

Requate, Till; Göhlmann, Silja; Tauchmann, Harald; Schmidt, Christoph M.

Working Paper

Tobacco and alcohol: complements or substitutes? A statistical Guinea Pig approach

Economics Working Paper, No. 2006-18

Provided in Cooperation with:

Christian-Albrechts-University of Kiel, Department of Economics

Suggested Citation: Requate, Till; Göhlmann, Silja; Tauchmann, Harald; Schmidt, Christoph M. (2006) : Tobacco and alcohol: complements or substitutes? A statistical Guinea Pig approach, Economics Working Paper, No. 2006-18, Kiel University, Department of Economics, Kiel

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/22017>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Tobacco and Alcohol: Complements or Substitutes? - A Statistical Guinea Pig Approach

by Harald Tauchmann, Silja Göhlmann, Till Requate
and Christoph M. Schmidt

C | A | U

Christian-Albrechts-Universität Kiel

Department of Economics

Economics Working Paper

No 2006-18



Tobacco and Alcohol: Complements or Substitutes?

–

A Statistical Guinea Pig Approach[†]

Harald Tauchmann

RWI Essen

Silja Göhlmann

RWI Essen

Till Requate

University Kiel

Christoph M. Schmidt

RWI Essen and Ruhr-University Bochum

November 2006

Abstract: The question of whether two drugs – namely alcohol and tobacco – are used as complements or substitutes is of crucial interest if side-effects of anti-drug policies are considered. Numerous papers have empirically addressed this issue by estimating demand systems for alcohol and tobacco and subsequently calculating cross-price effects. However, this traditional approach often is seriously hampered by insufficient price-variation observed in survey data. We, therefore, suggest an alternative instrumental variables approach that statistically mimics an experimental study and does not rely on prices as explanatory variables. This approach is applied to German survey data. Our estimation results suggest that a reduction in tobacco consumption results in a reduction in alcohol consumption, too. It is shown theoretically that this implies that alcohol and tobacco are complements. Hence, we conclude that successful anti-smoking policies will not result in the unintended side-effect of an increased (ab)use of alcohol.

JEL Classification: C31, D12, I12.

Key words: interdependence in consumption, tobacco and alcohol, instrumental variables approach.

[†]All correspondence to Harald Tauchmann, Rheinisch-Westfälisches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (RWI Essen), Hohenzollernstraße 1-3, D-45128 Essen, Germany. Fax: +49-201-8149-200. Email: harald.tauchmann@rwi-essen.de. We would like to thank Boris Augurzky and Lars Siemers as well as participants at the Scottish Economic Society Annual Conference 2006, the European Society for Population Economics 20th Annual Conference, and the Verein für Socialpolitik Annual Conference 2006 for many useful comments. Any errors are our own.

1 Introduction

The consumption of psychoactive substances has been subject to regulation for centuries. While numerous drugs like opium, cocaine, marijuana, and ecstasy nowadays are completely banned in almost any western society, others are still legally consumed on a widespread basis, most prominently alcohol and tobacco. Nevertheless, in most western economies consumption is penalized by taxes and often restricted, e.g. purchase is subject to a minimum age. In general, regulation seems to be well justified from the perspective of economic theory. The consumption of alcohol and tobacco – and of course the consumption of many illicit drugs as well – may involve external effects to other individuals and the society as a whole. In many cases, these are unlikely to be internalized via bilateral bargaining because of transaction costs and ill-defined or non-enforceable property rights. Annoyance, health problems, and even death by second-hand smoking, alcohol related violence and crime, road accidents caused by drug abuse involving other parties¹ and extra costs to the social security systems² may serve as examples for such externalities.

Yet, the question of how to design measures aiming at the reduction of drug usage remains controversial. This especially applies to so called soft (illicit) drugs and licit psychoactive substances. At the one hand, it is often argued that consumption of ‘soft’ and even legal drugs serves as ‘gateway’ to drug usage in general and, therefore, as potential gateway to extremely harmful substances. If this argument is correct, it may be appropriate to apply tough measures even to soft drugs in order to hit drug usage in general. Others argue that drug usage is a – maybe unfavorable – yet inevitable phenomenon in any society. Restricting the access to ‘soft’ drugs may therefore only encourage potential drug users to turn to other, probably more harmful, substances. If this argument applies, designing optimal policies for the regulation of drug usage is more complex, since inter-drug substitution has to be considered an important issue.

Currently, in Germany a heated debate on restricting the consumption of legal drugs is going on. Namely, smoking bans are discussed with respect to bars and pubs,

¹In many cases, e.g. in case of accidental death, statutory compensation for immaterial damage is likely to be incomplete and, therefore, fails to internalize external costs properly.

²The question of whether smokers do decrease total health care expenditures because of dying early rather than actually increase expenditures, is still subject to an ongoing debate, e.g. Warschburger (2000).

schools, and even motorists. Analyzing the effect of such bans is of great interest and research has been carried out for other countries, where bans have already become implemented; see for example Wasserman et al. (1991), Chaloupka & Grossman (1996) and Tauras & Chaloupka (1999). These studies come to the conclusion that smoking restrictions in fact do reduce tobacco consumption. In this paper, we condition on the effectiveness of anti-drug policies and address the question of whether a reduced tolerance against smoking will ultimately lead to less overall drug usage or whether it may encourage smokers to turn to drugs other than tobacco.

From the perspective of economic theory, in order to answer this question one has to determine whether tobacco and other drugs are consumed as substitutes or complement goods. Correspondingly, our analysis addresses this question using econometric techniques. In doing this, we focus on the interdependence of tobacco and alcohol, namely because these two substances are by far the most commonly consumed drugs in Germany, and therefore are likely to be the most relevant ones. Moreover, data concerning the consumption of alcohol and tobacco are available through several surveys and are probably more reliable than data concerning the consumption of illicit psychoactive substances.

2 Literature

The question of whether two goods are consumed as complements or substitutes lies within the core of micro-economic consumer theory. The sign of the cross-price derivatives derived from Hicksian demand functions precisely answers this question. Correspondingly, the vast majority of econometric analyses that has so far addressed the question of substitutability with respect to tobacco and alcohol is based on estimating demand functions and calculating cross-price effects from estimated price-coefficients.³ Yet, the majority of empirical studies fail to distinguish Hicksian from Marshallian demand properly.

Jones (1989), Florkowski & McNamara (1992) and Goel & Morey (1995) rely on aggregate data at state or national level. Several more recent studies use survey data at individual consumer level from several different countries; e.g. Jimenez & Labeaga (1994), Decker & Schwarz (2000), Cameron & Williams (2001), Zhao & Harris (2004),

³As an extension to basic consumer theory, lagged endogenous variables are often additionally included as regressors in order to account for the addictive nature of both drugs and to test for Becker & Murphy's (1988) rational addiction hypothesis.

and Picone et al. (2004).⁴ Irrespective of the level of aggregation and the country considered, most of these studies find cross-price effects being negative and therefore conclude that alcohol and tobacco are complements. As the only exception, Goel & Morey (1995) find positive and significant cross-price elasticities.

Despite its rigorous derivation from micro-economic theory, the well-established cross-price approach, however, suffers from severe shortcomings when applied to survey data at the level of individual consumers. More specifically, for the identification of cross-price effects this approach critically relies on high-quality price data that is both exogenous and displays sufficient variation. Unfortunately, prices in general are not consumer specific. That is, the same price should apply to any individual consumer in the same market. Therefore, such analyses typically have to rely solely on price-variation across periods (e.g. Jimenez & Labeaga (1994)) and/or across regions (e.g. Zhao & Harris (2004) or Picone et al. (2004)), though price-variation often seems to be rather limited.

Yet, consumption patterns are likely to vary across periods and regions for other reasons than different prices alone. Even worse, price-differences might even reflect varying consumption patterns rather than the other way round. Quite regularly the lack of individual specific price data does not allow for or, at least, seriously hampers controlling for period- and region-specific heterogeneity.⁵ Hence, it seems to be strongly disputable whether the corresponding price-coefficients capture true price effects but not time or regional effects. Jimenez & Labeaga (1994: 235) quite tellingly exemplify this problem by characterizing the price variables employed in their analysis “as a group of quarterly dummies with restriction”. Others (e.g. Picone et al. 2004: 1068) complain about prices and time effects being highly collinear, almost equally well revealing the problem of price data being barely sufficient for identifying substitutability or complementarity.

⁴Chaloupka & Laixuthai (1997), DiNardo & Lemieux (2001), and Williams et al. (2001), address the interdependency of the consumption of alcohol and drugs others than tobacco, for instance, marijuana. Moreover, several related papers do not use prices as explanatory variables and, therefore, are concerned with correlation of drinking and smoking rather than interdependency, e.g. Su & Yen (2000), Lee & Abdel-Gahny (2004), and Yen (2005).

⁵If price variation is either exclusively across time or exclusively across regions, corresponding sets of period- or region-specific dummies obviously are not identified. If, instead, prices vary across time and regions, in theory two sets of dummies could be included along with prices. In practice, however, this will often not be feasible because of severe collinearity. Moreover, random effects is just a feigned alternative to time- or regional dummies, since the implicit assumption that period- and region-specific effects are uncorrelated with period- and region-specific prices is rather implausible.

In the light of this rather general problem we suggest a different approach that is not based on prices⁶ but directly estimates effects from the consumption of one drug to the consumption of the other. In fact, explaining the consumption of two drugs mutually by each other is not completely new to the literature. One recent analysis (Bask & Melkersson 2004), which is based on aggregate data from Sweden, uses consumption levels of tobacco as an explanatory variable for contemporaneous alcohol consumption and vice versa. Nevertheless, Bask & Melkersson (2004) still critically rely on price data that serve as instrumental variables and the analysis still ultimately aims at estimating cross-price effects. In contrast, the approach presented by the following section does not rely on – presumably insufficient – price data altogether. Moreover, our work contributes to the existing literature as, to our knowledge, it is the first econometric application where German micro-data is used to analyze the interdependency in the consumption of alcohol and tobacco. In Germany, prices of alcohol and tobacco display only minimal variation over time as well as across regions. Therefore our approach seems to be particularly well suited to the German case.

3 The Econometric Framework

3.1 A Statistical Guinea Pig approach

If we were biologists rather than economists and if we were interested in the behavior of guinea pigs rather than human beings we would typically not consider estimating demand functions with prices serving as explanatory variables.⁷ Nevertheless, we still could examine whether our test animals consumed two kinds of feed as complements or substitutes. In order to do this, we would treat them with certain doses of one feed and measure the intake of the other. As a matter of course, in the context of drug (ab)use it is not possible or, at least, it is highly questionable in ethical terms to carry out such an experiment with human beings.⁸ Nevertheless, we can mimic such an experiment by applying statistical procedures to survey data. Hence, we express

⁶Picone et al. (2004) do not exclusively rely on price data, since they employ a “smoking ban index” as additional explanatory variable for both tobacco and alcohol consumption.

⁷Yet, one may consider using implicit prices – such as the effort that is necessary to collect certain kinds of feed – instead of obviously inexistent market prices.

⁸A clinical study which tried to address the research question of this paper at least had to exclude non-smokers from the experiment, in order to avoid exposing them to a substance that is known to be addictive and noxious.

the (latent) demand for one good – say alcohol – a_{it}^* as a function of the (latent) consumption of tobacco c_{it}^* and common explanatory variables x_{it} as well as alcohol-specific ones z_{ait} , and vice versa. Time and regional effects, including those due to temporal and regional price variation, are accounted for by including sets of dummy variables in the vector x_{it} .

$$a_{it}^* = \gamma_a c_{it}^* + \beta'_a x_{it} + \delta'_a z_{ait} + \varepsilon_{ait} \quad (1)$$

$$c_{it}^* = \gamma_c a_{it}^* + \beta'_c x_{it} + \delta'_c z_{cit} + \varepsilon_{cit} \quad (2)$$

This structural model that explains the demand for one good by the consumption level of the other stays in line with micro-economic theory if the individual consumers' optimization problem is subject to a fixed consumption constraint concerning the latter good. This exactly holds for an experimental situation. In this representation the coefficient γ_a measures what would happen to the (latent) consumption of alcohol if the (latent) consumption of tobacco were exogenously reduced by one unit; i.e. γ_a represents the derivative of the Marshallian demand for alcohol with respect to the restricted consumption of tobacco.⁹ This analogously applies to γ_c . In this study we use these coefficients as a measure of complementarity in consumption which exactly answers the question which often is relevant when thinking about side-effects of drug related regulation: “Imagine the regulator could manage to reduce smoking by a certain amount, how would this affect the consumption of alcohol?” As the equations (1) and (2) describe (hypothetical) experiments they can be both interpreted in terms of a causal relationship and the “autonomy requirement” (cf. Wooldridge 2002: 209) is satisfied, even though both structural equations explain the behavior of the same economic unit.

Obviously, the coefficients γ originate from restricted Marshallian demand and do not coincide with cross-price derivatives of Hicksian demand functions. However, it is shown in Appendix A that for any regular utility function our proposed measures of complementarity γ_a and γ_c necessarily show the opposite sign than the corresponding cross-price derivatives of Hicksian demand functions do, given restricted Marshallian demand is evaluated at the unrestricted consumer's optimum.¹⁰ Therefore, if the qualitative question of whether alcohol and tobacco are consumed as complements or substitutes is addressed, our empirical approach that mimics an experimental study –

⁹If feedback-effects are taken into account, one might think of $(1 - \gamma_a \gamma_c)^{-1} \gamma_a$ as the more appropriate measure. For model stability, the condition $1 - \gamma_a \gamma_c > 0$ needs to be satisfied.

¹⁰This condition holds as we analyze survey data collected from a situation with consumption restrictions not yet in place.

in terms of micro-economic theory – is fully equivalent to estimating Hicksian cross-price effects.

However, the survey data used for this study are not gathered from an experiment. Therefore, results from naively estimating (1) and (2) are severely biased because of c_{it}^* and a_{it}^* being endogenous regressors. Nonetheless, the coefficients θ of the corresponding reduced form representation

$$a_{it}^* = \theta'_{a1}x_{it} + \theta'_{a2}z_{ait} + \theta'_{a3}z_{cit} + v_{ait} \quad (3)$$

$$c_{it}^* = \theta'_{c1}x_{it} + \theta'_{c3}z_{ait} + \theta'_{c2}z_{cit} + v_{cit} \quad (4)$$

$$\theta_{a1} \equiv \frac{\gamma_a\beta_c + \beta_a}{1 - \gamma_a\gamma_c}, \quad \theta_{a2} \equiv \frac{\delta_a}{1 - \gamma_a\gamma_c}, \quad \theta_{a3} \equiv \frac{\gamma_a\delta_c}{1 - \gamma_a\gamma_c}, \quad v_{ait} \equiv \frac{\gamma_a\varepsilon_{cit} + \varepsilon_{ait}}{1 - \gamma_a\gamma_c}$$

$\theta_{c1}, \theta_{c2}, \theta_{c3},$ and v_{cit} analogously

can be estimated consistently. If z_{ait} and z_{cit} were empty, that is, if we had no instruments for alcohol and tobacco consumption respectively, estimates for θ would be of no value to our research question. However, with valid instruments z_{ait} and z_{cit} in hand one can calculate any structural coefficients including γ , since $\gamma_a = \frac{\theta_{a3k}}{\theta_{c2k}}$ and $\gamma_c = \frac{\theta_{c3k}}{\theta_{a2k}}$ hold.¹¹ As a more efficient alternative, one can employ the classical two stage instrumental variables estimator. That is, fitted values obtained from estimating the reduced form equations serve as regressors in the structural equations and the parameters γ are directly estimated as regression coefficients. Evidently, this two-step approach still relies on valid instruments. Our reported results are based on the two-step approach.

Fortunately, the data comprises variables which can be expected to be well suited instruments both for the consumption of alcohol and tobacco. Drinking as well as smoking habits at parental home are likely to have a strong effect on children's later consumption habits. For instance, Bantle & Haisken-DeNew (2002) find significant correlations between parental smoking behavior and children's tobacco consumption for Germany. In order to use parental consumption habits as instruments, we argue that parents' smoking habits do influence children's later tobacco consumption, but conditional on children's later smoking behavior, they will not have an effect on their drinking habits, vice versa. That is, even though parents' tobacco consumption and

¹¹The subscript k indicates the k th element of the corresponding vector. I.e. if the vectors z_a and z_c consist of more than one element, several different estimates for γ_a and γ_c can be calculated. However, because of the two-step approach estimated in this paper, there is just one estimator of γ_a and γ_c .

children’s later alcohol use are possibly correlated, the correlation purely operates through children’s own smoking habits (and other observables) but does not capture a direct effect. Fortunately, with respect to the validity of our identifying assumptions we do not have to rely on intuition alone but we have the opportunity of testing them. Consumption habits of both mothers and fathers serve as instruments. Thus, the vectors z_{ait} and z_{cit} consist of more than one element.¹² Hence, the structural coefficients γ are over-identified and one can apply tests of over-identifying restrictions.

3.2 Estimation

The consumption patterns of both alcohol and tobacco are characterized by large shares of corner solutions as observed in the data used for this study. That is, many consumers do not drink or smoke at all. To account for this, the linear equations (1) and (2) are formulated in terms of latent consumption, rather than actual demand. Latent consumption, i.e. the inclination to consume, might well fall below zero if an individual dislikes tobacco or alcohol. In contrast, actual consumption is always non-negative and zero consumption is observed regardless how strong the disgust at alcohol or nicotine might ever be. Since negative latent consumption is observed as zero actual consumption, the dependent variables are censored and if one accepts the assumption of normally distributed errors, the Tobit model is the obvious estimation procedure both for the reduced form and the structural model¹³, cf. Maddala (1983: 245) and Nelson & Olsen (1978).

Employing a two-step estimation procedure requires some caution in calculating valid standard errors. Either an appropriate correction procedure, cf. Murphy & Topel (1985), is required or bootstrapping, which encompasses both stages of the estimation procedure. We chose the latter strategy and report bootstrapped standard errors for the structural model parameters. Because of censoring in the dependent variables, one cannot calculate regression residuals on which to base tests for over-identifying restrictions. We therefore use an alternative representation of the usual test procedure that is not based on residuals but compares fitted values obtained from estimating

¹²In addition, consumption habits of mothers and fathers (expressed in different consumption levels) are parameterized as sets of dummy-variables not as two single variables.

¹³We do not account for correlated errors by estimating the equations of the systems simultaneously. Potential gains in efficiency that might be achieved by using a system estimator seem to be rather limited since both equations share all/most of the explanatory variables and no cross-equation restrictions are imposed.

the reduced form and the structural model, see McFadden (1999: 8). In addition, we test whether the different estimates for γ_a and γ_c that can be calculated from the reduced form model using coefficients attached to different instrumental-variables do significantly differ. These tests can be regarded as quasi-tests for the validity of over-identifying restrictions.

It is important to note that in a two-step approach not $\text{var}(\varepsilon_a)$ but instead $\text{var}(\gamma_a v_c + \varepsilon_a) = \text{var}(v_a)$ is estimated as second-step regression variance. Clearly, this analogously applies to $\text{var}(\varepsilon_c)$. As long as we are exclusively interested in the model coefficients this is of no relevance to our analysis. Yet, if we were interested in marginal effects on actual, not latent, consumption an approach would be required that would allow for the identification of $\text{var}(\varepsilon_a)$, cf. Smith & Blundell (1986).

4 The Data

4.1 Data Sources

This analysis uses data from the “Population Survey on the Consumption of Psychoactive Substances in Germany”¹⁴ collected by IFT¹⁵ Munich; see Kraus & Augustin (2001) for a detailed description. The data is not a panel but consists of seven separate cross sections at the level of individual consumers. Additionally, five significantly smaller supplementary surveys were conducted primarily to address sampling issues. The (regular) surveys were carried out by mail at irregular intervals in the years 1980, 1986, 1990, 1992, 1995, 1997, and 2000. The sample size varies significantly from 4455 in 1992 to 21632 in 1990. While the first two surveys concentrate solely on West Germany the one carried out in 1992 exclusively deals with the former East German GDR. All other waves cover Germany as a whole. Until 1992 only German citizens but no immigrants without the German citizenship were interviewed. Later on, the whole German speaking population was included in the survey. The data comprises comprehensive information with respect to various legal as well as illicit drugs so also on prevalence, frequency and intensity of consumption, consumption habits and age at first use. Additionally, detailed information on socioeconomic characteristics is provided along with attitudes towards several drug-related issues.

Unfortunately, the questionnaire and the study’s target population have changed

¹⁴Bundesstudie “Repräsentativerhebung zum Gebrauch psychoaktiver Substanzen in Deutschland”

¹⁵Institute for Therapy Research (Institut für Therapieforschung)

over time. The first wave focuses on teens and young adults aged 12 to 24. Later on the upper age limit was successively raised up to 39 in 1990. Since 1995 the target population solely consists of adults aged 18 to 59. As a consequence, consumers' family background increasingly became a minor issue and therefore smoking as well as drinking habits at parental home are not reported in waves more recent than 1992. The recent waves therefore lack those instrumental variables that are decisive for our econometric model and, consequently, our analysis has to rely on data collected in 1980, 1986, 1990, and 1992. We do not consider individuals younger than 16 years for estimating the model. Though numerous people from this age group do report having consumed alcohol or tobacco this often may reflect experimenting rather than already settled consumption patterns. After excluding observations with missing data the sample consists of 26516 individuals.¹⁶

4.2 Variables

In our analysis, the quantity of tobacco consumed is measured by the average number of smoked cigarettes per day. The variable takes the value zero, if the individual answers to be an ex- or never smoker. Alcohol consumption is defined as grams of alcohol drunken per day which is calculated from the reported glasses of beer, wine and spirits per week.¹⁷

Numerous consumers do report to be a drinker or smoker but do not report the amount of alcohol or nicotine consumed. This, for instance, applies to all individuals that smoke cigars, small cigars or pipes, since only cigarette consumers were asked about frequency and amount of tobacco consumption. In our sample, quantitative information regarding consumption is missing for 20 percent of all drinkers and for 17 percent of all smokers. Nevertheless, we do not exclude these observation from our analysis but let the probability to either drink or smoke enter the overall likelihood function being maximized.¹⁸

¹⁶25695 observations are used for estimating the equations explaining alcohol consumption and 26353 are used for estimating the equations explaining tobacco consumption because of missing information about either dependent variable.

¹⁷We use standard values for beverages' alcohol content: one glass of beer (0.3l) contains 12 grams of alcohol, one glass of wine (0.25l) 20 grams, and one glass of spirits (0.02l) 5.6 grams.

¹⁸For the univariate Tobit model this can quite easily be implemented by recoding consumers with no information about quantitative consumption as non-consumers and multiplying the explanatory variables by minus one.

The variable average number of cigarettes smoked per day takes integer values only, so one might think of estimating a classical count-data model rather than the Tobit model proposed in this paper. However, we do not follow this modeling approach since tobacco consumption is not a genuine count-data phenomenon. In fact, any amount of tobacco can be consumed if cigarettes are partially smoked. Moreover, in the survey that is used for our analysis – as in many similar ones – individuals were asked about the average number of cigarettes smoked per day. Consequently, the correct answers to this question would not necessarily take integer values even if cigarettes were always completely smoked by individuals. In other words, the fact that cigarette consumption is measured as an integer is a matter of imprecise reporting, i.e. rounding error, rather than due to an underlying Poisson process. Parametric count-data models like the Poisson or the negative binomial, therefore, are likely to misspecify the true data generating process.

In our empirical analysis, we control for gender, age, age squared and a dummy variable indicating living in West-Germany. Moreover, the vector x_{it} includes parental education, parental marital status, number of children at parents home as well as the way individuals have grown up reflecting the social background of the family. For the latter, we distinguish between having grown up with the mother, the father or both captured by an interaction term. Parental education is included in the specification in form of four dummies: parent has a “low schooling degree”, “a medium degree”, “a high degree”, or a “university degree”. “Parent has no degree” serves as reference group. By interacting parental education with dummy variables indicating having grown up with the parent we allow parental education to have an effect only if the respondent has grown up with the parent. Parental marital status is measured by one dummy variable indicating whether parents are married. Variables often controlled for by other authors – e.g. Chaloupka & Laixuthai (1997), Williams (2005), Yen (2005) – like own education, marital and labor market status, number of children, current living situation as well as income are not used as explanatory variables because of their potential endogeneity. Notwithstanding, we also experimented with including these variables in additional specifications but it turned out that this does not change our main findings.¹⁹

As discussed, parental smoking and drinking habits serve as instruments z_{cit} and z_{ait} . Individuals that already have moved out from parental home are retrospectively asked about these variables. For our regression analysis, each parent’s smoking behavior is

¹⁹See Table 7 and 8 in Appendix B for estimation results.

characterized by three categories: (i) smoker, (ii) ex- or (iii) never-smoker whereas the last one serves as reference group. With regard to parents’ drinking habits instruments are parameterized as three dummy variables for each parent: parent drinks (i) (almost) daily, (ii) several times a week, (iii) several times a month. Parent (almost) never drinks is chosen as reference group. We interacted parental consumption habits with having grown up with this parent in order to make sure that only parental habits enter the analysis that could have influenced children’s consumption behavior. See Tables 5 and 6 in Appendix B for descriptive statistics of all variables.

5 Estimation Results

Naively estimating equations (1) and (2) by a Tobit procedure, ignoring the endogeneity of the right hand side variables consumption of tobacco or alcohol respectively, indicates a strong correlation between the consumption of both substances. The estimates of γ_a as well as γ_c are highly significant and take values of 0.37 and 0.28 respectively. However, these results are certainly biased and do not tell anything about the interdependence of alcohol and tobacco consumption. For this, the instrumental variables approach is required.

5.1 Reduced Form Results

The corresponding results for the reduced form equations (3) and (4) are presented in Table 1. In qualitative terms, the main result is that the chosen instruments are highly correlated with the endogenous variables c_{it}^* and a_{it}^* . Thus, the parents’ smoking habits have a significant effect on the smoking behavior of the children and this holds for drinking behavior as well. The inclination to smoke increases with the intensity of parental tobacco consumption and the propensity to drink increases with the frequency a parent drinks. The findings of relevant instruments are confirmed by *LR*-tests, see Davis & Kim (2002),²⁰ and by tests of joint significance of instruments as well. For smoking the corresponding F-statistics is as high as 272.6, for drinking it takes a value of 104.9. Furthermore, results also exhibit “cross-correlations” between parental drinking habits to individual’s smoking habits and vice versa. Surprisingly, while

²⁰The $\chi^2(1)$ -statistic takes a value of 2484.9 concerning parents’ smoking habits and 716.6 concerning parents’ drinking habits. Because of the absence of *OLS*-residuals Shea-Partial-R-Squares are calculated using Tobit pseudo residuals instead.

Table 1: Results for the reduced form

Variable	Drinking		Smoking	
	Coefficient	St. Error	Coefficient	St. Error
father monthly drinker	1.796**	0.363	-1.542**	0.436
father weekly drinker	3.230**	0.365	-1.507**	0.439
father daily drinker	4.146**	0.357	-1.154**	0.426
mother monthly drinker	2.903**	0.268	-1.199**	0.329
mother weekly drinker	4.686**	0.355	-0.580	0.437
mother daily drinker	4.557**	0.464	-0.569	0.569
father ex-smoker	0.711*	0.288	3.593**	0.366
father smoker	0.821**	0.297	6.995**	0.369
mother ex-smoker	0.185	0.341	2.997**	0.415
mother smoker	0.497	0.296	7.464**	0.345
constant	-8.246**	1.978	-35.171**	2.379
year 1986	-2.826**	0.385	-3.893**	0.467
year 1990	-3.075**	0.313	-4.983**	0.373
year 1992	-7.622**	0.776	-5.667**	0.768
west	-7.738**	0.654	0.119	0.575
female	-11.231**	0.211	-4.449**	0.257
age	2.200**	0.143	3.271**	0.176
age ² /100	-3.120**	0.267	-5.536**	0.327
parents married	-0.215	0.324	-2.086**	0.382
father has low degree	0.766*	0.364	-0.425	0.436
father has medium degree	0.489	0.455	-0.769	0.553
father has high degree	0.025	0.736	-1.908*	0.911
father has uni degree	0.958	0.503	-2.450**	0.614
mother has low degree	-0.141	0.280	-0.520	0.338
mother has medium degree	-0.002	0.359	-0.517	0.439
mother has high degree	-0.980	0.765	-2.852**	0.968
mother has uni degree	-0.094	0.584	-2.121**	0.719
grown up with mother	-2.024**	0.716	-4.596**	0.826
grown up with father	-4.580**	1.230	-5.387**	1.508
grown up with both	1.181	1.326	0.873	1.532
no. children at parents home	0.104	0.075	0.648**	0.089
LR-statistic	4364.426		2419.640	
number of obs.	25695		26353	

Note: ** significant at the 1%-level; * significant at the 5% level.

the correlation between the propensity to drink and parental smoking behavior is positive, we find a significantly, negative correlation between the propensity to smoke and parental drinking habits.

With regard to our control variables the results of the reduced forms exhibit a trend of a decreasing inclination to smoke and drink over time as well as a lower propensity to consume tobacco and alcohol for women compared to men. Moreover, results indicate a significant negative correlation of the propensity to drink or smoke with having grown up with at least one parent compared to individuals having grown up with other persons. Yet, we find a significant positive (but diminishing) correlation with age. Parental education has a significantly negative effect on the propensity to smoke and the number of children at parents home as well as the parental marital status are significant only for the inclination to smoke as well.

When including other, potentially endogenous variables, we find no significant correlation of the inclination to drink and smoke with income; see Table 7 in Appendix B for reduced form estimation results. Yet, the own education level is significantly and negatively correlated as well as being married compared to being single. With regard to the working status results exhibit that unemployed, full time workers as well as persons doing military or community service have a larger propensity to drink and smoke than individuals not participating at the labor market whereas pupils are less inclined. Individuals working part-time or being in vocational training show a higher propensity to smoke than non-participating individuals. Moreover, the higher the number of children the higher is the inclination to smoke. Again, in our final specification we omit these variables because the causal direction is not clear a priori.

5.2 Structural Model Results

Table 2 reports the results for the structural equations (1) and (2). Regarding γ_a and γ_c , the parameters of primary interest, estimates exhibit that (i) smoking significantly increases the propensity to drink but, in contrast, that (ii) drinking significantly decreases the propensity to smoke. In conclusion, the first result argues in favor of complementarity between smoking and drinking while the latter seems to indicate that drinking and smoking were substitutes. The latter, apparently, mirrors the reduced form result that exhibits a negative correlation between the propensity to smoke and parental drinking habits.

Table 2: Results for the structural model

Parameter	Ex. Variable	Drinking		Smoking	
		Estimate	St. Error	Estimate	St. Error
γ_a	fitted smoking	0.089**	0.024	–	–
γ_c	fitted drinking	–	–	-0.224**	0.049
δ_a	father monthly drinker	1.947**	0.299	–	–
	father weekly drinker	3.399**	0.323	–	–
	father daily drinker	4.293**	0.371	–	–
	mother monthly drinker	2.994**	0.276	–	–
	mother weekly drinker	4.707**	0.404	–	–
	mother daily drinker	4.587**	0.513	–	–
δ_c	father ex-smoker	–	–	3.775**	0.440
	father smoker	–	–	7.222**	0.408
	mother ex-smoker	–	–	3.063**	0.420
	mother smoker	–	–	7.604**	0.353
β	constant	-5.234**	1.947	-37.053**	2.387
	year 1986	-2.491**	0.358	-4.515**	0.482
	year 1990	-2.655**	0.340	-5.649**	0.453
	year 1992	-7.136**	0.590	-7.366**	0.892
	west	-7.751**	0.478	-1.618*	0.753
	female	-10.841**	0.253	-6.957**	0.639
	age	1.915**	0.155	3.763**	0.202
	age ² /100	-2.631**	0.281	-6.230**	0.361
	parents married	0.016	0.271	-2.171**	0.388
	father has low degree	0.808*	0.324	-0.325	0.463
	father has medium degree	0.559	0.379	-0.758	0.647
	father has high degree	0.191	0.601	-1.951	1.001
	father has uni degree	1.176**	0.432	-2.296**	0.664
	mother has low degree	-0.102	0.270	-0.575	0.333
	mother has medium degree	0.039	0.341	-0.547	0.491
	mother has high degree	-0.732	0.860	-3.028**	0.957
	mother has uni degree	0.085	0.560	-2.144*	0.884
	grown up with mother	-1.653*	0.674	-5.111**	0.854
	grown up with father	-3.898**	1.232	-6.899**	1.537
	grown up with both	1.078	1.150	1.128	1.515
no. children at parents home	0.045	0.084	0.681**	0.093	
LR-statistic		4362.324		2400.042	
number of obs.		25695		26353	
ovi-test		0.489		0.000	

Notes: ** significant at the the 1% level; * significant at the the 5% level; bootstrapped st. errors (100 repetitions); “ovi-test” indicates p-values for testing over-identifying restrictions.

As it is shown that γ_a and γ_c need to bear the opposite sign than Hicksian cross-price derivatives do, which are well known to be symmetric, this asymmetry seems to contradict theory, immediately raising the question whether we can trust this result. In econometric terms, this means that we have to test if our identifying assumptions hold that parental smoking habits do influence children’s later tobacco consumption but do not affect their drinking behavior conditional on their smoking habits, vice versa. Actually, the over-identification test as presented in Table 2 rejects the null hypothesis for the smoking equation. In contrast, the test statistics for the drinking equation indicate that parental smoking habits are valid instruments for smoking. These results are confirmed by “quasi-over-identification-tests”. With respect to smoking the hypothesis is rejected that all different estimates for γ , which can be calculated from the reduced form, coincide. Yet, the opposite holds for drinking.

These dissymmetric test results might be explained as follows. Apparently, our empirical analysis supports the hypothesis that parental smoking habits do not have effects on children’s future alcohol consumption that operate through unobserved channels. In contrast, the reverse does hold for parental drinking habits. Drinking at parental home, therefore, seems to affect children’s future lives in a more general way than parental smoking habits do. This result is quite plausible in the case of excessive consumption. Severe alcohol abuse is likely to damage family live in general and, therefore, might affect children through various channels, while excessive smoking – though harmful to health – is not likely to have comparable effects. Yet, even beyond this extreme case, drinking, which unlike smoking often is a collaborative activity, might serve as an indicator for unobserved parental attributes like sociableness or fun-lovingness. Such parental attributes potentially are of general importance to children’s character building and therefore might be reflected in children’s future general consumption behavior.

In consequence, we can trust the estimate for γ_a and, therefore, we can conclude that alcohol and tobacco are consumed as complements rather than substitutes. This result is in line with the main body of previous literature that comes to the same conclusion, though applying approaches different to ours. In contrast, the estimate for γ_c is of no value for any economic interpretation. Its negative sign that seemingly indicates substitutability just represents a statistical artefact resting on invalid instruments.

At this point one may wonder why we have allowed $\hat{\gamma}_a$ and $\hat{\gamma}_c$ to exhibit opposite signs rather than imposing the restriction $\text{sign}(\gamma_a) = \text{sign}(\gamma_c)$ on the estimates. The reason for this is the lack of valid instruments for the identification of γ_c . Since we

have not properly identified γ_c , estimates for this parameter cannot contribute to our research question which, in turn, exclusively has to be answered on basis of the estimate for γ_a . This problem is not solved by imposing cross-equation restrictions. Yet, even worse, imposing such restrictions might render $\hat{\gamma}_a$ biased, too.²¹

6 Model Extensions

6.1 Non-Linear Specifications

In the model presented so far the degree of complementarity in the consumption of alcohol and tobacco is captured by the fixed coefficients γ . Yet, the assumption that the degree of complementarity in consumption does not depend on consumption levels seems to be quite strong. One way to address this problem is specifying γ as a function of endogenous variables, i.e. $\gamma_a = \gamma_a(c_{it}^*)$, γ_c analogously. In this case, even if a simple linear relationship is assumed, a reduced form model representation does not longer exist in closed form. Nevertheless, a linear instrumental variable estimator that deals with non-linear functions of endogenous regressors as if they were additional explanatory variables still can be applied in order to obtain estimates for the structural parameters, see Wooldridge (2002: 232). For this approach additional instruments are required. Interaction terms of the original instruments z_{it} or, alternatively, squares and higher order powers of \hat{a}_{it}^* and \hat{c}_{it}^* seem to be the most obvious choices, see Wooldridge (2002: 237). Rather than a linear specification we chose a quadratic one

$$\gamma_a = \gamma_{a1} + \gamma_{a2} \frac{(c_{it}^*)^2}{1000} \quad (5)$$

$$\gamma_c = \gamma_{c1} + \gamma_{c2} \frac{(a_{it}^*)^2}{1000}, \quad (6)$$

which corresponds to cubic structural equations. This choice is for technical reasons. Fitted values for $(a_{it}^*)^3$ and $(c_{it}^*)^3$ still can be obtained from simple Tobit regressions with $(a_{it})^3$ and $(c_{it})^3$ serving as left hand side variables. In contrast – due to non-negativeness – squares do not allow for this approach. Several versions of non-linear model specifications are estimated, using (i) $(\hat{a}_{it}^*)^3$ and $(\hat{c}_{it}^*)^3$, (ii) $(\hat{a}_{it}^*)^2$, $(\hat{c}_{it}^*)^2$, $(\hat{a}_{it}^*)^3$, and $(\hat{c}_{it}^*)^3$ and, (iii) interaction terms of the elements of z_{ait} and, respectively, z_{cit} as

²¹Since the likelihood function of the Tobit model is globally concave, binding inequality constraints will always result in corner solutions. In our case $[\hat{\gamma}_a \ \hat{\gamma}_c] = [-0 \ -0.224]$ maximizes the restricted likelihood function. I.e. the supposedly biased estimator for γ_c prevails over the consistent one for γ_a if the restriction $\text{sign}(\gamma_a) = \text{sign}(\gamma_c)$ is imposed.

Table 3: Results for non-linear model extensions

Model	Parameter	Drinking		Smoking	
		Estimate	St. Error	Estimate	St. Error
(i)	γ_{a1}	0.546	0.394	–	–
	γ_{a2}	-0.461	0.395	–	–
	γ_{c1}	–	–	0.770**	0.247
	γ_{c2}	–	–	-0.167**	0.045
	ovi-test		0.000		0.000
(ii)	γ_{a1}	0.589	0.308	–	–
	γ_{a2}	-0.507	0.310	–	–
	γ_{c1}	–	–	0.079	0.156
	γ_{c2}	–	–	-0.004	0.003
	ovi-test		0.000		0.000
(iii)	γ_{a1}	0.452	0.289	–	–
	γ_{a2}	-0.365	0.258	–	–
	γ_{c1}	–	–	-0.197	0.170
	γ_{c2}	–	–	-0.001	0.028
	ovi-test		0.116		0.000

Note: “ovi-test” indicates p-values for testing over-identifying restrictions.

additional instruments; see Table 3 for the estimation results concerning γ_{a1} , γ_{a2} , γ_{c1} , and γ_{c2} .

These results indicate that the additional insights gained from estimating non-linear extensions to the basic model are rather limited. Tests for over-identifying restrictions always reject the assumptions which are necessary to identify the non-linear model or, at least, do not allow for accepting them. Moreover, the coefficients $\hat{\gamma}_{a2}$ and $\hat{\gamma}_{c2}$ often turn out to be insignificant. Therefore, we stick to the original linear model.

6.2 Separate Models for Males and Females

Our analysis reveals pronounced gender-effects on the consumption of tobacco as well as the consumption of alcohol, see Tables 1 and 2. In order to analyze whether gender does matter not just for the level of consumption but also for the interdependence in consumption, the model is separately estimated for males and females. Table 4 displays estimates for the structural coefficients γ ; see Tables 9 to 12 in Appendix B for a comprehensive list of estimation results.

Though the *LR*-statistic²² strongly argues in favor of separate models for males

²²The comprehensive $\chi^2(58)$ -statistic for the reduced form takes a value as high as 2978. If smoking

Table 4: Results for separate models for males and females

Gender	Parameter	Drinking		Smoking	
		Estimate	St. Error	Estimate	St. Error
male	γ_a	0.135**	0.041	–	–
	γ_c	–	–	-0.159**	0.055
	ovi-test		0.379		0.000
female	γ_a	0.037	0.025	–	–
	γ_c	–	–	-0.337**	0.102
	ovi-test		0.920		0.061

Note: “ovi-test” indicates p-values for testing over-identifying restrictions.

and females, in qualitative terms the results are similar to those obtained from the pooled model for either gender. For both men and women $\hat{\gamma}_c$ is negative, yet - as in the pooled model - over-identification tests reject the identifying assumptions. In contrast, $\hat{\gamma}_a$ takes positive values for both genders and its identification is not fundamentally questioned for the males’ or for the females’ model by the relevant test-statistics.

The main difference to the results obtained from the split model, therefore, is a quantitative one. While for males $\hat{\gamma}_a$ is of a substantially larger magnitude than in the pooled model, the parameter takes a much smaller value for females and even becomes insignificant. Therefore, the positive effect from smoking to drinking that is found in this analysis is a males’ phenomenon while for females it seems to be of much smaller magnitude and might even be non-existent. Thus, drinking habits seem to differ between males and females even beyond the mere level of alcohol consumption. This result might reflect gender-specific variation in preferences as well as differing social conventions.

7 Conclusions

In this paper a new approach for analyzing the interdependence in the consumption of alcohol and tobacco was proposed and applied to German survey data. We use an alternative measure of complementarity which – in qualitative terms – is shown to be equivalent to conventional Hicksian cross-price derivatives, yet it is not based on the estimation of cross-price effects. In fact, the proposed instrumental variable approach mimics an experimental study and therefore – in contrast to the main body of the existing literature – does not rely on high-quality price data which often may

and drinking are treated separately, pooled models are rejected for either drug.

not be available. This makes it particularly well suited to the German case where price variation for both goods is extremely limited. Moreover, the lack of price variation is a frequent obstacle to survey data based analyses of consumers' behavior, not unique to the case of alcohol and tobacco. Instrumental variables approaches, similar to the one proposed here, might therefore serve as a promising modeling strategy if interdependence in consumption is analyzed and if sufficient price data for estimating a conventional demand system is not available.

Our estimation results suggest that tobacco and alcohol are consumed as complements. This result rests on a positive effect from the consumption of tobacco to consumption of alcohol that is found in the data. From a policy perspective, this can be interpreted as follows: if the government could achieve a reduction in smoking or in the inclination to smoke by any anti-drug policy, this would also decrease the propensity to consume alcohol. Thus, there would be no unintended side-effects in form of an increased (ab)use of alcohol to compensate for the reduced level of nicotine intake. Even the reverse, i.e. a reduction in the consumption of both drugs, seems to be the consequence. Yet, this result is statistically firm only for males. For females this effect seems to be much smaller and might even be non-existent.

References

- Bantle, C. & J. Haisken-DeNew (2002):** Smoke Signals: The Intergenerational Transmission of Smoking Behavior, *DIW Discussion Paper 277*.
- Bask, M. & M. Melkersen (2004):** Rationally Addicted to Drinking and Smoking? *Applied Economics* 36, 373-381.
- Becker, G.S. & K.M. Murphy (1988):** A theory of Rational Addiction, *American Economic Review* 84, 396-418.
- Cameron, L. & J. Williams (2001):** Cannabis, Alcohol and Cigarettes: Substitutes or Complements?, *The Economic Record* 77, 19-34.
- Chaloupka, F.J. & M. Grossman (1996):** Price, Tobacco Control Policies and Youth Smoking, *NBER Working Paper 5740*.
- Chaloupka, F.J. & A. Laixuthai (1997):** Do Youths Substitute Alcohol and Marijuana? Some Econometric Evidence, *Eastern Economic Journal* 23, 253-276.
- Davis, G.C. & S.Y. Kim (2002):** Measuring Instrument Relevance in the Single Endogenous Regressor – Multiple Instrument case: a simplifying procedure, *Economics Letters* 74, 321-325.
- Decker, S.L. & A.E. Schwartz (2000):** Cigarettes and Alcohol: Substitutes or Complements?, *NBER Working Paper 7535*.
- DiNardo, J. & T. Lemieux (2001):** Alcohol, Marijuana, and American Youth: the Unintended Effects of Government Regulation, *Journal of Health Economics* 20, 991-1010.
- Florkowski, W.J. & K.T. McNamara (1992):** Policy Implications of Alcohol and Tobacco Demand in Poland, *Journal of Policy Modelling* 14, 93-99.
- Goel, R.K. & M.J. Morey (1995):** The Interdependence of Cigarette and Liquor Demand, *Southern Economics Journal* 62, 451-459.
- Jimenez, S. & J.M. Labeaga (1994):** It is Possible to Reduce Tobacco Consumption via Alcohol Taxation, *Health Economics* 3, 231-241.

- Jones, A.M. (1989):** A System Approach to the Demand for Alcohol and Tobacco, *Bulletin of Economic Research* 41, 85-106.
- Kraus, L. & R. Augustin (2001):** Population Survey on the Consumption of Psychoactive Substances in the German Adult Population 2000, *Sucht - Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Praxis* 47, Sonderheft 1, 1-88.
- Lee, Y.G. & M. Abdel-Ghany (2004):** American Youth Consumption of Licit and Illicit Substances, *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 28, 454-465.
- Maddala, G.S. (1983):** Limited-Dependent and Qualitative Variables in Econometrics, Cambridge U.K., Cambridge University Press.
- McFadden, D. (1999):** Lecture Notes – Econometrics and Statistics, download: http://emlab.berkeley.edu/users/mcfadden/e240b_f01/ch6.pdf.
- Murphy, K.M. & R.H. Topel (1985):** Estimation and Inference in Two-Step Econometric Models, *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 3, 370-379.
- Nelson, F.D. & L. Olsen (1978):** Specification and Estimation of a Simultaneous Equation Model with Limited Dependent Variables, *International Economic Review* 19, 695-710.
- Picone, G.A., F. Sloan & J.G. Trogdon (2004):** The Effect on of the Tobacco Settlement and Smoking Bans on Alcohol Consumption, *Health Economics* 13, 1063-1080.
- Smith, R. & R. Blundell (1986):** An Exogeneity Test for the Simultaneous Equation Tobit Model with an Application to Labor Supply, *Econometrica* 54, 679-685.
- Su, S.B. & S.T. Yen (2000):** A Censored System of Cigarette and Alcohol Consumption, *Applied Economics* 32, 729-737.
- Tauras, J.A. & F.J. Chaloupka (1999):** Price, Clean Indoor Air Laws, and Cigarette Smoking: Evidence from Longitudinal Data for Young Adults, *NBER Working Paper* 6937.
- Warschburger, S. (2000):** Rauchen und Sozialversicherung: Eine empirische Analyse der Konsequenzen veränderter Rauchgewohnheiten auf das bundesdeutsche Rentensystem, Ph.D.-Thesis University of Dortmund.

- Wasserman, J. , W.G. Manning, J.P. Newhouse & J.D. Winkler (1991):** The Effects of Excise Taxes and Regulations on Cigarette Smoking, *Journal of Health Economics* 10, 43-64.
- Williams, J., R.L. Pacula, F.J. Chloupka & H. Wechsler (2001):** Alcohol and Marijuana use among College Studens: Economic Complements or Substitutes?, *NBER Working Paper* 8401.
- Wooldridge, J.M. (2002):** *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data*, Cambridge Massachusetts, MIT Press.
- Yen, S.T. (2005):** A Multivariate Sample-Selection Model: Estimating Cigarette and Alcohol demands with Zero Observations, *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 87, 453-466.
- Zhao, X. & M.N. Harris (2004):** Demand for Marijuana, Alcohol and Tobacco: Participation, Levels of Consumption and Cross-equation Correlation, *The Economic Record* 80, 394-410.

Appendix

A Equivalence of Measures of Complementarity

In this appendix we show that the cross price effect of increasing the price of tobacco (alcohol) on the Hicksian demand for alcohol (tobacco) has always the opposite sign of the effect resulting from increasing the consumption of tobacco (alcohol) on the Marshallian demand for alcohol (tobacco).

To see this, we write the consumer's direct utility as $U(a, c, w)$, where we denote by a, c , and w the amounts of consumed alcohol, tobacco and a compound good consisting of all other goods, respectively. For simplicity, any subscripts i and t denoting specific individuals and periods are skipped. The corresponding prices are p_a, p_c , and p_w . Hicksian demand for alcohol is written as $a^H(p_a, p_c, p_w, \bar{U})$, for some fixed utility level \bar{U} . Accordingly, the restricted Marshallian demand for alcohol, if the consumption of tobacco \bar{c} is given, is denoted by $a^M(p_a, p_c, p_w, \bar{c}, y)$ where y is income. We now state the following result:

Proposition: If U is strictly quasi-concave, and both the Marshallian and the Hicksian demand is characterized by interior solutions in a, c , and w , then

$$\text{sign} \left[\frac{\partial a^H(p_a, p_c, p_w, \bar{U})}{\partial p_c} \right] = -\text{sign} \left[\frac{\partial a^M(p_a, p_c, p_w, \bar{c}, y)}{\partial \bar{c}} \right]. \quad (7)$$

Proof: By definition $a^H(p_a, p_c, p_w, \bar{U})$ is the solution of $\min_{a,c,w} \{p_a a + p_c c + p_w w\}$ subject to

$$U(a, c, w) = \bar{U}. \quad (8)$$

The first-order necessary conditions for the expenditure minimum are given by

$$U_a(a, c, w) = \lambda^{-1} p_a \equiv \mu p_a \quad (9)$$

$$U_c(a, c, w) = \lambda^{-1} p_c \equiv \mu p_c \quad (10)$$

$$U_w(a, c, w) = \lambda^{-1} p_w \equiv \mu p_w \quad (11)$$

where λ is the Langrange multiplier with respect to (8) and $\mu = \lambda^{-1}$. In order to obtain $\partial a / \partial p_c$ we differentiate the equation system (9)-(11) and (8) totally with respect to p_c to obtain:

$$\begin{bmatrix} U_{aa} & U_{ac} & U_{aw} & -p_a \\ U_{ac} & U_{cc} & U_{cw} & -p_c \\ U_{aw} & U_{cw} & U_{ww} & -p_w \\ \mu p_a & \mu p_c & \mu p_w & 0 \end{bmatrix} \times \begin{bmatrix} \partial a^H / \partial p_c \\ \partial c^H / \partial p_c \\ \partial w^H / \partial p_c \\ \partial \mu / \partial p_c \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \mu \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (12)$$

where we have made use of (9)-(11) in the last row of the matrix. Solving (12) we obtain for $\partial a/\partial p_c$ (we omit the expressions of the other effects being of no further interest here):

$$\frac{\partial a^H}{\partial p_c} = -\mu \frac{p_w^2 U_{ac} - p_c p_w U_{aw} - p_a p_w U_{cw} + p_a p_c U_{ww}}{D} \quad (13)$$

where the denominator D is given by

$$\begin{aligned} D = & p_a^2 [U_{cc} U_{ww} - U_{cw}^2] + p_c^2 [U_{aa} U_{ww} - U_{aw}^2] + p_w^2 [U_{aa} U_{cc} - U_{ac}^2] \\ & + 2p_a p_c [U_{aw} U_{cw} - U_{ac} U_{ww}] + 2p_a p_w [U_{ac} U_{cw} - U_{cc} U_{aw}] \\ & + 2p_c p_w [U_{ac} U_{aw} - U_{aa} U_{cw}] \end{aligned}$$

and is greater than zero by strict quasi-concavity and the resulting second-order condition of the consumer's expenditure minimization problem.

We now look at the restricted Marshallian demand $a^M(p_a, p_c, p_w, \bar{c}, y)$ which by definition is the solution of $\max_{a,c,w} U(a, c, w)$ subject to

$$p_a a + p_c c + p_w w = y \quad (14)$$

and $c \leq \bar{c}$. The Lagrange function is then given by $\mathcal{L}(a, c, w, \mu, \nu) = U(a, c, w) + \mu[y - p_a a - p_c c - p_w w] + \nu[\bar{c} - c]$. Assuming that the constraint $c \leq \bar{c}$ holds with equality, the first-order necessary conditions for the utility maximum are given by

$$U_a(a, \bar{c}, w) = \mu p_a \quad (15)$$

$$U_w(a, \bar{c}, w) = \mu p_w. \quad (16)$$

Differentiating (15), (16) and (14) with respect to \bar{c} we obtain:

$$\begin{bmatrix} U_{aa} & U_{aw} & -p_a \\ U_{aw} & U_{ww} & -p_w \\ p_a & p_w & 0 \end{bmatrix} \times \begin{bmatrix} \partial a^M / \partial \bar{c} \\ \partial w^M / \partial \bar{c} \\ \partial \mu / \partial \bar{c} \end{bmatrix} = - \begin{bmatrix} U_{ac} \\ U_{cw} \\ p_c \end{bmatrix}.$$

Solving this system we obtain for $\partial a/\partial \bar{c}$ (again omitting the other expressions) we obtain:

$$\frac{\partial a^M}{\partial \bar{c}} = - \frac{p_w^2 U_{ac} - p_c p_w U_{aw} - p_a p_w U_{cw} + p_a p_c U_{ww}}{D'} \quad (17)$$

where the denominator $D' = p_w^2 U_{aa} + p_a^2 U_{ww} - 2p_a p_w U_{aw}$ is negative by strict quasi-concavity.

Finally, comparing (13) and (17) we obtain

$$\frac{\partial a^H}{\partial p_c} = \frac{\partial a^M}{\partial \bar{c}} \frac{\mu D'}{D} \quad (18)$$

establishing (7).

B Supplementary Tables

Table 5: Description of dependent variables

Variable	Mean	St. Dev.	Number of obs.
All			
drinker	0.729	0.444	25654
smoker	0.428	0.495	26353
grams of alcohol drunken by drinkers	15.112	16.418	15505
number of cigarettes smoked by smokers	16.043	8.547	9372
drinker without quant. information	0.203	0.402	18711
smoker without quant. information	0.169	0.374	11272
Males			
drinker	0.838	0.369	12916
smoker	0.462	0.499	13063
grams of alcohol drunken by drinkers	19.076	18.763	9056
number of cigarettes smoked by smokers	17.433	8.801	5061
drinker without quant. information	0.185	0.389	10817
smoker without quant. information	0.161	0.368	6034
Females			
drinker	0.620	0.486	12738
smoker	0.394	0.489	13290
grams of alcohol drunken by drinkers	9.546	10.037	6449
number of cigarettes smoked by smokers	14.412	7.936	4311
drinker without quant. information	0.228	0.419	7894
smoker without quant. information	0.177	0.382	5238

Table 6: Description of explanatory variables

Variable	All		Males		Females	
	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.
<i>father never drinker</i>	0.186	0.389	0.180	0.384	0.193	0.395
father monthly drinker	0.236	0.424	0.236	0.425	0.235	0.424
father weekly drinker	0.259	0.438	0.268	0.443	0.250	0.433
father daily drinker	0.319	0.466	0.316	0.465	0.323	0.468
<i>mother never drinker</i>	0.507	0.500	0.499	0.500	0.514	0.500
mother monthly drinker	0.285	0.452	0.292	0.455	0.280	0.449
mother weekly drinker	0.136	0.342	0.141	0.348	0.130	0.336
mother daily drinker	0.072	0.259	0.068	0.251	0.076	0.266
<i>father never-smoker</i>	0.276	0.447	0.275	0.447	0.276	0.447
father ex-smoker	0.351	0.477	0.357	0.479	0.345	0.475
father smoker	0.373	0.484	0.368	0.482	0.379	0.485
<i>mother never-smoker</i>	0.674	0.469	0.676	0.468	0.673	0.469
mother ex-smoker	0.126	0.331	0.128	0.334	0.124	0.330
mother smoker	0.200	0.400	0.197	0.397	0.203	0.402
<i>year 1980</i>	0.187	0.390	0.193	0.395	0.180	0.384
year 1986	0.128	0.334	0.133	0.340	0.123	0.328
year 1990	0.581	0.493	0.573	0.495	0.590	0.492
year 1992	0.104	0.305	0.101	0.302	0.107	0.309
west	0.838	0.368	0.844	0.362	0.832	0.374
female	0.503	0.500	–	–	–	–
age	24.318	6.297	24.213	6.275	24.421	6.317
age ² /100	6.310	3.351	6.256	0.064	6.363	3.366
parents married	0.807	0.395	0.811	0.392	0.805	0.396
<i>father has no school degree</i>	0.139	0.346	0.138	0.344	0.140	0.347
father has a low degree	0.531	0.499	0.533	0.499	0.529	0.499
father has a medium degree	0.156	0.363	0.159	0.366	0.151	0.358
father has a high degree	0.032	0.175	0.032	0.176	0.032	0.176
father has a university degree	0.142	0.349	0.138	0.345	0.148	0.355
<i>mother has no school degree</i>	0.309	0.462	0.304	0.460	0.315	0.464
mother has a low degree	0.416	0.493	0.424	0.494	0.408	0.491
mother has a medium degree	0.191	0.393	0.189	0.391	0.193	0.395
mother has a high degree	0.024	0.154	0.025	0.157	0.023	0.150
mother has a university degree	0.059	0.236	0.058	0.234	0.061	0.240
grown up with mother	0.953	0.212	0.954	0.211	0.952	0.214
grown up with father	0.891	0.312	0.891	0.312	0.890	0.312
grown up with both	0.881	0.324	0.881	0.324	0.882	0.323
no. children at parents home	2.752	1.462	2.732	1.434	2.772	1.488

Notes: Descriptive statistics for those 26516 observations that are included in at least one of the reduced form regressions; statistics are proposed for all variables prior to interacting with dummies indicating having grown up with the parent; reference-categories italicized.

Table 7: **Reduced Forms – spec. including potentially endogenous variables**

Variable	Drinking		Smoking	
	Coefficient	St. Error	Coefficient	St. Error
father monthly drinker	1.722**	0.379	-1.217**	0.450
father weekly drinker	3.274**	0.382	-1.244**	0.452
father daily drinker	4.108**	0.374	-1.146**	0.440
mother monthly drinker	2.941**	0.281	-0.606	0.339
mother weekly drinker	4.518**	0.371	-0.217	0.451
mother daily drinker	4.409**	0.483	-0.159	0.582
father ex-smoker	0.654*	0.301	3.562**	0.377
father smoker	0.716*	0.312	6.413**	0.381
mother ex-smoker	0.577	0.356	3.277**	0.426
mother smoker	0.552	0.311	6.729**	0.356
constant	6.896*	3.022	-21.458**	3.537
year 1986	-2.300**	0.420	-2.904**	0.498
year 1990	-2.618**	0.355	-4.167**	0.417
year 1992	-7.431**	0.900	-6.317**	0.868
west	-7.888**	0.787	-0.414	0.696
female	-10.818**	0.239	-3.728**	0.286
age	1.178**	0.201	2.596**	0.239
age ² /100	-1.259**	0.353	-4.342**	0.420
parents married	-0.167	0.341	-1.464**	0.397
parents not married but together	-2.210	1.903	-0.622	2.067
father has low degree	0.817*	0.381	0.023	0.449
father has medium degree	0.661	0.481	0.785	0.575
father has high degree	-0.068	0.784	0.684	0.951
father has uni degree	1.414**	0.539	0.603	0.648
mother has low degree	-0.123	0.293	-0.111	0.347
mother has medium degree	0.001	0.381	0.749	0.458
mother has high degree	-0.690	0.809	-0.962	1.008
mother has uni degree	-0.330	0.620	-0.429	0.754
grown up with mother	-2.119**	0.756	-4.067**	0.859
grown up with father	-4.892**	1.364	-5.722**	1.554
grown up with both	1.572	1.391	0.599	1.578
no. children at parents home	0.093	0.083	0.522**	0.096
married	-1.514**	0.382	-2.456**	0.440
separated / divorced	-0.050	0.672	3.916**	0.747
widowed	-2.177	2.595	-0.392	3.051
number own children	-0.201	0.225	0.642*	0.250
low school degree	-2.399**	0.701	-2.418**	0.764
medium school degree	-2.011**	0.707	-5.805**	0.776
high school degree	-2.107**	0.744	-10.319**	0.829
unemployed	2.645**	0.766	5.578**	0.880
part time job	0.226	0.677	2.333**	0.805
full time job	2.116**	0.508	3.643**	0.612
military or civil service	2.398*	0.967	2.449*	1.157
less than a part time job	1.317	1.095	3.673**	1.249
pupil	-5.530**	0.920	-8.223**	1.065
student	0.538	0.700	0.221	0.873
in vocational training	0.170	0.614	2.934**	0.734
in other kind of training	0.646	0.827	2.271*	0.957
number of persons per household	-0.027	0.104	-0.903**	0.124
household income 1000 – 1499 DM	-0.119	0.705	0.368	0.822
household income 1500 – 1999 DM	-0.999	0.653	0.334	0.767
household income 2000 – 2499 DM	-0.618	0.641	-0.168	0.754
household income 2500 – 2999 DM	-0.800	0.635	-0.160	0.752
household income 3000 – 3999 DM	-1.068	0.630	-0.387	0.749
household income 4000 DM and more	-0.073	0.638	0.399	0.760
number of obs.		23195		23746

Note: ** significant at the 1%-level; * significant at the 5% level.

Table 8: Structural model – spec. including potentially endogenous variables

Parameter	Ex. Variable	Drinking		Smoking		
		Coefficient	St. Error	Coefficient	St. Error	
γ_a	fitted smoking	0.100**	0.029	–	–	
γ_c	fitted drinking	–	–	-0.155**	0.050	
δ_a	father monthly drinker	1.854**	0.342	–	–	
	father weekly drinker	3.417**	0.342	–	–	
	father daily drinker	4.244**	0.348	–	–	
	mother monthly drinker	3.001**	0.260	–	–	
	mother weekly drinker	4.540**	0.404	–	–	
δ_c	mother daily drinker	4.418**	0.509	–	–	
	father ex-smoker	–	–	3.645**	0.433	
	father smoker	–	–	6.501**	0.414	
	mother ex-smoker	–	–	3.408**	0.482	
β	mother smoker	–	–	6.863**	0.355	
	constant	8.983**	2.797	-20.285**	3.891	
	year 1986	-2.010**	0.473	-3.252**	0.505	
	year 1990	-2.199**	0.407	-4.569**	0.485	
	year 1992	-6.791**	0.810	-7.480**	0.990	
	west	-7.834**	0.667	-1.631	0.900	
	female	-10.451**	0.287	-5.397**	0.690	
	age	0.917**	0.204	2.776**	0.270	
	age ² /100	-0.817*	0.367	-4.529**	0.467	
	parents married	0.036	0.413	-1.507**	0.425	
	parents not married but together	-2.098	2.333	-0.979	2.119	
	father has low degree	0.822*	0.343	0.113	0.499	
	father has medium degree	0.591	0.434	0.848	0.570	
	father has high degree	-0.125	0.733	0.680	0.944	
	father has uni degree	1.372**	0.514	0.814	0.735	
	mother has low degree	-0.114	0.315	-0.129	0.368	
	mother has medium degree	-0.066	0.391	0.766	0.539	
	mother has high degree	-0.582	0.740	-1.003	1.136	
	mother has uni degree	-0.279	0.531	-0.447	0.811	
	grown up with mother	-1.698	0.920	-4.355**	0.830	
	grown up with father	-4.192**	1.433	-6.980**	1.698	
	grown up with both	1.468	1.507	0.825	1.665	
	no. children at parents home	0.039	0.083	0.540**	0.091	
	β	married	-1.262**	0.411	-2.705**	0.504
		separated / divorced	-0.441	0.852	3.922**	0.742
		widowed	-2.189	2.541	-0.822	3.271
		number own children	-0.270	0.241	0.610*	0.267
low school degree		-2.143*	1.020	-2.845**	0.627	
medium school degree		-1.402	1.013	-6.199**	0.634	
high school degree		-1.040	1.088	-10.738**	0.763	
unemployed		2.078*	0.866	5.984**	0.763	
part time job		-0.013	0.614	2.384**	0.728	
full time job		1.743**	0.478	3.948**	0.605	
military or civil service		2.143*	0.968	2.821*	1.401	
less than a part time job		0.953	1.395	3.886**	1.064	
pupil		-4.676**	1.150	-9.174**	0.848	
student		0.511	0.699	0.299	0.869	
in vocational training		-0.133	0.603	2.934**	0.615	
in other kind of training		0.416	0.835	2.346*	0.934	
number of persons per household		0.062	0.123	-0.907**	0.163	
household income 1000 – 1499 DM		-0.162	0.759	0.339	0.780	
household income 1500 – 1999 DM		-1.030	0.691	0.186	0.861	
household income 2000 – 2499 DM		-0.598	0.674	-0.266	0.812	
household income 2500 – 2999 DM		-0.779	0.624	-0.296	0.860	
household income 3000 – 3999 DM		-1.026	0.632	-0.568	0.844	
household income 4000 DM and more		-0.108	0.672	0.390	0.870	
number of obs.			23195		23746	
ovi-test			0.472		0.038	

Notes: ** significant at the the 1% level; * significant at the the 5% level; bootstrapped st. errors (100 repetitions); “ovi-test” indicates p-values for testing over-identifying restrictions.

Table 9: Males: reduced form estimates

Variable	Drinking		Smoking	
	Coefficient	St. Error	Coefficient	St. Error
father monthly drinker	1.820**	0.604	-2.006**	0.634
father weekly drinker	4.200**	0.606	-2.076**	0.439
father daily drinker	5.914**	0.597	-1.154	0.620
mother monthly drinker	2.689**	0.443	-1.095**	0.471
mother weekly drinker	4.784**	0.584	-0.722	0.627
mother daily drinker	4.291**	0.795	-0.305	0.840
father ex-smoker	1.257**	0.476	3.957**	0.523
father smoker	1.209*	0.497	7.411**	0.535
mother ex-smoker	0.235	0.566	2.758**	0.598
mother smoker	0.764	0.491	6.934**	0.501
constant	-18.087**	3.310	-40.047**	3.433
year 1986	-1.564*	0.628	-3.968**	0.663
year 1990	-2.241**	0.515	-5.763**	0.538
year 1992	-5.609**	1.363	-7.078**	1.116
west	-8.271**	1.169	-2.138**	0.839
age	2.952**	0.237	3.666**	0.254
age ² /100	-4.278**	0.445	-6.026**	0.473
parents married	-0.407	0.421	-2.000**	0.556
father has low degree	0.760	0.606	-1.243*	0.630
father has medium degree	-0.126	0.754	-2.018*	0.797
father has high degree	-1.307	1.222	-2.439	1.314
father has uni degree	-0.077	0.846	-3.693**	0.892
mother has low degree	-0.591	0.464	-0.447	0.488
mother has medium degree	-0.179	0.602	-0.193	0.639
mother has high degree	-1.596	1.242	-2.441	1.346
mother has uni degree	-1.293	0.986	-2.038	1.051
grown up with mother	-4.071**	1.199	-4.970**	1.216
grown up with father	-8.252**	2.111	-7.333**	2.168
grown up with both	4.409*	2.154	4.213	2.206
no. children at parents home	0.338**	0.128	0.764**	0.131
LR-statistic	1084.954		1177.506	
number of obs.	12922		13064	

Note: ** significant at the 1%-level; * significant at the 5% level.

Table 10: **Females: reduced form estimates**

Variable	Drinking		Smoking	
	Coefficient	St. Error	Coefficient	St. Error
father monthly drinker	1.413**	0.346	-1.059	0.590
father weekly drinker	1.863**	0.350	-0.914	0.596
father daily drinker	2.021**	0.339	-1.156*	0.574
mother monthly drinker	2.505**	0.260	-1.355**	0.452
mother weekly drinker	3.903**	0.344	-0.405	0.599
mother daily drinker	4.230**	0.433	-1.324	0.760
father ex-smoker	0.051	0.277	3.163**	0.502
father smoker	0.296	0.283	6.402**	0.501
mother ex-smoker	0.236	0.327	3.239**	0.567
mother smoker	0.214	0.285	7.856**	0.468
constant	-7.900**	1.881	-34.204**	3.238
year 1986	-3.698**	0.377	-3.741**	0.647
year 1990	-3.372**	0.303	-4.166**	0.509
year 1992	-6.943**	0.709	-4.368**	1.043
west	-4.853**	0.586	2.248**	0.778
age	1.216**	0.136	2.852**	0.239
age ² /100	-1.606**	0.255	-5.008**	0.445
parents married	0.015	0.309	-2.137**	0.516
father has low degree	0.650	0.348	0.383	0.592
father has medium degree	0.945*	0.438	0.503	0.754
father has high degree	1.071	0.708	-1.439	1.241
father has uni degree	1.749**	0.478	-1.127	0.832
mother has low degree	0.286	0.270	-2.122*	0.967
mother has medium degree	0.250	0.342	-0.542	0.460
mother has high degree	-0.146	0.751	-0.876	0.593
mother has uni degree	0.905	0.552	-3.229*	1.376
grown up with mother	-0.123	0.682	-4.149**	1.103
grown up with father	-0.026	1.279	-3.035	2.068
grown up with both	-2.453	1.304	-2.730	2.098
no. children at parents home	-0.116	0.071	0.536**	0.118
LR-statistic	966.002		1098.150	
number of obs.	12773		13291	

Note: ** significant at the 1%-level; * significant at the 5% level.

Table 11: Males: structural form estimates

Parameter	Ex. Variable	Drinking		Smoking	
		Estimate	St. Error	Estimate	St. Error
γ_a	fitted smoking	0.135**	0.041	–	–
γ_c	fitted drinking	–	–	-0.159**	0.055
δ_a	father monthly drinker	2.108**	0.458	–	–
	father weekly drinker	4.529**	0.533	–	–
	father daily drinker	6.122**	0.547	–	–
	mother monthly drinker	2.813**	0.414	–	–
	mother weekly drinker	4.855**	0.563	–	–
	mother daily drinker	4.279**	0.885	–	–
δ_c	father ex-smoker	–	–	4.209**	0.596
	father smoker	–	–	7.697**	0.557
	mother ex-smoker	–	–	2.824**	0.592
	mother smoker	–	–	7.092**	0.544
β	constant	-12.869**	3.167	-42.937**	3.797
	year 1986	-1.048	0.666	-4.218**	0.727
	year 1990	-1.494*	0.593	-6.119**	0.603
	year 1992	-4.694**	1.218	-7.970**	1.220
	west	-8.001**	0.922	-3.481**	0.954
	age	2.467**	0.242	4.134**	0.311
	age ² /100	-3.472**	0.441	-6.696**	0.548
	parents married	-0.034	0.608	-2.142**	0.615
	father has low degree	0.940	0.656	-1.264	0.671
	father has medium degree	0.150	0.779	-2.234**	0.768
	father has high degree	-0.972	1.225	-2.771*	1.375
	father has uni degree	0.432	0.839	-3.903**	0.957
	mother has low degree	-0.536	0.397	-0.593	0.465
	mother has medium degree	-0.159	0.549	-0.287	0.659
	mother has high degree	-1.249	1.057	-2.695*	1.307
	mother has uni degree	-1.020	0.950	-2.240*	1.044
	grown up with mother	-3.429*	1.565	-5.770**	1.255
	grown up with father	-6.939**	1.968	-9.329**	2.041
	grown up with both	3.775	2.154	4.877*	2.063
	no. children at parents home	0.232	0.144	0.835**	0.132
LR-statistic		1082.242		1158.070	
number of obs.		12922		13064	
ovi-test		0.379		0.000	

Notes: ** significant at the the 1% level; * significant at the the 5% level; bootstrapped st. errors (100 repetitions); “ovi-test” indicates p-values for testing over-identifying restrictions.

Table 12: **Females: structural form estimates**

Parameter	Ex. Variable	Drinking		Smoking	
		Estimate	St. Error	Estimate	St. Error
γ_a	fitted smoking	0.038	0.025	–	–
γ_c	fitted drinking	–	–	-0.337**	0.102
δ_a	father monthly drinker	1.453**	0.370	–	–
	father weekly drinker	1.898**	0.411	–	–
	father daily drinker	2.070**	0.386	–	–
	mother monthly drinker	2.556**	0.253	–	–
	mother weekly drinker	3.918**	0.311	–	–
	mother daily drinker	4.272**	0.449	–	–
δ_c	father ex-smoker	–	–	3.145**	0.513
	father smoker	–	–	6.458**	0.488
	mother ex-smoker	–	–	3.343**	0.588
	mother smoker	–	–	7.960**	0.487
β	constant	-6.610**	1.830	-36.975**	3.659
	year 1986	-3.556**	0.367	-4.965**	0.879
	year 1990	-3.213**	0.355	-5.267**	0.655
	year 1992	-6.772**	0.626	-6.672**	1.376
	west	-4.932**	0.466	0.642	1.039
	age	1.109**	0.139	3.265**	0.276
	age ² /100	-1.418**	0.253	-5.551**	0.517
	parents married	0.087	0.353	-2.119**	0.581
	father has low degree	0.634*	0.314	0.584	0.598
	father has medium degree	0.921*	0.398	0.807	0.842
	father has high degree	1.119	0.697	-1.077	1.452
	father has uni degree	1.787**	0.471	-0.506	0.885
	mother has low degree	0.306	0.279	-0.453	0.497
	mother has medium degree	0.286	0.330	-0.795	0.692
	mother has high degree	-0.015	0.842	-3.155	1.758
	mother has uni degree	0.993	0.580	-1.848	1.061
	grown up with mother	0.017	0.649	-4.177**	1.218
	grown up with father	0.087	1.896	-3.346	2.191
	grown up with both	-2.335	1.820	-3.617	2.416
	no. children at parents home	-0.136	0.073	0.498**	0.119
LR-statistic		965.576		1090.842	
number of obs.		12773		13291	
ovi-test		0.920		0.061	

Notes: ** significant at the the 1% level; * significant at the the 5% level; bootstrapped st. errors (100 repetitions); “ovi-test” indicates p-values for testing over-identifying restrictions.