

**Fact Sheet on Working Paper: “Residential Segregation and Unequal Access to Local Public Services in India: Evidence from 1.5m Neighborhoods,”**  
by, Sam Asher<sup>Ⓜ</sup>, Kritarth Jha<sup>Ⓜ</sup>, Anjali Adukia<sup>Ⓜ</sup>, Paul Novosad<sup>Ⓜ</sup>, Brandon Tan<sup>Ⓜ</sup><sup>1</sup>

---

This working paper documents (1) the residential segregation of Scheduled Caste and Muslim communities across 1.5 million Indian neighborhoods, (2) the relative access to public services in Scheduled Caste and Muslim neighborhoods, and (3) child outcomes in those neighborhoods.

We find three primary results:

1. **India's cities have a high level of segregation on the basis of both caste and religion—about as much as current levels of Black/White segregation in the United States.** While this level of segregation is substantial, it is considerably less than U.S. segregation at its peak in the 1960s and 1970s. 26% of India's Muslims live in neighborhoods that are more than 80% Muslim; 17% of SCs live in neighborhoods that are more than 80% SC. Scheduled Caste segregation in cities is just as high as it is in rural areas, and it is even higher for Muslims.
2. **Government-supplied public services are less likely to be found in neighborhoods with high numbers of SCs and Muslims.** This is true for nearly every service that we could measure: secondary schools, clinics and hospitals, electricity, water, and sewerage are all systematically worse in SC and Muslim neighborhoods than in other neighborhoods in the very same cities. The only exception was for urban primary schools, which are more common in urban SC neighborhoods (but less common in rural SC neighborhoods, and in both urban and rural Muslim neighborhoods). The differences in service access are statistically significant and substantial.
3. **Children growing up in SC and Muslim neighborhoods fare worse than children in non-marginalized neighborhoods in the same cities.** This is true even for non-SC non-Muslim children growing up in SC and Muslim neighborhoods. A child growing up in a 100% Muslim neighborhood can expect to obtain two fewer years of education than a child growing up in a 0% Muslim neighborhood. Kids living in SC neighborhoods face a penalty only slightly smaller. The neighborhood effect explains about half of the urban educational disadvantage of SC and Muslim children.

These disparities have not been systematically documented before, because neighborhood-level data in Indian cities has not previously been available. **Analyzing service access at the district or subdistrict level, as has been more common, would not detect most of these disparities, which are across neighborhoods but within subdistricts (see [Figures 5–7 of the paper](#)).**

The most recent figures and detailed discussion can be found [in the paper](#). This is a working paper, has not yet been reviewed by referees, and will be revised before publication.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ⓜ Author name order was selected randomly using the AEA Randomization Tool

We encourage readers to be aware of the following details:

1. The study is based on data from 2011–13. The neighborhood patterns described in the paper are likely to be persistent and have emerged over decades of migration and policy. **The results are not attributed to specific policies of any specific government, and due to the timing, say nothing about the policies of the current government or what has changed in the last decade.**
2. **The paper is descriptive and does not attribute the results to specific factors or policies.** In particular, the association between public service access and the neighborhood marginalized group share could come from discrimination against those neighborhoods, or from the sorting of marginalized groups into less-serviced neighborhoods. The paper does not distinguish between these two channels. But even if the results come from sorting, the net result is a substantial service and outcome disparity for people living in marginalized group neighborhoods.
3. The most recent National Sample Survey data suggest that on average Muslims have living standards (wages, consumption, income) that are between those of Forward / Others and Scheduled Castes. Some survey measures find that [Muslims are doing worse than SCs](#) on some dimensions, [especially in education](#).
4. The current draft of the paper does not study outcomes for members of Scheduled Tribes or OBCs. The paper is focused on cities, and only 4% of members of Scheduled Tribes live in cities. Given the data available to us, it was not possible to identify neighborhoods that are predominantly OBC.