

Entrepreneurial bricolage and its effects on new venture growth and adaptiveness in an emerging economy

Yu, Xiaoyu; Li, Yajie; Su, Zhongfeng; Tao, Yida; Nguyen, Bang; Xia, Fan

Published in:
Asia Pacific Journal of Management

DOI:
10.1007/s10490-019-09657-1

Publication date:
2020

Document version:
Accepted manuscript

Citation for published version (APA):
Yu, X., Li, Y., Su, Z., Tao, Y., Nguyen, B., & Xia, F. (2020). Entrepreneurial bricolage and its effects on new venture growth and adaptiveness in an emerging economy. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 37, 1141-1163. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-019-09657-1>

Go to publication entry in University of Southern Denmark's Research Portal

Terms of use

This work is brought to you by the University of Southern Denmark.
Unless otherwise specified it has been shared according to the terms for self-archiving.
If no other license is stated, these terms apply:

- You may download this work for personal use only.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying this open access version

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details and we will investigate your claim.
Please direct all enquiries to puresupport@bib.sdu.dk

Entrepreneurial bricolage and its effects on new venture growth and adaptiveness in an emerging economy

ABSTRACT

Driven by boosting economic developments, emerging economies are experiencing massive institutional changes in regulatory structures and market systems. Coupled with fierce market competition and reforms, serious challenges for the sustainable development of new ventures are created due to smallness and newness. This study adds knowledge to current research concerning how new ventures grow and adapt to the rapid environmental shifts in emerging economies by exploring the effects of entrepreneurial bricolage. Specifically, this study finds that entrepreneurial bricolage has a positive impact on both new venture growth and adaptiveness. Further, institutional void has contradicting effects on these two relationships. The effectiveness of entrepreneurial bricolage on new venture growth is stronger in a context with serious institutional void, while the effectiveness of entrepreneurial bricolage on new venture adaptiveness is weaker in a context with serious institutional void. These findings not only enrich our knowledge on the implications of entrepreneurial bricolage, but also advance our understanding of the emerging economy context.

Keywords: Entrepreneurial bricolage; growth; adaptiveness; institutional void; emerging economy; new venture; sustainable development

Introduction

Emerging economies are experiencing massive institutional changes in regulations and market systems, driven by growth in economic development. Coupled with fierce market competition and reforms, serious challenges for sustainable development of new ventures are created (Cope, 2011; McGrath, 1999; Shepherd, 2003; Singh, Corner, & Pavlovich, 2007). New ventures not only face challenges in how to grow continually, but also how to survive from uncertain changes from both market and institutional environments (Zhou & Li, 2010). Thus, a key issue to develop sustainable competitive advantage for new ventures in an emerging economy is to understand ways to take account for growth and adaptiveness in their strategy simultaneously.

Prior literature has responded to the issue of growth and adaptiveness separately from a resource-based view and organization theory. Scholars argue that valuable, inimitable, rare and non-substitutable (VIRN) resource is a source of firm heterogeneity that generates superior performance and competitive advantage (Black & Boal, 1994; Reed & DeFillippi, 1990). More importantly, that the value of a resource is determined by the environment (Zhou & Li, 2010) and therefore, the value changes in such a way that a VIRN resource often lags behind the rapid changes of the environment.

However, this explanation is weakened for new ventures in an emerging economy. Compared to a mature economy, an emerging economy generally has an inadequate institutional arrangement, which generates an underdeveloped strategic factor market and a significant institutional void (Bruton, Su, & Filatotchev, 2018; Luo & Chung, 2013; Mair & Marti, 2009; Puffer, McCarthy, & Boisot, 2010; Shi, Sun, Yan, & Zhu, 2017; Shi, Sun, & Peng, 2012). The

underdeveloped strategic factor market impedes new ventures to acquire VERN resources from a strategic factor market to support their growth (Deng, 2009; Ireland, Hitt & Sirmon, 2003; Sirmon, Hitt & Ireland, 2007; Webb, Ireland, Hitt, Kistruck & Tihanyi, 2011). Resource constraints for new ventures also result in challenges to prepare slack resources to respond to environmental turbulence (Baker & Nelson, 2005). With such dynamic market characteristics, this study aims to address how new ventures grow and adapt to environmental turbulence in an emerging economy.

Entrepreneurial bricolage is defined as “making do by applying combinations of the resources at hand to new problems and opportunities” (Baker & Nelson, 2005: 333). Entrepreneurial bricolage actively and creatively assists new ventures in overcoming resource limitations by responding to environmental changes (Garud & Karnøe, 2003; Baker & Nelson, 2005; Desa & Basu, 2013; Senyard, Baker, Steffens & Davidsson, 2014; Yu, Li, Chen, Meng, & Tao, 2018). It is a strategic orientation that may contribute to growing continuously and buffering environmental turbulence by reconfiguring existing resources.

This study explores the effects of entrepreneurial bricolage on new venture growth and adaptiveness with the moderating effects of institutional void. It makes three main contributions to current research. First, this study develops entrepreneurial bricolage literature by empirically examining its relationship with two new performance indicators, growth and adaptiveness. Second, this study reveals the moderating role played by institutional void in the relationship between entrepreneurial bricolage and its outcomes. Prior literature indicates that entrepreneurial bricolage may have both benefits and downsides (Baker, Nelson, & Eesley, 2003; Baker & Nelson, 2005), thus its effects could be contextual dependent. This study, accordingly, advances our understanding on the implications of entrepreneurial bricolage. Third, revealing the

contingent boundary effects of institutional void, this study contributes to research focusing on the context of emerging economies (Bruton, Ahlstrom, & Li, 2010; Gilbert, McDougall, & Audretsch, 2006; Khaire, 2010; Luo, Zhou, & Liu, 2005; Sine, Mitsuhashi & Kirsch, 2006; Wei & Ling, 2015; Yamakawa, Peng & Deeds, 2015; Zimmerman & Zeitz, 2002). In addition, this study has significant practical value, as its findings can guide new ventures in an emerging economy to leverage entrepreneurial bricolage to foster growth and adapt to environmental turbulence.

Literature review and hypotheses development

Sustainable competitive advantage for new ventures

New ventures play an important role in boosting the economy of an emerging country (Baum, Locke, & Smith, 2001; Gilbert, McDougall, & Audretsch, 2006; Goedhuys & Sleuwaegen, 2010; Hitt, Ireland, Camp, & Sexton, 2001; Peng & Heath, 1996; Puffer, McCarthy & Boisot, 2010; Shane & Venkataraman, 2000; Sun & Lee, 2013). However, they often suffer from a high failure rate (Cope, 2011; Mcgrath, 1999; Shepherd, 2003; Singh, Corner, & Pavlovich, 2007), especially in emerging economies. For instance, a report indicated that the life expectancy of Chinese new ventures is less than three years, and more than 70 percent cannot survive one year (Wang & Chen, 2010). A major concern is how new ventures can maintain a sustainable competitive advantage.

Two aspects of sustainable competitive advantage have been mentioned, namely, how much above-all return rates have been created and how long this advantage can be kept (Hall, 1993). These are also two main challenges for new ventures. First, new ventures implement entrepreneurial activities to pursue new opportunities by starting up new business from nothing (Stevenson & Jarillo, 1990). They have the advantage of newness. The speed to develop new

business determines whether it could survive before other competitive competitors enter the same market (Gilbert, McDougall, & Audretsch, 2006). Thus, new venture growth determines whether it can survive from the survival threshold (Zimmerman & Zeitz, 2002).

Second, new ventures are also vulnerable due to liability of newness, which inhibits new ventures to overcome environmental turbulence (Guo, Su, & Ahlstrom, 2016; Phillips & Tracey, 2007; Thornhill & Amit, 2003). For mature companies, slack resources are accumulated to buffer the uncertainty from external environments (Tan & Peng, 2003), while new ventures are often in a resource-constraint condition (Baker & Nelson, 2005). They concentrate all the resources to develop current opportunity to achieve fast growth. Thus, they could easily fail when experiencing environmental turbulence, such that the opportunity may not exist due to an announcement of a new regulation or changes of market demand when they are still exploiting the opportunity. Thus, new venture adaptiveness determines whether new ventures could adapt themselves to the new competitive environment (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000). Thus, growth and adaptiveness are two important indicators of sustainable competitive advantage for new ventures.

Although the resource-based view (RBV) provides explanations for sustainable competitive advantage, it is limited to explain that of new ventures in an emerging economy. The RBV proposes that sustainable competitive advantage is primarily driven by a firm's valuable, inimitable, rare and non-substitutable resources. However, on the one hand, RBV could fail to explain the success of new ventures because new ventures are hard to acquire VIRC resources (Baker & Nelson, 2005). On the other hand, RBV does not fully explain how firms achieve competitive advantage in the context of fast changing environments because resource value is determined by the characteristics of the given environment (Zhou & Li, 2010). Meanwhile, resource changes and adaptations often lag behind environmental changes (Teece, Pisano, &

Shuen, 1997). Thus, it is hard to adapt to institutional reform that is taking place in emerging economy.

From entrepreneurial bricolage literature (An, Zhao, Cao, Zhang, & Liu, 2018; Baker, Miner, & Eesley, 2003; Baker & Nelson 2005; Desa & Basu, 2013; Duymedjian & Rüling, 2010; Garud & Karnøe 2003; Guo, Su, & Ahlstrom, 2016; Phillips & Tracey, 2007; Salunke, Weerawardena, & McColl-Kennedy, 2013; Senyard, Baker, Steffens, & Davidsson, 2014; Wu, Liu, & Zhang, 2017; Yu, Li, Chen, Meng, & Tao, 2018), entrepreneurial bricolage is a strategic orientation or choice to recombine resources at hand when firms encounter new problems and opportunities (Baker & Nelson, 2005). Specifically, “making do” implies “a bias toward action and active engagement with problems or opportunities rather than lingering over questions of whether a workable outcome can be created from what is at hand”, “combination of resources for new purposes” refers to “the combination and reuse resources for different applications than those for which they were originally intended or used”, and “resources at hand” includes existing resources and “resources that are available very cheaply or for free” (Baker & Nelson, 2005: 334-336). On the one hand, entrepreneurial bricolage provides an approach for firms that have limited resources to grow (Baker & Nelson, 2005). On the other hand, reconfiguration of resources at hand creates a possibility to respond to emergent requirements (Wu, Liu, & Zhang, 2017). Along this line, this study explains how new ventures grow and adapt to environmental turbulence in an emerging economy from the entrepreneurial bricolage perspective.

Entrepreneurial bricolage and new venture growth

The start point of a new venture is around the creation and exploitation of entrepreneurial bricolage. Entrepreneurial bricolage helps new ventures exploit opportunities for growth. We

argue that entrepreneurial bricolage has a positive relationship with new venture growth for the following reasons.

First, entrepreneurial bricolage increases the novelty of opportunity creation. The value of opportunity is created from the reconfiguration of means and ends (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). By utilizing resources in different combinations, new ventures render unique products or services to existing markets or create new markets (Salunke, Weerawardena, & McColl-Kennedy, 2013). In this approach, entrepreneurial bricolage drives new ventures to create and discover innovative opportunities before their competitors.

Second, entrepreneurial bricolage breaks the limitation of resource constraint when exploiting opportunities. Opportunities often have substantial resource requirements (Alvarez & Busenitz, 2001; Srivastava, Fahey, & Christensen, 2001). To successfully pursue them, new ventures must be able to satisfy these requirements. Entrepreneurial bricolage facilitates new ventures that explore new combinations of both existing resources and external resources, which are available very cheaply or for free (Baker & Nelson, 2005). The efforts to acquire the right resources for exploiting opportunities are not necessary. It thereby contributes new ventures to overcoming their resource constraints for growth.

Prior literature has indicated that new ventures in emerging economies often have a higher failure rate in that the underdeveloped strategic factor market not only inhibits their opportunities for growth, both also impede them from meeting resource requirements to capture new opportunities (Wright, Filatotchev, Hoskisson, & Peng, 2005). Thus, entrepreneurial bricolage contributes new ventures by capturing more opportunities for growth. It accordingly helps new ventures in emerging economies to conquer the resource challenges for growth. Therefore, we propose that:

Hypothesis 1: There is a positive relationship between entrepreneurial bricolage and new venture growth in emerging economies.

Entrepreneurial bricolage and new venture adaptiveness

Adaptiveness refers to the extent new ventures change their resource allocation and operational routines to match the changing environment (Nelson & Winter, 1982). Hitt, Keats and DeMaire (1998) predicted that the technological revolution and globalization would induce to a new competitive landscape, thus adaptiveness would become crucial for new ventures' survival. This study argues that entrepreneurial bricolage has a positive relationship with new venture adaptiveness for the following reasons.

New ventures deploying entrepreneurial bricolage have to constantly scan and monitor the environment, and reconfigure resources to respond to those changes (Vakratsas & Ma, 2009), which enhance new ventures adaptiveness. On the one hand, entrepreneurial bricolage generates a bias toward action and active engagement with opportunities (Baker & Nelson, 2005). It accordingly drives new ventures to actively search for external changes. Salunke et al. (2013) prove that entrepreneurial bricolage facilitates the development of service entrepreneurship by interacting and learning from different actors. The constant interaction with related linkage helps new ventures to collect wide information about demanding changes. Baker and Nelson (2005) observed that new ventures could use entrepreneurial bricolage to form a close relationship with customers and suppliers. Thus, entrepreneurial bricolage often contributes new ventures to capturing external changes.

On the other hand, entrepreneurial bricolage often involves improvisation and unexpected innovation (Desa, 2011). Entrepreneurial bricolage encourages new ventures to actively recombine resources at hand rather than worrying on whether they are able to do so or not.

Improvising with resources at hand help new ventures to respond to changes without hesitation (Baker & Nelson, 2005). And the experimentation process could create unexpected results which may buffer future environmental changes by strengthening new ventures' abilities to identify new opportunities (An, Zhao, Cao, Zhang, & Liu, 2018; Guo, Su, & Ahlstrom, 2016). Thus, entrepreneurial bricolage encourages new ventures to go beyond their boundaries regularly to search for external changes, enlarging their scan scope and to identify opportunities. Therefore, we propose that:

Hypothesis 2: There is a positive relationship between entrepreneurial bricolage and new venture adaptiveness in emerging economies.

The moderating impact of institutional void

Entrepreneurial bricolage involves crafting existing rules and establishing new routines for utilizing resources at hand (Baker & Nelson, 2005; Desa, 2011; Desa & Basu, 2013; Garud & Karnøe, 2003). Desa (2001) argues that entrepreneurial bricolage is a mechanism to assist the development of new ventures under institutional transformation. Entrepreneurial bricolage breaks existing rules and norms of how to use and combine resources, and the recombination could also be a process to form new rules and norms. This ongoing process depends on the external institutional environment (Desa, 2011; Sarasvathy, 2006).

Institutional context indicates rules, norms and beliefs surrounding economic activity that define or enforce socially acceptable economic behaviour (Oliver, 1997). A critical characteristic of institutional context in an emerging economy is that it gradually reforms the institution from a non-market economy to a market economy. Institutional void exists when an institutional architecture is still developing (Bruton, Su, & Filatotchev, 2018; Desa, 2012; Mair & Marti,

2009; Shi, Sun, & Peng, 2012). Thus, to elaborate the relationship between entrepreneurial bricolage and outcomes, we further investigate the moderating role played by institutional void.

Institutional void refers to the absent of rules, norms and beliefs surrounding entrepreneurial activity (Mair & Marti, 2009; Shi, Sun, & Peng, 2012). In emerging economies, institutional void often presents in terms of lacking prevailing norms or business practices, having difficulties to find business regulations and rules to follow, the high tolerance on substandard products or services, the weak enforcement of laws and regulations, unexpected changes in regulation, and likewise (Desa, 2012; Peng, Wang, & Jiang, 2008; Puffer, McCarthy, & Boisot, 2010).

Institutional void generates significant challenges for new ventures to survival and success in the market (Aidis, Estrin, & Mickiewicz, 2008; Smallbone & Welter, 2011). For example, Bruton, Su and Filatotchev (2018) indicated that institutional void leads to dysfunctional competition which has a negative impact on new venture performance.

This study argues that institutional void positively moderates the linkage of entrepreneurial bricolage to new venture growth. Institutional void reflects the situations where institutional arrangements that support a market economy is absent, weak, or cannot work effectively (Mair & Marti, 2009). Accordingly, institutional void impedes the market participation of new ventures (Mair & Marti, 2009), in that they are often in a weak position to capture opportunities for growth (Cai, Chen, Chen, & Bruton, 2017; Deng, 2009; Ireland, Hitt, & Sirmon, 2003; Sirmon, Hitt, & Ireland, 2007; Webb, Kistruck, Ireland & Ketchen, 2010). In high level of institutional void, new ventures that take entrepreneurial bricolage as strategic choice can better overcome the inefficiency of factor market. Casper (2000) studied technology firms in Germany during its reform period from a non-market to a market orientated institution. The study found that even though a non-market institution would meet obstacles, the fast growing entrepreneurial firms

often used existing practices as a “tool kit” to develop novel business strategies. In these unsupportive institutional environments, knowing how to mobilize resources at hand to match the opportunity is utmost important (Desa, 2012). Entrepreneurial bricolage is a mechanism to mobilize resources under unfavourable institutional environments (Desa, 2012; Gras & Nason, 2015; Mair & Marti, 2009). While entrepreneurial bricolage is also important for new venture growth in an environment characterized by less institutional void; its impact will be not so significant, because entrepreneurial bricolage cannot completely play its facilitating role in new venture growth within this environment. Therefore, we propose that:

Hypothesis 3: Institutional void has a positive moderating effect on the relationship between entrepreneurial bricolage and new venture growth.

In contrast, this study argues that institutional void negatively moderates the linkage of entrepreneurial bricolage to new venture adaptiveness. The positive functions of entrepreneurial bricolage on adaptiveness are mainly through embracing the uncertainty from markets by improving the efficiency of scanning environment and responding to changes. However, these benefits of entrepreneurial bricolage on adaptiveness could be weakened with a high level of institutional void. Desa (2012) analyzed the adaptive function of entrepreneurial bricolage in social ventures and found that with high institutional support, the adaptive effects are lower. During the reform process, a high level of institutional void often represents radical policy changes in such aspect. A total absent of rules could induce larger changes by creating rules from nothing, compared with improving certain aspects of rules. The positive effects of entrepreneurial bricolage to embrace demanding uncertainty could be neutralized by policy changes. With a gradually improving institutional environment, market related information will be easier to obtain. Therefore, we propose that:

Hypothesis 4: Institutional void has a negative moderating effect on the relationship between entrepreneurial bricolage and new venture adaptiveness.

Please insert Figure 1 about here

Methodology

Sample and data collection

We used survey data to test our hypotheses. We designed a questionnaire drawing on previous studies. We adopted a back-translation approach to ensure the match between Chinese and English versions (Brislin, 1980). Then, we undertook a pilot study on 10 founders and modified the questionnaire based to the results of the pilot test.

The survey was administrated in 2016. First, we obtained the directories of firms located in entrepreneurial parks in Beijing, Shanghai, Guangzhou, and Shenzhen. Then, we randomly selected new ventures younger than 9 years from the directories. Before the formal survey, we telephoned one founder in each sampled new venture to ensure our response rate. Subsequently, we sent emails enclosed with our questionnaire to these founders and asked them to complete our questionnaire. Finally, we got 354 valid responses. We conducted a t-test to check the non-response bias along with the ventures' major attributes including firm size, firm age, initial capital, and sales turnover. The results indicated that there is no significant difference between

respondents and non-respondents. Hence, non-response bias is not a serious problem in this study.

Measures

We adopted scales from prior studies to measure our variables. All items were measured by a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

New venture growth. Gilbert, McDougall and Audretsch (2006) have indicated that “although there is no single overriding measure of new venture growth, our review of the literature suggests that the most important measures of new venture growth are in terms of sales, employment, and market share”. Thus, following Anderson and Eshima (2013), we measured new venture growth by asking each respondent to rate his or her venture’s growth relative to its principal competitors over the last three years on: (1) sales growth, (2) market share growth, and (3) employee growth. We employed subjective measures rather than objective measures, since objective data is often unavailable as well as subjective measures are better at diminishing the respondents’ unwillingness of providing confidential information (Dess & Robinson, 1984; Anderson & Eshima, 2013).

New venture adaptiveness. This study developed a four-item measurement of new venture adaptiveness based on the study of Ruekert et al. (1985), and Zhou and Li (2010). They were (1) We allowed the business to evolve as opportunities emerged; (2) We adapted what we were doing to the resources we had; (3) We were flexible and took advantage of opportunities as they arose; (4) We avoided courses of action that restricted our flexibility and adaptability.

Entrepreneurial bricolage. Following Senyard, Baker, Steffens and Davidsson (2014), we measured entrepreneurial bricolage using eight items. They were: (1) We are confident of our ability to find workable solutions to new challenges by using our existing resources; (2) We gladly take on a broader range of challenges than others with our resources would be able to; (3) We use any existing resource that seems useful responding to a new problem or opportunity; (4) We deal with new challenges by applying a combination of our existing resources and other resources inexpensively available to us; (5) When dealing with new problems or opportunities, we take action by assuming that we will find a workable solution; (6) By combining our existing resources, we take on a surprising variety of new challenges; (7) When we face new challenges, we put together workable solutions from our existing resources; and (8) We combine resources to accomplish new challenges that the resources weren't originally intended to accomplish.

Institutional void. In emerging economies, institutional void often presents itself in terms of lacking prevailing norms or business practices, having difficulties to find business regulations and rules to follow, the high tolerance on substandard products or services, the weak enforcement of laws and regulations, and likewise (Mair & Marti, 2009; Shi, Sun, & Peng, 2012). Following the suggestion of Desa (2012), we measured institutional void from regulative, normative and cognitive facets. Most research of institutional void are qualitative or conceptual studies (e.g. Mair & Marti, 2009), and only a small number of studies use a quantitative method with second hand data from regional level index (e.g. Shi, Sun, & Peng, 2012). We argue that these measurements may not reflect differences between industries and enterprises. Institution itself is an objective environment, but institutional void tend to be a subjective perception of the institutional environment. Hence, we measured institutional void using five Likert scale items: (1) Prevailing norms or business practices are lacking; (2) It is difficult to find business regulations

to follow, (3) It is difficult to find business rules to follow, (4) The tolerance on substandard products or services is high, and (5) The enforcement of laws and regulations is weak.

Control Variables. We controlled for ten variables. The first two were firm size (number of employees) and firm age (number of years since foundation) as they were found to have significant impacts on employment growth rate (Baron & Tang, 2009). The third one was sales turnover in the previous year, as it has a profound impact on new venture growth (Anderson & Eshima, 2013). Then, initial capital (firm's capital at funding) was controlled, since it represents the resources base to facilitate new venture growth (Eisenhardt & Schoonhoven, 1990). We also controlled for ownership with 1 representing private ownership and 0 as non-private ownership (Zahra, 1996; Doh, Teegen & Mudambi, 2004). We especially highlighted private ownership, because it may be more difficulty for private firm to acquire resources (Schulze, Lubatkin & Dino, 2003). Both locations (Yu, Tao, Tao, Xia, & Li, 2017) and industries (Guillén, 2002) were also controlled as dummies. Finally, we controlled technology uncertainty, market demand uncertainty and competitive intensity (Guo, Tang, & Su, 2014). They were respectively measured by following questions: (1) It is very difficult to keep pace with technological changes in the industry; (2) It is very difficult to predict customer's preference in the future; and (3) We hear of new competitive moves almost every day.

Reliability and validity

Following Anderson and Gerbing (1988), we conducted standard procedures to test reliability and validity of variables. The results are shown in Table 1, containing Cronbach's alpha (CA), composite reliability (CR), and average variance extracted (AVE), factor loadings and model fit indexes.

We assessed the reliabilities of variables. As we have mentioned above, the CA indicators of entrepreneurial bricolage, institutional void and new venture growth were all above the threshold of 0.700 (Cronbach, 1951), which indicated a good consistency. The CR exceeded the threshold of 0.700 (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson and Tatham, 2006), which further indicated our measurements are reliable.

Then, we did confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to assess the convergent and discriminant validity. The CFA result reports the adequate model fit indexes ($\chi^2 = 379.820$; $\chi^2/df = 2.359$; IFI=0.945; TLI=0.934; CFI=0.944; RSMEA=0.062), confirming the one-dimensionality of each construct in our model. First, to assess the convergent validity, we found the factor loadings were all above 0.4 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994) and significant (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). Thus, these results demonstrated convergent validity. Second, the discriminant validity was also proved since the squared correlations between pairs of constructs were lower than the AVE values of the corresponding constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). We also conducted chi-square difference test by comparing the significant change in chi-square between our model and the model with fixed correlation at 1.0 for each pair of constructs. The three models with fixed correlation at 1.0 had significant difference in chi-square change. For example, comparing a model that allowed for correlation between entrepreneurial bricolage and new venture growth with a model that fixed their correlation at 1.0 yielded a significant change in chi-square ($\Delta\chi^2_{(\Delta df=1, n=354)} = 38.830$, $p < 0.001$). These results indicated good convergent and discriminant validity.

Measures and Validation

Please insert Table 1 about here

Common method bias

Common method bias makes one factor account for the majority of covariance in variables (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). We took the Harman's one-factor test to test it (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). The test reported that the first factor only explaining 34.143% of the variance, indicating that common method bias was not a serious problem. Moreover, we ran a one-factor CFA model to check common method bias (Korsgaard & Roberson, 1995). The model did not fit well ($\chi^2 = 985.773$; $\chi^2/df = 5.799$; IFI = 0.793; TLI = 0.768; CFI = 0.792; RSMEA = 0.117). As a result, common method bias was not a big issue in this study.

Results

Table 2 presents descriptive statistics on all variables and correlations between them.

Please insert Table 2 and Table 3 about here

We employed a linear regression model to test our hypotheses. We calculated variance inflation factor (VIF) statistics in each model to check for the threat of multicollinearity. All of them are well below the threshold of 10 (Neter, Wasserman, & Kutner, 1990). Hence, multicollinearity is not a serious problem in this study. We tested our hypotheses in six steps.

Model 1-3 tested the relationship between entrepreneurial bricolage and new venture growth. First, we only included control variables into Model 1. Then, we added entrepreneurial bricolage in Model 2. This model reports that entrepreneurial bricolage is positively related to new venture growth ($\beta = 0.503, p < 0.001$), supporting Hypothesis 1 that entrepreneurial bricolage has a positive effect on new venture growth in emerging economies. In Model 3, we tested the moderating effect of institutional void. The results of this model indicate that the interaction of entrepreneurial bricolage and institutional void is positively related to new venture growth ($\beta = 0.075, p < 0.05$). Thus, Hypothesis 3, which predicts that the relationship of entrepreneurial bricolage of new venture growth is positively moderated by institutional void, is also supported.

Model 4-6 tested the relationship between entrepreneurial bricolage and new venture adaptiveness. First, we only included control variables into Model 4. Then, we added entrepreneurial bricolage in Model 5. This model reports that entrepreneurial bricolage is positively related to new venture adaptiveness ($\beta = 0.551, p < 0.001$), supporting Hypothesis 2 that entrepreneurial bricolage has a positive effect on new venture growth in emerging economies. In Model 6, we tested the moderating effect of institutional void. The results of this model indicate that the interaction of entrepreneurial bricolage and institutional void is negatively related to new venture adaptiveness ($\beta = -0.080, p < 0.05$). Thus, Hypothesis 4, which predicts that the relationship of entrepreneurial bricolage of new venture adaptiveness is negatively moderated by institutional void, is also supported.

To better interpret the results, we plotted the moderating effect of institutional void on the relationship between entrepreneurial bricolage and new venture growth, and the moderating effect of institutional void on the relationship between entrepreneurial bricolage and new venture adaptiveness, by following the procedures recommended by Aiken and West (1991). As shown

in Fig. 2, the relationship of entrepreneurial bricolage on new venture growth is positively stronger with higher institutional void (high institutional void, simple slope= 0.926, $p < 0.001$; low institutional void, simple slope= 0.755, $p < 0.001$), which further supported Hypothesis 3. As shown in Fig. 3, the relationship of entrepreneurial bricolage on new venture growth is positively weaker with higher institutional void (high institutional void, simple slope= 0.443, $p < 0.001$; low institutional void, simple slope= 0.523, $p < 0.001$)

Please insert Fig. 2 and Fig. 3 about here

Discussion and implications

Contributions

This study makes three theoretical contributions. First, this study makes a contribution to the entrepreneurial bricolage literature by empirically examining the roles of entrepreneurial bricolage in emerging economy. Since Baker and Nelson (2005) introduced entrepreneurial bricolage into strategic research, empirical research is limited, and the outcomes of entrepreneurial bricolage is limited to innovative solutions (Senyard, Baker, Steffens, & Davidsson, 2014). For instance, Senyard, Baker, Steffens and Davidsson (2014) found that entrepreneurial bricolage works as a pathway for new resource-constrained firms to achieve innovation, and Guo, Su and Ahlstrom (2016) found that besides facilitating business model innovation directly, entrepreneurial bricolage also serves as a conduit through which exploratory orientation affects business model innovation. A more generalized outcome of entrepreneurial bricolage is still unclear (Baker & Nelson, 2005). This study finds that entrepreneurial bricolage

positively affects new venture growth and adaptiveness, advancing our understanding on the implications of entrepreneurial bricolage (An, Zhao, Cao, Zhang, & Liu, 2018; Baker, Miner, & Eesley, 2003; Baker & Nelson 2005; Desa & Basu, 2013; Duymedjian & Rüling 2010; Garud & Karnøe, 2003; Guo, Su, & Ahlstrom, 2016; Phillips & Tracey, 2007; Salunke, Weerawardena, & McColl-Kennedy, 2013; Senyard, Baker, Steffens, & Davidsson, 2014; Wu, Liu, & Zhang, 2017). We expand the outcomes of entrepreneurial bricolage in this research. Both new venture growth and adaptiveness can be enhanced through entrepreneurial bricolage.

Second, this research also contributes to entrepreneurial bricolage literature by finding the boundary condition of entrepreneurial bricolage. Prior literature indicates that entrepreneurial bricolage may have both benefits and downsides (Baker, Nelson, & Eesley, 2003; Baker & Nelson, 2005), thus its effects could be contextual dependent. However, few research has examined the conditional factors. This study finds that institutional void has a positive moderating impact on the linkage between entrepreneurial bricolage and new venture growth, and a negative moderating impact on the linkage between entrepreneurial bricolage and new venture adaptiveness. As a result, institutional void reflects an important boundary condition for entrepreneurial bricolage. This study, accordingly, advances our understanding on the implications of entrepreneurial bricolage, and appeals to more scholars to study the more detailed context of entrepreneurial bricolage.

Third, this study contributes to research focusing on the context of emerging economies by finding out the two-sides of institutional void. Many studies regard institutional void as the main characteristic of emerging economies and reveal its dark side (Ahlstrom & Bruton, 2010; Bruton, Ahlstrom, & Li, 2010; Gilbert, McDougall, & Audretsch, 2006; Khaire, 2010; Luo, Zhou, & Liu, 2005; Peng, 2002; Peng & Luo, 2002; Sine, Mitsuhashi & Kirsch, 2006; Wei & Ling, 2015;

Yamakawa, Peng & Deeds, 2015; Zimmerman & Zeitz, 2002). For example, Bruton, Su and Filatotchev (2018) indicated that institutional void leads to dysfunctional competition, which has a negative impact on new venture performance. However, this study not only finds the dark side of institutional void but also finds the light side of institutional void. Therefore, we expand the understanding of emerging economies and how it could affect the performance of new ventures.

Practical implications

This study has two suggestions for new ventures in emerging economies. First, it shows that entrepreneurial bricolage is an effective strategy in an emerging economy as it can enhance both new venture growth and adaptiveness (Hewitt-Dundas, 2006; Rao & Drazin, 2002). In particular, new venture should take good use of resources at hand and proactively take actions rather than lingering over questions of whether a workable outcome can be created through combining and reusing resources that are available cheaply for new applications. Second, this study implies that the function of entrepreneurial bricolage is contextual dependent. Institutional void positively moderates the relationship of entrepreneurial bricolage to new venture growth, but negatively moderates the relationship of entrepreneurial bricolage to new venture adaptiveness. As a result, new ventures facing serious institutional void should pay more attention to entrepreneurial bricolage and find a balance of utilizing entrepreneurial bricolage.

Limitations and future research

This study is limited in several ways. First, its findings are based on data from China. Although China is the biggest emerging market in the world, the development in this country is unprecedented and unparalleled. A similar track may not be observed in other developing countries. Thus, it is vital to explore whether the findings can be generalized to other emerging countries. Second, the data used in this study are cross-sectional; a longitudinal dataset is under

demand to test causal relationships between constructs. Third, although we found little trace of common method bias, we cannot thoroughly rule it out based on our current approach. Future research should combine subjective and objective data to avoid possible bias. One way to solve common method bias is to use marketization index (for the four regions/provinces) or use the institutional fragility index (See Shi, Sun, Yan, & Zhu, 2017) to do a robust test.

Future studies can be inspired in at least two ways. First, this study introduced new venture growth and adaptiveness as new implications of entrepreneurial bricolage. Further research may extend the implications to more performance outcomes. Second, this study found that the effectiveness of entrepreneurial bricolage is contingent on institutional void. Future studies may take more moderators into consideration to draw a more comprehensive picture on the implications of entrepreneurial bricolage.

Conclusion

Coupled with boosting economic development, emerging economies are experiencing massive institutional changes including regulatory and market systems. Yet, due to smallness and newness, fierce market competition and a series of reforms, serious challenges for sustainable development of new ventures are created. This study adds knowledge to current research concerning how new ventures grow and adapt the rapid environmental shifts in emerging economies by exploring the effects of entrepreneurial bricolage. From the entrepreneurial bricolage literature, this study finds that entrepreneurial bricolage has a positive impact on new venture growth and adaptiveness. This is because entrepreneurial bricolage contributes new ventures to overcoming resource constraints on growth caused by the underdeveloped strategic

factor market, and via instant responding to environmental changes. Further, institutional void has contradicting effects on these two relationships. The effectiveness of entrepreneurial bricolage on new venture growth is stronger in the context with serious institutional void, but the effectiveness of entrepreneurial bricolage on new venture adaptiveness is weaker in the context with serious institutional void. These findings not only enrich our knowledge on implications of entrepreneurial bricolage, but also advance our understanding on the context of emerging economy. We encourage increasing scholars to devote in exploring the outcomes of entrepreneurial bricolage and the institutional context of emerging economy.

Acknowledgements We thank the National Natural Science Foundation of China (71772117; 71472119), Innovation Program of Shanghai Municipal Education Commission, and the Program for Professor of Special Appointment (Young Eastern Scholar) at Shanghai Institutions of Higher Learning (QD2016015) for generous financial support. We are grateful to the anonymous reviewers and the APJM editors for their detailed and constructive comments on our paper. We would like to thank Mike W Peng, Yuli Zhang, Weilei (Stone) Shi, Sunny Li Sun, Jun Yang and Andy Spicer for their helpful comments on the Special Issue Conference, Tianjin, China, June 2018.

References

Ahlstrom, D., & Bruton, G. D. (2010). Rapid institutional shifts and the co-evolution of entrepreneurial firms in transition economies. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(3), 531-554.

- Aidis, R., Estrin, S., & Mickiewicz, T. (2008). Institutions and entrepreneurship development in Russia: A comparative perspective. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 23 (6), 656-672.
- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Alvarez, S. A., & Busenitz, L. W. (2001). The entrepreneurship of resource-based theory. *Journal of Management*, 27(6), 755-775.
- An, W., Zhao, X., Cao, Z., Zhang, J., & Liu, H. (2018). How Bricolage Drives Corporate Entrepreneurship: The Roles of Opportunity Identification and Learning Orientation. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 35(1), 49-65.
- Andersson, U., Cuervo-Cazurra, A. & Nielsen, B. B. (2014). From the editors: Explaining interaction effects within and across levels of analysis. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 45, 1063-1071.
- Anderson, B. S., & Eshima, Y. (2013). The influence of firm age and intangible resources on the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and firm growth among Japanese SMEs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28(3), 413-429.
- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological bulletin*, 103(3), 411-423.
- Baker, T., & Nelson, R. E. (2005). Creating something from nothing: Resource construction through entrepreneurial bricolage. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(3), 329-366.
- Baker, T., Miner, A. S., & Eesley, D. T. (2003). Improvising firms: Bricolage, account giving and improvisational competencies in the founding process. *Research Policy*, 32(2), 255-276.
- Baron, R. A., & Tang, J. (2009). Entrepreneurs' social skills and new venture performance: Mediating mechanisms and cultural generality. *Journal of Management*, 35(2), 282-306.
- Baum, J. R., Locke, E. A., & Smith, K. G. (2001). A multidimensional model of venture growth. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(2), 292-303.
- Black, J. A. , & Boal, K. B. (1994). Strategic resources: traits, configurations and paths to sustainable competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15(S2), 18.

- Brislin, R. W. (1980). Translation and content analysis of oral and written materials. In HC Triandis & Jw Berry (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 2. Methodology* (pp. 389-444).
- Bruton, G. D., Ahlstrom, D., & Li, H. L. (2010). Institutional theory and entrepreneurship: where are we now and where do we need to move in the future?. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 34*(3), 421-440.
- Bruton, G. D., Su, Z., & Filatotchev, I. (2018). New venture performance in transition economies from different institutional perspectives. *Journal of Small Business Management, 56*(3): 374-391.
- Cai, L., Chen, B., Chen, J., & Bruton, G. D. (2017). Dysfunctional competition & innovation strategy of new ventures as they mature. *Journal of Business Research, 78*, 111-118.
- Casper, S. (2000). Institutional adaptiveness, technology policy, and the diffusion of new business models: the case of german biotechnology. *Organization Studies, 21*(5), 887-914.
- Cope, J. (2011). Entrepreneurial learning from failure: An interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Journal of Business Venturing, 26*(6), 604-623.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*(3), 297-334.
- Deng, P. (2009). Why do Chinese firms tend to acquire strategic assets in international expansion?. *Journal of World Business, 44*(1), 74-84.
- Desa, G. (2012). Resource mobilization in international social entrepreneurship: bricolage as a mechanism of institutional transformation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 36*(4), 727-751.
- Desa, G., & Basu, S. (2013). Optimization or bricolage? Overcoming resource constraints in global social entrepreneurship. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 7*(1), 26-49.
- Dess, G. G., & Robinson Jr, R. B. (1984). Measuring organizational performance in the absence of objective measures: the case of the privately-held firm and conglomerate business unit. *Strategic Management Journal, 5*(3), 265-273.
- Doh, J. P., Teegen, H., & Mudambi, R. (2004). Balancing private and state ownership in emerging markets' telecommunications infrastructure: country, industry, and firm influences. *Journal of International Business Studies, 35*(3), 233-250.
- Duymedjian, R., & Ruling, C. C. (2010). Towards a foundation of bricolage in organization and management theory. *Organization Studies, 31*(2), 133-151.

- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Schoonhoven, C. B. (1990). Organizational growth: linking founding team, strategy, environment, and growth among U.S. semiconductor ventures, 1978-1988. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(3), 504-529.
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: what are they?. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10), 1105-1121.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39-50.
- Garud, R., & Karnøe, P. (2003). Bricolage versus breakthrough: Distributed and embedded agency in technology entrepreneurship. *Research Policy*, 32(2), 277-300.
- Gilbert, B. A., McDougall, P. P., & Audretsch, D. B. (2006). New venture growth: a review and extension. *Journal of Management*, 32(6), 926-950.
- Goedhuys, M., & Sleuwaegen, L. (2010). High-growth entrepreneurial firms in Africa: a quantile regression approach. *Small Business Economics*, 34(1), 31-51.
- Gras, D., & Nason, R. S. (2015). Bric by bric: The role of the family household in sustaining a venture in impoverished indian slums. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 30(4), 546-563.
- Guillén, M. F. (2002). Structural inertia, imitation, and foreign expansion: South Korean firms and business groups in China, 1987–1995. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(3), 509-525.
- Guo, H., Su, Z., & Ahlstrom, D. (2016). Business model innovation: The effects of exploratory orientation, opportunity recognition, and entrepreneurial bricolage in an emerging economy. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 33(2), 533-549.
- Guo, H., Tang, J., & Su, Z. (2014). To be different, or to be the same? The interactive effect of organizational regulatory legitimacy and entrepreneurial orientation on new venture performance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 31(3), 665-685.
- Hall, R. (1993). A framework linking intangible resources and capabilities to sustainable competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(8), 607-618.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis*. Vol. 6, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

- Hewitt-Dundas, N. (2006). Resource and capability constraints to innovation in small and large plants. *Small Business Economics*, 26(3), 257-277.
- Hitt, M. A., Keats, B. W., & Demarie, S. M. (1998). Navigating in the new competitive landscape: building strategic flexibility and competitive advantage in the 21st century. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 12(4), 22-42.
- Hitt, M. A., Ireland, R. D., Camp, S. M., & Sexton, D. L. (2001). Strategic entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial strategies for wealth creation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(6-7), 479-491.
- Ireland, R. D., Hitt, M. A., & Sirmon, D. G. (2003). A model of strategic entrepreneurship: the construct and its dimensions. *Journal of Management*, 29(6), 963-989.
- Khaire, M. (2010). Young and no money? Never mind: The material impact of social resources on new venture growth. *Organization Science*, 21(1), 168-185.
- Korsgaard, M. A., & Roberson, L. (1995). Procedural justice in performance evaluation: The role of instrumental and non-instrumental voice in performance appraisal discussions. *Journal of Management*, 21(4), 657-669.
- Lavie, D. (2006). Capability reconfiguration: an analysis of incumbent responses to technological change. *The Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), 153-174.
- Li, H., & Zhang, Y. (2007). The role of managers' political networking and functional experience in new venture performance: Evidence from China's transition economy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(8), 791-804.
- Liu, W., Yang, H., & Zhang, G. (2012). Does family business excel in firm performance? An institution-based view. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 29(4), 965-987.
- Luo, X. R., & Chung, C. N. (2013). Filling or abusing the institutional void? Ownership and management control of public family businesses in an emerging market. *Organization Science*, 24(2), 591-613.
- Luo, X., Zhou, L., & Liu, S. S. (2005). Entrepreneurial firms in the context of China's transition economy: an integrative framework and empirical examination. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(3), 277-284.
- Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2009). Entrepreneurship in and around institutional voids: A case study from Bangladesh. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(5), 419-435.
- Meyer, K. E., Estrin, S., Bhaumik, S. K., & Peng, M. W. (2009). Institutions, resources, and entry strategies in emerging economies. *Strategic Management Journal*, 30(1), 61-80.

- Mcgrath, R. G. (1999). Falling forward: real options reasoning and entrepreneurial failure. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(1), 13-30.
- Neter, J., Wasserman, W., & Kutner, M. H., (1990). *Applied linear statistical models*. Chicago: Irwin.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychological theory*. New York, NY: MacGraw-Hill.
- Oliver, C. (1997). Sustainable competitive advantage: combining institutional and resource-based views. *Strategic Management Journal*, 697-713.
- Peng, M. W., & Heath, P. S. (1996). The growth of the firm in planned economies in transition: Institutions, organizations, and strategic choice. *Academy of management review*, 21(2), 492-528.
- Peng, M. W., & Luo, Y. (2000). Managerial ties and firm performance in a transition economy: The nature of a micro-macro link. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(3), 486-501.
- Peng, M. W. (2002). Towards an institution-based view of business strategy. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 19(2-3), 251-267.
- Phillips, N., & Tracey, P. (2007). Opportunity recognition, entrepreneurial capabilities and bricolage: Connecting institutional theory and entrepreneurship in strategic organization. *Strategic Organization*, 5(3), 313-320.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 12(4), 531-544.
- Puffer, S. M., McCarthy, D. J., & Boisot, M. (2010). Entrepreneurship in Russia and China: the impact of formal institutional voids. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(3), 441-467.
- Rao, H., & Drazin, R. (2002). Overcoming resource constraints on product innovation by recruiting talent from rivals: A study of the mutual fund industry, 1986–1994. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(3), 491-507.
- Reed, R., & Defillippi, R. J. (1990). Causal ambiguity, barriers to imitation, and sustainable competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 15(1), 88-102.
- Salunke, S., Weerawardena, J., & McColl-Kennedy, J. R. (2013). Competing through service innovation: The role of bricolage and entrepreneurship in project-oriented firms. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(8), 1085-1097.
- Sarasvathy, S.D. (2006). Markets in human hope. In D.K. Sarasvathy (Ed.), *Effectuation: Elements of entrepreneurial expertise* (pp. 205–228). Charlottesville, VA: Edward Elgar.

- Schulze, W. S., Lubatkin, M. H., & Dino, R. N. (2003). Exploring the agency consequences of ownership dispersion among the directors of private family firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(2), 179-194.
- Senyard, J., Baker, T., Steffens, P., & Davidsson, P. (2014). Bricolage as a path to innovativeness for resource-constrained new firms. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 31(2), 211-230.
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217-226.
- Shepherd, D. A. (2003). Learning from business failure: Propositions of grief recovery for the self-employed. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(2), 318-328.
- Shi, W., Sun, S. L., & Peng, M. W. (2012). Sub-national institutional contingencies, network positions, and IJV partner selection. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(7), 1221-1245.
- Shi, W., Sun, S. L., Yan, D., & Zhu, Z. (2017). Institutional fragility and outward foreign direct investment from China. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 48(4), 452-476.
- Sine, W. D., Mitsuhashi, H., & Kirsch, D. A. (2006). Revisiting Burns and Stalker: Formal structure and new venture performance in emerging economic sectors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(1), 121-132.
- Singh, S., Corner, P., & Pavlovich, K. (2007). Coping with entrepreneurial failure. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 13(4), 331-344.
- Sirmon, D. G., Hitt, M. A., & Ireland, R. D. (2007). Managing firm resources in dynamic environments to create value: Looking inside the black box. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(1), 273-292.
- Smallbone, D. & Welter, F. (2001). The distinctiveness of entrepreneurship in transition economies. *Small Business Economics*, 16(4), 249-262.
- Srivastava, R. K., Fahey, L., & Christensen, H. K. (2001). The resource-based view and marketing: The role of market-based assets in gaining competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 27(6), 777-802.
- Stam, W., & Elfring, T. (2008). Entrepreneurial orientation and new venture performance: The moderating role of intra-and extraindustry social capital. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(1), 97-111.
- Sun, S. L., & Lee, R. P. (2013). Enhancing innovation through international joint venture portfolios: from the emerging firm perspective. *Journal of International Marketing*, 21(3), 1-23.

- Sun, S. L., Peng, M. W., Lee, R. P., & Tan, W. (2015). Institutional open access in the home country and outward internationalization. *Journal of World Business*, 50(1): 234-246.
- Tan, J., & Peng, M. W. (2003). Organizational slack and firm performance during economic transitions: Two studies from an emerging economy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(13), 15.
- Tece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509-533.
- Thornhill, S., & Amit, R. (2003). Learning about failure: Bankruptcy, firm age, and the resource-based view. *Organization Science*, 14(5), 497-509.
- Vakratsas, D., & Ma, Z. (2009). Firm adaptiveness and performance heterogeneity: the case of sales–advertising dynamics in an evolving product market. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 19(1), 21.
- Venkatraman, N., & Ramanujam, V. (1986). Measurement of business performance in strategy research: A comparison of approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(4), 801-814.
- Wang, D., & Chen, Y. (2010). The Effect of Entrepreneurial Social Capital on New Venture Performance. *Scientific Management Research*, 30(2), 25-29 (in Chinese).
- Webb, J. W., Ireland, R. D., Hitt, M. A., Kistruck, G. M., & Tihanyi, L. (2011). Where is the opportunity without the customer? An integration of marketing activities, the entrepreneurship process, and institutional theory. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 39(4), 537-554.
- Webb, J. W., Kistruck, G. M., Ireland, R. D., & Ketchen Jr, D. J. (2010). The entrepreneurship process in base of the pyramid markets: The case of multinational enterprise/nongovernment organization alliances. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(3), 555-581.
- Wei, L. Q., & Ling, Y. (2015). CEO characteristics and corporate entrepreneurship in transition economies: Evidence from China. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(6), 1157-1165.
- Wright, M., Filatotchev, I., Hoskisson, R. E., & Peng, M. W. (2005). Strategy research in emerging economies: Challenging the conventional wisdom. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(1), 1-33.
- Wu, L., Liu, H., & Zhang, J. (2017). Bricolage effects on new-product development speed and creativity: The moderating role of technological turbulence. *Journal of Business Research*, 70, 127-135.

- Yamakawa, Y., Peng, M. W., & Deeds, D. L. (2015). Rising from the ashes: Cognitive determinants of venture growth after entrepreneurial failure. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 39(2), 209-236.
- Yu, X., Li, Y., Chen, D.Q., Meng, X, T., & Tao, X. M. (2018). Entrepreneurial bricolage and online store performance in emerging economies. *Electron Markets*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-018-0302-9>
- Yu, X., Tao, Y., Tao, X., Xia, F., & Li, Y. (2017). Managing uncertainty in emerging economies: The interaction effects between causation and effectuation on firm performance. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2017.11.017>.
- Zahra, S. A. (1996). Governance, ownership, and corporate entrepreneurship: The moderating impact of industry technological opportunities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39 (6), 1713-1735.
- Zhou, K. Z. , & Li, C. B. (2010). How strategic orientations influence the building of dynamic capability in emerging economies. *Journal of Business Research*, 63(3), 0-231.
- Zimmerman, M. A., & Zeitz, G. J. (2002). Beyond survival: Achieving new venture growth by building legitimacy. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(3), 414-431.

Table 1. Measures and Validation

	Brief Items	Loading
	Entrepreneurial bricolage (<i>CA</i> =0.896 ; <i>CR</i> = 0.888; <i>AVE</i> = 0.499)	
1.	We are confident of our ability to find workable solutions to new challenges by using our existing resources	0.771
2.	We gladly take on a broader range of challenges than others with our resources would be able to	0.696
3.	We use any existing resource that seems useful responding to a new problem or opportunity	0.700
4.	We deal with new challenges by applying a combination of our existing resources and other resources inexpensively available to us	0.740
5.	When dealing with new problems or opportunities, we take action by assuming that we will find a workable solution	0.688
6.	By combining our existing resources, we take on a surprising variety of new challenges	0.709
7.	When we face new challenges, we put together workable solutions from our existing resources	0.649
8.	We combine resources to accomplish new challenges that the resources weren't originally intended to accomplish	0.694
	Institutional void (<i>CA</i> =0.826; <i>CR</i> =0.829; <i>AVE</i> =0.493)	
1.	Prevailing norms or business practices are lacking	0.649
2.	It is difficult to find business regulations to follow	0.723
3.	It is difficult to find business rules to follow	0.632
4.	Substandard products or services could be accepted by customers	0.739
5.	The enforcement of laws and regulations is weak	0.758
	New venture growth (<i>CA</i> =0.901; <i>CR</i> =0.904; <i>AVE</i> =0.758)	
1.	Sales growth	0.925
2.	Market share growth	0.875
3.	Employment growth	0.808
	New venture adaptiveness (<i>CA</i> =0.865; <i>CR</i> = 0.868; <i>AVE</i> = 0.625)	
1.	We allowed the business to evolve as opportunities emerged	0.796
2.	We adapted what we were doing to the resources we had	0.783
3.	We were flexible and took advantage of opportunities as they arose	0.903
4.	We avoided courses of action that restricted our flexibility and adaptability	0.663
$\chi^2 =379.820$; $\chi^2/df=2.359$; <i>IFI</i> =0.945; <i>TLI</i> =0.934; <i>CFI</i> =0.944; <i>RSMEA</i> =0.062		

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Matrix

Variables	Mean	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Firm size ^c	3.891	1.859								
2. Firm age	3.527	1.847	0.069							
3. Sales turnover ^b	7.409	2.104	0.587***	0.078						
4. Initial capital ^a	5.936	2.099	0.582***	0.028	0.592***					
5. Firm ownership	0.780	0.407	-0.364***	0.038	-0.118*	-0.184***				
6 Technology uncertainty	4.941	1.523	0.112*	0.026	0.063	0.091	0.043			
7 Demand uncertainty	4.957	1.371	0.023	0.031	-0.003	0.011	0.023	0.562***		
8 Competitive intensity	5.097	1.357	0.060	0.029	0.059	0.009	0.005	0.724***	0.535***	
9 Industry 1	0.333	0.472	0.101	0.113*	-0.051	0.067	-0.133*	-0.114*	-0.175***	-0.046
10 Industry 2	0.285	0.452	0.089	0.032	0.077	0.018	0.154**	0.221***	0.164**	0.228***
11 Industry 3	0.065	0.247	-0.076	-0.102	0.044	-0.015	0.002	-0.073	-0.091	-0.109*
12 Location 1	0.319	0.467	-0.155**	-0.033	-0.060	-0.059	0.081	0.059	0.016	0.043
13 Location 2	0.186	0.390	-0.124*	0.149**	-0.113*	-0.058	0.081	0.018	0.080	0.086
14 Location 3	0.331	0.471	0.240***	0.011	0.111*	0.069	-0.178***	-0.090	-0.077	-0.147**
15 Institutional void	4.146	1.140	-0.044	0.015	-0.011	0.009	0.106*	0.171**	0.223***	0.079
16 Entrepreneurial bricolage	5.232	0.883	-0.037	-0.039	0.027	0.056	0.092	0.366***	0.385***	0.453***
17 New venture adaptiveness	5.539	1.030	0.090	-0.082	0.111*	0.108*	-0.020	0.318***	0.279***	0.308***
18 New venture growth	4.849	1.108	0.159**	-0.023	0.054	0.152**	-0.046	0.348***	0.350***	0.298***

Variables	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
10 Industry 2	-0.447***								
11 Industry 3	-0.186***	-0.167**							
12 Location 1	0.094	-0.057	0.115*						
13 Location 2	-0.077	0.051	-0.008	-0.328***					
14 Location 3	-0.089	0.035	-0.088	-0.481***	-0.336***				
15 Institutional void	-0.022	-0.030	0.016	-0.025	0.142**	-0.093			
16 Entrepreneurial bricolage	-0.053	0.075	0.024	0.024	0.042	-0.119*	0.163**		
17 New venture adaptiveness	-0.070	0.041	0.058	0.071	-0.003	-0.082	0.033	0.505***	
18 New venture growth	-0.027	0.046	-0.121*	-0.058	-0.001	0.007	0.257***	0.474***	0.288***

Table 3. Results of Hierarchical Regression Analyses

	New venture growth			New venture adaptiveness		
Firm size	0.071 ⁺ (0.042)	0.095* (0.039)	0.095* (0.039)	0.016 (0.040)	0.041 (0.036)	0.041 (0.036)
Firm age	-0.021 (0.030)	-0.011 (0.028)	-0.007 (0.028)	-0.048 ⁺ (0.028)	-0.037 (0.025)	-0.041 (0.025)
Sales turnover	-0.053 (0.035)	-0.053 (0.032)	-0.059 ⁺ (0.032)	0.029 (0.033)	0.029 (0.030)	0.035 (0.030)
Initial capital	0.063 ⁺ (0.034)	0.038 (0.032)	0.043 (0.031)	0.026 (0.032)	-0.002 (0.029)	-0.006 (0.029)
Firm ownership	-0.046 (0.148)	-0.128 (0.136)	-0.109 (0.136)	-0.083 (0.141)	-0.173 (0.126)	-0.194 (0.126)
Technology uncertainty	0.092 ⁺ (0.055)	0.095 ⁺ (0.050)	0.095 ⁺ (0.050)	0.082 (0.052)	0.085 ⁺ (0.046)	0.085 ⁺ (0.046)
Competitive intensity	0.086 (0.061)	-0.033 (0.058)	-0.039 (0.058)	0.126* (0.058)	-0.005 (0.054)	0.001 (0.053)
Demand uncertainty	0.137** (0.050)	0.072 (0.047)	0.072 (0.046)	0.085 ⁺ (0.047)	0.015 (0.043)	0.014 (0.043)
Industry 1	-0.110 (0.141)	-0.131 (0.130)	-0.132 (0.129)	-0.125 (0.134)	-0.148 (0.120)	-0.147 (0.119)
Industry 2	-0.162 (0.144)	-0.148 (0.132)	-0.155 (0.132)	-0.147 (0.137)	-0.131 (0.122)	-0.125 (0.122)
Industry 3	-0.416 ⁺ (0.237)	-0.561* (0.219)	-0.574** (0.219)	0.276 (0.226)	0.117 (0.203)	0.130 (0.202)
Location 1	-0.189 (0.162)	-0.125 (0.150)	-0.113 (0.149)	0.093 (0.155)	0.162 (0.139)	0.149 (0.138)
Location 2	-0.203 (0.187)	-0.130 (0.172)	-0.126 (0.172)	0.082 (0.178)	0.162 (0.159)	0.158 (0.158)
Location 3	-0.086 (0.165)	-0.032 (0.152)	-0.024 (0.152)	-0.082 (0.157)	-0.023 (0.141)	-0.031 (0.140)
Institutional void	0.196*** (0.049)	0.167*** (0.045)	0.143** (0.047)	-0.015 (0.047)	-0.047 (0.042)	-0.022 (0.043)
Entrepreneurial bricolage		0.503*** (0.065)	0.530*** (0.066)		0.551*** (0.060)	0.523*** (0.061)
Entrepreneurial bricolage* Institutional void			0.075* (0.038)			-0.080* (0.035)
_cons	2.548*** (0.402)	1.002* (0.421)	0.960* (0.420)	4.000*** (0.383)	2.307*** (0.389)	2.351*** (0.387)
R^2	0.234	0.351	0.359	0.161	0.330	0.340
adj. R^2	0.200	0.320	0.326	0.123	0.298	0.307
F	6.862	11.332	10.992	4.283	10.301	10.131

Standard errors in parentheses

+ p < 0.10, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Fig. 1 Research Model




Fig. 2 The moderating effect of institutional void on the relationship between entrepreneurial bricolage and new venture growth




Fig. 3 The moderating effect of institutional void on the relationship between entrepreneurial bricolage and new venture adaptiveness

