

**human relations**

CONFIDENTIAL: for peer review only

**A Web of Opportunity or the Same Old Story? Women Digital Entrepreneurs and Intersectionality Theory**

Journal:	<i>Human Relations</i>
Manuscript ID	HR-2015-0174.R2
Manuscript Type:	Standard Manuscript
Keywords:	Entrepreneurship, Internet, intersectionality , digital enterprise, online business, digital, whitewashing, online entrepreneurship, women, gender

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## A Web of Opportunity or the Same Old Story?

### Women Digital Entrepreneurs and Intersectionality Theory

#### ABSTRACT

This article critically analyses the manner in which intersectionality and related social positionality shape digital enterprise activities. Despite popular claims of meritocratic opportunity enactment within traditional forms of entrepreneurship, ascribed social characteristics intersect to influence the realisation of entrepreneurial potential. However, it is purported that the emerging field of digital entrepreneurship may act as a 'great leveller' due to perceived lower barriers to entry, disembodiment of the entrepreneurial actor and the absence of visible markers of disadvantage online. Using an interpretivist approach, we analyse empirical evidence from UK women digital entrepreneurs which reveals how the privileges and disadvantages arising from intersecting social positions of gender, race and class status are reproduced online. This analysis challenges the notion that the Internet is a neutral platform for entrepreneurship and supports our thesis that offline inequality, in the form of marked bodies, social positionality and associated resource constraints, is produced and reproduced in the online environment.

Key Words: entrepreneurship, Internet, intersectionality, digital enterprise, online business, online entrepreneurship, digital, whitewashing, women, gender

#### Introduction

Popular discourse portrays the Internet as an enabler of entrepreneurial potential given its accessibility as digital enterprise platform (Accenture, 2014; LeBlanc, 2015; Schmidt, 2011). Underpinning such assumptions is an implicit axiom that the widespread uptake of digital technologies has universally increased entrepreneurial possibilities (Castells, 2010; Mole and Mole, 2010). However, how socially marginalised or disadvantaged people have

1  
2  
3 experienced this shift remains under-explored. Digital entrepreneurship has been defined as  
4  
5 'the pursuit of opportunities based on the use of digital media and other information and  
6  
7 communication technologies' (Davidson and Vaast, 2010: 2). Accordingly, focus tends to be  
8  
9 placed upon the Internet's enhancement of entrepreneurial opportunity exploitation (Hull et  
10  
11 al., 2007). Barriers to entry are expected to be very low; digital start-ups presumably require  
12  
13 neither formal premises nor costly equipment, and operations can be flexible whilst  
14  
15 technological expertise is either easily accessible or commonly held. Moreover, the virtual  
16  
17 environment is assumed to negate social marginality, ensuring greater meritocracy within  
18  
19 entrepreneurship by concealing the disadvantages of a 'marked' body (Haraway, 1999).  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 This article critically evaluates such assumptions with the analytical framework  
25  
26 offered by intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991; May, 2015) and positionality (Anthias, 2001a,  
27  
28 2001b, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2013). We argue that socially constructed disadvantageous  
29  
30 ascriptions are reproduced within the digital context. Accordingly, our research objective is  
31  
32 to explore how intersecting ascriptions of gender, race and class influence the entrepreneurial  
33  
34 experiences of women developing digital ventures. Women, as a category, form the basis of  
35  
36 our analysis, not only because the subjugation of women and femininity within the gender  
37  
38 binary marks them as a marginalised class (Bradley, 2007), but also in recognition of  
39  
40 contemporary feminist critiques of the gendered bias within the ontology of entrepreneurship  
41  
42 theorising (Henry et al., 2015). However, despite the universality of gender as a valorisation  
43  
44 device, we are wary of the assumption that gender effects are universal (Anthias, 2013;  
45  
46 Crenshaw, 2015). Articulated through an intersectional matrix of social positions, issues of  
47  
48 race/ethnicity and class, amongst others, necessarily complicate those of gender. Thus, we  
49  
50 adopt a positionality-based perspective (Anthias, 2013) to assess if the online environment  
51  
52 can ameliorate the entrepreneurial constraints of marginalised social positionality.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 To explore such issues, this paper is structured as follows. We commence by outlining  
4 the phenomenon of women's digital entrepreneurship. We then draw upon theories of  
5 intersectionality and positionality to analytically consider if and how their impacts may be  
6 reproduced within this realm. Next, we illustrate this critique through an interpretative  
7 methodology, analysing in-depth qualitative evidence which focuses upon women digital  
8 entrepreneurs in the UK, and explores the inter-relationships between gender, race and class  
9 in this context. Finally, the implications of these arguments are evaluated in the discussion  
10 and conclusion.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

### 20 21 **Women, gender and digital entrepreneurship** 22

23  
24 The manner in which ascribed characteristics and institutional biases constrain  
25 entrepreneurial potential has been explored at length (Ahl, 2006; Högberg et al., 2014). It has  
26 been demonstrated that gendered assumptions confer detriment upon women in terms of  
27 creating or growing new ventures (Marlow and McAdam, 2015). Disadvantages arising from  
28 such biases and related stereotypes have become coterminous with an assumed agentic  
29 entrepreneurial deficit. Hence, those who do not resemble the normative entrepreneur –  
30 white, male, usually middle class or the hero of a 'rags to riches' story (Ogbor, 2000) – find  
31 their legitimacy and access to resources constrained by their subject position (Jayawarna et  
32 al., 2014a and b). Yet, despite such constraints, women across the globe participate in a  
33 diverse range of entrepreneurial activities, developing agentic strategies to gather and exploit  
34 resources and navigate complex barriers to their full participation<sup>1</sup> (Al-Dajani and Marlow,  
35 2013; Essers et al., 2010; Forson, 2013).  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 In recent years, the digital environment has been presented in the popular media as a  
52 unique entrepreneurial space. Assumptions of its neutrality and meritocratic functionality  
53 suggest 'anyone' can create a business with only 'a laptop, something to sell, and your  
54 imagination' (LeBlanc, 2015). This rhetoric of easy income generation specifically hails  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 marginalised groups – for example, women with caring responsibilities and people of colour  
4  
5 – who face greater challenges to employment, yet whose entrepreneurial aims are constrained  
6  
7 by hegemonic conceptions of the entrepreneur. The virtual world is therein portrayed as  
8  
9 distinct from the physical, where social biases based upon physicality can be transcended due  
10  
11 to the presumed disembodied nature of interactions (Martin and Wright, 2005).  
12  
13

14  
15 But despite substantial growth in online trading, there is still a lack of data on digital  
16  
17 entrepreneurs. Approximately 12 million people, or 31 percent of UK Internet users, engaged  
18  
19 in online trading in 2011, representing a 50 percent year-on-year increase from 2010  
20  
21 (Williams, 2011). Little is known about the diversity and distribution of this activity, and  
22  
23 even less about the extent to which it may enable individuals to overcome the negative  
24  
25 aspects of social marginality. Broad heterogeneity exists amongst digital businesses: some  
26  
27 are heavily tech-based (e.g. web design, e-retail) while others can be classed as digital simply  
28  
29 because marketing and communications occur predominantly online. The degree of technical  
30  
31 knowledge and resources required, as well as possibilities for scalability, vary significantly  
32  
33 between such businesses, although these are rarely taken into consideration as factors in the  
34  
35 outcomes of entrepreneurial efforts.  
36  
37

38  
39 The limited research specifically upon women digital entrepreneurs has been based on  
40  
41 assumptions of a 'neutral' Web; thus, the manner in which the phenomenon is gendered,  
42  
43 racialised or affected by class position remains under-explored (Forson and Özbilgin, 2003;  
44  
45 Jome et al., 2006) and ignored by surveys of Internet use (Harding, 2007; Pew, 2012; Ofcom,  
46  
47 2011). Furthermore, the wide variety of entrepreneurial activity in which women are engaged  
48  
49 online tends to be neglected in favour of a focus on high-tech entrepreneurship, popularly  
50  
51 perceived as the epitome of digital entrepreneurship (Kaplan and Malach-Pines, 2010).  
52  
53 Adopting an interdisciplinary perspective reveals facets of the phenomenon largely ignored  
54  
55 by existing conceptions. Cyberfeminist and critical race studies literatures suggest that the  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 online environment is highly integrated with the offline world, and that markers of gender  
4 (Sassen, 2002; Wajcman, 2010) and race (Daniels, 2009; 2012; Nakamura, 2008) are both  
5 detectable and influential online. New media scholars affirm and extend these theories,  
6  
7 illustrating how socio-economic resource disparity is reproduced online (boyd, 2009;  
8  
9 Marwick, 2014). Such critique contradicts the claim that the digital landscape constitutes a  
10  
11 meritocratic entrepreneurial context. To develop such arguments, we introduce  
12  
13 intersectionality and positionality theory as a critical analytical framework with which to  
14  
15 consider the impact of social position upon digital entrepreneurial activity.  
16  
17  
18  
19

### 20 21 **Intersectionality and positionality in entrepreneurship studies** 22

23  
24 Originating in Black feminism (Crenshaw, 1991, 2015; Hill Collins, 1990; hooks,  
25  
26 1981; 2000/2015; May, 2015), the concept of intersectionality illuminated the interaction  
27  
28 between non-dominant race and gender categories as a specific form of oppression (Essers et  
29  
30 al., 2010), wherein markers of social identity are ‘inextricably interconnected in the  
31  
32 production of social practices of exclusion’ (Crenshaw, 1997: 237). In its complex analysis  
33  
34 of marginality, intersectionality disengages from the extensively problematised single-axis or  
35  
36 additive perspectives (Forson, 2006; Martinez Dy et al., 2014). Instead, exclusionary  
37  
38 categories, and the social inequalities they precipitate, are understood as interdependent and  
39  
40 mutually constitutive (Bradley and Healy, 2008; Healy et al., 2011). Although a contested  
41  
42 construct (Carbin and Edenheim, 2013; Geerts and van der Tuin, 2013), it is nevertheless  
43  
44 efficacious in revealing how multiple dimensions of social inequality shape experiences of  
45  
46 digital entrepreneurship, posited as a pathway to ameliorate the effects of such inequalities.  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 The body of work by Anthias on translocational positionality (2001a, 2001b, 2006,  
52  
53 2007, 2008; 2013) outlines a framework elaborating upon the original intersectionality  
54  
55 concepts. Anthias argues that intersectionality informs positionality, defined as ‘the space at  
56  
57 the intersection of structure (social position/social effects) and agency (social  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 positioning/meaning and practice)' (2001a: 635). As such, the construct of positionality  
4  
5 moves beyond earlier conceptions of intersecting identities, instead highlighting durable yet  
6  
7 dynamic social locations and processes. Crucially, positionality is understood to influence  
8  
9 resource allocation (Anthias, 2001b), so it is relevant to the relationship between marginality  
10  
11 and the resource accumulation vital to founding and growing entrepreneurial ventures.  
12  
13

14  
15 Women, immigrants, and people of colour remain 'othered' within the entrepreneurial  
16  
17 domain but have been subject to increasing, although discrete, analyses of their experiences  
18  
19 as business owners (Carter et al., 2015). There are, however, a number of exceptions wherein  
20  
21 intersectional perspectives interrogate the simultaneous impacts of race/ethnicity, gender,  
22  
23 class and religion on entrepreneurship, in various combinations (Essers et al., 2010; Forson,  
24  
25 2006, 2013; Knight, 2014).<sup>ii</sup> Such studies focus upon gender, race/ethnicity and class as  
26  
27 relevant to entrepreneurship given their centrality to positions within social hierarchies and  
28  
29 related resource accrual (Anthias, 2001b). Forson (2013) calls attention to the entrepreneurial  
30  
31 activities of migrant women of colour, examining confrontations, negotiations and dialogue  
32  
33 between simultaneous, and sometimes conflicting, social roles. Nonetheless, how social  
34  
35 positions affect entrepreneurial activity in the allegedly neutral digital environment remains  
36  
37 under-investigated.  
38  
39  
40  
41

42  
43 Contemporary intersectional perspectives understand gender, race/ethnicity and class  
44  
45 as discursive categories, produced by a range of discourses and practices which convey  
46  
47 contextually shifting social meanings (Byrne, 2006; McRobbie, 2009). This aligns with  
48  
49 notions of gender in current feminist entrepreneurship theory (Ahl and Marlow, 2012; Carter  
50  
51 et al., 2015). 'Race' is understood to have socio-historical rather than scientific roots (Hall,  
52  
53 1997); however, the notion of race is still a powerful cultural construct that informs actions  
54  
55 and affects lives (Van Laer and Janssens, 2011). It is related to, but not equivalent with,  
56  
57 ethnicity: the former is generally accepted to be a broader social category loosely based on  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 physical characteristics (e.g. Asian, Black, White), whereas the latter is more often tied to  
4 aspects of identity such as culture, language, geographical origin or national association (e.g.  
5 Bengali, Jamaican, Irish) (see Karner, 2007). Yet they are closely linked: discrimination on  
6 ethnic grounds may be called racism, and racial and ethnic minorities may experience some  
7 commonalities of experience, although the significance of skin colour (or other racialised  
8 phenotypical characteristics) as a marker of difference varies between societies (Eriksen,  
9 1996: 30; Holvino, 2010). They may also be combined; in the UK, British Asian, Black  
10 British and White British are common racio-ethnic descriptors. In this article, we focus  
11 primarily on race given the manner in which physical appearance serves, not  
12 unproblematically, as a marker for racial categorisation, which we argue is sustained in the  
13 online space.

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 The final category, social class, is conceptualised as encompassing not merely  
29 economic phenomena but also social and cultural distinction and reproduction, although  
30 economic relations are still key shapers of this dynamic (Savage et al., 2013; Bradley, 2014).  
31 Although the term is fluid, and the problem of theorising the relationship between class status  
32 and socio-economic position the subject of persistent debate (Ashley and Empson, 2013), we  
33 stress its relevance given the nature of resource distribution as a critical factor in  
34 entrepreneurial activity.

35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44 Anthias (2001a) identifies social positions as characterised by hierarchical difference  
45 and unequal access to economic, political, symbolic and cultural resources. Naturalised via  
46 continuous social reinforcement, these hierarchies are made to appear invisible by means of  
47 apparent normalcy (Acker, 2006; Ahmed, 2012). Evidence suggests structural inequalities  
48 persist despite policy initiatives to promote equal opportunities (Holvino, 2010; Tomlinson et  
49 al., 2013). From a positional perspective, then, entrepreneurship is embedded within complex  
50 social hierarchies which influence the unequal accumulation of resources. Consequently, a  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 marginal positionality constraining the accrual of human, social and economic capital  
4  
5 (Anthias, 2001b), is likely to pose structural barriers to entrepreneurial activity.  
6  
7

8 Our research proposition, therefore, is to ascertain how the positionality of  
9  
10 entrepreneurial actors in co-constituted social hierarchies of gender, race and class affects  
11  
12 their legitimacy and access to resources for creating sustainable digital ventures. Eriksson-  
13  
14 Zetterquist et al. (2009) argue that in order to understand technology's potential effects,  
15  
16 analysing the social settings, political, economic and cultural contexts in which it is used is  
17  
18 essential. But popular discourse on digital entrepreneurship (Accenture, 2014, Genachowski,  
19  
20 2011; Government Equalities Office, 2014) does not appear to consider this argument.  
21  
22 Analytical attention should be given to the influence of social hierarchies, positionality and  
23  
24 resource distribution on digital entrepreneurial activity, and, more broadly, how nuanced  
25  
26 experiences of privilege and disadvantage function in the increasingly significant context of  
27  
28 the digital environment. Failure to do so will likely result in theoretical neglect of the manner  
29  
30 in which social disadvantage is transmuted and reproduced online (boyd, 2009; Ituma and  
31  
32 Simpson, 2009; Marwick, 2014).  
33  
34  
35

### 36 37 *Analytical Summary* 38

39  
40 Contemporary cultural discourse regarding digital entrepreneurship is implicitly  
41  
42 imbued with the rhetoric of meritocracy, arising from the belief that actors operate virtually  
43  
44 in a supposedly neutral online environment. We draw upon interdisciplinary literature to  
45  
46 consider how this notion may be contradicted through tacit practices which manifest the  
47  
48 socially embedded and embodied presence, and barriers encountered by marginalised actors.  
49  
50 Whilst much has been made of the ease of entrepreneurship through the Internet, accessing  
51  
52 appropriate resources remains critical to create a sustainable venture. We suggest the axiom  
53  
54 applied to offline entrepreneurship - the greater the resources invested at start-up, the greater  
55  
56 the chances of longevity and growth - (Anyadike-Danes et al., 2015) applies equally to online  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 ventures. A theoretical framework based upon intersectionality and positionality theory  
4 enables us to examine the effects of gender, race and class upon entrepreneurial activity.  
5  
6  
7 With it, we map known dimensions of offline inequality and explore them in the online  
8  
9  
10 context. This is necessary in order to understand whether digital entrepreneurship is able to  
11  
12 ameliorate social inequality, or whether it may be reproduced online. We argue that the social  
13  
14 privileges and material resources available to invest in digital ventures are critically linked to  
15  
16 the positionality of individuals within social hierarchies. Using empirical evidence, we now  
17  
18 illustrate how gender, class and race work in concert to position women digital entrepreneurs  
19  
20 in specific social locations, and explore related implications.  
21  
22

### 23 **Methodology and method**

24  
25  
26 As this study explores the lived experiences of digital entrepreneurs, a qualitative,  
27  
28 interpretivist approach is axiomatic (Barbour, 2001; Case, 2003; Weick, 2007). We aim to  
29  
30 enable women's experiences to be analysed without comparison to an 'unmarked male  
31  
32 template' (Jackson, 2012: 1001) which negatively affects how their activity is perceived (De  
33  
34 Bruin et al., 2007; Ahl, 2006). Our intersectional approach recognises first, that the  
35  
36 experiences of women of colour are qualitatively different from those of white women;  
37  
38 second, that in Western contexts, whiteness functions as an unmarked normative social  
39  
40 position, similar to maleness (Ahmed, 2012; Byrne, 2006), and third, that class status and  
41  
42 history is closely related to resource accumulation, with associated effects on  
43  
44 entrepreneurship (Jayawarna et al., 2014b). Whilst the notion of the co-constitutive nature of  
45  
46 categories and their effects is fundamental to our arguments, we proceed under the  
47  
48 epistemological assumption that gender, race and class can be analysed separately although  
49  
50 ontologically, they are articulated in conjunction (Adib and Guerrier, 2003).  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 The study consisted of semi-structured, in-depth interviews with 26 women digital  
57  
58 entrepreneurs within the UK. As all women are understood to have a non-dominant gendered  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 ascription, gender was used as the initial framing category, but the ways in which class status  
4 and ascriptions of race influenced legitimacy, image and resource accrual were also explored.  
5  
6  
7 Initial contacts were obtained through a UK women's business incubator using a purposive  
8 sampling method (Guest et al., 2006). Participant firms were located in diverse sectors, with  
9 trading histories ranging from three months to 13 years. The interviews focused on three  
10 areas: social factors and resources that enabled or constrained start-up, technical skills, and  
11 benefits and challenges of digital entrepreneurship. They were digitally recorded, transcribed  
12 verbatim, coded using NVivo10, and analysed thematically. Demographic information was  
13 collected with a participant survey.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 To action the analytical constructs, each subject was asked to self-identify their  
25 gender and race. All respondents identified as women and one as a transgender woman. We  
26 recognise that such identity markers are externally ascribed but also internally interpreted;  
27 accordingly, we utilised respondent articulations of gender and race. Allocating class status,  
28 however, is more challenging given the controversy surrounding this ascription, in  
29 conjunction with diverse and complex indicators (Savage et al., 2013). We draw upon a  
30 concept of class that understands access to various capitals, namely economic, social, cultural  
31 and symbolic, as the consequences of a non-neutral social process shaped not only by culture,  
32 but also institutions and structures (Ashley and Empson, 2013). To operationalise the  
33 concept, we used substantive and reflective indicators from respondents and observational  
34 indicators from the primary researcher, paying particular attention to household income,  
35 personal income, education and employment history, job title at last paid position, and the  
36 inferred social level of personal and business networks. We then drew links between this  
37 data, our theoretical framework and the resources available both at start-up and at the time of  
38 interview, in order to infer information about their socio-economic class, which we mapped  
39 to the UK class model outlined by Bradley (2014, Appendix A).  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Following the thematic analytical method of Braun and Clarke (2006) and the  
4 qualitative (interview-based) methods approach of Guest et al. (2006), we used an iterative  
5 process of analysis alternating between deduction and induction. Coding was accomplished  
6 in four rounds. An initial list of broad codes was developed based on key concepts extracted  
7 from the literature analysis and methodology; this included: gender, race, ethnicity, class,  
8 resources, intersections, benefits and challenges of the digital environment for  
9 entrepreneurship. The first round occurred during transcription when passages relevant to the  
10 research question were marked and coded. Data was then imported into NVivo10 and coded  
11 using the start list; additional broad codes were developed and shared with the research team  
12 to establish content validity and reliability through independent assessment. Inductive coding  
13 was then undertaken to develop finer first order concepts. The constant comparative method  
14 was used, so newly gathered data was compared with previously collected and coded data  
15 (Bowen, 2008). This included identifying emergent links between data points, adding new  
16 codes to segments of previously coded interviews and excluding extraneous codes for a near-  
17 finalised codebook. Respondents were then individually consulted to confirm that their  
18 voices were being appropriately translated, after which a final round of coding took place.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 Next, we considered the conceptual relationships between codes and concepts, sorting  
40 them into potential second order themes and aggregate dimensions (Braun and Clarke, 2006;  
41 Gioia et al., 2012). To confirm themes, we considered both their frequency across interviews  
42 and the varying weights and meanings of related concepts afforded by different interviewees.  
43 For further refinement, coded data extracts were reviewed for suitability and fit with  
44 emergent themes and dimensions. Lastly, the entire data set was reviewed to confirm that the  
45 final data structure (Figure 1, adapted from Gioia et al., 2012) accurately reflected the  
46 richness of the data as well as addressed the research question (Braun and Clarke, 2006).  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
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

*INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE*

-----

As Jackson (2012) notes, the power hierarchy between researchers and respondents can lead to the ‘ventriloquisation’ of conversations whereby original voices are translated into narratives that fit academic analyses. This encourages an epistemological bias that Golombisky (2006) argues prioritises the researcher voice in contemporary social science. Thus, to ensure a reflexive feminist approach and avoid academic ventriloquism, a condensed version of the thematic analysis (Appendix B) was sent to respondents with their feedback incorporated into the final analysis.

#### *Sample Characteristics*

Table 1 describes the characteristics of the sample and their firms. Further detail is available in Appendix C.

-----

*INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE*

-----

#### **Encountering structural inequalities online: Traditional gender roles, resource access, visibility and invisibility**

Three key areas pertaining to structural inequalities in social positionality and resource access were identified in participant accounts: impact of traditional gender roles, resourcing the firm, and issues of visibility/invisibility online. Although each experience was unique, the thematic areas in which structural inequality was evident visibly corresponded with the social categories of gender, class and race, reiterating the critical nature of these categories to processes of social valorisation and experiences of entrepreneurship (Anthias,

1  
2  
3 2013; Bradley, 2007; Jayawarna et al., 2014b). This is significant; it indicates that  
4 experiences of digital entrepreneurship are still subject to the social biases that inform offline  
5 entrepreneurship and therefore are not negated in the digital context. In addition, the  
6 interaction of inequalities in the unique positionalities of subjects produced complex  
7 intersectional experiences of privilege and disadvantage, which we explore in the findings  
8 and discussion.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

### 16 *Traditional gender roles and digital entrepreneurship*

17  
18  
19 Reflecting labour market segregation (Bradley, 2007; Mayer, 2006), the majority (19)  
20 of respondents created new ventures in feminised sectors such as health and beauty, apparel,  
21 or marketing services, which related to previous employment. Creating new businesses linked  
22 to past employment is typical for all new start-ups (Storey and Greene, 2010), a trend which  
23 reproduces the gendered divisions evident within the wider economy. Unsurprisingly, such  
24 structural differences were replicated in the online environment. However, there is a key  
25 difference: regardless of sector, these women are operating within a digital technological  
26 context. Thus, traditionally feminised activities are transposed into the realm of computing,  
27 which is embedded in masculinity (Wajcman, 2010). Despite a long history of accomplished  
28 women programmers and computer scientists, with numerous notable examples (e.g.  
29 Margaret Hamilton, Grace Hopper, Mae Jemison, Ada Lovelace, Steve Shirley), the number  
30 of women pursuing computer science degrees has decreased sharply since the 1980s  
31 (Fessenden, 2014; Henn, 2014), whilst women leave the technology industry at high rates due  
32 to hostility and sexism at work and online (Lien, 2015; Wu, 2015).  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 Kelan (2009) identifies a persistent tension between feminine stereotypes and beliefs  
52 about technological competence. As R3 (MR:UW:web design), noted: 'A lot of people do  
53 think that women in technology are a bit thick. And quite often at meeting I will say, I'm not  
54 just a pretty face. I do know how to build a website. And people are a bit taken aback by  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 that.' Similarly, R1 (WB:MM:e-retail) described having her capabilities and online venture  
4 underestimated such that she is 'not taken seriously': 'I [say I] do a website and then it's like  
5 oh, eBay. So they just think you're new and you're stupid...I just find they don't take you  
6 that seriously.' Even in an industry not explicitly digital, compromised legitimacy due to  
7 gender was a concern espoused by other respondents, such as R12 (WB:MM:arts and crafts):  
8 'When I very first started out I wasn't taken seriously, and they saw me as a bit of a little girl,  
9 and they [were] just entertaining me really... You've really got to put your foot down, in  
10 order for people to take you seriously.'

21 *The function of hegemonic femininity and masculinity* At the same time, hegemonic  
22 femininity was constructed by some as an asset to business relations. The popular assumption  
23 that women have superior communication and relationship-building skills emerged for  
24 respondents who felt able to connect with clients in ways men could not: 'I've got quite a  
25 friendly approachable way about me that sometimes men don't necessarily have'  
26 (R12:WB:MM:arts and crafts). Whilst acknowledging sexism in the wider business world,  
27 R26 felt the typical characteristics women are presumed to possess enabled them to compete  
28 in small business: 'it is a man's world, in a lot of industries, but I think actually in small  
29 business you can make yourself stand out and compete against men in the same, if not in a  
30 better way, because you've probably got the empathy and that side of things that men might  
31 not necessarily have' (BA:UM:marketing).

46 Similarly, R23 associated empathy with women and decisiveness and problem-  
47 solving with men, noting that in order to problem-solve effectively, one may have to be 'man  
48 and woman' simultaneously: 'people might write in complaining about an article. [We have  
49 to] address it, deal with it, write back to them, say I acknowledge your viewpoints, we'll take  
50 it into consideration...sort out problems. So you have to be a man, but a woman'  
51 (BB:LM:editing). R9 observed that she played a stereotypically feminine role in the business:  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 'typically a woman would be the organiser, the person running the back end of things making  
4 sure everything's running smoothly, and I definitely fit into that' (WB:LM:digital marketing).  
5  
6

7 These accounts illustrate that the virtual aspects of a business do not preclude hegemonic  
8 femininity and masculinity from shaping the mind-sets of respondents and customers and  
9 consequently, experiences of digital entrepreneurship.  
10  
11

12  
13  
14 *Flexibility and family life* Given the tensions between accommodating employment  
15 demands and domestic responsibilities, contemporary popular and business media (e.g.  
16 Forbes, Huffington Post, Mashable) has heralded entrepreneurship as a solution for women  
17 (Akalp, 2011; LeBlanc, 2015; MacNeil, 2012). It is assumed that by enacting  
18 entrepreneurship through self-employment, thereby creating one's own job (Kitching and  
19 Marlow, 2013), agentic power to determine terms and conditions of labour is transferred to  
20 the self-employed individual. This is deemed particularly useful for women as it appears to  
21 convey the authority to organise waged work around domestic rhythms (Jayawarna et al.,  
22 2014b). Such advantages are expected to be enhanced for digital entrepreneurs, as the  
23 business 'tool-kit' of computing devices and technical knowledge occupy little physical  
24 space, and interactions take place in the seemingly atemporal environment of the Internet  
25 (Kelan, 2009; Mason et al., 2011). This point was echoed by those respondents motivated by  
26 the belief that digital entrepreneurship would enable a better work-life balance, offering  
27 specific forms of flexibility whilst requiring few resources for relatively rapid returns. R16  
28 (BB:LM:e-retail) succinctly captured the sentiments of respondents with family  
29 responsibilities: 'It makes it easier for women because they can manage home life, family  
30 life, and run a business from home'.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 Recent critiques of the argument that home-based entrepreneurship offers women  
53 flexibility to meld a range of domestic demands with economic participation have noted the  
54 naiveté of such assumptions (Marlow, 2014). Commercial enterprises are subject to market  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 discipline via customer demands which undermines the notion of personal autonomy. Indeed,  
4 women with childcare responsibilities who opted for digital entrepreneurship as a flexible  
5 work strategy were generally unable to reconcile such tensions. Embedding the work space in  
6 the domestic environment through a digital medium removed traditional physical and  
7 temporal barriers, so the business was a constant and demanding presence. R5 (BB:UM:e-  
8 retail/service) noted: 'I gave up one high-stress job for time with my kids, and I'm just not  
9 having time with my kids'. R22 (BA:UW:training) stated that working at home in order to  
10 spend more time with her children had been completely counter-productive: 'The biggest  
11 challenge for me now is they [my children] are here and I feel that I'm not as constructive as  
12 I could be if I was working away from the house'. What emerges here is a contradiction:  
13 rather than resolving the friction between caring roles and economic participation, home-  
14 based digital enterprise can intensify both areas of responsibility rather than achieving  
15 confluence (Marlow, 2002; Rouse and Jayawarna, 2006).  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 The experience of R13 (BA:UM:fashion design/e-retail) illustrates an intersectional  
33 challenge due to the expectations of her husband's family that she adheres to traditional  
34 Asian femininity, wherein the husband is the breadwinner: '...they've tried to turn me away  
35 and say look, leave it to your husband to bring in the money, you don't need to do this. They  
36 couldn't understand my reasons for it.' As one of the few respondents explicitly focused on  
37 building a global, growth business, she also noted that motherhood made it 'difficult to start a  
38 business,' and that if she not had a child, she might have been 'in a better position' and more  
39 able to travel for business. To avoid familial disapproval, she hid her business from her in-  
40 laws and so was unable to take advantage of childcare that would otherwise be available.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 Even for women without children, or those with sufficient financial resources to  
53 purchase childcare, the virtual nature of trading online created a high-pressure context in  
54 which the business was 'always open'. Indeed, given the importance of electronic  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 performance reviews for Internet ventures, ensuring prompt responses is imperative, which  
4 exacerbates time management stresses. This evidence suggests that rather than acting to  
5 ameliorate time pressures and generate flexibility, digital entrepreneurship presents new  
6 challenges as the epitome of contemporary trends whereby technology blurs the physical and  
7 temporal barriers between workplace and home (Wajcman, 2015).  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

13  
14  
15 *Resourcing the firm: Relating social class to resource access*  
16

17  
18 This analysis highlights the resurgence of familiar themes regarding the  
19 disadvantageous influence of gender upon women's entrepreneurial activities, presenting a  
20 challenge to the alleged neutrality of the digital context. Yet, recognising the limitations of  
21 using gender as a generic discriminator, our second analytical theme explores class position  
22 and in particular, entrepreneurial resource accrual. Such resources include substantive  
23 elements such as finance, and more tacit elements such as time and various forms of human  
24 capital (Jayawarna et al., 2014a). Consequently, how class positions individuals in the socio-  
25 economic context is critical in terms of their ability to access and accrue such resources.  
26  
27 Generally, potential entrepreneurs with high levels of education, financial capital, business  
28 experience and industry contacts are more likely to create ventures which endure and grow  
29 (Jones, 2014; Wright et al., 2015); this is the case in the high-tech sphere as well (Braguinsky  
30 et al., 2012). Our empirical evidence supports this argument, as the influence of social class  
31 upon resource acquisition was fundamental, despite the digital context being lauded as  
32 requiring few resources to facilitate new venture creation. However, the relative importance  
33 of specific pools of resources varied dependent upon positionality, and affected the types of  
34 businesses in which respondents engaged.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52  
53 *The relative importance of technical knowledge* Technical knowledge, or alternatively,  
54 access to the services of people who possessed it, was a significant human capital resource.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
Continual, dynamic learning regarding digital selling technologies and tools was necessary to

1  
2  
3 develop a web presence and communicate effectively with industry professionals, particularly  
4 website development and technical support providers. Crucially, those who had adequate  
5 financial and temporal resources, in addition to the human capital of business and  
6 management experience from previous employment, mobilised these resources alongside any  
7 technical knowledge. Privileged positionality equipped them with sufficient antecedent social  
8 resources to overcome knowledge limitations and develop their entrepreneurial ideas.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

17 Staying abreast of the dynamism of the online space was central to respondent  
18 discussions. As R6 (BA:UM:e-retail) noted: 'It's constant learning and developing. Because  
19 the online space changes so quickly...if you don't know, you cannot really work with  
20 anybody to tell them what you want because they will talk in a language that you can't  
21 understand.' R9 (WB:LM:web design) echoed this: 'If you don't understand it, then how are  
22 you supposed to understand where your money's going? It doesn't work.' This ability to  
23 understand was attained through a continuous process of self-education combining intensive  
24 research, paid training, drawing upon network contacts and hiring professional assistance.  
25 These options required varying combinations of finance and time, both of which were  
26 facilitated by higher positionality.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 The interlinked nature of financial and temporal resources and their centrality to  
40 success in the online space was illustrated by R20: 'I think that when you factor in the costs  
41 of the time needed to participate in the things that would make you visible online, whether  
42 you do it in a bootstrapping sense, as in you learn how to do these things and you do them  
43 yourself, or you hire in an agency and they help you do it, overall it's going to cost you more  
44 [than in the past] to prove a concept online.' She, along with other respondents who had been  
45 working in the digital space for more than ten years, observed that what it takes today to have  
46 a successful online business is dramatically different to a decade ago. R13 (BA:UM:fashion  
47 design/e-retail) concurred: 'In 2005 it was a lot easier just to get a domain, to place yourself.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 It was a simple SEO process...But now I think it's so crowded that you have to do so much  
4 more, you need to do PR, you need blogging. Google made it tougher to get yourself ranked.'

5  
6  
7 More recent entrants were unaware of this and entered the space naively: 'In my ignorance I  
8 thought once I got the website up I assumed people would just find me. So it was a case of  
9 getting my website noticed, getting on Google, using the right keywords on Google to  
10 advertise and promote it, and that took – it took, before I started getting recognised and sales  
11 coming in, probably about four or five months' (R16: BB:LM:e-retail).  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 Access to knowledgeable networks proved to be a key source of social advantage. R4  
20 (WB:UM:e-retail) belonged to a governmental task force in which she engaged with CEOs of  
21 leading e-commerce firms. She leveraged extensively off these networks: 'you get to meet  
22 people that are quite high up in the other businesses. To me that's really useful, because I can  
23 then drop them a line on LinkedIn and go, "Listen, I've got a problem..." Having such  
24 informal access to experts enabled the development of her knowledge base and skill-set. In  
25 contrast, working-class women without such advantages (e.g. R3, R17) spoke of trying to  
26 build networks and the need to prove themselves throughout their careers, illustrating a  
27 dearth of social capital resources. Given such disadvantages, technological competence  
28 became essential for them in a manner not evident for more affluent women.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 The relevance of class-based influences upon cultural and educational experiences  
43 was also evident. For example, R6 (BA:UM:e-retail) explained: 'My parents were very  
44 educated and came from a socioeconomic class where education is so important. [They]  
45 exposed us to everything, and gave us the best of everything in terms of exposure and  
46 education.' She linked her elite educational background to the confidence needed to  
47 undertake her digital enterprise: 'if you have [the] ability to go to the best institutions in the  
48 world, they...carry you in a way where you feel that you're more confident, and ... you have  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the ability to go out there and create change.’ In this case, class-based privilege somewhat  
4 ameliorated the expected constraints of a non-dominant gender and racial positionality.  
5  
6

7  
8 *The critical nature of financial resources* Operating a digital business cheaply and flexibly  
9 appealed to respondents in most circumstances. This included those who wanted to manage  
10 child care, women disillusioned with previous employment and seeking a new career, and  
11 highly educated and experienced women faced with intersecting gendered, racialised, and  
12 ageist barriers to continued participation in the labour market. Thus, regardless of their  
13 situation, respondents stated they elected to create a digital business as it appeared more  
14 accessible than a bricks-and-mortar business. Yet, despite the ostensibly lower entry costs, a  
15 lack of financial resources, combined with limited knowledge and business support services  
16 presented significant challenges, especially to those in the lowest socio-economic positions.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 The case of R17 (BB:UU:e-retail) offers an example of a marginalised and  
29 economically vulnerable individual pushed into entrepreneurship despite a dearth of  
30 resources and human capital. An unemployed hairdresser claiming benefits, the Jobcentre  
31 encouraged her to start an e-retail business by joining the now-defunct ‘Get British  
32 Businesses Online’ scheme, which offered a free website for two years. With few financial  
33 resources and experiencing losses on her site, difficulties in accessing resources evoked fear  
34 and insecurity: ‘I’d have to start paying to continue. I’d have to start funding my own  
35 website, so there’s lots of things I still need to learn to do. And certain things I’m sort of  
36 nervous to do it in case I mess it up.’ Her lack of human capital was a key obstacle: ‘I’ve got  
37 no technical experience. I’m not very good with the Internet.’ She also repeatedly pointed to  
38 a lack of financial resources underpinning every business challenge stating, ‘There are so  
39 many different things that have to be done if you want to be successful selling on the Internet.  
40 I thought it was an easy thing but it’s not. It’s only easy if you’ve got money.’  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The experience of R7 (WB:P:fashion design), a precarious worker, illustrated another  
4 type of financial challenge. To fund her business she took a minimum-wage job, restricting  
5 the time available to invest in her new venture: 'I funded mine through my part-time job. And  
6 then I started to work full-time, and I had the money to fund it, just not the time...it's a  
7 difficult balance to achieve'. Thus, despite the assumption that starting digital businesses is  
8 generally low-cost, for working class people and precarious workers attempting to trade  
9 online, finance emerged as critical issue. In the case of e-retailers, transactional payment  
10 websites could be prohibitively expensive, maintaining stock levels to satisfy uncertain  
11 demand was challenging, and buying in support was simply unaffordable.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 Even beyond the start-up stage, digital entrepreneurship can be costly; resources are  
25 continuously utilised for site optimisation and search engine discovery. This is a critical  
26 aspect of online trading, as noted by R11 (BB:UM:make-up school): 'If you're doing a  
27 Google advert and you only have £100, no one's going to see it. Other people are spending  
28 £1000 every day. So you're competing with much, much bigger players.' Neither is it  
29 necessarily low-risk; R2 (BB:MM:manufacturing/e-retail), funded her business by drawing  
30 upon her pension, investing her only source of future security: 'I've got no money...I was  
31 able to actually cash in a percentage of my pension and that's actually what I used to initiate  
32 the business. Imagine having to start a business, with a pension.' However, that she had a  
33 pension pot to access at all illustrates the class-based benefits of a middle-class professional  
34 career for the pursuit of digital entrepreneurial aims. Notably, those who reported having  
35 access to all the resources they might need were educated, middle-class white women with  
36 professional/management experience and financial resources: 'I think everything that I would  
37 need, I would be comfortable in accessing' (R8:WB:MM:vintage fashion).  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54  
55 *Visibility and invisibility online*  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Our critical analysis of the Internet as a trading platform suggests that the alleged neutrality of the digital environment does not compensate for constructed social ascriptions and class-related resource constraints. However, operating remotely and using electronic representations may still be expected to remove the marked body as a legitimating physical representation of the business. In contrast to historical experiences of women working in the male-dominated IT field, such as Dame Stephanie Shirley adopting the name 'Steve', none of the respondents reported concealing their identity as women. But whilst gender remained a substantive presence, for example, informing sectoral choices and impacting upon legitimacy and resource accrual – the complex process of using physicality as an evaluatory process is explored in more detail here in relation to the category of race.

*Whitewashing websites* Black British and British Asian respondents illustrated how, even on the Web, whiteness served as a privilege and political resource inaccessible to entrepreneurs of colour. This was manifest in decisions regarding digital profiles, branding and marketing, activities crucial for customer capture in what is portrayed as a neutral marketplace. Such decisions included consideration of a process termed 'whitewashing' (R5:BB:UM:e-retail/service) as a strategy to address anticipated discrimination. This practice, adopted to conceal ethnic names, identities and racialised physical appearances in order to appeal to a wider market, arose several times during interviews. As R5 reflected: 'As soon as...there's a black face or a minority face, it seems to be generally accepted that those products are for black people. So you have to kind of whitewash it [to] get more sales'. A respondent with a Nigerian name (R24:BB:MM:consulting) was asked by a business partner to whitewash her online profile to appeal to a wider market: 'You'd have to change your picture, change your name, so you're a white person with a white name. And she said, you know, have a think about it'. R23 (BB:LM:editing) explained that as a black woman, whitewashing was one option to avoid the 'risk' of making yourself visible: 'I didn't want to

1  
2  
3 put my picture on...cos I know it's risky...as a black woman. It could mean lack of business,  
4  
5 people don't want to use you, they don't trust you...or do you put blonde people on the front  
6  
7 of all your pictures?' Another respondent (R22:BA:UW:training) whitewashed by using an  
8  
9 Anglicised version of her name: 'I...hid my identity as an Asian woman because I believed  
10  
11 that if people saw my name...they'd be thinking who is she, is she foreign or what is she. So  
12  
13 I used to hide my name.' Eventually, however, her discomfort with this deception prompted  
14  
15 her to abandon this stance: 'I took all the masks off, I put the little decoration on my  
16  
17 forehead, the bindi, and I thought, you know, I'm an Asian woman, this is what I'm good at,  
18  
19 this is what I'm going to do'.  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 Conversely, maintaining a visible ethnic identity was important for products aimed at  
25  
26 specific minority markets, inspiring trust and familiarity. For example, R5 (BB:UM:e-  
27  
28 retail/service), some of whose products were specifically for Afro-textured hair, noted 'It  
29  
30 helps to have the face that they're expecting to see when I say yeah, I have that problem.'  
31  
32 Yet, this was also deemed a limiting strategy as such markets were constrained by their niche  
33  
34 reach and appeal. Her portfolio also included products intended for a mass market, and she  
35  
36 described challenges in communicating with a wider audience: 'We shouldn't...have to  
37  
38 remove all the black images so that I can get "everybody". It doesn't work. It makes me very  
39  
40 frustrated.' In contrast, for white respondents, the influence of their own race upon the  
41  
42 business appeared inconsequential; it did not factor highly, if at all, in their decisions.  
43  
44 Comments on race and ethnicity reflected the assumption that they were, along with other  
45  
46 social markers, easily 'hidden' online: 'You're not restricted by class, gender, ethnicity,  
47  
48 because you can portray yourself however you want' (R9:WB:LM:digital marketing).  
49  
50 Another white participant questioned the rationale for exposing identifying markers unless it  
51  
52 'added value': 'Why would you want to go around with a tattoo on your head saying you're a  
53  
54 lesbian or you're black or you're...do you know what I mean? It's one of those things that  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 you would bring into a relationship, whether that's a professional relationship or otherwise.  
4  
5 Because it adds value to the relationship' (R20:WB:MM:e-retail/consultancy).  
6  
7

8 It is evident from these responses that race was generally of little consequence for the  
9  
10 white participants. Whilst belonging to a marginalised race is neither private nor concealable,  
11  
12 the effects of 'whiteness' are invisible. It is normative, requiring neither explanation nor  
13  
14 recognition (Ahmed, 2012). In keeping with this invisibility, the Web is perceived as non-  
15  
16 racial space in which the prototypical user is assumed to be white (Kettrey and Laster, 2014).  
17  
18 Although this offers implicit privileges to white actors, given embedded normativity, it does  
19  
20 not disturb the alleged neutrality of the online environment.  
21  
22

### 23 24 **Systemic inequality and enabling conditions for digital enterprise**

25  
26  
27 Contrary to popular suggestion, systemic inequalities do not disappear when  
28  
29 transfigured through the medium of the Internet. From this evidence, it emerges that digital  
30  
31 entrepreneurial activity occurs in heterogeneous contexts, and that successful venture creation  
32  
33 requires appropriate enabling conditions. Participant experiences suggest that aside from  
34  
35 simple access to technology, these conditions coalesce around three interlinked areas:  
36  
37 finance, technological knowledge and competence, and applicable previous work experience.  
38  
39 These enabling conditions were related to positionality, such that offline intersecting social  
40  
41 hierarchies of gender, race and class influenced and shaped the opportunities perceived and  
42  
43 pursued in the online environment. Normative gender role expectations meant that successful  
44  
45 performance of hegemonic femininity functioned as a cultural resource, resonating with  
46  
47 Kelan's observation that although gender in contemporary work environments is said to  
48  
49 matter no longer, women are still assumed to possess typical feminine skills that are now  
50  
51 considered an asset in business interactions (2009: 25). Normative racial identity (whiteness)  
52  
53 emerged as a critical asset; visible minority ethnic designation through images and names  
54  
55 was deemed a potential detriment in terms of reaching mainstream markets or, conversely, a  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 signifier of a niche market/product only suitable for those who share the heritage of the  
4  
5 entrepreneurial actor.  
6  
7

8  
9 Rather than being a neutral or levelling space, the online environment merely  
10 reflected the social inequalities evident in the lives of respondents. Prior higher status  
11 employment was associated with greater stocks of savings for start-up capital, as well as  
12 access to networks offering accessible and pertinent knowledge and technical support. This  
13 evidence reflects arguments emphasising the relevance of social positionality and life chance  
14 conditions to entrepreneurial activity, due to their impacts upon class and life course  
15 pathways (Anderson and Miller, 2003; Jayawarna et al., 2014). Additionally, the importance  
16 of social and human capital accrued in prior higher status employment challenges the popular  
17 notion that ‘anyone’ can start a viable online business with minimal investment.  
18 Respondents offered numerous examples of how offline stigmas and disadvantages persisted  
19 within the online context, such that for women, it neither eliminates sexism nor resolves  
20 tensions between work and family life (Marlow, 2014; Mirchandani, 2000). Rather, there is a  
21 paradox between the everyday rhetoric of digital equality and the reality of familiar inequity.  
22 Digital enterprise has the scope to exacerbate class-based inequalities regarding the accrual  
23 of, or access to, technological knowledge. The rate of change and volume of information  
24 available is daunting for those with limited knowledge; even for the most skilled, having both  
25 time and financial resources to exploit rapidly changing technology is essential to  
26 maintaining successful enterprises on the web.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 For Black and Asian women, these experiences were complicated by racialised  
50 challenges to online self-representation. As white elite and upper middle-class males  
51 dominate positions of power in advanced Western economies, normalised and naturalised by  
52 socially constructed hegemonic practice (Acker, 2006; Bradley, 2007), whiteness and  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 masculinity provide intangible resources to entrepreneurial legitimacy. This is exacerbated  
4  
5 for women of colour and others whose physical appearance visibly signifies 'difference' from  
6  
7 the norm. Whether or not they opt to whitewash their sites, habitual practices undertaken  
8  
9 online can lead to the unconscious enactment of embodied identities (Schultze, 2014). Such  
10  
11 evidence suggests that embodied disadvantage is reproduced in the online space, as even  
12  
13 respondents with high levels of human capital and managerial expertise face barriers to self-  
14  
15 representation given racial discrimination and anti-Blackness in particular (Woods, 2013).  
16  
17 Both subtle and blatant racial discrimination is evident in work contexts, as well as online  
18  
19 (Kettrey and Laster, 2014; Van Laer and Janssens, 2011), forcing entrepreneurs of colour to  
20  
21 grapple with difficult, indeed shocking, choices when deciding how to portray themselves. In  
22  
23 contrast, actors whose identities reflect the mainstream 'ideal' entrepreneurial type (Ogbor,  
24  
25 2000; Ahl, 2006) are able to expend considerably less effort on how they present themselves  
26  
27 to audiences and potential clients. This privilege is a significant resource not afforded to  
28  
29 those whose bodies and ways of being are othered by a non-dominant positionality,  
30  
31 particularly with regard to race. It is clear that the acquisition of key human capital resources,  
32  
33 whilst beneficial to most entrepreneurial processes, is not sufficient to overcome the  
34  
35 disadvantages posed by the racialised structures within the dominant socio-economic context.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 This evidence supports literature suggesting that disadvantaged positionality reduces  
42  
43 the likelihood of accessing appropriate enabling conditions, particularly in access to finance,  
44  
45 social networks, and educational and employment experiences that contribute to knowledge,  
46  
47 all of which were here found to be crucial to the start-up process. Positionality influences  
48  
49 which entrepreneurial activities may be pursued, as the higher-margin, knowledge-based  
50  
51 online services businesses enabled by Internet technologies (Mason et al., 2011) were  
52  
53 relatively inaccessible to people of working class backgrounds without qualifications and  
54  
55 professional experience. This disadvantage was compounded by gender and race, with  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 additional challenges faced when attempting to overcome the constraints of gender-based  
4 caring responsibilities, enter sexist environments and avoid racial discrimination.  
5  
6

7  
8 These findings extend entrepreneurship theory by illuminating the heterogeneity of  
9 experiences amongst digital entrepreneurial actors and how social positionality influences  
10 access to entrepreneurial resources. Drawing from this evidence, we dispute claims that the  
11 digital environment opens up new possibilities for meritocratic entrepreneurial activity;  
12 rather, the potential exists for the emergence of yet another discourse linking marginality  
13 with deficiency, thereby reproducing the 'same old story' (Ahl and Marlow, 2012).  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

### 21 **Limitations and future research**

22  
23  
24  
25 Limitations to the empirical study are acknowledged; there are small numbers in each  
26 sub-category, thus, future research needs to replicate and extend this study. Moreover, whilst  
27 the evidence regarding constrained access to resources illustrates theoretical analyses of class  
28 influences, we acknowledge that it is especially important to ensure that the most marginal  
29 individuals are afforded greater visibility. Future research should focus directly upon such  
30 groups, particularly working class women given that they are seen as those who might benefit  
31 most from online opportunities (Thompson Jackson, 2009). A further related limitation is that  
32 the sample, for access reasons, did not include members of UK new migrant populations and  
33 non-English speaking ethnic minority entrepreneurs. Neither did it consider as primary the  
34 intersections of alternative characteristics, such as age or geographic location. However, it is  
35 suggested that the theoretical framework and contributions of this research may be applied to  
36 facilitate future research into how digital entrepreneurship is experienced by members of  
37 these and other populations. Future studies may also wish to consider taking the household as  
38 the unit of analysis, or engage in multi-level analysis, ideally with a longitudinal real-time  
39 design to capture long-term business outcomes.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Conclusion and implications

In addressing our research question regarding how intersectional positionality affects the accrual of entrepreneurial resources by women undertaking digital ventures, we critique the notion that the Internet is a meritocratic space for entrepreneurial activity. Rather, we argue that offline positionality has the capacity to constrain entrepreneurial potential in the online space. Drawing upon cyberfeminist theorising (Daniels, 2009) which disputes arguments that the virtual environment is distinct from the social world, we explore the manner in which the idealised entrepreneurial actor is transposed into the digital context. In effect, the physicality of the subject penetrates the virtual domain via a variety of visual and textual representations, which have the scope to offer advantages to those who meet stereotypical normativity. Our critical analysis, supported by empirical evidence, suggests that as a socio-technical artefact, the online environment reflects, reproduces and potentially exacerbates offline social hierarchies.

Given the alleged promise of the Internet as a new site of entrepreneurial opportunity realisation, the implications of such arguments are far reaching. The current trend of encouraging digital enterprise as a means to social mobility and economic independence for the disadvantaged is, at the least, questionable. If positionality and structural inequality are not taken into consideration, those who encounter the discourse of digital meritocratic possibility can only make sense of under-achievement through assumed agentic inadequacy. There is an inherent contradiction between the potential afforded to digital enterprise and the actuality of its realisation; unfortunately, those for whom this is allegedly an enhancing space are most likely to be vulnerable to failure and its related consequences. We progress extant theory by focusing upon the heterogeneity of digital entrepreneurial actors and how social positionality both constrains and enables venture creation and performance through resourcing issues. Whilst successful online venturing is primarily associated with

1  
2  
3 technological knowledge, we demonstrate that material, cultural and tacit resources are  
4 essential to this process. Accrual of diverse resources is theoretically framed as embedded  
5 within positionality, which informs unequal structural distribution mechanisms that persist  
6 within the online context. We use intersectionality and positionality theory to build a  
7 theoretical platform for future research, linking these constructs to cyberfeminist, critical race  
8 studies and cyberculture literature (Daniels, 2009; Nakamura, 2008; boyd, 2009). In so doing,  
9 we integrate contemporary perspectives to enable a novel critique of the popular assumptions  
10 surrounding digital entrepreneurship.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 The overarching contribution of this article, however, extends beyond its central  
22 critique of the Internet as a neutral and meritocratic entrepreneurial platform to a wider  
23 critique of entrepreneurship in general as a meritocratic activity. It concludes that the  
24 ontological assumptions underpinning much of the discourse on entrepreneurship, and on  
25 digital entrepreneurship in particular, are marred by their inattention to the socially embedded  
26 nature of such activities. Policy initiatives suggesting that the Internet can be a 'great leveller'  
27 for social inequalities should proceed with caution, lest they become part of evangelical  
28 contemporary rhetoric promoting the potential of entrepreneurship for the marginalised and  
29 disadvantaged.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

#### 45 **References**

46  
47 Accenture (2014). The promise of digital entrepreneurs: Creating 10 million youth jobs in the  
48 G20 countries. [online] Available at:  
49  
50 <<http://www.accenture.com/SiteCollectionDocuments/PDF/Accenture-Promise-Digital-Entrepreneurs-Creating-10-Million-Youth-Jobs-G20-Countries.pdf>>  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Acker, J (2006) Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender &*  
4 *Society*, 20(4): 441-464.  
5  
6  
7  
8 Adib, A, Guerrier, Y (2003) The interlocking of gender with nationality, race, ethnicity and  
9 class: The narratives of women in hotel work. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 10(4): 413-  
10 432.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 Ahl, H (2006) Why Research on Women Entrepreneurs Needs New Directions.  
16 *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(5): 595-621.  
17  
18  
19  
20 Ahl, H and Marlow, S (2012) Exploring the dynamics of gender, feminism and  
21 entrepreneurship: Advancing debate to escape a dead end? *Organization*, 19(5): 543-562.  
22  
23  
24  
25 Ahmed, S (2012) *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. Durham and  
26 London: Duke University Press.  
27  
28  
29  
30 Akalp, N (2011) Why Women Make Excellent Entrepreneurs in the Digital Age. *Mashable*.  
31 25 Oct. [online] Available at: <[http://mashable.com/2011/10/25/women-](http://mashable.com/2011/10/25/women-entrepreneurs/#iGu1JkE478qc)  
32 [entrepreneurs/#iGu1JkE478qc](http://mashable.com/2011/10/25/women-entrepreneurs/#iGu1JkE478qc)>.  
33  
34  
35  
36 Al-Dajani, H, Marlow, S (2013) Empowerment and entrepreneurship: a theoretical  
37 framework. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 19(5): 503-524.  
38  
39  
40  
41 Ashley, L and Empson, L (2013) Differentiation and discrimination: Understanding social  
42 class and social exclusion in leading law firms. *Human Relations*, 66(2): 219-244.  
43  
44  
45  
46 Anderson, A and Miller, C (2003) "Class Matters": Human and Social Capital in the  
47 Entrepreneurial Process. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 32: 17-36.  
48  
49  
50  
51 Anthias, F (2001a) New hybridities, old concepts: The limits of 'culture'. *Ethnic and Racial*  
52 *Studies*, 24(4): 619-641.  
53  
54  
55  
56 Anthias, F (2001b) The material and the symbolic in theorizing social stratification: Issues of  
57 gender, ethnicity and class. *British Journal of Sociology*, 52(3): 367-390.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Anthias, F (2006) Belongings in a Globalising and Unequal World: Rethinking  
4  
5 Translocations. In: Yuval-Davis, N, Kannabiran, K, Vieten, U (eds) *The Situated Politics of*  
6  
7 *Belonging*. London: Sage, 17-31.

8  
9  
10 Anthias, F (2007) Ethnic ties: Social capital and the question of mobilisability. *The*  
11  
12 *Sociological Review* 55(4): 788-805.

13  
14 Anthias, F (2008) Thinking through the lens of translocational positionality: A  
15  
16 intersectionality frame for understanding identity and belonging. *Translocations: Migration*  
17  
18 *and Social Change* 4(1): 5-20. [online] Available at:  
19  
20 [http://www.dcu.ie/imrstr/volume\\_4\\_issue\\_1/Vol\\_4\\_Issue\\_1\\_Floya\\_Anthias.pdf](http://www.dcu.ie/imrstr/volume_4_issue_1/Vol_4_Issue_1_Floya_Anthias.pdf).

21  
22  
23 Anthias, F (2013) Hierarchies of social location, class and intersectionality: Towards a  
24  
25 translocational frame. *International Sociology*, 28(1): 121- 137.

26  
27  
28 Anyadike-Danes, M, Hart, M and Du, J (2015) Firm dynamics and job creation in the United  
29  
30 Kingdom: 1998–2013. *International Small Business Journal*, 33(1): 12-27.

31  
32  
33 Barbour, R (2001) Checklists for improving rigour in qualitative research: A case of the tail  
34  
35 wagging the dog? *British Medical Journal*, 322: 1115–1117.

36  
37  
38 Bird, B and Brush, C (2002) A gendered perspective on organizational creation.  
39  
40 *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 26: 41–65.

41  
42  
43 Bowen, GA (2008) Naturalistic inquiry and the saturation concept: A research note.  
44  
45 *Qualitative Research*, 8: 137-152.

46  
47  
48 boyd, d (2009) “The Not-So-Hidden Politics of Class Online.” Personal Democracy Forum,  
49  
50 New York, June 30. Available at: [http://www.racialicious.com/2009/07/09/the-not-so-](http://www.racialicious.com/2009/07/09/the-not-so-hidden-politics-of-class-online)  
51  
52 [hidden-politics-of-class-online](http://www.racialicious.com/2009/07/09/the-not-so-hidden-politics-of-class-online).

53  
54  
55 Bradley, H (2007). *Gender*. Cambridge: Polity.



1  
2  
3 Bradley, H, and Healy, G (2008) *Ethnicity and Gender at Work: inequalities, careers and*  
4  
5 *employment relations*. London and New York: Palgrave and Macmillan.

6  
7  
8 Braguinsky, S, Klepper, S, Ohyama, A (2012) High-Tech Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Law*  
9  
10 *and Economics*, 55(4): 869-900.

11  
12 Braun, V and Clarke, V (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research*  
13  
14 *in Psychology*, 3(2): 77-101.

15  
16  
17 Byrne, B (2006) *White Lives: The Interplay Of 'Race', Class And Gender In Everyday Life*.  
18  
19 New York: Routledge.

20  
21  
22 Carbin, M, Edenheim, S (2013) The intersectional turn in feminist theory: A dream of a  
23  
24 common language? *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 20: 233-248.

25  
26  
27 Carter, S, Mwaura, S, Ram, M, Trehan, K, and Jones, T (2015) Barriers to ethnic minority  
28  
29 and Women's enterprise: existing evidence, policy tensions and unsettled questions.  
30  
31 *International Small Business Journal*, 33(1): 49-69.

32  
33  
34 Case, P (2003) "From objectivity to subjectivity: Pursuing subjective authenticity in  
35  
36 organizational research". In Westwood, R and Clegg, S (eds), *Debating Organization: Point-*  
37  
38 *Counterpoint in Organization Studies*. Oxford: Blackwell, 35-49.

39  
40  
41 Castells, M (2010) *The Rise of the Network Society*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

42  
43  
44 Crenshaw, K (1991) Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence  
45  
46 against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6): 1241-1299.

47  
48  
49 Crenshaw, K (1997) Intersectionality and identity politics: learning from violence against  
50  
51 women of colour. In: Shanley, ML, Narayan, U (eds), *Reconstructing Political Theory*.

52  
53 Oxford: Polity Press.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Crenshaw, K (2015) Why intersectionality can't wait. Washington Post [online] 24 Sept.

4 Available at: [http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-theory/wp/2015/09/24/why-](http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-theory/wp/2015/09/24/why-intersectionality-cant-wait/)  
5  
6 intersectionality-cant-wait/  
7

8  
9  
10 Daniels, J (2009) Rethinking cyberfeminism(s): Race, gender, and embodiment. *WSQ:*  
11  
12 *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 37(1-2): 101-124.

13  
14  
15 Daniels, J (2012) Race and racism in Internet studies: A review and critique. *New Media &*  
16  
17 *Society*, 15(5): 695-719.

18  
19  
20 Davidson, E and Vaast, E (2010) Digital Entrepreneurship and Its Sociomaterial Enactment.  
21  
22 *In System Sciences (HICSS), 2010 43rd Hawaii International Conference*. Honolulu, HI, 5-8  
23  
24 Jan 2010. [online] Available at: <http://www.hicss.hawaii.edu/bp43/IN6.pdf>.

25  
26  
27 Davidson, M, Fielden, S, and Omar, A (2010) Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic female  
28  
29 business owners. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 16(1): 58 –  
30  
31 80.

32  
33  
34 De Bruin, A, Brush, CG and Welter, F (2007) Advancing a framework for coherent research  
35  
36 on women's entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31(3): 323-339.

37  
38  
39 Forson, C and Özbilgin, M (2003) Dot-com women entrepreneurs in the UK. *The*  
40  
41 *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 4(1): 13-24.

42  
43  
44 Eriksen, T (1996) Ethnicity, Race, Class and Nation. *Ethnicity*. In: Hutchinson, A, Smith, A  
45  
46 (eds) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

47  
48  
49 Eriksson-Zetterquist, U, Lindberg, K and Styhre, A (2009) When the good times are over:  
50  
51 Professionals encountering new technology. *Human Relations*, 62(8): 1145-1167.

52  
53  
54 Essers, C, Benschop, Y and Dooreward, H (2010) Female ethnicity: Understanding Muslim  
55  
56 immigrant businesswomen in the Netherlands. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 17(3): 320-  
57  
58 339.  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Fessenden, M (2014) What Happened to All the Women in Computer Science?  
4  
5 *Smithsonian.com*. 22 Oct. [online] Available at: <[http://www.smithsonianmag.com/smart-](http://www.smithsonianmag.com/smart-news/what-happened-all-women-computer-science-1-180953111/#RlySJdRam1cg8zjt.99)  
6  
7 [news/what-happened-all-women-computer-science-1-180953111/#RlySJdRam1cg8zjt.99](http://www.smithsonianmag.com/smart-news/what-happened-all-women-computer-science-1-180953111/#RlySJdRam1cg8zjt.99)>  
8  
9  
10 Fielden, S. Davidson, M (2012) BAME women business owners: how intersectionality  
11  
12 affects discrimination and social support. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*,  
13  
14 27(8): 559-581.  
15  
16  
17 Forson, C (2006) The strategic framework for women's enterprise: BME women at the  
18  
19 margins. *Equal Opportunities International*, 25(6): 418-32.  
20  
21  
22 Forson, C (2013) Contextualising migrant black business women's work-life balance  
23  
24 experiences. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 19(5):460-77.  
25  
26  
27 Geerts, E, van der Tuin, I (2013) From intersectionality to interference: Feminist onto-  
28  
29 epistemological reflections on the politics of representation. *Women's Studies International*  
30  
31 *Forum*, 41(3): 171–178.  
32  
33  
34 Genachowski, J (2011 January) Prepared Remarks of Chairman Julius Genachowski, Federal  
35  
36 Communications Commission. Presented at Minority Media & Telecom Council Broadband  
37  
38 and Social Justice Summit, Washington, DC, USA.  
39  
40  
41 Golombisky, K (2006). Gendering the interview: Feminist reflections on gender as  
42  
43 performance in research. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 29: 165-192.  
44  
45  
46 Government Equalities Office (2014) Female entrepreneurs set to benefit from superfast  
47  
48 broadband. [online] Available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/news/female-](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/female-entrepreneurs-set-to-benefit-from-superfast-broadband)  
49  
50 [entrepreneurs-set-to-benefit-from-superfast-broadband](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/female-entrepreneurs-set-to-benefit-from-superfast-broadband).  
51  
52  
53 Gioia, DJ, Hamilton, KE and Corley AL (2012) Seeking Qualitative Rigor in Inductive  
54  
55 Research: Notes on the Gioia Methodology. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16(1): 15-31.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Guest, G, Bunce, A and Johnson, L (2006) How many interviews are enough?: an experiment  
4 with data saturation and variability. *Field Methods*, 18(1): 59-82.

5  
6  
7 Hall, S (1997) "Race, The Floating Signifier". Lecture, Goldsmith's College. [online]  
8 Available at: <[http://www.mediaed.org/assets/products/407/transcript\\_407.pdf](http://www.mediaed.org/assets/products/407/transcript_407.pdf)>

9  
10  
11  
12 Haraway, D (1999) The Biopolitics of Postmodern Bodies: Determinations of Self in Immune  
13 System Discourse. In: Price, J, Shildrick, M (eds) *Feminist Theory and the Body: A Reader*.  
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

Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Harding, R (2007) State of Women's Enterprise in the UK. [online] Available at:  
[http://www.prowess.org.uk/wp-](http://www.prowess.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/StateofWomensenterpriseintheukfinal.pdf)  
[content/uploads/2011/10/StateofWomensenterpriseintheukfinal.pdf](http://www.prowess.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/StateofWomensenterpriseintheukfinal.pdf)>

Healy, G, Bradley, H and Forson, C (2011) Intersectional sensibilities in analysing inequality  
regimes in public sector organizations. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 18(5): 467-487.

Henn, S (2014) When Women Stopped Coding. *NPR Planet Money*. 21 Oct. [online]  
Available at: <[http://www.npr.org/sections/money/2014/10/21/357629765/when-women-](http://www.npr.org/sections/money/2014/10/21/357629765/when-women-stopped-coding)  
[stopped-coding](http://www.npr.org/sections/money/2014/10/21/357629765/when-women-stopped-coding)>

Henry, C, Foss, L, Ahl, H (2015) Gender and Entrepreneurship Research: A review of  
methodological approaches. *International Small Business Journal*, forthcoming.

Hill Collins, P (1990/2000) *Black Feminist Thought*. 2nd Edition. New York, NY: Routledge.

Högberg, L, Schölin, T, Ram, M and Jones, T (2014) Categorising and labelling  
entrepreneurs: Business support organisations constructing the Other through prefixes of  
ethnicity and immigrantship. *International Small Business Journal* (0)0: 1-19.

Holvino, E (2010) Intersections: The Simultaneity of Race, Gender and Class in Organization  
Studies. *Gender, Work and Organization*: 17(3): 248-277.

- 1  
2  
3 hooks, b (1981) *Ain't I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism*. Boston,: South End Press.  
4  
5  
6 hooks, b (2000/2015) *Feminism is for Everybody: Passionate Politics*. Oxon: Routledge.  
7  
8 Hull, CE, Hung, YC, Hair, N, Perotti, V and DeMartino, R (2007) Taking advantage of  
9 digital opportunities: A typology of digital entrepreneurship. *International Journal of*  
10 *Networking and Virtual Organisations*, 4(3): 290-303.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 Ituma, A and Simpson, R (2009) The 'boundaryless' career and career boundaries: Applying  
16 an institutionalist perspective to ICT workers in the context of nigeria. *Human Relations*,  
17 62(5): 727-761.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22 Jackson, C (2012) Speech, gender and power: beyond testimony. *Development and Change*,  
23 43(5): 999–1023.  
24  
25  
26  
27 Jayawarna, D, Jones, O and Macpherson, A (2014a) Entrepreneurial potential: The role of  
28 human and cultural capitals. *International Small Business Journal*, 32(8): 918-943.  
29  
30  
31  
32 Jayawarna, D, Rouse, J and Macpherson, A (2014b) Life course pathways to business start-  
33 up. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 26(3-4): 282-312.  
34  
35  
36  
37 Jome, LM, Donahue, MP and Siegel, LA (2006) Working in the uncharted technology  
38 frontier: Characteristics of women web entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business and Psychology*,  
39 21(1): 127-147.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44 Kaplan, G and Malach-Pines, A (2010) *Women Serial High-Technology Entrepreneurs*. In:  
45 Ed. A. Malach-Pines and M. Özbilgin. *Handbook of Research on High-Technology*  
46 *Entrepreneurs*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham UK, pp. 333-344.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51 Karner, C (2007) *Ethnicity and Everyday Life*. Oxon: Routledge.  
52  
53  
54 Kelan, E (2009) *Performing Gender at Work*. Houndmills: Palgrave-MacMillan.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Kettrey, HH and Laster WN (2014) Staking territory in the “World White Web”: An  
4 exploration of the roles of overt and color-blind racism in maintaining racial boundaries on a  
5 popular web site. *Social Currents*, 1(3): 257-274.  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 Kitching, J and Marlow, S (2013) HR practice and small firm growth: Balancing informality  
11 and Formality. In: Saridakis, G, Cooper, CL (eds) *How Can HR Drive Growth?* Edward  
12 Elgar, Cheltenham, 26-40.  
13  
14

15  
16  
17 Knight, M (2014) Race-ing, Classing and Gendering Racialized Women's Participation in  
18 Entrepreneurship. *Gender, Work and Organization*, forthcoming.  
19  
20

21  
22 Kwong, C, Thompson, P, Jones-Evans, D and Brooksbank, D (2009) Nascent entrepreneurial  
23 activity within female ethnic minority groups, *International Journal of Entrepreneurial*  
24 *Behavior & Research*, 15(3): 262 – 281.  
25  
26

27  
28  
29 LeBlanc, C (2015) Why the Rise of DIY Business Tools Is Good for Women Business  
30 Owners. *Huffington Post*. 29 Jan. [online] Available at: <[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/cat-](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/cat-leblanc/why-the-rise-of-diy-business-tools-is-good-for-women-business-owners_b_6544782.html)  
31 [leblanc/why-the-rise-of-diy-business-tools-is-good-for-women-business-](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/cat-leblanc/why-the-rise-of-diy-business-tools-is-good-for-women-business-owners_b_6544782.html)  
32 [owners\\_b\\_6544782.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/cat-leblanc/why-the-rise-of-diy-business-tools-is-good-for-women-business-owners_b_6544782.html)>  
33  
34  
35

36  
37  
38 Lien, T (2015) Why are women leaving the tech industry in droves? *LA Times*. 22 Feb.  
39 [online] Available at: <[http://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-women-tech-20150222-](http://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-women-tech-20150222-story.html#page=1)  
40 [story.html#page=1](http://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-women-tech-20150222-story.html#page=1)>  
41  
42  
43

44  
45  
46 MacNeil, N (2012) Entrepreneurship Is The New Women's Movement. *Forbes*. 8 Jun.  
47 [online] Available at: <[http://www.forbes.com/sites/work-in-](http://www.forbes.com/sites/work-in-progress/2012/06/08/entrepreneurship-is-the-new-womens-movement/)  
48 [progress/2012/06/08/](http://www.forbes.com/sites/work-in-progress/2012/06/08/entrepreneurship-is-the-new-womens-movement/)  
49 [entrepreneurship -is-the-new-womens-movement/](http://www.forbes.com/sites/work-in-progress/2012/06/08/entrepreneurship-is-the-new-womens-movement/)>  
50  
51

52  
53 Marlow, S (2002) Women and self-employment: A part of or apart from theoretical  
54 construct? *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 3(2): 83-91.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Marlow, S (2014) Exploring future research agendas in the field of gender and  
4 entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 6(2): 102-120.  
5  
6  
7  
8 Marlow, S and McAdam, M. (2015) Incubation or Induction? Gendered Identity Work in the  
9 Context of Technology Business Incubation. *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, 39 (4):  
10 719-995.  
11  
12  
13  
14 Martin, LM and Wright, LT (2005), No gender in cyberspace? Empowering entrepreneurship  
15 and innovation in female-run ICT small firms. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial*  
16 *Behaviour & Research*, 11(2): 162-178.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 Martinez Dy, A, Martin, L, Marlow, S (2014) Developing a critical realist positional  
22 approach to intersectionality. *Journal of Critical Realism*, 13(5): 447-466.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 Marwick, A (2014) Conform or fail: Social media's broken promise. *New Scientist*, 13 May p.  
28 28-29.  
29  
30  
31  
32 Mason, CM, Carter, S and Tagg, S (2011) Invisible businesses: The characteristics of home-  
33 based businesses in the United Kingdom. *Regional Studies*, 45(5): 625–639.  
34  
35  
36  
37 May, V (2015) *Pursing Intersectionality, Unsettling Dominant Imaginaries*. New York:  
38 Routledge.  
39  
40  
41 Mayer, H (2006) Economic trends and location patterns of women high-tech entrepreneurs.  
42 *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, 26(11) Article 1. [online] Available at:  
43 <http://digitalknowledge.babson.edu/fer/vol26/iss11/1>.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48 McRobbie, A (2009) *The Aftermath of Feminism: Gender, Culture and Social Change*.  
49 London: Sage.  
50  
51  
52  
53 Mole, KF, Mole, M (2010) Entrepreneurship as the Structuration of Individual and  
54 Opportunity: A Response Using a Critical Realist Perspective: Comment on Sarason, Dean  
55 and Dillard. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(2): 230–237.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Nakamura, L (2008) *Digitizing Race: Visual Cultures of the Internet*. New York: Routledge.

4  
5 Ogbor, JO (2000) Mythicizing and reification in entrepreneurial discourse: Ideology-critique  
6 of entrepreneurial studies. *Journal of Management Studies*, 37(5): 605-635.

7  
8  
9  
10 Rouse, J and Jayawarna, D (2006) The financing of disadvantaged entrepreneurs: Are  
11 enterprise programmes overcoming the finance gap? *International Journal of*  
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

*Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 12(6): 388-400.

Sassen, S (2002) Towards a sociology of information technology. *Current Sociology*, 50(3):  
365–88.

Savage, M, Devine, F, Cunningham, N, Taylor, M, Li, Y, Hjellbrekke, J, Le Roux, B,  
Friedman, S and Miles, A (2013) A new model of social class: Findings from the BBC's  
Brexit British class survey experiment. *Sociology*, 0(0): 1– 32.

Schmidt, E (2011) The Internet is the path to Britain's prosperity'. *The Daily Telegraph*. 16  
May. [online] Available at: <<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/internet/8515771/The-internet-is-the-path-to-Britains-prosperity.html>>

Schultze, U (2014) Performing Embodied Identity in Virtual Worlds. *European Journal of*  
*Information Systems*, 23: 84-95

Storey, DJ and Greene, FJ (2010) *Small business and entrepreneurship*. Harlow: Financial  
Times Prentice Hall.

Thompson Jackson, J (2009) Capitalizing on digital entrepreneurship for low-income  
residents and communities. *West Virginia Law Review*, 112: 187-198.

Tomlinson, J, Muzio, D, Sommerlad, H, Webley, L and Duff, L (2013) Structure, agency and  
career strategies of white women and black and minority ethnic individuals in the legal  
profession. *Human Relations*, 66(2): 245-269.



1  
2  
3 Van Laer, K, Janssens, M (2011) Ethnic minority professionals' experiences with subtle  
4 discrimination in the workplace. *Human Relations*, 64(9): 1203-1227.

5  
6  
7  
8 Wajcman, J (2010) Feminist theories of technology. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 34(1):  
9 143-152.

10  
11  
12 Wajcman, J (2015) *Pressed for Time: The Acceleration of Life in Digital Capitalism*. Chicago  
13 and London: University of Chicago Press.

14  
15  
16  
17 Weick, KE (2007) The generative properties of richness. *Academy of Management Journal*,  
18 50: 14–19.

19  
20  
21  
22 Williams, M (2011) Office of National Statistics Metadata, Internet Access - Households and  
23 Individuals, 2011 . Released: 31 August 2011. [online] Available at:  
24  
25  
26  
27 <[http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171778\\_227158.pdf](http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171778_227158.pdf)>

28  
29  
30  
31 Woods, T (2013) Surrogate selves: notes on anti-trafficking and anti-Blackness. *Social*  
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  
*Identities: Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture*, 19(1): 120-134.

Wu, B (2015) A moment that changed me – Gamergate. *The Guardian*. [online] Available at:  
<<http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/aug/21/gamergate-sexism-games-industry-women-trolls>>

**Table 1. Sample characteristics**

<i>Characteristics</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Age</b>		
18-30	3	11.5
31-40	10	38.5
41-50	9	34.6
51-60	4	15.4
<b>Race</b>		
White British	13	50

Black British	8	30.8
British Asian	4	15.4
Mixed-Race	1	3.8
<b>Socio-economic Class</b>		
Upper – Middle	7	26.9
Middle – Middle	10	38.5
Lower – Middle	4	15.4
Working Class – Upper	2	7.7
Working Class – Feminised	1	3.8
Working Class – Un/underemployed	1	3.8
Precariat	1	3.8
<b>Start-up Funding (£)</b>		
0-500	9	34.6
500-1K	4	15.4
1K-10K	1	3.8
10-20K	4	15.4
20-50K	5	19.2
50-100K	1	3.8
Declined to answer	2	7.7
<b>Industry Sector<sup>iii</sup></b>		
Health and Beauty	5	19.2
Fashion & Accessories	7	26.9
Digital Marketing	5	19.2
Publishing	2	7.7
Children's Products/Services	3	11.5
Other Professional Services	6	23.1
<b>Product/Service</b>		
Product Only	9	34.6
Service Only	11	42.3
Combination	6	23.1
<b>Years of Operation</b>		
0-3	14	53.9
3-5	2	7.7
5-8	6	23.1
8+	4	15.3

1  
2  
3  
4 \_\_\_\_\_  
5 <sup>i</sup> Indeed, using large data bases and weighting variables to create matched studies exploring the performance of  
6 male and female led ventures (Robb & Watson, 2012) demonstrates that women led firms perform slightly  
7 better. Thus, a range of gender related influences constrain women's entrepreneurial activity but their minority  
8 presence within the domain cannot be prescribed to any form of any ability deficit (Marlow, 2014).  
9

10  
11 <sup>ii</sup> There also exist a number of studies of female ethnic minority entrepreneurs, which, whilst providing useful  
12 data and insights, do not engage an intersectional framing (e.g. Davidson et al, 2010; Kwong et al, 2009).  
13 However, some later work (e.g. Fielden and Davidson, 2012) demonstrates a shift towards an explicitly  
14 intersectional perspective.  
15

16  
17 <sup>iii</sup> The total number of businesses in 'Industry Sector' exceeds 26 because some respondents ran multiple  
18 businesses across sectors.  
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

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




Figure 1. Data Structure  
254x190mm (96 x 96 DPI)

peer review only