



UWS Academic Portal

Beyond the dolls house? Barbie entrepreneur dolls and the commodification, fetishisation and consumption of idealised, gendered entrepreneurial identity

Smith, Robert; Nadin, Sara; Jones, Sally

Published in:
Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal

DOI:
[10.1108/QMR-01-2017-0035](https://doi.org/10.1108/QMR-01-2017-0035)

Published: 11/11/2019

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication on the UWS Academic Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Smith, R., Nadin, S., & Jones, S. (2019). Beyond the dolls house? Barbie entrepreneur dolls and the commodification, fetishisation and consumption of idealised, gendered entrepreneurial identity. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 22(5), 745-765. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QMR-01-2017-0035>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the UWS Academic Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact pure@uws.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Emerald Open Access Policy: "As soon as we've published an article, the version of the article that has been accepted for publication, the Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) can be used for a variety of non-commercial scholarly purposes, subject to full attribution."

http://www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/openaccess/oa_policies.htm



Beyond the Dolls House? Barbie entrepreneur dolls and the commodification, fetishisation and consumption of idealized, gendered entrepreneurial identity

Journal:	<i>Qualitative Market Research</i>
Manuscript ID	QMR-01-2017-0035.R3
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Gendered entrepreneurial Identity, Fetishism, Sexism, Barbie entrepreneur dolls

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Qualitative Market Research

Beyond the Dolls House? Barbie entrepreneur dolls and the commodification, fetishisation and consumption of idealised, gendered entrepreneurial identity

Abstract

Purpose: This article examines the concepts of gendered, entrepreneurial identity and fetishism through an analysis of images of Barbie entrepreneur. It draws on the literatures of entrepreneurial identity and fetishism to examine how such identity is socially constructed from childhood and how exposure to such dolls can shape and influence perceptions of entrepreneurial identity.

Design/Methodology/Approach: Using semiotic analysis we conduct a visual analysis of the Barbie to make observations and inferences on gendered entrepreneurial identity and fetishism from the dolls and artefacts.

Findings: The gendered images of Barbie dolls were influenced by societal perceptions of what an entrepreneur should look like, reflecting the fetishisation of entrepreneurship, especially for women. Mirroring and exaggerating gendered perceptions, the dolls express hyper-femininity reflected in both the physical embodiment of the doll as well as their adornments / accessories. This includes handbags, high-heeled shoes, short skirts, haute-couture and designer clothes. Such items and the dolls themselves become fetishised objects, making context and culture of vital importance.

Research Implications/Limitations: There are positive and negative implications in relation to how we might, as a society, present unrealistic gendered images and role models of entrepreneurship to children. The obvious limitation is that the methodology limits what can be said or understood, albeit the imagery mirrors socially constructed reality for the context examined.

Originality/Value: This is original research in that no previous published studies have tackled gendered entrepreneurial identity in relation to fetishism. The value of the work lies in discussing the concepts and embeds them in the expanding conversation surrounding gendered entrepreneurial identities.

Introduction

In her seminal book, Angela Holdsworth (1998) made a call for women to come '*out of the doll's house*'. We read this as a call for women to escape from the trappings of patriarchal domestication and sexism. We consider that Holdsworth's call is still

1
2
3 significant, because despite the passing of time it could be argued that little has changed
4 since then in relation to how women, and particularly women entrepreneurs, are depicted
5 in the media. In this provocative article, using Barbie as a visual metaphor (Koller, 2004)
6 for gendered feminine entrepreneurial identity, we consider how the iconic 'Barbie' Doll
7 has moved beyond the Doll's House as a commodified, but arguably fetishised and
8 consumed gendered, entrepreneurial identity to become a creditable role model for young
9 girls aspiring to entrepreneurial careers. Koller (2004) highlighted the abundance of
10 masculinised metaphor which skew the business media discourse. Although, Barbie is
11 seemingly 'just' a toy, there is potential to influence, and thus shape, societal perceptions
12 of such identities and perpetuate potentially damaging stereotypical representations. To
13 illustrate this, we examine (through a scholarly gaze) the contentious ideological and
14 philosophical relationships between 'Barbie' as a plasticised example of feminism, and
15 fetishism through the rubric of a consumed entrepreneurial identity, as marketed by
16 Mattel. We explore the concept of 'emphasised femininity' (Connell, 2005) as a foil for
17 the concept of 'hegemonic masculinity' (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005) which shapes
18 masculine notions and pervades entrepreneurial identity.¹ In an anthropological sense, the
19 dolls visually represent ideal typical, secular reified formulaic images of revered
20 entrepreneurial identities arguably imbued with mystical qualities (as man-made objects
21 with power over others). In this article we apply the theory and literature of fetishism
22 sparingly, because the article is not so much about fetishism per se, but about how
23 entrepreneurial identity can be fetishised and consumed.

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 We also build on the broader utilisation of visual research in gender studies and on
52 Barbie as a representation of complex female entrepreneurial identity (Pritchard et al,
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2016) expressive of “*excessive entrepreneurial femininity*” (Lewis, 2014:1858). In the
4
5 process, we examine fetishism, and sexual objectification (Saguy et al. 2010) facilitated
6
7 via social constructionism and its links to gendered consumer stereotyping (Campenni,
8
9 1999). We adopt a gendered lens (Bem, 1993), focusing attention on gender differences
10
11 and identity aspects by applying concepts from feminist studies and female
12
13 entrepreneurship (Rouse *et al*, 2013) to study the social construction of fetishism
14
15 associated with Barbie (Bignell, 1999) and the gendered consumer stereotyping this
16
17 reflects and perpetuates. We also address issues of ‘realness’ (Holter, 2003) associated
18
19 with hegemonic concepts, which draw their power from the direct experience of women
20
21 rather than from the structural basis of their subordination. In the process, we make a
22
23 clear contribution by synthesising the relevant literatures of gendered entrepreneurial
24
25 identity, feminism and fetishism to build on the salient ideological arguments of both.
26
27 Prior to this paper we are not aware of any other(s) which combine arguments from the
28
29 fields of entrepreneurship, marketing and fetishism. In the separate literatures the
30
31 arguments remain unconnected. We join theories concepts and arguments across the
32
33 disparate literatures and conduct an analysis of images associated with Barbie
34
35 entrepreneur dolls to provide empirical evidence.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 The ontogenesis of this work began during a conference presentation in 2012, when
44
45 the lead author was presenting a paper on female entrepreneurial identity (See Smith,
46
47 2012/2014), including slides of Barbie entrepreneur dolls and a fetishised image of a pair
48
49 of red high-heeled shoes, from the cover of a textbook on women in business. Both
50
51 images caused controversy and patently split the mainly female audience in terms of their
52
53 reaction. Half of the female attendees approved but others disapproved volubly, and it
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 was apparent that this presentation had struck a nerve. This engendered debate on aspects
4 of the fetishism of female entrepreneurial identity and ‘emphasised femininity’ (Connell,
5 2005), which was duly tweeted. After the lecture the lead author was approached by two
6 female scholars who had not been at the presentation but were nevertheless disparaging
7 in their comments. One remarked “*Did you really present an image of Barbie?*”, before
8 both shook their heads and walked away. It was immediately apparent that the topic was
9 worthy of further research. Authors two and three were in the audience and this
10 continuing conversation grew from there.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 The research problematics relate to how female entrepreneurial identities are
24 influenced by socially constructed and arguably fetishised images and artefacts of
25 identity in the workplace; and how these images and artefacts are represented in the form
26 of Barbie dolls. These are important and related social themes worthy of study because of
27 contemporary arguments and debates over 1) the right of women to wear non-sexualised
28 (sexist) clothing in the workplace (see Donaghue, 2017); and 2) societal debates around
29 the social construction of female work place identities and mediated images thereof (see
30 Gill et al, 2017). Indeed, Hanke (1992) has argued that hegemonic masculinity has been
31 employed in studying media representations primarily because the concept helps us make
32 sense of both the diversity and the selectiveness of images in mass media. Workplaces
33 constitute an interesting site where individuals ‘do gender’, whilst constructing their
34 professional identities, and where the concept of ‘femininity’ typically has negative
35 connotations (Holmes & Schnurr, 2006).
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 Having set the scene, we move on to discuss the theoretical underpinning of the
4 article synthesising relevant entrepreneurship literature with that of fetishism. We begin
5 with a discussion on the socially constructed nature of a particular gendered female
6 entrepreneurial identity before considering fetishism and commodification in relation to
7 the creation of the entrepreneurial identity. We then consider the academic literature on
8 Barbie dolls and how this relates to the commodification of the particular entrepreneurial
9 identity. Following this, we articulate the research methodology of visual semiotics and
10 semiotic analysis before presenting and analysing the research empirically. We then
11 discuss the importance of this research, before ending with some important conclusions.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 We appreciate that the results obtained are somewhat descriptive until one casts a
26 critical eye over them and understands the relevant ties of the differing Barbie images to
27 a wider socio-economic critique of women and business women over these differing time
28 periods. When Barbie was introduced in the 1950s and 1960s there was little conception,
29 from the makers Mattel, that Barbie was or could be an entrepreneur. She was primarily a
30 role model and vehicle for showcasing different occupations and therefore by extension
31 upwardly mobile neo-liberal identities (Walkerdine, 2003; Donaghue, 2017). Presumably,
32 it was the societal preoccupation with the ideology of entrepreneurism from the 1980s
33 that awoke the toymaker to the potential for income generation by marketing a Business
34 Woman Barbie. At this stage the metamorphosis was achieved by virtue of clothing and
35 artefacts associated with business alone. It was not until circa 2013 that the Barbie
36 Entrepreneur doll concept came of age, with multiple ethnicities represented and a more
37 nuanced range of artefacts. Despite these facts, the product is still primarily focused on
38 the children's market, albeit the 'designer' Barbie's were no doubt targeted at wealthy
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 mothers and collectors. The changes in appearance, clothing and artefacts mirror the
4
5 changing times and the wider political discourse surrounding women and their
6
7 representation through Barbie.
8
9

10 11 **Theoretical underpinning** 12

13
14 Here we examine how female entrepreneurial identity is socially constructed from an
15
16 early age and how social perceptions of such identity is influenced by gendered objects
17
18 such as toys and in particular, dolls and vice versa. However, it is necessary first, to
19
20 discuss the importance and significance of dolls to girls. This aspect of childhood
21
22 socialisation has a long history. For example, Rheingold and Cook (1975) found that the
23
24 contents of a child's room had a significant impact on their development and that this was
25
26 influenced by parental perceptions of what was appropriate for boys and girls – girls were
27
28 generally provided with dolls houses, dolls and other toys of domesticity (cookers,
29
30 hoovers, irons, etc.). Francis (2010) argues, from an educational perspective, that several
31
32 decades' later toy preferences are still highly gendered, with boys preferring action and
33
34 technology and girls often choosing toys linked with stereotypically feminine interests.
35
36 This is important in relation to this study, given that we use Barbie dolls as a measure /
37
38 proxy for female entrepreneurial identity.
39
40
41
42
43

44 It is helpful at this stage to define the key terms discussed and particularly how we
45
46 understand the terms entrepreneurship and fetishism in relation to each other.
47
48 Entrepreneurship is narrowly defined as – “*The activity of setting up a business or*
49
50 *businesses, taking on financial risks in the hope of profit*”. However, this generic
51
52 definition is not very helpful and a better way of understanding this creative socio-
53
54 economic phenomenon is to view it as “*the creation and extraction of value from an*
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *environment*” (Anderson, 1995). We are particularly concerned with issues of
4
5 entrepreneurial identity and gender. Fetishism is variously defined in the Oxford
6
7 Dictionary as: 1) A form of sexual behaviour in which gratification is linked to an
8
9 abnormal degree to a particular object, activity, part of the body; 2) An excessive and
10
11 irrational devotion, or commitment, to a particular thing e.g. *‘the fetishism of consumer*
12
13 *goods*’; and 3) Worship of an inanimate object for its supposed magical powers or
14
15 because it is considered to be inhabited by a spirit. We consider these in relation to
16
17 entrepreneurial identity.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 ***Considering the literature on gendered female entrepreneurial identity***

25
26 There is a burgeoning literature on entrepreneurial identity, which focuses on the
27
28 privileging of maleness and masculinity in such representations (Ogbor, 2000; Shaw,
29
30 Marlow & Lam, 2009; Smith, 2010; Ahl & Marlow, 2012; Jones, 2014). Ogbor (2000)
31
32 examined conventional entrepreneurial discourses and praxis, arguing that the concept of
33
34 entrepreneurship is discriminatory, gender-biased, ethnocentrically determined and
35
36 ideologically controlled, sustaining prevailing societal biases and also contradictory
37
38 assumptions and knowledge about the reality of entrepreneurs. Shaw et al (2009) argued
39
40 that gender shapes the possession of entrepreneurial capital and that there is an
41
42 interplay between economic, human, social and symbolic capital all of which shapes
43
44 female entrepreneurial identity. Smith (2010) further confirmed that entrepreneurship
45
46 is ideologically skewed towards masculine ideology, with negative perceptions of
47
48 female entrepreneurs being commonplace. Ahl and Marlow (2012) identified a
49
50 persistent, but occluded, gender bias within the entrepreneurial discourse whereby
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 women were positioned as lacking and incomplete men. Jones (2014) argues that, rather
4 than being gender neutral or meritocratic, discourses of entrepreneurship are saturated
5 with gendered meanings which position entrepreneurs in potentially damaging ways.
6
7 Collectively, the gist of these studies is that the concept of entrepreneurship *per se* is
8 dominated by a patriarchal rhetoric that emphasises masculinity and its cultural norms.
9
10 This serves to skew the narrative on entrepreneurship by privileging 'heroic' male
11 entrepreneurs, whilst marginalising and silencing alternative non-hegemonic identities.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Studies relating to female entrepreneurial identity *per se* are quite rare, albeit there is
21 a strong literature on female-entrepreneurship and gendered aspects of entrepreneurship.
22 A major, recurring theme in the literature is how entrepreneurs, and in particular, female-
23 entrepreneurs are 'silenced' and portrayed in the media (see the studies of Christensen &
24 Askegaard, 2001; Nicholson & Anderson, 2005; Radu & Redien-Collot, 2008; Smith,
25 2009; Achtenhagen & Welter, 2011; Eikhoff, and Summers & Carter 2012). Christensen
26 and Askegaard (2001) examined the masculinised discourses of corporate identity and
27 image management. Nicholson and Anderson (2005) did likewise for entrepreneurship,
28 arguing that entrepreneurship is socially constructed through masculine myth and
29 metaphor whereby entrepreneurs are frequently presented using dynamic masculine
30 metaphors. Radu and Redien-Collot (2008) examined social representations of
31 entrepreneurs in the French press arguing that these were skewed towards the masculine².
32
33 Smith (2009) examined discourses of female entrepreneurs in the media and identified
34 the – 'Diva complex' as a positive female metaphor and entrepreneurial identity.
35
36 Achtenhagen and Welter (2011) examined the representation of women's
37 entrepreneurship in German media/newspapers and found that these conformed to and
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 regulated the nature of women's entrepreneurship by highlighting 'typical' and 'socially
4
5 desirable' behaviour of women entrepreneurs. Eikhoff, Summers, and Carter (2012)
6
7 examined gendered representations of women entrepreneurs in a women's magazine.³
8
9
10 They found that women were portrayed as engaging in traditional female activities and
11
12 pursuits and as being domestically centred. The general 'consensus' of such studies are
13
14 that female-entrepreneurs are presented as being 'lesser' than male-entrepreneurs and are
15
16 subjected to a socially constructed, process of trivialisation and domestication. For
17
18 example, female-entrepreneurs are regularly discussed in relation to their specific, 'roles';
19
20 such as motherhood, and their domestic and personal relationships; moreover, female-
21
22 entrepreneurs are questioned about their image. Indeed, there is a fascination with
23
24 artefacts and clothing. This is fitting because Sahlins (1976:185) argued that clothes
25
26 reflect many things such as time and place of activity; social status; age; ethnicity; and
27
28 subculture. Clothes act as boundary and differential mechanisms through which we
29
30 fashion entrepreneurial identities (Smith, 2012). Similarly, Schiermer (2011) focused on
31
32 the notion of the 'fashion object' and the linkages between fetishism and fashion theory.
33
34
35
36
37

38 This fascination with fashion and appearance can be framed as a form of journalistic
39
40 fetishism because male-entrepreneurs do not receive such a 'gender-biased-interrogation'
41
42 and are constructed more seriously in relation to business topics (Ljunggren & Kolvereid,
43
44 1996). Nor are women seen as being good entrepreneurial role-models (Ahl & Marlow,
45
46 2012). The world of male-dominated journalism reproduces and perpetuates such
47
48 inequalities via chauvinism, sexism and patronising attitudes albeit female journalists can
49
50 be equally acerbic in their commentary on female-entrepreneurs (See Nadin, Jones &
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Smith, 2017). These issues influence how female entrepreneurs are portrayed in the
4 media and in turn how they are depicted as role-models.
5
6

7
8 Indeed, from an academic perspective, entrepreneurial identity is constructed as a
9 performed male dominated paradigm (Down & Warren, 2008; Giazitzoglu & Down,
10 2015) via artefacts, objects and possessions which are associated with masculine imagery
11 and enactments relating to success. This is mirrored in popular culture in novels of
12 capitalist, corporate culture where masculine entrepreneurial identity is commodified and
13 fetishised and female identity and values are constructed in relation to masculine norms
14 and desires (Ellis, 1991 – *American Psycho*; Anderson, 2008 – *City Boy*; James, 2011-
15 *Fifty Shades of Grey*). In such novels, masculine entrepreneurial identity is portrayed via
16 possession of designer clothing; bad-boy-values, behaviours and imagery, reminiscent of
17 entrepreneurship as a form of hyper-masculinity, or hegemonic masculinity (Connell &
18 Messerschmidt, 2005). Conversely, female identity is constructed as an appendage to
19 male identity, with sexism and overt heterosexuality presented as the norm. In the novel
20 ‘*Confessions of a Citygirl*’ (Stcherbatcheff, 2010), the entrepreneurial heroine performs,
21 mirrors and parodies fetishised masculine values and admits to getting ahead by
22 performing her corporate feminine role as expected, to capitalise on feminine guiles. This
23 cultural dimension is important in identity creation because the female entrepreneurial
24 identity crafted for Barbie comes from this socially constructed cultural stock.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 In the academic literature, negative female-stereotypes abound including – *Divas*
48 (Smith, 2009); ‘*Daddy’s girl, little princess, bitch, dolly-bird secretary, gold-digger*
49 (Smith, 2014); and the *Matriarch* (Smith, 2015). Within this tranche of work there is an
50 emerging obsession with artefacts and clothing as a medium through which
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

entrepreneurial identity is constructed, portrayed, performed and fashioned (see Smith, 2010; Clarke, 2011). In corporate culture, there is a focus on conservative business attire in its feminised manifestation(s). This includes dark-coloured-suits, power blouses with high-heeled shoes often being the norm.⁴ Experts on corporate dress warn ‘would be corporate players’ to avoid flamboyant displays of colourful ‘diva’ clothing. The *female* entrepreneur who emerges is dressed sensibly like a school ‘mam’ with a stern ‘tied back’ hairdo, elegant glasses and business artefacts such as matching handbag and laptop (see Smith, 2014). Artefacts thus become serious signifiers of entrepreneurial and corporate identity (Johnson & Lennon, 1999; Christensen & Askegaard, 2001) and even in academic books on women in business settings, the front covers depict and fetishise, for example red coloured, shiny, high-heeled shoes (See Reeves, 2010). Female-entrepreneurial identity thus appears to be constructed in an ‘idealised’ and, as will be argued, a fetishised manner. The literature on fetish and fetishism to which we turn helps us to frame this paper because to the best of our knowledge fetishism as a concept has seldom appeared in the entrepreneurship literature albeit Crawford, Dimov and McKelvie (2016) consider the obsession with the academic literature of entrepreneurship as a theoretical fetishism in itself. In the case of Barbie, fetishism is introduced via emphasising the desirability of 1) an objectified female entrepreneurial identity; 2) the gendered clothing and accessories associated with such an identity.

What is apparent from this perusal of the literature is that the differentiation of the idealised female entrepreneur from the male entrepreneur is achieved by a social process of belittling and criticizing female actions and endeavours via artefacts, clothing and issues such as domesticity. Little or no consideration has been given to important topics

1
2
3 such as commodification of entrepreneurial identity and the obvious links with the
4 concepts of sexuality and fetishism. Issues of sexuality and fetishised entrepreneurial
5 identity are therefore ignored in the literature albeit they are present in reality. This is a
6 critical omission and are important gap in the literature.
7
8
9
10
11

12 13 14 ***Fetishisation and commodification*** 15

16
17
18 Our review covers both ‘commodity’ fetishism (Marx, 2000) and ‘sexual’ fetishism
19 (Freud, 1928) because 1) a commodity is an object outside us, whose properties satisfy a
20 human want or desire; which 2) because of their nature and context can become an object
21 of sexual desire through the interpretation of others. As a concept, fetishism and its
22 myriad practices have been the focus of research in marketing and consumer research
23 (Jhally, 1990; Graeber, 2005) but less so in entrepreneurship research circles. Jhally
24 (1990) linked commodification to fetishism and the relationship between people and
25 objects through the process of ‘objectification’, which is instrumental in the mediation of
26 human needs through the appropriation of objects. Such objects often have a symbolic as
27 well as an economic, psychological and physical value and, according to Jhally, are
28 simultaneously communicators (about society and power relations) and satisfiers (of
29 human needs). Nevertheless, as a commodity, *per se*, Barbie has value for customers
30 (Walsh, 2010) which goes beyond mere possession and consumption. This is because it is
31 part of a brand(ed) community (Bohm & Batta, 2010; Graeber, 2005) that fetishises
32 notions of feminine perfection and therefore exerts a curious fascination for many (Pietz,
33 1985, 1987). This has obvious negative connotations. Such ‘commodity oriented’
34 fetishism has a schizophrenic influence, being simultaneously deleterious and useful
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 (Billig, 1999). Bohm and Batta (2010) argue that commodity fetishism, within the wider
4 ideological system of capitalism (and thus entrepreneurship), can be viewed and
5 explained by understanding it as a sense of enjoyment or consumptive desire. The very
6 process of marketing can promote both commodification and fetishism of a product albeit
7 the relationship between child and doll is a romanticised, emotional (not sexualised)
8 fetish because the child most-likely values the doll and its accessories as cherished
9 possessions in an expanding collection. The child may be unaware of adult interpretations
10 of the doll in the real world, seeing the doll as an object of idolisation, although they are
11 ultimately consuming a product that is highly sexualised. The same may not be the case
12 in relation to an adult's fetishisation of the same product, which may manifest more as
13 'commodity narcissism' (Cluley & Dunne, 2012).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Fetishism assists in the process of identity building via the provision of
31 psychological, sociological, emotional, devotional and sexual affirmation. Fetish and
32 fetishism come into play via the notion of consumer desires (see Belk, Ger & Askegaard,
33 2000, 2003; Belk, Ger & Lascu, 1993; Schroeder, 2002, 2008; Schouten & McAlexander,
34 1995; and Belk & Wallendorf, 1990). The process of fetishisation imbues a product with
35 value, either overtly or via subtle polysemic communication (Schroeder & Borgerson,
36 2003) through a triadic discourse encapsulating individual, community and object.
37 Marketing trades on fetishism (Walsh, 2010) because it aims to sell more of the same
38 branded products to customers and, in the case of toys such as Barbie, it encourages
39 parent and child alike to own the entire portfolio or collection. As a process, it generates
40 systems of meanings around the product which helps us achieve a sublime state of 'want
41 satisfaction', taking us beyond reality, liminally (Schroeder, 2008).⁵ Marketers invoke
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 tropes and imagery associated with fetishistic behaviour to sell both product and socially
4 constructed imagery. Advertising is the engine of consumption (Schroeder & Zwick,
5 2004) enabling the dissemination of carefully packaged, eroticised reproductions of real-
6 world identities (Johansson, 1999). It merits the scholarly gaze of disciplines as diverse
7 as marketing, consumer research, anthropology, sociology, cultural studies, postcolonial
8 studies, literature and art (Johansson, 1999; Miklitsch, 1996; Schroeder, 2008; Walsh,
9 2010). An obvious gap in the literature is that of any notable contribution from the
10 discipline of entrepreneurship.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Perusing the academic literature on Barbie dolls

23
24
25 The now ubiquitous 'Barbie doll' was created by American businesswoman Ruth
26 Handler and launched in March, 1959 by American toy manufacturers Mattel Inc. She
27 was inspired to create the doll by watching her daughter Barbara (hence Barbie) playing
28 with paper dolls and noticed that she would give them adult roles and work-related
29 scenarios. Ruth had the idea of creating a doll which represented a realistic role model for
30 children. She was further inspired by encountering a German manufactured doll 'Lilli' (a
31 stereotypical blond bombshell) whilst on holiday. She purchased the doll and gave it to
32 her husband Elliot, a founding member of Mattel (Cox, 1977). Controversially, Bignell
33 (1999) tells us that 'Lilli' was based on a risqué newspaper cartoon and sold as a sex toy
34 in tobacconist shops. This is (ironically) relevant given the subsequent iconic and
35 fetishistic status of Barbie dolls. Mattel has sold over a billion Barbie dolls since its
36 launch, making it a globally recognised iconic brand and, also, a collectable commodity.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53 It was an ideal vehicle for the sale of related merchandise (accessories, clothes, friends of
54 Barbie, etc.) and became popular, impacting on social values by conveying characteristics
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of accessorised female independence, representing an idealised ‘upscale’ life-style which
4 resonated with affluent children and their mothers (Cox, 1977). From the 1970s onwards,
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

of accessorised female independence, representing an idealised ‘upscale’ life-style which resonated with affluent children and their mothers (Cox, 1977). From the 1970s onwards, Mattel marketed Barbie as a ‘career woman’ (Messner, 2000:776).⁶ In this article, we examine the fetishisation of female-entrepreneurship, with Barbie arguably being representative of a semiotic expression of this phenomenon, but equally the focus is on dolls themselves as being expressive of fetishistic memes.⁷ We make links between the literatures to further understandings in both spheres. However, it is important to remember that Barbie is the result of an entrepreneurial venture by Ruth and Elliot Handler and ultimately Mattel. This is important because Barbie is first and foremost a product and a commodity and thus capable of being fetishised.

There is a constantly growing, academic literature on Barbie (see DuCille, 1994; Attfield, 1996; Bignell, 1999; Rogers, 1999; Messner, 2000; Spigel, 2001; and Lord, 2004) based around actively constructing a flawed image of gender. Indeed, Messner (2000:765) stresses that “*Children’s gendered immersion in popular culture provides symbolic resources on which children and parents actively create (or disrupt) categorical difference*”. Messner (2000:775) further notes that “*Barbie is likely one of the most immediately identifiable symbols of femininity in the world*”. Moreover, DuCille (1994:50) claimed that Barbie was an “*...icon of true white womanhood and femininity*”. There are obvious links here to emphasised femininity (Connell, 2005) and excessive entrepreneurial femininity (Lewis, 2014). These are serious claims and position her as an iconic totem of femininity and therefore open to fetishistic endeavors. Yet, Rogers, (1999) in defining, and discussing, ‘*Barbie Culture*’ argued that Barbie is plastic in terms of what meanings children and adults create around her, in that owners bring their own

1
2
3 understandings and meanings to the play. Rogers argues that Barbie, despite being
4
5 denigrated as sexist and racist is more complex because her sexuality is not clear-cut, and
6
7 her class situation is ambiguous – she exists to be consumed (whether innocently by
8
9 children or otherwise by adults). Here, we concentrate on the issues of gendered identity
10
11 and fashion and not primarily on sex and sexuality. Bignell (1999) suggests that in real
12
13 life, if ‘scaled-up’ Barbie’s vital statistics would be an unrealistic 36-18-33, but points
14
15 out that despite the erotic heritage of Lilli, significant markers of sexual and procreative
16
17 capacity are absent.⁸ Nevertheless, DuCille (1994:50) suggests that Barbie allows little
18
19 girls to dream. Indeed, Messner (2000) argues that ‘the Barbie narrative’ is symbolically
20
21 a serious competitor to the ‘warrior narrative’ (Jordan & Cowan, 1995) espoused by
22
23 boys. The warrior narrative also pervades entrepreneurial identity (Gomez & Korine,
24
25 2008).
26
27
28
29

30
31 There is an alternative literature, whereby academics comment on the sexualised
32
33 (and thus fetishised) nature of Barbie; the idealised femininity and unrealistic aspect of
34
35 Barbie’s physical dimensions; and possible links to eating disorders and self-esteem
36
37 issues (Dittmar, Halliwell & Ive, 2006; van der Hoort, Guterstam & Ehrsson, 2011). It is
38
39 a ferocious and frenetic debate but not necessarily, directly related to this study other than
40
41 potentially making Barbie a negative role model in terms of identity formation. In terms
42
43 of both ideologies, feminism and fetishism, much is simply open to interpretation.
44
45
46

47 This theoretical discussion sets up a tri-partite framework whereby we have: Barbie,
48
49 as fetishised commodities; Barbie as a sexualised entity; and their accessories and
50
51 clothing as representations of fetishised entrepreneurial identity.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Methodological underpinning

Our methodological orientation was based on the premise that images should be studied as indicators of underlying cultural forces (Hall, 1973) and was complicated because we were analysing photographs that represented such underlying forces and exacerbated because the staged images contained semiotic elements of adorned fashion and embodied identities, all of which are require separate forms of consideration in terms of visual research (Emmison & Smith, 2000). To obtain empirical data we conducted a qualitative visually directed, semiotic analysis (viz a viz Chandler, 2007) of pertinent images located on the web using Google. We were mindful of the advice of Emmison and Smith (2000) that determining bias in visual images is no easy task. From the thousands of images located we selected and downloaded images we considered appropriate because in our experience they were representative of the ‘majority’ of images we encountered and because they illustrated the theoretical points we discuss. We used the key words – *Barbie Businesswomen Dolls, Barbie Entrepreneur Dolls, Barbie Executive Dolls* and combinations therefore. These searches brought up similar images. In total we conducted ten separate searches using cognate search and looked at appropriate websites – those which appear in table 1. The criteria set was that it had to be a website capable of 1) being cited and 2) one which obviously used the images with permission and held copyright to the images. Most of the websites did not have such permissions and were avoided for obvious ethical reasons. We quickly reached saturation with hundreds of websites displaying the same images.

We worked hard to overcome selectivity bias (Keeble et al, 2015) by ensuring that, as each category emerged, there were other exemplars of the image visible across

1
2
3 websites and by applying the eligibility criteria discussed above. With qualitative
4
5 research and in particular visual images this has to be done intuitively using common
6
7 sense judgement (Emmison & Smith, 2000) because the researchers are an integral part
8
9 of the process and separating the two is neither possible nor desirable. Instead, it is
10
11 necessary to be transparent and reflexive (Polit & Beck, 2014) about the processes by
12
13 which data have been collected, analyzed, and presented. In carrying out the analysis we
14
15 were aware of our own preconceptions, relationship dynamics, and analytic focus. We
16
17 thus avoided obviously satirical and doctored images and contentious websites which
18
19 were difficult to verify.
20
21
22
23

24 We pasted the images onto a wall mounted board and using qualitative analytic
25
26 techniques (Banks, 2008; Miles, Huberman & Saldana, 2013) we created galleries (visual
27
28 storyboards) of relevant images. We adopted the strategy ‘Photographic Montage
29
30 Critique’ (Berger & Mohr, 2016; Berger & Mohr, 1989; Dillon, 2004) to make sense of
31
32 the selected images. Photo-montage as a visual narrative methodology relies on critique
33
34 by placing visual fragments (photographs or images) in juxtaposition to each other to
35
36 create a montage of images which present a visual story for interpretation and permits
37
38 visualisation of new themes using sensory data (Smith, 2014). We juxtaposed relevant
39
40 images in ‘close-proximity’ to each other to allow us to develop themes for discussion,
41
42 whilst paying particular attention to the symbolic and socially constructed elements in the
43
44 images. In keeping with the above criteria, we rejected images which were satirical and
45
46 obviously doctored or where the authors were obviously biased or un-named. We were
47
48 careful to avoid sites where there was an obvious agenda (Emmison & Smith, 2000). We
49
50
51
52
53
54 also focused on aesthetic elements such as impressions and feelings. To assist in the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 analysis, each author conducted their analysis separately and shared their observations
4 and findings with each other to develop a collective and more nuanced understanding.
5
6 This was very helpful. For example, due to our different previous readings of the
7 literature and the gender differences the lead author often did not fully understand the
8 subtleties of the arguments surrounding feminism and the feminist literature. This was
9 resolved by patient discussion and additional readings. This ensured a consensus of
10 opinion emerged and thus allowed a form of triangulation and validation. The methods
11 used were justified by virtue of mirroring those used and published in Smith (2014).
12 Triangulation with the literature was achieved by matching the themes found to the
13 theories and literature discussed above.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 From the analysis of the galleries we developed tables to present the findings,
27 primarily because of the difficulties and cost of obtaining copyright and printing colour
28 photographs and other practical challenges. This enabled us to use the images as a
29 springboard for subsequent theoretical abstraction. The images are available from author
30 one on request.
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 It is difficult to recreate the aesthetic experience, and the power of the imagery in
39 helping us reach a more nuanced understanding, by using text. We have attempted to
40 overcome this by embedding the basic analysis/observation in the tables of findings,
41 which provide a description of the images. Readers are encouraged to do their own
42 'Google images' search after reading this article to complement their understanding from
43 the reading so that they can confirm or refute the findings below.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 **Analysis and discussion**

55
56
57
58
59
60

Analysis.

The analysis below is developed from our intuitive, visual observations, based on our collective understanding of gender and entrepreneurial identity as they emerged from the photo-montages.⁹ It is of note that this entails an unintentional element of fashion critique which introduces a judgmental element to the analysis.¹⁰ See Table 1 below: -

Image, description and location	Observational Analysis
<p>Image 1: is of the original Barbie Business Woman doll (circa 1990s). She is dressed in sensible matching business attire of black and white checked blouse with a blue tightfitting pencil skirt finished off with a mismatched pink handbag and pale blue high heels. Tied-back hair, glasses and mobile phone complete the image. The link to this image is no longer available demonstrating the perils of internet research.</p>	<p>This model denotes an appropriately gendered business persona (for the time-period). Of interest is the mobile phone with the aerial, the only particularly relevant iconic artefact related to business. The other clothing and artefacts relate to women's fashion.</p>
<p>Image 2: Provides an updated but still sensible model for the twenty-first century. The new Barbie Executive is dressed in a matching grey business suit with pleated skirt, softened by matching red blouse and choker style costume jewelry. Black high heeled shoes complete the image. Big blonde hair is the order of the day. The flip style mobile telephone and large black handbag with clip boards, etc. presents a business persona. Located: https://uk.pinterest.com/ariellakeepsake/barbies/</p>	<p>This image provides a professional corporate image denoting a more personable entrepreneurial persona. The new Barbie Business woman is now more feminised and fashion conscious. The overall appearance is of corporate stylishness – the message is Executive Barbie means business.</p>
<p>Image 3: Presents Game Developer Barbie in a Khaki coloured jacket and grey 'T' shirt with blue denim jeans and trainers complete the picture. This model sports 'big', vivid auburn / died red hair and matching glasses. Located: http://www.idealco.co.uk/blog/4682-game-developer-barbie-mattel-introduces-new-career-doll/</p>	<p>This model presents a more casual business image with 'dress as you please' Barbie. This offering, mirrors and parodies the stay at home entrepreneur. The return of the glasses may be an attempt to make Barbie appear more serious. The message conveyed is that fashion is paramount and business attire optional but as a prototype for Entrepreneur Barbie it was a step in a different direction.</p>
<p>Image 4: Presents Computer Engineer Barbie in fashionable matching pink and pale blue pastel coloured casual attire with dark jeans. The long blonde hair continues the casual imagery. A pink (gender coded) coloured tablet completes the contemporary business image. Located: https://biancajchadda.wordpress.com/2014/02/21/entrepreneurship-never-looked-so-pink/</p>	<p>Fashion is the key idiom and again, glasses, possibly to denote a higher IQ. The use of pink and pastels suggests that Barbie may have entered a male dominated profession, but her femininity is still preserved. She certainly is not 'one of the guys'.</p>

<p>Image 5: Depicts a special edition Barbie linked to haute-couture designer clothing manufacturers. Note the fawn coloured overcoat, blazer and matching handbag portraying a rich, casual business persona. Located: http://www.emirates247.com/news/emirates/barbie-dazzles-in-iconic-haute-couture-exhibition-in-dubai-2015-09-04-1.602314.</p>	<p>The exhibition in Dubai for collectors presented 24 limited edition Barbie dolls associated with fashion houses such as Hervé Léger, Christian Dior, Oscar de la Renta, Monique Lhuillier, Versace, Christian Louboutin and Armani. Throughout the decades, no fashion trend has been overlooked as Mattel / Barbie has collaborated with more than 75 fashion designers worldwide including Givenchy, Christian Louboutin and Burberry, remaining a true fashion icon.¹¹ The relevance of this collection being included is that it takes the fetishisation of the Barbie into a new arena for rich collectors and also introduces the world of designer clothing into the world of Barbie. Given that children now access the internet more frequently and freely there is a potential for these specialist images to influence the children's perceptions of entrepreneurial identity.</p>
<p>Image 6: Unveils the new Barbie Entrepreneur Doll range introduced in 2014. All of the dolls in this range wear themed pink dresses but Barbie is now multi-racial and multi-cultural. Located: https://theblackconversation.wordpress.com/2014/05/30/mattel-creates-new-black-barbie-entrepreneur-doll-now-barbie-is-intelligent-business-minded-and-well-black/</p>	<p>Collectively, the coordinated image sends a message of equality to the children and also sends messages of diversity and possibility to children of all ethnicities. However, there is still an undertone of white, Anglo-Saxon gendered sensibilities here, with the dresses and accessories being mainly pink.</p>
<p>Image 7: No Barbie Entrepreneur should be without accessories and these include a pink purse, a black patent leather handbag, an Apple iPad and a flip chart. Located: http://westcoastmama.net/entrepreneur-barbie/</p>	<p>This accessory set allows owners to add to the business image of Barbie Entrepreneur doll or to accessorise other Barbie models with a business persona. The accessories have the power to do this.</p>
<p>Image 8: Depicts a feminised CEO Barbie with 'bobbed' hairstyle. Note the traditional 'cradle' telephone juxtaposed with the contemporary laptop and flowers depicting a more 'homely' persona. Sensibility and conservative values is a recurring theme. Located: http://www.theonion.com/article/ceo-barbie-criticized-for-promoting-unrealistic-ca-1787</p>	<p>This image and imagery introduces a sense of datedness and even nostalgia and may perhaps blur the boundaries between work and home because the furniture is atypical for office furniture. However, sexism is still present because of the denim effect suit, the tightfitting white coloured polo necked top and mini skirt.</p>
<p>Image 9: Returns Barbie to a commodity in her packaging but this special edition depicts a pin striped Barbie with feminine power blouse, earphones, large utilitarian handbag and a latte coffee. Located: https://www.amazon.com/Barbie-Millicent-Roberts-Pinstripe-Fashion/dp/B000AMVXG8</p>	<p>Sexism and fetishism are brought into play because the power blouse, under garment is a tightfitting bodice type waist coat with matching leggings.</p>

Table 1 Commodification and evolution of Barbie Entrepreneur dolls.

1
2
3 The main themes to emerge are those of objectified ‘entrepreneurial artefacts’ – namely
4 telephones, computers, iPads and work clothing such as power blouses. In this respect,
5 these are used in ‘fashioning’ an entrepreneurial identity (Smith, 2012). Therefore,
6 entrepreneurial identities are facilitated via adornment, the wearing of accessories, and
7 the process of accessorising. The images individually and collectively and particularly
8 when taken in sequence demonstrate a fabricated neo-liberal identity via the conspicuous
9 display of consumerist fashions (see Walkerdine, 2003). As the Barbie concept is based
10 on ‘play’ and ‘role playing’ there is very little backstory, and therefore, little
11 philosophical, or epistemological underpinning behind it, albeit there are Barbie
12 storybooks which now provide a sanitised backstory and ideology. The relationship
13 between owner and doll and their maturity/immaturity dictates the potential storylines
14 that come into play.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 In the case of Barbie, the *commercialisation* of the product (Barbie) creates a desire
32 for it, which is increased via the processes of *commodification* (of the gendered
33 entrepreneurial identity) which establishes the desire for possessing the dolls. The success
34 of the product in turns *objectifies* and *reifies* the idea of Barbie being representative of a
35 legitimised entrepreneurial (and feminine) identity; and of Barbie as a role model. In
36 time, the notion of collectability comes into play and recreates the desire for ownership of
37 the entire collection and the need to possess the desirable objects. This leads to
38 veneration of Barbie and thus fetishisation. Fetishisation plays out via the links to
39 designer labels and cultural artefacts associated with enterprise, or socially constructed
40 gendered aspects of such identities. Fetishisation and commodification creep in because
41 of the issue of collectability and a desire to own, or possess, all the accessories. Barbie
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

dolls in their packaging become a collectable commodity ‘in their own right’. Special edition dolls can fetch a considerable price at auction thereby increasing their collectability and viability as an investment to those who can afford to pay for such connoisseurship. Such items will inevitably become ‘must have’ items for collectors. However, fetishisation is also implicit because the accessories are displayed on a (to some) flawed, controversial and sexualised object, namely Barbie doll herself. We are struck by the fact that the ‘style’ is also very glamorous and depicts the female entrepreneurial body as something heavily invested in.

Table 1 also tells us ‘Barbie the entrepreneur’ has changed over time and we believe that this is in keeping with a more empowered Barbie. We do however acknowledge that there is a counter argument that Barbie is increasingly being subjected to and thus enthralled to male power. In other words, which argument you accept is a subjective, qualitative one dependent upon your ideological leanings viz a viz Barbie. There is therefore no unified emerging image of Barbie per se. What is being presented and for whom is clearly open to interpretation.

In Table 2, we encounter the Barbie 2014 interactive promotional material (as ppt slides) that accompanies the product.¹²

Slide	Description
Image 1: What’s An Entrepreneur (opening slide).	This links the Barbie doll with the concept of entrepreneurship.
Image 2: What’s An Entrepreneur (explanatory slide).	This slide provides detailed age and gender specific definitions and explanations of what an entrepreneur is. An entrepreneur is defined as being “ <i>an adventurous person who takes risks to start a business</i> ”. This simplified version is linked to gender specific roles by questions such as “Do you like cooking, crafts and animals?”
Image 3: Be An Entrepreneur Now!	This slide exhorts the child to be an entrepreneur now. After listing other possibilities, the child is exhorted to follow what they love to start a lemonade stand, a gardening service or a mobile veggie stand.
Image 4: Believes in You	This slide exhorts the child to believe in themselves and be

	creative. The message is to work hard to SUCCEED, DREAM and MAKE A DIFFERENCE. This is a bespoke enterprise culture where anything is possible via play. The handout ends with a creative exercise and an instruction to ask mum and dad for help.
--	--

Table 2: Barbie Entrepreneur 2014 promotional material.

In Table 2, the child is subliminally sold an ideological standpoint with age and gender specific messages. The cartoon style images depict flowers and puppies using pastel pinks and blues. It sells a subliminal image of entrepreneurial success and also, an achievable identity via reciprocal self-belief. However, from an adult perspective the message is simplistic and patronising.

Discussion.

It is apparent from our readings and analysis that the aesthetics and resultant feelings evoked by the Barbie products analysed will differ according to whether the product is consumed by a child or an adult. The polysemic images and semiotic messages (Schroeder & Borgerson, 2003) broadcast by the dolls' adult origins may become confusing to the children. Barbie introduces fetishism 'by the back door' and is more insidious because of it. It also raises questions as to the role of the consumer in defining whether or not something is a fetish – just because Barbie is made for children, it does not mean it cannot be fetishised. This is worthy of further academic study. Our work extends this knowledge to the study of entrepreneurship, with the Barbie entrepreneur phenomenon being one manifestation of the fetishisation of (female) entrepreneurship and the entrepreneur as an 'object of desire' (Jones & Spicer 2009).

1
2
3 It is also incumbent upon us to consider the marketing implications of Barbie. We
4
5 consider 'Barbie the entrepreneur' as both a reflection of neo-liberalist society
6
7 (Donoghue, 2007) and its changing norms as discussed above but also a game changing
8
9 event because it allows children to express perhaps previously unarticulated ambitions to
10
11 become an entrepreneur, or consider other entrepreneurial career options. This makes
12
13 Barbie entrepreneur dolls very marketable as a commodity. We believe this is a totally
14
15 separate argument to the one discussed that Barbie must remain Barbie because men like
16
17 it, however, although some women may still believe they need to look like her others will
18
19 engage with the entrepreneurial role modelling aspects of the changing identity and play
20
21 at being an entrepreneur.
22
23
24
25

26 Another area of interest worth discussing is the wider social context, and, the
27
28 triggers for the emergence of the Barbie entrepreneur in 1990s. We believe that the
29
30 triggers resulted from two contributory scenarios. The first relates to the movement to
31
32 encourage female entrepreneurs which obviously helped considerably because Mattel
33
34 appear to heed to changing attitudes and ideas and the new hype about female
35
36 entrepreneurs is an obvious marketing point. The second relates to the competition from
37
38 the American Girl doll and others which offer a non-sexualised doll identity played a
39
40 significant role in the development of the Barbie entrepreneur doll. The resultant product
41
42 therefore mirrors an emphasised femininity (Connell, 2005) which can be read as being
43
44 an excessive entrepreneurial femininity (Lewis, 2014) which creates a sexualised
45
46 objectification (Saguy et al, 2010) of an idealised and arguably fetishised entrepreneurial
47
48 identity which stands in opposition to traditional hegemonic masculinity (Connell &
49
50 Messerschmidt, 2005). The exaggerated imagery of Barbie the doll as the carrier of these
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ideological and theoretical representations inexorably links it to fetishism by virtue of its
4
5 inherent plasticised sexuality.
6

7
8 Bignell (1999) stresses that sex and gender representation in toys has been the
9
10 subject of debate from several points of view, reflecting the diverse and contradictory
11
12 ways in which childhood is constructed in discourse. Bignell further suggests that the
13
14 promotion of 'representational' educational toys, inhibit a child's creative and
15
16 imaginative play, and their fantasy worlds distort the child's perceptions of 'real life',
17
18 leading to maladjusted behaviour. Moreover, feminists argue that sex differentiations in
19
20 toys valorize and perpetuate harmful gender stereotypes and skew identifications with
21
22 masculine or feminine role-models (Dittmar et al, 2006; van der Hoort, Guterstam &
23
24 Ehrsson, 2011). It could be argued that Barbie, as 'entrepreneur' or 'career woman',
25
26 challenges traditional gendered stereotypes and thus reflects a 'feminist' agenda in terms
27
28 of representing women in the work place (rather than just the domestic realm, or to be
29
30 provocative, the 'dolls house'). However, we agree it is a highly gendered and
31
32 commodified form of emancipation and one, which from our reading of the literature,
33
34 reflects the patriarchal gaze concerning the 'ideal woman'. Contemporary
35
36 'Entrepreneurial Barbie' represents a post-feminist ideal, providing an aspirational figure
37
38 for girls, showing that women can 'have it all', (i.e. the perfect body / wardrobe / career).
39
40 This is made quite explicit in the 2014 'Barbie Entrepreneur' release, which comes
41
42 equipped with an instruction guide for girls about how to become an entrepreneur (see
43
44 Table 2). This underlines the potential influence of Barbie as a role model and
45
46 educational toy, especially in the current context of the promotion of entrepreneurship
47
48 and the provision of entrepreneurial education, even at primary school level. This
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 highlights the need to intellectually interrogate ‘entrepreneurial Barbie’, to identify the
4
5 ways in which she is fetishised and the values this expresses in respect of idealised and
6
7 plasticised embodiments of contemporary femininity.
8
9

10
11 Nevertheless, this research has identified that, despite being flawed, ‘Barbie’
12
13 entrepreneur dolls in their many forms counter hegemonic masculinity as understood by
14
15 Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) and even transcend its gendered equivalent of
16
17 ‘emphasised femininity’ (Connell, 2005). As such they enact a form of hegemonic
18
19 femininity, whereby women (as depicted by Barbie) exert an alternative power play. We
20
21 are entitled to dispute the ‘realness’ (Holter, 2003) of Barbie and the hegemonic concepts
22
23 associated with her fetishised entrepreneurial wardrobe but nevertheless she draws her
24
25 power from the direct experience of women (as lived through a patriarchal lens) rather
26
27 than from an idealised vision of a perfect politically and socially correct version of what
28
29 female entrepreneurial identity should look like. In many respects, Barbie as an art form
30
31 imitates but does not reflect reality, otherwise, stripped of fantasy and fetish, she would
32
33 not sell so well as a product. The dolls act as ‘totemic’ commodities and their accessories
34
35 as fetishised objects and therein lies the problem. In becoming totemic there is a danger
36
37 that hidden nuances such as fetishisation, commodification and sexualisation become lost
38
39 to view, justifying our adoption of a critical perspective and argument that Barbie
40
41 represents a form of hegemonic femininity.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Conclusions**

51
52 At the heart of this discussion, leaving aside academic arguments and theories, we must
53
54 remember are little girls (and not-so-little-girls who once played with Barbie) and their
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 relationship with their dolls. First and foremost, we argue that Barbie is simultaneously
4 an object of ‘play’ and an object of ‘socialisation’, as well as being a commercial product
5 with multiple markets and reasons for consumption. In this respect we see gendered ‘role
6 modelling’ (Eriksson-Zetterquist, 2008) as a key concept. According to Eriksson-
7 Zetterquist ‘role modelling’ is based upon a comparison between an ‘image’ of oneself
8 with that of a person (or in this case an object) which serves as an idealistic proto-model
9 that personifies desirable role traits, which leads to directive action. The girls thus model
10 themselves on the idealised and reified mental constructs associated with female
11 entrepreneurs and their idealised totemic appearance. In this respect, Barbie entrepreneur
12 doll is breaking away from traditional stereotypical representations of female pursuits.
13 That Barbie is not representative of the average woman (if there is such a thing) cannot
14 be ignored, but neither too are her competitors.¹³ Barbie is also part of the ‘little-princess
15 syndrome’ (Himes, 2015) and the distortion of feminine values. This cannot be avoided
16 because Barbie dolls are deliberately inflated representations but are after all a child’s
17 toy. They are intended for children, not adults who can become sensitive to the potential
18 harm that such dolls can do and serious in their approach to collecting rather than
19 playing. We argue that there is a role for such animations of entrepreneurial ideals and
20 identities. To their credit, Mattel took earlier criticisms on board in designing
21 entrepreneurial Barbie and her culturally diverse versions. This led to acclaim from the
22 media and industry commentators, but occurred at a time when sales of Barbie were in
23 decline. This tells us something about the market and consumers, because it is no longer a
24 mono children’s market but a nuanced market for adults too, whereby they can possess a
25 product imbued with nostalgia that evades ‘political correctness’ and where the clothing

1
2
3 and artefacts remind them of their youth and/or of fetishised values from a bygone era. In
4 the process, Barbie (by default), has crossed over from a children's to an adult market.
5
6
7 There are wider implications too, in that the commodification of Barbie in the form of
8
9
10 'designer' dolls, aimed at wealthy collectors, allows the individuation of a fetishised
11
12 entrepreneurial identity and different versions for the rich and poor.
13

14
15 Dolls present an idealised gender perspective. It could be argued that the early years
16
17 of the Barbie phenomenon are epitomised as being representative of the reality of 1950s
18
19 and 1960s corporate America with its WASPish values, in which the business norms
20
21 were patriarchal and masculine.¹⁴ One could argue that Barbie dolls merely parody and
22
23 mimic now flawed values and represent a spirit of nostalgia, imbuing them with an
24
25 anachronistic quality. However, we believe it is representative of contemporary reality
26
27 because, during our research, we also came across an article in '*Management Today*',
28
29 where Victoria Beckham is presented on the front cover having been nominated female
30
31 entrepreneur of the year in 2014.¹⁵ We were struck by the similarities between her image
32
33 and that of the Barbie entrepreneur doll.¹⁶ Indeed, Barbie is now taken seriously by the
34
35 media. For example, in the wake of the 2014 Barbie Entrepreneur doll's release, the
36
37 editors of the US based *Entrepreneur Magazine* polled readers to ask if Barbie was a
38
39 serious role model and if entrepreneurs would buy them for their children. We do not
40
41 have access to the poll but this surely legitimises the phenomenon.
42
43
44
45

46
47 What is also important is that it is adults who fetishise consumer products such as
48
49 Barbie dolls. Adults vicariously collect the dolls and can afford to accessorise them and
50
51 buy expensive special editions. It is parents who buy the accessories and outfits for their
52
53 daughters, which begs the question - who is Barbie really for? Barbie exists in a super or
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 hyper-feminised environment. It is all about Barbie - her companion Ken seldom shares
4 the limelight. In comparison, he is treated like a lump of plastic and has been given no
5 equalised entrepreneurial status or persona. Ironically, it is he who is silent and silenced
6 thus *reversing* gender roles and discrimination.
7
8
9
10

11
12 Why is this discussion important? It is because discussing gendered identity via the
13 medium of Barbie allows us as scholars to consider issues such as commodification,
14 sexuality, fetishisation etc. in a relatively 'safe' environment.¹⁷ We argue that discussing
15 a plastic object/subject is preferable to exploring such sensitive issues with real life
16 subjects. Moreover, it is important because consideration of Barbie Entrepreneur merely
17 as a child's doll disguises the sexualisation of the adopted entrepreneurial identity and
18 obscures the symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 2004) done to its reality.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 The value of Barbie Entrepreneur dolls goes far beyond its economic importance as
31 a commodified fetish that reaches into households internationally (Walsh, 2010)
32 attaching itself to object, people, place and played experience. This piece responds to
33 Mick's (2003) call for research on fetishes and the cross-fertilisation of disciplines
34 (entrepreneurship and management studies) thereby developing theoretical, conceptual
35 and empirical synergies that deepen our understanding. We illuminate and contribute to
36 extant research on fetishism and consumption and on gendered entrepreneurial identity.
37 This study is important because, according to Holmes and Schnurr (2006), negative
38 perceptions of female identity can be reclaimed and reinterpreted positively by framing
39 'doing femininity' at work as normal, unmarked, and effective workplace behaviour,
40 instead of enacting contested parodic instantiations of workplace femininity.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

Achtenhagen, L., Welter, F. (2011). Surfing on the ironing board – the representation of women's entrepreneurship in German newspapers. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, **23**(9-10), pp.763-786.

Ahl, H., Marlow, S. (2012). Exploring the dynamics of gender, feminism and entrepreneurship: advancing debate to escape a dead end? *Organization*, **19**(5), pp.543-562.

Anderson, A.R. (1995). *Enterprise in Arcadia* unpublished PhD thesis, University of Stirling, Stirling.

Anderson, G., (2008). *Cityboy: Beer and Loathing in the Square Mile*. London: Headline Book Publishing.

Attfield, J. (1996). Barbie and Action Man: Adult toys for girls and boys 1959-93. In P. Kirkham (Ed.) *The Gendered Object*, Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Banks, M. (2008). *Using Visual Data in Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.

Belk, W.R., Ger, G., Askegaard, S. (2000) 'The Missing Streetcar Named Desire', in S. Ratneshwar, D.G. Mick and C. Huffman (Eds.) *The Why of Consumption*, London: Routledge. pp. 98-119.

Belk, W.R., Ger, G, Askegaard, S. (2003). The Fire of Desire: A Multisited Inquiry into Consumer Passion, *Journal of Consumer Research*, **30**(3), pp.326-351.

Belk, R.W., Wallendorf, M. (1990) 'The Sacred Meanings of Money', *Journal of Economic Psychology*, **11**(1), pp.35-67.

Bem, S. L. (1993). *The Lenses of Gender: Transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Berger, J., Mohr, J. (2016). *Another Way of Telling*. London, Oxford, New York, New Delhi, Sydney: Bloomsbury.

Berger, J., Mohr, J. (1989), *A Seventh Man: Migrant Workers in Europe*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Bignell, J. (1999). *Barbie and Action Man: Indeterminate and Overdetermined Gender in the Culture of Toys*. Paper presented at the 'Anti-Bodies' conference, Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College, 1999.

1
2
3
4 Billig, M. (1999). 'Commodity Fetishism and Repression: Reflections on Marx, Freud
5 and the Psychology of Consumer Capitalism', *Theory & Psychology*, **9**(3), pp.313-329.
6

7
8 Bohm, S., Batta, A. (2010) 'Just Doing It: Enjoying Commodity Fetishism with Lacan',
9 *Organization*, **17**(3), pp.345-361.
10

11 Bourdieu, P. (2004). Gender and Symbolic Violence. In Scheper-Hughes, N. and
12 Bourgios, P.I. (Eds.) *Violence in War and Peace: An Anthology*. Maldon MA, Oxford
13 and Victoria: Blackwell Publishing pp.339 – 342.
14

15
16 Campenni, E. (1999). Gender Stereotyping of Children's Toys: A Comparison of Parents
17 and Nonparents. *Sex Roles*, **40**(1), pp.121–138.
18

19 Chandler, D. (2007) '*Semiotics: The Basics*', London: Routledge.
20

21 Christensen, L.T., Askegaard, S., (2001). Corporate identity and corporate image
22 Revisited: a semiotic perspective, *European Journal of Marketing*, **35**(3/4), pp.292-315.
23

24
25 Clarke, J. (2011). Revitalizing Entrepreneurship: How visual symbols are used in
26 entrepreneurial performances. *Journal of Management Studies*, **48**(6), pp.1365-1391.
27

28
29
30 Cluley, R., Dunne, S. (2012). Commodity Narcissism. *Marketing Theory*, **12**(3), pp.251-
31 265.
32

33
34
35 Connell, R.W. (2005). *Masculinities*. Second Edition. Berkeley, CA: University of
36 California Press.
37

38
39
40
41 Connell, R.W., Messerschmidt, J.W. (2005). Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the
42 Concept. *Gender and Society*, **19**(6) pp.829-859.
43

44
45
46 Cox, D.R., (1977). Barbie and her playmates. *Journal of Popular Culture*, **11**(2), pp.303-
47 307.
48

49
50 Crawford, G.C., Dimov, D., McKelvey, B., (2016). Realism, Empiricism, and Fetishism
51 in the Study of Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, **25**(2), pp.168-170.
52

53 Dillon, G.L. (2004). Montage/Critique: Another Way of Writing Social History,
54 *Postmodern Culture*, **14**(2). DOI: 10.1353/pmc.2004.0005
55
56
57

1
2
3 Dittmar, H., Halliwell, E., Ive, S. (2006). Does Barbie make girls want to be thin? The
4 effect of experimental exposure to images of dolls on the body image of 5- to 8-year-old
5 girls. *Developmental Psychology*, **42**(2), pp.283-292.
6

7
8 Donaghue, N. (2017). Seriously Stylish: Academic Femininities and the Politics of
9 Feminism and Fashion in Academia. In A. S. Elias, Gill, R. and Scharff, C. (Eds.)
10 *Aesthetic Labour: Rethinking Beauty Politics in Neoliberalism* London: Palgrave
11 Macmillan, pp. 231-246.
12

13
14 Down, S., Warren, L. (2008), Constructing narratives of enterprise: clichés and
15 entrepreneurial self-identity. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and*
16 *Research*, **14**(1), pp.4-23.
17

18
19
20 DuCille, A. (1994). Dyes and Dolls: Multicultural Barbie and the Merchandising of
21 Difference. *Differences*, **6**(1).
22

23
24 Eikhoff, D.R., Summers, J., Carter, S. (2013). Women doing their own thing: media
25 representations of female entrepreneurship; *International Journal of Entrepreneurial*
26 *Behaviour and Research*; **19**(5), pp.547-564.
27

28
29 Ellis, B.E. (1991). *American Psycho*: New York: Vintage books.
30

31
32 Emmison, M., Smith, P. (2000). *Researching the visual*. London: Sage.
33

34
35 Eriksson-Zetterquist, U. (2008). Gendered role modelling—A paradoxical construction
36 process. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, **24**(3), pp.259–270.
37

38
39 Francis, B. (2010). Gender, toys and learning. *Oxford Review of Education*, **36**(3),
40 pp.325-344.
41

42
43 Freud, S. (1928). Fetishism. *The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, **9**, pp.161-
44 166.
45

46
47 Giazitzoglu, A., Down, S. (2017). Performing entrepreneurial masculinity: An
48 ethnographic account. *International Small Business Journal*, **35**(1). DOI:
49 10.1177/0266242615599244.
50

51
52 Gill, R., K Kelan, E., M Scharff, C. (2017). A Postfeminist Sensibility at Work. *Gender,*
53 *Work and Organization*, **24**(3), pp. 226-244.
54

55
56 Ger, G., Belk, R.W., Lascu, D.N. (1993). The Development of Consumer Desire in
57 Marketizing and Developing Economies: The Cases of Romania and Turkey, *Advances in*
58 *Consumer Research* **20**(1), pp.102-107.
59
60

1
2
3
4 Gomez, P.Y., Korine, H. (2008). *Entrepreneurs and Democracy: A Political Theory of*
5 *Corporate Governance* Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town,
6 Singapore, Sao Paulo and Delhi: Cambridge University Press.

7
8
9 Graeber, D. (2005) Fetishism as Social Creativity, *Anthropological Theory*, **5**(4), pp.407-
10 438.

11
12 Hall, S. (1973). 'The determinations of news photographs' of news, deviance, social
13 problems and the mass media. London: Constable. in S. Cohen & J. Young(eds). *The*
14 *Manufacture*

15
16
17 Hanke, R. (1992). Redesigning Men: Hegemonic masculinity in transition. In S. Craig
18 (Ed.) *Men, Masculinity, and the Media*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

19
20
21 Himes, C. (2015). 'Does the Shoe Fit: A deeper look into how princess stories have
22 shaped both our society and our actions'. Undergraduate senior honors thesis - Ball State
23 – Cardinal Scholar, <http://liblink.bsu.edu/catkey/1776016>

24
25 Holdsworth, A. (1988) *Out of the Dolls House: The Story of Women in the Twentieth*
26 *Century*. London: BBC Books.

27
28 Holmes, J., Schnurr, S. (2006). 'Doing femininity' at work: More than just relational
29 practice *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, **10**(1), pp. 31–51.

30
31
32 Holter, O.G. (2003). *Can men do it? Men and gender equality-The Nordic*
33 *experience*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Nordic Council of Ministers.

34
35 Jhally, S. (1990). *The Codes of Advertising: Fetishism and the Political Economy of*
36 *Meaning in the Consumer Society*. New York: Routledge.

37
38
39 Jones, S. (2014). Gendered Discourses of Entrepreneurship in UK Higher Education: The
40 fictive entrepreneur and the fictive student *International Small Business Journal* **32** (3):
41 pp.237-258.

42
43 James, E.L. (2011). *Fifty Shades of Grey*. London: Vintage Books.

44
45 Jones, C., Spicer, A. (2005). The Sublime Object of Entrepreneurship.
46 *Organization*, **12**(2), pp.223-246.

47
48
49 Johnson, K.P., Lennon, S.J. (1999). *Appearance and Power (Dress, Body, Culture)*.
50 London: Bloomsbury Academic.

51
52
53 Jordon, E., Curran, A. (1995). Warrior Narratives in the kindergarten classroom:
54 Renegotiating the social contract? *Gender and Society*, **9**, pp.727-43.

1
2
3 Keeble, C., Law, G.R., Barber, S. and Baxter, P.D. (2015) Choosing a Method to Reduce
4 Selection Bias: A Tool for Researchers. *Open Journal of Epidemiology*, 5, 155-162.

5
6 Kitch, C. (2001). *The Girl on the Magazine Cover: The Origins of Visual Stereotypes in*
7 *American Mass Media*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

8
9 Koller, V. (2004). *Metaphor and gender in business media discourse: A*
10 *critical cognitive study*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

11
12
13
14 Langer, R. (2007) Marketing, Prosumption and Innovation in the Fetish Community, in
15 B. Cova, R. Kozinets and A. Shankar (Eds.) *Consumer Tribes*, Oxford, U.K:
16 Butterworth-Heinemann. pp.243-259.

17
18
19 Lewis, P. (2014). Postfeminism, Femininities and Organization Studies: Exploring a New
20 Agenda. *Organization Studies*, 35(12), pp.1-22.

21
22 Lord, M.G. (2004). *Forever Barbie: The Unauthorized Biography of a Real Doll*. Walker.

23
24 Ljunggren E., Kolvereid, (1996). New Business Formation: Does Gender Make a
25 Difference. *Women in Management Review*. 11(4), pp.3-12.

26
27
28 Marx, K. (2000). The Fetishism of the Commodity and the Secret *Thereof*. In *Capital*.
29 *A Critique of Political Economy*. Volume I. Book One. Progress Publishers, Moscow,
30 USSR.

31
32
33 Messner, M.A., (2000). Barbie Girls versus Sea Monsters: Children Constructing Gender,
34 *Gender and Society*, 14(6), pp.765-784.

35
36 Mick, D.G. (2003), Editorial, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29(4), pp.455-462.

37
38 Miklitsch, R. (1996). The Commodity-Body-Sign: Toward a General Economy of
39 "Commodity Fetishism", *Cultural Critique* 33, pp.5-40.

40
41 Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M., Saldana, J. (2013). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods*
42 *Sourcebook*, London: Sage.

43
44
45 Nadin, S., Jones, S., Smith, R. (2017). Heroines of Enterprise: Post-recession media
46 representations of well-respected female-entrepreneurs. Working paper.

47
48
49
50 Nicholson, L., Anderson, A.R. (2005). News and nuances of the entrepreneurial
51 metaphor: linguistic games in entrepreneurial sense-making and sense-giving.
52 *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*; 29(2), pp.153-172.

53
54
55 Ogbor, J. (2000). Mythicizing and Reification in Entrepreneurial discourse: Ideology
56 critique of entrepreneurial studies, *Journal of Management Studies*; 37(5), pp.605-35.

1
2
3
4 O'Donnell, K.A. (1999). Good Girls Gone Bad: The Consumption of Fetish Fashion and
5 the Sexual Empowerment of Women, *Advances in Consumer Research*, **26**(1), pp.184-
6 189.
7

8
9 Pietz, W. (1985). The Problem of the Fetish, I, Res 9 (Spring), pp. 5-17.
10

11 Pietz, W. (1987). The Problem of the Fetish, II, Res 13 (Spring) pp. 23-45.
12

13 Polit, D. F., Beck, C. T. (2014). Essentials of nursing research: Appraising evidence for
14 nursing practice. Philadelphia, PA: Wolters Kluwer/Lippincott/Williams & Wilkins
15 Health.
16

17
18 Pritchard, K; Mackenzie-Davey, K., Cooper H (2016). Barbie and “the plastic
19 sexualisation of the entrepreneur”, Gender, Work and Organization Conference, Keele
20 June, 2016.
21

22
23 Radu, M., & Redien-Collot, R., (2008). The Social Representation of Entrepreneurs in
24 the French Press: Desirable and Feasible Models? *International Small Business Journal*,
25 **26**(3), pp. 259-298.
26

27
28
29 Reeves. M. (2010). *Women in Business: Theory, Case Studies, and Legal Challenges*.
30 London: Routledge.
31

32
33
34 Rheingold, H.L, Cook, K.V. (1975). The Contents of Boys and Girls Rooms as an index
35 of potential behaviour. *Child Development*, **46**(2), pp.459-456.
36

37
38
39 Rogers, M.F. (1999). *Barbie Culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
40

41 Rouse, J., Treanor, L., & Fleck, E. (2013). The gendering of entrepreneurship: theoretical
42 and empirical insights. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and*
43 *Research*, **19**(5), pp. 452-459.
44

45
46 Saguy, T., Quinn, D.M., Davido, J.F., Prato, F. (2010). Interacting Like a Body:
47 Objectification Can Lead Women to Narrow Their Presence in Social Interactions.
48 *Psychological Science*, **21**(2), pp. 178-82.
49

50
51 Sahlins. M. (1976). *Culture and Practical Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
52

53 Schiermer. B. (2011). Quasi-objects, Cult Objects and Fashion Objects
54 On Two Kinds of Fetishism on Display in Modern Culture. *Theory, Culture and Society*,
55 **28**(1).
56
57
58
59
60

Schouten, J.W., McAlexander, J.H. (1995). Subcultures of Consumption: An Ethnography of the New Bikers, *Journal of Consumer Research* 1, pp.43-61.

Schroeder, J.E. (2009). Fetishization, in W. Donsbach (ed.) *International Encyclopedia of Communication*, Volume 4, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, pp.1803-1808.

Schroeder, J.E. Borgerson, J.L. (2003). Dark Desires: Fetishism, Ontology, and Representation in Contemporary Advertising, in T. Reichert and J. Lambiase (eds.) *Sex in Advertising: Perspectives on the Erotic Appeal*, Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. pp.65-87.

Schroeder, J.E, Zwick, D. (2004). Mirrors of Masculinity: Representations and Identity in Advertising Images, *Consumption Markets and Culture*, 7(1), pp.21-52.

Shaw, E., Marlow, S., Lam, W., (2009). Gender and entrepreneurial capital: implications for firm performance", *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 1(1), pp.25-41.

Smith, R. (2009). The Diva Cycle as an Alternative Social Construction of Female Entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Gender*, 1(2), pp.148-163.

Smith, R., (2010). Masculinity, Doxa and the Institutionalisation of Entrepreneurial Identity in the Novel City Boy, *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Gender*, 2(1), pp.27-48.

Smith, R., (2012). Fashioning gendered entrepreneurial identities, *ISBE Enterprising Matters Magazine*, February Edition.

Smith, R., (2012). *Images, forms and presence outside and beyond the pink ghetto*, ISBE Dublin.

Smith, R. (2014). Images, forms and presence outside and beyond the pink ghetto, *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 29(8), pp.466-486.

Smith R. (2014). Assessing the contribution of the 'Theory of Matriarchy' to the Entrepreneurship and Family Business literatures. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Gender*. 6(3), pp.255-275.

Smith, R. (2014a). Images, Forms and Presence outside and beyond the Pink Ghetto. *Gender in Management*. 29(8), pp.466-486.

Spicer, A., Jones, C. (2009). *Unmasking the Entrepreneur*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

1
2
3 Spigel, L. (2001). Barbies without Ken: Femininity, Feminism, and the Art–Culture
4 System. In Spigel, L (Ed.) *Welcome to the Dream house: Popular media and postwar*
5 *suburbs*. London: Duke University Press.

6
7
8 Stcherbatcheff, B. (2010). *Confessions of a City Girl*. London: Virgin Books.

9
10
11 van der Hoort B, Guterstam A, Ehrsson H.H, (2011). Being Barbie: The Size of One's
12 Own Body Determines the Perceived Size of the World. *PLoS ONE*, 6(5).

13
14
15
16 Walkerdine, V. (2003). Reclassifying Upward Mobility: Femininity and the neo-liberal
17 subject. *Gender & Education*, 15(3).

18
19
20
21 Walsh, A. (2010) 'The Commodification of Fetishes: Telling the Difference Between
22 Natural and Synthetic Sapphires, *American Ethnologist*, 37(1), pp.98-114.

23 24 25 26 27 28 **End Notes**

29
30
31 ¹ The theory of Hegemonic masculinity recognises multiple masculinities that vary across time, culture and
32 the individual. Hegemonic masculinity is defined as the current configuration of practice that legitimises
33 men's dominant position in society and justifies the subordination of women. Conceptually, it explains how
34 and why men maintain dominant social roles over women, and other gender identities. The concept of
35 emphasised femininity revolves around the idea that women have to display an emphasised version of their
36 femininity to counter male displays of masculine hegemony. Both exaggerated concepts cause males and
37 females to act a certain way, or look a certain way.

38 ² Social representations result from perceptive and cognitive constructions of reality and transform social
39 objects (people, contexts, situations) into symbolic categories (values, beliefs, ideologies).

40 ³ Media representations 1) influence, whether women perceive entrepreneurship as desirable and attainable
41 and the impact entrepreneurial aspirations; and 2) shape how key stakeholders such as bankers or clients
42 view and interact with female business owners, thereby impacting women entrepreneurs' business relations
43 and opportunities.

44 ⁴ For a discussion of the concept of power blouses see [https://www.standard.co.uk/fashion/how-to-work-](https://www.standard.co.uk/fashion/how-to-work-the-gillian-anderson-power-blouse-8651814.html)
45 [the-gillian-anderson-power-blouse-8651814.html](https://www.standard.co.uk/fashion/how-to-work-the-gillian-anderson-power-blouse-8651814.html) but a power blouse is a silk, super-soft, perfectly pressed
46 blouse. Power blouses are associated with designer labels such as 'French label Equipment' or Calvin
47 Klein.

48 ⁵ We are minded of the work of Spicer and Jones (2005) and their notion of the sublime object of
49 entrepreneurship and the entrepreneur as an (phantasmic) object of desire.

50 ⁶ For an overview of the Barbie phenomenon see Lord (2004) and Gomez and Korine (2008).

51 ⁷ A meme is an element of culture or system of behaviour passed from one individual to another by
52 imitation or other non-genetic means.

53 ⁸ Nevertheless, it must be stressed that Bignall (1999) discusses adult porn sites associated with the Barbie
54 phenomenon. It would be easier to concentrate on this aspect for an SI such as this, but it is the fetishisation
55 of an idealised gendered identity that we are interested in. Of interest is what Bignell refers to as the
56 indeterminacy of Barbie's sexual identity i.e. the lack of nipples and female genitalia.

⁹ The lead author is a middle-aged male academic and the second and third authors are mature and experienced female academics. All are white and from working class backgrounds and collectively are well published in entrepreneurship research circles. All are senior academics – Professor, Reader and Senior Lecturer.

¹⁰ Please note that the analysis presented is that of the authors and that other academics from various disciplines may read the images differently.

¹¹ See <http://www.barbiemedia.com/designers.html> and the newspaper article - <https://www.theguardian.com/fashion/2015/aug/25/toy-trend-barbie-style-reboot-sophia-webster> for a fuller discussion of the phenomenon.

¹² <http://www.slideshare.net/Startupi/barbie-entrepreneur>

¹³ Bratz and Sindy dolls. They too have exaggerated features and stereotypical aspects.

¹⁴ White Anglo-Saxon Protestant.

¹⁵ Note that the Spice girls have their dolls too.

¹⁶ We had a 'spot-the-difference' moment.

¹⁷ Albeit. Mattel have in the past, acted paternally and protectively and have sued academics for disparaging its product by attempting to link it to eating disorders and potentially negative publicity.