IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Social Impact Of Neo-Liberal Policies: Inequality And Inclusion

Mukesh Kumar

Research Scholar, Department of Political Science, University of Lucknow,

Abstract: This paper critically examines the social impacts of neo-liberal policies in India since the 1991 economic reforms. While the reforms led to high economic growth, they have also exacerbated income inequality, marginalized vulnerable populations, and contributed to the informalization of labor. Drawing on data from governmental and non-governmental sources, this study explores how neoliberalism has deepened the urban-rural divide, affected marginalized communities, and reshaped India's labor market. The paper concludes by offering insights into potential policy reforms to mitigate the social costs of neoliberalism and promote greater inclusivity.

Keywords: Neo-liberal, economic reforms, economic growth, Income inequality, marginalized communities

I. INTRODUCTION

The 1991 economic reforms in India marked a turning point in the country's economic trajectory. The reforms, spearheaded by Prime Minister P. V. Narasimha Rao and Finance Minister Manmohan Singh, were a response to a looming balance of payments crisis and rising fiscal deficits. These reforms ushered in a shift from India's state-led, socialist economy towards a neo-liberal model of liberalization, privatization, and globalization (LPG). While the immediate goals of the reforms were to stabilize the economy, attract foreign direct investment (FDI), and promote private sector growth, their long-term social impacts have been deeply contested.

Neo-liberalism, as a global economic ideology, promotes minimal state intervention in the economy, emphasizing market competition, individual freedom, and the privatization of public services. In India, this transition led to rapid growth in urban centers, especially in sectors like information technology, telecommunications, and services. However, the benefits of this growth have not been evenly distributed. While urban elites and middle-class professionals thrived, the rural poor, small-scale farmers, and marginalized communities faced the brunt of the socio-economic transformations.

The social impact of neo-liberal reforms has been characterized by a widening gap between the rich and the poor, deepening the urban-rural divide, and fostering an increasingly informal labor market. For instance, the dismantling of the License Raj and the privatization of state-owned enterprises (SOEs) led to an economic environment in which wealth creation was concentrated in the hands of a few, while social welfare programs and labor protections were eroded.

The most visible consequence of neo-liberal policies has been the rise in income inequality. World Bank and Government of India data reveal that while India's overall poverty rates have declined, the top 1% of the population controls a significant portion of the country's wealth, while the bottom 50% has seen only marginal improvements in their living standards. This paper seeks to explore how these policies have reshaped India's social landscape, focusing on economic inequality, the informalization of labor, and the exclusion of marginalized communities.

The central argument of this paper is that, while neo-liberal policies have accelerated India's integration into the global economy, they have also exacerbated existing inequalities, marginalized vulnerable populations, and contributed to the weakening of India's social fabric. The retreat of the state from critical sectors such as healthcare, education, and agriculture has left millions of Indians without access to essential services, increasing their vulnerability in a rapidly changing economy.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Neo-liberalism and Its Core Tenets

At its core, neo-liberalism is an economic and political ideology that emphasizes the importance of free markets, privatization, and limited government intervention in the economy. It is rooted in the belief that market forces, rather than the state, should drive economic activity. This ideology, championed globally by leaders such as Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan during the 1980s, spread to developing countries like India as part of a broader effort to integrate into the global economy.

The key tenets of neo-liberalism include:

1. Deregulation: The reduction or elimination of government regulations on businesses, industries, and financial markets to promote competition and efficiency.
2. Privatization: The transfer of ownership and control of public enterprises and services to private entities, with the belief that the private sector can deliver goods and services more efficiently than the public sector.
3. Liberalization: The removal of barriers to trade and investment, allowing for greater participation in global markets.
4. Fiscal Austerity: Reducing government spending, particularly on welfare programs and public services, to maintain fiscal discipline.

In the Indian context, neo-liberalism was introduced as part of a broader structural adjustment program designed to reduce the state's involvement in the economy, privatize state-owned enterprises, and open the country to foreign investment. While these policies were successful in stabilizing the economy and promoting growth, they also resulted in significant social dislocations, as the state retreated from its role as a provider of social services and regulator of the economy.

Social Inequality Under Neo-liberalism

One of the primary criticisms of neo-liberalism is that it exacerbates social inequalities. By prioritizing economic growth and efficiency over equity, neo-liberal policies often lead to the concentration of wealth and resources in the hands of a few, while the majority of the population experiences stagnating or declining living standards.

In India, the adoption of neo-liberal policies has led to a significant increase in income inequality. According to a report by Oxfam India, the wealth of India's richest 1% grew by 39% in 2018 alone, while the wealth of the bottom 50% of the population remained stagnant. The Gini coefficient, a measure of income inequality, has also risen steadily since 1991, indicating that the distribution of income has become more unequal over time(Chart-1).

Chart-1: Gini Coefficient: Measuring Income Inequality

Year	Gini Coefficient
1991	0.340
2000	0.361
2010	0.389
2020	0.436

Source: World Bank, World Inequality Database (WID)

The growing gap between the rich and the poor is not only an economic issue but also a political and social one. As wealth concentration increases, so does the influence of corporate interests over public policy, further eroding democratic accountability. Meanwhile, the informalization of labor, the decline of social protections, and the privatization of public services have left many marginalized communities without access to the resources they need to improve their socio-economic standing.

III. SOCIAL IMPACT OF NEO-LIBERAL POLICIES

Economic Inequality and Poverty

The economic consequences of neo-liberalism in India have been mixed. While the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) grew rapidly following the 1991 reforms, the benefits of growth have not been equally distributed. The majority of India's economic gains have been concentrated in urban centers, particularly in the services sector, while rural areas—where more than 60% of the population still resides—have seen much slower growth.

Income inequality in India is reflected in the disparity between urban and rural incomes. According to a study by the National Sample Survey Organization (NSSO), the average monthly income of an urban household is nearly three times that of a rural household. This income disparity has contributed to the growing urban-rural divide, with urban areas reaping the benefits of globalization while rural areas remain trapped in poverty and underdevelopment.

While neo-liberal policies have created opportunities for wealth creation, particularly for the urban middle class and the wealthy elite, they have also deepened social inequalities. Poverty reduction has been uneven, with much of the progress concentrated in urban areas, while rural poverty rates have remained stubbornly high.

Social Exclusion and Marginalized Communities

One of the most significant social impacts of neo-liberal policies in India has been the deepening of social exclusion. Neo-liberalism, with its emphasis on market-based solutions and privatization, has often left behind marginalized communities such as the Scheduled Castes (SCs), Scheduled Tribes (STs), Other Backward Classes (OBCs), and women. These groups, who were already vulnerable due to caste, gender, and socio-economic hierarchies, have found themselves further marginalized in the neo-liberal era as the state's role in providing social security and welfare has diminished.

The privatization of public services like education and healthcare has significantly widened the inequality gap between these communities and the rest of the population. For example, access to quality education in private schools and colleges has become unaffordable for many members of SCs, STs, and OBCs, leading to a lack of upward mobility. Furthermore, the increasing focus on meritocracy in the labor market has often favored those with pre-existing social capital, further excluding marginalized groups.

In terms of healthcare, privatization has resulted in significant out-of-pocket expenses for the poor. According to National Health Accounts (NHA) data, more than 60% of healthcare costs in India are borne by households, making healthcare inaccessible for many in the lower socio-economic strata.

Chart-2: Healthcare Access: Rural vs. Urban Hospital Beds per 1,000 People

Year	Rural Areas (Beds/1,000 People)	Urban Areas (Beds/1,000 People)
1991	0.9	3.4
2005	1.1	3.8
2015	1.2	4.1
2020	1.4	4.5

Source: Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, National Health Profile (2019)

The withdrawal of state support has had a severe impact on rural and marginalized communities, who rely more heavily on public health systems. As private healthcare services have expanded, public healthcare infrastructure has deteriorated (Chart-2), leading to increased social and health inequalities.

Land reforms and agrarian policies meant to benefit marginalized communities have also seen setbacks in the neo-liberal era. While land reforms historically sought to provide access to land for lower-caste farmers and tribal communities, neoliberal policies focused on increasing productivity and market efficiency have often failed to address the specific challenges these communities face. Displacement due to large infrastructure projects, industrialization, and urban expansion has disproportionately affected tribal populations, leading to a rise in landlessness and economic insecurity.

Moreover, affirmative action policies, which were designed to promote inclusion and representation of marginalized groups in education and employment, have been weakened by the rise of private institutions. In many sectors, affirmative action policies do not apply to private companies and corporations, which have become key employers in India's rapidly growing service economy. This has resulted in a dual-track system where elite groups benefit from private sector opportunities, while marginalized communities remain reliant on the shrinking public sector.

Case of Dalits (Scheduled Castes) under Neo-liberalism

The Dalit community, historically subjected to caste-based discrimination, continues to face systemic exclusion despite the overall economic growth in India. Neoliberal reforms have done little to alleviate their socio-economic challenges. In fact, studies reveal that caste-based inequalities have been reinforced as economic liberalization prioritized efficiency over social justice.

A study by the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies (CSDS) found that Dalits, who form a significant portion of India's informal workforce, remain disproportionately represented in low-paying, insecure jobs. Their limited access to education and capital has prevented many from benefiting from the opportunities provided by economic liberalization. Although reservations in government jobs and educational institutions exist, these policies have not kept pace with the rapid expansion of the private sector, leaving many Dalits behind.

IV. THE URBAN-RURAL DIVIDE

The urban-rural divide in India has been a growing concern in the neo-liberal era, with the economic benefits of liberalization largely concentrated in urban centers. Urban areas, particularly metropolitan cities like Delhi, Mumbai, Bangalore, and Hyderabad, have emerged as hubs of global capital and economic growth. The expansion of the information technology (IT), telecommunications, and financial services sectors has created substantial opportunities for skilled labor, but this growth has not translated into widespread benefits for the rural economy.

Rural India, which still depends heavily on agriculture, has experienced slower economic growth, with many regions suffering from agrarian distress and stagnant wages. Agriculture, which accounts for nearly 55% of India's workforce, has been largely bypassed by the neo-liberal reforms, as agricultural subsidies have been reduced and the sector has been exposed to global market forces without adequate support. This has led to increased indebtedness among farmers, many of whom lack access to modern technologies and adequate credit facilities.

A significant aspect of the urban-rural divide is the migration from rural areas to cities. As rural incomes stagnate, millions of people have migrated to urban areas in search of better economic opportunities. However, many of these migrants end up in informal employment with low wages, little job security, and no access to social protections. According to the National Sample Survey Office (NSSO), nearly 93% of India's workforce is employed in the informal sector, with a large proportion of these workers being rural migrants.

Agriculture under Neo-Liberalism

The agriculture sector has suffered significantly under the neo-liberal framework. The reduction of state support for farmers, combined with the opening of agricultural markets to global competition, has left many small and marginal farmers unable to compete. The withdrawal of subsidies on fertilizers, seeds, and irrigation has increased the cost of agricultural inputs, while the privatization of agricultural research has limited the accessibility of new technologies to large-scale commercial farms.

The decline in government support for agriculture has been particularly detrimental to the rural poor, who depend on subsistence farming for their livelihoods. The result has been a crisis in Indian agriculture, with many farmers trapped in cycles of debt and poverty. The growing incidence of farmer suicides, especially in states like Maharashtra, Karnataka, and Andhra Pradesh, highlights the severity of the agrarian crisis under neo-liberalism. These suicides have been linked to rising indebtedness, crop failures, and the pressure to repay loans taken from private moneylenders at high interest rates.

V. LABOR MARKETS AND INFORMALIZATION

Informalization of Labor

One of the key features of neo-liberal policies in India has been the informalization of the labor market. The drive to increase labor market flexibility and attract foreign investment has led to a shift away from formal employment with benefits and protections, towards informal and contractual labor, where workers are hired on a short-term or casual basis with little job security. This has significantly weakened the bargaining power of labor unions and diminished worker protections.

The contract labor system, which has proliferated under neo-liberalism, allows employers to hire workers on a temporary basis, avoiding the legal obligations of permanent employment such as minimum wage laws, health benefits, and pension contributions. This has led to the growth of a large informal workforce that is denied access to social security, job security, and other labor rights.

According to the International Labour Organization (ILO), the informal sector accounts for over 80% of employment in India, with most workers engaged in low-wage jobs that provide no legal protections. The lack of formal employment opportunities has also contributed to the growth of the gig economy, where workers are hired on a task-by-task basis through platforms like Uber, Ola, and Swiggy. While these platforms offer flexibility, they provide few benefits and no long-term security for workers.

Gender and Informalization

The impact of informalization has been particularly severe for women, who constitute a significant portion of the informal labor force. Women are often concentrated in low-paying jobs in sectors such as domestic work, textile manufacturing, and construction, where they face discrimination, exploitation, and poor working conditions. Furthermore, the feminization of poverty under neo-liberalism has meant that women bear the brunt of cuts in public spending on healthcare, childcare, and social security, as they are often the primary caregivers in households.

Chart-3: Female Labor Force Participation Rate (%)

Year	Female Labor Force Participation (%)
1991	36%
2005	32%
2010	28%
2020	21%

Source: International Labour Organization (ILO), National Sample Survey Office (NSSO)

Women's participation in formal labor markets has also been limited by gender norms and patriarchal structures that restrict their access to education and employment opportunities (Chart-3). As a result, many women are forced into informal employment, where they earn lower wages and have fewer opportunities for upward mobility.

VI. EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

Privatization of Public Services

One of the most significant aspects of neo-liberal reforms in India has been the privatization of key public services, including education, healthcare, utilities, and transportation. Privatization was driven by the belief that private sector involvement would improve the efficiency and quality of service delivery, as the government sought to reduce its fiscal burden and promote competition.

However, the privatization of essential public services has had far-reaching social consequences, particularly for low-income and marginalized populations. As private providers entered sectors previously dominated by the state, access to these services increasingly became a function of one's ability to pay, deepening the inequality between the rich and the poor. This shift has undermined the universal access to services that were previously seen as a fundamental right, leading to increased exclusion of vulnerable groups.

Impact on Education

In the field of education, the neo-liberal focus on privatization has resulted in the growth of private schools, colleges, and universities. The public education system, particularly in rural areas, has suffered from underfunding, leading to a decline in quality and infrastructure. As a result, wealthier families have increasingly turned to private schools, which often offer better facilities, higher-quality teachers, and more comprehensive curricula.

For lower-income families, however, the high cost of private education has become a significant barrier to upward mobility. According to a report by the National Sample Survey Office (NSSO), the cost of education has risen sharply in the neo-liberal era, with private school fees becoming unaffordable for many families. This has created a dual-track system where the wealthy have access to top-tier education, while the poor must rely on under-resourced public schools.

The Right to Education (RTE) Act, passed in 2009, was an attempt by the government to address these disparities by mandating free and compulsory education for all children aged 6 to 14. However, the implementation of the RTE Act has been uneven, with many public schools lacking the resources to meet the required standards. Furthermore, while the RTE mandates that private schools reserve 25% of their seats for children from economically weaker sections (EWS), this provision has faced resistance from many private institutions, further limiting access for marginalized students.

The result of these developments has been a widening gap in educational outcomes between rich and poor students. According to a report by Oxfam India, children from Scheduled Castes (SCs), Scheduled Tribes (STs), and Other Backward Classes (OBCs) are less likely to attend private schools, limiting their access to quality education and perpetuating intergenerational inequality. The privatization of education has, in effect, reinforced existing social hierarchies, making it more difficult for marginalized groups to compete in the labor market and achieve social mobility.

Impact on Healthcare

The privatization of healthcare has similarly led to a dual system, where wealthier individuals have access to high-quality private hospitals, while the poor are left to rely on overburdened and underfunded public health services. The public healthcare system in India has long been characterized by a shortage of doctors, inadequate infrastructure, and poor-quality care. In response to these deficiencies, the government has increasingly encouraged private sector participation in healthcare, leading to a rapid expansion of private hospitals, clinics, and insurance schemes.

However, the rise of private healthcare has further marginalized low-income groups, who cannot afford the high costs associated with private treatment. According to National Health Accounts (NHA) data, nearly 60% of healthcare costs in India are paid out-of-pocket by households, placing a significant financial burden on the poor. This has led to a situation where many families are forced to choose between paying for healthcare and meeting other basic needs, such as food and education.

In rural areas, where the public healthcare system is the primary provider of medical services, the effects of privatization have been particularly severe. Government-run primary health centers (PHCs) and district hospitals, which are supposed to serve as the first point of contact for healthcare in rural areas, are often understaffed and poorly equipped. The privatization of healthcare services has done little to address these issues, as private providers tend to focus on urban centers and wealthier patients, leaving rural populations underserved.

The rise of private health insurance schemes, promoted as a way to improve healthcare access, has also been problematic. Many private insurance plans are designed to cover only hospitalization costs, leaving out expenses for preventive care, outpatient services, and medicines. As a result, even those who have insurance often face significant out-of-pocket expenses, particularly for chronic illnesses.

These developments have further deepened health inequalities in India. Marginalized communities, particularly those in remote rural areas, are disproportionately affected by the lack of access to affordable healthcare, leading to poorer health outcomes and higher infant mortality rates. Additionally, women, who often bear the responsibility for family health and caregiving, are particularly vulnerable to the rising costs of healthcare, as they are more likely to prioritize the health of family members over their own needs.

VII. WELFARE POLICIES AND SOCIAL SECURITY

Retreat of the Welfare State

One of the hallmarks of neo-liberalism is the retrenchment of the welfare state, as governments reduce spending on social security programs in an effort to maintain fiscal discipline. In India, this has meant significant cuts to key welfare programs that were designed to support the poor and vulnerable populations, such as the Public Distribution System (PDS), subsidized housing, and rural employment schemes.

While the Public Distribution System (PDS) continues to provide subsidized food grains to low-income households, the system has been plagued by inefficiencies, leakages, and corruption. Under neo-liberalism, efforts to reform the PDS have focused on introducing targeted schemes rather than universal subsidies, which has limited the reach of the program. Critics argue that this shift has left many eligible households without access to food support, exacerbating food insecurity in rural areas.

Another important welfare program, the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA), which guarantees 100 days of wage employment to rural households, has also faced challenges under neo-liberal policies. While the program has been praised for providing a safety net for rural workers, its implementation has been inconsistent, with delays in wage payments and inadequate funding in some states. Furthermore, critics argue that MGNREGA has not been adequately funded, as the government has prioritized infrastructure projects and urban development over rural employment schemes.

The informalization of labor under neo-liberalism has also weakened social security protections for workers. Many workers in the informal economy, including domestic workers, construction laborers, and agricultural workers, are not covered by social security schemes, such as pensions, health insurance, or unemployment benefits. This has left millions of workers vulnerable to economic shocks, such as job losses or health emergencies, without a safety net to fall back on.

Gendered Impact of Welfare Cuts

The gendered impact of welfare cuts is another significant aspect of the social impact of neo-liberal policies. Women, particularly those from marginalized communities, are disproportionately affected by cuts to welfare programs, as they are more likely to rely on public services for healthcare, education, and childcare. The reduction in public spending on maternal health services, for example, has had a detrimental impact on women's health, particularly in rural areas where access to private healthcare is limited.

Women are also disproportionately represented in the informal sector, where they are often employed as domestic workers, home-based workers, or in agricultural labor. These jobs are typically low-paying and do not provide social security benefits, leaving women vulnerable to poverty and economic insecurity. The absence of childcare support further exacerbates this situation, as many women are forced to leave the workforce to take care of their families, perpetuating cycles of gender inequality.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The social impact of neo-liberal policies in India has been profound, particularly in terms of widening inequality and deepening the exclusion of marginalized groups. While the economic growth generated by neo-liberal reforms has benefited certain sections of society, particularly urban elites and middle-class professionals, it has left large segments of the population behind. The privatization of public services, the informalization of labor, and the retrenchment of the welfare state have all contributed to a social environment in which access to basic services is increasingly determined by one's socio-economic status.

The withdrawal of the state from sectors like healthcare, education, and social security has left millions of Indians without the support they need to improve their lives. As a result, inequality has deepened, with marginalized communities, particularly in rural areas, facing the brunt of the changes brought about by neo-liberalism. If India is to achieve inclusive growth and social equity, it will need to reconsider the balance between market-driven policies and the role of the state in providing for the welfare of its citizens.

REFERENCES

- Bhaduri(2005). Development with Dignity: A Case for Full Employment. New Delhi: National Book Trust.
- Gupta(2012). Red Tape: Bureaucracy, Structural Violence, and Poverty in India. Duke University Press.
- Jayadev, & A. Narayan (2018). The Legacy of Economic Liberalization in India: Inequality and Social Exclusion. Journal of South Asian Studies, 41(2), 253-270.
- Sen& A. Sengupta(2010). Misallocation of Resources in the Indian Economy: A Neo-Liberal Dilemma. Indian Economic Review, 45(4), 147-162.
- Shah(2013). The Crooked Line: Crony Capitalism in Neo-Liberal India. Journal of Contemporary Asia, 43(3), 427-446.
- Subramanian(2008). India's Turn: Understanding the Economic Transformation. Oxford University Press.
- Amartya Sen (1999). Development as Freedom. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- C.P.Chandrasekhar, & J. Ghosh (2002). The Market that Failed: Neo-Liberal Economic Reforms in India. LeftWord Books.
- Census of India. (2011). Housing and Slum Conditions in India. Government of India.
- Centre for the Study of Developing Societies (CSDS). (2019). Indian Youth Survey: Aspirations, Attitudes, and Politics. New Delhi: CSDS.
- Ghanshyam Shah (2004). Social Movements in India: A Review of Literature. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- International Labour Organization (ILO). (2018). India Wage Report: Wage Policies for Decent Work and Inclusive Growth. Geneva: ILO.
- International Monetary Fund (IMF). (1991). India: Economic Reforms and Stabilization. IMF Report No. 91/154.
- J. Bhagwati & A. Panagariya(2013). Why Growth Matters: How Economic Growth in India Reduced Poverty and the Lessons for Other Developing Countries. New York: PublicAffairs.
- J. Drèze, & A. Sen(2013). An Uncertain Glory: India and its Contradictions. Princeton University Press.
- J. Harriss(2007). Politics and the Neo-Liberal Urban in India. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 31(2), 351-367.
- K. Sundaram & S.D. Tendulkar (2003). Poverty in India in the 1990s: Revised Estimates and Methodology. Economic & Political Weekly, 38(44), 4567-4578.
- M. G.Rao, & N.Singh, (2005). The Political Economy of Federalism in India. Oxford University Press.
- M. Weiner(2001). The Struggle for Equality: Caste in Indian Politics. Foreign Affairs, 80(3), 109-122.
- Ministry of Finance. (2020). Economic Survey of India. Government of India.
- Ministry of Health & Family Welfare. (2019). National Health Profile. Government of India.
- Ministry of Labour and Employment. (2020). Annual Report 2019-2020. Government of India.
- National Health Accounts (NHA). (2018). Public Health Expenditure in India. Government of India. Retrieved from https://mohfw.gov.in
- National Sample Survey Office (NSSO). (2020). Periodic Labour Force Survey (PLFS). Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India.
- Oxfam India. (2018). Reward Work, Not Wealth: Oxfam Inequality Report. Retrieved from https://www.oxfamindia.org
- P. Bardhan(2010). Awakening Giants, Feet of Clay: Assessing the Economic Rise of China and India. Princeton University Press.

- P. Chatterjee (2004). The Politics of the Governed: Reflections on Popular Politics in Most of the World. New York: Columbia University Press.
- P. Sainath (2010). Everybody Loves a Good Drought: Stories from India's Poorest Districts. Penguin Books India.
- Planning Commission. (2011). Poverty Estimates in India. Government of India. Retrieved from https://niti.gov.in/planningcommission.gov.in
- R. Mukherjee (2017). Democracy, Capitalism, and India's Economic Transition. Asian Journal of Comparative Politics, 2(1), 22-41.
- R. Nagaraj (2013). Industrial Performance, Economic Reforms, and Policies in India. Economic & Political Weekly, 48(39), 51-59.
- T. Piketty & L.Chancel(2017). Indian Income Inequality, 1922-2014: From British Raj to Billionaire Raj? WID Working Paper Series No. 2017/11.
- U. Patnaik(2016). Neo-Liberalism and Rural Poverty in India. Social Scientist, 44(1), 15-25.
- United Nations Population Division. (2019). World Urbanization Prospects. United Nations. Retrieved from https://population.un.org/wup/
- World Bank. (2020). World Inequality Database (WID). Retrieved from https://wid.world