Annual Review Article:

Rethinking heteronormativity in entrepreneurship studies research

Author

Nick Rumens

Abstract

This review article critiques how entrepreneurship scholars have engaged with heteronormativity. Research on entrepreneurship and heteronormativity is emergent and largely confined to the literature on lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and queer (LGBTQ) entrepreneurs. Despite generating valuable insights into heteronormativity's impact on LGBTQ entrepreneurs, there is unevenness in how it is conceptualised in terms of definition and deployment. Elaborated in a set of critical observations, this article argues that the choices entrepreneurship scholars make about how heteronormativity is (not) defined and utilised are clearly consequential for any analysis of its dynamics in and outside the entrepreneurship domain. To progress debate and research, this article conceptualises heteronormativity as analytical category that is steeped in in queer and feminist theory. This review calls for clearer and deeper conceptual engagements with heteronormativity and a more encompassing approach to the study of heteronormativity that focuses also on its relationship with heterosexuality and heterosexual entrepreneurs.

Keywords: entrepreneurship, heteronormativity, queer theory, sexuality

Introduction

The mobilisation of heteronormativity as an analytical category in entrepreneurship research is relatively new (Essers et al., 2023; Galloway, 2012; Marlow et al., 2018; Rumens and Ozturk, 2019; Wang, 2024), but it is a long-established and analytically powerful concept in sexuality and gender studies (Jackson, 2018; Marchia and Sommer, 2019; Seidman, 1997; Varela et al., 2016; Warner, 1993). Entering the academic scene during the emergence of queer theory in the early 1990s (Butler, 1990; De Lauretis, 1991; Halperin, 1995; Sedgwick, 1990; Warner, 1993), heteronormativity has been called upon by queer theorists to critique its own constitution as a system of sexual oppression based on the normalisation and regulation of heterosexuality (Edelman, 2004; Ferguson, 2003; Halberstam, 2011). In this capacity, heteronormativity has served to expose and problematise institutionalised heterosexuality and heterosexual privilege, focusing on the implications for lesbian, gay, bisexual and queer (LGBQ) people. Historically, LGBQ sexualities have been (re)constructed as 'unnatural' and 'deviant' in discourses of heteronormativity, which continues unabated in some world regions: consensual same-sex sexual acts are currently criminalised in 53 countries, punishable by imprisonment and, in two nations, by the death penalty (ILGA, 2023). In other countries, including those where LGBQ equality rights have been accomplished, major disparities exist in how LGBQ people are (un)protected from and experience discrimination based on sexual orientation (ILGA, 2020). While the contemporary salience of researching heteronormativity's largely adverse impact on LGBQ people is irrefutable, entrepreneurship studies scholarship has yet to interrogate fully the reproduction of heteronormativity, both in its own backyard and in a wide array of entrepreneurial contexts.

Explaining this slow progress, some scholars have called out the heteronormative assumptions that underpin extant entrepreneurship scholarship (Essers et al., 2023; Galloway, 2012; Kushins and Behounek, 2020; Marlow et al., 2018; Marlow and Dy, 2018; Rumens and

Ozturk, 2019; Wang, 2024). Galloway (2007) was one of the first to question and take steps to address the assumption of heterosexuality in entrepreneurship research by breaking the 'silence' enveloping gay men's entrepreneurship. Similarly, Wang (2024: 1) has traced a related knowledge lacuna regarding research on lesbian entrepreneurs, complaining that 'the experiences of lesbian entrepreneurs are frequently marginalized and overlooked in both societal and academic contexts'. Additionally, Marlow et al. (2018: 118) have identified another normative assumption that pertains to how entrepreneurship 'gendered analyses draw almost exclusively upon women as the unit of analysis and assume an exclusive heteronormative binary'. This is conspicuous in the universal categorisation of men and women entrepreneurs as 'heterosexual', which reproduces and sustains a heterosexual/homosexual binary. Thus, the potential disruptions to this binary that may be generated when LGBQ entrepreneurs are introduced into heteronormative entrepreneurship research agendas remains understudied.

On the matter of how entrepreneurship venues have been conceptualised, Kushins and Behounek (2020) and others (Boers, 2018; Kidney, 2021) have highlighted that scholars have typically applied a 'heteronormative perspective'. Critiquing the heteronormative bias in family business research, Kushins and Behounek (2020: 1) point out how the family is routinely assumed to be 'an opposite-sex, married couple, living with their children under the same roof'. This heteronormative definition restricts how entrepreneurship scholars may understand familial attributes and arrangements in cultural contexts where LGBQ and trans people (LGBTQ) are able to access same-sex marriage and reproductive technologies as well as forming alternative 'chosen families' (Weeks, 2007; Weeks et al., 2001). Overall, the mounting disquiet among scholars about how heteronormativity has impacted on entrepreneurship studies is an encouraging sign of progress. For this to develop and flourish it is important to

review current definitions and deployments of heteronormativity in entrepreneurship studies, outlining the implications of such for advancing the field on this frontier.

One of the lynchpins of this annual review is a set of critical observations about how entrepreneurship scholars have conceptualised heteronormativity, both in definition and deployment, and the potential constraints this has imposed on its analytical capability. Foreshadowing the discussion that follows, my first observation is that while heteronormativity has started to appear in entrepreneurship research, it is not always defined or conceptualised with sufficient conceptual clarity, giving rise to unanswered questions about how it relates to other concepts and theories used to study sexual oppression. Vagueness in how it is understood also permeates discussions, or lack thereof, about how and to what end it is being deployed. Connected to this, a second observation concerns the tendency to demonstrate heteronormativity's functioning and effects within entrepreneurship domains. One limitation of this is that entrepreneurship research can appear tentative about tapping into queer theory's anti-normative impulse to challenge and transform heteronormativity. Anticipating the possibilities of so doing, scholars could account for non-normative forms of sex, sexuality and gender in entrepreneurship, as well as studying non-normative modes of entrepreneurship.

A third observation centres on the tendency to galvanise LGBQ entrepreneurs as 'typical' and 'exemplar' research subjects who are most affected by heteronormativity. As noted above, there are compelling reasons for understanding heteronormativity from the diverse perspectives of LGBQ entrepreneurs (Essers et al., 2022; Galloway, 2007, 2012; Marlow et al., 2018; Wang, 2024; Yamamura and Lasselle, 2024). However, there are potential problems that relate to how LGBQ entrepreneurs can be reproduced in deficit and the Other to 'mainstream' heteronormative modes of entrepreneurship that assume entrepreneurs are heterosexual. One vexing issue is that heterosexuality remains an unmarked category that evades scrutiny. Engaged as an analytical category that retains its roots in feminist and queer

theory, scholars may use heteronormativity to question the assumption of heterosexuality and heterosexual privilege but also examine the diversity within heterosexual relations. Currently, entrepreneurship scholarship has largely overlooked the argument that heterosexuals struggle also to inhabit heteronormative norms that relate to sex, gender and sexuality in specific entrepreneurial domains.

This article unpacks these observations to demonstrate how current definitions and deployments of heteronormativity in entrepreneurship research can be rethought, enabling scholars to realise heteronormativity's analytical power more fully. Said differently, while heteronormativity can be used productively to demonstrate empirically its constitution in entrepreneurial venues, motivations, behaviours, subjectivities and activities, it has more to offer in terms of stimulating social change and opening spaces beyond restrictive heteronormative constrictions of sexuality and gender. Before I pursue this, it is important to state that this annual review is not a literature review – the volume of entrepreneurship scholarship that addresses or uses heteronormativity as a concept is too slender. Rather, this review can be read as appreciative critique of past and emerging contributions on this topic area, which are largely confined to research on LGBTQ entrepreneurs. To progress debate and entrepreneurship research on heteronormativity, I engage more deeply with heteronormativity as an analytical category that leverages its queer theory framework, outlining the implications of such for future entrepreneurship research.

This article is structured as follows. I begin by outlining the origins, definitions and uses of heteronormativity within sexuality and gender studies. This is necessary because heteronormativity has a long scholarly pedigree in this domain, such that entrepreneurship scholars can gain from harvesting some of the conceptual insights cultivated by scholars in this field. Following this, I outline and illustrate three critical observations about how entrepreneurship scholars have engaged heteronormativity. Informed by this critique, I signpost

avenues for future entrepreneurship research on heteronormativity: queering heteronormativity and entrepreneurship; naming heterosexual entrepreneurs as heterosexual; heteronormativity and family business; heteronormativity, gender and entrepreneurship. These pathways build on my observations and the conceptual resources discussed in relation to heteronormativity's origins in queer theory and subsequent theoretical developments.

Heteronormativity: origins, definitions and developments

The sexuality and gender studies literature on heteronormativity and its related terms is far too theoretically nuanced and voluminous for an article section to do it justice. I provide instead an overview that discusses the conceptual underpinning of heteronormativity and some of the theoretical developments that are pertinent to my argument. These scholarly contributions are summarised in Table 1.

[Table 1 at back]

It is imperative to acknowledge the contribution of queer theorist Michael Warner, who is widely credited for being the first to conceptualise heteronormativity, as 'the elemental form of human association, as the very model of inter-gender relations, as the individual basis of all community, and as the means of reproduction without which society wouldn't exist' (1993: xxi). Warner's definition was indebted to gay and lesbian studies as well as feminist concepts that are often seen as the forerunners of heteronormativity. Coining the term 'compulsory heterosexuality', Rich (1980) highlighted how women's sexuality was regulated through the imposition of heterosexuality as a social institution, reproducing patriarchal norms and practices. In this frame, both gender and patriarchy perform lead roles in constituting sexual normativity, compelling Rich (1980) to specify the hitherto neglected gendered particularities of lesbian experiences. In contrast, Gayle Rubin's (1985) feminist theorising treated sexuality

as an object of analysis in its own right by showing how sexuality and sex are regulated through relations of patriarchal power. This analytical shift permitted Rubin to demonstrate how sexual normalcy regulates all people, being implicated in multiple systems of oppression and privilege. In addition to feminist theorising, Warner's (1993) formulation of heteronormativity gleaned theoretical insights from Foucault's (1978) poststructuralist ideas on sexuality, discourse and productive forms of power. This is most apparent in Warner's (1993) concern with the normative power and violence that is exercised through the exclusionary and normalising effects produced by the ongoing reproduction of the heterosexual/homosexual binary.

The conceptual gains associated with mobilising heteronormativity as an analytical category are significant for entrepreneurship scholars. This significance is largely due to the theoretical underpinning of Warner's (1993) perspective on heteronormativity, which crystallised out of the first flush of queer theorising during the early 1990s in the US (Butler, 1990; De Lauretis, 1991; Sedgwick, 1990). As an intellectual project, queer theory sought to critique what is 'normal' and normative (Halperin, 1995). At that time, queer theory was taken up by scholars to reject essentialist binaristic formations of sexuality (e.g. heterosexuality/homosexuality) and show how sexuality could be understood as a category of knowledge and, thus, as a discursive cultural invention (Halperin, 1995; Sedgwick, 1990). Supporting that project, Warner's (1993) conceptualisation of heteronormativity as an analytical category was used to interrogate heteronormativity's operation as a normative regime, problematising 'heterosexual culture's exclusive ability to interpret itself as society' (1993: 8). Heteronormativity is both ubiquitous and invisible, identified by Warner as a social problem lurking in plain sight, all the time structuring and organising social institutions, relationships, intimacies and subjectivities. To expose, problematise and rupture its normative status and effects, queer theorists have garnered the analytical power of heteronormativity,

which also focuses attention on what is constituted as non-normative – the sexualities and genders that do not and cannot meet heteronormative ideals.

As captured in Table 1, entrepreneurship scholars stand to gain from mobilising Warner's (1993) conception of heteronormativity as an analytical category because it can generate critique that is charged by a political anti-normative impulse. According to Warner, anti-normativity is central to queer critique, because 'heteronormativity can be overcome only by actively imagining a necessarily and desirably queer world' (1993: xvi). Since the 1980s queer politics has shared the same anti-normative impetus as queer theory: to destabilise the heterosexual/homosexual binary; to undermine the gender binary and; critique gay and lesbian assimilationist politics that promoted heteronormative forms of inclusion such as gay marriage (Sullivan, 2003). One advantage of anti-normative queer critique and politics for entrepreneurship scholars is the potential it harbours for imagining non-heteronormative forms of entrepreneurship. Increased attention may also be paid to non-normative entrepreneurs who do not or cannot fit into binaristic categories of sex, sexuality and gender. Another advantage is that queer theory can teach entrepreneurship scholars valuable lessons about the perils of assuming that initiatives designed to improve LGBTQ inclusion is synonymous with equality and freedom, when its realities have been shown to reproduce existing forms of exclusion and hierarchies (Ahmed, 2012). The upshot of this is that queer theory's anti-normative drive is not characterised by pleas for tolerance and inclusion, but for social transformation.

Scholarly enthusiasm for utilising and developing heteronormativity as an analytical category has remained undented since Warner (1993). However, Warner's (1993) contribution to heteronormativity, which separates the analysis of sexuality from gender, has been criticised for ignoring the relationship between heteronormativity and gender (Jackson, 2006; Miriam, 2007). For the purposes of this article, scholarly contributions that have addressed this omission are particularly valuable because they underline, albeit in different ways (see Table 1), how

heteronormativity is implicated in the reproduction of binaristic categories of gender (Jackson, 2006, 2018; LeMaster et al., 2019; Marchia and Sommer, 2019; Miriam, 2007). For feminist theorist Stevi Jackson (2006: 105; emphasis in original), heteronormativity must be 'rethought in terms of *what* is subject to regulation on both sides of the normatively prescribed boundaries of heterosexuality: both sexuality *and* gender'. Expounding a feminist sociology of sexuality, Jackson (2018: 136) argues that queer theory's conceptualisation of heterosexuality as a norm against which other sexualities are understood as (ab)normal can divert attention away from the task of interrogating heterosexuality as a gender relationship. Jackson (2018) develops an analytical approach that credits Warner's (1993) queer theory perspective on heteronormativity that focuses on sexuality and cultivates a sociological analysis of social structural arrangements, so it can grapple with the relationship between institutional heterosexuality and gender hierarchies, as previously taken up in lesbian-feminist research (Rich, 1980). One conceptual gain for entrepreneurship scholars of adopting such a feminist perspective on heteronormativity is that heterosexuality may be analysed both in terms of sexual desire and acts but also gendered divisions of labour. One advantage of this is that 'doing' heterosexuality includes both its normative and non-normative forms. In this frame, analyses can target not only heterosexual men's dominance in how household labour is divided, but also how such gendered divisions of labour are subject to alteration that can produce non-normative gender hierarchies and divisions of labour. In other words, how heterosexual men and women can deviate from normative gendered divisions of labour and arrangements based on monogamy.

Addressing the relationship between heteronormativity and gender from a different angle, other scholars have sought to link heteronormativity and cisnormativity (LeMaster et al., 2019; Marchia and Sommer, 2019). The term cisnormativity started to appear in research that unpacked the assumption that people are or should be 'gender normal' (i.e. 'cisgender'): those individuals whose assigned birth sex is aligned with gender expression (Bauer et al.,

2009). In other words, when an individual's assigned birth sex is male, he is expected to be a man, and for an individual whose assigned birth sex is female, she is expected to be a woman. Bauer et al. (2009) submit that this cisnormative assumption is so prevalent that it is difficult to recognise and, hence, rarely questioned. Like heteronormativity, cisnormativity has been engaged as an analytical category, exposing and problematising its core assumptions as systemic and its inimical effects on those who struggle to and cannot occupy cisgender norms. It is in debates on cisnormativity and gender normativity that the concept of 'cisheteronormativity' (LeMaster et al., 2019) or 'cisnormative-heteronormativity' (Marchia and Sommer, 2019) has emerged. Drawing on trans-feminist and queer perspectives, LeMaster et al. (2019) directs deploys cisheteronormativity as a category of analysis that demonstrates its conceptual value in how it understands sex, gender and sexuality are simultaneously regulated norms (see also Marchia and Sommer, 2019). Understood as such, cisheteronormativity can be used to interrogate the assumptions that underpin gender normativity as well as those genders that do not conform to cisgender norms. As an analytical category, cisheteronormativity can support entrepreneurship scholarship that is concerned with the simultaneous operation of sexual and gender normativity in and through entrepreneurship domains, behaviours and activities.

In summary, heteronormativity is a concept that crystallised out of Warner's (1993) early contribution to queer theory, the enduring relevance of which lies in its capacity to analyse heterosexuality as normative, culturally imposed and violent. When understood through queer theory and feminist perspectives, the analytical power of heteronormativity extends beyond interrogating its constitution and normalising effects. It can highlight the possibilities for its subversion and eradication, inspire thought about non-normative worlds and foster strategies for social transformation. As Table 1 shows, queer and feminist contributions to heteronormativity's analytical repertoire represents a rich bank of conceptual resources for

entrepreneurship studies scholars to confront and undermine heteronormativity's grip on the field, and within a wide array of entrepreneurial settings. Additionally, the discussion above also shows that the choices made about how heteronormativity is defined are clearly consequential for any analysis of its dynamics, impact and eradication. With these points in mind, I turn now to discuss how entrepreneurship scholars have engaged with heteronormativity.

Insights from entrepreneurship research on heteronormativity: some critical observations

In this section I review how entrepreneurship scholars have engaged heteronormativity, both in definition and deployment, structured around three critical observations. Table 2 summarises much of this scholarship in terms of its principal research focus, how it defines and deploys heteronormativity and my observations thereof. As Table 2 shows, the importance of this segment of entrepreneurship studies literature is apparent in the various angles it has adopted to study and call out heteronormativity as a harmful normative regime (Essers et al., 2023; Galloway, 2012; Kushins and Behounek, 2020; Marlow et al., 2018; Marlow and Dy, 2018; Rumens and Ozturk, 2019; Wang, 2024; Yamamura and Lasselle, 2024). To support and embolden the future efforts of entrepreneurship scholars working in this area, it is vital to acknowledge that the analytical potential of heteronormativity as a category of analysis is not fully realised within entrepreneurship studies, partly hindered by issues concerning its definition and deployment. Accordingly, I unpack three observations: clarity of definition and deployment of heteronormativity; using heteronormativity to empirically demonstrate its functioning and effects; heteronormativity and LGBTQ entrepreneurial perspectives.

Clarity of definition and deployment of heteronormativity

Evidence indicates that some entrepreneurship research has stumbled over the matter of conceptualising heteronormativity, both in terms of definition and deployment (e.g. Fletcher et al. 2024; Galloway, 2012; Kidney et al. 2024; Marlow et al., 2018; Yamamura and Lasselle, 2024). This is not a trifling semantic quibble. Rather, the sometimes-vague sense in which heteronormativity is defined or, in some cases, not defined, can render it a free-floating signifier that lacks historical and contextual specificity. In turn, this can limit or stifle research that examines its distinctive forms (e.g., as gendered, as cisnormative) and fosters strategies to rupture and dismantle heteronormativity in entrepreneurship. This is exemplified in Yamamura and Lassalle's (2024) insightful study on the contextual embeddedness of LGBTQ 'intersectional entrepreneurs'. Noteworthy for addressing the paucity of research on intersectionality in LGBTQ entrepreneurship scholarship (see also Esser et al., 2023), Yamamura and Lasselle (2024) refer to 'heteronormativity' several times but fail to conceptualise the term. This is striking in a study that attends to intersecting systems of oppression and the exploits of entrepreneurs who experience vulnerability because they are positioned at these intersections. Notably, one study participant (Angela) mentions 'sexist and heteronormative stigma', indicating that some of her entrepreneurial experiences are shaped at the intersection of heteronormativity and sexism. But without conceptualising heteronormativity, Yamamura and Lasselle (2024) weaken the study's analytical traction to grasp the complex relationship between these two oppressive regimes.

Likewise, Fletcher et al's (2024) study focuses on what resources are acquired by LGBT entrepreneurs from LGBT-specific networks. Again, this represents a valuable scholarly intervention into an understudied area that deserves research. Fletcher et al. (2024: 1127) acknowledge that there are 'wider issues related to heteronormativity within traditional entrepreneurial communities that undermine LGBT individuals' ability to express their

potential'. Couched in terms of concern about its structuring force within the entrepreneurial field, Fletcher et al. (2024) start to pave a pathway that promises a biting critique of heteronormativity and LGBT entrepreneurial potential. However, the delivery on this promise is uneven, because it is at this juncture when discussion stalls on how heteronormativity is to be rallied theoretically and for what purpose. Consequently, Fletcher et al. (2024: 1127) unwittingly debilitate heteronormativity's analytical purchase for helping them to interrogate the 'dominant gendered and heteronormative views of entrepreneurship and leadership'. In this sentence there is some faint indication about how heteronormativity may be connected to dominant gendered entrepreneurship discourse, but, conceptually, the coordinates connecting heteronormativity, sexuality and gender are not mapped out precisely. Similarly, Fletcher et al. (2024) are conceptually vague about heteronormativity when it is said to have a 'presence' (2024: 1139), is formulated as a set of 'ideals and constraints' (2024: 1139), an 'environment' (2024: 1143) and can exert 'pressure' (2024: 1143). I do not dispute any of these possibilities for understanding heteronormativity and its embodiment in entrepreneurial venues. But without conceptual precision about how heteronormativity is defined and deployed, such that we may, for example, understand its links to gender and its gendering effects, heteronormativity's dynamic, shifting and open relationship with specific entrepreneurial environments remains unclear.

Conceptual cloudiness is evident also in entrepreneurship research that draws on heteronormativity alongside other concepts to analyse sexual discrimination and oppression. In Kidney et al. (2024:1), heteronormativity is garrisoned alongside heterosexism and homophobia in a study that aims to 'focus on the impact of heterosexism on LGBT+ entrepreneurial activities'. Heteronormativity is specified via Ingraham's (2002) definition that echoes Warner's (1993) conceptualisation, which underscores how institutionalised heterosexuality sets the normative standard for sexual relations. After that, the study switches

focus to heterosexism and homophobia, leaving heteronormativity analytically redundant. While heterosexism has analytical potency to demonstrate how heterosexual norms shape LGBTQ entrepreneurial activities, Kidney et al. (2024) miss the opportunity to enlist heteronormativity as an analytical category that can be used to dislodge heterosexual norms. As such, doubt ensues about how Kidney et al. (2024) intend heteronormativity to dialogue with heterosexism and homophobia, which are conceptually distinct terms.

Diving into the sexuality studies literature can provide clarity to that end. Originating in the field of psychology (Weinberg, 1972), homophobia has been used to describe an irrational fear toward same-sex sexualities that is expressed through hostility and violence aimed at gay men and lesbians. Homophobia has been roundly criticised for not being a legitimate 'phobia' and individualising sexual oppression to the homophobic individual, whereas heterosexism refers to an ideological and structural system of oppression that reproduces the normative and privileged status of heterosexuality (Herek, 1990). In contrast, heteronormativity differs from these terms in the emphasis it places on the normalisation of heterosexuality and its associated effects. Some commentators have understood homophobia and heterosexism as acts or components of heteronormativity, which help to enforce its normalising relations of power (Varela et al., 2016). When such conceptual signposting is absent or difficult to discern, research is vulnerable to criticism about how heteronormativity is unhelpfully reduced to a term of reference that is evacuated of its analytical and anti-normative political possibilities. Yet a queer critique that embraces anti-normativity may be precisely what Kidney et al. (2024) need to help them displace 'the heterosexual norm' they rightly castigate for marginalising 'LGBT+ entrepreneurship' research.

Using heteronormativity to empirically demonstrate its functioning and effects within entrepreneurial domains

My second critical observation is that entrepreneurship research has largely settled for using heteronormativity to demonstrate empirically its functioning within entrepreneurial contexts and effects on LGBTQ entrepreneurs. From one perspective, this has considerable merits. Research in this vein has highlighted, for example, hitherto neglected aspects and consequences of how heteronormativity can sustain a gender binary that assumes entrepreneurs are heterosexual (Marlow et al., 2018), constrain the constitution of LGBTQ entrepreneurial identities and behaviours (Essers et al., 2023; Galloway, 2012; Rumens and Ozturk, 2019), and negatively impact on LGBTQ entrepreneurial activities (Kidney et al., 2024; Redien-Collot, 2024; Wang, 2024). From another perspective, while this literature has sought to interrogate the operation of heteronormativity, it varies greatly in how it articulates (sometimes not at all) an explicit relation to anti-normativity and social transformation.

Pursuing this, I consider, first, Galloway's (2007, 2012) research on gay men's entrepreneurship. One reason for selecting Galloway (2007, 2012) is because this scholarship represents some of the first to hold heteronormativity accountable in processes of knowledge production within entrepreneurship studies. Empirically, Galloway (2012) was one of few scholars to demonstrate the impact of heteronormativity on gay men's entrepreneurial motivations, activities, behaviours and venues. In Galloway (2007), it is striking that heteronormativity is not mentioned, but the ensuing analysis that breaks the 'silence' that has enwrapped gay men's entrepreneurship is all but in name a piercing analysis about how heteronormative assumptions constitute and sustain such omissions as 'normal'. Were this the case, we may anticipate heteronormativity being deployed as an analytical category that could expand more fully on the specific ways in which heteronormative entrepreneurial norms, academic and state institutions bolster its hegemony and normalising power. Moreover, while Galloway (2007) articulates a need to correct knowledge gaps about 'gay entrepreneurship', the ambition and tone of this call to arms is muted as it misses its cue to delineate scenes of

political engagement that could disrupt what Warner (1993) describes as ‘the normal business of the academy’. In other words, a queer theory perspective on heteronormative knowledge production can interrogate what can and cannot be known, with the aim of eradicating the normalising and oppressive effects produced by heteronormative canons of entrepreneurship scholarship.

Conversely, in a companion article, Galloway (2012: 380) names heteronormativity in the aim of an interview-based study of gay men entrepreneurs, to address how ‘heteronormativity pervades social and employment cultures’. However, in this example, Warner’s (1993) contribution to heteronormativity is uncredited and, instead, Galloway (2012) broaches the matter of defining heteronormativity via the social constructionism of Jeffrey Weeks’ (2007) writing on sexuality. Here, Weeks’ comments on heterosexuality as an institution appears to provide a point of contact with feminist and queer theorising on heteronormativity. But Galloway (2012) leaves unanswered the question of what exactly is the relationship between Weeks’ sociology of sexuality and heteronormativity? Weeks is heavily associated with a socio-historical construction of human sexuality that predates the germination of queer theories. While his early writing conceptualised the socio-historical nature of homosexuality (1985), which has broadly influenced the emergence of queer theory, Weeks (1995: 116) later admonished queer theory for its ‘elitism’, anti-identitarian stance and valorisation of transgressive politics. Weeks’ scholarship can be understood to display some nodes of potential connection with queer theory, but it has much more in common with a sociology of sexuality that diverges from the discursive and textual analyses cultivated by queer theorists, and forms of queer politics based on discursive resignification. While heteronormativity may be understood, perhaps only in part, through the perspective of Weeks’ social constructionism, Galloway (2012) does not proceed along this or any other path, including those that lead into the discursive realm of queer theory. In effect, Galloway’s (2012)

engagement of heteronormativity is theoretically limited, and used primarily for empirical demonstration, which, despite its obvious merits, subdues the political possibilities for destabilising the ontological security of heterosexual norms that shape gay men's entrepreneurial behaviour and identities in specific ways.

Similarly, I consider, second, Marlow et al's (2018) forceful and ambitious intervention that aims to 'queer' heteronormative assumptions in entrepreneurship. They acknowledge that 'gendered analyses draw almost exclusively upon women as the unit of analysis and assume an exclusive heteronormative binary' (2018: 118). As a corrective, they take gay men and lesbians instead of heterosexuals as a unit of analysis, to 'queer' the current gendered nature of entrepreneurial research that assumes heterosexuality. While they use heteronormativity as an analytical category to that end, and while it is deployed to 'queer' extant research, neither heteronormativity nor queer are conceptualised fully. Had they done so, this would enable them to converse in specific ways to elucidate a bolder queer(ed) political agenda for change. In Marlow et al. (2018), heteronormativity and queer are not anchored deeply in queer theory, despite implying a relationship between them. While swapping heterosexuals for gay men and lesbians as units of analysis represents an important methodological choice that can challenge a gendered heteronormative sex/gender binary, its claim to be a 'queer' – anti-normative - move has its limits. Significantly, Marlow et al's (2018: 132) study disrupts extant heteronormative constructions of entrepreneurship and they acknowledge the potential 'opportunities to develop a greater understanding of how individual gays and lesbians may negotiate heteronormative norms, [and] may choose to queer these norms'. Recognising this is a crucial step for expanding entrepreneurship scholars' understanding of what heteronormativity determines as non-normative sexualities and genders. But to advance this requires a deeper appreciation than is perhaps apparent in Marlow et al. (2018) about heteronormativity's analytical capacity for cultivating analyses that embrace anti-normativity and social transformation.

Heteronormativity and LGBTQ entrepreneurial perspectives

A third observation centres on how the manifestations and impact of heteronormativity are understood almost exclusively through the perspectives of LGBTQ entrepreneurs (Galloway, 2012; Wang, 2024). As mentioned previously, there are forceful arguments about why LGBTQ entrepreneurs are commonly selected as exemplary research subjects to garner empirical insights into how heteronormativity is connected to power, which has implications for sexualities that are constituted as normal and abnormal. Despite the penetrating insights into heteronormativity LGBTQ perspectives may yield, research on this topic may unwittingly recast LGBTQ entrepreneurs in deficit against a heteronormative entrepreneurship ideal. In this binaristic formulation, more attention has been directed toward LGBTQ entrepreneurship, and far less has targeted heterosexuals and how they are constituted as normative entrepreneurial subjects within entrepreneurial discourse. Yet heterosexuals who embody the subject position of exemplar entrepreneurial subjects warrant interrogation, not least because we can examine how heteronormativity has gendering effects that have helped to normalise heterosexual men as ideal entrepreneurial actors (Marlow and Martinez Dy, 2018). Shielded also from scrutiny are the conditions under which heterosexuals may also struggle to inhabit gendered heteronormative entrepreneurship norms. Saying as much is to recognise that heterosexuals are not a homogenous social category, as they have different investments in a heteronormative order (Rumens et al., 2019). Accepting this argument unlocks another portal to examine how some heterosexuals may engage in counter-struggles as entrepreneurs that problematise the subject positions afforded to them in gendered heteronormative entrepreneurial discourse. These points considered, heterosexuals represent potentially important research subjects in entrepreneurship, not least in terms of naming heterosexuals *as* heterosexuals and, thus, problematising heterosexuality as an unmarked social category.

Furthermore, well-intentioned entrepreneurship research may generate reified constructions of LGBTQ entrepreneurs that do not apprehend the specific contextual contingencies of heteronormativity that variously shape LGBTQ entrepreneurship. This criticism throws into greater relief the potential drawbacks of amassing LGBTQ entrepreneurs in study samples. This approach to sample construction is not unique to entrepreneurship studies, but also evident in management and organisation studies and other disciplines within the social sciences. However, studies that aggregate LGBTQ entrepreneurs under one umbrella can inadequately account for the differences in how heteronormativity is understood and experienced *within* and *between* LGBTQ entrepreneurs.

For example, Schindehutte et al's (2005) survey of GLB entrepreneurs is dominated by Caucasian gay men (72% of their sample), so little insight is available into how lesbian and bisexual entrepreneurs experience barriers to entrepreneurship. This is not to say that scholars should abandon this approach to studying LGBTQ entrepreneurs. Rather, they must be acute to the necessity of teasing out differences within and between LGBTQ categories of sexuality and gender. This is particularly salient in the light of entrepreneurship research that shows how some gay men entrepreneurs can inhabit gender norms coded as heteronormatively masculine, enabling them to repudiate femininity and, thus, conform to a heteronormative ideal of entrepreneurship as masculine (Rumens and Ozturk, 2019). Contrasting this, gender non-conforming gay men entrepreneurs may be more vulnerable to the gendering effects of heteronormativity within entrepreneurial ventures and settings that endorse and reproduce a male entrepreneurial norm. In comparison, the experiences of lesbian, bisexual and trans women entrepreneurs vary based on gender differences that reveal differences in how LGBTQ entrepreneurs are positioned differently within heteronormativity (see Darden et al., 2022; Wang, 2024). Similarly, small-scale research involving LGBTQ entrepreneurs situated within wider configurations of difference has produced nuanced empirical insights into how LGBTQ

entrepreneurs can experience ‘vulnerability’ at the intersections of competing systems of discrimination (see Yamamura and Lasselle, 2024).

In summary, entrepreneurship research on heteronormativity is sparse but it has started to forge inroads into heteronormativity and its impact on entrepreneurship studies and beyond in wider entrepreneurial contexts and activities. As the discussion above has shown, entrepreneurship scholars vary in how they engage heteronormativity, both in definition and deployment. Some barely acknowledge its theoretical origins or struggle to provide sufficient conceptual clarity, while others have galvanised it as an analytical category to demonstrate or explain the constitution and effects of heteronormativity in entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship scholars who use heteronormativity as an analytical category is scant, especially from a queer theory perspective that could detail possibilities of subversion and imagine queer(er) entrepreneurial worlds. This considered, the next section outlines directions for future research that can help entrepreneurship scholars to realise more fully the utility of heteronormativity as an analytical category.

[Table 2 at back]

M**oving forward**

In this section, I delineate ideas for potential research directions that build on my critical observations (see Table 2) and the conceptual resources summarised in Table 1. In so doing, I draw on additional research within entrepreneurship, sociology and sexuality and gender studies to illustrate my ideas and nurture possibilities for deploying heteronormativity with greater conceptual precision and broader scope. I concentrate on four avenues for future research: queering heteronormativity and entrepreneurship; naming heterosexual entrepreneurs

as heterosexual; heteronormativity and family business; heteronormativity, gender and entrepreneurship.

Queering heteronormativity and entrepreneurship

As indicated in Table 1, entrepreneurship scholars can contribute to the study of heteronormativity using a variety of theoretical perspectives, such as but not limited to queer, feminist and trans theories. However, heteronormativity's theoretical origins in queer theory remain highly influential. Acknowledging this, I invite entrepreneurship scholars to engage in processes of queering heteronormativity and entrepreneurship. By this, I refer to strategies of reading and analysis that go against the grain of heteronormativity, to expose its normative logics and evince new ways of understanding the constitution of entrepreneurship (e.g. motivations, intentions, identities, subjectivities, relations) that are currently enmeshed within existing heteronormative relations of power.

Outlined in Table 1 are some of the key conceptual components of Warner's (1993) contribution to heteronormativity, which may be used by entrepreneurship scholars to generate modes of queering. One component involves deconstructing the heterosexual/homosexual binary, whereby a discursive-based critique of binary oppositions is undertaken to destabilise the supposed stability of this binary. One outcome of this is that 'truths' about heterosexuality, as something natural and normal, are contested, allowing alternative readings of sex, sexuality and gender to emerge. One such line of inquiry for entrepreneurship scholars is to interrogate how the heterosexual/homosexual binary is reproduced in entrepreneurial domains, behaviours and identities, highlighting its instability and susceptibility to collapse. This avenue of research could galvanise an additional conceptual component of Warner's (1993) contribution to heteronormativity that is concerned with destabilising normative assumptions that suggest the occupation of binaristic categories of sex, gender and sexuality is singular, fixed and uniform.

Indeed, there is still much we need to know about what happens to entrepreneurs who cannot and do not want to fit into binaristic categories of sex, sexuality and gender. Also, what we know about entrepreneurs who may disrupt a heteronormative heterosexual/homosexual binary remains patchy, including those heterosexuals who seek to loosen or sever their attachments to heteronormative, gendered entrepreneurial norms.

Queering the relationship between heteronormativity and entrepreneurship may encompass the deconstruction and destabilisation of other heteronormative binaries. For example, Halberstam's (2011) concept of 'queered failure' is based on a queering of heteronormative ideas of success and failure, which may appeal to entrepreneurship scholars interested in rethinking what success and failure means in entrepreneurial domains. Halberstam (2011: 88) dismantles the logics of 'failure' as a chiefly negative concept that denotes a lack of accomplishment and success. Countering a heteronormative concept of failure as something that must be avoided, Halberstam (2011:1-2) advances failure as an 'artform' that is predicated on a refusal to 'acquiesce' to heteronormativity's 'dominant logics of power and discipline'. Specifically, Halberstam (2011:2) questions the binaristic formulation of success/failure in a heteronormative capitalist society' that continuously equates the former to 'wealth accumulation'. A queered notion of failure is said to unearth possibilities for different kinds of rewards when it is used to critique the imperative of success based on 'trying and trying again' (Halberstam, 2011:3).

Linking this to entrepreneurship, future research may unpack discourses of heteronormative entrepreneurial success and failure that are tethered to capital accumulation. Indeed, current research on entrepreneurship success and failure tends to be preoccupied with identifying the influencing factors responsible for obstructing and achieving economic growth and business productivity (Devece et al., 2016; Johnson et al., 2021). This concern also structures emergent research on LGBTQ small business survival and failure rates (Blackman

et al., 2024). Yet non-normative alternatives to a notion of entrepreneurial success may reside in queered notions of failure that are connected to anti-capitalist practices, non-normativity and critique. From this viewpoint, failure is understood as a form of critique that can problematise the normalising effects of heteronormative notions of success. Additionally, it can encourage exploration of the possibilities of queered forms of entrepreneurship that are less interested in wealth accumulation than with challenging heteronormativity.

To illustrate, Chin (2021: 1372) coins the term 'sacrificial entrepreneurship' to describe the entrepreneurship in his study of Canadian queer and trans people of colour entrepreneurs who are involved in queer anti-racist performance community initiatives. In this example, these entrepreneurs redirected public resources designed for entrepreneurial 'individual profit-making' to construct 'spaces of citizenship that politicised the relationships among race, sexuality, gender, class and disability' (2021: 1371-72). Further research is needed that examines these types of entrepreneurial contexts that allow entrepreneurs to engage in activities that destabilise the simultaneous regulation of sex, sexual and gender norms and entrepreneurial norms regarding success and failure.

Naming heterosexual entrepreneurs as heterosexual: heteronormativity, heterosexuality and entrepreneurship

Another valuable avenue of future research can be signposted as naming heterosexual entrepreneurs *as* heterosexual entrepreneurs. One pressing reason for entrepreneurship scholars to contribute to this endeavour is that prior entrepreneurship research on heteronormativity has tended to focus on LGBTQ participants. Similarly, previous queer theory analyses have largely been devoted to the interrogation of heteronormativity and its impact on LGBTQ people (Jackson, 2006). Overlooked in both bodies of literature are the different ways in which heterosexuals are affected by heteronormativity. Feminist scholars have pointed out that forms

of normative heterosexuality based on traditional gender arrangements, relations and monogamy cannot be assumed to hold the same appeal to all heterosexuals (Jackson, 2006; Miriam, 2007). As indicated in Table 1, some feminist perspectives on heteronormativity have sought to provide the detail of claiming heterosexuality is normative (Jackson, 2006, 2018). As an analytical category, gendered-heteronormativity can equip entrepreneurship scholars with the conceptual focus that recognises normative heterosexuality is neither monolithic nor static, and that heterosexual men and women are positioned differently within heteronormative entrepreneurial discourse based on a rigid sex/gender binary. The ways in which heterosexuality is gendered through heteronormativity warrants sustained scholarly attention because it promises to shed light on the interconnections between sexuality and gender within heteronormative entrepreneurial discourse and the domestic and organisational domains across which entrepreneurship occurs. Thus to say naming entrepreneurs as heterosexual demands ongoing rigorous analysis of the nature of normative heterosexuality and how this is regulated through sexual and gender norms, as well as the examination of how heterosexuals may choose to resist the heteronormative nature of entrepreneurship.

Similarly, entrepreneurship research has yet to explore the implications of instability in the heterosexual/homosexual binary for how research subjects are assumed to be and hailed as ‘heterosexual’. Studies have shown that some heterosexual men and women who have enjoyed sexual experiences with people of the same sex and occupy urban LGBTQ leisure spaces are uncomfortable with identifying themselves as ‘heterosexual-only’ (Bettani, 2015; Dean, 2014). Such research suggests that the rigidity of the heterosexual/homosexual binary is far more supple and locationally specific than discourses of heteronormativity would have us believe. This gives rise to questions about how heterosexuals negotiate subject positions within discourses of heteronormativity. Smith and Shin’s (2015) study explored how cisgender heterosexuals of colour wrestled with the components of heteronormative discourse to position

themselves as supportive of LGB people. Although they found some heterosexual men belittled some LGB struggles and essentialised their identities, other heterosexual men empathised with LGB people's oppression through their experiences of racial discrimination. The implications of heterosexuals blurring the heterosexual/homosexual binary for examining heterosexual entrepreneurial identities, motivations and intentions is unclear. One possibility is that entrepreneurs who have an ambiguous relationship with a heterosexual identity category may feel disposed to build bridges into LGBTQ entrepreneurial domains, becoming influential constituents in the support networks of LGBTQ entrepreneurs. Scholars may consider investigating how heterosexual entrepreneurs negotiate discourses of heteronormativity in entrepreneurial contexts and activities that support LGBTQ equality projects and business ventures.

Equally, it is important that attention is paid to how heteronormativity and heterosexuality are (re)shaped in entrepreneurship contexts structured by other systems of oppression. Scholars have pointed out that entrepreneurship is linked to Whiteness, evidenced by its symbolic association with credibility and its idealised performance by heroic white men (Ogbor, 2000; Marlow and Martinez Dy, 2018). The relations between Whiteness and heterosexuality are seldom acknowledged in the entrepreneurship literature (Giazitzoglu and Korede, 2023), despite a commanding body of evidence that shows how heterosexuality is constructed through formations of race. Cohen (1997) demonstrates how in the historical past heteronormativity has origins in discourses of white supremacy. Access to marriage was regulated among heterosexuals; historically a privileged institution in the US for white heterosexuals but not heterosexuals of colour who were subjugated by a system of slavery in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Further, Dean (2016) highlights cultural stereotypes that couch black heterosexualities as hypersexual, while white heterosexualities are designated 'normal'. Thus, how stereotyped black heterosexual identities, subjectivities and behaviours

are shaped at the intersections of entrepreneurship, whiteness, racial oppression and heteronormativity deserves sustained analysis. Research by Giazitzoglu and Korede (2023) shows how Black African men immigrant entrepreneurs sought entrepreneurial credibility by adopting identity management strategies to associate their personal and business identities with symbolic whiteness. But in this study, as seems to be the case more broadly, heterosexuality remains an unmarked category, leaving it and its relationship with heteronormativity unaccountable in the reproduction of whiteness and racial Otherness in entrepreneurial contexts. Clearly, more entrepreneurship research is needed to shed light on these intersections to cultivate empirical granularity.

Heteronormativity and family business

Mobilising heteronormativity as an analytical category that is grounded in queer theory can help entrepreneurship scholars to expose and problematise the heteronormative assumptions that currently underpin issues pertaining to family businesses. Family business represents a major research site in entrepreneurship studies, but it appears largely oblivious to the ways in which it reproduces heteronormative assumptions about family attributes and arrangements (Boers, 2018; Kushinsa and Behounek, 2020). This is easily observed in literature reviews of family business scholarship. For example, Combs et al. (2020: 47) review scholarship on the relationship between business family attributes and family firms, the results of which reveal a glaring knowledge gap on LGBTQ family businesses, despite calls for broadening the concept of family in family business (Danes et al., 2023). Thus, one vexing assumption concerns the concept of the family, which is largely undifferentiated in family business research. Kushinsa and Behounek (2020: 1) have pointed out that conceptualising the notion of the family in family business has received ‘limited debate’ using a ‘limited theoretical palette’, such that ‘scholars typically take for granted that a family is an opposite-sex, married couple, living with their children under the same roof’. This heteronormative assumption is criticised for failing to

account for social shifts that have conditioned the possibility for alternative family attributes and arrangements. Another disadvantage is that it restricts the types of family businesses that may be studied, excluding those that comprise LGBTQ people.

Challenging these aspects of heteronormative nature of family business scholarship should be considered urgent, as it promises to unlock new empirical insights and perspectives on not only the concept of family, but also the nature and type of familial relationships within family businesses. Queer studies research has demonstrated how LGBTQ people have created 'chosen families' (Weston, 1991) characterised by relations based on preference not biology, often out of necessity when they are rejected by blood relatives. Families of choice may comprise friends, romantic unwed partners and (ex)lovers; crucially, such families have been shown to be as durable, intimate and meaningful as families of origin (Weeks et al., 2001). Some scholars have described these familial networks as 'queer families' because they are alternative non-normative familial arrangements that rupture the 'naturalness' of heteronormative familial arrangements (Lehr, 1999). At the same time, many LGBTQ people have sought to emulate a heteronormative nuclear family through same-sex marriage and child rearing, taking advantage of legal reforms and advances in reproductive technologies and surrogacy. Here, then, empirical research is needed that examines how LGBTQ people may reproduce and contest heteronormative familial attributes, arrangements and a relationship with business that may or may not always be obvious to them. By considering such diversity in non-traditional families, family business scholars can confront the heteronormative bias in family business theories so they may be revised and expanded.

Heteronormativity, gender and entrepreneurship

As an analytical category, gendered-heteronormativity could construct new inroads for understanding relations between entrepreneurship, gender and patriarchy. A vital stream of

literature has examined how women's entrepreneurship is embedded within and shaped by patriarchy, sociocultural values and gender ideologies (Barragan et al., 2018; Shahriar, 2018; Tlaiss and Kauser, 2019). Aspects of this literature have shown how women's entrepreneurship can exist in a relation of both complicity and contestation, where women entrepreneurs can rupture and conform to patriarchal notions of gender through entrepreneurial activities. Yet the analytical priorities exhibited in this literature do not encompass heteronormativity. In cultural contexts where patriarchy is institutionalised, apparent in studies on women's entrepreneurship in Islamic countries (Barragan et al., 2018; Tlaiss and Kauser, 2019), the examination of its political conjunction with gendered heteronormativity could highlight how the gendered nature of women's entrepreneurship in these contexts colludes with compulsory heterosexuality.

Again, Jackson's (2006) focus on relations within heterosexuality as a gender relationship can help entrepreneurship scholars to track how heteronormative entrepreneurial domains can sustain gender divisions that reproduce and disrupt patriarchal relations between men and women. Analysing gendered-heteronormativity may also address unanswered research questions about the opportunities and capacities for lesbian and bisexual women's entrepreneurship within patriarchal societies, especially those that continue to criminalise 'homosexuality'. Thus, the contextual specificities of heteronormativity must be considered, not least because they vary significantly, such as in contexts where they are entangled with patriarchal norms (Song et al., 2023), while in others they are intertwined within power relations that have advanced LGBTQ politics (Drucker, 2015).

Pursuing other lines of inquiry, entrepreneurship scholars have yet to examine fully how heteronormativity has shaped the identity categories 'mumpreneurs' and 'dadpreneurs', and what forms 'mumpreneurship' and 'dadpreneurship' may subsequently take. Entrepreneurship that takes place in households is hugely significant both in volume and in how parents are/not able to manage the demands of being parents and entrepreneurs (Boz Semerci and Volery, 2018;

Carter, 2011; Carter et al., 2017). To date, notable research has shown how gendered modes of mum- and dadpreneurship can reproduce and disrupt a dominant male entrepreneurial norm (Duberley and Carrigan, 2013; Hytti et al., 2024; Lewis et al., 2022; Tao and Essers, 2024). However, this literature is largely guilty of reproducing the assumption that 'mumpreneurs' and 'dadpreneurs' are heterosexual. Combatting the heteronormative bias in this segment of entrepreneurship research may open windows into how gendered divisions of (non)domestic labour are shaped by and shape the experience of mum- and dadpreneurship. For example, studies have shown a more equal distribution of housework between same-sex couples than heterosexuals, with some same-sex couples defining and allocating housework based on a same-sex not gendered heteronormative construction of specific housework activities as feminine and masculine (Bauer, 2016; Goldberg, 2013). Examining these types of gendered arrangements within same-sex households could yield exciting research on non-normative forms of entrepreneurship that occur within diverse households.

Angled differently, gendered heteronormativity can exert analytical traction on the relationship between men's entrepreneurship and heteronormative masculinity. As Marlow and Martinez Dy (2018: 9) aver, although men are the 'normative subject within entrepreneurial discourse, they are genderless', often eluding research analysis. This has prompted a growing cabal of scholars to deconstruct and problematise entrepreneurial masculinities that repudiate women and femininity, reinforcing gender binaries in entrepreneurial contexts (Giazitzoglu and Down, 2017; Hytti et al., 2024; Korede, 2024; Smith, 2010). Crucially, the relationship between heteronormative masculinity and entrepreneurship remains understudied (Marlow and Martinez Dy, 2018). How gendered heteronormativity shapes men's entrepreneurship promises to expand the scope for understanding how different gay/bisexual men can/not inhabit a heteronormative entrepreneurial male norm. Studies that focus on how these categories of men may rupture and/or bolster this entrepreneurial norm are warranted. Here, heteronormativity

may be deployed to analyse homonormativity, a term used by Duggan (2002: 179) to refer to a politics of ‘queer’ assimilation that ‘does not contest dominant heteronormative assumptions and institutions’.

To illustrate, Rumens and Ozturk (2019) examined how heteronormativity impacted on the construction of gay men’s entrepreneurial identities in a context of gay and lesbian normalisation. They found some gay men entrepreneurs in UK were keen to cast themselves as gender conforming by forming attachments to heteronormative masculinity. In so doing, they distanced themselves from ‘camp’ gay men entrepreneurs who were repudiated for demonstrating an ‘excess of femininity’. Expressing misogynistic overtones in their views about ‘camp’ gay men entrepreneurs, but also some women, these gay men entrepreneurs reinscribed femininity as Other in masculine entrepreneurial discourse. As such, the homonormative politics of gay and lesbian normalisation is seen to collude with heteronormative masculinity, evidenced in how some gay men wished to be situated within a heteronormative masculine entrepreneurial discourse so they could be discursively constituted as ‘normal’ entrepreneurs. As such, the gendering of sexuality represents an important research focus because the dynamics between gender and sexuality are implicated in how gay men’s entrepreneurship may reproduce homonormative gender hierarchies.

Lastly, the assumption that men and women entrepreneurs are cisgender has helped to enwrap the experiences of trans and non-binary entrepreneurs in silence. As Table 1 shows, the conceptual components of cisheteronormativity enable analysis of both sexual and gender normativity, as equal emphasis is placed on sex, sexuality and gender as simultaneously regulated norms. Countering cisnormative bias in entrepreneurship scholarship is warranted, because entrepreneurs are frequently assumed to be cisgender (Chin, 2021; Ciprikis et al., 2024; Darden et al., 2022). As ‘trans’ visibility has increased in some cultural contexts, entrepreneurship research is needed to problematise cisheteronormativity and its shaping

effects on trans and non-binary entrepreneurship. For example, Darden et al. (2022) compared the fear of failure among transgender and cisgender entrepreneurs and found transgender entrepreneurs differ considerably from cisgender entrepreneurs regarding fear of funding, idea potential and, most importantly, personal entrepreneurial ability due to prior experiences of fear of stigmatised and discrimination. Other studies have found differences between transgender and cisgender entrepreneurs in terms of entrepreneurial intention and income generation that disadvantage transgender entrepreneurs (Ciprikis et al., 2024). Thus, research that unpacks what is at stake for trans and non-binary entrepreneurship when it is shaped by cisheteronormative norms can undermine the normative assumptions that reproduce gender normativity in entrepreneurship studies.

Conclusion

In this review article I have sought to show how heteronormativity can be deployed as an analytical category by entrepreneurship scholars, demonstrating the conceptual gains when closer attention is paid to matters of definition and deployment. That part of my argument, elaborated in my critical observations of progress so far, has underscored how the choices entrepreneurship scholars make about how heteronormativity is (not) defined and utilised are clearly consequential for any analysis of its dynamics in and outside the entrepreneurship domain. I do not wish to prescribe how heteronormativity should be understood and mobilised by entrepreneurship scholars – this has not been my intention in this review. Rather, I urge researchers in this field to consider what they want heteronormativity *to do* and, thus, what kind of conceptual resources they require to grasp heteronormativity's complex relationship with entrepreneurship. Unmooring heteronormativity from its origins in queer and feminist

theory is unhelpful, not least because it may weaken its analytical purchase and anti-normative political potential.

Moving forward, there is a pressing need to expand the study of heteronormativity beyond the confines of what has been dubbed ‘LGBTQ entrepreneurship’ or, worse still, ‘gay entrepreneurship’ (see Galloway, 2012; Kidney et al., 2024). Already displaying signs of solidifying into a discrete niche subfield carved out by entrepreneurship studies scholars, its normalising effects on extant scholarly activity can be discerned in the typical types of research questions and study participants being addressed and recruited. Currently, engagements with heteronormativity are located here, and this is potentially disadvantageous for advancing entrepreneurship on heteronormativity, because it reaffirms that heteronormativity is a prime concern only for LGBTQ entrepreneurs. By annexing heteronormativity to a designated sphere of critical interrogation akin to how women’s entrepreneurship has developed (Marlow and Martinez Dy, 2018), there is a danger that critiques of heteronormativity are safely contained. Phrased differently, there is less likelihood of heteronormativity being subjected to ongoing scrutiny within and across entrepreneurship studies, such that its critique and confrontation becomes a shared responsibility and the possibilities for its disruption multiply. As I have reasoned above, enlarging entrepreneurial analyses of heteronormativity to include the relationship between heterosexuals and heteronormativity is an important step that names heterosexuality as unmarked category, and seeks to deconstruct its relationship with heteronormativity.

In closing, it is important to locate the efforts of entrepreneurship scholars tackling heteronormativity as an endeavour that is largely located in the Global North. Yet heteronormativity can exert a vice-like grip in cultural contexts in the Global South. Entrepreneurship research that addresses heteronormativity and its impact on entrepreneurial activities and contexts in the Global South is very rare. Correcting this, I anticipate research

that could generate insights into how heteronormativity and entrepreneurship are entangled with social problems such as poverty, impaired social mobility and vulnerability. Similarly, heteronormative cultures in the Global South that have been resculpted by the forces of colonialism are potentially important research sites for unpacking how heteronormativity comprises struggles about sexuality and gender that are connected to race, ethnicity and class. Undoubtedly, there is a great deal at stake here. If heteronormativity really does matter to entrepreneurship studies, as is clearly the case for an emboldened small number of scholars, then many others within the entrepreneurship field need to galvanise more fully the political charge and intellectual energy that has animated heteronormativity as an analytical category since its inception.

References

Ahmed S (2012) *On being included*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Barragan S, Erogul, MS and Essers C (2018) Strategic (dis) obedience: female entrepreneurs reflecting on and acting upon patriarchal practices. *Gender, Work & Organization* 25(5): 575-592.

Backman M, Carpenter CS, Dujeancourt E and Mann S (2024) Sexual orientation, entrepreneurship, and firm survival. *Small Business Economics*. Epub ahead of print 7 October 2024. DOI:10.1007/s11187-024-00976-2.

Bauer G (2016) Gender roles, comparative advantages and the life course: The division of domestic labor in same-sex and different-sex couples. *European Journal of Population* 32, 99-128.

Bauer GR, Hammond R, Travers R, Kaay M, Hohenadel KM and Boyce M (2009) “I don't think this is theoretical; this is our lives”: how erasure impacts health care for transgender people. *Journal of the Association of Nurses in AIDS Care 20*(5): 348-361.

Bettani S (2015) Straight subjectivities in homonormative spaces: moving towards a new, ‘dynamic’ heteronormativity? *Gender, Place & Culture 22*(2): 239-254.

Boers B (2018). Heteronormativity and the family firm: Will we ever see a queer family business? In Ratten V, Ramadani V, Dana LP, Hisrich RD and Ferreira J (Eds.) *Gender and family entrepreneurship*. London: Routledge, pp 171-182.

Boz Semerci A and Volery T (2018) Entrepreneurs as parents: The antecedents and consequence of parenting stress. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research* 24(1): 41-58.

Butler J (1990/1999) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Anniversary Edition. New York: Routledge.

Carter S (2011) The rewards of entrepreneurship: Exploring the incomes, wealth, and economic well–being of entrepreneurial households. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 35(1): 39-55.

Carter S, Kuhl A, Marlow S and Mwaura S. (2017) Households as a site of entrepreneurial activity. *Foundations and Trends® in Entrepreneurship* 13(2): 81-190.

Chin M (2021) Sacrificial entrepreneurship: the political economy of queer and trans of color community arts under neoliberalism. *Journal of Homosexuality 68*(8): 1371-1392.

Ciprikis K, Cassells D and Berrill J (2024) Transgender self-employment outcomes: evidence from the USA. *Small Business Economics* 63: 871–896.

Cohen CJ (1997) Punks, Bulldaggers, and Welfare Queens: The Radical Potential of Queer Politics? *GLQ* 3: 437-465.

Combs JG, Shanine, KK, Burrows S, Allen JS and Pounds TW (2020). What do we know about business families? Setting the stage for leveraging family science theories. *Family Business Review*, 33(1): 38-63.

Danes SM, Zachary RK and Balabram E (2023) Family Firm Research Frontier. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal* 13: 549-565.

Darden BB, Kellermanns FW and Best EL (2022) Entrepreneurial fear of failure: Transgender versus cis-gender entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights* 18: 1-8.

De Lauretis T (1991) Queer theory: Lesbian and gay sexualities an introduction. *Differences* 3(2): iii-xviii.

Dean JJ (2014) *Straights: Heterosexuality in post-closeted culture*. New York: New York University Press.

Devece C, Peris-Ortiz M and Rueda-Armengot C (2016) Entrepreneurship during economic crisis: Success factors and paths to failure. *Journal of business research* 69(11): 5366-5370.

Drucker P (2015) *Warped: Gay normality and queer anti-capitalism*. Leiden: Brill.

Duberley J and Carrigan M (2013) The career identities of ‘mumpreneurs’: Women’s experiences of combining enterprise and motherhood. *International Small Business Journal*. 31(6): 629-651.

Duggan L (2002) The New Homonormativity: The Sexual Politics of Neoliberalism. In Castronovo R and Nelson DD (Eds.) *Materializing Democracy: Toward a Revitalized Cultural Politics*. Durham: Duke University Press, pp. 175-94.

Edelman L (2004) *No future: Queer theory and the death drive*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Essers C, van der Heijden B, Fletcher L and Pijpers R (2023) It's all about identity: The identity constructions of LGBT entrepreneurs from an intersectionality perspective. *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship* 41(7): 774–795.

Ferguson RA (2003) *Aberrations in Black: Toward a Queer of Colour Critique*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Fletcher L, Incerti V and Essers C (2024) A social identity perspective on lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) entrepreneurs' networking behavior. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy* 18(5): 1126-1146.

Foucault M (1978) *The History of Sexuality. Vol. 1. An Introduction*. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Random House.

Giazitzoglu A and Down S (2017) Performing entrepreneurial masculinity: An ethnographic account. *International Small Business Journal* 35(1): 40-60.

Giazitzoglu A and Korede T (2023) Identity-work among Black African male immigrant entrepreneurs residing in Northern English regional contexts: A qualitative examination. *Journal of Business Research*. Epub ahead of print 2 May 2023. DOI: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.113978 113978.

Galloway L (2007) Entrepreneurship and the gay minority. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation* 8(4): 271–280.

Galloway L (2012) The experiences of male gay business owners in the UK. *International Small Business Journal 30*(8): 890-906.

Goldberg AE (2013) "Doing" and "undoing" gender: The meaning and division of housework in same-sex couples. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 5(2): 85-104.

Halberstam JJ (2011) *The Queer Art of Failure*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Halperin D (1995) *Saint=Foucault: Towards a Gay Hagiography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Herek GM (1990) The context of anti-gay violence: Notes on cultural and psychological heterosexism. *Journal of interpersonal violence 5*(3): 316-333.

Hytti U, Karhunen P and Radu-Lefebvre M (2024) Entrepreneurial masculinity: a fatherhood perspective. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 48(1): 246-273.

International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association [ILGA]. (2020). *World State Sponsored Homophobia Report*. ILGA.

International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association [ILGA]. (2023) *Our identities under arrest: A global overview on the enforcement of laws criminalising consensual same-sex sexual acts between adults and diverse gender expressions* 2nd Edition. Geneva: ILGA.

Ingraham C (2002) The Heterosexual Imaginary. In Jackson S and Scott S (Eds.) *Gender: A Sociological Reader*. London: Routledge, pp. 79-84.

Jackson S (2006) Interchanges: Gender, sexuality and heterosexuality: The complexity (and limits) of heteronormativity *Feminist theory 7*(1): 105-121.

Jackson S (2018) Why "heteronormativity" is not enough. In Messerschmidt, JW, Yancey Martin, P, Messner, MA and Connell, R. (Eds.) *Gender Reckonings: New Social Theory and Research.* New York: New York University Press, pp. 134-155.

Johnson D, Bock AJ and Thompson A (2022) Interpretation of successful and failed events in entrepreneurial firms: Acknowledgement practice under uncertainty. *International Small Business Journal* 40(7): 845-874.

Kidney E (2021) Entrepreneurship and coming out: exploring the experiences of gay and lesbian entrepreneurs. In Cooney T (ed.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Minority Entrepreneurship*. London: Palgrave McMillan, pp. 223–235.

Kidney E, McAdam M and Cooney TM (2024) Everyday prejudices: an intersectional exploration of the experiences of lesbian and gay entrepreneurs. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*. Epub ahead of print 29 January 2024. DOI: 10.1108/IJEBR-12-2022-1114.

Korede T (2024) Constructing non-hegemonic entrepreneurial masculinity: the case of Black men doing entrepreneurship in a predominantly white context. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*. Epub ahead of Print 8 November 2024. DOI: 10.1108/IJGE-04-2024-0139.

Kushins ER and Behounek E (2020) Using sociological theory to problematize family business research. *Journal of Family Business Strategy* 11(1): 1-9.

Lehr V (1999) *Queer family values: Debunking the myth of the nuclear family*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

LeMaster B, Shultz D, McNeill J, Bowers G and Rust R (2019) Unlearning cisheteronormativity at the intersections of difference: Performing queer worldmaking through collaged relational autoethnography. *Text and Performance Quarterly* 39(4), 341-370.

Lewis P, Rumens N and Simpson R (2022) Postfeminism, hybrid mumpreneur identities and the reproduction of masculine entrepreneurship. *International Small Business Journal 40*(1): 68-89.

Marchia J and Sommer JM (2019) (Re) defining heteronormativity. *Sexualities 22*(3): 267-295.

Marlow S and Martinez Dy A (2018) Annual review article: Is it time to rethink the gender agenda in entrepreneurship research? *International Small Business Journal 36*(1): 3-22.

Marlow S, Greene FJ and Coad A (2018) Advancing gendered analyses of entrepreneurship: A critical exploration of entrepreneurial activity among gay men and lesbian women. *British Journal of Management* 29(1): 118–135.

Miriam K (2007) Toward a Phenomenology of Sex-Right: Reviving radical feminist theory of compulsory sexuality. *Hypatia* 22(1): 210-28.

Ogbor JO (2000) Mythicizing and Reification in Entrepreneurial Discourse: Ideology-Critique of Entrepreneurial Studies. *Journal of Management Studies* 37(5): 605-635.

Redien-Collot R (2024) LGBTQ Entrepreneurship: Balancing the Tension Between Emancipation and Counter-Participation. In Gedro JA and Rocco TS (Eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of LGBTQ Identity in Organizations and Society*. London: Routledge, pp. 464-475.

Rich A (1980) Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence. *Signs* 5(4): 631–660.

Rubin G (1984) Thinking sex: Notes for a radical theory of the politics of sexuality. In: Carole S. Vance (eds). *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*. Boston, Massachusetts: Routledge, pp. 267-319.

Rumens N and Ozturk MB (2019) Heteronormativity and the (Re)construction of gay male entrepreneurial identities. *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship* 37(7): 671–688.

Rumens N, De Souza EM and Brewis J (2019) Queering queer theory in management and organization studies: Notes toward queering heterosexuality. *Organization Studies* 40(4): 593-612.

Schindehutte M, Morris M and Allen J (2005) Homosexuality and entrepreneurship. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation* 6(1): 27–40.

Sedgwick EK (1990) *Epistemology of the closet.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Seidman S (1997) *Difference Troubles: Queering Social Theory and Sexual Politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shahriar AZM (2018) Gender differences in entrepreneurial propensity: Evidence from matrilineal and patriarchal societies. *Journal of Business Venturing* 33(6): 762-779.

Smith R (2010) Masculinity, doxa and the institutionalisation of entrepreneurial identity in the novel Cityboy. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship 2*(1): 27-48.

Smith LC and Shin RQ (2015) Negotiating the intersection of racial oppression and heteronormativity. *Journal of Homosexuality* 62(11): 1459-1484.

Song C, Chatterjee JS, Doane DL and Doneys P (2023) Men in mixed-orientation marriages in contemporary China: Unpacking the role of heteronormativity and patriarchy. *Journal of Family Issues* 44(5): 1197-1214.

Tlaiss HA and Kauser S (2019) Entrepreneurial leadership, patriarchy, gender, and identity in the Arab world: Lebanon in focus. *Journal of small business management* 57(2): 517-537.

Tao Y and Essers C (2024) "Dadpreneurship": a new practice among second-generation Chinese-Dutch entrepreneurs to achieve work-life balance. In Kruyen P, Andre S and Van der Heijden B (Eds.) *Maintaining a Sustainable Work–Life Balance*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 156-162.

Varela MD, Dhawan N and Engel A (Eds) (2016) *Hegemony and heteronormativity: Revisiting' the political' in queer politics*. London: Routledge.

Wang HZ (2024) Navigating intimacy and queer entrepreneurship: Relational work in Taiwanese lesbian couples' business endeavors. *Current Sociology*. Epub ahead of print 13 March 2024. DOI:10.1177/001139212412384.

Warner M (1993) Introduction. In: Michael Warner (ed) *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 3–17.

Watson D, Benozzo A and Fida R (2024) Trans people in the workplace: Possibilities for subverting heteronormativity. *Work, Employment and Society* 38(3): 744-765.

Weeks J (1985) *Sexuality and its discontents: Meanings, myths, and modern sexualities*. London: Routledge.

Weeks J (1995) *Invented Moralities: Sexual values in an age of uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Weeks J, Heaphy B and Donovan C (2001) *Same sex intimacies: Families of choice and other life experiments*. London: Routledge.

Weeks J (2007) *The World We Have Won*. London: Routledge.

Weinberg G (1972) *Society and the Healthy Homosexual*. New York: St Martin's Press.

Weston K (1991) *Families we choose: Lesbians, gays, kinship*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Yamamura S and Lassalle P (2024) Intersectional entrepreneurship: the burden of contextual embeddedness beyond the business. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, ahead-of-print https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-12-2022-1117

Table 1: Conceptual developments in understanding heteronormativity

Scholar	Category of analysis	Principal conceptual focus	Conceptual components	Observations
Warner (1993)	Heteronormativity	Sexuality Sexual normativity Heterosexual privilege LGBQ+ sexualities Normative violence	Grounded in queer theory Heterosexual privilege is linked to social oppression Destabilises power relations that reproduce heteronormative binaries and sexual normalisation Deconstructs the heterosexual/homosexual binary Anti-normative queer critique and political action	Foregrounds sexuality and heteronormative violence Anti-assimilationist Seeks social transformation of heteronormative institutions, practices and values Links to gender and patriarchy are overlooked
Jackson (2006, 2018)	Gendered heteronormativity	Gender and sexuality Normative heterosexuality Heteronormativity produces specific gender effects	Grounded in feminist theory Feminist-sociological analysis of social structure Problematising institutional heterosexuality Heterosexuality is a gender relationship	Analysis of heteronormativity must include gender and sexuality Foregrounds what occurs within heterosexual relations Attention paid to gendered heterosexual deviations from normative heterosexuality
LeMaster (2019)	Cis-heteronormativity	Gender normativity Sexual normativity Heteronormativity and cisnormativity	Informed by trans-feminist and queer theories Gender and sexual normativity operate simultaneously Sex, gender and sexuality are regulated norms Anti-normative critique and political action	Interrogates the assumption of gender normativity based on alignment Gender normativity is central to the reproduction of heteronormativity Foregrounds non-normative genders

Table 2: How entrepreneurship scholarship has engaged with heteronormativity

Article	Main research focus	Definition and use of heteronormativity	Principal observations about definition and use of heteronormativity
Backman et al. (2024)	Examines differences in firm survival for ventures started by sexual minority individuals compared to those started by heterosexual people using Swedish business registry data	Mentioned once in relation to Rumens and Ozturk's (2019), which explores the impact of heteronormativity on gay men's entrepreneurship in the UK No evidence of use either as a concept or analytical category	Insights into the impact of heteronormativity on firm survival rates of LGBT businesses Does not use heteronormativity as a concept or analytical category Heteronormativity could help to theorise the relationship LGBT business owners, society and business survival rates
Essers et al. (2023)	Examines how LGBT entrepreneurs in the Netherlands engage in entrepreneurship at the intersection of sexuality and gender	'Heteronormativity concerns gender and sexuality and legitimises inequalities regarding both categories (Rumens and Ozturk, 2019) at individual and societal levels' (2023: 778) Deployed as a concept more than an analytical category	Defined via Rumens and Ozturk (2019) without acknowledging its queer theory origins Insufficient theoretical conceptualisation of heteronormativity as a category and how it is deployed analytically
Fletcher et al. (2024)	Focuses on how LGBT entrepreneurs engage with and draw resources from LGBT networks, using survey data from the UK, mainland Europe and North America	Described as having a presence, as being pervasive and in terms of ideals, constraints and embodiment Acknowledges how heteronormativity can undermine LGBT entrepreneurship Deployed more as a concept than an analytical category	No obvious theoretical conceptualisation and no acknowledgement of its queer theory and feminist lineage Little clarity about the explicit nature of heteronormative ideals, assimilation, constraints, work environments, Underutilised as an analytical category
Galloway (2007)	Analysing the reasons for the silence about gay men's entrepreneurship, especially in the UK	No mention of heteronormativity	Describes and critiques 'mainstream' (heteronormative) entrepreneurship scholarship, but fails to name it as 'heteronormative'
Galloway (2012)	Examines the motivations for and experiences of	Grounded in Week's (2009) social constructionism that conceptualises	Queer theory origins are unacknowledged and not developed

	business ownership amongst 11 male gay entrepreneurs in the UK	heterosexuality as an institutional and norm Deployed as a category of analysis without its queer theory	Weak insights into the existence or potential for anti-normative forms of gay men's entrepreneurship Potential for using heteronormativity as an analytical category not fully realised
Kidney et al. (2024)	Examines the impact of heterosexism on LGBT+ entrepreneurial activities in Ireland	Linked to feminism and queer theory Defined via Ingraham's (2002) definition that underscores how institutionalised heterosexuality sets the normative standard for sexual relations Largely deployed as a concept than an analytical category	Link to queer theory briefly described but little detail provided Weak theoretical dialogue between heteronormativity, heterosexism and homophobia
Marlow et al. (2018)	Focuses on self-employment amongst gay men and lesbian women, using data from a population-based study of 163,000 UK adults	Heteronormativity is defined as socially embedded, commonly assumed, linked to a heterosexual gender binary and susceptible to challenge Deployed as an analytical category	Relationship to queer theory is not articulated as explicitly as it could be Falls short of using heteronormativity to articulate ideas about the potential for anti-normative forms of gay and lesbian entrepreneurship
Rumens & Ozturk (2019)	How heteronormativity shapes the discursive (re)construction of entrepreneurial identities among UK gay men small business owners	Heteronormativity defined using Warner (1993) and queer theory Deployed as an analytical category	Demonstrates the impact of heteronormativity on gay men's entrepreneurial identities Links to gay normalisation and homonormativity are developed Weak on using heteronormativity to articulate anti-normative entrepreneurial alternatives
Wang (2024)	Addresses the 'void in understanding gender distinctions in queer entrepreneurship' by examining Taiwanese lesbian entrepreneurship	Linked and central to the reproduction of a white, male norm in entrepreneurship scholarship Deployed as an analytical category	Evidence of treating heteronormativity as an analytical category to deconstruct gendered heteronormative entrepreneurship research Could be embedded in feminist-queer theory more explicitly

			Weak on using heteronormativity to articulate anti-normative entrepreneurial alternatives
Yamamura & Lasselle (2024)	Examines the contextual embeddedness of intersectional LGBTIQA* entrepreneurs in Germany and the Netherlands	Mentioned once, suggesting that intersectional issues can challenge binary views and heteronormativity Treated as a concept only	Heteronormativity is not conceptualised, despite one participant discussing heteronormative and sexist stigma Not used as an analytical category Little insight into how heteronormativity intersects with sexism and entrepreneurship