

The deal:
**Gender, entrepreneurial
business and family life**

Dina Bowman

This thesis is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of
Philosophy

Department of Sociology
Faculty of Life and Social Sciences
Swinburne University of Technology

April 2008

Abstract

This study explores the interrelationship of business and family life. It examines how men and women as entrepreneurs, and as the spouses of entrepreneurs, account for their business and family lives. My findings suggest the persistence of deeply embedded beliefs about what men and women should do, especially as parents, despite institutional and structural change. These beliefs take the form of a gender-based 'deal' that frames the control and use of resources (money, time, space and care) that underpin engagement in business and family life.

Most of the male entrepreneurs in this study were intensely engaged in business and dipped in and out of family life. Belief in the deal enabled these entrepreneurial men to define the rules of resource use. They profited from the deal in that it enabled them to accumulate more economic capital while having a family. However, identifying the winners and losers of the deal is not straightforward. These men 'won' in business but for some, this came at the expense of their health and personal relationships.

The entrepreneurial men's belief in the deal shaped their wives' control and use of resources. Their wives accepted the terms of the deal because of their commitment to a particular form of mothering, their beliefs about family, the benefits of a privileged lifestyle, or because it seemed non-negotiable. Most argued that accepting the deal was their choice and an assertion of their commitment to nonmarket values. This locked them into dependency and denied them direct access to convertible forms of capital.

The female entrepreneurs managed their resources so that they could engage in both business and family life. They understood this as their choice. Most experienced intense social and personal pressure to comply with the terms of the deal as mothers and wives. Their economic capital meant that they could modify the deal but they did not – or could not – fundamentally challenge it.

The husbands admired and supported their entrepreneurial wives; they saw it as their wives' choice to engage in business. Some understood the shifts in power that resulted from their wives' wealth as an opportunity for greater involvement with their children, and for personal growth. None saw their entrepreneurial wives as providers.

Drawing on Bourdieu's concepts of field, capital, and habitus, this study suggests new ways of understanding how men and women compete for resources, which, in turn, affects their accumulation of various forms of capital.

Acknowledgements

Many people enriched and enabled this project. I would particularly like to thank:

- the men and women who generously shared their stories and insights
- my supervisor Professor Michael Gilding for his patience and critical encouragement
- my associate supervisor Dr Karen Farquharson for her clear-sighted and forthright comments
- my fellow students in Michael's post-grad group – the group meetings were an invaluable source of support and critical comment
- Dr Meg Carter for her support and generosity in reading my drafts and for helping me to articulate the nature of 'the deal'
- Christopher Baker for his comments and proofreading
- Mary-Jo O'Rourke for copy editing the final text; and
- Stephen, Felix, Sophie and Olympia for accommodating my uncomfortable obsession over the past few years.

Thank you.

Dina Bowman

April 2008.

Declaration

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award to the candidate of any other degree or diploma, except where due reference is made in the text of the thesis.

To the best of my knowledge it contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the text of the thesis.

This thesis has been professionally copy edited. This editing has addressed only the style and/or grammar of the thesis and not its substantive content. All errors and omissions are my own.

Dina Bowman

April 2008

Table of contents

Chapter one: Introduction	1
Structure of this thesis	2
Chapter two: Literature review	4
Overview	4
Understanding economic activity	4
Understanding entrepreneurial activity	6
Separate spheres	10
Resources, labour, gifts and relationships	14
Choice and bargaining	20
Understanding complexity	23
This study	26
Chapter three: Methodology	30
Overview	30
Research perspective	30
Research method	31
The sample	36
The interview process	42
Data analysis	44
Theory and practice	47
Limitations and suggestions for future research	49
Conclusion	50
Chapter four: The male entrepreneurs	51
Overview	51
The men	51
Business: Ideas and dispositions	52
Accounting for success	54
Family life: Ideas and dispositions	58

Contests and contradictions	65
Discussion and conclusions	77
Chapter five: The wives	80
Overview	80
The wives	80
Business: Ideas and dispositions	81
Accounting for success	85
Family: Ideas and dispositions	87
Contests and contradictions	92
Discussion and conclusions	104
Chapter six: The female entrepreneurs	108
Overview	108
The women	108
Business: Ideas and dispositions	109
Accounting for success	111
Family: Ideas and dispositions	115
Contests and contradictions	117
Copreneurs	130
Discussion and conclusions	136
Chapter seven: The husbands	139
Overview	139
The husbands	139
Business: Ideas and dispositions	139
Accounting for success	141
Family: Ideas and dispositions	143
Contests and contradictions	145
Discussion and conclusions	154
Chapter eight: Conclusions	157
Overview	157
Accounting for success	158
Accounting for family	160
The deal: Gender, entrepreneurial business and family life	161

Change and lack of change	162
Conclusions	165
References	167
Appendix	178
Interview schedules	178
List of publications produced as a result of the project	182

List of Tables

1	Interviewees	32
2	Selected characteristics of entrepreneurs – age	36
3	Selected characteristics of entrepreneurs – family background	37
4	Selected characteristics of entrepreneurs – education	37
5	Characteristics of entrepreneurs – family and children	38
6	Selected characteristics of businesses	39
7	Selected characteristics of spouses	42

Chapter one: Introduction

In the popular imagination, male entrepreneurs are often celebrated as individual heroes of the market. Some are also cast as family men. Popular representations of entrepreneurs' wives cast them as endlessly supportive, waiting patiently in the background. Occasionally, they are portrayed as gold-diggers. Female entrepreneurs are lionised as superwomen who combine market success with family life, while their husbands are understood as unusually progressive.

This study examines how men and women as entrepreneurs, and as the spouses of entrepreneurs, account for their business and family lives. It is based on 50 qualitative semi-structured interviews with entrepreneurs (20 men and 11 women) and their spouses (13 wives and 6 husbands). I explore how men and women draw on, reproduce, and challenge popular representations of entrepreneurial business and family life. The extent to which their accounts reflect the lived experiences and practices of the interviewees is unknown. Nevertheless, the accounts reveal something of their understandings of business and family and reflect the narrative frameworks on which they draw.

My findings suggest the persistence of deeply embedded beliefs about what men and women should do, especially as parents, despite institutional and structural change. These beliefs take the form of a gender-based 'deal'. The terms of this deal are that men should provide and that women should care. My findings suggest that belief in the deal frames the control and use of resources including money, time, space and care, which in turn enables the accumulation of further capital in its various forms. For the men and women in this study, this deal served as a reference point and a fallback position.

The deal assumes general agreement and defines reasonable or possible choices. In this study, the idea of 'choice' tended to be used by women, and by men in relation to women but belief in the deal precluded explicit negotiation for almost all of the men and women. While some interviewees expressed a desire to do things differently, the embedded nature of belief in the deal meant that it was difficult to challenge. The interviewees' accounts suggest that change occurs in the face of persistent underlying pressures to conform to gendered roles within the family and the market. Not surprisingly, perhaps, women as entrepreneurs were the primary change agents; the wives wanted change but most could not effect it. Men as entrepreneurs

were generally content with the deal, while the husbands of entrepreneurs cast change as a challenge and an opportunity for personal growth.

This thesis examines the ways in which broader social structures and discourses frame the lives of individuals. I argue that decisions about who engages in what kinds of work at what time are fundamentally about control and use of resources, particularly, money, time, space and care. These decisions reflect institutional, structural and cultural beliefs and understandings about the value of particular kinds of work and relationships. They reflect and reinforce power relations.

I draw on Pierre Bourdieu's concepts of field, habitus and forms of capital to analyse the processes that underpin the engagement of men and women in business and family life. I argue that individuals compete for positions of power within the fields of business and family. This does not necessarily mean that individuals consciously set out to exploit one another; indeed, individual desires and aspirations may coincide *or* conflict. Nevertheless, the extent to which one successfully gets – and keeps – whatever it is one wants depends on available forms of capital *and* one's understandings of what is reasonable, desirable and possible. These understandings are framed by one's embodied history and dispositions that interact with the 'particular forms of capital and particular narratives' and 'regulatory and coercive discourses' (Webb et al. 2002: 68) of the fields – and games – in which one is engaged.

By focusing on men and women as entrepreneurs and as spouses, I go beyond an analysis based solely on gender to identify the processes that implicitly frame the 'reasonable' choices individuals make. I argue that the gendered division of labour cannot be understood fully without understanding how economic and intimate activity and relationships interconnect. I also suggest new ways of understanding how men and women compete for resources, which, in turn, affects their accumulation of various forms of capital.

Structure of this thesis

The thesis consists of three main sections. The first three chapters lay the foundation of the thesis. In this chapter, I have briefly introduced my argument.

In the second chapter, the literature review, I describe the context for my research. I briefly discuss understandings of economic activity and entrepreneurship. I review research on work and family, domestic labour, and business and family life, which consistently identify money, time, space and ideologies of care as areas of conflict and contest. I then discuss the notions of choice, negotiation and strategic bargaining, which are important concepts in both economics and sociology. Feminist

theorists and researchers increasingly use Bourdieu's conceptual framework as a means of bridging the gap between agency and structure. In this chapter, I introduce my use of his concepts. I suggest that Bourdieu's concepts of field, habitus and capital can enable a more nuanced analysis of the competition for the resources that underpin the accumulation of various forms of capital. Bourdieu's concepts are useful because he understands that individuals have 'contradictory goals' and 'conflicting pressures' (Townsend 2002: 3). The use of his concepts enables an analysis that highlights how power structures are imposed on and incorporated in individuals. In the final part of this chapter, I situate my research and explain my focus on entrepreneurs and their spouses.

In the third chapter, I focus on this study's methodology. I discuss the research method, my perspective as a researcher, the origins of the study, the sample, and consider the application of Bourdieu's concepts to this research. I make recommendations for further research, consider the limitations of this study and assess its contributions.

The second section of the thesis, comprising four chapters, reports on the findings of this study. In chapters four, five, six and seven, I focus respectively on men as entrepreneurs, their wives, women as entrepreneurs, and their husbands. These chapters have similar frameworks and each is organised around five sections. First, I introduce the interviewees. I briefly explore their dispositions towards and understandings of business success, their pathways to entrepreneurial business, and their success stories. I then examine their dispositions towards and understandings of family life. In the fourth section, I examine the contests and contradictions around money, time, space, and care. In the fifth and final section of each chapter, I draw some conclusions on the findings.

In the final chapter, I draw together the findings of this study to make some broader conclusions.

Chapter two: Literature review

Overview

In this chapter, I describe the context for my research. I briefly discuss understandings of economic activity and entrepreneurship. I review research on work and family, domestic labour, and business and family life, which consistently identify money, time, space and ideologies of care as areas of conflict and contest. I then discuss choice, negotiation and strategic bargaining, which are important concepts in both economics and sociology. Bourdieu's conceptual framework provides a useful means of bridging the gap between agency and structure. In this chapter, I introduce my use of his concepts. In the final part of this chapter, I situate my research and explain my focus on entrepreneurs and their spouses.

Understanding economic activity

In her book *Economics for humans*, the US economist Julie Nelson refers to a 'very old definition of economics' as being 'about the provisioning of goods and services to meet our material needs' (2006: 1). She suggests that economics is about how we use our time and money to provide for ourselves. Importantly, this simple definition encompasses both paid *and* unpaid effort and is embodied rather than abstract. Mainstream neo-classical economics takes a much narrower view of economic activity. This narrow view ignores nonmarket work and emphasises rational self-interest.

The idea of economic activity as market work is historically situated. As Nelson points out, understanding of the economy as 'mechanistic' and 'amoral' has '*particular* historical roots' (2006: 7, italics in original). Classical economics developed as a response to the social and technological changes that took place during the industrial revolution. The 'father' of mainstream classical economics, Adam Smith, sought to understand the processes of wealth creation and the ways in which society provided people with the 'necessaries and conveniences of life' (Smith, cited in Nelson 2006: 10). Smith argued that the free market, made up of self-interested individuals, promotes general economic well-being. However, Smith was 'also well aware that interests other than self-interest drive the individual' (Swedberg 2003: 3). Indeed, the US economist Nancy Folbre (2001) observes that Smith's argument was based on his assumption that people are fundamentally *unselfish*. Despite this, the notion of the self-

interested individual captured the imagination of theorists, and became the basis of mainstream western economic thought.

The development of separate disciplines within the social sciences saw a division of different aspects of life between economics and sociology (Friedland and Robertson 1990; Granovetter 1990; Swedberg 2003). Accounts of the splitting of economics and sociology describe fiercely fought academic turf battles. As a discipline, sociology retreated from a focus on economic and political aspects of life and focused instead on 'such unclaimed subjects as the family' (Granovetter 1990: 89). Meanwhile, mainstream neo-classical economics focused on the market and self-interest, rational choice, and the independent, rational individual who is unconstrained by 'the typically complex reality of everyday life' (May 2006: 630). The development of distinct disciplines focusing on different aspects of life reinforced the belief that economic and non-economic activity occur in separate spheres. This belief is compounded by the pervasiveness of neo-classical economic thought which obscures that economics is, as Bourdieu suggests, 'embedded in a particular society ... rooted in a system of belief or values [and that] an *economic common sense*, [is] linked ... to the social and cognitive structures of a particular social order' (2005: 10, italics in original). Over the past fifteen years or so, feminist economics has challenged the bias of mainstream economic thought that highlights market activity and independence and ignores interdependence and nonmarket activities and relations. However, mainstream economics has largely ignored these critiques (Ferber and Nelson 2003: viii).

Since the 1980s, there has been a revival of interest in economic sociology, which Neil Smelser and Richard Swedberg define as 'the sociological perspective applied to economic phenomena' (2005: 3). In this definition, economic phenomena are those concerned with 'the production, distribution, exchange and consumption of scarce goods and services' (Smelser and Swedberg 2005: 3). Like much of mainstream neo-classical economics, economic sociology has focused on the market. Nelson notes that economists 'use the term "nonmarket" to describe work that is not directly paid for and therefore difficult to put a price on' (2001: xi). By largely overlooking nonmarket work and resources, economic sociology has tended to reproduce the gender bias of mainstream economics. Indeed, some sociologists suggest that economic sociology has 'even narrower topical boundaries than economics' (England and Folbre 2005: 629). Like feminist economists, feminist sociologists (England and Folbre 2005, Milkman and Townsley 1994, Zelizer 2002) have argued for a broader perspective on economic activity. They advocate an economic sociology that examines both the market and nonmarket. Nevertheless,

mainstream economic sociology, like mainstream economics, still tends to accept a sharp distinction between market and nonmarket activities, paid and unpaid work, and public and private spheres. For many economists and sociologists, the economy *is* the market and activities that take place outside the market are 'non-economic'.

Understanding entrepreneurial activity

Interest in entrepreneurship has fluctuated over time, since Richard Cantillon's (1755) influential *Essay on the nature of commerce* introduced the word 'entrepreneur' into the study of economics (Jennings 1994: 63). Cantillon understood entrepreneurs to be the bearers of risk in uncertain conditions. In his view, beggars and thieves were entrepreneurs due to the uncertainty of their income (Jennings 1994: 37). Adam Smith cited Cantillon's work in his *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations*, but there is some debate about whether Smith used the concept of entrepreneurship (Formaini 2001: 3–4). In any case, the classical school of British economic thought that grew from Smith's work largely ignored the concept of entrepreneurship (Formaini 2001), and both classical and mainstream neo-classical economics – with the important exceptions of Knight and Schumpeter – have generally disregarded the role of entrepreneurs in the economy (Granovetter 1990: 105).

An interest in the study of entrepreneurs has re-emerged over the past few decades within sociology and the field of entrepreneurship research. Swedberg (2004: 8) suggests that the 'main novelty' in recent economic sociology relates to entrepreneurship. He highlights the work of two US scholars, Mark Granovetter and AnnaLee Saxenian, as being influential in the development of sociology of entrepreneurship. Granovetter (1985) emphasises the importance of understanding economic activity as embedded in structures of social relations and Saxenian (1994) focuses on how social structures shape the exchange of information, innovation and economic development.

The emerging sociology of entrepreneurship examines the individual and social processes involved in and stemming from entrepreneurial activity (Swedberg 2004: 8). The relatively new field of entrepreneurship research has a quite different approach. It has its roots in business and management studies, but grows out of psychology, economics and sociology (Thornton 1999: 34). Entrepreneurship research tends to focus on the individual and the processes by which he (usually he) achieves entrepreneurial success.

Entrepreneurship research has developed around four major areas of interest, which reflect historical economic fluctuations (Landstrom 2005: 13–31). The first

research focus developed from administration and political science and centred on the Austrian school of economics (Landstrom 2005). Influential researchers included Ludwig von Mises (1881–1973), Friedreich von Hayek (1899–1992), and Israel Kirzner (1930–). This research emphasises the role of the entrepreneur in the market and focuses on individual characteristics and behaviours such as risk-taking.

The second area of research interest grew out of the Austrian tradition (Landstrom 2005). It centred on the US and economists such as Joseph Schumpeter (1883–1950) and Frank Knight (1885–1972). Innovation was the key to entrepreneurship for Schumpeter. He defined innovation as ‘the doing of new things or the doing of things that are already being done in a new way’ (Schumpeter 1947: 151). This research focus has been extremely influential. As Helene Ahl observes, ‘Schumpeter’s (1934/1983) *The theory of economic development* ... is, in spite of its age, by far the most cited work about entrepreneurship, even among contemporary writers’ (2006: 599). Knight’s (1921) *Risk, uncertainty and profit* is the second most cited work on entrepreneurship (Ahl 2006). He built on Cantillon’s work to emphasise entrepreneurs’ role in exploiting ‘the inherent, absolute unpredictability of things’ (Knight 1921: Part III, Chapter X, paragraph 33).

The third area of entrepreneurship research grew out of behavioural science and psychology and reflected a shift in focus from understanding entrepreneurship to understanding how to develop entrepreneurial skills and attributes (Landstrom 2005). David McClelland (1961) was a key researcher in this area. His work spearheaded a large body of research that sought to identify characteristics and motivations of entrepreneurs. These characteristics included a high need for achievement, an internal locus of control, a propensity and tolerance for risk, tolerance for ambiguity, over-optimism, and a desire for autonomy (see Lambing and Khuel 2000 for a good overview of this literature). The traits identified by this research became so numerous that it led Tom Gartner to observe that ‘Who is an entrepreneur? is the wrong question’ (1989).

The fourth focus of research interest developed in the late 1970s when there was a resurgence of interest in entrepreneurship and its role in job creation (Landstrom 2005). David Birch’s influential report *The job creation process* (1979) highlighted the role of small new firms in creating employment. Birch distinguished between ‘mice’ (the self-employed who were not interested in growth), ‘elephants’ (large firms) and ‘gazelles’ (fast growth oriented entrepreneurial ventures). This research led to a research focus on the role of small firms and networks. These four areas of research

interest continue to be influential within the study of entrepreneurship and have shaped how entrepreneurship is defined.

Regardless of the definition, the archetypal entrepreneur within entrepreneurship studies is male. Entrepreneurial activity has long been associated with a particular form of masculinity that is tough, hard, and unforgiving as Collins and Moore's classic description of the 'enterprising man' suggests:

As a group, they do not have the qualities of patience, understanding, and charity many of us may admire and wish for in our fellows. This is understandable. In the long and trying way of the entrepreneur, such qualities may come to be so much excess baggage. What is necessary to the man who travels this way is great imagination, fortitude, and hardness of purpose ... The men who travel the entrepreneurial way are, taken in balance, not remarkably likeable people ... As any one of them might say in the vernacular of the world of the entrepreneur, 'Nice guys don't win'. (cited in Ogbor 2000: 617)

This image of entrepreneurial masculinity corresponds closely with the idea of 'economic man' who is characterised by self-interest, indifference, detachment, independence, rationality and, as Maria Agren and Amy Louise Erickson suggest, risk-taking (2005: 121). Indeed, RW Connell suggests the 'individual of neo-liberal theory' has 'the attributes and the interests of a male entrepreneur' (2000: 51).

Both academic research and popular business literature reinforce and reflect the idea of the hard and fast male entrepreneur (Ahl 2006; Mulholland 1996). Connell observes that our understanding of the attitudes and practices of entrepreneurs tends to come from 'management literature, business journalism, corporate self-promotion, and from studies of local business elites' (2000: 52). Accordingly, our understanding of entrepreneurial masculinity may reflect its portrayal more than its practice. Profiles of individual heroic entrepreneurs reinforce and perpetuate entrepreneurial myths, which 'necessarily bypass the reality and balance of real working lives' (Nicholson and Anderson 2005: 166). In so doing, entrepreneurship literature obscures 'the links between individual activity and resources' including access to economic capital, education, support and 'other forms of help, such as family labour – women's labour in particular' (Mulholland 2003: 15). It also stereotypes men by emphasising a particular form of masculinity (Ahl 2006: 613).

In mainstream entrepreneurship research, gender is considered relevant only when it relates to women, who are cast in opposition to the norm of male entrepreneurship (Ahl 2006, 2002; Lewis 2006). There is a growing research focus on gender and entrepreneurs (Bruni et al. 2005, 2004; Fischer et al. 1993; Greene et al. 2003; Greer and Greene 2003), but the study of female entrepreneurs remains a niche area of study (Ahl 2006). Attention remains focused on the differences between men and women as entrepreneurs even though research suggests that men and women, as *entrepreneurs*, have more similarities than differences. Women's entrepreneurial activity is often characterised as 'small business' and 'no growth' (Ahl 2006, Brush et al. 2006, Langowitz and Morgan 2003). However, Birley (1989) found that entrepreneurial women have similar motivations to those of men and are interested in growth, and Watson et al. (2006) found that, even though female-owned businesses may have different patterns of business growth, they have similar growth outcomes to those of male-owned businesses. They argue that the common assumption that female-owned businesses are not interested in growth is due, in part, to the greater number of male-owned and -controlled businesses. Moreover, they suggest that the business growth of female-owned businesses in Australia is misrepresented, because debt is often used as an indicator of growth, and women tend to minimise debt and fund business growth from equity.

Many authors suggest that women become entrepreneurs in response to discriminatory and inflexible labour markets (see, for example, Weiler and Bernasek 2001). In the study of entrepreneurship, 'work-family balance' is seen as a 'woman's issue' (Greene et al. 2003: 10) and researchers still tend to understand women's business 'as secondary and complementary to both male-owned businesses and [women's] primary responsibility, the family' (Ahl 2006: 605). Some recent entrepreneurship research has recognised the importance of the family in providing human, cultural and social capital (Aldrich et al. 2002; Berger 1991; Crosa et al. 2002, Light and Gold 2000; Renzulli et al. 2000), but the family still tends to be considered as 'women's business'. An important exception is the work of Howard Aldrich and Jennifer Cliff (2003) who not only highlight the importance of the family to entrepreneurial business, but also recognise the effect of entrepreneurial business on the family. They argue that the success or otherwise of the business 'can affect an entrepreneurial family's resources, potentially trigger certain family transitions, and ultimately even change family members' norms, attitudes and values' (Aldrich and Cliff 2003: 574). Their work has created some interest in what is known as the 'family embeddedness' approach. Interest in this perspective remains limited and the emphasis of research is

on the effect of the family on business, rather than the other way around (see, for example, Craig et al. 2007; Craig and Lindsay 2002; Parvinen and Mattsson 2005).

Research that explores the effect of business activity on the family tends to focus on the negative effects of business on women, especially as wives. This kind of research reflects the relative powerlessness of women within the family. For example, Belinda Fehlberg's legal research examined how wives of entrepreneurs may be exposed to financial risk and suffer the consequences of 'sexually transmitted debt' (1997). Supriya Singh's (1995) research highlighted not only wives' lack of awareness about their husbands' business risk-taking but also their 'informed powerlessness' where they felt unable to influence decisions even if they were aware of business activities. Where couples are in business together, research suggests this sense of powerlessness persists. For example, Kathy Marshack (1998, 1994) found that despite popular media representations of copreneurs¹ as egalitarian partners in business and family life, copreneurial couples tend to be stereotypically 'traditional'. Her research suggests that copreneurs' roles and responsibilities are shaped by deeply held beliefs about gender combined with women's belief in the importance of avoiding conflict. Marshack argues that these beliefs reinforced gendered roles and inequalities both in business and in the domestic sphere. More recent research by Elizabeth Larsen also suggests that a belief in the importance of avoiding conflict shaped the roles and responsibilities of married couples in the family business, and led to 'gendered tasks and workspaces' (2006: 360) which reinforced gendered hierarchies within the business.

Entrepreneurship research, like mainstream neo-classical economics and much of sociology, has been deeply influenced by the belief that the market is separate from and more important than the domestic sphere. The understanding that economic activity only occurs in the market is historically situated and gendered. As research on the intersections of business and family life suggests, it is also misleading.

Separate spheres

Connell observes that 'the contemporary division between 'work and home' is quite recent and is well documented' (2005: 370). Industrialisation physically separated 'work' from home by locating 'work' in factories and offices rather than at home, and by creating a 'work day'. This separation contrasted with 'earlier patterns, which interspersed work and family life' (Williams 2001: 31). As Davidoff and Hall (1987) point

¹ A neologism, which refers to couples who are in business together (Barnett and Barnett 1988).

out, the separation of public and private spheres was neither universal nor complete because middle-class homes relied on the labour of working-class men and women as servants. Nevertheless, over time, men's engagement in the market came to be seen as individual and almost heroic (Connell 2005; Williams 2001), while women's domestic contributions came to be understood as manifestations of 'care' rather than work.

The cultural association of men with market activities and women with nonmarket activities has profound effects on how men and women understand themselves in relation to the market and to the family. As Connell puts it, 'masculinities and femininities are constituted by women's relationship with the domestic and men's relationship with the economy' (2005: 371). With industrialisation, the market institutionalised particular forms of masculinity (Connell 2005: 188). The US legal scholar Joan Williams argues that the market became a proving ground for men, so that 'manhood became contingent on success in market work' (2001: 25). Women's domestic labour and support underpinned and enabled men's market work (Davidoff and Hall 1987; Williams 2001). But this was obscured by the ideology of domesticity which 'created a symbolic world ... divided into a private sphere of selfless women and a public sphere of market actors pursuing their own self-interest' (Williams 2001: 31). The idea of separate spheres reinforced, and continues to reinforce, ideas and practices about masculinity and femininity both in the market and in the family. The idea of separate spheres did not just divide the spheres, as Connell points out, 'the domestic was *subordinated* to the public. Modern capitalist society is thus marked by a structural subordination of women, rather than by the direct personal power of individual men over individual women' (2005: 371, emphasis added). It is also marked by a subordination of the nonmarket to the market.

The ideology of domesticity was instrumental in recasting the family as 'primarily an emotional rather than an economic unit' (Williams 2001: 23). Maternal attention was – and continues to be – an important feature of the ideology of domesticity. According to this ideology, families need privacy and 'large amounts of parental [especially maternal] attention' (Williams 2001: 23). As more women participated in the market, women as mothers became caught between conflicting ideologies. As Sharon Hays puts it, to be a 'good' mother one needs to stay at home and 'be there' for the children; but to do so is to pay 'the price of being treated as an outsider in the larger public world of the market' (1996: 149). She suggests that the power of the ideology of intensive mothering is so strong that, even where women engage with the market, they pay 'the price of an impossible double shift' (1996: 149) where they attempt to carry the full load of family and domestic care as well as their

market work. In this way, the ideology of intensive mothering means that neither 'good' mothers who stay at home and focus on their children, nor mothers who engage in market activity, can ever 'get it right' (Hays 1996: 149).

Belief in the importance of 'good' mothering is widespread. The UK sociologist Simon Duncan suggests that, 'conventional understandings of good mothering ... transcend class differences' (2003: 20), but the *practice* of 'good mothering' depends on an individual's class, ethnicity, and social background. Duncan's study suggests that while women may share a commitment to being a 'good mother', they do not necessarily share the same understanding of what that is. He found that, for some women, engagement with the market and paid work was an expression of their commitment to good mothering, while for other women 'being there' for their children was primarily important. Deirdre Johnston and Debra Swanson observe that we live 'in an era of contested motherhood ideologies' (2006: 509). Whatever their differences, these ideologies have a shared belief in the central importance of the mother-child relationship and tend to ignore 'fathers and coparents' (Johnston and Swanson 2006: 518). These mother-child ideologies are reinforced by the strong association of fathering with providing or 'breadwinning'. As Nicholas Townsend observes, 'providing is something that men do as *fathers*' (2002: 129, original emphasis).

In twentieth century Australia, a strong male dominated trade union tradition, legal recognition of male breadwinning status and a regulated economy entrenched the idea and the practice of the male breadwinner (Hearn 2006). The *idea* of separate spheres (market/nonmarket, work/family) persists in the face of changes to the market and shifting ideas about the family. As a result, women as mothers are caught between ideologies and expectations, and are confronted by the cultural contradictions that Hays (1996) described. At the same time, men are locked into roles as providers even when they may want to be more engaged fathers (Townsend 2002).

'Work and family' literature specifically addresses the intersection of the market and domestic sphere but implicitly understands work and family as separate rather than interconnected. This literature tends to highlight the ways in which individuals – especially women – are caught between the demands of the market and the domestic sphere, which they need to choose between (Hakim 2001) or balance (Black 2005; Blunt 2004; Tom 2004). The idea of work/family balance obscures the 'seamless messy whole' (Pocock 2003: 15) of daily life, which cannot be neatly separated and balanced, or juggled (Armstrong 2006). It also masks the gendered division of market and nonmarket activities and relations. As Connell puts it:

the idea of 'work/life balance' is a conservative expression of a radical impulse ... for ... gender equality ... This impulse is expressed as a demand for 'balance' because of the impossibility of realizing equality within an institutional system that subordinates home to economy. (2005: 378)

Understanding the market as separate from the domestic sphere pervades research in economics, sociology, entrepreneurship and business. These disciplines tend to focus on one sphere and ignore the other(s). The US sociologist Viviana Zelizer's work is an exception. Her research highlights the interpenetrations of the market and nonmarket (2005, 2000b). In her review of economic and sociological research, she identifies three main approaches to understanding intimate and economic activities and relations. The first and most common approach is to see separate spheres as 'hostile worlds'. This view understands the market as inherently corrupting while the nonmarket or domestic sphere is seen as inherently caring but susceptible to corruption by 'the invading, predatory, economic world' (2000b: 3). Importantly, in this view the risk of corruption runs both ways: the market can contaminate personal relations just as 'intimacy can also contaminate rational economic behaviour' (2000b: 23). Theorists such as Hochschild (2003) and Folbre (2001) who are concerned about the commercialisation of intimate relations could be described as adopting this kind of approach.

The second approach described by Zelizer is what she calls the 'nothing but' analysis, which understands 'the mingling of economic activity and intimacy' as 'nothing but another version of normal market activity, nothing but a form of cultural expression, or nothing but an exercise of power' (2000a: 21). This approach encompasses the work of materialist feminists such as Christine Delphy and Diane Leonard (1992), and economists such as Gary Becker (1993, 1981). Zelizer suggests that these 'nothing but' analyses are an improvement on the 'hostile worlds' analysis because they acknowledge the role of economic activity, power and culture in intimate relations. Nevertheless, she suggests that the 'nothing but' explanations do not adequately explain the variety of the interactions between 'economic transactions and intimate relations' (2005: 32).

She advocates a third approach, which she calls a 'connected lives' analysis. This approach attempts to understand the intersections of economic activity and interpersonal relations. Zelizer argues that '[m]oney cohabits regularly with intimacy, and even sustains it' (2000a: 28) and suggests that we are all 'constantly negotiating

appropriate matches between our intimate relations and crucial economic activities' (2005: 30). She does not define how matches may be 'appropriate'. However, she does recognise that 'some negotiated matches involve injustice, cruelty, damage, or confusion' which she explains as being the result of 'improper uses of power' rather than the mix of 'personal relations with economic activity' (2005: 307). In a more recent article, she responds to criticisms of her argument and emphasises the importance of understanding *how* power works in the interrelationships of intimacy and economic activity. As she puts it, 'analysts should worry less about the pernicious effects of mixing markets with intimacy, and instead concentrate on identifying the processes that generate unfairness and exploitation' (Zelizer 2007: 12). One such process revolves around competition over resources that underpin economic and intimate activities and relations.

Resources, labour, gifts and relationships

Research on female entrepreneurship, family and business, work and family, and domestic labour consistently identifies money, time, space, and care as areas of conflict and contest. These intertwined aspects of life are often understood in terms of the labour used to produce them, the relationships that frame them, as gifts or as resources that can be used and exploited.

Money

Money is readily understood as a fundamental resource. In a capitalist society, money underpins market and nonmarket activity. Money is powerful both as a means of control and as a symbol of control (Wilson 1999: 88). Importantly, money enables the control and use of other resources. For many, the statement that money can buy time or space is unremarkable, but the idea that money can buy love is abhorrent. The 'separate spheres and hostile worlds' approach (Zelizer 2005) understands money and intimacy as opposites. According to this view, financial calculations endanger intimate relations and marrying for money negates the possibility of a 'meaningful relationship' (Zelizer 2005: 23). This view is gendered, in that it disproportionately affects women and girls. As Singh points out, '[f]or women, more than men, the central dilemma of modern life in Western countries is how to manage committed personal and family relationships on the one hand and financial independence on the other' (1997: 155).

In her study of marriage and money, Singh (1997: 73) found that couples developed strategies to manage the conflicts between competing beliefs. These strategies were similar to those identified by Michael Bittman and Frances Lovejoy

(1993) in their study of domestic labour. The strategies included ignoring money, trivialising it as unimportant, blurring the contributions through pooling of income and expenditure, and understanding money within the marriage as different from 'market money' (Singh 1997: 73–74). 'Marriage money' was understood as 'collective, cooperative and nebulous' as opposed to the 'individual, contractual and calculable' money of the market (1997:73–74). Her identification of different kinds of monies – 'marriage money' and 'market money' – each with its own meaning, value and gender emphasises the fundamental importance of recognising both economic and sociological perspectives.

Other more recent research on the changing patterns of couples' money-management, such as that done by Vogler et al. (2006) identifies class-based trends in marriage money-management. They suggest that despite the widespread belief that marriage should be a partnership, the idea of the man as breadwinner persists – especially among the 'working or intermediate classes' (2006: 477). Vogler et al. observe that a move towards greater equality in money-management is 'mainly confined to younger, middle-class, childless, cohabiting couples, and cohabiting mothers' (2006: 477). Their findings suggest that, by ignoring the unequal earning power of men and women, couples' money-management strategies reinforce the inequalities of the market by transferring them to the domestic sphere. In this way, domestic money-management strategies, whether or not they are explicit, reflect and reinforce relations of power both within the family and within the market.

Time

Like money, time is a socially constructed and contested resource (Bittman et al. 2003; Gershuny et al. 1994; Perrons et al. 2005; Urry 2000). As a resource, time is fundamentally different from money because time cannot be accumulated for later use (Blunsdon et al. 2006). However, to some extent, money can buy time. Buying time effectively means using other people's time, so that one can use one's own time as one chooses. In this sense, time use is linked to power. Jarvis (2004) observes that our use of time is subject to four kinds of constraint. The first is biological: our time use is shaped by our physical needs to sleep, eat and so on. Second, regulatory frameworks and social expectations shape how individuals spend time at different stages of life. Third, structural and physical constraints, such as the availability of transport and childcare, affect our use of time. Finally, social and cultural expectations of gender roles, especially around parenting, operate as a constraint on time use. All four forms

of constraint – biological, regulatory and social, structural and physical, and social and cultural – are interconnected and gendered.

The interconnections of constraint are exemplified by the ‘breadwinner/housewife’ model of work, which relies on dividing the day into ‘work’ and ‘non-work’ time and physically separating different forms of work (Connell 2005; Davidoff and Hall 1987; Williams 2001). The idea of separate time and space for ‘work’ and ‘non-work’ has persisted, even though the separation was – and continues to be – imperfect (Davidoff and Hall 1987; Mirchandani 1998; Saleff 2002) and shifting (Abbott 2005; Gilding 1991; Jarvis 2004; Sheller and Urry 2003). The widespread belief in the importance of sharing domestic work and childcare (Bittman and Lovejoy 1993; Bittman and Pixley 1997) is not reflected in practice (Bittman and Pixley 1997; McMahan 1999; Pocock 2003; Probert 2002; Squire and Tilly 2007) and women continue to carry the ‘second shift’ that Hochschild (1989) described (Sex Discrimination Unit, HREOC 2005). Time use is not a simple matter of choice. Rather, it is closely connected to power relations (Blunsdon et al. 2006). Connell argues that ‘time and time management is a first-class gender justice issue’ (2005: 375). But as Folbre and Bittman observe, ‘we have more experience accounting for money than we do for time’ (2004: preface). The association of money with time frames our understanding of time; so that time spent earning money is seen as worth more than other time. Understanding time as a resource highlights contests over its use (Blunsdon et al. 2006; Jarvis 2004) and can reveal the different ways time is understood – and valued – within the market and nonmarket (Folbre and Bittman 2004).

Space

Space and time are inextricably intertwined. Sheller and Urry suggest that there are now ‘multiple publics’ and ‘multiple privates’ (2003: 108). Technological and regulatory changes have led to more ‘flexible’ work practices and have eroded the physical separation of work and home for many workers. Some researchers see this process as positive because ‘the physical merging of work and family sphere promises to ease the “time bind”’ (Saleff 2002: 467), but much depends on the nature of the work, the basis on which working at home is done, and who is doing the work. Kiran Mirchandani’s study focused on two contradictory representations of home-based work in the popular press and academic literature, which promote the idea of the flexibility of home-based work and at the same time suggest that successful home-based work relies on keeping ‘work and non-work spheres separate’ (Mirchandani 2000: 167). For the home-based workers in her study, flexibility enabled an integration of family and

market work but also resulted in extremely long working hours. This ‘flexibility’ did not challenge the gendered expectations of domestic and family care work. The women in her study remained responsible for family and domestic care work in addition to their paid work; hence, the emphasis on keeping ‘work’ and ‘non-work’ separate.

Intense engagement in the market also shapes control and use of the domestic space. Kate Mulholland argues that entrepreneurial men’s work activity is ‘so pervasive that it invades and colonises ... domestic life’ (2003: 111). At the same time, she suggests that their ‘[a]bsence from home is a central part of the construction of masculinity and business for men’ (2003: 118). Being absent reinforces the notion of the separate spheres. For entrepreneurial men the home is a refuge from the market, which provides ‘an uncluttered environment and a space for “thinking time”’ (Mulholland 2003: 122). Accordingly, she suggests, these men ‘have a particular interest in the way wifely work is performed’ in that they want the home to provide a refuge and a haven (2003: 122). Other research suggests that female entrepreneurs – especially married women – experience the domestic sphere in a quite different way from male entrepreneurs, because the domestic sphere brings ‘role conflict’ and work demands for women rather than peace and quiet (Loscocco and Leicht in Greene et al. 2003).

Expectations about the control and use of space are gendered. Women are expected to ‘be there’ as wives and mothers, whereas men are able to fulfil their roles and responsibilities as husbands and fathers by being absent from the domestic sphere. Mulholland argues that men’s absence from home shapes their families’ use and experience of space, time and care. She suggests that women cover for their husbands’ absence from the family by relieving them of ‘the demands of fathering’ (2003: 118) and dealing with their children’s – and their own – disappointments. For entrepreneurial men, absence from home is seen as a sacrifice and, in this way, Mulholland (2003) suggests, these men are able to be ‘family men’ despite being absent from the domestic sphere. How men and women control and use space reflects and reinforces power relations. Understanding space as a resource makes the nature of these contests more clear.

Care

Care can encompass ‘caring for’ and ‘caring about’ (Nakano Glenn 2000). ‘Caring for’ includes the work of caring such as domestic labour, childcare, and other family and domestic tasks, while ‘caring about’ includes emotional engagement, intimacy and support. These different aspects of care are often conflated. For example, Hochschild defines care as:

an emotional bond, usually mutual, between caregiver and cared for, a bond in which the caregiver feels responsible for others' well being and does mental, emotional, and physical work in the course of fulfilling that responsibility. Thus, care *of* a person implies care *about* him or her. (2003: 214, original emphasis)

Notwithstanding concerns about the encroachment of market values into intimate life, it is important to recognise that care and intimacy do not necessarily coincide. As Zelizer (2005) rightly points out, intimate relations may not be caring, just as caring relations may not be intimate. Care and market activity are related. Care underpins market activity, which, in turn, resources care. But as Paula England observes, 'until recently' there was a tacit assumption in economic theory that men provide and women care. The effect of this assumption was that care 'remained invisible' (England 2003: 45).

Within sociology, there is a sense of unease about the encroachment of market values into the nonmarket and the commercialisation of intimate relations (for example, Folbre 2001; Hochschild 2003). Care is often understood as a gift (Hochschild 2003) that is given within the context of intimate reciprocal relationships that are not the site of economic activity. UK sociologist Anthony Giddens (1999, 1992) suggests that the family has changed from being primarily an economic institution to one that is characterised by equality, intimacy and choice. He argues that individuals can now choose to 'couple' and 'uncouple' depending on their satisfaction with the relationship. For Giddens, emotional communication and intimacy form the basis of couple-relationships and 'the rewards derived from such communication are the main basis for the relationship to continue' (1999: [4]). Giddens' ideas have been criticised for overstating the extent to which change has taken place and 'failing to distinguish the experiences of lived lives from views of how they should be lived' (Jamieson 1999: 480). Nevertheless, Giddens is right in highlighting changed expectations of family relationships.

Discourses of egalitarian intimate relationships both obscure and intensify the economic nature of family relationships. Margrit Eichler (1981) argues that non-economic resources, such as the means to fulfil another's emotional needs are important sources of power within relationships, but she acknowledges that such power is 'precarious at best' (1981: 215). Jean Duncombe and Dennis Marsden suggest that the ability to provide or withhold emotional intimacy is a form of power that adheres to men, and is reinforced by their emotional engagement in paid work. In turn, this intense

engagement with the market results in an emotional distance from their wives. In this way, men's economic and structural power, combined with an unequal investment in intimacy, make 'women more emotionally vulnerable' (Duncombe and Marsden 1995: 161). Women's investment in intimate relationships may also be at the expense of engagement with the market, which consequently intensifies their economic dependency and vulnerability. Duncombe and Marsden recognise the interconnectedness of intimate and economic relations and argue that a sociological examination of intimacy 'must be firmly located in the context of wider gender inequalities of economic and political power' (1995: 154). They suggest that 'a commitment to 'being in love' or 'loving' blocks out perceptions of exploitation' for women (Duncombe and Marsden 1995: 163). Women adopt strategies similar to those described by Singh (1997) in relation to money-management, and Bittman and Pixley (1997) in relation to housework, to manage the gap between their belief in what a relationship 'should be' and its reality. Duncombe and Marsden draw on Hochschild's concepts of 'emotion work' and the 'cover story' to argue that women 'collude with male power by living the family "myth" and "playing the couple game"' (1995: 162). They suggest that women only reveal their true feelings of dissatisfaction when they no longer 'care enough to undertake any emotional cover-up' (1995: 163). The idea of family myths or cover stories are useful in identifying discourses that frame individuals' understandings – 'the rules of the game' – but this does not necessarily mean that these individuals have false consciousness as Duncombe and Marsden suggest. Other explanations for the use of cover stories may include a desire to present well to the interviewer, and an awareness of the unacceptability of any economic motivation in an intimate relationship.

Cultural discourses around the market and masculinity and women and care obscure the interrelationships of care and the market. Caring is not confined to the family or domestic sphere. Mulholland (2003: 130) argues that the gendered consumption and production of care is obscured by the 'discourses of workaholism [and] 'family man''. She argues that entrepreneurial men are able to invest their emotional resources in business because their wives nurture and emotionally support them and 'compensate for their [husbands'] poor emotional performance as "family men"' (2004: 116). Where the pursuit of wealth and business success is valued, there is little incentive for men to change this arrangement. Men's engagement with the market is also reinforced by cultural discourses around fathering, which understand market work and providing for their families as a manifestation of care. Townsend observes that '[d]evotion to one's job is both a sign of commitment to fatherhood and

an activity that detracts from the time a father spends with his children' (2002: 129). He argues that men manage this contradiction by relying on women's caring labour as wives and mothers.

Treating care 'as a form of exploitable labour runs counter to deeply held beliefs, according to which women care in the name of love' (McMahon 1999: 57), but Anthony McMahon argues that this does not necessarily devalue love. Indeed, he argues that understanding love as being 'capable of exploitation' respects its power (1999: 49). Characterising care as a resource that requires labour to produce (Delphy and Leonard 1992), can be invested (Mulholland 2003; Reay 2004, 2000) and exploited (McMahon 1999) highlights its value and reveals contests over its production and use. It also emphasises the interconnection of market and nonmarket activities and relations.

Choice and bargaining

Conflict and competition over the use of money, time, space and care are interrelated (Jarvis 2004). Throughout much of the literature that focuses on the gendered division of labour, there is an understanding that money, time, space, and care enable and support market and nonmarket work. However, this understanding seems isolated to this literature. Within mainstream neo-classical economics and sociology more broadly, the interconnected nature of these resources tends not be acknowledged. Instead, how men and women engage in market and nonmarket work is often framed in terms of choice or bargaining.

The idea of individual choice is important in both economic and social theory. Late twentieth century social theorists, such as Anthony Giddens and Ulrich Beck, emphasise choice and decision-making. Giddens (1999, 1992, 1991) argues that, in the absence of tradition, and in response to globalisation and increasing risk, individuals choose from an array of options to consciously construct identities. Beck suggests, 'The choosing, deciding, shaping human being who aspires to be the author of his or her own life, the creator of an individual identity, is the central character of our time' (2001: 165). For Beck, decision-making, risk-assessment and calculated risk-taking characterise modern life. However, one's ability to 'be the author' of one's own life, assess risk and offset potential harm depends on access to resources as well as the ability to envision options. Beverley Skeggs observes that choice is 'a particularly middle-class way of operating in the world, dependent on access to resources' and a sense of entitlement (2004: 139). In a similar way, some feminist scholars have argued that the idea of the 'project of the self' is gendered because it conflicts with the

conventional gendered expectation of women – especially mothers – to be there for others (Adkins 2003, 2004; Armstrong 2006; McNay 1999). They suggest that the ability to ‘live one’s own life’ depends on a greater desire for self-fulfilment and individualisation than, for example, fulfilling caring responsibilities for others, especially children. These critiques highlight the gendered and classed nature of individual choice.

Rational choice models within neo-classical economics assume that individuals make self-interested decisions based on rational assessment of available options. The US economist Gary Becker (1993, 1981) applied neo-classical principles to the family and domestic work. Becker suggested that men generally do more market work and women more household work because such specialisation maximises the overall benefit for the family as a whole. His analysis is based explicitly on the assumption that the family has an altruistic ‘head’ who provides for the family and is able to influence the behaviour of other family members (England 2003: 46). England (2003) points out that Becker does not discuss the possibility of the family head not being altruistic, and he assumes women’s altruism towards family members, especially children. Furthermore, Friedland and Robertson observe that ‘there is no place in Becker’s analysis for generalized cultural norms that structure and pre-empt choice ... Nor is the analysis sensitive to power relations that transcend and define the rubric of short-term transactions’ (1990: 23).

Bargaining models – in both economics and sociology – assume that individuals are motivated by self-interest. They build on rational choice models such as Becker’s. Bargaining choice theory acknowledges that differences in bargaining power are determined to some extent by one’s resources (England and Folbre 2005; England and Kilbourne 1990; Hewitson 2002). Resources ‘allow one to get one’s way in a relationship ... [or] to leave the relationship if desired’ (England and Folbre 2005: 641). The strength of one’s fallback position – that is, one’s position if one left the negotiation – is known as the ‘threat point’. An awareness of the threat point of the other parties to a negotiation strengthens one’s bargaining position. For example, if a husband believes that his wife has fewer resources and options outside of the relationship, his bargaining position is strengthened while his wife’s is weakened. The power of her threats to leave will be undermined by his awareness of her limited options. Similarly, if a woman believes that her position will be worse outside of the relationship than within it, then her bargaining power will be compromised.

Within marriage, bargaining power is not only determined by the nature of one’s resources, but also by how those resources are valued more broadly. England and

Kilbourne suggest that financial resources are more effective than 'domestic contributions' in producing 'marital power' (1990: 163). They argue that women's investments in relationships, belief in altruism, commitment to their children, and responsibility for nonmarket domestic work combine to affect women's threat points and reduce their bargaining power within their relationships (1990: 171–179). Women's bargaining power is reduced because their investments, beliefs and responsibilities are not readily convertible to economic power. On the other hand, men's bargaining power within marriage – and the market – is reinforced by their investment in market work and their role as providers because these investments are transferable. In this way, cultural, social and economic factors combine to reduce women's and increase men's *individual* bargaining power.

In her book, *The sexual contract*, Carole Pateman identifies the problem as being with the marriage contract rather than any individual's ability to negotiate within it. She argues that an underlying historical contract based on the 'male sex right' (1988: 12) frames men and women's power in both public and private spheres. This contract is naturalised and thus difficult to challenge or change. She argues that the overarching and pervasive nature of the contract means that 'however hard any couple may try to avoid replicating patriarchal relations, none of us can entirely escape the social and legal consequences of the marriage contract' (1988: 18). In this way women's power (or lack of power) within the 'private' sphere of marriage is inextricably intertwined with their power (or lack of power) within the public sphere.

Gender affects the value of financial and domestic contributions within marriage. Bittman et al. (2003) suggest that women's financial resources are not effective in enabling women to get their husbands to do more domestic work, which is contrary to what neo-classical economic models might predict. They found that, as Australian women increased their earnings, they decreased the amount of housework they did, but they could not or did not 'try to use it to increase their husbands' housework' (Bittman et al. 2003: 209). Further, they found that, where women earned more money than their husbands, they increased their housework to 'compensate' for deviating from gendered expectations. In this way, they suggest, 'gender trumps money' (Bittman et al. 2003: 210). Their research suggests that gendered expectations and beliefs *as well* as available resources shape individuals' actions. It highlights the complex interaction of different forms of capital that underpin power relations in the market and nonmarket.

Understanding complexity

Increasingly, social researchers attempt to develop multi-layered approaches to explain how men and women make decisions about market and nonmarket work. For example, Jordan et al. (1994: 149) emphasise the importance of using 'economic concepts (investments, pay-offs, opportunity costs), political relations (power, subordination, resistance) and sociological processes (moral constraints, order, responsibility)' in any analysis. Such a multi-faceted approach is necessarily complex and 'requires a language that captures both the social constraints within which people operate and the scope of agency they exercise within those constraints' (Williams 2001: 38). Pierre Bourdieu's concepts provide such a language.

Bourdieu's concepts of habitus, field and capital help 'to make sense of the relationship between objective social structures (institutions, discourse, fields, ideologies) and everyday practices (what people do and why they do it)' (Webb et al. 2002: 1). His ideas enable an analysis of *how* power persists (Moi 1991: 1019). A growing body of researchers (for example, Adkins 2003; Kraus 2006; Lawler 2004; Reay 2004; Skeggs 1999, 2004; Townsend 2002; Williams 2001) draw on his concepts to analyse the interplay of class, gender and other social characteristics and processes in the persistence of privilege and inequality. In this study, Bourdieu's concepts provide a way to make sense of the contradictions and complexities of men's and women's accounts of business and family life. Bourdieu's concepts are interrelated and can only be fully understood together. I will introduce each in turn.

Drawing on his familiarity with rugby, Bourdieu uses the interrelated metaphors of field and game (Calhoun 2003). He uses the metaphor of field to describe any system of structured positions such as academia, business, or family. Fields are not fixed; they change as they reflect and respond to the games that shape them and to the other fields that they intersect and overlap. Bourdieu uses the metaphor of the 'game' to refer to the struggle for positions of power within a field. He argues that individuals implicitly accept and reinforce the value of the game by participating in it. As he puts it: 'Those who take part in the struggle help to reproduce the game by helping – more or less completely, depending on the field – to produce belief in the value of the stakes' (1993: 74). For example, to play football is to accept that football is a game that is worth playing, at least to some extent. Playing football on a regular basis requires an investment of time, energy, and other resources, as well as a belief in the game as a game. That belief reinforces the value of the rules and discourses around football, which in turn frames participation in the game. However, 'this does not necessarily

mean that everyone will play the game in the same way' (Moi 1991: 1022).

Participation in the game also depends on an individual's habitus, their 'feel for the game', and their various forms of capital.

The term habitus describes our beliefs, values, tastes, predispositions and commonsense. Each field generates its own habitus or system of embodied 'lasting, transposable dispositions' (Bourdieu 1977: 83). Bourdieu acknowledges that 'the idea of *habitus* has a long tradition behind it' (1993: 86, italics in original). He revived the term to suggest both habits and dispositions that have 'become durably incorporated in the body'; 'the term reminds us that it [is] linked to individual history' (Bourdieu 1993: 86). The concept of habitus incorporates not only our individual histories but also our collective histories; we inherit understandings of what it means to occupy a particular social space. Bourdieu refers to the apparently unconscious awareness of how the field works as a 'feel for the game' (Bourdieu 1990: 52). This feel for the game encompasses an understanding of the '*unspoken and unspeakable* rules for what can be legitimately said – or perceived – within the field' (Moi 1991: 1022). It also provides us with a sense of the conversion and re-conversion possibilities of different forms of capital within and between fields.

Where habitus and field match, power relations are normalised and seem unremarkable and natural; in this way habitus is related to cultural capital. Indeed, Bourdieu argued, 'the *habitus* is a capital, but one, which, because it is embodied, appears as innate' (1993: 86, italics in original). The habitus reflects and reinforces class, gender, ethnicity, sexuality and other social classifications. Habitus is social *and* individual in that it reflects and reinforces social classifications and is a reflection of an individual's lived experience. In this way, there can be a business habitus or a masculine habitus, but it is not fixed because the social interacts with the *particular* lived experience and social trajectory of an individual (Wacquant 2004). For Bourdieu, habitus is a 'generative principle of regulated improvisations' (1990: 157), which 'realises itself' in relation to the field (1990: 116) as a feel for the game which 'allows for and demands invention and improvisation' (Bourdieu 1990: 63).

Bourdieu used the metaphor of capital to describe different interrelated forms of power including economic capital (money, wealth, assets), social capital (social relations, connections and networks) and cultural capital (including symbolic, educational, and linguistic capital). Individuals have different combinations or 'packages of capital' (Silva and Edwards 2004: 3). Bourdieu used the metaphor of capital to explain the relationship of different fields. Different forms of capital have different values depending on the field in which an individual is operating; '[a] capital

does not exist and function except in relation to a field' (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992: 101). An individual's habitus, including their class, ethnicity and gender, frames the value and use of the various forms of capital to which they have access (Skeggs: 1997: 9). Capital can be converted between or within fields, but it requires an awareness of the conversion possibilities. For example, a successful footballer may have large amounts of economic capital (lots of money) which has accumulated as a result of his investment in his human capital (fitness and skill at football). Some footballers may be able to transfer these assets for use in other fields, such as business or the media. However, others may lack the necessary cultural or social capital, and may not understand the rules of the game, or have an awareness of how to exploit their capital in other fields. Capital can also be reproduced and converted across generations. For example, a footballer may use his economic capital to invest in a private school education for his children and thereby enable them to accumulate particular forms of cultural, social and human capital.

Some scholars have expressed concern that the metaphor of capital imposes a 'functionalist economic rationality on social life' (Silva and Edwards 2004: 11). But Skeggs argues that Bourdieu 'uses economic metaphors – of capital – to *dispute* the centrality of the economy as a separate sphere, whilst developing a model to illustrate how different resources and assets accumulate in bodies and are carried across social spaces' (2004: 16, emphasis added). His use of economic metaphors can be confusing but it enables an analysis that reveals the differential value of various forms of capital. Forms of capital derive their meaning and value from the social relationships that make up the different fields. Bourdieu (1977) described an 'economy of practices' in which people decide how to invest their energy and effort, and develop strategies to get what they want. Bourdieu stressed that there are many different forms of capital that people want to accumulate. However, he acknowledged that, in a capitalist society, economic and symbolic capital are the most easily converted forms of capital across fields and across generations.

Capital, field and habitus work together. Some critics argue that Bourdieu's theories are overly deterministic and static (see Callhoun 2003 and Sweetman 2003 for a good overview of critiques). However, as Paul Sweetman (2003: 533) observes, habitus does not determine action; rather, it mediates it. Indeed, Bourdieu was 'exasperated by' criticisms of determinism because he emphasised the '*generative capacities* of dispositions' (cited in Sweetman 2003: 534, original emphasis). Habitus reflects social classifications and the judgements associated with those classifications, so that those who possess authority in the form of symbolic capital frame what is

legitimate within a field. For example, businessmen may render a woman's involvement in business illegitimate and peripheral and thus affect her ability to participate effectively in the market. As Skeggs puts it:

Legitimation is the key mechanism in the conversion [of capital] to power ... Capital has to be regarded as legitimate ... before its value is realizable. It is this conversion process ... that challenges the critique made of Bourdieu, that he reduces everything to exchange-value. (2004: 17)

Bourdieu (1998) suggests that those who are dominated unconsciously collude with their domination through misrecognition of the processes of domination. For Bourdieu, this misrecognition is an embodied belief rather than an intellectual awareness or understanding. As a result, he argues that change cannot come about solely as a result of the 'awakening of consciousness'; rather, there needs to be a 'transformation of the objective structures' that have produced and sustained the dispositions and beliefs in the first place (1998: 121). Sudden changes in social arrangements can lead to changes in belief, but this only happens if individuals are aware of the processes by which belief and dispositions are reproduced and sustained. However, he also argues that, even where crises cause the world not to appear 'natural', those in power will seek to manage understandings and preserve 'a universe of that which is taken for granted' (Bourdieu 1977: 170). Bourdieu's concept of misrecognition and symbolic violence is similar to Luke's (1974) concept of latent power and Gramsci's (1971) concept of hegemony, but as Moi observes, Bourdieu's theories enable an analysis that can reveal the 'specific and practical construction and implementation of hegemonic ideology' (1991: 1019). This is why researchers who want to address the complexity of power relations have so enthusiastically adopted Bourdieu's concepts.

This study

In this chapter, I have argued that much of mainstream economic, sociological and entrepreneurship literature implicitly understands economic activity as that which takes place in the market. This understanding is historically situated and gendered. It is also remarkably persistent. Researchers have variously described the mismatch between structural change and changes in belief and practice as 'lagged adaptation' (Gershuny et al. 1994), a 'collision' (Pocock 2003) and a 'stalled revolution' (Hochschild

1989). Bourdieu's (2005, 2001, 1998, 1985, 1977) concepts of field, habitus and capital are useful in explaining how and why change is slow and uneven, because he understands that individuals have 'contradictory goals' and 'conflicting pressures' (Townsend 2002: 3). The use of his concepts enables an analysis that highlights how power structures are imposed on, and incorporated in individuals. They enable a nuanced analysis of the interplay of an individual's habitus, 'packages of capital' (Silva and Edwards 2004: 3), and the fields in which she or he is engaged and invested.

I draw on Bourdieu's concepts to analyse how men and women account for the competition for resources that facilitate the accumulation of various forms of capital. Money, time, space and care are interrelated resources that enable engagement in both the market and nonmarket. Understanding these aspects of life as resources makes the contests over their use and production easier to identify. Bargaining choice theory acknowledges that differences in bargaining power are determined to some extent by one's resources. In this study, I argue that power does not just relate to one's resources, it also relates to one's understanding of and commitment to the field(s) in which one is engaged, and one's awareness of the conversion and reconversion possibilities of capital within and across fields.

I use the metaphor of 'the deal' to refer to the basis on which resources are controlled and used. My use of the concept is derived from a number of sources including the work of Carole Pateman ('the sexual contract'), Nicholas Townsend ('the package deal'), Viviana Zelizer ('negotiated matches'), as well as popular usage as revealed in the interviews, and more broadly. The deal is a persistent but essentially arbitrary set of rules that frames involvement in the fields of business and family life. The gender-based deal or rule-set that I focus on in this study is only one of many implicit beliefs that frame how we live.

The deal has two interrelated parts: the first is that market relations and activities have more value and importance than nonmarket relations and activities. This aspect of the deal is fundamental to western capitalism and underpins much of how we live. The second part of the deal is the understanding that men provide and women care. These two parts of the deal buttress one another, and in this way capitalism and the gendered division of labour are inextricably linked.

It is important to note that the second part of the deal has two aspects. The first is structural and material. For much of the last century, especially in Australia, the legislative and social policy framework underpinning participation in the market was explicitly based on the idea of 'traditional' families in which men provide and women care. Over the past thirty years or so, in response to second-wave feminism, most of

these policy and legislative impediments to women's participation in the market have been removed. In principle, men and women are now equally free to engage in market or nonmarket work. The in-principle and incomplete nature of these changes is underscored by unequal pay, inadequate child and other care services, and the lack of representation of women as directors of public companies, among other things.

Nevertheless, the second part of the deal persists. This aspect is one of embodied *belief*. It is particularly persistent in relation to mothering and fathering. This persistent belief in a gender-based deal suggests that the main game for women as mothers *should* be mothering. The deal understands mothers' engagement with the market as optional. In a similar way, it understands fathers' contribution to family care and domestic work as optional; their main game *should* be in the market. In addition, the terms of this deal suggest that women should be responsible for caring for and about others – which remains optional for men.

Belief in this gender-based deal provides the basis for engagement in market and nonmarket activities in much of contemporary Australia. It is important to emphasise that this deal is at odds with the lived experience of many men and women and with the discourses of individualism and choice. Nevertheless, it appears to continue to frame how people understand market and nonmarket work. Belief in the deal defines how the games of business and family are played, which, in turn, shapes the nature of these fields. Belief in the deal has material consequences: on a broad social level (for example, inadequate provision of childcare services); on an individual level (for example, men feeling that they have an inalienable right to leisure), and on a psychological and emotional level (for example, women feeling guilty about not 'being there' for their children).

Male entrepreneurs and their wives appear to epitomise the persistence of the 'traditional' deal in which men make the money and their wives do the rest. As McMahon observes, 'everybody knows' that 'men at the top of the social and political [and business] hierarchy depend on their wives' (1999: 45). On the other hand, women as entrepreneurs appear to challenge the deal by succeeding in the market. This study explores the extent to which men and women as entrepreneurs conform to these stereotypes. I focus on entrepreneurs and their wives or husbands for two reasons. First, the entrepreneurial myth emphasises individual success and downplays or ignores the resources and support used in the pursuit and achievement of success. Second, increasingly, family relationships are cast as non-economic and, as an ideal, are characterised as egalitarian and fulfilling. By looking at men and women both as entrepreneurs and as husbands and wives, this study provides differing perspectives

on the competing discourses around entrepreneurial business and family life. It explores the ways in which men and women account for their market and family activities and relations, and the interpenetrations of business and family life. Specifically, it focuses on how men and women manage and account for the contest for resources – money, time, space and care – in a social and cultural environment that emphasises individualism and risk. This thesis explores three related questions.

1. How do men and women understand and account for their market success?
2. How do men and women understand and account for their family relationships?
3. How do men and women understand and account for their engagement in business and family life?

These three questions relate to a broader overarching question about gender and the social and cultural processes by which market and nonmarket activities interpenetrate. In the following chapter, I describe the study in more detail.

Chapter three: Methodology

Overview

In this chapter, I discuss my perspective as a researcher and the origins of the study. I discuss the research method and the sample. I examine some of the issues that I encountered in recruiting and interviewing entrepreneurs and their spouses, including issues of confidentiality and anonymity and how these affect data use. I then discuss the application of Bourdieu's concepts to this research. Finally, I identify some of the limitations of this study and reflect on the research process.¹

Research perspective

Many sociologists have emphasised the importance of reflexivity in social research, but as Natasha Mauthner and Andrea Doucet (2003: 414) point out the problems associated with the *practice* of reflexivity tend not to be discussed. They argue that too often '[t]he "embodied", situated and subjective researcher carrying out the analysis is rendered invisible as are the interpersonal, social and institutional contexts' (2003: 5). As a result, they suggest, issues of power in interpretation and analysis are obscured. Mauthner and Doucet argue that 'situating ourselves socially and emotionally in relation to respondents is an important part of reflexivity' (2003: 420). However, they caution against using 'gender, class, ethnicity, sexuality and geographic location' as tokens to represent difference. Rather they suggest that it is important to understand the impact of these on the researcher's interpretation and analysis. In a similar way, Bourdieu argues that 'reflexive analysis must consider successively position in the social space, position in the field and position in the scholastic universe' (2004: 94). He cautions against 'the temptation of indulging in the type of reflexivity that could be called *narcissistic*' (2004: 89, emphasis in original) and stresses the importance of recognising the collective understandings and biases which are the product of the fields in which intellectuals operate.

My research is influenced not only by my personal history, but also by my position within the field of sociology and 'scholastic universe'. The following brief autobiography aims to place me broadly in relation to both the subject of this study and the field of sociology. I started this research in my late forties, having picked up a

¹ This chapter draws on Bowman 2005a

previously abandoned attempt at postgraduate study. I had not studied sociology before embarking on this research. My previous tertiary education related to languages, linguistics and later social policy and law. I was born in Leeds, in the north of England in the mid 1950s, the seventh of eight children. We came to Australia when I was a young child. When I was in my early twenties, I had the first of four children; since then I have zigzagged between intense engagement in paid employment, family care, and business – with my partner and on my own account. My trajectory reflects my gender, class, ethnicity and my understandings of family, care and the market, which, in turn, are situated in time and place.

My family background, in which business was seen as largely irrelevant rather than natural, and my experience and understanding of caring, inform my observation and practice of business. My experience in business has also influenced my ambivalent disposition towards business. I was initially motivated to do this research because I wanted to make sense of the contradictions I had experienced and observed in business and family life. I wanted to make explicit the resources that go towards business success, but I also wanted to avoid a simplistic analysis that contrasted money with happiness or one that understood caring, domestic and family work as separate from – or somehow better than – market activity. My starting point was an understanding of the interconnectedness of market and nonmarket activities and relations.

Research method

This study focuses on how men and women make sense of what they do in business and family life. I adopted a qualitative research approach because it allows for an in-depth exploration of meaning and social processes (Punch 2005). Semi-structured interviews allow a nuanced exploration of sensitive topics. While some researchers see the interview as providing the ‘possibility for transformation’ of the interviewee (Kezar 2003: 396), I adopted an exploratory approach to interviewing. Semi-structured interviews allow the interviewee as well as the interviewer to shape the ‘conversation’. The interviewee can introduce additional material and emphasise what she or he feels is important. This freedom has some inherent disadvantages. Interviews can be long; at first, some data may seem irrelevant and some questions may remain unasked or unanswered. However, these disadvantages are balanced by the rich and often unexpected detail that can emerge from a broad ranging discussion. Interviews also provide the opportunity to gather additional information about the individual and his or her environment, especially when they are conducted face to face

at his or her home or office. Details such as the interviewee's accent, appearance, manner, the half-empty bottle of wine on the kitchen bench or the proud display of awards on an office sideboard all provide rich contextual information.

From September 2003 through to December 2004, I conducted 50 semi-structured interviews with entrepreneurs (20 men and 11 women) and their spouses (13 wives and 6 husbands). The interviewees included 22 couples of whom at least one was an entrepreneur; and 6 entrepreneurs whose spouses were unavailable or declined to be interviewed. See Table 1 below. Six entrepreneurs were 'copreneurs', that is, couples who had joint entrepreneurial enterprises. For the most part, I have identified these people only as entrepreneurs, but in Chapter six I discuss the female copreneurs as a group – for reasons I discuss later in this chapter (see page 46). The interviews were conducted in four states of Australia. For reasons of confidentiality, the unit of analysis in this study is the individual rather than the couple or the business.

Table 1: Interviewees

Interviewees	Couples	Individuals
Male entrepreneurs and wives	13	26
Female entrepreneurs and husbands	6	12
Copreneurs	3	6
Male entrepreneurs – wives declined		4
Female entrepreneurs – husbands declined		2
Total	22	50

There is much debate around the definition of entrepreneurs. For the purposes of this study, I understand entrepreneurship as being characterised by innovation (Schumpeter 1934, 1947), fast growth (Legge and Hindle 1997), and risk (Bird 1989, Cantillon 1755; Knight [1921]). These characteristics help to distinguish growth oriented entrepreneurial businesses – 'gazelles' – from the 'mice' (small businesses) and 'elephants' (corporations) that Birch (1987, 1979) described.

Burrage (2002: 3) suggests finding entrepreneurs is like 'hunting heffalumps and gazelles' – they are hard to define and hard to catch. Accordingly, I developed a two-part recruitment process comprising identification of possible participants and invitation to participate. I developed a database of potential interviewees from a range of business lists such as the Ernst and Young *Entrepreneur of the Year* award winners and finalists (national and state), and the *Business Review Weekly* (BRW) 'Rich 200' which estimates the wealth of Australia's richest families and individuals The 'Rich 200'

is commonly referred to as the Rich List. I also used other lists such as the *BRW* 'Young Rich', the *BRW* 'Fastest 100' and Deloitte's 'Technology Fast Fifty'. All these lists celebrate wealth and business success; most invite participation and can be important marketing tools for businesses and individuals. The Rich List is different because people do not choose to be included and they often resent being listed. Because I wanted to interview male and female entrepreneurs, I also accessed lists of women's business awards such as the Telstra Business Woman of the Year Award and the Australian Business Women's Hall of Fame, to balance the male dominance of the other lists.

I identified potential interviewees from business lists over a five-year period from 1999–2004 for four reasons. First, by sourcing interviewees from these lists, I limited potential interviewees to recognised entrepreneurs whose businesses were characterised by fast growth, innovation and risk. Second, I wanted to capture people at various stages in their pursuit of success. Given the instability of newly acquired wealth, some of the entrepreneurs I approached had experienced or were experiencing financial and business stress, while others were enjoying the more recent acknowledgement and celebration of their success. Third, I wanted to maximise the potential for confidentiality. Relying on several sources increases the potential for anonymity, especially given the small size of Australia's business community. The final reason is that I wanted to be prepared to answer the question: 'How did you get my name?' Surprisingly, only one person asked me that question.

At first, I adopted a formal approach, sending written invitations to participate to potential interviewees. I soon discarded this approach, as it was resource-intensive in terms of time, labour and money. I found that with a little research it was remarkably easy to access direct email addresses, which are particularly useful in bypassing gatekeepers such as secretaries and personal assistants. Most entrepreneurs replied promptly and we arranged interviews quickly. Generally, interviewees would provide me with their contact details so I could explain my research in more detail and make arrangements over the telephone with them or with their personal assistants. The direct access that email gave me to the entrepreneurs may reflect the open nature of entrepreneurs who often place a high value on being accessible to do business. However, it may have been a peculiarity of the early 2000s. With the sharp increase in email traffic, many entrepreneurs now have their email filtered by a personal assistant or software program.

I invited 70 entrepreneurs across Australia to participate in my research. Of those approached, 16 (23%) did not respond and 23 (33%) declined; some provided no

reason, while others said that they were too busy or overseas or 'just not interested'. Thirty-one entrepreneurs, 44% of those contacted, accepted the invitation to participate and were interviewed (11 female, 20 male). The recruitment process fell into two phases; the first ten or fifteen entrepreneurs whom I approached in September 2003 were surprisingly easy to recruit. I then encountered a number of difficulties and few of my invitations to participate were accepted until later in 2004. In Australia, most companies have a July–June financial year and timing may have affected the recruitment process. I had less success in recruiting participants during the middle of the year when business is very busy than later in the year when, perhaps, entrepreneurs are more settled in their business activities and more able to spare time to participate in a project such as this.

Besides being hard to identify and access, entrepreneurs value their personal privacy, they often have well developed PR skills, and they may have more power and money than the researcher. So it is not surprising that interviewers and researchers often describe a sense of anxiety about interviewing the rich and the powerful. For example, Michael Gilding described how he struggled to overcome his feelings of reticence in approaching the very wealthy.

For a long time, I put off doing the interviews. I cannot imagine anyone on the Rich Lists agreeing to talk with me. I read academic studies of wealth. None of them involve interviews. One American researcher writes that he tried but he gave up – partly because no one would talk with him, and partly because the few people who did talk were so guarded about what they said that it wasn't worth the effort (2002: 6).

Gilding notes that his anxiety was not only about researching the rich, but also breaking the taboo of asking about money. I wrestled with similar anxieties: who would agree to speak to me, and how I could broach the taboo topics of money and family.

I invited participation by introducing myself as researching the topical issue of 'work and family balance'. Of those who accepted my invitation to participate, all were in heterosexual relationships and all had children (ranging in age from a few months through to adulthood). The method of recruitment may have affected the sample as some entrepreneurs may have opted out if they were uncomfortable in discussing family issues or felt that the issues were not relevant to them.

The interviewees identified three reasons for participation in my research. The first was a desire to share their knowledge and act as a mentor to others. For example,

Julia – an entrepreneur – said, ‘That’s what’s missing in the world. There are people like me who become entrepreneurial with nobody guiding them about the pitfalls they’re about to fall into, and you keep falling in and thinking, Oh God! I wish somebody had told me about that’. The second reason was that the interview was an opportunity to confide and talk openly for some interviewees. Being an entrepreneur can be lonely and being the spouse of an entrepreneur can be lonelier still, especially when one is obliged to keep up appearances. As one woman commented:

It’s important not to look broke because you’re never going to get anywhere if ... you look ... desperate. Friends and family think that we’re loaded ... because we happen to rent a big house and we act like we’ve got money.

The fact that the interview was confidential meant, perhaps, that participants felt freer to talk about personal matters. Several interviewees commented on how the interview felt ‘therapeutic’. The third reason was public relations. A number of interviewees appeared confused at first about the purpose of the interview even though I gave them information about the research when I invited them to participate, and again at the start of the interview. Several entrepreneurs offered me samples of their products and gave me tours of their business premises. I got the impression that the interview may have seemed like just another in a long series of interviews. This confusion led to the third major challenge (aside from identifying them and getting agreement to participate): getting past the public relations spin. I will discuss this later in this chapter (see page 46).

In the information that I provided when I first approached potential interviewees, I described my research as focusing on entrepreneurs and their spouses. However, I was often unsure about the relationship status of the entrepreneurs whom I approached. Accordingly, I usually interviewed the entrepreneur first, and towards the end of the interview, I invited participation of the spouse. Most entrepreneurs gave me their spouses’ contact details or immediately rang them to ask if they would agree to be interviewed. Only four men and two women entrepreneurs had spouses who were unavailable or declined to be interviewed. The four male entrepreneurs whose wives declined or were unavailable did not provide me with their wives’ contact details so I relied on them to communicate my request. Only one immediately let me know his wife did not want to participate. The rest declined by default, in that they did not get back to me despite repeated follow-up phone calls and requests. Of the two women whose

husbands declined or were unavailable, one entrepreneur immediately said no. She said, ‘He won't even talk to me, so he's unlikely to talk to you. He hasn't talked to me for four years. I can imagine, actually that would be really interesting. That would be so funny if I gave you his name. But I won't’. The other woman got back to me quickly, saying that her husband ‘just wasn't interested’.

The sample

In the section below, I describe some of the characteristics of the entrepreneurs and the spouses. I have deliberately de-coupled spouses in order to maximise confidentiality and I have changed potentially identifiable features such as age, ethnicity and number of children.

The entrepreneurs

I interviewed 31 entrepreneurs: 20 men and 11 women. Most of the entrepreneurs in my sample were younger than 50 years of age. The female entrepreneurs tended to be younger than the male entrepreneurs. Two of the women were in their 50s, while nine of the men were 50 or older. See Table 2 for details. Almost all the entrepreneurs in my sample were Australian born. Only three (one female and two male) entrepreneurs were not born in Australia. Of those born in Australia, the sample was overwhelmingly of Anglo-Australian background, with only four (one woman and three men) of the 31 entrepreneurs indicating that they had a non-Anglo-Australian heritage.

Table 2: Selected characteristics of entrepreneurs – age

	Women		Men		Total	
Age < 50 years of age	9	82%	11	55%	20	65%
Age > 50 years of age	2	18%	9	45%	11	35%
Total	11	100%	20	100%	31	100%

Note. I categorise both copreneurs as entrepreneurs rather than defining one as a spouse.

Most of the entrepreneurs in my sample came from relatively privileged backgrounds. While I did not specifically ask about their parents' professions, most of those who provided information (24 of the 31) had parents who were in business (either small business or as executives in large corporations) or were professionals such as accountants or lawyers. Five entrepreneurs described their parents as ‘working-class’ and one entrepreneur's family had a farming background. Interestingly, the male

entrepreneurs were more likely to be from a privileged background than the female entrepreneurs. See Table 3 for details.

Table 3: Selected characteristics of entrepreneurs – family background

	Women		Men		Total	
Business or corporate	1	11%	10	67%	11	46%
Professional	3	33%	4	27%	7	29%
'Working class'	4	44%	1	7%	5	21%
Rural	1	11%			1	4%
Total	9	100%	15	100%	24	100%

Note: 24 of the 31 interviewees provided details. These categories are broadly descriptive.

Most of the entrepreneurs had tertiary qualifications (diploma, degree or post-graduate qualifications). The male entrepreneurs were slightly more likely than the women to have tertiary qualifications. Of the four men who did not have tertiary qualifications, two had completed Year 12 and two had completed only Year 9 or 10. The two men who had left school before completing year 12 were both aged over 50. Three female entrepreneurs did not have tertiary qualifications, one had completed Year 12 and the other two had completed Year 10. These women were aged in their forties and fifties; two were copreneurs and one had started her business in her mid-forties. See Table 4.

Table 4: Selected characteristics of entrepreneurs – education

	Women		Men		Total	
Tertiary qualification	8	73%	16	80%	27	77%
Year 12 secondary school	1	9 %	2	10 %	3	10%
Year 9/10 secondary school	2	18%	2	10%	4	13%
Total	11	100%	20	100%	31	100%

Most of the entrepreneurs were formally married. Six entrepreneurs (one female and five male) were in de-facto relationships. Nevertheless, I avoid the term 'partner' because of its business connotations and presumption of equality, and use the terms husband or wife, or spouse. Three of the female entrepreneurs and five of the male entrepreneurs were in second 'marriage-type' relationships; and one man was in his fourth marriage. Most of the entrepreneurs had long standing relationships of ten years or more. Of the 11 female entrepreneurs, five were in relationships of less than ten

years, five were in relationships of between 15 and 25 years' duration and one had been married for more than 30 years. Almost half of the male entrepreneurs had relationships of between ten and 30 years' duration; four men had marriages of more than 30 years.

All of the couples interviewed had at least one child. Most of the entrepreneurs had at least two children. The children (including children from previous marriages) ranged in age from a few months through to middle age. At the time of the interview most of the entrepreneurs still had children living at home with them; one female entrepreneur and two male entrepreneurs no longer had their children living at home with them, and one male entrepreneur did not formally live with his wife or her child.

Table 5: Characteristics of entrepreneurs – family and children

	Women		Men		Total	
Relationship						
De facto	1	9%	5	25%	6	19%
Married	9	82%	15	75%	24	77%
Separated	1	9%			1	3%
Total	11	100%	20	100%	31	100%
Marriage type relationship						
First	8	73%	14	70%	22	71%
Second or more	3	27%	6	30%	9	29%
Total	11	100%	20	100%	31	100%
Length of relationship						
< 10 years	5	45%	7	35%	12	39%
10 years – 30 years	5	45%	9	45%	14	45%
> 30 years	1	10%	4	20%	5	16%
Total	11	100%	20	100%	31	100%
Children						
One child	2	18%	3	15%	5	16%
Two children	3	27%	9	45%	12	39%
Three or more children	6	55%	8	40%	14	45%
Total	11	100%	20	100%	31	100%

Many of the entrepreneurs in my sample had more than one business. Table 6 relates to their primary business activity. Of the 31 entrepreneurs, almost half (15)

owned businesses that operated internationally, with substantial export operations and/or international offices/subsidiaries. Seven owned established national businesses and nine owned start-ups or emerging businesses. The male entrepreneurs were only slightly more likely to have businesses that operated internationally; half (10) of the male entrepreneurs owned businesses that operated internationally compared with 45% (five) of the female entrepreneurs. Three (27%) of the female entrepreneurs owned established national businesses compared with four (20%) of the men. Slightly more (6 of the 20 or 30%) of the male entrepreneurs had start-up or emerging businesses than the women (3 of the 11 or 27%). Only three of the businesses were public companies, with the rest privately held. Two male entrepreneurs had purchased established companies and transformed them into international companies, one man had acquired the business via a management buy-out, and the rest had established and grown their businesses from scratch.

Table 6: Selected characteristics of businesses

Sector	Women		Men		Total	
	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage
Manufacturing	4	36%	5	25%	9	29%
Information technology	1	18%	6	30%	7	10%
Business services	1	9%	4	20%	5	16%
Media and communications	2	9%	1	5%	3	6%
Biotechnology	1	9%	2	10%	3	23%
Retail	1	9%	1	5%	2	10%
Personal services	1	9%	1	5%	2	6%
Total	11	100%	20	100%	31	100%

The sample in context

While there is reliable information about business activity in Australia, there is little reliable data available on entrepreneurs, in Australia or elsewhere. In part, this is due to problems associated with defining entrepreneurs (Gartner 1989; Kilby 1971; Lambing and Keuhl 2000; Shane and Venkataraman 2000). Michael Burrage observes that the social analysis of entrepreneurship is distorted because it either relies on the biographies and autobiographies of 'the most celebrated' or on statistical data, that equates self-employment with entrepreneurship,

thereby including professionals like barristers and dentists, tradesmen, peasant farmers, small holders, corner shops, and casual labour on building sites. The work of some of them may include an element of entrepreneurship, but they are not quite what social scientists mean when they refer to entrepreneurs. (2002: 3)

The *Business Review Weekly* (BRW) lists such as the 'Rich 200' and 'Fastest 100' are a key source of information about entrepreneurs. Gilding (1999: 174) argues that the BRW Rich Lists 'offer the best available profile of the largest private fortunes in Australia' despite being 'biased toward self-publicising individuals and spectacular success stories, and against old wealth distributed around old families' (1999: 173). An analysis of the 'Rich 200' (BRW 2005) indicates that it is predominantly a list of rich men, with only 11 (or 6%) women on the list in 2005, 'down from 13 in 2004, 14 in 2003 and 12 in 2002' (Skeffington 2005: 33). The average age of individuals listed on the 'Rich 200' in 2005 was 62. Most were Australian born, with only 61 people (31%) on the list born overseas. Most people (80%) on the 2005 'Rich 200' were married and on average had three children (Skeffington 2005: 30, 33). The latest Rich List (2007) shows that little has changed other than the cut-off point for entry, which is now \$180 million, up \$50 million from the previous year. Older, married men still dominate the list.

The Ernst and Young (E&Y) Entrepreneur of the Year Award was established in 1986. According to Ernst and Young (2005: 1) 'more than 40 countries' participate in the award program. The E&Y Entrepreneur of the Year Award was established in Australia in 2001. It invites nominations from entrepreneurs and entries are judged in terms of 'entrepreneurial spirit, innovation, personal integrity/influence, financial performance, strategic direction, and national/global impact' (E&Y 2005: 1). To date, no study of the award entrants or recipients has been undertaken in Australia. In Britain, E&Y commissioned Michael Burrage of the London School of Economics to analyse characteristics of 500 finalists. Most (95%) of the UK E&Y finalists were men (2002: 5), and were relatively well educated – just over half of those who provided information had university education (2002: 6). Most had started out in business before the age of 44 (2002: 4), few inherited their companies (less than 5%) but family background was important, as was family support (2002: 5) and social and business networks (2004: 10). Most (66.1%) of the companies were at least five years old and most (80.7%) were in service industries, although 19.3% were in manufacturing. Most had experienced fast growth, and around 20% of the firms had made a loss, while most of the rest made

a relatively small profit (2002: 4). Around one third were 'serial entrepreneurs' having previously formed companies (2002: 9).

The characteristics of entrepreneurs in these studies and lists reflect the nature and purpose of these data sources. My sample tends to be similar to the British E&Y study. In part, this reflects my methods of recruitment because I was interested in the very wealthy as well as the 'wannabe wealthy' rather than the small-scale 'lifestyle' entrepreneur. However, my sample is different from the UK study because I did not solely rely on Australian E&Y Entrepreneur of the Year lists, as noted above.

Husbands and wives

I interviewed 22 couples, three of whom were copreneurs. Four wives and two husbands were unavailable or declined to be interviewed. For the purposes of this analysis, I have identified copreneurs as entrepreneurs only. Accordingly, the sample includes 19 spouses (13 women and six men).

I interviewed 13 women as wives of entrepreneurs. Most (8 of the 13) were aged in their thirties, were of Anglo-Australian background (10 of the 13) and had tertiary qualifications (9 of the 13). Just over half of the women provided details of their family backgrounds. Of these, four had parents who had small businesses or worked as corporate executives, two had parents in the professions, and one described her background as working class. All the women had been in paid employment prior to the birth of their children. At the time of the interview, most (9 of the 13) of the women were full-time wives and mothers. Only four of the wives had paid employment; three of these women had professional occupations, and one worked in the service sector. Most of the wives were formally married (10 of the 13). For most, this marriage was their first. Five of the women had been married for less than five years, three had been married for five to fifteen years, two had been married for between fifteen and thirty years, and three had been married for thirty years. To some extent the duration of their relationships reflected the women's ages. Four of the women had three children, four had two children, and the remaining five women each had one child. The children were aged from a few months through to their twenties. Six of the women had babies or pre-school children, six had school-age or teenage children, and three had young-adult children. Two women no longer had their children at home with them.

I interviewed six husbands of entrepreneurs. Two were aged in their forties, two were in their fifties and two were sixty years of age or older. All of the men were older than their wives. These men were also older than the most of the male entrepreneurs. Four of the six were of Anglo-Australian background. Half had tertiary qualifications.

Three of the men were business owners or retired business owners, one had just joined his wife in her business, and two had professional or semi-professional employment. None, even those who were semi-retired, were fully engaged with family and domestic activities in the same way as the wives of male entrepreneurs. Five of the six husbands were formally married. For most of the men this marriage was their first. Most of the men had been married for more than ten years. All of these men had children; most had at least three. Three of the men had children who were still at school, two had adult children who were no longer living at home, and one man had a baby. See Table 7.

Table 7: Selected characteristics of spouses

	Wives		Husbands		Total	
Australian born	10	77%	6	100%	16	84%
Born outside Australia	3	33%	-	-	3	16%
Total	13	100%	6¹	100%	19	100%
Education						
Tertiary qualification	9	69%	3	50%	12	71%
Year 12 secondary school	2	15%			2	12%
Year 10 secondary school	2	15%	1	16%	3	18%
Total	13	100%	6²	100%	19²	100%
Age < 40 years of age	8	62%	0	0%	8	42%
Age ≥ 40 years of age	5	38%	6	100%	11	58%
Total	13	100%	6	100%	19	100%

1. Two husbands had non-Anglo backgrounds but were Australian born

2. Two husbands did not provide information about their educational qualifications

The interview process

Once an entrepreneur had agreed to participate in the research, I undertook background research including searches of the internet, business magazines and popular press to develop an understanding of the entrepreneur and his or her story. After the interview I followed up with some basic company research, checking publicly available records through ASIC (Australian Securities and Insurance Commission) and ASX (Australian Stock Exchange) to develop some understanding of the company's structure and size. Given that most of the companies were privately held, it was very difficult to obtain accurate information on turnover and other financial indicators.

However, it was possible to develop a reasonably good understanding of business structure. Interestingly, the information was often at odds with the story told in the interview. For example, entrepreneurs frequently glossed over ownership details and company structures, referring to 'my company' when ownership was shared. One husband referred to his wife's company as 'our business'. These apparent discrepancies highlight how complex interrelationships between business and family are glossed over in the business story.

In-depth semi structured interviews enable an exploration of the interviewees' understandings and experience. I started the interview with an open-ended question asking the interviewee to tell me about his or her background. The interviewee could choose to interpret this as referring to his or her business background or family background. The interview schedule was structured to move from a discussion of business through to more personal issues around family. The schedule aimed to explore the individual's business and family background, understandings of success, failure and risk, hopes for the future, identity as a family and community member, and sources of support – spiritual, emotional and practical. (See Appendix for entrepreneur and spouse interview schedules). These schedules provided the basic structure for the interviews. The interviews varied according to the individual interaction. Some interviewees went into detail about business strategies and plans, others focused on issues of family and relationships. Some questions remained unasked because I felt uncomfortable asking that particular interviewee a specific question, the interview focused on other issues or I had not included the questions in the interview schedule. In retrospect, I wish I had asked more specific and difficult questions, especially about their sex and money, but I am not sure that these questions would have been answered.

I interviewed each person separately. I assured all interviewees of confidentiality to facilitate frank discussion. Interviews took from 45 minutes to over two hours and were tape-recorded. Almost all of the entrepreneurs were interviewed at their business premises. I interviewed one entrepreneur at my office as he was in Melbourne for the day. Most of the wives were interviewed at home: four were interviewed by phone due to their demands of work or because they were interstate and further research funds were not available. Phone interviews have some disadvantages, in that the interviewer misses non-verbal and environmental information. I could not see what they looked like or see their surroundings. Nevertheless, contextual information emerged. For example, one interview was repeatedly interrupted by frenzied banging on the door as children, who were supposed

to be in the care of a nanny, demanded their mother's attention. Another woman, a senior executive who lived and worked in another city during the week, was interviewed at her workplace. Again, this phone interview was interrupted by urgent demands and was conducted under very strict time constraints. In contrast, I interviewed only one of the six husbands at his home. I interviewed four husbands at their workplaces and one husband at my office. This meant that I was unable to situate most of the husbands in their domestic setting.

I made notes about the location of the interview, which included boardrooms in city skyscrapers, suburban offices, factories, semi-derelict buildings used as warehouses, enormous mansions, inner-city apartments, country houses and modest suburban homes. I noted how I felt before the interview, and after the interview I noted my impressions of the interview. I transcribed the interviews verbatim; then I changed names and identifying details such as particular ethnicity and nature of business.

Data analysis

I adopted first one, then another approach to analyse the transcripts. First, I analysed them as narratives. I edited the transcripts and rewrote them as stories for each individual and for each couple. I abandoned this approach because the stories were identifiable, and in reducing the accounts to stories I found it was difficult to avoid narrative frameworks such as the 'self-made man' or the 'super-woman' that gloss over contradictions and complexities. Nevertheless, this was a useful step in comparing the couples' stories and it helped to identify key themes and 'troubling questions' (Frank 2005). It also highlighted the narrative frameworks that the interviewees and I drew on in telling family and business stories.

My second approach was to identify broad themes in the transcripts and use these themes as a starting point to code the transcripts. This process drew on the grounded theory approach, which Strauss and Corbin describe as 'a qualitative research method that uses a systematic set of procedures to develop inductively derived grounded theory about a phenomenon' (1998: 24). As Bryman and Burgess note, 'much research that claims to be using grounded theory does not adopt the full set of procedures recommended by its developers' (in Gibbs 2002: 166). My research approach was 'grounded' in that the theoretical approach emerged from the data. I have zigzagged from the data to the literature and back again, iterating towards an argument.

Contradictions and complexities are important because, as Skeggs (1999: 31–34) observes, a desire for coherence may obscure socially significant contradictions. I

discovered Bourdieu not long after I had abandoned my first attempt at analysis. His concepts helped me to make sense of the complexities and contradictions that were revealed in the interviewees' accounts of business and family life.

The interview data are what the couples said in response to my questions. As Singh (1997: 39) observes, 'At a different time and place, and to a different researcher, they may have shared more or less'. I attended to what was said – or left unsaid – and to how it was said. The way people talked, the words they chose and the way they structured their stories reveal much about their understandings and identities. At the same time, I was aware that the interview data consists of accounts. Each person has a different story and a different perspective and, as McCarthy et al. (2003) have suggested, neither is necessarily 'true'. However, the differences and similarities in the stories of the entrepreneurs and their spouses can be revealing. For example, one entrepreneur made no mention of the serious financial and business challenges he was facing, while his wife took the opportunity to lambast him and describe her anxieties about their financial situation.

At first, I had wanted to compare his and her stories in an attempt to implement a research strategy that addressed the 'problems of women's silence and invisibility' in accounts of business and entrepreneurship (Mulholland 2003: 17). Mulholland suggests that a comparison of the accounts of husbands and wives can 'expose the manner in which positions of power are competed for, contested and eventually negotiated in the family business'. Such a comparison can also reveal how 'the contradictions between domesticity and enterprise become points of tension in such husband and wife partnerships' (2003: 17–18).

However, for reasons of confidentiality I have decoupled the interviewees, as some of the material is potentially hurtful and damaging. The interviewees were often quite scathing in their assessment of their husbands or wives. For example, a wife talked about her husband's 'huge ego' and 'anger-management issues', a male entrepreneur was disparaging of his wife whom he referred to as 'hopeless' and 'Mrs Negative' and another wife described her husband as deluded. Interviewees often sought reassurance that what they said would remain confidential from their husbands or wives. For example, one man agreed that I could interview his wife 'as long as you don't repeat what I said [laughs]', and a woman said, 'I wouldn't want him to hear that [laughs]. This is between us, isn't it? It's not going to go anywhere? ... You're not really *A Current Affair*, are you?' The importance of maintaining their trust means I have had to modify my initial plan of comparing his and her stories, as one partner may recognise his or her own story and by association his or her spouse's story. To some

extent, this diminishes the power of the data, but it is unavoidable if confidentiality is to be maintained. Throughout this study, I use pseudonyms and I have changed potentially identifying characteristics. Where I need to maximise confidentiality I refer to the interviewees in general terms. Nevertheless, it is difficult to achieve internal confidentiality (Khayatt 1992; Tolich 2004).

The issue of confidentiality was especially problematic in relation to the three copreneurial couples. The individuals in these couples may be recognisable to one another, especially as copreneurs. The men in these couples were not significantly different to the other male entrepreneurs, so I have considered them together. However, the copreneurial women were significantly different from the other female entrepreneurs. For this reason, I have considered them separately within the chapter dealing with female entrepreneurs. I have changed potentially identifying details to maximise confidentiality and have attempted to balance internal confidentiality and the integrity of the data.

Entrepreneurs are often experienced media performers, and generally, I knew something of their stories through the business and popular press. The business story generally follows a set pattern whether it is the story of success or failure, or triumph over failure (Benoit 1997; Hamilton 2006; Hytti 2003; Mulholland 2003; Ogbor 2000). As one entrepreneur said, 'We have a good story. It's a story, which we've polished over the years'. The businesses in this study were almost all newly established, but many of the entrepreneurs come from established business families. Almost all emphasised the 'self-made' nature of their success. At first, I worried about getting past the well-worn public relations spin, but then I decided that to some extent everything they told me could be seen as some form of spin in that the interviewees were seeking to provide "morally adequate" versions of their life choices' (Jordan et al. 1994: 4). As Frank observes, 'stories [are] told in the conventional rhetoric of a cultural context' (2002: 6). The interviewees' accounts were framed by 'the rules of the game', which determined what could be said to me (a middle-aged woman researcher) by them as interviewees. A qualitative researcher cannot know the 'true' version of events but can recognise the narrative frameworks that the interviewees drew on in telling their stories about business and about family.

Mulholland highlighted how the wives of entrepreneurs 'frequently challenged their husbands' embellished accounts and the marginality of their own work in the enterprise' (2003: 19). In this study, I found that *both* husbands and wives of entrepreneurs challenged the story of individual effort and happy families. For many of these husbands and wives, the public story seemed somewhat irrelevant. For example,

one husband said: 'I'd heard her story, sort of lived her story, I suppose, and it was clear at some of those [award] functions that I was really superfluous'. The interviewees' stories need to be interpreted within the framework of the overarching myths around entrepreneurs, couple-relationships, fathering and mothering. By interviewing entrepreneurs and their spouses, I gained different perspectives on the entrepreneurial success story as a genre, and on family stories. These accounts highlight what Ogbor calls the "how" of power – those practices, techniques and procedures that constitute the mechanisms of power over individuals' (2000: 608). How the men and women told their stories revealed something of their various forms of capital and their feel for the game.

As individuals, we draw on a 'limited repertoire of available and sanctioned stories ... to interpret and communicate ... [our] experiences' (Hytti 2003: 56-57). The meanings and identities created by stories may be 'contradictory, blurred and elusive' (Hytti, 2003: 53) because, as Polkinghorne suggests, '[w]e are in the middle of stories and cannot be sure how they will end; we are constantly having to revise the plot as new events are added to our lives' (1988: 150). The respondents' accounts are at times contradictory and confused, as detailed individual stories interrupt and contradict the polished success or family story. This interplay of narratives and counter-narratives within an individual's story reveals the push and pull of identities and fields.

Theory and practice

Bourdieu's concepts highlight the relationship of social characteristics and processes. The connectedness of the concepts of field, capitals, and habitus presents specific challenges and opportunities. While it is important to emphasise the relational aspects of habitus, and capital within and between different fields, this can be difficult to articulate clearly without falling into the trap of seeing fields as concrete, separate sites and habitus as fixed. This study seeks to examine the interconnectedness of the fields of entrepreneurial business and of family. These two fields are 'social site[s] where people and institutions engage in particular activities' (Webb et al. 2002: 68). Within these two fields, I explore the dispositions and practices of the various agents – men and women as entrepreneurs and men and women as spouses. I focus on three interrelated aspects of habitus in this study. The first relates to gender. Gender frames and embodies other aspects of habitus. The second aspect of habitus relates to entrepreneurial business. Entrepreneurial business is a particular form of market activity that is understood within particular cultural frameworks. Gender frames the overarching narrative habitus of entrepreneurial business: this habitus is reinforced and

reflected in the media representation of business, in general, and entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial activity, in particular. Until recently, the idea of the 'self-made' man (and woman) was not one that sat comfortably with many Australians. However, it has gained legitimacy and become more pervasive. This is why I asked interviewees about their understandings of success and their business story. I was interested to see to what extent their stories coincided with the narratives of business success. Some research suggests that men and women have different motivations as entrepreneurs, and that they do business differently. I was interested to explore the extent to which the *idea* of entrepreneurship influenced entrepreneurs' business practice. I also wanted to explore how the dominant narrative of business framed their spouses' understanding of and response to the entrepreneurs' practice. I was interested to examine to what extent gender affected the motivations and practice of entrepreneurial business, and the response to a spouse's pursuit of entrepreneurial business. The third aspect of habitus relates to family. Again, this is framed by gender, class and ethnicity. I asked interviewees about their families: their understandings of family, their roles within their own families and what they did in their families. I wanted to explore the differences and similarities of understanding and practice of family for men as entrepreneurs or husbands of entrepreneurs, and for women as entrepreneurs or wives of entrepreneurs.

To maintain 'the idea that we live simultaneously in multiple synchronic fields' (Silva and Edwards 2004: 3), and to highlight the interplay of different forms of capital and habitus is difficult to achieve. I have adopted the following approaches to analysing and presenting the data. I have organised findings relationally. The first two findings chapters focus on men as entrepreneurs and women as spouses of entrepreneurs. The next two chapters focus on women as entrepreneurs and men as spouses of entrepreneurs. In this way, I make explicit the ways in which gender frames the use and conversion of different forms of capital, and highlight the relations of men and women in and between the fields of entrepreneurial business and family. Within each chapter, I focus on individuals' use of four key resources: money, time, space and care. The ways in which the men and women compete for and use these resources reflect their interest in and disposition towards business and family, as well as their ability to exploit different forms of capital. This approach enables an analysis that highlights those forms of capital, which are not easily convertible across fields.

Limitations and suggestions for future research

This study has a number of limitations. First, the sample is not representative of Australian entrepreneurs and their spouses. Given the qualitative nature of the research, the findings cannot be generalised. Nevertheless, the data provided considerable insight into the resources used in pursuing entrepreneurial success, and the meanings of entrepreneurial success and family for Australian entrepreneurs and their spouses. Importantly, this study explored the experience and understandings of both men and women as entrepreneurs, and as spouses of entrepreneurs. Second, the need to maintain confidentiality constrained how I could present the data, as much of the rich detail is also potentially identifying and could not be presented. Third, in retrospect, I wish I had asked more detailed questions about economic capital (especially about debt, ownership, financial management) and intimacy (for example about their sexual relationships): answers to these kinds of questions would reveal more nuanced information about the precise nature of the deal for these couples. However, I am not sure if direct questions on these topics would have been answered in the context of an interview, but this may be a rich avenue for future research. Fourth, in the absence of direct observation, I have had to rely on what the interviewees said they did which may or may not reflect their actual practice. The interviews are snapshots, which can provide insights into the understandings of the individuals at that particular time. There are significant barriers to researching very busy, high profile and private people, but different insights may be gained by adopting other research strategies.

To better understand the intersections of business and family, future research could focus on entrepreneurs and their children. Such research could provide some insight into the experience and understandings of children and young people about their parents' pursuit of market success. This research would be particularly interesting in relation to intergenerational understandings of success, family and business. Other research could explore specific interconnections of business relations and activities such as business structure and ownership, debt and asset protection with family relations and activities. Such research could explore the extent to which business activity reflects and reinforces specific power relations within families. Future research could also apply my analysis to non-entrepreneurs, to test whether it is useful in understanding the interpenetration of 'work' and family life more broadly.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have described the research methodologies and approaches that I adopted in this study. I have described the sample, which I have set in context of other information about entrepreneurs. I have discussed how I have used Bourdieu's concepts in this study and reviewed some of the issues I confronted in conducting the research. Finally, I outlined some limitations of the study and suggested some possible future research to address these limitations. The following four chapters outline the findings of my study. I begin by examining male entrepreneurs.

Chapter four: The male entrepreneurs

Overview

Most entrepreneurship literature refers to ‘entrepreneurs’ and ‘female entrepreneurs’ as if gender is only relevant when it is not male. In focusing on male entrepreneurs first, I highlight some of the assumptions around men and entrepreneurship. This chapter serves as a reference point for the following chapters. In this chapter, I introduce the men, discuss their ideas about and dispositions towards business and examine how they account for their business success. I examine their ideas and dispositions regarding family life. I then focus on their accounts of their control and use of money, time, space and care to highlight contradictions and contests over these resources. In the final section, I make some conclusions drawn from the men’s accounts¹.

The men

The interviewees had remarkably similar backgrounds. Most were Anglo-Australian and tertiary-educated. Just over half of the men were younger than 50 years of age, with most (6) in their 30s, four in their 40s and one man in his 20s. Seven men were in their 50s (7) with two in their late 60s. Most (15 of 20) of the entrepreneurs were in long-term stable relationships. All of the men had children. Most (17) had at least two children – some many more. The children ranged in age from a few months through to early thirties. Two of the male entrepreneurs no longer had children living at home, and one man did not live with his wife or her child. Most (14 of the 20) of the men had wives who were not in paid employment. Three of the men were in business with their wives, and three men had wives who had jobs (two full-time, one part-time). None of the men was primarily responsible for domestic and family work.

The entrepreneurs had businesses in manufacturing, IT, business services, biotechnology, media and communications, retail and personal service sectors. Most had more than one business. Half of the men owned businesses that operated internationally. Four of the entrepreneurs owned established national businesses. Six of the men were serial entrepreneurs who had new start-up or emerging businesses.

¹ This chapter draws on Bowman, D. (2007) ‘Men’s business: Negotiating entrepreneurial business and family life’, *Journal of Sociology*, 43 (4) pp. 385–400

Most (17) had established and grown their businesses from scratch. Two entrepreneurs had purchased established companies and transformed them into international companies and one had acquired the business via a management buy-out.

Business: Ideas and dispositions

I asked these men about their motivations for going into and continuing in business. In explaining their motivations, they drew on two interrelated cultural narratives: the story of the individual heroic entrepreneur who overcame hardship to achieve success, and the story of individual personal growth and self-fulfilment. For these men, entrepreneurial business was a personal endeavour and one that brought individual rewards. Despite some occasional references to being motivated 'for the family', the accounts are overwhelmingly self-centred.

Almost all said that money did not motivate them; instead, they focussed on personal growth, control, and a sense of achievement. The men fused self-actualisation with market success. When talking about their motivations, several of the men used the language of self-help and referred to self-help literature, which encouraged and inspired them. For example, Greg described how he drew inspiration from self-help texts such as *Think and grow rich* and *The ancient art of Chinese warfare*. They also explicitly modelled themselves on exemplars of male business success, such as Richard Branson. For these men, entrepreneurial business was intimately tied up with individualism and masculinity. Many of the men described the pursuit of business success as an opportunity to prove themselves to themselves and to others. For example, David described his dot com experience, as 'my proving – that's when I proved whether I could do something or not – and now I don't feel I have to prove it. I'm more comfortable with myself'. Nevertheless, he said, 'I think that ultimately you are proving it to yourself. Because that's what gets you up and drives you, I guess'.

Many of these men said they were driven by a desire to demonstrate to their fathers that they could achieve success on their own – even if they did not have to. For example, Michael, who described his father as 'an exceptionally talented businessman who runs one of the largest companies in Australia', said he was 'adamant' that he was going to succeed in business on his own – 'even though his advice would have been valuable'. He acknowledged that 'there's probably a bit of competitiveness between us'. In a similar way, a sense of competition with his father motivated Robert. He described the long-lasting effect of this competition and desire to please his father:

I was sitting on the plane coming back from overseas the other day, and this company – we'd be a hundred million dollar company – and I thought if only my dad could see me now. I don't think he believed that I could get there ... so I was determined to do it. I was probably more driven by my father than anybody else.

The men also talked about a desire for control, especially being in control of their own destinies, but they were reluctant to refer explicitly to a desire for power. When they did refer to power or a desire for dominance, it was framed as a joke or trivialised. For example, Lachlan downplayed his desire for control and ownership as a 'small boy thing, you know, a small boy wants every one of the collecting cards, or the model cars, or the action men or whatever'. Mark joked that he was in business because of 'megalomania!' He quickly corrected himself by laughing and saying 'joke' and went on to explain that he was driven by the creative process of problem solving. 'It's just the challenge of taking something that's fundamentally stuffed and converting it to something useful'.

Most of these men had won awards and public recognition, but they were equivocal about this acknowledgement of their success. For example, James said he did not want to be included in the BRW 'Young Rich List'; 'what's the point? Just get a few people pissed off!' Michael said he was 'not really comfortable with the whole Ernst and Young Entrepreneur of the Year thing', but, he said, he thought that recognition of his success was important for his 'immediate family'. Phillip was ambivalent about his motivations but he said that his 'greatest ambition' was to walk down Pitt Street² with his business partner after they've made 'however much money' and for people to say, 'Oh, that's Phillip Lewis'. For Phillip, recognition that he was better than other men was important. As he put it, 'just to know that you're not like them; and people just knowing who you are, just quietly'.

For these men the pursuit of wealth and entrepreneurial success was unremarkable. Their accounts of their business motivations and their ideas of success reflect their backgrounds. More broadly, their accounts reflect the field of entrepreneurial business – which values particular forms of capital – and the narrative frameworks of entrepreneurial business and entrepreneurial masculinity. In the next section, I discuss their business success stories, which describe their pathways into business and reveal the resources on which they relied.

² A well-known street in the premier business district of Sydney

Accounting for success

Almost all men who provided information had a privileged background. Their parents – especially fathers – had their own business, were professionals (accounting and law) or were executives in large corporations. For these men the idea and practice of business made sense; going into business was not really a conscious decision, it just seemed natural. For example, Phillip, who followed his father's example by going into the same kind of business, said he went into business after university because 'I knew the people, I knew the language, the equipment, all that sort of stuff'. Mark also felt business came naturally. He explained, 'Why do business? Why not be a plumber? It's just the environment I was brought up in. ... My dad was a CEO of a number of companies and he created an environment. I like the environment'.

The men's paths into business reflected their families' class and dispositions. The sons of accountants, lawyers and actuaries tended to follow their father's paths, at least initially. For example, Steve said, 'I didn't know what I wanted to do so I did an accounting degree because my dad was an accountant'. University education provided access to different forms of capital. It provided formal skills and knowledge, which were useful in doing business and acted as a safety net against risk. As David said, 'I figured having a professional qualification behind me meant that if it fell over, then I could always get another job in an accounting firm if I wanted to'. Importantly, professional qualifications opened up networks and employment opportunities, which enabled further skill development and the accrual of more capital in its various forms. This accumulation of capital was taken for granted by most of the men. For example, Mark glossed over details of his career as if he were bored with recounting his story.

A mate of mine saw an opportunity and said 'Hey, you could do this'. Um, prior to that I worked for the [Big Consulting Company] – the management consulting firm – for five years. Prior to that, couple of years, I did my MBA at [Prestigious Business School] and also was overseas for a little bit here and there, and prior to that I'd lived in the US et cetera, et cetera right back to when I joined [Big Accounting Company] out of university.

Access to interrelated forms of capital enabled the pursuit of economic capital for most of these men. Their understanding of and familiarity with business meant that they could effectively exploit their extensive networks to maximise access to further economic capital. While attempting to conform to the narrative of the individual entrepreneurial hero in the business story, most of these men acknowledged receiving

assistance from male family members and business associates. Several men described how their fathers had stepped in to provide employment and direction for them as young men. These men had been relatively unsuccessful at school and their fathers' businesses had provided an alternative to further study and access to business opportunities and skill development. For some, this path was not actively chosen. Robert explained:

My background really has always been in this business. I started working in this business for my father when I was twenty. Not that I chose the business to work in. I didn't do too well at school and my father said to me: you're going to have to get a job.

Most of the male entrepreneurs acknowledged the usefulness of their networks that provided access to business advice, financial help and introductions to clients and investors. For example, Peter talked about how people in his network 'pushed work' his way. Some men, like James, had access to significant resources and networks in establishing their businesses. James worked for a large corporation, which established a spin-off company. He explained how he ran the business as an employee before taking over the company. Doing this helped him develop a profile in the market while earning a salary.

It wasn't difficult because for the two years at [Big Corp] that I was doing that my profile was increasing significantly out in the market ... and when it came time to take it over there wasn't any revenue there, but you had a market, you had a reputation. You had contacts and it was about right.

The men's accounts emphasised luck and business acumen and downplayed the forms of capital that they were able to exploit. For example, one man received start-up money from a friend with whom he played football but he explained his networks and access to resources in terms of luck. He said, 'I've always been lucky. I've had partners in business and my partners have also been my best friends, aside from a business partnership ... I've been very lucky there'. The men also tended to frame assistance in such a way as to highlight their own skills and ability. For example, another man described one of his 'smart moves' as formulating a board to make the business 'professional' and to 'mitigate' risk. 'My father was on the board, funnily enough another guy from [Mega Co] who was my boss's boss back then, he was on

the board ... So I never really ever felt lonely. Um, I guess, I wasn't under pressure'. As the son of a businessman, he had a 'feel for the game'. He knew how he could make use of his family and business connections. More importantly, he wanted to exploit these connections, and was proud of his ability to do so. In telling his story, he was able to appear effortlessly astute. Similarly, another entrepreneur, Michael, characterised the early days in business as 'solitary', saying, 'the hardest part was there was very little support'. At the same time, he described how he had 'a partner who basically gave ... a quarter of million dollars to start the company' and he had 'unbelievable support' from 'another guy a very good friend of mine who's married to my wife's cousin – he's family – and he runs a very successful company'. His contradictory account emphasised the importance of 'doing it on ... my own' despite the financial and business support he received from within his network. By framing their business beginnings in terms of luck, astute exploitation of resources and solitary endeavour, the men's accounts reflect and reinforce key aspects of the entrepreneurial myth.

Only three of the twenty male entrepreneurs said they had had no real help when starting out in business. These men did not have middle class backgrounds and had to develop the networks and resources that the other men inherited as part of their social space. These entrepreneurs emphasised their independence and the solo nature of their success. They succeeded in spite of their backgrounds. For example, Bill, who described his background as 'immigrant, working class', stressed the independent nature of his success: 'in reality you are still on your own. You are'. For these men, education and networks forged through employment were more important than family networks or resources in starting out in business.

In telling their business stories, most of the male entrepreneurs highlighted their fearless resolve in the face of risk and uncertainty. For example, Jack told the story of how his international business faced collapse as a result of fast growth combined with the peremptory withdrawal of the bank's support, which left the business 'in a hell of a situation'. The Australian business was 'forced' into voluntary administration while the company restructured. He explained that this 'was the only way' that he could protect the company from the creditors. In telling this story, he distinguished between the 'ten core creditors and they're as loyal as the day is long' and the '700 other creditors that ... are one off'; these creditors were the ones that he had to 'protect' the company from. In this way, he could maintain an identity as the protector of the business, who survived the onslaught of rapacious banks and creditors. In fact, he described this time as 'the most successful time of our business'.

Being an astute manager of risk is a key element of entrepreneurial masculinity. Andrew argued that 'managing risk is what business is all about'. He compared doing business with gambling:

This is a very risky business and you don't make a profit without taking a risk. I don't gamble at casinos because the odds are stacked against you ... but I like gambling when the odds are at least ten or 25 per cent in my favour which they are generally in business. So I gamble but I gamble where even if I lose I should get away with it and if I win, I win – good! That's the theory.

Their risk-taking approach was presented as calculated and worldly. For example, Bill, who said that he had 'made and lost about five fortunes', split risk across several companies. He said, 'It really doesn't matter. I mean, the money is important – but it's not important. It's important to maintain a certain lifestyle but it's not critically important'.

The entrepreneurial success story emphasises the importance of hard work and persistence in achieving success, and suggests that anyone can achieve business success if she or he tries hard enough. At the same time, it suggests that entrepreneurs are special because of their vision and ability to take risks. Mulholland argues that the 'masculine discourse surrounding the triumph of financial wheeling and dealing ... makes men feel powerful, and it is the guile of power which they find so seductive' (2003: 100). Business survival stories reinforce the image of the entrepreneur as a lone hero overcoming hardships and managing risk. The idea of achieving success through a combination of hard work, persistence, resolve, talent and acumen framed not only how these men told their stories, but also how they lived their lives. These men lived out the entrepreneurial story.

For most of these men, engagement in business and the accumulation of economic capital came first. This was unremarkable. For most, as sons of businessmen, entrepreneurial business seemed 'natural'. It consumed their time, their energy and bolstered their identity as 'self-made' men. Their intense focus on business provided them with economic and social capital and, consequently, reinforced their positions of power within the fields of business and the family. Their 'feel for the game' reproduced the game (Bourdieu 1990: 52); their habitus as entrepreneurial men fitted neatly with the field of entrepreneurial business. It was only within the field of family that a lack of fit appeared in their accounts.

Family life: Ideas and dispositions

Quite a few of the men were puzzled when I asked them to 'tell me a little bit about their family'. Some asked me 'which one?' Some described their family of origin, telling me about their family background, their parents, brothers and sisters and their position in the family. Others detailed the number and gender of their children, and how long they had been married. Some of the men appeared uncomfortable talking about their roles as husbands and fathers. For example, Brent groaned, 'Oh god, I hate these things'. In part, this may have been because the men felt defensive. They were uncertain about what they 'should' say so they were more tense and cautious than when discussing business matters.

Almost all the men insisted that 'family comes first'. For example, David emphasised that family was 'the number one priority and then work comes second, but a distant second in terms of my priorities and what I do'. For many of the men the idea of family was an important motivating force. Aaron, whose children had left home, explained:

First of all, I want a happy family life. I mean that is still the ultimate thing: the family. For that, you really do all the work. For me, if the family would break up, I think I would be totally devastated. Because that is, really, the anchor. If the family is okay, you can do all sorts of things, in your business life as well. But if that breaks up I would probably lose every sense of doing anything.

The men made sense of the contradictions between their intense engagement with business and their avowed commitment to family in two ways: (1) by referring to their family arrangements as 'traditional' or 'complementary', and (2) as partnerships that enabled them to be engaged and active fathers. Importantly, these understandings were not necessarily mutually exclusive. Some men who said that they had 'traditional' family arrangements also said they wanted to be engaged fathers and 'fantastic' partners. I will discuss each of these ideas in turn.

Most of the men described their family life as 'traditional' or 'complementary'. For these men the 'traditional' or 'complementary' arrangement was one where they worked and made money and their wives cared for the children, the home and their husbands. These men were slightly defensive of their family arrangements. They recognised that this approach was not the contemporary ideal, but said that this arrangement worked for them. Like many of the men, Michael presented his position as

a personal preference rather than as an ideological position. In his words, 'I'm not saying that either the female or the male should stay at home. I'm just saying that I would prefer to see this complementary relationship'. Interestingly, they insisted that the 'traditional' approach was not only their preference but also their wives' choice. Sam described his role as 'fairly traditional'. He said, 'Obviously I'm a provider. I don't particularly want my wife to work'. When asked if she worked, he replied somewhat defensively, 'Well, she works pretty hard given that she's the mother of three little kids'. He explained that his wife did not work 'outside the home' but he said, 'she's got interests and things ... but she doesn't actually have paid employment ... I mean, if she really wanted to we could arrange it. But generally speaking I prefer her to be at home, and she likes it anyway'. Michael and his wife had been together since they were teenagers. They had two young children. Michael said his 'two favourite passions in life are business and family'. He was a little defensive when I asked him about his family life; he said that he thought that people had a 'perception that we're fifties style' but he insisted 'we're not'.

We're probably not the current ideal ... We're pretty traditional in that Suzie was committed to being a housewife and a mother, and that's what she wanted to do. Today it's changed and there'd be people who would say 'Oh you're stuck at home' type of thing. Whereas she would turn around and say: this is exactly what I want to do. And I guess our roles are pretty clearly defined. They're very traditional.

The men's business habitus framed their view of family life. They made money and were intensely engaged with business, and their wives cared for the children, the home, and their husbands. That was the deal. An entrepreneur in his thirties explained:

In business you try to get complementary skills. I wouldn't hire thirteen CEOs. In a home environment, it just seems to me that if you've got two people who are out there forging careers, I'm not sure that there's enough time for the family.

James explained that his relationship with his wife was 'technically a business relationship' because, for him, running a family had similarities to running a business. For James, shared values and goals were the 'fundamentals' and their business as a family was to raise their children. He compared a husband and wife to 'HR and Finance

– they work well together but you don't try and get the finance person to run HR or vice versa. It's the same sort of thing. Look, it is a partnership'. For these men, the idea, and practice of separate spheres worked well. Mark had been married for about five years. He and his wife had one child. He described his wife as 'an employee of mine – of my own personal business'. She was 'incredibly supportive' and managed 'a whole range of stuff' for him including 'the farm ... renovations of the apartment in Perth, or xyz, she manages that side of our relationship – that business she looks after. I look after the other stuff, and away we go. So that's good'. For Mark the deal worked well. For most of the men, the deal was implicit. There was no need to refer to it because, for them, it was unremarkable. It had evolved, usually 'when the kids came along'. The older men said that their wives had 'grown up with the business'. For example, Phillip explained that he and his wife 'have been together thirty years ... She hasn't known anything different ... It works out well'. Most of these men saw the specialisation of roles within the family as practical and commonsense, especially when there were children. Because it was 'natural', there was no need for negotiation or discussion.

However, some men did refer to the 'deal'. For example, Robert said that his second wife, who had been his secretary before they married, knew what she was getting into when she married him. Robert said his family 'complain all the time' but he dismissed the kids' complaints because 'they're kids'. He admitted that it was a hard balance for his wife but he said 'she has to balance having a very privileged lifestyle' with whether they got enough time together as a couple and a family 'for the things that we want to do'. He said that he could 'probably change things' but he probably would not. Similarly, Richard argued that his intense focus and engagement with business was reasonable as long as he was making money. He said that he would only listen to his wife's protests if he worked 'ridiculous hours' and did not make 'any money'. 'If it got to that stage, I'd listen to her ... I'd say, yeah, this is stupid and just pull it back'.

A few men were clear that the deal was not open for negotiation. Business came first and no-one was going to get in their way. These men, who had working-class backgrounds, articulated what most of the other men left unsaid. For example, Pete, who was in a long-term relationship and had three children, said, 'I always thought that business was more important. I focused on business'. Bill, who seemed proud of his no-holds barred approach to business, described himself as having a 'PhD in sleaze'. He said he 'got rid of' his first wife and raised his children as a single father. At the time of the interview, he had been with his current wife for several years. He said their relationship was 'great' but insisted:

If there's something that I want to do in life – nobody's going to stop me ... I'll do what I want to do. I'm not going to harm anybody but if nobody likes what I'm doing well they can all go and jump. And I don't harm anybody and I'm generous with my time with mates and people and I enjoy that. I do that for me. Because that's the way I like to live.

Economic capital was important in framing the terms of the deal and bolstering the men's power within their relationships. Some men said that their wives were not particularly happy with the deal, but accepted it, albeit reluctantly, so that they could care for the children. These men referred to their wives' choice in putting the children and family first, even where their accounts suggest that the 'choice' was constrained. For example, Nick explained that he 'came out of a traditional family' so, for him, their family arrangement was a 'conscious decision' but:

she would say no, she was railroaded. She reckons women are just, you know, this is a social thing that's got to absolutely change, um, but she went along with it. It has taken her probably seven years to come to a point where she is. What she is doing is meaningful. It's taken her a very, very long time and she still struggles with it but it's something that she wouldn't want to change.

In a similar way, Robert said that his wife stopped working in the business because:

she just wanted to balance out family. We had young family and she felt that probably putting the family first was important. She didn't see a need – a real need – financially there was no real need for her to work. It wasn't as if she had to work for herself. Even today she still talks about maybe going back and doing something – and she can or she can't – that's her decision. I don't mind what she does.

Such a 'hands-off' approach obscures the circumstances in which these 'choices' are made, and hints at challenges to the terms of the deal. The focus of these men's accounts of their family arrangements is on what the wives do or do not do. This was presented as a choice. The men's engagement in the market was taken as a given.

Even in their own terms, the men did not always profit from the 'traditional' arrangement or deal. Some men suggested that their intense engagement with

business came at personal cost to their family relationships and to themselves. For example, Andrew described his relationship with his wife as 'not strong personally'. They stayed together because of the business and because he was 'too old to be bloody skipping around'. Some older men told their stories of fathering with a sense of reflection and assessment. Importantly, they did not appear to regret what they had done, even if they felt some sadness about how things had turned out. Aaron described how although he worked hard he always 'caught up' with the family and 'breakfast in the morning together' because 'of course, when I came home they [the children] were already in bed'. Aaron said, 'The family kept very, very close' but he acknowledged that when it came to rearing the children 'in the end, she [his wife] did it'. As a father, he was 'fairly strict' and his children often criticised him. He wryly observed, 'If someone criticises me that way in the office, I can sack them, but I can't sack them [his children]'. Lachlan was very uncomfortable in discussing his children. He described himself as 'not the perfect father at all'. He said that in retrospect 'you see your own failings more clearly ... and you think could you have done it better? And maybe I could have. Maybe I should have. Maybe she [his wife] would think that I wouldn't have been that good at it. I don't know'. Even where the costs of the deal were acknowledged, these men seemed to see it as part of the natural order of things and impossible to shift or change.

While the 'traditional' approach was the most common understanding of family, some of the younger men emphasised a desire to be active and engaged fathers and committed – if not equal – partners. For example, Mark said 'within the family environment, I just want to be a great dad and a fantastic partner'. These men prided themselves on being hands-on engaged fathers. This idea of engaged fathering had different meanings for the men. Mark said, 'I changed nappies from the first day ... no one asked me to'. However, while he spoke about the desire to be hands-on, he also said that he did not want to change the way he lived. 'It doesn't change me at all ... I think the worst thing you can do is you can let it adversely affect your life'. Aside from some nappy changing, Mark's approach to fathering seemed similar to the more traditional approach described above. For him, occasional nappy changing was a symbol of engaged fathering.

Some of the younger men were explicit in wanting to do things differently from their fathers. David said that he wanted to be not only a father 'but a friend as well and someone who shares experiences with them and someone that they can talk freely with'. He was adamant that he did not want to be seen as 'an authoritarian figure'. He wanted to be someone his kids could 'look up to' and 'admire' not only for his achievements in business but also 'in life' as 'a good person'. He wanted to 'instil in

them good values and ... provide a good education for them and a loving home environment where they can grow up and be the best they can be'. For Mark, like most of these younger men being a great dad meant 'being there', 'being supportive' and 'creating the right opportunities' and 'the right environment' for his children and his wife. Except for the vague notion of 'being there', this understanding of fathering is similar to the traditional approach in its emphasis on providing as a key aspect of fathering.

Some of the younger men understood engaged fathering as playing with their children and involving them – even when very young – in the business. For example, Brent, who said he worked extremely long hours on his various business ventures, argued that being based at home enabled him to engage with his children, because if he were based away from home they 'wouldn't know who I was'. He said, 'My kids love me. They're always running up [saying] 'I miss you Daddy''. Brent discouraged his wife's involvement in the business, but he encouraged his sons to participate in meetings when business associates met at his home. He said, 'they're not going to learn if they're just pushed away'. Brent understood engaging his sons in the business and teaching them business skills as an important part of fathering. This emphasis on the reproduction of the cultural capital of business was an important aspect of fathering for many of the men.

While these men were intensely engaged with business, they all appeared to have reflected on their roles within the family, especially as fathers. For these men, fathering was both a public and private relationship. Michael emphasised the importance of 'continually appraising what you want to do, and where you are' both in business and in family life because there is a danger that you will 'fall off course' if things become 'routine' and you take them for granted. He emphasised the importance of values in rearing his children, whose behaviour he saw as a reflection of his success at fathering. In talking about his children, he used business terminology such as 'performance indicators' and 'benchmarking'. He focused on 'external indicators' of achievement in fathering his children, such as sending them to private school, providing them with a holiday house, travel and dance lessons and so on. James worried that his children would become 'spoilt little shits' like other children he saw at the private school they attended. For James, a public demonstration of his success at fathering was important. He compared himself to friends and business associates:

I respect them in business and they're great friends but watching them being fathers, well, you think ... that's not the way I want to be. Then you

start seeing it in their kids – how they act – and you think that's not the way it's going to be with me.

The younger men knew what they wanted to avoid as fathers. They did not want to repeat their fathers' mistakes but they did not seem to have figured out how they could do that in practice. For most of these men, engaged fathering relied on the ongoing constant mothering provided by their wives. In this way, the men could intermittently engage with their families, while business remained their main game. This is consistent with Townsend's (2002: 82–3) finding that 'women, as wives and mothers, mediate and facilitate' men's fathering.

The younger men tended to say they wanted to be 'partners' with their wives as well as engaged dads, but it was a partnership that was very similar to the 'traditional' deal. For these younger men, long-term commitment was part of being a 'fantastic partner'. David wanted his relationship with his second wife to 'last forever'. He saw the success of this relationship as a 'central part of who I am and what I am and that defines me as opposed to my job defining me'. Nick said that he loved his relationship with his wife despite fighting 'like cats and dogs', because they knew they were in it 'for the long haul'. This long-term commitment also meant a desire for stability and unchanging support. Nick described his concerns about potential changes in his relationship with his wife once the children were older:

We had six years of marriage before we had kids coming along and that was just a fantastic period in our life. I don't want to be at the stage ... where I have all this financial benefit and success in terms of freedom of time to say let's go and travel and let's do all these other things. And she's going to say 'No. I want to get back to my career' ... that scares me a little bit.

The traditional deal delivers many benefits to men, so perhaps it is not surprising that Nick feared a change that could jeopardise his privileges.

Some of the younger men said they struggled with the ideal of an equal partnership with their wives. For example, Matt described how many of his business associates who had been in relationships that 'crumbled due to the time constraints of the business' chose 'very, very simple women who don't have many expectations of them'. This was because 'they've got so many expectations at work that they don't really want those expectations when they get home'. He 'could understand it' but would

not do it himself, because he was 'from a different generation'. For Matt, whether 'in business or in life', a wife was a partner. Even though he and his wife had 'a lot of clashes' because they were 'both very strong people', he said he 'wouldn't have it any other way'. Nevertheless, like some of the younger men, Matt was struggling to find a way to reconcile his ideas about relationships with the pressures of doing business. He saw himself as being caught up in a time of social change. 'We're in a sort of transition stage I reckon, like my generation ... our parents were either there or not, so you've either got a role model of how to be a stay-at-home parent or you've got a role model of how to be an absent parent'. Significantly, he centred the problem of equal relationships around children and parenting. For Matt, the care of children disrupted ideas of equality. The men's accounts suggest that children are central to the deal. In the absence of children, there could be an approximation of equality, but the presence of children fundamentally changed expectations and triggered the implicit deal.

Regardless of how they described their family lives, these men remained intensely focused on and engaged with business. While some men talked about wanting to do things differently and be more engaged fathers, they did not fundamentally question the nature of the deal. In the following section, I will explore the contest over resources and implicit contradictions in these men's lives.

Contests and contradictions

The men emphasised the importance of individualism, choice and autonomy, but their accounts also reveal their embeddedness in social and familial networks that resourced and supported them. For most of the men, access to these resources was taken as a given; it was unproblematic, and therefore unremarkable. As a result, their accounts tend to be relatively free of conflict and tension. Indeed, if these accounts were read alone, one might get the impression that the pursuit of entrepreneurial business success was relatively easy. However, their accounts of everyday business and family life *hint* at tensions over the use of four interrelated resources: money, time, space and care. This tension arises from their wives' challenges to their use – as of right – of resources and, for some, it comes from the physical cost of the relentless pursuit of entrepreneurial success.

Money

In this study, I consider money both as a form of economic capital that frames power relations, and as a specific resource that is used to support activities. Most of these men experienced little conflict about the control and use of money. The ability to

accumulate economic capital underpinned the men's power to shape the nature of their involvement in the fields of business and family. For these men, money was important as a means, rather than as an end in itself. This was obvious and commonsense. As they put it, 'money is really only necessary to go to the next step', the money was 'nice' but 'amassing it is not the object'. Money was not important as long as you had enough. For most of these men, money was a first step, once you had enough and it ceased being a motivating force 'then there are other things that you need to do, to feel like you have achieved something'. However, exactly how much was enough was difficult to determine. Mark observed that there 'probably' was a point 'when you don't need to chase the dollar because you have created enough wealth ... then you can choose more philanthropic things to do'. But he wasn't at that stage, and he was not sure when he would be. In this way, the men acknowledged the importance of money while distancing themselves from it.

Money was tied up with their sense of masculinity. Sam, who had married several times and had a large number of children, saw a direct relationship between money, family and his sense of masculinity. His wealth enabled him to demonstrate that he was extraordinary in being able to continue to remarry and father children. As he put it, 'a normal man couldn't afford to get married again [and have] ... so many ex-wives'. Mulholland suggests that the ideology of breadwinning supports men's intense engagement with the market and allows the pursuit of business success to be understood as 'sacrifice' (Mulholland 2003: 101). The men's role as 'breadwinner' underpinned their pursuit of wealth and their risk-taking behaviour, and enabled them to be 'family men'. For example, Aaron described the pressure of developing his international business, 'You have to have the determination to get through, because the whole existence of the whole family, everything depends on that success. I am totally committed to the company. If the company were to collapse then everything privately would collapse too'. Aaron could reconcile his intense engagement with business with his statements that 'family comes first' because he was 'risking everything' for them. In this way, his pursuit of business success became a sacrifice. In a similar way, Jack emphasised his role as leader, in his story of fighting the banks and winning.

I had to go home one night and tell them that I thought we were going to lose our house ... I thought the bank was going to repossess our house on the Monday. On Friday I asked them to pack up a bag of the things that were most critical to them ... so if someone tried to come to take our

house off us – they had that suitcase they could grab ... It was tough. Yeah, it was tough. The kids were upset ... but you shouldn't shelter them from the truth.

According to Jack, this story had become family story – not just a business story – of survival in which he is cast as the hero. This story also allowed Jack to frame his experience in terms of fathering. Exposing his children to financial risk was teaching them the realities of life and toughening them up. These accounts rely on cultural discourses of entrepreneurial masculinity that emphasise hard and fast risk-taking, and cast men as protectors and providers.

However, the men seemed aware that their wives and children did not necessarily share or understand their intense engagement with entrepreneurial business. They recognised that they had different and competing objectives and that the financial risks they took affected their families, but most rationalised their actions in terms of their role as providers, and rejected their wives' concerns as irrelevant. For example, Richard laughingly told me that he dismissed his wife's concerns about borrowings with a flippant 'We won't worry about that, darling'. Another man suggested that families 'don't always understand the risk the way you do'. To illustrate this he told the story of how, in the early days of his business, he sold the family home to fund business development. He explained that he did not find the experience as stressful as his wife 'because I was focused on making sure I had the financial resources to continue doing what I was doing. I was more concerned about getting the money out of the house and she was more concerned about retaining the house'. He described this as 'a difficult time' and made sense of his apparent disregard for her desire for financial security by explaining that that he and his wife had 'always had a different view of stability'.

Wherever we are is home: it could be a humpy, it could be a mansion. It doesn't really matter. So long as the family is happy, healthy and engaged, involved, doing things that make them feel good. That's it. That's all that's needed. All the rest of it is just crap.

By referring to 'higher' notions of love and happiness, he renders his wife's concern for financial security as illegitimate.

Only one man emphasised the importance of taking calculated risks to protect the interests of the family. He said, 'It really gets down to: What do you have at risk? If

you have your whole life and family at risk, fear would be in there ... [that's] putting too much at risk'. He explained that he had developed structures so that 'if I fall, I don't fall far'. For this man, risk management was an inherent part of his role as provider, underpinned by what he called 'the basic principles of making sure your family's looked after'. As entrepreneurs, the other men seemed to trust in their ability to manage risk. They seemed to understand money as theirs to use as they thought fit – even where it was family money. Their roles as providers and protectors underpinned and legitimised their risk-taking. Their ability to accumulate money bolstered their sense of masculinity and power, which fed their sense of entitlement to resources, and enabled them to engage fully in the market and accumulate more economic, symbolic and social capital. Their wives' protests were rendered illegitimate and dismissed.

Time

Most of these men did not feel a sense of conflict over their time use. For these men time was an important resource, closely allied to money. Indeed, for many of the men, time was money. Most of the male entrepreneurs in this study operated within a competitive global business environment with frequent international travel and – they insisted – an expectation of constant availability. These men emphasised the long hours they worked, but most considered long hours as a way of life. Their accounts reflect a tough masculinity that is associated with hard work and a relentless drive to succeed and yet they appeared keen to suggest a sense of effortlessness. For example, Mark said, 'I think it is a lifestyle that you're always working ... sometimes it's hard to switch off but that's okay – that's how I work'. Aaron argued that working long hours was not stressful, 'I don't consider it as stress. It's just part of the life ... I'm not working so hard any more ... every Saturday and Sunday I come in here. I probably am working sixty hours or so'. Greg, who said he worked twelve hours a day, seven days a week, said he did not see work as a 'pain', but he wanted to get to a stage where he did not have to work so hard. Nevertheless, he also said 'I'll probably work just as hard as I work now. But I want to *not* have to do anything'.

Most of the men said they needed to be available twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, and they said that they enjoyed the ability to be constantly in touch with their business. They delighted in technologies that enabled constant communication. They argued that availability to take a call at any time of day or night was especially important in a global environment where the call could be an important deal. Technology enabled the twenty-four hour, seven day a week, business engagement that many of these men embraced. For example, Andrew managed his

constant availability by having a number of phones for different purposes. International business meant that business contact continued throughout the night. For Andrew 'it's a twenty-four hour day'. He was 'not upset by the phone ringing at any time of the day or night' but he acknowledged that it irritated his wife who he said 'chastised' him when he forgot to turn his BlackBerry to silent. Michael said that he did not *want* to turn off from business. He enjoyed the gadgets that allowed him to engage with business no matter where he was.

If we're watching a movie, I'll have my BlackBerry on the table with me. I want to read what's happening. If someone sends me an email, I want to know what's happening. I really enjoy it ... I'm addicted to that sort of stuff. I never find it intrusive because I love it!

This delight in being constantly in touch may have been a response to the novelty of communication devices such as BlackBerries, which were relatively recent innovations in 2004, but there is a sense that being constantly available reinforced these men's feelings of power and importance. Very few men talked about feeling hounded by the demands for constant communication. Rather, most detailed their non-stop calls as if to underline their importance. For example, one man recounted his normal day:

I come in the office in the morning. I get all the phone calls from USA. Then Tokyo is one hour's difference and that starts at 10. Hong Kong starts at 11, the Middle East starts in the afternoon and Europe in the evening. So you are constantly non-stop. [laughs]

While these men emphasised how hard they worked, at the same time most sought to minimise the effect of working long hours on themselves or their families. Aaron recounted his heavy work and international travel schedule and downplayed it: 'I just do it. [laughs] I don't have any problems'. Other men emphasised their extraordinary powers by describing their long hours and their ability to manage with little sleep. For example, Brent talked about how he usually rose very early in the morning. 'I'm up, let's go! ... I'll be up at three and I'm on the computer and I just get everything done'. For most of the men, engagement with business fitted neatly with their roles as providers for their families, because for the men 'providing is something that men do as *fathers*' (Townsend 2002: 129, original emphasis). Those men who said they wanted to be more engaged fathers and committed 'nurturing' partners managed

the contradiction between this desire and their long working hours by emphasising choice and flexibility in the use of their time, especially as it related to interactions with their families. Flexibility meant being able to go on holiday, or attend children's concerts, sporting events and other occasional events. For example, Michael said

I give more quality time to my kids because I'm able to participate in things that most parents can't ... You know, there are things like: Ruby's birthday is on Friday and I'm going to be there. I had the ability to say 'Yes I'm going to that without question'. And that sort of choice is important.

Only one man talked about managing his time to engage with his family on a more regular basis. James described the notion of 'quality time' as 'a load of crap'. He said he tried to be an 'active father as much as I can'. When he could, he drove the children to school and he made an effort to be home in time to help bathe the children and get them ready for bed. He said he tried to arrange his travel and business commitments to participate in birthdays and school-related events: 'I'd be surprised if the kids ever said I was never around'. This man was the exception to the rule. However, even his more engaged approach relied on his wife's consistent background family care.

An intense commitment to business took time. These men were enabled to use their time on business because their wives were spending their time on family and domestic care work. Most of the men acknowledged the impact of their time use on their family relationships. However, generally, they talked about this as something to be managed in a theoretical sense, or they noted the impacts but effectively ignored them. Both approaches allowed the men to define the 'rules' of time use. For these men, any protest about the use of time was illegitimate. For example, Phillip argued that 'the whole thing is one. The whole family is involved in the business, because that's what the family does as an economic unit'. He said that the idea that time should be divided into 'time for home, some time for work, some time for sleep' was nonsense. For Phillip, 'work is an indelible part of life. It's not like you work, you live, you come back. The whole thing is one. It's that holistic thing. And you can pick and choose what to do in all of that'. However, he acknowledged that 'people [his wife and children] get resentful because they think that the boundaries have been breached'.

These men understood time as theirs to use as they saw fit, in much the same way as they understood money as theirs to use as they chose. Several men responded to my question about work and family balance by talking about their own needs. For

example, Robert said that starting out and growing the business was hard but now he had found a balance. He said, 'Today I balance – you know I fly planes, I race cars, I play golf. I do my business. I have my friends. I try to balance it all out'. Paul worked about fifty hours a week. He said finding a balance was not hard: 'You just say, well I'm not working on the weekend. I've got other things to do – renovate, enjoy life, go to the footy, those types of things. So no, it's not terribly difficult'. Because the basic deal was that the men use their time to provide, any leftover time could then be legitimately devoted to their own leisure.

Most of the men were keen to represent an effortless, energetic use of time. They talked about choice, control and flexibility and yet, despite the portrayal of effortless intense engagement with business, a few men did reveal the personal costs of being caught up in the relentless game of entrepreneurial business over which they did not have full control. The demands of business came at a cost to themselves in terms of their health and the quality of their family relationships. Several men described how they had put off surgery or discharged themselves early from hospital due to the pressure of business. As one man observed:

that's the thing about business, entrepreneurial business, there's no getting off. You can't just wake up one day and say 'you know what? I'm off this. I'll employ someone else to do my job and I'll go kick a footy for a couple of days'. That just doesn't happen.

The relentless nature of entrepreneurial business is associated with a heroic masculinity. Being a protector and provider brings privilege and power but there are costs associated with the deal. The men's power within the family allowed them to use time in the pursuit of business success, which enabled the accumulation of economic, social and symbolic capital. However, identifying the winners and losers of the deal is not straightforward. Much depends on the game that is being played. These men may 'win' in business, but, for some, it came at the expense their health and personal relationships along the way.

Space

Money, time, care, and space are interrelated. Two aspects of the men's control and use of space emerge from their accounts: (1) their intense engagement with business meant business pervaded domestic space, and (2) their extensive travel and intense long hours at work meant that they were frequently absent from home. I will

discuss each in turn. The men drew on the idea of separate spheres in their accounts of space and time, but they also appeared to understand business and family as overlapping, interpenetrating fields. They did business wherever and whenever they wanted, and yet at the same time most also saw family life as separate from business. Family and home was something and somewhere they could retreat to or dip in and out of as they chose. Some men said they valued the change of environment from office or factory to home. For example, Michael said he enjoyed home-related tasks and argued that they enabled him to think about business issues, 'I quite enjoy, if I'm sitting on a lawnmower riding around on our property cutting the lawns, I quite enjoy the forty minutes of being able to think about business'. Brent described how 'once or twice a week or sometimes even three times a week – depending on how hectic things are' he came home to engage with his children.

We'll have a play ... we have dinner and then Penny will bath them and I'm doing stuff on the computer. I play with them, watch some TV with them, they fall asleep, put them to bed and then I'm back in the study until about ten.

His wife made the dinner, tidied up and got the children ready for bed. Business and family inhabited the same space but the demands of his family did not encroach on his ability to do business. Business dominated and framed their use of space. These entrepreneurs not only worked long hours – they often did not stop working, which meant that for these men business could and did take place anywhere and at almost any time.

For many of these men there was little distinction between home and work, and most liked it that way. Communication technologies enabled entrepreneurial business to pervade time and place. For example, James insisted that technology enabled him to better balance work and family because he could check emails on the beach. This access to information enabled him to relax because he felt the need to be available to oversee business issues: 'If anything pops up I'm on my mobile. If there are any issues or anything like that, they can get hold of me and ... I can deal with things'. Some men recognised that the pervasiveness of business activity led to conflict. Nick, who described himself as a 'capitalist with a conscience', related an incident about being interrupted while playing at home with the children:

It's an important phone call ... I'm trying to do a mega deal and ... I'm trying to think, and work on this because it's France. It's nine o'clock in the morning there and it's six o'clock at night here, and my wife's coming in saying, 'where's the [baby's] bottle?' And I'm like: leave me alone! [laughs] Just piss off! And all of a sudden, she feels completely belittled ... 'I'm just a shitty old house mum and you're doing all these mega deals' and I find that – that's all a struggle. I'm sorry! She struggles terribly with her place in life. You know, she was a doctor and now she's a house mum and married to her husband who's getting all these accolades.

For Nick, it seemed, there was no question that the 'mega deal' had priority over his interactions with his wife and children. Nick appeared to see it as his wife's problem that she had yet to adapt to 'her place in life'. His entrepreneurial activity came first; for him that was part of the deal, and his wife needed to get used to that.

Many of the male entrepreneurs said that they were emotionally and intellectually engaged with business no matter where they were. Some talked about not *wanting* to turn off, despite acknowledging the effects of their intense focus on business and disengagement from family. Their primary interest was in business. For example, one man described the impact of his focus on business during his first marriage:

When I was at home with my wife, I was thinking about work. And it was hard to switch off because I was probably 24/7 thinking about it, and you know – it's hard. You can't have a relationship when you're like that ... So anyway ... I think that it was a timing issue for me in terms of my ambition and I guess probably what I was prepared to sacrifice.

The second aspect of these men's use of space relates to their extensive travel. Their accounts of extensive travel reinforce their heroic masculinity as entrepreneurs. For these men, travel was both effortless and a sacrifice. As Philip put it, 'it's a pain in the arse. But you've got to do it'. The men described their itineraries and showed me their travel schedules, as if to underline their toughness in the face of relentless demands. For example, Aaron said he had 'no problems' with his travel schedules.

Let's say in the mornings, I'm in the office and I get a plane at two o'clock to Hong Kong, arrive at nine o'clock there, and then I go into our office

next morning until eleven o'clock, and then flying back at twelve o'clock and arrive back at nine here and go back to the office.

Travel had its benefits. It gave the men a sense of importance and achievement. As one man said, 'When I go to Beijing, I thoroughly enjoy walking into an office over there in a foreign country that we've started from nothing'.

For these men, being away on business was not really different from their everyday absence from home – the difference was a matter of degree, not kind. Some of the men acknowledged that being away on business affected their family relationships, but most argued that their flexibility compensated for their absence. However, they were aware that their absence was not unremarkable. For example, Jack explained that if his wife mixed with 'a regular group of people they'd be saying negative things. How on earth can you do that? How do you put up with that stuff?' But, he said, 'if she mingles with people who all work hard ... entrepreneurial people who are all travelling, working' then his absence seemed unexceptional. In this way, he attempted to manage his wife's reaction to his absence by making it appear normal, rather than responding to her desire to have him at home more often.

The men's accounts of their use of space are at odds with their expressed desires to be more engaged hands-on fathers. For most of these men, home was something that could be dipped in and out of. It existed in the background, subordinate to the main game of business. Their role as provider shaped and legitimised their use of space. Business penetrated the domestic sphere, not only through their use of communication technologies, but also by their absence. The absence of entrepreneurial men shaped their family relationships, and their absence from the domestic sphere enabled their emotional investment in business, in much the same way as Mulholland (2003) suggests.

Care

For most of these men, business was the main game. Indeed, for some it was the only game. As Andrew said, 'Well, it is my life ... what else is there but business? Well, not much. There isn't much'. The idea of separate spheres worked for most of these men. For most of these men, the commitment to the game of entrepreneurial business framed their lives and shaped their use of money, time, space and their relationships. The family remained in the background as a resource. For most, this was unremarkable. It was the deal. For example, Tom worked for 'eighteen hours a day, for four and a half years, seven days a week' to establish his company. He said, 'I was

fortunate in that I had a partner who was prepared to take on some of that, although it wasn't an acknowledged take on in the early days. It wasn't until much later that I recognised how one-sided it was'. Tom's realisation was prompted by his wife leaving him, after 25 years of marriage. Like many of the men, Tom had been happy with the deal and unaware of how dissatisfied his wife had been with their relationship. He thought things worked pretty well. He was 'largely responsible for the business' and his wife was 'largely responsible for the relationship and for the family'. This was not a conscious division of roles and he 'didn't think about it – at all' until 'she left for the first time in 25 years. That was a bit of a catalyst. And it still took a while to bring me around'. Tom reconciled with his wife, but he continued to feel torn between his intense engagement with business and his commitment to his family.

There have been times when for both us when we've said this is just too hard ... I know there have been times when we both said it. I'm not just talking about the business. I'm talking about the interpersonal relationships around the business or around the family at times of stress. It's just tough, just tough. I wouldn't consider parting from it [the family], apart from under a moment of stress, but absolutely not – way too valuable! But I think the same way about the company, too.

The men's accounts hint at tensions around and challenges to the deal, which gave priority to the men's intense engagement in the market. However, most of the men seemed prepared to ignore or 'manage' their wives' complaints. For example, Richard said that his relationship with his second wife suffered because they 'don't get a lot of privacy' as whenever they were not with the children they were with his business friends and associates 'and that really frustrates her'. But he said his wife had to balance that with the privileged lifestyle the business provided the family. For Richard, the deal was not negotiable.

The tensions around the deal were also revealed in the description of strategies that some of the men said they had attempted to implement. Often these strategies were developed after a fight or separation. For example, Nick and his wife had tried to create strategies to support their relationship. He explained that 'the strategies are born out of the fact that we'd had a huge row' and their relationship had been 'deteriorating', so they decided to 'call a stop, pull back and get back in touch'. Common strategies included going out on 'dates' with their wives and regular family holidays. However, the men said they found it difficult to put these strategies into practice because business

came first. Robert, who was a member of an exclusive international executive support organisation, described how:

We have to detail, as part of our strategy for the year, what we're going to do in our personal lifestyles, especially in relationships. So you know, you put down we'll have four weekends away – and that was one of my strategies – I think last year we managed two of the four. We did have two weekends away just by ourselves. Something always pops up.

The men emphasised the *idea* of 'work and family balance', which was framed as theory rather than practice. When I asked the men about work and family balance, several drew me diagrams and used phrases and concepts I later found were from business self-help literature. For example, Richard leapt up and drew diagrams on the boardroom whiteboard. He said he firmly believed that business and family should be kept separate because 'it's dangerous to mingle the two ... very dangerous'. He drew three circles and a triangle linking them. He explained 'There's work, there's social, and there's family'. These are 'competing forces'. He explained that 'you've just got to decide and trade off'; you might spend too much time on work but you can balance that out by going on a holiday or spending time with your family. Jack said he took a considered approach to life. He also drew a diagram of three overlapping 'circles of life', which he labelled 'what's good for Jack', 'what's good for the family' and 'what's good for business'. He explained, 'I try to keep three bits of my life all interactive. And that tends to work for me'. He argued that if he could 'get things happening in there [the overlapping section of the circles] the more I can get things happening in there, the more I cover all three'. Jack went on to illustrate this by describing how he could cover all three aspects of life by having the family attend a business function. For Jack this covered all bases. But he admitted that the theory did not always work in practice.

The one where I get it wrong is over here a lot [colours in the 'what's good for Jack' circle] And what's that bit? That's the bit between Jack and business because the reality is that those circles don't always sit that way. I'm typically doing more of sort of this [business]. Jack gets less time than Jack really should.

When the men talked about 'work and family', they tended to focus on their own needs for space, time and care. They did not always get the balance right but there seemed little doubt that business came first.

The younger men appeared particularly keen to represent themselves as making an effort to engage as fathers and husbands. For example, Nick said that he had a clear view about what he 'should' do as a husband and father but he admitted that 'actions sometimes don't get carried out [laughing] as much as they should'. He said 'running a business like mine is a walk in the park compared to being a 'conscientious partner and father to your kids. I find that weighs on my mind a hell of a lot more than any mega deal with the US'. Robert said that as a child he 'never ever' saw his businessman father. He said he wanted to do things differently but admitted that he was unreliable. 'If it's planned ahead I'm right, but the off the cuff things are really difficult'. David and his wife had a young baby. It was his second marriage and he said that he was aware that he did not manage 'work/life balance' in his previous marriage. He said 'having made the mistake, I diligently make sure that I don't do that. I don't work weekends' but he said he would 'take phone calls at night from people overseas – that's fine'. Importantly, for most of these men, managing the interpenetration of business and family life did not mean substantially changing their business practices. Instead, it meant choosing to engage with family on their own terms. This was not a simple choice. Rather, it was framed by their understanding of their roles as husbands and fathers and their investment in a particular form of entrepreneurial masculinity.

Discussion and conclusions

No matter how they described their family arrangements, these men's lives were dominated by business. They were 'caught up in and by the game' of business (Bourdieu 1998: 76–7). They had a 'more or less unthinking commitment to the logic, values and capital' (Webb et al. 2002: 26) of business. These men used the time, money, space, and emotional and intellectual engagement they needed (wanted) to do business. Their dispositions as entrepreneurial men and the field of entrepreneurial business fitted together neatly. This fit made their deep interest in the game of entrepreneurial business seem natural and unremarkable. For most, it also made their lack of engagement with their families seem inevitable.

Bourdieu suggests that participation in a field is based on an interest in and understanding of the game. A player needs 'to participate, to admit that the game is worth playing and that the stakes that are created in and through this fact are worth

pursuing' (Bourdieu 1998: 77). The men in this study had varying degrees of interest and investment in the fields of business and family. Most of the men acknowledged that business was their primary interest when they were talking about business, but when talking about family life they said family 'came first'. These men sought to explain their interest in business as being 'for the family'. In this way, their financial, physical, emotional and intellectual investment in business was constructed as an economic and emotional investment in the family. A few men were explicit in saying that their interest in business over-rode any interest in family life. Unlike the sons of businessmen, these men had working class backgrounds. They had not inherited the social space (Skeggs 1997) or occupational culture of the bourgeoisie (Berger 1991, Light and Gold 2000) in which the 'traditional' family arrangements that enable intense engagement with business seem natural and unremarkable. As a result, they articulated what was unsaid or 'euphemized' (Bourdieu 1977: 191) by the other men.

Entrepreneurial business exerts intense pressure on men to conform to a particular form of masculinity that conflicts with changing expectations of family as a site for intimate, egalitarian relationships. Connell and Messerschmidt suggest that '[w]ithout treating privileged men as objects of pity, we should recognise that hegemonic masculinity does not necessarily translate into a satisfying experience of life' (2005: 852). Certainly, these men's accounts suggest that costs are associated with their intense engagement with the pursuit of entrepreneurial success. As Bourdieu observes 'male privilege is also a trap, and it has its negative side in the permanent tension and contention' (2001: 50) of having to prove manliness.

These entrepreneur's accounts of business and family life hint at tensions and mismatches, which most men acknowledged but did nothing about. Some men expressed desires for more engaged and committed relationships. Their gestures towards more engaged family relationships can be understood as an adaptation to changing expectations. The lopsided and slight nature of these gestures – they did not change how they did business and their attempts at engagement with family were sporadic – can be explained in two related ways. First, the men can be seen as having embodied dispositions, which no longer match the demands and expectations of contemporary family life. This argument suggests that, even if they wanted to change what they did, their deeply ingrained understandings and dispositions 'are not of the kind that can be suspended by a simple effort of will, founded on a libratory awakening of consciousness' (Bourdieu 2001: 39). For these men, the embodied dispositions as entrepreneurial men are not easily cast off – even if they want to change. The pull of economic, social, and symbolic power associated with male entrepreneurial business

reinforced their commitment to and engagement in business. Importantly, it also framed the nature of their engagement.

The second related explanation for their lack of change emphasises the persistence of social processes and structures despite apparent change. Bourdieu argues that fields are constantly subject to '*partial revolutions*' when new players challenge aspects of the game but 'do not call into question the very foundations of the game' (1993: 74). The men's expressed desire to 'do things differently' and their 'choice' to engage with their children may be understood as a response to changed expectations of family life, but one that did not fundamentally challenge or change the basis of the implied (sometimes explicit) deal. Their economic and symbolic power as entrepreneurial men continued to frame the terms of the deal and the nature of the game/s in which they engaged.

Taken alone, neither explanation fully captures the push-and-pull of individual habitus and competing overlapping fields. For each of these men, embodied dispositions and histories interacted with the 'particular forms of capital and particular narratives' and 'regulatory and coercive discourses' (Webb et al. 2002: 68) of the fields in which they are engaged. The extent to which these interactions created a sense of tension or lack of fit depended on both their particular habitus and the field within which they operated. For most of these men, most of the time, entrepreneurial business was the main game, so they experienced little tension. This does not necessarily mean that the other players – such as their wives and children – felt a similar sense of ease. I explore the wives' perspective in the following chapter.

Chapter five: The wives

Overview

In this chapter, I focus on the wives of entrepreneurs. This chapter is structured in a similar way to the previous chapter. It is organised around five sections. First, I introduce the women. I briefly explore their dispositions towards and understanding of success and examine their understandings of and attitudes towards their husbands' business activities. I discuss the ways in which they tell their husbands' business stories. I then examine their dispositions towards and understandings of family life. In the fourth section, I examine the tensions and conflicts around four main resources: money, time, space and care. In so doing I highlight their control and use of various forms of capital in the fields of business and family. In the final section I argue that their understandings of and commitment to their 'main game' not only framed how they responded to and made sense of the competing demands of business and family, but also limited their power to change the nature of 'the deal'.

The wives

I interviewed 13 wives of entrepreneurs; most (8 of the 13) were aged in their thirties, were of Anglo-Australian background (10 of the 13) and had tertiary qualifications (9 of the 13). Just over half of the women provided details of their family backgrounds. Of these, four had parents who had small businesses or worked as corporate executives, two had parents in the professions, and one described her background as working class. All the women had been in paid employment prior to the birth of their children. At the time of the interview most (9 of the 13) of the women were full-time 'stay-at-home' wives and mothers. Only four of the wives had paid employment; three of these women had professional occupations, and one worked in the service sector.

Most of the wives were formally married (10 of the 13). For most, this marriage was their first. Five of the women had been married for less than five years, three had been married for five to 15 years, two had been married for between 15 and 30 years, and three had been married for 30 years. To some extent, the duration of their relationships reflected the women's ages. Four of the women had three children, four

had two children, and the remaining five women each had one child. The children were aged from a few months through to their twenties. Six of the women had babies or pre-school children, six had school age or teenage children, and three had young adult children. Two women no longer had their children living at home with them.

Business: Ideas and dispositions

To better understand how the women perceived their husbands' pursuit of entrepreneurial success, I first asked them about their own desires and ambitions. Most of the wives (9 of the 13) were not in paid employment. However, most (6 of the 9) of these women said that they had not actively 'chosen' to be an 'at home mother'. As one woman put it, 'it just sort of worked out that way'. These women's choices and ambitions were framed around their husbands' business activities and the needs of their children. Several of the women said that they had thought their lives would be different. For example, Nadine said 'I was convinced I would have a job ...' and Camilla, who had three young children, explained that it was not what she had imagined her future would be.

It's not what I envisaged [laughs], I can tell you, when I was idealistic and studying drama. But I never envisaged that I would love being a mother so much. I never thought that I would want to be at home with children. I am fortunate enough that that is possible.

She added that when the children were older she was hoping to 'get back into paid work and do something then'.

For most of these women, the commitment to provide care to their children and others came first. Nevertheless, these women seemed almost apologetic for their engagement in nonmarket work. These women's accounts flicker between complaint and the assertion of choice. Their understandings and responses to the dominant, competing discourses of individualism and care reflect their habitus as predominantly middle-class women. For most of these women, caught between the pull of family and the market, the family won. In part, this is because their husbands defined the terms of the deal. As I showed in the previous chapter, they took the money, time, space and emotional energy they needed to participate in entrepreneurial business; their wives had to make do with whatever resources were left over. But it is also because the wives'

habitus framed what appeared to be reasonable choices to them. For example, Sophie had three young children. She had worked as an interior designer until she stopped employment to care for her father:

My father was really sick at the time and I was helping to nurse him, and then I had babies. I'd on and off thought about going back to work. ... There have been times over the past few years where I've been really keen on doing something on my own but it always comes back to Carl doesn't want to have two businesses in the one house. He feels that it would be a bit detrimental.

A disposition towards caring and a commitment to family relationships combined with lack of support from her husband left Sophie with few apparent choices, despite her considerable wealth.

Most of these women put their ambitions and dreams on hold to meet their demands of caring for their families and to avoid conflict. For example, one woman said she planned to go back to her profession part-time once her children had grown. Others had vague ideas about setting up a 'little shop or something', or 'doing charity work'. But most felt too constrained to do that, given the demands of caring for their children and husbands. For example, Nadine, whose two adult children no longer lived at home, said that she would like to work as a volunteer at a museum, but she felt that the time commitment would mean that she would not be available if her husband needed her, so she decided not to pursue her ambition any further.

The wives tended to talk about their motivations and understandings of success in terms of the family. For most of these women, most of the time, the main game was the family. This commitment to the family was defined, in part, by their husbands' intense engagement with business. However, three women said they actively chose to be at-home wives and mothers. These women framed their ambitions in terms of their children. Their idea of success was being 'a good mum'. For example, Debbie said:

For me success is just having two happy healthy children. For me, it's just knowing that I've been a good mum to them and I'm happy, they're happy, we're happy. I don't do a paid job where I get payment for what I've done during the week but just seeing the kids happy and thriving is my success.

The wives' ability to fulfil their ambitions to be 'at-home' mothers was enabled – at least in part – by their husbands' economic capital. This was part of the implicit deal.

Only one of the 'stay-at-home' wives felt able to take steps towards fulfilling her ambitions. Tessa, who had three young children, said she dreamed of combining motherhood with business. A highly-qualified professional, she described how she had struggled to adapt to a new country and a new marriage while retaining a sense of self. She had unsuccessfully attempted to work in her husband's business, and had since decided to invest in another business with a friend, as this would provide her with some business opportunities while she cared for her children. As she put it, 'now it's time for me to, you know, to go back to my dreams'. Importantly, perhaps, she was one of the few wives who was not of Anglo-Australian background, and she had her own money.

Four of the wives had paid employment. Of these, two said they worked to protect themselves and their children from the impact of their husbands' unsuccessful business activities. They no longer had faith in their husbands' ability to deliver on the deal. The other two women emphasised their independence. Both these women had been single mothers before their current relationships. They trusted in their own abilities and did not depend on their husbands. One said she enjoyed her work in the service sector and valued her independence. 'I have my own life and a normal day job ... we have our own things that we do. I like it. His interests are his interests and my interests are my interests'. The other woman said she had 'always been independent' and she planned to maintain her independence, even though, sometimes, it was tempting to think about stopping work or working with her partner in his business.

The women talked about their husbands' motivations in three ways. They said they thought their husbands worked hard 'for the family', for money and for a sense of achievement. These motivations were intertwined, but the women tended to emphasise their husbands' fundamental motivation as the desire to provide for the family. This primary motivation explained and excused the other motivations. For example, Debbie described her husband's motivation as:

The family – to give the kids the best possible – not to give them the best – but to give them the best chance ... It's his own self-gratification, I suppose ... It's not to make money. He's not driven by money at all. Like that's just the bonus that you get from having the satisfaction of running a

successful business, and the kids and me obviously – that would be what drives him for sure.

This kind of explanation casts the pursuit of business success as both a form of altruism and self-actualisation, and reflects the men's descriptions of their motivations. The desire for money was downplayed, even though it is an important part of providing for the family. The pursuit of success was also explained as an opportunity for their husbands to feel a 'sense of success' as a man. As one wife said, 'I don't know whether it's the male thing ... he's so committed to this, that success is important because that would give him a sense of worth through this business'.

A few of the women were puzzled by what fuelled their husbands' ambitions. For example, Sally said she did not know what motivated her partner to work so hard, especially because he didn't seem to enjoy it. She admired his energy and focus but did not understand it:

I wish I had it. I wish I knew. I've never been that motivated, I've always worked for the enjoyment of work. I think you do it for monetary response, for the recognition, but you enjoy it. But he's driven. And it's this – I don't know – he makes himself sick.

Most of the wives admired their husbands and were even slightly in awe of them. For example, Tessa told a story about how her husband had compared himself with Superman because of his enormous power and responsibilities. 'He's not a superman of course, but he has so many people to look after, responsibilities ... I think he's really great, sometimes I think, Oh look, I'm just an ordinary person and you are high above'. Helen was similarly admiring of her husband. 'He's really clever. He's the cleverest person I've ever met, and I love to hear him talk ... you know, I've heard him give a speech at one of these conferences, and it's just like [gestures amazed adoration and laughs]!'

This admiration was not shared by those few wives whose husbands' inconsistent success had jeopardised the family's financial stability. For these women an acknowledgment of their husbands' hard work or determination was tempered by a sense of disillusion and resentment. For example, when asked what she thought motivated her husband, Liz said, 'Dreams, I suppose. I dunno [laughs]. Just wanting to

have choices, I guess, the freedom to have choices ... It's money for dreams. Wanting to have what you think you want'. She described his idea of success as 'the money side of things and being seen to have achieved in business'. She acknowledged that he 'loves the kids' but said her husband's motivation was 'more the business-oriented stuff – and that he's provided well for the family'. Women like Liz had disengaged from their partners' pursuit of success. They said that they would like their husbands to be successful but they did not expect or rely on it. Liz, who had maintained her own career while caring for the children, said she saw herself as successful but was disillusioned with her husband's pursuit of success. 'To me my kids are my success, I think, because they're lovely. I don't see monetary gain as success at all. It's a personal thing, I suppose'. She contrasted her sense of success with that of her husband, whom she saw as unsuccessful, even in his own terms. She said, 'I've achieved success. I have! [laughs] Very selfish. [laughs] I think I have. My career has been fine. But Christopher? I don't think so'. This woman had managed to combine a degree of economic independence with an investment in family and friends. Several other wives also contrasted their values with those of their husbands. These women's accounts suggest that they were playing in a different game from that of their husbands. They invested their time and emotion energy into the family and personal relationships, rather than the pursuit of economic success. In this way, they could feel a sense of success, but this investment or sense of success was not easily converted to effective power.

Accounting for success

Just over half the women (7 of the 13) had been involved in the establishment of their husbands' businesses. These women had their own experience of and perspective on the establishment of the business. Women quite commonly provide unpaid labour or 'help out' (Mulholland 2003; Ochberg 1987; Pateman 1988) in their husbands' business, especially in the early days. Mulholland argues that the importance of this labour is minimised as 'perhaps unconsciously, the husband places himself as the nucleus of the activity and his wife's contribution, however necessary, is ... understood to be marginal' (2003: 44). These wives talked about providing services such as bookkeeping, data entry, administration, assistance with business strategy, advertising and PR in the early days of the business. Often they said that they had provided this help while they had jobs of their own. For example, Sophie described the early days of her husband's business:

I would be at my job during the day and I'd go to his office at night and data input or whatever and my mum would go in and we'd all sit there and do basic data entry or anything and that's sort of how it started. Then he moved offices ... he scouted around and found an office ... and it sort of fell into place under his direction, which probably if I was in that position it wouldn't have happened. He just sort of makes things happen. He has this decision-making ability ... He makes his decision and he sticks with it.

Sophie's account of her husband's business beginnings conforms to the dominant narrative of the individual entrepreneur who 'just sort of makes things happen'; she emphasised her husband's decision-making ability and business acumen rather than highlighting her own and her mother's contribution. Interestingly, her husband did not mention their contributions at all.

Some of the women who had provided labour and other forms of support to their husbands in the early days of the business saw this as an extension of their role as supportive wife. Others had attempted to be more engaged in their husbands' businesses but had dropped out or effectively been pushed out of the business as it grew. For example, Nancy described how she was responsible for accounting and administrative work 'but then as we got bigger we got more people on to do the things like payroll and reception and all that sort of stuff'. Later in the interview, she described how difficult she found it to adjust to having no role in the business. 'I just used to hang around because I didn't know what to do. There was no structure at all in my life'. Some women framed their decision to focus on their children rather than remain involved in the business as a choice, but one that was constrained by circumstance. For example, Angie said that she had tried to work with her husband in their business but had responded to his constant criticism by 'focusing one hundred per cent on the kids'.

Three of the wives had met and married their husbands after they had established their business and become successful. These women were either unaware of the business story or had only heard the story from their husbands. Where the wives had met their husbands after the establishment of the business, the business story reinforced the men's identity as astute risk-takers who had started the business from nothing.

Family: Ideas and dispositions

When I asked these women about their families, they talked about three main aspects of family life: parenting (themselves as mothers and their husbands as fathers), their couple relationships; and their role as members of extended families. For most of the women, being a 'good mum' meant being a 'stay-at-home' mother. It meant 'being there'. A surprising number of women emphasised that they did not use paid childcare. For example, Helen believed her daughter 'needs to be with family ... I don't think I am prepared mentally to hand her over to complete strangers'. This statement echoes Joan Williams' argument that the ideology of intensive mothering and domesticity casts *all* childcare as care by 'complete strangers' (2000: 31) which is tantamount to desertion. In this way, childcare choices for women are reduced to either caring for children oneself or more or less abandoning them. Helen said that her husband had told her to 'get a nanny for a few days', but she insisted that she couldn't 'justify that'. While she could foresee a time it would be justifiable, at the time of the interview she felt she needed to focus on her child.

For most of these women, being a mother meant organising the children, driving them to and from school and other activities, arranging social occasions, and participating in school outings. For example, Debbie said being a mum meant 'just making sure that they are good kids and that they get the ability to try a lot of things, like tennis and tap and jazz and ballet and swimming. I take them everywhere just to give them the best opportunities'. The women took pride in their mothering, and for many their relationship with their children came first. A few, like Debbie, had never wanted to do anything else: 'My top priority is my children, to make sure that they are all well looked after, and then myself, and then Hugo probably'. Helen described how she valued her husband's opinion of her as 'the best mum in the world. That gives me a lot of pride – that he thinks that of me ... I just need his approval. It's really important to me that I do have his approval and that he's happy with the way I am'. Nevertheless, Helen seemed very concerned that I would judge her harshly for being a 'stay-at-home mum'. After the interview she said, 'I don't want to come across like a dickhead'.

Other women said that they had never imagined that they would become stay-at-home mothers. For example, Nadine explained that she always thought that she would have a career, but as immigrants, it did not seem practical for both of them to work outside the home 'as we have no family here we cannot rely on anybody'. Camilla – who had a privileged family background – explained that she had been brought up with:

an expectation that we would work – that we would have a career, that we would do something useful in the public sphere, not just in the private sphere – that we all wanted something more than being a housewife.

These wives experienced intense pressure to conform to the rules of the game and focus on the family, which in turn enabled their husbands to engage fully with the market. Nevertheless, Camilla argued that being a ‘stay-at-home’ mum was a personal choice and had nothing to do with being married to an entrepreneur. ‘The sacrifices I’ve made [are] because I wanted to be an at-home parent – I can’t blame him for those – or the business or anything else’. Camilla’s account flickers between discourses of individualism and care. Like many of these women, she embodied the idea of public and private spheres in which, as Connell (2005) has suggested, the nonmarket or private sphere is subordinate and inferior to the market or public sphere. Yet at the same time, she challenged that idea and defended the nature of her family work. She suggested that perhaps ‘we’ve undervalued what being a housewife can actually be’. As mothers, Australian women are under intense pressure to “‘prove’ themselves as mothers’ (Pocock 2003: 82). This pressure is at odds with the pressure to prove oneself in the market. The wives’ accounts reveal some of the tension of being caught between two competing ideologies and fields.

The women talked about their relationship with their husbands in two main ways: as a ‘team’ led by their husbands whom they saw as providers, and as companions and partners. Like their husbands, most of these wives drew on the idea of complementary roles within the family. However, unlike the men, most of these women also said that they wanted to be equal partners who shared the work of rearing a family. Most of the wives described their role as providing support to their husbands to enable them to succeed in business. They saw their domestic and family work as enabling their husbands to focus on business unencumbered by the concerns of daily life. The wives described how they managed all the ‘fiddly things’ like banking, household repairs, renovations, ‘paper work’ relating to private companies and investment properties, as well as their various homes overseas and interstate. The wives also provided emotional and practical support to their husbands in business. Sophie described her role as being a ‘sounding board’ for her husband but stressed that ‘ultimately the decision is his’. Camilla said that she would ‘look at his emails and important letters and things’ because she had a ‘good grasp of language’, but she characterised this as ‘dabbling’ and

stressed that, other than that, she had not been involved with the business which she described as 'his bag'. Most of the women downplayed their contribution. For example, one woman said 'support behind the scenes is really all I am, I have to confess'. For these women the deal, whether explicit or implicit, was that they supported their husbands and took care of the 'fiddly things' of family and domestic life, and in return their husbands provided a comfortable and privileged lifestyle for them and their children.

While most of the women described the family as a team, it was clear that the husband was the team leader. For example, Camilla said:

I think we are a good team. We're very much in love, which is good after fifteen years of marriage. I think he is the stronger of the two of us but we support each other really well ... He provides a lot of guidance for us. He's a very strong personality.

Characterising the family as a team enabled the women to reconcile their desire to be equal partners with their husbands' dominance. The women seemed keen to emphasise that they were not submissive. They talked about standing up for themselves and 'giving as good as they get'. For example, Helen insisted, 'I am not a slave to him or his business at all'. Sally described her relationship with her husband as a rollercoaster ride. She said that her husband was in the front seat because 'if I was in the front seat our relationship wouldn't have survived.' She excused his aggressive and dominant behaviour for the sake of their relationship: 'He's dealing with things all the time at work and to come home and have to fight the whole time and not get his own way, we wouldn't have survived'. But she insisted that she stood up for herself in the relationship and said that she was 'not afraid'. These accounts suggest emotional aspects of the deal, in which the women needed to manage their husbands' and their own emotions in an attempt to reconcile unequal, aggressive and dominating behaviour with ideas of partnership and love.

While most wives said things 'had evolved' because of the children and their husbands' need for support, some women insisted that they had actively chosen a traditional relationship. For example, Helen said she felt lucky to have met her husband. She had been financially secure with a successful career but had longed for marriage and a family. I interviewed her in a large, modern mansion in an affluent harbour-side

suburb of Sydney. She described herself as 'so fortunate' and said, with tears welling in her eyes and a voice breaking with emotion, 'It's almost like my life has turned into a bit of a fairy tale'. She said, 'I'm forever grateful that I met him'. She described how, as a woman in her late thirties, she had 'jumped at the chance' to marry and settle down:

I'd been working pretty hard and I must admit I thought, mmm that would be nice. The reality is a bit different though [laughs]. I'm a pretty traditional person and having got married later in life and had a child later in life ... I guess I was ready to relax a little bit because the pressure is on you when you don't have the traditional family.

These wives' accounts suggest that there is intense pressure to conform to a 'traditional' relationship. A few women, like Helen, succumbed to the powerful societal pressure to 'have the traditional family' but most of these women found themselves caught up by the deal that 'just sort of happened'. Most were unaware of the implicit deal or its terms *until* they found themselves caught up by it.

Most of the wives emphasised their husband's role as provider. For some of these women, intense involvement with work was part of what it is to be a man. For example, Nadine said 'to a certain extent that's natural really'. She insisted that 'the family is number one' for her husband and that he was fulfilling his role as provider by working hard. However, these women were also keen to emphasise the equal nature of their relationships. In doing so, they highlighted their decision-making power while trivialising the nature of their work. For example, Camilla said, 'I make the majority of the decisions about the children and stuff and the minutiae of the day', and Tessa emphasised that she and her husband made joint decisions about 'important things' but 'trivial things, like housework' were her responsibility. She explained this in terms of skills, saying that she was better suited to these tasks than her husband. 'He's not good at it, so I am happy to take over everything at home, housework, whatever, the children, I look after them. Of course, he spends time to play with them. He's very, very close to all of them'. Interestingly, the women also emphasised that they were not the sole decision-makers on family matters. For example, Nadine described herself as 'the organiser to a certain point'. She was keen to point out that her husband 'played his part' in making decisions about the children 'because we talked about things' but she said 'I run more or less everything at home. You know, all for the family'.

The women understood that their role was to support their husbands and enable them to 'work really intensively'. For example, Sophie said:

I make sure the house runs smoothly for him and the kids are all okay and everything. I think ... the most important thing for him is his family and his family life, and he goes to work to support what happens at home. So if the things are happy at home then he feels happy and secure enough to go off to work. So I make sure things on that front are all running okay.

Most of the wives had paid domestic help but they were still responsible for making sure everything ran smoothly. Nadine emphasised how lucky she had been because her husband did not want her to be burdened by domestic work 'just because I was home'. The few women who expressed dissatisfaction with their husbands' lack of involvement with domestic tasks excused this as being due to their husbands' focus on business. For example, Liz observed that her husband no longer cooked meals as he had in the past: 'I don't know when it stopped but ... he doesn't sort of contribute in that way very much anymore, but then he's out doing business and bits and pieces'. Casting their husbands' primary role as providers framed these wives' understanding of their own contribution. It simultaneously served to trivialise their work and emphasise the importance of their husbands' business activity. In this way, their husbands' business activity was seen as legitimate, and their family work was legitimate in that it enabled their husbands' engagement in the market.

A few wives talked about their husbands as companions or partners. Meredith said that she and her husband 'pull together with everything'.

I personally feel a very strong sense of family, and community of family ...
And I think we genuinely care for each other and respect each other and that we like each other. And I think those sorts of things are really important.

Mandy described her relationship with her partner as 'very easy going. We have a good relationship. I don't hold him back in any way. He certainly doesn't hold me back in any way, and I think if I can help him in some way I'm there'. These women had paid employment, which perhaps gave them sufficient independence to engage with their

husbands on a more equal basis. Gemma described her relationship with her husband as a partnership: 'we're both a breadwinner; we're both support people'. Nevertheless, despite having paid employment, these wives also had the main responsibility for domestic and family work. They said they did this to keep the family happy. For example, Meredith, a senior executive who worked away from home during the week, said she:

didn't yell when the house looked like a bomb had hit it by Saturday morning ... What's important is: are the kids going along okay? Are they happy? Are they fed? Are the dynamics working okay? If that's going okay, then I'll clean up on Saturday morning.

Like the other wives, these women made sense of their responsibility for domestic and family care work in terms of a commitment to family and their relationships. Paid employment did not excuse these women from the underlying deal, but it did give them sufficient economic independence to engage with their husbands as companions and partners.

Contests and contradictions

Contests over resources were explicit in these women's accounts compared to their husband's accounts of business and family life. They complained about what they saw as unfair or unequal situations and were frank about criticising their husbands' behaviour, but they tended to then downplay their complaints, or excuse their husbands' behaviour. For most of these women, most of the time, the family was the main game. Their understandings of what it was to be a good mother and wife influenced their investment of emotional capital (Reay 2004) in their families. This focus on the family enabled them to rationalise their husbands' at times aggressive and domineering behaviour. As long as he kept his part of the deal and provided for the family, they were able to invest their energies and resources in family relationships, especially with their children. They contrasted their values with their husbands, but for most, family life and relationships were framed by their husbands' business activities.

Money

Like their husbands, the wives in this study explicitly and implicitly referred to the deal. Money was an important part of the deal. Many of these women were prepared to

take full responsibility for the children and family in return for 'a great lifestyle'. These women emphasised the connection between their husbands' hard work and the rewards that flowed from business success. As one woman said, 'he makes everything we have possible'. Another woman described the link between long hours, stress and material rewards as a 'pay-off'. The deal was inherently risky. Most of the wives were aware of the risks inherent in being tied to their husbands' fortunes, but they trusted in their husbands' ability to manage risk and provide for and protect the family. For example, Debbie said, 'I've never been nervous with anything that he's done because he's never been one to take too great a risk as in, you know, sacrifice everything ... I've always just known that they'd work out really'. Nevertheless, trusting in their husbands' ability to pull through was not always comfortable, as one woman, whose husband had had several unsuccessful business ventures, explained:

It's very difficult on the marriage and the family ... because I like to be independent ... whereas at the moment I'm just sitting on a rollercoaster and I'm just sitting behind and he's the one that's dragging me, sort of thing, you know what I mean ... he's got the main control and um yeah ... I don't know if he told you the full story about the business, we, um, we actually lost a bit of money ... We lost everything and having to sell the house ... made me realise that stability is everything [laughs]. You sort of know where you're heading ... whereas when you don't have it you just don't know ... See if it were up to me I would have just ... said, okay, we're fine, just leave it at that ... But he is always out there looking for something, you know what I mean.

This woman became inarticulate when talking about the effect of business risk on her life. It was as if she were uncomfortable articulating her sense of powerlessness. Indeed, some women admitted that not thinking about the risks was a way of protecting themselves. For example, Debbie, whose father's business had failed, said, 'I've seen it firsthand with my mum and dad but I'm not going to dwell on it'. In fact, a surprising number of wives were unaware of or uninterested in the details of their husbands' business activities, even if they had been involved initially. Some women wanted more involvement with and information about the business, but said that they were not able to achieve this. Instead, they put their faith in their husbands' abilities and explained their

lack of information as being due to lack of time or their own lack of business knowledge. For example, Angie said, 'maybe it's because I've got to ask, because he is so busy' and Tessa – a highly-qualified woman who managed her own business investments – explained: 'I can't even talk about business with him ... well, that's not our subject mainly ... because I can't understand much, so mainly we talk about children and family members, like my family and his family'. These explanations obscure power relations. These wives' lack of understanding and information about their husbands' business activities, together with their domestic and caring responsibilities, meant that the women put blind faith in their husbands' ability to manage risk and provide for the family. Unless they had economic capital of their own, this blind faith locked these women into dependency.

Several women expressed a sense of anger and resentment about the risks to which they and their children had been exposed. For example, Liz described her life as the wife of an entrepreneur as a 'bloody battle'. The constant sense of uncertainty meant that she did not believe that the good times would last. She said: 'That's the hard thing, living on tenterhooks the whole time wondering what's going on and what's happening now? ... I think it's good to have your feet firmly planted on the ground, [laughs] not to be such a visionary'. Liz said that she was prepared to put up with a lot in the short term but the deal had its limits.

If you think it's short term, you cope with it. But ... you know, I've just got to the stage where I just think, yeah, I've had enough of this. I just don't want to do this anymore. I think I've made that point over the last few weeks. [laughs] Two years, pal. That's it, mate! And, if it doesn't alter in that time – I'm out the door.

Where wives felt that their husbands had not adhered to the deal; their response was to withdraw or threaten to withdraw from the relationship. Importantly, their threat-points were influenced by their economic capital. If they had their own employment or sources of income, they were less prepared to tolerate their husbands' dangerous risk-taking. For example, Meredith described how she had almost reached her limit when her husband's business jeopardised the family's financial wellbeing.

Our marriage was at a very critical stage ... He put us in jeopardy financially and I was very, very, very, angry with him because he didn't undertake the checks and balances I asked him to do. If we had lost everything, I would have left him.

She described how she 'activated a plan' to help him salvage the business and she made sure that 'everything' was in her name. She had forgiven her husband because: 'you have to if you're going to stay married and have a relationship. Marriage is all about forgetting stuff and not expecting it all to be perfect, and moving on'. As a senior executive with a career of her own, Meredith was able to manage the extent to which she and her children were exposed to risk. Her economic capital evened up the odds so that she could renegotiate some of the terms of the deal. However, most of the wives did not have their own sources of income. These women simultaneously emphasised the importance of money and trivialised it. They trusted in their husbands' ability to provide and supported them in their business activities, and at the same time they emphasised the importance of family care work, especially mothering. In this way, they reinforced their dependence and the terms of the deal.

Time

The pull of business and their husbands' intense engagement in business framed how the women used and experienced time. For example, Nadine described her adaptation to the 'rhythm' of her husband's global business. Camilla argued that, if her husband had been an executive at a similar level in a corporation, his work would have 'invaded' their lives to the same extent as his business did. She then corrected herself and said 'invade is a negative term. It definitely defines our lives. It puts parameters around our life and helps define it'. Most of the women talked about wanting more of their husbands' time, but they had resigned themselves to business coming first. For example, Mandy acknowledged that their relationship might not work so well if she were 'more demanding of his time ... because he needs the time to do what he needs to do. He certainly doesn't need someone giving him a hard time'. The women defended their husbands' intense engagement with business by emphasising their husbands' responsibility and the importance of their work and comparing them with 'other people'. For example, Debbie explained:

He works pretty hard ... An employee can just switch off and go home, whereas he always knows that he's got other people's lives in his hands. ... with all his staff ... That's always on his mind ... because they rely on their jobs to live their lives.

The men's flexible use of time meant that women could not rely on their husbands for day-to-day assistance. Instead, as the previous chapter suggested, the wives and children served as a background to the men's business activities, into which they could dip from time to time. From the wives' perspective, this flexibility meant not being able to rely on or plan for their husbands' engagement with family life. Sophie explained:

He doesn't like to be relied on to be home at a particular time or to be available at a particular time mid week to do activities or anything like that – like he doesn't want to be – because he can't be tied to that because he never knows what's going to pop up in a day ... He'll suddenly come home at four o'clock one day and have a swim with the kids or he'll leave late one morning to be here with the kids. So he spends a lot of time with the children and with me, family time – although it's not necessarily structured. I've got other friends whose husbands will be home for dinner every night or three evenings a week whereas I can't really rely on Josh for that.

The wives' experience and use of time was defined by their husbands' intense engagement with business and intermittent interaction with the family.

Space

In a similar way, their husbands' business activities affected the wives' experience and use of space because of their husbands' frequent absence, unpredictable presence, and the pervasiveness of business. Most of the women had resigned themselves to their husband's frequent absence and disengagement from family life. These wives tended to accommodate themselves to their husbands' absence. Sophie described how things 'sort of evolved over time. And we've probably got used to the way life is now'. Angie explained her children 'never said, "Where's Dad?" ...

because they got used to him working hard and never being home ... it was just normal to them'. Indeed, for many of these wives their husbands' absence was unremarkable. For example, Nancy described how at first she would miss her husband: 'For the first three days I used to miss him ... but now I don't. I don't. I mean, once he's gone, he's gone. It doesn't really make that much difference now whether he's here or gone'. As another woman said, 'during the week you don't sort of notice as much because he's off at work all day and it's really only those few hours at night time'. Nevertheless, their husbands' absence increased the wives' domestic and family responsibility. One woman observed that whenever any family drama occurred or she needed help with the children, her husband was overseas. As a result, she felt like a 'single parent' because her husband was 'never' there. The wives responded to this sense of loneliness and added responsibility by relying heavily on family and close friends for company and support. Sally – who had homes in two cities – said, 'I'm lucky because I have got a lot of friends in both cities, and had that network before [she got married and had a child]'. And Angie described how she relied on her mother's support, especially when her son was ill, 'If I didn't have the family it would have been very hard ... because he was never around'. For most of these women, investment in social networks and in strong family relationships with their parents - especially mothers - and siblings mitigated the costs associated with the deal.

While most expressed a desire to have stronger relationships with their husbands, some women, especially the older women, said they felt a sense of relief when their husbands were away from home as it freed them from their husbands' demanding behaviour.

Nancy: It's quite nice. It's quite nice to be home alone. I quite enjoy that. It's like a nice break – it's like a holiday [laughs]. Yes, it is, and also especially the way the way he is and – no I shouldn't say – I don't mean his behaviour – that's probably not the right thing. But sometimes it's nice for me to have that space.

Liz: And when he goes overseas, at times I think, Oh God how nice! [laughs] You know ... and the kids will say 'Oh great. Can we do this?' 'Yeah, sure' ... Which is silly because it's not like he's demanding or any of those sorts of things, it's just that, you know.

These wives used their husbands' absence as a means of asserting their independence – in relatively minor ways – while not challenging the fundamental nature of the deal.

Most of the women said that, when their husbands were home, they often were mentally and emotionally disengaged from their surroundings. Their husbands were simultaneously both absent and present. As one woman said 'He thinks he's here and he's not here, even when he is here, he's not here'. Sally described how her husband liked to work in the living room.

He wants to be where the action is. And yet, where the action is, is also where the disruptions are. And if he's in the room and you ask him questions ... he finds that frustrating because I am interrupting him, but if he wants to be part of it, *be* part of it. If he wants to be at work, go to work, and that's a bone of contention for the last four years.

Their husbands' intense engagement in business framed how these women used their domestic space.

The wives tended to complain about the situations they found themselves in, and yet at the same time they defended themselves and their husbands. Their accounts oscillated between complaint and the assertion of choice. They tended to counter each statement of their needs or desires with a corresponding explanation or excuse for their husbands' absence and distraction. For example, one woman described how she would call her husband in the evening.

He's invariably late ... he's always very apologetic about that so I think he feels a little bit guilty, and maybe I contribute to that because by the time we get to the end of the day I'm desperate for him to come home. Overall he balances by making a conscious effort to be with us, you know, as much as he can. He says that he switches off but I know that he doesn't. I love being home with Bella but I'm not terribly stimulated mentally so I find when Myles comes in, I feed off him a lot, which he seems not to mind.

The flicking between complaint, excuse, rationalisation and a poignant expression of need combines to create a sense of powerlessness. Most of the wives seemed unable

or unwilling to change how they live or to demand changes from their husbands. Rather, they accommodated themselves to what was available and made sense of the situation by understanding their husbands' intense involvement with business as an expression of care.

Care

Money, time and space are inextricably bound up with care. These wives' accounts of family life focused on their relationships with their husbands and their roles as mothers. A commitment to family and the idea of love was central for many of these women, even when relationships were less than satisfying. This commitment to love provided the framework for these women's lives and enabled them to forgive and excuse their husbands' failings. For example, Liz said of her husband, who had experienced a series of business failures, 'I love him. I mean, you know, that's the other thing, if I didn't love him, I'd have been gone a long time ago'. Sally had few expectations of her husband. She argued that both husbands and wives 'have to give – at different times both should give', but she said 'that's something that at the moment he's not quite ready for'. Sally said she put up with a less than perfect relationship because:

He's here. He's with me. That's all I can ask for. Asking for more he couldn't deliver. I suppose, it's knowing boundaries, knowing what you can push and what you can't. I've got a guy who's totally devoted to me; even when he does it his own way and in his own time. I'll cruise along. If I get frustrated with it, well, it's my own fault, I chose this. And no-one else can be blamed for it. I chose it. I wasn't made to do it.

Sally's choice was the flipside of the deal that was described by the men in the previous chapter. She argued that her acceptance of the deal was her choice, even though she was aware that it did not conform to contemporary expectations. Sally said that her friends did not understand her relationship. 'They think I am totally weird because I'm living life with a partner who's never there. And as I say to them, it's my choice'.

For most of the wives, investment of emotional capital in their relationships made sense. Even if they had somewhat reluctantly accepted the terms of the deal – as most had - they did so because it made sense to them and seemed to be the only reasonable option. Nevertheless, choosing to accept this deal had some personal costs for these

women. Some wives described a sense of loneliness, lack of companionship, a sense of being overlooked and lost, and of being caught up with their husbands' stress. Angie described her sense of loneliness and neglect but excused her husband. She said, 'I know it's not intentional, but that's how it feels ... When he's away my parents come over and I think, gee, it seems weird to have somebody to talk to at night, because normally I don't get it from Jason'. Most of the wives expressed a desire for more communication and attention. For example, Gemma rather wistfully said, 'It would be nice to have somebody who does switch off from work and who you could have some nice quality time with'. But she recognised that her husband was so absorbed with business that 'everything else is a bit of a sideline'. Not surprisingly, she admitted, 'I've found that really difficult'. In a similar way, their husbands' emotional response to the stress of business affected their relationships, as Sally explained: 'It gets quite stressful, because you're involved in it despite trying to pull yourself away from it ... It's the emotional ups and downs that he's experiencing that affect you'. Another woman described the emotional effect of business challenges on her husband and his relationship with her and their children.

He has a – what would you call it – quite a serious temper which he can lose at times. He has anger-management issues, which he now acknowledges ... when the business isn't travelling well ... his threshold for holding his temper is reduced ... He's a lot more volatile.

Most of these wives accommodated themselves to the limitations and constraints of their relationships with their husbands. As one woman said, 'you get used to it'. These wives seemed prepared to put up with their situations because of their commitment to the idea of love and family and, perhaps because they felt that if they wanted a relationship with that particular man then they had little choice but to accept the terms on which he was prepared to engage with them. Implicit in this was an understanding that they did not have the means to change the unequal basis of the relationship. These wives recognised that they were caught up in an unfair situation, but they rationalised their husbands' absence, disengagement, lack of affection, and aggression in terms of their husbands' intense focus on work, which was part of the deal. Most of the women did not like their husbands' behaviour but they tolerated and excused it because 'it's what you have to sacrifice for the rewards'. For example, for Sally, loving her husband

meant accepting his self-centredness, 'It's not important in his life – it's happening to the other person. What's important is immediate and affects him ... I just ignore it and say well, that's him'. Sophie said she understood her husband's preoccupation with the business: 'it's his baby, he has to protect it'. She excused her husband's lack of attention and engagement because of his intense focus on business.

Sometimes his mind wanders. He's always got so much stuff going on up there that I'll be having a conversation with him and he will literally wander off midway through, like I won't have finished talking and he'll wander off and go to his computer, which as you can imagine is extremely frustrating ... So we have those issues. And he doesn't mean to ... It's just, I think, his mind just goes a lot faster than what his ears are listening or something ... he never turns off. He's always thinking about work.

In a similar way, Sally argued that her husband was not really aware that he treated her in a 'dismissive' manner: 'I don't know if he actually realises that he does it'. Other women explained their husbands' behaviour in terms of gender. For example, Liz said laughingly, 'men can't help being selfish and horrible'. Liz tried to explain her relationship in terms of men's essential selfishness and women's responsibility for care. 'I just wonder whether women compromise themselves more easily than men. I don't know whether it's just part of what's built in women ... Women have to make sure things are okay whereas men are very self-focused'. Like most of the wives, she did not seem able or prepared to analyse her experience in terms of power. Explaining their husbands' behaviour in terms of business stress, absent-mindedness or gender allowed these wives to articulate their complaints while excusing their husbands.

Some of the wives said they felt it was important to develop strategies to engage with their husbands as a couple. Strategies included regular holidays without the children, 'date nights' – although their husbands were reluctant to participate and 'forgot' – and frequent communication with 'three or four phone calls a day'. These strategies suggest that the wives were emotionally available to their husbands, to share business success or provide support throughout the day, but their husbands were not available in the same way. For example, Nadine said that 'family was number one' for her husband. She was always available to support him 'if something comes up, he rings quickly, if it's exciting or if something went wrong, you know, he rings'. But she accepted that business

came first and he was not always available to support her. She described how she would call him on his private line but if he did not have time, he would say “Later!” He only says “Later!” and I know, look, it’s not the time ... to talk.’

These wives’ commitment to family and the relationship served to excuse their husbands’ behaviour but they did not lose sight of the gaps between their reality and their expectations. Their accounts reveal their inability to change the terms of the deal no matter how much they complained. But they cast this as their choice. For example, Sally described the conflict caused by the different understandings and expectations of her relationship with her husband. She explained how they had ‘discussions’ because she was ‘in this relationship as a partner’, not as his ‘employee’. She said that sometimes her husband ‘struggled with that’ because he expected to be treated as the boss at home just as he was at work. Despite thinking what he did at work was ‘fabulous’, she insisted that what he ‘*should*’ be doing when he came home was to ‘spend time with us’. At the same time, Sally was adamant that it was her choice to be with him, even though he was ‘never there’. Angie explained that there had been many times when she wanted to leave her husband because ‘he was never home’, but she had ‘persevered’ because she was committed to the idea of family.

The wives were frank about their husbands’ shortcomings, especially as fathers. They were acutely aware of the gap between what their husbands said about how they wanted to act as fathers and what they did. For example, one woman explained how her husband:

is always going to have a conflict over what he wants to give and what everyone else expects of him ... In his mind, he’s doing everything he has to do. He doesn’t want to be like his father who didn’t have time for him, but he has the same sort of role as his father so ...

Another woman expressed sadness about her husband’s relationship with their children:

Our son said ... ‘Dad’s never been around’. My husband always said ‘I’m going to have time for my kids’. But the other day he said, ‘I’ve really missed the boat’. And for somebody supposedly aware of all these things, yeah, he has in lots of ways ... I think it’s a bit sad really. I’ve got the memories with the kids, but he’s not been there.

Several of the women said that their husbands made an effort to engage with their children because they wanted to do things differently from their own fathers, or because they could see that their relationships with their children were not strong. For example, Debbie said that her husband made an effort because he did not want to be like his father with whom he had no meaningful relationship 'so he really puts the time and effort in now'. Angie described how the children's attitude to their father had changed his behaviour: 'I think that's what made him realise – the kids' attitude to him – he probably realised that he was not spending much time with them'. These men may have engaged more with their children than their own fathers had with them; however, these comments need to be seen in context. The emphasis was on the effort; their husbands still worked extremely long hours and were often absent.

Some of the younger women said that they wanted their husbands to be more engaged at home with household and caring tasks. These women had expected that their husbands would be partners who would share in the care of their children. However, they found that the reality of their family life was different from how they had imagined things would be. Camilla described how difficult she found being unable to rely on her husband to share parenting and other tasks on a regular basis. She argued with him but in the end resigned herself to accepting what he was prepared to give. 'All the way through Louis has said get more help, get more help because we'd end up in these arguments, you know ... and I'd be like: "But I don't want more help, I want their father here"'. Eventually, after the birth of their third child, Camilla employed a nanny and resigned herself to the fact that her husband was not going to share parenting as she had imagined. She rationalised his inconsistent involvement in terms of the relentless demands of the business, and in terms of the quality of the time he did spend with their children. She said, 'He's here when it suits the business for him to be here. And when he is here – when there's a lull in the business – he will spend a heck of a lot of time with them and it's really good quality time, and when he's needed at work or he's away he simply can't do it'.

Money, time, space and care are interrelated so it is almost impossible to focus on one without some discussion of at least one of the others. The women's accounts consistently indicate that their control and use of these resources were shaped by their husbands' involvement in business. The wives' commitment to family relationships served as a foil to their husbands' intense engagement in business. The one reinforced the other.

Discussion and conclusions

Most of these women were committed to family first. Their lives were framed by their husbands' ambitions and business activities and yet their interest centred on the family. A few said that they had always wanted to be stay-at-home mothers but most found that the situation 'evolved'. These women were aware that their 'choices' did not conform to the ideals of individualism and the market. Their accounts reflect 'everyday negotiations both *with* and *within* their gender traditions' (Williams 2001: 258) and between and within two competing ideologies: individualism and the market, and intensive mothering and domesticity. These women were neither 'grateful slaves' nor 'self-made women' (Hakim 1991). Their accounts reveal how their individual habitus reflecting their class, gender, ethnicity and lived experience intersected with the structural and institutional frameworks of business and family. For most, given the institutional, cultural and structural pressures and the explicit and implicit pressure from their husbands, their 'choice' to put family first seemed reasonable. It was part of the deal, which was imposed on them from without – by their husbands and broader society – and by themselves from within.

Despite their dissatisfaction, most of the wives did not directly oppose their husbands. Instead, most resigned or accommodated themselves to the deal, some disengaged, but few attempted to modify the terms of the deal. These women did not seek to directly challenge their husbands' dominance for three main reasons. First, there were clear advantages to their compliance with the deal in terms of a privileged lifestyle for themselves and their children. Second, the men's economic and symbolic capital meant that the husbands were able to frame the deal on a 'take it or leave it' basis. Third, and perhaps most important, was their belief in and commitment to the idea of family. The women's only effective strategy for changing the deal was to challenge the men by threatening to leave or actually leaving. This was a risky strategy as it might not result in the outcome the women desired. Not surprisingly then, the women had to be extremely unhappy before they were prepared to risk their relationship with their husbands. They also had to have the financial means to leave without jeopardising their interests or those of their children. Those who had access to economic capital of their own were more able to assert themselves, but they still took responsibility for domestic and family work. Their economic capital provided them with a measure of power but the fundamental deal was not challenged.

The wives focused on the family. They took pride in their mothering and made sense of their circumstances by framing their husbands' business activities as being 'for the family'. Some also saw it as part of their husbands' quest for self-fulfilment and personal growth. Most of these wives (with the exception of those whose husbands had not been consistently successful) admired and respected their husbands, even if some were slightly puzzled by them. At the same time, the wives tended to cast their values in opposition to their husbands, explicitly valuing the nonmarket over the market. Most drew on narratives of selflessness, love, commitment and fulfilment through family relationships, especially as mothers. They explicitly set their values in opposition to those of the market. In doing so, they felt a sense of success on their own terms. However, the emotional and symbolic capital they accrued within the family was not easily convertible to other forms of capital or transferable to other fields. By solely focusing on one field, they locked themselves into dependency on their husbands, and locked themselves out of the market.

For most of these wives, money was an explicit part of the deal. This finding counters the assertion that families are no longer primarily economic units and instead are now characterised by egalitarian, intimate, companionate relationships. The women were clear that the money made a difference; most seemed prepared to put up with disengagement, disregard and absence as long as the pay-off was a stable and privileged lifestyle for themselves and their children. While most of these women wanted more involvement from the men – especially in relation to the children, family activities, companionship and intimacy – their husbands' role as provider served to excuse much of their husbands' behaviour. While almost all the wives cast their relationship with their husbands as a team, it was clear that the men were the leaders. Their role as providers and their economic capital reinforced their power within the family.

The interconnection of money and intimacy in itself is not fundamentally problematic because, as Zelizer has argued, 'money cohabits regularly with intimacy, and even sustains it' (2005: 28). She points out that the problem does not lie with the intertwining of money and intimacy, but rather with the abuse of power. This may seem a relatively obvious observation but it is important, especially in response to the 'hostile world' theorists who understand money and intimacy as opposites. The problem with her argument is that it does not explicitly address the different and often unequal kinds of power that flow from money and from care.

For most of these wives, the deal was inherently risky because it relied on entrepreneurial activity that was itself inherently risky. Some wives recognised this, but most of the women were unaware of or chose to ignore the level of financial risk to which they and their children were exposed. As long as everything worked, it was better not to dwell on it. The few women who had experienced the consequences of their husbands' risk-taking behaviour responded either by developing their own financial independence or by 'focusing one hundred per cent' on the children and trusting in their husbands' ability to pull through. These women were angry but all said that their commitment to family underpinned their decision to forgive their husbands. However, they insisted that there were limits to what the level of risk that they would accept.

The women's lack of power in their relationships is revealed by the way in which their husbands' business activities defined the wives' control and use of money, time, space and care. They acknowledged that their husbands' business activities defined their use of time but at the same time defended their husbands, in terms of their role as providers, and by reference to 'other people'. These women resigned themselves to accepting what their husbands could give. Business dominated the women's lives by its omnipresence and by their husbands' absence. Again, most of these women resigned themselves to this and developed strong social and family networks to provide the companionship that their husbands did not give them. Some of the wives felt a sense of relief in their husbands' absence. Most were aware that their husbands' absence and intense engagement with business did not conform to societal expectations, but they framed their acceptance of the situation as choice.

Engagement with intimate family relationships was the most contested area of life for these women. This was closely associated with time and absence. The women's accounts reveal attempts to challenge and change the nature of the deal, but their lack of power in the relationship meant that these attempts were largely unsuccessful. They made sense of the apparent contradictions by reference to love and commitment to family. This framework enabled them to accept and excuse their husbands' behaviour. Some attempted to encourage their husbands to engage more with them and their children, but none attempted to change or challenge their husbands' intense engagement with business. Their attempts at change focused only on their interactions in the field of family, not business. While they did not engage directly with business themselves, they privileged business activities. By default, these women allowed business to come first for their husbands and define their family relationships and

activities. Importantly, these wives' intense focus on family was enabled – to some extent – by their husbands' accumulation of economic capital. As a result, perhaps, while they were aware of the costs of the deal, they did not directly challenge it. Instead, they sought to rationalise and explain their husbands' behaviour in terms of gender and the demands of business.

Gender is important in understanding how these women negotiated their ways through the push and pull of the market and nonmarket. But it is only one aspect. The wives' accounts illustrate the 'complex relationship between individual and social resources' (Thomson et al. 2003: 43). These women were not powerless. They had a range of capitals on which they could draw: education, strong family and friendship networks and money – even if it was 'family money' rather than their own. But there were limits to their power and how they could use it. Their power was constrained because their husbands framed the nature of 'the deal'. This deal was reinforced by the fields of business and family, which cast men's engagement with business and women's – especially mothers' – focus on the family as normal and natural. The wives' habitus framed their understanding of what was reasonable or possible, and this combined with their lack of convertible capital to lock them into a deal which most had been unaware they had entered.

In the next two chapters, I focus on women as entrepreneurs and their husbands. An examination of how entrepreneurial women and their husbands negotiate the competing pressures of business and family highlights the interplay of factors that shape engagement in business and family life.

Chapter six: The female entrepreneurs

Overview

In this chapter, I focus on women who are entrepreneurs. The chapter is organised around six sections. First, I introduce the women and briefly describe them and their businesses. Second, I examine their motivations and understandings of success and the ways in which they told their business stories. Third, I explore their dispositions and ideas about family. I then examine the contradictions and contests relating to money, time, space and care. In the fifth section of this chapter, I focus on three women who were in business with their husbands. These women were different from the other female entrepreneurs, and in many ways were more similar to the wives. In the final section, I focus on the interplay of habitus, capitals and fields to argue, that while economic power brought a measure of control and autonomy within the market, for most of these women this power did not carry over to the field of the family.

The women

I interviewed 11 women entrepreneurs. Most of these women were aged in their thirties or forties; three were in their fifties. All were Australian born, although two women had non-Anglo heritage. Of the nine women who provided information, five had 'working-class' or rural backgrounds. This is quite different from the male entrepreneurs, most of whom had privileged backgrounds. Most of these women (8 of the 11) had university qualifications; several commented that they were the first in their family to have attended university. Nine of the 11 women were formally married, one was in a de facto relationship, and one had separated from her long-term partner and at the time of the interview had started a new relationship. More of the female entrepreneurs were formally married than the male entrepreneurs. Similar proportions of women and men entrepreneurs were in a second marriage. Most were married to men who were older than them. Most were married to businessmen (8 of the 11): three of the husbands had their own businesses, three of the women were in business with their husbands – these women were 'copreneurs' – and two were married to semi-retired business owners. Of the 11 women, only three had husbands who were employed as professionals or semi-professionals. None of the female entrepreneurs had full-time stay-at-home spouses like the male entrepreneurs. All the women had children: just over half of these women (6) had at least three children (some many more), three had two children, and two had one

child. Most (9 of the 11) had children who still lived at home. Six had school-aged children, two had teenage or young adult children, two had babies, and one woman's children were adult and had children of their own.

The women had businesses in retail, IT, biotechnology, business services, personal services, manufacturing and media sectors. Almost half (5 of the 11) had businesses that operated internationally. Three owned established national businesses, and three of the women had early stage businesses. Almost all the women had established their businesses from scratch, although one copreneur joined her husband in the business some time after he had established it.

Business: Ideas and dispositions

Like the men, the women's motivations for going into business and pursuing business success were interrelated and at times contradictory. They described themselves as being motivated by money, a desire for creativity and a sense of achievement. As Rachel put it: 'the two great drivers are money and personal success'. Some of the women were unequivocal about their desire to reproduce the lifestyle and environment they had known as children. For example, Amanda, who had 'a very entrepreneurial father', said she wanted to secure a similar level of wealth for herself and her children.

I always wanted to have my own business ... because we'd always been brought up [to understand] that you don't make money working for other people. I had no intention of leeching off my parents. I always wanted to work myself and be my own breadwinner and I wanted my children to be brought up in exactly the same lifestyle I had.

For Amanda, going into business was natural. As she put it: 'everything is just a natural progression, and things just open up along the way and you meet people and opportunities just come from nowhere'.

Being raised in families where business skills were practised and discussed made business seem 'natural' even where gender acted as an initial barrier. Hannah, whose father had 'steered' her into the 'appropriate' career of teaching, described the influence growing up in a family that was dominated by her father's business activities. 'I grew up in a business-like atmosphere ... There was always discussion around the table ... I was very attracted to business. I just liked the atmosphere or something'. This love of the business environment is similar to that expressed by the male entrepreneurs and suggests a non-gendered disposition towards entrepreneurial activities – an

entrepreneurial habitus. However, the opportunity to fulfil business aspirations was framed by gender, class and ethnicity, which in turn shaped access to and use of various forms of capital. Despite her attraction to business, Hannah, who was in her mid-forties, had not had the opportunity to be in business, other than as her husband's assistant, until her husband's business failed. Her husband's business difficulties provided her with the opportunity to overcome the gender-based barriers that had previously blocked her. As she put it, 'up to that point I'd been in my husband's shadow. I'd been the loose-ends merchant or the fix-it-up, backroom sort of person'.

Like the men, these women were motivated by a desire for a sense of achievement and personal satisfaction. Leila observed, 'the sense of achievement is a powerful drug – there is definitely an addictive aspect to running your own business'. But unlike the male entrepreneurs, who were often driven by a sense of competition with their fathers, the women tended to be motivated by a desire to please their parents. For example, Erica explained that for a long time her 'working-class immigrant' parents' pride in her achievements kept her going: 'I think praise was my drug [laughs] and I think you can recognise that later on – what motivates you is for people to say that you've done well'.

Proving others wrong and succeeding in spite of detractors was a strong motivating force for both the men and women. As Sarah put it, 'I get a huge kick out of the fact that we're a successful business, and we've gone beyond where people would have imagined that we would be'. However, unlike the men, the women tended to emphasise the importance of acting as role models for other women and young girls, and their own children. Their accounts suggest that women face particular challenges in succeeding in business and yet the women emphasised individual hard work and talent rather than social or structural obstacles. Amanda, who said she gave lots of talks to young girls about succeeding in business, summed it up. 'It's not about being smart; it's just about applying yourself and working hard'. Melanie also emphasised the importance of hard work and sacrifice, and hinted at gender-based barriers to business success. She saw her intense engagement with business as providing an important role model for her children, especially her sons, 'I like them to see ... a woman who's working and putting in – and that they should allow their partners to do that as well'.

The women's accounts are similar to those of the male entrepreneurs in that they reflect the entrepreneurial myth and are strongly gendered. But the women's business success did not reinforce their femininity in the same way that business success reinforced the male entrepreneurs' masculinity. For example, Sarah described the disparaging attitudes of male friends and relatives, who reacted to her business activities with comments to her husband, such as 'Oh! what a cute idea. It will keep her

busy'. For the male entrepreneurs, gender acted as a symbolic conduit that enabled their access to other forms of capitals and resources. For these women, gender acted as a symbolic barrier to particular capitals and resources.

These women were aware that, as entrepreneurs they were challenging cultural and social expectations. This was especially the case for the older women. These women made sense of the explicit or implicit sexism that they had encountered in doing business by either arguing that they were different from other women who become upset by this kind of 'symbolic violence' (Bourdieu 2001), or explaining it away in terms of gender. For example, Emma described how a young man at a business function she was hosting mistook her for a secretary. She said that it did not bother her because she did not need external affirmation. She commented, 'You know, I think that women who get upset at these things are probably just insecure themselves'. Hannah argued that women have a 'different way of viewing life'. She said 'Maybe this is a female perspective [but men] have a bigger ego'. She illustrated this with an anecdote about an associate with whom she was doing a joint venture, who put his name on a presentation even though she had written it. 'It's an ego driven thing. I wouldn't have thought to do it but a man has to put his imprimatur on it all the time. Do you know what I mean? I just think men and women are different animals – thank God! [laughs]'.

These women either saw themselves as somehow different from most women or identified themselves as different from – and maybe better than – men. They shared similar motivations and understandings of business except that, while the men talked about proving themselves to their fathers, most of the women emphasised the importance of providing a positive role model for their children and other women. Their contradictory explanations understood gender to be simultaneously important and irrelevant.

Accounting for success

The female entrepreneurs in this study drew on the same narrative frameworks as the male entrepreneurs, despite the gendered nature of the entrepreneurial myth. Benoit argues that 'gender expectations make it difficult for women to tell a success story about their business accomplishments' (1997: 156–157). She observes that women use more explicit 'acclaiming strategies' such as emphasising the risks they took in achieving success and emphasising the individual nature of their success. According to Benoit, women do this to counter the cultural tendency of emphasising women's dependency and trivialising women's achievements. However, another explanation is that women emphasise their risk-taking and the individual nature of success because they draw on the same entrepreneurial myth as men.

In this study, just over half of the women described themselves as 'naïve' and 'gutsy'. They had an idea, saw an opportunity and went for it. They told their story as if their success in starting out and growing a business was 'lucky' and 'just happened'. Like the men, they glossed over the resources to which they had access and emphasised their risk-taking and fearlessness. For example, Leila, the daughter of an immigrant businessman, left secure professional employment, set up a company and used her superannuation to make her first product: 'I don't feel like it was a risk. It just felt like fun to me ... I was very gutsy and naïve, so there was no business plan or anything. It was just, Oh, I'm going to do this!' Erica grew up in a small country town. Her parents were also hard-working immigrants. After completing university and working in the industry for several years, she established her business. 'I had quite a naïve attitude, I think, that it was quite easy to make money. I didn't have a mortgage. I didn't have any responsibilities. I really wanted to do it. I was really excited about it so I wasn't afraid of failing'.

These women identified themselves as entrepreneurs. Like their male counterparts, they highlighted the almost accidental nature of their business success while also taking credit for having the nous and tenacity to make the most of the opportunity they 'stumbled upon'. For example, Julia, who was married to a successful businessman, described how as a slightly bored housewife she saw a business opportunity and 'just set up a tiny little business ... to see whether it would work or not and ... it did, and it was very, very successful. Very popular!' At the same time, the women also tended to emphasise the considered and calculated ways in which they researched the business opportunity, assessed the risk and carefully established their businesses while minimising risk. For example, Amanda explained:

I didn't risk things. I had a student come and work for me privately in my home, three days a week, unbeknownst to my employer ... I was on a really good wage and I wasn't prepared to just throw that in. I hedged my bets ... because while for me it was the greatest idea in the world it doesn't necessarily mean that somebody else is going to think that.

The women drew on different aspects of the heroic narratives of the entrepreneurial myth and emphasised the individual nature of success. Like the men, the women were both 'naïve and gutsy' in the face of risk, and considered and calculated entrepreneurs who assessed and managed risk.

The women acknowledged emotional and domestic support, and the financial assistance and business advice they received from their families. For these women,

initial financial support from their parents and husbands was particularly important, whereas the male entrepreneurs relied on friends and associates for initial financial assistance. The difference in sources of financial support may reflect the gendered nature of business networks rather than structural inequalities, although one woman did comment that she borrowed money from her father because 'there is no way the bank would have given me one cent'.

Some women used their husbands' expertise in the early days of the business and their roles became redundant as the business grew, in much the same way as the wives of the male entrepreneurs. For example, Hannah's husband had initially provided her with professional advice: 'it was good to talk to him because he's an excellent problem-solver ... he's really given me a lot in that area'. But he had since taken on more of a 'peripheral role' because she now knew what she used to ask him. Rachel explained that her husband worked in the same industry so they shared information, which was a 'real boon'.

You know, he was probably top of the field and if I referred anything to him, I had that total quality control that he could look after for me. Um and that made it a lot of fun for him because he got access to a lot of interesting stuff ... So there was a lot of synergy there. And it worked well for us.

These women were able to capitalise on their husbands' business skills, expertise and networks, in much the same way as the male entrepreneurs used their wives' labour, networks and skills. These contributions are generally obscured in the business success story. In telling their business stories, these women downplayed the business support that the husbands said they provided (see Chapter seven), just as the male entrepreneurs downplayed or ignored their wives' contributions. However, while the men took their wives' domestic and family contributions for granted, the women tended to cast their husbands' support as extraordinarily generous. For example, Melanie said that her husband was the person who helped her most by 'allowing' her to pursue her business activities. She corrected herself:

Not allowing me to do it but allowing me the space to run here and there at crazy hours ... You know, when you have three young children, it's a pretty generous thing, or supportive thing, for somebody to be optimistic and helpful. So that would have been my biggest help as to why, as to

how I continued and got over that hurdle of an idea into a business. You know, unwavering support from my partner.

In a similar manner, Julia said that her husband was the greatest help because he supported her and 'allowed' her to leave her role as housewife. She emphasised his support at home rather than in relation to the business.

He basically went from being a husband to being a widower almost [laughs] ... I'm very busy and he's very supportive ... All the things that a wife normally would do [laughing] he does. I'm really lucky. Luck is not strong enough a word to say the good fortune of having someone like that as a partner. Because it would not be possible without this really, really true support of your partner.

The women's paths into business had some similarities with those of the men. Like the men the women had access to various forms of capital, such as education, and social and business networks. Like the men, most of the women had a 'feel for the game' of business which they had acquired either from their families of origin or through their marriages to businessmen. However, unlike the men, for most of the women, their ability to devote energy, time and resources to business was shaped by their commitment to family relationships, especially the care of their children. Not surprisingly, then, women such as Julia considered themselves lucky.

Like the men, the women in this study all had growth oriented businesses. As one woman said, 'I always want to make it bigger and better'. Growth was an integral aspect of their businesses. However, family responsibilities had affected the pattern of business growth for most of the women, unlike the men. Five of the women started out in business before they had children, two older women embarked in business once their children had grown, and four of the women started out in business when they had young children. Not surprisingly, the four women who had young children when they started out in business talked about their business growth in the context of their family responsibilities. Some like Rachel grew her business slowly at first to fit around the children. 'I could take more work if I wanted and push it away without it really affecting the business; that really gave me the flexibility that I needed'. After three or four years, her business grew from 'the micro to the small business stage'. At that time, she found she was getting more and more work which required her to spend time away from home. This meant she had to organise childcare and arrange for help with domestic work – she referred to this as 'putting a structure around myself'. As the children became less

dependent, she was able to put more time into the business. In her words, 'I grew the business as the children grew up'. In this way, she did not fundamentally challenge the deal.

Overcoming difficulties and surviving hardships are common themes in the entrepreneurial story. Like the men, these women stressed the challenges that they had encountered along the way. They stressed their skill, tenacity and hard work in managing the tough times and cast themselves as different from most people. As Julia put it, 'It's just an inner thing that you have or you haven't ... Some people give up earlier than others. ... I think that you should give up once your breathing stops [laughs]. ... It's not an option to give in'. However, unlike the men, some women seemed reluctant to take credit for surviving by dint of their hard work and persistence. These women highlighted luck or 'the universe' when describing how they had survived tough times. For example, Erica described the physical and emotional impact of business stress.

You care more about the business than you care about anything at times. I lost a lot of hair. I literally thought I was going bald because so much of my hair fell out because I was in such financial difficulty. There have been times when my bookkeeper said you're trading insolvently and just as I was about to say we've got to close it down, the phone would ring. And it was the head of [Giant Co] saying 'I'm ready to sign. Where do I sign?' ... It's like the universe has stepped in at that absolute last minute. I mean it happens still now ... things sort of step in at the last minute and work.

This New-Age faith is similar to the male entrepreneurs' reliance on self-help business books and inspirational business biographies, but whereas the men referred to texts that focused on individual characteristics and strategies, these women seemed to have more generalised faith in the universe rather than in themselves. These few women appeared unable to take full credit for their tenacity and fearlessness, unlike the male entrepreneurs.

Family: Ideas and dispositions

Most of the women centred their discussion of family relationships on their children, focusing either on their role as mothers or on their husband's role as fathers. Their understanding of mothering and fathering framed their engagement with the market. Most of these women were committed to the idea – if not the practice – of hands-on mothering. A commitment to hands-on mothering combined with intense engagement to business created tensions. Some women emphasised the pressure they

felt from others to conform to the 'traditional' role of mother and wife. For example, Leila explained that, despite her husband's 'respect' for what she had achieved, she felt that he had a deep anger towards her because:

He felt that I really put my business first. He always felt like my priorities were: number one my business ... and then he was at the bottom of the pile. He and the kids were at the bottom of the pile ... He was from a Middle Eastern background, where women were women. They had their place. And while he admired me getting out there and achieving, I think there was a disappointment in me not being a mother at home.

Melanie described how her mother cautioned her to take more care of her husband because she was 'putting too much pressure on him', she explained that for her mother 'the woman was just there in the background to do what had to be done so that the man could go to work'. The pressure to be a 'traditional' mother also came from within. Sarah said she felt pressure 'because of the way I want to be seen by my children, not by the people around me'. She said that she 'overcompensated' for the guilt she felt by being very involved with their school. For Sarah, being a 'good enough' mother was not enough. She explained: 'I want my children to see me as they see their other friends' mums. I want to run the perfect household. I want all their school lunches to be ready. I want all their homework to be done'.

The women talked about hands-on mothering in terms of mothering tasks and time. Mothering tasks took on a symbolic status and enabled the women to make sense of the contradictions inherent in their intense engagement with business and their desire to be hands-on mothers. For example, Sarah described how she would take her children to the library, just as her mother had taken her when she was young. For Sarah, going to the library with her children was symbolic of 'wholesome type things' that she associated with mothering. She described herself as 'pretty much the traditional mother' who read to her children at night, played with them on weekends, and drove them around to parties. She said that she probably did more housework than her husband 'like most wives'. At times, she wished he would do a little more, but she insisted, 'He's good. He's a hands-on dad'. She made sense of his unequal contribution to household tasks by referring to 'traditional roles' which are part of the implicit deal, and she further rationalised her situation by suggesting that it was her choice to do more because it assuaged her guilt for breaching the terms of the deal.

There were a few exceptions to the general acceptance of 'traditional' roles in the family. A few women saw domestic and family work as a shared role and responsibility. They considered themselves 'lucky'. For example, Rachel said:

We've always treated the family as a – it's never just been my job – it's always been our job. And so there was never that conflict ... I've got the most marvellous husband. Everyone ought to have my husband [laughs]. He's great. You could always say is it luck or is it the cleverest thing I've done to marry him? [laughs]

These few women emphasised that their husbands were special, and as Melanie said 'certainly not your regular man'. In this way, they used the deal as a reference point against which they assessed their own situations.

Contests and contradictions

In many ways, these women's accounts of business success are similar to those of the male entrepreneurs, but their accounts of family life and the interconnections of business and family life are strikingly different. For most of these women, business *and* family – especially the care of their children – were the main games. They experienced intense pressure as they tried to manage the pull of business and family. This pressure is highlighted in their accounts of their control and use of money, time, space and care.

Money

Most of the female entrepreneurs said that money was important. They understood that money brings a measure of control and power. These women did not want to be dependent. For example, Amanda explained how her parents taught her the importance of being in control of her own money. Depending on a husband was too risky; 'they could go and do some big deal and lose the whole lot and you've been sitting there going: Hey! ... and it's gone [laughs] I've seen that. And you can't be like that. If you control your own destiny then you know where you sit.' All these women understood that money increased choice and independence. Even the few women who said that money was not an issue stressed the importance of having 'enough' money. They were frugal and cautious because they understood the fallout of business failure. Unlike the wives, these women were not prepared to tie themselves to their husbands' fortunes.

Most of the women were keen to emphasise their calculated risk-taking which some contrasted with men's more cavalier risk-taking. For example, Hannah, who established her business after her husband's business failure and bankruptcy, said:

Maybe men just jump and take the plunge without sort of working it through in detail. I know that Bruce used to say 'it'll be fine, it'll be fine'. [laughs] Yeah, but I want to do my sums. I want to make sure I'll be fine. It's different risk levels, different caution rates. I think it's very poor management not to do your sums first ... because there are a lot of people that you've got responsibility for and you can't afford to be a failure.

For most of these women, the idea of financial freedom did not equate to freedom of choice in the same way as it did for the male entrepreneurs. Money did not fundamentally change the deal. As one woman remarked, 'being able to do what you want is the biggest thing – not what you *have* to do' but she observed, 'life's always made up of *have to do's*, isn't it?' Unlike the male entrepreneurs, these women did not feel that they fulfilled their family responsibilities through their business success. Even where they were earning much more than their husbands, they said they felt judged as inadequate mothers and wives rather than as successful entrepreneurs. Melanie said she felt puzzled and angry that her husband did not appreciate her contribution. 'Sometimes he is irrational and cracks it at me, and I think, what have I done? All I'm doing is working and trying to provide, you know'. Amanda said that her husband liked the money, but being more successful than her husband meant she had to manage his feelings.

Males like to be the boss. And he's obviously got a powerful wife and that's probably a hard thing but I try to ... We make compromises on things like, you know, some things he's in charge of, because otherwise he says 'if I'm not in charge of that, why am I here?' [laughs]

By default, the deal understands men as providers and is based on an understanding that wives should support their husbands emotionally and domestically. Unlike the wives, these women did *not* see their husbands as providers, because they could provide for themselves and their families. But the female entrepreneurs were not considered as providers themselves, even where they were bringing in most of the

family income. Not only were they not seen as providers, they also had to manage their husbands' feelings about their business success.

Almost all the women fiercely protected the power and independence that accrued from their business activities. These women preferred to keep business and family relationships separate as much as possible. One woman explained:

The way he runs his business is his business and the way I run my business is mine – and that's what I always say to him. The way we run our household and our properties and our joint investments, is both of our decisions but the way we each run our own businesses, separate ... I don't ever talk to him about my business ... It's better if he just does what he does and I do what I do [laughs].

Keeping their business activities separate from their husbands enabled them to maintain their independence and sense of control without fundamentally challenging the deal.

Time

For these women time was a valuable resource, which they managed carefully. These entrepreneurs took an active approach to managing the intersection of business and family, but most did not challenge their domestic and caring roles. They worked long hours, but they managed their time to enable them to do business and fulfil what they saw as their roles as mothers and wives. These women were organised. As Leila, who worked 'seven days a week – at least twelve hours' in the early days of the business, observed, 'when you have kids your time management really improves because you can't afford to stuff up. Every minute counts'. They developed structures and systems at business and at home. They took control of their time so that they could manage a wide range of activities. As Rachel said, 'you have to be able to organise it'. They emphasised making lists and fitting in business-related work around domestic and family responsibilities. For these women, organisation equalled control. As Hannah observed, 'You know what you can do ... Just because you are busy doesn't mean that there's pressure'. Amanda relied on detailed organisation to manage her 'family time': 'We just balance it ... I organise our Saturdays, I write a list of what we've got to do ... if we put it all down ... and time it out then we can get all that done'.

This emphasis on organisation and 'balance' obscured their heavy load of family and market work. Most of the women did not challenge the basic deal. Instead, they sought to manage their time to do both business and family work. This was not always easy. For example, Sarah described how she worked until midnight at least one night a

week so she could 'crank in the hours' without encroaching on what she saw as 'family time'. Melanie said she would 'work back late one or two nights week until one or two in the morning' each week. Hannah adopted a similar strategy while growing her business.

On your average day, I'd get to the office at nine. I'd work straight through until about five thirty, six, go home, cook dinner, bathe the kids when they were little, put them to bed and then I would go back to the office, and I would work there quite regularly till one o'clock, two o'clock, three o'clock in the morning and then go back and have a sleep for four hours and then start again. And that was something that was done for years on end.

Most of the women with young children did what Leila called the 'night thing', which was to work at night once the children were asleep. The women described how they got more hours out of the day by sleeping less. Rachel said she built her business 'on no sleep' and Leila described her 'flexibility of the sleeping' as a 'real asset' which enabled her to achieve a 'balance' because she could be with her family after school and in the evening and then work until 'until three or four in the morning and do overseas work on the phone'. Again, the language of flexibility and balance obscures the heavy workload caused by the fundamentally unchanged expectations of women to support and care, regardless of their market activity. These women were caught between the pull of business and family. They stressed their self-disciplined use of time, which they contrasted with other women and their husbands. For example, one woman commented on her husband's TV viewing habits and added 'I have a very strong driving force to get things done. I probably don't ever stop. I don't think I ever sit on a couch. I don't think I ever watch television'. For these women, it was important to manage time because, unlike the male entrepreneurs, they had intense non-negotiable demands to engage with family activities and relations. As Hannah put it, 'the children can't be managed so the business has got to be managed'.

The women's accounts highlight their scrupulous control of time use, and yet like the men, they drew on the idea of flexibility. Many of the women presented it as their choice to manage these multiple pressures. For example, Amanda described how she has structured her life so that she did not have to bring business related work home:

When I come to work, I work ... I don't take lunch and I work my butt off. I work in my car. I plan. If I've got to make calls I'll make them all in my car on my mobile ... I also like to exercise ... so I've got to plan all that to fit in

and see [the baby] and stuff. I am highly organised. But it suits me. It works beautifully for me. I get everything done that I want to get done.

For these women, time was the most contested resource. Blunsdon et al. (2006) point out that time is a limited resource. Unlike money, it cannot be saved up for later. They could only get more time through organisation, reducing 'optional' activities like sleeping or leisure, or through sharing their work with others. Implicit in all these accounts is a sense that the women had to manage and make do with the time that they had, in contrast to the male entrepreneurs who took the time they needed and wanted in doing business.

A key factor in creating the women's sense of time squeeze was their commitment to a particular style of mothering. Their commitment to hands-on mothering and to entrepreneurial business forced these women to make trade-offs, especially where their husbands were not prepared to change their side of the deal. For example, one woman said she consciously traded-off greater business growth for a greater investment of time in rearing her children. 'I'd like to do more but ... It would be completely wrong to deny them [her children] time and assistance just for the business ... If I wanted to spend more time here and deny them time – that's a choice you have – but it's a choice I wouldn't make'. She found her situation 'frustrating' but argued that there was no point in thinking about what she could do if she had more time because that would only make her 'bitter and frustrated'. From her perspective, it was more productive and empowering to work within her constraints, because 'there's only value in doing something that you can control or thinking about things that you can change'.

These women were committed to business *and* to caring for their children. They actively managed their time and the intersections of business and family so that they could do both. The basic deal remained based on an implicit division of responsibilities, which understood men's primary responsibility to provide for the family, with everything else optional, and women's main responsibility to support and care, with everything else – including market work - optional. Most did not challenge the basic deal; instead they focused on developing systems and structures 'to make it work'. Their economic power enabled them to manage their time, but their belief in particular forms of mothering defined how they 'chose' to engage in market and nonmarket work.

Some women sought to do things differently, but contests over time use persisted. For example, Erica had encouraged her husband to work in her business so that they could better manage business and family life. As the founder and owner of the business she had economic power, but he was the 'man of the household', which made things 'interesting'. She described how they 'had many arguments at night' which she

attributed to the time they spent together and to the fact that was more aware of his time-use so 'if he's late – it's like: Why are you late?'. She said that they were 'figuring out who is better at what and who will take responsibility for what' but this did not mean a total renegotiation of the deal. Her economic power did not mean that she could dictate terms, unlike the male entrepreneurs. As she put it, 'if he divorced me or got rid of me I'd have to give him half of everything anyway'.

Default understandings of gendered roles and responsibilities are very hard to change. The symbolic power of this woman's husband, as a man, trumped (Bittman et al. 2003) her economic power as an entrepreneur. Her success and wealth did not equate to equality within the home. Her authority within the business was challenged by her husband. Importantly, this challenge may not have been conscious or deliberate. Both this woman and her husband were adamant that they wanted to share domestic and family care and do things differently from the norm. Their deep understandings of gendered roles and responsibilities can be seen as evidence of the persistence of embodied beliefs, which understand particular roles and responsibilities for men and women as natural, even though these beliefs no longer fit changed social conditions. The mismatch between their beliefs and practice can also be seen evidence of the processes by which those who benefit from particular forms of patriarchal masculinity seek to preserve 'a universe of that which is taken for granted' (Bourdieu 1977: 170).

Only one woman did not feel caught in a competition over time. She was 'lucky' because she went into business when her children had grown up and 'didn't need' her. As she said, 'timing is everything ... isn't it?' She downplayed how hard she worked – like the men – and emphasised her choice to work hard. She said, 'It's not like: Oh God! I've got to work today! ... I look forward to every day. I don't have to work as much as I do. It's my own choice, you know'. Because her children were grown and she was no longer defined by mothering, she was able to play the game like the male entrepreneurs whose time was their own.

Space

Like male entrepreneurs, the female entrepreneurs worked hard. Like the men, most of these women had multiple business and family spaces and, like the men, technology enabled these women to do business across these spaces. For some, even the most private spaces became workspaces. For example, Sarah described how she and her husband, who also had a business, caught up on business in the evenings: 'We don't really use our lounge room anymore. By the time the kids go to bed ... we sit in our bed and we just chat and do computer work every night'. However, the women's accounts of working at home were quite different from those of the men. While the

men's accounts assumed a background of domesticity, the women's accounts of their business activities were of domestic interruptions or working late after the children had gone to bed.

Unlike the men, the 'public' space of business also became family spaces for these women. Most of the women took – or said they had taken – their babies and young children to work with them so that they could do business while maintaining hands-on mothering. For example, Erica, who had established her business before she had children, acknowledged that since her son's birth her priorities had changed. She was no longer as interested in the 'perks, parties, the clothes and the money, and the scene, and everything else'. Now she said, 'I couldn't give a damn about that. I don't go to any parties. [laughs] It's nice to leave work by six. It's nice having him with me. I don't want to miss out on any of it because it just goes by so fast'. She integrated her baby into her business. Her personal assistant acted as nanny and the baby had his own office, which she acknowledged, 'you could never do ... as an employee'. The entrepreneurs recognised that their staff sometimes found having children on-site difficult. However, as one woman put it: 'people who get pissed off by children don't work at [Fast Company]'. As business owners, these women had the power to define how the business space was used. It was their space.

'Being there' was an important source of conflict for these women. They needed and wanted to be engaged with business, which often involved travel and long hours away from home. The female entrepreneurs were less likely than the male entrepreneurs to travel extensively for business. In part, this may have been due to the nature of their businesses and because they were more considered about absences from home. Leila, who used to travel overseas five or six times a year, acknowledged that travelling had its benefits: 'It felt important. It felt successful and it felt challenging'. At the time of the interview, she had restructured the business and begun to delegate international business trips to her staff. 'When it's not new ground, it doesn't need me. I need to be there at the cutting edge'.

The women were much more aware than the men of the need to accommodate their families in making travel arrangements. They tended to explicitly acknowledge their husbands' support in caring for children while they travelled on business. Several observed that family and friends regarded this support as unusual and an imposition on their husbands. For example, Melanie described her friends' reactions to her frequent travel:

I just see their faces when ... my husband might say, 'Oh no, we can't do that, Melanie's in London next week' or something. 'Oh! So what happens

with the kids? Do they go to your mum's?' 'No, no, no, they're okay, and I pick them up' And I think in a way they feel a little bit sorry for him, as much as they see the rewards from my business. I think that they can see that there are monetary rewards, so they're, kind of, not sure how they would handle it, I think.

Other women described the pressure they experienced from their husbands to 'be there'. For example, an entrepreneur who described herself as 'an active, hands-on mother' described the pressure she had felt from her husband who would 'really make mileage' out of her absence by saying to their children, 'your mother's not there. She's not a good mother'. She explained, 'I always had that guilt of I'm not a good mother'. However, her understanding of her mothering changed when she and her daughter listened to a tape recording made when the daughter was a young child. They were surprised that she was at home making dinner because the family story was that the mother was 'never there' when the children were young.

We were so led to believe, all of us ... you know, you take one thing that you're doing, or you take one late event, or even if it happens a couple of times, and it suddenly becomes this really badgering issue between people. It becomes the major story. And in my case it was ... that I wasn't there for the kids.

These women challenged deep expectations that women should focus on family first. Their accounts reveal the intense pressure they experienced from friends and family – and sometimes themselves – to be 'there' and be available. Unlike the men, hard work and an intense focus on business did not excuse them from engagement with their families.

Most of these women felt pressure to be available not only for their children but also for their husbands, and family and friends more broadly. Julia described the intensity of her focus on business as a 'bit of a weakness' because, even though it enabled her to grow her business, she felt 'a bit selfish' because she had not engaged with the family as fully as she 'should have':

I do what I want to do rather than what I need to do and then that comes back and bites you because you feel guilty about not having done it. So it's an area I need to work on personally I think. It's helped me drive the business to where it is. But it's a negative not a positive really ... If I'm with friends; I don't talk about the business. I don't talk business to my

husband. One of the hardest things is not wanting to turn off, you know, because I don't particularly want to, but you know you have to.

Unlike the male entrepreneurs, an intense focus on business did not excuse her from being available for and engaged with family and friends. Another woman described her sense of being caught between the demands of business and her husband's demands for her to be there for him:

He said to me a couple of days ago, 'I get lonely, you know. You're not around'. Whereas all I could feel is: How come you're shitty with me? I'm working flat out trying to keep up ... So I couldn't understand why he was grumpy with me ... When it had all sort of calmed down, you know, he said, 'I just get lonely, at night watching TV' ... He's human too.

Her husband expected to be looked after and even though she resented it, this woman accepted that it was her responsibility to care for his feelings and help him cope with her engagement with business. The male entrepreneurs did not feel a similar sense of responsibility. The male entrepreneurs talked about the same intense focus on business, but even where they recognised the impact of this on their families, they did not feel responsible for their wives' or children's feelings. For the male entrepreneurs, familial discontent was unavoidable fall-out or background interference, which they could ignore; it did not detract from their primary focus on entrepreneurial business. In contrast, these women not only felt pressure to be there, they felt responsible for the feelings of others when they were not.

Care

Money, time and space are intertwined with care. These entrepreneurial women managed their resources so that they could maintain and manage their relationships with their husbands and children. However, their accounts suggest that this 'management' was not the same as control. Rather, they made do with what they could; they smoothed over conflict, patched up disappointments and tried to meet competing demands. Overwhelmingly there is a sense that these women were responsible not only for domestic and family care but also for what Hochschild (1997) calls 'emotion work'. Most managed their emotions rather than changing things. Their commitment to hands-on mothering often conflicted with their ideas about and practice of business. As a result, many of the women talked about their feelings of guilt and frustration as they wrestled with competing beliefs and demands. Sarah articulated the push and pull of

wanting to put the children first while also wanting to be intensely engaged with business:

I will say to myself, of course, my kids come first no matter and I live by that and then all of a sudden I will say, well why did I just do that? Why did I just agree to do that, if my kids really do come first? Is it about money? I think well, No! I'm not doing that extra time at work to earn more money, so why are you doing it? And, you know, I feel very uncomfortable with that tussle and that's why I say, every single day without exaggeration some aspect of that thought comes into my mind.

She described how she struggled to reconcile being a 'very hands-on mum' with working long hours. She worried about whether she had got the 'balance' right and anxiously accounted for her time, arguing that it was 'largely about quality' rather than the quantity of time spent with her children. Her commitment to being with her children *when she could*, allowed her to define herself as 'a very, very, very hands-on mum', even though she said that 'can also sound strange if I work long hours as well'. In this respect, she was similar to the men who described themselves as 'hands-on' fathers while also working extremely long hours. The difference is that the men did not feel guilty (or at least did not say they felt guilty).

The women tended to assess themselves against an imagined benchmark of 'other mothers'. Indeed, some women said they felt compelled to compensate for their involvement in business, so that they could feel 'normal' and be 'that mother too'.

On the days I pick up the kids from school I'll cook very traditional dinners, you know, we'll have the roast dinner or whatever because I want to *be that mother too* ... It is non-stop – you don't ever sit around. But I love it because I feel like I'm being very normal then. I feel like I'm probably being more like my peers on those two days when I pick up the kids from school and fluff around.

Being 'that mother' meant 'not working'; in characterising her non-stop effort as 'fluffing around', this woman reflected the dominant idea of mothering as separate and different from her care as a provider. A few women admitted that they did not always want to spend time with their children, especially when business matters were pressing. Nevertheless, they felt that their lack of interest was contrary to expectations of intensive, hands-on mothering, and that they *should* want to be with their children. As

one woman put it, 'I do question myself about have I had the quality time? ... But I get bored ... I suppose I just keep track of time. You know, I don't have a lot of it'.

The women's engagement with their children was also framed by their husbands' engagement with their children, just as the men's fathering was mediated by their wives. But unlike the male entrepreneurs, most of these women could not rely on their husbands' consistent hands-on care for their children, which meant that, unlike the men, the women could not dip in and out of family life. Nevertheless, for these women, being there, engaging with their children and sharing in domestic and family work were all important characteristics of being a 'good dad'. For example, Erica said she found her husband's love for his children 'a very attractive quality'. She explained, 'I never wanted to be with someone who just cared about career. It wasn't what my father was. I wanted someone like that who loved their kids first, and their family. And, he is like that, so I'm lucky in a sense. I don't think every man could do it'. The women who had husbands who were engaged with the children and 'helped out' with domestic tasks, considered themselves 'lucky' and their husbands 'special'. Where their husbands did not share the parenting, the women tended to rationalise and excuse their husbands. For example, one woman suggested that her husband's time-consuming weekly sporting commitment enabled her to have 'selfish time' to 'play mum' with their children. She defended his use of leisure time arguing that it was 'his time', and added that if she wanted to play sport 'he'd let me'. But she said, 'I actually like it! Because I can just be with the kids, I love that time with them. That's when I play mum'. She contrasted her values with those of her husband in a similar way to the wives, and in doing so rationalised the unequal responsibility for the children. To avoid 'relationship problems' this woman said 'sometimes I have to make it about *men*, not about my husband ... I have to make myself realise that it is about ... men in general. You know, they don't have those pressures of that balance'. Another woman explained how her husband did not 'relate well' to their children. Indeed, she said, one of their children described her as a single parent. Nevertheless, she rationalised the situation.

You know what it's like. [laughs] ... Okay, he doesn't necessarily pull his weight but then ... You can rationalise these things. If you go and rationalise them in a negative way then it's not helpful. It doesn't help anybody, least of all it doesn't help yourself, but if you rationalise in a positive way, then okay.

For this woman, it was easier to ignore the negatives and focus her energy on managing within what was available, rather than trying to change the fundamental terms of the

deal. Her response to her situation reflected her beliefs about and commitment to family and parenting.

Despite significant economic capital, which in theory should have enabled change, these entrepreneurial women were similar to the wives in that they rationalised their husbands' behaviour in terms of gender. Most of the female entrepreneurs seemed aware that their economic capital and their success in business did not counter the gendered divisions of power or labour in the family. These women were financially independent and intensely engaged in business, yet most had responsibility for managing domestic and family work, even though they had cleaners and other domestic staff. For many of these women, taking responsibility for the family and domestic tasks was a way, not only of demonstrating commitment to their family, but also of maintaining control without challenging the basic deal. For example, Amanda said, 'I run the household. I run all the stuff, all the parties, and all that. If I didn't have a structure, it wouldn't happen. I can run it my way. If I left it to him, it would be disastrous [laughs]. It's better if I do it, then I know where it is'. Most of these women tried to do everything or at least try to hold everything together. One woman said her son described her as 'the glue that keeps the family together'. She said, 'I'm sort of like the balancing act in the family ... if anything needs to happen it's no good asking him [her husband] to do it unless it's something really easy like getting milk or the bread'. But, she said, 'it doesn't worry me because I'm used to it'. These women did everything because, for most, there was little choice. They were caught between two fields; by moving into the field of business, they had succeeded at a 'partial revolution'. They could define how they worked in business; it was much more difficult for them to redefine their involvement in their families, or insist on greater involvement in domestic and family work by their husbands. Most still experienced intense cultural, social and practical pressures as they tried to straddle the fields of business and family.

Unlike the male entrepreneurs, these women tended to be protective of their husbands' egos and feelings and worry about the effect of their success and focus on business on their husbands. For example, Hannah said 'it's not always easy' for her husband, and Sarah said her husband found her success in business difficult to manage because 'it's not the traditional role of a woman to overshadow the man'. She insisted that they were not 'that traditional' but said, 'I think that that's a lot of pressure for someone – and there's only so many times you want to hear: Oh she's amazing!' Some of the women referred to their husbands' resentment of their success. For example, one woman described how her husband would mock her business success when they were at parties or other social occasions. Another woman described her confused sense of

frustration and concern about her husband's reaction to her intense engagement with business.

There was a stage back two years ago, when he was drinking. I'd be at work and he'd be home just having a bottle of wine. And it got to be a problem because he was lonely ... I realised that there can be costs associated to working hard, being committed – all those things that you're supposed to be, but ... because the kids are looked after, ... the house is tidy, da dah there was someone else there too who was not being looked after. He's an adult ... I'd always thought he was fine. And he was fine. But he wasn't. He said 'I miss you! We got married to be together', you know, so, and I, yeah ...

Business success did not excuse these women from family responsibilities in the same way as it did for the male entrepreneurs. Indeed, for some women business success brought the added burden of managing their husbands' emotional response to their success. The female entrepreneurs were more economically independent than the wives. Nevertheless, most worked around their husbands and avoided challenging the basic deal. As a result, perhaps, while some husbands 'helped out' and a few actively shared, most did not fundamentally change their behaviour. Very few of the women had active partnerships where they shared family work. The few women who had independent, undemanding husbands acknowledged that they were lucky, but suggested that they would not have put up with anything less. For example, one woman said 'if I had a different type of partner I would be divorced without a doubt', and Julia said:

My husband has always been fairly independent anyway ...we're not each other's vital organ, which is a good thing. He's very independent ... He's not ... dependent on me to be there ... That would be a real strain on us both, wouldn't it? Because he'd be saying you're always at work, and that's where I wanted to be! [laughs].

Most of the women made sense of the contradiction between their commitment to the idea of partnership and their lived experience by arguing that the pressures they experienced were temporary and that 'things will change over time'. They seemed to see themselves as being in the middle of a process of social change. While they experienced conflicting pressures as wives, mothers and successful entrepreneurs, they

seemed to believe that, in the future, these pressures would ease for other women. For example, Leila insisted, 'It's changing. I think there is a really lovely change towards men taking on more of the home roles. But definitely ... women juggle both, whereas men sort of seem to be able to come home and just collapse after a hard day'. Sarah also thought that 'maybe things will change over time ... just the pressures women put on themselves'. This focus on the future enabled the women to identify the pressures they felt in general terms. Their vague hopes that 'things will change' also enabled them to avoid articulating their discontent with the current deal. Entrepreneurial activity provided women with a measure of independence and flexibility without challenging institutional frameworks. Hannah explained that, compared to the expectations she had as a young girl, things had improved. 'When I was growing up my expectation was that I would be married to somebody and I wouldn't be working because that was what happened with my mother'. She said that she would not be surprised to see more women entrepreneurs 'in another generation's time' because 'it suits women. Women are going to have to opt this way if they want to have a family as well as work – because work is not flexible ... so it's going to lead to the development of a lot of alternative work situations'. This vision of new work forms does not challenge how work is structured more broadly; rather it focuses on how some energetic and clear-sighted women can find individual solutions to managing business and family life.

Overall, the female entrepreneurs' accounts suggest that alone the women's economic capital was insufficient to change the nature of the deal. Instead, they used their 'packages of capital' (Silva and Edwards 2004: 3) to manage their resources to defend their engagement in business, which in turn brought them some independence and control. Importantly, for most their increased economic capital did not fundamentally change expectations about their engagement in family life. Unlike the male entrepreneurs, these women were not *enabled* to engage in the market by their family arrangements – notwithstanding initial assistance from their husbands. Rather they maintained their involvement in the market in the face of intense pressure to conform to 'traditional' roles of mother and wife – even where their husbands were supportive.

Copreneurs

In analysing the interviews, it became apparent that the copreneurial women had a different kind of experience of business and family from that of the other female entrepreneurs. Accordingly, I decided to consider the three copreneurial women separately. I did not do this for the copreneurial men as they were similar to the other male entrepreneurs. The copreneurial women's accounts illustrate the way their involvement in business was shaped by their relationship with their husbands.

The implicit gender-based deal had an even more powerful effect because these women were invested in their relationship first. All three women talked about being motivated to go into business with their husbands because of their relationship. The first woman had established a small business with her husband but had then gone on to train as a teacher. She described how she decided to work full-time in the business because she did not want to have 'parallel lives' as a couple. Her commitment to their business was intertwined with her commitment to her relationship with her husband. She 'didn't make a conscious decision' but, once she became pregnant, she 'just never really went back' to teaching. The second woman joined her husband in business because their relationship was 'getting really rocky because he was so absorbed in it [the business] all the time'. So she decided to quit her stressful job and join him in the business.

I thought, stuff it! I'm quitting and I said, 'I'm going to come and work with you'. I don't think he wanted that at all. I think he was terrified. I don't think he knew how to say no. So I bullied my way into the company and it was really hard.

The third woman had worked with her husband for many years. Like the wives who had helped out in their husbands' businesses, she found that her role changed as the business grew, and for some time she did not have an active role in the business. When his business partnership broke up, she was drawn back into the business again. She found this difficult, as the power dynamic had changed and their business had become more like 'his business'. She explained, 'Where once upon a time we were equal partners in what we did, in the last three or four years it has got to where he wants to be the boss of it all'. When she challenged her husband for not involving her in decision-making, he said 'but you're my wife and we've always been in this together, and we're together'. For her husband it seemed she was first and foremost his wife. She said, 'I don't like it. I want to be an equal ... I don't like having to fight for it all the time, but that's where we're at, at the moment'. Rather than trying to change the situation, she attempted to manage her feelings. She argued that having 'a positive mental attitude' was important. She kept going because she believed that 'it doesn't have to go on forever'. Her investment in her personal relationship with her husband seemed to counter the dissatisfaction she felt about their business relationship, but she was acutely aware that her relationship fell short of the ideal of partnership.

I think it's hard if you're in a relationship and then you're also in a business relationship and then one person wants to be the boss because

in a relationship you should be equal, not one person telling the other person how to be. And I think that's probably the hardest ... I think that is the most difficult thing.

Nevertheless, she explained the unequal power within their relationship in a similar way to the wives, by emphasising her husband's clear-sighted decisiveness. She said he had 'a very clear picture of what he wants' and sometimes what they wanted 'didn't gel', so then she had to give her husband 'space to [laughs] to do what he needs to do'.

The three women who were in business with their husbands were also similar to the wives in that they contrasted their values with those of their husbands. For example, one woman said, 'To me success is not material. It's more how rich your life is, that to me is success. And my husband's idea is very different from mine. His idea of success is material'. She described his idea of success as 'male – he wants the power and the ego – recognition – look at me! I've done a great job, you know'. Another woman said she wanted a balance between business and family. She described how she resisted becoming obsessed with the business like her husband. 'I don't want to be obsessed. I want the company to succeed and I want to work in and I want to be proud of it, but I don't want to be that one-dimensional'.

The copreneurial women are interesting as they illustrate how the field of family intersects with and dominates business. Their role as wives compromised their role as business partners, while their husbands' role in the family reinforced their dominant role in the business. As wives, these copreneurial women had much in common with the other wives of entrepreneurs (see Chapter five). The copreneurial women were completely wedded to their business fortunes as couples. They did not have the same level of autonomy and power as the other entrepreneurial women, nor did they have the somewhat constrained autonomy of the wives. The copreneurial women were caught between business and family. They had to fight for recognition as equal partners within the business, and this relative lack of power carried over to their relationship at home. One woman said, 'He lets me be the boss at home. [laughs] So I suppose I've got to let him be the boss at work [laughs]'. While being the boss at home might bring a measure of power, it is not power that is easily convertible, so perhaps it is not surprising that her husband did not 'try to be the boss at home'.

Like the other female entrepreneurs, these women changed the way they did business to better meet their children's needs. However, unlike the other female entrepreneurs, their engagement with family weakened their power within the business, because their husbands continued to work uninterrupted in the business, while they took time out to care for the children. For example, one woman seemed keen to present

herself as having been a 'good mother' who had 'never left' the children. She said 'we just incorporated them into the business. I mean, that's one of the benefits, you don't have to leave them'. Later in the interview she described how, when the children reached school age, her husband continued to travel on business 'and I was at home. I think I resented that quite a lot. I felt that it was, you know, there was no way that he was going to stay at home so it obviously fell to me'. When I asked her why he couldn't stay at home, she exclaimed, 'Because he wouldn't! He wasn't going to. That just wasn't an option. And I wouldn't have wanted him to do that because, you know, I can't understand this idea where you've got to do this because it's fifty/fifty'. She added that she did not really want to leave the children with him as she felt she 'did a better job', but 'that didn't stop me resenting the fact that I spent a lot of my time on my own with two small children and the business'. Unlike the wives who succumbed to pressure to drop out of the businesses they had helped to establish, this woman stood her ground and insisted on going on business trips while her husband stayed at home with the children. She explained, 'I deliberately did that, kept doing those things. I didn't want to drop out. I did drop back but I didn't want to drop out so much, so I kept those things going'.

These women's commitment to family work, especially childcare, affected their involvement in the business. They were not able to manage time and space in the same way as the other female entrepreneurs, because their husbands shaped their involvement in business. Nonetheless, they had more economic leverage than the non-entrepreneurial wives, so they could insist on maintaining involvement in the business. They were protective of their husbands and defended their lack of assistance with the family and children. Like the wives, these women's accounts flip between complaint and an assertion of autonomy but, unlike the wives, they did not talk about choice. However, they did refer to ideas of complementarity and teamwork.

I mean it wasn't all my effort. There was a huge effort on both our parts, but running a business requires quite as much care as children, so at times it was my skills that might be more in demand than his. At times it would be more his, at times it would be his presence at times it would be mine. I think we were pretty good at kind of flowing to some extent.

This woman drew on the idea of partnership to gloss over the apparent inequality of their arrangement and, like the wives, she emphasised her autonomy while also complaining about the lived experience of the deal.

Two of the copreneurial women described selling their homes to invest in the business. Unlike the wives, this motivated the copreneurial women to engage more fully

with the business so that they could have some input into decision-making. For example, one copreneurial woman explained how she and her husband decided to sell their home to 'inject more money' into the business. She said that she had always been adamant that she would not sell the house but she 'decided that it needed to be done, so we sold it in a week'. While this was a 'huge' step, it was worth it 'because there was enough blue sky in the business to warrant the risk'. She described herself as a 'risk-taker' who assessed the risks and decided that 'keeping the business alive' was more important than keeping the house. Nevertheless, she admitted that she would 'periodically bring it up and tell him he was an asshole because he made me sell the house but I don't really mean it. I don't regret it – very much ...' This woman's account suggests that she felt part of the decision-making process, even though it was a decision made under pressure. The other woman's experience was quite different. She said that selling their house made her feel 'very insecure' and while she didn't 'think she wanted to' sell the house, she 'just did it' because even though *she* did not think the risk would pay off, her husband 'certainly had that belief'. And, as she said with a dry laugh, 'He won!' Even though she was a partner in the business, as a wife she lacked decision-making power. Her account suggests that she was well aware of this. She was angry but she did not have the means to effect change within the business or her relationship. Her only recourse was to leave, and having invested so heavily in both the business and the relationship, leaving was not an easy option.

Two of the copreneurial women described the strategies aimed at developing a better relationship with their husbands. Most of these strategies were unsuccessful. For example, one woman described her attempt at instituting a 'date night', a strategy also favoured by the wives (see Chapter five).

We started out Monday night, date night, where we'd go to dinner just the two of us. We didn't get there every week ... but most of the time we did make those dates and then when our relationship got better, the lawyer came along to one, one Monday night, and then he invited someone else another Monday night and after a while I said they're not Monday night date nights any more. They're 'let's talk work' nights.

For this woman, business literally dominated her relationship with her husband.

The copreneurial women's threat points were compromised by their investment in both the relationship and the business. They had to be very unhappy to leave the relationship and jeopardise their investment in the business. Nevertheless, one woman described why she left her husband and children.

It was everything. It was mostly work and he and I had no relationship. We weren't going out. We weren't talking, we only talked work. Sex was just something you did because you needed to do it. There wasn't any great passion or romance there, which really pissed me off. The kids were real heavy duty at the time ... They had their own issues and they were treating me like shit ... you know. I was just taken for granted and I decided they could all go to hell. And I left.

She explained that she went back to her husband because 'he absolutely begged me'. For this woman separation worked even though it was 'a shame' she had to leave. She said she was glad to have left because it forced him to pay attention to her as a *wife* and not just as a business partner.

I'm really glad I did it because I don't think he understood how desperate I was or how lonely I was. I'd sit next to him all day every day at work and I slept next to him at night and I was incredibly lonely because he could only do work. He couldn't do anything but work and I think that finally got through to him that if I was going to be lonely then I'd go and be alone because at least then I only had to look after myself .

This woman's husband was intensely engaged in business, and his investment in that game overshadowed everything else including their relationship. For this woman, investment in business alone was not enough. She also valued a more intense engagement in her intimate relationships. Leaving her husband enabled her to renegotiate their personal relationship and also strengthened her role within the business. Since then, she said, 'He's just made a huge, huge effort. I think he thought he really was going to lose me and it was worth trying not to'. She used her strategic advantage to even up the odds so that they were a little less skewed in her husband's favour. However, her account suggests that the basic deal – that she supports her husband while he focuses on the business – remains in the background and exerts a strong pull, which she continues to resist.

The three copreneurial women share similarities with the wives *and* with the female entrepreneurs. Their accounts illustrate how copreneurial women's involvement in business is shaped by their relationship with their husbands, as Marshack (1998, 1994) and Larsen (2006) have suggested.

Discussion and conclusions

The entrepreneurial women had similar motivations and levels of commitment to business as the male entrepreneurs. They also shared similar dispositions and understandings of family with the wives. They were caught up in the family and were subject to intense pressures to comply with the deal in much the same way as mothers and wives. At the same time, they were caught up in business. As entrepreneurs, they could change the nature of the deal to some extent. For example, they could use their time and space in ways that enabled them to do both business and family. Their economic power enabled them to modify the terms of the deal, but alone it was not sufficient to transform the nature of the deal.

They had access to a range of supports and resources but, like the men, they tended to emphasise their own individual tenacity, talent and hard work and cast their success as individual. The nature and source of the support they received was different from the male entrepreneurs. None of the female entrepreneurs received financial assistance from business associates or through business networks. Instead the women relied on kinship networks and, unlike the men, they highlighted the assistance and support that they received for family responsibilities.

Like the wives of entrepreneurs, the female entrepreneurs experienced intense pressure and competition over money, time, space and care. But unlike the male entrepreneurs, they did not take these resources as a given. Rather, they actively organised and managed these resources. These women seemed aware that they risked losing control of these resources if they did not actively guard them. Even those women who were 'lucky' enough to have supportive husbands seemed to understand that, unless they protected their ability to control their resources, they could lose that power. This is not necessarily a reflection on the individuals' relationships; rather, it highlights intense social and cultural pressure on women to fulfil domestic, family and support roles.

Being a mother was important to these women. For some, being a 'good enough' mother was not enough; they wanted to be perfect mothers. In a strange way, an emphasis on mothering counterbalanced their pursuit of business success. It is as if they were exaggerating one aspect of their femininity to make up for breaching gender norms in pursuing business. This finding supports Bittman et al.'s (2003) research, which suggests that Australian women who earn more than their husbands do more housework to compensate for their transgression of gender norms. But it is important to note that not all the women responded in this way. A few were frank about their relative

disinterest in hands-on mothering, although they knew they *should* want to be more engaged.

For most of the entrepreneurial women, economic power brought a measure of control and autonomy within the market. This power did not necessarily carry over to the field of the family. Indeed, most of the women experienced intense pressure to conform to social and cultural expectations of what they should do as 'good' wives and mothers. Their hold on economic power was precarious, not so much because of the uncertain nature of entrepreneurial success, but because of the intense pressure to conform to 'traditional' roles within the family. These women fiercely guarded their autonomy in business where they had control, whereas within the family most were prepared to work around their husbands rather than fundamentally transform the nature of the deal.

The copreneurial women's accounts highlight the relatively precarious nature of women's capital and power. The copreneurial women did not have the same level of autonomy or control over their resources as the other female entrepreneurs. Even though they presented themselves as partners, their husbands were the dominant players in the business. For these men, business came first and the women did the rest. Unlike most of the wives, these copreneurial women had a measure of economic power through their involvement in the business, but for most this power was compromised because it was tied to their husbands. The copreneurial women were caught between business and family. They had to fight for recognition as equal partners within the business, and this relative lack of power carried over to their relationships at home.

The entrepreneurial women invested in and accepted different aspects of both the market and the nonmarket games. They shared similar beliefs about and dispositions towards business as the male entrepreneurs. They also shared similar understandings and dispositions towards mothering as the wives. They challenged some of the terms of the deals, but they did not fundamentally change the nature of the overall deal. As a result, they bolstered both the entrepreneurial heroic myth *and* the idea that women support and care regardless of what else they may be doing – in much the same way as the male entrepreneurs.

Gender is an important aspect of habitus that shapes engagement with business and family life. But it is not the only aspect. Family background, lived experience and ethnicity, among other things, combine with gender to create a habitus, which shapes an individual's disposition and understanding of various fields, and frames the value and use of their various forms of capital. Habitus incorporates a 'feel for the game' but it does not shape the rules of the game or the nature of the field. These women had an understanding and feel for the game of business; they also had a feel for the game of family – as wives and mothers. But other more dominant players worked to shape the

field in a way that suited their own interests. The women had succeeded at a 'partial revolution'. To some extent, their economic capital enabled them to define how they worked in business; it was much more difficult for them to redefine their involvement in their families, or to insist on their husbands' greater involvement in domestic and family life. This does not mean that change is impossible. It does mean that it is hard and that intense pressure is exerted against new players – like these entrepreneurial women – who seek to change the rules of the game(s).

In the next chapter I focus on the husbands of female entrepreneurs, I argue that the men's accrued symbolic, economic and cultural capital shaped their responses to their wives' greater economic capital so that, despite some shifts in power, the fundamental deal remained the same.

Chapter seven: The husbands

Overview

In this chapter, I focus on the husbands of entrepreneurs. This chapter is structured similarly to the previous chapters. It is organised around five main sections. First, I introduce the men. Second, I briefly explore their dispositions towards and understandings of success, and examine their understandings of and attitudes towards their wives' pursuit of entrepreneurial success. I then focus on their understandings of and dispositions towards family life. In the fourth section, I examine contests over the key resources of money, time, space and care. Taken alone the men in these accounts – in the main – seem flexible, caring and admiring of their wives. It is only when their accounts are compared with those of the female entrepreneurs that contradictions are made visible.

The husbands

I interviewed six husbands of entrepreneurs. Two were aged in their forties, two were in their fifties and two were sixty years of age or older. All of the men were older than their wives. These men were also older than most of the male entrepreneurs. Four of the six were of Anglo-Australian background. Half had tertiary qualifications. Three of the men were business owners or retired business owners, one had just joined his wife in her business, and two had professional or semi-professional employment. None, even those who were semi-retired, was fully engaged with family and domestic activities in the same way as the wives of male entrepreneurs. Five of the six husbands were formally married. For most of the men, this marriage was their first. Most of the men had been married for more than ten years. All of these men had children; most had at least three. Three of the men had children who were still at school, two had adult children who no longer lived at home, and one man had a baby.

Business: Ideas and dispositions

To understand better how the men understood their wives' pursuit of entrepreneurial success, I first asked them about their own desires and ambitions. All of them talked about their business and careers. Their engagement in the market was taken as a given. These men emphasised their success and achievements in

business and their careers. They catalogued their success and presented themselves as experienced and successful men who supported their wives' ambitions. These men understood their wives as special; their accounts reflect a sense of pride in and admiration of their wives' achievements. For example, one man contrasted his wife's energy, determination and positive attitude with his friends' 'whingeing wives'.

In the whole time I've known her, she has never complained about the hours she's been up, the time she got home ... Every time she talks, she talks about where she's going, where she's headed, what's she's doing, what her thoughts are, what her views are, where she's going to be tomorrow, she doesn't really waste her energy on what she's done or how much it's made her tired. And that's a fascinating aspect, to actually listen to someone like that they, they never wallow in mediocrity and say 'Oh I'm so tired!' That's not like her. And it's refreshing to hear.

George described his wife as a 'very determined sort of person' who 'could make a success of anything'. He said that he'd 'been able to guide her' but acknowledged that her success was due to her hard work and determination. In a similar way, Danny argued that his wife 'would be successful in whatever she did', even though he suggested that with his support she could 'pursue things more broadly, maybe more rapidly, [and] maybe ... dream a bit higher'. The men's accounts hinted at generosity towards their wives as they 'allowed' or 'enabled' them to do business. As Trevor put it, 'it's her turn now'. George, who was semi-retired, admitted to feeling a bit lonely at times, but said 'she's entitled to her turn. She's entitled to a fair go with her company'. These statements mirror the female entrepreneurs' accounts and take the men's power within the family as a given. Perhaps because the men had already achieved some success, they were able to be magnanimous. For example, Danny said it was 'fortunate' that he was 'a bit older' than his wife as he had already had a successful career when his wife established her business: 'I have achieved a lot more than I ever thought I'd achieve anyway. And I was pretty satisfied with some of the things I'd done'.

The men also tended to emphasise having shared goals with their wives. These men referred to 'us', 'we' and 'our goals'. They emphasised the shared nature of their wives' success, which they understood in the context of family goals. As one man said, 'it's not an individual pursuit'. Another said:

I don't say if it hadn't been for me, she wouldn't have been where she is today. But I think it is part of the package. The team works together and even if we are not pushing the same barrow we're heading in the same direction and we're on the same track – and our goals are the same.

This is quite different from the ways in which the wives of the male entrepreneurs spoke of their husbands' business. The wives tended to downplay their role in the business. While suggesting that their husbands pursued entrepreneurial success 'for the family' most had no doubt that the business – and the success – belonged to their husbands alone. None of the wives referred to 'our business' when referring to their husbands' business activities.

The men's accounts flicker between admiration and acknowledgement of their wives' success and appropriation of that success. Their accounts of teamwork and shared goals set the women's protectiveness towards their business activities in sharp relief. The analogy of the team serves to minimise any sense of competition; it neutralises their wives' power and, as team coach, the men could take some credit for their wives' success.

Accounting for success

Mulholland argues that entrepreneurial men have the advantage of 'wifely support' in establishing businesses in 'ways that are inconceivable in a reversed scenario' (2003:28). Almost all of these men supported their wives in a variety of ways, but how they described their support was quite different from the support the wives of entrepreneurs described. These men were not dependent on their wives' fortunes, although most appreciated the wealth that flowed from their wives' business activities. Of the six men, only one had met his wife after she had established her business. This man had been a long-term business associate and mentor but had only been in a relationship with his wife for a relatively short time. The other men had met and married their wives before they had established their businesses. In telling their wives' business stories, the men emphasised the support they had provided. Most of these men cast their initial support as being that of a mentor or enabler, rather than a helpmeet. Almost all of the husbands talked about providing some form of support to their wives when they first established their businesses. This help ranged from financial assistance, professional advice and business advice through to practical work such as painting and fitting out of premises.

Some of the husbands referred to help and resources that their wives had not mentioned in their interviews with me. It is hard to know whether the men were

exaggerating their roles, or whether their wives were downplaying the support they had received from their husbands. For example, Trevor told a much more detailed story about his wife's business beginnings than she had. He emphasised the slow beginnings and the importance of networks, and explained how his wife went into partnership with an associate, something she did not mention in her interview with me. Danny described how he had funded the establishment of his wife's business, which his wife did not mention in her interview. He explained:

I felt that if I didn't borrow this money and give her an opportunity to have a go and do something for herself, I would feel like the ogre who prevented her from living her dream ... And it was like allowing, not allowing her to do what she wanted, but facilitating a process and I thought, well, it's just money anyway. I've been paying banks for twenty years; another couple of years won't kill me.

Two men said that they paid little attention to their wives' businesses in the early days, as they considered them little more than hobbies or 'cottage industries' with their 'real' job remaining as wives and mothers. One husband explained 'Oh, I thought it was a great idea. I never thought that it would be what it is today'. Another man said, 'It was just seen as value adding to the family activities to provide a bit more income; it wasn't seen as a bona fide real job because it was dictated to around other activities in the family, so it didn't have a high place'. This husband emphasised the slow beginnings of his wife's business and framed the business within the context of the family. He described how the family changed its understanding of his wife's business once it became obvious that it could grow and become sustainable and successful.

There had to be a mindset change, with our kids in particular, I mean I was quite happy for that and I think it gave her opportunities that she wanted. And, she clearly, at that stage, had a strong sense that this was a business that she could do, that was of value and that had opportunities for growth.

These accounts suggest that the husbands could enable their wives' business activities – and by implication prevent them – yet at the same time the husbands recognised that their wives were determined, and in a sense, unstoppable. The husbands of entrepreneurs admired their spouses' energy and determination much as

the wives admired their entrepreneurial husbands. But unlike these husbands, none of the wives of male entrepreneurs felt that they had enabled their business success, and, unlike these men, none implied that they had the power to prevent their entrepreneurial husbands from engaging in business.

The husbands' stories provide different perspectives on their entrepreneurial wives' success stories. When telling their wives' success stories, these men tended to emphasise the financial and business support and advice they provided, whereas their entrepreneurial wives emphasised the assistance they received for family care. Like the wives of entrepreneurs, these men framed their support of their spouses' ambitions as a choice. These men maintained their own careers or involvement in business, and, having achieved success, they were prepared to shift focus slightly to accommodate their wives' greater involvement in business.

Family: Ideas and dispositions

In general, most of these men seemed much more comfortable talking about family issues and relationships than the male entrepreneurs. Almost all the men described their relationship with their wives as a partnership. Understanding their relationships as partnerships provided the framework for their decision-making about work and family. For example, Bob understood a commitment to a lifelong relationship as providing the framework for negotiation and equality within a relationship.

Both of us entered into this partnership saying this is for life ... A partnership is always about negotiation but underneath it all, there's this sense that this is a life commitment. And ... you'd better bring your cards to the table prepared to negotiate because that's what's got to happen.

The men also referred to the idea of the family as a team. But their understanding of a team was different from the teams described by wives of entrepreneurs where the husbands were the team leaders. As older, relatively successful men, they were able to support their wives without feeling overshadowed or resentful. For example, Danny said that he 'relegated the role of boss many, many years ago'. He explained:

Look, I suppose, being European and being the breadwinner in the early stages of our relationship ... it didn't take me long to realise that as the supposed head of the family – maybe my decisions weren't always appropriate. And there was another person here that wanted to

contribute, not only where I thought, but the whole package and that made a lot of sense. So I don't see myself as the head of the family, I see us more as a team.

These men considered themselves as important team players, even if their wives were the star players. Indeed, some men seemed to regard themselves as team coach – especially in their accounts of their wives' business beginnings. The men's accounts were framed by reference to what they assumed to be the 'normal deal'. They were aware that having powerful wives went against social and cultural norms. Their accounts implicitly refer to power and the contests over power, but they framed these contests in terms of partnership. Bob argued that it was important for men who were married to successful women to have a strong sense of self-worth so that they do not feel overshadowed. He observed, 'It's easy to become progressively threatened and have relationships sour. It's a sense of self worth because suddenly your partner is judged externally by a lot of other people as being this exceptional, wonderful person'. While the men were proud of their wives, it was a different sense of pride from the awe and admiration which some of the wives felt towards their entrepreneurial husbands. There was a sense that their wives were their equals, rather than some kind of superwomen.

The men talked about their fathering in two main ways: like the male entrepreneurs, some men emphasised investing in their children and 'setting them up' by sending them to private schools, instilling them with values, and providing them with the economic, social and cultural capital that would enable them to reproduce their wealth and status. The younger men also tended to emphasise fathering as an opportunity for personal growth and fulfilment, and saw fathering as a way of making a difference. For example, Grant saw fathering as an opportunity to 'leave a really good mark on another person – to have them happy and well adjusted and balanced'. He saw his hands-on fathering as a way of controlling how his children were raised: 'I like the feeling of control in that ... I know that I am giving of myself rather than paying someone else to do it for me ... it's probably worth the investment. It feels pretty good. It's actually quite rewarding'. Interestingly, Grant understood that there was a trade-off between his investment in his career and his children. Danny, who described himself as a 'dad, partner and husband first', explained how he decided to change gear and support his wife's ambitions.

I was actually quite satisfied with myself and I was, I suppose, content with who I was, where I was, and more importantly, where I was going in

a family aspect, rather than in an individual career perspective. I was looking at my future as a dad, partner, husband more than actual career.

Like the wives, these men framed their support of their partners' ambitions as a choice. But unlike the wives, the choice for these men was not either the market or the family; rather, they were able to maintain involvement with the market, as well as engage more with their families.

Contests and contradictions

In most of these men's accounts, there was a sense of slight disappointment and regret over their lost privileges of patriarchy. Unlike the entrepreneurial men, they could not unilaterally define the rules of resource use; they could not always get the money, time, space, and care they needed. These twinges of regret were mitigated by the benefits that flowed from their wives' business success.

Money

None of the husbands considered his wife as the sole financial provider for the family, even where she had greater wealth and earning capacity than him. Most saw the money that flowed from their wives' business activities as a bonus. They liked the money their wives brought into the family and were prepared to tolerate some inconvenience and sacrifice in return for the lifestyle that their wives' wealth enabled. Nevertheless, there was a sense that the wealth came at a cost. The men compared their wives' business success against their performance as mothers. For example, one husband acknowledged that 'the financial rewards obviously have been good', but there had been a cost 'in terms of the number of hours we spend with our kids'. This man did not seem to consider that he could be a 'stay-at-home' dad like most of the wives of entrepreneurs. The underlying expectation that mothers should 'be there' and be hands-on mothers remained strong in these men's accounts.

Because of their ongoing engagement with the market, none of the husbands was exposed to risk in quite the same way as the wives of entrepreneurs. All the husbands were employed, had their own businesses or were semi-retired. They all had their own separate incomes and had insulated themselves from any potential financial risk caused by their wives' businesses. For example, Trevor explained how he restructured his own business and personal finances to protect his assets by putting them into a self-managed superannuation trust fund, 'so ... it doesn't actually belong to me. But that's the only reason we done [sic] that because otherwise we wouldn't have had anything'. Unlike most of the wives of entrepreneurs, these

husbands were able to rearrange their affairs to protect themselves from risk while maintaining their own incomes.

Where husbands had provided funding for their wives' businesses they emphasised how they had done so after full consideration of the risks. For example, Danny said that he had carefully weighed up the riskiness of his wife's business venture before deciding to support it by borrowing against their home.

When she first came up with the idea of me borrowing money, I was very, very reluctant, and talked about it at length with a couple of close family friends ... What I had in my mind as a long-term future was about to be threatened, because potentially I was going to borrow an amount of money and repay it with no return ... I don't consider myself an entrepreneurial type or a risk-taker financially, so I felt threatened in that sense.

Interestingly, he referred to the house as 'my' house, which is similar to the way in which the male entrepreneurs assumed financial control of the family home. As a husband, he had greater control and power over how joint assets could be used than the wives of the male entrepreneurs.

The men's accounts highlighted risk management and the importance of protecting the family as a group. This is quite different from the wives accounts' which show they felt tied to their husbands' fortunes. It is also different from the male entrepreneurs, most of whom engaged in risky business activities. These husbands unambiguously sought to protect themselves, and the family from risk. For example, one man described how, as a couple, he and his wife developed a risk management strategy to enable the development of his wife's company without placing the family in jeopardy. He said they decided against him joining her company because they didn't want to risk 'putting all our eggs in the one basket. That's diversified the risk for the family and that's the way we managed it'. But he emphasised this family risk management strategy had come at some cost to his career: 'It has had a negative impact on my output at work. And I worry about the capacity I've had at work to fly as high as I might have otherwise and be as good as I could be ... because it definitely has had some impact'. Again, there is an implicit reference to the 'norm' where the man 'should' be enabled to fulfil his career aspirations.

Time

The deal assumes that men will be enabled to take the time they need to engage in the market. For these men, that deal no longer completely applied because their wives were actively engaged in the market and actively competed for time with them. For these men, competition over time use was played out in three main ways: adaptation to changed demands; resisting change by ignoring the need for it; or explicit negotiation. Most of the husbands said that they responded to their wives' changed roles and responsibilities by adapting or 'evolving' to better meet changing demands. This adaptation was not easy, as it required a change of focus and a reordering of priorities. For example, Danny, who had been focused on his career, had struggled to adapt to the demands of his wife's business activities.

I did find it difficult because ten years ago ... I had my own career ... I had a lot of goals that I wanted to achieve ... I was working long hours at that time and to step back from that, initially, to help my wife was a problem for me ... Ten years ago my core function was [my job] and I happened to be married with a couple of kids. Now I'm a dad who helps his wife and I happen to work at the same time. So there's been that switch around.

Danny refocused on his family but maintained his involvement in the market. His decision to invest more in family and domestic activities did not tie him to his wife's fortunes, unlike most of the wives of entrepreneurs who were bound to their husbands' success or failure. Several factors helped him to make that shift. His wife's business was successful, he had a sense of achievement from a relatively successful career and perhaps most importantly, his wife was determined to pursue her market goals. If Danny wanted to be with that woman, he needed to accept her terms and support her in her market activities. She had sufficient economic capital to insist on a change in some of the terms of the deal.

Grant also made significant changes so that he could better mesh work and family. By joining his wife in her business, Grant gained greater autonomy and power than he may have had as an employee elsewhere. He was no longer subject to a 'slavish' workplace culture and had flexibility to engage with his family and work on his terms. Unlike the copreneurial wives whose relationship diminished their power within the business, Grant's status within the relationship enhanced his power within the business. Like the women entrepreneurs, he emphasised the importance of having processes in place to enable a balance between business and family responsibilities.

He said that he looked forward to a time when the business would 'run itself'. Then, he said 'we'll be able to commit time in other parts of our lives and more time as a family':

We need to create the time and the only way to create the time is to have business processes properly in place and clients be aware that we're actually bringing up a family as well ... So we'll get a model working ... I think the pay back is more time. And more time to decide what to do with that time either as a family or ... as an individual.

The use of the inclusive 'we' obscures exactly how decisions about time use would be made. Interestingly, he described himself as a 'business partner' and took responsibility for developing these 'business processes', even though it was his wife's business.

A few husbands talked about providing ad hoc support for their wives by taking on more of the family tasks. For these men, the basic deal remained the same, but they 'helped out' their wives when they could. For example, Joe emphasised the reciprocal nature of their ad hoc support. He said 'I guess we just intuitively know or verbally communicate that we need the time'. He then went on to illustrate how his wife went 'beyond the realms of normality' of helping him during busy periods in his business: 'She just knows that I need these few weeks. So she picks up the slack. And there might be other times of the year where it is the reverse or another week of the year, or a couple days or whatever'. Joe was the only husband who also had a business in which he was actively engaged. He and his wife had four small children, and he admitted that, when both he and his wife were very busy, he sometimes felt frustrated because, unlike his business associates, he did not have the full-time support of an 'at-home' wife and mother. Like many of the interviewees, Joe referred to and assessed his situation against an implied deal in which men provide and women support. The ad hoc nature of his support relied on his wife's consistent and ongoing responsibility for family and domestic care – he 'helped out' when he could. The unspoken deal suggests that for Joe the main game was business, and his wife's main game was (or should have been) the family, even though she was intensely engaged in her successful business. Or to put it another way, it was okay by Joe for his wife to engage in business as long as she did most of the family work as well.

Most of the men managed to retain their 'me time'; again this just 'seemed to happen'. For example, one man described how he insisted on his weekly 'switch off' time despite the demands on of businesses and children.

My mobile's off and my BlackBerry doesn't even get in the car, and no kids, and no wife, and no phones, and no nothing and it's just for five hours that's my time ... And I don't generally work a lot during the day on the weekend, neither does my wife, generally, we try not to. Sunday usually is a family day ... We haven't really sat down and discussed that; that's just the way it has evolved.

A lack of discussion meant that the fallback deal was triggered. It seemed normal and natural for this man to take his leisure time and 'not to work' on the weekend because he did not consider family and domestic work his responsibility under the terms of the unspoken deal. There was an assumption that his wife would take care of the children and domestic matters, even though she worked long hours in her business.

A few husbands said that they were relatively unaffected by their wives' long hours at work. For example, Trevor was semi-retired at the time of the interview. As a businessman, he knew that business could be unpredictable and demanding. His wife stayed in another city during the week to enable her to focus on work. At the time of the interview, this couple had no children living at home. Trevor was content to enjoy his semi-retirement and, having been married for more than thirty years, he was happy to spend time with his wife when he could. Having already reaped the benefits of the deal, he was prepared to let her have her turn at investing time in business.

Only one husband talked about actively negotiating time use. Bob had a successful professional career and he and his wife had school-age children. He said they were 'very competitive of time' and had 'heated discussions' and 'play argy bargy' about time. He described how they had developed the strategy of having weekly family negotiations about how they would manage the competing demands for the coming week. 'We typically have our negotiations for the week on Sunday night with the family dinner and say: This is what everyone's got on. How are we going to manage this week?' By actively negotiating time use, this man and his wife challenged the unspoken nature of the deal and made the competition over time use explicit.

Space

None of the husbands talked about their wives' business dominating the domestic space. There was not the same sense of competition over space or presence for these men as for the wives of entrepreneurs. There are two main reasons for this: the men were away from home themselves and were engaged in their business, career or activities, and there was little conflict over space because these men's wives did not encroach on their husbands' space in the same way as the

male entrepreneurs. These husbands were clear about their own need for space. For example, one man said he got 'fussy and irritable' unless he had his own space. Unlike most of the wives of entrepreneurs, the husbands had the means to ensure they had the space they needed.

As businessmen or engaged professionals, they either had travelled extensively in the past or continued to travel on business so they understood their wives' need to travel and saw it as an unavoidable part of doing business. Most of the men focused on the practical implications of their wives' travel and the increased 'family load' when their wives were away. Their response to their wives' absence was framed around conformity to or deviance from ideals of mothering. Some men highlighted the effect of their wives' absence on their children rather than on themselves.

She travels a fair bit so and when she first started travelling ... my daughter's very close to her mum, and she was, she'd be a bit sad when she'd go. But now it's not a foreign concept to them that Mum won't be home for a couple of days, or a week or whatever.

Indeed, most of the husbands said that they were relatively unaffected by their wives' absence from home. In part, this may be due to their active involvement in business or employment. One husband said he thought a little bit of space was 'healthy'. However, it could be that they were reluctant to articulate the emotional dependence on their wives that the entrepreneurial women mentioned in their interviews with me. Only one man expressed a sense of loneliness, but even he was stoic in his sadness: 'It's a pity but one's got to be realistic about these things. I'd prefer to spend more time with her, walk in the bush, hold hands with her, and do all those sorts of things but that's not currently available to me. It will become so'. Like some of the wives, this man traded off his sense of loneliness against an investment in a future in which – he hoped – he would have more time with his wife and a greater sense of intimacy.

Care

Unlike the male entrepreneurs, these men could not take their family relationships for granted. Most of the men described shifts in power in their relationship that had accompanied their wives' business success. Implicit in these accounts is an understanding that they had been the boss or had been selfish but had changed and become more inclined to share.

The men's accounts of changing roles rely on the contradictory ideas of evolution and choice. Both these ideas obscure shifts in power. For example, George described how after the birth of their first child he decided to change his role. He said, 'I consciously took – without discussing it as such with her – I changed that role around ... she's entitled to her turn'. As a semi-retired businessman, he said he was not entirely happy with his situation but described himself as 'pragmatic' in supporting his wife by caring for the children and helping out with domestic tasks: 'someone has to do it ... She's entitled to a fair go with her company'.

The men emphasised their personal growth as they supported their wives and became more engaged and active fathers. They men cast their support of their wives as a mature response to their partners' needs and desires. They characterised the 'evolution' of their relationships as part of 'growing up' with less room for 'the me talk and the ego talk'. The men cast the shift in power as a natural process, but their accounts suggest that it was also an uncomfortable and difficult process. Like some of the wives, some of these men felt overshadowed and 'left behind'. As one man admitted, 'Everything's not rosy. We've had our times where we've been screaming at each other because I think ... What about me? ... I think I got left behind somewhere in you know... when I have my moments'. He admitted that 'maybe I should grow up and get over it!' but said that when he was in his 'selfish "What about me?" moments' he resented his wife's success because of its effects on his career. But he represented his resentment as an occasional twinge rather than a persistent feeling.

When I'm not thinking about myself as much, I see that we've grown enormously as a unit and gone further than I ever thought we would – not in a financial sense – but we've grown so much as a group. I get more rewards out of that growth than I would have as an individual in my own career.

Most of these husbands represented the process of change as one of growth. Unlike the wives, who contrasted their values with those of their entrepreneurial husbands, these men maintained interest in the market as well as the family, and they retained considerable power as men despite shifts in power. They explained the process of change in terms of their own characteristics as 'evolved' men, as well as in terms of broader social change. Like the wives and the female entrepreneurs, the men referred to and assessed their situation against an imagined norm. For example, Bob described his family 'as a bit odd in a way' because he had 'probably been there as much as she has for the younger kids. I think they don't have a strong sense of mum

versus dad activities within the household because of that'. Danny understood his change from 'breadwinner' and 'head of the family' as being the result of an 'evolutionary process between my wife and me'. For Danny, this process reflected their unique relationship and special attributes as well as overall social change.

Her mum and dad probably didn't see each other on weekends, dad was in the garage, mum was in the house and would call when dinner was ready. And similarly, my mum and dad, and they came from a different country – we're just not like them.

Nevertheless, the idea that a woman should be available for her children is deeply ingrained. For example, Bob, who shared parenting with his wife, said their children had a 'sense of loss' because their mother was not there fulltime – 'like some other mothers are'. He worried that their children had missed out on 'that special bond that develops when a mum is there all the time and has time to listen to your every discussion and makes the meals for you and does special things'. This concern about what their children may have missed was despite his commitment to shared parenting. It reflects the deep belief that mothers should be there for their children. Other men expressed concern about the effects of a 'lack of balance' on their children. For example, one man expressed concern for the long-term effects of their lifestyle on their children.

I think they appreciate us as parents and they appreciate that we put food on the table and they live in a comfortable existence. But do they believe that our way of conducting our lives, our work ethic and our home style is for them? They're telling us now that they're not convinced that that's the only way or the right way to go.

None of the fathers stayed at home and provided full-time care in the same way as most of the wives. In this way, despite their change in focus and increased engagement in the family, they did not fundamentally change the deal. Responsibility for the children's wellbeing – for the most part – remained with their wives.

The men emphasised the importance of mothering and the key role their wives played in their families. For example, George described his wife as 'welding the family as a unit'. Implicitly, these men understood mothering as being hands-on. Trevor described how his wife looked after the kids and 'helped out' in his business before going into business herself. He said that it 'would have been almost impossible' for her

to start her business while the children were still young. He corrected himself and said it:

would have been very, very hard. Well, I suppose you know there would have been ways around doing it but I mean you'd have to get people to look after the kids and then of course your family doesn't grow up properly you know. We've got two real good kids ... They've both got their own businesses and they've never given us a minute's trouble either of them so she brought them up properly. [laughs]

Now that he was semi-retired, he was relaxed about his wife's engagement with business, because she had already kept her part of the deal in rearing the children and supporting his business.

The husbands admired their wives' mothering skills and, to some extent, their admiration of their wives' mothering skills excused the husbands from intensive parenting tasks. George said of his wife, 'she's a great mother. They couldn't have a better mother'. Joe said that in an 'ideal world' having a stay-at-home parent would be good for the children, but said that it was not an option for them as individuals. He was adamant that he would not be prepared to 'sit at home all day' as a parent and so, he said, he could not expect his wife to be an at-home mother. He described his wife's mothering in terms of her focus on their children's education: 'She's very good at sitting down with them ... and doing extra tuition from school and so on. And they need it because they need the stimulation, and she's particularly good at that'.

These men tended to describe their relationship as a partnership, in which they were working together towards a common family goal. For some of the men, this meant sharing the domestic and family workload. These men talked about sharing and 'doing what needed to be done'. For example, Danny said he saw domestic and family work as 'part of my role, it's part of who I am. I know that we need to eat. I know that we need to have clean clothes and I know that the grass needs cutting. It's not something that I really spend a lot of time thinking about'. Most of the men acknowledged that their wives did do more house and family work than they did. For example, Joe admitted that his wife 'probably does more' housework and 'a little bit more of the organising side in terms of what are we having for dinner and social arrangements and things like that'. But he insisted 'we both do everything. Whatever is needed we do'.

In the absence of direct observation, it is hard to know whether the husbands or women are exaggerating their domestic and family care contributions. These men

appear to believe that they have made or are making changes. Certainly their change in focus seems to be put into practice much more than the male entrepreneurs' slight gestures towards engagement and equality. Their accounts of a shift in focus can be understood as a cover story that obscures the persistence of an underlying deal from which they continue to benefit. However, their change in focus can also be understood as a response to their entrepreneurial wives' ability to redefine the basis on which resources are controlled and used. This redefinition is limited, because both the husbands and their wives are still subject to broader social and structural pressures that reinforce and reflect embodied dispositions and understandings about gender, business and family life.

Discussion and conclusions

I interviewed only six husbands. Some of their stories contradicted the stories told by their wives, and some confirmed their wives' stories. While some men spent much of the interview talking about their own businesses or jobs, the focus was on their role as husbands of entrepreneurs. This focus may have affected the ways in which they talked about family. They may have given family more emphasis because, perhaps, that was what they thought I wanted.

These men have a quite different approach to family compared to the male entrepreneurs. Where the male entrepreneurs tended to favour a traditional or complementary approach, almost all of these men referred to their relationships as partnerships. These men were committed to the notion of family and most took some action to put their ideas into practice. Some were not necessarily completely happy with their circumstances, but they were prepared to put up with things for the sake of the family. In this way, they are similar to the wives of entrepreneurs who valued family more than their own independence. However, the husbands of entrepreneurs were different from the wives because they were not dependent on their partners in the same way the wives were. These men appreciated the rewards that flowed from their wives' businesses and, while some may have been slightly disappointed that their wives were not like other wives and mothers, most were proud of their achievements.

Implicit in these men's accounts of 'growing up' is an adaptation to shifting power dynamics, but few of the men referred to conflict. In part, perhaps this is because they did not see the conflict. Their habitus as men was such that they saw themselves as 'good guys' who enabled their wives' pursuit and achievement of success and responded to the challenges this created. They were proud of their flexibility and responsiveness. A few observed that this had been at some cost to

themselves and their children but none considered that they should take on the role of fulltime husband and father and give up their participation in the market.

A number of striking differences are apparent between the husbands of entrepreneurs and the wives of entrepreneurs. These men have access to a much wider range of capitals than the wives of entrepreneurs. They generally had their own sources of income, in addition to the benefits that flowed from their wives' businesses. Most had significant social and cultural capital, having extensive professional and business networks. Very few expressed a sense of loneliness. All had significant symbolic capital as successful men. Their economic, social, cultural and symbolic capital combined to provide them with more power than the wives of entrepreneurs. There are also significant differences between the men I interviewed as husbands of entrepreneurs and as entrepreneurs. The husbands did not take their wives for granted. They had a different attitude towards their relationships and a different understanding of partnership. They understood their relationship with their wives as a partnership – as equals on the same team – whereas most of the male entrepreneurs understood their relationships as 'complementary'.

The basic deal against which the interviewees compared and assessed their own situations is one where men provide and women care. Under the terms of this deal, women can also engage in market activity, but it is understood as a choice. In a similar way, men can also do family care and domestic work, but again this is understood as a choice. Women are also responsible for emotion work – the caring for and about others. Men can also do this but it is not expected; if they do, they are 'special'. For these husbands of entrepreneurial women, the first two parts of the deal changed – at least in part. The women in these families engaged in the market, provided for their families and did family care work, as did the men. The difference is that the entrepreneurial women remained responsible for the emotional wellbeing of their families, and their market-based contribution was understood as optional. For most of these couples, the husband's engagement with the market remained unquestioned, and their increased engagement with the family was seen as especially generous because it was optional.

Most of the husbands responded to shifts in power: where they had been the boss in the past, they were 'learning to be equal'. Some said they valued the personal growth and more engaged relationships with their children that accompanied their changed focus. For most of these men, there was very little cost involved in their wives' business activities. All benefited significantly from the increased wealth that flowed to the family. Not surprisingly then, these men were generally content with the slightly modified deal. These husbands had little external incentive to change other

than from their wives. Their wives used their capital – especially economic capital – and resources to push for change from their husbands. These women had to be fiercely determined and vigilant in pushing for change. The changes they had effected were fragile, because of the intense social pressure on both the men and the women to conform to the underlying deal.

Chapter eight: Conclusions

Overview

This chapter brings together the findings of the study. First, I summarise the findings, and identify how these findings build on and sit with other research. Second, I restate the theoretical argument that I have developed in this thesis. I consider how the findings from this study illuminate understandings of market and nonmarket work. Finally, I reflect upon on the limitations of the study and consider recommendations for future research.

In western capitalist societies, economic activity and intimate relations are often considered as separate and antithetical; this study addressed business and family as interconnected rather than separate. I focused on entrepreneurs and their wives or husbands for two reasons. First, the entrepreneurial myth emphasises individual success and downplays or ignores the resources and support used in the pursuit and achievement of success. Second, family relationships are increasingly cast as non-economic and, as an ideal, are characterised as egalitarian and fulfilling. By focusing on entrepreneurs and their husbands or wives, I was able to explore the processes by which economic and intimate relations and activities interconnect, and the means by which power relations persist and change.

For entrepreneurs, the family provides access to resources that support business development and growth and enable the further accumulation of capital. For the families of entrepreneurs, business can provide economic, social, cultural and symbolic capital, which in turn provides access to resources that enable engagement in market and nonmarket activities. By looking at men and women both as entrepreneurs and as husbands and wives, this study provides differing perspectives on the competing discourses around entrepreneurial business and family life. It has explored how men and women account for their business and family lives. Specifically, it focused on how men and women manage and account for the contest for resources – money, time, space and care – in a social and cultural environment that emphasises individualism and risk. This study focused on three main questions: How do men and women understand and account for their market success? How do men and women understand and account for their family relationships? How do men and women understand and account for their engagement in business and family life?

Accounting for success

In this study, I found that men and women as entrepreneurs drew on the same narrative frameworks of entrepreneurial success in telling their business stories. The entrepreneurs shared similar orientations and dispositions towards entrepreneurial business, regardless of gender. This finding supports the findings of research such as that done by Berger 1991, Birley 1989, Brush et al. 2006, Greer and Green 2003, Light and Gold 2000, and Mulholland 2003. While entrepreneurship is associated strongly with a particular form of masculinity (Bruni et al. 2005, 2004), in this study I found gender affected the subtleties of entrepreneurial performance more than it affected the orientation towards entrepreneurial business activity.

For most of the 20 male entrepreneurs I interviewed the pursuit of entrepreneurial success was unremarkable – their accounts reflect the interaction of their habitus, their ‘packages of capital’ (Silva and Edwards 2004: 3) and the fields in which they were invested. Most had a family background in business, which provided them with economic, social, cultural and symbolic capital as well as a business habitus, which gave them a feel for the game of business. Their accounts conformed to the narrative of entrepreneurial success; they emphasised their individual hard work and talent and downplayed their resources. Access to interrelated forms of capital enabled the pursuit of economic capital for most of these men. Doing business seemed natural: their habitus fitted with the field of business.

The 13 wives understood their husbands’ pursuit of success as being ‘for the family’ or as part of their husbands’ quest for self-fulfilment as men. Most of these women were proud of their husbands, although some were puzzled by their husbands’ relentless pursuit of business success. While most of the wives had ‘helped out’ in the business, all saw the business as their husbands’ rather than as a joint enterprise. Most of these wives were not engaged in market work and saw family as their main ‘game’. Nevertheless, the wives seemed almost apologetic for their focus on nonmarket work. These women’s accounts flickered between complaint and the assertion of choice. Their understandings and responses to the dominant, competing discourses of individualism and caring reflect their habitus as predominantly middle-class women. For most of these women, caught between the pull of family and the market, the family won. In part, this is because their husbands defined the terms of the deal, but it is also because the wives’ habitus framed what appeared to be reasonable choices to them. The dominant narratives for these women related to mothering and family rather than business.

The accounts of the 11 female entrepreneurs I interviewed are similar to the male entrepreneurs in that they reflect the entrepreneurial myth and are strongly gendered. But the women's entrepreneurial activity did not reinforce their femininity in the same way business success reinforced the male entrepreneurs' masculinity. Like the men, the women entrepreneurs in this study downplayed the resources to which they had access and emphasised their luck, guts, hard work and raw talent. The main difference between the men and women's success storytelling is that, where the women did talk about assistance, they emphasised support from the family and *for* the family. While the male entrepreneurs focused on business support and ignored domestic support, the female entrepreneurs emphasised domestic support but downplayed any business support that their husbands said they had provided. They shared the same kind of disposition towards entrepreneurial business as the men, but their engagement in business was affected by their commitment to family relationships – especially the care of their children. These women were caught between the two fields of business and family. Unlike the men, the women accommodated the children by managing how they did business. Because of their competing responsibilities, they actively managed their resources and fiercely guarded their involvement in business – apparently aware that their foothold in the field of business was precarious. Most were under intense cultural, social and personal pressure to be 'good' wives and mothers. Nevertheless, in these accounts they understood gender to be simultaneously important and irrelevant.

The six husbands' accounts flickered between admiration and acknowledgement of their wives' success and an appropriation of that success. Their accounts of teamwork and shared goals set the women's protectiveness towards their business activities in sharp relief. The analogy of the team served to minimise any sense of competition; it neutralised their wives' power and, as team coach, the men could take some credit for their wives' success. Mulholland has argued that men have the advantage of 'wifely support' in establishing businesses in 'ways that are inconceivable in a reversed scenario' (2003: 28). I found that almost all of these men supported their wives in a variety of ways, but the details of their support were quite different from that of the wives of entrepreneurs. These men were not dependent on their wives' fortunes, although most appreciated the wealth that flowed from their wives' business activities. Their habitus as older successful men was such that they saw themselves as 'good guys' for enabling their wives' pursuit – and achievement – of success and for responding to the challenges this created.

Accounting for family

Most of the male entrepreneurs said family came first. They made sense of the contradictions between their intense engagement with business and their avowed commitment to family by referring to their family as traditional or complementary and as partnerships that enabled them to be active and engaged fathers. The men's accounts suggest that children are central to the deal. In the absence of children there could be an approximation of equality, but the presence of children fundamentally changed expectations and triggered the implicit deal. Nevertheless, those men who described their family relationships as traditional or complementary insisted it was a personal preference and their wives' choice. A hands-off approach to their wives' choices obscured the circumstances in which these choices were made. Their accounts of everyday business and family life hinted at conflicts over the use of resources but, for most of the men, most of the time, their dispositions neatly matched the fields within which they operated. For most of these men, most of the time, the deal worked, in that they were enabled to intensely engage with business while dipping in and out of family life.

For most of the wives, most of the time, the main game was family. While only three women said they actively chose to be at-home wives and mothers, most of the wives insisted that it was their personal choice to invest in their children. Nonetheless, they acknowledged it was not what they had expected they would be doing. Most of the wives characterised their family relationships as teams led by their husbands who were providers. Most drew on the idea of complementary relationships, but also said they wanted to be – and have – equal partners who shared the work of rearing children. For most of these women, the deal was that they supported their husbands, and took care of the 'fiddly things' of family and domestic life, and in return their husbands provided a comfortable and privileged lifestyle for them and their children. Most said their traditional relationship had just evolved, although a few said that they had actively chosen their relationship. Their accounts suggest strong social pressure to conform to a 'traditional' relationship. Nevertheless, they were keen to highlight the equal nature of their relationship; they insisted that they had decision-making power but trivialised the nature of their contribution. They complained about their husbands and then tried to excuse or explain the behaviour they complained about. Contests over resources were explicit in these women's accounts. The few women who understood their relationship as companions or partners tended to have their own employment. Their economic capital enabled these few wives to even up the deal with their husbands.

For most of the 11 female entrepreneurs, business *and* family were the main games. The female entrepreneurs' accounts of family life are strikingly different from those of the male entrepreneurs, because the women actively guarded and managed their resources, whereas the men took the resources for granted. Their accounts are also different from the wives' accounts in that they did not understand their husbands as providers but, like the wives, they felt intense pressure from others and themselves to be 'good' wives and mothers. Most were committed to the idea of hands-on mothering and thought they were 'lucky' to have 'special' husbands who 'allowed' them to intensely focus on business. Most managed the push-and-pull of business and family, rather than challenging the basis on which family and business work was done.

Almost all of the six husbands I interviewed saw their relationship with their wives as a partnership. They also referred to the idea of the family as a team, but their understanding of a team was different from the teams described by wives of entrepreneurs, where the husbands were the team leaders. These men considered themselves as important team members, even if their wives were the star players. Indeed, some men seemed to regard themselves as coach – especially in their accounts of their wives' business beginnings. These men seemed aware that having powerful wives went against social and cultural norms. Their accounts implicitly refer to contests over power but these were framed in terms of partnership and personal growth.

The deal: Gender, entrepreneurial business and family life

I have argued that belief in an underlying gender-based deal continues to define the basis on which men and women access available resources to support their involvement in their business and family lives. This deal shapes the fields of business and family life. The deal has two interrelated parts: the first is that nonmarket relations and activities are seen as separate from and less important than market based relations and activities. This aspect of the deal is fundamental to western capitalism and underpins much of how we live. The second interrelated part of the deal is the understanding that men provide and women care¹. The contemporary manifestation of this part of the deal has two optional clauses: (1) women may also engage in market activity but this should not be their main game, especially if they have children; and (2) men may contribute to family care and domestic work, but their main game should be in the market. What is important about the deal is that it is so pervasive that it is taken as a given, commonsense and unremarkable, even where it contradicts the pervasive

¹ In this context 'care' includes both the practical and emotional aspects of caring.

discourses of individualism and choice. The deal frames the nature of choice. The choices that seem possible or reasonable depend on the interplay of an individual's habitus, 'packages of capital' (Silva and Edwards 2004: 3) and the fields within which they are engaged. Belief in the deal constrains possible action. Importantly, these constraints benefit some players in some fields more than others.

By interviewing entrepreneurs and their husbands or wives, I was able to compare and contrast the different understandings and experiences of men and women as entrepreneurs and as the spouses of entrepreneurs. My findings suggest that gender is an important aspect of habitus that shapes engagement with business and family life. But it is not the only aspect. Family background, lived experience, ethnicity and gender among other things combine to create an individual habitus, which shapes an individual's disposition towards and understanding of various fields, and frames the value and use of the various forms of capital to which they have access. Habitus incorporates a 'feel for the game' but this alone is not enough to shape the rules of the game or the nature of the field.

Change and lack of change

My findings suggest that, despite apparent change, belief in a gender-based deal continues to serve as a reference point and a fallback position for men and women, especially as parents. Despite a focus in work and family literature on balance and negotiation, the intersections of market and nonmarket activities and relations are generally *not* negotiated explicitly. Indeed, the unspoken 'rules of the game' pre-empt choices, which are limited to what appears possible.

Tensions and mismatches

The interviewees' accounts of family and business life suggest tensions and mismatches. Women's economic capital seems to be a key factor in how these tensions manifest. These tensions are most apparent in the women's accounts and primarily revolve around competition over time and care. The female entrepreneurs actively managed and guarded their resources, while the wives flickered between complaint and an assertion of choice. They wanted more time and more care from their husbands, but they made do with what they got. The men's accounts *hint* at tensions. The male entrepreneurs defined resource rules, so for most there was little tension except that caused by their wives' dissatisfaction. Unlike the entrepreneurial men, the husbands could not unilaterally define the rules of resource use; the benefits that flowed from their wives' business success mitigated their twinges of regret for the lost privileges of patriarchy.

Gender, resources and the accumulation of capital

The wives' accounts reveal attempts to challenge and change the nature of the deal, but their lack of power meant that these attempts were largely unsuccessful. By default, these women enabled business to come first for their husbands and define their family relationships and activities. By investing heavily in family relationships, they locked themselves into dependency and a reliance on their husbands' intense engagement in business. The wives' accounts illustrate the 'complex relationship between individual and social resources' (Thomson et al. 2003: 43). These women were not powerless. They had a range of capitals on which they could draw: education, strong family and friendship networks and money – even if it was 'family money' rather than their own. But there were limits to their power and how they could use it. Their power was constrained because their husbands framed the nature of 'the deal'. This deal was reinforced by the fields of business and family, which cast men's engagement with business and women's – especially mothers' – focus on the family as normal and natural. Importantly, the wives' habitus framed their understanding of what was reasonable or possible and this combined with their lack of convertible capital to lock them into a deal that was not of their making.

Economic power brought the entrepreneurial women a measure of control and autonomy within the market, but this power did not necessarily carry over to the field of the family. Indeed, most of the women experienced intense pressure to conform to social and cultural expectations of what they should do as 'good' wives and mothers. The power provided by their economic capital was fragile because of the intense pressure to conform to 'traditional' roles within the family. These women fiercely guarded their autonomy in business where they had control, whereas within the family most were prepared to work around their husbands rather than fundamentally transform the nature of the deal. The copreneurial women's accounts underscore the relatively precarious nature of women's capital and power. The copreneurial women did not have the same level of autonomy or control over their resources as the other female entrepreneurs. Even though they presented themselves as partners, their husbands appeared to be the dominant players in the business. While they had a measure of economic power through their involvement in the business, for most this power was compromised because it was tied to their husbands.

Interconnections of fields

The ability to engage intensely in business or family life is not just about time, money, space or care. These resources are interconnected and overlap. The control and use of these resources is shaped by the interaction of the embodied dispositions

and histories of individuals and their packages of capital with the 'particular forms of capital and particular narratives' and 'regulatory and coercive discourses' (Webb et al. 2002: 68) of the fields in which they are engaged. The extent to which these interactions created a sense of tension or lack of fit depends on both one's particular habitus and the field within which one is engaged. It also depends on an ability to use one's capital to maximise one's position within the field and change the rules of the game. For most of the entrepreneurial men, most of the time, entrepreneurial business was the main game. Their habitus, packages of capital and the field of entrepreneurial business fitted neatly, so they experienced little tension. What tension they did feel arose, for most, from the dissatisfactions of their wives, within the field of family. Most acknowledged these dissatisfactions but effectively ignored them, because they were locked into a particular way of doing business.

The wives felt a sense of tension because their investments in the nonmarket and the capitals that they accrued were not legitimised or valued in the market. Further, no matter how hard they tried, they could not define the 'rules of the game' for their husbands' participation in the family. Rather, they had to accommodate themselves to their husbands' intermittent engagement, which shaped how they experienced family. They experienced tension between their expectations of family life and relationships and the reality, and because they were aware that their accumulated capital was not easily convertible and was not valued by others in fields outside of the family.

The entrepreneurial women had an interest in and feel for the game of business as well as an investment in family life – as mothers and wives. But other more dominant players shaped the field(s) to suit their own interests. These women had succeeded at a partial revolution. To some extent, their economic capital enabled them to define how they worked in business; it was much more difficult for them to redefine their involvement in their families, or insist on greater involvement in domestic and family work by their husbands. Their husbands responded to their wives' pressure to change, in part, because this pressure was backed by economic capital. They understood that if they wanted to maintain a relationship with that particular woman they had to make some changes. These changes were not always easy or comfortable because they involved the loss of some – but not all – of the privileges of patriarchy.

Change and lack of change: Partial revolutions

My findings suggest that social change is jagged and lopsided. Bourdieu argues that deeply ingrained understandings and dispositions 'are not of the kind that

can be suspended by a simple effort of will, founded on a liberatory awakening of consciousness' (2001: 39). Family and gender relations that are framed as natural are hard to contest particularly when this 'natural' understanding is reinforced structurally, culturally and socially. Bourdieu (1998) suggests that those who are dominated unconsciously collude with their domination through misrecognition of the processes of domination. Patterns of power seem natural and unremarkable. For Bourdieu, this misrecognition is an embodied belief rather than an intellectual awareness or understanding. As a result, he argues, change cannot come about solely from the 'awakening of consciousness'; rather there needs to be a 'transformation of the objective structures' that have produced and sustained the dispositions and beliefs in the first place (1998: 121). Bourdieu argues that fields are constantly subject to '*partial revolutions*' when new players challenge aspects of the game but 'do not call into question the very foundations of the game' (1993: 74). This does not mean that change is impossible. It does mean that change is difficult to achieve and that intense pressure is exerted against new players – like entrepreneurial women – who seek to change the rules of the game.

Bourdieu argues that sudden changes in social arrangements can lead to changes in belief, but this only happens if individuals are aware of the processes by which belief and dispositions are reproduced and sustained. However, he also argues that, even where crises cause the world not to appear 'natural', those in power will seek to manage understandings and preserve 'a universe of that which is taken for granted' (Bourdieu 1977: 170). This may explain the persistence of belief in the 'natural' gender-based division of labour notwithstanding the social changes of the last thirty years or so.

Conclusions

In this thesis, I have argued that the gendered division of labour cannot be fully understood without an understanding of the ways economic and intimate activity and relationships interconnect. Specifically, I have argued that entrepreneurial activity cannot be fully understood unless it is seen in the context of family and social relationships. I have argued that business and family is interrelated for both men and women. The nature of the entrepreneurial myth obscures this interrelationship.

How we organise and understand market and nonmarket work reflects and reinforces both the resources that we have access to and our understandings of what we can and should do. Looking at domestic labour in isolation from market work or market work in isolation from nonmarket work distorts our understandings of both. My

analysis of the processes that underpin engagement in business and family life is important for the following reasons.

First, it makes explicit the resources that are involved in market success. It challenges the entrepreneurial myth and situates entrepreneurs socially and culturally. This is important for those who aspire to engage in entrepreneurial activity as it provides them with an understanding of the resources and capitals that are obscured in success stories. It is also important more generally as we are increasingly encouraged to be entrepreneurial even though we may lack the necessary resources, appetite or ability to absorb risk.

Second, my analysis makes explicit the intense pressure on both men and women to conform to gendered expectations and suggests some reasons for the uneven nature of change. On an individual level, change not only requires resources but also intense effort and clarity of purpose.

Third, this study highlights the distortions inherent in analyses that solely focus on either the nonmarket or the market. As Julie Nelson (2006: 8) suggests, the idea that there has to be a choice between 'love or money' is misleading. To move beyond what Zelizer describes as 'hostile worlds' and 'nothing but' analyses, we need to develop an understanding of the processes by which men and women are enabled or impeded in their economic and intimate activities and relations. This study is a contribution to such an understanding.

Change relies on an awareness and articulation of the particular historical and social processes that shape and reinforce power. My findings suggest that change is happening but it is patchy and uneven. The major contribution of this study is in providing another way of understanding the terms on which men and women participate in business and family life. Those who benefit most from the idea that social rules are natural and unchangeable have a stake in fostering and maintaining such beliefs. This study has shown how the belief in an underlying, largely unspoken deal shapes daily life. Understanding how this belief shapes the control and use of resources and the accumulation of various forms of capital is an important step towards redefining the nature of the game for men and women in business and family life, and, more broadly.

References

- Abbott, A. (2005) 'Sociology of work and occupations', pp. 307–30 in N. Smelser and R. Swedberg (eds) *The handbook of economic sociology*, 2nd edn, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Adkins, L. (2004) 'Introduction: Feminism, Bourdieu and after', pp. 3–18 in L. Adkins and B. Skeggs (eds) *Feminism after Bourdieu*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Adkins, L. (2003) 'Reflexivity: Freedom or habit of gender?' *Theory Culture Society* 20, 21–42.
- Ahl, H. (2006) 'Why research on women entrepreneurs needs new directions', *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, 30 (5): 595–621.
- Ahl, H. (2002) 'The construction of the female entrepreneur as the Other', pp. 52–67 in B. Czarniawska and H. Höpfl (eds) *Casting the Other*. London: Routledge.
- Agren, M. and A. Erickson (2005) *The marital economy in Scandinavia and Britain, 1400-1900*. London: Ashgate Publishing.
- Aldrich, H. and J. Cliff (2003) 'The pervasive effects of a family on entrepreneurship: Toward a family embeddedness perspective', *Journal of Business Venturing* 18: 573–596.
- Aldrich, H., N. Carter and M. Ruef (2002) 'With very little help from their friends: gender and relational composition of nascent entrepreneurs' start-up teams', pp. 156–69 in W. Bygrave (ed) *Frontiers of entrepreneurship research 2002*. Babson Park, MA: Babson Centre for Entrepreneurial Studies.
- Armstrong, J. (2006) 'Beyond "juggling" and "flexibility": classed and gendered experiences of combining employment and motherhood', *Sociological Research Online* 11 (2) <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/11/2/armstrong.html> accessed 14 August 2007.
- Barnett, F. and S. Barnett (1988) *Working together: Entrepreneurial couples*. Berkeley, CA: Ten Speed Press.
- Beck, U. (2001) 'Living your own life in a runaway world: Individualisation, globalisation and politics', pp.164–74 in W. Hutton and A. Giddens (eds) *On the edge: Living with global capitalism*. London: Vintage.

- Becker, G. (1993) 'Nobel Lecture: The economic way of looking at behavior', *Journal of Political Economy* 101: 385–409.
- Becker, G. (1981) *A treatise on the family*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Benoit, P.J. (1997) *Telling the success story. Acclaiming and disclaiming discourse*. New York: State University of New York.
- Berger, B. (1991) *The culture of entrepreneurship*. San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies.
- Birch, D. (1987) *Job creation in America*. New York: Free Press.
- Birch, D. (1979) 'The job creation process, Final report to Economic Development Administration'. MIT Program on Neighbourhood and Regional Change. Cambridge, Mass: MIT.
- Bird, B. (1989) *Entrepreneurial behaviour*. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Birley, S. (1989) 'Female entrepreneurs: Are they really any different?' *Journal of Small Business Management* 27: 32–37.
- Bittman, M, P. England, L. Sayer, N. Folbre and G. Matheson (2003) 'When does gender trump money? Bargaining and time in household work', *American Journal of Sociology* 109(1): 186–214.
- Bittman, M. and F. Lovejoy (1993) 'Domestic power: Negotiating an unequal division of labour within a framework of equality', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology* 29: 302–21.
- Bittman, M. and J. Pixley (1997) *The double life of the family*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Blunsdon, B., P. Blyton, K. Reed and A. Dastmalchian (2006) 'Introduction. Work, life and the work-life issue'. pp. 1–16 in P. Blyton, B. Blunsdon, K. Reed and A. Dastmalchian, (eds.) *Work-life integration: International perspectives on the balancing of multiple roles*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Blunt, S. (2004) *Working mother: How to balance childcare and career*. Chichester: Summersdale Publishers Ltd.
- Bourdieu, P. (2005) *The social structures of the economy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2004) *Science of science and reflexivity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2001) *Masculine domination*. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998) *Practical reason: On the theory of action*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Bourdieu, P. (1993) *Sociology in question*. London: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990) *The logic of practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1985) 'The forms of capital', pp. 241–58 in J. G. Richardson (ed.) *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*. New York: Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977) *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. and L. Wacquant (1992) *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Bruni, A., S. Gherardi and B. Poggio (2005) *Gender and entrepreneurship. An ethnographic approach*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Bruni, A., S. Gherardi and B. Poggio (2004) 'Doing gender, doing entrepreneurship: An ethnographic account of intertwined practices', *Gender, Work and Organisation* 11 (4): 406–29.
- Brush, C., N. Carter, E. Gatewood, P. Greene and M. Hart (eds) (2006) *Growth-oriented women entrepreneurs and their businesses*. Cheltenham UK: Edward Elgar.
- Burrage, M. (2002) *Hunting heffalumps and gazelles*, Ernst and Young LLP www.ey.com/uk. Accessed 1 May 2005.
- Calhoun, C. (2003) 'Pierre Bourdieu', pp. 274–309 in G. Ritzer (ed) *Blackwell companion to the major social theorists*, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Cantillon, R. (1755) *Essay on the nature of commerce*. H. Higgs (trans) [1931] Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Collinson, D. and J. Hearn (eds) (1996) *Men as mangers, managers as men: Critical perspectives on men, masculinities and managements*, London: Sage.
- Connell, R.W. (2005) 'A really good husband: work/life balance, gender equity and social change', *Australian Journal of Social Issues* 40: 369–83.
- Connell, R.W. (2000) *The men and the boys*. St Leonards: Allen and Unwin.
- Connell, R.W. and J. Messerschmidt (2005) 'Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept' *Gender and Society*, 19 (6) 829–59.
- Craig, J., C. Dibrell and P. Davis (2007) 'Leveraging family-based brand identity to enhance firm competitiveness and performance in family businesses' School of Business, Business papers. Bond University
- Craig, J. and N. Lindsay, (2002) 'Incorporating the family dynamic into the entrepreneurship process', *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 9 (4), 416–30.

- Crosa, B., H. Aldrich and L. Keister (2002) 'Is there a wealth affect? Financial and human capital as determinants of business startups', *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*. Babson Park, MA: Babson Centre for Entrepreneurial Studies.
- Davidoff, L. and C. Hall (1987) *Family fortunes. Men and women of the English middle class 1780–1850*. London: Hutchinson.
- Delphy, C. and D. Leonard (1992) *Familiar exploitation*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Duncan, S. (2003) 'Mothers, care and employment: Values and theories'. CAVA Working Paper, 1. Leeds: University of Leeds
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/cava/papers/workingpapers.htm> Accessed 27 August 2007.
- Duncombe, J. and D. Marsden (1995) "'Workaholics' and 'whingeing women': theorising intimacy and emotion work - the last frontier of gender inequality?' *The Sociological Review* 43 (1): 150–69.
- Eichler, M. 1981. 'Power, dependency, love and the sexual division of labour', *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, 4 (2): 201–19.
- England, P. (2003) 'Separative and soluble selves: Dichotomous thinking in economics', pp. 33-59 in J. Nelson and M. Ferber (eds) *Feminist economics today*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- England, P. and N. Folbre (2005) 'Gender and economic sociology', pp. 61-80 in N. Smelser and R. Swedberg (eds) *Handbook of economic sociology*. Russell Sage and Princeton.
- England, P. and B. Kilbourne (1990) 'Markets, marriages, and other mates: The problem of power' pp.163–88 in R. Friedland and A.F. Robertson (eds) *Beyond the marketplace: Rethinking economy and society*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Fehlberg, B. (1997) *Sexually transmitted debt: Surety experience and English law*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ferber, M. and J. Nelson (2003) *Feminist economics today: Beyond economic man*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fischer, E., A. Reuber and L. Dyke (1993) 'A theoretical overview and extension of research on sex, gender, and entrepreneurship', *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8 (2): 151–168.
- Folbre, N. (2001) *The invisible heart: Economics and family values*. New York: New Press.

- Frank, A. (2005) 'Narrative theory and method in the ethics and practice of social research'. Key Centre for Women's Health in Society, The University of Melbourne 9–10 August 2005.
- Frank, A. (2002) 'Why study people's stories? The dialogical ethics of narrative analysis', *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 1 (1), Article 6.
- Friedland, R. and A. Robertson (1990) *Beyond the marketplace*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Gartner, T. (1989) 'Who is an entrepreneur? Is the wrong question', *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 13: 47–64.
- Gershuny, J., M. Godwin and S. Jones (1994) 'The domestic labour revolution: A process of lagged adaptation?' pp 151-197 in M Anderson, F Bechofer and J. Gershuny (eds) *The social and political economy of the household*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gibbs, G. (2002) *Qualitative data analysis: Explorations with NVivo*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Giddens, A. (1999) Lecture 4, Reith Lectures BBC.
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/english/static/events/reith_99/week4/lecture4.htm. Accessed 26 May 2003.
- Giddens, A. (1992) *The transformation of intimacy: Sexuality, love and eroticism in modern societies*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gilding, M. (2002) *Secrets of the super rich*. Sydney: HarperCollins.
- Gilding, M. (1999) 'Superwealth in Australia: entrepreneurs, accumulation and the capitalist class', *Journal of Sociology* 35 (2): 169–82.
- Gilding, M. (1991) *The making and breaking of the Australian family*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Gramsci, A. (1971) *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Q. Hoare and G. Nowell Smith (eds. and trans.) London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Granovetter, M. (1990) 'The old and the new economic sociology: A history and an agenda', in R. Friedland and A. Robertson (eds) *Beyond the marketplace: Rethinking economy and society*. New York: Walter de Gruyter and Co.
- Granovetter, M. (1985) 'Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness', *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(3): 481–510.
- Greene, P., M Hart, E. Gatewood, C. Brush and N. Carter (2003) 'Women entrepreneurs: moving front and centre: An overview of research and

- theory'. White paper. United States Association for Small Business and Entrepreneurship. <http://www.usasbe.org/knowledge/whitepapers/> Last accessed 27th August 2007.
- Greer, M. and P. Greene (2003) 'Feminist theory and the study of entrepreneurship', pp. 1–24 in J. Butler (ed) *New perspectives on women entrepreneurs*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Hakim, C. (2001) *Work-lifestyle choices in the 21st century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hakim, C. (1991) 'Grateful slaves and self-made women: Fact and fantasy in women's work orientations', *European Sociological Review* 7(2), 101–21.
- Hamilton, E. (2006) 'Whose story is it anyway? Narrative accounts of the role of women in founding and establishing family businesses', *International Small Business Journal* 24 (3): 253–79.
- Hays, S. (1996) *The cultural contradictions of motherhood*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Hearn, M. (2006) 'Securing the man: narratives of gender and nation in the verdicts of Henry Bournes Higgins', *Australian Historical Studies*, 37 (127) 1–24.
- Hewitson, G. (2002) 'Domestic labour, neoclassical economics and gender identity: An overview'. Discussion Paper, Series A 02.01. Melbourne: School of Business, Latrobe University.
- Hochschild, A. (2003) *The commercialization of intimate life: Notes from home and work*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hochschild, A. (1997) *The time bind: When work becomes home and home becomes work*. Seattle: Metropolitan Books.
- Hochschild, A. (1989) *The second shift: Working parents and the revolution at home*. New York: Viking.
- Hytti, U. (2003) 'Stories of entrepreneurs: Narrative constructions of identities'. PhD thesis. Turku, Finland: Turku School of Economics and Business Administration, Small Business Institute.
- Jamieson, L. (1999) 'Intimacy transformed? A critical look at the "pure relationship"' *Sociology* 33(3): 477–94.
- Jarvis, H. (2004) 'City time: managing the infrastructure of everyday life'. ESRC Work life Seminar Five, London: LSE.
- Jennings, D. (1994) *Multiple perspectives of entrepreneurship: Texts, readings, and cases*. Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing Co.
- Johnston, D. and D. Swanson (2006) 'Constructing the "good mother": The experience of mothering ideologies by work status' *Sex Roles* 54: 509–19.

- Jordan, B., M. Redley and S. James (1994) *Putting the family first*. London: UCL Press.
- Kezar, A. (2003) 'Transformational elite interviews: principles and problems' *Qualitative Inquiry*, 9(3): 395–415.
- Khayatt, M. (1992) *Lesbian teachers: An invisible presence*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Knight, F. [1921] (1985) *Risk, uncertainty, and profit*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Krais, B. (2006) 'Gender, sociological theory and Bourdieu's sociology of practice', *Theory, Culture and Society* 23 (6): 119–34.
- Lambing, P. and E. Khuel (2000) *Entrepreneurship*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Landstrom, H. (2005) 'Pioneers in entrepreneurship research', in G. Corbetta, M. Huse and D. Ravasi (eds) *Crossroads of entrepreneurship*. New York: Springer.
- Langowitz, N. and C. Morgan (2003) 'Women entrepreneurs: Breaking through the glass barrier', pp. 101–19 in J. Butler (ed) *New perspectives on women entrepreneurs*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Larsen, E. (2006) 'The impact of occupational sex segregation on family businesses: The case of American harness racing', *Gender, Work and Organization* 13 (4), 359–82.
- Lawler, S. (2004) 'Rules of engagement: *habitus*, power and resistance', pp. 110–28 in: L. Adkins and B. Skeggs (eds) *Feminism after Bourdieu*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Legge J. and K. Hindle. (1997) *Entrepreneurship: How innovators create the future*. Melbourne: Macmillan.
- Lewis, P. (2006) 'The quest for invisibility: female entrepreneurs and the masculine norm of entrepreneurship', *Gender, Work and Organization* 13 (5): 453–69.
- Light, I. and S. Gold (2000) *Ethnic economies* San Diego: Academic.
- Marshack, K. (1998) *Entrepreneurial couples: Making it work at work and at home*. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black.
- Marshack, K. (1994). 'Copreneurs and dual-career couples: are they different?' *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 19 (1), 49–69.
- Mauthner, N. and A. Doucet (2003) 'Reflexive accounts and accounts of reflexivity in qualitative data analysis', *Sociology* 37 (3), 413–31.
- May, A. (2006) "'Sweeping the heavens for a comet": Women, the language of political economy, and higher education in the US', *Feminist Economics* 12 (4): 625–40.

- McCarthy, J., J Holland and V Gillies (2003) 'Multiple perspectives on the "family" lives of young people: methodological and theoretical issues in case study research', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 6 (1): 1–23.
- McClelland, D. (1961) *The achieving society*. Princeton, NJ: van Nostrand.
- McMahon, A. (1999) *Taking care of men: Sexual politics in the public mind*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- McNay, L. (1999) 'Gender, *habitus* and the field. Pierre Bourdieu and the limits of reflexivity', *Theory Culture and Society* 16 (1): 95–117.
- Milkman, R. and E. Townsley (1994) 'Gender and the economy', pp. 600–19 in N. Smelser and R. Swedberg (eds) *The handbook of economic sociology*. New York: Princeton University Press.
- Mirchandani, K. (2000) "'The best of both worlds" and "cutting my own throat": Contradictory images of home-based work', *Qualitative Sociology* 23(2): 159–82.
- Mirchandani, K. (1998) 'Protecting the boundary: Teleworker insights on the expansive concept of work', *Gender and Society* 12: 168–87.
- Moi, T. (1991) 'Appropriating Bourdieu: Feminist theory and Bourdieu's sociology of culture', *New Literary History* 22 (4): 1017–49.
- Mulholland, K. (2003) *Class, gender and the family business*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mulholland, K. (1996) 'Entrepreneurialism, masculinities and the self made man', in pp. 123-149 in D. Collinson and J. Hearn (eds) *Men as managers, managers as men: Critical perspectives on men, masculinities and managements*. London: Sage.
- Nakano Glenn, E. (2000) 'Creating a caring society', *Contemporary Sociology*, 29 (1): 84–94.
- Nelson, J. (2006) *Economics for humans*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Nicholson, L. and A. Anderson (2005) 'News and nuances of the entrepreneurial myth and metaphor: Linguistic games in entrepreneurial sense-making and sense-giving', *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* March, 153–72.
- Ochberg, R. (1987) 'The male career code and the ideology of role', pp. 193-210 in H. Bord (ed) *The making of masculinities*. London: Allen Unwin.
- Ogbor, J. (2000) 'Mythicizing and reification in entrepreneurial discourse: Ideology-critique of entrepreneurial studies', *Journal of Management Studies* 37: 605–35.

- Parvinen, P. and J. Mattson (2005) 'Family firms as a case of network embeddedness – theoretical and practical implications'. Paper presented at Industrial Marketing and Purchasing conference in Phuket.
- Pateman, C. (1988) *The sexual contract*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Perrons, D., C. Fagan, L. McDowell, K. Ray and K. Ward (2005) 'Work, life and time in the new economy: An introduction', *Time and Society* 14 (1): 51–64.
- Pocock, B. (2003) *The work/life collision*. Annandale: The Federation Press.
- Polkinghorne, D. (1988) *Narrative knowing and the human sciences*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Probert, B. (2002) 'Clare Burton memorial lecture: "Grateful slaves" or "self-made women": A matter of choice or policy?' *Australian Feminist Studies* 17 (37): 7–17.
- Punch, K. (2005) *Introduction to social research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. London: Sage.
- Reay, D. (2004) 'Gendering Bourdieu's concept of capitals? Emotional capital, women and social class', pp. 57-74 in L. Adkins and B. Skeggs (eds) *Feminism after Bourdieu*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Reay, D. (2000) 'A useful extension of Bourdieu's conceptual framework?: Emotional capital as a way of understanding mothers' involvement in their children's education', *The Sociological Review* 48 (4): 568–85.
- Renzulli, L., H. Aldrich and J. Moody (2000) 'Family matters: Gender, networks, and entrepreneurial outcomes', *Social Forces* 79 (2): 523–46.
- Saleff, J. (2002) 'Where home is the office. The new form of flexible work', pp. 464–95 in B. Wellman and C. Haythornthwaite (eds) *The internet in everyday life*. Carlton: Blackwell Publishing.
- Schumpeter, J. (1947) 'The creative responses in economic history', *The Journal of Economic History*. 7 (2) (Nov., 1947) in pp.149-159. R. Swedberg (ed) (1991) *Joseph A. Schumpeter: The economics and sociology of capitalism*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Schumpeter J. (1934) *The theory of economic development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Sex Discrimination Unit, Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (2005) 'Striking the balance: Women, men, work and family' Discussion Paper 2005. Sydney: Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission.
- Shane, S. and R. Venkataraman (2000) 'The promise of entrepreneurship as a field in research', *The Academy of Management Review* 25(1): 217–27.

- Sheller, M. and J. Urry (2003) 'Mobile transformations of "public" and "private" life', *Theory Culture Society* 20 (3): 107–25.
- Silva, E. and R. Edwards (2004) 'Operationalizing Bourdieu on capitals: A discussion of the "construction of the object"'. Working paper 7 for the ESRC Methods Programme. Manchester: Open University and Manchester University. http://www.ccsr.ac.uk/methods/publications/documents/WP7_00_0.pdf. Last accessed 28 August 2007.
- Singh, S. (1997) *Marriage money: The social shaping of money in marriage and banking*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Singh, S. (1995) 'For love, not money: Women, information and the family business'. Melbourne: Consumer Advocacy and Financial Counselling Association.
- Skeffington, R. (2005) 'Rich 200 overview: The billionaire boom', *The Billionaire Boom BRW Rich 200*, May 19–25: 33 Sydney: Fairfax Business Media.
- Skeggs, B. (2004) *Class, self, culture*. London: Routledge.
- Skeggs, B. (1999) 'Exchange, value and affect: Bourdieu and the "self"', pp. 75–95 in L. Adkins and B. Skeggs (eds) *Feminism after Bourdieu*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Skeggs, B. (1997) *Formations of class and gender*. London: Sage.
- Smelser, N. and R. Swedberg (2005) *The handbook of economic sociology*. 2nd edn, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Squire, S. and J. Tilly (2007) *It's about time: Women, men, work and family*. Sydney: Sex and Age Discrimination Unit, Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission.
- Strauss, A.L. and J. Corbin (1998) *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Swedberg, R. (2004). 'On the present state of economic sociology (1990s)', *Economic Sociology European Electronic Newsletter* 5 (2): 2–17.
- Swedberg, R. (2003) *Principles of economic sociology*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tolich, M. (2004) 'Internal confidentiality: When confidentiality assurances fail relational informants', *Qualitative Sociology* 27(1) 101–6
- Tom, D. (2004) *Find the balance: essential steps to fulfilment in your work and life*. London: BBC Books.
- Thomson, R., S. Henderson, J. Holland (2003) 'Making the most of what you've got? Resources, values and inequalities in young women's transitions to adulthood' *Educational Review*, Vol 55 (1) 33–46

- Thornton, P. (1999) 'The sociology of entrepreneurship', *Annual Review of Sociology* 25: 19–46.
- Townsend, N. (2002) *The package deal: Marriage, work and fatherhood in men's lives*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Urry, J. (2000) *Sociology of time and place*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Vogler, C., M. Brockmann and R. Wiggins (2006) 'Intimate relationships and changing patterns of money management at the beginning of the twenty-first century', *The British Journal of Sociology* (57) 3: 455–82.
- Wacquant, L. (2004) 'Habitus', pp. 315–19 in J. Beckert and M. Zafirovski (eds) *International encyclopedia of economic sociology*. London: Routledge.
- Watson, J., R. Newby and A. Mahuka (2006) 'Comparing the growth and external funding of male and female controlled SMEs in Australia', pp. 205–31 in C. Brush, N. Carter, E. Gatewood, P. Green and M. Hart (eds) *Growth-oriented women entrepreneurs and their businesses*. Northampton, MA, US: Edward Elgar.
- Webb, J., T. Schirato and G. Danaher (2002) *Understanding Bourdieu*. St Leonards: Allen and Unwin.
- Weiler, S. and A. Bernasek (2001) 'Dodging the glass ceiling? Networks and the new wave of women entrepreneurs', *The Social Science Journal* 38: 85–103.
- Williams, J. (2001) *Unbending Gender: Why family and work conflict and what to do about it*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, V. (1999) *The secret life of money: Exposing the private parts of personal money*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Zelizer, V. (2007) 'Reflections on intimacy', *Accounts* 6 (2) 10–12.
- Zelizer, V. (2005) *The purchase of intimacy*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Zelizer, V. (2002) 'Enter culture', pp. 101–25 in M. Guillén, R. Collins, P. England and M. Meyer (eds) *The new economic sociology: Developments in an emerging field*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Zelizer, V. (2000a) 'Fine tuning the Zelizer view', *Economy and Society* 29 (3): 383–89.
- Zelizer, V. (2000b) 'The purchase of intimacy', *Law and Social Inquiry* Fall: 817–48.

Appendix

Interview schedules

These schedules provided the framework for interviews.

Interview schedule 1: Entrepreneur

Preliminaries

Thanks for participation. Recap research and discuss consent form. Stress that interview will be taped and all information will be treated as strictly confidential.

The tape recording will be transcribed and identifying factors will be changed to de-identify you. Prior to publication of any results of this research, if it is thought that you could be identified, I will contact you to check that you are comfortable with the publication of the material

Questions

The interview will be in two parts – the first part will focus on your work/business and the second part will focus on family issues.

1. First, could you tell me a little about yourself? What's your background?
[Initial questions to ascertain personal details - age, ethnic background, education etc as required]
2. How did you start out in business?
3. What motivated you? And what motivates you now?
4. Who do you think was of most help in your early days and why?
5. When you look back on your career so far – how would you describe it?
6. Could you briefly describe your most significant achievements in business?
7. What has been the most exciting moment or experience in business?
Could you tell me a bit about that time ...?
8. What about the tough times? Have there been tough times? Tell me a bit about the challenges you have faced in your drive for success.
9. How do you cope with the pressure of remaining competitive?
10. What kept you going - what gave you the motivation to keep on – and to make sacrifices?
11. How many hours do you work on average?
12. What do you look forward to?
13. Are you a spiritual person? How would you describe your belief system?
14. If you weren't in business, what do you think you'd do?

15. When you think of success – what do you think? How would you describe success?
16. Do you ever think about failure or the risk of failure?
17. How do you deal with risk?

Family:

Now I'd like to turn to family issues

18. Can you tell me a bit about your family? *[If not already ascertained, prompt for details of marital status (1st or 2nd +), details of partner (gender age etc), children etc?]*
19. How would you describe the role your wife/husband/family [whichever relevant] plays in your career? *[Expand on response: Is s/he in paid employment? How does this help/hinder you in your work?]*
20. What kind of impact do you think your career has had on your life?
21. What kind of impact do you think your career has had on your family?
22. So far, what have been the most significant moments in your family life, for you? (positive and maybe not so positive)
23. How would you describe your role in your family?
24. There's a lot talked about work/family balance nowadays. What are your thoughts?
25. How have you managed to achieve some kind of balance between your work and your family? Any specific strategies – is it something you think about?
26. How did you and your family cope during tough times? *(Who provided most support?)*
27. Every family and relationship goes through difficulties, have there been times when you've thought that maybe your relationship/s needed more attention than you could give? How did you cope?
28. You have children, how would you describe yourself as a father/ mother?
29. What do you want for your children and your family?
30. What do you do to relax?
31. What do you see as your greatest contribution to the community?
32. Would you like to add anything else?
33. Would you be prepared to invite your spouse/partner to participate in an interview? *[If so, could I have a contact number/address? Or hand over information sheet and letter of invitation. If not, is there any reason?]*

Thank you for your time

Interview schedule 2: Spouse

Preliminaries

Thanks for participation. Recap research and discuss consent form. Stress that interview will be taped and all information will be treated as strictly confidential.

The tape recording will be transcribed and identifying factors will be changed to de-identify you. Prior to publication of any results of this research, if it is thought that you could be identified, I will contact you to check that you are comfortable with the publication of the material

Questions

First, I'd like to ask you some questions about yourself.

1. [Initial questions to ascertain personal details - age, ethnic background, education etc as required]

Business

2. Tell me a little about your / your husband/wife's business?
3. How did you (plural) /he/she start out in business?
4. What do you think motivated you (plural) /him/her? - And what motivates you (plural) /him/her now?
5. What is your role in the business? [If no formal role - then do you /did you provide support or assistance to your partner in relation to the business? If so what kind of support?]
6. When you look back on your career/ business [or if more relevant life] so far – how would you describe it?
7. What have been some of your most significant achievements?
8. What has been the most exciting moment or experience as an entrepreneur/ the partner of an entrepreneur [whichever relevant]? Can you tell me a bit about that time...?
9. What about the tough times? Have there been tough times? Tell me a bit about the challenges you have faced in your/his/her drive for success.
10. How do you /he/she cope/s with the pressure of remaining competitive?
11. What kept /keeps you going – what gave/ gives you the motivation to keep on - and to make sacrifices?
12. What do you look forward to?
13. What is your inspiration?
14. If you/he/she weren't/wasn't in business, what do you think you'd/he/she'd do?
15. How would you describe success?

16. Do you ever think about failure or the risk of failure? How do you deal with risk?

Family:

Turning to your family now *[linking to pick up on relevant responses to previous questions]*

17. Can you tell me a bit about your family situation? *[If not already ascertained, prompt for details of marital status (1st or 2nd +), details of partner (gender age etc), children etc]*
18. How would you describe the role you have played/play in your partner's career? *[Expand on response: Do you work in the business with him/her? If so in what capacity? If not what do you do?]*
19. What kind of impact do you think your partner's career/business has had on your life? So far, what have been the most significant moments in your family life, for you? (positive and maybe not so positive)
20. There's a lot talked about work family/ balance nowadays. What do you think about that? How have you/he/she managed to achieve some kind of balance between work and family?
21. How do you understand your role in your family?
22. You spoke about some of the tough times that you've experienced in your/his/her business, *[refer to any relevant response from previous questions]* how did you and your family cope during that time? *(Who provided most support?)*
23. Every family and relationship goes through difficulties, have there been times when you've thought that maybe your relationship/s needed more attention than you/he/she could give? How did you cope?
24. You have children – how would you describe yourself as a mother/father *[whichever relevant]?*
25. What do you want for your children and your family?
26. What do you do to relax?
27. What do you see as your greatest contribution to the community?
28. Would you like to add anything else?

Thank you for your time.

List of publications produced as a result of the project

- Bowman, D. (2007) 'Deals and choices: Gender, business and family', *Public sociologies: Lessons and Trans-Tasman comparisons*, TASA/SAANZ Joint Conference 2007, 4–7 December 2007, University of Auckland.
- Bowman, D. (2007) 'Men's business: Negotiating entrepreneurial business and family life' *Journal of Sociology*, 43(4) 385–400.
- Bowman, D. (2006) 'Entrepreneurs: family, business, and gender' in *Sociology for a mobile world TASA 2006. Proceedings of the annual conference of the Australian Sociological Association*, University of Western Australia and Murdoch University, 4–7 December 2006.
- Bowman, D. (2005a) 'Getting past the spin: challenges in researching entrepreneurs' *Community, place, change. TASA 2005. Proceedings of the annual conference of the Australian Sociological Association*, University of Tasmania, 5–8 December 2005.
- Bowman, D. (2005b) 'Love and money. Entrepreneurs, family, business and success', *Regional frontiers of entrepreneurship research 2005. Compilation of papers of the second AGSE international entrepreneurship research exchange*, Australian Graduate School of Entrepreneurship, Swinburne University of Technology.