International Journal of Environmental Sciences
ISSN: 2229-7359
Vol. 11 No. 20s, 2025
https://theaspd.com/index.php

Differently Abled Women And Employability – Are Women With Disabilities At A Greater Disadvantage?

Dr.Neeta Sinha[1], Dr.Supriya Pal[2], Dr.Niyati Shah[3], Ms.Aishwarya Vishwakarma[4], Ms.Anmol Mathur[5]
[1]Associate Professor, Pandit Deendayal Energy University, Gandhinagar
[2]Assistant Professor, Pandit Deendayal Energy University, Gandhinagar
[3]Assistant Professor, Pandit Deendayal Energy University, Gandhinagar
[4]Research Scholar, Pandit Deendayal Energy University, Gandhinagar
[5]Research Scholar, Pandit Deendayal Energy University, Gandhinagar

Abstract
Women with disabilities face compounded challenges in employability due to the intersection of gender and disability-related discrimination. This study investigates whether differently abled women experience greater employment disadvantages compared to their male counterparts and other marginalized groups. Drawing from psychological theories such as Stigma Theory, Social Identity Theory, Self-Efficacy Theory, and Stereotype Threat Theory, the study explores how societal biases, workplace exclusion, and internalized perceptions of capability impact their employability. The research employs a mixed-methods approach. A sample of 262 respondents was analyzed using ANOVA to determine gender-based disparities in employment-related challenges. While findings indicate no significant gender difference in overall employability challenges, financial constraints, hiring issues, or workplace biases, significant disparities exist in employment accessibility and skill development opportunities, with women facing greater barriers. These findings align with global literature on the compounded disadvantages faced by women with disabilities due to deep-rooted societal norms, limited vocational training, and lack of targeted policy interventions.
The study underscores the need for inclusive employment policies that specifically address gendered barriers faced by women with disabilities. It calls for targeted interventions such as accessible skill development programs, mentorship opportunities, and employer sensitization programs to foster equitable workplace environments. By shifting focus from broad gender-neutral policies to intersectional approaches that consider both gender and disability, policymakers and organizations can better promote economic independence and workplace inclusion for differently abled women.
Key words: Disability, Divyang, discrimination, gender, women, PwDs

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Employment is a crucial determinant of economic independence, social inclusion, and overall well-being. However, access to employment opportunities is not equal for all segments of the population. Among the most marginalized groups in the labor market are persons with disabilities (PwDs), who often face structural and attitudinal barriers to securing and sustaining employment. Within this broader group, women with disabilities encounter unique and compounded challenges. This dual marginalization exacerbates employment disparities, limiting their access to job opportunities, career advancement, and workplace accommodations.

The global discourse on disability and employment highlights the persistent challenges faced by PwDs in achieving gainful employment. While international frameworks such as the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) emphasize equal employment opportunities, gender disparities within the disabled workforce remain stark.

According to the 2011 Census of India, the country had approximately 26.8 million individuals with disabilities, representing 2.21% of the total population. Of this disabled population, 56% (around 14.9 million) were males, while 44% (approximately 11.9 million) were females. In contrast, the overall population distribution was 51% male and 49% female. This indicates a higher prevalence of reported disabilities among males compared to females. Women with disabilities encounter numerous challenges due to the intersection of gender, disability, and economic hardship. Cultural norms, traditions, and ingrained biases further isolate them, contributing to low self-esteem and emotional distress. The absence of adequate support systems and limited access to education hinder their financial independence, forcing them to rely on family members or caregivers. In some cultures, a mother is blamed for giving birth to a child with a disability, and this stigma is even harsher if the mother herself has a disability. Societal norms

often define masculinity through roles like provider and leader, but when a man has a disability, he may be perceived as falling short of these ideals, which can perpetuate damaging stereotypes about both gender and disability. Psychological theories provide valuable insights into the barriers they encounter in securing employment. Theories related to stigma, social identity, self-efficacy, and workplace inclusion help explain why women with disabilities experience greater disadvantage compared to their male or able-bodied counterparts.

Erving Goffman's **Stigma Theory (1963)** suggests that individuals with disabilities are often perceived as 'deviant' from societal norms, leading to prejudice and discrimination. For women with disabilities, this stigma is compounded by traditional gender norms that already limit women's roles in professional spaces. Society often views them as dependent, incapable, or requiring excessive accommodations, reducing their opportunities for meaningful employment. These stereotypes can result in employer bias, limiting access to job opportunities, career advancement, and fair wages.

Tajfel and Turner's **Social Identity Theory (1979)** explains how individuals categorize themselves into in-groups and out-groups, leading to bias and exclusion. Women with disabilities belong to multiple marginalized groups, often being placed in the 'out-group' in professional settings. This exclusion results in fewer networking opportunities, professional mentorships, and leadership roles. In male-dominated or physically demanding industries, these women may be further sidelined due to the perception that they lack the 'ideal worker' attributes.

Albert Bandura's **Self-Efficacy Theory (1977)** highlights how a person's belief in their ability to perform a task affects their motivation and success. Women with disabilities may internalize societal biases and develop lower self-efficacy regarding their professional capabilities. If they grow up facing repeated rejections or a lack of role models, they may hesitate to apply for jobs or negotiate better working conditions. This reduced self-confidence can affect job performance, career progression, and willingness to take leadership roles.

Claude Steele's **Stereotype Threat Theory (1995)** explains how awareness of negative stereotypes can affect an individual's performance. Women with disabilities may experience anxiety about confirming stereotypes related to incompetence or inefficiency in the workplace. This added psychological pressure can impact their job performance, leading to further marginalization and reinforcing workplace biases.

Positive psychology and inclusion models, such as **Langer's Mindfulness Theory (1989)** and **the Contact Hypothesis (Allport, 1954),** suggest that increasing awareness and direct interactions with differently abled women can reduce prejudice and improve workplace integration. Organizations that implement disability-inclusive policies, mentorship programs, and flexible work environments create spaces where these women can thrive.

Psychological theories reveal how structural and attitudinal barriers contribute to the employability challenges faced by women with disabilities. Stigma, social exclusion, low self-efficacy, stereotype threat, and workplace biases collectively place them at a greater disadvantage. Addressing these issues requires both policy-level interventions and organizational shifts toward inclusive and empowering work environments.

1.2 Research Problem

Despite increased awareness and legislative efforts to promote workplace inclusivity, women with disabilities continue to face significant employability challenges. These challenges stem from multiple sources, including employer biases, inadequate workplace accommodations, lack of educational and vocational training opportunities, and cultural perceptions of gender roles and disability. Moreover, limited access to professional networks and the absence of targeted employment policies further hinder their participation in the labor force.

Research Gap

Existing research on employment and disability primarily focuses on general challenges faced by PwDs or gender-based employment disparities. However, the specific barriers encountered by women with disabilities remain an underexplored area, particularly in developing countries where socio-economic constraints further limit their opportunities. This study aims to bridge this research gap by examining whether women with disabilities are at a greater disadvantage in job availability compared to their male counterparts and other marginalized groups.

1.3 Research Objectives

- To analyze the employment gap between men and women with disabilities.

- To identify the key factors contributing to the employment challenges faced by women with disabilities.
- To evaluate the effectiveness of existing policies and programs aimed at enhancing employment opportunities for women with disabilities.
- To propose recommendations for improving workplace inclusivity and accessibility.

1.4 Research Questions

This research will address the following questions:

1. What are the primary employment barriers faced by women with disabilities?
2. How does the employment rate of women with disabilities compare to that of men with disabilities?
3. What policy interventions and inclusive strategies can improve job opportunities for women with disabilities?

1.5 Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference in overall employability challenges faced by individuals based on gender among persons with disabilities.
2. There is no significant difference in job availability/accessibility challenges faced by individuals based on gender among persons with disabilities.
3. There is no significant difference in employability related financial challenges faced by individuals based on gender among persons with disabilities.
4. There is no significant difference in employability related Skill development challenges faced by individuals based on gender among persons with disabilities.
5. There is no significant difference in employability policy related challenges faced by individuals based on gender among persons with disabilities.
6. There is no significant difference in employability related social bias and attitude challenges faced by individuals based on gender among persons with disabilities.
7. There is no significant difference in employability related hiring challenges faced by individuals based on gender among persons with disabilities.

1.6 Significance of the Study

The findings of this study have the potential to contribute to both academic discourse and practical policy reforms. By shedding light on the specific disadvantages faced by women with disabilities, the study can inform policymakers, employers, and advocacy groups working towards inclusive employment practices. Additionally, the study aims to enhance understanding of how intersectionality—specifically the overlap of gender and disability—affects labor market outcomes. The research will also provide recommendations for businesses, government agencies, and civil society organizations to create more equitable employment opportunities.

1.7 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

- **Research Approach**

A **mixed-methods approach** was used:

Survey was done to collect data on gender disparities in job availability. Data was collected through the snowball method from 262 participants across Gujarat. The collected data was divided into different strata based on gender and type of disability.

Analysis:

Table no. [1]: Summary and ANOVA results of Employability Challenges Across Genders

SUMMARY

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Male	77	288.944	3.75253	0.16825
Female	31	112.972	3.64427	0.13073

ANOVA

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	0.25904	1	0.25904	1.64329	0.20267	3.93069
Within Groups	16.7093	106	0.15763			

Total	16.9683	107

Table no. [1] provides a summary of employability challenges faced by persons with disabilities (PWD) based on gender. The analysis compares the experiences of male and female respondents. The average employability challenge score for males is 3.75, while for females, it is slightly lower at 3.64. The variance is also higher for males (0.168) compared to females (0.131), indicating slightly more variation in the responses among males.

The F-statistic (1.643) is less than the critical F-value (3.931), and the p-value (0.203) is greater than 0.05. These results suggest that there is no substantial difference in employability challenges faced by males and females within this sample. Therefore, gender does not appear to be a significant factor affecting employability challenges among PWD.

Table no. [2]: Summary and ANOVA results of Availability of Employment across genders

SUMMARY

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Female	73	288	3.945205	0.871956
Male	189	687.5	3.637566	1.180443

ANOVA

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	4.983875	1	4.983875	4.551418	0.033828	3.877473
Within Groups	284.7041	260	1.095016			
Total	289.688	261				

Table no. [2] The average score for females was 3.945, slightly higher than the score for males, which was 3.638. This indicates that females have a marginally more favorable perception of employment availability compared to males. Variances in scores reveal differing levels of consistency, with females showing less variability (0.872) compared to males (1.180).

The between-group sum of squares (SS) was 4.984, and the within-group SS was 284.704. The F-statistic was calculated as 4.551, with a p-value of 0.034. Since the p-value is below the 0.05 significance level, the differences in mean scores between genders are statistically significant. Additionally, the F-statistic exceeds the critical F-value of 3.877, further supporting the presence of significant differences.

These results suggest that gender significantly influences perceptions of employment availability among PWD.

Table no. [3]: Summary and ANOVA Results of Financial Challenges Across Genders

SUMMARY

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Female	73	245.5	3.363014	0.50528
Male	189	640.25	3.387566	0.607305

ANOVA

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	0.031745	1	0.031745	0.054822	0.81506	3.877473
Within Groups	150.5534	260	0.579052			
Total	150.5852	261				

Table no. [3] The average financial challenge scores were comparable, with females reporting an average score of 3.36 and males slightly higher at 3.39. Variance in financial challenges was lower among females (0.505), indicating more consistency in their experiences, while males had a higher variance (0.607), suggesting greater variability within this group.

The between-group sum of squares (SS) was 0.032, and the within-group SS was 150.553. The calculated F-statistic was 0.055, with a corresponding p-value of 0.815. Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, the analysis indicates no statistically significant differences in financial challenges between females and males. Furthermore, the F-statistic is far below the critical F-value of 3.877, reaffirming the lack of significance.

These findings suggest that gender does not significantly influence financial challenges among PWD in this sample. Both groups experience similar levels of financial challenges, which implies that interventions aimed at addressing these challenges can adopt a gender-neutral approach while focusing on other key factors.

Table no. [4]: Summary and ANOVA results of Skill Development and Self-Employment Challenges across Genders

SUMMARY

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Female	73	270.25	3.702055	0.219458
Male	189	663.375	3.509921	0.353541

ANOVA

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	1.943983	1	1.943983	6.143866	0.013822	3.877473
Within Groups	82.26672	260	0.31641			
Total	84.2107	261				

Table no. [4] The Female group had an average score of 3.70 with a variance of 0.219, while the Male group had a slightly lower average score of 3.51 and a higher variance of 0.354. This suggests that while females, on average, reported slightly higher skill development levels, there was more variability in scores among males.

The between-group sum of squares (SS) was 1.944, while the within-group SS was 82.267, indicating that most of the variation in Skill Development and Self-Employment Challenges was within the groups rather than between them. The F-statistic value of 6.144 and the corresponding p-value of 0.014 indicate that the difference in skill development between males and females is statistically significant at the 5% level, as the p-value is below 0.05. Additionally, the F-statistic exceeds the critical F-value of 3.877, further supporting the conclusion that the differences are significant.

These results suggest that gender has a significant impact on Skill Development and Self-Employment Challenges among PWD in this sample, with females reporting higher average skill development compared to males. This finding highlights the need for targeted interventions to address potential disparities and ensure equitable access to Skill Development and Self-Employment Challenges opportunities for both genders, which could ultimately help reduce employability challenges faced by PWD.

Table no [5]: Summary and ANOVA results of Practices and policies Challenges across different genders

SUMMARY

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Female	73	298	4.082192	0.493151
Male	189	760.5	4.02381	0.809271

ANOVA

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	0.179492	1	0.179492	0.248697	0.618416	3.877473
Within Groups	187.6497	260	0.72173			
Total	187.8292	261				

Table no. [5] These groups represent the gender distribution of persons with disabilities (PWD) included in the study. The table highlights only slight variations in the average employability challenges scores among the two groups. The **Female** group had an average score of **4.08**, while the **Male** group scored **4.02**. The variance in scores was slightly lower for females (**0.49**) compared to males (**0.81**), suggesting a greater consistency in employability challenge experiences for females.

The **between-group sum of squares (SS)** was **0.18**, while the **within-group SS** was much larger at **187.65**, indicating that most of the variability in employability challenges occurred within, rather than between, the gender groups. The **F-statistic** value was **0.25**, with a corresponding **p-value** of **0.618**, which is far greater than the typical significance level of **0.05**. This suggests that the differences observed in the average scores are not statistically significant. Additionally, the F-statistic is much smaller than the critical F-value of **3.88**, reinforcing the conclusion that the differences between genders are likely due to random chance. The relatively low variance within the male group (0.809) compared to the female group (0.493) might point to differences in perception or experiences regarding employability challenges, but this does not result in a significant difference in the overall analysis. This finding highlights gender-based differences in how policies and practices are experienced but suggests that these differences are not substantial enough in this particular context to lead to a significant overall effect. These findings suggest the need for further exploration into whether other variables, such as disability type or regional policies, may account for variations in the experiences of male and female participants.

Table no [6]: Summary and ANOVA results of Social and attitude bias related challenges across different genders

SUMMARY

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Female	73	283	3.876712	0.534936
Male	189	755.75	3.998677	0.709772

ANOVA

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	0.783345	1	0.783345	1.184453	0.277459	3.877473
Within Groups	171.9526	260	0.661356			
Total	172.7359	261				

Table no. [6] The Female group had an average score of **3.88**, with a variance of **0.535**, while the Male group had a slightly higher average score of **4.00** and a variance of **0.710**. These values indicate a slightly greater variation in scores within the Male group compared to the Female group.

The between-group sum of squares (SS) was **0.783**, while the within-group SS was much larger at **171.953**, suggesting that most of the variability in social and attitude bias scores occurred within groups (Female and Male), rather than between them.

The F-statistic value was **1.184**, with a corresponding p-value of **0.277**. Since the p-value is greater than the standard significance threshold of 0.05, the analysis indicates that the differences in average social and attitude bias scores between Female and Male groups are not statistically significant. Additionally, the F-statistic is smaller than the critical F-value of **3.877**, further confirming that the observed differences are likely due to random variation rather than a meaningful effect of gender on social and attitude bias.

These findings suggests that attitudinal biases toward people with disabilities often transcend gender distinctions and are shaped more by societal norms, cultural perceptions, and personal exposure to

disability issues. While gender can influence social attitudes in specific domains, the relatively equal means across genders suggest a shared acknowledgment of the challenges faced by persons with disabilities, perhaps driven by increasing awareness through policy advocacy and education.

The slightly higher variability in male responses (variance = 0.71) compared to females (variance = 0.53) could reflect diverse socio-cultural exposures and workplace dynamics influencing individual attitudes. Future studies could explore intersecting demographic factors, such as education or profession, to better understand the nuanced dimensions of these biases.

Table no [7]: Summary and ANOVA results of Hiring related challenges across different genders

SUMMARY

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Female	73	235	3.219178	0.656509
Male	189	622.7143	3.294785	0.806908

ANOVA

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	0.301024	1	0.301024	0.393363	0.531088	3.877473
Within Groups	198.9674	260	0.765259			
Total	199.2684	261				

Table no. [7] The Female group had an average score of 3.22 with a variance of 0.657, while the Male group scored slightly higher on average at 3.29 with a variance of 0.807. The variance within both groups highlights some differences in consistency of hiring issues scores.

The one-way ANOVA results were used to test whether these differences in average scores across gender groups were statistically significant. The between-group sum of squares (SS) was 0.301, while the within-group SS was much larger at 198.967, indicating that most of the variability in hiring issues occurred within, rather than between, the two groups. The F-statistic value was 0.393, with a corresponding p-value of 0.531. Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, the analysis indicates no statistically significant differences in hiring issues scores between Female and Male groups. Additionally, the F-statistic is smaller than the critical F-value of 3.88, reinforcing the conclusion that any observed differences are likely due to chance rather than a meaningful effect.

One possible explanation for this outcome could be the universality of barriers faced by persons with disabilities, regardless of gender. Challenges such as lack of accessibility, discrimination, and inadequate workplace accommodations tend to impact all individuals with disabilities similarly (Barnes & Mercer, 2010).

The slightly higher average among males may reflect gender-specific experiences, with men potentially facing added stigma related to traditional masculinity, while women's challenges may involve gender discrimination not fully reflected in the data.

DISCUSSION

5.1.2 Gender and Its Role in Employability Challenges for PWD

The findings of this study indicate that gender does not significantly influence the employability challenges faced by persons with disabilities (PWD). This conclusion challenges traditional narratives that often focus on gender disparities in employment and aligns with a growing body of research emphasizing the multifaceted nature of employability challenges.

Existing literature presents mixed results regarding the impact of gender on employability for PWD. Some studies highlight gender as a critical factor influencing employment outcomes, while others argue that factors such as education, socio-economic status, and workplace accessibility have a more substantial impact. For instance, Hwa (2017) explored employers' perceptions of persons with disabilities and found evidence of gender differences in how employers view employability. However, the study noted that these

differences are often mediated by societal attitudes and expectations, rather than gender itself being a determinant of employment opportunities.

Similarly, Pettinicchio and Maroto (2017) emphasized the intersectionality of gender and disability in shaping labor market outcomes. While their research highlighted disparities between men and women with disabilities, it also underscored the importance of addressing broader structural inequalities that affect employment opportunities. This perspective aligns with the findings of the current study, which suggest that gender alone may not be a significant predictor of employability challenges.

The findings of Ramachandra et al. (2017), noted that workplace accommodation and skill development are essential in improving employability for PWD, regardless of gender.

In contrast, some studies, such as those by Ebuenyi et al. (2019), have highlighted the role of gender-specific expectations in shaping employment opportunities. Their research indicated that women with disabilities often face additional barriers, such as caregiving responsibilities and societal biases, which can limit their access to employment. While these challenges are significant, they do not negate the findings of this study, which suggest that gender, as an isolated factor, does not significantly influence employability challenges when broader socio-demographic factors are considered.

Furthermore, Beatty et al. (2018) provided a comprehensive review of organizational treatment of PWD, highlighting that inclusive workplace policies and practices are more decisive in improving employment outcomes than gender. This aligns with the current study's findings, suggesting that interventions aimed at reducing employability challenges should focus on creating supportive environments rather than targeting gender-specific issues.

(b) Gender Disparities in Employment accessibility

Research consistently emphasizes that women with disabilities often face compounded discrimination due to both gender and disability, leading to lower employment rates and greater challenges in accessing equitable opportunities. Seidu et al. (2023) found that women with disabilities in Ghana experience societal stigma, lack of adequate support services, and limited opportunities, all of which hinder their employment prospects. These challenges are deeply rooted in cultural and societal norms that marginalize women and perpetuate gender inequality.

Similarly, Shiwakoti et al. (2021) highlight the intersectionality of gender and disability in their study on reproductive health access for women with disabilities in Nepal. They argue that limited access to essential services, such as reproductive healthcare, negatively impacts the overall well-being and employability of women with disabilities. Poor health outcomes and the added burden of navigating inaccessible healthcare systems can reduce the ability of women with disabilities to participate fully in the labor market.

The findings of this study underscore these disparities by demonstrating significant gender-based differences in employment accessibility. Women with disabilities may face structural and systemic barriers, such as discriminatory hiring practices, workplace inaccessibility, and insufficient legal protections. Additionally, caregiving responsibilities, which disproportionately fall on women, may further limit their ability to seek and retain employment opportunities.

Financial Challenges Across Genders

Harrison et al. (2020) similarly found that financial barriers, particularly in accessing essential services like healthcare, are experienced across genders and are not necessarily driven by gender-specific dynamics. This aligns with the current study's findings, suggesting that the financial difficulties faced by PWD are often rooted in systemic issues rather than gender disparities. These systemic challenges include limited income opportunities, insufficient social support, and barriers to accessing services, which tend to impact all PWD irrespective of gender.

Harrison et al. (2020) argue that while women often encounter unique social barriers, the financial obstacles they face are largely shared by their male counterparts within similar socioeconomic contexts.

The findings also raise questions about the broader determinants of financial challenges for PWD. Factors such as type of disability, age, and employment status may play a more prominent role than gender in shaping financial outcomes. These determinants, as noted in other studies, contribute to the systemic inequities faced by PWD and suggest that future research should explore these variables more deeply to develop targeted interventions.

Skill Development and Self-Employment Challenges Across Genders

Research underscores that women with disabilities face unique challenges compared to their male counterparts, which stem from deeply entrenched gender norms and discriminatory practices in society.

Schimmele (2024) notes that women with disabilities often encounter higher levels of discrimination and lower employment rates, primarily due to negative employer attitudes and a lack of appropriate accommodations. These factors can restrict their access to opportunities for skill development and self-employment.

Similarly, Coffey et al. (2014) highlight that visually impaired women report substantial barriers in the workplace, including limited access to training and negative perceptions about their abilities. This reflects a broader pattern of exclusion that affects women with disabilities across various contexts. Furthermore, Chumo et al. (2023) emphasize the intersectionality of gender and disability, noting that the compounded effects can lead to reduced self-esteem and limited access to essential resources. This lack of support creates significant obstacles in achieving self-employment or acquiring the skills necessary for sustainable employment.

Policy and practices related challenges across different genders

The findings are consistent with existing literature, which often emphasizes that employability challenges for PWDs are shaped more by structural and systemic barriers than by gender alone. Studies by Mitra and Sambamoorthi (2006) highlight that PWDs face significant challenges, including lack of accessible infrastructure, employer bias, and inadequate policy implementation, which cut across gender lines. While there are some gender-specific differences in employability challenges, larger societal and institutional barriers tend to affect both male and female persons with disabilities more significantly.

Social and attitude bias within different genders

Furthermore, the lack of significant gender differences aligns with studies that highlight the complexity of biases among PWDs. Research by Brown and Moloney (2018) emphasized that perceptions of bias and discrimination are often shaped more by intersectional factors, such as disability type, cultural background, and socio-economic status, than by gender alone. While gender can influence specific attitudes in broader populations, its effects are often less pronounced in marginalized groups such as PWDs.

These results suggest the need for future research to explore other variables, such as education level, employment status, or societal support systems, that may more directly impact social and attitude biases among PWDs. Addressing such factors may offer a more nuanced understanding of how these biases are shaped and experienced across diverse demographic groups.

By focusing on broader influences beyond gender, interventions can be designed to more effectively mitigate biases and foster inclusivity for PWDs in various societal contexts.

Hiring issues across different genders

This finding is consistent with previous studies that have explored gender differences in the context of disability and employment, suggests that gender may not be a strong determinant in the hiring process for PWD, as other factors such as the nature of disability, workplace accommodation, and organizational policies tend to play a more substantial role. Additionally, the lack of gender differences could reflect broader societal attitudes towards disability, where the barriers faced by both genders may be similarly perceived and addressed within the workplace context.

In summary, the absence of a statistically significant difference between the two gender groups implies that while gender may influence many aspects of employment, it does not appear to have a substantial effect on the specific challenges related to hiring for PWD in this study. This conclusion highlights the importance of focusing on other factors that may have a more meaningful impact on hiring decisions and the employment experiences of PWD.

REFERENCES:

1. Beatty, J., Baldridge, D., Boehm, S., Kulkarni, M., & Colella, A. (2018). On the treatment of persons with disabilities in organizations: A review and research agenda. Human Resource Management, 58(2), 119-137. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21940
2. Brown, R. L., & Moloney, M. E. (2018). Intersectionality, work, and well-being: The effects of gender and disability. Gender & Society, 33(1), 94–122. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243218800636 (Original work published 2019)
3. Browne, S. E., Connors, D., & Stern, N. (1985). With the power of each breath: A disabled women's anthology (1st ed.). Cleis Press.
4. Census. (2011). Census 2011. Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Government of India. Retrieved January 12, 2017, from http://disabilityaffairs.gov.in/content/page/state-ut-wise-persons.php
5. Chumo, I., Kabaria, C., & Mberu, B. (2023). Social inclusion of persons with disability in employment: What would it take to socially support employed persons with disability in the labor market? Frontiers in Rehabilitation Science, 4, 1125129. https://doi.org/10.3389/fresc.2023.1125129

6. Coffey, K., Smith, A., & Johnson, R. (2014). Barriers to employment for visually impaired women. International Journal of Workplace Health Management. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijwhm-06-2013-0022
7. Deegan, M. J. (1985). Women and disability: The double handicap (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351318082
8. Driedger, D. (1996). Across borders: Women with disabilities working together. Journal of Disability Policy Studies, 8(1–2), 255–257. https://doi.org/10.1080/108976218/thumbnails/1
9. Ebuenyi, I., Ham, L., Bunders, J., & Regeer, B. (2019). Expectations management; employer perspectives on opportunities for improved employment of persons with mental disabilities in Kenya. Disability and Rehabilitation, 42(12), 1687-1696. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2018.1534006
10. Fine, M., & Asch, A. (Eds.). (1988). Women with disabilities: Essays in psychology, culture, and politics. Temple University Press.
11. Forman, J., Salter, N. P., Schafer, K., & Dausch, M. (2023). Creating a culture of inclusivity for employees with sensory disabilities: Best practices for organizations. Consulting Psychology Journal, 75(3), 225–239. https://doi.org/10.1037/cpb0000226
12. Harrison, J., Thomson, R., Banda, H., Mbera, G., Gregorius, S., Stenberg, B., ... & Marshall, T. (2020). Access to health care for people with disabilities in rural Malawi: What are the barriers? BMC Public Health, 20(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-08691-9
13. Hwa, M. (2017). Employers' perceptions of persons with disabilities: Evidence of gender differences. GATR Journal of Management and Marketing Review, 2(1), 01-07. https://doi.org/10.35609/jmmr.2017.2.1(1)
14. Higenyi, F., & Guzu, B. (2022). Disability and workplace inclusiveness; regulatory and structural experiences from developing economies: A case of selected organizations in Kampala metropolitan, Uganda. African Journal of Governance and Development (AJGD), 11(2), 408–419. https://doi.org/10.36369/2616-9045/2022/v11i2a2
15. Mitra, S., & Sambamoorthi, U. (2006). Government programs to promote employment among persons with disabilities in India. Indian Journal of Social Development, 6(2), 195–213. Retrieved from https://ssrn.com/abstract=2338071
16. Oliver, M. (1983). Social work with disabled people. Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-86058-6
17. Oliver, M. (2013). The social model of disability: Thirty years on. Disability & Society, 28(7), 1024–1026. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2013.818773
18. Pettinicchio, D., & Maroto, M. (2017). Employment outcomes among men and women with disabilities: How the intersection of gender and disability status shapes labor market inequality. In M. J. Barrington (Ed.), Social Stratification: Trends and Prospects, 3-33. https://doi.org/10.1108/s1479-354720170000010003
19. Ramachandra, S. S., Murthy, G. V. S., Shamanna, B. R., Allagh, K. P., Pant, H. B., & John, N. (2017). Factors Influencing Employment and Employability for Persons with Disability: Insights from a City in South India. Indian journal of occupational and environmental medicine, 21(1), 36–41. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijoem.IJOEM_44_16
20. Schimmele, C. (2024). Workplace accommodations and the labour force status of persons with disabilities. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-4503504/v1
21. Seidu, A. (2023). A mixed-methods study of the awareness and functionality of sexual and reproductive health services among persons with disability in Ghana. Reproductive Health, 20(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12978-023-01700-1
22. Seidu, A., Malau-Aduli, B., McBain-Rigg, K., Malau-Aduli, A., & Emeto, T. (2023). "God is my only health insurance": A mixed-methods study on the experiences of persons with disability in accessing sexual and reproductive health services in Ghana. Frontiers in Public Health, 11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1232046
23. Shiwakoti, R., Gurung, Y., Poudel, R., Neupane, S., Thapa, R., Deuja, S., ... & Pathak, R. (2021). Factors affecting utilization of sexual and reproductive health services among women with disabilities: A mixed-method cross-sectional study from Ilam district, Nepal. BMC Health Services Research, 21(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-021-07382-4
24. This research is part of Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR) sponsored project on "An Assessment of Employability Challenges of Persons with Disabilities"