

# The short-run impacts of Connecticut's paid sick leave legislation

Thomas Ahn\* and Aaron Yelowitz

AQ1 5 Economics, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506, USA

In 2012, Connecticut became the first state to enact paid sick leave legislation. Using a difference-in-differences framework, we find the law had modest but negative effects on the labour market, particularly on the likelihood of working in the past week.

10 **Keywords:** paid sick leave; mandated benefits; difference-in-differences; fringe benefits; employment

**JEL Classification:** J33; J38; H75; I18; I12

#### I. Introduction

Roughly 80% of low-wage workers in the US do not
have access to paid sick leave. Commentators have
noted that the US lags behind other countries by
failing to mandate employers offer paid sick leave
(Heymann *et al.*, 2007). This proposition has been
gaining popular and legislative support across many
US cities and states. President Obama has called for a
federal law to guarantee workers paid sick leave to

recover from illness or care for sick family members (Obama, 2014).

Part of the appeal of paid sick leave is that it 25 appears, at first glance, to be relatively painless. Most paid sick leave laws equate to very slight pay increases, and compared to labour reforms such as minimum wage increases or employer-provided health insurance, impact is expected to be minor 30 (Summers, 1989; Kowloski and Kolstad, 2014).

AQ2 30

However, accommodating paid sick leave may not be a trivial increase in costs for employers. Changes in the law and subsequent absenteeism patterns will require adjustments in work schedules and HR policy. Monitoring costs may 35 increase.<sup>1</sup> The firm's flexibility in the use of its work force may decline. These factors may lead to a greater\_than anticipated reduction in labour demand. Whether there is an observable impact, of course, is an empirical question; however, 40 greater care must be exercised to ensure that the empirical framework does not suffer from bias, as any impact is expected to be small.

We use the American Community Survey (ACS), a difference-in-differences approach, and the paid sick leave law enacted in Connecticut in 2012 to estimate the initial impacts of the mandate. This approach is attractive for three reasons. First, statewide implementation avoids concerns about overlapping labour markets, an issue present with citywide implementation (Ahn, 2011). Second, Connecticut is surrounded by similar states that serve as a control. Third, several nearby states will soon introduce paid sick leave,

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author. E-mail: thomas.ahn@uky.edu

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Other studies of changes in mandated sick leave benefits in Germany show that employees may use more generous benefits as a means to shirk work. See Ziebarth and Karlsson (2010) and Ziebarth and Karlsson (2014).

which dampens mobility responses across state borders. We find that the law increased unemployment by a modest amount.

In addition to evaluating unemployment numbers, we focus on labour force participation. Unemployment may arise due to decreased labour

60 demand *and* increased labour supply. We estimate only small changes in labour force participation rate (LFPR), which, along with our negative employment effects, points to a sizable decrease in labour demand as a result of the law.

#### 65 II. Data

We use one-year samples of the 2009–2012 ACS Public Use Microdata Sample. The number of records contained in a one-year PUMS file is about 1% of the total in the nation.<sup>2</sup> Unlike most surveys,

- <sup>70</sup> respondents are required to participate in the ACS.<sup>3</sup> To create the sample, we examine Connecticut and the five other states that comprise the New England region (Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, and Maine).<sup>4</sup>
- 75 The ACS asks labour force information on individuals aged 16 and older; we focus on individuals aged 16 to 64, excluding individuals who have imputed values on key demographic variables. We also exclude an individual from a particular regres-
- <sup>80</sup> sion if the pertinent response was imputed.<sup>5</sup> We focus on three contemporaneous measures of work activity: work in the previous week, unemployment and labour force participation.<sup>6</sup>

Table 1 presents summary statistics. In the full sample, there are more than 347 000 individuals. The typical respondent worked more than 1400 hours per year. More than three-quarters of the sample was in the labour force, and of those, 9% was unemployed. Approximately 37% of the sample has a high school diploma or less, more than 80% is white, and 7% is legal noncitizens. Labour market outcomes gradually improved over this period, as the economy was emerging from the Great Recession. The final two columns compare Connecticut to other New England states. Although 95 many labour market variables are similar, annual wage income is higher in Connecticut. It also has a larger fraction minority and noncitizens. Among those who are working (or had worked in the past 5 years), nearly 30% are classified as service workers, the occupation targeted by the law.

#### III. Description of the Connecticut Paid Sick Leave Law

Connecticut General Statute 31-57r mandates that large firms (50 or more employees) must offer paid 105 sick leave to service workers beginning 1 January 2012. A worker accrues one hour of sick leave for every 40 hours worked, which equates to a 2.5% pay increase at most (if all sick leave hours are used). Workers cannot earn (or use) more than 40 hours of 110 sick leave and are allowed to carry over a maximum of 40 hours from year to year. In 2012, no other New England state had a similar law in place.

Table 2 shows – using County Business Patternsdata for Connecticut in 2012 – the fraction of workers115in each industry employed at large firms. The mandate115would be expected to have large impacts on the'Educational Services,' 'Management of Companiesand Enterprises,' 'Health Care and Social Assistance,'120'Administrative and Support,' 'Transportation and120Warehousing,' and 'Information' sectors. Although'Manufacturing' should have many affected workers,this industry was exempt from the mandate.

# **IV. Empirical Analysis**

We rely on a 'difference-in-differences' estimator:

$$OUTCOME_{ist} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 POST_{it} TREAT_{is} + \beta_2 POST_{it} + \beta_3 TREAT_{is}$$
(1)  
+  $\beta_4 X_i + \varepsilon_{ist}$ 

where  $OUTCOME_{ist}$  is one of the contemporaneous 125 labour market outcomes for individual *i* in state *s* in

A<u>Q7</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> http://www.census.gov/acs/www/data\_documentation/public\_use\_microdata\_sample/

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> http://www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/language\_brochures/ACSQandA\_ENG10.pdf

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> We also estimate our models with an alternate control: New York and New Jersey. Results are qualitatively similar to results with New England states. See <u>Supplementary</u> Tables 1 and 2 at sites.google.com/site/tomsyahn/ <sup>5</sup> This follows Bollinger and Hirsch (2006).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> The ACS contains annual measures of work, but we cannot use them in the analysis because the answers mostly pertain to the period before the sick leave law.

#### Table 1. Summary statistics

|                           | All      | 2009     | 2010     | 2011     | 2012     | СТ       | Other states |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|
| In labour force           | 0.789    | 0.794    | 0.787    | 0.786    | 0.787    | 0.794    | 0.787        |
| Worked                    | 0.710    | 0.718    | 0.704    | 0.708    | 0.713    | 0.712    | 0.710        |
| Unemployed                | 0.090    | 0.087    | 0.097    | 0.090    | 0.086    | 0.098    | 0.087        |
| Hours in last 12 months   | 1422     | 1453     | 1403     | 1412     | 1421     | 1427     | 1421         |
|                           | (1020)   | (1007)   | (1019)   | (1028)   | (1026)   | (1027)   | (1018)       |
| Worked in last 12 months  | 0.803    | 0.820    | 0.799    | 0.796    | 0.799    | 0.800    | 0.804        |
| Wages in last 12 months   | 37 029   | 38 753   | 36 806   | 35 778   | 36 740   | 41 482   | 35 609       |
| -                         | (57 690) | (60 335) | (57 217) | (54 689) | (58 276) | (70 938) | (52 694)     |
| State minimum wage        | 8.17     | 8.37     | 8.32     | 8.07     | 7.92     | 8.48     | 8.07         |
|                           | (0.39)   | (0.34)   | (0.35)   | (0.34)   | (0.35)   | (0.16)   | (0.39)       |
| Paid sick leave mandate?  | 0.060    | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0.241    | 0.247    | 0            |
| Service worker            | 0.291    | 0.278    | 0.297    | 0.294    | 0.296    | 0.29     | 0.292        |
| Age                       | 40.3     | 40.1     | 40.3     | 40.5     | 40.4     | 40.5     | 40.3         |
|                           | (14.0)   | (13.8)   | (14.0)   | (14.1)   | (14.1)   | (13.9)   | (14.0)       |
| Male                      | 0.49     | 0.49     | 0.49     | 0.49     | 0.49     | 0.49     | 0.49         |
| White                     | 0.81     | 0.83     | 0.81     | 0.81     | 0.80     | 0.73     | 0.84         |
| Black                     | 0.06     | 0.06     | 0.06     | 0.06     | 0.06     | 0.10     | 0.05         |
| Hispanic                  | 0.082    | 0.075    | 0.082    | 0.084    | 0.086    | 0.123    | 0.068        |
| Non-citizen               | 0.073    | 0.072    | 0.074    | 0.072    | 0.073    | 0.085    | 0.069        |
| Married                   | 0.494    | 0.501    | 0.492    | 0.497    | 0.485    | 0.5      | 0.492        |
| Military service          | 0.065    | 0.069    | 0.066    | 0.065    | 0.058    | 0.059    | 0.067        |
| Child aged 0–5            | 0.04     | 0.04     | 0.041    | 0.04     | 0.039    | 0.041    | 0.04         |
| Child aged 6–17           | 0.099    | 0.1      | 0.099    | 0.099    | 0.097    | 0.106    | 0.096        |
| Children aged0–5 and 6–17 | 0.029    | 0.029    | 0.029    | 0.029    | 0.029    | 0.032    | 0.028        |
| Difficulty with English   | 0.07     | 0.069    | 0.071    | 0.072    | 0.069    | 0.084    | 0.066        |
| No diploma                | 0.117    | 0.12     | 0.119    | 0.118    | 0.111    | 0.123    | 0.115        |
| HS grad/GED               | 0.253    | 0.255    | 0.255    | 0.248    | 0.256    | 0.252    | 0.254        |
| Some college              | 0.289    | 0.29     | 0.286    | 0.291    | 0.288    | 0.283    | 0.291        |
| College graduate          | 0.341    | 0.335    | 0.34     | 0.343    | 0.346    | 0.342    | 0.341        |
| Observations              | 347 169  | 85 343   | 85 864   | 88 683   | 87 279   | 83 934   | 263235       |

Notes: All values weighted. All dollar amounts in constant 2012 dollars. SDs are in parentheses.

year t,  $POST_{it}$  TREAT<sub>is</sub> is the interaction term that proxies for Connecticut's paid sick leave mandate, and  $X_i$  is a set of characteristics that vary at the individual level. In various specifications, we 130 include dummy variables for  $POST_{it}$  (or a set of year dummies), TREAT<sub>is</sub> (or a set of state dummies), and state-year trends. By including state-year trends, we control for pre-existing trends that might be correlated with Connecticut's sick leave 135 law. In general, the inclusion of trends does not have a noticeable impact on the magnitude of our results, especially for 'working last week.' See Wolfers (2006) for a discussion of the difficulties of separating out pre-existing trends from dynamic effects of

140 ing out pre-existing trends from dynamic effects of a policy shock. All specifications are estimated as

linear models with weights, and SEs are corrected for with nonnested two-way clustering at the state and year levels (Cameron *et al.*, 2011).

The results in Table 3 show that the sick leave law 145 had negative economic consequences. The effect on labour supply is small; LFPR increases by 0.3%. It is imprecisely estimated and, at most, suggestive of a small number of marginal workers being induced to enter the labour force. Negative unemployment 150 effects are remarkably robust to specifications, and very precisely estimated.<sup>7</sup> As a result of decreased labour demand (and not from increased competition from new labour market entrants), the fraction of unemployed workers increases by 0.9 percentage 155 points. Because firms respond by reducing the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> If we include state and year fixed effects, state-year trends, individual demographic characteristics, and the state minimum wage, results become statistically insignificant. See Supplementary Table 3.

AQ6

Table 2. Employment in large firms

| NAICS<br>Code | Industry  | 2012<br>Employment | Fraction in large firm | Fraction employment not suppressed |
|---------------|---|--------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|
|               | Full state  | 1 463 732          | 0.59                   | 1.00                               |
| 11            | Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting                                  | 338                | 0.00                   | 0.84                               |
| 21            | Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction                               | 1,111              | 0.00                   | 0.37                               |
| 23            | Construction  | 49 438             | 0.25                   | 0.96                               |
| 31            | Manufacturing   | 153 757            | 0.69                   | 0.79                               |
| 42            | Wholesale Trade   | 72 424             | 0.56                   | 1.00                               |
| 44            | Retail Trade  | 183 809            | 0.49                   | 1.00                               |
| 48            | Transportation and Warehousing  | 39 996             | 0.68                   | 1.00                               |
| 51            | Information   | 36 542             | 0.65                   | 0.94                               |
| 52            | Finance and Insurance   | 115 456            | 0.55                   | 0.72                               |
| 53            | Real Estate and Rental and Leasing  | 18 753             | 0.18                   | 0.84                               |
| 54            | Professional, Scientific and Technical Services                             | 102 622            | 0.53                   | 0.96                               |
| 55            | Management of Companies and Enterprises                                     | 36 011             | 0.86                   | 0.99                               |
| 56            | Administrative and Support and Waste<br>Management and Remediation Services | 90 045             | 0.67                   | 0.93                               |
| 61            | Educational Services  | 66 005             | 0.86                   | 1.00                               |
| 62            | Health Care and Social Assistance   | 268 876            | 0.68                   | 1.00                               |
| 71            | Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation   | 25 460             | 0.50                   | 0.97                               |
| 72            | Accommodation and Food Services   | 134 280            | 0.29                   | 0.88                               |
| 81            | Other Services, except Public Administration                                | 59 762             | 0.12                   | 0.97                               |
| 99            | Unclassified  | 55                 | 0.00                   | 0.84                               |

*Notes*: Data from County Business Patterns data for Connecticut for 2012. Employment in several industries suppressed; thus industry totals do not add up to state totals.

number of vacancies, deadweight loss is positive. The likelihood of working decreases by a similar amount.

At the bottom of Table 3, we separate the results by age (under 30 years /30 years and above), for

several reasons. First, education may be incomplete for young workers. Second, sick leave is more valu-

able to those in poor health or those who have sick

children, and older age proxies for this. Results sug-

gest that older workers have a higher valuation of

sick leave, and firms perceive older workers as more

costly.<sup>8</sup> Alternative specifications where we stratify

the sample by gender and more age categories show that men aged 30 to 54 and women aged 40 to 54 are

particularly hard, hit by decreased labour demand.

Unemployment increases for these groups by

roughly 1.4 percentage points. Teenage workers

who are mostly engaged in temporary, summer

(or advanced to positions) that offer more generous health benefits, including sick-leave.<sup>9</sup>

180

# **V. Conclusion**

We analysed the short-run impacts of Connecticut's sick leave law and found a small decrease in employment concentrated on older workers. Although there are real labour market impacts, the magnitudes seem 185 rather small to justify the level of political and popular interest in the policy.

It is important to acknowledge that our study examines the short-run impacts of Connecticut's law. Indeed, given the retrospective nature of some of the ACS questions, we are unable to examine usual hours of work or wage rates for workers, because neither question is asked post-implementation. As a consequence, we cannot currently exploit the variation in Connecticut's sick leave law with respect to how it treated service workers from nonservice workers, or workers in large firms from

170

160

165

175

<sup>5</sup> work are unaffected by changes in sick-leave policy. We also find that workers 55 years and older are not impacted. This may be because older workers may have already self-selected into companies

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> See supplementary material for a simple theory model.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> See Supplementary Table 4 for complete results.

| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  | -0.0061 0<br>-0.0116) 0<br>- 0<br>0<br>- 0<br>0<br>- 0<br>0<br>26<br>26<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0 | 0088 (0010) (0000000000000000000000000000000 | .0089           |   |                               |                          |                     |
|---|--|--|-----------------|---|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  | )<br>yed Worked 0<br>(0.0103) (0   | .0022)<br>.0028<br>.0033) –                  | .0023)          | $\begin{array}{c} 0.0023\\ (0.0025)\\ -\end{array}$ | -0.0092<br>(0.0016)<br>0.0027 | -0.0092<br>(0.0016)<br>- | -0.0124<br>(0.0017) |
| Obs. $(0.0034)$ $(0.0033)$ Obs. $342278$ $(0.0033)$ Under 30 sub-sample       In labour force       Unemployed       Worked $(0.0035)$ $POST_{ii}$ TREAT <sub>is</sub> $-0.0014$ $-0.0015$ $-0.0055$ $0.0046$ $0.00$ $POST_{ii}$ TREAT <sub>is</sub> $-0.0014$ $-0.0015$ $-0.0055$ $0.0046$ $0.002$ $POST_{ii}$ $TREAT_{is}$ $0.0065$ $-0.0015$ $-0.0037$ $-0.0087$ $-0.0087$ $-0.0087$ $-0.0087$ $-0.0087$ $-0.0087$ $-0.0087$ $-0.0087$ $-0.0087$ $-0.0030$ $-0.0030$ $-0.0030$ $-0.0033$ $-0.0033$ $-0.0027$ $-0.0033$ $-0.0027$ $-0.0033$ $-0.0012$ $-0.0033$ $-0.0027$ $-0.0033$ $-0.0027$ $-0.0033$ $-0.0027$ $-0.0033$ $-0.0027$ $-0.0033$ $-0.0027$ $-0.0033$ $-0.0012$ $-0.0033$ $-0.0102$ $-0.0033$ $-0.0012$ $-0.0033$ $-0.0027$ $-0.0033$ $-0.0027$ $-0.0033$ $-0.0027$ $-0.0033$ $-0.0027$ $-0.0033$ $-0.0027$ $-0.0033$ $-0.0023$ $-0.0033$   | (0<br>26<br>-0.0055 0<br>(0.0103) (0   | 0033)  |                 | I   | (0.0033)<br>(0.0075           | I                        | I                   |
| Under 30 sub-sampleIn labour forceUnemployedWorked0.00460.00 $POST_{ir}$ TREAT $_{is}$ $-0.0015$ $-0.0055$ $0.0046$ $0.00$ $POST_{ir}$ $-0.0014$ $-0.0015$ $-0.0055$ $0.0046$ $0.0028$ $POST_{ir}$ $-0.0070$ $-0.0015$ $-0.0033$ $0.0028$ $0.0028$ $POST_{ir}$ $0.0065$ $-0.0070$ $-0.0033$ $0.0027$ $POST_{ir}$ $0.0062$ $-0.0070$ $-0.0033$ $0.0027$ $Obs.867130.0022-0.00330.0102Obs.867130.0021-0.00330.0102Obs.867130.00210.00230.0102OST_{ir}TREAT_{is}0.0021-0.0033OST_{ir}TREAT_{is}0.0021-0.00330.0102OST_{ir}TREAT_{is}0.0021-0.00330.0102OST_{ir}TREAT_{is}0.0022-0.00330.0102OST_{ir}0.0021-0.00330.01022OST_{ir}0.00220.0023OST_{ir}0.0023OST_{ir}0.0023OST_{ir}0.0023OST_{ir}0.0023OST_{ir}0.0023OST_{ir}0.0$   | yed Worked<br>-0.0055 0<br>(0.0103) (0   | 5 824  |                 |   | (0.0038)<br>340 077           |                          |                     |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  | yed Worked<br>-0.0055 0<br>(0.0103) (0   |  |                 |   |                               |                          |                     |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  | (0.0103) (0  | .0046 (                                      | .0047           | 0.0017  | -0.0089                       | -0.0090                  | -0.0110             |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  |  | 0028) ((00000000000000000000000000000000000  | .0033)          | (0.0041)  | (0.0083)<br>0.0035            | (0.0080)                 | (0.0129)<br>-       |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  | , 0)   | .0027)                                       |                 |   | (0.0081)                      |                          |                     |
| Obs.         86 713         59 236 <b>30 and over sub-sample</b> 59 236         59 236 $POST_{ii} TREAT_{is}$ 0.0021         0.0033         0.0102         0.01 $POST_{ii} TREAT_{is}$ 0.00221         0.0033         0.0102         0.01 $POST_{ii} TREAT_{is}$ 0.0021         0.0033         0.0102         0.00 $POST_{ii}$ 0.0021         0.0033         0.0102         0.00 $POST_{ii}$ 0.0021         0.0033         0.0102         0.00 $POST_{ii}$ 0.0023         0.0023         0.0027         -         -         0.0057         - $TREAT_{is}$ 0.0108         -         -         -         0.0023         -         -         0.0023         -         -         0.0023         -         -         -         0.0023         -         -         -         0.0023         -         -         -         -         0.0023         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         0.0023         -         -         -         -         0.0023         -         -         -         -  | - 0  | .0030<br>.0043) –                            |                 | I   | 0.0097 (0.0091)               | I                        | I                   |
| <b>30 and over sub-sample</b> 0.0021         0.0033         0.0102         0.01 $POST_{ii} TREAT_{is}$ 0.0021         0.0033         0.0102         0.01 $POST_{ii} TREAT_{is}$ 0.0022         (0.0030)         (0.0053)         (0.0012)         (0.00 $POST_{ii}$ -0.0030         -         -         -         -0.0057         - $POST_{ii}$ 0.0108         -         -         -         0.0057         - $TREAT_{is}$ 0.0108         -         -         -         0.0023         - $TREAT_{is}$ 0.0108         -         -         -         0.0023         -         -         0.0023         -         -         -         0.0023         -         -         -         0.0023         -         -         -         0.0023         -         -         0.0023         -         -         0.0023         -         -         0.0023         -         -         0.0023         -         -         0.0023         -         -         0.0035         -         -         0.0035         -         -         -         0.0035         -         -         - <td< td=""><td>59</td><td>236</td><td></td><td></td><td>85 974</td><td></td><td></td></td<> | 59   | 236  |                 |   | 85 974                        |                          |                     |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   |  |  |                 |   |                               |                          |                     |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  | -0.0033 0<br>(0.0053) (0   | 0102 (0012) (0                               | .0103<br>.0025) | 0.0027<br>(0.0028)                                  | -0.0106 (0.0021)              | -0.0107<br>(0.0031)      | -0.0099 $(0.0036)$  |
| $\begin{array}{rcrcccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   |  |  |                 | . 1   | 0.0040                        | . 1                      | . 1                 |
| (0.0035)  | 0 0  | .0023)                                       |                 | L   | (0.0030)<br>0.0107            | I                        | I                   |
|   | 0)   | .0035)                                       |                 |   | (0.0034)                      |                          |                     |
| State dumnies? No Yes Yes No Yes  | Yes No   | Y 000 /                                      | es              | Yes   | 201 +C2<br>No                 | Yes                      | Yes                 |
| Year dumnies? No Yes Yes No Yes   | Yes No   | Y  | es              | Yes   | No                            | Yes                      | Yes                 |
| State-year trends? No No Yes No No  | Yes No   | Z  | 0               | Yes   | No                            | No                       | Yes                 |

workers in small firms, both of which would allow for a 'triple-differences' specification.

- 200 In addition, our results do not offer insight into long-run consequences. For instance, firms near state borders may relocate or adjust employee numbers/work hours. Firms in affected industries may also shift costs back to workers (Summers,
- 205 1989; Gruber, 1994). Our future work will examine these outcomes when data become available. The key market failure motivating paid sick leave laws is mitigating the spread of infectious disease. Given the modest labour market impacts,
- 210 future studies should also examine whether such benefits have appeared.

### **Supplemental Data**

Supplemental data for this article can be accessed here.

#### 215 **References**

AQ3

- Ahn, T. (2011) Distributional impacts of a local living wage increase with ability sorting, *Economics Letters*, **112**, 283–86. doi:10.1016/j. econlet.2011.05.035
- 220 Bollinger, C. R. and Hirsch, B. T. (2006) Match bias from earnings imputation in the current population survey: the case of imperfect matching, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 24, 483–519, doi:10.1086/504276

- Cameron, A. C., Gelbach, J. B. and Miller, D. L. (2011) 225
  Robust inference with multiway clustering, *Journal* of Business & Economic Statistics, 29, 238–49. doi:10.1198/jbes.2010.07136
- Gruber, J. (1994) The incidence of mandated maternity benefits, *American Economic Review*, **84**, 230 622–41.
- Heymann, J., Earle, A. and Hayes, J. (2007) *The Work, Family and Equity Index: how Does the United States Measure Up*?, Institute for Health & Social Policy.
- Kowloski, A. and Kolstad, J. (2014) Mandate-Based Health Reform and the Labor Market: evidence from the Massachusetts Reform, NBER Working Paper 17933.
- Obama, B. (2014) State of the Union Address. Available at 240 http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/full-text-ofobamas-2014-state-of-the-union-address/2014/01/28/ e0c93358-887f-11e3-a5bd-844629433ba3\_story.html (accessed 26 August 2014).
- Summers, L. (1989) Some simple economics of mandated 245 benefits, *American Economic Review*, **79**, 177–84.
- Wolfers, J. (2006) Did unilateral divorce laws raise divorce rates? A reconciliation and new results, *American Economic Review*, 96, 1802–20. doi:10.1257/aer.96.5.1802
- Ziebarth, N. R. and Karlsson, M. (2010) A natural experiment on sick pay cuts, sickness absence, and labor costs, *Journal of Public Economics*, **94**, 1108–22. doi:10.1016/j.jpubeco.2010.09.001
- Ziebarth, N. R. and Karlsson, M. (2014) The effects 255 of expanding the generosity of the statutory sickness insurance system, *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 29, 208–30. doi:10.1002/jae.2317

235 AQ4

250

AQ5