


ERRATUM

Having a voice in your group: Increasing productivity through group participation – ERRATUM

Sherry Jueyu Wu  and Elizabeth Levy Paluck

<https://doi.org/10.1017/bpp.2022.9>, Published by Cambridge University Press, 8 April 2022

Keywords: group dynamics; behavioral change; productivity; voice; field experiment

Cambridge apologises for a publisher-introduced error during the production process of the above article (Wu and Paluck, 2022).

Table 1 was incorrectly typeset. The corrected Table 1 is reproduced below.

Table 1. Productivity Change During the Six-Week Experiment Period and Sustained Productivity Change After the Experiment.

	<i>Productivity per 6-week (in Chinese Yuan)</i>			
	Experimental period		Long-term	
	(6 weeks during intervention)		(6 weeks post-intervention)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Participatory meetings	584.39* (259.12)	592.30** (229.31)	491.17* (206.21)	532.72** (179.70)
Work experience		42.87 (30.78)		63.72** (23.63)
Education		184.19 (118.97)		-109.21 (180.72)
Baseline productivity (first 6-week period)		0.44*** (0.06)		0.33*** (0.06)
Baseline productivity (second 6-week period)		0.04 (0.05)		0.13* (0.05)

(Continued)

Table 1. (Continued.)

	Productivity per 6-week (in Chinese Yuan)			
	Experimental period		Long-term	
	(6 weeks during intervention)		(6 weeks post-intervention)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Departmental fixed effects	YES	YES	YES	YES
Constant	6,310.16*** (466.48)	4,043.36*** (411.36)	7,656.74*** (279.19)	5,860.00*** (379.50)
N (clusters)	65	65	65	65
N (individuals)	1611	1490	1561	1440
Control mean estimate	6320.64	6455.84	5648.30	5603.92

Note: The comparison condition to the participatory meetings is the control-observer condition. Models include full-time sewing workers paid by piece-rates. Supervisors ($N = 65$) and staff members ($N = 76$) whose productivity cannot be determined by gross salary were excluded in the productivity data analysis. For workers who did not show up on any given day, their productivity was counted as zero for that day. See Table S8 for substantively and statistically consistent results using missing data imputation to account for those who did not provide demographic information or who left their positions. * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

Reference

Wu, S. J. and E. L. Paluck (2022), ‘Having a voice in your group: Increasing productivity through group participation’, *Behavioural Public Policy*, <https://doi.org/10.1017/bpp.2022.9>

Cite this article: Wu SJ, Paluck EL (2022). Having a voice in your group: Increasing productivity through group participation – ERRATUM. *Behavioural Public Policy* 1–2. <https://doi.org/10.1017/bpp.2022.22>