


Please cite the Published Version

Jones, Sally , Al-Dajani, Haya, Ekinsmyth, Carol and Treanor, Lorna (2025) Guest editorial: Expanding horizons: feminist perspectives and approaches in contemporary gender and entrepreneurship research. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 17 (1). pp. 1-18. ISSN 1756-6266

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijge-03-2025-313>

Publisher: Emerald

Version: Accepted Version

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/638764/>

Usage rights:  [Creative Commons: Attribution 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Additional Information: This is an author-produced version of the published paper. Uploaded in accordance with the University's Research Publications Policy.

Enquiries:

If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)



**Expanding Horizons: Feminist Perspectives and Approaches
in Contemporary Gender and Entrepreneurship Research**

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Editorial

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

IJGE SI on Feminist Approaches to Gender and Entrepreneurship Research

Expanding Horizons: Feminist Perspectives and Approaches in Contemporary Gender and Entrepreneurship Research

Despite its significant aims to reduce and ultimately eradicate sexist inequality and oppression (Bell *et al.*, 2020: 177), feminism remains a relatively underdeveloped driver within gender and entrepreneurship research. Much extant scholarship either neglects to adopt a feminist lens or, when it does, employs this perspective implicitly rather than explicitly as a theoretical or methodological framework (Henry *et al.*, 2016). Feminism itself is not monolithic; it encompasses diverse traditions such as Islamic feminism, Black feminism, post-colonial feminism, materialist feminism, and socialist feminism. Each feminist stance prioritises different dimensions of women's lived experiences, yet they share common epistemological concerns: namely, how gender shapes conceptions of knowledge, knowers, and the practices of inquiry and justification (Anderson, 2024). These epistemological challenges are critical for advancing gender and entrepreneurship research. They allow us to interrogate and critique normative assumptions about entrepreneurial activities and behaviours (Marlow, 2012), and move beyond the persistence of neoliberal assumptions, the privileging of masculinised entrepreneurial archetypes (Ogbor, 2000), and the marginalisation of diverse, contextually embedded experiences (Calás *et al.*, 2009). This special issue offers a pivotal step towards addressing these gaps, and features contributions that engage deeply with feminist philosophies and epistemologies, to enrich gender and entrepreneurship research.

In the *call for papers* for this special issue, we welcomed both conceptual and empirical studies that explicitly foreground feminist theories as drivers for research design and analysis, particularly those that challenge and reframe normative understandings of entrepreneurial activities. Recognising the importance of methodological innovation, we invited papers outlining feminist-driven methodologies and approaches that reflect the multiplicities of gender in contemporary societies. We were especially keen on studies applying intersectional feminist perspectives to examine the interplay of gender with other social dimensions, as well as research rooted in non-Western feminist philosophies that interrogate and advance knowledge from the Global South. Additionally, we encouraged contributions employing non-traditional research methods to achieve feminist aims and critical studies that question and offer alternatives to hegemonic feminist approaches in gender and entrepreneurship scholarship. Through this call, we aimed to highlight the diversity of feminist thought and its capacity to generate novel insights and perspectives in the field. As such, this special issue seeks to foreground the potential of feminist-informed entrepreneurship research to ask novel questions that critique the gendered contours of entrepreneurship globally. By embracing the plurality of feminist traditions and philosophies, the contributions in this issue aim to push the boundaries of how we understand entrepreneurship and to offer diverse perspectives and methodologies.

In line with our own feminist values and methodologies centred around collaborative knowledge-building, emphasising intersectionality, and disrupting traditional, hierarchical approaches to academic research, we designed and facilitated two in-person professional development workshops (PDWs) and one live online PDW for potential contributors to the special issue. Their purpose was to enhance the robustness of potential contributors' theoretical contributions in gender and entrepreneurship research, and to deepen understanding of the implications of gender when conceptualised as a social construction in entrepreneurship research. The PDWs provided participants with critical insights into feminist and gender theories, exploring diverse perspectives such as performativity, intersectionality, and gender as

1
2
3 a form of capital or discourse. The PDWs also addressed key challenges in the field, including
4 critiques of essentialism and the overreliance on traditional methodologies. Overall,
5 participants were guided to situate their research within existing knowledge, articulate its
6 significance, and align it with broader theoretical conversations, thereby strengthening their
7 academic contributions and expanding publication potential. We are grateful for the 29
8 submissions received for this special issue. Although only six articles could be included, we
9 sincerely hope that the remaining 23 submissions, enriched and refined through the PDWs and
10 reviewer feedback, will continue to be developed and find publication opportunities beyond
11 this volume.
12
13

14
15 We now briefly present the evolution of feminist research approaches in entrepreneurship
16 research and then discuss and reflect upon how feminist theories and approaches offer
17 transformative contributions to entrepreneurship research. Following this, we showcase the six
18 articles featured in this special issue, and finally, we share our recommendations for how future
19 gender and entrepreneurship research can continue to challenge conventional paradigms,
20 traditional epistemologies, methodologies, and assumptions, and advocate for a more inclusive
21 and equitable understanding of entrepreneurship.
22
23

24 **Evolution of Feminist Approaches in Entrepreneurship Research**

25
26 Feminist-informed entrepreneurship research challenges established conventional paradigms
27 and offers comprehensive ways of analysing and understanding entrepreneurship. Feminist
28 approaches to entrepreneurship research have evolved significantly since Schwartz's (1976)
29 foundational work. Early contributions, predominantly rooted in white Western perspectives,
30 drew on liberal feminism, which emphasised equal opportunities for men and women, focusing
31 on removing systemic barriers to entrepreneurial participation. Feminist concerns were further
32 developed through social feminist approaches, which highlighted the importance of relational
33 and contextual influences, particularly how gendered social expectations shape entrepreneurial
34 experiences. Poststructuralist feminism further advanced the field by deconstructing gender
35 norms and narratives, exposing how entrenched discourses often perpetuate male-centric
36 definitions of entrepreneurship. More recently, intersectional feminism has brought critical
37 attention to the multiple, intersecting layers of oppression influencing entrepreneurial
38 opportunities and outcomes. However, while all these frameworks have significantly enriched
39 the field, they predominantly centre on experiences and contexts from the Global North,
40 leaving a notable gap in feminist perspectives from the Global South. The absence of these
41 perspectives limits the field's inclusivity and hinders the development of a truly global
42 understanding of gendered entrepreneurship.
43
44
45
46

47 ***Liberal and Social Feminisms in Entrepreneurship Scholarship***

48
49 Initially focused on addressing gender biases within the field, feminist scholarship has grown
50 to embrace a more nuanced and inclusive understanding of entrepreneurship, positioning it
51 within complex social structures and intersecting systems of power. This evolution began with
52 feminist theories including liberal feminism (1970's-1990's) and social feminism (1990's-
53 2000's), each contributing distinct perspectives to the study of gender and entrepreneurship. At
54 this time, entrepreneurship research had neglected gender as a critical factor, reflecting broader
55 societal biases. Male entrepreneurs were considered the norm, while women entrepreneurs
56 were treated as exceptions or anomalies within a male-dominated field (Ahl, 2006). This
57 androcentric framing not only marginalised women's entrepreneurial activities but also
58
59
60

perpetuated stereotypes that portrayed women as less ambitious, less innovative, and less capable of entrepreneurial success (Marlow and McAdam, 2013).

Liberal feminism, which advocates for equal opportunities for women in entrepreneurship is exemplified by Schwartz (1976), who was the first to explicitly focus on women's entrepreneurship. She argued that societal norms and institutional structures systematically marginalised women in business, and highlighted how discriminatory practices in access to credit, training, and professional networks perpetuated gender inequalities, framing women's entrepreneurial efforts as secondary to men's. Her analysis laid the groundwork for later feminist research by emphasising the need to redefine entrepreneurship in more inclusive and equitable terms. Studies rooted in liberal feminism often focused on removing structural barriers, such as access to funding, mentorship, and networks (Brush *et al.*, 2009), and the undervaluing of sectors where women were overrepresented, such as retail and caregiving industries (Brush *et al.*, 2009). These critiques marked the beginning of a shift from individualistic explanations of women's underrepresentation to a broader analysis of systemic inequalities, and extensively documented the *liability of newness* compounded by gender biases in entrepreneurial ecosystems (Carter *et al.*, 2015).

While liberal feminism successfully highlighted systemic disparities, its individualistic focus was critiqued for overlooking broader societal and cultural dynamics affecting women collectively. As Ahl (2006) argues, liberal feminist approaches often risk reinforcing stereotypes by framing women entrepreneurs as exceptions who succeed despite systemic challenges. This narrow focus limits the exploration of how deeply embedded gender norms influence entrepreneurial opportunities and behaviours. As a result, women's entrepreneurship researchers moved beyond treating women entrepreneurs as isolated exceptions and started to examine entrepreneurship as embedded in gendered social structures, giving rise to social feminist theory.

Social feminist entrepreneurship research enriched the discourse by emphasising the critical role of relational and contextual factors in shaping entrepreneurship (Ahl, 2006; Jones, 2014). It recognised gender as a socially constructed phenomenon, shaped by cultural norms, institutions, and power dynamics. In doing so, it distinguished gender from sex (West and Zimmerman, 1989). Rather than focusing solely on women, and gender as a binary variable, social feminism considers how entrepreneurial opportunities and practices are shaped by deeply ingrained gender norms and systemic inequalities. Research adopting a social feminist lens explores how gendered social expectations influence entrepreneurial motivations and outcomes (Marlow and McAdam, 2013; Jennings and Brush 2013; Ahl and Nelson, 2015). A gap persists however, in longitudinal studies that explore how these dynamics evolve over time and intersect with other social identities, such as race and class.

Similarly, societal perceptions of risk and innovation are often skewed to favour masculinized behaviours, marginalising entrepreneurial models that prioritise collaboration, sustainability, or community impact - values more frequently associated with women (Al-Dajani, 2022). This broader understanding of entrepreneurship as a gendered phenomenon has been central to developing more inclusive and critical approaches to the field. In this regard, poststructuralist feminism has interrogated these assumptions and broadened the definition of entrepreneurship to include diverse practices and motivations that extend beyond the narrow scope of economic gain.

Poststructuralist Feminism in Entrepreneurship Scholarship

1
2
3
4 Poststructuralist feminism has provided a critical lens for deconstructing dominant
5 entrepreneurial narratives, questioning the traditional masculinisation of entrepreneurship (Ahl
6 and Marlow, 2012). It argues that gender is deeply intertwined with power dynamics, shaping
7 how individuals experience and are perceived within entrepreneurial contexts (Treanor, *et al.*,
8 2021). Within poststructuralist feminism, gender operates as both a structural and performative
9 construct, influencing access to resources, networks, and opportunities (Marlow and Patton,
10 2005). Additionally, poststructuralist feminist scholars have examined how language, discourse,
11 and power shape the construction of entrepreneurship as a gendered phenomenon. For
12 example, Ahl (2006) argues that the entrepreneurship literature often reinforces masculine
13 norms by valorising traits such as risk-taking and independence while marginalising
14 collaborative and nurturing approaches often associated with women. Marlow and McAdam
15 (2013) and Hubert and Brindley (2015) for example, also argue that the persistent stereotype
16 of male entrepreneurs as risk-takers and innovators reinforces biases against women and non-
17 binary individuals, often portraying them as less capable or ambitious. Poststructuralist feminist
18 studies have also critiqued the portrayal of women entrepreneurs in media and policy as
19 inherently transformative agents, burdening them with unrealistic expectations (Gill and
20 Ganesh, 2007; Nadin *et al.*, 2020). While poststructuralist feminism has deepened the
21 theoretical understanding of how entrepreneurship is gendered, it remains underutilised in
22 empirical studies. The challenge lies in operationalising this perspective in research designs
23 that produce actionable insights for policy and practice.
24
25
26
27

28 ***Intersectional Feminism in Entrepreneurship Scholarship***

29
30
31 Intersectionality, a concept popularised by Crenshaw (1989), has gained increasing traction in
32 gender and entrepreneurship research, providing a nuanced framework to examine how
33 multiple, intersecting identities shape entrepreneurial experiences. By exploring the interplay
34 of gender with other dimensions such as race, class, ethnicity, and migration status,
35 intersectional analyses illuminate the complex and often compounding forms of oppression
36 that affect entrepreneurs in diverse ways. This approach has enriched our understanding of
37 entrepreneurship by highlighting the heterogeneity of women's experiences and challenging
38 monolithic representations of women entrepreneurs.
39
40

41 One of the key contributions of intersectional research is its focus on how overlapping identities
42 influence entrepreneurial identities and practices. For instance, Essers and Benschop (2007)
43 examined the experiences of Moroccan and Turkish women entrepreneurs in the Netherlands,
44 revealing how their entrepreneurial identities were shaped by the intersection of gender,
45 ethnicity, and religion. These women often navigated conflicting cultural expectations, using
46 entrepreneurship as a space to negotiate and assert their identities. Such studies underscore the
47 importance of considering multiple identity dimensions to avoid simplistic portrayals of
48 women entrepreneurs as a homogeneous group.
49
50

51 Intersectional research has also highlighted how systemic inequalities are compounded for
52 individuals occupying multiple marginalised identities. For example, Martinez Dy *et al.*,
53 (2017) explored how race and class intersect with gender to constrain entrepreneurial
54 opportunities. Their study found that women of colour often face intersecting structural
55 barriers, including racialised stereotypes, limited access to funding, and exclusion from
56 entrepreneurial networks. Similarly, studies on immigrant and refugee women entrepreneurs
57 emphasise how intersecting challenges, such as legal restrictions, language barriers or
58
59
60

1
2
3 disability, exacerbate the gendered disadvantages these groups face (Adeeko and Treanor,
4 2022; Marlow and Swail, 2021; Althalathini *et al.*, 2021; Ramadani *et al.*, 2023).

5
6 Additionally, intersectional perspectives have further contributed to understanding how
7 entrepreneurial ecosystems perpetuate or mitigate intersecting inequalities (Pickernell *et al.*,
8 2022). Ozkazanc-Pan, and Muntean, (2022) argue that policies and support structures often fail
9 to address the specific needs of entrepreneurs with intersecting identities. For instance,
10 programs designed to support women entrepreneurs may inadvertently exclude migrant women
11 by not accounting for their unique legal or social constraints (Aman *et al.*, 2022)

12
13
14
15 Intersectionality has significantly enriched gender and entrepreneurship research by
16 challenging essentialist notions of women entrepreneurs and illuminating the complex
17 interplay of multiple identities. It has advanced the field's understanding of how systemic
18 inequalities shape entrepreneurial experiences, practices, and ecosystems. However, the
19 adoption of intersectionality remains uneven, with most studies focusing on gender in isolation.
20 As McCall (2005) notes, intersectional analyses often face methodological challenges, such as
21 disentangling the effects of overlapping identities. Addressing these challenges requires
22 innovative methodological approaches that capture the complexity of lived experiences.
23 Furthermore, to fully realise its potential, intersectional feminist research must address the
24 underrepresentation of marginalised women in the Global North and, the underrepresentation
25 of Global South perspectives. By doing so, intersectional analyses can contribute to a more
26 inclusive and comprehensive understanding of entrepreneurship.

27 28 29 30 **Reframing Entrepreneurship: A Path to Inclusion and Equity through Contemporary** 31 **Feminist Perspectives**

32
33 The integration of feminist lenses into gender and entrepreneurship research has significantly
34 enriched the field by challenging traditional assumptions and broadening the scope of inquiry.
35 Contributions from liberal, social, poststructuralist, and intersectional feminist perspectives
36 have revealed the structural and cultural dynamics that shape entrepreneurial experiences.
37 Feminist scholarship has broadened the definition of entrepreneurship, moving beyond
38 economic success to incorporate social and community impacts. For example, studies of home-
39 based businesses demonstrate how women leverage business ventures in family and
40 community spaces to address spatial and gender inequalities (Ekinsmyth, 2013). Similarly,
41 feminist critiques have exposed male-centric biases in entrepreneurship theories, advancing the
42 recognition of informal entrepreneurship and home-based businesses that traditional metrics
43 often overlook (Henry *et al.*, 2016; Al-Dajani *et al.*, 2019). However, despite such
44 advancements, significant gaps persist in the diversity of feminist perspectives, the
45 representation of marginalised voices, and the limited methodological approaches adopted in
46 this body of research.

47
48
49
50 The literature continues to be dominated by liberal feminist perspectives, which focus on
51 achieving equality by addressing structural barriers. While valuable, this approach often
52 overlooks the deeper cultural and historical dynamics that influence entrepreneurship. For
53 instance, the integration of post-colonial feminist frameworks can provide critical insights into
54 how colonial histories and global inequalities have shaped entrepreneurial opportunities,
55 particularly for women in the Global South (Syed and Ali, 2021). By exploring these
56 dynamics, post-colonial feminism will help to deconstruct the Western-centric narratives that
57 dominate the field and illuminate the specific challenges faced by entrepreneurs in historically
58 marginalised contexts. Additionally, postmodern feminist theories reject stable and universal
59

1
2
3 categories such as *woman* or *gender*, arguing instead for fluid, performative conceptions of
4 identity (Butler, 1990). This perspective destabilises binary understandings and foregrounds
5 the role of discourse and repeated acts in constituting gendered identities. Similarly, standpoint
6 epistemology (Hartsock, 2016) challenges the presumed neutrality of traditional research
7 paradigms, positing that marginalised groups possess unique epistemic privilege due to their
8 lived experiences of oppression.
9

10
11 With regards to the underrepresentation of marginalised voices, the majority of existing
12 research focuses on white, heterosexual, middle-class women, limiting the generalizability of
13 findings and overlooking the unique experiences of groups such as LGBTQ+ entrepreneurs,
14 indigenous women, and women of colour. The entrepreneurial journeys of these groups are
15 shaped by intersecting systems of oppression that remain largely underexplored. Addressing
16 this gap requires more inclusive sampling strategies and participatory research methods that
17 capture the diversity of entrepreneurial experiences. Indeed, feminist research generally
18 emphasises the importance of reflexivity, collaboration, and empowerment in research
19 methodologies. By integrating lived experiences and participatory approaches, feminist
20 scholars challenge hierarchical researcher-researched relationships and redefine the boundaries
21 of credible knowledge (Smith, 1987). Emerging methodologies such as arts-based approaches
22 (New, 2019), autoethnography (Martinez Dy, 2021), and intersectional analyses (Martinez Dy
23 and Jayawarna, 2020) illustrate the potential of feminist lenses to address the complexities of
24 gendered entrepreneurial experiences. Furthermore, feminist scholarship advocates for policies
25 and institutional reforms that dismantle structural barriers, creating a more inclusive
26 entrepreneurial landscape (Marlow and McAdam, 2013; Hillenkamp and dos Santos, 2019;
27 Treanor and Marlow, 2024).
28
29
30

31
32 Significantly, methodological limitations further constrain the field (Henry *et al.*, 2016). Many
33 studies rely on cross-sectional designs and self-reported data, which can introduce biases and
34 fail to capture the evolving nature of gendered entrepreneurial experiences. To address these
35 issues, longitudinal and mixed-method approaches can provide deeper insights into how
36 entrepreneurial journeys unfold over time and across different contexts. Such methodologies
37 can also support the exploration of intersectional dynamics, allowing researchers to better
38 understand how overlapping identities influence entrepreneurial outcomes.
39
40

41
42 The translation of feminist insights into actionable policies and practices also remains limited.
43 While feminist perspectives have advanced the conceptual understanding of gender and
44 entrepreneurship, their application to real-world contexts has been uneven. Feminist-informed
45 initiatives, such as gender-sensitive support systems, women-focused incubators, and
46 mentorship programs, have facilitated advances in improving the gender gap in entrepreneurial
47 ecosystems (Treanor and Burkinshaw, 2023; Ekinsmyth and Treanor, 2024) but highlight
48 further progress is required in destabilising the normative masculine entrepreneurial
49 construction within business support provision and spaces (Treanor and Marlow, 2024).
50 Similarly, around the world, there is still a long way to go before welfare policies (Jones and
51 Nadin, 2024) and family policies (Ekinsmyth, 2022) support equitable access to secure self-
52 employment and entrepreneurship. Stronger collaborations between academics, policymakers,
53 and practitioners are necessary to ensure that feminist research leads to meaningful and
54 sustainable change.
55
56

57
58 Feminist scholarship has also influenced the development of, or at least attempts to achieve,
59 inclusive entrepreneurial ecosystems, emphasising the need for policies and practices that
60 challenge the gendered contours of entrepreneurship (Ozkazanc-Pan, and Muntean, 2022). For

1
2
3 instance, feminist critiques have brought attention to the value of collective entrepreneurial
4 efforts, which are often overlooked in individualistic frameworks (de Bruin and Swail,
5 Yousafzai and Aljanova in this special issue). By emphasising solidarity and collaboration,
6 feminist perspectives can inform the design of entrepreneurship ecosystems that empower
7 entire communities.
8
9

10 This special issue seeks to build on these achievements and bridge these gaps by showcasing
11 contemporary feminist-informed research that asks new questions and critiques the gendered
12 dimensions of entrepreneurship worldwide. By integrating diverse feminist frameworks, the
13 contributions in this special issue challenge dominant narratives and offer new insights into the
14 entrepreneurial experiences of women and other marginalised groups. Through these efforts,
15 the special issue aims to advance a more inclusive and equitable understanding of
16 entrepreneurship, fostering a global dialogue that moves the field forward.
17
18

19 **Showcasing Feminist Approaches in the Gender and Entrepreneurship Scholarship in** 20 **this Special Issue** 21

22
23 Reflecting the diversity of feminist theories and approaches, the six articles in this special issue
24 employ a broad spectrum of feminist perspectives, each offering distinct contributions to
25 understanding the intersection of gender and entrepreneurship across varied international
26 contexts and sectors. Collectively, these works deepen the field by providing multidimensional
27 insights into the systemic dynamics shaping entrepreneurial opportunities and practices. By
28 interrogating existing theories, practices, and policies, they illuminate overlooked complexities
29 and propose alternative frameworks. Drawing on feminist perspectives such as standpoint
30 theory, poststructuralism, and post-colonialism, these studies critically examine entrenched
31 norms within entrepreneurship research. Each article contributes to ongoing efforts to foster
32 inclusivity and drive transformative change in this evolving discipline.
33
34

35 *Anne de Bruin and Janine Swail* offer a conceptual article that holds special value and
36 innovation in its theoretical framing, notably drawing upon both constructionism and
37 poststructuralist feminist approaches to place attention on both the *doing* and *undoing* of
38 gender. In adopting this feminist perspective their paper highlights how existing
39 entrepreneurial ecosystems (EEs) are shaped by unacknowledged gender dynamics. The value
40 of feminist research generally, is the identification and interrogation of often unacknowledged
41 assumptions and practices. This recognition is the fundamental starting point to enable change,
42 and de Bruin and Swail identify potential avenues to enhance the inclusivity of entrepreneurial
43 ecosystems. They argue that EEs need to embrace the possibility of new ‘path creation’ (an
44 agentic concept) rather than accepting ‘path dependence’ (i.e. believing the current state of
45 being is inevitable as it results, non-agentially, from historical trajectories with their in-built
46 biases). In doing so, they challenge feminist researchers to move beyond identification and
47 interrogation of the unacknowledged and to simultaneously seek proposed pathways to enable
48 (gender-) system change – to undo current gender regimes and set processes and systems on
49 new, gender-equitable paths (path creation). This powerful model of undoing and creation
50 offers a framework through which feminist research can proceed for transformative potential.
51
52

53 The authors demonstrate the power of this approach through an empirical focus on changing
54 the gendered EE discourse (a poststructuralist approach), using the example of feminist
55 entrepreneur funding venture *Coralus*. This ‘window study’ offers practical insights on the
56 transformative potential of undoing and re-writing the rules of engagement, illustrating the
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 construction of new social processes within an entrepreneurial ecosystem. Coralus is a multi-
4 national, multi-actor feminist enterprise-funding organisation for women and non-binary
5 entrepreneurs, purposely named as a metaphor for the regenerative and gender variable/non-
6 binary (hermaphrodite, single sex individuals) nature of coral colonies. The authors
7 subsequently show how mindsets can be changed, and thinking shifted, to create more inclusive
8 EEs, and argue that these changes require a constructionist-poststructuralist approach from
9 both scholars and EE agents.
10
11
12

13
14 The future research directions suggested by this article are fourfold. First, the authors suggest
15 that their underlying premise, that new path creation is a prerequisite for the evolution of EEs
16 towards inclusivity, should be explored further. Second, they argue that future research should
17 broaden empirical foci, drawing on new examples and exploring the relationship between
18 traditional EEs and alternative EEs. For example, they suggest, alongside others, that we should
19 explore whether alternative EEs are needed, to support disadvantaged groups or different forms
20 of entrepreneurship. They also suggest further study of both the discursive construction and
21 reconstruction of EEs. Finally, they argue for further research that broadens the consideration
22 of inclusivity beyond gender to other disadvantaged groups and intersectional identities.
23 Overall, the authors offer a feminist conceptual contribution that advances the understanding
24 of evolution of entrepreneurial ecosystems (EEs) by examining potential pathways to make
25 gendered EEs more inclusive.
26
27

28
29 The extended literature review by *Persephone de Magdalene and Kai Green* contributes to
30 the evolving feminist and gender-aware literature on social entrepreneurship (SE), emphasising
31 its developing role in challenging exclusionary norms in traditional entrepreneurship research.
32 It portrays this shift as a journey through ‘turbulent waters’ symbolising the complexities of
33 addressing marginalisation while fostering egalitarianism, freedom, and self-expression. These
34 ‘turbulent waters’, they argue, reflect the tensions arising from the ongoing struggles of
35 marginalised groups, including Indigenous, non-white populations, and Global South scholars,
36 as they seek recognition within neo-colonial and Global North-dominated institutions. In their
37 paper, the authors utilise a five-stage literature review process, which aims to develop a
38 ‘theoretically-informed gender-aware framework for future SE research’.
39
40

41
42 The article acknowledges the progress that has been made by feminist scholars in moving SE
43 away from Anglo-American norms, but find the mainstream literature remains far from fully
44 embracing of the diversity of cultures, languages, and perspectives required for truly inclusive
45 research. They argue that, meta-theoretically, SE offers a crucial opportunity to break away
46 from the trajectory of traditional entrepreneurship research; concluding that feminist
47 approaches encourage the development of more nuanced theories, which address the systemic
48 challenges faced by women entrepreneurs, other marginalised groups, and their intersections.
49

50
51 Feminist theory shapes their research questions and methodology. They critically reflect on
52 their positionality as Global North scholars striving to normalise the inclusion of historically
53 underrepresented perspectives. They are also explicit in their political aim to foster societal
54 transformation through allyship, collective visioning, and values-driven action. They highlight
55 the value of feminist epistemological perspectives within SE research and critique the
56 dominance in the mainstream literature of male-centred and ‘heroic’ visions of
57 entrepreneurship, calling instead for theory-building grounded in the lived experiences of
58 women, Indigenous peoples, and LGBTQI+ individuals.
59
60

1
2
3 The literature review finds that feminist and gender-informed research on social
4 entrepreneurship is rich in relational and embedded accounts of the economy, providing an
5 important corrective to discourse that discounts Indigenous and other marginalised forms of
6 SE. Indeed, they find critical perspectives that question the androcentric positioning of the
7 social entrepreneur as a heroic figure (Teasdale *et al.*, 2023), gendered assumptions about non-
8 economic motivations (Byrne *et al.*, 2019), de-contextualised accounts of SE (de Bruin *et al.*,
9 2023) and the domination of white, western theorising that renders mute minority voices and
10 experiences (Jurado and Mika, 2023) (their citations).
11
12

13
14 To address these challenges in future research, the authors advocate for more transdisciplinary
15 research that integrates diverse disciplinary perspectives and worldviews. While the
16 methodological approach underpinning this paper is not innovative, their robust approach
17 contributes a 'state-of-play' account of the epistemological approaches, themes, and
18 knowledge gaps in social entrepreneurship studies, highlighting the innovations within this
19 literature and suggesting future pathways for strengthening feminist work in social
20 entrepreneurship involving researching subordinated groups engaging in SE. The article
21 ultimately underscores the importance of challenging dominant norms in entrepreneurship
22 research to create a more inclusive and equitable field, specifically calling for scholars to
23 engage in transdisciplinary research as feminist practice to support transformational societal
24 change.
25
26

27 **Beverly Best, Paul Lasalle and Katerina Nicolopoulou** explore how women entrepreneurs in
28 the Caribbean leverage digital technologies for business transformation, framed through a post-
29 colonial feminist perspective. This approach showcases the influence of context and
30 embeddedness upon women's entrepreneurial activity. Their study highlights the opportunities
31 and challenges that digitalisation brings to women-owned businesses in Caribbean Small Island
32 Developing States (SIDS), highlighting the patriarchal paradox in this context, where many
33 households are headed by women. Its post-colonial feminist perspective emphasises unique
34 historical, cultural, and economic dynamics and identifies how colonial legacies and societal
35 structures shape women's entrepreneurial activities in this context. Thirty semi-structured
36 interviews were conducted with women digital entrepreneurs from Trinidad and Tobago,
37 Jamaica, and Barbados, covering various sectors. Drawing upon this data, the article develops
38 a feminist informed theoretical 'SHERO' framework - Sustainability, Hope, Empowerment,
39 Resilience, and Optimism. This framework reimagines entrepreneurship as a multidimensional
40 process that prioritises community impact and inclusivity over profit-driven objectives. This
41 challenges traditional entrepreneurial frameworks, which emphasise individualism and
42 financial growth. The authors also highlight the importance of community and resilience in
43 overcoming socio-cultural constraints. For instance, these women leverage digital tools to
44 transcend the limitations of *islandness*, such as restricted market access, geographical barriers
45 and infrastructural gaps. Their strategies include building online communities, engaging with
46 global audiences, and utilising digital platforms to amplify their visibility and agency, to help
47 them navigate systemic structural barriers.
48
49
50
51

52
53 In using post-colonial feminism, the authors seek to challenge generalisations of Caribbean
54 women and emphasise the intersecting experiences of women in post-colonial settings, along
55 with their specific contexts and positions. Participants emphasised the importance of social
56 responsibility and creating sustainable ventures in their use of digital technologies, rather than
57 solely focusing on profit. That said, digitalisation does provide new avenues for growth,
58 helping balance profit-making with a desire to address societal challenges. Opportunities for
59 building resilience emerge, with digital technologies serving as tools for adaptation and
60

1
2
3 continuity, particularly during crises like the COVID-19 pandemic. Ultimately, the article
4 argues that women entrepreneurs in this context navigate dual spaces as leaders and innovators
5 in male-dominated fields, using digital tools to assert their agency. However, they still face
6 challenges, such as persistent gender biases and cultural stereotypes.
7

8
9 This article offers a critical, intersectional analysis of gender, race, class and historical, politico-
10 socio-economic approach, to understand the social positioning and experiences of women
11 entrepreneurs. The use of post-colonial, feminist theory disrupts Western-centric paradigms,
12 focusing on a historically marginalised context, and giving voice to women who are often
13 overlooked and unheard, a basic tenet of feminist research. However, their analysis moves
14 beyond a single-axis focus on gender to incorporate multiple intersecting factors such as
15 education, cultural norms and digital access to explore entrepreneurial opportunities,
16 experiences and outcomes. The authors acknowledge their own positionality, an important
17 aspect of feminist-informed research, and importantly, they frame female entrepreneurs as
18 agents of change who navigate and reshape digital spaces to overcome patriarchal barriers,
19 aligning with broader feminist principles of empowerment and resistance. This study, as so
20 many feminist analyses do, challenges traditional male-centric entrepreneurial narratives to
21 highlight the positive and unique contributions of women, which remain frequently
22 overlooked. The authors recommend that future studies should further explore the nuanced
23 experiences of women entrepreneurs in diverse non-Western contexts to advance feminist
24 theoretical insights into digital entrepreneurship.
25
26
27
28
29

30 In line with *Anne de Bruin and Janine Swail* in this special issue, this article demonstrates
31 that newer or specific forms of entrepreneurship, in this case - digital entrepreneurship,
32 represent a frontier of opportunity and challenge for gender and entrepreneurship scholars, as
33 feminist theory and analyses can play a transformative role in such domains (Dy *et al.*, 2017).
34 Digital technologies have reshaped the entrepreneurial landscape, creating new opportunities
35 for connection, innovation, and market access. For women and other marginalised groups,
36 digital platforms have the potential to overcome systemic barriers and marginalisation,
37 including geographic isolation, limited resources, and exclusion from traditional networks.
38 However, these technologies are not neutral; they operate within structures that often replicate
39 or amplify existing inequalities (Martinez Dy *et al.*, 2018). While digital platforms create
40 pathways for inclusion, they also expose women to new forms of marginalisation, such as
41 online harassment, algorithmic biases, and the difficulties of accessing digital tools in the
42 Global South (Henry, *et al.*, 2022). Digital entrepreneurship's potential to introduce new
43 pathways to exclusion highlights the need for future critical focus on the design and use of
44 digital technologies (Shivers-McNair *et al.*, 2019).
45
46
47

48 *Caroline Essers, Maura McAdam and Carolin Ossenkop*, explore the identity work
49 undertaken by ten Dutch women entrepreneurs working in masculinised industries, while
50 seeking to establish their entrepreneurial legitimacy. Establishing entrepreneurial legitimacy
51 within such gendered contexts represents a process requiring women to fit in, while
52 simultaneously standing out (De Clercq and Voronov, 2009).
53
54

55 The authors employ a postfeminist lens in their analysis. Postfeminism, the gendered relation
56 of neoliberalism, is a constellation of gendered narratives and beliefs that informs the thinking,
57 subjectivities, behaviours and expectations of women, such that women are expected to be
58 agentic, enterprising and capable of attaining success if they expend sufficient effort (Treanor
59 and Marlow, 2021). This requires self-regulation of their subjectivities, effort and emotions to
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

maximise their fit with the ideal neoliberal citizen (Gill *et al.*, 2017; Treanor *et al.*, 2021). As Lewis (2014) highlights, postfeminism is most useful when used as an analytical lens to highlight the influence of such gendered discourses and beliefs upon individual thinking, behaviours and subjectivities. In deploying a postfeminist lens within their study, the authors investigate how their respondents discursively and subjectively make sense of their gendered contexts and, in so doing, illustrate how local gender regimes and individual actions may constrain and/or promote their entrepreneurial endeavours of these women. Their analysis identifies three forms of identity work that underpin the quest to establish legitimacy: knowledge, situatedness and positionality.

The women sought legitimacy through, for example, undertaking extensive preparation because competence for women is never assumed (Treanor *et al.*, 2021); thus, knowledge was used as proof of fit, as the women entrepreneurs were regularly questioned on their specific knowledge and expertise by (often male) stakeholders. In what Gill *et al.* (2017) might regard as an acceptance of '*just the way it is*', these women undertook additional labour to be prepared and attain legitimacy despite, and potentially unaware of the contradiction with, the postfeminist fallacy of meritocracy and equality. In terms of 'situatedness' the authors consider how the women must balance a more masculine approach of doing business with societal expectations related to being a woman. The authors identify several aspects within their theme of 'positionality' in categorising the women's identity work. They conclude that, within the context of Dutch, male-dominated industries, postfeminism interpellated women entrepreneurs to constitute a masculine, individualised, entrepreneurial subjectivity, while simultaneously enacting highly feminised performances through physical appearance and images of motherhood.

The deployment of a postfeminist lens in their analyses reveals how the women portrayed entrepreneurship positively with self-improvement, reinvention and happiness presented as being available to any woman expending sufficient effort, while simultaneously minimising tensions or difficulties to maintain the positive and upbeat disposition expected of the ideal postfeminist woman. Importantly, the postfeminist perspective also provides insights into how gendered, neoliberal and entrepreneurial narratives impact upon the psychic lives of women, regulating behaviours and what is acceptable or not. Again, when we consider the findings of this study through a postfeminist lens, we see how postfeminism reproduces and maintains traditional forms of femininity and gender norms, despite its associated discourse of meritocracy and unfettered potential. So too then, the women in this study distance themselves from other women and seek to bolster their entrepreneurial capital and legitimacy by associating with 'real' male entrepreneurs. In doing so, they contribute to the maintenance and reproduction of the masculinised gendering of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial discourses.

Nicola Patterson and Sharon Mavin adopt a social constructionist and feminist standpoint approach to support their aim of providing space for women to voice and contextualise their lived experiences. Their study comprises five cases of women entrepreneurs in IT, law, construction, beauty, and childcare. Using a two-stage semi-structured interview process, and through discourse analysis, they provide new insights into the entrenched patriarchal socio-cultural context for women entrepreneurial leaders in the UK.

Patriarchy has been less studied in recent years because it was regarded as monolithic and unchanging, however, from a social constructionist perspective the doing, undoing and re-doing of gender and patriarchy can be highlighted. As the operationalisation of gender and gender regimes change according to time and context, so too does patriarchy and its

1
2
3 manifestations. The focus on patriarchy, therefore, renders this a novel and timely study, which
4 not only explores patriarchy in contemporary society, but does so in the context of the Global
5 North, where frequently gender equality is assumed, given the existence of various legislative
6 provisions.
7

8
9 In common with *Essers, Mcadam and Ossenkop* in this special issue, this article highlights
10 how women entrepreneurial leaders manage the competing discourses of patriarchy and
11 individualism, provoking a discursive paradox that actively shapes their individual
12 experiences, while serving to subjugate women more broadly. The authors explain this
13 management as a process, which they term discursive blending, which involves the blurring
14 and merging of contradictory discursive expectations. The women use the individualism
15 discourse to obscure patriarchy's domination *and* as a resource to resist patriarchal gender
16 power relations. To blend the discourses, the women use specific tactics, for example, engaging
17 in patriarchal bargains, such as 'dressing *not* to impress'; they also highlight how they can
18 sidestep and manoeuvre these bargains and utilise 'patriarchal advantages' to turn gender
19 oppression into benefits by 'working it positively'. The article, in common with others in this
20 special issue, ultimately reinforces the importance of, and need for, feminism and feminist
21 research to disrupt the ever-increasing power of patriarchy and its influence upon women, and
22 by default others, in the context of entrepreneurial activity and indeed more widely. It
23 ultimately challenges scholars to (re)consider patriarchy in entrepreneurship research, as a
24 vehicle to expose and contest gender-neutral assumptions. Their use of a feminist standpoint
25 approach is crucial to legitimising women's lived experiences as a basis for knowledge
26 production, helping to expose hidden power structures whilst providing a feminist critique of
27 neoliberal individualism.
28
29
30
31
32

33 The final article in this special issue, by *Shumaila Yousafzai and Nurlykhan Aljanova*,
34 examines the role of feminist solidarity in driving women's empowerment within Kyrgyzstan's
35 distinctive socio-cultural and economic landscape. Employing a post-colonial feminist lens and
36 based on thirty-two in-depth interviews with Kyrgyz women entrepreneurs, the authors explore
37 how traditional practices, such as *Ashar* (collective work) and *Gap* (community gatherings),
38 are adapted to intersect with feminist principles. These practices foster both individual
39 empowerment and community transformation, providing a unique lens through which to view
40 women's entrepreneurship in Kyrgyzstan. The authors introduce a spiral model of women's
41 empowerment, illustrating a cyclical process where personal agency, mentorship, and
42 collective solidarity mutually reinforce socio-economic change.
43
44

45 The article highlights feminist solidarity as a transformative force, extending individual
46 empowerment into collective socio-economic progress. Here, solidarity manifests in the form
47 of community support, cultural preservation, and mentorship, which collectively drive
48 sustainable development. Within Kyrgyzstan's community-based tourism (CBT) sector, this
49 solidarity enables women to utilise local resources for entrepreneurship while preserving
50 cultural identity. The authors consider how women-led cooperatives emphasise skills
51 development, shared profits, and mentorship, fostering inclusive economic participation and
52 creating a ripple effect of empowerment across communities. Through blending feminist
53 principles with local traditions, these initiatives address socio-economic inequalities while
54 safeguarding cultural heritage.
55
56
57

58 Despite the positive impact, the authors acknowledge the complexities inherent in feminist
59 solidarity, such as tensions within community dynamics, unequal access to resources, and the
60

1
2
3 challenge of balancing cultural authenticity with innovation. They advocate for culturally
4 sensitive policies and active local stakeholder involvement, cautioning against oversimplified
5 interventions that fail to respect specific socio-cultural contexts. In critiquing the dominance
6 of Western-centric feminist frameworks, *Yousfzai and Aljanova* provide a localised
7 perspective on empowerment, highlighting how Kyrgyz women entrepreneurs navigate
8 systemic inequalities through grassroots approaches.
9

10
11 This article makes a significant contribution to the special issue by advancing a context-specific
12 understanding of feminist solidarity and its role in women's empowerment. It demonstrates
13 how entrepreneurship, when informed by feminist principles, can serve as a powerful tool not
14 only for economic growth but also for addressing systemic inequalities and preserving cultural
15 traditions. The authors combine feminist theory with grassroots practices, enriching the
16 discourse on collective action, gender equality, and sustainable development. In framing
17 feminist solidarity within local cultural traditions, the study bridges global feminist discourse
18 and localised practices, demonstrating how cultural heritage can be mobilised for
19 empowerment. Their work provides valuable insights for scholars and policymakers,
20 highlighting the importance of context in shaping entrepreneurship and empowerment
21 practices. The article underscores the transformative potential of feminist solidarity and shows
22 how blending traditional practices with modern entrepreneurial approaches, helps Kyrgyz
23 women entrepreneurs challenge gender norms, enhance cultural heritage, and achieve
24 sustainable development.
25
26
27
28

29 We see how a feminist perspective informs the methodological approach and data analysis in
30 this study. Methodologically, they employ strategies (such as snowballing) to ensure the
31 inclusion of diverse voices within the Kyrgyzstan Community-Based Tourism (CBT), offering
32 a contextually grounded richness to their findings. The authors also incorporate feminist ethical
33 concerns through active collaboration with women entrepreneurs, empowering them to take
34 ownership of their narratives. Additionally, conducting interviews in multiple languages
35 (Russian, Kyrgyz, Uzbek), facilitated open and culturally sensitive communication, while
36 reflecting their feminist commitment to inclusivity and accessibility. Like others in this special
37 issue, the authors adopt a reflexive approach, acknowledging their own positionalities and
38 biases, ensuring that interpretations remain authentic and grounded in participants' realities.
39 This is also evident in the incorporation of indigenous practices such as 'Ashar,' 'Gap,' and
40 'Sogum,' highlighting their significance in fostering feminist solidarity and empowerment in
41 the CBT sector. Their analysis is multi-level, linking the macro, meso and the micro;
42 progressing from personal narratives to community solidarity, and finally to broader socio-
43 economic impacts. This approach aligns with feminist research principles in emphasising a
44 holistic and relational understanding of empowerment and its complexities.
45
46
47
48
49

50 This article, along with that of *Best, Lassalle and Nicolopoulou* in this special issue, enriches
51 feminist scholarship by offering a nuanced, post-colonial perspective on gender and
52 entrepreneurship that challenges and critiques Western-centric paradigms and highlights the
53 unique challenges and opportunities faced by women in the global south.
54
55

56 **Recommendations for Future Research**

57

58 Despite the advances made in gender and entrepreneurship scholarship thus far, feminist
59 theories remain underutilised in entrepreneurship research. This special issue addresses this
60

1
2
3 gap by highlighting the potential of feminist-informed research to challenge and critique the
4 gendered contours of entrepreneurship globally. By integrating diverse feminist perspectives,
5 the articles in this special issue offer new insights into the systemic forces shaping
6 entrepreneurship, while advancing the field toward greater inclusivity and equity. To this
7 extent, we build on the recommendations made in the six featured articles and offer the
8 following future research avenues.
9

10 11 ***Integrating Feminist Theories*** 12

13 While the articles in this special issue incorporate perspectives such as post-colonial feminism,
14 feminist standpoint theory, and postfeminism, other feminist frameworks remain
15 underexplored in gender and entrepreneurship research. For example, Islamic feminism offers
16 a valuable lens for examining the intersection of gender, religion, and entrepreneurship in
17 Muslim-majority societies. Rooted in principles of justice, equity, and empowerment within an
18 Islamic framework (Althalathini *et al.*, 2020, 2021), this perspective could be used to
19 investigate how Islamic values shape entrepreneurial activities and redefine women's agency
20 in patriarchal contexts. Similarly, ecofeminism critiques the dual exploitation of women and
21 nature, creating opportunities to explore how women entrepreneurs address ecological
22 challenges and promote sustainable practices (Stephenson and Furman, 2024). Transfeminist
23 approaches (Friedman and Rodriguez Gustá, 2023) could illuminate the experiences of
24 transgender and gender-diverse entrepreneurs, challenging the binary assumptions often
25 embedded in gender and entrepreneurship research. Finally, queer feminism provides an
26 avenue to investigate the entrepreneurial experiences of LGBTQ+ individuals and the ways
27 they navigate gendered and heteronormative business environments (Friedrich and Steyaert,
28 2024). Incorporating these diverse feminist perspectives and others will expand the scope of
29 research, fostering a more inclusive, intersectional and comprehensive understanding of
30 entrepreneurship and its nuanced implications for different individuals in different contexts.
31
32
33
34

35 ***Expanding Contextual Diversity*** 36

37 This special issue's inclusion of research on underexplored non-Western contexts such as
38 Kyrgyzstan and the Caribbean, underscores the importance of exploring underrepresented
39 regions and socio-cultural dynamics in entrepreneurship. These foci challenge dominant
40 narratives and amplify voices that are seldom heard within the gender and entrepreneurship
41 literature. These studies, along with the article by *de Bruin and Swail*, reframe
42 entrepreneurship as, not just a means of economic gain and profit, but as a form of collective
43 social transformation, challenging patriarchal structures and fostering community resilience
44 within these contexts. Ultimately the articles in this special issue provide insights into how
45 broad feminist principles, and specific theories such as postcolonial feminism, postfeminism,
46 constructionism, poststructuralism or feminist standpoint theory as examples, can be applied
47 within diverse cultural contexts to analyse and illuminate the influence of gender upon
48 entrepreneurship and create the possibility of change to advance the social positioning and
49 improve the experiences of women. Diverse contexts challenge the dominance of white
50 Western-centric narratives and highlight the rich diversity of entrepreneurial practices globally.
51 Future studies can continue prioritising non-White, non-Western perspectives to uncover the
52 unique challenges and opportunities faced by entrepreneurs in these regions, thereby
53 broadening the field's understanding of how entrepreneurship operates across varied cultural
54 and institutional settings.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Challenging Masculinised Narratives

Continuing to challenge the traditionally masculinised framing of entrepreneurship, which has historically excluded or marginalised non-dominant groups, remains an important research direction. This involves questioning the gendered language, imagery, and values that underpin entrepreneurship discourse and reimagining entrepreneurship as an inclusive and multifaceted phenomenon (Ahl and Nelson, 2015). By dismantling the hegemonic *heroic entrepreneur* archetype, feminist scholarship creates space for alternative narratives that celebrate diverse entrepreneurial practices. Interestingly, in this volume Essers, McAdam and Ossenkop, and Patterson and Mavin, adopt different feminist theoretical perspectives and tools (postfeminism and standpoint feminist research respectively) to analyse gendered entrepreneurship discourses and highlight how women are disadvantaged within prevailing gender regimes. For early career researchers embarking upon gender and entrepreneurship research, this should offer comfort that often there is not a single best way to approach a research topic. Feminism and feminist research theories are a broad church wherein their common core objective is to illuminate inequality in the hope of advancing not just knowledge but the material situation of women.

Centring Diversity: Valuing Underrepresented Entrepreneurial Experiences

Future research should prioritise recognising and valuing the diverse experiences of entrepreneurs, particularly those from underrepresented and marginalised communities. Traditional studies have often focused on male-dominated industries or highly visible entrepreneurial success stories, neglecting the unique challenges and contributions of women, LGBTQ+ individuals, and entrepreneurs from racialised or marginalised backgrounds (Brush *et al.*, 2009). An intersectional feminist approach (hooks, 1981; Crenshaw, 1989) is essential to understanding how overlapping systems of oppression—such as gender, race, class, and sexual orientation—shape these entrepreneurial experiences. By adopting inclusive methodologies and expanding the scope of inquiry, future research can amplify the voices of those often excluded from mainstream narratives, fostering a more equitable and comprehensive understanding of entrepreneurship that can inform policy and practice.

Focusing on Collectivism

Gender and entrepreneurship research often emphasises individualistic frameworks, which can obscure the collective dimensions of entrepreneurial activities. Future research can explore the ways in which collectivist approaches drive entrepreneurial practices and outcomes. By focusing on collective action and shared responsibility, researchers can reveal how entrepreneurship contributes to community resilience and sustainable development (Al-Dajani, 2022).

Addressing Structural Inequities

A critical area for future feminist research lies in addressing the structural barriers that women entrepreneurs face. These barriers, perpetuated by patriarchal and neoliberal systems, significantly limit entrepreneurial opportunities and reinforce gender inequities. Scholars can critically engage with these systemic challenges to uncover how they intersect with race, class, and other social identities. Research that exposes and interrogates these structural inequities

will not only contribute to feminist theoretical advancements but also inform policies and interventions aimed at creating more equitable entrepreneurial ecosystems.

By integrating underexplored feminist theories, prioritising diverse contexts, examining collective approaches, and addressing structural inequities, future research can advance the field of gender and entrepreneurship in more inclusive and transformative directions.

Conclusion

This volume lays a robust foundation for reimagining gender and entrepreneurship research through feminist perspectives. By integrating diverse theoretical and empirical insights, it challenges dominant paradigms and opens new avenues for inquiry. The six featured articles not only enrich our understanding of gendered entrepreneurial experiences but also offer actionable pathways for promoting inclusivity and empowerment. As researchers, policymakers, and practitioners engage with these insights, we encourage them to adopt contemporary feminist-informed approaches that prioritise systemic change and amplify the voices of marginalised entrepreneurs worldwide. We hope this issue serves as a catalyst for advancing the field towards greater inclusivity, diversity, and equity.

References:

- Adeeko, N. and Treanor, L. (2022). "Negotiating stigmatised identities: Enterprising refugee women in the United Kingdom." *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 23-46.
- Ahl, H. J. (2006). "Why Research on Women Entrepreneurs Needs New Directions." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 30 No.5, pp. 595-621.
- Ahl, H. and Marlow, S. (2012). "Exploring the Dynamics of Gender, Feminism and Entrepreneurship: Advancing Debate to Escape a Dead End?" *Organization*, Vol. 19 No. 5, pp. 543-562.
- Ahl, H. and Nelson, T. (2015). "How policy positions women entrepreneurs: A comparative analysis of state discourse in Sweden and the United States", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol, 30 No. 2, pp. 273-291.
- Al-Dajani, H. (2022). "Future Proofing Entrepreneurship in the Arab World." *Arab Economic and Business Journal*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 2-7.
- Al-Dajani, H., Akbar, H., Carter, S., and Shaw, E. (2019). "Defying contextual embeddedness: Evidence from displaced women entrepreneurs in Jordan." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, Vol. 31 No. 3-4, pp. 1-29.
- Althalathini, D., Al-Dajani, H., and Apostolopoulos, N. (2020). "Navigating Gaza's Conflict through Women's Entrepreneurship." *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 297-316.
- Althalathini, D., Al-Dajani, H., and Apostolopoulos, N. (2021). "The Impact of Islamic Feminism in Empowering Women's Entrepreneurship in Conflict Zones: Evidence from Afghanistan, Iraq and Palestine." *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 178 No. 1, pp. 39-55.
- Aman, R., Ahokangas, P., Elo, M. and Zhang, X. (2022). "Migrant Women Entrepreneurship and the Entrepreneurial Ecosystem." Pickernell, D. G., Battisti, M., Dann, Z. and Ekinsmyth, C. (Eds.), *Disadvantaged Entrepreneurship and the Entrepreneurial Ecosystem*. Emerald Publishing Limited, Bingley, pp. 87 – 119.
- Anderson, E. (2024). "Feminist Epistemology and Philosophy of Science", Zalta E.N. (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall Edition), available at:

- 1
2
3 <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2024/entries/feminism-epistemology> (accessed 13
4 December 2024).
- 5
6 Bell, E., Meriläinen, S., Taylor, S. and Tienari, J. (2020). "Dangerous knowledge: The
7 political, personal, and epistemological promise of feminist research in management and
8 organization studies." *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp.
9 177-192.
- 10
11 Best, B., Lasalle, P. and Nicolopoulou, K. (2024). "Unlocking the "SHERO" Within: An
12 exploration of how female entrepreneurs in the Caribbean use digital technologies for
13 business transformation." *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*.
- 14
15 Brush, C., de Bruin, A. and Welter, F. (2009). "A Gender-Aware Framework for Women's
16 Entrepreneurship." *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 1 No. 1,
17 pp. 8-24.
- 18
19 Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, Routledge, New
20 York.
- 21
22 Byrne, J., Fattoum, S. and Diaz Garcia, M. (2019). "Role models and women entrepreneurs:
23 Entrepreneurial superwoman has her say." *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol.
24 57 No. 1, pp. 154-184.
- 25
26 Calás, M., Smircich, L. and Bourne, K. A. (2009). "Extending the Boundaries: Reframing
27 'entrepreneurship as social change' through feminist perspectives." *Academy of
28 Management Review*, Vol. 34 No. 3, pp. 552-569.
- 29
30 Carter, S., Shaw, E., Lam, W. and Wilson, F. (2015). "Gender, entrepreneurship, and bank
31 lending: The criteria and processes used by bank loan officers in assessing applications."
32 *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 31 No. 3, pp. 427-444.
- 33
34 Crenshaw, K. (1989). "Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist
35 critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics." *University
36 of Chicago Legal Forum*, Vol. 1, pp. 139-167.
- 37
38 de Bruin, A. and Swail, J. (2024). "Advancing gender inclusivity: Moving entrepreneurial
39 ecosystems onto new paths." *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*.
- 40
41 de Bruin, A., Roy, M., Grant, S. and Lewis, K. (2023). "Advancing a contextualized,
42 community-centric understanding of social entrepreneurial ecosystems." *Business &
43 Society*, Vol. 62 No. 5, pp. 1069-1102.
- 44
45 De Clercq, D. and Voronov, M. (2009). "Toward a practice perspective of entrepreneurship:
46 Entrepreneurial legitimacy as habitus." *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 27 No.
47 4, pp. 395-419.
- 48
49 de Magdalene, P. and Green, K. R. (2024). "Gender and social entrepreneurship in turbulent
50 waters: Developing a gender-aware conceptual framework." *International Journal of
51 Gender and Entrepreneurship*.
- 52
53 Ekinsmyth, C. (2013). "Managing the business of everyday life: The roles of space and place
54 in "mumpreneurship"." *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*,
55 Vol. 19 No. 5, pp. 525-546.
- 56
57 Ekinsmyth, C. (2022). "Family policy and women's entrepreneurship." *State of the Art
58 Review*, 56, Enterprise Research Centre, December.
- 59
60 Ekinsmyth, C. and Treanor, L. (2024). "Fuelling Growth: Comprehensive Government
Support for Women Entrepreneurs Urgently Needed." *Women's Enterprise Policy Group*,
available at
https://pure.port.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/95442903/Fuelling_Growth_Comprehensive_Government_Support_for_Women_Entrepreneurs_Urgently_Needed.pdf (accessed 19
December 2024).

- 1
2
3 Essers, C. and Benschop, Y. (2007). "Enterprising identities: Female entrepreneurs of
4 Moroccan or Turkish origin in the Netherlands." *Organization Studies*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp.
5 49-69.
- 6 Essers, C., McAdam, M. and Ossenkop, C. (2024). "Legitimacy and Women Entrepreneurs in
7 Masculinised Industries: A Postfeminist Perspective." *International Journal of Gender
8 and Entrepreneurship*.
- 9
10 Friedman, E. J. and Rodríguez Gustá, A. L. (2023). "Feminists, popular feminists, and
11 transfeminists: Young Argentine activists define their own identities." *Journal of Youth
12 Studies*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2023.2298318>
- 13 Friedrich, J. and Steyaert, C. (2024). "Emancipatory entrepreneuring as disidentification: A
14 queer-feminist view of becoming a democratic cooperative." *Human Relations*,
15 <https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267241302783>
- 16 Gill, R. and Ganesh, S. (2007). "Empowerment, constraint, and the entrepreneurial self: A
17 study of white women entrepreneurs." *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, Vol.
18 35 No. 3, pp. 268-293.
- 19 Gill, R., Kelan, E. K. and Scharff, C. M. (2017). "A postfeminist sensibility at work."
20 *Gender, Work and Organization*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 226-244.
- 21 Hartsock, N. C. M. (2016). "The Feminist Standpoint: Toward a Specifically Feminist
22 Historical Materialism.", McCann, C. R., Kim, S-K., and Ergun, E. (Eds.), *Feminist
23 Theory Reader: Local and Global Perspectives* (5th Edition), Routledge, New York and
24 London, pp. 267-277.
- 25 Henry, C., Foss, L. and Ahl, H. (2016). "Gender and Entrepreneurship Research: A review of
26 methodological approaches." *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 34 No. 3, pp.
27 217-241.
- 28 Henry, N., Vasil, S., and Witt, A. (2022). "Digital citizenship in a global society: a feminist
29 approach." *Feminist Media Studies*, Vol. 22 No. 8, 1972-1989.
- 30 Hillenkamp, I. and dos Santos, L. L. (2019). "The Domestic Domain within a Post-colonial,
31 Feminist Reading of Social Enterprise: Towards a substantive, gender-based concept of
32 solidarity enterprise.", Eynaud, P., Laville, J-L., dos Santos, L. L., Banerjee, S., Avelino,
33 F. and Hulgard, L. (Eds.) *Theory of Social Enterprise and Pluralism* Routledge, New York
34 and Abingdon, pp. 90-115.
- 35 Jennings, J. E., and Brush, C. G. (2013). "Research on Women Entrepreneurs: Challenges to
36 (and from) the broader entrepreneurship literature?" *Academy of Management Annals*,
37 Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 663-715.
- 38 Jones, S. (2014). "Gendered Discourses of Entrepreneurship in UK Higher Education: The
39 fictive entrepreneur and the fictive student." *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 32
40 No. 3, pp. 237-258.
- 41 Jones, S. and Nadin, S. (2024). "I'd like to make a proper go of it but it's really scary: The
42 perpetual liminality of informally self-employed women as stigmatized entrepreneurs."
43 *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 1-18.
- 44 Jurado, T. and Mika, J. (2023). "Indigenous entrepreneurs' export practices in Aotearoa New
45 Zealand." *Small Enterprise Research*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 1-23.
- 46 Lewis, P. (2014). "Postfeminism, Femininities and Organization Studies: Exploring a new
47 agenda." *Organization Studies*, Vol. 35 No. 12, pp. 1845-1866.
- 48 Marlow, S. (2012). "Feminism, Gender and Entrepreneurship." Mole, K. and Ram. M. (Eds.)
49 *Perspectives in Entrepreneurship: A Critical Approach*, Springer Publishing, London, pp.
50 59-74.
- 51 Marlow, S., Hicks, S. and Treanor, L. (2019). "Gendering Entrepreneurial Behaviour.",
52 McAdam, M. and Cunningham, J. A. (Eds.), *Entrepreneurial Behaviour*. Palgrave
53 Macmillan, Cham, pp. 39-60.
- 54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Marlow, S. and McAdam, M. (2015). "Incubation or induction? Gendered identity work in
4 the context of technology business incubation." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*,
5 Vol. 39 No. 4, pp. 791-816.
- 6 Marlow, S. and Patton, D. (2005). "All Credit to Men? Entrepreneurship, finance, and
7 gender." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 29, No. pp. 717-735.
- 8 Martinez Dy, A. (2021). "Doing one's work" in entrepreneurship studies: Interpellation,
9 distraction, disruption and transformation." *International Journal of Gender and*
10 *Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 207-224.
- 11 Martinez Dy, A. and Jayawarna, D. (2020). "Bios, mythoi and women entrepreneurs: A
12 Wynterian analysis of the intersectional impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on self-
13 employed women and women-owned businesses." *International Small Business Journal*,
14 Vol. 38 No. 5, pp. 391-403.
- 15 Martinez Dy, A., Marlow, S. and Martin, L. (2017). "A Web of Opportunity or the Same Old
16 Story? Women digital entrepreneurs and intersectionality theory." *Human Relations*. Vol.
17 70 No. 3, pp. 286-311.
- 18 Martinez Dy, A., Martin, L. and Marlow, S. (2018). "Emancipation through digital
19 entrepreneurship? A critical realist analysis." *Organization*, Vol. 25 No. 5, pp. 585-608.
- 20 McCall, L. (2005). "The complexity of intersectionality." *Signs: Journal of Women in*
21 *Culture and Society*, Vol. 30 No. 3, pp. 1771-1800.
- 22 Nadin, S., Smith, R. and Jones, S. (2020). "Heroines of enterprise: Post-recession media
23 representations of women and entrepreneurship in a UK newspaper 2008–2016."
24 *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 38 No. 6, pp. 557-577.
- 25 New, E. (2019). *Sketching the Profile of Female Entrepreneurs: A Qualitative Exploration*
26 *Using an Art-Based, Feminist Methodology* (Doctoral dissertation, Faculty of Arts,
27 University of Regina).
- 28 Ogbor, J. O. (2000). "Mythicizing and Reification in Entrepreneurial Discourse: Ideology-
29 Critique of Entrepreneurial Studies." *Journal of Management Studies*. Vol. 37 No. 5, pp.
30 605-635.
- 31 Ozkazanc-Pan, B. and Muntean, S. (2022). *Entrepreneurial Ecosystems: A Gender*
32 *Perspective*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and New York.
- 33 Patterson, N., and Mavin, S. (2024). "When patriarchy and individualism collide:
34 Experiences of women entrepreneurial leaders." *International Journal of Gender and*
35 *Entrepreneurship*.
- 36 Pickernell, D. G., Battisti, M., Dann, Z. and Ekinsmyth, C. (Eds.). (2022). *Disadvantaged*
37 *Entrepreneurship and the Entrepreneurial Ecosystem*. Emerald Publishing Limited,
38 Bingley.
- 39 Ramadani, V., Dana, L.-P. and Ratten, V. (2023). "Immigrant and refugee women's
40 entrepreneurship: Challenges, strategies, and opportunities." *Entrepreneurial Migration*,
41 Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 98-123.
- 42 Schwartz, E. B. (1976). "Entrepreneurship: New female frontier." *Journal of Contemporary*
43 *Business*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 47-76.
- 44 Shivers-McNair, A., Gonzales, L. and Zhyvotovska, T. (2019). "An intersectional
45 technofeminist framework for community-driven technology innovation." *Computers and*
46 *Composition*, Vol. 51, 43-54.
- 47 Smith, D. E. (1987). "Women's Perspective as a Radical Critique of Sociology.", Harding, S.
48 (Ed.), *Feminism and Methodology*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington and
49 Indianapolis, pp. 84-96
- 50 Stephenson, E. and Furman, S. (2024). "Climate Just Entrepreneurship: Feminist
51 Entrepreneurship for Climate Action.", *International Journal of Gender and*
52 *Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 16 No.1, pp. 89-109.
- 53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Syed, J. and Ali, F. (2021). "Gender equality in the Global South: A postcolonial feminist
4 critique." *Gender, Work & Organization*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp. 132-149.
- 5 Teasdale, S., Roy, M., Nicholls, A. and Hervieux, C. (2023). "Turning rebellion into money?
6 Social entrepreneurship as the strategic performance of systems change." *Strategic
7 Entrepreneurship Journal*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 19-39.
- 8 Treanor, L. and Burkinshaw, H. (2023). *Charter for Inclusive Entrepreneurship*, available at:
9 [https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/business/who-we-are/centres-and-
10 institutes/hgi/documents/charter-brochure-digital-version.pdf](https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/business/who-we-are/centres-and-institutes/hgi/documents/charter-brochure-digital-version.pdf) (Accessed 19 December
11 2024).
- 12
13 Treanor, L. and Marlow, S. (2021). "Paws for thought? Analysing how prevailing
14 masculinities constrain career progression for UK women veterinary surgeons." *Human
15 Relations*, Vol. 74 No. 2, pp. 105-130.
- 16 Treanor, L. and Marlow, S. (2024). "A nudge in the right direction? Gender-informed support
17 by female business-incubation managers for female STEM-entrepreneurs."
18 *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, Vol. 37 No. 1-2, pp. 92-112.
- 19 Treanor, L., Marlow, S. and Swail, J. (2021), "Rationalizing the postfeminist paradox: The
20 case of UK women veterinary professionals." *Gender, Work & Organization*, Vol. 28, No.
21 pp. 337-360.
- 22 West, C. and Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). "Doing Gender." *Gender & Society*, Vol. 1 No. 2,
23 pp. 125-151.
- 24 Yousafzai, S., and Aljanova, N. (2024). "Empowerment and Collective Action: Feminist
25 solidarity through women's entrepreneurship in Kyrgyzstan's community-based tourism."
26 *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60