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The U.S. and Latin America in a great race between technology and education
From 2000 to 2015 Inequality fell in Latin America and mobility increased, for the first time ever children surpassed their parents in education…especially women

Why & how? Transfer programs conditional on school attendance (CCTs) target excluded groups…
Starting in 1997, Mexico Progresa-Oportunidades-Prospera spreads to Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Argentina. It targets women with children.
Mothers and children in Hildago Mexico

The Prospera (previously Oportunidades) is a conditional cash transfer program benefits nearly six million families about ¼ of Mexico’s population.

Launched 1997 after a financial crisis, it has been replicated in 52 countries including most large Latin American countries (as in Bolsa Familia)

See 2014 interview of Francesca Lamanna, social protection specialist at the World Bank,
Why is inequality rising in the U.S.? Answer “the new geography of Jobs” e.g. Amazon 2 in Queens

- UCB’s Enrico Moretti points out rising inequality between cities with college educated
- Relevant to the NYC and the Bronz right now: Amazon HQ coming to Queens…
- Here are his slides (right click to open in a new tab)
Why is inequality high & rising in the U.S. and in NYC?

Answer: “the new geography of Jobs” e.g. Amazon 2 in Queens

- UCB’s Enrico Moretti points out rising inequality between cities with college educated
- Who benefits when college educated pop increases?
- NYC and the Bronx right now: Amazon HQ 2 coming…
- Enrico’s slides (right click to open in a new tab)
- Furman Center on Gentrification? Who has to move?
- See also DSI report on Washington Heights
- Where has crime fallen dramatically in New York City?
- A tale of two blackouts, 1977 and 2003?
Who can stop rising high & rising in the U.S. and in NYC? Answer: our Mayor and Governor or...
Inequality is falling in Latin America, but rising in the U.S...can this be fixed by free education?

- In the USA, growth slowed and access to education reproduced inequality... top 1% courted by best schools (not the most meritorious)
- Inequality and expensive selective schools reduced mobility and reinforced inequality...
- In Latin America, expansion of education through social transfer programs and faster growth 2000 to 2015 led to falling inequality and rising mobility
Inequality is falling in Latin America, but rising in the Bronx and the U.S…free education? Alexandria Ocasio Cortez or Mayor Bloomberg (New America)

• In the USA, growth slowed and access to education reproduced inequality… top 1% courted by best schools (not the most meritorious)

• Inequality and expensive selective schools reduced mobility and reinforced inequality…

• In Latin America, expansion of education through social transfer programs and faster growth 2000 to 2015 led to falling inequality and rising mobility
Chile mobility increases: share of education not explained by parent’s SES

Figure C-1: Intergenerational Education Mobility Chile: share of education gap not explained by parents education

Source: SEDLAC/CEDLAS Education Stats Mobility*
Chile inequality is falling...

Figure G-1 Chile Inequality Gini Falls

Source: SEDLAC (CEDLAS and The World Bank)
Three women Presidents 2013 (but alas...)

Presidents Kirchner, Bachelet, and Rousseff (Arg, Chile & Brazil)

Presidents of Brazil, Chile and Argentina Ernesto Geisel (1974-99), Augusto Pinochet (1974-1990) & Jorge Rafael Videla (1976-81)
Chilean students creatively “protest” high cost of college and student debt... why?
Answer: student loans lower income students into college and middle class or higher: example Camila Vallejo Dowling Chilean student leader now congress-woman under President Michelle Bachelet:
Education: gender convergence opens new gender gap… starting with 1968 cohort, Latin women become more educated than men (Nopo, 2012)

Changes from 1990 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Females 21-30</th>
<th>Males 21-30</th>
<th>Ratio F/M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yrs Educ</td>
<td>change</td>
<td>Yrs Educ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CEDLAS/SEDLAC Education and Gender Statistics
Globalization and new technologies means more education needed to climb to top...

Changes in the Income Ladder in the United States

The rungs of the income ladder have grown further apart (income inequality has increased)

...but children’s chances of climbing from lower to higher rungs have not changed.
Share of Workers with College Degree
The Relation Between the Share of College Graduates in a City and the Wage of High School Graduates in that City
Economic Output Per Square Kilometer
Patents per Worker
Education raises social mobility if children more educated than their parents: 3 related Mobility measures

1. *Intergenerational Education Mobility*: Gatsby curve for Chile & Latin America

2. *Absolute Mobility*: how far NYC residents climb compared to parents?

3. *College mobility*: access vs. success for 30 million students: Chetty et al 2017 “solving social problems with big data…”
Intergenerational Education Mobility

- Educational IGM: do you have more education than your parents? .... across generations.
- If your education matches that of your parent’s: Low IGM family status and SES determine your future.
- **Mobility is a break with the past, your** generation is better educated than your parents...
- The more correlated with your schooling is with your parents the less social mobility there is... you need connections to get into a good school
- IGM Mobility can be negative....see Venezuela for example
THE GREAT GATSBY CURVE
High Inequality is Associated With Less Economic Mobility

Intergenerational earnings elasticity

$y = 2.2x - 0.27$
$R^2 = 0.76$

Source: Criba (2011), OECD, CEA estimates
Figure 1. Great Gatsby Curve: Gini income vs. Mobility (youths 13:19), 16 LatAm ctrys, 1995 and 2011

Notes: Educational mobility: Educational Mobility Index for teenagers (13 to 19). Source: SEDLAC (CEDLAS and World Bank) database downloaded May 2013. For Peru and Dom Rep the first observed year is 1997 and 1996 respectively, the last observed year for Costa Rica, El Salvador and Mexico is 2010. Source: SEDLAC (CEDLAS and The World Bank) data downloaded October 2014.
Convergence: “todos somos Americanos”…

Figure 1A Latin America and U.S. Income Gini's Converge

U.S. Income Gini

Latin America Gini

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>U.S. Income Gini</th>
<th>Latin America Gini</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did education reduce inequality in LatAm?

Figure 12: For LA-4 Inter Generational Mobility increased before Gini began to fall

Source: (Argentina, Brazil Chile and Mexico, Population Weighted) CEDLAS SEDLAC and the World Bank
LatAm Middle Class emerging....

Figure 2B LatAm & Caribbean middle class (% >$10/day PPP 2005)

Source: World Bank, Povcalnet March 2012
(http://iresearch.worldbank.org/PovcalNet/index.htm?1)
Figure 12. Change in the Gini index, selected Latin American countries, 2000-2010.

Source: Figure 1.3 from Ferreira et al (2010), modified by Ferreira (2012). Data source: World bank 2011
Mobility across U.S. cities and regions Chetty et al. find lots of variation with lower mobility in the South.

http://www.equality-of-opportunity.org/
Gatsby curve NYC has highest inequality, but mobility in top 1/4 of U.S. cities: 1980-82 kids in 25th get to 44th in 2010-12

Figure 2: Great Gatsby Curve for 60 largest U.S. urban areas

Children of parents in the 25th percentile in 1980-82 climbed on average to the percentile shown on the Y axis by 2010-12

Absolute Intergenerational Mobility, 1980-82 Cohort (see Chetty et al. 2014, Table 8).
Measure 2: Absolute Mobility across major Cities-urban labor markets

- **Absolute Mobility**: Where you end up in the income distribution compared to your parents:

- **Example Chetty et al. 2014**: New Yorkers whose families start at the 25th percentile end up at the 44 percentile on average.

- **New York has top 20 mobility** but the highest inequality of any city… a number rich cities have this characteristic.

- Chetty et. al 2014 matches 18 million tax returns, 1980 more or less to about 2010… big data from the IRS…
Immigration associated with higher inequality

**Figure 6B: Fraction of Foreign Born & Inequality in the 60 largest U.S. cities (commuter zones)**

Vertical Axis: The Gini Coefficient is a widely used inequality index, note, a 1% increase in FB share raises the Gini by 1/2 a point, New York City has an astonishingly high Gini of 68 (.68) but w/o its FB share of 30% it would be 53, high but not dramatically higher than the national Gini of 48 (48).
Gatsby curve for major cities in U.S.
NYC an exception: Highest inequality, but mobility in top 1/4 of U.S. cities: 1980-82 kids in 25th get to 44th in 2010-12

Figure 2: Great Gatsby Curve for 60 largest U.S. urban areas

Children of parents in the 25th percentile in 1980-82 climbed on average to the percentile shown on the Y axis by 2010-12

Absolute Intergenerational Mobility, 1980-82 Cohort (see Chetty et al. 2014, Table 8).
Immigration associated with higher mobility
Immigration is associated with higher mobility
U.S. FB share rose from 4.7 in 1970 to 13 in 2012, a rise of over about 8 percentage points.

Figure FB-1 US and NYC Foreign born back to 1900 share

Immigration and inequality short not long term depends on education and innovation…

- **Immigration increases inequality in ST** Chetty cities data shows as FB share 4.7% to 13%+ from 1970 to 2010 can explain rise in Gini from 40 to 44 (have the distance to 48)

- **Inequality increases ST** as immigrants compete: Hispanic but not native wages fall with immigration & integration.

- **Immigration increases mobility** in the Americas as children stimulate growth and invest in schooling wages rise for immigrants and natives over the over longer term (CBO, 2013).

- **Financial inclusion & immigration** reform raises growth and asset accumulation by Hispanics, reducing share of inherited wealth, see Piketty, 2014, p. 83-84.

Mobility varies across the US

Figure X: Correlates of Spatial Variation in Upward Mobility

Immigration to U.S.

- Increases Inequality
  - Short term Hispanic wages decline
  - Immigration reform increases financial inclusion wages rise

- Increases Mobility
  - more educated children become adults

Long term Inequality falls and mobility increases

Evidence from U.S. Cities Chetty et al. 2014

Immigration reform increases financial inclusion wages rise

Picketty 2014 and CBO 2013
Measure 3 college mobility as defined by Chetty et al. 2017 matters...

- They match 30 million IRS returns to children’s education.
- A college education *raises social mobility* if parents have less education (immigrants?)
- A college education also reduces inequality if the share of well educated increases into to a larger middle class...
- They find colleges level the playing field for any starting point.
- Current admissions and fees exacerbate rather than attenuate inequality, except in a few schools.
Measure 3: College mobility leads higher and more equal incomes for low income entrants

Poor students who attend top colleges do about as well as their rich classmates.
Measure 3: college mobility leads higher and more equal incomes for low income entrants

- Define a college’s *mobility rate* (MR) as the fraction of its students who come from bottom quintile and end up in top quintile

\[
\text{Mobility Rate} = \frac{\text{Success Rate}}{\text{Access}} \\
P(\text{Child in Q5 & Parent in Q1}) = \frac{P(\text{Child in Q5 | Parent in Q1})}{P(\text{Parent in Q1})}
\]

- E.g., SUNY-Stony Brook: \(8.4\% = \frac{51.2\%}{16.4\%}\)

- The mobility rate should be interpreted as an accounting measure rather than a causal effect
Mobility is share from low group (access) times the share that make it (61% x 63% = 38%)

Colleges with the highest mobility rate, from the bottom 40 percent to the top 40 percent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Pct. from Bottom 40%</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
<th>&quot;Mobility&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vaughn College of Aeronautics and Technology</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College of New York</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M International University</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehman College</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard M. Baruch College</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Los Angeles</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimson Technical College</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas-Pan American</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City College of Technology</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jay College of Criminal Justice</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Success rate measures the percent of lower-income students who ended up in the top 40 percent. Data here comes from the 1980-82 cohort, roughly the college classes of 2002-4. By this stage in life, income ranks are relatively stable.
Chetty et al. 2017 publish several mobility measures... see the NY Times for more

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Mobility Rate</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cal State University – LA</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pace University – New York</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SUNY – Stony Brook</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Technical Career Institutes</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of Texas – Pan American</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CUNY System</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Glendale Community College</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>South Texas College</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cal State Polytechnic – Pomona</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>University of Texas – El Paso</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chetty et al. 2017 publishes some college measures... see the NY Times for more
Top 10 Colleges in America By Mobility Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Mobility Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUNY-Bernard Baruch</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNY-City</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNY-Lehman</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal State-Los Angeles</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNY-John Jay</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace University</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY-Stony Brook</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNY-NY City Tech</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNY-Brooklyn</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Career Institutes</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. College in the U.S.</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is a NY Times interactive graphic “selective public schools” light up…
What about Fordham?

Variation in Access Conditional on Success Rate

- Much of the variation in mobility rates is driven by differences in access at a given success rate
- Not just driven by “vertical selection” across colleges that have very different students and outcomes
- Ex: SUNY-Stony Brook and CUNY have similar success rates to Fordham, NYU, and Wagner, but very different levels of access

Lessons on Mobility Rates

- **Fact #3**: Certain mid-tier public institutions (e.g., CUNY, Cal-State) have the highest bottom-to-top quintile mobility rates
- But highly selective institutions (e.g., Berkeley, Harvard) channel more low-income students to the top 1%
Mobility report cards online at NY Times
http://www.equality-of-opportunity.org/documents/

Mobility Report Cards: The Role of Colleges in Intergenerational Mobility

Raj Chetty, Stanford
John N. Friedman, Brown
Emmanuel Saez, UC-Berkeley
Nicholas Turner, U.S. Treasury
Danny Yagan, UC-Berkeley

February 2017

The median family income of a student from City College of New York is $40,200, and 15% come from the top 20 percent. About 12% of students at City College of New York came from a poor family but became a rich adult.

A new study, based on millions of anonymous tax records, shows that some colleges are even more economically segregated than previously understood, while others are associated with income mobility.

Below, estimates of how City College of New York compares with its peer schools in economic diversity and student outcomes.
Mobility Report Cards
Columbia vs. SUNY-Stony Brook

Percent of Students

Parent Income Quintile

1 2 3 4 5

Columbia
SUNY-Stony Brook
Introduction

- What role do colleges play in intergenerational income mobility?
  - Large returns to college attendance suggest that higher education can be an important pathway to upward mobility
  - But inequality in access between high- and low-income families may limit (or even reverse) this effect

- Evaluating colleges’ role in mobility requires analysis of two factors:
  - [Outcomes] Which colleges are most effective in helping children climb the income ladder?
  - [Access] How can we increase access to such colleges for students from low-income families?
Lessons on Outcomes

- **Fact #2**: At any given college, students from low- and high-income families have very similar earnings outcomes.

- Colleges effectively “level the playing field” across students with different socioeconomic backgrounds whom they admit.

- No indication of “mismatch” of low-SES students who are admitted to selective colleges under current policies.

- Low-SES students at less-selective colleges are unlikely to do better than high-SES students at more-selective colleges.

- Within-college earnings gradient therefore places a tight upper bound on the degree of mismatch.

- Any current affirmative action policies for low-income students have little cost to universities in terms of students’ outcomes.
Discussion: Broad Lessons for Policy

1. Low-income students admitted to selective colleges do not appear over-placed, based on their earnings outcomes
   - Provides support for policies that seek to bring more such students to selective colleges

2. Efforts to expand low-income access often focus on elite colleges
   - But the high-mobility-rate colleges identified here may provide a more scalable model for upward mobility
   - Instructional costs at high-mobility-rate colleges are far lower...
Correlates of Top 20% Mobility Rate

College Type

- Public
- For-Profit
- 4-Year College

Selectivity

- Rejection Rate
- Rejection Rate, Public
- Rejection Rate, Private

Institutional Characteristics

- Enrollment
- Completion Rate
- Avg. Faculty Salary
- STEM Major Share

Expend. & Cost

- Instr. Expenditures per Student
- Net Cost for Poor
- Sticker Price

Magnitude of Correlation

- Negative Correlation
- Positive Correlation
Inequality and Mobility

Trends in Low-Income Access from 2000-2011 by CUNY Campus

Share from low income families going down: not good
Education increases inequality if …

Distribution of Access Across Colleges (Enrollment-Weighted)

- Harvard = 3.0%
- Berkeley = 8.8%
- SUNY-Stony Brook = 16.4%
- Glendale Community College = 32.4%
Immigration, growth and inequality short term long term

- **Immigration increases inequality in ST** Chetty cities data shows as FB share 4.7% to 13%+ from 1970 to 2010 can explain rise in Gini from 40 to 44 (have the distance to 48)

- **Inequality increases ST** as immigrants compete: Hispanic but not native wages fall with immigration & integration.

- **Immigration increases mobility** vs. LatAm and within the U.S. children of immigrants consistently outperform natives in school this increases Hispanic wages over longer term (CBO, 2013).

- **Financial inclusion & immigration** reform raises growth and asset accumulation by Hispanics, reducing share of inherited wealth, see Piketty, 2014, p. 83-84.

Gender and Mobility…in Latin America

1. Since 1970 female education increased faster than male but return to education (Mincer coefficient) fell less for women…

2. Female labor force participation increasing in Latin America where FHH increasing, but no reduction in social mobility: migration, employment opportunities.

3. In the United States, assortative mating has increased inequality, in Latin American education correlation for couples falling in most countries, reducing inequality…

4. Redistributive social programs target women and children conditional on education…
Figure 1: Mean Years of Schooling
25 to 64 Population (1960-2009)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, NCES, Author Calculations
Family structure and mobility in the U.S.

Figure 6D: Fraction of Single Mothers and Abs Mobility 60 largest U.S. commuting zones

\[ y = -0.0073x + 0.52 \]

\[ R^2 = 0.4 \]

Absolute Intergenerational Mobility, 1980-82 Cohort

(see Chetty et al. 2014, Table 8).
Family structure and mobility in Latin America

Figure F-10 Changes in Social Mobility against changes in the Share of Female Headed HH 1990-2011. Source: SEDLAC/CEDLAS World Bank. *Venezuela ends in 2006.

The graph shows a scatter plot with countries such as Brazil, Chile, Peru, Mexico, and others plotted according to their change in social mobility (y-axis) and change in the share of female-headed households (x-axis). The line of best fit is represented by the equation:

\[ y = 0.38x + 3.2 \]

with an R² of 0.20 and t-value of 1.85.
Why the Gatsby curve is working in Latin America and in the United States:

- Rising inequality in the U.S. is at the very top 1% and 10% al la Piketty, but this does not affect mobility.
- LatAm has a rising middle class, improved education (starting from a low base).
- Class, race & family structure create obstacles to mobility in the U.S. despite some progress in access to education…
- CCTs and education policy working in LatAm but less in the United States (preschool etc.)
The Gatsby Curve works across Latin America Countries and over time

- **Convergence:** inequality high in LatAm mobility low relative to U.S. now converging
- **Social policy:** LatAm greater commitment to equity that the USA (since 2000 at least)
- **Gender:** large gains in education made by women, rise in Female headed households increased mobility
- **New data available**
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