

Simple Tables for Municipality Proliferation

September 8, 2023

Contents

1	MAIN	2
1.1	Alternative Instrument Tables	7
1.2	Balance Table	13

List of Figures

List of Tables

1	Effects of change in Black Migration on Municipal Proliferation	2
2	Effects of change in Black Migration on Municipal Proliferation, Percentage	3
3	Effects of change in Black Migration on Municipal Proliferation	4
4	Effects of change in Black Migration on Municipal Proliferation	5
5	Robustness of Effects on Municipalities to the Inclusion of Baseline Controls	6
6	Robustness of Effects on Municipalities to Alternative Specifications	8
7	Robustness of Effects on Municipalities to Alternative Specifications	9
8	Robustness of Effects on School Districts to Alternative Specifications	10
9	Robustness of Effects on Townships to Alternative Specifications	11
10	Robustness of Effects on Special Districts to Alternative Specifications	12
11	14

Table 1: Effects of change in Black Migration on Municipal Proliferation

	C. Goodman		Census of Governments		
	Municipalities		School districts	Townships	Special districts
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Panel A: First Stage					
\widehat{GM}	3.46*** (0.42)	3.46*** (0.42)	3.46*** (0.42)	3.46*** (0.42)	3.46*** (0.42)
Panel B: OLS					
GM	0.01* (0.00)	0.01** (0.00)	0.29*** (0.08)	0.02*** (0.01)	-0.03*** (0.01)
Panel C: Reduced Form					
\widehat{GM}	0.04* (0.02)	0.05** (0.02)	1.45*** (0.42)	0.10*** (0.03)	-0.08** (0.03)
Panel D: 2SLS					
GM	0.01* (0.01)	0.02** (0.01)	0.42*** (0.12)	0.03*** (0.01)	-0.02** (0.01)
First Stage F-Stat	68.63	68.63	68.63	68.63	68.63
Dependent Variable Mean	-.17	-.2	-3.58	-.25	.26
Observations	130	130	130	130	130

" $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$ "

Table 2: Effects of change in Black Migration on Municipal Proliferation, Percentage

	C. Goodman		Census of Governments		
	Municipalities		School districts	Townships	Special districts
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Panel A: First Stage					
\widehat{GM}	1.26*** (0.46)	1.26*** (0.46)	1.26*** (0.46)	1.26*** (0.46)	1.26*** (0.46)
Panel B: OLS					
GM	-0.01*** (0.00)	-0.01** (0.00)	0.29*** (0.09)	0.00 (0.00)	-0.04** (0.02)
Panel C: Reduced Form					
\widehat{GM}	-0.01 (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)	0.80** (0.33)	-0.00 (0.01)	-0.03 (0.05)
Panel D: 2SLS					
GM	-0.01 (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)	0.63*** (0.23)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.02 (0.04)
First Stage F-Stat	7.35	7.35	7.35	7.35	7.35
Dependent Variable Mean	.11	.09	-3.32	-.02	.68
Observations	130	130	130	130	130

" $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$ "

Table 3: Effects of change in Black Migration on Municipal Proliferation

	C. Goodman		Census of Governments		
	Municipalities		School districts	Townships	Special districts
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Panel A: First Stage					
\widehat{GM}	3.46*** (0.42)	3.46*** (0.42)	3.46*** (0.42)	3.46*** (0.42)	3.46*** (0.42)
Panel B: OLS					
GM	0.00* (0.00)	0.01** (0.00)	0.18*** (0.05)	0.01*** (0.00)	-0.02** (0.01)
Panel C: Reduced Form					
\widehat{GM}	0.02* (0.01)	0.03** (0.01)	0.92*** (0.22)	0.07*** (0.02)	-0.06** (0.03)
Panel D: 2SLS					
GM	0.01** (0.00)	0.01** (0.00)	0.27*** (0.06)	0.02*** (0.00)	-0.02** (0.01)
First Stage F-Stat	68.63	68.63	68.63	68.63	68.63
Dependent Variable Mean	-.1	-.11	-1.88	-.16	.19
Observations	130	130	130	130	130

" $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$ "

Table 4: Effects of change in Black Migration on Municipal Proliferation

	C. Goodman		Census of Governments		
	Municipalities		School districts	Townships	Special districts
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Panel A: First Stage					
\widehat{GM}	3.46*** (0.42)	3.46*** (0.42)	3.46*** (0.42)	3.46*** (0.42)	3.46*** (0.42)
Panel B: OLS					
GM	0.01 (0.02)	-0.00 (0.02)	0.02 (0.02)	0.03 (0.06)	0.09 (0.19)
Panel C: Reduced Form					
\widehat{GM}	0.03 (0.06)	0.00 (0.06)	0.12* (0.07)	0.44*** (0.15)	0.92 (0.86)
Panel D: 2SLS					
GM	0.01 (0.02)	0.00 (0.02)	0.03* (0.02)	0.11*** (0.03)	0.27 (0.24)
First Stage F-Stat	68.63	68.63	68.63	68.63	68.63
Dependent Variable Mean	1.29	1.42	2.15	2.28	-3.45
Observations	130	130	123	98	114

" $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$ "

Table 5: **Robustness of Effects on Municipalities to the Inclusion of Baseline Controls**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Percentage Point Change in Urban Black Population	-0.01 (0.01)	-0.01 (0.01)	0.01* (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	-0.01 (0.01)
First stage F-Stat	117.57	96.39	68.63	57.90	49.44	36.91	56.28	56.77	56.26	56.26
GM (OLS)	-0.01	-0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.01
R2 (OLS)	0.06	0.25	0.36	0.40	0.43	0.38	0.42	0.44	0.37	0.37
Observations	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130
Census region FEs	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fraction of recent southern Black migrants	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fraction of land incorporated, 1940	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N
Fraction of CZ population in largest city	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Meters of railroad per square meter of land	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
1940 urban population	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N
1940 total population	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
1940 manufacturing share	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
1940 baseline outcome	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Log 1940 population density	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
1940 urban fraction	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

Column (3) of this table replicates Panel D Column (1) of asdfa. The remainder of the columns in the table alter specification choices to test for the stability of various baseline controls... * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

1.1 Alternative Instrument Tables

Table 6: **Robustness of Effects on Municipalities to Alternative Specifications**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Percentage Point Change in Urban Black Population	-0.01 (0.01)	-0.01 (0.01)	0.01* (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)	0.02** (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
First stage F-Stat	117.57	96.39	68.63	57.90	49.44	36.91	56.28	56.77	56.26	55.21	40.50	55.55	24.20
GM (OLS)	-0.01	-0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.01	-0.00	0.01	-0.01
R2 (OLS)	0.06	0.25	0.36	0.40	0.43	0.38	0.42	0.44	0.37	0.62	0.46	0.39	0.76
Observations	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130
Census region FEs	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fraction of recent southern Black migrants	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fraction of land incorporated, 1940	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Fraction of CZ population in largest city	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Meters of railroad per square meter of land	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
1940 urban population	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
1940 total population	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
1940 manufacturing share	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
1940 baseline outcome	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Log 1940 population density	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
1940 urban fraction	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y

Column (3) adjusts the outcome variable by total population, rather than urban population. Columns (4), (5), (6), and (7) are th: Column (4) uses an instrument residualized on southern state fixed effects. This accounts for shocks correlated between southern states and non-southern destinations. Column (5) drops the 15 southern counties coded as central in MSAs with a 1990 population over one million before constructing the instrument. This accounts for shocks correlated across both southern and non-southern urban areas. Column (6) constructs the migration links using southern state of birth of recent black migrants. Column (7) uses southern white migrants as the instrument and endogeneous variable to validate that this phenomenon is regarding Black southern migrants, not just any southern migrants. Columns (8), (9), (10), and (11) use the 1940 full count census from IPUMS [cite ipums], rather than the intermediate/cleaned version used in , to construct the destination sample, which allows us to allow us to modify the sample in two important ways. Column (8) validates the use of this sample, the specification is otherwise equivalent to column (1). Column (9) switches Texas from a southern to a non-southern city. Column (10) uses rural migrants only, defined as having reported moving from outside of an incorporated city between 1935-40. Column (11) employs both northern Texas and rural migrants only. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 7: **Robustness of Effects on Municipalities to Alternative Specifications**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Percentage Point Change in Urban Black Population	-0.01 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.01)	0.02** (0.01)	0.01* (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.01* (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)	0.02*** (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
First stage F-Stat	117.57	96.39	68.63	57.90	49.44	36.91	56.28	56.77	56.26	53.87	40.50	55.55	24.36
GM (OLS)	-0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	-0.00	-0.00	0.01	-0.01
R2 (OLS)	0.03	0.23	0.34	0.39	0.41	0.36	0.41	0.44	0.35	0.61	0.46	0.36	0.74
Observations	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130
Census region FEs	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fraction of recent southern Black migrants	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fraction of land incorporated, 1940	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Fraction of CZ population in largest city	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Meters of railroad per square meter of land	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
1940 urban population	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
1940 total population	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
1940 manufacturing share	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
1940 baseline outcome	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Log 1940 population density	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
1940 urban fraction	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y

Column (3) adjusts the outcome variable by total population, rather than urban population. Columns (4), (5), (6), and (7) are th: Column (4) uses an instrument residualized on southern state fixed effects. This accounts for shocks correlated between southern states and non-southern destinations. Column (5) drops the 15 southern counties coded as central in MSAs with a 1990 population over one million before constructing the instrument. This accounts for shocks correlated across both southern and non-southern urban areas. Column (6) constructs the migration links using southern state of birth of recent black migrants. Column (7) uses southern white migrants as the instrument and endogeneous variable to validate that this phenomenon is regarding Black southern migrants, not just any southern migrants. Columns (8), (9), (10), and (11) use the 1940 full count census from IPUMS [cite ipums], rather than the intermediate/cleaned version used in , to construct the destination sample, which allows us to allow us to modify the sample in two important ways. Column (8) validates the use of this sample, the specification is otherwise equivalent to column (1). Column (9) switches Texas from a southern to a non-southern city. Column (10) uses rural migrants only, defined as having reported moving from outside of an incorporated city between 1935-40. Column (11) employs both northern Texas and rural migrants only. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 8: **Robustness of Effects on School Districts to Alternative Specifications**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Percentage Point Change in Urban Black Population	0.20*** (0.07)	0.47*** (0.09)	0.42*** (0.12)	0.38*** (0.11)	0.38*** (0.12)	0.27** (0.11)	0.38*** (0.11)	0.37*** (0.12)	0.30** (0.13)	-0.00 (0.01)	0.21* (0.12)	0.39*** (0.13)	0.00 (0.00)
First stage F-Stat	117.57	96.39	68.63	57.90	49.44	36.91	56.28	56.77	56.26	53.11	40.50	55.55	26.11
GM (OLS)	0.26	0.35	0.29	0.27	0.26	0.12	0.26	0.24	0.15	-0.00	0.09	0.25	0.00
R2 (OLS)	0.12	0.35	0.36	0.38	0.38	0.45	0.38	0.38	0.44	1.00	0.47	0.38	1.00
Observations	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130
Census region FEs	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fraction of recent southern Black migrants	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fraction of land incorporated, 1940	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Fraction of CZ population in largest city	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Meters of railroad per square meter of land	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
1940 urban population	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
1940 total population	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
1940 manufacturing share	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
1940 baseline outcome	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Log 1940 population density	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
1940 urban fraction	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y

Column (3) adjusts the outcome variable by total population, rather than urban population. Columns (4), (5), (6), and (7) are the: Column (4) uses an instrument residualized on southern state fixed effects. This accounts for shocks correlated between southern states and non-southern destinations. Column (5) drops the 15 southern counties coded as central in MSAs with a 1990 population over one million by constructing the instrument. This accounts for shocks correlated across both southern and non-southern urban areas. Column (6) constructs the migration links using southern state of birth of recent black migrants. Column (7) uses southern white migrants as the instrument and endogenous variable to validate that this phenomenon is regarding Black southern migrants, not just any southern migrants. Columns (8), (9), (10), and (11) use the 1940 full count census from IPUMS [cite ipums], rather than the intermediate/cleaned version used in [cite], to construct the destination sample, which allows us to allow us to measure the sample in two important ways. Column (8) validates the use of this sample, the specification is otherwise equivalent to column (1). Column (9) switches Texas from a southern to a non-southern state. Column (10) uses rural migrants only, defined as having reported moving from outside of an incorporated city between 1935-40. Column (11) employs both northern Texas and rural migrants only. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table 9: **Robustness of Effects on Townships to Alternative Specifications**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Percentage Point Change in Urban Black Population	0.20*** (0.07)	0.47*** (0.09)	0.42*** (0.12)	0.38*** (0.11)	0.38*** (0.12)	0.27** (0.11)	0.38*** (0.11)	0.37*** (0.12)	0.30** (0.13)	-0.00 (0.01)	0.21* (0.12)	0.39*** (0.13)	0.00 (0.00)
First stage F-Stat	117.57	96.39	68.63	57.90	49.44	36.91	56.28	56.77	56.26	53.11	40.50	55.55	26.00
GM (OLS)	0.26	0.35	0.29	0.27	0.26	0.12	0.26	0.24	0.15	-0.00	0.09	0.25	0.00
R2 (OLS)	0.12	0.35	0.36	0.38	0.38	0.45	0.38	0.38	0.44	1.00	0.47	0.38	1.00
Observations	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130
Census region FEs	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fraction of recent southern Black migrants	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fraction of land incorporated, 1940	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Fraction of CZ population in largest city	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Meters of railroad per square meter of land	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
1940 urban population	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
1940 total population	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
1940 manufacturing share	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
1940 baseline outcome	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Log 1940 population density	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
1940 urban fraction	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y

Column (3) adjusts the outcome variable by total population, rather than urban population. Columns (4), (5), (6), and (7) are the same as column (1) but use different instruments. Column (4) uses an instrument residualized on southern state fixed effects. This accounts for shocks correlated between southern states and non-southern destinations. Column (5) drops the 15 southern counties coded as central in MSAs with a 1990 population over one million by excluding them from constructing the instrument. This accounts for shocks correlated across both southern and non-southern urban areas. Column (6) constructs the migration links using southern state of birth of recent Black migrants. Column (7) uses southern white migrants as the instrument and endogenous variable to validate that this phenomenon is regarding Black southern migrants, not just any southern migrants. Columns (8), (9), (10), and (11) use the 1940 full count census from IPUMS [cite ipums], rather than the intermediate/cleaned version used in [cite previous], to construct the destination sample, which allows us to allow us to measure migration in two important ways. Column (8) validates the use of this sample, the specification is otherwise equivalent to column (1). Column (9) switches Texas from a southern to a non-southern state. Column (10) uses rural migrants only, defined as having reported moving from outside of an incorporated city between 1935-40. Column (11) employs both northern Texas and rural migrants only. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 10: **Robustness of Effects on Special Districts to Alternative Specifications**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Percentage Point Change in Urban Black Population	-0.02*** (0.01)	-0.04*** (0.01)	-0.02** (0.01)	-0.01 (0.01)	-0.02* (0.01)	-0.02** (0.01)	-0.01 (0.01)	-0.01 (0.01)	-0.02* (0.01)	-0.02*** (0.01)	-0.00 (0.01)	-0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.02)
First stage F-Stat	117.57	96.39	68.63	57.90	49.44	36.91	56.28	56.77	56.26	72.34	40.50	55.55	20.90
GM (OLS)	-0.03	-0.03	-0.03	-0.02	-0.03	-0.03	-0.02	-0.02	-0.03	-0.03	-0.01	-0.02	-0.02
R2 (OLS)	0.14	0.22	0.23	0.27	0.24	0.23	0.26	0.26	0.23	0.25	0.27	0.27	0.44
Observations	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130
Census region FEs	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fraction of recent southern Black migrants	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fraction of land incorporated, 1940	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Fraction of CZ population in largest city	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Meters of railroad per square meter of land	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
1940 urban population	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
1940 total population	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
1940 manufacturing share	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
1940 baseline outcome	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Log 1940 population density	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
1940 urban fraction	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y

Column (3) adjusts the outcome variable by total population, rather than urban population. Columns (4), (5), (6), and (7) are th: Column (4) uses an instrument residualized on southern state fixed effects. This accounts for shocks correlated between southern states and non-southern destinations. Column (5) drops the 15 southern counties coded as central in MSAs with a 1990 population over one million before constructing the instrument. This accounts for shocks correlated across both southern and non-southern urban areas. Column (6) constructs the migration links using southern state of birth of recent black migrants. Column (7) uses southern white migrants as the instrument and endogeneous variable to validate that this phenomenon is regarding Black southern migrants, not just any southern migrants. Columns (8), (9), (10), and (11) use the 1940 full count census from IPUMS [cite ipums], rather than the intermediate/cleaned version used in , to construct the destination sample, which allows us to allow us to modify the sample in two important ways. Column (8) validates the use of this sample, the specification is otherwise equivalent to column (1). Column (9) switches Texas from a southern to a non-southern city. Column (10) uses rural migrants only, defined as having reported moving from outside of an incorporated city between 1935-40. Column (11) employs both northern Texas and rural migrants only. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

1.2 Balance Table

Table 11

	1940-1970 Pooled	1940-1950	1950-1960	1960-1970	Stacked
ln_pop_dens1940 on GM_hat	0.38*** (0.11)	0.38*** (0.11)	1.94*** (0.47)	0.90* (0.36)	0.40*** (0.11)
urban_share1940 on GM_hat	0.05* (0.02)	0.09** (0.03)	0.18 (0.10)	0.04 (0.08)	0.06* (0.03)
mfg_lfshare on GM_hat	1.89** (0.68)	2.41* (1.03)	6.45* (3.04)	4.32** (1.39)	2.28* (0.92)
b_gen_muni_cz1940_pc on GM_hat	-0.18*** (0.05)	-0.12 (0.07)	-0.74** (0.27)	-0.67** (0.22)	-0.19* (0.08)
b_schdist_ind_cz1940_pc on GM_hat	-1.53*** (0.44)	-1.94*** (0.53)	-8.20*** (1.93)	-1.99 (1.63)	-1.76*** (0.48)
b_spdist_cz1940_pc on GM_hat	-0.02 (0.04)	0.05 (0.08)	-0.11 (0.20)	-0.19 (0.14)	-0.02 (0.07)
b_gen_town_cz1940_pc on GM_hat	-0.37*** (0.07)	-0.39*** (0.10)	-1.49*** (0.41)	-0.92*** (0.22)	-0.42*** (0.09)
b_goodman_cz1940_pc on GM_hat	-0.16*** (0.05)	-0.10 (0.06)	-0.67** (0.25)	-0.60** (0.21)	-0.17* (0.07)
frac_land on GM_hat	0.05* (0.02)	0.03 (0.02)	0.27* (0.12)	0.14 (0.08)	0.05* (0.02)
transpo_cost_1920 on GM_hat	-0.09 (0.05)	-0.11 (0.10)	-0.43 (0.24)	-0.17 (0.14)	-0.10 (0.06)
coastal on GM_hat	0.01 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.04)	0.10 (0.12)	0.07 (0.06)	0.01 (0.03)
avg_precip on GM_hat	0.21 (0.57)	0.70 (1.01)	4.32 (3.60)	-2.20 (1.54)	0.29 (0.92)
avg_temp on GM_hat	-1.52 (1.74)	-0.48 (3.14)	-2.06 (8.34)	-7.77 (5.21)	-1.52 (2.75)
n_wells on GM_hat	-24.20 (14.50)	-22.49 (15.75)	-42.45 (46.79)	-100.26 (67.81)	-27.14 (14.91)
totfrac_in_main_city on GM_hat	0.06** (0.02)	0.06** (0.02)	0.30** (0.10)	0.15* (0.07)	0.07*** (0.02)
urbfrac_in_main_city on GM_hat	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.02)	0.09 (0.09)	0.00 (0.04)	0.01 (0.02)
m_rr on GM_hat	1.1e+05 (77678.60)	-1.8e+04 (1.5e+05)	-3.1e+04 (4.7e+05)	8.0e+05** (2.7e+05)	1.1e+05 (1.7e+05)
m_rr_sqm2 on GM_hat	0.00* (0.00)	0.00* (0.00)	0.00** (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00* (0.00)
popc1940 on GM_hat	5.5e+05* (2.3e+05)	3.6e+05 (2.2e+05)	2.6e+06* (1.1e+06)	1.8e+06* (7.2e+05)	6.0e+05** (2.2e+05)
pop1940 on GM_hat	6.1e+05* (2.4e+05)	3.8e+05 (2.5e+05)	2.8e+06* (1.1e+06)	2.1e+06** (7.9e+05)	6.6e+05* (2.6e+05)

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$