A   Supplemental Appendix: Additional tables (NOT FOR PUBLICATION)

A.1   Construction of the treatment indicator

Table A.1: West German Antennas (ARD)

Location	Coordinates	Altitude	Height	Power	Frequency
Bungsberg, NDR-Mast	54°13′0″N, 10°43′8″E	136	154	260	703.25
Neumünster	53°58′46″N, 9°50′59″E	27	141	500	527.25
Hamburg-Moorfleet	53°31′9″N, 10°6′10″E	1	264	500	751.25
Hamburg-Moorfleet	53°31′9″N, 10°6′10″E	1	264	100	203.25
Dannenberg/Zernien	53°3′56″N, 10°53′50″E	102	234	250	647.25
Scholzplatz, Berlin (West)	52°30′22″N, 13°13′10″E	66	220	100	189.25
Tofhaus/Harz-West	51°48′6″N, 10°31′56″E	820	243	100	210.25
Rimberg	50°47′51″N, 9°27′41″E	572	155	400	759.25
Hoher Meißner	51°13′42″N, 9°51′50″E	705	155	100	189.25
Kreuzberg (Rhön)	50°22′12″N, 9°58′48″E	927	182	100	55.25
Ochsenkopf	50°1′50″N, 11°48′29″E	990	160	100	62.25
Hoher Bogen	49°14′57″N, 12°53′27″E	976	70	500	743.25

Source: Norddeutscher Rundfunk, ed. (1989). Altitude and height of the antenna mast in meters. Power in kW. Frequency in MHz.

A.2   Definition of treatment area

Based on the antenna data above, we calculate average signal strength of the main West German TV broadcaster, ARD, in each one of the municipalities in East Germany (7529 municipalities in 1993, 5793 municipalities in 1998). These data are then used to define the treatment region in the EVS (Income and Expenditure Survey): municipalities with an average signal strength higher than −86.8dB (the average level in Dresden) are defined as "treated".

In other data sets observations may not be coded at the municipality level. Official data from the Statistical Yearbooks of the GDR is mostly available at the level of *Bezirke* (districts; 15 in East Germany as of 1990). Figures 1 and 3 show the boundaries of these districts (a list of the districts can be found in Table A.2). The analysis in Table 1 is based on district-level data. We define the districts of Dresden (south-east), Neubrandenburg and Rostock (north-east) as treated (cf. Figure 3).

Official migration statistics (as used in Tables 2 and A.3) are defined at the level of *Kreise* (counties). In the years until 1994, there were 215 *Kreise* in East Germany. We consider a *Kreis* as treated if average signal strength is higher than −86.8dB. This yields the following 23 *Kreise* in the control area (listed in descending order of signal strength): Dresden Stadt, Altentreptow, Niesky, Anklam, Ribnitz-Damgarten, Malchin, Bautzen, Neubrandenburg Stadt, Ueckermünde, Teterow,

Löbau, Pirna, Greifswald Land, Demmin, Görlitz Land, Grimmen, Wolgast, Greifswald Stadt, Zittau, Görlitz Stadt, Stralsund Land, Stralsund Stadt, Rügen.

The IAB's census of plants (Establishment History Panel, BHP) used in Table 3 has a variable indicating in which *Kreis* each plant/establishment is located. However, the county borders used in this context are the ones as of 2008. Due to several waves of county redistricting which occurred after 1994, there were only 86 *Kreise* left in East Germany as of 2008. Applying the same criteria as above, we obtain the following list of 11 *Kreise* in the control region: Dresden Stadt, Neubrandenburg Stadt, Greifswald Stadt, Stralsund Stadt, Rügen, Demmin, Nordvorpommern, Ostvorpommern, Uecker-Randow, Görlitz, Sächsische Schweiz-Osterzgebirge.

Table A.2: States and districts in East Germany

State (*Bundesland*)	District (*Bezirk*)
Mecklenburg-Vorpommern	Neubrandenburg*
	Rostock*
	Schwerin
Sachsen-Anhalt	Halle
	Magdeburg
Brandenburg	Cottbus
	Frankfurt/Oder
	Potsdam
Thüringen	Erfurt
	Gera
	Suhl
Sachsen	Dresden*
	Karl-Marx-Stadt (Chemnitz)
	Leipzig
Berlin	Berlin (East)

Districts were the administrative units of the GDR before 1990, states are the administrative divisions of the FRG (East Germany after 1990). The correspondence between districts and states is only approximate. Asterisks (*) denote districts in the control area (i.e., not covered by West German TV).

A.3 Migration data, 1991–1993

Table A.3 displays total migration rates between 1991 and 1993 from treatment and control areas and the breakdown of these rates by destination (Berlin, West Germany, control region, and treatment region). The numbers capture the moves of people that move out of their *Kreis* (district) of residence to another *Kreis* (they do not capture moves within the same *Kreis*).

The table suggests that total migration rates were low and similar in treatment and control areas (considerably higher rates were recorded in the years 1989 and 1990; see Hunt, 2006. However, there is no breakdown of migration by place of origin available for those years, so that one cannot compare migration rates by treatment region). The migration rates to areas outside of East Germany (i.e., Berlin and West Germany) were again similar when comparing control and treatment regions. We observe that migration rates from control to treatment areas were higher than from treatment to control areas, since the treatment area is much larger than the control area (about 10% of the population in East Germany lived in the control area).

Table A.3: Migration matrix, 1991–1993

Origin	Total	by destination:				Population
		Berlin	East Germany, Treatment	East Germany, Control	West Germany	
East Germany, Treatment	821,873 (6.38%)	43,106 (0.33%)	546,684 (4.25%)	30,981 (0.24%)	201,102 (1.56%)	12,873,985
East Germany, Control	100,934 (6.17%)	4,141 (0.25%)	32,421 (1.98%)	36,640 (2.24%)	27,732 (1.7%)	1,634,665

Population figures refer to 1991. Figures in italics express the total number of people moving across county borders from 1991 to 1993, relatively to original population size in 1991. Source: own analysis based on migration matrices (by *Kreis*), German Federal Statistical Office.

In Table A.4 we show how total outmigration rates from East Germany to West Germany differed by treatment region and age category. Differential outmigration by age could be problematic if the response to "treatment" through West German media varies by age. The analysis below shows, however, that outmigration rates were similar in treatment and control regions across all age categories.

Table A.4: Migration rates 1991–1993 (county level), by age and treatment status

Variable:					
Migration rate to West Germany, 1991–1993 in % of original population aged:	Treatment	Control	Diff.	Std. err.	p-value
below 18	1.047	1.035	0.012	0.076	0.870
18–25	4.679	4.704	-0.025	0.235	0.917
25–30	3.636	3.486	0.150	0.184	0.420
30–50	1.731	1.617	0.114	0.11	0.306
50–65	0.447	0.486	-0.039	0.034	0.262
above 65	0.358	0.407	-0.049	0.039	0.227

Total number of counties (*Kreise*): 215 (192 treatment, 23 control). P-values based on t-tests of difference in means, allowing for unequal variances. Source: own analysis based on migration matrices (by *Kreis*) and population data by age, German Federal Statistical Office and state statistical offices.

A.4 Differences in consumption levels and advertising

Table A.5 presents the data underlying Figures 5 and 6.

Table A.5: Differences in consumption levels and advertising: Raw data

Goods	Treatment	Control	Difference	Std.err.	Share of advertising time (%)	Avg. budget share (%)
Panel A: EVS 1993						
Food and drinks	8.826	8.812	0.014	0.031	42.5	23.7
Body and mouth care	6.558	6.568	-0.010	0.067	17.89	3.4
Cleaning and washing	4.774	4.754	0.020	0.097	11	0.7
Media, leisure	7.248	7.345	-0.096	0.044	5.47	6.3
Home and garden	7.645	7.636	0.008	0.065	3.66	11.7
Pharmaceuticals	3.125	3.213	-0.088	0.131	3.19	0.7
Cras, accessories	5.960	6.122	-0.162	0.182	2.95	14.1
Transportation and tourism	6.347	6.717	-0.370	0.107	1.15	5.9
Photo, optics, watches, and jewelry	4.165	4.112	0.053	0.127	0.83	1.1
Clothes and textiles	7.505	7.601	-0.096	0.048	0.78	8.4
All other	8.908	8.930	-0.022	0.022	0	24.1
Panel B: EVS 1998						
Food and drinks	7.231	7.178	0.053	0.024	42.5	15.5
Body and mouth care	4.953	4.935	0.017	0.049	17.89	2.3
Cleaning and washing	3.532	3.430	0.103	0.060	11	0.6
Media, leisure	6.082	6.117	-0.035	0.036	5.47	6.2
Home and garden	5.940	5.896	0.043	0.059	3.66	9.4
Pharmaceuticals	3.681	3.688	-0.007	0.072	3.19	0.9
Cars, accessories	4.939	4.728	0.211	0.136	2.95	12.9
Transportation and tourism	4.206	4.632	-0.426	0.092	1.15	6.3
Photo, optics, watches, jewelry	3.254	3.313	-0.060	0.087	0.83	1.2
Clothes, textiles	5.838	5.715	0.123	0.067	0.78	6.1
Other	8.173	8.110	0.063	0.021	0	38.6

Figures correspond to the logarithm of average consumption expenditures of all households in the respective regions. Refer also to the notes to Figures 5 and 6 and Table 7.

A.5   Additional robustness checks

A.5.1   Clustering levels

Consumption patterns could be correlated even across households located in different, neighboring municipalities. That is why our default level of clustering in the regressions (clustering at the municipality level) could be missing some patterns of correlation in the error terms.

Unfortunately, due to confidentiality reasons we do not know the exact coordinates of the municipalities of the households in the dataset and thus we cannot group neighboring municipalities together. As an alternative approach, we divide each of the five post-Reunification states (*Länder*) of East Germany into cells corresponding to 1, 3, 5 or 10 dB of signal strength. For example, in the last case, we would divide Saxony into 9 cells corresponding to signal strengths of $(-106.8; -96.8]$, $(-96.8; -86.8]$, $(-86.8; -76.8]$, $(-76.8; -66.8]$ dB etc. Even though some households in the same cell may lie in disjoint regions, in most cases one cell would consist of adjacent municipalities.

This method results in a number of clusters varying between approximately 300 (1dB cells) and 40 (10dB cells). Results in Table A.6 below, based on our baseline regression of Table 8, column 1, show that the aggregation of households into larger clusters does not affect the precision of our estimates. In all cases (with the possible exception of the case of 10dB cells) the number of resulting clusters is safely above the threshold suggested by Cameron et al. (2008), allaying fears of overrejection of null hypotheses.

A.5.2   Omitting selected categories of consumption goods

Another concern could be the role of single categories of goods in our analysis. As evident in Figures 5 and 6, some categories of goods are responsible for a large share of the advertising time (most notably, food and drinks, body and mouth care, and cleaning and washing products), whereas other categories have almost no advertising. In table A.7, we replicate the baseline regression of Table 8, column 1, omitting each one of the categories of consumption goods: starting in column (1) with the goods with zero advertising and ending in column (11), which leaves out food and drinks (columns are sorted in increasing intensity of advertising for the omitted category).

The results are reassuring: point estimates on the interaction term of interest (Treatment $\times$ Advertising) are mostly unchanged in magnitude and significance. In column (11) we drop the category with the highest intensity of advertising (42.5% of advertising time) and with the second-largest budget share (15.46%), food and drinks. Even in this case, the magnitude of the point estimate is preserved at 1.927 (compared to the baseline estimate of 1.537), even though the larger standard error reduces the p-value to 0.32.

A.5.3   Use of the continuous treatment definition

Tables A.8 and A.9 replicate all the results of the main paper using, where applicable, the continuous treatment definition instead of the threshold-based one. This alternative definition confirms all results of the analysis in both magnitude and significance.

Table A.6: Regression results, EVS — Recomposition of consumption: Clustering

Dependent Variable:	$100 \times \log(1+\text{expenditures})$			
Clustering level	1dB cells × state dummies	3dB cells × state dummies	5dB cells × state dummies	10dB cells × state dummies
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Panel A: EVS 1993				
Advertising	16.549***	16.549***	16.549***	16.549***
	[0.427]	[0.455]	[0.296]	[0.285]
Treatment	-8.960	-8.960	-8.960	-8.960
	[5.706]	[5.533]	[5.609]	[6.386]
Treatment × Advertising	1.537***	1.537**	1.537***	1.537***
	[0.593]	[0.626]	[0.568]	[0.531]
N. of observations	102355	102355	102355	102355
N. of households	9305	9305	9305	9305
N. of clusters	296	119	75	40
Panel B: EVS 1998				
Advertising	3.398***	3.398***	3.398***	3.398***
	[0.264]	[0.315]	[0.312]	[0.381]
Treatment	3.989	3.989	3.989	3.989
	[4.845]	[2.882]	[2.893]	[2.890]
Treatment × Advertising	0.197	0.197	0.197	0.197
	[0.308]	[0.361]	[0.358]	[0.425]
N. of observations	129734	129734	129734	129734
N. of households	11794	11794	11794	11794
N. of clusters	320	123	74	41

*** significant at 1%, ** at 5%, * at 10%. Robust standard errors in brackets, clustered by municipality (by household in column (1)). All regressions weighted by EVS sampling weights and budget shares. Advertising defined as minutes per day (cf. Table 7). Number of municipalities: 1359 (1993), 1896 (1998).

Table A.7: Regression results, EVS — Recomposition of consumption: Omitting categories

Dependent Variable:					$100 \times \log(1+\text{expenditures})$						
Omitted category:	Other (no adv.)	Clothes, textiles	Photo, optics	Transp., tourism	Cars	Pharma-ceuticals	Home, garden	Media, leisure	Cleaning, washing	Body care	Food, drinks
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Panel A: EVS 1993											
Advertising	30.261***	16.749***	15.663***	15.371***	11.780***	15.993***	16.662***	16.273***	16.498***	17.138***	-85.601***
	[0.649]	[0.401]	[0.383]	[0.403]	[0.696]	[0.388]	[0.381]	[0.401]	[0.389]	[0.392]	[1.669]
Treatment	-12.759	-8.845	-9.187	-6.345	-7.083*	-8.954	-10.588*	-8.787	-9.023	-9.055	-9.104
	[8.274]	[6.388]	[5.947]	[6.782]	[3.905]	[6.018]	[6.368]	[6.260]	[5.968]	[6.079]	[5.828]
Treatment × Advertising	2.182**	1.518***	1.573***	1.122**	1.275*	1.536***	1.751***	1.518***	1.538***	1.522***	1.927
	[0.909]	[0.580]	[0.545]	[0.566]	[0.762]	[0.548]	[0.564]	[0.565]	[0.548]	[0.546]	[1.936]
N. of observations	93050	93050	93050	93050	93050	93050	93050	93050	93050	93050	93050
N. of households	9305	9305	9305	9305	9305	9305	9305	9305	9305	9305	9305
Panel B: EVS 1998											
Advertising	30.762***	2.191***	2.556***	0.722	-0.801	3.018***	2.434***	3.138***	3.549***	4.500***	-151.211***
	[0.451]	[0.258]	[0.235]	[0.441]	[0.568]	[0.238]	[0.249]	[0.235]	[0.239]	[0.260]	[1.612]
Treatment	1.623	3.295	4.146	8.026	0.914	4.042	3.962	4.553	3.956	4.031	3.994
	[5.283]	[4.530]	[4.775]	[7.556]	[2.182]	[4.695]	[4.642]	[4.937]	[4.668]	[4.736]	[4.404]
Treatment × Advertising	0.615	0.311	0.171	-0.439	0.579	0.191	0.2	0.157	0.194	0.215	0.18
	[0.526]	[0.302]	[0.280]	[0.481]	[0.610]	[0.283]	[0.296]	[0.280]	[0.284]	[0.301]	[1.825]
N. of observations	117940	117940	117940	117940	117940	117940	117940	117940	117940	117940	117940
N. of households	11794	11794	11794	11794	11794	11794	11794	11794	11794	11794	11794

*** significant at 1%, ** at 5%, * at 10%. Robust standard errors in brackets, clustered by municipality (by household in column (1)). All regressions weighted by EVS sampling weights and budget shares. Advertising defined as minutes per day (cf. Table 7). Number of municipalities: 1359 (1993), 1896 (1998).

Table A.8: Regression results, EVS — Aggregate consumption behavior and financial instruments: Continuous treatment definition

Dependent Variable (×100)	log Disposable Income	log Total Private Consumption	Savings> 0 (0/1)	Interest payment (0/1) on:	
				Consumption Credit	Overdraft
Equivalent to:	Table 5, column (1)	Table 5, column (2)	Table 5, column (3)	Table 6, column (1)	Table 6, column (2)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Panel A: EVS 1993					
Treatment (continuous)	-0.626	0.444	-0.623	2.638	-0.789
	[2.326]	[1.605]	[2.593]	[2.906]	[1.875]
N. of observations	9305	9305	9305	9305	9305
Panel B: EVS 1998					
Treatment (continuous)	-1.092	-0.147	0.047	-0.667	-0.899
	[2.168]	[1.493]	[1.798]	[1.894]	[1.239]
N. of observations	11794	11794	11794	11794	11794

*** significant at 1%, ** at 5%, * at 10%. Robust standard errors in brackets, clustered by municipality. Sampling weights used. All dependent variables multiplied by 100. All regressions include a full set of state dummies and household covariates as in Table 4, except column (1), where log disposable income is excluded from the set of regressors. Column (3) corresponds to a linear probability model. The dependent variable is defined as 1 if savings are positive, 0 otherwise. Columns (4) and (5): the dependent variable is defined as 1 if interest payments are positive, 0 if absent. Number of municipalities: 1359 (1993), 1896 (1998).

65

Table A.9: Regression results, EVS — Recomposition of consumption: Continuous treatment definition

Dependent variable: $100 \times \log(1+\text{expenditures})$

Specification:	Household covariates	Shares of adv. time	No budget weights	Household clustering	Including East Berlin	-86.8dB ±30dB	-86.8dB ±20dB	-86.8dB ±10dB	Distance to West
Equivalent to:	Table 8, column (2)	Table 8, column (3)	Table 8, column (4)	Table 9, column (1)	Table 9, column (2)	Table 10, column (1)	Table 10, column (2)	Table 10, column (3)	Table 11, column (1)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Panel A: EVS 1993									
Advertising	16.071***	2.576***	28.588***	16.071***	16.059***	16.135***	16.047***	17.065***	15.691***
	[0.495]	[0.079]	[0.903]	[0.542]	[0.493]	[0.506]	[0.530]	[0.553]	[1.750]
Treatment (continuous)	-5.24	-14.266*	-11.220	-14.267**	-16.382**	-19.457**	-18.215**	7.842	-19.814*
	[3.601]	[7.472]	[7.454]	[6.128]	[7.354]	[7.706]	[9.254]	[13.312]	[11.249]
Advertising × Treatment (continuous)	2.132***	0.342***	2.673**	2.132***	2.181***	2.430***	2.344**	-0.816	2.355**
	[0.714]	[0.115]	[1.185]	[0.635]	[0.673]	[0.787]	[1.019]	[1.443]	[1.133]
Treatment (continuous) × Distance									-0.048
									[0.083]
Advertising × Distance									0.002
									[0.009]
N. of observations	102355	102355	102355	102355	111056	72842	53405	26081	102355
N. of households	9305	9305	9305	9305	11096	622	4855	2371	9305
Panel B: EVS 1998									
Advertising	3.518***	0.564***	22.059***	3.518***	3.567***	3.593***	3.347***	3.296***	3.394***
	[0.296]	[0.047]	[0.873]	[0.363]	[0.298]	[0.289]	[0.285]	[0.307]	[0.710]
Treatment (continuous)	-0.777	2.155	-0.039	2.155	1.929	-2.783	-4.918	6.073	-5.24
	[1.964]	[5.040]	[3.908]	[3.788]	[4.911]	[5.505]	[5.588]	[7.043]	[6.346]
Advertising × Treatment (continuous)	0.059	0.009	0.765	0.059	-0.143	0.346	0.805*	-0.248	0.134
	[0.355]	[0.057]	[0.949]	[0.402]	[0.386]	[0.399]	[0.441]	[0.682]	[0.516]
Treatment (continuous) × Distance									-0.063*
									[0.036]
Advertising × Distance									0.001
									[0.003]
N. of observations	129734	129734	129734	129734	141966	87571	65626	34078	129734
N. of households	11794	11794	11794	11794	12906	7961	5966	3098	11794

*** significant at 1%, ** at 5%, * at 10%. Robust standard errors in brackets, clustered by municipality. Sampling weights used. Further notes, see Tables 8, 9, 10, and 11.

A.6 Balancedness of covariates, EVS: Alternative samples

Table A.10: Balancedness of covariates, EVS: Sample -86.8±30dB

Variable	Treatment	Control	Diff.	Std. Err.	p-value
EVS 1993					
Disposable Income	41676.4	40341.7	-1334.7	1062.6	0.209
Age	47.9	49.8	1.9	1	0.071
N. of Children	0.787	0.668	-0.118	0.047	0.011
Single	0.246	0.288	0.042	0.024	0.082
Female	0.430	0.414	-0.016	0.026	0.545
German	0.998	0.995	-0.003	0.002	0.172
Employed	0.498	0.513	0.015	0.026	0.554
Retired	0.248	0.269	0.021	0.025	0.389
On Welfare	0.027	0.027	0.000	0.009	0.975
Small City (< 5000 inh.)	0.190	0.215	0.026	0.021	0.225
Panel B: EVS 1998					
Disposable Income	12050.3	12150.2	-99.9	287.6	0.728
Age	52.7	51.7	1.0	0.8	0.217
N. of Children	0.347	0.406	-0.059	0.022	0.009
Single	0.358	0.306	0.052	0.022	0.017
Female	0.438	0.432	0.006	0.020	0.756
German	0.999	0.993	0.005	0.002	0.002
Employed	0.530	0.543	-0.013	0.020	0.526
Retired	0.363	0.351	0.013	0.021	0.536
On Welfare	0.009	0.018	-0.009	0.004	0.026
Small City (< 5000 inh.)	0.174	0.231	-0.058	0.014	0.000

Total number of observations: 6622 in 1993 (5352 treatment, 1270 control), 7961 in 1998 (6314 treatment, 1647 control).

Table A.11: Balancedness of covariates, EVS: Sample -86.8 ± 20dB

Variable	Treatment	Control	Diff.	Std. Err.	p-value
Panel A: EVS 1993					
Disposable Income	40821.8	41747.6	-925.8	1122.1	0.409
Age	49.4	48	1.4	1.1	0.191
N. of Children	0.691	0.780	-0.089	0.049	0.067
Single	0.275	0.248	0.027	0.026	0.299
Female	0.401	0.431	-0.030	0.027	0.276
German	0.995	0.998	-0.004	0.003	0.218
Employed	0.534	0.501	0.033	0.028	0.232
Retired	0.251	0.250	0.001	0.026	0.984
On Welfare	0.025	0.028	-0.003	0.009	0.773
Small City ($<$ 5000 inh.)	0.228	0.192	0.037	0.022	0.103
Panel B: EVS 1998					
Disposable Income	48627	48313.8	313.2	1204.3	0.795
Age	51.4	52.7	-1.3	1.3	0.113
N. of Children	0.422	0.346	0.076	0.059	0.001
Single	0.296	0.359	-0.064	0.032	0.005
Female	0.433	0.439	-0.006	0.034	0.777
German	0.990	0.999	-0.008	0.002	0.000
Employed	0.553	0.530	0.023	0.034	0.278
Retired	0.338	0.363	-0.024	0.034	0.262
On Welfare	0.017	0.009	0.008	0.010	0.052
Small City ($<$ 5000 inh.)	0.236	0.176	0.060	0.029	0.000

Total number of observations: 4855 in 1993 (3597 treatment, 1258 control), 5966 in 1998 (4331 treatment, 1635 control).

Table A.12: Balancedness of covariates, EVS: Sample -86.8 ± 10dB

Variable	Treatment	Control	Diff.	Std. Err.	p-value
Panel A: EVS 1993					
Disposable Income	42974.5	41764	1210.5	1380.8	0.381
Age	49.4	47.8	1.6	1.3	0.227
N. of Children	0.754	0.782	-0.028	0.059	0.637
Single	0.229	0.249	-0.020	0.032	0.537
Female	0.369	0.434	-0.065	0.034	0.052
German	0.997	0.998	-0.001	0.002	0.547
Employed	0.561	0.502	0.059	0.034	0.083
Retired	0.265	0.248	0.017	0.034	0.614
On Welfare	0.014	0.027	-0.013	0.010	0.165
Small City ($<$ 5000 inh.)	0.315	0.190	0.126	0.029	0.000
Panel B: EVS 1998					
Disposable Income	51056.8	48249.6	2807.1	1497.9	0.061
Age	51.6	52.6	-1.0	1.3	0.357
N. of Children	0.433	0.347	0.086	0.059	0.005
Single	0.283	0.360	-0.077	0.032	0.007
Female	0.419	0.438	-0.018	0.034	0.483
German	0.998	0.999	0	0.002	0.850
Employed	0.570	0.532	0.037	0.034	0.157
Retired	0.343	0.358	-0.015	0.034	0.582
On Welfare	0.006	0.009	-0.003	0.010	0.412
Small City ($<$ 5000 inh.)	0.319	0.172	0.147	0.029	0.000

Total number of observations: 2371 in 1993 (1216 treatment, 1155 control), 3098 in 1998 (1518 treatment, 1580 control).