





S.

Blue: Black Reds: Hispanic Yellow: White Pink: Other Light Blue: Missing



Add health ^{*} Curarrini, Jackson Pin (2009,2010) figure, Jackson (2019)

Homophily, Behavior, and Economic Well-Being: Three Network Forces

- Job contacts
 - opportunities flow via family, friends
- Peer influence, identity, pressures
 - *behaviors*: norms, culture, aspirations shaped by friends, family...
- Information
 - *learn* about benefits of decisions from friends, herding of groups



Social Capital in US I and II

Raj Chetty*, Matthew Jackson*, Theresa Kuchler*, Johannes Stroebel* Nathan Hendren, Robert Fluegge, Sara Gong, Federico González, Armelle Grondin Matthew Jacob, Drew Johnston, Martin Koenen, Eduardo Laguna-Muggenburg Florian Mudekereza, Tom Rutter, Nicolaj Thor, Wilbur Townsend, Ruby Zhang Mike Bailey, Pablo Barberá, Monica Bhole & Nils Wernerfelt



*Co-Principal Investigators and Corresponding Authors

Social Capital: which ones predict economic mobility?

- **Connectedness** *bridging capital* access to info, opportunities
 - cross-class connections: inverse of homophily

Social Capital: which ones predict economic mobility?

- **Connectedness** *bridging capital* access to info, opportunities
 - cross-class connections: inverse of homophily
- Cohesiveness bonding capital tight connections on local basis aids cooperation, favor exchange
 - clustering: are my friends friends with each other? Do my friend and I have friends in common?

Social Capital: which ones predict economic mobility?

- **Connectedness** *bridging capital* access to info, opportunities
 - cross-class connections: inverse of homophily
- Cohesiveness bonding capital tight connections on local basis aids cooperation, favor exchange
 - clustering: are my friends friends with each other? Do my friend and I have friends in common?

• Civic Engagement - Trust, Culture, Norms... functioning of institutions

Data

- U.S. Facebook users May 28, 2022
 - ages 25–44 (1978–1997 birth cohorts)
 - 30-day active
 - at least 100 friends in US
- 72.2 million individuals, 21 billion friendships: 84% coverage of 25–44-year-olds
- Friendships, demographics, memberships, geography (zip, county)
- Supplementary data :
 - Census data: incomes, economic mobility
 - Parent-child links: self-reported parent and other clues, prioritizing mothers

Economic Connectedness / Homophily: Percent of High-SES Friends



Economic Connectedness: Percent of High-SES Friends



Economic Connectedness: Percent of High-SES Friends



Economic Connectedness of Low-SES Individuals by County Normalized Share of Above-Median Friends Among Below-Median People



Note: see the Social Capital Atlas (www.socialcapital.org) for an interactive version of this map and downloadable data

The Geography of Upward Mobility in the United States

Average Income at Age 35 for Children whose Parents Earned \$27,000 (25th percentile)



Note: Blue = More Upward Mobility, Red = Less Upward Mobility Source: Chetty, Friedman, Hendren, Jones, Porter 2018



Upward Mobility vs. Economic Connectedness, by County 200 Largest Counties



Upward Mobility vs. Economic Connectedness, by County 200 Largest Counties



Correlations between Upward Mobility and Measures of Social Capital Coefficients from County-level Multivariable Regression



Social Capital and Upward Mobility in Counties with Predominantly White Residents EC vs. Upward Mobility

Understanding Economic Connectedness

• EC strongly predicts mobility

• Natural next question: What drives economic connectedness?

- **Exposure**: Are high SES people around?
- Bias: Do people friend across class lines when exposed?
- Settings: Where are friendships made? Different settings have different exposure and bias...

Friendship Shares by Setting vs. Socioeconomic Status

Friendship Shares by Setting vs. Socioeconomic Status

Exposure to Above-Median SES Peers By Setting Low-SES People

Friending Bias, by Setting

A last question:

• Are things changing?

-Are we more divided?

–Is how we make friendships becoming more dependent upon technology?

How heterosexual couples have met 45% Online 40% via Friends 35% 30% **X**Bar via Family 25% School 20% 15% Work Neighbors 10% Church College 5% 0% 1970 1990 2000 2010 2020 1940 1950 1960 1980 Rosenfeld etal 2019 Year Couple Met

Discussion!

Economic Mobility vs. Cross-SES Connectedness for Low- vs. High-SES Individuals County-Level

Friending Bias vs. Exposure to High-SES Students, by High School

Friending Bias vs. Exposure to High-SES Students, by College

Friending Bias vs. Exposure to High-SES Students, by College

Friending Bias vs. Exposure to High-SES Students, by College

College Wage Premium

Relationship between Clustering and Upward Mobility ZIP-level, selected cities

Relationship between Clustering, Upward Mobility, and EC ZIP-level, selected cities

Relationship between Upward Mobility and Economic Connectedness ZIP-level, selected cities

Distributions of ZIP Code-Level Correlations between Upward Mobility and Social Capital Measures across Counties

Economic Homophily on FB: Mean Friend SES Rank vs. Own Rank

Clustering & Support

• Clustering – closure, transitivity:

• Support – friend in common:

Relative Geographic Coverage of Facebook Data

Correlations between Upward Mobility and Measures of Social Capital County-level Univariate Correlations

Correlations between Social Capital and Life Expectancy at Age 40 for Bottom-Income-Quartile Men

Univariate County-level Correlations

