



**ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER**

**Social Science**

**SOCIAL IMAGES OF EYE DONATION: THE PATHWAY TOWARDS MAKING A 'GIFT OF SIGHT'**

**KEY WORDS:** Corneal Transplantation, Deceased, Eye Donation, and Willingness

<b>Kumari. S</b>	Doctoral Candidate, Faculty of Arts, Department of Sociology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.
<b>Suraj</b>	Medical Social Worker, ICMR Project, Department Of Radiation Oncology, Government Medical College And Hospital, Chandigarh.
<b>Kaur. A*</b>	SRF, ICMR Project, Department Of Radiation Oncology, Government Medical College And Hospital, Chandigarh. *Corresponding Author

**ABSTRACT**  
 Stupendous possibility of scientific and technological advancement in the field of health care services, the corneal transplantation emerges as a mechanism to enhance the life of a corneal blind person. The number of corneal transplantation has increased with the decrease in graft failure. The institutionalization of corneal transplantation and eye donation has blurred the line between human and machine. This brings a transformation in the outlook of people towards body and eye in the society. The body is considered as a machine and cornea (part of eye anatomy) is regarded as spare part which can be exchanged to replace the healthy donated cornea with the damage cornea of a recipient. The paper seeks to understand the perception towards dead body and willingness for eye donation in the society. The symbolic meaning attached with body and eye in the society is also outlined in the paper. The aim of the paper is to describe the representation of eye and willingness for eye donation among students of Panjab University and its affiliated colleges in Chandigarh, India.

**INTRODUCTION:**

With the considerable improvement in technology, surgery and post-operative care in the medical realm, organ and tissue transplantation is no longer considered as an experiment<sup>1,2</sup>. The outcome of transplant has improved and the rate of failed graft has also declined, which is responsible for the success rate of graft and the increase in the number of organ transplantation<sup>4</sup>. Organ and tissue transplantation institutionalizes as an instrument of saving and enhancing the life of a diseased person<sup>5</sup>. Organs, such as heart, liver, kidney, lung, etc. and tissues, such as cornea, bone, skin, heart valves, etc. are commonly transplanted to replace the recipient's damaged organ or tissue with the healthy organ or tissue of a donor<sup>6-7</sup>. Different countries have adopted different mechanism to procure organs or tissues, for instance, the opt-in policy of the UK and USA and opt-out policy of France and Spain for the dynamics of organ donation and transplantation<sup>8</sup>. The dynamics of organ donation and transplantation has blurred the line between human and machine. The human body is imagined as a machine and communal in the society. In the medical domain, the human body parts, such as heart, liver, kidney, corneas, etc. are compared with spare parts of the machine<sup>9</sup>. This enables the physician to accept the body as a commodity and valuable resource for cadaveric organ transplantation, research and education<sup>9-11</sup>. The notion of 'altruism' and 'living in' in the body of a recipient after the death of a donor supersedes the idea 'commodification of body' in the area of organ donation and transplantation<sup>12</sup>.

In personal and social context, emotional investment with deceased and symbolic meaning is attached to the body and identity that are not easy to separate even after death<sup>10-11</sup>. The body is treated physically and socially as per associated symbolic meanings, such as 'temple', 'tomb of the soul', 'machine' etc. It is believed that the people should give respect to a dead body and the expression of fear is emotionally involved with a corpse<sup>9</sup>. Socio-cultural beliefs about the dead body, medical reconceptualization of death and continuing social bond with deceased raise concerns on the process of organ retrieval and specific organ to be donated among donor families<sup>10-11</sup>.

Therefore, the focus of the present study is on the social and cultural context of eye donation due to the significance of vision and sight for existence in the society. Corneal transplantation facilitates the rehabilitation and enhances the life of a corneal blind person through regaining the lost vision<sup>13</sup>. According to National Programme for Control of

Blindness (NPCB, 2015), approximately 6.8 million corneal blind people (unilateral) along with millions bilateral corneal blind people reside in India. Nearly 25,000 to 30,000 new cases of corneal blindness are incorporated in the backlog annually<sup>14-16</sup>. There is a requirement of about 277,000 healthy corneas for corneal transplantation, which can be retrieved only through the process of eye donation. There is a wide disparity in the chain of demand and supply of donated corneas due to the dearth of eye donor. Consequently, corneal blind patients have to wait for one to two years on an average to get corneal transplantation done<sup>16-17</sup>.

**Literature Reviews:**

In the study of Sque and Payne (1996), the fear of disfigurement, symbol of beauty that attaches with eye, the dignity of dead bodies and belief in the afterlife were identified as reasons for the refusal of eye donation among ten relatives out of twenty four relatives of organ donors in England<sup>18</sup>. The study of Hayward and Madill (2003) also delineated associated symbols, such as attractiveness, attachment, memory, visibility, sight, identity, self and soul with the eye which created reluctance among Muslim of Pakistani origin and White English living in the north of England<sup>19</sup>.

Haddow (2005, 2010) observed that there was a reluctance to donate an eye of a deceased relative among the general public. Symbolic meanings like 'the window of the soul', 'visible part of the body', 'related with identity and personhood', and 'visible expression' or 'important for the interaction' were associated with the eye. Therefore the eye was not only associated with the ability to see (Sight) but also with insight and understanding<sup>10-11</sup>. Lawlor and Kerridge (2011) underlined metaphorical references, such as the association of beauty, truth, soul, vision, image, sight, wisdom, insight, God and evil with eye in literature, cultural narratives, philosophy, and faith tradition. It was found that even families of an organ donor who agreed to donate the heart or kidney of the donor, had refused to donate the donor's eye<sup>20</sup>.

The study of Lawlor and Kerridge (2013) explored reasons for the decision on eye donation and examined the reasons behind the refusal to donate eye as compared to other organs among 21 relatives of deceased in Australia. The feeling of discomfort associated with the removal of visible organ had raised a concern for the physical appearance of the body. The symbol of identity and beauty that attached to the eye had also developed a concern about eye donation. It was believed that

the corneal retrieval might threaten the identity and physical or spiritual beauty of the deceased. These concerns obscured the requirement and benefit of eye donation and corneal transplantation<sup>21</sup>.

Pandey et al. (2014) viewed that there were multiple reasons behind the reluctance among people in India to donate the eye. These reasons were perceptions about death and dead bodies, the idea of being born blind in next birth, facial mutilation, religious belief, lack of awareness and distrust in healthcare setting<sup>22</sup>. The retrospective study of Sharma et al. (2018) described the reluctance for donating the eye of a young deceased relative among their family members. The decision of elders and rural population on eye donation of their deceased relatives also influenced with a number of reasons. These were lack of awareness, facial disfigurement, fear of being born blind in next birth, diseased status of corneas and climatic and geographical condition<sup>23</sup>.

Kumari (2020) showed that despite of the institutionalization of corneal transplantation in the realm of medicine, corneal blindness still existed as a health issue in India<sup>16</sup>. Hon'ble Prime Minister Narendra Modi mentioned in the 'Mann Ki Baat' on 24<sup>th</sup> October 2015 that only one out of four corneal blind patients had an opportunity of corneal transplantation. The request was also made among the general public to donate the eye of their deceased relatives<sup>24</sup>. The public support and participation was essential to promote eye donation and prevent corneal blindness in the society<sup>14, 16</sup>. Hence, the present study emphasizes on the different aspects related to the decision of eye donation and the willingness towards eye donation among students of Panjab University and its affiliated colleges in Chandigarh, India

**Aims of the study:**

1. To describe perceptions behind the deceased's body and the eye which further influence the decision of eye donation
2. To assess whether awareness on eye donation as enough for the willingness and promotion of eye donation

**MATERIALS AND METHODS:**

The cross sectional (independent study) was carried out among 1213 students of Panjab University Chandigarh and its affiliated colleges, for a period of five months (15<sup>th</sup> October 2019 to 15<sup>th</sup> March 2020). The nature of the study was descriptive and the self developed questionnaire (quantitative method) for data collection was used. The universe was selected by using the purposive sampling (non-probability sampling) method and the area selected for study was the Panjab University Chandigarh (sector-14) and the five affiliated government colleges in Chandigarh, India. Post Graduate Government College (Sector-11), Post Graduate Government College for Girls (sector-11), Post Graduate Government for Girls (sector-42), Post Graduate Government College (sector-46) and Government College of Commerce

and Business Administration (sector-50) were five government colleges in Chandigarh, India. The unit of analysis was those students who were pursuing any degree or diploma from Panjab University and its affiliated colleges on regular mode only, as they had more opportunity to engage with awareness activities related to social issues, including organ donation.

A structured questionnaire, encompassing both open ended and closed ended set of questions was administered to 1323 students. Those students refusing to participate were excluded (n=11) from the study. Nearly 77 questionnaires did not return back, 13 respondents unmet the required the study criterion, and 9 questionnaires were incomplete or left unanswered. The total responses recorded were 1213 out of 1323 questionnaires distributed and the response rate was approximately 91.7%. The questionnaire was divided into three sections: The *first section* dealt with the social demographic profile of the respondent. The *second section* comprised the perception and beliefs about different aspects of eye donation. The *third section* illustrated different aspects related to the willingness of respondents towards eye donation.

The data was compiled and entered in Ms-excel sheet and IBM SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) version 20, was used to analyse the data, employing descriptive statistical measures. Measures of central tendency (mean, median and mode), dispersion measures (standard deviation and standard error) and association measures (correlation like Spearman's rho) were computed. The confidence interval (CI) was fixed at 95% and the p-value less than 0.01 considered statistically significant in T-test, Chi-square test and Spearman's rho. Along with these, percentages, frequency tables, cross table, figures and a discussion were also employed to encapsulate and display the data.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS:**

The study encompassed 1213 students of Panjab University and its affiliated colleges, Chandigarh to study their perception towards eye donation, including Male 610, Female 600 and other 03. Respondents belonged to different age groups that ranged from 16-45 years (mean=21.13, median=20.00 and mode=20). They were also belonged to different religions, including Hindu (73.5%), Sikh (19.4%), Muslim (2.8%), Christian (0.5%) and Others (3.9%). They also further fell in different caste based categories, including General (75.6%), SC (12.8%), ST (4.3%), and OBC (7.3%). They were residing at Urban (59.2%), Semi-urban (13.3%) and Rural (27.5%). Respondents were enrolled under various courses, such as follows, Graduation (61.8%), Post-Graduation (26.9%), M.Phil (1.8%), Ph.D. (7.9%) and others (1.6%) [Table 1].

**Table 1: The socio-demographic profile of respondents (n=1213)**

	Fq	%age	Mean	Skewness	SD	SE Mean	Chi-Sq.	T	Mean difference (95% CI)	P value
<b>Age</b>			21.13	1.754	3.497	0.100	1688.445	210.415	21.125 (20.93, 21.32)	.000
16-25	1113	91.7								
26-35	98	8.1								
36-45	02	0.2								
<b>Gender</b>			1.50	0.059	0.505	0.015	597.657	103.395	1.500 (1.47, 1.53)	.000
Male	610	50.3								
Female	600	49.5								
Other	03	0.2								
<b>Religion</b>			1.42	2.769	0.1892	0.026	2301.044	55.456	1.420 (1.37, 1.47)	.000
Hindu	891	73.5								
Sikh	235	19.4								
Muslim	34	2.8								
Christian	06	0.5								
Others	47	3.9								

<b>Caste</b>			1.43	2.019	0.879	0.025	1647.185	56.820	1.434 (1.38, 1.48)	.000
General	917	75.6								
SC	155	12.8								
ST	52	4.3								
OBC	89	7.3								
<b>Location</b>			1.68	0.661	.876	0.025	402.007	66.916	1.683 (1.63-1.73)	.000
Urban	718	59.2								
Semi-urban	161	13.3								
Rural	334	27.5								
<b>Courses</b>			1.61	1.795	.969	0.028	1587.174	57.696	1.605 (1.55, 1.66)	.000
Graduation	750	61.8								
PG	326	26.9								
M. Phil	22	1.8								
Ph. D	96	7.9								
Others	19	1.6								

The respondents expressed their views on the use of the human body after the death of an individual. Around 143 (11.8%) respondents perceived that the whole body should be cremated, 550 (45.3%) opined that the body should be used to save and enhance another's life by donating the organs and 85 (7%) believed that the whole dead body could be donated for research purpose. A total of 424 (35.0%) respondents imagined that the body's organs as well as the whole body could be donated and used for saving life and research purpose. Nearly 11(0.9%) respondents felt that although the whole body should be cremated, but organs could also be donated, (Mean=2.68, SD=1.099, Chi-Sq. =889.519, SEMean=0.032, Skewness=0.169, T=84.861, CI=95% & P<0.00). The views on dead body were statistically associated with the willingness towards eye donation (P value ≤ 0.01 in two tailed test of Spearman's rho). Schweda and Schicktanz (2009) also found that the notion behind the human body after death, such as perceiving body as a machine, identity of a person, afterlife, 'live on' in another body after death etc. interwove with the willingness towards organ donation among the general public<sup>25</sup>.

Approximately 557(47.6%) respondents observed the 'eye' as a part of the body, just like other organs which could be donated or transplanted. Nearly 261 (21.5%) and 348 (28.7%) respondents perceived the 'eye' as an identity of a person and as a visible part of the body. Around 11(0.9%) responded considered that the 'eye' might be that part of the body which could be replaced as well as it could be taken as an identity of the person and the visible part of the body. About 13(1.1%) respondents observed the 'eye' as a part of the body that could be replaced along with the visible part of the body. There were almost 03(0.2%) respondents who accepted the 'eye' as an identity of a person along with a part of the body that could be replaced (Mean=1.87, SD=0.959, Chi-Sq. =1371.269, Skewness=0.783, T=67.986, CI=95% & P<0.00).

**Table 2** illustrates the social perception of respondents towards different aspects of eye donation. Out of the total 1213 (100%) around 977 (80.5%) respondents accepted that the family of deceased played an important role in the decision making of eye donation of their beloved ones, it might be due to emotional attachment, fear of disfigurement of facial structure, belief of being born blind in the next birth or any other social perceptions (SD=0.396, Chi-Sq. =452.664, Skewness=1.545, T=105.055, CI=95% & P<0.00). Correspondingly, the study of Randhawa (1998) found that the decision of organ donation was not an individual affair, but the whole family members would participate in the decision of donating the organ of their deceased relative<sup>26</sup>. Newton (2011) also outlined that the attitude of family members towards organ donation and the desire of maintaining cohesion in the family influenced the decision of individual on organ donation<sup>27</sup>.

Approximately 259 respondents viewed that the belief of cremating the whole body after death and the threat of being born blind in next birth that was attached with eye donation

refrained people from donating the eyes of their deceased relatives. The proportion of uncertain about the significance of these beliefs on the decision of eye donation (37.7% of respondents) was higher than those who accepted the influence of beliefs on the decision of eye donation (21.4% of respondents). The willingness towards eye donation was statistically correlated with these beliefs (P value ≤ 0.01 in two tailed test of spearman's rho). Verble and Worth (1999) also found that the beliefs influenced the decision of the deceased's family negatively on organ donation, such as the need of body parts in the next life, cremate the dead body as a whole and fear of disfigurement<sup>28</sup>. Randhawa (2012) recommended that the cultural and social needs of the family members of potential organ donor should be considered. There was a need for constant communication between hospital staff involving in organ transplantation and faith leader, in order to resolve the dilemma of family members on eye donation of their deceased relative and to promote organ donation in the society<sup>29</sup>.

Nearly 47.8% respondents believed that their religion supported the course of eye donation, while 12.2% respondents opined that the religion was against the eye donation. More than 40% of respondents did not know about the stance of religion on the decision of eye donation, (SD=0.934, Chi-Sq. =254.920, Skewness=0.156, T=71.649, Non-parametric test Spearman's correlation with age, gender, caste, religion, course, place of residence and the stance of religion towards eye donation, it was statistically significant 2 tailed CI=99% P≤0.01). These findings showed that the proportion of ignorant about the stance of religion on eye donation was more than the unfavourable stance of religion on eye donation. Similarly, in the study of Randhawa (1998), 38 participants out of 64 had no idea about the stance of their religion on organ donation. The findings showed that there was a desire to know about the stance of religion on organ donation among respondents, so that they could make more informed decisions. The uncertainty about the decision of organ donation was associated with the stance of religion<sup>26</sup>. Davis and Randhawa (2006) suggested that religion and faith leaders could be used to spread correct information about organ donation and to promote organ donation through awareness programmes among the public<sup>30</sup>.

Around 47.2% of respondents acknowledged that the messages like 'Metaphor-A gift of sight', 'Share Vision' and 'Live In' were enough to motivate or encourage the family to donate the eyes of a recently deceased family member or relative. Nearly 28.3% respondents responded with 'No' and 24.5% respondents were unsure about the role of these messages in the promotion of eye donation (SD=0.816, Chi-Sq. =108.155, Skewness=0.440, T=75.643, CI=95%, P=0.00). Sque, Payne & Macleod (2006) highlighted that the discourse of 'gift of life' and 'gift of sight' acted as a motivational factor for organ donation among some families. However, the discourse overlooked the complexities involving in the decision of organ donation and the sacrificial element of the decision of organ donation<sup>31</sup>.

Duggal et al. (2003) showed that more than 52% of respondents were willing to donate their eyes after death due to numerous reason, such as 'living on after death', 'doing good act for humanity', 'need of a friend or relative' and 'previous decision of donation by a friend or relative'<sup>32</sup>. In the present study, only 78 (6.4%) respondents replied that the eye of their deceased relative was donated or they knew the person who donated the eye of his or her deceased relative. These eye donors were the parent (4 in numbers), grandparent (24 in numbers), sibling (1 in numbers), secondary or tertiary relatives (32 in numbers) of respondents. Along with them, there were ten (10) friends and seven (7) neighbours of respondents who donated the eye of their deceased relatives. (Mean= 6.78, Median=07, Mode=07, SD=0.924, SE Mean=0.027, Skewness=-4.373, T=255.468, CI=95%, P=0.00). Approximately 87 (7.2%) participants recognized that they knew the persons who had transplanted their cornea (Mean= 1.93, SD=0.258, SE Mean=0.007, Skewness=-3.324, T=260.167, CI=95%, P=0.00).

Gogate & Gogate (2011) recapitulated that awareness was necessary to promote eye donation among the public. However, raising awareness was not only sufficient to encourage people for eye donation. There was a need to focus on catalysts which facilitated eye donation in the society, such as the idea of noble act and helping other involving in eye donation<sup>33</sup>. In the same way, the present study also revealed that apart from awareness, favourable attitude of the person, family and society towards eye donation could considerably influence the willingness for eye donation among the general public. More than 77.4% respondents pondered that the mere awareness was not enough. While only 22.6% respondents believed that the mere awareness about eye donation was enough to promote eye donation among the general public (Mean= 1.77, SD=0.418, SE Mean=0.012, Skewness=-1.313).

**Table 2: Perceptions towards eye donation (n=1213)**

Perceptions	Fq (%)
<b>Beliefs attached with eye donation refrain people from eye donation</b>	
Yes	259(21.3)
No	497(41.0)
Can't say	457(37.7)
<b>The role of family plays in the decision of eye donation</b>	
Yes	977(80.5)
No	236(19.5)
<b>Stance of religion on eye donation</b>	
Support eye donation	580(47.8)
Against eye donation	148(12.2)
Don't know	485(40.0)
<b>Messages are appropriate and enough to promote eye donation</b>	
Yes	573(47.2)
No	343(28.3)
Don't know	297(24.5)
<b>Mere awareness enough for eye donation</b>	
Yes	274(22.6)
No	939(77.4)

The **Table 3** illuminates catalysts that could bring willingness towards eye donation among the general public in the society. Out of 939 respondents, around 66.2% considered the favourable attitude of a person towards eye donation, 65.5% respondents pondered the favourable attitude of family members, relatives and friends towards eye donation, 61.7% respondents thought the favourable cultural & religious belief towards eye donation and 61.9% respondents regarded a sense of community responsibility among general public as catalysts in the realm of eye donation (Mean= 4.83, Median=5, Mode=5, SD=1.798, SE Mean=0.052, Skewness=-0.736, T=93.481, Chi Sq. = 999.848, Spearman's correlation with Religion, Gender, Place of residence and catalysts required willingness, the statistical significant was 2 tailed & CI=99%,

P≤0.000).

**Table 3: Catalysts for the willingness of people for eye donation (n=939)**

Requirement	Fq (%)
Favourable attitude of a person towards eye donation	622(66.2)
Favourable attitude of family members, relatives and friends towards eye donation	615(65.5)
Favourable cultural and religious belief towards eye donation	579(61.7)
A sense of community responsibility among general public	582(61.9)

**\*Figures comprise multiple responses**

The present study delineated the perception of respondents towards organ and eye donation through their comfort for the decision of an organ and eye donation and its retrieval procedure. As per 346 (28.5%) respondents, organ donation like, kidney, liver, heart, etc. was more comfortable than donating the eye. There were about 823 (67.8%) respondents who found no difference in donating any organ, including the eye. Around 44 (3.6%) respondents were uncertain about the ease of the decision of organ and eye donation, (Mean= 1.75, Median=2, Mode=2, SD=0.510, SE Mean=0.015, Skewness=-0.301). **Table 4** displays the willingness to donate a specific organ and tissue after death in case of respondents' case and deceased relative of respondents. Kidney and cornea were more favourable organ and tissue to donate in case of respondents and their deceased relatives, followed by heart, liver and skin. The study of Seth et al. (2009) also found that the more retrieval and transplanted organs and tissues were cornea and kidney, followed by liver and cardiac valves<sup>34</sup>.

**Table 4: The willingness to donate organs & tissues after the death**

Organs/ tissues	Responses	%age	SD	T	Skewness
<b>In case of respondents</b>					
Kidney	792	65.3	0.476	98.514	0.643
Heart	697	57.5	0.495	100.370	0.302
Cornea	791	65.2	0.476	98.520	0.639
Liver	638	52.6	0.500	102.772	0.104
Skin	495	40.8	0.492	112.764	0.375
<b>In case of deceased relative of respondents</b>					
Kidney	697	57.5	0.495	100.370	0.302
Heart	627	51.7	0.500	103.324	0.068
Cornea	710	58.5	0.493	99.967	0.347
Liver	597	49.2	0.500	105.000	0.031
Skin	489	40.3	0.491	113.333	0.395

**\*Figures comprise multiple responses**

The willingness towards eye donation was statistically correlated with the stance of religion and the use of metaphor (P value ≤ 0.01 in two tailed test of Spearman's rho). The computation of Spearman's rho showed that the association of variables, such as age and education with the willingness towards eye donation (in respondents' case) was statistical significant (P value ≤ 0.01 in two tailed test). The willingness of the person towards eye donation was statistically associated with the willingness to donate the eye of a deceased relative (P value ≤ 0.01 in two tailed test). Only 206 (17%) respondents had taken a pledge to donate their eye after death (SD=0.376, Mean=1.83, Median=2, Mode=2, SE Mean=0.11, Skewness=-1.761, Chi-Sq. =528.932, T=169.690, it was statistical significant the CI=95%, P=0.00). Gender and willingness towards eye donation were statistically correlated with the pledge for eye donation (P value ≤ 0.01 in two tailed test). A total of 234 (19.3%) and 188 (15.5%) respondents showed the unwillingness and uncertainty in donating their organs and tissues after death. In case of deceased relative of respondents, about 365 (30.1%) and 138 (11.4%) respondents

were unwilling and undecided to donate organs and tissues of their relatives after death.

**CONCLUSION:**

The dynamics of eye donation and corneal transplantation emerge as a mechanism that restores the lost vision and enhances the life of a corneal blind person. The disproportion is observed in the demand and supply of donated corneas due to the scarcity of eye donor. There are numerous factors which influence the decision of a person on eye donation. The present study observes different facets of eye donation that could influence the willingness towards eye donation. The stance of family and religion on organ donation plays an important role in the decision of eye donation. Socio-cultural concerns about body and life after death, such as the donation of organs after death, dead body as a whole, living on in recipients, death practices and attitude towards organ donation persuade the decision of family members on organ donation<sup>35</sup>. Seth et al. (2009) identified reasons for the refusal to donate organ among families of potential donors in the study, such as differences in opinion of family members, fear of disfigurement, lack of social support, lack of understanding, negative publicity, belief in rebirth, religious concern and indifferent attitude<sup>34</sup>. There are some other factors, such as lack of awareness, distrust in the healthcare setting and misunderstanding of religious teaching. The decision of person on eye donation is an interaction of multiple reasons<sup>36</sup>. There is a need of coordination among health personnel, public agencies and society in order to promote eye donation. Hence, the focus is not only given to the dissemination of knowledge on eye donation through awareness campaigns, but also to the favourable attitude of persons, their family members and socio-cultural beliefs towards eye donation in the society. Apart from these, there is a need to cultivate the sense of community responsibility among the general public in order to promote eye donation in the society. Social institutions like school, religion, family, media, government and legal system could play a positive role in this context. Students irrespective of their discipline can act as a motivator in boosting the rate of eye donation in the society with accurate education on eye donation<sup>37-38</sup>. The study emphasizes that the past experience of eye donation and corneal transplantation as well as knowing donors and recipients influence the willingness of respondents towards eye donation. Donor's families and recipients, along with their family members could be contributed with their life stories and experience in the promotion of eye donation in the society. Health policy makers should consider socio-cultural variables of people like age, gender, religion, education and place of residence in order to make the dynamics of eye donation and corneal transplantation more effective. There is a need of multipronged strategies to eliminate corneal blindness in India, for example, awareness activities related to corneal blindness and eye donation, strengthening infrastructure in both urban and rural areas, recruitment of human resources, etc. Public support and community participation is essential to develop strategies related to prevention, promotion and rehabilitation in the context of corneal blindness, eye donation and corneal transplantation<sup>39</sup>. Disciplines like sociology, economics, anthropology, psychology, law, political science and so on should work academically in the realm of corneal blindness and corneal transplantation. An interdisciplinary research is required to explore those factors that could act as an interconnection between the attitude and willingness of people towards eye donation in the society.

**REFERENCES**

1. Fox, R. C. & Swazey, J. P. (1992). *Spare parts: Organ replacement in American society* [e-book]. Retrieved from <http://b-ok.xyz/dl/970593/26b194>
2. Linden, P. K. (2009). History of solid organ transplantation and organ donation. *Crit. Care Clin.* 25, 165-184. doi: 10.1016/j.ccc.2008.12.001
3. Ehlers, N., Hjortdal, J. & Nielsen, K. (2009). Corneal grafting and Banking. In Mayr, T. B., Duncker, G.I. W & Armitage, W. J. (Eds.), *Eye Banking* (Vol. 43, pp. 1-14). Retrieved from <http://b-ok.xyz/dl/1100285/8c17f1>
4. Marcovitz, H. (2011). *Organ and body donation*. USA: ABDO Publishing

- Company. Retrieved from <http://b-ok.xyz/dl/1251259/d8abeb>
5. Diaz, F.B.B.S., Ribeiro, L. & Chaoubah, A. (2017). Analysis of the factors that influence the cornea donation process. *Journal of Nursing UFPE on line*, 11(4), 1692-1700. doi: 10.5205/reuol.9763-85423-1-SM.1104201718
6. Chabalewski, F. & Norris, M.K.G. (1994). The gift of life: Talking to families about organ and tissue donation. *The American Journal of Nursing*, 94(6), 28-33. doi: 10.2307/3464441
7. National Organ and Tissue Transplant Organization. (2020). FAQs. Retrieved from <https://www.notto.gov.in/faqs.htm> on 9-06-2020 at 01:27 pm
8. Saunders, B. (2012). Organ donation: Opt in and opt out strategies. In: eLS. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd: Chichester, 1-6. doi: 10.1002/9780470015902.a0024197
9. Synnott, A. (2002). *The body social: Symbolism, self and society* [e-book]. Retrieved from <http://b-ok.xyz/dl/973954/43c3e0>
10. Haddow, G. (2010). The Phenomenology of death, embodiment, and organ transplantation. In Moore, L. J., & Kosut, M. (Eds.), *The body reader: Essential social and cultural readings* (pp. 108-123). New York: New York University Press.
11. Haddow, G. (2005). The phenomenology of death, embodiment and organ transplantation. *Sociology of health and illness*, 27(1), 92-113. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9566.2005.00433.x>
12. Lupton, D. (2003). *Medicine as culture: Illness, disease and the body in western societies* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). [e-book] Retrieved from <http://b-ok.xyz/dl/1068651/Telc33>
13. Resnikoff, S., Pascolini, D., Etya'ale, D., Kocur, I., Pararajasegaram, R., Pokharel, G. P. and Mariotti, S. P. (2004). Global data on visual impairment in the year 2002. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 82, 844-851. Retrieved from <http://www.who.int/bulletin/volumes/82/11/en/844.pdf?ua=1>
14. National Programme for Control of Blindness. (n.d.). National programme for control of blindness. Retrieved from <http://pbhealth.gov.in/pdf/Blindness.pdf>
15. NPCB-INDIA Quarterly Newsletter. (Oct-Dec 2015). *Controlling corneal blindness*. Retrieved from <http://npcb.nic.in/writereaddata/mainlinkfile/File322.pdf>
16. Kumari, S. (2020). A vision behind hospital corneal retrieval programme in the context of eye donation: An Indian scenario. *International Journal for Innovative Research in Multidisciplinary Field*, 6(1), 64-72. DOIs:10.2015/IJIRMF.2455.0620/202001011
17. Panigarhi, S., Rath, B., Sahu, R. K., Rath, S., Sethi, S. K. & Mahapatra, K. (2017). Knowledge, attitude and willingness for eye donation in general population of Odisha in Eastern India. *IOSR Journal of dental and medical science*, 16(7), 1-6. doi: 10.9790/0853-1607010106
18. Sque, M. & Payne, S. A. (1996). Dissonant loss: The experiences of donor relatives. *Social science and Medicine*, 43(9), 1359-1370. doi: 10.1016/0277-9536(96)0000-02
19. Hayward, C. & Madill, A. (2003). The meanings of organ donation: Muslims of Pakistani origin and white English nationals living in North England. *Social science and Medicine*, 57(3), 389-401. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(02\)00364-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(02)00364-7)
20. Lawlor, M. & Kerridge, I. (2011). Anything but the eyes: Culture, identity, and the selective refusal of corneal donation. *Transplantation*, 92(11), 1188-1190. doi: 10.1097/TP.0b013e318235c817
21. Lawlor, M. & Kerridge, I. (2013). Understanding selective refusal of eye donation: Identity, beauty, and interpersonal relationship. *Journal of bioethical inquiry*, 11(1), 57-64. doi: 10.1007/s11673-013-9497-9
22. Pandey, N. U., Gupta, A. K., Jain, A. K., Koushal, V., Bindra, N., & Minz, C. (2016). Can eye donation rates be increased in hospitals: a pilot study in a tertiary care hospital in North India?. *Public health*, 136, 141-143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2015.10.026>
23. Sharma, R. L., Sharma, K., Sharma, S. & Korla, S. (2018). Hospital-based corneal retrieval at Shimla hills: An effective alternative to improve eye donation- Retrospective analysis of an eye bank data. *International Journal of Social Rehabilitation*, 3(1), 10-13. Doi: 10.4103/ijosr.ijosr\_2\_18
24. Modi, N. (2015). *Mann Ki Baat*. Retrieved from <http://www.narendramodi.in/pmi-modi-s-mann-ki-baat-october-2015-367640>
25. Schweda, M. & Schickanz, S. (2009). The "spare parts person"? Conceptions of human body and their implication for public attitudes towards organ donation and organ sale. *Philosophy, Ethics and Humanities in Medicine*, 4(4). doi: 10.1186/1747-5341-4-4
26. Randhawa, G. (1998). An exploratory study examining the influence of religion on attitudes towards organ donation among the Asian population in Luton, UK. *Nephrology Dialysis Transplantation*, 13 (8), 1949-1954, Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1093/ndt/13.8.1949>
27. Newton, J. D. (2011). How does the general public view posthumous organ donation? A meta-synthesis of the qualitative literature. *BMC Public Health*, 11(791), 1-11. Doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-11-791
28. Verble, M. & Worth, J. (1999). Dealing with the fear of mutilation in the donation discussion. *Journal of Transplant Coordination*, 9(1), 54-56. Doi: 10.7182/prtr.1.9.1.ng3r6718543619g4
29. Randhawa, G., Brocklehurst, A., Pateman, R., Kinsella, S. & Parry, V. (2012). Religion and organ donation: The views of UK faith leaders. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 51(3), 743-751. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41653864>
30. Davis, C. & Randhawa, G. (2006). The influence of religion on organ donation among the black Caribbean and black African population: A pilot study in the UK. *Ethnicity and disease*, 16(1), 281-285. Retrieved from <http://forms.ishib.org/ED/journal/16-1-281.pdf>
31. Sque, M., Payne, S., & Macleod Clark, J. (2006). Gift of life or sacrifice?: Key discourses to understanding organ donor families' decision-making. *Mortality*, 11(2), 117-132. DOI: 10.1080/13576270600615260
32. Duggal, M., Brar, G. S., Prasad, V. S., & Gupta, A. (2003). Public attitude towards eye donation in Northwestern India. *Transplantation proceeding*, 35(1), 19-20. Doi: 10.1016/S0041-1345(02)03826-5
33. Gogate, B., & Gogate, P. (2011). Eye donation: mere awareness and willingness not enough. Only a catalyst can improve corneal harvesting rates. *Indian journal of ophthalmology*, 59(4), 332-333. doi: 10.4103/0301-4738.82016
34. Seth, A. K., Nambiar, P., Joshi, A., Ramprasad, R., Choubey, R., Puri, P., ... & Bhatore, H. (2009). First prospective study on brain stem death and attitudes toward organ donation in India. *Liver Transplantation*, 15(11), 1443-1447.

- <https://doi.org/10.1002/lt.21912>
35. Sharp, C. & Randhawa, G. (2016). Cultural attitude towards death practices, the body after death and life after death in deceased organ donation: A UK polish migrant perspective. *Journal of Palliative care and medicine*, 6(3), 1-7. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4172/2165-7386.1000262>
  36. Irving, M. J., Tong, A., Jan, S., Cass, A., Rose, J., Chadban, S., ... Howard, K. (2012). Factors that influence the decision to be an organ donor: A systematic review of the qualitative literature. *Nephrology Dialysis transplant*, 27(1), 2526-2533. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ndt/gfr683>
  37. Gupta, N., Vashist, P., Ganger, A., Tandon, R., & Gupta, S. K. (2018). Eye donation and eye banking in India. *The National medical journal of India*, 31(5), 283-286. DOI: 10.4103/0970-258X.261189
  38. Nanda, R., Gupta, D., & Sahni, B. (2017). Assessment of Knowledge and Attitude Regarding Eye Donation among School Students- "Time To Educate Early". *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PREVENTIVE AND PUBLIC HEALTH SCIENCES*, 3(1), 20-22. Doi: 10.17354/ijpphs/2016/61
  39. Gupta, N., Tandon, R., Gupta, S. K., Sreenivas, V., & Vashist, P. (2013). Burden of corneal blindness in India. *Indian journal of community medicine: official publication of Indian Association of Preventive & Social Medicine*, 38(4), 198-206. doi: 10.4103/0970-0218.120153