

If not for profit,
for what and how?

S O C I A L
E N T E R P R I S E

Social Entrepreneurship: Effectuation and Bricolage Approaches to Venture Establishment in West Africa

William Asamoah OWUSU & Frank JANSSEN
CRECIS, Louvain School of Management
Université catholique de Louvain

EMES-SOCENT Conference Selected Papers, no. LG13-42

4th EMES International Research Conference on Social Enterprise - Liege, 2013

Interuniversity Attraction Pole (IAP)
on Social Enterprise (SOCENT) 2012-2017

and



 **EMES network**



Abstract

How can a social entrepreneur overcome resource constraints in an uncertain environment? According to Sarasvathy and Dew (2005), it is indeed possible to create new markets through a process of exploration (which includes experimentation, flexibility, innovation etc). Despite the strength of the resource based view (RBV), its weaknesses are revealed, particularly due to resource constraints facing new social ventures as a result of the failure of governments and the market. Precisely, the theoretical assumptions about the nature of resources and resource environments offer little assistance for understanding how entrepreneurship may bring value to otherwise worthless resources and assist in growth of the firm, despite resource scarcity. The behavioral theories of "entrepreneurial effectuation and bricolage" (Sarasvathy, 2001, 2008; Baker and Nelson, 2005) have been extended to social entrepreneurship to explore entrepreneurial opportunities, create and develop new organizations (Bird and Schjoedt, 2009). Effectuation and Bricolage, that are valuable concepts to explain how social ventures are established in resource poor environment has received less attention. As a result the objective of our paper is to theoretically explore how social entrepreneurs overcome resource constraints in an uncertain environment through effectuation and bricolage, as well as to examine how these theories can be used in the African environment.

Keywords: Social Entrepreneurship, Resource Constraints, Effectuation, Bricolage, Venture Establishment in West Africa.

© William Asamoah Owusu (william.owusu@student.uclouvain.be) & Frank Janssen (frank.janssen@uclouvain.be) 2013. EMES-SOCENT Conference Selected Papers are available on the EMES website (www.emes.net) and on the SOCENT website (www.iap-socent.be). These papers do not undergo any editing process. They are published with the support of the Belgian Science Policy Office, within an Interuniversity Attraction Pole (IAP) on social enterprise entitled "If not for profit, for what? And how?".

1. INTRODUCTION

Social entrepreneurship (SE), or entrepreneurial activity with an embedded social purpose, has been on the rise in the recent decade (Austin, Stevenson and Wei-Skillern, 2006; Smith and Stevens, 2010; Mair and Marti, 2006; Peredo and McLean, 2006), and it gives coherence and identity to a hitherto disparate group of individuals and organizations concerned with a range of issues including poverty, social inequality, and the natural environment (Dacin, Dacin, and Tracey, 2011). The rising interest of SE, could be attributed to two major advantages (Bacq and Janssen, 2011) which are firstly, the innovativeness of solving the ever growing complex social problems (Zahra, Rawhouser, Bhawe, Neubaum, and Hayton, 2008; Alvarez and Barney, 2007; Peredo and Chrisman, 2006) and secondly, the combination of social welfare and commercial logics to form hybrid organizations spreading across sectors (Bosma and Levie, 2010; Kistruck, and Beamish, 2010; Battilana and Dorado, 2010; Tracey and Phillip, 2007) to uniquely alleviate poverty and achieve other millennium development goals (Seelos, Ganly and Mair, 2006).

According to Karanda and Toledano (2012), the wider diversity of formal structures in which SE can emerge, along with the increasing popularity of the concept have, however, come with less certainty about what exactly a social entrepreneur is and does. Although their activities vary in size, scale, and purpose, in general: (1) They pursue revenue generation strategies through trading, partly due to the declining support from traditional philanthropic and government sources to be more entrepreneurial, financially sustainable (Di Domenico, Tracey and Haugh, 2009) autonomous and flexible in order to, (2) associate with communities characterized by limited access to resources (Peredo and Chrisman, 2006) and, (3) achieve social and environmental goals.

Resource constraints compel social entrepreneurs to explore and exploit solutions that require many of the ingredients associated with successful business innovation (Alvord, Brown, and Letts 2004). This calls for ways of utilizing local resources at hand to achieve financial and social sustainability in Africa, where the prevalence and impact of SE are not contextualized (Visser, 2011). In view of the fact that findings in a developed economy should not be assumed to be equally applicable in an emerging economy like Africa (Bruton, Ahlstrom and Obloj, 2008), our work is a review of literature on how social entrepreneur's use effectuation and bricolage approaches to overcome resource constraints in West Africa.

Africa is a continent where 70% of the 60 countries among the world's bottom billion reside and social ventures face an environment in which quality resources are extremely scarce and therefore expensive (Collier, 2007; Seelos and Mair, 2005; Zahra *et al.*, 2009) or where institutional financing mechanisms are absent or weak (Mair and Marti, 2009; Kistruck, Webb, Sutter and Ireland, 2011). Hence, effectuation and bricolage are used as mechanisms of institutional transformation (Sarasvathy, 2001; Dasa, 2011; Desa and Basu, 2013; Di Domenico *et al.*, 2010).

Our objective is to build on the works of Sarasvathy (2001), Levi-Strauss (1967) and Baker & Nelson (2005) to investigate how social entrepreneurs adopt effectuation and bricolage approaches to overcome resource constraints in creating ventures in West Africa. Specifically, we investigate the influence of effectuation and bricolage on social venture establishment in Africa. The paper is structured as follows. Theories to be used are presented first, followed by fundamentals of SE and resource constraints in Africa, how resources are mobilized, and then how effectuation and bricolage approaches are adopted and their influence on new social venture establishment. Lastly, we conclude.

2. THEORIZING

2.1. Theory of resource dependence

According to Froelich (1999), organizations that rely on few sources for vital inputs becomes highly dependent on and beholden to those providers for survival. The key to organizational survival is the ability to acquire and maintain resources. Therefore, effective organizations identify and appropriately respond to the criteria for continued resource acquisition from each key provider (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978).

Social entrepreneurs, especially nonprofit organizations operate in an increasing turbulent context where building sustainable organizations has emerged as a criteria need (Weerawardena, McDonald and Mort, 2010). Despite the persistent limitations on resource availability, social entrepreneurs tend to find ways to survive and even thrive. In view of the resource constraints facing social entrepreneurs, Emerson (2003) suggests that social ventures could obtain their financial resources from a wide range of sources; from grants and charitable gifts to traditional equity investments.

2.2. Theories of Entrepreneurial Behaviours

Over the past decade, a number of different theoretical perspectives have emerged to describe the logic and behavior underlying the entrepreneurial process. Such perspectives include effectuation (Sarasvathy, 2001, 2008), entrepreneurial bricolage (Baker & Nelson, 2005), and the creation perspective (Alvarez & Barney, 2007).

2.2.1. *Effectuation and Bricolage Theories*

Most of the perspectives on social venture creation can be traced to have a root in effectuation and bricolage. According to the emerging theoretical perspectives of entrepreneurship, entrepreneurs (1) focus primarily on the resources they have on hand and ignore market needs in uncovering an opportunity (Baker & Nelson, 2005; Sarasvathy, 2001); (2) ignore long-run returns and focus primarily on what they are willing to lose in making decisions about whether to pursue an opportunity (Sarasvathy, 2001); (3) refuse to enact the resource limitations dictated by the environment (Baker & Nelson, 2005); and (4) eschew long-range goals and plans (Sarasvathy, 2001). While a strategy of effectuation carries with it a higher risk of entrepreneurial failure, it is also liable to be more efficient because entrepreneurs following it are able to change tack more easily in response to changing circumstances and to take advantage of new resources as they become available (Sarasvathy, 2001). Although effectuation does have the potential to shed light on social entrepreneurship, Di Domenico *et al.*, (2010) suggests the concept of bricolage is most appropriate because it is a flexible approach that is especially suited to the study of an organizational form that is designed to create both social and commercial value under conditions of resource scarcity.

2.2.2. *Creation Theory*

The path to new venture creation may follow a well-defined causation approach in which those who identify opportunities, bring together resources efficiently, and work according to a plan to achieve competitive advantage. However, the path to new venture creation may also be a process of experimentation, affordable loss, and flexibility that results in entrepreneurial success (Chandler, DeTienne, McKelvie, and Mumford, 2011). Both discovery and creation theories seek to explain entrepreneurial actions in terms of their impact on the ability of entrepreneurs to form and exploit opportunities (Alvarez and Barney, 2007). Referring to theories of entrepreneurship behaviours at appendix, aspects of creation theory has been described by effectuation and bricolage approaches (Saravasthy, 2001, 2008; Baker and Nelson, 2005).

3. FUNDAMENTALS OF SE AND RESOURCE CONSTRAINTS IN AFRICA

Different perspectives on SE have emerged throughout the world (Bacq and Janssen, 2011; Smith and Stevens, 2010; Steyaert and Katz, 2004). SE has often risen as a result of weak state social programs or funding, due to either the retreat or poor functioning of the state (Kerlin, 2010; Haugh, 2007). Historical development of entrepreneurship in Africa compared to other regions, demonstrates slow growth of entrepreneurial activity since colonization. The reasons for such a slow growth and poor economies include government policies (Robson and Obeng, 2008), socio-cultural factors (Kiggundu, 2002), and a lack of human and financial capital (Mair and Marti, 2009; Kistruck *et al.*, 2011; Kerlin, 2013). In contrast to social entrepreneurship in developing countries, issues of colonial traditions, government intervention, cultural biases, and processes used by the development community, impact the methods by which social entrepreneurs successfully function (Katzenstein and Chrispin, 2011).

In the African context, SE which is an alternative practice to the grant seeking model of development, emerged mainly after the withdrawal of state funding, due to external conditions imposed by foreign actors, as well as institutional support provided by foreign aid organizations as key drivers (Poon, 2011). Indeed, Masendeke and Mugova (2009) report that high levels of unemployment and the negative social impact of structural adjustment reforms promoted by international financial institutions have led to the recent movement towards social entrepreneurship. Structural Adjustment Program (SAP) was designed during the oil crisis of the 1970s, as strict conditions for developing countries to acquire loans to reduce the fiscal imbalance of the recipient nations and to speed up market-oriented reforms, particularly by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF). After such a policy, Africa, which was and is still depending much on World Bank and IMF's monetary support adopted reduction in state expenditure, deregulation and privatization similar to what occurred in Western Europe. Domestic enterprises could not compete with foreign firms and it led to socio-economic problems where the poor could not afford for food, health facilities and basic education. The situation motivated the Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) or the third sector to help in creating community-led social ventures to pursue economic, social, or environmental aims, considered essential for economic development through resource acquisition and network creation that precede formal venture creation (Haugh, 2007; Di Domenico *et al.*, 2010; Baker and Nelson, 2005). Non-state actors had lots of international aid, as state institutions' ability to manage the economy came into doubt (Masendeke and Mugova 2009).

4. HOW SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS MOBILIZE RESOURCES IN AFRICA

Resources are a critical sub element of entrepreneurship process (Penrose, 1959). In view of that, entrepreneurship is generally characterized as the exploitation of an opportunity to create value by mobilizing resources to achieve entrepreneurial objectives (Timmons, 2009). Much entrepreneurial behaviour - and much of the research literature in entrepreneurship - is about "resource seeking" behaviours, that is, it deals with firms attempting to generate ostensibly adequate resources to pursue an opportunity. In other words, strategies for attaining competitive advantages emphasize developing and configuring existing resource strengths into a valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable resource base (Aldrich, 1999; Brush, Greene and Hart, 2001). But what if you do not have a legacy of resource strength? (*Ibid.*). Due to the global financial crisis, raising funds through the government and traditional capital market, however, has been difficult for nonprofit organizations (Emerson & Bonini, 2003). "The non distributive restriction on surpluses generated by nonprofit organizations and the embedded social purpose of for-profit or hybrid forms of social enterprise limit social entrepreneurs from tapping into the same capital markets as commercial entrepreneurs" (Austin *et al.*, 2006). In view of that, most firms in development... "can't always get what they want, and certainly don't always get what they need" (Aldrich 1999). According to Wiklund, Baker and Shepherd, (2009), the modal firm is created with limited financial, social, temporal and other resource buffers. Though the Resource Based View (RBV) proposes that resources are generally

developed internally, ventures must also turn to external sources to mobilize such resources (Teng, 2007). As a result, firms are able to find responses to the environmental constraints and dependencies they face, because they enjoy great latitude in their processes of collecting and utilizing resources which they cannot always acquire or employ via rational or standard procedures (Baker and Aldrich, 2000).

Review of literature highlights a number of ways many initiatives operate in developing countries that have no structures or resources to enable or support traditional entrepreneurship (Seelos and Mair, 2005). Compared with commercial ventures, social entrepreneurs are likely to have a significantly wider array of relevant stakeholders (Low, 2006), with actors existing outside the firm who engage in problem-solving actively related to the business of the focal firm and who are willing to freely share their findings with others (von Hippel and von Krogh, 2003). Thus, those afflicted by a social ill and receives the goods or services are the reason the social venture exists. The notion of investors may involve an array of contributors and supporters, many of whom have a vested interest in the success of the enterprise in achieving its social mission, but have decreased expectation of gain and potentially little authority to control its activities (Knott and McCarthy, 2007). As a result, social ventures build collaborative relationships to garner resources in order to achieve their social and economic value-creation objectives (Chell 2007; Pearce and Doh 2005) through partnerships with different types of public, private, education, and social sector entities to enhance a venture's capacity to generate greater social value (Di Domenico and Haugh 2007) in Africa. On the other hand, collaborating with other actors to solve social problems could also be due to the arguable greater pressure on the social entrepreneur to make the right decision to draw from a situation and create value necessitated by the so-called 'double, or indeed triple, bottom line' (Chell, 2007). With the multidimensional nature of poverty (Mair and Marti, 2007), a weak social network may be a determining obstacle to escaping it (World Bank, 2002), therefore, such a strategic fit to SE, is a beneficial tool to combat the vicious cycle of poverty. According to Di Domenico *et al.*, (2010), these include the use of networks and social resourcing, financial bootstrapping, strategies of effectuation and bricolage.

4.1. Effectuation approach

Theoretically, effectuation originated from the study of Mark and Olsen's (1975) work on organisational learning. Organisational intelligence which comes from either rational calculation about future consequences, is used to choose between alternatives, or learning by experience where feedback from previous experience is used to choose among alternatives. According to Sarasvathy (2001; 2008), effectuation as a distinct approach to new venture creation, is described as "a logic of entrepreneurial expertise, a dynamic and interactive process of creating new artifacts such as firms, markets, and economies in the world." The theory suggests that under conditions of uncertainty, entrepreneurs adopt a decision logic that is different to that explicated by a traditional, more rational model of entrepreneurship (called "causation"). Sarasvathy (2008) uses the metaphor "patchwork quilt", to symbolize the entrepreneur as a developer of the opportunity by experimenting and changing direction as new information becomes available. The "patchwork quilter" sees the world as still in-the-making with a significant role for human action. "While each patch used in the quilt is a rather arbitrary piece of fabric, some belonging to the quilter and others brought to them at one time or another by friends, a good quilter manages to construct an aesthetically appealing and even meaningful pattern." It is a principle of means-driven (as opposed to goal-driven) action. The emphasis is on creating something new with existing means than discovering new ways to achieve given goals (Saravasthy, 2008).

Effectuation therefore has association with four (4) key principles (Sarasvathy, 2001; Chandler *et al.*, 2009). They are: (1) a focus on short-term experiments to identify opportunities in an unpredictable future rather than defining the final objective up front; (2) a focus on projects where the potential losses in the worst-case scenario are affordable, rather than maximizing expected returns; (3) use of pre-commitments - a dimension shared with causation construct (Sarasvathy, 2001) and strategic alliances in an attempt to control an unpredictable future, rather than prediction of an uncertain one

with business plans and competitive analysis; (4) remaining flexible for entrepreneurs to take advantage of changing environmental contingencies rather than preexisting capabilities and resources.

Effectuation processes take a set of means as given and focus on selecting between possible effects that can be created with that set of means (Sarasvathy, 2001). The questions "Who am I?", "What do I know?", and "Whom do I know?" allow for an examination of the means available to an entrepreneur, which allows him or her to consider what he or she can do (Sarasvathy & Dew, 2005). Through interacting with others and engaging with stakeholders, the entrepreneur discovers new means and establishes new goals that allow for reevaluation of means and possible courses of action (Sarasvathy & Dew, 2005). The assumption of effectuation theory is that, entrepreneurial opportunities are subjective, socially constructed, and created by an entrepreneur through enactment, where "managers construct, rearrange, single out, and demolish many 'objective' features of their surroundings to create their own constraints" (Weick, 1979).

4.2. Bricolage approach

Bricolage is a concept which was firstly considered by French structural anthropologist, Claude Levi-Strauss (1967) in the exploration of sensemaking in some societies. He adapted the term as a metaphor to encapsulate processes of cultural hybridization. The bricoleur acts on what Levi-Strauss calls his 'stock' - his repertoire of resource elements - sometimes odd and heterogeneous - that have been collected according to the overarching principle that they might come in useful at some point. It also shares a capacity to mobilize practical knowledge in a way that challenges general theoretical approaches that specify *a priori* how resources should be utilized. From its origins, bricolage has travelled to cognitive science, information technology, innovation, and organization theory (Duymedjian and Rulings, 2010). A perusal of the definitions of bricolage in Table 1 suggests the focus are on two key factors, i.e. making do with current resources and recombination of resources for new purpose.

Table 1. Definitions of Bricolage

	Source	Definition
1.	Baker, Miner, and Eesley (2003)	Existing social network contacts as resources for building technology businesses.
2.	Baker and Nelson (2005)	Making do with current resources, and creating new products or services from tools and materials at hand.
3.	Ciborra (2002)	Tinkering through the combination of resources at hand.
4.	Ciborra (1996)	Existing organizational mechanisms, forms and "junk routines" used as resources to construct the plat-hand form organization and its constituent structures.
5.	Di Domenico <i>et al.</i> , (2010).	Bricolage is characterized as making do with available resources, a refusal to be constrained by limitations, and improvisation.
6.	Gundry <i>et al.</i> , (2011)	Bricolage specifically involves the creative adaptation and manipulation of resources such as human capital, materials, financial resources, and social capital to solve a problem or embrace a new opportunity.
7.	Garud and Karnoe (2003)	Available materials "such as wood and lorry gears," other "modest resources" and miscellaneous "embedded" individuals providing inputs for development of Danish wind turbines.
8.	Lanzara (1999)	Institutions built "not on the ruins but with the ruins" of the old regime. Information system fragments, components, results of small experiments used as elements of complex and multilayered systems; systems built "on the ruins and with the ruins of old systems".
9.	Levise-Strauss (1967)	Making due with the means or resources at hand.
10.	Sirmon, Hitt and Ireland (2007)	Bricolage is in line with structuring, bundling and leveraging resource bundles and deploying them with two exceptions: bricolage focuses on structuring, and bundling accumulated existing resources (making do) rather than acquiring resources (resource seeking behaviours).
11.	Steffens, Senyard and Baker (2009)	Bricolage is a process of resource use and development characterised by using resources at hand, recombining resources and making do.
12.	Weick (1993)	To use whatever resources and repertoire one has to perform whatever task one faces
13.	Zahra <i>et al.</i> , (2009)	Entrepreneurs who act on locally discovered opportunities with locally available resources.

The contributions within the entrepreneurship literature relate bricolage to improvisation (Weick, 1993), use of knowledge domains (Baker, *et al.*, 2003), innovation (Garud and Karnoe, 2003; Ferneley and Bell, 2006), creativity (Rao, Monin, & Durand, 2003), and firm resilience (Weick, 1993). It implies the creation of something new through a process in which actors recombine and transform existing resources (Venkataraman, 1997; Garud, Kumaraswamy and Nayyar, 1998). According to Gundry *et al.*, (2011), bricolage specifically involves the creative adaptation and manipulation of resources such as human capital, materials, financial resources, and social capital to solve a problem

or embrace a new opportunity. The filling of the food security gap in Africa, by blending the tacit knowledge of an agribusiness owner, full time employees, students from high schools and universities (volunteers), and other available inputs to reduce post-harvest losses is an example of bricolage. Further, they are often developed by entrepreneurs committed to personal and social goals of resourcefulness, including values that focus on conservation rather than consumption of resources (Shepherd, Douglas and Shanley, 2000). The behavioral theory of "entrepreneurial bricolage" (Senyard, Baker, and Davidson, 2009) has been extended to resource poor environment in entrepreneurship and has been defined as "making do by applying combinations of resources already at hand" and in the rejection of institutional constraints (Baker and Nelson, 2005), either through their own resource stock or accessing resources through existing networks. Social entrepreneurs make use of their governance and stakeholder networks to access and construct resources, and they deploy persuasive tactics to build legitimacy and financial sustainability. In this approach, "the lack of resources pushes the social entrepreneurs to use all available means to acquire unused or underused resources that are capable of being leveraged in a different way to create social value" (Di Domenico *et al.*, 2010). It therefore engages multiple actors characterized as "moving ahead on the basis of inputs of actors who possess local knowledge, but through their interactions, are able to gradually transform emerging paths to higher degrees of functionality" (Garud and Karnoe, 2003). Also, based on resource sub processes defined by Sirmon, Hitt & Ireland (2007), bricolage is in line with structuring, bundling and leveraging resource bundles and deploying them with two exceptions: bricolage focuses on structuring and bundling accumulated existing resources (making do) rather than on acquiring resources (resource seeking behaviours) or divesting resources within the resource process (Hargadon and Sutton, 1997). In other words, entrepreneurs, (1) engage with problems instead of waiting and questioning whether a workable outcome can be created from what is already at hand, (2) refuse to enact limitations, (3) combine resources for new purposes and (4) build on resources at hand instead of divesting them (Baker and Nelson, 2005). Whereas optimization focuses on goal-directed resources-acquisition, bricoleurs focus on addressing opportunities and problems with existing undervalued, slack, or discarded resources that are either for free or cheap in cost (Desa and Basu, 2013).

Firms that cannot afford costly and regular resources due to necessity adopt bricolage resource mobilization. They develop new approaches that are both scalable and sustainable - a process known as 'catalytic innovation' (Christensen *et al.*, 2006). In view of that, the "necessity-based" bricolage is satisficing in nature (Duymedjian and Ruling, 2010) because entrepreneurs use available resources at hand to achieve acceptable goals. Nevertheless, unintentionally, bricolage may pioneer new capabilities (Philips and Tracey, 2007) that sometimes assists social ventures to alleviate resource constraints as an opportunity to scale up (Di Domenico *et al.*, 2010).

Social ventures that operate in developing economies face an environment in which quality resources are extremely scarce and therefore expensive (Collier, 2007; Seelos and Mair, 2005; Zahra *et al.*, 2009) or where institutional financing mechanisms are absent or weak (Mair and Marti, 2009; Kistruck *et al.*, 2011). As a result, recent research on bricolage has been affiliated with SE to build upon previous studies (Zahra *et al.*, 2009; Griffiths *et al.*, 2009). Bricolage, as a strategy, is a useful response to circumstances that are unpredicted and often surprising (Ciborra, 1996).

The need-based entrepreneurialism, the Traditional Civil Society model that builds on traditional forms of social interaction (Kerlin, 2013), and employing novel types of resources in new ways to serve the poor (Seelos and Mair, 2005) are some of the characteristics of the social entrepreneurs found in the Factor-Driven Economies of Africa. Karanada and Toledano (2012) suggests that such social entrepreneurs would be close to Rehn and Taalas' (2004) concept of "mundane entrepreneur" or Zahra *et al.*'s., (2009) "social bricoleur" who act on locally discovered opportunities with locally available resources.

4.2.1. Influence of effectuation and bricolage on new social venture establishment

The relationship between effectuation/bricolage and performance is not straightforward. Bricolage for instance may sometimes reach "brilliant unforeseen" results (Levi-Strauss, 1967), be helpful when it is carefully used but harmful at very high levels (Baker and Nelson, 2005).

Studies reveal that the new venture formation process is fraught with multiple challenges and pressures from the environment. Such challenges could be the lack of legitimacy, partly due to inherent liability of newness that all fledging firms encounter (Stinchcombe, 1965), or the difficulties in acquiring resources like skills and necessary finances to purchase the additional resources (Brush, Carter, Gatewood, Greene & Hart 2006). Baker and Nelson (2005), suggest that firms engaged in bricolage may be able to find ways to make do without the need to purchase expensive resources that otherwise similar firms would need to acquire before moving forward. Moreover, unlike the resource seeking approach which implicitly suggests acquiring resources in venture creation process, Sirmon *et al.* (2007) suggest that value creation can occur by recombining existing resources and capabilities or making changes to the resources available to the firm (Morrow, Sirmon, Hitt, & Holcomb, 2007). Having to "muddle through", may allow bricoleurs to discover entirely new opportunities unimaginable in situations of high resource availability (Baker and Nelson, 2005, Baker *et al.*, 2003; Hmieleski and Corbett, 2006). The in-depth knowledge of available resources provide an understanding, not only of what things are, but of how they can be *related* to one another (Duymedjian and Rülings, 2010). With the use of dynamic capabilities (Teece, Pisano and Shuen, 1997), skills in resource combination, and knowledge about the social needs that are local and therefore non-discernible or easily misunderstood from afar (Zahra, *et al.*, 2009), the social bricoleur get the resources assembled, tested, discarded, substituted, configured and reconfigured to produce outcomes.

Alternatively, Steffens *et al.*, (2009) expects high level of bricolage to have counteracting influences with respect to the overall level of advantage / disadvantage across the broad range of resources of the firm. As noted earlier, nascent firms more often than not, however, face severe resource constraints during venture creation (Shepherd Douglas and Shanley, 2000). They may not have access to the necessary resources required for developing innovative outcomes (Teece, 1986) but instead of waiting for a 'better time' or decline to pursue the opportunity, they adopt a bricolage approach, which includes a bias for action (Baker and Nelson (2005) or bend the rules of what resources "should" versus "could" be used for (Senyard, Baker and Steffens, 2010). In other words, some resource areas of the firm will not be developed to the fullest. After committing to the creation of a firm and defining what the firm is to become, bricolage may be considered as "the only thing we can personally do" (Lanzara, 1999). Arguably, "bricolage is usually associated with second best solutions, maladaptation, imperfection, inefficiency, incompleteness, slowness, but as a matter of fact in many design situations it is the only thing we can reasonably do when we are engaged in action" (Ibid). Also, most authors attest to the fact that "making do" solutions may prove to be of lower or inferior quality or technically inferior (Garud and Karnoe, 2003) or 'just good enough' (Berchicci and Hulsink, 2006). Firms engaged in higher levels of bricolage behaviours will tend to recombine existing resources to address a problem or opportunity (Steffens, Senyard, and Baker, 2009). However, resource combination frequently shift and change as bricoleurs tinker and experiment (Lanzara, 1999) for new unexpected cultural resources (Miettinen and Virkkunen, 2005). In effect, constant tinkering and experimentation may result to a tremendous waste of financial and human resources (Ciborra, 2002) which is costly for young social ventures to afford.

Normally, recombining existing resources to address a problem or opportunity is the role of the entrepreneur and applying elements of improvisation and creativity (Hmieleski and Corbett, 2006). In some cases, this overcomes limitations in social entrepreneurship as unintentionally, bricolage may pioneer new capabilities that sometimes assists social ventures to alleviate resource constraints as an opportunity to scale up (Philips and Tracey, 2007; Di Domenico *et al.*, 2010). Particularly, the actions

of social bricoleurs facilitate economic development and sustainability of social ventures. Illustrating, "the role of the hiding hand" in the context of homelessness, *Association la Voute Nubienne (AVN)*, a hybrid non-profit organization founded in 1998, have created a self-sustaining construction market by training farmers in the construction of homes with vaulted earth-brick roofs in Burkina Faso. The home design provides an affordable, ecologically sustainable housing alternative for the right Sahel desertified environment.

5. CONCLUSION

SE in the context of important problems, such as durable poverty, environmental degradation, endemic violent conflict, and demographic unbalances is increasingly attracting the attention of management scholars (Dacin, Dacin and Matear, 2010; Mair and Marti, 2009). On the other hand, social entrepreneurs are faced with declining support from traditional philanthropic and government sources. As desperate times call for desperate measures, the traditional entrepreneurship theory of causation may not only be suitable to study venture establishment in an uncertain environment. Sarasvathy (2001) posit that, causation theory is more useful in static, linear, and independent environments with focus on the predictable aspects of an uncertain future. Instead, effectuation and bricolage approaches, which are consistent with creation theory, are more visible for research-based knowledge in establishing new social ventures in resource constrained environment. However, few studies to date have adopted the emerging behavioral theories of effectuation and bricolage to study SE (Zahra *et al.*, 2009; Desa and Basu, 2013; Desa, 2011, Di Domenico, Haugh and Tracey, 2010).

REFERENCES

- Aldrich, H. E. (1999). *Organizations Evolving*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications
- Alvarez, S. A. & Barney, J. B. (2007). Discovery and Creation: Alternative Theories of Entrepreneurial Actions. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*. Vol. 1, Issue 1-2.
- Alvord, S. H., Brown, L. D., & Letts, C. W. (2004). Social Entrepreneurship and Societal Transformation. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 40 (3): 260-282.
- Austin, J., Stevenson, H. & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship: Same, Different, or Both? *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice* 30 (1): 1-22.
- Bacq, S. & Janssen, F. (2011). The Multiple Faces of Social Entrepreneurship: A Review of Definitional Issues Based on Geographical and Thematic Criteria. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 23: 5-6, 373-403.
- Baker, T. & Aldrich, H. E. (2000). Bricolage and resource-seeking: Improvisational responses to dependence in entrepreneurial firms. Working Paper. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Baker, T., Miner, A. & Easley, D. (2003). "Improving firms: Bricolage, account giving and improvisational competency in the founding process." *Research Policy*. Vol. 32. No. 2: 255-276.
- Baker, T. & Nelson, R. (2005). Creating something from nothing: Resource construction through entrepreneurial bricolage. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 50, 329-366.
- Battilana, J. & Dorado, S. (2010). Building Sustainable Hybrid Organizations: The Case of Commercial Microfinance Organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*. Vol. 53, No. 6, 1419-1440.
- Berchecchi, L. & Hulsink, W. (2006) *Of Bikes and Men: Innovation patterns and strategic entrepreneurship in the human-powered vehicle sector*. Strategic Entrepreneurship: the role of networking Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.
- Bird, B. & Schjoedt, L. (2009). Entrepreneurial behavior: Its nature, scope, recent research, and agenda for future research. In A.L. Carsrud & M. Brännback (Eds.), *Understanding the entrepreneurial mind (international studies in entrepreneurship)* (pp. 327-358). New York: Springer.
- Bosma, N. & Levie, J. (2009). Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2009 Executive Report, GERA, Babson.
- Brush, C. G., Carter, N., Gatewood, E., Greene, P. & Hart, M. (2006). The use of bootstrapping by women entrepreneurs in positioning for growth. *Venture Capital*. Vol. 8 No. 1: 15-31.
- Brush, C. G., Greene, P. G. & Hart, M. M. (2001). From initial idea to unique advantage: The entrepreneurial challenge of constructing a resource base. *Academy of Management Executive*. Vol. 15. No. 1: 64-80.
- Bruton, G. D., Ahlstrom, D. & Obloj, K. (2008). Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economics: Where Are We Today and Where Should the Research Go in the Future. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*. Baylor University.
- Chandler, G.N., DeTienne, D., McKelvie, A., & Mumford, A. (2011). Causation and effectuation processes: A validation study. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26, 375-390.
- Chell, E. (2007). Social enterprise and entrepreneurship: Towards a convergent theory of the entrepreneurial process. *International Small Business Journal*, 25(1), 5-26.
- Christensen, C. M., & Bower, J. L. (1995). Disruptive technologies: Catching the wave. *Harvard Business Review*, January-February.
- Ciborra, C. (2002) *The Labyrinths of Information: Challenging the Wisdom of Systems*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ciborra, C. U. (1996). The platform organization: Recombining strategies, structures and surprises. *Organization Science*, 7, 103-118.
- Collier, P. (2007). *The Bottom Billion: Why the poorest countries are failing and what can be done about it*. Oxford University Press.
- Dacin, P. A., Dacin, M. T., & Matear, M. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: Why we don't need a new Theory and how we move forward from here. *Academy of Management Perspective*.

- Dacin, M. T., Dacin, P. A. & Tracey, P. (2011). Social Entrepreneurship: A Critique and Future Directions. *Organization Science*. Vol. 22:1203-1213.
- Desa, G. (2011). Resource mobilization in international social entrepreneurship: Bricolage as a mechanism of institutional transformation. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*.
- Desa, G. & Basu, S. (2013). Optimization or Bricolage? Overcoming resource constraints in global social entrepreneurship. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*. [Online] Available from: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2177185 [Assessed: Thursday, March 7, 2013 at 18:23].
- Di Domenico, M., & Haugh, H. (2007). Strategic partnering: Results from a survey of social ventures in the UK. Paper presented at the International Social Entrepreneurship Research Conference, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Di Domenico, M., Haugh, H., & Tracey, P. (2010). Social bricolage: Theorizing social value creation in social entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*.
- Di Domenico, M., Tracey, P., & Haugh, H. (2009). The dialectic of social exchange: Theorizing corporate social enterprise collaboration. *Organization Studies*. Vol. 887.
- Duymedjian, R. & Rülings, C. C. (2004). Practices of physical and digital special effect practices of physical and digital special effects making: An exploration of similarities.
- Duymedjian, R. & Rülings, C. C. (2010). Towards a foundation of bricolage in organization and management theory. *Organization Studies*. Vol. 31. No. 2: 133-151.
- Emerson, J., & Bonini, S. (2003). *The Blended Value Map: Tracking the intersects and opportunities of economic, social and environmental value creation*. Palo Alto, CA: Skoll Foundation.
- Ferneley, E & Bell, F. (2006). Using bricolage to integrate business and information technology innovation in SMEs. *Technovation*. Vol. 26. No. 2: 232-241.
- Garud, R. & Karnoe, P. (2003). Bricolage versus breakthrough: distributed and embedded agency in technology entrepreneurship. *Research Policy*. Vol. 32: 277-300.
- Garud, R., Kumaraswamy, A., & Nayyar, P. (1998) Real options or fool's gold: perspective makes the difference. *Academy of Management Review*, 3(2), 212-214.
- Griffiths, M., Gundry, L., Kickul, J., & Fernandez, A. (2009). Innovation ecology as a precursor to entrepreneurial growth: A Cross-country empirical investigation. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*. Vol. 16. No. 3: 375-390.
- Gundry, L. K., Kickul, J. R., Griffiths, M. D., & Bacq, S. C. (2011). Entrepreneurial bricolage and innovation ecology: Precursors to social innovation? *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*. Vol. 13: Iss. 19, Article 3.
- Hargadon, A. & Sutton, R. I. (1997). 'Technology brokering and innovation in a product development firm', *Administrative Science Quarterly*. Vol. 42: 716-749.
- Haugh, H. (2007). Community-led social venture creation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. Baylor University.
- Hmieleski, K. M. & Corbett, A. C. (2006). Proclivity for improvisation as a predictor of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Small Business Management*. Vol. 44. No. 1: 45-63.
- Karanda, C. & Toledano, N. (2012). Social entrepreneurship in South Africa: A different narrative for a different context. *Social Enterprise Journal*, Vol. 8 No. 3:201-215.
- Katzenstein, J. & Chrispin, B. R. (2011). Social entrepreneurship and a new model for international development in the 21st century. *Journal of Development Entrepreneurship*. Vol. 16, No. 1:87-102.
- Kerlin, J. A. (2013). Defining social enterprise across different contexts: A conceptual framework based on institutional factors. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 42, 1: 84-108.
- Kerlin, J. A. (2010). A comparative analysis of the global emergence of social enterprise. *Voluntas*, 21:162-179.
- Kiggundu, M. N. (2002). Entrepreneurs and Entrepreneurship in Africa: What is Known and What Needs to be Done. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*.
- Kistruck, G. M. & Beamish, P. W. (2010). The Interplay of Form, Structure and Embeddedness in Social Intrapreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. Baylor University.
- Kistruck, G. M., Webb, J. W., Sutter, C. J., & Ireland, R. D. (2011). Microfranchising in Base-of-the-Pyramid Markets: Institutional Challenges and Adaptations to the Franchise Model. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. Baylor University. Vol. 35, 3.

- Knott, J. H., & McCarthy, D. (2007). Policy venture capital: Foundations, government partnerships, and child care programs. *Administration & Society*, 39(3), 319–353.
- Lanzara, G. F. (1999) Between transient constructs and persistent structures: Designing systems in action. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems* 8(4): 331-349.
- Levi-Strauss, C. (1967). *The savage mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Low, C. (2006). A framework for the governance of social enterprises. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 33(5/6), 376–385.
- Mair, J. & Marti, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41, 36–44.
- Mair, J. & Marti, I. (2007). Entrepreneurship for social impact: Encouraging market access in rural Bangladesh. Vol. 7. No. 4: 493-501.
- Mair, J. & Marti, I. (2009). Entrepreneurship in and Around Institutional Voids: A Case Study from Bangladesh. *Journal of Business Venturing*. No. 24: 419–435. Elsevier.
- March, J.G. & Olsen, J.P. (1975). The uncertainty of the past: Organizational ambiguous learning. *European Journal of Political Research*, 3, 147–171.
- Masendeke, A., & Mugova, A. (2009). Social enterprise in Zimbabwe and Zambia. In J. Kerlin (Ed.), *Social enterprise. A global comparison*. Lebanon, NH: Tufts University Press.
- Miettinen, R., & Virkkunen, J. (2005). Epistemic objects, artefacts and organizational change. *Organization*. Vol. 12: 437–456.
- Morrow, J. L., Sirmon, D. G., Hitt, M. A., & Holcomb, T. R. (2007) Creating value in the face of declining performance: Firm strategies and organizational recovery. *Strategic Management Journal* 28(3): 271-283.
- Pearce, J., & Doh, J. P. (2005). The high impact of collaborative social initiatives. *Sloan Management Review*, 46(3), 329–339.
- Penrose, E. (1959). *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Peredo, A. M. & Chrisman, J. J. (2006). Towards a Theory of Community-based enterprise. *Academy of Management Review*. Vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 309-328.
- Philips, N., & Tracey, P. (2007). Opportunity recognition, entrepreneurial capabilities and bricolage: Connecting Institutional theory and entrepreneurship in strategic organization. *Strategic Organization*. Vol. 5. No. 3: 313-320.
- Poon, D. (2011). The Emergence and Development of Social Enterprise Sectors. *Social Impact Research Experience Journal*. Wharton School.
- Rao, H., Monin, P. & Durand, R. (2003). Border crossing: Bricolage and the erosion of categorical boundaries in French gastronomy. *American Sociological Review*. Vol. 70. No. 6: 968-991.
- Rehn, A. & Taalas, S. (2004). Acquaintances and connections - blat, the Soviet Union, and mundane entrepreneurship". *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*. Vol. 16, No. 3.
- Robson, P. J. A., & Obeng, B. A. (2008). The barrier to growth in Ghana. *Small Business Economics*. Vol. 30, No. 4: 385-403.
- Sarasvathy, S.D. (2001). Causation and effectuation: Towards a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 243–288.
- Sarasvathy, S.D. (2008). *Effectuation: Elements of entrepreneurial expertise*. *New horizons in entrepreneurship research*. Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Sarasvathy, S.D. & Dew, N. (2005). New market creation as transformation. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 15(5), 533–565.
- Seelos, C., Ganly, K., & Mair, J. (2006). Social Entrepreneurs Directly Contribute to Global Development Goals. In Mair, J., Robinson, J. & Hockerts, K. (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship* (pp. 235–254). Basingstoke, United Kingdom. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2005). Social entrepreneurship: Creating new business models to serve the poor. *Business Horizons*, 48, 241-246.
- Senyard, J., Baker, T., & Davidson, P. (2009). Entrepreneurial bricolage: Towards systematic empirical testing. *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*: Vol. 29: Iss. 5, Article 5. [Online] Available from: <http://digitalknowledge.babson.edu/fer/vol29/iss5/> [on Thursday, March 24, 2013 at 14:29].

- Senyard, J. M., Baker, T. & Steffens, P. R. (2010). *Entrepreneurial Bricolage and firm performance: moderating effects of firm change and innovativeness*. In : 2010 Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management - Dare to Care: Passion and Compassion in Management Practice & Research, 6 - 10 August, Montreal, Canada.
- Senyard, J., Davidsson, P., & Steffens, P. (2010). The role of bricolage and resource constraints in high potential sustainability ventures. In: 2010 BCERC: Babson College Entrepreneurship Research Conference, 10-12 June, Lausanne, Switzerland. (In Press). [Online] Available from: QUT Digital Repository: <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/> [Accessed: Sunday, April 7, 2013 at 06:09].
- Shepherd, D. A. Douglas, E. G. & Shanley, M. (2000). New venture survival: Ignorance, external shocks, and risk reduction strategies. *Journal of Business Venturing*. Vol. 15. No. 5-6: 393-410.
- 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*. Vol. 32. No. 1: 273-292.
- Smith, B. R., & Stevens, C. E. (2010). Different types of social entrepreneurship: The role of geography and embeddedness on the measurement and scaling of social value. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*. Vol. 22, No. 6: 575-598.
- Steffens, Senyard, and Baker (2009). Linking resource acquisition and development processes to resource-based advantage: bricolage and the resource-based view. In: *6th AGSE International Entrepreneurship Research Exchange*, 4-6 Feb. 2009, University of Adelaide, Adelaide.
- Steyaert, C., & Katz, J. (2004). Reclaiming the space of entrepreneurship in society: Geographical, discursive and social dimensions. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 16: 179-96.
- Stinchcombe, A. L. (1965). Social structure and organizations. In J. D. March (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizations* (pp. 142-193). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G. & Shuen, A. (1997) Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal* 18(7): 509-533.
- Teng, B. S. (2007). Corporate entrepreneurship activities through strategic alliances: A resource-based approach toward competitive advantage. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44(1), 119–142.
- Timmons, J. S. (2009). *New Venture Creation: Entrepreneurship for the 21st Century*. Boston: McGraw Hill/Irwin.
- Tracey, P. & Phillips, N. (2007). The Distinctive Challenge of Educating Social Entrepreneurs: A Postscript and Rejoinder to the Special Issue on Entrepreneurship Education. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 6, 264-271.
- United Nations (2007). *The Millennium Development Goals Report*. New York.
- Venkataraman, S. (1997). The distinctive domain of entrepreneurship research: An editor's perspective. In J. Katz & R. Brockhaus (eds.), *Advances in Entrepreneurship, firm emergence and growth* (Volume 3, pp. 119–138). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Visser, K. (2011). Social entrepreneurship in South Africa: context, relevance and extent. *Industry and Higher Education*. Vol. 25, No. 4:233-247.
- von Hippel, E. (2005). *Democratizing Innovation*. MIT Press: Cambridge, MA.
- von Hippel, E. & von Krogh, G. (2003). Open Source software and the 'Private-Collective' innovation model: Issues for organization science. *Organization Science*. Vol. 14. No. 2: 209-233.
- Weerawardena, J., McDonald, R. E. & Mort, G. S. (2010). Sustainability of nonprofit organizations: An empirical investigation.
- Weick, K. E. (1993). The collapse of sense making in organizations. The mann gulch disaster. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. Vol. 38. No. 4: 628-652.
- Wiklund, J., Baker, T. & Shepherd, D. (2009). The age-effect of financial indicators as buffers against the liability of newness, *Journal of business Venturing*.
- World Bank, (2002). *World Development Report: Building institutions for markets*. Oxford University Press. New York, NY.

- Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O. & Shulman, J. M. (2009). A Typology of Social Entrepreneurs: Motives, Search Processes and Ethical Challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing* 24: 519-532.
- Zahra, S. A., Rawhouser, H. N., Bhawe, N., Neubaum, D. O. & Hayton, J. C. (2008). Globalization of Social Entrepreneurship Opportunities. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* 2: 117-131.

APPENDIX - THEORIES OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP BEHAVIOURS

Effectuation Theory	Bricolage Theory	Creation Theory
<p>Items pertaining to the effectuation construct loaded onto four factors:</p> <p>Experimentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develops multiple variations of a product or service to arrive at a commercial offering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Creation of multiple different product prototypes _ Delivering different services in the process of finding an offering • Experiments with different ways to sell and/or deliver a product or service: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Use of different distribution channels _ Use of different revenue models • Changes the product or service substantially as the venture develops <p>Affordable loss</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commits only limited amounts of resources to the venture at a time: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Seeks out ways of doing things in inexpensive ways • Limits the resources committed to the venture in to what could be lost: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Develops product or service using only personal resources <p>Flexibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responds to unplanned opportunities as they arise: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Rapidly changes the offering or revenue model of the venture as new opportunities arise • Adapts what they are doing to the resources on hand: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Focuses on what is readily available when deciding on a course of action • Avoids courses of action that restrict flexibility and adaptability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Consciously rejects courses of action that will lock them in (relationships or investments) <p>Pre-commitments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enters into agreements with customers, suppliers, and other organizations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Negotiates with other parties prior to having a fully developed product or service 	<p>Bricolage definition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Takes identifiable action to solve problems: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Experiments to solve problems (instead of trying to figure it out conceptually) • Combines existing resources in creating solutions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Uses goods on hand to create solutions to solve problems _ Uses readily available skills to create solutions to solve problems _ Uses existing contacts to create solutions to solve problems • Reuses resources for purposes other than those for which they were originally designed. • Uses existing resources (rather than seeking resources from outside). <p>Bricolage domains</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses forgotten, discarded, worn, or presumed “single-application” materials to create new solutions (physical inputs): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Uses physical goods for surprising purposes • Involves customers, suppliers, and hangers-on in projects (labor inputs): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Regularly interacts with other stakeholders (physical presence at the venture; online interaction) • Encourages the use of amateur and self-taught skills that would otherwise go unapplied (skills inputs). • Works around rules and standards (institutional environment): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Does things that surprise people, e.g., bumping up against norms or laws 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main assumption There is no “end” until the creation process has unfolded, i.e., opportunities cannot be understood until they exist, and they only exist after they are enacted in an iterative process of action and reaction (Weick, 1979). • Theoretical Approach Consistent with effectuation and bricolage Approaches. • Objectives Opportunities are created, endogenously, by the actions, reactions, and enactment of entrepreneurs exploring ways to produce new products or services (Baker and Nelson, 2005; Gartner, 1985; Sarasvathy, 2001; Weick, 1979). • Time orientation Entrepreneurs do not wait for exogenous shocks to form opportunities and then provide agency to those opportunities, they act (Baker and Nelson, 2005; Sarasvathy, 2001). • Nature of Entrepreneurs May or may not differ from non entrepreneurs, ex ante. Differences may emerge, ex post. • Decision making context Uncertain

Source: Adapted from Fisher (2012), Chandler et al., (2011), Sarasvathy (2001), Baker & Nelson (2005), Senyard et al., (2009), Weick (1979), Gartner (1985).