

# To Be Or Not To Be? Paradox Of Guanxi In Creating A Sustainable Entrepreneurial Ecosystem

Peng Ren\*, Weiying Chong

## Abstract

*The role of Chinese indigenous culture in the sustainability of the entrepreneurial ecosystem remains underexplored. Drawing upon social network theory, this study examines the unique entrepreneurial culture of guanxi across different temporal dimensions within the Chinese entrepreneurial ecosystem. We propose that the impact of guanxi on the entrepreneurial ecosystem is inconsistent across stages. In early phases, guanxi may facilitate collaboration among participants, but in mature stages, it might lead to a shift in entrepreneurial culture towards competition and conservatism. Such disparities can divert participants who emphasize guanxi away from their original intent of value creation, thereby weakening the social network of guanxi in the circulation of resources, information, and knowledge, potentially leading to the decline of the Entrepreneurial Ecosystem. Furthermore, we analyze the limitations of this study. We hope that our discussion on these issues will spur researchers to explore the governance contradictions of guanxi in different stages of the entrepreneurial ecosystem in China, promoting sustainable development of this framework. More importantly, the governance contradictions of guanxi across various time periods may provoke discussions on the limitations of applying social network theory in the field of entrepreneurship.*

**Key Words:** *Entrepreneurial Ecosystem, Guanxi, Value Creation, Social Network, Entrepreneurial Culture.*

## 1 Introduction

In the field of entrepreneurship, culture is perceived as a set of rules, norms, values, and beliefs formed and adhered to within social interactions (Porrás-Paez, 2023). The development and evolution of entrepreneurial culture are networked, closely related to the interactions between the entrepreneurial environment and its participants, especially evident within an ecosystem framework (Minguzzi & Passaro, 2001). The normative and value-oriented aspects of entrepreneurial culture may be key in stimulating entrepreneurial

---

<sup>1</sup>.School of Management & Marketing, Faculty of Business and Law, Taylor's University, Subang Jaya, 47500, Selangor, Malaysia.

corresponding author\* Peng Ren

vitality (Cohen, 2006; Donaldson, 2021; Igwe, et al. 2020).

As a unique entrepreneurial culture, Guanxi in Chinese business and management is widely regarded as an emotion-sensitive, network-based method of resource allocation (Chung, 2006; Guo & Miller, 2010). Guanxi underscores reciprocal social connections and networks, offering access to resources, benefits for social status and mobility in Chinese society (Wu & Wallace, 2021). Beyond expanding through social networks, Guanxi also relies on emotional bonds, with the cultivation and maintenance of Guanxi through gifts or favors as an accepted norm (Guo & Miller, 2010). Nolan & Roway (2020) thus consider Guanxi a 'coupling' of entrepreneurial culture and social networks, embodying both cultural and network traits.

Under the framework of social network theory, Guanxi functions not only through individual and organizational network interactions but also influences resource accumulation, knowledge sharing, and information transfer through network structural features (like network density, centrality, and bridging relationships), thereby providing necessary support for the sustainable development of EE (Youssef, et al. 2018; Igwe & Ochinanwata, 2021). This support manifests in two aspects: the expansion of the ecosystem's space and collaboration in participant interactions. Zahra and Nambisan (2012) discussed the importance of collaboration and competition for successful entrepreneurship from a cultural perspective, highlighting the significance of strategic thinking in utilizing corporate resources and capabilities. Spigel (2017) therefore believes that culture can provide necessary support for the spatial development of EE. This supportive drive allows entrepreneurial culture to substitute for formal institutions, planning the expansion of EE in socially accepted ways (Roundy, 2017). Hence, integrating different cultural experiences benefits ecosystem-level entrepreneurial performance, showcasing the importance of cultural networks in promoting EE sustainability (Shen, Guo & Ma, 2023).

As a culture, Guanxi also promotes participant collaboration in a conventional way. Stimulating a 'consensus' among participants is a key condition for evolving EE (Thompson, Purdy & Ventresca, 2018; Spigel & Harrison, 2018; Bouncken & Kraus, 2022). Harper-Anderson (2018), based on a comparative study between entrepreneurial support organizations in Chicago, Pittsburgh, and Richmond, found that differences in cooperative practices partly stem from cultural and institutional norms shaped by different leadership styles. This suggests that Guanxi's cooperativeness is variable, determining the level of collaboration among entrepreneurs (Donaldson, 2021).

However, few studies discuss the association between Guanxi and the Entrepreneurial Ecosystem (EE), particularly how Guanxi, as a product of coupling entrepreneurial culture and social network, facilitates the sustainable development of EE. As stated by Chen, et al. (2021), most Chinese researchers directly adopt foreign EE theories, neglecting the specificity of local culture. The foundation of Guanxi is reciprocal relations, not the self-interest and fairness principles common in Western social networks, making the former

more closed and stable (Luo & Yeh, 2012). Additionally, as a local culture, Guanxi emphasizes establishing and maintaining interdependent social connections over focusing on individual ability, innovation, and competitive strategies (Guo & Miller, 2010). Underestimating these differences may lead to policies and development strategies becoming disconnected from Chinese entrepreneurial practice (Zapalska & Edwards, 2001). Such governance structural flaws misguide the understanding of EE dynamics, thereby disrupting the formulation of entrepreneurial strategies (Tan, 2002; Hong, Ge & Wu, 2023).

Hence, to build an EE based on the Chinese context, exploring the role of Guanxi is essential. Discussing this issue allows EE to dynamically examine and refine itself, not only promotes efficient resource allocation but also helps maintain the system's vitality and adaptability. Achieving this goal is challenging, requiring participants and managers in EE to deeply understand localized entrepreneurial culture and social networks, and to flexibly adjust strategies at transitional points to suit the system's developmental stage (Donaldson, 2021; Cantner et al. 2021). From an academic research perspective, exploring the importance of this mechanism not only enriches the understanding of EE sustainability and offers new research paths. This perspective underscores the necessity of analyzing and designing cultural networks in dynamic environments and effectively managing the relationship between collaboration and competition at different stages. This poses new challenges for both theory and practice, providing valuable insights for future entrepreneurial research and practice.

## **2 Guanxi and Sustainability of Entrepreneurial Ecosystem**

### **2.1 The Effects of Guanxi on Entrepreneurship Activities**

Guanxi can be understood as a culturally-based, networked social structure in China, typically centered around influential or resourceful individuals. These central figures link other network members through personal relationships, fostering trust and mutual dependence for exchanging resources, information, and support (Ma & Xu, 2016). This mixed "cultural network" consists of interdependent individuals or organizations, adopting interaction modes distinct from those external to it (Chung, 2006). Guanxi circles in Chinese entrepreneurship are akin to "entrepreneurial communities" as mentioned by Roundy (2019), but unlike these communities, which often have formal norms such as rules, systems, and laws, guanxi circles operate on unspoken norms (Nolan & Rowley, 2020).

Guanxi provides a unique "circle" perspective, extending entrepreneurs' advantages in resource acquisition and knowledge sharing (Gao, et al. 2020; Guan & Frenkel, 2019; Luo, Cheng & Zhang, 2016). For instance, Gao et al. (2020) revealed methods for calculating relationship strength within Chinese guanxi circles, highlighting more efficient interactions within the circle, especially in resource sharing and information circulation. Additionally, Guanxi can stimulate extra-role organizational performance through trust, benefiting the entire organization (Luo, et al. 2016).

However, the impacts of Guanxi are not always positive. Built on unspoken "hidden rules," it raises concerns about fairness in resource acquisition and information exchange,

potentially leading to unfair resource distribution (Yu, Nahm & Song, 2017). Such reliance may also exacerbate corruption (Fan, 2022).

The fixed and exclusive nature of Guanxi might also hinder productive entrepreneurial activities. Service industries, unlike those based on industrial production or knowledge services, do not create new value but engage in value distribution and transfer (Baumol, 1990). Guanxi-based entrepreneurship might prioritize emotional maintenance over value creation, potentially diverting from the original intent of enhancing market competitiveness through improved product quality or services (Gu, Hung & Tse, 2008).

The dual role of Guanxi in entrepreneurship, as both a bonding mechanism for resource acquisition and a facilitator of knowledge mobilization, requires a more dynamic examination of its impact on the entrepreneurial process. This necessitates moving beyond a "cross-sectional" understanding of Guanxi to appreciate its dynamic and phase-specific influences on entrepreneurship (Luo & Yeh, 2012; Li, Millo & Zachariadis, 2022).

## 2.2 The Effects of Guanxi in Creating a Sustainable Entrepreneurial Ecosystem

The Entrepreneurial Ecosystem (EE) is a framework emphasizing cycles and processes, where early and mature stages differ significantly in participant interactions. Roundy & Fayard (2018) attribute these differences to variations in "vitality," which enhances collaboration levels among participants. Spigel & Harrison (2018) see this relationship as key to ecosystem replication, highlighting the crucial role of social dynamics in EE development. Initially, participants in an EE are dispersed and unconnected, changing with the rise of entrepreneurial culture and social network transformations. These cultural perceptions and micro-material dynamics stimulate vitality, impacting the internal circulation of knowledge, information, and resources, thereby driving evolution of EEs (Mack & Meyer, 2016; Cantner et al. 2019).

Prior research scarcely directly discusses Guanxi and EE sustainability. However, vitality can act as a medium linking Guanxi and EE. Social dynamics, a key component of vitality in EE, depend heavily on social networks, emphasizing interaction among individuals and groups. This network-based approach encourages collaboration and knowledge and information exchange within the network. Thus, EEs based on social dynamics develop cohesive entrepreneurial cultures, fostering mutually beneficial relationships among entrepreneurs (Donaldson, 2021).

Guanxi, particularly in an entrepreneurial cultural context, can stimulate social dynamics. Thompson, Purdy & Ventresca (2018) view social dynamics as a "cohesive force" promoting consensus. Guanxi builds consensus through interpersonal relationship maintenance. This consensus establishes connections for the flow of resources, information, and knowledge, transforming resources into necessary interpersonal relationships and vice versa (Spigel & Harrison, 2018; Luo & Yeh, 2012).

However, the impact of guanxi on social dynamics is double-edged, offering collaboration opportunities and sowing seeds of competition (Chung, 2006). This dual nature may lead to varying effects across different stages, influencing sustainability of EE (Spigel & Harrison, 2018).

### **Early Stage**

In the Chinese cultural context, guanxi emphasizes long-term interaction and mutual obligations, providing a fundamental logic deeply rooted in the entrepreneurial environment: trust and equitable transactions (Puffer, McCarthy, & Boisot, 2010). Networks established through guanxi are often based on shared cultural understandings and values, facilitating fairness in transactions and interactions (Luo & Yeh, 2012). This orientation towards equity is particularly crucial for startups, which typically lack market influence and negotiation power (Roundy & Bayer, 2019). However, by garnering trust, members of guanxi circles can share existing social networks, thereby gaining rapid expansion capabilities (Hoang & Antoncic, 2003). Correspondingly, they need to share their resources, information, and technology in exchange to expand the influence of guanxi and facilitate subsequent entrants (McGrath & O'Toole, 2014).

Guanxi's maintenance of fairness stimulates the vibrancy of social networks (Luo & Yeh, 2012). Compared to other social networks, guanxi places greater emphasis on reciprocal framework, aiding in ensuring that even smaller or newly established enterprises gain support and resources within the entrepreneurial ecosystem, thus maintaining fairness (Guo & Miller, 2010). Stable interpersonal networks not only reduce the risks and losses brought by uncertainty but also expand product markets and promote information flow at the microeconomic level (Leyden, Link, & Siegel, 2014; Popov, Simonova & Komarova, 2019). Within these networks, participants can share feedback, technical knowledge, and new opportunities through open markets, meaning even those with less capital or resources can gain support through guanxi, which might be challenging in traditional business settings, thus creating a more positive social dynamic (Guo & Miller, 2010).

Moreover, active guanxi networks also encourage value creation (Scerri & Agarwal, 2013). In guanxi culture, the deepening of interpersonal relationships often accompanies the exchange of knowledge and experience, facilitating the discovery of new business opportunities, collective learning, and value creation within the entrepreneurial ecosystem (Aldrich & Martinez, 2001). As guanxi becomes more intimate, participants can access more key resources and knowledge, a privilege not based on professionalism but on the closeness of guanxi (Gao et al., 2020). This means that in guanxi networks, the role of partners is not merely transactional but also advisory (Igwe et al., 2021). This unique function of guanxi, distinct from other social networks, fosters cross-industry and cross-domain collaborations, which are crucial sources of value creation (Fu, Tsui & Dess, 2014).

Therefore, guanxi in the early stages of the ecosystem, by promoting knowledge exchange, reducing collaboration costs, and creating an environment conducive to innovation, provides strong support for creating competitive advantages for participants.

### **Mature Stage**

The role of guanxi in Chinese culture is not linear; it may undergo disruptive transformations at different developmental stages (Egbert, 2009). Attitudes toward external units tend to become more conservative with the maturation of guanxi, leading to exclusivity and distrust toward outsiders (Nolan & Rowley, 2020).

Exclusivity and distrust may hinder value creation within ecosystems (Spigel & Harrison, 2018). Baumol (1990) posits that the duality of guanxi over a more extended time frame could reverse its role in "productive" activities. In the initial stages, the guanxi circle retains some openness due to insufficient resources, information, and knowledge within existing networks (Chung, 2006). Participants in guanxi, driven by survival needs, need to maintain continuous value production (Luo & Yeh, 2012). However, once the produced value satisfies members' survival needs, the value orientation of guanxi may shift to non-productive activities (Baumol, 1990). This shift implies a change in the network structure of the guanxi circle, where core members may detach from value production and exploit their monopoly position to gain benefits, such as offering consulting, financial, and human resource services (Baumol, 1990). Other members utilize their status advantages to obtain outsourcing tasks, which they then subcontract to more peripheral non-member individuals or organizations, like new participants (Hwang et al. 2009; Arias, 1998). These new participants may face inequitable treatment in terms of rights and obligations, bearing more obligations while enjoying fewer returns (Luo & Yeh, 2012; Guo & Miller, 2010). As guanxi circle members begin to focus on these areas, it signifies the system's departure from the "value creation" track, transitioning to a "non-productive entrepreneurial environment" focusing on internal interests and value distribution (Fu, Tsui & Dess, 2006).

The survival needs of the guanxi circle can also affect its transformation, leading to unfair distribution (Guo & Miller, 2010). In this case, Guanxi may still maintain a relative fairness, but this fairness is not for everyone, only for members within the guanxi circle (Egbert, 2009). Early collaboration among participants can lead to fixed cooperation preferences, a stereotype based on stability, resulting in participants' dependence on the established pattern within the network frame, thereby reducing exploration of external resources, knowledge, or information (Wang et al., 2014). Not only are there pitfalls in terms of closure, but participants may also choose to further enhance their competitive awareness of the external environment while improving communication with existing partners, potentially reinforcing the closure of the guanxi circle (Barboza & Laruccia, 2016). In the early stages, these drawbacks may be suppressed due to common survival challenges, but mature guanxi circles may form different hierarchies, meaning members with closer guanxi can exploit advantages in resources and information for profit, such as engaging in support, service, and consulting entrepreneurial activities (Gu, Hung & Tse, 2008). Compared to direct engagement in productive entrepreneurship, "these activities have the advantage of reducing the effort and cost input in entrepreneurial management. Core members can thus focus their main effort and cost on maintaining interpersonal relationships, further

strengthening guanxi" (Weng & Xu, 2018; Nolan & Rowley, 2020). Therefore, the maturation of the guanxi circle also hinders the "productivity" aspect of EE, as participants refuse the involvement of other individuals or organizations and attempt to build "barriers" at the edge of quanzi (Chung, 2006; Muldoon, Bauman & Lucy, 2018).

The shift in value creation and fairness means that the internal social dynamic of EE is hindered, which Muldoon, Bauman & Lucy (2018) describe as "the inhibition of dynamism by trust." Indeed, trust within a specific guanxi circle, which may imply distrust of external groups (Chen et al. 2018), can drive entrepreneurial activities more efficiently in the early stages, as early participants' trust is "elastic," which is a major reason many studies recognize the contribution of social networks to the sustainability of EE (Cantner et al. 2021; Mack & Meyer, 2016). However, in mature stages, established guanxi may conflict with external communities due to exclusivity (Vrontis et al. 2021). At this point, the original advantage of guanxi—cohesion—may transform into excessive concentration of resources, knowledge, and information (Guo & Miller, 2010). This implies a differentiation in trust levels between different levels within the guanxi circle (Luo & Yeh, 2012). This differentiation leads to shackles in the circulation of resources, information, and knowledge, triggering the decline of the ecosystem (Spigel & Harrison, 2018).

### **Conclusion and Recommendations**

In scrutinizing the role of guanxi in sustainability, we posit that entrepreneurial ecosystems (EEs) influenced by guanxi face governance dilemmas. Guanxi networks are dynamic, implying that guanxi's governance mechanisms might shift throughout different stages of the entrepreneurial process (Guo & Miller, 2010). This shift is multifaceted; on one hand, as survival issues resolve, participants' motivations for maintaining guanxi may shift from initial survival to benefit expansion, potentially signaling a decrease in innovation and efficiency (Guo & Miller, 2010; Chung, 2006). On the other hand, challenges from other guanxi networks might render the original governance mechanisms ineffective (Gu, Hung & Tse, 2008). More critically, guanxi essentially represents an unspoken set of network rules, emphasizing reciprocity based on subjective perceptions (Luo & Yeh, 2012). However, subjective expectations do not always align with objective realities, potentially generating a sense of "unfairness" among participants, thereby deepening divisions over resource distribution, information sharing, and knowledge exchange (Chen & Chen, 2004). Hence, the efficacy of guanxi-focused governance might wane as entrepreneurial activities progress (Aldrich & Martinez, 2001; Chung, 2006).

A more extreme possibility is that emphasizing guanxi could yield opposite results at different stages of entrepreneurship (Lumpkin et al., 2013). In the early stages, participants choose to suspend competition and form cooperative relations for rapid access to resources, knowledge, and information, maintaining a positive and open attitude toward external participants and keeping communication between internal and external parties. However, EEs do not produce resources but stimulate their own evolution by absorbing external knowledge, resources, and information (Spigel & Harrison, 2018). As the EE matures, the initially cohesive guanxi may need to choose between accepting new members (and their

accompanying resources, knowledge, and information) and maintaining existing cooperative relationships (Guo & Miller, 2010; Luo & Yeh, 2012). Opting for new members might weaken guanxi's influence and challenge the established social network, whereas favoring existing partners might impede the integration of external individuals and organizations (Hoang & Antoncic, 2003; Guthrie, 1998). Influenced by traditional Chinese mianzi and renqing culture, most participants tend to choose the latter, leading to exclusivity and closure in guanxi (Chung, 2006). Therefore, guanxi that initially supported participants might, in its mature state, hinder further entrepreneurial development (Lumpkin et al. 2013; Shir et al. 2019).

Some studies thus suggest that guanxi is suitable only for early-stage entrepreneurship, and as the enterprise scales and operates, a greater emphasis on formal institutional governance is warranted (Chung, 2006; Lumpkin et al. 2013). However, this may not apply to a broader entrepreneurial environment. EEs are considered a diversified entrepreneurial framework, encompassing participants from various industries and organizations, making it challenging to bind these participants with uniform corporate charters or industry conventions (Mack & Meyer, 2016). Furthermore, researchers generally regard EEs as spontaneously cohesive rather than formed by top-down administrative orders, implying limited policy and formal institutional interventions in EEs (Thompson, Purdy & Ventresca, 2018; Spigel & Harrison, 2018; Cantner et al. 2021). Therefore, it is a challenge for EE governors to decide whether to develop guanxi. Encouraging participants to develop guanxi might yield a stable and rapidly developing ecosystem in the short term, at the cost of potentially forming competition against other social networks and monopolizing resources (Spigel & Harrison, 2018); but limiting development of guanxi might fail to ensure that ventures obtain necessary resources and technology, possibly leading to inability of ecosystems to transition smoothly to a mature stage (Mack & Meyer, 2016).

The contradictory role of guanxi at different stages also highlights the complexity of social networks. The duality of guanxi suggests that the functions and effects of social networks may differ, and sometimes be opposite, depending on the stage or environment. This contradiction has been explored in the past decades, as indicated by Berkman et al. (2000), who demonstrated that network influences might change paradoxically over time or in different societal settings. Valente et al. (2015) arrived at similar conclusions through their analysis of the role of social networks at different times. Scott (1988) and Krause et al. (2007) attributed these changes to shifts in network roles and structures. Thus, the applicability of social network theory might be challenged.

Guanxi, as a unique cultural element in China, plays a pivotal role in the construction of entrepreneurial ecosystems. Research indicates that studies on entrepreneurship in China place a stronger emphasis on the significance of culture and social capital in promoting indigenous entrepreneurial spirit (Li & Matlay, 2006). This implies that in the context of Chinese entrepreneurial ecosystems (EE), human capital, knowledge creation, and financing channels are the primary drivers of local entrepreneurial activities (Lai &



Vonortas, 2019). Unveiling this concept is instrumental in understanding the complexities of how social networks in a Chinese-specific context either facilitate or constrain the development of EEs. More importantly, exploring the governance dilemmas of entrepreneurial ecosystems (EE) based on guanxi contributes to enhancing understandings of the limitations of applying social network theory in the field of entrepreneurship.

### **Limitations**

This study delves into the unique culture of guanxi in China and its impact on entrepreneurial ecosystems, yet our analysis might be overly reliant on a singular cultural background. This cultural bias could limit the general applicability of our conclusions, as entrepreneurial ecosystems in different cultural and social environments may exhibit diverse dynamics. Therefore, our study might lack a comparative perspective on similar social network phenomena in other cultural contexts, restricting the broad application of our theoretical framework.

### **Consideration of the Time Dimension:**

While we discussed the changing roles of guanxi at different developmental stages, we might not have fully revealed the specific mechanisms and underlying motivations for these changes. An analysis over time is crucial for understanding how guanxi affects the long-term development of entrepreneurial ecosystems, but past research might not have delved deeply into these complex transitional processes. More detailed time series analyses or longitudinal studies could help better understand the specific roles and impacts of guanxi at different stages.

### **Scope of Application of Social Network Theory:**

Our study largely relies on the framework of social network theory to analyze guanxi, but this may overlook the contributions of other theoretical frameworks. Theories from fields such as organizational behavior, psychology, and cultural studies might offer more insights into the complexity and multidimensionality of guanxi. Thus, our study may be too confined to existing theoretical models, not fully considering the significance of theoretical advancements in other disciplines for understanding the role of guanxi in entrepreneurial ecosystems.

### **Limitations of Empirical Data:**

Our research is mainly based on theoretical analysis and literature review, possibly lacking support from empirical data. Although literature analysis provides a vital theoretical basis for understanding the role of guanxi, the absence of direct empirical studies to support our conclusions might limit their persuasiveness. Future research should consider incorporating methods such as quantitative analysis, survey research, or case studies to provide a more robust empirical foundation to validate and extend our findings.

### **Application at the Policy and Practice Levels:**

Our study theoretically explores the impact of guanxi on entrepreneurial ecosystems but lacks discussion on how to address the challenges it poses at the policy and practical levels.

Future research should focus more on how to translate theoretical insights into specific strategies and action guidelines, particularly on how to effectively manage and utilize social networks in entrepreneurial environments to promote the health and sustainable development of entrepreneurial ecosystems.

#### **Complexity of Variables:**

Although our study focuses on guanxi, it might not fully consider the multidimensionality and complexity of guanxi. The manifestation and impact of guanxi can vary significantly among different individuals, organizations, and environments. Our study might not have fully captured these differences, potentially overlooking the uniqueness and variability of guanxi in different contexts. A more nuanced analysis, considering the impact of various background and environmental factors, could provide a deeper perspective on our understanding of guanxi and its impact on entrepreneurial ecosystems.

#### **Future Study**

Based on this study, future research exploring the role of guanxi in entrepreneurial ecosystems (EE) shall focus on several key aspects. First, a more comprehensive cultural analysis is crucial for understanding the local cultures of China and other regions and their impact on the sustainability of EEs. This includes in-depth exploration of the applicability and variations of the concept of guanxi in different cultural and regional contexts (Theodoraki, Messeghem & Rice, 2018). Secondly, developing and testing dynamic ecosystem models that reflect the different stages of EE will help understand how guanxi evolves over time and its impact on the entrepreneurial process (Spigel & Harrison, 2018). Additionally, researching policies and intervention measures, especially discussions on how to resolve conflicting choices in guanxi governance, can provide guidance for promoting more open and inclusive EEs (Schwarzkopf, 2016). Finally, comparative studies of the effects of guanxi at different stages will enhance researchers' understanding of the applicability of social network theory over time (Hoang & Antoncic, 2003).

#### **Acknowledgements**

In the process of writing and conducting research for this thesis, I have received invaluable support and guidance, for which I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude. First and foremost, I extend my deepest thanks to my supervisor, Associate Professor Dr. Chong Wei Ying from Taylor University. Additionally, I am particularly grateful to Taylor's University for providing academic resources and a research environment that allowed me to conduct my study in a stimulating academic atmosphere and to continually explore and deepen my research topic.

#### **Ethical Statement**

We hereby declare that there are no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper. This study did not involve human participants, discussion and evaluation of human data, or human rights issues. There are no conflicts of interest in this research, and no grants supported this work.

### **Declaration Statement of Generative AI**

We engaged in discussions with ChatGPT, the outcomes of which inspired some of the perspectives in the manuscript. We also utilized ChatGPT for checking vocabulary and grammar to enhance the professionalism of the language used. However, the manuscript is not AI-generated but is the result of the authors' literature review, contemplation, and discussion. This manuscript has passed the ZeroGPT detection.

### **References**

- Aldrich, H. E., & Martinez, M. A. (2001). Many are called, but few are chosen: An evolutionary perspective for the study of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 25(4), 41-56.
- Arias, J. (1998). A relationship marketing approach to guanxi. *European Journal of Marketing*, 32, 145-156.
- Barboza, A. P. C., & Laruccia, M. M. (2016). INNOVATION NETWORKS: THE EFFECTS OF COLLABORATION IN THE OIL AND GAS INDUSTRIES. *CPMark-Caderno Profissional de Marketing*, 4(2), 38-53.
- Baumol, W. J. (1990). Quality changes and productivity measurement: Hedonics and an alternative. *Journal of Accounting, Auditing & Finance*, 5(1), 105-117.
- Berkman, L., Glass, T., Brissette, I., & Seeman, T. (2000). From social integration to health: Durkheim in the new millennium.. *Social science & medicine*, 51 6, 843-57 .
- Bornstein, R. (2011). An Interactionist Perspective on Interpersonal Dependency. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20, 124 - 128.
- Bouncken, R. B., & Kraus, S. (2022). Entrepreneurial ecosystems in an interconnected world: emergence, governance and digitalization. *Review of Managerial Science*, 16(1), 1-14.
- Burt, R. S., & Burzynska, K. (2017). Chinese entrepreneurs, social networks, and guanxi. *Management and Organization Review*, 13(2), 221-260.
- Cantner, U., Cunningham, J. A., Lehmann, E. E., & Menter, M. (2021). Entrepreneurial ecosystems: a dynamic lifecycle model. *Small Business Economics*, 57, 407-423.
- Chen, X. P., & Chen, C. C. (2004). On the intricacies of the Chinese guanxi: A process model of guanxi development. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 21, 305-324.
- Chen, J. J., Cheng, X., Gong, S. X., & Tan, Y. (2014). Do higher value firms voluntarily disclose more information? Evidence from China. *The British Accounting Review*, 46(1), 18-32.
- Chen, F. W., Fu, L. W., Wang, K., Tsai, S. B., & Su, C. H. (2018). The influence of

entrepreneurship and social networks on economic growth—from a sustainable innovation perspective. *Sustainability*, 10(7), 2510.

Chen, J., Cai, L., Bruton, G. D., & Sheng, N. (2021). Entrepreneurial ecosystems: What we know and where we move as we build an understanding of China. In *Entrepreneurship in China* (pp. 18-36). Routledge.

Cohen, B. (2006). Sustainable valley entrepreneurial ecosystems. *Business strategy and the Environment*, 15(1), 1-14.

Chung, C. N. (2006). Beyond guanxi: Network contingencies in Taiwanese business groups. *Organization studies*, 27(4), 461-489.

Donaldson, C. (2021). Culture in the entrepreneurial ecosystem: A conceptual framing. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 17(1), 289-319.

Egbert, H. (2009). Business success through social networks? A comment on social networks and business success. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 68(3), 665-677.

Fan, Y. (2002). Questioning guanxi: definition, classification and implications. *International business review*, 11(5), 543-561.

Fu, P. P., Tsui, A. S., & Dess, G. G. (2006). The dynamics of guanxi in Chinese hightech firms: Implications for knowledge management and decision making. *Management International Review*, 46, 277-305.

Gao, X., Luo, J. D., Yang, K., Fu, X., Liu, L., & Gu, W. (2020). Predicting tie strength of Chinese guanxi by using big data of social networks. *Journal of Social Computing*, 1(1), 40-52.

Gu, F. F., Hung, K., & Tse, D. K. (2008). When does guanxi matter? Issues of capitalization and its dark sides. *Journal of marketing*, 72(4), 12-28.

Guan, X., & Frenkel, S. J. (2019). Explaining supervisor–subordinate guanxi and subordinate performance through a conservation of resources lens. *Human Relations*, 72(11), 1752-1775.

Guo, C., & Miller, J. K. (2010). Guanxi dynamics and entrepreneurial firm creation and development in China. *Management and Organization Review*, 6(2), 267-291.

Guthrie, D. (1998). The declining significance of guanxi in China's economic transition. *The China Quarterly*, 154, 254-282.

Harper-Anderson, E. (2018). Intersections of partnership and leadership in entrepreneurial ecosystems: Comparing three US regions. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 32(2), 119-134.

Hong, M., Ge, Z., & Wu, C. (2023). The emergence of entrepreneurial ecosystems by capital, habitus, and practice: A two-phase model based on Bourdieu's approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13.

Hwang, D. B., Golemon, P. L., Chen, Y., Wang, T. S., & Hung, W. S. (2009). Guanxi and business ethics in Confucian society today: An empirical case study in Taiwan. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 89, 235-250.

Igwe, P. A., & Ochinanwata, C. (2021). How to Start African Informal Entrepreneurial Evolution?. *Journal of African Business*, 22(4), 514-31.

Igwe, P. A., Odunukan, K., Rahman, M., Rugara, D. G., & Ochinanwata, C. (2020). How entrepreneurship ecosystem influences the development of frugal innovation and informal entrepreneurship. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 62(5), 475-488.

Krause, J., Croft, D., & James, R. (2007). Social network theory in the behavioural sciences: potential applications. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 62, 15 - 27. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-007-0445-8>.

Lai, Y., & Vonortas, N. S. (2019). Regional entrepreneurial ecosystems in China. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 28(4), 875-897.

Leyden, D. P., Link, A. N., & Siegel, D. S. (2014). A theoretical analysis of the role of social networks in entrepreneurship. *Research Policy*, 43(7), 1157-1163.

Li, J., & Matlay, H. (2006). Chinese entrepreneurship and small business development: an overview and research agenda. *Journal of small business and enterprise development*, 13(2), 248-262.

Li, T., Millo, Y., & Zachariadis, M. (2022). COUNTING ON GUANXI WHEN TRANSACTING MILLIONS? HYBRID GUANXI AND THE BEAUTY OF BRICOLAGE.

Lovett, S., Simmons, L. C., & Kali, R. (1999). Guanxi versus the market: Ethics and efficiency. *Journal of international business studies*, 30, 231-247.

Lumpkin, G. T., Moss, T. W., Gras, D. M., Kato, S., & Amezcuca, A. S. (2013). Entrepreneurial processes in social contexts: how are they different, if at all?. *Small Business Economics*, 40, 761-783.

Luo, J. D., & Yeh, Y. C. (2012). Neither collectivism nor individualism: Trust in the Chinese guanxi circle. *Journal of Trust Research*, 2(1), 53-70.

Luo, J. D., Cheng, M. Y., & Zhang, T. (2016). Guanxi circle and organizational citizenship behavior: Context of a Chinese workplace. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 33, 649-671.

Luo, Y., & Chen, M. (1997). Does guanxi influence firm performance?. *Asia Pacific journal of management*, 14, 1-16.

Ma, S., & Xu, H. (2016). From consumption to production: understanding the tourism lifestyle entrepreneur in Dali. *Tourism Tribune*, 31(5), 81-88.

Mack, E., & Mayer, H. (2016). The evolutionary dynamics of entrepreneurial ecosystems. *Urban studies*, 53(10), 2118-2133.

McGrath, H., & O'Toole, T. (2014). A cross-cultural comparison of the network capability development of entrepreneurial firms. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 43(6), 897-910.

Minguzzi, A., & Passaro, R. (2001). The network of relationships between the economic environment and the entrepreneurial culture in small firms. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(2), 181-207.

Muldoon, J., Bauman, A., & Lucy, C. (2018). Entrepreneurial ecosystem: do you trust or distrust?. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 12(2), 158-177.

Nolan, J., & Rowley, C. (2020). Whither guanxi and social networks in China? A review of theory and practice. *Asia Pacific business review*, 26(2), 113-123.

Park, S. H., & Luo, Y. (2001). Guanxi and organizational dynamics: Organizational networking in Chinese firms. *Strategic management journal*, 22(5), 455-477.

Popov, E. V., Simonova, V. L., & Komarova, O. V. (2019). Effects of social media in the digital economy. *Bulletin of Ural Federal University. Series Economics and Management*, 18(2), 168-185.

Porrás-Paez, A. (2023). 'Take it easy': how informal institutions shape an emerging economy Entrepreneurial Ecosystem. *Regional Studies, Regional Science*, 10(1), 581-591.

Puffer, S., McCarthy, D., & Boisot, M. (2010). Entrepreneurship in Russia and China: The Impact of Formal Institutional Voids. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34, 441 - 467.

Qinxian, G. (2012). Leadership in Malaysia: Managerial and strategic implications of Chinese face (mianzi), relation ties (guanxi) and human affection (renqing). In XIX Biennial Conference of the European Association of Chinese Studies (EACS), Paris, September (Vol. 4).

Roundy, P. T. (2017). Social entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial ecosystems: Complementary or disjoint phenomena?. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 44(9), 1252-1267.

Roundy, P. T., & Fayard, D. (2019). Dynamic capabilities and entrepreneurial ecosystems: The

micro-foundations of regional entrepreneurship. *The Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 28(1), 94-120.

Roundy, P. T. (2019). "It takes a village" to support entrepreneurship: Intersecting economic and community dynamics in small town entrepreneurial ecosystems. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 15(4), 1443-1475.

Roundy, P. T., & Bayer, M. A. (2019). To bridge or buffer? A resource dependence theory of nascent entrepreneurial ecosystems. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 11(4), 550-575.

Scerri, M., & Agarwal, R. (2013). The Evolution of the Production Function: Transition to the "Value Creation Cube". In *Driving the economy through innovation and entrepreneurship: Emerging agenda for technology management* (pp. 561-572). Springer India.

Schwarzkopf, C. (2016). Fostering Innovation and entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurial Ecosystem and Entrepreneurial Fundamentals in the USA and Germany*, 79-107.

Scott, J. (1988). Social Network Analysis. *Sociology*, 22, 109 - 127. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038588022001007>.

Shen, R., Guo, H., & Ma, H. (2023). How do entrepreneurs' cross-cultural experiences contribute to entrepreneurial ecosystem performance?. *Journal of World Business*, 58(2), 101398.

Shir, N., Nikolaev, B. N., & Wincent, J. (2019). Entrepreneurship and well-being: The role of psychological autonomy, competence, and relatedness. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34(5), 105875.

Spigel, B. (2017). The relational organization of entrepreneurial ecosystems. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 41(1), 49-72.

Spigel, B., & Harrison, R. (2018). Toward a process theory of entrepreneurial ecosystems. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 12(1), 151-168.

Stam, E., & Van de Ven, A. (2021). Entrepreneurial ecosystem elements. *Small business economics*, 56, 809-832.

Tan, J. (2002). Culture, Nation, and Entrepreneurial Strategic Orientations: Implications for an Emerging Economy. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 26, 111 -95.

Theodoraki, C., Messeghem, K., & Rice, M. P. (2018). A social capital approach to the development of sustainable entrepreneurial ecosystems: an explorative study. *Small Business Economics*, 51, 153-170.

Thompson, T. A., Purdy, J. M., & Ventresca, M. J. (2018). How entrepreneurial ecosystems take form: Evidence from social impact initiatives in Seattle. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 12(1),

96-116.

Valente, T., Palinkas, L., Czaja, S., Chu, K., & Brown, C. (2015). Social Network Analysis for Program Implementation. *PLoS ONE*, 10.

Vrontis, D., Christofi, M., Battisti, E., & Graziano, E. A. (2021). Intellectual capital, knowledge sharing and equity crowdfunding. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 22(1), 95-121.

Wang, C., Rodan, S., Fruin, M., & Xu, X. (2014). Knowledge networks, collaboration networks, and exploratory innovation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(2), 484-514.

Weng, Y., & Xu, H. (2018). How guanxi affects job search outcomes in China? Job match and job turnover. *China Economic Review*, 51, 70-82.

Wu, Q., & Wallace, M. (2021). Social Networks and Workers' Earnings in Contemporary China. *East Asia*, 38, 39-60.

Yu, H., Nahm, A. Y., & Song, Z. (2017). Guanxi, political connections and resource acquisition in Chinese publicly listed private sector firms. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 23(3), 336-353.

Youssef, A. B., Boubaker, S., & Omri, A. (2018). Entrepreneurship and sustainability: The need for innovative and institutional solutions. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 129, 232-241.

Zahra, S. A., & Nambisan, S. (2012). Entrepreneurship and strategic thinking in business ecosystems. *Business horizons*, 55(3), 219-229.

Zapalska, A. M., & Edwards, W. (2001). Chinese entrepreneurship in a cultural and economic perspective. *Journal of small business management*, 39(3), 286-292.