30
DISCUSSION PAPER

An Impact Evaluation of Better Work from a Gender Perspective

APRIL 2019

Dira Djaya
Drusilla Brown
Luisa Lupo

International Labour Organization
IFC International Finance Corporation WORLD BANK GROUP
BetterWork

ILO CATALOGUING IN PUBLICATION DATA

Dira Djaya

Drusilla Brown

Luisa Lupo

An Impact Evaluation of Better Work from a Gender Perspective

International Labour Office

April 2019

First published JANUARY 2019

ILO publications can be obtained through major booksellers or ILO local offices in many countries, or direct from ILO Publications, International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland. Catalogues or lists of new publications are available free of charge from the above address, or by email: pubvente@ilo.org

Visit our website: www.ilo.org/publns

Cover photo: ©ILO/IFC

Printed by ILO

Better Work Discussion Paper 30

An Impact Evaluation of Better Work from a Gender Perspective: Analyzing Worker Surveys from Haiti, Nicaragua, Indonesia, Vietnam and Jordan

Dira Djaya, Tufts University
Drusilla Brown, Tufts University
Luisa Lupo, Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies

April 2019

Abstract

The expansion of export-oriented manufacturing and the globalization of production sparked a longstanding debate on the consequences of the feminization of labour for women's empowerment and gender equality. This paper examines the impact of Better Work, a policy intervention consisting of factory-level assessments of labour rights compliance, training, advisory services, and capacity-building at firm, national, regional and global levels, in Haiti, Nicaragua, Indonesia, Vietnam, and Jordan. By taking differences in educational levels and stage in the life cycle as likely determinants of disparities among sub-groups of women, the analysis focuses on three key dimensions of empowerment: (i) Work attributes, namely take-home pay, hours of work and promotions; (ii) voicing of concerns, particularly about overtime work, sexual harassment, verbal and physical abuse; and (iii) health and wellbeing, comprising of physical and mental health indicators. Better Work appears most successful in fostering improvement in objective work attributes, particularly take-home pay and hours of work and concerns about overtime, with women in relatively more vulnerable positions benefiting the most. Gender disparities remain in terms of opportunities for upward mobility, pointing to the need to better address their determinants and to foster more inclusive leadership.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

Since the 1970s, the rise of export-oriented industrialization in the developing world has increased the demand for female labour and, consequently, has sparked a debate on the consequences of the "feminization" of labour, not only for women, but also for gender equality in countries experiencing industrial expansion. While some researchers highlight the empowering potential of employment in export-oriented manufacturing in terms of increased earning and decision-making power, others contend the low wages and occupational segregation which often characterize these jobs create new forms of subordination, specifically along gender lines.

Since 2007, Better Work, a partner programme of the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the International Finance Corporation (IFC), has worked to promote humane working conditions in apparel factories in developing and emerging countries. Better Work utilizes a multi-stakeholder, multi-dimensional approach of enterprise assessments, training, policy engagement, advisory services, and interventions to encourage compliance with labour standards among participating factories.[1] Better Work also seeks to foster gender equality, reduce sexual harassment, and close the gender pay gap in the global garment industry, through targeted factory initiatives and by strengthening policies and practices at the national, regional, and international levels.

Beginning in 2010, Tufts University's Labor Lab has used a quasi-experimental approach to identify the causal impact of Better Work. Surveys have been administered to workers in Better Work participating factories, asking a range of questions varying from demographic information, concerns regarding their treatment and work and life outcomes. More than 14,000 worker survey responses have been processed from Better Work participating factories located in Jordan, Indonesia, Vietnam, Nicaragua, and Haiti. This rich, gender-disaggregated dataset thus offers unique insights on the evolution of working conditions and workers' perceptions in garment sector factories across an array of different socio-cultural and economic landscapes.

A gender analysis of Better Work baseline data in Vietnam for the period 2010 to 2012 was conducted by Fontana and Silberman (2013). The material presented in this paper builds on a similar approach, taking differences in workers' educational level and stage in the life cycle as likely determinants of differences among sub-groups of women. By doing so, this paper seeks to answer the following questions: Has Better Work been effective in reducing existing gender gaps? If so, are all women better off, or were changes distributed differently among sub-groups of women?

[1] https://betterwork.org

The analysis draws from a panel of Better Work worker survey data gathered during the period from 2010 to 2016, and evaluates the programme's overall impact across three interrelated dimensions: (i) Work attributes, especially pay, hours of work, and promotions; (ii) concerns and voice, including about sexual harassment, physical and verbal abuse; and (iii) health and wellbeing, specifically physical and mental health.

This paper finds that exposure to Better Work has a positive impact on gender gaps in wages and hours of work, as well as concerns about overtime, in most country programmes. Changes are most evident for women with children and with lower levels of formal education relative to all the other women, suggesting that improved compliance with labour standards is most beneficial for workers in relatively more vulnerable positions. In some instances, women became more vocal about sexual harassment, verbal and physical abuse, suggesting that participation in the Better Work programme may have a positive impact on their awareness and capacity to voice concerns. Gender disparities remain in terms of opportunities for upward mobility, pointing to the need to better understand their determinants, as well as the potential measures to foster more inclusive leadership.

The remainder of this study is structured as follows. The next section provides an overview of the key debates in the literature on the feminization of labour in export-oriented apparel production from a global perspective. Section 3 details the empirical methodology underlying this study, while section 4 describes the survey data used for the analysis. Section 5 discusses the impact of the Better Work programme by gender and for different constituencies of women across a range of dimensions, including work attributes and workers' perceptions. Section 6 concludes by identifying potential avenues for action and future research.

2. Gender Inequalities in the Global Garment Industry: A Cross-Country Comparison

The question of whether employment in export-manufacturing improves or is detrimental to the status of women received increasing attention throughout the past decades. Many scholars have argued that the high demand for female labour within the apparel industry benefits women, improving their self-esteem and autonomy (Kabeer, 2002) and providing financial opportunities to lift them and their families out of poverty (Lim, 1983). According to proponents of the empowerment argument, factory work improves the status of women in relative terms, as it provides them with a better alternative compared to more precarious and temporary options, such as employment in the informal sector. Critics contend the low wages and poor working conditions associated with labour-intensive factory work expose women to a double jeopardy, not only as women, but also as workers in absolute terms (Fernandez-Kelly, 1983; Elson and Pearson, 2011).

Despite economic structures, gender dynamics and labour market institutions differ considerably both across countries and overtime, the experiences of garment sector workers share many similarities that indicate a common set of challenges in ensuring gender equality throughout the global garment value chain. Substantial research on the maquila industry in Mexico and Central America (Tiano, 1994; Fleck 2001; Ver Beek, 2001; Domínguez et al., 2010), and on gender and labour conditions in export-processing zones across South and Southeast Asia (Chant, 1995, Silvey, 2000; Ong, 2010) has shown the myriad ways in which female workers are exploited in factory settings such as low pay, long working hours and flexible contracts.

Poor working conditions at varying degrees are a common problem across garment sector firms for all workers, but they are even more so for women, who concentrate in a narrow range of low-skilled and low-paid positions. Discriminatory practices, such as dismissals and terminations of pregnant workers, managerial beliefs and stereotypes about women's skills and supposedly more docile attitudes intensify gender segregation, both horizontally and vertically. Not only are women less likely than men to occupy managerial positions (Prieto-Carron, 2008), but they also bear the burden of combining their domestic responsibilities with paid employment (Folbre, 2006). The gender division of labour on the factory-floor thus reflects gender and generational divisions of roles and responsibilities in the home. These are key to understanding inequalities both between men and women, and among different sub-groups of women, for example, according to their stage in the life cycle.

A number of studies from the mid-1980s to the early 2000s has made visible the exposure of garment sector workers to violence and harassment by factory managers and line supervisors. Although the majority of studies focus on export-processing along the US-Mexico border, and in Central America (Fussel, 2000; Gates, 2002; Maquila Solidarity Network, 2003; Salzinger, 2003; Pantaleón, 2003), recent studies are increasingly documenting the experiences of violence and harassment in firms throughout the Asia Pacific region, including in Sri Lanka (Hancock, 2006; Hancock et al., 2011), Bangladesh (Khosla, 2009; Hossain, 2012), and Cambodia (CARE, 2017). Across an array of different industrial and geopolitical contexts, violence and harassment are found to dominate the narratives and the everyday lives of women in the garment industry. While these issues often reflect broader community and societal problems, they are incompatible with decent work and represent a major obstacle to women's equal participation in the labour market.

Further, poor working conditions and abusive workplace practices have significant implications for workers' health and wellbeing. Early research on the *maquila* industry, for instance, has denounced the significant health risks facing workers in export-manufacturing (Ver Beek, 2001), as well as the poor living conditions and serious environmental problems characterizing worker's accommodations (Tello Sanchez, 2003; Williams & Homedes, 2001). Studies for the manufacturing industry also show that women are more likely to report poorer mental health compared to men (Khan et al., 2010; Del Prado-Lu, 2004), or relative to women employed in

different sectors of the economy (Liberato & Fennell, 2007). According to ethnographic research, however, women's higher reporting of mental health symptoms should not be examined in isolation, but rather in relation to the multiple forms of power asymmetries confronting women on the factory-floor (Ong, 2010). As suggested by Pun (2000, p.542) chronic complaints, such as headaches and backaches, are common among female workers in the most low-skilled and precarious positions, and can be viewed as "embodied resistance," specifically to oppressive working conditions and the authority of male supervisors.

These considerations should not blind us to blanket assertions on the implications of having a garment sector job for women's empowerment. The answer to this question ultimately depends on a range of factors that are specific to each country context, including economic and cultural variables, different labour market institutions, as well as what factors are considered—the way empowerment is defined, the profile of female factory workers and, finally, with whom they are compared.

An overview of broad economic and social indicators of the countries included in this study (Table 1) provides some context for interpreting results regarding women's empowerment and the garment sector. Haiti is the poorest country in this study and has the lowest rank in terms of human development outcomes (including life expectancy, mean years of schooling and gross national income). The overall female labour force participation rate in non-agricultural sectors stands at about 59 percent, higher than the average for Latin America and the Caribbean, although a large share of women are in vulnerable forms of employment, particularly own-account workers and family work. In Nicaragua, human development outcomes and income levels are higher relative to Haiti, although women's participation in the labour force is relatively low (50 percent). In addition, the current political unrest and climate of uncertainty in Nicaragua poses a distinct set of challenges to the promotion of decent work opportunities for both women and men.

Vietnam and to a lesser extent Indonesia are the countries in the Southeast Asia region with the highest support for women's employment and leadership (Evans, 2017) and the female labour force participation rate in the garment sector is relatively high, at 80 and 82 percent respectively. Vietnam is richer in per capita terms, with over 70 percent of women workers in non-agricultural work, and has reached parity in terms of the gender gaps measured by the Gender Development Index. In Indonesia, by contrast, gender gaps in human development achievements are close to parity, although a large share of the female labour force is still employed in agricultural production. Jordan is richer in per capita terms, but gender biases are more pervasive. Women represent only 14 percent of the total workforce in non-agriculture and concentrate both in the service and manufacturing sectors. In the development of its garment sector, Jordan presents some similarities with Haiti and Nicaragua, where trade agreements with the US have been key drivers of growth and expansion of the sector, while in Indonesia and Vietnam garment production is a longstanding tradition.

Table 1. Economic and gender situation by country

Indicator (2017)	Haiti	Nicaragua	Indonesia	Vietnam	Jordan
Estimated gross national income per capita 2011 PPP $ (Female)	1,400	3,434	7,259	5,345	2,459
Estimated gross national income per capita 2011 PPP $ (Male)	1,937	6,930	14,385	6,383	13,971
Exported value, apparel and clothing accessories (USD thousands)	34,917	1,296,863	8,568,820	24,340,325	1,563,454
Share of employment in nonagriculture (Female, % of total employment in nonagriculture)	59%	50%	51%	73%	14%
Share of employment in the garment sector (Female, % of total employment in the garment sector)	68%	55%	80%	82%	69%
Gender Development Index (GDI)	n.a.	0.966	0.932	1.005	0.857
Human Development Index (HDI) rank	168	124	116	116	95

Sources: Authors' elaboration using ILO, World Bank, UNDP and ITC data.

Another important differentiating factor among the countries in this study are different degrees of feminization in garment sector firms. While in Indonesia and Vietnam women represent the overwhelming majority of workers in the sector, Haiti and Nicaragua show a more even distribution by gender. According to Caraway (2007; 2006), these patterns can be explained by differences in labour market institutions, including different levels of unionization, specifically between Asia and Latin America. Stronger, male-dominated unions in Latin America historically slowed down or obstructed feminization, for fear of downward pressures on wages, de-skilling of jobs, or to defend male shares of employment (Ibid.). The opposite is valid for countries in the Southeast Asia region, where state-controlled unions and enterprise-level bargaining fuelled employers' choice for women workers. In Jordan, by contrast, women represent a small fraction of the workforce and garment production is characterized by a heavy reliance on migrant workers.

The gender literature also suggests unions in the garment sector are oftentimes male-dominated and inattentive to women's concerns (Razavi & Pearson, 2004; Evans, 2017). Yet, some efforts to increase women's bargaining power are particularly worthy of consideration. An example is the Maria Elena Cuadra (MEC) independent women's movement in Nicaragua. Established in 1994, MEC has played a key role in mobilizing women workers across the county's free trade zone, providing job training and sensitization on gender issues, including domestic violence and reproductive health (Mendez, 2005). In Vietnam, by contrast, the General Confederation of Labor has committed to increase the percentage of women in union leadership to at least 30 percent (Evans, 2017). This and other similar instances of women's organizing (for example, those documented by Dominguez, 2010) highlight the varied alternatives, opportunities for solidarity, collective action and agency existing for women in export-oriented manufacturing.

Notwithstanding the challenges discussed in this chapter, the apparel industry at a global level continues to employ women in disproportionally large numbers. This thus prompts us to question whether there are interventions and if so, of what kind, that can alleviate the asymmetric costs of export-oriented industrialization on female workers. In a rigorous evaluation of Better Work's effectiveness in changing workers' lives and the business of firms, Brown et al. (2016) provide a comprehensive overview of Better Work's impact on working conditions, firm organization, and global supply chain dynamics. This paper provides more nuance on Better Work's impact on working conditions from a gender perspective, drawing from a subset of the same survey data for Haiti, Nicaragua, Indonesia, Vietnam, and Jordan.

3. Methodology

To assess the impact of Better Work, identification is achieved by exploiting idiosyncrasies of programme delivery and strategic timing of data collection, as described in Brown et al (2016).[2] Enterprise assessments are unannounced and occur in a window of 11 to 14 months after the preceding assessment. Each assessment marks the start of a new *cycle,* dividing the Better Work timeline into defined phases. Sometime after an assessment, an impact evaluation survey data collection occurs in factories assigned at random.

The *cycle* variable is recoded to a set of binary variables taking on a value of 1 if a particular assessment has just been completed, and zero otherwise. In order to match the analytical approach of Fontana and Silberman (2013), this paper employs a slightly simpler specification that takes into consideration changes across cycles of exposure to Better Work. In their paper, Fontana and Silberman (Ibid.) calculated the mean by gender and among female workers for each working condition variable reported by workers at baseline. They then tested for a statistically significant gender difference in average baseline responses. Drawing from a similar approach, this paper uses a difference-in-difference methodology to test whether the average gender gap detected in the baseline for select outcome variables of interest declines over subsequent assessment cycles. That is, we estimate:

$$y_{xt} = \ \propto + \beta * female + \ \delta_t * cycle_t + \gamma_t * female * cycle_t + \epsilon_{xt} \qquad (1)$$

Where $cycle_t$ is a binary variable equal to 1 if the most recent previous assessment was the t^{th} assessment and zero otherwise,
female is a binary variable equal to 1 if the participant if female and zero otherwise,

[2] Ibid.

y_{xt} is the outcome variable of interest for worker x at $cycle_t$,
and ϵ_{xt} is the error term.

For each country, a series of difference-in-difference calculations are conducted, one for each assessment cycle after $cycle_1$. Each regression compares the response to the baseline to the response at $cycle_t$. The excluded group in equation (1) is $cycle_1$. A factory-level balanced panel is employed for each assessment cycle. Only factories for which there was a survey both shortly after the first assessment and after the t[th] are included in the difference-in-difference calculation for the t[th] cycle.

Results of estimating equation (1) can be interpreted as follows. The coefficient of *female* (β) measures the gender differential in the baseline. The coefficient of $cycle_t$ (δ_t) measures whether the outcome variable changed between the first assessment and the t[th] assessment. The coefficient of $female * cycle_t$ (γ_t) measures whether the gender differential changed between $cycle_1$ and $cycle_t$. The total treatment effect for women is the sum of the coefficient on the *cycle* variable and the *fem_cycle*$_t$ interaction. A negative coefficient for $female * cycle_t$ means that the outcome variable has reduced for women relative to men at the t[th] assessment.

As dependent variables we estimate hourly pay and weekly hours of work, voicing of concerns, promotion rates, as well as physical and mental health indexes. Workers' voicing of concerns and complaints ranges from issues of excess overtime and low pay to sexual harassment, verbal, and physical abuse. The survey questions in this category ask whether each issue is a particular concern for workers. For the purposes of this analysis, variables are coded as 1 if the participant reported any level of concern and 0 if no concern was expressed. Health and wellbeing indicators include variables related to self-reported perceptions of restlessness, sadness, crying, hopelessness, as well as fatigue, stomach pain, aches, dizziness, thirst, and hunger, among others. To simplify the analysis, these different sets of health and wellbeing outcomes are combined into two indexes, accounting for physical and mental health respectively, in which each component has equal weight.

Next, to examine whether changes in the dependent variables are distributed differently among sub-groups of women with different care responsibilities and levels of formal education, we test the following for women only:

$$y_{xt} = \propto +\beta * child + \delta_t * cycle_t + \gamma_t * child * cycle_t + \epsilon_{xt} \quad (2)$$

$$y_{xt} = \propto +\beta * low\ education + \delta_t * cycle_t + \gamma_t * low\ education * cycle_t + \epsilon_{xt} \quad (3)$$

Where *child* is a binary variable that takes value one when the respondent has one child or more and zero otherwise,
low education is a binary variable taking value one when the respondent has a lower secondary school diploma or less, and value zero for higher levels of education.

The coefficients for the *cycle* variables capture the treatment effect for women without children and with higher levels of education, while the differential for women with children, and low levels of education are captured by the *children*cycle* and *low education* cycle* interactions. Comparing outcomes between different sub-groups of women has the potential to provide more nuance on gender inequalities, as they are compounded by other axes of difference. It would be interesting to compare the status of women with lower education to men with a similar educational level, or between women with children and men with children, to see if gender differences persist within these categories. Due to the relatively small number of men in the sample, however, it was not possible to address this question.

4. Data

The data for analysis were collected during the monitoring and evaluation of Better Work apparel factories between 2010 and 2016 in Jordan, Indonesia, Vietnam, Nicaragua, and Haiti. When a factory joins Better Work and completes an initial period of advisory, the programme's enterprise advisors conduct an assessment, collecting data regarding factory compliance with labour standards prior to the start of other programme activities. In the following years, advisors conduct assessments approximately once per year to track the progress of the factory's ability to achieve compliance.

In a rigorous evaluation of Better Work's effectiveness in changing workers' lives and the business of firms, Brown et al. (2016) provide a comprehensive overview of Better Work's impact on working conditions, firm organization and global supply chain dynamics. This paper provides more nuance on these findings, drawing from a subset of the same data for Haiti, Indonesia, Jordan, Nicaragua and Vietnam. In each factory, a random selection of workers and four factory managers are given surveys using a tablet computer. When possible, the same workers surveyed during a preceding visit are chosen to be surveyed again in following visits. Typically, 30 workers per factory are surveyed. However, in smaller factories, the sample size is limited to 5 percent of the workforce. Sample sizes of the individual country datasets used in this analysis are Vietnam – 6,000 observations, Indonesia – 4,165 observations, Jordan – 2,084 observations, Nicaragua – 684 observations, and Haiti – 1,073 observations; for a combined sample size of 14,007 observations.

Summary statistics of demographic variables for each country case study are shown in Tables 2, 6, 10, 14, and 18 respectively. In all countries, more than half of the sample is female. Indonesia and Vietnam have the most feminized workforce and women comprise over 80 percent of respondents. In comparison, in Nicaragua and Jordan, women represent about 68 percent of the sample, while Haiti has a nearly equal representation by gender. Due to differences in the local context and the way data was collected, the main dividing lines between different sub-groups of

women vary slightly across countries. For the case of Vietnam, for example, we compare outcomes between women with young children (between 0 and 5 years of age) and all the other women, and for women with tertiary education relative to less educated women. In Haiti, the main dividing line with respect to formal education is primary school. The survey for Jordan does not include information on the number of children, and therefore we only compare outcomes among women with different educational levels. Details on the construction and coding of the dependent variables estimated in the next sections are discussed in the Appendix.

This study has several limitations, the first pertains to the use of surveys to elicit information about workers' concerns about sensitive topics, such as sexual harassment, physical and verbal abuse. The questions were translated and read out in the local language, complemented in some cases with images to aid misunderstandings, and administered to respondents through Audio Computer-Assisted Self-Interviews (ACASI) software. This strategy potentially increased workers' comfort in sharing their concerns and shielded them from the risk of being overheard by supervisors or managers. It is important to mention, however, that a significant number of workers chose not to answer certain questions. This reticence may be due to stigma, fear of repercussions, fatalism or lack of trust among workers and may influence estimation results in important ways. Quantitative evidence emerging from this study should therefore be complemented by qualitative, in-depth interviews and participant observation to better understand workers' perceptions and experiences.

Another avenue for future research may be to examine the extent of vertical segregation in garment sector factories. This study only takes into consideration worker surveys, but survey responses from factory managers yield important insights on the pervasiveness of gender stereotypes and barriers to women's advancement in leadership positions. Finally, it was not entirely possible to select firms at random for their exposure to the Better Work programme, although the timing of Better Work compliance assessments is, to some degree, random, since visits are unannounced and occur at intervals of 11 to 14 months.

5. Findings

Haiti

While the introduction of the apparel assembly industry in Haiti dates back to the 1960s, it is in the 1980s that the country fully adopted the model of export-based economic development, encouraged by the US Agency for International Development (USAID), the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank. Export-oriented assembly production fell in the early 1990s, as a reaction to increasing political instability and competition from neighbouring Central American countries, specifically Honduras and Nicaragua. Following the Haitian Hemispheric Opportunity through Partnership Encouragement Act (HOPE) 2006 and its revision in 2008,

garment production intensified, US-based firms increased their investments and the number of jobs in the garment sector expanded rapidly. The changes in legislation introduced with HOPE II had profound effects on sourcing practices, allowing for more flexibility in the rules of origin for textiles used for production and making participation conditional upon labour standards compliance, through mandatory participation in the Better Work programme.[3]

The export-oriented model, however, did little to reduce poverty (Shamsie, 2010; Hammond 2018). Haiti remains the poorest country in the Americas, with half of its population living on less than 1 dollar per day, and 80 percent on less than 2 dollars per day (World Bank, 2016). The earthquake in 2010 further exacerbated social and economic insecurity, causing thousands of casualties, the displacement of 1.3 million people and immense structural damage (World Bank, 2010). In an attempt to revive the Haitian economy and harness offshore production opportunities for US-based manufacturers, the US Congress passed the Haiti Economic Lift Program (HELP) Act in 2010, increasing tariff preference levels and extending the benefits of the HOPE II legislation to 2020, as well as to additional textile and apparel products.

Women in Haiti play a major economic role, but have long been considered second-class citizens (Padgett and Warnecke, 2011). Historically, their household responsibilities revolved around managing domestic work and agricultural production. Environmental degradation and the shift towards large-scale, mono-crop agricultural production, however, changed the rural landscape considerably, increasing rural women's engagement in the urban labour market, specifically in the informal and assembly industry sectors (Gardella 2006; Steckley and Shamsie, 2015). According to recent estimates, women represent 68 percent of the workforce in the expanding textile and apparel industry, contributing to about 90 percent of national exports (CFI, 2018).

Regression results for Haiti are shown in Tables 2 to 5. About 68 percent of respondents are women, and more women than men report having children (73 compared to 69 percent). Given the limitations of the dataset, observations from assessment 3 and 4, and 5 to 9 are combined. Baseline results suggest the difference in average pay by gender at baseline is not statistically significant, although women report lower take home pay. This difference is largely driven by a marked pay differential at the disadvantage of women with children, who earn about 0.58 USD per hour compared to 0.83 USD for women without children. One of the reasons why women with children report systematically lower take-home pay are incorrect payments of maternity benefits. These include, but are not limited to, changing the employment status, benefits and seniority of workers

[3] The HOPE II law requires that Haiti in cooperation with the ILO establishes a Technical Assistance Improvement and Compliance Needs Assessment and Remediation Program (TAICNAR) to assesses Haitian apparel factories exporting under the HOPE II law on compliance with international core labour standards and national Haitian labour law, assists these factories on their remediation efforts and provide capacity building to the Haitian Government on these aspects. The latest Better Work Synthesis Report detailing enterprise level compliance performance under the HOPE II legislation is available at https://betterwork.org/blog/portfolio/better-work-haiti-16th-biannual-synthesis-report/. Accessed 6 July 2018.

during maternity leave, or withholding payments during breastfeeding breaks. This is confirmed by the findings from Better Work Haiti's unannounced factory assessments, which suggest non-compliance levels for leave, particularly maternity, reached up to 60 percent in 2016.

Although we do not find evidence for a statistically significant difference in reports of concerns between men and women, women with no formal education or education up to primary school are 15 percent less likely to voice concerns about sexual harassment compared to more educated women, as shown in Panel 1, Table 5. Similarly, women with children are 25 percent less likely to express any form of dissatisfaction about overtime work compared to women without children. These findings suggest women in relatively more vulnerable positions, specifically with greater care responsibilities or lower levels of education, may not feel comfortable expressing their concerns or voice dissatisfaction with working conditions, for example, because of fear of stigma or repercussions from managers and supervisors.

Difference-in-difference estimates are reported in Panels 3 to 6 (Tables 3 to 5). The main finding is that objective work attributes improve for both women and men, and that this shift benefits women with children relatively more than other women. As shown in Table 3, hourly pay increases by about 0.32 USD for workers in factories at cycle 2, while the gap identified at baseline between women with children and all the other women is reversed in more mature factories (cycles from 5 to 9, Table 5). Overall, this pattern suggests improved compliance with labour standards has disproportionate benefits for women who bear the burden of combining unpaid care with paid employment.

There is mixed evidence on the impact of exposure to Better Work on workers' voicing of concerns. Voicing of concerns about sexual harassment decreases as factories become more mature in their participation to the programme, first among women, and then among both genders in factories at their tenth assessment cycle. A similar pattern is observed for voicing of concerns about physical abuse and overtime work, which decrease considerably for men and women at cycle 3 and 4. While this reduction in reports could indicate that workers are experiencing improvements in their work environment, it may still be the case that workers face persistent barriers, especially when it comes to sensitive issues.

Two exceptions are that male and female workers become more likely to voice concerns about verbal abuse in more mature factories (Table 3), while women with children become relatively more vocal about physical abuse (Table 4). This finding is positive because this sub-group of women is likely to have lower bargaining power relative to other groups of workers, for example, because of lack of alternatives or fear that their ability to support their children may be compromised if they come forward. Starting from 2012, Better Work Haiti has placed a strong focus on employer-worker dialogue and the establishment of friendly dispute settlement

mechanisms, the way this initiative influenced workers' perceptions and ability to voice concerns is therefore an area that merits further attention.

As shown by difference-in-difference estimates for health and wellbeing, exposure to Better Work is associated with a consistent improvement in physical health symptoms among all workers, and between women with lower levels of education relative to all the other women. Improvements in workers' health go hand in hand with reductions in hours of work, potentially suggesting that excessive working hours have important implications for health outcomes, although this analysis does not allow to directly assess this hypothesis.

Overall, results show that objective work attributes and physical health improve for both men and women and among sub-groups of women as factories become more mature in their participation to Better Work. Another important finding is that the category of workers facing the greatest vulnerabilities are women with children. Both their lower likelihood to voice concerns and lower take-home pay identified at baseline point in this direction. Despite improvements occurring in these dimensions over the course of exposure to Better Work, women's upward mobility and reports of mental health symptoms deteriorate slightly in more mature factories. This suggests priority should be given to measures that address these asymmetries, both through holistic mental health services and initiatives to build women's leadership and career opportunities.

While improving compliance with the law is critical, engaging with national stakeholders to advance their gender equality agenda is equally important. With respect to maternity legislation, for example, benefits only cover six weeks of the statutory leave duration of twelve weeks, leaving women with little income to pay for basic household goods and support their children. Another area for future programme activities may be the promotion of quality childcare service provision among employers, to offer concrete support to workers in their role as caregivers beyond labour standards compliance.

Nicaragua

Nicaragua is the first country in Central America and second in the Americas (after Haiti) to have joined Better Work. Both its political history and garment sector make it unique within the Central American region. Export-processing zones have only had a significant presence in Nicaragua since the 1990s, when the Chamorro government initiated a process of increasing privatizations, reductions in public spending and downsizing of the public sector (Bandy and Mendez, 2003). While the country experienced dramatic political transformations and political volatility in the past decades, the apparel industry grew exponentially, from 715 million USD in 2005 to 1.3 billion USD in 2015, accounting for 30 percent of Nicaragua's total exports (World Bank, 2017). Due to its proximity to the US, low labour costs and tariff preference levels (TPLs) under the Dominican

Republic-Central America Free Trade Agreement (DR-CAFTA), Nicaragua is equally integrated into the American and Asian segment of the global garment value chain (Gereffi and Bair, 2014). Until the expiration of TPLs in 2014, most of the fabrics used for production were imported from China and other Asian countries, manufactured in Nicaragua and then exported duty-free to the US market, making the sector highly competitive in the region. As of 2017, the sector held steadily to increasing competition, employing about 8 percent of all formally employed Nicaraguans, of whom around 55 percent were women (World Bank, 2017).

The labour force in garment production is less feminized relative to other countries in Asia and Latin America. During the Sandinista decade, the government promoted women's integration into production, particularly in agriculture, in an attempt to increase the supply of food to the urban population and fill the vacuum created by men's engagement in the Contra War. The revolution opened new opportunities for women's employment and women's movements, reflecting the government's an attempt to strengthen class and national consciousness (Montoya, 2003). Privatization and export-promotion following the right-turn of the Chamorro government put an end to the revolutionary project and, in contrast to the experiences of other countries in this study, brought Nicaraguan women back to their traditional household responsibilities. This factor, combined with the country's history of strong, male-dominated unions, has contributed in making the sector relatively less feminized compared to the Southeast Asian countries examined in this study.

Estimates for Nicaragua are reported in Table 6. At baseline, we do not observe any statistically significant difference in pay, working hours and reported health between the genders, while, similar to the case study of Haiti, women are considerably less likely than men to voice their concerns. More specifically, they are 21 percent less likely than men to express their concerns about sexual harassment and 31 percent less likely to raise concerns about verbal abuse. Consistent with the notion that highly educated women may be more comfortable expressing their opinions, women with secondary education are more likely to voice concerns about sexual harassment at baseline compared to women with no formal education, or with education up to primary school.

Panels 2 to 4 in Table 14 show Better Work's treatment effects on gender gaps. With regards to objective work attributes, we find that hourly pay (including bonuses) decreased for women relative to men's by 0.11 USD in factories at their second assessment cycle, with no significant change in working hours, but this effect dissipates by cycle 3. Due to the relatively small number of factories evaluated, there is considerable noise in the estimation results. Figures for weekly hours, for example, are not statistically significant and have sizable standard deviations, precluding the ability to make inferences.

Despite voicing of concerns being relatively low and likely reflecting a certain degree of reticence among workers, as firms become more mature in their participation to Better Work the incidence

of reports becomes even lower. Voicing about sexual harassment declines during assessment cycle 2 and concerns about verbal abuse decline at cycle 3, with an equivalent treatment effect for women and men. Declining trends are also apparent for average overtime concerns, especially among women with up to secondary education relative to more educated workers. This pattern may suggest that women with lower levels of education experienced an improvement in working conditions, notwithstanding their lower bargaining power relative to highly educated women. Interestingly, women with children are less likely to voice concerns about sexual harassment and verbal abuse at baseline, but become more vocal about these issues at cycles 2 and 3 relative to all the other women. This finding is positive as it may indicate that women in relatively weaker positions are gaining more confidence to come forward.

Positive change occurs in terms of reported physical health, as reports of symptoms decrease among both men and women. Thus, the impact Better Work Nicaragua has been strong but focused to workers' reports of physical health symptoms and voicing of concerns among women with children. Objective work attributes remained unchanged and, in some instances, showed a deteriorating trend in factories up to their second assessment.

The analysis also demonstrates that very few workers voice their concerns, and that barriers exist specifically for women with lower levels of formal education. One solution to this issue may be increasing managers' awareness about sexual harassment on the factory floor, which, in turn, is likely to translate into broader organizational awareness and improvements in workplace relations (Brown et al., 2016). While directly addressing barriers that prevent women in relatively weaker positions to express concerns is crucial, another solution may be to include the involvement of men in sexual harassment prevention trainings. This is likely to foster a culture of gender equality among all workers, creating the space for women to be assertive. Finally, we only examined data for factories at their third assessment or lower. It is important to explore the way these outcomes vary overtime as firms participating to the programme become more mature.

Indonesia

Indonesia is characterized by less rigid gender relations in the way family and kinship are organized compared to other countries in South and East Asia (Kabeer, 2003). This can be traced back to the Suharto or New Order regime (1966-1998), when the government adopted a discourse of separate but equal gender roles, while simultaneously emphasizing selflessness and the care for dependents as qualifying aspects of women's identities (Caraway, 2007). Islam is the religion of about 85 percent of Indonesians and, historically, has placed relatively few restrictions on women's engagement in work outside of the home, particularly in Java where the majority of garment sector firms are concentrated (Ibid.).

Yet, women's integration into the labour market has been uneven, particularly in comparison to other countries in the Southeast Asia region. Despite a narrowing of wage disparities between men and women in past decades, gender egalitarian change appears to have stalled. While the median income for women compared to men increased from 57 percent in 1990 to 84 percent in 2011 (Schaner and Das, 2013), female-male labour force participation rate has stagnated at 50 percent, with women concentrating in specific sector of the economy, including the garment and informal sectors (ILO, 2016).

The textile and garment industry is among Indonesia's oldest sectors and has historically played a key role in the economy from colonial times to the Suharto regime (Hill, 1992; Thee, 2009). Since the country's transition away from import substitution towards export-promotion, the sector has grown rapidly. At the turn of the new millennium, the country experienced increasing competition as a result of the expiration of the Multi-Fibre Arrangement in 2005 and the exponential growth of China, but remains a major exporter of garment worldwide.

Women's integration into the labour force took place in the 1970s and 1980s. This pattern of feminization has been documented widely. White (in Silvey, 2003, p.134), for example, describes: "Large scale, factory-based export production has […] meant a distinct feminisation of the industrial work force. Thus, for example, garment factories actually released male sewing-machine operators and took on new female workers as they shifted to export production." Supply-side factors, such as the improvement in women's educational attainment and lowering fertility rates, contributed to this phenomenon by creating a pool of potential women workers, especially migrants from rural areas, to meet the demands of increasing garment production.

In our dataset, women represent 88 percent of the total sample, which therefore appears to be particularly feminized, even in comparison to nationwide estimates for the sector. Workers are on average between 25 and 35 years of age. Men in the sample are slightly younger and more educated than women, with about 59 percent of male workers reporting to have completed secondary education, compared to 42 percent among women. The majority of respondents is married (97 percent) and has children (67 percent), although more women than men report having at least one child. This finding reflects shifting beliefs and stereotypes among employers on the profile of the "ideal worker," as older married women are increasingly perceived to be more reliable and experienced workers than their unmarried counterparts (Fontana & Silberman, 2013; Tiano, 2006).

Difference-in-difference estimates for Indonesia are reported in Table 10 to 13. At baseline, there is no significant difference in pay and weekly working hours between men and women. This finding reflects industry-wide estimates, showing that after adjusting for a broad range of factors, including demographic, educational, geographical, sub-industry, and occupational variances by gender, there is no substantial difference in earnings (Cowgill & Huynh, 2016). Along these lines, Caraway (2007) finds that firm-level data for an array of export-oriented industries does not show

any substantial difference in wages between men and women. This seems to be in contrast with the extent of feminization characterizing the garment sector in the country, because it contradicts the assertion by some scholars that feminization results from women's cheaper labour cost relative to men. As Caraway argues, however, it is revealing of the extent to which employers' preference for female workers is shaped by gender stereotypes, rather than cost savings.

As regression results in Table 11 illustrate, there have been important improvements in objective work attributes. As shown in Panel 6, throughout the course of exposure to Better Work, hourly pay increased on average by USD 0.18 for both male and female workers. The treatment effects, however, vary considerably over each assessment cycle. A gender-differentiated impact on pay and hours emerges in the period of the second assessment, as can be seen in Panel 2. Men's hourly pay rises by USD 0.142 and hours of work decline by about 3 hours per week. For women, these changes are relatively smaller, as pay increases by only 0.03 USD per hour, and weekly hours decline by 0.6. These gender differentials disappear for workers in factories at the fifth assessment, for whom earnings are on average USD 0.11 higher than at baseline. Hours of work, by contrast, remain constant for men at the time of the fifth assessment, while they decrease for women by about 2 hours per week.

Table 12 and 13 show variations in outcomes among different subgroups of women. At baseline, results suggest there is no significant difference in average pay or hours worked between women with different levels of education, or with different care responsibilities. Thus, specifically for women with higher education, we do not find evidence for the existence of wage premiums, which signal that women's qualifications are not rewarded accordingly. Some changes emerge between cycles 3 and 5, suggesting that exposure to Better Work has differentiated impacts according to women's stage in the life cycle and educational attainment. The main finding is that advancements in objective work attributes benefited women in more vulnerable positions relatively more than all the other women. For instance, as reported in Panel 5, Table 13, by cycle 5 weekly hours of work decreased for women with education up to junior high or lower, relative to women with higher education. This subgroup of women is likely to occupy lower-skilled and lower-paid positions in factories compared to more educated workers, and thus may be more adversely affected by longer working hours.

Similarly, weekly hours of work decreased by about 3 hours for women with at least one child relative to women without children at cycle 5 (Table 12). This reduction in hours of work, however, should be interpreted with caution, as regression results vary considerably by assessment cycle. The coefficients for pay show a more consistent pattern, specifically for women with children, as illustrated by regression results in Panel 3 to 5 (Table 12). This finding is promising as this subgroup of women is likely to have greater childrearing responsibilities, less free time, and possibly higher levels of household expenditure relative to all the other women.

With respect to concerns and voice, at baseline, men report feeling more concerned about overtime than women. It is interesting to note, however, that the amount of weekly hours worked among women respondents shows greater variance compared to men's (Table 10). Besides, reflecting the finding that men report being more concerned about overtime at baseline and that hours of work decrease relatively more for men than for women, their concerns decrease at the time of the fifth assessment, while this coefficient remains positive for women.

Further, as shown in regression results by gender, workers' voicing of issues related to violence and harassment at the workplace increases by the fifth assessment, suggesting that exposure to Better Work may have a positive impact on workers' awareness and capacity to voice concerns. More specifically, the number of workers reporting to be concerned about sexual harassment and physical abuse increases for both men and women, while women become more vocal than men about verbal abuse. Consistent with these findings, the impact evaluation of Better Work (Brown et al., 2016) shows that the average level of sexual harassment concern per factory is higher in Indonesia relative to other Better Work country programmes and there is evidence to suggest that workers are more comfortable expressing their opinions and seeking help from their trade union representative.

Differences in reports among sub-groups of women suggest the level of education and whether women have children plays an important role in determining their likelihood of voicing concerns. Similar to trends observed for Vietnam (Fontana & Silberman, 2013), highly educated women appear to be more dissatisfied and to report relatively more concerns than women with lower educational levels. Similarly, women with children are less likely to report being concerned on a range of issues, including verbal abuse and overtime work, compared to all the other women. In some instances, reductions in concerns may be a reflection of improved working conditions. If we consider overtime work, for example, regression results suggest that weekly hours of work decreased by 2 and 5 hours respectively for women with lower education and with one child or more—their level of concerns could reflect this change. Despite this, differences in bargaining power between sub-groups of women need to be better understood and addressed through capacity-building activities in factory committees (particularly Better Work's worker-management committees) and trade unions.

In contrast with the notion that employment in labour-intensive industries, such as export-oriented manufacturing, may have gender differentiated effects on workers' health and wellbeing, we do not find any gender disparity in terms of self-reported health at baseline. Physical health, however, seems to deteriorate for both male and female workers in factories at cycle 4, while some gender gaps emerge for factories at cycle 5. These findings stand in contrast with the increase in pay and decrease in working hours we observe for women at the fifth assessment cycle, suggesting the need for additional research to better understand these discrepancies.

A number of trends among sub-groups of women are particularly worthy of consideration. While overall physical health appears to deteriorate slightly for women compared to men, this differential is less pronounced among women with children. Results in Table 12 and 13 also show a reduction in reports of mental health symptoms among women with lower education relative to all the other women, consistent with the argument that improved labour standards compliance has a disproportionate impact on women occupying lower-paid and lower-skilled occupations.

Vietnam

Similar to Indonesia, but to a greater degree, gender inequalities in Vietnam do not take the extreme forms found in some other parts of the developing world (Kabeer and Trần, 2006; Kabeer, 2003). In terms of gender-related human development indicators, the UNDP ranked Vietnam at the 67th place out of 189 countries and territories in 2017, higher than the average for Southeast Asia and other countries of a similar income level. The country is characterized by one of the highest women's labour force participation rates in the world and experienced a narrowing of gender gap in tertiary education. Women historically play key economic roles, managing the household budget, agricultural production and marketing of products (Ibid.). Despite these achievements, Vietnam is among the few countries where the gender pay gap has been widening in the past years (ILO, 2013; 2016). Asymmetries in the gender distribution of domestic roles and responsibilities are a contributing factor to these disparities, particularly for women combining their greater share of domestic work and child care with paid employment.

The garment industry has a long tradition in Vietnam. Prior to 1986, when the Communist Party adopted the model of "market-oriented socialist economy under state guidance" or *doi moi*, the industry was prevalently public-owned and a major exporter for Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Following the economic transition and collapse of the Soviet Bloc, trade relationships with the US and European Union intensified and the sector experienced sustained economic growth. The economic transition also fuelled the emergence of a small but dynamic private sector, which contributed significantly to employment creation and export growth (Kabeer and Trần, 2006). In 2017, Vietnam ranked as the third largest exporter of garment products. With 5.9 percent of global market share and USD 24 billion of products, the garment industry thus represents the country's leading export sector and employs over 2.5 million workers (IFC, 2017; ITC, 2017).

Since the economic reform, the majority of workers employed in garment production were young, unmarried women migrating from rural areas as a strategy to diversify household income. In light of their primary role within the household and in agricultural production, most married women were excluded from outward migration and thus engaged relatively less in export-oriented labour markets. This, in part, has changed following reductions in women's fertility rate and the shrinking of the agricultural sector, as well as shifts in managerial beliefs about the "ideal female worker,"

with married middle aged women increasingly being employed in the industry (Fontana and Silberman, 2013).

In our sample, women represent 81 percent of respondents, the majority has lower secondary education and about 32 percent has at least one child with less than five years of age. Consistent with economy-wide estimates, baseline figures for our sample suggest the gender pay gap is equal to about 0.19 USD per hour, with no significant difference in average weekly hours of work between men and women. Among the findings in the study by Fontana and Silberman (2013) is that women with upper-secondary education or higher are not paid a wage premium relative to women with education up to junior high. But a pay gap exists when comparing average earnings between women with higher levels of education (e.g. with a Bachelor degree or junior college) relative to all the other women. Although women with tertiary education represent a small fraction of the female sample (1.4 percent), estimation results in Table 20 suggest they earn on average 0.21 USD more than women with secondary education or lower. This finding supports the argument that choosing "upper secondary education as the main 'dividing line' [masks] more marked differences between a smaller group of female workers with university education and the rest of the female workers" (Ibid., pp.14-15). Additionally, women with low education work on average 4 hours more than highly educated women, suggesting that workers at the lower end of the occupational distribution are also those most affected by long workdays and excessive overtime.

Baseline estimates for take-home pay in Vietnam stand in contrast with the other countries discussed in this study. While we do not find any significant difference in average pay reported by men and women in most country programmes, the gender pay gap in Vietnam is equal to 0.19 USD per hour. One potential explanation for this discrepancy is that women systematically receive lower attendance and productivity bonuses compared to men. These bonuses are common practice in the Vietnamese context and are determined based on attendance and performance records. Because they are voluntary in nature and, in most cases, exclude leave days that are only provided to women – including menstruation, pre-natal, maternity and birth-control leave – they end up by disproportionately penalizing women. This pattern is compounded by the fact that women are 20 percent less likely than men to receive promotions at baseline. Despite a relatively larger number of women in supervisory roles, thus, findings suggest firms are particularly segregated by gender, both horizontally and vertically.

Other differentiating factors, such as stage in the life cycle and levels of education have yet to be incorporated. Women with young children are 6 percent less likely than other women to be promoted while this gap is equal to about 16 percent for women with education up to lower secondary school. These estimates suggest disparities between men and women mask more marked inequalities among sub-groups of women. Some priority areas for Better Work programme activities in Vietnam might revolve around the promotion of gender-aware production incentives

and attendance bonuses or the strengthening the wage structure for each position and level of seniority.

Better Work treatment effects are shown in Tables 18 to 20. Regression results suggest there is a strong and persistent pattern reducing the gender differential in pay, which rises for both female and male workers across all assessment cycles. Further, the gender differential falls. The treatment effect increases as firms become more mature in their participation to the programme. At the time of the fourth assessment, female workers' average hourly pay is 0.43 USD higher than it was at baseline, eliminating about 85 percent of the pay gap present in the first assessment. The data also indicates that pay increased specifically for women with children, while hours of work decreased first among women with lower levels of education at cycle 3, then among women at cycle 4, and for both genders at cycle 5. These trends suggest exposure to Better Work positively affected objective work attributes, specifically for women with greater childrearing responsibilities and in relatively low-paid, low-skilled positions.

In the case of concerns and voice, we do not find statistically significant differences between genders at baseline. Relative to other women, however, women with infants are less likely to voice concerns about sexual harassment and verbal abuse. It may be the case that this category of women feels less empowered to raise dissatisfaction compared to other women, for example because of fear of repercussions from management or supervisors, which may compromise their ability to raise financial resources for their children.

Although we find very low reporting of concerns among workers at baseline, estimates for following assessment cycles show that concerns continue to decline for both women and men in most categories. Concerns about overtime decline between the third and fifth assessment cycles for male and female workers alike, while women report a decline in sexual harassment concerns at the second and fourth assessment. The reduction in voicing of concerns becomes statistically significant for both genders by the fifth assessment, although small in magnitude. While declining trends may reflect overall improvements in objective work attributes, especially with respect to overtime work, they need to be interpreted with caution, particularly in light of the country's institutional setting. With a unique, state-controlled, top-down and male-dominated union body, it is possible that workers, particularly women, do not expect to be heard and thus are less likely to voice dissatisfaction with working conditions or violence in the workplace.

Similar to the case of Haiti, two exceptions are particularly worthy of consideration. First, as illustrated by the coefficients in Table 19, women with young children become relatively more likely to speak up about sexual harassment and physical abuse, relative to other women across different assessment cycles. Second, women with up to secondary education become relatively more likely to voice their concerns with both physical and verbal abuse, compared to highly educated women in factories at their fifth assessment. These shifts may reflect an improvement in

women's ability to speak up, notwithstanding the current limitations in terms of workers' opportunities for collective action. A potential avenue for future research is exploring the reasons for this shift. As an example, further research could explore the extent of women's participation in Performance Improvement Consultative Committees (PICCs) – a key component of Better Work's in-factory services bringing together worker and management representatives – and its impact on women's ability to voice concerns.

Differences between male and female workers are significant with respect to reported health and wellbeing. Contrary to the findings for the other country programmes, women report higher mental and physical health symptoms at baseline, but reports are lower among women with lower levels of formal education, a finding which is consistent with the patterns observed for the dimension of concerns and voice. Significant improvements in mental and physical health emerge following exposure to Better Work, and become stronger over time.

Further, improvements in physical health are most sizeable among women relative to men, and women with low education relative to women with tertiary education. This finding is interesting, as it may support the argument that working conditions improved specifically for women with lower levels of formal education, who simultaneously experienced a consistent reduction in hours of work. In fact, according to Kabeer and Trần (2006), the overwhelming majority of complaints in Vietnamese garment sector factories are directly or indirectly related to working hours. Complaints expressed by workers in their study echo those identified in Better Work participating firms and range from having to sit in the same position for extended periods of time, to exhaustion, having no time or energy left to enjoy the company of friends and occupational health problems including headache, backache, poor vision, sore throat, dizziness and rhinitis.

In sum, Better Work Vietnam has been effective in improving objective work attributes, closing 50 percent of the gender pay gap observed at baseline in all factories surveyed, and by 85 percent in factories that are relatively more advanced in their engagement with Better Work. Changes had a differentiated impact on different constituencies of women. While take-home pay (including bonuses) increased for women with young children relatively more than for other women, weekly working hours declined specifically for women with lower levels of education—who worked longer hours at baseline. Mixed evidence is found in terms of workers' voicing of concerns. Although findings suggest reported concerns declined in more mature factories, these trends should be interpreted with caution, as opportunities for collective action remain limited, specifically for women in relatively more vulnerable positions. Finally, reports about health symptoms improved after exposure to Better Work, potentially indicating that persistent improvements in pay and working hours may have positive spillovers on workers' wellbeing.

Jordan

The economy in Jordan is relatively more developed compared to the other countries where Better Work operates and presents important discontinuities both in terms of its industrialization trajectory and gender norms. Despite being relatively richer in terms of GDP per capita and at a higher stage in the development process, Jordan lags behind with respect to women's empowerment indicators. The female labour force participation rate is among the lowest in the world and low in comparison to other countries in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region, particularly for women with tertiary education and married women (Assaad et al., 2012).

The apparel industry constitutes a key industrial sector, which accounts to about 19 percent of total exports, and employs over 60,000 workers, of whom the majority are migrant workers from South and Southeast Asia (ILO, 2017). Similar to Haiti and Nicaragua, its development has been fuelled by trade agreements with the US and, at a later stage, with the EU. From a limited industrial base, garment production expanded rapidly following the Qualifying Industrial Zone (QIZ) agreement and the US-Jordan Free Trade Agreement. By 2006, Jordan contributed to 48.5 percent of the total garment exports from the MENA region to the US, from less than 1 percent only a decade earlier (Shamel and Nadvi, 2013).

As shown by recent estimates, the garment sector in Jordan is highly feminized and dependent on international migrants, often hired through parent companies in Asian countries and recruitment agencies. With a highly segmented labour force, comprising of Jordanians, migrant workers and refugees, thus gender inequalities intersect with other axes of difference, particularly migration status and ethnicity. Until 2010, migrant workers in the QIZ did not have the same formal rights to unionize and to collective bargaining as Jordanian workers (Azmeh and Nadvi, 2013). In 2016, the national minimum wage for Jordanian workers was 190 dinars (268 USD), but was set at 110 dinars (155 USD) for migrants (LO/FTF, 2018).

Reports of workplace abuse relating to restriction of movement, bonded labour and coercion are widely documented in the literature (Azmeh and Nadvi, 2013; Better Work, 2016). About two thirds of factories participating to Better Work Jordan are found in non-compliance with human and labour rights, particularly with respect to restrictions of movement for workers from their workplace, dormitory or industrial zone. The threat of deportation or the withholding of passports are other common disciplinary tools used against migrant workers (Ibid.). Discrimination takes varying forms and has a toll on workers' wellbeing. Better Work's impact assessment (Brown et al. 2016), for instance, finds that when workers are prevented from returning home by their employer, they are up to 20 percent more likely to be distressed, and in factories where workers suffer abusive treatment there is a ten percent increase in workers feeling fearful about the future.

In our sample, migrant workers represent about 64 percent of interviewees. About 57 percent of women workers are migrants, compared to 81 percent among men. Baseline estimates of the coefficient for female are reported in Panel 1 (Table 19). While hourly pay for female workers is statistically equal to pay for male workers, women work 6.5 fewer hours per week on average. Despite Jordan being the only country in this study with significant gender differences in hours of work, work intensity is higher compared to the other countries in this study with hours of work as high as 10 per day over six-days a week, on average. This suggests that excessive hours often driven by unrealistic production targets common in the industry pose major risks to workers' welfare particularly in Jordan, where the majority of workers are international migrants.

With respect to differences among sub-groups of women, we find a statistically significant difference in average take-home pay between women with different educational levels, with an average wage premium for highly educated women equal to about 0.08 USD per hour. This finding stands in contrast to the other countries examined in this study with the exception of Vietnam, where the wage premium only exists for the small number of women with tertiary education. Due to the fact that surveys for Jordan do not include questions on marital status and number of children, it is not possible to examine disparities between women with different household responsibilities.

Gender and treatment effects for Jordan are reported in Table 19 and 20. With respect to objective work attributes, we observe a persistent increase in pay across consecutive assessment cycles, which, however, is larger for men. Average hourly pay rose between the first and second assessments by 0.42 USD, as can be seen in Panel 2. The hourly pay of female workers relative to males at the time of the second assessment compared to the first assessment fell by 0.226 USD, with a total increase in pay equal to about 0.19 USD for women, compared to 0.42 for men. A summary comparison between the first assessment and subsequent assessments is provided in Panel 7. The results indicate that, on average, hourly pay is 0.17 USD higher in subsequent assessments as compared to the first assessment and that there is no gender differential. Further, as shown in Table 20, increases in pay across assessment cycles affect all women with no statistically significant difference in terms of levels of education.

Similarly, we find that weekly working hours decrease for both men and women, but the reduction is significantly higher for men. Between the first and second assessment, weekly hours decline by 14.56 for men, while the gender differential shrinks by 9.1 hours per week. The treatment effect for women is -5.5 hours per week on average. Between cycle 2 and 6, hours worked decrease by about 3.6 hours for men, while only by 0.20 for women. This finding is not necessarily a bad outcome, because it is consistent with the fact that men reported a greater number of weekly working hours at baseline.

Another important finding is that women are more likely than men to voice concerns about sexual harassment, verbal abuse and overtime work at baseline. More precisely, they are 12 percent more likely to voice their concerns about sexual harassment, 20 percent more likely to express concerns about verbal abuse and 17 percent more likely to voice their dissatisfaction with excess overtime compared to men. Consistent with findings for the other countries examined in this study, however, women with lower levels of education are relatively less likely to voice their concerns compared to highly educated women. For example, as shown in Panel 1, Table 20, women with education up to secondary school are 38 percent less likely to voice concerns about verbal abuse, and 14 percent less likely to be vocal about sexual harassment. Women also report poorer mental health compared to men, while women with lower education are considerably less likely to report crying and feeling fearful relative to all the other women.

Better Work Jordan is cognizant of these disparities. One of the findings from a training initiative on sexual harassment prevention cites the fear of speaking out as one of the greatest challenges uncovered by the training (Better Work, 2014). Interestingly, evidence suggests the likelihood that women in most vulnerable positions express concerns increases as factories become more mature in their participation to the programme. This is apparent for women with secondary education or lower, who become relatively more vocal about verbal abuse. This estimate should be interpreted positively, however, as this subgroup of women had the lowest levels of reported dissatisfaction at baseline despite being more likely to be exposed to poorer working conditions relative to highly educated women.

Voicing of concerns emerged as the outcome showing the greatest disparities, both between men and women, and among sub-groups of women. This outcome also shows the greatest change. In Jordan and Vietnam, impact is apparent for women in relatively more vulnerable positions (i.e. women with children and/or with lower levels of formal education), for whom the likelihood of voicing concerns increased in comparison to all the other women. Future research should better understand the reasons for these shifts, for example, by exploring women workers' involvement in PICCs. Finally, we find that reported physical and mental health symptoms improved for workers in factories that are more advanced in their participation to the programme, suggesting that improved working conditions and voice may have important implications for their wellbeing.

6. Conclusions

This study examined the impact of Better Work, a policy intervention consisting of factory-level assessments of labour rights compliance, training, advisory services, and capacity-building at firm, national, regional, and global levels, in Haiti, Nicaragua, Indonesia, Vietnam, and Jordan. The analysis focused on three key dimensions that allow understanding whether Better Work has been effective in alleviating the asymmetric costs of export-oriented industrialization on women workers: (i) Work attributes, namely take-home pay, hours of work and promotions; (ii) voicing of concerns, particularly about overtime work, sexual harassment, verbal and physical abuse; and (iii) health and wellbeing, comprising of physical and mental health indicators. The analysis extended beyond the "men"/"women" binary, taking differences in educational levels and stage in the life cycle as likely determinants of disparities among sub-groups of women.

An important consideration is that the status of women in the garment sector reflects country-specific gender imbalances, which depend on economic and cultural factors, as well as different labour market institutions. Notwithstanding different trajectories in industrialization processes and women's integration into paid employment, the experiences of garment sector workers share many similarities that indicate a common set of challenges in achieving gender equality throughout the global garment value chain. The analysis also identified a number of positive trends demonstrating that Better Work yields promising results for women working in the garment industry beyond national borders.

Of the three dimensions examined in this study, Better Work appears most successful in fostering improvement in objective work attributes, particularly take-home pay and hours of work. Positive change for take-home pay is apparent in Indonesia, Vietnam, Jordan, and Haiti, while hours of work decrease especially in Indonesia, Vietnam, and Jordan. Further, these changes are likely to have important implications for workers' reports of concerns about overtime and physical health symptoms, which show an overall improvement in factories that are more mature in their participation to the programme.

Women with children and women with lower levels of formal education emerge as the most vulnerable groups. In Haiti, when firms first enrolled in Better Work, women with children reported a considerably lower pay relative to all the other women, suggesting that incorrect payments of maternity benefits and other discriminatory practices are endemic and require specific measures. This is an issue in Vietnam too, where asymmetries in the distribution of voluntary production and attendance incentives disproportionately penalize women's take-home pay. Findings for both countries suggest improved compliance with labour standards has the potential to partially close these disparities. Other areas for future programme activities may be the promotion of quality childcare provision among employers, as well as increased consideration of gender issues in the distribution of attendance and productivity incentives.

Another issue emerging from the cases of Jordan, Nicaragua, and Haiti, is that women with lower education are systematically less likely to voice their concerns about sensitive issues, not only relative to men, but also compared to highly educated women. In some instances, these disparities narrow as factories become more mature in their participation to Better Work. Thus, further research could explore women's participation in PICCs and their impact on women's ability to raise concerns.

Finally, as illustrated by the existing gender disparities in promotion rates, vertical segregation is systemic in the industry and particularly resistant to change. Hence, exploring ways to foster more inclusive leadership is a priority. While promoting skill development and expanding initiatives to build women's leadership and career opportunities, such as through supervisory skills training, are crucial, initiatives should pay a closer attention to the involvement of men, who have a key role to play in supporting the empowerment of women.

References

Assaad, R., R. Hendy, and S. Yassin. 2012. "Gender and the Jordanian Labor Market." *Economic Research Forum Working Paper Series*, Working Paper no. 701.

Azmeh, S., and K. Nadvi. 2013. "'Greater Chinese' Global Production Networks in the Middle East: The Rise of the Jordanian Garment Industry." Development and Change 44, no. 6: 1317–40. https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.12065.

Bair, J., and G. Gereffi. 2014. "Towards Better Work in Central America: Nicaragua and the CAFTA Context." In Towards Better Work: Understanding Labour in Apparel Global Value Chains, edited by Arianna Rossi, Amy Luinstra, and John Pickles, 251–75. Advances in Labour Studies. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Bandy, J., and J. Mendez. "A Place of Their Own? Women Organizers in The Maquilas of Nicaragua and Mexico." Mobilization: An International Quarterly 8, no. 2 (June 1, 2003): 173–88. https://doi.org/10.17813/maiq.8.2.n0u57237861h2h67.

Beladi, H., C. Chao, and D. Hollas. 2013. "Does Globalization Weaken Labor Unions in Developing Countries?" *The Journal of International Trade & Economic Development* 22, no. 4 (June): 562–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638199.2011.578752.

Better Work. 2014. "Addressing Sexual Harassment in Jordan's Garment Industry." *Case Study*. Jordan: Better Work.

Brown, D.K., Dehejia, R.H. and Robertson, R., 2018. The Impact of Better Work. Geneva: Better Work.

Chant, S. 1992. "Gender and Export Manufacturing in the Philippines: Continuity or Change in Female Employment? The Case of the Mactan Export Processing Zone." Gender, Place & Culture 2, no. 2 (September): 147–76. https://doi.org/10.1080/09663699550021991.

Caraway, T. L. 2006. "Gendered Paths of Industrialization: A Cross-Regional Comparative Analysis." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 41, no. 1 (March 1, 2006): 26–52. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02686306.

———. 2007. *Assembling Women: The Feminization of Global Manufacturing*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

CARE International. 2017. *'I know I cannot quit.' The Prevalence and Productivity Cost of Sexual Harassment to the Cambodian Garment Industry*. Canberra: CARE Australia.

Center for Facilitation of Investments (CFI-Haiti). 2018. *Garment Sector Overview*.

Chan, A. and R. Ross. 2002. "From North-South to South-South - The True Face of Global Competition Comment." *Foreign Affairs* 81, 8–13.

Cowgill, M., and P. Huynh. 2016. "Weak Minimum Wage Compliance in Asia's Garment Industry," Asia-Pacific Garment and Footwear Sector Research Note, Issue 5. Bangkok: ILO.

Cravey, A. J. 1998. *Women and Work in Mexico's Maquiladoras*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Del Prado-Lu, J. L. 2004. "Risk Factors to Musculoskeletal Disorders and Anthropometric Measurements of Filipino Manufacturing Workers." *International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics: JOSE* 10, no. 4: 349–59.

Domínguez, E., R. Icaza, C. Quintero, S. López, and Å. Stenman. 2010. "Women Workers in the Maquiladoras and the Debate on Global Labor Standards." Feminist Economics 16 (October 1): 185–209. https://doi.org/10.1080/13545701.2010.530603.

Elson, D., and R. Pearson. 2011. "The Subordination of Women and the Internationalization of Factory Production." In V., Nalini, L. Duggan, N. Wiegersma, and L. Nisonoff eds. The Women, Gender and Development Reader. Zed Books Ltd., 212–223.

Evans, A. 2017. "Patriarchal Unions = Weaker Unions? Industrial Relations in the Asian Garment Industry." *Third World Quarterly* 38, no. 7: 1619–38.
Fernández-Kelly, M. P. 1983. *For We Are Sold, I and My People: Women and Industry in Mexico's Frontier*. SUNY Press.
Fleck, S., 2001. A gender perspective on maquila employment and wages in Mexico. The Economics of Gender in Mexico, pp.133-173.
Folbre, N. 2006. "Measuring Care: Gender, Empowerment, and the Care Economy." *Journal of Human Development* 7, no. 2: 183–99. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649880600768512.
Fontana, M., and A. Silberman. 2013. "Analysing Better Work Data from a Gender Perspective: A Preliminary Exploration of Worker Surveys with a Focus on Vietnam," Better Work Discussion Paper, No. 13.
Fussell, E. 2000. ''Making Labor Flexible: The Recomposition of Tijuana's Maquiladora Female Labor Force.'' Feminist Economics 6(3): 59–79.
Gardella, A. 2006. Gender Assessment for USAID/Haiti Country Strategy Statement. Port-au-Prince, Haiti: United States Agency for International Development.
Gates, L. C. 2002. "The Strategic Uses of Gender in Household Negotiations: Women Workers on Mexico's Northern Border." Bulletin of Latin American Research 21, no. 4: 507–26. https://doi.org/10.1111/1470-9856.00057.
Guendelman, S., and M. J. Silberg. 1993. "The Health Consequences of Maquiladora Work: Women on the US-Mexican Border." American Journal of Public Health 83, no. 1: 37–44. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.83.1.37.
Hammond, C. 2018. "Stitching Time: Artisanal Collaboration and Slow Fashion in Post-Disaster Haiti." Fashion Theory (February 26), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/1362704X.2018.1441001.
Hancock, P. (2006). Violence, women, work and empowerment: Narratives from factory women in Sri Lanka's Export Processing Zones. Gender, Technology and Development, 10(2), 211-228.
Hancock, P., S. Middleton, J. Moore, and I. Edirisinghe. 2011). Gender, status and empowerment: A study among women who work in Sri Lanka's Export Processing Zones (EPZs). *Social Justice Research Centre, Edith Cowan University, Australia*.
Haspels, N. 2001. Action against sexual harassment at work in Asia and the Pacific. *International Labour Organization*.
Hill, H. 1992. Indonesia's Textile and Garment Industries: Developments in an Asian Perspective. *Institute of Southeast Asia*.
Hossfeld, L. 2009. "Feminization of Labor." In Encyclopedia of Gender and Society, 319–20. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412964517.
Hossain, N. 2012. Exports, equity, and empowerment: The effects of readymade garments manufacturing employment on gender equality in Bangladesh. Background paper for the WDR.
Hovell, M.F., Sipan, C., Hofstetter, C.R., DuBois, B.C., Krefft, A., Conway, J., Jasis, M. and Isaacs, H.L., 1988. Occupational health risks for Mexican women: The case of the maquiladora along the Mexican-United States border. International Journal of Health Services, 18(4), pp.617-627.
Danish Trade Union Council for International Development and Cooperation (LO/TFT). 2018. *Labour Market Profile 2018: Jordan*. LO/TFT.

International Finance Corporation (IFC). 2017. *IFC Engagement in the Nicaraguan Apparel Sector*. Overview.
———. 2017. *IFC Engagement in the Vietnamese Apparel Sector*. Overview.
International Labour Office (ILO). 2017. Global Wage Report 2016/17: Wage Inequality in the Workplace. Geneva: ILO Publications.
———. 2017. "Migrant domestic and garment workers in Jordan: A baseline analysis of trafficking in persons and related laws and policies" Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Branch (FUNDAMENTALS). Geneva: ILO, 2017.
———. 2016. "Wages and Productivity in the Garment Sector in Asia and the Pacific and the Arab States." Garment and Footwear Sector Research Note.
———. 2013. "Despite High Labour Force Participation Rate for Women, Gender Pay Gap on the Rise." Press Release, ILO News, Hanoi.
Kabeer, N. 2002 *The Power to Choose: Bangladeshi Women and Labor Market Decisions in London and Dhaka*. Verso.
———, N., 2003. Gender Mainstreaming in Poverty Eradication and the Millennium Development Goals: A handbook for policy-makers and other stakeholders. Commonwealth Secretariat.
———, N, and S. Mahmud. 2004. "Globalization, Gender and Poverty: Bangladeshi Women Workers in Export and Local Markets." Journal of International Development 16, no. 1: 93–109. https://doi.org/10.1002/jid.1065.
———, N., and T. V. A. Trần. 2006. "Globalisation, gender and work in the context of economic transition: the case of Viet Nam." United Nations Development Programme Viet Nam.
Khan, D. A., S. Qayyum, S. Saleem, W. M. Ansari, and F. A. Khan. 2010. "Lead Exposure and Its Adverse Health Effects among Occupational Worker's Children." *Toxicology and Industrial Health* 26, no. 8: 497–504.
Khosla, N. 2009. "The ready-made garments industry in Bangladesh: A means to reducing gender-based social exclusion of women?" Journal of International Women's Studies, 11(1), 289-303.Liberato, A. S. Q., and D. Fennell. 2007. "Gender and Well-Being in the Dominican Republic: The Impact of Free Trade Zone Employment and Female Headship." *World Development* 35, no. 3: 394–409.
Lim, L. 1983. "Capitalism, Imperialism, and Patriarchy: The Dilemma of Third-World Women Workers in Multinational Factories." Women, Men and the International Division of Labor, 70–91.
Maquila Solidarity Network. 2003. A Canadian Success Story? Gildan Activewear: T-Shirts. Toronto: Maquila Solidarity Network.
Mendez, J. B. 2005. *From the Revolution to the Maquiladoras: Gender, Labor, and Globalization in Nicaragua*. Duke University Press.
Ong, A. 2010. *Spirits of Resistance and Capitalist Discipline, Second Edition: Factory Women in Malaysia*. SUNY Press.
Padgett, A., and T. Warnecke. 2011. "Diamonds in the Rubble: The Women of Haiti." Journal of Economic Issues 45, no. 3: 527–58. https://doi.org/10.2753/JEI0021-3624450301.
Pantaleon, L. 2003. "Sexual harassment in the export processing zones of the Dominican Republic." Globalization and the Workplace, Cornell University ILR Sschool.
Pun, N. 2000. "Opening a Minor Genre of Resistance in Reform China: Scream, Dream, and Transgression in a Workplace." *Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique* 8, no. 2: 531–55.

———. 2005. *Made in China: Women Factory Workers in a Global Workplace*. Duke University Press.
Razavi, S., and Pearson, R. 2004. "Globalization, export-oriented employment and social policy: Gendered connections." In Globalization, export-oriented employment and social policy (pp. 1-29). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
Rossi, A. 2015. "Better Work: Harnessing Incentives and Influencing Policy to Strengthen Labour Standards Compliance in Global Production Networks." Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society 8, no. 3: 505–20. https://doi.org/10.1093/cjres/rsv021.
Salzinger, L. 2003. *Genders in Production: Making Workers in Mexico's Global Factories*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Schaner, S. and Das, S., 2016. "Female labor force participation in Asia: Indonesia country study," Asian Development Bank, Economics Working Paper Series, No. 474.
Shamsie, Y. 2010. "Time for a "High-Road" Approach to EPZ Development in Haiti." In Conflict Prevention and Peace Forum (CPPF) Social Science Research Council January, vol. 24, p. 2010.
Silvey, R. M. 2000. "Stigmatized Spaces: Gender and Mobility under Crisis in South Sulawesi, Indonesia." Gender, Place & Culture 7, no. 2 (June 1): 143–61. https://doi.org/10.1080/713668869.
———. "Spaces of Protest: Gendered Migration, Social Networks, and Labor Activism in West Java, Indonesia." Political Geography 22, no. 2 (February 1, 2003): 129–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-6298(02)00092-6.
Steckley, M., and Y. Shamsie. 2015. "Manufacturing Corporate Landscapes: The Case of Agrarian Displacement and Food (in)Security in Haiti." Third World Quarterly 36, no. 1: 179–97. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2015.976042.
Tello Sánchez, G. 2003. "Los derechos humanos y laborales de las trabajadoras de la maquila en Coahuila. La construcción de sujetos ciudadanos colectivos." Democracia y derechos humanos en México. Tres estudios de caso.
Thee, K. W. 2009. The Development of Labour-intensive Garment Manufacturing in Indonesia, Journal of Contemporary Asia, 39:4, 562-578, DOI: 10.1080/00472330903076818
Tiano, S. 1994. *Patriarchy on the Line: Labor, Gender, and Ideology in the Mexican Maquila Industry*. Temple University Press.
Van Klaveren, M. 2016. *Wages in Context in the Garment Industry in Asia*. Amsterdam: WageIndicator Foundation.
Ver Beek, K. A. 2001. "Maquiladoras: Exploitation or Emancipation? An Overview of the Situation of Maquiladora Workers in Honduras." World Development 29, no. 9: 1553–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(01)00057-2.
Williams, D. M., and N. Homedes. 2001. "The Impact of the Maquiladoras on Health and Health Policy along the U.S.-Mexico Border." *Journal of Public Health Policy* 22, no. 3 (September): 320–37. https://doi.org/10.2307/3343145.
World Bank. 2010. "Haiti Earthquake PDNA: Assessment of Damage, Losses, General and Sectoral Needs." Annex to the Action Plan for National Recovery and Development of Haiti.
———. 2016. *The World Bank in Haiti*. Overview.
World Economic Forum. 2017. *The Global Gender Gap Report*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.

Appendix

Construction of Dependent Variables

Pay and Working Hours. Workers are asked which days they usually work and the start and end times of each workday. They are also asked how often they are paid and how much they were paid the last time they were paid. This data is used to calculate weekly hours and hourly pay in US dollars and includes both bonuses and wage payments.

Promotions. Workers are asked whether they received a promotion during the past year. Answers are coded as a binary variable that takes value one if the respondent has recently been promoted and zero otherwise.

Concerns and Voice. Workers are surveyed on an array of workplace concerns, ranging from excess overtime and low pay to sexual harassment and verbal abuse. The questions ask whether each issue is a particular concern for workers and then what action they may have taken in response to the concern. For the purposes of this analysis, the concern variables are coded as 1 if the participant reported any level of concern and zero if he/she did not express any concern.

Health and Wellbeing. Workers are surveyed both on their physical and mental health. In all countries, workers are asked to report the health symptoms they may experience, such as stomach pain, hunger and fatigue. Mental health is measured by indicators such as frequency of crying or feeling sad, fearful or hopeless about the future. Each variable is coded on a five-point scale with 1 = never and 5 = all of the time. For the purpose of the analysis we constructed two indexes for physical and mental health respectively, by taking the average of reported symptoms.

Regression results

Haiti

Table 2. Summary statistics of outcome variables by gender

	(1) Men					(2) Women				
Variables	Mean	Sd.	Min.	Max.	Obs.	Mean	Sd.	Min.	Max.	Obs.
Weekly working hours	52.71	9.92	32	84	252	50.23	9.429	32	85	557
Weekly pay ($)	44.34	21.60	10.99	126.00	255	40.92	18.49	10.11	120.57	515
Hourly pay ($)	0.86	0.43	0.15	2.55	222	0.82	0.37	0.14	3.34	453
Promotions (%)	0.24	0.42	0	1	288	0.17	0.38	0	1	632
Sexual harassment (%)	0.38	0.49	0	1	226	0.26	0.44	0	1	235
Verbal abuse (%)	0.60	0.49	0	1	137	0.49	0.50	0	1	136
Physical abuse (%)	0.38	0.49	0	1	81	0.22	0.41	0	1	187
Overtime concern (%)	0.19	0.40	0	1	167	0.21	0.41	0	1	160
Physical Health Symptoms	2.65	0.75	1	4.33	176	2.69	0.83	1	5	362
Aches	2.47	0.91	1	5	177	2.63	1.00	1	5	366
Fatigue	2.29	0.95	1	5	178	2.33	1.02	1	5	364
Thirst	3.19	1.24	1	5	176	3.11	1.23	1	5	367
Mental Health Symptoms	2.03	1.07	1	5	272	1.99	1.04	1	5	578
Fearful	2.11	1.21	1	5	275	2.02	1.15	1	5	598
Cry	1.99	1.16	1	5	277	1.96	1.19	1	5	587

Table 3. Better Work treatment effects by gender

	(1) Cycle 1 (baseline)		(2) Cycle 2		(3) Cycle 3-4		(4) Cycle 5-9		(5) Cycle 10		Cum. Effect Cycles 2-10	
	Cons.	Fem.	Cycle 2	Fem* Cycle2	Cycle 3-4	Fem.* Cycle 3-4	Cycle 5-9	Fem* Cycle 5-9	Cycle 10	Fem.* Cycle 10	Cycle 2-10	Fem.* Cycle 2-10
WORK ATTRIBUTES												
Hourly Pay ($)	0.785***	-0.0939	0.316**	-0.111	-0.174++	0.0752	0.0780	0.0256	0.115	0.221	0.175++	0.175++
	(0.0829)	(0.117)	(0.0903)	(0.242)	(0.109)	(0.108)	(0.119)	(0.147)	(0.128)	(0.162)	(0.0920)	(0.0920)
Weekly Hours	54.33***	-2.451	-5.333*	-0.0384	-1.910	2.848	-3.739+	-0.861	-3.938++	-0.488	-2.909	-0.129
	(2.237)	(3.917)	(2.344)	(3.885)	(1.555)	(3.856)	(2.573)	(3.973)	(2.348)	(3.918)	(2.719)	(4.213)
Promotions (%)	0.429*	-0.114	-0.0212	-0.138	-0.133	0.0814	-0.246+	0.0742	-0.349*	0.136	-0.166	0.0386
	(0.170)	(0.178)	(0.180)	(0.177)	(0.0986)	(0.0874)	(0.169)	(0.171)	(0.182)	(0.185)	(0.198)	(0.197)
CONCERNS AND VOICE												
Sexual Harassment (%)	0.437***	-0.0897	0.0625	-0.289*	0.126	-0.416**	-0.0494	-0.0799	-0.210*	0.0669	-0.0966	-0.0417
	(0.0469)	(0.0723)	(0.0469)	(0.113)	(0.130)	(0.142)	(0.0798)	(0.145)	(0.0942)	(0.107)	(0.109)	(0.197)
Verbal Abuse (%)	0.647***	-0.118	-0.114	0.184	0.246**	-0.266++	0.0372	0.0432	0.153	0.0596	-0.0525	0.0654
	(0.101)	(0.145)	(0.119)	(0.140)	(0.0830)	(0.170)	(0.120)	(0.179)	(0.139)	(0.151)	(0.127)	(0.183)
Physical Abuse (%)	0.500	-0.389	0.100	0.256	-0.445**	0.312++	-0.0333	0.0422	-0.300	0.650	0	0.187
	(0.417)	(0.465)	(0.417)	(0.467)	(0.148)	(0.179)	(0.405)	(0.467)	(0.448)	(0.479)	(0.459)	(0.562)
Overtime concern (%)	0.333++	0.0238	0.238	-0.227	-0.227***	-0.0526	0.142	-0.234	-0.0333	0.0972	0.140	-0.142
	(0.179)	(0.182)	(0.204)	(0.202)	(0.0595)	(0.106)	(0.185)	(0.201)	(0.206)	(0.213)	(0.207)	(0.224)
HEALTH AND WELLBEING												
Physical Health Symptoms[4]	2.981***	0.0352	-0.420++	-0.0966	-0.0665	-0.0814	-0.561*	-0.0516	-0.737**	0.120	-0.607*	-0.0430
	(0.244)	(0.347)	(0.240)	(0.483)	(0.297)	(0.374)	(0.301)	(0.415)	(0.260)	(0.383)	(0.286)	(0.390)
Mental Health Symptoms[5]	2.050***	-0.0652	-0.0692	0.322	0.0261	0.155	-0.00513	-0.11	-0.175	0.445	-0.169	0.0224
	(-0.181)	(-0.26)	(-0.203)	(-0.291)	(-0.141)	(-0.226)	(-0.235)	(-0.343)	(-0.223)	(-0.35)	(-0.201)	(-0.34)

Coefficients highlighted in blue represent significant variations from baseline estimates in the variables of interest
Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, ++ p<0.15, + p<0.20

[4] Scale reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha): 0.6032.
[5] Scale reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha): 0.7437.

Table 4. Better Work treatment effects between women with at least one child and other women

	(1) Cycle 1 (baseline)		(2) Cycle 2		(3) Cycle 3-4		(4) Cycle 5-9		(5) Cycle 10		(6) Cum. Effect Cycles 2-10	
	Cons.	Child.	Cycle 2	Child* Cycle2	Cycle 3-4	Child.* Cycle 3-4	Cycle 5-9	Child* Cycle 5-9	Cycle 10	Child.* Cycle 10	Cycle 2-10	Child.* Cycle 2-10
WORK ATTRIBUTES												
Hourly Pay ($)	0.825***	-0.241**	0.223	0.0876	-0.101	-0.0443	-0.0290	0.273**	0.235	0.143	0.125	0.0610
	(0.0814)	(0.0843)	(0.225)	(0.0877)	(0.146)	(0.127)	(0.137)	(0.122)	(0.172)	(0.197)	(0.187)	(0.166)
Weekly Hours	50.04***	3.139	-1.602	-5.382+	-1.620	3.216	-1.054	-3.956	-1.754	-2.902	-0.138	-4.787
	(5.212)	(3.601)	(5.247)	(3.582)	(2.454)	(3.462)	(5.352)	(3.428)	(5.127)	(3.672)	(6.875)	(4.021)
Promotions (%)	0.214	0.167	0.102	-0.306	0.0132	-0.0911	-0.0451	-0.185	-0.155	-0.120	0.112	-0.387*
	(0.164)	(0.210)	(0.186)	(0.209)	(0.0621)	(0.0866)	(0.126)	(0.174)	(0.169)	(0.222)	(0.141)	(0.186)
CONCERNS AND VOICE												
Sexual Harassment (%)	0.333++	0.0238	-0.143	0.0549	0.0667	-0.224*	0.0833	-0.209	-0.0208	-0.156	-0.0631	-0.118
	(0.176)	(0.187)	(0.180)	(0.197)	(0.116)	(0.108)	(0.154)	(0.177)	(0.199)	(0.210)	(0.148)	(0.173)
Verbal Abuse (%)	0.500**	0.0455	0.0625	-0.0290	0.117	0.0422	0.184	-0.120	0.500***	-0.335*	0.0455	-0.0504
	(0.133)	(0.137)	(0.220)	(0.251)	(0.163)	(0.218)	(0.151)	(0.165)	(0.127)	(0.159)	(0.149)	(0.214)
Physical Abuse (%)	0	0.200	0.500***	-0.200	-0.467***	0.347*	0.333**	-0.303++	0.143+	0.203	0.600**	-0.644***
	(5.27e-09)	(0.201)	(5.27e-09)	(0.201)	(0.120)	(0.165)	(0.149)	(0.175)	(0.0877)	(0.386)	(0.160)	(0.147)
Overtime concern (%)	0.500**	-0.250*	0	0.107	-0.471***	0.298++	-0.0238	0.0842	-0.167	0.317*	0.0294	0.00630
	(0.134)	(0.118)	(0.300)	(0.278)	(0.138)	(0.178)	(0.176)	(0.153)	(0.143)	(0.163)	(0.235)	(0.226)
HEALTH AND WELLBEING												
Physical Health Symptoms	3.250***	-0.389	-0.743**	0.427	-0.139	0.0780	-0.713**	0.207	-0.708**	0.154	-0.798**	0.247
	(0.276)	(0.354)	(0.285)	(0.426)	(0.197)	(0.383)	(0.279)	(0.314)	(0.304)	(0.380)	(0.288)	(0.328)
Mental Health Symptoms	1.893***	0.160	0.342	-0.339+	-0.0278	0.264++	0.140	-0.301	0.138	-0.0365	-0.0151	-0.220
	(0.242)	(0.160)	(0.243)	(0.208)	(0.206)	(0.147)	(0.303)	(0.235)	(0.316)	(0.252)	(0.305)	(0.228)

Coefficients highlighted in blue represent significant variations from baseline estimates in the variables of interest
Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, ++ p<0.15, + p<0.20

Table 5. Better Work treatment effects between women with education up to primary school and other women (with secondary education)

	(1) Cycle 1 (baseline)		(2) Cycle 2		(3) Cycle 3-4		(4) Cycle 5-9		(5) Cycle 10		(6) Cum. Effect Cycles 2-10	
	Cons.	Lower Educ.	Cycle 2	Lower Educ.* Cycle2	Cycle 3-4	Lower Educ.* Cycle 3-4	Cycle 5-9	Lower Educ.* Cycle 5-9	Cycle 10	Lower Educ.* Cycle 10	Cycle 2-10	Lower Educ.* Cycle 2-10
WORK ATTRIBUTES												
Hourly Pay ($)	0.709***	-0.0607	0.28	-0.127	-0.118	-0.0284	0.123+	-0.00438	0.315**	-0.178	0.128	0.0526
	(-0.0716)	(-0.124)	(-0.233)	(-0.372)	(-0.101)	(-0.0944)	(-0.0899)	(-0.116)	(-0.108)	(-0.141)	(-0.139)	(-0.173)
Weekly Hours	51.35***	1.652	-3.893	-2.807*	0.224	1.392	-2.261	-4.813**	-3.051	-0.585	-2.124	-3.304
	(-3.645)	(-1.147)	(-3.668)	(-1.147)	(-1.705)	(-2.17)	(-3.862)	(-1.914)	(-3.68)	(-3.055)	(-4.738)	(-2.613)
Promotions (%)	0.292**	0.0720	-0.0341	-0.163	0.0237	-0.244**	-0.107	-0.190	-0.181*	-0.183	-0.0760	-0.194
	(0.0891)	(0.234)	(0.144)	(0.338)	(0.0460)	(0.0900)	(0.0801)	(0.239)	(0.0976)	(0.230)	(0.0887)	(0.251)
CONCERNS AND VOICE												
Sexual Harassment (%)	0.400***	-0.150**	-0.162+	0.112	0.007	-0.185	-0.0901	0.022	-0.186*	0.136	-0.197++	0.178*
	(-0.0921)	(-0.0394)	(-0.0978)	(-0.232)	(-0.107)	(-0.139)	(-0.0967)	(-0.0795)	(-0.0998)	(-0.161)	(-0.116)	(-0.0836)
Verbal Abuse (%)	0.583***	-0.183++	-0.00758	0.108	0.0446	0.289*	0.0688	0.103	0.222**	-0.0222	-0.0301	0.13
	(-0.0815)	(-0.0983)	(-0.0832)	(-0.379)	(-0.0998)	(-0.157)	(-0.104)	(-0.102)	(-0.0954)	(-0.256)	(-0.112)	(-0.122)
Physical Abuse (%)	0.2	-0.2	0.329	0.00392	-0.226***	0.12	0.0742	0.0925	0.153	0.847**	0.0812	0.252
	(-0.241)	(-0.241)	(-0.251)	(-0.503)	(-0.0659)	(-0.195)	(-0.234)	(-0.252)	(-0.283)	(-0.283)	(-0.277)	(-0.263)
Overtime concern (%)	0.400***	-0.15	-0.0087	0.425	-0.339***	0.464***	-0.0429	0.0845	-0.0296	0.28	-0.00465	0.00465
	(-0.0853)	(-0.202)	(-0.125)	(-0.335)	(-0.0493)	(-0.103)	(-0.0874)	(-0.201)	(-0.13)	(-0.221)	(-0.113)	(-0.324)
HEALTH AND WELLBEING												
Physical Health Symptoms	2.976***	0.135	-0.456*	-0.0719	-0.127	0.0662	-0.510**	-0.369+	-0.529*	-0.583**	-0.565*	-0.346
	(0.134)	(0.183)	(0.200)	(0.276)	(0.156)	(0.618)	(0.192)	(0.252)	(0.238)	(0.225)	(0.236)	(0.283)
Mental Health Symptoms	2.091***	-0.318	-0.000745	0.799	0.0750	0.311	-0.144	0.239	0.0616	0.166	-0.286	0.450
	(0.397)	(0.513)	(0.414)	(0.889)	(0.173)	(0.290)	(0.402)	(0.497)	(0.420)	(0.659)	(0.426)	(0.520)

Coefficients highlighted in blue represent significant variations from baseline estimates in the variables of interest
Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, ++ p<0.15, + p<0.20

Nicaragua

Table 6. Summary statistics of outcome variables by gender

	(1) Men					(2) Women				
Variables	Mean	Sd.	Min.	Max.	Obs.	Mean	Sd.	Min.	Max.	Obs.
Weekly working hours	54.15	4.79	35	67	209	53.70	5. 22	37	77	245
Weekly pay ($)	44.87	12.84	16.37	124.08	202	43.24	10.82	17.88	97.21	222
Hourly pay ($)	0.83	0.24	0.26	2.06	196	0.81	0.21	0.33	1.94	220
Promotions (%)	0.20	0.40	0	1	215	0.20	0.40	0	1	250
Sexual harassment (%)	0.19	0.40	0	1	167	0.21	0.41	0	1	160
Verbal abuse (%)	0.60	0.49	0	1	137	0.49	0.50	0	1	136
Physical abuse (%)	0.58	0.50	0	1	69	0.31	0.47	0	1	83
Overtime concern (%)	0.38	0.49	0	1	226	0.26	0.44	0	1	235
Physical Health Symptoms	1.50	0.52	0.67	3.33	198	1.57	0.49	0.67	3.67	229
Fatigue	2.56	1.02	1	5	214	2.66	0.99	1	5	250
Stomach pain	1.21	1.25	0	5	216	1.10	1.34	0	5	251
Dizzy	0.77	1.06	0	4	214	1.05	1.26	0	5	254
Thirst	1.18	1.63	0	5	214	1.44	1.68	0	5	254
Hunger	1.49	0.72	1	5	199	1.44	0.71	1	5	232
Aches	1.67	1.61	0	5	216	1.51	1.70	0	5	250
Mental Health Symptoms	1.86	0.79	1	5	112	2.06	0.91	1	5	106
Sad	1.75	0.84	1	5	118	2.13	1.08	1	5	118
Restless	1.86	0.95	1	5	120	1.77	0.94	1	5	112
Hopeless	1.95	1.05	1	5	114	2.30	1.25	1	5	112

Table 7. Better Work treatment effects by gender

	(1) Cycle 1 (baseline)		Cycle 2		(2) Cycle 3		(3) Cum. Effects Cycles 2-3	
	Cons.	Fem.	Cycle 2	Fem.* Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Fem* Cycle 3	Cycle 2_3	Fem.* Cycle2_3
WORK ATTRIBUTES								
Hourly Pay ($)	0.805***	0.00232	0.0242	-0.113**	0.0935	-0.0128	0.0625	-0.0349
	(0.0599)	(0.0466)	(0.0567)	(0.0447)	(0.0815)	(0.0565)	(0.0581)	(0.0536)
Weekly Hours	54.69***	-1.568+	-0.557	-0.324	-1.914++	1.335	-1.328	0.659
	(1.001)	(1.098)	(0.977)	(0.983)	(1.171)	(1.350)	(0.965)	(1.108)
Promotions (%)	0.240***	-0.00149	0.0104	-0.0364	-0.0759+	0.0197	-0.0376	-0.00962
	(0.0359)	(0.0601)	(0.0855)	(0.0923)	(0.0521)	(0.0617)	(0.0413)	(0.0482)
CONCERNS AND VOICE								
Sexual Harassment (%)	0.486***	-0.213**	-0.133*	0.152	-0.0968+	0.144++	-0.114***	0.152++
	(0.0506)	(0.0793)	(0.0590)	(0.135)	(0.0606)	(0.0814)	(0.0318)	(0.0905)
Verbal Abuse (%)	0.773***	-0.309**	-0.189+	0.0896	-0.189**	0.312+	-0.189*	0.251+
	(0.0650)	(0.102)	(0.125)	(0.161)	(0.0660)	(0.200)	(0.0815)	(0.167)
Physical Abuse (%)	0.515***	-0.140	0.0563	-0.124	0.172	-0.256	0.118	-0.196
	(0.103)	(0.129)	(0.203)	(0.127)	(0.151)	(0.223)	(0.129)	(0.177)
Overtime concern (%)	0.167***	0.0641	-0.00667	-0.0991	0.0914	-0.205**	0.0476	-0.158*
	(0.0287)	(0.0496)	(0.0935)	(0.104)	(0.0649)	(0.0811)	(0.0692)	(0.0816)
HEALTH AND WELLBEING								
Physical Health Symptoms[6]	1.600***	0.0470	-0.276**	0.178	-0.120	-0.0200	-0.187*	0.0599
	(0.0753)	(0.0718)	(0.0799)	(0.175)	(0.107)	(0.0932)	(0.0808)	(0.107)
Mental Health Symptoms[7]	1.885***	0.0962	-0.0730	-0.0506	-0.0156	0.290	-0.0415	0.189
	(0.0889)	(0.178)	(0.264)	(0.219)	(0.127)	(0.297)	(0.128)	(0.243)

Coefficients highlighted in blue represent significant variations from baseline estimates in the variables of interest
Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, ++ p<0.15, + p<0.20

[6] Scale reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha): 0.7666.
[7] Scale reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha): 0.7709.

Table 8. Better Work treatment effects between women with at least one child and other women

	(1) Cycle 1 (baseline)		Cycle 2		(2) Cycle 3		(3) Cum. Effects Cycles 2-3	
	Cons.	Child.	Cycle 2	Child.* Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Child.* Cycle 3	Cycle 2_3	Child.* Cycle2_3
WORK ATTRIBUTES								
Hourly Pay ($)	0.788***	0.0248	-0.0276	0.00596	0.0892	-0.00432	0.0124	0.0173
	(0.0558)	(0.0474)	(0.0595)	(0.0518)	(0.0745)	(0.0503)	(0.0617)	(0.0577)
Weekly Hours	54.18***	-1.306	-0.984	1.443	-1.265	0.942	-2.284	1.984
	(1.825)	(1.576)	(1.720)	(1.531)	(2.645)	(2.446)	(2.417)	(2.449)
Promotions (%)	0.158**	0.0979	0.00211	0.0113	0.00340	-0.0810	0.0921	-0.170*
	(0.0612)	(0.0781)	(0.0823)	(0.0845)	(0.111)	(0.114)	(0.0919)	(0.0882)
CONCERNS AND VOICE								
Sexual Harassment (%)	0.571***	-0.379**	-0.0977	0.162	-0.183	0.328*	-0.155	0.253
	(0.109)	(0.110)	(0.248)	(0.259)	(0.136)	(0.152)	(0.252)	(0.265)
Verbal Abuse (%)	0.727***	-0.361*	-0.227	0.382**	-0.0844	0.282	-0.273	0.458++
	(0.134)	(0.154)	(0.233)	(0.148)	(0.108)	(0.206)	(0.199)	(0.242)
Physical Abuse (%)	0.500**	-0.154	0.300	-0.411	0.0556	0.0176	-0.100	0.0351
	(0.183)	(0.209)	(0.289)	(0.315)	(0.186)	(0.164)	(0.435)	(0.459)
Overtime concern (%)	0.167+	0.0833	0.0833	-0.230	0.127	-0.232	0.0152	-0.163
	(0.105)	(0.135)	(0.106)	(0.167)	(0.144)	(0.229)	(0.187)	(0.237)
HEALTH AND WELLBEING								
Physical Health Symptoms	1.713***	-0.0809	-0.205	-0.0405	-0.135	-0.0280	-0.0989	-0.0351
	(0.166)	(0.160)	(0.176)	(0.170)	(0.230)	(0.247)	(0.211)	(0.206)
Mental Health Symptoms	2.139***	-0.206	-0.333++	0.240	-0.0764	0.214	-0.106	0.329
	(0.166)	(0.187)	(0.187)	(0.195)	(0.227)	(0.261)	(0.337)	(0.277)

Coefficients highlighted in blue represent significant variations from baseline estimates in the variables of interest
Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, ++ p<0.15, + p<0.20

Table 9. Better Work treatment effects between women with lower than secondary education and other women

	(1) Cycle 1 (baseline)		Cycle 2		(2) Cycle 3		(3) Cum. Effects Cycles 2-3	
	Cons.	Lower Educ.	Cycle 2	Lower Educ.* Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Lower Educ.* Cycle 3	Cycle 2_3	Lower Educ.* Cycle2_3
WORK ATTRIBUTES								
Hourly Pay ($)	0.806***	0.00193	-0.0563	0.0384	0.0539	0.0388	0.0359	-0.00999
	(0.0733)	(0.0514)	(0.0636)	(0.0630)	(0.0788)	(0.0521)	(0.0994)	(0.0780)
Weekly Hours	54.91***	-2.118+	-2.128	2.796	-2.506	2.416++	-3.556++	3.468++
	(1.729)	(1.324)	(2.596)	(2.864)	(1.872)	(1.385)	(2.094)	(1.858)
Promotions (%)	0.125++	0.133	0.153	-0.191+	0.115	-0.215++	0.225++	-0.328**
	(0.0744)	(0.0954)	(0.187)	(0.122)	(0.116)	(0.122)	(0.135)	(0.122)
CONCERNS AND VOICE								
Sexual Harassment (%)	0.455***	-0.218*	-0.121	0.210	0.134	-0.0802	-0.0170	0.0565
	(0.106)	(0.108)	(0.234)	(0.216)	(0.145)	(0.116)	(0.161)	(0.145)
Verbal Abuse (%)	0.600***	-0.181	-0.225*	0.361+	0.300++	-0.208	0.0667	-0.00215
	(0.145)	(0.158)	(0.109)	(0.226)	(0.179)	(0.267)	(0.227)	(0.257)
Physical Abuse (%)	0.600***	-0.267++	-0.100	0.188	-0.100	0.204	-0.267	0.224
	(0.108)	(0.151)	(0.280)	(0.219)	(0.144)	(0.200)	(0.283)	(0.317)
Overtime concern (%)	0.100	0.162	-0.100	0.0199	0.233	-0.344+	0.233+	-0.422*
	(0.0948)	(0.127)	(0.0948)	(0.155)	(0.172)	(0.236)	(0.160)	(0.214)
HEALTH AND WELLBEING								
Physical Health Symptoms	1.778***	-0.155++	-0.382**	0.192*	-0.243++	0.106	-0.287*	0.190+
	(0.119)	(0.0950)	(0.147)	(0.0870)	(0.142)	(0.142)	(0.147)	(0.123)
Mental Health Symptoms	2.121***	-0.178	-0.205	0.0661	-4.33e-08	0.114	0.0269	0.154
	(0.165)	(0.179)	(0.349)	(0.268)	(0.317)	(0.279)	(0.315)	(0.262)

Coefficients highlighted in blue represent significant variations from baseline estimates in the variables of interest
Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, ++ p<0.15, + p<0.20

Indonesia

Table 10. Summary statistics of outcome variables by gender

	(1) Men					(2) Women				
Variables	Mean	Sd.	Min.	Max.	Obs.	Mean	Sd.	Min.	Max.	Obs.
Weekly working hours	49.37	6.84	32	84	474	49.15	7.221	32	98	3,051
Weekly pay ($)	48.83	19.18	19.17	129.2	423	44.23	15.71	10.25	132.1	2,695
Hourly pay ($)	1.00	0.39	0.40	2.84	370	0.91	0.34	0.19	2.90	2,350
Promotions (%)	0.16	0.37	0	1	321	0.11	0.32	0	1	2,362
Sexual harassment (%)	0.84	0.37	0	1	306	0.82	0.39	0	1	1,560
Verbal abuse (%)	0.81	0.39	0	1	361	0.77	0.42	0	1	2,009
Physical abuse (%)	0.89	0.31	0	1	336	0.84	0.37	0	1	1,753
Overtime concern (%)	0.29	0.46	0	1	471	0.22	0.41	0	1	2,932
Physical Health Symptoms	2.35	0.57	1	3.83	275	2.44	0.57	1	4.67	2,014
Fatigue	2.40	0.95	1	5	544	2.36	0.93	1	5	3,526
Stomach pain	1.97	0.81	1	4	541	2.14	0.78	1	5	3,537
Dizzy	2.26	0.81	1	4	543	2.41	0.81	1	5	3,547
Thirst	3.19	1.31	1	5	334	3.29	1.40	1	5	2,513
Hunger	1.59	0.76	1	5	281	1.57	0.66	1	5	2,056
Aches	2.38	0.86	1	5	337	2.52	0.89	1	5	2,522
Mental Health Symptoms	1.62	0.69	1	3.8	150	1.66	0.71	1	4.8	1,033
Restless	1.87	0.99	1	4	162	1.79	0.97	1	5	1,143
Fearful	1.59	0.86	1	4	292	1.58	0.90	1	5	1,705
Sad	1.62	0.85	1	5	294	1.66	0.91	1	5	1,714
Cry	1.18	0.53	1	3	291	1.47	0.82	1	5	1,689
Hopeless	1.63	0.95	1	5	292	1.56	0.94	1	5	1,630

Table 11. Better Work treatment effects by gender

	(1) Cycle 1 (baseline)		Cycle 2		(2) Cycle 3		(3) Cycle 4		(4) Cycle 5		(5) Cum. Effects Cycles 2-5	
	Cons.	Fem.	Cycle 2	Fem.* Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Fem* Cycle 3	Cycle 4	Fem.* Cycle 4	Cycle 5	Fem* Cycle 5	Cycle 2-5	Fem.* Cycle2-5
WORK ATTRIBUTES												
Hourly Pay ($)	0.804***	0.0394	0.142**	-0.111*	0.118++	0.0208	0.465***	-0.264**	0.108**	-0.0247	0.179***	-0.0777+
	(0.0500)	(0.0465)	(0.0659)	(0.0601)	(0.0706)	(0.0724)	(0.0578)	(0.110)	(0.0500)	(0.0465)	(0.0656)	(0.0595)
Weekly Hours	50.15***	-1.330++	-3.139**	2.498*	-0.402	0.104	0.148	1.487	-0.652	-2.074**	-1.300+	0.919
	(1.056)	(0.884)	(1.155)	(1.330)	(1.120)	(1.134)	(1.287)	(1.455)	(1.056)	(0.885)	(0.895)	(1.052)
Promotions (%)	0.132***	-0.0334	0.0772	-0.0671	-0.0134	0.00826	0.103*	-0.116**	-0.132***	0.272***	0.0292	-0.0258
	(0.0363)	(0.0386)	(0.0844)	(0.0809)	(0.0511)	(0.0484)	(0.0554)	(0.0525)	(0.0363)	(0.0386)	(0.0518)	(0.0505)
CONCERNS AND VOICE												
Sexual Harassment (%)	0.849***	0.00737	-0.0560	-0.0253	-0.0859	0.0357	-0.0633	0.102	0.151***	-0.00737	-0.0608	0.0107
	(0.0517)	(0.0579)	(0.100)	(0.119)	(0.0834)	(0.101)	(0.0541)	(0.0821)	(0.0518)	(0.0580)	(0.0703)	(0.0809)
Verbal Abuse (%)	0.776***	0.00875	0.0366	-0.0847	0.0720	-0.0919	0.0991+	-0.0114	0.0241	0.108*	0.0625	-0.0806
	(0.0562)	(0.0554)	(0.0840)	(0.103)	(0.0797)	(0.0845)	(0.0687)	(0.0707)	(0.0562)	(0.0554)	(0.0639)	(0.0710)
Physical Abuse (%)	0.897***	-0.0118	-0.103	0.0425	0.00088	-0.0675	-0.0216	0.0653	0.103**	0.0118	-0.0299	-0.0228
	(0.0432)	(0.0414)	(0.0872)	(0.0987)	(0.0765)	(0.0682)	(0.0562)	(0.0673)	(0.0432)	(0.0415)	(0.0573)	(0.0566)
Overtime concern (%)	0.309***	-0.105*	-0.0402	0.00816	0.0135	0.0132	0.0444	-0.105	-0.309***	0.391***	-0.0134	0.0138
	(0.0484)	(0.0548)	(0.0655)	(0.0774)	(0.0975)	(0.0993)	(0.0573)	(0.0995)	(0.0485)	(0.0548)	(0.0632)	(0.0644)
HEALTH AND WELLBEING												
Physical Health Symptoms[8]	2.346***	0.0721	-0.110	0.125	0.0552	-0.0306	0.262***	-0.171	0.0540	0.124*	0.0272	0.00176
	(0.0664)	(0.0734)	(0.133)	(0.137)	(0.109)	(0.116)	(0.0828)	(0.134)	(0.0665)	(0.0735)	(0.0916)	(0.0963)
Mental Health Symptoms[9]	1.508***	0.106	-0.208++	0.234+	0.194	-0.162	0.167	-0.129	0.00833	0.137	0.0546	-0.0224
	(0.117)	(0.121)	(0.141)	(0.162)	(0.154)	(0.176)	(0.139)	(0.219)	(0.117)	(0.121)	(0.129)	(0.142)

Coefficients highlighted in blue represent significant variations from baseline estimates in the variables of interest
Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, ++ p<0.15, + p<0.20

[8] Scale reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha): 0.6854.
[9] Scale reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha): 0.8197.

Table 12. Better Work treatment effects between women with at least one child and other women

	(1) Cycle 1 (baseline)		(2) Cycle 2		(3) Cycle 3		(4) Cycle 4		(5) Cycle 5		(6) Cum. Effects Cycles 2-5	
	Cons.	Child	Cycle 2	Child* Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Child* Cycle 3	Cycle 4	Child* Cycle 4	Cycle 5	Child* Cycle 5	Cycle 2-5	Child* Cycle2-5
WORK ATTRIBUTES												
Hourly Pay ($)	0.859***	-0.0237	0.0417	0.00037	0.0498	0.121**	0.350***	-0.105++	0.00112	0.0960**	0.0744*	0.0393
	(0.0535)	(0.0470)	(0.0726)	(0.0678)	(0.0611)	(0.0446)	(0.0788)	(0.0673)	(0.0536)	(0.0470)	(0.0435)	(0.0453)
Weekly Hours	48.45***	0.588	-0.215	-0.831	0.253	-0.661	-2.660++	5.424**	2.179***	-5.168***	0.0925	-0.725
	(0.798)	(0.726)	(1.090)	(0.745)	(1.178)	(0.946)	(1.578)	(2.151)	(0.798)	(0.726)	(0.908)	(0.856)
Promotions (%)	0.134***	-0.0542**	0.0103	0.0159	-0.0193	0.0216	0.0887++	-0.105***	0.102***	-0.0700***	-0.00994	0.0189
	(0.0235)	(0.0208)	(0.0375)	(0.0363)	(0.0367)	(0.0296)	(0.0566)	(0.0260)	(0.0235)	(0.0208)	(0.0317)	(0.0296)
CONCERNS AND VOICE												
Sexual Harassment (%)	0.859***	-0.00419	0.0115	-0.123+	-0.0387	-0.0238	-0.0127	0.0298	0.141***	0.00419	-0.0156	-0.0473
	(0.0266)	(0.0365)	(0.0518)	(0.0838)	(0.0574)	(0.0817)	(0.0688)	(0.117)	(0.0266)	(0.0366)	(0.0480)	(0.0691)
Verbal Abuse (%)	0.805***	-0.0334	0.0436	-0.107++	-0.105**	0.142***	-0.00488	0.129	0.195***	-0.109***	-0.0650+	0.0708+
	(0.0263)	(0.0323)	(0.0546)	(0.0680)	(0.0462)	(0.0476)	(0.0986)	(0.144)	(0.0263)	(0.0323)	(0.0462)	(0.0491)
Physical Abuse (%)	0.897***	-0.0186	-0.0327	-0.0421	-0.0590	0.00300	0.0315	-0.000894	0.103***	0.0186	-0.0407	-0.0085
	(0.0237)	(0.0314)	(0.0522)	(0.0725)	(0.0483)	(0.0596)	(0.0651)	(0.0918)	(0.0237)	(0.0314)	(0.0388)	(0.0496)
Overtime concern (%)	0.243***	-0.0470	-0.0306	0.00540	-0.0586	0.128**	0.0424	-0.0693+	0.0900**	-0.0690*	-0.0418	0.0659++
	(0.0342)	(0.0377)	(0.0482)	(0.0534)	(0.0486)	(0.0608)	(0.0826)	(0.0495)	(0.0342)	(0.0377)	(0.0382)	(0.0438)
HEALTH AND WELLBEING												
Physical Health Symptoms	2.387***	0.0511	0.0328	-0.0666	-0.0158	0.0481	0.269*	-0.207***	0.280***	-0.184***	0.0475	-0.0332
	(0.0511)	(0.0494)	(0.0742)	(0.0934)	(0.0620)	(0.0620)	(0.139)	(0.0720)	(0.0511)	(0.0495)	(0.0565)	(0.0644)
Mental Health Symptoms	1.607***	0.0123	-0.00678	-0.0219	0.0806	-0.0594	0.222++	-0.236*	-0.207***	0.359***	0.0932	-0.0841
	(0.0710)	(0.0852)	(0.121)	(0.140)	(0.102)	(0.0950)	(0.136)	(0.118)	(0.0711)	(0.0854)	-0.0869	(0.0987)

Coefficients highlighted in blue represent significant variations from baseline estimates in the variables of interest
Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, ++ p<0.15, + p<0.20

Table 13. Better Work treatment effects between women with lower than secondary education and other women

	(1) Cycle 1 (baseline)		(2) Cycle 2		(3) Cycle 3		(4) Cycle 4		(5) Cycle 5		(5) Cum. Effects Cycles 2-5	
	Cons.	Lower Educ.	Cycle 2	Lower educ.* Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Lower educ.* Cycle 3	Cycle 4	Lower educ.* Cycle 4	Cycle 5	Lower educ.* Cycle 5	Cycle 2-5	Lower educ.* Cycle2-5
WORK ATTRIBUTES												
Hourly Pay ($)	0.876***	-0.0553	0.0549	-0.0231	0.0738+	0.105++	0.243*	0.0289	0.0559	0.0377	0.0760**	0.0424
	(0.0660)	(0.0460)	(0.0774)	(0.0571)	(0.0540)	(0.0633)	(0.143)	(0.0742)	(0.0660)	(0.0461)	(0.0359)	(0.0465)
Weekly Hours	49.08***	-0.419	-0.291	-0.801	0.106	-0.577	1.700	-0.226	-1.550++	-2.109**	-0.0426	-0.603
	(1.011)	(0.910)	(1.459)	(1.325)	(1.247)	(1.155)	(1.731)	(2.090)	(1.012)	(0.910)	(1.158)	(1.059)
Promotions (%)	0.092***	0.00995	0.0463	-0.0351	-0.0135	0.0149	0.0615	-0.0509++	0.158***	-0.0781***	0.0142	-0.0161
	(0.0210)	(0.0188)	(0.0466)	(0.0425)	(0.0382)	(0.0378)	(0.0526)	(0.0310)	(0.0210)	(0.0188)	(0.0321)	(0.0320)
CONCERNS AND VOICE												
Sexual Harassment (%)	0.877***	-0.0365	-0.0457	-0.0610	-0.0380	-0.0380	0.0228	-0.0198	0.123***	0.0365	-0.0243	-0.0452
	(0.0240)	(0.0390)	(0.0655)	(0.0652)	(0.0303)	(0.0598)	(0.0441)	(0.113)	(0.0241)	(0.0390)	(0.0369)	(0.0461)
Verbal Abuse (%)	0.812***	-0.0470	-0.0138	-0.0443	-0.00265	-0.0227	0.0281	0.102++	0.188***	-0.286***	-0.0127	-0.0110
	(0.0315)	(0.0381)	(0.0710)	(0.0643)	(0.0368)	(0.0534)	(0.0321)	(0.0658)	(0.0315)	(0.0381)	(0.0396)	(0.0441)
Physical Abuse (%)	0.905***	-0.0332	-0.0592	-0.0121	-0.0403	-0.0379	0.0538++	-0.0428	0.0955***	0.0332	-0.0338	-0.0298
	(0.0239)	(0.0270)	(0.0616)	(0.0500)	(0.0340)	(0.0467)	(0.0361)	(0.0824)	(0.0240)	(0.0270)	(0.0340)	(0.0343)
Overtime concern (%)	0.261***	-0.0778**	0.00321	-0.0567	0.0569	-0.0620	0.0718	-0.147++	0.0326	-0.105***	0.0388	-0.0697+
	(0.0351)	(0.0364)	(0.0633)	(0.0667)	(0.0537)	(0.0518)	(0.0554)	(0.0923)	(0.0352)	(0.0364)	(0.0456)	(0.0484)
HEALTH AND WELLBEING												
Physical Health Symptoms	2.457***	-0.0627+	0.0239	-0.0597	-0.00994	0.0469	0.000268	0.185**	0.0956*	0.0731++	0.0188	0.0143
	(0.0491)	(0.0436)	(0.0567)	(0.0879)	(0.0613)	(0.0725)	(0.133)	(0.0788)	(0.0491)	(0.0436)	(0.0537)	(0.0631)
Mental Health Symptoms	1.687***	-0.127++	-0.0693	0.0829	0.0130	0.0477	-0.104	0.253	0.113++	-0.373***	-0.00943	0.0759
	(0.0750)	(0.0794)	(0.102)	(0.145)	(0.110)	(0.112)	(0.207)	(0.223)	(0.0751)	(0.0795)	(0.100)	(0.116)

Coefficients highlighted in blue represent significant variations from baseline estimates in the variables of interest
Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, ++ p<0.15, + p<0.20

Vietnam

Table 14. Summary statistics of outcome variables by gender

	(1) Men					(2) Women				
Variables	Mean	Sd.	Min.	Max.	Obs.	Mean	Sd.	Min.	Max.	Obs.
Weekly working hours	58.26	7.62	32	96	1,066	58.52	7.49	32	90.50	4,649
Weekly pay ($)	50.97	21.71	11.74	137.7	1,066	45.29	17.87	10.40	139.5	4,715
Hourly pay ($)	0.89	0.41	0.20	2.73	1,012	0.78	0.33	0.16	3.22	4,501
Promotions (%)	0.25	0.43	0	1	850	0.13	0.33	0	1	3,810
Sexual harassment (%)	0.03	0.17	0	1	1,108	0.02	0.14	0	1	4,823
Verbal abuse (%)	0.07	0.25	0	1	1,113	0.07	0.25	0	1	4,847
Physical abuse (%)	0.05	0.21	0	1	1,108	0.02	0.15	0	1	4,837
Overtime concern (%)	0.08	0.27	0	1	1,114	0.06	0.24	0	1	4,824
Physical Health Symptoms	1.26	0.32	1	3	853	1.34	0.35	1.0	3.5	3,836
Fatigue	1.24	0.46	1	3	1,124	1.36	0.56	1	4	4,875
Headache	1.48	0.61	1	4	854	1.72	0.66	1	4	3,839
Stomach pain	1.30	0.58	1	4	1,124	1.34	0.61	1	4	4,873
Skin problems	1.12	0.39	1	3	854	1.11	0.37	1.0	4.0	3,839
Dizzy	1.24	0.49	1	3	1,124	1.43	0.60	1	4	4,875
Back Pain										
Thirst	1.16	0.44	1	4	854	1.18	0.46	1.0	4.0	3,839
Hunger	1.14	0.46	1	4	853	1.14	0.42	1.0	4.0	3,839
Mental Health Symptoms	1.12	0.27	1	3	853	1.19	0.36	1	4	3,836
Restless	1.08	0.34	1	5	1,124	1.12	0.39	1	5	4,873
Fearful	1.09	0.37	1	5	1,124	1.13	0.42	1	5	4,872
Sad	1.26	0.59	1	5	1,123	1.31	0.61	1	5	4,872
Cry	1.04	0.25	1	5	1,124	1.22	0.51	1	5	4,873
Hopeless	1.12	0.43	1	5	1,124	1.14	0.43	1	5	4,873

Table 15. Better Work treatment effects by gender

	(1) Cycle 1 (baseline)		(2) Cycle 2		(3) Cycle 3		(4) Cycle 4		(5) Cycle 5		(5) Cum. Effects Cycles 2-5	
	Cons.	Fem.	Cycle 2	Fem.* Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Fem* Cycle 3	Cycle 4	Fem.* Cycle 4	Cycle 5	Fem* Cycle 5	Cycle 2_5	Fem.* Cycle2_5
WORK ATTRIBUTES												
Hourly Pay ($)	0.815***	-0.192***	0.0900**	0.120***	0.198***	0.104**	0.261***	0.164**	0.478***	-0.0304	0.235***	0.0686**
	(0.0471)	(0.0375)	(0.0442)	(0.0398)	(0.0471)	(0.0441)	(0.0722)	(0.0688)	(0.120)	(0.0795)	(0.0304)	(0.0299)
Weekly Hours	58.40***	0.589	0.118	-0.514	-0.347	-0.490	-0.00715	-2.940**	-3.439***	0.824	0.237	-1.294*
	(1.013)	(0.831)	(1.262)	(1.230)	(0.994)	(0.908)	(1.276)	(1.242)	(1.068)	(1.166)	(0.721)	(0.669)
Promotions (%)	0.341***	-0.203**	-0	0.0195	-0.0706	0.0510	-0.0468	0.0177	-0.141	0.151	0.0441	-0.0572
	(0.0763)	(0.0792)	(0.0936)	(0.0975)	(0.0908)	(0.0966)	(0.148)	(0.144)	(0.214)	(0.203)	(0.0676)	(0.0700)
CONCERNS AND VOICE												
Sexual Harassment (%)	0.0194**	0.0144	0.0211+	-0.0411**	0.0116	-0.0253	0.0201	-0.0401*	-0.0194**	-0.00427	0.00787	-0.0238*
	(0.0092)	(0.0112)	(0.0154)	(0.0176)	(0.0157)	(0.0195)	(0.0218)	(0.0215)	(0.0093)	(0.0135)	(0.0100)	(0.0127)
Verbal Abuse (%)	0.0777***	0.0180	0.00603	-0.0228	-0.0312	-0.00301	0.0144	-0.0800**	-0.0110	-0.0341	0.0115	-0.0337*
	(0.0179)	(0.0186)	(0.0254)	(0.0283)	(0.0251)	(0.0266)	(0.0356)	(0.0364)	(0.0696)	(0.0528)	(0.0159)	(0.0181)
Physical Abuse (%)	0.0392**	-0.00622	0.00967	-0.0220	-0.00046	-0.0109	0.000784	-0.0201	0.0275	-0.0503	-0.0008	-0.0128
	(0.0150)	(0.0166)	(0.0228)	(0.0238)	(0.0217)	(0.0233)	(0.0270)	(0.0283)	(0.0694)	(0.0615)	(0.0143)	(0.0149)
Overtime concern (%)	0.127***	-0.0342+	-0.0387	0.0114	-0.0958***	0.0382+	-0.0874**	0.0247	-0.127***	0.105***	-0.0336++	0.00133
	(0.0209)	(0.0236)	(0.0304)	(0.0330)	(0.0282)	(0.0293)	(0.0340)	(0.0350)	(0.0209)	(0.0348)	(0.0220)	(0.0226)
HEALTH AND WELLBEING												
Physical Health Symptoms[10]	1.310***	0.0950**	-0.0297	-0.0104	-0.104***	-0.0149	-0.0900**	-0.0347	-0.110*	-0.0791*	-0.0397	-0.0276
	(0.0360)	(0.0371)	(0.0460)	(0.0523)	(0.0376)	(0.0412)	(0.0435)	(0.0530)	(0.0634)	(0.0427)	(0.0330)	(0.0378)
Mental Health Symptoms[11]	1.164***	0.0669**	-0.0329	-0.0371	-0.0861**	0.0111	-0.0873**	0.0202	-0.124***	0.0406+	-0.043++	-0.0213
	(0.0273)	(0.0271)	(0.0374)	(0.0401)	(0.0349)	(0.0350)	(0.0340)	(0.0393)	(0.0401)	(0.0293)	(0.0265)	(0.0296)

Coefficients highlighted in blue represent significant variations from baseline estimates in the variables of interest
Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, ++ p<0.15, + p<0.20

[10] Scale reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha): 0.7786
[11] Scale reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha): 0.7929

Table 16. Better Work treatment effects between women with at least one young child and other women

	(1) Cycle 1 (baseline)		Cycle 2		(2) Cycle 3		(3) Cycle 4		(4) Cycle 5		(5) Cum. Effects Cycles 2-5	
	Cons.	Child	Cycle 2	Child* Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Child* Cycle 3	Cycle 4	Child* Cycle 4	Cycle 5	Child* Cycle 5	Cycle 2_5	Child* Cycle2_5
WORK ATTRIBUTES												
Hourly Pay ($)	0.628***	-0.0193	0.210***	0.0459*	0.319***	0.000195	0.417***	0.0384	0.464***	0.0343*	0.300***	0.0104
	(0.0243)	(0.0153)	(0.0267)	(0.0270)	(0.0321)	(0.0302)	(0.0446)	(0.0379)	(0.0545)	(0.0200)	(0.0190)	(0.0203)
Weekly Hours	59.26***	-0.909*	-0.225	-0.399	-0.847	0.129	-2.757*	0.716	-2.843***	0.246	-0.999++	0.0198
	(0.610)	(0.494)	(0.910)	(0.665)	(0.818)	(0.659)	(1.413)	(1.164)	(0.815)	(1.006)	(0.619)	(0.600)
Promotions (%)	0.164***	-0.0595**	-0.0102	0.0913***	-0.0511**	0.0962***	-0.0735***	0.134***	-0.0172	0.0708	-0.0338*	0.0722***
	(0.0207)	(0.0237)	(0.0231)	(0.0339)	(0.0197)	(0.0338)	(0.0262)	(0.0456)	(0.0663)	(0.0823)	(0.0176)	(0.0259)
CONCERNS AND VOICE												
Sexual Harassment (%)	0.0418***	-0.0266***	-0.0206*	0.0213**	-0.0160+	0.0162	-0.0211*	0.0192++	-0.0284**	0.0132	-0.0216**	0.0202**
	(0.00869)	(0.00677)	(0.0106)	(0.0102)	(0.0114)	(0.0131)	(0.0121)	(0.0125)	(0.0124)	(0.0105)	(0.00817)	(0.00774)
Verbal Abuse (%)	0.107***	-0.0367*	-0.0257+	0.0338++	-0.0300	-0.0131	-0.069***	0.0448*	-0.0666*	0.0736*	-0.0294*	0.0272*
	(0.0174)	(0.0193)	(0.0179)	(0.0215)	(0.0268)	(0.0289)	(0.0195)	(0.0249)	(0.0363)	(0.0377)	(0.0156)	(0.0160)
Physical Abuse (%)	0.0380***	-0.017++	0.0072	0.00422	-0.0102	0.00805	-0.017++	0.00931	-0.0113	-0.0100	-0.0170**	0.0128+
	(0.00877)	(0.0110)	(0.0130)	(0.0143)	(0.0109)	(0.0150)	(0.0106)	(0.0164)	(0.0235)	(0.0245)	(0.00831)	(0.00933)
Overtime concern (%)	0.0997***	-0.0235	-0.0285+	0.0202	-0.066***	0.0240	-0.062***	0.00532	-0.0197	-0.0308	-0.0324**	0.00344
	(0.0191)	(0.0235)	(0.0200)	(0.0279)	(0.0223)	(0.0239)	(0.0197)	(0.0276)	(0.0431)	(0.0415)	(0.0140)	(0.0191)
HEALTH AND WELLBEING												
Physical Health Symptoms	1.405***	0.00249	-0.0583*	0.00173	-0.121***	-0.0329	-0.136***	0.00283	-0.185***	-0.0206	-0.0584**	-0.0293+
	(0.0271)	(0.0218)	(0.0309)	(0.0286)	(0.0317)	(0.0293)	(0.0310)	(0.0325)	(0.0570)	(0.0421)	(0.0225)	(0.0218)
Mental Health Symptoms	1.244***	-0.0435++	-0.0818**	0.0224	-0.0793*	-0.0196	-0.101***	0.0620+	-0.0782+	-0.0500	-0.067***	0.0127
	(0.0296)	(0.0293)	(0.0324)	(0.0318)	(0.0396)	(0.0421)	(0.0315)	(0.0425)	(0.0574)	(0.0468)	(0.0246)	(0.0257)

Coefficients highlighted in blue represent significant variations from baseline estimates in the variables of interest
Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, ++ p<0.15, + p<0.20

Table 17. Better Work treatment effects between women with lower education and other women

	(1) Cycle 1 (baseline)		(2) Cycle 2		(3) Cycle 3		(4) Cycle 4		(5) Cycle 5		Cum. Effects Cycles 2-5	
	Cons.	Lower Educ.	Cycle 2	Lower Educ.* Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Lower Educ.* Cycle 3	Cycle 4	Lower Educ.* Cycle 4	Cycle 5	Lower Educ.* Cycle 5	Cycle 2_5	Lower Educ.* Cycle2_5
WORK ATTRIBUTES												
Hourly Pay ($)	0.823***	-0.209***	0.302**	-0.0794	0.283**	0.0357	0.320***	0.113	0.396**	0.0799	0.319***	-0.0154
	(0.0765)	(0.0780)	(0.119)	(0.116)	(0.136)	(0.132)	(0.118)	(0.106)	(0.149)	(0.137)	(0.0767)	(0.0790)
Weekly Hours	54.83***	4.341***	-0.0970	-0.324	2.405++	-3.395**	-1.191	-1.417	-0.330	-2.544**	-1.676	0.633
	(0.902)	(0.924)	(1.683)	(1.547)	(1.489)	(1.349)	(2.998)	(2.339)	(1.098)	(0.959)	(1.453)	(1.423)
Promotions (%)	0.308***	-0.162***	-0.0654*	0.0639++	-0.114**	0.0792++	-0.123**	0.0791+	-0.174*	0.181**	-0.0866**	0.0753**
	(0.0337)	(0.0331)	(0.0363)	(0.0410)	(0.0476)	(0.0486)	(0.0552)	(0.0574)	(0.0868)	(0.0762)	(0.0345)	(0.0363)
CONCERNS AND VOICE												
Sexual Harassment (%)	0.0682*	-0.0358	-0.0206	0.00636	0.0175	-0.0311	0.0429	-0.0611	-0.0682*	0.0451	-0.0163	0.000606
	(0.0383)	(0.0361)	(0.0527)	(0.0508)	(0.0665)	(0.0664)	(0.0851)	(0.0816)	(0.0385)	(0.0375)	(0.0338)	(0.0325)
Verbal Abuse (%)	0.190***	-0.0986++	-0.00866	-0.00758	-0.0283	-0.0102	-0.0238	-0.0327	-0.190***	0.154**	0.0176	-0.0414
	(0.0686)	(0.0642)	(0.0944)	(0.0915)	(0.0833)	(0.0844)	(0.106)	(0.102)	(0.0688)	(0.0741)	(0.0504)	(0.0489)
Physical Abuse (%)	0.0952**	-0.0647++	-0.0255	0.0196	0.0159	-0.0262	0.0224	-0.0387	-0.0952**	0.0833*	-0.00859	-0.00516
	(0.0429)	(0.0406)	(0.0624)	(0.0589)	(0.0725)	(0.0751)	(0.0902)	(0.0888)	(0.0431)	(0.0456)	(0.0412)	(0.0413)
Overtime concern (%)	0.163**	-0.0730	0.0372	-0.0625	-0.109*	0.0522	0.0594	-0.126	0.00388	-0.0381	0.0321	-0.0671
	(0.0626)	(0.0642)	(0.0790)	(0.0829)	(0.0581)	(0.0599)	(0.115)	(0.123)	(0.109)	(0.102)	(0.0488)	(0.0536)
HEALTH AND WELLBEING												
Physical Health Symptoms	1.432***	-0.0275	0.121*	-0.186***	-0.101*	-0.0343	-0.00126	-0.140	0.0890	-0.297+	0.0470	-0.119*
	(0.0529)	(0.0560)	(0.0678)	(0.0670)	(0.0588)	(0.0617)	(0.119)	(0.112)	(0.180)	(0.207)	(0.0601)	(0.0634)
Mental Health Symptoms	1.468***	-0.248***	-0.0637	-0.0131	-0.274**	0.192*	-0.0904	0.00846	0.0985	-0.210+	-0.0361	-0.0292
	(0.0987)	(0.0888)	(0.105)	(0.0973)	(0.112)	(0.107)	(0.181)	(0.172)	(0.148)	(0.146)	(0.0803)	(0.0770)

Coefficients highlighted in blue represent significant variations from baseline estimates in the variables of interest
Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, ++ p<0.15, + p<0.20

Jordan

Table 18. Summary statistics of outcome variables by gender

	(1) Men					(2) Women				
Variables	Mean	Sd.	Min.	Max.	Obs.	Mean	Sd.	Min.	Max.	Obs.
Weekly working hours	65.80	10.59	36	95.00	482	61.40	10.66	32.00	99	1,091
Weekly pay ($)	62.71	19.55	17.34	136.31	471	59.47	16.61	15.10	136.40	1,098
Hourly pay ($)	1.00	0.35	0.34	2.27	395	1.01	0.32	0.19	2.60	950
Promotions (%)	0.41	0.49	0	1	581	0.30	0.46	0	1	1,289
Sexual harassment (%)	0.26	0.44	0	1	515	0.33	0.47	0	1	1,041
Verbal abuse (%)	0.35	0.48	0	1	285	0.45	0.50	0	1	604
Physical abuse (%)	0.27	0.45	0	1	237	0.36	0.48	0	1	535
Overtime concern (%)	0.33	0.47	0	1	548	0.40	0.49	0	1	1,177
Physical Health Symptoms	1.30	0.52	0.67	3.33	449	1.33	0.55	0.67	3.33	703
Thirst	1.09	1.50	0	5	588	1.32	1.61	0	5	1,291
Hunger	1.54	0.91	1	5	453	1.54	0.99	1	5	711
Aches	1.29	1.36	0	5	591	1.38	1.54	0	5	1,290
Mental Health Symptoms	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fearful	1.55	1.07	1	5	247	1.89	1.21	1	5	624
Cry	1.42	0.90	1	5	308	1.67	1.09	1	5	668

Table 19. Better Work treatment effects by gender

	(1) Cycle 1 (baseline)		(2) Cycle 2		(3) Cycle 3		(4) Cycle 4		(5) Cycle 5		(6) Cycles 6		(6) Cum. Effect Cycles 2-6	
	Cons.	Fem.	Cycle 2	Fem.* Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Fem.* Cycle 3	Cycle 4	Fem.* Cycle 4	Cycle 5	Fem.* Cycle 5	Cycle 6	Fem.* Cycle 6	Cycle 2-6	Fem.* Cycle2-6
WORK ATTRIBUTES														
Hourly Pay ($)	0.890***	0.0108	0.421**	-0.226++	0.0874	0.0881	0.220***	-0.151**	0.137+	0.0076	0.165***	0.0412	0.172***	-0.0259
	(0.0420)	(0.0391)	(-0.169)	(-0.136)	(-0.083)	(-0.079)	(-0.065)	(-0.054)	(-0.101)	(-0.092)	(-0.042)	(-0.097)	(-0.059)	(-0.045)
Weekly Hours	67.91***	-6.507***	-14.56***	9.082*	-4.784++	2.347	-3.189+	4.081*	0.49	2.251	-3.2	9.219***	-3.616*	3.461*
	(1.592)	(1.814)	(-4.785)	(-4.687)	(-2.841)	(-2.554)	(-2.293)	(-2.035)	(-2.909)	(-2.287)	(-3.302)	(-2.008)	(-1.895)	(-1.673)
Promotions (%)	0.347***	-0.103*	-0.0806*	0.126+	0.0758	0.0742	0.0527	-0.0859	-0.222***	0.274***	0.0916**	-0.0110	0.347***	-0.103*
	(0.0339)	(0.0559)	(0.0416)	(0.0861)	(0.0713)	(0.0835)	(0.0818)	(0.0851)	(0.0408)	(0.0596)	(0.0426)	(0.0593)	(0.0339)	(0.0559)
CONCERNS AND VOICE														
Sexual Harassment (%)	0.259***	0.122**	0.186	-0.281***	0.0253	-0.0436	0.0174	-0.170***	-0.0698	0.0566	0.208***	-0.439***	0.0188	-0.0988*
	(0.0470)	(0.0450)	(0.150)	(0.0834)	(0.0766)	(0.0649)	(0.0347)	(0.0535)	(0.0790)	(0.107)	(0.0476)	(0.0831)	(0.0464)	(0.0513)
Verbal Abuse (%)	0.378***	0.198**	0.422*	-0.427**	-0.113	-0.0420	-0.0851	-0.263**	-0.0815	-0.0884	-0.0444	-0.213**	-0.0472	-0.153*
	(0.0735)	(0.0788)	(0.241)	(0.204)	(0.120)	(0.120)	(0.0710)	(0.105)	(0.128)	(0.116)	(0.121)	(0.0868)	(0.0918)	(0.0844)
Physical Abuse (%)	0.242***	0.122++	-0.242***	0.253	0.109+	0.00196	0.0522	-0.152	-0.0938	0.0867	0.258***	-0.384***	0.0426	-0.0439
	(0.0681)	(0.0745)	(0.0681)	(0.235)	(0.0759)	(0.0989)	(0.101)	(0.125)	(0.111)	(0.136)	(0.0681)	(0.0811)	(0.0767)	(0.0879)
Overtime concern (%)	0.321***	0.169**	0.0362	-0.197**	0.0257	-0.0513	0.147**	-0.380***	-0.113	0.0273	-0.0543	-0.221***	0.0376	-0.167**
	(0.0535)	(0.0684)	(0.0666)	(0.0852)	(0.0708)	(0.0878)	(0.0552)	(0.0697)	(0.108)	(0.119)	(0.0720)	(0.0769)	(0.0593)	(0.0730)
HEALTH AND WELLBEING														
Mental Health Symptoms														
Fearful	1.564***	0.178	-0.0638	0.197	-0.248+	0.318	-0.405*	0.101	0.0900	-0.339	-0.164	-0.214	-0.212	0.0901
	(0.165)	(0.177)	(0.309)	(0.335)	(0.176)	(0.251)	(0.196)	(0.251)	(0.300)	(0.330)	(0.202)	(0.231)	(0.181)	(0.198)
Cry	1.609***	0.286*	-0.609***	0.828++	0.120	-0.129	-0.198+	0.0296	-0.350*	0.133	0.0573	-0.381**	-0.134	0.0434
	(0.154)	(0.155)	(0.154)	(0.504)	(0.156)	(0.239)	(0.146)	(0.164)	(0.186)	(0.278)	(0.154)	(0.182)	(0.120)	(0.167)
Physical Health Symptoms[12]	1.297***	0.0884	0.286*	-0.261*	0.0626	-0.131+	-0.0273	-0.0610	-0.0659	-0.0185	-0.364***	0.112	-0.0110	-0.0729
	(0.0500)	(0.0797)	(0.161)	(0.147)	(0.0598)	(0.0933)	(0.0551)	(0.0897)	(0.0966)	(0.104)	(0.0635)	(0.128)	(0.0382)	(0.0752)

Coefficients highlighted in blue represent significant variations from baseline estimates in the variables of interest
Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, ++ p<0.15, + p<0.20

[12] Scale reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha): 0.6489.

Table 20. Better Work treatment effects between women with up to lower secondary education and other women

	(1) Cycle 1 (baseline)		(2) Cycle 2		(3) Cycle 3		(4) Cycle 4		(5) Cycle 5		(6) Cycles 6		(6) Cum. Effect Cycles 2-6	
	Cons.	Lower Educ.	Cycle 2	Lower Educ.* Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Lower Educ.* Cycle 3	Cycle 4	Lower Educ.* Cycle 4	Cycle 5	Lower Educ.* Cycle 5	Cycle 6	Lower Educ.* Cycle 6	Cycle 2-6	Lower Educ.* Cycle2-6
WORK ATTRIBUTES														
Hourly Pay ($)	0.932***	-0.0824**	0.279***	-0.170*	0.157**	-0.0251	0.160***	-0.0813*	0.167***	-0.0632	0.193**	-0.119***	0.179***	-0.0885*
	(0.0303)	(0.0317)	(0.0908)	(0.0882)	(0.0606)	(0.0754)	(0.0496)	(0.0466)	(0.0445)	(0.0620)	(0.0775)	(0.0383)	(0.0388)	(0.0426)
Weekly Hours	59.23***	-6.326**	5.657***	2.263	-0.370	-2.061	3.862++	-5.446**	5.558**	-4.296**	7.082*	-3.083+	0.914	-2.765**
	(1.776)	(2.974)	(1.531)	(4.697)	(1.569)	(1.618)	(2.398)	(1.927)	(2.220)	(1.776)	(4.098)	(2.210)	(1.785)	(1.211)
Promotions (%)	0.29***	-0.0666+	-0.142**	0.241**	0.127++	0.0419	0.125**	0.0738	-0.0104	0.0485	-0.159**	0.222**	0.0216	0.0809
	(0.0419)	(0.0480)	(0.0650)	(0.106)	(0.0837)	(0.0989)	(0.0558)	(0.0728)	(0.0723)	(0.0721)	(0.0580)	(0.0968)	(0.0594)	(0.0809)
CONCERNS AND VOICE														
Sexual Harassment (%)	0.439***	-0.140**	0.00542	-0.167+	-0.0802	0.0918	-0.158**	0.0623	-0.0734	0.0210	-0.195***	0.0954	-0.0744+	-0.00248
	(0.0375)	(0.0547)	(0.121)	(0.113)	(0.0642)	(0.0833)	(0.0580)	(0.0876)	(0.0938)	(0.0831)	(0.0633)	(0.212)	(0.0519)	(0.0679)
Verbal Abuse (%)	0.716***	-0.377***	0.106+	-0.150*	-0.280***	0.215*	-0.486***	0.419***	-0.278*	0.242*	-0.369***	0.231**	-0.250***	0.164**
	(0.0572)	(0.0526)	(0.0777)	(0.0832)	(0.0871)	(0.108)	(0.0787)	(0.101)	(0.134)	(0.117)	(0.0831)	(0.0884)	(0.0675)	(0.0630)
Physical Abuse (%)	0.407***	-0.107++	0.0434	-0.129	0.0773	0.00869	-0.0684	-0.0356	-0.0941	0.0512	-0.0884++	-0.0116	0.0309	-0.0613
	(0.0488)	(0.0633)	(0.172)	(0.143)	(0.100)	(0.151)	(0.0865)	(0.101)	(0.0926)	(0.0980)	(0.0526)	(0.212)	(0.0768)	(0.0889)
Overtime concern (%)	0.517***	-0.0732	-0.102**	-0.136+	-0.0476	-0.0221	-0.127++	-0.0514	-0.117	-0.0541	-0.256***	-0.0968	-0.0945++	-0.0738
	(0.0388)	(0.0556)	(0.0452)	(0.0943)	(0.0626)	(0.101)	(0.0781)	(0.0909)	(0.104)	(0.109)	(0.0452)	(0.0878)	(0.0590)	(0.0788)
HEALTH AND WELLBEING														
Physical Health Symp.	1.341***	0.0786	-0.141	0.249++	-0.0687	0.0434	-0.0987	0.0124	-0.0130	-0.180++	-0.205++	-0.215	-0.0630	-0.0351
	(0.0832)	(0.0867)	(0.111)	(0.154)	(0.121)	(0.115)	(0.0928)	(0.0988)	(0.122)	(0.115)	(0.120)	(0.201)	(0.108)	(0.109)
Mental Health Symp.														
Fearful	1.956***	-0.584***	0.0444	0.0282	-0.139	0.159	-0.456***	0.248	-0.436**	0.619*	-0.494++	0.122	-0.169	0.161
	(0.0919)	(0.149)	(0.154)	(0.175)	(0.140)	(0.222)	(0.150)	(0.201)	(0.178)	(0.297)	(0.314)	(0.371)	(0.130)	(0.174)
Cry	2.008***	-0.302**	0.253	-0.292	-0.0673	0.0863	-0.376**	0.229	-0.268**	-0.195	-0.326***	-0.179	-0.0386	-0.0889
	(0.0961)	(0.145)	(0.394)	(0.429)	(0.153)	(0.185)	(0.141)	(0.211)	(0.123)	(0.221)	(0.113)	(0.186)	(0.127)	(0.136)

Coefficients highlighted in blue represent significant variations from baseline estimates in the variables of interest
Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1, ++ p<0.15, + p<0.20

The Better Work Discussion Paper Series is an original, peer-reviewed series that presents rigorous, work-in-progress research material for comment and feedback. It is addressed to researchers, policymakers and development practitioners to generate comments and encourage discussion.

THE BETTER WORK GLOBAL PROGRAMME IS SUPPORTED BY PARTICIPATING BRANDS AND FACTORIES, AND THE FOLLOWING KEY DONOR PARTNERS (IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER):

Australia (Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, DFAT)

Denmark (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Danida)

Germany (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, BMZ)

Netherlands (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, MFA)

Switzerland (State Secretariat for Economic Affairs, SECO)

United States (US Department of Labor, USDOL)

International Labour Organization

IFC International Finance Corporation WORLD BANK GROUP