

This document is an output from a project funded by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) and the Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA) for the benefit of developing countries. The views expressed are not necessarily those of DFID or IZA.

506 We find that more than a third of the individuals in our sample are migrants, and their
507 median age of departure is 20. Furthermore, we find that more than half of the total internal youth
508 migration is temporary and rural-to-rural or urban-to-urban, in contrast with the more widely
509 studied rural-to-urban permanent migration. Indeed, this finding highlights prior evidence from
510 documenting the relevance of these mobility patterns in francophone West Africa (Beauchemin
511 and Bocquier, 2004; Beauchemin, 2011).

512 Our findings suggest that the determinants of internal migration in Senegal are
513 heterogeneous by gender and differ for those leaving their childhood residence for an urban or
514 rural destination. Similar to Chort et al. (2017), we find that Senegalese women are more likely to
515 migrate for reasons related to marriage, something that has been documented in other sub-Saharan
516 African countries (Kudo, 2015). We also find that childhood socioeconomic conditions, such as
517 father's education, the demographic composition of the household, and access to educational
518 opportunities where individuals grew up, can shape later youth migration differently for women
519 and men. For example, fathers' education has a particularly important role in women's migration
520 choices: the more educated the father, the more (less) likely are the daughters to move to urban
521 (rural) areas. In our sample, 72 percent of the female migrants are married. This result could
522 suggest that father's education is influential in marriage arrangements and in the probability that a
523 daughter will marry someone and leave the childhood residence with her new husband in search
524 of greater economic opportunity in urban areas. These results are similar to those found by
525 Quisumbing and McNiven (2006) in the Philippines, where father's education increases the
526 probability of a daughter moving from the village, and interestingly, mother's education has the
527 opposite effect. However, this is only conjecture, as we do not have further information to
528 disentangle the role of marriage and economic opportunities in the decision to migrate.

529 Furthermore, our findings suggest that the presence of younger siblings during childhood
530 is associated with migration decisions. For instance, women with younger sisters (but not brothers)
531 are more likely to migrate, suggesting that younger female siblings act as substitutes in household
532 responsibilities. We also find that those who lived in households with a higher asset index, when
533 they were 10 years old, are more likely to migrate to urban areas. This may be because these young
534 women and men are able to finance the costs of migrating to urban areas and to reap the benefits
535 of better employment opportunities in the cities.

536 The characteristics of the community in which children reside also shape migration
537 decisions. Proximity to better social infrastructure during childhood, particularly primary schools
538 and hospitals, is generally associated with a lower probability of migrating. The one clear
539 exception is access to secondary schools, which in fact increases the probability of migration to
540 urban areas for young women. While proximity to secondary schools may mitigate the need to
541 migrate in search of more education, such accessibility is likely associated with higher schooling
542 attainment, especially for girls whose parents are more reluctant to send their daughters away to
543 boarding schools and/or reside with relatives in order to raise school attainment. These human
544 capital investments may subsequently encourage migration of young women to urban areas in
545 search of employment opportunities that utilize their human capital and education. Although we
546 are not able to test this empirically, it is plausible that access to secondary school is more relevant
547 for women than men, because education has a larger effect on female than male migration. Indeed,
548 Chort et al. (2017) show that years of schooling increases the likelihood of migrating to urban
549 areas, especially for women, suggesting that education can be a channel to promoting women's
550 migration, independent of the usual reason of migrating for family and marriage reasons.

551 Our findings motivate further research on the expected consequences of internal youth
552 migration for individuals, their households, and their communities. Even though migration can
553 expand labor market opportunities, some research has pointed out that young people are vulnerable
554 to negative migration experiences (Tienda et al., 2008; Heckert, 2015). Furthermore, while young
555 migrants can provide benefits to their households by sending remittances, the high costs of
556 financing migration and family disruptions could also negatively affect those households.²⁷
557 Similarly, while remittances can improve the economic conditions of the communities of origin,
558 migration can also be detrimental if the young, educated people leave their communities (as with
559 “brain drain”). Whether the benefits outweigh the costs of migration on individuals, households,
560 and communities remains an empirical question and cannot be answered generally. However,
561 future research can build on our findings by collecting long-term, longitudinal data, before and
562 after migration, thus allowing researchers to track the welfare consequences of internal migration
563 of young individuals, their households, and communities. This research can identify patterns and
564 circumstances which may enable policymakers to intervene to ensure the benefits of migration
565 outweigh its possible negative consequences.

566 While there is still much to be learned about the internal migration of young people in
567 Senegal, and more generally, in other developing countries, the high degree of mobility and the
568 recognition of certain factors that contribute to these population movements is important
569 knowledge for policymakers, both in terms of affecting and planning for the widespread migration.
570 While there remain many questions about the determinants of migration and how to cope with the
571 stresses on communities and households affected by these population movements, there is every
572 reason to expect that they will only accelerate in years to come. Indeed, in a country such as

²⁷ The literature on the effects of remittances on household welfare is vast in developing countries. For instance, see Binci and Gianelli (2018) for a review of the effects of remittances on education and child labor.

573 Senegal where the young population will have doubled by 2035, and more than half of the
574 population still lives in the rural areas, factors such as increasing land pressure, the adverse effects
575 of climate change, and rapid structural transformation to a more industrialized and service-oriented
576 economy can be expected to increase internal youth mobility in the country (de Brauw et al., 2014;
577 Ba et al., 2017).

578 Although our analysis sheds light on whether childhood conditions influence later youth
579 mobility, it does not establish causality between the socioeconomic factors when young migrants
580 were 10 years old and their later internal mobility decisions in Senegal. To provide such causal
581 empirical evidence, future research could leverage experimental methods, an emerging
582 methodology in migration research (McKenzie, 2015), to study specific policy instruments for
583 managing internal migration.

References

- Abramitzky, R., Boustan, L. P., & Abramitzky, K. (2013). Have the poor always been less likely to migrate? Evidence from inheritance practices during the age of mass migration. *Journal of Development Economics*, 102, 2–14.
- Assaad, R., & Arntz, M. (2005). Constrained geographical mobility and gendered labor market outcomes under structural adjustment: Evidence from Egypt. *World Development*, 33(3), 431–454.
- Auwalin, I. (2019). Ethnic identity and internal migration decision in Indonesia. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 1-21.
- Beauchemin, C., & Bocquier, P. (2004). Migration and urbanisation in francophone West Africa: An overview of the recent empirical evidence. *Urban Studies*, 41(11), 2245–2272.
- Beauchemin, C. (2011). Rural–urban migration in West Africa: Towards a reversal? Migration trends and economic situation in Burkina Faso and Côte d'Ivoire. *Population, Space and Place*, 17(1), 47–72.
- Ba C, B. J and Diop. D. (2017). Senegal: the fluidity of internal migration as an answer to local constraints. In : Rural Africa in motion. Dynamics and drivers of migration South of the Sahara. Mercandalli Sara (ed.), Losch Bruno (ed.). Rome : FAO-CIRAD, pp. 32-33. ISBN 978-92-5-109974-2
- Beegle, K., & Poulin, M. (2013). Migration and the transition to adulthood in contemporary Malawi. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 648(1), 38-51.
- Beegle, K., De Weerd, J., & Dercon, S. (2011). Migration and economic mobility in Tanzania: Evidence from a tracking survey. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 93(3), 1010–1033.
- Bilsborrow, R. E., Oberai, A. S., & Standing, G. (1984). *Migration Surveys in Low Income Countries: Guidelines for Survey and Questionnaire Design*. London: Croom Helm.
- Binci, M., & Giannelli, G. C. (2016). Internal versus international migration: Impacts of remittances on child labor and schooling in Vietnam. *International Migration Review*.
- Brockerhoff, M., & Eu, H. (1993). Demographic and socioeconomic determinants of female rural to urban migration in Sub-Saharan Africa. *International Migration Review*, 27(3), 557–577.
- Chort, I. (2014). Mexican migrants to the US: What do unrealized migration intentions tell us about gender inequalities? *World Development*, 59, 535–552.
- Chort, I., De Vreyer, P., & Zuber, T. (2017). Gendered internal migration patterns in Senegal. Working Paper No. DT/2017/02, DIAL (Développement, Institutions et Mondialisation).

- Rosenzweig, M. R., & Stark, O. (1989). Consumption smoothing, migration, and marriage: Evidence from rural India. *Journal of Political Economy*, 97(4): 905–926.
- Safir, A. (2009) Who leaves, who moves in? The impact of positive and negative income shocks on migration in Senegal. Working Paper No 76, World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Smith, J. P., & Thomas, D. (1998). On the road: Marriage and mobility in Malaysia. *Journal of Human Resources*, 33(4), 805–832.
- Stark, O., & Bloom, D. E. (1985). The new economics of labor migration. *American Economic Review*, 75(2), 173–178.
- Stark, O. (1991). *The Migration of Labor* (pp. 216–220). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sy, M. (1991). Reasons for Senegalese migration determined by ethnic background and social status. *Pop Sahel*, (16), 29-35.
- Tansel, A. (1997). Schooling attainment, parental education, and gender in Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 45(4), 825-856.
- Taylor, J. E. (1999). The new economics of labor migration and the role of remittances in the migration process. *International Migration* 37(1), 63–88.
- _____ (2001). Migration: New dimensions and characteristics, causes, consequences and implications for rural poverty. *Food, agriculture, and rural development: Current and emerging issues for economic analysis and policy research*, 167.
<http://www.fao.org/docrep/003/X9808e/x9808e07.htm#ee>
- Taylor, J. E., & Martin, P. L. (2001). Human capital: Migration and rural population change. In *Handbook of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 1, Part A, ed. B. L. Gardner and G. C. Rauser, 457-511. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Tegegne, A. D., & Penker, M. (2016). Determinants of rural out-migration in Ethiopia: Who stays and who goes?. *Demographic Research*, 35, 1011-1044.
- Tienda, M., Taylor, L., and Moghan, J. (2007). New frontiers, uncertain futures: Migrant youth and children of migrants in a globalised world. Zürich, Switzerland: Background paper prepared for Zurich Migration Workshop (Vol.17), August 26 2007.
- United Nations Development Program (UNDP) (2009). *Overcoming Barriers: Human Mobility and Development*. Human Development Report. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wooldridge, J. M. (2002). *Econometric analysis of cross section and panel data* MIT Press. Cambridge, MA, 108.

World Bank (2006). Senegal second Poverty Reduction Paper Strategy. World Bank, Washington, DC.

World Bank (2007). Development and the next generation. World Development Report, World Bank. Washington, DC.

World Bank (2019). World Development Indicators

Young, A. (2013) 'Inequality, the Urban-Rural Gap, and Migration', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 128: 1727-1785.

TABLES

Table 1: Distribution of Migrants by Rural/Urban Birthplace and 2003 Residence

	Urban–Rural	Rural–Rural	Urban–Urban	Rural–Urban
Primary	60.6%	7.3%	26.2%	59.8%
Repeat	3.0%	0.5%	4.3%	8.3%
Return	1.5%	14.7%	14.5%	2.3%
Temporary	34.8%	77.5%	55.1%	29.5%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
N ^a	66	409	325	132

^a Refers to the total number of migrants by urban–rural destination.

Table 2: Socioeconomic Characteristics of Migrants and Nonmigrants

	Migrant	Non-migrant	Total
<i>Individual Characteristics in 2003</i>			
Percentage female	64%	53%	57%
Average age	27.79 (4.55)	26.40 (4.42)	26.90 (4.52)
Years of education	4.14 (4.61)	4.45 (4.25)	4.34 (4.38)
Ethnicity groups (%)*			
Wolof	29.4%	35.8%	33.5%
Poular	24.7%	20.0%	21.7%
Sose	13.8%	17.84%	15%
Serere	20.4%	16.2%	18.9%
Diola	8.2%	5.0%	6.2%
% whose Father has no education	73.1%	69.2%	70.6%
% whose Mother has no education	85.4%	82.7%	83.7%
<i>Characteristics at age of 10 years</i>			
Average number of older siblings	1.80 (2.01)	1.88 (2.05)	1.85 (2.04)
Average number of younger siblings	2.57 (2.09)	2.42 (2.10)	2.47 (2.10)
Access to primary school	86%	95%	91%
Access to secondary school	45%	55%	51%
Access to hospital	71%	83%	79%
<i>Distribution by asset quartiles</i>			
First	40.22%	31.5%	34.6%
Second	19.57%	18.1%	18.6%
Third	28.60%	25.6%	23.1%
Fourth	21.61%	24.8%	23.7%
N	855	1546	2401

Notes: Standard deviations in parenthesis. Other ethnicity and regional dummy variables are not shown. Individuals from other ethnicities represent 4% of the sample.

Table 3: Average Marginal Effects of Multinomial Logits by Rural and Urban Destination

	Panel A ALL		Panel B MEN		Panel C WOMEN	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
<i>Individual Characteristics</i>						
Gender	-0.072*** (0.015)	-0.009 (0.015)				
Age	0.085*** (0.024)	-0.052** (0.024)	0.061* (0.034)	-0.028 (0.037)	0.096*** (0.034)	-0.058* (0.031)
Age-squared	-0.001*** (0.000)	0.001** (0.000)	-0.001+ (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)	-0.002*** (0.001)	0.001** (0.001)
Wolof	-0.025 (0.033)	-0.049+ (0.032)	-0.026 (0.047)	-0.111** (0.046)	-0.029 (0.046)	-0.000 (0.044)
Poular	-0.016 (0.027)	-0.021 (0.032)	0.045 (0.034)	-0.054 (0.046)	-0.079** (0.040)	0.008 (0.045)
Serere	0.004 (0.035)	-0.167*** (0.042)	-0.030 (0.048)	-0.155*** (0.058)	0.033 (0.050)	-0.174*** (0.059)
Diola	-0.027 (0.042)	-0.006 (0.044)	0.020 (0.055)	-0.013 (0.063)	-0.056 (0.059)	-0.003 (0.061)
Other ethnicity	-0.099* (0.053)	-0.071+ (0.047)	-0.062 (0.083)	-0.141* (0.073)	-0.131* (0.071)	-0.011 (0.063)
<i>Household Characteristics</i>						
Father's education	-0.018*** (0.007)	0.012*** (0.004)	-0.017* (0.009)	0.006 (0.006)	-0.022** (0.009)	0.018*** (0.005)
Mother's education	-0.006 (0.010)	0.004 (0.006)	0.005 (0.013)	-0.006 (0.009)	-0.012 (0.014)	0.008 (0.007)
Asset index (z-score)	-0.007 (0.012)	0.029** (0.012)	-0.021 (0.018)	0.033* (0.019)	-0.000 (0.017)	0.022 (0.016)
Older siblings	-0.002 (0.004)	-0.002 (0.004)	-0.009+ (0.006)	-0.006 (0.005)	0.004 (0.006)	-0.000 (0.005)
Younger siblings	0.009** (0.004)	0.000 (0.004)	0.002 (0.005)	0.005 (0.005)	0.013** (0.005)	-0.004 (0.005)
Loss of parent(s)	0.070*** (0.027)	0.035 (0.030)	0.068* (0.042)	0.062 (0.051)	0.077** (0.036)	0.020 (0.038)
<i>Community Characteristics</i>						
Primary school	-0.024 (0.024)	-0.175*** (0.037)	0.027 (0.034)	-0.198*** (0.061)	-0.063* (0.033)	-0.170*** (0.048)
Secondary school	-0.002 (0.026)	0.028 (0.029)	0.034 (0.034)	-0.054 (0.041)	-0.033 (0.037)	0.102** (0.040)
Hospital	-0.074*** (0.020)	0.044 (0.035)	-0.039+ (0.027)	0.080+ (0.055)	-0.097*** (0.028)	0.020 (0.045)
Rural 10 years	0.155*** (0.031)	-0.070** (0.029)	0.168*** (0.043)	-0.130*** (0.043)	0.129*** (0.043)	-0.022 (0.040)

Notes: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, + p<0.15. Standard errors calculated using the delta method. All models include regional dummies for childhood place when 10 years old. Number of observations: ALL: 2,401; Men: 1,035; Women: 1,366.

Table 4: Average Marginal Effects including Siblings' Gender and Age Composition

	Panel A		Panel B		Panel C	
	ALL		MEN		WOMEN	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
Father's education	-0.018*** (0.007)	0.012*** (0.004)	-0.017* (0.009)	0.006 (0.006)	-0.023** (0.009)	0.018*** (0.005)
Mother's education	-0.005 (0.010)	0.004 (0.006)	0.006 (0.013)	-0.006 (0.009)	-0.011 (0.014)	0.008 (0.007)
No. older brothers	0.003 (0.006)	0.006 (0.006)	-0.014 (0.010)	-0.000 (0.008)	0.017* (0.009)	0.013+ (0.008)
No. older sisters	-0.007 (0.007)	-0.013* (0.007)	-0.005 (0.011)	-0.013 (0.010)	-0.010 (0.010)	-0.015+ (0.009)
No. younger brothers	0.005 (0.005)	-0.002 (0.006)	-0.001 (0.007)	0.001 (0.008)	0.010 (0.008)	-0.007 (0.008)
No. younger sisters	0.013** (0.006)	0.002 (0.006)	0.007 (0.008)	0.007 (0.008)	0.016** (0.008)	-0.002 (0.008)
Asset index (z-score)	-0.007 (0.012)	0.029** (0.012)	-0.021 (0.018)	0.033* (0.019)	-0.000 (0.017)	0.022 (0.016)
Loss of parent(s)	0.070*** (0.027)	0.038 (0.030)	0.064+ (0.042)	0.064 (0.051)	0.078** (0.036)	0.021 (0.038)

Notes: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, + p<0.15. Standard errors calculated using the delta method. All models include individual and community variables as well as regional dummies for childhood place when 10 years old. Number of observations: ALL: 2,401; Men: 1,035; Women: 1,366.

ONLINE APPENDIX (NOT FOR PUBLICATION)

Table A.1: Average Marginal Effects—Main Results including Individual’s Education

	Panel A		Panel B		Panel C	
	ALL		MEN		WOMEN	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
<i>Individual Characteristics</i>						
Gender	-0.075*** (0.016)	-0.014 (0.015)				
Age	0.088*** (0.024)	-0.051** (0.024)	0.074** (0.034)	-0.034 (0.037)	0.096*** (0.034)	-0.054* (0.031)
Age-squared	-0.001*** (0.000)	0.001** (0.000)	-0.001* (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)	-0.002*** (0.001)	0.001* (0.001)
Years of education	0.002 (0.002)	0.003+ (0.002)	0.008*** (0.002)	0.005** (0.003)	-0.006* (0.003)	0.001 (0.003)
<i>Household Characteristics</i>						
Father’s education	-0.017** (0.007)	0.010** (0.004)	-0.019** (0.009)	0.003 (0.006)	-0.016* (0.010)	0.017*** (0.005)
Mother’s education	-0.011 (0.011)	0.004 (0.006)	0.004 (0.013)	-0.007 (0.009)	-0.020 (0.016)	0.009 (0.008)
Asset index (z-score)	-0.007 (0.012)	0.026** (0.012)	-0.025 (0.018)	0.029+ (0.019)	0.006 (0.017)	0.019 (0.016)
No. older siblings	-0.001 (0.004)	-0.004 (0.004)	-0.011* (0.006)	-0.008 (0.006)	0.006 (0.006)	-0.001 (0.005)
No. younger siblings	0.008** (0.004)	0.001 (0.004)	0.002 (0.004)	0.005 (0.005)	0.013** (0.005)	-0.003 (0.005)
Loss of parent(s)	0.067** (0.027)	0.044+ (0.031)	0.074* (0.042)	0.075 (0.052)	0.067* (0.036)	0.025 (0.038)
<i>Community Characteristics</i>						
Primary school	-0.027 (0.024)	-0.174*** (0.038)	0.014 (0.033)	-0.192*** (0.062)	-0.058* (0.034)	-0.167*** (0.048)
Secondary school	-0.003 (0.026)	0.025 (0.029)	0.029 (0.033)	-0.049 (0.041)	-0.035 (0.038)	0.098** (0.041)
Hospital	-0.073*** (0.020)	0.044 (0.035)	-0.044+ (0.027)	0.080+ (0.055)	-0.089*** (0.028)	0.017 (0.045)
Rural at 10 years	0.159*** (0.031)	-0.074** (0.030)	0.171*** (0.042)	-0.124*** (0.043)	0.122*** (0.044)	-0.031 (0.040)

Notes: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, + p<0.15. Standard errors calculated using the delta method. All models include regional dummies for childhood place at 10 years old. Number of observations: ALL: 2,401; Men: 1,035; Women: 1,366.

Table A.2: Average Marginal Effects—Main Results excluding the Youngest Migrants

	ALL	
	Rural	Urban
<i>Individual Characteristics</i>		
Gender	−0.071*** (0.015)	−0.012 (0.015)
Age	0.077*** (0.024)	−0.022 (0.024)
Age-squared	−0.001*** (0.000)	0.001 (0.000)
<i>Household Characteristics</i>		
Father's education	−0.014** (0.006)	0.010*** (0.004)
Mother's education	−0.006 (0.010)	0.004 (0.006)
Asset index (z_score)	−0.004 (0.012)	0.028** (0.012)
Older siblings	−0.001 (0.004)	−0.001 (0.004)
Younger siblings	0.008** (0.003)	0.001 (0.003)
Loss of parent(s)	0.063** (0.027)	0.047* (0.029)
<i>Community Characteristics</i>		
Primary school	−0.029 (0.024)	−0.149*** (0.037)
Secondary school	0.006 (0.026)	0.017 (0.028)
Hospital	−0.078*** (0.020)	0.044 (0.034)
Rural at 10 years old	0.156*** (0.031)	−0.065** (0.028)

Notes: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, + p<0.15. Standard errors calculated using the delta method. All models include regional dummies for childhood place when 10 years old. Number of Observations: ALL: 2,274.

Table A.3: Average Marginal Effects—Main Results excluding Temporary Migrants

	ALL	
	Rural	Urban
Gender	−0.026** (0.012)	−0.008 (0.014)
Age	0.048** (0.020)	−0.022 (0.023)
Age-squared	−0.001** (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)
<i>Household Characteristics</i>		
Father's education	−0.007+ (0.004)	0.009** (0.004)
Mother's education	−0.002 (0.006)	0.001 (0.006)
Asset index	−0.006 (0.010)	0.042*** (0.012)
No. older siblings	−0.004 (0.003)	−0.002 (0.003)
No. younger siblings	0.001 (0.003)	−0.005+ (0.004)
Loss of parent(s)	0.037* (0.020)	0.057** (0.027)
<i>Community Characteristics</i>		
Primary school	−0.019 (0.022)	−0.165*** (0.034)
Secondary school	0.012 (0.020)	0.030 (0.027)
Hospital	−0.013 (0.018)	0.027 (0.032)
Rural at 10 years	0.054** (0.024)	−0.001 (0.028)

Notes: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, + p<0.15. Standard errors calculated using the delta method. All models include ethnicity dummies and regional dummies for childhood place when 10 years old. Number of observations 1,897

Table A.4: Main Results including interaction between Asset Index and Rural Origin

	Panel A		Panel B		Panel C	
	All		MEN		Women	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
Father's education	-0.018*** (0.007)	0.012*** (0.004)	-0.016* (0.009)	0.006 (0.006)	-0.022** (0.009)	0.018*** (0.005)
Mother's education	-0.006 (0.010)	0.004 (0.006)	0.006 (0.012)	-0.006 (0.009)	-0.012 (0.014)	0.008 (0.007)
Older siblings	-0.002 (0.004)	-0.002 (0.004)	-0.010* (0.006)	-0.006 (0.005)	0.004 (0.006)	-0.000 (0.005)
Younger siblings	0.009** (0.003)	0.000 (0.004)	0.003 (0.004)	0.005 (0.005)	0.013** (0.005)	-0.004 (0.005)
Asset index	0.029+ (0.020)	0.033** (0.014)	0.032 (0.032)	0.044** (0.021)	0.027 (0.027)	0.020 (0.019)
Rural at 10 years	0.148*** (0.030)	-0.080*** (0.031)	0.165*** (0.047)	-0.164*** (0.049)	0.126*** (0.045)	-0.022 (0.040)
Rural*asset	-0.056** (0.024)	-0.022 (0.024)	-0.079** (0.038)	-0.068* (0.040)	-0.042 (0.033)	0.001 (0.031)
Loss of parent(s)	0.069*** (0.027)	0.034 (0.030)	0.070* (0.041)	0.059 (0.051)	0.075** (0.036)	0.020 (0.038)

Notes: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, + p<0.15. Standard errors calculated using the delta method. All models include individual and community variables as well as regional dummies for childhood place when 10 years old. Number of observations: ALL: 2,401; Men: 1,035; Women: 1,366.