Local ability to "rewire" and socioeconomic performance: Evidence from US counties before and after the Great Recession

Partridge, Mark D. and Tsvetkova, Alexandra

The Ohio State University

9 May 2018

Local ability to "rewire" and socioeconomic performance: Evidence from US counties before and after the Great Recession

Mark Partridge[1,2,3] and Alexandra Tsvetkova[1*]

[1] The Ohio State University
[2] Jinan, University, Guangzhou China
[3] Urban Studies and Regional Science, Gran Sasso Science Institute, L'Aquila, Italy

May 9, 2018

Abstract:

We examine the effects of three broad groups of socioeconomic factors on poverty, income and employment growth in US counties before and after the Great Recession. The factors reflect different aspects of county economic structure, social/demographic attributes, and natural amenities, as well as position within the urban-rural hierarchy. Our main focus is on the dynamic adjustments within local labor markets, which we approximate with novel measures that capture the ability of a county to *rewire* by reallocating employees from shrinking to expanding sectors. We use cross-sectional, first-difference and quantile regressions and find that county industrial composition (if it is fast- or slow-growing) and the rewiring ability are of increasing importance. Some of our most policy-relevant findings come from the quantile analysis of differenced job growth. For counties that are lower at the distribution of the response function, the labor-market measures of flexibility emerge as important predictors of growth, suggesting that removing barriers to flow of resources within lagging economies might be a viable policy option.

Acknowledgements:

The authors appreciate the partial support of USDA AFRI grant #11400612 "Maximizing the Gains of Old and New Energy Development for America`s Rural Communities" and US Economic Development Administration grant #ED17HDQ3120040 "Regional Economic Development as a New Theoretical Framework: Integrating Data Science, Complex Adaptive Systems and Social Sciences for Precision Policies"

The United States has always experienced spatial differences in economic activity and wellbeing (e.g., Carlino and Mills 1996 and Rey and Montouri 1999), although long-running convergence historically mitigated the disparities (Caselli and Coleman 2001; Carlino and Mills 1993). Recent structural changes related to deindustrialization, technological change, and globalization have weakened or even reversed the convergence forces. This change has reinforced income differentials, particularly in the Rustbelt, coal country, and much of rural America, which found themselves unprepared to face the new challenges (Autor, Dorn and Hanson 2013; Autor, Katz and Kearney 2008). The uneven recovery from the Great Recession has further fueled the perceptions that large regions are being left behind (Lowrey 2017).[1]

Against this backdrop, going back to the 1960s, we first document the trends of converging and then diverging economic fortunes across US states and counties. In further analysis, we show that there is truth to the perception that there are regional differences between the pre- and post-recession performance, causing us to want to understand some reasons for these trends to help inform a better understanding of economic resilience for better labor market policies. For the 2000-2015 period, we then econometrically explore the underlying drivers of economic performance at the county level. We bring together a wide range of factors that have been shown to shape regional socioeconomic performance including economic structure, social/demographic attributes, and natural amenities, as well as a position within the urban-rural hierarchy.[2] The selection of the three general variable groupings follows from the economic development

[1]Center for American Progress (2017) provides a nice summary of these trends. To illustrate the associated despair, the US has come under grips of a wrenching opioid crisis and related "deaths of despair" that are often associated with the lack of economic opportunity (Betz and Jones 2018; Case and Deaton 2015; Goetz and Davlasheridze 2018).

[2]A few studies bring together a wide range of explanatory variables when analyzing county-level performance (e.g., Rupasingha, Goetz and Freshwater, 2002 and Rupasingha and Goetz, 2007). In some cases, researchers prefer to reduce the number of variables used in estimation via principal component analysis, which is useful in predicting outcomes but deprives a researcher the ability to measure the relative impact for each individual variable that is retained as part of the principal components (Khatiwada, 2014).

literature (Beyers 2013; Partridge 2010; Rupasingha, Goetz and Freshwater 2002). Understanding the underlying forces – and possible changes in their influence between the pre- and post-Great Recession period[3] – would help shape up-to-date policy responses aimed at lifting localities left behind backed since the Great Recession. Indeed, this roadmap is consistent with recent calls to depart from development strategies that are ineffective and identify new approaches (Fodor 2012).

A novel contribution is we complement traditional, mainly "static" measures of economic structure with measures that approximate the ability of a county to *rewire* by reallocating employees across sectors. Overall, these measures reflect the flexibility of the local labor markets. Researchers have long highlighted the importance of sectoral shifts and restructuring for the local socioeconomic performance (e.g. Fan and Casetti 1994). Interest in the effects of worker reallocation has motivated scholars to understand the changes brought by the Great Recession and recent technological changes—e.g., use of more robots (Foster, Grim and Haltiwanger 2016). The three measures of county labor market flexibility offer insights into the role played by industrial and occupational adjustments within local economies.

There is emerging evidence that this period experienced many changes in economic relationships (Elsby, Hobijn and Sahin 2010; Hobijn and Sahin 2013). In assessing such changes, we examine the pre-recession (2000-2007), recession (2007-2010) and post-recession (2010-2015) periods. We use several econometric techniques, such as cross-sectional, first-difference, and quantile regression to understand contemporary determinants of local economic well-being. Our main analysis uses difference-in-difference estimation (Bertrand, Duflo and Mullainathan 2004) and investigates the changing importance of each factor in explaining employment growth, change in poverty rates, and median household income growth for US counties.

[3] Previous research documents changing patterns of effects at least for some determinants of regional economic performance (Foster, Grim and Haltiwanger 2016; Moscarini and Postel-Vinay 2016).

Our results suggest some changing relationships. We find that the role played by county industrial composition (if it is fast- or slow-growing) is of *increasing* importance. Another *increasingly* important factor is the local labor market's ability to "rewire" by facilitating the movement of workers across industries and occupations in response to changing economic conditions. Interestingly, after the dynamism of a local economy is accounted for, industrial diversity is insignificant, suggesting that diversity's role in stabilizing and promoting growth in local communities (Hammond and Thompson 2004; Watson and Deller 2017) may be working more through labor-market flexibility. Some of our most policy-relevant findings come from the quantile analysis of differenced job growth. For counties in the lower part of the distribution of the economic outcomes, the labor-market flexibility measures emerge as predictors of growth, suggesting that enhancing labor flows within lagging economies might be a viable policy option.

In what follows we start with a brief descriptive analysis to ascertain that economic well-being is diverging geographically. Concluding that there are good reasons to believe so, we follow with a short literature review. We next describe the data and empirical specifications followed by the empirical results. We separately discuss the results for poverty (and median household income growth to a lesser degree) and job growth. The paper finishes with our concluding thoughts and policy suggestions.

Is Basic Economic Well-Being Diverging?

The uneven recovery from the Great Recession has helped lead to a growing sense that some places are being left behind. Yet, this flies against conventional economic wisdom from neoclassical growth theory that regional incomes have been converging since the Civil War (Barro and Sala-i-Martin 1990). To investigate, using US Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) data, we calculate the average standard deviation in per-capita income for each year between 1969-2016 (standardized by national per-capita income) for US states and counties. Specifically, we calculate unweighted standard deviations that reflect differences across space and standard deviations weighted by population to show spatial

differences for the average person (which is national income inequality minus the within-state/county component of inequality). The results are plotted in figure 1 where the left panel shows unweighted standard deviations for states and counties, and the right panel shows corresponding standard deviations weighted by population.

Figure 1 shows that analysis at the state level masks considerable within-state inequality. Turning to the county-level results, the unweighted standard deviations show a slight downward trend until 1994, falling to about 0.17 before rising almost 50% to 0.25 in 2014, then falling back to 0.23 in 2016. The population-weighted standard deviations illustrate a stronger upward trend. After falling slightly to about 0.20 in 1976, the weighted standard deviation steadily increases to about 0.32 in 2016, or a rise of about 60%. The analysis was repeated by removing transfer payments and the divergence pattern for the resulting "market per-capita" personal income is even more striking, further suggesting that economic opportunities are increasingly geographically unequal (not shown)[4]. So while these trends emerged pre-recession, they have since continued.

We also did the same using the unweighted and weighted standard deviations of annual wage and salary job growth. There is steady convergence of job growth rates until 2010. After which, there has been about a one-third increase in the unweighted variation between 2010-2016, though the weighted standard deviation had a more modest increase (not shown). The divergence in job growth is much more modest, though the post-recession period represents a departure from the pre-recession trend of convergence. The implication is that there are reasons to believe that some regions are increasingly lagging and that the trends now extend to job growth as well as income.[5]

---

[4] We also tested for the presence of spatial autocorrelation of per-capita personal income during the 1989-2015 period as evidenced by the Moran's I statistic (in earlier years, the US Bureau of Economic Analysis does not report income data for some counties, which create "holes" in the contiguity matrix preventing us from obtaining Moran's I for years leading to 1989). In every year the Moran's I is statistically significant at the 0.001 level strongly suggesting that per capita income is spatially clustered. The magnitude of the statistic has a general negative trend that bottoms at 0.157 in 2006, then grows to 0.254 in 2011 and decreases slightly afterwards with the value of 0.207 in 2015.

[5]The unweighted standard deviation in market per-capita income at the county level bottomed out in 1978



Figure 1. Average standard deviations in per-capita income (unweighted on the left, weighted on the right)

There is also reasons to point to a relative decline in rural America compared to urban America, which has been a recent hot topic in the popular press (e.g., Adamy and Overberg, 2017). For example, in the immediate pre-recession period, nonmetropolitan America was making rapid progress in narrowing the relative population growth gap with metropolitan America. (USDA Economic Research Service, 2018). Yet, after the Great Recession, nonmetropolitan population growth virtually tanked, even turning negative for much of the post-recession period (which is unprecedented since the Great Depression). While our focus is not to assess why there is differential growth, it does support the public perception that the fortunes of rural areas have turned for the worst in recent years.

Literature review

The literature investigating the determinants of regional economic growth is enormous and highlights many factors that are important for local socioeconomic wellbeing across space and time. Such factors can be generally grouped into several broad categories[6] related to the presence of certain industries and related structural metrics such as (1) industry diversity (Watson and Deller 2017), (2) human capital and innovation (Faggian

at 0.20, then rose to 0.32 in 2014 before settling to 0.29 in 2016. The corresponding data for the weighted figures are bottoming out at 0.23 in 1978 and rising to just over 0.39 in 2016.

[6]Of course, there are many ways to group economic performance determinants into broad categories (Martin et al. 2016; Martin, Sunley and Tyler 2015).

and McCann 2008; Fallah, Partridge and Rickman 2014; Goetz and Hu 1996), (3) population demographics (Stephans and Deskin 2018; Amcoff and Westholm 2007), (4) culture, social capital and related factors (Akçomak and Ter Weel 2009; Rupasingha, Goetz and Freshwater 2002; Rupasingha, Goetz and Freshwater 2000), and (5) amenities (Deller, Lledo and Marcouiller 2008; Deller et al. 2001) among others. The performance of rural and remote regions has been further defined by remoteness and access to agglomeration (Andersson and Lööf 2011; Partridge et al. 2007; Partridge et al. 2009).

The Great Recession threw the US economy from its long-term growth trend and further intensified scholarly debates on the determinants of regional economic growth. The central topic has increasingly moved to the notion of resilience—i.e., the ability of regions to withstand and recover from shocks. Aside from a concerted effort to operationalize and measure resilience, the discussion focuses on the same broad categories described above (Martin, Sunley and Tyler 2015). The economic resilience literature suggests that the Great Recession revealed many underlying discrepancies in regional economic fundamentals, speeding up the process of divergence in economic fortunes that could be undetectable during prosperous times (Lagravinese 2015). Some researchers argue the Great Recession especially hurt regions that lacked strong engines of growth (Martin, Sunley and Tyler 2015) and exacerbated the long-simmering socioeconomic problems in rural and lagging communities. Others claim that the Great Recession was a watershed for the US economy (Florida 2009; Gore 2010), implying that the nation will need new ways to spatially reallocate resources.

When one thinks about economic resilience as an adjustment process to a shock, the economic variables currently used in the literature may be insufficient, as they focus on a structure of a local economy (e.g. Lagravinese 2015) and generally ignore the dynamics of actually how a local economy readjusts and rewires. Thus, a key goal of our study is to develop new dynamic measures of local economic adjustment and to assess their effects on economic outcomes.

The literature also points to an important role played by various social/demographic factors in defining regional performance. For instance, the importance of human capital for economic growth is well established (Lucas, 1988; Nelson & Phelps, 1966). Other research points to local racial and ethnic composition as important for socioeconomic wellbeing. For example, Easterly (2001) and Partridge and Rickman (2005) find high-poverty US places tend have greater minority populations.

Putnam, Leonardi and Nanetti (1994) stress the role of social capital in regional socioeconomic outcomes. The level of social capital in a community is generally related to participation in associational activities and trust. Several empirical studies find a positive effect of social capital on a range of US economic growth indicators (Rupasingha, Goetz and Freshwater, 2000; 2002).

Amenity-led economic development has received significant scholarly attention (Green et al. 2005). Many high-amenity places have been able to capitalize and attract in-migration, even to rural areas (Partridge 2010), although it is unclear how the Great Recession and housing bust affected the long-run prospects of high-amenity locales.

Empirical implementation, data and variables

We start our analysis with a descriptive look at changes in poverty and job growth pre- and post-recession followed by cross-sectional regressions for the post-recession period (2010-2015). Our basic theoretical approach follows the "workhorse" regional/urban spatial equilibrium model in which profits and household utility are equalized across space (Glaeser and Gottlieb, 2009). While disequilibrium shocks (e.g., technological change, demand shocks, macroeconomic fluctuations) are always hitting the system, the model is best used to show the direction a regional economy will adjust toward equilibrium. This represents our initial cross-sectional econometric analysis of the factors driving county-level job growth and poverty rates. Of course, while we try to mitigate any endogeneity, cross-sectional approaches can suffer from omitted variable bias.

In the next step we repeat the analysis using a differencing strategy in order to

account for time-invariant unobservable factors and to benchmark the post-recession dynamics against the pre-recession period (2010-2015 minus 2000-2007). We then estimate corresponding models by differencing out the recession years (2010-2015 minus 2007-2010) to isolate changes that occurred since the recession. Finally, to assess heterogeneity among fast- and slow-growing locals, quantile regression of the differenced models is used to estimate changes at the 10th, 50th and 90th percentiles of the conditional distribution of the dependent variable. The analyses are performed using data for over 3,000 counties in the continental US (1,986 nonmetro and 1,052 metro). To follow the long tradition of the literature, all models are estimated separately for nonmetro and metro counties to avoid aggregation bias and to account for differing levels of agglomeration. Likewise, the discussion below of divergence of local economic fortunes and the differing industry compositions would affect rural and urban America differently.

Cross-Section "Level" Equations for 2010-2015

The cross-sectional model for the 2010-2015 period is shown in (1):

$$Y_{c\tau} = \beta_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta_1 ECON1_{c\tau}} + \boldsymbol{\beta_2 ECON2_{ct}} + \boldsymbol{\beta_3 SOC_{ct}} + \boldsymbol{\beta_4 GEOG_c} + \boldsymbol{X\beta} + \theta_s + \varepsilon_{c\tau} \qquad (1)$$

where c denotes county, τ is a time period from time t to time $t1$, and subscript s indicates state. The error terms $\varepsilon_{c\tau}$ are clustered by within one of the 179 BEA economic areas to account for spatial autocorrelation.[7] The clustering within BEA economic areas captures the high integration within the areas and the clustering allows each region to have its own form of spatial autocorrelation.[8] Our discussion focuses on the 2010-2015 results, though we briefly review corresponding models for the 2000-2007 pre-recession and the 2007-2010 recession periods (the results are in the Appendix).

[7] We also estimated spatial Durbin models, which produce generally identical results.

[8] We could account for spatial autocorrelation with a traditional spatial econometric approach. However, that would require us to impose a structure on the way the residuals are connected through a weight matrix **W** that is usually selected in an *ad hoc* manner that may not reflect the actual connectivity or have a any relationship to the actual economic region—while the clustering encompasses all forms of spatial autocorrelation that may exist thought a **W** matrix.

The two dependent variables are the 2010-2015 annual (average) change in the poverty rate and the 2010-2015 annualized job growth. Since our sample periods have different durations, we use annualized and average measures to maintain comparability. The vectors ***ECON1***, ***ECON2***, ***SOC***, and ***GEOG*** refer to economic indicators measured over the period under consideration, initial-period economic indicators (measured at the beginning of the period), initial-period social indicators and the county's geographical attributes, respectively. Using explanatory variables at their beginning levels should alleviate reverse causality concerns, though omitted variable bias may still exist. To be sure, our key economic variables should be exogenous as described below. The vector $\boldsymbol{X}$ comprises a set of controls and θ_s are state dummies to capture the role of state-specific policies on growth and other factors fixed for each state.

The average annual change in the poverty rate is calculated by dividing the change in poverty over the whole period by the number of years, whereas annualized job growth is calculated using the compound annual growth rate formula[9]. The poverty data are from the Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program and employment is from US Census Bureau County Business Patterns (CBP). Note that CBP data do not include government employment, which means that our results are most applicable to the private sector.

In addition to several traditional economic measures used in the literature, we include a set of relatively novel variables that approximate the degree of rewiring of the local economy, which, taken together, constitute the ***ECON1*** and ***ECON2*** vectors in Equation (1). Our main approach is to consider the role of industrial structure in determining job growth (after controlling for other features) to separate its effects from the labor-market flexibility effects we are also considering. Thus, after we simply control for how industry composition affects job growth/demand shocks, we include the

[9] $AnnEmpGr_{c\tau} = (Emp_{ct1}/Emp_{ct})^{1/n} - 1$ and $AvPovChange_{c\tau} = (PovRate_{ct1} - PovRate_{ct})/n$, where n is the number of years between t and $t1$.

measures of labor-market flexibility to assess whether they are providing any additional effects on economic outcomes. Does the ability of an economy to "rewire" or shift resources from weak- to strong-performing industries have a tangible effect on improving local performance, for which the answer to this question is important to understand the underlying mechanisms of how local resilience manifests itself.

Starting with ***ECON1***, the industry mix variable, *IndMix*, is the predicted growth rate of county employment if all its industries grow at corresponding national growth rates. This measure is sometimes called the Bartik instrument (Bartik, 1991) and is routinely used as an *exogenous* instrument for employment growth. Rather, we are using it as an exogenous measure of demand shocks that arise from each local area having different industry compositions (Betz and Partridge 2013; Tsvetkova, Partridge and Betz 2017). Equation (2) shows how *IndMix* is calculated:

$$IndMix_{c\tau} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} Sh_{cit} NatGr_{i\tau} \quad (2)$$

where all subscripts are identical to above with subscript *i* indicating industry at the 4-digit NAICS level and there are *N* industries. Sh_{cit} is the share of industry *i*'s employment in county *c* at the beginning of the period τ and $NatGr_{i\tau}$ is the annualized national industry growth rate over the period. Because national growth rates and initial industry shares are used, industry mix is typically assumed to be exogenous. This condition is true as long as there are no labor supply responses associated with lagged industry composition aside from labor supply variables we already control for (reducing any labor supply factors in the residual correlated with lagged industry composition).

One limitation of the CBP is that it has numerous data suppressions when the Census Bureau is concerned that individual firms can be identified in the data. Generally, smaller rural counties have more suppressed values. Thus, we use CBP four-digit level data after a linear programming algorithm estimates the suppressed values. The source for these data is the W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research that uses the

Isserman and Westervelt (2006) algorithm in constructing the data.[10]

Turning to ***ECON1,*** the *JobsFlow* variable is a measure that approximates the expected ease of finding a job in a different sector if one is displaced from work. What it picks up is after accounting for industrial structure's direct effects on labor demand shocks, does having an industrial structure that facilitates movements of workers across sectors have further positive effects in limiting negative shocks and enhancing the effects of positive shocks. The variable takes into account job-to-job flow information at the 2-digit NAICS level from the US Census Bureau Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) program and industrial composition of a county at the beginning of a period as reflected in the CBP. It is calculated as follows.

$$JobsFlow_{\mathrm{ct}} = \sum_i \sum_j Sh_{cit} Sh_{cjt} Flow_{ij} \qquad (3)$$

where Sh_{cit} is county *c*'s share of employment in the *origin* sector *i* at time *t*, the beginning of a period under consideration; Sh_{cjt} is county *c*'s share of employment in the *destination* sector *j* at time *t* and $Flow_{ij}$ is the percent of total employment leaving sector *i* that ends up in sector *j* as reflected in the LEHD. Thus, for each industry × industry pair, the larger the size of the job flow $Flow_{ij}$ from industry *i* to industry *j*, the easier it should be to move between the two sectors if there are job losses or growth in either sector. The sectors are defined at the 2-digit NAICS level and circular flows within a sector are excluded, i.e. when calculating (3), $i \neq j$. Because the job flow data is at the national level, like the industry mix term, it should be exogenous. The CBP is the data source for employment shares used in calculations.

The next two measures, *OccEmpMobility* and *IndEmpMobility*, approximate the dynamics (changes) in a local economy over period τ as evidenced by moves of

[10]See Weinstein, Partridge and Tsvetkova (2018) for details of the CBP data used here. It is highly correlated with *Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages* in the range of 0.95, at least for some industries, though it appears to be not quite as accurate as the data provided by the private vendor EMSI, which we use in a few cases. However, the advantage of this CBP data is that the algorithm is replicable and has undergone a peer review.

employees across industries and occupations during the period (Levernier, Partridge and Rickman 2000). It follows the logic of dissimilarity index used in research on racial segregation and diversity (Ellis Wright and Parks 2004) but instead of differences in a locality's racial composition, it captures dissimilarity in employment distribution at the beginning and the end of a period. The measures show the percentage of total county employment at the end of a period that needs to move to other industries or occupations, respectively, in order for the industrial/occupational composition of the local economy to be the same as at the beginning of a period. A greater number suggests that a larger share of workers switched industries or occupations during the period. The motivation for these two measures is similar to the job flows variable except it focusses a little more on the localities track record of shifting workers rather than the national track record of the industry composition in job-flow mobility.

Equation (4) shows the index:

$$EmpMobility_{c\tau} = \sum_i |Sh_{ict1} - Sh_{ict}| \quad (4)$$

where *i* refers to an industry at the 4-digit NAICS level and all other subscripts are defined as before. The CBP is the data source for *IndEmpMobility* whereas a proprietary data set from Economic Modelling Specialists, Intl. (EMSI)[11] on the county-level employment by occupation is used to derive *OccEmpMobility.*

Also included in the ***ECON2*** vector is an industry diversity measure, *IndDiversity*, which is calculate as follows using the EMSI data:

$$IndDiversity_{c\mathrm{t}} = 10{,}000 - \sum_i Sh_{cit}^2 \quad (5)$$

where Sh_{cit}^2 is a squared share of employment in industry *i* (at 4-digit NAICS level) in

[11]For their county-level employment data, EMSI combines various publicly available sources, such as the BLS *Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages* (QCEW) and others, to fill in values suppressed due to confidentiality concerns ensuring that the final data output is consistent across counties with those reported by industry, occupation, state, and national totals. Many studies have used EMSI data (Betz et al., 2015; Tsvetkova, Partridge and Betz 2017). As noted above, the EMSI employment-by-industry data appear to be as accurate if not more accurate than the CBP data if one considers the entire year and not just March when the CBP survey takes place.

county *c* in year *t,* which is the beginning period τ. Subtracting the summed squared shares from the maximum possible value ensures that the larger values of *IndDiversity* correspond to a more diverse industry structure. The general expectation is that industry diversity is associated with better economic outcomes because shocks to one sector are less likely to lead to adverse aggregate outcomes. In more industrially diverse economies, average share of a single industry or a sector tends to be smaller meaning that it would be easier for its former workforce to find jobs elsewhere (Hammond and Thompson 2004; Watson and Deller 2017). By controlling for diversity, we also hope to assess whether our labor-market flexibility effects are really just picking up more general diversity effects that have already been found in the literature.

The last two variables included in this vector of economic factors are a share of manufacturing in total county employment, *ManufShare* and a share of labor-intensive (low-wage) manufacturing, *LowWageManufShare*[12] calculated using the EMSI data. We use deep lags of this variables in our models to mitigate potential endogeneity concerns, i.e. the 2000 share of manufacturing is used in the equations that refer to 2010-2015 and the 1990 share of manufacturing is used in equations that focus on the Great Recession and pre-Recession periods.[13]

---

[12]The following industries are included in the labor-intensive manufacturing category: NAICS3131 Fiber, Yarn and Thread Mills; NAICS3132 Fabric Mills; NAICS3133 Textile and Fabric Finishing and Fabric Coating Mills; NAICS3141 Textile Furnishings Mills; NAICS3149 Other Textile Product Mills; NAICS3151 Apparel Knitting Mills; NAICS3152 Cut and Sew Apparel Manufacturing; NAICS3159 Apparel Accessories and Other Apparel Manufacturing; NAICS3161 Leather and Hide Tanning and Finishing; NAICS3162 Footwear Manufacturing; NAICS3169 Other Leather and Allied Product Manufacturing; NAICS3371 Household and Institutional Furniture and Kitchen Cabinet Manufacturing; NAICS3372 Office Furniture (including Fixtures) Manufacturing; NAICS3379 Other Furniture Related Product Manufacturing; NAICS3399 Other Miscellaneous Manufacturing.

[13]We use EMSI data for the lagged industry shares for several reasons. First, because the "unsuppressed" CBP data are available starting in 1998, using county employment data by industry from EMSI allows us to calculate the deep lags for 1990. Second, when measuring diversity of a local economy and the relative size of manufacturing, using all industries (including government) allows characterizing the whole local economy, not just its private sector part. Given that government jobs can be a sizeable share of employment in many small counties, particularly in remote and lagging regions, variables calculated from CBP might introduce non-random measurement error. Finally, using the same data source ensures consistency in how "local economy" is defined, thus the estimation coefficients on the industry composition variables should be internally comparable.

Including manufacturing shares in our models accounts for the general decline in the sector's employment dating to the 1970s, which suggests that more manufacturing-intensive places may be economically struggling. Aside from general manufacturing, labor-intensive manufacturing is particularly exposed to low-wage manufacturing import competition from places such as Vietnam and China (Autor and Dorn 2013), although empirical estimation results for *LowWageManufShare* are usually statistically insignificant.[14] Indeed, we want to control for these effects to separate the effects of long-term restricting in manufacturing from the more general factors described above. Similarly, to account for susceptibility of a county to differing global and commodity market trends, we control for the deep-lagged 1990/2000 employment shares of agriculture, and mining (these two variables are not reported for brevity). Farm and mining communities are exposed to commodity boom/bust cycles, labor-saving technological change, and technological innovations such as hydraulic fracturing. Because we use deep lags of these variables, EMSI data are used in their calculation.

The ***SOC*** vector includes variables that reflect the county's social characteristics. The first is a measure of social capital, *SocialCap,* using the approach developed by Rupasingha and co-authors (Rupasingha, Goetz and Freshwater 2000; 2002). The social capital measure is derived from community and individual factors that are related to the propensity of residents to participate in associational activities[15]. Such factors include the county's prevalence of membership organizations, voting in presidential elections, and participating in US Census Bureau surveys. The data source is http://aese.psu.edu/nercrd/community/social-capital-resources for the year that most

[14]With manufacturing share included in the model, one needs to be careful in interpreting the low-wage manufacturing share coefficient. It is picking up the *difference* between the low-wage manufacturing effect and the general manufacturing effect, not whether low-wage manufacturing has a statistically significant effect, which needs to be jointly considered by assessing the effects of both variables.

15 The index consists of four components and is constructed using principal component analysis. The four components are standardized to have mean zero and standard deviation of one. It is hoped this standardization would minimize potential concerns related to different weights used in index construction over years.

closely corresponds to each specific model[16]. For example, for the 2010-2015 level equations in (1), we use the lagged 2009 social capital values.

Besides the level of human capital, the ***SOC*** vector includes education, 2000 poverty rate and measures of racial/ethnic composition. The educational attainment is measured by the share of adults with less than high school diploma, *%LessHS*, and the share of adult population with a bachelor degree or higher, *%BA*. There is a long literature that suggests that having a higher initial share of college graduates, for example, is associated with significantly faster local growth in the ensuing decades (Simon 1998; Simon and Nardinelli 2002). In particular, we are interested if greater human capital is a positive force in recovering from the Great Recession that improves a local community's resilience after acounting for other local characteristics.

The models include the shares of population that are African-American, Native American, Asian and of other races to account for social and labor market effects (e.g., discrimination). For brevity, we do not report the racial and ethnic variable results. All education and race variables are lagged to mitigate endogeneity concerns, i.e. the 1990 measures are used in models for the 2000-2007 and 2007-2010 periods and the 2000 measures are used in models covering the 2010-2015 period. Finally, the 2000 poverty rate is included to test for the effects of poverty, which can also be empirically related to the quality of local institutions. The data for all variables come from the US Decennial Census, in which the 1960 poverty measure is from a special Census tabulation for the USDA Economic Research Service.

The geographical attributes include distance to the population-weighed centroid of a nearby Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) (a distance to the population-weighed centroid of own MSA for metro counties) and incremental distances to MSAs of increasingly larger sizes (population of at least 250, 500 and 1,500 thousand in 1990)

[16]The social capital county-level data are available for years 1990, 1997, 2005, 2009 and 2014.

following the logic of Central Place Theory as described by Partridge et al. (2008). The distances are calculated using ArcGIS software. We include these variables to assess whether access to the urban center had differential effects post recession as accessibility is a key feature for rural commuting, while in metro settings, the housing crisis differentially affected exurban and suburban areas. For brevity, we display estimation results for the distance to the nearby MSA, *NearMSAkm*, only. Proximity to the Great Lakes, Pacific and Atlantic oceans (within 50 miles) is captured by dummies *GrtLakes, PacificOcean* and *AtlanticOcean* to reflect their roles as amenities. For brevity, these three variables are not reported in the tables below. Using the USDA 1 (low) to 7 (highest) natural amenity classification (https://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/natural-amenities-scale/), we include individual measures for those valued at 4 (average) to 7 (highest) via inclusion of *Amenity4, Amenity5, Amenity6* and *Amenity7* indicator variables. This allows us to assess the possible changing role of natural amenities such as for Florida and western Sunbelt regions that were particularly hard hit by the housing bust (Carruthers and Mulligan 2013).

The models also include several common socioeconomic controls used in regional economic analysis. Two population measures account for the effects of agglomeration economies. We include the lagged county population and lagged log population of the nearest (if nonmetro) or own (for metro counties) metropolitan area population as reported by the US Census Bureau. Finally, the cross-sectional level models include state fixed effects to factor out unchanging state-level characteristics that may impact county-level social and economic performance.

Differenced Equations (OLS and Quantile Regressions)

Our main model assesses differences between the post-recession expansion and the pre-recession expansion via first-differencing of the dependent and all explanatory variables, except we don't difference the deep-lagged variables (which are still included). The differencing factors out time-invariant unobservables that could potentially bias our level

results. Equation (6) is separately estimated for nonmetro and metro subsamples (error terms are clustered at the level of BEA economic areas):

$$\Delta Y_{c\tau} = \beta_0 + \boldsymbol{\beta_1 \Delta ECON1_{c\tau}} + \boldsymbol{\beta_2} \Delta \boldsymbol{ECON2}_{ct} + \beta_3 ManufEmp_{ct} + \beta_4 LowWageManufEmp_{ct} + \beta_5 \Delta SocialCap_{ct} + \boldsymbol{\beta_6 SOC}_{ct} + \boldsymbol{\beta_7 GEOG}_c + \boldsymbol{X\beta} + \varepsilon_{c\tau} \quad (6)$$

where c denotes county and τ is the period from time t to time $t1$. The dependent variables are the first differences of (a) annualized employment growth rates for the 2010-2015 period and the 2000-2007 period; (b) average yearly change in poverty rates over the 2010-2015 period and the 2000-2007 period; and (c) annualized median household income growth over the 2010-2015 period and the 2000-2007 period. We repeat the analysis comparing post-recession (2010-2015) to the recession years (2007-2010), with the results reported in the Appendix (not discussed). The $\Delta\boldsymbol{ECON1}$ vector includes *IndMix*, *OccEmpMobility* and *IndEmpMobility* measures differenced over periods corresponding to the differencing of the dependent variables. The $\boldsymbol{\Delta ECON2}$ vector includes economic variables that are measured at the beginning of each period and are differenced in accordance to the dependent variable differencing, e.g. 2010 value minus 2000 value for our main specification that compares the post-recession and the pre-recession periods. These variables are *JobFlow* and *IndDiversity*. The deep-lagged shares of manufacturing, low-wage manufacturing, agriculture, and mining are used without transformation.

Among social characteristics, only the values of social capital are differenced. All other variables are used in the form identical to Equation (1). The same applies to the geographical attributes that are constant over time. The control variables do not change between Equations (1) and (6) except for the omission of the state fixed effects in the latter because they are differenced away. Because the county fixed effects are factored out, the coefficients in the differenced equations are interpreted as within-county responses to changes in explanatory variables.

The deep-lagged variables have a different interpretation in the first-difference models. The unchanging level effects of these (and all other constant) variables are differenced away in the fixed effects. What is left is the persistent disequilibrium effects of those variables that would likely decrease over time. That is, if those variable coefficients are statistically insignificant, that *does not* mean that the variable has no influence because its constant effects over time could be in the fixed effect that are differenced out of the model. Appendix table A1 summarizes all variables and their data sources, whereas Appendix table A2 shows summary statistics.

Our last step is to explore the heterogeneity of the effects at different points of the conditional distribution of the response function. In particular, we seek to explore the variations in the statistically significant relationships for high-performing *vs.* low-growing counties, in which the OLS model produces responses near the mean/median of the distribution. To do so, we re-estimate Equation (6) using quantile regression for the 10th, 50th and 90th percentiles (we report the 10th and the 90th percentile results only).

Estimation results and discussion

We arrange our presentation of results around the two main dependent variables starting with the average change in the poverty rate with a short discussion of median household income for the differenced models. The estimation results from all three steps (level and differenced equations followed by quantile regression) are presented together. After discussing the poverty and median household income models, we present corresponding results for employment growth.

Change in Poverty Rates

Figure 2 shows geographical distribution of the 2000-2007 average poverty rate change (left panel) and of post-recession dynamics (2010-2015) relative to the presented pre-recession trends (right panel). A visual inspection of figure 2 suggests that during the pre-recession expansion, the West tended to perform better with a modest decrease or no

change in poverty (except for counties in Washington and Oregon, as well as in the southwest part of the West North Central Census division), with the mid-Atlantic region and Florida also faring well. However, when comparing the differences in poverty rate changes in the post- and pre-recession periods, there is somewhat of a reversion to the mean. The west of the country fared much worse together with the mid-Atlantic region and Florida after the recession. While the East performed much better in general, note that persistently poor regions such as the Mississippi Delta, southeastern Black belt, and central Appalachia fared worse in both the pre- and post-Great Recession expansions. Yet, the perception that manufacturing-centered regions in the Rustbelt performed poorly after the recession is not supported at least in terms of poverty rates.



Figure 2. Pre- and Post-Recession Annual Poverty Dynamics

The empirical analysis for the cross-section level model and the first-difference model is presented in Table 1.[17] The results point to differing effects of the three variable groupings. What stands out in both the post-recession level model and the first-difference models is the important role of whether a county experienced favorable (unfavorable) demand shocks associated with a fast-growing (or slow-growing) industry composition (*IndMix*). However, in some sense, because of the difficulty to change an area's industry composition, the ability of policymakers to influence local poverty in the short-to-

[17]Regarding the base first difference poverty models, the Chow test rejects the joint null that the metropolitan coefficients equal the nonmetropolitan coefficients at the 5% level.

medium term is then somewhat limited.

Rural economies tend to lack the scale that typically leads to better labor market matching found in large cities (Rosenthal and Strange 2004). Thus, it seems more likely that having more industry and occupational job mobility would relate to lower rural poverty. Industry mobility is especially associated with lower nonmetro poverty rates in the level models, consistent with positive rewiring effects or resilience. However, in the level models, greater occupational mobility is related to increases in the 2010-2015 poverty rates, indicating that at least at the bottom of the income distribution (where labor mobility is able to affect poverty rates), occupational mobility is likely to reflect downward moves implying lower pay and worse aggregate performance in terms of poverty measures. In both the metro and nonmetro cross-section models, the other labor-market dynamic variables are statistically insignificant except that greater industry diversity is associated with lower metro poverty over the 2010-2015 period (column 2, only weakly significant). In the first-difference models, the dynamic variables are statistically insignificant except for greater occupation mobility is associated with *greater reductions* in metro poverty rates between the two economic expansions (column 4).

Contrary to what may be expected, greater manufacturing share in nonmetro counties is negatively related to poverty rates in both the cross-sectional model (col. 1) and in the change between the two economic expansions (col. 3). One likely explanation is that manufacturing sustained a modest bounce back after the recession that especially helped nonmetro low-wage households. Yet, greater share of low-wage manufacturing is statistically insignificant, suggesting that any poverty-reducing effects are general to all of manufacturing.

Turning to the other social/demographic attributes, social capital is insignificant, while historical poverty levels tend to be related to decreased poverty change. Places with greater levels of human capital measured by the share of college graduates enjoyed decrease/smaller increase in metro and nonmetro poverty. However, this could be

unexpected, as higher levels of university graduates would normally impact those above the poverty line. A somewhat unexpected result is a statistically significant negative association between the share of adults with less than high school degree and average poverty rate in metro counties.

Regarding the geography variables, being closer to metropolitan areas is associated with higher nonmetropolitan poverty, which is inconsistent with Partridge and Rickman (2008) and may reflect troubles in exurban areas as a result of the housing crash. Similarly, being farther away from the metropolitan core is associated with higher *metro* poverty in the first-difference metro model (col. 4), further suggesting that poor exurban metro households struggled in the wake of the Great Recession and housing bust, though it is not clear if this is a permanent effect. Finally, when considering the relative change in poverty between the two economic expansions (cols 3-4), higher natural amenities are generally related to relatively higher poverty in the latter period, suggesting that those areas were struggling to recover.

Table 1. OLS Estimation Results for Average Change in Poverty and Annualized Median Household Income Growth

Explanatory variables	Poverty rate change				Income growth	
	2010-2015		2010-2015 minus 2000-2007		2010-2015 minus 2000-2007	
	Nonmetro	Metro	Nonmetro	Metro	Nonmetro	Metro
IndMix	-.07**	-.081***	-.046***	-.1***	.11**	.27***
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.05)	(0.09)
JobsFlow	-.036	6.0e-03	-.04	.021	.058	-.22
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.08)	(0.14)
OccEmpMobility	5.4e-03**	1.6e-03	1.9e-03	-7.2e-03***	.019***	9.8e-03
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)
IndEmpMobility	-1.6e-03**	4.5e-04	5.0e-04	-9.9e-04	4.3e-03**	6.9e-03*
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
IndDiversity	-2.7e-05	-4.7e-05*	5.4e-07	9.7e-05	-9.4e-05	-4.0e-04
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
ManufShare	-.37**	-.031	-.47***	-.15	1.7***	2.5***
	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.18)	(0.22)	(0.59)	(0.78)
LowWageManufShare	-4.1e-03	-6.6e-03*	8.6e-04	-4.2e-03	-6.1e-04	-5.5e-03
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)
SocialCap	6.5e-03	-.016	-1.5e-04	-.02	-.019	-.05
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.07)	(0.07)
%LessHS	-5.8e-03	-7.1e-03**	-3.8e-04	8.7e-04	-.013	-.01

	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)
%BA	-.012***	-7.7e-03**	-.014**	-.013**	.021	.038
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.03)
PovRate2000	2.0e-03	2.2e-03	-8.5e-03*	-.016**	-.011	-7.6e-03
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.02)
NearMSAkm	-5.5e-04**	1.0e-03	-3.4e-04	2.8e-03***	2.3e-03***	-5.0e-03**
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Amenity4	.022	-.23*	-.078	-.021	.45	.041
	(0.10)	(0.12)	(0.07)	(0.11)	(0.30)	(0.38)
Amenity5	-.11**	-.075*	.12**	.16***	-.7***	-.71***
	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.04)	(0.21)	(0.16)
Amenity6	-.058**	.021	.064**	.078**	-.12	-.15
	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.10)	(0.10)
Amenity7	-.05	.014	.23***	.11	-.75***	-.32
	(0.05)	(0.07)	(0.05)	(0.08)	(0.18)	(0.26)
Constant	.76**	.63**	-.032	-.11	-.3	-.33
	(0.31)	(0.28)	(0.14)	(0.15)	(0.42)	(0.55)
Observations	1986	1052	1986	1052	1986	1052
R^2	0.165	0.199	0.085	0.155	0.210	0.188

***, **, * - significant at 0.01, 0.05, and 0.1 respectively; standard errors clustered at BEA area level in parentheses; all models include a full set of controls as described in the text (*AgriShare, MiningShare, IncDist250, IncDist500, IncDist1500, %Black, %Native, %Asian, %Other, GrtLakes, PacificOcean, AtlanticOcean, LnMSApop, TotPop* and state fixed effects in the 2010-2015 equation).

As noted above, we do not stress the earlier level models for 2000-2007 and 2007-2010 results (in Appendix tables A3 and A4). Briefly, there is some evidence of changing responses that may be consistent with a structural shift as a result of the Great Recession (Florida 2009; Gore 2010). The economic flows and rewiring measures do not emerge as important predictors of lower poverty before the recession (although they all are weakly significant in the nonmetro sample). During the 2000-2007 period it is surprising that both low and high levels of human capital are *positively* related to changes in the poverty rate, in which areas with higher shares of college graduates might have crowded out low-paying jobs. Manufacturing share is statistically insignificant before the recession, perhaps because the positive effects of its higher blue-collar wages were offset by its steady pre-recession decline in employment. During the recession, nonmetro counties with greater manufacturing concentration suffered larger increases in poverty rates, consistent with rapid declines in manufacturing employment.

To explore possible heterogeneity across counties with various poverty dynamics, we re-estimate Equation (6) using quantile regression. Table 2 shows estimation results for the 0.1 and 0.9 centiles (for brevity). That is, relative to the prerecession expansion, the 10th percentile results reflect the weakest performers in terms of changes in poverty rates (in reducing poverty), while the 90th percentile results are representative of the performance of those who made the most gains in reducing poverty thereafter. For the most part, these results suggest that at the tails of the poverty rate distribution, the general pattern is one of statistically insignificant coefficients, meaning that at the tails, the reasons for their relative post-recession performance are mainly idiosyncratic.

A couple key results are unchanged. One is that for the strongest part of the poverty distribution, demand shocks related to their industry mix is negatively related to nonmetro poverty. Likewise, *IndMix* remains negative and statistically significant in both the metro and nonmetro samples at the 50th percentile (not reported). Thus, industry composition's positive effects on the ability of a locality to reduce poverty are clearest at the middle of metro distribution and in the lower half (counties more successful in reducing poverty) of the nonmetro distribution. Moreover, a concentration of nonmetro manufacturing is negatively related to poverty in at both ends of the distribution. Consistent with the OLS results, higher levels of college graduates are associated with lower metro poverty at both the 10th and 90th percentile, although in the former case the coefficient is significant at the 0.1 level only. Finally, though it is a little weaker in the metro case, high natural amenities locations tend to have higher poverty rates, especially in less poverty-ridden counties.

Table 2. Quantile Regression Results for Average Poverty Change, 2010-2015 Minus 2000-2007

Explanatory variables	10th percentile		90th percentile	
	Nonmetro	Metro	Nonmetro	Metro
IndMix	-.051**	-.11*	-.019	-.043
	(-2.52)	(-1.91)	(-0.70)	(-1.11)
JobsFlow	-.037	.038	-.041	.068

	(-0.92)	(0.56)	(-0.99)	(1.40)
OccEmpMobility	4.2e-03*	-6.2e-03	7.2e-05	-8.1e-03**
	(1.71)	(-1.06)	(0.04)	(-2.25)
IndEmpMobility	1.2e-03	-1.3e-03	-5.2e-04	3.1e-04
	(1.42)	(-0.74)	(-0.51)	(0.24)
IndDiversity	-1.3e-06	-1.3e-04	3.5e-05	6.4e-05
	(-0.01)	(-0.53)	(0.34)	(0.41)
ManufShare	-.59**	-.21	-.59***	-.1
	(-2.13)	(-0.41)	(-2.71)	(-0.37)
LowWageManufShare	-1.5e-03	-7.4e-03	3.7e-03	-3.1e-03
	(-0.29)	(-1.01)	(0.86)	(-0.44)
SocialCap	2.8e-03	.057	-.042	-.067*
	(0.10)	(1.15)	(-1.53)	(-1.81)
%LessHS	-5.2e-03	1.5e-03	5.5e-05	2.5e-03
	(-1.54)	(0.26)	(0.02)	(0.55)
%BA	-.015*	-.031***	-8.6e-03	-.011*
	(-1.80)	(-3.11)	(-1.16)	(-1.70)
PovRate1960	-.03***	-.069***	.025***	.016**
	(-4.81)	(-5.42)	(3.70)	(2.34)
NearMSAkm	-3.1e-04	3.4e-03**	-3.2e-04	3.8e-03***
	(-1.05)	(2.39)	(-1.11)	(3.01)
Amenity4	.32**	-.17	-.21	-.021
	(2.13)	(-0.80)	(-1.49)	(-0.13)
Amenity5	.19**	.21***	.027	.099**
	(2.48)	(2.72)	(0.45)	(2.39)
Amenity6	.099**	.12*	.038	.051
	(2.44)	(1.74)	(0.89)	(1.19)
Amenity7	.24***	.018	.19***	.18*
	(3.18)	(0.14)	(2.64)	(1.76)
Constant	.12	-.069	.33***	.11
	(0.73)	(-0.29)	(2.72)	(1.09)
Observations	1,986	1,052	1,986	1,052
Pseudo R^2	0.123	0.142	0.104	0.150

***, **, * - significant at 0.01, 0.05, and 0.1 respectively; standard errors clustered at BEA area level in parentheses; all models include a full set of controls as described in the text (*AgriShare, MiningShare, IncDist250, IncDist500, IncDist1500, %Black, %Native, %Asian, %Other, GrtLakes, PacificOcean, AtlanticOcean, LnMSApop* and *TotPop*).

Overall, our poverty results suggest that a locality's industry composition is one of the most important determinants in alleviating poverty. In the differenced analysis, which is our main focus, the industry mix term and manufacturing shares in nonmetro counties are more important in reducing poverty *after* the recession compared to the pre-recession expansion, although the *IndMix* variable seems less relevant at the ends of poverty performance distribution among counties.

Median Household Income Growth Rates

As noted above, we briefly discuss the median household income growth results for the first-differenced post-recession/pre-recession models shown in the far-right panel in Table 1. Besides space limitations, a key reason for the brief discussion is that the median household income results are in many ways a mirror image of the poverty results. Industry-mix demand shocks are positively related to median household income growth, again supporting industry composition's key role in well-being. As in the quantile regression results for the poverty rate models, industry composition is a particularly important growth determinant at the middle of distribution (not shown). Unlike the poverty results, however, growing industry composition is also a strong predictor of income growth in low-performing metro counties (the variable is insignificant in counties with the best relative median household income gains).

For nonmetro areas, greater occupation and industry workforce mobility is associated with higher median household income growth. Manufacturing concentration appears to promote faster median household income growth relative to the pre-recession expansion in both county types. In the nonmetro model, high amenity areas had lower income growth, which may reflect weak post-recession economies, though it could reflect a compensating differential in spatial equilibrium. Conversely, the amenity variables are only weakly significant in the metro model.

Employment Growth Rates

Figure 3 shows the changes in the geographical pattern of job growth before and after the Great Recession. The left panel plots annualized employment growth rate during the 2000-2007 period, while the right panel presents the difference between the pre-

recession and post-recession periods. The spatial patterns of job growth are visually consistent with poverty performance reported in Figure 2 in that regions that had less job growth generally had higher poverty rates. The seeming reversal of this pattern in the right-hand-side panel again suggests that the West fared better pre-recession, with the East faring relatively better post-recession. In particular, job growth in the Great Lakes region generally accelerated. The relative post-recession improvement for much of the Rustbelt is surprising in light of the strong performance of President Trump in the 2016 election and the associated public discussion thereafter.



Figure 3. Pre- and post-recession employment growth dynamics

Table 3 reports the estimation results for the cross-section post-recession model and for the differenced model comparing the post- and pre-recession periods.[18] Again, economic factors emerge as important in determining the employment performance of both metro and nonmetro counties. Local economies that experienced positive demand shocks associated with their industry composition enjoyed greater annual job growth rates. For the level equations results displayed in the left-hand-side panel, employment turnover across occupations and industries (only across industries in the nonmetro sample) are positively related to job growth. Yet, this statistically significant effect only

[18]For the base first difference employment model, the Chow test that the metropolitan coefficients jointly equal the nonmetropolitan coefficients can be rejected at the 0.1% level of statistical significance.

applies to nonmetro counties in the first-difference models between the two expansions (col 3). While the ease for workers to change sectors (*JobsFlow*) has a statistically insignificant coefficient in the level models, its effects become positive and statistically significant when differencing out the fixed effect (cols 3-4). Conversely, having a greater diversity of industries is statistically insignificant across all models. Manufacturing share is positively related to nonmetro job growth in the 2010-15 equation but when subtracting the pre-recession period, this effect is statistically insignificant. There is no statistical evidence that concentrations of manufacturing reduce employment growth. It is unclear whether this is just a post-recession bounce back but it does weakly suggest that manufacturing is currently associated with lower rural poverty.

To summarize estimation results for the economic variables, economic structure that affords more opportunities for labor to change industries and occupations, especially in nonmetro counties, emerges as an important factor for areas to outperform their pre-recession performance in job growth. That is, economies that more successfully rewired are the ones in which it easiest for workers to shift to growing firms. This factor appears to be more important than before the crisis. Interestingly enough, after accounting for industry composition using employment shares, as well as for the intensity of employment dynamics and inter-sectoral flows, industrial diversity (commonly believed to be an important determinant of economic growth) is consistently insignificant. Most likely, these results suggest that it is not diversity *per se* that matters but the degree to which the industrial structure of a local economy facilitates flows of employees and other resources across industries and occupations.

In terms of the social variables, the 2010-2015 level models (cols 1-2) point to a positive relationship between employment growth and higher levels of human capital measured by the share of college graduates. This education result does not hold in the differenced models, perhaps because the impact of human capital is totally captured by the fixed effects. High natural-amenity nonmetro places grow slower during the post-

recession period compared to their less-attractive counterparts. This result is consistent with the poverty models and suggests that one possible structural change could be the 20th century's amenity-led migration (Partridge 2010) is no longer stoking job growth. However, the amenity results are also consistent with the possibility that high-amenity places (e.g. Florida and California)—which suffered larger declines in the quality of life during the Great Recession (Carruthers and Mulligan 2013)—had a slower recovery from the housing crash and the Great Recession (at least initially).

Table 3. OLS Estimation Results for Annualized Employment Growth

Explanatory variables	2010-2015		2010-2015 minus 2000-2007	
	Nonmetro	Metro	Nonmetro	Metro
IndMix	.62**	.87**	.61***	1.4***
	(0.30)	(0.35)	(0.22)	(0.30)
JobsFlow	.35	.66	1.6**	1.7**
	(0.35)	(0.44)	(0.63)	(0.76)
OccEmpMobility	.092**	.18**	.098***	.017
	(0.04)	(0.07)	(0.03)	(0.05)
IndEmpMobility	.045***	-.019	.021*	.019
	(0.01)	(0.03)	(0.01)	(0.01)
IndDiversity	9.7e-05	-9.0e-06	-6.8e-04	3.9e-03
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
ManufShare	3.9**	.18	2	-6.4
	(1.57)	(3.08)	(1.97)	(5.65)
LowWageManufShare	1.7e-03	.029	.014	.01
	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.02)	(0.03)
SocialCap	-.34**	-.34*	.24	-.12
	(0.14)	(0.20)	(0.29)	(0.26)
%LessHS	-.016	-.04	-.028	-.02
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
%BA	.14***	.11***	-.033	.026
	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.04)
PovRat2000	-.013	.019	.016	.06
	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.08)	(0.06)
NearMSAkm	2.8e-04	-1.7e-03	2.3e-03	-8.5e-03
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.01)
Amenity4	-.39	.14	-1.4*	.62
	(0.58)	(0.54)	(0.77)	(0.52)
Amenity5	.086	-.5**	-.29	-.24
	(0.40)	(0.21)	(0.48)	(0.32)
Amenity6	.31	-.023	-.32	-.27
	(0.20)	(0.21)	(0.28)	(0.36)
Amenity7	-.022	-.056	-1.5***	-.77
	(0.43)	(0.32)	(0.48)	(0.53)

Constant	-6.9**	-6	.37	.081
	(3.10)	(10.90)	(0.99)	(1.24)
Observations	1986	1052	1986	1052
R^2	0.198	0.267	0.130	0.147

***, **, * - significant at 0.01, 0.05, and 0.1 respectively; standard errors clustered at BEA area level in parentheses; all models include a full set of controls as described in the text (*AgriShare, MiningShare, IncDist250, IncDist500, IncDist1500, %Black, %Native, %Asian, %Other, GrtLakes, PacificOcean, AtlanticOcean, LnMSApop, TotPop* and state fixed effects in the 2010-2015 equation).

We now examine the heterogeneity of the employment responses between fast- and slow-growing counties using the quantile regressions for the first-difference between the two economic expansions (in Table 4). A high-growth industry mix especially supports growth at the 90th percentile. Not only do such counties presumably have a faster-growing industry composition, but they get more "bang-per-buck" from their structure. In the case of slow-growers (left panel), only metro counties benefit from a fast-growing industry mix, in which the metro coefficient is barely just over one-half of the corresponding coefficient at the 90% percentile. Nonmetro poor performers appear to be unable to benefit from a better industry structure, in which they are doubly penalized because such places likely have an unfavourable structure to begin with. Noteworthy, at the 10th percentile, metro and nonmetro county job growth is positively associated with the adaptability and rewiring of their economies as measured by the *JobFlow* and *OccEmpMobility* variables.

Although further analysis should confirm and validate this assessment, it appears that targeting industrial development by accounting for the existing industry composition and labor flows among sectors is likely to produce better results in lagging areas compared to attempts to increase industrial diversity or to create clusters *per se*. That is, trying to attract and develop industries that can take advantage of the accumulated expertise of a region and organically blend into the existing local structure facilitating

flows of resources appears to lead to greater job growth. Thus, designing industry development strategies that take into account the ability of some industries (given the industrial structure already in place) to complement workforce mobility may be a better tactic than relying on input-output linkages, clusters, or knowledge spillovers that have produced dubious results (Duranton 2011; Feser, Resnki and Goldstein 2008). The results of our analysis are in line with a developing literature in evolutionary economics on the nature of industrial recombination in a region (He, Yan and Rigby 2016; Neffke, Henning and Boschma 2011; Poncet and de Waldemar 2013; Tsvetkova and Partridge 2017).

Table 4. Quantile Regression Results for Annualized Employment Growth, 2010-2015 Minus 2000-2007

Explanatory variables	10th percentile		90th percentile	
	Nonmetro	Metro	Nonmetro	Metro
IndMix	.088	.82**	.94***	1.7***
	(0.33)	(2.30)	(2.75)	(5.46)
JobsFlow	1.1**	1.1*	.72	.47
	(2.33)	(1.89)	(1.41)	(0.76)
OccEmpMobility	.066***	.14***	.03	-.069
	(2.68)	(2.74)	(0.98)	(-1.37)
IndEmpMobility	.012	.016	.022	.03
	(0.90)	(0.75)	(1.44)	(1.49)
IndDiversity	6.9e-04	3.5e-03	-6.4e-04	1.1e-03
	(0.69)	(1.39)	(-0.56)	(0.60)
ManufShare	2.7	2.1	3.5	-3.2
	(1.13)	(0.68)	(1.17)	(-1.28)
LowWageManufShare	6.7e-03	-7.2e-04	-.035	.026
	(0.17)	(-0.02)	(-1.01)	(0.76)
SocialCap	-.24	-.71	.56*	-.12
	(-0.82)	(-1.29)	(1.89)	(-0.38)
%LessHS	-7.5e-03	-.074	.022	-.064*
	(-0.19)	(-1.22)	(0.66)	(-1.68)
%BA	-.024	.076	.062	-.059
	(-0.33)	(1.48)	(0.88)	(-1.17)
PovRate1960	-.076	.19**	-5.6e-03	.086
	(-1.29)	(2.25)	(-0.09)	(1.20)
NearMSAkm	2.6e-03	-8.1e-03	5.1e-04	-.02**
	(0.73)	(-0.62)	(0.13)	(-2.08)
PacificOcean	.72	.57	-.79	-1.3
	(0.31)	(0.81)	(-0.60)	(-1.38)
AtlanticOcean	-.71	.42	.023	-.17

	(-1.24)	(1.10)	(0.04)	(-0.44)
Amenity4	-.48	.15	-.57*	.019
	(-1.37)	(0.38)	(-1.67)	(0.07)
Amenity5	-1	-.79	-1.5**	.4
	(-1.63)	(-1.19)	(-1.99)	(0.83)
Amenity6	-1.5	-.72	-.87	.92
	(-1.44)	(-1.33)	(-0.56)	(1.16)
Amenity7	-4.1	.15	-2	2.2**
	(-1.19)	(0.20)	(-0.62)	(2.12)
Constant	-1.3	-2.5	.5	2.4*
	(-0.77)	(-1.50)	(0.34)	(1.69)
Observations	1,986	1,052	1,986	1,052
Pseudo R^2	0.110	0.227	0.135	0.178

***, **, * - significant at 0.01, 0.05, and 0.1 respectively; standard errors clustered at BEA area level in parentheses; all models include a full set of controls as described in the text (*AgriShare, MiningShare, IncDist250, IncDist500, IncDist1500, %Black, %Native, %Asian, %Other, GrtLakes, PacificOcean, AtlanticOcean, LnMSApop* and *TotPop*).

Conclusion

In this article we explore how various economic, social, and geography factors influence US county economic wellbeing in the 21st century. We do this by splitting the sample into three periods: pre-recession, recession and post-recession. Using a combination of cross-sectional, first-difference, and quantile regression analyses, we try to detect structural changes that possibly occurred during or since the Great Recession in the determinants of job growth and the change in poverty rates in rural and urban counties. In addition to focusing on demand shocks due to industry mix and other traditional determinants, we consider several relatively novel measures of labor-market flexibility aimed at measuring the ability of local areas to reallocate workers across industries and occupations.

We present descriptive evidence that suggests that the East's performance during the post-recession expansion improved relative to the pre-recession expansion (including in the Rustbelt), which contradicts the public view that President Trump's victory was driven by frustrated voters in stagnating areas. Given that the economic performance seems to be improving, the wide-spread frustration might stem from the so-called mental anchoring, whereas people might be fixated on the Great Recession decline and ignore the signs of better performance in the recent years.

Our estimation suggests that through the three periods considered, economic factors are important determinants of economic well-being. In general, the primary factor that is almost universally associated with lower poverty and greater job growth (at least in the middle of distribution) is the demand shocks related to county's industry mix—which on the negative side for policymakers implies that once a location's industry composition is set, it is hard to alter its economic growth path. On the positive side, however, there is some evidence that counties exhibiting greater flexibility of their economies, measured by the shifts in employment across industries and occupations or by the propensity of the local industrial structure to accommodate higher intersectoral job flows, often performed better after the recession (especially in rural and areas).

The quantile regression results for differenced employment growth suggest that with the exception of nonmetro job growth at the lower part of the distribution, industry mix demand shocks are key factors driving job growth at both the upper and lower parts of the distribution. Likewise, measures of employment reallocation appear to be most important at the lower end of the distribution (and in rural areas). Conversely, there is weak evidence that having a more diverse industry structure positively affects outcomes, suggesting that once labor-market mobility factors are accounted for, there is little left for diversity to influence economic outcomes. Especially at the lower end of the distribution in terms of job growth, the ability of counties to reallocate labor towards faster growing firms and industries (to rewire) is an important factor behind better performance since the Great Recession. This finding has important policy implications. Rather than simple diversification efforts or efforts to build clusters, our findings suggest that lagging areas should focus more on helping those firms and industries that would facilitate reallocation of labor towards its more productive use.

Of demographic factors, the importance of higher human capital was only modestly confirmed. While more research is needed, the results suggest a smaller role for human capital in determining economic growth. Of course, this could represent some of

the adjustment coming out of the Great Recession and may change. The positive effects of natural amenities observed in the 20th century as documented in the literature are mostly reversed during the Great Recession and after, pointing to the limitations of reliance on amenity-led development in US counties. In addition, the decline of amenity-led growth in the 21st century may suggest that at least in terms of spatial equilibrium, amenity migration may have run its course. To conclude, we find that any structural changes are relatively modest with a post-recession shift toward economic factors such as industry composition and away from human capital and amenity-led growth. Yet, in some ways, these modest changes may make it harder for policymakers to even out growth.

References

Adamy, Janet, and Paul Overberg. 2017. "Rural America Is the New 'Inner City'." *Wall Street Journal.* [https://www.wsj.com/articles/rural-america-is-the-new-inner-city-1495817008] Accessed on May 12, 2018.

Akçomak, I Semih, and Bas Ter Weel. 2009. "Social capital, innovation and growth: Evidence from Europe." *European Economic Review* 53 (5):544-567.

Amcoff, Jan, and Erik Westholm. 2007. "Understanding rural change—demography as a key to the future." *Futures* 39 (4):363-379. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2006.08.009.

Andersson, Martin, and Hans Lööf. 2011. "Agglomeration and productivity: Evidence from firm-level data." *The Annals of Regional Science* 46 (3):601-620.

Autor, David H, and David Dorn. 2013. "The growth of low-skill service jobs and the polarization of the US labor market." *The American Economic Review* 103 (5):1553-1597.

Autor, David H., David Dorn, and Gordon H. Hanson. 2013. "The China Syndrome: Local Labor Market Effects of Import Competition in the United States." *American Economic Review,* 103 (6): 2121-68.

Autor, David H., Lawrence F. Katz and Melissa S. Kearney 2008. "Trends in US wage inequality: Revising the revisionists." The Review of Economics and Statistics 90 (2):300-323.

Barro, Robert J, and Xavier Sala-i-Martin. 1990. Economic growth and convergence across the United States. National Bureau of Economic Research.

Bartik, Timothy J. 1991. "Who benefits from state and local economic development policies?" *Books from Upjohn Press*.

Bertrand, Marianne, Esther Duflo, and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2004. "How Much Should We Trust Differences-In-Differences Estimates?*." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 119 (1):249-275. doi: 10.1162/003355304772839588.

Betz, Michael R., Michael Farren, Linda Lobao, and Mark Partridge. 2015. "Coal mining, economic development, and the natural resource curse." *Energy Economics* 50:105-116.

Betz, Michael R., and Lauren E. Jones. 2018. "Drug overdoses, wages, and employment: Not all growth is created equal." Invited paper presented at the ASSA Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, PA.

Betz, Michael R., and Mark Partridge. 2013. "Country road take me home: Migration patterns in Appalachian America and place-based policy." *International Regional Science Review* 36 (3):267-295.

Beyers, William B. 2013. "The Great Recession and state unemployment trends." *Economic Development Quarterly* 27 (2):114-123.

Carlino, Gerald A, and Leonard O.Mills. 1993. Are U.S. regional incomes converging?: A time series analysis. Journal of Monetary Economics, 32(2), 335-346. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3932(93)90009-5

Carlino, Gerald A, and Leonard O.Mills. 1996. "Testing neoclassical convergence in regional incomes and earnings." *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 26 (6):565-590. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-0462(96)02137-0

Carruthers, John I, and Gordon F Mulligan. 2013. "Through the Crisis: The "Plane of Living" and the Spatial Disposition of Housing Values in the United States." *Economic Development Quarterly* 27 (2):124-143.

Case, Anne, and Angus Deaton. 2015. "Rising morbidity and mortality in midlife among white non-Hispanic Americans in the 21st century." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112 (49):15078-15083. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1518393112.

Caselli, Francesco and Wilbur John Coleman. 2001. "The U.S. structural transformation and regional convergence: A reinterpretation." *Journal of Political Economy* 109 (3):584-616. doi:10.1086/321015

Center for American Progress. 2018. "Bold Ideas for State Action." available at [http://app.mx3.americanprogressaction.org/e/es.aspx?s=785&e=1143846&elqTrackId=ac8045166cea40e9af686322c61b4fc1&elq=c2a61413727c4b3fad58a30a84e21f2d&elqaid=37750&elqat=1.] accessed May 12, 2018.

Chetty, Raj, Nathaniel Hendren, Patrick Kline, and Emmanuel Saez. 2014. "Where is the land of opportunity? The geography of intergenerational mobility in the United States." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 129 (4):1553-1623.

Deller, Steven, Victor Lledo, and David W. Marcouiller. 2008. "Modeling regional economic growth with a focus on amenities." *Review of Urban & Regional Development Studies* 20 (1):1–21.

Deller, Steven, Tsung-Hsiu Sue Tsai, David W Marcouiller, and Donald BK English. 2001. "The role of amenities and quality of life in rural economic growth." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 83 (2):352-365.

Duranton, Gilles. 2011. "California dreamin': The feeble case for cluster policies." *Review of Economic Analysis* 3 (1):3-45.

Easterly, William. 2001. *The elusive quest for growth: economists' adventures and misadventures in the tropics*. Vol. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Ellis, Mark, Richard Wright, and Virginia Parks. 2004. "Work together, live apart? Geographies of racial and ethnic segregation at home and at work." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 94 (3):620-637.

Michael W. L. Elsby, Bart Hobijn, and Aysegul Sahin. 2010. "The labor market in the Great Recession." *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* 41 (1 Spring):1-69.

Faggian, Alessandra, and Philip McCann. 2008. "Human capital, graduate migration and innovation in British regions." *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 33 (2):317-333.

Fallah, Belal, Mark Partridge, and Dan S. Rickman. 2014. "Geography and high-tech employment growth in US counties." *Journal of Economic Geography* 14 (4):683-720.

Fan, C. Cindy, and Emilio Casetti. 1994. "The spatial and temporal dynamics of US regional income inequality, 1950–1989." *The Annals of Regional Science* 28 (2):177-196. doi: 10.1007/BF01581768.

Feser, Edward, Henry Renski, and Harvey Goldstein. 2008. "Clusters and economic development outcomes: An analysis of the link between clustering and industry growth." *Economic Development Quarterly* 22 (4):324-344.

Florida, Richard. March 2009. "How the crash will reshape America." *The Atlantic*.

Fodor, E. 2012. "Relationship between growth and prosperity in the 100 largest U.S. metropolitan areas." *Economic Development Quarterly* 26:220-230.

Foster, Lucia, Cheryl Grim, and John Haltiwanger. 2016. "Reallocation in the Great Recession: Cleansing or Not?" *Journal of Labor Economics* 34:S293-S331.

Glaeser, Edward L. and Joshua D. Gottlieb. 2009. "The Wealth of Cities: Agglomeration Economies and Spatial Equilibrium in the United States." NBER Working Paper #14806.

Goetz, Stephan, and Meri Davlasheridze. 2018. "Explaining spatial disparities in drug overdoses, 1970-2014." Invited paper presented at the ASSA Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, PA.

Goetz, Stephan, and Dayuan Hu. 1996. "Economic growth and human capital accumulation: Simultaneity and expanded convergence tests." *Economics Letters* 51 (3):355-362.

Goetz, Stephan, Mark Partridge, and Heather Stephens. 2018. "The economic status of rural America in the President Trump era and beyond." *Applied Economic Policy Perspectives* 40 (1): 97-118.

Gore, C. 2010. "The global recession of 2009 in a long-term development perspective." *Journal of International Development* 22:714-738.

Green, Gary Paul, Steven C. Deller, and David W. Marcouiller, eds. 2005. *Amenities and rural development: Theory, methods and public policy*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Hammond, George W., and Eric Thompson. 2004. "Employment risk in U.S. metropolitan and nonmetropolitan regions: The influence of industrial specialization and population characteristics." *Journal of Regional Science* 44 (3):517-542.

He, Canfei, Yan Yan, and David Rigby. 2016. "Regional industrial evolution in China." *Papers in Regional Science*. doi: 10.1111/pirs.12246.

Hobijn, Bart, and AyşegüL Şahin. 2013. "Beveridge Curve Shifts across Countries since the Great Recession." *IMF Economic Review* 61 (4):566-600. doi: 10.1057/imfer.2013.18.

Isserman, Andrew M, and James Westervelt. 2006. "1.5 million missing numbers: Overcoming employment suppression in County Business Patterns data." *International Regional Science Review* 29 (3):311-335.

Khatiwada, Lila K. 2014. "Modeling and Explaining County-level Prosperity in the U.S." *Journal of Regional Analysis and Policy* 44 (2).

Lagravinese, Raffaele. 2015. "Economic crisis and rising gaps North–South: evidence from the Italian regions." *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* 8 (2):331-342.

Levernier, William, Mark D. Partridge, and Dan S. Rickman. 2000. "The Causes of Regional Variations in US Poverty: A Cross-County Analysis." *Journal of Regional Science* 40 (3): 473-497.

Lowrey, Annie. December 2017. "The Great Recession is still with us." *The Atlantic.*

Lucas, Robert 1988. "On the mechanics of economic development." *Journal of Monetary Economics* 22 (1):3-42.

Martin, Ron, Peter Sunley, Ben Gardiner, and Peter Tyler. 2016. "How Regions React to Recessions: Resilience and the Role of Economic Structure." *Regional Studies* 50 (4):561-585. doi: 10.1080/00343404.2015.1136410.

Martin, Ron, Peter Sunley, and Peter Tyler. 2015. "Local growth evolutions: recession, resilience and recovery." *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* 8 (2):141-148. doi: 10.1093/cjres/rsv012.

Neffke, Frank, Martin Henning, and Ron Boschma. 2011. "How do regions diversify over time? Industry relatedness and the development of new growth paths in regions." *Economic Geography* 87 (3):237-265.

Nelson, Richard R, and Edmund S Phelps. 1966. "Investment in humans, technological diffusion, and economic growth." *The American economic review* 56 (1/2):69-75.

Partridge, Mark. 2010. "The duelling models: NEG vs amenity migration in explaining US engines of growth." *Papers in Regional Science* 89 (3):513-536.

Partridge, Mark, Ray D Bollman, M Rose Olfert, and Alessandro Alasia. 2007. "Riding the wave of urban growth in the countryside: spread, backwash, or stagnation?" *Land Economics* 83 (2):128-152.

Partridge, Mark, and Dan S Rickman. 2005. "High-poverty nonmetropolitan counties in America: Can economic development help?" *International Regional Science Review* 28 (4):415-440.

Partridge, Mark, and Dan S Rickman. 2008. "Distance from urban agglomeration economies and rural poverty" *Journal of Regional Science* 48 (2):285-310.

Partridge, Mark, Dan S Rickman, Kamar Ali, and M Rose Olfert. 2008. "Lost in space: population growth in the American hinterlands and small cities." *Journal of Economic Geography* 8 (6):727-757.

Partridge, Mark, Dan S Rickman, Kamar Ali, and M Rose Olfert. 2009. "Agglomeration spillovers and wage and housing cost gradients across the urban hierarchy." *Journal of International Economics* 78 (1):126-140.

Poncet, Sandra, and Felipe Starosta de Waldemar. 2013. "Product relatedness and firm exports in China." *The World Bank Economic Review* 29 (3):579-605.

Putnam, Robert D., Robert Leonardi, and Raffaella Y. Nanetti. 1994. *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton University Press.

Rey, Sergio J., and Brett D. Montouri. 1999. "US Regional income convergence: A spatial econometric perspective." *Regional Studies* 33 (2): 143-156. doi:10.1080/00343409950122945

Rosenthal, Stuart S., and William Strange. 2004. "Evidence on the Nature and Sources of Agglomerated Economies." In *Handbook of Regional and Urban Economics, Volume 4:*

Cities and Geography, edited by J. Vernon Henderson and Jacques-François Thisse, 2119-2166. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Rupasingha, Anil, and Stephan J Goetz. 2007. "Social and political forces as determinants of poverty: A spatial analysis." *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 36 (4):650-671.

Rupasingha, Anil, Stephan Goetz, and David Freshwater. 2002. "Social and institutional factors as determinants of economic growth: Evidence from the United States counties." *Papers in Regional Science* 81 (2):139–155

Rupasingha, Anil, Stephan J Goetz, and David Freshwater. 2000. "Social capital and economic growth: a county-level analysis." *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics* 32 (3):565-572.

Rupasingha, Anil, Stephan J Goetz, and David Freshwater. 2006. "The production of social capital in US counties." *The journal of socio-economics* 35 (1):83-101.

Simon, Curtis J. 1998. "Human capital and metropolitan employment growth." *Journal of Urban Economics* 43 (2):223-243.

Simon, Curtis J, and Clark Nardinelli. 2002. "Human capital and the rise of American cities, 1900–1990." *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 32 (1):59-96.

Stephens, Heather, and Deskins, John. 2018. "Economic Distress and Labor Market Participation." Invited paper presented at the ASSA Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, PA.

Tsvetkova, Alexandra, and Mark Partridge. 2017. "Regional industrial cohesion and business dynamics of single-unit and multi-unit firms." 64th Annual North American Meetings of the Regional Science Association International, Vancouver, BC.

Tsvetkova, Alexandra, Mark Partridge, and Michael R. Betz. 2017. "Entrepreneurial and employment responses to economic conditions across the rural-urban continuum." *The Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 672 (1):83-102.

United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. 2018. "Overview." [https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/population-migration/] Accessed on May 12, 2018.

Watson, Philip, and Steven Deller. 2017. "Economic diversity, unemployment and the Great Recession." *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance* 64 (Supplement C):1-11.

Weinstein, Amanda, Mark Partridge, and Alexandra Tsvetkova. 2018. "Follow the money: Aggregate, sectoral and spatial effects of an energy boom on local earnings." *Resources Policy* 55:196-209.

Appendix

Table A1. Brief variable description and sources

Group	Variable	Brief description	Data source(s)
Dependent	*AnnEmpGrowth*	Annualized employment growth in a county	"Unsuppressed" CBP*
	AvPovRateChange	Average yearly change in poverty rate	SAIPE
Economic	*IndMix*	Industry mix term from shift-share analysis; expected growth rate in a county if all its industries grow at the corresponding national growth rates	"Unsuppressed" CBP*
	JobsFlow	A measure of how easy it is to find employment in another sector given county's industrial composition	LEHD, "Unsuppressed" CBP*
	OccEmpMobility	A measure of employment share at the end of a period that needs to shift to another occupation in order for the county's occupational composition to be the same as at the beginning of a period	EMSI
	IndEmpMobility	A measure of employment share at the end of a period that needs to shift to another industry in order for the county's industrial composition to be the same as at the beginning of a period	"Unsuppressed" CBP*
	IndDiversity	10,000 minus Herfindahl-Hirschman index calculated for industry employment shares at the 4-digit NAICS level	"Unsuppressed" CBP*
	ManufShare	Share of employment in manufacturing	EMSI
	LabIntManuf	Share of employment in labor-intensive manufacturing (see Footnote 6 for a list of industries)	EMSI
	AgriShare	Share of employment in agriculture	EMSI
	MiningShare	Share of employment in mining	EMSI
Social	*SocialCap*	A measure of social capital in a county	Rupasingha et al. (2006)
	%LessHS	Share of adults with less than high school diploma	US Census
	%BA	Share of adults with BA degree	US Census
	%Black	Share of African-American population	US Census
	%Native	Share of Native American population	US Census
	%Asian	Share of Asian population	US Census
	%Other	Share of other races	US Census
	PovRate1960	Historical poverty rate in 1960	US Census
Geography	*NearMSAkm*	Distance to nearby MSA in kilometers	US Census shape files processed with ArcGIS
	PacificOcean	Indicator for counties within 50 mi of Pacific Ocean	US Census shape files processed with ArcGIS
	AtlanticOcean	Indicator for counties within 50 mi of Atlantic Ocean	US Census shape files processed with ArcGIS
	GrtLakes	Indicator for counties within 50 mi of Great Lakes	US Census shape files processed with ArcGIS
	IncDist250	Incremental distance to MSA of at least 250 thousand in 1990	US Census shape files processed with ArcGIS
	IncDist500	Incremental distance to MSA of at least 500 thousand in 1990	US Census shape files processed with ArcGIS
	IncDist1500	- Incremental distance to MSA of at least 1500 thousand in 1990	US Census shape files processed with ArcGIS
	Amenity4	Level 4 natural amenity index	USDA
	Amenity5	Level 5 natural amenity index	USDA

	Amenity6	Level 6 natural amenity index	USDA
	Amenity7	Level 7 natural amenity index	USDA
Controls	*LnMSApop*	Log of 1990 size of the nearby (or own for metro counties) MSA	US Census
	TotPop	Own county population in 1990	US Census

* CBP with suppressed data filled using linear programming algorithm (Isserman & Westervelt, 2006)

Table A2. Summary statistics by county type for main periods*

Variable	Nonmetro counties				Metro counties			
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Dependent variables								
AnnEmpGrowth	0.84	3.66	-11.31	47.15	1.50	2.56	-31.21	19.09
AvPovRateChange	-0.11	0.43	-3.12	2.79	-0.07	0.35	-1.54	1.52
ΔAnnEmpGrowth	0.50	4.60	-30.00	66.98	0.18	3.69	-56.80	30.03
ΔAvPovRateChange	-0.34	0.49	-3.07	2.52	-0.30	0.44	-2.41	1.21
Explanatory variables: Economic								
IndMix	1.65	0.52	-1.01	5.44	1.70	0.38	-0.93	4.27
JobsFlow	4.09	0.58	0.67	6.68	4.41	0.46	1.48	5.51
OccEmpMobility	12.86	5.97	0.00	87.21	9.87	4.53	2.01	43.43
IndEmpMobility	43.68	17.81	12.25	172.68	33.34	15.93	13.30	177.53
IndDiversity	9,467.4	420.45	2,458.6	9,825.3	9,623.1	378.1	2,509.8	9,865.4
ManufShare	0.12	0.10	0.00	0.50	0.12	0.08	0.00	0.58
LabIntManuf	2.25	4.12	0.02	41.50	1.82	3.33	0.03	43.11
AgriShare	0.13	0.10	0.00	0.62	0.06	0.07	0.00	0.45
MiningShare	0.02	0.04	0.00	0.84	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.31
ΔIndMix	1.26	1.09	-8.67	7.07	1.23	0.82	-4.01	5.34
ΔJobsFlow	0.03	0.48	-3.34	4.20	-0.03	0.38	-2.34	2.53
ΔOccEmpMobility	-4.63	7.25	-55.04	63.51	-4.20	4.80	-54.36	15.48
ΔIndEmpMobility	-17.25	19.82	-165.96	95.38	-14.65	13.89	-129.28	46.00
ΔIndDiversity	-5.93	198.50	-2,812.42	1,033.6	-2.58	131.93	-1,151.80	1,285.22
Explanatory variables: Social								
SocialCap	0.26	1.41	-3.42	7.07	-0.50	0.95	-3.93	17.44
%LessHS	24.19	8.93	3.67	65.30	19.84	7.53	3.04	49.55
%BA	9.70	3.93	2.58	40.02	13.20	5.64	2.47	36.55
%Black	7.89	14.89	0.00	86.49	10.33	13.45	0.03	80.34
%Native	1.95	7.00	0.00	85.60	0.76	2.05	0.02	36.88
%Asian	0.41	0.46	0.00	5.81	1.51	2.41	0.00	31.34
%Other	2.49	4.95	0.00	39.06	2.76	4.74	0.03	39.08
PovRate2000	14.09	5.33	2.63	43.80	10.66	4.26	1.85	32.41
ΔSocialCap	0.00	0.67	-4.81	3.75	-0.01	0.61	-1.67	11.24
Explanatory variables: Geography								
NearMSAkm	96.72	58.02	17.01	408.19	24.50	20.02	0.00	96.87
PacificOcean	0.01	0.09	0.00	1.00	0.03	0.17	0.00	1.00
AtlanticOcean	0.04	0.20	0.00	1.00	0.16	0.36	0.00	1.00
GrtLakes	0.03	0.16	0.00	1.00	0.06	0.23	0.00	1.00
IncDist250	68.38	109.32	0.00	621.43	37.02	74.32	0.00	621.56
IncDist500	42.88	65.88	0.00	426.36	36.76	68.20	0.00	490.54
IncDist1500	89.05	111.06	0.00	557.70	91.76	131.31	0.00	599.21
Amenity4	0.31	0.46	0.00	1.00	0.33	0.47	0.00	1.00

Amenity5	0.08	0.28	0.00	1.00	0.07	0.26	0.00	1.00
Amenity6	0.03	0.18	0.00	1.00	0.06	0.23	0.00	1.00
Amenity7	0.01	0.10	0.00	1.00	0.02	0.14	0.00	1.00
Control variables								
LnMSApop	0.31	2.01	0.00	15.41	9.84	6.04	0.00	16.07
TotPop	24,097	22,606	414	182,193	210,669	463,821	1,771	9,519,338
Observations	1,986				1,052			

* Summary statistics are given for the 2010-2015 level equations and 2010-2015 minus 2000-2007 differenced equations.

Table A3. OLS estimation results for level equations, pre-recession 2000-2007

Explanatory variables	Employment growth		Change in poverty	
	Nonmetro	Metro	Nonmetro	Metro
IndMix	.76***	1.2***	-.032***	-.016
	(0.12)	(0.27)	(0.01)	(0.02)
JobsFlow	.57***	.46	-.024*	-.012
	(0.19)	(0.43)	(0.01)	(0.02)
OccEmpMobility	.056***	.011	-1.8e-03*	-3.0e-03
	(0.02)	(0.05)	(0.00)	(0.00)
IndEmpMobility	-3.2e-03	.041**	6.2e-04*	-3.8e-05
	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.00)	(0.00)
IndDiversity	2.1e-04	9.5e-04	1.3e-05	-7.5e-06
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
ManufShare	.22	4.6	-.082	.14
	(1.19)	(2.92)	(0.12)	(0.14)
LowWageManufShare	-.017	-.03	4.9e-04	4.9e-03**
	(0.01)	(0.03)	(0.00)	(0.00)
SocialCap	-.33***	-.63***	3.4e-03	.011
	(0.11)	(0.18)	(0.01)	(0.01)
%LessHS	2.9e-03	-.02	3.2e-03*	2.2e-03
	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.00)	(0.00)
%BA	.072*	.075**	8.8e-03**	.013***
	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.00)	(0.00)
PovRate1990	-.055*	-.19***	7.3e-03**	.021***
	(0.03)	(0.06)	(0.00)	(0.01)
NearMSAkm	-2.5e-03*	.011*	-1.4e-04	-1.4e-03***
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Amenity4	.56	-.62	-.2**	.15
	(0.54)	(0.74)	(0.08)	(0.10)
Amenity5	.46	-.52	-.17***	-.13***
	(0.34)	(0.38)	(0.05)	(0.03)
Amenity6	.37**	-.065	-.031*	-.012
	(0.17)	(0.18)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Amenity7	.78**	.081	-.06*	-.032
	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.03)	(0.05)
Constant	-4.2	-12*	-.2	-.058
	(3.90)	(6.56)	(0.23)	(0.25)
Observations	1986	1052	1986	1052
R^2	0.244	0.336	0.415	0.410

***, **, * - significant at 0.01, 0.05, and 0.1 respectively; standard errors clustered at BEA area level in parentheses; all models include a full set of controls as described in the text (*AgriShare, MiningShare, IncDist250, IncDist500, IncDist1500, %Black, %Native, %Asian, %Other, GrtLakes, PacificOcean, AtlanticOcean, LnMSApop, TotPop* and state fixed effects).

Table A4. OLS estimation results for level equations, recession 2007-2010

Explanatory variables	Employment growth		Change in poverty	
	Nonmetro	Metro	Nonmetro	Metro
IndMix	.71***	.63***	-.055***	-.046**
	(0.19)	(0.12)	(0.02)	(0.02)
JobsFlow	.15	.24	.051	.038
	(0.41)	(0.28)	(0.04)	(0.05)
OccEmpMobility	.018	-.13***	-1.5e-03	-.013*
	(0.06)	(0.03)	(0.00)	(0.01)
IndEmpMobility	-.011	-9.6e-03	-2.6e-03*	-1.6e-03
	(0.03)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)
IndDiversity	-1.3e-03**	-2.9e-04	6.6e-05	2.1e-05
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
ManufShare	-2.9*	-.89	.56**	.11
	(1.66)	(1.62)	(0.27)	(0.29)
LowWageManufShare	.016	-2.3e-03	7.9e-03	-8.6e-04
	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.01)	(0.01)
SocialCap	-2.8e-03	.037	-.047**	-9.0e-03
	(0.13)	(0.11)	(0.02)	(0.02)
%LessHS	-1.6e-03	-.058*	-5.4e-03	4.9e-03
	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.01)	(0.01)
%BA	-.031	-.037	1.7e-03	-5.7e-03
	(0.06)	(0.03)	(0.01)	(0.01)
PovRate2000	-.068	.014	-8.5e-03	9.5e-03
	(0.06)	(0.04)	(0.01)	(0.01)
NearMSAkm	6.1e-03**	-5.4e-04	-7.5e-04**	-3.6e-03***
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Amenity4	-.79	-.59	.11	-.22
	(0.69)	(0.41)	(0.14)	(0.19)
Amenity5	-.46	.11	3.7e-03	.13*
	(0.51)	(0.27)	(0.09)	(0.07)
Amenity6	.024	.16	.12**	.025
	(0.29)	(0.20)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Amenity7	.76	-.44	.096	.053
	(0.98)	(0.39)	(0.09)	(0.10)
Constant	10**	3.8	.11	.48
	(5.25)	(2.69)	(0.69)	(0.67)
Observations	1986	1052	1986	1052
R^2	0.223	0.384	0.218	0.257

***, **, * - significant at 0.01, 0.05, and 0.1 respectively; standard errors clustered at BEA area level in parentheses; all models include a full set of controls as described in the text (*AgriShare, MiningShare, IncDist250, IncDist500, IncDist1500, %Black, %Native, %Asian, %Other, GrtLakes, PacificOcean, AtlanticOcean, LnMSApop, TotPop* and state fixed effects).

Table A5. OLS estimation results for differenced equations, 2010-2015 minus 2007-2010

Explanatory variables	ΔEmployment growth		ΔChange in poverty	
	Nonmetro	Metro	Nonmetro	Metro
ΔIndMix	.93***	1.3***	-.09***	-.11***
	(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.02)	(0.03)
ΔJobsFlow	2.6***	.8	-.064	-.087
	(0.84)	(1.28)	(0.09)	(0.12)
ΔOccEmpMobility	.017	-.053	3.3e-03	-5.3e-03
	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.00)	(0.01)
ΔIndEmpMobility	.024	-.014	-2.5e-03	1.5e-03
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.00)	(0.00)
ΔIndDiversity	2.1e-03	-2.7e-03	-1.1e-04	2.0e-04
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
ManufShare	3.2	-1.7	-.82**	-.032
	(2.41)	(4.57)	(0.36)	(0.45)
LowWageManufShare	-7.9e-03	-1.5e-03	-.016**	-7.6e-03
	(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.01)	(0.01)
ΔSocialCap	.56	.39	-.1**	2.5e-03
	(0.37)	(0.48)	(0.05)	(0.09)
%LessHS	-5.8e-03	.097**	2.1e-03	-6.8e-03
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.01)	(0.01)
%BA	-.032	.092***	-6.9e-04	-2.0e-03
	(0.06)	(0.03)	(0.01)	(0.01)
PovRate2000	-.027	-.17**	.014	-.015
	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.01)	(0.02)
NearMSAkm	-5.3e-03	1.7e-03	2.1e-04	4.6e-03***
	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Amenity4	-.75	.37	-.2	.1
	(0.85)	(0.68)	(0.15)	(0.23)
Amenity5	.79	-.49	-.19	-.041
	(0.57)	(0.35)	(0.13)	(0.09)
Amenity6	.54*	-.13	-.18**	-.037
	(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.07)	(0.06)
Amenity7	.8	1.4***	-.2*	-.42***
	(0.77)	(0.48)	(0.11)	(0.11)
Constant	-.4	-3.6***	(0.24)	(0.29)
	(1.51)	(1.14)	1986	1052
Observations	1986	1052	0.081	0.101
R^2	0.143	0.216	(0.24)	(0.29)

***, **, * - significant at 0.01, 0.05, and 0.1 respectively; standard errors clustered at BEA area level in parentheses; all models include a full set of controls as described in the text (*AgriShare, MiningShare, IncDist250, IncDist500, IncDist1500, %Black, %Native, %Asian, %Other, GrtLakes, PacificOcean, AtlanticOcean, LnMSApop* and *TotPop*).