhi: NCPEDP.

Norwich, B. (2008). What future for special schools and inclusion? Conceptual and professional perspectives. *British Journal of Special Education, 35*(3), 136–143.

O'Keefe, P. (2009). *People with disabilities in India: From commitments to outcomes*. Washington, DC: World Bank. http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2009/07/11027298/people-disabilities-india-commitments-outcomes

Parent, W., Kregel, J., & Johnson, A. (1996). Consumer satisfaction: A survey of individuals with disabilities who receive supported employment services. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilites, 11*, 207–221.

Piers, E. V., & Harris, D. B. (1969). *Manual for Piers-Harris children's self-concept scale (The way I feel about myself)*. Nashville, Tennessee: Counsellor Recordings & Tests.

Plummer, K. (2001). *Documents of life 2*. London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Touchstone.

Radford, J. P. (1994). Intellectual disability and the heritage of modernity. In M. H. Rioux, & M. Bach (Eds.), *Disability is not measles: New research paradigms in disability*. Institut Roeher: North York, Ontario.

Rudenstine, N. L. (2001). Student diversity and higher learning. In G. Orfield (Ed.), *Diversity challenged: Evidence of the impact of affirmative action* (pp. 31–48). Cambridge, UK: Harvard Education.

Rungta, S. K. (2004). *Training and employment of PWDs: India 2002*. International Labour Organization: Ability Asia Country Study Series.

Shafer, M., Kregel, J., Banks, P. D., & Hill, M. (1988). What does the boss think? An analysis of employer evaluations of workers with mental retardation. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 9*, 377–391.

Snodgrass, J. (1976). Clifford R. Shaw and Henry D. McKay: Chicago criminologists. *British Journal of Criminology, 16*, 1–19.

Stouffer, S. A. (1930). Experimental comparison of statistical and case history methods in attitude research. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Chicago.

Supalla, T. (1986). The classifier system in American sign language. In Collette Craig (Ed.), *Noun classes and categorization*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Taylor, C. (1994). The politics of recognition. In A. Gutman (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition* (pp. 25–73). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Thomas, J. (1983). Toward a critical ethnography: A reexamination of the Chicago legacy. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 11*(4), 477–490.

Thomas, G., & Vaughn, M. (2004). *Inclusive education: A reader*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Winzer, M. A. (1993). *The history of special education: From isolation to integration*. Washington, DC: Gallauded University Press.

Zborowski, M. (1960). *People in pain*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Žižek, S. (2009). *In defense of lost causes*. London: Verso.

Other Sources

Census of India. (2001). Registrar General of India (censusindia.gov.in).

Census of India. (2011). Registrar General of India (censusindia.gov.in).

Department of School Education and Literacy, Annual Reports 2005–06; 2012–13; 2013–14; 2014–15, Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), Government of India.

Directorate General of Employment & Training. (2004). National classification of occupations, Ministry of Labour, Government of India.

Education of Children with Special Needs (Position Paper of National Focus Group). (2006). National Council of Educational Research and Training.

International Labour Organization (ILO). (1983). Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment (Disabled Persons) Convention (No. 159), http://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO:12100:P12100_INSTRUMENT_ID:312304:NO

Ministry of Human Resource Development. (2005). Inclusion in Education of Children and Youth with Disability, Government of India.

National Policy for Persons with Disabilities. (2006). No. 3-1/1993-DD.III, Government of India, Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment.

Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act. (1995). Ministry of Human Resources and Development, Government of India.

Survey of Employment of Americans with Disabilities. (2010, October). Conducted by Harris initiative for Kessler Foundation and National Organization on Disability. New York, NY: Harris Interactive. http://www.2010disabilitysurveys.org/octsurvey/pdfs/surveyresults.pdf

The Central Civil Services (Classification, Control, and Appeal) Rules. (1965).