# DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

No. 8593

## INTERSTATE RISK SHARING IN GERMANY: 1970-2006

Ralf Hepp and Jürgen von Hagen

### INTERNATIONAL MACROECONOMICS

# Centre for Economic Policy Research

## www.cepr.org

# INTERSTATE RISK SHARING IN GERMANY: 1970-2006

**Ralf Hepp, Fordham University**
**Jürgen von Hagen, Universität Bonn, Indiana University and CEPR**

This Discussion Paper is issued under the auspices of the Centre's research programme in **INTERNATIONAL MACROECONOMICS**. Any opinions expressed here are those of the author(s) and not those of the Centre for Economic Policy Research. Research disseminated by CEPR may include views on policy, but the Centre itself takes no institutional policy positions.

The Centre for Economic Policy Research was established in 1983 as an educational charity, to promote independent analysis and public discussion of open economies and the relations among them. It is pluralist and non-partisan, bringing economic research to bear on the analysis of medium- and long-run policy questions.

These Discussion Papers often represent preliminary or incomplete work, circulated to encourage discussion and comment. Citation and use of such a paper should take account of its provisional character.

# ABSTRACT

## Interstate Risk Sharing in Germany: 1970-2006

We study the channels of interstate risk sharing in Germany for the time period 1970 to 2006, estimating the degrees of smoothing of a shock to a state's gross domestic product by factor markets, the government sector, and credit markets, respectively. Within the government sector, we pay special attention to Germany's fiscal equalization mechanism. For pre-unification Germany, we find that about 19 percent of a shock is smoothed by private factor markets, 50 percent is smoothed by the German government sector, and a further 17 percent is smoothed through credit markets. For the postunification period, 1995 to 2006, the relative importance of the smoothing channels has changed. Factor markets contribute around 50.5 percent to consumption smoothing. The government sector's role is diminished, but still economically significant: it smoothes around 10 percent of a shock

Ralf Hepp
Fordham University
Department of Economics
E-525 Dealy Hall
441 E. Fordham Rd
Bronx, NY 10458
USA
Email: hepp@fordham.edu

Jürgen von Hagen
Institut für Internationale
Wirtschaftspolitik
Universität Bonn
Lennestrasse 37
53113 Bonn
GERMANY
Email: vonhagen@uni-bonn.de

For further Discussion Papers by this author see:
www.cepr.org/pubs/new-dps/dplist.asp?authorid=153057

For further Discussion Papers by this author see:
www.cepr.org/pubs/new-dps/dplist.asp?authorid=110199

# 1 Introduction

The stability of an economic union such as a federation or a large nation depends crucially on its capacity to deal with idiosyncratic shocks to regional output. In a world with perfect asset markets, such shocks do not matter much, as consumers in all regions of the union can insure themselves against them. With imperfect asset markets, however, other channels of interregional risk sharing move to the forefront. Apart from capital markets, labor markets provide opportunities for risk sharing if workers residing in one region can work and earn incomes in another region. Furthermore, the credit market can provide opportunities for borrowing and lending across regions and, thus, for consumption smoothing. Finally, the public sector can contribute to interregional risk sharing if a negative shock to the income of one region triggers transfers payments either horizontally from other regions or vertically from the central government offsetting the impact of the original shock.

Recent research has emphasized the important role of fiscal arrangements for income and consumption risk sharing among the residents of different regions of a country or federation, which are exposed to region-specific shocks (e.g., Atkeson and Bayoumi, 1993; Wildasin, 1996; Persson and Tabellini, 1996a, 1996b; Bucovetsky, 1998; Lockwood, 1999; Boadway, 2004). Risk sharing of this kind can work through the budget of the central government to which all regions contribute with tax payments and from which all regions receive transfers and other payments, or through explicit mechanisms of of fiscal equalization, i.e., revenue sharing among regional or state governments. Such arrangements have received considerable interest in recent years, both in the context of designing the fiscal framework of the European Monetary Union (EMU) and in the design of new federal systems in developing countries (Boadway and Shah, 2007).

Empirical research on interregional risk sharing so far has concentrated mostly on the US and Canada.[3] In an influential study, Asdrubali et al. (1996) [henceforth, ASY] measure the (relative) importance of the three channels of risk sharing among the states of the US. They find that, for the period from 1963 to 1990, 39 percent of idiosyncratic shocks to the gross state product of US states are smoothed by capital markets, 13 percent by federal fiscal transfers, and 23 percent by credit markets.[4] Their results are largely confirmed by Mélitz and Zumer (1998) who also perform a number of methodological robustness checks. Athanasoulis and van Wincoop (1998) disregard the potential of credit markets for risk sharing and find that capital markets and the public sector smooth 35 and 10 percent of state-specific shocks in the US, respectively.

Bayoumi and Klein (1997) use Canadian provincial trade-balance data to determine the degree of risk sharing within Canada and between Canada and other OECD countries.[5] They find a high degree of risk sharing among Canadian provinces but little risk sharing across international borders. In a similar vein, Crucini (1999) finds substantial risk sharing among Canadian provinces

---

[3] A closely related literature in international finance deals with consumption and output risk-sharing at the international level. Contrary to theoretical predictions, the empirical international literature finds a lack of consumption risk-sharing: cross-border consumption correlations are typically lower than the corresponding output correlations. This empirical regularity has been dubbed the "quantity anomaly" [see, for example, Backus et al. (1992), Baxter and Crucini (1993), Obstfeld (1994)]. Studying consumption and output risk-sharing between U.S. states, Hess and Shin (1998) find that the quantity anomaly is present at the national level in the US as well.

[4] Asdrubali and Kim (2004) find similar results for US states; however, when they look at OECD countries and at the EU15, the results are markedly different: Capital markets and international transfers play almost no role, only credit markets do and they contribute about 22 percent to consumption smoothing.

[5] As pointed out by Sorensen and Yosha (2000), Bayoumi and Klein's estimation does not distinguish between the three separate smoothing channels.

and U.S. States; but a much lower degree of risk sharing between these and other countries. Ostergaard et al. (2002) also use U.S. and Canadian data to focus on the consumption-smoothing role of credit markets. They find that both U.S. states and Canadian provinces achieve some, but not full consumption smoothing through credit markets. Del Negro (2002) questions the findings of considerable interstate risk sharing in some of the earlier literature. He argues that theymay be due to a lack of corrections for measurement errors, especially in state level output data. Using a factor model, and he does not find much evidence for consumption risk sharing across US states. .[6]

The capacity to provide interregional risk sharing has also been investigated for several other countries. Mélitz and Zumer (1998) find that the degree of risk sharing provided by capital markets in the UK and Italy is similar to the US, while risk sharing operating through the public sector and credit markets is very low or even nonexistent.[7] There are also a few studies focusing on risk sharing in Germany. Büttner (1999, 2002) uses the methodology of ASY, but focuses exclusively on the effectiveness of the fiscal system of West Germany to smooth state income, not state output, for the 1970 to 1997 time period. He finds that the German fiscal system smoothes only around 15 percent of a shock to state income, with about 6 percent coming from the fiscal equalization system. Kellermann (2001a) looks at German data for the same time period, 1970 to 1997. However, he distinguishes between pre- and post-unification data. For the pre-unification sample, he finds that the fiscal system smoothes over 40 percent of shocks to state income. Additionally, private capital markets smooth out about 30 percent of such shocks. In the post-unification data, the role of private capital markets in consumption smoothing is drastically reduced (to 7 and 1 percent, respectively).[8] Kellermann does not consider ex-post smoothing through credit markets.[9] Jüßen (2006) investigates risk sharing in post-unification Germany, using a modified version of ASY's methodology and disaggregated data of 271 labor market regions for the years 1995 to 2002. His study suggests that private capital markets almost completely smooth out region-specific income shocks, with the German fiscal system providing no additional insurance. In a more recent study, Hepp and von Hagen (2011) focus on the redistribution and risk sharing properties of the German fiscal system with respect to both state income and state government budgets since 1970. They find that, particularly with respect to state government budgets, both redistribution and insurance effects of the German fiscal system are quite significant.

This paper provides new and comprehensive empirical evidence on risk sharing channels in Germany. Risk sharing for consumption smoothing purposes is accomplished through factor markets, credit markets and the public sector. Within the public sector channel, we further focus on the fiscal equalization mechanism. Germany, like Canada and in contrast to the United States, has an explicit, formula-based mechanism for fiscal equalization, the *Länderfinanzausgleich* (LFA). In practice, this means that the LFA insures state budgets against asymmetric shocks in the short run and leads to (some) long-term convergence in fiscal capacity among German states (see Hepp and von Hagen, 2011). The focus of this paper is to determine the average contribution of the public sector (and of the LFA) to consumption smoothing in a state (and compare that to the contribution of both factor and credit markets). To the best of our knowledge, this is the first paper on Germany

---

[6] However, Del Negro's strategy for identifying measurement error in state level output entails assuming that the GDP quantity index and CPI-deflated GDP measure the same thing, which is a questionable assumption. We would like to thank an anonymous referee for pointing this out.

[7] Following a different methodological approach, van Wincoop (1995) uses data on Japanese regions and finds that the correlation of consumption growth rates within Japan is similar to that on the international level.

[8] The results in these two papers differ mainly due to differences in their definitions of state income and disposable state income as well as differences in the time period considered.

[9] In the revised and published version of the paper (Kellermann, 2001b), the author drops the post-unification data altogether and finds that factor markets smooth around 12 percent of asymmetric shocks, the public sector more than 80 percent, and credit markets provide no smoothing or dis-smoothing depending on the regression setup.

that considers all three smoothing channels simultaneously and relies on a sufficiently long post-unification data set.

A second focus of this paper is the comparison of risk sharing before and after German unification. From 1970 to 1994, only states in the former West Germany were part of the LFA. Since 1995, however, all German states have been included in the LFA. One of the key differences between the two time periods is the increased heterogeneity in per capita incomes that came with the inclusion of the significantly poorer East German states in 1995. Another important difference is that, after unification, channeling huge, permanent transfers from West to East Germany (above and beyond those provided by the LFA) has become a prime function of the German fiscal system. With the integration of East Germany, the average size of transfers in the fiscal equalization mechanism also increased substantially. In view of this, we ask how unification has affected the degree of risk sharing among the states of the German federation.

We find that, for the time period 1970 to 1994, the government sector (including social security, tax redistribution, and the fiscal equalization mechanism) was the most important smoothing channel with over 50 percent consumption smoothing. Slightly less than five percent of the smoothing effect came from the fiscal equalization mechanism. Factor markets were the other important channel of risk sharing, contributing around 19 percent. Finally, credit markets contributed another 17 percent to risk sharing. For the post-reunification period, 1995 to 2006, the relative importance of the three channels has changed. In the complete sample, factor markets now contribute around 50.5 percent to risk sharing, and credit markets contribute another 17.5 percent. The government sector's role is diminished: It smoothes around 10 percent of a shock. For this time period, we also split our sample between West and East German states. In West Germany, 63 percent of idiosyncratic shocks are smoothed out by factor markets; and another 15 percent by the government sector. In East Germany, factor markets smooth about 34.5 percent of the volatility in state GDP, the government sector about 19 percent, and another 18 percent are smoothed by credit markets.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. In section 2, we describe the empirical methodology we use to investigate the risk sharing channels in Germany. Section 3 provides a detailed description of our data and data sources. Our main empirical results are presented and interpreted in section 4. Section 5 concludes.


## 2 Data

As stated above, our study focuses on estimating the importance of factor markets, the government sector, and credit markets in consumption smoothing at the state level in Germany. In this section, we provide a more detailed description of the variables used in the panel data analysis. We construct two different data sets: The first consists of annual data of the 10 West German states (excluding West-Berlin) from 1970 to 1994. Because of our special focus on the fiscal equalization mechanism (*Länderfinanzausgleich*) in Germany, we choose the year 1995 as the cut-off year for our sample. The year 1995 was the first year when the "new" states of East Germany where fully integrated into the fiscal equalization mechanism.[10] Hence, the second data set contains annual data of all 16 German states covering the period from 1995 to 2006. Both panel data sets are balanced.

---

[10] Choosing 1990, the year of unification, as the cut-off date does not significantly change the results presented below.

First, we construct *real gross domestic product per capita* at the state level from our original data. For the 1970-1994 period, we have state-level data on aggregate real gross domestic product. The real GDP values in our original data are constructed by using a common national, rather than state-specific, GDP deflator with base year 1991.[11] We then divide these aggregate values by the population of the state to get real per capita values. Second, we define *real state income* in a way fairly standard in this literature, namely as the sum of *real net state income at factor prices per capita* and all real tax revenues (before redistribution) with tax incidence within a state's boundaries.[12] Aggregate real net state income at factor prices is provided in the data, and we obtain real values for the tax revenues by using the GDP deflator described previously. At this point, it is important to understand how the German fiscal system is structured. First, all taxes are collected by the states rather than the federal government. These taxes therefore include federal (*Bundessteuern*), state (*Landessteuern*), and local taxes (*Gemeindesteuern*), as well as taxes that are shared among all three levels of government, so-called *Gemeinschaftsteuern.* *Gemeinschaftsteuern* include important taxes like value added tax revenue, corporate income tax and personal income tax revenue. When constructing real state income per capita, we add the total tax incidence of these taxes, rather than only the share that remains with the state and local governments, since this more appropriately reflects the financial strength of a state.

We construct several different versions of what we call *real disposable state income per capita* in order to be able to distinguish the role of the *Länderfinanzausgleich* and its components from other elements of the German fiscal system. The variable $dsi_n$ is defined as disposable income of private households plus the tax revenue that remains within the state and is not transferred to the federal and/or other state governments at stage $n$.[13] For example, $dsi_4$ contains the disposable income of private households (*after* the contributions to and benefits from the social security system) and the total tax revenue[14] remaining within the state *before* the fiscal equalization mechanism (LFA). We then define a new disposable state income variable after each step of LFA. As prescribed by law, Germany's fiscal equalization mechanism is conducted in three stages. At the first stage, VAT revenue is redistributed to reduce the variation in per capita VAT receipts among states. States with higher than national average VAT revenue per capita make transfer payments to states with lower than national average VAT revenue per capita in order to push either state closer to the pre-redistribution national average per capita revenue.[15] At the second stage, states make transfer payments amongst each other based on a more comprehensive measure of a state's resource needs and tax capacity. At the third and last stage, the federal government provides additional federal grants (*Bundesergänzungszuweisungen*) to further narrow differences in tax capacity between states. After the last stage of the fiscal equalization mechanism, real disposable state income per capita, $dsi_1$, includes the state and local share of VAT revenue that remains within the state, state-to-state transfers (if applicable), federal grants (again, if applicable), state taxes (*Landessteuern*), and net local taxes (*Gemeindesteuern*). In other words, the difference $(si - dsi_1)$ can be interpreted as the combined effects of the social security system, transfer of federal (shares of) taxes, and the

---

[11] von Hagen and Neumann (1994) show that real exchange rate variance among German states has been very low since the 1970s, i.e., price level changes between German states have been very similar. Hence, the use of a common GDP deflator should not be problematic.

[12] *Net state income at factor prices* here corresponds to *net national income at factor prices* in national accounting data.

[13] In the German official data, disposable income of private households is defined as household income after taxes and social security payments or receipts.

[14] At this point, all federal taxes, and the federal share of income and local taxes are netted out here.

[15] A more detailed description of the fiscal equalization mechanism in Germany can be found in Hepp and von Hagen (2001).

fiscal equalization mechanism. Finally, we define *real state consumption per capita* $c_i$ as the sum of real private and public per-capita consumption in state $i$.

Data on gross domestic product, net national income at factor prices, population, private and public consumption for 1970-1994 was provided to us by the Statistisches Landesamt Baden-Württemberg (1998). For the period 1995-2006, we use national accounting data provided online by the German federal and state statistical offices (Statistisches Landesamt Baden-Württemberg, 2008) which was computed using a standardized European Union methodology (ESVG1995). Data on tax revenues before and after redistribution come from publications of the German federal statistical office (Statistisches Bundesamt, 1977, 1989, 2000). Data on VAT redistribution and state-to-state transfers is from annual publications of the Bundesrat (Bundesrat). Tax data for the years 1995 to 2002 was provided by the Statistical Office of Baden-Württemberg, data for the years 2003 to 2006 is available online from the German Federal Statistical Office (Statistisches Bundesamt). As previously described, in the data set covering the years 1970 to 1994, all nominal variables are converted into real values with the aforementioned national GDP deflator with base year 1991, and then divided by the state's population to get per capita values. In contrast, nominal and real values for a state's gross domestic product, its private and public consumption are available for the 1995 to 2006 time period. They are converted from nominal to real values by (different) *state-specific* deflators for each of the three series. For the conversion of all other variables into real values, we use the state-specific GDP deflator with base year 1991.

# 3 Methodology

We follow the framework of Asdrubali et al. (1996) to investigate the importance of different channels for risk sharing at the state level in Germany. We focus on three main channels: factor markets, the government sector, and private credit markets.[16,17] For the government sector, we distinguish between the effect of individual components of the German tax and transfer system and all of them combined.[18] Following Asdrubali et al., we start from the following identity,

$$gdp_i = \frac{gdp_i}{si_i} \frac{si_i}{dsi_i} \frac{dsi_i}{c_i} c_i \qquad (1)$$

where $gdp_i$ is the gross domestic product of state $i$, $si_i$ is state income, $dsi_i$ is disposable state income, and $c_i$ is state consumption.[19] We then perform a period-by-period decomposition of the cross-sectional variance in state gross domestic product. To do that, we take logs and differences of equation(1), multiply both sides by $\Delta \log(gdp)$ and take expectations to obtain

---

[16] In contrast to Asdrubali et al. (1996) who call the smoothing channel from state GDP to state income "capital markets", we call it "factor markets". The reason is that – in addition to cross-ownership of productive assets – many workers are working in neighboring states (this is especially true for city states and their neighbors), contributing to the neighboring state's GDP while generating net factor income for their state of residence which is included in state income.

[17] For a detailed description of the mechanics of each of these smoothing channels, see Asdrubali et al. (1996).

[18] These components include social security, unemployment and pension benefits/payments, tax redistribution, and the components of the German *Länderfinanzausgleich* (redistribution of state share of VAT revenue, state-to-state transfers, and federal grants to states).

[19] A more detailed description of these variables can be found in section 2.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{var}(\Delta \log(gdp)) = {}& \operatorname{cov}(\Delta \log(gdp), \Delta \log(gdp) - \Delta \log(si)) \\
& + \operatorname{cov}(\Delta \log(gdp), \Delta \log(si) - \Delta \log(dsi)) \\
& + \operatorname{cov}(\Delta \log(gdp), \Delta \log(dsi) - \Delta \log(c)) \\
& + \operatorname{cov}(\Delta \log(gdp), \Delta \log(c))
\end{aligned}
\tag{2}
$$

Dividing both sides by the variance of $\Delta \log(gdp)$, we get:

$$
1 = \beta_F + \beta_G + \beta_C + \beta_U
\tag{3}
$$

where the $\beta$'s are ordinary least squares (OLS) estimates. For example, $\beta_F$ is the OLS estimate of the slope in the regression of $(\Delta \log(gdp) - \Delta \log(si))$ on $\Delta \log(gdp)$. Full risk sharing through factor markets alone corresponds to $\beta_F = 1$, implying that state income *si* is unaffected by changes in state gross domestic product *gdp*; i.e. there is no co-movement of state income and state gross domestic product. In contrast, $\beta_F = 0$ implies perfect co-movement of state income and state gross domestic product; in this case, factor markets do not contribute to consumption smoothing. The coefficients $\beta_G$ and $\beta_C$ are interpreted similarly. $\beta_U$ is the "unsmoothed" part of the variance of state gross domestic product, i.e., the part which fully affects the consumption of a state's residents.[20,21]

We implement this framework by separately running the following four panel regressions:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta \log(gdp_{it}) - \Delta \log(si_{it}) &= \alpha_{F,t} + \beta_F \Delta \log(gdp_{it}) + \varepsilon_{F,it} \\
\Delta \log(si_{it}) - \Delta \log(dsi_{1,it}) &= \alpha_{G,t} + \beta_G \Delta \log(gdp_{it}) + \varepsilon_{G,it} \\
\Delta \log(dsi_{1,it}) - \Delta \log(c_{it}) &= \alpha_{C,t} + \beta_C \Delta \log(gdp_{it}) + \varepsilon_{C,it} \\
\Delta \log(c_{it}) &= \alpha_{U,t} + \beta_U \Delta \log(gdp_{it}) + \varepsilon_{U,it}
\end{aligned}
\tag{4}
$$

where the cross-sectional dimension is German states and $\alpha_{\bullet,t}$ are time fixed effects. They are included to capture shocks to the growth rate of *aggregate* (national) gross domestic product.

In a second and third set of regressions, we sharpen the focus on the risk sharing effects of the various components of the German government sector. For that purpose, we define disposable state income in different ways[22]: as disposable state income after transfer of federal (share of) taxes and social security, but *before* any transfer payments/receipts triggered by the German *Länderfinanzausgleich* have been made ($dsi_4$); and as disposable state income after these transfers have taken place ($dsi_1$). For this scenario, we run the following five panel regressions:

---

[20] Alternatively, as described in ASY, the coefficients represent the fraction of shocks to a state's GDP smoothed by a particular channel. For example, $\beta_F$=0.43 means that 43 percent of a shock to a state's GDP is smoothed by factor markets. In our paper, we would sometimes describe that as "43 percent risk sharing".

[21] As in Asdrubali et al. (1996), our coefficient estimates are not restricted to be positive. A negative coefficient implies *dis-smoothing* of the respective channel.

[22] A more detailed description of definitions of disposable state income can be found in section 2 and in footnote 12.

$$\Delta \log(gdp_{it}) - \Delta \log(si_{it}) = \alpha_{F,t} + \beta_F \Delta \log(gdp_{it}) + \varepsilon_{F,it}$$

$$\Delta \log(si_{it}) - \Delta \log(dsi_{4,it}) = \alpha_{G1,t} + \beta_{G1} \Delta \log(gdp_{it}) + \varepsilon_{G1,it}$$

$$\Delta \log(dsi_{4,it}) - \Delta \log(dsi_{1,it}) = \alpha_{G2,t} + \beta_{G2} \Delta \log(gdp_{it}) + \varepsilon_{G2,it} \qquad (5)$$

$$\Delta \log(dsi_{1,it}) - \Delta \log(c_{it}) = \alpha_{C,t} + \beta_C \Delta \log(gdp_{it}) + \varepsilon_{C,it}$$

$$\Delta \log(c_{it}) = \alpha_{U,t} + \beta_U \Delta \log(gdp_{it}) + \varepsilon_{U,it}$$

Finally, when we also distinguish disposable state income after each of the three stages of the German *Länderfinanzausgleich*, we run the following set of regressions:

$$\Delta \log(gdp_{it}) - \Delta \log(si_{it}) = \alpha_{F,t} + \beta_F \Delta \log(gdp_{it}) + \varepsilon_{F,it}$$

$$\Delta \log(si_{it}) - \Delta \log(dsi_{4,it}) = \alpha_{G1,t} + \beta_{G1} \Delta \log(gdp_{it}) + \varepsilon_{G1,it}$$

$$\Delta \log(dsi_{4,it}) - \Delta \log(dsi_{3,it}) = \alpha_{G2.1,t} + \beta_{G2.1} \Delta \log(gdp_{it}) + \varepsilon_{G2.1,it}$$

$$\Delta \log(dsi_{3,it}) - \Delta \log(dsi_{2,it}) = \alpha_{G2.2,t} + \beta_{G2.2} \Delta \log(gdp_{it}) + \varepsilon_{G2.2,it} \qquad (6)$$

$$\Delta \log(dsi_{2,it}) - \Delta \log(dsi_{1,it}) = \alpha_{G2.3,t} + \beta_{G2.3} \Delta \log(gdp_{it}) + \varepsilon_{G2.3,it}$$

$$\Delta \log(dsi_{1,it}) - \Delta \log(c_{it}) = \alpha_{C,t} + \beta_C \Delta \log(gdp_{it}) + \varepsilon_{C,it}$$

$$\Delta \log(c_{it}) = \alpha_{U,t} + \beta_U \Delta \log(gdp_{it}) + \varepsilon_{U,it}$$

where time fixed effects $\alpha_{\bullet,t}$ are included again. The $N$ different $dsi_n$-terms represent disposable state income after a particular component of the government sector has been taken into account.

Given the nature of our data, several econometric issues need to be addressed before estimating equations (4), (5), and (6). We find evidence for panel-specific heteroskedasticity and contemporaneous correlation across panels in the error matrix. Furthermore, the error terms appear to be serially correlated. In order to deal with these issues, Asdrubali et al. (1996) use feasible generalized least squares (FGLS) in their equation-by-equation estimation. According to Beck and Katz (1995, 1996), it is problematic to apply FGLS to this type of economic data, however. Their Monte Carlo simulations show that standard errors are seriously underestimated using FGLS, thereby providing overconfidence in the significance of the estimated parameters. Furthermore, the correction for contemporaneously correlated errors requires that the number of years $T$ in a sample is at least as large as the number of cross-sectional units $N$. This requirement is not fulfilled for some of our sub-samples. And even for the full sample, each element of the covariance matrix of the errors would be estimated based on very few observations. For these reasons, Beck and Katz suggest the use of an ordinary least squares approach with panel-corrected standard errors (PCSE) instead. Their Monte Carlo simulations show that the error terms estimated in this way are very accurate, even when the error structures in the panel are complicated.[23] Our preferred approach is therefore to use ordinary least squares estimation with panel-corrected standard errors (PCSE) as introduced by Beck and Katz (1995). STATA's implementation of the PCSE method allows us to control for panel-specific heteroskedasticity and contemporaneous correlation across panels.

---

[23] Reed and Webb (2010) further investigate the properties of the PCSE estimator. They find that coefficient standard errors are not estimated with much precision if the explanatory variable is highly persistent and serial correlation in errors is present. Fortunately, our explanatory variables are not highly persistent (and we control for serial correlation in errors), and hence, we are not very concerned about this issue. Reed and Webb also find that when the time dimension is much larger than the cross section of the data (T>N), the PCSE estimator is not very efficient compared to using feasible generalized least squares (FGLS). This may be an issue for our pre-unification period where we have 25 years of data for 10 states. As a robustness check, we compared our results using PCSE with those from FGLS. The results are very similar in terms of significance levels of our estimated coefficients.

Furthermore, we assume first-order autocorrelation of the error terms (within panels) and a common coefficient for the AR(1) process to all panels.[24]

# 4  Results

In this section, we present and interpret the results from estimating the regressions (4), (5), and (6), using ordinary least squares with panel-corrected standard errors (PCSE). We will also estimate these equations by interacting our explanatory variable $\Delta \log(gdp_{it})$ with a dummy variable for city states and small states, respectively. The dummy variable $city_i$ equals one, if a state is a city state, and zero otherwise. The dummy variable $small_i$ equals one if a (non-city) state's economic size (measured by absolute GDP) is relatively small, and zero otherwise.[25]. These dummies indicate the additional degree of consumption smoothing obtained by small and city states, respectively. They allow us to test whether or not city states and small states benefit from more risk sharing than the large states. Our regression setup in (4) is similar to that in Asdrubali et al. (1996). We distinguish between the following channels of consumption smoothing here: factor markets ($\beta_F$), the government sector ($\beta_G$), credit markets ($\beta_C$), and the unsmoothed part ($\beta_U$).

In table 1, we present the results for the sample period 1970 to 1994, which includes only the ten states of West Germany. We start with estimating the regressions in (4) one by one. The most effective consumption smoothing channel is the government sector which smoothes about 54 percent of the volatility of GDP, followed by factor markets with almost 20 percent. The consumption smoothing effect of credit markets is statistically significant at about 17 percent. About 9 percent of GDP volatility is not smoothed. As explained earlier, consumption smoothing by the government sector is achieved here by a combination of taxation, social security contributions/benefits, and the fiscal equalization mechanism. As a next step, we distinguish between consumption smoothing via the government sector through social security and through the fiscal equalization mechanism separately (eq.(5)). We find that taxation and social security contributions/benefits contribute about 50 percent to consumption smoothing. The coefficient for the fiscal equalization mechanism is at about five percent, but is not statistically significant. However, further investigation of the individual components of the fiscal equalization mechanism (eq.(6)) reveals that state-to-state transfers contribute about 5 percent to consumption smoothing, and redistribution of VAT revenue another 3.6 percent. The coefficient on federal grants is negative (but not statistically significant), implying a potentially destabilizing role of federal grants.

Given the special treatment of city states in the fiscal equalization mechanism and the heterogeneity of the size of German states, we control for both city states and small states. The results are presented in columns 4 to 6 in table 1. The results from a modified version of equation (6) show that the importance of different channels of consumption smoothing is independent of state size with only a few exceptions.[26] Similar to the previous results, credit markets contribute around 17.5 percent of consumption smoothing for all states. The contribution of factor markets is smaller for large and city states with about 12.4 percent, but larger for small states with about 25.1 percent. Splitting the fiscal system into the transfer of federal tax (share)/social security and the components of the fiscal equalization mechanism reveals that the former is the main consumption smoothing channel. Of the components of the fiscal equalization mechanism, VAT revenue

---

[24] As a robustness check, we also run the regressions assuming panel specific AR(1) processes. The results do not significantly differ and are available upon request.
[25] For a list of states and their categorization, see table 5.
[26] Regression results for modified versions of equations (4) and (5) are not reported, but are available upon request.

distribution and state-to-state transfers contribute about 4 and 5 percent to consumption smoothing, respectively, independent of state size. Federal grants seem to be marginally destabilizing for large and city states, and significantly so for small states with about negative 6 percent.

We now turn our focus to data from the post-unification period 1995 to 2006. First, we will consider the full sample including all 16 German states. As can be seen in table 2, both factor and credit markets contribute significantly to consumption smoothing with 50.5 and 17.5 percent, respectively. The government sector's contribution is only around ten percent with no contribution from the fiscal equalization mechanism, however. Thus, unification has reversed the role of markets and the public sector in providing consumption smoothing. Overall, approximately 21 percent of regional shocks are unsmoothed, much more than in Germany before unification. To gain further insight into this reversal of roles between factor markets and the public sector, we compare mean growth rates of output, income, and government transfers over time (see table 9). The mean growth rate of both cross-state output and income among West German states declines between the two time periods from 2.03 to 1.24 percent, and from 1.97 to 1.31 percent, respectively. Furthermore, their respective variances drop by about half. At the same time, the mean growth rate of total government transfers drops slightly from 4.39 to 3.79 percent, accompanied by a rather dramatic drop in variance. The fact that the variation of government transfer growth rates declines relative to that of output growth lends support to the notion that our regression results are driven by decreased effectiveness of government transfers. We also ran regressions with interactive explanatory variables controlling for state size. In the last column we report the $\chi^2$ statistic testing for joint significance of the coefficients of the interactive variables for small and city states together. Only the smoothing effects of state-to-state transfers differ between large states and all other states.

Given the stark economic differences between West and East German states and the ongoing integration process of former East Germany into West Germany, we divide our sample and look at both sub-sets of states separately. In doing so, we now measure the degree of consumption smoothing for East German states around an average East German level of consumption, and the degree of consumption smoothing for West German states around an average West German level of consumption, allowing for the possibility that the difference between the two reference levels of consumption is driven by other shocks.

Starting with the results for East Germany in table 3, we see that all three channels contribute (statistically significantly) to consumption smoothing. Factor markets contribute with about 34 percent, the government sector with about 20 percent, and credit markets with around 18 percent. About 24 percent of output volatility is unsmoothed. When we further divide the government sector up into its components, we find that only the coefficient for the fiscal equalization mechanism is significant and contributes about 7.6 percent to consumption smoothing. In particular, the VAT revenue contributes about five percent to consumption smoothing. Including an interactive dummy variable for Berlin reveals that it is the main benefactor of VAT revenue redistribution (see the $\chi^2$ statistic in the last column).[27]

Turning to West Germany for the post-unification period, we see in table 4 that factor markets are by far the most important smoothing channel with a contribution of about 63 percent. The government sector overall contributes merely 16.7 percent, mainly via social security. In fact, the fiscal equalization mechanism does not seem to contribute significantly. Distinguishing by state size (see the $\chi^2$ statistic in the last column) does not alter these results. Only state-to-state transfers

---

[27] All East German states fall into the category "small state" except Berlin, which is a city state (see table 5).

to small states are less effective than state-to-state transfers to other states.[28] Interestingly, the share of unsmoothed shocks among the West German states is only 13 percent, which is close to the pre-unification value and is considerably less than the share of unsmoothed shocks in East Germany.

The variance decomposition reveals that the variance of average output growth rates of West German states over time is much higher than that of East German states (see table 11). Furthermore, these output growth rates between East and West Germany are only weakly correlated. After risk sharing through factor markets, government transfers, and credit markets, growth rates of consumption are much more highly correlated between the two parts of the country, while most of the variation in these growth rates now comes from East Germany. Another, not unexpected, aspect of unification is presented in table 10: average per capita transfer receipts decrease within West Germany as a consequence of unification. The respective means, standard deviations, and ranges of transfers make clear that these transfers are now more tightly distributed around their mean and that all West German states are making net transfers to East Germany. The response of the federal fiscal transfer mechanism alone to the unification, however, is somewhat different: While the maximum transfer receipt by a West German state is virtually unchanged (from Euro 1,648 to Euro 1,757), the maximum transfer payment by a West German state increases significantly (from Euro 1,151 to Euro 2,439). Hence, flows among West German states are diminished, providing further support for the diminished role of the public sector for West Germany after unification.

# 5 Conclusion

Our empirical analysis explores the channels of consumption smoothing, with a special focus on the fiscal equalization mechanism in Germany, using data from 1970 to 2006, and hence covering pre- and post-unification Germany. Several interesting findings emerge. When we focus on the time period 1970 to 1994, we find that the government sector plays the most important role in smoothing output volatility. Our estimate of 54 percent of consumption smoothing provided by the government sector is significantly higher than in Asdrubali et al. (1996) for the US of 23 percent for the 1964 to 1990 time period. At the same time, the contribution of factor markets is about half as big in Germany compared to the US (19.5 percent vs. 39 percent). After 1995, when East Germany is included in our sample, our results indicate that all three channels of consumption smoothing – factor markets, credit markets, and the government sector – contribute significantly. Now, however, factor markets contribute the most to consumption smoothing with about 50 percent. Since the post-unification data time period is relatively short, it will be interesting to see whether the factor markets will retain their important role as a consumption smoothing channel. For the entire sample, the contribution of the fiscal equalization mechanism to consumption smoothing is modest. Its contribution is typically less than five percent. Given, however, that the fiscal equalization mechanism was not primarily intended as a smoothing mechanism, its contribution is considerable. Most of the consumption smoothing provided by the public sector is accomplished through the social security system and unemployment insurance.

---

[28] As a robustness check, all regressions in section 4 were also run with state fixed effects. The results did not differ much quantitatively and not at all qualitatively. We also distinguished between positive and negative shocks to state income to see whether there is asymmetry in the effectiveness of the risk sharing channels. The results were inconclusive, however.

Earlier studies have pointed out that German unification has changed the nature of Germany's federal fiscal system, which has become a mechanism for large-scale transfers from West to East Germany. Our results show that another effect of this change has been that the public sector lost much of its effectiveness as a risk sharing device among the West German states, a fact that has been unnoticed so far. While the overall degree of risk sharing among the West German states has remained the same after unification, most of the risk sharing is now being provided by factor markets. It is plausible that risk sharing provided by factor markets puts more emphasis on (regional or sectoral) labor mobility than government provided risk sharing, and that it leaves households who do not own diversified portfolios of financial assets with less protection against region-specific shocks than others. If so, the loss of publicly provided risk sharing may have added to the dissatisfaction of West German households with the outcomes of German unification. Public protection against region-specific economic shocks in East Germany has been on the order of only 20 percent, while 24 percent of regional shocks are unsmoothed. This may explain why there is much dissatisfaction in spite of the large transfers received in that part of Germany, too.

# References

Asdrubali, Pierfederico and Soyoung Kim, "Dynamic Risk Sharing in the United States and Europe," Journal of Monetary Economics 51, 2004, pp. 809–836.

Asdrubali, Pierfederico, Bent E. Sorensen, and Oved Yosha, "Channels of Interstate Risk Sharing: United States 1963-1990," Quarterly Journal of Economics, 1996, 111 (4), 1081–1110.

Athanasoulis, Stefano G. and Eric van Wincoop, "Risk Sharing within the United States: What Do Financial Markets and Fiscal Federalism Accomplish?", The Review of Economics and Statistics, November 2001, 83 (4), 688–698.

Atkeson, A., and T. Bayoumi. "Do Private Capital Markets Insure Regional Risk? Evidence from the United States and Europe," *Open Economies Review 4*, 1993, 303–324.

Backus, David, Patrick Kehoe, and Finn Kydland, "International Real Business Cycles," Journal of Political Economy, 1992, 100, 745–775.

Baxter, Marianne and Mario Crucini, "Explaining Saving - Investment Correlations," American Economic Review, June 1993, 83 (3), 416–436.

Bayoumi, Tamim and Michael Klein, "A Provincial View of Economic Integration," IMF Staff Papers, December 1997, 44 (4), 534–556.

Beck, Nathaniel and Jonathan N. Katz, "What To Do (and Not To Do) with Time-Series Cross-Section Data," American Political Science Review, September 1995, 89 (3), 634–647.

Beck, Nathaniel and Jonathan N. Katz, "Nuisance vs. Substance: Specifying and Estimating Time-Series-Cross-Section Models," Political Analysis 6, 1996, pp. 1–36.

Boadway, Robin. "The Theory and Practice of Equalization." *CESifo Economic Studies* 50:1, 2004, 211-54.

Boadway, R., and A. Shah. *Intergovernmental Fiscal Transfers: Principles and Practice.* 2007, Washington DC: The World Bank.

Bucovetsky, Sam, "Federalism, Equalization, and Risk Aversion," Journal of Public Economics, March 1998, 67 (3), 301–328.

Bundesrat, Zweite Verordnung zur Durchführung des Finanzausgleichsgesetzes im Ausgleichsjahr ...., Drucksache, various years.

Büttner, Thiess, "Regional Stabilization by Fiscal Equalization? Theoretical Considerations and Empirical Evidence from Germany," 1999. ZEW Mannheim, mimeo.

Büttner, Thiess, "Fiscal Federalism and Interstate Risk Sharing: Empirical Evidence from Germany," Economics Letters 74, 2002, pp. 195–202.

Crucini, Mario, "On International and National Dimensions of Risk Sharing," Review of Economics and Statistics, February 1999, 81 (1), 73–84.

Del Negro, Marco, "Asymmetric Shocks among U.S. States," Journal of International Economics 56, 2002, pp. 273–297.

Hepp, Ralf and Jürgen von Hagen, "Regional Risk sharing and Redistribution in the German Federation," 2001. CEPR Discussion Paper No.2662.

Hepp, Ralf and Jürgen von Hagen, "Fiscal Federalism in Germany: Stabilization and Redistribution Before and After Unification," Publius – The Journal of Federalism, 2011, *doi:10.1093/publius/pjr004.*

Hess, Gregory and Kwanho Shin, "Intranational Business Cycles in the United States," Journal of International Economics 44, 1998, pp. 289–313.

Jüßen, Falko, "Interregional Risk Sharing And Fiscal Redistribution in Unified Germany," Papers in Regional Science, June 2006, 85 (2), 235–255.

Kellermann, Kersten, "Stabilization Properties of Interregional Fiscal Flows: Evidence for Germany, 1970-1997," 2001a, University of Fribourg, Center of Public Finance, mimeo.

Kellermann, Kersten, Interregionales Risk Sharing zwischen den Bundesländern," Konjunkturpolitik 47(4), 2001b, 271-291.

Lockwood, Ben, "Inter-regional Insurance," Journal of Public Economics 72, 1999, pp. 1–37.

Mélitz, J. and F. Zumer (2002), "Regional Redistribution and Stabilization by the Center in Canada, France, the UK and the US: A Reassessment and New Tests," Journal of Public Economics, 86 (2), 263–286.

Obstfeld, Maurice, "Are Industrial Country Consumption Risks Globally Diversified?," in Leonardo Leiderman and Assaf Razin, eds., Capital Mobility: The Impact on Consumption, Investment, and Growth, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Ostergaard, Charlotte, Bent Sørensen, and Oved Yosha, "Consumption and Aggregate Constraints: Evidence from U.S. States and Canadian Provinces," Journal of Political Economy, June 2002, 110 (3), 634–645.

Persson, T. and G. Tabellini. "Risk Sharing and Moral Hazard," *Econometrica, 64 (3)*, 1996a, 623–646.

Persson, T., and G. Tabellini, "Risk Sharing and Redistribution," *Journal of Political Economy*, *104 (5)*, 1996b, 979–1009.

Reed, W. Robert and Rachel Webb, "The PCSE Estimator is Good – Just Not As Good As You Think", Journal of Time Series Econometrics 2(1), 2010, Article 8.

Sørensen, Bent and Oved Yosha, "Federal Insurance of US States: An Empirical Investigation," in Assaf Razin and Efraim Sadka, eds., Globalization: Public Economics Policy Perspectives, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Sørensen, Bent and Oved Yosha, "International Risk Sharing and European Monetary Unification," Journal of International Economics 45, August 1998, pp. 211–238.

Sørensen, Bent and Oved Yosha, "Intranational and International Credit Market Integration: Evidence from Regional Income and Consumption Patterns," in Gregory Shin and Eric van Wincoop, eds., Intranational Macroeconomics, Cambridge University Press, 2000, chapter 3, pp. 60–75.

Statistisches Bundesamt, Fachserie 14, Finanzen und Steuern, Reihe 4.S.1, Kassenmässige Steuereinnahmen, 1967 bis 1976, W. Kohlhammer Verlag Stuttgart und Mainz, 1977.

Statistisches Bundesamt, Fachserie 14, Finanzen und Steuern, Reihe 4.S.1, Kassenmässige Steuereinnahmen, 1977 bis 1987, Metzler-Poeschel Verlag Stuttgart, 1989.

Statistisches Bundesamt, Fachserie 14, Finanzen und Steuern, Reihe 4.S.1, Kassenmässige Steuereinnahmen, 1988 bis 1999, Metzler-Poeschel Verlag Stuttgart, 2000.

Statistisches Bundesamt, Fachserie 14, Finanzen und Steuern, Reihe 4, Steuerhaushalt, Metzler-Poeschel Verlag Stuttgart, various years.

Statistisches Landesamt Baden-Württemberg, Arbeitskreis Volkswirtschaftliche Gesamtrechnungen der Länder, Berechnungstand 1998, electronic copy, 1998.

Statistisches Landesamt Baden-Württemberg, Arbeitskreis Volkswirtschaftliche Gesamtrechnungen der Länder, Berechnungstand 1998, available online at http://www.vgrdl.de/Arbeitskreis_VGR/home.asp, 2008.

van Wincoop, Eric, "Regional Risk sharing," European Economic Review 39, 1995, pp. 1545–1568.

von Hagen, Jürgen and Manfred J.M. Neumann, "Real Exchange Rates Within and Between Currency Areas: How Far Away is EMU?," The Review of Economics and Statistics, May 1994, 76 (2), 236–244.

Wildasin, David E. "Introduction: Fiscal Aspects of Evolving Federations", *International Tax and Public Finance 3(2)*, 1996, 121-135.

# 6 Tables

Table 1: Consumption smoothing in Germany, PCSE regression results, 1970-1994.

| | Eq. (4) | Eq. (5) | Eq. (6) | modified eq. (6) | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | | | Large (Default) | Small | City |
| *(F) Factor markets* | 0.195 (0.068)*** | 0.195 (0.068)*** | 0.195 (0.068)*** | 0.124 (0.071)* | 0.127 (0.071)* | 0.113 (0.092) |
| *(G) Government sector, overall* | 0.541 (0.105)*** | | | | | |
| *(G.1) Transfer of federal tax (share) and social security* | | 0.5 (0.096)*** | 0.5 (0.096)*** | 0.541 (0.097)*** | -0.101 (0.072) | -0.04 (0.134) |
| *(G.2) Fiscal Equalization Mechanism, overall* | | 0.048 (0.043) | | | | |
| *(G.2.1) VAT revenue redistribution* | | | 0.036 (0.019)* | 0.039 (0.020)* | -0.021 (0.024) | 0.009 (0.025) |
| *(G.2.2) state-to-state transfers* | | | 0.05 (0.014)*** | 0.051 (0.014)*** | 0 (0.005) | -0.004 (0.018) |
| *(G.2.3) federal grants* | | | -0.044 (0.035) | -0.004 (0.036) | -0.055 (0.026)** | -0.069 (0.049) |
| *(C) Credit markets* | 0.173 (0.081)** | 0.173 (0.081)** | 0.173 (0.081)** | 0.175 (0.079)** | 0.051 (0.055) | -0.067 (0.100) |
| *(U) Unsmoothed* | 0.085 (0.042)** | 0.085 (0.042)** | 0.085 (0.042)** | 0.089 (0.043)** | -0.017 (0.032) | 0 (0.045) |
| *Observations* | 240 | 240 | 240 | 240 | | |
| *No. of states* | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | | |

*Notes*: * significant at 10 percent; ** significant at 5 percent; *** significant at 1 percent. Panel-corrected standard errors are in parentheses, and time-fixed effects are omitted. The sample data consists of all ten West German states (excluding West-Berlin) for the time period 1970 to 1994.

We perform a panel-corrected standard errors (PCSE) estimation controlling for panel-specific heterogeneity, contemporaneous correlation, and common first-order serial correlation. The regression equations for the three columns are described in equations (4), (5), and (6) in the text, respectively. The coefficients describe the consumption smoothing effect of the respective channel listed in the lead column.

The regression results reported in the last three columns are from a modified version of (6) in the text with the added interactive explanatory variables $\Delta \log(gdp_{it}) \times small_i$ and $\Delta \log(gdp_{it}) \times city_i$. The coefficients of these interactive terms describe the difference of the consumption smoothing effect of the respective channel for small and city states, respectively, relative to that for large states, listed in column 4.

Table 2: Consumption smoothing in Germany, PCSE regression results, 1995-2006.

| | Eq. (4) | Eq. (5) | Eq. (6) | $\chi^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *(F) Factor markets* | 0.505 | 0.505 | 0.505 | 2.54 |
| | (0.074)*** | (0.074)*** | (0.074)*** | (0.281) |
| *(G) Government sector, overall* | 0.114 | | | 2.35 |
| | (0.072) | | | (0.308) |
| *(G.1) Transfer of federal tax (share) and social security* | | 0.103 | 0.103 | 4.48 |
| | | (0.059)* | (0.059)* | (0.106) |
| *(G.2) Fiscal Equalization Mechanism, overall* | | 0.02 | | 0.24 |
| | | (0.035) | | (0.889) |
| *(G.2.1) VAT revenue redistribution* | | | 0.008 | 0.1 |
| | | | (0.024) | (0.952) |
| *(G.2.2) state-to-state transfers* | | | 0.008 | 5.64 |
| | | | (0.013) | (0.060)* |
| *(G.2.3) federal grants* | | | -0.001 | 4.24 |
| | | | (0.029) | (0.120) |
| *(C) Credit markets* | 0.175 | 0.175 | 0.175 | 0.78 |
| | (0.056)*** | (0.056)*** | (0.056)*** | (0.676) |
| *(U) Unsmoothed* | 0.208 | 0.208 | 0.208 | 0.99 |
| | (0.069)*** | (0.069)*** | (0.069)*** | (0.610) |
| *Observations* | 176 | 176 | 176 | |
| *No. of states* | 16 | 16 | 16 | |

*Notes*: * significant at 10 percent; ** significant at 5 percent; *** significant at 1 percent. Panel-corrected standard errors are in parentheses, and time-fixed effects are omitted. The sample data consists of all 16 German states for the time period from 1995 to 2006. We perform a panel-corrected standard errors (PCSE) estimation controlling for panel-specific heterogeneity, contemporaneous correlation, and common first-order serial correlation. The regression equations for the three columns are described in equations (4), (5), and (6) in the text, respectively. The coefficients describe the consumption smoothing effect of the respective channel listed in the lead column. The $\chi^2$-statistic reported in the last column tests the joint significance of the added interactive explanatory variables $\Delta \log(gdp_{it}) \times small_i$ and $\Delta \log(gdp_{it}) \times city_i$ included into a modified version of (6) in the text. Its p-value is reported in parentheses. If we get a significant statistic, then the respective smoothing channel for small and city states together is different from that of large states.

Table 3: Consumption smoothing in Germany, PCSE regression results, 1995-2006, East Germany.

| | Eq. (4) | Eq. (5) | Eq. (6) | $\chi^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *(F) Factor markets* | 0.345 | 0.345 | 0.345 | 0.21 |
| | (0.105)*** | (0.105)*** | (0.105)*** | (0.646) |
| *(G) Government sector, overall* | 0.198 | | | 0.35 |
| | (0.086)** | | | (0.553) |
| *(G.1) Transfer of federal tax (share) and social security* | | 0.121 | 0.121 | 0.1 |
| | | (0.078) | (0.078) | (0.749) |
| *(G.2) Fiscal Equalization Mechanism, overall* | | 0.076 | | 1.83 |
| | | (0.025)*** | | (0.177) |
| *(G.2.1) VAT revenue redistribution* | | | 0.05 | 4.33 |
| | | | (0.024)** | (0.038)** |
| *(G.2.2) state-to-state transfers* | | | 0.021 | 0.11 |
| | | | (0.017) | (0.742) |
| *(G.2.3) federal grants* | | | 0.005 | 0.75 |
| | | | (0.006) | (0.388) |
| *(C) Credit markets* | 0.178 | 0.178 | 0.178 | 1.51 |
| | (0.069)** | (0.069)** | (0.069)** | (0.220) |
| *(U) Unsmoothed* | 0.244 | 0.244 | 0.244 | 0.88 |
| | (0.099)** | (0.099)** | (0.099)** | (0.348) |
| *Observations* | 66 | 66 | 66 | |
| *No. of states* | 6 | 6 | 6 | |

*Notes*: * significant at 10 percent; ** significant at 5 percent; *** significant at 1 percent. Panel-corrected standard errors are in parentheses, and time-fixed effects are omitted. The sample data consists of the five East German states and Berlin for the time period 1995 to 2006.

We perform a panel-corrected standard errors (PCSE) estimation controlling for panel-specific heterogeneity, contemporaneous correlation, and common first-order serial correlation. The regression equations for columns the three columns are described in equations (4), (5), and (6) in the text, respectively. The coefficients describe the consumption smoothing effect of the respective channel listed in the lead column. The $\chi^2$-statistic reported in the last column tests the joint significance of the added interactive explanatory variables $\Delta \log(gdp_{it}) \times small_i$ and $\Delta \log(gdp_{it}) \times city_i$ included into a modified version of (6) in the text. Its p-value is reported in parentheses. If we get a significant statistic, then the respective smoothing channel for small and city states together is different from that of large states.

Table 4: Consumption smoothing in Germany, PCSE regression results, 1995-2006, West Germany.

| | Eq. (4) | Eq. (5) | Eq. (6) | $\chi^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *(F) Factor markets* | 0.632 (0.110)*** | 0.632 (0.110)*** | 0.632 (0.110)*** | 1.71 (0.426) |
| *(G) Government sector, overall* | 0.167 (0.097)* | | | 3.54 (0.171) |
| *(G.1) Transfer of federal tax (share) and social security* | | 0.139 (0.060)** | 0.139 (0.060)** | 4.08 (0.130) |
| *(G.2) Fiscal Equalization Mechanism, overall* | | 0.044 (0.057) | | 2.35 (0.309) |
| *(G.2.1) VAT revenue redistribution* | | | -0.003 (0.035) | 3.39 (0.184) |
| *(G.2.2) state-to-state transfers* | | | 0.005 (0.025) | 6.44 (0.040)** |
| *(G.2.3) federal grants* | | | 0.035 (0.031) | 1.18 (0.555) |
| *(C) Credit markets* | 0.083 (0.063) | 0.083 (0.063) | 0.083 (0.063) | 0.71 (0.700) |
| *(U) Unsmoothed* | 0.134 (0.072)* | 0.134 (0.072)* | 0.134 (0.072)* | 0.91 (0.633) |
| *Observations* | 110 | 110 | 110 | |
| *No. of states* | 10 | 10 | 10 | |

*Notes*: * significant at 10 percent; ** significant at 5 percent; *** significant at 1 percent. Panel-corrected standard errors are in parentheses, and time-fixed effects are omitted. The sample data consists of the ten West German states (excluding Berlin) for the time period 1995 to 2006.
We perform a panel-corrected standard errors (PCSE) estimation controlling for panel-specific heterogeneity, contemporaneous correlation, and common first-order serial correlation. The regression equations for the three columns are described in equations (4), (5), and (6) in the text, respectively. The coefficients describe the consumption smoothing effect of the respective channel listed in the lead column.
The $\chi^2$-statistic reported in the last column tests the joint significance of the added interactive explanatory variables $\Delta \log(gdp_{it}) \times small_i$ and $\Delta \log(gdp_{it}) \times city_i$ included into a modified version of (6) in the text. Its p-value is reported in parentheses. If we get a significant statistic, then the respective smoothing channel for small and city states together is different from that of large states.

Table 5: German states in the sample.

| West | East |
|------|------|
| Bayern | Berlin (C) |
| Baden-Wuerttemberg | Brandenburg (S) |
| Bremen (C) | Mecklenburg-Vorpommern (S) |
| Hamburg (C) | Sachsen (S) |
| Hessen | Sachsen-Anhalt (S) |
| Niedersachsen | Thüringen (S) |
| Nordrhein-Westfalen | |
| Rheinland-Pfalz (S) | |
| Saarland (S) | |
| Schleswig-Holstein (S) | |

*Notes*: *C* indicates a city state, and *S* indicates a small state.

Table 6: Descriptive statistics, West Germany, 1970-2005.

| Variable | Year | Mean | Standard deviation | Coeff. of variation | Minimum | Maximum | Year | Mean | Standard deviation | Coeff. of variation | Minimum | Maximum |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gross state product | 1970 | 13548.97 | 3604.77 | 0.266 | 10673.85 | 22174.13 | 1991 | 22916.64 | 4669.97 | 0.204 | 18889.94 | 33844.66 |
| State income | | 14195.53 | 5408.07 | 0.381 | 10272.94 | 27717.71 | | 22334.62 | 5292.63 | 0.237 | 16672.55 | 35536.75 |
| Disp. state income | | 9680.46 | 1207.81 | 0.125 | 8586.92 | 12747.43 | | 16412.53 | 1869.38 | 0.114 | 13905.00 | 19793.93 |
| State consumption | | 9232.39 | 713.70 | 0.077 | 8503.96 | 10919.47 | | 16086.26 | 1614.45 | 0.100 | 13977.14 | 18900.09 |
| Private consumption | | 6732.17 | 548.29 | 0.081 | 6164.64 | 7989.94 | | 12170.55 | 1343.16 | 0.110 | 10240.42 | 14510.24 |
| Public consumption | | 2500.23 | 173.34 | 0.069 | 2339.32 | 2929.53 | | 3915.72 | 308.87 | 0.079 | 3627.95 | 4565.05 |
| Gross state product | 1975 | 15001.89 | 3875.11 | 0.258 | 11941.16 | 24355.12 | 1995 | 22740.56 | 4796.40 | 0.211 | 18551.15 | 34143.84 |
| State income | | 15643.49 | 5741.14 | 0.367 | 11547.85 | 30235.45 | | 22271.77 | 5381.75 | 0.242 | 16978.89 | 36571.74 |
| Disp. state income | | 11280.04 | 1203.68 | 0.107 | 10368.64 | 14442.25 | | 16242.27 | 1620.42 | 0.100 | 14780.63 | 19329.11 |
| State consumption | | 10862.22 | 741.42 | 0.068 | 10123.68 | 12655.37 | | 16565.35 | 1318.65 | 0.080 | 15090.17 | 19047.98 |
| Private consumption | | 7809.03 | 518.61 | 0.066 | 7262.19 | 9072.72 | | 12602.01 | 1011.13 | 0.080 | 11289.47 | 14521.36 |
| Public consumption | | 3053.18 | 244.82 | 0.080 | 2835.29 | 3582.65 | | 3963.33 | 345.01 | 0.087 | 3700.50 | 4665.99 |
| Gross state product | 1980 | 17673.53 | 4488.72 | 0.254 | 14222.43 | 28444.22 | 2000 | 24919.32 | 5473.76 | 0.220 | 19765.83 | 37107.45 |
| State income | | 18426.57 | 6549.82 | 0.355 | 13727.72 | 35102.05 | | 24431.72 | 5803.83 | 0.238 | 19423.52 | 39535.30 |
| Disp. state income | | 13105.81 | 1142.96 | 0.087 | 12154.33 | 16162.29 | | 17748.26 | 1782.84 | 0.100 | 15916.67 | 21261.20 |
| State consumption | | 12768.21 | 822.37 | 0.064 | 11842.75 | 14735.18 | | 17893.22 | 1515.84 | 0.085 | 16569.72 | 20703.39 |
| Private consumption | | 9286.62 | 549.91 | 0.059 | 8667.08 | 10660.09 | | 13624.23 | 1165.07 | 0.086 | 12605.19 | 15667.04 |
| Public consumption | | 3481.59 | 321.58 | 0.092 | 3175.68 | 4075.09 | | 4269.00 | 378.59 | 0.089 | 3934.80 | 5036.35 |
| Gross state product | 1985 | 18860.98 | 4985.44 | 0.264 | 14963.99 | 31491.15 | 2005 | 25445.96 | 5669.02 | 0.223 | 19898.94 | 37675.02 |
| State income | | 19293.36 | 6913.266 | 0.358 | 13970.42 | 37195.14 | | 24797.98 | 6409.94 | 0.258 | 19454.33 | 41941.95 |
| Disp. state income | | 13692.17 | 1089.948 | 0.080 | 12343.83 | 16390.16 | | 18168.76 | 1764.28 | 0.097 | 16359.13 | 22079.05 |
| State consumption | | 13350.56 | 785.799 | 0.059 | 12427.21 | 15194.87 | | 18183.98 | 1679.63 | 0.092 | 16600.94 | 22124.22 |
| Private consumption | | 9613.24 | 514.107 | 0.053 | 8993.64 | 10769.54 | | 13893.85 | 1456.71 | 0.105 | 12623.33 | 17240.65 |
| Public consumption | | 3737.33 | 351.484 | 0.094 | 3433.57 | 4425.333 | | 4290.12 | 247.29 | 0.058 | 3977.61 | 4883.57 |

*Note: The means of the variables in the table are calculated as unweighted means. All numbers are expressed in 1991 euros.*

Table 7: Descriptive statistics, Germany, 1995-2006.

| Variable | Year | Mean | Standard deviation | Coefficient of variation | Minimum | Maximum |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gross state product | **1991** | 17755.29 | 8208.17 | 0.462 | 6625.18 | 33844.66 |
| State income | | . | . | . | . | . |
| Disp. state income | | . | . | . | . | . |
| State consumption | | 13962.63 | 3409.85 | 0.244 | 9051.41 | 18900.09 |
| Private consumption | | 10359.05 | 2841.70 | 0.274 | 6203.64 | 14510.24 |
| Public consumption | | 3603.59 | 599.83 | 0.166 | 2725.53 | 4565.05 |
| | | | | | | |
| Gross state product | **1995** | 18965.38 | 6594.56 | 0.348 | 10641.35 | 34143.84 |
| State income | | 18229.39 | 7115.22 | 0.390 | 9487.89 | 36571.74 |
| Disp. state income | | 14442.59 | 2923.56 | 0.202 | 10465.30 | 19329.11 |
| State consumption | | 15176.36 | 2393.35 | 0.158 | 11849.49 | 19047.98 |
| Private consumption | | 11054.79 | 2399.88 | 0.217 | 7582.12 | 14521.36 |
| Public consumption | | 4121.57 | 386.14 | 0.094 | 3700.50 | 5011.48 |
| | | | | | | |
| Gross state product | **2000** | 20766.21 | 7176.32 | 0.346 | 12169.30 | 37107.45 |
| State income | | 19844.47 | 7767.56 | 0.391 | 10422.15 | 39535.30 |
| Disp. state income | | 15861.06 | 2984.34 | 0.188 | 11857.91 | 21261.20 |
| State consumption | | 16427.13 | 2430.62 | 0.148 | 13239.09 | 20703.39 |
| Private consumption | | 12070.13 | 2352.54 | 0.195 | 8789.37 | 15667.04 |
| Public consumption | | 4357.01 | 376.46 | 0.086 | 3934.80 | 5184.60 |
| | | | | | | |
| Gross state product | **2005** | 21325.95 | 7132.18 | 0.334 | 13208.54 | 37675.02 |
| State income | | 20112.34 | 8079.85 | 0.402 | 10749.65 | 41941.95 |
| Disp. state income | | 16195.63 | 3026.86 | 0.187 | 12028.27 | 22079.05 |
| State consumption | | 16535.92 | 2660.94 | 0.161 | 13166.74 | 22124.22 |
| Private consumption | | 12218.94 | 2566.29 | 0.210 | 8875.94 | 17240.65 |
| Public consumption | | 4316.97 | 271.92 | 0.063 | 3977.61 | 5006.38 |

*Note: The means of the variables in the table are calculated as unweighted means. All numbers are expressed in 1991 euros.*

Table 8: Descriptive statistics, East Germany, 1995-2006.

| Variable | Year | Mean | Standard deviation | Coefficient of variation | Minimum | Maximum |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gross state product | **1991** | 9153.04 | 4559.52 | 0.498 | 6625.18 | 18427.46 |
| State income | | . | . | . | . | . |
| Disp. state income | | . | . | . | . | . |
| State consumption | | 10423.25 | 2477.35 | 0.238 | 9051.41 | 15456.55 |
| Private consumption | | 7339.88 | 1864.65 | 0.254 | 6203.64 | 11108.34 |
| Public consumption | | 3083.37 | 622.94 | 0.202 | 2725.53 | 4348.21 |
| | | | | | | |
| Gross state product | **1995** | 12673.42 | 3611.69 | 0.285 | 10641.35 | 19981.02 |
| State income | | 11492.07 | 3548.75 | 0.309 | 9487.89 | 18641.37 |
| Disp. state income | | 11443.11 | 1908.23 | 0.167 | 10465.30 | 15317.31 |
| State consumption | | 12861.39 | 1940.36 | 0.151 | 11849.49 | 16805.54 |
| Private consumption | | 8476.09 | 1634.18 | 0.193 | 7582.12 | 11794.06 |
| Public consumption | | 4385.30 | 315.45 | 0.072 | 4173.13 | 5011.48 |
| | | | | | | |
| Gross state product | **2000** | 13844.36 | 2928.48 | 0.212 | 12169.30 | 19794.40 |
| State income | | 12199.05 | 2853.83 | 0.234 | 10422.15 | 17924.78 |
| Disp. state income | | 12715.73 | 1415.17 | 0.111 | 11857.91 | 15570.90 |
| State consumption | | 13983.64 | 1457.41 | 0.104 | 13239.09 | 16952.41 |
| Private consumption | | 9479.96 | 1130.88 | 0.119 | 8789.37 | 11767.81 |
| Public consumption | | 4503.68 | 354.77 | 0.079 | 4177.84 | 5184.60 |
| | | | | | | |
| Gross state product | **2005** | 14459.28 | 2055.59 | 0.142 | 13208.54 | 18549.27 |
| State income | | 12302.94 | 2190.90 | 0.178 | 10749.65 | 16654.78 |
| Disp. state income | | 12907.09 | 1057.76 | 0.082 | 12028.27 | 14978.74 |
| State consumption | | 13789.15 | 1295.31 | 0.094 | 13166.74 | 16428.22 |
| Private consumption | | 9427.42 | 988.04 | 0.105 | 8875.94 | 11421.84 |
| Public consumption | | 4361.73 | 328.48 | 0.075 | 4124.56 | 5006.38 |

*Note: The means of the variables in the table are calculated as unweighted means. All numbers are expressed in 1991 euros.*

Table 9: Average growth rates.

| Growth rates (%) | West, 1970-1994 Mean | Variance | West, 1995-2006 Mean | Variance | East, 1995-2006 Mean | Variance | All, 1995-2006 Mean | Variance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| state GDP | 2.03 | 4.88 | 1.24 | 2.49 | 1.60 | 2.28 | 1.37 | 2.43 |
| state income | 1.97 | 7.25 | 1.31 | 3.71 | 1.11 | 3.63 | 1.24 | 3.67 |
| disp. state income | 2.05 | 4.12 | 1.27 | 2.33 | 1.33 | 2.09 | 1.29 | 2.23 |
| consumption | 2.17 | 2.69 | 0.96 | 1.21 | 0.71 | 2.17 | 0.87 | 1.58 |
| gov't transfers, total | 4.39 | 3,285.11 | 3.79 | 544.24 | -1.90 | 2,756.50 | 1.77 | 1,326.02 |
| social security | 2.65 | 243.39 | 2.82 | 405.09 | 6.35 | 19,276.71 | 4.07 | 7,036.35 |
| LFA | -11.00 | 29,785.52 | 6.40 | 1,249.82 | 2.15 | 28.25 | 4.89 | 818.03 |

*Note:      The values in the table are means and variances of growth rates of per capita values of the above variables.*


Table 10: Average levels of government transfers.

| Euros per capita | Mean | Std. Dev. | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Dev. | Minimum | Maximum |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | West, 1970-1994 | | | | West, 1995-2006 | | |
| Gov't Transfers, total | -5,481.34 | 5,202.08 | -24,162.53 | 92.83 | -6,405.53 | 4,416.44 | -20,379.11 | -1,993.92 |
| Social Security | -5,505.96 | 4,921.45 | -23,155.49 | -224.78 | -6,248.03 | 3,728.61 | -17,940.28 | -3,009.32 |
| LFA | 24.63 | 376.22 | -1,150.68 | 1,648.15 | -157.51 | 863.71 | -2,438.83 | 1,757.23 |
| | | East, 1995-2006 | | | | All, 1995-2006 | | |
| Gov't Transfers, total | 405.12 | 1,341.67 | -3,324.06 | 1,641.65 | -3,851.54 | 4,873.38 | -20,379.11 | 1,641.65 |
| Social Security | -950.75 | 1,273.18 | -4,382.38 | 212.13 | -4,261.55 | 3,984.42 | -17,940.28 | 212.13 |
| LFA | 1,355.87 | 131.94 | 1,058.32 | 1,667.85 | 410.01 | 1,005.41 | -2,438.83 | 1,757.23 |

*Note:      The numbers are expressed in 1991 euros and are per capita values.*

Table 11: Variance decomposition of growth rates.

| Variable | Var(All) | Var(East) | Var(West) | Cov(E,W) | Corr(E,W) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GDP growth | 0.868 | 0.503 | 1.520 | 0.434 | 0.496 |
| State income growth | 2.104 | 1.883 | 2.503 | 1.838 | 0.847 |
| Disp. state income growth | 1.312 | 1.552 | 1.571 | 1.024 | 0.656 |
| Consumption growth | 0.988 | 1.799 | 0.782 | 0.917 | 0.773 |

*Note:* *The values contained here are over-time variances and covariances.*