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## CASE STUDY

## RUSSIA

## SECTION 1. DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

This section describes a description of the participating organizations from Russia in terms of their company type, sector, size, geographic location, number of employees, ratio of women to total employees, and nature of the company.

## Table 1

COMPANY PROFILE

|  |  | Frequency ( f ) | Percentage (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type of Company |  |  |  |
|  | Service | 3 | 75 |
|  | Research Center | 1 | 25 |
| Sector |  |  |  |
|  | Academia | 1 | 25 |
|  | Education \& Consulting | 3 | 75 |
| Size of the Company |  |  |  |
|  | Small | 4 | 100 |
|  | Medium | - | - |
| Geographical Location |  |  |  |
|  | Local | 4 | 100 |
| Number of Employees |  |  |  |
|  | Between 1-10 | 3 | 75 |
|  | Between 11-20 | 1 | 25 |
| \% of Female to Total \# of Employees |  |  |  |
|  | 64\% | 1 | 25 |
|  | 60\% | 1 | 25 |
|  | 56\% | 1 | 25 |
|  | 25\% | 1 | 25 |
| Nature of Company in the Supply Chain |  |  |  |
|  | Service-Provider | 4 | 100 |

Table 1 presents the participating organizations. In terms of the type of company, all four organizations which were represented in the survey belong to the service-oriented industry, and all of these institutions represent the academe. With regard to the company size, all belong to small scale
organization with less than 20 employees. Note, however, that the classification based on company size was based on the respondents' perception, which could be confirmed later on with some follow-up questions.

With regard to the percentage of female employees compared to the total number of employees in the organization, the results in Table 1 show that except for one organization that only had $25 \%$ of its employees to be female, the great majority of the organizations participating in the survey have at least $56 \%$ of its workforce coming from the women sector, with the highlight organization reaching as high as 64\%.

Finally, when grouped according to the nature of the company within the supply chain, Table 1 shows that all of these organizations are suppliers or service providers.

## Table 2

RESPONDENTS' PROFILE

|  |  | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sex |  |  |  |
|  | Female | 4 | 100 |
| Age |  |  |  |
|  | $\leq 20$ but >30 | 1 | 25 |
|  | $\leq 40$ but >50 | 1 | 25 |
|  | $\leq 50$ but >60 | 2 | 50 |
| Highest Educational Attainment |  |  |  |
|  | MBA | 2 | 50 |
|  | PhD in Technique | 2 | 50 |
| Language |  |  |  |
|  | Russian, English | 2 | 50 |
|  | Russian, English, Japanese | 1 | 25 |
|  | Russian, English, Chinese | 1 | 25 |
| Marital Status |  |  |  |
|  | Single | 1 | 25 |
|  | Married | 2 | 50 |
|  | Divorced | 1 | 25 |
| No. of Years in the Company |  |  |  |
|  | 1.5 | 1 | 25 |
|  | 8 | 1 | 25 |
|  | 18 | 1 | 25 |
|  | 20 | 1 | 25 |


| Status in Company |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Permanent | 4 | 100 |
|  | Temporary | - | - |

Table 2 shows the respondents' profile in terms of sex, age, highest educational attainment, language spoken, marital status, no. of years in the respondent-company, and employment status.

All were represented by women, with one or $25 \%$ whose age falling below 30 years old, and another (25\%) respondent with age range between 40-50 years old, while the rest of the respondents or 50\%, are above 50 years old.

Table 3
ROLE OF WOMEN IN THE COMPANY/BUSINESS ( $\mathrm{n}=4$ )

|  |  | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Positions Held |  |  |  |
|  | Director | 3 | 75 |
|  | Researcher | 1 | 25 |
| Tasks Performed |  | 3 | 75 |
|  | People Management, Strategy <br> Development, Operational Issues | 1 | 25 |
|  | Research Projects, monitoring activities <br> of certain APEC groups |  |  |

Table 3 shows the respondents' description in terms of the positions held and tasks performed with their companies.

With regard to positions held by the respondents, three among the four, or $75 \%$, held the position of director of the organizations, while one, or $25 \%$, was a researcher. The results therefore imply that in terms of the viewpoint represented in the survey, majority of the respondents were advocating the middle and/or top management perspectives which may be collaborated later on by staff and clients, as a way to deepen the analysis.

## SECTION 2. PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN THE BUSINESS

This section presents the participation of women in their business organizations, with particular emphasis on governance, consultation, access, leadership, and enabling conditions.

## Table 4

WOMEN'S PARTICIPATION, CONSULTATION, AND DECISION-MAKING (GOVERNANCE)

| Participation Variables | Mean | SD | Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Women participate in the formulation of policies, programs and projects that may affect the personnel | 3.00 | 0.82 | Active |
| b. Women's concerns, suggestions and recommendations are taken into consideration | 3.25 | 0.50 | Active |
| c. Women are consulted on the formulation of policies, programs and projects that may affect the personnel | 3.00 | 0.82 | Active |
| d. Women participate and are consulted on company matters that affect their work life | 2.50 | 1.00 | Active |
| e. The company has a gender focal person and/or women's desk that performs to people's expectations of catering to the needs of women | 1.25 | 0.50 | No/Little |
| f. The company has adequate policies, programs and projects that allow women to contribute their expertise in the growth and development of the company | 3.00 | 0.82 | Active |
| g. The company implements a Gender and Development Framework and Action Plan | 1.25 | 0.50 | No/Little |
| h. The company allocates adequate financial resources to implement the Gender And Development Action Plan with priority in supporting women trainings, projects, events | 1.25 | 0.50 | No/Little |
| Overall, Women's PCD (Governance) | 2.31 | 0.68 | Occasional |

Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Little PCD of Women), 1.50-2.49 (Occasional PCD of Women), 2.50-3.49 (Active PCD of Women), 3.50-
4.00 (Very Active PCD of Women)

Table 4 presents the results of the respondents' assessment of their organizations' governance in terms of women's participation, consultation and decision-making. Apparently, all the organizations which participated in the study have active governance mechanisms for women, particularly for the following areas: (a) formulation of policies, programs and projects ( $\bar{X}=3.00, S D=0.82$ ); (b) consideration of the concerns, suggestions and recommendations ( $\bar{x}=3.25, S D=0.50$ ); (c) formulation of policies, programs and projects that may affect the personnel ( $\bar{x}=3.00, S D=0.82$ ); (d) participation and consultation on matters that affect family life ( $\bar{x}=2.50, S D=1.00$ ); and ( f ) adequacy of policies, programs and projects that allow women to contribute expertise ( $\bar{x}=3.00, S D=0.82$ ).

However, it was also found that the respondents regard their organizations as having no or little mechanisms for governance in terms of the following: (e) a gender focal person and/or women's desk ( $\bar{X}$ $=1.25, S D=0.50)$; $(\mathrm{g})$ implementation of the GAD framework and action plan ( $\overline{\mathrm{x}}=1.25, \mathrm{SD}=0.50$ ); and (h) the allocation of resources to implement the GAD action plan ( $\bar{x}=1.25, S D=0.50$ ).

Finally, the overall results show that governance mechanisms for the participation, consultation of and decision-making for women at the participating organizations are done occasionally ( $\bar{x}=2.31$, SD $=0.68$ ).

## Table 5

## Reasons Why Women Are Consulted

| Reasons | Mean | SD | Remarks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Women can see things through a gender lens. | 1.25 | 0.71 | No/Very Little |
| b. Women have a wide broader vision of looking at <br> things. | 2.50 | 0.58 | Strong |
| c. Women are able to bring to new interactions their <br> a ccum ula te d experience of dealing <br> professionally, academically, and personally with <br> men. | 3.50 | 1.00 | Strong |
| d. Women see a big meeting with a potential service <br> provider as a chance to explore options in <br> collaboration with an expert resource | 2.50 | 0.58 | Strong |
| e. Women are inclined to be more inquisitive, <br> wanting to hear everyone's thoughts before <br> deciding. | 2.75 | 0.50 | Strong |
| f. Women are exploration-oriented |  |  |  |
| g. Women attend more to relationships and to the <br> challenge of balancing multiple stakeholders' <br> interests | 2.75 | 0.50 | Strong |
| Overall |  | 0.62 | Strong |

Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 1.50-2.49 (little/Some appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 2.50-3.49 (Strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women)

Table 5 shows the respondents self-assessed level of appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women in their workplaces.

Results show that there is a strong appreciation and/or agreement for women consultation in terms of: ( $b$ ) women have a wide and broader vision ( $\bar{x}=2.50, S D=0.58$ ); (c) women are able to bring new interactions ( $\bar{x}=3.50, S D=1.00$ ); ( $d$ ) women see the chance for collaboration ( $\bar{x}=2.50, S D=0.58$ ); (e) women's inquisitiveness and tendency to want to hear out everyone before deciding ( $\bar{x}=2.75, S D=$ 0.50 ); ( $f$ ) women are exploration-oriented ( $\bar{x}=2.75, S D=0.50$ ); and ( $g$ ) women's ability to attend to more relationships and balance multiple interests ( $\bar{x}=2.75, S D=0.50$ ).

However, the results also indicate that the respondents have little/some appreciation and/or agreement only on the practice of consulting women in terms of (a) women can see things through a gender lens ( $\bar{x}=1.25, S D=0.71$ ).

Finally, the study found that overall, there is a strong agreement for the practice of consulting women in the workplace, at least among the organizations which participated ( $\bar{X}=2.57, S D=0.62$ ).

## Table 6

Women's Participation in the Decision-Making Mechanisms ( $\mathrm{n}=4$ )

|  | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| a. Established company instit ution <br> structures(meetings, forum, written suggestion) | 2 | $\mathbf{5 0}$ |
| b. Women's desk or gender focal person |  |  |
| c. Women network advocacy(organizations) |  |  |
| d. Consensus-building mechanisms | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ |

Note: Multiple responses
Table 6 presents the various forms of participation engaged in by the respondents' organizations to ensure women's participation in the workplace. Results show that two, or about $50 \%$ of the respondents, declared that there are established institutional structures in their organizations, while the other two respondents also mentioned of the availability of consensus-building mechanisms.

## Table 7

## Women's Access to Resources, Opportunities, Benefits, and Gains

| Enabling Resources | Mean | SD | Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Access to decision-making bodies and processes: women's decisions are respected by the company | 3.50 | 0.58 | Very Strong |
| b. Access to Credit and financial resources allocation. The company allows women to avail credit for start-up on livelihood projects | 2.75 | 0.50 | Strong |
| c. Access to Markets. Women avail of opportunities in engaging with the company in terms of expanding income base or scaling the business | 3.00 | 0.82 | Strong |
| d. Salary, Benefits, etc. Based on industry rate, the company provides equal pay for equal work regardless of gender. | 3.50 | 0.58 | Very Strong |
| e. There are jobs wherein men are paid higher than women considering the same tasks done | 2.25 | 0.50 | Little |
| f. There are differences in benefits because of gender | 1.75 | 0.96 | Little |
| g. The company allows flexi- time for women | 2.75 | 0.50 | Strong |
| h. Women are given equal chances to be promoted to supervisory or managerial ranks | 3.25 | 0.96 | Strong |
| i. The company allows women to work from home on some days to accommodate family duties | 2.75 | 0.50 | Strong |


| Enabling Resources | Mean | SD | Remarks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| j. The company has a policy on sexual- harassment against <br> women | 1.25 | 0.50 | Very Little |
| Overall | $\mathbf{2 . 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 4}$ | Strong |

Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 1.50-2.49 (little/Some appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 2.50-3.49 (Strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women)

Table 8

Women's Access to Capability Building-Education, Training, \& Information.

| Variables | Mean | SD | Remarks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a.The company provides gender and cultural trainings to <br> enhance the participation of women in contributing their <br> expertise for the progress of the company. | 2.00 | 0.00 | Little |
| b. Women attend these trainings regularly | 2.00 | 0.00 | Little |
| c. The company encourages women as well as men to go on study <br> through scholarship or educational assistance program. | 3.00 | 0.00 | Strong |
| d. Women are given more priority for trainings than men. | 2.00 | 0.00 | Little |
| e. Women avail of scholarships granted to them | 2.75 | 0.50 | Strong |
| Overall | $\mathbf{2 . 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 0}$ | Little |

Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 1.50-2.49 (little/Some appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 2.50-3.49 (Strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women)

## Table 9

Women's Access to Leadership, Voice, \& Visibility

| Variables | Mean | SD | Remarks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. The company give chances for women to become project <br> leaders. | 3.75 | 0.50 | Very <br> Strong |
| b. Women are given the chance to lead company programs, <br> prestigious events, or other significant projects. | 3.75 | 0.50 | Very <br> Strong |
| c. The company is gender sensitive in its language. | 2.75 | 0.50 | Strong |
| d. The company is unionized dominated by women the roster of <br> officers. | 2.00 | 0.00 | Little |
| e. The company has open communication to employees and <br> partners through dialogues to encourage women and men to <br> foster good relationships. | 2.75 | 0.50 | Strong |


| Variables | Mean | SD | Remarks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| f. The company supports women organizations and activities. | 3.00 | 0.00 | Strong |
| g. Women are provided trainings for leadership positions. | 3.00 | 0.00 | Strong |
| Overall | $\mathbf{3 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 9}$ | Strong |

Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 1.50-2.49 (little/Some appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 2.50-3.49 (Strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women)

Table 10
Women's Access to Innovation \& Technology

| Variables | Mean | SD | Remarks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. The company supports innovative business approaches <br> /activities that encourage more women to participate. | 3.50 | 1.00 | Very Strong |
| b. Modern technology enhances or improves women's <br> participation company programs and projects. | 3.50 | 1.00 | Very Strong |
| c. Women network is effective in in our area. | 2.75 | 0.50 | Strong |
| d. Women actively participate in social marketing ( e.g. <br> Facebook, twitter, instagram etc.) | 3.75 | 0.50 | Very Strong |
| Overall | $\mathbf{3 . 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 5}$ | Strong |

Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 1.50-2.49 (little/Some appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 2.50-3.49 (Strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women)

Table 11

## Enabling Conditions for the Sustainability of Women in Inclusive Business.

| Enabling conditions for sustainability | Mean | SD | Remarks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Appropriate government policy framework supporting <br> Women inclusive business | 3.00 | 0.00 | Strong |
| b. Accessible and relevant Information | 3.00 | 0.82 | Strong |
| C. Adequate financial support from lending institutions; Gender <br> responsive Bank policy that allow women to access credit with <br> less cumbersome requirements | 2.75 | 0.50 | Strong |


| d. Strong partnerships and networking of like-minded inclusive <br> business entrepreneurs, investors \& advisers | 2.50 | 1.00 | Strong |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| e. Continuous visibility that highlights the contribution of <br> women in inclusive business | 3.00 | 0.00 | Strong |
| f. Government and private lending institutions provide <br> incentives for women in inclusive business | 2.50 | 0.58 | Strong |
| Overall | $\mathbf{2 . 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4 8}$ | Strong |

Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 1.50-2.49 (little/Some appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 2.50-3.49 (Strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women)

## SECTION 3. CHALLENGES/CONSTRAINTS

Table 12
Challenges/Constraints for Women to go for Inclusive Business

| Challenges/constraints | Mean | SD | Remarks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Unavailability or dearth of Information about <br> Inclusive Business | 3.00 | 0.00 | Strong |
| b. Very rigid/stringent policy framework/Rules | 2.00 | 0.00 | Little |
| c. Lack or insufficient Support /Financial Resources <br> towards Inclusive Business | 2.25 | 0.50 | Little |
| d. Incomprehensible Structural Capacity of women in <br> inclusive business(e.g. partnerships not clear, etc.) | 2.75 | 0.50 | Strong |
| e. Personal attitudes (fear , insecurity, | 2.75 | 0.50 | Strong |
| f. Family influences | 2.00 | 0.00 | Little |
| g. Cultural perspectives that hinder women to engage <br> in business | 2.75 | 0.50 | Strong |
| Overall | $\mathbf{2 . 5 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 9}$ | Strong |

Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 1.50-2.49 (little/Some appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 2.50-3.49 (Strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women)

Table 13

## Challenges/Constraints for Companies to Invest in Women

| Challenges/constraints | Mean | SD | Remarks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Unavailability or dearth of Information about <br> Inclusive Business | 2.25 | 0.50 | Little |
| b. Very rigid/stringent policy framework/Rules | 2.25 | 0.50 | Little |
| c. Lack or insufficient Support/Financial Resources <br> towards Inclusive Business | 3.00 | 0.00 | Strong |
| d. Incomprehensible Structural Capacity of women in <br> inclusive business (e.g. Not clear understanding of <br> working attitudes of women, others, please specify) | 2.00 | 0.00 | Little |
| e. Cultural perspectives of engaging in women(e.g. <br> not favorable environment, others, please specify) | 2.00 | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0}$ | Little |
| Overall | $\mathbf{2 . 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 0}$ | Little |

Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 1.50-2.49 (little/Some appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 2.50-3.49 (Strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women)

Table 14

Challenges/Constraints to Empower Women at the Base of Pyramid (BOP)

| Challenges/constraints | Mean | SD | Remarks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Unavailability or dearth of Information about Inclusive <br> Business | 2.75 | 0.50 | Strong |
| b. Very rigid/stringent policy framework/Rules | 3.00 | 0.82 | Strong |
| c. Lack or insufficient Support/Financial Resources <br> towards Inclusive Business | 3.00 | 0.00 | Strong |
| d. Incomprehensible Structural Capacity of women in <br> inclusive business (e.g. Not clear understanding of <br> working attitudes of women, others, please specify) | 1.50 | 0.00 | Little |
| Overall | $\mathbf{2 . 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 3}$ | Strong |

Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 1.50-2.49 (little/Some appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 2.50-3.49 (Strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women)

Table 15

Government Agencies' Support for Women in Inclusive Business

| Challenges/constraints | Mean | SD | Remarks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Framework, programs, projects | 2.00 | 0.00 | Little |
| b. Financial, materials, equipment | 1.75 | 0.50 | Little |
| c. Technology, information, marketing | 1.75 | 0.50 | Little |
| d. Training, education, advertising | 1.50 | 1.00 | Little |
| e. Networking, linkaging, matchmaking | 2.00 | 0.00 | Little |
| Overall | $\mathbf{1 . 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4 0}$ | Little |

Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 1.50-2.49 (little/Some appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 2.50-3.49 (Strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women)

Table 16
Private Companies' Support for Women in Inclusive Business

| Challenges/constraints | Mean | SD | Remarks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Framework, programs, projects | 2.25 | 0.50 | Little |
| b. Financial, materials, equipment | 2.00 | 0.00 | Little |
| c. Technology, information, marketing | 2.25 | 0.50 | Little |
| d. Training, education, advertising | 1.25 | 0.96 | Very Little |
| e. Networking, linkaging, matchmaking | 1.50 | 1.00 | Little |
| Overall | $\mathbf{1 . 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 9}$ | Little |

Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 1.50-2.49 (little/Some appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 2.50-3.49 (Strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women)

Table 17
Financial Institutions' (Banks and Other Lending Companies) Support for Women in Inclusive Business

| Challenges/constraints | Mean | SD | Remarks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Framework, programs, projects | 1.75 | 0.50 | Little |
| b. Financial, materials, equipment | 1.75 | 0.50 | Little |
| c. Technology, information, marketing | 1.75 | 0.50 | Little |
| d. Training, education, advertising | 1.50 | 1.00 | Little |


| e. Networking, linkaging, matchmaking | 2.00 | 0.00 | Little |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Overall | 1.75 | $\mathbf{0 . 5 0}$ | Little |

Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 1.50-2.49 (little/Some appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 2.50-3.49 (Strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women)

Table 18

Civil Society's (NGO) Support for Women in Inclusive Business

| Challenges/constraints | Mean | SD | Remarks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Framework, programs, projects | 2.25 | 0.50 | Little |
| b. Financial, materials, equipment | 2.75 | 0.96 | Strong |
| c. Technology, information, marketing | 2.25 | 0.50 | Little |
| d. Training, education, advertising | 2.25 | 0.50 | Little |
| e. Networking, linkaging, matchmaking | 2.25 | 0.50 | Little |
| Overall | $\mathbf{2 . 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 9}$ | Little |

Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 1.50-2.49 (little/Some appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 2.50-3.49 (Strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women)

Table 19
Cooperatives' Support for Women in Inclusive Business

| Challenges/constraints | Mean | SD | Remarks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Framework, programs, projects | 2.00 | 0.00 | Little |
| b. Financial, materials, equipment | 2.00 | 0.00 | Little |
| c. Technology, information, marketing | 2.00 | 0.00 | Little |
| d. Training, education, advertising | 2.00 | 0.00 | Little |
| e. Networking, linkaging, matchmaking | 2.00 | 0.00 | Little |
| Overall | $\mathbf{2 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0}$ | Little |

Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 1.50-2.49 (little/Some appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 2.50-3.49 (Strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women)

Table 20

## Academes' Support for Women in Inclusive Business

| Challenges/constraints | Mean | SD | Remarks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Framework, programs, projects | 1.00 | 1.15 | Very Little |
| b. Financial, materials, equipment | 1.00 | 1.15 | Very Little |
| c. Technology, information, marketing | 1.00 | 1.15 | Very Little |
| d. Training, education, advertising | 1.00 | 1.15 | Very Little |
| e. Networking, linkaging, matchmaking | 1.00 | 1.15 | Very Little |
| Overall | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 1 5}$ | Very Little |

Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 1.50-2.49 (little/Some appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 2.50-3.49 (Strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women)

Table 21
Development Partners' Support for Women in Inclusive Business

| Challenges/constraints | Mean | SD | Remarks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Framework, programs, projects | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| b. Financial, materials, equipment | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| c. Technology, information, marketing | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| d. Training, education, advertising | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| e. Networking, linkaging, matchmaking | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| Overall | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0}$ |  |
| Legend. 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 1.50-2.49 (little/Some |  |  |  |

Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 1.50-2.49 (little/Some appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 2.50-3.49 (Strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women)

Table 22

## Summary of Institutions' Support for Women in Inclusive Business

| Institutions | Framework <br> Programs, <br> Projects | Financial, <br> Materials, <br> Equipment | Technology, <br> Information <br> Marketing | Training, <br> Education <br> Advertisin <br> g | Networking, <br> Linkaging <br> Matchmakin <br> g | Overall <br> Mean | Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1. Government <br> Agencies | 2.00 | 1.75 | 1.75 | 1.50 | 2.00 | $\mathbf{1 . 8 0}$ | Little |
| 2. Private <br> Companies | 2.25 | 2.00 | 2.25 | 1.25 | 1.50 | $\mathbf{1 . 8 5}$ | Little |
| 3. Financial <br> Institutions <br>  | 1.75 | 1.75 | 1.75 | 1.50 | 2.00 | $\mathbf{1 . 7 5}$ | Little |


| other <br> Lending) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 4. Civil Society <br> (NGOs) | 2.25 | 2.75 | 2.25 | 2.25 | 2.25 | $\mathbf{2 . 3 5}$ | Little |
| 5. Cooperatives | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | $\mathbf{2 . 0 0}$ | Little |
| 6. Academe | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | Very <br> Little |
| 7. Development <br> Partners | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0}$ |  |
| Overall | $\mathbf{1 . 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 5 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 5 4}$ | Little |
| Remarks | Little | Little | Little | Little | Little | Little |  |

Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 1.50-2.49 (little/Some appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 2.50-3.49 (Strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong appreciation and/or agreement for the practice of consulting women)

