Conflict, Institutions, and Economic Behavior: Legacies of the Cambodian Genocide

Katsuo Kogure
Yoshito Takasaki

Japan-ASEAN Transdisciplinary Studies Working Paper Series No.7
April 2019

Conflict, Institutions, and Economic Behavior: Legacies of the Cambodian Genocide *

Katsuo Kogure† Yoshito Takasaki‡

April 20, 2019

Abstract

This paper considers how the Cambodian genocide under the Pol Pot regime (1975-1979) altered people's post-conflict behaviors through institutional changes. Combining spatial genocide data and the complete count 1998 Population Census microdata, we examine the impacts of the genocide on subsequent investments in children's education for couples who had their first child during and after the Pol Pot era. These two couples had distinct institutional experiences: The former were controlled as family organizations – state-owned spouses and children – and the latter were not. We find adverse genocide impacts only among the former couples. Plausible underlying mechanisms are discussed.

Keywords: conflict, genocide, institutions, education, Cambodia
JEL Codes: N35, O15, O17, Z13

*We are grateful to Abhijit Banerjee, Samuel Bowles, Keisuke Hirano, Kosuke Imai, Mamoru Kaneko, Hisaki Kono, Takashi Kurosaki, Chiaki Moriguchi, Tetsushi Murao, Masao Ogaki, Takeshi Sakurai, Pablo Selaya, Akira Shibanuma, David Yanagizawa-Drott, and seminar/conference participants at Kyoto University, Prefectural University of Kumamoto, Hosei University, 2014 Japanese Economic Association Spring Meeting at Doshisha University, 68th European Meeting of the Econometric Society at Toulouse School of Economics, 2015 Hayami Conference at GRIPS, 2015 Pacific Conference for Development Economics at UCSD, and Joint Conference on Logic, Game Theory, and Social Choice 8 and the 8th Pan-Pacific Conference on Game Theory at Academia Sinica for helpful comments on earlier versions of this work. We also gratefully acknowledge H.E. San Sy Than, H.E. Hang Lina, and Fumihiko Nishi for providing us with the complete count 1998 Cambodia Population Census microdata. The paper does not reflect the views of the National Institute of Statistics, Ministry of Planning, Cambodia. This study is supported by Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research No.15K17044 and No.25257106, Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

†Corresponding author. Center for Cultural Research and Studies, School of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Aizu, Tsuruga, Ikki-machi, Aizuwakamatsu, Fukushima 965-8580, Japan. Tel: +81-242-37-2500. Email: kkogure@u-aizu.ac.jp.

‡Graduate School of Economics, University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan. Tel: +81-3-5841-5530. Email: takasaki@e.u-tokyo.ac.jp.

I. Introduction

The past 15 years have seen a surge in economic research on the causes and economic consequences of war and conflict (see Blattman and Miguel (2010) for a review). "(T)he social and institutional legacies of conflict are arguably the most important but least understood of all war impacts" (Blattman and Miguel (2010, p. 42)); few studies, however, have sought to fill this lacuna by examining how institutions emerge during wars/conflicts and how those institutions influence people's behaviors. This paper considers how a civil conflict altered people's post-conflict behaviors through institutional changes. We show that the impacts are distinct between two social groups which had different institutional experiences during the conflict and discuss plausible underlying mechanisms with particular attention to the social context. Our study sheds new light on why institutions which emerge during conflict persistently shape people's behaviors.

We look at the Cambodian conflict – the Khmer Rouge's rule (1975-1979) and the Vietnamese rule and peace process (1979-1998).[1] The armed conflict during the Vietnam War (which started in 1970) ended in April 1975 with the victory of the Khmer Rouge (officially the Communist Party of Kampuchea). The Khmer Rouge led by Pol Pot established the state of Democratic Kampuchea in 1976 and ruled the country until the regime was overthrown by the Vietnamese army in January 1979. They implemented its radical "Maoist and Marxist-Leninist transformation program," which led the entire country into genocide: Approximately two million people died from execution, disease, starvation, or exhaustion.[2] We study the Cambodian genocide, one

[1] Our study does not cover the armed conflict during the Vietnam War (1970-1975). Chandler (2008) provides a description of each of these three conflict periods. Vietnam withdrew its forces from Cambodia in 1989.

[2] According to this estimate, about 27 percent of the total population – 7.3 million in 1975 (Ross (1998)) – died during the Pol Pot regime. Estimates of the number of people who died during the Pol Pot regime vary across studies (e.g., Dy (2007, p. 69)).

of the worst human tragedies of the 20th century (Brecht (1987)), and its institutional and economic legacies.

According to North (1990), institutions are defined as "the rules of the game in a society," which consist of 'formal rules' (e.g., constitutions, laws), 'informal rules' (e.g., norms, codes of conduct, conventions), and 'their enforcement characteristics.' The communist revolution by the Khmer Rouge was so radical that these three rules were simultaneously changed, as follows.[3]

First, private property was completely denied by the constitution (i.e., change in formal rules). This ban included not only material private properties but also one's own family: Spouses and children were owned by the state as collective property (Short (2004, pp. 316–317)). Second, people were forced to conform to the ideologies of the Pol Pot regime (Locard (2004)) (i.e., change in informal rules). Third, those who disobeyed the formal and informal rules of the Pol Pot regime were suspected of being enemies of the society and were sent to reeducation camps and/or executed (i.e., change in the enforcement mechanism). Thus, the Cambodian genocide resulted from the *violence* of the Khmer Rouge in forcing people to follow its rules.

We examine the impacts of the Cambodian genocide on parental investments in children's education after the collapse of the Pol Pot regime in 1979. We focus on these behavioral outcomes for two main reasons. The first is that human capital, a fundamental determinant of countries' economic performance (e.g., Barro and Sala-i-Martin (2003)), was lost during the Pol Pot era (Kiernan (2008)) because the Khmer Rouge tried to exterminate all intellectuals in the society (Vickery (1999, p. 39)). Understanding how human capital has been recovered and accumulated since 1979 is

[3]Whereas formal rules can take a relatively short time to change, informal rules and enforcement characteristics which are related to culture usually take much longer time to change (e.g., Hayami and Godo (2005, pp. 9–30)). Roland (2004) defines formal rules and informal rules as 'fast-moving institutions' and 'slow-moving institutions,' respectively.

crucial to design post-conflict economic policies in Cambodia.

The second reason is that parental behaviors may have suffered from the *institutional inertia* of the Pol Pot regime, as follows. First, the Khmer Rouge not only persecuted intellectuals and executed many of them, but also denied and abolished formal school education.[4] Although formal school education resumed soon after the collapse of the regime (Vickery (1986, pp. 154–159)), the ideologies regarding the denial of education and intellectuals may have influenced people's subsequent behaviors regarding children's education.

Second, as the remnants of the Khmer Rouge continued to fight against the new government army in guerilla warfare until the 1990s, *the threat of violence* by the Khmer Rouge was persistent. Under these unstable social situations, parents may have complied with the Khmer Rouge's rules for fear that it might recapture power. Indeed, the majority of survivors suffered from long-term mental health disorders, such as post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) (e.g., Beth et al. (2011)), implying that the subsequent behaviors might have continued to be constrained by the Khmer Rouge's ideologies.

We consider two types of couples: those who had their first child during and after the Pol Pot era.[5] While their decisions were made in similar environment after the Pol Pot era, they had had distinct experiences of the complete denial of private ownership during the Pol Pot era, including the state ownership of spouses and children.[6] Specif-

[4]The slogans on the denial of education include the following: "There are no diplomas, only diplomas one can visualize."; "The spade is your pen, the rice field is your paper."; "If you wish to pass your Bac, part one and part two, you must build dams and canals." (Locard (2004, pp. 95–96)).

[5]Data limitations (described below) preclude us from analyzing the impacts of the genocide on the behaviors for couples who had their first child before the Pol Pot era.

[6]The slogans on the state ownership of spouses and children include the following: "The Angkar is the mother and father of all young children, as well as all adolescent boys and girls."; "The Angkar looks after you all, brothers and sisters, mothers and fathers."; "If parents beat their children, it is a sign they despise the Angkar. Thus, the Angkar will have no compassion at all for them." (Locard (2004, pp. 107–109)). Here, Angkar means the Khmer Rouge's top leadership.

ically, the former couples had been controlled as family organizations and the latter had not. As a result, the former couples' decision making may have suffered more strongly from the institutional inertia of the Pol Pot regime. Confirming evidence that the potential concern of the endogeneity of childbearing is unlikely, we examine the heterogeneous impacts of the genocide on the behaviors between these two couples.

Our analysis utilizes two sets of data: (1) the Khmer Rouge historical database, which contains comprehensive and detailed information on the mass killings during the Pol Pot regime with geocoded locations of more than 500 execution sites (henceforth, 'killing sites') and the number of victims, and (2) the complete count 1998 Cambodia Population Census microdata, which contain the basic information of individual and household socioeconomic characteristics as well as information of latitude and longitude coordinates of villages in the country.

Combining these two types of spatial point data, one for 'events' of our interest and the other for subjects exposed to the events, we construct village-level binary and continuous measures of couples' exposure to genocidal violence during the Pol Pot regime. We assume that couples were more severely exposed to the genocidal violence if they lived in closer proximity to the execution sites where more people were executed. Based on the measures, we estimate the impacts of the genocide on the educational outcomes of children aged 15-21 and 6-14 separately for couples whose first child was born during and after the Pol Pot era. Since the majority (all children but first child aged 19-21 among the former couples) were born after the Pol Pot era, we can examine the potentially persistent effects of the institutional catastrophe during the conflict.

The most critical potential threat to our identification of the genocide impacts is the endogeneity of the locations of events: Since the locations of killing sites were not randomly chosen, our genocide measures based on the distance can be endogenous

as a determinant of outcomes. Indeed, we find that killing sites were established in relatively developed areas.

To address this concern, our empirical design follows one of Fisher's three principles of experimental designs, "blocking" ("local control"), with the aim of comparing outcomes among more homogeneous groups to reduce bias (Fisher (1935)).[7] Specifically, using Geographic Information Systems (GIS), we limit our original sample to households living around killing sites and then compare children's educational outcomes among households within the spatial clusters. To bolster identification, we further limit the sample to households living within selected spatial clusters with similar levels of regional development prior to the Pol Pot era, which we call *balanced spatial clusters*. Since the locations of killing sites within balanced spatial clusters are plausibly assumed to be exogenous, we can further reduce bias. Alternative instrumental variable approach is not feasible in our context, because it is difficult to find valid instrumental variables which are correlated with the locations of execution sites, but not with children's educational outcomes.

The analysis reveals a sharp contrast between couples whose first child was born during and after the Pol Pot regime: The genocide had adverse impacts on children's educational outcomes (both aged 15-21 and 6-14) only among the former couples. These findings are robust to alternative size of spatial clusters, alternative measures of genocidal violence, and various potential threats to identification, including potential omitted variable bias due to remaining unobserved confounders within balanced spatial clusters. We then examine four potential mechanisms underlying these patterns: fertility, income, health, and supply-side factors. The analysis shows no evidence supporting them. We finally discuss a plausible behavioral mechanism based

[7]The Fisher's three basic principles of experimental designs are "randomization," "replication," and "local control." Our quasi-experimental approach using observational data can only follow the third principle.

on heterogeneity analyses and findings in the related literature, especially those from social psychology, with careful attention to the social context, as follows.

First of all, the violence by the Khmer Rouge triggered *the emotion of fear* among people. The fear prevailed under unstable situations after the collapse of the Pol Pot regime, serving as a key *motivating force* of people's behaviors through time. Yet, whether the fear was *induced* and *causally* influenced a *specific* behavior, such as investments in children's education, depended on people's social ties with the Khmer Rouge society. Because couples who had their first child under the Pol Pot regime were strongly embedded in the Khmer Rouge society, they felt a sense of belonging to the Khmer Rouge, thereby being influenced by its ideologies. Thus, their behaviors continued to be susceptible to fear, which was greater for those who were severely exposed to the genocidal violence.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II clarifies our contribution to the literature. Section III provides a description of the spatial genocide data. Section IV discusses the empirical strategy. Section V provides the analysis and empirical results. Section VI interprets the results. Section VII concludes.

II. Related Literature

Our study contributes to five strands of existing literature. The first strand of literature on institutions usually (often implicitly) considers two definitions of institutions: 'institutions-as-rules' and 'institutions-as-equilibria' (e.g., Alesina and Giuliano (2015), Greif and Kingston (2011)). On one hand, the institutions-as-rules approach, which follows North's definition of institutions, treats the rules and the enforcement as separate issues. On the other hand, the institutions-as-equilibria approach treats the enforcement of the rules as endogenous: Focusing on *motivation* provided by the beliefs, norms, and expectations that shape individual behaviors, it carefully explains

incentives for individuals to follow the rules and studies the rules and the enforcement within a unified framework (Greif (2006)).

One key advantage of the institutions-as-rules approach is that it is possible to isolate the effects of one specific institution or one type of institution from those of other institutions or other types of institutions. At the same time, extant works on the effects of formal rules often assume that the rules are externally enforced and pay little attention to the type and effectiveness of the enforcement (Greif and Kingston (2011)); extant works on the effects of informal rules (culture) often impose apparently strong assumptions on the transmission of values, beliefs, and/or norms across generations.[8]

Although our study follows the institutions-as-rules approach, distinct from previous studies, we focus on the enforcement (violence) and try to isolate its effects from those of the rules. Moreover, in choosing our study samples and behavioral outcomes, we pay particular attention to the underlying institutions and social structure. This enables us to explain why and how couples were motivated to comply with the rules of the Pol Pot regime even after its collapse, thus effectively following the institutions-as-equilibria approach. In other words, our study distills the essence of the two institutional approaches.

The second is the recent small, but growing, stream of literature on the relationships among violence, preferences, and behaviors (e.g., Bellows and Miguel (2009), Blattman (2009), Callen et al. (2014), Voors et al. (2012)). The existing econometric and experimental studies report significant associations between violence and behaviors and between violence and preferences. Our study provides suggestive evidence that the effects of violence on economic behaviors can differ depending on the insti-

[8]Guiso et al. (2006, p. 23), for example, define culture as "those customary beliefs and values that ethnic, religious, and social groups transmit fairly unchanged from generation to generation." This definition is often adopted in empirical works.

tutions which emerge during conflict and the social structure in which individuals are embedded.

The third is the literature that examines the effects of violent conflict on children's schooling outcomes (e.g., Akresh and de Walque (2011), Alderman et al. (2006), Chamarbagwala and Morán (2011), Lee (2014), Shemyakina (2011); de Walque (2006), Islam et al. (2016), and Merrouche (2011) study the Cambodian context). These existing works study the effects among children who were of school age, of pre-school age, or in utero during conflict. In contrast, to examine the potentially persistent effects of institutions which emerged during the conflict, we study children who received formal school education after the genocidal violence (most of them were born well after the genocide).

The fourth strand of literature addresses the relationship between political mass killings and subsequent economic performance (e.g., Acemoglu et al. (2011), Chaney and Hornbeck (2016), Rogall and Yanagizawa-Drott (2014), Waldinger (2010)). The existing works study the change in social structure as a result of mass killings and examine the effects on subsequent economic performance. In contrast, our study focuses on the relationship between direct experiences of the holocaust among individuals and their subsequent behaviors.

The fifth stream of literature investigates the relationship between historical events and economic development (see Nunn (2009, 2014) for reviews). The literature studies historical events, such as European colonization (e.g., Acemoglu et al. (2001)), Africa's slave trade (e.g., Nunn (2008)), and the French Revolution (Acemoglu et al. (2011)). Although our study captures the effects of a relatively recent historical event, it provides a detailed description of the historical persistence at the micro level, taking into account motivations and incentives that individuals faced in the process of social change.

III. Killing Sites under the Pol Pot Regime

A. Genocide Data and Geographic Distribution of Killing Sites

We utilize the Khmer Rouge historical database developed by the Document Center of Cambodia (DC-Cam).[9] DC-Cam conducted a large-scale survey between 1995 and 2004 to comprehend the mass killings under the Pol Pot regime. Covering 121 districts in 21 provinces out of 183 districts in 24 provinces, the survey found 534 killing sites and collected information regarding their locations (latitude and longitude), types, and number of remains of victims of execution.[10] Excluding 1 site with no location information and 19 sites with inconsistent location information, we consider the remaining 514 killing sites in our analysis.[11]

Figure 1 depicts the geographic distribution of the 514 killing sites, along with information about victims.[12] The base map corresponds to the 1977 administrative divisions, consisting of seven zones (Northwest, West, Southwest, East, Center, North, and Northeast) and three autonomous regions (Kratie, Mondul Kiri, and Kampong Soam).[13] The 1998 district map and village points are also depicted.[14] The districts

[9]DC-Cam is an independent Cambodian research institute founded by Yale University's Cambodian Genocide Program in January 1995; it became an independent non-governmental organization in January 1997 (http://www.dccam.org/).

[10]The 534 sites are classified as 'burial' (278 sites) (including 1 site classified as a 'killing site'), 'prison' (110), 'burial and prison' (67), 'memorial' (49), 'burial and memorial' (15), 'memorial and prison' (3), or 'burial, prison, and memorial' (12). The information about victims is available for all types of execution sites; executions were conducted in all types.

[11]The 514 killing sites consist of 271 burial, 104 prison, 63 burial-and-prison, 48 memorial, 14 burial-and-memorial, 3 memorial-and-prison, and 11 burial-memorial-and-prison sites.

[12]The number of victims is often reported in intervals and we use the lower bound for analysis. Using the upper bound or median yields similar results. The results are available from the authors upon request. We do not have information regarding the number of victims in each year.

[13]The GIS polygon data were developed by the authors based on the digital layer prepared by Yale University's Cambodian Genocide Program (http://gsp.yale.edu/case-studies/cambodian-genocide-program). The 1977 administrative divisions differ from those before and after the Pol Pot regime, with each zone containing two or more provinces or parts of provinces and the three autonomous regions as independent provinces. The administrative divisions in 1973 (before the Pol Pot regime) are largely the same as those in 1998 (after the Pol Pot regime), except for some newly created provinces (e.g., Banteay Mean Chey, which was split off from Battambang in 1988).

[14]The GIS point data include 12,702 village points in all provinces but Phnom Penh, the nation's



Figure 1: Geographic Distribution of Killing Sites under the Pol Pot Regime

Notes: The figure shows the geographic distribution of 514 killing sites and their number of victims in districts surveyed by DC-Cam. The 1977 administrative zones of the Pol Pot regime and the 1998 districts are depicted. The maps include information on he district mean of years of schooling of non-migrant women aged 36-50 who should have finished primary school education, if they received any education, before 1975 and the national and provincial road networks in 1973.

with a white background are those not surveyed by DC-Cam, most of which are located in remote areas. Killing sites are widely distributed in the surveyed areas. A relatively large number of killing sites is located in the eastern zone (144 sites, about 28 percent), where a large-scale purge was carried out in 1977-1978 (Kiernan (2008, pp. 205–210)).

capital. The distribution of villages in 1998 is largely consistent with that during the Pol Pot era; we select all village codes of individuals born before 1974 (one year before the Pol Pot regime began), whose birth villages are the same as those where they lived in 1998, finding that 81 percent of these villages is matched with the 1998 villages. We substitute the 1998 village point data for those during the Pol Pot era.

B. Location Determinants of Killing Sites

International organizations and historians provide anecdotal evidence that schools, universities, and government buildings were used as prisons and reeducation camps and trucks were used to transport prisoners to prisons or burial sites (Chandler (1999), Kiernan (2008, p. 316)). This suggests that killing sites were located in relatively developed areas. Figure 1 depicts two measures which should be correlated with the level of regional development prior to the Pol Pot era: the national and provincial road networks in 1973 (*major roads*) and the district mean education levels of women aged 36-50 who have never migrated, a cohort that should have finished primary school education, if receiving any education, before 1975.[15] Many killing sites are located near major roads and in districts with relatively high education levels, though those located relatively far from major roads are also common in the eastern and western zones. These relationships are empirically confirmed in Appendix Table A2 (columns 1 and 3).

IV. Empirical Design

A. Target Population, Study Population, Study Samples, and Subsamples

Target Population. People were divided into two social classes: "new people" and "base people" (e.g., Dy (2007, pp. 30–32)). In general, urban people were classified as new people and rural people were base people; new people, who were considered enemies of the society, were persecuted, whereas base people, who were considered innocent, were treated relatively favorably. Urban people were forced to

[15]The corresponding descriptive statistics are reported in Appendix Table A1. Based on the historical map stored in DC-Cam archives, we develop the 1973 GIS line data from the GIS line data of the 1998 national and provincial road networks. The education system before the Pol Pot regime followed the French 6·4·3 education system (e.g., Nguonly (2004)). We focus on female education because women were relatively less affected by armed conflict during the Vietnam War than men, who were more likely to migrate or join the Khmer Rouge. We focus on females who speak Khmer as their first language and are Buddhist.

migrate to the countryside in 1975, and many of them experienced forced migration several times during the Pol Pot era (Kiernan (2008)).

Our target population is non-migrant base people (rural) couples who were alive in 1998 (i.e., survivors of the Pol Pot regime) and had their first child during and after the Pol Pot era. Unfortunately, we exclude new people (urban) couples and base people (rural) couples with migration experience (about 57 percent of the couples in rural areas). This is because our genocide measures (defined below) are based on the points of killing sites and villages where couples lived in 1998 and defining those measures is feasible only for non-migrant couples.[16]

Study Population. Using the complete count 1998 Population Census microdata, we define the study population as follows (Appendix Table A3 provides the complete sampling procedure). First, we select households with a mother aged 34-45 whose first child was born in 1977-1982 (i.e., right before and after the breakdown of the Pol Pot regime). We focus on mothers aged 34-45 because most of them were married during or right after the Pol Pot regime (National Institute of Statistics (2001, pp. 96–97)). Second, we limit these households to non-migrant rural households (i.e., households that resided in rural areas in 1998 and included a husband and wife who had never migrated). Third, we further restrict these households to reduce unobserved factors that may be correlated with children's educational outcomes. The resulting study population consists of 49,150 households.[17]

Since the 1998 Census data do not contain direct information of the birth order

[16]Migrant couples are slightly older and more educated. The means (standard deviations) of age and years of schooling for 49,150 non-migrant rural couples (study population defined next) and 64,490 migrant rural couples (before imposing condition 16 in Appendix Table A3) are as follows: mother's age – 39.20 (2.95) vs. 39.48 (2.93); father's age – 42.04 (4.75) vs. 42.81 (4.93); mother's education – 2.14 (2.46) vs. 2.37 (2.56); and father's education – 3.69 (2.89) vs. 4.11 (3.00).

[17]Complete information about the variables used in our analysis is available for about 89 percent of the study population. Appendix Tables A4 and A5 (column 1) provide the descriptive statistics of characteristics of these 43,535 households, their children aged 15-21 and 6-14, and the villages where they reside.

of children, we identify first child as follows: the oldest child in households in which the number of the mother's own living children is the same as the number of children living together at the time of the Census (i.e., no children lived apart from their parents). Although child migration and mortality are potential threats to identification in our empirical analysis based on this identifier of first child, they are unlikely to be major concerns for the following reasons. First, child migration is unrelated with the locations of killing sites (our binary genocide measure (*Genocidal Violence I*) defined below) in our main sample (Sample Ⅲ defined shortly) (see columns 1-3 of Appendix Table A6). Second, for a more conservative identifier of first child, we limit the samples to households which have not experienced a child's death and confirm similar results in the robustness check below.

Study Samples. From the study population, we construct three study samples for our analysis (*Samples I, Ⅱ, and Ⅲ*) as follows. Sample I consists of households residing in districts surveyed by DC-Cam (Figure 1). We then restrict samples to mitigate the endogeneity of killing-site locations: Sample Ⅱ consists of households residing in villages within 6.0 km of killing sites and Sample Ⅲ is composed of households residing in villages within spatial clusters with similar levels of regional development (henceforth, *balanced spatial clusters*), as discussed in the next subsection. Samples I, Ⅱ, and Ⅲ contain 41,054, 20,956, and 8,302 households, respectively.

Subsamples. We divide each sample into two groups: households whose first child was born during and after the Pol Pot regime (1977-1979 and 1980-1982). We further divide the latter households into two: those whose first child was born in 1980 and in 1981-1982, the former of which corresponds to a transition period. We analyze these three subsamples separately, with an assumption that the timing of having the first child is unrelated to the potential impacts of the genocide on children's educational outcomes. This assumption implies that for example, if couples whose

first child was born in 1980 or 1981-1982 had had their first child in 1977-1979, their estimated genocide impacts would be identical to those for couples whose first child was actually born in 1977-1979.

Ideally, a difference-in-differences approach could address the potential endogeneity of the timing of childbearing as well as the endogeneity of the locations of killing sites. However, such an approach is not feasible in our context due to a small number of two types of households whose first child was born during and after the Pol Pot regime within balanced spatial clusters in Sample Ⅲ (and Sample Ⅳ defined below). We assess the plausibility of the assumption of the exogeneity of the timing of childbearing as follows.

First, comparing the number of children among the three sets of couples (those whose first child was born in 1977-1979, 1980, and 1981-1982) for Sample Ⅲ (and Sample Ⅳ), we confirm that the earlier couples had their first child, the more children they had and the number of children decreases linearly across the three subsamples (Appendix Table A7). This suggests that these couples had similar fertility behaviors.[18] This is also consistent with anecdotal evidence that people did not anticipate the fall of the Pol Pot regime (Kiernan (2008)); adjusting the timing of childbearing ex ante should have been very limited.

Second, we consider covariate balance across the three subsamples for Sample Ⅲ (and Sample Ⅳ) (the detailed results are available from the authors upon request). Following Imbens and Rubin (2015), we calculate the normalized differences[19] in the

[18] According to the Cambodia Demographic and Health Survey 2000, the median age at first birth is similar across women aged 25-29 (at 21.5), 30-34 (at 22.3), 35-39 (at 21.6), 40-44 (at 22.4), and 45-49 (at 21.4) (National Institute of Statistics (2001, p. 64)), the last three of which mostly correspond to our sample (women aged 34-45 in 1998).

[19] The normalized difference is measured by the difference in means, scaled by the square root of the average of the two within-group variances. This measure provides a scale- and sample size-free way to assess the covariate balance between two groups. Smaller values for normalized differences indicate that covariates are more balanced. As a rule of thumb, the absolute value of the normalized difference exceeding one quarter calls into question the robustness of the results in regression analysis

means of all covariates (parental age and education, zone dummies, district dummies, and spatial-cluster dummies) between each two of the three subsamples. The results show modest normalized differences, with only 22 (28) and 6 (6) out of 998 (397) normalized differences (about 2.2 percent (7.1 percent) and 0.6 percent (1.5 percent) of the total) larger than 0.10 and 0.25, respectively, in absolute value for all two pairs of the three subsamples of Sample Ⅲ (Sample Ⅳ). This provides evidence that the three subsamples generally have similar covariate distributions. To be conservative, below we limit these three subsamples to those with more balanced covariates (propensity score screened samples), showing the robustness of our results based on the original subsamples.

B. External Validity

The descriptive statistics of the study population, Samples Ⅰ, Ⅱ, and Ⅲ are reported in Appendix Tables A4 and A5. The comparison of household and village characteristics across the samples shows that compared to the study population, Samples Ⅰ, Ⅱ, and Ⅲ, especially the latter two, contain households and villages with favorable characteristics (Appendix Table A8) because Samples Ⅱ and Ⅲ focus on villages around killing sites, which tended to be located in relatively developed areas (Appendix Table A2). Thus, the results based on the two local samples should be taken with some caution regarding external validity.

C. Balanced Spatial Clusters

Fisher's Exact Test. To select balanced spatial clusters with similar levels of regional development, we employ Fisher's exact test (Fisher (1925)), which is a statistical significance test for independence between two variables, to test the spatial homogeneity within clusters. Since in-migration is generally strongly correlated with

(Imbens and Rubin (2015)).

regional development (e.g., Mazumdar (1987)), we use the proportion of migrant households as a proxy for the level of regional development. Lacking historical migration data, we use the data in the 1998 Census to calculate the migrant proportion as a proxy for the level of regional development prior to the Pol Pot era.[20] The validity of this proxy measure requires the following assumptions: (1) The distribution of the migrant proportion within each spatial cluster based on the 1998 Census data is the same as that prior to the Pol Pot era;[21] and (2) errors in this proxy are not systematically related to both the locations of killing sites and children's educational outcomes.

Since it is not feasible to directly assess the validity of these assumptions, we examine the relationships between killing-site locations and pre-treatment village/parental characteristics. If the locations of killing sites are correlated with the level of regional development, then the former should be positively correlated with the education levels of non-migrant women aged 36-50 and/or the level of parental education; if the errors in the proxy measure are correlated with the locations of killing sites and children's educational outcomes, then the locations of killing sites should also be correlated with the pre-treatment village and/or parental characteristics. Thus, the locations of killing sites having little correlation with the pre-treatment village and parental

[20]Directly using the education levels of non-migrant women aged 36-50 as a proxy for the level of regional economic development as we did above (Figure 1) is not feasible because doing so would require us to consider the joint distribution of the education levels and ages (as they are systematically related to each other), which is technically difficult in Fisher's exact test for the independence/homogeneity between *two categorical variables* (Fisher (1925)). Using the distance from villages to main roads during the Pol Pot era as a proxy for the level of regional development is also not feasible because the distance to the road is strongly correlated with the distance from villages to the killing sites, depending on their location relative to the road within spatial clusters.

[21]Although many people were forced to migrate under the Pol Pot regime (Kiernan (2008)) and fled to Thailand or Vietnam around the collapse of the Pol Pot regime (Robinson (1998)), the political and social environment within spatial clusters should have been similar. This is because the spatial clusters we use are much smaller than the main administrative divisions under the Pol Pot regime – seven zones, each of which consisted of three to seven regions (Dy (2007, pp. 23–25)). (A region was an administrative unit below a zone. Each region consisted of districts, each of which consisted of sub-districts. Each sub-district consisted of cooperatives (villages).) For a robustness check, we also consider 4.0 km spatial clusters, as discussed below; the smaller the spatial clusters, the more similar the within-cluster environment.

characteristics supports the first and second assumptions.

We calculate the migrant proportion based on nuclear households (a different sample from the one for analysis) to attain a better balance, as shown next (Appendix Table A9 provides the complete sampling procedure).[22] We confirm that the migrant proportion is positively correlated with the locations of killing sites (columns 2 and 4 of Appendix Table A2). For a robustness check, we also consider other samples to define the migrant proportion in Appendix Section A.2.

Procedures. We describe the procedures for selecting balanced spatial clusters. Let us consider a specific case for Killing Site A, depicted in Figure 2. First, using GIS, we additionally create 2.0 km and 4.0 km buffers around each killing site and identify village points within the 0-2.0 km, 2.0-4.0 km, and 4.0-6.0 km buffers of each spatial cluster.[23] Second, using these village points as identifiers, we identify the non-migrant and migrant households living within the 0-2.0 km, 2.0-4.0 km, and 4.0-6.0 km buffers of each spatial cluster for each subsample of the households whose first child was born in 1977-1979, 1980, and 1981-1982. Third, for each subsample, we test the homogeneity in the proportion of migrant households across the three buffers using Fisher's exact test.[24] The null hypothesis is that the proportion of migrant households has no association across the three buffers. We define spatial clusters as balanced spatial ones if the null hypothesis cannot be rejected for all three

[22]Using migrant households selected under the same conditions as non-migrant households selected in the study population (Appendix Table A3), except for their migrant status, yields relatively unbalanced results – positive correlations of killing-site locations with the education level of non-migrant women aged 36-50 and parents (columns 1-3 of Appendix Table A11). We consider various samples (Appendix Table A10) based on the test for joint significance of pre-treatment covariates.

[23]Village points located exactly 2.0 (4.0) km from killing sites, if any, belong to 0-2.0 (2.0-4.0) km buffers, not 2.0-4.0 (4.0-6.0) km buffers. Since our analysis uses both binary and continuous genocide measures, the narrower the bandwidth for defining spatial clusters, the better; however, if the bandwidth is too narrow, the number of observations is too small for conducting a statistical test. Based on these considerations, we use a 2.0 km bandwidth.

[24]Fisher's exact test is used particularly when the sample size is small. We do not employ the chi-squared test because in many spatial clusters the three buffers have unequal numbers of households with very low frequencies of non-migrant or migrant households in the cells (see Table 1).



Figure 2: Spatial Clusters

Note: The number of villages within 0-2.0 km, 2.0-4.0 km, and 4.0-6.0 km of Killing Site A is 5, 8, and 18, respectively.

Table 1: Results of Fisher's Exact Tests for Killing Site A

	No. of Villages (1)	Non-mig. HHs (2)	Migrant HHs (3)	Total (4)
A. 1977-1979 (Fisher's exact p-value = 0.001)				
0-2.0 km	3	5	1	6
2.0-4.0 km	7	14	3	17
4.0-6.0 km	14	17	28	45
Total	24	36	32	68
B. 1980 (Fisher's exact p-value = 0.049)				
0-2.0 km	3	4	6	10
2.0-4.0 km	8	13	7	20
4.0-6.0 km	17	18	36	54
Total	28	35	49	84
C. 1981-1982 (Fisher's exact p-value = 0.001)				
0-2.0 km	5	13	5	18
2.0-4.0 km	7	23	12	35
4.0-6.0 km	18	33	62	95
Total	30	69	79	148

Note: Fisher's exact p-values are from two-sided Fisher's exact tests.

subsamples.[25]

Results. Table 1 shows the results of Fisher's exact tests for Killing Site A. In all three subsamples, the number of non-migrant households is larger than that of migrant households within the 0-2.0 km and 2.0-4.0 km buffers; the converse holds true within the 4.0-6.0 km buffer. As the null hypothesis is rejected at conventional levels in all three subsamples, the spatial cluster of Killing Site A is not balanced. The results of the same Fisher's exact tests for all 514 killing sites are depicted in Appendix Figure A1 (Appendix Section A.1 describes the detailed results). Sample Ⅲ consists of households living within 115 balanced spatial clusters.

D. Assessing the Exogeneity

Table 2 examines the relationships of the locations of killing sites with pre-treatment village characteristics (panel A) and parental characteristics (panel B) for each sub-

[25]To be conservative, for each subsample, we also examine the homogeneity in the proportion of migrant households among households residing in villages within the 0-2.0 km and 2.0-4.0 km buffers of 4.0 km spatial clusters. If the balanced spatial clusters do not have the homogeneous distribution of migrant households within the 4.0 km spatial clusters, then we exclude households living within such spatial clusters from Sample Ⅲ.

sample of Samples I, II, and III.[26] The dependent variable is an indicator variable equal to 1 if the points of villages (where couples live) are located within 3.0 km of killing sites and 0 otherwise (our binary genocide measure defined below). All regressions include zone and district fixed effects. The regressions for Samples II and III additionally include *spatial cluster fixed effects*: Unobserved factors shared within spatial clusters are fully controlled for. We estimate all regression equations by ordinary least squares (OLS); we also examine the joint significance of the listed variables. The significant relationships between the locations of killing sites and predetermined variables found in Samples I and II vanish in Sample III. Based on these results, we assume that the locations of killing sites are exogenous within balanced spatial clusters. Below we conduct sensitivity analysis to address the remaining concerns about omitted variable bias due to unobserved confounders that vary within balanced spatial clusters.

V. Analysis

A. Children's Educational Outcomes

We evaluate educational outcomes of children aged 15-21 and 6-14. In the 1998 Cambodian education system, the former cohort had already finished the nine year compulsory education (though some were still receiving it due to delayed entry, temporary dropout, or grade retention); the latter cohort were still receiving it, if they were receiving any education. The results for older and younger cohorts enable us to see how the genocide altered parental investments in children's education over time between the couples whose first child was born during and after the Pol Pot regime.

Since most of these children were born after the Pol Pot regime, their existence may have been affected by the parents' exposure to genocidal violence through their fertility decisions. Thus, we use household, not child, as a unit of analysis for household-

[26]The corresponding mean comparison is provided in Appendix Tables A14 and A13, respectively.

Table 2: Relationships between Locations of Killing Sites and Predetermined Village/Parental Characteristics

Sample:	Sample I			Sample II (All spatial clusters)			Sample III (Balanced spatial clusters)		
Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
				A. Village characteristics					
Distance to major roads (km)	-0.004***	-0.002	-0.003***	0.001	0.001	0.000	-0.010	0.000	-0.003
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.010)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.118***	0.176***	0.074**	0.041	0.207***	0.014	0.053	0.190	0.076
aged 36-50 with grade 1-5	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.030)	(0.073)	(0.071)	(0.060)	(0.117)	(0.116)	(0.090)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.485***	0.467***	0.369***	0.514***	0.507***	0.350***	0.054	0.221	0.150
aged 36-50 with grade 6 or above	(0.064)	(0.061)	(0.054)	(0.115)	(0.110)	(0.095)	(0.184)	(0.180)	(0.144)
Spatial cluster fixed effects	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	3,989	4,154	5,197	1,979	2,098	2,577	839	889	1,128
R-squared	0.145	0.126	0.125	0.381	0.351	0.329	0.478	0.439	0.443
p-value of the listed variables	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.003	0.755	0.285	0.575
				B. Parental characteristics					
Mother's age	0.000	-0.002	-0.001	-0.002	-0.007***	-0.001	0.000	-0.003	-0.005*
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)
Father's age	0.000	0.001	0.000	-0.003*	0.003*	0.000	-0.003	0.003	0.001
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)
Mother with grade 1-5	0.042***	0.031***	0.020***	0.025*	0.037**	0.008	0.034	0.033	0.021
	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.008)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.011)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.016)
Mother with grade 6 or above	0.065***	0.039**	0.052***	0.058***	0.028	0.052***	0.047	-0.031	-0.005
	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.015)	(0.022)	(0.024)	(0.019)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.029)
Father with grade 1-5	0.023**	0.001	0.020**	0.000	-0.014	0.013	-0.012	0.010	0.010
	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.008)	(0.016)	(0.018)	(0.012)	(0.027)	(0.029)	(0.018)
Father with grade 6 or above	0.058***	0.040***	0.059***	0.018	0.029	0.036**	-0.010	0.030	0.010
	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.011)	(0.018)	(0.020)	(0.015)	(0.028)	(0.031)	(0.023)
Spatial cluster fixed effects	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	11,141	10,642	19,271	5,738	5,474	9,744	2,137	2,154	4,011
R-squared	0.149	0.128	0.134	0.407	0.37	0.349	0.477	0.463	0.452
p-value of the listed variables	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.003	0.002	0.014	0.538	0.280	0.319
Num. of killing sites	435	435	435	433	433	433	115	115	115

Notes: The table reports OLS estimates where the unit of observation is the village in panel A and the household in panel B. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses in panel A and robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by village, are reported in parentheses in panel B. Sample I – households in the districts surveyed by DC-Cam; Sample II – households within 6.0 km of killing sites; Sample III – households within 6.0 km of the selected killing sites (6.0 km balanced spatial clusters); the dependent variable is an indicator variable equal to 1 if villages are located within 3.0 km of killing sites and 0 otherwise. Zone and district fixed effects are controlled for in all regressions. p-values are from F-tests for the joint significance of the listed variables. *** = Significant at the 1 percent level. ** = Significant at the 5 percent level. * = Significant at the 10 percent level.

level outcomes – the proportion or average among children within households.[27]

We consider three outcome measures for children aged 15-21 and 6-14: the proportion having never attended school (*No schooling*), the proportion having completed primary school (*Primary school completion*), and the average years of schooling (*Years of schooling*) for children aged 15-21 and the proportion having never attended school (*No schooling*), the proportion attending school (*School attendance*), and the average grade progression (*Grade progression*) for children aged 6-14. The grade progression of each child is measured by $Grade - (Age - 5)$, which takes 0 if the child progresses from any grade to the next higher one and negative values otherwise.

B. Measures of Genocidal Violence

We construct two measures of genocidal violence during the Pol Pot regime: a binary measure (*Genocidal Violence I*) and a continuous measure (*Genocidal Violence II*). We use the location information of villages for that of households: Households living in the same village share the same location information. The binary measure takes the value of 1 if the points of villages where couples lived are located within 3.0 km of at least one killing site and 0 otherwise. We assume that couples living within 3.0 km of killing sites were exposed to genocidal violence and those living outside were not.[28]

The continuous measure combines the distance from the villages where couples lived to killing sites and the number of victims at the killing sites. We assume that couples were exposed to genocidal violence in all killing sites located within 6.0 km of the villages where they lived (for a robustness check, we also consider 4.0 km and 8.0

[27]Indeed, genocidal violence is positively correlated with the number of children aged 15-18 and aged 15-17 among households whose first child was born in 1980 and 1981-1982, respectively (panel A-5 of Appendix Table A15) and negatively correlated with the number of children aged 6-14, particularly the number of female children aged 6-14, among households whose first child was born in 1981-1982 (panels A-11, A-14, and A-15 of Appendix Table A15). The corresponding child-level analyses (with child as the unit of analysis) yield results consistent with those reported here.

[28]Similar violence measures based on spatial data are used in the relevant literature (e.g., Callen et al. (2014)). We have no data on the personal experience of violence during the Pol Pot regime.

km spatial clusters). In addition, we assume that couples were more severely exposed to genocidal violence if they lived in closer proximity to the killing sites and if more people were executed there.

Specifically, identifying village points located within 6.0 km of each killing site, we calculate the distance from the village points to the killing site and then calculate the inverse-distance weighted sum of the numbers of victims (for a robustness check, we also consider the measure based on the second- and third-order polynomial in distance in Appendix Section A.2).[29] We use the logarithmic value for our continuous genocide measure because the original value has right-skewed distribution; see Appendix Figure A2 for distributions of our continuous measures. Since 184 killing sites lack information about the number of victims (Figure 1), our analysis based on the continuous genocide measure is based on households residing in villages with complete information about victims for all killing sites located within 6.0 km of the villages.[30]

We call this sample *Sample IV*. The total number of households decreases from 8,302 in Sample Ⅲ to 3,821 in Sample Ⅳ (see Appendix Table A4). Although these two samples have similar household characteristics, Sample Ⅳ has slightly worse village characteristics than Sample Ⅲ (Appendix Table A8), probably because relatively developed villages are located in a greater number of spatial clusters, thus being likely to face the missing data problem. At the same time, compared to Samples Ⅰ, Ⅱ, and

[29]We do not take into account geographic conditions such as elevation and gradient in constructing the measure of genocidal violence because they are unlikely to differ significantly within small spatial clusters. Cambodia mostly consists of flat and low-lying plains at elevations below 100 meters, and this is especially the case in the central part of the country where most spatial clusters are located (Appendix Figure A1). Although rivers can potentially make the local geographic conditions heterogeneous within spatial clusters, our GIS data for rivers are incomplete. Geographically heterogeneous spatial clusters are less likely to be balanced because the level of regional development can vary within the clusters according to geographic conditions.

[30]Although a few correlations are found between the continuous genocide measure and pretreatment village/parental characteristics, no measures of parental education, which is a key proxy for the level of regional development, are correlated with the continuous genocide measure across the three subsamples (columns 4-6 of Appendix Table A16).

Ⅲ, the household and village characteristics of Sample Ⅳ are more similar to those of the study population.

C. Empirical Specification

We estimate the following regression equation:

$$Y_{ivbdz} = \alpha + \gamma GenocidalViolence_v + \mathbf{X}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta}_1 + \mathbf{X}_v'\boldsymbol{\beta}_2 + \phi_b + \pi_d + \lambda_z + \epsilon_{ivbdz}, \quad (1)$$

where Y_{ivbdz} is a children's educational outcome of household i in village v, spatial cluster b, district d, and zone z; $GenocidalViolence_v$ is the binary/continuous genocide measure; $\mathbf{X}_i$ is a vector of pre-treatment parental characteristics (age and education); $\mathbf{X}_v$ is a vector of pre-treatment village characteristics (distance to major roads (km), the education levels of non-migrant women aged 36-50); ϕ_b denotes spatial cluster fixed effects (only for Samples Ⅱ, Ⅲ, and Ⅳ); π_d and λ_z denote district and zone fixed effects, respectively.

This specification exploits variations within spatial clusters as the spatial cluster fixed effects fully control for unobserved cluster-level heterogeneity. We assume constant spillover effects, if any, around killing sites, which are controlled for by spatial cluster fixed effects. We assume no spillover effects across spatial clusters. A parameter of our interest is γ, which captures the impact of the genocide on the outcome. The estimated γ based on Samples Ⅲ and Ⅳ provides the reliable estimate of the impact of the genocide on the children's educational outcome. We estimate equations (1) by OLS with robust standard errors clustered by village.[31]

D. Main Results

[31]The clustering at the level of spatial cluster for conservative inference is not feasible because many villages fall within more than one spatial cluster (see Figure 2). Since the administrative unit above village, commune, was determined after the Pol Pot regime, commune-level clustering is not adequate. When we used the administrative unit above commune, district, for clustering, most estimation results except for some for the binary violence measure reported below are statistically significant at conventional levels, despite the small number of districts covered in Samples Ⅲ and Ⅳ within balanced spatial clusters (66 and 51 districts, respectively). The results are available from the authors upon request.

Table 3 presents the estimated impacts of the genocide on educational outcomes. Although the estimated impacts are mostly positive in Samples I and II, some results become negative in Samples III and IV. This is particularly true for households whose first child was born in 1977-1979. For instance, although the incidence of exposure to genocidal violence among parents (binary measure) increased the years of schooling of children aged 15-21 by 0.136 years in Sample I, it decreased their years of schooling by 0.355 years (7.9 percent of the mean among those with no exposure) in Sample III (column 7 in panels A-1 vs. A-3); qualitatively the same results hold for the severity of genocidal violence captured by the continuous measure (panel A-4).

The adverse impacts in Samples III and IV are found for children aged both 15-21 and 6-14; for instance, a one standard deviation increase in the continuous genocide measure (28.8 percent and 28.9 percent increase for children aged 15-21 and 6-14, respectively) is associated with a 1.162 percentage point decrease in the primary school completion rate of children aged 15-21 and a 1.556 percentage point decrease in the school attendance rate of children aged 6-14, respectively (column 4 of panels A-4 and B-4).[32] This suggests that the genocide had lasting adverse impacts on the parental investments in children's education.

E. Potential Mechanisms

We next consider potential mechanisms underlying the adverse genocide impacts. We estimate the "net treatment differences" defined by Rosenbaum (1984) by adjusting for the observed values of the post-treatment variables which might alter the children's educational outcomes in equation (1). Such post-treatment variables are intermediary outcomes that might be affected by genocidal violence. Thus, this analysis generally

[32]The estimated impacts are small in magnitude because, distinct from the binary genocide measure, these estimates capture the relative difference among couples with different levels of exposure to the genocide within spatial clusters, assuming that all couples within spatial clusters were exposed to genocidal violence.

Table 3: Impacts of Genocide on Children's Educational Outcomes

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	A. Children aged 15-21								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			Primary school completion			Years of schooling		
	A-1. Sample I								
Genocidal Violence I	-0.005	-0.002	-0.009	0.027***	0.018	0.050***	0.136**	0.119*	0.269***
	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.009)	(0.062)	(0.068)	(0.056)
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.231	0.212	0.214	0.299	0.330	0.308	4.038	4.218	4.075
Observations	11,141	10,642	19,271	11,141	10,642	19,271	11,141	10,642	19,271
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	2,886	2,602	4,654	2,886	2,602	4,654	2,886	2,602	4,654
R-squared	0.291	0.262	0.219	0.229	0.210	0.172	0.357	0.325	0.299
	A-2. Sample II (all spatial clusters)								
Genocidal Violence I	0.011	0.011	-0.010	0.016	0.002	0.041***	0.029	-0.013	0.192***
	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.009)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.012)	(0.085)	(0.089)	(0.070)
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.192	0.177	0.172	0.329	0.362	0.341	4.343	4.527	4.403
Observations	5,738	5,474	9,744	5,738	5,474	9,744	5,738	5,474	9,744
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	2,632	2,398	4,316	2,632	2,398	4,316	2,632	2,398	4,316
R-squared	0.341	0.292	0.236	0.277	0.268	0.217	0.395	0.360	0.327
	A-3. Sample III (balanced spatial clusters)								
Genocidal Violence I	0.033*	-0.004	-0.002	-0.026	-0.020	0.005	-0.355**	-0.191	-0.018
	(0.019)	(0.021)	(0.015)	(0.023)	(0.025)	(0.019)	(0.146)	(0.158)	(0.118)
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.19	0.184	0.17	0.355	0.375	0.353	4.515	4.61	4.530
Observations	2,137	2,154	4,011	2,137	2,154	4,011	2,137	2,154	4,011
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	965	945	1,764	965	945	1,764	965	945	1,764
R-squared	0.394	0.354	0.271	0.333	0.318	0.237	0.454	0.401	0.350
	A-4. Sample IV (balanced spatial clusters)								
Genocidal Violence II	0.0432**	-0.0078	0.0119	-0.0403**	0.0086	0.0101	-0.3720***	0.0348	0.0264
	(0.0205)	(0.0186)	(0.0150)	(0.0170)	(0.0234)	(0.0209)	(0.1264)	(0.1428)	(0.1133)
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 6.0 km)	0.231	0.222	0.200	0.317	0.319	0.307	4.176	4.177	4.171
Mean of Genocidal Violence II	6.022	5.864	5.651	6.022	5.864	5.651	6.022	5.864	5.651
S.D. of Genocidal Violence II	1.736	1.742	1.707	1.736	1.742	1.707	1.736	1.742	1.707
Observations	1,008	1,015	1,798	1,008	1,015	1,798	1,008	1,015	1,798
R-squared	0.374	0.322	0.272	0.307	0.264	0.209	0.440	0.362	0.335

Continue

Table 3: Impacts of Genocide on Children's Educational Outcomes

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	B. Children aged 6-14								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			School attendance			Grade progression		
	B-1. Sample I								
Genocidal Violence I	-0.005	-0.003	-0.015**	0.006	0.003	0.016**	-0.008	0.000	0.057**
	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.035)	(0.036)	(0.028)
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.366	0.349	0.360	0.618	0.635	0.622	-3.712	-3.656	-3.637
Observations	10,520	10,185	18,661	10,520	10,185	18,661	10,520	10,185	18,661
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	2,697	2,490	4,476	2,697	2,490	4,476	2,697	2,490	4,476
R-squared	0.233	0.225	0.224	0.222	0.217	0.214	0.150	0.155	0.160
	B-2. Sample II (all spatial clusters)								
Genocidal Violence I	0.001	0.016	-0.002	0.002	-0.016	0.006	-0.041	0.000	-0.011
	(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.009)	(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.009)	(0.049)	(0.047)	(0.034)
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.323	0.312	0.315	0.659	0.672	0.667	-3.588	-3.554	-3.488
Observations	5,402	5,246	9,416	5,402	5,246	9,416	5,402	5,246	9,416
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	2,460	2,294	4,149	2,460	2,294	4,149	2,460	2,294	4,149
R-squared	0.283	0.271	0.269	0.271	0.262	0.260	0.218	0.209	0.208
	B-3. Sample III (balanced spatial clusters)								
Genocidal Violence I	0.031	0.040*	-0.006	-0.032	-0.040*	0.015	-0.148*	-0.003	0.027
	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.014)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.015)	(0.088)	(0.073)	(0.054)
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.314	0.306	0.305	0.665	0.677	0.676	-3.547	-3.565	-3.441
Observations	2,027	2,068	3,900	2,027	2,068	3,900	2,027	2,068	3,900
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	908	909	1,705	908	909	1,705	908	909	1,705
R-squared	0.349	0.322	0.310	0.340	0.308	0.298	0.283	0.265	0.236
	B-4. Sample IV (balanced spatial clusters)								
Genocidal Violence II	0.0543**	-0.0012	0.0165	-0.0538**	0.0094	-0.0159	-0.1855**	-0.0060	0.0537
	(0.0210)	(0.0208)	(0.0144)	(0.0218)	(0.0213)	(0.0148)	(0.0810)	(0.0724)	(0.0516)
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 6.0 km)	0.342	0.346	0.333	0.637	0.637	0.647	-3.669	-3.623	-3.548
Mean of Genocidal Violence II	6.018	5.864	5.647	6.018	5.864	5.647	6.018	5.864	5.647
S.D. of Genocidal Violence II	1.740	1.749	1.710	1.740	1.749	1.710	1.740	1.749	1.710
Observations	951	974	1,752	951	974	1,752	951	974	1,752
R-squared	0.352	0.306	0.299	0.352	0.294	0.287	0.234	0.232	0.229

Notes: The table reports OLS estimates where the unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by village, are reported in parentheses. Sample I – households in the districts surveyed by DC-Cam; Sample II – households within 6.0 km of killing sites; Sample III – households within 6.0 km of the selected killing sites (6.0 km balanced spatial clusters); Sample IV – households within 6.0 km of the selected killing sites with victim information (6.0 km balanced spatial clusters). "No schooling" is the proportion of children aged 15-21 (6-14) who have never attended school. "Primary school completion" is the proportion of children aged 15-21 who have completed primary school. "Years of schooling" is the average years of schooling of children aged 15-21. "School attendance" is the proportion of children aged 6-14 who attended school at the time of the 1998 Census. "Grade progression" is the average grade progression of children aged 6-14 measured by Grade - (Age - 5). See Section V.B for the definitions of "Genocidal Violence I" and "Genocidal Violence II." In all regressions, the following variables are controlled: mother's age, father's age, a set of dummy variables for mothers' and fathers' educational attainment (grade 1-5 and grade 6 or above), three variables on village characteristics (the distance to major roads (km)), the proportion of non-migrant women aged 36-50 with grade 1-5, and the proportion of non-migrant women aged 36-50 with grade 6 or above), zone and district fixed effects, and spatial cluster fixed effects (only in panels A-2, A-3, A-4, B-2, B-3, and B-4). *** = Significant at the 1 percent level. ** = Significant at the 5 percent level. * = Significant at the 10 percent level.

lacks causal interpretation. Still, if the estimated coefficients of the genocide measures decrease in magnitude after additionally adjusting for the post-treatment variables, it provides insights that they capture underlying potential mechanisms.

We mainly consider four potential mechanisms: fertility, income, health, and supply-side factors. These factors which can influence parent's educational decisions might also be systematically related with the genocide. For example, supply-side factors such as limited access to schools could be a driving force because schools were often used as prisons and execution sites under the Pol Pot regime and the reconstruction of schools after its collapse might have been delayed around killing sites.

Table 4 reports the estimated net treatment differences for Samples Ⅲ and Ⅳ; the results reported in Table 3 are replicated as *Baseline Specification* in each panel. We consider four specifications by sequentially adjusting for the following sets of the post-treatment variables to see the significance of each potential mechanism (Specifications I, Ⅱ, Ⅲ, and Ⅳ).[33]

(1) Specification I adds variables of the composition of children for whom we constructed household-level educational outcomes: a full set of dummy variables for having a child of each age and a female child of each age among children aged 15-21 (panel A) and 6-14 (panel B). This specification adjusts for parent fertility decisions.

(2) Specification Ⅱ further adjusts for household income by adding variables for female-headed households (dummy), parental occupation (two dummy variables for mother and father working in a non-farm sector), and housing conditions (a set of dummy variables for better housing (light, fuel, water, toilet) conditions; see the notes to Appendix Table A15 for detailed information about the variables

[33]The descriptive statistics of the post-treatment variables adjusted for in each specification are available from the authors upon request.

Table 4: Genocide Impacts Adjusted for Post-treatment Characteristics

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	A. Children aged 15-21								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			Primary school completion			Years of schooling		
	A-1. Sample Ⅲ (balanced spatial clusters): Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.033*	-0.004	-0.002	-0.026	-0.020	0.005	-0.355**	-0.191	-0.018
	(0.019)	(0.021)	(0.015)	(0.023)	(0.025)	(0.019)	(0.146)	(0.158)	(0.118)
Specification Ⅰ	0.033*	-0.002	-0.001	-0.023	-0.022	0.005	-0.339**	-0.211	-0.018
	(0.018)	(0.021)	(0.015)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.018)	(0.142)	(0.157)	(0.115)
Specification Ⅱ	0.034*	-0.002	-0.002	-0.028	-0.027	0.005	-0.370***	-0.238	-0.027
	(0.019)	(0.021)	(0.015)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.018)	(0.138)	(0.152)	(0.108)
Specification Ⅲ	0.038**	-0.002	-0.002	-0.032	-0.022	0.006	-0.394***	-0.213	-0.027
	(0.019)	(0.021)	(0.015)	(0.022)	(0.024)	(0.017)	(0.137)	(0.151)	(0.107)
Specification Ⅳ	0.042**	0.003	-0.001	-0.041*	-0.027	0.001	-0.453***	-0.256	-0.051
	(0.019)	(0.021)	(0.015)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.018)	(0.140)	(0.152)	(0.109)
Observations	2,137	2,154	4,011	2,137	2,154	4,011	2,137	2,154	4,011
	A-2. Sample Ⅳ (balanced spatial clusters): Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	0.0432**	-0.0078	0.0119	-0.0403**	0.0086	0.0101	-0.3720***	0.0348	0.0264
	(0.0205)	(0.0186)	(0.0150)	(0.0170)	(0.0234)	(0.0209)	(0.1264)	(0.1428)	(0.1133)
Specification Ⅰ	0.0425**	-0.0071	0.0131	-0.0402**	0.0083	0.0078	-0.3748***	0.0301	0.0077
	(0.0208)	(0.0180)	(0.0148)	(0.0172)	(0.0219)	(0.0210)	(0.1247)	(0.1328)	(0.1116)
Specification Ⅱ	0.0427**	-0.0061	0.0115	-0.0432**	0.0114	0.0097	-0.3880***	0.0363	0.0199
	(0.0211)	(0.0180)	(0.0150)	(0.0170)	(0.0210)	(0.0206)	(0.1251)	(0.1271)	(0.1093)
Specification Ⅲ	0.0417*	-0.0032	0.0132	-0.0424***	0.0077	0.0128	-0.3868***	0.0135	0.0331
	(0.0218)	(0.0181)	(0.0155)	(0.0160)	(0.0207)	(0.0210)	(0.1224)	(0.1283)	(0.1114)
Specification Ⅳ	0.0421*	-0.0011	0.0093	-0.0454***	0.0053	0.0099	-0.4063***	-0.0086	0.0357
	(0.0223)	(0.0181)	(0.0163)	(0.0171)	(0.0208)	(0.0205)	(0.1327)	(0.1296)	(0.1127)
Observations	1,008	1,015	1,798	1,008	1,015	1,798	1,008	1,015	1,798

Continue

Table 4: Genocide Impacts Adjusted for Post-treatment Characteristics

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	B. Children aged 6-14								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			School attendance			Grade progression		
	B-1. Sample Ⅲ (balanced spatial clusters): Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.031	0.040*	-0.006	-0.032	-0.040*	0.015	-0.148*	-0.003	0.027
	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.014)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.015)	(0.088)	(0.073)	(0.054)
Specification Ⅰ	0.035*	0.034	-0.004	-0.035*	-0.033	0.012	-0.115	-0.078	-0.010
	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.014)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.014)	(0.078)	(0.067)	(0.048)
Specification Ⅱ	0.037*	0.035*	-0.004	-0.037*	-0.035*	0.012	-0.131*	-0.086	-0.015
	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.014)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.014)	(0.076)	(0.066)	(0.046)
Specification Ⅲ	0.042**	0.034	-0.004	-0.042**	-0.034*	0.013	-0.154**	-0.077	-0.014
	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.014)	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.014)	(0.076)	(0.066)	(0.046)
Specification Ⅳ	0.045**	0.038*	-0.006	-0.045**	-0.038*	0.014	-0.189**	-0.088	-0.026
	(0.021)	(0.020)	(0.014)	(0.022)	(0.020)	(0.014)	(0.076)	(0.064)	(0.047)
Observations	2,027	2,068	3,900	2,027	2,068	3,900	2,027	2,068	3,900
	B-2. Sample Ⅳ (balanced spatial clusters): Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	0.0543**	-0.0012	0.0165	-0.0538**	0.0094	-0.0159	-0.1855**	-0.0060	0.0537
	(0.0210)	(0.0208)	(0.0144)	(0.0218)	(0.0213)	(0.0148)	(0.0810)	(0.0724)	(0.0516)
Specification Ⅰ	0.0581***	0.0049	0.0146	-0.0580***	0.0032	-0.0145	-0.2018***	0.0146	-0.0102
	(0.0209)	(0.0199)	(0.0142)	(0.0215)	(0.0203)	(0.0145)	(0.0711)	(0.0719)	(0.0464)
Specification Ⅱ	0.0613***	0.0058	0.0133	-0.0608***	0.0021	-0.0134	-0.2194***	0.0130	-0.0081
	(0.0214)	(0.0200)	(0.0144)	(0.0220)	(0.0204)	(0.0146)	(0.0703)	(0.0715)	(0.0464)
Specification Ⅲ	0.0666***	0.0100	0.0126	-0.0666***	-0.0013	-0.0132	-0.2292***	0.0098	-0.0040
	(0.0220)	(0.0199)	(0.0141)	(0.0225)	(0.0205)	(0.0144)	(0.0713)	(0.0717)	(0.0457)
Specification Ⅳ	0.0709***	0.0137	0.0105	-0.0707***	-0.0044	-0.0110	-0.2462***	-0.0113	-0.0144
	(0.0225)	(0.0186)	(0.0137)	(0.0230)	(0.0186)	(0.0142)	(0.0758)	(0.0723)	(0.0435)
Observations	951	974	1,752	951	974	1,752	951	974	1,752

Notes: The table reports OLS estimates where the unit of observation is the household. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by village, are reported in parentheses. See the notes to Table 3 for the samples, the dependent variables, the genocide measures, and the variables included in the baseline specification. In Specifications I-Ⅳ, the following variables are additionally controlled: Specification Ⅰ – a set of dummy variables on the composition of children and female children aged 15-21 (panel A) and 6-14 (panel B); Specification Ⅱ – a dummy variable for female-headed households, two dummy variables for mother and father working in a non-farm sector, and a set of dummy variables for better housing (light, fuel, water, and toilet) conditions; Specification Ⅲ – a set of dummy variables on the composition of children and female children aged 6-14 (panel A) and 15-21 (panel B), two dummy variables for having grandmother and grandfather, and a dummy variable for having children aged younger than 6 years; Specification Ⅳ – a dummy variable for having a child who died, the logarithmic value of the village population, two dummy variables for having primary and secondary schools in the village, and two continuous variables of the distance (km) to the nearest primary and secondary schools. *** = Significant at the 1 percent level. ** = Significant at the 5 percent level. * = Significant at the 10 percent level.

of housing conditions).

(3) Specification Ⅲ further adjusts for fertility and demographic composition not adjusted for in Specification I: a full set of dummy variables for the composition of remaining school-age children and female school-age children, i.e., those aged 6-14 (panel A) and 15-21 (panel B), as well as a dummy variable for having children aged younger than 6 years and two dummy variables for having a grandmother and grandfather.

(4) Specification Ⅳ further adjusts for child mortality (a proxy for health) and village characteristics (supply-side factors): a dummy variable for having a child who died, the logarithm of village population, two dummy variables for primary and secondary schools available in the village, and two continuous variables of distance (km) to the nearest primary and secondary schools.

The estimated impacts of the genocide measures on the intermediary outcomes corresponding to these post-treatment variables adjusted for in each specification are reported in Appendix Table A15 (panels A-5-A-15 for Specification I, panels A-22-A-28 for Specification Ⅱ, panels A-5-A-18 for Specification Ⅲ, and panels B-1-B-5 for Specification Ⅳ).[34] The results show that the genocide did not significantly influence most of the intermediary outcomes regarding fertility, income, health, and supply-side factors.[35]

[34]For household-level outcomes (panels A-1-A-28), we estimate equation (1) for sample Ⅲ, with some adjustments, if any, detailed in the notes to Appendix Table A15. Panels A-1-A-4 examine the genocide impacts on married, divorced, and widowed mothers and migrant households, respectively. For village-level outcomes (panels B-1-B-5), we estimate equation (1) among villages for sample Ⅲ.

[35]The following exceptions are noted. First, couples whose first child was born in 1977-1979 living in villages around killing sites are less likely to have experienced a child's death (panel A-21). This pattern is opposite to the health channel. For a robustness check, we repeat the analyses excluding couples who experienced the death of child, finding results very similar to those reported here. Second, although villages around killing sites are less likely to have a primary school, which is consistent with the supply channel, they rather have better access to secondary schools, which is opposite to the supply channel (panels B-1-B-5 of Appendix Table A15).

In each panel of Table 4, the estimated coefficients of the genocide measures do not decrease in magnitude, but rather mostly grow somewhat stronger after sequentially adjusting for the post-treatment variables. This suggests that our empirical results are not driven by the mechanisms captured by these post-treatment variables, such as fertility, income, health, and supply-side factors. We return to the discussion of potential underlying mechanisms in Section VI.

F. Robustness Checks

This subsection conducts a series of robustness checks by examining how robust our base results are to alternative size of spatial clusters, more balanced subsamples than the original ones, potential sample selection bias based on survivors of the Pol Pot era, and a conservative identifier of first child. Appendix Section A.2 also considers alternative samples and alternative genocide measures.

Alternative Size of Spatial Clusters. We consider 4.0 km and 8.0 km spatial clusters.[36] Compared to the original 6.0 km spatial clusters, the number of balanced spatial clusters is greater (smaller) and the number of observations within each spatial cluster is smaller (greater) for the 4.0 km (8.0 km) spatial clusters; thus, a trade-off exists between omitted variable bias and statistical power in these two alternative spatial clusters. The estimation results are largely consistent with the original results based on the 6.0 km spatial clusters (see Appendix Tables A17 and A18).[37]

[36]We follow the same procedures described in Section IV.C in selecting balanced spatial clusters for 4.0 km and 8.0 km spatial clusters to conduct Fisher's exact tests. We consider various samples for Fisher's exact tests with different definitions of the proportion of migrants to attain a better balance. Although the sample for 4.0 km spatial clusters is selected under the same conditions as that for 6.0 km spatial clusters (Appendix Table A9), the sample for 8.0 km spatial clusters is selected without imposing the conditions that the type of family is nuclear and all children speak Khmer (Cambodian) and believe in Buddhism (i.e., conditions 12-14 in Appendix Table A9).

[37]In the study samples based on the 4.0 km and 8.0 km spatial clusters, some correlations are found between the binary genocide measure and pre-treatment village/parental characteristics (Appendix Table A19) and between the continuous genocide measure and pre-treatment village/parental characteristics (columns 1-3 and 7-9 of Appendix Table A16).

Balanced Subsamples. We construct more balanced subsamples than the original ones as follows. For each two of the three subsamples of Sample Ⅲ, we estimate the propensity score using probit models based on two specifications: flexible ones following the algorithm proposed by Imbens and Rubin (2015) and linear ones that only include basic covariates.[38] We then limit the samples to those observations with a propensity score between 0.1 and 0.9.[39] To construct more balanced subsamples than the original Sample Ⅳ, we further limit these propensity score screened samples to households residing in villages with complete information about victims for all killing sites located within 6.0 km of the villages (in the same way of constructing Sample Ⅳ from Sample Ⅲ). The estimation results based on these two trimmed samples for Samples Ⅲ and Ⅳ are largely consistent with the original results (see Appendix Tables A20 and A21).

Sample Selection Problem. Our analysis, which is based on survivors of the Pol Pot era, involves potential selection bias as follows. Under the Pol Pot regime, intellectuals were targeted for execution, and many of them were executed (e.g., Kiernan (2008)). If intellectuals who lived near killing sites were more likely to be executed during the Pol Pot regime, our estimates in Table 3 may be biased upward in columns 1-3 and downward in columns 4-10. To address this potential problem,

[38]Both specifications include the following basic covariates: mother's age, father's age, a set of dummy variables for mother's and father's educational attainment (grade 1-5 and grade 6 or above), zone and district fixed effects, and spatial cluster fixed effects. The flexible specifications additionally include 81 cross-product terms for the 1977-1979 and 1980 subsamples, 85 cross-product terms for 1977-1979 and 1981-1982 subsamples, and 84 cross-product terms for 1980 and 1981-1982 subsamples (no additional linear terms are included). The selection of the cross-product terms is based on a likelihood ratio test statistics for the null hypothesis that the coefficient of the additional variable is equal to zero. We use 2.71 as the threshold value for the inclusion of cross-product terms following the suggestion made by Imbens and Rubin (2015).

[39]Although six normalized differences are still larger than 0.25 in absolute value as in the original samples, their absolute values generally become smaller. For instance, the average absolute value of the six normalized differences is 0.56 in the original samples and 0.40 (0.48) in the trimmed samples based on the propensity score estimated with the flexible specifications (linear specifications). All results of the normalized differences across trimmed subsamples for Samples Ⅲ and Ⅳ are available from the authors upon request.

we repeat the analyses for couples who completed grade 0-5.[40] Because those who had more than basic primary education (i.e., grade 6) were considered intellectuals under the Pol Pot regime (Vickery (1999, p. 39)), those couples are likely to have been treated as non-intellectuals. The estimation results are largely consistent with the original results (see Appendix Table A22).

Conservative Identifier of First Child. To address the potential problem of our identifier of first child discussed above, we focus on households which have not experienced a child's death. The estimation results are largely consistent with the original results (Appendix Table A23).

G. Sensitivity Analysis

This subsection assesses the sensitivity of our main results to potential omitted variable bias due to remaining unobserved confounders that vary within balanced spatial clusters for Samples Ⅲ and Ⅳ. Following the approach proposed by Oster (2018) (building on the methodology of Altonji et al. (2005)), we consider coefficient stability, taking into account both coefficient movements and R-squared movements when covariates are included, with an assumption that both observed and unobserved covariates explain the same amount of variability (variance) in the outcome variable in a regression model (see Appendix Section A.3 for details). We confirm that the estimated negative impacts are robust to omitted variable bias (Appendix Table A26).

H. Heterogeneity

Given the robustness of our base results, we now examine heterogeneity in the genocide impacts among different groups, the results of which help us understand potential underlying mechanisms other than those discussed above.

Gender. We first repeat the analyses for households with at least one male or

[40] We examine the relationships between killing-site locations and widows for households in which either the mother or father has or both have never migrated outside his/her or their villages of birth, finding no significant relationships (see panel A-3 of Appendix Table A15).

female child aged 15-21 and 6-14 (see Appendix Table A27).[41] The adverse genocide impacts on children's educational outcomes are relatively strong for males.

First Child. We next repeat the analyses focusing on outcome measures of the first child of couples (see Appendix Table A28).[42] Compared to the original results, the adverse genocide impacts on the first child are somewhat strong.

Five Subsamples. Lastly, we examine heterogeneity in the genocide impacts among couples whose first child was born in 1977-1978, 1979, 1981, and 1982 separately, as well as 1980 (see Appendix Table A29).[43] The adverse genocide impacts are generally relatively strong among couples whose first child was born in 1977-1978.

VI. Discussion

This section discusses a plausible underlying mechanism behind our main empirical findings based on the heterogeneity analyses and findings from the related literature, with careful attention to the social context. Due to limited availability of data, empirically examining the mechanism discussed is beyond the scope of this paper, unfortunately.

First of all, the genocide under the Khmer Rouge should have triggered *the emotion of fear* among people; fear may be defined as beliefs about being punished or executed by the Khmer Rouge. That the majority of survivors has suffered from long-term mental health disorders, including post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD; see, e.g., Beth et al. (2011)), suggests that fear may have prevailed over a long period

[41] As a caution, having female children aged 6-14 is somewhat correlated with couples' exposure to genocidal violence (see panel A-14 of Appendix Table A15).

[42] Focusing on outcome measures of children other than the first child gives rise to unstable results (especially in the 1981-1982 subsample) because we need to restrict the sample to households with more than one child.

[43] Conducting Fisher's exact tests for the 1977-1978, 1979, 1981, and 1982 subsamples is not feasible because of the small number of balanced spatial clusters. We simply divide Samples Ⅲ and Ⅳ into the five subsamples for the analyses. For the same reason, we do not examine heterogeneity among couples whose first child was born in 1977 or 1978.

of time under the unstable situations of local guerrilla warfare.

We conjecture that fear was a key *motivating force* of couples' subsequent behaviors.[44] The couples might not have always felt fear, but rather fear might have been *induced* when the couples made decisions that could be influenced by the ideologies of the Pol Pot regime. This is consistent with Loewenstein (2000), who argues that powerful emotions are induced at the time of important decisions. Among Cambodians, parental investments in children's education, especially for male children and/or the first child, involve important and deliberate decisions.

Our conjecture is also consistent with recent empirical findings by Callen et al. (2014) regarding the relationships among violence, fear, and risk preferences in Afghanistan: Combining behavioral field experiments and administrative violence data, they find that individuals exposed to violence change their risk preferences only when they are primed with fear; neither psychological primes nor exposure to violence per se induces changes in risk preferences.

Second, whether the fear is induced and *causally* influences a specific economic behavior, such as educational investments in children after 1979, might have depended on the couples' social ties with the Khmer Rouge society. Our conjecture is that because the couples whose first child was born during the Pol Pot regime, especially during an earlier period of the regime, were strongly embedded in the Khmer Rouge society ("historical embeddedness," Granovetter (1985)), they might have felt a sense of belonging to the Khmer Rouge, having been persistently influenced by its ideologies under the potential threat of violence.

In social psychology, this behavioral tendency is known as "self-categorization,"

[44]There is a growing body of literature on the role of emotions, including fear, in human decision making among both psychologists and economists (see, e.g., Elster (1998), Rick and Loewenstein (2008), Lerner et al. (2015) for reviews). However, little is known about the relationship of emotions and the institutions individuals face or the social structure in which individuals are embedded. Our study provides some insights into those relationships.

which generates a feeling of belonging and group identity and transforms individual thoughts, perceptions, and behaviors to conform to the prototype of the in-group (see, e.g., Hogg and Vaughan (2011, Chapter 7)). The relevant ideologies might include the denial of education and intellectuals and the state ownership of spouses and children, which may have led parents to invest less in children's education. As a result, their educational investments might have been susceptible to fear, and this might have been particularly strong for those who were more severely exposed to genocidal violence.

An alternative interpretation might also be possible. As social situations were unstable after the collapse of the Pol Pot regime, the couples might have continued to face execution risk over time, while updating their perception about the risk. Since execution risk is unavoidable, non-tradable, and non-insurable, it might be regarded as "background risk" (e.g., Gollier and Pratt (1996), Eeckhoudt et al. (1996)).[45] Couples' risk preference might endogenously change with the external environment; in particular, those who were more severely exposed to genocidal violence might have faced higher background risk, having become more risk-averse in their investments in children's education.[46]

Lastly, we touch on remaining concerns about migration that might affect our results. Child (parental) migration is somewhat more (less) common in the subsample of couples whose first child was born in 1977-1979 than those of couples whose first child was born in 1980 and 1981-1982 (Appendix Table A6).[47] At the same

[45]Background risk is environmental risk often used to explain heterogeneity in risk attitudes. Background risk makes people less willing to take other risks under some regularity assumptions about preference (see, e.g., Guiso and Sodini (2013)).

[46]Some evidence suggests that fearful people make pessimistic risk estimates and risk-averse choices (e.g., Lerner and Keltner (2001)) and overreact to the low probability of catastrophic risks (e.g., Sunstein (2003), Sunstein and Zeckhauser (2011)). The latter is known as "probability neglect" in behavioral economics.

[47]This may be because children of the former couples were more likely to be married than those of the latter couples (the former children were older on average) and the former couples (who were older on average) were less mobile (more stable).

time, neither child nor parental migration is related with the locations of killing sites within balanced spatial clusters in each of the three subsamples (columns 1-6). Thus, it is unlikely that the estimated genocide impact in each subsample is driven by child/parental migration and our overall results change. The consistent results in the more balanced subsamples (propensity score screened samples) discussed above also buttress their robustness to migration.

VII. Conclusions

This paper examined how the Cambodian genocide under the Pol Pot regime altered people's post-conflict behaviors through institutional changes. Combining spatial genocide data and the complete count 1998 Census microdata, we found that the genocide adversely influenced children's educational outcomes among couples who had their first child during the Pol Pot era, but not afterward. After showing the robustness of the findings and empirically refuting several potential underlying mechanisms behind them, we discussed a plausible behavioral mechanism in this social context.

Exploring the institutional catastrophe in Cambodia, our study provides insights into the complex relationships among violence, institutions, social structure, social situation, and economic behaviors. Our results highlight the importance of carefully considering these elements in studying people's post-conflict behaviors. Such considerations can lead to effective post-conflict policy design as well as a better understanding of human behavior.

References

Acemoglu, D., D. Cantoni, S. Johnson, and J. A. Robinson (2011). The consequences of radical reform: The french revolution. *American Economic Review 101*(7),

3286–3307.

Acemoglu, D., T. A. Hassan, and J. A. Robinson (2011). Social structure and development: A legacy of the holocaust in russia. *Quarterly Journal of Economics 126*(2), 895–946.

Acemoglu, D., S. Johnson, and J. A. Robinson (2001). The colonial origins of comparative development: An empirical investigation. *American Economic Review 91*(5), 1369–1401.

Akresh, R. and D. de Walque (2011). Armed conflict and schooling: Evidence from the 1994 rwandan genocide. unpublished manuscript, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Alderman, H., J. Hoddinott, and B. Kinsey (2006). Long term consequences of early childhood malnutrition. *Oxford Economic Papers 58*(3), 450–474.

Alesina, A. and P. Giuliano (2015). Culture and institutions. *Journal of Economic Literature 53*(4), 898–944.

Altonji, J. G., T. E. Elder, and C. R. Taber (2005). Selection on observed and unobserved variables: Assessing the effectiveness of catholic schools. *Journal of Political Economy 113*(1), 151–184.

Barro, R. J. and X. Sala-i-Martin (2003). *Economic Growth* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: MIT Press.

Bellows, J. and E. Miguel (2009). War and local collective action in sierra leone. *Journal of Public Economics 93*(11-12), 1144–1157.

Beth, V. S., R. Daryn, and C. Youk (2011). *Cambodia's Hidden Scars: Trauma Psychology in the Wake of the Khmer Rouge*. Phnom Penh: Documentation Center of Cambodia.

Blattman, C. (2009). From violence to voting: War and political participation in uganda. *American Political Science Review 103*(2), 231–247.

Blattman, C. and E. Miguel (2010). Civil war. *Journal of Economic Literature 48*(1), 3–57.

Brecht, G. (1987). World's worst massacres. *Whole Earth Review 2*, 74.

Callen, M., M. Isaqzadeh, J. D. Long, and C. Sprenger (2014). Violence and risk preference: Experimental evidence from afghanistan. *American Economic Review 104*(1), 123–148.

Chamarbagwala, R. and H. E. Morán (2011). The human capital consequences of civil war: Evidence from guatemala. *Journal of Development Economics 94*(1), 41–61.

Chandler, D. (1999). *Voices from S-21.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Chaney, E. and R. Hornbeck (2016). Economic dynamics in the malthusian era: Evidence from the 1609 spanish expulsion of the moriscos. *Economic Journal 126*(594), 1404–1440.

de Walque, D. (2006). The socio-demographic legacy of the khmer rouge period in cambodia. *Population Studies 60*(2), 223–231.

Dy, K. (2007). *A History of Democratic Kampuchea (1975-1979).* Phnom Penh: Documentation Center of Cambodia.

Eeckhoudt, L., C. Gollier, and H. Schlesinger (1996). Changes in background risk and risk taking behavior. *Econometrica 64*(3), 683–689.

Elster, J. (1998). Emotions and economic theory. *Journal of Economic Literature 36*(1), 47–74.

Fisher, R. A. (1925). *Statistical Methods for Research Workers* (1st ed.). London: Oliver and Boyd.

Fisher, R. A. (1935). *Design of Experiments* (1st ed.). London: Oliver and Boyd.

Gollier, C. and J. W. Pratt (1996). Risk vulnerability and the tempering effect of background risk. *Econometrica 64*(5), 1109–1123.

Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology 91*(3), 481–510.

Greif, A. (2006). *Institutions and the Path to the Modern Economy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Greif, A. and C. Kingston (2011). Institutions: Rules or equilibria? In G. Caballero and N. Schofield (Eds.), *Political Economy of Institutions, Democracy and Voting*, pp. 13–44. Springer.

Guiso, L., P. Sapienza, and L. Zingales (2006). Does culture affect economic outcomes? *Journal of Economic Perspectives 20*(2), 23–48.

Guiso, L. and P. Sodini (2013). Household finance: An emerging field. In G. M. Constantinides, M. Harris, and R. M. Stulz (Eds.), *Handbook of the Economics of Finance*, Volume 2B, Chapter 21, pp. 1397–1532. New York: North Holland.

Hayami, Y. and Y. Godo (2005). *Development Economics: From the Poverty To the Wealth of Nations* (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Hogg, M. A. and G. M. Vaughan (2011). *Social Psychology* (6th ed.). Harlow: Princeton Hall.

Imbens, G. W. and D. B. Rubin (2015). *Causal Inference for Statistics, Social, and Biomedical Sciences: An Introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Islam, A., C. Ouch, R. Smyth, and L. C. Wang (2016). The long-term effects of civil conflicts on education, earnings, and fertility: Evidence from cambodia. *Journal of Comparative Economics 44*(3), 800–820.

Kiernan, B. (2008). *The Pol Pot Regime: Race, Power, and Genocide in Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge, 1975-79* (3rd ed.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lee, C. (2014). *In Utero* exposure to the korean war and its long-term effects on socioeconomic and health outcomes. *Journal of Health Economics 33*, 76–93.

Lerner, J. S. and D. Keltner (2001). Fear, anger, and risk. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 81*(1), 146–159.

Lerner, J. S., Y. Li, P. Valdesolo, and K. Kassam (2015). Emotion and decision making. *Annual Review of Psychology 66*(1), 799–823.

Locard, H. (2004). *Pol Pot's Little Red Book – The Sayings of Angkar*. Chiang Mai: Silkworm Books.

Loewenstein, G. (2000). Emotions in economic theory and economic behavior. *American Economic Review 90*(2), 426–432.

Mazumdar, D. (1987). Rural-urban migration in developing countries. In E. S. Mills (Ed.), *Handbook of Regional and Urban Economics: Urban Economics*, Volume 2, Chapter 28, pp. 1097–1128. New York: North Holland.

Merrouche, O. (2011). The long term educational cost of war: Evidence from landmine contamination in cambodia. *Journal of Development Studies 47*(3), 399–416.

National Institute of Statistics (2001). *Cambodia Demographic and Health Survey 2000*. Phnom Penh: National Institute of Statistics, Ministry of Planning, ORC Macro.

Nguonly, L. (2004). Needs assessment for arts education in cambodia. paper presented at the UNESCO Regional Expert Symposium on Arts Education in Asia, Hong Kong.

North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nunn, N. (2008). The long-term effects of africa's slave trades. *Quarterly Journal of Economics 123*(1), 139–176.

Nunn, N. (2009). The importance of history for economic development. *Annual Review of Economics 1*(1), 65–92.

Nunn, N. (2014). Historical development. In P. Aghion and S. Durlauf (Eds.), *Handbook of Economic Growth*, Volume 2A, Chapter 7, pp. 347–402. New York: North Holland.

Oster, E. (2018). Unobservable selection and coefficient stability: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* (forthcoming).

Rick, S. and G. Loewenstein (2008). The role of emotion in economic behavior. In M. Lewis, J. M. Haviland-Jones, and L. F. Barrett (Eds.), *Handbook of Emotions* (3rd ed.), Volume 2A, Chapter 7, pp. 138–156. New York: Guilford Press.

Robinson, W. C. (1998). *Terms of Refuge: The Indo-Chinese Exodus and the International Response*. London: Zed Books.

Rogall, T. and D. Yanagizawa-Drott (2014). The legacy of political mass killings: Evidence from the rwandan genocide. unpublished manuscript, Stockholm University and Harvard University.

Roland, G. (2004). Understanding institutional change: Fast-moving and slow-moving institutions. *Studies in Comparative International Development 38*(4), 109–131.

Rosenbaum, P. R. (1984). The consequences of adjustment for a concomitant variable that has been affected by the treatment. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A (General) 147*(5), 656–666.

Ross, R. R. (1998). *Cambodia: A Country Study*. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office for the Library of Congress.

Shemyakina, O. (2011). The effect of armed conflict on accumulation of schooling: Results from tajikistan. *Journal of Development Economics 95*(2), 186–200.

Short, P. (2004). *Pol Pot: Anatomy of a Nightmare*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Sunstein, C. R. (2003). Terrorism and probability neglect. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty 26*(2/3), 121–136.

Sunstein, C. R. and R. Zeckhauser (2011). Overreaction to fearsome risks. *Environmental and Resource Economics 48*(3), 435–449.

Vickery, M. (1986). *Kampuchea: Politics, Economics and Society*. London: Frances Pinter.

Vickery, M. (1999). *Cambodia 1975-1982*. Boston: South End Press.

Voors, M. J., E. E. M. Nillesen, P. Verwimp, E. H. Bulte, R. Lensink, and D. P. V. Soest (2012). Violent conflict and behavior: A field experiment in burundi. *American Economic Review 102*(2), 941–964.

Waldinger, F. (2010). Quality matters: The expulsion of professors and the consequences for phd student outcomes in nazi germany. *Journal of Political Economy 118*(4), 787–831.

For Online Publication

Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

A.1 Results of Fisher's Exact Tests for 514 Killing Sites

Figure A1 depicts the results of the Fisher's exact tests for all 514 killing sites. The Fisher's exact tests are not conducted for 79 sites located in urban areas and 2 sites for which no villages exist within the corresponding spatial clusters. Of the remaining 433 killing sites, 124 have balanced spatial clusters and 309 do not. These 309 killing sites include 54 killing sites for which the Fisher's exact tests are not done in a complete way because there are no observations in either one or two of the three subsamples. Spatial clusters located away from major roads are more likely to be balanced (column 1 of Table A12). Of the 124 balanced spatial clusters, 9 do not have the homogeneous distribution of migrant households within the 4.0 km spatial clusters and thus households living within these 9 spatial clusters are excluded from Sample Ⅲ. As a result, Sample Ⅲ consists of households living within 115 balanced spatial clusters. The descriptive statistics of household, child, and village characteristics in each sample are reported in Tables A4 and A5.

A.2 Robustness Checks

This section examines how robust our base results are to alternative samples and alternative genocide measures.

Alternative Samples. We consider three alternative samples (*Samples Ⅲ-A, Ⅲ-B, and Ⅲ-C*) (see Table A24). These three samples are constructed based on the Fisher's exact tests for three different samples (*FET Samples Ⅲ-A, Ⅲ-B, and Ⅲ-C*) (see Table A10). FET Sample Ⅲ-A is selected under the same conditions as our study population. However, the following exceptions are noted. In addition to condition 16 (migrant status) given in Table A3, we do not impose conditions 8-10; Sample Ⅲ is also obtained from the sample selected in the same manner (*FET Sample Ⅲ*) (see Table A9). This is because these conditions to reduce unobserved factors that may be correlated with outcomes (conditions 8-10) and to assume parental education as a pre-treatment characteristic (conditions 8 and 9) for econometric analysis are not needed for Fisher's exact tests (though since the number of observations excluded by imposing these three conditions is small, this difference in imposed conditions should not affect our main results).

We perform the same procedures to obtain the three study samples (*Samples Ⅲ-A, Ⅲ-B,*

and III-C) as those to obtain Sample III described in Section IV.C. FET Samples III-B and III-C are two extreme samples selected by imposing all or no conditions, respectively, listed in Table A10. Fisher's exact tests are conducted for the whole FET Sample III-C because with no condition imposed on the age of the first child, the subsamples defined by the age of first child are irrelevant.

Killing-site locations are mostly non-significantly correlated with pre-treatment village and parental characteristics in Samples III-B and III-C (Table A11) (the sample size is relatively small in Sample III-C because the number of balanced spatial clusters is small). Although some correlations are found in Sample III-A, they are not strong relative to those found in Samples I and II. The estimated genocide impacts are largely consistent with those based on Samples III and IV, though there is some difference in the magnitude of estimated coefficients and statistical significance levels (see Table A24 which reports estimates for equation (1) with only pre-treatment variables controlled for (*Baseline specification*) and the specification with a full set of post-treatment variables (*Specification IV*)).

Alternative Genocide Measures. We consider alternative continuous genocide measures – second- and third-order polynomial in distance (see Figure A2 for the distribution of these alternative measures). With a higher order polynomial in distance, the weights for couples living in distant villages decrease more rapidly. The estimation results for our main samples based on the 6.0 km spatial clusters are largely consistent with the original results (see Table A25).

A.3 Sensitivity Analysis

We conduct a sensitivity analysis using the approach proposed by Oster (2018). This approach considers both coefficient movements and R-squared movements when covariates are included, assuming that both observed and unobserved covariates explain the same amount of variability (variance) in the outcome variable in a regression model. Based on her results, we consider the following bias-adjusted genocide impacts,

$$\gamma^* \approx \hat{\gamma}_{BS} - \delta(\hat{\gamma}_{RS} - \hat{\gamma}_{BS})\frac{R^2_{max} - R^2_{BS}}{R^2_{BS} - R^2_{RS}},$$

where $\hat{\gamma}_{BS}$ and $\hat{\gamma}_{RS}$ are the estimates based on the Baseline specification and Restricted specification, respectively; Restricted specification adjusts for regional fixed effects (zone and district fixed effects) and spatial cluster fixed effects only.

Our interest is how coefficient estimates change due to unobserved confounders conditional on regional fixed effects and spatial cluster fixed effects. δ is the proportional degree of selection. Following Oster's suggestion, we assume equal selection: The ratio of the coefficient movement is the same as that of the R-squared movement. To allow the true genocide impacts to be overestimated or underestimated, we consider two cases for $\delta = 1$ and $\delta = -1$: The former assumes the same amount of selection that goes into the same direction, whereas the latter assumes the same amount of selection that goes into the opposite direction. R^2_{BS} and R^2_{RS}, respectively, are the R-squared from the baseline regression model (Baseline specification) and restricted regression model with only regional fixed effects and spatial cluster fixed effects controlled for (Restricted specification) defined above. R^2_{max} is the R-squared from a regression that controls for all observed and unobserved covariates. Although R^2_{max} is unobserved, we know that R^2_{max} is bounded by the upper bound 1 ($R^2_{max} = 1$), which gives the most conservative estimate of the genocide impacts, γ^*. R^2_{max} below 1 is considered in empirical works based on her recommendation (she derives a cutoff value of 1.3 as a multiplier for the R-squared from restricted regression models).

We consider two cases: (1) $R^2_{max} = 1.3 \times R^2_{BS}$ and (2) $R^2_{max} = 1$ (see Table A26). In the first case ($R^2_{max} = 1.3 \times R^2_{BS}$), regardless of the direction of unobserved selection, the genocide impacts are coherently estimated negatively only for children aged 15-21 and 6-14 of the couples who had their first child in 1977-1979 for Samples Ⅲ and Ⅳ. For some outcomes, this holds true even for the most conservative case ($R^2_{max} = 1$). These results suggest that omitted variable bias is unlikely to be significant to alter our conclusion.

Table A1: Descriptive Statistics – Killing-Site Characteristics

Areas:	Urban & Rural	Rural			
Corresponding sample:		Sample I	Sample II	Sample III	Sample IV
Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Prop. of killing sites	0.642	0.664	0.667	0.722	1.000
with info. about victims	(0.480)	(0.473)	(0.472)	(0.450)	(0.000)
ln (Num. of victims)	6.518	6.468	6.468	6.015	6.015
	(1.940)	(1.958)	(1.958)	(1.614)	(1.614)
Num. of killing sites	514	435	433	115	83

Notes: The unit of observation is the killing site. Standard deviations are reported in parentheses.

Table A2: Location Determinants of Killing Sites

Areas:	Urban & Rural		Rural	
Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Distance to major roads (km)	-0.006***	-0.008***	-0.005***	-0.008***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.086***		0.085***	
aged 36-50 with grade 1-5	(0.020)		(0.020)	
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.291***		0.268***	
aged 36-50 with grade 6 or above	(0.033)		(0.035)	
Prop. of migrant households		0.039***		0.027**
		(0.013)		(0.013)
Zone and district fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	8,247	10,503	7,903	10,022
Prop. of villages located near K.S.	0.234	0.235	0.227	0.224
R-squared	0.136	0.131	0.120	0.109

Notes: The table reports OLS estimates where the unit of observation is the village. The dependent variable is an indicator variable equal to 1 if villages are located within 3.0 km of killing sites and 0 otherwise. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. *** = Significant at the 1 percent level. ** = Significant at the 5 percent level. * = Significant at the 10 percent level.

Table A3: Construction of Study Population

No.	Description of conditions	Observations
(0)	Total number of households in the 100% count 1998 Census microdata is provided.	2,188,177
(1)	No households live in Phnom Penh, the capital city of Cambodia.	2,014,502
(2)	Households include a mother aged 34-45 and the oldest child aged 16-21.	280,460
(3)	If mother's marital status is 'married,' then the households include a father.	262,142
(4)	If households include father, then the difference in age between mother and father is in the range between -3 and 20.	250,972
(5)	Mother and father were born in Cambodia.	249,108
(6)	Mother and father speak Khmer (Cambodian) as their mother tongue.	240,598
(7)	Mother and father believe in Buddhism.	238,760
(8)	The highest grade of school that mother, father, and children completed is not missing or other.	238,112
(9)	The highest grade that mother and father completed does not exceed the one they could attain before 1975.	229,554
(10)	The information of housing (light, fuel, water, and toilet) conditions is not missing or other.	219,320
(11)	No households live in a 'special settlement.'	218,815
(12)	Number of children born alive to the mother is equal to number of children living together at the time of the 1998 Census.	147,740
(13)	If the age of ith child is the same as that of $i+1$th child, then the two children were born in the same birth district.	147,461
(14)	Mother's marital status is 'married.'	128,988
(15)	All households live in rural areas.	113,640
(16)	Both mother and father have never migrated outside their birth villages before.	49,150

Notes: The table shows the procedures for developing the baseline sample used for our analysis. The sample is developed from the 100% count 1998 Census microdata, with 2,188,177 households. Columns 2 and 3 describe conditions and the number of households that satisfy the conditions, respectively. 'father' is used only for 'married' households. The resulting sample consists of 49,150 households.

Table A4: Descriptive Statistics – Household Characteristics

A. Households with their first child born in 1977-1979					
Sample:	Study population	Sample I	Sample II	Sample III	Sample IV
Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
A-1. Parental characteristics					
Mother's age	40.609	40.595	40.565	40.647	40.621
	(2.714)	(2.714)	(2.716)	(2.667)	(2.688)
Father's age	44.046	44.018	43.964	44.183	44.295
	(4.632)	(4.617)	(4.511)	(4.521)	(4.593)
Mother without any grade	0.411	0.405	0.368	0.361	0.388
	(0.492)	(0.491)	(0.482)	(0.480)	(0.488)
Mother with grade 1-5	0.479	0.485	0.513	0.518	0.510
	(0.500)	(0.500)	(0.500)	(0.500)	(0.500)
Mother with grade 6 or above	0.110	0.110	0.120	0.121	0.102
	(0.313)	(0.313)	(0.324)	(0.326)	(0.303)
Father without any grade	0.200	0.195	0.169	0.161	0.174
	(0.400)	(0.396)	(0.375)	(0.368)	(0.379)
Father with grade 1-5	0.510	0.512	0.521	0.507	0.527
	(0.500)	(0.500)	(0.500)	(0.500)	(0.500)
Father with grade 6 or above	0.290	0.293	0.310	0.332	0.300
	(0.454)	(0.455)	(0.463)	(0.471)	(0.458)
Observations	11,736	11,141	5,738	2,137	1,008
A-2. Children's educational outcomes					
A-2-1. Age 15-21					
No schooling	0.215	0.211	0.176	0.184	0.231
	(0.362)	(0.359)	(0.331)	(0.335)	(0.367)
Primary school completion	0.317	0.324	0.357	0.354	0.317
	(0.395)	(0.397)	(0.408)	(0.408)	(0.393)
Years of schooling	4.186	4.242	4.544	4.513	4.176
	(2.755)	(2.756)	(2.721)	(2.732)	(2.739)
Observations	11,736	11,141	5,738	2,137	1,008
A-2-2. Age 6-14					
No schooling	0.349	0.346	0.308	0.311	0.342
	(0.381)	(0.380)	(0.363)	(0.369)	(0.380)
School attendance	0.634	0.638	0.674	0.668	0.637
	(0.385)	(0.384)	(0.370)	(0.378)	(0.387)
Grade progression	-3.665	-3.651	-3.539	-3.551	-3.669
	(1.485)	(1.480)	(1.470)	(1.473)	(1.464)
Observations	11,087	10,520	5,402	2,027	951

Continue

Table A4: Descriptive Statistics – Household Characteristics

B. Households with their first child born in 1980					
Sample:	Study population	Sample I	Sample II	Sample III	Sample IV
Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
B-1. Parental characteristics					
Mother's age	39.386	39.379	39.369	39.398	39.497
	(2.735)	(2.731)	(2.723)	(2.734)	(2.794)
Father's age	42.178	42.163	42.149	42.253	42.296
	(4.400)	(4.398)	(4.364)	(4.274)	(4.427)
Mother without any grade	0.426	0.418	0.385	0.388	0.423
	(0.495)	(0.493)	(0.487)	(0.487)	(0.494)
Mother with grade 1-5	0.482	0.489	0.514	0.513	0.494
	(0.500)	(0.500)	(0.500)	(0.500)	(0.500)
Mother with grade 6 or above	0.092	0.093	0.100	0.099	0.084
	(0.290)	(0.291)	(0.300)	(0.299)	(0.277)
Father without any grade	0.212	0.208	0.187	0.186	0.220
	(0.409)	(0.406)	(0.390)	(0.389)	(0.414)
Father with grade 1-5	0.531	0.534	0.540	0.532	0.525
	(0.499)	(0.499)	(0.498)	(0.499)	(0.500)
Father with grade 6 or above	0.257	0.258	0.273	0.282	0.255
	(0.437)	(0.437)	(0.445)	(0.450)	(0.436)
Observations	11,235	10,642	5,474	2,154	1,015
B-2. Children's educational outcomes					
B-2-1. Age 15-18					
No schooling	0.202	0.196	0.167	0.175	0.222
	(0.365)	(0.360)	(0.337)	(0.344)	(0.374)
Primary school completion	0.342	0.349	0.381	0.378	0.319
	(0.420)	(0.422)	(0.432)	(0.430)	(0.412)
Years of schooling	4.325	4.385	4.674	4.636	4.177
	(2.823)	(2.821)	(2.819)	(2.837)	(2.788)
Observations	11,235	10,642	5,474	2,154	1,015
B-2-2. Age 6-14					
No schooling	0.339	0.332	0.300	0.299	0.346
	(0.368)	(0.365)	(0.350)	(0.357)	(0.375)
School attendance	0.645	0.652	0.683	0.683	0.637
	(0.371)	(0.369)	(0.356)	(0.361)	(0.379)
Grade progression	-3.620	-3.601	-3.508	-3.529	-3.623
	(1.447)	(1.440)	(1.427)	(1.414)	(1.391)
Observations	10,747	10,185	5,246	2,068	974

Continue

Table A4: Descriptive Statistics – Household Characteristics

C. Households with their first child born in 1981-1982					
Sample:	Study population	Sample I	Sample II	Sample III	Sample IV
Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
C-1. Parental characteristics					
Mother's age	38.270	38.266	38.238	38.162	38.144
	(2.854)	(2.858)	(2.846)	(2.830)	(2.848)
Father's age	40.816	40.794	40.790	40.738	40.732
	(4.598)	(4.583)	(4.552)	(4.468)	(4.545)
Mother without any grade	0.463	0.453	0.420	0.418	0.452
	(0.499)	(0.498)	(0.494)	(0.493)	(0.498)
Mother with grade 1-5	0.468	0.477	0.504	0.503	0.477
	(0.499)	(0.499)	(0.500)	(0.500)	(0.500)
Mother with grade 6 or above	0.069	0.070	0.076	0.079	0.071
	(0.254)	(0.255)	(0.265)	(0.270)	(0.256)
Father without any grade	0.255	0.251	0.219	0.225	0.231
	(0.436)	(0.433)	(0.413)	(0.418)	(0.422)
Father with grade 1-5	0.543	0.546	0.561	0.548	0.546
	(0.498)	(0.498)	(0.496)	(0.498)	(0.498)
Father with grade 6 or above	0.203	0.204	0.221	0.227	0.222
	(0.402)	(0.403)	(0.415)	(0.419)	(0.416)
Observations	20,564	19,271	9,744	4,011	1,798
C-2. Children's educational outcomes					
C-2-1. Age 15-17					
No schooling	0.204	0.199	0.165	0.174	0.200
	(0.389)	(0.385)	(0.358)	(0.365)	(0.383)
Primary school completion	0.327	0.333	0.369	0.361	0.307
	(0.448)	(0.451)	(0.462)	(0.459)	(0.440)
Years of schooling	4.204	4.257	4.568	4.548	4.171
	(2.873)	(2.875)	(2.873)	(2.898)	(2.819)
Observations	20,564	19,271	9,744	4,011	1,798
C-2-2. Age 6-14					
No schooling	0.348	0.342	0.305	0.297	0.333
	(0.368)	(0.365)	(0.347)	(0.346)	(0.360)
School attendance	0.634	0.640	0.677	0.683	0.647
	(0.372)	(0.369)	(0.353)	(0.353)	(0.364)
Grade progression	-3.593	-3.571	-3.441	-3.407	-3.548
	(1.427)	(1.420)	(1.403)	(1.390)	(1.392)
Observations	19,918	18,661	9,416	3,900	1,752

Notes: The standard deviations are reported in parentheses. Study population – households living in the districts surveyed and not surveyed by DC-Cam; Sample I – households living in the districts surveyed by DC-Cam; Sample II – households living within 6.0 km of the killing sites in the surveyed districts; Sample III – households living within 6.0 km of the selected killing sites (the 6.0 km balanced spatial clusters) in the surveyed districts; Sample IV – households of Sample III with complete victim information for all killing sites located within 6.0 km of the villages where they live.

Table A5: Descriptive Statistics – Village Characteristics

Variable	Sample: Study population (1)	Sample I (2)	Sample II (3)	Sample III (4)	Sample IV (5)
A. Households with their first child born in 1977-1979					
Distance to major roads (km)	9.952	8.829	8.466	8.748	8.936
	(12.391)	(9.295)	(9.285)	(9.870)	(8.814)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.484	0.475	0.448	0.452	0.476
aged 36-50 without any grade	(0.229)	(0.227)	(0.221)	(0.226)	(0.226)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.414	0.422	0.442	0.438	0.430
aged 36-50 with grade 1-5	(0.207)	(0.206)	(0.201)	(0.208)	(0.210)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.102	0.103	0.109	0.111	0.095
aged 36-50 with grade 6 or above	(0.116)	(0.115)	(0.115)	(0.119)	(0.101)
Observations	4,286	3,989	1,979	839	376
B. Households with their first child born in 1980					
Distance to major roads (km)	9.559	8.660	8.419	8.861	9.577
	(11.569)	(9.177)	(9.234)	(9.701)	(9.138)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.480	0.472	0.444	0.448	0.478
aged 36-50 without any grade	(0.228)	(0.226)	(0.221)	(0.226)	(0.227)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.416	0.424	0.443	0.438	0.427
aged 36-50 with grade 1-5	(0.207)	(0.206)	(0.202)	(0.209)	(0.211)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.104	0.104	0.112	0.114	0.094
aged 36-50 with grade 6 or above	(0.118)	(0.117)	(0.118)	(0.121)	(0.104)
Observations	4,448	4,154	2,098	889	403
C. Households with their first child born in 1981-1982					
Distance to major roads (km)	9.731	8.686	8.422	8.595	9.466
	(11.903)	(9.075)	(9.123)	(9.495)	(8.684)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.492	0.482	0.456	0.457	0.483
aged 36-50 without any grade	(0.233)	(0.230)	(0.222)	(0.222)	(0.222)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.408	0.417	0.436	0.433	0.427
aged 36-50 with grade 1-5	(0.211)	(0.209)	(0.205)	(0.208)	(0.209)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.100	0.101	0.108	0.110	0.091
aged 36-50 with grade 6 or above	(0.118)	(0.117)	(0.117)	(0.119)	(0.110)
Observations	5,595	5,197	2,577	1,128	512

Note: See the notes to Table A4.

Table A6: Exogeneity of Child and Parental Migration – Sample Ⅲ

	Child migration			Parental migration		
Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Genocidal Violence I	-0.008	0.000	-0.011	0.004	-0.004	0.003
	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.015)	(0.024)	(0.021)	(0.017)
Observations	3,568	3,168	5,892	4,543	4,780	9,030
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.411	0.312	0.322	0.512	0.539	0.546
Mean (All)	0.401	0.320	0.319	0.530	0.549	0.556
R-squared	0.182	0.175	0.187	0.234	0.244	0.228

Notes: The table reports OLS estimates where the unit of observation is the household. *Genocidal Violence I* is the binary genocide measure, which takes the value 1 if the points of villages where couples lived are located within 3.0 km of at least one killing site and 0 otherwise. The dependent variable in columns 1-3 (4-6) takes 1 if households do not satisfy the condition 12 (16) in Table A3 and 0 otherwise. The sample used in the analyses includes households selected under all conditions except condition 12 (16) for Sample Ⅲ. All regressions control for mother's and father's characteristics (age and education), zone and district fixed effects and spatial cluster fixed effects. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by village, are reported in parentheses. *** = Significant at the 1 percent level. ** = Significant at the 5 percent level. * = Significant at the 10 percent level.

Table A7: Exogeneity of the Timing of Childbearing – Difference in Number of Children across Subsamples

Sample:	Sample III	Sample IV
Dependent variable:	Num. of children	Num. of children
Variable	(1)	(2)
HH with first child born in 1977-79	0.642***	0.626***
	(0.050)	(0.071)
HH with first child born in 1980	0.359***	0.315***
	(0.042)	(0.057)
Parental characteristics	Yes	Yes
Zone, district, and spatial cluster fixed effects	Yes	Yes
Observations	8,302	3,821
Observations (HH with first child born in 1977-79)	2,137	1,008
Observations (HH with first child born in 1980)	2,154	1,015
R-squared	0.107	0.121
p-value of the two listed variables	0.000	0.000

Notes: The table reports OLS estimates where the unit of observation is the household. The dependent variable is the number of children in households. "HH with first child born in 1977-1979 (1980)" is an indicator variable equal to 1 if households had their first child born in 1977-1979 (1980) and 0 otherwise ("HH with first child born in 1981-1982" is excluded as the base case). Parental characteristics include the mother's and father's age and education. Robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by village, are reported in parentheses. p-values are from F-tests for the joint significance of the two listed variables. *** = Significant at the 1 percent level. ** = Significant at the 5 percent level. * = Significant at the 10 percent level.

Table A8: External Validity – Mean Differences across Samples

A. Households with their first child born in 1977-1979							
Reference sample:	Study population				Sample Ⅰ	Sample Ⅱ	Sample Ⅲ
	vs.	vs.	vs.	vs.	vs.	vs.	vs.
Limited sample:	Sample Ⅰ	Sample Ⅱ	Sample Ⅲ	Sample Ⅳ	Sample Ⅱ	Sample Ⅲ	Sample Ⅳ
Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
A-1. Parental characteristics							
Mother's age	0.000	0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	-0.002	0.002
	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)
Father's age	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.002**	0.001	0.000	0.002
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)
Mother with grade 1-5	0.007	0.047***	0.022***	0.002	0.037***	0.008	-0.011
	(0.004)	(0.010)	(0.008)	(0.006)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.017)
Mother with grade 6 or above	0.001	0.058***	0.017	-0.006	0.056***	-0.002	-0.037
	(0.007)	(0.017)	(0.013)	(0.009)	(0.015)	(0.017)	(0.025)
Father with grade 1-5	0.012*	0.049***	0.016*	0.005	0.039***	0.006	-0.002
	(0.006)	(0.013)	(0.009)	(0.007)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.022)
Father with grade 6 or above	0.012*	0.068***	0.040***	0.009	0.069***	0.018	-0.011
	(0.007)	(0.014)	(0.011)	(0.008)	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.023)
Zone fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
District fixed effects	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	11,736	11,736	11,736	11,736	11,141	5,738	2,137
Observations (Limited sample)	11,141	5,738	2,137	1,008	5,738	2,137	1,008
R-squared	0.120	0.054	0.020	0.016	0.236	0.506	0.577
p-value of the listed variables	0.095	0.000	0.000	0.162	0.000	0.770	0.538
A-2. Village characteristics							
Distance to major roads (km)	-0.006***	-0.004***	-0.001	-0.001***	-0.005***	0.014***	0.022***
	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.006)
Proportion of non-migrant women	0.068***	0.232***	0.078**	-0.010	0.132***	0.025	-0.013
aged 36-50 with grade 1-5	(0.018)	(0.037)	(0.030)	(0.022)	(0.042)	(0.052)	(0.077)
Proportion of non-migrant women	-0.033	0.224***	0.123**	-0.048	0.288***	0.136*	-0.075
aged 36-50 with grade 6 or above	(0.035)	(0.066)	(0.053)	(0.034)	(0.069)	(0.082)	(0.127)
Zone fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
District fixed effects	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	4,286	4,286	4,286	4,286	3,989	1,979	839
Observations (Limited sample)	3,989	1,979	839	376	1,979	839	376
R-squared	0.217	0.057	0.019	0.015	0.209	0.502	0.558
p-value of the listed variables	0.000	0.000	0.003	0.021	0.000	0.000	0.002

Continue

Table A8: External Validity – Mean Differences across Samples

B. Households with their first child born in 1980							
Reference sample:	Study population				Sample Ⅰ	Sample Ⅱ	Sample Ⅲ
	vs.	vs.	vs.	vs.	vs.	vs.	vs.
Limited sample:	Sample Ⅰ	Sample Ⅱ	Sample Ⅲ	Sample Ⅳ	Sample Ⅱ	Sample Ⅲ	Sample Ⅳ
Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
B-1. Parental characteristics							
Mother's age	0.000	0.001	-0.001	0.002	0.001	-0.001	0.001
	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)
Father's age	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.004*
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)
Mother with grade 1-5	0.012***	0.043***	0.013	-0.004	0.017	0.000	-0.004
	(0.005)	(0.011)	(0.008)	(0.006)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.017)
Mother with grade 6 or above	0.011	0.052***	0.011	-0.011	0.026	-0.006	0.002
	(0.008)	(0.018)	(0.015)	(0.010)	(0.017)	(0.020)	(0.026)
Father with grade 1-5	0.009	0.032**	0.006	-0.012	0.017	0.005	-0.017
	(0.006)	(0.013)	(0.010)	(0.007)	(0.012)	(0.014)	(0.021)
Father with grade 6 or above	0.005	0.056***	0.023**	-0.008	0.046***	0.023	-0.068***
	(0.007)	(0.015)	(0.012)	(0.009)	(0.014)	(0.016)	(0.024)
Zone fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
District fixed effects	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	11,235	11,235	11,235	11,235	10,642	5,474	2,154
Observations (Limited sample)	10,642	5,474	2,154	1,015	5,474	2,154	1,015
R-squared	0.118	0.045	0.020	0.017	0.195	0.453	0.601
p-value of the listed variables	0.019	0.000	0.067	0.205	0.001	0.771	0.021
B-2. Village characteristics							
Distance to major roads (km)	-0.006***	-0.004***	0.000	0.000	-0.002	0.015***	0.022***
	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.006)
Proportion of non-migrant women	0.080***	0.239***	0.065**	-0.016	0.143***	0.053	-0.080
aged 36-50 with grade 1-5	(0.017)	(0.036)	(0.030)	(0.022)	(0.041)	(0.050)	(0.073)
Proportion of non-migrant women	-0.038	0.275***	0.149***	-0.057*	0.363***	0.054	-0.122
aged 36-50 with grade 6 or above	(0.033)	(0.064)	(0.051)	(0.033)	(0.066)	(0.079)	(0.119)
Zone fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
District fixed effects	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	4,448	4,448	4,448	4,448	4,154	2,098	889
Observations (Limited sample)	4,154	2,098	889	403	2,098	889	403
R-squared	0.192	0.059	0.023	0.015	0.198	0.474	0.575
p-value of the listed variables	0.000	0.000	0.007	0.192	0.000	0.000	0.001

Continue

Table A8: External Validity – Mean Differences across Samples

C. Households with their first child born in 1981-1982							
Reference sample:	Study population				Sample I	Sample II	Sample III
Limited sample:	vs. Sample I	vs. Sample II	vs. Sample III	vs. Sample IV	vs. Sample II	vs. Sample III	vs. Sample IV
Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
C-1. Parental characteristics							
Mother's age	0.000	-0.002	-0.004***	-0.002*	-0.002	-0.005***	0.003
	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Father's age	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.001	-0.001
	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)
Mother with grade 1-5	0.021***	0.042***	0.020***	-0.005	0.012	0.022***	-0.005
	(0.004)	(0.008)	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.013)
Mother with grade 6 or above	0.022***	0.055***	0.032**	-0.004	0.028**	0.033*	-0.015
	(0.007)	(0.015)	(0.013)	(0.009)	(0.014)	(0.017)	(0.023)
Father with grade 1-5	0.000	0.053***	0.009	0.004	0.044***	-0.010	-0.009
	(0.004)	(0.009)	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.015)
Father with grade 6 or above	-0.004	0.080***	0.027***	0.015**	0.077***	-0.005	0.014
	(0.006)	(0.011)	(0.009)	(0.007)	(0.011)	(0.013)	(0.018)
Zone fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
District fixed effects	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	20,564	20,564	20,564	20,564	19,271	9,744	4,011
Observations (Limited sample)	19,271	9,744	4,011	1,798	9,744	4,011	1,798
R-squared	0.118	0.042	0.016	0.013	0.201	0.471	0.547
p-value of the listed variables	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.133	0.000	0.007	0.627
C-2. Village characteristics							
Distance to major roads (km)	-0.006***	-0.004***	0.000	0.000	-0.004***	0.014***	0.021***
	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.005)
Proportion of non-migrant women aged 36-50 with grade 1-5	0.082***	0.219***	0.078***	0.000	0.098***	0.031	-0.024
	(0.015)	(0.032)	(0.026)	(0.019)	(0.036)	(0.043)	(0.063)
Proportion of non-migrant women aged 36-50 with grade 6 or above	-0.027	0.235***	0.137***	-0.059*	0.273***	0.064	-0.034
	(0.030)	(0.057)	(0.045)	(0.031)	(0.059)	(0.076)	(0.113)
Zone fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
District fixed effects	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	5,595	5,595	5,595	5,595	5,197	2,577	1,128
Observations (Limited sample)	5,197	2,577	1,128	512	2,577	1,128	512
R-squared	0.208	0.051	0.022	0.014	0.197	0.474	0.564
p-value of the listed variables	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.116	0.000	0.000	0.000

Notes: The table reports OLS estimates where the unit of observation is the household in panels A-1, B-1,and C-1 and the village in panels A-2, B-2, and C-2. The dependent variable is an indicator variable equal to 1 if households/villages are included in both the reference and limited samples and 0 otherwise. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. The regressions in columns 1-4 do not include district fixed effects because about 60 districts in the study population (districts with white background, not surveyed by DC-Cam) are not included in Samples I, II, III (see Figure A1). *p*-values are from *F*-tests for the joint significance of the listed variables. *** = Significant at the 1 percent level. ** = Significant at the 5 percent level. * = Significant at the 10 percent level.

Table A9: Construction of Sample for Fisher's Exact Tests

No.	Description of conditions	Observations
(0)	Total number of households in the 100% count 1998 Census microdata is provided.	2,188,177
(1)	No households live in Phnom Penh, the capital city of Cambodia.	2,014,502
(2)	Households include a mother aged 34-45 and the oldest child aged 16-21.	280,460
(3)	If mother's marital status is 'married,' then the households include a father.	262,142
(4)	If households include father, then the difference in age between mother and father is in the range between -3 and 20.	250,972
(5)	Mother and father were born in Cambodia.	249,108
(6)	Mother and father speak Khmer (Cambodian) as their mother tongue.	240,598
(7)	Mother and father believe in Buddhism.	238,760
(8)	No households live in a 'special settlement.'	238,205
(9)	Number of children born alive to the mother is equal to number of children living together at the time of the 1998 Census.	161,362
(10)	If the age of ith child is the same as that of $i+1$th child, then the two children were born in the same birth district.	161,048
(11)	Mother's marital status is 'married.'	141,282
(12)	No households include grandfather, grandmother, grandchild, other relatives, or non-relatives.	110,646
(13)	All children in households speak Khmer (Cambodian) as their mother tongue.	110,496
(14)	All children in households believe in Buddhism.	110,425
(15)	All children in households have never married.	108,518

Notes: The table shows the procedures for constructing the sample used for Fisher's exact tests. See the notes to Table A3.

Table A10: Alternative Samples for Fisher's Exact Tests

Sample:	FET Sample Ⅲ (1)	FET Sample Ⅲ-A (2)	FET Sample Ⅲ-B (3)	FET Sample Ⅲ-C (4)
Age of first child	16-21	16-21	16-21	-
Household composition	NF	-	NF	-
Household type	-	-	Normal	-
Mother and father				
Place of birth	Cam	Cam	Cam	-
Previous residence	-	-	Cam	-
Mother tongue	Kh	Kh	Kh	-
Religion	Budd	Budd	Budd	-
Children				
Place of birth	-	-	Cam	-
Previous residence	-	-	Cam	-
Mother tongue	Kh	-	Kh	-
Religion	Budd	-	Budd	-
Marital status	NM	-	NM	-

Notes: NF – nuclear family; Cam – Cambodia; Kh – Khmer; Budd. – Buddhism; NM – never married. "-" means that no restriction is imposed. The detailed procedures for constructing FET Sample Ⅲ are reported in Table A9. Fisher's exact tests based on FET Samples Ⅲ, Ⅱ I-A, and Ⅲ-B (with three subsamples) are conducted for each subsample and Fisher's exact tests based on FET Sample Ⅲ-C (without subsamples) are not.

Table A11: Exogeneity of Locations of Killing Sites – Alternative Samples

Sample:	Sample Ⅲ-A			Sample Ⅲ-B			Sample Ⅲ-C		
Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
				A. Village characteristics					
Distance to major roads (km)	-0.014	-0.006	-0.009	-0.011	-0.003	-0.004	-0.024	-0.009	-0.009
	(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.009)	(0.020)	(0.017)	(0.016)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.045	0.145	0.033	0.070	0.182	0.056	0.044	0.198	0.151
aged 36-50 with grade 1-5	(0.118)	(0.115)	(0.092)	(0.114)	(0.111)	(0.087)	(0.171)	(0.170)	(0.129)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.256	0.309*	0.251*	0.165	0.276	0.142	-0.022	0.228	0.239
aged 36-50 with grade 6 or above	(0.176)	(0.162)	(0.135)	(0.178)	(0.173)	(0.138)	(0.288)	(0.260)	(0.192)
Observations	834	895	1,128	892	951	1,207	440	470	592
Num. of balanced spatial clusters	108	108	108	122	122	122	60	60	60
R-squared	0.464	0.450	0.434	0.472	0.428	0.434	0.495	0.467	0.466
p-value of the listed variables	0.292	0.172	0.169	0.506	0.173	0.610	0.595	0.442	0.254
				B. Parental characteristics					
Mother's age	0.000	-0.003	-0.004	-0.001	-0.003	-0.004	-0.001	-0.001	-0.004
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.004)
Father's age	-0.005**	0.002	0.000	-0.002	0.003	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.005*
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Mother with grade 1-5	0.044**	0.018	0.004	0.041*	0.024	0.020	0.046	0.050	0.022
	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.016)	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.015)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.022)
Mother with grade 6 or above	0.082**	-0.021	0.047*	0.057*	-0.028	-0.003	0.089*	-0.008	0.034
	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.027)	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.029)	(0.052)	(0.047)	(0.037)
Father with grade 1-5	-0.007	-0.008	0.032*	-0.009	0.004	0.008	0.012	-0.032	0.045*
	(0.026)	(0.029)	(0.017)	(0.026)	(0.028)	(0.018)	(0.036)	(0.039)	(0.024)
Father with grade 6 or above	0.002	0.043	0.037	0.009	0.030	0.007	0.003	0.010	0.031
	(0.029)	(0.031)	(0.023)	(0.028)	(0.030)	(0.023)	(0.037)	(0.040)	(0.031)
Observations	2,125	2,224	4,138	2,273	2,307	4,286	1,135	1,120	2,088
Num. of balanced spatial clusters	108	108	108	122	122	122	60	60	60
R-squared	0.481	0.472	0.440	0.470	0.451	0.438	0.496	0.486	0.487
p-value of the listed variables	0.014	0.298	0.165	0.267	0.402	0.564	0.600	0.622	0.156

Notes: The table reports OLS estimates where the unit of observation is the village in panel A and the household in panel B. The dependent variable is an indicator variable equal to 1 if villages are located within 3.0 km of killing sites and 0 otherwise. All regressions also include zone and district fixed effects and spatial cluster fixed effects. p-values are from F-tests for the joint significance of the listed variables. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses in panel A and robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by village, are reported in parentheses in panel B. *** = Significant at the 1 percent level. ** = Significant at the 5 percent level. * = Significant at the 10 percent level.

Table A12: Killing Site Characteristics with Balanced Spatial Clusters and Information about Victims

Killing site:	Killing sites used for F.E. tests			Killing sites with Balanced spatial clusters (B.S.C)	
Dependent variable:	Have B.S.C.	Have Vict. Info.	ln (Num. of Vict.)	Have Vict. Info.	ln (Num. of Vict.)
Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Distance to major roads (km)	0.007***	0.003	-0.027**	-0.004	-0.044*
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.013)	(0.005)	(0.023)
Prop. of non-migrant women aged	0.084	0.146	1.080	-0.350	1.735
36-50 with grade 1-5	(0.137)	(0.148)	(0.753)	(0.265)	(1.185)
Prop. of non-migrant women aged	-0.347	-0.598**	1.511	-0.455	-2.373
36-50 with grade 6 or above	(0.221)	(0.266)	(1.355)	(0.595)	(2.228)
Zone fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	408	408	274	111	80
Num. of dep. variables (= 1)	111	274	-	80	-
R-squared	0.068	0.049	0.100	0.110	0.173
p-value of the listed variables	0.003	0.029	0.014	0.363	0.081

Notes: The table reports OLS estimates where the unit of observation is the killing site. Out of 433 killing sites in columns 1-2 and 115 killing sites in column 4, 25 and 4 sites, respectively, are excluded because of a lack of information about the educational levels of non-migrant women aged 36-50 around the sites; 274 and 80 killing sites with information about victims are analyzed in columns 3 and 5, respectively. The dependent variable in column 1 is an indicator variable equal to 1 if killing sites have balanced spatial clusters and 0 otherwise. The dependent variable in columns 2 and 4 is an indicator variable equal to 1 if killing sites have information about victims and 0 otherwise. The dependent variable in columns 3 and 5 is the logarithmic value of the lower bound of the number of victims at each killing site. The education levels of non-migrant women aged 36-50 are the ones of non-migrant women aged 36-50 living in villages within 3.0 km of each killing site. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. p-values are from F-tests for the joint significance of the three listed variables. *** = Significant at the 1 percent level. ** = Significant at the 5 percent level. * = Significant at the 10 percent level.

Table A13: Mean Differences (Treatments vs. Controls) – Household Characteristics

A. Households with their first child born in 1977-1979									
Sample:	Sample I			Sample II (All spatial clusters)			Sample III (Balanced spatial clusters)		
Variable	< 3 km of K.S. (1)	≥ 3 km of K.S. (2)	diff. (3)	< 3 km of K.S. (4)	≥ 3 km of K.S. (5)	diff. (6)	< 3 km of K.S. (7)	≥ 3 km of K.S. (8)	diff. (9)
A-1. Parental characteristics									
Mother's age	40.602	40.593	0.009	40.548	40.579	-0.030	40.625	40.666	-0.041
	(2.692)	(2.722)	(0.059)	(2.713)	(2.720)	(0.072)	(2.670)	(2.666)	(0.116)
Father's age	44.016	44.019	-0.003	43.916	44.004	-0.087	44.131	44.226	-0.096
	(4.491)	(4.660)	(0.100)	(4.482)	(4.535)	(0.120)	(4.576)	(4.477)	(0.197)
Mother without any grade	0.339	0.428	-0.089***	0.340	0.391	-0.050***	0.315	0.398	-0.083***
	(0.474)	(0.495)	(0.011)	(0.474)	(0.488)	(0.013)	(0.465)	(0.490)	(0.021)
Mother with grade 1-5	0.527	0.470	0.057***	0.529	0.499	0.030**	0.562	0.482	0.080***
	(0.499)	(0.499)	(0.011)	(0.499)	(0.500)	(0.013)	(0.496)	(0.500)	(0.022)
Mother with grade 6 or above	0.134	0.102	0.032***	0.131	0.110	0.021**	0.123	0.119	0.004
	(0.340)	(0.303)	(0.007)	(0.337)	(0.313)	(0.009)	(0.329)	(0.324)	(0.014)
Father without any grade	0.156	0.209	-0.053***	0.160	0.177	-0.017*	0.156	0.165	-0.008
	(0.363)	(0.407)	(0.009)	(0.366)	(0.382)	(0.010)	(0.363)	(0.371)	(0.016)
Father with grade 1-5	0.512	0.512	0.000	0.511	0.529	-0.017	0.508	0.507	0.001
	(0.500)	(0.500)	(0.011)	(0.500)	(0.499)	(0.013)	(0.500)	(0.500)	(0.022)
Father with grade 6 or above	0.332	0.279	0.054***	0.329	0.295	0.034***	0.336	0.328	0.007
	(0.471)	(0.448)	(0.010)	(0.470)	(0.456)	(0.012)	(0.472)	(0.470)	(0.020)
Observations	2,886	8,255		2,632	3,106		965	1,172	
A-2. Children's educational outcomes									
A-2-1. Age 15-21									
No schooling	0.152	0.231	-0.079***	0.156	0.192	-0.036***	0.176	0.190	-0.014
	(0.312)	(0.372)	(0.008)	(0.316)	(0.343)	(0.009)	(0.330)	(0.340)	(0.015)
Primary school completion	0.396	0.299	0.097***	0.390	0.329	0.062***	0.352	0.355	-0.003
	(0.416)	(0.387)	(0.009)	(0.415)	(0.399)	(0.011)	(0.409)	(0.407)	(0.018)
Years of schooling	4.826	4.038	0.788***	4.780	4.343	0.437***	4.512	4.515	-0.003
	(2.754)	(2.728)	(0.059)	(2.758)	(2.675)	(0.072)	(2.759)	(2.711)	(0.119)
Observations	2,886	8,255		2,632	3,106		965	1,172	
A-2-2. Age 6-14									
No schooling	0.288	0.366	-0.078***	0.291	0.323	-0.032***	0.308	0.314	-0.007
	(0.351)	(0.387)	(0.008)	(0.353)	(0.370)	(0.010)	(0.364)	(0.373)	(0.016)
School attendance	0.695	0.618	0.077***	0.692	0.659	0.033***	0.671	0.665	0.005
	(0.360)	(0.390)	(0.009)	(0.363)	(0.376)	(0.010)	(0.376)	(0.380)	(0.017)
Grade progression	-3.473	-3.712	0.240***	-3.480	-3.588	0.108***	-3.556	-3.547	-0.009
	(1.428)	(1.492)	(0.033)	(1.441)	(1.493)	(0.040)	(1.429)	(1.509)	(0.066)
Observations	2,697	7,823		2,460	2,942		908	1,119	

Continue

Table A13: Mean Differences (Treatments vs. Controls) – Household Characteristics

B. Households with their first child born in 1980									
Sample:	Sample I			Sample II (All spatial clusters)			Sample III (Balanced spatial clusters)		
Variable	<3 km of K.S. (1)	≥ 3 km of K.S. (2)	diff. (3)	<3 km of K.S. (4)	≥ 3 km of K.S. (5)	diff. (6)	<3 km of K.S. (7)	≥ 3 km of K.S. (8)	diff. (9)
B-1. Parental characteristics									
Mother's age	39.351	39.388	-0.037	39.323	39.406	-0.083	39.286	39.486	-0.200*
	(2.750)	(2.725)	(0.062)	(2.741)	(2.709)	(0.074)	(2.795)	(2.684)	(0.119)
Father's age	42.236	42.139	0.097	42.155	42.143	0.012	42.196	42.297	-0.101
	(4.400)	(4.398)	(0.099)	(4.352)	(4.374)	(0.119)	(4.198)	(4.334)	(0.186)
Mother without any grade	0.357	0.438	-0.080***	0.360	0.405	-0.046***	0.372	0.400	-0.028
	(0.479)	(0.496)	(0.011)	(0.480)	(0.491)	(0.013)	(0.484)	(0.490)	(0.021)
Mother with grade 1-5	0.533	0.475	0.058***	0.535	0.498	0.037***	0.544	0.489	0.055**
	(0.499)	(0.499)	(0.011)	(0.499)	(0.500)	(0.014)	(0.498)	(0.500)	(0.022)
Mother with grade 6 or above	0.110	0.088	0.022***	0.105	0.097	0.008	0.084	0.111	-0.027**
	(0.313)	(0.283)	(0.007)	(0.306)	(0.295)	(0.008)	(0.277)	(0.314)	(0.013)
Father without any grade	0.176	0.218	-0.042***	0.183	0.190	-0.007	0.186	0.186	0.000
	(0.381)	(0.413)	(0.009)	(0.387)	(0.393)	(0.011)	(0.390)	(0.389)	(0.017)
Father with grade 1-5	0.531	0.536	-0.004	0.530	0.548	-0.019	0.531	0.533	-0.001
	(0.499)	(0.499)	(0.011)	(0.499)	(0.498)	(0.014)	(0.499)	(0.499)	(0.022)
Father with grade 6 or above	0.292	0.247	0.046***	0.287	0.261	0.026**	0.283	0.281	0.001
	(0.455)	(0.431)	(0.010)	(0.453)	(0.439)	(0.012)	(0.450)	(0.450)	(0.020)
Observations	2,602	8,040		2,398	3,076		945	1,209	
B-2. Children's educational outcomes									
B-2-1. Age 15-18									
No schooling	0.149	0.212	-0.063***	0.154	0.177	-0.023**	0.164	0.184	-0.021
	(0.324)	(0.370)	(0.008)	(0.328)	(0.343)	(0.009)	(0.335)	(0.351)	(0.015)
Primary school completion	0.410	0.330	0.080***	0.405	0.362	0.043***	0.383	0.375	0.008
	(0.438)	(0.415)	(0.009)	(0.437)	(0.428)	(0.012)	(0.433)	(0.428)	(0.019)
Years of schooling	4.904	4.218	0.687***	4.863	4.527	0.336***	4.669	4.610	0.059
	(2.852)	(2.791)	(0.063)	(2.865)	(2.775)	(0.077)	(2.822)	(2.848)	(0.123)
Observations	2,602	8,040		2,398	3,076		945	1,209	
B-2-2. Age 6-14									
No schooling	0.281	0.349	-0.068***	0.286	0.312	-0.025***	0.290	0.306	-0.015
	(0.342)	(0.371)	(0.008)	(0.346)	(0.353)	(0.010)	(0.352)	(0.361)	(0.016)
School attendance	0.702	0.635	0.067***	0.698	0.672	0.026***	0.691	0.677	0.013
	(0.347)	(0.374)	(0.008)	(0.351)	(0.359)	(0.010)	(0.356)	(0.364)	(0.016)
Grade progression	-3.430	-3.656	0.226***	-3.450	-3.554	0.104***	-3.482	-3.565	0.083
	(1.422)	(1.442)	(0.033)	(1.421)	(1.430)	(0.040)	(1.367)	(1.450)	(0.063)
Observations	2,490	7,695		2,294	2,952		909	1,159	

Continue

Table A13: Mean Differences (Treatments vs. Controls) – Household Characteristics

C. Households with their first child born in 1981-1982									
Sample:	Sample I			Sample II (All spatial clusters)			Sample III (Balanced spatial clusters)		
Variable	< 3 km of K.S. (1)	≥ 3 km of K.S. (2)	diff. (3)	< 3 km of K.S. (4)	≥ 3 km of K.S. (5)	diff. (6)	< 3 km of K.S. (7)	≥ 3 km of K.S. (8)	diff. (9)
C-1. Parental characteristics									
Mother's age	38.293	38.257	0.037	38.266	38.216	0.049	38.090	38.219	-0.130
	(2.837)	(2.865)	(0.048)	(2.831)	(2.857)	(0.058)	(2.813)	(2.843)	(0.090)
Father's age	40.887	40.765	0.122	40.862	40.733	0.130	40.738	40.738	0.000
	(4.506)	(4.607)	(0.077)	(4.517)	(4.579)	(0.093)	(4.484)	(4.456)	(0.142)
Mother without any grade	0.396	0.471	-0.076***	0.400	0.435	-0.035***	0.390	0.439	-0.049***
	(0.489)	(0.499)	(0.008)	(0.490)	(0.496)	(0.010)	(0.488)	(0.496)	(0.016)
Mother with grade 1-5	0.515	0.465	0.049***	0.515	0.496	0.019*	0.535	0.478	0.056***
	(0.500)	(0.499)	(0.008)	(0.500)	(0.500)	(0.010)	(0.499)	(0.500)	(0.016)
Mother with grade 6 or above	0.090	0.064	0.026***	0.085	0.069	0.015***	0.075	0.082	-0.007
	(0.286)	(0.244)	(0.004)	(0.279)	(0.254)	(0.005)	(0.264)	(0.275)	(0.009)
Father without any grade	0.207	0.264	-0.057***	0.208	0.227	-0.018**	0.223	0.227	-0.004
	(0.405)	(0.441)	(0.007)	(0.406)	(0.419)	(0.008)	(0.416)	(0.419)	(0.013)
Father with grade 1-5	0.552	0.544	0.008	0.558	0.563	-0.005	0.559	0.539	0.020
	(0.497)	(0.498)	(0.008)	(0.497)	(0.496)	(0.010)	(0.497)	(0.499)	(0.016)
Father with grade 6 or above	0.241	0.192	0.049***	0.234	0.210	0.024***	0.218	0.234	-0.016
	(0.428)	(0.394)	(0.007)	(0.423)	(0.407)	(0.008)	(0.413)	(0.424)	(0.013)
Observations	4,654	14,617		4,316	5,428		1,764	2,247	
C-2. Children's educational outcomes									
C-2-1. Age 15-17									
No schooling	0.152	0.214	-0.061***	0.156	0.172	-0.016**	0.179	0.170	0.009
	(0.347)	(0.396)	(0.006)	(0.351)	(0.363)	(0.007)	(0.371)	(0.361)	(0.012)
Primary school completion	0.411	0.308	0.103***	0.404	0.341	0.063***	0.371	0.353	0.018
	(0.472)	(0.441)	(0.008)	(0.471)	(0.452)	(0.009)	(0.462)	(0.457)	(0.015)
Years of schooling	4.831	4.075	0.756***	4.775	4.403	0.372***	4.572	4.530	0.042
	(2.935)	(2.832)	(0.048)	(2.940)	(2.808)	(0.058)	(2.937)	(2.868)	(0.092)
Observations	4,654	14,617		4,316	5,428		1,764	2,247	
C-2-2. Age 6-14									
No schooling	0.287	0.360	-0.073***	0.292	0.315	-0.023***	0.288	0.305	-0.016
	(0.342)	(0.370)	(0.006)	(0.345)	(0.349)	(0.007)	(0.346)	(0.346)	(0.011)
School attendance	0.696	0.622	0.074***	0.691	0.667	0.024***	0.692	0.676	0.017
	(0.349)	(0.374)	(0.006)	(0.352)	(0.353)	(0.007)	(0.353)	(0.352)	(0.011)
Grade progression	-3.362	-3.637	0.274***	-3.380	-3.488	0.109***	-3.364	-3.441	0.077*
	(1.427)	(1.412)	(0.024)	(1.423)	(1.386)	(0.029)	(1.395)	(1.385)	(0.045)
Observations	4,476	14,185		4,149	5,267		1,705	2,195	

Notes: The unit of observation is the household. Standard deviations are reported in parentheses in columns 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8. Standard errors of differences in means are reported in parentheses in columns 3, 6, and 9. *** = Significant at the 1 percent level. ** = Significant at the 5 percent level. * = Significant at the 10 percent level.

Table A14: Mean Differences (Treatments vs. Controls) – Village Characteristics

Sample:	Sample I			Sample II (All spatial clusters)			Sample III (Balanced spatial clusters)		
Variable	< 3 km of K.S. (1)	≥ 3 km of K.S. (2)	diff. (3)	< 3 km of K.S. (4)	≥ 3 km of K.S. (5)	diff. (6)	< 3 km of K.S. (7)	≥ 3 km of K.S. (8)	diff. (9)
A. Households with their first child born in 1977-1979									
Distance to major roads (km)	8.153	9.041	-0.889**	8.390	8.527	-0.137	8.766	8.732	0.034
	(8.852)	(9.421)	(0.345)	(9.035)	(9.482)	(0.420)	(10.023)	(9.746)	(0.684)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.417	0.494	-0.077***	0.422	0.469	-0.047***	0.425	0.475	-0.049***
aged 36-50 without any grade	(0.218)	(0.226)	(0.008)	(0.217)	(0.221)	(0.010)	(0.224)	(0.226)	(0.016)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.454	0.411	0.043***	0.453	0.434	0.020**	0.456	0.422	0.035**
aged 36-50 with grade 1-5	(0.195)	(0.208)	(0.008)	(0.197)	(0.203)	(0.009)	(0.210)	(0.204)	(0.014)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.129	0.095	0.034***	0.125	0.097	0.028***	0.118	0.104	0.014*
aged 36-50 with grade 6 or above	(0.127)	(0.109)	(0.004)	(0.125)	(0.105)	(0.005)	(0.131)	(0.107)	(0.008)
Observations	953	3,036		879	1,100		390	449	
B. Households with their first child born in 1980									
Distance to major roads (km)	8.277	8.775	-0.499	8.519	8.346	0.173	9.183	8.602	0.581
	(8.931)	(9.249)	(0.337)	(9.098)	(9.338)	(0.408)	(9.975)	(9.477)	(0.655)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.407	0.491	-0.085***	0.412	0.468	-0.057***	0.416	0.474	-0.058***
aged 36-50 without any grade	(0.216)	(0.226)	(0.008)	(0.215)	(0.222)	(0.010)	(0.224)	(0.225)	(0.015)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.464	0.412	0.052***	0.463	0.429	0.034***	0.464	0.416	0.048***
aged 36-50 with grade 1-5	(0.197)	(0.207)	(0.008)	(0.199)	(0.203)	(0.009)	(0.213)	(0.203)	(0.014)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.130	0.097	0.033***	0.125	0.103	0.022***	0.120	0.110	0.010
aged 36-50 with grade 6 or above	(0.124)	(0.114)	(0.004)	(0.123)	(0.113)	(0.005)	(0.124)	(0.118)	(0.008)
Observations	964	3,190		895	1,203		397	492	
C. Households with their first child born in 1981-1982									
Distance to major roads (km)	8.160	8.843	-0.683**	8.411	8.430	-0.019	8.813	8.732	0.394
	(8.851)	(9.136)	(0.299)	(9.016)	(9.205)	(0.363)	(9.896)	(9.746)	(0.569)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.432	0.497	-0.066***	0.437	0.470	-0.033***	0.440	0.475	-0.032**
aged 36-50 without any grade	(0.223)	(0.230)	(0.008)	(0.222)	(0.221)	(0.009)	(0.228)	(0.226)	(0.013)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.445	0.409	0.035***	0.444	0.430	0.013*	0.446	0.422	0.024*
aged 36-50 with grade 1-5	(0.201)	(0.211)	(0.007)	(0.203)	(0.206)	(0.008)	(0.215)	(0.204)	(0.012)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.124	0.094	0.030***	0.119	0.099	0.020***	0.115	0.104	0.008
aged 36-50 with grade 6 or above	(0.124)	(0.113)	(0.004)	(0.121)	(0.112)	(0.005)	(0.121)	(0.107)	(0.007)
Observations	1,195	4,002		1,107	1,470		503	625	

Notes: The unit of observation is the village. Standard deviations are reported in parentheses in columns 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8. Standard errors of differences in means are reported in parentheses in columns 3, 6, and 9. *** = Significant at the 1 percent level. ** = Significant at the 5 percent level. * = Significant at the 10 percent level.

Table A15: Potential Mechanisms – Impacts of Genocide on Other Post-treatment Variables

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	A-1. Married			A-2. Divorced			A-3. Widowed		
Genocidal Violence I	0.004	-0.017	-0.004	-0.002	0.003	0.004	-0.006	0.013	0.004
	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.007)
Observations	5,299	5,441	10,197	5,299	5,441	10,197	4,359	4,539	8,492
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.858	0.883	0.888	0.042	0.043	0.043	0.082	0.059	0.053
R-squared	0.074	0.070	0.039	0.057	0.052	0.031	0.077	0.076	0.039
	A-4. Migrant households			A-5. Num. of children aged 15-21			A-6. Male children aged 15-21		
Genocidal Violence I	0.007	-0.002	0.005	-0.020	0.063**	0.040*	-0.009	0.033	0.008
	(0.024)	(0.021)	(0.017)	(0.041)	(0.028)	(0.021)	(0.023)	(0.025)	(0.021)
Observations	4,543	4,780	9,030	2,137	2,154	4,011	2,137	2,154	4,011
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.582	0.592	0.596	2.243	1.810	1.316	0.758	0.685	0.585
R-squared	0.232	0.243	0.225	0.122	0.110	0.073	0.126	0.095	0.064
	A-7. Num. of male children aged 15-21			A-8. Female children aged 15-21			A-9. Num. of female children aged 15-21		
Genocidal Violence I	-0.033	0.059	0.020	0.000	0.002	0.000	0.012	0.004	0.021
	(0.047)	(0.039)	(0.026)	(0.022)	(0.026)	(0.019)	(0.043)	(0.040)	(0.026)
Observations	2,137	2,154	4,011	2,137	2,154	4,011	2,137	2,154	4,011
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	1.142	0.897	0.668	0.750	0.699	0.572	1.102	0.912	0.648
R-squared	0.120	0.094	0.065	0.099	0.107	0.060	0.104	0.103	0.062
	A-10. Children aged 6-14			A-11. Num. of children aged 6-14			A-12. Male children aged 6-14		
Genocidal Violence I	-0.021	0.003	-0.006	0.005	-0.056	-0.164***	0.020	0.004	-0.012
	(0.016)	(0.009)	(0.007)	(0.069)	(0.064)	(0.046)	(0.024)	(0.026)	(0.016)
Observations	2,137	2,154	4,011	2,137	2,154	4,011	2,137	2,154	4,011
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.955	0.959	0.977	2.448	2.640	2.806	0.750	0.768	0.796
R-squared	0.107	0.099	0.070	0.126	0.127	0.101	0.117	0.099	0.064

Continue

Table A15: Potential Mechanisms – Impacts of Genocide on Other Post-treatment Variables

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	A-13. Num. of male children aged 6-14			A-14. Female children aged 6-14			A-15. Num. of female children aged 6-14		
Genocidal Violence I	0.062	-0.016	-0.060	-0.041	0.014	-0.029*	-0.057	-0.040	-0.103**
	(0.055)	(0.058)	(0.041)	(0.027)	(0.022)	(0.017)	(0.060)	(0.052)	(0.043)
Observations	2,137	2,154	4,011	2,137	2,154	4,011	2,137	2,154	4,011
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	1.236	1.344	1.385	0.742	0.764	0.815	1.212	1.296	1.421
R-squared	0.120	0.113	0.070	0.117	0.114	0.064	0.123	0.122	0.072
	A-16. Children aged younger than 6			A-17. Grandmother			A-18. Grandfather		
Genocidal Violence I	-0.033	0.025	-0.010	-0.012	0.000	0.023***	0.008	0.002	0.001
	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.021)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.009)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.005)
Observations	2,137	2,154	4,011	2,137	2,154	4,011	2,137	2,154	4,011
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.573	0.576	0.658	0.038	0.046	0.039	0.011	0.017	0.015
R-squared	0.161	0.182	0.122	0.114	0.091	0.065	0.169	0.107	0.061
	A-19. Num. of male children born			A-20. Num. of female children born			A-21. HH with child death		
Genocidal Violence I	-0.056	0.053	-0.005	-0.119	-0.080	-0.059	-0.073**	-0.020	0.025
	(0.095)	(0.091)	(0.063)	(0.095)	(0.089)	(0.071)	(0.031)	(0.030)	(0.021)
Observations	2,137	2,154	4,011	2,137	2,154	4,011	2,137	2,154	4,011
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	3.184	3.036	2.880	3.032	2.935	2.838	0.386	0.369	0.366
R-squared	0.143	0.131	0.078	0.133	0.150	0.097	0.120	0.151	0.095
	A-22. Female head			A-23. Mother working in a non-farm sector			A-24. Father working in a non-farm sector		
Genocidal Violence I	-0.013	-0.012	0.001	0.010	0.026**	0.020	0.028	0.026	0.042**
	(0.012)	(0.015)	(0.011)	(0.015)	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.024)	(0.022)	(0.017)
Observations	2,137	2,154	4,011	2,137	2,154	4,011	2,137	2,154	4,011
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.047	0.044	0.039	0.055	0.038	0.059	0.127	0.117	0.109
R-squared	0.202	0.189	0.107	0.207	0.167	0.245	0.248	0.248	0.213

Continue

Table A15: Potential Mechanisms – Impacts of Genocide on Other Post-treatment Variables

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	A-25. Light			A-26. Fuel			A-27. Water		
Genocidal Violence I	0.033	-0.001	-0.011	0.009	0.007	-0.003	0.036	0.038	-0.002
	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.017)	(0.008)	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.021)
Observations	2,137	2,154	4,011	2,137	2,154	4,011	2,137	2,154	4,011
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.080	0.065	0.070	0.010	0.006	0.010	0.241	0.246	0.223
R-squared	0.266	0.198	0.251	0.129	0.088	0.055	0.473	0.464	0.429
	A-28. Toilet			B-1. ln (Population)			B-2. Village with a primary school		
Genocidal Violence I	-0.043**	-0.001	-0.009	0.051	0.039	0.058	-0.053	-0.077*	-0.047
	(0.020)	(0.017)	(0.014)	(0.045)	(0.041)	(0.036)	(0.050)	(0.043)	(0.039)
Observations	2,137	2,154	4,011	839	889	1,128	839	889	1,128
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.127	0.092	0.090	6.741	6.734	6.643	0.416	0.409	0.389
R-squared	0.341	0.282	0.259	0.585	0.601	0.583	0.281	0.308	0.269
	B-3. Village with a secondary school			B-4. Distance to primary school (km)			B-5. Distance to secondary school (km)		
Genocidal Violence I	0.013	0.011	0.003	0.031	0.065	0.009	-0.365**	-0.345**	-0.336***
	(0.024)	(0.020)	(0.017)	(0.080)	(0.071)	(0.065)	(0.157)	(0.151)	(0.129)
Observations	839	889	1,128	839	889	1,128	839	889	1,128
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.051	0.055	0.048	0.822	0.843	0.878	3.822	3.771	3.860
R-squared	0.255	0.230	0.191	0.693	0.674	0.651	0.934	0.929	0.918

Notes: The table reports OLS estimates where the unit of observation is the household in panels A-1-A-28 and the village in panels B-1-B-5. The dependent variables are given in each panel. The variables of housing conditions are defined as follows: "Light," the variable for better lighting conditions, takes 1 if the main source of light is city power, generator, or both city power and generator and 0 if it is kerosene, candle, or battery; "Fuel," the variable for better fuel conditions, takes 1 if the main cooking fuel is electricity, liquefied petroleum gas (LPG), or charcoal and 0 if it is kerosene, firewood, or none; "Water," the variable for better water conditions, takes 1 if the main source of the drinking water supply is bought, piped water, or tube/pipe well and 0 if it is a dug well, spring, river, stream, lake/pond, or rain; "Toilet," the variable for better toilet conditions, takes 1 if a toilet facility is available within the premises and 0 otherwise. The sample used in each analysis is Sample Ⅲ with the following exceptions: (1) Migrant households selected under the same conditions (except for their migrant status) are also included in panels A-1 and A-4; (2) migrant and non-migrant households with divorced, widowed, and separated mothers are also included in panels A-1 and A-3; (3) the sample is limited to households in which either mother or father or both have never migrated outside her/his/their birth villages in panel A-3. All regressions control for zone and district fixed effects and spatial cluster fixed effects. The following covariates are also controlled for: mother's characteristics (age and education) in panels A-1-A-3; mother's and father's characteristics (age and education) in panel A-4; mother's and father's characteristics (age and education) and village characteristics (distance to major roads, education levels of non-migrant women aged 36-50) in panels A-5-A-28; village characteristics in panels B-1-B-5. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. In panel A, they are adjusted for clustering by village. *** = Significant at the 1 percent level. ** = Significant at the 5 percent level. * = Significant at the 10 percent level.

Table A16: Exogeneity of Continuous Genocide Measure – Alternative Samples

Size of balanced spatial clusters	4.0 km			6.0 km			8.0 km		
Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
				A. Village characteristics					
Distance to major roads (km)	-0.021	-0.024	-0.024	-0.044	-0.022	-0.043*	-0.027	-0.049	-0.043*
	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.024)	(0.030)	(0.032)	(0.026)	(0.017)	(0.030)	(0.025)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.470	0.493*	0.370	-0.285	-0.103	-0.082	0.422	0.586	0.337
aged 36-50 with grade 1-5	(0.334)	(0.296)	(0.245)	(0.288)	(0.262)	(0.186)	(0.287)	(0.379)	(0.267)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.872**	0.650*	0.558*	0.649	0.455	0.304	0.109	0.550	0.078
aged 36-50 with grade 6 or above	(0.413)	(0.384)	(0.337)	(0.412)	(0.461)	(0.322)	(0.400)	(0.400)	(0.342)
Observations	383	391	482	376	403	512	340	357	452
Num. of balanced spatial clusters	190	190	190	115	115	115	60	60	60
R-squared	0.882	0.883	0.883	0.892	0.893	0.899	0.877	0.854	0.858
p-value of the listed variables	0.076	0.102	0.153	0.105	0.599	0.115	0.240	0.194	0.370
				B. Parental characteristics					
Mother's age	-0.028**	-0.001	0.005	-0.009	0.007	0.000	-0.006	-0.013	-0.008
	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.005)	(0.009)	(0.011)	(0.007)
Father's age	0.007	-0.003	-0.007*	-0.010**	-0.004	-0.001	-0.002	0.002	0.004
	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.008)	(0.005)
Mother with grade 1-5	0.034	0.115**	0.071**	0.032	-0.031	-0.023	-0.002	-0.001	0.034
	(0.061)	(0.057)	(0.035)	(0.038)	(0.045)	(0.027)	(0.048)	(0.067)	(0.055)
Mother with grade 6 or above	0.048	0.003	0.102	0.064	-0.088	-0.042	-0.123*	-0.016	-0.074
	(0.099)	(0.091)	(0.068)	(0.065)	(0.087)	(0.049)	(0.069)	(0.106)	(0.074)
Father with grade 1-5	0.145	-0.096	0.013	-0.062	-0.008	-0.031	-0.033	0.058	0.025
	(0.111)	(0.075)	(0.043)	(0.047)	(0.054)	(0.034)	(0.056)	(0.105)	(0.044)
Father with grade 6 or above	0.143	-0.104	0.013	-0.022	-0.016	0.015	0.017	0.157*	0.087*
	(0.095)	(0.076)	(0.052)	(0.055)	(0.064)	(0.044)	(0.059)	(0.081)	(0.048)
Observations	1,067	1,014	1,792	1,008	1,015	1,798	924	888	1,541
Num. of balanced spatial clusters	190	190	190	115	115	115	60	60	60
R-squared	0.845	0.870	0.890	0.902	0.892	0.896	0.874	0.812	0.839
p-value of the listed variables	0.257	0.341	0.161	0.003	0.919	0.764	0.532	0.466	0.381

Notes: The table reports OLS estimates where the unit of observation is the village in panel A and the household in panel B. The dependent variable is the logarithmic value of the continuous genocide measure based on the first-order polynomial in distance (Genocidal Violence II). All regressions control for zone and district fixed effects and spatial cluster fixed effects. p-values are from F-tests for the joint significance of the listed variables. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses in panel A and robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by village, are reported in parentheses in panel B. *** = Significant at the 1 percent level. ** = Significant at the 5 percent level. * = Significant at the 10 percent level.

Table A17: Robustness Check – Alternative Size of Balanced Spatial Clusters (4.0 km)

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	A. Children aged 15-21								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			Primary school completion			Years of schooling		
	A-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.036**	0.000	-0.007	0.012	-0.008	0.007	-0.055	-0.103	0.015
	(0.016)	(0.018)	(0.014)	(0.023)	(0.025)	(0.020)	(0.133)	(0.153)	(0.117)
R-squared	0.348	0.315	0.251	0.317	0.309	0.233	0.416	0.386	0.345
Specification Ⅳ	0.034*	0.003	-0.009	-0.014	-0.023	-0.010	-0.175	-0.173	-0.070
	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.014)	(0.022)	(0.024)	(0.018)	(0.131)	(0.148)	(0.110)
R-squared	0.375	0.338	0.267	0.396	0.369	0.296	0.486	0.448	0.407
Mean ($\geq$ 2.0 km)	0.144	0.146	0.141	0.365	0.409	0.400	4.691	4.900	4.835
Observations	2,294	2,210	4,005	2,294	2,210	4,005	2,294	2,210	4,005
Observations ($<$ 2.0 km of K.S.)	1,009	976	1,707	1,009	976	1,707	1,009	976	1,707
	A-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	0.0194**	0.0046	0.0099	0.0035	0.0024	0.0089	-0.0626	-0.0434	-0.0406
	(0.0090)	(0.0136)	(0.0120)	(0.0147)	(0.0162)	(0.0209)	(0.0950)	(0.0966)	(0.1083)
R-squared	0.358	0.318	0.237	0.301	0.280	0.223	0.413	0.355	0.332
Specification Ⅳ	0.0237**	0.0075	0.0075	-0.0057	0.0096	0.0064	-0.1181	-0.0057	-0.0346
	(0.0110)	(0.0139)	(0.0132)	(0.0154)	(0.0151)	(0.0210)	(0.0968)	(0.0957)	(0.1046)
R-squared	0.401	0.351	0.263	0.371	0.360	0.289	0.476	0.428	0.398
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 4.0 km)	0.157	0.169	0.146	0.363	0.365	0.390	4.648	4.534	4.713
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.149	5.903	5.786	6.149	5.903	5.786	6.149	5.903	5.786
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.927	1.891	1.812	1.927	1.891	1.812	1.927	1.891	1.812
Observations	1,067	1,014	1,792	1,067	1,014	1,792	1,067	1,014	1,792

Continue

Table A17: Robustness Check – Alternative Size of Balanced Spatial Clusters (4.0 km)

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	B. Children aged 6-14								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			School attendance			Grade progression		
	B-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.026	0.011	-0.015	-0.019	-0.012	0.015	-0.006	0.023	0.058
	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.015)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.015)	(0.083)	(0.073)	(0.061)
R-squared	0.314	0.287	0.267	0.302	0.280	0.261	0.231	0.275	0.222
Specification Ⅳ	0.020	0.019	-0.016	-0.019	-0.020	0.014	-0.082	-0.017	0.010
	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.015)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.015)	(0.069)	(0.065)	(0.049)
R-squared	0.414	0.368	0.335	0.393	0.357	0.321	0.493	0.498	0.472
Mean ($\geq$ 2.0 km)	0.276	0.274	0.286	0.705	0.707	0.696	-3.483	-3.473	-3.369
Observations	2,165	2,129	3,858	2,165	2,129	3,858	2,165	2,129	3,858
Observations ($<$ 2.0 km of K.S.)	947	933	1,634	947	933	1,634	947	933	1,634
	B-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	0.0303**	-0.0040	0.0033	-0.0308**	0.0112	-0.0018	-0.0334	0.0329	0.0436
	(0.0126)	(0.0133)	(0.0108)	(0.0129)	(0.0139)	(0.0113)	(0.0445)	(0.0441)	(0.0492)
R-squared	0.328	0.298	0.283	0.323	0.287	0.275	0.220	0.280	0.223
Specification Ⅳ	0.0292**	-0.0132	0.0016	-0.0307**	0.0201	-0.0022	-0.1032**	0.0370	0.0157
	(0.0132)	(0.0127)	(0.0109)	(0.0137)	(0.0132)	(0.0115)	(0.0460)	(0.0402)	(0.0390)
R-squared	0.432	0.390	0.355	0.416	0.377	0.340	0.513	0.537	0.486
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 4.0 km)	0.267	0.298	0.281	0.720	0.685	0.699	-3.455	-3.505	-3.372
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.153	5.894	5.785	6.153	5.894	5.785	6.153	5.894	5.785
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.931	1.900	1.804	1.931	1.900	1.804	1.931	1.900	1.804
Observations	1,001	982	1,738	1,001	982	1,738	1,001	982	1,738

Note: See the notes to Tables 3 and 4.

Table A18: Robustness Check – Alternative Size of Balanced Spatial Clusters (8.0 km)

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	A. Children aged 15-21								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			Primary school completion			Years of schooling		
	A-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	-0.001	-0.020	0.024	-0.004	0.070***	0.022	-0.094	0.428**	0.052
	(0.023)	(0.021)	(0.018)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.021)	(0.167)	(0.171)	(0.129)
R-squared	0.333	0.329	0.257	0.297	0.289	0.224	0.395	0.373	0.336
Specification Ⅳ	0.002	-0.020	0.029	-0.016	0.059**	0.008	-0.171	0.349**	-0.054
	(0.023)	(0.022)	(0.018)	(0.021)	(0.024)	(0.020)	(0.153)	(0.168)	(0.120)
R-squared	0.363	0.352	0.285	0.366	0.359	0.285	0.454	0.438	0.408
Mean ($\geq$ 4.0 km)	0.240	0.208	0.204	0.311	0.318	0.306	4.084	4.179	4.128
Observations	1,914	1,914	3,511	1,914	1,914	3,511	1,914	1,914	3,511
Observations ($<$ 4.0 km of K.S.)	969	968	1,839	969	968	1,839	969	968	1,839
	A-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	0.0005	-0.0083	-0.0140	-0.0063	-0.0092	-0.0027	-0.0131	-0.0144	0.0253
	(0.0214)	(0.0157)	(0.0168)	(0.0179)	(0.0186)	(0.0205)	(0.1369)	(0.1078)	(0.1181)
R-squared	0.270	0.281	0.231	0.241	0.190	0.167	0.346	0.289	0.291
Specification Ⅳ	0.0142	-0.0091	-0.0139	-0.0139	-0.0113	-0.0036	-0.0630	-0.0210	0.0113
	(0.0221)	(0.0157)	(0.0169)	(0.0177)	(0.0175)	(0.0191)	(0.1327)	(0.1040)	(0.1148)
R-squared	0.320	0.321	0.268	0.323	0.292	0.254	0.421	0.387	0.381
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 8.0 km)	0.247	0.221	0.229	0.298	0.294	0.282	3.958	4.020	3.908
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.047	5.934	5.712	6.047	5.934	5.712	6.047	5.934	5.712
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.715	1.736	1.748	1.715	1.736	1.748	1.715	1.736	1.748
Observations	924	888	1,541	924	888	1,541	924	888	1,541

Continue

Table A18: Robustness Check – Alternative Size of Balanced Spatial Clusters (8.0 km)

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	B. Children aged 6-14								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			School attendance			Grade progression		
	B-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.030	0.008	0.021	-0.030	-0.004	-0.021	-0.038	-0.019	-0.008
	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.018)	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.018)	(0.098)	(0.091)	(0.067)
R-squared	0.303	0.291	0.290	0.292	0.278	0.273	0.223	0.233	0.198
Specification Ⅳ	0.039	0.012	0.026	-0.038	-0.007	-0.027	-0.091	-0.023	-0.089
	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.018)	(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.018)	(0.079)	(0.084)	(0.059)
R-squared	0.378	0.356	0.356	0.359	0.338	0.334	0.522	0.471	0.480
Mean ($\geq$ 4.0 km)	0.347	0.329	0.343	0.631	0.652	0.638	-3.739	-3.691	-3.625
Observations	1,827	1,830	3,407	1,827	1,830	3,407	1,827	1,830	3,407
Observations ($<$ 4.0 km of K.S.)	929	926	1,785	929	926	1,785	929	926	1,785
	B-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	0.0264	-0.0122	-0.0102	-0.0218	0.0124	0.0093	-0.0765	-0.0343	-0.008
	(0.0195)	(0.0165)	(0.0159)	(0.0196)	(0.0170)	(0.0161)	(0.0837)	(0.0545)	(0.0433)
R-squared	0.251	0.230	0.239	0.233	0.226	0.218	0.179	0.152	0.165
Specification Ⅳ	0.0295	-0.0137	-0.0078	-0.0227	0.0153	0.0070	-0.1126*	-0.0162	-0.0162
	(0.0201)	(0.0156)	(0.0144)	(0.0203)	(0.0162)	(0.0151)	(0.0647)	(0.0531)	(0.0409)
R-squared	0.341	0.331	0.320	0.310	0.313	0.292	0.508	0.472	0.502
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 8.0 km)	0.381	0.378	0.374	0.596	0.602	0.604	-3.759	-3.731	-3.682
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.042	5.941	5.708	6.042	5.941	5.708	6.042	5.941	5.708
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.716	1.740	1.747	1.716	1.740	1.747	1.716	1.740	1.747
Observations	874	848	1,500	874	848	1,500	874	848	1,500

Note: See the notes to Tables 3 and 4.

Table A19: Exogeneity of Locations of Killing Sites – Alternative Samples

Size of balanced spatial clusters	4.0 km			8.0 km		
Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	A. Village characteristics					
Distance to major roads (km)	0.017	0.032**	0.013	0.007	0.016	0.009
	(0.016)	(0.014)	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.009)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.082	0.204*	0.143	0.049	0.061	0.048
aged 36-50 with grade 1-5	(0.122)	(0.121)	(0.097)	(0.116)	(0.115)	(0.092)
Prop. of non-migrant women	0.224	0.239	0.243	0.112	0.218	0.181
aged 36-50 with grade 6 or above	(0.184)	(0.176)	(0.155)	(0.167)	(0.170)	(0.151)
Observations	841	865	1,076	701	742	960
Num. of balanced spatial clusters	190	190	190	60	60	60
R-squared	0.467	0.45	0.429	0.504	0.451	0.448
p-value of the listed variables	0.498	0.040	0.217	0.846	0.327	0.539
	B. Parental characteristics					
Mother's age	0.000	-0.001	0.000	-0.003	-0.006	0.002
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)
Father's age	-0.001	0.005*	-0.001	-0.003	-0.002	-0.004**
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Mother with grade 1-5	0.018	0.008	0.020	0.020	-0.016	-0.005
	(0.020)	(0.022)	(0.015)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.017)
Mother with grade 6 or above	0.016	0.001	0.046	0.032	-0.024	-0.002
	(0.033)	(0.040)	(0.029)	(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.026)
Father with grade 1-5	-0.007	-0.027	-0.004	0.036	-0.025	-0.013
	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.017)	(0.028)	(0.026)	(0.016)
Father with grade 6 or above	0.000	-0.030	-0.002	0.040	0.048	0.024
	(0.030)	(0.031)	(0.022)	(0.032)	(0.031)	(0.021)
Observations	2,294	2,210	4,005	1,914	1,914	3,511
Num. of balanced spatial clusters	190	190	190	60	60	60
R-squared	0.491	0.449	0.443	0.510	0.496	0.485
p-value of the listed variables	0.976	0.540	0.696	0.410	0.027	0.096

Notes: The table reports OLS estimates where the unit of observation is the village in panel A and the household in panel B. The dependent variable is an indicator variable equal to 1 if villages are located within 2.0 km (in columns 1-3) and 4.0 km (in columns 4-6) of killing sites and 0 otherwise. All regressions also include zone and district fixed effects and spatial cluster fixed effects. p-values are from F-tests for the joint significance of the listed variables. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses in panel A and robust standard errors, adjusted for clustering by village, are reported in parentheses in panel B. *** = Significant at the 1 percent level. ** = Significant at the 5 percent level. * = Significant at the 10 percent level.

Table A20: Robustness Check – Trimmed Subsamples Based on Propensity Score Estimated with Flexible Specifications

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	A. Children aged 15-21								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			Primary school completion			Years of schooling		
	A-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.035*	-0.005		-0.020	-0.012		-0.343**	-0.140	
	(0.019)	(0.022)		(0.024)	(0.026)		(0.150)	(0.166)	
R-squared	0.396	0.346		0.328	0.308		0.453	0.394	
Specification Ⅳ	0.043**	0.004		-0.034	-0.019		-0.438***	-0.205	
	(0.019)	(0.022)		(0.023)	(0.026)		(0.144)	(0.161)	
R-squared	0.420	0.370		0.391	0.374		0.509	0.464	
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.193	0.181		0.353	0.377		4.515	4.636	
Observations	1,951	1,928		1,951	1,928		1,951	1,928	
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	876	858		876	858		876	858	
	A-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	0.0447**	-0.0104		-0.0359**	0.0078		-0.3749***	0.0380	
	(0.0210)	(0.0201)		(0.0176)	(0.0255)		(0.1313)	(0.1553)	
R-squared	0.373	0.304		0.300	0.255		0.437	0.350	
Specification Ⅳ	0.0451**	-0.0036		-0.0411**	0.0006		-0.4141***	-0.0210	
	(0.0226)	(0.0196)		(0.0171)	(0.0231)		(0.1359)	(0.1424)	
R-squared	0.414	0.349		0.380	0.352		0.493	0.445	
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 6.0 km)	0.233	0.216		0.316	0.329		4.176	4.241	
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.057	5.899		6.057	5.899		6.057	5.899	
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.742	1.740		1.742	1.740		1.742	1.740	
Observations	948	914		948	914		948	914	

Continue

Table A20: Robustness Check – Trimmed Subsamples Based on Propensity Score Estimated with Flexible Specifications

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	A. Children aged 15-21								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			Primary school completion			Years of schooling		
	A-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.034*		0.001	-0.028		0.013	-0.351**		0.021
	(0.019)		(0.017)	(0.024)		(0.021)	(0.150)		(0.131)
R-squared	0.394		0.292	0.334		0.263	0.457		0.371
Specification Ⅳ	0.043**		0.006	-0.043*		0.008	-0.450***		-0.032
	(0.019)		(0.018)	(0.024)		(0.021)	(0.145)		(0.126)
R-squared	0.420		0.314	0.395		0.340	0.513		0.446
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.196		0.166	0.356		0.365	4.495		4.635
Observations	1,951		2,614	1,951		2,614	1,951		2,614
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	888		1,163	888		1,163	888		1,163
	A-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	0.0424*		0.0149	-0.0387**		-0.0012	-0.3710***		-0.0389
	(0.0219)		(0.0171)	(0.0187)		(0.0265)	(0.1359)		(0.1309)
R-squared	0.365		0.283	0.305		0.231	0.437		0.356
Specification Ⅳ	0.0420*		0.0137	-0.0480**		0.0067	-0.4357***		-0.0053
	(0.0241)		(0.0170)	(0.0186)		(0.0247)	(0.1404)		(0.1225)
R-squared	0.408		0.311	0.379		0.316	0.495		0.435
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 6.0 km)	0.233		0.200	0.313		0.321	4.155		4.231
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.048		5.759	6.048		5.759	6.048		5.759
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.742		1.733	1.742		1.733	1.742		1.733
Observations	933		1,205	933		1,205	933		1,205

Continue

Table A20: Robustness Check – Trimmed Subsamples Based on Propensity Score Estimated with Flexible Specifications

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	A. Children aged 15-21								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			Primary school completion			Years of schooling		
	A-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	-0.003	0.007		-0.015	-0.004		-0.170	-0.099	
	(0.022)	(0.016)		(0.025)	(0.020)		(0.160)	(0.123)	
R-squared	0.350	0.269		0.314	0.243		0.400	0.352	
Specification Ⅳ	0.006	0.009		-0.022	-0.012		-0.239	-0.152	
	(0.021)	(0.016)		(0.024)	(0.020)		(0.154)	(0.116)	
R-squared	0.371	0.289		0.378	0.314		0.466	0.427	
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.186	0.166		0.376	0.355		4.610	4.566	
Observations	2,058	3,399		2,058	3,399		2,058	3,399	
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	915	1,510		915	1,510		915	1,510	
	A-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	-0.0080	0.0044		0.0084	-0.0009		0.0238	0.0044	
	(0.0204)	(0.0163)		(0.0254)	(0.0229)		(0.1545)	(0.1206)	
R-squared	0.313	0.272		0.264	0.218		0.358	0.338	
Specification Ⅳ	-0.0034	0.0039		0.0058	0.0012		-0.0135	0.0206	
	(0.0195)	(0.0172)		(0.0228)	(0.0226)		(0.1427)	(0.1178)	
R-squared	0.356	0.297		0.357	0.296		0.448	0.422	
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 6.0 km)	0.223	0.200		0.320	0.309		4.164	4.159	
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	5.881	5.715		5.881	5.715		5.881	5.715	
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.749	1.706		1.749	1.706		1.749	1.706	
Observations	969	1,541		969	1,541		969	1,541	

Continue

Table A20: Robustness Check – Trimmed Subsamples Based on Propensity Score Estimated with Flexible Specifications

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	B. Children aged 6-14								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			School attendance			Grade progression		
	B-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.034	0.043*		-0.037	-0.043*		-0.151*	0.021	
	(0.022)	(0.023)		(0.022)	(0.023)		(0.091)	(0.076)	
R-squared	0.347	0.307		0.339	0.297		0.269	0.253	
Specification Ⅳ	0.049**	0.046**		-0.050**	-0.046**		-0.191**	-0.066	
	(0.022)	(0.021)		(0.023)	(0.021)		(0.078)	(0.067)	
R-squared	0.420	0.388		0.403	0.370		0.531	0.486	
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.313	0.291		0.666	0.690		-3.541	-3.537	
Observations	1,849	1,852		1,849	1,852		1,849	1,852	
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	825	827		825	827		825	827	
	B-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	0.0492**	0.0004		-0.0485**	0.0070		-0.2096***	0.0101	
	(0.0220)	(0.0227)		(0.0228)	(0.0234)		(0.0802)	(0.0740)	
R-squared	0.346	0.287		0.352	0.280		0.230	0.217	
Specification Ⅳ	0.0692***	0.0150		-0.0683***	-0.0064		-0.2591***	-0.0074	
	(0.0235)	(0.0198)		(0.0240)	(0.0200)		(0.0788)	(0.0737)	
R-squared	0.433	0.396		0.426	0.375		0.522	0.487	
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 6.0 km)	0.345	0.335		0.634	0.646		-3.672	-3.589	
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.055	5.898		6.055	5.898		6.055	5.898	
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.746	1.747		1.746	1.747		1.746	1.747	
Observations	894	876		894	876		894	876	

Continue

Table A20: Robustness Check – Trimmed Subsamples Based on Propensity Score Estimated with Flexible Specifications

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	B. Children aged 6-14								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			School attendance			Grade progression		
	B-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.038*		0.006	-0.041*		0.005	-0.169*		-0.065
	(0.022)		(0.018)	(0.022)		(0.018)	(0.091)		(0.066)
R-squared	0.351		0.313	0.343		0.302	0.285		0.258
Specification Ⅳ	0.050**		0.012	-0.052**		-0.001	-0.218***		-0.104*
	(0.022)		(0.017)	(0.023)		(0.018)	(0.079)		(0.058)
R-squared	0.424		0.384	0.405		0.362	0.536		0.498
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.315		0.284	0.664		0.693	-3.548		-3.397
Observations	1,847		2,534	1,847		2,534	1,847		2,534
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	835		1,118	835		1,118	835		1,118
	B-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	0.0648***		0.0335**	-0.0640***		-0.0353**	-0.2332***		-0.0293
	(0.0208)		(0.0170)	(0.0214)		(0.0175)	(0.0832)		(0.0684)
R-squared	0.354		0.288	0.356		0.281	0.237		0.247
Specification Ⅳ	0.0804***		0.0267	-0.0802***		-0.0300*	-0.3042***		-0.0691
	(0.0239)		(0.0162)	(0.0241)		(0.0167)	(0.0690)		(0.0543)
R-squared	0.442		0.363	0.429		0.349	0.535		0.507
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 6.0 km)	0.344		0.322	0.634		0.658	-3.674		-3.527
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.046		5.755	6.046		5.755	6.046		5.755
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.745		1.735	1.745		1.735	1.745		1.735
Observations	881		1,174	881		1,174	881		1,174

Continue

Table A20: Robustness Check – Trimmed Subsamples Based on Propensity Score Estimated with Flexible Specifications

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	B. Children aged 6-14								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			School attendance			Grade progression		
	B-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification		0.034	0.003		-0.033	0.008		0.004	-0.016
		(0.023)	(0.015)		(0.022)	(0.016)		(0.074)	(0.059)
R-squared		0.322	0.306		0.307	0.295		0.263	0.236
Specification Ⅳ		0.033	0.004		-0.033	0.006		-0.062	-0.077
		(0.021)	(0.015)		(0.021)	(0.015)		(0.065)	(0.052)
R-squared		0.395	0.367		0.372	0.346		0.493	0.493
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)		0.305	0.301		0.677	0.678		-3.554	-3.427
Observations		1,978	3,309		1,978	3,309		1,978	3,309
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)		881	1,462		881	1,462		881	1,462
	B-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification		0.0069	0.0104		0.0019	-0.0085		-0.0359	0.0599
		(0.0218)	(0.0166)		(0.0227)	(0.0167)		(0.0717)	(0.0580)
R-squared		0.297	0.296		0.284	0.288		0.229	0.226
Specification Ⅳ		0.0202	0.0048		-0.0098	-0.0042		-0.0640	-0.0201
		(0.0199)	(0.0155)		(0.0202)	(0.0158)		(0.0618)	(0.0480)
R-squared		0.394	0.364		0.370	0.345		0.497	0.500
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 6.0 km)		0.348	0.339		0.634	0.641		-3.624	-3.568
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ		5.878	5.708		5.878	5.708		5.878	5.708
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ		1.755	1.710		1.755	1.710		1.755	1.710
Observations		931	1,502		931	1,502		931	1,502

Notes: See the notes to Tables 3 and 4. For each two of the three subsamples of Sample Ⅲ, we estimate the propensity score using probit models based on flexible specifications following the algorithm proposed by Imbens and Rubin (2015). The specifications include basic covariates (mother's age, father's age, a set of dummy variables for mother's and father's educational attainment (grade 1-5 and grade 6 or above), zone and district fixed effects, and spatial cluster fixed effects) and the corresponding cross-products (81 cross-product terms for the 1977-1979 and 1980 subsamples, 85 cross-product terms for 1977-1979 and 1981-1982 subsamples, and 84 cross-product terms for 1980 and 1981-1982 subsamples). The selection of the cross-product terms is selected based on a likelihood ratio test statistics for the null hypothesis that the coefficient of the additional variable is equal to zero (we use 2.71 as the threshold value for the inclusion of cross-product terms). We then limit the samples to those observations with a propensity score between 0.1 and 0.9. For the three subsamples of Sample Ⅳ, we further limit these propensity score screened samples to households residing in villages with complete information about victims for all killing sites located within 6.0 km of the villages.

Table A21: Robustness Check – Trimmed Subsamples Based on Propensity Score Estimated with Linear Specifications

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	A. Children aged 15-21								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			Primary school completion			Years of schooling		
	A-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.032*	-0.008		-0.023	-0.019		-0.340**	-0.167	
	(0.019)	(0.021)		(0.024)	(0.025)		(0.146)	(0.158)	
R-squared	0.388	0.342		0.330	0.317		0.450	0.396	
Specification Ⅳ	0.040**	-0.001		-0.039*	-0.025		-0.441***	-0.233	
	(0.019)	(0.021)		(0.023)	(0.024)		(0.140)	(0.152)	
R-squared	0.411	0.364		0.394	0.380		0.507	0.464	
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.191	0.182		0.355	0.376		4.512	4.630	
Observations	2,093	2,084		2,093	2,084		2,093	2,084	
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	945	934		945	934		945	934	
	A-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	0.0468**	-0.0104		-0.0405**	0.0075		-0.3939***	0.0422	
	(0.0209)	(0.0186)		(0.0175)	(0.0234)		(0.1295)	(0.1429)	
R-squared	0.374	0.310		0.308	0.261		0.442	0.356	
Specification Ⅳ	0.0468**	-0.0045		-0.0459***	0.0039		-0.4344***	0.0023	
	(0.0226)	(0.0180)		(0.0172)	(0.0207)		(0.1351)	(0.1275)	
R-squared	0.416	0.351		0.384	0.356		0.498	0.449	
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 6.0 km)	0.230	0.216		0.318	0.321		4.189	4.207	
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.016	5.851		6.016	5.851		6.016	5.851	
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.74	1.746		1.74	1.746		1.74	1.746	
Observations	995	985		995	985		995	985	

Continue

Table A21: Robustness Check – Trimmed Subsamples Based on Propensity Score Estimated with Linear Specifications

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	A. Children aged 15-21								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			Primary school completion			Years of schooling		
	A-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.035*		0.005	-0.029		0.012	-0.368**		0.019
	(0.019)		(0.017)	(0.024)		(0.020)	(0.149)		(0.126)
R-squared	0.392		0.281	0.332		0.253	0.454		0.368
Specification Ⅳ	0.044**		0.007	-0.044*		0.007	-0.471***		-0.019
	(0.019)		(0.017)	(0.023)		(0.020)	(0.144)		(0.119)
R-squared	0.416		0.302	0.397		0.330	0.513		0.443
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.191		0.173	0.360		0.359	4.533		4.567
Observations	2,064		3,055	2,064		3,055	2,064		3,055
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	939		1,388	939		1,388	939		1,388
	A-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	0.0426**		0.0229	-0.0388**		-0.0021	-0.3561***		-0.0476
	(0.0207)		(0.0175)	(0.0171)		(0.0231)	(0.1286)		(0.1323)
R-squared	0.367		0.274	0.304		0.224	0.437		0.348
Specification Ⅳ	0.0411*		0.0219	-0.0443**		0.0020	-0.3952***		-0.0307
	(0.0223)		(0.0177)	(0.0171)		(0.0221)	(0.1350)		(0.1266)
R-squared	0.410		0.303	0.377		0.305	0.494		0.426
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 6.0 km)	0.232		0.202	0.317		0.319	4.177		4.205
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.055		5.797	6.055		5.797	6.055		5.797
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.724		1.727	1.724		1.727	1.724		1.727
Observations	978		1,420	978		1,420	978		1,420

Continue

Table A21: Robustness Check – Trimmed Subsamples Based on Propensity Score Estimated with Linear Specifications

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	A. Children aged 15-21								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			Primary school completion			Years of schooling		
	A-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification		-0.004	0.004		-0.020	0.002		-0.187	-0.035
		(0.021)	(0.015)		(0.025)	(0.019)		(0.158)	(0.119)
R-squared		0.352	0.273		0.317	0.237		0.402	0.350
Specification Ⅳ		0.003	0.004		-0.028	-0.003		-0.253*	-0.072
		(0.021)	(0.015)		(0.024)	(0.018)		(0.152)	(0.110)
R-squared		0.372	0.293		0.379	0.307		0.468	0.424
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)		0.185	0.169		0.375	0.353		4.605	4.532
Observations		2,138	3,819		2,138	3,819		2,138	3,819
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)		940	1,682		940	1,682		940	1,682
	A-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification		-0.0076	0.0053		0.0083	0.0037		0.0386	0.0554
		(0.0186)	(0.0161)		(0.0233)	(0.0226)		(0.1423)	(0.1202)
R-squared		0.322	0.276		0.264	0.213		0.366	0.344
Specification Ⅳ		-0.0012	0.0014		0.0049	0.0053		-0.0039	0.0768
		(0.0181)	(0.0175)		(0.0207)	(0.0223)		(0.1286)	(0.1200)
R-squared		0.362	0.301		0.357	0.286		0.456	0.423
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 6.0 km)		0.223	0.201		0.320	0.308		4.173	4.157
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ		5.870	5.703		5.870	5.703		5.870	5.703
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ		1.740	1.689		1.740	1.689		1.740	1.689
Observations		1,008	1,716		1,008	1,716		1,008	1,716

Continue

Table A21: Robustness Check – Trimmed Subsamples Based on Propensity Score Estimated with Linear Specifications

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	B. Children aged 6-14								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			School attendance			Grade progression		
	B-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.031	0.043*		-0.032	-0.042*		-0.146*	-0.001	
	(0.021)	(0.023)		(0.022)	(0.022)		(0.089)	(0.074)	
R-squared	0.340	0.307		0.331	0.294		0.271	0.253	
Specification Ⅳ	0.045**	0.043**		-0.045**	-0.042**		-0.185**	-0.089	
	(0.021)	(0.021)		(0.022)	(0.020)		(0.077)	(0.065)	
R-squared	0.418	0.385		0.398	0.365		0.529	0.483	
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.312	0.296		0.667	0.687		-3.546	-3.539	
Observations	1,986	2,001		1,986	2,001		1,986	2,001	
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	890	899		890	899		890	899	
	B-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	0.0513**	0.0000		-0.0511**	0.0083		-0.2044***	-0.0097	
	(0.0218)	(0.0210)		(0.0225)	(0.0215)		(0.0782)	(0.0728)	
R-squared	0.349	0.285		0.350	0.275		0.232	0.220	
Specification Ⅳ	0.0693***	0.0163		-0.0695***	-0.0070		-0.2593***	-0.0135	
	(0.0231)	(0.0188)		(0.0236)	(0.0188)		(0.0770)	(0.0722)	
R-squared	0.438	0.389		0.425	0.365		0.519	0.485	
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 6.0 km)	0.340	0.339		0.639	0.644		-3.654	-3.604	
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.014	5.851		6.014	5.851		6.014	5.851	
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.744	1.753		1.744	1.753		1.744	1.753	
Observations	939	944		939	944		939	944	

Continue

Table A21: Robustness Check – Trimmed Subsamples Based on Propensity Score Estimated with Linear Specifications

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	B. Children aged 6-14								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			School attendance			Grade progression		
	B-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.034		0.007	-0.035		0.003	-0.155*		-0.035
	(0.021)		(0.016)	(0.022)		(0.017)	(0.090)		(0.060)
R-squared	0.355		0.312	0.349		0.299	0.286		0.251
Specification Ⅳ	0.046**		0.009	-0.046**		0.001	-0.200**		-0.088*
	(0.021)		(0.016)	(0.022)		(0.016)	(0.078)		(0.052)
R-squared	0.429		0.382	0.413		0.358	0.543		0.498
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.315		0.292	0.665		0.686	-3.543		-3.407
Observations	1,956		2,963	1,956		2,963	1,956		2,963
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	882		1,339	882		1,339	882		1,339
	B-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	0.0517**		0.0221	-0.0513**		-0.0205	-0.1882**		-0.0184
	(0.0215)		(0.0162)	(0.0223)		(0.0170)	(0.0797)		(0.0638)
R-squared	0.361		0.283	0.362		0.275	0.237		0.237
Specification Ⅳ	0.0670***		0.0232	-0.0667***		-0.0217	-0.2306***		-0.0526
	(0.0232)		(0.0149)	(0.0236)		(0.0160)	(0.0772)		(0.0467)
R-squared	0.449		0.360	0.436		0.342	0.532		0.500
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 6.0 km)	0.342		0.323	0.636		0.656	-3.669		-3.516
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.052		5.790	6.052		5.790	6.052		5.790
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.729		1.731	1.729		1.731	1.729		1.731
Observations	923		1,384	923		1,384	923		1,384

Continue

Table A21: Robustness Check – Trimmed Subsamples Based on Propensity Score Estimated with Linear Specifications

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	B. Children aged 6-14								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			School attendance			Grade progression		
	B-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification		0.040*	-0.001		-0.040*	0.012		-0.002	0.018
		(0.022)	(0.015)		(0.022)	(0.015)		(0.074)	(0.055)
R-squared		0.319	0.305		0.305	0.293		0.259	0.234
Specification Ⅳ		0.038*	-0.002		-0.038*	0.011		-0.087	-0.045
		(0.020)	(0.014)		(0.020)	(0.015)		(0.064)	(0.048)
R-squared		0.395	0.366		0.374	0.346		0.487	0.493
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)		0.304	0.302		0.679	0.678		-3.557	-3.439
Observations		2,053	3,715		2,053	3,715		2,053	3,715
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)		904	1,628		904	1,628		904	1,628
	B-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification		-0.0010	0.0116		0.0092	-0.0091		-0.0059	0.0932*
		(0.0210)	(0.0160)		(0.0214)	(0.0163)		(0.0727)	(0.0540)
R-squared		0.303	0.297		0.291	0.285		0.227	0.230
Specification Ⅳ		0.0142	0.0029		-0.0049	-0.0019		-0.0119	0.0161
		(0.0188)	(0.0149)		(0.0187)	(0.0153)		(0.0726)	(0.0449)
R-squared		0.400	0.364		0.376	0.343		0.488	0.501
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 6.0 km)		0.344	0.335		0.639	0.645		-3.620	-3.560
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ		5.871	5.697		5.871	5.697		5.871	5.697
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ		1.746	1.694		1.746	1.694		1.746	1.694
Observations		967	1,673		967	1,673		967	1,673

Notes: See the notes to Tables 3 and 4. For each two of the three subsamples of Sample Ⅲ, we estimate the propensity score using probit models based on linear specifications that include basic covariates (mother's age, father's age, a set of dummy variables for mother's and father's educational attainment (grade 1-5 and grade 6 or above), zone and district fixed effects, and spatial cluster fixed effects). We then limit the samples to those observations with a propensity score between 0.1 and 0.9. For the three subsamples of Sample Ⅳ, we further limit these propensity score screened samples to households residing in villages with complete information about victims for all killing sites located within 6.0 km of the villages.

Table A22: Robustness Check – Non-intellectuals

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	A. Children aged 15-21								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			Primary school completion			Years of schooling		
	A-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.022	0.005	0.003	0.005	-0.026	0.010	-0.194	-0.328	-0.012
	(0.026)	(0.030)	(0.019)	(0.027)	(0.031)	(0.021)	(0.174)	(0.202)	(0.126)
R-squared	0.408	0.381	0.287	0.288	0.300	0.211	0.419	0.406	0.320
Specification Ⅳ	0.034	0.017	0.004	-0.013	-0.038	0.008	-0.336*	-0.408**	-0.043
	(0.026)	(0.029)	(0.019)	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.021)	(0.181)	(0.189)	(0.122)
R-squared	0.444	0.406	0.310	0.347	0.366	0.280	0.475	0.468	0.392
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.239	0.220	0.201	0.247	0.292	0.286	3.786	4.059	4.059
Observations	1,367	1,486	3,004	1,367	1,486	3,004	1,367	1,486	3,004
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	616	652	1,338	616	652	1,338	616	652	1,338
	A-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	0.0524*	0.0144	0.0088	-0.0218	0.0068	0.0181	-0.3048**	-0.0709	0.0050
	(0.0284)	(0.0215)	(0.0166)	(0.0199)	(0.0278)	(0.0224)	(0.1511)	(0.1612)	(0.1168)
R-squared	0.352	0.335	0.285	0.219	0.221	0.182	0.370	0.336	0.314
Specification Ⅳ	0.0472	0.0222	0.0088	-0.0282	0.0060	0.0156	-0.3546**	-0.1006	-0.0055
	(0.0292)	(0.0210)	(0.0178)	(0.0201)	(0.0238)	(0.0219)	(0.1550)	(0.1465)	(0.1176)
R-squared	0.416	0.386	0.323	0.311	0.325	0.275	0.436	0.421	0.411
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 6.0 km)	0.284	0.253	0.235	0.224	0.246	0.255	3.515	3.690	3.783
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.045	5.933	5.717	6.045	5.933	5.717	6.045	5.933	5.717
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.78	1.798	1.734	1.78	1.798	1.734	1.78	1.798	1.734
Observations	674	730	1,361	674	730	1,361	674	730	1,361

Continue

Table A22: Robustness Check – Non-intellectuals

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	B. Children aged 6-14								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			School attendance			Grade progression		
	B-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.020	0.037	-0.004	-0.018	-0.051*	0.015	-0.073	-0.017	0.037
	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.017)	(0.030)	(0.028)	(0.018)	(0.122)	(0.090)	(0.064)
R-squared	0.377	0.348	0.310	0.363	0.336	0.296	0.301	0.279	0.206
Specification Ⅳ	0.031	0.038	-0.002	-0.030	-0.054**	0.012	-0.116	-0.037	-0.004
	(0.030)	(0.027)	(0.016)	(0.031)	(0.026)	(0.017)	(0.103)	(0.084)	(0.056)
R-squared	0.463	0.416	0.372	0.441	0.398	0.351	0.587	0.530	0.494
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.368	0.350	0.338	0.607	0.635	0.641	-3.766	-3.732	-3.613
Observations	1,295	1,431	2,926	1,295	1,431	2,926	1,295	1,431	2,926
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	580	628	1,296	580	628	1,296	580	628	1,296
	B-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	0.0518*	-0.0057	0.0166	-0.0519*	0.0073	-0.0134	-0.2034**	-0.0208	0.0596
	(0.0285)	(0.0246)	(0.0161)	(0.0296)	(0.0245)	(0.0172)	(0.1024)	(0.0776)	(0.0687)
R-squared	0.348	0.308	0.299	0.351	0.304	0.286	0.255	0.253	0.198
Specification Ⅳ	0.0747**	0.0092	0.0091	-0.0760**	-0.0072	-0.0082	-0.2005**	0.0011	-0.0148
	(0.0290)	(0.0238)	(0.0158)	(0.0300)	(0.0237)	(0.0171)	(0.0894)	(0.0732)	(0.0505)
R-squared	0.460	0.408	0.370	0.447	0.392	0.345	0.601	0.523	0.509
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 6.0 km)	0.400	0.395	0.371	0.576	0.588	0.608	-3.832	-3.789	-3.705
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.058	5.937	5.706	6.058	5.937	5.706	6.058	5.937	5.706
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.776	1.804	1.738	1.776	1.804	1.738	1.776	1.804	1.738
Observations	635	705	1,329	635	705	1,329	635	705	1,329

Notes: See the notes to Tables 3 and 4. Non-intellectuals are couples with grade 0-5 completed.

Table A23: Robustness Check – Households without Child Death

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	A. Children aged 15-21								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			Primary school completion			Years of schooling		
	A-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.061**	0.038	0.005	-0.057*	-0.004	-0.005	-0.662***	-0.301	-0.092
	(0.024)	(0.027)	(0.020)	(0.029)	(0.032)	(0.025)	(0.177)	(0.207)	(0.153)
R-squared	0.439	0.427	0.313	0.368	0.351	0.272	0.490	0.442	0.385
Specification IV	0.076***	0.039	0.003	-0.073***	-0.028	-0.008	-0.801***	-0.428**	-0.106
	(0.024)	(0.027)	(0.020)	(0.028)	(0.032)	(0.023)	(0.168)	(0.209)	(0.139)
R-squared	0.465	0.451	0.339	0.428	0.417	0.343	0.540	0.504	0.463
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.180	0.162	0.156	0.392	0.395	0.375	4.737	4.821	4.707
Observations	1,343	1,323	2,489	1,343	1,323	2,489	1,343	1,323	2,489
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	623	560	1,065	623	560	1,065	623	560	1,065
	A-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	0.0848***	-0.0001	0.0121	-0.0514***	0.0176	0.0281	-0.5824***	0.1039	0.1035
	(0.0263)	(0.0238)	(0.0201)	(0.0183)	(0.0300)	(0.0283)	(0.1369)	(0.1824)	(0.1508)
R-squared	0.439	0.402	0.300	0.349	0.312	0.245	0.486	0.428	0.373
Specification IV	0.0901***	0.0015	0.0060	-0.0595***	0.0174	0.0326	-0.6552***	0.0832	0.1615
	(0.0281)	(0.0232)	(0.0208)	(0.0193)	(0.0264)	(0.0274)	(0.1557)	(0.1686)	(0.1430)
R-squared	0.488	0.466	0.340	0.443	0.429	0.327	0.551	0.533	0.466
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 6.0 km)	0.232	0.211	0.198	0.329	0.344	0.314	4.235	4.345	4.223
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.006	5.919	5.635	6.006	5.919	5.635	6.006	5.919	5.635
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.756	1.776	1.724	1.756	1.776	1.724	1.756	1.776	1.724
Observations	650	661	1,110	650	661	1,110	650	661	1,110

Continue

Table A23: Robustness Check – Households without Child Death

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	B. Children aged 6-14								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			School attendance			Grade progression		
	B-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.058**	0.055*	0.009	-0.051*	-0.053*	0.002	-0.226**	-0.091	0.030
	(0.028)	(0.032)	(0.018)	(0.029)	(0.031)	(0.018)	(0.113)	(0.106)	(0.071)
R-squared	0.390	0.390	0.337	0.383	0.369	0.328	0.339	0.302	0.271
Specification IV	0.075***	0.055*	0.003	-0.064**	-0.053*	0.008	-0.311***	-0.137	-0.011
	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.018)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.018)	(0.098)	(0.090)	(0.061)
R-squared	0.474	0.472	0.397	0.455	0.444	0.381	0.572	0.520	0.513
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.295	0.289	0.297	0.68	0.693	0.684	-3.499	-3.458	-3.417
Observations	1,261	1,261	2,417	1,261	1,261	2,417	1,261	1,261	2,417
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	579	535	1,024	579	535	1,024	579	535	1,024
	B-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	0.0652***	-0.0141	0.0385***	-0.0607**	0.0240	-0.0432**	-0.2438**	-0.0013	0.0939
	(0.0245)	(0.0269)	(0.0186)	(0.0255)	(0.0288)	(0.0183)	(0.1093)	(0.0905)	(0.0641)
R-squared	0.371	0.379	0.325	0.371	0.356	0.322	0.260	0.279	0.271
Specification IV	0.0748***	-0.0041	0.0246	-0.0714***	0.0156	-0.0295*	-0.2958***	-0.0019	0.0188
	(0.0261)	(0.0227)	(0.0179)	(0.0267)	(0.0241)	(0.0179)	(0.0961)	(0.0929)	(0.0598)
R-squared	0.483	0.482	0.403	0.465	0.451	0.390	0.554	0.524	0.530
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 6.0 km)	0.329	0.335	0.329	0.648	0.646	0.651	-3.672	-3.537	-3.526
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	5.996	5.928	5.638	5.996	5.928	5.638	5.996	5.928	5.638
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.762	1.778	1.727	1.762	1.778	1.727	1.762	1.778	1.727
Observations	607	634	1,085	607	634	1,085	607	634	1,085

Notes: The table reports estimates of the impacts of the genocide (see the notes to Tables 3 and 4). The estimates are based on the samples of households without a child's death. *** = Significant at the 1 percent level. ** = Significant at the 5 percent level. * = Significant at the 10 percent level.

Table A24: Robustness Check – Alternative Samples

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	A. Children aged 15-21								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			Primary school completion			Years of schooling		
	A-1-1. Sample Ⅲ-A: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.033	-0.024	-0.005	-0.027	-0.013	0.021	-0.340**	-0.045	0.023
	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.015)	(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.018)	(0.154)	(0.152)	(0.115)
R-squared	0.354	0.324	0.265	0.336	0.326	0.238	0.430	0.394	0.351
Specification Ⅳ	0.034*	-0.021	-0.010	-0.026	-0.012	0.042**	-0.332**	-0.037	0.143
	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.015)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.017)	(0.147)	(0.149)	(0.104)
R-squared	0.384	0.349	0.285	0.398	0.406	0.308	0.491	0.475	0.423
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.203	0.192	0.180	0.341	0.372	0.338	4.384	4.563	4.420
Observations	2,125	2,224	4,138	2,125	2,224	4,138	2,125	2,224	4,138
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	939	985	1,853	939	985	1,853	939	985	1,853
	A-1-2. Sample Ⅲ-B: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.031*	-0.004	-0.004	-0.020	-0.014	0.016	-0.324**	-0.196	0.035
	(0.018)	(0.020)	(0.014)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.018)	(0.141)	(0.148)	(0.111)
R-squared	0.388	0.353	0.269	0.326	0.315	0.233	0.447	0.399	0.346
Specification Ⅳ	0.039**	0.002	-0.004	-0.035	-0.022	0.006	-0.422***	-0.256*	-0.029
	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.014)	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.017)	(0.136)	(0.144)	(0.102)
R-squared	0.410	0.372	0.290	0.388	0.378	0.305	0.504	0.465	0.422
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.188	0.179	0.167	0.353	0.374	0.354	4.515	4.636	4.549
Observations	2,273	2,307	4,286	2,273	2,307	4,286	2,273	2,307	4,286
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	1,039	1,023	1,905	1,039	1,023	1,905	1,039	1,023	1,905
	A-1-3. Sample Ⅲ-C: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.068**	0.010	0.009	0.007	-0.073**	-0.008	-0.290	-0.448**	-0.168
	(0.029)	(0.027)	(0.022)	(0.033)	(0.033)	(0.028)	(0.222)	(0.224)	(0.176)
R-squared	0.374	0.377	0.293	0.335	0.359	0.247	0.437	0.438	0.377
Specification Ⅳ	0.081***	0.015	0.010	-0.002	-0.068**	-0.008	-0.407*	-0.412*	-0.197
	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.022)	(0.032)	(0.031)	(0.027)	(0.212)	(0.215)	(0.167)
R-squared	0.423	0.410	0.328	0.414	0.441	0.329	0.509	0.526	0.452
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.224	0.206	0.215	0.309	0.363	0.288	4.160	4.457	4.063
Observations	1,135	1,120	2,088	1,135	1,120	2,088	1,135	1,120	2,088
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	535	517	989	535	517	989	535	517	989

Continue

Table A24: Robustness Check – Alternative Samples

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	A. Children aged 15-21								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			Primary school completion			Years of schooling		
	A-2-1. Sample IV-A: Genocidal Violence II								
Baseline specification	0.0165	-0.0114	-0.0057	-0.0275	0.0052	0.0250	-0.2854**	0.0186	0.1736
	(0.0245)	(0.0219)	(0.0168)	(0.0177)	(0.0230)	(0.0235)	(0.1318)	(0.1583)	(0.1348)
R-squared	0.338	0.299	0.264	0.328	0.272	0.197	0.443	0.350	0.322
Specification IV	0.0216	-0.0066	-0.0141	-0.0261	0.0031	0.0318	-0.2923**	0.0033	0.2096*
	(0.0253)	(0.0222)	(0.0176)	(0.0165)	(0.0225)	(0.0227)	(0.1362)	(0.1539)	(0.1244)
R-squared	0.402	0.337	0.300	0.403	0.380	0.276	0.513	0.451	0.410
Mean of the outcome (< 6.0 km)	0.248	0.233	0.216	0.297	0.308	0.290	4.007	4.100	4.016
Mean of Genocidal Violence II	6.179	6.055	5.901	6.179	6.055	5.901	6.179	6.055	5.901
S.D. of Genocidal Violence II	1.644	1.626	1.642	1.644	1.626	1.642	1.644	1.626	1.642
Observations	887	930	1,585	887	930	1,585	887	930	1,585
	A-2-2. Sample IV-B: Genocidal Violence II								
Baseline specification	0.0398**	-0.0078	0.0074	-0.0337*	0.0168	0.0164	-0.3261**	0.0597	0.0680
	(0.0201)	(0.0178)	(0.0148)	(0.0174)	(0.0226)	(0.0209)	(0.1267)	(0.1380)	(0.1115)
R-squared	0.368	0.333	0.271	0.294	0.266	0.198	0.426	0.366	0.327
Specification IV	0.0398*	-0.0019	0.0059	-0.0434**	0.0118	0.0139	-0.3888***	0.0163	0.0682
	(0.0215)	(0.0171)	(0.0158)	(0.0173)	(0.0206)	(0.0202)	(0.1335)	(0.1263)	(0.1101)
R-squared	0.409	0.369	0.297	0.365	0.355	0.273	0.483	0.451	0.410
Mean of the outcome (< 6.0 km)	0.221	0.210	0.193	0.323	0.320	0.316	4.240	4.230	4.229
Mean of Genocidal Violence II	6.032	5.884	5.682	6.032	5.884	5.682	6.032	5.884	5.682
S.D. of Genocidal Violence II	1.669	1.684	1.668	1.669	1.684	1.668	1.669	1.684	1.668
Observations	1,109	1,120	1,960	1,109	1,120	1,960	1,109	1,120	1,960
	A-2-3. Sample IV-C: Genocidal Violence II								
Baseline specification	0.0609*	-0.0197	-0.0121	-0.0273	-0.0057	0.0033	-0.3799**	-0.0268	-0.0005
	(0.0328)	(0.0166)	(0.0161)	(0.0219)	(0.0200)	(0.0217)	(0.1810)	(0.1371)	(0.1236)
R-squared	0.363	0.355	0.289	0.331	0.326	0.224	0.451	0.404	0.388
Specification IV	0.0759**	-0.0310*	-0.0337*	-0.0477**	0.0090	0.0158	-0.5945***	0.0568	0.0771
	(0.0350)	(0.0184)	(0.0173)	(0.0227)	(0.0202)	(0.0222)	(0.1890)	(0.1339)	(0.1237)
R-squared	0.455	0.417	0.351	0.436	0.455	0.330	0.533	0.519	0.488
Mean of the outcome (< 6.0 km)	0.294	0.264	0.251	0.287	0.297	0.251	3.792	3.949	3.772
Mean of Genocidal Violence II	6.382	6.219	6.240	6.382	6.219	6.240	6.382	6.219	6.240
S.D. of Genocidal Violence II	1.587	1.726	1.651	1.587	1.726	1.651	1.587	1.726	1.651
Observations	525	489	868	525	489	868	525	489	868

Continue

Table A24: Robustness Check – Alternative Samples

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Outcomes on:	B. Children aged 6-14								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			School attendance			Grade progression		
	B-1-1. Sample Ⅲ-A: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.035	0.030	0.000	-0.036	-0.029	0.005	-0.186**	0.033	0.014
	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.016)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.016)	(0.094)	(0.077)	(0.056)
R-squared	0.338	0.307	0.293	0.327	0.296	0.279	0.278	0.253	0.227
Specification Ⅳ	0.044**	0.027	-0.010	-0.042*	-0.026	0.012	-0.141*	-0.012	0.002
	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.015)	(0.023)	(0.021)	(0.016)	(0.078)	(0.067)	(0.047)
R-squared	0.412	0.390	0.357	0.393	0.371	0.333	0.528	0.475	0.497
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.325	0.310	0.311	0.654	0.673	0.669	-3.584	-3.588	-3.499
Observations	2,018	2,137	4,023	2,018	2,137	4,023	2,018	2,137	4,023
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	887	944	1,800	887	944	1,800	887	944	1,800
	B-1-2. Sample Ⅲ-B: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.023	0.036*	-0.006	-0.022	-0.036*	0.014	-0.112	-0.015	0.007
	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.014)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.014)	(0.089)	(0.071)	(0.051)
R-squared	0.347	0.315	0.301	0.338	0.300	0.289	0.283	0.257	0.229
Specification Ⅳ	0.035*	0.034*	-0.007	-0.033	-0.034*	0.014	-0.158**	-0.102*	-0.030
	(0.021)	(0.019)	(0.013)	(0.021)	(0.019)	(0.014)	(0.075)	(0.062)	(0.045)
R-squared	0.419	0.390	0.366	0.399	0.369	0.346	0.536	0.480	0.485
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.317	0.306	0.304	0.662	0.677	0.676	-3.558	-3.555	-3.432
Observations	2,149	2,215	4,167	2,149	2,215	4,167	2,149	2,215	4,167
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	974	985	1,844	974	985	1,844	974	985	1,844
	B-1-3. Sample Ⅲ-C: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.028	0.027	-0.002	-0.022	-0.044	0.005	-0.161	0.004	-0.086
	(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.022)	(0.033)	(0.032)	(0.021)	(0.127)	(0.116)	(0.085)
R-squared	0.342	0.335	0.340	0.330	0.324	0.336	0.252	0.300	0.230
Specification Ⅳ	0.039	0.016	0.000	-0.033	-0.027	0.002	-0.170	-0.077	-0.073
	(0.033)	(0.031)	(0.022)	(0.034)	(0.031)	(0.022)	(0.113)	(0.099)	(0.071)
R-squared	0.446	0.422	0.403	0.426	0.402	0.393	0.531	0.531	0.505
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.355	0.349	0.354	0.627	0.637	0.627	-3.724	-3.698	-3.553
Observations	1,079	1,075	2,033	1,079	1,075	2,033	1,079	1,075	2,033
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	503	494	957	503	494	957	503	494	957

Continue

Table A24: Robustness Check – Alternative Samples

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Outcomes on:	B. Children aged 6-14								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			School attendance			Grade progression		
	B-2-1. Sample Ⅳ-A: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	0.0351	-0.0068	-0.0106	-0.0335	-0.0114	-0.0057	-0.1987**	0.0058	0.0966*
	(0.0259)	(0.0241)	(0.0148)	(0.0258)	(0.0219)	(0.0168)	(0.0929)	(0.0828)	(0.0576)
R-squared	0.331	0.295	0.271	0.326	0.299	0.264	0.243	0.215	0.223
Specification Ⅳ	0.0392	-0.0002	-0.0207	-0.0398	0.0061	0.0193	-0.1625*	0.0128	0.0880*
	(0.0259)	(0.0217)	(0.0140)	(0.0261)	(0.0215)	(0.0147)	(0.0854)	(0.0775)	(0.0486)
R-squared	0.426	0.407	0.358	0.408	0.385	0.333	0.540	0.472	0.513
Mean of the outcome (< 6.0 km)	0.370	0.372	0.361	0.607	0.609	0.617	-3.725	-3.689	-3.647
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.164	6.066	5.902	6.164	6.066	5.902	6.164	6.066	5.902
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.642	1.633	1.643	1.642	1.633	1.643	1.642	1.633	1.643
Observations	839	894	1,547	839	894	1,547	839	894	1,547
	B-2-2. Sample Ⅳ-B: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	0.0559***	-0.0005	0.0137	-0.0540**	0.0064	-0.0134	-0.1750**	0.0175	0.0611
	(0.0207)	(0.0204)	(0.0140)	(0.0214)	(0.0208)	(0.0144)	(0.0792)	(0.0706)	(0.0511)
R-squared	0.349	0.294	0.293	0.348	0.283	0.282	0.233	0.223	0.218
Specification Ⅳ	0.0717***	0.0127	0.0055	-0.0708***	-0.0058	-0.0065	-0.2354***	0.0021	-0.0110
	(0.0219)	(0.0183)	(0.0133)	(0.0224)	(0.0181)	(0.0140)	(0.0744)	(0.0707)	(0.0429)
R-squared	0.433	0.388	0.363	0.416	0.368	0.343	0.526	0.480	0.488
Mean of the outcome (< 6.0 km)	0.333	0.341	0.325	0.646	0.642	0.655	-3.648	-3.593	-3.540
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.027	5.888	5.680	6.027	5.888	5.680	6.027	5.888	5.680
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.68	1.690	1.669	1.68	1.690	1.669	1.68	1.690	1.669
Observations	1,038	1,074	1,908	1,038	1,074	1,908	1,038	1,074	1,908
	B-2-3. Sample Ⅳ-C: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	0.0478	0.0027	-0.0135	-0.0284	0.0026	0.0152	-0.2443**	-0.1075*	0.0113
	(0.0318)	(0.0199)	(0.0151)	(0.0290)	(0.0184)	(0.0144)	(0.1189)	(0.0624)	(0.0552)
R-squared	0.343	0.303	0.295	0.323	0.288	0.286	0.205	0.278	0.242
Specification Ⅳ	0.0611*	0.0022	-0.0195	-0.0454	0.0045	0.0200	-0.2138**	-0.0807	-0.0031
	(0.0353)	(0.0256)	(0.0143)	(0.0323)	(0.0230)	(0.0140)	(0.0946)	(0.0682)	(0.0457)
R-squared	0.468	0.411	0.379	0.446	0.392	0.364	0.542	0.549	0.538
Mean of the outcome (< 6.0 km)	0.398	0.410	0.396	0.580	0.568	0.584	-3.815	-3.769	-3.660
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.336	6.219	6.239	6.336	6.219	6.239	6.336	6.219	6.239
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.594	1.734	1.654	1.594	1.734	1.654	1.594	1.734	1.654
Observations	495	470	848	495	470	848	495	470	848

Note: See the notes to Tables 3 and 4.

Table A25: Robustness Check – Alternative Genocide Measures

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	A. Children aged 15-21								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			Primary school completion			Years of schooling		
	A-1. Quadratic polynomial in distance								
Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	0.0254**	-0.0013	0.0061	-0.0218**	0.0045	0.0047	-0.2152***	0.0028	0.0175
	(0.0111)	(0.0100)	(0.0085)	(0.0092)	(0.0123)	(0.0120)	(0.0695)	(0.0740)	(0.0642)
Mean of the outcome (< 6.0 km)	0.231	0.222	0.200	0.317	0.319	0.307	4.176	4.177	4.171
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	4.794	4.677	4.412	4.794	4.677	4.412	4.794	4.677	4.412
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	2.037	2.093	1.987	2.037	2.093	1.987	2.037	2.093	1.987
Observations	1,008	1,015	1,798	1,008	1,015	1,798	1,008	1,015	1,798
R-squared	0.375	0.322	0.272	0.307	0.264	0.209	0.441	0.362	0.335
	A-2. Cubic polynomial in distance								
Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	0.0171**	0.0000	0.0039	-0.0139**	0.0031	0.0031	-0.1430***	-0.0024	0.0138
	(0.0075)	(0.0067)	(0.0058)	(0.0063)	(0.0082)	(0.0082)	(0.0478)	(0.0493)	(0.0439)
Mean of the outcome (< 6.0 km)	0.231	0.222	0.200	0.317	0.319	0.307	4.176	4.177	4.171
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	3.581	3.506	3.185	3.581	3.506	3.185	3.581	3.506	3.185
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	2.445	2.561	2.377	2.445	2.561	2.377	2.445	2.561	2.377
Observations	1,008	1,015	1,798	1,008	1,015	1,798	1,008	1,015	1,798
R-squared	0.375	0.322	0.272	0.306	0.264	0.209	0.441	0.362	0.335
Cohort	B. Children aged 6-14								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			School attendance			Grade progression		
	B-1. Quadratic polynomial in distance								
Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	0.0274**	0.0005	0.0076	-0.0272**	0.0038	-0.0068	-0.1096**	-0.0101	0.0328
	(0.0116)	(0.0113)	(0.0084)	(0.0119)	(0.0116)	(0.0086)	(0.0446)	(0.0395)	(0.0280)
Mean of the outcome (< 6.0 km)	0.342	0.346	0.333	0.637	0.637	0.647	-3.669	-3.623	-3.548
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	4.786	4.678	4.408	4.786	4.678	4.408	4.786	4.678	4.408
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	2.047	2.107	1.994	2.047	2.107	1.994	2.047	2.107	1.994
Observations	951	974	1,752	951	974	1,752	951	974	1,752
R-squared	0.351	0.306	0.299	0.352	0.294	0.287	0.235	0.232	0.229
	B-2. Cubic polynomial in distance								
Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	0.0176**	0.0008	0.0045	-0.0176**	0.0021	-0.0038	-0.0750**	-0.0087	0.0233
	(0.0078)	(0.0076)	(0.0057)	(0.0080)	(0.0079)	(0.0059)	(0.0302)	(0.0267)	(0.0190)
Mean of the outcome (< 6.0 km)	0.342	0.346	0.333	0.637	0.637	0.647	-3.669	-3.623	-3.548
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	3.568	3.508	3.182	3.568	3.508	3.182	3.568	3.508	3.182
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	2.460	2.583	2.389	2.460	2.583	2.389	2.460	2.583	2.389
Observations	951	974	1,752	951	974	1,752	951	974	1,752
R-squared	0.350	0.306	0.298	0.351	0.294	0.287	0.235	0.232	0.230

Note: See the notes to Table 3.

Table A26: Sensitivity Analysis

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	A. Children aged 15-21								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			Primary school completion			Years of schooling		
	A-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
	$R^2_{max} = 1.3 \times R^2_{BS}$								
$\delta = 1$	0.046	0.011	0.012	-0.037	-0.033	-0.009	-0.441	-0.299	-0.127
$\delta = -1$	0.024	-0.020	-0.015	-0.014	-0.007	0.019	-0.269	-0.084	0.091
	$R^2_{max} = 1$								
$\delta = 1$	0.096	0.090	0.118	-0.100	-0.112	-0.147	-0.700	-0.725	-0.693
$\delta = -1$	-0.029	-0.098	-0.121	0.049	0.072	0.157	-0.011	0.342	0.658
	A-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
	$R^2_{max} = 1.3 \times R^2_{BS}$								
$\delta = 1$	0.0470	-0.0146	0.0130	-0.0510	0.0147	0.0050	-0.4412	0.0878	-0.0005
$\delta = -1$	0.0394	-0.0010	0.0107	-0.0296	0.0025	0.0151	-0.3029	-0.0183	0.0534
	$R^2_{max} = 1$								
$\delta = 1$	0.0644	-0.0556	0.0220	-0.1213	0.0653	-0.0536	-0.6652	0.3464	-0.1515
$\delta = -1$	0.0221	0.0400	0.0017	0.0407	-0.0481	0.0738	-0.0789	-0.2769	0.2044

Continue

Table A26: Sensitivity Analysis

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	B. Children aged 6-14								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			School attendance			Grade progression		
	B-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence Ⅰ								
	$R^2_{max} = 1.3 \times R^2_{BS}$								
$\delta = 1$	0.056	0.062	0.012	-0.056	-0.061	-0.003	-0.220	-0.053	-0.018
$\delta = -1$	0.007	0.018	-0.024	-0.009	-0.019	0.033	-0.076	0.047	0.071
	$R^2_{max} = 1$								
$\delta = 1$	0.182	0.192	0.129	-0.184	-0.197	-0.124	-0.757	-0.468	-0.453
$\delta = -1$	-0.119	-0.113	-0.141	0.119	0.118	0.155	0.461	0.462	0.507
	B-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
	$R^2_{max} = 1.3 \times R^2_{BS}$								
$\delta = 1$	0.0610	-0.0105	0.0204	-0.0597	0.0180	-0.0195	-0.2338	0.0216	0.0432
$\delta = -1$	0.0477	0.0081	0.0126	-0.0479	0.0008	-0.0122	-0.1371	-0.0335	0.0642
	$R^2_{max} = 1$								
$\delta = 1$	0.0953	-0.0713	0.0468	-0.0899	0.0786	-0.0460	-0.7123	0.2976	-0.0641
$\delta = -1$	0.0133	0.0689	-0.0138	-0.0177	-0.0598	0.0143	0.3414	-0.3095	0.1715

Notes: The table considers the coefficient bounds based on Oster's approach. See Section A.3 for detailed explanation.

Table A27: Heterogeneity – Gender

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	A. Children aged 15-21								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			Primary school completion			Years of schooling		
	A-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
	A-1-1. Male								
Baseline specification	0.046**	-0.011	-0.028*	-0.027	-0.001	-0.013	-0.398**	-0.142	-0.034
	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.017)	(0.030)	(0.032)	(0.028)	(0.180)	(0.195)	(0.166)
R-squared	0.344	0.300	0.276	0.319	0.311	0.262	0.405	0.372	0.359
Specification Ⅳ	0.049**	-0.010	-0.031*	-0.044	-0.006	-0.016	-0.494***	-0.164	-0.047
	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.017)	(0.029)	(0.033)	(0.026)	(0.172)	(0.194)	(0.148)
R-squared	0.368	0.320	0.291	0.370	0.362	0.315	0.458	0.430	0.423
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.144	0.125	0.126	0.427	0.457	0.443	4.995	5.249	5.143
Observations	1,639	1,487	2,345	1,639	1,487	2,345	1,639	1,487	2,345
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	751	659	1,030	751	659	1,030	751	659	1,030
	A-1-2. Female								
Baseline specification	-0.002	0.018	0.018	-0.031	-0.048*	0.015	-0.242	-0.417**	-0.011
	(0.027)	(0.028)	(0.022)	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.022)	(0.175)	(0.184)	(0.138)
R-squared	0.445	0.421	0.332	0.357	0.384	0.314	0.510	0.486	0.434
Specification Ⅳ	0.012	0.023	0.018	-0.042	-0.035	0.013	-0.347**	-0.392**	-0.028
	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.023)	(0.028)	(0.029)	(0.023)	(0.172)	(0.191)	(0.143)
R-squared	0.459	0.435	0.344	0.396	0.422	0.334	0.538	0.518	0.452
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.236	0.225	0.221	0.298	0.309	0.258	4.076	4.138	3.881
Observations	1,575	1,498	2,293	1,575	1,498	2,293	1,575	1,498	2,293
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	696	653	1,007	696	653	1,007	696	653	1,007

Continue

Table A27: Heterogeneity – Gender

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	A. Children aged 15-21								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			Primary school completion			Years of schooling		
	A-2. Sample IV: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
	A-2-1. Male								
Baseline specification	0.0420*	0.0121	0.0082	-0.0456*	0.0270	0.0334	-0.4409***	-0.1025	0.1398
	(0.0240)	(0.0213)	(0.0180)	(0.0256)	(0.0328)	(0.0321)	(0.1632)	(0.1710)	(0.1654)
R-squared	0.326	0.261	0.262	0.269	0.29	0.241	0.374	0.348	0.333
Specification Ⅳ	0.0370	0.0157	0.0076	-0.0466*	0.0240	0.0339	-0.4688***	-0.1659	0.1684
	(0.0245)	(0.0233)	(0.0196)	(0.0250)	(0.0329)	(0.0333)	(0.1590)	(0.1867)	(0.1727)
R-squared	0.375	0.307	0.292	0.342	0.376	0.298	0.432	0.428	0.407
Mean of the outcome (< 6.0 km)	0.170	0.144	0.153	0.379	0.420	0.387	4.665	4.948	4.719
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.022	5.864	5.651	6.022	5.864	5.651	6.022	5.864	5.651
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.736	1.742	1.707	1.736	1.742	1.707	1.736	1.742	1.707
Observations	771	698	1,046	771	698	1,046	771	698	1,046
	A-2-2. Female								
Baseline specification	0.0351	-0.0156	0.0343	-0.0430*	0.0108	-0.0231	-0.2775	0.1723	-0.1598
	(0.0351)	(0.0271)	(0.0227)	(0.0255)	(0.0267)	(0.0199)	(0.2028)	(0.1697)	(0.1310)
R-squared	0.391	0.377	0.329	0.319	0.285	0.228	0.464	0.413	0.396
Specification Ⅳ	0.0312	-0.0122	0.0237	-0.0511*	-0.0016	-0.0213	-0.3097	0.1117	-0.1292
	(0.0363)	(0.0277)	(0.0239)	(0.0264)	(0.0254)	(0.0195)	(0.2115)	(0.1695)	(0.1277)
R-squared	0.434	0.425	0.354	0.416	0.396	0.315	0.526	0.502	0.455
Mean of the outcome (< 6.0 km)	0.282	0.285	0.254	0.265	0.223	0.226	3.736	3.480	3.557
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.022	5.864	5.651	6.022	5.864	5.651	6.022	5.864	5.651
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.736	1.742	1.707	1.736	1.742	1.707	1.736	1.742	1.707
Observations	757	711	1,043	757	711	1,043	757	711	1,043

Continue

Table A27: Heterogeneity – Gender

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	B. Children aged 6-14								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			School attendance			Grade progression		
	B-1. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
	B-1-1. Male								
Baseline specification	0.060**	0.029	-0.015	-0.061**	-0.033	0.010	-0.174	0.016	0.042
	(0.030)	(0.027)	(0.018)	(0.030)	(0.028)	(0.019)	(0.117)	(0.110)	(0.078)
R-squared	0.292	0.312	0.257	0.294	0.296	0.258	0.214	0.229	0.185
Specification Ⅳ	0.074***	0.016	-0.019	-0.075***	-0.020	0.013	-0.267***	-0.106	-0.019
	(0.027)	(0.025)	(0.017)	(0.028)	(0.026)	(0.018)	(0.095)	(0.085)	(0.061)
R-squared	0.429	0.439	0.385	0.417	0.417	0.369	0.582	0.577	0.538
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.309	0.305	0.305	0.679	0.685	0.686	-3.447	-3.592	-3.454
Observations	1,609	1,661	3,201	1,609	1,661	3,201	1,609	1,661	3,201
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	730	733	1,412	730	733	1,412	730	733	1,412
	B-1-2. Female								
Baseline specification	0.021	0.053**	0.012	-0.022	-0.054**	0.002	-0.141	-0.159*	-0.007
	(0.024)	(0.026)	(0.018)	(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.019)	(0.103)	(0.088)	(0.058)
R-squared	0.431	0.395	0.366	0.400	0.360	0.329	0.585	0.575	0.548
Specification Ⅳ	0.031	0.052**	0.011	-0.030	-0.053**	0.004	-0.188*	-0.166*	-0.005
	(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.018)	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.019)	(0.105)	(0.089)	(0.059)
R-squared	0.441	0.405	0.371	0.408	0.370	0.334	0.600	0.586	0.555
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.336	0.322	0.318	0.636	0.655	0.655	-3.584	-3.508	-3.458
Observations	1,573	1,648	3,171	1,573	1,648	3,171	1,573	1,648	3,171
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	703	724	1,340	703	724	1,340	703	724	1,340

Continue

Table A27: Heterogeneity – Gender

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	B. Children aged 6-14								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			School attendance			Grade progression		
	B-2. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
	B-2-1. Male								
Baseline specification	0.0723***	0.0078	0.0140	-0.0699***	-0.0052	-0.0161	-0.3761***	0.0222	0.1057
	(0.0252)	(0.0274)	(0.0175)	(0.0260)	(0.0284)	(0.0178)	(0.0916)	(0.1069)	(0.0661)
R-squared	0.298	0.299	0.262	0.304	0.290	0.262	0.183	0.192	0.189
Specification Ⅳ	0.1025***	0.0198	-0.0043	-0.0983***	-0.0172	0.0017	-0.3663***	-0.0103	0.0183
	(0.0259)	(0.0234)	(0.0166)	(0.0266)	(0.0242)	(0.0170)	(0.0830)	(0.0898)	(0.0516)
R-squared	0.455	0.432	0.395	0.445	0.418	0.379	0.583	0.593	0.553
Mean of the outcome (< 6.0 km)	0.342	0.350	0.328	0.644	0.641	0.660	-3.628	-3.637	-3.538
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.007	5.911	5.645	6.007	5.911	5.645	6.007	5.911	5.645
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.741	1.772	1.719	1.741	1.772	1.719	1.741	1.772	1.719
Observations	766	769	1,447	766	769	1,447	766	769	1,447
	B-2-2. Female								
Baseline specification	0.0429	-0.0013	0.0044	-0.0417	0.0125	0.0007	-0.0268	-0.0458	0.0282
	(0.0305)	(0.0247)	(0.0181)	(0.0310)	(0.0231)	(0.0187)	(0.1178)	(0.1054)	(0.0869)
R-squared	0.320	0.249	0.270	0.317	0.242	0.256	0.231	0.214	0.189
Specification Ⅳ	0.0319	0.0165	0.0110	-0.0329	-0.0069	-0.0074	-0.1777	-0.0292	-0.0170
	(0.0302)	(0.0212)	(0.0177)	(0.0301)	(0.0201)	(0.0185)	(0.1161)	(0.0863)	(0.0683)
R-squared	0.447	0.401	0.385	0.418	0.372	0.354	0.626	0.581	0.574
Mean of the outcome (< 6.0 km)	0.369	0.364	0.349	0.604	0.614	0.628	-3.676	-3.607	-3.535
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.030	5.831	5.625	6.030	5.831	5.625	6.030	5.831	5.625
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.705	1.763	1.711	1.705	1.763	1.711	1.705	1.763	1.711
Observations	726	779	1,429	726	779	1,429	726	779	1,429

Note: See the notes to Tables 3 and 4.

Table A28: Heterogeneity – First Child

Subsample:	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82	1977-79	1980	1981-82
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Cohort:	First child								
Dependent variable:	No schooling			Primary school completion			Years of schooling		
	A. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I								
Baseline specification	0.052**	0.005	-0.005	-0.051*	-0.022	0.012	-0.636***	-0.204	0.038
	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.016)	(0.026)	(0.028)	(0.020)	(0.168)	(0.175)	(0.123)
R-squared	0.323	0.329	0.262	0.293	0.280	0.230	0.391	0.366	0.339
Specification Ⅳ	0.053**	0.013	-0.004	-0.056**	-0.032	0.006	-0.682***	-0.297*	-0.297*
	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.016)	(0.026)	(0.028)	(0.019)	(0.164)	(0.169)	(0.169)
R-squared	0.349	0.357	0.285	0.343	0.354	0.300	0.443	0.452	0.452
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.189	0.19	0.176	0.398	0.406	0.364	4.863	4.782	4.592
Observations	2,137	2,154	4,011	2,137	2,154	4,011	2,137	2,154	4,011
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	965	945	1,764	965	945	1,764	965	945	1,764
	B. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ								
Baseline specification	0.0567**	0.0027	0.0119	-0.0565**	0.0120	0.0147	-0.4838***	0.0460	0.0466
	(0.0237)	(0.0191)	(0.0155)	(0.0247)	(0.0251)	(0.0223)	(0.1642)	(0.1603)	(0.1201)
R-squared	0.308	0.298	0.261	0.260	0.239	0.204	0.373	0.324	0.323
Specification Ⅳ	0.0527**	0.0109	0.0105	-0.0677**	0.0032	0.0126	-0.5288***	-0.0219	0.0403
	(0.0261)	(0.0189)	(0.0166)	(0.0262)	(0.0215)	(0.0221)	(0.1739)	(0.1435)	(0.1198)
R-squared	0.356	0.341	0.291	0.323	0.354	0.278	0.437	0.440	0.405
Mean of the outcome ($<$ 6.0 km)	0.224	0.234	0.206	0.357	0.345	0.316	4.493	4.301	4.214
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.022	5.864	5.651	6.022	5.864	5.651	6.022	5.864	5.651
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.736	1.742	1.707	1.736	1.742	1.707	1.736	1.742	1.707
Observations	1,008	1,015	1,798	1,008	1,015	1,798	1,008	1,015	1,798

Note: See the notes to Tables 3 and 4.

Table A29: Heterogeneity – Five Subsamples

Subsample:	1977-78	1979	1980	1981	1982	1977-78	1979	1980	1981	1982
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	A. Sample Ⅲ: Genocidal Violence I									
Cohort:	Children aged 15-21					Children aged 6-14				
Dependent variable:	No schooling					No schooling				
Baseline specification	0.030	0.028	-0.018	0.001	-0.035	0.058*	-0.009	0.029	-0.022	-0.013
	(0.035)	(0.030)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.027)	(0.035)	(0.031)	(0.024)	(0.022)	(0.023)
R-squared	0.392	0.337	0.258	0.229	0.213	0.363	0.353	0.273	0.291	0.273
Specification Ⅳ	0.039	0.039	-0.005	0.009	-0.028	0.059	0.009	0.040*	-0.016	-0.009
	(0.035)	(0.029)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.028)	(0.036)	(0.032)	(0.023)	(0.022)	(0.023)
R-squared	0.403	0.363	0.268	0.238	0.222	0.366	0.373	0.284	0.293	0.279
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.205	0.178	0.184	0.162	0.180	0.296	0.328	0.306	0.299	0.312
Dependent variable:	Primary school completion					School attendance				
Baseline specification	-0.029	0.001	-0.006	0.006	0.040	-0.060*	0.011	-0.029	0.032	0.020
	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.029)	(0.028)	(0.032)	(0.036)	(0.032)	(0.024)	(0.022)	(0.023)
R-squared	0.300	0.274	0.212	0.216	0.185	0.357	0.342	0.260	0.281	0.266
Specification Ⅳ	-0.039	-0.021	-0.027	-0.015	0.015	-0.062*	-0.008	-0.039*	0.025	0.015
	(0.038)	(0.036)	(0.029)	(0.027)	(0.032)	(0.037)	(0.033)	(0.023)	(0.022)	(0.023)
R-squared	0.332	0.296	0.232	0.233	0.201	0.360	0.361	0.270	0.283	0.271
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	0.333	0.373	0.375	0.369	0.335	0.676	0.657	0.677	0.681	0.670
Dependent variable:	Years of schooling					Grade progression				
Baseline specification	-0.217	-0.312	-0.075	0.035	0.206	-0.288*	0.022	0.025	0.030	0.084
	(0.263)	(0.245)	(0.194)	(0.197)	(0.199)	(0.164)	(0.114)	(0.078)	(0.081)	(0.092)
R-squared	0.380	0.333	0.271	0.276	0.244	0.307	0.300	0.221	0.217	0.224
Specification Ⅳ	-0.311	-0.471**	-0.234	-0.112	0.067	-0.312*	-0.047	-0.006	-0.012	0.024
	(0.261)	(0.237)	(0.185)	(0.186)	(0.197)	(0.165)	(0.124)	(0.076)	(0.079)	(0.094)
R-squared	0.410	0.365	0.294	0.299	0.262	0.326	0.312	0.229	0.227	0.234
Mean ($\geq$ 3.0 km)	4.369	4.631	4.61	4.631	4.413	-3.534	-3.557	-3.565	-3.388	-3.501
Observations	951	1,186	2,154	2,148	1,863	896	1,131	2,068	2,083	1,817
Observations ($<$ 3.0 km of K.S.)	431	534	945	946	818	402	506	909	909	796

Continue

Table A29: Heterogeneity – Five Subsamples

Subsample:	1977-78	1979	1980	1981	1982	1977-78	1979	1980	1981	1982
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	B. Sample Ⅳ: Genocidal Violence Ⅱ									
Cohort:	Children aged 15-21					Children aged 6-14				
Dependent variable:	No schooling					No schooling				
Baseline specification	0.0433	0.0444*	-0.0010	0.0174	0.0022	0.0948**	0.0384	0.0050	0.0156	0.0200
	(0.0496)	(0.0248)	(0.0217)	(0.0218)	(0.0245)	(0.0440)	(0.0269)	(0.0239)	(0.0197)	(0.0292)
R-squared	0.311	0.262	0.225	0.222	0.194	0.313	0.300	0.244	0.262	0.260
Specification Ⅳ	0.0486	0.0538**	0.0027	0.0192	-0.0049	0.0965**	0.0572**	0.0087	0.0160	0.0176
	(0.0501)	(0.0252)	(0.0215)	(0.0221)	(0.0245)	(0.0466)	(0.0274)	(0.0227)	(0.0199)	(0.0280)
R-squared	0.339	0.299	0.235	0.233	0.213	0.325	0.346	0.266	0.272	0.271
Mean of the outcome (< 6.0 km)	0.258	0.209	0.222	0.193	0.208	0.332	0.351	0.346	0.327	0.340
Dependent variable:	Primary school completion					School attendance				
Baseline specification	-0.0538	-0.0073	0.0014	-0.0049	0.0248	-0.0912**	-0.0395	0.0037	-0.0100	-0.0260
	(0.0384)	(0.0240)	(0.0260)	(0.0305)	(0.0279)	(0.0445)	(0.0265)	(0.0245)	(0.0209)	(0.0300)
R-squared	0.228	0.215	0.171	0.191	0.129	0.328	0.293	0.235	0.248	0.245
Specification Ⅳ	-0.0656	-0.0177	-0.0024	-0.0136	0.0217	-0.0923**	-0.0578**	0.0001	-0.0101	-0.0246
	(0.0406)	(0.0243)	(0.0265)	(0.0297)	(0.0269)	(0.0465)	(0.0273)	(0.0227)	(0.0212)	(0.0290)
R-squared	0.274	0.261	0.189	0.217	0.148	0.335	0.337	0.259	0.256	0.255
Mean of the outcome (< 6.0 km)	0.302	0.329	0.319	0.328	0.283	0.645	0.63	0.637	0.656	0.637
Dependent variable:	Years of schooling					Grade progression				
Baseline specification	-0.4028	-0.2254	-0.0266	0.0067	0.0612	-0.2925	-0.0603	-0.0265	0.0728	0.0386
	(0.3159)	(0.1754)	(0.1723)	(0.1911)	(0.1610)	(0.1942)	(0.0964)	(0.0735)	(0.0722)	(0.0916)
R-squared	0.286	0.276	0.236	0.251	0.195	0.271	0.216	0.180	0.190	0.220
Specification Ⅳ	-0.4977	-0.3133*	-0.0584	-0.0437	0.0722	-0.3170	-0.1031	-0.0498	0.0393	0.0200
	(0.3428)	(0.1786)	(0.1739)	(0.1916)	(0.1533)	(0.2022)	(0.1055)	(0.0744)	(0.0702)	(0.0911)
R-squared	0.345	0.328	0.256	0.279	0.221	0.299	0.235	0.191	0.215	0.230
Mean of the outcome (< 6.0 km)	4.066	4.264	4.177	4.283	4.038	-3.666	-3.672	-3.623	-3.482	-3.627
Mean of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	6.081	5.975	5.864	5.658	5.643	6.068	5.978	5.864	5.658	5.634
S.D. of Genocidal Violence Ⅱ	1.694	1.769	1.742	1.721	1.693	1.701	1.771	1.749	1.722	1.697
Observations	449	559	1,015	979	819	424	527	974	951	801

Note: See the notes to Tables 3 and 4.



Figure A1: Results of Fisher's Exact Tests



Figure A2: Distribution of Continuous Genocide Measures

Note: The figure provides kernel density of the distribution of the continuous genocide measures based on the first-, second-, and third-order polynomials in distance.

Figure A3: District Codes

Notes: The figure provides the 1998 district codes. The 1977 administrative divisions of Democratic Kampuchea (DK zones (1977)) and the 1998 districts (Districts) are depicted. Conflict districts were not covered by the 1998 Cambodia Population Census due to military operations: Anlong Veaeng (District 2201), Samlot (District 209), and Veal Veaeng (District 1506).



Figure A4: Killing-Site Codes

Notes: The figure provides killing-site codes. The 1977 administrative divisions of Democratic Kampuchea (DK zones (1977)) and the 1998 districts (Districts) are depicted.