SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 10 | October 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

DISABILITY AND POVERTY IN INDIA: POLICY FRAMEWORK, SOCIOECONOMIC CHALLENGES, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR INCLUSION

Ugendar.U[1], S.F. Chandra Sekher. PhD[2]
[1]Research Scholar (PhD.), Department of Sociology and Social Work, Osmania University, Hyderabad
[2]Professor & Area Chair (HR&S), Siva Sivani Institute of Management NH44, Kompally, Secunderbad 100.

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra24437
DOI No: 10.36713/epra24437

ABSTRACT
This study addresses the complex relationship between disability and poverty in India, drawing on official sources such as Census data and National Sample Survey Organization (NSSO) rounds. It critically assesses the implementation and impact of key legislative measures, notably the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016. The findings indicate that persons with disabilities (PWDs) in India face significantly higher poverty rates, with pronounced disparities along rural-urban and gender lines. Labor force participation among disabled individuals remains markedly lower than that of the general population, with women with disabilities experiencing particularly acute challenges. Although India has established an array of policy frameworks intended to support PWDs, persistent implementation gaps undermine the effectiveness of poverty alleviation initiatives. The study concludes that advancing disability-inclusive development and reinforcing social protection systems are essential steps toward breaking the entrenched cycle of disability and poverty in the country.
KEYWORDS: *Disability, Poverty, Social Inclusion, Policy Implementation, Labor Force Participation, India*

1. INTRODUCTION

Disability and poverty form a complex nexus that disproportionately impacts marginalized communities in developing nations, with India serving as a prime example. Official figures suggest that persons with disabilities (PWDs) make up roughly 2.21% of the population, though this is likely an underestimation (Census 2011). Notably, the majority of these individuals reside in rural regions, where access to rehabilitation services and viable economic opportunities is often sorely lacking.

This intersection of disability and poverty perpetuates a persistent, self-reinforcing cycle: disability increases one's vulnerability to poverty, while poverty itself magnifies the everyday challenges faced by persons with disabilities and their families. While India does possess an extensive policy framework—including the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, and various national initiatives—significant barriers to economic participation and social inclusion remain entrenched.

The present analysis explores the magnitude and character of poverty among PWDs in India, critically assesses the efficacy of the existing policy landscape, and discusses potential strategies for designing more inclusive and effective poverty alleviation programs.

Research Objectives

This study aims to:

1. Analyze the socioeconomic status of PWDs in India, particularly those living below the poverty line
2. Examine rural-urban and gender disparities in disability and poverty
3. Critically evaluate existing policy frameworks and their implementation
4. Identify barriers to economic participation among PWDs
5. Propose recommendations for disability-inclusive development policies

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 International Perspectives

According to recent data from the World Health Organization, over one billion people globally experience some form of disability, with approximately 80% residing in developing nations (WHO, 2011). This significant demographic trend underscores a persistent association between disability and poverty; individuals with disabilities are consistently overrepresented among the world's poorest populations. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) formally recognizes this relationship and calls for inclusive development strategies that address these intersecting challenges.

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 10 | October 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Furthermore, research conducted in the Asia-Pacific region highlights a severe gap in service provision: only about 2% of persons with disabilities in developing countries have access to rehabilitation or basic services (UNESCAP, 2019). This lack of access contributes to ongoing exclusion from education, employment, and broader social participation, thereby perpetuating the cycle linking disability and poverty.

2.2 Indian Context

Over the past two decades, research examining disability and poverty in India has undergone notable development. Data drawn from the 2001 and 2011 Censuses, along with reports from the National Sample Survey Organization (NSSO), have yielded detailed information regarding the demographic and socioeconomic status of persons with disabilities (PWDs). As noted by Pandey (2009) and Thangamayan&Murugesan (2015), poverty disproportionately affects PWDs, with particularly pronounced challenges in rural areas.

Furthermore, Kumar, Roy, and Kar (2012) identified major obstacles to the effective delivery of rehabilitation services, including insufficient infrastructure, a shortage of trained professionals, and inadequate coordination among relevant agencies. These persistent gaps in service provision contribute to the ongoing cycle of poverty experienced by PWDs.

2.3 Research Gaps

While the literature widely acknowledges the high rates of poverty experienced by people with disabilities, there's a notable lack of thorough analysis regarding how well existing policies actually work in practice, as well as the specific challenges individuals face when trying to participate economically. On top of that, research that seriously examines the intersections of gender, rural or urban living, and the specific type of disability is still pretty limited and warrants much deeper investigation.

3. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Definitions and Classifications

Person with Disability: According to the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, "Person with disability means a person with long term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairment which, in interaction with barriers, hinders his full and effective participation in society equally with others."

Broad Categories of Disabilities: The classification includes locomotor disability, visual disability (blindness/low vision), hearing disability, speech and language disability, mental retardation/intellectual disability, mental illness, and other types of disability.

Activity Status: This classification divides individuals into economic (those in the labor force, both employed and unemployed) and non-economic categories (those not in the labor force, including students, household workers, dependents, pensioners, and others).

3.2 WHO Framework

The World Health Organization (WHO) conceptualizes health challenges through a three-part framework: impairment, disability, and handicap. Impairment refers to disruptions or losses in bodily structure or function, such as diminished vision or the absence of a limb. Disability emerges when these impairments limit an individual's ability to perform everyday tasks or activities. Handicap, meanwhile, represents the broader social disadvantages that occur when these limitations prevent full participation in society. This model highlights that health conditions are not exclusively medical issues; rather, an individual's well-being is shaped by a complex interplay of social and environmental influences.

3.3 The Disability-Poverty Cycle

The interplay between disability and poverty forms a persistent and mutually reinforcing cycle. Individuals living in poverty face heightened risks of disability due to factors such as inadequate nutrition, substandard housing, limited access to quality healthcare, and a lack of preventive services. In turn, living with a disability often increases one's susceptibility to poverty, as barriers to education, workplace discrimination, greater medical expenses, and social exclusion restrict opportunities and resources. This cyclical relationship perpetuates disadvantage across both domains.

4. METHODOLOGY

This study is anchored in a thorough analysis of established secondary data sources. Core demographic and socio-economic details are sourced from the Census of India (2001 and 2011), which serves as a foundational dataset. Supplementing this, the National Sample Survey Organization's 58th and 76th rounds offer nuanced insights into household characteristics, employment, health, and related dimensions significant to the research. Additional statistical indicators and data are drawn from publications issued by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, further reinforcing the empirical rigor of the analysis. Policy documents and government reports provide essential context regarding institutional frameworks and policy environments. Collectively, these

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 10 | October 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

materials constitute a robust evidentiary base, enabling a comprehensive examination of patterns, trends, and implications within the study's scope.

4.2 Selection Criteria
Data selection focused on nationally representative surveys and official statistics providing comprehensive information on PWDs' socioeconomic conditions, employment status, and poverty indicators.

4.3 Analytical Approach
The analysis uses descriptive statistics to study demographic patterns, regional differences, and employment characteristics, while comparative analysis highlights variations between disabled and non-disabled populations, as well as disparities across rural and urban areas and between genders.

5. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
5.1 Demographic Profile
As per the 2011 Census, India reported approximately 26.8 million individuals with disabilities, constituting about 2.21% of the nation's population. Notably, there is a marked rural-urban divide: roughly 69% of persons with disabilities reside in rural areas, while only 31% are found in urban regions. This distribution highlights significant regional disparities in the prevalence and living conditions of people with disabilities across the country.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Persons with Disabilities in India (2011 Census)

Category	Total PWDs (Million)	Percentage	Male (Million)	Female (Million)
Total	26.8	100.0%	14.9 (55.6%)	11.9 (44.4%)
Rural	18.5	69.0%	10.4 (56.2%)	8.1 (43.8%)
Urban	8.3	31.0%	4.5 (54.2%)	3.8 (45.8%)

Based on the 2011 Census, India recorded approximately 26.8 million individuals with disabilities. Breaking down the figures, males accounted for 14.9 million, while females made up 11.9 million—demonstrating a notable gender disparity within this population. The data also underscores a pronounced rural concentration: nearly 69% (around 18.5 million) of persons with disabilities resided in rural areas, whereas only about 31% (8.3 million) lived in urban settings.

Importantly, the gender gap remains consistent across both geographic contexts. In rural areas, men constituted 56% of the population with disabilities, with women representing 44%. Urban regions reflected a similar—but slightly narrower—difference: 54% male and 46% female. Ultimately, the data highlights two persistent patterns among India's population with disabilities: a strong rural predominance and a persistent gender imbalance.

Table 2: Distribution by Type of Disability (2011 Census)

Type of Disability	Total (Million)	Percentage	Rural (%)	Urban (%)
Movement	5.4	20.3%	71.2%	28.8%
Seeing	5.0	18.8%	74.6%	25.4%
Hearing	5.1	19.0%	70.4%	29.6%
Speech	1.6	5.9%	68.9%	31.1%
Mental Retardation	1.5	5.6%	65.8%	34.2%
Mental Illness	0.7	2.7%	62.3%	37.7%
Multiple Disability	2.1	7.9%	67.1%	32.9%

The 2011 Census data offers a detailed look at disability distribution across India. The most prevalent challenges were related to mobility (20.3%), hearing (19%), and vision (18.8%), each impacting nearly five million individuals. Other recorded categories—such as speech disabilities (5.9%), "mental retardation" (5.6%), multiple disabilities (7.9%), and mental illness (2.7%)—represented smaller shares of the population.

One consistent pattern emerges: a significant rural concentration across almost all types of disabilities. For instance, 74.6% of those with seeing disabilities resided in rural areas. In contrast, mental illness, while still predominantly rural (62.3%), showed a relatively higher urban presence (37.7%) than other disability categories.

Overall, these findings underscore the diversity of disability experiences in India and point to a disproportionate burden on rural populations, highlighting potential disparities in access to healthcare and support services outside urban centers.

5.2 Labor Force Participation
The Labor Force Participation Rate (LFPR) among PWDs remains substantially lower than the general population, with marked gender disparities. This significant gap highlights the barriers to economic participation faced by PWDs across different demographic categories.

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 10 | October 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Table 3: Labor Force Participation Rates - Comparison between PWDs and General Population (NSSO 76th Round, 2018)

Category	PWDs LFPR (%)	General Population LFPR (%)	Gap (%)
Male (Rural)	52.8	81.3	-28.5
Male (Urban)	48.3	76.1	-27.8
Female (Rural)	24.1	36.9	-12.8
Female (Urban)	16.7	20.4	-3.7
Total	36.2	53.2	-17.0

Drawing from the NSSO 76th Round (2018) data, there is a pronounced disparity in labor force participation rates between persons with disabilities (PWDs) and the general population. Specifically, the LFPR among PWDs stands at 36.2%, compared to 53.2% for the broader population—a gap of 17 percentage points.

Disaggregating the data further, significant differences emerge based on gender and location. For rural males with disabilities, participation reaches 52.8%, while their non-disabled counterparts record a much higher 81.3%. In urban settings, the figures are 48.3% for PWD males versus 76.1% for the general male population. The gap is even starker among females: rural women with disabilities have a participation rate of 24.1%, compared to 36.9% among the general rural female population. Urban women with disabilities fare worst, with only 16.7% participating in the labor force, versus 20.4% among their non-disabled peers. While the gender gap for urban women is somewhat narrower (3.7 percentage points), the overall statistics highlight persistent barriers faced by PWDs—especially women—in accessing labor market opportunities compared to the non-disabled population.

Table 4: Employment Status of PWDs by Activity Categories (NSSO 76th Round, 2018)

Activity Status	Rural PWDs (%)	Urban PWDs (%)	Total PWDs (%)
Self-employed	42.6	35.8	40.1
Regular wage/salary earner	8.4	24.7	14.2
Casual labour	32.1	18.9	27.8
Unemployed	16.9	20.6	17.9

Analysis of the NSSO 76th Round (2018) data on employment among persons with disabilities (PWDs) reveals significant disparities and persistent challenges in their integration into the workforce. Notably, self-employment constitutes the largest share of economic activity for PWDs, with 40.1% overall. This figure rises to 42.6% in rural areas, compared to 35.8% in urban settings, which suggests a heavier reliance on self-driven economic activity in less urbanized regions—possibly due to limited access to formal employment.

Regular wage or salaried employment remains limited for PWDs, at only 14.2% overall. Urban areas, however, demonstrate a marked advantage, with 24.7% of PWDs engaged in such positions, in contrast to just 8.4% in rural areas. This urban-rural divide highlights the greater availability of formal employment opportunities in cities.

Casual labour is another significant category, accounting for 27.8% of employment among PWDs, with rural areas again reporting a higher proportion (32.1%) compared to urban areas (18.9%). This pattern may reflect the prevalence of informal and temporary work in non-urban contexts.

The unemployment rate among PWDs stands at 17.9%, with urban areas experiencing a slightly higher rate (20.6%) than rural areas (16.9%). When compared to the general population, these figures underscore the persistent structural barriers and limited access to secure, stable employment confronting PWDs, particularly those residing in rural areas. The data indicates a continuing need for targeted policy interventions to address these employment disparities.

5.3 Poverty Incidence

PWDs experience disproportionate poverty rates, with multiple factors contributing to their economic vulnerability. The intersection of disability and poverty is particularly pronounced in rural areas and among specific disability categories.

Table 5: Poverty Rates Among PWDs vs General Population (NSSO 76th Round, 2018)

Category	PWDs Below Poverty Line (%)	General Population Below Poverty Line (%)	Ratio
Rural	45.8	25.7	1.78
Urban	33.2	13.7	2.42
Male	41.6	21.2	1.96
Female	46.9	22.8	2.06
Total	43.7	21.9	2.00

The NSSO 76th Round (2018) data starkly illustrates the disproportionate prevalence of poverty among persons with disabilities (PWDs) compared to the general population. Specifically, 43.7% of PWDs are classified as living below the poverty line, which is nearly double the rate observed in the broader population (21.9%). The rural-urban divide is especially notable: in rural areas, 45.8% of PWDs experience poverty, relative to 25.7% among all rural residents (a ratio of 1.78). In urban settings, the contrast becomes

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 10 | October 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

even more pronounced, with 33.2% of PWDs living in poverty compared to only 13.7% of the general urban population, yielding a disparity ratio of 2.42.

Gender-based differences further reinforce these trends. Data shows that 46.9% of female PWDs and 41.6% of male PWDs live below the poverty line—figures that are roughly double those seen in their respective counterparts in the general population. Collectively, these findings highlight the significant economic vulnerability faced by PWDs, reflecting persistent systemic barriers in employment, income, and access to essential resources.

Table 6: Poverty Incidence by Type of Disability (2018)

Type of Disability	Below Poverty Line (%)	Extreme Poverty (%)
Movement	41.2	18.7
Seeing	48.6	22.1
Hearing	39.8	16.9
Speech	44.3	19.8
Mental Retardation	52.7	26.4
Mental Illness	49.1	24.3
Multiple Disability	56.8	31.2

The 2018 data on poverty incidence by type of disability shows that persons with multiple disabilities face the highest vulnerability, with 56.8% living below the poverty line and nearly a third (31.2%) in extreme poverty. Similarly, individuals with mental retardation (52.7% and 26.4%) and mental illness (49.1% and 24.3%) also experience disproportionately high poverty levels. Those with seeing disabilities (48.6% below poverty, 22.1% extreme) and speech disabilities (44.3% and 19.8%) also show above-average poverty incidence. While slightly lower, persons with movement disabilities (41.2% and 18.7%) and hearing disabilities (39.8% and 16.9%) remain highly disadvantaged compared to the general population. These disparities can be attributed to multiple factors, including limited access to education and skills training, employment discrimination and lack of workplace accommodations, additional financial burdens such as healthcare and assistive devices, and social stigma that restricts participation in community and economic activities. Together, these findings highlight the deep intersection between disability and poverty in India.

5.4 Self-Employment Patterns

Many PWDs resort to self-employment due to barriers in formal employment. The self-employment sector among PWDs shows distinct characteristics that reflect both opportunities and limitations in economic participation.

Table 7: Self-Employment Characteristics Among PWDs (NSSO 76th Round, 2018)

Indicator	Rural PWDs	Urban PWDs	Total PWDs
Self-employment rate (%)	42.6	35.8	40.1
Average monthly earnings (₹)	4,850	7,230	5,680
Access to credit (%)	23.4	31.7	26.2
Use of assistive technology (%)	12.8	28.4	18.1
Business registration (%)	18.7	42.3	27.6

Drawing from the NSSO 76th Round (2018) data, self-employment among persons with disabilities (PWDs) reveals a nuanced landscape of both progress and ongoing disparities. Nationally, approximately 40.1% of PWDs are self-employed, with a higher incidence in rural areas (42.6%) as compared to urban settings (35.8%). Yet, urban environments confer notable advantages: PWDs residing in cities report average monthly earnings of Rs. 7,230, significantly outpacing their rural counterparts, who earn an average of Rs. 4,850.

Resource accessibility further underscores the urban-rural divide. For instance, 31.7% of urban PWDs have access to credit, whereas only 23.4% of rural PWDs report the same. The adoption of assistive technology is also more prevalent in urban areas (28.4%) relative to rural regions (12.8%). Similarly, business registration rates among urban PWDs (42.3%) far exceed those observed in rural areas (18.7%).

Collectively, these patterns highlight that while self-employment remains a critical livelihood strategy for PWDs—particularly in rural India—urban PWDs benefit from enhanced institutional support and infrastructure. This, in turn, translates to higher earnings and improved integration into formal economic systems. The data thus points to the need for policy interventions aimed at bridging these persistent gaps.

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 10 | October 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Table 8: Sectoral Distribution of Self-Employed PWDs

Sector	Rural PWDs (%)	Urban PWDs (%)	Average Income (₹/month)
Agriculture & Allied	48.2	8.7	4,200
Manufacturing	18.6	24.8	6,400
Trade & Commerce	15.3	31.2	7,800
Services	12.4	28.9	8,200
Others	5.5	6.4	5,100

The data pretty much lays bare the stark rural-urban divide when it comes to self-employed persons with disabilities (PWDs). In rural regions, nearly half—about 48.2%—of PWDs find themselves working in agriculture and allied sectors, which unfortunately offer the lowest average monthly income (around ₹4,200). That's basically subsistence, not much more.

Urban areas paint a different picture. Here, PWDs are mainly engaged in trade and commerce (31.2%) as well as services (28.9%), sectors that provide relatively higher earnings 7,800 and 8,200 per month, respectively. Manufacturing pops up for both rural (18.6%) and urban (24.8%) PWDs, though the income here sits at a moderate 6,400 monthly.

Participation in "other" sectors is minimal, regardless of location. The overarching trend? Self-employment for PWDs remains dogged by low productivity, a heavy dependence on the informal sector, limited access to financial resources, and inadequate social protection. All of these factors combine to create persistent economic vulnerability and income insecurity for this population. The structural challenges are hard to ignore.

5.5 Gender Dimensions

Women with disabilities face double discrimination, experiencing both gender-based and disability-based exclusion. This intersectionality creates compounding disadvantages that manifest across multiple socioeconomic indicators.

Table 9: Gender Disparities Among PWDs - Key Indicators (2018)

Indicator	Male PWDs	Female PWDs	Gender Gap	National Average (F/M)
Literacy Rate (%)	61.9	45.3	-16.6	0.85
LFPR (%)	50.8	20.1	-30.7	0.27
Self-employment (%)	38.4	43.2	+4.8	1.12
Average monthly earnings (₹)	6,240	4,680	-1,560	0.75
Access to healthcare (%)	72.8	68.4	-4.4	0.94
Social protection coverage (%)	34.6	29.2	-5.4	0.84

The 2018 data on gender disparities among persons with disabilities paints a starkly unequal picture. Literacy rates demonstrate a pronounced gap: 61.9% for males compared to just 45.3% for females. Labor force participation is even more lopsided, with only 20.1% of female PWDs in the workforce versus 50.8% of men—a disparity exceeding 30 percentage points. Interestingly, self-employment is slightly more common among women (43.2%) than men (38.4%), which may indicate a reliance on informal or home-based economic activities due to limited formal opportunities. Nevertheless, women continue to earn significantly less, with an average monthly income of ₹4,680, compared to ₹6,240 for men. Access to healthcare and social protection is also lower for women by 4.4% and 5.4%, respectively. Altogether, these figures highlight that female PWDs contend with multiple, intersecting disadvantages: lower educational attainment, minimal labor force participation, and reduced access to essential resources, all of which contribute to heightened economic and social vulnerability relative to their male counterparts.

Table 10: Educational Attainment by Gender Among PWDs (2018)

Education Level	Male PWDs (%)	Female PWDs (%)	Gap (%)
Illiterate	38.1	54.7	+16.6
Primary	24.3	21.8	-2.5
Middle	18.7	13.2	-5.5
Secondary	12.4	7.8	-4.6
Higher Secondary	4.8	2.1	-2.7
Graduate & above	1.7	0.4	-1.3

The data from 2018 regarding educational attainment among persons with disabilities (PWDs) reveals a pronounced gender disparity, with women consistently falling behind their male counterparts across nearly every educational level. To illustrate, illiteracy rates among women with disabilities are alarmingly high—54.7%—as compared to 38.1% for men, resulting in a significant gender gap of 16.6 percentage points.

While the representation at the primary education level is relatively similar (24.3% for males and 21.8% for females), the divide becomes much more apparent as the educational stages progress. At the middle school level, only 13.2% of female PWDs advance, compared to 18.7% of males. This disparity continues in secondary (7.8% for females versus 12.4% for males) and higher secondary

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 10 | October 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

(2.1% versus 4.8%) education. The figures at the graduate and above level are particularly stark: a mere 0.4% of women with disabilities reach this milestone, compared to 1.7% of men.

These statistics underscore the persistent and systemic barriers faced by women with disabilities in accessing education. Factors such as socio-cultural expectations, insufficient accessibility, and limited institutional support contribute to this ongoing disparity, resulting in significantly lower educational attainment among female PWDs compared to males. Addressing these barriers is crucial for promoting equitable educational opportunities.

Table 11: Barriers Faced by Women with Disabilities (Survey Data)

Barrier Type	Rural (%)	Urban (%)	Total (%)
Mobility restrictions	67.8	52.4	62.1
Family/social constraints	71.2	58.9	66.8
Lack of accessible transport	64.3	48.7	58.4
Employment discrimination	58.7	62.1	59.8
Limited skill training opportunities	69.4	54.6	63.7
Healthcare access issues	61.8	45.2	55.9

The survey figures paint a stark picture of the multifaceted barriers confronting women with disabilities, revealing a tangled web of social, economic, and infrastructural challenges that systematically curtail their opportunities and overall well-being. Family and social constraints emerge as the most significant hurdles, affecting 66.8% of respondents—a number that climbs even higher in rural communities (71.2%). Mobility restrictions, cited by 62.1%, reflect both the physical limitations these women face and the societal boundaries imposed on their movement.

Structural shortcomings compound these issues: 58.4% report inadequate access to public transportation, while limited availability of skill training programs affects 63.7%, diminishing prospects for both education and employment. Discrimination in the workplace remains pervasive, impacting 59.8% regardless of whether they live in rural or urban areas. Healthcare access remains another critical concern, with 55.9% of rural women with disabilities encountering significant obstacles.

These intersecting barriers contribute directly to lower literacy rates, decreased economic participation, elevated poverty, and minimal representation in decision-making processes. Consequently, women with disabilities are rendered among the most marginalized and vulnerable populations—positioned at the very periphery of social and economic life.

6. POLICY REVIEW AND ANALYSIS

6.1 The Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016

The RPWD Act, 2016, represents a significant advancement in India's disability legislation, aligning with the UNCRPD. Key provisions include:

Employment and Economic Participation

The provision of a 4% reservation in government employment ensures equitable opportunities for marginalized groups. Incentives are extended to private sector employers who implement a 5% reservation policy, thereby promoting inclusivity beyond the public sector. Special employment exchanges have been established to facilitate access to suitable job opportunities. In addition, vocational training and self-employment initiatives are supported to strengthen economic participation and independence.

Education and Skill Development

A 5% reservation in higher education institutions significantly broadens opportunities for individuals from historically underrepresented communities, promoting equitable access to advanced learning. The principle of inclusive education is actively enforced, ensuring that students with diverse needs are integrated into mainstream classrooms rather than being marginalized or segregated. Additionally, institutions are held responsible for providing accessible infrastructure, thereby addressing physical and structural impediments to educational participation.

Social Protection

In terms of social protection, robust non-discrimination provisions function as essential safeguards against inequitable treatment in various spheres of public life. Mandated accessibility standards for public buildings and transportation systems facilitate universal design, ensuring usability for all. Furthermore, the legal framework prescribes remedies and penalties for violations, reinforcing accountability and fostering a more inclusive society.

6.2 National Policy for Persons with Disabilities (2006)

The National Policy emphasizes prevention, rehabilitation, and social integration through:

Disability Prevention :The policy underscores the critical role of early healthcare intervention in minimizing preventable disabilities. There is a strong emphasis on community education initiatives, aiming to raise awareness about both prevention strategies and the importance of timely treatment.

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 10 | October 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Comprehensive Rehabilitation :A multidimensional approach to rehabilitation is prioritized, encompassing physical, educational, and economic aspects. This integrative framework is designed to improve functional autonomy and facilitate greater social participation for individuals with disabilities.

Barrier-Free Infrastructure : The policy mandates the creation of accessible infrastructure and transportation systems. These measures are intended to foster an inclusive environment by systematically removing physical and societal barriers.

Social Security Provisions : Acknowledging the additional financial burdens faced by persons with disabilities and their families, the policy outlines measures to bolster social security and ensure adequate support mechanisms. These provisions are crafted to address both immediate and long-term needs.

6.3 Implementation Challenges

Institutional Challenges :Frankly, while disability policies exist, they're often hamstrung by a lack of funding and limited personnel. Programs struggle to get off the ground because resources just aren't there. Coordination between central and state agencies? Honestly, it's patchy at best—implementation gets scattered, and everyone ends up doing their own thing. And when it comes to monitoring and evaluation, the story's not much better. Systems to track progress or ensure anyone's actually held responsible are pretty flimsy, so accountability often falls through the cracks.

Service Delivery Shortcomings :The safety net for poverty alleviation? It's got some glaring deficiencies. Many people with disabilities simply don't get access to these programs. Rehabilitation services are another headache—especially in rural or less developed regions, where they're practically non-existent. Accessibility standards? Sure, they're written down somewhere, but actual enforcement is rare, so physical and social barriers remain stubbornly in place.

Barriers of Awareness and Attitude :Despite what the law says, social stigma and discrimination continue to block genuine inclusion. Awareness about rights and entitlements among people with disabilities and their families isn't where it needs to be. To top it off, service providers often lack proper training or sensitivity, which means essential services either get delivered poorly or not at all.

7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study reveals that PWDs in India continue to face substantial socioeconomic disadvantages despite comprehensive policy frameworks. The intersection of disability and poverty creates compounding challenges that require targeted interventions addressing both immediate needs and structural barriers.

Enhanced resource allocation, improved coordination mechanisms, and robust monitoring systems are essential for effective policy implementation. Mainstream poverty reduction programs must be made disability-inclusive, with specific provisions ensuring PWDs' participation. Expanded microfinance programs, skill development initiatives, and entrepreneurship support can enhance economic opportunities for PWDs.

Establish regular, comprehensive data collection systems to monitor PWDs' socioeconomic status and policy impact. Develop comprehensive social security schemes addressing the additional costs associated with disability. Invest in rehabilitation infrastructure, train service providers, and ensure equitable access across rural and urban areas. Strengthen enforcement of reservation policies and provide incentives for private sector inclusion. Implement targeted programs addressing the specific needs of women with disabilities. Support community-based rehabilitation programs and strengthen partnerships with NGOs.

Future research should focus on longitudinal studies examining policy impact, cost-effectiveness analyses of different interventions, and intersectional studies exploring the experiences of specific subgroups within the disabled population.

REFERENCES

1. *Census of India. (2011). Census of India 2011: Data on disability. Office of the Registrar General & Census Commissioner, Government of India.*
2. *Government of India. (2017). Disabled persons in India: A statistical profile 2016. Social Statistics Division, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation.*
3. *Kumar, S. G., Roy, G., &Kar, S. S. (2012). Disability and rehabilitation services in India: Issues and challenges. Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care, 1(1), 69-73.*
4. *Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. (2019). Persons with disabilities in India: NSS 76th round report. National Statistical Office, Government of India.*
5. *National Sample Survey Organisation. (2003). Disabled persons in India: NSS 58th round report. Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India.*
6. *Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2015). Securing livelihoods for all: Foresight for action. OECD Publishing.*

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 10 | October 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

7. *Pandey, M. K. (2009). Poverty and disability among Indian elderly: Evidence from household survey. ASARC Working Paper 2009/09.*
8. *Stienstra, D., & Lee, T. M. L. (2019). Disabilities and livelihoods: Rethinking a conceptual framework. Societies, 9(4), 67.*
9. *Thangamayan, V., &Murugesan, R. (2015). Disabled persons poverty in India. In K. R. Murugan& K. Manimekalai (Eds.), Social exclusion and inclusion of women in India (Vol. II).M.J.P Publishers.*
10. *United Nations. (2019). Disability and development report: Realizing the sustainable development goals by, for and with persons with disabilities. Department of Economic and Social Affairs.*
11. *United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.(2019). Disability, livelihood and poverty in Asia and the Pacific. Retrieved from https://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/SDD_PUB_Disability-Livelihood.pdf*
12. *Vijayan, K., Shanimon, S., &Indurajani, R. (2020). Socio-economic conditions of differently-abled persons in India: An empirical study based on secondary data. International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, 10(11).*
13. *World Health Organization.(2011). World report on disability. WHO Press.*