

Unfolding Bricolage in Social Entrepreneurship: A Way Forward for Future Research

MISBAH NOOR

PhD Scholar, Islamia College Peshawar

Email: misbahnoor86@yahoo.com

FAYAZ ALI SHAH

Assistant Professor, Department of Management Sciences, Islamia College, Peshawar.

Email: fayaz@icp.edu.pk

SHAHID JAN KAKAKHEL

Associate Professor/Chairman

Department of Management Sciences, Islamia College, Peshawar

Email: shahidjan@icp.edu.pk

Abstract

Social entrepreneurship has been recently becoming center of attention for academicians and practitioners. It is mainly because of its critical role in addressing unmet needs and social problems of underprivileged communities around the globe. Social entrepreneurs are often confronted with the scarcity of resources as they are inherently located in resource constrained settings. Given the scarcity of resources and the crucial role of social entrepreneurship, bricolage is emerging as a promising strategy to address resource scarcity in impoverished settings. In this vein, this paper provides a comprehensive review of literature on bricolage and how it unfolds in social entrepreneurship. The review also sheds light on the conceptual evolution of bricolage and how it invades the entrepreneurship literature. A systematic approach was adopted for conducting the literature search in order to capture all the recent work on bricolage in context of social entrepreneurship. The review shows that most of the studies on bricolage in context of social entrepreneurship are concentrated in developed countries and more stable environments with only few exceptions. Also social bricolage theory which is an extension of entrepreneurial bricolage is still understudied and needs further investigation and documentation. The paper holds particular relevance for academicians and researchers as it provides useful insights into concepts of bricolage and its relevance to social entrepreneurship.

Keywords: *Entrepreneurship, Bricolage, Social Entrepreneurship, Social Bricolage.*

Introduction

Social entrepreneurship is becoming one of the most promising avenue and center of attention for many scholars and practitioners over the last two decades. One of the major reason for the increased popularity of the field is the ability of social entrepreneurs to bring about transformational changes by filling the institutional voids in areas not adequately addressed by the existing bodies (government and highly commercialized private sector) (Schaefer, Corner & Kearins, 2015). But the sad part of the story is that despite of the critical role of social entrepreneurs in meeting the needs of underserved individuals and societies, they face certain distinctive challenges such as lack of political and institutional support and particularly difficulties in mobilizing the needed resources as they mostly work in impoverished resource

constrained settings . Sunley and Pinch (2012) highlighted the resource challenges of social enterprises and argued that financial and other resource constraints are the major challenges that social entrepreneurs face during their growth and development phases, thus slowing down the pace of creating social value and adversely affects their ability to be innovative.

Against this backdrop, social entrepreneurs while facing scarcity of resources always try to come up with the most practical solutions for the existing difficulties and challenges. As social entrepreneurs strive hard to solve various multifaceted problems by using sustainable and scalable approaches, therefore they attempt to understand and change or sometimes even create the products, and offer most appropriate solutions to address the problems at hand. Literature shows that there are different theoretical perspectives that provides logic and explain behaviors of entrepreneurs when faced with the scarcity of resources (Desa & Basu, 2013; Rawhouser, Villanueva, & Newbert, 2017). Such as entrepreneurial bricolage (Baker & Nelson, 2005), user entrepreneurship (Shah & Tripsas, 2007), and effectuation (Sarasvathy, 2001). Despite of some similarities ,their distinctiveness has been widely documented (Fisher, 2012; Selden & Fletcher, 2015; Welter, Mauer, & Wuebker, 2016).Among these perspectives entrepreneurial bricolage and effectuation have been the center of attention for providing behavioral models and giving general explanations of what entrepreneurs do in practice i.e. to exploit an opportunity(Fisher, 2012;Welter et al., 2016).

Baker and Nelson in 2005, explained that bricolage involves making do with what is at hand, while denying to be constrained by restrictions and limitations in impoverished settings. Therefore bricolage can be regarded as the most suitable theory for explaining resource mobilization under conditions of resource scarcity as it describes resources as socially constructed, allowing the social mechanisms to help create something from nothing(Bacq, Ofstein, Kickul & Gundry,2015;Baker &Nelson , 2005;Fisher,2012;Linna ,2013; Servantie & Rispal, 2018).

Thus owing to the critical role of social entrepreneurship in addressing the unmet needs of the society and serving the marginalized communities and realizing the importance of bricolage as one of the key drivers of creating value by means of entrepreneurial innovation (Baker & Nelson, 2005), this paper attempts to provide a comprehensive review of literature on bricolage and how it unfolds in the context of social entrepreneurship.

Methodology of the Study

This section discusses various factors that were being considered while writing the review in order to make it more systematic, comprehensive and logical. First of all, a list of keywords such as *bricolage*, *entrepreneurship*, *social bricolage* and *social entrepreneurship* was developed in order to keep the search more focused. These keywords were then used to search the online databases such as Web of Science, Scopus, Emerald, Elsevier and Springer Link for locating the literature most relevant to our topic. Moreover in order to keep the review focused only those articles were selected for the purpose of review from initial set of papers generated after search via key terms, which explicitly focused on bricolage in context of social entrepreneurship. Also in order to have more recent view on bricolage in social entrepreneurship, only those articles were selected and reviewed that were published from 2000 and onwards in impact factor key journals having papers relevant to our area of study.

Conceptual Evolution of Bricolage

Levi Strauss (1966), a French anthropologist was the first one to introduce the notion of bricolage and defined it as “making do by using resources at hand” (p.17) in his book “*The Savage Mind*”. Since then, the initial idea of bricolage kept on evolving and grown to be enormously popular (Duymedjian & Rüling, 2010). Levi Strauss contrasted the bricoleurs with “civilized” engineers and argued that a bricoleur make use of already available means and resources, hence overcoming the constraints (German & Barrett, 2005)

while on the other hand an engineer mobilize resources intended for a specific project meeting that particular project's requirements.

Bricolage strategy contrasts optimization which involves acquiring resources of high quality with proven capability to be used for specific purpose for which these resources are actually intended for (Desa & Basu, 2013). Resources can be described as assets, information, processes and attributes of a firm, its capabilities and the acquired/required knowledge (Barney, 1991). According to Bacq, Ofstein, Kickul and Gundry (2015) there can be material resources or non-material resources such as knowledge and skills.

Levi Strauss reacted to individual bricoleur by arguing that bricolage occurs when an individual tries to accomplish any specific task by making use of limited stock of materials from different sources, as he has nothing else to be used. In other words Levi Strauss's definition refers to the creative use of whatever is at hand. Bricoleur can be described as an entrepreneur who can work creatively under pressure and uses and recombines whatever is at hand into something creative and novel (Weick, 1993). Whenever it is necessary a bricoleur can re-strategize in order to respond to disasters (Johannisson & Olaison, 2007) and unexpected situations (Ciborra, 1996) by employing different creative organizational combinations. According to Johannisson and Olaison (2007) bricolage is about handling and surviving unanticipated and sudden circumstances. Weick (1993) also associated bricolage with resilience and argues that it helps an individual to take action in order to overcome a crisis. Thus it can be argued that bricolage is linked with improvisation (Baker, Miner, & Eesley, 2003) in an unforeseen situation or more generally in an ever-changing dynamic environment.

Literature shows that Le Loarne (2005), also regarded creativity and bricolage as two analogical concepts and said that "*Bricolage is considered as one kind of creativity*" (p.1). According to Le Loarne (2005), there are three components on which bricolage is based i.e. (1) the identity of the bricoleurs (2) the process through which resources are accumulated (3) and the environment from which the resources are acquired regarded as "unwanted".

Entrepreneurship Literature Embracing Bricolage

Review of extant literature shows that the concept of making do with whatever is at hand has been in use and applicable to different disciplines such as political science, innovation, genetics, economics, education and entrepreneurship (Baker, 2007; Desa, 2011). Particularly the entrepreneurship literature embraced the concept of bricolage in 2003. When Baker and colleagues extended the initial concept of bricolage of 'making do' to 'refusal to enact limitations' as they observed the entrepreneurs to be actively engaged in refusing the constraints imposed by different environmental settings. Later in 2005, Baker and Nelson examined the behavior of different resource scarce firms and argued that how firms in resource scarce settings can offer unique goods and services by making use of and recombining the existing resources for different new purposes. They explained how firms create something new from those resources that were actually unwanted or regarded as useless by other firms i.e. Baker and Nelson view the firm as being the "*bricoleur*". Whereas on the other hand Phillips and Tracy (2007) defined bricoleurs in terms of entrepreneurs. According to Phillips and Tracy, bricoleurs can be described as those entrepreneurs that challenge the traditional conservative views, regarding the part played by the environment, in shaping an organization's success or its failure.

Baker and Nelson (2005) described bricolage as application of different combinations of resources in order to solve problems and capitalize on opportunities in an effort of making do with already available resources. Thus it would not be wrong to say that entrepreneurs through bricolage try to "recycle" combine and reuse the existing resources (Baker & Nelson, 2005) i.e. it involves reusing and deploying the discarded, unwanted and ignored resources innovatively rather than using them for the purposes for which they are originally intended for (Di Domenico et al., 2010). Baker and Nelson further argued that bricolage can be seen with respect to different domains such as customers, physical inputs, labor, skills and

institutional or regulatory domains. They also associated bricolage with a number of different elements such as collection of various physical resources, networking and reliance on self-taught skills that are acquired via experience (Ronkko, Peltonen, & Arenius, 2013) rather than relying on high quality skills developed as a result of high cost specialized trainings. During their study, Baker and Nelson, found that there were firms who were involved in parallel bricolage i.e. practicing bricolage in every domain and use every element of it, also they noticed that some firms practice selective bricolage i.e. using bricolage in some aspects but bricolage doesn't constitute an essential element of their entire business activity and then also there were some firms that doesn't use bricolage at all. Baker and Nelson, observed that those (firms) who were using selective bricolage were growing but the firms with no and parallel bricolage were not able to grow or found difficulties in their growth. Baker and Nelson attributed mutually exclusive nature of parallel bricolage to be considered as major barrier in growth of these firms and argued that a move from parallel to selective bricolage is important in order to enter broader markets (Baker & Nelson, 2005).

Other than Baker and Nelson, literature also highlights other scholars who have discussed the role of bricolage in entrepreneurship such as Vanevenhoven, Winkel, Malewicki, Dougan and Bronson (2011) discussed the effect of bricolage on entrepreneurship and argued that viability of entrepreneurial activity improves through bricolage as it provides means by which bricoleurs can progress through entrepreneurial process. They explained how through bricolage entrepreneurs can leverage internal and external resources for sustainability and advancement of their venture.

Literature review shows that in an effort of making do with what is available, bricoleurs attempt to refuse to enact limitations (Baker & Nelson, 2005). Baker and Nelson, introduced this constructive viewpoint to bricolage and observed that some firms consciously and frequently tend to ignore and disregard the limitations imposed by the scarcity of resources and standard norms by coming up with and observing different solutions. They observed that firms in their study consciously tried to test and challenge conventional limitations. Later in 2010, Di Domenico and colleagues redefined this construct of refusal to enact limitations by the refusal to be constrained by limitations through illustrating that how some firms intentionally and frequently responded to conventional limitations by developing such offerings that undermine these limitations and created social value. Literature witnesses that many other scholars also later supported this second construct of bricolage i.e. "refusal to be enacted by limitations" such as Molecke and Pinkse (2017) argued that entrepreneurs by engaging in bricolage do not accept the limitations imposed by their environment rather they try to make what is required and possible with whatever resources they have at hand.

Moreover if we look at the notion of relying on "resources at hand" it seems that it is much more similar and refers to the critical role of internal resources of a firm as highlighted by Penrose in 1959. However in the previous studies the term "at hand" has been expanded to even include resources that can be readily acquired and available from somewhere else outside the organization (Baker & Nelson, 2005). This refers to the utilization of those local untapped and hidden resources that are not adequately used or identified and valued by other parties and consequently available to the organizations at very low cost (Di Domenico et al, 2010). Hence it can be argued that bricolage may involve acquiring resources from external sources and partners, creating a mutually beneficial joint enterprise, referring towards collective bricolage (Duymedjian & Ruling, 2010).

Furthermore from the literature it is evident that Baker and Nelson (2005) also highlighted the critical role of using external resources through the notion of selective bricolage suggesting that combination, acquisition and reconfiguration of resources allow the firms to disrupt the pre-existing practices and norms. Thus allowing the organization to strategically get involved in more deep seated and innovative actions with greater potential for growth (Baker & Nelson, 2005).

Review of extant literature also highlights another important and closely related construct of bricolage i.e. improvisation. Although the process of bricolage is hardly planned but since the bricoleurs have complete understanding of the internal knowledge and the resource abilities of their organizations along with the external environment, they usually tend to improvise (Weick, 1998). Among several different studies on improvisation, the most prominent one is that of Weick (1993), where he used jazz improvisation as a vehicle to position his ideas for discussing improvisation in organizations. According to Weick, improvisation doesn't involve any preplanned working as it is used to address the unexpected situations and events. Actually improvisation happens in case of substantial convergence between plan and its implementation i.e. it occurs between decision and action (Moorman & Miner, 2013). That is why intimate information and knowledge about all the existing resources is needed for improvisation (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2001) in order to be able to respond to unexpected situations.

It has been observed that two important elements i.e. creativity and intuition forms the basis for the process of improvisation (Ryle, 1979; Simon, 1987; Ciborra, 1996). In an unexpected situation it is not possible for improviser to hunt for new resources so they opt for bricolage by making use of those resources that are readily and easily available at hand. Literature shows that improvisation can also be defined as making use of available resources whether they are social, affective or cognitive to resolve an issue as it is experienced (Cunha, Cunha, & Kamoche, 1999). Thus considering improvisation as a characteristic of bricolage, Weick (1993) associated bricolage with improvisation in a study on the Mann Gulch fire disaster in 1949, and showed how bricoleurs were "able to create order out of whatever materials were at hand" replacing "a traditional order with an improvised order" (p.639–640).

Also it has been observed that "improvisation" in practice is very much closely linked with the constructs of bricolage i.e. 'making do' and 'refusal to be constrained by limitations' in many ways. In studies of organizational improvisation it is observed that the practice of 'making do with materials at hand' can be examined and better explored by using the promising lens of improvisation (Miner, Bassoff, & Moorman, 2001). Baker et al. (2003) also recognized improvisation while explaining bricolage as a concept which is mostly employed for describing the resources raised through improvisation. Similarly bricoleurs can be described as "tinkerers . . . improvising, imagining, playing and searching for new, unexpected cultural resources" (Miettinen & Virkkunen, 2005, p. 451). Hence from literature the similarity between the two concepts is evident, which led them to be used as synonyms and interchangeable in many cases (Garud & Karnoe, 2003).

According to Cunha et al. (1999) sometimes bricolage is being seen as a characteristic of improvisation. Many other researchers such as Baker and Nelson (2005) also argued that despite of the fact that people who are improvising are also often engaged in bricolage but sometimes bricolage may also occur independently as an antecedent to improvisation. Also as compared to bricolage in case of improvisation, improvisers doesn't have enough time for resource acquisition, except for using those, that are currently available at hand i.e. there is no time lag in improvisation (Miner et al., 2001).

Thus bricolage and improvisation are similar with respect to the utilization of resources at hand due to time limitations in case of improvisation while due to the resource constraints in case of bricolage. Hence transformation of few scarce resources into valuable outputs is one of the most important elements of bricolage (Desa, 2012).

Social Entrepreneurship and Bricolage

Just as, bricolage has importance in entrepreneurship, literature shows that it holds particular relevance in the field of social entrepreneurship. Bricolage in context of social entrepreneurship, refers to creative and innovative combinations of already existing and scarce resources in order to create positive social impact in communities and societies (Gundry, Kickul, Griffiths, & Bacq, 2011). As evident from the review of extant literature, social entrepreneurship usually flourishes in resource scarce environments under the institutional

voids (Bacq et al., 2015). Therefore the success of social entrepreneurs to create impact depends upon how effectively they combine and make use of scarce resources and offer creative solutions to various social problems (Bacq et al., 2015).

Review of social entrepreneurship literature shows that the field (social entrepreneurship) also witnesses the descriptions of the construct of “making do” (Zahra, Gedajlovich, Niobium, & Shulman, 2009) because social entrepreneurs and their ventures quite often face challenges of resource acquisition as they mostly start out with only limited resources at hand. Thus it can be argued that bricolage serves as a suitable lens to explain how social entrepreneurs and the social ventures are still able to function given the scarcity of resources that they face.

The theme of improvisation is also evident in social entrepreneurship literature with respect to the combination of resources for addressing various social issues. It is argued that social entrepreneurs are capable of addressing environmental constraints by mobilizing and using the resources that are usually not accessible through standard ways and processes. In this vein Di Domenico et al. (2010) elucidated that the assets that are idle and no more required serves as the beginning of community mobilization for the creation of social ventures in many communities. As bricolage involves resources raised through improvisation (Baker et al., 2003), therefore social entrepreneurs attempts to create something through improvisation and creative thinking by trial and error (Di Domenico et al., 2010).

Furthermore literature review also highlights that different extensions and conceptualizations of the traditional concept of bricolage has been made in social entrepreneurship research such as Oliver and McKague (2009) regarded network bricolage as a critical practice in order to realize social outcomes. Later in 2010, Di Domenico and colleagues recognized the importance of bricolage in providing opportunities to the entrepreneurial ventures for mobilizing the resources effectively and innovatively and hence extended the constructs of bricolage i.e. “*making do, the refusal to be constrained by limitations, and improvisation*” by proposing three additional constructs i.e. “*the creation of social value, stakeholder participation and persuasion*” referring to specific ‘*social bricolage*’ approach in context of social entrepreneurship.

The notion of “making do” has been interpreted by Di Domenico et al. (2010) as making use of unused, idle or untapped resources for new purposes which is consistent with much of bricolage literature in entrepreneurship. Their “refusal to be constrained by limitation” is much more similar to what was proposed by Baker and Nelson (2005) with more focus perhaps on “refusal to be constrained” by different regulatory, political and institutional challenges. Di Domenico et al. (2010) also included improvisation in their model of social bricolage as process of trial and error.

However the other three constructs of their proposed model of social bricolage i.e. “social value creation, stakeholder involvement, and persuasion” are way different from the conceptualization of bricolage elsewhere in the literature. The construct of “social value creation” refers that bricolage results in generation of positive social value for the societies and communities while on the contrary it has been widely debated in literature that sometimes bricolage may results in losses to communities because of offering substandard and cheap solutions and breaking the standards and norms (Senyard, Baker, Steffens, & Davidsson, 2014). Similarly the constructs of stakeholder participation and persuasion are also unique and are clearly linked with the social element of “social bricolage” in social entrepreneurship.

Current Status of Research on Bricolage in Social Entrepreneurship Literature

In this section we give a brief and comprehensive review of literary work on bricolage in field of social entrepreneurship. The application of bricolage in social entrepreneurship can be traced back by the work of Zahra et al. (2009) who gave a typology of social entrepreneurs and introduced the notion of “social bricoleurs”. Based upon the ways through which entrepreneurs discover and identify different opportunities, gain access to different resources and pursue their mission, Zahra et al. (2009)

distinguished social entrepreneurs as *social bricoleurs* (addressing different local social issues on small scale), *social constructionist* (addressing needs that are underserved through introducing innovations and reforms to a wider social system) and the *social engineers* who bring revolutionary changes by addressing social issues in prevailing structures. Similarly Halme, Lindeman, and Linna (2012) introduced the concept of *intrapreneurial bricolage* and showed that middle managers in MNCs dedicated to inclusive innovation can serve as *social intrapreneurs* by overcoming organizational and resource constraints and thus promoting pro poor business solutions and models.

Other researchers have also highlighted the significance of bricolage in context of social entrepreneurship. Such as Desa (2012) in a study on 202 social enterprises located in different countries examined the impact of different technological, regulatory and political institutions on the process of resource mobilization i.e. more specifically he studied resource mobilization by social entrepreneurs while working under unsupportive institutional conditions. He found that through bricolage process, social enterprises can survive and overcome the institutional constraints. It has also been found that bricolage is used by the social entrepreneurs in countries having low index ratings with respect to ease of doing business and technological achievements, however no direct link was found between political stability of the country and the use of bricolage by the social entrepreneurs (Desa, 2012). Desa, further demonstrated that use of bricolage can also serve as legitimizing instrument for entrepreneurial venture to alter the institutional pillars.

In the same vein Gundry et al. (2011) called these institutional conditions as 'innovation ecology' and argued that innovation for social impact relies on these conditions. Gundry and colleagues, further explained that the extent to which social entrepreneurs use bricolage directly affects their ability to offer and develop innovative solutions to various social problems, as through bricolage they are better able to attract and modify the existing or readily available resources in novel ways i.e. referring to social innovation. Literature review highlights that Linna (2013) also realized the relationship between social entrepreneurs and innovation and referred to them as 'innovator-entrepreneurs' owing to their ability to offer low cost and affordable solution to the people living at the bottom of pyramid (BOP).

Another important theme emerged from the literature review is the relationship between the bricolage behavior of social ventures and scaling of their (social ventures) social impact. In this vein Bacq et al. (2015) investigated that how scaling of social impact of different social ventures is being influenced by bricolage and attempted to give rationale that why social entrepreneurial firms that are engaged in bricolage are likely to have larger social impact. They tested their hypothesis on a data set of 123 social enterprises and found that there exist a positive relationship between scaling of social impact and bricolage behavior of social enterprises. While scaling of social impact can be described in terms of process by which an organization attempts to match its output through expansion and adaptations, in order to better meet the scale of the social issue that they are addressing (Desa & Koch, 2014). Social impact scaling can further be understood in two ways i.e. "depth impact" and the "breadth impact". Depth impact implies the expansion in the scope of products and services being offered to a particular community i.e. it refers to the qualitative upgrading whereas on the other hand the breadth impact refers to the increase in number of beneficiaries or geographical expansion i.e. the quantitative progression of the impact.

Molecke and Pinkse (2017) made an effort to recognize the underlying relationship between social entrepreneurship and bricolage, investigated how social enterprises use different methodologies for measuring social impact in order to address frictions among various stakeholders in social enterprises through the lens of bricolage. Their study revealed that social entrepreneurs use two approaches for managing frictions with their stakeholders. At first social entrepreneurs strive to delegitimize the traditional formal methodologies that are used to measure the outcome by perceiving them as irrelevant, incomplete, imprudent and immeasurable. Second they attempted to establish the legitimacy of approaches based on bricolage for measurement of social impact.

Although social entrepreneurs may generally face some frictions with their stakeholders, they sometimes do have hard times with their financial resource providers (Sunley & Pinch, 2012). Sunley and Pinch in their study compared two theoretical perspectives i.e. social bricolage and evolutionary entrepreneurialism approach and explained the link between demand and use of funding with the social enterprises' development strategy. The social bricolage approach refers that social enterprises manage to survive in resource constraint environments through improvisation and making use of idle capital. While the second evolutionary approach refers to the reliance of social enterprises on customs and practices that social enterprises have learnt from the environments in which these enterprises are operating.

While reviewing the literature on bricolage in social entrepreneurship we also came across a series of studies that have looked the concept of bricolage in social entrepreneurship from theoretical point of view and compared it with similar concepts such as effectuation, causation and optimization. In this vein, considering the critical role of resources for the development of a venture, Desa and Basu (2013) examined two approaches of resource mobilization i.e. bricolage and optimization and also analyzed the conditions that serves as antecedent for the selection of these approaches. Optimization refers to the acquisition of standard resource having proven capabilities for the specific purpose for which these resources are actually intended for (Garud & Karnoe, 2003). Desa and Basu provided useful insights about how optimization and bricolage are used for resource mobilization under changing conditions and the relative importance of the two approaches. They also found that although optimization and bricolage are contrasting approaches but they are not always substitutes for each other.

Later in 2013, Owusu and Janssen studied bricolage and effectuation and explained that how by using these approaches resource constraints can be overcome by social entrepreneurs in uncertain conditions and studied the effect of these approaches on social ventures. Sarasvathy (2008) described effectuation as the logic of entrepreneurial expertise. In effectuation an entrepreneur is assumed to have a set of means from which he then attempts to create possible effects (Fisher, 2012) i.e. the common point between effectuation and bricolage is to create or invent something from already available resources. In similar vein Servanti and Rispal (2018) examined how over the lifecycle of a particular venture the combination of causation, bricolage and effectuation changes and also analyzed the elements responsible for such changes. A longitudinal case study approach was used to analyze the underlying behaviors and alternations of the three theories at the development, progression and replication periods of the entrepreneurial process of the case. They provided useful insights into the areas where causation is required and also those for which bricolage or effectuation is needed.

Another important research paper found during literature search that links bricolage with other related concepts is by Nelson and Lima (2019). In their study on community of Córrego d'Antas, which was hit by a natural disaster, Nelson and Lima examined the entrepreneurial actions based on different types and combinations of effectuation, social bricolage and causation. Their study serves to further deepen our understanding on the relationship between bricolage and effectuation particularly in case of response to natural disasters.

Review of extant literature also highlights a stream of work studying the effects of bricolage on social ventures growth and the possible mission drift encountered by these ventures. Such as Ladstaetter, Plank and Hemetsberger (2018) in their study on a social enterprise *Die Bäckerei* that embodies bricolage behavior showed that the potentially conflicting social and economic goals can lead to break downs in social enterprises due to diverging standards for evaluation of their performance resulting from diverging interpretations of their organizational identity. In their study they showed that bricolage can serve both as a cause and a way out for temporary breakdowns while complete breakdowns call for more planning on part of practitioners than they normally do as it imposes a limit to bricolage approach of doing routine business. However their findings are based on a single case and needs further verification.

Similarly Kwong, Tasavori and Cheung (2017) explored impact of collective bricolage on social enterprises' mission and explained how asymmetry of power among partners and nature of their involvement can have influence on their mission. In the same vein Bojica, Jimenez, Nava and Fuentes (2018) explored how bricolage plays important role in the growth of social entrepreneurship organizations (SEOs) and revealed that the influence of bricolage on the growth of SEOs depends upon three factors i.e. resource availability, the extent of control that organization has in using these resources and the top management team diversity in tenure of the organization. They also argued that bricolage is not restricted to resource scarce situations rather in resource rich environment bricolage has more potential to contribute positively towards organizational growth.

More recently, Langevang and Namatovu (2019) extended social bricolage theory to post conflict settings. In their study in post conflict northern Uganda, they showed how social bricolage is employed by a group of marginalized young entrepreneurs to create social change. They showed how mobilizing peers and practices of rekindling cultural resources that existed before war were used to reunite the broken communities. However they found that constructs of stake holder participation and persuasion were less significant and had different dynamics in post war context and calls for the further investigation of the different forms and dynamics of social bricolage model in different contexts.

Discussion

Based on the literature reviewed so far it can be argued that social entrepreneurship has been recently becoming center of attention for academicians and practitioners. It is mainly because of its critical role in addressing unmet needs and social problems of underprivileged communities around the globe. Social entrepreneurs are often confronted with the scarcity of resources as they are inherently located in resource constrained settings. Given the scarcity of resources and the crucial role of social entrepreneurship, bricolage is emerging as a promising strategy to address resource scarcity in impoverished settings. . Many social entrepreneurial ventures are having problems in gaining access to funding and other resources resulting in majority of social entrepreneurs relying on their own restricted stream of resources (Sunley & Pinch, 2012). In other words social entrepreneurs embark bricolage behavior in order to develop distinctive set of resources for creating innovative solutions to various problems. Though in literature on entrepreneurial resourcefulness, bricolage has been widely discussed and emerged as a most promising theme (Davidsson, Baker, & Senyard, 2017) but there is dearth of literature on bricolage in social entrepreneurship. Understanding how bricolage unfolds in social entrepreneurship can help social entrepreneurs in better decision making and strategy implementation. Accordingly the following section of the paper discusses and highlights the potential areas that need to be investigated by future researchers on the basis of the literature reviewed so far.

Future Research Directions

As the review shows that social entrepreneurship research has recently witnessed growth of interest in resource mobilization process of social entrepreneurial ventures (Ciambotti & Pedrini, 2019) because they are inherently located in resource scarce environments and face severe constraints (Desa & Basu, 2013; Linna, 2013; Rawhouser et al, 2017; Janssen et al., 2018). However, most of the studies on bricolage in social entrepreneurship till date are concentrated in developed countries and relatively stable contexts with few exceptions. Literature review also shows that although the social entrepreneurs usually work in resource scarce environments around the globe but these resource constraints become more extensive and severe in case of developing countries marked by extreme poverty, lack of infrastructure and political and economic support (Bacq et al., 2015) therefore there is need for further empirical studies to explore how bricolage uniquely unfolds (Ladstaetter et al., 2018) particularly in a developing country's context and the underlying mechanism that social ventures use to mobilize the scarce resources.

Considering the fact that one of the main characteristic of social entrepreneurial ventures is their ability to combine the resources in an innovative way (Mair & Marti, 2006) it can be argued that bricolage theory provides a useful lens to analyze the resource constraints of such ventures (Bacq et al. 2015; Ladstaetter et al., 2018; Servantie & Rispal, 2018). Particularly 'social bricolage' theory better fits the nature of social entrepreneurial ventures (Ciambotti & Pedrini, 2019; Di Domenico et al., 2010; Janssen et al. 2018; Ladstaetter et al., 2018). Also it is evident from the literature reviewed so far, that much of the debate in social entrepreneurship revolves around network bricolage, entrepreneurial bricolage and intrapreneurial bricolage while there is dearth of studies specifically employing the theoretical lens of social bricolage to study the resource mobilization by social entrepreneurs. Also the additional constructs of *social bricolage* as proposed by Di Domenico et al. (2010) i.e. social value creation, stake holder participation and the persuasion are still understudied and needs further investigation and documentation (Janssen et al., 2018; Ciambotti & Pedrini, 2019). Therefore we suggest that further empirical investigation is needed on resource mobilization practices of social entrepreneurs both at individual and organizational level using the theoretical lens of social bricolage particularly in developing countries' context .

Moreover methodologically, literature is dominated by qualitative single case studies while there is a need for further studies employing multiple case study approach, as multiple case studies allow for literal or theoretical replication (Yin, 2009) and hence making the findings more generalizable or transferable to other similar contexts. Also we suggest that there is need for shift of focus from qualitative to quantitative enquiries and in future researchers should pursue more quantitative studies to further empirically test and validate the bricolage behavior of social entrepreneurs and social enterprises in different socio-economic contexts.

References

- Bacq, S., Ofstein, L. F., Kickul, J. R., & Gundry, L. K. (2015). Bricolage in social entrepreneurship: How creative resource mobilization fosters greater social impact. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 16(4), 283-289.
- Baker, T. (2007). Resources in play: Bricolage in the Toy Store (y). *Journal of business venturing*, 22(5), 694-711.
- 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.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of management*, 17(1), 99-120.
- Bojica, A. M., Ruiz Jiménez, J. M., Ruiz Nava, J. A., & Fuentes-Fuentes, M. M. (2018). Bricolage and growth in social entrepreneurship organisations. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 30(3-4), 362-389.
- Ciambotti, G., & Pedrini, M. (2019). Hybrid harvesting strategies to overcome resource constraints: evidence from social enterprises in Kenya. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1-20.
- Ciborra, C. U. (1996). The platform organization: Recombining strategies, structures, and surprises. *Organization science*, 7(2), 103-118.
- Cooper, A. C., Gimeno-Gascon, F. J., & Woo, C. Y. (1994). Initial human and financial capital as predictors of new venture performance. *Journal of business venturing*, 9(5), 371-395.
- Davidsson, P., Baker, T., & Senyard, J. M. (2017). A measure of entrepreneurial bricolage behavior. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*.
- 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.

- Desa, G., & Koch, J. L. (2014). Scaling social impact: Building sustainable social ventures at the base-of-the-pyramid. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 5(2), 146-174.
- Di Domenico, M., Haugh, H., & Tracey, P. (2010). Social bricolage: Theorizing social value creation in social enterprises. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 34(4), 681-703.
- Duymedjian, R., & Rüling, C. C. (2010). Towards a foundation of bricolage in organization and management theory. *Organization Studies*, 31(2), 133-151.
- Fisher, G. (2012). Effectuation, causation, and bricolage: A behavioral comparison of emerging theories in entrepreneurship research. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 36(5), 1019-1051.
- Garud, R., & Karnøe, P. (2003). Bricolage versus breakthrough: distributed and embedded agency in technology entrepreneurship. *Research policy*, 32(2), 277-300.
- George, G., McGahan, A. M., & Prabhu, J. (2012). Innovation for inclusive growth: Towards a theoretical framework and a research agenda. *Journal of management studies*, 49(4), 661-683.
- 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*, 31(19), 3.
- Halme, M., Lindeman, S., & Linna, P. (2012). Innovation for inclusive business: Intrapreneurial bricolage in multinational corporations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(4), 743-784.
- Janssen, F., Fayolle, A., & Wuillaume, A. (2018). Researching bricolage in social entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 30(3-4), 450-470.
- Johannisson, B., & Olaison, L. (2007). The moment of truth—Reconstructing entrepreneurship and social capital in the eye of the storm. *Review of social economy*, 65(1), 55-78.
- Kwong, C., Tasavori, M., & Wun-mei Cheung, C. (2017). Bricolage, collaboration and mission drift in social enterprises. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 29(7-8), 609-638.
- Ladstaetter, F., Plank, A., & Hemetsberger, A. (2018). The merits and limits of making do: bricolage and breakdowns in a social enterprise. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 30(3-4), 283-309.
- Langevang, T., & Namatovu, R. (2019). Social bricolage in the aftermath of war. *Entrepreneurship & regional development*, 31(9-10), 785-805.
- Le Loarne, S. (2005) 'Bricolage versus creativity what's the difference?' *25th EGOS Colloquium*, Berlin, Technical University, Berlin, Germany, 20 pages.
- Levi-Strauss, C. 1967. *The Savage Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Linna, P. (2013). Bricolage as a means of innovating in a resource-scarce environment: A study of innovator-entrepreneurs at the BOP. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 18(03), 1350015.
- Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of world business*, 41(1), 36-44.
- McKague, K., Oliver, C., & Branzei, O. (2010). Sustainable local enterprise networks: Network bricolage as institutional entrepreneurship in low income economies.
- Miettinen, R., & Virkkunen, J. (2005). Epistemic objects, artifacts and organizational change. *Organization*, 12(3), 437-456.
- Miner, A. S., Bassof, P., & Moorman, C. (2001). Organizational improvisation and learning: A field study. *Administrative science quarterly*, 46(2), 304-337.
- Molecke, G., & Pinkse, J. (2017). Accountability for social impact: A bricolage perspective on impact measurement in social enterprises. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 32(5), 550-568.
- Moorman, C., & Miner, A. S. (1998). Organizational improvisation and organizational memory. *Academy of management Review*, 23(4), 698-723.
- Mosakowski, E. (1998). Entrepreneurial resources, organizational choices, and competitive outcomes. *Organization science*, 9(6), 625-643.
- Nelson, R., & Lima, E. (2019). Effectuations, social bricolage and causation in the response to a natural disaster. *Small Business Economics*, 1-30.
- Owusu, W. A., & Janssen, F. (2013). Social entrepreneurship: Effectuation and bricolage approaches to venture establishment in west Africa. In *4th EMES International Research Conference on Social Enterprise*.
- Penrose, E. T. 1959. *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*. New York: Wiley.

- 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.
- Pina e Cunha, M., Vieira da Cunha, J., & Kamoche, K. (1999). Organizational improvisation: What, when, how and why. *International journal of management reviews*, 1(3), 299-341.
- Rawhouser*, H., Villanueva, J., & Newbert, S. L. (2017). Strategies and tools for entrepreneurial resource access: A cross-disciplinary review and typology. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 19(4), 473-491.
- Rönkkö, M., Peltonen, J., & Arenius, P. (2014). Selective or parallel? Toward measuring the domains of entrepreneurial bricolage. In *Entrepreneurial resourcefulness: Competing with constraints*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Ryle, G. (Ed.) (1979) 'Improvisation', *On Thinking*, Blackwell, London, UK, pp.121–130.
- Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001). Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of management Review*, 26(2), 243-263.
- Sarasvathy, S. D. (2008). New horizons in entrepreneurship. Effectuation: Elements of entrepreneurial expertise. Northampton, MA, US.
- Schaefer, K., Corner, P. D., & Kearins, K. (2015). Social, environmental and sustainable entrepreneurship research: what is needed for sustainability-as-flourishing?. *Organization & environment*, 28(4), 394-413.
- Selden, P. D., & Fletcher, D. E. (2015). The entrepreneurial journey as an emergent hierarchical system of artifact-creating processes. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 30(4), 603-615.
- 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.
- Servantie, V., & Rispal, M. H. (2018). Bricolage, effectuation, and causation shifts over time in the context of social entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 30(3-4), 310-335.
- Shah, S. K., & Tripsas, M. (2007). The accidental entrepreneur: The emergent and collective process of user entrepreneurship. *Strategic entrepreneurship journal*, 1(1-2), 123-140.
- Simon, H. A. (1987). Making management decisions: The role of intuition and emotion. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 1(1), 57-64.
- Teasdale, S., Sunley, P., & Pinch, S. (2012). Financing social enterprise: social bricolage or evolutionary entrepreneurialism?. *Social Enterprise Journal*.
- Vanevenhoven, J., Winkel, D., Malewicki, D., Dougan, W. L., & Bronson, J. (2011). Varieties of Bricolage and the Process of Entrepreneurship. *New England Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 14(2), 7.
- Weick, K. E. (1993). Organizational redesign as improvisation. *Organizational change and redesign: Ideas and insights for improving performance*, 346, 379.
- Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2001). *Managing the unexpected* (Vol. 9). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Welter, C., Mauer, R., & Wuebker, R. J. (2016). Bridging behavioral models and theoretical concepts: effectuation and bricolage in the opportunity creation framework. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 10(1), 5-20.
- Yin RK. (2009) *Case study research: Design and methods*: Sage publications, INC.
- 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(5), 519-532.