

HOW RESEARCH GRANTING COUNCILS AND SIMILAR ORGANIZATIONS HAVE APPROACHED SOCIAL INCLUSION (PROCESS AND OUTCOMES)

;

;

© 2020, MAURICE OCHIENG BOLO



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction, provided the original work is properly credited.

Cette œuvre est mise à disposition selon les termes de la licence Creative Commons Attribution (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>), qui permet l'utilisation, la distribution et la reproduction sans restriction, pourvu que le mérite de la création originale soit adéquatement reconnu.

IDRC Grant/ Subvention du CRDI: 109388-001-Support for strategic communications and uptake of knowledge outputs

Desk study: How research granting councils and similar organizations have approached social inclusion (process and outcomes)

1.0. Introduction: What is social inclusion and why emphasize on gender and social inclusion?

The World Bank (2020) defines social inclusion as the process of improving the terms on which individuals and groups take part in society in ways that improve the ability, opportunity, and dignity of those disadvantaged on the basis of their identity. Social inclusion involves the integration of previously excluded persons or groups in societal activities or processes (ibid). The Centre for Economic and Social Inclusion (2002) defines Social inclusion as the process by which efforts are made to ensure that everyone, regardless of their experiences and circumstances, can achieve their potential in life. To achieve inclusion, income and employment are necessary but not sufficient. An inclusive society is also characterized by a striving for reduced inequality, a balance between individuals' rights and duties and increased social cohesion. The European Working Group on Empowering the Excluded (1999) explains social inclusion to be the development of capacity and opportunity to play a full role, not only in economic terms, but also in social, psychological and political terms.

Social inclusion goes beyond interests, incentives, values and group size and enables people's capacity to work together by making the them-us boundaries permeable (Woolcock, 2013). Where social inclusion is practiced, opportunities and meaningful participation are enhanced and societies (not just groups and networks) are able to peacefully manage collective action problems. Social cohesion is often needed to determine what the key problems are; identify and prioritize responses including those that are politically supportable; and identify how losers can be compensated, if at all (ibid). Exclusion is often based on social identity, which is in most cases contested (ibid). Identity may be derived from gender, age, location, occupation, race, ethnicity, religion, citizenship status, disability; economic, cultural and class factors; sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI), among other factors (World Bank 2020). Exclusion often denies the excluded persons the opportunity to lead a better life, which takes away their dignity, security and their capacity to act (ibid). Inequalities are pernicious and injustices associated with them can be perceived or imagined (Woolcock, 2013). Social exclusion stems from the combination of multiple factors of deprivation (Townsend, 1993; Bradshaw et al., 2004), pertaining to dimensions such as: economic distress, deficient schooling, inadequate housing, unemployment, etc. (Mancinelli, 2008). Definitions of social exclusion focus on the

“classification” of target groups excluded or at risk of exclusion made on the bases of factors of disadvantage that can, for example, be economical, physical, geographical, or linked to gender, age, etc. (ibid).

The concept of social exclusion seems to point to the multidimensional nature of the process of exclusion, which amplifies its effects on individuals, groups within region or urban areas, or in society as a whole. Substantial social, political and economic costs for individuals and countries are associated with social exclusion. Individual losses include losses in opportunities for education and employment outcomes and the more personal physical and mental health costs. National economic costs of exclusion include forgone gross domestic product (GDP) and human capital wealth. Exclusion or the perception of exclusion may cause certain groups to opt out of markets, services, and spaces, with costs to both individuals and the national economy (World Bank 2020). A socially inclusive society requires informed communities that have the means, skills and opportunities to communicate. Without these attributes, other social policy measures will fail (Comm Dev Foundation and IBM 1997).

In gender inclusion, for example, while progress has been made in increasing female labor force participation (FLFP) in the past 20 years, the pace has been uneven, and large gaps remain. FLFP was 54 percent for the median Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries in 2014, 14 percentage points below male labor force participation (MLFP); for the median middle-income country, FLFP was only 49 percent, 26 percentage points below MLFP; and for the median low-income country, FLFP was 64 percent, 13 points below MLFP (Ostry et al 2018). This gender gap in the labor force costs countries at the bottom half of gender inequality around 35 percent of GDP. The benefit of gender inclusion is that women bring new skills, different risk preference and response to incentives, from men, at the workplace. Narrowing gender gaps benefits both men and women, because participation of women in the labor force results in more workers (Ostry et al 2018).

People / persons with disabilities is known as a people first language and is based on the need to affirm and define the person first before the impairment or disability. In the UK, the preferred term is “disabled persons” as people do not have disabilities, but rather impairments that become disabling due to society not being comprehensively accessible and inclusive (Al Ju Beh 2017). In this review article, both these terms have been used interchangeably. Disability is complex, multidimensional, contested and difficult to define (WHO and World Bank 2011; Mitra 2006). Disabilities can be temporary or permanent and mild or severe. Persons with disability include those with long term physical, mental or intellectual or sensory impairments, which in interaction with various barriers may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others (UNCRDP 2006). An impairment on its own would not lead to a disability should there be a completely inclusive and comprehensive accessible environment, which includes addressing attitudinal barriers such as stereotypes, prejudices and other forms of paternalistic and patronizing treatment (Schulze 2010). When there is disability inclusion, the person with disability is accepted and recognized as an individual beyond his/her disability; has personal

relationships with family, friends and acquaintances; is involved in recreation and social activities; has appropriate living accommodation; is employed; has appropriate formal and informal support (Rimmerman 2013). Disability inclusive development seeks to ensure the full participation of people with disabilities as empowered self-advocates in development processes and emergency responses. It works to address the barriers that hinder their access and participation (A Ju Beh 2015).

In social inclusion, societies, and not just groups and networks, are able to peacefully manage collective action problems. Everyone is included and treated equally without discrimination. In spite of this, and the fact that diversity-through-process constitutes an indicator for accountability as part of the driving efforts around unconscious bias, inclusion continues to be a frustration and challenge for many organizations (Bersin et al 2017). Most people with disabilities are either unemployed or under employed; those that are employed earn lower wages (Groce et al 2011; WHO & World Bank 2011; Mitra 2014 and Rohwerder 2015). Some studies have demonstrated that a larger proportion of women with disabilities than men with disabilities are employed (Mizunoya and Mitra 2013). Other studies suggest that women with disabilities have lower wages than men with disabilities (Heymann et al 2014; Lamichanne 2015). Table 1 represents the employment rates of men and women with and without disability in 51 countries (Mont 2014).

Table 1: Employment rates by gender and disability

Gender	Men %	Women %
With disability	52.8	19.6
Without disability	64.9	29.9

A study of 55 countries during an economic crisis found that many people with disabilities lost their jobs and funding because employment was cut. This has contributed to the widening employment gap even among those more educated persons (Lamicchane 2015). People with intellectual disabilities, mental illness or multiple disabilities have been found to be less likely than people with other disabilities to access employment (Groce et al 2011; Morgan Banks and Polack 2014; Mizunoyo and Mitra 2013; WHO and World Bank 2011). Studies in Nepal, Cambodia and Bangladesh found that people with physical impairments were less likely to find jobs than people with hearing and visual impairments even when they had longer periods of schooling (Lamicchane 2015).

Gender receives special attention in social inclusion because gender issues cause social exclusion and they also intersect with other attributes that cause social exclusion, thus exacerbating it. Owing to this, programs that consider themselves to be comprehensively inclusive ensure that gender inclusion stands alone as an attribute as well as an attribute that intersects with other attributes associated with social exclusion, which makes the exclusion worse. Consequently, the all-encompassing term Gender and Social Inclusion (GeSI) acknowledges the duality of gender in the social inclusion discourse. Using the term “social inclusion” or “gender inclusion”, may misrepresent the desired outcome because the

latter disregards the intersectionality of gender and the former disregards other forms of exclusion.

In gender and social inclusion people of all genders should be treated as equals, because despite many differences, they all share a common humanity or human dignity. Where equity is practiced, there is fair distribution of goods or process among individuals or groups. Inequities, therefore, are differences that are unnecessary, avoidable, unfair, and unjust. Inequities are a common characteristic in the following relational conditions/ attributes and should be identified and addressed (DfID, 2005).

- a. Gender: The differences in the roles and experiences of men, women, boys and girls.
- b. Income: Money received, especially on a regular basis, for work or through investments.
- c. Life-stage/age: [Power] relations between people depending on their position defined by age, marriage, household position (head/widow etc.).
- d. Youth: This category can stand alone or belong to the life-stage / age category depending on the prominence it takes in the area of development.
- e. Geography: Geography could be defined by access to land, roads, markets; situated-ness e.g. rural and urban, or highlands and lowlands etc.
- f. Race/ Ethnicity/ Caste: Race represents people from the same geographical region and with a common genetic composition; Ethnicity is represented by people belonging to a social group with a common national and cultural tradition. Castes are social classes occurring in certain regions and religion (e.g. India and Hinduism) defined along people's wealth, occupation, heredity / lineage
- g. Disability: Disability is a physical, sensual or mental condition that impairs a person's movement, senses or activities.

Other areas of exclusion include HIV or other health status, migrant status, religion, sexual orientation, social status or where they live. An intervention may choose to focus one or more of the above attributes of inequity. It is advisable for all SGCs to choose at least four GeSI areas of focus with gender as a stand-alone and intersecting attribute; age, disability and geography ranking the highest. In contexts where attributes other than these four are prominent, they may be considered and discussed in addition to, but not instead of, gender, age, disability and geography inclusion.

2.0. Barriers to social inclusion

Owing to barriers to disability, estimates of around 40% of people with disabilities benefit from international cooperation programs (Schultze 2010).

2.1. Attitudinal barriers

Stigmatization and discrimination deny people with disability their dignity and potential and are one of the greatest obstacles to achieving equality of opportunity (Wapling and Downie 2012; UNICEF 2013; Heymann et al 2014; Bruijn et al 2012). The non-disabled cannot see past the impairment, discrimination, fear of bullying and low expectations of people with disabilities (DFID 2000; WHO and World Bank 2011; UNICEF 2013).

2.2. Environmental barriers

Examples: Some banks do not allow visually impaired persons to open accounts. Some HIV testing facilities do not provide sign language interpreters due to confidential policies (Wapling and Downie 2012; Al Ju'beh 2017). Discrimination may not be intended but systems can indirectly exclude people with disability by not taking their needs into account (WHO and World Bank 2011). Lack of enforcement and political support can limit inclusion of people with disabilities, e.g. an evaluation of Norway's work on disability inclusion in development and humanitarian action found that its disability inclusion documents had been ignored or forgotten and disability was not a priority theme for the government (NCG 2012) and disability interventions were not mainstreamed and coordinated.

2.3. Internalized barrier

Excluded persons may lack proactive behavior in expressing their opinions or claiming their rights, leading to further exclusion (PPUA Penca 2013). Low expectations of people with disabilities can undermine their confidence and aspirations (DFID 2000; WHO and World Bank 2011; Mont 2014).

2.4. Lack of participation

Lack of consultation and involvement of people with disabilities is a barrier to their inclusion in society (WHO and World Bank 2011; DESA 2011).

2.5. Inadequate data and statistics

Lack of rigorous and comparable data and statistics, combined with evidence on programs that work often impedes understanding and action on disability inclusion (WHO & World Bank 2011).

2.6. Inaccurate concern over cost / difficulty of disability inclusion

Perceived cost (Coe and Wapling 2010) is a major cause of social exclusion of people with disabilities. Inadequate funding and allocations for implementing policies and plans can prevent inclusion of people with disabilities (WHO & World Bank 2011). Other excuses are that disability inclusion is too difficult and requires specialist knowledge, and the people with disabilities require special programs (Bruijn et al 2012). Staff may also be overloaded and not have time for additional issues (ibid) or that it is only relevant in developed countries. Excuses have to be tackled to establish commitment to disability inclusion.

3.0. Why is social inclusion important in research?

Barriers to assistance of and support of disabled persons include lack of awareness and funding, lack of adequate human resources, inappropriate policies and institutional framework, inadequate and unresponsive services, poor service coordination and attitudes and abuse (WHO and World Bank 2011). A budget allocation of 2 – 7% is recommended for development organizations to raise awareness and to make buildings, communication and transport accessible (Bruijn et al 2012). This should be included at the design stage of the project and not regarded as an additional cost (Coe and Wapling 2010). The cost of including people with disabilities are far outweighed by the long term financial benefits to individuals, families and society (CBM 2012).

Barriers to education have resulted in the proportion of disabled children accessing school being almost 50% of the proportion of non-disabled children (Trani et al 2012). Girls with disabilities are less likely to receive an education than boys with disabilities (Trani and Leob 2012); WHO and World Bank 2011; Trani et al 2012). Children with physical disability are generally more likely to be enrolled in school than children with intellectual or sensory impairments (WHO & World Bank 2011; Trani et al 2012). Exclusion from school denies children with disabilities an opportunity for social networking, community participation and all manner of medical, social, nutritional and developmental resources, which can lead to isolation, decreased autonomy and a lower quality of life (Morgon Banks & Polack, 2014).

Overcoming labor market barriers experienced by people with disabilities requires a combination of a range of approaches (Heymann et al., 2014; Mitra, 2014), which include the following: antidiscrimination laws; hiring quotas; wage subsidies; vocational rehabilitation and accommodation in the work place (Rimmerman, 2013; Fembek et al., 2013; WHO & World Bank, 2011; Mont, 2014; Mitra, 2014). The aim is to change attitudes in the workplace and amongst people with disabilities and their families (WHO & World Bank, 2011; Mont, 2014).

Compounding the changes associated with the inclusion gap between people with and without disability is the lack of rigorous impact evaluations of employment programs for people with disabilities in low and medium income countries (Mont 2014).

Enabling access to communication technologies to marginalized people and community groups gives them the power to express their knowledge and describe their activities to a wide audience while giving validity to their experiences (Comm Dev Foundation and IBM 1997). Key benefits of high access to information are significant and demonstrable (Rand corporation 1995). They include collaborative idea generation and problem solving; streamlining internal communications and decision making (especially in large organizations); and collaborative grant application and report writing (gathering background information, sharing drafts etc.) (Comm Dev Foundation and IBM 1997). Marginalized communities are likely to be attracted to information about themselves, provided by themselves and that shares their experiences. Information produced by other non-marginalized communities is also useful for marginalized people because it enables them to make decisions to generate their own information (ibid). Information on and by both marginalized and non-marginalized communities should be shared with mixed audiences from both communities to facilitate mutual understanding and appreciation of each community by the other, which is a prerequisite to integration of these two communities. Without explaining why this is the case, Mancinelli (2008) indicated that adoption and application of new technologies in education – particularly aimed at disadvantaged groups is beneficial, but there is increasing evidence that new technologies could work to increase rather than reduce inequalities, and promote rather than eradicate the so-called “digital divide”.

The science granting council initiative may be termed as an initiative towards transforming SGCs to inclusive information societies. Our operational definition of an information society, is a society that organises itself around knowledge and the management of innovation and

change and uses the information it possesses to drive its transformation and development such that human intellectual creativity flourishes (Karvalics 2008). An information society can also be called a knowledge society or knowledge-based society that is characterized by a high level of information intensity in the everyday life of most citizens, in most organizations and workplaces (Pintér 2008; Net Result, 1997).

An information society uses common or compatible technology for a wide range of personal, social, educational and business activities. It also transmits and receives digital data rapidly between places irrespective of distance (The INSINC Working Party on Social Inclusion in the Information Society, in collaboration with the Community Development Foundation- cited in The Net Result, 1997). Information, therefore, plays a crucial role in transforming a particular society whose difference from others rests in its quality of, and access to information, which to the society becomes essential, central and indispensable (Pinter, 2008).

Not all individuals are fully integrated in information society. Some groups, such as people with disabilities, immigrants or the former prisoners are often excluded (Ribas, Almeda & Bodelón, 2005). When exclusion is caused by a combination of multiple factors, such as being a woman and a former inmate, it is termed as multiple exclusion. Owing to intersectionality of gender and other factors associated with exclusion, women from excluded communities encounter greater difficulties, than men, such as entering the labor market (Apel & Sweeten 2010). The fight against social exclusion in general, and multiple exclusion – due to intersection of causes, in particular, must become a primary objective (Silver, 1995).

4.0. Approaches towards transformation of Science Granting Councils to information societies

Design for all, also called inclusive design, or universal design refers to a broad spectrum design meant to produce products such as buildings and physical environments that are inherently accessible to the widest possible diversity of people, young and old; tall and small; with and without permanent and functional disabilities (Lelegems and Froyen 2014). The Universal Design (UD) approach supports inclusive design processes that produce equitable benefits that are appropriate to human functioning, gender, demographic group and social, economic and cultural setting (DESA, 2013). UD principles include equitable use; flexibility in use; simple and intuitive use; perceptible information; tolerance for error; low physical effort; and size and space for approach and use (UNICEF, 2013). It is practical and affordable, even in developing countries (WHO & World Bank, 2011). Building accessibility and the principle of universal design into the change agenda would ensure that every environment, space, product or service, whether physical or virtual, could be easily approached, reached, entered, exited, interacted with, understood or otherwise used by persons of varying capabilities (DESA, 2013).

Drawing from work by Molnar (2008) on establishment of eGovernment during the European Union states' transition to information society, target groups for inclusion could be reached through transparent and time and cost saving access to rising standards of

information services that benefit stakeholders. Elimination of unnecessary steps in the publishing process and automation of services may attract some excluded persons.

Other strategies associated with enhancing inclusion are identifying and eliminating barriers to excluded participation such as developing/ adopting with or without adaptation: Anti-discrimination laws; participation quotas; cost subsidies; and facilitation to enhance access to the source (Rimmerman, 2013; Fembek et al., 2013; WHO & World Bank, 2011; Mont, 2014; Mitra, 2014). Further, rigorous impact evaluations of funded programs for participation by excluded people and change attitudes in the organization, in this case the science granting councils, and amongst people participating in the grants (Mont 2014; WHO & World Bank, 2011; Mont, 2014). It is also important to note that marginalized communities are likely to be attracted to information about themselves, provided by themselves and that shares their experiences (Mont 2014). Information produced by other communities or science granting councils sharing their experiences and ideas is useful for enabling people to make decisions to generate their own information (ibid).

Another strategy to carry on furthering an inclusive and unrestrictive Information Society was applied by 34 European countries that signed the Riga Ministerial Declaration in 2006 (Empirica 2006). The Ministerial Riga Declaration provided the following policy objectives and targets (ibid). To half the gap in internet usage by 2010 for groups at risk, such as older people, people with disabilities, and unemployed persons; to increase broadband coverage (i.e. the availability of broadband infrastructure) in Europe to at least 90% of the EU population by 2010; to ensure that all public websites are accessible by 2010; by 2008, to put in place actions in the field of digital literacy and skills so as to half gaps for groups at risk of exclusion by 2010; by 2007, make recommendations on accessibility standards and common approaches, which could become mandatory in public procurement by 2010; and assess the necessity for legislative measures in the field of e-Accessibility, and take account of accessibility requirements in the review of the electronic communications regulatory framework beginning in June 2006 (Empirica, 2006).

5.0. Benefits of disability inclusion

5.1. Increased earnings and labor productivity

Each additional year of schooling completed by an adult with disability reduced the probability by 2.5% that his/her household belonged to the poorest two quintiles (Morgon Banks & Polack, 2014). It is estimated that in Pakistan, rehabilitating people with incurable blindness would lead to gross aggregate gains in household earnings of USD 71.8 million p.a. (ibid).

5.2. Increased tax revenues

Increased participation of people with disabilities and their caregivers in the labor force will increase a country's potential tax base (Morgon Banks & Polack, 2014). In Scotland, for every 1£ spent on a supported employment project, £5.87 were saved due to decreased need for disability welfare benefits and increased tax income (ibid).

5.3. Improved individual and family wellbeing

A new focus on accountability, data, transparency and “diversity through process” is driving effort through unconscious bias training and education throughout the business community. In spite of the efforts, diversity and inclusion continue to be frustrating and challenging for many organizations (Bersin et al 2017).

The extent of marginalization depends on the condition resulting to marginalization. For example, data on disability is still largely absent from data collection and monitoring mechanisms in international development (Mitra, 2013). The invisibility of people with disabilities in the mainstream development narrative has ‘resulted in development interventions unintentionally leaving out people with disabilities from their target groups (Al Ju’beh, 2017; Bruijn et al., 2012). Lack of data about disability means that policy makers and practitioners are more likely to put disability aside (Groce et al., 2011). It has contributed to the false impression that people with disabilities are a ‘very small group, reserved for the specialist attention of health or rehabilitation professionals and beyond the scope of development studies’ (Mitra et al., 2013, p. 1). Even so, disability is complex and, therefore, difficult to measure (Mitra, 2013; Madans et al., 2011; Wissenbach, 2014). For example, measuring child disability is particularly difficult as children develop at different speeds, which makes it difficult to assess function and distinguish significant limitations from variations in normal development (UNICEF, 2013). In addition, people with disabilities may not be willing to identify themselves for fear of becoming labelled and marginalized (Kett & Twigg, 2007). Developing global indicators for the monitoring and evaluation of disability policies and programs is very challenging (Groce et al., 2011).

6.0 Discussion and recommendations

The foregoing literature review has demonstrated that gender and social inclusion in Science Granting Councils can be achieved through the transformation process towards becoming information societies. Examples have been drawn from numerous contexts, and some interventions are more relevant to the context of SGCs than others. The Universal Design (UD), which is meant to produce [knowledge] products that are inherently accessible to the widest possible diversity of people, as was explained by Lelegems and Froyen (2014), appears to be a most desirable approach for SGCs to adopt [and adapt] because it produces equitable benefits that are appropriate to human functioning, gender, demographic group and social, economic and cultural settings (DESA, 2013). The work funded by SGCs and its knowledge products should be equitably accessible for use; should be useful in a myriad ways many of which should be simple and intuitive; and the information generated should be accessible and clear for multiple audiences. Owing to the need to include persons of a range of capacities, SGC rules for granting should have some tolerance for, and mechanism to address error in qualifying products; some of the products must require moderate physical and mental effort. To achieve these, SGCs may have to increase the range of skills of grantees they consider for grants and the range of products the grantees produce. Products could range from simple publications e.g. short stories [e.g. stories of change]; blog posts; power-point presentations; stories through photos; briefs; reports and refereed journal publications. Each grantee skill category and type of product should be allocated funding and other resources equitably. The SGCs should ensure that every environment, space, product or service, whether physical or virtual, could be easily approached, reached, entered, exited, interacted with, understood or otherwise used by persons of varying capabilities as advised by DESA (2013).

This study has identified five complementing strategies that could be used by SGCs to enable them to achieve the information societies status. First, each council needs to identify target groups for inclusion; information that is beneficial to each group; and transparent and cost effective ways to reach these groups. Unnecessary steps in the publishing process should be eliminated and some services automated in order to attract some excluded persons.

The second strategy towards social inclusion would be to identify and eliminate barriers to inclusive participation such as developing/ adopting, with or without adaptation, the following processes. Formulation of, commitment to, and implementation of laws e.g. anti-discrimination laws; participation quotas; cost subsidies; and facilitation to enhance access to the source (Rimmerman, 2013; Fembek et al., 2013; WHO & World Bank, 2011; Mont, 2014; Mitra, 2014).

The third strategy involves committing to specific policy objectives and targets (Empirica 2006). Examples of these include halving the inclusion gap in internet usage halved by a specified period, e.g. five years, for groups at risk, such as women, youth and people with disabilities. This could be done by including the cost of internet in the grant or facilitation for increase in broadband coverage in organizations or for researchers located in marginal geographies and ensure that they are accessible by a predetermined date.

Fourthly, rigorous impact evaluations of funded programs for participation by excluded people and changed attitudes in the SGCs, and amongst people participating in the grants must be conducted (Mont 2014; WHO & World Bank, 2011). Outputs on and from marginalized groups should be shared in forums that include the marginalized because marginalized communities are likely to be attracted to information about themselves, provided by themselves, and that shares their experiences (Mont 2014). A sharing forum among SGCs (together with their recently included groups) at various stages of their transformation to Information Societies should be held annually and lessons presented documented, published and widely circulated for adoption for application to further enhance social inclusion.

Finally, and very importantly, there is need to develop the capacity of SGCs to implement these strategies. Skilled personnel to guide the implementation of these activities can be hired and capacity of incumbent leadership and technical personnel developed through sensitization and some basic skill development to enable them to understand, buy-in and support the additional implementation strategies. Financial allocation for the implementation of these strategies needs to be factored in during the designing of the council programs. To achieve gender mainstreaming, at least five percent of the budget should be committed to gender mainstreaming (OSAGI 2001). To raise awareness and make buildings, communication and transport accessible to disabled persons, a budget allocation of 2 – 7% is recommended (Bruijn et al 2012). To attain comprehensive social inclusion in SGCs, a budget of 7 – 12% may suffice.

7.0. Conclusion

In conclusion, if SGCs adopt [and adapt] the recommendations given in this study according to their context, they are likely to become gender and social inclusive information societies. Often programs are aware of what needs to be done, but they lack the capacity in terms of skills and financial resources required for effective implementation. Organizations tend not to plan for gender and social inclusion from the beginning. If the decision to be inclusive comes after the initial implementation, organizations must seek ways to improve their capacities, in terms of skills and finances, to implement the requisite additional interventions.

8.1. Bibliography

- Al Ju'beh, K. (2017). Disability inclusive development toolkit. Bensheim: CBM.
<http://www.cbm.org/article/downloads/54741/CBM-DID-TOOLKIT-accessible.pdf>
- Apel & Sweeten 2010, Silver, 1995 (cited in Barreiro-Gen, M., Novo-Corti, I. and Varela-Candamio, L. 2013. e-Prisons and New Technologies: ICT as a Mechanism of Social Inclusion of Prisoners. International Journal of Knowledge Society Research, 4(3), 1-10.
- Bersin, J., Pester B, Shwartz J and van der Vyuer, B. 2017. Rewriting the Rules for the Digital age. In Deloitte's fifth Annual Global Human Central Trends Report and Survey. Deloitte University Press.
- Bradshaw J., Kemp P., Baldwin S., Rowe, A. (2004): The Drivers of Social Exclusion. A review of the literature (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, London). Cited by Mancinelli 2008.
- Bruijn, P., Regeer, B., Cornielje, H., Wolting, R., van Veen, S. & Maharaj, N. (2012). Count me in: Include people with disabilities in development projects – A practical guide for organisations in North and South. Veenendaal: LIGHT FOR THE WORLD.
<http://www.lightfortheworld.nl/docs/default-source/capacity-building/count-me-in---include-people-with-disabilities-indevelopment-projects.pdf?sfvrsn=18>
- CBM. (2012). Inclusion made easy: A quick program guide to disability in development. Bensheim: CBM. http://www.cbm.org/article/downloads/78851/CBM_Inclusion_Made_Easy_-_complete_guide.pdf
- Coe, S. & Wapling, L. (2010). Practical lessons from four projects on disability-inclusive development programming. Development in Practice, 20(7), 879-886.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2010.508109> accessed 15 July 2020
- DESA. (2011). Best practices for including persons with disabilities in all aspects of development efforts. New York: UN.
http://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/best_practices_publication_2011.pdf
- DESA. (2013). Accessibility and Development: Mainstreaming disability in the post-2015 development agenda. New York: UN.
http://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/accessibility_and_development.pdf
- DFID. (2000). Disability, Poverty and Development. DFID. <http://www.make-developmentinclusive.org/docsen/DFIDdisabilityPovertyDev.pdf>
- DFID 2005. Reducing poverty by tackling social exclusion. A DFID policy paper. September 2005. Published by the Department for International Development.
https://www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/development/docs/social_exclusion.pdf
- Empirica (2006): Benchmarking in a Policy Perspective. Report n. 5: eInclusion. (Gesellschaft für Kommunikations- und Technologieforschung mbH, Bonn). Cited by Elisa Mancinelli 2008. e-inclusion in the information society. In Information Society: From Theory to Political Practice Coursebook. Gondolat – Új Mandátum, 2008. Budapest
- OSAGI 2001. Mainstreaming gender perspectives in national budgets. Office of the Special Advisor on Gender Issues and the Advancement of Women.
<https://www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/gmtoolsnatlbudgets.htm> obtained on 19/08/2020

Fembek, M., Butcher, T. H., Heindorf, I. & Wallner-Mikl, C. (2013). Zero Project report 2013: Employment. Klosterneuburg: Essl Foundation. http://zeroproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Zero-Report_e-2013.pdf

Groce, N., Kett, M., Lang, R. & Trani, J-F. (2011) Disability and Poverty: the need for a more nuanced understanding of implications for development policy and practice. *Third World Quarterly*, 32(8), 1493-1513. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2011.604520>

Heymann, J., M.A. Stein, & G. Moreno (Eds) 2014. *Disability and equality at work*. New York: Oxford University Press. Cited by Rohwerder, B. (2015). *Disability inclusion: Topic guide*. Birmingham, UK: GSDRC, University of Birmingham.

J. D. Ostry, J. Alvarez, R. Espinoza, and C. Papageorgiou 2018. *Economic Gains from Gender Inclusion: New Mechanisms, New Evidence*. IMF Staff Discussion note SDN 18/06. <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/Staff-Discussion-Notes/Issues/2018/10/09/Economic-Gains-From-Gender-Inclusion-New-Mechanisms-New-Evidence-45543> Accessed on 17 July 2020

Karvalics, L. Z. 2008, *Information Society – What is it exactly? The meaning, history and conceptual framework of an expression*. In *Information Society From Theory to Political Practice*. Coursebook. Gondolat – Új Mandátum, Budapest, 2008

Lamicchane, K. (2015). *Disability, education and employment in developing countries: From charity to investment*. CUP. Cited by Rohwerder, B. (2015). *Disability inclusion: Topic guide*. Birmingham, UK: GSDRC, University of Birmingham.

Lelegems, E. and Froyen, H. 2014. *Universal Design, A Methodological Approach*. *Design for All*, October 2014 - Vol. 9, No. 10. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304015764_Universal_Design_A_Methodological_Approach

Mancinelli E. 2008. *e-Inclusion in the Information Society*. In *Information Society From Theory to Political Practice*. Coursebook. Gondolat – Új Mandátum, Budapest, 2008

Mitra, S. (2014). *Employment challenges and successes in low- and middle-Income countries*. In J. Heymann, M. Stein, & G. Moreno (Eds), *Disability and equality at work*. New York: Oxford University Press. Cited by Rohwerder, B. (2015). *Disability inclusion: Topic guide*. Birmingham, UK: GSDRC, University of Birmingham.

Mizunoya, S. & Mitra, S. (2013). Is there a disability gap in employment rates in developing countries? *World Development*, 42, 28–43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2012.05.037>

Mont, D. (2014). *Employment policy approaches and multisectoral implementation in low-and middle-income countries*. In J. Heymann, M. A. Stein, & G. Moreno (Eds). *Disability and equality at work*. New York: Oxford University Press. Cited by Rohwerder, B. (2015). *Disability inclusion: Topic guide*. Birmingham, UK: GSDRC, University of Birmingham.

Morgon Banks, L. & Polack, S. (2014). *The economic costs of exclusion and gains of inclusion of people with disabilities: Evidence from low and middle income countries*. CBM, International Centre for Evidence in Disability, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine. <http://disabilitycentre.lshtm.ac.uk/files/2014/07/Costs-of-Exclusion-and-Gains-of-Inclusion-Report.pdf>

Net Result, The 1997: Social Inclusion in the Information Society. Report of the National Working Party on Social Inclusion in the Information Society. Community Development Foundation, London (England).; IBM, London (England).

Nordic Consulting Group (NCG). (2012). Mainstreaming disability in the new development paradigm: Evaluation of Norwegian support to promote the rights of persons with disabilities. Oslo: NORAD. <http://www.norad.no/en/toolspublications/publications/2012/mainstreaming-disability-in-the-new-development-paradigmevaluation-of-norwegian-support-to-promote-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities/>

Pintér, R. 2008 Towards getting to know information society. In Information Society From Theory to Political Practice. Coursebook. Gondolat – Új Mandátum, Budapest, 2008

PPUA Penca (Center for Election Access of Citizens with Disabilities). (2013). Accessible elections for persons with disabilities in five Southeast Asian countries. USAID & AGENDA. http://www.ifes.org/sites/default/files/accessible_elections_for_for_persons_with_disabilites_agenda.pdf

Ribas, Almeda & Bodelón, 2005 (cited in Barreiro-Gen, M., Novo-Corti, I. and Varela-Candamio, L. 2013. e-Prisons and New Technologies: ICT as a Mechanism of Social Inclusion of Prisoners. International Journal of Knowledge Society Research, 4(3), 1-10.

Rimmerman, A. (2013). Social inclusion of people with disabilities: National and international perspectives. CUP. Cited by Rohwerder, B. (2015). Disability inclusion: Topic guide. Birmingham, UK: GSDRC, University of Birmingham.

Rohwerder, B. (2015). Disability inclusion: Topic guide. Birmingham, UK: GSDRC, University of Birmingham.

Schulze, M. (2010). Understanding the UN convention on the rights of persons with disabilities. Handicap International. http://www.hiproweb.org/uploads/tx_hidrtdocs/HICRPDManual2010.pdf

Silver, 1995 (cited in Barreiro-Gen, M., Novo-Corti, I. and Varela-Candamio, L. 2013. e-Prisons and New Technologies: ICT as a Mechanism of Social Inclusion of Prisoners. International Journal of Knowledge Society Research, 4(3), 1-10.

Townsend, P. (1993): The international analysis of poverty (Harvester – Wheatsheaf, New York)

Trani, J-F. & Loeb, M. (2012). Poverty and disability: a vicious circle? Evidence from Afghanistan and Zambia. Journal of International Development, 24(S1), S19–S52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jid.1709>

Trani, J-F., Bakhshi, P. & Nandipati, A. (2012). ‘Delivering’ education; maintaining inequality. The case of children with disabilities in Afghanistan. Cambridge Journal of Education, 42(3), 345-365. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2012.706259>

UNCRDP. (2006). Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities and optional protocol. New York: UN. <http://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/convention/convoptprot-e.pdf>

UNICEF. (2013). The state of the world’s children 2013: Children with disabilities. New York: UNICEF. http://www.unicef.org/publications/files/SWCR2013_ENG_Lo_res_24_Apr_2013.pdf

UNRCDP – United Nations’ Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities.

Wapling, L. & Downie, B. 2012. Beyond charity: a donor’s guide to inclusion – Disability funding in the era of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Boston: Disability Rights Fund. http://www.disabilityrightsfund.org/files/beyond_charity_a_donors_guide_to_inclusion.pdf

WHO & World Bank. (2011). World report on disability. Geneva: WHO.
http://www.who.int/disabilities/world_report/2011/report.pdf

Woolcock, M. 2013. Social Inclusion: Its Significance for Development Theory, Research and Policy. World Bank and Harvard University. UNESCO Paris, March 2013.
http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/SHS/pdf/Workshop-Social-Inclusion_Woolcock-Michael.pdf

World Bank, the 2020. The world bank group definition of inclusion.
<https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/social-inclusion#:~:text=Social%20inclusion%20is%20the%20process,the%20basis%20of%20their%20identity.> Obtained on 10 July 2020