
Leaders in Social Movements: Evidence from Unions in Myanmar

Journal:	<i>American Economic Review</i>
Manuscript ID	AER-2023-0758.R2
Manuscript Type:	Administrator
Keywords:	J51, J52, D23

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

May 31, 2023

Disclosure Statement for Laura Boudreau

"Union Leaders: Experimental Evidence from Myanmar"

The author declares that she has no relevant or material financial interests.

This project was conducted with financial support by the International Growth Centre, the Suntory and Toyota International Centres for Economics and Related Disciplines (STICERD) at the London School of Economics, and the Joint Usage and Research Center (IER, Hitotsubashi University).

Study pre-registration: AEARCTR-0005183.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Laura Boudreau". The script is cursive and fluid, with the first name "Laura" and last name "Boudreau" clearly distinguishable.

Laura Boudreau
Assistant Professor of Economics
Columbia Business School, Columbia University
l.boudreau@columbia.edu

May 31, 2023

Disclosure Statement for Rocco Macchiavello


"Union Leaders: Experimental Evidence from Myanmar"

The author declares that he has no relevant or material financial interests.

This project was conducted with financial support from the International Growth Centre, the Suntory and Toyota International Centre for Economics and Related Disciplines (STICERD) at the London School of Economics, and the Joint Usage and Research Center (IER, Hitotsubashi University).

Study pre-registration: AEARCTR-0005183.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rocco Macchiavello', written in a cursive style.

Rocco Macchiavello
Professor, Department of Management
London School of Economics & Political Sciences
R.Macchiavello@lse.ac.uk

June 1, 2023

Disclosure Statement for Virginia Minni

"Union Leaders: Experimental Evidence from Myanmar"

The author declares that she has no relevant or material financial interests.

This project was conducted with financial support by the International Growth Centre, the Suntory and Toyota International Centres for Economics and Related Disciplines (STICERD) at the London School of Economics, and the Joint Usage and Research Center (IER, Hitotsubashi University).

Study pre-registration: AEARCTR-0005183.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Virginia Minni', with a large, stylized loop at the beginning.

Virginia Minni
Post-Doctoral Fellow
Institute for Fiscal Studies
virginia.minni@chicagobooth.edu

June 1, 2023

Disclosure Statement for Mari Tanaka


"Union Leaders: Experimental Evidence from Myanmar"

The author declares that she has no relevant or material financial interests.

This project was conducted with financial support by the International Growth Centre, the Suntory and Toyota International Centres for Economics and Related Disciplines (STICERD) at the London School of Economics, and the Joint Usage and Research Center (IER, Hitotsubashi University).

Study pre-registration: AEARCTR-0005183.

Sincerely,

A rectangular box containing a handwritten signature in black ink. The signature appears to be '田中万理' (Tanaka Mari).

Mari Tanaka
Associate Professor
Institute of Economic Research, Hitotsubashi University
mari.tanaka@r.hit-u.ac.jp

LEADERS IN SOCIAL MOVEMENTS: EVIDENCE FROM UNIONS IN MYANMAR*

Laura Boudreau[†], Rocco Macchiavello[‡], Virginia Minni[§], and Mari Tanaka*

[†]Columbia University, NBER, BREAD, CEPR, IZA and IGC

[‡]LSE Department of Management, STICERD, and IGC

[§]University of Chicago, Booth School of Business, CEPR and IZA

*University of Tokyo, Hitotsubashi University, IZA

November 8, 2024

Abstract

Social movements are catalysts for crucial institutional changes. To succeed, they must coordinate members' views (consensus building) and actions (mobilization). We study union leaders within Myanmar's burgeoning labor movement. Union leaders are positively selected on both ability and personality traits that enable them to influence others, yet they earn lower wages. In group discussions about workers' views on an upcoming national minimum wage negotiation, randomly embedded leaders build consensus around the union's preferred policy. In an experiment that mimics individual decision-making in a collective action set-up, leaders increase mobilization through coordination.

JEL Classification: [J51, J52, D23, D70, C93]

Keywords: [leaders, unions, consensus-building, mobilization, field experiments]

*We gratefully acknowledge financial support from the IGC, the STICERD, the Joint Usage and Research Center (IER, Hitotsubashi University), and JSPS Grant Number JP23K20609. We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the staff at the CTUM, the CTUM-affiliated trade unions' leaders of garment factories, staff at the CTUM Women Center, the Myanmar Survey Research, Aye Thidar Han Naw, Myat Mo Phu, Sergio Andres Florez Orrego, Ottavia Pesenti, Gabriel Rourke, Xinyu Ren, Oliver Seager, Yoel Sevi, Athina Valioulis, Wenzhi Wang for assisting our data collection and excellent research assistance. We have benefited from comments from seminar participants at CEPR Org, Columbia, Dartmouth, LSE, MIT, Munich, NBER Org, Osaka University, SIOE, UMichigan, University of Tokyo, and Wharton. IRB approval was obtained from the LSE (31/10/2019), Columbia (IRB-AAAS7778, 30/4/2020), and Hitotsubashi (2019C011, 12/05/2019). The study is listed on the AEA registry (AEARCTR-0005183). All errors are our own.

1 Introduction

Social movements have been catalysts for many institutional changes: the eight-hour day movement in the 19th century, the suffragettes in the early 1900s, the civil rights movements in the 1950s, and the green movement in this century (Della Porta and Diani, 2020), to name but a few. To succeed, social movements must coordinate their members' views and collective actions. Coordinating views requires building *consensus* around common objectives and tactics among diverse members. Once a consensus is built, coordinating actions requires *mobilizing* members to participate in activities that have high private costs and uncertain public benefits (Ganz, 2010). But unlike in more commonly studied organizations, such as firms and bureaucracies, monetary incentives, contracts, and hierarchies are often unavailable to align views and to motivate members in social movements.

In the absence of these organizational tools, *leaders* may play critical roles. We think of leadership as “...the ability to induce others to follow absent the power to compel or to provide formal contractual incentives... A leader is someone with followers, who follow voluntarily” (Hermalin, 2012). Economic theory suggests that leaders may act as coordinators in both consensus building and mobilization. For example, leaders may build consensus among a group by providing information about the state of the world or payoffs that coordinate views (Hermalin, 1998; Caillaud and Tirole, 2007; Dewan and Myatt, 2008). They may mobilize group members by communicating that a high-cooperation equilibrium is to be played (Loeper et al., 2014). To date, however, empirical evidence on leaders' roles in consensus building and mobilization outside the lab remains scarce due to measurement and identification challenges. On the measurement side, it is difficult to observe many leaders performing the same task. On the identification side, it is difficult to distinguish if a given individual influences others (i.e., is, in fact, a leader) or if their behavior reflects underlying group dynamics – a version of the well-known “reflection problem” (Manski, 1993).

This paper presents experimental evidence that union leaders in the bur-

geoning labor movement in Myanmar act as coordinators in both members' views (consensus building) and actions (mobilization).

The labor movement in Myanmar is broadly representative of the struggles in organizing labor in newly industrializing countries (see, e.g., Visser 2019). We collaborate with the Confederation of Trade Unions in Myanmar (CTUM), the largest confederation of labor unions at the national level, during the months preceding the revision of the national minimum wage. The CTUM represented workers' interests in the national minimum wage setting process. In the run-up to the planned May 2020 negotiations, it organized weekend sessions with workers employed in 17 garment factories with CTUM-affiliated unions to discuss the minimum wage and to gather systematic information on workers' skills and living costs. We helped the CTUM to organize the discussions and to conduct the surveys. This allowed us to embed multiple experiments to examine (1) whether and how union leaders build consensus around the minimum wage level and (2) whether and how they mobilize workers to participate in privately costly activities for the common good.

In each factory, the union leadership is structured around an elected union president and executive committee that negotiates with the factory management and coordinates activities with the confederation. Below these formal roles, several line leaders (LLs) interact with, mobilize, and gather and channel the concerns of the workers. LLs have many traits in common with, and many eventually become, (formal) leaders of the movement. The survey sessions organized in partnership with CTUM provided a unique opportunity to characterize the types of individuals who emerge as leaders in labor movements, adding to our scant understanding of selection into leadership roles in social movements. The greater number of LLs also allowed us to conduct two field experiments to investigate how leaders influence workers' views and behavior in the context of a high-stakes, real-world collective action effort with uncertain payoffs – the CTUM's negotiation on the national minimum-wage level – while avoiding many of the risks associated with mobilization around, for example, factory strikes or street protests.

Our first main finding is that union leaders differ from workers – both union

members and non-members – along key traits that psychologists and organizational sociologists associate with the ability to influence others (Judge et al., 2002). Union leaders also stand out on other traits identified as relevant for political selection (Caselli and Morelli, 2004; Dal Bó et al., 2017). Union leaders are more extroverted, less neurotic, and more conscientious compared to workers. They have greater grit and locus of control and are more altruistic. Union leaders have more work experience but earn substantially less, however, compared to workers, both unconditionally and even more so after controlling for demographics, ability, skills, and personality traits. In the Myanmar context, leadership roles in the union movement appear to come at significant private costs – a view echoed in workers’ and leaders’ surveys.¹

We then present results from two field experiments to explore leaders’ roles as coordinators. In our first experiment on consensus-building, we randomly embedded LLs in group discussions about workers’ preferred and expected minimum wage levels. To mimic naturally occurring behavior, leaders were not announced nor given specific instructions. In groups with LLs, we randomized whether the leader was from the workers’ own or a different factory. This allows us to examine the importance of leaders’ *social connections* (Bandiera et al., 2009) or their *formal role* (Aghion and Tirole, 1997) in the union in determining their effects. Motivated by the political science literature, we test whether leaders aggregate workers’ views and build consensus around the median worker’s view (Black, 1958) or whether they align workers’ views and build consensus around their unions’ views (Lenz, 2012). We find evidence of the latter: leaders increase consensus around their unions’ preferred minimum wage levels by 22%. We cannot reject that the effects are the same for own versus external leaders, indicating that leaders’ social ties or formal role alone cannot explain the results. Additionally, examining heterogeneity by leaders’ traits shows that leaders’ charisma is important for their ability to achieve consensus, further highlighting that social ties and formal authority are not

¹Budde et al. (2024) examines the selection of German work councils’ representatives. They find that these representatives are also positively selected in terms of wages but, crucially, not in terms of prosociality. Furthermore, in Germany, becoming a worker representative improves job security.

the primary drivers. Textual analysis of the discussion transcripts reveals how leaders increase convergence in views among workers and how they impact group dynamics. The transcripts show that leaders rarely invoke their formal role in the discussions. Instead, leaders introduce information to the discussions that align workers' views with the union's position. While, in doing so, they partially crowd out workers' speech, groups with leaders are rated as more active by the field team, and, following the discussions, workers reported higher engagement and the perception that the group achieved consensus.

In our second experiment on mobilization, we invited workers to participate in an unannounced survey on living costs. Participation was privately costly because it required workers to sacrifice the remainder of their one and only weekend day. It conveyed a public benefit since the CTUM planned to use the data to campaign for its preferred minimum wage level. To mimic workers' participation decisions in collective actions such as protests, we introduced strategic complementarity by promising a substantial additional donation to the CTUM skills training center for each discussion group for which all workers attended the survey. To test for potential mechanisms, we randomly varied whether workers: (i) were invited to the survey by a LL; (ii) were informed about how many discussion group members were invited by a LL; (iii) were told that a LL would observe their decision to participate.

Our experiments were in the field at the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. The unexpected reduction in sample size implies that we are underpowered to tease out differences across treatment arms in the mobilization experiment. While the results should be interpreted cautiously, we find – again – that leaders play a coordinating role: moving from being informed that a leader would invite one group member only to being informed that they would invite all but one group member increases attendance by 36%. This indicates that leaders can be key in selecting and communicating the equilibrium to be played, which involves, in this case, all workers participating in the survey. In contrast, being invited by a leader alone does not increase attendance. Observation of the workers' choice by a leader also increases attendance, possibly due to a signaling channel rather than a sanctioning one.

This research contributes to three strands of literature. First, it contributes to an emerging empirical literature on the determinants of social movements' formation and growth. One stream of this literature focuses on how information about others' participation affects individuals' decisions to participate in protests; underscoring the importance of coordination (Enikolopov et al., 2020; Manacorda and Tesei, 2020; González, 2020). In a field setting, however, Cantoni et al. (2019) find evidence of strategic substitutability in protest turnout in the context of Hong Kong's democracy movement. Even if leaders do not serve a coordinating role, they may still foster mobilization through other channels (e.g., motivation and social pressure). A second stream focuses on how leaders affect individuals' decisions to participate. Dippel and Heblich (2021) and Cagé et al. (2022) provide evidence from different historical social movements that exposure to leaders increases participation. We complement this literature by conducting field experiments on leaders' role in enhancing coordination in social movements, both in terms of members' views and actions; our ability to study beliefs, which are central to coordination, and to identify causal effects to understand mechanisms align with Callen et al.'s (2023) argument that these approaches are crucial for understanding drivers of institutional change.

Second, it contributes to the literature on leaders' roles in group decision-making and in overcoming collective action problems. A sizable theoretical literature focuses on forms of information provision by leaders that serve to coordinate beliefs and actions (Hermalin, 1998; Caillaud and Tirole, 2007; Dewan and Myatt, 2008; Bolton et al., 2013; Loeper et al., 2014; Akerlof and Holden, 2016). Empirically, the literature primarily features lab experiments (Potters et al., 2007; Komai et al., 2010; Sahin et al., 2015). More recently, a limited number of field experiments have studied leadership in real-world settings, including local elected leaders and contributions to public goods (Jack and Recalde, 2015); encouragement of endogenous leadership and team performance in an escape room challenge (Englmaier et al., 2022); and exposure to charismatic speeches and worker effort (Antonakis et al., 2022).² We con-

²Grossman and Baldassarri (2012) and Deserranno et al. (2019) use field experiments to

tribute by providing evidence on leaders’ personal traits and roles in influencing groups’ views and actions leveraging field experiments with many real-world leaders. Our experimental designs and data enable us to provide novel micro-evidence on the mechanisms through which leaders influence outcomes in the context of a burgeoning labor movement’s effort to influence a high-stakes policy-setting process.

Third, this paper contributes to a growing literature on industrial relations and labor unions in developing countries (Freeman, 2010; Tanaka, 2020; Boudreau, 2021; Macchiavello et al., 2020; Breza et al., 2022; Akerlof et al., 2020; Corradini et al., 2023). Workplace discrimination against union leaders appears to be widespread in developing countries. For example, International Labor Organization (2024) and Human Rights Watch (2015b,a) report cases in Peru, Mexico, Philippines, Algeria, Bangladesh, Cambodia, and Pakistan. Our evidence that union leaders are positively selected both on skills and pro-sociality is consistent with involvement in the movement entailing substantial private costs – perhaps because of workplace discrimination in Myanmar. Lin et al. (2019) find that factories with work committees led by elected worker representatives have a lower incidence of industrial disputes. We contribute experimental evidence that union leaders play important roles in shaping unions’ effectiveness in achieving their objectives.

The rest of the paper unfolds as follows: Section 2 provides background information on our setting, Section 3 describes our research design, Section 4 compares union leaders to other workers along demographic, economic, and psychological characteristics, Section 5 discusses the design and results of the consensus-building experiment, Section 6 does the same for the mobilization experiment, and, Section 7 offers concluding remarks.

examine how the selection procedure for leaders – formal elections versus less democratic processes – affects the groups’ performance and the type of leader selected.

2 Context

2.1 Unions in Myanmar

Unions have been legally allowed in Myanmar since 2011 when the country embarked upon a process of policy reforms (The Labor Organization Law, 2011). Between 2011 and 2020, the number of unions grew rapidly. According to the Ministry of Labour, Immigration and Population, as of mid-2020, there were 2,861 registered trade unions.³ We study unions in Myanmar's export-oriented garment sector, which is the largest exporting industrial sector in Myanmar with approximately 600 factories employing nearly 500,000 workers (Myanmar Garment Manufacturers Association, 2020).

According to The Myanmar Labor Organization Law (2011), any group of 30 or more workers can form a factory-level union. Unions are thus organized at the factory level. The CTUM is the largest confederation of trade unions in Myanmar. In 2015, the CTUM was officially recognized as the only national-level trade union confederation in Myanmar, marking a significant phase in Myanmar's labor movement. As of late 2019, there were 47 garment factories in Myanmar that had a factory-level basic union affiliated to the CTUM, representing 10% of the garment sector and 58% of unions in the industrial sector affiliated to the CTUM.

To form a union, members must elect a union's Executive Team (ET). The president leads the union's ET, which also includes an Executive Committee comprising one secretary, one treasurer, and four other elected members. The ET members' duties differ depending on their position, but a key task is to regularly attend meetings with the factory management. To become a member of the ET, a worker must have worked at the factory for at least six months, be at least 21 years old, and have a valid national identification number. The Law prescribes that elections are held every two years (unless the president resigns, in which case an emergency election is held). There is no term limit.

Below the ET, line/team leaders (LLs) play a critical role in facilitating

³These consist of 2,683 basic organizations, 147 township organizations, 22 state/regional organizations, 8 federations, and 1 confederation.

communication with workers. LLs are not elected but are instead recommended by union members (66%), selected by the ET (24%), or self-nominated (10%). We also find based on our survey that, relative to presidents, LLs spend significantly less of their time communicating with management and meeting with other presidents and significantly more of their time coordinating members, motivating members, and recruiting new members to the union. Workers seek out LLs for advice and social activities more often than they seek out presidents. For these reasons – and since there are many more LLs than presidents (170 compared to 18 in our sample) – the two experiments described in this paper focus on LLs’ roles in coordinating workers’ views and actions.

Being a union leader is costly. Union leaders work in the factories and are not paid for the additional time and effort requested by their role. In our survey, 70% of presidents and 40% of LLs reported having experienced disadvantages at their factories due to their union activity. Moreover, union leaders earn less than workers (see Table 1). In line with this, while the CTUM aims to have 1 LL for every 10 workers in unionized factories, in practice the ratio is smaller (1 LL for every 33 workers in our sample).

Union leaders, though, matter. Garment factories with democratically-elected worker representatives are less likely to experience industrial disputes (Lin et al., 2019). This suggests that elected worker leaders may contribute to healthier industrial relations. More generally, union leaders negotiate with management about several issues. Approximately 70% of the respondents reported that the union at their factory had negotiated with management about pay, with working conditions, leave, and working hours also being important issues.

2.2 The minimum wage in Myanmar

The Minimum Wage Law (2013) requires Myanmar’s statutory minimum wage to be reconsidered every two years. A tripartite National Minimum Wage Committee (NMWC) consisting of representatives from employers, workers’ organizations, and the government was responsible for revising the minimum

wage. The CTUM represents workers in the NMWC. In the 2018 negotiations, for example, the CTUM advocated for a 6600 Myanmar Kyat (MMK) (USD 4.87) minimum wage for an eight-hour workday and mobilized workers to demonstrate in favor of its position. The minimum wage was ultimately increased from MMK 3600 (USD 2.65) to MMK 4800 (USD 3.54).

The minimum wage is highly relevant for garment workers. 59% of workers in our sample reported the legal minimum wage as their daily base wage.⁴ Nearly all other workers reported a daily base wage just above this amount (only 4% reported a base wage below it). Turning to daily take-home pay for an 8-hour workday (including base pay, skill premiums, and bonuses), there is a dramatic jump at the legal minimum, with 20% of our sample reporting earning between 100-110% of it. In sum, the minimum wage binds for 20% of our sample, and, by determining base pay, it plausibly affects workers' earnings above it (e.g., Autor et al., 2016; Derenoncourt et al., 2021).

A higher minimum wage, however, plausibly entails trade-offs for garment workers. Administrative data on industrial dispute cases negotiated at the Township Conciliation Body in the Yangon region reveal that, out of 407 disputes in the garment sector, termination is the leading cause (nearly 60% of disputes), followed by wages (nearly 20%). Employers can, and do, terminate workers. An increase in the minimum wage could, in principle, put workers in our sample at higher risk of job loss.

The next revision of the minimum wage was scheduled for May 2020. CTUM aimed to enter the negotiations equipped with evidence of workers' skills, living costs, and views on the national minimum wage. In 2019, it sought collaboration with our research team to collect such evidence. Based on surveys and discussion groups with garment workers, we produced a joint report to inform CTUM's position. As part of the collaboration, we agreed to embed field experiments to study union leaders.

⁴The daily base wage is the base level of wage for 8 standard hours without reflecting skill premiums, bonuses, and overtime earnings.

3 Research design

3.1 Sampling

We implemented the field activities with workers employed at garment factories in the Yangon and Bago regions that had a factory-level basic union affiliated with the CTUM from December 2019 to March 2020. These regions are home to the majority of garment factories in Myanmar. At the time, 41 garment factories had a union affiliated with the CTUM. We planned to include all factories sufficiently close to the survey location and with an operating union (some factories were still in the process of finalizing the establishment of the union). Our final list included 28 unions. Unfortunately, due to COVID-19, we had to stop our fieldwork early; 17 unions fully completed the data collection activities while additional 2 unions partially completed them. The average factory in our sample employs 1187 workers, has a 40% union membership rate, and has had a union for 29 months, with the union president’s tenure of 16 months.

Within each factory, we used a sampling protocol designed to obtain a sample that was representative of the populations of interest: union leaders (presidents and LLs) and sewing section workers (union members and non-members). In garment production, the majority of workers are employed in the sewing section – about 68% of workers in our sample of factories. We sampled skilled and unskilled workers, although we excluded the limited number of workers in supervisory positions (line supervisors and above) out of a concern that they may perceive the sessions to be adversarial toward management and thus would be uncooperative. The CTUM also aimed to collect data on workers’ skills, which we supported by developing a skill assessment module for machine operators based on a global industrial engineering database of garment complexity. The database only exists for the sewing portion of the garment production process.

We conducted a stratified random selection of around 90 workers per factory. Within factory, we stratified by line, union membership, and skill level (for details, see Boudreau et al. (2024)). As we discuss below, for each factory,

we started the data collection with union leaders and then continued with the workers. In total, we invited 18 presidents and 1 secretary (19 factories),⁵ all of whom participated. We invited 190 LLs (or ET members) from 19 factories, and 170 participated.⁶ For workers, due to COVID-19, we covered 17 factories. We invited 1511 workers and 916 (61%) participated. Among them, we invited 936 union members of which 594 (63%) participated, and 575 non-union members of which 322 (56%) participated. While we invited similar numbers of workers per factory, the turn-out was in part influenced by the union leaders, which raises the concern that factories with more capable union leaders may have larger sample sizes and thus receive more weight in our analysis. Thus, throughout the analysis, we weigh observations so that each factory counts equally by using probability weights calculated as the total number of workers across factories divided by the number of workers in the specific factory.

3.2 Field activities

We embedded a series of experiments in the survey and discussion process. We preregistered the experiments on the AEA’s RCT registry. For each factory, we scheduled two consecutive sessions on Sundays. In each session, we included two factories. The sessions were held on Sundays because it is the only weekday when most workers do not work. We compensated participants for their time at the average daily wage rate (6000 kyats) and for transportation costs (5000 kyats), if needed. Workers work very long hours and only have one weekend day – participation in the session is thus costly. We aimed to limit any actual or perceived influence of the CTUM on participants’ behavior by only allowing the research staff and the participants to be onsite during the sessions.

This paper focuses on the second session, in which LLs and workers participated.⁷ In the morning, we implemented a survey, a skill assessment, the

⁵One union was replacing its president, and the Secretary stepped in the role ad interim.

⁶When there were not enough LLs to invite to the factory union, ET members were invited to take the place of LLs.

⁷Boudreau et al. (2024) describe field activities in detail, including the first session, in which only presidents and LLs participated. This experiment is underpowered due to the smaller sample size induced by the COVID-19 outbreak.

consensus-building experiment, and a public good experiment. The consensus-building experiment was designed to test how leaders' participation in group discussions influenced the group's consensus around the minimum wage. The public good experiment was designed to test the leading by example mechanism proposed by Hermalin (1998), using sewing machines donated to the CTUM Skills Training Centre as a public good. Only 7% of leaders and 18% of workers donated less than the full endowment amount.

After lunch, we conducted the mobilization experiment, in which we invited workers to remain for an additional, unanticipated, living cost survey for the afternoon. This design aims to mirror the incentives faced by workers when deciding whether to participate in collective actions, such as street demonstrations in support of the CTUM's proposed minimum wage level while avoiding experimentally mobilizing them to engage in potentially risky actions. Throughout the day, we collected audio and video recordings and field-team observation forms of the main activities.

4 Who are the union leaders?

One of the essences of leadership is the ability to induce others to follow absent the power to compel or to provide formal contractual incentives (Hermalin, 2012). This suggests that leaders may exhibit particular characteristics that enable them to influence followers. We explore how union leaders' traits compare to those of non-leaders.

Economic theories are largely silent on the question of who becomes a leader (Hermalin, 2012). We thus focus on traits that psychologists and organizational sociologists associate with individuals' ability to influence others. A meta-analysis of psychology research on the Big Five Inventory (BFI) personality traits identifies extroversion as the personality trait most highly correlated with leadership, followed by neuroticism (negative correlation), conscientiousness, and openness. Only agreeableness was not found to be correlated (Judge et al., 2002). We measure the BFI personality traits following Rammstedt and John (2007). The literature also identifies locus of control (Howell and Avo-

lio, 1993) and grit (Schimschal and Lomas, 2018; Caza and Posner, 2019) as important. We measure locus of control using a 5-point Likert scale question from the World Values Survey and grit using several questions developed by Duckworth and Quinn (2009).⁸ Finally, we consider traits identified as relevant for political selection: ability and honesty or prosociality. We measure ability using Raven scores (Bilker et al., 2012) and educational attainment. We measure prosociality using altruism elicited in an incentivized question.⁹

We compare the characteristics of leaders and non-leaders using the following regression specification:

$$Y_{if} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \text{LineLeader}_i + \alpha_2 \text{President}_i + \gamma_f + \epsilon_{if} \quad (1)$$

where Y_{if} is a characteristic of worker i in factory f . LineLeader_i is an indicator of being a line leader, and President_i is an indicator of being a president. γ_f is a factory fixed effect, and ϵ_{if} is the residual. Due to the limited number of clusters (17 factories), we report p -values calculated using the wild cluster bootstrap-t procedure (Cameron et al., 2008).

Table 1 presents the results. Each row reports the result from estimating Equation (1) for the characteristic in the row. Relative to non-leaders, union leaders are older and more likely to be male (Panel A). Union leaders have longer tenure at their factories and substantially more experience in the garment sector. Despite this, presidents and LLs appear to earn less compared to workers, although the differences are not statistically significant (Panel B). Wage differences become more negative for leaders but remain statistically insignificant when additional controls are added (see Table A.1 in the Appendix). This underscores that not only is being a union leader not a paid job (they earn their wages by working in the factories as do workers), but also that they may face discrimination by their employers.

⁸Individual charisma – defined as the ability to transmit information in a symbolic, value-based, and emotional manner – is also important for leadership (Antonakis et al., 2016, 2022). Hermalin (2023) formalizes charisma in an economic model. Charisma, however, is conceptualized as a set of behaviors (House, 1977; House and Howell, 1992) rather than a trait – the focus of this section.

⁹How much to keep or to donate to a local orphanage out of a 1500 kyat endowment.

Turning to personality traits, we find a pattern of differences that is highly consistent with the psychology literature: leaders are significantly more extroverted, less neurotic, and more conscientious, but – if anything – less open than non-leaders. LLs, whose responsibilities entail communication with workers and recruitment of new union members, are more agreeable than non-leaders. Reverse-coding neuroticism and taking the average across index components, leaders score significantly higher than workers. We also find that leaders have higher grit and, in the case of presidents, locus of control.

Table 1: Differences between Leaders and Workers

	Observations	Worker Mean	Coeff. on Line Leader	Coeff. on President	<i>p</i> -value of diff, cols (3)-(4)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
<i>Panel A: Demographics & Ability</i>					
Female	1104	0.967	-0.116 [0.025]	-0.518 [0.001]	0.007
Age	1104	25.005	1.859 [0.003]	4.918 [0.002]	0.064
Migrant	1104	0.520	-0.046 [0.295]	-0.085 [0.414]	0.739
Education (Yrs)	1104	7.754	-0.176 [0.491]	0.799 [0.343]	0.261
Raven Score	1104	4.524	-0.085 [0.776]	1.749 [0.008]	0.010
<i>Panel B: Employment & Minimum Wage Views</i>					
Months in Factory	1104	29.888	13.010 [0.000]	18.573 [0.001]	0.133
Months in Sector	1104	50.621	24.796 [0.000]	28.216 [0.014]	0.771
Income (Last Month)	777	245382.8	-3329.160 [0.438]	-23619.74 [0.060]	0.132
Sewing Efficiency	777	0.018	-0.114 [0.061]	0.072 [0.648]	0.249
Preferred Min Wage	1104	7504.258	28.294 [0.861]	171.402 [0.477]	0.553
Expected Min Wage	1104	6545.961	-140.598 [0.252]	-91.844 [0.690]	0.806
<i>Panel C: Personality traits</i>					
Altruism	1104	1268.777	142.460 [0.000]	147.861 [0.134]	0.953
Extraversion	1104	3.392	0.244 [0.014]	0.488 [0.017]	0.124
Agreeableness	1104	3.862	0.214 [0.005]	0.113 [0.623]	0.699
Conscientiousness	1104	3.979	0.225 [0.001]	0.507 [0.001]	0.055
Neuroticism	1104	2.665	-0.290 [0.001]	-0.670 [0.018]	0.145
Openness	1104	3.001	-0.065 [0.298]	-0.473 [0.009]	0.037
BFI Index	1104	2.314	0.182 [0.000]	0.261 [0.024]	0.428
Grit	1104	2.571	0.854 [0.000]	1.202 [0.000]	0.021
Locus of Control	1104	4.008	0.192 [0.221]	0.349 [0.085]	0.373

Notes. Unit of observation is worker. Probability weights are used. Controlling for Factory fixed effects. *p*-values calculated using the wild cluster bootstrap-t method are reported in square brackets. For the Income variable, only those workers whose positions were eligible for the skill assessment, who have non-missing values for sewing efficiency, are considered.

Turning to leaders' ability and prosociality, presidents – but not LLs – have higher Raven Scores and more schooling. This suggests positive selection for presidents (who are elected), consistently with evidence on politicians (Dal Bó et al., 2017) and in contrast to the hypothesis that individuals with the highest opportunity cost do not enter into union leadership positions (Caselli and Morelli, 2004). Turning to prosociality, leaders are significantly more altruistic. This is inconsistent with individuals pursuing union leadership positions to extract rents through dishonest means and is, instead, consistent with the private costs borne by union leaders in our context.

Union leaders thus have distinctive traits: they possess a psychological ability to influence followers and are positively selected on altruism and ability. This is in line with leadership as a phenomenon that exists independent of office or title and that entails the ability to induce others to voluntarily follow. Relative to presidents, LLs are more numerous but less selected. While a non-trivial fraction of them will go on to take up formal leadership roles,¹⁰ they do not exhibit all of the presidents' distinctive traits, thus making it harder to detect leaders' influence on outcomes in the two experiments. As the rest of the empirical analysis focuses on LLs, we denote them as *leaders* in the remainder of the paper.

5 Consensus-building experiment

We begin by examining leaders' role in coordinating views. It was important for the CTUM to achieve a certain consensus among workers on the minimum wage to determine a credible position and mobilize workers to support it. This motivated us to conduct an experiment in which we randomized the presence of a union leader in a workers' group discussion about the minimum wage.

¹⁰In our data, 21.4% (13%) of LLs (workers) aspire to become elected union leaders in the future (p of diff. < 0.05).

5.1 Experimental design

The experiment was implemented after workers completed the baseline survey. We stratified workers by their factory and union membership and randomly assigned them to one of three types of discussion groups. In the first type of group, we randomly assigned a leader from the same factory to participate in the group’s discussion. In the second type, motivated by the possibility that leaders primarily influence workers through their social ties or formal authority – rather than because of their traits – we randomly assigned a leader from a different factory whom workers are unlikely to have social ties with or to recognize as a union leader. No leader was assigned to control groups. Workers and leaders arrived in the group discussion room concurrently. Leaders were not announced, identified, nor given specific instructions. We randomized discussion groups to have 5 or 6 members (including the leaders in the count). This allows us to hold group size constant across treatment arms.

Appendix Table A.2 reports balance tests across the three experimental arms. While the treatment and control arms are balanced across nearly all tests, there are a few statistical imbalances. We present results controlling for covariates selected using the post double selection (PDS) lasso (Belloni et al., 2014) to assuage concerns that imbalances among covariates between the treatment and control groups may influence our results.

The field team explained to discussion groups that they would discuss the minimum wage. It provided a brief background of the minimum wage-setting process and its history in Myanmar. The team then explained that the CTUM would prepare a proposal for the government on the minimum wage increase and that the CTUM wanted to gather workers’ expectations and opinions to help determine its proposal. The field team did not explicitly request groups to reach a consensus. Finally, it told groups that they would have 30 minutes to discuss and requested participants to turn off their cell phones. See Appendix B.1 for the prompt’s text.

Discussion groups were provided with reporting templates and scrap paper to summarize their groups’ opinions. At the end of the 30 minutes, groups had 5 minutes to summarize their discussion using the templates. The field

team informed groups that the discussion summaries would be shared with the CTUM to help it prepare its minimum wage proposal. At the end of the group discussion session, workers and leaders participated in a follow-up survey. We recorded and transcribed the audio from the discussions. Discussions for 35 groups were not recorded; consequently, we have transcripts for 167 out of 202 groups.

5.2 Results

5.2.1 Do Leaders Build Consensus?

We estimate the effects of leaders' participation on convergence to (1) the *preferred* minimum wage level and (2) the *expected* minimum wage level of the median worker in the group as well as of the union. In principle, the group discussion can alter workers' preferences for the minimum wage, as well as their perceptions of the negotiation process. We thus elicit workers' preferred minimum wage and what they expect to be the final outcome of the negotiation. Furthermore, since LLs act as liaisons between elected union leaders and workers, they transmit information both up and down the organization. Building on political theories of democracy, we distinguish two cases. In the first, the unions aim to reflect the will of workers in the minimum wage negotiations, and LLs will try to build consensus around the median worker's view (*aggregating views*, as in Black (1958)). In the second, the unions aim to align workers' views with what they perceive to be the right outcome, in which case LLs will try to build consensus around the unions' views (*aligning views*, as in Lenz (2012)). The unions' views may diverge from workers' for many reasons; for example, they have better information about the economic trade-offs that higher minimum wages may entail, they place more weight on the concerns of non-union members because they aim to grow their membership, or they take negotiation strategy into account. We do not take a stand on why workers' and the unions' views on the minimum wage may diverge. To distinguish between the two cases, we test for convergence in workers' preferences and expectations for the minimum wage to those of the median worker and to those of the union.

To measure the union’s preferred (expected) level, we take the median of the preferred (expected) minimum wage among all union leaders within the factory – president, EC, and LLs – measured during the baseline leader survey. In both cases, we measure the absolute deviation in each worker’s view from the baseline median worker’s (union leader’s) before and after the group discussion. For the external leader arm, we use the median of the external factory’s union leaders. We estimate:

$$Y_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Leader_i + \mathbf{X}_i' \beta + \epsilon_i \quad (2)$$

$$Y_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 OwnLeader_i + \alpha_2 ExternalLeader_i + \mathbf{X}_i' \beta + \epsilon_i \quad (3)$$

where Y_i is the outcome for worker i . $Leader_i$ is an indicator for having a leader participate in your group’s discussion; X_i is a vector of strata fixed effects, group size fixed effects, and controls selected by the PDS lasso; ϵ_i is the residual. Depending on the outcome variable, the analysis is done either at the worker level or at the discussion group level. For individual-level regressions, we report standard errors clustered by group. For group-level regressions, we report robust standard errors. We also present RI p -values and we report the maximum of the two in the text. In equation 3, $OwnLeader_i$ is an indicator for having a leader from your own factory in your group, and $ExternalLeader_i$ is an indicator for having a leader from a different factory in your group.


Table 2 presents the results. Panel A presents the effect of having a leader participate, while Panel B presents the effects separately for internal and external leaders. Columns (1)-(2) report results for convergence to the median worker’s views, and (3)-(4) for convergence to the union leaders’ views. Beginning with the former, we are unable to reject the null of no convergence to the median worker’s preferred and expected minimum wage levels in either panel. In contrast, leaders’ participation leads workers’ preferences for the minimum wage to converge to the union’s preferred level (column (3)). There is a 22% decrease in the average absolute deviation from the union’s preferred view ($p=0.023$). Panel B shows that leaders from external factories induce convergence to their own union’s preferred minimum wage ($p=0.139$). This supports the hypothesis that, while social ties and/or formal authority may matter, they

are not the only channels through which leaders influence followers.

Turning to column (4), there is no convergence in workers' beliefs to the union's expected level; the point estimate on *Leader* is negative, but it is small and not statistically significant. There are also no effects when splitting by own versus external leader. In both panels, we reject that the effect on convergence in views in column (3) is equal to that on convergence in beliefs in column (4) ($p=0.06$).¹¹ The differential effects between convergence in preferences and in beliefs is clearly illustrated in Figure 1: there is a compression of treatment workers' views toward those of the union leaders, for preferences, but not for beliefs. This begs the question why would leaders induce convergence in preferences but not in beliefs? We offer two considerations. First, beliefs were more aligned to start with: the coefficient of variation is 78.7 for workers' preferences (18.9 for leaders) and 16.0 for workers' beliefs (18.2 for leaders) in the baseline survey. Second, as noted earlier, LLs do not spend much time on activities, such as meetings with management and meetings with leaders in other unions, that may give them insider information about the likely outcome of the minimum-wage negotiation process.

¹¹Appendix Table A.3 shows that there is a sizable (29%) reduction in the within-group standard deviation of workers' preferred minimum wage levels but no change in the within-group standard deviation of workers' expected minimum wage.

Figure 1: Endline Deviation of Minimum Wage Preferences and Beliefs from Leaders



Notes. The two sub-figures plot the distributions of the absolute value of endline treated workers' preferences/beliefs minus baseline median leader's preferences/beliefs against control workers' endline absolute deviation from baseline median leader. p -value for the Kolmogorov-Smirnov equality-of-distributions test of the two distributions in the left (right) sub-figure is 0.000 (0.349, respectively).

The results are consistent with leaders primarily *aligning* workers' views with those of the union by building consensus around the union's preferred minimum wage level. They are not consistent with leaders primarily building consensus by *aggregating* workers' views around the median worker's position.

Table 2: Group Discussions: consensus-building

	Primary outcomes				Consensus-building and engagement outcomes			
	Deviation from median worker in discussion group			Deviation from median union leader	(5) Log(Total Word Count)	(6) Log(Likely Worker Word Count)	(7) Observed Group Activity	(8) Self-Reported Engagement
	(1) Preference	(2) Belief	(3) Preference	(4) Belief				
Panel A: Leader Leader	-83.85 (116.4) [0.472] {0.514}	142.5 (93.6) [0.129] {0.155}	-266.4** (103.2) [0.011] {0.023}	-11.77 (74.0) [0.874] {0.878}	-0.141 (0.095) [0.139] {0.143}	-0.401*** (0.12) [0.002] {0.003}	0.264*** (0.079) [0.001] {0.002}	0.114*** (0.042) [0.007] {0.012}
	R-squared	0.211	0.251	0.330	0.342	0.235	0.373	0.347
	p-value for testing Preference = Belief	0.077			0.018			
	Panel B: Own versus External LL External Leader	3.099 (157.4) [0.984] {0.988}	179.0 (128.5) [0.165] {0.181}	-210.8 (127.8) [0.101] {0.139}	49.56 (108.5) [0.648] {0.658}	0.0322 (0.11) [0.773] {0.780}	-0.173 (0.14) [0.219] {0.236}	0.186* (0.11) [0.095] {0.116}
Own Leader	-140.1 (136.3) [0.305] {0.324}	119.0 (107.4) [0.269] {0.318}	-302.3** (120.9) [0.013] {0.020}	-50.92 (80.7) [0.529] {0.561}	-0.266** (0.11) [0.019] {0.021}	-0.531*** (0.14) [0.000] {0.002}	0.265*** (0.088) [0.003] {0.005}	0.123*** (0.045) [0.007] {0.007}
R-squared	0.213	0.252	0.331	0.344	0.271	0.407	0.355	0.147
Control Mean	991.637	404.697	1194.103	654.399	1002.175	872.674	-0.090	-0.089
Number of Observations	914	914	914	914	167	166	202	914
External=Own								
p-values	0.422	0.671	0.513	0.379	0.015	0.010	0.483	0.682
RI p-values	0.480	0.719	0.538	0.407	0.016	0.015	0.535	0.683
p-value for testing Preference = Belief								
External LL	0.304	0.060						
Own LL	0.063	0.050						
Unit of Observation	Worker	Worker	Worker	Worker	Group	Group	Group	Worker

Notes. In all regressions, probability weights are used. Where the unit of observation is worker, standard errors are clustered at the group level. Standard errors are in parentheses. The *p*-values calculated using this standard error are in square brackets. The randomization inference (RI) *p*-values are in curly brackets based on 1000 randomization draws (Young, 2019). The last row in each panel reports the *p*-values for (inter-model) testing the equivalence of coefficients between Column 1 and 2, and testing the equivalence of coefficients between Column 3 and 4. In Columns 1-2, the dependent variables are the absolute value of the endline minimum wage preference/belief minus the workers' median wage preference/belief at the discussion group level at baseline. In Columns 3-4, the dependent variables are the absolute value of the endline minimum wage preference/belief minus the median of leaders' preferences and beliefs at the factory level. In column 5, the dependent variable is the logarithm of the total number of words spoken by the group members. In column 6, the dependent variable is the logarithm of the total number of words spoken by possible workers (group members who are not identified as a confirmed/possible leader). In columns 7-8, the dependent variables (Self-reported Engagement and Observed Group Activity) are index variables constructed following the methodology from Anderson (2008). Stratification fixed effects are factory FE $\times$ union membership status (columns 1-4, 8) and factory fixed effects (columns 5-7). Group size fixed effects are controlled in columns 1-5 and 7-8. For column 6, we note that the number of possible workers is systematically lower in leader groups because leaders are more likely to be identified in these groups. This mechanically reduces the number of words by possible workers in control groups. Therefore, in columns 6, we control for the fixed effects of the number of possible workers. Control variables are selected by applying the post-double lasso control selection procedure. The set of potential control variables consists of all variables in Table 1, baseline absolute deviations in preference and belief from the median worker and the median leader, number of union social activities outside of work, perceived factory management's attitude toward union, gender preference for union leaders, and perceived overlap in interest with union members, non-members, and managers, as well as squared terms of all of these variables (aggregated at the group level in columns 5-7). All variables are standardized. Lasso selects the baseline deviation corresponding to the outcome variable in columns 1-4, none in columns 5-7, and grit and squared agreeableness in column 8.

When interpreting the results for internal and external leaders, recall that we did not announce or identify leaders in the experiment. Despite this, workers in both internal and external leader groups are substantially more likely to perceive the presence of a leader compared to the control group ($p < 0.01$, Appendix Table A.4). Consistent with workers being more likely to have ties with internal leaders, though, workers are almost twice as likely to perceive the presence of a leader from their own factory compared to an external factory ($p = 0.000$). Conditional on that, 50% (19%) report having met the leader before in internal (external) groups. This raises the question of how internal and external leaders influence workers' preferences, which we now turn to.

5.2.2 The Mechanics of Consensus Building

Information. Do leaders align views by providing information, as in Hermalin (1998); Caillaud and Tirole (2007); Dewan and Myatt (2008)? We combine data from the group discussion transcripts with information on the group's first preferred (expected) minimum wage level entered in the group discussion reporting form. Recall that – to ensure naturally occurring behavior – we did not identify LLs in the groups and, therefore, the transcripts do not include speakers' identities. We asked the transcription company to identify whether there was (1) a confirmed leader, which is a group member who self-identified as a union leader; (2) a possible leader, which is a group member who was not a confirmed leader but who led the discussion and/or explained the questions and answers. Out of 47 (58) internal (external) leader groups, only 4 (1) had confirmed leaders. At the same time, 41 (56) internal (external) leader groups out of the remaining 43 (57) had a possible leader identified. That is, leaders do not introduce their formal role in the union to yield influence and steer the discussion, but (likely) do take on the role of leading the discussion.¹²

Among leader groups, we examine whether the speaker who first mentions the first preferred (expected) minimum wage level entered in the group dis-

¹²24 of 62 control groups had a possible leader. Since we cannot rule out that the transcribers were influenced by the knowledge of groups' treatment status, we do not analyze this variable as an outcome.

cussion reporting form is coded as a possible or a confirmed leader or as a worker.¹³ Although LLs only account for 19.4% of group discussion members, leaders mention the preferred minimum wage first in 39.2% of groups and the expected minimum wage first in 38.4%. In both cases, we reject that possible leaders and workers are equally likely to mention the minimum wage levels first ($p < 0.000$). The evidence is consistent with leaders introducing influential or preferred values of the minimum wage, in line with the results in Table 2 on leaders' aligning views.

We also explore how leader groups' responses to the question on the possible benefits, harms, and heterogeneous effects associated with increasing the minimum wage compare to those of non-leader groups. Leader groups submit 23.5% longer responses ($p < 0.05$, Appendix Table A.5, column (1)). Although we cannot show that the longer responses are due to information introduced by the leader, this is consistent with our other evidence.¹⁴

Discussion group activity. The presence of a leader also affects the level of activity in the group discussion and workers' actual and perceived engagement. We measure engagement in the discussion in three ways: the total amount of speech and the amount of speech by workers in the discussion transcripts, a group-level summary index based on the field team's assessment, a worker-level summary index based on several questions about workers' enjoyment of, and engagement in, the group discussion. We construct indexes following Anderson (2008) (see Boudreau et al. (2024) for details).

Column (5), Table 2, shows that groups with leaders discuss a bit less than control groups. Although not statistically significant, their discussions are about 13% shorter; the decline is driven by leaders from workers' own factory (Panel B). Column (6) shows that workers speak less when a leader is present

¹³We focus on treatment groups that 1) reported a preferred (expected) minimum wage in the group discussion form, 2) had at least one person mentioning a preferred (expected) minimum wage level in the transcript, and 3) had a possible or a confirmed leader in the transcript. 74 (86) groups meet these criteria for preferred (expected) minimum wages.

¹⁴On average, control groups input between 12-14 words per prompt. We do not detect differences in the textual content of groups' responses across treatment arms, possibly due to the prompt being quite specific.

($p=0.003$).¹⁵ The decrease in average worker speech is relatively larger than the decrease in total speech, suggesting that leaders speak more than workers. The fact that the leader's speech crowds out, as opposed to crowds in, worker speech is also consistent with leaders aligning instead of aggregating views.

Column (7) shows that the field team rates groups with leaders 26% of a standard deviation (sd) higher in terms of having an active discussion ($p<0.01$). The estimated effects for leaders from workers' own factory and from an external factory are similar. This effect is driven by groups with leaders having a 6.8 pp lower share of members distracted ($p<0.05$, control mean is 20.3%) and being 17.3 and 18.4 pp more likely to have a member summarizing opinions and taking notes, respectively, relative to control means of 26.4% ($p<0.01$) and 65.4% ($p<0.01$). There is no difference in whether a member is actively facilitating the discussion or asking workers' opinions (Appendix Table A.6).

Finally, column (8) shows that leaders' participation increases workers' self-reported engagement by about 0.11 of a sd ($p=0.012$). Own factory leaders and external factory leaders have similar effects. Leaders increase workers' enjoyment ($p=0.067$) and self-reported participation in the discussion ($p=0.203$). The largest effect, by far, is on workers' perception that the group achieved consensus: leaders' participation increases self-reported consensus by 0.3 sd ($p\approx 0.000$) (Appendix Table A.7).

5.2.3 Leaders' Charisma and Consensus Building

Section 4 showed that union leaders are systematically different from workers in terms of their traits, which may affect their communication skills and charisma. By revealed preference, presidents have traits that union members identify as important for their ability to lead. This observation motivates us to consider LLs' resemblance to presidents and whether this resemblance matters for leaders' efficacy in the group discussion.¹⁶

¹⁵To prevent a mechanical negative relationship between leaders' presence and workers' speech, we control for the fixed effects of the number of workers, subtracting 1 from the total group size for treatment groups with confirmed/possible leaders.

¹⁶This analysis was not pre-specified and should be interpreted as exploratory.

Appendix Figure A.1 shows the cumulative distributions of the predicted probabilities of LLs and workers being similar to presidents using a probit model with demographic and ability variables (as in Table 1, Panel A), job tenure (months in factory/sector), and personality traits (as in Table 1, Panel C). The horizontal line at 0.5 indicates that LLs in the bottom half of the similarity distribution are indistinguishable from workers. LLs in the top half, however, are distinct and closely resemble presidents. We thus construct a binary indicator for whether a LL is above the median in their predicted similarity to the president and use it as a summary measure of LLs' quality. Reassuringly, this measure is positively correlated with an index that measures LLs' effort for the union's activities (coeff. = 0.312; $p < 0.001$) and with LLs' aspirations to become an elected union leader (coeff. = 0.172; $p < 0.05$). Other than this, high- and low-similarity leaders are similar: they have the same information about the union's views on the minimum wage, similar social ties with workers and rates of engagement with the union, and, by construction, the same formal role. The similarity index thus is likely to mainly capture differences across LLs in traits associated with leadership.

We find that high-similarity leaders drive consensus building. They decrease the deviation from the union's preferred minimum wage level by about 26% compared to about 19% for low-similarity leaders ($p=0.5$, Table 3, Panel A, column (1)). The transcripts also reveal that high-similarity leaders crowd out workers' speech significantly less than low-similarity leaders ($p=0.012$, Table 3, Panel A, columns (3)–(4)). High-similarity leaders achieve the same, or greater, alignment with the union's views without trading off workers' participation to the extent that low-similarity leaders do.

This is possibly because the high-similarity leaders take a more active role in the discussion. They are rated higher in leadership behaviors such as speaking and consensus building, according to the research staff's observations of the discussion (Table 3, Panel B). The transcripts also show that high-similarity leaders are more likely to be the first speaker to introduce the preferred minimum wage level that appears in the group discussion form (44% compared to 33%), although not for the expected minimum wage level (40% compared to

37%).

Table 3: Group discussion: heterogeneity by leader similarity to presidents

Panel A: Deviation from union leaders' views and engagement					
	Deviation from median union leader		Engagement in group discussion		
	Preference	Belief	Log(Total Word Count)	Log(Likely Worker Word Count)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
High Similarity Leader	-310.8*** (115.3)	-32.51 (90.57)	0.0101 (0.103)	-0.149 (0.153)	
Low Similarity Leader	-222.4* (128.0)	8.517 (93.09)	-0.282** (0.117)	-0.492*** (0.177)	
R-squared	0.331	0.342	0.268	0.409	
Number of obs.	914	914	166	166	
Control Mean	1194.1	654.4	1002.2	872.7	
<u>p-values</u>					
High Similarity= Low Similarity:	0.500	0.708	0.019	0.012	
Panel B: Leader behavior					
	Speaking	Listening	Consensus building	Conflict resolution	Leadership
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
High Similarity Leader	0.859*** (0.306)	0.536** (0.269)	0.700** (0.325)	0.336 (0.393)	0.584* (0.322)
R-squared	0.071	0.058	0.044	0.028	0.045
Number of obs.	119	119	119	117	118
Low Similarity Leader Mean	4.24	4.52	3.78	3.14	4.34

Notes. Unit of observation is worker for *Deviation from median union leader* and discussion group elsewhere. In Panel A, the dependent variables represent deviation from the factory median of baseline leaders' views and preferences, the logarithm of the total number of words spoken by the group members and the logarithm of the total number of words spoken by possible workers (group members who are not identified as a confirmed/possible leader). In Panel B, the dependent variables are: *Speaking*, assessing the extent of LL speaking; *Listening*, assessing the extent of LL listening; *ConsensusBuilding*, assessing the extent of LL engaged in consensus building; *ConflictResolution*, assessing the extent of LL engaged in conflict resolution; and *Leadership*, assessing the extent of LL showing leadership. All dependent variables in Panel B are measured on a Likert scale 1-7 separately by two members of the research staff and the average is taken. The variable *High/Low Similarity Leader* is a binary variable equal to 1 if the estimated probability of a line leader having similar attributes to the president is above/below the median in the treatment group. Missing observations in Panel B Cols. 4 and 5 are due to data entry errors. Probability weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses. Control variables are selected by post-double lasso control selection procedure, selecting the baseline deviation corresponding to the outcome variable in columns 1 and 2, and nothing elsewhere. We also control for stratification FEs (Factory FEs x Union FEs) in Panel A and group size FEs across both panels.

Leaders' formal authority is unlikely to have played a significant role in the group discussion. LLs have no formal authority in the context of the experiment. While their affiliation with the union may endow them with

authority in the workers’ eyes, this is unlikely to be important. Besides the evidence that leaders themselves rarely invoke their formal authority in the discussions and the results of the comparison between high- and low-similarity leaders, we also find no evidence that union leaders are more influential on members of their organization.¹⁷

Summary: In sum, the evidence from the transcripts, the field teams’ observations, and workers’ self-reports show that leaders achieve alignment in workers’ preferences with those of the union by actively introducing information, engaging in the discussion, and behaving in ways that build consensus. Leaders’ traits – rather than social ties with workers or formal roles – matter most for their ability to achieve consensus. Not only do LLs who more closely resemble union presidents achieve the same, or greater, alignment with the union’s views without trading off workers’ participation, but further heterogeneity analysis suggests that social ties and formal authority are unlikely to be key channels of leaders’ influence on group discussions.

5.2.4 Robustness & placebo tests

We conducted several robustness and placebo tests for the results. First, we have so far used weights that adjust for the differences in participation rates across factories but not for type of workers participating. However, the main results remain similar when using alternative weights that additionally adjust for the differences in the union member share between participants and invitees, or between participants and the population of sewing workers, in each factory. Second, the results raise the question of whether the same effects can be achieved by any prominent individuals having traits that are common among leaders. To examine this, each control discussion group, we assigned a placebo leader, defined as the worker with the highest predicted leader similarity score, and found stronger convergence to the real leaders’ preferences

¹⁷We were interested in the possibility that a leader’s influence may be limited to members of their organization and planned, without pre-specifying it, to test for HTEs by union affiliation in both experiments. We do not find strong evidence of heterogeneity by union affiliation in either experiment (see Boudreau et al. (2024)).

relative to the placebo leaders’ preferences. Additionally, we showed that our results hold even after controlling for the average or the maximum of the similarity score among workers in the discussion group. These results suggest that the real leaders exert influence above and beyond other potentially prominent individuals. Third, we confirmed that the results using the leader similarity score are robust to dropping one family of variables (i.e., demographics and job tenure, Raven score, BFI personality traits, and other personality traits) at a time in the similarity prediction model. We also found that the effects on convergence are not heterogeneous by the gender of the leader. These results indicate that the traits of effective leaders are not solely captured by a single aspect. We present and discuss these and other robustness checks in the paper’s Supplementary Materials (Boudreau et al., 2024).

6 Mobilization experiment

Having established that leaders achieve consensus, we now turn to their role in mobilizing workers. We present results from a multi-arms field experiment designed to test the main channels put forward by the (formal) theoretical literature on leadership. The experiments were in the field at the onset of the pandemic. Our inability to complete data collection significantly reduced our statistical power in this experiment. We succinctly describe the experiment and interpret its main results as suggestive.

6.1 Experimental design

We aimed to design the experiment to test the channels through which leaders may influence workers’ willingness to participate in a high-stakes, real-world collective action. We faced the challenge, though, that experimentally mobilizing workers to participate in street demonstrations around the minimum wage would subject workers to undue risk. Consequently, we aimed to mirror the incentives that workers face when deciding whether to participate in these types of collective actions while avoiding many of the associated risks.

There are three key ingredients. First, a costly action: at the end of session 2, we invited workers to participate in an *unannounced* cost of living survey that required them to stay for the rest of the day. Garment workers have a 6-day workweek, often work overtime on the seventh day, and already agreed to a half-day session on their one weekend day. Second, a common cause: the cost of living survey would inform the CTUM’s negotiating position. Third, a need for coordination: we announced that, for each discussion group where *all* members attend the survey, we would donate 8000 kyats (about \$5.60) to the CTUM Skills Training Centre. Like the minimum wage, the training centre serves all garment workers, not only union members.

The theoretical literature suggests three main channels through which leaders might increase mobilization. First, leaders may *motivate* workers to participate, emotionally appealing to exert effort to help CTUM (Ganz, 2010; Hermalin, 2023). Second, leaders may *coordinate* workers, selecting and communicating the equilibrium to be played and reducing strategic uncertainty (Dewan and Myatt, 2008; Akerlof and Holden, 2016). Finally, leaders may *observe* workers’ effort and then sanction free-riders (Hermalin, 2012) or provide non-monetary rewards (e.g., praise and esteem) for it (Ganz, 2010).

Appendix Figure A.2 illustrates the experiment’s treatment arms. First, we stratified discussion groups by factory and consensus-building treatment arm and then randomized them to high or low mobilization by the leader. In the high (low) condition, all but one (only one) member were (was) invited by a leader. We then experimentally varied the three channels. In the **Motivation** arm workers are invited by a leader instead of by research staff.¹⁸ In the **Coordination** arm workers are told whether the leader invites all but one member (*High coordination*) or only one member (*Low coordination*) of their group. Finally, in the **Observation** arm workers are informed that a leader will observe their participation.¹⁹

¹⁸Leaders and research staff use the same invitation script. Appendix Section B.2 reports the scripts for each treatment arm.

¹⁹Appendix Table A.2 reports balance checks across the experimental arms. For the first survey session, the field team ran out of time to complete this experiment. For this reason, two factories drop, reducing the number of observations to 790. The coordination arms –

6.2 Results

We first estimate:

$$Y_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Leader_i + \alpha_2 HC_i + \alpha_3 LC_i + \alpha_4 Obs_i + \mathbf{X}_i' \theta + \epsilon_i \quad (4)$$

where Y_i is attendance at the afternoon session for worker i . $Leader_i$ is an indicator for being motivated by the leader, HC_i (LC_i) is an indicator for when the worker is being informed that she is in a high (low) coordination group, and Obs_i is an indicator for being in the leader observation arm. X_i is a vector of strata fixed effects (factory x discussion group). ϵ_i is the residual. We report 95% confidence intervals calculated using robust and clustered (at the discussion group level) standard errors. We also present RI p -values. In the text, when both RI and conventional p -values are calculated, we report the maximum of the two. Control variables are selected by PDS lasso. We also estimate a version of equation (4) where we interact HC_i , LC_i , and Obs_i with indicators for being invited by the leader ($Leader_i$) or by the research team ($NoLeader_i$).

If a key role for leaders in our setting is to motivate their followers, then workers invited to participate by the leader will be more likely to attend the session ($\alpha_1 > 0$). If a key role for leaders is to coordinate their followers, then workers informed that they are in a high coordination group will be more likely to attend compared to those who are informed that they are in a low coordination group ($\alpha_2 > \alpha_3$). Finally, if a key role for leaders is to sanction bad behavior or to reward good behavior, workers who learn that a leader will observe their decision will be more likely to attend ($\alpha_4 > 0$).


Figure 2 presents the results.²⁰ The reference group is workers who are invited by the research staff and are not provided with coordination or observation information. Panel A presents the results of estimating eqn. 4 while Panel B includes the interactions with the $Leader_i$ and $NoLeader_i$ indicators.

in which workers were informed about how many group members were being invited by a leader – have a slightly smaller sample size to avoid deception.

²⁰The estimated regressions (with and without PDS lasso selected controls) are reported in Appendix Table A.8.

The figure shows 95% confidence intervals calculated using robust standard errors (blue, left) and standard errors clustered at the discussion group level (red, right). The estimated coefficient for the Leader arm, α_1 , shows that motivation by the leader does not affect attendance.²¹

Figure 2: Mobilization Experiment



Notes. This plot shows the impact of different treatment arms on whether a worker attends the minimum wage survey. 95% confidence intervals calculated by using robust and clustered (at the discussion group level) standard errors are reported. RI p -values based on 1000 randomization draws (Young, 2019) are also reported on the top. Factory FEs $\times$ Discussion Group FEs are controlled. Control variables are selected by post-double lasso selection procedure. Panel A shows the result of estimating equation (4). Panel B shows the result of estimating $Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Leader}_i + \beta_2 \text{Leader}_i * \text{HC}_i + \beta_3 \text{NoLeader}_i * \text{HC}_i + \beta_4 \text{Leader}_i * \text{LC}_i + \beta_5 \text{NoLeader}_i * \text{LC}_i + \beta_6 \text{Leader}_i * \text{Obs}_i + \beta_7 \text{NoLeader}_i * \text{Obs}_i + \mathbf{X}_i' \theta + \epsilon_i$.

Turning to coordination, the Figure shows that high coordination by the leader substantially increases attendance compared to low coordination. Moving from being informed that the leader will invite one group member only to

²¹It may be that providing leaders with a set script to invite workers muted their role as motivators. While the null result may mask heterogeneity by leader type, unfortunately we cannot explore this possibility, as we do not know which leader invited a given worker.

being informed that they will invite all but one member increases attendance by 12 pp or 36% compared to the control group mean ($p=0.152$). The effects of moving from low to high coordination by the leader are qualitatively larger for those who are also motivated by the leader: there is a 22 pp or 65% increase in attendance ($p=0.104$) compared to an increase of 13 pp or 37% ($p=0.300$) when not motivated. While motivation by the leader alone may not influence attendance, it may work as a complement to coordination.

Finally, informing workers that the leader will observe their decision increases attendance by 4 pp or about 12% (not statistically significant). This is similar when a worker is invited by the research staff or by a leader. Observation of the workers' decision by the leader may influence attendance through two potential mechanisms: leaders acting as judges, sanctioning workers who do not attend, or workers perceiving that attending sends a positive signal about their type. Depending on workers' priors about attendance, these mechanisms generate different effects. Under a sanctioning mechanism, workers with higher priors about their group members' likelihood of attending the session should be more likely to attend when their decision is observed by the leader. We explore these mechanisms in Appendix C and find evidence more consistent with a signaling mechanism rather than the sanctioning one.²²

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we present novel evidence on union leaders in Myanmar's labor movement in the garment sector and how leaders influence workers' views and collective actions in the run-up to a national minimum wage negotiation. It is generally challenging to pinpoint the specific influences of leaders within organizations or movements because their actions are often difficult to observe in sufficient detail and it is hard to untangle if influential individuals shape others or just reflect underlying group dynamics. We conducted two field experiments and gathered detailed information on the traits of workers and union leaders at every level of the union hierarchy to examine whether and

²²This analysis was not pre-specified and should be interpreted as exploratory.

how union leaders affect the inner workings of labor movements.

We find that union leaders are *positively selected* compared to rank-and-file workers in terms of their personality traits, grit, and locus of control, which psychologists and organizational sociologists link with the ability to influence collective outcomes. They are also positively selected on prosociality, and for the union presidents who are the most selected leaders in our sample, ability. This evidence suggests that one mechanism through which leaders influence followers is their distinct set of personal characteristics. An interesting avenue for future research is to assess the extent to which this positive selection generalizes to other contexts. It is sometimes argued that union leaders might be negatively selected in terms of ability as lower-ability workers stand to gain more from collective representation.

A first experiment provides evidence that union leaders play a key role in building consensus among workers around their unions' objectives; they *coordinate views*. Leaders build consensus around their unions' preferred minimum wage, as opposed to aggregating workers' preferences. Albeit with more limited statistical power, a second experiment explores channels through which leaders mobilize workers to take privately costly actions for their common good, finding evidence in favor of leaders coordinating workers' equilibrium selection. Hence, in addition to coordinating views, leaders may also *coordinate actions*.

These results raise the question of whether consensus-building also facilitates mobilization. Given our experimental design and the low statistical power of our mobilization experiment, we cannot conclusively answer this question. Appendix Figure A.3 explores the correlation between consensus building and mobilization across our two experimental designs and provides some suggestive evidence that leaders might play a role in connecting these two goals. Among groups that were assigned a leader, there is a positive correlation between consensus building achieved in the group discussion in the first experiment and workers' mobilization in the second experiment ($p=0.077$). No such correlation is observed for groups without leaders ($p=0.737$). This pattern possibly suggests that rather than consensus itself, it is the process through which consensus is reached that might matter for mobilization. For example,

common knowledge of the consensus reached could be key for mobilization and may be facilitated by leaders. Exploring the potential *causal* link between consensus-building and mobilization in the context of social movements is a valuable direction for future research.

References

- Aghion, Philippe and Jean Tirole**, “Formal and Real Authority in Organizations,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 1997, *105* (1), 1–29.
- Akerlof, Robert and Richard Holden**, “Movers and shakers,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2016, *131* (4), 1849–1874.
- , **Anik Ashraf, Rocco Macchiavello, and Atonu Rabbani**, “Layoffs and productivity at a Bangladeshi sweater factory,” 2020.
- Anderson, Michael L**, “Multiple Inference and Gender Differences in the Effects of Early Intervention: A Reevaluation of the Abecedarian, Perry Preschool, and Early Training Projects,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 2008, *103* (484), 1481–1495.
- Antonakis, John, Giovanna d’Adda, Roberto Weber, and Christian Zehnder**, ““Just words? Just speeches?” On the economic value of charismatic leadership,” *Management Science*, 2022, *68*, 6355–7064.
- , **Nicolas Bastardo, Philippe Jacquart, and Boas Shamir**, “Leadership by example in the weak-link game,” *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 2016, *3*, 293–319.
- Autor, David H., Alan Manning, and Christopher L. Smith**, “The Contribution of the Minimum Wage to US Wage Inequality over Three Decades: A Reassessment,” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 2016, *8* (1), 58–99.
- Bandiera, Oriana, Iwan Barankay, and Imran Rasul**, “Social connections and incentives in the workplace: Evidence from personnel records,” *Econometrica*, 2009, *77*, 1047–1094.
- Belloni, Alexandre, Victor Chernozhukov, and Christian Hansen**, “Inference on Treatment Effects after Selection among High-Dimensional Contr,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 2014, *81* (2), 608–650.
- Bilker, Warren B, John A Hansen, Colleen M Brensinger, Jan Richard, Raquel E Gur, and Ruben C Gur**, “Development of abbreviated nine-item forms of the Raven’s standard progressive matrices test,” *Assessment*, 2012, *19* (3), 354–369.
- Black, Duncan**, *The theory of committees and elections*, Cambridge University Press, 1958.

- Bolton, Patrick, Markus K Brunnermeier, and Laura Veldkamp**, “Leadership, coordination, and corporate culture,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 2013, 80 (2), 512–537.
- Boudreau, Laura**, “Multinational enforcement of labor law: Experimental evidence from Bangladesh’s apparel sector,” *Working Paper*, 2021.
- , **Rocco Macchiavello, Virginia Minni, and Mari Tanaka**, “Supplementary Materials: Leaders in Social Movements: Evidence From Unions in Myanmar,” Technical Report, SSRN Research Paper Series No. 4864165 2024. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4864165>.
- Breza, Emily, Supreet Kaur, and Nandita Krishnaswamy**, “Coordination without Organization: Collective Labor Supply in Decentralized Spot Markets,” Technical Report 2022.
- Budde, Julian, Thomas Dohmen, Simon Jäger, and Simon Trenkle**, “Worker Representatives,” *mimeo*, 2024.
- Cagé, Julia, Anna Dagorret, Pauline Grosjean, and Saumitra Jha**, “Heroes and Villains: The Effects of Heroism on Autocratic Values and Nazi Collaboration in France,” *American Economic Review*, 2022.
- Caillaud, Bernard and Jean Tirole**, “Consensus building: How to persuade a group,” *American Economic Review*, 2007, 97 (5), 1877–1900.
- Callen, Michael, Jonathan L Weigel, and Noam Yuchtman**, “Experiments about institutions,” *Annual Review of Economics*, 2023, 16.
- Cameron, A Colin, Jonah B Gelbach, and Douglas L Miller**, “Bootstrap-based improvements for inference with clustered errors,” *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 2008, 90 (3), 414–427.
- Cantoni, Davide, David Y Yang, Noam Yuchtman, and Y Jane Zhang**, “Protests as strategic games: Experimental evidence from Hong Kong’s antiauthoritarian movement,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2019, 134, 1–57.
- Caselli, Francesco and Massimo Morelli**, “Bad politicians,” *Journal of Public Economics*, 2004, 88.
- Caza, Arran and Barry Z. Posner**, “How and when does grit influence leaders’ behavior?,” *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 2019, 40 (1).

- Corradini, Viola, Lorenzo Lagos, and Garima Sharma**, “Collective Bargaining for Women: How Unions Can Create Female-Friendly Jobs,” Technical Report 2023.
- Dal Bó, Ernesto, Frederico Finan, Olle Folke, Torsten Persson, and Johanna Rickne**, “Who becomes a Politician?,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2017, 132 (4).
- Della Porta, Donatella and Mario Diani**, *Social movements: An introduction (3rd ed.)*, Oxford: Blackwell, 2020.
- Derenoncourt, Ellora, Francois Gérard, Lorenzo Lagos, and Claire Montialoux**, “Racial Inequality, Minimum Wage Spillovers, and the Informal Sector,” 2021.
- Deserranno, Erika, Miri Stryjan, and Munshi Sulaiman**, “Leader Selection and Service Delivery in Community Groups: Experimental Evidence from Uganda,” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 2019, 11, 240–267.
- Dewan, Torun and David P Myatt**, “The qualities of leadership: Direction, communication, and obfuscation,” *The American Political Science Review*, 2008, 102, 351–368.
- Dippel, Christian and Stephan Heblich**, “Leadership and Social Movements: The Forty-Eighters in the Civil War,” *American Economic Review*, 2021, 111, 1–35.
- Duckworth, Angela Lee and Patrick D Quinn**, “Development and validation of the Short Grit Scale (GRIT-S),” *Journal of personality assessment*, 2009, 91 (2), 166–174.
- Englmaier, Florian, Stefan Grimm, Dominik Grothe, David Schindler, and Simeon Schudy**, “The value of leadership: Evidence from a large-scale field experiment,” Technical Report 2022.
- Enikolopov, Ruben, Alexey Makarin, and Maria Petrova**, “Social media and protest participation: Evidence from Russia,” *Econometrica*, 2020, 88 (4), 1479–1514.
- Freeman, Richard B**, “Labor regulations, unions, and social protection in developing countries: Market distortions or efficient institutions?,” *Handbook of development economics*, 2010, 5, 4657–4702.


- Ganz, Marshall**, “Leading Change: Leadership, Organization, and Social Movements,” in Nitin Nohria and Rakesh Khurana, eds., *Handbook of Leadership Theory and Practice: A Harvard Business School Centennial Colloquium*, Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation, 2010, chapter 19.
- González, Felipe**, “Collective action in networks: Evidence from the Chilean student movement,” *Journal of Public Economics*, 2020, 188, 1–13.
- Green, Edward J. and Robert H. Porter**, “Noncooperative Collusion under Imperfect Price Information,” *Econometrica*, 1984, 52 (1), 87–100.
- Grossman, Guy and Delia Baldassarri**, “The impact of elections on cooperation: Evidence from a lab-in-the-field experiment in Uganda,” *American journal of political science*, 2012, 56 (4), 964–985.
- Hermalin, Benjamin E.**, “Toward an Economic Theory of Leadership: Leading by Example,” *The American Economic Review*, 1998, 88 (5), 1188–1206.
- , “Leadership and corporate culture,” *Handbook of organizational economics*, 2012, pp. 432–78.
- Hermalin, Benjamin E.**, “At the helm, Kirk or Spock? The pros and cons of charismatic leadership,” *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 2023, 15 (2), 465–492.
- House, Robert J.**, *A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership*. 1977.
- and **Jane M. Howell**, “Personality and Charismatic Leadership,” *Leadership Quarterly*, 1992, 3 (2).
- Howell, Jane M. and Bruce J. Avolio**, “Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Locus of Control, and Support for Innovation: Key Predictors of Consolidated-Business-Unit Performance,” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1993, 78 (6).
- Human Rights Watch**, ““No Room to Bargain” Unfair and Abusive Labor Practices in Pakistan,” <https://www.hrw.org/report/2019/01/23/no-room-bargain/unfair-and-abusive-labor-practices-pakistan> 2015.
- , ““Work Faster or Get Out”: Labor Rights Abuses in Cambodia’s Garment Industry,” <https://www.hrw.org/report/2015/03/12/work-faster-or-get-out/labor-rights-abuses-cambodias-garment-industry> 2015.

- International Labor Organization**, “Reports of the Committee on Freedom of Association: 405th Report of the Committee on Freedom of Association,” https://webapps.ilo.org/wcmstp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---relconf/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_916541.pdf 2024.
- Jack, B Kelsey and María P Recalde**, “Leadership and the voluntary provision of public goods: Field evidence from Bolivia,” *Journal of Public Economics*, 2015, 122, 80–93.
- Judge, Timothy A., Joyce E. Bono, Remus Ilies, and Megan W. Gerhardt**, “Personality and Leadership: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review,” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2002, 87 (4).
- Komai, Mana, Philip J. Grossman, and Trevis Deters**, “Leadership and Information in a Single Shot Collective Action Game: An Experimental Study,” *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 2010, 32 (2), 119–134.
- Lenz, Gabriel**, *Follow the Leader?: How Voters Respond to Politicians’ Policies and Performance*, University of Chicago Press, 2012.
- Lin, Min Zarni, Mari Tanaka, Virginia Minni, Hanh Nguyen, Khin Suu Thet, and Rocco Macchiavello**, “Industrial relations and workplace communication in Myanmar garment sector,” 2019.
- Loeper, Antoine, Jakub Steiner, and Colin Stewart**, “Influential opinion leaders,” *The Economic Journal*, 2014, 124 (581), 1147–1167.
- Macchiavello, Rocco, Andreas Menzel, Atonu Rabbani, and Christopher Woodruff**, “Challenges of Change: An Experiment Training Women to Manage in the Bangladeshi Garment Sector,” *Working Paper*, 2020.
- Manacorda, Marco and Andrea Tesei**, “Liberation technology: Mobile phones and political mobilization in Africa,” *Econometrica*, 2020, 88 (2), 533–567.
- Manski, Charles F**, “Identification of endogenous social effects: The reflection problem,” *The review of economic studies*, 1993, 60 (3), 531–542.
- Potters, Jan, Martin Sefton, and Lise Vesterlund**, “Leading-by-example and Signaling in Voluntary Contribution Games: An Experimental Study,” *Economic Theory*, 2007, 33 (1), 169–182.


- Rammstedt, Beatrice and Oliver P John**, “Measuring personality in one minute or less: A 10-item short version of the Big Five Inventory in English and German,” *Journal of research in Personality*, 2007, *41* (1), 203–212.
- Sahin, Selhan Garip, Catherine Eckel, and Mana Komai**, “An Experimental Study of Leadership Institutions in Collective Action Games,” *Journal of the Economic Science Association*, 2015, *1* (1), 100–113.
- Schimschal, Sarah E. and Tim Lomas**, “Gritty Leaders: The Impact of Grit on Positive Leadership Capacity,” *Psychological Reports*, 2018, *122* (4).
- Tanaka, Mari**, “Exporting Sweatshops? Evidence from Myanmar,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 2020, *102*, 442–456.
- Visser, Jelle**, “Trade unions in the balance,” *ILO ACTRAV Working Paper*, 2019.
- Young, Alwyn**, “Channeling Fisher: Randomization Tests and the Statistical Insignificance of Seemingly Significant Experimental Results,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2019, *134* (2), 557–598.

A Appendix A: additional figures and tables

Figure A.1: Workers’ and line leaders’ similarity to presidents



Notes. This figure shows the cumulative distribution of the probability of a worker being a president estimated by a probit model with demographic and ability variables (gender, age, migrant (0/1), education, and raven score), job tenure (months in factory/sector), and personality traits (altruism, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, openness, grit, and locus of control).

Figure A.2: Mobilization Experiment

Notes. This figure presents the design of the mobilization experiment. First, we stratify discussion groups by factory and consensus-building treatment arm and then randomize them to high or low mobilization by the leader. In a high (low) condition group, all but one (only one) member are (is) invited by a leader. Second, we stratify workers by discussion groups and randomly assign workers to be invited by a leader (motivation treatment) or to be invited by research staff so that the number of workers invited by a leader in each group is consistent with the assignment of the group to high or low coordination. Lastly, stratifying by discussion groups, we randomly assign workers to two treatments and a control group: being informed about how many members in the group are invited by leaders (coordination treatment), being informed that a leader will observe their participation decision (leader observation treatment), and no information (control). Among workers who are assigned to coordination treatment, those in high (low) coordination groups are told that all but one (only one) member are (is) invited by a leader.

Figure A.3: Average convergence to union minimum wage preference & share mobilized



Notes. The figure is a binned scatterplot with group weights applied. The variable on the x-axis measures the level of preference convergence, defined as the baseline workers' preference deviation from the median union leader subtracted by the endline preference deviation from the median union leader. Both variables are residualized by factory and group size fixed effects, and the mean of each variable has been added back before plotting.

Table A.1: Differences between Leaders and Workers, with controls

	Observations	Worker Mean	Coeff. on Line Leader	Coeff. on President	<i>p</i> -value of diff, cols (3)-(4)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
<i>Panel A: Demographics & Ability</i>					
Female	1104	0.967	-0.136 [0.009]	-0.533 [0.001]	0.007
Age	1104	25.005	0.017 [0.982]	3.077 [0.066]	0.041
Migrant	1104	0.520	-0.011 [0.826]	0.038 [0.692]	0.687
Education(Yrs)	1104	7.754	0.141 [0.544]	0.650 [0.444]	0.544
Raven Score	1104	4.524	0.124 [0.717]	1.592 [0.011]	0.010
<i>Panel B: Employment & Minimum Wage Views</i>					
Months in Factory	1104	29.888	2.484 [0.506]	6.269 [0.249]	0.422
Months in Sector	1104	50.621	13.456 [0.000]	7.365 [0.447]	0.522
Income (Last Month)	777	245382.8	-2959.417 [0.561]	-24449.62 [0.040]	0.079
Sewing Efficiency	777	0.018	-0.094 [0.372]	0.055 [0.846]	0.490
Preferred Min Wage	1104	7504.258	75.421 [0.751]	175.284 [0.454]	0.651
Expected Min Wage	1104	6545.961	-211.319 [0.130]	-350.109 [0.120]	0.517
<i>Panel C: Personality traits</i>					
Altruism	1104	1268.777	205.197 [0.001]	320.024 [0.029]	0.254
Extraversion	1104	3.392	-0.000 [0.627]	0.000 [0.683]	0.444
Agreeableness	1104	3.862	-0.000 [0.627]	0.000 [0.683]	0.444
Conscientiousness	1104	3.979	-0.000 [0.627]	0.000 [0.683]	0.444
Neuroticism	1104	2.665	0.000 [0.627]	-0.000 [0.683]	0.444
Openness	1104	3.001	-0.000 [0.627]	0.000 [0.683]	0.444
BFI Index	1104	2.314	0.000 [0.627]	-0.000 [0.683]	0.444
Grit	1104	2.571	0.933 [0.000]	1.371 [0.000]	0.017
Locus of Control	1104	4.008	0.184 [0.292]	0.377 [0.171]	0.396

Notes. Unit of observation is worker. Probability weights used. All regressions include factory FE. The sewing efficiency and income regressions control for all other variables included in the table. All other regressions control for all other variables included in the table except for sewing efficiency and income. *p*-values calculated using the wild cluster bootstrap-t method.

Table A.2: Experiment balance tables

Panel A: Consensus-building experiment								
Variable	Mean (SE)				Difference in means (p-value)			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	Control	Own LL	External LL	Any LL	Own LL	External LL	Any LL	External vs. Own LL
Gender	1.022 (0.148)	1.033 (0.178)	1.061 (0.239)	1.045 (0.207)	0.005 (0.659)	0.025 (0.160)	0.012 (0.288)	0.029 (0.166)
Age	25.737 (6.440)	23.929 (5.556)	24.552 (5.792)	24.198 (5.662)	-1.494*** (0.000)	-1.129** (0.037)	-1.324*** (0.001)	0.551 (0.250)
Education (Yrs)	7.627 (2.660)	7.969 (2.855)	7.675 (2.740)	7.842 (2.807)	0.327 (0.140)	-0.031 (0.895)	0.222 (0.250)	-0.171 (0.484)
Raven Score	4.376 (2.763)	4.895 (2.806)	4.654 (2.746)	4.791 (2.780)	0.457** (0.033)	0.318 (0.234)	0.355* (0.075)	-0.298 (0.214)
Months in Factory	29.840 (33.458)	27.547 (30.497)	29.747 (36.326)	28.494 (33.115)	-0.521 (0.801)	0.150 (0.943)	-0.291 (0.871)	1.023 (0.631)
Min. Wage Belief	6559.07 (994.64)	6379.55 (1049.95)	6419.87 (1009.60)	6396.92 (1031.91)	-114.29 (0.122)	-29.48 (0.677)	-77.99 (0.191)	56.20 (0.516)
Min. Wage Preference	7523.60 (1557.76)	7249.00 (1514.25)	7295.48 (1540.26)	7269.01 (1524.10)	-187.48 (0.108)	-116.89 (0.350)	-138.74 (0.161)	91.11 (0.520)
Absolute diff., worker and median worker min. wage preference	918.09 (1074.97)	848.38 (953.29)	791.99 (1018.47)	824.09 (981.26)	-78.32 (0.222)	-127.19 (0.114)	-88.47 (0.115)	-37.51 (0.699)
Absolute diff., worker and median worker min. wage belief	483.773 (746.662)	495.565 (758.140)	529.647 (730.671)	510.243 (745.865)	-9.492 (0.869)	53.593 (0.330)	21.308 (0.645)	47.414 (0.501)
Absolute diff., worker and median leader min. wage preference	1250.88 (1175.24)	1202.64 (1019.36)	1148.04 (1058.05)	1179.12 (1035.48)	-71.46 (0.445)	-91.64 (0.294)	-71.51 (0.345)	-15.23 (0.882)
Absolute diff., worker and median leader min. wage belief	741.400 (800.409)	719.938 (803.475)	900.127 (910.828)	797.541 (855.135)	-43.216 (0.532)	194.681** (0.019)	62.275 (0.309)	222.724** (0.025)
Last Month Income	242720.2 (39172.1)	234366.1 (38648.5)	234317.5 (37231.3)	234345.1 (38005.9)	-3114.1 (0.153)	-1774.8 (0.448)	-2806.3 (0.162)	-438.1 (0.836)
Observations	425	284	206	490	709	631	915	490

Panel B: Mobilization, Coordination, and Leader Observation experiment							
Variable	Difference in means (p-value)						
	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
	LL	LL & Low Coord.	LL & High Coord.	LL & Social Pressure	Social Pressure	Low Coord.	High Coord.
Gender	-0.047 (0.567)	0.136 (0.273)	-0.138 (0.242)	-0.033 (0.697)	-0.012 (0.756)	-0.010 (0.759)	-0.000 ()
Age	-2.938** (0.039)	3.277* (0.085)	-0.001 (1.000)	-1.206 (0.329)	-0.050 (0.967)	0.488 (0.696)	10.000 (0.226)
Education (Yrs)	-0.333 (0.636)	-0.143 (0.888)	0.398 (0.783)	-0.140 (0.851)	-0.065 (0.917)	-0.566 (0.430)	-2.000* (0.056)
Raven Score	-0.472 (0.555)	-0.798 (0.413)	0.331 (0.767)	0.690 (0.365)	-0.590 (0.334)	0.005 (0.995)	-3.000*** (0.005)
Months in Factory	-5.990 (0.292)	8.601 (0.528)	16.928 (0.170)	2.884 (0.492)	-7.121 (0.111)	-4.760 (0.400)	1.500 (0.889)
Min. Wage Belief	-326.64 (0.170)	-184.36 (0.558)	-178.74 (0.701)	-18.58 (0.938)	-105.97 (0.613)	106.89 (0.664)	-100.00 (0.331)
Min. Wage Preference	138.25 (0.643)	-3.01 (0.995)	999.97 (0.155)	231.91 (0.467)	238.45 (0.484)	256.88 (0.437)	600.00 (0.331)
Absolute diff., worker and median worker min. wage preference	-90.05 (0.691)	72.68 (0.793)	65.56 (0.855)	26.55 (0.898)	198.22 (0.354)	164.20 (0.528)	-600.00 (0.331)
Absolute diff., worker and median worker min. wage belief	-299.861* (0.083)	59.530 (0.746)	-184.758 (0.680)	-17.956 (0.929)	318.106** (0.045)	271.972 (0.182)	-0.000 ()
Absolute diff., worker and median leader min. wage preference	-22.02 (0.935)	70.98 (0.746)	151.18 (0.833)	-338.63 (0.165)	230.18 (0.330)	147.03 (0.419)	-600.00 (0.331)
Absolute diff., worker and median leader min. wage belief	-277.539 (0.161)	-140.638 (0.458)	-386.913 (0.290)	-155.202 (0.416)	10.771 (0.954)	10.885 (0.938)	-100.000 (0.331)
Last Month Income	-12242.9 (0.222)	6238.1 (0.518)	-1156.0 (0.914)	-12952.3* (0.082)	-6105.5 (0.423)	-5150.0 (0.215)	-9000.0 (0.381)
Observations	257	145	214	251	254	228	161

Notes. Probability weights are used. Standard errors are reported in parentheses (clustered at group level for Panel A, robust for Panel B). Observations are at the worker level. Columns 5-8 control for factory FE x union status. Columns 9-15 control for factory FE x discussion group FE. Columns 1-4 report the mean with standard errors in parentheses. Columns 5-15 report the difference in means between the stated treatment group and the control group for the given experiment, with p-values in parentheses.

Table A.3: Group Discussions: standard deviation in views, group level

	SD (Min. Wage Preferences)			SD (Min. Wage Beliefs)		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Leader	-213.8** (107.7)			46.74 (63.24)		
External Leader		-244.0* (133.7)			87.15 (86.43)	
Own Leader		-194.4 (123.3)			20.74 (71.72)	
Leader, High Similarity			-254.6** (117.1)			58.23 (72.93)
Leader, Low Similarity			-174.0 (133.3)			35.52 (74.74)
R-squared	0.147	0.147	0.149	0.123	0.127	0.123
Control Mean	724.933	724.933	724.933	265.858	265.858	265.858
Number of obs.	202	202	202	202	202	202
<u>p-values</u>						
External = Own:		0.722			0.476	
High Similarity = Low Similarity:			0.527			0.764

Notes. Regression at the group level. Probability weights are used. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. Controlling for factory and group size FE. The dependent variable is the standard deviation in workers' minimum wage preferences (beliefs) at the group level in follow up. Preferences and beliefs are winsorized at 5 and 95 percent. The variable *Leader, High Similarity* is a binary variable equal to 1 if the estimated probability of a line leader having similar attributes to president is above the median in the treatment group.

Table A.4: Workers’ awareness of a leader’s participation in the group discussion

	Was there a LL in your discussion group?		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Leader	0.409*** (0.0523)		
External Leader		0.222*** (0.0642)	
Own Leader		0.523*** (0.0574)	
Leader, High Similarity			0.323*** (0.0626)
Leader, Low Similarity			0.487*** (0.0616)
R-squared	0.283	0.329	0.297
Control Mean	0.215	0.215	0.215
Number of obs.	746	746	746
<u>p-values</u>			
External = Own:		0.000	
High Similarity = Low Similarity:			0.013

Notes. Unit of observation is worker. Probability weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses. Dependent variable is the worker’s belief about the presence of a union line leader or an EC member in their group. The variable *Leader, High Similarity* is a binary variable equal to 1 if the estimated probability of a line leader having similar attributes to the president is above the median in the treatment group. Stratification FEs are included: Factory FEs x Union FEs. Controlling for group size FEs. The sample size in this regression is smaller than the full worker sample (n=914) because 18% of workers incorrectly reported that they were line leaders in the follow-up survey and were not asked this question. In the Supplementary Materials, we report balance tests for the subset of workers with non-missing data for this question.

Table A.5: Word counts of responses to question prompts in group discussion experiment

	Log(Total Words)			Log(Topic 1: Benefit)			Log(Topic 2: Harm)			Log(Topic 3: Heterogeneity)		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Leader Group	0.211** (0.106)			0.203 (0.128)			0.183 (0.139)			0.231 (0.161)		
Own Leader Group		0.272** (0.110)			0.241* (0.133)			0.180 (0.145)			0.489*** (0.167)	
External Leader Group		0.116 (0.124)			0.144 (0.154)			0.188 (0.168)			-0.170 (0.216)	
Leader Group, High Similarity			0.236** (0.117)			0.212 (0.143)			0.228 (0.152)			0.224 (0.185)
Leader Group, Low Similarity			0.187 (0.115)			0.193 (0.140)			0.139 (0.153)			0.238 (0.191)
R-squared	0.178	0.191	0.179	0.092	0.095	0.092	0.127	0.127	0.129	0.187	0.244	0.187
Control Mean	36.949	36.949	36.949	11.951	11.951	11.951	13.580	13.580	13.580	11.419	11.419	11.419
Number of obs.	202	202	202	202	202	202	202	202	202	202	202	202
p-values												
P-val: Own LL= External LL		0.110			0.433			0.958			0.002	
P-val: High Quality=Low Quality			0.601			0.876			0.478			0.941

Notes. Unit of observation is discussion group. Probability weights are used. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. Dependent variables are the number of words written in group discussion form as the group's answers to each of the following questions: (1) How do you think that a minimum wage increase may benefit workers? (*Topic 1: Benefit*); (2) How do you think that a minimum wage increase may harm workers? (*Topic 2: Harm*); (3) Do you think it will affect different groups of workers, for example, skilled versus unskilled, union members versus non-members, differently? (*Topic 3: Heterogeneity*). In Columns 1-3, we consider the total number of words combining the three questions. The variable *Leader, High Similarity* is a binary variable equal to 1 if the estimated probability of a line leader having similar attributes to the president is above the median in the treatment group. Stratification FEs are Factory FEs. Fixed effect of the number of group members is also controlled. Control mean shows the average number of words in control group before taking a logarithm.

Table A.6: Group behavior, as assessed by research staff

	Observed Group Activity (1)	Share engaged (2)	Share distracted (3)	Active facilitation (4)	Asking opinions (5)	Summarizing opinions (6)	Taking notes (7)
Panel A: Leader							
Leader	0.234*** (0.0809)	0.0262 (0.0268)	-0.0681** (0.0277)	-0.00180 (0.0615)	-0.0135 (0.0618)	0.173*** (0.0562)	0.184*** (0.0551)
R-squared	0.352	0.177	0.202	0.220	0.309	0.337	0.300
Panel B: Own vs. External Leader							
Own Leader	0.265*** (0.0882)	0.0424 (0.0291)	-0.110*** (0.0282)	-0.0164 (0.0689)	0.0327 (0.0682)	0.186*** (0.0671)	0.141** (0.0596)
External Leader	0.186* (0.111)	0.00102 (0.0352)	-0.00365 (0.0362)	0.0210 (0.0821)	-0.0852 (0.0816)	0.153** (0.0704)	0.249*** (0.0788)
R-squared	0.355	0.184	0.248	0.221	0.318	0.338	0.310
p-values							
Own Leader = External Leader	0.483	0.234	0.001	0.661	0.151	0.683	0.182
Panel C: High vs. Low Similarity Leader							
Leader Group, High Similarity (50th)	0.285*** (0.0869)	-0.00196 (0.0315)	-0.0572* (0.0313)	0.0313 (0.0694)	0.0752 (0.0725)	0.186*** (0.0649)	0.245*** (0.0636)
Leader Group, Low Similarity	0.184* (0.105)	0.0537* (0.0304)	-0.0787** (0.0325)	-0.0341 (0.0791)	-0.100 (0.0724)	0.161** (0.0704)	0.124* (0.0686)
R-squared	0.356	0.190	0.204	0.224	0.330	0.337	0.312
Control Group Mean	-0.090	0.819	0.203	0.721	0.464	0.264	0.654
Number of obs.	202	202	202	202	202	202	202
p-values							
High Similarity = Low Similarity	0.334	0.085	0.501	0.431	0.025	0.744	0.113

Notes. Unit of observation is discussion group. Probability weights are used. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. Dependent variables are: *Observed Group Activity*, the index variable constructed following the methodology from Anderson (2008) using the variables in cols. 2-7; *ShareEngaged*, the share of workers within a group that are engaged in the discussion; *ShareDistracted*, the share of workers within a group that are distracted during the discussion; *ActiveFacilitation*, an indicator for whether someone is actively facilitating the group; *AskingOpinions*, an indicator for whether someone is asking others' opinions; *SummarizingOpinions*, an indicator for whether someone is summarizing opinions in the group; *TakingNotes*, an indicator for whether someone is taking notes in the group. Two members of the field team rated each group, and we average their observations in the analysis. The variable *Leader, High Similarity* is a binary variable equal to 1 if the estimated probability of a line leader having similar attributes to the president is above the median in the treatment group. Stratification FEs are Factory FEs. Controlling for group size FEs.

Table A.7: Engagement in Group Discussions

	Enjoyment		Achievement of Consensus		Participation	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Leader	0.0901*		0.308***		0.0892	
	(0.0512)		(0.0821)		(0.0698)	
Own Leader		0.114**		0.348***		0.0531
		(0.0562)		(0.0879)		(0.0729)
External Leader		0.0530		0.245**		0.145
		(0.0659)		(0.119)		(0.103)
R-squared	0.062	0.064	0.099	0.100	0.069	0.071
Control Mean	-0.039	-0.039	-0.126	-0.126	-0.019	-0.019
Number of obs.	914	914	914	914	914	914
p-values						
External = Own:		0.349		0.400		0.374

Notes. Unit of observation is worker in all columns. The three outcome variables are indexes of the following self-reported survey measures of participants' engagement. *Enjoyment* includes interest and enjoyment of the discussion as well whether the respondent perceived it to be worthwhile (*Group Interested*, *Group Enjoy*, *Group Uncase* [reverse score]), and *Group Waste* [reverse score]. *Achievement of Consensus* includes group consensus on minimum wage preferences and prediction (*Group Agree Ideal* and *Group Agree Prediction*). *Participation* includes freedom to express views (*Group Express Ideas*), and active participation by all members (*Group All Participate*). The index variables are constructed following the methodology from Anderson (2008). Probability weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses. Controlling for group size FE and stratification FEs (Factory FEs x Union FEs).

Table A.8: Mobilization Experiment Results

	Attendance at afternoon survey session			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
High Coord.	0.0639 (0.064) <0.065> {0.312}	0.0790 (0.066) <0.066> {0.224}		
Low Coord.	-0.0596 (0.064) <0.068> {0.341}	-0.0514 (0.064) <0.068> {0.421}		
Observation	0.0393 (0.045) <0.042> {0.421}	0.0467 (0.046) <0.043> {0.330}		
Leader	-0.0100 (0.044) <0.045> {0.825}	-0.0135 (0.044) <0.045> {0.765}		
High Coord. & No Leader			0.101 (0.11) <0.12> {0.386}	0.101 (0.11) <0.12> {0.375}
Low Coord. & No Leader			-0.0246 (0.076) <0.079> {0.727}	-0.0170 (0.078) <0.081> {0.816}
High Coord. & Leader			0.0836 (0.089) <0.086> {0.356}	0.0904 (0.090) <0.085> {0.320}
Low Coord. & Leader			-0.136 (0.10) <0.098> {0.203}	-0.161 (0.099) <0.094> {0.116}
Observation & No Leader			0.0557 (0.069) <0.060> {0.424}	0.0492 (0.069) <0.059> {0.481}
Observation & Leader			0.0578 (0.076) <0.078> {0.443}	0.0631 (0.077) <0.077> {0.400}
Leader Only			0.0313 (0.075) <0.073> {0.673}	0.0169 (0.075) <0.073> {0.804}
R-squared	0.347	0.332	0.348	0.334
Control Mean	0.341	0.341	0.341	0.341
Observations	790	790	790	790
<i>p-values</i>				
High Coord. = Low Coord.	0.146	0.130		
No Leader: High Coord. = Low Coord.			0.298	0.332
Leader: High Coord. = Low Coord.			0.082	0.043
Observation: Leader = No Leader			0.978	0.853
<i>RI p-values</i>				
High Coord. = Low Coord.	0.152	0.138		
No Leader: High Coord. = Low Coord.			0.300	0.343
Leader: High Coord. = Low Coord.			0.104	0.052
Observation: Leader = No Leader			0.977	0.863
PDS Lasso Selected Controls	Y	N	Y	N

Notes. Unit of observation is worker. Probability weights used. Robust standard errors are shown in parentheses, standard errors clustered at the group level are shown in angular brackets. The randomization inference (RI) *p*-values from a regression using robust standard errors are in curly brackets based on 1000 randomization draws (Young, 2019). The dependent variable is an indicator for whether the worker attends the minimum wage survey. Stratification fixed effects are Factory FEs $\times$ Discussion Group FEs. Control variables in Columns (1) and (3) are selected by applying the post-double lasso control selection procedure.

B Appendix B: field implementation

B.1 Consensus-building experiment: Discussion prompt provided to groups

At the beginning of the consensus-building experiment, after discussion groups were seated together, the field team explained the prompt below, which they also provided to discussion groups in writing.

We are now starting discussion about minimum wage. Please turn off your phones. The last time the government set the minimum wage was in March 2018. At that time, the government set it at K4800 for an eight-hour workday. The government will announce a new minimum wage in 2020. The CTUM will prepare a proposal for the government on the minimum wage increase. The CTUM wants to gather workers' expectations and opinions to help determine its proposal. For 30 minutes, we would like for you to please discuss the following questions:

(i) How do you think that a minimum wage increase may benefit workers? How do you think that a minimum wage increase may harm workers? Do you think it will affect different groups of workers, for example, skilled versus unskilled, union members versus non-members, differently?

(ii) In 2020, at what level do you think the government will set the new minimum wage for an eight-hour workday?

(iii) In your opinion, what would be the ideal minimum wage level for an eight-hour workday?

Your summary will be provided to the CTUM to help it prepare its proposal to the government. We provide some white blank papers so that you can take notes on these papers while you discuss. At the end of the 30 minutes, please take five minutes to summarize the group's opinions about these questions using this sheet.

B.2 Mobilization Session 3: information provided to workers in each treatment arm

Prior to the surprise invitation, the field team handed the worker their payment in an envelope. After handing them their payment, they read the following scripts:

1. *Leader or staff invitation, no information arm:* Invites worker to do a final survey that is about living standards and working conditions and tells the worker that participation in the survey is entirely voluntary and that it was already very good that they came to the session and did the surveys in the morning. Given that the final survey is a surprise, the research team is going to donate 8000 kyats to buy sewing machines and training fabric for CTUM Training Centre per each discussion group where every member of the group participates in the Minimum Wage Survey.
2. *High coordination information (leader and staff invitation):* Same as (1), plus staff tells worker: “Everyone will be told about the final survey, but LLs might not have time to speak with every worker. They will be able to speak with only X worker in your group,” where $X = \text{group size} - 1$.
3. *Low coordination information, staff invitation:* Same as (1), plus staff tells worker: “Everyone will be told about the final survey, but LLs might not have time to speak with every worker. They will be able to speak with only **one worker** in your group.”
4. *Low coordination information, leader invitation:* Same as (1), plus staff tells worker: “Everyone will be told about the final survey, but LLs might not have time to speak with every worker. They will be able to speak with only **you** in your group.”
5. *Social pressure information:* Same as (1), plus staff tells worker: “If you are staying for the survey, I will accompany you to the room, and some LLs will welcome you and register you.”

C Appendix C: signaling versus sanction in mobilization experiment leader observation arm

In the mobilization experiment, we identify two potential mechanisms through which observation of the worker’s decision by the leader may influence attendance: Leaders acting as judges, sanctioning workers who do not attend, or workers perceiving that attending sends a positive signal about their type. Depending on workers’ priors, in certain environments, these mechanisms generate different effects. When expected participation of other workers in the group is high, “not showing up” implies deviating from the everyone-attending equilibrium for a private, one-shot gain (similar to the sanctioning model in Green and Porter (1984) where any firm that deviates from collusion is punished later). If leaders function as judges to enforce participation (Hermalin, 2012), workers may anticipate potential sanctions from the leader later on. In contrast, when expected participation of others is low, showing up distinguishes oneself from those who choose not to attend. The incentive for workers to attend in this setting is better explained by a signaling model, where “good-type” workers have a lower cost of effort to attend compared to “bad-type” workers. In a separating equilibrium, only “good-type” workers attend.


The aforementioned models may not reflect our environment; e.g., *if* leaders punish anyone who did not attend the session regardless of how many members show up, the effect of having one’s decision observed by the leader need not depend on one’s prior. In this case, we will not find evidence of heterogeneity by workers’ expectations of their group members’ participation.

We did not directly measure workers’ priors, so we use a random forest algorithm to predict them using the control group’s characteristics and attendance; for details, see the notes for Appendix Figure C.1. We partition the sample at the median into high- and low-predicted priors. We interact indicators for high- or low-predicted priors with indicators for each treatment condition, controlling for the main effect of workers’ predicted priors. We caution that we may not be measuring workers’ priors correctly, and the predicted prior variable may capture other types of worker heterogeneity. For these rea-

sons, and because this analysis was not pre-specified, the results should be interpreted as exploratory.

Figure C.1 presents the results. As the results are similar when interacting predicted priors with the treatment indicators in the more parsimonious and the fully interacted specifications (eqns. 4 and ??, respectively), we focus on the former. Panel A shows that there is no effect of being told that a leader will observe their decision among workers with high predicted priors, while for workers with low predicted priors, being told that a leader will observe their decision increases attendance by 11 pp or 32% (RI $p = 0.12$ with robust standard errors). We interpret this as suggestive evidence of a signaling mechanism in which workers aim to signal their type to the leader in order to increase their status.

Figure C.1: Mobilization Experiment: Heterogeneity by Workers' Estimated Prior (with PDS Controls)



Notes. This plot shows the heterogeneous impact of different treatment arms on whether worker attends the minimum wage survey. 95% confidence intervals calculated by using bootstrap standard errors are reported. RI p -values based on 1000 randomization draws (Young, 2019) are also reported on the top. Factory FEs $\times$ Discussion Group FEs are controlled. Control variables are selected by post-double lasso selection procedure. As we did not directly measure workers' priors, we use a random forest algorithm to predict them using the control group's characteristics and attendance. We implement the random forest algorithm using the randomForest package in R, which is widely used and implements a standard algorithm. The list of variables includes demographics, personality, employment characteristics, union participation and views, baseline minimum wage views, group discussion mean self-reported engagement (leaving out worker's report) and worker's self-reported engagement, and other group-discussion-related variables. The complete list is in Boudreau et al. (2024). We use the control group as the training set. Once we have created the random forest model using the control group, we apply it to the rest of the sample in order to generate each worker's predicted likelihood of attendance. We grow a forest with 250,000 trees; we use the default settings for other parameters, such as the number of variables to randomly sample at each split for growing trees. We stratify the random sampling of control workers by factory. We use these predicted likelihoods to construct, for each worker, the expected probability that all other workers in their group will attend the session. We then partition the sample at the median into high- and low-predicted priors.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS: LEADERS IN SOCIAL MOVEMENTS: EVIDENCE FROM UNIONS IN MYANMAR

Laura Boudreau*

Rocco Macchiavello[†]

Virginia Minni[‡]

Mari Tanaka[§]

November 8, 2024

*Columbia University, NBER, BREAD, CEPR, IZA and IGC. l.boudreau@columbia.edu

[†]STICERD, IGC and Department of Economics, LSE. r.macchiavello@lse.ac.uk

[‡]University of Chicago, Booth School of Business, CEPR and IZA. virginia.minni@chicagobooth.edu

[§]University of Tokyo, Hitotsubashi University, IZA. m.tanaka@e.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Contents

1	Overview of field implementation	3
1.1	Protocol for random sampling of workers who were not union leaders . . .	3
1.2	Field activities	4
1.3	Implementation of Mobilization Experiment	5
2	Variable lists & definitions	7
2.1	Post Double Selection lasso variables not already included in Table 1 . . .	7
2.2	Index variables	8
3	Main results estimated with alternative weighting schemes	9
4	Who are the union leaders: Robustness checks	17
5	Consensus building experiment: additional tables & figures	17
5.1	Additional figures and tables	17
5.2	Balance tables dropping workers who incorrectly reported being line leaders	20
5.3	Placebo and robustness tests for consensus-building experiment	22
6	Mobilization experiment: List of variables eligible to be included in regression forest prediction analysis	31
7	Mobilization and leading by example experiment (presidents and line leaders)	32
8	Public good experiment (line leaders and workers)	35
8.1	Public good: line leaders	36
8.2	Public good: workers	38

1 Overview of field implementation

1.1 Protocol for random sampling of workers who were not union leaders

We used a random sampling protocol that we designed to obtain a sample that was representative of the target population: sewing operators in the targeted factories, including union members and non-union members. It entailed three stages. First, the CTUM convened the presidents and secretaries of the 28 garment basic unions for an introduction meeting. During the meeting, the CTUM explained the research, requested the unions' participation, and introduced the survey team. Union leaders also completed (1) a factory information form about the factory's sewing lines, their sizes, and their union membership rate and (2) a union information form about the union's organizational structure. Leaders were informed in advance that the survey team would request this information.

Second, the research team assigned LLs and EC members to sewing lines¹ and stratified sewing lines by their quartile in the distribution (across lines) of the share of unionized workers on the line. We then implemented a stratified random selection of up to 11 sewing lines; in factories with fewer than 11 LLs and EC members, the research team selected a number of lines equal to the total number of LLs and EC members. We prioritized LLs, only selecting EC members in factories with fewer than 11 LLs. In factories with fewer than 11 sewing lines, we selected the minimum of {Number of sewing lines, Number of LLs + EC members}. In factories with greater than 50 workers per line, we randomly selected the front or back half of the line to participate. When factories were >80% unionized (<20% unionized), we slightly oversampled lines from bottom (top) quartile unionization rate. This was to ensure adequate representation of non-union (union) members in field activities. We excluded sewing lines if the president was the only union leader on the line, although in practice, this was rare.

Third, for each randomly selected line, if it had a LL on it, we assigned the LL to make a complete list of workers on the line, including their union membership status and skill level (higher/low). If a line had multiple LLs, we randomly selected one to make the list. If a line had no LLs, we selected the LL from the nearest non-randomly selected line and broke ties using random selection. We also invited these LLs to participate in the field activities.

LLs brought the lists of workers to their union's first session, which we describe in

¹Oftentimes, each LL or EC member was responsible for daily communication with workers in specific sewing lines. In such cases, we used the existing assignment of LL and EC members to sewing lines.

Section 1 of the paper. At this stage, the survey team conducted a stratified random selection of around 90 workers per factory; within factory, we stratified by line, union membership, and skill level.

1.2 Field activities

We embedded a series of experiments in the survey and discussion process. We preregistered the experiments on the AEA’s RCT registry. For each factory, we scheduled two consecutive sessions on Sundays. In each session, we included two factories. The sessions were held on Sundays because it is the only weekday when most workers do not work. We compensated participants for their transportation costs (5000 kyats) and time at the average wage rate of a typical working day (6000 kyats).² It is important to underscore that participation in the session is still costly to workers, as they work very long hours and only have one weekend day. Throughout the activities, we only allowed the research staff and the participants to be onsite when the sessions were taking place; in this way, we aimed to limit any actual or perceived influence of the CTUM on participants’ behavior and survey responses.


Figure 1 provides an overview of the field activities. In session 1, only presidents and LLs participated. We implemented a survey and a skill assessment as well as a mobilization experiment (EXP 1). The survey covered basic demographic questions as well as information on wages, behavioral characteristics, and psychological traits. The mobilization experiment was about presidents motivating LLs to mobilize workers to attend the session the next Sunday (session 2) and encouraging LLs to produce posters for CTUM’s annual International Women’s Day activities (March 8, 2020). Given the much more limited number of presidents compared to LLs, the more limited number of LLs compared to workers, and, crucially, the smaller sample sizes than initially planned due to the Covid-19 outbreak, our results for the mobilization experiment (EXP 1) are underpowered compared to those with workers. As such, we present this experiment in Section 7 of these Supplementary Materials.

In session 2, which is the focus of the main paper, only LLs and workers participated. In the morning, we implemented a survey, a skill assessment, the public good experiment (EXP 2), and the consensus building experiment on the minimum wage (EXP 3). The public good experiment was designed to test leaders’ potential role of leading by example in the provision of a public good, that is sewing machines for CTUM Skills Training Centre (e.g., Jack and Recalde (2015)). The consensus building experiment was designed to test

²When unions preferred to organize communal transportation, we did not reimburse participants.

how leaders’ participation in group discussions about workers’ preferred and expected minimum wage levels influenced the group’s consensus around these levels.

Figure 1: Overview of field activities



We do not discuss the public good experiment (EXP 2) in the main paper due to very little variation across the treatment arms: only 7% of leaders and 18% of workers donated less than the full endowment amount (regardless of treatment arm). We present this experiment in Section 8 of these Supplementary Materials.

After lunch, we conducted the mobilization experiment (EXP 4), in which we invited workers to remain for an additional, unanticipated living cost survey for the rest of the afternoon. The CTUM planned to use the living cost data from the survey to campaign for its preferred minimum wage level. We induced a strategic complementarity in turnout at the discussion group level by donating to a worker skills training center for each full discussion group that attended the survey. In this design, we aimed to mirror the incentives faced by workers when deciding whether to participate in collective actions, such as street demonstrations in support of the CTUM’s proposed minimum wage level, while avoiding experimentally mobilizing them to engage in potentially risky actions.

1.3 Implementation of Mobilization Experiment

The mobilization experiment in Session 2 was implemented as follows: After workers completed the group discussion and follow-up survey, we provided them with lunch. The field team told workers that they would receive their participation payment after lunch,

at which time the session would end and a bus would transport workers back to their factory (the meeting point for workers' sharing transportation).³

During lunch, the field team prepared the final experiment. At the end of lunch, the field team informed workers that they would be called into a separate room to sign for their payment and provided them with two paper cards: one that included their number in the order in which they would receive the payment, starting from 1 in each discussion group, and one that was a color-code corresponding to their treatment assignment. Workers were not informed about the meaning of the color coding. The field team also requested that workers turn off their cell phones, barring a critical need to keep it on. In a separate room, the field team informed leaders about the surprise survey session. Among leaders who could stay, the field team randomly assigned two of them to the room where leaders invited workers to stay for the afternoon session and provided them with the invitation script. The rest of the leaders were sent to the room where the survey would take place.

After lunch, the field team called workers by their numbers. When workers entered the payment room, they went to the desk corresponding to the color of their card. Each desk was staffed with a member of the field team, and in the leader motivation treatment arms, a leader. The field team member provided the worker with an envelope containing their payment, the worker signed, and the invitation for the afternoon session corresponding to the desk's treatment arm was made. The paper's Online Appendix provides the scripts for each invitation treatment arm.⁴

The research team carefully planned workers' movement from the discussion room to the payment room and then either directly to the afternoon survey room (if they accepted the invitation) or to the bus (if they did not). We also ensured that there were small amounts of buffer time between workers. These aspects of the design were important in order to prevent information spillovers across workers and were carefully enforced. While they increased the amount of time required to issue the payments, the field team quickly became adept at implementing the procedures. Unfortunately, for the first survey session, which included two factories, the field team ran out of time to complete this experiment. For this reason, the number of observations drops to 790, resulting in a loss of statistical power.

³During lunch, the field team calculated workers' survey incentive payments and implemented the randomized assignment for the mobilization experiment. The field team also randomly assigned the order in which motivated or non-motivated workers would be invited (either all motivated first or all motivated second). Workers ate lunch with their discussion group members in the discussion room.


⁴Note that our implementation ensured that we did not deceive participants.

2 Variable lists & definitions

2.1 Post Double Selection lasso variables not already included in Table 1

- Management attitude towards union membership: "How would you describe management's general attitude towards union membership?" Minimum score is 1 = Extremely negative, management may punish workers for union participation. Maximum score is 5 = Very positive, management encourages workers to participate and provides access to factory's facilities to coordinate
- Gender preference for union president (union line leaders): "Overall, who do you think would be a better union president (union line leader), a man or a woman?"
- Overlap in interests with union members, non-members, and managers. Based on the "Adapted Inclusion of Others in Self (IOS) scale" (Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, Mashek, Lewandowski, Wright and Aron, 2004), which measures the extent to which individuals perceive community- and self-interest as overlapping. IOS has been validated across a wide variety of contexts, and adapted versions are found to be strongly correlated with environmental behavior (Schultz, 2002) and connectness to the community (Mashek, Cannaday and Tangney, 2007). We code the measure from 1 to 7, where 7 implies highest overlap. Figure 2 displays the survey question: applicants are asked to choose between sets of pictures, each showing two circles (labeled "self" and "community") with varying degrees of overlap, from non-overlapping to almost completely overlapping.

Figure 2: Inclusion of Others in Self scale



Notes. The figure represents the type of figures shown to participants to elicit their overlap in interest with union members, non-members, and managers. One picture was shown for each type of counterpart. x indicates the counterpart (union members, non-members and managers, respectively).

2.2 Index variables

Consensus-building: Active Group Index

- Share of workers seem to be engaged in the group discussion (e.g. telling opinions, listening to other people's opinions, writing down notes);
- Share of workers seem to be distracted or not paying attention to the group discussion (e.g. looking down, chatting about irrelevant topics);
- Indicator for one or more persons who are actively facilitating discussion;
- Indicator for one or more persons who are asking other workers' opinions;
- Indicator for one or more persons who are summarizing group's opinions;
- Indicator for one or more persons who are writing down notes.

Consensus-building experiment: Worker Engagement Index

- Enjoyment:
 - The group discussion was interesting, engaging and informative;
 - The group discussion was a waste of my time (reversed score);
 - There were some moments during the discussion when I felt unease and I did not know what to say or do (reversed score);
 - Overall, I enjoyed being part of this group discussion.
- Achievement of consensus:
 - At the end of the discussion, to what extent did your group agree on the prediction of the level of the minimum wage that the government will set?;
 - At the end of the discussion, to what extent did your group agree on the ideal level of the minimum wage that the government should set?.
- Participation:
 - During the group discussion, I felt confident to express my views and opinions;
 - All members of my group actively participated in the discussion.

3 Main results estimated with alternative weighting schemes

Throughout the empirical analysis, we weight observations so that each factory equally counts in the analysis by using probability weights calculated as the total number of workers across factories divided by the number of workers in the specific factory. Our rationale for this approach is that while we invited very similar numbers of workers per factory, factory-level turn-out was in part determined by the union leaders. This raises the concern that factories with more (less) capable union leaders may have larger (smaller) sample sizes and thus receive more (less) weight in our analysis.

These weights only adjust for the number of workers in each factory who participated in our field activities. They do not adjust for possible differences between the *types of workers* who participate and who do not; in particular, one may be concerned that union members may be more likely to participate compared to non-union members; if so, our estimates are not representative at the factory-level.

To explore selection into our sample, Table 1 compares factory-level sample statistics (namely, fractions of union members, female workers, and low-skilled workers) for each factory's entire sewing section workers, invited workers, and survey participants. We chose invitees by a stratified random sampling of around 90 workers from the sewing section of each factory. To calculate the statistics for each factory's sewing section workers, we use information provided by the union presidents. We have missing information in two factories because presidents in these factories did not provide enough information to calculate them. Therefore, in this analysis, we focus on 15 factories with non-missing information. In Table 1, columns (1)-(3) present the means and standard deviations of each variable for the population of sewing section workers, invited workers, and participants. For invited workers, we do not have information on gender and skills unless the worker participated in the survey. Columns (4)-(6) show the differences in means across samples.

Table 1: Factory-level sample statistics at each stage of sample selection

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Mean / (SD)		Difference in means / (p-value)			
	Population (Sewing Section)	Invitees	Participants	Participants-Population	Invitees-Population	Participants-Invitees
Union Member Share	0.467 (0.263)	0.623 (0.186)	0.670 (0.198)	0.203** (0.041)	0.156* (0.086)	0.047 (0.136)
Female Share	0.902 (0.197)		0.968 (0.031)	0.066 (0.358)		
Helper Share	0.146 (0.116)		0.118 (0.069)	-0.022 (0.586)		
Observations	15	15	15	30	30	30

Notes. Unit of observation is factory. Columns (1)–(4) show the mean of factory-level sample statistics (fractions of union members, female workers, and low-skilled workers (helpers)) for each sample of workers: factory’s sewing section workers (Column 1), workers invited to Session 2 (Column 2), workers participated in Session 2 (Column 3). Standard deviation are shown in the parenthesis. Columns (1) uses information collected from presidents about the total number of workers, number of union members, number of female workers, and number of helpers in the factory’s sewing section. Column (2) uses information about union membership status for each invited worker (we do not have other characteristics for invited workers who did not participate the survey). Column (3) uses worker survey data. Columns (4)–(6) show the differences in sample statistics across samples controlling for factory fixed effects: the difference between sewing section workers and participants (Column 4), the difference between sewing section workers and invitees (Column 5), and the difference between invitees and participants (Column 6). P-values based on standard errors clustered at factory-level are in parentheses.

Column (4) shows that the union member share is about 20 percentage points higher among participants compared to sewing workers, while the shares of females and helpers are balanced. This over-representation of union members is mostly driven by selection from sewing workers into invitees (column 5) and slightly by self-selection among invitees to participate (column 6). Importantly, among invitees, selection into participation is not significantly different between union and non-union members (column 6).

Over-sampling of union members is partly due to a stratification scheme in the sampling protocol; we specified a fixed number for each type of workers (stratified by union membership and skills) to invite for each factory, and we had a higher number of union members to invite compared to non-members. More specifically, depending on the number of LLs in the factory, in each selected line, we aimed to have around 50–56% of the invitees to be union members as long as there were enough non-members and members in the list. It turned out that the actual share of union members among invited workers (0.62) is somewhat higher than the targeted share of union members in the protocol (0.50–0.56). We investigated the reason for this and found that a set of the LLs in three factories possibly deviated from our sampling protocol by listing fewer non-members than what we expect from the overall membership rate in the factory. This results in not having enough non-members listed in some of the lines, causing a higher share of union members among invitees than the targeted share in the protocol.

Given these statistics, we examine the robustness of our main results to using two alternative weights. The alternative weights adjust for the differences in union member share between participants and invitees or between participants and the population of

sewing workers, while keeping the feature of our original weights that each factory equally counts. For each factory i and worker type k (union membership), we define a weight $w_{ik}^* = \frac{S_{ik}}{A_{ik}} K_i$ where A_{ik} is the total number of type k workers who participated in the survey from factory i , and S_i is either 1) total number of type k workers invited to the survey in factory i (defined as “invitee weight”) or 2) total number of type k workers in the sewing section of factory i (defined as “population weight”). K_i is the factory-specific component to keep the feature that each factory equally counts and to have the inverse of weights sum up to one (i.e., $\sum_k \frac{1}{w_{ik}^*} = \frac{1}{w_i}$, where w_i is our original weight). For the population weight, we do not have information for workers in two factories, so these factories drop from the analysis when these weights are used.

Beginning with the descriptive comparison of union leaders and workers, we examined the robustness of Table 1 in the paper to the two alternative weights and to no weights. Tables 2 (invitee weight), 3 (population weight), and 4 (no weight) present the results. The results are quantitatively and qualitatively similar to our original results. Table 5 shows that the main results for the group discussion experiment hold if we use these two alternative weighting approaches or do not use weights in the regressions. Finally, Table 6 shows the main results for the mobilization experiment are qualitatively similar using the original and invitee weights, although the estimate for the Observation arm is sensitive to the population and unweighted schemes.⁵ The High Coordination coefficient is also sensitive to the specification without weights. For the reasons discussed above, however, we prefer the specifications with weights.

⁵The difference in the Observation coefficient is largely due to the weighting scheme, as opposed to the subsample in column (3) of table 6.

Table 2: Differences between Leaders and Workers: Weights for non-leader workers to make them representative of workers invited to the sessions

	Observations	Worker Mean	Coeff. on Line Leader	Coeff. on President	<i>p</i> -value of diff, cols (3)-(4)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
<i>Panel A: Demographics & Ability</i>					
Female	1104	0.966	-0.117 [0.024]	-0.518 [0.001]	0.007
Age	1104	24.848	1.856 [0.003]	4.918 [0.002]	0.064
Migrant	1104	0.511	-0.042 [0.341]	-0.080 [0.445]	0.742
Education(Yrs)	1104	7.776	-0.184 [0.474]	0.794 [0.342]	0.260
Raven Score	1104	4.672	-0.104 [0.730]	1.722 [0.009]	0.010
<i>Panel B: Employment & Minimum Wage Views</i>					
Months in Factory	1104	27.369	13.242 [0.000]	18.848 [0.000]	0.132
Months in Sector	1104	47.503	25.003 [0.000]	28.509 [0.013]	0.767
Income (Last Month)	777	238915.3	-3157.6 [0.469]	-23064.7 [0.070]	0.143
Sewing Efficiency	777	0.011	-0.109 [0.068]	0.072 [0.647]	0.261
Preferred Min Wage	1104	7345.983	21.094 [0.897]	166.319 [0.484]	0.548
Expected Min Wage	1104	6443.731	-136.156 [0.262]	-85.870 [0.707]	0.801
<i>Panel C: Personality traits</i>					
Altruism	1104	1252.577	146.949 [0.000]	154.508 [0.124]	0.936
Extraversion	1104	3.400	0.240 [0.020]	0.484 [0.021]	0.126
Agreeableness	1104	3.874	0.215 [0.005]	0.113 [0.620]	0.698
Conscientiousness	1104	3.949	0.225 [0.001]	0.514 [0.002]	0.052
Neuroticism	1104	2.678	-0.302 [0.001]	-0.687 [0.016]	0.142
Openness	1104	2.980	-0.068 [0.301]	-0.476 [0.010]	0.037
BFI Index	1104	2.305	0.183 [0.000]	0.264 [0.023]	0.421
Grit	1104	2.576	0.849 [0.000]	1.194 [0.000]	0.022
Locus of Control	1104	4.033	0.192 [0.218]	0.352 [0.083]	0.365

Notes. Unit of observation is worker. Probability weights are used. Controlling for Factory fixed effects. *p*-values calculated using the wild cluster bootstrap-t method are reported in square brackets. For the Income variable, only those workers with non-missing value on sewing efficiency are considered.

Table 3: Differences between Leaders and Workers: Weights for non-leader workers to make them representative of population of sewing section workers

	Observations	Worker Mean	Coeff. on Line Leader	Coeff. on President	<i>p</i> -value of diff, cols (3)-(4)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
<i>Panel A: Demographics & Ability</i>					
Female	985	0.965	-0.118 [0.042]	-0.505 [0.001]	0.009
Age	985	24.753	2.052 [0.007]	5.253 [0.001]	0.050
Migrant	985	0.538	-0.051 [0.300]	-0.110 [0.281]	0.600
Education(Yrs)	985	7.846	-0.211 [0.463]	0.721 [0.404]	0.293
Raven Score	985	4.638	-0.145 [0.698]	1.630 [0.014]	0.010
<i>Panel B: Employment & Minimum Wage Views</i>					
Months in Factory	985	27.109	15.792 [0.000]	21.569 [0.001]	0.124
Months in Sector	985	48.848	26.336 [0.000]	30.590 [0.013]	0.722
Income (Last Month)	695	233303.9	-2595.1 [0.571]	-23507.0 [0.045]	0.109
Sewing Efficiency	695	-0.003	-0.107 [0.148]	0.070 [0.706]	0.319
Preferred Min Wage	985	7470.177	21.398 [0.908]	178.423 [0.408]	0.536
Expected Min Wage	985	6435.014	-50.710 [0.683]	-11.957 [0.960]	0.846
<i>Panel C: Personality traits</i>					
Altruism	985	1269.349	144.757 [0.001]	159.233 [0.137]	0.891
Extraversion	985	3.456	0.184 [0.136]	0.433 [0.052]	0.125
Agreeableness	985	3.905	0.206 [0.009]	0.105 [0.646]	0.699
Conscientiousness	985	3.922	0.239 [0.009]	0.527 [0.002]	0.054
Neuroticism	985	2.713	-0.278 [0.005]	-0.674 [0.013]	0.124
Openness	985	2.935	-0.043 [0.609]	-0.447 [0.020]	0.044
BFI Index	985	2.301	0.173 [0.000]	0.258 [0.017]	0.389
Grit	985	2.584	0.862 [0.000]	1.221 [0.000]	0.019
Locus of Control	985	4.112	0.220 [0.240]	0.382 [0.071]	0.361

Notes. Unit of observation is worker. Probability weights are used. Controlling for Factory fixed effects. *p*-values calculated using the wild cluster bootstrap-t method are reported in square brackets. For the Income variable, only those workers with non-missing value on sewing efficiency are considered.

Table 4: Differences between Leaders and Workers: No weights

	Observations	Worker Mean	Coeff. on Line Leader	Coeff. on President	<i>p</i> -value of diff, cols (3)-(4)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
<i>Panel A: Demographics & Ability</i>					
Female	1104	0.967	-0.112 [0.029]	-0.513 [0.002]	0.006
Age	1104	25.005	1.856 [0.002]	4.911 [0.003]	0.065
Migrant	1104	0.520	-0.047 [0.290]	-0.090 [0.387]	0.710
Education(Yrs)	1104	7.754	-0.156 [0.525]	0.811 [0.333]	0.268
Raven Score	1104	4.524	-0.089 [0.761]	1.784 [0.006]	0.009
<i>Panel B: Employment & Minimum Wage Views</i>					
Months in Factory	1104	29.888	12.886 [0.000]	18.405 [0.001]	0.132
Months in Sector	1104	50.621	24.813 [0.000]	28.222 [0.015]	0.774
Income (Last Month)	777	245382.8	-3105.672 [0.472]	-23091.46 [0.063]	0.136
Sewing Efficiency	777	0.018	-0.113 [0.067]	0.082 [0.605]	0.229
Preferred Min Wage	1104	7504.258	14.947 [0.929]	156.430 [0.523]	0.558
Expected Min Wage	1104	6545.961	-158.013 [0.193]	-111.554 [0.627]	0.815
<i>Panel C: Personality traits</i>					
Altruism	1104	1268.777	139.340 [0.000]	144.556 [0.142]	0.958
Extraversion	1104	3.392	0.245 [0.013]	0.488 [0.016]	0.130
Agreeableness	1104	3.862	0.220 [0.004]	0.121 [0.600]	0.705
Conscientiousness	1104	3.979	0.227 [0.001]	0.504 [0.001]	0.057
Neuroticism	1104	2.665	-0.295 [0.000]	-0.681 [0.017]	0.139
Openness	1104	3.001	-0.065 [0.309]	-0.475 [0.008]	0.036
BFI Index	1104	2.314	0.184 [0.000]	0.264 [0.024]	0.429
Grit	1104	2.571	0.857 [0.000]	1.207 [0.000]	0.021
Locus of Control	1104	4.008	0.202 [0.203]	0.354 [0.084]	0.390

Notes. Unit of observation is worker. No weights are used. Controlling for Factory fixed effects. *p*-values calculated using the wild cluster bootstrap-t method are reported in square brackets. For the Income variable, only those workers with non-missing value on sewing efficiency are considered.

Table 5: Group discussion experiment: consensus-building results with alternative weights and without weights

	Deviation from median worker in discussion group								Deviation from median union leader							
	Baseline Weight				Invitee Weight				Baseline Weight				Invitee Weight			
	(1) Preference	(2) Belief	(3) Preference	(4) Belief	(5) Preference	(6) Belief	(7) Preference	(8) Belief	(9) Preference	(10) Belief	(11) Preference	(12) Belief	(13) Preference	(14) Belief	(15) Preference	(16) Belief
<i>Panel A: Leader</i>																
Leader	-83.85 (116.4) [0.472] {0.514}	142.5 (93.6) [0.129] {0.155}	-81.37 (114.6) [0.479] {0.511}	108.4 (73.9) [0.144] {0.164}	-139.9 (146.6) [0.341] {0.375}	97.47 (85.3) [0.255] {0.323}	-74.27 (116.1) [0.523] {0.547}	113.8 (82.5) [0.169] {0.200}	-266.4** (103.2) [0.011] {0.023}	-11.77 (74.0) [0.874] {0.878}	-215.0** (100.7) [0.034] {0.047}	4.456 (70.3) [0.950] {0.941}	-284.0** (114.5) [0.014] {0.028}	-10.91 (96.5) [0.910] {0.909}	-274.6*** (95.4) [0.004] {0.005}	20.31 (74.7) [0.786] {0.783}
R-squared	0.211	0.251	0.204	0.242	0.167	0.134	0.188	0.198	0.330	0.342	0.335	0.340	0.399	0.320	0.323	0.312
p-value for testing Preference = Belief	0.077		0.111		0.109		0.133		0.018		0.049		0.023		0.007	
<i>Panel B: Own versus External LL</i>																
External Leader	3.099 (157.4) [0.984] {0.988}	179.0 (128.5) [0.165] {0.181}	22.43 (155.6) [0.886] {0.912}	178.5* (98.9) [0.072] {0.084}	-2.961 (177.2) [0.987] {0.995}	167.3 (108.3) [0.124] {0.177}	5.066 (156.3) [0.974] {0.977}	192.4* (111.3) [0.085] {0.101}	-210.8 (127.8) [0.101] {0.139}	49.56 (108.5) [0.648] {0.658}	-145.8 (120.2) [0.227] {0.271}	61.89 (95.2) [0.516] {0.535}	-227.7 (137.9) [0.100] {0.132}	27.57 (113.5) [0.808] {0.818}	-224.0** (108.4) [0.040] {0.057}	102.7 (105.9) [0.334] {0.336}
Own Leader	-140.1 (136.3) [0.305] {0.324}	119.0 (107.4) [0.269] {0.318}	-148.7 (128.4) [0.248] {0.271}	62.81 (82.5) [0.447] {0.458}	-222.0 (162.9) [0.175] {0.202}	55.56 (97.0) [0.508] {0.595}	-124.7 (123.5) [0.314] {0.316}	64.03 (89.6) [0.476] {0.493}	-302.3** (120.9) [0.013] {0.020}	-50.92 (80.7) [0.529] {0.561}	-259.8** (122.6) [0.035] {0.052}	-32.35 (78.5) [0.681] {0.703}	-317.5** (130.8) [0.016] {0.029}	-33.55 (114.0) [0.769] {0.783}	-306.7*** (113.0) [0.007] {0.008}	-30.90 (82.6) [0.709] {0.725}
R-squared	0.213	0.252	0.207	0.246	0.173	0.138	0.190	0.202	0.331	0.344	0.337	0.342	0.400	0.321	0.324	0.315
Control Mean	991.637 914	404.697 914	963.537 914	403.604 914	960.598 795	406.600 795	1025.236 914	441.509 914	1194.103 914	654.399 914	1158.355 914	625.396 914	1204.038 795	709.069 795	1232.665 914	655.189 914
Number of Observations																
External=Own																
p-values	0.422	0.671	0.300	0.269	0.205	0.341	0.392	0.257	0.513	0.379	0.417	0.346	0.531	0.627	0.482	0.235
RI p-values	0.480	0.719	0.353	0.307	0.250	0.382	0.458	0.297	0.538	0.407	0.471	0.356	0.563	0.651	0.508	0.236
p-value for testing Preference = Belief																
External LL	0.304		0.318		0.349		0.244		0.060		0.134		0.082		0.017	
Own LL	0.063		0.108		0.094		0.163		0.050		0.091		0.049		0.030	
PDS Lasso Selected Controls	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Notes. Unit of observation is worker. Standard errors are clustered at the group level, and are shown in parentheses. The p -values calculated using this standard error are in square brackets. The randomization inference (RI) p -values are in curly brackets based on 1000 randomization draws (Young, 2019). The last row in each panel reports the p -values for (inter-model) testing the equivalence of coefficients between the corresponding preference and belief regression. In Columns 1-8, the dependent variables are the absolute value of the endline minimum wage preference/belief minus the workers' median wage preference/belief at the discussion group level at baseline. In Columns 9-16, the dependent variables are the absolute value of the endline minimum wage preference/belief minus the median of leaders' preferences and beliefs at baseline at the factory level. Stratification fixed effects are Factory FEs $\times$ Union FEs. Control variables are selected by applying the post-double lasso control selection procedure.

Table 6: Mobilization experiment: results with alternative weights and without weights

	Attendance at afternoon survey session			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Baseline Weights	Invitee Weights	Population Weights	Unweighted
Leader	-0.0135 (0.045) <0.045> {0.760}	-0.0244 (0.045) <0.045> {0.578}	-0.00964 (0.050) <0.050> {0.850}	-0.0368 (0.040) <0.040> {0.349}
High Coord.	0.0790 (0.066) <0.066> {0.241}	0.0863 (0.072) <0.072> {0.222}	0.0610 (0.081) <0.081> {0.464}	0.0163 (0.062) <0.062> {0.770}
Low Coord.	-0.0514 (0.068) <0.068> {0.456}	-0.0274 (0.063) <0.063> {0.706}	-0.0945 (0.062) <0.062> {0.132}	-0.0589 (0.062) <0.062> {0.359}
Observation	0.0467 (0.043) <0.043> {0.317}	0.0603 (0.045) <0.045> {0.210}	-0.0487 (0.065) <0.065> {0.489}	0.0101 (0.040) <0.040> {0.816}
R-squared	0.332	0.314	0.506	0.313
Control Mean	0.341	0.333	0.452	0.358
Observations	790	790	671	790
High Coord. = Low Coord.				
<i>p</i> -values	0.145	0.203	0.094	0.367
RI <i>p</i> -values	0.144	0.209	0.109	0.372
PDS Lasso Selected Controls	Y	Y	Y	Y

Notes. Unit of observation is worker. Standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses. The dependent variable is an indicator for whether the worker attends the minimum wage survey. Stratification fixed effects are Factory FEs $\times$ Discussion Group FEs. Control variables are selected by applying the post-double lasso control selection procedure.

4 Who are the union leaders: Robustness checks

We report an additional result on wages for Section 4 in the paper that provides descriptions on the union leaders.

Table 7: Wages: Presidents, line leaders, union and non-union workers


	Last month income (logs)			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
President	-0.121 (0.0886)	-0.137 (0.122)	-0.145 (0.127)	-0.285 (0.277)
Line Leader	-0.0826 (0.121)	-0.107 (0.137)	-0.118 (0.144)	-0.197 (0.243)
Union Worker	0.0473 (0.0411)	0.0449 (0.0413)	0.0405 (0.0413)	0.0365 (0.0419)
R-squared	0.096	0.115	0.118	0.134
Number of obs.	771	771	771	771
Demographic controls	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Skills controls	No	No	Yes	Yes
Personality controls	No	No	No	Yes

Notes. Probability weights and robust standard errors used. Controlling for factory FE. Sample restricted to sewing operators since we could collect data on their skills by developing a skill assessment module for sewing operators. The dependent variable is the last month total income in logs. Demographic controls are gender, age, education, raven score, migrant status, experience in factory and in garment sector. Skills controls are average sewing efficiency and skill grade. Personality controls are the Big Five traits, locus of control and grit.

5 Consensus building experiment: additional tables & figures

5.1 Additional figures and tables

Figure 3: Discussion group forms: Common bi- and tri-grams in responses to each discussion prompt



Notes. This figure shows the frequencies of common bi- and tri-grams in discussion groups' responses to 3 questions in the discussion prompt: 1) "How do you think that a minimum wage increase may benefit workers?"; 2) "How do you think that a minimum wage increase may harm workers?"; and 3) "Do you think it will affect different groups of workers, for example, skilled versus unskilled, union members versus non-members, differently?". Each discussion group was requested to write down their answer to each of 3 topics in a reporting template at the end of the group discussion.

Table 8: Heterogeneous treatment effects by union membership: Consensus building & mobilization experiments

	Consensus-building experiment				Mobilization experiment
	Deviation from median worker in discussion group		Deviation from median union leader		Attendance at afternoon session
	(1) Preference	(2) Belief	(3) Preference	(4) Belief	(5)
Leader, Union	-156.4 (121.9)	134.5 (124.3)	-298.4** (116.2)	6.091 (84.8)	0.0139 (0.047)
Leader, Non-Union	66.48 (161.5)	159.1** (78.6)	-199.9 (138.5)	-48.62 (91.1)	-0.0661 (0.059)
High Coord., No Union					0.0947 (0.077)
Low Coord., No Union					-0.0845 (0.085)
Observation, No Union					-0.0171 (0.064)
High Coord., Union					0.0527 (0.072)
Low Coord., Union					-0.0279 (0.073)
Observation, Union					0.0668 (0.051)
Union					-0.0434 (0.063)
R-squared	0.213	0.251	0.330	0.342	0.374
Number of obs.	914	914	914	914	915
Control Mean, Union	1019.98	422.40	1249.43	635.37	0.29
Control Mean, Non-Union	940.80	372.94	1094.85	688.53	0.30
<i>p-value</i>					
Leader: Union = Non-Union	0.140	0.848	0.505	0.571	0.271
High Coord: Union = Non-Union					0.666
Low Coord: Union = Non-Union					0.595
Observation: Union = Non-Union					0.301

Notes. Unit of observation is worker. Probability weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses. The dependent variables in columns 1–2 are the deviation from the median discussion group worker’s views and preferences respectively. The dependent variables in columns 3–4 are the deviation from the factory median of baseline leaders’ views and preferences respectively. Columns 1–4 control for the baseline value of the dependent variable, strata fixed effects, and group size fixed effects. The dependent variable in column 5 is an indicator for attendance at the afternoon session. Stratification fixed effects for columns 1–4 are Factory FEs $\times$ Union FEs and for column 5 is Factory FEs $\times$ Discussion Group FEs. Column 5 additionally controls for the interactions between non-union status and inclusion in the leader observation arm, high coordination arm, and low coordination arm of the experiment.

5.2 Balance tables dropping workers who incorrectly reported being line leaders

We report balance tests for the subset of workers with non-missing data for the question "Was there a LL in your discussion group?" in the follow-up survey after the group discussions. The sample of workers with non-missing data for this question is smaller than the full worker sample (n=914) because 18% of workers incorrectly reported that they were line leaders in the follow-up survey and were not asked this question.

Table 9: Share of workers who answer that they are a LL in the follow-up survey

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Mean / (SE)			Difference in means / (p-value)	
	Control	Own LL	External LL	Diff Own-Control	Diff External-Control
Correctly answer that they are not a LL/EC	0.806 (0.396)	0.887 (0.318)	0.844 (0.364)	0.014 (0.377)	-0.008 (0.615)
Observations	425	284	206	709	631

Notes. Probability weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses. Controlling for factory FE x union status. Columns (1)-(3) show the mean share of workers who correctly answer that they are not a LL/EC in the follow-up survey for each sample: control (Column 1), own LL (Column 2), and external LL (Column 3). Standard errors are shown in parenthesis. Columns (4)-(6) show the differences in means across samples: the difference between own and control samples (Column 4), and the difference between external and control (Column 5). P-values based on standard errors clustered at the group level are in parenthesis.

Table 10: Balancing table using only the workers who correctly answer that they are not a LL/EC in the follow-up survey

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	Mean / (SE)			Difference in means / (p-value)	
	Control	Own LL	External LL	Diff Own-Control	Diff External-Control
Gender	1.028 (0.165)	1.037 (0.189)	1.062 (0.242)	0.006 (0.653)	0.021 (0.315)
Age	25.518 (6.552)	23.457 (5.190)	24.482 (5.566)	-1.916*** (0.000)	-1.147** (0.037)
Education (Yrs)	7.620 (2.711)	7.997 (2.909)	7.687 (2.798)	0.386 (0.119)	-0.013 (0.961)
Literacy	2.077 (0.323)	2.074 (0.347)	2.113 (0.426)	-0.003 (0.927)	0.036 (0.295)
Raven Score	4.558 (2.736)	5.033 (2.785)	4.792 (2.771)	0.514** (0.022)	0.410 (0.162)
Months in Factory	28.313 (33.021)	25.742 (28.880)	30.186 (38.408)	-0.095 (0.964)	1.217 (0.607)
Months in Sector	49.037 (48.482)	39.159 (37.473)	49.394 (52.833)	-6.336** (0.032)	1.607 (0.720)
Min. Wage Belief	6,509.660 (1,036.336)	6,332.367 (1,064.034)	6,376.171 (1,044.922)	-129.236 (0.106)	-29.120 (0.723)
Min. Wage Preference	7,496.740 (1,592.867)	7,216.832 (1,524.021)	7,295.683 (1,607.800)	-185.740 (0.166)	-112.789 (0.419)
Absolute diff., worker and median leader min. wage preference	1,301.959 (1,194.818)	1,215.885 (1,024.726)	1,229.245 (1,070.047)	-93.329 (0.384)	-59.061 (0.532)
Absolute diff., worker and median leader min. wage belief	754.704 (829.345)	739.031 (812.436)	907.145 (960.233)	-54.891 (0.451)	178.393* (0.055)
Grade	2.662 (1.434)	2.879 (1.412)	2.793 (1.515)	0.056 (0.492)	-0.172* (0.075)
Last Month Income	242561.453 (38,239.953)	233188.438 (38,216.246)	235591.016 (39,089.641)	-1,746.769 (0.453)	-1,880.242 (0.507)
Observations	332	243	171	575	503

Notes. Probability weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses. Controlling for factory FE x union status. Columns (1)-(3) show the mean of demographic, ability, employment and minimum wage views variables for each sample: control (Column 1), own LL (Column 2), and external LL (Column 3). Standard errors are shown in parenthesis. Columns (4)-(6) show the differences in means across samples: the difference between own and control samples (Column 4), and the difference between external and control (Column 5). P-values based on standard errors clustered at the group level are in parenthesis. Statistics use only the workers who correctly answer that they are not a LL/EC in the follow-up survey.

5.3 Placebo and robustness tests for consensus-building experiment

We conduct a placebo test for the main results. For each control discussion group, we identify the worker with the highest predicted leader similarity score, and we assign this worker as the placebo leader. For leader groups, we use the assigned leader's baseline view. We test whether we find greater convergence in treatment groups to the real leader's view compared to the placebo leader's view. Column (1) of Table 11 shows that we find much stronger convergence to the real leaders' minimum wage preferences relative to the placebo leaders' preferences. The evidence of convergence is qualitatively stronger for the own leader treatment arm, although there is suggestive evidence of greater convergence to the external leaders' preferences compared to the placebo control leaders' (column (2)). Consistent with our main results, we find no evidence of effects on expectations about the likely minimum wage level (columns (3) and (4)).

We also conduct multiple robustness checks. First, Table 12 shows that results are very similar if we use the mean of views rather than the median as used in our main specification. Second, we check whether union leaders have effects on group discussion outcomes even conditional on the predicted leader similarity of the workers in their discussion group. We show that our results hold controlling for the average or the maximum of the similarity score among workers in the discussion group (Table 13). We also run a flexible specification where we rank group participants by their similarity score and control for the similarity of each rank (Table 14, Panel A). It is clear that leaders influence groups' outcomes above and beyond even other potentially prominent individuals in the group.

Third, the results hold when controlling for the leader or placebo leader similarity (Table 14, Panel B). Fourth, we conduct a robustness test for our leader similarity measure, which is that we drop one family of variables in the prediction model at a time (i.e., demographics variables, Raven score, personality measures, and psychological measures) and re-estimate the results. Our results are robust to dropping each family of variables, as reported in Table 17.

Finally, leaders are somewhat more likely than workers to be men (12.9% compared to 3.3%). Gender is an observable characteristic that may be an alternative channel through which leaders affect workers or may complement or substitute for leadership. Consequently, we separately test for effects of female and male leaders in Table 15. While the smaller sample of male leaders limits our precision for this group, the effects do not provide evidence of heterogeneity except for the deviation from the union's beliefs about

the minimum wage; in addition to inducing convergence in preferences to the union's ideal (of a similar magnitude as female leaders), male leaders also induce convergence in beliefs to that of the union's leaders. As the leader's gender also affects the group's gender composition, which may affect consensus building through other channels than leadership, Table 15 also shows that our main results are robust to controlling for groups' gender composition.

Robustness checks for leaders' traits and charisma. We examine the real leaders' similarity relative to placebo control leaders, whom we define in the same way as the first placebo test above. We use the similarity score to partition the control group into high and low placebo leader similarity. Table 16 presents the results. For minimum wage preferences and beliefs, we first use the baseline construction of the outcome, then we exclude the individual leader's views from the union views and finally we use deviation from the placebo leader view for the control groups. Across numerous specifications, our main results continue to hold: high-similarity union leaders are the most effective at inducing convergence to the union's preferred minimum wage and increasing engagement in the discussion. We cannot reject that the effects of low-similarity union leaders and placebo leaders are the same, which is consistent with our finding that they are indistinguishable in terms of their similarity to union presidents. We also conduct a robustness test for our leader similarity measure, which is that we drop one family of variables in the prediction model at a time (i.e., demographics, personality traits, psychological traits, and Raven score) and re-estimate the results. Our results are robust to dropping each family of variables as shown by Table 17 below.

Table 11: Placebo leaders (workers with highest leader similarity) in control groups

	Predicted Leader Control Deviation from median union leader			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Preference		Belief	
Leader	-256.7** (122.0)		136.1 (83.68)	
Own Leader		-288.3** (143.0)		127.6 (95.73)
External Leader		-206.8 (153.7)		149.6 (109.3)
R-squared	0.286	0.286	0.485	0.485
Control Mean	1395.362	1395.362	684.124	684.124
Number of obs.	833	833	833	833
<u>p-values</u>				
External=Own:		0.628		0.850

Notes. Unit of observation is worker. Probability weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses. For groups with leaders, the dependent variables are the absolute value of the endline minimum wage preference/belief minus the median of leaders' preferences and beliefs at baseline at the factory level. For control groups, the dependent variables are the absolute value of the endline minimum wage preference/belief minus baseline preference/belief of the worker of highest similarity (placebo leader). Sample restricted to workers who are not placebo leaders. Stratification FEs included: Factory FEs x Union FEs. Controlling for group size FE.

Table 12: Group Discussions: deviation from mean views

	Deviation from workers' mean in discussion group		Deviation from union leaders' mean in factory	
	(1) Preferences	(2) Beliefs	(3) Preferences	(4) Beliefs
Panel A: Leader				
Leader	-57.74 (84.88)	67.30 (54.77)	-223.0** (94.63)	-19.82 (55.04)
R-squared	0.218	0.347	0.246	0.340
Control Mean	987.455	506.739	1130.078	712.308
Number of obs.	914	914	914	914
Panel B: Own versus External LL				
Own Leader	-127.4 (104.1)	40.95 (69.88)	-248.9** (105.4)	-25.43 (64.38)
External Leader	50.03 (112.0)	108.0 (72.04)	-182.9 (111.2)	-11.05 (76.99)
R-squared	0.224	0.348	0.247	0.340
Control Mean	987.455	506.739	1130.078	712.308
Number of obs.	914	914	914	914
<u>p-values</u>				
External=Own:	0.189	0.468	0.532	0.869

Notes. Unit of observation is worker. Probability weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses. In Col. 1-2, the dependent variables are the absolute value of the endline minimum wage preference/belief minus the workers' mean wage preference/belief at the discussion group level at baseline. In Col. 3-4, the dependent variables are the absolute value of the endline minimum wage preference/belief minus the mean of leaders' preferences and beliefs at baseline at the factory level. Stratification FEs included: Factory FEs x Union FEs. Controlling for group size FE and baseline deviation.

Table 13: Average and max discussion group leader similarity and union leader

	Deviation from median union leader	
	(1) Preference	(2) Belief
Panel A: Average discussion group leader similarity		
Leader	-198.1*** (68.75)	-20.52 (42.08)
Average Group Similarity	-7889.4*** (1511.1)	1019.3 (1530.9)
R-squared	0.344	0.342
Panel B: Maximum discussion group leader similarity		
Leader	-204.3*** (68.73)	-22.81 (41.84)
Max Similarity in Group	-1496.5*** (307.2)	268.6 (321.7)
R-squared	0.342	0.343
Control Mean	1194.103	654.399
Number of obs.	914	914

Notes. Unit of observation is worker in all columns. The dependent variables represent the absolute value of the endline minimum wage preference/belief minus the workers' median wage preference/belief at the discussion group level at baseline. Probability weights are used. Bootstrap standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses. Controlling for group size FE, stratification FEs (Factory FEs x Union FEs), and baseline deviation.

Table 14: Robustness to flexibly controlling for group and leader similarity

	Deviation from median union leader	
	(1) Preference	(2) Belief
Panel A: Flexibly controlling for Individual President Similarity		
Leader	-176.8*** (67.76)	-18.30 (42.64)
Similarity of Member w/ Rank=1	-1245.5*** (314.8)	347.5 (353.4)
Similarity of Member w/ Rank=2	7058.2* (3717.9)	-1021.5 (3160.4)
Similarity of Member w/ Rank=3	-67187.5*** (22904.7)	-5010.5 (18472.9)
Similarity of Member w/ Rank=4	-89949.5 (74186.7)	-23648.9 (64674.4)
R-squared	0.358	0.344
Panel B: Controlling for Placebo President Similarity		
Leader	-241.8*** (67.26)	-23.81 (41.05)
Leader or placebo leader similarity	-856.1*** (299.8)	426.9 (345.9)
R-squared	0.333	0.344
Control Mean	1194.103	654.399
Number of obs.	914	914

Notes. Unit of observation is worker in all columns. The dependent variables represent the absolute value of the endline minimum wage preference/belief minus the workers' median wage preference/belief at the discussion group level at baseline. Probability weights are used. Bootstrap standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses. Controlling for group size FEs, stratification FEs (Factory FEs x Union FEs), and baseline deviation.

Table 15: Robustness to gender of leader and share of men in the group discussion

	Deviation from median union leader			
	(1) Preference	(2)	(3) Belief	(4)
Panel A: Leader				
Female Leader	-248.2** (114.4)		10.66 (78.48)	
Male Leader	-368.8** (186.6)		-190.8 (123.4)	
Leader		-243.4** (105.5)		28.95 (75.25)
Male share in group		-582.3 (751.3)		-1032.7*** (347.9)
R-squared	0.331	0.332	0.347	0.356
P-val: Female Leader = Male Leader	0.548		0.109	
Panel B: Own versus External LL				
Own Female Leader	-304.7** (136.4)		-28.16 (86.65)	
Own Male Leader	-211.5 (237.6)		-158.4 (128.0)	
External Female Leader	-142.2 (140.7)		77.39 (119.7)	
External Male Leader	-743.6*** (208.6)		-265.8 (291.6)	
Own Leader		-280.4** (127.0)		-12.62 (81.08)
External Leader		-184.9 (123.4)		95.46 (111.2)
Male share in group		-593.8 (746.0)		-1046.5*** (348.1)
R-squared	0.336	0.333	0.349	0.359
Control Mean	1194.103	1194.103	654.399	654.399
Number of obs.	914	914	914	914
P-val: Female Own = Male Own	0.730		0.329	
P-val: Female External = Male External	0.010		0.279	
P-val: Female Own = Female External	0.309		0.411	
P-val: Male Own = Male External	0.089		0.737	
P-val: Own Leader = External Leader		0.498		0.352

Notes. Unit of observation is worker in all columns. The dependent variables represent the absolute value of the endline minimum wage preference/belief minus the workers' median wage preference/belief at the discussion group level at baseline. Probability weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses. Controlling for group size FEs, stratification FEs (Factory FEs x Union FEs), and baseline deviation.

Table 16: Placebo control group leaders, leader similarity, and main results, control group leader is member with highest similarity

	Deviation from Union Median	Deviation Exc. Leader	Deviation from Union or Placebo leader	Deviation from Union Median	Deviation Exc. Leader	Deviation from Union or Placebo leader
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Preference			Belief		
Leader, High Similarity	-365.2** (142.1)	-323.0** (144.1)	-509.1*** (183.4)	-54.40 (114.8)	-43.93 (115.9)	64.03 (116.4)
Leader, Low Similarity	-278.5* (148.1)	-250.8* (149.9)	-470.4** (196.7)	-26.31 (115.3)	-6.790 (115.0)	33.80 (121.2)
Control, High Similarity	-58.18 (164.7)	-87.75 (165.9)	-262.2 (207.0)	-25.73 (117.1)	-20.89 (117.1)	-23.89 (145.1)
R-squared	0.323	0.319	0.291	0.342	0.340	0.342
Control Mean	1135.491	1188.522	1395.362	713.572	656.318	684.124
Number of obs.	833	833	833	833	833	833
<u>p-values</u>						
High Similarity= Low:	0.507	0.582	0.773	0.796	0.733	0.792
Leader High= Control High:	0.037	0.102	0.118	0.781	0.825	0.503
Leader Low= Control High:	0.176	0.312	0.284	0.996	0.890	0.710

Notes. Unit of observation is worker in all columns. The variable *Leader*, *High Similarity* is a binary variable equal to 1 if the estimated probability of a line leader having similar attributes to president is above the median in the treatment group. The probabilities are estimated for each worker based on a probit model, which includes demographics (gender, age, education, migrant(0/1), months in factory/sector), personality metrics (extraversion, agree- ableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, openness) and psychological metrics (raven, score, grit, altruism, locus of control). In the control group, the worker with the highest probit scores is considered as the leader (placebo leader). The variable *Control*, *High Similarity* is a binary variable equal to 1 if the placebo leader's probit score is above the median in the control group. Sample restricted to workers who are not placebo leaders. The dependent variables in Cols. 1-6 represent the deviation from the factory median of baseline leaders' preferences and beliefs (Cols. 1 and 4, respectively); Cols. 2 and 5 exclude the individual leader view from construction of the factory median for the leader groups and Cols. 3 and 6 use deviation from the placebo leader view for the control groups. Probability weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses. Controlling for group size FEs, stratification FEs (Factory FEs x Union FEs), and baseline deviation.

Table 17: Taking out families of variables from president probit model

	Deviation from median union leader	
	Preference	Belief
Panel A: Probability estimated without demographic controls		
Leader, High Similarity	-315.2*** (110.2)	67.93 (91.65)
Leader, Low Similarity	-223.1* (129.3)	-81.42 (88.39)
R-squared	0.331	0.347
P-val: High Similarity= Low Similarity	0.470	0.138
Panel B: Probability estimated without personality metrics		
Leader, High Similarity	-368.5*** (116.2)	-92.18 (84.58)
Leader, Low Similarity	-162.8 (130.1)	68.80 (95.45)
R-squared	0.335	0.348
P-val: High Similarity= Low Similarity	0.146	0.136
Panel C: Probability estimated without psychological metrics		
Leader, High Similarity	-359.7*** (107.4)	-11.73 (83.66)
Leader, Low Similarity	-166.2 (141.8)	-11.81 (97.11)
R-squared	0.334	0.342
P-val: High Similarity= Low Similarity	0.181	0.999
Panel D: Probability estimated without Raven score		
Leader, High Similarity	-347.4*** (115.0)	-41.99 (89.58)
Leader, Low Similarity	-186.1 (129.2)	17.99 (92.68)
R-squared	0.333	0.343
P-val: High Similarity= Low Similarity	0.231	0.577
Control Mean	1194.103	654.399
Number of obs.	914	914

Notes. Unit of observation is worker. The variable *Leader, High Similarity* is a binary variable equal to 1 if the estimated probability of a line leader having similar attributes to president is above the median. The probabilities are estimated for each worker based on a probit model, which includes demographics (gender, age, education, migrant(0/1), months in factory/sector), personality metrics (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, openness) and psychological metrics (raven score, altruism, grit, locus of control). The dependent variables represent the absolute value of the endline minimum wage preference/belief minus the median of leaders' preferences and beliefs at baseline at the factory level. Probability weights are used. Standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses. Controlling for group size FEs, stratification FEs (Factory FEs x Union FEs), and baseline deviation.

6 Mobilization experiment: List of variables eligible to be included in regression forest prediction analysis

- Demographics-related:
 - Age
 - Female
 - Raven Score
 - Migrant
 - Years of education
 - Perceived relationship with family
- Personality and psychology:
 - Extraversion (Big Five Inventory (BFI))
 - Agreeableness (BFI)
 - Conscientiousness (BFI)
 - Neuroticism (BFI)
 - Openness (BFI)
 - Grit
 - Altruism (amount of donation to orphanage)
 - Locus of control (perceived degree of choice in life)
- Employment:
 - Tenure in factory
 - Experience in sector
 - Total income from factory (previous month)
 - Base wage from factory (previous month)
 - Position type
 - Skill grade indicators
 - Perceived relationship with management

- Indicator for expecting to work in the same factory in one year
- Union participation and views:
 - Indicator for being a union member
 - Perceived relationship with union
 - Perceived relationship with non-union members in factory
 - Number of times met a union leader outside of factory for social activities (past 4 months)
 - Number of times sought work-related advice from a union leader (past 4 months)
 - Number of union meetings attended (past 4 months)
 - View on whether men or women are better union presidents (or neutral)
 - View on whether men or women are better union line leaders (or neutral)
- Group discussion:
 - Baseline minimum wage guess (winsorized)
 - Baseline minimum wage ideal (winsorized)
 - Mean of workers' self-reported engagement in group discussion, leaving out focal worker's own report
 - Focal worker's self-reported engagement in group discussion
 - Indicator for whether worker and line leader from same production line if line leader in group discussion
 - Count of workers in discussion group from same production line
- Other:
 - Factory fixed effects
 - Number of times met co-workers outside of factory for social activities (past 4 months)


7 Mobilization and leading by example experiment (presidents and line leaders)

We report the design and results of the mobilization and leading-by-example experiment we conducted with union presidents and Line Leaders (LLs) in Session 1. The context

is for the president to motivate LLs to recruit workers for the survey taking place the next Sunday (Session 2) and to encourage LLs to produce posters for CTUM’s annual International Women’s Day activities (March 8, 2020). As part of the Session 1 activities, LLs are given 30 minutes to produce similar posters (one slogan per poster, all LLs choose slogans from the same list). The goal of the experiment is to test the motivation and leading-by-example channels of leadership.

The experiment consists of a cross-cutting design with two interventions, as Figure 4 illustrates. In the Speech by President arm, LLs receive a motivational speech by the president of their union, where the president is given a standardized set of instructions with talking points by the research staff. The Speech by President arm is to test whether motivation by the president increases LLs’ effort to recruit workers. In the Poster by President arm, a sample poster about CTUM’s annual International Women’s Day activities made by the President is shown to the LLs, and they are informed that the president made it. In order to isolate the effect of being informed about the president doing the poster versus simply seeing a sample poster, the other arms are shown a sample poster made by research staff. The Poster by President arm is to test whether leading by example increases LLs’ effort to prepare posters for the CTUM.

Figure 4: Session 1: Mobilization and Leading by Example



We estimate the following model:

$$Y_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_2 Speech_i + \alpha_1 Poster_i + \alpha_3 Speech_i \times Poster_i + \mathbf{X}_i' \beta + \epsilon_i \quad (1)$$

where Y_i is an outcome of LL i representing either the share of workers showing up in session 2 (out of the total number assigned to invite) or the number of completed

posters. X_i includes factory FE and other controls depending on the outcome (see Table 18 notes). Robust standard errors are reported. We weight observations so that they are representative at the factory level. As mentioned in Section 3.2 of the paper, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, we could only cover 60% of the sample and given the much lower number of LLs compared to workers, we are underpowered to detect effects in these experiments.

Table 18 reports the results. Beginning with column (1), the number of observations is less than the 170 LLs who took the survey because we lose: the LLs from the final two factories that only completed Session 1; 13 LLs who could not come to take the survey in session 1 but took it in session 2; 26 LLs who were mistakenly not assigned a line to invite or assigned the same line as at least one other LL. For the worker mobilization outcome, we mainly focus on looking at the impact of the Speech arm, in which LLs received a motivational speech by the president about mobilizing workers to session 2. In addition to the lack of statistical power, the null results may be explained by contamination across the experimental arms since individual interviews with the LLs revealed that in a number of factories, presidents organized a second meeting with all LLs to discuss how to invite the workers, hence likely nullifying any potential effect of the experimental speech.

Column (2) reports the number of completed posters. The number of observations is less than the 170 LLs who took the survey because we lose the 13 LLs who took the survey in session 2 and 13 LLs who had to leave before the poster session due to personal/unexpected reasons. The results suggest a negative effect of both the speech and the poster arms, suggesting that the president intervention might have crowded out the LLs' actions. However, the standard errors are wide, and we are underpowered to make more definite statements.

Table 18: Mobilization (of workers to Session 2) and Leading by Example Experiment

	Mobilization of Workers	Poster of Activities
	Share Workers (1)	No. Completed Posters (2)
Speech	0.010 (0.055) [0.856] {0.853}	-1.848 (2.386) [0.440] {0.450}
Poster	0.073 (0.040) [0.068] {0.078}	-1.784 (2.496) [0.476] {0.474}
Speech $\times$ Poster	-0.090 (0.076) [0.240] {0.280}	-0.826 (3.478) [0.813] {0.812}
R-squared	0.624	0.313
Control Mean	0.615	16.287
Number of Obs.	117	144
<i>p</i> -values		
Poster = Speech	0.217	0.977
Poster + Speech + Poster $\times$ Speech = 0	0.900	0.131
RI <i>p</i> -values		
Poster = Speech	0.255	0.930
Poster + Speech + Poster $\times$ Speech = 0	0.550	0.160
MDE	0.178	3.545


Notes. Unit of observation is LL. Probability weights are used. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. Conventional *p*-values are in square brackets, while randomization inference *p*-values (Young, 2019) are in curly brackets. Dependent variables in Columns 1 is the share of workers present out of total number each LL invited. The dependent variable in Column 2 is the number of completed posters without mistakes. Factory fixed effects are controlled. Additional control variables in Columns 1 are the number of workers each LL was assigned to invite and the share of union members in the line. Additional control variable in Columns 2 is an indicator for whether LL could not write well. MDE (minimal detectable effect) is determined from power calculations using planned sample size of 1792 workers, 358 discussion groups, 308 LL, and 28 unions, at a 10% significance level and 80% power.

8 Public good experiment (line leaders and workers)

We ran a two-part public good experiment: the first part was with the LLs and the second was with the workers. In both parts of the experiment, we privately endow participants with 1500 Kyat and ask how much they want to keep and how much they want to donate

to buy sewing machines for CTUM Skills Training Centre.⁶ However, participants can receive additional information depending on the treatment arm they are allocated to. The experiment is designed to test the leading-by-example channel of leadership (Hermalin (1998); Potters, Sefton and Vesterlund (2007)): on the leaders' side, we investigate to what extent leaders are willing to donate more when their average contribution is disclosed to workers from their same factory versus a different factory; on the followers' side, we test whether leaders' signaling role varies depending on whether the leaders are from the same versus a different factory. However, as shown in Figure 5, only 7% of LLs and 18% of workers donated less than the full amount (regardless of treatment arm).

Figure 5: Censoring in the Public Good Experiment



Notes. This figure plots the response to the Public Good (PG) Contribution question, separately by treatment arm. The figure on the left is for the experiment with workers and the figure on the right is for the experiment with the line leaders.

8.1 Public good: line leaders

Figure 6 illustrates the experimental design for the LLs. In the Contribution Public - Same Factory arm, we tell LLs that their contribution is observed by workers from their factories. In the Contribution Public - Different Factory arm we tell LLs that their contribution is observed by workers from another factory. The Contribution Private

⁶The CTUM Skills Training Centre serves all garment workers, not only union members.

arm is the control group, where the LL contribution is not observed by anyone. The public contribution arms are to test whether the ability to signal the marginal value of a donation to workers increases leaders' contribution. The distinction between whether the contribution is disclosed to the same factory versus a different factory is to test whether this would depend on whether the decision is observed by workers from their own or another factory. We estimate the following model:

$$Y_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \textit{Public Same Factory}_i + \alpha_2 \textit{Public Dif.f. Factory}_i + \mathbf{X}'_i \beta + \epsilon_i \tag{2}$$

where Y_i is the amount donated to CTUM in Myanmar kyats (out of the 1500 endowment) and X_i includes factory FE. Standard errors are robust. We weigh observations so that they are representative at the factory level. Table 19 reports the results. In Column (1), we group together the two treatment arms, i.e. the contribution being public, and in Column (2) we report the full specification as in Equation 2. A specification using a binary outcome of full donation (1500 kyats) versus partial or no donation yields similar results.

Figure 6: LLs: Leading by Example on a Public Good




Table 19: Public Good Experiment: LL Results


	PG Amount the Line Leader Donated	
	(1)	(2)
Contribution Public	8.758 (32.90)	
Contribution Public, Same Factory		8.097 (33.07)
Contribution Public, Different Factory		9.497 (40.13)
R-squared	0.236	0.236
Mean	1447.1	1447.1
Control Mean	1421.9	1421.9
Number of obs.	170	170
<u>p-values</u>		
Public, Same Factory = Public, Diff. Factory:		0.965

Notes. Unit of observation is LL. Probability weights and robust standard errors used. Controlling for factory FE. The outcome variable is measured in Myanmar kyats.

8.2 Public good: workers

Figure 7 illustrates the experimental design for the public good experiment with the workers. In the Told Leader Contribution - Same Factory arm, workers are told the average LLs' contribution from their factory (from the public arm only); in the Told Leader Contribution - Different Factory arm, workers are told the average LLs' contribution from another factory (from the public arm only); in the Told Leader Contribution - Factory not Specified arm, workers are told the average LLs' contribution amount from the other factory, however, it is not specified which factory. For all treatment arms, there is minimal variation in the donation amount shown (as already evident from Figure 5): the median donation amount shown is 1500 kyats and the interdecile range of the donation amount shown is 300 kyats. The goal is to test whether observing leaders' contributions induces greater contributions by the workers and whether this depends on whether workers observe contributions by LLs from their own factory or LLs from other factories.

Figure 7: Workers: Signaling in Sequential Provision of Public Good



In Table 20, we report the results from estimating the following model:

$$Y_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Told\ Same_i + \alpha_2 Told\ Diff_i + \alpha_3 Told\ Not\ Specified_i + \beta X_i + \epsilon_i \quad (3)$$

where Y_i is the amount donated to CTUM in Myanmar kyats (out of the 1500 endowment), X_i includes factory times union membership FE. Standard errors are robust. We weigh observations so that they are representative at the factory level. Table 20 reports the results. In Column (1), we group together the 3 treatment arms to just test the effect of being told about the LLs' contribution. In Column (2), we separate out the arm where the factory was not specified versus the other two arms where a factory was specified. Finally, in Column (3) we report the full specification as in Equation 3. A specification using a binary outcome of full donation (1500 kyats) versus partial or no donation yields similar results.

Table 20: Public Good Experiment: Worker Results

	PG Amount the Worker Donated		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Told Leader Contribution	36.55 (26.51)		
Told Leader Contribution, Factory specified		40.38 (27.88)	
Told Leader Contribution, Factory not specified		28.57 (32.95)	28.58 (32.97)
Told Leader Contribution, Same Factory			37.22 (31.91)
Told Leader Contribution, Different Factory			43.61 (32.03)
R-squared	0.186	0.186	0.186
Mean	1348.8	1348.8	1348.8
Control Mean	1327.2	1327.2	1327.2
Number of obs.	916	916	916
<u>p-values</u>			
Factory = Factory not specified:		0.675	
Same Factory = Diff. Factory = Factory not specified:			0.896

Notes. Unit of observation is worker. Probability weights and robust standard errors used. Controlling for factory times union FE. The outcome variable is measured in Myanmar kyats.

References

- Aron, Arthur, Tracy McLaughlin-Volpe, Debra Mashek, Gary Lewandowski, Stephen C Wright, and Elaine N Aron, “Including others in the self,” *European review of social psychology*, 2004, 15 (1), 101–132.
- Hermalin, Benjamin E., “Toward an Economic Theory of Leadership: Leading by Example,” *The American Economic Review*, 1998, 88 (5), 1188–1206.
- Jack, B Kelsey and María P Recalde, “Leadership and the voluntary provision of public goods: Field evidence from Bolivia,” *Journal of Public Economics*, 2015, 122, 80–93.

Mashek, Debra, Lisa W Cannaday, and June P Tangney, “Inclusion of community in self scale: A single-item pictorial measure of community connectedness,” *Journal of Community Psychology*, 2007, *35* (2), 257–275.

Potters, Jan, Martin Sefton, and Lise Vesterlund, “Leading-by-example and Signaling in Voluntary Contribution Games: An Experimental Study,” *Economic Theory*, 2007, *33* (1), 169–182.

Schultz, P Wesley, “Inclusion with nature: The psychology of human-nature relations,” *Psychology of sustainable development*, 2002, pp. 61–78.

Young, Alwyn, “Channeling Fisher: Randomization Tests and the Statistical Insignificance of Seemingly Significant Experimental Results,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2019, *134* (2), 557–598.