University of the Philippines Population Institute
WORKING PAPER SERIES
No. 2019-01

Disability levels and differentials among Older Filipinos *

Cruz G. T., Cruz C.J.P., and Villegas, J.A.

January 2019
Diliman, Quezon City

Disability levels and differentials among Older Filipinos
Grace T. Cruz[1], Christian Joy P. Cruz[2] and Justine Villegas[3]

Background

The global population is aging. This is indicated in the shifting age structure towards an increasing number and proportion of older persons as a result of the rapid declines in fertility rates coupled with reductions in mortality and increased longevity. The aging process is closely interrelated with increasing incidence of disability as we can expect an increasing proportion of older people with higher risks of disability and long-term illnesses with advancing age. Estimates show "more than 46 per cent of older persons 60 years and over have disabilities" (United Nations-Disability Department of Economic & Social Affairs 2018).

To help address the intersecting issues of aging and disability, the global framework on Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 2015-2030 tackles exclusion and vulnerability. The new global agenda ensure that "no one is left behind" by promising a balanced development that seeks to realize the human rights of *all* people (United Nations Development Programme 2016). It advocates for the inclusion of people with disabilities (PWD) and responding to the needs of older people, particularly those with disability and living in poverty. More importantly, it goes "beyond treating older persons as a vulnerable group by recognizing older people as the active agents of societal development in order to achieve truly transformative, inclusive and sustainable development outcomes" Dugarova 2017:7)

The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) outlines the legal obligations of states to promote and protect the rights of persons with disabilities in society to guarantee comprehensive development (Small 2007). One means towards the fulfillment of this goal is "the collection of data on disability to create and implement more PWD inclusive policies" (Marella, Devine, Armecin, Zayas, Marco and Vaughan 2016). At present, disability data and statistics needed to create better policies and programs remain lacking, especially in lower-income nations which house most of the world's disabled. Sound data is needed to maximize and allocate the *limited* resources that are at their disposal (Palmer & Harley 2011).

Defining Disability: The Medical versus the Social Model

There are two general theoretical models commonly used to frame and define disability which are usually pitted against each other: the *medical model* which highlights the physical

---

[1] Professor, University of the Philippines Population Institute (UPPI)
[2] University Researcher, University of the Philippines Population Institute (UPPI)
[3] Researcher, Demographic Research and Development Foundation, Inc. (DRDF)

impairment and medical condition of the individual and the *social model* which argues that disability is a "social construct" (Barnes et al. 2002, cited by Palmer & Harley 2011). The use of the medical model implies that disability is primarily the loss of bodily and social functioning, and so intervention should be *rehabilitative* in nature (Palmer & Harley 2011).

Meanwhile, the social model argues that disability is experienced, *not* mainly due to bodily impairment and loss of functioning, but largely due to the *social stigma* that usually discriminates and treats people with impairment as "social outcasts" and labels them as "futile members" of society. All these lead to the loss of political and socioeconomic opportunities for persons with disabilities (PWDs). Unlike the medical model which suggests individual solutions (i.e. assistance, care) to the struggles faced by PWDs, the social model adapts a more structural and political approach to the issue at hand, and calls instead for more inclusive policies and programs in favor of PWDs (Palmer & Harley 2011).

Palmer and Harley (2011) also explained that both models have been criticized - the medical model for viewing disability merely as physiological impairment and loss of functioning, and not taking social, relational and environmental barriers (that also significantly contribute to the "disabling" of PWDs) into account; and the social model for vehemently discounting the bodily impairment's actual impact on the ability of the individual to interact with others and with his/her environment. Thus, the *social-relational model/ bio-psychosocial model* (Washington Group on Disability Statistics 2016) was born, which aimed to fuse the core principles of the two. This model, which acknowledges how both bodily impairment and social and environmental barriers could shape the quality of life of PWDs, is one of the main underlying frameworks of the "International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health" (ICF) created by the World Health Organization in 2002 (Office for Disability Studies 2017).

The ICF is used as the universal classification system and guide of social researchers in researching disability (Mont 2017; Badley 2008, cited by Palmer & Harley 2011) and is a product of "nearly a decade of collaboration and field testing across a range of countries" (Leonardi *et al.* 2006, cited by Palmer and Harley 2011).

The Washington Group Short Set of Questions on Disability

The Washington Group (WG) Short Set of Questions on Disability measure was formulated in accordance with the ICF[4] in order to produce an internationally comparable set of data on disability, to contribute to efforts towards "equalization of opportunities, rehabilitation for PWDs and prevention" (Washington Group on Disability Statistics 2016 and Office of Disability

---

[4]The ICF as a universal framework for disability studies aims to provide *common grounds* for different cultures to assess the experiences of their disabled members so that "inequality could be identified, measured or remedied" (Leonardi *et al.* 2006, p.1220, cited by Palmer & Harley 2011) and the extent of exclusion, discrimination and disablement experienced by PWDs across countries could be solidly taken into account by research instruments and measures (Madans et al.. 2011).

Studies 2017). The activities included in the measure are the ones considered as functions/activities commonly performed across all nations, disregarding geographical and cultural differences. Unlike the Activities of Daily Living (ADLs) and Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADLs) which focus on basic functioning of individuals within particular contexts, the WG Short Set of Questions on Disability are more generic and brief, and only aims to identify "people at greater risk than the general population for participation restrictions due to the presence of difficulties in six core functional domains: seeing, hearing, walking or climbing steps, remembering or concentrating, washing all over or dressing and communicating" (Washington Group on Disability Statistics 2016 and Madans et al. 2011). The WG measure asks if the respondent has "no difficulty, some difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or is unable to do the said activities.

The WG measure's objectives are limited to: "(1) representing the majority, but not all persons with limitation in basic activity functioning in any one nation; (2) representing the most commonly occurring limitations in basic activity functioning within any country; and (3) capturing persons with similar problems across countries" to be able to "compare levels of participation in employment, education, or family life for those with disability versus those without disability to see if persons with disability have achieved social inclusion" (Washington Group on Disability Statistics, 2016).

The WG measure's questions are constructed in a simple and general tone to further eliminate social and cultural biases (Palmer & Harley 2011). The measure is considered as most appropriately included in national census surveys. When juxtaposed and analyzed together with other socio-demographic and economic variables (i.e. education, employment and access to health services), the WG measure data could substantially inform policies and programs aimed at providing more opportunities for the disabled population (Washington Group on Disability Statistics 2016; Virola & Encarnacion 2016 and Madans et al. 2011).

The WG Short Set of Questions on Disability was produced by the Washington Group (WG) on Disability Statistics, "a voluntary working group composed of more than 100 National Statistical Offices and international non-governmental and disability organizations in the United States" (Office of Disability Studies 2017), established in 2002 (Virola & Encarnacion 2016 and Madans et al. 2011).

Concerns on the Use of the WG Short Set of Questions

Due to its general tone, the WG short set of questions on disability could not be used to capture higher-order functioning limitations and severe disabling conditions (including cognitive/mental impairment) Since one of its main objectives is only to "identify persons with similar types and levels of limitations in basic activity functioning regardless of nationality or culture" (Washington Group on Disability Statistics 2016), it could not be used to produce information on specific disability needs (Palmer & Harley 2011),

In cases where more detailed information is needed, the Washington Group on Disability Statistics (2016) suggests the use of "The Washington Group Extended Set on Functioning" which aims to cover more detailed information about respondents, including "information on upper body functioning; psychosocial difficulties; pain and fatigue; and the additional information in certain domains of functioning both with and without the use of assistive technology/aids (e.g. wheelchairs, hearing aids)" (Madans et al. 2011)

Meanwhile, the cut-off for responses/severity threshold used also greatly influences the outcome of the use of the WG measure (Mont 2007). For instance, when all four response categories were employed in a pilot study in a rural area in Vietnam, disability prevalence decreased. It generated higher disability prevalence rates only when the severity threshold was cut to "some difficulty"[5] (Palmer & Harley 2011).

Study objective

In response to this new global framework for action to address the ageing and disability issues in the country, the Philippine government has initiated the collection of data on disability. Using this available data, this paper aims to provide a measure of the level and differentials in disability among older Filipinos ages 60 years and over using the Washington Group Short Set of Questions on Disability Measure collected in the 2010 Philippine Census of Population and Housing (CPH). It examines the differentials in disability by sex for each of the six individual items and in the summary measure of disability (i.e. those who experienced at least one disability). In particular, it examines the gender difference in disability prevalence across age, urban-rural residence, region of residence, marital status and education.

Data and Methodology

The study makes use of data from the 2010 CPH covering a total of 6,230,480 Filipinos ages 60 years and over living in households. The 2010 CPH is the first time that the country collected data on disability using the WG measure. The WG includes a 6-item measure that measures difficulty in six domains of health including: seeing, hearing, walking or climbing steps, remembering or concentrating, self-caring, and communicating using his/her usual language. The intention is to focus on their difficulties that are the result of some physical or mental health problem.

---

[5] "The Washington Group recommends a cut-off of "at least one domain that is coded as 'a lot of difficulty' or 'cannot do it at all'" to be used internationally in the reporting of disability statistics in order that comparable rates can be obtained from different countries" (Palmer & Harley 2011).

In the study we examine the level of difficulty experienced in any of the multiple items as well as a summary measure indicating difficulty in any of the items. A person is considered to have a disability if he/she reports that he/she is unable to do at least one of the aforementioned six items. We also examine the level of disability for each of the six-items to determine which among them the respondents found most difficult to perform.

The 2010 CPH collected disability using a binary response categories (Yes or No) but did not inquire the severity level of the difficulty as provided in the original version of the WG questions. In particular, the 2010 CPH used the following questions to measure functional difficulty:

Does _____ have any difficulty/problem in...?

a. Seeing, even when wearing eyeglasses
b. Hearing, even when using a hearing aid
c. Walking or climbing steps
d. Remembering or concentrating
e. Self-caring (bathing or dressing)
f. Communicating using his/her usual language

The foregoing questions provide a good estimate of the level of functional health although it can be limited in the sense that the data for the entire household is provided by one respondent. While the census information is furnished by a responsible member of the household, it is possible that the respondent may not be able to perfectly represent the condition of each household member. Such data limitation should be taken into account when analyzing the results particularly when compared with other findings where respondents are made to provide their own self-assessment of their health condition.

Results

Table 1 shows the distribution of the older person 60 years and over with functional difficulty across the six domains for both sexes. It also shows the summary indicator which shows the proportion who experienced at least one difficulty.

Results show 18.8 percent have experienced at least one difficulty in the six activities including seeing, hearing, walking or climbing steps, remembering or concentrating, self-caring or communicating using his/her usual language. Females exhibit a higher level of difficulty relative to the males (19.1% vs. 17.8%) with the level of difficulty increasing dramatically with age i.e. from 13.2 percent among those in their 60s to 38.2 percent among those in their 80s. In terms of marital status, the widowed/widower registered the highest level of functional difficulty (23.7%) while those currently in union, either formal cohabiting registered the least disability (16%). Very little differential is noted by place of residence with those living in rural areas experiencing slightly higher level of disability relative to those in the urban areas but those

residing in the low income regions such as Bicol Region (23.2%), MIMAROPA (22%), ARMM (20.8%) and Eastern Visayas Region (20.2%)registered relatively higher levels of disability. Those residing in CAR had the lowest level of disability (15.1%).

Among the six domains considered, vision is the most commonly reported difficulty (13.4%) with no apparent gender difference. Vision difficulty increases with advancing age from 11.7 percent from among the youngest cohort to (60-69) to 23.8 percent among those in the oldest cohort (80+). Results also show a clear education gradient with the level of vision difficulty declining with increasing educational attainment i.e. from 15.6 percent among those with elementary education to 11.7 percent among those who attained at least some high school education. Sight deficiency is more apparent among the females and is consistently observed across all categories with the margin most pronounced among the never married disability level higher by 2.3 percent relative to that of the males.

Following vision, the following functional difficulty were noted in descending level of prevalence: walking or climbing steps (5.8%), hearing (5.6%), remembering or concentration (2.8%), self-care (1.9%) and communication using own language (1.2%).For these remaining domains, the differential for the functional difficulty across age, marital status, education, urban-rural residence and place of residence are generally consistent with the pattern found with vision difficulty.

Table 2 provides the same data for the older male Filipinos. Overall, 17.8 percent of older males reported at least one disability with the level higher among the older, lower educated and the widower. Those in their 80s exhibit the highest disability prevalence (37.5%) with over a third of reporting difficulty in at least one of the six domains. Other higher disability groups include the widower (24.1%), those living in the low less developed regions such as Bicol (21.6%) and MIMAROPA (22.8%) and those with the lowest educational attainment (20.9%). Those from the youngest cohort 60+ (13.2%) and those with the highest educational attainment (15.8%) displayed the least level of disability. No significant urban-rural disability is noted.

Seeing even when wearing glasses (12.6%) is the most predominant disability reported by older males, particularly among the octogenarians with almost a quarter (23.1%) prevalence rate. Similarly, high prevalence is noted in the poorer regions of Bicol (16%), MIMAROPA (15.9%) and ARMM (15.5%).A relatively high level of eye problem is also report in NCR (14.8%). Hearing even when wearing hearing aid (5.5%) and climbing stairs (5.4%) are the next most common difficulty reported while difficulty using his own language (1.2%) emerged as least difficult to perform.

The corresponding figures for the older Filipinas is presented in Table 3. Results demonstrate the expected greater prevalence in disability among the older females relative to their male counterparts. Overall disability level is 19.1 percent. The age gradient is very pronounced with the disability prevalence significantly increasing threefold among those in their 80s relative to those in their 60s (38.7% vs. 13.1%). A clear negative education-disability gradient is also

evident with the disability declining rapidly with increasing education i.e. 15.8 percent among those with the highest educational attainment compared to 23.1% among those in the lowest education bracket. Other high disability sectors include the widows and those living in the poorer areas of Bicol Region, MIMAROPA and ARMM. No significant urban-rural divide in disability is noted.

Similar to the males, problems with the eyesight is the dominant disability (13.9%) among the elder Filipinas with the level more than twice the reported mobility (6%) and hearing (5.6%) difficulties. There is a much lower level reporting cognitive problems (remembering and concentrating: 2.8%), self-care (1.9%) and communicating with her own language (1.2%).

Table 4 provides the gender difference in the level of difficulty in the summary indicator and across all six domains. Results show a higher level of disability among the females relative to the males in the overall summary indicator with the female disability level exceeding that of their males by 1.3 percent. Greatest female disadvantage is noted in the ARMM (2.5%) and among the elementary educated (2.2%). Generally, the female disability disadvantage is evident in almost all categories, except in the marital status categories where the ever married males (currently married, living-in, widowed and divorced) displayed higher disability level compared to their female counterparts. Only the never married followed the general pattern with the females displaying greater disability relative to their male counterparts.

The female disadvantage is also evident, albeit to a lower degree in cognition (remembering or concentrating) and ambulation (walking or climbing steps) with the differentials most pronounced among those in their advanced ages (80+) and those with the lowest educational attainment (elementary). Gender differentials in disability is less pronounced in the performance of self-care, hearing and communicating using one's local language.

The foregoing discussion highlight the very clear age, sex and education gradient in the disability experience of older Filipinos. The following discussions will explore the extent of disability experience among the older people by assessing the number and mean number of disabilities experienced by age, sex and education.

Data presented in Table 5 indicate that of those with disability, the majority (62.8%) reported only one problem with the remaining 37.2 percent with multiple disabilities. A little more than a fifth (21.5%) had two disabilities and 8.6 percent had three. About 2 percent or 21,986 older people in 2010 had severe disability condition having reported all 6 disabilities. This vulnerable group is more likely to include the females, in the oldest age group and those with the lowest educational attainment. Data on the average number of disabilities also validate the age, sex and education gradient. For example, those in the 80s registered an average of 2.2 disabilities as compared to 1.37 among those in their 60s. Older people with the lowest education registered an average of 1.8 disabilities as compared to 1.5 for those with high school or better education.

Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation

This paper provides an analysis of the disability of older Filipinos using the WG 6-item measure of difficulty in six domains of health which was first collected in the country in the 2010 Census of Population and Housing. Results show almost a fifth (18.8%) of older Filipinos has at least one disability with higher prevalence observed among the females, oldest age group (80+), lowest educational group, widowed and those living in the low income regions of Bicol, MIMAROPA and ARMM. The finding showing the females displaying a higher prevalence of disability than men is consistent with the observed global trends (WHO & World Bank 2011, Mitra and Sambamoorthi 2014).

Sensory difficulty particularly with eyesight is the most predominant problem reported. Another sensory problem, hearing difficulty as well as difficulty with ambulation are the next common problems although to a much lesser degree relative to vision problems. Ambulation which afflicts less than half the level with eyesight indicates the extent to which older people find it difficult to get around on foot which, like the other sensory difficulties. Cognitive problems seem least pronounced, indicated by difficulty communicating with one's own language as the least difficult to perform. This implies that the older Filipinos demonstrate lesser challenge with social and cognitive abilities as they seem better able to talk, listen or understand speech. This is consistent with the relatively lower level with cognitive difficulty expressed in their difficulty remembering or concentrating. The close interrelationship among health issues suggest that problems expressed for one difficulty could be as a result of other health problems, particularly for those who reported multiple difficulties. For example, those who expressed problems with communication can be aggravated or linked to hearing and eye impairment which are more prevalent problems affecting older Filipinos.

Those with multiple disabilities are the most vulnerable groups who need more urgent attention the extent of which is indicated with the reported average of 1.65 disabilities. The average number of difficulties increases with advancing age and declines with increasing education. The females also report slightly more disabilities than the males. There is a small proportion (2%) with extreme vulnerability having all six disabilities.

The findings are useful in demonstrating the extent and distribution of disability among the Filipino older people that can direct policies and program to improve the wellbeing of older people. In particular, results highlight the need to focus intervention on the more vulnerable groups i.e. those with difficulty seeing and those with multiple disabilities. In this connection, it may be useful for policy and programs to review our eye health service interventions starting at younger ages. This is because other studies reveal similar problems among the older population in the academic sector (University of the Philippines Wellness Initiative for seniors and elders [UPWISE], 2018). Those with high likelihood of multiple disability experiences should be given priority attention.

This first attempt to collect disability data in the census that allows the computation of the WG disability measure is a significant step forward in advancing the analysis of old age health in the Philippines. The findings allow the generation of useful indicators that can benchmark Philippine elder disability status in various context with that of other countries with similar data. However, caution should be exercised in the interpretation of the prevalence particularly when doing inter-country comparison given the contested definition of disability. There are quality and methods of data collection issues including the fact that the data may not necessarily be self-reports. The level of health service utilization may also affect disclosure rates particularly in the Philippine context where the level of unmet need for health utilization due to economic and other reasons remains substantial (Cruz, Natividad, Gonzales and Saito 2016). Poor service provision and stigma may also result in lower disclosure which may result in a higher prevalence of disability in developed countries being reported compared to developing countries (Al Ju'beh 2015). Developing countries have predominantly collected disability data through censuses or use measures focused exclusively on a narrow choice of impairments. These countries tend to report low disability rates. Countries that collect their data through surveys and measure activity limitations and participation restrictions in addition to impairments tend to report higher prevalence (WHO and World Bank 2011).

Table 1: Level of disability among older Filipinos by background characteristics, Both Sexes, CPH 2010

Background Characteristics	seeing, even when wearing eyeglasses		hearing, even when using a hearing aid		walking or climbing steps		remembering or concentrating		self-caring (bathing or dressing)		communicating using his/her usual language		*% with at least one disability*	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
TOTAL	13.4	6,229,068	5.6	6,228,969	5.8	6,228,819	2.8	6,228,775	1.9	6,228,746	1.2	6,228,576	18.8	6,230,480
AGE														
60-69	10.3	3,718,563	2.4	3,718,487	2.9	3,718,369	1.2	3,718,357	0.7	3,718,339	0.6	3,718,228	13.2	3,719,415
70-79	15.8	1,846,494	7.1	1,846,468	7.2	1,846,459	3.2	1,846,425	2.0	1,846,418	1.3	1,846,365	22.2	1,846,874
80+	23.8	664,011	19.0	664,014	18.2	663,991	10.6	663,993	8.5	663,989	4.2	663,983	38.2	664,191
TYPE OF RESIDENCE														
Urban	13.8	2,490,707	4.6	2,490,678	5.4	2,490,632	2.3	2,490,632	1.9	2,490,618	1.1	2,490,587	18.2	2,491,115
Rural	13.1	3,738,361	6.2	3,738,291	6.0	3,738,187	3.1	3,738,143	2.0	3,738,128	1.2	3,737,989	18.7	3,739,365
REGION														
NCR	15.5	678,700	4.2	678,700	5.5	678,701	2.1	678,699	1.8	678,701	1.0	678,701	19.2	678,767
CAR	7.5	111,294	6.2	111,294	6.7	111,294	3.3	111,295	2.1	111,294	1.2	111,294	15.1	111,299
Region 1	12.1	424,701	6.3	424,701	6.0	424,701	3.0	424,701	2.1	424,700	1.2	424,700	18.1	424,718
Region 2	12.3	234,153	6.6	234,146	5.7	234,146	2.9	234,141	1.8	234,135	1.1	234,138	17.7	234,182
Region 3	13.9	707,872	4.9	707,871	5.8	707,872	2.3	707,872	1.9	707,872	1.2	707,870	18.6	707,941

Background Characteristics	seeing, even when wearing eyeglasses		hearing, even when using a hearing aid		walking or climbing steps		remembering or concentrating		self-caring (bathing or dressing)		communicating using his/her usual language		*% with at least one disability*	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Region 4A	13.1	776,253	4.5	776,253	5.3	776,253	2.1	776,253	1.7	776,253	1.1	776,253	17.6	776,301
Region 4B	16.5	181,132	6.7	181,132	6.9	181,132	3.1	181,132	2.1	181,132	1.4	181,131	22.0	181,141
Region 5	16.8	399,851	7.4	399,851	7.1	399,851	3.4	399,851	2.2	399,851	1.4	399,851	23.2	399,865
Region 6	10.7	614,278	4.9	614,278	5.3	614,278	2.9	614,278	2.0	614,278	1.2	614,278	16.1	614,307
Region 7	12.2	530,155	5.8	530,155	6.0	530,153	2.9	530,151	2.1	530,153	1.2	530,152	18.1	530,198
Region 8	13.9	336,766	6.8	336,776	6.4	336,776	3.2	336,776	2.0	336,776	1.2	336,776	20.2	336,781
Region 9	13.8	209,909	6.2	209,909	5.6	209,909	2.9	209,909	1.8	209,909	1.2	209,909	18.8	209,917
Region 10	12.1	267,918	5.8	267,918	5.1	267,918	3.0	267,918	1.9	267,918	1.2	267,918	17.4	267,928
Region 11	13.1	278,913	4.9	278,912	4.9	278,911	2.8	278,907	1.8	278,907	1.2	278,902	17.7	278,935
Region 12	12.8	216,477	5.6	216,455	5.6	216,435	3.1	216,429	1.9	216,430	1.3	216,402	17.6	216,586
CARAGA	14.0	167,835	5.9	167,835	5.3	167,835	3.2	167,835	1.8	167,835	1.1	167,835	19.2	167,839
ARMM	16.1	92,851	9.5	92,783	8.2	92,654	5.3	92,628	2.6	92,602	2.1	92,466	20.8	93,775
MARITAL STATUS														
Single	11.7	383,313	5.9	383,312	6.3	383,316	3.4	383,295	2.5	383,307	2.2	383,309	18.4	383,738
Married	12.0	3,717,388	4.1	3,717,307	4.4	3,717,184	1.9	3,717,183	1.3	3,717,138	0.8	3,717,012	16.0	3,718,000
Widowed	16.5	1,899,736	8.4	1,899,722	8.5	1,899,697	4.5	1,899,679	3.1	1,899,681	1.7	1,899,637	23.7	1,900,005

Background Characteristics	seeing, even when wearing eyeglasses		hearing, even when using a hearing aid		walking or climbing steps		remembering or concentrating		self-caring (bathing or dressing)		communicating using his/her usual language		*% with at least one disability*	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Divorced/Separated	12.7	96,167	4.7	96,169	5.1	96,166	2.3	96,162	1.5	96,162	1.2	96,160	17.7	93,193
Common-law/ Live-in	12.1	126,213	4.4	126,213	4.1	126,208	1.8	126,211	1.1	126,212	0.7	126,212	16.0	126,224
Unknown	13.7	6,251	6.9	6,246	6.8	6,248	4.0	6,245	2.6	6,246	2.4	6,246	19.3	6,320

EDUCATION

	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Elementary	15.6	2,264,550	8.2	2,264,510	7.4	2,264,444	4.0	2,264,375	2.5	2,264,388	1.6	2,264,255	22.5	2,265,129
Elementary grad	12.6	1,545,540	4.9	1,545,519	5.3	1,545,489	2.4	1,545,500	1.7	1,545,476	1.0	1,545,478	17.7	1,545,626
High school & over	11.7	2,401,045	3.4	2,401,014	4.6	2,400,961	1.8	2,400,973	1.6	2,400,958	0.9	2,400,919	16.0	2,401,222

*data excludes those "not reported".

Table 2: Level of disability among older Filipinos by background characteristics, Males, CPH 2010

Background Characteristics	seeing, even when wearing eyeglasses		hearing, even when using a hearing aid		walking or climbing steps		remembering or concentrating		self-caring (bathing or dressing)		communicating using his/her usual language		% with at least one disability	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
TOTAL	12.6	2,753,446	5.5	2,753,377	5.4	2,753,286	2.4	2,753,276	1.8	2,753,277	1.2	2,753,156	17.8	2,754,055
AGE														
60-69	10.0	1,739,773	2.6	1,739,725	3.1	1,739,646	1.2	1,739,661	0.8	1,739,663	0.7	1,739,572	13.2	1,740,145
70-79	15.3	776,972	7.8	776,949	7.2	776,949	3.0	776,932	2.1	776,930	1.4	776,897	22.2	777,127
80+	23.1	236,701	19.5	236,703	16.9	236,691	9.4	236,683	7.5	236,684	3.8	236,687	37.5	236,783
TYPE OF RESIDENCE														
Urban	13.0	1,078,136	4.4	1,078,116	5.0	1,078,087	2.0	1,078,102	1.7	1,078,100	1.1	1,078,070	17.4	1,078,292
Rural	12.4	1,675,310	6.2	1,675,261	5.7	1,675,199	2.7	1,675,174	1.8	1,675,177	1.2	1,675,086	18.1	1,675,763
REGION														
NCR	14.8	285,752	4.0	285,752	5.1	285,752	1.8	285,751	1.8	285,752	1.0	285,752	18.4	285,779
CAR	6.7	50,367	5.9	50,367	6.1	50,367	2.7	50,368	1.9	50,368	1.1	50,367	14.0	50,368
Region 1	11.3	178,232	6.2	178,232	5.5	178,232	2.4	178,232	1.8	178,232	1.2	178,232	17.1	178,240
Region 2	11.4	104,412	6.5	104,406	5.4	104,407	2.5	104,406	1.6	104,408	1.1	104,402	17.0	104,424

Background Characteristics	seeing, even when wearing eyeglasses		hearing, even when using a hearing aid		walking or climbing steps		remembering or concentrating		self-caring (bathing or dressing)		communicating using his/her usual language		*% with at least one disability*	
	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*
Region 3	12.9	308,415	4.6	308,414	5.2	308,415	1.8	308,415	1.6	308,415	1.1	308,415	17.5	308,446
Region 4A	12.1	329,128	4.3	329,128	4.7	329,128	1.7	329,128	1.5	329,128	1.1	329,128	16.5	329,151
Region 4B	15.9	82,730	6.8	82,730	6.8	82,730	2.7	82,730	1.9	82,730	1.3	82,730	21.6	82,735
Region 5	16.0	174,039	7.8	174,039	6.9	174,039	3.0	174,039	2.1	174,039	1.4	174,039	22.8	174,046
Region 6	10.0	262,574	4.8	262,574	5.2	262,574	2.4	262,574	1.8	262,574	1.2	262,574	15.5	262,591
Region 7	11.6	235,441	5.8	235,441	5.7	235,439	2.6	235,439	1.9	235,440	1.2	235,439	17.6	235,464
Region 8	13.3	153,179	6.9	153,179	6.1	153,179	2.8	153,179	1.8	153,179	1.1	153,179	19.6	153,183
Region 9	13.3	99,057	6.4	99,057	5.4	99,057	2.7	99,057	1.6	99,057	1.1	99,057	18.5	99,062
Region 10	11.7	124,756	5.9	124,756	5.0	124,756	2.8	124,756	1.9	124,756	1.2	124,756	17.1	124,759
Region 11	12.5	134,273	5.0	134,271	4.8	134,270	2.5	134,268	1.7	134,269	1.2	134,264	17.2	134,283
Region 12	12.3	103,679	5.6	103,669	5.4	103,659	2.8	103,664	1.8	103,664	1.2	103,647	17.2	103,715
CARAGA	13.5	78,619	6.1	78,619	5.2	78,619	2.9	78,619	1.6	78,619	1.1	78,619	18.9	78,621
ARMM	15.5	48,793	9.0	48,743	7.4	48,663	4.9	48,651	2.4	48,647	1.9	48,556	19.8	49,188
MARITAL STATUS														
Single	10.1	118,515	5.9	118,511	5.6	118,517	3.1	118,515	2.1	118,520	2.4	118,523	17.3	118,710
Married	12.2	2,113,600	4.7	2,113,536	4.9	2,113,451	2.0	2,113,445	1.5	2,113,438	1.0	2,113,329	16.7	2,113,915

Background Characteristics	seeing, even when wearing eyeglasses		hearing, even when using a hearing aid		walking or climbing steps		remembering or concentrating		self-caring (bathing or dressing)		communicating using his/her usual language		*% with at least one disability*	
	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*
Widowed	15.8	401,469	10.0	401,469	8.7	401,464	4.4	401,463	3.2	401,463	1.9	401,447	24.1	401,535
Divorced/Separated	12.1	39,227	5.4	39,228	5.5	39,227	2.4	39,222	1.6	39,225	1.3	39,225	18.0	39,235
Common-law/ Live-in	12.0	78,767	4.6	78,767	4.2	78,762	1.7	78,766	1.1	78,766	0.7	78,766	16.1	78,773
Unknown	13.3	1,868	6.9	1,866	6.2	1,865	4.4	1,865	2.7	1,865	2.8	1,866	18.9	1,887
EDUCATION														
Elementary	14.5	968,639	8.0	968,612	6.6	968,567	3.4	968,533	2.0	968,544	1.4	968,456	20.9	968,880
Elementary grad	11.8	623,775	5.0	623,758	5.0	623,738	2.1	623,750	1.5	623,739	1.0	623,736	16.7	623,807
High school & over	11.5	1,152,990	3.6	1,152,972	4.6	1,152,945	1.7	1,152,954	1.6	1,152,955	1.0	1,152,923	15.8	1,153,074

*data excludes those "not reported".

Table 3: Level of disability among older Filipinos by background characteristics, Females, CPH 2010

Background Characteristics	seeing, even when wearing eyeglasses		hearing, even when using a hearing aid		walking or climbing steps		remembering or concentrating		self-caring (bathing or dressing)		communicating using his/her usual language		% with at least one disability	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
TOTAL	13.9	3,475,622	5.6	3,475,592	6.0	3,475,533	3.1	3,475,499	2.1	3,475,469	1.2	3,475,420	19.1	3,476,425
AGE														
60-69	10.6	1,978,790	2.2	1,978,762	2.7	1,978,723	1.2	1,978,696	0.7	1,978,676	0.5	1,978,656	13.1	1,979,270
70-79	16.1	1,069,522	6.7	1,069,519	7.2	1,069,510	3.3	1,069,493	2.0	1,069,488	1.2	1,069,468	22.2	1,069,747
80+	24.2	427,310	18.6	427,311	18.9	427,300	11.3	427,310	9.0	427,305	4.4	427,296	38.7	427,408
TYPE OF RESIDENCE														
Urban	14.4	1,412,571	4.7	1,412,562	5.7	1,412,545	2.6	1,412,530	2.0	1,412,518	1.1	1,412,517	18.8	1,412,823
Rural	13.6	2,063,051	6.2	2,063,030	6.3	2,062,988	3.4	2,062,969	2.2	2,062,951	1.3	2,062,903	19.3	2,063,602
REGION														
NCR	16.0	392,948	4.4	392,948	5.8	392,949	2.4	392,948	1.9	392,949	1.1	392,949	19.8	392,988
CAR	8.2	60,927	6.5	60,927	7.3	60,927	3.7	60,927	2.3	60,926	1.3	60,927	15.9	60,931
Region 1	12.8	246,469	6.5	246,469	6.3	246,469	3.4	246,469	2.4	246,468	1.3	246,468	18.6	246,478
Region 2	13.0	129,741	6.6	129,740	6.0	129,739	3.2	129,735	1.9	129,727	1.2	129,736	18.3	129,758
Region 3	14.7	399,457	5.2	399,457	6.3	399,457	2.6	399,457	2.1	399,457	1.3	399,455	19.5	399,495

Background Characteristics	seeing, even when wearing eyeglasses		hearing, even when using a hearing aid		walking or climbing steps		remembering or concentrating		self-caring (bathing or dressing)		communicating using his/her usual language		*% with at least one disability*	
	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*
Region 4A	13.9	447,125	4.7	447,125	5.8	447,125	2.4	447,125	1.9	447,125	1.2	447,125	18.4	447,150
Region 4B	17.0	98,402	6.6	98,402	7.1	98,402	3.4	98,402	2.2	98,402	1.4	98,401	22.3	98,406
Region 5	17.5	225,812	7.1	225,812	7.2	225,812	3.7	225,812	2.3	225,812	1.4	225,812	23.5	225,819
Region 6	11.2	351,704	5.1	351,704	5.4	351,704	3.3	351,704	2.1	351,704	1.2	351,704	16.5	351,716
Region 7	12.6	294,714	5.7	294,714	6.2	294,714	3.2	294,714	2.3	294,713	1.2	294,713	18.5	294,734
Region 8	14.3	183,597	6.7	183,597	6.6	183,597	3.6	183,597	2.2	183,597	1.2	183,597	20.6	183,598
Region 9	14.3	110,852	6.1	110,852	5.7	110,852	3.2	110,852	1.9	110,852	1.3	110,852	19.2	110,855
Region 10	12.5	143,162	5.6	143,162	5.1	143,162	3.3	143,162	2.0	143,162	1.2	143,162	17.7	143,169
Region 11	13.6	144,640	4.8	144,641	5.0	144,641	3.0	144,639	1.9	144,638	1.2	144,638	18.1	144,652
Region 12	13.2	112,798	5.6	112,786	5.7	112,776	3.5	112,765	2.1	112,766	1.4	112,755	18	112,871
CARAGA	14.5	89,216	5.7	89,216	5.4	89,216	3.5	89,216	1.9	89,216	1.1	89,216	19.5	89,218
ARMM	16.8	44,058	10.0	44,040	9.1	43,991	5.6	43,977	2.9	43,955	2.3	43,910	22.3	44,587
MARITAL STATUS														
Single	12.4	264,798	5.9	264,801	6.6	264,799	3.6	264,780	2.7	264,787	2.0	264,786	18.9	265,028
Married	11.7	1,603,788	3.4	1,603,771	3.8	1,603,733	1.7	1,603,738	1.1	1,603,700	0.7	1,603,683	15.1	1,604,085
Widowed	16.7	1,498,267	8.0	1,498,253	8.4	1,498,233	4.5	1,498,216	3.1	1,498,218	1.6	1,498,190	23.6	1,498,470

Background Characteristics	seeing, even when wearing eyeglasses		hearing, even when using a hearing aid		walking or climbing steps		remembering or concentrating		self-caring (bathing or dressing)		communicating using his/her usual language		% with at least one disability	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Divorced/Separated	13.2	56,940	4.2	56,941	4.7	56,939	2.3	56,940	1.5	56,937	1.1	56,935	17.5	56,958
Common-law/ Live-in	12.4	47,446	4.1	47,446	3.8	47,446	1.9	47,445	1.0	47,446	0.7	47,446	15.9	47,451
Unknown	13.9	4,383	6.8	4,380	7.0	4,383	3.8	4,380	2.6	4,381	2.3	4,380	19.4	4,433
EDUCATION														
Elementary	16.4	1,295,911	8.4	1,295,898	7.9	1,295,877	4.5	1,295,842	2.8	1,295,844	1.7	1,295,799	23.1	1,296,249
Elementary grad	13.2	921,765	4.8	921,761	5.5	921,751	2.6	921,750	1.8	921,737	1.0	921,742	17.8	921,819
High school & over	12.0	1,248,055	3.2	1,248,042	4.5	1,248,016	1.9	1,248,016	1.5	1,248,003	0.8	1,247,996	15.8	1,248,148

*data excludes those "not reported".

Table 4: Gender difference in the level of disability among older Filipinos by background characteristics, CPH 2010

Background Characteristics	seeing, even when wearing eyeglasses	hearing, even when using a hearing aid	walking or climbing steps	remembering or concentrating	self-caring (bathing or dressing)	communicating using his/her usual language	*% with at least one disability*
TOTAL	1.3	0.1	0.6	0.7	0.3	0.0	1.3
AGE							
60-69	0.6	(0.4)	(0.4)	0.0	(0.1)	(0.2)	(0.1)
70-79	0.8	(1.1)	0.0	0.3	(0.1)	(0.2)	0.0
80+	1.1	(0.9)	2.0	1.9	1.5	0.6	1.2
TYPE OF RESIDENCE							
Urban	1.4	0.3	0.7	0.6	0.3	0.0	1.4
Rural	1.2	0.0	0.6	0.7	0.4	0.1	1.2
REGION							
NCR	1.2	0.4	0.7	0.6	0.1	0.1	1.4
CAR	1.5	0.6	1.2	1.0	0.4	0.2	1.9
Region 1	1.5	0.3	0.8	1.0	0.6	0.1	1.5
Region 2	1.6	0.1	0.6	0.7	0.3	0.1	1.3
Region 3	1.8	0.6	1.1	0.8	0.5	0.2	2.0
Region 4A	1.8	0.4	1.1	0.7	0.4	0.1	1.9
Region 4B	1.1	(0.2)	0.3	0.7	0.3	0.1	0.7
Region 5	1.5	(0.7)	0.3	0.7	0.2	0.0	0.7
Region 6	1.2	0.3	0.2	0.9	0.3	0.0	1.0
Region 7	1.0	(0.1)	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.0	0.9

Background Characteristics	seeing, even when wearing eyeglasses	hearing, even when using a hearing aid	walking or climbing steps	remembering or concentrating	self-caring (bathing or dressing)	communicating using his/her usual language	*% with at least one disability*
Region 8	1.0	(0.2)	0.5	0.8	0.4	0.1	1.0
Region 9	1.0	(0.3)	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.7
Region 10	0.8	(0.3)	0.1	0.5	0.1	0.0	0.6
Region 11	1.1	(0.2)	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.0	0.9
Region 12	0.9	0.0	0.3	0.7	0.3	0.2	0.8
CARAGA	1.0	(0.4)	0.2	0.6	0.3	0.0	0.6
ARMM	1.3	1.0	1.7	0.7	0.5	0.4	2.5
MARITAL STATUS							
Single	2.3	0.0	1.0	0.5	0.6	(0.4)	1.6
Married	(0.5)	(1.3)	(1.1)	(0.3)	(0.4)	(0.3)	(1.6)
Widowed	0.9	(2.0)	(0.3)	0.1	(0.1)	(0.3)	(0.5)
Divorced/Separated	1.1	(1.2)	(0.8)	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.2)	(0.5)
Common-law/ Live-in	0.4	(0.5)	(0.4)	0.2	(0.1)	0.0	(0.2)
Unknown	0.6	(0.1)	0.8	(0.6)	(0.1)	(0.5)	0.5
EDUCATION							
Elementary	1.9	0.4	1.3	1.1	0.8	0.3	2.2
Elementary grad	1.4	(0.2)	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.0	1.1
High school & over	0.5	(0.4)	(0.1)	0.2	(0.1)	(0.2)	0.0

Table 5: Distribution of those with disability by number of disability reported and mean number disability by age, gender and education, CPH 2010

Number of Difficulty/ Percent	SEX						AGE						EDUCATION						ALL	
	Male		Female		Both Sexes		60-69		70-79		80 and older		Elem, not graduated		Elem, graduate		HS & Higher			
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1	63.7	312828	62.2	411968	62.8	724796	75.5	369341	60.9	250084	41.5	105371	56.9	285711	64.4	172686	69.8	264047	62.8	724796
2	21.5	105719	21.5	142819	21.5	248538	16.7	81791	24.0	98534	26.9	68213	24.3	122364	21.2	56871	18.0	68112	21.5	248538
3	8.4	41290	8.8	58015	8.6	99305	5.0	24234	8.9	36613	15.1	38458	10.3	51585	7.9	21253	6.8	25872	8.6	99305
4	3.3	16076	3.8	24911	3.6	40987	1.6	7813	3.3	13649	7.7	19525	4.3	21735	3.2	8671	2.7	10293	3.6	40987
5	1.4	6904	1.7	11235	1.6	18139	0.5	2690	1.3	5289	4.0	10160	1.9	9588	1.4	3745	1.2	4646	1.6	18139
6	1.7	8122	2.1	13864	1.9	21986	0.7	3645	1.5	6151	4.8	12190	2.3	11569	1.8	4773	1.4	5458	1.9	21986
TOTAL	100.0	490957	100.0	662831	100	1153769	100	489514	100	410320	100	1153751	100	502552	100	267999	100	378428	100	1153751
Mean number of disability	1.62		1.68		1.65		1.37		1.64		2.2		1.77		1.61		1.52		1.65	

References

Al Ju'beh 2015

CBM International. (N.d.). "Disaggregation by Disability: A way forward – the Washington Group Questions." *CBM.org.* Retrieved October 5, 2018 (https://www.cbm.org/Disaggregation-by-Disability-A-way-forward--498229.php)

Cruz, G. T., Natividad, J. N., Gonzales, M. L., & Saito, Y. (2016). *Aging in the Philippines: Findings from the 2007 Philippine Study on Aging*. Quezon City:University of the Philippines Population Institute and Demographic Research and Development Foundation.

DFID Inclusive Societies. 2017. *Ensuring Everyone Counts when Disaster Strikes: Sharing Early Learning from UK Aid Funded Project on Disability Data in Humanitarian Contexts.* Retrieved October 5, 2018 (https://medium.com/@DFID_Inclusive/ensuring-everyone-counts-when-disaster-strikes-4487919ce634)

Dugarova, Esuna. 2017. *Ageing, Older Persons and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.* Retrieved December 10, 2018 (https://www.un.org/development/desa/ageing/wp-content/uploads/sites/24/2017/07/UNDP_AARP_HelpAge_International_AgeingOlderpersons-and-2030-Agenda-2.pdf)

Eide, Arne and Mitch E. Loeb. 2005. *Data and Statistics on Disability in Developing Countries.* Retrieved October 10, 2018 (http://www.firah.org/centre-ressources/upload/notices2/juin-2014/data-and-statistics-on-disability-in-developing-countries.pdf)

Loeb, Mitchell. N.d. *Disgggregation by Disability: A Way Forward- the Washington Group Questions.* Retrieved October 8, 2018 (https://www.cbm.org/Disaggregation-by-Disability-A-way-forward--498229.php)

Madans, Jennifer H., Mitchell E. Loeb and Barbara M. Altman. . (2011). "Measuring Disability and Monitoring the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities: The Work of the Washington Group on Disability Statistics." *Springer Link.* Retrieved October 5, 2018 (https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/1471-2458-11-S4-S4)

Madans, Jennifer, Barbara Altman, Elizabeth Rasch, Margaret Mbogoni, Malin Synneborn, Jeremiah Band, Angela Me and Elena DePalma. 2004. *Washington Group Position Paper: Proposed Purpose of an Internationally Comparable General Disability Measure.* Retrieved October 10, 2018 (http://www.washingtongroup-disability.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/WG_purpose_paper.pdf)

Marella, Manjula, Alexandra Devine, Graeme Ferdinand Armecin, Jerome Zayas, Ma Jesusa Marco and Cathy Vaughan. 2016. "Rapid Assessment of Disability in the Philippines: Understanding Prevalence, Well-being, and Access to the Community for People with Disabilities to Inform the W-DARE Project." *Population Health Metrics* 14(26). Retrieved October 5, 2018 (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4971707/)

Mitra, Sophie, Aleksandra Posarac and Brandon Vick . (2011). *Disability and Poverty in Developing Countries: A Snapshot from the World Health Survey.* Retrieved October 7, 2017 (http://siteresources.worldbank.org/SOCIALPROTECTION/Resources/SP-Discussion-papers/Disability-DP/1109.pdf)

Mont, Daniel. 2017. *How does the WG-SS differ from Disability Eligibility Determination?* Retrieved October 8, 2017 (http://www.washingtongroup-disability.com/washington-group-blog/wg-ss-differ-disability-eligibility-determination/)

Office for Disability Issues. 2017. *Information on the Washington Group Short Set of Questions on Disability.* Retrieved October 5, 2018 (https://www.odi.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/Information-Sheet-Washington-Group-Short-Set-of-Questions-on-Disability2.pdf)

Palmer, Michael and David Harley. 2012. "Models and Measurement in Disability: An International Review." *Health Policy and Planning* 27(5):357-364. Retrieved October 5, 2018 (https://academic.oup.com/heapol/article/27/5/357/749458)

Small, Michael. 2007. "The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities." *Australian Human Rights Commission.* Retrieved December 10, 2018 (https://www.humanrights.gov.au/news/speeches/convention-rights-persons-disabilities)

United Nations Development Programme. 2016. "Leave No One Behind: Ageing, Gender and the 2030 Agenda." *UNDP: Issue Brief.* Retrieved December 10, 2018 (http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/womens-empowerment/leave-no-one-behind--ageing--gender-and-the-sdgs.html)

United Nations-Disability: Department of Economics & Social Affairs. 2018. *Ageing and disability.* Retrieved December 10, 2018 (https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/disability-and-ageing.html)

University of the Philippines Wellness Initiative for Seniors and Elders [UPWISE] (2018). Project Report.

Vaughan, Cathy, Jerome Zayas, Alexandra Devine, Liz Gill-Atkinson, Manjula Marella, Joy Garcia, Krissy Bisda, Joy Salgado, Carolyn Sobritchea, Tanya Edmonds, Sally Baker and Ma. Jesusa Marco. (2015). "Study Protocol- W-Dare: A Three-Year Program of Participatory Action Research to Improve the Sexual and Reproductive Health of Women with Disabilities in the Philippines." *BMC Public Health.* Retrieved October 5, 2018 (https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-015-2308-y)

Virola, Romulo and Jessamyn Encarnacion. 2016. "Chapter 14- The Washington Group on the improvement of Disability Statistics Globally: Perspectives from the Philippines" in *International Measurement of Disability: Purpose, Method and Application* edited by Barbara M. Altman. Retrieved October 8, 2018 (https://books.google.com.ph/books?id=YQJkDAAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&hl=fil#v=onepage&q=Chapter%2014&f=false

Washington Group on Disability Statistics. 2016. *Short Set of Disability Questions.* Retrieved October 5, 2018 (http://www.washingtongroup-disability.com/washington-group-question-sets/short-set-of-disability-questions/)

World Health Organization (WHO) & World Bank (WB). 2011. *World Report on Disability.* Retrieved October 5, 2018 (http://www.who.int/disabilities/world_report/2011/report.pdf)

World Health Organization. 2011. "Technical Appendix B: Overview of Global and Regional Initiatives on Disability Statistics." *World Report on Disability.* Retrieved October 5, 2018 (http://www.who.int/disabilities/world_report/2011/technical_appendices.pdf)

World Health Organization (WHO) & United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP). 2008. *Training Manual on Disability Statistics.* Retrieved October 5, 2018 (https://unstats.un.org/unsd/censuskb20/Attachments/2008ESCAP_TrainManDisabty-GUID7c07895389164cdab0b0b7609136f117.pdf)

Acknowledgement