



Envisioning female entrepreneur: leaders anew from a gender perspective

Envisioning
female
entrepreneur

395

Nicola Patterson, Sharon Mavin and Jane Turner

Newcastle Business School, Northumbria University, Newcastle-Upon-Tyne, UK

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to explore the convergence of female entrepreneurship, women in management and leadership fields from a gender perspective to bring a gender consciousness to the development and construction of the emerging entrepreneurial leadership theory base.

Design/methodology/approach – A conceptual paper that argues for the convergence of the entrepreneurship and leadership fields to enable an interchange of ideas, and learn from the developments within each field from a gender perspective. Whilst scholars have recently begun to explore the concept of entrepreneurial leadership, these early developments have remained gender blind, gender defensive and gender neutral.

Findings – A central argument is that female entrepreneur leader's experience social role incongruity. In order to be perceived by their followers as credible and legitimate entrepreneurial leaders, women are expected to manage their dual presence across the symbolic spaces of femininity and masculinity, doing gender well and doing gender differently to meet social role expectations of being a woman, whilst also meeting dominant masculine constructions of leadership and entrepreneurship.

Practical implications – This paper extends understandings of entrepreneurial leadership, highlighting the importance of foregrounding gender, to make visible and integrate the historical developments of gender within the entrepreneurship and leadership fields. Both scholars and practitioners must “unlearn” and “rethink” our learnt state of being in relation to gender, leadership and entrepreneurship in order to move beyond the “given” and disrupt masculinities' hierarchical superiority.

Originality/value – The paper argues that blends of agentic and communal behaviours must be recognized as accessible to both women and men for effective entrepreneurial leadership. This will provide female entrepreneurial leaders the fluidity to do both and be something else as a person. Offering understandings of gender to extant gender blind, gender neutral and gender defensive constructions of entrepreneurial leadership will progress understandings of the framework emerging from this conceptualization.

Keywords Women, Gender, Entrepreneurship, Leadership, Entrepreneurial leadership, Entrepreneurialism

Paper type Conceptual paper

1. Introduction

Leadership and entrepreneurship studies have both been constructed against a masculine backdrop of patriarchy (Bryans and Mavin, 2003) enabling masculine hierarchical superiority to flourish (Knights and Kerfoot, 2004). Whilst, both fields have retained their independence from one another, more recent studies have begun to explore the nexus of the two fields (Cogliser and Brigham, 2004; Vecchio, 2003), but have neglected to consider this from a gender perspective.

The authors would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments and feedback.



Gender in Management: An
International Journal
Vol. 27 No. 6, 2012
pp. 395-416

© Emerald Group Publishing Limited
1754-2413
DOI 10.1108/17542411211269338

It is the central tenet of this paper that future research exploring the convergence of the two fields should learn from the gendered pitfalls of the female entrepreneurship, women in management and leadership fields. Furthermore, in so doing it will enable an interchange of ideas across theory bases from a gender perspective. The need for a greater gender consciousness has been highlighted in both the gender in management and female entrepreneurship fields. In their review of gender in management research over the past 25 years, Broadbridge and Simpson (2011) call for greater focus on studies which explore gendered hierarchies and constructions which have become accepted. A similar call is made within the female entrepreneurship literature base by Orser *et al.* (2011). They highlight the need for further studies of entrepreneurship which question gendered assumptions, rather than continue to focus on sex differences (Klyver, 2011). Consequently, exploring the nexus of entrepreneurship and leadership from a gender perspective may enable an exchange of ideas across disciplines which could support further developments.

The aim of this conceptual study is to extend Cogliser and Brigham's (2004) comparative work on entrepreneurship and leadership by exploring the convergence of the female entrepreneurship, women in management and leadership literatures from a gender perspective, to bring a gender consciousness to the development and construction of the emerging entrepreneurial leadership theory base. This paper will therefore make a contribution to the emerging entrepreneurial leadership discipline by identifying the gendered historical and cultural progression of both the entrepreneurship and leadership fields and highlighting the need to be cognizant of the potential gendered construction of entrepreneurial leadership as a result of the fields' convergence. Furthermore, this paper responds to both Broadbridge and Simpson's (2011) and Orser *et al.*'s (2011) calls by critiquing current constructions of leadership and entrepreneurship from a gender perspective, to understand how gendered language has permeated constructions of entrepreneurial leadership providing a gender consciousness to this developing area.

This paper commences with a consideration of patriarchy and gender which frame this paper and provide understandings of the gendered nature of organizations. Masculine constructions of leadership and entrepreneurship are delineated, respectively, highlighting the complexities women must contend with in order to meet gender social role expectations and their leader role expectations. This is followed by a discussion of the appropriateness of converging the two fields to foreground gender, in order to disrupt masculine hierarchical superiority within the early entrepreneurial leadership which are recognised to be gender blind, gender defensive and gender neutral. Conceptual developments from a gender perspective are positioned to challenge our deeply held assumptions and conceptions of gender and consequent gendered interpretations before outlining areas for future research.

2. Patriarchy, gender and organizations

Understandings of patriarchy and gender are outlined to provide the backcloth to this paper and ground this study within mainstream sociological research on gender. Exploring the leadership experiences of female entrepreneurs through the concepts of patriarchy and gender enables greater socio-cultural understandings, which have remained relatively absent in both the leadership (Kelan, 2008) and entrepreneurship (Hurley, 1999; Ahl, 2006) literatures.

Patriarchy is a pervasive analytical category which is enmeshed within all social processes (Walby, 1989; Butler, 1990; Nicolson, 1996; Thornley and Thörnqvist, 2009) providing an understanding of gender relations which positions men as legitimate and natural figures of authority, enabling male supremacy at a societal and organizational level to flourish (Simpson and Lewis, 2005). Subsequently, the social order dictates that women are subordinated to men (Butler, 2004; de Beauvoir, 1988) which is in turn reflected in organizational structures (Katila and Merilainen, 1999). This understanding of patriarchy provides a background to everyday lives and the background to this paper.

Gender is understood to be socially constructed (Fonow and Cook, 1991; Bruni *et al.*, 2004a; Jackson and Scott, 2002; Lorber and Farrell, 1991; Butler, 1990), a product of historic, social and cultural meanings (Jackson and Scott, 2002; Gherardi, 1994). It is understood to provide “socially produced distinctions between male and female, masculine and feminine” (Acker, 1992, p. 250; Simpson and Lewis, 2005; Ahl, 2006). Masculinities and femininities are “forms of subjectivities [...] that are present in all persons, men as well as women” (Alvesson and Due Billing, 1997, p. 85) (Table I). As subjectivities they “offer an alternative to the variable-orientated fixation on ‘men’ and ‘women’ using the bodies as a firm criterion for classification” (Alvesson and Due Billing, 1997, p. 82), thus enabling social flux to allow both women and men to continuously enter spaces of masculinity and femininity as they maintain a dual presence (Gherardi, 1994). The concept of “doing gender”, as social practices and processes which are interpreted as masculine or feminine expressions, is useful in distinguishing between socially constructed gender and biological sex (West and Zimmerman, 1987; Deutsch, 2007). However, as West and Zimmerman (1987), Messerschmidt (2009) and Mavin and Grandy (2011) argue, an individuals’ gender is not interpreted without account for their body.

Against a backdrop of patriarchy, women and men are interpreted through socio-cultural scripts of what is deemed appropriate characteristics and behaviours for either sex (Eagly and Karau, 2002); consequently, sex categorization is an intrinsic and unavoidable consideration within gender construction. Messerschmidt (2009) highlights doing gender’s neglect of “sex category” as an explicit element of “doing gender”. Messerschmidt (2009, p. 86) asserts that the congruence society attributes to sex and gender has resulted in the categories becoming “indistinguishable”, failing to address how “both sex category and gender behaviour are socially constructed in and through the body” (Messerschmidt, 2009, p. 88). The body cannot be ignored when considering

Masculinities (Bem, 1981; Hines, 1992)	Femininities (Bem, 1981; Grant, 1988; Marshall, 1993)
Hard	Empathetic
Dry	Compassionate
Impersonal	Nurturing
Objective	Cooperative
Explicit	Acceptance
Action-orientated	Emotional
Outer focused	Helpful
Analytical	Shy
Aggressive	Sensitive
Dominant	Soft spoken
Forceful	Understanding
Assertive	Warm

Table I.
Masculinities and
femininities

gender as it is invariably enmeshed in the doing of gender (Messerschmidt, 2009). Women who behave in a masculine way create incongruity with their socially perceived female body, therefore, their behaviour is devalued (Messerschmidt, 2009). Doing gender must be understood as “experienced in and through the body” (Messerschmidt, 2009, p. 87). However, socio-cultural understandings of gender being biologically determined have extended into organizations, shaping job role expectations, resulting in automatic recognition of gender stereotypes within organizations (Powell *et al.*, 2008).

Organizational processes and practices that embody the attributes which society most commonly associates with one sex over another, are referred to as gendered as they “reflect and reinforce prevailing conceptions of masculinity and femininity” (Maier, 1999, p. 71). Such gendered understandings place social role expectations for women and men to behave in accordance with the accepted norms and expectations of their sex distributed in such a way that men are positioned as the breadwinner and women as the homemaker (Eagly *et al.*, 2000). Women are aligned with domestic/unpaid labour associated with femininity and still take primary responsibility for family life (Eagly and Carli, 2007). Leadership is not synonymous with family life as its demands prohibit career progression and reduce women’s earning power, leaving women with less time for out of hours socializing, networking and corporate entertaining demanded by senior roles – constructing the “female disadvantage” (Eagly and Carli, 2007). Waged labour is therefore incongruent with gender social expectations of femininity and subsequent understandings of behavioural expectations of being a woman. The manifestation of doing gender at work is evidenced in Ford’s (2006) empirical study exploring senior manager experiences in a UK local council. Her research highlights a “macho-management discourse” which demonstrates masculine models of leadership not only remain a significant part of leadership, but are continually valued over more feminine expressions to define effective leadership. This is illustrated in participants depictions of the need for rational, individualistic, process driven, and competitive approaches (Ford, 2006). The pervasiveness of patriarchy can also be seen within entrepreneurship through Gupta *et al.*’s (2009) empirical study exploring the role of socially constructed gender stereotypes in entrepreneurship and their influence on men and women’s entrepreneurial intentions. Their study highlighted that both women and men positively associated masculinities with entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial intentions. Gupta *et al.*’s (2009, p. 413) call for further studies which “acknowledge the invisible masculinity of entrepreneurship that so profoundly influences [our] assumptions, variables, theoretical and measurement models and methodologies (Ahl, 2006)”.

Women at work are marginalized and disadvantaged (Martin, 2006) as the attributes most commonly associated with women are deemed ineffective (Schnurr, 2008) within organizations. Consequently, women and men have learnt to become leaders and entrepreneurs against the masculine backdrop of patriarchy (Bryans and Mavin, 2003), engaging in gender practices which support the structure of unequal power relations (Kerfoot and Knights, 1993). The paper now turns to discuss how patriarchal understandings and hierarchical superiority of masculinity has permeated the social construction of leadership and entrepreneurship.

3. Masculine construction of leadership

The paper builds on the understanding of patriarchy and gender which grounds our understandings of organizations, leadership and individual roles upon gendered expectations. Discourses of leadership, have reinforced male suitability and

effectiveness, normalizing masculinity and men (Calas and Smircich, 1996) making it difficult to separate leadership and men (Eagly and Carli, 2007). This has been sustained through developments within the field constructed by men, from male experiences (Elliott and Stead, 2008; Kelan, 2008; Ferrario, 1991). Leadership has been historically and culturally shaped by the symbolic universe of masculinity (Schnurr, 2008; Eagly and Carli, 2007, 2003; Eagly, 2007; Due Billing and Alvesson, 2000; Sinclair, 1998), as the language of masculinity and leadership have become so deeply intertwined they have become synonymous (Hearn and Parkin, 1988; Schnurr, 2008). Consequently, women learn to become leaders from a male backdrop (Bryans and Mavin, 2003; Elliott and Stead, 2008) as masculinities became the measure from which other social categories were evaluated (Due Billing and Alvesson, 2000). However, when women enter the symbolic space of leadership, their socially perceived sex category is incongruent with the gender behaviour expected within the leadership process. Women are cast as “intruders” in male territories (Gherardi, 1996), denying them the power and resources of the patriarchal state (Walby, 1989).

An example of the gendered construction of leadership is illustrated in Kumra and Vinnicombe’s (2008) study identifying whether the promotion to partner process within professional services in the UK was sex biased. The study found that women were deprived of opportunities due to existing male partners’ gendered assumptions that women’s husbands would be unwilling to relocate (Kumra and Vinnicombe, 2008). Kumra and Vinnicombe’s (2008) study highlights women’s hierarchical position as second and “Other” against a patriarchal backcloth as their domestic role as a wife is highlighted as a key factor in career progression decisions. The gendered construction reaffirms the understanding that leadership is not synonymous with family life as its demands prohibit career progression and reduce women’s earning power. Such gendered understandings have had an adverse effect on the number of women entering leadership positions (Due Billing and Alvesson, 2000). Women, therefore, remain an underrepresented group within the upper echelons of organizations in both public and private sectors which Elliott and Stead (2008) assert requires further empirical research to understand women’s experiences and practices of leadership.

Eagly and Carli (2007, 2008) construct an agentic and communal leadership framework (Table II), illustrating our gendered evaluations of leadership performance (Mavin, 2009b) with respect to leadership role expectations for women and men. Eagly and Carli (2007) contend that agentic behaviour, such as aggression, competitiveness, control and task focus is congenial to men. Whilst women are associated with communal behaviour portrayed through concern for others in their affectionate, friendly and compassionate behaviour (Eagly and Carli, 2008).

Through such an understanding, both women and men are sex-role stereotyped; women to communal behaviours and men to agentic behaviours. Agentic leadership behaviours are portrayed positively when demonstrated by men, but when demonstrated by women our assumptions are challenged, leading to negative behavioural perceptions (Schnurr, 2008; Mavin, 2009a,b). Attributes such as assertiveness and task focus, do not fit with stereotypical understandings of women and make us feel uncomfortable (Mavin, 2009b). Women are labeled bitches, battle axes (Mavin, 2009a) increasing their visibility (Simpson and Lewis, 2005) further as they are marked out as different as a result of their social role incongruity (Eagly, 2005). Mavin (2009a) suggests that this gendered labeling of women behaving in masculine ways recategorizes women who challenge the established

GM 27,6 400	Agentic	Communal
	Aggressive	Supportive
	Determined	Interpersonal
	Competitive	Empathetic
	Driven	Friendly
	Ambitious	Sensitive
	Tough	Compassionate
	Independent	Kind
	Task focused	Helpful
	Political	Gentle
	Controlled	Affectionate
	Self reliant	Sympathetic

Table II.
Agentic and communal
behaviours

Source: Adapted from Eagly and Carli (2007)

gendered social order, as a form of resistance in response to their attempts to join men at the top of the gender hierarchy which emphasizes their deviance as they do gender differently (Mavin and Grandy, 2011).

Eagly and Carli (2007, p. 67) highlight the difficulty for women “to pull off such a transformation while maintaining a sense of authenticity as a leader”. Whilst it may be difficult for some women to remain authentic within the constraints of the double bind (Eagly and Carli, 2007), it is not as transformative for other women as they feel comfortable to behave in both masculine and feminine ways. This understanding perpetuates essentialist notions of women and men, disregarding our understanding of gender in constant social flux (Due Billing and Alvesson, 2000). Whilst for some women behaving in a masculine way requires a behavioural shift, for others behaving in a masculine way is comfortable (Mavin, 2009a) and highlights more about others’ gendered interpretations. However, this crossing of the symbolic space of gender could potentially marginalize women further, and cast them as an “outgroup” member (Powell *et al.*, 2008) as they do not legitimately occupy masculine space.

Even women who behave in an agentic way and succeed in their leadership role find their competence and performance questioned and devalued (Eagly and Karau, 2002). Acker (1992) research of political candidates illustrates this gendered complexity, as the women in their study are expected to live up to stereotypical expectations of being a political leader and a woman. Political candidates are expected to engage in self-promoting activities to increase public opinions of competence. In satisfying their political role, they risk social rejection and likeability (Bligh and Kohles, 2008) as their gender behaviour is incongruent to their socially perceived sex category. Women political candidates, therefore, must contend with the need to satisfy voters that they are masculine enough to convey the appropriate political strengths and not too feminine to ensure the political strengths are sustained without losing their identity as a woman (Bligh and Kohles, 2008).

Women are therefore faced with the dilemma of behaving in perceived communal ways to satisfy the gender social role expectations of being a women and behaving agentially to be perceived as a legitimate leader. With the gender binary as a frame of reference, women leaders either challenge our gendered assumptions by behaving in an agentic way to meet leadership expectations and are labeled with terms such as

“bitches”, or they conform to the gender social role expectations of being a woman and behave in a communal way but fail to live up to leadership expectations and are, therefore, labeled ineffective and “babeled” (Mavin, 2009a,b). These derogatory labels “babes” and “bitches” illustrate a lack of gender fluidity (Bryans and Mavin, 2003) and create another binary from which to reference women’s behaviour. This review of the literature has highlighted how women fail to simultaneously satisfy the social role expectations of being a leader and expectations of being a woman and therefore deviate from the norm (Schnurr, 2008).

The richness and complexity of our lives encourage us to cross symbolic borders and do gender differently (Mavin and Grandy, 2011). The double bind presents women leaders with the challenge of wrestling with meeting extreme expectations in binary opposition in order to develop a style that balances their expected gender identity and effective leadership behaviours expected by women and agentic behaviours expected of leaders (Eagly and Carli, 2007; Schnurr, 2008). To sacrifice either communal or agentic behaviours, women risk being perceived as unfeminine or ineffective leaders (Schnurr, 2008). More recent research by Mavin and Grandy (2011) offer conceptions of doing gender well and doing gender differently through exaggerated, multiple and simultaneous enactments of masculinity and femininity to empirically explore how exotic dancers do gender and manage the stigma of their identify construction. In doing so, Mavin and Grandy (2011) problematize the masculinity/femininity binary as they present doing gender as complex and fluid. They assert that this provides the opportunity for multiple and simultaneous enactments of masculinity and femininity to unsettle gendered assumptions in organizations. Applying this gender consciousness in the development of the entrepreneurial leadership field will highlight and progress understandings of gender complexities.

Given the above discussion on the masculine hegemony within the leadership field, the paper moves to identify the parallels between leadership and entrepreneurship from a gender perspective, as masculine constructions of entrepreneurship are discussed next.

4. Masculine construction of entrepreneurship

Analysing entrepreneurship from a gender perspective highlights the dominance of masculinity as a result of the field’s economic roots, predominance of comparative studies; and the linguistic practices that have created truth effects (Kelan, 2008) to sustain masculinity hegemony.

The entrepreneurship field began to gain pace and develop from the early twentieth century when economists (Knight, 1921; Schumpeter, 1934) began to focus their attention on the area (Hébert and Link, 1988; Bruni *et al.*, 2004b). Hence, economics has significantly shaped the discourse of entrepreneurship and small business research (Hébert and Link, 1988), with contemporary studies and public policy still driven by an economic logic (Fenwick, 2002). Consequently, this economic reliance has led research to focus on growth, profit, firm size (Fenwick, 2002; Patterson and Mavin, 2009) and the field adopting economics’ accepted objectivist – masculine – ontology; gendering studies of entrepreneurship (Ahl, 2006).

Within the masculine economic construction of entrepreneurship, a non-growth orientation is deemed to be non-entrepreneurial and labeled inferior, “trundler,” “mice,” “failure” and is therefore devalued (Lewis, 2006). Both women and men entrepreneurs are

orientated to start and run small and stable businesses (Lewis, 2006), with Watson's (2002) study highlighting no performance differences between male and female businesses which have the same input. However, as Lewis (2006, p. 456) contends "the fact that many small and stable businesses are run by men" and their performance output is the same as women who began their businesses with comparable inputs, is underplayed therefore a lack of growth potential or desire is positioned as women's problem rather than a wider socio-cultural structural problem (Bruni *et al.*, 2007). Consequently, this understanding has resulted in "all men get to be free riders on their few growth orientated fellow businessmen in these texts while the women are marked out as non-grower" (Ahl, 2002, p. 58), coined as the "female under-performance hypothesis" (Marlow *et al.*, 2009).

In Ahl's (2006) discourse analysis of 81 research articles on female entrepreneurship from 1982 to 2000[1], 65 per cent of the articles justified the importance of their studies based on an economic growth rationale, with just 8 per cent drawing upon the under-developed (Marlow *et al.*, 2009) gendered nature of research. This highlights the precedence placed on performance and growth issues, with the neglect of gender and the consequential power relations of this social order. Such an emphasis on economic growth has resulted in the field suffering as a result of this unquestioned positivist stance (Blackburn and Kovalainen, 2009). As Due Billing and Alvesson (2000, p. 145) assert "statistics are always unreliable and frequently say more about norms of classification than about reality". Linguistic practices that we engage with have created and serve to perpetuate truth effects (Kelan, 2008) in relation to normalizing masculinity within the entrepreneurship field.

The language used to describe concepts of "entrepreneur" and "entrepreneurship" are symptomatic of their masculine roots (Bruni *et al.*, 2004a, 2005; Patterson and Mavin, 2009) (e.g. strong willed, energetic, active, visionary, daring, courageous, risk taking, driven and achievement orientated). Over time the reproduction of such linguistic practices are powerful, creating truth effects (Kelan, 2008) that sustain the masculine hegemony bestowing entrepreneurial legitimacy to men. Bruni *et al.*'s (2004a) ethnographic study of a women owned production company and male owned gay and lesbian magazine highlighted how both the women and men within their study performed expressions of masculinity to align with the masculine discourse of entrepreneurship.

This is reflected in Ahl's (2006) key research paper on the discourse analysis of 81 female entrepreneurship articles which highlights the predominance of the masculine language drawn on to construct the field. Ahl (2006) mapped out the language used to describe the concepts of "entrepreneur" and "entrepreneurship" against Bem's (1981) masculinity and femininity index (see Table III comparing masculinity with "entrepreneur" and Table IV comparing femininity with "entrepreneur").

Words conveying masculinity had greater alignment and were positioned as credible when associated with entrepreneur (Table III). There was great disparity between the words used in the articles to describe an entrepreneur and words of femininity (Table IV). Ahl (2006) noted that words depicting femininity are positioned conversely to the words drawn upon to construct an entrepreneur. Furthermore, she conducted the same analysis for entrepreneurship, with positive connotations attached to language constructed on masculine terms fostering change and improvement. Masculine notions of aggression, ambition, and competitiveness are aligned positively with entrepreneurship and are not associated with femininity and women (Marlow, 2006) demonstrating the gendered construction. Thus, masculinity and men are permitted the luxury of invisibility and all

Bem's masculinity words	Words used to describe an entrepreneur
Self reliant	Self centred, internal <i>locus</i> of control, self efficacious, mentally free, able
Defends own beliefs	Strong willed
Assertive	Able to withstand opposition
Strong personality	Resolute, firm in temper
Forceful, athletic	Unusually energetic, capacity for sustained effort, active
Has leadership abilities	Skilled at organizing visionary
Willing to take risks	Seeks difficulty, optimistic, daring, courageous
Makes decisions easily	Decisive in spite of uncertainty
Self-sufficient	Independent and detached
Dominant, aggressive	Influential, seeks power, wants a private kingdom and a dynasty
Willing to take a stand	Stick to a course
Act as a leader	Leading economic and moral progress, pilot of industrialism, manager
Individualistic	Detached
Competitive	Wants to fight and conquer, wants to prove superiority
Ambitious	Achievement orientated
Independent	Independent, mentally free
Analytical	Exercising sound judgement, superior business talent, foresighted, astute, perceptive, intelligent

Source: Taken from Ahl (2006)

Table III.
Highlighting the alignment of Bem's words of masculinity and words used to describe an entrepreneur

Bem's femininity words	Opposite words used to describe entrepreneurs
Gentle	Cautious
Loyal	Follower dependent
Sensitive to the needs of others	Selfless, connected
Shy	Cowardly
Yielding	Yielding, no need to put a mark on the world, subordinate, passenger, irresolute, following, weak, wavering, external <i>locus</i> on control, fatalist, wishy-washy, uncommitted, avoids power, avoids struggle and competition, self doubting, no need to prove oneself
Gullible	Gullible, blind, shortsighted, impressionable, making bad judgements, unable, mentally constrained, stupid, disorganized, chaotic, lack of business talent, moody
Sympathetic, affectionate, understanding, warm, compassionate, eager to soothe hurt feelings, soft spoken, tender, loves children, does not use harsh language, cheerful, childlike, flatterable	No match

Source: Taken from Ahl (2006)

Table IV.
Highlighting words of femininity from Bem are direct opposites of the words used to describe an entrepreneur

that is non-masculine is cast as the “other” and becomes visible (Bruni *et al.*, 2004a; Simpson and Lewis, 2005). Consequently, the invisibility of masculinity within entrepreneurial activities (Lewis, 2006) has enabled entrepreneur and men to become interchangeable terms (Ahl, 2002; Bruni *et al.*, 2004a, b), with many early studies even using the male pronoun (Ahl, 2006) perpetuating the dominant discourse “think entrepreneur”, “think male” (Marlow *et al.*, 2009). Women are, therefore, marked out by having the pre-fix “female” or “woman” in front of the word entrepreneur, thus highlighting their difference from the normative conception of men and masculinity from which their behaviour is measured (Lewis, 2006).

Language of masculinity commonly drawn upon to describe entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship is an important gender practice, signifying ideals and accepted understandings (Martin, 2006). Through the gendered language of entrepreneurship women are “portrayed as the interloper” (Shaw *et al.*, 2009, p. 28) within the field, in a similar vein as Gherardi’s (1994) description of women as travellers within management. Entrepreneurship and small business research’s gendered understandings fail to separate sex category and gender behaviour, neglecting how “both sex category and gender behaviour are socially constructed in and through the body” (Messerschmidt, 2009, p. 88). Female entrepreneurs who behave in a masculine way or draw upon the language of masculinity create great incongruity with her socially perceived female body, jolting our assumptions (Mavin, 2009b) of what is deemed as suitable behaviour for women within their gender social role (Eagly, 1987; Eagly *et al.*, 2000). Their behaviour therefore disrupts the gender social order and is devalued (Messerschmidt, 2009).

The intertwined nature of masculinity and entrepreneurship has resulted in field becoming “malestreamed”, as the masculine norm is utilized as the “yardstick” (Mirchandani, 1999, p. 233) from which to measure the extent to which women demonstrate “successful” (masculine) entrepreneurial traits and behaviour (Mirchandani, 1999; Ahl, 2006; Lewis, 2006; Bruni *et al.*, 2004a,b). As Lewis (2006, p. 455) contends:

[...] members of a minority group such as women are therefore judged by and evaluated against a normative established by the majority group which is presented as the self-evident standard against which difference is measured.

Consequently, many sex comparison studies persist (Marlow *et al.*, 2009), charting psychological, trait and behavioural differences between male and female entrepreneurs (Ahl, 2006; Bruni *et al.*, 2007), measured typically through survey and interview methods (Mirchandani, 1999). Ahl (2006) notes in her study that 62 per cent of studies compared female entrepreneurs to male entrepreneurs. Bruni *et al.* (2007) review of the female entrepreneurship special editions of *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* also highlighted a similar position with 29 of the 52 articles sex comparison studies.

The simple inclusion of women through sex comparison studies within entrepreneurship studies has done little to challenge gendered historical and cultural conceptions of entrepreneur and entrepreneurship (Mirchandani, 1999). Instead they have focused on deriving sex specific personal attributes (Blackburn and Kovalainen, 2009) to emphasize the assumption that women and men entrepreneurs are essentially different (Ahl, 2006), labeling women underperformers (DuRietz and Henrekson, 2000), deemed to enter entrepreneurship with shortfalls and inadequacies (Ahl, 2006). The focus of comparative studies therefore remains on identifying women’s perceived

“shortfalls”, and differences to the assumed norm (men), in order to enable them to address and alleviate women’s entrepreneurial disadvantage to achieved “honourable man status” (Marlow and Patton, 2005, p. 722).

This position lacks theoretical grounding from a feminist perspective (Brush, 1992), ignoring historical, cultural and societal influences (Chell and Baines, 1998). As a result the power perspective implicit within such established structures is rendered invisible (Mirchandani, 1999; Ogbor, 2000) creating the perception that women have the power to liberate themselves from structural barriers through training, education and align themselves with appropriate networks (Mirchandani, 1999) emphasizing the need for them to become something different, to become more like men.

Consequently, comparative studies with the objective of constructing a framework capturing the way that women do business, prioritizes sex over other categories, with differences within sexes and over time and space (Ahl, 2006), continually under emphasized (Mirchandani, 1999; Lewis, 2009). By consolidating women’s diverse experiences into a category that represents all women, fails to capture women’s subjectivities and ignores the “messy” real life realities of female entrepreneurs (Bruni *et al.*, 2007). Sex comparisons have been and are useful in cultivating a space for gender and women’s issues to be constructed, however, over-emphasis of such studies risk perpetuating essentialist notions that women’s gender is biologically determined (Due Billing and Alvesson, 2000). This enables the male norm to remain unchallenged and the gender social order remains intact.

Both entrepreneurship and leadership have been constructed against a masculine backcloth (Bryans and Mavin, 2003) from which women and men have learned to become entrepreneurs and leaders. The gendered parallel drawn between the two fields is explored in the next section outlining the need for the convergence of the two fields to progress understandings of the fields.

5. Gender analysis converging entrepreneurship and leadership

Despite calls dating back to the mid-1980s to extend and overlap leadership within the small business context (Miller and Friesen, 1984; Gartner *et al.*, 1992), leadership within entrepreneurship has been a relatively neglected area (Daily *et al.*, 2002; Jensen and Luthans, 2006; Jones and Crompton, 2008). Entrepreneurship has generally been treated as a separate field of study from more mainstream organizational areas such as leadership (Vecchio, 2003; Cogliser and Brigham, 2004; Jensen and Luthans, 2006).

A number of parallels have been drawn between the two disciplines in relation to historical progression, i.e. focus traits or personality attributes (Vecchio, 2003; Cogliser and Brigham, 2004) and conceptual overlaps such as vision, influence, leading innovative/creative people and planning (Cogliser and Brigham, 2004). The identification of such parallels and overlaps has led to some recent developments in the convergence of the two fields (Jones and Crompton, 2008; Chen, 2007; Jensen and Luthans, 2006; Cogliser and Brigham, 2004; Gupta *et al.*, 2004; Vecchio, 2003; Daily *et al.*, 2002), however, none have analysed the nexus of leadership and entrepreneurship (Cogliser and Brigham, 2004) from a gender perspective.

Cogliser and Brigham’s (2004) study extends Gartner *et al.* (1992) proposal to integrate entrepreneurship and leadership by highlighting the conceptual overlap of the fields – vision, influence, leading innovative/creative people and planning. Vision is an established element within the leadership field particularly in relation to

charismatic, transformational, and visionary leadership but has been given less attention in the entrepreneurship field, notwithstanding its link to successful venture growth (Cogliser and Brigham, 2004; Baum *et al.*, 1998). Entrepreneurs are expected to create a vision that convinces stakeholders to follow and/or buy into a venture that may be high risk (Gupta *et al.*, 2004). Without the buy in of stakeholders entrepreneurs' visions may never be realised, highlighting the importance of others' perception within entrepreneurship or leadership. Consequently, the second identified theme influence is imperative within leadership and entrepreneurship to enlist the support and resources required to achieve the business objectives (Cogliser and Brigham, 2004). The third aspect, leading innovative and creative people, is related strongly to successful entrepreneurship, particularly in relation to idea generation but again places emphasis on others within this process. The fourth identified theme, planning, has been shown to positively influence high performance leadership in complex contexts.

The conceptual overlaps identified highlight the gendered foundations from which entrepreneurial leadership is developing. In recognising follower involvement and understanding entrepreneurial leadership as a social process, a gender perspective must be included to understand how women experience entrepreneurial leadership and furthermore how they are evaluated and interpreted in relation to their social role expectations.

The paper also considers where theoretical gender similarities can be drawn, focusing upon the key issues of eradication of difference, emphasis of difference and constructing an archetype for women before moving on to identify and analyse the parallels of the convergence from a gender perspective. The first similarity from a gender perspective across both fields is women's initial strategy to ascend to leadership and entrepreneurial positions as they strive for some level of acceptance by eradicating their difference (Hekman, 1997; Knights and Kerfoot, 2004). Within both the leadership and entrepreneurship literature women are called upon to become "honorary men" (Marlow *et al.*, 2009) and take on a metaphorical sex change. However, both fields fail to recognise that whilst for some women behaving in a masculine way requires a behavioural shift, for other women behaving in a masculine way is more comfortable (Mavin, 2009a) which further highlights the gendered expectations within the two fields.

Women in leadership literature has progressed from this initial strategy of eradication to an approach whereby feminine notions of leadership are accepted and valorised (Knights and Kerfoot, 2004), giving rise to a second coping strategy of emphasizing difference (Hekman, 1997; Knights and Kerfoot, 2004). This essentializes women, positioning them as the new leadership ideal (Kelan, 2008), which fails to disrupt the gender social order (Knights and Kerfoot, 2004). This is a strategy not yet conceptually or theoretically developed within the female entrepreneurship literature, however, the notion of the "entrepreneuse" (Skinner, 1987) has already been highlighted and promoted as a possible challenge to the established masculine construction of the entrepreneur.

The prominence of entrepreneurship sex comparative studies (Marlow *et al.*, 2009) outlining descriptive differences between the sexes could lead to the creation of an archetype profile of a woman entrepreneur (Mirchandani, 1999). Here, the female entrepreneur literature could learn from the pitfalls (Cogliser and Brigham, 2004) of the women in leadership literature. Within the female entrepreneurship literature, Marlow *et al.* (2009) recognise that continued gendered analysis within the female entrepreneurship will only ever enable partial understandings of women's entrepreneurial experiences. The women in leadership literature has progressed further, highlighting the harmful effects

of constructing an alternative feminine notion of leadership as a perpetuation of the gender dualism (Due Billing and Alvesson, 2000) which simply attempts to usurp traditional masculine constructions of leadership with feminine constructions, failing to move beyond the dominant gender binary (Knights and Kerfoot, 2004).

The identified overlap of female entrepreneurs and leaders attempting to eradicate their perceived difference adds to the overlaps identified by Cogliser and Brigham (2004) from a gender perspective. Discussing the historical progression of both the leadership and entrepreneurship fields from a gender perspective has highlighted the mistake made by the women in leadership literature in attempting to valorise a feminine form of leadership. The convergence of female entrepreneurship and women in leadership literatures, presents an opportunity to learn from the criticisms and mistakes of both fields.

6. Entrepreneurial leadership: a gendered construction

A number of scholars have begun to explore and offer their understandings of entrepreneurial leadership (Vecchio, 2003; Gupta *et al.*, 2004; Chen, 2007; Darling *et al.*, 2007; Kuratko, 2007). This section analyses the emerging field of entrepreneurial leadership to highlight the need for a gender consciousness to prevent gendered developments.

Darling *et al.* (2007) offer an understanding of entrepreneurial management leadership which they outline as encompassing: breaking new ground, going beyond the known and helping to create the future. They offer four strategies; attention through vision, meaning through communication, trust through positioning, and confidence through respect that they assert, can also be applied to small and large organizations. The central tenant of their construction is that the entrepreneurial leader should endeavour to foster an environment that is supportive and has the potential to develop associates to ensure they have the loyalty and commitment to continue working towards organizational achievement (Darling *et al.*, 2007).

Whilst Chen (2007) outlines entrepreneurial leadership as the creative response to new market opportunities through new business creation. Chen's (2007) empirical study of high-tech entrepreneurial teams within Taiwan aimed to develop entrepreneurial leadership by examining whether increased levels of entrepreneurial leadership generated higher levels of creativity amongst team members by measuring patent creation. Findings indicated that entrepreneurial leadership does stimulate entrepreneurial team members' creativity, however, Kuratko (2007) suggests this focus on business creation is limiting. He sees entrepreneurial leadership as a unique concept combining the identification of opportunities, risk taking beyond security and being resolute enough to follow ideas through.

Gupta *et al.*'s (2004) construction of entrepreneurial leadership goes further than most in outlining their understanding of the notion. They highlight the need to learn from the mistakes and historical progression of both leadership and entrepreneurship fields. They suggest that entrepreneurial leadership is the fusion of three concepts; entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial orientation and entrepreneurial management, with leadership enabling them to develop their own conceptualisation of entrepreneurial leadership as a process rather than individual attributes.

Their construction highlights two interrelated challenges in the process of entrepreneurial leadership: scenario enactment, in relation to how entrepreneur-leaders envisage and create scenarios to foster change; and cast enactment in relation to how

entrepreneur-leaders convince others to provide the required resources to fulfil the goals. Gupta *et al.*'s (2004) central premise of entrepreneurial leadership is that entrepreneur-leaders should be able to create visionary scenarios capable of mobilising a supporting cast to enact the vision. They delineate their two challenges further as they propose that scenario enactment requires the entrepreneur-leader to frame challenges, absorbing uncertainty and clear the way whilst the second challenge of cast enactment requires commitment building and specifying limits. From a gender perspective, the emergent construction of entrepreneurial leadership is ripe for attention and analysis. With the exception of an acknowledgment that diversity should be considered within the topic (Jones and Crompton, 2008), initial studies have remained gender blind, gender neutral or gender defensive.

When analysing the descriptions and words used by scholars constructing entrepreneurial leadership, the masculine hegemony from its two founding disciplines has clearly permeated into these early developments, seen in the significant emphasis placed on risk taking and innovation (Gupta *et al.*, 2004) (Table V). Drawing on Ahl's (2006) comparison of Bem's (1981) descriptions of masculinity to entrepreneurship (Table III) and Eagly and Carli's (2007) agentic and communal behaviour framework outlined in Section 4, Table V highlights the masculine prevalence across the two separate fields which has laid the foundations for the masculine construction of entrepreneurial leadership as scholars converge the two fields.

The table illustrates the flow from masculinity to entrepreneurship and leadership to lead into final descriptions of entrepreneurial leadership in the fourth column. The justification for the development of the area is based upon a masculine growth rationale (Jones and Crompton, 2008) conveying the importance of performance enhancement (Gupta *et al.*, 2004).

However, whilst masculinity is evident within Table V there were clearly masculinities noted by Bem (1981), entrepreneur descriptions from Ahl (2006) and agentic behaviours from Eagly and Carli (2007) that had not transpired within the entrepreneurial leadership construction, e.g. forceful, athletic, dominant, aggressive, individualistic and independent. Those noted which did not match the descriptions of entrepreneurship are those which are individualistic attributes that indicate little or no regard to others. This already indicates that early developments have begun to recognise the need to learn from the separate fields' mistakes and identified the need to move away from an individualistic focus, which is prevalent in earlier conceptions of leadership, and involve others.

Consequently, descriptions of entrepreneurial leadership begin to span both descriptions of masculinity and femininity and agentic and communal. For example, vision is identified within the framework (Gupta *et al.*, 2004; Darling *et al.*, 2007), which is a masculinity and agentic behaviour. However, for this vision to be successfully achieved this must be communicated in a way that motivates followers and employees to enact (Gupta *et al.*, 2004). Communicating and interpersonal skills are identified as femininities and communal behaviour within Table VI illustrating their recognition or acknowledgement within entrepreneurial leadership conceptualisations.

Whilst it is clear that femininities and communal behaviours do not have an equal weighting, the framework's recognition for the need for, and intertwined nature of both masculinities and femininities, agentic and communal behaviours, progresses both the separate fields of entrepreneurship and leadership from a gender perspective.

Bem's masculinity words (Ahl, 2006)	Word used to describe an entrepreneur (Ahl, 2006)	Agentic behaviours (Eagly and Carli, 2007)	Entrepreneurial leadership words
Defends own beliefs	Strong willed	Assertive	Being resolute to follow ideas through (Kuratko, 2007)
Assertive	Able to withstand opposition	Assertive	Being resolute to follow ideas through (Kuratko, 2007) Confidence through the respect that they assert (Darling <i>et al.</i> , 2007)
Strong personality	Resolute, firm in temper	Dominant	Being resolute to follow ideas through (Kuratko, 2007)
Act as a leader	Leading economic and moral progress, pilot of industrialism, manager	Controlling	Absorb uncertainty (Gupta <i>et al.</i> , 2004)
Has leadership abilities	Skilled at organizing visionary	No match	Attention through vision (Darling <i>et al.</i> , 2007)
Willing to take risks	Seeks difficulty, optimistic, daring, courageous	No match	Create visionary scenarios (Gupta <i>et al.</i> , 2004)
Makes decisions easily	Decisive in spite of uncertainty	Self confidence	Risk taking (Kuratko, 2007)
Ambitious	Achievement orientated	Ambition	Frames challenges (Gupta <i>et al.</i> , 2004)
Analytical	Exercising sound judgement, superior business talent, foresighted, astute, perceptive, intelligent	Analytical	Absorb uncertainty (Gupta <i>et al.</i> , 2004)
Willing to take a stand	Stick to a course	No match	Risk taking (Kuratko, 2007)
Forceful, athletic	Unusually energetic, capacity for sustained effort, active	Forceful	Creativity amongst team members by measuring patent creation (Chen, 2007)
Self-sufficient	Independent and detached	Self reliant	Identify opportunities (Kuratko, 2007)
Dominant, aggressive	Influent, seeks power, wants a private kingdom and a dynasty	Aggressive	Frame challenges (Gupta <i>et al.</i> , 2004)
Individualistic	Detached	Self reliant	Being resolute to follow ideas through (Kuratko, 2007)
Competitive	Wants to fight and conquer, wants to prove superiority	Competitive, driven	
Independent	Independent, mentally free	Independent	No match

Table V.
Masculine influence within entrepreneurship and leadership leading masculine construction of entrepreneurial leadership

Table VI.
Femininity and communal
link to entrepreneurial
leadership

Bem's femininity word's	Communal behaviours (Eagly and Carli, 2007)	Entrepreneurial leadership
Helpful	Supportive	Supportive (Darling <i>et al.</i> , 2007)
Soft spoken, does not use harsh language	Interpersonal	Communication (Jones and Crompton, 2008)
Friendly	Friendly	Meaning through communication (Darling <i>et al.</i> , 2007)
Sensitive to others needs	Sensitive	No match
Sympathetic	Sympathetic	
Warm	Kind	
Understanding	Empathetic	

It begins to recognise masculinities and femininities as subjectivities (Alvesson and Due Billing, 1997) legitimising the flux between the two symbolic spaces (Due Billing and Alvesson, 2000) without attempting to create alternative masculinities and femininities (Risman, 2009) which work within the given gender binary (Mavin, 2009b). However, such theoretical progression still fails to identify and explore the complexity of this process between entrepreneur-leaders and their followers from a gender perspective. Whilst the theoretical construct permits entrepreneur-leaders the social flux to move between the two symbolic spaces, followers may not. As Mavin (2009a,b) notes women displaying masculinities and behaving in an agentic manner jolts our assumptions as they are incongruent with our social role expectations of feminine women. Female entrepreneur-leader's legitimacy and credibility may come into question (Jeanes, 2007) as they display social role incongruity, an issue already well documented within the gender and women in leadership literature (Eagly, 2005; Mavin, 2009a,b). Further conceptual and empirical studies are required to explore how gender is experienced within entrepreneurial leadership to avoid "academic amnesia" (Sayles and Stewart, 1995) and learn from the pitfalls of leadership and entrepreneurship scholars.

7. Conclusion

This conceptual gender analysis of the masculine construction of both the entrepreneurship and leadership fields has highlighted the learning to be achieved by converging the two fields (Vecchio, 2003; Cogliser and Brigham, 2004). Recent developments of entrepreneurial leadership highlight how the predominance of masculine hegemony present in the founding disciplines of entrepreneurship and leadership have permeated this emerging field. However, critiquing early constructions of entrepreneurial leadership also illuminates some progression from the entrepreneurship and leadership fields. Entrepreneurial leadership recognises the need for both masculinities and femininities, agentic and communal behaviour. Whilst femininities and communal behaviours are still not equal to masculinities and agentic behaviour their very acknowledgement is progressive.

The inclusion of communal behaviour also progresses the entrepreneurial leadership field as it requires an acknowledgement of followers' involvement, emphasizing entrepreneurial leadership as a social process rather than an individualistic focus. Therefore, entrepreneurial leadership could be viewed as a useful framework to explore

women's experiences. Further research should empirically explore women's entrepreneurial leadership experiences from a gender perspective. Stories of gender experiences are required to increase visibility, challenge assumptions and highlight the gendered nature of within the entrepreneurial-leadership context. Identifying the harmful effects of gendering and gendered practice is a constructive step towards acceptance of a society that maintains equality without denying diversity. Scholars must therefore be cognizant to distinguish between sex category and gender behaviour (Messerschmidt, 2009) to understand the fluidity of femininities and masculinities (Due Billing and Alvesson, 2000). This paper therefore extends understandings of entrepreneurial leadership, highlighting the importance of foregrounding gender, to make visible and integrate the historical developments of gender within the entrepreneurship and leadership fields.

Both fields have experienced a dominance of positivist approaches which fail to acknowledge and explore gendered experiences and which reproduce the gendered social order (Bruni *et al.*, 2007). Alternative ontological and epistemological approaches from the dominant male epistemologies which have traditionally dominated the entrepreneurship and leadership fields will highlight the gendered nature of the field, and it is argued here, offer fresh insights and assist the emerging field of entrepreneurial leadership to develop a gender awareness. Future research is required to explore and understand the contextual sensitivity of women's historical, social and cultural location (Lewis, 2009; Mirchandani, 1999) by raising a gender consciousness which is currently not addressed in the emerging entrepreneurial leadership literature.

To progress studies of entrepreneurship and leadership from a gender perspective methodologically requires the implementation of "less" accepted qualitative methods to broaden methodological perspectives and develop gender understandings by further exploring how gender is done well and differently (Mavin and Grandy, 2011). Life histories, is a method not traditionally adopted within the entrepreneurship literature and discourse analysis would enable studies of the linguistic practices that have created truth effects (Kelan, 2008) which have contributed to the construction, reproduction and maintenance of masculine dominance across the leadership and entrepreneurship literatures. By remaining reflexively vigilant, gender analysis can make a significant contribution to the emerging field of entrepreneurial leadership by questioning gendered developments and highlights how gender is done well and differently (Mavin and Grandy, 2011) to envision female entrepreneur-leaders anew.

Note

1. Ahl (2006) reviewed articles from four leading entrepreneurship journals: *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *Journal of Business Venturing*, *The Journal of Small Business and Management*, and *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*.

References

- Acker, J. (1992), "From sex roles to gendered institutions", *Contemporary Sociology*, Vol. 2 No. 5, pp. 565-9.
- Ahl, H. (2002), "The construction of the entrepreneur as the other", in Czarniawska, B. and Höpfl, H. (Eds), *Casting the Other: The Production and Maintenance of Inequalities in Work Organizations*, Routledge, London, pp. 52-67.

- Ahl, H. (2006), "Why research on women entrepreneurs needs new directions", *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, Vol. 30 No. 5, pp. 595-621.
- Alvesson, M. and Due Billing, Y. (1997), *Understanding Gender and Organizations*, Sage, London.
- Baum, J.R., Locke, E.A. and Kirkpatrick, S.A. (1998), "A longitudinal study of the relation of vision and vision communication to venture growth", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 83, pp. 43-54.
- Bem, S. (1981), *Bem Sex-role Inventory*, Mind Garden, Palo Alto, CA.
- Blackburn, R. and Kovalainen, A. (2009), "Researching small firms and entrepreneurship: past, present and future", *International Journal of Management Review*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 127-48.
- Bligh, M.C. and Kohles, J.C. (2008), "Negotiating gender role expectations: rhetorical leadership and women in the US Senate", *Leadership*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 381-402.
- Broadbridge, R. and Simpson, R. (2011), "25 years on: reflecting on the past and looking to the future in gender and management research", *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 22, pp. 470-83.
- Bruni, A., Brush, C.G. and Welter, F. (2007), "Advancing a framework for coherent research on women's entrepreneurship", *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, May, pp. 323-39.
- Bruni, A., Gherardi, S. and Poggio, B. (2004a), "Doing gender, doing entrepreneurship: an ethnographic account of intertwined practices", *Gender, Work and Organization*, Vol. 11 No. 4, pp. 406-29.
- Bruni, A., Gherardi, S. and Poggio, B. (2004b), "Entrepreneur-mentality, gender and the study of women entrepreneurs", *Journal of Organisational Change Management*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 256-68.
- Bruni, A., Gherardi, S. and Poggio, B. (2005), *Gender and Entrepreneurship: An Ethnographic Approach*, Routledge, Abingdon.
- Brush, C.G. (1992), "Research on women business owners: past trends, a new perspective and future directions", *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 5-30.
- Bryans, P. and Mavin, S. (2003), "Women learning to become managers: learning to fit in or to play a different game?", *Management and Learning*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 111-34.
- Butler, J. (1990), *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, Routledge, London.
- Butler, J. (2004), *Undoing Gender*, Routledge, Abingdon.
- Calas, M. and Smircich, L. (1996), "From the woman's point of view: feminist approaches to organization studies", in Clegg, S., Hardy, C. and Nord, W.R. (Eds), *Handbook of Organization Studies*, Chapter 1.8, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Chell, E. and Baines, S. (1998), "Does gender affect business 'performance'? A study of microbusinesses in business services in the UK", *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 117-35.
- Chen, M.H. (2007), "Entrepreneurial leadership and new ventures: creativity in entrepreneurial teams", *Creativity and Innovation Management*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 239-49.
- Cogliser, C.C. and Brigham, K.H. (2004), "The intersection of leadership and entrepreneurship: mutual lessons to be learned", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 15, pp. 771-99.
- Daily, C.M., McDougall, P.P. and Covin, J.G. (2002), "Governance and strategic leadership in entrepreneurial firms", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 387-412.
- Darling, J., Gabriellson, M. and Seristo, H. (2007), "Enhancing contemporary entrepreneurship: a focus on management leadership", *European Business Review*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 4-21.
- de Beauvoir, S. (1988), *The Second Sex*, Pan, London.

- Deutsch, F.M. (2007), "Undoing gender", *Gender & Society*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 106-27.
- Due Billing, Y. and Alvesson, M. (2000), "Questioning the notion of feminine leadership: a critical perspective on the gender labelling of leadership", *Gender, Work and Organization*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 144-57.
- DuRietz, A. and Henrekson, M. (2000), "Testing the female underperformance hypothesis", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 1-10.
- Eagly, A.H. (1987), *Sex Differences in Social Behaviour: A Social-role Interpretation*, Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Eagly, A.H. (2005), "Achieving relational authenticity in leadership: does gender matter?", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 459-74.
- Eagly, A.H. (2007), "Female leadership advantage and disadvantage: resolving the contradictions", *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, Vol. 31, pp. 1-12.
- Eagly, A.H. and Carli, L.L. (2003), "The female advantage: an evaluation of the evidence", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 14, pp. 807-34.
- Eagly, A.H. and Carli, L.L. (2007), "Women and the labyrinth of leadership", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 85 No. 9, pp. 62-71.
- Eagly, A.H. and Carli, L.L. (2008), *Through the Labyrinth*, Harvard Business School, Boston, MA.
- Eagly, A.H. and Karau, S.J. (2002), "Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders", *Psychological Review*, Vol. 109, pp. 573-98.
- Eagly, A.H., Wood, W. and Diekmann, A. (2000), "Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: a current appraisal", in Eckes, T. and Trautner, H.M. (Eds), *The Developmental Social Psychology of Gender*, Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.
- Elliott, C. and Stead, V. (2008), "Learning from leading women's experience: towards a sociological understanding", *Leadership*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 159-81.
- Fenwick, T. (2002), "Transgressive desires: new enterprising selves in the new capitalism", *Work Employment and Society*, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 703-23.
- Ferrario, M. (1991), "Sex differences in leadership style: myth or reality", *Women in Management Review*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 16-21.
- Fonow, M. and Cook, J. (1991), *Beyond Methodology, Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research*, Indiana Press, Indianapolis, IN.
- Ford, J. (2006), "Discourses of leadership: gender, identity and contradiction in a UK public sector organization", *Leadership*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 77-99.
- Gartner, W.B., Bird, B.J. and Starr, J.A. (1992), "Acting as if: differentiating entrepreneurial from organizational behaviour", *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, pp. 13-31.
- Gherardi, S. (1994), "The gender we think the gender we do in our everyday organizational lives", *Human Relations*, Vol. 47 No. 6, pp. 591-610.
- Gherardi, S. (1996), "Gendered organizational cultures: narratives of women travellers in a male world", *Gender Work and Organizations*, Vol. 3 No. 4, pp. 187-201.
- Grant, J. (1988), "Women as managers: what they can offer to organizations?", *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 56-63.
- Gupta, V., MacMillan, I.C. and Surie, G. (2004), "Entrepreneurial leadership: developing and measuring a cross-cultural construct", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 241-60.
- Gupta, V.K., Turban, D.B., Arzu Wasti, S. and Sikar, A. (2009), "The role of gender stereotypes in perceptions of entrepreneurs and intentions to become entrepreneurs", *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 397-417.

- Hearn, J. and Parkin, P.W. (1988), "Women, men and leadership: a critical review of assumptions, practices and change in the industrialized nations", in Alder, N. and Izrali, D. (Eds), *Women in Management Worldwide*, M. E. Sharpe, Armonk, NY, pp. 17-40.
- Hébert, R.F. and Link, A.N. (1988), *The Entrepreneur: Mainstream Views and Radical Critiques*, Praeger Press, New York, NY.
- Hekman, S. (1997), "Truth and method: feminist standpoint theory revisited", *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 341-65.
- Hurley, A.E. (1999), "Incorporating feminist theories into sociological theories of entrepreneurship", *Women in Management Review*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 54-62.
- Jackson, S. and Scott, S. (2002), *Gender: A Sociological Reader*, Routledge, Abingdon.
- Jeanes, E.L. (2007), "The doing and undoing of gender: the importance of being a credible female victim", *Gender, Work and Organization*, Vol. 14 No. 6, pp. 552-71.
- Jensen, S. and Luthans, F. (2006), "Entrepreneurs as authentic leaders: impact on employee's attitudes", *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, Vol. 27 No. 8, pp. 646-66.
- Jones, O. and Crompton, H. (2008), "Entrepreneurial leadership and the management of small firms", *British Academy of Management Conference, The Majestic Hotel, Harrogate, Manchester Metropolitan University Business School, Manchester, 9-11 September*, pp. 1-22.
- Katila, S. and Merilainen, S. (1999), "Serious researcher or just another nice girl? Doing gender in a male dominated scientific community", *Gender, Work and Organization*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 163-73.
- Kelan, E.K. (2008), "The discursive construction of gender in contemporary management literature", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 81, pp. 427-45.
- Kerfoot, D. and Knights, D. (1993), "Management, masculinity and manipulation: from paternalism to corporate strategy in financial services in Britain", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 659-77.
- Klyver, K. (2011), "Gender differences in entrepreneurial networks: adding an alter perspective", *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 26 No. 5, pp. 332-50.
- Knight, F.H. (1921), *Risk, Uncertainty and Profit*, Augustus Kelley, New York, NY.
- Knights, D. and Kerfoot, D. (2004), "Between representations and subjectivity: gender binaries and the politics of organizational transformation", *Gender, Work and Organization*, Vol. 11 No. 4, pp. 430-54.
- Kumra, S. and Vinnicombe, S. (2008), "A study of the promotion to partner process in a professional service firm: how women are disadvantaged", *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 19, pp. 65-74.
- Kuratko, D.F. (2007), "Corporate entrepreneurship: foundations and trends", *Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 151-203.
- Lewis, P. (2006), "The quest for invisibility: female entrepreneurs and the masculine norm of entrepreneurship", *Gender, Work and Organization*, Vol. 13 No. 5, pp. 453-69.
- Lewis, P. (2009), "The search for authentic enterprise identity; difference and professionalism among women business owners", *British Academy of Management, Brighton Centre, Brighton, Kent Business School, Canterbury, 15-17 September*, pp. 1-15.
- Lorber, J. and Farrell, S.A. (1991), *The Social Construction of Gender*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA.
- Maier, M. (1999), "On the gendered substructure of organization: dimensions and dilemmas of corporate masculinity", in Powell, G.N. (Ed.), *The Handbook of Gender and Work*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA, pp. 69-94.

- Marlow, S. (2006), "Enterprising futures of dead-end jobs? Women, self employment and social exclusion", *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 27 No. 6, pp. 588-600.
- Marlow, S. and Patton, D. (2005), "All credit to men? Entrepreneurship, finance and gender", *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 29 No. 6, pp. 717-35.
- Marlow, S., Henry, C. and Carter, S. (2009), "Introduction: female entrepreneurship", *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 1-9, special edition.
- Martin, P.Y. (2006), "Practising gender at work: further thoughts on reflexivity", *Gender, Work and Organization*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 254-76.
- Mavin, S. (2009a), "Gender stereotypes: popular culture construction of women leaders", *Human Resource Development*, Newcastle Business School, Northumbria University, Newcastle, pp. 1-25, 10-12 June.
- Mavin, S. (2009b), "Navigating the labyrinth: senior women managing emotion", *Int. J. Work Organisation and Emotion*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 81-3.
- Mavin, S. and Grandy, G. (2011), "Doing gender well and differently in dirty work: the case of exotic dancers", *Gender, Work and Organization*, 4 August.
- Messerschmidt, J.W. (2009), "'Doing gender': the impact of a salient sociological concept", *Gender & Society*, Vol. 23 No. 1, pp. 85-8.
- Miller, D. and Friesen, P.H. (1984), *Organizations: A Quantum View*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Mirchandani, K. (1999), "Feminist insight on gendered work: new directions in research on women and entrepreneurship", *Gender, Work and Organization*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 224-35.
- Nicolson, P. (1996), *Gender, Power and Organization: A Psychological Perspective*, Routledge, London.
- Ogbor, J.O. (2000), "Mythicizing and reification in entrepreneurial discourse: ideology-critique of entrepreneurial studies", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 37 No. 5, pp. 605-35.
- Orser, B.J., Elliott, C. and Leck, J. (2011), "Feminist attributes and entrepreneurial identity", *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 26 No. 8.
- Patterson, N. and Mavin, S. (2009), "Women entrepreneurs: jumping the corporate ship and gaining new wings", *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 173-92.
- Powell, G.N., Butterfield, D.A. and Bartol, K.M. (2008), "Leader evaluations: a new female advantage?", *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 154-74.
- Risman, B.J. (2009), "From doing to undoing: gender as we know it", *Gender & Society*, Vol. 23 No. 1, pp. 81-4.
- Sayles, L.R. and Stewart, A. (1995), "Belated recognition for work-flow entrepreneurs: a case of selective perception and amnesia in management thought", *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 7-24.
- Schnurr, S. (2008), "Surviving in a man's world with a sense of humour: an analysis of women leaders use of humour at work", *Leadership*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 299-320.
- Schumpeter, J. (1934), *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*, Harper and Row, New York, NY.
- Shaw, E., Marlow, S., Lam, W. and Carter, S. (2009), "Gender and entrepreneurial capital: implications for firm performance", *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 25-41.
- Simpson, R. and Lewis, P. (2005), "An investigation of silence and a scrutiny of transparency: re-examining gender in organization literature through the concepts of voice and visibility", *Human Relations*, Vol. 58 No. 10, pp. 1253-75.

- Sinclair, A. (1998), *Doing Leadership Differently: Gender Power and Sexuality in a Changing Business Culture*, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne.
- Skinner, J. (1987), "Enter the entrepreneuse", *Women in Management Review*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 177-82.
- Thornley, C. and Thornqvist, C. (2009), "State employment and the gender pay gap", *Gender, Work and Organization*, Vol. 16 No. 5, pp. 529-34.
- Vecchio, R.P. (2003), "Entrepreneurship and leadership: common trends and common threads", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 303-27.
- Walby, S. (1989), "Theorizing patriarchy", *Sociology*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 213-34.
- Watson, J. (2002), "Comparing the performance of male and female controlled businesses: relating outputs to inputs", *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 91-100.
- West, C. and Zimmerman, D. (1987), "Doing gender", *Gender in Society*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 125-51.

Further reading

- Hearn, J. (1994), "Changing men and changing management: social change, social research and social action", in Davidson, M. and Burke, R.J. (Eds), *Women in Management, Current Research Issues*, Chapter 13, Paul Chapman, London.
- Moore, D.P., Moore, J.L. and Moore, J.W. (2011), "How women entrepreneurs lead and why they manage that way", *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 220-33.
- Shaw, E., Carter, S. and Marlow, S. (2007), "Constructing female entrepreneurship policy in the UK: is the US a relevant benchmark?", paper presented at Institute for Small Business and Entrepreneurship Conference: International Entrepreneurship, The Radisson Hotel, Glasgow, Hunter Centre for Entrepreneurship, Strathclyde University, Glasgow, 7-9 November.

Corresponding author

Nicola Patterson can be contacted at: nicola.patterson@northumbria.ac.uk