Indian Research Journal
Vol -3 , ISSUE – 12, Jan - 2014
ISSN No - 2230 - 7850

Available online at www.isrj.org

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

The Sociology of Disability

Dr. Ashok Yakkaldevi
Assistant Professor, Dept. of Sociology,
A.R. Burla Mahila Varishtha Mahavidyalaya, Solapur

ABSTRACT:

Inability is a wonder that is socially characterized, has pervasive social results for people, and has critical effect on social orders (Barnartt 2005). The social reality of handicap is described by "extensive variety in the experience of disability by vast quantities of individuals who in any case offer regular states of avoidance, underestimation, and disservice" (Williams 2001:141). In the meantime, notwithstanding avoidance, underestimation, and burden, the typical importance natural in inability might be communicated in a solid and positive feeling of personality. Handicap can likewise be seen as a political benefit, in the feeling of conveying consent to be absolved from the work-based framework, military administration, obligation, and criminal risk (Stone 1984).

KEYWORDS: Sociology of Disability, notwithstanding avoidance, military administration, criminal risk

I. Introduction

In the medicinal writing, incapacity is thought to be "a physical or mental hindrance that considerably confines one or a greater amount of the significant life exercises" (Fried et al. 2004). In this connection, inability is seen as a restorative element. Analysis of inability depends on either (an) a self-reported trouble or requirement for help with doing exercises and/or performing common parts or (b) execution based tests of working. While hindrance is a precondition for incapacity as a medicinal substance, inability does not inexorably need to come about because of a physical or mental disability.

The demography and the study of disease transmission of handicap shift contingent upon how persons with incapacity are characterized (Verbrugge 1990; LaPlante 1991, 1993; Ing and Tewey 1994; Kaye et al. 1996; La Plante and Carlson 1996). The Social Security Administration characterizes persons with incapacities as the individuals who have a physical or mental condition that keeps them from taking part in paid vocation. Different meanings of handicap incorporate having a characterized condition thought to be incapacitating (e.g., deafness); utilizing assistive gadgets; self-distinguishing as a man with an inability; and being viewed by others as having a handicap. Irving Zola (1993) shrewdly contended that the origination, estimation, and numbering of incapacity vary legitimately relying upon the reason for which this data is required. What's more, inability is a status that might possibly be material at various times in an individual's life. Zola kept up, along these lines, that incapacity is best imagined as liquid and persistent instead of as settled or dichotomous. The pertinence of the last point is accepting expanding significance in the connection of populace maturing.

II. How did the Topic of Disability Become a Matter of Interest?

After World War II, social researchers working in social prescription, social arrangement, and recovery started to concentrate on social parts of perpetual ailment and handicap identifying with damage. The vast majority of this work concentrated on the commonness of incapacity yet needed concurrence on definitions or ways to deal with estimation. Weights for estimation elucidation rose up out of various sources, thus speaking to various hobbies. An early British report, trying to archive the quantities of persons with impedances, demonstrated that terms, for example, weakness, inability, and debilitation were not obviously characterized. The World Health Organization (WHO) attempted the undertaking of adding to a reasonable arrangement of definitions, which finished in distribution of the International Classification of Impairments, Disabilities, and Handicaps (WHO 1980). In light of a legitimate concern for legitimizing allotment of Social Security advantages in the United States, Saad Nagi (1979) delivered comparable definitions as he endeavored to accommodate inconsistencies between meanings of "therapeutic impedance" and "capacity to work."

Despite the fact that Nagi and associates added to the human science of inability as ahead of schedule as 1965, there was little catch up on their ideas until reports were issued in the 1990s by the Institute of Medicine (IOM) and the National Academy of Sciences (Pope and Tarlov 1991; Brandt and Pope 1997). Wording initially determined by Nagi (1965) gave a premise to the IOM's separation among pathology, hindrance, useful constraint, a possibly debilitating condition, and an incapacity. The IOM reports unequivocally embraced utilization of a conceptualization of handicap that fuses natural components as essential patrons to the formation of incapacity and suggested moving the center from the individual and the debilitation to the cooperation between the disability and the earth. Significantly, in this view, the social classification of "handicapped" is socially, instead of therapeutically, developed (Higgins 1992), to some extent by social definitions and to some extent by the requests and requirements of social and physical situations. This conceptualization challenges the restorative model of inability, in which the attention is on a disability related constraint needing remediation.

Social researchers' aggregate commitments to a "sociomedical model of impairing disease" (Bury 1997:138) fortified better approaches for taking a gander at handicap. For instance, the work of Goffman (1963) on disgrace impacted perspectives of the way of mental and physical disease and authenticity of calculated and research approaches. Market analysts concentrated on national issues connected with inability advantages and business, a large portion of which were sociological and also monetary in nature, for instance, the structure and capacity of handicap projects, costs connected with professional recovery (VR) and with specific sorts of incapacity, for example, mental impediment, investigations of open projects, for example, Social Security, and impacts of handicap on the work supply. In 1956, institution of Social Security Disability Insurance formalized an approach association between medicinal guess and occupation potential, building up a surety of advantages for persons esteemed at danger, that is, defenseless, because of their wellbeing. The approach was gone for decreasing these persons' monetary danger, however the enactment adequately gave a connection to dialog of rights among persons with handicaps. Legislators proposed the ideas of focused help and individual confidence as different options for all inclusive qualification, reflecting worry about the capacity of the welfare state to accept look after persons with inabilities—showing differentiating perspectives that have encircled a proceeding with verbal confrontation about fitting societal reactions to the requirements of crippled persons.

In the late 1960s and mid 1970s, the joined driving force gave by the social liberties development, an expanding number of persons with handicaps going to school, and gifted administration among persons with incapacities added to the start of the autonomous living development (Scotch 1989). This development was commenced on a sociopolitical model of handicap, that is, inability emerging from cooperation of a man with a specific situation, instead of a restorative model in which incapacity is connected with physical or mental impedance. In the sociopolitical model, inability is seen as a result of individual environment collaboration as opposed to as an individual attribute. This perspective, thusly, suggests that the handicap mathematical statement can be altered by adjusting a man's capacity through recovery or natural change. The social model of handicap created by British scholars basically marked down individual utilitarian restrictions and centered rather on the impacts of an "abusive" situation and social structure.

III. Sociology and the Study of Disability

Sociological exploration on endless sickness, weakness, and inability started with an end goal to comprehend the relationship between encounters of manifestations or impedance, the social circumstances inside of which individuals live, and the consolidated impact these have on individuals' lives. Real subjects that have been produced incorporate conforming to inability through socialization procedures and supposition of a wiped out part, understanding handicap as a type of aberrance, the minority bunch model of incapacity, development of inability developments, and administration of sickness and inability in individuals' ordinary lives.

A. Acclimating to Disability

For a significant part of the twentieth century, inability was basically characterized by a biomedical system and comprehended as a property inborn in people who were "unique in relation to typical." The medicinal model generally compared handicap with reliance, suggesting people's requirement for welfare and different types of social protection. Along these lines, much early sociological and social brain research concentrated on people's change in accordance with a subordinate status. Handicap onset was seen as requiring a redefinition of one's circumstance and a recreation of parts and social cooperation designs (Albrecht 1976). Researchers concentrated on acclimation to, and adapting to, impedance (Cohn 1961; Kelman, Miller, and Lowenthal 1964; Ludwig and Collette 1970; Safilios-Rothschild 1970; Ben-Sira 1981, 1983), confidence and inspiration in recovery settings (Litman 1966; Starkey 1968; Brown and Rawlinson 1976), and the significance of social backing from family and group (New et al. 1968; Tolsdorf 1976; Petersen 1979; Smith 1979, 1981).

In her investigation of the unpredictability of people's cooperations with the managerial arrangement of welfare, Blaxter (1976) kept up that inability is best comprehended inside of the structure of a profession, in which the last result is dependably later on. Patients' meanings of self and necessities are persistently being produced and arranged, thus molding their help-looking for conduct. Blaxter, similar to Roth (1963) and Scheff (1965), watched that the way that people present themselves is formed by the organizations with whom they associate, getting under way a constant procedure of conformity. Julius Roth (1963) saw timetables created by the therapeutic calling as organizing the patient's vocation in routes harmonious with the plan of the medicinal association. Scheff (1965, 1966) recommended that associations use generalizations of the "best possible customer" as a gadget for taking care of vulnerability. The more minor the customers, the less exact and substantial the generalizations will be. Safilios-Rothschild (1976) noticed that there was striking comparability in demeanors toward the handicapped and ladies, both of whom have a comprehended need to acknowledge and change in accordance with a stereotyped part to get endorsement.

How meanings of incapacity are socially made (Higgins 1992; Goode 1994) or supported through cooperation (Gerschick 1998), and through mentalities of others toward persons with handicaps (Yuker, Block, and Campbell 1960; Siller and Chipman 1964; Yuker, Block, and Younng 1966; Richardson and Royce 1968; Shears and Jensema 1969; Richardson 1970, 1971; Schroedel 1978; Altman 1981), has been a topic in the work of numerous sociologists. Comer and Piliavin (1972) recommended that the physically fit show less variability in verbal yield, less grinning conduct, less eye contact, and more prominent engine hindrance with the debilitated. This, thusly, constrains sorts of social association for handicapped persons and gives them with less chances to experimenting with parts and conduct. Davis (1964) kept up that the all the more plainly characterized and unmistakable the inability, the more noteworthy the simplicity with which the debilitated individual and the gathering change in accordance with one another. Equivocalness encompassing level of impedance, on the other hand, negatively affects interpersonal connections (Zahn 1973), bringing about confounded desires, objectives that are indistinct, and parts that are conflicting. In this way, as indicated by Gove (1976), social orders, for example, the United States, which have created formal procedures for managing the crippled, have a tendency to be more tolerant of incapacity than those that have no such procedures.

The open door for honest to goodness exceptions from common part commitments, predictable with Parsons' (1951) idea of the wiped out part, was viewed by a few sociologists as practically synonymous with handicap. For instance, Gordon (1966) utilized the thought of a "weakened part" to portray the prohibition of crippled persons from social exercises and obligations. David Mechanic (1959) concentrated on incapacity as a natural issue, expressing that "visual deficiency, paraplegia, deafness, or some other condition . . . renders [the] capacity to possess typical social parts either restricted, far fetched, or unimaginable" (p. 38). Workman (1968) later recognized the basic part of the earth, be that as it may: "the working guideline of . . . recovery endeavors is to change the aptitudes and environment of a man so his condition results at all conceivable incapacity and disturbance of life examples" (p. 410). Hahn (1994) takes note of that this suggestion could have put restorative human science at the focal point of the developing field of psychosocial recovery. Repairman's attention on individual working and on the as far as anyone knows intrinsic impacts of a hindrance seemed to come from the medicinal model of handicap, in spite of the fact that his later affirmation of the significance of the fit between people's qualities and the situations in which they worked (Mechanic and Aiken 1991) showed a shift far from the ramifications of the wiped out part idea.

IV. Disability Movements

In the 1970s, hard of hearing persons challenged outside phone organizations around the nation in light of resentment at paying for extraordinary gear and spend more to make long-separate phone calls. This show was translated as an enthusiastic reaction to the smashed trust that years of volunteer push to accomplish information transfers access would be effective. Prohibition, delineated by the avoidance experienced by hard of hearing persons from phone access, came to assume a constructive part in the advancement of an "incapacity group," serving as an impetus for a feeling of shared character and recognizing an objective for aggregate activity (Scotch 2001).

Similarly, dark force, women's activist, and other social developments of the 1960s focused on a positive mental self view established in the aggregate personality of an avoided bunch requesting more prominent investment.

Scotch (2001) contends that various elements supported a social development of crippled persons:

- Medical advancements, including prosthetics, solutions, and surgical systems, empowered longer life, survival of wounds, and more full cooperation in regular life exercises.
- The advancement of a philosophy of deinstitutionalization and standardization, particularly in the emotional wellness field, empowered the development of noninstitutional emotionally supportive networks and more prominent cooperation in group life.
- With the changing age structure of the bigger society, an expanding number of elderly persons had physical inabilities and shared administration needs.
- The Vietnam War delivered countless veterans who were activists, and the war itself created across the board dissents that legitimated social activism.

It is likewise critical that amid the 1960s and mid 1970s various significant projects were instituted that advanced more finish cooperation by persons with inabilities: the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968, extended subsidizing for professional and autonomous living administrations under the VR program starting in 1968, the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act of 1970, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act in 1974, and Project Head Start in 1974. These projects spoke to a legitimate expansion of an example of growing qualifications and administrations gave by the government in view of comprehensively held social and political qualities, an example alluded to by Daniel Bell as an "upheaval of rising privileges" (Scotch 2001). This example, more than vocal backing by debilitated persons, is thought to have cultivated the appropriation of Section 504 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act. Buyer bunches did, nonetheless, in this manner challenge the postponed execution of Section 504 at workplaces of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which added to inability bunches getting to be engaged to take an interest all the more effectively in the political enclosure.

The issues confronted by persons with various sorts of debilitations, and the proposed answers for these issues, might be entirely diverse, making the advancement of a common cognizance hazardous (Scotch 1989). Barnartt and Scotch (2002) contemplated "disagreeable political activities" inside of incapacitated groups from 1970 to 1999. They inferred that requests for craved changes and activities were regularly impedance particular. "Cross-handicap" dissents, including requests that possibly apply to individuals with a wide range of debilitations, were found to happen just 28 percent of the time. This examination by Barnartt and Scotch proposed that, since persons with various impedances might not have a mutual aggregate awareness, coordinated support by extensive quantities of persons with incapacities is liable to be occasional.

V. Managing the Experience of Chronic Illness/Disability

Examinations that endeavor to see how individuals oversee disease in their regular lives speak to a push to enlighten an "insider's" viewpoint: What is the subjective experience of ailment? The experience of handicap is one center inside of the subjective experience of disease as talked about by Conrad (1987). Interestingly, Conrad traits a developing enthusiasm for the ailment involvement to some extent to the inability development that had its starting points in the 1970s: "These self improvement and backing bunches considered experiential information important, since they were one might say "specialists" in it, and cultivated another social consciousness of the issues of living with handicap" (pp. 3–4).

A human science of sickness experience is worried with how individuals live with and regardless of disease. It depends on deliberately gathered and broke down information from a number and assortment of persons with a specific sickness, as in Schneider and Conrad's (1983) investigation of living with epilepsy and O'Brien's (1983) investigation of living with endless hemodialysis. The attention is on the significance of disease to the individual, the social association of the individual's reality, and the procedures the individual uses in adjustment.

This viewpoint is subjectively unique in relation to the thought of changing in accordance with an inability status characterized by others (an "outsider's" instead of an "insider's" perspective). It perceives that people imaginatively deal with their ailment in their regular lives, characterizing and rethinking who they are and how they identify with others. Corbin and Strauss (1985) contended that sickness experience can be highly conceptualized regarding work that should be expert. Since work is an idea integral to the lives of people who don't have endless disease, this conceptualization shows shared experience for individuals who are sick and individuals who are well—

an alternate translation from the wiped out part conceptualization. Conrad (1987) alerts against overconceptualizing the ailment experience as sorts of work, be that as it may, keeping up that overseeing different parts of sickness has different implications too.

The idea of vocation, utilized by Blaxter (1976) in her investigation of handicapped people's cooperations with social offices, is applicable to comprehension the sickness experience. Conrad noticed that the idea of sickness direction (Corbin and Strauss 1985) might be significantly more suitable to ponders in the experience of ailment since it includes process and change and does not expect linearity or precision in disease movement. Other central worries from examination on the experience of disease incorporate the need to oversee vulnerability and shame (see, e.g., Schneider and Conrad 1983) and the requirement for true to life work and reconstitution of self (see, e.g., Corbin and Strauss 1985; Charmaz 1987).

Bibliography:

1. Albrecht, Gary L. 1976. “Socialization and the Disability Process.” Pp. 3–38 in The Sociology of Physical Disability and Rehabilitation, edited by G. L. Albrecht. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
2. Albrecht, Gary L. 1992. The Disability Business. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
3. Altman, Barbara M. 1981. “Studies of Attitudes toward the Handicapped: The Need for a New Direction.” Social Problems 28: 321–37.
4. Altman, Barbara M. 2001. “Disability Definitions, Models, Classification Schemes, and Applications.” Pp. 97–123 in The Handbook of Disability Studies, edited by G. L. Albrecht, K. D. Seelman, and M. Bury. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
5. Anspach, Rene R. 1979. “From Stigma to Identity Politics: Political Activism among the Physically Disabled and Former Mental Patients.” Social Science and Medicine 13A:765–73.
6. Asch, Adrienne. 2001. “Disability, Bioethics, and Human Rights.” Pp. 297–326 in The Handbook of Disability Studies, edited by G. L. Albrecht, K. D. Seelman, and M. Bury. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
7. Barnartt, Sharon. 2005. “Report of the ASA Committee on the Status of Persons with Disabilities (PWD).” Retrieved August 23, 2014 (http://www.asanet.org/images/asa/docs/pdf/Disabilities%20Status%20Committee%20Report%202005.pdf).
8. Barnartt, Sharon and Richard Scotch. 2002. Disability Protests: Contentious Politics, 1970–1999. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
9. Becker, Howard. 1963. Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance. New York: Free Press.
10. Ben-Sira, Zeev. 1981. “The Structure of Readjustment of the Disabled: An Additional Perspective on Rehabilitation.” Social Science and Medicine 15A:565–81.
11. Ben-Sira, Zeev. 1983. “Loss, Stress and Readjustment: The Structure of Coping and Bereavement and Disability.” Social Science and Medicine 17:1619–32.
12. Blaxter, Mildred. 1976. The Meaning of Disability: A Sociological Study of Impairment. New York: Neale Watson Academic.
13. Bogdan, Robert and Steven J. Taylor. 1987. “Toward a Sociology of Acceptance: The Other Side of the Study of Deviance.” Social Policy 18:34–39.
14. Bogdan, Robert and Steven J. Taylor. 1989. “Relationships with Severely Disabled People: The Social Construction of Humanness.” Social Problems 36:135–48.
15. Brandt, Edward N., Jr. and Andrew M. Pope, eds. 1997. Enabling America. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
16. Brown, Julia and May Rawlinson. 1976. “The Morale of Patients Following Open-Heart Surgery.” Journal of Health and Social Behavior 17:134–44.
17. Bury, Michael. 1997. Health and Illness in a Changing Society. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
18. Charmaz, Kathy. 1987. “Struggling for a Self: Identity Levels of the Chronically Ill.” Pp. 283–321 in Research in the Sociology of Health Care, vol. 6, edited by J. A. Roth and P. Conrad. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
19. Christiansen, John B. and Sharon N. Barnartt. 1987. “The Silent Minority: The Socioeconomic Status of Deaf People.” Pp. 171–96 in Understanding Deafness Socially, edited by P. C. Higgins and J. E. Nash. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
20. Cohn, Nancy. 1961. “Understanding the Process of Adjustment to Disability.” Journal of Rehabilitation 27:16–18.
21. Comer, Ronald J. and Jane A. Piliavin. 1972. “The Effects of Physical Deviance upon Face-to-Face Interaction.” Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 23:33–39.

22. Conrad, Peter. 1987. “The Experience of Illness: Recent and New Directions.” Pp. 1–31 in Research in the Sociology of Health Care, vol. 6, edited by J. A. Roth and P. Conrad. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
23. Conrad, Peter and Joseph W. Schneider. 1992. Deviance and Medicalization: From Badness to Sickness. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
24. Corbin, Juliet and Anselm L. Strauss. 1985. “Managing Chronic Illness at Home.” Qualitative Sociology 8:224–47.
25. Davis, Fred. 1964. “Deviance Disavowal: The Management of Strained Identity by the Visibly Handicapped.” Pp. 119–37 in The Other Side, edited by H. S. Becker. New York: Free Press.
26. DeJong, Gerben. 1979. “Independent Living: from Social Movement to Analytic Paradigm.” Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation 60:435–40.
27. Erikson, Kai T. 1964. “Notes on the Sociology of Deviance.” Pp. 9–21 in The Other Side, edited by H. S. Becker. New York: Free Press.
28. Fox, Ellen. 1997. “Predominance of the Curative Model of Medical Care: A Residual Problem.” Journal of the American Medical Association 278:761–63.
29. Freidson, Eliot. 1965. “Disability as Social Deviance.” Pp. 71–99 in Sociology and Rehabilitation, edited by M. B. Sussman. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
30. Fried, Linda P., Luigi Ferrucci, Jonathan Darer, Jeff D. Williamson, and Gerard Anderson. 2004. “Untangling the Concepts of Disability, Frailty, and Comorbidity: Implications for Improved Targeting and Care.” Journal of Gerontology: Medical Sciences 59:255–63.
31. Garland-Thomson, Rosemarie. 2004. “The New Disability Studies: From Oedipus to the Human Genome.” Pp. 5–11 in Disability Studies in the University, Emory across Academe, No. 4, edited by R. Garland-Thomson. Atlanta, GA: Academic Exchange.
32. Gerschick, Thomas J. 1998. “Sisyphus in a Wheelchair: Men with Physical Disabilities Confront Gender Domination.” Pp. 189–213 in Everyday Inequalities: Critical Inquiries, edited by J. O’Brien and J. A. Howard. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
33. Gill, Carol. 2001. “Divided Understandings: The Social Experience of Disability.” Pp. 351–72 in The Handbook of Disability Studies, edited by G. L. Albrecht, K. D. Seelman, and M. Bury. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
34. Gilman, Sander L. 2004. “Defining Disability: The Case of Obesity.” Pp.49–55 in Disability Studies in the University, Emory across Academe, No. 4, edited by R. Garland- Thomson. Atlanta, GA: Academic Exchange.
35. Gliedman, John and William Roth. 1980. The Unexpected Minority. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
36. Goffman, Erving. 1963. Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. Goode, David. 1994. A World without Words: The Social Construction of Children Born Deaf and Blind. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
37. Gordon, Gerald. 1966. Role Theory and Illness. New Haven, CT: College & University Press.
38. Gove,Walter R. 1976. “Societal Reaction Theory and Disability.” Pp. 57–71 in The Sociology of Physical Disability and Rehabilitation, edited by G. L. Albrecht. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
39. Gove,Walter R. and Patrick Howell. 1974. “Individual Resources and Mental Hospitalization: A Comparison and Evaluation of the Societal Reaction and Psychiatric Perspectives.” American Sociological Review 39:86–100.
40. Hahn, Harlan. 1982. “Disability and Rehabilitation Policy: Is Paternalistic Neglect Really Benign?” Public Administration Review 42:385–389.
41. Hahn, Harlan. 1983. “Paternalism and Public Policy.” Society 20:36–46.
42. Hahn, Harlan. 1984. “Reconceptualizing Disability: A Political Science Perspective.” Rehabilitation Literature 48:362–65.
43. Hahn, Harlan. 1985a. “Toward a Politics of Disability: Definition, Disciplines and Politics.” The Social Science Journal 22:87–105.
44. Hahn, Harlan. 1985b. “Disability Policy and the Problem of Discrimination.” American Behavioral Scientist 28:293–318.
45. Hahn, Harlan. 1986. “Disability and the Urban Environment: A Perspective on Los Angeles.” Society and Space 4:273–88.
46. Hahn, Harlan. 1993a. “The Political Implications of Disability Definitions and Data.” Journal of Disability Policy Studies 4:41–52.
47. Hahn, Harlan. 1993b. “The Potential Impact of Disability Studies on Political Science (as Well as Vice-Versa).” Policy Studies Journal 21:740–51.

48. Hahn, Harlan. 1994. "The Minority Group Model of Disability: Implications for Medical Sociology." Pp. 3–24 in Research in the Sociology of Health Care, vol. 11, edited by R. Weitz and J. J. Kronenfeld. Greenwich CT: JAI Press.
49. Hahn, Harlan. 2000. "Accommodations and the ADA: Biased Reasoning or Unreasonable Bias?" Berkeley Journal of Employment and Labor Law 21:166–92.
50. Hahn, Harlan and Todd L. Belt. 2004. "Disability Identity and Attitudes toward Cure in a Sample of Disabled Activists." Journal of Health and Social Behavior 45:453–64.
51. Hanks, Michael and Dennis E. Poplin. 1981. "The Sociology of Physical Disability: A Review of Literature and Some Conceptual Perspectives." Deviant Behavior 2:309–328.
52. Higgins, Paul C. 1992. Making Disability: Exploring the Social Transformations of Human Variation. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
53. Hunt, Paul, ed. 1966. Stigma: the Experience of Disability. London, England: Chapman.
54. Ing, Christine D. and Betsy P. Tewey. 1994. Summary of Data on Children and Youth with Disabilities.Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research.
55. Kaye, Stephen, Mitchell P. LaPlante, Dawn Carlson, and Barbara L. Wenger. 1996. "Trends in Disability Rates in the United States, 1970–1994." Disability StatisticsAbstract, No. 17. Washington, DC: National Institute of Disability and Rehabilitation Research.
56. Kelman, Howard R., Jonas N. Miller, and Milton Lowenthal. 1964. "Post Hospital Adaptation of a Chronically Ill and Disabled Rehabilitation Population." Journal of Health and Social Behavior 5:108–14.
57. Kutner, Nancy G. 1987. "Social Worlds and Identity in End-Stage Renal Disease." Pp. 33–71 in Research in the Sociology of Health Care, vol. 6, edited by J.A. Roth and P. Conrad. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
58. Kutner, Nancy G. 2003. "Paradigm Tension in Management of Chronic Disease." Pp. 107–23 in Research in the Sociology of Health Care, vol. 21, edited by J. J. Kronenfeld. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier.
59. LaPlante, Mitchell P. 1991. Disability in Basic Life Activities across the Life Span. Disability Statistics Report 1. Washington, DC: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research.
60. LaPlante, Mitchell P. 1993. State Estimates of Disability in America. Disability Statistics Report 3. Washington, DC: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research.
61. LaPlante, Mitchell P. and Dawn Carlson. 1996. Disability in the United States: Prevalence and Causes, 1992. Disability Statistics Report 7. Washington, DC: National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research.
62. Litman, Theodor J. 1966. "The Family and Physical Rehabilitation." Journal of Chronic Disability 19:211–20.
63. Ludwig, E. G. and John Collette. 1970. "Dependency, Social Isolation and Mental Health in a Disabled Population." Social Psychiatry 5:92–95.
64. Mechanic, David. 1959. "Illness and Social Disability: Some Problems in Analysis." Pacific Sociological Review 2:37–41.
65. Mechanic, David. 1968. Medical Sociology: A Selective View. New York: Free Press.
66. Mechanic, David and Linda H. Aiken. 1991. "Social Science, Medicine, and Health Policy." Pp. 1–9 in Applications of Social Sciences to Clinical Medicine and Health Policy, edited by L. H. Aiken and D. Mechanic. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
67. Nagi, Saad Z. 1965. "Some Conceptual Issues in Disability and Rehabilitation." Pp. 100–13 in Sociology and Rehabilitation, edited by M. B. Sussman. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
68. Nagi, Saad Z. 1979. "The Concept and Measurement of Disability." Pp. 1–15 in Disability Policies and Government Programs, edited by E. D. Berkowitz. New York: Praeger.
69. New, Peter, Anthony Ruscio, Rhea P. Priest, Dora Petritsi, and Linda George. 1968. "The Support Structure of Heart and Stroke Patients." Social Science and Medicine 2:185–200.
70. O'Brien, Mary Elizabeth. 1983. The Courage to Survive: The Life Career of the Chronic Dialysis Patient. New York: Grune & Stratton.
71. Parsons, Talcott. 1951. The Social System. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
72. Petersen, Yen. 1979. "The Impact of Physical Disability on Marital Adjustment: A Literature Review." Family Coordinator 28:47–51.
73. Pope, Andrew M. and Alvin R. Tarlov, eds. 1991. Disability in America. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
74. Richardson, Stephen A. 1970. "Age and Sex Differences in Values toward Physical Handicaps." Journal of Health and Social Behavior 11:207–14.

75. Richardson, Stephen A. 1971. “Children’s Values and Friendships: A Study of Physical Disability.” Journal of Health and Social Behavior 12:253–58.
76. Richardson, Stephen A. and Jacqueline Royce. 1968. “Race and Physical Handicap in Children’s Preference for Other Children.” Child Development 39:467–80.
77. Roth, Julius A. 1963. Timetables. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.
78. Safilios-Rothschild, Constantina. 1970. The Sociology and Social Psychology of Disability and Rehabilitation. New York: Random House.
79. Safilios-Rothschild, Constantina. 1976. “Disabled Persons’ Self- Definitions and Their Implications for Rehabilitation.” Pp. 39–56 in The Sociology of Physical Disability and Rehabilitation, edited by G. L. Albrecht. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
80. Scheff, Thomas J. 1965. “Typification in the Diagnostic Practices of Rehabilitation Agencies.” Pp. 139–47 in Sociology and Rehabilitation, edited by M. B. Sussman. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
81. Scheff, Thomas J. 1966. Being Mentally Ill. London, England: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
82. Schneider, Joseph W. and Peter Conrad. 1983. Having Epilepsy: The Experience and Control of Illness. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
83. Schroedel, John G., ed. 1978. Attitudes toward Persons with Disabilities: A Compendium of Related Literature. Albertson, NY: Human Resources Center.
84. Scotch, Richard W. 1989. “Politics and Policy in the History of the Disability Rights Movement.” The Milbank Quarterly 67 (suppl 2, part 2):380–400.
85. Scotch, Richard W. 2001. From Good Will to Civil Rights: Transforming Federal Disability Policy. 2d ed. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
86. Scott, Robert A. 1965. “Comments about Interpersonal Processes of Rehabilitation.” Pp. 132–38 in Sociology and Rehabilitation, edited by M. B. Sussman. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
87. Scott, Robert A. 1969. The Making of Blind Men. New York: Russell Sage.
88. Shears, Loyda M. and Carl J. Jensema. 1969. “Social Acceptability of Anomalous Persons.” Exceptional Children 36:91–96.
89. Siller, Jerome and Abram Chipman. 1964. “Factorial Structure and Correlates of the Attitudes toward Disabled Persons Scale.” Educational and Psychological Measurement 24:831–40.
90. Smith, Richard T. 1979. “Disability and the Recovery Process: Role of Social Networks.” Pp. 218–26 in Patients, Physicians and Illness, 3d ed., edited by E. G. Jaco. New York: Free Press.
91. Smith, Richard T. 1981. “The Role of Social Resources in Cardiac Rehabilitation.” Pp. 221–32 in Physical Conditioning and Cardiovascular Rehabilitation, edited by L. S. Cohen, M. B. Mock, and I. Ringqvist. New York: John Wiley.
92. Starkey, Pearl D. 1968. “Sick-Role Retention as a Factor in Nonrehabilitation.” Journal of Counseling Psychology 15:75–79.
93. Stone, Deborah A. 1984. The Disabled State. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
94. Stroman, Duane F. 1982. The Awakening Minorities.Washington, DC: University Press of America.
95. Tolsdorf, Christopher C. 1976. “Social Networks, Support and Coping: An Exploratory Study.” Family Process 15:407–409.
96. Turner, Bryan S. 2001. “Disability and the Sociology of the Body.” Pp. 252–66 in The Handbook of Disability Studies, edited by G. L. Albrecht, K. D. Seelman, and M. Bury. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
97. Verbrugge, Lois M. 1990. “The Iceberg of Disability.” Pp. 55–75 in The Legacy of Longevity: Health and Health Care in Later Life, edited by S. M. Stahl. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
98. Williams, Gareth. 2001. “Theorizing Disability.” Pp. 123–44 in The Handbook of Disability Studies, edited by G. L. Albrecht, K. D. Seelman, and M. Bury. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
99. World Health Organization (WHO). 1980. International Classification of Impairments, Disabilities and Handicaps. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO.
100. Yuker, Harold E., Janet R. Block, and William J. Campbell. 1960. A Scale to Measure Attitudes toward Disabled Persons. Albertson, NY: Human Resources Foundation.
101. Yuker, Harold E., Janet R. Block, and Janet H. Younng. 1966. The Measurement of Attitudes toward Disabled Persons. Human Resources Study No. 7. Albertson, NY: Human Resources Center.
102. Zahn, Margaret A. 1973. “Incapacity, Impotence and Invisible Impairment: Their Effects upon Interpersonal Relations.” Journal of Health and Social Behavior 14:115–23.
103. Zola, Irving K. 1982. Missing Pieces: A Chronicle of Living with a Disability. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

104.Zola, Irving K. 1989. “Toward the Necessary Universalizing of Disability Policy.” The Milbank Quarterly 67:401–26.
105.Zola, Irving K. 1991. “Bringing Our Bodies and Ourselves Back In: Reflections on a Past, Present, and Future ‘Medical Sociology.’” Journal of Health and Social Behavior 32:1–16.
106.Zola, Irving K. 1993. “Disability Statistics, What We Count and What It Tells Us.” Journal of Disability Policy Studies 4:9–29.