

MEDDELANDEN FRÅN  
SVENSKA HANDELSHÖGSKOLAN  
SWEDISH SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS  
AND BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION  
WORKING PAPERS

458

Tarja Pietiläinen

GENDER AND FEMALE ENTREPRENEURSHIP  
IN A PRO-ENTREPRENEURSHIP MAGAZINE

2001

Key words: entrepreneurship, entrepreneur, gender, woman, female, discourse, media

© Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration,  
Tarja Pietiläinen

Tarja Pietiläinen  
Department of Management and Organization  
Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration  
P.O.Box 479  
00101 Helsinki, Finland

Distributor:

Library  
Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration  
P.O.Box 479  
00101 Helsinki  
Finland

Phone: +358-9-431 33 376, +358-9-431 33 265  
Fax: +358-9-431 33 425  
E-mail: [publ@shh.fi](mailto:publ@shh.fi)  
<http://www.shh.fi/link/bib/publications.htm>

Helsingin kauppakorkeakoulun HeSE print, Helsingfors 2001

ISBN 951-555- 691-0  
ISSN 0357-4598

## **Gender and female entrepreneurship in a pro-entrepreneurship magazine**

Tarja Pietiläinen<sup>1</sup>

Abstract: In this working paper I discuss gendered entrepreneurship by exploring how the media writes about female entrepreneurship. The starting point is that the media when talking and writing about female entrepreneurs and female entrepreneurship, mould meanings of gender in entrepreneurship. I view entrepreneurship and gender as socially constructed, discursive phenomena. To uncover the processes of constructing gender in female entrepreneurship this paper applies a discursive framework, which treats language as a representational system producing and circulating meaning. The focus on language use as action implies that practises of writing and talking about female entrepreneurship 'make' gender as much as the women entrepreneurs themselves: both involve working on culturally shared meanings to make reality intelligible. The data consists of articles published in *Yrittäjä*, a pro-SME magazine, in 1990-1997. In the analysis I show how gender is constructed in media talk. as a women's issue Women entrepreneurs are constantly compared with men and with an implicitly masculine ideal of entrepreneurship and with strengths and weaknesses of women are displayed pointing out that the meaning making of gender taking place in the data refers to equality discourse. Finally I discuss possible consequences of the hegemonic equality discourse and suggest lines of further research.

Key words: entrepreneurship, entrepreneur, gender, woman, female, discourse, media

---

<sup>1</sup> Home address: Ilmarinkatu 44 C 23, 33500 Tampere  
Tel +358 (0)3 261 117 09 or +358 (0)40 507 06 73  
tarja.pietilainen@uta.fi

## CONTENTS

<a href="#">1. Introduction</a> .....	3
<a href="#">2. Data</a> .....	4
<a href="#">3. Discursive framework and methodology</a> .....	6
<a href="#">4. The hegemonic equality discourse</a> .....	10
<a href="#">4.1. Equal and same, equal and different</a> .....	12
<a href="#">4.2. Same but individually different</a> .....	13
<a href="#">4.3. Different but equal</a> .....	16
<a href="#">4.4. Shaking universal woman and femaleness</a> .....	19
<a href="#">5. Equality discourse in pro-entrepreneurship media talk</a> .....	20
<a href="#">6. Discussion</a> .....	24
<a href="#">REFERENCES</a> .....	27

## 1. Introduction

In this working paper I discuss gendered entrepreneurship by exploring how the media writes about female entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship has become a common topic in public discourse. It is said to solve high unemployment, renew local, declining economies, bring product and service innovations for consumers and free people to put their creativity into productive use. Another common way of writing and speaking about entrepreneurship is to tell success stories of individual entrepreneurs: how they started their business, what difficulties they had to overcome, when did the path to success open up. The Media represents entrepreneurship frequently as an economic, employment or business success issue, but rarely as a gender issue. However, when they talk about entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship, they also talk about women and men as well as femininities and masculinities.

The starting point of this paper is that talking and writing about female entrepreneurs and female entrepreneurship are acts which mould the meanings of gender in entrepreneurship. The Media is especially powerful (re)producer and circulator of public discourse on female entrepreneurship as they persuade “our consent to ways of talking about reality that are often regarded as normal and acceptable beyond the confines of the media” (Macdonald, 1995, 3; cf. also Fairclough, 1997). To unfold gendering meaning making of entrepreneurship I analyse articles selected from *Yrittäjä* (Entrepreneur), a professional magazine of entrepreneurs.

To uncover the processes of constructing gender in female entrepreneurship the paper applies a discursive framework, which treats language as a representational system producing and circulating meaning. Language is used to construct meaningful ideas, beliefs and conceptions about female entrepreneurship through representations. In this sense language use is a social act, and saying becomes practices, which produce knowledge about female entrepreneurship. The Focus on language use as action implies that the practises of writing and talking about female entrepreneurship ‘make’ gender as much as women entrepreneurs) themselves : both involve working on culturally shared meanings to make reality intelligible. This approach treats various kinds of texts – interviews, annual reports, strategy documents, videos etc. – as equally authentic and legitimate versions of reality. Different texts are produced

following different conventions (e.g. scientific, legislative, administrative, journalistic) but none of them can be said to represent female entrepreneurship more truthful than any other, although they admittedly construct different versions of the phenomenon and some are culturally considered more legitimate or truthful than others.

The discursive framework invites us to conceptualise gender in terms of activities and practises that (re)produce gendered images, meanings, ways of thinking and acting that guide our understandings and perceptions of how relationships between female and male entrepreneurs are or should be (cf. Kinnunen & Korvajärvi, 1996, 19). In this approach gender is actively 'done' and 'redone' in different settings. Gender is not so much a stable, 'pure' category of being than a state of becoming that gets constant reaffirmation in meaning making. Doing gender suggests a 'fuzzy' category of gender which is always known from someone else's standpoint and defined in relation to other social and cultural categories like entrepreneurship, management or ownership.

In the next section I describe the data, and in section three I elaborate how doing gender is linked to social constructionism, what methodological issues the connection implies and how I use textual analysis as a critical reading. In section four I present an analysis in which I respond critically to and resist the obvious and self evident interpretations that the data persuade me to make of female entrepreneurship. The critical reading shows that equality thinking dominates the meaning-making of female entrepreneurship in the articles. After the analysis I relate equality thinking to feminist gender to reveal what kind of gender perceptions it is premised on. Finally, I discuss the benefits and limitations of equality thinking in research on female entrepreneurship and argue for a reconceptualising of gender as an act of doing.

## **2. Data**

I am interested in finding out what currently are the appropriate ways to talk<sup>2</sup> about women entrepreneurs and female entrepreneurship in the context of a pro-SME (Small and Medium Sized Enterprise) media. I assume that pro-entrepreneurship media raise

---

<sup>2</sup> Talk in this paper refers also to written language use.

issues that are considered relevant, important, novel and interesting within entrepreneurship and talk about them in ways that can be recognised and accepted among the entrepreneurship-oriented readers. Critical media studies have pointed out how journalistic practises give voice mainly to official and otherwise legitimised sources and therefore tend to re-produce and sustain a prevailing world view (Fairclough, 1997, 69). Guided by this notion of media it was easy to choose *Yrittäjä*-magazine, a decidedly pro-SME print media.

The data consists of 18 articles (see App. 1.) selected from '*Yrittäjä*' ('Entrepreneur'), a magazine published by the Federation of Finnish Enterprises, a network of 20 regional organizations with 420 local associations and 62 branch organizations representing 85 000 SMEs. FFE is the largest central organization representing the interests of SMEs in Finland. According to the editor-in-chief of *Yrittäjä* it is "a professional magazine of entrepreneurs, which focuses on entrepreneurial policy and legislation, creates visions for SME-entrepreneurship, anticipates future directions in entrepreneurial thinking and acts as a forerunner in starting public discussion about them"<sup>3</sup>. The first issue of '*Yrittäjä*' came out in 1982 and at the moment it is the only Finnish magazine clearly concentrating on social, political and business-related issues of SMEs. In 1998 the periodical had approximately 20 000 subscribers (in April 2000, 23 000), mainly SME-owners.

The articles were selected in the spring of 1998 for my Master's thesis. The choice of time period was a practical matter: the first full volume of '*Yrittäjä*' that was available in the university library was 1990, and from that year onward I went through all copies until 1997. I selected all articles that explicitly talk about women entrepreneurs or female entrepreneurship. I also browsed through the earlier, incomplete volumes to check how the topic was covered in the 80s, but could not find any articles before 1991 in the available issues. There are four 'types' of articles in the data: eight of the articles are interviews with women entrepreneurs, six are interviews with experts on female entrepreneurship, two report research findings on the topic and the remaining two are comments from women entrepreneurs on one of the research report articles.

---

<sup>3</sup> Personal communication Lantto/Pietiläinen 11.6.1998.

The first type of articles is based on interviews with women entrepreneurs, written by specified or anonymous journalists. They are so-called entrepreneur stories, i.e. the emphasis is on how women entrepreneurs experience being entrepreneurs and running a firm. These type of stories are, according to the editor-in-chief, very popular among readers. The second type gives voice to institutional actors in female entrepreneurship, i.e. executive directors of The Central Association of Female Entrepreneurs in Finland, managing director of The Centre for Female Entrepreneurs (member of Jobs & Society Association in Finland) and university researchers on female entrepreneurship. Although these articles are also written by journalists and use interviews as their sources, they do not resemble experience stories. Instead, the interviewees are represented as experts in the field, possessing privileged and general knowledge of female entrepreneurship. The third type of articles reports research findings on the topic, using mostly factual and detached ways of expression. They speak in the 'objective' voice of research and in them facts, not people, speak for themselves. We do find out who has written them – one by a journalist and the other by the two researchers of the study in question – but it seems to be irrelevant to the objectified substance in the articles. The fourth type is closely related to entrepreneur stories. The women entrepreneurs are called upon to comment on issues that university researchers have identified as relevant to female entrepreneurship. The journalist lets women entrepreneurs themselves express their opinions and experiences about the theoretical issues e.g. how does it feel to be a female owner-manager in a male dominated business to bring in the practical side of female entrepreneurship.

### **3. Discursive framework and methodology**

Analysing the textual construction of entrepreneurship and gender requires a theory and methodology that directs our attention to meaning making and a critical examination of it. A critical analysis of meaning-making is inherently about interpreting and evaluating, and therefore it is crucial that the researcher explicates what the theoretical grounds of her interpretations are. In my work entrepreneurship and gender are viewed in my work as socially constructed, discursive phenomena. There can be no clear-cut definitions of the concepts before the analysis within this framework, as they would obscure the meaning making of the phenomena in the data

when differing from meanings given in the definition. The interest lies in interpreting how the concepts are constructed, not what their ‘right’ meaning is. Entrepreneurship is considered discussed by the media when words like entrepreneurship, entrepreneur, enterprise are mentioned, that is when the text recognises a cultural phenomenon called entrepreneurship by addressing it. In this paper the same orientation applies for gender. It is discussed when words like woman, female, femininity, man, masculine or masculinity appear in the text.

Social constructionism is based on certain meta-theoretical key assumptions about, firstly, how the researcher assumes that we as humans relate to reality and, secondly, how we can know about reality. Following Burr (1995, 3-8), I elaborate the key assumptions through four main ideas of social constructionism. **Firstly**, our reality, including ourselves as people, is produced in social processes, following, **secondly**, that meanings of reality are produced by people in relations. We perceive reality and reality presents itself to us through meanings with which we construct different versions of reality and make knowledge- claims about it accordingly. In processes of reality- construction knowledge, truth and facts are also socially negotiated, implying that the ways in which we commonly understand reality and the concepts we use are historically and culturally specific. Accordingly, **thirdly**, different ways of understanding are specific to particular cultures and periods of time . They are products of their culture and history and “dependent upon the particular social and economic arrangements prevailing in that culture at that time” (ibid. 4).

The meaning- mediated construction of reality brings language into focus. There are, of course, other ways of meaning- production, e.g. music and painting, but in my study the data consists of written language . **Fourthly**, language provides us with a way of structuring our experience and reality, and the concepts we use do not pre-date language but are made possible by it. Language offers us a system of categories for dividing up our experience and giving it meanings.

The concept which incorporates the above mentioned assumptions is discourse. The notion of discourse I employ is heavily dependent upon the Foucauldian theoretical tradition, although I refer to Hall’s Foucault- inspired definition of discourse. Hall states that “ discourse is a group of statements which provide a language for talking

about a particular kind of knowledge about a topic. When statements about a topic are made within a particular discourse, the discourse makes it possible to construct the topic in a certain way. It also limits the other ways in which the topic can be constructed” (Hall, 1992, 291).

Discourse dissolves the distinction between language and practise, thought and action, because it “is about the production of knowledge through language”(ibid.). According to Foucault (quoted in Mills, 1997, 17) “one of the most productive ways of thinking about discourse is not as a group of signs or a stretch of text, but as ‘practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak’. In this sense, a discourse is something which produces something else (an utterance, a concept, an effect), rather than something which exists in and of itself and which can be analysed in isolation.” Different discourses invite different actions and therefore discourses can be identified by the effects their knowledges produce.

Discourses consist of statements which articulate the basic assumptions of the discourse in question. Statements form a coherent and logical way of understanding a phenomenon “because any one statement implies a relation to all the others” (Hall, 1992, 291). Coherence is produced through systematic and regular relationships and differences between statements (ibid., 293) which, in turn, leads to that statements structuring the same discourse can be even opposite in meaning but systematically connected. They can be detected by the systematicity of the ideas, opinions, concepts and ways of thinking they weave into a meaning web. Statements are governed by a discourse- specific practice which sets boundaries on what and how can be said, who can say, about the topic in question on what conditions and in which context . Hence also discourses themselves are “produced by a practice ... the practice of producing meaning” (ibid.). Meaning production is based on making differences and hierarchies. Differences are made by creating categories/concepts and by defining (naming) people and objects according to the categorising criteria (e.g. entrepreneurs and women entrepreneurs). Many categories and concepts are also arranged as dichotomies, where the polar ends have mutually exclusive meanings. Hierarchy is produced when meanings and perceptions of value are closely linked together: some ideas, opinions, concepts, ways of thinking and behaving are considered more

legitimate and convincing than others, i.e. we tend to make some versions of reality more truthful than others. Knowledges are therefore something that people do.

Power is inherently intertwined with the processes of knowledge production implying that discourses are power/knowledge formations which declare what is worth knowing in the first place and who can know it. Discourses provide different knowledges (versions) of the reality. Although we are born to language and its' culturally specific use, "language is a site of variability, disagreement and potential conflict" (Bur, 1995, 8) because of the various discourses available for reality construction in a certain time and place. We as language users participate in constant negotiation and struggle over the hegemony to define the most truthful knowledges of reality by actively using the different available discourses to argue for our own version. Hall elaborates this kind of Foucauldian productive power- concept by stating that "it is the outcome of this (i.e. discursive TP) struggle which will decide the 'truth' of the situation" because "it is power, rather than the facts about reality, which make things 'true'" (Hall, 1992, 293). We act out power in language when we reproduce and confirm widely held interpretations of reality, when we question their validity or when we offer an alternative interpretation.

Discourses construct positions for speakers, from which the discourse specific knowledges make sense (Hall, 1995, 292). Thus, speakers have to construct themselves as subjects of a discourse before they can make knowledge claims within a particular discourse. Discourses do not flow from the intentions of a single source or a single speaker, but they provide positions from which to state legitimately something about reality. Therefore cultural objects, like magazine articles, should be analysed without trying to find out the intentions of the writers or the speakers in the texts. language actors actively position themselves in the subject position constructed by different discourses. Change is possible because discourses are open systems which draw on "elements in other discourses, binding them into [their] own network[s] of meanings" (ibid.). Thus actors are not prisoners of discourse since they actively use, mould and deconstruct discourses.

In my analysis the symbolic meaning- making of gender is emphasised, as the focus of the study is language , i.e. discourse operates on in the level of language. In order

to reach the discursive processes of meaning- making doing gender, as method, reading in the analysis. Doing gender is a method of producing interpretations of how gendered meanings are constructed in the data when discussing female entrepreneurship and evaluating the interpretations in relation to gender theory. It is an analytical construction that conceptualises gender as an ongoing, discursive process or as activities which define and redefine perceptions and understandings of how relationships between women and men are or should be (cf. Korvajärvi, 1998, 13-15). Doing gender does not assume a permanent, stable division between women and men, but examines how the relations between genders are constructed in the everyday, cultural flow of meaning making. “Thus gender is not necessarily tied to embodied women or men (implies a permanent division TP), but to their activities” (ibid., 13).

Doing gender can also be used as a method of interpreting theoretical texts. Hence, in the present analysis, doing gender enables us to see different gender theories as possible and legitimate explanations. I use different theories as a resource to evaluate what kind of gender theory implicit assumptions are based on. A critical analysis aims at contextually grounded, critical interpretations of texts and therefore it is crucial to be able to identify and appreciate different gender theories in the data even if they are in conflict with one’s own theoretical commitments. Implicit gender assumptions become visible by undoing the meanings that media talk takes for granted and presents as facts about female entrepreneurship. In accordance, I pay close attention to such meaning making that produces and sustains categories of gender and actively processes differences, sameness and hierarchies between them.

#### **4. The hegemonic equality discourse**

The overall impression of the articles is puzzling: in one way entrepreneurship is not “a gender issue” as stated explicitly in one of the articles, on the other hand the articles are written to give more media coverage to women entrepreneurs and ‘female issues’ in entrepreneurship. According to the editor-in–chief, readers have requested more stories about women entrepreneurs. In every article there are parts where I as a reader cannot be sure whether it is about women’s entrepreneurship or entrepreneurship without gender. All of a sudden gender disappears, although it has

been the primary inspiration to write the story in the first place. Could it be that being a woman entrepreneur is significant for an interesting story but in ‘actual’ entrepreneurship it no longer matters?

The articles present the idea that being a woman is a criteria which separates women entrepreneurs from entrepreneurs in general. This separation is achieved by using a vocabulary and an iconography that is culturally associated with women and femaleness, and thus women and femaleness become the ‘gender’ of entrepreneurship. It makes sense to write stories about female issues in entrepreneurship and represent femaleness as a novelty and a speciality that deserves public attention when there is a presumption that normally entrepreneurship is a male issue. Constructing a difference between female and male entrepreneurs and their entrepreneurship creates a situation where women and their activities are compared with male counterparts even if it is not explicitly stated. There is actually no need to emphasise the comparison with men because entrepreneurship is culturally and historically a male territory. Focusing on the maleness of an entrepreneur would not easily make an interesting story to write and publish unlike the femaleness of an entrepreneur .

After having read the data few times it became obvious to me that comparing both businesses owned by women and women entrepreneurs as persons to businesses owned by men and men entrepreneurs was a common way to produce meanings of woman and femaleness in media- talk about gender and entrepreneurship. It also became apparent to me very soon, being a member of a Nordic society, that the texts have strong tendencies to see female entrepreneurship in the light of equality. Feminist research has studied equality for a considerable time and concluded that comparing women to men always in this direction (Widerberg, 1986, 40) – is a basic assumption of equality approach to gender. I consider comparing women to men as the primary discursive practice in equality discourse. In this chapter I first analyse what kind of statements construct the equality discourse and how they are related to each other. Secondly I elaborate on what kind of gender the understanding of equality discourse implies. The number after every data extracts refers to the item number of the data article in question in App. 1.

#### 4.1. Equal and same, equal and different

Extract 1. *“She has recently completed a one-year management training where she was the only woman participant. ‘In the training I found out that I have not enough capabilities to cope with stress and pressure. My male colleagues on the other hand were less capable of caring, listening and showing emotional warmth’”*. No. 13

Extract 2. *“According to Nyberg women still have to overcome more barriers than men when becoming entrepreneurs.”* No.12

The extracts illustrate how women are compared to men in the data. The comparison examines how women differ from men in relation to different factors that are considered relevant in entrepreneurship. These factors, include besides personal characteristics and the barriers to entrepreneurship mentioned above, goals, behavioural patterns and the line of business. These comparisons result in differentiating and uniting factors which seem to explain perceived and experienced gender differences in entrepreneurship in paradoxical ways. How can female and male entrepreneurs at the same time be equal- and- same and equal- but- different? Texts circle around these statements time and again to argue for equality between women and men entrepreneurs and their activities.

In the Scandinavian and the Finnish context equality is strongly associated with gender relations (Parvikko, 1991, 48). Equality has dominated the discussion and activities to improve women’s position in society since the turn of the century (Bergman, 1995, 52-57; Koivunen, 1996, 78), because equality has been a strong and legitimate argument for women to gain access to previously closed areas of life and to denied rights (Bergman, 1995, 54; cf. Holli, 1999). Perceived and experienced inequality has sparked demands of equality in different social and political arenas, including entrepreneurship.. Although laws support gender equality in almost every aspect of life in contemporary Finland, genders are treated differently in many ways making people unequal also in practice (Hellsten, 1997, 47). These aspects contextualise media- talk in the articles of *Yrittäjä*-magazine into a historical development which associates gender relations with equality, manifesting also, how media- talk is embedded in prevailing discourses. Thus, it is almost self- evident that representational practices of entrepreneurship put female entrepreneurs and their

businesses in an unequal position in a historically male world of entrepreneurship. Revealing how equality discourse works to divide women's entrepreneurship from men's entrepreneurship is therefore significant to make it possible to imagine alternative ways to write about gender in entrepreneurship.

Holli (1995, 16) argues that equality incorporates both sameness and the difference of genders. Comparison is possible between two groups which firstly have something in common and secondly something different in order to be perceived as distinct groups. Thus, groups cannot be identical, because it would make comparing impossible, nor totally different, because there would not be any common factors to make the comparison sensible. (ibid. 16, 22 and 1997, 137; cf. Berggren, 1987, 91). No wonder that one gets confused, when, on the one hand, there are arguments which support the notion that women entrepreneurs are different and, on the other hand, we are assured that entrepreneurship is not a matter of gender. The first approach assumes that gender equality is a future goal, the other that equality is already there because it is the birthright of every human being regardless of gender.

#### 4.2. Same but individually different

Extract 3. *"Entrepreneurship is not a question of gender but a female entrepreneur is under different kind of pressures and expectations than a male entrepreneur."* No. 15

Extract 4. *"We could, nevertheless, say that differences can more often be found in the attitudes of the environment towards female and male entrepreneurs rather than in the female and the male entrepreneurs themselves."* No. 11

Extract 5. *"Managing Director Ritva Nyberg claims that it is important to find right entrepreneurial personalities because just anybody cannot make it. 'Entrepreneurship requires a deep sense of responsibility and a willingness to take risks which call for special abilities to endure pressure.'* "No. 12

The third extract above defines entrepreneurship as a phenomenon with its' own 'natural laws' to which individual men or women must adopt and not vice versa.

Separating people, entrepreneurs, from the phenomenon of entrepreneurship constructs a dehumanised entrepreneurship where gender, or even other human qualities, are not relevant. In other words, gender becomes a human attribute and therefore one of the characteristics of an individual. That is why gender, an individual human quality, can not be attached to the 'natural laws' of entrepreneurship. Every entrepreneur is forced to relate to entrepreneurship in the same way and the gender of the entrepreneur is not an explanation for perceiving or experiencing differences in entrepreneurship.

Statements of sameness present entrepreneurship as offering equal opportunities for both genders. Despite the genderless notion of entrepreneurship women entrepreneurs experience that they are not equal with male entrepreneurs. Because the reason for inequality cannot be due to practices of entrepreneurship, explanations emerging from the individual conditions become relevant. Extract five above explains entrepreneurship with personality which focuses the discussion of gender differences on the individual characteristics of female entrepreneurs. Becoming an entrepreneur and gaining success in entrepreneurial work depends on suitable characteristics. The research on (female) entrepreneurship has supported this conceptualisation and there is a long tradition of defining the right characteristics of an entrepreneur. In this line of research characteristics are generally discussed in terms of 'genuine entrepreneurship' (e.g. Hajba, 1985, Carland & Carland, 1991, Chell & Hedberg-Jalonen & Miettinen, 1997). In extract four above the first impression is that there are also collective reasons for inequality but a reference to attitudes reduces the problem once again to the individual level and people's subjective perceptions of reality. The data presents personal choice as an additional argument for gender differences. Choice implies a situation where a woman entrepreneur can decide upon alternatives available to every entrepreneur. If she ends up experiencing gender inequality it is ascribed to her choice.

The data constructs inequality as a problem of women entrepreneurs. Media-talk produces understandings of female entrepreneurship that over and over again confirm women's inferior adaptation to the conditions of entrepreneurship. It is stated that traditional female role-models do not support growth to entrepreneurship, that women have not enough skills and abilities to acquire knowledge, that their networks

are too small and of a wrong kind, etc. Especially convincing are the arguments concerning women's family responsibilities: over half of the articles take up the topic. The main point put forward is that a lot of problems facing women as entrepreneurs are caused by difficulties to combine family responsibilities with entrepreneurship. Thus, childcare and home management are seen as personal problems of a female entrepreneur, due to her choice to be a wife and a mother. Another popular line of reasoning is to elaborate on the credibility problems of female entrepreneurs. The data points out that women's entrepreneurship is linked to low commitment, micro-enterprising, short term vision and a hobby-like way of doing business. In research the same reasoning is connected with the credibility problems that women face when they apply for financing for their enterprise (cf. Lee-Gosselin & Gris , 1990, 427; Koper, 1993, 64-66; Kaur & Hayden, 1993, 103; Carter & Rosa, 1998, 7). Hence, whatever is presented about women's entrepreneurship compared to men's, the result is that their activities somehow seem to be more problematic or exceptional than what they should be (cf. Holli, 1995, 17).

Despite the gender equality assumption women and their business activities do not fit into the emerging definition of an entrepreneur and entrepreneurship. A special position is constructed for women within entrepreneurship which defines her and her activities as gendered in an otherwise genderless entrepreneurial reality (cf. Nousiainen, 1998, 34). Comparing women and men as entrepreneurs is based on an assumption that what is known about men's entrepreneurship can be applied to female entrepreneurs. More accurately what is known about men's entrepreneurship is treated like knowledge about entrepreneurship in general, suggesting that men's entrepreneurship is a universal norm. In accordance, gender-sensitive research on entrepreneurship has found that the ideal image of an entrepreneur comprises typically masculine features (Hajba, 1987; Stevenson, 1990, 441; Fagenson & Marcus, 1991; Kovalainen, 1994 and 1995) and feminist research has shown that the gender-equality thinking produces the masculine as the norm to which women and their activities are compared also in other contexts (e.g. Kanter, 1977; Berggren, 1987, 115; Honkanen, 1993,51; Braidotti, 1994, 9).

Why is it then, that statements of sameness construct explanations that attribute perceived and experienced inequality in entrepreneurship to the individual women

entrepreneurs? Why are individual and private, or in other contexts, cultural, educational and societal reasons acceptable (Nousiainen, 1998, 32), but seeing the phenomenon of entrepreneurship as gendered is not? The sameness of gender in entrepreneurship has the consequence that gender is perceived primarily as an individual characteristic. Sameness of gender implies a conception of equality which is founded on the belief that women and men are united by undivided humanness. If we consider that perceived and experienced inequalities can be explained by gendered entrepreneurship, we deny the idea that women and men are united by humanness, because gender is considered in this line of reasoning as an embodied attribute, and thus not separable from the individual. That is, people are gendered and their actions are gendered. This kind of embodied gender- difference calls to question the idea of undivided humanness. Contrary to the gender- difference view, the sameness of women and men indicates that we are primarily human beings and gender is a compulsory trait, but still a characteristic that everyone can possess in a varying degree. Human activities and phenomena are not assumed to be gendered and therefore it is up to the individual to make choices to adjust to the prevailing conditions. Therefore it is logical to safeguard the implicit division between genderless entrepreneurship and gendered women and their entrepreneurial activities by articulating reasons that emerge from individuality, not from gendered practices of entrepreneurship.

#### 4.3. Different but equal

Extract 6. “ *‘A woman entrepreneur is not equal compared to a man entrepreneur. A handicrafts shop is not as valued as a shop in some typical male line of business. Handicrafts are ‘only women’s stuff’. On what grounds are women not appreciated as much as men? If a woman has managed to keep the business running successfully for 70 years it has required much more from a woman than it would have from a man.’* ” No. 17

Extract 7. “ *‘Thus, gender is significant both when combining business and family and depending on what line of business the enterprise is established’, concludes Kovalainen.*” No. 8

Extract 6 above takes on a new way of reasoning gender equality in entrepreneurship. Genders are regarded unequal because they are treated differently (cf. Hellsten, 1997, 47): women entrepreneurs do not receive the same appreciative recognition as men, although their entrepreneurial performance would deserve it. This lack of appreciation is a recurring theme in the data (cf. Virta, 1986, 49-51, Holli, 1995, 24), to the extent that media-talk seems to represent it as a prime example of the experienced inequality by women entrepreneurs. Although women are, at the moment, considered equal to men, it is not denied that equality itself is an important and desirable goal in gender relations. It is, however, more of a future ideal than present practice. Therefore it is legitimate to argue that gender differences can and do explain inequality in practices of entrepreneurship, as extract 7 above points out.

The language of the extracts above constructs an equality discourse through statements of difference. They, too, make meaning by comparing women to men entrepreneurs but, instead of constructing entrepreneurship as gender-neutral and women as gendered, they produce a form of entrepreneurship that has gendered consequences in the lives of women. It is accepted that gender differences make women and men entrepreneurs unequal. The question which rises when inequality is accepted is how this should be dealt with. Statements of difference create a space within the discourse within which it is possible to argue for solutions that explicitly focus on improving women's situation in the name of future equality. In Sweden and in Finland governmental loans offered only to women entrepreneurs are a good example of the actions which the gender-difference line of reasoning makes possible.

Extract 8. *“A strong need for co-operation is characteristic to women entrepreneurs in general. Women support each other and create strong networks.”* No. 14

Extract 9. *“The Managing Director of Oras-Transportation Ltd. Outi Oras-Laaksonen, believes that femaleness can be a value in it self in management. People are not afraid to approach a woman manager, and thus they enable decisions that are beneficial both for the company and its personnel.”* No. 6

Extract 10. *“I believe that in an association for women only you can more easily express your opinions. You can encourage different interests more flexibly into open and general discussion.”* No. 18

Extract eight above claims that co-operation is a need that characterises all women. It is a strong essentialist argument about women, conveying that there is something in all women that unites them and identifies them as a group. Female characteristics and needs imply the existence of some kind of female essence, femaleness (Honkanen, 1993, 56), which makes women act like women and do female things. Essentialist arguments about female nature sharpen and naturalise gender differences and they make femaleness a set starting point for demands and actions which aim at increasing the appreciation of women entrepreneurs and their entrepreneurship.

Statements of difference based on essentialism reverse hierarchy (Holli, 1995, 28). This reversal serves as a means to create positive meanings for women entrepreneurs and their entrepreneurship. It takes place when the features produced by the statements of sameness as ‘shortcomings’ or ‘deviations’ of women entrepreneurs are defined as particular strengths of women. In both cases the process of comparing women to men remains intact. Extract 9 exemplifies how those qualities, which are culturally understood as feminine, empathy, communication skills and relational approach e.g. are redefined as valuable resources that complement masculine management practices (cf. Wahl, 1996, 20-21, 26). Extract 10 defines activities intended for women only. They are spaces of true equality where women entrepreneurs have a real opportunity to be heard and raise subjects that are genuinely relevant to them (Räsänen, 1990, 20-21). The text suggests that it is impossible for a woman entrepreneur to receive proper attention at all in a male dominated environment.

The statements of difference give space for valuing the cultural expressions of woman and the female in entrepreneurship. It is no longer necessary to perceive women’s entrepreneurship problematic, trivial and insignificant. Instead, women’s entrepreneurship, their women-only activities and their holistic view of life can be seen as valuable as such. In this kind of reasoning femaleness turns into a ‘value added’ in entrepreneurship.

#### 4.4. Different woman

Extract 11. *"Terhi finds it delightful that, contrary to her fearful expectations in the beginning, she has been able to get clients and being a female consultant has not aroused too many suspicions, although sometimes some men are keen to 'take her measure' as a capable adviser in organisational development. Subjects such as psychology, work hygiene and other issues related to work environment are more commonly seen as women's expertise areas."* No. 2

In most of the data the link between masculinity and entrepreneurship remains hidden. Masculinity is mainly constructed as an opposition to femaleness or as the ideal entrepreneurship to which women are compared. The extract above introduces one construction with which masculinity is inscribed into entrepreneurship. It is implied that the fields of expertise in consulting are gender- labelled and when a woman consultant crosses the gender boundary, she faces credibility problems and testing because of her gender (cf. Wahl, 1996, 22-23). She does not fit into the position of an expert because of her 'wrong' gender. Being a woman makes the masculine gender- label of a certain area of expertise visible and brings into question its assumed gender neutrality.

Elsewhere in the data a resembling gendering process is connected to management and to the position of a manager. A female owner-manager identifies herself strongly with the managerial position stating that she prefers to manage the work of others. Management is typically connected to masculine characteristics and behaviours (e.g. Kanter, 1977; Wahl, 1995 and 1996; Avotie, 1998). When a woman is cited to openly admit her managerial ambitions, the text runs a risk of jeopardizing her femininity as she is represented as a gendered exception to the underlying masculine norm of management (Wahl, 1995, 23). The situation becomes more complicated when she starts to talk about her three-year-old son. When a woman entrepreneur **and** a mother is claimed to prefer managerial tasks, established meanings of manager and femininity come into conflict. Both managing and mothering take up a lot of time and require commitment to work/home and the text puts her into a position where she is compared both to masculine manager and feminine mother ideals. The positions of manager and mother seem to exclude each other in a woman entrepreneur's life because a good

manager makes a bad mother and vice versa. The text manages to 'shake' cultural femininity which is corrected latter by a quotation in which she says that mothering, of course, is the most important thing in her life.

Statements of difference construct meaning-relations that show how masculine seemingly gender-neutral phenomena are. Women in typically male tasks or expertise areas reveal how they are associated with masculinity and as a result question their apparent gender neutrality (Holli, 1995, 29). Thus, essentialist differences and clear distinctions between genders are blurred and universal femaleness becomes doubtful. On the one hand, the constructed boundary between genders proves to be obscured and transformable when a woman entrepreneur is represented as successfully occupy a male identity position of an expert in organisational development or identifying herself principally as the manager of her firm. On the other hand, representations of women entrepreneurs who combine crossing gender-boundaries and 'staying female' introduce new meanings that turn universal femaleness into more heterogeneous categories which allow differences between women entrepreneurs and various representations of femaleness in entrepreneurship. Emerging differences within the categories of woman and femaleness challenge the division between entrepreneurship and embodied entrepreneurs. As Stevenson (1990, 442) states, entrepreneurship changes the entrepreneur as a human being, woman or man. I would take Stevenson's argument further and suggest that entrepreneurship is constructed in relational practices, in which case entrepreneurs, too, change entrepreneurship.

### **5. Equality discourse in pro-entrepreneurship media talk**

The equality discourse dominates the media-talk about female entrepreneurship in *Yrittäjä* magazine. It constructs one understanding of woman and female in entrepreneurship. It explains how women entrepreneurs and their entrepreneurship are a problematic exception to the male norm as well as how the femaleness that unites all women entrepreneurs, makes a valuable and indispensable resource in entrepreneurship. Both lines of reasoning produce woman and female as the gender in entrepreneurship leaving man and masculine intact. Thus, in the pro-entrepreneurship media-talk, gender is mainly a question related to women and femaleness. Based on her research on Finnish equality policy, Holli (1995, 1997) argues that gender-

equality thinking has been flexible and changed over time. In this light it is easy to see why the present analysis shows that media-talk also touches the boundaries of femininity and masculinity although, at the same time reproducing equality discourse. The more experiences of women entrepreneurs are represented in the media, the greater is the possibility of variety, while, to keep the topic novel and interesting, different stories of it must be written and published, thus allowing the differences of real life women entrepreneurs to become visible.

The media-talk in equality discourse sustains a division between women and men entrepreneurs as well as female and male entrepreneurship. To put it more accurately, women entrepreneurs and their entrepreneurial activities are separated from, in most cases implicitly masculine, entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship. The division is grounded in a gender theory that constructs gender as a difference between women and men. Actually analysing what kind of gender theory grounds knowledge about gender in equality discourse seems almost a superfluous task. Separating **female** entrepreneurship from the 'remaining' entrepreneurship produces a view of the two genders that is familiar to most of us living in a modern, western society. This is due to the taken-for-grantedness which prompts us to "assume that every human being is either a male or a female" (Kessler & McKenna, 1978, 1). The first compulsory thing to know about a person is her/his gender. It becomes evident how automatically we usually 'decipher' this information when we cannot decide immediately someone's gender. It is crucial to know it because after gender attribution we start to treat each other as representatives of one or another gender with all its culturally shared implications. It is, for example, natural to ask women entrepreneurs about combining work and family responsibilities when their entrepreneurship is discussed, but it does not easily occur to anyone to make the same question to a man entrepreneur in the same situation. Becoming of a gender as well as attributing a gender to oneself and others is to a great extent a naturalised process. The prevailing understanding is that we can all be categorised either as women or men (some might be a mixture), and there exists no other gender categories. Although there are variations in gendered features, ultimately a differentiating factor can be found in our biology (before genes it was chromosomes and before them the genitals).

In this respect the media-talk in equality discourse reproduces the prevailing gender theory which constitutes women and men as complementary opposites (Holli, 1997, 138). However, a biological understanding of gender permits various interpretations of gender difference as can be seen from statements of sameness and difference constructing equality discourse. Regarding the two genders as one and the same is linked to an androgynous gender perception (Huuska, 1998, 87-88). According to Huuska androgyny assumes gender to be a factor of secondary importance in differentiating human beings. Gender difference is not perceived as a difference between women and men but as a difference between individuals who display various combinations of female and male elements. (Ibid., 87-88.) The existence of female and male factors themselves is taken for granted. In media-talk comparison constructs a male norm of entrepreneurship from which women entrepreneurs seem to be deviating. A logical solution is that in order to overcome 'problems' facing women entrepreneurs they should seek to adapt to the norm. An adaptation based on androgyny would mean developing an entrepreneurial identity and behaviours which emphasise male elements.

Statements of difference ascribe such meanings to femaleness that make it a uniting and universal factor for all women. Huuska connects descriptions of a gender's nature to an essentialist gender perception (ibid., 37). When this perception is applied certain features and characteristics are dichotomously labelled as female or male and they are considered typical for women or men as groups, not as individuals. The notion that a gender difference exists between women and men implies fundamentally uniting factors within these gender groups. As a result, clearly identifiable, opposite and exclusive categories of women and men are constructed. (Ibid., 38.) An essentialist gender perception is widely used in media-talk. Essentialism offers a 'pro-woman' point of view from which it is possible to resist and reverse belittling meanings that follow from the comparison of women entrepreneurs to the male norm. Lack of appreciation can be legitimately confronted with actions favouring women entrepreneurs and activities for women entrepreneurs only. They make sense, are convincing, justifiable and acceptable as they are based on the idea of natural female qualities and characteristics. At the same time, culturally highly female features are confirmed and no woman entrepreneur is urged to desert her 'true nature'.

Table 1. summarises how statements of sameness and difference construct the equality discourse in media-talk, based on the analysis of the data. The first column displays the topics (objects of knowledge) which are spoken of in equality discourse. I have arranged the objects of knowledge starting from deeply rooted beliefs to more practical topics. The two following columns show what knowledge claims or the statement of sameness and difference make about the objects. They are arranged according to the objects of knowledge on the left column, i.e. intersections of columns and rows under the headings of the middle and right columns (statements) exhibit how the different objects of knowledge are discussed. Although, the statements differ in every aspect, they share a common discursive meaning making practice, that of comparing women and men..

Table 1. Statements constructing equality discourse in media-talk

<b>Object of knowledge</b>	<b>STATEMENTS OF SAMENESS</b>	<b>STATEMENTS OF DIFFERENCE</b>
State of gender equality	Gender equality is already a reality because it is the birthright of every human being.	Equality is a future goal because genders are treated unequally.
Interpretation of gender difference	Androgynous gender; gender differentiates individuals.	Essentialist gender; gender differentiates women and men as groups.
Discursive practice of producing meaning	Comparing women entrepreneurs and their entrepreneurship to men or to the masculine ideal of entrepreneurship.	Comparing women entrepreneurs and their entrepreneurship to men or to the masculine ideal of entrepreneurship.
Woman and the female in relation to (masculine) entrepreneurship	Women entrepreneurs and their entrepreneurship is a problematic exception to the masculine norm.	Femaleness is a valuable and complementary resource of male/masculine entrepreneurship.
Reason of perceived and experienced inequalities	Individual factors and private reasons of women entrepreneurs.	Lack of appreciation and unequal treatment of women and their entrepreneurship.

Solutions to perceived inequality	Securing equal rights and equal opportunities for all entrepreneurs (explicit), adapting the masculine norm for women (implicit).	Providing same sex activities for mutual support and raising consciousness, building up the appreciation of women entrepreneurs and their entrepreneurship, when necessary through women-favouring actions.
-----------------------------------	---	---

## 6. Discussion

Equality-thinking is the prevailing discourse in the pro-entrepreneurship media-talk in Yrittäjä. Women entrepreneurs are constantly compared to men and the implicitly masculine ideal of entrepreneurship, and the strengths and weaknesses of women and their entrepreneurial activities are displayed. Thus, equality discourse constructs gender as a women's issue and invites us to think about entrepreneurship and gender in the context of sameness and differences of women and men entrepreneurs.

The conclusion of this analysis is that pro-entrepreneurship media-talk privileges those knowledge claims that leave little space for representing other gendering processes in entrepreneurship than those emerging from the 'pure' categories of women and men. My concern is what media can say about gender in business in the first place. The lack of frames to imagine, speak of and write about gender in business, beyond a separate but complementary line of reasoning, leaves a myriad of gendered entrepreneurial experiences outside the scope of public knowledge.

On the other hand, subscribing to a hegemonic equality discourse offers few meaning making resources to consumers of media discourse for constructing new, but comprehensible meanings to gender and entrepreneurship. Nevertheless, new meanings are needed. When gender is discussed within the equality discourse, the discussion tends to polarise the relations of genders as the discourse constructs a victim and an oppressor and the speaking subject is invited to take sides. The positions assume experiences many of us have and can give accounts of, but being and doing gender in everyday situations is a much more complex, problematic and

contingent issue (cf. Haraway, 1991). However, the persistence of the equality discourse to offer hegemonic, privileged knowledges about gender makes it difficult to discuss and reflect on experiences of gender discrimination outside gender dichotomies or to find new solutions to a subtly discriminating culture. Research also shows evidence of silencing the subject. Korvajärvi (1998) found out in her study on gendering dynamics in white-collar work that gender divisions are perceived to exist 'out there', but in one's immediate environment inequalities are not present. Also Czarniawska & Calás (1997) report that university students interpreted stories of gender discrimination to take place in another country, usually outside the western world.

As a site for the meaning making of gender in entrepreneurship media-talk supports the research on female entrepreneurship, where similar arguments are put forward in similar lines of reasoning. There is evidence that women entrepreneurs face credibility problems (e.g. Ljunggren & Nilsson, 1995; Kaur & Hayden, 1993), have difficulties in combining entrepreneurship and family (e.g. Stoner et al. 1990; Loscocco & Robinson, 1991; Green & Cohen, 1995) and show the characteristics of entrepreneurs in varying degrees (e.g. Hajba, 1985; Sexton & Bowman-Upton, 1990). There are also studies of women-only activities to resist inequality (e.g. Sangregorio, 1996; Nilsson, 1997; Taylor, 1998).

This research resembles knowledge claims stemming from the meaning making in the equality discourse. I do not criticise the equality approach as such because it renders possibilities to make an under-researched area more visible and to offer research based arguments for people who support female entrepreneurship. What I find troubling is that gender too often remains unexplicated in equality oriented studies. It is time to elaborate more on how gender is and could be theorised in research on entrepreneurship. Reconceptualising gender opens up new possibilities to address the issue. For example, Rosa & Hamilton (1994, 9) question in their survey the relevance of comparing women and men entrepreneurs, because of the heterogeneity of gender categories. Lee-Gosselin & Grisé (1990, 426), point out that women entrepreneurs are frequently asked how their social environment supports them, but we lack the same kind of data from men entrepreneurs.

Besides media, research is also a discursive activity and a main (re)producer of shared meanings. My study examines the dominant discourse of discussing gender in female entrepreneurship. The next step is to construct new, competing meanings of gender in entrepreneurship. Although my analysis focuses on detecting the discursive practices of a dominant discourse, the hegemonic meaning making also takes place in relation to marginality and silences. One possible way to proceed in grasping the discontinuities would be to explore entrepreneurial discourses and how gender is intertwined with them. This approach could enable an insight to what is marginalized and what remains silent, thus making visible the excluded side of 'media' entrepreneurship.

It would, of course, require a new analysis of the data to pursue the implications of this point of view. A glance at the data shows that one marginalizing is especially striking. The context of the present data is Finland struggling with and recovering from the worst recession after the war and the publisher of the data is a central lobbyist of SME interests yet the severe entrepreneurial situation does not emerge in any significant way in the pro-women-entrepreneurship media talk. Only one article from 1991 (No. 3) frames the story within the recession; The story is about the courage of a young hairdresser who has left her job to start a business in the middle of a rapidly declining economy. Otherwise, the topic is mentioned in passing in six other articles, three of which construct the recession as an employment issue (No. 12, 17, 9), and the remaining three mention it in relation to bankruptcies (No. 8, 16, 18). However, these observations reflect only the explicit language use in the data. A deeper discursive analysis would be able to explore how media-talk relates discourses of entrepreneurship to the recession (e.g. success stories and difficulties) and what are gendering process in this context. In this respect marginalizing and silencing are powerful ways of producing meaning: they make legitimate discourses about entrepreneurship and gender visible in a particular time and place.

## REFERENCES

- Avotie, Leena (1998), *Chefer ur ett genuskulturellt perspektiv. Företagsekonomiska institutionen, Uppsala Universitet, Doctoral thesis no. 72. Uppsala.*
- Berggren, Anne Marie (1987), *Likhet eller särart – harmoni eller konflikt. En analys av kvinnorörelsens idéer med utgångspunkt i utvecklingen i USA under 1960- och 70-talet. Meddelanden från historiska institutionen i Göteborg, nr 30. Göteborg.*
- Bergman, Solveig (1995), *Feministisk motkultur och kvinnomakt: ”nya” kvinnorörelser och en studie av feminismen i Västtyskland. Meddelanden från Ekonomisk-statsvetenskapliga fakulteten vid Åbo Akademi, Ser A 432. Sociologiska institutionen, Åbo.*
- Braidotti, Rosi (1994), *Nomadic subjects. Embodiment and sexual difference in contemporary feminist theory.* Columbia University Press, New York.
- Bur, Vivien (1995), *An Introduction to Social Constructionism.* Routledge, London.
- Carland, Jo Ann C. & Carland, James W. (1991), *An empirical investigation into the distinctions between male and female entrepreneurs and managers. International Small Business Journal, 9 (3), 62-72.*
- Carter, Sara & Rosa, Peter (1998), *The financing of male- and female-owned businesses. Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, 10 (3), 17 pages. At <http://gw2.epnet.com>.*
- Chell, Elisabeth & Hedberg-Jalonen, Nina & Miettinen, Asko (1997), *Are types of business owner-managers universal? A cross country study of the UK, New Zealand and Finland. In Donckels, Rik & Miettinen, Asko (eds.), Entrepreneurship and SME research: on its way to the next millennium, 3-18. Ashgate, Adlershot.*
- Czarniawska, Barbara & Calás, Martha B. (1997), *Another Country: Explaining gender Discrimination with ‘Culture’. Administrative Studies, 4, 326-341.*
- Fagenson, Ellen A. & Marcus, Eric C. (1991), *Perceptions of the sex-role stereotypic characteristics of entrepreneurs: Women’s evaluations. Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice, 9 (4), 15 pages. At <http://gw1.epnet.com>*
- Fairclough, Norman (1995), *Media Discourse.* Edward Arnold, London.
- Fairclough, Norman (1997), *Miten media puhuu.* Alkuteos: Media discourse 1995. Vastapaino, Tampere.

- Green, Eileen & Cohen, Laurie (1995), Women's business: are women entrepreneurs breaking new ground or simply balancing the demands of 'women's work' in a new way? *Journal of Gender Studies*, 4 (3), 18 pages. At <http://gw2.epnet.com>
- Hajba, Sirpa (1987), Nainen yrittäjänä: yritysten uusperustantaa koskeva tutkimus. In Toiviainen, Esko (ed.), *Yrittäjyys ja aluetutkimus*. Oulussa 16.-17.5. 1985 pidetyn tutkijaseminaarin raportti. Oulun yliopisto, Pohjois-Suomen tutkimuslaitos, C 78.
- Hajba, Sirpa (1985), Mies- ja naisyrittäjien persoonallisuus. Helsingin kauppakorkeakoulu, työpapereita, F-133.
- Hall, Stuart (1992), The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power. In Hall, Stuart & Gieben, Bram (eds.), *Formations of Modernity*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Haraway, Donna (1991), Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. In *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women. The Reinvention of Nature*. Routledge, New York.
- Hellsten, Sirkku (1997), Tasa-arvon ja autonomian paradoksit. *Naistutkimus-Kvinnoforskning*, 10 (4), 46-50.
- Holli, Anne Maria (1999), Debatten om jämställdhet i det militära – ett finskt fall. In Bergquist, Kristina & (ed.), *Likestilte demokratier?: kjønn og politik i Norden*. Universitetsforlaget, Oslo.
- Holli, Anne Maria (1997), On equality and Trojan Horses. The challenges of the Finnish experience to feminist theory. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 4 (2), 133-164.
- Holli, Anne Maria (1995), Tasa-arvosta ja Trojan hevosista. Feministinen käsitekriittikki ja Suomalaisen tasa-arvopolitiikan käytännöt. *Naistutkimus – Kvinnoforskning*, 8 (3), 14-33.
- Honkanen, Katriina (1993), Vilken kvinna? Om uppfattningar om kvinnor inom kvinnorörelsen och feministisk teori. *Naistutkimus-Kvinnoforskning*, 6 (3), 50-58.
- Huuska, Maarit (1998), Transseksuaalisen sukupuoli-identiteetin rakentuminen. Tampereen yliopisto, Sosiologian ja sosiaalipsykologian laitos, tutkimuksia A 30.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss (1977), *Men and women of the corporation*. Basic Books, New York.
- Kaur, Davinder & Hayden, Carol (1993), Not just for pin money. a case study of the West Midlands Clothing Business Start-up Project. In Allen, Sheila & Truman, Carol (eds.), *Women in business. Perspectives on women entrepreneurs*, 1-13. Routledge, London.

- Kessler, Suzanne J. & McKenna, Wendy (1978), *Gender: An ethnomethodological approach*. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Kinnunen, Merja & Korvajärvi, Päivi (1996), Johdanto: naiset ja miehet työelämässä. In Kinnunen, Merja & Korvajärvi, Päivi (toim.), *Työelämän sukupuolistavat käytännöt*, 9-22. Vastapaino, Tampere.
- Koivunen, Anu (1996), Emansipaatio. In Koivunen, Anu & Liljeström, Marianne (eds.), *Avainsanat. 10 askelta feministiseen tutkimukseen*, 77-109. Vastapaino, Tampere.
- Koper, Gerda (1993), Women entrepreneurs and the granting of business credit. In Allen, Sheila & Truman, Carol (eds.), *Women in business. Perspectives on women entrepreneurs*, 57-69. Routledge, London.
- Korvajärvi, Päivi (1998), Gendering dynamics in white-collar work organizations. Acta Universitatis Tamperensis 200. Tampereen yliopisto, Tampere.
- Kovalainen, Anne (1995), Naisen paikka yrittäjänä. *Työelämän tutkimus*, 6 (1), 12-17.
- Kovalainen, Anne (1994), The invisibility of gender in economics. Turun Kauppakorkeakoulun julkaisuja, sarja A 2. Turku.
- Lee-Gosselin, Hélèn & Grisé, Jacque (1990), Are women owner-managers challenging our definitions of entrepreneurship? An in-depth survey. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9, 423-433.
- Ljunggren, Elisabet & Nilsson, Pernilla (1995), Female entrepreneurs in Scandinavia. An institutional perspective on entrepreneurship. In Tuohimaa, Sinikka & Työlähti, Nina & Fyhn, AsbjØrg (eds.), *On the terms of northern woman*. Femina Borealis Publication Series Number 1. University of Oulu, Oulu.
- Loscocco, Karyn A. & Robinson, Joyce (1991), Barriers to women's small-business success in the United States. *Gender & Society*, 5 (4), 511-532.
- Macdonald, Myra (1995), *Representing woman. Myths of femininity in the popular media*. Edward Arnold, London.
- Mills, Sara (1997), *Discourse*. Routledge, London.
- Nilsson, Pernilla (1997), Business counselling services directed towards female entrepreneurs – some legitimacy dilemmas. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 9 (3), 239-258.

- Nousiainen, Kevät (1998), Ero ja yhdenvertaisuus. *Naistutkimus-Kvinnoforskning*, 11 (3), 31-36.
- Parvikko, Tuija (1991), Conceptions of gender equality: Similarity and difference. In Meehen, Elizabeth & Sevenhuijsen, Selma (eds.), *Equality politics and gender*, 36-51. Sage, London.
- Räsänen, Leila (1990), Kokeilun lähtökohdat ja opetukset. In Räsänen, Leila (ed.), *Vammalan naisyrittäjäkurssi – kvinnoföretagarekursen i Vammala*. Pohjoismainen AVAA-projekti, Det nordiska BRYT-projektet. Nro 27/190. Työpoliittinen tutkimus 3, 11-23. Työministeriö, Helsinki.
- Sangregorio, Inga-Lisa (1996), Conversations with advisers of female entrepreneurs. In *Aspects of women's entrepreneurship*. NUTEK B 10, 13-36. Stockholm.
- Sexton, Donald L. & Bowman-Upton, Nancy (1990), Female and male entrepreneurs: Psychological characteristic and their role in gender related discrimination. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 5 (1), 29-36.
- Stevenson, Lois (1990), Some methodological problems associated with researching women entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9, 439-446.
- Stoner, Charles R. & Hartman Richard I. & Arora Raj (1990), Work-home role conflict in female owners of small business: An exploratory study. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 28 (1), 30-38.
- Taylor, Suzanne (1998), The National Association of Women Business Owners. In *Proceedings of Women Entrepreneurs in Small and Medium Enterprises*, 129-132. OECD, Paris.
- Wahl, Anna (1996), Företagsledning som en konstruktion av manlighet. *Kvinnovetenskaplig Tidskrift*, 17(1), 15-29.
- Wahl, Anna (1995), *Men's Perceptions of Women and Management*. Fritzers, Stockholm.
- Widerberg, Karin (1986), Har kvinnoforskning med jämställdhetspolitik att göra? *Kvinnovetenskaplig tidskrift* 7 (3), 36-47.
- Virta, Sirpa (1986), Naisyrittäjät ja yrittäjäksi aikovat naiset. Raportti Kauppa- ja teollisuusministeriön Nainen ja yritystoiminta –työryhmän naisyrittäjyyden edistämistutkimuksesta. Tampere.

Appendix 1.

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Headline of the article</u>	<u>Type of item</u>	<u>Named speakers</u>	<u>No. and year</u>	<u>Page(s)</u>
18	Finnish female entrepreneurs – models for the whole world	Interview	MD, chairwoman Ritva Sjöholm, Central Organisation of Female Entrepreneurs	4/97	40-41
17	A lot is required of a woman	Entrepreneur story	MD Riitta Suomi, Sylvi Salonen Ltd.	4/1997	38-40
16	It is wise to keep production domestic	Entrepreneur story	Woman Entrepreneur of the Year 1997, MD Eila Helén, Eila Helén Ltd.	3/1997	24-25
15	Special loans for female entrepreneurs were needed	Interview	Journalist VV; chairwoman Ritva Sjöholm, Central Organisation of Female Entrepreneurs	3/1997	23
14	The barriers to entrepreneurship are still higher for women than for men	Interview	Journalist VV; MD Ritva Nyberg, Centre for Female Entrepreneurship	2/1997	18-19
13	Sirpa Kaalikoski grew up to be a merchant. Everyone does and wants to do her work well	Entrepreneur story	Journalist Urpu-Kaarina Yli-Laurila; Merchant Sirpa Kaalikoski, Järvelän K-Rauta-Maatalous	4/1996	28-29
12	Barriers to women's entrepreneurship are reduced	Interview	MD Ritva Nyberg, Centre for Female Entrepreneurship	4/1996	26-27
11	Women and men are, after all, not different as entrepreneurs.	Report on research	Researcher Jarna Heinonen and Kaisa Leiwo, Turku Business School	4/1996	24, 26
10	A young woman entrepreneur has to make an effort to gain credibility	Entrepreneur story	Journalist Greetta Lamminen; MD Helena Kuivalainen, Miska Ltd.	1/1995	46-47
9	You learn by doing – even by handicraft	Entrepreneur story	Journalist Markku Vesterinen; owner-entrepreneurs Varpu Honkakoski ja Arja Varis, Sinooperi Ltd.	1/1995	43-45
8	High heels cannot break the class ceiling	Interview	Dr Anne Kovalainen	4/1994	21-23
7	A woman's life has many aspects	Comment	Chairwoman Birgitta Hautala, Central Organisation of Female Entrepreneurs	1/1994	44
6	Femaleness brings advantage to	Comment	MD Outi Oras-Laaksonen, Oras Liikenne	1/1994	44

	leadership		Ltd.		
5	Even autonomy sustains the division between the work of women and men	Report on research		1/1994	43-45
4	Woman Entrepreneur of the Year - Aino Mäkipeura from Rovaniemi	Entrepreneur story	Entrepreneur Aino Mäkipeura, Pikakuljetus Rovaniemi	2/1992	28
3	The emerging recession did not prevent her from starting a business of her own	Entrepreneur story	Journalist Markku Summa; entrepreneur Taina Liukkonen, Salon White Lies	6/1991	54-57
2	New self-confidence from entrepreneurship	Entrepreneur story	Journalist Salme Blomster; Dr Terhi Pöyhönen, Helsingin työyhteisökonsultit Ltd.	5/1991	20-22
1	Working at home – not a temporary solution but a permanent way of work	Interview	Journalist Markku Vesterinen; Psychologist Anna Kock, Effektiva Relationer; Dr Minna Salmi	5/1991	17-18