**Online supplementary material A: Missing data**

*Table A1. Factors associated with having missing data on punishments for crimes (odds ratios, clustered standard errors in parenthesis)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Gender = Male (female = ref. category) | 0.85\*\*  (0.05) |
| Place of residence = Urban (rural = ref. category) | 0.02\*\*\*  (0.01) |
| Age | 1.00  (0.00) |
|  |  |
| *Occupation (field labourer = ref. category)* |  |
| Craftsman | 0.98  (0.09) |
| Domestic | 1.01  (0.18) |
| Other | 0.61  (0.30) |
| Unknown occupation | 1.07  (0.10) |
|  |  |
| *Establishment size (small establishment = ref. category)* |  |
| Medium-sized establishment | 1.37  (0.69) |
| Large establishment | 1.81  (1.01) |
|  |  |
| *Place of birth (DWI = ref. category)* |  |
| Africa | 0.68\*\*  (0.11) |
| Other | 1.61  (0.57) |
|  |  |
| *Religious affiliation (protestant = ref. category)* |  |
| Roman Catholic | 1.07  (0.37) |
| Other / Unknown | 0.46  (0.25) |
|  |  |
| Marital status (unmarried = ref. category) |  |
| Married | 0.97  (0.14) |
| Widow | 2.33\*\*  (0.83) |
|  |  |
| Constant | 2.89\*\*  (1.46) |
| Observations | 16,468 |

*Note: \* = statistically significant at the 10 percent confidence level; \*\* = statistically significant at the 5 percent confidence level; \*\*\* = statistically significant at the 1 percent confidence level. Standard errors clustered by geocode (plantation or urban location).  
Source: DWI panel*

**Online supplementary material B: Robustness tests**

We will in this online supplementary material explore the robustness of our econometric analysis of the explanatory factors, by changing the specification of the model analyzed. The different models are the following:

* Model 1: core model, see main text.
* Model 2: as model 1, but occupations categorized by status instead of specific occupational groups.
* Model 3: as model 1, but children below age of 15 omitted from the analysis.
* Model 4: as model 1, but assuming that all observations for which information on punishments is missing means that the individual was never punished for any crime.
* Model 5: models 2 and 4 above combined.
* Model 6: models 3 and 4 above combined.
* Model 7: as model 1, but including location fixed effects (by plantation or urban location)

Results from this exercise are reported in Table B1 below.

*Table B1. Robustness tests of factors associated with probability of with enslaved person’s being punished for some crime (odds ratios, clustered standard errors in parenthesis) (odds ratios, clustered standard errors)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Model 1* | *Model 2* | *Model 3* | *Model 4* | *Model 5* | *Model 6* | *Model 7* |
| Gender = Male (female = ref. category) | *4.51\*\*\**  *(0.90)* | *4.43\*\*\**  *(0.87)* | *4.34\*\*\**  *(0.86)* | *4.92\*\*\**  *(0.96)* | *4.86\*\*\**  *(0.92)* | *4.92\*\*\**  *(0.95)* | *9.12\*\*\**  *(4.14)* |
| Place of residence = Urban (rural = ref. category) | *0.51*  *(0.23)* | *0.49*  *(0.24)* | *0.55*  *(0.25)* | *1.91*  *(0.84)* | *1.88*  *(0.85)* | *2.18\**  *(0.95)* |  |
| Age | *1.03\*\*\**  *(0.01)* | *1.03\*\*\**  *(0.01)* | *1.01\**  *(0.01)* | *1.03\*\*\**  *(0.00)* | *1.03\*\*\**  *(0.00)* | *1.01\*\**  *(0.00)* | *1.02\*\**  *(0.01)* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Occupation (field labourer = ref. category)* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Craftsman | *0.68*  *(0.17)* |  | *0.66*  *(0.17)* | *0.69*  *(0.18)* |  | *0.68*  *(0.17)* | *0.94*  *(0.42)* |
| Domestic | *0.82*  *(0.30)* |  | *0.88*  *(0.32)* | *0.79*  *(0.26)* |  | *0.85*  *(0.27)* | *0.86*  *(0.58)* |
| Other | *0.54*  *(0.31)* |  | *0.61*  *(0.35)* | *0.50*  *(0.29)* |  | *0.56*  *(0.32)* | *3.00*  *(3.85)* |
| Unknown occupation | *0.36\*\*\**  *(0.11)* |  | *0.65*  *(0.22)* | *0.34\*\*\**  *(0.10)* |  | *0.67*  *(0.19)* | *0.08\*\*\**  *(0.07)* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Status of occupation (low = ref. category) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| High |  | *0.70*  *(0.16)* |  |  | *0.70*  *(0.15)* |  |  |
| Unknown |  | *0.35\*\*\**  *(0.11)* |  |  | *0.34\*\*\**  *(0.10)* |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Establishment size (small establishment = ref. category)* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Medium-sized establishment | *0.57*  *(0.24)* | *0.56*  *(0.24)* | *0.67*  *(0.28)* | *0.45\**  *(0.18)* | *0.44\**  *(0.19)* | *0.54*  *(0.22)* |  |
| Large establishment | *0.70*  *(0.41)* | *0.68*  *(0.39)* | *0.79*  *(0.45)* | *0.46\**  *(0.22)* | *0.45\**  *(0.22)* | *0.55*  *(0.26)* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Place of birth (DWI = ref. category)* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Africa | *0.53\**  *(0.19)* | *0.53\**  *(0.18)* | *0.64*  *(0.22)* | *0.69*  *(0.20)* | *0.69*  *(0.20)* | *0.84*  *(0.20)* | *0.82*  *(0.50)* |
| Other | *1.90*  *(1.27)* | *1.91*  *(1.27)* | *2.20*  *(1.44)* | *1.50*  *(0.97)* | *1.52*  *(0.98)* | *1.69*  *(1.09)* | *2.29*  *(2.43)* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Religious affiliation (protestant = ref. category)* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Roman Catholic | *0.86*  *(0.35)* | *0.86*  *(0.35)* | *0.86*  *(0.35)* | *0.84*  *(0.25)* | *0.83*  *(0.25)* | *0.83*  *(0.25)* | *0.84*  *(0.41)* |
| Other / Unknown | *1.78*  *(1.52)* | *1.77*  *(1.50)* | *2.16*  *(1.82)* | *3.85\*\**  *(2.36)* | *3.77\*\**  *(2.31)* | *4.31\*\**  *(2.67)* | *5.27*  *(6.63)* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Marital status (unmarried = ref. category) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Married | *0.90*  *(0.30)* | *0.90*  *(0.30)* | *0.94*  *(0.30)* | *0.92*  *(0.30)* | *0.92*  *(0.30)* | *0.94*  *(0.30)* | *3.09\*\**  *(1.39)* |
| Widow |  |  |  |  |  |  | *0.00*  *(0.00)* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | *0.02\*\*\**  *(0.01)* | *0.02\*\*\**  *(0.01)* | *0.03\*\*\**  *(0.02)* | *0.004\*\*\**  *(0.002)* | *0.004\*\*\**  *(0.002)* | *0.008\*\*\**  *(0.005)* |  |
| Observations | *4,152* | *4,152* | *3,066* | *16,404* | *16,404* | *12,084* | *1,570* |

*Note: \* = statistically significant at the 10 percent confidence level; \*\* = statistically significant at the 5 percent confidence level; \*\*\* = statistically significant at the 1 percent confidence level. Observations with a very positive “moral character” are omitted from the statistical analysis since all of them were reported as unpunished for crimes.  
Source: DWI panel*

Model 1 is the core model of our analysis, discussed in the main text of the article. In model 2, we include a status-variable of the occupations as an explanatory variable, instead of occupational groups (field laborers, domestic servants, craftsmen, and other). We then classify the individuals into different categories depending on the occupation they were reported to hold, employing the HISCLASS-scheme.(Leeuwen and Maas 2011), differentiating between low status occupations (HISCLASS 10, 11 or 12) and somewhat more privileged occupations (HISCLASS 1-9). This does not change the picture: the status of the position is not associated with the outcome variable. Some people with an unknown occupation were potentially still less prone to undertake acts of resistance.

Model 3 excludes all children, below the age of 15, from the sample as the youngest person reported to have been punished for a crime was 15 years of age. Excluding the children from the sample does not change virtually any of the estimated coefficients, with one important exception: age. In the core model, the probability of having been punished for a crime increased with the age of the individual, but once we exclude the children, this relationship is no longer as strong (lower odds ratio). The seeming positive association between age and punishment for crimes was thus mainly driven by all the children, who were reported as never having been punished for some crime.

In models 1–3, we only include observations where we have direct evidence in the source on whether or not the individual had been punished for some crime. As was noted in the article, this omits around 75 per cent of the enslaved population for which the masters failed to record this information. In models 4–6, we make the assumption that the masters failed, as a rule, to fill in this information for individuals who never had been punished for some crime, in order to see if including the whole enslaved population, with this assumption, changes any of the results. Models 4–6 are in all other aspects copies of models 1–3. The estimates show that most of the results are robust to this change in the model, with two exceptions. All estimated coefficients remain similar to the ones estimated in models 1–3, both in terms of the size of the coefficient, and in the confidence level. The first exception to this pattern is the rural dummy variable. Many of the observations where we lack information on the “punishments”-variable are from the rural part of the island. Once we include them, under the assumption that missing information means the individual never was punished for some crime, the estimates in models 4-6 shows that the estimated odds ratio for the rural dummy becomes higher than one, but the odds ratio is in two of the three models not statistically significant. The second exception is the place of birth-variable: once we include those with missing information, the estimated lower odds ratio for persons born in Africa is no longer statistically significant.

Model 7, finally, employs a location fixed effects analysis, to analyze differences within one and the same plantation. In the main this does not change the picture compared to our baseline model 1. One exception is the marital status, where married persons seemingly exhibit a higher probability of having been punished for some crime.

We next turn to a robustness test of the factors associated with the depiction of the individuals’ “moral character”. We change the model in the same way as in the previous robustness test, i.e.:

* Model 8: core model, see main text.
* Model 9: as model 8, but occupations categorized by status instead of specific occupational groups.
* Model 10: as model 8, but children below age of 15 omitted from the analysis.

The only effect of this exercise, compared to the baseline model 8, is that when we exclude children from the analysis, persons with an unknown occupation are no longer less probable to be depicted in negative terms.

*Table B2. Robustness tests of factors associated with characterization of enslaved (odds ratios, clustered standard errors in parenthesis) (odds ratios, clustered standard errors)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 8 | Model 9 | Model 10 |
| Gender = Male (female = ref. category) | 1.29\*\*\*  (0.11) | 1.28\*\*\*  (0.10) | 1.32\*\*\*  (0.11) |
| Place of residence = Urban (rural = ref. category) | 1.15  (0.63) | 1.16  (0.65) | 0.78  (0.36) |
| Age | 1.01\*\*\*  (0.00) | 1.01\*\*\*  (0.00) | 1.00  (0.00) |
|  |  |  |  |
| *Occupation (field labourer = ref. category)* |  |  |  |
| Craftsman | 0.71\*\*\*  (0.08) |  | 0.70\*\*\*  (0.08) |
| Domestic | 0.77\*\*\*  (0.10) |  | 0.78\*\*\*  (0.09) |
| Other | 0.83  (0.26) |  | 1.41  (0.37) |
| Unknown occupation | 0.68\*\*\*  (0.07) |  | 0.86  (0.13) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Status of occupation (low = ref. category) |  |  |  |
| High |  | 0.74\*\*\*  (0.07) |  |
| Unknown |  | 0.67\*\*\*  (0.07) |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| *Establishment size (small establishment = ref. category)* |  |  |  |
| Medium-sized establishment | 1.78  (0.95) | 1.78  (0.96) | 1.31  (0.57) |
| Large establishment | 1.48  (0.85) | 1.48  (0.85) | 1.09  (0.51) |
|  |  |  |  |
| *Place of birth (DWI = ref. category)* |  |  |  |
| Africa | 1.14  (0.17) | 1.14  (0.17) | 1.25  (0.18) |
| Other | 0.90  (0.30) | 0.90  (0.30) | 1.10  (0.29) |
|  |  |  |  |
| *Religious affiliation (protestant = ref. category)* |  |  |  |
| Roman Catholic | 0.78  (0.17) | 0.78  (0.17) | 0.79  (0.16) |
| Other / Unknown | 0.83  (0.29) | 0.83  (0.29) | 0.99  (0.40) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Marital status (unmarried = ref. category) |  |  |  |
| Married | 0.66\*\*\*  (0.10) | 0.65\*\*\* (0.10) | 0.67\*\*\*  (0.10) |
| Widow | 0.41  (0.23) | 0.41  (0.23) | 0.50  (0.24) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 16,333 | 16,333 | 12,071 |

*Note: \* = statistically significant at the 10 percent confidence level; \*\* = statistically significant at the 5 percent confidence level; \*\*\* = statistically significant at the 1 percent confidence level.  
Source: DWI panel*