Online Appendix

Appendix Table 1: Estimates of Connecticut's Sick Leave Law (NJ and NY as controls)									
	In labor force			Unemployed			Worked		
$POST_{it}$	-0.0023	-0.0024	-0.0110	0.0063	0.0063	0.0044	-0.0089	-0.0090	-0.0140
$\cdot TREAT_{is}$	(0.0030)	(0.0040)	(0.0031)	(0.0020)	(0.0014)	(0.0027)	(0.0027)	(0.0032)	(0.0009)
$POST_{it}$	-0.0015	---	---	-0.0038	---	---	0.0019	---	---
	(0.0034)			(0.0021)			(0.0045)		
$TREAT_{is}$	0.0345	---	---	0.0046	---	---	0.03	---	---
	(0.0073)			(0.0044)			(0.0026)		
Obs.	722,558			541,829			717,113		
Under 30 Sub-sample									
	In labor force			Unemployed			Worked		
$POST_{it}$	-0.0057	-0.0056	-0.0166	-0.0003	-0.0003	0.0000	-0.0032	-0.0031	-0.0102
$\cdot TREAT_{is}$	(0.0049)	(0.0069)	(0.0112)	(0.0014)	(0.0014)	(0.0033)	(0.0063)	(0.0065)	(0.0111)
$POST_{it}$	-0.0029	---	---	-0.0037	---	---	-0.0019	---	---
	(0.0048)			(0.0025)			(0.0055)		
$TREAT_{is}$	0.0623	---	---	-0.0053	---	---	0.056	---	---
	(0.0120)			(0.0012)			(0.0097)		
Obs.	188,367			119,753			186,315		
30 and Over Sub-sample									
$POST_{it}$	-0.0009	-0.0009	-0.0058	0.0086	0.0086	0.0059	-0.0109	-0.0109	-0.0123
$\cdot TREAT_{is}$	(0.0026)	(0.0031)	(0.0048)	(0.0021)	(0.0016)	(0.0055)	(0.0027)	(0.0028)	(0.0034)
$POST_{it}$	-0.0004	---	---	-0.004	---	---	0.0038	---	---
	(0.0023)			(0.0024)			(0.0032)		
$TREAT_{is}$	0.0285	---	---	0.0047	---	---	0.0255	---	---
	(0.0080)			(0.0049)			(0.0030)		
Obs.	534,191			422,076			530,798		
State dummies?	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Year dummies?	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
State-year trends?	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes

Notes: All specifications weighted and corrected for non-nested two-way clustering. Sample drawn from 2009-2012 ACS using Connecticut, New Jersey and New York. All specifications include controls for age, gender, education, race/ethnicity, citizenship, marital status, military service, children, difficulty with English and a constant term.

Appendix Table 2: Estimates of Connecticut's Sick Leave Law (NJ and NY as controls)									
	In labor force			Unemployed			Worked		
$POST_{it}$ $\cdot TREAT_{is}$	-0.0025 (0.0030)	-0.0027 (0.0045)	-0.0050 (0.0021)	0.0064 (0.0023)	0.0062 (0.0008)	0.0087 (0.0029)	-0.0091 (0.0030)	-0.0092 (0.0050)	-0.0119 (0.0002)
$POST_{it}$	0.0062 (0.0032)	---	---	-0.0073 (0.0030)	---	---	0.0101 (0.0026)	---	---
$TREAT_{is}$	0.0102 (0.0068)	---	---	0.0159 (0.0045)	---	---	0.0037 (0.0188)	---	---
$MINWAGE_{ist}$	0.0245 (0.0008)	0.0679 (0.0008)	0.0566 (0.0011)	-0.0113 (0.0009)	0.0282 (0.0105)	0.0411 (0.0216)	0.0265 (0.0194)	0.0337 (0.0078)	0.0202 (0.0016)
State dummies?	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Year dummies?	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
State-year trends?	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Obs.	722,558			541,829			717,113		
Notes: All specifications weighted and corrected for non-nested two-way clustering. Sample drawn from 2009-2012 ACS using Connecticut, New Jersey and New York. All specifications include controls for age, gender, education, race/ethnicity, citizenship, marital status, military service, children, difficulty with English and a constant term.									

Appendix Table 3: Estimates of Connecticut's Sick Leave Law									
	In labor force			Unemployed			Worked		
$POST_{it}$ $\cdot TREAT_{is}$	0.0022 (0.0022)	0.0013 (0.0015)	-0.0014 (0.0034)	0.0085 (0.0009)	0.0085 (0.0023)	-0.0011 (0.0052)	-0.0090 (0.0014)	-0.0098 (0.0013)	-0.0041 (0.0048)
$POST_{it}$	-0.0051 (0.0032)	---	---	-0.0028 (0.0024)	---	---	0.0008 (0.0036)	---	---
$TREAT_{is}$	0.0066 (0.0029)	---	---	-0.0011 (0.0032)	---	---	0.0097 (0.0040)	---	---
$MINWAGE_{ist}$	0.0005 (0.0076)	0.0254 (0.0070)	0.0276 (0.0188)	0.0101 (0.0059)	0.0097 (0.0137)	-0.0201 (0.0169)	-0.0055 (0.0090)	0.0159 (0.0071)	0.0481 (0.0205)
State dummies?	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Year dummies?	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
State-year trends?	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Sample size	342,278			266,824			340,077		
Notes: All specifications are weighted, and correct for non-nested two-way clustering via method in Cameron, Gelbach and Miller (JBES, 2011). Sample drawn from 2009-2012 ACS using 6 New England States. All specifications include controls for age, gender, education, race/ethnicity, citizenship, marital status, military service, children, difficulty with English and a constant term.									

Once we include all individual level demographic variables, state and year dummies, state, year trends, AND state-level minimum wage, many of our results become statistically insignificant. This is most likely

due to the high degree of collinearity among the state minimum wage levels and the combination of state and year dummies and the state-year trend.

New England states minimum wages between 2009 and 2012 were as follows:

Federal: $6.55 in 2009, $7.25 thereafter
CT: $8.00 in 2009, $8.25 thereafter
MA: $8.00
NH: $7.25
RI: $7.40
VT: $8.06 in 2009-10, $8.15 in 2011, $8.46 in 2012
ME: $7.25 in 2009, $7.50 thereafter

(Source: http://www.dol.gov/whd/state/stateMinWageHis.htm and
http://www.dol.gov/whd/minwage/america.htm)

For MA, NH, and RI, the state dummies would have tracked minimum wage perfectly (with a slight correction for inflation, which was also stable year to year). For VT, a state, year trend with parameter value around 1.02 would have predicted the minimum wage trajectory very closely. For CT and ME, beyond 2009, state dummies would have tracked minimum wage perfectly.

Overall, then, it is no surprise the inclusion of state minimum wage creas problems for the regression.