

**Table 1 Crude Birth Rate 1861 English Counties**

	(1)	(2)
<b>Infant mortality 1861</b>	0.0454 (4.74)**	0.0348 (2.45)*
<b>Female/Male Ratio</b>	-12.4556 (2.85)**	-14.6640 (2.48)*
<b>Female wage proxy (illiteracy at marriage 1860)</b>	0.1956 (5.49)**	0.1836 (4.92)**
<b>Male wage proxy (illiteracy at marriage 1860)</b>	-0.1092 (-3.49)**	-0.0577 (-1.14)**
<b>R Sq</b>	0.7560	0.8041
<b>Obs</b>	42	42
<b>Est</b>	OLS	Population weighted OLS

**Notes:** Robust t statistics in parentheses: \*\* significant at 1%, \* significant at 5%

Observations exclude London, but include Monmouthshire, and extra-metropolitan Kent, Surrey and Middlesex. Variable key in Appendix. IV versions of (1) and (2) with endogenous mortality were estimated with a selection of plausible instruments - % male manufacturing employment 1851, % girls not at school in 1851, % domestic service 1841. Despite high first stage F ratios, tests of endogeneity, such as those due to Durbin, Wu and Hausman, did not reject the null of exogeneity.

**Table 2 Crude Birth Rate in Europe 1870-1914: Panel Regressions**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<b>death</b>	0.4589 (2.86)**	0.5387 (4.17)**	0.3839 (2.51)*	0.4592 (3.81)**	0.6086 (7.98)**	0.6571 (8.31)**
<b>Gnppe</b>	-0.0066 (2.58)*	-0.0041 (3.41)**	-0.0033 (1.84)*	-0.0025 (2.02)*		
<b>illit</b>	0.0362 (2.23)*	0.0205 (1.14)				
<b>year</b>	1.0311 (1.62)	0.6707 (2.23)*				
<b>femalespop</b>	-	-	7.9011 (0.16)	-52.2968 (1.43)		-59.409 (2.22)*
<b>R<sup>2</sup> Within</b>	0.6478	0.6637	0.6557	0.6380	0.5356	0.6065
<b>Betwn</b>	0.4999	0.5600	0.4878	0.7078	0.5608	0.6496
<b>Overl</b>	0.4546	0.5137	0.4112	0.5169	0.5430	0.4747
<b>Obs</b>	78	78	74	74	88	78
<b>Est</b>	FE	RE	FE	RE	IV FE	IV RE

Notes: Absolute value of robust (except 5 and 6) z or t statistics in parentheses; \* significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%.

Hausman on 1 and 2 accepts random. Eqn. 5 Instrumented: deathr; Instruments: year area pop. First stage F-stat=37.04. Eqn. 6 Instrumented: deathr; Instruments: year area pop. First stage F-stat= 33.05. 5 and 6 were Hausman tested against their OLS (efficient) equivalents and the null of exogeneity could not be rejected. Femalespop was significant at 1.8% level in the OLS version of 6, (coeff -62)

**Table 3 European Fertility and Proportion of Women Single c 1900**

	<b>Birth rate</b>	<b>Percentage women aged 20-24 single</b>	<b>Percentage women aged 25-29 single</b>
<b>Austria</b>	35.0	66	38
<b>Hungary</b>	39.4	36	15
<b>Belgium</b>	28.9	71	41
<b>Bulgaria</b>	42.3	24	3
<b>Denmark</b>	29.7	75	42
<b>Finland</b>	32.6	68	40
<b>France</b>	21.3	58	30
<b>Germany</b>	35.6	71	34
<b>Italy</b>	33.0	60	30
<b>Netherlands</b>	31.6	79	44
<b>Norway</b>	29.7	77	48
<b>Portugal</b>	30.5	69	41
<b>Romania</b>	38.8	20	8
<b>Russia</b>	49.3	*28	*9
<b>Serbia</b>	42.4	16	2
<b>Spain</b>	33.9	55	26
<b>Sweden</b>	27.0	80	52
<b>Switzerland</b>	28.6	78	45
<b>Great Britain</b>	28.7	73	42

Source: Hajnal 1965; Mitchell 1975

Notes: \* USSR 1926

**Table 4 Mean Age at First Marriage for Women 1861;  
English County Regressions**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
<b>Birth rate 61</b>	-0.1867 (-7.49)**	-0.1870 (14.76)**	-0.2032 (8.92)**
<b>Female ratio</b>	2.1708 (1.26)	3.0968 (2.94)**	3.1573 (3.18)**
<b>Obs</b>	42	42	42
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	0.7	0.67	0.7240
<b>Endogeneity test</b>	-	-	Robust score chi2(1) = 1.1292 (p = 0.2880) Robust regression F(1,38)=1.1366 (p = 0.2931)
<b>Estimation</b>	OLS	Population weighted OLS	Population weighted TSLS IV

Notes: Robust t statistics in parentheses; \*\* significant at 1%. Intercepts not reported.  
Eq 3 Instrumented: birth61, Instruments: female ratio, depositsinsavingsbanks manuf  
girlsnotat; first stage F stat=9.76.

**Table 5 European Marriage, Schooling and Illiteracy 1890-10**

	<b>% of women aged 25-29 single around 1900</b>	<b>Primary school children c.1890 % of pop</b>	<b>% illiteracy 1910 (Flora)</b>
<b>Austria-Hungary</b>	27	12.6	17
<b>Belgium</b>	41	10.1	13.4
<b>Bulgaria</b>	3	5.9	62.2
<b>Denmark</b>	42	15.4	3
<b>Finland</b>	40	2.3	1.1 [45]**
<b>France</b>	30	14.7	11.9
<b>Germany</b>	34	15.9	3
<b>Greece</b>	13	7.8	59.7
<b>Italy</b>	30	8.1	39.3
<b>Netherlands</b>	44	14.2	7.5
<b>Norway</b>	48	14.3	3
<b>Portugal</b>	41	4.7	68.9
<b>Romania</b>	8	3.2	65
<b>Russia</b>	9	2	55
<b>Serbia</b>	2	3	77.5
<b>Spain</b>	26	10.5	52.2
<b>Sweden</b>	52	15.1	1.5
<b>Switzerland</b>	45	16	1.5
<b>Great Britain</b>	42	13	7.5

Source: Hajnal 1965 Tables 2 and 3; Mitchell 1975; Flora 1975.

Notes: Single women in Austria and Hungary are aggregated.

\* per 1000 of under 15 age group.

\*\* see discussion in text.

**Table 6 Illiteracy Regressions Europe 1910**

	(1)	(2)	(3)
<b>propnsingle</b>	-0.556 (2.08)*	-1.425 (3.60)**	-1.347 (7.94)**
<b>schooling</b>	-3.73 (4.07)**	-2.11 (1.64)	
<b>constant</b>	85.165 (14.37)**	96.129 (7.59)**	72.128 (18.00)**
<b>Obs</b>	19	18	19
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	0.87	0.71	0.6
Estimation	OLS	IV	OLS

Notes Robust t statistics in parentheses; significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%  
Eqn (2) Instrumented: propnsingle, Instruments: schooling agrilab  
First stage F-stat=9.34

**Table 7 Illiteracy in English Counties 1885**

	Age at Marriage 1861	Boys not at school 1851	Girls not at School 1851	Infant Mortality 1861	R <sup>2</sup>	N	Estimation method
(i)	-1.7839 [-2.92]**	0.3017 [3.34]**	0.1723 [2.59]**	-	0.6684	42	OLS
(ii)	-2.0907 [-3.56]**	0.2664 [2.51]**	0.1796 [2.62]**	-	0.7695	42	Population weighted OLS
(iii)	-1.6714 [-2.07]*	0.2841 [2.68]**	0.1437 [1.98]*	0.0275 [0.94]	0.7763	42	Population weighted OLS

Notes: London excluded. Monmouth and extra metropolitan Kent, Surrey and Middlesex included. Robust t ratios in parentheses. \* significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%.

**Table 8 Production Function Random Effects Panel Regressions:  
Europe 1870-1910**

Dependent variable log GNP per head

	<b>Log Human capital (% literacy)</b>	<b>Log Capital (rail km per head)</b>	<b>Resources in agriculture</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup> within between overall</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Estimation</b>
<b>(1)</b>	0.1167 [2.55]**	0.0799 [2.27]*	-1.5445 [-9.97]**	0.5892 0.9212 0.8703	77	Panel Random Effects
<b>(2)</b>	0.1186 [2.19]*	0.0703 [1.21]	-1.5871 [2.61]*	0.5899 0.9200 0.8693	77	Panel Fixed Effects
<b>(3)</b>	0.5109 [2.93]**	-0.0115 [0.14]	-0.8918 [-2.74]**	0.3535 0.8664 0.7516	72	Panel IV Random, ec2sls human capital and capital endogenous, Instruments: agrilab, average tariff, year, death rate. First stage F-stat 7.18 and 15.70 for human and physical capital respectively.

Note: Robust z ratios (random) or t ratios (fixed) in parentheses. A Hausman test of (i) efficient against (ii) consistent does not allow rejection of null of no systematic differences in coefficients. A Hausman test of (iii) consistent against (i) efficient does not allow rejection of null of no systematic differences in coefficients