



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Inclusive business models

Empowering women in urban agriculture in Burkina Faso

Kini, J.

Publication date

2022

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Kini, J. (2022). *Inclusive business models: Empowering women in urban agriculture in Burkina Faso*.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

References

- Abdel-Latif, A., & Schmitz H. (2010). 'Growth Alliances: Insights from Egypt'. *Business and Politics*, 12(4): 1–27.
- Acemoglu D., Johnson S., & Robinson J. (2005). Institutions as the Fundamental Cause of Long-run Growth. In *Handbook of Economic Growth*. Edited by Aghion, P., and S. Durlauf. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Acemoglu, D., & Robinson J. (2012). *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Adams, R., Jeanrenaud S., Bessant J., Denyer D., & Overy P. (2016). Sustainability-oriented Innovation: A Systematic Review. *International Journal of Management*. Rev. 2016, 18:180–205.
- ADB (Asian Development Bank). (2016). How Inclusive is Inclusive Business for Women? Examples from Asia and Latin America [Internet]. Asian Dev. Bank 2016.
- AFDB (African Development Bank). (2020). African Economic Outlook 2020: Developing Africa's Workforce for the Future. Retrieved from: <https://www.afdb.org/en/documents/african-economic-outlook-2020>.
- Aflatoon International (2017). Aflatoon+ : Compétences de vie et éducation financière à travers le genre. Document de Programme d'Enseignement, Stichting Aflatoon International.
- Agri-ProFocus (2014). Gender in value chains: Practical toolkit to integrate a genderperspective in agricultural value chain development. https://agriprofocus.com/upload/ToolkitENGgender_in_Value_ChainsJan2014compressed1415203230.pdf
- Aïm, R. (2013). L'essentiel de la théorie des organisations, Gualino, coll. «Les Carrés , 2013, p.152
- Akerlof, G.A. (1970). The Market for "Lemons": Quality Uncertainty and the Market Mechanism. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* Vol. 84, No. 3 (Aug., 1970), pp. 488-500.
- Akouwerabou, B.D. (2014). Allocation de la Main d'œuvre et Productivité Agricole au Burkina Faso. *PhD Dissertation, Université Ouaga II*.
- Aldrich, H.E., & Fiol, C.M. (1994). Fools rush in? The institutional context of industry creation. *Academic Management Review*. 19(4):645–670.
- Alenda, J., & Robert, P. (2018). La cohérence institutionnelle d'une économie dépendante : formes de l'État et conflits redistributifs autour de la rente au Burkina Faso. *Revue de la régulation : Capitalisme, institutions, pouvoirs*. 24 | 2nd semestre / Autumn 2018.
- Alkire, S. (2002). *Valuing Freedoms: Sen's Capability Approach and Poverty Reduction*, Oxford: *Oxford University Press*.
- Alkire, S. (2007). *Choosing Dimensions: the Capability Approach and Multidimensional Poverty*, Chronic Poverty Research Centre Working Paper 88, OPHI, Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford.
- Alnaim, F. (2015). Criticisms of the Case Study. *Global Journal of Human-Social Science: A Arts & Humanities – Psychology*. Volume 15 Issue 7 Version 1.0 Year 2015.
- Altaf, A. (2019). The Many Hidden Faces Of Extreme Poverty: Inclusion And Exclusion Of Extreme Poor People In Development Interventions In Bangladesh, Benin And Ethiopia. *PhD Dissertation, University of Amsterdam*.
- Amartya, S. (1999). *Development as Freedom*. Oxford University Press.

- Anokhin, S., & Schulze, W. S. (2009). Entrepreneurship, innovation, and corruption. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(5), 465–476.
- Aragie, E., Angelucci, F., & Demanet, C. (2018). Appui à la formulation du deuxième Programme National du Secteur Rural (PNSR 2) du Burkina Faso. Rapport d'analyse de politique. SAPAA (Projet de suivi et analyse des politiques agricoles et alimentaires). Rome, FAO. Retrieved from: <http://www.fao.org/3/I8504FR/i8504fr.pdf>.
- Armour, J., & Cumming, D. (2008). Bankruptcy law and entrepreneurship. *American Law and Economics Review*, 10(2), 303–350.
- Ashby, J., Hartl, M., Lambrou, Y., Larson, G., Lubbock, A., Pehu, E., & Ragasa, C. (2009). Investing in Women as Drivers of Agricultural Growth. Agriculture and Rural Development. Gender in Agriculture. <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTARD/Resources/webexec>. Retrieved from http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTARD/Resources/webexecutivesummaryARD_GiA_InvstInWomen_8Pg_web.pdf.
- Ashraf, D., Farah, I. (2007). Education and women's empowerment: Re-examining the relationship. *Education, Gender and Empowerment: Perspectives from South Asia*, 15-31. Available at: http://ecommons.aku.edu/pakistan_ied_pdck/97
- Assemblée Nationale (2012). Loi N°034-2012/AN portant Réorganisation Agraire et Foncière du 02 juillet 2012 et son décret d'application. Décret de Promulgation, Journal Officiel du Burkina Faso.
- Ateliers de Cergy (2019). Atelier International de maîtrise d'œuvre urbaine du 1er au 15 mars 2019. Document de Sujet, <https://ateliers.org/media/workshop/documents/>
- AU (African Union), 2014. Common African Position On The Post2015 Development Agenda". Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, during the 22nd Ordinary Session of the Assembly of the Union on 31 January 2014.
- Bado, A.B. (2015). La Démocratie au Burkina Faso aux Prises avec les Systèmes Traditionnels de Gouvernance. *SER – Société d'Édition de Revues-Etudes*, 2015/4 avril | pages 19 à 30. Voir <https://www.cairn.info/revue-etudes-2015-4-page-19.htm>.
- Bako, P. (2016). *Efficacité Technique des Producteurs agricole au Burkina Faso*. Thèse de Doctorat, Université Ouaga II.
- Bambara, D., Sawadogo, J., Kaboré O., & Bilgo A. (2019). Variabilité de certains paramètres climatiques et impacts sur la durée des périodes humides de développement végétal dans une station au centre et une autre au nord du Burkina Faso, *Vertigo-la revue électronique en sciences de l'environnement*, Volume 19 Numéro 1 | mars 2019: <https://doi.org/10.4000/vertigo.24384>.
- Bandiera, O., Buehren, N., Burgess, R., Goldstein, M., Gulesci, S., Rasul, I., & Sulaiman, M. (2015). *Women's economic empowerment in action : Evidence from a randomized control trial in Africa*. International Labour Office, Employment Policy Department, Employment and Labour Market Policies Branch. Geneva: ILO, 2015 vi, 40 p. Employment working paper, No. 187, ISSN: 1999-2939 ; 1999-2947: Geneva: International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD).
- . Bannick, M., Goldman, P., & Kubzansky, M. (2015). Frontier capital: Early Stage Investing for Financial Returns and Social Impact in Emerging Markets. [Internet]. *Omidyar. Network*. 2015.

- Baud, I.S.A & Hordijk, M.A. (2009). Dealing with Risks in Urban Governance: What Can we Learn from 'Resilience Thinking'. *The 4th International Conference of the International Forum on Urbanism (IFoU)*, 2009 Amsterdam/Delft.
- Baumol, W.J. (1990). Entrepreneurship: Productive, unproductive, and destructive. *Journal of Political Economy*. 98(5), 893–921.
- Baumol, W.J. (1982). An Uprising in the Theory of Industry Structure. *The American Economic Review*, Vol 72, No. 1 (Mar., 1982), pp. 1-15.
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative Case Study Methodology: Study Design and Implementation for Novice Researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 544-556.
- Bebbington, A. (1999). Capitals and Capabilities: A Framework for Analyzing Peasant Viability, Rural Livelihoods and Poverty. *World Development*, 27(12), 2021-2044.
- Behal, A. (2011). Education, Women Empowerment and Related Issues. *International Educational E-Journal*, {Quarterly}, Volume-I, Issue-I Oct-Nov-Dec 2011.
- Berner, E., Gomez, G., & Knorringa, P. (2012). Helping a large number of people become a little less poor: The logic of survival entrepreneurs. *European Journal of Development Research*, 24(3), 382–396.
- Besley, T., & Persson, T. (2014a). Why do developing countries tax so little? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 28(4), 99–120.
- Bianchi, M., & Henrekson, M. (2005). Is Neoclassical Economics Entrepreneurless? *KYKLOS* 58 (August), 353–377.
- Biggeri, M., Libanora, R., Mariani, S., & Menchini, L. (2006). Children conceptualizing their capabilities: results of a survey conducted during the First Children's Congress on Child Labour. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities* 7 (1), 59-83.
- Bird, J.N. (2019). Death and dying in a Karen refugee community: An overlooked challenge in the resettlement process. *Ethnography* 2019, Vol. 20(4), 443–462. DOI: 10.1177/1466138118768624.
- Black, S.E., & Strahan P.E. (2002). Entrepreneurship and bank credit availability. *The Journal of Finance*, 57(6), 2807–2833.
- Boccanfuso, D., & Kaboré, S. T. (2004). Croissance, Inégalité et Pauvreté dans les Années Quatre-vingt-Dix Au Burkina Faso Et Au Sénégal. *De Boeck Supérieur* | « *Revue d'économie du développement* » 2004/2 Vol. 12 |, pages 9 à 35. <https://www.cairn.info/revue-d-economie-du-developpement-2004-2-page-9.htm>.
- Bolwig, S., Ponte, S., Du Toit, A., Riisgaard, L., & Halberg, N. (2010). Integrating Poverty and Environmental Concerns into value-chain Analysis: A conceptual framework. *Development Policy Review*, 2010, 28(2), 173-194.
- Bonnell, V., & Veglio F. (2011). Inclusive business for sustainable livelihoods. *Field Actions Science Reports* [Online], Vol.5, connection on 04 July 2021. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/factsreports/840>.
- Boodhna, A. (2011). *Sourcing Gender: Gender productivity and sustainable sourcing strategies*. *The New Business Models for Sustainable Trading Relationships project*. International Institute for Environment and Development/Sustainable Food Lab 2011.

- Bosma, N., Content, J., Sanders, M., & Stam, E. (2018). *Institutions, entrepreneurship, and economic growth in Europe*. *Small Business Economics*, 51:483–499. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-018-0012-x>.
- Bougdira, A., Ahaitouf, A., & Akharraz, I. (2016). An Intelligent Traceability System: Efficient Tool for Supply Chain Sustainability. *Technologies and Materials for Renewable Energy, Environment and Sustainability. AIP Conf. Proc. 1758, 030010-1–030010-7; doi: 10.1063/1.4959406*.
- Bressy, G., & Konkuyt, C. (2008). *Management and business economics. Memory aid*. 9th Edition. Dalloz campus; 2008.
- Brooke, G.T. (2010). Uncertainty, Profit And Entrepreneurial Action: Frank Knight's Contribution Reconsidered.. *Journal Of The History Of Economic Thought, Volume 32, Number 2, June 2010*.
- Brush, C.G., De Bruin, A., & Welter, F. (2009). A gender-aware framework for women's entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 1(1), 8–24.
- Bruton, G.D., Ahlstrom, D., & Li, H.L. (2010.). Institutional theory and entrepreneurship: Where are we now and where do we need to move in the future? *Entrepreneurship Theory Practice* 34(3) , 421–440.
- CABE (Centre for African Bio-Entrepreneurship). (2016). Linking smallholders to markets: pilot study on developing value chains for conserving local biodiversity and improving diets. *A Group capacity assessment report*, See <https://www.cabe-africa.org/wp-con>.
- Cadre Stratégique de Lutte contre la Pauvreté(CSLP) 2000-2010. *Document de Politique nationale du Burkina Faso*.
- Caplan, M.A., & Ricciardelli, L. (2016). Institutionalizing Neoliberalism: 21st-Century Capitalism, Market Sprawl, and Social Policy in the United States. *Poverty & Public Policy*, 8 :1, p.20-39.
- Carlton, D.W., & Perloff, J.M. (2005). *Modern Industrial Organization*. 4th Edition ©2005 | Pearson.
- Carter, C.R., & Rogers, D.S. (2008). A framework of sustainable supply chain management: moving toward new theory. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management Vol. 38 Iss 5* , pp.360 – 387.
- Cassar, G., & Friedman, H. (2009). Does self-efficacy affect entrepreneurial investment? *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* 3(3), 241–260.
- CCI (Chambre de Commerce et d'Industrie), 2018. Etat des lieux de l'entreprenariat féminin au Burkina Faso et la perception des femmes chefs d'entreprises sur le climat des affaires. Direction des Etudes et de la Stratégie, Rapport définitif, Mars 2018.
- Chowdhury, F., Audretsch, D. ,, & Belitski, M. (2019). Institutions and Entrepreneurship Quality. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 2019, Vol, 43(1) 51–81.
- Christopher, M. (2000). The Agile Supply Chain: Competing in Volatile Markets. *Industrial Marketing Managemen*, 29, 37–44 (2000). © 2000 Elsevier Science Inc.
- Clark, D.A. (2002). *Visions of Development: A Study of Human Values*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

- Coles, C., & Mitchell, J. (2011). Gender and agricultural value chains. A review of current knowledge and practice and their policy implications. *ESA Working paper No. 11-05, March 2011. Agricultural Development Economics Division, FAO.*
- Comim, F., Qizilbash, M., & Alkiré, S. (2008). The Capability Approach: Concepts, Measures and Applications. *Cambridge Books Online*. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511492587>.
- Comin, F. (2001). Operationalizing Sen's Capability Approach. Paper presented at the Conference on Justice and Poverty: Examining Sen's Capability Approach. June 5-7, Cambridge.
- Company, & McKinsey. (2012). *Women Matter: Making the breakthrough*. Retrieved from Online: <https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/organization/our-insights/women-matter>.
- Cornwall, A., & Rivas, A.M. (2015). From 'gender equality and 'women's empowerment' to global justice: reclaiming a transformative agenda for gender and development. *Third World Quarterly, Volume 36, 2015 – Issue 2*, Pages 396-415.
- Cox, D.R., & Wermuth, N. (2001). Causal Inference and Statistical Fallacies. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences 2001.*, Pages 1554-1561.
- Creswell, J.W. (2013). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches. *Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage*.
- Crocker, D. (2007). Deliberative participation in local development. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities 8(3)*, 431-55. [Taylor & Francis Online].
- CSLP (Cadre Stratégique de Lutte contre la Pauvreté) 2000-2010. Document de Politique nationale du Burkina Faso.
- Daci-Zejnullahi, E. (2014). Gender perspective in agriculture value chain development in Kosovo. *Turkish Journal of Agricultural and Natural Sciences Special Issue:2*.
- DANIDA (Danish International Development Agency). (2010). *Gender and Value Chain Development*. Evaluation Study Report, February 2010.
- Davidsson, P., & Honig, B. (2003). The role of social and human capital among nascent entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing 18(3)*, 301-331.
- Dekker, M. (2004). Risk, Resettlement and Relations: Social Security in Rural Zimbabwe. *Research Series, Vrije University of Amsterdam*.
- Delaunay, D., & Boyer, F. (2017). Habiter Ouagadougou. Monographie No 5, Mars 2017, dans Monographies Sud-Nord « Collection de Documents Scientifiques pour la valorisation des recherches sur les transformations sociétales aux Suds ». ISSN.
- Demetriou, H. (2009). The case study. In E Wilson (Ed), *School -based Research*. London: Sage, pp.203-215.
- Deneulin, S., & Stewart, F. (2002). Amartya Sen's contribution to development thinking. *Studies in Comparative International Development 37(2)*, pp.61-70.
- Dietrich, M., & Bauer, A. (2013). *The Inclusive Business Market in the Philippines*. A Report of the Asian Development Bank (ADB), presented at the 2nd Inclusive Business Forum, on 16 September 2013. Last accessed on 16-12-2017, at 10:12.
- Diwedi, D.N. (2002). Managerial Economics. *New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.*, P. 650. ISBN 81-259-1004-2.

- Dolan, C. (2001). The good wife's struggle over resources in the Kenyan horticultural sector. *The Journal of Development Studies* 37(3), 39-70.
- Dreze, J.H. (1985). (Uncertainty and) The Firm in General Equilibrium Theory. *The Economic Journal* 95 (Supplement: Conference Papers), p.1-20.
- Duska, R., & Ragatz, J.A. (2008). How Losing Soul Leads to Ethical Corruption in Business. *Leadership and Business Ethics, Issues in Business Ethics Volume 25*, pp.151-163.
- UN-ECN.6, (2018). Challenges and opportunities in achieving gender equality and the empowerment of rural women and girls. Report of the Secretary-General, at the Sixty-second session on 12–23 March 2018. Available at: <http://undocs.org/E/CN.6/2018/3>
- Easley, C.E., Eberhart, R.N., Skousen, B.R., & Cheng, J. (2018). Institutions and Entrepreneurial Activity: The Interactive Influence of Misaligned Formal and Informal Institutions. *Strategy Science* 3(2), 393-407. <https://doi.org/10.1287/stsc.2018.0060>.
- Eisenhardt, K.M., & Graebner, M. E. (2007). Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges. *The Academy of Management Journal* 50(1), 25-32.
- Encaoua, D. (1986). Réglementation et concurrence: quelques éléments de théorie économique. In : *Économie & prévision n°76, 1986-5. Numéro Spécial. Déréglementation, privatisation et concurrence*, pp.7-46.
- European Parliamentary, 2019. Women in politics: A global perspective. Briefing notes, PE 635.543–March, 2019. [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2019/635543/EPRS_BRI\(2019\)635543_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2019/635543/EPRS_BRI(2019)635543_EN.pdf)
- Evans, S., Roth, N., & Sturm, F. (2004). Performance measurement and added value of networks. In *Collaborative Networked Organisations: A research agenda for emerging business models*. KLUWER ACADEMIC PUBLISHERS. New York, Boston, Dordrecht, London, Pp. 147-152.
- FAARF (Fond d'Appui aux Activités Rémunératrices des Femmes) (1997). Le Projet Crédit Sante FAARF/OMS : Une expérience du Burkina Faso. Document de communication.
- Fairchild, C. (2014). Women CEOs in the Fortune 1000: By the numbers. *Fortune*. <http://fortune.com/2014/07/08/women-ceos-fortune-500-1000/>.
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organisation), (2014a). *Developing Sustainable Food Value chains Guiding Principle*. Rome, 2014.
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organisation), (2012). *State of Food Insecurity in the World*. Rome.
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organisation). (2015). *Inclusive Business Models. Guidelines for improving linkages between producer groups and buyers of agricultural produce [Internet]*. Organ. Food Agric. Nations, United 2015.
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organisation). (2016). *Developing gender-sensitive value chains – A guiding framework*. Rome.
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization). (2011). *The State of Food and Agriculture 2010–2011: Women in Agriculture: Closing the Gender Gap for Development*. Rome, Italy: FAO. Accessed at: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i2050e/i2050e00.htm>.
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organisation). (2014). *State of Food and Agriculture*. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4040e.pdf>.

- Farming First, & FAO, 2012. The female face of farming. See https://farmingfirst.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Farming-First-Female-Face-of-Farming_Brochure.pdf
- Farnworth, C.R. (2011). Gender-Aware Value Chain Development. Expert Group Meeting: Enabling rural women's economic empowerment: Institutions, opportunities and participation. UN Women in Collaboration with FAO, IFAD and WFP. Accra, Ghana 20-23 September 20.
- Farnworth, C.R., Kruijssen, F., Longley, C., & Kantor, P. (2015). Gender integration in livestock and fisheries value chains: Emerging good practices from analysis to action. *International Journal of Agricultural Resources, Governance and Ecology*.
- Fisher, E., M. Bavinck, and A. Amsalu. (2018). Transforming asymmetrical conflicts over natural resources in the Global South. *Ecology and Society* 23(4):28. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-10386-230428>
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The Order of Things: An archaeology of the human sciences*. *Routledge Classics, Taylor and Francis e-Library*.
- Frediani, A.A. (2007). Amartya Sen, the World Bank, and the redress of urban poverty: a Brazilian Case study. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities* 8 (1), 133-52.
- Frediani, A.A. (2010). Sen's Capability Approach as a framework to the practice of development. *Development in Practice, Vol.20, No.2 (April 2010)*, pp.173-187.
- Freeman, E., & Liedtka, J. (1997). Stakeholder Capitalism and the Value Chain. *European Management Journal* Vol[15, No 3], pp.286-296, 1997.
- Fuentelasz, L., González, C., Maícas, J., & Montero, J. (2015). How different formal institutions affect opportunity and necessity entrepreneurship. *Business Research Quarterly (2015) 18*, 246-258.
- Gakidou, E., Cowling, K., Lozano, R., & Murray, C. (2010). Increased educational attainment and its effect on child mortality in 175 countries between 1970 and 2009: a systematic analysis. *Lancet. 2010 Sep 18;376(9745)*, 959-74. Doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(10)61257-3.
- Galbusera, L., & Fellin, L. (2014). The intersubjective endeavor of psychopathology research: methodological reflections on a second-person perspective approach. *Frontiers in Psychology | Cognitive Science, Volume5 | Article1150*.
- George, G., McGahan, A.M., & Prabhu, J. (2012). Innovation for Inclusive Growth: Towards a Theoretical Framework and a Research Agenda . *Journal of Management Studies* 49:4, Doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2012.01048.
- Gholipour, H., & Tajul, A.M. (2012). Governance Matters and Entrepreneurial Activities. *Thunderbird International Business Review Vol. 54 No. 5 September/October 2012*. DOI: 10.1002/tie.
- Giné, R., & Pérez-Foguet, A. (2010). Improved methods to calculate water poverty index at the local scale. *Journal of Environmental Engineering* 136(11), 1287-1298.
- Global Agriculture, 2015. Agriculture at a Crossroads: Findings and Recommendations for Future Farming. Facts & Figures ava <https://www.globalagriculture.org/report-topics/women-in-agriculture.html>
- Golja, T., & Požega, S. (2012). Inclusive Business – What It Is All About? Managing Inclusive Companies [Internet]. *International Review of Management. Mark. 2012, 2*, 22-42.

- Gore, C. (1997). Irreducibly Social Goods and the Informational Basis of Amartya Sen's Capability Approach. *Journal of International Development* 9 (2), 235-250.
- Gouvernement du Burkina Faso, 2019. *Sur le chemin du développement local. Les acquis du PNT2 au Burkina Faso*. PNT2, Banque Mondiale, GEF, KIT, Ouagadougou.
- Greene, S., Pendall, R., Scott, M., & Lei, S. (2016). *Open Cities: From Economic Exclusion to Urban Inclusion*. Urban Institute, Metropolitan Housing and Communities Policy Center.
- Gregg, P.M. (1974). Units and Levels of Analysis: A Problem Policy Analysis in Federal Systems. *Publius*, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 59-86
- Gunasekaran, A., Lai, K., & Cheng, T. C. (2007). Responsive Supply Chain: A Competitive Strategy in a networked economy. *Omega (The International Journal of Management Science)* Omega 36(2008), 549-564.
- Gupta, J., Pouw, N., & Ros-Tonen, M. (2015). Towards an Elaborated Theory of Inclusive Development [Internet]. *European Journal of Development. Res.* 2015, 27, 541-559.
- Gustafsson, J. (2017). Single case studies vs. multiple case studies: A comparative study. <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1064378/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.
- Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. Third edition.
- Hart, S., Milstein, M., & Overview, E. (2003). Creating sustainable value [Internet]. *Management* 2003, 17:56-69.
- Hatch, M., & Cunliff, A. L. (2009). Théories des organisations : de l'intérêt de perspectives multiples, De Boeck Université, coll. « *Manager RH* », 2009, 418 p. (ISBN 978-2804106898).
- Hawley, F.B. (2009). (published online in 2009) The Risk Theory of Profit (1893). *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol.7, Issue 4, p.459-479 1893. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1506384>.
- Hayek, F.A. (2009). The Pure Theory of Capital. *The Ludwig von Mises Institute printing* 2009, Auburn, Alabama 2009.
- Hickey, S. (2010). The Government of Chronic Poverty: From Exclusion to Citizenship? *The Journal of Development Studies* 46:7, 1139-1155, DOI: 10.1080/00220388.2010.487100.
- Hickey, S., Sen, K., & Bukenya, B. (2015). *The Politics of Inclusive Development: Interrogating the Evidence*. Oxford University Press. First Edition published 2015.
- Hollensen, S. (2014). *Global marketing*, Pearson.
- Hörisch, J., Kollat, J., & Brieger S. A. (2017). What influences environmental entrepreneurship? A multilevel analysis of the determinants of entrepreneurs' environmental orientation *Small Business Economics* volume 48, pages 47-69(2017). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-016-9765-2>
- Hsieh, H., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, Vol. 15 No. 9, November 2005. 1277-1288.
- Humberg, K., & Braun, B. (2014). (Chapter 12). Social Business and Poverty Alleviation: Lessons from Grameen Danone and Grameen Veolia. A. Grove and G.A. Berg (eds.). *Social Business*, DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-45275-8_12.
- Humblot, M. (2018). Female farmer associations as adaptation strategies to climate variability in Ouagadougou's peri-urban agriculture. WFE Project Policy Brief. https://knowledge4food.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/2018_wfe-policybrief3-180613.pdf

- Hunt, J. (2016). Aid and Development . in *“International Development: Issues and Challenges”, 3rd Edition Palgrave, by Kingsbury D., McKay J., Hunt J., McGillivray M. and Clarke M., 2016, p162-187.*
- Hurst, E., & Pugsley, B. (2011). What Do Small Businesses Do? *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, Fall 2011.*
- IAGU (Institut Africain de Gestion Urbaine). (2007). *Etude de cas sur le financement des agriculteurs et agricultrices urbains de Ouagadougou (Burkina Faso).* Centre de Recherches pour le Développement International (CRDI) [online], Mars 2007.
- IDRC (2006). *Feeding the sustainable city.* <http://www.idrc.ca/EN/Documents/feeding-the-sustainable-city.pdf>.
- IFC(International Finance Corporation), 2019. Créer des Marchés au Burkina Faso: Développer et Mobiliser le Secteur Privé pour Renforcer la Résilience Économique du Burkina Faso. Diagnostic Secteur Privé Pays, Juillet, 2019. World Bank Group, <https://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/f559446a-73de-423e-9b22-39160d023ed1/201907-CPSD-Burkina-Faso-FR.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CVID=mNf5Hss>.
- Inclusive Business Accelerator. (2016). *Introduction to Inclusive Business [Internet]. 2016.* Retrieved from <https://iba.ventures/introduction-to-inclusive-business/>. Last access on 14-3-2-17 at 5:23.
- INSD, (2000) Profil et évolution de la pauvreté au Burkina Faso, Ouagadougou, Mars.
- INSD, (2007). Analyse des résultats de l'enquête annuelle sur les conditions de vie des ménages en 2007. Rapport d'activité, Octobre 2007.
- INSD, (2009). Monographie de la commune urbaine de Ouagadougou. Analyse des résultats du recensement général de la population et de l'habitat de 2006. *Rapport d'activité.*
- INSD, (2015). Profil de pauvreté et d'inégalités : Résultats de l'Enquête multisectorielle continue (EMC) 2014. Rapport, Novembre 2015.
- INSD (Institut National de la Statistique et de la Démographie), 2020. Livret « Femmes et Hommes au Burkina Faso en 2018 ». Rapport d'Évaluation Partielle de la Politique Nationale Genre, Juin 2020.
- International Finance Corporation, (2016). *Investing in Women along Agribusiness Value Chains.* Report 2016-2021 International Finance Corporation, World Bank Group. <http://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/d19235d7-2ba7-4f7b-b0c6-198fe9e4d30/Women+in+Agri+V>.
- International Labour Organization. (2014). *Global Employment Trends 2014: Risk of a jobless recovery? P.45.* Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_233953.pdf.
- Investopedia. (2019). *Free Markets.* Retrieved from See <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/f/freemarket.asp> Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2012). What drives corporate social performance? The role of nation-level institutions. *Journal of International Business Studies, 2012, 43, 834–864.*
- Jaworski, J., Kohli, A., & Sahay, A. (2000). Market-driven versus driving markets. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, December 2000, Volume 28, Issue 1, pp.45–54.*
- Jehle, G.A., & Reny, P.J. (2000). *Advanced Microeconomic Theory, 2nd edition.* Boston: Addison Wesley.

- Japan International Cooperation Agency, (2013). Country Gender Profile: Burkina Faso. Mitsubishi UFJ Research and Consulting, March, 2013.
- Jonkman, N.T., & Jansen, B. (2019). Urban soil management of marginalized lands: recognizing history. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, Volume 41, December 2019, Pages 43-48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2019.11.002>
- Kabeer, N. (1999). Resources, agency, achievements: Reflections on the measurement of women's empowerment. *Development and Change* 30, 435–464.
- Kaboré, W-T.T., Hien, E., Zombré, P., Coulibaly, A., Houot, S., & Masse D. (2011). Valorisation de substrats organiques divers dans l'agriculture péri-urbaine de Ouagadougou (Burkina Faso) pour l'amendement et la fertilisation des sols : acteurs et pratiques. *Biotechnology, Agronomy, Society and Environment*, Volume 15 (2011) numéro 2.
- Kafando, Y. (2006). *Transport urbain et santé des populations : le cas de Ouagadougou (Burkina Faso)*. Abomey (BEN) : Ouagadougou : Université d'Abomey Calavi: IRD,2006, 95 p. multigr.
- Kaplinsky, R., & Morris, M. (2000). *A handbook for value chain research*. Ottawa, Canada: IDRC.
- Karim, N.A. (2001). Jobs, gender and small enterprises in Bangladesh : factors affecting women entrepreneurs in small and cottage industries in Bangladesh. *SEED Working Paper No. 14 – Series on women's entrepreneurship development and gender in enterprises*.
- Ketchen, J. D., & Hult, G. M. (2007). Bridging organization theory and supply chain management: The case of best value supply chains. *Journal of Operations Management* 25 (2007) , 573–580.
- Khan, M. (2010). Political Settlements and the Governance of Growth-enhancing Institution. *London: School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS)*. [Mimeo].
- Kingsbury, D. (2016). Environment and Development in "International Development: Issues and Challenges. 3rd Edition Palgrave, by Kingsbury D., McKay J., Hunt J., McGillivray M. and Clarke M., 2016, p260-289.
- Kini, J. (2016). Statut Agricole des Ménages et Sécurité Alimentaire au Burkina Faso. *Thèse de Doctorat Unique, Ecole Doctorale de Droit, Sciences Politique, Economique et de Gestion*. Université OuagaII.
- Kini, J. (2017). Inclusive water poverty index: a holistic approach for helping local water and sanitation services planning. *Water Policy* 19 (2017), 758–772.
- Kini, J., Pouw, N., & Gupta, J. (2020). Organic vegetables demand in urban area using a count outcome model: case study of Burkina Faso. *Agricultural and Food Economics*, vol.8, 22 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40100-020-00166-0>
- Kini, J., & Roumba, T. (2020). Kini, J., Roumba T. (2021). The impact of Social and Financial Education on adolescents in Burkina Faso. *Impact Evaluation Report*, Aflatoun International Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
- Klapper, L., Laeven, L., & Rajan, R. (2006). Entry regulation as a barrier to entrepreneurship. *Journal of Financial Economics* 82(3), 591–629.
- Knight, F.H. (2006). Risk, Uncertainty and Profit. *Dover Publications, INC Mineola, New York*. *An unabridged republication of the 1957 edition of the work originally published in 1921*.
- Kourula A., Pisani N., Kolk A., 2017. Corporate sustainability and inclusive development:

- highlights from international business and management research. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, Volume 24, February 2017, Pages 14–18.
- La Porta, R., & Shleifer, A. (2014). Informality and Development. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 28(3), 109–126.
- Laixhay, P. (2017). *L'endettement des pays dits en voie de développement. Un exemple : le Burkina Faso*. Retrieved from www.cadtm.org/L-endettement-des-pays-dits-en.
- Laven, A., Eerdewijk, A., Senders, A., van Wees, C., R., & Snelder. (2009). Gender in value chains: Emerging lessons and questions. *Arnhem, the Netherlands: Agri-ProFocus*.
- Laven, A., & Pyburn, R. (2015). Facilitating gender inclusive agri-business. *Knowledge Management for Development Journal*, 11(1), 10-30.
- Lee, C.C., & Yang, J. (2000). Knowledge value chain. *Journal of Management Development*, Vol.19 Iss 9, pp.783–794.
- Lee, C.C., Yang, J., & Yu, L.M. (2001). The knowledge value of customers and employees in product quality. *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 20 Iss 8, pp. 691 – 706.
- Lee, S., Yamakawa, Y., Peng, M., & Barney, J. (2011). How do bankruptcy laws affect entrepreneurship development around the world? . *J. Bus. Venturing* 26(5), 505–520.
- Levie, J., & Autio, E. (2011). Regulatory burden, rule of law, and entry of strategic entrepreneurs: An international panel study. *Journal of Management Studies*. 48(6), 1392–1419.
- Likoko, E.A, & Kini, J. (2017). Inclusive business—a business approach to development. . *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 2017, 24, 84–88.
- Likoko, E.A, Pouw, N.R.M, Odame, H. & Okeyo-Owuor, J.B. (2019). Rethinking Female Entrepreneurship and Wellbeing in Kisumu, Kenya. In *“In book: The Wellbeing of Women in Entrepreneurship A Global Perspective”*; 1st Edition, Routledge
- London, T., & Hart, S. (2011). Next Generation Business Strategies for the Base of the Pyramid [Internet]. *Pearson Educ.Inc. Publ. as FT Press Up. Saddle River, New Jersey 07458*.
- Lucas, J., & Robert, E. (1978). On the Size and Distribution of Business Firms . *Bell Journal of Economics* 9 (Autumn) , 508–523.
- MAFAP (Monitoring and Analysing Food and Agricultural Policies), 2013. Revue des politiques agricoles et alimentaires au Burkina Faso. Série rapport pays SPAAA, FAO, Rome, Italie. http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/mafap/documents/Burkina_Faso/BURKINA_FASO_Country_Report_FR_July2013.pdf.
- Mair, J., Marti, I., & Ventresca, M. (2012). Building inclusive markets in rural Bangladesh: How intermediaries work institutional voids. *Academic. Management Journal*. 55(4), 819–850.
- Mainardes, E.W., Ferreira, J.J., Raposo, ML. (2014). Strategy and Strategic Management Concepts: Are They Recognised By Management Students? *Ekonomika a management*, Vol. 1:XVII. DOI: 10.15240/tul/001/2014-1-004
- Mander, H. (2005). Rights as struggle: towards a more just and humane world. in *Gready and Ensor (eds.) (2005)*.
- Marlow, S., & Dy, A.M. (2017). Annual review article: Is it time to rethink the gender agenda in entrepreneurship research? *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship*, 1-20. S:// doi.org/10.1177/0266242617738321.

- Marsden, T., Banks, J., & Bristow, G. (2000). Food Supply Chains Approaches: Exploring their Role in Rural Development. *Sociologia Ruralis*, Vol 40, Number 4. *European Society for Rural Sociology*, ISSN 0038–0199.
- Maslow, A.H. (1943). A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50 , 370-396.
- May, J.F. (2017). The Politics of Family Planning Policies and Programs in sub-Saharan Africa. *Population and Development Review*, Volume43, IssueS1 Supplement: *Fertility Transition In Sub-Saharan Africa*.
- McDonald, C. M. (2016). Integrating packaging and supply chain decisions: Selection of economic handling unit quantities. *International Journal of Production Economics* 180(2016), 208–221.
- McMullen, J., Ray Bagby, D., & Palich, L. (2008). Economic freedom and the motivation to engage in entrepreneurial action. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. 875-895. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2008.00260.x>.
- Mehra, R., & Rojas, M.H. (2008). *A Significant Shift: Women, Food Security and Agriculture in a Global Marketplace*. Retrieved from A Report of the International Centre for Research on Women (ICRW): <https://www.icrw.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/A-Significant-Shift-Women-Fo>
- Melitz, M.J. (2004). When and how should infant industries be protected? *Journal of International Economics* 66 (2005) 177– 196.
- MENA (Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale et de l'Alphabétisation), 2011. Tableau de bord de l'Éducation de Base Année scolaire 2010/2011. Direction Générale des Etudes et de la Planification, Septembre 2011.
- Milanovic, B. (2016). *Global inequality: A New Approach for the Age of Globalization*. *Harvard University Press*, 2016 (ISBN 9780674737136).
- Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Hydraulique (MAH). (2004). *Document de Stratégie de Développement Rural à l'horizon 2015*.
- Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Sécurité alimentaire, (2013). *Politique Nationale de la Sécurité Alimentaire et Nutritionnelle (PNSAN)*. *Document de politique nationale*.
- Ministère de l'Habitat et de l'Urbanisme, (. (2008). *Politique nationale de l'habitat et du développement urbain*. *Document de politique nationale*, Mars 2008.
- Ministère de la Femme de la Solidarité Nationale et de la Famille-MFSNF. (2017). *Tableau de bord statistique «Femme et Genre» 2016. Rapport d'activité*. Retrieved from http://www.cns.bf/IMG/pdf/tableau_de_bord_statistique_2016_femme_et_genre_final.pdf
- Mishra, D., Sharma, R., Kumar, S., & Dubey, R. (2016). Bridging and buffering: Strategies for mitigating supply risk and improving supply chain performance. *International Journal of Production Economics* 180 (2016) , 183–197.
- Moccia, & Luigi. (2011). Réflexions sur l'idée de propriété. In : *Revue internationale de droit comparé*. Vol. 63 N°1,2011, Pp. 7-37 ; doi : <https://doi.org/10.3406/ridc.2011.20130>.
- Mohammadi, & Khyareh, M. (2017). Institutions and entrepreneurship: The mediating role of corruption. *World Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*, 13(3) , 262–282.
- Moses, C., & Norton, A. (2001). *To Claim our Rights: livelihood security, human rights and sustainable developmen*. *London, Overseas Development Institute*.

- Mutua, E., Njuki, J., & Waithanji, E. (2014). Review of gender and value chain analysis, development and evaluation toolkits. *Nairobi, Kenya: International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)*.
- Naguib, J., Oppermann, A., & Rosendahl, C. (2013). Inclusive business models Options for support through PSD programmes [Internet]. *Dtsch. Gesellschaft für Int. Zusammenarbeit* 2013.
- Narayan, D. (2005). *Measuring Empowerment: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives*. Edited by Deepa Narayan. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Narayan, D. (2002). Empowerment and Poverty Reduction: A Sourcebook. Draft Report of the PREM (Poverty Reduction and Economic Management (PREM) network, World Bank, May, 2002.
- Natemyer, W., & Hersey, P. (2011). *Classics of Organizational Behavior (1995)*. Fourth edition, Waveland Press, 2011.
- Njuki, J., Kaaria, S., Chamunorwa, A., & Chiuri, W. (2011a). Linking smallholder farmers to markets, gender and intra-household dynamics: Does the choice of commodity matter? . *European Journal of Development Research* 23(3), 426.
- North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance* . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (2000). Women's Capabilities and Social Justice. *Journal of Human Development*, 1:2, 219-247, DOI: 10.1080/713678045.
- O'Reilly, K. (2019). *Ethnographic Methods [second Edition]*. <https://hdl.handle.net/2134/15689>.
- Odame, H.S. (2014). *Innovation Dynamics and Agricultural Biotechnology in Kenya*. PhD Dissertation, Erasmus University Rotterdam.
- ODI, (2015). *Leaving no one behind: How the SDGs can bring real change? Briefing by Claire Melamed, March 2015 [Online]* . Retrieved from <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/9534.pdf>.
- OECD, (2012). *Gender Equality in Education, Employment and Entrepreneurship: Final Report to the MCM 2012*. <http://www.oecd.org/employment/50423364.pdf>.
- Ouédraogo, F. (2018). Groupements de femmes rurales au Burkina Faso : Enjeux et défis pour un développement durable. *Entraide & Fraternité : Pour que la Terre tourne plus juste, Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles*, www.entraide.be.
- Oyèwùmí, O. (2011). *Gender Epistemologies in Africa. Gendering Traditions, Spaces, Social Institutions, and Identities*. Book, Palgrave Social Sciences Collection. DOI <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230116276>.
- Pache, A.C. Santos F. (2010). When worlds collide: The internal dynamics of organizational responses to conflicting institutional demands . *Academic Management Review*. 35(3), 455–476.
- Paré-Kaboré, A. (2003). *La Problématique de l'éducation des Filles au Burkina Faso*. Document de Travail, Université de Ouagadougou. <https://www.pogbi.org/telechargements/scolarisation.pdf>.
- Patton, C.V., Sawicki, D.S., & Clark, J.J. (2016). *Basic Methods of Policy Analysis and Planning*. Third Edition, Routledge.
- Penrose, E. (1959). *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*. New York: John Wiley.

- Petkoski, D. (2014). Firmenich in India Changing the Rules of Engagement with Low Income Consumers Firmenich ' s Response. *World Business Council for Sustainable Development, 2014*.
- Plan National de Développement Economique et Social, (. (2016-2020). *Document de politique nationale du Burkina Faso*.
- Popper, K. (1963). Science: Conjectures And Refutations . *A lecture given at Peterhouse, Cambridge, in Summer 1953, Originally published under the title 'Philosophy of Science: a Personal Report' in British Philosophy in Mid-Century, ed. C. A. Mace, 1957*.
- Porter, M. E. (1985). Competitive Advantage: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance with a New Introduction. *The Free Press, Edition 1985*.
- Pouw, N. (2011). When growth is empty: towards an inclusive economics. *The Broker 25*, pp.4-8.
- Pouw, N. (2017). *An Introduction to Gender and Wellbeing in Microeconomics*. Routledge Focus.
- Pouw, N., & Gupta, J. (2017). Inclusive development: a multi-disciplinary approach. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, March 2017*.
- Prahalad, C., & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-creation experiences: The next practice in value creation [Internet]. *J. Interact. Mark. 2004*, 18:5–14.
- Pruzan-Jorgensen, P. M. (2016). Business Must Close the Gender Gap. BSR Blog. Accessed March 14, 2016. www.bsr.org/en/our-insights/blog-view/business-must-close-the-gender-gap.
- Raffinot, M., & Siri, A. (2015). *Etude diagnostique sur les obstacles à la croissance au Burkina Faso*. Fonds Europeen de Developpement, Rapport Final, Septembre 2015.
- Rakopoulos, T., & Rio, K. (2018). Introduction to an anthropology of wealth, History and Anthropology, 29:3, 275-291, DOI: 10.1080/02757206.2018.1460600
- REN-LAC (Réseau National de Lutte Anti-Corruption). (2014). Rapport d'Etude «Genre et Corruption au Burkina Faso», Mars 2014. Collection REN-LAC-ISSN : 0796-5915. <https://www.ndi.org/sites/default/files/RAPPORT-GENRE-ET-CORRUPTION-AU-BF.pdf>
- Reynolds, P. (2010). New firm creation: A global assessment of national, contextual, and individual factors. *Foundations and Trends in Entrepreneurship, 6(5–6)*, 315–496.
- Riisgaard, L., Fibla, A., & Ponte, S. (2010). Gender and Value Chain Development. Evaluation Study, 2010. *The Danish Institute for International Studies, Global economy, regulation and development*.
- Robineau, O. (2014) « Les quartiers non-lotis : espaces de l'entre-deux dans la ville burkinabé », Carnets de géographes [En ligne], 7 | 2014, mis en ligne le 01 décembre 2014, consulté le 30 avril 2019. URL :<http://journals.openedition.org/cdg/478> ; DOI : 10.4000/cdg.478.
- Roper, S., & Arvanitis, S. (2012). From knowledge to added value: A comparative, panel-data analysis of the innovation value chain in Irish and Swiss manufacturing firms. *Research Policy 41 (2012)* , 1093– 1106.
- Roper, S., Du, J., & Love, J.H. (2008). Modelling the innovation value chain. *Research Policy 37 (2008)* , 961–977.

- Ros-Tonen, M.A., Bitzer, V., Laven, A., de Leth, D.O., Van Leynseele, Y., & Vos, A. (2019). Conceptualizing inclusiveness of smallholder value chain integration. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 41, 10-17.
- Rousseau, K., Gautier, D., & Wardell, D. (2017). Socio-economic differentiation and Shea Globalisation in Western Burkina Faso: Integrating Gender Politics and Agrarian Change. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*.
- Safari, E. (2011). Perceptions of the accommodation sector regarding the tourism value chain with specific reference to the Western Province of Rwanda. Master Thesis, Cape Peninsula University of Technology.
- Samadi, A. (2019). Institutions and entrepreneurship: unidirectional or bidirectional causality? *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research* (2019) 9:3, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40497-018-0129-z>.
- Samman, E., & Santo, M. (2009). Agency and Empowerment: A review of concepts, indicators and empirical evidence. *Prepared for the 2009 Human Development Report in Latin America and the Caribbean First Draft: May 18, 2009*.
- Sarkis, J., Zhu, Q., & Lai, K.-h. (2011). An organizational theoretic review of green supply chain management literature. *Int. J. Production Economics* 130(2011), 1–15.
- Sarroub, L. K. (2008). Living Glocally' With Literacy Success in the Midwest. *Theory Into Practice* . 47 (1): 59–67. Doi:10.1080/00405840701764789.
- Sarroub, L. K. (2009). Glocalism in literacy and marriage in transnational lives. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies (Special Issue: Immigration, Language, and Education)* 6(1-2), 63-80.
- Savadogo, B. (2013). Analyse Critique des Politiques Éducatives et de Développement du Burkina Faso de 1960 A 2012, Perspectives Ante et Post 2015. Network for international policies and cooperation in education and training. See https://www.norrag.org/fileadmin/Post-2015/Case_Study_Post-2015_BF_FINAL.pdf.
- Savadogo, K. (1986). *An Analysis Of The Economic And Sociodemographic Determinants Of Household Food Consumption In Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso (Urban Consumption, Aids Model)*. PhD Thesis, Purdue University.
- Savadogo, K., Akouwerabou, D.B, & Combray, O. (2012). Education impact assessment on agricultural productivity in Burkina Faso through a directional distance function. *Convergence Project Working paper 2012*.
- Savadogo, K., Combray, O.S., & Akouwerabou, D.B. (2016). Impacts des Services Sociaux sur a Productivité Agricole au Burkina Faso : Approche par la Fonction Distance Output. *De Boeck Supérieur | « Mondes en développement »*, 2016/2 n° 174, 153-167.
- Schoar, A. (2010). The divide between subsistence and transformational entrepreneurship. In J. Lerner & S. Stern (Eds.), *NBER innovation policy and the economy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Scoones, I. (1998). Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: A Framework for Analysis. *IDS Working Paper 72, 1998*.
- Scott, W. (2008). *Institutions and Organizations*, 3rd ed. (Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA).
- Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2005). Social entrepreneurship: Creating new business models to serve the poor. *Business Horizons* (2005) 48, 241—246.

- Sen, A. (1985). *Commodities and Capabilities*. Amsterdam: North-Holland;1985.
- Sen, A. (1992). *Inequality reexamined*. New York Oxford New York: Russell Sage Foundation Clarendon Press Oxford Univ. Press. ISBN 9780198289289.
- Sen, A. (2001). Economic Development and Capability Expansion in Historical perspective. *Pacific Economic Review* 6(2), 179-91.
- Sen, A. (2002). *Rationality and Freedom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sen, K. (2015). The Political Determinants of Economic Growth: An Analytical Review. In *The Politics of Accumulation and Growth, Part II of "The Politics of Inclusive Development: Interrogating the Evidence*. Edited by Sam Hickey, Kunal Sen, and Badru Buke.
- Senders, A., Lentink, A., Vanderschaeghe, M., & Terrillon, J. (2014). Gender in value chains: Practical toolkit to integrate a gender perspective in agricultural value chain development. *Agri-ProFocus*.
- Seuring, S., & Müller, M. (2008). From a literature review to a conceptual framework for sustainable supply chain management. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 16 (2008) , 1699–1710.
- Shankar, A. V., Onyura, M. A., & Alderman, J. (2015). Agency-Based Empowerment Training Enhances Sales Capacity of Female Energy Entrepreneurs in Kenya. *Journal of Health Communication*, 20:sup1, 67-75, DOI:10.1080/10810730.2014.1002959.
- Shankar, A. V., Onyura, M. A., Ojode, M., & Millan, E. (2015). Fostering Agency and Wellbeing in Women: an evaluation of the IMAGINE Initiative. *Development in Practice*, 25:3, 375-388, DOI: 10.1080/09614524.2015.1016868. .
- Shettar, R. (2015). A Study on Issues and Challenges of Women Empowerment in India. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*. Volume 17, Issue 4. Ver. I (Apr. 2015), pp.13-19.
- Singer, M., & Donoso, P. (2008). Upstream or downstream in the value chain? . *Journal of Business Research* 61 (2008) , 669–677.
- Smallbone, D., & Welter, F. (2012). Entrepreneurship and institutional change in transition economies: The Commonwealth of Independent States, Central and Eastern Europe and China compared. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 24(3–4), 215–233.
- Sobel, R. (2008). Testing Baumol: Institutional quality and the productivity of entrepreneurship . *Journal of Business Venturing*, 23(6), 641–655.
- Sopov, M., Saavedra, Y., Sertse, Y., & Vellema, W. H. (2014). Is Inclusive Business for you? Managing and upscaling an inclusive company: Lessons from the field. [Internet]. 2014. Centre for Development Innovation, Wageningen UR. 2014.
- Sory, I., & Soura, A. (2014). Recourir à l'entre-deux : une proposition pour mieux nommer et décrire la production des espaces informels de Ouagadougou. *Carnets de géographes [En ligne]*, 7 | 2014, mis en ligne le 01 décembre 2014, consulté le 01 février 2017, URL : <http://cdg.revues.org/528> ; DOI : 10.4000/cdg.528.
- Souratie M.W., Koinda F., Samandoulougou R., & Decaluwé B. (2019). Politiques Agricoles, Emploi, et Revenu des Femmes au Burkina Faso. Working Paper 2019-19.
- Stainer, A., & Stainer, L. (1998). Business performance: a stakeholder approach. *International Journal of Business Performance Management [Internet]*. 1998, 1:2–12.

- Staritz, Cornelia, & José, G. R. (2013). *Global Value Chains, Economic Upgrading, and Gender: Case Studies of the Horticulture, Tourism, and Call Center Industries*. Washington, DC: The World Bank. Accessed at: <http://www.capturingthegains.org>.
- Steel, P., Taras, V., Uggerslev, K., & Bosco F. (2018). The Happy Culture: A Theoretical, Meta-Analytic, and Empirical Review of the Relationship Between Culture and Wealth and Subjective Well-Being. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 2018, Vol. 22(2) 128–169.
- Stratégie de Croissance Accélérée et de Développement durable (SCADD) 2010-2015. *Document de politique nationale du Burkina Faso*.
- Sullivan, C. A. (2002). Calculating A Water Poverty Index. *Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Wallingford, UK*.
- Sullivan, D. (1998). Ontology Comment International Business : International Business : Vision [Internet]. *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* 1998, 29, 877–885.
- Tarafdar, M., & Qrunfleh, S. (2016). Agile Supply Chain strategies and Supply Chain Performance: Complementary Roles of Supply Chain Practices and Information Systems Capability for Agility. *International Journal of Production Research*, 55:4, 925-938, DOI: 10.
- Tarnagda, B., Tankoano, A., Tapsoba, F., Sourabié, P.B., Abdoullahi H.O., Djbrine, A.O., Drabo, K.M., Traoré, Y., & Savadogo, A. (2017). 2017 Évaluation des pratiques agricoles des légumes feuilles: le cas des utilisations des pesticides et des intrants chimiques sur les sites maraîchers de Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso. *Journal of Applied Biosciences* 117: 11658-11668.
- TCP (Trésor et Comptabilité Publique). (2019). *Note d'Information du Marché des Titres Publics, Décembre 2019*. Voir https://www.umoatitres.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/NI_BURKINA-FASO_2019.pdf.
- Tendler, J. (1997). *Good Government in the Tropics*. Baltimore. *John Hopkins University Press*.
- Tevera, D. (1999). Urban agriculture in Africa: A comparative analysis of findings from Zimbabwe, Kenya and Zambia. *African Urban Quarterly* 11, 181–87.32.
- Tolbert, P., & Zucker, L. (1983). Institutional sources of change in the formal structure of organizations: The diffusion of civil service reform, 1880–1935. *Admin. Sci. Quart.* 28(1), 22–39.
- Traub, A. (2014). Detail's Choice: How raising wages and improving schedules for women in the retail industry would benefit America. *Demos*, www.demos.org/publication/retails-choice-how-raising-wages-and-improving-schedules-women-retail-industry-would-ben.
- Trochim, W.M.K, 2020. Research Methods Knowledge Base, in *Change and Conditions by Conjoint.ly*. Sydney, Australia. ABN 56 616 169 021. <https://conjointly.com/kb/positivism-and-post-positivism/> [last visited on 12/11/2020 at 16:30].
- UA (African Union). (2014). *Common African Position On The Post2015 Development Agenda*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, during the 22nd Ordinary Session of the Assembly of the Union on 31 January 2014.
- UN (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs). (2016). *Leaving no one behind: the imperative of inclusive development. Report on the World Social Situation 2016*. United Nations publication. ISBN 978-92-1-130336-0.

- United Nations (2015). Sustainable Development Goals: Goal 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls, Targets and Indicators. <https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal5?page=1> .
- UN Environment. (2019). *Global Environment Outlook-Geo-6: Healthy Planet, Healthy People*. Cambridge University Press, DOI : 10.1017/9781108627146.
- UNCTAD(United Nations Conference on Trade and Development). (1999). *The Social Responsibility of Transnational Corporations [Internet]*.
- UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). (2003). *Rapport pays : Suivi des Objectifs du Millénaire pour le Développement. Décembre, 2003*.
- UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). (2010). *Business Solutions to Poverty: How inclusive business models create opportunities for all in Emerging Europe and Central Asia [Internet]*. United Nations Dev. Program. UNDP Reg. Bur. Eur. Commonw. Indep. States 2010.
- UN-Habitat (United Nations Human Settlements Programme). (2007). *Profil Urbain National du Burkina Faso. Programme Participatif de l'élaboration des profils urbains dans les pays africains, Caraïbes et pacifiques (ACP)*.
- UN-Habitat (United Nations Human Settlements Programme). (2015). *Elaboration Du Rapport National Habitat Iii Du Burkina Faso. Rapport final*.
- UN-Habitat (United Nations Human Settlements Programme). (2016). *Urbanization and Development: Emerging Futures. World Cities Report 2016, United Nations Human Settlements Programme, 2016*.
- UNOCHA (United nations Organisation for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs). (2020). *BURKINA FASO Rapport de situation, 27 févr. 2020*. <https://reports.unocha.org/fr/country/burkina-faso/>.
- USAID(U.S Agency for International Development). (2009). *Promoting Gender Equitable Opportunities in Agricultural Value Chains: a Handbook. Prepared by Rubin, D. and Manfre, C. for USAID*.
- USAID(U.S Agency for International Development). (2013). *ICT Applications and Agricultural Input Supply Companies: Highlights from Africa*. Briefing Paper. Accessed at: http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00J7PB.pdf.
- Vegelin, C. (2016). *Global changes, national development and urban poverty: Political engagement among the poor in Mexico City*. PhD Thesis, FMG, University of Amsterdam. <http://hdl.handle.net/11245/1.539909>.
- Velmuradova, M. (2004). Epistémologies et méthodologies de la recherche en Sciences de gestion. Note de synthèse. [Autre] USTV. 2004, pp.105. hal-01582285.
- Vizard, P., Fukuda-Parr, S., & Elson, D. (2011): Introduction: The Capability Approach and Human Rights, *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 12:1, 1-22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19452829.2010.541728>.
- Vossenbergh, S. (2016). Gender-Aware Women's Entrepreneurship Development for Inclusive Development in Sub-Saharan Africa [Internet]. *J. Chem. Inf. Model.* 2016, 53, 1689–1699.
- Wach, E. (2012). IDS Practice Paper Research Summary 9: Measuring the "Inclusivity" of Inclusive Business [Internet]. *IDS Pract. Pap.* 2012, 2012:i-ii.

- Waithanji, E., Njuki, J., & Bagalwa, N. (2013). Gendered participation in livestock markets. Chapter 5: In: Njuki, J. and Sanginga, P. (eds), Women, livestock ownership and markets: Bridging the gender gap in eastern and southern Africa. *New York, USA: Routledge*.
- Wells, T. (2012). Sen's Capability Approach, In Feiser J. & Dowden B. (eds.). *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy (2012)*.
- Welter, F. (2011). Contextualizing Entrepreneurship—Conceptual Challenges and Ways Forward. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, Volume 35, Issue 1*, p.165-184: 17 Jan 2011.
- Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Apr. - Jun., 1984)*, pp. 171-180.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society, 1(2)*, 125–151.
- Whitley, R. D. (1999). Divergent capitalisms: The social structuring and change of business systems. *Oxford: Oxford University Press*.
- WHO (World Health Organization), & United Nations Children's Fund. (2014). *Update: Progress on Sanitation and Drinking Water," p. 8–9. http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2010/9789241563956_eng_full_text.pdf?ua=1*.
- WHO (World Health Organization),, United Nations Children's Fund, & Progress on Drinking Water and Sanitation. (2012). *Update*. (Geneva, 2012).
- Wight, C. (2012). Critical Realism: some responses. *Review of International Studies , January 2012, Vol. 38, No. 1 (January 2012)*, pp. 267-274.
- Wilk, J., & Jonsson, A. (2013). From water poverty to water prosperity—a more participatory approach to studying local water resources management. *Water Resources Management 27(3)*, 695–713.
- WFEs Project. (2015). *WFEs in Kenya and Burkina Faso: Building Inclusive Business Models for Food Security in the City Slums of Kisumu and Ouagadougou*.
- Wodon, Q.T., de la Brière, B. (2018). Unrealized Potential : The High Cost of Gender Inequality in Earnings. The Cost of Gender Inequality. Washington, DC: World Bank. © World Bank. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/29865> License: CC BY 3.0 IGO.
- World Bank. (2007). *Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook (<http://worldbank.org/genderinag>); The World Development Report: Agriculture for Development. The World Bank. Washington, DC. 2007; International Assessment of Agricultural Science and Technology for Devevelopment*.
- World Bank. (2011). *Household Cookstoves, Environment, Health and Climate Change*. Washington, D.C., 2011.
- World Bank. (2012). *World Development Report: Gender Equality and Development. World Bank Group, <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/4391> License: CC BY 3.0 IGO."*
- World Bank. (2014). Women, Business and Law 2014: Removing Restrictions to Enhance Gender Equality. p. 8 <http://wbl.worldbank.org/~media/FPDKM/WBL/Documents/Reports/2014/Women-Business-and-the-Law-2014-Key-Findings.pdf>.
- World Bank. (2015). *The World Bank Annual Report 2015*. Retrieved from [Online]: <http://www.worldbank.org/en/about/annual-report>

- World Bank. (2015). *Women, Business and the Law 2016: Getting to Equal*. Washington, DC: World Bank. doi:10.1596/978-1-4648-0677-3. License: Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 3.0 IGO. Accessed at:http://wbl.worldbank.org/~/_/media/WBG/WBL/Documents/Reports/2016/Women-Business-and-the-Law-2016.pdf. .
- World Bank Findex, (2014). Financial Inclusion Data. Retrieved from <http://datatopics.worldbank.org/financialinclusion/indv-characteristics/gender>
- World Bank (2019b). Burkina Faso : bienvenue à l'école des maris et futurs maris. Article du 16 Septembre 2019. <https://www.banquemondiale.org/fr/news/feature/2019/09/16/burkina-faso-welcome-to-mamboues-school-for-husbands-and-future-husbands>
- World Bank (2019a). Rapport 2018 sur la pauvreté et la prospérité partagée : Compléter le puzzle de la pauvreté. Aperçu. Banque mondiale, Washington. Licence : Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 3.0 IGO. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/30418/211330ovFR.pdf?sequence=35&isAllowed=y>
- Yin, R. K. (2003). Case study research: Design and methods . *Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage*.
- Zahonogo, P. (2011). Non-farm activities and arbitration between food and non food consumption in rural Burkina Faso: A household level analysis. *African Journal of Food Science Vol. 5(2)*, pp. 69 – 81.
- Zhang, Q., Vonderembse, M.A., & Lim, J. S. (2002). Value chain flexibility: A dichotomy of competence and capability. *International Journal of Production Research*, 40:3, 561-583, DOI: 10.1080/00207540110091695.
- Zougmore, F., Damiba L., D'haen, S., & Dayamba, S.D. (2019). État des connaissances scientifiques sur les ressources en eau au Burkina Faso et de l'impact des changements climatiques sur ces ressources. Report produced under the project "Projet d'Appui Scientifique aux processus de Plans Nationaux d'Adaptation dans les pays francophones les moins avancés d'Afrique subsaharienne", Climate Analytics gGmbH, Berlin.
- Zoumba N.B., 2018. L'entrepreneuriat par nécessité et par opportunité: essai de compréhension dans le contexte burkinabè. Gestion et management. Université Paris-Est, 2018. Français. <https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-02096312>.
- Zwarteveen, M. Z. 1994. Gender issues, water issues: A gender perspective to irrigation management. Colombo, Sri Lanka: International Irrigation Management Institute (IIMI). viii, 62p. (IIMI working paper no. 32).

Web-sites

<https://www.burkina24.com/2019/07/08/faarf-plus-de-10-milliards-de-fcfa-octroyes-a-150-000-femmes-en-2018/>

<https://www.burkina24.com/2019/07/08/faarf-plus-de-10-milliards-de-fcfa-octroyes-a-150-000-femmes-en-2018/>

<https://www.leconomistedufaso.bf/2019/02/11/fonds-nationaux-86745-milliards-f-cfa-de-credits-entre-2012-et-2016/>

<https://www.leconomistedufaso.bf/2019/02/11/fonds-nationaux-86745-milliards-f-cfa-de-credits-entre-2012-et-2016/>

<https://www.social-protection.org/gimi/RessourcePDF.action;jsessionid=Qc0xBz4AsVXI-fHlhnCNGUGtVYrBgPLAbCkXmOty4Z9qzSyZDZc9!-1445899656?id=18220>

<https://www.unCDF.org/article/5481/faciliter-laccs-au-crdit-par-les-femmes-au-burkina-faso>

<https://www.unCDF.org/article/5481/faciliter-laccs-au-crdit-par-les-femmes-au-burkina-faso>

Perspective Monde, 2017. Burkina Faso, Site officiel de l'Université de Sherbrooke. <http://perspective.usherbrooke.ca/bilan/pays/BFA/fr.html>

To read: UN Women (2017) <http://www.unwomen.org/en/what-we-do/economic-empowerment/facts-and-figures>.

To read: UN Women (2018): <https://www.unwomen.org/en/what-we-do/economic-empowerment/facts-and-figures>

https://lefaso.net/spip.php?page=impression&id_article=10361

To read: Warwick University (2020): <https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/ces/research/current/socialtheory/maps/criticalrealism/>

Appendix

Annex 1: Additional Descriptive Statistics

Table 9b: Women's group savings mobilisation

Savings	Kossodo	Tanghin	Tampouy
Number of member saver	32	0	30
Total amount	48000	0	96000

Source: The author based on Focus Group Discussion data (2017)

Table 10b: Loans offered to members

Loans to members	Saisonnrière	Belembaongo	Nabonswendé (AMIFOB)
Number of member beneficiary	2	0	0
Total amount	8000	0	0

Source: The author based on Focus Group Discussion data (2017)

Table 11b: Type of Household lead

Sex_Head of household	Freq.	Percent
Men	39	33.05
Woman	79	66.95
Total	118	100.00

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 12b: Age of the interviewees

Age	Freq.	Percent
21-30	10	8.47
31-40	23	19.49
41-50	32	27.12
51—60	33	27.97
>60	20	16.95
Total	118	100

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 13b: Marital status of the interviewed

Marital status	Freq.	Percent
Single	1	0.85
Widow	38	32.2
Married	79	66.95
Total	118	100

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 14b: Religion of the interviewees

Religion	Freq.	Percent
Christian	66	55.93
Muslim	52	44.07
Total	118	100

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 15b: Type of marriage

Type of marriage	Freq.	Percent
Monogamy	82	71.93
Poligamy	32	28.07
Total	114	100

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 16b: Interviewee's household size

Size	Total members	Children
Tampouy	12.4	6.3
Tanghin	9.9	5.6
Kossodo	8.9	5.7
Total	10.5	5.9

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 17b: Education level of the interviewees

Education level	Freq.	Percent
0	60	50.85
1	39	33.05
2	15	12.71
3	3	2.54
4	1	0.85
Total	118	100

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 18b: Principal income sources of the interviewees

Principal income source	Freq.	Percent
Vegetable trade	1	0.85
Sewing	1	0.85
Gardening	116	98.3
Total	118	100

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 19b: Number of plots exploited by the interviewees

Number of plots	Mean	min	max	Median
Tampouy	4.0	1	11	3
Tanghin	16.0	3	45	14
Kossodo	6.8	3	8	7
Total	19.5	1	45	7

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 20b. Proportion of the principally produced crops

Principal crop	Freq.	Percent
Amarranth	41	35.34
Sorrel	1	0.86
Carot	1	0.86
Lettuce	71	61.21
Tomato	2	1.72
Total	116	100.00

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 21b: Proportion of the secondarily produced crops

Secondary crop	Freq.	Percent
Amarranth	50	47.17
Corchorus olitorius or Tossa jute (Boulvanka)	11	10.38
Cabbage	3	2.83
Okra	1	0.94
Cleome Leaves (Spider Flower)	11	10.38
Lettuce	24	22.64
Eggplant (aubergine)	1	0.94
Onion	1	0.94
Sorrel	4	3.77
Total	106	100.00

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 22b: Proportion of production season for the first main crop per year

Seasons	Freq.	Percent
1	2	1.72
2	1	0.86
3	112	96.55
4	1	0.86
Total	116	100.00

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 23b: Proportion of production season for the second main crop per year

Season second main crop	Freq.	Percent
1	7	6.42
2	3	2.75
3	99	90.83
Total	109	100.00

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 24b: Source of workforce used by the interviewees

Source	Freq.	Percent
Famille	101	74.26
famille et employée	35	25.74
Total	136	100.00

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 25b: Source of workforce used by the interviewees

	Freq.	Percent
Commercial	19	16.38
Commercial and Consumption	97	83.62
Total	116	100.00

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 26b: Duration of the interviewees in their group

Duration	Freq.	Percent
2	1	0.85
4	13	11.02
6	17	14.41
7	87	73.73
Total	118	100.00

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 27b: Proportion of food intake of adults per day

Meals _Adults	Freq.	Percent
1	11	9.32
2	87	73.73
3	20	16.95
Total	118	100.00

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 28b: Proportion of food intake of children per day

Meals per day	Freq.	Percent
2	15	13.04
3	86	74.78
4	13	11.30
5	1	0.87
Total	115	100.00

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 29b: Proportion of the interviewees fearing to lack food

Sex	Never	Sometimes	Rarely	Often	Total
Female	10.92	42.86	15.13	31.09	100.00
Male	15.79	26.32	31.58	26.32	100.00
Total	11.59	40.58	17.39	30.43	100.00

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 30b: Proportion of interviewees who cannot access their preferred food

Sex	Never	Sometimes	Rarely	Often	Total
Female	4.20	50.42	10.92	34.45	100.00
Male	0.00	31.58	36.84	31.58	100.00
Total	3.62	47.83	14.49	34.06	100.00

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 31b: Proportion of interviewees who cannot regular access to quality food

Sex	Never	Sometimes	Rarely	Often	Total
Female	4.20	63.03	11.76	21.01	100.00
Male	0.00	36.84	36.84	26.32	100.00
Total	3.62	59.42	15.22	21.74	100.00

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 32b: Proportion of interviewees who eat non-desired food

Sex	Never	Sometimes	Rarely	Often	Total
Female	3.36	51.26	19.33	26.05	100.00
Male	0.00	47.37	26.32	26.32	100.00
Total	2.90	50.72	20.29	26.09	100.00

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 33b: Proportion of interviewees who eat smaller food

Sex	Never	Sometimes	Rarely	Often	Total
Female	10.92	52.10	25.21	11.76	100.00
Male	36.84	26.32	21.05	15.79	100.00
Total	14.49	48.55	24.64	12.32	100.00

Source: The author based on Baseline Data (2017)

Table 34b: Proportion of women who experienced extreme poverty

Extreme poverty	Freq.	Percent
No	27	41.54
Yes	38	58.46
Total	65	100.00

Source: *The author based on Life Story Data (2018)*

Table 35b: Proportion of women who experienced a lack of food

Lack food	Freq.	Percent
No	31	48.44
Yes	33	51.56
Total	64	100.00

Source: *The author based on Life Story Data (2018)*

Table 36b: Proportion of women suffered from the lack of income

	Freq.	Percent
No	16	25.00
Yes	48	75.00
Total	64	100.00

Source: *The author based on Life Story Data (2018)*

Table 37b: Proportion of women feeding alone their children

Feeding alone	Freq.	Percent
No	51	79.69
Yes	13	20.31
Total	64	100.00

Source: *The author based on Life Story Data (2018)*

Table 38b: Proportion of women suffered from heath

	Freq.	Percent
No	58	90.63
Yes	6	9.38
Total	64	100.00

Source: *The author based on Life Story Data (2018)*

Table 39b: Proportion of women widow

Widow	Freq.	Percent
No	53	81.54
Yes	12	18.46
Total	65	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 40b: Proportion of women how experienced gender-based violence

	Freq.	Percent
No	58	95.08
Yes	3	4.92
Total	61	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 41b: Dynamics in women's time resource

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Sleep time then	51	9.411	3.699	3	20
Sleep time now	67	7.597	1.404	6	12
Production time then	51	6.215	5.056	0	13
Production time now	67	10.149	2.565	4	15
Domestic work time then	51	8.372	3.446	0	16
Domestic work time now	67	6.223	2.366	0	12

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 42b: Proportion of women's controlling their time before

Control time before	Freq.	Percent
No	14	28.00
Yes, partially	28	56.00
Yes, fully	8	16.00
Total	50	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 43b: Proportion of women's controlling their time now

Control time now	Freq.	Percent
0	3	4.55
1	11	16.67
2	52	78.79
Total	66	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 44b: Proportion of women with access to space resource

Access space	Freq.	Percent
No	45	67.16
Yes	22	32.84
Total	67	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 45b: Proportion of women controlling the space then

Control space	Freq.	Percent
Non applicable	45	67.16
No	18	26.87
Yes	4	5.97
Total	67	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 46b: Proportion of women controlling their space now

	Freq.	Percent
No	64	95.52
Yes	3	4.48
Total	67	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 47b: Proportion of women accessing material resources then

	Freq.	Percent
No	45	70.31
Yes	19	29.69
Total	64	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 48b: Proportion of women controlling their material resources now

	Freq.	Percent
No	1	1.49
Yes, partially	6	8.96
Yes, fully	60	89.55
Total	67	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 49b: Proportion of women accessing financial resources then

	Freq.	Percent
No	40	62.50
Yes	24	37.50
Total	64	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 50b: Proportion of women controlling their material resources then

	Freq.	Percent
Non applicable	39	60.94
Yes	25	39.06
Total	64	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 51b: Proportion of women accessing human capital then

	Freq.	Percent
No	66	98.51
Yes	1	1.49
Total	67	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 52b: Proportion of women accessing human capital now

	Freq.	Percent
No	3	4.48
Yes	64	95.52
Total	67	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 53b: Proportion of women accessing relational resources then

	Freq.	Percent
No	52	77.61
Yes	15	22.39
Total	67	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 54b: Proportion of women accessing relational resources now

	Freq.	Percent
No	1	1.49
Yes	66	98.51
Total	67	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 55b: Proportion of women accessing natural resources then

	Freq.	Percent
Non	51	77.27
Yes	15	22.73
Total	66	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 56b: Proportion of women accessing natural resources now

	Freq.	Percent
0	39	59.09
1	27	40.91
Total	66	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 57b: Meaning of doing business

Business meaning	Freq.	Percent
Negative	20	29.85
Don't know	30	44.78
Positive	17	25.37
Total	67	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 58b: Proportion of interviewees doing business

Activity strategy	Freq.	Percent
Activity diversification	5	16.67
Alternating crops in function of the..	1	3.33
Crop diversification	12	40.00
Growing in regard to period	3	10.00
Managing buyers to keep them coming	1	3.33
None	3	10.00
Organic brand	2	6.67

Production techniques	1	3.33
Selling strategy	1	3.33
Work individually (not in collectively)	1	3.33
Total	30	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 59b: Cohesion within the groups

	Freq.	Percent
Acceptable	1	1.52
Good	65	98.48
Total	66	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 60b: Mutual support within the groups

	Freq.	Percent
No	12	17.91
Yes	55	82.09
Total	67	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 61b: Destination of the purchased vegetable

Utilisation	N	Percent (%)
Animal consumption	1	0.26
Family consumption	322	83.42
Social events (consumption)	31	8.03
Intermediaries	32	8.29
Total	386	100.00

Source: The author based on Demand Follow-up survey (2017, 2018)

Table 62b: Proportion of purchasers per type and site (N=283)

Percent (%)	Tampouy	Kossodo	Tanghin	Total
Animal consumption	0.26	0.00	0.00	0.26
Family consumption	36.53	45.34	1.55	83.42
Social events (consumption)	3.63	3.11	1.30	8.03
Intermediaries	0.78	2.59	4.92	8.29
Total	41.19	51.04	7.77	100.00

Source: The author based on Demand Follow-up survey (2017, 2018)

Table 63b: Purchased quantity per site (N=283)

Site	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Std. Error of Mean
Tampouy	1.61	.75	4.31	.34
Kossodo	3.69	.70	10.38	.74
Tanghin	155.83	62.50	317.93	57.10
Total	15.06	.75	98.36	5.00

Source: The author based on Demand Follow-up survey (2017, 2018)

Table 64b: Purchased quantity per type destination (type of buyer) [N=283]

Utilisation	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Std. Error of Mean
Animal consumption	.50	.50	.	.
Family consumption	10.88	.70	109.25	6.37
Social events (consumption)	26.89	5.50	41.99	7.66
Restaurant	1.16	.97	1.094	.38
Market place	76.97	62.50	59.87	13.38
Total	15.06	.75	98.36	5.00

Source: The author based on Demand Follow-up survey (2017, 2018)

Table 66b: Quality appreciation per type of buyers (N=283)

	Bad	Good	Very good	Excellent	Total
Animal consumption	0.00	0.27	0.00	0.00	0.27
Family consumption	0.53	72.41	8.75	1.86	83.55
Social events (consumption)	0.00	7.16	0.53	0.00	7.69
Intermediaries	0.00	6.90	1.59	0.00	8.49
Total	0.53	86.74	10.88	1.86	100.00

Source: The author based on Demand Follow-up survey (2017, 2018)

Table 67b: Price appreciation per type of buyers (N=283)

	Affordable	Expensive	Cheap	Total
Animal consumption	0.27	0.00	0.00	0.27
Family consumption	70.59	6.95	5.88	83.42
Social events (consumption)	6.68	0.80	0.27	7.75
Intermediaries	7.75	0.80	0.00	8.56
Total	85.29	8.56	6.15	100.00

Source: The author based on Demand Follow-up survey (2017, 2018)

Table 68b: Duration of buyer frequentation of the production sites (N=230)

Site	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Std. Error of Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Tampouy	7.13	5	4.95	0.45	1	22
Kossodo	4.48	4	2.80	0.28	1	12
Tanghin	10.25	10	6.08	1.75	2	20
Total	6.15	5	4.51	0.30	1	22

Source: The author based on Demand Follow-up survey (2017, 2018)

Table 69b: Distance travelled (round-trip) per site buyers (N=243)

Site	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Std. Error of Mean
Tampouy	2.16	0.80	4.71	0.35
Kossodo	6.38	2.00	10.57	0.65
Tanghin	10.68	4.00	12.92	2.25
Total	5.06	1.20	9.33	0.42

Source: The author based on Demand Follow-up survey (2017, 2018)

Table 70b: Monthly frequency of buyer on the site (N=243)

Site	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Std. Error of Mean
Tampouy	10.70	8.00	9.48	0.71
Kossodo	7.86	8.00	6.60	0.46
Tanghin	27.40	30.00	21.88	3.99
Total	10.52	8.00	10.88	0.54

Source: The author based on Demand Follow-up survey (2017, 2018)

Table 71b: Monthly expenses of displacement to the sites (N=243)

Site	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Std. Error of Mean
Tampouy	7774,73	3600	11024,934	1143,232
Kossodo	2861,1	2000	4288,222	467,883
Tanghin	34516,67	30000	42046,421	12137,756
Total	7288,79	2400	15074,415	1096,502

Source: The author based on Demand Follow-up survey (2017, 2018)

Table 71b: Monthly income of buyers (N=220)

Site	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Std. Error of Mean
Tampouy	181,910.89	150,000	146,909.16	14,618.01
Kossodo	181,117.65	150,000	141,232.50	13,984.10
Tanghin	158,571.43	100,000	171,064.86	45,719.01
Total	180,032.26	150,000	145,299.58	9,863.58

Source: The author based on Demand Follow-up survey (2017, 2018)

Table 73b: Average expenses of buyer's family (N=201)

Site		Total Expenses	Food Expenses	Expense vegetables
Tampouy	Mean	100288.66	59164.95	15824.74
	Median	90000.00	45000.00	10000.00
	Std. Deviation	71625.18	77543.49	20338.03
	Std. Error of Mean	7272.44	7873.35	2065.01
Kossodo	Mean	95073.53	56715.69	24794.12
	Median	80000.00	50000.00	20000.00
	Std. Deviation	53995.30	62648.85	17829.41
	Std. Error of Mean	5346.33	6203.16	1765.38
Tanghin	Mean	86023.79	50976.14	19392.86
	Median	80000.00	45000.00	21000.00
	Std. Deviation	60723.84	41765.48	16431.89
	Std. Error of Mean	16229.13	11162.29	4391.61
Total	Mean	96853.68	57453.83	20354.46
	Median	80000.00	45000.00	15000.00
	Std. Deviation	62871.78	68586.26	19345.36
	Std. Error of Mean	4307.90	4699.45	1325.52

Source: The author based on Demand Follow-up survey (2017, 2018)

Table 74b: Buyers opinion on change in products availability (N=247)

	Don't know	No	Yes	Total
Tampouy	1.62	32.79	14.17	48.58
Kossodo	12.15	17.41	16.19	45.75
Tanghin	0.81	2.02	2.83	5.67
Total	14.57	52.23	33.20	100.00

Source: The author based on Demand Follow-up survey (2017, 2018)

Table 75b: Buyers opinion on change in production diversification (N=244)

	Don't know	No	Yes	Total
Tampouy	5.74	9.43	33.20	48.36
Kossodo	11.07	13.11	21.72	45.90
Tanghin	0.41	2.87	2.46	5.74
Total	17.21	25.41	57.38	100.00

Source: The author based on Demand Follow-up survey (2017, 2018)

Table 76b: Extent of achievement

Extent	Freq.	Percent
2	2	4.76
3	1	2.38
4	3	7.14
5	12	28.57
6	7	16.67
7	5	11.90
8	6	14.29
9	2	4.76
10	4	9.52
Total	42	100.00

Source: The author based on Demand Follow-up survey (2017, 2018)

Table 77b: Net change in time control

Change time control	Freq.	Percent
0	13	32.50
1	21	52.50
2	6	15.00
Total	40	100.00

Source: The author based on Demand Follow-up survey (2017, 2018)

Table 78b: Net change in space resources

Net change	Freq.	Percent
0	9	21.43
1	33	78.57
Total	42	100.00

Source: The author based on Demand Follow-up survey (2017, 2018)

Table 79b: Net change in material resources

Net change in material	Freq.	Percent
0	11	26.19
1	31	73.81
Total	42	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 80b: Net change in financial resources

Net change in finance	Freq.	Percent
0	16	38.10
1	26	61.90
Total	42	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 81b: Net change in human capital

Net change in human	Freq.	Percent
0	1	2.38
1	41	97.62
Total	42	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 82b: Net change in relational resources

Net change in relations	Freq.	Percent
0	13	30.95
1	29	69.05
Total	42	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 83b: Net change in natural resources

Net change in natural	Freq.	Percent
1	1	2.38
0	24	57.14
1	17	40.48
Total	42	100.00

Source: The author based on Life Story Data (2018)

Table 84b: Buyers opinion on change happened for women individually (N=230)

	Don't know	No	Yes	Total
Tampouy	23.91	3.48	24.35	51.74
Kossodo	20.00	17.39	10.87	48.26
Total	43.91	20.87	35.22	100.00

Source: The author based on Demand Follow-up survey (2017, 2018)

Table 85b: Type of change women individually living conditions (N=81)

	+/-	+	++	Total
Tampouy	2.47	66.67	0.00	69.14
Kossodo	0.00	30.86	0.00	30.86
Total	2.47	97.53	0.00	100.00

Source: The author based on Demand Follow-up survey (2017, 2018)

Table 86b: Profit categorisation for women in GAIB and non-GAIB

Profit group	Entrepreneurs Group (PADev)	GAIB model (%)	Non-GAIB model (%)	Total
< 284	Very poor survival entrepreneur	58.90	41.94	53.85
284 =< 710	Poor survival entrepreneurs	32.88	22.58	29.81
710= < 1420	Average entrepreneur	6.85	19.35	10.58
1420 = <2840	Rich (growth-oriented) entrepreneur	1.37	3.23	1.92
> 2840	Very rich (growth-oriented) entrepreneur	0.00	12.90	3.85

Source: The author based on the Baseline and fieldwork data (2017, 2018)

Annex 2: Gender-aware inclusive business, components, indicators and measurement

Table 8.1: Gender-aware Inclusive Business Index Components, Indicators and measurement

Components	Indicators	Definition	Measurement
Innovative (I)	Existence of local scale market or place	Existence of a market and place-specific nature of market that creates successful business	yes/no
	Creation of opportunities	Induced opportunities in (by) the business Tools built upon customary wisdom and environmental sustainability;	0 if not at all to 10 if absolute opportunities creations
	Sustainable value creation	Practices (techniques) build upon customary wisdom and environmental sustainability	0 if not at all to 10 absolute consideration
	Gender barrier removal	Removal of social barriers; Removal of ecological barriers; Removal of geographic barriers; Removal of economic barriers	0 not at all and 10: absolute removal
Credible (C)	Stable commercial connection horizontal level	Coordination between production: level of organisation	Level of organisation: 0 if not organised to 10 if well organised
	Stable commercial connection vertical level	Relationship with retailers; Relationship with end-consumers; Relationship with Restaurant/ processors	1 if bad relationship to 10 if strong/ excellent relationship
	Long term commercial connection at horizontal level	Duration of the WFE organisation; Governance dynamics	1 if short time organised group to 10 if very long time organised group; 1 for very bad governance to 10 excellent governance
	Long term commercial connection at vertical level	Dynamics of the relationship with Retailers; Dynamics of relationship with end-consumers; Dynamics of relationship with restaurant/ processors	Trusty/ confident for each type of buyers (buyer year frequentation of the site); Proportion of buyers regular (or buyer frequenting the site at least four time per month)
Buyer's attachment to the business (site)	Buyer's attachment rate to the business (site/place)	Perceived buyer attachment to the site (by producers): 1 to 10	
Gender awareness in their commercial relations	To what extent gender barriers matter in the commercial relations (vertical)	0 if gender fully matters in vertical relations to 10 if gender no matters	

Access to market where poor people (purchasers) can access too	Proportion of low-income buyers (under the poverty line in Burkina Faso) who have access to these business products	Proportion of low-income buyers (under the poverty line in Burkina Faso) (%)
Reasonability of the prices	Affordability perception of products by buyers	Percentage of buyers who perceive the price affordable (%)
	Risk exposure of actors in the chain	Balanced risk (same exposure to climate and institutional risks) between actors in the chain: Yes/ no (yes, if the risk happens, there is no production and then no food to retail and consume for all the actors in the chain); and no if the occurrence of the risk (no food production) does only affect producers and no the other actors
Affordable (A)	Transportation costs for resellers (farm to marketplace)	Round trip transport cost (mean) for resellers
Equitable access of smallholders to the local market	Transportation costs for end-consumers	Round trip transport cost (mean) for end-consumers
	Responsibility of actors in the chain	Balanced responsibilities between actors (market-driven business; producers-driven business): yes if producer-driven business; no if market-driven business
	Compared rewards of actors in the chain	Balanced rewards between actors in the chain (most rewarded actors): 10 if producers to 0 if others (based on the appreciation of the producers' groups)
Gender barrier removal at the chains' nodes level	Gender barriers to buyers' access to affordable price to food	0 if full gender barriers to buyer access to affordable food to 10 no gender barriers to access to affordable (price) food

Adaptable (A)	Business environment	Ability to cope with their business environment i.e. Competition with other value chains; competition within the value chain)	0 if high competition to 10 if no competition
	Market conditions (requirements)	Ability to cope with buyer requirement of product availability; Product diversification; Product quality	Buyers perception of food availability (%)
			Buyers perception of food diversification (%)
	Political institutions requirements	Exposure degree and ability to cope with political change: land politics, urbanisation politics	Buyers perception of food quality (%)
			0 if Extremely vulnerable to politics (no possibility to cope) to Resilient (great possibility to cope with political institutions dynamics)
	Economic institutions and resources	Access to credit	0 if no access to credit and 10 if full access to credit
		Access to water	0 if access no access to water to 10 if permanent access to water
		Access to inputs	0 if difficult/expensive access to inputs to 10 if full access to inputs/cheapest access
		Access to information	0 if no access to information to 10 if permanent access to information
	Social environment	Access to training/knowledge	0 if no access to regular training/knowledge to 10 full access to regular training/knowledge
Ability to cope with cultural norms and gender barriers removal		0 if Removal of gender barriers at all to 10 if absolute removal of gender barriers	
Ability to cope with natural environment	Ability to cope with climate change such as flooding and drought	0 if no business strategies against drought/flooding to strong business strategies against drought/flooding	
Viable (V)	Demand	Frequency of buyers on the sites	Monthly frequency of production site by consumers (mean)
		Value of purchased food per month	Mean of purchased value per round-trip
	Production cost	Level of production cost per woman	Mean of production cost per woman and per season
	Revenue	Level of revenue received per woman	Mean of revenue per woman
	Benefit	Level of benefit (difference revenue and production cost)	Mean of benefit per woman
Other outcomes	Producers perceived benefits/ outcomes of their business	0 if no additional outcomes to 10 if strong other perceived outcomes	

Source: The author

Individual interviews coding codes

AG: Aminata Gouda
AT: Alisata Tiendrebeogo
BY: Bibata Yaogo
CZ: Clarisse ZONGO
EK: Eugenie KABORE
FZ: Françoise Zoundi
HS: Habibou Sawadogo
JB: Jean Bandé
MK: Mamounata Kologo
RO: Rosalie Ouedraogo
SD: Salimata Dao
SID: Sophie Ilboudo/Delma
TB: TENIN BANDAOGO

Annex 3: Questionnaire, Focus Group Guideline and group capacity assessment

Baseline Survey Questionnaire

Women Food Entrepreneurs in Kenya and Burkina Faso. Building inclusive business models for food security in the city slums of Kisumu and Ouagadougou

A. Background information

A.1. Interview date	
A.2. Name of Enumerator	
A.3. Name of Respondent	
A.4. Contact phone	
A.5. Residence: 1-Boulmiougou, 2-Kossod, 3-Tampouy, 4-Tanghin	
A.6. Village	
A.7. Nearest landmark	

- A.8. What is the type of household?
1. Male- headed
 2. Female-headed
 3. Male –headed, female run
 4. Child –headed
 5. Elderly looking after orphans
 6. Others

A9	A.10.	A.11.	A.12.	A.13.	A.14.
Age (yrs)	Sex	Marital Status	Type of marriage	Religion	Level of education
1=<20 2=21-30 3=31-40 4=41-50 5=51-60 6=>60	1=Male 2=Female	1=Married 2=Single 3= Widowed 4= Divorced / separated 5=Free union 6=Other (specify)	1=Monogamous 2=Polygamous	1=Muslim 2=Christian 3=Traditional religion 4= Atheist 5=Other	1= None 2=Nursery 3=Lower Primary 4= primary 5=Secondary 6=Post-secondary training 7= University 8=Artisanal training 9= Other

A.15. How many people normally / usually live in the household? _____

Spouse(s)	Children	Relatives	Workers	Total

B. Livelihoods of household members and household income

B.1. What is the main source of income for

(i) Respondent _____

(ii) Spouse(s) (if respondent is married) _____

B.2. Are there people in your household that are earning a living? Yes..... No.....

List the other sources of income of

(i) Respondent _____

(ii) Spouse (if respondent is married) _____

(iii) Other family members in the household _____

C. Household food consumption

C.1. Foodstuffs frequently consumed in the household

* Sources may include buying, grown on own farm, grown on group farm, etc.

** If the household does not buy, the respondent should report the price they would get if they sold the foodstuff rather than consumed it at home.

The most commonly eaten foodstuff	No. of times consumed per week	No. or Kgs per week	Where sourced? *	Price, XOF per unit or Kg **	Are these foodstuffs easily available and affordable? 1=Yes, 2=No
Carbohydrates (List types) Ugali, Cassava, Porridge, Sweet potatoes, Rice, Arrowroots, Chapatti, Chips, etc.					

Vegetables (List types) e.g. Sukuma wiki, managu, dek, cowpeas etc.					
Meats- fish (Omena, Obambo, Ngege, Mgongo wazi, mbuta, wiu and others) (Chicken, pork, meat, matumbo and others),					
Fish					
Chicken					
Meat					
Pork					
Matumbo					
Pulses (List types) e.g. Beans, green grams, lentils, French beans, cowpeas etc.					
Beans					
Green grams					
Peas					
Njahe					
Eggs					
Milk					
Others(specify)					
Others(specify)					

C2	C3	C4	C5	C6
The 4 most commonly consumed foodstuffs by the household members in order of priority	What is the quality of the food that you consume?	What factors determine the choice of food you will buy?	How many meals do the adults eat per day?	How many meals do the children in this household eat per day?
	1=Very good 2=Good 3=Fair 4=Poor 5=Very poor	1=Nutritional needs 2=Cost 3=Availability 4= Cooking preferences 5=Seasonality 6=Preparation time 7=Other:	1=One 2=Two 3=Three 4=Four 5=Five 6=Other	1=One 2=Two 3=Three 4=Four 5=Five 6=Other

C7	C8	
Which foods would you like to eat more often than you are currently eating?	Why don't you eat these foods as often as you would like? 1=Preparation Time 2=Price 3=Availability 4=Culture restrictions 5=Religious restrictions 6=Other	
C9	C10	
Do you or anyone in your household eat anything (meal or snack) outside the home?	Who eats outside the home? 1=Respondent 2=Spouse 3=Children	What other places do you and your family members eat from outside the home? 1=School feeding program 2=Restaurant/ hotel 3=Other people's homes 4=Workplace meals 5=Roadside food 6=Others (Specify
1=Yes 2=No		

C11. One month food recall

In the past four weeks (February 2017):	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
Did you worry that your household would not have enough food?				
Were you or any household members not able to eat the kinds of foods you preferred because of a lack of resources (Finances)?				
Did you or any household member have to eat a limited variety of foods due to a lack of resources (Finances)?				
Did you or any household member have to eat some foods that you did not want to eat because of a lack of resources (Finances) to obtain other types of food?				

Did you or any household member have to eat a smaller meal than you felt you needed because there was not enough food? (Availability)				
Did you or any other household member have to eat fewer meals in a day because there was not enough food? (Availability)				
Was there ever no food to eat of any kind in your household because of lack of resources (Finances) to get food?				
Did you or any household member go to sleep at night hungry because there was not enough food? (Availability)				
Were you or any household member forced to use less preferred food? (Availability)				
Were you forced to reduce the quantity of food served to the household members? (Availability)				
Were you forced to reduce your food consumption? (Availability)				

D: Nutrition questions

D1. What do you understand by the term balanced diet/nutritious food?

.....
.....

D2. What has your community considered to be nutritious food in the past?

.....
.....

D3. What are some of the things that affect the quality of food that you eat in this community?

.....
.....

D4. What challenges do you face in maintaining a healthy diet at the household level? (Probe for other answers apart from 'lack of money')

.....
.....

D5	D6	D7	D8
Has the food you consume changed in recent years?	What changes have taken place?	What factors have caused these changes?	How can your nutrition and that of your family/ community be improved?
1=Yes 2=No	1=Increased portions 2=Diversity 3=Decreased portions 4=Less diversity 5=More nutritious 6=Less nutritious 7=No Change	1=Decreased availability 2=Increased availability 3=Increased cost 4=Reduced cost 5=Production in own farm 7=Improved storage 8=Others	1= Increased availability through local production 2=Using improved low-cost production technology such as vertical and horizontal gardens 3=Improve skills on post-harvest management and storage 4=Others

D9	D10	D11
How nutritious is the food that you consume?	Do you deliberately maintain a healthy/nutritious diet for you/ your family?	Have you or your family suffered from any nutrition related sickness?
1= Excellent 2=Good 3=Average 4= Poor 5=Bad	1=Yes 2=No	1=Yes 2=No Name of disease(s):

E: Food production

E.1. Do your household own a farm? (i) Yes, __ (ii) No __

If yes to E.1 above, please complete the table below

E.2	E.3	E.4	E.5	E.6	E.7
Location of farm	Size of farm (ac) 1= <0.5 2= 0.5-1 3= 1- 1.5 4= 1.5-2 5= >2.0 6=Do not know	Four most important food crops grown in order of priority	No. of times planting per year 1= Once 2= Twice 3= > Twice 4= Not sure	Source of labour for farming activities 1=Family 2=Hired 3= Family and hired	Value of crops (KShs) per planting season 1= < 500 2= 600-1000 3= 1100-5000 4= > 5000

E.8	E.9	E.10	E.11	E.12
Food crop grown	Is the food that you grow for subsistence use, commercial use or both? 1=Subsistence use 2=Commercial use 3=Both	What proportion of the crops do you usually sell? 1=1/10 (10%) 2=1/4 (25%) 3=1/2 (50%) 4=3/4 (75%) 5=All (100%)	Where do you sell the crops? 1= At the farm gate 2= In the market (Specify) 3=Others (specify)	Who are the buyers? 1= Traders 2= Corporations 3= Middlemen 4= Local consumers 5= Processors 6=Others

E.13. Why did you choose to grow these foods?

.....

E.14. What crops would you like to grow, but have not yet grown?

1.....

2..... 3.....

E.15. Why have you not grown these crops?

.....

.....

.....

E.16. Do you do any irrigation? 1= Yes 2= No

E.17. What type of irrigation do you do? 1=Bucket, 2=Drip, 3=Channel, 4= Flood

E.18. What crops do you grow under irrigation?

E.19. What is the main source of water for irrigation?

E.20. What is the quality of water that you use to irrigate the land / crops?

1= Very good 2=Good 3= Fair 4= Bad 5= Very bad

F. Community level networks

F.1a. Do you belong to any group that is involved in food production, marketing and value addition activities? (i)Yes ___ (ii) No ___

b. If no in F.1a what are your reasons for not joining any group?

1=Lack of time

2=Lack of trust

3=Gender disparity

4=Discrimination and stigmatization

5=Attitude

F.2. What is the name of Group

.....

F.3. When was the group formed?.....

For how long have you been in the group? 1= <1year 2=2-3 years 3= 3-6 years 4= >6 years	Does the group have an account?		What is the major source of money in the group's account?
	1= Yes 2= No 3= Not sure	If yes, do you know how much money is in that account? 1= yes 2= No 3=Not sure	1= Individual savings 2= Farm Produce sales 3= Donor support 4= Loans 5= Membership fee 6= Interest on loan 7=Others (Specify)

F.4. Why did you join the group and what general benefits have you got?

Why did you join this group? 1=Income generation 2= Collective marketing 3=Bulk production 4=Sharing information 5=Joint training 5=Religion 6=Joint resource use 7= Savings and loans 8=Merry-go-round 9=Other (specify)	Which activities is the group involved in?	How have you /family benefited from the group? 1=New good crops / variety 2=Training 3=Better income 4=Group work 5=More food 6=Collective marketing 7=Training 8=Market information 9=Collective marketing and bargaining 10=Community cohesion and a sense of belonging 11=Others

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION!

Group Capacity Assessment Tool

Group name _____ Contacts _____
 Sub county _____ Ward / Location _____

1. Group formation and characteristics

Variable	Total Units (No. or XOF)
Date formed—year / month	
Date registered -- year / month	
Do you have a constitution (Yes/No.)	
Year finalised and adopted	
No. of registered members	
---Male	
---Female	
---Youth	
No. of active members (participate in group activities)	
---Male	
---Female	
---Youth	
Total capitalization (XOF)	
---Registration	
---Shares	
---Savings	
--- Other partners	
Assets & value (XOF)	
---Land	
---Office	
---Other buildings	
---Equipment	
---Other assets	

2. Group governance

Leadership and meetings held since formation and attendance	Number	Members/ attending Male	Female	Youth
Executive committee				
Production committee				
Marketing committee				

Other committee (s)				
Ordinary meetings				
Annual general meetings				
Special general meetings				
Frequency of elections				
Trainings on group governance				

3. Conflict resolutions and management

Variable	Codes	Reponses
Have there been disputes within the group in the last 2 years	Yes/No	
How are issues resolved	1. Not Very Satisfactory 2. Not satisfactory 3 Average 4 Satisfactory 5 Very satisfactory	
Has there been any group dispute the members' has been unable to resolve?	Yes/No	
If yes what other steps were taken	Local Administration. Courts Others Specify	

4. Group business

4.1 Business component

Variable	Planned activities	Description of on-going activities
Existing business plan		
Group member's main business		
1		
2		
3		
Group common activities		
1		
2		
3		
Out-sourced services		

1		
2		
3		

4.2 Financial products and services

Financial service	Number of members using	Total (XOF)
Savings mobilisation		
Loans offered to members		
Revenue collected from group marketing		
Other specify (_____)		
Financial products	No. of products	Number of members using
Savings products		
Loan products		
Other (specify) _____		
Other (specify) _____		

5. Capacity for ALVs production and marketing

5.1 Trainings

Number of past trainings on ALVs	Total units	Gaps in trainings
--Production		
--Value addition		
--Marketing		
--Nutrition		
--Other training		
Number of members trained on any of the above (Male, female)	Male	Female
--Production		
--Value addition		
--Marketing		
--Nutrition		
--Other training		
Participation in events aimed at promotion of ALVs (event & number attending)	Male	Female
--Production		

--Value addition		
-- utilization		
---Other		

5.2 Production, value addition and marketing

Variables	Being produced/acre	Planned/acre
Acreage planned for ALV production this season (Oct-Dec, short rains)		
--Group level		
--Individual level (average)		
Acreage under ALV production for each variety		Indicate number of members involved
Variety 1		
Variety 2		
Variety 3		
Variety 4		
Variety 5		
ALV seed stock (variety & amount)		Indicate number of members involved
Variety 1		
Variety 2		
Variety 3		
Variety 4		
Variety 5		
Quantities added value for each variety (Kgs)		Indicate the type of value addition (sun-dried, processed into flour, packaged etc)
Variety 1		
Variety 2		
Variety 3		
Variety 4		
Variety 5		
Quantities being supplied to markets		Indicate market supplied
Variety 1		
Variety 2		
Variety 3		
Variety 4		
Variety 5		

5.3 Capacity for supply market linkages

Preferred marketing channels	Rank preference (1-Least preferred and 5-Most preferred)	Average quantity sold per member per season
Farm-gate (end consumers)		
Middlemen		
Local market (nearest to farm)		
Urban markets		
Hotels and restaurants		
Schools		
Other (Specify)_____		
Possible institutional markets close to group	Potential demand for ALVs in Kgs (if any)	Preferred ALVs
1		
2		
3		
Number of members interested in ALV production & marketing	Male _____	Female _____
Provide average Kgs sold per member per week	Male_____	Female _____
Number of members accessing technologies for ALV production & marketing	Male_____	Female_____
Irrigation		
Staggered production		
Seed producers		
Multilayer gardens		
Mandala gardens		
Sorting before sale		
Processing/cleaning/plucking		
Packaging		
Preservation (Drying and packaging)		
Home economics (cooking,		
Other (Specify)		

6. Constraints to ALV production and marketing

Constraint	Ranking (1-5: where 1 is most important and 5 is least important)	Coping strategy
Production		
1		
2		
3		
Marketing		
1		
2		
3		

7. Group partners (for which period the last 5, 10,15 years?)

Name of partner organisation	Activities supported	Level of funding to group (XOF)	No. of members benefitting
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			

Annex 4: Ethics Approval from the University of Amsterdam



Date
16 February 2017

Contact
Karen Kraal

Email
aissr@uva.nl

Phone
+31 (0)20 525 3659

APPROVAL FORM –AISSR Ethical Advisory Board

Name of research: Women food entrepreneurs in Burkina Faso: Building inclusive business models for food security in city slums of Ouagadougou

Name of researcher: Janvier Kini PhD, GPIO Department, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Formal supervisors: Prof. Joyeeta Gupta and Dr Nicky Pouw, GPIO Department, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Faculty: Social & Behavioural Sciences, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

The AISSR Ethical Advisory Board (mandated by the Faculty Ethics Committee) has evaluated and granted approval for this study.

On behalf of the Ethical boards
Karen Kraal (Secretary of the AISSR Ethical Advisory Board and representative in the Faculty Ethics Committee)



Kloveniersburgwal 48
1012 CX Amsterdam
The Netherlands

Secretariat room B.19
+31 (0)20 525 22 62

www.aissr.uva.nl
aissr@uva.nl

Samenvatting

Economische uitsluiting en genderongelijkheid zijn twee problemen die met elkaar verbonden zijn en waarmee vrouwen vandaag de dag wereldwijd nog steeds te kampen hebben. De uitsluiting van vrouwen uit commerciële waardeketens wordt verergerd door de genderongelijkheid die in de meeste lage-inkomenslanden nog steeds bestaat. Wereldwijd werken bijvoorbeeld meer dan 740 miljoen vrouwen in de informele arbeidssector en meer dan 90% van deze vrouwen bevindt zich in Sub-Sahara Afrika (SSA). Deze vrouwen zijn vaak uitgesloten van het formele economische systeem en daarmee van commerciële waardeketens. Toch zijn zij cruciale voedsel- en inkomensverschaffers voor hun gezinnen en proberen zij de eindjes aan elkaar te knopen door voedselondernemerschap. Veel van deze vrouwelijke voedselondernemers (voedselproducenten, -verwerkers en -verkopers) in de snel groeiende steden van SSA organiseren zich in groepen om toegang te krijgen tot landbouwgronden en deze collectief te exploiteren. Zo overwinnen zij de aanvankelijke genderbarrières en -beperkingen. Hun volledige potentieel in stedelijke voedselketens wordt echter systematisch over het hoofd gezien door particuliere en publieke actoren en instellingen. Dit beperkt hun toegang tot markten, middelen en instellingen, waardoor ze hun positie verliezen en in armoede blijven leven. In deze dissertatie wordt onderscheid gemaakt tussen vrouwelijke voedselondernemers (WFE) en vrouwelijke overlevingsondernemers (WSE). WFE verschillen van WSE, omdat de laatstgenoemden slechts een inkomen proberen te verwerven om in de basisbehoeften van hun gezin te voorzien, terwijl WFE winst kunnen maken nadat ze zichzelf een minimumloon voor hun arbeid hebben uitbetaald. Ik maak dit onderscheid omdat vrouwelijke ondernemers verschillende doelstellingen hebben. Door dit onderscheid te maken, wil ik beleidsmakers informatie verschaffen die hen in staat stelt adequate beleidsmaatregelen te treffen voor elke categorie vrouwelijke ondernemers.

Als de mensheid de duurzame-ontwikkelingsdoelen (SDG's) wilt bereiken, moet genderongelijkheid dringend worden overwonnen. Genderongelijkheid is een onaanvaardbaar actueel probleem dat dringend moet worden aangepakt. SDG5 'gendergelijkheid verwezenlijken en alle vrouwen en meisjes mondiger maken' verwoordt dan ook duidelijk de wil en ambitie van de internationale gemeenschap op dit punt; om alle productieve middelen, op voet van gelijkheid, te mobiliseren voor het proces van welvaartscreatie om armoede te bestrijden en 'niemand achter te laten'.

Als reactie op het bovengenoemde probleem is het concept 'inclusief ondernemen' geïntroduceerd om de (gender)uitsluiting en de armoede-effecten van mainstream bedrijfsmodellen aan te pakken. Hoewel inclusief ondernemen in theorie bijdraagt

tot betere zakelijke kansen en empowerment van gemarginaliseerden en armen, waaronder vrouwen, is het mondiale empirische bewijs hiervan schaars en gericht op landen met hoge inkomens. Momenteel zijn er met name drie hiaten in de kennis die in de literatuur overheersen: (a) gebrek aan inzicht in de rol van vrouwen in stedelijke voedselketens en discussie over waardeketenstrategieën vanuit een genderbewust en inclusief perspectief; (b) onvoldoende bewijs van hoe bedrijfsmodellen voor inclusiviteit in stedelijke voedselwaardeketens de capaciteiten en rollen van WSE/WFE waarnemen en beïnvloeden; en (c) gebrek aan bewijs met een solide theoretische basis over hoe gendergevoelige en inclusieve bedrijfsmodellen kunnen bijdragen aan de economische empowerment van vrouwen in de SSA's stedelijke voedselsector.

Deze dissertatie wil een antwoord geven op de volgende hoofdvraag: Hoe kunnen genderbewuste inclusieve bedrijfsmodellen bijdragen aan de economische empowerment van WSE/WFE in de stedelijke voedselwaardeketens in lage-inkomenslanden, en wat betekenen genderbewuste inclusieve bedrijven in de praktijk?

De dissertatie is gebaseerd op de bredere theorie van inclusieve ontwikkeling voor het ontwikkelen en testen van een geïntegreerd empowermentmodel voor vrouwen. Dit model verbindt de notie van genderongelijkheid, inclusieve bedrijfsindicatoren (binnen voedselwaardeketens) en de capaciteiten van vrouwen. Aangezien inclusieve ontwikkeling een relationele benadering gebruikt, erkent de manier waarop de stedelijke voedselwaardeketens worden geanalyseerd de wisselwerking tussen genderongelijkheid en (niet) inclusieve ontwikkeling. Specifiek gezegd, dit onderzoek: (a) definieert de omvang van de doelgroep onder de bevolking aan de onderkant van de piramide; (b) ontwikkelt een meer genderbewuste en inclusieve waardeketen als een kader en proces voor samenwerking tussen belanghebbenden in het bedrijfsleven met behulp van het Foucaultiaanse perspectief van de mens; (c) ontwikkelt een conceptueel model voor genderbewust en inclusief ondernemen, geformaliseerd in een index; en (d) combineert de 'capability' en economisch welzijn op bedrijfsniveau benaderingen van de waardeketen om een analytisch kader te ontwerpen voor de economische empowerment van vrouwen in de stedelijke context.

Dit onderzoek maakt gebruik van een systemische benadering met een kritische intersubjectiviteit om de mechanismen te onderzoeken die leiden tot de economische empowerment van WSE/WFE in Ouagadougou. Naast een beoordeling van de literatuur en beleidsdocumenten werden drie belangrijke methoden gebruikt voor het verzamelen van gegevens: 6 focusgroep discussies, een enquête (project

baseline en productie/vraag follow-up: 433 kopers geënquêteerd, 124 huishoudens bij baseline) en levensgeschiedenissen (69 individuen geïnterviewd). Ook werden drie methoden gebruikt om de gegevens te analyseren: inhoudsanalyse, beschrijvende of ex-post analyse van beleidsdocumenten, beschrijvende statistiek en causaliteitsanalyse met behulp van geavanceerde kwantitatieve methoden. Causaliteitsanalyse met behulp van kwantitatieve methoden, waaronder econometrische modellering (kwantiele regressiemodellen), werden gebruikt om de uitkomsten van de empowerment van vrouwen te analyseren en met name hun winstgevendheid. Het negatieve binomiale regressiemodel, het lineaire regressiemodel en de kwantiele regressie werden gebruikt om de vraag naar de voedingsproducten van WSE/WFE op de stedelijke markt te analyseren.

Hoofdstuk 5 behandelt de vragen: “Hoe draagt overheidsbeleid bij aan de empowerment van WSE/WFE? Wat zijn hun sterke en zwakke punten?” Voorafgaand aan de beantwoording van deze vragen is de beleidscontext geanalyseerd, waarbij de focus lag op de contextvariabelen die van invloed zijn op het ontwerp en de implementatie van overheidsbeleid op nationaal niveau. De conclusie luidt dat de beleidscontext geworteld is in een tweeledig bestuursstelsel in het land. Enerzijds is er het oude gewonterechtsstelsel dat dorpen, gemeenten en districten bestuurt, dat nog steeds aanwezig en machtig is. De macht van dit stelsel hangt af van het vertrouwen dat de dorpingen hebben in hun traditionele stamhoofden om morele waarden zoals integriteit hoog te houden. Dit stelsel van gewonterechtig bestuur is echter informeel, omdat het niet op schrift is vastgelegd en verschilt per etnische groep in het land. Aan de andere kant is er het moderne bestuursstelsel dat is geërfd van de kolonisatie. Dit bestuursstelsel is gebaseerd op de (geschreven) rechtsregels en is als zodanig het formele stelsel dat op elke burger in het land kan worden toegepast.

Het is de taak van de formele instelling (bijv. de regering) om het ontwikkelingsbeleid in het land te ontwerpen en uit te voeren. Het dualisme van het bestuursstelsel berust op het feit dat de formele instellingen het informele stelsel nodig hebben, met name wanneer het gaat om de uitvoering van bepaald beleid in het veld. De informele instellingen hebben op hun beurt de formele instellingen nodig, omdat de informele instellingen geen ontwikkelingsbeleid hebben ontworpen. Bijgevolg ontstaan er informele regelingen tussen de formele institutionele en de informele institutionele actoren. Bovendien is corruptie nog steeds de meest invloedrijke informele instelling, zowel op economisch als op politiek gebied. De dualiteit tussen het gewonterecht en het moderne bestuursstelsel maakt corrupt gedrag

mogelijk dat van invloed is op inefficiënte beleidsresultaten in het veld die niet worden gecontroleerd door sancties of de rechterlijke macht (onderdeel van het formele bestuursstelsel).

Ten tweede werd in deze beleidscontext het ontwikkelingsbeleid in de periode van de markteconomie (1990 tot heden), en de bijdrage daarvan aan de empowerment van vrouwen, geanalyseerd om de doeltreffendheid van het beleid bij de aanpak van de ongelijkheid van mannen en vrouwen en de economische uitsluiting van vrouwen te beoordelen. De conclusie luidt dat sinds 1990: a) het onderwijsbeleid de deelname van vrouwen aan het formele onderwijsstelsel heeft vergroot, waardoor de genderkloof in de toegang tot de ontwikkeling van menselijk kapitaal is verkleind (ook bereidt dit toekomstige generaties voor op het accepteren van gendergelijkheid); b) het landbouwmoderniseringsbeleid de toegang van vrouwen tot land met 70% heeft vergroot, de kosten van meststoffen met 10% heeft verlaagd en de toegang van vrouwen tot landbouwapparatuur met 10% heeft vergroot; en c) het nationale financieringsbeleid de toegang van vrouwen tot krediet aanzienlijk heeft vergroot, hetgeen van invloed is op het scheppen van banen en het opzetten van bedrijven in het land. Bijvoorbeeld, van de 18 bestaande nationale fondsen heeft alleen al het steunfonds voor inkomsten genererende activiteiten voor vrouwen (FAARF) in 2018 meer dan XOF 10 miljard (EUR 15.244.832) aan leningen verstrekt aan 150.000 vrouwen en meer dan 2.164.975 vrouwen hebben van het steunfonds geprofiteerd sinds 1991. Ondanks de successen die zijn geboekt op het gebied van de empowerment van vrouwen, zijn er verdere verbeteringen nodig in beleidsontwerp en -uitvoering, met name voor de extreem armen die worden uitgesloten of zichzelf uitsluiten van ontwikkelingsinterventies. De sterke punten van het beleid hebben betrekking op de doeltreffendheid ervan bij het terugdringen van de ongelijkheid tussen mannen en vrouwen in verschillende sleutelsectoren (onderwijs, landbouw, financiering, enz.); het belangrijkste zwakke punt is het magere vermogen van het beleid om de culturele normen die ten grondslag liggen aan de verschillen tussen mannen en vrouwen in de samenleving, in beduidende mate om te buigen.

Hoofdstuk 6 gaat in op twee vragen: “Hoe zien stedelijke voedselwaardeketens eruit en welke positie nemen vrouwen aan de onderkant van de piramide (BoP) daarin in?” en “Hoe dragen de huidige bedrijfsstrategieën van WSE/WFE bij aan het collectief opbouwen van hun capaciteiten?” In dit hoofdstuk zijn de collectieve capaciteiten van de groepen WSE/WFE geanalyseerd en de manieren waarop de participatie van vrouwen in de voedselwaardeketens hun collectief functioneren tot stand brengt. Het hoofdstuk concludeert allereerst dat er in het stedelijke voedselsysteem twee soorten waardeketens naast elkaar bestaan: de korte en

de lange waardeketen. In de korte waardeketen komen twee subgroepen naar voren: 1) voedselproducenten die hun gewassen alleen op productielocaties aan eindconsumenten verkopen, en 2) producenten die op de marktplaatsen verkopen. In het eerste geval worden de reiskosten gedragen door de eindconsumenten. Dit kan de gehechtheid van de eindconsumenten aan de productieplaatsen verklaren, meestal wanneer de gekochte gewassen iets specifiek hebben (bijv. biologisch voedsel) en er geen of weinig concurrentie bestaat tussen de producenten. In het tweede geval worden de reiskosten gedeeld tussen de voedselproducent en de eindconsument. Dit kan voor de producent een strategie zijn om een betere prijs te krijgen, vooral wanneer er concurrentie is tussen producenten op dezelfde productielocatie. BoP-vrouwen nemen in deze waardeketens de topositie in als producenten; zij zijn de belangrijkste of sterkste beïnvloeders van de waardeketens. In de lange waardeketens brengen tussenpersonen het voedsel naar de marktplaatsen waar aan de behoeften van de eindconsumenten wordt voldaan. Er zijn twee soorten tussenpersonen: i) voedselproducenten die ook groothandelaars zijn en die naast hun eigen voedsel ook het voedsel van hun collega's op dezelfde productielocatie kopen, en ook hun voedsel aan detailhandelaars op de marktplaatsen leveren; ii) niet-voedselproducenten die naar de productielocaties komen om het voedsel te kopen en aan detailhandelaars op de marktplaatsen te leveren. In lange waardeketens concurreren BoP-vrouwen met andere producenten (waaronder mannen). Hierdoor worden BoP-vrouwen blootgesteld aan genderbarrières, waardoor ze geen hogere positie kunnen bereiken; ook al zijn ze voedselproducenten, ze hebben meestal geen controle over het land dat ze exploiteren. In de casestudies functioneren de meeste BoP-vrouwen als voedselintermediairs in de lange waardeketens.

De huidige bedrijfsstrategieën van WSE/WFE omvatten: (a) productieplanning om te voorkomen dat iedereen op hetzelfde moment hetzelfde gewas teelt; b) teelt van de meest gevraagde gewassen tijdens jaarlijkse festiviteiten zoals Kerstmis en Nieuwjaar; c) teelt van gewassen die zich hebben aangepast aan het warme klimaat en de periode van waterstress; d) gezamenlijk verkoopsysteem; en e) individuele verkoop. Strategieën (b) en (c) zijn succesvol omdat de voedselproductie van vrouwen in december tot half januari aanzienlijk toeneemt, en de meeste geteelde gewassen (bijv. sla, ui, suikerbiet, wortel) in deze periode tot eind juni schaars zijn. Strategie d) is ook succesvol, omdat de meeste vrouwelijke producenten die bij dit systeem betrokken zijn toegang hebben tot een premumprijs, doordat zij goed georganiseerd zijn en biologisch voedsel produceren. Strategieën (a) en (e) zijn minder succesvol, omdat (a) niet als richtlijn is voorgeschreven en (e) de WSE/WFE blootstelt aan een slechte verkoop (lage prijzen) als gevolg van concurrerend

gedrag, hetgeen leidt tot grote voedselverspilling, in ieder geval op de korte termijn. Strategie (a) kan worden verbeterd als de vrouwen deze opschrijven als richtlijn en consequent toepassen onder hun groepsleden.

Hoofdstuk 7 gaat in op de vraag: "Hoe dragen de huidige bedrijfsstrategieën van de WSE/WFE bij aan het opbouwen van hun individuele capaciteiten?" Dit hoofdstuk analyseerde de individuele capaciteiten van WSE/WFE en hoe zij functioneren binnen stedelijke voedselwaardeketens. Geconcludeerd wordt dat vrouwen verschillende bedrijfsstrategieën hebben die bestaan uit: (a) gewasdiversificatie, (b) activiteit diversificatie (een combinatie van teelt en ander werk), en (c) het toepassen van verschillende productie- en marketingtechnieken, zoals een gezamenlijk verkoopsysteem en een biologisch voedselmerk. Strategie (c) werkt goed voor BoP-vrouwen, omdat zij vanwege hun biologisch voedselmerk toegang krijgen tot een premium prijs. Dit verhoogt de inkomsten uit hun bedrijf. Deze strategieën dragen dus bij aan het vergroten van de toegang van vrouwen tot basisbehoeften (bijv. voedsel, onderwijs voor de kinderen, gezondheidszorg, drinkwater) via hun verdiende inkomen. Deze bedrijfsstrategieën vergroten ook de relationele hulpbronnen (sociale relaties) van BoP-vrouwen, waardoor hun gevoel van eigenwaarde en controle toeneemt. Ten slotte is hun invloed op de besluitvorming binnen het gezin toegenomen door het inkomen dat zij met hun bedrijvigheid verdienen en de bijdrage die zij leveren aan de uitgaven van hun huishouden.

Hoofdstuk 8 behandelt de vraag: "Wat zijn de voorwaarden voor een bedrijfsmodel om genderbewust en inclusief te zijn voor arme vrouwen in waardeketens?" In dit hoofdstuk zijn de elementen en voorwaarden geanalyseerd voor het testen van de hypothese over een genderbewust en inclusief bedrijfsmodel. Er wordt geconcludeerd dat er twee niveaus van voorwaarden nodig zijn om een bedrijf genderbewust en inclusief te laten zijn: de noodzakelijke voorwaarden en de secundaire voorwaarden. De noodzakelijke voorwaarden houden verband met de waardeketen waarin een bedrijf opereert: werken het communicatiesysteem, het productiesysteem en de fysieke componenten van de waardeketen goed genoeg om de hele waardeketen te laten leven, groeien en produceren? In het hoofdstuk wordt geconcludeerd dat een bedrijfsmodel aan drie voorwaarden moet voldoen om genderbewust en inclusief te zijn. Ten eerste moeten de componenten van een businessmodel-waardeketen (d.w.z. de actoren) fysiek identificeerbaar zijn. Deze fysieke componenten moeten elkaar aanvullen in plaats van concurreren, zoals de organen in het lichaam van een mens. Dat wil zeggen dat de WSE en de andere actoren in de waardeketen - hoewel zij individueel autonoom zijn - samen moeten evolueren als zij in hun omgeving willen overleven. Daarom is

er geen of zeer weinig concurrentie nodig voor een genderbewust en inclusief bedrijfsmodel, aangezien concurrentie de ongelijkheid tussen mannen en vrouwen eerder verergert. Concurrentie op dit niveau verergert ook de onevenwichtige verhouding tussen machtige actoren (mensen met veel middelen) en machteloze actoren (mensen met weinig middelen). Ten tweede moet de waardeketen van een businessmodel een efficiënt communicatiesysteem hebben, wat betekent dat er een snelle stroom is van informatie/kennis evenals van producten en diensten tussen de fysieke componenten van de waardeketen. In de studiecontext bedroeg deze doorstromingsnelheid gemiddeld tot een uur; de tijd dat een product de productielocatie verlaat tot het bij de eindconsument thuis is. Ten derde moet de waardeketen van een bedrijfsmodel een performante productiefunctie hebben, wat betekent dat er jaarlijks een significante hoeveelheid voedsel wordt geproduceerd en op de markt gebracht, die voldoet aan de behoeften van de stadsbevolking. In de casestudy's laten de bedrijven gericht op niet-biologische voedselproductie een grotere voedselopbrengst zien dan de biologische voedselbedrijven.

Een bedrijfsmodel is pas genderbewust en inclusief als de waarde van de genderbewuste en inclusieve bedrijfsindex ten minste gelijk is aan de drempelwaarde van 0,6. Dit is een samengestelde index die bestaat uit vijf componenten, 25 indicatoren en 38 sub-indicatoren. Na in de praktijk te hebben getoetst of in de casestudies aan zowel de noodzakelijke als de toereikende voorwaarden is voldaan, concludeert het hoofdstuk dat er drie soorten bedrijven zijn: genderblinde bedrijven, overgangsbetrijven en genderbewuste inclusieve bedrijven (GAIB).

Hoofdstuk 9 behandelt de vraag: "Hoe versterkt een genderbewust en inclusief bedrijfsmodel de empowerment van WSE in de stedelijke context?". Dit hoofdstuk analyseert de verklarende factoren achter de bijdrage van een genderbewust inclusief bedrijf aan het individueel functioneren van vrouwen (als resultaat van hun economische empowerment). Ten eerste is een GAIB-model een bedrijfsmodel dat in zijn korte waardeketen rekening houdt met genderongelijkheid en de inclusie van mensen met weinig middelen, ingebed in een bottom-up benadering van zakendoen. Een dergelijk model plaatst menselijke waardigheid centraal in de bedrijfsvoering en beschouwt de andere actoren als complementair en niet als concurrentie. Ten tweede zijn alle belanghebbenden (maatschappelijke organisaties (CSOs), niet-gouvernementele organisaties (NGOs), financieringsprogramma's of programma's voor het koppelen van bedrijven, bedrijven (mannen en vrouwen), en de staat) bij een GAIB verantwoordelijk voor het behoud van de stedelijke zakelijke omgeving. Dit soort bedrijvigheid wordt (louter) gedreven door mensen uit de BoP, met name diegenen die betrokken zijn bij downstream-activiteiten in de

waardeketen. Omdat business-as-usual geen optie meer is, zijn multi-stakeholder partnerschappen (inclusief de maatschappelijke- en staatsorganisaties en de particuliere sector-coöperaties, kleine en middelgrote ondernemingen (SMEs), en grote bedrijven) nodig om een effectieve en succesvolle deelname van de armen in het bedrijfsleven te bereiken. Niet-genderbewuste conventionele bedrijfsmodellen bieden geen ruimte voor WSE. In multi-stakeholderpartnerschappen, kunnen mensen uit de BoP die geïnteresseerd zijn in deelname aan GAIB: (a) geïdentificeerd worden op basis van lokale armoedecriteria; (b) (zelf)georganiseerd worden onder een formele CSO (vereniging/groep) als producenten of verwerkers van lokaal voedsel; en (c) de CSO voorzien (door de staat, NGOs of particuliere sector) van een BoP-bevolking met de nodige activa om hun bedrijfsactiviteiten op te starten.

In de praktijk houdt GAIB in dat vrouwen en mannen op korte en middellange termijn zelf (of door de financiers van de bedrijfsactiviteiten) worden georganiseerd in afzonderlijke groepen op de horizontale knooppunten van de waardeketen (aangezien het verschil tussen mannen en vrouwen een sociaal feit is), terwijl op lange termijn wordt gewerkt aan de bewustmaking van mannen over de voordelen van het doorbreken van genderbarrières als gevolg van sociale en culturele normen. Dit vereist dat de mentaliteit van mannen als superieur aan vrouwen moet veranderen, mogelijk door sociale, culturele en religieuze informele instellingen te veranderen. Deze instellingen zijn zo machtig dat de formele instellingen (wetten) hier op korte termijn geen rekening mee kunnen houden. Het is een proces dat tijd vergt, en waarbij zowel vrouwelijke als mannelijke belanghebbenden betrokken moeten worden. De bevordering van succesvolle programma's zoals de 'school van modelechtgenoten', die vrouwen en hun echtgenoten helpen om de genderongelijkheid in huishoudens weg te werken, kan een concrete oplossing zijn. Daarna kunnen zowel vrouwen als mannen op horizontaal niveau in de stedelijke voedselwaardeketen samenwerken. Dit vereist een volledige deelname van de nationale en lokale autoriteiten en van maatschappelijke organisaties en NGOs. Verder is vroegtijdige scholing (voor jongens en meisjes), waarin het wegnemen van genderongelijkheid is geïntegreerd, een goede weg voor de volgende generaties.

In het hoofdstuk wordt geconcludeerd dat GAIB: a) de materiële of financiële voordelen voor vrouwen rechtstreeks verbetert door deel te nemen in deze bedrijven, en ook hun immateriële voordelen verbetert; b) de tijdsbesteding van vrouwen aan huishoudelijk (onbetaald) werk vermindert en aan betaald werk verhoogt; c) sociaal voordelig is omdat het kwaliteitsvoedsel levert aan de stedelijke gemeenschap; en d) dat meer dan 96% van de vrouwen in het bedrijf nog steeds overlevingsondernemers (WSE) zijn.

GAIB dragen bij aan de economische empowerment van vrouwen door: (a) de toename van hun middelen en agency in termen van materieel en niet-materieel welzijn; (b) individuele bedrijfsstrategieën en hoe deze strategieën bijdragen aan het vormgeven van hun middelen en agency; en (c) collectieve bedrijfsstrategieën van vrouwen, die soms identiek zijn aan hun individuele strategieën. Sommige vrouwengroepen hebben aanvullende strategieën, zoals het brandmerken van hun oogst (bijv. biologische voedselproductie) en het hebben van een gemeenschappelijk verkoopsysteem. Via deze bedrijfsstrategieën krijgen vrouwen momenteel toegang tot en vergroten zij hun individuele capaciteiten en menselijke, natuurlijke, financiële, sociale/ relationele en fysieke (bijv. ruimte) relaties. Via de samenwerkingsstrategie concurreren de vrouwen binnen een groep ook niet met elkaar en zorgen zij ervoor dat elk van hen tegen een goede prijs produceert en verkoopt. Dit draagt bij tot het vergroten van hun collectieve capaciteiten zoals vermogen (activa en relaties) en hun bestuursstelsel (agency). Met name het menselijk kapitaal (capaciteitsopbouw) is een centrale bepalende factor voor de verbetering van vrouwen hun hulpbronnen.

In deze dissertatie wordt geconcludeerd dat: (a) GAIB een model is dat gendergelijkheid kan bevorderen en mogelijk de verwezenlijking van SDG 5 kan ondersteunen; b) GAIB-strategieën vrouwen in staat zullen stellen hun bijdrage te leveren aan ontwikkeling, hen economisch en sociaal te empoweren en zo hun menselijk kapitaal effectiever in te zetten in lage-inkomenslanden; (c) GAIB is een model dat overheidssteun nodig heeft om in een samenleving ingang te vinden; d) die steun, inclusief beleidsmaatregelen ter vergroting van het menselijk kapitaal, zowel gericht op volwassenen als op jongeren en kinderen, alsmede beleidsmaatregelen ter vergroting van de toegang van vrouwen tot en hun controle over productiefactoren, zoals verbeterde zaden, technologieën, (organische) meststoffen, krediet en land, moeten worden gestimuleerd. Met name moeten hervormingen van het landrecht, die inclusief moeten zijn door duidelijk te maken hoe en waarom vrouwen gelijke rechten hebben wat betreft toegang tot en controle over land dat tot nu toe in de meeste lage-inkomenslanden (alleen) door mannen werd beheerst, beter worden bevorderd.

