ABSTRACT

Objectives: As a result of a plethora of scholarly articles by feminist scholars of entrepreneurship it is now widely accepted that the notion of entrepreneurship is ideologically skewed towards masculine ideology. Although this body of work has been quietly acknowledged it has not invoked a reply, or refutation, from male entrepreneurship scholars. Nor has it led to an increase in studies about the influence of masculinity on entrepreneurial behaviour or identity. Therefore the objective of this paper is to begin to address this by analysing an alternative social construction of entrepreneurship relating to how masculinity influences entrepreneurial identity in print. The data used is text from the thinly veiled biographical novel ‘Cityboy’ written in an aggressive and unashamedly masculine style. Whilst the focus is not upon entrepreneurs per se it is upon the male orientated entrepreneurial institution that is the ‘City’.

Approach: The methodological approach used in this paper is that of biographical analysis; supported by a supplementary analysis of similar biographies of Traders; this is triangulated by photographs downloaded from the internet. This approach allows rich data to be collected from practical sources permitting a comparative approach to be adopted. The approach has obvious limitations but is a practical method.

Results: The results from this empirical study are tentative but illustrate 1) That the socially constructed nature of the ‘City Trader’ as an entrepreneurial identity is portrayed as being a manly pursuit; and 2) How such discrimination is inherent within an institutionalised systemic behaviour in which men are encouraged to be risk-takers and players. This institutionalised ‘boyish’ behaviour is used to build up a masculine identity rooted in Thatcherite enterprise culture. Although no clear conclusion can be articulated because of the subjective nature of the interpretation, links with accepted entrepreneurship theory are drawn. It is thus an exploratory study into the pervasiveness of masculine doxa in constructing entrepreneurial identity. The study makes an incremental contribution by acknowledging the power of male dominance in shaping entrepreneurial realities albeit the conclusions are mainly drawn from one book.

Implications: This study opens up the field for further studies of skewed masculine entrepreneurial identities under the rubric of the ‘bad boy entrepreneur’.

Value: In critically discussing and acknowledging the male genderedness of entrepreneurial identity in a particular system this paper makes a contribution to our understanding of the socially constructed nature of how we tell, understand and appreciate stories which present an entrepreneurial identity. Granted the hero of the story is fictional but the overlaps with the accepted storylines of entrepreneur stories are illuminating. The paper provides another heuristic device for understanding the social construction of gendered entrepreneurial identities making it of interest to feminist scholars of entrepreneurship and to social constructionists alike.
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MASCULINITY, DOXA AND THE INSTITUTIONALISATION OF ENTREPRENEURIAL IDENTITY IN THE NOVEL CITYBOY

“Who is Cityboy? He’s every brash, bespoke-suited FT carrying idiot who has ever pushed past you in the tube. He’s the egotistical buffoon who loudly brags about how much cash he’s made on the market at otherwise pleasant dinner parties. He’s a greedy ruthless wanker whose actions are helping form this world into the shithole it’s rapidly becoming. For one period of my life it was me”.


Thus wrote the city trader, turned author Geraint Anderson writing as his alter-ego of Steve Jones alias ‘Cityboy’. This thinly veiled biography, masquerading as a best selling novel tells an alternative tale of masculinity. It is of interest to scholars of entrepreneurship because it details the social construction of a ‘bad-boy’ entrepreneurial identity in a particular entrepreneurial milieu. Nevertheless, it is an important social commentary on our times and on the theme of entrepreneurial greed. These are powerful contemporary descriptors which provide useful insights into the otherwise closed masculine institution of the City. The book has achieved ‘Cult status’ amongst upwardly mobile men but does not resonate with women. Now where have we heard that before?
The main argument of this paper presupposes certain essentialist elements regarding men/masculinity and women/femininity which although they must be treated with caution set up an ideal typification which philosophically is essentially suspect to constructionists. The manner in which the binary prescription is reproduced through social constructions must be based on such essentialisms i.e. that there is an essence of masculinity and of entrepreneurial action as conducted by all men. Frustratingly the characteristics and properties that pertain to the practice of entrepreneurship are not present in all men or women in equal measure. Are such properties even essential? Is there a true essence to entrepreneurial activity? Such deeply philosophical questions cannot be addressed in an analysis of a novel. However, because one of the fundamental principles of social constructionism is that there is no one truth there must be room in theory for different interpretations of truth such as that told by Geraint Anderson.

This paper engages with an abundant inter-disciplinary literature between gender and entrepreneurship. As a male, the author makes no apologies for the unashamedly masculine construction of the paper. The study offers a new and exciting take upon the gendered construction of multiple and hegemonic entrepreneurial identities as understood by Hearn, 1998 & Connell, 2000. It adds a different nuance to the literature and transcends the mere adding of the male voice. It amounts to a fundamental rethinking on the very nature of gender equalities (Hearn, 1998:781) in the work place where entrepreneurial identities are enacted. It also serves a dual purpose of presenting an additional study in the growing international body of sociological research into masculinity per se. This is of significance in relation to women's entrepreneurship because it does not seek to privilege feminist theory, or to advance it. Instead, it conducts an unsympathetic trawl through an admittedly sexist novel which may lead readers to the same conclusions as if they had led the feminist literature.
This study explores the critical interface between institutional theory, gender and entrepreneurship. Moreover, it is a critical study on men and on multiple masculinities (Hearn, 1998; Connell, 2000). To properly explore the contribution of masculinity to the entrepreneurial construct one must turn to the work of feminist scholars, such as Lerner (1986), Sundin (1995), Holmquist (2000), Holmquist & Lindgren (2002), and Campbell (2002) all of whom highlighted the hegemonic masculinity underpinning entrepreneurship and entrepreneur stories. For Gunnerud (1997) entrepreneurship is a male activity. Lerner (1986: 219) highlighted the male hegemony of the symbol system and Campbell (2002) refers to “Kohlberg’s and McClelland’s, healthy, achieving male”. According to Holmquist (2000) and Sundin (1995) the entrepreneur is individually recognised as a masculine super-human leader and hero, a lone, strong man who fights against conservative structures to realize his dream. This is relevant because as an institution the ideology of the City is conservative and traditionalist. Holmquist & Lindgren (2002: 7) argue that this creates the elitist notion of entrepreneurs as the chosen few, as mythic, Herculian figures. Holmquist & Lindgren (2002: 6) refer to “masculine white successful networking society” and (2002: 8) liken entrepreneurs to daring conquerors. Also, Bernard (1998: 11) refers to an alienating “machismo element” associated with masculinity and the PWE (Protestant Work Ethic). Incisively, Holmquist & Lindgren (2002: 12) discuss the notions of the single hero as being a typical masculine construction. Key themes to emerge in the novel are machismo and heroism.

The above is not a review of female entrepreneurship per se. This has been done elsewhere by Ahl (2002) and Carter, Anderson and Shaw (2003). As a result of this plethora of scholarly articles by feminist entrepreneurship scholars operating at the intersection of gender studies it is
now widely accepted that entrepreneurship is ideologically skewed towards masculine ideology. Although this body of work has been quietly acknowledged by scholars such as Ogbor (2000) with his ideology critique, it has not invoked a reply, or refutation from male entrepreneurship scholars. **The question is should it?** The purpose in writing this article is **not to challenge nor inflame inter-disciplinary gender warfare but to encourage more men and women to write about the feminine and masculine aspects of entrepreneurship so as to advance understanding around the impact of gender.** Therefore the real issue is to align the work of entrepreneurship scholars engaged in a gender perspective so that a greater appreciation of the fact that much of the work is masculine in its focus, and therefore there is a need for a body of literature which reflects the construction of views of both sexes\(^1\).

Nor **has this division** led to an apparent increase in studies about the influence of masculinity on entrepreneurial behaviour or identity. This is not unusual because in conventional sociology, Hearn (1998: 781) appreciates that scholars frequently ignore the “gendered relations” and that such theory reproduces patriarchal social relations. Therefore in this paper we address this by analysing an alternative social construction of entrepreneurship relating to how masculinity influences entrepreneurial identity in print. The paper thus seeks to invoke a “problematizing” of the silence (Hearn, 1998: 781).

To do this, this paper considers the subject of institutionalised entrepreneurial identities and in particular the socially constructed nature of the Cityboy as a genre (Stock Brokers and financial analysts). Institutions are critical influences which structure how we order our actions and environment. **Critically, gender is also a social institution (Martin, 2004), and not a separate**

---

\(^1\) The question of whether being a male researcher is essential to the production and interpretation of my research is a theme which underpins the discursive production of the paper. Perhaps I am writing as a man to men and may need to take a second step backwards.
disparate sociological phenomena. According to Martin the defining characteristic most commonly attributed to social institutions is endurance, or persistence over time. Contemporary research into institutions, and institutional theory, highlight practices, conflict, identity, power, and change (all of which feature in this paper) thus with multiple gendered issues combining within an institutional framework it is hardly surprising that detailed analysis is problematic. Thus an analysis of a novel such as this one offers a means through which the invisible dynamics and complex intersections with other institutions become more visible. Martin (1990) refers to the moral politics of organisations and institutions and appreciates that gender and sexuality play a part in shaping the morale and morality of organisations.

According to Connell (2000: 5) “masculinities are defined and sustained in institutions...” achieved through “Active Construction” and “dynamic” interplay (Connell, 2000). Hwang & Powell (2005) consider the social context of entrepreneurship and in particular how the larger social environment lends both cognitive and socio-political legitimacy to entrepreneurial activity. For them, institutions act as bridges across which values can be transferred and the professionals who operate within such institutions (such as the traders and analysts) act as institutional entrepreneurs. Readers may wonder why these occupations could be construed as being entrepreneurial and encompassed by the rubric of entrepreneurial identity. However, entrepreneurship is a deeply social phenomena and a number of scholars have sought to locate applications of it in various social settings such as Bechhofer & Elliot’s seminal study of bourgeoisie shopkeepers in Edinburgh (Bechhofer & Elliot, 1985); the study of Bourgois (2000) in relation to the entrepreneurial nature of Puerto Rican crack cocaine dealers; and Rehn & Sköld (2003) in their study of economic bragging rights amongst hip-hop artists. All these studies
locate entrepreneurial cultures in very different social settings and suggest that entrepreneurial identity may indeed be very diverse.

Studies by other scholars of the Stock broking trade suggest that there is an entrepreneurial element to Stockbroking as an activity. Examples include Barber & O’Dean (2001), Coates & Herbert (2008) and Blomberg (2009). Barber & O’Dean (2001: 261) argue that theoretical models predict that overconfident investors trade excessively and that men are more overconfident than women. Barber & O’Dean (2001) point out that several studies confirm that differences in confidence are greatest for tasks perceived to be in the masculine domain suggesting that men like the thrill of gambling because it is a risk-seeking and entertaining activity. This rather tenuous link relating to the associations between city stockbrokering and entrepreneurial activity as practiced in large scale corporate city organizations has its limitations despite additional linkages with entrepreneurship theory via risk taking and hedonistic behaviour as exemplified by men in the novel. This might be less to do with an inherent masculine entrepreneurial identity reinforced by the environment than what is 'taught' via masculine doxa and class based rhetoric and ideology. Moreover, this perception of over-confidence is perhaps related to the fact that the men can behave with more ‘bullishness’ because of their superiority of numbers and because of the masculine shaping to the milieu. This idea that it may be the relative security of their hallowed class based existence and corporate employment and security which enables them to behave as if they were carefree entrepreneurs must be considered as must the notion of a masculine safety net afforded by a privileged background serving to embolden city traders to behave with a certain arrogance and confidence. Coates & Herbert (2008) in a study of city traders found that testosterone levels in younger men could influence their risk taking propensity. Cooper, Woo, and Dunkelberg (1988) in examining overconfidence in entrepreneurs found a similar pattern making it essential
to investigate the influence of the social institution that is masculinity. Through the literary medium of the novel this study seeks to determine whether the social institution of the City can be re-read as an entrepreneurial milieu and whether the stories of the blue-blooded Stockbroking elite can be re-storied as a form of entrepreneur story.

2 – WHAT THE LITERATURE TELLS US ABOUT MASCULINITY

This review focuses upon making a connection between masculinity and entrepreneurship within the genre of entrepreneur stories because it is now widely accepted in academic circles that traditional entrepreneur stories, with their masculine bias, simply do not resonate with many women. This illustrates a schism between gender and narrative.

Masculinity

Masculinity is frustratingly defined as the trait of behaving in ways considered typical for men and is associated with the state of manhood, defined as - the trait of being manly, or having the characteristics of an adult male. Masculinity is also a cultural social construct in which it is difficult to separate the subjective actions, traits, beliefs, mores and values of the male entrepreneur from aspects of biological masculinity. According to MacKinnon (2003) the mass media do not so much "reflect" masculinity in society as "teach" it, by creating or reinforcing its images. Zoonen (1995: 327) argues that masculinity is a discourse of power and centrality, whereas femininity is one of powerlessness and marginality. Masculinity is associated with the concepts of manhood, boyishness, machismo, virility and patriarchy and as a social identity is both personal and social. It is not singular therefore one can adopt plural masculinities (Segal,

2 Hofstede (1980) defined masculinity as the extent to which dominant social values are ‘achievement’ and ‘success’ as opposed to caring for others and quality of life and this is demonstrated in the novel.
Masculinity thus has certain characteristics assigned to it by culture. As a result of primary and secondary socialisation, men come to believe that certain characteristics are definitive in determining their manliness and masculinity. This continuing social process pervades entrepreneurship and how men choose to enact it as narrative and identity.

The trait theorist, Wetherell investigated men, masculinity, and the process of becoming a man arguing that ‘masculine identity’ is actively produced by men from available social constructions (Wetherell, 1997: 301-321). By social constructions we mean social scripts that conform to expectations of how men define themselves in relation to other men. **Men and women may read and interpret the same script differently.** Gilmore (1990) stresses that masculinity is defined by achievement and manhood becomes a prize to won or wrested by struggle. This develops the argument that many aspects of behaviour associated with entrepreneurship, per se have roots in masculine behaviour. Connell (1995) stresses that masculinities are constructed through power relations, particularly hegemonic masculinity. Moreover, there is a connection between the economic organisation of society (Capitalism) and the psychology of masculinity (Tolson, 1977; Seidler, 1991). Hegemonic forms of masculinity are associated with competitiveness, aggressiveness and the non-articulation of emotion. Tolson refers to a deep structure of male identity arguing that Capitalism encourages these traits and produces distinctive habitual sets of gestures, tones of voice and personalities. For Seidler (1991) the Capitalist ethos encourages self-control, stoicism and self-discipline, but this is but one reading. Another is the hedonistic streak. It is of significance that Wetherell (1997: 327) distinguishes between working and middle class masculinities and both Seidler and Tolson argue that economic differences between classes dictate the types of masculinity available to men. Indeed masculinity and entrepreneurial ideology merge as for Seidler personality, character, and social skills become marketable commodities. Indeed, Tjeder (2002) examined the characters of self-made-men for whom striving for riches
became a mark of their masculinity. For Tjeder, their character became their capital. The very basis of masculinity and manhood centres around capitalising upon character traits.

**Manhood**

For Kindlon & Thompson (1998: 31) boys have a greater propensity towards risk taking being prone to overachieving. As they enter into manhood they become socialised in a repetitive behavioural straightjacket of masculinity = manhood = heroism = bravado. This is significant because the social institution of manhood influences heroism and by default - entrepreneurial proclivity. Manhood may appear divorced from entrepreneurial theory but given its archetypal nature it may very well be an important factor in the practice of entrepreneurship as a male dominated phenomenon. Indeed, manhood permeates the construct and its narratives.

Five important precepts central to entrepreneur stories are attributable as central precepts of manhood. These are - the notion of the self-made man; action; competitiveness; the quest for legitimacy; and hard work. Biddulph (1998: 240) stresses that the myth of the self-made man is central to manhood and that the truly self-made man exists nowhere in reality as we need other to help us. The myth is not exclusive to the entrepreneurial narrative but emanates from the wider narrative of manhood. Biddulph citing the work of Bly (1991) asserts that men are renowned for their love of “action”. Kindlon & Thompson (1999: 76) discuss the dominant model of masculinity associated with strength and stoicism whereby boys are raised to have an affinity towards heroic action figures. Biddulph (1998: 178) further suggests that male competitiveness is a destructive personality trait. Indeed, Kindlon & Thompson (1999: 114) argue that “Men’s lives

---

3 The notion of traits is central to the way the author views social constructionist theory in relation to entrepreneurship and despite acknowledging and accepting the views of Gartner and others that traits are problematic, essentialist and thus apparently anti constructionist traits are nevertheless fundamental building blocks of stories.
are filled with competition for dominance, status and power, often just for fun”. For Biddulph (1998: 178) men are “compulsively searching for approval that never comes”. Approval is central to the quest for legitimacy and is of importance to the entrepreneur. The heroic quest for legitimacy may be an artefact of masculinity not entrepreneur stories. Additionally, Kindlon & Thompson (1999: 6) stress that boys “struggle for self-respect” and may demand it – therefore the entrepreneurial quest for legitimacy may have its roots in a deeper psychological need. Biddulph (1998: 152) notes men “love to work” and can be found out of working hours in sheds, pursuing activities synonymous with work. It is perhaps no mere coincidence that these central precepts of the entrepreneurship are central precepts of manhood. Competitiveness is part and parcel of the entrepreneurial spirit and is a masculine trait. Loden (1985: 90) argues that the masculine tradition ensures that one learns to “take charge, to be visible, to strategise, and to see others as either supporters or opponents”. Walvin & Morgan (1991) suggest that there is a definite link between manliness, morality, the work ethic and social class. Bourke (1994: 44) discusses the “emphasis on working class masculinity and strength”, whilst McKibbin (1990) discusses the heroic notion of masculinity and its attachment with manual labour, and working class ideology. Conversely, Jordan et al (1992: 134) note, “women’s accounts of their employment decisions are constructed within rhetoric of obligations to family” - “fitting in”, not “making good”.

Despite the fact that the gendered nature of entrepreneurship has been highlighted at an ideological level no serious attempt has been made to explain how and why this is so? Or by which mechanisms it is promulgated at a taken for granted level. One such under researched mechanism, closely linked to ideology is that of Doxa (Catano, 2001; Sorenson, 2008).

**The role of doxa in shaping entrepreneurial behaviour and identity**
The links between doxa and entrepreneurial narrative have been charted by the seminal study of Catano (2001). Doxa’s are taken for granted “re-enactments or re-experiencing of a set of meanings already socially established” (Catano, 2001: 2). To Catano, doxa is a “quasi perfect correspondence between assumed objectives in the natural world and a subjective experience of the social and cultural”. They operate at the level of knowledge passed down by word of mouth, or by observation. Moreover, they contain naturalised and internalised knowledge related to our desires, needs, rituals and beliefs presented as self-evident givens. Another facet of doxa is that it is enacted as a performative behaviour and relates to being (for example being a man, or being an entrepreneur). As Wetherell (1997: 5-6) stresses, “To be a working class man is to live out and inhabit a very different set of practices and narratives about what it means to be a ‘real man’ compared to, say middle-class, professional or academic masculinity”. Catano (2001: 32) subtly describes doxa as being a cultural belief relating to opinion and appearance as opposed to episteme or knowledge as certainty. It comes into its own at the level of masculine self-making and is achieved via enacting doxa. Doxa thus pervades entrepreneurial narratives via pre-existing mechanisms of social maintenance, embedded and performed in pre-entrepreneurial narrative. Doxic scripts, such as those discussed above, as to what is acceptable behaviour for a man, or scripts pertaining to ethnicity remain deeply hidden. Thus when an ethnic man enacts culturally prescribed doxa, in an entrepreneurial setting the actions are imbued with doxic value. Although the doxic rhetorics of masculinity and femininity are poles apart masculine rhetoric holds sway. Catano (2001: 180) talks of the dominant rhetoric of masculine action thus the hallowed trait of entrepreneurial action may well stem from the social construction of masculinity because narratives of the self-made entrepreneur are ultimately “dramas of masculine action” (Catano, 2001: 72). For Catano, the rhetorical performance of masculinity is enacted via the myth of the self-made and the act of self-making.
Masculinity, deviancy and entrepreneurial identity

Interest in how masculinity influences entrepreneurial identity is growing (Bruni, Gherardi & Poggio, 2004). Bruni, Gherardi & Poggio (2004: 406) stress that entrepreneurial action is an archetype of social action enacted via the institutionalization of masculine values and symbols. Thus it can be read as being culturally produced and reproduced in social practices as situated practice. Thus social processes and institutions position people as ‘men’ and ‘women’ within entrepreneurial practices and as ‘entrepreneurs’ within gendered practices. The works of Bourgois (2000) and Rehn & Sköld (2003) are worthy of consideration because they touch on the subject, as do the unpublished studies of Smith (2002) and Smith & Anderson (2003). Smith (2002) examined the social construction of entrepreneurial iconology noting how it was skewed towards images of deviancy, criminality and notions of the ‘bad boy entrepreneur’. Extending this work, Smith & Anderson looked at how certain combinations of masculine clothing and artifacts rooted in working class culture were used to construct various levels of entrepreneurial identity – thus masculine sigils such as cigars, top of the range cars, tailored suits worn in conjunction with open necked shirts and accessories such as jewellery (bling) could be used to present an entrepreneurial identity. However, it was noted that such items could also be used in different combinations to construct a criminal identity. Entrepreneurial and criminal identity can become confused.

Thus to fully appreciate the significance of masculinity to entrepreneurship it is necessary to take a step backwards and consider how we (as men) tell entrepreneur stories. The pervasiveness of masculinity emerged from an immersion in the literature – a point recognised by many feminist entrepreneurial scholars. Masculine doxa shape the image of the entrepreneur as being male; a lone operator; materialistic, who has achieved success and not by inheritance. Thus the social phenomena of work, constructs how we behave and masculinity. Entrepreneurship thus reinforces masculine doxa.
Manhood, deviancy, doxa and entrepreneurial identity underpin masculinity as an institution. Collinson and Hearns (1996) in their book “Men as managers, managers as men” discuss masculinity and the undertones of virility within organizations, which is of relevance to this paper from a theoretical perspective. Indeed, Collinson & Hearns (1996) referred to the “cult of the macho manager” and in the novel Cityboy we can see that this cult prevails as a masculinity representing egotistical male entrepreneurial values (Mulholland, in Collinson & Hearns, 1996: 134). As an institutional variable, masculinity is of vital importance because even in the 21st Century, contemporary management and organizational practices still exhibit forms of behaviour, characterised as masculine (Kerfoot & Knights, 2010). Nevertheless, despite the fact that masculinities are shifting the pre-eminence of masculinity is seldom questioned (Knights & McCabe, 2001).

3 – BIOGRAPHICAL ANALYSIS AS A METHODOLOGY

This study was inspired by the narrative tradition and innovative writing of Barbara Czarniawska in relation to how the social construction of masculinity influences entrepreneurial identity in print. This paper therefore presents an illustrative, largely descriptive case in which biography must become the both the method of presentation and analysis. This brings elements of complexity and tension into play. It can be difficult to be objective when elements of a fictional story resonate with theory but one cannot be sure of the veracity of the data. This paper fits into a small but growing stream of research focusing upon the biographical analysis of entrepreneur stories including those of Morrison (2001); Kontos (2004); Jones & Conway (2004); Goss (2005); Smith (2005); Fillis (2006); Down (2006) and
Conway (2007). This is because the novel ‘Cityboy’ is but a thinly veiled biography of its narrator Geraint Anderson. As Denzin (1996: 22) has noted the dividing line between fact and fiction has become blurred. Thus one does not know if one is reading fact, fiction or faction as a half way genre. Thus any analysis of the text must be interpretive and subjective. Like Denzin (1996: 25) suggests we as readers must learn to connect and join biographically meaningful experiences to societal practices. Denzin (1996: 18-22) argued that all biographical narratives are constructed through the devices of gender, class and familial beginnings and are written with a particular audience in mind. The fact that the narrative is neither a complete fiction nor a biography may pose problems in analysing the text because biographical structuring relies on an open, interpretative process of becoming (Chamberlayne, Bornat, Wengrof, 2000). This methodology permits the employment of institutional/constructionist theory as an analytical framework to explore entrepreneurship.

The author read the novel several times for different purposes. The first reading was as a reader. As academics we often step into analysis mode and take material out of context. The second, slower reading was conducted to extrapolate data from the script. The third reading assembled the data according to the themes of masculinity and heroism. No elaborate system of coding was employed and the decision for inclusion or exclusion was made on the basis of its fit with entrepreneurship theory. Thus sections which resonated with entrepreneurship theory and those which challenged it were selected. Because it is a novel it is difficult to decide how trustworthy all the material actually is e.g. one may be dealing with fictional composites. Thus the only reliable metric is that of narrative truth and logic (Spence & Wallerstein, 1984) which dictates that a story does not always have to be

---

4 This is significant because it ties into the emerging stream of literature in relation to narrative aspects of entrepreneurship via the recent proliferation of special issues in relation to narrative.

5 The methodological base of the study is unconventional because of the essence of the narrative. It is difficult to construct a paper when methodology does not precede the study. When this occurs one must rely on writing skill and resonance.
true if it resonates with our experiences. The novel is after all a “self referential narrative” as understood by Wells (2003).

4 – READING THE NOVEL CITYBOY

The publication of the novel ‘Cityboy’ met with mixed reception from readers and critics, alike. It is either a book which you love or loath. Although it was written as a novel with the usual disclaimer “While this book is true in the sense of being an accurate depiction of a certain kind of career in the City, none of the characters or institutions portrayed are in any way based on real people or banks and any similarity is purely coincidental” it does not read like a novel, but as a biography. For this reason it belongs to the genre of autobiography. The disclaimer is merely a convenient literary device to protect against a law suit; and one which allows Anderson to create classic City types which pillory the culture of the City as a whole. In many respects Anderson has penned an imaginative reconstruction, a re-storied reality which enables outsiders to read the City as the masculine institution it is.

4.1 – Masculinity and the Cityboy persona

In the novel, Anderson presents his alter ego Steve Jones as being a ‘Cokehead’ existing in a hard drinking, drug taking masculine culture where the traders snort cocaine through rolled up twenty pound notes. The world he narrates is that of hedonistic yobbish self-indulgence. For example in setting the scene Anderson (2008:1) narrates that his “fifth glass of absinth cost his bank £1.2 million because he slept in”. Indeed, much of the focus of the unfolding story is upon bad boy behaviour. Alcohol and the act of libation features heavily in the story and we read of Jones peering at the world through bloodshot eyes (Anderson, 2008: 8). Much of the creative tension in the writing is built around a platform of profane language with words such as shit, bullshit,
dickheads, fuck, cocksucker and motherfucker peppered the pages. It serves to bring the narrative of high rolling chicanery back down to earth because it is not the hyperbolised and smooth presentation of an entrepreneurial narrative of success but the language of the pub and of private thought. As such it injects a sense of realism into the tale but brings it down to the level of the gutter. But even entrepreneurs swear and use profane language. There are two main loci for the story - the pub and the workplace.

The pub: Steve Jones received his introduction to the Cityboy culture and to degenerate hedonism over a few drinks in the pub with his work colleagues. We read of hundreds of men in smart navy blue suits, shouting and drinking champagne in a fog of cigarette smoke. Nearly all were white and under forty. The pub is a very important institution in their lives because it is where they play and let their hair down. It is clearly a hunting ground and a place where they can exercise their bragging rights. In City pubs we hear that “Essex Girls” and “Gold Digging” secretaries are on the prowl for wealthy City gents. It was in the pub that Jones was initiated into the masculine culture of boozing and blagging, of panache and presentation, and to the world of chancers and charmers (2008:109).

The workplace: We read of Jones operating in a climate of pressure on the trading floor which results in “toxin fuelled sweat” making his shirt drip. Anderson describes a hierarchy on the trading floor where one begins as an analyst and works one's way up to be a salesman and then a trader before becoming a manager. Anderson (2008:128) talks of learning “old style brokering tactics”. Success in brokering is built upon a bedrock of long hours and hard work and Anderson (2008: 160) argues that rich Cityboys are basically an unhappy lot because they suffer from status anxiety and debilitating competitiveness in that the long hard hours they put in leads to an imbalance and to spoiled family life which drives many to a destructive hedonistic lifestyle of sex, drugs and alcohol to compensate. Anderson mentions the study of Cass, Shaw & LeBlanc
(2008) which found that US stockbrokers are more likely to suffer from clinical depression than the average male. Indeed, Anderson delves quite deeply into this theme parodying Steven Covey’s work (Covey, 2004) which he re labels as the “7 habits of highly defective people”:-

- Insecurity: The need for approval and a propensity to be prone to imagined slights;
- Competitiveness: The need to beat others and be acknowledged (possibly linked to sex drive);
- Upbringing: Living under the thrall of parental pressure to succeed and in particular the influence of Weberian Protestant Work Ethic which is alive and well in the Square Mile. Anderson paraphrasing Freud quips “The best thing a father can do is die when his son is in his teens”;
- Denying life: By being obsessive and becoming a workaholic;
- Fear: a self induced fear of losing ones wife, ones job and income;
- Greed: And the lust for more money driven by stories of the salaries of others in the City;
- Family: The need to spend time away from the family because of dreadful wives and irritating children.

4.2 – Doxa and the Cityboy persona

The subject of whispered, conspiratorial masculine doxa is implicit within the script. For example, Anderson (2008:8) talks of an unspoken code of silence and greed amongst traders. Much of this necessary doxa is imparted in stories and vignettes in the pub through the mechanism of mentoring. Indeed, Steve Jones first mentor David Flynn appears to have played a significant part in his business education and the honing of his survival skills. One of his first exposures to the power of doxa and the masculine persona of the Cityboy was the insight of Flynn that “You don’t fuck with the traders”. Jones has to learn to - publish [analysts reports] or perish; press the flesh with clients; treat them to meals; learn the core skills of cheating and
stealing legally; all whilst watching his back. Simultaneously, he must learn the dark skills of self-aggrandisement. In the ensuing years Jones learned various tricks of the trade that traders use to survive a self destructive hedonistic streak - such as the breakdown ruse; playing the Alcoholics Anonymous card; playing the race or sexist card; inducing sympathy through false bereavement stories; whistle blowing and admitting to a being a closet gambler (2008: 54/55).

More importantly, the quick learning Jones picked up the lingo of trading and how to talk consultantese, how to brag, how to bullshit and how to come across as opinionated and egotistic – all very necessary skills of deception and survival. In the words of Anderson (2008: 60) he became a “braying Cityboy and loveable rogue”. In various parts of the nolesque biography, Anderson discusses the skills required of a truly successful City trader making reference to

- the necessity of mastering Sun-Tzu’s “Art of War”;
- developing a personality of psychopathic selfishness we have come to associate with the fictional serial killer Hannibal Lector; and
- displaying inconsideration and ruthlessness on the scale of Genghis Khan.

These are stunning insights into masculine competitiveness and Anderson goes on to describe a battery of communicational techniques used by Alpha male Cityboy types to deceive and to win at all cost including using gamesmanship; telling apocryphal stories which cast one in a good light; developing false friendliness; spreading lies and rumours; and bullying others. The ambitious Cityboys must develop an insatiable appetite for greed and an aura of cultivated arrogance. Moreover, Anderson (2008:186) highlights the need to develop a “show mans” personality. These are important doxic masculine scripts which are not generally written down but are passed on from person to person by stories and by example.

4.3 – Appreciating the semiotic aspects of the Cityboy phenomenon
There is also a semiotic aspect to the Cityboy culture. Through the use of descriptive language, Anderson builds up a classic storyline of how Jones metamorphosed from a ponytailed [hippy] youth with a goatee beard and piercings into an archetypal Cityboy, replete with a £6 suit he bought in a charity shop. We read that he emerged as a young, lean stockbroker. Indeed, Anderson makes much of the £6 suit in the story because it cloaks his alter ego with the mantle of humble beginnings. In describing this £6 suit Anderson was no doubt seeking to set his alter ego apart from the crowd, but we do not hear anything about its colour, or cut, or whether it was in any way different. This is doubtful because it is necessary for acolytes to fit into the background and scenery. Dressing up is an integral part of entrepreneurial identity when one is chasing the big city dream as appreciated by Simon Down (Down, 2006: 1) who talks of his time as an entrepreneur thus “…we would dress up in dark business suits, ties and sheepskin overcoats. Cheap and flashy cigars would be smoked…”. Thus it is part of entrepreneurship and masculinity.

Sharp clothes and artifacts are very much part of creating a Cityboy persona. Blue pinstripe suits are obviously de rigueur as are gaudy ties with Windsor knots. The more rakish amongst them even dare to remove their ties. Being seen to be risqué is also part of the package thus Cityboys in bespoke suits are expected to be seen out and about with mistresses. He is expected to have a “wedge” and to “flash the cash” and behave with delusions of grandeur. It is part of the expected performance. As a genre, the Cityboy must learn to be roguish and behave badly out of work. This picture of laddish non-conformity is continued in the following passage (2008: 41-47) in which Anderson describes booze soaked traders with “stereotypical beer bellies and working class banter”. He describes them as being “sexist” and “chauvinistic”, wearing Armani suits and drinking Bollinger Champagne. He describes one in particular Tony with his “Saville Row Suits, £3,000 Rolex and £250 Oxford Brogues”. This Cityboy imagery is build upon a platform of conspicuous and visible consumption in that having the wherewithal to order and pay for expensive champagne is a sign of having superior power and status. What is significant is that the
semiotic imagery of the Cityboy is built around a tension between blokish entrepreneurial culture and class based traditions of the pinstriped and bowler hated City Gent. This mismatch is palpable when Anderson (2008: 4) describes a scene where “Wideboy City traders” discuss deals in “slimy cultured tones”. Eriksson-Zetterquist (2008) refers to a conscious process of enacted “gendered role modelling” and this is what the semiotics of Cityboy identity is all about. It is about being seen to conform and to belong to a masculine elite but to do so with panache and with individuality. Visually the image depicts a classic example of Smith & Anderson’s (2003) paradox of conforming-non-conformity. For a representation of this contrived masculine imagery see the picture box at the beginning of the paper.

The importance of semiotics, come into play when Anderson describes Jones’s nemesis the inimitable Hugo Bentley. Bentley is the proverbial Corporate Warrior – loud, self obsessed, an arrogant prick, egotistical, an arsehole, a smug prick, smarmy, a schmoozer who lives on planet wealth, drives flash cars, wears bespoke suits, a Rolex watch and is a master of aggressive one-upmanship, hostile putdowns and catty comments. Thus in a short space in the medium of the novel Anderson has covered a plethora of negative descriptors associated with an entrepreneurial persona. These subjects are difficult to research but are rarely acknowledged facets of entrepreneurial character which are deserving of further research. However, the real importance of the vile Bentley was to act as a spur for Jones. Hatred drove him on to succeed. Bentley always won the best trader award and it was Jones’s ambition to beat him. This introduces the angle of male competiveness, but perhaps a contrived one nevertheless.

4.4 – Linking ‘Cityboy’ personas to entrepreneurship per se

The subject of entrepreneurship is even more silent in the script than the subject of doxa. So much so that it would be possible to blink and miss it. It is discernable to those able to read it out of the text. It exists primarily at a narrative level and begins with the disingenuous mechanism of
positioning the fictional Jones as a poor-boy-made-good. Thus the narrative of Jones metamorphosing from a middle class background is designed to invoke sympathy in readers who revere the ideology and storylines of the heroic entrepreneur rising from nowhere. But it is a clever ruse. He may have been a pot smoking graduate but one from Cambridge so the links to entrepreneurial mythology are tenuous. This is important because being an ‘alumni’ of Cambridge places him in a higher social strata possibly upper middle class and by virtue of this part of the establishment. But the flirtation with entrepreneurial mythology does not end there because we read of Jones dreaming of an entrepreneurial career path selling trinkets on a beach in Goa until his brother got him an introduction to the City. Introductions to the City are very much a middle class invitation to join an occupational fraternity. Thus Jones is not some working class kid from the schemes but a well educated member of the establishment. What is important about this particular passage is that it demonstrates how much entrepreneurial ideology, culture and mythology has pervaded the very social fabric of the British psyche.

The connection to entrepreneurial ideology does not end there because we hear that many of journeymen traders are “Essex Boys” who lack a university education but possess a sharpness of thought inherited from their market trader, ‘Barrow boy’ fathers. This passing reference is significant because the Essex boy culture is an entrepreneurial one being both a work ethic and an entrepreneurial dream. The ethos of the Essex boy is to work hard, take risks and make money, but there is also a darker, ‘gangstery’ side where one plays hard. The reference to barrow boys is directly related to enterprise culture because in Britain the entrepreneur is regarded as “a posh barrow boy” (Drakopoulou Dodd, 2007). Semiotically, it feeds into the literature of the Spiv and is of note because as Burns (2001) famously wrote “scratch an entrepreneur and you will find a Spiv”. The “Essex Girl” phenomenon is also part of an entrepreneurial culture in that the proverbial poor-girl is expected to make the most of their social capital and attract the moneyed to
them. Skeggs (2005) in examining how white working-class women are portrayed in proximity to national public morality discussed the tough Essex Girl culture and how they generate value by investing in their self and appearance to generate exchange-value via affects and display. Skeggs argues that in public many white working-class women are forced to display their ‘lack’ of moral value according to the symbolic values generated by social forces. Davies (2009) discusses the category of blonde and Essex-girl jokes and positions such jokes as being funny because the subjects are canny, clever, crafty and calculating and achieve their rise in social status via legitimate competition. Yurchak (2003) in the context of the Russian new capitalist classes narrates a similar process whereby women smitten by the entrepreneurial ethic set out to trap wealthy entrepreneurs as husbands.

The importance of entrepreneurship per se takes a turn in the book when Jones becomes a “Cityboy entrepreneur” by dint of hard work after climbing the management ladder. Jones appreciates that he is not the brightest broker but that he has a talent for cultivating clients by socialising and imbibing with them. His rise up the managerial chain is helped when he encounters and develops a partnership with a colleague Michael, a great City analyst who having Aspergers syndrome lives in an autistic emotionless bubble and operates ruthlessly and clinically. In terms of both research into entrepreneurship and masculinity this is important because the incidence of such disorders are higher in males and appear to play a part in the cognitive thought process driving men to take greater risks (Smith, 2008). Together they form a winning partnership and closed many deals together. When Jones was headhunted by another company as a fund manager he took Michael with him. The partnership blossomed after a serendipitous meeting with Richard Montague, a Hedge Fund Manager.
The introduction propelled Jones into a new financial league, a world inhabited by the sons and daughters of the rich and the business jet set. These clients referred to collectively as the “minted” had serious money to invest or play with. Jones entered the murky world of the rogue trader where he had a new set of doxa in relation to nefarious business to learn – insider trading; spreading false rumours; the black art of trash and cash; spinning; and pumping and dumping all of which are techniques designed to inflate the amount of money one can extract from a deal to the detriment of the client. Being associated with such business high rollers was good for business and his social life. On one particular three day bender in Spain Jones was introduced to a hedonistic world dominated by the three C’s – Champagne, cocaine and cards. His companions were described as “being born into outrageously rich families” (2008: 165). Slowly Jones developed a serious reputation as a player. In entering this world of semi-autonomy, Jones was recast in the role of an entrepreneur on the verge of owning his own brokerage company.

In the masculine playscape that is the City, women do not feature much in Anderson’s nightmarish fairytale of masculine success except as floozies and playthings. That is until he meets his match in an avaricious female trader Jane Carter whom he falls for. She becomes his mistress but being ambitious has a strategy of conducting strategic office affairs. In all it is quite a depressing trawl through the mire of the institution that is the City. In the end Jones tires of it all principally on the grounds of morality and retires to become a beach bum in Goa while he reflects upon his future. In reality Geraint Anderson left to become a highly paid journalist writing under the pseudonym of Cityboy thus making use of his social capital at a time (pre recession) when a paying readership was mildly amused by the outrageous antics of City trader types.
5 – REVISITING THE STORY FROM A GENDER PERSPECTIVE

In terms of what the novel tells us about the role of gender in shaping institutions such as the City the powerful story is obviously a one sided affair. To make sense of it we analyse the story through the works of the influential feminist scholar Barbara Czarniawska [Czarniawska, (2004/3); Gustavsson & Czarniawska (2004); Czarniawska & Rhodes (2004); Czarniawska, Mörck, Tullberg, Nordberg, (2005); Czarniawska (2006/9); Czarniawska (2006); and Czarniawska (2008)]. Indeed, Czarniawska, (2006/9) suggests that gender production in the workplace is framed by a process of negotiation. This occurs through a mixture of – Positioning; Doing gender (gender as an accomplishment, an achieved property of situated conduct); Negotiation of identities” (which take place when positioning is contested); and Coercive gendering (ascribing gender to people through discriminatory action (Czarniawska, 2006). This permits us to distinguish a self-positioning from an attributive positioning. In writing the novel Anderson positioned his alter ego in relation to the City as an institution and engaged in a discursive production of an imagined self – a fictional character which enabled him to explore some negative aspects of the production of self. Much of the antics described by Anderson can be attributed to “doing gender” in that it occurs in a situated context. We see evidence of contested identities in the epic battle of wills between Jones and Bentley. The coercive gendering aspect becomes evident through the treatment of women as playthings in the pub and in the workplace. It is also significant that much of the gendering activity took place outside of work in the pub.

Czarniawska & Rhodes (2004) consider the relationship between popular culture and management practice suggesting that much popular culture is based on established and repeated patterns of emplotment which teach practices and provide models for how practice is understood. This is a very similar process to doxa. Czarniawska & Rhodes suggest that such strong plots provide possible blueprints for the management of meaning in organizations and thus institutions.
To prove their point they examined two popular novels about the financial services industry which perpetuate particular strong plots in relation to gendered practices in financial services finding that these were predominantly masculine. To back this up they also examined parodies of working life in comic strips and animated cartoons which demonstrate that popular culture can also be a site for the critique of, and resistance to, strong plots. Anderson seeks, rather unconvincingly through emplotment to weave the rhetoric of entrepreneurship into his narrative. In stories of rogue trading (Leeson, 1997) this is not uncommon as the deviant hero plays up the status of lowly beginnings.

A similar pattern emerges in respect of the semiotic aspects of identity. In relation to the semiotics of Cityboy identity, Czarniawska et al (2005) highlight the importance of men’s fashion and bodily aesthetics in the construction of gender from the perspective of being a transnational cultural process. By analysing masculine iconography in the visual medias they established that masculinity is variable and prone to change and can be conceptualised in terms of power and social class differences in relation to a global economic order. They highlight the work of Robert Connell (Connell, 2000) who proposed that men and women uncritically adopt and relate to a dominant white middleclass ideal? This is significant because visually Cityboy (and entrepreneurial) identity is constructed from the basis of the traditional City Gent with blue pinstripe suit and bowler hat. To update the image to the present day and take cognisance of enterprise culture when Anderson posses for his Cityboy persona he adds the masculine sigils of the Cuban Cigar and the now ubiquitous red braces made famous by the movie Wall Street. These are synonymous with entrepreneurial identity. But the gendered entrepreneurial identities constructed run deeper than mere clothing because the Cityboy persona encompasses the melded multiple masculinities of the aggressive male with the more cultured and middle class dominant rhetorics of masculine leadership (Connell, 2000). The Cityboy thus spans twin hierarchies and hegemonies through the honoured statuses of leader and
entrepreneur (Connell, 2000). This is of immense importance because if the entrepreneur is an
honoured masculine identity (in line with the concept posited by Connell, 2000) then it is obviously
deply problematic for women to make the concept their own. This position becomes clearer when
one reads the text of Ahl (2004) in relation to the gendered nature of the heroic Schumpeterian
entrepreneur whose world is constructed and written with entrepreneurship being a function of men.
Leaving aside the insidiousness of political correctness one wonders if much has really changed. The
world inhabited by Jones does not appear to have changed because in public and in private
institutions men will be men.

Although a reading of the novel Cityboy may be depressing for women and enlightened men it
should be considered in the context of the work of Czarniawska (2004/3) who reported on interest
in Swedish newspapers that women were entering the financial services not just as bank clerks,
but as avant-garde, traders and analysts. To make her point Czarniawska analysed a Swedish
detective story "Star Crash", whose theme is a crash of the stock exchange and its impact on
Stockholm world of finances. The main character is a young woman analyst. Czarniawska found
that as a genre, detective stories have rules that dramatise events and lead to a demonization of
prominent characters. Novels are an ideal way to explore the socially constructed nature of
gender in the workplace because the constructionism inherent in writing novels make accessible
cultural constructs to the readers via the construction of the character. This is an aspect of identity
construction which cannot be presented in an academic format. The fictionalisation process
brings forth cultural stereotypes which although fictitious and perhaps subliminal, articulate that
the world of finance is no place for women. Consequentially those who made it were considered
"unnatural" – twice everything else the men are, especially the vice. Women can only be the
victims – and the perpetrators – in it. This is further confirmed by ethnographic studies of women
in finances and mass media reporting. What is significant is that the fictional Jones is very much
operating in a naturalised environment. It is also significant that the tragic figure of Jane Carter is
positioned as a “Femme Fatale”, a type identified by Czarniawska (2004). The above analysis is in keeping with the work of Blomberg (2009) into the gendered nature of masculine hierarchies in the Stockholm Stock Exchange which found that men are valued higher than women in the world of finance and that this gender specific regime is produced by situated face-to-face encounters between foremost male analysts and male brokers which manifest themselves as a rather sexist and female-discriminating discourse. The positions of the men and women in Anderson’s tale are undoubtedly different but they do not occur in separate spheres of activity but are shaped and influenced by the institutions of masculinity and the City. It is in the City that these differences are reproduced and articulated through gendered characterization and hierarchies.

The themes of “process of negotiation”, positioning, doing gender, negotiation of identities, and coercive gendering suggested by Czarniawska and colleagues act as a heuristic device to help us organise and re-read the material presented in the novel and categorise it for deeper analysis from which conclusions can be drawn.

6. SOME TENTATIVE CONCLUSIONS

The rationale for presenting the material contained in this paper highlights 1) that hegemonic masculinity pervades the practice of entrepreneurship in institutions as well as the theory; and 2) that it is an important facet which requires further detailed analysis. As a novel, ‘Cityboy’ works because it tackles the issues of masculinity (and gender discrimination) as a social institution and the City as a social institution. It reveals a social milieu where hedonism meets ambition and greed where a masculine enterprise credo holds sway. There is an obvious hierarchy of masculine success where superior social class and middle and upper class connections count. To be connected to the correct families and pedigrees matters because the

---

6 Nevertheless, we are not concerned with narrative genre per se or how the novel works, or does not work.
fictional Jones, like his creator may dally with entrepreneurial mythology and identity but it is ultimately the institutions of gender, class and family beginnings which matter (albeit these are also narrative devices). Jones (aka Anderson) has the correct middle class sensibilities and familial connections – Cambridge educated and with family in the City. This highlights that whilst traditional entrepreneurs stories may highlight being alone and rising from humble beginnings the narratives of the blue-blooded do not – they emphasis familial solidarity and no matter how much society may flirt with entrepreneurial identity it is but a passing flight of fancy. The attempt at re-storying it as an entrepreneurial narrative does not have the necessary authenticity about it. Because Jones (aka Anderson) does not belong to the entrepreneurial classes he feels uncomfortable with his settings and with the twin institutions of deviant masculinity and the City. Anderson never relinquishes ownership of his voyeuristic tale completely to Jones and as such one senses a moralistic distancing from the debauchery and hedonism hinted at. As a result neither Anderson nor Jones, take ownership of the story resulting in moral disapproval7.

The hedonism and harsh form of masculinity portrayed may be a particularly class based doxic script associated with the working class trading mentality which infuses the City. The key points to take away are that the socially constructed nature of Cityboy identity corresponds to the ‘bad boy’ entrepreneurial identity highlighted by Smith (2002) and Smith & Anderson (2003). Moreover, it is a discourse of power as understood by Zoonen (1995). Trading, irrespective of

7 As a story it somehow does not ring true and from an autobiographical perspective does not possess veracity despite possessing authenticity. The story lacks the sustained characterization of the well written biography or novel and thus lacks a sense of purpose. This failure in storytelling terms should not detract from the power of the book in uncovering the full extent of the masculine doxa which pervades the players as they enact their masculine identities and like Anderson and Jones hide behind the social institution of masculinity and the City. Stories of blue blooded entrepreneurship rarely surface and Anderson is to be applauded for documenting the Machiavellian antics of the City establishment set.
setting is portrayed as being a manly pursuit and provides legitimation in terms of achievement and success as articulated by Hofsted (1980). Despite the embedded social discrimination inherent within the institution of the City, institutionalised systemic behaviour in which men are encouraged to be risk-takers and players is endemic. This institutionalised ‘laddish’ behaviour is used to build up a masculine identity which has its roots in Thatcherite enterprise culture. The boyish bad behaviour is reminiscent of the narratives of masculinity scholars such as Bly, Biddulph and Kindlon & Thompson. The hedonism and deviancy practiced by the players in the entrepreneurial eco-system is presented as masculine antics which resonate with Catano’s dramas of masculine action.

The paper illustrates ways in which the form of enterprise exacerbates hegemonic masculinity. In terms of academic research it helps to bolster study of masculinity in a loosely entrepreneurship-focused context and so restore a degree of balance with plethora of research exploring femininity, identity and entrepreneurialism. So what are the consequences for real life men and women entrepreneurs as a result of engaging in masculinized entrepreneurial rhetoric? Will they view entrepreneurship as being an interesting career choice or as a viable way of making a living? To some, such novels may act as a suppressing mechanism, whilst for others it will act as an inspirational challenge. Clearly there are lessons to be learned from developing Connell’s four versions of masculinity in terms of impact on entrepreneurial development for both men and women. Even Connell appreciates that “hegemonic” masculinity is actually encompassed by very few men in reality. Nevertheless, it continues to thrive because of “complicit” masculinity which is supported by men because it privileges them in relation to women. The major question for future research must be “how does one re-script hegemonic masculinities?” Another important question to emerge is that how does the particular version of masculinity as
portrayed in the novel co-create stereotypical images of femininity such as Madonna / wife, whore, and witch? Do such novels really perpetuate such socially divisive stereotypes, or do we as experienced readers recognize that we are only being spun a story? As an author and entrepreneurship scholar how much license within the discipline do we have to explore, opine and muse even within the relaxed rules of a special edition such as this!

Although no clear conclusion can be articulated because of the subjective nature of the interpretation links with accepted entrepreneurship theory have been tentatively drawn out which make the paper of interest as an exploratory study into the pervasiveness of masculine doxa in constructing entrepreneurial identity. In the process, the study has made an incremental contribution by acknowledging the power of male dominance in shaping entrepreneurial realities. There are obvious limitations in that the conclusions are drawn from one book and supporting material. Nevertheless, the use of entrepreneurial story telling as the dominant methodological approach for this paper is unorthodox. It may be necessary to take a step backwards and remind oneself that because the chosen story is a novel and essentially fictional (although semi-autobiographical) the issue of exaggeration must be considered. It is intended to thrill and entertain, and therefore for this reason it is difficult to analyse in objective gendered ways. Nevertheless, the main implication is that it opens up the field for further studies of skewed masculine entrepreneurial identities under the rubric of the ‘bad boy entrepreneur’. In critically discussing and acknowledging the male genderedness of entrepreneurial identity in a particular system this paper makes a contribution to our understanding of the socially constructed nature of how we tell, understand and appreciate stories which present an entrepreneurial identity. Granted the hero of the story is fictional but the overlaps with the accepted storylines of entrepreneur stories are illuminating. The paper provides another heuristic device for understanding the social construction of gendered entrepreneurial identities making it of interest to feminist scholars of entrepreneurship and to social constructionists alike. This paper
has the potential to challenge normative assumptions in terms of the perpetual policy quest of making women more like men which presents a less than attractive picture on the evidence of this narrative analysis. In the final analysis, Cityboy stories can be accommodated under the rubric of entrepreneur stories and the social institution of the City can be re-read as an entrepreneurial milieu. This paper has analysed masculinity and femininity as normative frames which impact women, men, business and society via the construction and enactment of gendered entrepreneurial identities. Although this study has demonstrated a fascinating insight into the testosterone fuelled financial world of the City the author stops short of suggesting that such class and status biased behaviours might just equally be evident in female traders in an institution where class overrides gender because in the novel there is just not the evidence for it. However, for a feminine perspective on the city as an institution one must read the novel ‘Confessions of a City Girl’ (Anonymous, 2009). Therein lies another story!
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