



HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

Am Econ J Appl Econ. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2024 January 11.

Published in final edited form as:

Am Econ J Appl Econ. 2018 April ; 10(2): 125–162. doi:10.1257/app.20150431.

Neighborhood Sanitation and Infant Mortality†

MICHAEL GERUSO,

Department of Economics, University of Texas at Austin, 2225 Speedway, Austin, TX 78712 and NBER

DEAN SPEARS

Department of Economics, University of Texas at Austin, 2225 Speedway, Austin, TX 78712
Economics and Planning Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, Delhi; and r.i.c.e.

Abstract

In this paper, we shed new light on a long-standing puzzle: in India, Muslim children are substantially more likely than Hindu children to survive to their first birthday, even though Indian Muslims have lower wealth, consumption, educational attainment, and access to state services. Contrary to the prior literature, we show that the observed mortality advantage accrues not to Muslim households themselves but rather to their neighbors, who are also likely to be Muslim. Investigating mechanisms, we provide a collage of evidence suggesting externalities due to poor sanitation are a channel linking the religious composition of neighborhoods to infant mortality.

Keywords

I12; I14; J13; O15; Q53; R23; Z12

In this paper, we address a long-standing puzzle in the development and health literature: in India, Muslim children are substantially more likely than Hindu children to survive to their first birthday, even though Muslims have lower wealth, consumption, and educational attainment, and face worse access to state services such as piped water and health infrastructure, compared to the majority Hindus.¹ By age one, mortality among Muslims is 17 percent lower than among Hindus, with an additional 1.1 infants per 100 surviving. Bhalotra, Valente, and van Soest (2010) named this robust and persistent pattern a “puzzle,” showing that individual and household characteristics could not explain it.²

After replicating the fact that Muslim children have a large survival advantage in India, we show that the mortality difference can be accounted for by two facts. First, compared

†Go to <https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20150431> to visit the article page for additional materials and author disclosure statement(s) or to comment in the online discussion forum.

dean@riceinstitute.org .

¹This phenomenon, which has existed since at least the 1960s and which has been documented by Shariff, (1995); Bhat and Zavier (2005); Bhalotra and van Soest (2008); and Bhalotra, Valente, and van Soest (2010), is hard to reconcile with the well-developed literature on the importance of parental income in predicting child health and mortality. For overviews of the literature and applications in the United States, see Cutler and Lleras-Muney (2010), and Geruso (2012).

²Bhalotra, Valente, and van Soest (2010) carefully demonstrated that individual and household characteristics, development expenditure, and village-level health services and health infrastructure could not account for the Muslim mortality advantage.

to the typical Hindu infant, the typical Muslim infant lives in a neighborhood where a larger share of her neighbors are Muslim. Second, both Hindu and Muslim infants are more likely to survive in neighborhoods with high shares of Muslim neighbors. The natural question, then, is: what makes neighborhoods disproportionately inhabited by Muslims better places for the health of (Muslim and Hindu) children? We show, consistent with the well-known relative disadvantage of Muslims in India (Sachar et al. 2006, and Deolalikar 2009), that neighborhoods with high shares of Muslim households are associated with *worse* characteristics that predict infant health along many observable dimensions—with the important exception of sanitation.

Despite relative economic advantage, India's majority Hindu population is 25 percentage points more likely to defecate in the open—that is, in open places such as in fields, behind bushes, or near roads—than the minority Muslim population. This Hindu-Muslim behavioral difference implies that the fraction of a household's neighbors who are Muslim is strongly correlated with the local sanitation environment to which the household is exposed. For example, in nationally representative data, Hindus residing in neighborhoods that are 10 percent Muslim are exposed to a local open defecation prevalence of 63 percent, while Hindus residing in neighborhoods that are 90 percent Muslim are exposed to a local open defecation prevalence of 46 percent. To better understand this variation, we draw on a survey by Coffey et al. (2014), in rural northern India that was designed to elicit richer detail on stated and revealed preferences toward latrine ownership and use. While both Hindus and Muslims in India are significantly more likely to defecate in the open than similarly poor people in other developing countries, there is a significant gap in attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors between these two groups in India. Hindus are more likely to report that using a toilet or latrine near their home is “impure” and that defecating away from the home in the open is part of a healthy lifestyle. Even conditional on ownership of a working latrine, Hindus are less likely to *use* it. The idea that latrine demand could be significantly influenced by social factors beyond price and wealth accords with recent qualitative work in India (Coffey et al. 2017) and experimental interventions in Bangladesh (Guiteras et al. 2015).³

After establishing that the mortality advantage accrues, in fact, to both Hindu and Muslim neighbors of Muslims and after observing that local sanitation is strongly associated with the share of Muslim neighbors, we provide a collage of evidence consistent with poor sanitation as the channel linking religious composition of neighborhoods to infant mortality. We show: that the partial correlation between Muslim neighbors and mortality diminishes once one controls for the sanitation practices of neighbors; that in the minority of neighborhoods where there is no open defecation, there is no mortality advantage associated with a higher proportion of Muslim neighbors; that where there is non-negligible open defecation, regional variation in the strength of the Hindu-Muslim difference in defecation behaviors predicts the regional strength of the Muslim mortality advantage; that other child outcomes with a specific biological link to the bacteria and worms spread by fecal matter (in particular, anemia, and low current weight) are correlated with Muslim neighbors in the same pattern as

³Coffey et al. (2017), documents significant resistance to the adoption of effective, low-cost improvements to sanitation in India.

infant mortality; and child health inputs (diet, hand washing, access to piped water) and that child health outcomes (vaccinations, institutional births) that need not be affected by open defecation do not positively covary with the Muslim share in the neighborhood.

As a final exercise, we attempt to understand the potential size of the apparent mortality externalities of open defecation by instrumenting for neighborhood sanitation with the religious composition of neighbors, holding constant own religious identity and own latrine/toilet use. These regressions have the advantage that the coefficient of interest is identified off of a component of the variation in neighbors' behavior that is carefully documented in the paper. However, even though we show that the observed correlates of Muslim neighborhoods would tend to bias against the finding of a negative externality under this strategy, the neighborhoods where Muslims are concentrated may be different in unobservable ways, so these results are presented with caution. With that caveat, we find that a 10 percentage point reduction in the fraction of neighbors defecating in the open is associated with a decline in infant mortality of 6 infants per 1,000, or about 8 percent of the population mean infant mortality rate (IMR).⁴ By replicating the IV results within various subsets of the data—for example, boys and girls separately, first-borns and later-borns separately, and rural and urban neighborhoods separately—we show that these results are not confounded by phenomena like differential son preference by Hindus and Muslims, birth order explanations, or differential sorting of Muslims to urban areas.

The implied importance of open defecation for infant mortality in the modern Indian context fits with evidence by Bleakley (2007), Cutler and Miller (2005), and Watson (2006), regarding the role of sanitation and water in determining health and human capital outcomes in the historical United States.⁵ In particular, Cutler and Miller (2005) shows that clean water and sanitation interventions in US cities explain large shares of the decline in infant mortality in the United States at the turn of the twentieth century.⁶ Our estimates are also consistent with the most credible data on cause of death during early-life in India, which show that a large share (22 percent) of non-neonatal child deaths in India are due to diarrhea, which is just one symptom of the diseases transmitted via open defecation.⁷

It is difficult to overstate the potential importance of this issue. Today, more than a billion people continue to defecate in the open. Ending this practice has become a target of governments, nongovernmental organizations, and private foundations (Coffey and Spears 2017). For example: ending open defecation was adopted in September 2015 among the United Nation's new Sustainable Development Goals; in India in 2014, the central government launched a 100-day construction plan during which one toilet or latrine was

⁴To give a sense of how large a 10 percentage point decline in open defecation would be, we note that despite India's rapid economic growth over the last two decades and a large government investment specific to open defecation (Spears 2013), open defecation rates have fallen in India by no more than 1 percentage point per year between 2001 and 2011 on average (Government of India 2011).

⁵Watson (2006) studied federal interventions to improve water and sanitation on US Indian reservations, finding effects on local infant mortality and spillovers to neighboring localities. Bleakley (2007) studied the eradication of hookworm in school-aged children in the US South at the turn of the twentieth century, documenting impacts on school enrollment and attendance and on later-life income.

⁶Cutler and Miller (2005) shows that the introduction of clean water technologies in US cities beginning around 1900 reduced the infant mortality rate by 87 deaths per thousand, or 46 percent of the base of 189 per thousand. Naively applying our IV estimates would predict that cutting open defecation in half from 66 percent to 33 percent would reduce infant mortality by 20 deaths per thousand ($= -0.33 \cdot 61.4$). This would be a 28 percent reduction in the baseline Indian infant mortality rate of 72 deaths per thousand during our sample period.

⁷See Million Death Study Collaborators (2010).

to be constructed every second; from 2007 to 2014, the World Bank Group committed an average of over \$3 billion per year to water and sanitation; and since 2005, the Gates Foundation has invested hundreds of millions of dollars to improve sanitation in developing countries, including efforts to “reinvent the toilet.” In parallel, researchers have investigated the economic (Guiteras, Levinsohn, and Mobarak 2015) and social (Guiteras et al. 2015) determinants of persistent open defecation. The rationale underlying much of this recent attention is that private demand for toilets and latrines may be below the social optimum, possibly because of inaccurate beliefs about the health benefits of improved sanitation, or because latrine use has an important public goods component. The public goods aspect of sanitation is indeed plausible. Epidemiological evidence and recent work by Duflo et al. (2015) suggests clear pathways by which exposure to fecal pathogens introduced by neighbors could lead to acute net malnutrition and ultimately death.⁸ Nonetheless, the research significantly lags the policy action and investment.⁹

Our paper develops important new facts on sanitation in the modern developing world—in part, by simply documenting striking patterns in stated and revealed preferences over latrines in India. But our study also contributes new evidence to a long-running debate: the past two centuries have produced the fastest declines in human mortality ever experienced. Much of this gain has come from declines in infant deaths. Economic historians examining the epidemiological transition to low infant mortality in developed countries have debated whether it reflects changes in nutrition, medical care, or the disease environment. The disease environment, including water and sanitation, has been found to be an important determinant of health and human capital outcomes around the world (Spears and Lamba 2016, Gertler et al. 2015, and Headey et al. 2015). Our study is unique in the economics literature in providing *even suggestive* evidence of the external impacts of open defecation on mortality. Establishing whether the harm from open defecation is primarily external is an important starting point for understanding behavior that is socially suboptimal and for justifying any policy intervention on the grounds of efficiency.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: we begin in Section I by replicating the Muslim mortality puzzle and showing that the mortality advantage in fact accrues to both Hindu and Muslim households in Muslim-concentrated neighborhoods. Section II then documents how neighborhood characteristics vary with religious composition, suggesting the possibility of a sanitation channel. Section III draws on several household survey datasets to understand these neighborhood differences in light of striking differences

⁸We discuss the epidemiological evidence in detail in Section IV. Duflo et al. (2015) shows that an integrated water and sanitation improvement program in rural India reduced diarrhea episodes by 30–50 percent.

⁹There are several reasons why, despite significant interest in and spending on this issue, the externalities of open defecation are not yet well understood. For one, OLS estimates are likely to be biased because neighborhoods with worse sanitation practices are likely to be worse in other unobservable dimensions as well. Further, efforts to estimate the impacts of sanitation via field experiments have been complicated by difficulties in generating a first-stage effect on latrine use. In many places, there exist deeply rooted preferences against using latrines and toilets, even those freely provided. The difficulty in generating a large first-stage effect has been demonstrated by three recent field experiments in rural India, each intending to estimate the effect of open defecation on child height (Hammer and Spears 2016, Clasen et al. 2014, and Gertler et al. 2015). Indeed, the difficulty of changing latrine use behavior, combined with the large number of neighborhood clusters required to measure mortality externalities, may explain the lack of any experimental evidence on sanitation and mortality to date. The number of neighborhood clusters required to detect even economically large mortality effects via a field experiment is large both because of the plausible effect size relative to the variance in mortality and because measuring local externalities necessarily implies randomization at the level of the locality, not the individual. We discuss the issue in online Appendix A.1.

between Hindu and Muslim respondents in stated beliefs and revealed preferences regarding the use of latrines. Section IV provides a variety of corroborating evidence supporting a sanitation channel, and Section V puts the magnitudes of the apparent sanitation externalities in context.

I. The Puzzle of Muslim Mortality Advantage

A. Data

For our main analysis, we use data from three rounds of the National Family Health Survey (NFHS) of India: 1992/1993, 1998/1999, and 2005/2006. The NFHS (India's version of the Demographic and Health Survey) is a large, nationally representative survey that collects data from women aged 15 to 49. Respondents report birth histories, including deaths and stillbirths, from which we calculate infant and neonatal mortality rates. The NFHS also includes information on household assets, household physical infrastructure, and health behaviors. With respect to the disposal of excreta, the respondents are asked about the type of toilet facility, if any, the household usually uses. We code a household as practicing open defecation (OD) if they report using no facility, or using a bush or a field.

Table 1 tabulates the summary statistics for our main analysis sample, which consists of Hindus and Muslims in all waves of the NFHS. Corresponding to the analysis below, children (live births) are the unit of observation.¹⁰ Our primary outcomes of interest are the infant mortality rate (IMR) and the neonatal mortality rate (NMR), defined respectively as the number of deaths among children less than one year old and less than one month old, scaled per 1,000 live births. Throughout the paper, we organize our analysis at the level of the child, constructing mortality rates from birth history information on around 280,000 Hindu and Muslim children in India over the three survey rounds.

Infant mortality is high across India, and consistent with previous studies, there is a large and significant Muslim survival advantage. Table 1 shows that across both groups during our sample period, more than 6 children in 100 died before their first birthday. Comparison of the Hindu and Muslim means shows that for every hundred live births, 1.1 fewer Hindu children will survive to age one, implying infant mortality is 17 percent higher among Hindus. Neonatal mortality shows a similar pattern, with a 19 percent survival deficit. This is despite Muslims having lower educational attainment and wealth, measured in this survey by assets. Though the NFHS does not measure consumption, the India Human Development Survey (IHDS), which is used to supplement the main analysis and is described below, shows that mean and median consumption are higher among Hindus than Muslims as well.¹¹

Below, we show that neighborhood characteristics are important in understanding the lower mortality rates of Muslim infants. We exploit the two-stage sampling structure of the survey design to identify neighborhoods as primary sampling units (PSUs).¹² The median survey

¹⁰Therefore, these averages are representative of young children and their households, not of all of India.

¹¹The unconditional mean and median consumption among Hindus in the IHDS is 985 and 710 rupees per month per capita, respectively. The unconditional mean and median consumption among Muslims is 831 and 623 rupees per month per capita, respectively.

PSU contains observations on 27 households, which are sampled from PSU-level frames of about 100–200 households. In rural areas, these PSU frames may be the entire village. In urban areas, they are census enumeration blocks.¹³ Therefore, PSU identifiers allow us to construct neighborhood-level variables that reflect the characteristics of small localities. For each PSU j in the NFHS, we calculate the fraction of sample respondents that are Muslim, \bar{M}_j , referred to below as Muslim concentration or Muslim share.

B. The Puzzle

Figure 1 illustrates the mortality puzzle that was most clearly documented by Bhalotra, Valente, and van Soest (2010). At all levels of socioeconomic status, mortality is lower among Muslim children than among Hindu children. The figure plots infant mortality, separately by religious group, against two alternative summary measures of household economic well-being. The NFHS, like all DHS surveys, does not measure income or consumption. Therefore, in panel A of Figure 1, we follow the literature (see, for example, Filmer and Pritchett 2001) in using asset ownership as a proxy for wealth, and collapsing seven categories of asset ownership into a single-dimensional wealth rank within the sample.¹⁴ This gives the horizontal axis a clear rank interpretation. As an alternative measure of parental endowment, we use mother's height along the horizontal axis in panel B of Figure 1. Maternal adult height predicts maternal adult health and reflects maternal economic well-being earlier in the mother's life (Case and Paxson 2008, Steckel 2009).

Consistent with asset ownership and mother's height capturing meaningful variation in endowments that is correlated with child survival, Figure 1 shows that infant mortality is steeply decreasing in both measures. The Muslim advantage documented by Shariff (1995); Bhat and Zavier (2005); Bhalotra and van Soest (2008); and Bhalotra, Valente, and van Soest (2010) is apparent in the large and statistically significant mortality differences at any fixed level of either measure of well-being. To put the size of the mortality difference in context, holding either wealth rank or maternal height constant at their medians, Figure 1 shows that about an additional 10 out of 1,000 infants in Hindu households will die before age one compared to Muslim infants. The figure is consistent with the unconditional difference in means of 11.1 (per thousand) in Table 1. The confidence intervals in the figure are not adjusted for clustering, though as we show in regressions clustered at the neighborhood level in Table 2, the mortality gap is strongly statistically significant and persists after conditioning on a wider set of person, household, and neighborhood characteristics.

¹²The NFHS is a two-stage random sample, first sampling PSUs and then households within sampled PSUs.

¹³Our data do not contain the sampling frame itself. According to the NFHS-3 report, rural PSUs are villages of "usually about 100 to 200 households." Large villages above 500 households were split into three possible PSUs. Urban PSUs are census enumeration blocks (approximately 150–200 households).

¹⁴We cannot use the preconstructed asset index included in the NFHS dataset because it is constructed including measures of sanitation. Therefore, following Filmer and Pritchett (2001), we construct a household's asset rank by: partitioning the sample into 128 = 2⁷ bins of indicators for ownership of seven assets listed in Table 1, ranking the bins by the average infant mortality rate in each bin, and assigning each household the median rank within the sample of its bin. Thus, the household of child 200,000 has more and better assets than 200,000 of the approximately 300,000 children in our sample. Unlike a principal component index, this measure has units with a clear interpretation.

C. The Solution: Neighborhoods

In Table 2, we analyze the extent to which neighborhood composition can statistically account for the Hindu-Muslim mortality gap, net of the religious identity of the respondent household. In the table, observations are children (live births). We estimate regressions of the form

$$Y_{ijt} = \alpha_1 M_{ijt} + \alpha_2 \overline{M}_j + \phi_{jt} + f(X_{ijt}) + \epsilon_{ijt}, \quad (1)$$

where i indexes live births, j indexes survey PSUs, and t indexes the three NFHS survey rounds.¹⁵ The dependent variable, Y_{ijt} , is an individual-level mortality indicator for infant or neonatal death, as indicated in the column headers of Table 2. It is scaled so that coefficients reflect impacts on deaths per thousand: Y_{ijt} is either 0 if a child survived to the specified age or 1,000 if she did not.¹⁶ The regressor of interest is an indicator for whether the household in which the child lived is Muslim, M_{ijt} . In some specifications, we include controls for the fraction of the PSU that is Muslim \overline{M}_j , or PSU fixed effects, ϕ_{jt} . Standard errors are clustered by PSU.

Panel A includes no covariates X_{ijt} beyond indicators for the survey round. Panel B adds controls for a set of demographic and socioeconomic characteristics that the literature on the determinants of early-life health in India has highlighted.¹⁷ The first column in Table 2 offers another illustration of the widely-documented mortality puzzle. In panel A, the Muslim coefficient replicates the unconditional mean infant mortality difference discussed above. In the corresponding column of panel B, the addition of individual, household, and PSU-level variables has essentially no net effect on the Muslim coefficient.

To capture the possibility of neighborhood effects, we include PSU fixed effects in columns 2 and 6 of Table 2. These controls attenuate the own Muslim coefficient and render it statistically insignificant. Contrary to the focus in the prior literature on the characteristics of Muslim respondents themselves, these columns show that it is the places where Muslims are more likely to reside that is most strongly associated with low infant mortality, and that this neighborhood effect is similar for Hindu and Muslim households. The respondent household's religious identity no longer predicts its child's survival. In the next two columns within each set of specifications (columns 3 and 7 in panels A and B of Table 2), we control for just one PSU-level variable: the fraction of the PSU that is Muslim (\overline{M}_j). Doing so has nearly the same effect on the own-Muslim coefficient as including a neighborhood fixed effect. Additionally, controlling for indicators for all-Muslim and all-Hindu neighborhoods in columns 4 and 8 of Table 2 replicates the same statistically insignificant point estimate

¹⁵All specifications include survey round fixed effects.

¹⁶This construction merely scales mortality rates and coefficients to match the standard of expressing rates per 1,000.

¹⁷These controls, labeled "extended controls" in Table 2, include: a full set of birth order indicators interacted with sex (Jayachandran and Pande 2013); indicators for household ownership of each of the seven assets asked about throughout survey rounds, the standard strategy for controlling for SES using these data (Filmer and Pritchett 2001); an indicator for whether the mother lives with her husband's parents (Coffey, Khera, and Spears 2013); indicators for child's birth month (Doblhammer and Vaupel 2001) and birth year; an urban indicator; household size; and several other individual and PSU-level variables. See the Table 2 notes for the full control list.

for the coefficient on own household Muslim as the specifications that are linear in \overline{M}_j . In all cases—infant and neonatal mortality, with and without extended controls—controlling for the religious composition of the neighborhood removes the association between a household's own religion and the child's mortality. These results imply that what has been widely documented as a Muslim survival advantage is actually an advantage accruing to the neighbors of Muslims.

Figure 2 displays corresponding semi-parametric plots of infant mortality versus Muslim concentration. Consistent with a negative coefficient on Muslim concentration in Table 2, the negative slope in \overline{M}_j in the figure indicates that infant mortality is lower for both Hindus and Muslims in neighborhoods with a greater proportion of Muslim neighbors. Also consistent with Table 2, the Muslim mortality advantage, reflected in the vertical distance between the regression lines, is smaller (about four deaths per thousand) and statistically insignificant once one holds constant the religious composition of a household's neighbors (panel A of Figure 2). After additionally conditioning on own household latrine use—a behavior that figures prominently in the analysis below—the point estimates converge even more closely (panel B of Figure 2).

II. Characteristics of Muslim Neighborhoods

The results in Table 2 raise an obvious question: What is different about neighborhoods where Muslims are likely to reside that confers a mortality advantage to the (Hindu *and* Muslim) residents of those places? In this section, we investigate how neighborhoods in this context vary with religious composition. We show a striking pattern in which Muslim-concentrated neighborhoods appear to be *worse* in terms of characteristics that predict infant health along many observable dimensions—with the singular exception of sanitation.

A. Better or Worse Places?

Hindus and Muslims are largely segregated by neighborhood in India, but a substantial minority of neighborhoods are mixed. Figure 3 plots the histogram of Muslim share, \overline{M}_j , across PSUs, with the point mass at zero (= 65 percent) excluded to maintain a readable scale. The histogram shows that between the extremes of perfect segregation of the majority Hindu and minority Muslim populations, there is substantial variation in \overline{M}_j . In particular, 31 percent of survey primary sampling units (PSUs) contain some fraction of Muslim residents strictly between zero and one. These mixed neighborhoods are what identify neighborhood religious composition effects separately from own religion in the regressions of Table 2.

To investigate how neighborhood-level characteristics covary with Muslim concentration, Figure 4 plots local polynomial regressions in which a set of ten variables capturing characteristics of children, parents, and their neighborhoods that are likely to be relevant health inputs, outputs, and correlates are regressed on \overline{M}_j . For ease of interpretation, we define each of the variables such that its range is [0, 1] and higher values predict better child health outcomes.¹⁸ The dependent variables include asset wealth (as the fraction of

¹⁸We confirm the sign of the relationships between these variables and mortality in online Appendix Table A2.

the seven assets reported in all survey rounds) and indicators for household electrification, household piped water, institutional delivery of the child, any child vaccinations, family possession of a national health card, mother having a say in child's health care, mothers' literacy, and latrine use. In panel A of Figure 4, we include all PSUs in the data. In panel B, we restrict the sample to the set of mixed-religion PSUs ($0 < \overline{M}_j < 1$).

Other than latrine use, the characteristics in Figure 4 are generally flat or declining in \overline{M}_j , indicating a mortality *disadvantage* of Muslim neighborhoods. The pattern is particularly clear and approximately linear in panel B of Figure 4, which excludes religiously homogenous PSUs. Panels C and D of Figure 4 summarize this intuition by predicting infant mortality on the basis of the neighborhood-level means of the variables examined in panels A and B, other than latrine use. We regress IMR on these variables, then apply the coefficient estimates to each PSU's characteristics to generate predictions.¹⁹ The predicted IMR (dashed line) is monotonically increasing in Muslim concentration, for both the full sample (panel C) and for the subset of mixed-religion PSUs (panel D). The actual IMR (solid line) exhibits exactly the opposite pattern, decreasing in the proportion of Muslim neighbors.

For completeness, online Appendix Table A1 reports the coefficients from the linear regressions corresponding to the local polynomials plotted in panel B of Figure 4. In online Appendix Table A2, we confirm the sign of the relationships between each of these characteristics and infant mortality by regressing IMR on each of the dependent variables in Table A1. Together, Figure 4 and Tables A1 and A2 show that among variables likely to cause or to be correlated with child health outcomes, almost all are either uncorrelated with \overline{M}_j or are changing in a way that would predict *worse* child health as Muslim concentration increases. In Section IVC, we turn to an additional dataset, the India Human Development Survey, to show that Muslim concentration is likewise uncorrelated with diet and hygiene behaviors that are not observable in our main dataset. The finding that Muslim-concentrated neighborhoods are no better and possibly worse for infant survival along most observables accords with observations about the relative disadvantage of India's Muslim minority (Sachar et al. 2006, Deolalikar 2009).

A clear exception to this pattern in which higher Muslim concentration predicts neutral or worse PSU characteristics is latrine use, defined as one minus the indicator for open defecation.²⁰ In neighborhoods with close to zero Muslim residents, open defecation averages nearly 70 percent. This decreases monotonically in Muslim concentration, with residents in all-Muslim neighborhoods facing local open defecation rates below 40 percent. In aggregate, given the patterns of residential sorting, exposure to local open defecation is higher for the typical Hindu child by a margin of 21 percentage points (Table 1, row 4). The relationship between \overline{M}_j and local open defecation—henceforth, OD—is primarily driven by variation in religious composition interacting with stable differences across Hindu and Muslim households in their probability of practicing open defecation. In online Appendix

¹⁹We also normalize the constant in the regression so that the mean predicted IMR exactly replicates the mean observed IMR.

²⁰Urban/rural status and household size show some association, but not after controlling for own household characteristics (own latrine use and own religion).

Figure A1, we show that, within the Hindu and Muslim subsamples, there is also a small gradient in which both groups are more likely to safely dispose of feces as M_j increases.²¹

B. Neighborhood Sanitation and IMR

In light of Figure 4, we examine the correlation between the sanitation differences across Hindu and Muslim neighborhoods and the observed Hindu-Muslim mortality differences. To precisely control for neighbors' behavior separately from that of the respondent household, we calculate a neighbor OD rate, \overline{OD}_{ij}^{-i} , where the superscript $-i$ indicates a leave-out mean, taken over all households in PSU j other than the respondent household.

In Figure 5, we plot local polynomial regressions of IMR on \overline{OD}_{ij}^{-i} separately for Hindus and Muslims. These plots parallel those from Figure 2 in which Muslim share was the regressor of interest, and ask whether the mortality association with sanitation follows the same pattern as the mortality association with religious composition. Panel A displays the raw correlation and panel B controls for the household's own latrine use.²² In both panels, the slope is similar across the two religious groups. At higher levels of \overline{OD}_{ij}^{-i} in panel A, point estimates suggest a possible Hindu-Muslim difference conditional on \overline{OD}_{ij}^{-i} , though that pattern is not robust and reverses in panel B with the addition of a control for own household OD.²³

In a series of supplemental tests in Table A3, we regress mortality outcomes on a Muslim indicator, local Muslim share, and own and neighbors' OD. The exercise is not intended to recover well identified causal effects of open defecation.²⁴ These "horserace" regressions address a more basic question: does the partial correlation between Muslim neighbors and own child mortality diminish once one controls for the sanitation practices of neighbors? We find that it does. Consistent with Figure 5, adding controls for own household and neighbors' OD attenuates the coefficient on \overline{M}_j to a magnitude that is economically small and statistically insignificant.

The result that neighborhood open defecation is strongly correlated with IMR is a very robust pattern.²⁵ A natural question in this context is whether differences in son preference and intra-household resource allocation between Hindus and Muslims could confound the results. To address this possibility, in panel A of online Appendix Table A4, we examine the correlation between local OD and IMR, splitting the sample by child's sex. The table

²¹This fact highlights the importance of controlling for the own household's use of latrines or toilets in any analysis examining the external effects of neighborhood-level sanitation.

²²Throughout, *latrine use* is used as a shorthand for latrine and toilet use, either of which can safely dispose of excreta.

²³As in all of the local polynomial regression plots, the 95 percent confidence intervals drawn in the figure are not corrected for clustering and will overstate the statistical significance of Hindu-Muslim differences. We rely on online Appendix Table A3 to assess the statistical significance of the OD-IMR cross-sectional relationship and Hindu-Muslim differences in it.

²⁴Further below, we estimate IV specifications to get a sense of magnitudes of the effect of \overline{OD}_j on IMR under strong identification assumptions that we make explicit.

²⁵In online Appendix Section A.2, we describe an alternative approach to statistically accounting for the mortality gaps. There, we estimate counterfactual Hindu mortality rates after nonparametrically reweighting the sample of Hindu children to match the joint distribution of characteristics in the Muslim child sample. Compared to the linear regressions above, this exercise more flexibly controls for the entire distribution of open defecation exposure, matching the probability mass in 20 bins defining the sanitation environment: 10 bands of local (PSU) open defecation interacted with household's own latrine use indicator. Online Appendix Table A5 reports the results of the exercise, which are closely consistent with Table 2 and Table A3 in the online Appendix.

shows that the Hindu-Muslim gaps in infant mortality are similar across boys and girls. More importantly, in both the boy and girl subsamples, these gaps attenuate to insignificance once the measures of open defecation are included. We also investigate whether the apparent relationship is confounded by the pattern documented in Jayachandran and Pande (2013), in which sex \times birth order interactions predict child health in India. The behavior has the potential for importance here because Hindu and Muslim household sizes in India differ and therefore, so do the mean birth orders across groups. Nonetheless, this phenomenon does not explain the patterns here: all regressions in panel B of Table 2 include the full set of sex indicators interacted with birth order indicators as controls, and panel B of Table A4 shows that the pattern of our results holds whether restricting the sample to only first births or to only second or later births. Because residence in an urban area was shown in Table 1 to differ significantly across religious groups, in panel C of Table A4 we replicate the regression separately for urban and rural areas, allowing more flexibility in how urban status is held constant. The results within the urban and rural subsamples are closely consistent with the overall patterns.

C. Heterogeneity in the Muslim Advantage

The facts above suggest that a channel operating behind the mortality advantage of Muslims may consist of two pieces. First, compared to the typical Hindu infant, the typical Muslim infant lives in a neighborhood where a larger share of her neighbors are Muslim. Second, Muslim neighbors are much less likely to defecate in the open. Below in Section IVA, we discuss the plausibility of a biological mechanism linking neighbors' OD to infant mortality via fecal pathogens. Here, we first examine some basic statistical predictions of this interpretation that do not require a deep understanding of the biological mechanism.

First, we note that if the channel linking mortality and religious composition of neighborhoods is indeed better sanitation, then in the subset of neighborhoods in which OD is rare, and the channel is therefore closed off, Muslim neighbors should not predict lower mortality. Table 3 tests this idea, dividing the sample of survey PSUs according to whether there is nonzero open defecation, and rerunning the mortality regressions from Table 2 within these partitions.²⁶

There is a clear pattern in the point estimates across this division: in places with zero reported open defecation, Muslim identity has an insignificant and often *positive* association with mortality. In places where open defecation is present, Muslim identity has a significantly negative association with mortality. This general pattern in Table 3 holds whether one examines the correlation between own religion and IMR (panel A), neighbors' religion and IMR (panel B), or the partial correlations of own and neighbors' religion in the same regression (panel C). It is striking that in places where the OD channel cannot operate by construction of the subsample, Muslim own identity and Muslim neighbor identity are

²⁶This partitioning—and more generally relying on measures of open defecation based on household-level responses—overstates the precision with which we can observe open defecation at the *person* level. This is because the type of household-level reports recorded in the NFHS do not account for the possibility of discordant latrine use behaviors among members of the same household. As we discuss in detail below in Section III, there can be substantial within-household differences in latrine use. Thus, even setting aside measurement error due to the PSU mean OD being calculated from a small sample, there is error in this measurement. Person-level open defecation is rare in the PSUs in column 1 of Table 3, but likely not a precise zero.

actually correlated with *higher* IMR, in clear contrast to the national, aggregate relationship that motivates this paper. The sign reversal is consistent with Figure 4, which shows that other than latrine use, neighborhoods with many Muslims tend to be worse in terms of features that would predict child health and human capital.

An alternative test in a similar spirit asks whether the Muslim neighborhood mortality effects are weaker in places where the “first stage” relationship between religious identity and sanitation practice is weaker. India is a large, geographically diverse country of 1.2 billion people. We exploit spatial heterogeneity across the states of India in the degree to which religious identity predicts revealed preference for open defecation. To do so, we divide the main survey data into 79 state-by-survey round cells.²⁷ For each cell, we calculate the means of IMR and OD separately for Hindus and Muslims. This allows us to calculate a first stage relationship ($E[OD|Hindu] - E[OD|Muslim]$) and a reduced form relationship ($E[IMR|Hindu] - E[IMR|Muslim]$) separately within each cell. In panel A of Figure 6, we plot these statistics against each other. Each scatter point is a state-by-survey round, and marker sizes are proportional to sample size. Most of the points lie in the right-hand portion of the graph because in most places, the prevalence of OD among Hindus exceeds that of Muslims, consistent with the national averages. But behind those national averages lies some heterogeneity, and panel A shows that only in the places where there is a strong behavioral difference in latrine use between Hindus and Muslims is there a strong association between religious identity and infant mortality. A regression line fit to the data points passes through the origin, indicating that in expectation, there is no relationship between religious identity and infant mortality in places where Hindus and Muslims have similar sanitation practices.

In panel B of Figure 6, we retain the same horizontal axis, but on the vertical axis, we plot the strength of the religion-IMR relationship, as revealed in a regression of infant mortality on a Muslim indicator. This is the same regression that is reported in the first column of Table 2, but here is estimated separately for each state-by-round cell. The vertical axis measures the *t*-statistics of the coefficients, rather than the coefficients themselves, in order to reduce the visual noise associated with any large but statistically insignificant estimates generated within the 79 cells of the partitioned sample. (Online Appendix Figure A2 plots the analogous graph using coefficients themselves.) Here again, the strength and direction of the statistical relationship between religious identity and mortality is clearly related to the strength and direction of the first-stage relationship: In the many places where Hindus are more likely to practice OD (right of the origin), Muslims, who tend to collocate near other Muslims, have an aggregate mortality advantage. In the few places where Hindus are less likely to practice OD (left of the origin), Muslims, who tend to collocate near other Muslims, have an aggregate mortality disadvantage.

Taken together, Table 3, Figure 6 and Figure A2 in the online Appendix support the idea that sanitation may be the channel linking religious composition of neighborhoods to infant mortality. Where there is no OD, there is no Muslim mortality advantage. And where there is non-zero OD, the strength of the Hindu-Muslim difference in OD predicts the strength of

²⁷The number of states increased from 25 to 29 across the years represented in the survey rounds.

the mortality advantage. This clearly suggests a mechanism in which neighborhood religious composition is predictive of IMR via its association with open defecation.

III. Hindu-Muslim Differences in Demand for Latrine Use

Given the observed association between the religious composition of neighborhoods and local sanitation, in this section we draw on several data sources to better understand Hindu-Muslim differences in attitudes and behaviors related to latrine/toilet use. Perhaps surprisingly, we show that open defecation in this context is not merely a matter of latrine affordability or access, but rather involves clear consumer preference heterogeneity.

More than half of the Indian population, over 600 million people, defecates in the open. Muslim Indians, though they are more likely to defecate in the open than the poor rural populations of much of the world, are much less likely to do so than Hindu Indians. In our main dataset, only 32 percent of Hindu children live in households that use latrines or toilets, compared to 57 percent of Muslim children. This gross difference cannot be explained by affordability because Hindus are the richer group: online Appendix Figure A3 shows that conditional on any level of asset wealth, Hindus are more likely to be exposed to open defecation and to defecate in the open themselves, compared to Muslims.²⁸ Importantly, although exposure to open defecation declines in wealth, even Hindus and Muslims in relatively wealthy households still practice OD at non-negligible rates and are still exposed to significantly high levels of open defecation by their neighbors.

To investigate these patterns in more detail, we turn briefly in Table 4 to data from the Sanitation Quality, Use, Access, and Trends (SQUAT) survey, which was collected in rural northern India in 2013 and 2014. Unlike our main analysis dataset (the NFHS), this survey was specifically designed to elicit preferences over latrine use, as distinct from latrine ownership. The survey is also unique in having a structure that permits reporting of different latrine use patterns by different members of the same household. The survey is described in more detail in Coffey et al. (2014).²⁹

Table 4 summarizes responses at the individual and household levels, with Hindu means in column 1 and Muslim means in column 2. Consistent with other data sources, the first row of the table shows that Hindus are significantly more likely than Muslims to practice OD—that is, they are less likely to use a latrine or toilet. This difference in revealed preferences is deeply embedded: the second row shows that a substantial minority of Hindus who reside in a household with a working latrine nonetheless choose to defecate in the open. Twenty-six percent of Hindus whose households own functional latrines choose not to use

²⁸Online Appendix Figure A3 also shows that this disparity holds conditioning instead on mother's height—thus paralleling Figure 1, which showed that Hindu IMR was higher at any level of asset wealth or mother's height. The associations of sanitation with asset wealth and mother's height strikingly resemble the associations of infant mortality with asset wealth and mother's height. Linear regressions confirm that the gaps are statistically significant ($p < 0.01$) in panels A and B. In panels C and D of online Appendix Figure A3, we plot own, rather than PSU, OD on the vertical axes. The pattern is nearly identical, highlighting that even relatively wealthy Hindus (and to a lesser extent relatively wealthy Muslims) are still likely to practice OD in this context. The richest Hindus by the asset wealth measure have OD rates in excess of 30 percent.

²⁹The SQUAT survey was designed to be representative of rural open defecation practices in five states of north India: Bihar, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, and Uttar Pradesh. These states are home to 40 percent of the population of India, and to 45 percent of households in India without a toilet or latrine. Surveyors interviewed 3,235 adults about their defecation practices and views on latrines and latrine use, and collected individual-level latrine use data for 22,787 household members.

them, compared to 10 percent of Muslims. These statistics mask some within-household heterogeneity: over 40 percent of households that had a working latrine had at least one member who nevertheless defecated in the open.

These statistics are especially useful in disentangling access to latrines from preferences over latrine *use*. People from households that owned a latrine used by another household member unambiguously had the option not to defecate in the open. These findings are consistent with accounts from Indian commentators (e.g., Ramaswami 2005) and evaluations by researchers (e.g., Barnard et al. 2013) that toilets constructed or paid for by the government often remain unused or repurposed. We investigate further in online Appendix Figure A4, where we compare latrine use behaviors at the individual (rather than household) level and separately by ownership of a working latrine. The figure shows that whether one examines all respondents, or just those residing in latrine-owning households, Hindus are more likely to defecate in the open.

To provide additional context to the fact that high socioeconomic status does not predict zero open defecation in this setting, we draw on another nationally representative survey, the India Human Development Survey, which has the advantage of being more recent than our main dataset and of allowing additional measures of household socioeconomic status. (See Section IVC for a fuller description of these data.) Among rural households in the 2012 IHDS in which the most highly-educated adult member holds a bachelor's degree or higher, 32 percent of households report practicing open defecation. For rural households in which the most highly-educated adult completed secondary school, the statistic is 51 percent. This contrasts with neighboring Bangladesh (in its 2011 DHS survey), where only 1 percent of rural households in which the most highly-educated adult completed *any* schooling beyond secondary defecated in the open, and where only 4 percent of households with a member who completed secondary school defecated in the open.

The roots of these behavioral differences are difficult to trace and are beyond the scope of this paper. Sanitation practices may have evolved differently across Muslim and Hindu communities for purely secular reasons, and could have been privately or socially optimal given the context under which they arose. Even specific religious instruction with respect to sanitation and hygiene that we observe today may have been established long ago—codifying then-existing norms, rather than establishing those norms.³⁰ Regardless of the historical path, today religion is a highly predictive marker for group differences.

While we take no position on whether religion causes OD per se, it is common for Indians to discuss waste disposal choices with reference to religious purity. Row 4 of Table 4 shows that a substantial fraction of both Hindu and Muslim respondents self-report that a religious leader has told them explicitly where to defecate. The table shows that Hindus are more likely than Muslims to respond that OD away from the home is pure, while using a

³⁰*The Laws of Manu*, a Hindu sacred text, advises defecating away from the home (Chapter 4 verse 151): “Far from his dwelling let him remove urine and excreta.” In contrast, the *Mishkat-al-Masabiha*, a Muslim sacred text, offers somewhat opposing advice: “Muadh reported God’s messenger as saying, ‘Guard against the three things which produce cursing: relieving one self in watering-places, in the middle of the road and in the shade.’”

latrine near the home is not pure. All Hindu-Muslim differences in the table are statistically significant at the 5 percent level.

The SQUAT data also allow us to observe plainly-stated beliefs about whether sanitation (latrine use) confers a health benefit to children. Respondents were asked “Imagine two villages, one in which everyone defecates in the open and one in which everyone uses a latrine. In which village do you think children would be healthier?” The final row of Table 4 shows that 40 percent of Hindus reported that open defecation was healthier, compared to 27 percent of Muslims. Hindus and Muslims gave statistically identical answers to the other questions in this module, which asked whether children would be healthier in villages where people ate rice or wheat and whether children would be healthier in villages where households used kerosene or dung as fuel.³¹

The possibility that open defecation would ever be chosen if a working toilet or latrine were available may be surprising to many readers, but these patterns, and indeed the Hindu-Muslim behavior difference itself, are well-known to many residents of rural India. Coffey et al. (2017) documents this fact in a qualitative study in rural northern India, recording, for example, how a Muslim woman from Uttar Pradesh described the differences: “Even if Hindus have made a latrine, still they go out to defecate in the open. Now for our people [Muslims], it’s not a problem. If we have a latrine in the house, we will use it.”^{32, 33}

In short, the pattern of especially poor sanitation in Hindu-concentrated neighborhoods is not merely a matter of affordability of or access to latrines and toilets. Instead, many Indians (Muslim and Hindu) report and reveal clear preferences against using latrines, and this clear preference for open defecation is particularly strong among the Hindu majority.

IV. Corroborating Evidence for the Open Defecation Channel

We next present a collage of evidence evaluating sanitation externalities as the possible channel linking the religious composition of neighborhoods to infant mortality. We begin by briefly outlining the biological mechanism, drawing on the prior literature. That discussion then guides several empirical tests with respect to intermediate health outcomes where effects of poor sanitation should be detectable, and which would not easily be explained by other phenomena. We conclude with a series of falsification tests.

³¹In this module of three questions, the order was: rice/wheat, followed by dung/kerosene, followed by OD/latrine. Respondents could answer that one of the two options within each set was healthier for children in the village, or that the two options had the same impact. Only the sanitation question showed a differential response pattern by religious identity. The *F*-stats, are, in the same order, 0.5, 2.7, and 9.7. We also note that this question about the health perceptions surrounding sanitation was asked before it was revealed that the survey was specifically focused on sanitation.

³²Coffey et al. (2017) also reports how a Hindu man in Haryana described his beliefs about the health benefits of open defecation: “[By defecating in the open] one can stretch the body, one can go out for a walk. You can also prevent yourself from getting diseases. If a latrine is in the house, bad smells will come, germs will grow. Latrines in the house are like...hell. The environment becomes completely polluted.”

³³Moreover, this behavior has long been recognized and documented publicly: cultural scholars attribute the modern persistence of OD among Hindus in India to the persistence of the Hindu caste system, with its ritual avoidance of excreta (Ramaswami 2005, Bathran 2011). Recently, Hindu politicians from both major political parties in India have echoed this sentiment with the slogan: “Toilets are more important than [Hindu] Temples.” Union Rural Development Minister Jairam Ramesh of the Congress party made the statement in October 2012. From the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), Gujarat Chief Minister and then-candidate for Prime Minister Narendra Modi made an identical statement in October 2013. And nearly a century ago, Gandhi campaigned to change Indian behavior with respect to excreta disposal, famously declaring, “Sanitation is more important than independence.”

A. Biological Mechanism

Bacteria and parasites, such as intestinal worms, live in feces. Fecal matter in the local environment gets onto feet and hands and into mouths directly. It can also contaminate food and water. These pathogenic processes have been documented since at least the nineteenth century.³⁴ By definition, open defecation is not limited to a confined or designated area. Feces are disposed of in crop fields, near homes, and in and along roads, implying widespread scope for disease transmission and potential harm, regardless of whether an individual chooses to use a latrine himself.

For children, infections caused by fecal pathogens can reduce net nutrition through caloric loss to diarrhea and parasites, as well as by expending calories to combat infections. Acute malnutrition due to infectious disease is well established in the epidemiological literature (Kielmann and McCord 1978, Mosley and Chen 1984) and recognized among economists (e.g., Cutler, Deaton, and Lleras-Muney 2006). Epidemiological evidence also suggests that exposure to fecal pathogens could lead to enteropathy—a chronic intestinal problem that prevents the proper absorption of calories and micronutrients (Humphrey 2009, Petri et al. 2008, Mondal et al. 2011, and Lin et al. 2013). The resulting acute malnutrition manifests as wasting (low weight) and can lead to death (Black, Morris, and Bryce 2003). It may also manifest as anemia as the body fails to absorb the nutrients necessary for red blood cell production (Rosenberg and Bowman 1982; Coffey, Geruso, and Spears forthcoming). We check this mechanism directly below by examining the intermediate outcomes of blood hemoglobin, weight-for-height, and weight-for-age.

For neonates (0–1 month old), the process is somewhat different but with the potential for similar mortality effects. Maternal exposure to fecal pathogens could cause neonatal mortality by reducing the quality of maternal net nutrition during gestation, in turn reducing uterine growth and birth weight. This possibility is highlighted by the recent finding in Prendergast et al. (2014) of a correlation between in-utero growth, growth hormones at birth, and mothers' exposure to open defecation in Zimbabwe.

The public goods features of sanitation have been highlighted in the economics literature. Guiteras, Levinsohn, and Mobarak (2014) investigated the determinants of latrine use in Bangladesh via a field experiment, finding an important role for local complementarities. Other studies have examined health outcomes impacted by the public goods problems of sanitation, though these have focused almost exclusively on worms, which comprise just one channel by which OD could affect health. In the Kenyan context, Miguel and Kremer (2004) studied the public goods problems associated with intestinal worms transmitted by contact with fecal matter. In the historical US context, Bleakley (2007) examined the impact of efforts by the Rockefeller Foundation at the turn of the century to eradicate widespread hookworm infections in the US South. Taken together, the economic literature supports the potential of important externalities of OD, while the epidemiological evidence suggests that health impacts could be significant and include mortality effects.

³⁴See Freedman (1991) for examples.

B. Tests of the Fecal Pathogens Channel

Anemia/Hemoglobin.—In Table 5, we examine a health outcome with a direct connection to the type of intestinal disease spread by open defecation. Anemia, defined as low levels of blood hemoglobin, can be caused by diets lacking iron, vitamin B12, and folic acid, all of which are necessary for the production of red blood cells. Intestinal parasites also importantly contribute to low blood hemoglobin in developing country settings, by causing blood loss in the stool, lack of appetite, increased motility (including via diarrhea), and competition for nutrients. Intestinal parasites also cause damage to the intestinal wall lining, which can inhibit the absorption of nutrients critical in red blood cell production (Rosenberg and Bowman 1982). The impacts of intestinal parasites on hemoglobin can be large even relative to the impacts of diet or micronutrient supplementation. For example, in a randomized control trial among Kenyan children, Friis et al. (2003) found that a single dose of deworming medicine was as effective in raising hemoglobin levels as the daily administration of micronutrient supplements, including iron, for a period of eight months. In the economics literature, Bleakley (2007) shows that a hookworm eradication campaign in the US South at the turn of the twentieth century raised school attendance and later-life incomes, with reduced anemia as the assumed channel.³⁵

The dependent variable in the first four columns of Table 5 is the child's blood hemoglobin, in g/dL, measured from a surveyor-collected blood sample analyzed by a portable device in the field. Mean hemoglobin in the sample is 10.3 g/dL, very near to the WHO threshold for moderate anemia (< 10 g/dL). The analysis sample is significantly smaller than in the main analysis because hemoglobin was measured only in the most recent NFHS survey round and because these measurements were taken only for children alive at the time of the interview and between one and five years old. Table 5 shows that Muslim children are observed to have higher hemoglobin on average (column 1), but this relationship disappears after controlling for neighborhood fixed effects (column 2) or the fraction of Muslims in the neighborhood (column 3). In column 4, the association between neighborhood religious composition and blood hemoglobin becomes smaller and insignificant after partialing out the contribution of poor sanitation. This pattern precisely tracks the pattern of Table 2 and online Appendix Table A3.

It is important to understand that the list of other potential causes of low hemoglobin here is very limited. As discussed in Coffey, Geruso, and Spears (forthcoming), the literature points to just diet, malaria, and the type of intestinal infections spread by poor sanitation as being plausible causes of anemia in this context. And we are able to investigate diet directly, which we do below in Section IVC, where we show that conditional on own religion, own diet is uncorrelated with the religious composition of neighborhoods.

Acute Malnutrition.—A related pathway from exposure to fecal pathogens to death is poor net nutrition—that is, calories consumed net of calories lost to diarrheal disease

³⁵In Bleakley (2007), anemia was the assumed channel, though it was not possible in that study to directly observe blood hemoglobin in the historical data. In a cross-country comparison of recent micro data in which hemoglobin was measured in blood samples, Coffey, Geruso, and Spears (forthcoming) shows that, at the country level, children's hemoglobin and sanitation are correlated, even after controlling for household-level diet data and national malaria incidence.

and parasites and expended in combating infections. Acute malnutrition is a well-known mechanism linking infectious disease to infant death (Kielmann and McCord 1978, Mosley and Chen 1984), our outcome of interest. If open defecation is causing deaths via infection, acute malnutrition should also be observable in weight. This intermediate outcome may also be of independent interest, because acute malnutrition could impact the human capital accumulation of surviving children.

We follow a standard practice (e.g., Schmidt et al. 2010) of using surveyor-measured weight to capture acute malnutrition and recent diarrhea. Weight, rather than self-reported diarrheal disease, is recommended due to widely recognized problems in survey-reported diarrhea. We discuss the problems with survey-reported diarrhea in this context in more detail in online Appendix A.3, and provide statistics in our own dataset highlighting these issues. Weight-for-age is the particular measure of recent diarrhea recommended by Schmidt et al. (2010). To evaluate robustness, we also examine weight-for-height.³⁶ We operationalize both measures as z -scores scaled to the World Health Organization's child growth standards.

Columns 5 through 12 in Table 5 repeat the exercise performed for hemoglobin, but now with measures of child weight as the dependent variables. The sample includes all children up to 24 months for whom a weight measurement was taken. Due to the DHS/NFHS surveying scheme, these detailed anthropometry measures exist for only a small subset of our main analysis sample. In the first three columns of Table 5, the dependent variable is weight-for-age. We report OLS regressions.³⁷ The extended controls are identical to those in the bottom panel of Table 2 with an additional control for height.³⁸

The results for weight follow the now-familiar pattern: in columns 5 and 9 of Table 5, an indicator for Muslim households predicts significantly higher z -scores (i.e., heavier children). Then, additionally controlling for Muslim concentration in the locality (\bar{M}_j) or controlling for a PSU fixed effect attenuates the coefficient on the Muslim indicator to insignificance. And finally, incrementally controlling for the local sanitation environment attenuates the coefficient on \bar{M}_j as well. This pattern of results supports the mechanism outlined above, as it shows that the fraction of Muslim neighbors is correlated with child malnutrition, but not after partialing out the association between religious composition of the neighborhood or neighborhood open defecation.

Breastfeeding Interactions.—Water and prepared food are two key pathways through which poor sanitation causes infections in children. Breastfeeding, which interrupts this pathway, is known to be protective against the transmission of such infections, and previous studies have shown important interactions in this context between the efficacy of breastfeeding and the quality of a household's water supply (see Jayachandran and Kuziemko 2010). Here, we examine whether the efficacy of breastfeeding is increasing

³⁶Height is an appropriate denominator for normalizing weight when analyzing acute malnutrition because height reflects long-term, but not recent, net nutritional and disease experience.

³⁷The sample here is smaller because weight in the NFHS is only consistently measured for children below age three at the time of the survey, whereas in our main analysis, we calculate IMR over a larger sample by using the mother's responses to retrospective questions about the timing of births and deaths over a longer look-back period.

³⁸We control for height-for-age to ensure that results are not spuriously driven by *chronic* malnutrition, which would be reflected in height. In practice, removing the height control does not affect the pattern of results in the table.

in the fraction of neighbors who defecate in the open. Operationally, this means examining interactions between breastfeeding and \overline{M}_j or \overline{OD}_j .

Table 6 examines various combinations of interactions between religion, breast-feeding, and sanitation in OLS regressions in which the dependent variable is IMR. The regressor of interest is an indicator for exclusive breastfeeding during the infant's first six months of life if she survived, or until death if she died. Controls are as in Table 2. Column 1 of Table 6 reports results for a specification interacting breastfeeding with the Muslim indicator. Unsurprisingly, the main effect of exclusive breastfeeding is large and negative—i.e., breastfeeding is associated with reduced mortality. But the significant positive coefficient estimate for the interaction term $breastfed \times Muslim$ indicates that breastfeeding is less beneficial to Muslim children than Hindu children, on average.

This nonintuitive pattern again appears to be due to the correlation between own religious identity and that of neighbors and due to the association of both with sanitation. After additionally controlling for \overline{M}_j or \overline{OD}_j and the interaction of each with breastfeeding in Table 6, the positive coefficient on $breastfed \times Muslim$ becomes insignificant (column 3) or flips sign (column 6). Overall, comparing columns 1 through 3, in which there are no controls for sanitation, with columns 5 through 7, in which these controls are included, suggests that the associations of the $breastfed \times Muslim$ and $breastfed \times fraction\ Muslim$ with mortality are operating via open defecation: living near more Hindus predicts a greater protective effect of breastfeeding only until the correlation between religious composition and sanitation is controlled for. These regressions indicate that Muslim children, on average, benefit less from breastfeeding only because they tend to live in better local sanitation environments, while Hindu children, on average, face environments where the protection conferred by breastfeeding matters more.³⁹

Online Appendix Table A6 shows that although the main effect of breastfeeding varies significantly as a function of baseline IMR, the coefficient on the interaction of breastfeeding with PSU fraction Muslim is remarkably similar across PSUs split by high versus low infant mortality rates. Thus, these results are not merely driven by a stronger effect of breastfeeding in locales where IMR is higher.

C. Falsification Tests

Panels A and B of Figure 4 show that two child health outcomes that should not be driven by local sanitation are indeed flat (institutional deliveries) or declining (vaccinations) in fraction Muslim, a clear contrast with the overall IMR patterns revealed in panels C and D of Figure 4 in which survival increases in fraction Muslim. In this section, we investigate whether the religious composition of neighbors is correlated with other important observable health behaviors, inputs, and outcomes that would not be expected to be importantly affected by open defecation. Although there is no reason in principle that variables related to sanitation and variables unrelated to sanitation should not be positively correlated, the

³⁹Like the main results in Table 2, estimates in Table 6 are identified off of the religion of neighbors, not the religion of the child's own household. Therefore, any unobserved differences in inputs like weaning foods between Hindu and Muslim households would be captured by controls for *Muslim* and *Muslim* \times *breastfed*.

special institutional feature of our setting is that higher concentration of Muslims in a locality predicts better sanitation but otherwise predicts worse or neutral neighborhood characteristics, allowing us to potentially separate which channel is operating.

Diet.—In Table 7, we ask whether Hindus living around many Muslims are likely to have different diets than Hindus living around few Muslims. Because our main dataset, the NFHS, was not designed to measure consumption and contains relatively little information on hygiene behaviors, we turn again to the India Human Development Survey (IHDS) of 2012.⁴⁰ Summary statistics for this supplemental dataset are included in online Appendix Table A7. For the set of variables common to both the IHDS and NFHS, such as urban residence, open defecation, and access to piped water, online Appendix Table A7 shows that the IHDS replicates the same Hindu-Muslim differences found in the NFHS, which are displayed in Table 1.

The dependent variables in Table 7 are listed in the column headers and include measures of meat, eggs, and dairy consumption, measured per household per month. For each of these diet variables, we first regress diet on *own* religion to demonstrate that the consumption data are rich enough to capture differences across Muslim and Hindu households. For example, column 1 shows that Muslims are a precisely estimated 15 percentage points more likely (on a base of 25 percentage points) to consume meat compared to Hindus. Such differences are expected and not problematic.

We add \bar{M}_j as a regressor in the second and third columns of Table 7 for each dependent variable. Panel A shows that there is no correlation between \bar{M}_j and the extensive margin of eating any meat, or between \bar{M}_j and the intensive margin of quantity of meat consumed. In panel B, we examine two other calorie- and protein-rich foods: eggs and milk. For all diet variables, the coefficients are small, not significantly different from zero, and robust to the inclusion of controls.⁴¹ This is true even though large, precisely estimated diet differences are apparent between Hindu and Muslim households for each consumption outcome in the table.

Table 7 is direct evidence against the notion that Hindus living around Muslims have systematically different diets than Hindus living around other Hindus, and similarly against the notion that Muslims living around Hindus have systematically different diets than Muslims living around other Muslims. Thus, there is no empirical evidence that our results are likely to be confounded by issues related to diet.

Other Hygiene and Water.—Diet is likely to have primarily private benefits, but hygiene practices like hand washing could generate externalities in principle. If these practices covary with Muslim concentration across localities, then our estimates could be reflecting a different hygiene-related externality associated with the religious composition of

⁴⁰The IHDS contains richer hygiene information and a complete consumption module, but it cannot be used to construct mortality rates that are similarly reliable to those from the NFHS. Specifically, we are limited by the fact that complete birth histories were not recorded for all women of childbearing age.

⁴¹We control for log per capita consumption and the urban classification of the household, which could be important in principle because richer and urban households in India are more likely to eat meat.

a neighborhood. In fact, Hindu and Muslim households do not appear to differ with respect to these health behaviors to the extent observable in these data. For example, the summary statistics from the IHDS data in online Appendix Table A7 reveal that unlike OD (practiced by 51 percent of Hindus and 31 percent of Muslims in the IHDS data), Hindu and Muslim households do not differ in hand washing (72 percent versus 70 percent) or purifying water (11 percent versus 12 percent).

In Table 8, we report on regressions in which the dependent variables are various measures of hygiene and water quality from the IHDS. The regressor of interest is Muslim share, \overline{M}_j . In the first eight columns the dependent variables are always washing hands, sometimes washing hands, always purifying water, and sometimes purifying water. In columns 9 and 10, the dependent variable is piped public water to the home, for which a similar measure is available in the NFHS. For completeness, in columns 11 and 12, we replicate the Figure 4 regression of OD on \overline{M}_j using the IHDS data. The last four columns can be compared directly to results in the NFHS dataset—although in a different time period.

Columns 1 through 8 in Table 8 show that there is no correlation between measures of washing or water purifying and \overline{M}_j . The only significant difference we find in the table—besides OD—is that Muslim concentration is associated with *less* access to public piped water. This is consistent with our analysis in the NFHS data presented above (see Figure 4 and online Appendix Table A1). Both the literature (Jayachandran and Kuziemko 2010) and our own analysis (online Appendix Table A2) indicate that lower access to piped water in this region implies a Muslim disadvantage with respect to health. The difference in piped water likely reflects the inferior access to state services faced by Muslims. It appears that the Hindu-Muslim difference in latrine use, therefore, is not merely a marker for a wider array of other important hygiene behaviors with public goods qualities.

Cough and Fever.—Although all types of infectious disease may respond to poor sanitation exposure due to a weakened immune system,⁴² respiratory infections and fevers may be less responsive than symptoms specifically related to the gut. As a falsification test, we examine here whether fever and cough respond to neighborhood religious composition differently than diarrhea, a symptom with a more direct (and presumably quantitatively stronger) link to sanitation.

As discussed above, our primary measure of recent diarrhea in children is based not on the survey reports of mothers, but on current weight. This follows the recommendation from the medical literature (Schmidt et al. 2010) of preferring surveyor-measured weight to capture recent diarrhea even when self-reports of the symptom are available. Our own analysis in online Appendix Table A8 suggests that a mother's education may significantly affect what she decides "counts" as diarrhea in her child. To overcome differences in the perceptions of

⁴²As Cutler and Miller (2005) explain: "It is difficult to determine which infectious diseases should have responded to clean water technologies, however. Hiram Mills, a member of the Massachusetts State Board of Health, and J. J. Reincke, a health officer in Hamburg, Germany, independently observed a marked reduction in overall mortality, not just mortality from waterborne diseases, on the introduction of water filtration more than a century ago. . . . The biological mechanism underpinning the so-called Mills-Reincke phenomenon would presumably be that contaminated water weakens the immune system, making one more susceptible to other contagions."

illness across mothers of different socioeconomic status, we compare the relative reporting of three different types of symptoms by the same mother.

The NFHS contains mothers' subjective reports of three infectious disease symptoms: fever, cough, and diarrhea. We estimate differences in the relative reporting of these symptoms within a mother across localities that vary in Muslim concentration. In a stacked regression in which an observation is a child \times symptom, we regress an indicator for a positive report of the symptom on mother \times child fixed effects. Online Appendix Figure A5 plots residuals from that regression—separately by symptom—against the religious composition of the PSU in which the child resides. The figure shows that for the fever and cough symptoms, residuals are clearly increasing in fraction Muslim. Diarrhea residuals, in contrast, are clearly decreasing in fraction Muslim. This means that mothers in neighborhoods with higher Muslim shares are differentially less likely to report their child as having recent diarrhea, relative to their reporting of recent fever and cough and relative to mothers in neighborhoods with fewer Muslims. Online Appendix Section A.4 describes the exercise in more detail and also reports on a parametric regression approach that yields the same pattern of results.⁴³

V. Sizing the Externalities

In this section, we attempt to understand the potential size of the sanitation externalities suggested by the evidence above. To do so, we instrument for the local sanitation environment with the religious composition variable, \overline{M}_j . This strategy would yield unbiased estimates of the externalities of interest if PSU religious composition predicted own-household infant mortality only through its association with nearby neighbors' open defecation. In contrast, it is clear from Figure 4 that the neighborhoods where Muslims are concentrated are somewhat different along several other observable dimensions. Even though the evidence above points toward Muslim neighborhoods being, if anything, worse in terms of observable correlates of child health (other than sanitation), we cannot rule out the possibility of important unobservables. We therefore view the IV analysis as informative primarily because these regressions are identified off of a subset of the variation in open defecation that is carefully documented above.

We regress mortality outcomes on variables capturing a household's own open defecation (OD_{ijt}) and neighbors' open defecation within the PSU (\overline{OD}_{jt}):

$$Y_{ijt} = \beta_1 \overline{OD}_{jt} + \beta_2 OD_{ijt} + \beta_3 M_{ijt} + f(X_{ijt}) + \epsilon_{ijt}. \quad (2)$$

We instrument for the mean open defecation rate among neighbors with the fraction of PSU households that are Muslim:

⁴³The parametric version of this mother fixed effect regression in online Appendix Table A12 yields a coefficient on diarrhea \times fraction Muslim that is significant at $p < 0.09$.

$$\overline{OD}_{ijt} = \gamma_1 \overline{M}_j + \gamma_2 OD_{ijt} + \gamma_3 M_{ijt} + f(X_{ijt}) + \mu_{ijt}. \quad (3)$$

As above, i indexes live births, j indexes survey PSUs, and t indexes the three NFHS survey rounds. The dependent variables are infant and neonatal mortality. Note that the indicator for the child residing in a Muslim household, M_{ijt} , absorbs any unobserved health behaviors or child investments that could be correlated with a household's own religion, such as differing Hindu and Muslim diets. We restrict attention to the mixed-religion PSU sample, over which the relationship between \overline{M}_j and other PSU characteristics, including \overline{OD}_j , is monotonic and approximately linear, as shown in panel B of Figure 4. That plot visually depicts a nonparametric version of the first-stage regression for the case of no controls.⁴⁴ Parametric first-stage estimates are presented in online Appendix Table A9, with first-stage F -statistics always exceeding weak instrument thresholds. We also estimate the first stage separately within subsamples defined by child's birth order, child's sex, child's *own* religion, and the location of the household in a rural or urban setting in order to demonstrate that the first-stage relationship is not driven by an association with any of these variables. Online Appendix Table A9 shows that the first-stage effect is strong, precisely estimated, and consistent across subsamples.

Table 9 presents the results of the IV analysis. Results for IMR are displayed in panel A. Results for NMR are in panel B. Columns 1 and 2 in each panel report OLS estimates for comparison. Columns 3 through 7 report IV estimates with various control sets.^{45, 46} Table 9 shows that instrumenting for \overline{OD}_{ij} with \overline{M}_j yields point estimates of about 50–60 infant deaths per thousand. To put the size in context, the IV coefficient in column 7 implies that a 10 percentage point reduction in the fraction of neighbors defecating in the open is associated with a decline in infant mortality of 6.1 children out of 1,000. For neonatal mortality (Table 9, panel B), the figure is 4.4 deaths per thousand. The magnitude of the estimated externality is similar across specifications that vary the control set, suggesting that the variation in open defecation that arises from the composition of neighbors is not strongly correlated with any individual-level behaviors or characteristics that affect mortality.⁴⁷

These effects are economically large. In the context of our data, the difference between a locality in which all of a household's neighbors defecate in the open and a locality where

⁴⁴Besides tracking the linearity of the first stage, restricting to mixed-religion PSUs confers the identification advantage that only respondents who have settled or remained in mixed neighborhoods contribute to estimating our coefficients. This could be important if the types of Hindus and Muslims who are willing to collocate with the other group are systematically different from those who are not. Panel A of Figure 4 suggests that all-Muslim and all-Hindu neighborhoods may indeed differ from mixed-religion neighborhoods, because the nonparametric plots jump at the endpoints ($\overline{M} = 0$ and $\overline{M} = 1$) for many variables.

⁴⁵All regressions include indicators for survey rounds. The extended controls are identical to those in Table 2.

⁴⁶The coefficient on own household OD becomes insignificant and unstable in the IV. This accords with the fact that own latrine use and neighbors' latrine use are highly correlated, as online Appendix Figure A1 shows.

⁴⁷The IV estimates may be larger than the OLS due to measurement error in the PSU-level variable \overline{OD}_{ij} , which is calculated over only the survey-sampled households, and because, as reported in Table 4 from the supplementary SQUAT data, even within a household there is variation in use of latrines that our main data cannot capture. Computations in the spirit of regression calibration indicate that measurement error in local area open defecation could plausibly account for the IV coefficients being approximately twice as large as our OLS coefficients, in large part because own household Muslim, own open defecation, and survey round are correlated with the "signal" in true PSU open defecation.

none of them do is associated with a larger reduction in child mortality than the difference between households at the bottom and top quintiles of asset wealth (see Figure 1). To understand the economic importance of our results, it is useful to consider external harm created by a single household defecating in the open. Because about one in every ten Indian households has an infant born each year, the coefficient on \overline{OD}_{ij}^{-i} is approximately equal to the sum of harm (across all neighbors) imposed by a single household that chooses open defecation, aggregated over ten years.⁴⁸

The implied importance of open defecation for infant mortality in the modern Indian context is consistent with evidence by Cutler and Miller (2005) and Watson (2006) on the role of clean water and sanitation in explaining large shares of declining infant mortality in the history of the United States.⁴⁹ Cutler and Miller (2005) shows that the introduction of clean water technologies in US cities beginning around 1900 reduced the infant mortality rate by 87 deaths per thousand, or 46 percent of the base of 189 per thousand. To put our findings in perspective, naively applying our IV estimates (Table 9, column 7) would predict that cutting open defecation in half from 66 percent to 33 percent would reduce infant mortality by 20 deaths per thousand in India ($= -0.33 \times 61.4$). This would be a 28 percent reduction in the baseline Indian infant mortality rate of 72 deaths per thousand during our sample period.⁵⁰ Our estimates are also consistent with the most credible data on cause of death during early life in India: using a census of all Indian deaths occurring from 2001 to 2003, Million Death Study Collaborators (2010) shows that 22 percent of non-neonatal child deaths (deaths from 1–59 months) in India are due to diarrhea, which is just one of the potential pathways by which intestinal worms and bacterial infections that are transmitted via open defecation could affect infant mortality.⁵¹

Although ours is the first paper to provide even suggestive evidence of mortality externalities associated with open defecation, recent work exploring other human capital impacts of open defecation has found effects with similarly large magnitudes. Gertler et al. (2015) performs a meta-analysis of open defecation-height experiments, and estimates a reduction

⁴⁸Consider the simple case in which all households contain one infant. Because the contribution of any household to the regressor \overline{OD}^{-i} is weighted by its share in the PSU, the harm caused by one household defecating in the open on any other single household is $\frac{1}{N-1} \cdot \beta$, where N is the number of households in the PSU and β is the coefficient on \overline{OD}^{-i} . The total external harm summed across the other $N-1$ households is then $N-1 \cdot \frac{1}{N-1} \cdot \beta = \beta$. In practice, about one in every ten Indian households has an infant born each year, so that the total harm equals β over a ten-year window.

⁴⁹Studying sanitation programs in the United States in the 1960s, where infant mortality was lower and therefore, the marginal effects would be expected to be smaller compared to India, Watson (2006) finds that “sanitation interventions explain almost 40 percent of the convergence in Native American and white infant mortality rates in reservation counties since 1970.” Galiani, Gertler, and Schargrodsky (2005), studying water privatization in Argentina, found a decline in all-cause child mortality by 8 percent, with effects reaching as high as 26 percent in the poorest places, which are likely to be better comparisons to India with respect to poverty. Given that interventions like water privatization could have such large effects on mortality, it is unsurprising to find similarly large effects of open defecation. Among other plausible channels, open defecation is likely to contaminate drinking water.

⁵⁰This calculation sets aside all complications of predictions out-of-sample, such as the potential for reinforcing or countervailing behavioral responses to such a dramatic shift in the local environment. The denominator 72 is the weighted average IMR of Hindus and Muslims from row 1 of Table 1.

⁵¹As we discuss in footnote 44, there is a plausible pathway from poor sanitation to *all* infectious disease, not merely diarrhea. In addition, Million Death Study Collaborators (2010) shows that an even larger fraction (33 percent) of neonatal deaths (deaths from 0–1 months) are attributable to low birth weight. As we discuss in Section IVA, there is clear epidemiological evidence that exposure to fecal pathogens reduces the body’s net absorption of nutrients. In mothers, poorer net nutrition would have direct impacts on child’s birthweight. Prendergast et al. (2014) finds suggestive evidence on birthweight specifically, showing a correlation between in-utero growth and mothers’ exposure to open defecation in Zimbabwe.

of 0.046 height-for-age standard deviations from a 10 percentage point reduction in open defecation. To compare the size of these height effects to our mortality estimates, one can scale the estimates using the correlation between IMR and height across Indian villages. In the NFHS, Indian villages with one more IMR point (0.0010) have children that are 0.0034 normalized height-for-age standard deviations shorter. Using this conversion factor to roughly translate between outcomes, our estimate of a 0.0061 mortality improvement for a 10 percentage point decline open defecation (Table 9, column 4) would be consistent with a 0.021 height-for-age effect. This effect size translated from our mortality estimates is roughly half of the Gertler et al. (2015) experimental effect sizes.

To examine the robustness of our IV results to more flexibly controlling for potential confounders, we reestimate the IV regressions over different partitions of our analysis sample. Dividing the sample into various partitions pushes the limit of what the data is powered to detect, but in online Appendix Table A10, we estimate the IV regression separately for Muslim and Hindu children (in each case continuing to instrument with the religious composition of all neighbors). The additional flexibility and smaller sample reduces statistical precision. The point estimate in the Muslim subsample is less than half the size of the corresponding point estimate in the Hindu subsample, though not statistically different from the Hindu effect or from zero. Similarly, online Appendix Table A10 shows that within subsamples of only girls or boys, only first-borns or later-borns, and only urban or rural PSUs, the IV results are never statistically different and are often quantitatively similar.⁵²

Finally, we note that individuals who are willing to live in more diverse neighborhoods could be systematically different from those who are not. However, any “cosmopolitan” advantage in health could not even *in principle* spuriously generate our results. This is because the instrument here does not measure the religious diversity of a PSU, it measures the share that is Muslim, which has an asymmetric relationship to religious diversity for Hindus and Muslims. For example, because most Hindus collocate with other Hindus and most Muslims collocate with other Muslims, for the typical Muslim, an increase in \bar{M}_j implies a less religiously diverse neighborhood. In contrast, for the typical Hindu, an increase in \bar{M}_j implies a more religiously diverse neighborhood. This predicted asymmetry stands in contrast to the symmetry of the effects we estimate in online Appendix Table A10, where we split the sample by own religion and find positive effects of \bar{M}_j on survival for both groups.⁵³

To show that unobservables associated with willingness to live in a diverse or cosmopolitan neighborhood are not driving our results, in online Appendix Table A11 we replicate our main IV analysis from Table 9, but include an additional control for diversity, defined as

⁵²It would be interesting to evaluate whether there was any interaction between own household latrine use and that of neighbors. A priori, it is unclear whether an interaction should exist: the disposal of feces in this context is distributed along roads, in fields, and near homes—that is, it is not relegated to areas trafficked only by those who do not use latrines. This implies that the effect of neighbors’ open defecation may be invariant to own household latrine use. Our estimation strategy, which focuses on neighbor effects, does not allow us identify the interaction term, as doing so would require a second instrument (for own open defecation, OD_i).

⁵³This is contrary to the diversity hypothesis, which would predict effects working in opposite directions for the two subsamples. Such a hypothesis would imply that, counter to our findings, Muslims living in a neighborhood with a 50 percent Muslim share would experience lower infant mortality than Muslims living in a neighborhood with a 100 percent Muslim share.

the fraction of neighbors who are religiously dissimilar from the respondent household. This religious dissimilarity variable moves in opposite directions for Hindu and Muslim households as \bar{M}_j increases. The regressions show that coefficients on religious dissimilarity in IMR and NMR regressions are small and indistinguishable from zero, and that the effects of interest are almost numerically identical to the specifications in Table 9.

VI. Conclusion

As of 2014, more than a billion people worldwide continued to defecate in the open, without the use of even basic latrines. While governments and others have invested heavily in reducing the practice in recent years, there has been disproportionately little evidence of the impact of open defecation on mortality. We view our study as informing ongoing policy efforts to reduce open defecation around the world, as well as contributing to the economic literature concerned with the impacts of infectious disease on health and human capital.

The pattern we document solves an existing puzzle in the literature—that in India, Muslim children suffer lower rates of mortality than Hindu children, despite being poorer on average. We show that this operates via the tendency of Muslims to reside near other Muslims, but that both Hindus and Muslims appear to gain advantage from Muslim neighbors. Investigating channels, we observe that Indian Muslims, despite being more likely to defecate in the open than Muslims in neighboring Pakistan or Bangladesh, practice open defecation at significantly lower rates than Indian Hindus, implying that the neighbors of Muslims are on average exposed to better sanitation environments in this context. Tests of the mechanisms linking open defecation to infant death, including contamination of food and water and acute malnutrition due to intestinal disease, lend support to this interpretation.

More broadly, our study provides insights into the public goods aspect of sanitation. Understanding this public goods component is important for policy interventions motivated by the efficiency concern that private demand is below the social optimum. The clear stated and revealed preferences towards open defecation reported in Section III suggest that the gap between individual perceptions regarding latrine use and the objective external harms of open defecation are significant. Practically, our results suggest that many infants die each year due to poor sanitation in their localities. In the context of India, a back-of-the-envelope calculation within the range of variation supported by the data suggests that reducing mean open defecation by 10 percentage points (one-quarter of a standard deviation across localities) would reduce IMR by 6 deaths per thousand, or about 8 percent of the mean mortality rate. With an estimated 26 million children born in India each year, this equates to 156,000 deaths annually. The sheer size of these potential effects highlights the need for further investigation into the externalities of sanitation in the modern developing world.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to seminar participants at the Population Association of America 2014, the Indian Statistical Institute, the Princeton University Center for Health and Wellbeing, and the University of Texas at Austin for comments and suggestions. We thank Sandy Black, Marika Cabral, Anne Case, Diane Coffey, Angus Deaton, Michel Guillot, Robert Jensen, Leigh Linden, Steve Trejo, and Eric Verhoogen for useful conversations. We gratefully acknowledge financial support from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, from grants 5 R24 HD042849 and 5 T32 HD007081 awarded to the Population Research Center at the University of Texas at Austin by the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, and from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation grant OPP1125318.

REFERENCES

- Barnard Sharmani, Parimita Routray, Fiona Majorin, Rachel Peletz, Sophie Boisson, Antara Sinha, and Thomas Clasen. 2013. "Impact of Indian Total Sanitation Campaign on Latrine Coverage and Use: A Cross-Sectional Study in Orissa Three Years following Programme Implementation." *PLoS ONE* 8 (8): e71438.
- Bathran Ravichandaran. 2011. "Indian Sanitation." *Economic and Political Weekly* 46 (51): 34–37.
- Sonia Bhalotra, Valente Christine, and van Soest Arthur. 2010. "The puzzle of Muslim advantage in child survival in India." *Journal of Health Economics* 29 (2): 191–204. [PubMed: 19969383]
- Bhalotra Sonia, and Arthur van Soest. 2008. "Birth-spacing, fertility and neonatal mortality in India: Dynamics, frailty, and fecundity." *Journal of Econometrics* 143 (2): 274–90.
- Bhat P. N. Mari, and Zavier A. J. Francis. 2005. "Role of Religion in Fertility Decline: The Case of Indian Muslims." *Economic and Political Weekly* 40 (5): 385–402.
- Black Robert E., Morris Saul S., and Bryce Jennifer. 2003. "Where and why are 10 million children dying every year?" *Lancet* 361 (9376): 2226–34. [PubMed: 12842379]
- Bleakley Hoyt. 2007. "Disease and Development: Evidence from Hookworm Eradication in the American South." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 122 (1): 73–117. [PubMed: 24146438]
- Case Anne, and Christina Paxson. 2008. "Stature and status: Height, ability, and labor market outcomes." *Journal of Political Economy* 116 (3): 499–532. [PubMed: 19603086]
- Clasen Thomas, Sophie Boisson, Parimita Routray, Belen Torondel, Melissa Bell, Oliver Cumming, Jeroen Ensink, et al. 2014. "Effectiveness of a rural sanitation programme on diarrhoea, soil-transmitted helminth infection, and child malnutrition in Odisha, India: A cluster-randomised trial." *Lancet Global Health* 2 (11): e645–53. [PubMed: 25442689]
- Coffey Diane, Geruso Michael, and Spears Dean. Forthcoming. "Sanitation, Disease Externalities and Anaemia: Evidence From Nepal." *Economic Journal*.
- Coffey Diane, Gupta Aashish, Hathi Payal, Khurana Nidhi, Spears Dean, Srivastav Nikhil, and Vyas Sangita. 2014. "Revealed Preference for Open Defecation: Evidence from a New Survey in Rural North India." *Economic and Political Weekly* 49 (38): 43.
- Coffey Diane, Gupta Aashish, Hathi Payal, Spears Dean, Srivastav Nikhil, and Vyas Sangita. 2017. "Untouchability, Pollution, and Latrine Pits: Understanding Open Defecation in Rural India." *Economic and Political Weekly* 52 (1).
- Coffey Diane, Khera Reetika, and Spears Dean. 2013. "Women's Status and Children's Height in India: Evidence from Rural Joint Households." <http://riceinstitute.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2013/04/CoffeyKheraSpears2013.pdf>.
- Cutler David, Angus Deaton, and Adriana Lleras-Muney. 2006. "The Determinants of Mortality." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 20 (3): 97–120.
- Cutler David M., and Adriana Lleras-Muney. 2010. "Understanding Differences in Health Behaviors by Education." *Journal of Health Economics* 29 (1): 1–28. [PubMed: 19963292]
- Cutler David, and Grant Miller. 2005. "The role of public health improvements in health advances: The twentieth-century United States." *Demography* 42 (1): 1–22. [PubMed: 15782893]
- Deolalikar Anil B. 2009. "How do Indian Muslims fare on social indicators?" In *Handbook of Muslims in India: Empirical and Policy Perspectives*, edited by Rakesh Basant and Abusaleh Shariff. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Doblhammer Gabriele, and Vaupel James W.. 2001. "Lifespan depends on month of birth." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 98 (5): 2934–39.
- Duflo Esther, Greenstone Michael, Guiteras Raymond, and Clasen Thomas. 2015. "Toilets Can Work: Short and Medium Run Health Impacts of Addressing Complementarities and Externalities in Water and Sanitation." National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) Working Paper 21521.
- Filmer Deon, and Pritchett Lant H.. 2001. "Estimating Wealth Effects Without Expenditure Data—or Tears: An Application to Educational Enrollments in States of India." *Demography* 38 (1): 115–32. [PubMed: 11227840]
- Freedman David A. 1991. "Statistical Models and Shoe Leather." *Sociological Methodology* 21: 291–313.
- Friis H, Mwaniki D, Omondi B, Muniu E, Thiong'o F, Ouma J, Magnussen P, et al. 2003. "Effects on haemoglobin of multi-micronutrient supplementation and multi-helminth chemotherapy: A randomized, controlled trial in Kenyan school children." *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 57 (4): 573–79. [PubMed: 12700619]
- Galiani Sebastian, Paul Gertler, and Ernesto Schargrodsy. 2005. "Water for Life: The Impact of the Privatization of Water Services on Child Mortality." *Journal of Political Economy* 113 (1): 83–120.
- Gertler Paul, Shah Manisha, Maria Laura Alzua, Lisa Cameron, Martinez Sebastian, and Patil Sumeet. 2015. "How Does Health Promotion Work? Evidence from the Dirty Business of Eliminating Open Defecation." National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) Working Paper 20997.
- Geruso Michael. 2012. "Black-White Disparities in Life Expectancy: How Much Can the Standard SES Variables Explain?" *Demography* 49 (2): 553–74. [PubMed: 22287272]
- Geruso Michael, and Spears Dean. 2018. "Neighborhood Sanitation and Infant Mortality: Dataset." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*. 10.1257/app.20150431.
- Government of India. 2011. "Census of India, 2011." <http://censusindia.gov.in/2011-Common/CensusData2011.html>.
- Guiteras Raymond P., Levine David I., Luby Stephen P., Polley Thomas H., Kaniz Khatun-e-Jannat, and Leanne Unicomb. 2016. "Disgust, Shame, and Soapy Water: Tests of Novel Interventions to Promote Safe Water and Hygiene." *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* 3 (2): 321–59.
- Guiteras Raymond P., James Levinsohn, and Ahmed Mushfiq Mobarak. 2015. "Encouraging sanitation investment in the developing world: A cluster-randomized trial." *Science* 348 (6237): 903–06. [PubMed: 25883316]
- Hammer Jeffrey, and Dean Spears. 2016. "Village sanitation and child health: Effects and external validity in a randomized field experiment in rural India." *Journal of Health Economics* 48: 135–48. [PubMed: 27179199]
- Headey Derek, Hoddinott John, Ali Disha, Tesfaye Roman, and Dereje Mekdim. 2015. "The Other Asian Enigma: Explaining the Rapid Reduction of Undernutrition in Bangladesh." *World Development* 66: 749–61.
- Humphrey Jean H. 2009. "Child undernutrition, tropical enteropathy, toilets, and handwashing." *Lancet* 374 (9694): 1032–35. [PubMed: 19766883]
- Jayachandran Seema, and Kuziemko Ilyana. 2010. "Why Do Mothers Breastfeed Girls Less than Boys? Evidence and Implications for Child Health in India." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 126 (3): 1485–1538.
- Jayachandran Seema, and Pande Rohini. 2013. "Why Are Indian Children Shorter than African Children?" http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/rpande/files/why_are_indian_children_shorter_than_african_children.pdf.
- Kielmann Arnfried A., and Colin McCord. 1978. "Weight-for-age as an index of risk of death in children." *Lancet* 311 (8076): 1247–50.
- Lin Audrie, Arnold Benjamin F., Sadia Afreen, Rie Goto, Tarique Mohammad Nurul Huda, Rashidul Haque, Rubhana Raqib, et al. 2013. "Household Environmental Conditions Are Associated with Enteropathy and Impaired Growth in Rural Bangladesh." *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* 89 (1): 130–37. [PubMed: 23629931]
- Miguel Edward, and Michael Kremer. 2004. "Worms: Identifying Impacts on Education and Health in the Presence of Treatment Externalities." *Econometrica* 72 (1): 159–217.

- Million Death Study Collaborators. 2010. "Causes of neonatal and child mortality in India: A nationally representative mortality survey." *Lancet* 376 (9755): 1853–60. [PubMed: 21075444]
- Mondal Dinesh, Minak Juliana, Alam Masud, Liu Yue, Dai Jing, Korpe Poonum, Liu Lei, et al. 2011. "Contribution of Enteric Infection, Altered Intestinal Barrier Function, and Maternal Malnutrition to Infant Malnutrition in Bangladesh." *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 54 (2): 185–92. [PubMed: 22109945]
- W. Henry Mosley, and Chen Lincoln C.. 1984. "An Analytical Framework for the Study of Child Survival in Developing Countries." *Population and Development Review* 10: 25–45.
- Petri William A. Jr., Mark Miller, Binder Henry J., Levine Myron M., Rebecca Dillingham, and Guerrant Richard L.. 2008. "Enteric infections, diarrhea, and their impact on function and development." *Journal of Clinical Investigation* 118 (4): 1277–90. [PubMed: 18382740]
- Prendergast Andrew J., Sandra Rukobo, Bernard Chasekwa, Kuda Mutasa, Robert Ntozini, Mbuya Mduduzi N. N., Andrew Jones, et al. 2014. "Stunting Is Characterized by Chronic Inflammation in Zimbabwean Infants." *PLoS ONE* 9 (2): e86928.
- Ramaswami Gita. 2005. *India Stinking: Manual Scavengers in Andhra Pradesh and Their Work*. New Delhi: Navayana.
- Rosenberg Irwin H., and Bowman Barbara B.. 1982. "Intestinal Physiology and Parasitic Diseases." *Reviews of Infectious Diseases* 4 (4): 763–67. [PubMed: 6812195]
- Sachar Rajindar, Hamid Saiyid, Oommen TK, Basith MA, Rakesh Basant, Akhtar Majeed, and Abusaleh Shariff. 2006. *Social, Economic and Educational Status of the Muslim Community of India*. Government of India. New Delhi, November.
- Schmidt Wolf-Peter, Sophie Boisson, Bernd Genser, Barreto Mauricio L., Kathy Baisley, Suzanne Filteau, and Sandy Cairncross. 2010. "Weight-for-age z-score as a proxy marker for diarrhoea in epidemiological studies." *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 64 (12): 1074–79. [PubMed: 19955098]
- Shariff Abusaleh. 1995. "Socio-Economic and Demographic Differentials between Hindus and Muslims in India." *Economic and Political Weekly* 30 (46): 2947–53.
- Spears Dean. 2013. "Policy Lessons from the Implementation of India's Total Sanitation Campaign." *India Policy Forum* 9: 63–104.
- Spears Dean, and Sneha Lamba. 2016. "Effects of Early-Life Exposure to Rural Sanitation on Childhood Cognitive Skills: Evidence from India's Total Sanitation Campaign." *Journal of Human Resources* 51 (2): 298–327.
- Steckel Richard. 2009. "Heights and human welfare: Recent developments and new directions." *Explorations in Economic History* 46 (1): 1–23.
- Watson Tara. 2006. "Public health investments and the infant mortality gap: Evidence from federal sanitation interventions on U.S. Indian reservations." *Journal of Public Economics* 90 (8–9): 1537–60.


This article has been cited by:

1. Matthias Flückiger, Markus Ludwig. 2023. Mobile phone coverage and infant mortality in sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 211, 462–485.
2. Dasgupta Aparajita, Majid Farhan, Wafa Hakim Orman. 2023. The nutritional cost of beef bans in India. *Journal of Development Economics* 163, 103104.
3. Seth Payal, Jain Palakh. 2023. What are the Key Determinants of Child Malnutrition in India? Empirical Evidence from NFHS-4. *The Indian Economic Journal* 53, 001946622211378.
4. Das Upasak, Kuang Jinyi, Ashraf Sania, Shpenev Alex, Bicchieri Cristina. 2023. Women as Pioneers: Examining Their Role in Decision Making on Toilet Construction in India. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities* 24:1, 70–97.
5. Evan Plous Kresch, Mark Walker, Michael Carlos Best, François Gerard, Naritomi Joana. 2023. Sanitation and property tax compliance: Analyzing the social contract in Brazil. *Journal of Development Economics* 160, 102954.
6. YuJung Julia Lee. 2022. Understanding the use of shared sanitation facilities in Delhi's slums. *Development in Practice* 30, 1–13.

7. Dayal Vikram, Murugesan Anand, Rahman Tauhidur. 2022. Drain on your health : Sanitation externalities from dirty drains in India. *Review of Development Economics* 26:4, 2251–2273.
8. Ranjan Mukesh, Laxmi Kant Dwivedi, Shivalingappa Halli. 2022. Infant Death Clustering in the Quarter of a Century in India: A Decomposition Analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 19:21, 14384. [PubMed: 36361267]
9. Natkhov Timur, Vasilenok Natalia. 2022. Ethnic-specific infant care practices and infant mortality in late Imperial Russia. *The Economic History Review* 52. .
10. Tiwari Piyush, Raghu Dharmapuri Tirumala, Jyoti Shukla. 2022. Household choices of sanitation infrastructure and impact on disease in India. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science* 49:8, 2054–2071.
11. Gupta Aashish, Sudharsanan Nikkil. 2022. Large and Persistent Life Expectancy Disparities between India's Social Groups. *Population and Development Review* 48:3, 863–882.
12. Prakash Srayasi, Kumar Pradeep, Dhillon Preeti, Unisa Sayeed. 2022. Correlates of access to sanitation facilities and benefits received from the Swachh Bharat Mission in India: analysis of cross-sectional data from the 2018 National Sample Survey. *BMJ Open* 12:7, e060118.
13. Oana-Ramona Socoliuc (Guri), Nicoleta Sirghi, D nu -Vasile Jemna, Mihaela David. 2022. Corruption and Population Health in the European Union Countries—An Institutional Perspective. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 19:9, 5110. [PubMed: 35564505]
14. Brown Caitlin, Kandpal Eeshani, Lee Jean, Williams Anaise. Unequal Households or Communities? Decomposing the Inequality in Nutritional Status in South Asia 38, .
15. Noorulhaq GHAFOOR . 2022. THE CAUSAL EFFECT OF WATER AND SANITATION ON CHILDREN UNDER FIVE-YEAR MORTALITY IN AFGHANISTAN. *ESTÜDAM Halk Sa ğ lı 1 Dergisi* 7:1, 83–97.
16. Chakraborty Saurav, Josef Novotný, Jadab Das, Bardhan Aditi, Roy Srijanee, Mondal Swikriti, Priyank Pravin Patel, Sneha Santra, Maity Indranil, Biswas Rimi, Maji Aparajita, Pramanik Suvamoy. 2022. Geography matters for sanitation! Spatial heterogeneity of the district-level correlates of open defecation in India. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 43:1, 62–84.
17. Chirgwin Hannah, Cairncross Sandy, Zehra Dua, Hugh Sharma Waddington. 2021. Interventions promoting uptake of water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) technologies in low- and middle-income countries: An evidence and gap map of effectiveness studies. *Campbell Systematic Reviews* 17:4. .
18. Singh Prachi, Dey Sagnik. 2021. Crop burning and forest fires: Long-term effect on adolescent height in India. *Resource and Energy Economics* 65, 101244.
19. YuJung Julia Lee, Tiffany Radcliff. 2021. Community interactions and sanitation use by the urban poor: Survey evidence from India's slums. *Urban Studies* 58:4, 715–732.
20. Hugh Sharma Waddington, Sandy Cairncross. 2021. PROTOCOL: Water, sanitation and hygiene for reducing childhood mortality in low- and middle-income countries. *Campbell Systematic Reviews* 17:1. .
21. Kumar Pradeep, Patel Ratna, Chauhan Shekhar, Srivastava Shobhit, Khare Ankur, Kamlesh Kumar Patel. 2021. Does socio-economic inequality in infant mortality still exists in India? An analysis based on National Family Health Survey 2005–06 and 2015–16. *Clinical Epidemiology and Global Health* 9, 116–122.
22. Zhou Wanli, Gu Yingwen, Wang Xiulin. 2021. Access to sanitary toilets and health outcomes: A panel data analysis using two-way fixed effects model. *Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering* 18:6, 8815–8830. [PubMed: 34814324]
23. Jennifer Orgill-Meyer. 2020. Interaction of village and school latrines on educational outcomes in India. *Journal of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development* 10:4, 618–627.
24. Spears Dean. 2020. Exposure to open defecation can account for the Indian enigma of child height. *Journal of Development Economics* 146, 102277.
25. Evan Plous Kresch, Molly Lipscomb, Schechter Laura. 2020. Externalities and Spillovers from Sanitation and Waste Management in Urban and Rural Neighborhoods. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy* 42:3, 395–420.

26. Evan Plous Kresch. 2020. The Buck Stops Where? Federalism, Uncertainty, and Investment in the Brazilian Water and Sanitation Sector. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 12:3, 374–401. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]
27. Daniel Gallardo-Albarrán. 2020. Sanitary infrastructures and the decline of mortality in Germany, 1877–1913†. *The Economic History Review* 73:3, 730–757.
28. Chakrabarti Suman, Singh Parvati, Bruckner Tim. 2020. Association of Poor Sanitation With Growth Measurements Among Children in India. *JAMA Network Open* 3:4, e202791.
29. Banerjee Subhanil, Ashok Kumar Sar, Shilpa Pandey. 2020. Improved yet Unsafe: An Aquatic Perspective of Indian Infant Mortality. *Journal of Health Management* 22:1, 57–66.
30. Spears Dean, Dey Sagnik, Chowdhury Sourangsu, Scovronick Noah, Vyas Sangita, Apte Joshua. 2019. The association of early-life exposure to ambient PM2.5 and later-childhood height-for-age in India: an observational study. *Environmental Health* 18:1. . [PubMed: 30606207]
31. Finaret Amelia B., Masters William A.. 2019. Beyond Calories: The New Economics of Nutrition. *Annual Review of Resource Economics* 11:1, 237–259.
32. Gupta Aashish. 2019. Where there is smoke: solid fuel externalities, gender, and adult respiratory health in India. *Population and Environment* 41:1, 32–51.
33. Ranjan Mukesh, Laxmi Kant Dwivedi. 2019. DEATH CLUSTERING IN INDIA: LEVELS, TRENDS, AND DIFFERENTIALS, 1992–2016. *Indian Journal of Child Health* 6:4, 165–172.
34. Adukia Anjali, Alsan Marcella, Kimberly Singer Babiarz, Goldhaber-Fiebert Jeremy D., Prince Lea. 2019. Religion and Sanitation Practices. *SSRN Electronic Journal* .
35. Kresch Evan, Lipscomb Molly, Schechter Laura. 2019. Externalities and Spillovers from Sanitation and Waste Management in Urban and Rural Neighborhoods. *SSRN Electronic Journal* .
36. Josef Novotný, František Ficek, Hill Joseph K.W., Anant Kumar. 2018. Social determinants of environmental health: A case of sanitation in rural Jharkhand. *Science of The Total Environment* 643, 762–774. [PubMed: 29958166]
37. Vyas Sangita, Spears Dean. 2018. Sanitation and Religion in South Asia: What Accounts for Differences across Countries?. *The Journal of Development Studies* 54:11, 2119–2135. [PubMed: 30363925]
38. Calvi Rossella, Mantovanelli Federico G.. 2018. Long-term effects of access to health care: Medical missions in colonial India. *Journal of Development Economics* 135, 285–303.
39. Saraswat Deepak. 2018. Gender Composition of Children and Sanitation Behavior in India. *SSRN Electronic Journal* .
40. Brown Caitlin, Calvi Rossella, Penglase Jacob. 2018. Sharing the Pie: Undernutrition, Intra-Household Allocation, and Poverty. *SSRN Electronic Journal* .

Panel A. IMR versus asset wealth



Panel B. IMR versus mother's height




Figure 1. PUZZLE: At ALL LEVELS of PARENTAL WEALTH AND HEALTH, HINDU IMR Is HIGHER

Notes: The figure plots local regressions of infant mortality on measures of economic well-being. The dependent variable is an indicator for death in the first year of life \times 1,000. Panel A plots mortality against asset wealth rank, constructed as described in the text. Panel B plots mortality against mother's height. Observations are children (live births). Thinner lines in the figure correspond to 95 percent confidence intervals that are not adjusted for clustering. Table 2 reports standard errors that account for clustering.




Figure 2. INFANT MORTALITY DECREASES WITH MUSLIM NEIGHBORS FOR BOTH HINDUS AND MUSLIMS

Notes: The figure plots local regressions of infant mortality on the fraction of the neighborhood that is Muslim. The dependent variable is an indicator for death in the first year of life $\times 1,000$. Neighborhoods are defined as survey PSUs. Panel A plots the raw relationship, separately for Hindus and Muslims. Panel B plots residuals after conditioning on own open defecation. Observations are live births in mixed-religion PSUs ($0 < \bar{M} < 1$). Thinner lines in the figure correspond to 95 percent confidence intervals that are not adjusted for clustering. Table 2 reports standard errors that account for clustering.




Figure 3. MUSLIM SHARE (\bar{M}) IN SURVEY PRIMARY SAMPLING UNITS

Notes: The figure shows the histogram of Muslim concentration across primary sampling units (PSUs) in the NFHS survey. Observations are PSUs. Most PSUs are perfectly segregated along religious lines, with either 0 percent or 100 percent Muslim shares. The point mass representing 100 percent Hindu, which comprises about two-thirds of all PSUs, is not drawn to scale.




Figure 4. GREATER MUSLIM SHARE (\bar{M}) PREDICTS NEUTRAL OR WORSE PSU CHARACTERISTICS, EXCEPT LATRINE USE

Notes: The figure plots local regressions. The dependent variables in panels A and B are household-level characteristics, and the regressor is Muslim concentration in the PSU (\bar{M}_j). Each dependent variable is defined such that higher values predict better infant health outcomes. The signs of the relationships between these variables and infant mortality are confirmed in online Appendix Table A2. The dependent variables include asset wealth (as the fraction of the seven assets reported in all survey rounds) and indicators for

household electrification, household piped water, institutional delivery of the child, any child vaccinations, family possession of a national health card, mother having a say in child's health care, mothers' literacy, and latrine use. Panel A includes all PSUs in the sample. Panel B includes only mixed-religion PSUs ($0 < \bar{M} < 1$). Observations are live births. In panels C and D, we plot actual and predicted IMR versus fraction Muslim in the full and mixed-PSU samples. Predicted values in panels C and D are generated via a regression of IMR on the neighborhood-level means of the variables examined in panels A and B, other than latrine use.

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript




Figure 5. NEIGHBORHOOD SANITATION AND INFANT MORTALITY

Notes: The figure plots local regressions of infant mortality on the fraction of the neighborhood that defecates in the open. The dependent variable is an indicator for death in the first year of life $\times 1,000$. Neighborhoods are defined as survey PSUs. Panel A plots the raw relationship, separately for Hindus and Muslims. Panel B plots residuals after conditioning on own open defecation. Observations are live births in mixed-religion PSUs ($0 < \bar{M} < 1$). Thinner lines in the figure correspond to 95 percent confidence intervals that are not adjusted for clustering. Online Appendix Table A3 reports standard errors that account for clustering.



Panel A. Δ IMR versus Δ ODPanel B. Muslim coefficient versus Δ OD

Figure 6. HINDU-MUSLIM IMR GAP TRACKS HETEROGENEITY IN FIRST-STAGE RELATIONSHIP ACROSS STATES

H Notes: The figure shows how heterogeneity in the “first-stage” relationship between religious identity and open defecation is reflected in the reduced-form relationship between religious identity and IMR. Scatter points are Indian states \times survey rounds, with marker sizes proportional to sample sizes. Panel A plots the Hindu-Muslim mean IMR difference versus the Hindu-Muslim mean difference in OD for each state \times round. Panel B plots the t -statistic on an indicator for Muslim in an individual-level regression in which the dependent variable is IMR. That regression follows the specification in panel A, column 1 of Table 2—but is estimated separately for each state \times round cell. OLS regressions fit to the scatterpoints are displayed in each panel, along with 95 percent confidence intervals.

TABLE 1—

SUMMARY STATISTICS: HINDUS AND MUSLIMS IN THE NFHS

| | <u>Hindu subsample</u> | | <u>Muslim subsample</u> | |
|---|------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|
| | <u>Mean</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>Mean</u> | <u>SD</u> |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| Infant mortality rate (IMR), year 1 | 74.1 | 261.9 | 63.0 | 243.0 |
| Neonatal mortality rate (NMR), month 1 | 47.5 | 212.6 | 39.8 | 195.6 |
| Household open defecation | 0.68 | 0.47 | 0.43 | 0.49 |
| Local (PSU) open defecation | 0.66 | 0.38 | 0.45 | 0.38 |
| Local (PSU) fraction Muslim | 0.06 | 0.14 | 0.69 | 0.31 |
| Household has electricity | 0.59 | 0.49 | 0.59 | 0.49 |
| Household has piped water | 0.35 | 0.48 | 0.37 | 0.48 |
| Household is urban | 0.28 | 0.45 | 0.40 | 0.49 |
| Household has radio | 0.36 | 0.48 | 0.36 | 0.48 |
| Household has TV | 0.33 | 0.47 | 0.31 | 0.46 |
| Household has refrigerator | 0.10 | 0.30 | 0.10 | 0.30 |
| Household has bicycle | 0.46 | 0.50 | 0.41 | 0.49 |
| Household has motorcycle | 0.12 | 0.33 | 0.10 | 0.29 |
| Household has car | 0.02 | 0.14 | 0.02 | 0.12 |
| Mother's height (cm) | 151.5 | 5.8 | 152.0 | 5.8 |
| Mother no education | 0.58 | 0.49 | 0.64 | 0.48 |
| Mother completed primary | 0.27 | 0.45 | 0.21 | 0.40 |
| Child breastfed for at least six months | 0.91 | 0.28 | 0.91 | 0.28 |
| Child's birth order | 2.46 | 1.17 | 2.74 | 1.20 |
| Child is female | 0.48 | 0.50 | 0.49 | 0.50 |
| Observations (live births) | 232,123 | | 46,300 | |

Notes: The table displays summary statistics for our main analysis sample, rounds 1, 2, and 3 of the NFHS. Neonatal and infant mortality are defined, respectively, as the number of deaths among children less than one month old and less than one year old, scaled per 1,000 live births. Observations are children (live births).

TABLE 2—

MAIN RESULT: NEIGHBORHOOD COMPOSITIONS PREDICTS MORTALITY

| Dependent variable: | Infant mortality (IMR) | | | | Neonatal mortality (NMR) | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| <i>Panel A. Survey round fixed effects only</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Muslim | -9.8 (1.5) | -4.1 (2.4) | -3.8 (2.3) | -3.8 (2.3) | -7.1 (1.2) | -2.8 (2.0) | -2.5 (2.0) | -2.5 (2.0) |
| PSU fraction Muslim | | | -9.6 (3.0) | -11.8 (4.2) | | | -7.4 (2.5) | -9.4 (3.3) |
| PSU fixed effects | | X | | | | X | | |
| Indicators for all Muslim and no Muslim | | | | X | | | | X |
| Mean of dependent variable | 72.2 | 72.2 | 72.2 | 72.2 | 46.2 | 46.2 | 46.2 | 46.2 |
| Observations (live births) | 278,423 | 278,423 | 278,423 | 278,423 | 278,423 | 278,423 | 278,423 | 278,423 |
| <i>Panel B. Extended controls</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Muslim | -9.5 (1.5) | -3.4 (2.4) | -4.2 (2.3) | -4.2 (2.3) | -5.8 (1.2) | -1.7 (2.0) | -2.1 (1.9) | -2.1 (1.9) |
| PSU fraction Muslim | | | -8.6 (2.9) | -13.3 (3.9) | | | -6.1 (2.5) | -9.9 (3.2) |
| Extended controls | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| PSU fixed effects | | X | | | | X | | |
| Indicators for all Muslim and no Muslim | | | | X | | | | X |
| Mean of dependent variable | 72.2 | 72.2 | 72.2 | 72.2 | 46.2 | 46.2 | 46.2 | 46.2 |
| Observations (live births) | 278,423 | 278,423 | 278,423 | 278,423 | 278,423 | 278,423 | 278,423 | 278,423 |

Notes: The table reports results from OLS regressions. The dependent variable in columns 1 through 4 is infant mortality (year 1). The dependent variable in columns 5 through 8 is neonatal mortality (month 1). Mortality variables are scaled as described in the text to generate coefficients that indicate impacts on rates $\times 1,000$ (deaths per 1,000 children). All regressions include survey round fixed effects. Columns 4 and 8 control both for the Muslim share of the PSU and for indicators for all-Muslim and all-Hindu neighborhoods. Extended controls in panel B include a full set of birth order indicators interacted with sex, indicators for household ownership of each of the seven assets asked about throughout NFHS survey rounds, an indicator for piped water, an indicator for whether the mother lives with her husband's parents, indicators for child's birth month and birth year, an indicator for the child being a multiple birth, an urban indicator, household size, mother's education in years, and an indicator for mother's literacy, as well as PSU-level means of household assets, household electricity, household piped water, whether births occurred in an institution, whether mothers had birth assistance, whether children were ever vaccinated, household possession of a health card, and father's education in years. See the text for additional details. Observations are children (live births). Standard errors are clustered at the PSU level.

TABLE 3—

HETEROGENEITY IN THE MUSLIM ADVANTAGE, BY LOCAL OD PREVALENCE

| Dependent variable: | Infant mortality (IMR) | | Neonatal mortality (NMR) | |
|---|------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| | PSU OD = 0 | PSU OD > 0 | PSU OD = 0 | PSU OD > 0 |
| Sample restriction: | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| <i>Panel A: Own religion</i> | | | | |
| Own household Muslim | 1.6 (3.9) | -8.7 (2.2) | 1.5 (3.3) | -6.5 (1.8) |
| χ^2 test for equality of coeffs. | $p = 0.02$ | | $p = 0.03$ | |
| <i>Panel B: Neighbors' religion</i> | | | | |
| PSU fraction Muslim | 1.6 (6.6) | -16.0 (4.0) | -1.1 (5.2) | -12.0 (3.0) |
| χ^2 test for equality of coeffs. | $p = 0.02$ | | $p = 0.07$ | |
| <i>Panel C: Own and neighbors' religion</i> | | | | |
| Own household Muslim | 1.6 (4.8) | -4.6 (2.6) | 3.2 (4.2) | -3.3 (2.2) |
| PSU fraction Muslim | 0.0 (8.3) | -11.4 (4.7) | -4.3 (6.7) | -8.7 (3.7) |
| χ^2 test: Own household Muslim | $p = 0.26$ | | $p = 0.16$ | |
| χ^2 test: PSU fraction Muslim | $p = 0.23$ | | $p = 0.57$ | |
| OD mean | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.00 | 0.60 |
| PSUs | 631 | 2,445 | 631 | 2,445 |
| Observations (live births) | 13,546 | 90,544 | 13,546 | 90,544 |

Notes: The table reports results from OLS regressions run over subsamples of the NFHS data. Columns divide the sample into partitions according to the mean of household-level open defecation in the PSU, either zero or greater than zero. The sample consists of mixed-religion PSUs ($0 < \bar{M} < 1$). Household-level observations of open defecation reported in the NFHS do not account for possibly discordant latrine use behaviors among household members. The dependent variable in columns 1 and 2 is infant mortality (year 1), and in columns 3 and 4 is neonatal mortality (month 1). The χ^2 statistic tests for equality between the reported coefficients in column 1 versus column 2 and in column 3 versus column 4. Survey round fixed effects are included in all specifications. See Table 2 for additional notes. Observations are children (live births). Standard errors are clustered at the PSU level.

TABLE 4—

STATED AND REVEALED PREFERENCES OVER LATRINE OWNERSHIP AND USE

| | Unit of observation | Hindu mean (1) | Muslim mean (2) |
|--|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Open defecation, unconditionally | All persons | 0.73 | 0.45 |
| | in household | (0.00) | (0.01) |
| Open defecation, conditional on owning latrine | All persons | 0.26 | 0.10 |
| | in household | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| Owns latrine | Household | 0.34 | 0.52 |
| | | (0.01) | (0.04) |
| Says religious leader ever told them where to defecate | Respondent | 0.16 | 0.33 |
| | | (0.00) | (0.01) |
| Says open defecation far from home is pure | Respondent | 0.53 | 0.40 |
| | | (0.01) | (0.04) |
| Says latrine use near home is pure | Respondent | 0.45 | 0.54 |
| | | (0.01) | (0.04) |
| Says open defecation is healthier for village children | Respondent | 0.40 | 0.27 |
| | | (0.01) | (0.03) |

Notes: The table reports means and standard errors of survey responses from the Sanitation Quality, Use, Access, and Trends (SQUAT) Survey, 2013–2014. Responses are stratified by religious group. The table contains information on 22,787 individuals in 3,235 sampled rural households in Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, and Uttar Pradesh. The unit of observation differs across rows and includes either all persons in the household, whether interviewed or told about; the household itself; or the survey respondent (one per household). Standard errors of the means, clustered by village, are shown in parentheses. All across-group comparisons are statistically significant at the 5 percent level.

TABLE 5—

TESTS OF MECHANISM: ANEMIA AND CURRENT WEIGHT

| Dependent variable: | Blood hemoglobin (g/dL) | | | | Weight-for-age z—score | | | | Weight-for-height z—score | | | |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) |
| Muslim | 0.151 (0.034) | -0.015 (0.049) | 0.020 (0.047) | 0.005 (0.046) | 0.128 (0.028) | 0.009 (0.059) | 0.056 (0.042) | 0.046 (0.042) | 0.135 (0.032) | 0.016 (0.062) | 0.032 (0.046) | 0.021 (0.045) |
| PSU fraction Muslim | | | 0.199 (0.062) | 0.090 (0.063) | | | 0.093 (0.074) | -0.009 (0.075) | | | 0.123 (0.084) | 0.001 (0.085) |
| Own household OD | | | | -0.256 (0.059) | | | | -0.139 (0.033) | | | | -0.159 (0.036) |
| PSU mean OD (except own) | | | | -0.155 (0.034) | | | | -0.274 (0.055) | | | | -0.326 (0.063) |
| Extended controls | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| PSU fixed effects | | X | | | | X | | | | X | | |
| Indicators for all Muslim and no Muslim | | | X | X | | | X | X | | | X | X |
| Mean of dep. variable | 10.3 | 10.3 | 10.3 | 10.3 | -1.89 | -1.89 | -1.89 | -1.89 | -0.94 | -0.94 | -0.94 | -0.94 |
| Observations (children) | 26,330 | 26,330 | 26,330 | 26,330 | 21,636 | 21,636 | 21,636 | 21,636 | 21,164 | 21,164 | 21,164 | 21,164 |

Notes: The table reports results from OLS regressions. The dependent variables are indicated at the column header and are either blood hemoglobin in g/dL, or weight-for-age or weight-for-height scaled as WHO z-scores. Hemoglobin levels are affected by intestinal parasites. Current weight is an outcome reflecting acute malnutrition, and is recommended in the medical literature as a preferred measure for recent bouts of diarrhea. PSU mean OD is calculated over all households in the PSU other than the respondent household. Controls are as described in the Table 2 notes. Observations are children (live births). Due to the DHS/NFHS surveying scheme, the hemoglobin and anthropometry measurements exist for only a small subset of our main analysis sample. The sample in columns 1 through 4 includes all observations for which hemoglobin was collected in the NFHS data. The sample in columns 5 through 12 includes all children up to 24 months for whom a weight measurement was taken. Standard errors are clustered at the PSU level.

TABLE 6—

TEST OF MECHANISM: INTERACTION BETWEEN BREASTFEEDING EFFICACY AND \overline{OD}

| Dependent variable: | Infant mortality (IMR) | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| Muslim | -38.4 | | -23.6 | | 9.9 | | -28.3 |
| | (14.0) | | (22.6) | | (13.7) | | (22.0) |
| Breastfed × Muslim | 31.5 | | 24.3 | | -20.8 | | 29.0 |
| | (14.1) | | (22.7) | | (13.8) | | (22.1) |
| PSU fraction Muslim | | -48.0 | -24.4 | | | 32.2 | 60.6 |
| | | (18.3) | (29.1) | | | (18.1) | (28.6) |
| PSU fraction Muslim × breastfed | | 35.5 | 11.2 | | | -51.2 | -80.3 |
| | | (18.1) | (29.1) | | | (17.8) | (28.5) |
| PSU OD (except own) | | | | 233.8 | 233.6 | 236.6 | 236.8 |
| | | | | (13.7) | (14.0) | (14.1) | (14.1) |
| PSU OD (except own) × breastfed | | | | -246.6 | -250.5 | -256.3 | -256.5 |
| | | | | (13.5) | (13.7) | (13.7) | (13.7) |
| Breastfed | -245.5 | -246.2 | -246.2 | -110.7 | -105.1 | -96.8 | -96.7 |
| | (6.4) | (6.7) | (6.7) | (7.7) | (8.5) | (8.8) | (8.8) |
| Extended controls | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Indicators for all Muslim and no Muslim | | X | X | | | X | X |
| Observations (live births) | 83,702 | 83,702 | 83,702 | 83,702 | 83,702 | 83,702 | 83,702 |

Notes: The table reports results from OLS regressions. The dependent variable is IMR, scaled as described in the text to generate coefficients that indicate impacts on rates $\times 1,000$ (deaths per 1,000 children). The breastfed indicator is equal to one if the infant was exclusively breastfed during the first six months of life if she survived, or until death if she died. PSU mean OD is calculated over all households in the PSU other than the respondent household. Controls are as described in the Table 2 notes. All regressions include survey round fixed effects. Observations are children (live births). Standard errors are clustered at the PSU level.

TABLE 7—

FALSIFICATION TESTS: \overline{M}_j DOES NOT PREDICT DIET DIFFERENCES ACROSS PSUs

| Dependent variable: | Nonvegetarian | | | Meat (kg), conditional on > 0 | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| <i>Panel A. Meat eating</i> | | | | | | |
| Muslim | 0.15 (0.02) | 0.15 (0.02) | 0.14 (0.02) | 0.89 (0.15) | 0.90 (0.21) | 0.84 (0.20) |
| PSU fraction Muslim | | 0.01 (0.04) | 0.01 (0.04) | | -0.02 (0.29) | -0.01 (0.30) |
| IHDS Controls | | | X | | | X |
| Mean of dependent variable | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 3.35 | 3.35 | 3.35 |
| Observations (households) | 37,195 | 37,195 | 37,195 | 9,235 | 9,235 | 9,235 |
| Dependent variable: | Eggs (dozen) | | | Milk (liters) | | |
| | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) |
| <i>Panel B. Other diet variables</i> | | | | | | |
| Muslim | 5.16 (0.56) | 4.27 (0.47) | 4.32 (0.47) | -2.89 (0.90) | -2.27 (0.61) | -1.95 (0.58) |
| PSU fraction Muslim | | 1.53 (0.96) | 1.51 (0.98) | | -1.08 (1.66) | 0.53 (1.56) |
| IHDS controls | | | X | | | X |
| Mean of dependent variable | 4.86 | 4.86 | 4.86 | 18.24 | 18.24 | 18.24 |
| Observations (households) | 37,195 | 37,195 | 37,195 | 37,195 | 37,195 | 37,195 |

Notes: The table reports results from OLS regressions, using data from the India Human Development Survey of 2012. Dependent variables are listed in the column headers, and include an indicator for consuming meat and continuous measures of meat consumed (kg), eggs consumed (dozens), and milk consumed (liters), per household per month. All columns control for own religion. IHDS controls include an urban indicator and log of consumption, measured as rupees per month per capita. Observations are households. Standard errors are clustered at the PSU level.

TABLE 8—

FALSIFICATION TESTS: \overline{M}_j DOES NOT PREDICT OTHER HYGIENE BEHAVIORS ACROSS PSUs

| Dependent variable: | Always wash hands after defecating | | Usually/ always wash hands after defecating | | Always purify water | | Usually/ always purify water | | Piped public water to home | | Open defecation | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|---|--------|---------------------|--------|------------------------------|--------|----------------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) |
| PSU fraction | 0.05 | 0.03 | -0.01 | -0.01 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | -0.01 | -0.07 | -0.11 | -0.19 | -0.14 |
| Muslim | (0.04) | (0.04) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.02) | (0.02) | (0.03) | (0.03) | (0.03) | (0.02) | (0.04) | (0.03) |
| IHDS controls | | X | | X | | X | | X | | X | | X |
| Mean of dep. variable | 0.72 | 0.72 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.49 | 0.49 |
| Observations (households) | 36,608 | 36,608 | 36,608 | 36,608 | 36,608 | 36,608 | 36,608 | 36,608 | 36,608 | 36,608 | 36,608 | 36,608 |

Notes: The table reports results from OLS regressions, using data from the India Human Development Survey of 2012. Dependent variables are listed in the column headers, and include indicators for washing hands after defecating, for purifying water, for own household open defecation, and for having public piped drinking water into the home. All columns control for own religion. IHDS controls include an urban indicator and log of consumption, measured as rupees per month per capita. Observations are households. Standard errors are clustered at the PSU level.

TABLE 9—

IV ESTIMATES EXPLOITING PSU-LEVEL VARIATION IN THE COMPOSITION OF NEIGHBORS

| Sample restriction: | Mixed religion PSUs | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | OLS | OLS | IV | IV | IV | IV | IV |
| Specification: | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| <i>Panel A. Infant mortality (IMR)</i> | | | | | | | |
| PSU mean OD (except own) | 44.0 | 23.9 | 68.6 | 52.1 | 45.8 | 51.0 | 61.4 |
| | (2.6) | (3.6) | (15.1) | (17.6) | (31.6) | (16.1) | (21.5) |
| Own household Muslim | | -3.5 | | -3.9 | -3.3 | -3.6 | -4.8 |
| | | (2.0) | | (2.3) | (2.0) | (2.4) | (2.1) |
| Own household OD | | 20.2 | | | 7.9 | | -14.1 |
| | | (2.6) | | | (17.9) | | (7.9) |
| Extended controls | | | | | | X | X |
| Mean of dependent variable | 72.0 | 72.0 | 72.0 | 72.0 | 72.0 | 72.0 | 72.0 |
| First stage F -stat | | | 74.4 | 74.8 | 97.0 | 200.3 | 230.7 |
| Observations (live births) | 104,090 | 104,090 | 104,090 | 104,090 | 104,090 | 104,090 | 104,090 |
| Sample restriction: | Mixed religion PSUs | | | | | | |
| Specification: | OLS | OLS | IV | IV | IV | IV | IV |
| | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) |
| <i>Panel B. Neonatal mortality (NMR)</i> | | | | | | | |
| PSU mean OD (except own) | 29.4 | 16.1 | 52.1 | 41.3 | 42.5 | 38.4 | 44.1 |
| | (2.0) | (2.9) | (11.7) | (14.1) | (25.5) | (13.0) | (17.4) |
| Own household Muslim | | -2.9 | | -2.5 | -2.6 | -1.4 | -2.1 |
| | | (1.6) | | (1.9) | (1.6) | (2.0) | (1.8) |
| Own household OD | | 13.5 | | | -1.4 | | -7.8 |
| | | (2.2) | | | (14.4) | | (6.4) |
| Extended controls | | | | | | X | X |
| Mean of dependent variable | 46.6 | 46.6 | 46.6 | 46.6 | 46.6 | 46.6 | 46.6 |
| First stage F -stat | | | 74.4 | 74.8 | 97.0 | 200.3 | 230.7 |
| Observations (live births) | 104,090 | 104,090 | 104,090 | 104,090 | 104,090 | 104,090 | 104,090 |

Notes: The table reports results from OLS and IV regressions of mortality on neighbors' open defecation in the PSU (\overline{OD}_{ij}^{-i}). IV estimates instrument \overline{OD}_{ij}^{-i} with \overline{M}_j . Mortality variables are scaled as described in the text to generate coefficients that indicate impacts on rates $\times 1,000$ (deaths per 1,000 children). The sample consists of mixed-religion PSUs ($0 < \overline{M} < 1$). Extended controls are as described in the Table 2 notes. All regressions include survey round fixed effects. Observations are children (live births). Standard errors are clustered at the PSU level.