

Brun, Martín; De Vera, Micole; Kadriu, Valon; Mierisch, Fabian

Working Paper

Reproduction of "Teaching Norms: Direct Evidence of Parental Transmission"

I4R Discussion Paper Series, No. 106

Provided in Cooperation with:
The Institute for Replication (I4R)

Suggested Citation: Brun, Martín; De Vera, Micole; Kadriu, Valon; Mierisch, Fabian (2024) :
Reproduction of "Teaching Norms: Direct Evidence of Parental Transmission", I4R Discussion
Paper Series, No. 106, Institute for Replication (I4R), s.l.

This Version is available at:
<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/286490>

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.



No. 106

I4R DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

Reproduction of “Teaching Norms: Direct Evidence of Parental Transmission”

Martín Brun

Micole De Vera

Valon Kadriu

Fabian Mierisch

March 2024

I4R DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

I4R DP No. 106

Reproduction of “Teaching Norms: Direct Evidence of Parental Transmission”

Martín Brun¹, Micole De Vera², Valon Kadriu³, Fabian Mierisch⁴

¹Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona/Spain

*²Center for Monetary and Financial Studies (CEMFI), Madrid/Spain and
IZA – Institute of Labor Economics, Bonn/Germany*

*³University of Kassel/Germany and International Center for Higher Education Research
(INCHER), Kassel/Germany*

⁴Catholic University Eichstätt-Ingolstadt/Germany

MARCH 2024

Any opinions in this paper are those of the author(s) and not those of the Institute for Replication (I4R). Research published in this series may include views on policy, but I4R takes no institutional policy positions.

I4R Discussion Papers are research papers of the Institute for Replication which are widely circulated to promote replications and meta-scientific work in the social sciences. Provided in cooperation with EconStor, a service of the [ZBW – Leibniz Information Centre for Economics](#), and [RWI – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research](#), I4R Discussion Papers are among others listed in RePEc (see IDEAS, EconPapers). Complete list of all I4R DPs - downloadable for free at the I4R website.

I4R Discussion Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

Editors

Abel Brodeur
University of Ottawa

Anna Dreber
Stockholm School of Economics

Jörg Ankel-Peters
RWI – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research

Reproduction of "Teaching Norms: Direct Evidence of Parental Transmission"^{*}

Martín Brun^a, Micole De Vera^b, Valon Kadriu^c, Fabian Mierisch^d

This version: March 11, 2024

^a*Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. Email: martin.brun@uab.cat*

^b*CEMFI and IZA. Email: micole.devera@cemfi.edu.es*

^c*University of Kassel and INCHER. Email: kadriu@uni-kassel.de*

^d*Catholic University Eichstaett-Ingolstadt. Email: fabian.mierisch@ku.de*

Abstract

This paper is a replication study of Brouwer, T., Galeotti, F., & Villeval, M. C. (2023), using the original data. The study explores how social norms are transmitted from one generation to another, specifically from parents to children. The authors conducted a field experiment involving 601 parents of children aged 3 to 12 in Lyon, France, to examine whether parents engage more in norm enforcement in the presence of their child, and whether the nature of punishment changes in the presence of the child. The study found that parents do engage more in norm enforcement in the presence of their child, and tend to use more indirect punishment when their child is present. This study highlights the role that parents play in transmitting social norms to their children. The replication analysis was successful, with the results of the original study being robust to changes in the model specification.

Keywords: replication, experiment, information provision, inequality, field experiment

^{*}This replication was undertaken as part of the "Vienna Replication Games", organized by the Institute for Replication. We are grateful to Abel Brodeur and the Institute for Replication for the organization. We extend our appreciation to the original authors of the paper for sharing their code and responding to our inquiries. All code for the replication can be found at Zenodo, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8114738>.

1. Introduction

This paper is a replication of Brouwer, T., Galeotti, F., & Villeval, M. C. (2023). Teaching Norms: Direct Evidence of Parental Transmission. *The Economic Journal*, 133(650), 872-887. We use the same date as the original authors for this replication.

Brouwer et al. (2023) explores how social norms are transmitted from one generation to another, particularly from parents to children. The authors conducted a field experiment involving 601 parents of children aged 3 to 12 in Lyon, France, to address two main questions: (1) whether parents engage more in norm enforcement in the presence of their child, and (2) whether the nature of punishment changes in the presence of the child. The authors found that parents do engage more in norm enforcement in the presence of their child, presumably to educate their child, and that parents tend to use more indirect punishment (withholding help to the violator) in the presence of their child, likely to avoid retaliation or negative externalities. The authors focus on the norm of non-littering and the violation thereof and employ a 3x2 design in which they varied the opportunity to enforce the norm and the presence of the child. The study suggests that parents play a crucial role in transmitting social norms to their children, not only by complying with them but also by punishing norm violations of others in the presence of their child.

1.1. Experimental Design

The study was conducted in Lyon, France, where 30 public elementary schools were randomly selected. A 3x2 between-subject design was employed to manipulate two variables. The first variable focused on the child's presence (Child and Alone), while the second variable pertained to the setting of a norm violation (Violation, Violation+Help, and Help). To ensure consistency, two trained actors, one male and one female, were recruited from a professional acting school. Data collection involved teams comprising an actor, two research assistants, and a supervisor. Both the actors and research assistants were unaware of the study's objective. Actors then recreated a scene in front of parents depending on the treatment condition. One treatment consisted of a norm violation (littering) and the other of an opportunity of helping the actor (the actor drops something which can be picked-up). Research assistants then recorded the reaction from the parents to the scene and then tried to conduct a short survey with the parent which was seemingly unrelated to the incident. Doing so, the study aimed to examine the prevalence of direct and indirect punishment for a social norm violation and investigate the influence of educative motives on parents' inclination to punish when their child is present.

2. Reproducibility

In general, the replication package was very complete and we acknowledge the authors' extensive efforts to make the replication as easy as possible. We find some minor issues with the replication package. Importantly, these did not change the qualitative interpretation of the results. We received feedback from the authors, who shared additional code that addressed most of our comments. Following, we state the minor issues we found and add the responses received.

First, there are some minor coding conventions the authors did not follow in the replication package. Most notably, the variable names were not consistently written in lower cases, and the variable values were not labeled. Especially the former made the construction of tables unnecessary complicated and lengthy. An additional code that corrected this was later shared by the authors. We appreciate the authors shared it and encourage them to add it to the replication package.

Another minor issue that came to our attention was the deviation from the pre-registered control variables. We are in favor of learning from practice and from the data and improving upon a pre-analysis plan where necessary. Therefore, we understand why the authors have pre-specified to control for the gender of the child, which then probably turned out to be difficult in practice (the authors did probably not anticipate many parents to bring more than one child with them, which made assigning the gender of the child difficult).¹ However, the authors also control for the daytime and if there were witnesses present at the experiment (which were not pre-specified). Although this did not change the results, we believe that this change from the pre-analysis plan should have been noted in the paper.

Aside from deviating from the vector of pre-specified control variables, the authors demonstrate an exemplary handling of the pre-analysis plan. Most notably, they indicate in the paper which analysis was pre-specified and which was not. As this helps with differentiating between data exploration and main results, we think of this as a nice feature of the study.

Besides from a different control vector, we deviate from the authors analysis by including a missing imputation into control variables. For imputed values, we include a missing category for categorical variables and include an indicator variable for continuous variables. However, this is only the case for very few observations, so the impact on the results is limited. Yet, in our point of view, this procedure should be included

¹This point was confirmed by the authors as a response to our comments.

as to not switch samples between analysis. We therefore recommend the adaption of this practice in all future analysis where missing values in control variables might be more common.

The largest issue we had with the original replication package was the missing code for the creation of the variables. This was later corrected by the authors, who shared code that allows reconstructing the variables used in the analysis and incorporated it into the replication package. Analyzing the variable construction code, we confirmed the variables are correctly processed.

3. Replication

We are generally capable of replicating the results of the authors when we use the vector of control variables used by the authors and do not include a missing imputation. However, we prefer the pre-specified vector of control variables and impute a few missing values in the control variables. This is why all our estimates are a bit different than the ones by the authors. Most importantly, our small changes to the regression do not change the interpretation, the rough effect size, or the significance level in any meaningful way. All the results of the authors are robust to our changes in the model specification.

Furthermore, we test the robustness of the results by including the following additional categorical variables to the pre-specified model: day time, if there were witnesses present, day fixed effects and the poverty rate in the district of the school as categorical variables. All results hold qualitatively for this change in model specification.

In one of the robustness checks done by the authors, reported in Appendix Table A7 Columns (1) and (4), the authors try to exclude guardians from the analysis. They implement this by excluding those who answer the survey and report they are not with their own child. This only excludes guardians who answer the survey. Within the sample used, there may still be children who are accompanied by their guardians but were not surveyed. We impose a stronger restriction and use only the sample where the accompanying adult is surveyed and reports to be the parent (excluding cases where the child is accompanied by the parent but is not surveyed). We note that the resulting sample is substantially diminished as we select a subset of those who are surveyed. The results to this is reported in Tables 14 and 15. There are significant quantitative differences in the results but the main qualitative conclusions reported in the paper remain.

For completeness, we also report the results when all robustness conditions are imposed simultaneously. The resulting sample then (1) excludes guardians, (2) excludes parents accompanying more than one child, and (3) excludes cases where a witness was recorded.

This again involves a significant reduction in observations. The main qualitative results of the paper remain, adding additional support for the robustness of the results.

4. Conclusion

Most importantly, we did not find any conventional mistakes, or even manipulations that would compromise the findings of the study. While we did use other model specifications, all results were perfectly robust and did not change in significance or in the economic interpretation. Furthermore, the authors made a great effort to provide a clean dataset and document their analysis step by step in the replication package. They even provided a code-book which was greatly appreciated. Finally, we also want to congratulate the authors on their transparent use of the pre-analysis plan and the indication of pre-registered analysis in the paper.

However, we noted some minor issues in the analysis. First, the authors did not follow all coding conventions in labelling and naming variables. This made the replication unnecessary tedious. We recommend to name all variables in lower case and label all variable values as seen in the tables (see “Coding Conventions”, or “A Practitioners Guide” for suitable references). The authors produced a code for it to answer our comments. We encourage them to add it to the replication package.

Second, the authors deviated from their pre-specified vector of control variables. In general, we are in favor of learning from the data and deviating from pre-analysis plans where new insights demand it. However, the results were qualitatively unchanged by the inclusion of the two additional control variables that were used in the results. As we would in this case prefer to stick to the pre-registered vector of control variables, we did not replicate the numerical values of the estimates without looking at the model specification in the code of the authors. Therefore, this (unwarranted) change in model specification led to some confusion in the replication.

Third, we would recommend including a missing imputation in control variables. This did not have a large impact on the main analysis, as only few variables had missing values, but did change the sample in some of the analysis conducted in the appendix. In general, we think of a missing imputation for control variables combined with a missing indicator as a good practice to not change samples between analysis.

Finally, we thank the authors for following our recommendation and improving the original replication package by adding the code for creation of the variables used. In many cases, mistakes happen at this stage of the analysis (Huntington-Klein et al., 2021), so code for creating and labelling the respective variables should be part of any replication

package. We believe replication packages should be as extensive as possible in this part of the analysis and we strongly recommend their inclusion in replication packages.

Taken together, we were able to (qualitatively) replicate all the findings in the study by Brouwer et al. (2023) and congratulate the authors on a well conducted and nicely documented study.

References

- Brouwer, T., Galeotti, F. and Villeval, M. C.: 2023, Teaching norms: Direct evidence of parental transmission, *The Economic Journal* **133**(650), 872–887.
- Huntington-Klein, N., Arenas, A., Beam, E., Bertoni, M., Bloem, J. R., Burli, P., Chen, N., Grieco, P., Ekpe, G., Pugatch, T., Saavedra, M. and Stopnitzky, Y.: 2021, The influence of hidden researcher decisions in applied microeconomics, *Economic Inquiry* **59**(3), 944–960.

5. Figures

Figure 1: Replication of Figure 1: Behavior of Parents, by Treatment and Condition




Figure 2: Original Figure 1: Behaviour of Parents, by Treatment and Condition from Brouwer et al. 2022 for Comparison




Figure 3: (a) Punishment Rates




Figure 4: (b) Helping Rates

6. Tables

Table 1: Replication of Table 1: Summary Statistics

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	ALL	ALONE	CHILD	DIFF.
Male Target	0.35 (0.48)	0.36 (0.48)	0.34 (0.47)	0.02 (0.04)
Witness	0.15 (0.35)	0.12 (0.33)	0.17 (0.38)	-0.05* (0.03)
Male Actor	0.51 (0.50)	0.52 (0.50)	0.50 (0.50)	0.02 (0.04)
Rich IRIS	0.51 (0.50)	0.50 (0.50)	0.51 (0.50)	-0.01 (0.04)
Morning	0.52 (0.50)	0.46 (0.50)	0.58 (0.49)	-0.13*** (0.04)
Rain	0.080 (0.27)	0.090 (0.29)	0.070 (0.25)	0.02 (0.02)
Hot	0.28 (0.45)	0.31 (0.46)	0.26 (0.44)	0.05 (0.04)
Survey Response	0.47 (0.50)	0.42 (0.49)	0.51 (0.50)	-0.09** (0.04)
Observations	601	301	300	601

Notes: Columns (1)-(3) contain standard deviations in parentheses. Column (4) contains standard errors in parentheses. a: Parents who could not be reached are excluded. Hence, the statistics are computed based on 503, 251, 252 observations in All, Alone, and Child, respectively. All tests are two-sided t-tests on the equality of means. * $p < 0.10$ ** $p < 0.05$ *** $p < 0.01$

Table 2: Table 1: Summary Statistics

	Mean (All)	SD (All)	Mean (Alone)	SD (Alone)	Mean (Child)	SD (Child)	Difference	SE
Male Target	0.35	0.48	0.36	0.48	0.34	0.47	0.02	0.04
Witness	0.15	0.35	0.12	0.33	0.17	0.38	-0.05*	0.03
Male Actor	0.51	0.50	0.52	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.02	0.04
Rich IRIS	0.51	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.51	0.50	-0.01	0.04
Morning	0.52	0.50	0.46	0.50	0.58	0.49	-0.13***	0.04
Rain	0.08	0.27	0.09	0.29	0.07	0.25	0.02	0.02
Hot	0.28	0.45	0.31	0.46	0.26	0.44	0.05	0.04
Survey Response	0.47	0.50	0.42	0.49	0.51	0.50	-0.09**	0.04

Table 3: Replication of Table 2: Determinants of Punishment Rate (Left) and Helping Rate (Right)

	Punishment		Helping	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Child	0.11** (0.05)	0.12 ** (0.04)	0.21 *** (0.05)	0.22 *** (0.06)
VH	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.10 ** (0.05)	-0.10 ** (0.04)
Child x VH	-0.13 *** (0.04)	-0.12 *** (0.04)	-0.06 (0.07)	-0.07 (0.08)
Male Target		0.06 ** (0.03)		0.03 (0.04)
Male Actor		-0.06 (0.04)		-0.22 *** (0.05)
Morning		-0.04 (0.03)		0.01 (0.04)
Witness		-0.04 (0.04)		-0.13 (0.08)
Rich area		0.02 (0.04)		0.01 (0.05)
Rain		0.01 (0.04)		-0.08 (0.07)
Hot		-0.04 (0.05)		0.06 (0.05)
Constant	0.11 *** (0.03)	0.14 *** (0.05)	0.26 *** (0.04)	0.36 *** (0.05)
Observations	400	399	401	400
Clusters	30	30	30	30
R2	0.04	0.07	0.06	0.13
F	7.74	5.17	7.36	6.45
df	29	29	29	29

Notes: The table contains results from pooled Ordinary Least Squared regressions. The dependent variable is a binary variable for punishment (columns 1 and 2) or helping (columns 3 and 4). Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the school level (30 clusters). One observation is dropped due to missing data on the target's gender. * $p < 0.10$ ** $p < 0.05$ *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 4: Table 2.1 - Punishment

	Punishment			
	No Controls	Pre-specified Controls	Paper Controls	Extended Controls
Constant	0.11 (0.03)**	0.11 (0.04)**	0.14 (0.05)**	0.30 (0.05)***
VH	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.03 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)
Child	0.11 (0.05)*	0.11 (0.05)*	0.12 (0.04)**	0.12 (0.04)**
Child x VH	-0.13 (0.04)**	-0.13 (0.04)**	-0.12 (0.04)**	-0.13 (0.05)*
Male Actor		-0.06 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.04)	0.15 (0.07)*
Male Target		0.06 (0.03)*	0.06 (0.03)*	0.07 (0.03)**
Rich Area		0.02 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	-0.38 (0.08)***
Rain		0.02 (0.04)	0.01 (0.04)	-0.01 (0.04)
Hot		-0.02 (0.05)	-0.04 (0.05)	-0.08 (0.07)
Morning			-0.04 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.04)
Witness			-0.04 (0.04)	-0.03 (0.05)
Clusters	30	30	30	30
F	-	-	-	-
df	29	29	29	29
R ²	0.04	0.06	0.07	0.15
Adj. R ²	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.06
Num. obs.	400	399	399	399

Table 5: Table 2.2 - Helping

	Helping			
	No Controls	Pre-specified Controls	Paper Controls	Extended Controls
Constant	0.26 (0.04)***	0.35 (0.05)***	0.36 (0.05)***	0.61 (0.07)***
VH	-0.10 (0.05)*	-0.10 (0.05)*	-0.10 (0.04)*	-0.12 (0.05)*
Child	0.21 (0.05)***	0.21 (0.06)***	0.22 (0.06)***	0.25 (0.06)***
Child x VH	-0.06 (0.07)	-0.07 (0.08)	-0.07 (0.08)	-0.10 (0.07)
Male Actor		-0.21 (0.05)***	-0.22 (0.05)***	-0.12 (0.16)
Male Target		0.02 (0.04)	0.03 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)
Rich Area		0.01 (0.05)	0.01 (0.05)	-0.37 (0.18)*
Rain		-0.07 (0.07)	-0.08 (0.07)	-0.18 (0.11)
Hot		0.05 (0.05)	0.06 (0.05)	0.06 (0.11)
Morning			0.01 (0.04)	0.02 (0.06)
Witness			-0.13 (0.08)	-0.14 (0.08)
Clusters	30	30	30	30
F	-	-	-	-
df	29	29	29	29
R ²	0.06	0.12	0.13	0.20
Adj. R ²	0.05	0.10	0.11	0.11
Num. obs.	401	400	400	400

Table 6: Table A2

	Morning				Afternoon			
	Alone	Child	All		Alone	Child	All	
Help	0.48 (0.07)	0.60 (0.07)	0.54 (0.05)	0.22	0.46 (0.08)	0.62 (0.08)	0.54 (0.06)	0.16
Violation	0.32 (0.07)	0.45 (0.07)	0.39 (0.05)	0.21	0.40 (0.08)	0.51 (0.09)	0.46 (0.06)	0.34
Violation+Help	0.44 (0.08)	0.39 (0.07)	0.41 (0.05)	0.62	0.40 (0.07)	0.55 (0.09)	0.46 (0.06)	0.20
Total	0.41 (0.04)	0.48 (0.04)	0.45 (0.03)	0.30	0.42 (0.04)	0.56 (0.05)	0.48 (0.03)	0.03
<i>N</i>	123	151	274		128	101	229	

Table 7: Table A3

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	All	Alone	Child	Diff.
Own Child	0.88 (0.33)	0.91 (0.29)	0.85 (0.36)	0.06 (0.05)
Son	0.61 (0.49)	0.62 (0.49)	0.61 (0.49)	0.01 (0.07)
Daughter	0.64 (0.48)	0.63 (0.49)	0.64 (0.48)	-0.01 (0.07)
No. of Children	1.46 (0.64)	1.40 (0.59)	1.52 (0.67)	-0.12 (0.09)
Child Age = 3	0.06 (0.25)	0.06 (0.24)	0.06 (0.25)	-0.00 (0.03)
Child Age = 4	0.16 (0.37)	0.16 (0.37)	0.17 (0.38)	-0.01 (0.05)
Child Age = 5	0.26 (0.44)	0.25 (0.44)	0.27 (0.45)	-0.02 (0.06)
Child Age = 6	0.18 (0.39)	0.17 (0.38)	0.19 (0.40)	-0.03 (0.05)
Child Age = 7	0.23 (0.42)	0.19 (0.39)	0.26 (0.44)	-0.07 (0.06)
Child Age = 8	0.21 (0.41)	0.23 (0.42)	0.20 (0.40)	0.03 (0.06)
Child Age = 9	0.19 (0.39)	0.15 (0.36)	0.22 (0.41)	-0.07 (0.05)
Child Age = 10	0.08 (0.27)	0.11 (0.31)	0.06 (0.23)	0.05 (0.04)
Child Age = 11	0.03 (0.18)	0.03 (0.18)	0.03 (0.18)	-0.00 (0.02)
<i>N</i>	229	104	125	229

Notes: For gender and age, totals are not equal to 1 because some parents reported having more than one child at the school. * $p < 0.10$ ** $p < 0.05$ *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 8: Replication of Table A4: Determinants of Punishment Rate (Left) and Helping Rate (Right)

	Punishment	Helping
	(1)	(2)
Child	0.11** (0.04)	0.22*** (0.05)
VH	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.10** (0.04)
Child x VH	-0.13*** (0.04)	-0.07 (0.08)
Male Target	0.06** (0.03)	0.03 (0.04)
Male Actor	-0.06 (0.04)	-0.22*** (0.05)
Morning	-0.04 (0.03)	0.01 (0.04)
Witness	-0.09*** (0.03)	-0.15 (0.10)
Child x Witness	0.09 (0.07)	0.02 (0.10)
Rich area	0.02 (0.04)	0.01 (0.05)
Rain	0.01 (0.03)	-0.08 (0.07)
Hot	-0.03 (0.04)	0.06 (0.05)
Constant	0.14*** (0.05)	0.37*** (0.05)
Observations	399	400
Clusters	30	30
R2	0.07	0.13
F	6.45	6.00
df	29	29

Notes: The table contains results from pooled Ordinary Least Squared regressions. The dependent variable is a binary variable for punishment (column 1) or helping (column 2). Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the school level (30 clusters). One observation is dropped due to missing data on the target's gender. * $p < 0.10$ ** $p < 0.05$ *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 9: Replication of Table A5: Punishment in the Violation Treatment

	Punishment Helping	
	(1)	(2)
Child	0.11**	0.09
	(0.04)	(0.06)
Male Target	0.10**	0.06
	(0.04)	(0.06)
Child x Male Target		0.07
		(0.15)
Male Actor	-0.09*	-0.09*
	(0.05)	(0.05)
Morning	-0.02	-0.03
	(0.05)	(0.05)
Witness	-0.10	-0.10
	(0.08)	(0.07)
Rich area	0.06	0.06
	(0.05)	(0.06)
Rain	-0.00	-0.00
	(0.06)	(0.06)
Hot	-0.09	-0.09
	(0.07)	(0.07)
Constant	0.14*	0.15*
	(0.07)	(0.08)
Observations	199	199
Clusters	29	29
R2	0.07	0.07
F	4.47	5.48
df	28	28

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the school level. One observation is dropped due to missing data on the target's gender. * $p < 0.10$ ** $p < 0.05$ *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 10: Table A6 - Paper Controls

	Punishment		Child	
	(1) Alone	(2) Child	(3) Alone	(4) Child
Child	0.12*** (0.04)	0.12*** (0.04)	0.22*** (0.05)	0.22*** (0.05)
VH	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.16*** (0.04)	-0.10** (0.04)	-0.17** (0.07)
Male Actor	-0.07 (0.05)	-0.13* (0.07)	-0.21*** (0.04)	-0.28*** (0.06)
Male Target	0.07* (0.04)	0.12*** (0.05)	0.03 (0.04)	0.04 (0.05)
Morning	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.08 (0.05)	0.00 (0.04)	0.00 (0.05)
Witness	-0.04 (0.04)	-0.08 (0.06)	-0.11* (0.06)	-0.16* (0.09)
Rich area	0.03 (0.04)	0.05 (0.07)	0.01 (0.05)	0.02 (0.06)
Rain	0.00 (0.03)	0.00 (0.06)	-0.10 (0.07)	-0.14 (0.10)
Hot	-0.04 (0.04)	-0.07 (0.07)	0.05 (0.05)	0.06 (0.06)
VH_C vs. VH_A	9.94		0.79	
N Observations	399	399	400	400
N_clust Clusters	30		30	
r2_p (Pseudo) R^2	0.097		0.113	
chi2 Wald χ^2	55.93		52.45	

Table 11: Table A6 - Prespecified Controls

	Punishment		Child	
	(1) Alone	(2) Child	(3) Alone	(4) Child
Child	0.11** (0.05)	0.11** (0.05)	0.21*** (0.05)	0.21*** (0.05)
VH	-0.03 (0.03)	-0.17*** (0.04)	-0.10** (0.04)	-0.17** (0.07)
Male Actor	-0.07 (0.05)	-0.12* (0.07)	-0.20*** (0.04)	-0.26*** (0.06)
Male Target	0.06* (0.04)	0.11** (0.05)	0.02 (0.03)	0.02 (0.04)
Rich area	0.03 (0.05)	0.05 (0.08)	0.01 (0.04)	0.02 (0.06)
Rain	0.01 (0.04)	0.02 (0.07)	-0.08 (0.07)	-0.11 (0.10)
Hot	-0.03 (0.05)	-0.05 (0.08)	0.04 (0.05)	0.06 (0.06)
VH_C vs. VH_A	9.23		0.74	
N Observations	399	399	400	400
N_clust Clusters	30		30	
r2_p (Pseudo) R^2	0.087		0.103	
chi2 Wald χ^2	28.31		43.04	

Table 12: Table A6 - Extended Controls

	Punishment		Child	
	(1) Alone	(2) Child	(3) Alone	(4) Child
Child	0.16*** (0.05)	0.16*** (0.05)	0.28*** (0.06)	0.28*** (0.06)
VH	-0.03 (0.04)	-0.20*** (0.05)	-0.12** (0.05)	-0.24*** (0.08)
Male Actor	0.49*** (0.01)	0.47*** (0.01)	-0.11 (0.17)	-0.14 (0.21)
Male Target	0.09** (0.04)	0.16*** (0.05)	0.03 (0.04)	0.04 (0.05)
Rich area	0.00 (.)	0.00 (.)	0.00 (.)	0.00 (.)
Rain	-0.02 (0.04)	-0.04 (0.08)	-0.17** (0.07)	-0.27** (0.13)
Hot	-0.06 (0.05)	-0.12 (0.09)	0.04 (0.10)	0.05 (0.12)
Morning	-0.04 (0.04)	-0.07 (0.07)	0.01 (0.05)	0.01 (0.07)
Witness	-0.04 (0.04)	-0.07 (0.08)	-0.14** (0.05)	-0.19** (0.09)
VH_C vs. VH_A	10.19		1.81	
N Observations	325	325	382	382
N_clust Clusters	19		27	
r2_p (Pseudo) R^2	0.185		0.160	
chi2 Wald χ^2	.		.	

Table 13: Table A7

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Punishment	Punishment	Punishment	Helping	Helping	Helping	HelpingParents
Child	0.13*** (0.05)	0.13** (0.06)	0.11** (0.04)	0.19*** (0.06)	0.18** (0.07)	0.19*** (0.06)	0.17*** (0.05)
VH	-0.05* (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.11** (0.04)	-0.10** (0.04)	-0.13** (0.06)	-0.10** (0.04)
Child × VH	-0.13** (0.05)	-0.13** (0.06)	-0.14*** (0.05)	-0.04 (0.08)	-0.11 (0.10)	-0.01 (0.08)	-0.05 (0.07)
Male Actor	-0.08* (0.04)	-0.06 (0.04)	-0.07 (0.05)	-0.24*** (0.05)	-0.21*** (0.05)	-0.22*** (0.05)	-0.20*** (0.05)
Male Target	0.07** (0.03)	0.07** (0.03)	0.05 (0.03)	0.02 (0.04)	0.04 (0.04)	0.04 (0.05)	0.03 (0.04)
Morning	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.05 (0.04)	-0.04 (0.04)	0.01 (0.04)	0.01 (0.05)	0.01 (0.05)	-0.00 (0.04)
Witness	-0.04 (0.04)	-0.05 (0.03)		-0.13* (0.08)	-0.07 (0.08)		-0.11 (0.07)
Rich area	0.02 (0.04)	0.03 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	0.01 (0.05)	-0.01 (0.05)	0.02 (0.05)	0.04 (0.05)
Rain	0.02 (0.04)	0.05 (0.04)	0.00 (0.04)	-0.07 (0.08)	-0.08 (0.09)	-0.13 (0.08)	-0.08 (0.07)
Hot	-0.03 (0.05)	-0.04 (0.05)	-0.05 (0.05)	0.05 (0.05)	0.01 (0.06)	0.04 (0.06)	-0.01 (0.05)
0.witness			0.00 (.)			0.00 (.)	
Constant	0.14*** (0.05)	0.13** (0.05)	0.16*** (0.05)	0.39*** (0.05)	0.37*** (0.05)	0.37*** (0.06)	0.36*** (0.05)
<i>N</i>	385	319	347	383	318	334	400
Clusters	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
<i>R</i> ²	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.13	0.11	0.13	0.10
F	4.91	2.78	3.92	6.21	7.18	7.41	5.61
df	29	29	29	29	29	29	29

Notes: * p < 0.10 ** p < 0.05 *** p < 0.01.

Table 14: Table A7 - Col (1)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Punishment	Punishment	Punishment	Punishment	Punishment	Punishment
Child	0.12** (0.05)	0.13** (0.05)	0.13*** (0.05)	0.16 (0.10)	0.15 (0.09)	0.14 (0.09)
VH	-0.05* (0.03)	-0.05 (0.03)	-0.05* (0.03)	0.01 (0.08)	0.02 (0.07)	0.02 (0.07)
Child × VH	-0.13*** (0.05)	-0.14*** (0.05)	-0.13** (0.05)	-0.25** (0.12)	-0.23* (0.11)	-0.23* (0.11)
Male Actor		-0.07* (0.04)	-0.08* (0.04)		-0.15*** (0.05)	-0.16*** (0.05)
Male Target		0.06** (0.03)	0.07** (0.03)		0.09 (0.06)	0.10 (0.06)
Rich area		0.02 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)		-0.01 (0.05)	-0.02 (0.04)
Rain		0.03 (0.05)	0.02 (0.04)		0.18 (0.13)	0.19 (0.12)
Hot		-0.02 (0.05)	-0.03 (0.05)		-0.02 (0.06)	0.00 (0.07)
Morning			-0.04 (0.03)			0.04 (0.06)
Witness			-0.04 (0.04)			-0.08 (0.09)
Constant	0.11*** (0.03)	0.12** (0.04)	0.14*** (0.05)	0.08 (0.06)	0.12* (0.06)	0.11 (0.07)
<i>N</i>	386	385	385	111	111	111
Clusters	30	30	30	29	29	29
<i>R</i> ²	0.05	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.17	0.18
F	9.30	4.49	4.91	.	5.13	4.55
df	29	29	29	28	28	28

Notes: Outcome is Punishment, guardians excluded. (1)-(3) excluding OwnChild = 0, (4)-(6) using only OwnChild = 1. * $p < 0.10$ ** $p < 0.05$ *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 15: Table A7 Col (4)

	(1) Helping	(2) Helping	(3) Helping	(4) Helping	(5) Helping	(6) Helping
Child	0.18*** (0.06)	0.18*** (0.06)	0.19*** (0.06)	-0.01 (0.14)	0.02 (0.14)	0.01 (0.14)
VH	-0.11** (0.05)	-0.11** (0.05)	-0.11** (0.04)	-0.20* (0.11)	-0.18 (0.12)	-0.20 (0.12)
Child × VH	-0.03 (0.07)	-0.04 (0.08)	-0.04 (0.08)	0.19 (0.18)	0.18 (0.19)	0.19 (0.20)
Male Actor		-0.22*** (0.05)	-0.24*** (0.05)		-0.14* (0.07)	-0.14* (0.07)
Male Target		0.02 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)		0.05 (0.07)	0.05 (0.07)
Rich area		0.01 (0.05)	0.01 (0.05)		0.10 (0.07)	0.10 (0.07)
Rain		-0.06 (0.07)	-0.07 (0.08)		0.17 (0.10)	0.16** (0.08)
Hot		0.04 (0.05)	0.05 (0.05)		0.03 (0.09)	0.00 (0.10)
Morning			0.01 (0.04)			-0.08 (0.08)
Witness			-0.13* (0.08)			-0.08 (0.12)
Constant	0.27*** (0.04)	0.37*** (0.05)	0.39*** (0.05)	0.32*** (0.08)	0.31*** (0.09)	0.37*** (0.10)
<i>N</i>	384	383	383	133	133	133
Clusters	30	30	30	29	29	29
<i>R</i> ²	0.05	0.12	0.13	0.03	0.07	0.08
F	5.73	6.33	6.21	2.44	2.25	1.99
df	29	29	29	28	28	28

Notes: Outcome is Helping, guardians excluded. (1)-(3) excluding OwnChild = 0, (4)-(6) using only OwnChild = 1. * p < 0.10 ** p < 0.05 *** p < 0.01.

Table 16: Table A7 Col (2) and (5)

	(1) Punishment	(2) Punishment	(3) Punishment	(4) Helping	(5) Helping	(6) Helping
Child	0.12* (0.07)	0.12* (0.07)	0.13** (0.06)	0.18** (0.07)	0.18** (0.07)	0.18** (0.07)
VH	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.03 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.10** (0.05)	-0.10** (0.04)	-0.10** (0.04)
Child × VH	-0.13** (0.06)	-0.14** (0.06)	-0.13** (0.06)	-0.09 (0.10)	-0.12 (0.10)	-0.11 (0.10)
Male Actor		-0.06 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.04)		-0.20*** (0.05)	-0.21*** (0.05)
Male Target		0.06* (0.03)	0.07** (0.03)		0.04 (0.04)	0.04 (0.04)
Rich area		0.03 (0.04)	0.03 (0.04)		-0.01 (0.05)	-0.01 (0.05)
Rain		0.05 (0.04)	0.05 (0.04)		-0.08 (0.08)	-0.08 (0.09)
Hot		-0.02 (0.05)	-0.04 (0.05)		-0.00 (0.05)	0.01 (0.06)
Morning			-0.05 (0.04)			0.01 (0.05)
Witness			-0.05 (0.03)			-0.07 (0.08)
Constant	0.11*** (0.03)	0.10** (0.04)	0.13** (0.05)	0.26*** (0.04)	0.36*** (0.05)	0.37*** (0.05)
<i>N</i>	320	319	319	319	318	318
Clusters	30	30	30	30	30	30
<i>R</i> ²	0.04	0.06	0.07	0.05	0.11	0.11
F	3.19	2.36	2.78	4.37	7.60	7.18
df	29	29	29	29	29	29

Notes: Excluding parents with 2 or more children. * $p < 0.10$ ** $p < 0.05$ *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 17: Table A7 Col (3) and (6)

	(1) Punishment	(2) Punishment	(3) Punishment	(4) Helping	(5) Helping	(6) Helping
Child	0.10** (0.05)	0.11** (0.05)	0.11** (0.04)	0.20*** (0.06)	0.19*** (0.06)	0.19*** (0.06)
VH	-0.04 (0.04)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.12** (0.05)	-0.13** (0.06)	-0.13** (0.06)
Child × VH	-0.14*** (0.05)	-0.15*** (0.05)	-0.14*** (0.05)	-0.02 (0.07)	-0.01 (0.08)	-0.01 (0.08)
Male Actor		-0.07 (0.05)	-0.07 (0.05)		-0.22*** (0.05)	-0.22*** (0.05)
Male Target		0.04 (0.03)	0.05 (0.03)		0.05 (0.05)	0.04 (0.05)
Rich area		0.01 (0.05)	0.02 (0.04)		0.02 (0.05)	0.02 (0.05)
Rain		0.01 (0.04)	0.00 (0.04)		-0.13 (0.08)	-0.13 (0.08)
Hot		-0.03 (0.05)	-0.05 (0.05)		0.04 (0.05)	0.04 (0.06)
Morning			-0.04 (0.04)			0.01 (0.05)
0.witness			0.00 (.)			0.00 (.)
Constant	0.12*** (0.04)	0.14*** (0.05)	0.16*** (0.05)	0.28*** (0.04)	0.37*** (0.07)	0.37*** (0.06)
<i>N</i>	348	347	347	335	334	334
Clusters	30	30	30	30	30	30
<i>R</i> ²	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.13	0.13
F	6.96	2.90	3.92	6.63	7.51	7.41
df	29	29	29	29	29	29

Notes: Only cases where no witness was recorded. * $p < 0.10$ ** $p < 0.05$ *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 18: Table A7 Col (7)

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	HelpingParents	HelpingParents	HelpingParents
Child	0.16*** (0.05)	0.16*** (0.05)	0.17*** (0.05)
VH	-0.10** (0.05)	-0.10** (0.04)	-0.10** (0.04)
Child × VH	-0.04 (0.06)	-0.05 (0.07)	-0.05 (0.07)
Male Actor		-0.19*** (0.05)	-0.20*** (0.05)
Male Target		0.03 (0.04)	0.03 (0.04)
Rich area		0.04 (0.05)	0.04 (0.05)
Rain		-0.07 (0.07)	-0.08 (0.07)
Hot		-0.02 (0.05)	-0.01 (0.05)
Morning			-0.00 (0.04)
Witness			-0.11 (0.07)
Constant	0.26*** (0.04)	0.34*** (0.05)	0.36*** (0.05)
<i>N</i>	401	400	400
Clusters	30	30	30
<i>R</i> ²	0.04	0.09	0.10
F	6.01	5.38	5.61
df	29	29	29

Notes: Code children helping as not helping, rather than helping. * $p < 0.10$ ** $p < 0.05$ *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 19: Table A7 – All robustness conditions simultaneously

	(1) Punishment	(2) Punishment	(3) Punishment	(4) Helping	(5) Helping	(6) Helping
Child	0.12* (0.06)	0.14** (0.06)	0.14** (0.06)	0.08 (0.07)	0.08 (0.07)	0.08 (0.07)
VH	-0.06* (0.03)	-0.05 (0.03)	-0.05* (0.03)	-0.13** (0.06)	-0.14** (0.06)	-0.13** (0.06)
Child × VH	-0.15** (0.06)	-0.16** (0.06)	-0.16** (0.06)	0.01 (0.11)	-0.00 (0.11)	-0.01 (0.11)
Male Actor		-0.10** (0.05)	-0.10** (0.05)		-0.21*** (0.05)	-0.21*** (0.05)
Male Target		0.06* (0.03)	0.06* (0.03)		0.05 (0.05)	0.05 (0.05)
Rich area		0.03 (0.05)	0.04 (0.05)		0.01 (0.05)	0.01 (0.05)
Rain		0.06 (0.06)	0.06 (0.06)		-0.13 (0.08)	-0.13 (0.08)
Hot		-0.03 (0.05)	-0.04 (0.05)		-0.03 (0.06)	-0.02 (0.06)
Morning			-0.03 (0.05)			0.02 (0.05)
0.witness			0.00 (.)			0.00 (.)
Constant	0.13*** (0.04)	0.14*** (0.04)	0.15*** (0.05)	0.29*** (0.05)	0.41*** (0.07)	0.40*** (0.06)
<i>N</i>	271	270	270	260	259	259
Clusters	30	30	30	30	30	30
<i>R</i> ²	0.05	0.08	0.09	0.03	0.10	0.10
F	4.73	2.91	2.59	2.80	4.49	5.19
df	29	29	29	29	29	29

Notes: * $p < 0.10$ ** $p < 0.05$ *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 20: Table 8 - Paper Controls

	Base		Child		Target		Income	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Child	0.12** (0.04)				0.02 (0.05)	0.12** (0.04)	0.15*** (0.05)	0.09*** (0.02)
1 Child		0.13* (0.06)						
1 Boy			0.12 (0.11)					
1 Girl			0.18* (0.09)					
2 children			0.11* (0.06)					
3+ children			-0.14*** (0.05)					
99.children2			0.00 (0.10)					
1 Child Age ≤ 5				0.07 (0.13)				
5 < 1 Child Age ≤ 8				0.19* (0.09)				
1 Child Age > 8				0.01 (0.10)				
2 Children				0.11* (0.06)				
3+ Children				-0.15*** (0.05)				
VH	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.10*** (0.02)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.05* (0.03)
VH × Child	-0.12*** (0.04)					-0.12*** (0.04)	-0.12** (0.05)	-0.12** (0.05)
VH × 1 Child		-0.13** (0.06)						
VH × 1 Boy			-0.10 (0.12)					
VH × 1 Girl			-0.23** (0.09)					
VH × 2 Children			-0.12 (0.08)					
VH × 3+ Children			0.09 (0.06)					
VH × Missing			0.13 (0.22)					
VH × 1 Child Age ≤ 5				-0.12 (0.14)				
VH × 5 < 1 Child Age ≤ 8				-0.17* (0.10)				
VH × 1 Child Age > 9				-0.07 (0.11)				
VH × 2 Children				-0.11 (0.08)				
VH × 3+ Children				0.10 (0.06)				
VH × Missing				0.09 (0.27)				
Male Target	0.06** (0.03)	0.07** (0.03)	0.06** (0.03)	0.07** (0.03)	0.06 (0.04)	0.08* (0.05)	0.07** (0.03)	0.07** (0.03)
Male Target × Child					0.02 (0.08)			
Male Actor	-0.06 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.04)	-0.10** (0.05)	-0.05 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.04)	-0.03 (0.03)
Male Actor × Child					0.07 (0.06)			
Male Actor × Male target						-0.03 (0.05)		
Rich area	0.02 (0.04)	0.03 (0.04)	0.03 (0.04)	0.03 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	0.03 (0.04)	0.06 (0.05)	
Rich area × Child							-0.07 (0.06)	
Medium Low Income								0.14*** (0.04)
Medium High Income								0.08** (0.04)
High Income								0.17** (0.06)
Medium Low Income × Child								0.09 (0.07)
Medium High Income × Child								0.04 (0.03)
High Income × Child								-0.03 (0.07)
Rain	0.01 (0.04)	0.02 (0.03)	0.02 (0.03)	0.02 (0.04)	0.01 (0.04)	0.01 (0.04)	0.01 (0.04)	-0.01 (0.03)
Hot	-0.04 (0.05)	-0.04 (0.05)	-0.05 (0.05)	-0.04 (0.05)	-0.04 (0.04)	-0.04 (0.05)	-0.04 (0.05)	-0.05 (0.03)
Observations	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400
Clusters	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
R ²	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.10	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.12
F
df	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29

Table 21: Table 8 - Prespecified Controls

	Base	Child		Target		Income		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Child	0.11** (0.05)				0.00 (0.05)	0.11** (0.05)	0.15*** (0.05)	0.09*** (0.02)
1 Child		0.12* (0.07)						
1 Boy			0.12 (0.11)					
1 Girl			0.17* (0.09)					
2 children			0.11* (0.07)					
3+ children			-0.12** (0.05)					
99.children2			-0.01 (0.10)					
1 Child Age ≤ 5				0.06 (0.14)				
5 < 1 Child Age ≤ 8				0.18* (0.09)				
1 Child Age > 8				0.01 (0.10)				
2 Children				0.11* (0.07)				
3+ Children				-0.12** (0.05)				
VH	-0.03 (0.03)	-0.03 (0.03)	-0.03 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.10*** (0.02)	-0.03 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.05 (0.03)
VH × Child	-0.13*** (0.04)					-0.13*** (0.04)	-0.13** (0.05)	-0.13** (0.05)
VH × 1 Child		-0.14** (0.06)						
VH × 1 Boy			-0.10 (0.12)					
VH × 1 Girl			-0.25*** (0.09)					
VH × 2 Children			-0.13 (0.08)					
VH × 3+ Children			0.06 (0.05)					
VH × Missing			0.13 (0.22)					
VH × 1 Child Age ≤ 5				-0.12 (0.14)				
VH × 5 < 1 Child Age ≤ 8				-0.18* (0.10)				
1 Child Age > 9				-0.09 (0.11)				
VH × 2 Children				-0.12 (0.08)				
VH × 3+ Children				0.06 (0.06)				
VH <i>times</i> Children Missing				0.09 (0.27)				
Male Target	0.06** (0.03)	0.06** (0.03)	0.06* (0.03)	0.06** (0.03)	0.06 (0.04)	0.08 (0.05)	0.06** (0.03)	0.06** (0.03)
Male Target × Child					0.01 (0.08)			
Male Actor	-0.06 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.04)	-0.10** (0.05)	-0.05 (0.04)	-0.06 (0.04)	-0.03 (0.04)
Male Actor × Child					0.08 (0.06)			
Male Actor × Male target						-0.03 (0.05)		
Rich area	0.02 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	0.03 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	0.06 (0.05)	0.04 (0.04)
Rich area × Child							-0.08 (0.06)	
Medium Low Income								0.14*** (0.04)
Medium High Income								0.05 (0.04)
High Income								0.13 (0.08)
Medium Low Income × Child								0.09 (0.07)
Medium High Income × Child								0.04 (0.04)
High Income × Child								-0.05 (0.08)
Rain	0.02 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	0.03 (0.04)	0.03 (0.04)	0.01 (0.04)	0.01 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	0.01 (0.04)
Hot	-0.02 (0.05)	-0.02 (0.05)	-0.03 (0.05)	-0.03 (0.05)	-0.02 (0.05)	-0.02 (0.05)	-0.02 (0.05)	-0.03 (0.04)
Observations	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400
Clusters	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
R ²	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.10	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.12
F	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
df	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29

Table 22: Table 8 - Extended Controls

	Base	Child		Target		Income		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Child	0.12** (0.05)				-0.00 (0.05)	0.12** (0.05)	0.17*** (0.06)	0.09*** (0.03)
1 Child		0.11 (0.07)						
1 Boy			0.10 (0.12)					
1 Girl			0.17* (0.10)					
2 children			0.14** (0.06)					
3+ children			-0.08** (0.04)					
99.children2			0.01 (0.13)					
1 Child Age ≤ 5				0.08 (0.16)				
5 < 1 Child Age ≤ 8				0.16 (0.10)				
1 Child Age > 8				-0.00 (0.09)				
2 Children				0.14** (0.06)				
3+ Children				-0.09* (0.05)				
VH	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.10*** (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)
VH × Child	-0.13*** (0.04)					-0.13*** (0.04)	-0.13** (0.05)	-0.13** (0.05)
VH × 1 Child		-0.12* (0.07)						
VH × 1 Boy			-0.09 (0.13)					
VH × 1 Girl			-0.22** (0.09)					
VH × 2 Children			-0.15** (0.07)					
VH × 3+ Children			0.03 (0.06)					
VH × Missing			0.07 (0.26)					
VH × 1 Child Age ≤ 5				-0.10 (0.16)				
VH × 5 < 1 Child Age ≤ 8				-0.16 (0.10)				
1 Child Age > 9				-0.05 (0.10)				
VH × 2 Children				-0.15** (0.07)				
VH × 3+ Children				0.04 (0.07)				
VH × Children Missing				-0.00 (0.30)				
Male Target	0.07** (0.03)	0.07** (0.03)	0.07** (0.03)	0.08** (0.03)	0.05 (0.04)	0.08 (0.05)	0.07** (0.03)	0.07** (0.03)
Male Target × Child					0.05 (0.08)			
Male Actor	0.16** (0.08)	0.17** (0.08)	0.16* (0.08)	0.16* (0.08)	0.12 (0.07)	0.17* (0.08)	0.17* (0.09)	0.17* (0.09)
Male Actor × Child					0.08 (0.06)			
Male Actor × Male target						-0.01 (0.06)		
Rich area	0.04 (0.05)	0.06 (0.05)	0.05 (0.08)	0.08 (0.07)	0.01 (0.05)	0.03 (0.05)	0.11*** (0.04)	-0.04 (0.02)
Rich area × Child							-0.09 (0.07)	
Medium Low Income								-0.10 (0.07)
Medium High Income								0.09** (0.04)
High Income								0.09 (0.06)
Medium Low Income × Child								0.12 (0.09)
Medium High Income × Child								0.05 (0.04)
High Income × Child								-0.04 (0.08)
Rain	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.00 (0.03)	0.00 (0.03)	0.01 (0.02)	-0.03 (0.02)	-0.02 (0.03)	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.00 (0.03)
Hot	-0.05 (0.05)	-0.05 (0.05)	-0.06 (0.05)	-0.06 (0.05)	-0.05 (0.05)	-0.05 (0.05)	-0.05 (0.05)	-0.04 (0.05)
Observations	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400
Clusters	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
R ²	0.16	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.16	0.16	0.17	0.17
F
df	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29

Table 23: Table 9 - Paper Controls

	Base		Child		Target		Income	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Child	0.22*** (0.06)				0.28*** (0.09)	0.22*** (0.06)	0.16* (0.09)	0.22*** (0.09)
1 Child		0.19** (0.07)						
1 Boy			0.16* (0.08)					
1 Girl			0.17* (0.10)					
2 children			0.27*** (0.09)					
3+ children			0.27** (0.10)					
99.children2			0.39** (0.16)					
1 Child Age ≤ 5				0.26** (0.12)				
5 < 1 Child Age ≤ 8				0.14 (0.12)				
1 Child Age > 8				0.05 (0.14)				
2 Children				0.27*** (0.09)				
3+ Children				0.26** (0.10)				
VH	-0.10** (0.04)	-0.10** (0.04)	-0.10** (0.04)	-0.10** (0.04)	-0.11** (0.04)	-0.10** (0.04)	-0.10** (0.04)	-0.11** (0.04)
VH × Child	-0.07 (0.08)				-0.06 (0.08)	-0.07 (0.08)	-0.08 (0.07)	-0.07 (0.08)
VH × 1 Child		-0.12 (0.10)						
VH × 1 Boy			-0.15 (0.12)					
VH × 1 Girl			-0.08 (0.11)					
VH × 2 Children			-0.02 (0.14)					
VH × 3+ Children			0.03 (0.24)					
VH × Missing			-0.04 (0.42)					
VH × 1 Child Age ≤ 5				-0.26 (0.17)				
VH × 5 < 1 Child Age ≤ 8				-0.07 (0.15)				
VH × 1 Child Age > 9				0.05 (0.16)				
VH × 2 Children				-0.02 (0.14)				
VH × 3+ Children				0.04 (0.24)				
VH × Missing				-0.09 (0.50)				
Male Target	0.03 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	0.02 (0.04)	0.05 (0.06)	0.05 (0.06)	0.03 (0.04)	0.03 (0.04)
Male Target × Child					-0.06 (0.11)			
Male Actor	-0.22*** (0.05)	-0.23*** (0.05)	-0.22*** (0.05)	-0.22*** (0.05)	-0.19*** (0.06)	-0.21*** (0.05)	-0.22*** (0.05)	-0.20*** (0.05)
Male Actor × Child					-0.07 (0.09)			
Male Actor × Male target						-0.05 (0.07)		
Rich area	0.01 (0.05)	0.02 (0.05)	0.01 (0.05)	0.01 (0.05)	0.01 (0.05)	0.01 (0.05)	-0.06 (0.06)	
Rich area × Child							0.14 (0.09)	
Medium Low Income								0.08 (0.10)
Medium High Income								-0.00 (0.10)
High Income								0.08 (0.07)
Medium Low Income × Child								-0.02 (0.15)
Medium High Income × Child								0.02 (0.13)
High Income × Child								0.02 (0.09)
Rain	-0.08 (0.07)	-0.08 (0.07)	-0.08 (0.07)	-0.08 (0.07)	-0.08 (0.08)	-0.09 (0.07)	-0.09 (0.08)	-0.08 (0.08)
Hot	0.06 (0.05)	0.06 (0.05)	0.05 (0.05)	0.06 (0.05)	0.06 (0.05)	0.06 (0.05)	0.06 (0.05)	0.06 (0.05)
Observations	401	401	401	401	401	401	401	401
Clusters	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
R ²	0.13	0.14	0.15	0.15	0.13	0.13	0.14	0.14
F
df	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29

Table 24: Table 9 - Prespecified Controls

	Base		Child		Target		Income	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Child	0.21***				0.27***	0.21***	0.15	0.21**
	(0.06)				(0.09)	(0.06)	(0.09)	(0.09)
1 Child		0.18**						
		(0.07)						
1 Boy			0.16*					
			(0.09)					
1 Girl			0.16					
			(0.09)					
2 children			0.25***					
			(0.09)					
3+ children			0.27**					
			(0.10)					
99.children2			0.37**					
			(0.15)					
1 Child Age ≤ 5				0.26**				
				(0.12)				
5 < 1 Child Age ≤ 8				0.12				
				(0.12)				
1 Child Age > 8				0.06				
				(0.14)				
2 Children				0.25***				
				(0.09)				
3+ Children				0.27**				
				(0.10)				
VH	-0.10**	-0.10**	-0.10**	-0.10**	-0.10**	-0.10**	-0.10**	-0.11**
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.04)	(0.04)
VH × Child	-0.07				-0.06	-0.07	-0.08	-0.08
	(0.08)				(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.08)
VH × 1 Child		-0.12						
		(0.10)						
VH × 1 Boy			-0.17					
			(0.12)					
VH × 1 Girl			-0.08					
			(0.12)					
VH × 2 Children			-0.00					
			(0.14)					
VH × 3+ Children			0.05					
			(0.24)					
VH × Missing			-0.03					
			(0.40)					
VH × 1 Child Age ≤ 5				-0.25				
				(0.16)				
VH × 5 < 1 Child Age ≤ 8				-0.08				
				(0.16)				
1 Child Age > 9				0.04				
				(0.16)				
VH × 2 Children				-0.00				
				(0.14)				
VH × 3+ Children				0.05				
				(0.24)				
VH × Children Missing				-0.07				
				(0.48)				
Male Target	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.01
	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.06)	(0.04)	(0.04)
Male Target × Child					-0.07			
					(0.10)			
Male Actor	-0.21***	-0.21***	-0.20***	-0.20***	-0.17***	-0.20***	-0.21***	-0.19***
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)
Male Actor × Child					-0.07			
					(0.10)			
Male Actor × Male target						-0.03		
						(0.07)		
Rich area	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	-0.06	-0.14
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.06)	(0.08)
Rich area × Child							0.14	
							(0.09)	
Medium Low Income								0.09
								(0.10)
Medium High Income								0.10
								(0.11)
High Income								0.23*
								(0.11)
Medium Low Income × Child								-0.02
								(0.16)
Medium High Income × Child								0.05
								(0.13)
High Income × Child								0.01
								(0.09)
Rain	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07	-0.06	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07	-0.13
	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.09)
Hot	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06
	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.04)
Observations	401	401	401	401	401	401	401	401
Clusters	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
R ²	0.12	0.13	0.14	0.14	0.12	0.12	0.13	0.13
F
df	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29

Table 25: Table 9 - Extended Controls

	Base		Child		Target		Income	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Child	0.24*** (0.06)				0.30*** (0.09)	0.24*** (0.06)	0.20** (0.10)	0.24** (0.09)
1 Child		0.21*** (0.07)						
1 Boy			0.18* (0.10)					
1 Girl			0.19** (0.09)					
2 children			0.28*** (0.10)					
3+ children			0.30** (0.13)					
99.children2			0.38*** (0.16)					
1 Child Age ≤ 5				0.27** (0.12)				
5 < 1 Child Age ≤ 8				0.18 (0.13)				
1 Child Age > 8				0.07 (0.13)				
2 Children				0.28*** (0.10)				
3+ Children				0.31** (0.13)				
VH	-0.11** (0.05)	-0.11** (0.05)	-0.11** (0.05)	-0.11** (0.05)	-0.12** (0.05)	-0.12** (0.05)	-0.11** (0.05)	-0.11** (0.05)
VH × Child	-0.09 (0.08)				-0.09 (0.08)	-0.09 (0.08)	-0.10 (0.08)	-0.09 (0.08)
VH × 1 Child		-0.14 (0.11)						
VH × 1 Boy			-0.20 (0.13)					
VH × 1 Girl			-0.09 (0.11)					
VH × 2 Children			-0.05 (0.16)					
VH × 3+ Children			0.05 (0.28)					
VH × Missing			-0.09 (0.41)					
VH × 1 Child Age ≤ 5				-0.25 (0.17)				
VH × 5 < 1 Child Age ≤ 8				-0.13 (0.17)				
1 Child Age > 9				0.06 (0.15)				
VH × 2 Children				-0.05 (0.16)				
VH × 3+ Children				0.05 (0.28)				
Male Target	0.01 (0.04)	0.01 (0.04)	0.01 (0.04)	0.00 (0.03)	0.04 (0.06)	0.04 (0.05)	0.01 (0.04)	0.01 (0.04)
Male Target × Child					-0.07 (0.11)			
Male Actor	-0.10 (0.16)	-0.10 (0.16)	-0.10 (0.17)	-0.10 (0.18)	-0.06 (0.17)	-0.08 (0.17)	-0.10 (0.16)	-0.10 (0.16)
Male Actor × Child					-0.06 (0.09)			
Male Actor × Male target						-0.07 (0.06)		
Rich area	0.07 (0.12)	0.11 (0.13)	0.13 (0.13)	0.10 (0.15)	0.07 (0.11)	0.07 (0.11)	0.01 (0.14)	-0.33*** (0.09)
Rich area × Child							0.09 (0.09)	
Medium Low Income								0.26* (0.15)
Medium High Income								0.39*** (0.11)
High Income								0.67*** (0.14)
Medium Low Income × Child								0.02 (0.15)
Medium High Income × Child								0.03 (0.14)
High Income × Child								-0.02 (0.09)
Rain	-0.17 (0.10)	-0.17 (0.11)	-0.17 (0.11)	-0.16 (0.11)	-0.16 (0.11)	-0.18* (0.10)	-0.17 (0.11)	-0.17 (0.10)
Hot	0.05 (0.09)	0.06 (0.10)	0.05 (0.09)	0.06 (0.10)	0.05 (0.09)	0.05 (0.09)	0.06 (0.09)	0.05 (0.09)
Observations	401	401	401	401	401	401	401	401
Clusters	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
R ²	0.19	0.20	0.21	0.21	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19
F
df	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29

Table 26: Table 10 - Paper Controls

	Punishment			Helping		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Child	0.114** (0.049)	0.111** (0.048)	0.113** (0.043)	0.216*** (0.054)	0.206*** (0.054)	0.223*** (0.057)
VH	-0.041 (0.028)	-0.040 (0.028)	-0.039 (0.029)	-0.104** (0.044)	-0.106** (0.044)	-0.096** (0.045)
VH × Child	-0.119*** (0.043)	-0.120*** (0.042)	-0.123*** (0.042)	-0.067 (0.078)	-0.066 (0.079)	-0.070 (0.078)
Time × Arriving	-0.001 (0.002)			-0.000 (0.002)		
Time × Leaving	-0.001 (0.002)			0.000 (0.003)		
T10 × Arriving		-0.001 (0.002)			-0.001 (0.002)	
T10 × Leaving		-0.000 (0.001)			0.001 (0.003)	
No. × Arriving			0.000 (0.008)			-0.013 (0.010)
No. × Leaving			-0.009 (0.008)			0.005 (0.013)
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	400	400	400	401	401	401
Clusters	30	30	30	30	30	30
R^2	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.13	0.13	0.14
F
df	29	29	29	29	29	29

Table 27: Table 10 - Prespecified Controls

	Punishment			Helping		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Child	0.112** (0.052)	0.109** (0.052)	0.110** (0.047)	0.202*** (0.052)	0.192*** (0.053)	0.212*** (0.055)
VH	-0.035 (0.029)	-0.034 (0.029)	-0.036 (0.031)	-0.101** (0.046)	-0.103** (0.046)	-0.093* (0.047)
VH × Child	-0.132*** (0.043)	-0.133*** (0.043)	-0.133*** (0.042)	-0.065 (0.078)	-0.064 (0.078)	-0.069 (0.077)
Time × Arriving	-0.000 (0.002)			-0.001 (0.002)		
Time × Leaving	-0.000 (0.002)			0.001 (0.003)		
T10 × Arriving		-0.001 (0.002)			-0.002 (0.002)	
T10 × Leaving		0.000 (0.001)			0.001 (0.003)	
No. × Arriving			0.001 (0.008)			-0.012 (0.011)
No. × Leaving			-0.010 (0.008)			0.005 (0.014)
Prespecified Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	400	400	400	401	401	401
Clusters	30	30	30	30	30	30
R^2	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.12	0.12	0.12
F
df	29	29	29	29	29	29

Table 28: Table 10 - Extended Controls

	Punishment			Helping		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Child	0.112** (0.052)	0.109** (0.052)	0.110** (0.047)	0.202*** (0.052)	0.192*** (0.053)	0.212*** (0.055)
VH	-0.035 (0.029)	-0.034 (0.029)	-0.036 (0.031)	-0.101** (0.046)	-0.103** (0.046)	-0.093* (0.047)
VH × Child	-0.132*** (0.043)	-0.133*** (0.043)	-0.133*** (0.042)	-0.065 (0.078)	-0.064 (0.078)	-0.069 (0.077)
Time × Arriving	-0.000 (0.002)			-0.001 (0.002)		
Time × Leaving	-0.000 (0.002)			0.001 (0.003)		
T10 × Arriving		-0.001 (0.002)			-0.002 (0.002)	
T10 × Leaving		0.000 (0.001)			0.001 (0.003)	
No. × Arriving			0.001 (0.008)			-0.012 (0.011)
No. × Leaving			-0.010 (0.008)			0.005 (0.014)
Extended Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	400	400	400	401	401	401
Clusters	30	30	30	30	30	30
R^2	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.12	0.12	0.12
F
df	29	29	29	29	29	29