



LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

2011-01-10

Raising Awareness for Disability

Can Disability Be Mainstreamed in
Development?

Department of Human Geography

University of Lund, Sweden

Utvecklingsstudier, kandidatkurs UTVK01

Autumn 2010

Author: Michael Wunsch

Examiner: Franz-Michael Rundquist

Supervisor: Lena Christensen

Copyright © Michael Wunsch 2011

All rights reserved. This document may be quoted and reproduced, provided the source is given.

Contents

List of Abbreviations:.....	I
Abstract.....	II
I Introduction.....	1
1 Research Purpose.....	1
2 Research Question.....	2
3 Delimitation.....	2
4 Theory.....	4
5 Method and Material.....	5
II Analysis.....	6
1 What Is Disability?.....	6
1.1 Defining Disability.....	6
1.2 Measuring Disability.....	9
1.3 Counteracting Disability.....	9
1.4 Disability and Development.....	10
1.5 Conclusion.....	11
2 Why Does Disability Matter?.....	11
2.1 Economic Reasons.....	12
2.2 Human Rights as Reason.....	13
2.3 Disability and Gender.....	14
2.4 Recent Developmental Reasons.....	15
2.5 Future Developmental Reasons.....	16
2.6 Conclusion.....	18
3 Lessons from Gender-mainstreaming.....	18
3.1 What Is Gender?.....	19
3.2 What Is Mainstreaming?.....	19
3.3 Short History.....	21
3.4 Strength and Opportunities.....	22
3.5 Weaknesses and Risks.....	23
3.6 Conclusion.....	26
4 Mainstreaming Disability?.....	27
4.1 Short History.....	27
4.2 Specific Characteristics of Disability.....	28
4.3 Conclusion.....	31
III Conclusion.....	34
IV Summary.....	35
V List of References.....	37

List of Abbreviations:

CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis
DfID	Department for International Development
DPO	Disabled People's Organisation
ECOSOC	United Nations Economic and Social Council
EDF	European Disability Forum
EU	European Union
GAD	Gender and Development
GTZ	German Society for Technical Cooperation (since January 2011: German Society for International Cooperation (GIZ))
MDG	United Nations Millennium Development Goal
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
SAP	Structural Adjustment Programmes
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
UN	United Nations
UNSTAT	United Nations Statistics Division
VSO	Voluntary Service Overseas
WHO	World Health Organization
WID	Women in Development

Abstract

In the broader context of an increasing awareness of perspectives that for long have been a taboo in development thinking, such as ecology and gender questions, this study focuses on the subject of disability in development. By raising the question if disability can be mainstreamed the subject of disability will be compared with what can be learned from gender-mainstreaming. Conducted as a critical discourse analysis, this study examines discourses of disability, especially the social model of disability. The results aim at strengthening the inclusiveness of policy approaches by advocating a multi-perspective approach to development in general and preparing the inclusion of the needs of disability in development especially.

Keywords: Development, Disability, Mainstreaming, Institutional Change, Discourse, Raising Awareness.

Raising Awareness for Disability

Can Disability Be Mainstreamed in Development?

I Introduction

Disability as a social and cultural phenomenon, causes, as will be explained below, unemployment, poverty, discrimination, human rights violations, abuse, and other similarly adverse effects. Albeit these demanding reasons, disability is not represented sufficiently within development action and thinking. This neglect of disabled peoples' needs by the development community has many negative implications for their lives especially as disabled people in developing countries often face particularly harsh conditions in addition to the already difficult reality of poverty. Met by stigma and neglect, people with impairments are oftentimes banned to the lowest strata of society and are denied work, family and dignity.

For a considerably long time, organisations for disabled people (DPO) have fought for the rights of their members. This means that policies and strategies had to be devised that on the one hand aim at the needs and wishes of disabled people and on the other hand raise awareness for this issue in society. This paper will examine one method of counteracting disability: disability-mainstreaming. If mainstreaming can be demonstrated to fulfil three tasks – to be a powerful tool that keeps its promise of inclusion, to fit the characteristics of disability issues and to generate positive effects for people with impairment – it can be concluded that mainstreaming might constitute an approach that indeed reaches the goals of inclusion and awareness raising. If, however, disability-mainstreaming is potentially harmful for the goals of enhancing the situations of disabled people, there might be the need for it to be stalled. This study will give an in-depth analysis of the potential of disability-mainstreaming.

1 Research Purpose

If development means progress for all, the definition inherently holds that all parts of society have to be integrated in the progress (see Albert & Hurst 2005:3). As some

people experience less chances to find a medium through which to formulate their needs and wishes it is utterly important for a society to prepare the instruments with which this can be made possible. It would be counter-productive to see disabled persons as sheer victims of their impairments, however. Therefore, these very instruments have to be enabling on many different levels and foster the productivity and creativity of people that live with impairments. For me, this aim has a purpose in itself. Furthermore, there is much to gain for the field of development from including disabled persons in developmental processes as will be further outlined in this study.

Therefore, the research in this paper finds its purpose in the need for including disabled people in development, firstly because of the values that can be gained for the economy and society in large. Secondly and more importantly this paper has the intention to represent disabled people and their intrinsic value as individuals.

With and on this socio-political background this study will focus on the approach of mainstreaming. The reason for excising this particular approach from the rest of the development body is that the few recent efforts for including disability in the field of development have focused on this particular approach. Testing the effectiveness and usability of this approach will show if it can stand up to its promises.

2 Research Question

The two research questions that will be examined in this paper are:

1. What is disability and why does it matter for development?, and
2. Does mainstreaming disability present a solution?

The first question outlines the case of disability in development. It compares arguments for the implementation of the subject of disability into development thinking.

Question number two seeks to identify if disability-mainstreaming is a viable solution by comparing the subject of gender with the subject of disability. It gives reason to study the effects that gender-mainstreaming has had on the organizational structure of development agents and the contents of applied policies of these organs.

3 Delimitation

This chapter will delineate the borders of topics within which this paper operates and define terms that have to be put into context.

First and foremost, this paper examines the topic of disability in development research and action. Subsequently, this work will merge the young field of disability studies with a more established field of development. This interdisciplinary approach is hoped to

give a better understanding of the interconnectedness of these two topics. This study does however not carry out any research concerning the development of disability or development disability which are two topics holding very similar descriptions to the one studied here. The following paragraphs will give an outline on what is meant by disability in development in this paper.

The term “development” on the one hand can be seen as describing a progress of a country or region towards an economic, social, cultural or otherwise enhanced status. The word “development” does not only carry positive connotations but can also be linked to negative aspects, such as dependency of poorer countries on wealthier ones, loss of culture and identity or the violation of human rights (see Potter et al. 2004:4). This paper will refer to development as a complex and spatially differing “field” (meaning a subject or topic with distinct actors) in which many people from different societies are engaged. Development as a “field” (comprising of research, aid, policies and other theoretical and practical action and populated by actors and receivers) originated and is perpetuated by global interests of wealth and power and of goodwill and philanthropy. Through this differentiation of the actors within development it is made possible to distinguish the varying approaches towards certain issues in the field of development by different actors. “Developing”, “developed” and “less developed” countries are terms that will be used in the meaning provided by those that are referred to.

The term “disability” on the other hand is understood in this paper as referring to any disadvantage that a person might encounter through the existence of an impairment. Although there will be a further investigation concerning the terms “disability” and “impairment” it is important to stress one thing: There is a distinct line between disability and impairment. An impairment is a deviation from the norm of how society sees a human body to function normally. Disability comes into being through the interaction between the person with impairment and society's norms. The relations between disability and impairment, impairment and society and disability and society are therefore seen as social constructs in this paper. As will be outlined later (see chapter 1.1), there are different discourses regarding disability and impairment.

When it comes to labelling the phenomenon of disability, there seems to be a form of dissonance between different actors (see Yeo 2001:3). EDF explicitly states that it is to be called “disabled person”, mirroring the passiveness of how a person becomes disabled, and “a person with impairment” (EDF 2002:4). Opposite to the definition, Davis describes that “the term 'person with disabilities' is preferred by many to 'disabled person' since the former term implies a quality added to someone's personhood rather than the second term's reduction of the person to the disability” (Davis 1995:XIII). If however considering both, impairment and disability being constructed by society, it follows that these phenomena are non-existent outside society. Just as terms specifying “ethnicity” and “gender” have changed with taste and fashion of the *Zeitgeist*, words describing disability and impairment will shift. It might therefore not be crucial how a phenomenon is labelled but how it is understood. My choice of terms will be “disabled

persons” and “persons with impairments”, which follows a form of convenience (easy to read, widely established).

Mainstreaming is described very differently by different actors (see chapter 3.2): a tool, a process, a strategy, etc. I will use the term “approach”. This word has a more general meaning and reflects the connotation of the overarching characteristics in societal organisations of mainstreaming.

I will come to explain selected discourses surrounding disability, notably called “models of disability”. The respective selection mainly aims at giving an overview on the topics that are of importance for the study of disability in development. Therefore I do not wish to give an exhaustive list of all understandings that encompass disability.

4 Theory

The analysis of disability in the field of development and of the approach of mainstreaming contained in this study rests on a combination of critical discourse analysis towards reading and analysing texts and a multi-perspective approach towards the topic of disability (as described in Devlieger et al. 2003:9-16). Through combination of these two approaches I hope to give a dense understanding of the aspects discussed in this paper.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is concerned about the way in which language as “social practice” (as glossed by Fairclough 2001:18), in the form of texts, visualisations or spoken language, take part in forming the individuals apprehension of life (Goodley 2010:104). The production and consumption of texts influences structures and processes in society (Jorgensen & Phillips 2002:61). Discourse as a social action in history constitutes society and culture and communicates ideologies (van Dijk in Schiffrin et al. 2003: chapter 18.0; Jorgensen & Phillips 2002:63) while self being impacted by other social practices (Jorgensen & Phillips 2002:61f). CDA focuses on social problems that arise from the uncritical usage of discourse in society and “primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context” (van Dijk in Schiffrin et al. 2003: chapter 18.0). Certain institutions and groups of individuals have the ability to control the acts and minds of other members of society. Their social power emanates from “privileged access to social resources” (ibid. chapter 18.1.2). By executing power through the use of “force, money, status, fame, knowledge, information, 'culture', or indeed various forms of public discourse and communication” (ibid.) these institutions and groups have the opportunity to alter and control predominant discourses and, thus, to alter and control the acts and minds of others.

Thereby, language determines in part in how a person defines her identity and her body. The comprehension of a somatic distinction changes between societies, while being connected to a linguistic realm (see Reynolds Whyte in Ingstad & Reynolds Whyte

1995:267-274). Socio-political institutions in the meantime possess a wide influence on how language is being used and communicated. Therefore, this paper will look on how societal actors shape and control in which way disability is being understood by usage of textual representations.

5 Method and Material

The research underlying this paper is conducted as a comparative study of literature in the form of a CDA. From the outset it has the objective to explore different descriptions of disability. A working definition of disability will be formed by investigating the opinions and arguments regarding this topic in different discourses. Simultaneously, gathered information about gender is providing experiences from a previously mainstreamed issues which will supply a fix-point to compare the subject of disability with.

On a step by step basis, the composition of argumentation in this paper is conducted by the following outline:

1. Through resources provided by the university, information in form of official research papers, formal organisational documents and informatory material by state agencies are searched. Different sources are scanned for respective topic – gender, mainstreaming and disability.
2. Hereupon, the conduction of a CDA concerning the understandings of mainstreaming and disability, parallel to an analysis of the negative and positive effects of gender-mainstreaming, examines the usability of mainstreaming as an approach in raising awareness for disability.
3. Finally, the gathered, compressed and compared information is assembled to form the multi-perspective conclusion of this paper. Herein lie most of the authors contributions to the topic.

Concerning material used for this study, such as studies, text books, handbooks, governmental documents and so on, some problems were encountered. These will be described in the following paragraphs.

As information about disability and disability-mainstreaming is scarce in development studies, there is a slight overbalance towards gender issues when it comes to literature. This results in two problems: Literature on disability and mainstreaming can be unrepresentative and lacking informed composition of data and information. A cautious comparison and thorough scrutinization of the literature available, however, has provided reliable information on the topic. At the same time, an overwhelming body of literature from gender related studies has made the task to find workable definitions for gender-mainstreaming without getting caught in a tight net of differing definitions difficult. Once again the comparison of the available literature has given a reliable tool

in selecting works that are significant for this study.

Works cited in this paper are of formal character, either through commissioning by official development bodies, such as the World Bank or the UN, or through being written by researchers. Credibility is secured through cross-references on critical issues. Due to the lack of research relating to disability in development however it is impossible to give a full picture of disability in developing countries.

As far as the case of the research questions that this paper seeks to answer are concerned, documents by developmental DPOs give valuable insights into the application of mainstreaming and respectively DPO's understandings of gender and disability. Although not being purely scientific texts, there is a variety of information that can be derived from them. It is mainly approaches and understandings towards disability that will, once examined, give insights into the workings of the community surrounding disability and development.

II Analysis

1 What Is Disability?

This chapter gives a short introduction to the subject of disability. It tries to depict the main divergences of different models of disability. Furthermore it gives a short overview of the problems connected with measuring the phenomenon of disability and how it is actively being counteracted. The chapter will close with examining the relations between disability and development.

1.1 Defining Disability

Disability as a concept holds a certain set of particular traits. As it does not offer any simple definition on what it is and who can be labelled disabled (Harriss-White 1996:3f, 5; EDF 2002:12) it is difficult to be described in simple terms. The WHO, describes disability as a “restriction or lack (resulting from an impairment) of ability to perform an activity in the manner or within the range considered normal for a human being” (WHO 1980:27-29) and UNSTAT adds that “disabilities are descriptions of disturbances in function at the level of the person” (UNSTAT 1990:1). The picture of disability drawn here can be viewed as medicinal, where the disabling factor has to be searched for at the individual's level and can be found in an impairment. This definition is part of the individual model of disability. The individual model of disability comprises of the medical and the charitable approach to disability (see chapter 1.3). It predetermines that

human nature possesses certain attributes that can be described as “normal” and “healthy”. Everything outside this range can be seen as “abnormal” or “unhealthy”.

Societal differences in defining disability and what is seen as being “normal” are however diverse and changing. Exemplifying the regional differences in the view on disability, Helander gives a definition that pays respect to the aspect that concepts regarding disability always are socially produced: A disabled person is “a person who in his/her society is regarded as disabled, because of difference in appearance and/or behaviour” (Helander 1999:11, for other examples on cultural differences see for example Hendriks 2009:13; Coleridge in Stone 1999:149-167). Thus, from within this perspective it can be argued that, firstly through the relationship with society, a person becomes disabled. Following this definition, being disabled implies that a person – due to his or her position in society and the nature of his impairment – has difficulties in interacting in societal space (Hendriks 2009:12; Jones & Webster 2006:6; Barron & Amerena 2007:10f; Stone 1999:19). Difficulties can occur in the form of “restrictions in personal care [...]; being mobile [...], communicating; participating in education; work performance, including household duties; behaving and socializing” and “childcare” (Helander 1999:12). The social model of disability, in contrary to the individual model of disability, sees impairment as a normally occurring phenomenon in society and tries to alter society to fit the needs of the disabled people (Albert & Hurst 2005:2). Here, society is seen as the cause of the problem (EDF 2002:8; Hendriks 2009:13f), through the aspects of institutional, environmental and attitudinal discrimination (Yeo 2001:4). The social model argues that the constitutional state has to bare the duty of correcting this disadvantage in representation of disabled people (Waldschmidt 2005:19). It has found wide popularity and recently many international development agencies have adopted this model of disability as their working definition (see for example Jones & Webster 2006:6; Yeo 2001:3; EDF 2002:4; Albert & Hurst 2005:4; GTZ 2006:10). From the perspective of the social model of disability inclusive policies can be understood as “policies which acknowledge that socially excluded, poor or vulnerable people are not a homogeneous group and that [they] have a right to be included in poverty alleviation and development work” (Yeo 2001:1)..

The cultural model of disability is concerned with the way disability is comprehended socially. It questions the concept of “normality” (Waldschmidt 2005:25) and the view on disabilities as different or similar (Devlieger et al. 2003:10f). Through dissolving the binary universe of disabled and non-disabled, the cultural model sets out to reverse the perspectives on impairment, studies the reactions on bodily difference and analyses how concepts of normality, the body and abilities are being constructed (Waldschmidt 2005:26f). Following this perspective human rights and social services are not enough to reach acceptance and participation. Merely if disabled people are seen as a necessary part of society and not solely as a excluded group this objective may be reached (Ibid. 2005:27).

Disability is but a label that is given to a wide range of different phenomena, linked through and thematically caused by a bodily impairment as only similarity. It is thus

created as a category in different discourses surrounding disability (*cf.* van Leeuwen 2008:144f). In reality, disability is never the sole label that can be applied to an individual. Instead, the identity of a person – disabled as much as non-disabled – is built up by very many different attributes which are changing in relation to the person and the person's environment. A disabled person can therefore at the same time be female or male, employed or unemployed, wealthy or poor, high-caste or low-caste and/or integrated in society or marginalized by society (Jones & Webster 2006:7). Even if this might be seen as an somewhat obvious argument, it is important to be aware that the status of being disabled is not a catch-all term and persons that have an impairment should therefore never be limited to this single characteristic. Impairment is a *conditio humana*, a part of human existence. It is thus part of any society – openly or hidden (see EDF 2006:6)¹.

In this essay a multi-perspective stance towards disability is promoted. It is beneficial to take all models as what they are and how they can contribute to an integrated understanding of disability in development. They can be used on their own grounds parallel to each other. Loaning knowledge and practices from the medical model can generate information on disability in relation to a Cartesian understanding of the human body, in which the body possesses an archetypical function and form. The social model can supply the necessary information on impairments in relation to how disability and environment are constructed by society. The cultural model challenges this view by asking what can be seen as normal and how “normality” is constructed by society. Due to their obvious epistemological and ontological differences it is not possible to merge these models. Joining these three models however side by side gives a dense understanding of the complex phenomenon of disability, which will aid in forming the conclusion of this paper. Also, because “models provide ways of reflecting about a reality” (Devlieger et al. 2003:14), this approach countervails the oftentimes simplistic and reductionist assumptions of such models. More scientific models of the understanding of disability exist, yet these are not essential for this study. Additionally, a multi-perspective approach towards disability seeks to contest the model thinking within disability studies.

Merging these very different discourses in an open environment and applying them to their respective fields, it can be distinguished, that impairment and disability effect both the individual and social life and are in turn themselves altered by the individual and social levels of understanding “normality”, thus resulting in an understanding of the body as both, a reality and a construct (see Seddon & Lang 2001:356f). In the words of Shakespeare and Watson: different impairments “have different implications for health and individual capacity, but also generate different responses from the broader cultural and social milieu” (Shakespeare & Watson 2002:12). Through a multi-perspective

1 As a personal note, I can imagine a society in which the prevalence of disability is close to zero, as rights to live is morbidly being denied to disabled people. Nazi Germany's eugenic programs can be seen as a more prominent example. Incidence rates however are still high in such a society. See also Poore 2007.

stance towards disability it is sought to pierce through argumentative and obdurate discourses of disability.

1.2 Measuring Disability

As can be read above, constructing a simple definition of what disability is and thereupon designing a tool with which policy-makers and researchers are able to survey this phenomenon is far from easy. Disability – borrowing the words from Robert Chambers – truly is “local, complex, diverse, dynamic and uncontrollable” (Chambers 1997, see also: Shakespeare & Watson 2002:19). As a category for appraisal and evaluation, the term “disability” carries more differences than similarities as it encompasses individuals from generally all societal backgrounds. In addition, there does not exist one single criterion with which disability can be assessed (Harriss-White 1996:4-5), adding to the difficulties of measuring disability.

The differing cultural definitions of disability (Coleridge in Barron & Amerena 2007:113f) and the complexity in measuring it can be read from the poor quality and incomparability of data on disability. Many countries have their own sets of norms regarding disability, causing wide variations in what kind of aspects are included in country surveys (Elwan 1999:4). Therefore, visible impairments might have been registered, but less visible ones (such as epilepsy) are not represented in the data (EDF 2002:9). Besides, data from developing countries bear the risk of being out-of-date as it is seldom updated (Harriss-White 1996:2).

The assessment of disability is a difficult task which renders formulating policies and designing projects aimed at disabled people complex. As will be further discussed below (see chapter 4.2), this argument is highly important for its relation to the field of development.

1.3 Counteracting Disability

In the course of time there have been many different policy approaches aimed at taking care of the needs of disabled persons, all of which were following certain discourses of disability. While charitable work aimed at helping disabled persons through exclusive (and excluding) welfare programs, physicists and medical scientists embraced a model in which equity was tried to reach through inventing a “cure” against disability. Lately, a social model has been devised, in which a human rights approach is sought to bring equality for disabled persons (Yeo 2001:16)².

Historically, measures combating disability, following Helander, can be divided into

- 2 Hendriks (2009:13) notes that the medical and the charitable model of disability can be seen as one and the same. There is however a distinct difference between a solely institutional approach and a medical approach in which the impaired patient is not institutionalized.

three main approaches: preventive measures, after-care and integrative measures. The first category includes methods such as vaccination, treatment for impairment inducing sicknesses or improving natal care, all of which are linked to a medical approach and closely knit to the individual model of disability. Although actively eradicating the causes of disability is fundamental, actions in this category do not comprise help for already disabled persons (Helander 1999:29). Instead, after-care, or rehabilitation, can be seen as trying to help disabled people to cope with different situations and supplying tools that empower the disabled. This approach can still be considered thematically originating in the individual model of disability (Ibid. 15f, 29; see also EDF 2002:8f). Only the last category of measures – integrative measures – aim at including disabled persons in the process of defining policies on all levels and opening society for disabled persons in general. It can be associated with the social model of disability (Hendriks 2009:13f). As an example, many of the projects conducted by the World Bank that were labelled as including integrative measures to combat disability were merely designed to conduct preventive measures (EDF 2002:11, see also Miller & Albert 2005:11).

The outline above has a social understanding of disability as its focal point. From this perspective the distinction between how measures are thought to help disabled people and how these are designed in reality is obvious. The subsequent question for project and policy evaluation is therefore: Are disabled people viewed as suffering victims and a burden to society or are they encouraged in taking part in the processes that form society? Depending on the argumentative point of origin, however, these questions will be answered differently.

1.4 Disability and Development

This chapter will provide a short description of how disability is featured in the field of development and most importantly report on the lack of awareness for disability. From the onset it is important to understand that development does not automatically lead to a better situation for disabled people but depending to its mode can entail positive or negative results (Jones in Stone 1999:59).

Following the social model of disability it is important to notice that understandings of the term “disability” coined in developed countries are not easily transferable to less developed countries (EDF 2002:8) and that thus the needs of disabled people can differ in different regions. Furthermore, the dissemination of information from the disabled individual to policy-makers can be distorted in the process and therefore cause a difference in the contents in “felt needs”, “expressed needs” and “assessed needs” (Helander 1999:34ff). It is hence important to notice that there can be a clear discrepancy between the objectives formulated by international development agencies and disabled persons in developing countries themselves.

By and large, the development community has neglected the issue of disability or has rarely been concerned with this topic to begin with. It is therefore no wonder that

“disability [is] not worked into development. Despite fine-sounding pronouncements, disability in development remains trapped, for the most part, in the ‘special needs’ ghetto of targeted projects concerned with health, education and welfare. It has not found a home in the development policy and practice mainstream” (Miller & Albert 2005:4). This paper will list adverse effects of disability to community and individuals and will develop arguments for the inclusion of disability issues in development.

There are some arguments commonly raised against including disability in development as described by EDF. Caring for disabled people is seen as a luxury. Measures and strategies to address the needs and wishes of disabled is therefore too expensive for less developed nations. Simultaneously, it is argued that disabled people are not able to account for any sort of productivity for society and it is hence more important to focus on preventive actions. Additionally, disability is seen as an issue that needs special attendance and care that cannot be generated by ordinary people (EDF 2002:15; see also Stone 1999:9; Jones in Stone 1999:58). As will be argued later in this paper (see chapter 2), all of these arguments are built on false assumptions and do not represent reality.

1.5 Conclusion

Impairment and disability are labels that are used within very different definitions. The models of understanding disability that will be further analysed in this study are the individual, social and cultural models. Guiding through this paper will be a multi-perspective approach that tries to accumulate the most valuable analytical findings of all of these three models through a CDA.

Disability is a phenomenon that is difficult to measure. Still, based on the differing assumptions made in the explanatory models of disability, different ways of counter-acting disability have been developed. Most of the measures that were used historically did not act in an inclusive manner towards disabled people. This also accounts for the help that was aimed at disabled people in developing countries. In comparison with developed countries, this aid has however not been excessive and it can therefore be argued that disability is not included in development.

2 Why Does Disability Matter?

As shown above, disability is currently not sufficiently displayed as a severe issue in the mainstream of the field of development. It might therefore be of importance to analyse why it is significant to be aware of problems stemming from disability in developmental action and research. At the same time it is crucial to scrutinize the argumentative origin of the arguments that will be found. This chapter fulfils therefore two objectives: it explores arguments for the implementation of disability in development while critically analysing these same arguments on the ground of a CDA.

2.1 Economic Reasons

Disability and poverty determine each other (Yeo & Moore 2003:575; Coleridge in Barron & Amerena 2007:112f)), both through the costs directly caused by disability and costs linked to care-taking by family members and the community as a whole (Elwan 1999:24, 26; EDF 2002:14, DfID 2000:3, 4). This chapter will further outline arguments that support this relationship.

Firstly, the loss of income plays an important role as disability causes a process of increased poverty. The economic damage to the household caused by a lack of income varies in degree according to the relation to the type of disability (Elwan 1999:24). This accounts both for the disabled and for the care-taker (Elwan 1999:25, DfID 2000:3).

The economic setback by a lack of income is further deepened by costs directly rooted in disability, such as treatment of injuries, recovery or rehabilitation. These can be drastically high, especially for individuals and households that are already poor or marginalized. (Elwan 1999:25)

A third catalyst that fuels the link between disability and poverty is provided by costs related to marginalization. Although social understandings of and the status linked to disability is different in different societies, stigma, abuse, disrespect and other societal barriers are often a common feature in many developing (and developed) countries. These negative attitudes towards people with impairment can in turn aggravate the effects of the impairment or even create new ones. (Elwan 1999:27)

There is another relation apparent between poverty and disability, in which lower wealth and directly or indirectly refused access to societal institutions can become a cause of impairment. Malnutrition, lower safety standards at home, at the workplace and within traffic, higher infection risks of diseases that cause impairments, drug abuse, and limited access to healthcare for poor individuals and their families increase the risk of being struck by disability (Harriss-White 1996:4; Helander 1999:27; DfID 2000:3).

Commentators from different discourses see a clear connection between disability and poverty that is characterized by reciprocity. This can result in grave forms with poverty and disability being intertwined in a vicious circle, in which both features strengthen each other. Yet, the sum of

- poverty, which can be seen as a form of economic and social disability,
- bodily impairments causing social disability, and
- other “weaknesses”, such as being of low-caste or female (see chapter 2.3), which can be seen as social disabilities

can together amplify the effects of each single phenomenon. This reinforcing relation between poverty, disability and other weaknesses is termed simultaneous deprivation (Harriss-White 1996:4, see also chapter 1.1).

It is estimated that up to 50 % of all impairments in developing countries are

preventable, with many children owing their disability to malnutrition (DfID 2000:3). This means huge costs for community and country, many of which could easily be eradicated by better health care programs.

Economic reasons, both at the individual and on the community level, are calling for a better dedication to disability as an important part of development. At the same time it has to be made clear that the logical rationality underlying any reasoning, in this case the reasoning that leads to finding positive connections between disability and economy, are constructed. Justifying inclusion of disability in development requires the alteration of existing frames. Disability is made to fit in economic reasoning by extending its frame and bridging it (*cf.* Squires 2007:147). Thus, the arguments listed above widely mirror the rationality of supporters of the social model of disability, thus adding to a predominant discourse of disability.

2.2 Human Rights as Reason

If development is seen as a human project that aims at including everybody in a progressive advancement towards a better society, disability induced by the interaction between an individual's impairment and society's norms can be seen as a limitation of its full realization. The fight against discrimination and the parallel attempt of inclusion is therefore a normative approach performed by supporters of the social model of disability. It sees society's *modus operandi* as open to alterations and defines positive objectives for future change. Seen this way, disability issues become one of the main foci of development of any society that strives for similar ethical aspirations.

Understanding disability in the light of human rights violation was mainly developed within the social model of disability. As a solution to the barriers that disabled face in society, supporters of the social model regard the state as an organ for citizen well-being that has to devise preventive matters to avert discrimination against people with impairments. This view has received much support by national and international institutions and finally found its way into the preamble of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities which states that “the universality, indivisibility, interdependence and interrelatedness of all human rights and fundamental freedoms and the need for persons with disabilities to be guaranteed their full enjoyment without discrimination” (UN 2006) is reaffirmed.

As many disabled people face discrimination through stigma and disadvantages their right to be seen as full members of society and as human beings is denied. Suppressing the tendency of neglecting aspects of disability in development is therefore an important task. “From a human rights perspective, development programmes can, therefore, no longer make excuses for not addressing disability, particularly as many development agencies now claim to be working within an explicit human rights framework” (Albert & Hurst 2005:4). Most international NGOs and the UN base their programs on a rights approach to aid and development (Kett in Barron & Amerena 2007:161).

Guaranteeing access to the resources and opportunities to fulfil economic, social, cultural, civil and political rights has to be an integral part of all development efforts, both if these are actively targeting disabled people or not, according to the social model of disability. It is argued by supporters of this model that implementing disability issues into development projects through a human rights approach entails more success than simply addressing the topic through one-sided efforts. Building a rehabilitation centre can satisfy the need of rehabilitation, but exclusion by schools might violate the right of education (EDF 2002:13). Disabled people themselves have been successful in implementing human rights approaches early on in their struggle for equality (Albert & Hurst 2005:7).

As can be seen above, from within the social model, reasons for implementing disability issues in development has meant to approach development through a focus on human rights. This strategy defines the issues that impaired people face to lie within the violation of human rights by society. This logical reasoning, which includes an ethical perspective, is however not self-evident, but was constructed by supporters of the social model of disability. Intrinsic rights of a human being are therefore being connected to the needs of disabled persons by logical reasoning. The analytical perspective described here displays the constructed nature of the human rights approach. Yet, It does not set out to relativise the necessity of weaving disability into the framework of legislation, jurisdiction and the executive branch. It can instead be seen as an additive to a greater endeavour, one which will be proposed later in this paper (see chapter V).

2.3 Disability and Gender

Gender and disability affect each other in various ways. A closer look at these two topics can therefore shed light on their connectedness. This is especially important in relation to aggravated effects worsening the hardship for people that live in developing countries. This chapter will hence visit topics such as poverty and discrimination as a sum of gender and disability.

With reference to India, Harriss-White proposes the hypothesis that female disabled persons have an advantage over male counterparts. A reason for this might be that, as women are often deployed in the domestic sphere, they are not seen as being disabled and therefore not labelled accordingly. At the same time disabled men are openly disadvantaged by and on the labour market. Another reason for this relationship can be the artificially low percentage of women in the Indian population, which gives an advantage to women seeking medical care (Harriss-White 1996:4).

Contrary to the example above, in general, it is argued that women are more disadvantaged in developing countries than men, caused by poorer care by the family and the community. This results in disabled women and girls having less school education, less working opportunities, being prone to abuse and even facing disadvantages in marriage compared to disabled men and non-disabled women (Elwan

1999:28).

Moreover, in many societies disability also affects women passively. Women hold the role of care-takers and are consequently deployed with the task of looking after disabled children and other family members. Women who are taking care of their impaired relatives, face heavy burdens in their work and miss opportunities for income-generating work (DfID 2001:60; Coleridge in Barron & Amarena 2007:115). Through this connection, non-disabled women can become socially disabled (*cf.* Elwan 1999:26). Simultaneously they inherit a higher risk of becoming impaired through their lower status in society the practice of social norms, such as genital mutilation (DfID 2000:5; Coleridge in Barron & Amarena 2007:115) and complications in child birth.

Women, both non-disabled and disabled, experience a potentially higher amount of negative effects caused by attitudes towards disability. Through this discourse, supporters for the social model of disability argument that it is essential to include the aspect of disability in development.

2.4 Recent Developmental Reasons

The United Nations Development Goals (MDGs) can be seen as one of the most important policy papers in recent times. All of the eight goals that constitute the MDGs encompass measures in combating issues, that in one way or the other are impaired by the existence of disability. This chapter will shortly highlight the connections between disability and the MDGs.

Disability is included in all of the MDGs according to the following list:

- Poverty and hunger, described in the first goal, is caused by and causes disability (see chapter 2.1).
- Goal number two, universal education, can be closely linked to disability, as it would mean that school facilities and teaching methods were to be adjusted to the needs of disabled pupils (Miles in Barron & Amerena 2007:75; Engelbrecht et al. in Maclachlan & Swartz 2009:181-189).
- Women and girls who are included in goal number three and also number five, are more prone to being abused and neglected if they have an impairment and do more easily become impaired (UN Enable without date 1, without date 2; see also chapter 2.3).
- Poor child health: mentioned in goal number four, together with poor maternal health, can induce impairments and thus lead to exclusion later on in life (*cf.* UN Enable without date 3).
- Goal number six aims at eradicating the effects brought about by HIV/AIDS. This sickness is often compared with and closely linked to disability (McConkey

in Barron & Amerena 2007:57; Rohleder, et al. in Maclachlan & Swartz 2009:137-147). Goal number six includes also other sicknesses, such as malaria, but fails to consider the serious case of disability as an overarching category of variable medical diagnoses.

- Environmental sustainability, described in goal number 7, is an important aspect which has to be considered when working with and for disabled people. The environment can cause impairment and disables people with impairment (see chapter 1.1).
- Discussed in goal number eight, global partnership is important for dissemination of information about the needs and wishes of disabled persons and simultaneously changing the view on disability on a global scale (see chapter 1.1).

With some commentators estimation of 80 % of the disabled population living in developing countries (Albrecht et al. 2001:140), disability issues pervade all of the MDGs (Coleridge in Barron & Amarena 2007:116). Yet disability is not openly mentioned (Barron & Amerena 2007:2). It can be argued, corresponding to the arguments above, that the logical connection between the MDGs and disability, however apparent, have come into being by a logical extension of the MDGs by supporters of the social model of disability, spearheaded by UN Enable. That the UN has chosen to extensively follow this model in its formulations of goals and agendas but has not done the same for the MDGs shows that the link between mainstreaming approaches and disability is a constructed one.

2.5 Future Developmental Reasons

There are arguments for disability to be incorporated in development that arise by reason that concern the economic and social development of a country. These will be shortly explained below.

It might be useful to debunk the arguments raised against the implementation of disability in development. It has been argued that ordinary people are not able to give the help needed to disabled people, that disability is too costly to address and that prevention promises better results than inclusive measures (see chapter 1.4). Disability can be seen as an all-encompassing subject of development as it pervades all strata of society. The costs and stakes related to disability for individuals and society are too high to be neglected. Following the reasoning of EDF, disability should not be seen as a specialist topic, but one that is closely linked to human rights issues while it is only some disabled people that need special and costly attendance. Addressing these issues in contrast saves costs in the long term, through enabling the productive side to disabled people's lives and through lowering future costs connected with disability. At the same time, costs can be lowered by the introduction of low cost measures that can be as or

even more effective than specialist and cost intensive measures. Last but not least, EDF puts forward that the application of preventive measures will never reach a status of perfect implementation as the causes to impairments cannot be eradicated. Therefore a human rights approach to disability and full attention towards including disability issues in development is supported by the EDF (EDF 2002:15f).

It is argued that the rate with which a country is developing has a direct reinforcing effect on the prevalence of disability. In the case of a country beginning to have a more advanced healthcare system, the age composition of the population will shift towards an older average of age. Older persons are generally more prone of becoming impaired. Additionally, the mortality rate of young disabled people decreases as the medical standard advances. As the population grows older and more disabled people survive childhood, developed countries have a growing composition of disabled people. (Helander 1999:29,31; EDF 2002:9, Miller & Albert 2005:11)

Simultaneously, better healthcare decreases disability incidences by prevention planning and action. As the social and physical environment gets adjusted to the needs of people with impairment, there are less cases of disability. This is done by primary preventions, which means actions directed at reducing factors that cause disability, such as improved nutrition or better safety at work standards or secondary preventions that seek for confining negative effects of an impairment. (Helander 1999:28f)

The environment in countries that are developing is undergoing a wide variety of changes, some of which are negative and some of which are positive in relation to disability. Industrial and agricultural development resulting in an increased use of hazardous chemicals and machines, increases in the quantity of traffic, urbanization and degradations in water, air and soil quality, all these components add to a higher prevalence of disability. At the same time, higher standards of living and institutional help and enhancements in education and income will cause a reduction of disability prevalence in the future of developing countries. (Ibid.1999:31)

Furthermore, similarly and relating to this, in countries with better healthcare systems, detection of impairment, that otherwise can go unnoticed, is possible. This causes a higher need for policy-makers to act, thus adding to a "felt" prevalence of disability in developed societies (*cf.* Helander 1999:21; EDF 2002:9).

Although there are no self-evident conclusions due to rudimentary research on this subject, supporters for the social model of disability point out that there is a growing number of people in developing countries that are in need of being acknowledged as marginalized individuals due to their impairments (Helander 1999:31). The discourse that is portrayed here uses this argument, as will be further outlined below (see chapter V) to legitimate certain approaches.

2.6 Conclusion

This chapter has compiled negative effects that are accumulated by the ignorance towards disability and positive effects that arise from the inclusion of disability in development. The arguments within this list originate in the social model of disability. It could be shown that all of the arguments for including disability in development are constructed in the light of this discourse and are therefore not universally valid. As products of social constructions they predetermine what kind of approaches will be utilised.

Meanwhile it has become clear that disability does not only constitute an add-on to development, but indeed is a social and cultural problem that needs attention of not only the development community but every one's. Disability runs through all strata of society and does not spare gender, social and economic influence, geography or politics. Thus, an attempt to limit the adverse effects of disability needs the commitment of all members of society and, as we have seen in the case of the cultural model of disability, requires transformative processes within society. Before turning to the question if this objective is within the range of mainstreaming, there is another lesson to be learned from the lack of disability within the development project.

As outlined above, disability is a topic that needs to be addressed by developed and developing societies equally. It has however not found a firm and stable place within development yet. Observing the lack of attention towards disability another question rises: If there is no attention directed towards disability in development, which other notions are missing? Challenging influential organisations within development such as the UN, the World Bank or governmental development agencies and their mode of conduct, a certain inclination towards a recurring trend can be detected. It can be argued that the subject discussed in this paper – disability – is one more term in the “league of equality” besides gender, race and class (see Davis 1995:1,4) that was forgotten until recently. This adds to the critical discussion surrounding development, most prominently spearheaded by post-development advocates (*cf.* Dasgubta 1985:30ff, Escobar 1995:154f). That disability has to be included in development is unequivocal, the way in which it should be included however is another question, one that will be analysed more profoundly in the rest of this paper.

3 Lessons from Gender-mainstreaming

Although there are commentators who claim holding an all-encompassing and true definition on what gender-mainstreaming is, there is not one clear definite understanding of this process. This chapter will provide a short outline on how gender-mainstreaming is being depicted in different discourses. Furthermore this chapter will research in which way gender-mainstreaming has succeeded in what it was set out to do.

It has to be kept in mind that gender-mainstreaming does not exist within a vacuum but is very much intertwined with policies, approaches and understandings that accompany and develop it. Therefore, the task of deducing what can be verified for gender-mainstreaming from this complexity is difficult. Even though, by comparing the available data it is possible to depict an approximate value of how it works (see Daly 2005:437).

3.1 What Is Gender?

This chapter will provide a working definition for the term gender.

The complexity of the discussion surrounding gender and sex has become a battleground for very different ideologies. It is therefore not possible, neither will it be tried, to illustrate this concept in its entirety. Looking at its creation and portraying the dialogue that it entails, it is possible to draw certain parallels that will be helpful for the objective of comparing gender-mainstreaming with the mainstreaming of disability.

In this paper gender is understood as a socially constructed notion. Just as the concept of disability derives from a scale between “normality” and “difference”, gender is identified by individuals in society as a notion that lies between masculinity and femininity (Henshall Momsen :2). In the following chapters differences and similarities between these two socially constructed categories will be disclosed.

3.2 What Is Mainstreaming?

Before analysing the relation between mainstreaming and gender it might be very helpful to explore what mainstreaming is and how it is applied, as established and concise definitions are widely missing (Mackay & Bilton 2003:2, Miller & Albert 2005:10, Squires 2007:39). Instead, every organisation applies its own description of the term and has developed different sets of rules for its application. This chapter will shortly describe and compare four of these different understandings for mainstreaming.

The overarching question that mainstreaming is trying to answer is how marginalized groups' interests can be treated for the promise of an inclusive, democratic society to become reality. Mainstreaming is but one instrument in reaching this target. Other approaches that were developed originated in the base of different understandings and acted upon different assumptions “in diagnosis, in the attribution of causality, in prognosis and in the resulting call for action” (Verloo 2001:3f). Equal treatment, specific equality policies (Verloo 2001:4), gender quotas and women's policy agencies (Squires 2007) can be rated as examples of other approaches.

According to Mackay & Bilton, mainstreaming is “a long-term strategy to frame policies in terms of the realities of people’s daily lives, and to change organisational cultures and

structures accordingly” with the ultimate objective “to create a fairer society” (Mackay & Bilton 2003:2). As a result, the authors argue, a sevenfold of aspects are promoted: equality, answering marginalized needs, transparency and openness in policy approaches, raised participation, combating aspects within organisational structures and society that discriminate, shifting the focus within politics to equality and better use of human resources (Ibid. 2003:2f).

Miller & Albert follow the definition of ECOSOC (Miller & Albert 2005:10), which states that mainstreaming a gender perspective is to include “women’s as well as men’s concerns and experiences [as] an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres so that women and men benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuated. The ultimate goal is to achieve gender equality.” (ECOSOC 1997:L.30,Para.4.) Miller & Albert call mainstreaming a strategy (Miller & Albert 2005:11) and add that it is applied on different levels simultaneously: Firstly on the level of an agencies culture, policies and practices, secondly within a program of the agency and lastly in the effect of the agency in reality (Miller & Albert 2005:14). All of these three spheres, according to Miller & Albert, are able to bring about change with the last one being the most potent one.

Hendriks draws heavily from the framework that Miller & Albert provide (see above) by adding that mainstreaming can be compared with inclusion (especially with disability). She reports however that there is no consent on which part, inclusion or mainstreaming, functions as the goal and which as the strategy (Hendriks 2009:15f).

Jones & Webster, writing for VSO, understand mainstreaming as “the process of engaging in a structured way with an issue as an organisation, at workplace, programme and policy levels, in order to address, and avoid increasing, the negative effects of that issue” (Jones & Webster 2006:8). VSO works according to the principles of involving those that are affected by the organisations' activities in every element and incorporating gender as an overarching theme of any action. This is put in place by organisational commitment, sensitisation, workplace mainstreaming, programme and policy mainstreaming.

In defining gender-mainstreaming, Squires describes mainstreaming as being “a set of tools and processes designed to integrate a gender perspective into all policies at the planning stage by considering the likely effects of policies on the respective situation of women and men, and then revising the policies if necessary such that they promote gender equality rather than reproduce gender inequality” (Squires 2007:39). The author elucidates that gender-mainstreaming tries to better represent “the substantive interests of women” in policy-making processes, through which, she puts forward, gender equality is assisted. This last statement can be criticized however on the grounds of an disproportional representation of interests of women in policy processes. Instead both, male and female views should be elevated simultaneously.

All of the here reviewed definitions contain differences in conceptualisation and

phrasing. Partly defined as process, partly as strategy, they encompass different time scales, from never ending to having a clear aim. Some definitions hold a more rigid stance on action, some call for structural change. In short, the lowest common denominator can be outlined: mainstreaming embraces any action or any means towards an action with the aim to include an identified issue into the mainstream of acting within an organisation or other system – finally it seeks to illuminate political and economic systems and ultimately tries to dye the very fabric of these with the colours of the issue at hand. Looking at the objective of mainstreaming it is a question of how the final aim is formulated. Is the ultimate aim of mainstreaming institutional change or is it social change? Is it able to potentially reach this goal? These questions will be explored later in the text and will function as integral parts to the solution presented in this paper.

3.3 Short History

From the beginnings, the development field was dominated and controlled by men and development projects were aimed at male participants, except for mothers that were supported by social welfare programs (Miller & Albert 2005:7). Successively the action of lobby groups concerned with the role of women in society changed the appearance of the field of development (Ibid. 2005:8). In the 1970s cultural change was high on the agenda of women's organisations. As these failed to bring about the change that they defined as their goal, the strategy shifted towards targeting political change in the 1980s (Squires 2007:4). With the United Nations World Conference on Women in Beijing in 1995, gender-mainstreaming experienced a widespread policy implementation within political organs (Squires 2007:10). This saw also the transition from WID approaches to GAD. The former were criticised for mainly focusing on bringing the needs and wishes of women to awareness but failing to see the heterogeneities within the group and missing to define the processes by which women became disadvantaged. Additionally, WID was only granted limited resources and was seen to even fail on its own grounds (Miller & Albert 2005:8, Squires 2007:44). The gender approach to development opened the field of development to scrutinization on the terms of power relations between men and women and subsequently changing the very structures of policy-making systems (Miller & Albert 2005:9).

As a principle and as a strategy, gender-mainstreaming was adopted early on by supranational organisations and even finds parts of its origins in these agencies (Squires 2007:42). Thus, gender-mainstreaming can rather be seen as an answer by supranational institutions to the pressure of implementing gender issues which was created by previously failed policies than social movement activism (Squires 2007:43f). The World Bank, in an effort to counteract past mistakes, embodied in SAP's and the neo-liberal approach in general, adopted an ideological transformation, with gender-mainstreaming being part of the new agenda. In the same way the UN and the EU deployed gender-mainstreaming strategies (Ibid. 45). Gender-mainstreaming finds its theoretical origin in gender inequalities analyses that aimed at elaborating concepts and approaches that were

inherently important to feminists and was thus interested in finding concepts that would change “organizational culture, processes and structures, especially those associated with policy-making” (Daly 2005:440). Internationally, gender-mainstreaming was received as an indication of modernity and progress, fuelling its wide global spread (Squires 2007:48).

3.4 Strength and Opportunities

Gender-mainstreaming is widely adopted by international governmental and non-governmental institutions and incorporated into their organisational body. Even the notably broad dissemination and acceptance of this notion and the subsequent integration of gender issues in policy organs, can be called a success in its own terms (Squires 2007:151). In part gender-mainstreaming has had significant impacts on the structural build-up of society. It is however difficult to measure which effects the strategy has had on real life policies and society in general (Ibid. 70). This chapter will describe some of the most important positive effects gender-mainstreaming has had.

It is reported that gender-mainstreaming has brought about positive changes as a personal and organisational approach and has introduced new tools to policy-making (Daly 2005:442). As a result, one of the positive, more practical effects that mainstreaming has had is gender disaggregated statistics. This form of data presentation readily shows differences, similarities and trends between the sexes, which enables policy-makers to target certain gender issues (Squires 2007:68). This follows a shift in the formulation of policies and it implies that new target groups are being defined and addressed.

The country of Sweden represents a showpiece of gender-mainstreaming, in quality as well as quantity of its adoption. In comparison to countries that lack behind in counteracting gender inequality, Sweden has successfully implemented both the target and the philosophy of mainstreaming gender. This can in part be explained by the advantageous disposition of the Swedish society as embracing equality and social understandings of problems from the beginning. It is thus a social factor, rather than a positive institutional prerequisite that has enabled organisations in Sweden to successfully adopt gender-mainstreaming (Daly 2005:446).

In the context of development, gender-mainstreaming has brought about several positive effects. Apart from aspects already discussed above, gender-mainstreaming involves three elements: the strengthening of women's organisations, greater gender awareness and elevated status of women in society and better representation of women in the legal framework of countries (Moser 2005 in: Squires 2007:72). Additionally, initiatives to advocate gender-mainstreaming by international organs, such as the World Bank has brought about a raised adaptation of this approach globally, thus adding to its distribution and consequently bringing its positive results to other parts of the globe (Squires 2007:72).

The argument has been brought forward that gender-mainstreaming is ready to be adopted by many institutions and organisations within many different contexts. Due to its open texture it can easily be permeated by the needs and understandings of the user. This can partly explain the wide spread of mainstreaming as both a strategy and as an approach (Squires 2007:49). Therefore it can be argued that the open structure of mainstreaming renders it to be a powerful and adoptable tool.

3.5 Weaknesses and Risks

It is crucial for this study to analyse in which way gender-mainstreaming has succeeded – as surely it has accomplished much and the change it has brought about on an institutional level of society is responsible for a predominant part in the progress towards equality in society. Without neglecting these positive effects this chapter will turn to the negative aspects of gender-mainstreaming, as it is these that sooner or later will be imparted to disability. It is the strategy (or process or tool or approach, however it might be defined) of mainstreaming that will loan its objectives to the mainstreaming of disability and it is therefore crucial to define and describe constraints and risks of adapting mainstreaming strategies for disability.

Gender-mainstreaming is commonly referred to “as a 'new' and more promising, transformative, even 'revolutionary' strategy” (Verloo 2001:1). Being a systematic institutional tool merely designed to address the challenges that former programs to combat female under-representation inherited, its shifting and revolutionary role, as will be outlined below, has been overstated.

The project of mainstreaming gender can be evaluated in its own terms, meaning that recent states of progress can be compared to the objectives it had formerly defined for itself. If the state is congruent to these goals or if the project is projected to reach the goals in the future, mainstreaming gender can be said to be successful. At the same time, external critiques are able to detect limitations to gender-mainstreaming that are not recognisable from within. The judgement of critiques from outside the project of mainstreaming gender is therefore an important component of determining whether the project has succeeded or whether it has failed.

Firstly, considering the theoretical base of gender-mainstreaming, it becomes clear that it seems to lack a precise definition both as a concept and as an approach. This results in a cleavage between definitions of different actors – those that are promoting its use and those that are adopting it as a strategy. Consequently, following the lacking definition of this notion, gender-mainstreaming becomes elastic to the frames of other approaches and understandings. Because “regular actors have to implement the strategy, it is unavoidable to frame the strategy and all its elements in terms that are meaningful and positive to them. Newly proffered frames (such as gender mainstreaming in this case) must 'resonate' or 'fit' with the existing frames within which the regular actors, or the dominant elite among those actors, operate. In order to be taken on board, they have to

resonate with the values and norms currently adopted by regular actors” (Ibid. 2001:9). It is actively tried to extent frames of institutions to create the space for an implementation of gender issues. Conversely, lacking precision in philosophical and theoretical points of origins turns gender-mainstreaming into the contested frame. This enables different actors to see different objectives within gender-mainstreaming and thus defining other goals to it than intended. Incidentally, the transformative strength of this approach gets lost in the redefinition of its objectives and significance. Therefore “although the gender discourse has filtered through to policy-making institutions, in the process actors have re-interpreted the concept to suit their institutional needs. In some instances, ‘gender’ has been used to side-step a focus on ‘women’ and the radical policy implications of overcoming their disprivilege” (Razavi and Miller 1995a:41). The objectives that gender-mainstreaming sets for itself are contested and ever changing and thus open for reinterpretation by policy-makers. Hence, gender-mainstreaming can be seen as a product of „neo-liberal governance and other more oppositional movement aims and achievements“ (Squires 2007:51). This relation between gender-mainstreaming and established policies towards success evaluation of gender equality is important to disclose. In some instances, experience has shown that it can vary from changing the view on family life through giving equal opportunities to stay at home, to a sole attempt of including women in the workplace. (Walby 2005:325)

In addition, as gender-mainstreaming is open to interpretation and ideological alteration, it becomes easy for actors to state that the strategy is being applied, when actually it is something very different from gender-mainstreaming that is being adopted (Daly 2005:439). Thus, “just as other strategies for gender equality, and maybe any policy, it can easily be perverted. The main dangers identified so far are the danger of disappearance of gender equality policies altogether, and the danger of being swept away by the mainstream instead of changing it.” (Verloo 2001:8) This has been shown to be true for gender-mainstreaming in several European countries. There, gender as a policy issue has been merely added to the agenda of governmental organisations “as an additional objective or consideration that then has to fight for its place among the policy priorities” (Daly 2005:444).

The weak theoretical ground of gender-mainstreaming has to be seen in correspondence with one of its inherent flaws: The theory underlying gender-mainstreaming does not question the state's superiority but sees policy-makers as lacking the knowledge concerning of gender. Consequently, it tries to introduce gender issues by the education of organisational staff. In doing so, gender-mainstreaming misses to accomplish its transformatory character (see Daly 2005:446; Squires 2007:137). Both, the construction of mainstreaming on a concept that misses clear definition and the failure to develop its full change-inducing character leads to mainstreaming bringing a quite gentle reform, which is hardly noticed, if at all.

A second adverse aspect to gender-mainstreaming affects its poor adoption by governmental institutions. Mainstreaming gender naturally includes complex notions of gender and mainstreaming that are barely well understood. This lack of understanding

might be a consequence of time pressure, misinformation, misinterpretation or simply ignorance. As the lone case of Sweden, as a “splendid specimen” for gender-mainstreaming above shows, it is cultural and social ideological heritage that makes this strategy available to adoption. The result of gender-mainstreaming in most countries however is devastating, as by the absence of an “enlightening” factor, the mainstreaming of gender becomes a shallow attempt of including a gender perspective in policy-making. This results in a perpetuated ignorance of the issues of gender and a loss in the comprehension of the complexity that lies within gender issues: “The assumptions behind these demands are rooted in a technocratic perspective in policymaking; they assume that the gender problematic is a simple problem, or that gender studies can provide the final analysis of the problem, and then action can follow” (Verloo 2001:13). Due to this technocratic approach towards gender, a form of security within politics is created that creates the illusion that gender issues have been addressed. As long as “the words that are used, habitually suggest consensus [...] – inequality between men and women, differences between men and women, equal opportunities between men and women” (Verloo 2001:14) the aims of this attempt seem to be in close vicinity. However “more often than not these words [...] function as buzz words: they allow the illusion of consensus, until a hidden difference of opinion can no longer be concealed.” (Verloo 2001:14) As with the problems resulting from the poor philosophical and theoretical standpoint of gender-mainstreaming, it can be argued that this approach is not transformatory but technocratic (Squires 2007:43) and top-down instead (Squires 2007:47). In other words, “to the extent that there is technocratization, gender mainstreaming resembles more a mode of delivery than a policy agenda or program in its own right” (Daly 2005:436)

Thirdly, gender-mainstreaming works on an institutional level, a fact that brings certain negative implications along. It is reported that gender-mainstreaming is internationally widely adopted as it stands for modernity and progress. The picture that is drawn by the example of the World Bank, the UN and the EU about gender-mainstreaming has spread globally and represents western ideologies, entangled with ideas of improved lifestyles. It is these institutions that are propagating the adoption of mainstreaming and thus account for the pressure that is performed on developing as well as developed countries (Squires 2007:71). Again, mainstreaming holds limitations that prevents the core values and ideas within addressing gender issues to be communicated. Subsequently, many countries pride themselves with having embraced gender-mainstreaming, even if this notion is not factually supported (Squires 2007:48, see Daly 2005:441). There is a general tendency of adopting the notion of gender-mainstreaming in politics, but the implementation is done in widely different forms (Daly 2005:438). “Hence, the introduction of gender mainstreaming, rather than emerging out of or being embedded in a philosophy about gender inequality as a structural phenomenon, tends to stem from policy-making exigencies or current styles or fashions. One could say that mainstreaming has won the 'style battle'” (Daly 2005:440). Additionally, mainstreaming works within politics, a field that is being changed constantly and in which objectives, such as gender-mainstreaming can easily be abandoned (see Verloo 2001:14). It is

therefore essential to consider that “it will always be necessary to be alert not to be swept away by the mainstream” (Ibid. 2001:10). Hence, gender-mainstreaming can be criticised for being a trend within political institutions and it has to be seen how long it will last as a policy objective.

Fourthly and lastly, as described above, gender-mainstreaming is mainly concerned with altering the structural, processual and cultural make-up of organisations, especially those who hold power over policy-making. However, the question to be asked is in which way this strategy is positively affecting society and changing societal norms and believes for the better. One might argue that a systematic approach in search of changing societal systems with the objective of adopting new perspectives and approaches is highly flawed. It rather seems as if the original transformative part of gender-mainstreaming is aimed at the state and the state alone, thus living in the reductionist assumption that change within governmental organisations is automatically altering the entire society (see Daly 2005:447). Yet, the practice of gender-mainstreaming is reported to have had adverse effects on the lives of women, as efforts and energy were redirected to fulfil the needs of gender-mainstreaming (Squires 2007:137).

As can be read from this critical view on gender-mainstreaming, there are many flaws within the system that create a plethora of negative direct and side-effects. These can be summarized: Firstly, due to its deficient theoretical base, mainstreaming of gender is subject to changes within politics. This poorly supported structure is secondly implemented in a rather unsound manner, aggravating the effects of the former negative aspects. Thirdly, hereupon, these wrenched and altered notions about mainstreaming and gender are transmitted globally to other countries, in large following a trend. As if this would not be sufficient, as a fourth point, a clear connection between an institutional approach to a verifiable change of norms and understandings in society is close to absent. Fifth, instead, gender-mainstreaming has partially had negative effects on the lives of women. It might be argued that if the level of activism for gender and subsequently the engagement in gender questions by gender-mainstreaming in governmental institutions was higher, many adverse and undesirable effects would be impeded (see Squires 2007:73). As discussed above, the flaws within the very structural and theoretical framework of mainstreaming are preventing it from becoming productive.

This critical examination has shown that gender-mainstreaming can be ripped from much of its initial positive arguments. With and through this knowledge, now is the time to take a closer look at the mainstreaming of disability. The overarching question for this endeavour will be: does mainstreaming constitute an approach that can be used for disability?

3.6 Conclusion

This discussion has shown that gender-mainstreaming lacks a precise definition and that

this approach has not always been able to reach the objectives that were assigned for it. Raising awareness for a topic, as important for individuals and change-inducing for society as disability, does need an approach that possesses the potential of transforming the understandings of individuals and groups. For a progressive change in organisations it holds that “easy assumptions cannot be made that concepts, systems and tools developed for gender mainstreaming can be automatically utilised for other equality groups, although it is undoubtedly the case that some are amenable for wider use” (Mackay & Bilton 2003:12). For changes in society's norms however, “work is needed to develop understanding of the requirements of a generic equalities approach which works with commonalities but also recognises that different dimensions of inequality may require different sorts of analyses and specific solutions”. Efforts of raising the quality of life for individuals in society that aims at building a deeper understanding of the notion of disability is needed. This approach should also supply the need of self-reflection targeting “normality” as an adjustable reality that can either disable or enable people. In the case of gender it was shown that mainstreaming was able to bring about certain positive alterations. It has however its inherent problems – a finding that will be further developed for the subject of disability in the next chapter.

4 Mainstreaming Disability?

Mainstreaming is seen by many as one of the best tools to accomplish the implementation of disability issues in development (*cf.* for example Finkelstein in Stone 1999:34). “To enhance the position of people with a disability in society, mainstreaming, awareness-raising and lobbying are key strategies“ deployed by the UN, EU, the World Bank and consequently disseminated to a wide range of different state institutions and organisations (Hendriks 2009:14). However, the method of mainstreaming disability in development is a contested notion that needs to be scrutinized for its positive and negative results on institutions and the society as a whole.

This chapter will analyse prospected positive and negative effects of disability-mainstreaming in the future. It collects the findings from the chapters above to give a dense picture of the subject of disability and its generic attributes. Thereupon a direct comparison with the subject of gender will be possible, which will represent an answer on the main research question of this paper. This comparison is possible as much of the work on disability-mainstreaming extracts its form and character from what gender approaches have exemplified (Miller & Albert 2005:10).

4.1 Short History

In 1993, the UN Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities (UN, 1993) was first in – unintentionally – describing mainstreaming

mechanisms for disability. Though the term “mainstreaming” was not being used, rules 21 and 22 do read like a definition of mainstreaming of disability (Miller & Albert 2005:9f). Due to development efforts resembling individual model's modes and underfunding, the standard rules never had the effect that initially was hoped for (Miller & Albert 2005:10). Much later, in 2006, the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities adopted mainstreaming as a main concept in propagating the awareness for disability in all its operations. As an actor, the UN has an explicit influence on a wide range of different governments and organisations. This force towards others has had a clear positive effect on the spread of mainstreaming disability. This was only aided further with the advocacy of this approach by other major donor agents, such as the World Bank and the EU, that early on were engaged in providing positive arguments for disability-mainstreaming.

As a concept, disability-mainstreaming loans many of its parts from gender-mainstreaming. It can be argued that many of the findings of the GAD approach have found their way into raising awareness for disability. Most notably, “disability as socially constructed and resulting from barriers to equal access, the need of a human rights approach, the importance of disabled people empowering themselves to be actors rather than subjects, and the reality of unequal power relationships across the entire spectrum of development work, from policy to practice” has been worked deeply into disability-mainstreaming (Miller & Albert 2005:9). It is argued that “the consequence of impairments was a disabling social exclusion and therefore disability issues should be included throughout national and international development strategies in all fields, including universal education, gender equity, maternal and child health and poverty reduction” (Barron & Amerena 2007:15). Subsequently, many governmental and non-governmental organisations, such as the DfID, SIDA, NORAD and GTZ have seen the potential of this method for their organisations as a “relatively economically attractive solution” (Barron & Amerena 2007:17) and have adopted it.

In recent times, to tackle problems emerging from diverse understandings of disability and mainstreaming, there have been written a number of manuals and guidelines on how to successfully implement disability into the organisational mainstream and on how to assess effects connected with it (see Miller & Albert 2005:13; Jones & Webster 2006; EDF 2002). This production of texts concerning the implementation of disability-mainstreaming shows the commitment to this method on a global scale, especially in European countries.

4.2 Specific Characteristics of Disability

This chapter analyses characteristics of disability that are specific to this subject in comparison to gender. It will be shown that disability offers a range of aspects that render the usage of mainstreaming methods in development difficult. The findings in this chapter are collected from different works and put together thematically. They will

become especially important in a final review of the advantages and disadvantages of this method at the end of this paper. Taking a closer look at the reasons why disability is such a difficult topic to understand six specifically important arguments will be outlined here.

Firstly, as mentioned above (see chapter 1.1), there is no consistent or explicit definition of neither impairment nor disability. Furthermore, there is not a single criterion with which disability can be assessed. This relationship between the real phenomenon and its conceptualisation adds to the difficulties in handling disability within the field of development. Enlisting questions concerning sex and gender in survey forms and thereupon processing the findings might be complex but does not compare to the complexity of assessing disability. The amount of work and engagement that an attempt of measuring disability entails might not yet be anticipated by many people working in the field of development.

Secondly, disability pervades all matters and parts of society, as any individual can become impaired or can indirectly be affected by the negative consequences of disability. Yet, as described in chapter 2.4, it is not mentioned in the MDGs. This shows the difficulty of incorporating disability in the formulation of development strategies and policies. Impaired people can be aimed at by special target groups, but are hard to reach, as they are geographically dispersed. It can therefore be asked if mainstreaming does in fact offer beneficial remedies, if it, as outlined above in the context of gender-mainstreaming, does oversimplify the concepts at hand. There is a real risk that an effort to understand and successively counteract disability will be weakened by shallow attempts to institutionalize disability.

Thirdly and linked to the argument above, age, gender, social status, human capital, ethnicity and many more attributes play a role in the life of disabled persons. Even if this might also be held true for the characteristics of gender, this leads to more implications concerning interconnectedness and complexity. Being male or female are definite categories, at least in the language of “normality”. Impairment, however, is unequally dispersed in space and time on a societal level (see Mitchell & Snyder IXf). On the individual level an impairment differs in the way it affects the person. Furthermore, an impairment is only partly constructed by discourses in society – it also means a real limitation in a persons life (see for example Thomas 1999). In this regard, “disability occupies a unique identity that must navigate the terrain between physical/cognitive differences and social stigma. No purely constructivist reading can adequately traverse this political and experiential divide” (Mitchell & Snyder 2000:3). Thus there are constant gradations in the category of disability. Policies aimed at raising the opportunities within disabled people's lives have to account for these inherent differences in the notion of disability. Working with a reduced level of grain and extent (*cf.* Ahl & Allen 1996:55-65) in the analysis of issues is a necessary tool – albeit a crude one – in the adoption of policies and strategies. The perceived gradual loss of important aspects of theoretical aspects underlying mainstreaming and disability when they are implemented into organizational forms is one of the results of this reduction of depth in

the critical perspectives. It is once again to be questioned if a systemic institutional approach towards disability through mainstreaming methods will not reduce the complexity of disability.

The fourth argument is based on the fact that there are less people living with some form of impairment than there are women. A number that is often used is that 10 % of the world's population is disabled (Barron & Amerena 2007:2). This compares to around 50 % of women in the world's population, which accordingly have had a much deeper impact and penetration in the form of quantity than disabled people can have (Miller & Albert 2005:7). The question here is if governments, DPOs and other NGOs are able to gain the momentum and commitment that is necessary to raise awareness for these issues. Recent engagement with this topic by many societal actors shows that there is a certain willingness to actively listen to the needs of disabled people. The future will show if society is prepared for accepting disabled people in their own terms. In the meantime, disability-mainstreaming runs the risk to be adopted simply because it offers “modernity”, as is documented for gender (see chapter 3.5). In the case of disability this will imply even greater superficiality due to the lower quantity of disabled people to guarantee a deeper understanding of the issues.

In the fifth place, mainstreaming is a tool developed by and for the needs of incorporating equality perspectives into the very frame of organisations. These organisations however are themselves weaved into the neo-liberal framework of the global economy and operate accordingly. As economic actors they pursue economic goals and think within economic terms. Catering to disabled people's needs with market-based provisions, however, is largely inappropriate as a response to conditions of disability (Harriss-White 1999, p. 137). Today, disabled people are often rather seen as a burden to the economy than as productive members of it. Indeed, disability itself is constructed as “a product of the exploitative economic structure of capitalist society: one which creates (and then oppresses) the so-called disabled body as one of the conditions that allow the capitalist class to accumulate wealth” (Russell and Malhotra 2002 in Panitch & Leys 2002). The acceptance of gender as a societal issue however goes hand in hand with a new approach in economic policies. Women, as well as men, have been and still are needed as bread-earners, both to sustain the needs of the household and to satisfy the hunger of the market. There is no similar need of disabled persons' workforce on the labour market. It can be asked if disability-mainstreaming is able to receive the same kind of support by actors that question the productiveness of disabled people.

The fetish of “normality” that offsets disabled people from society results from a direct medium of discrimination (see Gibilisco 2010). For gender, the tendency of neo-liberalism to embrace value-neutrality has partially had positive effects. Even if it has altered the framework of the gender-mainstreaming project adversely, neo-liberalism was aiding in disseminating gender-mainstreaming globally (Squires 2007:143ff). Only when it will be understood that disabled people are indeed able to add a wide range of different services and products to society it is possible to argue for an inclusion of

disabled people in the workspace.

The last and most striking argument invoked in this research is the fact that it is not exclusively knowledge that is being tried to communicate through mainstreaming. Ultimately it is an insight into the lives of people that has to be comprehended and in addition and most importantly a transformation of the image of “normality” that has to be allowed to take place. Even though supporters of mainstreaming promise to let this change occur on an institutional level, the approach eventually falls short of this aim, as could be shown above for gender-mainstreaming (see chapter 3.5). It can be argued that the image of “normality” that awareness-raising for disability is trying to change, is more deeply rooted in society than the one that was fought by gender-mainstreaming. Disability-mainstreaming has to alter the societal concept of the body *per se*, enabling imperfection to be seen as a part of a normal body and thus challenging the understanding of “normality”. Similar issues could “simply” be solved by gender equality advocates by changing the role of women in society. Similar to the categories of gender and sex, it is the social understanding of impairment and disability that forms limitations and opportunities for people that fall into this category.

Through attitudes and views actions and reactions will transform the environment of the interpreter and in turn fortify the attitudes and views that were constructed before. This social phenomenon exists, however, oftentimes parallel to felt hardship in everyday life caused by an impairment. Thus, the difference between disability and gender is that disability is not exclusively a social construct, but can mean real constraints of somatic functions that are being interpreted. (see discussion on interpretations of impairments: Crow in Barnes & Mercer 1996:55-72). As a solution the conceptualisation of the body in society has to be altered to mirror disability issues accordingly. Mainstreaming will hardly reach up to this goal (see chapter 3.5).

4.3 Conclusion

Concluding the chapters above, still the question if mainstreaming is a method that can adapt to the needs of the issue of disability stands unanswered. This chapter will compile the accumulated knowledge that has been outlined above parallel to other commentators' thoughts.

Advocates of disability-mainstreaming have brought forward many different arguments for this method. Depending on the ideological standpoint of the receiver of this proposal these are more or less convincing. Hendriks for Dark and Light Blind Care enumerates four arguments which she deems to be the most important ones: disability-mainstreaming “enables people with a disability to participate in daily society”, “helps decrease attitudinal, institutional and environmental barriers;” and “allows for people with a disability to be independent and make their own decisions for life”. Additionally this method is “more cost-effective and capable of servicing many more people than charity approaches” (Hendriks 2009:4, 17ff). EDF argues more closely to the term of

human rights and lists non-discrimination, access to societal structures and institutions, participation in social, political and economic life and freedom to association to be irreversible rights for everyone (EDF 2002:14). As an accepted definition of the term disability and mainstreaming is (depending on the perspective of the observer) contested and volitionally constructed as an open system, arguments for taking this method into service originate in a wide array of different fields. Jones & Webster for VSO also widely follow a human rights approach and add to this list of beneficial processes of disability-mainstreaming that every developmental policy that lacks the perspective of disability is necessarily bereft of a most important aspect of the lives of people in developing countries. The authors argue, as also has been discussed above, that only by the implementation of disability issues in policy and funding and most notably in the MDGs reality can be approximated (Jones & Webster 2006:10f).

Most often, as can be seen considering the examples of EDF, Dark and Light Blind Care, and VSO, arguments for the adaptation of mainstreaming consist of appeals to humanistic principles (in the form of human rights), economic calculations, descriptions of the life of disabled people and how to enhance their quality. This portfolio of arguments has been constructed by commentators that are supporters of the social model, a discourse which has recently gained most advocacy.

Putting untested arguments about positive effects on society and the life of disabled persons aside, there seems to have been a change within the organisational nature in many institutions. Mackay & Bilton, who analyse experiences of mainstreaming in the 1990s, state that “mainstreaming has been seen to increase problem-solving capacity and to enhance sound evidence-based policy-making” (Mackay & Bilton 2003:5, 142). Thus, the method created visible benefits on a structural level of organisations. This in part has also meant that participation of citizens and transparency of organisations was advanced by the adoption of new methods (Ibid. 143).

Hendriks mentions that disability-mainstreaming bears the opportunity of becoming further lifted by changes in the framework of legislation and policy-making in many countries, by a growing number of mainstreaming tools that are available, the capacity to use networks and platforms and the spread of information concerning disability through DPOs and NGOs (Hendriks 2009:30-32, 35-39). She adds that there is also the opportunity of learning from preceding efforts of equity mainstreaming, like gender-mainstreaming.

These positive trends within disability-mainstreaming are added to the benefits that have been observed for gender-mainstreaming (see chapter 3.4). The wide adoption of this method partially aided by its open structure has meant enhancement of DPOs, greater awareness of disability and the inclusion of disabled persons in institutional thinking, legal frameworks and society as a whole.

Contrary to these positive trends there is a wide spectrum of criticism. The gravest risks that disability mainstreaming can inherit from similar methods within gender are outlined above (see chapter 3.5). Summarizing these arguments, gender-mainstreaming

- has a weak theoretical framework. This causes unfavourable alteration by other understandings, its goals are not clear and it does not question the state.
- is poorly implemented which produces a technocratic way of thinking about gender and mainstreaming.
- often is *en vague*. Consequently, actors are not seriously trying to seize the problems of mainstreaming but see it as a tool to become “modern”.
- works on an organisational level. It remains questionable if it has any perceptible effects on society.
- is argued to adversely affect women's lives as resources for projects for women are relocated to gender-mainstreaming.

Adding to the negative effects that gender-mainstreaming was shown to imply, there are certain characteristics that give evidence that disability is different from gender. These are, as described in chapter 4.2:

- Disability and Impairment lack exact definitions causing assessment of these phenomena to be flawed.
- Disability pervades every society, which makes it hard to combat.
- There are variable gradations of disability that together with other aspects constitute it as a very complex issue.
- Gender issues were backed by a higher amount of people being members of this category than the number of people concerned with disability.
- Disability does not fit the needs of the neo-liberal economy as much as the concept of gender does.
- In the course of combating disability issues, supporters have to alter a very persistent view of “normality”.

Conclusively, in the course of this paper it could be shown that mainstreaming does not reach the objective of responding to the full needs of disability. Although mainstreaming is able to induce change in behaviour and thinking in organisations under certain circumstances, the scale of this progress does not comply with the objective of altering societal norms and views. Ideas about what the human body is and understandings of when it can be seen as fulfilling normal functions within society are required to be altered. What the individual sees as normality is constructed and propagated by all members of society. As long as an approach towards inclusive development does not include a method of identifying and adjusting what is being exchanged as “normality” within society, this approach will be deficient.

The next chapter is supposed to compress the findings that this paper has been able to accumulate so far. At the same time, the level of analysis will be raised to cover a broader perspective. What can be read from the information that was presented so far?

III Conclusion

This far, the critical discourse analysis underlying this study has shed light on many aspects of the character of mainstreaming. It was argued that mainstreaming is used for disability in conjunction with the social model of disability. I see the reason for the popularity of this approach to lie within two aspects: legitimisation and necessity. Legitimisation entails the logical alignment of disability by supporters for the social model to social arguments by which it becomes justified (*cf.* van Leeuwen 2008:105f) (see chapter 1.1). This meant that the state as an overarching body of society could be held responsible to counteract this matter (for an example of legitimating approaches of targeting the state see Loeb in Maclachlan & Swartz 2009:13-30). From this perspective, human rights emerge as the “perfect” approach to reach awareness for disability in a rhetorical process. Another reason for the popularity of mainstreaming lies within necessity: the enactment of laws that protect disabled people, was noticed not to reach the objective of changing society's attitudes towards disabled people alone. Therefore another approach was needed. Supporters for the social model found mainstreaming to be a powerful tool, as it is able to incorporate disability in societal institutions and thus to change the way in which these interact with society. Mainstreaming is therefore but a logical extension of the arguments that produced the social model of disability, one which is used to disconnect impairments from stigmatising associations (Mitchell & Snyder 2000:3) and adds to a discourse of disability. It constitutes an approach by which it is possible for experts with authority (*cf.* van Leeuwen 2008:107) to gain and defend supremacy of the social model of disability. At the same time it caters to hegemonic societal institutions and groups as aligning to this model and its positive attributes secures their power in society (*cf.* chapter 3.5).

Societal institutions can, however, not be equated with society itself. From a multi-perspective viewpoint and for the sake of its analytical depth, the social model holds much importance. Yet, to argue that inequalities of disabled people in the developing world will be eradicated by mainstreaming describes an artificial step from analysis to solution within the social model as the CDA has shown.

What is being needed instead is an approach that is able to induce change in society. As a solution to the above described problems of mainstreaming, any successful approach towards including disability in development and raising awareness for disability in (various) societies has to incorporate:

- multi-perspectivity as a theoretical base,
- inclusion of disabled people (desirably from development countries) on all stages of the approach,
- support for communicating the complexity of disability,
- potential to transform organisational structures,

- potential to transform societal attitudes and understandings, and
- measurable outcomes.

Beyond the answer to the paper's research question another conclusion emanates from the findings in this study (see chapter 2.6): If disability has been forgotten within development, how much else has not found its way into this field? As can be observed from the arguments above (see chapter 1.1), regarding development disability has to be seen as an important, yet complex, subject. It has to be treated with utter care and engagement. It can be asked what is actively done to include groups such as children, drug addicts, alcoholics, old people and others that either are fragile or are seen to be different from the picture of discursive “normality” in development. As this question is directly aimed at the very foundations of the field of development itself and therefore includes as well practice (in the form of institutional aid and policies) as research (in form of theoretical exploration of the subject), it can be understood as a hard critique of the field of development.

In contrast to the *modus operandi* of today, in which inclusion is solely linked to an intra-systemic logic of economics and politics, a new mode of development has to be found. This new method should not be regarded as a sole tag-on to today's systems of development but should instead be designed to be inclusive and participatory from the very beginning. On a wider perspective of this study, society and thus also the field of development has to actively scrutinize its own mode of understanding and to question discourses about disability and development. It has to be asked in which way the understanding of a concept is discriminating against the lives of people. This is a task that reaches further than politics as it starts at the very point of initiation of comprehension. The objective is to treat the cause rather than the symptoms – in this respective “normality” as devised in societal discourses. The aim of an integrative policy approach should thus be designed to identify barriers and risks to people by multiperspectivity. For the field of development this study offers a valuable lesson: it is required for the field of development to widen its ontological and epistemological base to make inclusive development possible.

IV Summary

This study was conducted as a critical discourse analysis. It has shown that disability is a serious issue that is important to be included in the field of development. Reasons for that can be found in economic arguments and in relation to current and future development and concerning gender and human rights. These reasons stem from different models explaining disability, with the social model being the most popular in developmental institutions. By the perspective of the social model, disability is seen as a problem that emerges from the treatment of impaired people in society. It sees the development of a human rights approach that, by the approach of mainstreaming

becomes implemented in social, especially governmental, institutions, as a solution to the problems resulting from the former.

However, the mainstreaming of gender has demonstrated that this approach carries its risks and mistakes. Ultimately, raising awareness for any topic implicates the engagement in an ideological reform that aims at altering the perception of the human condition. Even under the best circumstances, mainstreaming will not be capable to live up to this high goal. At best, this approach will induce a change of the organisational structure of those involved in development – although this can be seen as a subgoal of awareness-raising, it is unfortunately not enough to eradicate the limitations that are imposed on disabled people in different societies.

The crucial point to be understood from this study is twofold. First, new approaches towards raising awareness for disability have to be designed and implemented – approaches that foster multi-perspectivity, communicate the topics complexity, include disabled persons, carry the potential to change societal organisations and society itself and that have measurable results. Second, the mode of development has to be scrutinized as to give a wider understanding on which groups and topics are excluded from current discourses.

V List of References

- Ahl, V.; Allen, T. F. H. (1996) *Hierarchy Theory: A Vision, Vocabulary and Epistemology*, Columbia University Press.
- Albert, B.; Hurst, R. (2005) *Disability and a Human Rights Approach to Development*, Disability KaR Briefing Paper.
- Albrecht, G. L.; Seelman, K. D.; Bury, M. (eds.) (2001) *Handbook of Disability Studies*, Sage.
- Barron, T.; Amerena, P. (ed.) (2007) *Disability and Inclusive Development*, Leonard Cheshire International.
- Chambers, R. (1997) *Whose Reality Counts?: Putting the First Last*, 2nd edition, Intermediate Technology.
- Coleridge, P. (1999) "Development, Cultural Values and Disability: The Example of Afghanistan" in Stone, E (ed.) *Disability and Development: Learning from Action and Research on Disability in the Majority World*, The Disability Press.
- Coleridge, P. (2007) "Economic Empowerment" in Barron, T.; Amerena, P. (ed.) *Disability and Inclusive Development*, Leonard Cheshire International.
- Crow, L. (1996) "Including All of Our Lives: Renewing the Social Model of Disability" in Barnes, C.; Mercer, G. *Exploring the Divide*, The Disability Press.
- Daly, M. (2005) "Gender Mainstreaming in Theory and Practice", *Social Politics*, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 433-450.
- Dasgubta, S. (1985) *A Post Development Era: Essays in Poverty, Welfare and Development*, Mittal Publications.
- Davis, L. J. (1995) *Enforcing normalcy: disability, deafness, and the body*, Verso.
- Devlieger, P.; Rusch, F. R.; Pfeiffer, D. (2003) *Rethinking Disability: The Emergence of New Definitions, Concepts and Communities*, Garant.
- DfID (2000) *Disability, Poverty and Development*, http://www.dochas.ie/Pages/Resources/documents/dfid_disability.pdf (accessed 2010-12-15).
- DfID (2001) *Poverty: Bridging the Gap*, Guidance Notes. <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk+/http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications/poverty-bridging-gap-guidance.pdf> (accessed 2010-12-20).
- ECOSOC (1997) *Gender Mainstreaming in the United Nations System*, E.1997.L.10.Para.4; Adopted by ECOSOC July 1997.

- EDF (2002) *EDF Policy Paper Development Cooperation and Disability*, Doc. EDF 02/16 EN, Brussels.
- Elwan, A. (1999) *Poverty and Disability - A Survey of the Literature*, Social Protection Unit, Human Development Network, The World Bank.
- Engelbrecht, P.; Kitching, A.; Nel, W. (2009) "Education, Disability and International Development" in Maclachlan, M.; Swartz, L (ed.) *Disability & International Development: Towards Inclusive Global Health*, Springer.
- Escobar, A. (1995) *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*, Princeton University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2001) *Language and Power*, Language in Social Life Series, 2nd edition, Pearson Education.
- Finkelstein, V. (1999) "A Profession Allied to the Community: The Disabled People's Trade Union" in Stone, E (ed.) *Disability and Development: Learning from Action and Research on Disability in the Majority World*, The Disability Press.
- Gibilisco, P. (2010) "Neoliberalism and Impoverishment", *Online Opinion: Australia's E-journal of Social and Political Debate*, released 05.09.2010, <http://www.onlineopinion.com.au/view.asp?article=10770&page=0> (accessed 2010-12-07).
- Goodley, Dan (2010) *Disability Studies: An Interdisciplinary Introduction*, Sage Publications.
- GTZ (2006) *Disability and Development: A contribution to promoting the interests of persons with disabilities in German Development Cooperation*, Policy Paper, http://www.disabilityworld.org/01_07/gdcpolicypaper.shtml (accessed 2010-12-25).
- Harriss-White, B. (1996) *The Political Economy of Disability and Development*, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, Discussion Paper 73.
- Helander, E. (1999) *Prejudice and Dignity: An Introduction to Community-Based Rehabilitation*, Interregional Program for Disabled People, United Nations Development Program.
- Hendriks, V. (2009) *Visions on Mainstreaming Disability in Development: Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Constraints*, Intern Mainstreaming Disability Programme, Dark & Light Blind Care.
- Henshall Momsen, J. (2009) *Gender and Development*, Routledge Perspectives on Development, 2nd edition, Taylor & Francis.
- Hughes, B. (1999) "The Constitution of Impairment: Modernity and the aesthetic of oppression", *Disability & Society*, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 155-172.
- Ingstad, B.; Reynolds Whyte, S. (1995) *Disability and Culture*, University of California

Press.

- Jones, D.; Webster, L. (2006) *Handbook on Mainstreaming Disability*, VSO United Kingdom.
- Jones, H. (1999) "Integrating a Disability Perspective into Mainstream Development Programmes: The Experience of Save the Children (UK) in East Asia" in Stone, E (ed.) *Disability and Development: Learning from Action and Research on Disability in the Majority World*, The Disability Press.
- Jorgensen, M. W.; Phillis. L. J. (2002) *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Practice*, Sage Publications.
- Kett, M. (2007) "Conflict Recovery" in Barron, T.; Amerena, P. (ed.) *Disability and Inclusive Development*, Leonard Cheshire International.
- Loeb (2009) "The Effect of Failed States on the Well-Being and Lives of People with Disabilities" in Maclachlan, M.; Swartz, L (ed.) *Disability & International Development: Towards Inclusive Global Health*, Springer.
- Mackay, F.; Bilton, K. (2003) *Learning from Experience: Lessons in Mainstreaming Equal Opportunities*, Governance of Scotland Forum, Univeristy of Edinburgh.
- Maclachlan, M.; Swartz, L (ed.) (2009) *Disability & International Development: Towards Inclusive Global Health*, Springer.
- McConkey, R. (2007) "Community Based Services" in Barron, T.; Amerena, P. (ed.) *Disability and Inclusive Development*, Leonard Cheshire International.
- Miles, S. (2007) "Inclusive Education" in Barron, T.; Amerena, P. (ed.) *Disability and Inclusive Development*, Leonard Cheshire International.
- Miller, C.; Albert, B (2005) *Mainstreaming Disability in Development: Lessons from Gender Mainstreaming, Disability KaR Programme*, http://www.dfid.gov.uk/r4d/PDF/Outputs/Disability/RedPov_gender.pdf (accessed 2010-10-30).
- Mitchell, D. T.; Snyder, S. L. (2000) *Narrative Prosthesis: Disability and the Dependency of Discourse*, University of Michigan Press.
- Moser, C. (2005) "Has Gender Mainstreaming Failed?“, International Feminist Journal of Politics, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 513-31 in Squires, J. (2007) *The New Politics of Gender Equality*, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Poore, C. (2007) *Disability in Twentieth-Century German Culture*, The University of Michigan Press.
- Potter, R. B.; Binns, T.; Elliott, J. A.; Smith, D. (2004) *Geographies of Development*, 2nd edition, Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Razavi, S.; Miller, C. (1995) *From WID to GAD: Conceptual Shifts in the Women and Development Discourse*. UNRISD.

- Rohleder, P.; Swartz, L.; Philander, J. (2009) "Disability and HIV/AIDS: A Key Development Issue" in Maclachlan, M.; Swartz, L (ed.) *Disability & International Development: Towards Inclusive Global Health*, Springer.
- Russell, M., & Malhotra, R. (2002) "The political economy of disablement: advances and contradictions" in L. Panitch & C. Leys (Eds.) *Socialist Register 2002: a world of contradictions*, Monthly Review Press.
- SCB (2009) *Funktionsnedsattas Situation på Arbetsmarknaden*, 4:e kvartalet 2008, Information om Utbildning och Arbetsmarknad 2009:3.
- Seddon D., Lang R. (2001) *Mainstreaming Disability Issues into Development Studies- In Theory and Practice*, Paper presented at the 14th Annual Meeting of the Disability Studies Association, Winnipeg, Canada.
- Shakespeare, T.; Watson, N (2002) "The social model of disability: an outdated ideology?", *Research in Social Science and Disability*, Vol. 2, pp. 9-28.
- Squires, J. (2007) *The New Politics of Gender Equality*, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stone, E (ed.) (1999) *Disability and Development: Learning from Action and Research on Disability in the Majority World*, The Disability Press.
- Swain, J.; French, S. (2000) "Towards an Affirmation Model of Disability", *Disability & Society*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 569-582.
- Tait, J.; Lyall, C. (2005) *New Modes of Governance: Developing an Integrated Policy Approach to Science, Technology, Risk and the Environment*, Ashgate Publishing.
- Thomas, C (1999) *Female Forms: Experiencing and Understanding Disability*, Open University Press.
- UN (1993) *The Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities*, United Nations General Assembly, forty-eighth session, resolution 48/96, annex, of 20 December 1993.
- UN (2006) *Preamble to the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*.
- UN Enable online (without date 1) *The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Disability*, <http://www.un.org/disabilities/default.asp?id=1470> (accessed 2010-12-13).
- UN Enable Online (without date 2) *Women and Girls with Disabilities*, <http://www.un.org/disabilities/default.asp?navid=13&pid=1514> (accessed 2011-01-08).
- UN Enable Online (without date 3) *Factsheet on Persons with Disabilities*, <http://www.un.org/disabilities/default.asp?id=18> (accessed 2011-01-08).
- UNSTAT (1990) *Disability Statistics Compendium*, Statistics on Special Population Groups, Series Y, No. 4.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2003) "Critical Discourse Analysis", in Schiffrin, D.; Tannen, D.;

- Hamilton, H., E. (eds.) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Blackwell Publishing, Blackwell Reference Online, http://www.blackwellreference.com.ludwig.lub.lu.se/subscriber/tocnode?id=g9780631205968_chunk_g978063120596819 (accessed 2011-01-08)
- van Leeuwen, T. (2008) *Discourse and Practice: New Disability & International Development: Towards Inclusive Global Health Tools for Critical Analysis*, Oxford University Press.
- Verloo, M. (2001) *Another Velvet Revolution? Gender mainstreaming and the politics of implementation*. IWM Working Paper No. 5/2001.
- Walby, S. (2005) "Gender Mainstreaming: Productive Tensions in Theory and Practice", *Social Politics*, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 321-343.
- Waldschmidt, A. (2005) "Disability Studies: Individuelles, Soziales und / oder Kulturelles Modell von Behinderung?", *Psychologie & Gesellschaftskritik*, Vol. 1, No. 29, pp. 9-31.
- WHO (1980) *International Classification of Impairments, Disabilities and Handicaps: A Manual of Classification Relating to the Consequences of Disease*, World Health Organization.
- Yeo, R. (2001) *Chronic Poverty and Disability*, Chronic Poverty Research Center, Action on Disability and Development, Background Paper No. 4.
- Yeo, R.; Moore, K. (2003) "Including Disabled People in Poverty Reduction Work: 'Nothing About Us, Without Us'", *World Development*, Vol. 31, No. 3, pp. 571–590.