THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

BROOKINGS CAFETERIA PODCAST

HOW SOCIAL NETWORKS IMPACT ECONOMIC MOBILITY

Washington, D.C.

Friday, February 12, 2021

PARTICIPANTS:

Host:

> FRED DEWS
> Managing Editor, Podcasts and Digital Projects
> The Brookings Institution

Guests:

> CAMILLE BUSETTE
> Senior Fellow, Economic Studies, Governance Studies, Metropolitan Policy Program
> Director of the Race, Prosperity and Inclusion Initiative
> The Brookings Institution
>
> JOSEPH PARILLA
> Fellow, Metropolitan Policy Program
> The Brookings Institution

* * * * *

DEWS: Welcome to the Brookings Cafeteria. The podcast about ideas and the experts who have them. I'm Fred Dews. Who do you turn to for support and access to opportunities? Who can help you with information about a new job or educational choices, or healthcare and housing? This is you social network; your social capital, and it matters for your economic mobility in this society. In this episode, I speak with a scholar who, along with teams of researchers, has analyzed how social networks in four American cities impact social mobility and what that research says, in particular, about social networks by race, gender and income.

Camille Busette is a Senior Fellow in Economic Studies, Governance Studies, and the Metropolitan Policy Program and also the Director of the Race, Prosperity and Inclusion initiative here at Brookings. In our wide range in conversation, she talks about the research design, its findings and implications and some policy ideas to address social capital gaps. Also in this episode, Joe Parilla, a Fellow in the Metropolitan Policy Program and what he calls America's wage problem. The prevalence of low wage work, he says, puts families under financial strain. Listen to find out what can be done to lift struggling families into self-sufficiency. You can follow the Brookings podcast network on Twitter@policypodcast to learn information and links to all our shows, including Dollar and Sense: The Brookings Trade Podcast, the Current and our events podcast. First up, here's Joe Parilla with another metro lens.

PARILLA: Hi, this is Joseph Parilla, Fellow here at the Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program. America has a wage problem. In the past two decades, inflation adjusted wages have remained stagnant for most workers and low wages jobs have accounted for a large and increasing share of the nation's job growth. This prevalence of low wage work puts families under tremendous financial strain. In a new report Sifan Liu and I found that in 2019, 44 percent

of families with children did not earn a pretax pre-transfer income that was high enough to cover their family's living expenses. For Black and Latino families, that share increases to nearly 60 percent. Over 50 percent of families with children who are struggling to make ends meet in places like Miami, Las Vegas, Orlando and Los Angeles, whereas, on the lower end, the share of struggling families were slightly above 30 percent in places like Pittsburgh and Boston and Seattle.

What would be required to make a dent in these numbers, say lifting half of these struggling families into self-sufficiency? Well, to accomplish that, the nation needs more jobs that pay a family sustaining wage. As of 2019, the United States had a family sustaining job deficit of 9 million jobs where about 7 percent of full time positions. And again, local variation in this dynamic is quite significant. We provide a family sustaining wage for every metro area in the country and we find that nearly all have more struggling families in them than family sustaining jobs to support those families. So, here in the greater Washington region, for example, 37 percent of families with children do not earn high enough wages to make ends meet. And to move half of those struggling families into self-sufficiency, the region would need 166 thousand more jobs that pay, on average, $27 per hour. By contrast, say in Akron, Ohio, which is a much more affordable region, the family sustaining wage is closer to $21. So, why do we use this? Well, our reports objective is quite practical. We think that these families sustaining wage thresholds, by Metropolitan area, can guide public private partnerships that want to rebuild a more socially stable and prosperous economy in the wake of Covid-19. We also think these data can illuminate how national policies, say like a $15 federal minimum wage or a new child allowance, would come to ground in the nations diverse network of local economics each with their own unique labor markets and cost structures.

And finally, our findings point to three buckets of interventions that we think could address economic insecurity in the wake of Covid-19 and build more resilient in opportunity rich economics from the long term. But first, regional education and talent development efforts are critical even amidst records unemployment; family sustaining jobs remain unfilled in every metropolitan area. So, regional leaders should prioritize connecting struggling workers to these family sustaining jobs through skills and supportive services and reconnection efforts.

Second, economic development policies should really focus itself on encouraging business growth in those sectors that really concentrate family sustaining jobs; since not all industries are equal in this regard. And then third, we need to just raise the floor on more low-wage jobs. Talent development and economic development strategies alone are not going to close the nation's opportunity deficit without upgrading existing jobs that are not currently offering family sustaining wages. So, higher minimum wage is critical, other job quality interventions could be pursued locally, such as, helping small business upgrade their management and operations in human resources capabilities such that they can be more productive and really stay in business if minimum wage increases.

The point is that simply rebuilding the economy on a foundation of low wage work in the wake of COVID is going to miss an historic opportunity to invest in a higher quality more inclusive economic future.

DEWS: You can find more research like this on our website: Brookings.edu/metro. And now here's my interview with Camille Busette on social networks. Camille welcome back to the Brookings Cafeteria.

BUSETTE: It's great to be here, Fred. Thanks for inviting me.

DEWS: Certainly, and it's nice to see you again after a couple of years and here we are on

Zoom, but I think we're doing okay. And we're here to talk about research that you've been involved in with the, How We Rise, work at Brookings; Race, Prosperity and Inclusion Initiative that you direct. And the two papers, in particular, the two essays in particular that I want to draw the centers attention to, are about how networks impact economic mobility. And to set the stage; there's two papers. There's one that's focused on Charlotte, North Carolina.

BUSETTE: Right.

DEWS: And there's another paper that's focused on Racine, Wisconsin, San Francisco, California and Washington, D.C., and there's a whole group of scholars involved in the research work here. Camille, let me start by asking you what is meant by a social network and what does it have to do with social mobility?

BUSETTE: Great question. So, I know that a lot of people when they think about social networks they're really talking about Facebook and some of the media networks, but what we're talking about here are your social relationships; so who you know. And in the case of this research, what we wanted to know is who do you go to when you are looking for a new job or just finding out about employment opportunities? Who do you look to when you want to change your housing situation or your educational situation? Or you want to avail yourself of new training opportunities? We also, in this particular set of studies, looked at healthcare networks, so who do people turn to when they health issues because it unfolded while the pandemic was still going. We also are focused on the Covid networks and then we looked at childcare networks. But for the purposes of the two essays, we initially focused on what we found around who you turn to when you're looking for a job, educational or housing opportunities.

DEWS: And so, why that set of cities? In the one essay, again, it's Charlotte, North Carolina. In the other essay it's a combination of Washington, D.C., San Francisco, California

and Racine, Wisconsin, so why those four cities?

BUSETTE: So, when we think about economic mobility, which is the possibility that a poor child might end up higher on the economic ladder than his or her parents. When we think about that, these four cities actually represent very different economic mobility profiles. So, Charlotte, North Carolina is one of very low economic mobility, but lots of high income in that area. Racine, Wisconsin is extremely low mobility for a variety of different reasons. San Francisco is high mobility and Washington, D.C. is sort of a mixed, better than Charlotte, but certainly not as good as San Francisco. So, what we wanted to do was be able to see how peoples opportunity network; social networks, compare in different kinds of mobility context.

DEWS: I definitely want to get into the substance of the paper. That's what we're going to spend the most of the time here. But as a student, a long time ago, of policy design and interviewing people for policy research, I'm fascinated by how you and the other researchers actually conduct these studies. And especially, I know these were done last year at a time Coronavirus lockdowns. Can you kind of walk through how you and your collaborators conducted this research?

BUSETTE: Sure. So, for all four cities, what we had decided to do was conduct one-on-one interviews. We would actually ask people about who they reached out to and then have them describe these folks that they reached out to and what kinds of relationships they had with them, what sorts of resources were exchanged and how strong those relationships and how reciprocal those relationships were. So, these were conceived as one-on-one physical interviews like you and I sitting in a room and talking about these things. And then just as we were about to launch, everything went into COVID lockdown. And so we took a pause in both of those research projects and decided to do these interviews virtually. And of course, when you do interviews

virtually, they're a different set of considerations. So, now, you're looking at people where they are. You're seeing things about them that you wouldn't see like if you had in a more neutral location. So, we had to re-train our interviewers and make them aware of the fact that people can be sensitive about that; help the folks that you were interviewing from other backgrounds, if they wanted that, and the be very responsive if they hear or see something that requires an intervention. So, it's how we pivoted during COVID as we made things virtual. And in some cases we did them by phone because the folks we were interviewing didn't actually have broadband set up or weren't comfortable using it. So, that's how we conducted it and the interviews were about 60 to 90 minutes depending on how people answered and how in-depth they got into describing their network.

DEWS: I just want to also flag the physical design of these essays is beautiful. I like to always brag about the great design work that comes with a lot of these essays are on Brookings website. I just did an interview recently with Aloysius Ordu on foresight Africa; another beautiful report.

BUSETTE: Mm-hmm.

DEWS: I'll draw particular attention for listeners to the Charlotte essay because it has some great infographics in it about social networks. And just the infographics alone explain a lot of the substance of the reports. So, let's go there now, Camille, and you talked about this a little bit earlier but I just want to make sure I underscore for myself and for listeners that when you talk about a social network, it's not just necessarily you family and your friends, although it can be. But in particular, it's a set of people that you would turn to for, as you said, jobs, housing, education, healthcare advice. How do people acquire these social networks? How do we develop these social networks?

BUSETTE: Well, you're right. So, it could be your friends and family and we found that in a lot of cases most people's social networks relative to jobs, housing and education did include some family members, some friends, et cetera, and then obviously some professional contacts. But most people tend to form their networks and these connections through school and it could be as early as kindergarten. So, you know, you might grow up in a place and you're there and you're now 40 and you've known folks since you were in kindergarten. So, there are a lot of people like that. And then there are a lot of people who form they're social networks in addition to whatever happened in K thru 12th grade actually form it if they happen to go to college afterwards, so, community college or a four-year college or even if they happen to go graduate school. So, that whole educational setting is one of the primary ways that people form network. And that was true in every city that we looked at, but I'm going to put an asterisk and go back and talk a little about San Francisco.

So, people also generally across all these four cities tended to form their networks at work, as well, and work was a great place to form networks and as people change jobs, they all would have friends or colleagues from former positions, right, and former jobs in their networks. And so, jobs and schools seem to be the main institutional settings where people form their networks that had nothing to do with family or, very, very close relatives or friends that were in your neighborhood. So, those were the main settings, and I just wanted to just kind of double-back and talk a little bit about San Francisco.

So, San Francisco is a prime mobility city. It's also placed where there are a lot of people who kind of go there for the opportunities. It's well known as a tech and financial center. So, what we found is in San Francisco people also formed networks and community activities. This was really, really true particularly for people who are lower income in San Francisco. But it was

also very true for high income people. So, high income people had the usual pattern that we saw where they would meet people in school; largely construed K thru college, or graduate school. They also would meet people at work, but they also met people and there was a significant number of folks actually met people through community activities. And that released it out, that was very different from what we heard in the other three cities.

DEWS: When you talk about income, you talk about low income and high income. There's three income bands that are the parameters for the income lens on social networks; low, middle and high. Is that right?

BUSETTE: That was true for Charlotte. In San Francisco, it turned out that there really was kind of a cutoff at $50,000. We looked at the data and if you were under $50,000 a year, you had a different kind of set of social networks and if you were above $50,000, so it was a little bit more binary in San Francisco, but for the other cities, and particularly for Charlotte, it was like low, middle and high.

DEWS: Some of the other ways that you look at social mobility, social networks are through gender and also then through race and ethnicity and one of the most striking findings, I think, is when you look at it through the race and ethnicity lens, white people have the largest networks, I think, in all these cities, but they're exclusive white. White people have white networks, whereas, other people; African Americans, Latinos, Asian Americans, have smaller networks, but they tend to be more diverse. Can you talk about why that is and did that finding in particular surprise you?

BUSETTE: Yeah, that is the finding and, let me just even nuance it a little bit more. It was really, really, true for white men universally, I would say. And that did surprise us, so let me say, when we came into this our expectations were that we are going to see some differences,

right. We know just anecdotally that some people have better access to opportunities than others

and we would expect to show up somewhere in your social relationships. But beyond that, we

didn't really have a set of hypotheses or expectations. So, we were actually quite surprised to

found out how homogenous white networks were, particularly in places like Washington, D.C.,

or Charlotte, North Carolina, where there is a very significant African American population and

others, lots of others. And when you think about Washington, D.C., we're very cosmopolitan and

you meet people from all over the world here who are professionals, et cetera, in every kind of

portion of the employment landscape and yet whites really only socialize with whites with

respect to these kinds of opportunities. So, that was actually really surprising and I think we

understand why African Americans or Asian Americans or Latino Americans, why they might

have others in their networks. Well, they need to have access to opportunity and if white folks in

their specific vicinity tend to be the gatekeepers or have that information, it would make sense

for those folks to have whites in their networks and to have others in their networks, as well. But

the homogeneity of white networks was in fact really, really surprising.

DEWS: What is the cause for that, I mean, why do white people have such homogenous

networks, especially white men?

BUSETTE: Well, I think part of it has to do with they don't really need anybody else in

their networks. Their networks, actually turns out, work really well for them. So, when we look

to cross all of these cities, and I would say, in San Francisco white men had racially homogenous

networks, but they were slightly less racially homogenous in San Francisco than they were in

other places. But San Francisco had some interesting little twists here and there. But generally

speaking, white men and white women, whites in general, had broader networks, meaning they

had different kinds of people in their networks. So, they had colleagues, they had bosses, they

had relatives, brother-in-laws, father-in-laws, mothers, et cetera. They had friends from school, other parents where their kids go to school, et cetera. It's like really broad networks. And those were also bigger, networks were also bigger and the kinds of information that was exchanged across those networks. So, kids find jobs, or an actual contact or providing a reference; those were more numerous. A broader set of things were happening in those networks. And if that's working for you, which is what we found, like, those are networks that work, then you like really don't need to go out of that. And we also found that, particularly in Charlotte, but it was true in the other three cities that whites tended to also reside in places where there were mostly white people. So, in your neighborhood, your neighbor, the person down the street, the dad whose a soccer coach for your little neighborhood group or whatever, they were all white. So, the housing situation also tended to mirror those networks and people tended to be in these pretty, I would say, segregated sounds harsh, but I would say, racially homogenous, residential setups. And as a result, their kids often went to schools; whether it was public or private; they were also racially homogenous. So, with that is something that we saw as well.

DEWS: I want to draw our listeners' attention again back to the data visualization, especially on that question of diversity; who is in your network, the different kinds of people that are in different kinds of networks. It's just so striking that as you were just saying, Camille, white men have their mother, male relatives, male in-laws, daughters, sisters, spouses, ex-spouses, brothers, partners, sons, fathers-in-laws in their network, whereas, for example, Black men include their mother, a female in-law and a partner and Black women site a mother as prominent in their network and that's about it. I think for white people, white men especially, the homogenization of the networks really speaks to the underlying issue that you and so many scholars at Brookings are talking about; social mobility and equity issues.

BUSETTE: Absolutely. So, one of the reasons we did this, wanted to explore this area, is that we know as policy experts and you've had some scores of people in your podcasts and videos who will talk about specific kinds of initiatives that have been launched or approaches that have been tried; internships, training programs; a whole host of things that they've been -- housing voucher systems, right, a whole host of things have been tried to try to increase pathways to opportunities and yet, I would say, decades of efforts in those areas we've seen really kind of paltry gains relative to the level of effort.

And one of the things we wanted to explore here was why is that happening, right, there's got to be some other kind of set of barriers and challenges and many, many other folks who've looked at this have said, obviously racism is a key operating cultural kind of context. But what we wanted to do was, rather than to just say okay, maybe racism is operating and preventing people from accessing opportunities, but how is that actually operationalized? And we didn't come into this thinking, oh right, social networks are all about race. We actually didn't know, but what we did see is that you do see the way in which racial homogeneity really does alter the kinds of pathways that people can use as social grief, basically, that's used to access opportunities. And so, that's what we want to do, we want to kind of get behind the policies and see, okay what really operates and how do people really get these opportunities, how does that information flow? And the reason we wanted to do that was not only to explain the puzzle of all the work that's been done but very little gains. But also to say maybe in public policy we need to be much more intentional about the social network effects of policy or the social network requirements around public policy, particularly for accessing opportunity.

MR.DEWS: These reports have a lot of great recommendations that I want to ask you about in just a minute. I want to stay on these characteristics of social networks for just a

12

moment longer. Obviously, racial characteristics are overwhelmingly determinative of how people social networks are formed and their extent. You talked a little bit about income characteristics in the formation of social networks. What about gender, is there a way to look at gender characteristics in the way that men or women form their social networks? Or is that also again going to be based on race?

BUSETTE: It's a great question and actually we found that gender actually played a very important role in the following way. So, irrespective of ways, men seem to have a more consistent set of relationships and that people can go in and out of their networks as much and those relationships were pretty strong. For women, women tend to associate a lot with other women. So, they're tended to be a lot more, I would say, homogeneity relative to gender, and that was irrespective of race. But then, once you get beyond these kind of broader considerations, race was actually a really huge factor; race and gender. So, what social scientists talk about is intersection in all these, which basically means there are two factors operating, right, or more. So, in this case we're talking about race and gender. What we found was that race and gender was a great predictor of how valuable and how strong your social networks were. So, for white men, these networks tended to work really well. For white women, they worked well, but not as well as they did for white men. For Black women, the networks were smaller, the composition was really different; a little bit more friends and family and maybe a few colleagues here and there. And then for Black men, there was this huge drop-off and again, I think one of the most startling findings is that Black men, across all these cities, tended to have very small numbers, very small networks. And usually there were a couple of family members. There might a female colleague and then one male friend. And in Charlotte, we found that for actually accessing jobs, education and housing, Black men had one reliable contact in that network, which is a big

difference from everybody else. So, in this case we actually find that race and gender were very, very predictive and if you're Black and male, it's very likely, across all of these cities, very likely that your social networks' relative to opportunities is pretty small. And we believe that they are distinct policies linked reasons for that.

DEWS: I definitely want to ask you about those policy choices that you talk about in the papers. But why then question that on the on-the-ground effects of say a Black man's limited social network versus a white man's broader social network. What are the kinds of on-the-ground results that stem from those outcomes that you observe in these four cities or anywhere in the country really?

BUSETTE: And I mean, it is about those on-the-ground effects. And the on-the-ground effect is basically, you don't hear about opportunities, you don't hear about jobs, you don't hear about training opportunities, you don't hear about, hey, this new housing complex is opening up and they've got 30 percent of their housing is for people who are below a certain income level. You just don't hear that. You don't hear about it through anything. See, you're just not in a position to capitalize on opportunities. And so what that means is that your opportunity to increase your income is more limited. Your opportunity to get a job that maybe has a better core path is limited. Your opportunity to maybe get some training that will lead to a better career path is also limited. And what that means is not only just for you yourself, right, but also for your family and you have less income and you have fewer opportunities and you don't care about other opportunities; you're kind of stuck and your family is also stuck. And that means that you're not really in a position to move to a different area to have better opportunities for your kids, you're not in a position to have more disposable income so you can pay for tutors for them or extra curriculum activities or anything. So, if there are some real life consequences to having

14

really small networks in these particular areas.

DEWS: You just a minute ago eluded to the policy choices that are driving these gaps and social networks and social capital even. So, what are those kinds of policy choices that you see?

BUSETTE: So, one of the things that we looked at, particularly when we looked at the Charlotte results and we're really trying to understand, wow, why are networks so racially homogenous and why they are so small for Black men? We really focused on how people form those social networks. And you asked earlier how do they form, right? So, they form these networks at school and they form these networks at work. So, what we did is we then went back and the case with Charlotte and we did it for the other cities as well, but Charlotte was the first city that where really examined this and we saw that in school, schools are supposed to serve students, but in fact in Charlotte and in North Caroling more generally, Black boys were suspended at an alarmingly high rate relative to anybody else. And those suspensions tended to really accelerate between 6th and 11th grade, so a couple of important things about that. One is, first of all, if you're suspended at a high level, you're not going to be in school, which is where you're going to meet people and form these social networks. Secondly, that adolescent period from the 6th to the 11th grade, right, so we're talking about 12 to 17; something like that; is when young people actually start creating their own identities and it's a very important moment in their self-development that who they are, who they associate with, it helps them define themselves. And when they're pulled out of an institution where what people are doing is basically building those social relationships and social networks, they can never regain that time. And so in fact, their social networks end up being severely limited and their ability to actually use the trial and error method of becoming an adult; that moment has passed, essentially. And so that sets them

up to not be very successful in being able to create social network. So, their actual policy decisions around school climate that create those kind of asymmetries in the ability to create these social networks; that's number one. Number two, we found as I mentioned earlier, that a lot of folks live in pretty residentially racially homogenous networks so they're, you know, you look at any scatter plot and you can see like a lot of whites live in Washington, D.C., right, they tend to live in the West and Northwest sections of this city, Blacks live in the Eastern sections of the city and the twain never meet. There's never any connection between the two and those (inaudible) patterns are actually the result of an intentional public policy, particularly around redlining, and zoning, and investment of city, and other kinds of resources in economic development over a period of many, many, many decades, and that's what shows up. So, as a result of those policies and those actual choices that have been made, you get residentially segregated neighborhoods, residentially segregated, and then, therefore, racially segregated neighborhoods, racially segregated schools and then you also have, in the schools where you have significant proportions of non-white students, you also have public policies around school climate that make it much more challenging for those students, and particularly Black boys, to be able to form the kinds of networks that would help them later on.

DEWS: It's such an enormous issue. It's hard to get your mind around it if you're not already kind of a public policy scholar. Just a listener here trying to sort through all of these factors and this history. So, what can be done, I mean, what kind of new policy choices are available that can be made to address the social capital gaps that already exists, but also to try to prevent them moving forward?

BUSETTE: One of the things that I think about when I think about social capital and I think about social relationships and the findings of this particular set of projects is that where we

16

want to be is we want to be in a place where there is a free flow of information, free flow of options and opportunities. But that's kind of where we want to be. And so the public policy that would underpin that is public policy which is intentionally trying to create that environment. So, when you think about housing policy, right, there's lots of ink is spilled and lots of community meetings, et cetera, across the nation around affordable housing, about mixed residential housing, et cetera. But housing turns out to be actually very important to how people socialize. And so, thinking about housing, not just as an opportunity for people to be in an area that's more desirable, but also thinking about it as an opportunity to create different kinds of social networks, I think is an important way of thinking about housing policy. So, I think housing policy is right for some redesign and particularly housing policy that is not only focused on having different types of people live together, but also that allows people to go in and out of other neighborhoods, in and out of other high opportunity zones. So, thinking about transportation as part of housing policy, making that egress, basically, pretty easy, I think is also important.

And then as we had mentioned in our report, there are lots of other opportunities, so, we think looking at school climate is obviously low hanging fruit to the extent that school districts can collect data on what did those suspensions look like, what are the supports available for students who are suspended, what exactly are their particular living situations, et cetera and then create programs that basically think of suspensions as a last resort and try to support those kids in other ways I think is also really important.

But we also think that just in general overall when you think about opportunities and you think about a particular region or city, we have to think about how do we allow everybody to have access the same kinds of information. And so some of that is going to be through schools, some of it is going to be through housing, some of it is going to be because you actually create

more resources or you make more investments in particular areas to create conduits of information. So, a great example of that is in a lot of low income neighborhoods, kids don't have access to extra curriculum activities unless they are provided by a non-profit or provided by some government entity. And that is not true in high income areas, right, so, if I were in, let's say, Charlotte, North Carolina, I would say, well in this particular zip code, these kids don't have very many extra curriculum activities at all. So, we need to bump up the investment, either through private monies or public monies, and allow them to have access to Lacrosse and Debate and Little League and everything else. And then also, when we look at who these kids associate with, in a high income area the soccer coach is also going to be a venture capitalist, right, but in the low income area, that's not necessarily going to be the case. So, what these kids see as opportunities where they could go in their lives is significantly constrained. So, making sure that there are opportunities for everybody to see what that universe of options looks like is very, very important to public policy.

DEWS: I'm thinking about opportunities for everybody, Camille, I want to -- as you wrap up here -- call the Center's attention to the reports not only because they're full of amazing data, narrative, data visualizations and I encourage everyone to go to our website, Brookings Interview, find those reports and download them. But each report also, its title begins with the phrase: How We Rise. And how we rise is also the title a blog on the Brookings website that's associated with the Race Prosperity Inclusion Initiation. So, talking about an opportunity for everybody, can you, Camille, talk about the significance of the phrase: How We Rise?

BUSETTE: So, How We Rise really is about how all of us as a community support each other to get to the point where we can all realize our own ambitions, we can all succeed, and in so doing, with everyone else help. That's really what was about.

DEWS: Okay, well I want to thank you, Camille, for sharing with us today your time, your expertise on these very important public policies issues.

BUSETTE: Well, thanks so much, Fred. You know it's always a pleasure to be with you and I just want to thank our listeners and I'm always available if people have questions or want additional information on the research.

DEWS: Perfect and you can find the research on social networks in Charlotte and social networks in Racine, Wisconsin, San Francisco, California and Washington, D.C. and how they impact economic mobility on our website Brookings.edu. Camille, thank you.

BUSETTE: Thank you, Fred. Take care.

DEWS: A team of amazing colleagues helps make the Brookings Cafeteria possible. My thanks to Audio Engineer, Gaston Alvarado; to Bill Finan, Director of the Brookings Institution Press who does the book interviews; to my communication colleagues: Marie Wilkin, Adrianna Pita and Chris McKenna for their collaboration. And finally to Camilo Ramirez and Andrea Risotto for their guidance and support. Our podcast intern this semester is David Greenburg. The Brookings Cafeteria is brought to you by the Brookings Podcast Network, which also produces Dollar and Sense, the Current, and our events podcasts. Email your questions and comments to me at BCP@brookings.edu. If you have a question for a scholar, include an audio file and I'll play it and the answer on the air. Follow us on Twitter @policypodcasts. You can listen to the Brookings Cafeteria in all the usual places. Visit us online at Brookings.edu. Until next time, I'm Fred Dews.

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2024