* Use RENTGRS in the hedonics section instead of contract rent, since according to the IPUMS documentation gross rent should be more comparable (gross rent always includes utilities, etc. while contract rent may or may not).
* Filter observations on `hrswork2` (hours worked last week) instead of `uhrswork` for the period 1970 to 1990. If trends appear comparable across these two specification, probably nothing to worry about.
* Include more dwelling characteristics in the hedonic regressions, maybe some interaction terms. With so many observations and so much more data available (plumbing, stories, access, etc.) than we are using, I see no reason not to make the regressions a bit more sophisticated.
* Keep in mind that for 1970, only areas larger than 250,000 people are identified. This means that a lot of the bottom end of the city size distribution is cut-off compared to the analysis from later years. One way to assess the significance of this data limitation would be to figure out what percentile of the city size distribution 250,000 is in 1970 (perhaps from the list of SMSA populations I transcribed by hand from that Census document), then remove observations from below that percentile in my graphs for other years.
* Not exactly a sensitivity test, but find the official figures for metro area populations for each decade, and compare with the estimates I get from summing `perwt` within each metarea. This should show how ‘off’ our identification of areas is, hopefully it would line up well with the figures published in the “incompletely identified metropolitan areas” table on the IPUMS website.
* Use `incearn`, or construct its equivalent for the years that don’t have it, and use that as the basis for the `wage` variable.
* Divide `wage` by hours worked to get hourly wage instead of weekly wage. Moreover, don’t limit to “full time” workers. When I initially started working on this project, this was something I thought was important. The motivating anecdote in my mind is that big cities have low-skilled workers who work a lot of hours, so using their weekly wage as your measure would hide that. I think it’s also possible that cities have more high-skilled people who work fewer hours per week, so again looking at their weekly wage would understate their skills.