Innovating to grow women’s businesses
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Female entrepreneurs in Sub-Saharan Africa have fewer alternatives to entrepreneurship than in other regions.

A very specific context: in Sub-Saharan Africa…

- Women Self-employment is higher, and wage employment is lower, than in any other region.
- Only region where women’s self-employment more common than their wage employment.

=> women’s entrepreneurial success is key (gender gap reduction, growth, poverty reduction).

(source: Hallward-Driemeier, 2013)
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In Sub-Saharan Africa, women represent half of non-farm business (higher than in any other region), but:

- Entrepreneurship opportunities lead to **very unequal earnings between women and men**

- Various factors but the **sector** in which the firm operates is consistently found to be a major determinant of gender-observed differences in performance and growth

- Large differences in sectoral choice among men and women, vast majority of **female entrepreneurs clustering in low value-added industries**

- **Forgone growth and potential poverty reduction**
Sector is important for earnings (Uganda, Campos et al. 2015)

- Saloons: $86
- Catering: $148
- Metal Fabrication: $296
- Electricals: $371
But there are women who defy the odds: crossovers

Today: 2 studies

• Ethiopia: Crossovers: Female Entrepreneurs Who Enter Male Sectors
• Uganda: Breaking the metal ceiling: female entrepreneurs who succeed in male-dominated sectors in Uganda
Crossing over is more profitable

Profits in the last month (USD) - Ethiopia

- Crossovers: 700 USD
- Non-crossovers: 100 USD
And when they crossover, they make the same as men

Comparison of Monthly profits in male dominated sectors: Males vs females

- Male: $217
- Female cross over: $221
Existing evidence suggests that sector segregation is NOT about

• **NOT about education**: crossovers and non-crossovers show similar education levels.

• **Not about cognitive and non-cognitive skills**: crossovers and non-crossovers show similar level of scores such as digit span, Raven test, self efficacy, achievement striving, impulsiveness, passion for work, tenacity, locus of control…

• **Not about financial constraint**: in Uganda evidence suggests that sector choice is not driven by capital requirement
Existing evidence suggests that sector segregation is driven among other factors by:

- **Information**: in Ethiopia, more than 70% of non-crossovers believe they would make the same or less than the average crossover profits.

- **Psycho-social factors:**
  - A woman’s *first job* matters with path dependence.
  - *Parental occupation* impact positively effects for wage work but not farms.
  - **Male mentorship**
    - Crossovers are *twice* as likely to have a male role model compared to non-crossovers.
    - Crossovers are *3.5 times* more likely to be introduced to their sector by their father or other male family member.
    - Non-crossovers are *15 times* more likely to be introduced to their sector by their teachers.
Policy: What can be done about it?

2 innovation avenues

• **Start young**
  – Train teachers so that they stop sending girls to be caterers and boys to be carpenters
  – Technical and vocational training encouraging switching (e.g. success of “Lady Mechanics”)
  – Apprenticeship programs that provide incentives for girls to switch and build in the right kind of mentors

• **Information and mentoring**
  – Inform (at schools and for adults) about earnings differential between sectors
  – Mentoring and training bringing right set of skills and information to help open up the occupational space
1. Sector gender segregation matters

2. *Not business as usual business training*

3. Businesses registration, with a critical twist
It’s not encouraging (McKenzie and Woodruff (2014))…

- **Some positive impact on firm survival, business practices and revenues, but little not on profits**

- **Entrepreneurs learn the skills** they are taught and apply them, **but not an overwhelming response in terms of profits**

Questions:
- Are we **targeting the wrong people?**
- Are we **teaching the wrong skills?**
- Does training **need to be complemented with something else?** (e.g. finance?)
The wrong skills: evidence from Togo

The program (Campos et. al. 2017)

- **Personal initiative training** compared to a more standard business training (Business Edge)
- Personal initiative training comes from **business psychology** and focuses on how to think like an entrepreneur:
  - Goal setting
  - Planning and implementation
  - Overcoming obstacles
  - Future and action orientation
  - Being self-starting
E.g. training modules on finance:

**Standard Training**
- How to keep financial records
- The types of products banks offer
- What is needed for a loan

**Personal Initiative Training**
- Identify and approach unusual sources of money (self-starting)
- Do boot-strapping in order to not rely on external funding in the long term (future oriented)
- Don’t give up when you face financial problems but develop multiple plan Bs (persistence)
The wrong skills: evidence from Togo

Results: monthly profits

- PI training increased profits by US$60 per month

Bar chart showing:
- Personal Initiative Training
- Traditional Business Training
- Difference between the two trainings
For women the personal initiative training dominates

- Lead to **significantly higher innovation** (relative to Business Edge and the controls), particularly in **products**
- Significantly **higher use of credit**: Entrepreneurs are borrowing much higher amounts
- Significantly **higher investment**
- **Increase** in the **number of employees**
- **Higher sales and revenues**…and **profits**
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• WB Doing Business: “Informality comes at a cost: firms in the informal sector typically grow more slowly, have poorer access to credit and employ fewer workers.”

• One view (de Soto, 1989): informal firm owners would like to be formal, but costly regulations and bureaucracy prevent them from doing so. Under this view, policymakers should make formalization process cheaper and easier.

• An alternative view (Maloney, 2004): informal firms rationally opt out of the formal sector since they perceive little benefits from becoming formal.
Existing evidence not terribly encouraging:

- **Sri Lanka** (de Mel et. al. 2012): **no one registers when free**, but they might if you pay them to
- **Brazil** (Andrade et. al. 2016): **no impact of one-stop shops**
- **Bangladesh** (de Giorgi and Rahman 2013): **no impact of information campaign**
- Evidence from **Peru** (Alcázar et al. 2010 and Jaramillo 2009) and **Benin** (Benhassine et. al. 2017) shows **limited (less than 25%)** registration when **costs are covered**
Randomized experiment with 4 groups

- **Control group**

- **Treatment group 1**: assigned to receive *costless registration for the business registration certificate (BRC)*

- **Treatment group 2**: assigned to receive *costless registration for BRC, as well as for a tax-payer identification number (BRC+TPIN)*

- **Treatment group 3**: assigned to received *costless registration for BRC, along with an invitation to information session with a bank where business bank accounts are offered (BRC+IS+BBA)*
Impact on registration

Women registered less (esp with TPIN) mostly because their businesses closed
And with bank accounts came financial services

- **BRC and BRC + TPIN:** no significant effect for these indicators
- **But for the BRC + IS + BBA:**
  - Amount that the business can borrow: + 16%
  - **Amount borrowed:** + 24%
  - Has **insurance for business:** + 877% (from 1 to over 8%)
  - Does not take business money for the household: + 20%
Effects on Business Outcomes

BRC + IS + BBA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% inc.</th>
<th>sales</th>
<th>profits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>men</td>
<td>women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BRC and BRC + TPIN – no significant impacts
There is a strong need to grow women’s businesses in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Here we discussed some constraints and innovations to relax them:

- The effect of **lack of information and psycho-social factors** on **sector gender segregation**

- The **need to innovate on businesses training** (not business as usual, but rather relying on **psychological mechanisms that enhance personal initiative**)

- The need for **financial inclusion add-on to business registration intervention**