CASE STUDY

**PHILIPPINES**

**SECTION 1. DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE**

This section provides a description of the participating organizations from the Philippines 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 (n=13)**

| | | **Frequency (f)** | **Percentage (%)** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Type of Company | | | |
| | Manufacturing | 6 | 46.15 |
| | Trading | 2 | 15.38 |
| | Manufacturing & Trading | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Trading, Service | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Utility | 3 | 23.08 |
| Sector | | | |
| | Agribusiness | 2 | 15.38 |
| | Agribusiness/manufacturing | 2 | 15.38 |
| | Manufacturing | 3 | 23.08 |
| | Philippine made natural and organic personal care products | 1 | 7.69 |
| | training, technology, retail | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Utility | 2 | 15.38 |
| | Retail | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Did not indicate | 1 | 7.69 |
| Size of the Company | | | |
| | Small | 7 | 53.85 |
| | Medium | 5 | 38.46 |
| | Large | 1 | 7.69 |
| Geographical Location | | | |
| | Local | 10 | 76.92 |
| | Local & Multinational | 3 | 23.08 |
| Number of Employees | | | |
| | >10 | 1 | 7.69 |
| | ≤10 but > 20 | 5 | 38.46 |
| | ≤60 but > 70 | 1 | 7.69 |
| | ≤90 but > 100 | 1 | 7.69 |
| | ≤700 but >800 | 1 | 7.69 |
| | ≤1,000 but > 1500 | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Did not indicate | 3 | 23.08 |
| % of Female to Total # of Employees | | | |
| | 20% - 29.99% | 2 | 15.38 |
| | 30% - 39.99% | 1 | 7.69 |
| | 40% - 49.99% | 1 | 7.69 |
| | 50% - 59.99% | 3 | 23.08 |
| | 60% - 69.99% | 1 | 7.69 |
| | 80% - 89.99% | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Did not indicate | 4 | 30.77 |
| Nature of Company in the Supply Chain | | | |

**Table 1.**

**COMPANY PROFILE (n=13)**

| | | Frequency (f) | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Manufacturer & Exporter | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Manufacturer | 4 | 30.77 |
| | Producer | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Supplier, manufacturer, partner, consultant, value chain change inhibitor | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Partner & Distributor | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Service provider, partner, training | 4 | 30.77 |
| | Distributor, retailer | 1 | 7.69 |

Table 1 presents the participating organizations. In terms of the type of company, of the 13 organizations which were represented in the survey, six companies or 46.15% belong to the manufacturing industry, three companies or 23.08% came from utility, two companies or 15.38% from trading, while one company each came from manufacturing & trading, and trading/service, respectively.

In terms of the type of sector represented, results show that the 13 participating organizations where spread out, such that three or 23.08% came from manufacturing sector, two or 15.38% each, came from the agribusiness, agribusiness/manufacturing, and utility sectors, respectively. Lastly, one company or 7.69% each came from the Philippine made/organic personal care, training, technology & retail, and retail, respectively.

With regard to the company size, seven companies or 53.85% were considered as small scale, while five companies, or 38.46%, and one company or 7.69%, came from the medium and large scale organizations, respectively. Note, however, that the classification of company size was based only on the respondents' perception, which could be confirmed later on with some follow-up questions such as amount of capitalization.

In terms of geographical location, ten companies or 76.92% operate within the local economy, while three or 23.08% operate in both the local & multinational economies.

When the participating organizations were classified according to the number of employees, the results show that five, or 38.46%, have employees within the 10 to 20 manpower range, while one company each are shown to be having less than 10 manpower, within 60 to 70 manpower, between 90 to 100 manpower, 700 to 800 manpower, and within 1,000 to 1,500 employee manpower range, respectively. However, three organizations, or 23.08%, which were represented did not indicate any response for this item. The results show that the respondent-organizations represented a wide range of organizations..

With regard to the percentage of female employees compared to the total number of employees in the organization, the results show that three companies, or 23.08%, had female employees at the 50 to 59.99 percentage range of the their total number of employees, two companies, or 15.38% had 20% to 29.99% of its workforce filled-up with females, while the remaining companies, except for three companies which did not indicate the number of their employees, had their female to total employee ratio at 30%-39.99%, 40%-49.99%, 60%-69.99%, and, 80%-89.99%, respectively.

Finally, when grouped according to the nature of the company within the supply chain, the results in Table 1 show that four each, which is about 30.77%, from the participating companies, are manufacturers and service providers, respectively, while one company each, or about 7.69%, came from manufacturing & export, producer, partner & distributor, and allied or miscellaneous, respectively.

**Table 2.**
**RESPONDENTS' PROFILE (n=13)**

| | | Frequency (f) | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Sex | | | |
| | Female | 12 | 92.31 |
| | Male | 1 | 7.69 |
| Age | | | |
| | ≥30 but <40 | 6 | 46.15 |
| | ≥40 but <50 | 2 | 15.38 |
| | ≥50 but <60 | 5 | 38.46 |
| Highest Educational Attainment | | | |
| | Bachelor Degree | 9 | 69.23 |
| | Post-Graduate (Law) | 1 | 7.69 |
| | MBA | 2 | 15.38 |
| | Did not indicate | 1 | 7.69 |
| Language | | | |
| | Filipino, English | 12 | 92.31 |
| | Bisaya, English | 1 | 7.69 |
| | | | |
| Marital Status | | | |
| | Single | 4 | 30.77 |
| | Married | 9 | 69.23 |
| | Divorced | | |
| No. of Years in the Company | | | |
| | 0 - 10 | 8 | 61.54 |
| | 11 – 20 | 5 | 38.46 |
| Status in Company | | | |
| | Permanent | 10 | 76.92 |
| | Temporary | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Did not indicate | 2 | 15.38 |

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.

Majority of the thirteen companies which participated in the study, or about 92.31%, were represented by women, with only one company which had a male representative, which was about 7.69%.

In terms of age, there were relatively more young people who participated in the study with a count of six representatives, or 46.154% having their age range falling between 30 to 40 years old, five respondents or 38.46%, with ages already above 50 but less than 60 years old, while, 2 respondents, or 15.38%, were within 40 to 50 years old range. The results show, however, that based on a threshold age of 40, it may be said that the participating companies were equitably represented.

With regards to the respondents' educational attainment, the results show that 9 or about 69.23% were bachelor's degree holders, two or about 7.69% had MBA's, one or 7.69% holds a law degree, while one did not disclose any information. It may be said that respondents are academically well-prepared for their roles and functions in their organizations.

Results also showed that there were nine respondents, or 69.23%, who were married while four, or 30.77% were single. In terms of number of years, eight respondents disclosed that they have been with their present organizations for 10 years or less, while five have served between 11 to 20 years.

Finally, when respondents were grouped according to status in the company, it was found that 10 or 76.92% were permanent, one was temporary while two did not indicate their status.

**Table 3.**
**ROLE OF WOMEN IN THE COMPANY/BUSINESS (n=13)**

| | | **Frequency (f)** | **Percentage (%)** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Nature of engagement with the company | | | |
| | Owner | 10 | 76.92 |
| | Employee | 3 | 23.08 |
| Positions Held | | | |
| | CEO/President | 2 | 15.38 |
| | COO | 2 | 15.38 |
| | Director/General Manager | 5 | 38.46 |
| | VP | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Assistant VP | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Operations Support Head | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Not Indicated | 1 | 7.69 |
| Tasks Performed | | | |
| | Policy making, decision making | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Setting up the business, hiring, financing, accounting, training making the management and business decisions, legal compliance | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Steer company and external relations | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Assists VPs in their respective departments | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Leads and implements programs for the stakeholders of the foundation | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Head of Business Group | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Manages Clark Water Corporation | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Marketing | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Overall management & supervision | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Handles the second brand called Great Women | 1 | 7.69 |
| | Not Indicated | 3 | 23.08 |

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

In terms of nature of engagement, ten, or 76.92% of the respondents, were owners of their companies, while three were employees (23.08%).

With regard to positions held by the respondents, all of the respondents, except for one, who did not indicate his position, held managerial positions, two or 15.38% each of the positions of CEO/President, and COO, respectively, five or 38.46% were the directors and/or general managers of their companies, while one each or 7.69% came from the positions of VP, Assistant VP, and, Operations Support Head, respectively.

The results therefore imply that in terms of the vantage point represented in the survey, all of the respondents were either from the middle and/or top management echelons, which would make for an interesting comparison with the staff and clients' perspectives, 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 | 3.69 | 0.48 | Very Active |
| b. Women's concerns, suggestions and recommendations are taken into consideration | 3.69 | 0.48 | Very Active |
| c. Women are consulted on the formulation of policies, programs and projects that may affect the personnel | 3.54 | 0.52 | Very Active |
| d. Women participate and are consulted on company matters that affect their work life | 3.69 | 0.48 | Very 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 | 2.38 | 1.33 | Occasional |
| 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 | 1.22 | Active |
| g. The company implements a Gender and Development Framework and Action Plan | 2.15 | 1.21 | Occasional |
| h. The company allocates adequate financial resources to implement the Gender And Development Action Plan with priority in supporting women trainings, projects, events | 2.08 | 1.26 | Occasional |
| **Overall, Women's PCD (Governance)** | **3.03** | **0.87** | **Active** |

*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 very active governance mechanisms for women, particularly for the following areas: (a) formulation of policies, programs and projects ($\overline{x}$ = 3.69, SD = 0.48); (b) consideration of the concerns, suggestions and recommendations ($\overline{x}$ = 3.69, SD = 0.48); (c) consultation of women during formulation of policies, programs & projects ($\overline{x}$ = 3.54, SD = 0.52),and (d) participation and consultation on matters that affect family life ($\overline{x}$ = 3.69, SD = 0.48).

Furthermore, the participating organizations have been assessed to have active mechanisms for women in (f) adequacy of policies, programs and projects that allow women to contribute expertise ($\overline{x}$ = 3.00, SD = 1.22).

However, it was also found that the respondents regard their organizations as having only occasional mechanisms for governance in terms of the following: (e) a gender focal person and/or women's desk ($\overline{x}$ = 2.38, SD = 1.33); (g) implementation of the GAD framework and action plan ($\overline{x}$ = 2.15, SD = 1.21); and (h) the allocation of resources to implement the GAD action plan ($\overline{x}$ = 2.08, SD = 1.26).

Finally, the overall results show that governance mechanisms for the participation, consultation of and decision-making for women in the workplace of the participating organizations are active ($\overline{x}$ = 3.03, SD = 0.87).

**Table 5.**

**REASONS WHY WOMEN ARE CONSULTED**

| Bases for the Consultation of Women | **Mean** | **SD** | **Remarks** |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Women can see things through a gender lens. | 3.38 | 0.51 | Strong |
| b. Women have a wide and broader vision of looking at things. | 3.23 | 0.73 | Strong |
| c. Women are able to bring to new interactions their accumulated experience of dealing professionally, academically, and personally with men. | 3.46 | 0.52 | Strong |
| d. Women see a big meeting with a potential service provider as a chance to explore options in collaboration with an expert resource | 3.23 | 0.60 | Strong |
| e. Women are inclined to be more inquisitive, wanting to hear everyone's thoughts before deciding. | 3.31 | 0.63 | Strong |
| f. Women are exploration-oriented | 3.31 | 0.48 | Strong |
| g. Women attend more to relationships and to the challenge of balancing multiple stakeholders' interests | 2.69 | 0.53 | Strong |
| **Overall, Appreciation/Agreement for the Practice of Consulting Women** | **3.23** | **0.53** | **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 showed that respondents have strong appreciation and/or agreement on all the practice of consulting women, on the following grounds: (a) women can see things through a gender lens ($\overline{x}$ = 3.38, SD = 0.51); (b) women have a wide and broader vision ($\overline{x}$ = 3.23, SD = 0.73); (c) women are able to bring new interactions ($\overline{x}$ = 3.46, SD = 0.52); (d) women see the chance for collaboration ($\overline{x}$ = 3.23, SD = 0.60); (e) women's inquisitiveness and tendency to want to hear out everyone before deciding ($\overline{x}$ = 3.31, SD = 0.63); (f) women are exploration-oriented ($\overline{x}$ = 3.31, SD = 0.48); and (g) women's ability to attend to more relationships and balance multiple interests ($\overline{x}$ = 2.69, SD = 0.53).

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 ($\overline{x}$ = 3.23, SD = 0.53).

**Table 6.**
**WOMEN'S PARTICIPATION IN DECISION-MAKING MECHANISMS (n=13)**

| | **Frequency (f)** | **Percentage (%)** |
|---|---|---|
| a. Consultation | 1 | 5.56 |
| b. Established company institution structures (meetings, forum, written suggestion) | 10 | 55.56 |
| c. Women's desk or gender focal person | 2 | 11.11 |
| d. Women network advocacy (organizations ) | 3 | 16.67 |
| e. Consensus-building mechanisms | 2 | 11.11 |

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 10 of 18 answers, or 55.56% declared that there are established institutional structures in their organizations; three of 18 responses, or 16.67% expounded on organizations' participation in network advocacies, while provision for women's desk or gender focal persons, and consensus-building mechanisms were mentioned in every two of 18 responses, or 11.11 % each. The least utilized mechanism mentioned was consultation, which mentioned only once out of the 18 responses, or 5.56%.

**Table 7.**

**WOMEN'S ACCESS TO RESOURCES, OPPORTUNITIES, BENEFITS AND GAINS**

| Resources, Opportunities, Benefits & Gains | Mean | SD | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Access to decision-making bodies and processes: women's decisions are respected by the company | 3.69 | 0.48 | Very Strong |
| b. Access to Credit and financial resources allocation. The company allows women to avail credit for start-up on livelihood projects | 3.23 | 0.52 | Strong |
| c. Access to Markets. Women avail of opportunities in engaging with the company in terms of expanding income base or scaling the business | 3.38 | 0.49 | Strong |
| d. Salary, Benefits, etc. Based on industry rate, the company provides equal pay for equal work regardless of gender. | 3.62 | 0.65 | Very Strong |
| e. There are jobs wherein men are paid higher than women considering the same tasks done | 1.92 | 0.76 | Little |
| f. There are differences in benefits because of gender | 1.85 | 0.90 | Little |
| g. The company allows flexi- time for women | 3.23 | 0.73 | Strong |
| h. Women are given equal chances to be promoted to supervisory or managerial ranks | 3.62 | 0.65 | Strong |
| i. The company allows women to work from home on some days to accommodate family duties | 2.62 | 0.77 | Strong |
| j. The company has a policy on sexual- harassment against women | 3.15 | 0.80 | Strong |
| **Overall, Access to Resources, Opportunities, Benefits & Gains** | **3.03** | **0.67** | **Strong** |

*Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little access), 1.50-2.49 (Little/Some access), 2.50-3.49 (Strong access), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong access)*

Table 7 reports the assessment of the respondents regarding their organizations' provisions for women to be able to access resources, opportunities, benefits and gains in the workplace.

Results show that the respondents regard their organizations as very strong in terms of (a) providing access to decision-making bodies and processes to ensure that women's decisions are respected ($\overline{x}$ = 3.69, SD = 0.48); and (d) the salary & benefits package provided, and adherences to equal pay ($\overline{x}$ = 3.62, SD = 0.65).

Furthermore, respondents also believed that their organizations are strong in: (b) providing access to credit and financial resource allocation ($\overline{x}$ = 3.23, SD = 0.52); (c) providing access to markets ($\overline{x}$ = 3.38, SD = 0.49); (g) providing flexi-time for women ($\overline{x}$ = 3.23, SD = 0.73); (h) equal chances for promotion to supervisory/managerial ranks ($\overline{x}$ = 3.62, SD = 0.65); (i) providing the leeway for women to work from home ($\overline{x}$ = 2.62, SD = 0.77); (j) ensuring the presence of anti-sexual harassment against women ($\overline{x}$ = 3.15, SD = 0.80).

However, the respondents assessed their organizations as providing just little access in terms of (e) ensuring that women are paid equal to men for the same tasks ($\overline{x}$ = 1.92, SD = 0.76); and (f) in narrowing the differences in pay attributed to gender ($\overline{x}$ = 1.85, SD = 0.90).

Finally, respondents assessed their organizations to be strong overall in terms of providing access to resources, opportunities, benefits & gains for women's access in the workplace ($\overline{x}$ = 3.03, SD = 0.67).

**Table 8.**

**WOMEN'S ACCESS TO CAPABILITY BUILDING-EDUCATION, TRAINING & INFORMATION**

| Capacity Building, Training & Information Parameters | Mean | SD | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. The company provides gender and cultural trainings to enhance the participation of women in contributing their expertise for the progress of the company. | 3.08 | 0.65 | Strong |
| b. Women attend these trainings regularly | 3.15 | 0.55 | Strong |
| c. The company encourages women as well as men to go on study through scholarship or educational assistance program. | 3.00 | 0.58 | Strong |
| d. Women are given more priority for trainings than men. | 1.92 | 0.49 | Little |
| e. Women avail of scholarships granted to them | 2.62 | 0.39 | Strong |
| **Overall, Capacity Building, Training & Info Parameters** | **2.75** | **0.53** | **Strong** |

*Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little provision of access to capacity building-educ., training & info), 1.50-2.49 (Little/Some provision of access…), 2.50-3.49 (Strong provision of access…), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong provision of access…)*

Table 8 presents the result of the respondents' assessment of their organizations' provisions to ensure women's access to capability building-education, training & information in the workplace.

Results show that the participating organizations regard their efforts to provide capacity building, training & info to women is strong, particularly with regard to: (a) gender and cultural trainings ($\overline{x}$ = 3.08, SD = 0.65); (b) women's attendance to trainings ($\overline{x}$ = 3.15, SD = 0.55); and (c) study through scholarship or educational assistance ($\overline{x}$ = 3.00, SD = 0.58); and (e) ensuring that women actually avail of scholarships granted to them ($\overline{x}$ = 2.62, SD = 0.39)

However, respondents believe that their organizations are providing little access in terms of (d) providing more priority to women in trainings ($\overline{x}$ = 1.92, SD = 0.49).

Finally, results show that respondents regard their organizations to be strong overall in providing capacity building, training & info for women in the workplace ($\overline{x}$ = 2.75, SD = 0.53).

**Table 9.**

**WOMEN'S ACCESS TO LEADERSHIP, VOICE & VISIBILITY**

| Variables | Mean | SD | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. The company give chances for women to become project leaders. | 3.23 | 0.40 | Strong |
| b. Women are given the chance to lead company programs, prestigious events, or other significant projects. | 3.23 | 0.40 | Strong |
| c. The company is gender sensitive in its language. | 2.54 | 0.63 | Strong |
| d. The company is unionized dominated by women the roster of officers. | 1.62 | 0.87 | Little |
| e. The company has open communication to employees and partners through dialogues to encourage women and men to foster good relationships. | 2.77 | 0.47 | Strong |
| f. The company supports women organizations and activities. | 2.77 | 0.65 | Strong |
| g. Women are provided trainings for leadership positions. | 2.92 | 0.52 | Strong |
| **Overall** | **2.73** | **0.56** | **Strong** |

*Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little provision of access to leadership, voice & visibility), 1.50-2.49 (little/Some provision of access…), 2.50-3.49 (Strong provision of access…), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong provision of access…)*

Table 9 presents the respondents' assessment of their organizations' provision for women's access to leadership, voice & visibility in the workplace.

Results indicate that respondents believe that their organizations are strong in terms of (a) providing women chances to become project leaders ($\overline{x}$ = 3.23, SD = 0.40); (b) giving women the chance to lead com; (e) providing open communication through dialogues ($\overline{x}$ = 2.77, SD = 0.47); (f) providing support for women organizations and activities ($\overline{x}$ = 2.77, SD = 0.65); and (g) provision of trainings for leadership positions ($\overline{x}$ = 2.92, SD = 0.52).

However, respondents also believe that their organizations provided just little/some access to women in terms of: (d) the officers of the employees' union is dominantly women ($\overline{x}$ = 1.62, SD = 0.87).

Finally, the results show that the overall access to leadership provided by the organizations for women in the workplace has been rated by the respondents as strong ($\overline{x}$ = 2.73, SD = 0.56).

**Table 10.**

**Women's Access to Innovation & Technology**

| Variables | Mean | SD | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. The company supports innovative business approaches /activities that encourage more women to participate. | 3.08 | 0.50 | Strong |
| b. Modern technology enhances or improves women's participation company programs and projects. | 3.31 | 0.51 | Strong |
| c. Women network is effective in in our area. | 3.15 | 0.67 | Strong |
| d. Women actively participate in social marketing ( e.g. Facebook, twitter, instagram etc.) | 3.23 | 0.67 | Strong |
| **Overall, Women's Access to Innovation & Technology** | **3.19** | **0.67** | **Strong** |

*Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little provision of access to innovation & technology), 1.50-2.49 (Little/Some provision of access…), 2.50-3.49 (Strong provision of access…), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong provision of access…)*

Table 10 presents the respondents' assessment of the provision of access to innovation & technology for women in the workplace of the participating organizations. Results show that the provision for women's access to innovation and technology at the workplace was considered to be strong in the specific aspects, specifically: (a) business approaches to encourage women participation ($\overline{x}$ = 3.08, SD = 0.50); (b) modern technology that improves/enhances women participation ($\overline{x}$ = 3.31, SD = 0.51); (c) effective networking ($\overline{x}$ = 3.15, SD = 0.67); and (d) women participation in social marketing ($\overline{x}$ = 3.23, SD = 0.67).

Furthermore, the overall assessment for the provision of access to innovation and technology for women in the workplace is rated strong ($\overline{x}$ = 3.19, SD = 0.67).

**Table 11.**
**ENABLING CONDITIONS FOR SUSTAINABILITY OF WIB**

| Enabling conditions for sustainability | Mean | SD | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Appropriate government policy framework supporting Women inclusive business | 3.00 | 0.52 | Strong |
| b. Accessible and relevant Information | 3.00 | 0.52 | Strong |
| c. Adequate financial support from lending institutions; Gender responsive Bank policy that allow women to access credit with less cumbersome requirements | 2.92 | 0.52 | Strong |
| d. Strong partnerships and networking of like-minded inclusive business entrepreneurs, investors & advisers | 3.00 | 0.52 | Strong |
| e. Continuous visibility that highlights the contribution of women in inclusive business | 2.92 | 0.52 | Strong |

**Table 11.**

**ENABLING CONDITIONS FOR SUSTAINABILITY OF WIB**

| Enabling conditions for sustainability | Mean | SD | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|
| f. Government and private lending institutions provide incentives for women in inclusive business | 2.69 | 0.53 | Strong |
| **Overall** | **2.92** | **0.52** | **Strong** |

*Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little presence of enabling conditions for WIB), 1.50-2.49 (Little/Some presence of enabling conditions for WIB), 2.50-3.49 (Strong presence of enabling conditions for WIB), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong presences of enabling conditions for WIB)*

Table 11 presents the results of the assessment of the presence of enabling conditions for the sustainability of Women in Business (WIB).

It was found that the respondents believe that their organizations and other stakeholders provided strong enabling conditions for the sustainability of WIB in their workplaces in terms of: (a) appropriate government policy ($\overline{x}$ = 3.00, SD = 0.52); (b) access to information ($\overline{x}$ = 3.00, SD = 0.52); ($\overline{x}$ = 3.19, SD = 0.67); (c) adequate financial support ($\overline{x}$ = 2.92, SD = 0.52); (d) strong partnership and networking ($\overline{x}$ = 3.00, SD = 0.52); (e) continuous visibility ($\overline{x}$ = 2.92, SD = 0.52); (f) provision of incentives ($\overline{x}$ = 2.69, SD = 0.53).

Overall, the organizations were assessed to have strong enabling conditions for the sustainability of WIB in their workplaces ($\overline{x}$ = 2.92, SD = 0.52)

## SECTION 3. CHALLENGES/CONSTRAINTS

Section 3 presents the perceived challenges/constraints of women in inclusive business, and the challenges and constraints preventing the empowerment of women at the base of the pyramid.

**Table 12.**

**CHALLENGES/CONSTRAINTS OF WOMEN IN INCLUSIVE BUSINESS**

| Challenges/constraints | Mean | SD | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Unavailability or dearth of Information about Inclusive Business | 2.77 | 0.74 | Strong |
| b. Very rigid/stringent policy framework/Rules | 2.38 | 0.60 | Little |
| c. Lack of or insufficient Support /Financial Resources towards Inclusive Business | 2.46 | 0.70 | Little |
| d. Incomprehensible Structural Capacity of women in inclusive business(e.g. partnerships not clear, etc.) | 2.31 | 0.65 | Little |
| e. Personal attitudes (fear , insecurity, | 2.46 | 0.83 | Little |
| f. Family influences | 2.46 | 0.70 | Little |
| g. Cultural perspectives that hinder women to engage in business | 2.15 | 0.92 | Little |
| **Overall** | **2.43** | **0.73** | **Little** |

*Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little challenges and/or constraints), 1.50-2.49 (Little/Some challenges and/or constraints), 2.50-3.49 (Strong challenges and/or constraints), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong challenges and/or constraints)*

Table 12 presents the various challenges and/or constraints which were encountered by respondents which hamper the development of the interest of women towards Inclusive Business.

Results show that respondents consider the (a) unavailability or dearth of information about Inclusive Business as a strong challenge and/or constraint ($\overline{x}$ = 2.77, SD = 0.74).

Furthermore, the results also show that the respondents hold the belief that the following are merely little challenges and/or constraints: (b) rigid/stringent policy framework/rules ($\overline{x}$ = 2.38, SD = 0.60); (c) lack of or insufficient support/financial resources ($\overline{x}$ = 2.46, SD = 0.65); (d) incomprehensible structural capacity of women ($\overline{x}$ = 2.31, SD = 0.65); (e) personal attitudes ($\overline{x}$ = 2.46, SD = 0.83); (f) family influences ($\overline{x}$ = 2.46, SD = 0.70); and (g) cultural perspectives ($\overline{x}$ = 2.15, SD = 0.92).

Overall, the respondents regard the challenges and/or constraints that women in their workplace face which prevent them from going into inclusive business as little ($\overline{x}$ = 2.43, SD = 0.73).

**Table 13.**

**CHALLENGES/CONSTRAINTS PREVENTING THE EMPOWERMENT OF WOMEN AT THE BASE OF THE PYRAMID**

| Challenges/constraints | **Mean** | **SD** | **Remarks** |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Unavailability or dearth of Information about Inclusive Business | 2.77 | 0.74 | Strong |
| b. Very rigid/stringent policy framework/Rules | 2.62 | 0.72 | Strong |
| c. Lack of or insufficient Support /Financial Resources towards Inclusive Business | 2.54 | 0.63 | Strong |
| d. Incomprehensible Structural Capacity of women in inclusive business (e.g. Not clear understanding of working attitudes of women, others, please specify) | 2.38 | 0.60 | Little |
| **Overall, Constraints/Challenges for the Empowerment of Women at the BoP** | **2.58** | **0.67** | **Strong** |

*Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little challenges and/or constraints), 1.50-2.49 (Little/Some challenges and/or constraints), 2.50-3.49 (Strong challenges and/or constraints), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong challenges and/or constraints)*

Table 13 reports the challenges/constraints preventing the empowerment of women at the base of the pyramid, as perceived by the respondents.

Results show that respondents regard as strong the following challenges/constraints: (a) unavailability/dearth of information ($\overline{x}$ = 2.77, SD = 0.74); (b) rigid/stringent policy framework/rules ($\overline{x}$ = 2.62, SD = 0.72); (c) lack of or insufficient support/financial resources ($\overline{x}$ = 2.454, SD = 0.63).

However, results also show that respondents believe that an incomprehensible structural of capacity of women in business is just a little challenge/constraint ($\overline{x}$ = 2.38, SD = 0.60).

Finally, the overall results show that the respondents believe that there are strong constraints/challenges which are preventing the empowerment of women at the base of the pyramid ($\overline{x}$ = 2.58, SD = 0.67).

**SECTION 4. INSTITUTIONS' SUPPORT FOR WOMEN IN INCLUSIVE BUSINESS**

This section presents the respondents' assessment of support provided by the government agencies, private companies, financial institutions, civil society/non-government organizations, cooperatives, academe, and development partners.

**Table 15.**

**GOVERNMENT AGENCIES' SUPPORT FOR WOMEN IN INCLUSIVE BUSINESS**

| Challenges/constraints | **Mean** | **SD** | **Remarks** |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Framework, programs, projects | 2.38 | 1.00 | Little |
| b. Financial, materials, equipment | 2.15 | 0.89 | Little |
| c. Technology, information, marketing | 2.38 | 1.08 | Little |
| d. Training, education, advertising | 2.46 | 1.07 | Little |
| e. Networking, linkaging, matchmaking | 2.46 | 1.07 | Little |
| **Overall** | **2.37** | **1.02** | **Little** |

*Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little support), 1.50-2.49 (Little/Some support), 2.50-3.49 (Strong support), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong support)*

Table 15 presents the respondents' assessment of the government's support for women in inclusive business.

Results show that respondents believe that government agencies provide little support for women in inclusive business in terms of: (a) framework, programs, projects ($\overline{x}$ = 2.38, SD = 1.00); (b) financial, materials, equipment ($\overline{x}$ = 2.15, SD = 0.89); (c) technology, information, marketing ($\overline{x}$ = 2.38, SD = 1.08); (d) training, education, advertising ($\overline{x}$ = 2.46, SD = 1.07); (e) networking, linkaging, matchmaking ($\overline{x}$ = 2.46, SD = 1.07).

The overall results show that respondents believe that the government is providing little support for women in inclusive business ($\overline{x}$ = 2.37, SD = 1.02).

**Table 16.**

**PRIVATE COMPANIES' SUPPORT FOR WOMEN IN INCLUSIVE BUSINESS**

| Forms of Support | **Mean** | **SD** | **Remarks** |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Framework, programs, projects | 2.46 | 1.07 | Little |
| b. Financial, materials, equipment | 2.31 | 1.09 | Little |
| c. Technology, information, marketing | 2.46 | 1.07 | Little |
| d. Training, education, advertising | 2.62 | 1.19 | Strong |
| e. Networking, linkaging, matchmaking | 2.54 | 1.22 | Strong |
| **Overall** | **2.48** | **1.13** | **Little** |

*Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little support), 1.50-2.49 (Little/Some support), 2.50-3.49 (Strong support), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong support)*

Table 16 shows the report of the respondents' assessment of private company's support for women in inclusive business.

Results show that respondents regard as strong the following forms of support provided by private companies: (d) training, education, advertising ($\overline{x}$ = 2.62, SD = 1.19); and € networking, linkaging, matchmaking ($\overline{x}$ = 2.54, SD = 1.22).

However, results also show that respondents believe that private companies provide only little support women in inclusive business in terms of: (a) framework, programs, projects ($\overline{x}$ = 2.46, SD = 1.07); (b) financial, materials, equipment ($\overline{x}$ = 2.31, SD = 1.09); and (c) technology, information, marketing ($\overline{x}$ = 2.46, SD = 1.07).

Finally, results also show that respondents believe that the overall support provided by private companies to inclusive business is little ($\overline{x}$ = 2.48, SD = 1.13)

**Table 17.**

**FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS' (BANKS & OTHER LENDING COMPANIES) SUPPORT FOR WOMEN IN INCLUSIVE BUSINESS**

| Forms of Support | **Mean** | **SD** | **Remarks** |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Framework, programs, projects | 2.23 | 1.03 | Little |
| b. Financial, materials, equipment | 2.31 | 1.01 | Little |
| c. Technology, information, marketing | 2.00 | 1.29 | Little |
| d. Training, education, advertising | 2.00 | 1.12 | Little |
| e. Networking, linkaging, matchmaking | 1.85 | 1.33 | Little |
| **Overall** | **2.08** | **1.15** | **Little** |

*Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little support), 1.50-2.49 (Little/Some support), 2.50-3.49 (Strong support), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong support)*

Table 17 shows the results of the assessment made by the respondents on the support for women in inclusive business by financial institutions.

It was found that the respondents regarded the support provided by financial institutions to women in inclusive business as little in terms of: (a) framework, programs, projects ($\overline{x}$ = 2.23, SD = 1.03); (b) financial, materials, equipment ($\overline{x}$ = 2.31, SD = 1.01); (c) technology, information, marketing ($\overline{x}$ = 2.00, SD = 1.29); (d) training, education, advertising ($\overline{x}$ = 2.00, SD = 1.12); and (e) networking, linkaging, matchmaking ($\overline{x}$ = 1.85, SD = 1.33).

Finally, the overall results show that respondents believe that financial institutions provide only little support for women in inclusive business ($\overline{x}$ = 2.48, SD = 1.13).

**Table 18.**

**CIVIL SOCIETY'S SUPPORT FOR WOMEN IN INCLUSIVE BUSINESS**

| Forms of Support | **Mean** | **SD** | **Remarks** |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Framework, programs, projects | 2.46 | 1.04 | Little |
| b. Financial, materials, equipment | 2.15 | 1.04 | Little |
| c. Technology, information, marketing | 2.15 | 1.04 | Little |
| d. Training, education, advertising | 2.38 | 1.08 | Little |
| e. Networking, linkaging, matchmaking | 2.23 | 1.03 | Little |
| **Overall** | **2.28** | **1.04** | **Little** |

*Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little support), 1.50-2.49 (Little/Some support), 2.50-3.49 (Strong support), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong support)*

Table 18 contains the results of the assessment made by respondents on the extent of support provided by civil society to women in inclusive business.

It was found that respondents assessed the support for women inclusive business by civil society as little in terms of: (a) framework, programs, projects ($\overline{x}$ = 2.46, SD = 1.04); (b) financial, materials, equipment ($\overline{x}$ = 2.15, SD = 1.04); (c) technology, information, marketing ($\overline{x}$ = 2.15, SD = 1.04); (d) training, education, advertising ($\overline{x}$ = 2.38, SD = 1.08); and (e) networking, linkaging, matchmaking ($\overline{x}$ = 2.23, SD = 1.03).

Finally, the overall resuls show that respondents believe civil society is only providing little support for women in inclusive business ($\overline{x}$ = 2.28, SD = 1.04).

**Table 19.**

**COOPERATIVES' SUPPORT FOR WOMEN IN INCLUSIVE BUSINESS**

| Forms of Support | Mean | SD | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Framework, programs, projects | 2.31 | 1.10 | Little |
| b. Financial, materials, equipment | 2.00 | 1.36 | Little |
| c. Technology, information, marketing | 1.69 | 1.26 | Little |
| d. Training, education, advertising | 1.92 | 1.35 | Little |
| e. Networking, linkaging, matchmaking | 2.15 | 1.21 | Little |
| **Overall** | **2.32** | **1.26** | **Little** |

*Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little support), 1.50-2.49 (Little/Some support), 2.50-3.49 (Strong support), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong support)*

Table 19 presents the results of the assessment made by the respondents on the support provided by cooperatives for women in inclusive business.

Results show that cooperatives were assessed to be providing little support to women in inclusive business in terms of: (a) framework, programs, projects ($\overline{x}$ = 2.31, SD = 1.10) financial, materials, equipment ($\overline{x}$ = 2.00, SD = 1.36); (c) technology, information, marketing ($\overline{x}$ = 1.69, SD = 1.26); (d) training, education, advertising ($\overline{x}$ = 1.92, SD = 1.35); and (e) networking ($\overline{x}$ = 2.15, SD = 1.21).

Overall results show that cooperatives were providing only little support for women in inclusive business .

**Table 20**

**ACADEME'S SUPPORT FOR WOMEN IN BUSINESS**

| Forms of Support | Mean | SD | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Framework, programs, projects | 2.38 | 1.24 | Little |
| b. Financial, materials, equipment | 1.62 | 1.36 | Little |
| c. Technology, information, marketing | 1.77 | 1.38 | Little |
| d. Training, education, advertising | 1.92 | 1.31 | Little |
| e. Networking, linkaging, matchmaking | 2.15 | 1.37 | Little |
| **Overall** | **1.97** | **1.33** | **Little** |

*Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little support), 1.50-2.49 (Little/Some support), 2.50-3.49 (Strong support), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong support)*

Table 20 reflects the assessment made by the respondents on the support being provided by academe for women in inclusive business.

The results show that respondents believe that academe provides little support for women in business in terms of: (a) framework, programs, projects ($\overline{x}$ = 2.38, SD = 1.24); (b) financial, materials, equipment ($\overline{x}$ = 1.62, SD = 1.36); (c) technology, information, marketing ($\overline{x}$ = 1.77, SD = 1.38); (d) training, education, advertising ($\overline{x}$ = 1.92, SD = 1.31); (e) networking, linkaging, matchmaking (($\overline{x}$ = 2.15, SD = 1.33). ($\overline{x}$ = 2.28, SD = 1.26) ($\overline{x}$ = 2.28, SD = 1.26)

The overall results likewise show that the respondents regard academe's support for women in business as little ($\overline{x}$ = 1.97, SD = 1.33).

**Table 21.**

**DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS' SUPPORT FOR WOMEN IN INCLUSIVE BUSINESS**

| Forms of Support | **Mean** | **SD** | **Remarks** |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Framework, programs, projects | 1.85 | 1.31 | Little |
| b. Financial, materials, equipment | 1.46 | 1.60 | Very Little |
| c. Technology, information, marketing | 1.85 | 1.31 | Very Little |
| d. Training, education, advertising | 1.85 | 1.31 | Very Little |
| e. Networking, linkaging, matchmaking | 1.69 | 1.28 | Very Little |
| **Overall** | **1.74** | **1.36** | Very Little |

*Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little support), 1.50-2.49 (Little/Some support), 2.50-3.49 (Strong support), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong support)*

Table 21 presents the respondents' assessment of the support provided by development partners for women in inclusive business.

Results show that the respondents regard the support provided to women in inclusive business by development partners as little in terms of: (a) framework in terms of financial, materials, equipment ($\overline{x}$ = 1.85, SD = 1.31).

Furthermore, results also show that respondents regard as very little the support of development partners for women in inclusive business in terms of the: (b) financial, materials, equipment ($\overline{x}$ = 1.46, SD = 1.60); (c) technology, information, marketing ($\overline{x}$ = 1.85, SD = 1.31); (d) training, education, advertising ($\overline{x}$ = 1.85, SD = 1.31); (e) networking, linkaging, matchmaking ($\overline{x}$ = 1.69, SD = 1.28). ($\overline{x}$ = 1.97, SD = 1.33)

Finally, the overall assessment shows that the development partners' support for women partners was assessed by the respondents as very little ($\overline{x}$ = 1.74, SD = 1.36).

**Table 22. Summary of Institutions' Support for Women in Inclusive Business**

| **Institutions** | **Framework, Programs, Projects** | **Financial, Materials, Equipment** | **Technology, Information Marketing** | **Training, Education Advertising** | **Networking, Linkaging Matchmaking** | **Overall Mean** | **Remarks** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Government Agencies | 2.38 | 2.15 | 2.38 | 2.46 | 2.46 | **2.37** | |
| 2. Private Companies | 2.46 | 2.31 | 2.46 | 2.62 | 2.54 | **2.48** | |
| 3. Financial Institutions (Banks & other Lending) | 2.23 | 2.31 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.85 | **2.08** | |
| 4. Civil Society (NGOs) | 2.46 | 2.15 | 2.15 | 2.38 | 2.23 | **2.28** | |
| 5. Cooperatives | 2.31 | 2.00 | 1.69 | 1.92 | 2.15 | **2.32** | |
| 6. Academe | 2.38 | 1.62 | 1.77 | 1.92 | 2.15 | **1.97** | |
| 7. Development Partners | 1.85 | 1.46 | 1.85 | 1.85 | 1.69 | **1.74** | |
| **Overall** | **2.03** | **1.79** | **1.78** | **1.90** | **1.91** | **1.93** | |
| **Remarks** | **2.30** | **2.00** | **2.04** | **2.16** | **2.15** | **2.18** | |

*Legend: 1.00-1.49 (No/Very little support), 1.50-2.49 (Little/Some support), 2.50-3.49 (Strong support), 3.50-4.00 (Very strong support)*