



Entrepreneurship & Regional Development

An International Journal

ISSN: 0898-5626 (Print) 1464-5114 (Online) Journal homepage: <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tepn20>

Researching bricolage in social entrepreneurship

Frank Janssen, Alain Fayolle & Amélie Wuillaume

To cite this article: Frank Janssen, Alain Fayolle & Amélie Wuillaume (2018) Researching bricolage in social entrepreneurship, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 30:3-4, 450-470, DOI: [10.1080/08985626.2017.1413769](https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2017.1413769)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2017.1413769>



Published online: 09 Mar 2018.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 27



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Researching bricolage in social entrepreneurship

Frank Janssen^a, Alain Fayolle^b and Amélie Wuilaume^a

^aUniversité catholique de Louvain, Louvain Research Institute in Management, Louvain-La-Neuve, Belgium;

^bEMLYON Business School, Lyon, France

ABSTRACT

This paper introduces the special issue of Entrepreneurship and Regional Development on bricolage in social entrepreneurship. We anchor this special issue at the heart of an emerging body of research indicating that bricolage is the most appropriate approach to consider social firms operating in an environment characterized by institutional constraints or weak regulatory or political support (Di Domenico, Haugh, and Tracey 2010; Gundry et al. 2011). We describe both social entrepreneurship and bricolage. We then identify what closely links these notions. We conduct a literature review of the articles written on the nascent and growing research area at the intersection of social entrepreneurship and bricolage. We finally provide a brief overview of the contributions of each of the papers of this special issue and conclude by outlining a research agenda for future activities in this area of inquiry.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 24 May 2017

Accepted 16 November 2017

KEYWORDS

Social entrepreneurship;
bricolage; social bricolage

Introduction

This paper presents the results of a systematic literature review on bricolage in social entrepreneurship, outlines the set of new contributions on the topic provided by the papers in this issue and offers a research agenda for the future. We start by an overview of both bricolage and social entrepreneurship and then focus on the intersection of the two concepts. Building on previous work (Desa and Basu 2013; Di Domenico, Haugh, and Tracey 2010; Lévi-Strauss 1967), we define bricolage in social entrepreneurship as the making do with any resources at hand to provide innovative solutions for social needs that traditional organizations fail to address in an adequate way. Following the definition of Mair and Martí (2006), we consider social entrepreneurship as ‘the process involving the innovative use and combination of resources to pursue opportunities to catalyze social change and/or address social needs’.

Research indicates that social ventures rely on material bricolage since they seek to provide products or services as solutions to social problems by creating anything possible using resources at hand (Desa and Basu 2013; Di Domenico, Haugh, and Tracey 2010; Molecke and Pinkse 2017). It is also commonly agreed that bricolage constitutes an adequate way for a firm to act in a resources-constrained environment (Desa and Basu 2013; Desa and Koch 2014). The scarcity of resources accurately describes the environment in which social ventures evolve.

The resources-constrained environment is not the only criterion that makes the notions of social entrepreneurship and bricolage very close one to another. An additional element that is even more salient is the ability of both the social entrepreneur and the bricoleur to deal with resources' scarcity in an innovative way. The resources-constrained environment they face fuels the innovations they develop (Linna 2013). Nicholls (2009) argues that the problem-solving attitude of social entrepreneurs, characterized by a continuous generation of innovations, particularly fits with the bricolage approach (Nicholls 2009).

Moreover, both social entrepreneurship and bricolage (Baker and Nelson 2005; Stinchfield, Nelson, and Wood 2013) seem to question the rationality and the purely economic motivation often seen as underlying the entrepreneurial behavior. Social entrepreneurship and bricolage are part of a more constructivist approach. Entrepreneurs are not regarded as always adopting a behavior that follows a logical chain from inputs to outcomes (Desa 2012; Molecke and Pinkse 2017). They are not necessarily (or at least, not only) driven by economic considerations either. Just as social entrepreneurs, bricoleurs seem to care less about financial performance and growth (Stinchfield, Nelson, and Wood 2013). They do not (only) want to achieve an economic potential. These bricoleurs are often responsive to the needs of a local community that can only be accessed if the entrepreneurs know it personally (Stinchfield, Nelson, and Wood 2013). Since this community can often hardly afford to acquire the product/service, it is difficult for entrepreneurs to achieve a high economic potential by answering the needs of this community (Stinchfield, Nelson, and Wood 2013).

Social entrepreneurship and bricolage thus share important characteristics that make them very close one to another. Bricolage in social entrepreneurship, however, remains under-researched and little understood. This literature review documents the current state of the research and stresses the need for further theoretical and empirical developments.

The primary objective of this special issue is to promote research and understanding of bricolage in social entrepreneurship, especially at the intersection of different levels of analysis and in different contexts. This issue starts the discussion and urges scholars to advance the knowledge in these areas.

The next sections describe these concepts separately, identify papers at the intersection between these, discuss current research and its major findings, describe the papers included in this special issue and, finally, suggest a future research agenda.

Bricolage

The idea of bricolage has originally been introduced by Lévi-Strauss (1967) to describe a specific mode in which individuals relate to their environments (Duymedjian and Rüling 2010). Bricolage can be defined as 'making do' with 'whatever at hand' (Baker and Nelson 2005; Lévi-Strauss 1967). Since this initial definition of 'making do' of Lévi-Strauss (1967), the concept of bricolage has moved on and has gained popularity, especially during these last two decades (Duymedjian and Rüling 2010). It has been a subject of interest in various disciplines from anthropology to information technology or innovation management, just to name a few (Duymedjian and Rüling 2010), but the notion of bricolage has really started to enter the entrepreneurship literature with Baker and colleagues' research in 2003. This idea of bricolage is part of the growing line of thought challenging the traditional approach (Duymedjian and Rüling 2010) and supporting a 'less rational' entrepreneurial behavior (Stinchfield, Nelson, and Wood 2013). It is linked to resources-scarcity. After having looked

at the latter, we will examine the link between bricolage and opportunities, look at the different levels at which bricolage has been analyzed and question its boundaries with related constructs.

Resources-constrained environment as the catalyst

Entrepreneurs often operate in a context in which resources are limited. The resources-constrained environment may stem from various dimensions: the internal resources (too few employees or with outdated capabilities), the customers (people lacking the financial resources to afford the product/service) or the business environment (lack of a partners) (Witell et al. 2017). Entrepreneurs might therefore decide to engage in resources' seeking activities or abandon the idea of pursuing the identified opportunities (Baker and Nelson 2005). Traditional entrepreneurship has the tendency to enact the 'limitations' that the scarcity of resources constitutes. There is an alternative: a refusal to be constrained by the 'limitations' (Di Domenico, Haugh, and Tracey 2010). Under certain circumstances (Fisher 2012), entrepreneurs may compose with the resources that are at hand and with which they experience an intimate familiarity (Baker and Nelson 2005). This process is called bricolage.

Induced by the scarcity of the available resources, bricolage is an active engagement with problems by a combination of available resources (Baker and Nelson 2005). Three core aspects can characterize bricolage: the 'making do', the use of resources at hand and the (re) combination of these resources to tackle a problem (Baker and Nelson 2005). As a strategy, bricolage constitutes a response to unpredicted and surprising situations (Ciborra 1996).

This process often drives the discovery of innovations (Baker and Nelson 2005). In contrast to the idea that innovations require resources to be developed (Rothaermel and Deeds 2006), the bricolage approach rather follows the well-known adage 'necessity is the mother of invention' (Senyard et al. 2014). Two primary mechanisms allow explaining why firms engaging in bricolage tend to innovate more, i.e. the bias for action and the recombination (Senyard et al. 2014). First, most firms prefer to do nothing when they face opportunities for which the response seems too expensive in terms of resources (Baker, Miner, and Eesley 2003). Conversely, firms that engage in bricolage tinker with resources at hand to provide some kind of response (Senyard et al. 2014). They demonstrate a bias for action. Second, firms that use bricolage recombine (cheap or free) resources for other purposes than the ones for which they were intended (Senyard et al. 2014). They tend to be more creative than the ones that do not use bricolage (Senyard et al. 2014).

Bricolage and opportunities

It is traditionally considered that the entrepreneurial journey starts with the identification of an opportunity. The objectivist story tells us that the entrepreneur identifies an opportunity (Kassean et al. 2015) and, as an objective and independent reality, the opportunity is evaluated and exploited through venturing (Baker and Nelson 2005). Bricolage capabilities can help ventures to explore and exploit new opportunities (Baker and Nelson 2005). However, bricolage is anchored in a more constructivist perspective (Molecke and Pinkse 2017). If bricolage capabilities influence opportunities identification and exploitation, the reverse is also true (Baker and Nelson 2005). Bricoleurs do not see opportunities as objective

and a priori defined. Entrepreneurs that engage in bricolage do not simply accept limitations either (Molecke and Pinkse 2017). They enact their environment and shape what is desired and feasible with the resources they have at hand (Baker and Nelson 2005; Molecke and Pinkse 2017). Garud and Karnøe (2003) speak about 'co-shaping'. Bricoleurs are, in a sense, alert to both resources and opportunities (Baker and Nelson 2005). Most entrepreneurial opportunities are rather shaped and created, taking into account the available resources, than they are discovered. Shaped opportunities are then pursued to create value (Baker and Nelson 2005).

According to Vanevenhoven et al. (2011), the way entrepreneurs move from opportunities identification to opportunities exploitation depends on the type of bricolage used to combine resources. Vanevenhoven et al. (2011) propose to distinguish two forms of bricolage; internal and external. Each form serves a specific function of the entrepreneurial process and is vital for its success. Internal bricolage encompasses idiosyncratic predicates associated with the individuals such as personal and professional experience, academic certifications etc. These elements help to build the legitimacy of the entrepreneur. External bricolage relates to the combination of resources present in the external environment. These resources can be physical, such as products or machines, or social, such as the social network in which the entrepreneurs are embedded. Vanevenhoven et al. (2011) argue that both internal and external bricolage provide the means by which the entrepreneurs can move quickly and successfully from opportunity identification to opportunity exploitation.

In addition to Vanevenhoven et al. (2011), other efforts have been engaged to develop categorizations of bricolage (Duymedjian and Rüling 2010; Molecke and Pinkse 2017). Inspired by Lévi-Strauss (1967), Molecke and Pinkse (2017) also build two categories of bricolage based on the resources at hand and the objective of the resources' combination. On one hand, Molecke and Pinkse (2017) identify material bricolage, which is a process of various resources' combination as a means of finding workable 'approaches to a wide variety of problems and opportunities'. On the other, they refer to ideational bricolage as the mechanism through which older myths are combined in order to develop new myths that serve novel functions (Baker 2007; Molecke and Pinkse 2017).

Duymedjian and Rüling (2010) theoretically distinguish two types of bricolage that allow bricoleurs to establish legitimacy: familiar and convention-based bricolage. These two mechanisms share the ideal-typical characteristics of bricolage but differ in terms of the role of the negotiations and conventions that regulate the interactions between the different bricoleurs of the organization. Familiar bricolage relies on closeness, resonance and trust, since the repertoire is shared or mutually accessible by the bricoleurs (Duymedjian and Rüling 2010). In convention-based bricolage, relationships are negotiated, based on conventions.

Bricolage and different levels of analysis

Witell et al. (2017) indicate that bricolage is based on a set of four specific capabilities: (a) actively addressing resources' scarcity; (b) 'making do' with what is at hand; (c) improvising recombination of resources and (d) networking with external partners. In addition, Duymedjian and Rüling (2010) argue that an organizational memory, generating a 'knowledge base founded on experience', is necessary. Bricolage capabilities can explain why some organizations are more successful than others when facing resources' scarcity (Witell et al. 2017).

Since the introduction of the notion by Lévi-Strauss (1967), bricolage has been used to explain a wide range of phenomena in different domains and for diverse levels of analysis (Fisher 2012). In entrepreneurship, bricolage has been conceptually and empirically used to explain market creation (Baker and Nelson 2005), innovation capacity (Senyard et al. 2014), opportunity exploitation (Vanevenhoven et al. 2011), a firm's performance (Senyard, Baker, and Davidsson 2009) and firm growth (Baker, Miner, and Eesley 2003). In terms of level of analysis, bricolage has been considered at the individual (Stinchfield, Nelson, and Wood 2013), organizational (Duymedjian and Rüling 2010) and inter-organizational (or environmental) levels (Garud and Karnøe 2003).

At the individual level, the bricoleur is described as someone whose identity is tied to 'making it work', whatever the implications (Stinchfield, Nelson, and Wood 2013). She/he is animated by a strong determination to solve the targeted problem even at his/her own cost. He/she combines available resources for the sole purpose of finding a solution to a problem (Stinchfield, Nelson, and Wood 2013) and is a problem solver (Stinchfield, Nelson, and Wood 2013). These resources are often easily accessible and sometimes even free (often because those possessing these do not value these) (Phillips and Tracey 2007).

In terms of process, the entrepreneur's activities are organized around the development of three aspects; a repertoire, a dialogue and an outcome. He/she starts by collecting resources during 'unplanned encounters' and independently from any specific use (Duymedjian and Rüling 2010). In this way, the entrepreneur constitutes what Lévi-Strauss (1967) calls a 'repertoire'. Then, the entrepreneur uses, or reuses, and combines these resources (Baker and Nelson 2005). The bricoleur makes connections between resources, he/she makes things dialogue until an 'arrangement', the outcome, emerges (Duymedjian and Rüling 2010). He/she uses what he/she has and does not venture beyond this 'repertoire' (Duymedjian and Rüling 2010). This process of combining resources may be applied to inputs (physical, labor or skills), customers and markets and finally, the institutional and regulatory environment in order to create 'something from nothing' (Baker and Nelson 2005).

The bricoleur seems to ignore standards, conventions and constraints if these elements interfere with the 'making it work' (Stinchfield, Nelson, and Wood 2013). The bricoleur is responsive to the market, which can only be accessed if it is known personally by the bricoleur and is often local (Stinchfield, Nelson, and Wood 2013). The bricoleur seems to care little about financial performance (Stinchfield, Nelson, and Wood 2013). The ability to make do in complex and resources' constrained environment associated with a lack of debt allows him/her to survive for a very long period of time (Stinchfield, Nelson, and Wood 2013).

Duymedjian and Rüling (2010) oppose the bricoleur to the engineer in an effort to develop an ideal-typical configuration of actors in an organization. In contrast to the bricoleur using elements in stock, the engineer looks for specific resources that perfectly match with the requirements. The bricoleur works with the collected elements to create an outcome that is quite unique and different from what already exists (Duymedjian and Rüling 2010). Baker, Miner, and Eesley (2003) reject the idea that being a bricoleur is a static characteristic; it is rather dependent on the events and conditions at hand. Entrepreneurs may engage in bricolage under some circumstances and decide not to make use of bricolage under others (Baker, Miner, and Eesley 2003).

At the organizational level, bricolage capabilities have been shown to provide a survival advantage to the firm in periods of low resources (Witell et al. 2017). Firms that use bricolage are able to survive for a very long periods of time despite their poor financial results (Baker

and Nelson 2005). The works of Baker and Nelson (2005), Senyard et al. (2014) and Salunke, Weerawardena, and McColl-Kennedy (2013) indicate that the use of bricolage has positive effects on the firm's innovation (Senyard et al. 2014), performance (Senyard, Baker, and Davidsson 2009) and growth (Baker, Miner, and Eesley 2003). Senyard et al. (2014) suggest that variations in the degree to which entrepreneurial ventures engage in bricolage provide an explanation for innovativeness under resource constraints observed in new firms. In a highly competitive market, a decline in the stock of resources provides a firm that has bricolage capabilities an advantage compared to its competitors who are used to act with the right levels and types of resources (Baker and Nelson 2005). Salunke, Weerawardena, and McColl-Kennedy (2013) even demonstrate that bricolage contributes to a sustained competitive advantage in service firms through innovation. Higher levels of bricolage in entrepreneurial service firms trigger higher levels of innovation and lead to sustained competitive advantage (Salunke, Weerawardena, and McColl-Kennedy 2013).

At the inter-organizational level, bricolage relates to a 'mutually adaptive, collective and gradually emergent process in which many networked actors proceed through a series of small wins to create and then improve a technology' (Garud and Karnøe 2003; Spencer, Murtha, and Lenway 2005). Garud and Karnøe's (2003) work on the wind turbine industry describes how Danish firms have influenced important elements such as the design or the products' development. This emerged from an 'accumulation of artifacts, tools, practices, rules and knowledge' that has shaped actors in the domains of design, production, use, evaluation and regulation (Garud and Karnøe 2003). In the development of their framework, Spencer, Murtha, and Lenway (2005) associate bricolage with corporatism, for the consensual and networking aspect. They argue that the preexisting relationships among firms in a business association or social networking encourage innovators to develop relationships based on trust with other firms in the industry. Spencer, Murtha, and Lenway (2005) distinguish this corporatism associated with bricolage from the individualism that rather fits with the breakthrough approach in which competition prevails on cooperation.

Research concerning the effects of bricolage on innovation (Senyard et al. 2014), performance (Senyard, Baker, and Davidsson 2009) and growth (Baker, Miner, and Eesley 2003) needs to be put into perspective. Senyard, Baker, and Davidsson (2009) show that bricolage has a positive effect on a venture's performance at an emerging stage. However, if the firm is 'up-and-running', this effect on performance is rather negative (Senyard, Baker, and Davidsson 2009). Indeed, the firm can face some difficulties in meeting quality and performance because of the imperfect offering that emerges from the use of a bricolage approach (Senyard, Baker, and Davidsson 2009). According to Lanzara (1999), the outcomes of bricolage are 'second-best solutions' and are often imperfect and incomplete. Moreover, Ciborra (1996) stresses that bricolage may cause messiness, potential inefficiencies of trial-and-errors and unforeseeable outcomes. This author shows that bricolage enables a firm to adapt but, at the same time, constrains the firm's effectiveness. In the same way, Baker and Nelson (2005) make a distinction between two forms of bricolage (selective and parallel bricolage) that lead to different results, based on the frequency and the scope of the use of bricolage. Baker and Nelson (2005) note that bricolage leads to the discovery of innovations and allows surviving with poor results when used judiciously and selectively in one or a few domain(s) at the same time. However, bricolage can be harmful if engaged in parallel across several domains at a time or at very high levels. In addition, Senyard et al. (2014) note three other

potential negative effects of bricolage: (a) wasted efforts, (b) lack of cumulative development and (3) failure to engage with relevant suppliers and customers.

Bricolage and related constructs: effectuation and improvisation

Bricolage is sometimes confused with close constructs such as effectuation or improvisation. Like bricolage, effectuation and improvisation are considered as emerging theories that contrast with more traditional models of entrepreneurial behavior (Fisher 2012). These alternative approaches distance themselves from traditional thinking, i.e. from 'causation', (Sarasvathy 2001) that describes the entrepreneurial process as an economic and more rational mechanism (Fisher 2012; Sarasvathy 2001). In causation, a particular goal to target is taken as a given. The entrepreneur then tries to select means that allow to develop the a priori defined effect (Fisher 2012). The entrepreneur acts in a predictive logic (Toutain and Fayolle 2009). If bricolage, effectuation and improvisation all reject this logic, somehow overlap and share similar assumptions, they still can be distinguished in several ways, including the definition of success, the place of novelty or even the role of the resources (Archer, Baker, and Mauer 2009).

In opposition to the principle of 'causation', Sarasvathy (2008) introduced the concept of effectuation, a logic in which the world is considered as 'in-the-making' and 'makeable' by the human hand. Sarasvathy (2008) describes it as 'a logic of entrepreneurial expertise, a dynamic and interactive process of creating new artifacts in the world' (Sarasvathy 2001). Through effectuation, Sarasvathy (2008) captures the tendency of successful entrepreneurs to compose with controllable resources to limit the risk of investment loss in a venture. In this respect, and in many others, bricolage and effectuation appear to be similar, but still are different constructs. The main distinguishable feature between bricolage and effectuation is their starting point. In bricolage, 'something from nothing' is created by making do and using and combining the resources at hand for new purposes (Fisher 2012). In effectuation, the entrepreneur selects between possible effects that can be created with the given means (Fisher 2012). The process starts with the means, then the entrepreneur applies the affordable loss principle, he/she establishes strategic relation and leverages contingencies (Fisher 2012; Sarasvathy 2001).

Improvisation and bricolage are also close constructs, but can be conceptually distinguished (Baker, Miner, and Eesley 2003). Improvisation is defined as a 'combination of intuition, creativity and bricolage' (Leybourne and Sadler-Smith 2006) based on 'simple rules in order to yield an original composition' (Duymedjian and Rüling 2010) and relates to the degree to which design and execution converge (Baker, Miner, and Eesley 2003). Design and execution do not necessarily occur at the same time, but that they shape one another (Baker, Miner, and Eesley 2003). Entrepreneurs may design the firm as they create it; they are not calculating actors acting in a well-established, a priori defined and rational way (Baker, Miner, and Eesley 2003). In improvisation, Baker, Miner, and Eesley (2003) observe some degree of novelty and intentionality in the behaviors of the actors. They do not follow prior routines (Baker, Miner, and Eesley 2003), they combine with intuition, creativity and problem solving (Witell et al. 2017), based on an accumulation of knowledge and experiences (Duymedjian and Rüling 2010). The occurrence of improvisational activity may imply bricolage (Baker, Miner, and Eesley 2003). Baker, Miner, and Eesley (2003) use the example of planning to hike,

but using whatever materials at hand in order to make a camp. To summarize, improvisation implies bricolage, but bricolage does not imply improvisation (Baker, Miner, and Eesley 2003).

Now that we have clarified the notion of bricolage, we can take a look at social entrepreneurship, before trying to understand how these two concepts are intertwined.

Social entrepreneurship

Like bricolage (Duymedjian and Rüling 2010), social entrepreneurship has always existed. At all times, there have been forms of organizations and/or groups of individuals aiming at tackling social problems and creating social value. However the use of the term 'social entrepreneurship' has only emerged recently in the literature (Dacin, Dacin, and Tracey 2011). Social entrepreneurship as an 'international cultural phenomenon' (Dey, Steyaert, and Hjorth 2006) has started to draw scholars' curiosity and to spark discussions and debates mainly during the last two decades (Dacin, Dacin, and Tracey 2011; Janssen, Bacq, and Brouard 2012; Mair and Martí 2006; Zahra et al. 2009). It is said to be 'phenomenon-driven' since it has emerged from practitioners before attracting the attention of scholars (Mair and Martí 2006).

The first paper on social entrepreneurship has only been published in 1991 (Short, Moss, and Lumpkin 2009). Since then, it has become a hot topic. An always-growing body of research has first engaged in debates about definition, domains, forms and boundaries (Dacin, Dacin, and Matear 2010; Dacin, Dacin, and Tracey 2011). Early research has been dedicated to establishing the conceptual foundation of the notion of social entrepreneurship (Urbano et al. 2017). Empirical research followed, but most of it is qualitative and based on case studies (Dacin, Dacin, and Tracey 2011; Sassmannshausen and Volkmann 2016; Urbano et al. 2017). Today, there is a need for sound quantitative research, going beyond descriptive statistics (Urbano et al. 2017).

Social entrepreneurship definition

Some individuals or groups, animated by social concerns, try to address social needs, overlooked by governmental or non-governmental organisms (Zahra et al. 2009). These social actors using innovative processes to tackle social issues are becoming highly visible. As a global phenomenon, this has stimulated reflection among scholars (Zahra et al. 2009).

Defining the concept is complex (Zahra et al. 2009). Even the term 'social entrepreneurship' in itself raises tensions (Moss et al. 2011) and concerns (Zahra et al. 2009). While 'entrepreneurship' is often associated with economic development, the word 'social' exacerbates a social and altruistic dimension (Mair and Martí 2006). Social entrepreneurship gathers both social and economic elements, often viewed as conflicting terms in the same definition (Zahra et al. 2009) and originates from different schools of thought (Bacq and Janssen 2011). Austin, Stevenson, and Wei-Skillern (2006) and Moss et al. (2011) reconcile the different visions by supporting that social ventures incorporate for-profit, nonprofit and hybrid forms of organizing that address social problems. In addition, social ventures are characterized by elements of both entrepreneurial and social identities (Moss et al. 2011). According to Mair and Martí (2006), the key distinction between social ventures and other entrepreneurial ventures is only based on the relative priority given to social wealth creation vs. economic wealth. Social ventures focus on addressing social problems rather than growth or profitability (Moss et al. 2011). However, this social value creation may come from both social and

economic aspects (Mair and Martí 2006). Social ventures can seek to minimize cost and increase revenues in order to serve the social goal (Moss et al. 2011; Peredo and McLean 2006).

The numerous definitions (Bacq and Janssen 2011; Zahra et al. 2009) share some common elements: the creation of social value as the underlying drive (Dacin, Dacin, and Tracey 2011) and the innovative process, as a set of activities, by which the important social needs are addressed (Austin, Stevenson, and Wei-Skillern 2006; Mair and Martí 2006; Moss et al. 2011; Zahra et al. 2009) in order to enhance social wealth (Bacq and Janssen 2011; Mair and Martí 2006; Zahra et al. 2009). Most of the definitions also indicate that social entrepreneurship is associated to social improvement rather than traditional profit maximization (Zahra et al. 2009). Many of these also stress the central role of the social entrepreneur.

The social entrepreneur

The social venture is led by a social entrepreneur (or by a team), i.e. an individual animated by a social mission (Miller, Wesley, and Curtis 2010), who acts pro socially (McMullen and Bergman 2017). This mission constitutes a catalyst for the venture and defines its identity and underlying goals (Miller, Wesley, and Curtis 2010). By providing solutions to social problems (Dacin, Dacin, and Tracey 2011), the social entrepreneur aims at creating social value. Economic gains are not an end in itself for him/her, but only a means (Bacq and Janssen 2011).

However, it does not mean that the social entrepreneur is totally detached from the financial reality (Dacin, Dacin, and Tracey 2011). The creation of social value is also related to economic outcomes. Like the commercial entrepreneur, the social entrepreneur detects opportunities. The social entrepreneur often has a strong ethical fiber, adopts an innovative and visionary approach to tackle social problem and is a change agent (Bacq and Janssen 2011; Germak and Robinson 2014). Ideological and mission-driven, the social entrepreneur is animated by a willingness to change the world, his/her cities or his/her community (Germak and Robinson 2014).

Research conducted by Zahra et al. (2009) has deepened the understanding of the figure of the social entrepreneur. Based on the variation in the way entrepreneurs consider their mission, discover opportunities, gather resources to address the identified opportunities and impact the broader social system, Zahra et al. (2009) distinguish three types of social entrepreneurs: (a) the social bricoleur who tackles small-scale and local social needs; (b) the social constructionist who tackles underserved needs to 'introduce reforms and innovations' to the broader social system and (c) the social engineer who addresses social problem in existing structures in order to introduce revolutionary changes.

A number of authors have expressed skepticism concerning whether or not individual characteristics could enable to distinguish social entrepreneurship from other forms of entrepreneurship (Dacin, Dacin, and Matear 2010). Mair and Martí (2006) argue that 'who is the entrepreneur?' is not the right question, as it has been highlighted by Gartner (1988) several years earlier about the entrepreneur in general. According to Mair and Martí (2006), as for entrepreneurship in general, the focus of social entrepreneurship should be on the process or on the behavior (Austin, Stevenson, and Wei-Skillern 2006).

The process

According to Dorado (2006), the entrepreneurial process can be clustered into three subsets of activities; the opportunity definition, the leveraging of resources and the organization building.

The opportunity definition

The notion of opportunity lies at the core of entrepreneurship (Shane and Venkataraman 2000). Similarly, the identification of social opportunities constitutes the heart of social entrepreneurship (Bacq and Janssen 2011; Corner and Ho 2010; Mair and Martí 2006; Miller, Wesley, and Curtis 2010). Even if similarities exist between traditional and social entrepreneurship opportunities (Miller, Wesley, and Curtis 2010), research suggests that opportunities in social entrepreneurship are distinctive enough to be studied in their own right (Corner and Ho 2010; Miller, Wesley, and Curtis 2010).

Social entrepreneurs emerge because of the inability or the unwillingness of traditional businesses, governmental or non-governmental organizations to tackle some social needs (Dacin, Dacin, and Tracey 2011; Harding 2007; Thompson, Alvy, and Lees 2000; Zahra et al. 2009). Their inability to define and deliver products and services for communities in need and/or who cannot afford to pay constitutes the origin of social entrepreneurship (Austin, Stevenson, and Wei-Skillern 2006; Di Domenico, Haugh, and Tracey 2010). Social entrepreneurs then act to correct the perceived businesses' or government's failures (McMullen and Bergman 2017).

The opportunity requires the investment of scarce resources with the hope of returns (Austin, Stevenson, and Wei-Skillern 2006) and is identified and exploited through a set of four patterns (Corner and Ho 2010): (a) the opportunity development, which is a process (with different phases) in which ideas are shaped over time; (b) the collective action, in which actors group to create social value; (c) experience corridors, which are the prior experience the actors bring to the opportunity development and (d) the spark, which is the 'moment of inspiration' that triggers opportunity development (Corner and Ho 2010). The opportunity development is the overarching pattern under which the three other ones are developed (Corner and Ho 2010).

The resources' leveraging

The exploitation of opportunities cannot be initiated without resources (Bhawe, Rawhouser, and Pollack 2016). Like commercial entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs need financial, material but also human resources and have to operate with limited resources (Austin, Stevenson, and Wei-Skillern 2006).

In social entrepreneurship, the resources constraint is even more severe. Quality resources are scarce, and thus costly to obtain, in less developed countries (Desa and Basu 2013; Zahra et al. 2008). Even in developed regions, with more resources, the tension between the social goals and the financial returns makes the mobilization of resources difficult (Austin, Stevenson, and Wei-Skillern 2006; Desa and Basu 2013).

Concerning financial resources specifically, research highlights the presence of barriers related to financial constraints (Urbano et al. 2017). Many social firms feel that potential money providers underestimate their social and longer-term economic benefits (Sunley and Pinch 2012). Sunley and Pinch (2012) also mention the 'cultural aversion' of social

entrepreneurs to loans. Rather than trying to attract external financial resources, they prefer to 'live within their means' and to make the most of limited resources (Sunley and Pinch 2012).

The organization building

Social organizations are directly linked to an explicit and central social mission (Janssen, Bacq, and Brouard 2012) and share at least four main characteristics (Di Domenico, Haugh, and Tracey 2010). First, in reaction to the withdrawal of traditional sources of income such as grants, social ventures try to generate revenues through the sale of products and services. That allows them to achieve autonomy and become more flexible in terms of legal structures, strategies and markets (Di Domenico, Haugh, and Tracey 2010). Second, the fact that they finance their social goals enables them to make their social outcomes part of their economic performance (Peredo and Chrisman 2006). Third, in addition to the development of products and services addressing social needs, social firms pursue additional benefits such as enhancing social capital and community cohesion (Di Domenico, Haugh, and Tracey 2010). Fourth, most of the time, social enterprises emerge from the need for facilities and services of communities in resources-poor environment (Di Domenico, Haugh, and Tracey 2010). Mair, Battilana, and Cardenas (2012) add another feature that social ventures have in common: they share an industrial logic of justification, in which the value is based on the efficiency, the productivity and the operational effectiveness.

Social ventures are also often described in contrast to commercial firms (Bacq et al. 2015). The opportunities that trigger the venture are diverse, the motivations come from distinct missions, the network embeddedness is different, the nature of financial risks and profit varies, the use of creativity and innovation is different, the way resources are acquired and combined varies, the role of the individual and collective action to manage the firm diverges and the methods to assess performance are different (Austin, Stevenson, and Wei-Skillern 2006; Bacq et al. 2015; Shaw and Carter 2007).

If social entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship in the business sector are indeed different, Mair and Martí (2006) reject the dichotomous approach adopted in some research. They think that the distinction is rather as 'a continuum ranging from purely social to purely economic' (Austin, Stevenson, and Wei-Skillern 2006). If social entrepreneurship is mainly driven by ethical or moral motivations, there are other reasons to pursue social entrepreneurship that are less altruistic, such as personal fulfillment. Similarly, entrepreneurship in the business context can also incorporate some social motives in addition to more economic ones (Mair and Martí 2006).

If they cannot be strictly opposed to commercial ventures, social ventures are not charities either. Boundaries between public, private and non-commercial sectors are somehow blurred by the hybrid nature characterizing social enterprises. Hybridity is at the core of social firms (Ebrahim, Battilana, and Mair 2014). They are 'neither typical charities nor typical businesses' (Ebrahim, Battilana, and Mair 2014) and combine the logics, the structures, the systems, the activities and the goals of both mechanisms (Battilana and Lee 2014; Ebrahim, Battilana, and Mair 2014): like charity organizations, they pursue a social mission and, like commercial enterprises, they use market-based mechanisms to generate revenues (Miller et al. 2012). Social enterprises seek a double bottom line: they pursue a social mission through a commercial activity (Battilana and Lee 2014; Ebrahim, Battilana, and Mair 2014). This market activity is supposed to allow the firm to generate the financial means necessary to address

the mission. However, organizational hybridity equilibrium is not always guaranteed (Battilana and Lee 2014). Several authors warn against the risk of ‘mission drift’ when social organizations can lose sight of their primary social mission in their effort to generate economic revenue (Battilana and Lee 2014; Ebrahim, Battilana, and Mair 2014) or when the social activities become so important that the organization mainly or solely relies on subsidies or donations and does not aim at economic sustainability anymore.

Let us now look at the intersection between entrepreneurship and bricolage.

Bricolage in social entrepreneurship: what we learn from a literature review

We conducted a systematic literature review (Tranfield, Denyer, and Smart 2003) of bricolage in social entrepreneurship. We searched for articles published until July 2017 via Google Scholar. To be selected, the papers had to demonstrate an explicit statement of research objectives, intervening variables, and methods. They also had to explicitly mention one of the following words or phrases in the title, abstract, or keywords: social entrepreneurship, social enterprise, social firm, social entrepreneur, bricolage, bricolage for social needs, innovation, and social bricolage. We have only selected papers from established peer-reviewed journals, as they can be considered a source of validated knowledge and are more likely have a major impact on the field (Ordanini, Rubera, and DeFillippi 2008; Podsakoff et al. 2005). We also took papers coming from the proceedings of one high-quality conference.

From this initial set of articles obtained via a key words search, we eliminated irrelevant articles, duplicate articles, non-academic articles, and teaching cases. We only kept articles at the intersection between bricolage and social entrepreneurship. The publications are spread across social entrepreneurship journals (*Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, *Review of social economy*, *Social Enterprise Journal*), entrepreneurship journals (*Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *Journal of Business Venturing*, *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*), the above mentioned conference’s best papers proceedings (*Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*), and one general management journal (*Journal of Management Studies*). Table 1 shows the list of journals (and one conference) that have published articles about bricolage in a social entrepreneurial context and the repartition of articles across these journals.

If the individual level is present in many studies, highlighting the importance of social entrepreneurs in the social change (Gundry et al. 2011), their central levels of analysis are rather the process and environmental levels. Di Domenico, Haugh, and Tracey (2010) recognize ‘social bricolage’ as a concept in its own right. They extend the constructs of bricolage to define social bricolage as a set of six processes: (a) the making do, (b) the refusal to be

Table 1. Journals and number of articles.

Entrepreneurship theory and practice	1
Frontiers of entrepreneurship research	1
Journal of business venturing	2
Journal of developmental entrepreneurship	1
Journal of management studies	1
Journal of social entrepreneurship	1
Review of social economy	1
Social enterprise journal	1
Strategic entrepreneurship journal	1
Total	10

constrained by limitations, (c) the improvisation, (d) the social value creation, (e) the stakeholder participation and (f) the persuasion of significant actors. If there is a lot to discover about this emerging area, early research already provides us with a relevant insight into social bricolage.

According to Desa and Basu (2013), a bricolage approach can be used on its own or combined with another approach, i.e. optimization. They show the relative importance of optimization and bricolage, as two strategic processes of gathering resources under varying circumstances.

Gundry et al. (2011) study the impact of social entrepreneurs' use of bricolage on their ability to develop social innovation. Social entrepreneurship is constrained to combine existing and limited resources in a creative way in order to tackle social problems (Gundry et al. 2011). In this perspective, bricolage allows developing novel approaches to attract and use relevant resources, identify markets in need and offer adapted products and services (Gundry et al. 2011). In this way, the ability of the social entrepreneurs to provide social innovative solutions directly depends on the extent to which they use bricolage (Gundry et al. 2011). The notion of innovation is so closely linked to social entrepreneurs that Linna (2013) uses the term 'innovator-entrepreneurs' to refer to the persons who design low cost solutions for people at the base of the pyramid (BoP).

Halme, Lindeman, and Linna (2012) introduce the notion of 'intrapreneurial bricolage' as a fundamental entrepreneurial activity within a large organization characterized by an innovative assemblage of scarce resources. Their research is anchored in the idea that multinational corporations (MNC) are well equipped to roll out the necessary large-scale solutions, but that their management frameworks may sometimes constitute an obstacle slowing MNCs from reaching their full potential. Halme, Lindeman, and Linna (2012) show how middle-manager innovators dedicated to inclusive innovation can act as 'social intrapreneurs'. They overcome organizational constraints, mobilize resources and promote pro-poor business models using and bundling scarce resources.

Bacq et al. (2015) stress that bricolage is also effective to further expand or adapt the outcomes of the firm to better match the magnitude of the social needs addressed through continuous innovation (Desa and Koch 2014), a mechanism referred to as the 'scaling of the social impact'. Desa and Koch (2014) explore in depth, from inception to growth, how social ventures in emerging economies, specifically within BOP communities, scale social impact. They distinguish two forms of social impact that social firms can choose: (a) the depth impact, which emphasizes learning and relates to a social and economic empowerment through the offering of a large range of products and services in each village and (b) the breadth impact, which is more narrow and relates to a single product or service offering to thousands of villages. The path to scale is mediated, among other elements, by the process of resources' mobilization used by the entrepreneurial firm, by optimization or by bricolage. Their research suggests that optimization approaches mediate the route to breadth impact, while bricolage rather mediates the route to depth impact.

Looking at the organizational level of social bricolage is necessary, but it cannot be fully understood without taking into account the influence of environmental conditions. In this perspective, Dorado and Ventresca (2013) take an interest in the institutional conditions that impact the social entrepreneur's likelihood to engage with an opportunity. Their conceptual framework indicates that two sets of 'crescive' conditions¹ exist: the ones that motivate entrepreneurs to engage and the ones that alter the decision-making logic. They mobilize

bricolage to explain the entrepreneurial engagement in the context of complex social problems. Dorado and Ventresca (2013) argue that the entrepreneur who engages with an opportunity within an environment that is institutionally-constrained challenges institutional definitions to create value and identifies opportunities that are not technology-dependent processes. Desa (2012) further look at these institutional 'constraints' as both beneficial and adverse for the social entrepreneurs' activities at the international level. The author documents how international social entrepreneurs are able to function and grow in an unfavorable institutional environment. His case illustrations provide evidence that institutional pillars serve as both enabling and constraining conditions for the resources' mobilization of social entrepreneurs (Desa 2012). The paper further demonstrates how bricolage can act as a mechanism that reconfigures institutional environments. Specifically, if the selective use of bricolage allows entrepreneurial ventures to survive in poor institutional environments, it also acts as a legitimizing instrument allowing these to change institutional pillars (Desa 2012). Finally, these institutional conditions, which Gundry et al. (2011) call 'innovation ecology', also impact social innovation. Based on a survey conducted among 113 social entrepreneurs, they show that this ecology influences the degree of catalytic innovation, which is 'the development of products and services targeted to unserved markets'.

When we talk about impact of social bricolage, we must also consider how to measure this outcome. The ability to address social needs and problems is something that can hardly be measured (Bacq et al. 2015). Moreover, financial measures are certainly not the best means to capture the social value created (Bacq et al. 2015). This comes primarily from the fact that the products or services that the entrepreneur provides to the community in needs are non-quantifiable (Zahra et al. 2009). While in commercial firms, success can be assessed by the size of the firm, the growth rate, the processes, among others, the success of social entrepreneurial ventures is rather captured by the degree of innovations, the outcomes and the scaling of social impact (Bacq et al. 2015). Very recently, in an effort to understand the intertwining between bricolage and social entrepreneurship, Molecke and Pinkse (2017) have taken an interest in the approaches social entrepreneurs take to engage the frictions with stakeholders associated with the measurement of social impact. Their qualitative study reveals two mechanisms through which social entrepreneurs manage frictions with stakeholders. First, social entrepreneurs use four arguments to delegitimize the formal and traditional methodologies used to measure outcomes. They perceive these as immeasurable, imprudent, incomplete and irrelevant. These four lines of critique highlight the 'data-related or theoretical voids' of formal methodologies used by social entrepreneurs to justify the fact they do not use them. Second, they show that ideational and material bricolage are used to 'fill the voids' and develop creative alternatives that better fit with the social entrepreneurs' perceptions of social impact. They make do with 'what at-hand' to develop their own methodology to measure social impact.

As social entrepreneurs experience some frictions with stakeholders in general, they also face difficulties in their relation with financial resources' providers (Sunley and Pinch 2012). Indeed, the results of the research conducted by Sunley and Pinch (2012) show that most urban social enterprises prefer to make a limited use of external finance. These firms adopt a 'cautious approach' to finance and therefore, pursue an incremental growth. The bricolage approach helps to understand this adaptive financial management dominated by practical reasons. However, Sunley and Pinch (2012) argue that this 'bricolage' perspective depicts

the social firms in a way that can be too optimistic. This approach supports the idea that social firms can easily manage the poor and harsh environment in which they operate.

Finally, in addition to the resources-constrained environment and the inability of formal organizations to tackle a specific problem, the use of bricolage may also be triggered by the urgency of the situation. Johannisson and Olaison (2007) speak about 'emergency entrepreneurship'. They analyze how the inability of public institutions and other formal organizations to cope with a hurricane has triggered informal organizing. Private organizations, communities or individuals take spontaneous actions in direct response to a manmade/natural disaster. These help the authors to craft the notion of 'emergency entrepreneurship' as spontaneous and ephemeral initiatives oriented towards the provision of support for communities in need. It is from these combinations and integration of elements from the everyday routines to answer an urgency that social bricolage emerges (Johannisson and Olaison 2007).

Bricolage in social entrepreneurship: what we learn from the articles in this special issue²

This special issue aims at providing new insights on how the concept of bricolage is used to foster research on social entrepreneurship. Following the Call for Papers, we received 28 submissions. After at least three rounds of review, we finally selected seven papers, which are presented below.

The seven papers are addressing a set of important issues in relation to the ways the concept of bricolage can be thought and applied in the context of social entrepreneurship. Two papers question the relevance of the concept from a theoretical point of view. Two papers examine the role of bricolage in the growth of social businesses. Finally, three papers explore the diversity of situations in which bricolage behaviors can be applied.

The first two papers look at bricolage in the context of social entrepreneurship from a theoretical viewpoint, questioning the concept and its relationships with similar concepts or theories, like those of effectuation and improvisation. In their paper entitled 'Bricolage, effectuation and causation shifts over time in the context of social enterprises', Servantie and Hlady-Rispal examine how the combination of causation, effectuation and bricolage changes over a particular venture's life cycle and analyse the factors determining such shifts. Using a longitudinal case study of a Colombian foundation, the authors analyse the behaviours underlying the three theories and their alternations, specifically looking at three different periods of the entrepreneurial process: emergence, development and replication. The findings throw light on the activities that require causation and those that need bricolage or effectuation. In his paper, 'Disclosing everyday practices constituting social entrepreneuring – A case of necessity entrepreneurship' Johannisson, using a longitudinal methodology to study a Swedish work-integrating social enterprise and its everyday procedures, shows that a different kind of effectuation logic, called necessity effectuation, works in social enterprises. The findings also reveal structural practices, interpreted as dualities, that frame the processual practices. Based on this need for structure in the social enterprise, Johannisson claims that effectuation and bricolage metaphors are not the best theoretical lenses. For him, 'In social entrepreneuring, a weaving metaphor with the structural practices as the warp and the processual ones as the weft elements appears as more appropriate'.

The following two papers use the concept of bricolage to study processes by which social entrepreneurs make their business grow. In their paper entitled 'Bricolage and growth in

social entrepreneurship organizations', Bojica, Ruiz Jimenez, Ruiz Nava and Fuentes-Fuentes try to identify which configurations of resource endowment, autonomy in the use of resources, Top Management Team (TMT) diversity and bricolage foster organizational growth. Using a fuzzy-set theoretical technique, the authors show that the effect of bricolage on growth depends on the availability of resources, the degree of autonomy in using these and TMT diversity. The results also indicate that TMT gender diversity is not a relevant condition for growth, while members' previous experience of TMT in for-profit organizations has a negative impact on growth. In their paper entitled 'Resource bricolage and growth of product and market scope in social enterprises', Tasavori, Kwong and Pruthi, using interviews with nine social enterprises, suggest that social enterprises implement both internal and network (external) resources in the process of making do. More precisely, the authors show that social enterprises have heterogeneous practices in using bricolage to extend the product and market scope of their activities. As stressed in their conclusion 'Whereas social enterprises that rely on both internal and network bricolage are able to introduce new products and expand into new markets, those that use only internal resources first move towards either product or market development before embarking on the other through incremental improvisation'.

Finally, the last three papers investigate the diversity of social entrepreneurial situations and, as a consequence, the variety of forms (and effects) of bricolage practices. In their paper entitled 'The merits and limits of making do: Bricolage and breakdowns in a social enterprise', Ladstaetter, Plank and Hemetsberger apply a strategy as practice perspective to identify the sources of and responses to temporary and complete breakdowns in a social enterprise. Their results suggest that conflicting views of the organization's identity may result in diverging standards for evaluating economic and social performance and lead to breakdowns. They analyze why bricolage is a source of and a solution to temporary breakdowns and why, in a situation of complete breakdown, the social enterprise needs to find a new balance between its social and economic objectives, engaging itself in identity work. As a conclusion, Ladstaetter et al. show 'how breakdowns lead to an extension of the social enterprise repertoire and discuss how the combination of the social mission and bricolage behaviours enables the organization to eschew path dependency, mobilize alternative resources and build improvisational strategy'. In his paper, 'Grassroots entrepreneurs and social change at the bottom of the pyramid: the role of bricolage', using a resource-based view and an inductive methodology, Sarkar explores how grassroots entrepreneurs living at the bottom of the pyramid work with scarce resources and overcome a very high level of constraints to create something with nothing. Based on the study of eight cases, the findings reveal distinctive features of bricolage in this specific context, such as the setting aside of cultural norms, the rejigging of domain-specific skills and the use of spare time. In the last paper of the special issue, entitled 'Catalyzing social innovation: is entrepreneurial bricolage always good?' Kickul, Griffiths, Bacq and Garud, using a sample of 113 social entrepreneurs and an online questionnaire survey, to explore the role of social entrepreneurs' bricolage behaviour in enabling the creation of innovations in resource-constrained environments, called 'catalytic innovations'. By studying the linkage between bricolage and catalytic innovations, the authors contribute to highlighting negative effects of bricolage in cases of social entrepreneurs' extreme use of bricolage, leading to the assumption that the effects of bricolage might be dependent on the degree to which social entrepreneurs engage and rely on it.

Further research on bricolage in social entrepreneurship

Taken together, the papers reveal several important patterns that motivated us to set up this special issue on bricolage in social entrepreneurship. These also raise some important questions that are still unaddressed.

First of all, the processes composing 'social bricolage' in itself need to be better documented. We have seen that Di Domenico, Haugh, and Tracey (2010) define social bricolage as a set of six processes. The processes of persuasion of significant others and value creation are still quite unknown and need refinement. Di Domenico, Haugh, and Tracey (2010) highlight the potential to make significant contributions by extending the repertoire of persuasive practices in social bricolage. Specifically, they stress the interest to deepen our understanding of altruism and benevolence as practices that can also serve to persuade relevant stakeholders.

Desa (2012) encourages future research to study the extent to which the use of bricolage can affect the diffusion of social innovations. Desa and Basu (2013) show that bricolage and optimization, as to processes that can be combined, allow organizing resources in an innovative way. They further indicate that looking at how different combinations of the use of bricolage should enrich research. Bacq et al. (2015) question the use of bricolage for both social and for-profit entrepreneurs as a long term strategy, supposing that there might be a point at which social entrepreneurial enterprises should better engage in a resources' mobilization process rather than in maintaining bricolage. In the same way, Molecke and Pinkse (2017) also note that the use of bricolage to face the challenges inherent to the social impact measurement can vary according to the life stage of the social firm.

Other environments should also be investigated. Further research should be conducted in environments in which resources' constraints are different and in organizations that are not social firms (Di Domenico, Haugh, and Tracey 2010), like commercial ventures (Bacq et al. 2015) or large public corporations characterized by resource scarcity (Desa and Basu 2013; Halme, Lindeman, and Linna 2012). Concerning the study of bricolage in the business context, Molecke and Pinkse (2017) highlight the fact that even for-profit entrepreneurs increasingly consider their broader impact on society. In this sense, the measurement of the social impact becomes also relevant for these firms that are for-profit and should inspire not-for-profit firms.

Looking at social bricolage in another environment can also be understood in terms of institutional context. Therefore, Desa and Koch (2014) encourage further research to understand the optimal institutional conditions under which economic and social benefits can produce shared value.

The concept of social bricolage should also be enriched and further refined by investigating it in diverse national contexts (Di Domenico, Haugh, and Tracey 2010), especially in economically developed countries. Fayolle and Nakara (2012), for example, show that, in the context of France, in most necessity entrepreneurship situations they have investigated, necessity entrepreneurs adopt bricolage behaviours.

This field of research can also be enriched by the use of different methodologies. Specifically, the need for longitudinal studies has been stressed several times (Desa and Basu 2013; Gundry et al. 2011). Longitudinal approaches would allow to better capture changes occurring in bricolage (behaviours, practices, forms) and in the use of alternative strategies like causation or improvisation.

Most selected articles (five out of seven) in the special issue use qualitative methods, often based on a single case. Multiple case studies in different socio-cultural contexts could overcome the limitations inherent to single case studies and contribute to better understand how different forms of bricolage in diverse contexts impact social value creation. Using qualitative and quantitative methods, comparative studies are needed to better understand successful and unsuccessful bricolage strategies and practices.

Finally, research might have a look at the mechanisms by which resources are enacted and mobilized. For example, future research could study the creative use of resources practices, both at the individual and organizational (Sonenshein 2014) levels. Researchers could also explore situations where bricolage is combined with other resource mobilization practices, like bootstrapping or strategic alliances, leading to new or increased collaborations and/or personal networks sharing between social enterprises.

Notes

1. The authors define these as « conditions that impact the social entrepreneur's likelihood to engage with an opportunity ».
2. The editors of this special issue are: Alain Fayolle, EMLYON Business School; Frank Janssen, Université catholique de Louvain; Severine Le Loarne-Lemaire, Grenoble School of Management; Adnane Maalaoui, ESG Management School.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

References

- Archer, G. R., T. Baker, and R. Mauer. 2009. "Towards an Alternative Theory of Entrepreneurial Success: Integrating Bricolage, Effectuation and Improvisation (Summary)." *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research* 29 (6): 4.
- Austin, J., H. Stevenson, and J. Wei-Skillern. 2006. "Social and Commercial Entrepreneurship: Same, Different, or Both?" *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. 30: 1–22.
- Bacq, S., and F. Janssen. 2011. "The Multiple Faces of Social Entrepreneurship: A Review of Definitional Issues Based on Geographical and Thematic Criteria." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 23 (5–6): 373–403.
- Bacq, S., L. F. Ofstein, J. R. Kickul, and L. K. Gundry. 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., and R. E. Nelson. 2005. "Creating Something from Nothing: Resource Construction through Entrepreneurial Bricolage." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 50 (3): 329–366.
- Baker, T., A. S. Miner, and D. T. Eesley. 2003. "Improvising Firms: Bricolage, Account Giving and Improvisational Competencies in the Founding Process." *Research Policy* 32 (2): 255–276.
- Battilana, J., and M. Lee. 2014. "Advancing Research on Hybrid Organizing – Insights from the Study of Social Enterprises." *Academy of Management Annals* 8: 397–441.
- Bhawe, N., H. Rawhouser, and J. M. Pollack. 2016. "Horse and Craft: The Role of Resource Acquisition Order in New Ventures." *Journal of Business Venturing Insights* 6 (1): 7–13.
- Ciborra, C. U. 1996. "The Platform Organization: Recombining Strategies, Structures, and Surprises." *Organization Science*. 7 (2): 103–118.

- Corner, P. D., and M. Ho. 2010. "How Opportunities Develop in Social Entrepreneurship." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 34 (4): 635–659.
- Dacin, P. A., M. T. Dacin, and M. Matear. 2010. "Social Entrepreneurship: Why We Don't Need a New Theory and How We Move Forward From Here." *The Academy of Management Perspectives* 24 (3): 37–57.
- Dacin, M., P. Dacin, and P. Tracey. 2011. "Social Entrepreneurship: A Critique and Future Directions." *Organization Science* 22 (5): 1203–1213.
- 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., and S. Basu. 2013. "Optimization or Bricolage? Overcoming Resource Constraints in Global Social Entrepreneurship." *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* 7 (1): 26–49.
- Desa, G., and J. L. Koch. 2014. "Scaling Social Impact: Building Sustainable Social Ventures at the Base-of-the-Pyramid." *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship* 5 (2): 146–174.
- Dey, P., C. Steyaert, and D. Hjorth. 2006. "The Rhetoric of Social Entrepreneurship: Paralogy and New Language Games in Academic Discourse." *Entrepreneurship as Social Change: A Third Movements of Entrepreneurship*, 121–144. Cheltenham UK: Edward Elgar.
- Di Domenico, M., H. Haugh, and P. Tracey. 2010. "Social Bricolage: Theorizing Social Value Creation in Social Enterprises." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 34: 681–703.
- Dorado, S. 2006. "Social Entrepreneurial Ventures: Different Values So Different Process of Creation, No?" *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship* 11 (4): 319–343.
- Dorado, S., and M. J. Ventresca. 2013. "Crescive Entrepreneurship in Complex Social Problems: Institutional Conditions for Entrepreneurial Engagement." *Journal of Business Venturing* 28 (1): 69–82.
- Duymedjian, R., and C. C. Rüling. 2010. "Towards a Foundation of Bricolage in Organization and Management Theory." *Organization Studies* 31 (2): 133–151.
- Ebrahim, A., J. Battilana, and J. Mair. 2014. "The Governance of Social Enterprises: Mission Drift and Accountability Challenges in Hybrid Organizations." *Research in Organizational Behavior* 34: 81–100.
- Fayolle, A., and W. Nakara. 2012. "Création par nécessité et précarité: la face cachée de l'entrepreneuriat." *Economies et Sociétés, Série « Etudes Critiques en Management »*, KC, n°2, 9: 1729–1764.
- Fisher, G. 2012. "Effectuation, Causation, and Bricolage: A Behavioral Comparison of Emerging Theories in Entrepreneurship Research." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 36 (5): 1019–1051.
- Gartner, W. B. 1988. "Who is the Entrepreneur? Is the Wrong Question." *American Journal of Small Business* 12: 11–32.
- Garud, R., and P. Karnøe. 2003. "Bricolage versus Breakthrough: Distributed and Embedded Agency in Technology Entrepreneurship." *Research Policy* 32 (2): 277–300.
- Germak, A. J., and J. A. Robinson. 2014. "Exploring the Motivation of Nascent Social Entrepreneurs." *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship* 5 (1): 5–21.
- Gundry, L. K., J. R. Kickul, M. D. Griffiths, and S. C. Bacq. 2011. "Entrepreneurial Bricolage and Innovation Ecology: Precursors to Social Innovation?" *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research* 31 (19): 3.
- Halme, M., S. Lindeman, and P. Linna. 2012. "Innovation for Inclusive Business: Intrapreneurial Bricolage in Multinational Corporations." *Journal of Management Studies* 49 (4): 743–784.
- Harding, R. 2007. "Understanding Social Entrepreneurship." *Industry and Higher Education* 21 (1): 73–84.
- Janssen, F., S. Bacq, and F. Brouard. 2012. "L'entrepreneuriat social: un thème pour la recherche passée, présente et future." *Revue internationale PME: Économie et gestion de la petite et moyenne entreprise* 25 (3–4): 17–44.
- Johannisson, B., and L. Olaison. 2007. "The Moment of Truth-Reconstructing Entrepreneurship and Social Capital in the Eye of the Storm." *Review of Social Economy* 65 (1): 55–78.
- Kassean, H., J. Vanevenhoven, E. Liguori, and D. E. Winkel. 2015. "Entrepreneurship Education: A Need for Reflection, Real-World Experience and Action." *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research* 21 (5): 690–708.
- Lanzara, G. F. 1999. "Between Transient Constructs and Persistent Structures: Designing Systems in Action." *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems* 8 (4): 331–349.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1967. *The Savage Mind*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Leybourne, S., and E. Sadler-Smith. 2006. "The Role of Intuition and Improvisation in Project Management." *International Journal of Project Management* 24 (6): 483–492.

- 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 (3): 1350015.
- Mair, J., J. Battilana, and J. Cardenas. 2012. "Organizing for Society: A Typology of Social Entrepreneurial Models." *Journal of Business Ethics* 111 (3): 353–373.
- Mair, J., and I. Martí. 2006. "Social Entrepreneurship Research: A Source of Explanation, Prediction, and Delight." *Journal of World Business* 41 (1): 36–44.
- McMullen, J. S., and B. Bergman. 2017. "Social Entrepreneurship and the Development Paradox of Prosocial Motivation: A Cautionary Tale." *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* 11 (3): 243–270.
- Miller, T. L., I. I. Wesley, and L. Curtis. 2010. "Assessing Mission and Resources for Social Change: An Organizational Identity Perspective on Social Venture Capitalists' Decision Criteria." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 34 (4): 705–733.
- Miller, T. L., M. G. Grimes, J. S. McMullen, and T. J. Vogus. 2012. "Venturing for Others With Heart and Head: How Compassion Encourages Social Entrepreneurship." *Academy of Management Review* 37 (4): 616–640.
- Molecke, G., and J. Pinkse. 2017. "Accountability for Social Impact: A Bricolage Perspective on Impact Measurement in Social Enterprises." *Journal of Business Venturing* 32 (5): 550–568.
- Moss, T. W., J. C. Short, G. T. Payne, and G. T. Lumpkin. 2011. "Dual Identities in Social Ventures: An Exploratory Study." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 35 (4): 805–830.
- Nicholls, A. 2009. "We do Good Things, don't We?: Blended Value Accounting in Social Entrepreneurship." *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 34 (6): 755–769.
- Ordanini, A., G. Rubera, and R. DeFillippi. 2008. "The Many Moods of Inter-organizational Imitation: A Critical Review." *International Journal of Management Reviews* 10 (4): 375–398.
- Peredo, A. M., and J. J. Chrisman. 2006. "Toward a Theory of Community-based Enterprise." *Academy of Management Review* 31 (2): 309–328.
- Peredo, A. M., and M. McLean. 2006. "Social Entrepreneurship: A Critical Review of the Concept (July 2, 2006)." *Journal of World Business* 41 (1): 56–65.
- Phillips, N., and P. Tracey. 2007. "Opportunity Recognition, Entrepreneurial Capabilities and Bricolage: Connecting Institutional Theory and Entrepreneurship in Strategic Organizations." *Strategic Organization* 5 (3): 313–320.
- Podsakoff, P. M., S. B. MacKenzie, D. G. Bachrach, and N. P. Podsakoff. 2005. "The Influence of Management Journals in the 1980s and 1990s." *Strategic Management Journal* 26 (5): 473–488.
- Rothaermel, F. T., and D. L. Deeds. 2006. "Alliance Type, Alliance Experience and Alliance Management Capability in High-technology Ventures." *Journal of Business Venturing* 21 (4): 429–460.
- Salunke, S., J. Weerawardena, and J. R. McColl-Kennedy. 2013. "Competing Through Service Innovation: The Role of Bricolage and Entrepreneurship in Project-oriented Firms." *Journal of Business Research* 66 (8): 1085–1097.
- Sarasvathy, S. 2001. "Causation and Effectuation: Toward a Theoretical Shift from Economic Inevitability to Entrepreneurial Contingency." *The Academy of Management Review* 26 (2): 243–263.
- Sarasvathy, S. D. 2008. *Effectuation: Elements of Entrepreneurial Expertise, New Horizons in Entrepreneurship Series*. Cheltenham, UK; Massachusetts, USA: Edward Elgar.
- Sassmannshausen, S. P., and C. Volkmann. 2016. "The Scientometrics of Social Entrepreneurship and Its Establishment as an Academic Field." *Journal of Small Business Management*.
- Senyard, J., T. Baker, and P. Davidsson. 2009. "Entrepreneurial Bricolage: Towards Systemic Empirical Testing." *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*. 29 (5).
- Senyard, J., T. Baker, P. Steffens, and P. Davidsson. 2014. "Bricolage as a Path to Innovativeness for Resource-Constrained New Firms." *Journal of Product Innovation Management* 31 (2): 211–230.
- Shane, S., and S. Venkataraman. 2000. "The Promise of Entrepreneurship as a Field of Research." *Academy of management review* 25 (1): 217–226.
- Shaw, E., and S. Carter. 2007. "Social Entrepreneurship: Theoretical Antecedents and Empirical Analysis of Entrepreneurial Processes and Outcomes." *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development* 14 (3): 418–434.
- Short, J. C., T. W. Moss, and G. T. Lumpkin. 2009. "Research in Social Entrepreneurship: Past Contributions and Future Opportunities." *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* 3 (2): 161–194.

- Sonenshein, S. 2014. "How Organizations Foster the Creative Use of Resources." *Academy of Management Journal* 57 (3): 814–848.
- Spencer, J. W., T. P. Murtha, and S. A. Lenway. 2005. "How Governments Matter to New Industry Creation." *Academy of Management Review* 30 (2): 321–337.
- Stinchfield, B. T., R. E. Nelson, and M. S. Wood. 2013. "Learning from Levi-Strauss' Legacy: Art, Craft, Engineering, Bricolage, and Brokerage in Entrepreneurship." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 37 (4): 889–921.
- Sunley, P., and S. Pinch. 2012. "Financing Social Enterprise: Social Bricolage or Evolutionary Entrepreneurialism?" *Social Enterprise Journal* 8 (2): 108–122.
- Thompson, J., G. Alvy, and A. Lees. 2000. "Social Entrepreneurship—A New Look at the People and the Potential." *Management Decision* 38 (5): 328–338.
- Toutain, O., and A. Fayolle. 2009. "Le créateur d'entreprise est un « bricoleur »." *L'Expansion Entrepreneuriat* 20–26.
- Tranfield, D., D. Denyer, and P. Smart. 2003. "Towards a Methodology for Developing Evidence-Informed Management Knowledge by Means of Systematic Review." *British Journal of Management* 14 (3): 207–222.
- Urbano, D., E. Ferri, C. Alvarez, and M. Noguera. 2017. "Social Entrepreneurship and Institutional Conditions: An Empirical Analysis in Spain." In *Social Entrepreneurship in Non-Profit and Profit Sectors. Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives*. International Studies in Entrepreneurship, edited by M. Peris-Ortiz, F. Teulon, and D. Bonet-Fernandez, Vol. 36, pp. 53–64. Springer.
- Vanevenhoven, J., D. Winkel, D. Malewicki, W. L. Dougan, and J. Bronson. 2011. "Varieties of Bricolage and the Process of Entrepreneurship." *New England Journal of Entrepreneurship* 14 (2): 53.
- Witell, L., H. Gebauer, E. Jaakkola, W. Hammedi, L. Patricio, and H. Perks. 2017. "A Bricolage Perspective on Service Innovation." *Journal of Business Research* 79: 290–298.
- Zahra, S. A., E. Gedajlovic, D. O. Neubaum, and J. M. Shulman. 2009. "A Typology of Social Entrepreneurs: Motives, Search Processes and Ethical Challenges." *Journal of Business Venturing* 24 (5): 519–532.
- Zahra, S. A., H. N. Rawhouser, N. Bhawe, D. O. Neubaum, and J. C. Hayton. 2008. "Globalization of Social Entrepreneurship Opportunities." *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* 2 (2): 117–131.