

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

Effects of institutional support on innovation and performance: Roles of dysfunctional competition

Abstract

Purpose This study aims to empirically investigate the effects of institutional support on product and process innovation and firm performance and describe how dysfunctional competition influences relevant outcomes.

Design/methodology/approach This study develops a research model based on institution-based view and tests it using structural equation modeling and empirical data collected from 300 manufacturers in China.

Findings The results show that institutional support positively affects product and process innovation and firm performance. Both product and process innovation improve firm performance. The findings reveal that dysfunctional competition significantly reduces the positive effects of institutional support on product and process innovation but leaves the effects of institutional support and product and process innovation on firm performance unaffected.

Originality/value This study contributes to innovation literature by providing insights into the impact of China's institutional environment on manufacturing firms' product and process innovation decisions. The findings also contribute to institution-based view literature by providing empirical evidence on the joint effects of institutional support and dysfunctional competition on product and process innovation and firm performance. This study can help manufacturers in China take advantage of institutional environment and adjust product and process innovation decisions accordingly.

Keywords: institutional support; dysfunctional competition; innovation; performance; China

1. Introduction

Chinese manufacturing firms have made remarkable achievements on both product and process innovation (Zhang *et al.*, 2015). For example, China now ranks the first worldwide in terms of the number of patent applications by residents and has had the fastest annual growth in the world for several years (World Intellectual Property Organization, 2015). The Chinese government plays a major role in promoting innovation by providing institutional support (Li and Zhang, 2007; Sheng *et al.*, 2013; Zhang *et al.*, 2015). For example, national investment in science and technology accounted for 4.4% of the government's annual financial expenditure in 2014 (National Bureau of Statistics, 2014). The Chinese government has also introduced policies to transform China into a knowledge-based economy and improve firms' independent innovation in the 15-year medium-to-long-term plan for the development of science and technology (2006–2020) (Parayil and D'Costa, 2009). Institutional support refers to the extent to which government and its agencies give support to firms in order to mitigate the negative effects of inadequate institutional infrastructure (Li and Atuahene-Gima, 2001). Support from the government and its agencies can provide firms with low-cost resources (Qian *et al.*, 2013) and reduce policy uncertainty (Peng *et al.*, 2009) and so promote innovation (Li and Atuahene-Gima, 2001; Qian *et al.*, 2013). However, empirical findings of the effectiveness of institutional support have been inclusive, and some studies show no positive relationship between institutional support and innovation (Sheng *et al.*, 2011; Shu *et al.*, 2015).

China's institutional environment is also characterized by legal inadequacy and enforcement inefficiency (Sheng *et al.*, 2013; Wang *et al.*, 2011; Wang *et al.*, 2015). Firms may suffer from patent and copyright violation, widespread copying of original inventions, and breaches of contract and other agreements (Zhao, 2006; Zhou and Poppo, 2010). This institutional environment leads to dysfunctional competition, which refers to the extent to which firms' competitive behavior is unfair or unlawful, such as copyright and patent infringement (Li and Atuahene-Gima, 2001). In this way, dysfunctional competition may negatively affect firms' capabilities to profit from new

1
2
3 products and processes (Li and Atuahene-Gima, 2001; Li and Zhang, 2007; Li and Li,
4
5 2009) and attenuate the effectiveness of institutional support (Guo *et al.*, 2014; Lu *et*
6
7 *al.*, 2008). The institutional environment in China thus may have mixed effects on
8
9 manufacturing firms' product and process innovation (Parayil and D'Costa, 2009;
10
11 Zhou and Poppo, 2010; Qian *et al.*, 2013). However, there is limited empirical
12
13 evidence on how the effects of institutional support on product and process innovation
14
15 and firm performance are influenced by dysfunctional competition.

16
17 This study aims to empirically investigate the joint effects of institutional support
18
19 and dysfunctional competition on product and process innovation and firm
20
21 performance in China. It focuses on two research questions. First, how does
22
23 institutional support affect product and process innovation and firm performance?
24
25 Second, how does dysfunctional competition moderate these relationships? The
26
27 findings of this study can benefit researchers, practitioners, and policy makers. In
28
29 particular, it extends current knowledge of the impact of institutional environment on
30
31 product and process innovation and firm performance, contributing to innovation and
32
33 institution-based view literature. The findings can also help managers develop a better
34
35 understanding of the institutional environment in China and adapt innovation
36
37 strategies and practices accordingly. In addition, this study can offer guidelines to
38
39 policy makers in the Chinese government to devise programs and regulations to
40
41 promote innovation and development.

42 43 **2. Theoretical background and hypotheses**

44 45 *2.1 Institutional support*

46
47 Institutional support is a general reflection of financial and technical support from
48
49 government and its agencies, which provide firms with critical resources that they
50
51 may use for innovation and development (Li and Atuahene-Gima, 2001; Sheng *et al.*,
52
53 2013; Shu *et al.*, 2015). Support from the government and its agencies allows firms to
54
55 interpret policies and program correctly, decreasing environmental uncertainty (Peng,
56
57 2003; Ma *et al.*, 2014; Zhang *et al.*, 2015). Researchers argue that institutional support
58
59 plays an important role in Chinese firms' innovation strategies (Guo *et al.*, 2014; Qian
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

et al., 2013; Sheng *et al.*, 2011; Shu *et al.*, 2015). However, empirical studies have reported mixed findings on the effectiveness of institutional support. For example, Li and Atuahene-Gima (2001) find that institutional support positively influences product innovation and performance. Sheng *et al.* (2011) discover that institutional support reduces the effects of political ties on firm performance. Hence, there is a tangible need to identify the mechanisms through which institutional support affects innovation and firm performance.

2.2 Dysfunctional competition

Dysfunctional competition reflects managers' perception of legal protection against opportunistic or illegal activities in the market (Sheng *et al.*, 2013; Li and Zhang, 2007). It can drive firms to take action to respond to challenges in institutional environment. Researchers argue that dysfunctional competition hampers firms' capability to fully reap the potential benefits of innovation and negatively influences their performance (Li and Atuahene-Gima, 2001; Li and Li, 2009). For example, Li and Zhang (2007) find that dysfunctional competition can reduce the positive effects of managers' functional experiences on the performance of new ventures. Sheng *et al.* (2013) report that dysfunctional competition influences the effects of the speed of new product development on firm performance. However, there is limited empirical evidence on how dysfunctional competition affects the effectiveness of institutional support.

2.3 Product and process innovation

Innovation refers to new applications of knowledge, ideas, methods, and skills that can leverage a firm's competitiveness (Tellis *et al.*, 2009; Ho, 2011; Ruiz-Jiménez and Fuentes-Fuentes, 2013). The innovation subject can be either a product or a process (Gunday *et al.*, 2011; Un and Asakawa, 2015). Product innovation refers to the new products introduced to meet market demands and increase profits (Damanpour, 2010). Process innovation can be defined as the new techniques and processes introduced into operations that help to promote efficiency or effectiveness, and lower the costs of production and delivery (Un and Asakawa, 2015; Gunday *et al.*, 2011). There is empirical evidence that product and process innovation

1
2
3 are positively associated with firm performance and can bring firms sustainable
4 competitive advantages (Schoenherr and Swink, 2015; Kostopoulos *et al.*, 2011;
5 Tellis *et al.*, 2009; Ho, 2011). Researchers argue that product and process innovation
6 have different objective and competitive impact (Un and Asakawa, 2015). However,
7 the majority of existing empirical studies on the impact of institutional environment
8 on innovation have focused only on product innovation (Guo *et al.*, 2014; Li and
9 Atuahene-Gima, 2001; Wang *et al.*, 2011; Ma *et al.*, 2014). Hence, empirically
10 investigating the joint effects of institutional support and dysfunctional competition
11 on process innovation and comparing the findings with those of product innovation
12 can contribute to innovation literature (Damanpour, 2010; Un and Asakawa, 2015).
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 *2.4 Institution-based view*

23
24 Institution-based view emphasizes dynamic interactions between institutions and
25 organizations and views organizational behavior and strategic choices as the outcomes
26 of these interactions (Peng, 2002; Peng *et al.*, 2009). This view has been widely used
27 to investigate how institutions affect firms' decisions and performance (Peng *et al.*,
28 2008; Peng *et al.*, 2009; Peng, 2013; Fuentelsaz *et al.*, 2015) and so provides a
29 theoretical foundation for this study. Institutions set legitimate requirements for and
30 provide external resources supporting firms' operations (Fuentelsaz *et al.*, 2015; Lu *et al.*,
31 2008; Peng *et al.*, 2009; Peng, 2013). Firms' strategic choices are made within
32 institutional constraints (Peng, 2003). In particular, formal and informal institutions
33 form a compensatory infrastructure that advises firms of which strategic choices are
34 acceptable and supportable (Peng, 2002). Informal institutions play a bigger role when
35 formal ones are unclear or fail (Peng *et al.*, 2009). Institution-based view argues that
36 institutions directly determine strategy formulation and implementation (Peng, 2002)
37 and managers pursue their rational interests and make decisions within a given
38 institutional framework (Peng, 2006). Given China's underdeveloped market
39 mechanisms, institutions play a significant role in influencing Chinese firms' behavior
40 and decisions (Guo *et al.*, 2014; Sheng *et al.*, 2015).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 *2.5 Hypotheses*

57 Drawing on the institution-based view, it is here argued that institutional support
58

1
2
3
4 motivates Chinese firms to invest in product and process innovation because the
5 Chinese government has designed policies and programs to signal firms that
6 innovation is legitimate (Parayil and D'Costa, 2009; Peng, 2006). Firms with
7 competitive advantages in new product and process development are rewarded by the
8 government (Sheng *et al.*, 2013) and their success inspires other firms to model
9 themselves after the innovators and make more investments in innovation (Peng,
10 2003). Institutional support also allows firms to access critical resources provided by
11 the government, which helps them innovate and improve operations, which in turn
12 improve performance (Li and Zhang, 2007). In addition, managers' decisions are
13 constrained by institutional environment (Peng *et al.*, 2008). High levels of
14 dysfunctional competition indicates that it is difficult for firms to protect their
15 intellectual property rights and that their product and process innovation will be easily
16 copied or imitated by competitors (Li and Atuahene-Gima, 2001). The innovators then
17 are not able to fully capture the profits generated by their inventions. Hence, we argue
18 that dysfunctional competition reduces the positive impact of product and process
19 innovation on firm performance. Moreover, high levels of dysfunctional competition
20 indicate that managers may be behaving opportunistically and misusing institutional
21 support earmarked for innovation and development for personal interests. It also
22 becomes difficult for government officials to devise effective policies and supportive
23 programs (Peng, 2006). For this reason, we argue that dysfunctional competition
24 attenuates the effects of institutional support on product and process innovation and
25 firm performance. The conceptual model is shown in Figure 1.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 Insert Figure 1 here
47

48 2.5.1 *The effects of institutional support on product and process innovation*

49
50 We argue that institutional support plays a significant role in promoting product
51 and process innovation. China lacks market-supporting institutions, and the rules for
52 market competition remain unpredictable and unclear (Wang *et al.*, 2011; Zhou and
53 Poppo, 2010). Support from the government has become an important tool for firms to
54 deal with market uncertainty (Li and Atuahene-Gima, 2001), and it has significantly
55
56
57
58

1
2
3 influence on Chinese manufacturers' long-term strategy and investment decisions
4 (Peng *et al.*, 2008). Product innovation is a resource-consuming activity and poses
5 many challenges to manufacturers because of the lack of financial and technical
6 resources, poor management skills and capabilities, and uncertain business and
7 institutional environments (Guo *et al.*, 2014; Sheng *et al.*, 2013). Institutional support
8 provides critical external resources that foster the development of new products and
9 favorable policies and regulations that protect intellectual property rights, and rewards
10 innovators by granting legitimacy (Ma *et al.*, 2014; Li and Atuahene-Gima, 2001; Shu
11 *et al.*, 2015; Peng *et al.*, 2009). Hence, institutional support motivates firms to invest
12 in and improves their capabilities for product innovation (Lu *et al.*, 2008; Guo *et al.*,
13 2014; Shu *et al.*, 2015).

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 Process innovation is a complex and risky activity that requires tacit knowledge
25 and experienced employees (Un and Asakawa, 2015; Damanpour, 2010). The
26 technical information and support provided by the government and imported
27 advanced technologies allow Chinese manufacturers to learn skills and knowledge
28 from foreign competitors (Morgan and Berthon, 2008), which can significantly
29 improve process innovation (Shu *et al.*, 2015). Using financial support from the
30 government, Chinese companies can adopt new facilities and equipment and hire
31 global talent, which allow them to implement advanced processes designs used by
32 foreign competitors and develop new processes to improve the efficiency and
33 effectiveness of production and delivery operations (Qian *et al.*, 2013; Shu *et al.*,
34 2015). Thus, we propose the following hypotheses:

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45 *H1a: Institutional support is positively associated with product innovation.*

46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
H1b: Institutional support is positively associated with process innovation.

2.5.2 *The effect of institutional support on firm performance*

59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

The Chinese government and its agencies actively participate in business planning and guide economic activities, giving them an important role in firms' operations and strategic decisions (Cai *et al.*, 2010; Zhou and Poppo, 2010). Institutional support indicates that the government and its agencies favor specific firms (Peng, 2002; Guo *et al.*, 2014), so the firms can receive external financial and

1
2
3
4 technical resources at little cost (Sheng *et al.*, 2011). These resources can help the
5
6 firms learn technologies from advanced competitors, enabling the firms to optimize
7
8 production and supply chain operations and improve performance (Cai *et al.*, 2010;
9
10 Shu *et al.*, 2015). Institutional support also allows firms to develop a better
11
12 understanding of policies and predict their trends, which help them prepare for
13
14 changes in business and institutional environments and adjust long-term strategies
15
16 accordingly (Li and Atuahene-Gima, 2001; Shu *et al.*, 2015). Institutional support also
17
18 provides favorable policies and regulations, which enable firms to access to a wider
19
20 range of strategic choices, such as entering new markets or obtaining exclusive
21
22 licenses, which bring competitive advantages (Guo *et al.*, 2014; Sheng *et al.*, 2013).
23 Thus, we propose the following hypothesis:

24 *H2: Institutional support is positively associated with firm performance.*

25 2.5.3 The effects of product and process innovation on firm performance

26
27
28 Researchers argue that product and process innovation provide first-mover
29
30 advantages and superior profitability (Lu *et al.*, 2015; Tellis *et al.*, 2009; Gunday *et al.*,
31
32 2011; Walker, 2004). In particular, the novelty of new products allows firms to charge
33
34 a premium over competitors' products, increasing revenue and profits (Kostopoulos *et*
35
36 *al.*, 2011; Gunday *et al.*, 2011; Schoenherr and Swink, 2015). The new features,
37
38 improvements, or benefits associated with new products can also improve customer
39
40 satisfaction, attract new customers, and develop new market segments, improving
41
42 sales and performance (Morgan and Berthon, 2008; Kuo, 2013). By introducing new
43
44 elements to production materials, machinery, equipment, task specifications, and
45
46 workflow mechanisms, process innovation reduces operational costs and improves
47
48 quality, flexibility, speed, and delivery (Damanpour, 2010; Un and Asakawa, 2015).
49
50 Process innovation also helps a firm improve the nature of the operation and supply
51
52 chain processes, increasing productivity and firm performance. Thus, we propose the
53
54 following hypotheses:

54 *H3a: Product innovation is positively associated with firm performance.*

55 *H3b: Process innovation is positively associated with firm performance.*

56 2.5.4 The moderating effects of dysfunctional competition

1
2
3
4 The institution-based view argues that managers' decisions are constrained by
5 institutional environment (Peng, 2006). Managers take the influences of dysfunctional
6 competition, which is a noteworthy feature of China's institutional environment, into
7 account when they make strategic decisions (Sheng *et al.*, 2013; Zhou and Poppo,
8 2010; Peng, 2013). High levels of dysfunctional competition indicate that firms
9 frequently face unlawful or unfair competitive behavior in markets (Sheng *et al.*, 2013;
10 Li and Li, 2009). Dysfunctional competition also increases market uncertainty and
11 risks because opportunistic behavior is not severely punished, and so it counteracts
12 institutional support (Peng *et al.*, 2009; Lu *et al.*, 2008). In particular, because it is
13 difficult for firms to protect their intellectual property rights and profit from
14 innovations (Li and Atuahene-Gima, 2001), they become unwilling to invest in new
15 product and process development even if the government encourages them to do so
16 (Cai *et al.*, 2010). They may behave opportunistically by using the support acquired
17 from government in other areas rather than innovation. When dysfunctional
18 competition is intense, it also prevents government officials from acquiring accurate
19 market information (Shu *et al.*, 2015). This makes it harder for them to devise
20 effective policies and programs to support firms' innovation and development. Hence,
21 we argue that dysfunctional competition reduces the effects of institutional support on
22 product and process innovation and firm performance. In addition, firms are faced
23 with high risks of imitation and knowledge spillovers or leakage when dysfunctional
24 competition is intense (Li and Zhang, 2007; Li and Li, 2009). The efficacy of legal
25 mechanisms of protection is also low and hence innovators may not be able to become
26 principal beneficiaries of product and process innovation (Guo *et al.*, 2014; Zhao,
27 2006). Hence, we argue that dysfunctional competition reduces the effects of product
28 and process innovation on firm performance. Thus, we propose the following
29 hypotheses:
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 *H4a: Dysfunctional competition reduces the effect of institutional support on*
53 *product innovation.*

54 *H4b: Dysfunctional competition reduces the effect of institutional support on*
55 *process innovation.*
56
57
58

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

H4c: Dysfunctional competition reduces the effect of institutional support on firm performance.

H4d: Dysfunctional competition reduces the effect of product innovation on firm performance.

H4e: Dysfunctional competition reduces the effect of process innovation on firm performance.

3. Research methods

3.1 Sample and data collection

The sample was selected from three economic zones (i.e. Pearl River Delta, Yangtze River Delta, and Circum-Bohai Economic Zone) in China (Flynn *et al.*, 2010; Qi *et al.*, 2011). There are two reasons that the three regions are selected. First, the three economic zones are the most developed regions in China. There exists severe competitions and great governmental supports at the same time. Second, firms located in these three regions are inclined to compete through innovation (Zhang *et al.*, 2015). They can represent the most innovative companies in China. The high-tech industries in the three regions are targeted because innovation is strategically important in these industries.

The questionnaire was originally developed in English based on existing literature. The translation-back-translation method was used to produce a conceptually equivalent Chinese version (Flynn *et al.*, 2010). To ensure content validity, the questionnaire was pilot-tested using a sample of 15 manufacturing firms in China through face-to-face discussion. The wording of some questions was modified to ensure that the items were understandable and relevant to practices used in China (Flynn *et al.*, 2010). One key informant per firm method was adopted to fill out a questionnaire. The informants included senior managers such as general managers and directors, research and development (R&D) managers, operations and manufacturing managers, and supply chain and purchasing managers.

A professional market research firm was hired to collect the data (Cai *et al.*, 2010). The researchers designed the sampling framework and data collection instruction that

1
2
3 direct the professional interviewers of the market research firm in data collection. The
4 professional interviewers were also trained to ensure the reliable and complete
5 response. Before large sample data collection, the professional market research firm
6 selected 10 companies in each regions to test the survey. The questionnaire, sampling
7 framework, and data collection instruction are also amended based on the feedbacks.
8 From the target regions, 2379 manufacturing firms were randomly selected using the
9 directory provided by the National Bureau of Statistics of the People's Republic of
10 China, which is an agency within the state council charged with the collection and
11 publication of statistics related to the economy of China at national and local levels.
12 The market research firm first contacted the target manufacturers by telephone to
13 confirm that the informant would be able to answer the survey questions and to solicit
14 his or her participation in the study. Among the target sample, 2061 manufacturing
15 firms either could not be contacted due to incorrect contact information or declined to
16 participate in the survey. Then professional interviewers from the market research
17 firm were sent to visit the remaining 318 manufacturers and collect data using a
18 face-to-face interviews. Finally, 300 responses were received, resulting in a response
19 rate of 12.6%. Table 1 shows the profiles of the responding firms.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 -----
36 Insert Table 1 here
37 -----
38

39 *3.2 Measures*

40
41 Institutional support, dysfunctional competition, product and process innovation,
42 and firm performance were assessed using multiple items on a 7-point Likert-type
43 scale. The scales were adopted or adapted from previous studies and are listed in
44 Table 2. Institutional support was measured using four items to gauge the favorable
45 policies and programs, technical and financial resources, and permission for business
46 actions obtained from the government and its agencies (Li and Atuahene-Gima, 2001).
47 Dysfunctional competition was measured using four items to capture the managers'
48 perceptions of opportunistic, unfair, and unlawful activities in their principal industry
49 (Li and Atuahene-Gima, 2001). Product innovation was measured using three items
50 covering the speed and frequency of new product development, and process
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

1
2
3
4 innovation was measured using four items covering the speed and frequency of new
5
6 process development. These were adapted from Parasuraman (2000) and Tellis *et al.*
7
8 (2009). Firm performance was measured using four items covering profit, market
9
10 share, and sales. These were adapted from Qi *et al.* (2011) and Gunday *et al.* (2011).

11
12 R&D investment and new process investment served as control variables because
13
14 direct investment can improve product and process innovation (Shu *et al.*, 2015). This
15
16 study also controlled for the number of employees and ownership because large and
17
18 state-owned firms may have more advantages in accessing resources and institutional
19
20 support than smaller, private operations (Li and Atuahene-Gima, 2001; Sheng *et al.*,
21
22 2013).

23
24 -----
25 Insert Table 2 here
26 -----
27

28 3.3 Common method variance assessment

29
30 Because there was a single respondent from each firm, common method variance
31
32 (CMV) was a potential issue. According to Podsakoff *et al.* (2003), appropriate
33
34 arrangement of items in a questionnaire can reduce CMV. The constructs were
35
36 arranged in different sections of the questionnaire. Different instructions were used for
37
38 different scales (Table 2). Such questionnaire design can reduce respondents' potential
39
40 consistency in self-reporting (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2003). We conducted a Harman's
41
42 single-factor test including all items using exploratory factor analysis (Podsakoff *et al.*,
43
44 2003). There was no evidence of CMV because no single factor accounted for most of
45
46 the covariance. In addition, the correlation matrix (Table 3) shows that the strongest
47
48 correlation was 0.557. The lack of excessively strong correlations also indicates that
49
50 CMV is not a serious concern (Pavlou *et al.*, 2007).

51 4. Analysis and results

52
53 Partial least squares (PLS)-based structural equation modeling is used to test this
54
55 the research model because of the sample size (Peng and Lai, 2012). SmartPLS
56
57 software (3.2.1 version) is used to assess the measurement and structural models
58

(Ringle et al., 2015). A bootstrapping estimation procedure is used to examine the significance of the scale factor loadings in the measurement model and that of the path coefficients in the structural model (Peng and Lai, 2012; Wang *et al.*, 2010).

4.1 Measurement model

We employ Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability to assess the reliability of all the constructs. The values of Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability range from 0.773 to 0.855 and from 0.858 to 0.902, respectively (Table 2). These values are all above the recommended threshold value of 0.70 (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994), suggesting that all constructs are reliable.

Confirmative factor analysis (CFA) and average variance extracted (AVE) are used to assess the convergent and discriminant validity. All of the AVE values range from 0.604 to 0.697 (Table 2), which are above the recommended value of 0.50. The CFA analysis shows that the loadings of all items but one are above 0.7 (ranging from 0.662 to 0.873). Both tests indicate adequate convergent validity for all constructs (Fornell and Larcker, 1981; Henseler *et al.*, 2009).

Discriminant validity is assessed by comparing the square root of each construct's AVE to its correlation coefficients with other constructs. A square root higher than the correlation with other constructs suggests a satisfied discriminant validity (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). Table 3 shows the mean and standard deviations of the constructs and their correlations. Comparison of all the correlations and square roots of the AVEs on the diagonal indicates adequate discriminant validity of all constructs.

Insert Table 3 here

4.2 Structural model and hypotheses testing

The assessment of PLS models involves estimation of the path loadings and R^2 values (Wang *et al.*, 2010). Path loadings indicate the strength of the relationships between independent and dependent variables, and R^2 values indicate predictive power by showing the amount of variance explained by the independent variables (Peng and Lai, 2012). Results of the structural model using the pooled sample are

1
2
3
4 shown in Figure 2. Since the objective of PLS is to maximize variance explained,
5 therefore R^2 as a prediction oriented measure is used to evaluate PLS models. The
6 model explains 29.3% of variance in firm performance, 11.4% of variance in product
7 innovation, and 19.4% of the variance in process innovation. The standardized root
8 mean square residual (SRMR) is used to measure the goodness of model fit. It
9 assesses the average magnitude of the discrepancies between observed and expected
10 correlations as an absolute measure of model fit criterion (Henseler *et al.*, 2014). Our
11 results show that SRMR values of total sample, low dysfunctional competition sample,
12 and high dysfunctional competition sample were 0.039, 0.045, and 0.051, respectively.
13 All SRMR values are less than 0.08 indicating a satisfactory model fit. Following
14 Wetzels *et al.* (2009), the global goodness of fit (GoF) is also calculated. Our results
15 show that GoF of total sample, low dysfunctional competition sample, and high
16 dysfunctional competition sample are 0.371, 0.483, and 0.295, respectively, which
17 indicates a satisfactory model.
18
19

20 The results show that institutional support has significant effects on product
21 innovation ($b=0.300$, $P<0.001$), process innovation ($b=0.433$, $P<0.001$), and firm
22 performance ($b=0.215$, $P<0.001$). Product innovation ($b=0.199$, $P<0.05$) and process
23 innovation ($b=0.209$, $P<0.01$) are found to positively affect firm performance. These
24 findings provide support for H1a, H1b, H2, H3a, and H3b. The results also show that
25 firm size and type of ownership significantly influence firm performance and that the
26 effects of R&D investment and new process investment on product and process
27 innovation are insignificant.
28
29

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 -----
50 Insert Figure 2 here
51 -----
52

53 Following Koufteros *et al.* (2005), two groups are formed based on the mean
54 score on dysfunctional competition. Firms scoring below the mean score are classified
55 as belonging to the low group and those scoring above are placed in the high group.
56 There are 162 manufacturing firms in the group with high levels of dysfunctional
57
58

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

competition and 138 in the low group. A non-parametric approach, PLS based multi-group analysis (PLS-MGA), is used here to investigate the moderating effects of dysfunctional competition (Henseler *et al.*, 2009). The bootstrap estimates of the structural model based on two sub-samples are shown in Figure 3. Results of the comparison are shown in Table 4. The findings show that, at the 5% probability of error level, the effects of institutional support on product ($\Delta=0.375$, $P=0.000$) and process ($\Delta=0.162$, $P=0.043$) innovation are significantly larger in the low dysfunctional competition group, and the effects of institutional support, product innovation, and process innovation on firm performance are not statistically different in the two groups. In this way, the results indicate that dysfunctional competition negatively moderates the effects of institutional support on product and process innovation but does not influence the effects of institutional support, product innovation, and process innovation on firm performance. Therefore, the findings support H4a and H4b, but not H4c, H4d, or H4e.

Insert Figure 3 and Table 4 here

5. Discussion and conclusions

5.1 Theoretical contributions

This study contributes to both innovation and institution-based view literature. First, the results indicate that institutional support positively affects product and process innovation and firm performance. These findings are consistent with existing empirical evidence regarding the performance outcomes of institutional support (e.g. Cai *et al.*, 2010; Li and Atuahene-Gima, 2001; Guo *et al.*, 2014; Shu *et al.*, 2015) and confirm the importance of the government and its agencies in promoting innovation and business development in China. This may explain why Chinese manufacturers are investing more in innovation despite the underdeveloped institutional environment (Zhou and Poppo, 2010; Zhang *et al.*, 2015). PLS analysis further reveals that institutional support improves firm performance indirectly via product and process innovation (indirect effect= 0.150, $P=0.000$). These findings provide insights into the

1
2
3
4 complex relationships among institutional support, innovation, and performance. By
5 revealing that support from the government can improve firm performance both
6 directly and indirectly by promoting product and process innovation, this study
7 clarifies the mechanisms through which institutional support provides firms with
8 competitive advantages and how Chinese government officials influence their
9 operations and decisions. It also explains how institutions matter (Li and
10 Atuahene-Gima, 2001; Shu *et al.*, 2015; Qian *et al.*, 2013; Sheng *et al.*, 2011), so
11 contributing to the institution-based view literature (Peng *et al.*, 2009).
12
13
14
15
16
17

18
19 Second, we find that both product and process innovation enhance firm
20 performance, which is consistent with existing empirical findings (Walker, 2004;
21 Kostopoulos *et al.*, 2011; Gunday *et al.*, 2011; Ho, 2011). These results contribute to
22 the innovation literature by confirming the positive roles played by product and
23 process innovation in improving firm performance in China. They provide a possible
24 explanation for the rapid growth in the number of patent applications filed in China
25 (World Intellectual Property Organization, 2015). In addition, although researchers
26 argue that product and process innovation have different features (Un and Asakawa,
27 2015; Damanpour, 2010) and there is some empirical evidence that they influence
28 performance outcomes in different ways (Gunday *et al.*, 2011; Shu *et al.*, 2015), this
29 study provides empirical evidence that product and process innovation play similar
30 roles in improving firm performance in China and that the Chinese government can
31 promote product and process innovation using similar methods, contributing to the
32 innovation literature.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Third, this study reveals the contingent effects of dysfunctional competition on
46 the effectiveness of institutional support. In particular, results show that dysfunctional
47 competition attenuates the impact of institutional support on product and process
48 innovation. This provides one possible explanation for the inconsistent empirical
49 findings on the performance outcomes of institutional support (Cai *et al.*, 2010; Sheng
50 *et al.*, 2011; Shu *et al.*, 2015). The results improve current understanding of how
51 dysfunctional competition affects manufacturers' innovation decisions, contributing to
52 the innovation literature (Qian *et al.*, 2013; Guo *et al.*, 2014). The results also show
53
54
55
56
57
58

1
2
3 that China's institutional environment has both positive and negative influences on
4 product and process innovation and that researchers must consider the effects of
5 different institutional forces collectively when investigating the roles of institutional
6 environment in China (Li and Li, 2009; Li and Zhang, 2007). In addition, the findings
7 enrich the institution-based view literature by clarifying under what circumstances
8 institutions matter (Peng, 2002; Peng *et al.*, 2009).
9

10
11 Fourth, the results show that dysfunctional competition does not moderate the
12 effects of institutional support, product innovation, and process innovation on firm
13 performance. This is an interesting finding as it suggests that although dysfunctional
14 competition reduces the positive effects of institutional support on innovation, firms
15 can still benefit from institutional support and from product and process innovation.
16 The characteristics of innovation in China might be the reason for this seemingly
17 contradictory findings. Although the Chinese government seeks to promote
18 independent innovation (Parayil and D'Costa, 2009), Chinese manufacturers tend to
19 develop products and processes by imitating and adapting existing technologies to
20 unique local requirements (Wang *et al.*, 2011; Zhang *et al.*, 2015). In this way,
21 product and process innovation rely on refining, broadening, enhancing, and
22 exploiting current knowledge and skills. Dysfunctional competition encourages
23 knowledge spillovers and firms are less likely to be punished for copying and reverse
24 engineering existing products and processes than they are in developed countries (Li
25 and Atuahene-Gima, 2001; Guo *et al.*, 2014). Chinese manufacturers may profit
26 from the innovations that are developed by adapting and localizing competitors'
27 product and process designs when dysfunctional competition is intense (Zhang *et al.*,
28 2015). In addition, manufacturing firms may decide to use government support in
29 areas that are less likely influenced by dysfunctional competition, such as expanding
30 production capacity or investing abroad, instead of on innovation. Hence, they can
31 benefit from institutional support even when dysfunctional competition is intense.
32 Therefore, this study contributes to the institution-based view literature by showing
33 that dysfunctional competition affects innovation and firm performance in different
34 ways in China.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

5.2 Managerial implications

The findings of this study can provide guidelines to help manufacturing firms take advantage of China's institutional environment and gain competitive advantages. First, we suggest managers build personal ties with political leaders and officials in industrial bureaus and regulatory and supporting organizations. Firms should actively seek support from the government and its agencies and understand that they are particularly important resources that they can use to deal with China's institutional voids. Managers should use institutional support in product and process innovation and to improve operations. Second, we suggest firms invest in product and process innovation simultaneously because both of them can provide competitive advantages. In particular, it is suggested that firms learn new product and process designs produced by advanced competitors. They should also attend conferences and exhibitions to keep up with the product and process innovation in the industry. Managers should invest in improving the speed and frequency of new product and process development. Third, managers should be aware that dysfunctional competition influences innovation and firm performance in different ways. They should carefully evaluate the legal and competitive environment. When dysfunctional competition is intense, firms should reduce their efforts to acquire institutional support for product and process innovation. However, we suggest Chinese manufacturers invest in product and process innovation and use institutional support to improve operations even when dysfunctional competition is intense.

This study also has valuable implications for policy makers. Promoting innovation and development has become a major issue for the Chinese government and its agencies and the findings reveal that institutional support is a useful way for government officials to influence firms' decisions and operations. In particular, we suggest government officials devise policies and programs that reward product and process innovation. Technical and financial resources should be provided to support innovation and operations in manufacturing firms. Officials should also help firms obtain licenses to import technology and other equipment. In addition, officials should be aware that the effects of institutional support on product and process innovation are

1
2
3 reduced by dysfunctional competition. Hence, government and its agencies should
4 reduce dysfunctional competition to allow firms to fully reap the benefits of
5 institutional support. In particular, we suggest policy makers to develop laws
6 regulating market competition to protect intellectual property rights and improve the
7 enforcement of existing laws to punish unfair and unlawful practices, such as illegal
8 copying of new products and counterfeiting of products and trademarks.
9

10 11 12 13 14 15 *5.3 Limitations and future research directions*

16
17 This study has several limitations that open up avenues for future research. First,
18 it focuses on two characteristics of China's institutional environment. Researchers
19 argue that other institutional forces, such as legal enforceability (Zhou and Poppo,
20 2010), legal protection (Cai *et al.*, 2010), and regulatory legitimacy (Guo *et al.*, 2014),
21 also influence Chinese firms' operations and strategies. Future studies may investigate
22 the joint effects of different kinds of institutional forces on firms' innovation
23 decisions. Second, institutional support consists of many factors, such as R&D
24 investment, professional services, and loans, which may influence innovation and
25 operations in different ways. Future studies can investigate the effects of different
26 types of institutional support on firm performance. Third, our results provide insight
27 into how institutions matter in China. Researchers argue that the effects of
28 institutional forces may be influenced by cultural environment (Li and
29 Atuahene-Gima, 2001; Cai *et al.*, 2010). Future studies can generalize and validate
30 these findings into other countries with different institutional and cultural
31 environments. Fourth, this study measures firm performance using a Likert-type scale,
32 which is based on managers' perceptions and may be influenced by respondents'
33 personal opinions. Future studies can measure firm performance using objective
34 measures and ratio scales, such as market share.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

References

- Cai, S., Jun, M. and Yang, Z. (2010), "Implementing supply chain information integration in China: The role of institutional forces and trust", *Journal of Operations Management*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 257-268.
- Damanpour, F. (2010), "An integration of research findings of effects of firm size and market competition on product and process innovations", *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 996-1010.
- Flynn, B.B., Huo, B. and Zhao, X. (2010), "The impact of supply chain integration on performance: A contingency and configuration approach", *Journal of Operations Management*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp. 58-71.
- Fornell, C. and Larcker, D.F. (1981), "Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement errors", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 39-50.
- Fuentelsaz, L., Garrido, E. and Maicas, J. P. (2015), "Incumbents, technological change and institutions: How the value of complementary resources varies across markets", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 36 No. 12, pp. 1778-1801.
- Gunday ,G., Ulusoy, G., Kilic, K. and Alpkan, L. (2011), "Effects of innovation types on firm performance", *International Journal of Production Economics*, Vol. 133 No. 2, pp. 662-676.
- Guo, H., Xu, E. and Jacobs, M. (2014), "Managerial political ties and firm performance during institutional transitions: An analysis of mediating mechanisms", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 67 No. 2, pp. 116-127.
- Henseler, J., Dijkstra, T. K., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., Diamantopoulos, A., Straub, D. W., Ketchen, D. J., Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., and Calantone, R. J. (2014), "Common beliefs and reality about Partial Least Squares: Comments on Rönkkö & Evermann (2013)", *Organizational Research Methods*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 182-209.
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M. and Sinkovics, R. R. (2009), "The use of Partial Least Squares path modeling in international marketing", *Advances in International Marketing*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 277-320.
- Ho, L. (2011), "Meditation, learning, organizational innovation and performance", *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, Vol. 111, No.1, pp.113-131.
- Kuo, Y. (2013) "Technology readiness as moderator for construction company performance", *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, Vol. 113, No.4, pp.558 – 572.
- Li, H. and Atuahene-Gima, K. (2001), "Product innovation strategy and the performance of new technology ventures in China", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 44 No. 6, pp. 1123-1134.
- Li, H. and Li, J. (2009), "Top management team conflict and entrepreneurial strategy making in China", *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 263-283.
- Li, H. and Zhang, Y. (2007), "The role of managers' political networking and functional experience in new venture performance: Evidence from China's transition economy", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 28 No. 8, pp. 791-804.
- Lu, Y., Tsang, E. W. K. and Peng, M. W. (2008), "Knowledge management and

- 1
2
3 innovation strategy in the Asia pacific: Toward an institution-based view”, *Asia*
4 *Pacific Journal of Management*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 361-374.
- 5 Lu, K., Zhu, J. and Bao, H. (2015), “High-performance human resource management
6 and firm performance”, *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, Vol. 115 No. 2,
7 pp. 353-382.
- 8
9 Kostopoulos, K., Papalexandris, A., Papachroni, M. and Ioannou, G. (2011),
10 “Absorptive capacity, innovation, and financial performance”, *Journal of Business*
11 *Research*, Vol. 64 No. 12, pp. 1335-1343.
- 12
13 Koufteros, X., Vonderembse, M. and Jayaram, J. (2005), “Internal and external
14 integration for product development: The contingency effects of uncertainty,
15 equivocality, and platform strategy”, *Decision Sciences*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 97-133.
- 16
17 Ma, Z., Yu, M., Gao, C., Zhou, J. and Yang, Z. (2014), “Institutional constraints of
18 product innovation in China: Evidence from international joint ventures”, *Journal*
19 *of Business Research*, Vol. 68 No. 5, pp. 949-956.
- 20
21 Morgan, R. E. and Berthon, P. (2008), “Market orientation, generative learning,
22 innovation strategy and business performance inter - relationships in bioscience
23 firms”, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 45 No. 8, pp. 1329-1353.
- 24
25 Nunnally, J. C. and Bernstein, I. H. (1994), *Psychological theory*, New York,
26 McGraw-Hill.
- 27
28 National Bureau of Statistics (2014), *Statistical communique of national science and*
29 *technology investment in 2014*, Ministry of Science and Technology and Ministry
30 of Finance, Beijing
- 31
32 Parasuraman, A. (2000), “Technology Readiness Index (TRI) a multiple-item scale to
33 measure readiness to embrace new technologies”, *Journal of service research*, Vol.
34 2 No. 4, pp. 307-320.
- 35
36 Parayil, G. and D’Costa, A.P. (2009), *The new Asian innovation dynamics: China and*
37 *India in perspective*, England, Palgrave Macmillan
- 38
39 Pavlou, P.A., Liang, H. and Xue, Y. (2007), “Understanding and mitigating
40 uncertainty in online exchange relationships: A principal-agent perspective”, *MIS*
41 *Quarterly*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 105-136.
- 42
43 Peng, D. X. and Lai, F. (2012), “Using partial least squares in operations management
44 research: A practical guideline and summary of past research”, *Journal of*
45 *Operations Management*, Vol. 30 No. 6, pp. 467-480.
- 46
47 Peng, M. W. (2002), “Towards an institution-based view of business strategy”, *Asia*
48 *Pacific Journal of Management*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 251–267.
- 49
50 Peng, M. W. (2003), “Institutional transitions and strategic choices”, *Academy of*
51 *Management Review*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 275–296.
- 52
53 Peng, M. W. (2006), *Global strategy*, Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Thomson.
- 54
55 Peng, M. W. (2013), “An institution-based view of IPR protection”, *Business*
56 *Horizons*, Vol. 56 No. 2, pp. 135-139.
- 57
58 Peng, M. W., Sun, S. L., Pinkham, B. and Chen, H. (2009), “The institution-based
59 view as a third leg for a strategy tripod”, *The Academy of Management*
60 *Perspectives*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 63-81.
- 61
62 Peng, M. W., Wang, D. and Jiang, Y. (2008), “An institution-based view of

- international business strategy: A focus on emerging economies”, *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 39 No. 5, pp. 920–936.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y. and Podsakoff, N. P. (2003), “Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies”, *Journal of applied psychology*, Vol. 88 No. 5, pp. 879-903.
- Qi, Y., Zhao, X. and Sheu, C. (2011), “The impact of competitive strategy and supply chain strategy on business performance: The role of environmental uncertainty”, *Decision Sciences*, Vol. 42 No. 2, pp. 378-89.
- Qian, C., Cao, Q. and Takeuchi, R. (2013), “Top management team functional diversity and organizational innovation in China: The moderating effects of environment”, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 110-120.
- Ringle, C.M., Wende, S. and Becker, J.M. (2015), “SmartPLS 3.” Boenningstedt: SmartPLS GmbH, <http://www.smartpls.com>.
- Ruiz-Jiménez, J. M. and Fuentes-Fuentes, M. (2013), “Knowledge combination, innovation, organizational performance in technology firms”, *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, Vol. 113 No. 4, pp. 523-540.
- Sarstedt, M., Henseler, J. and Ringle, C. M. (2011), “Multi-group analysis in Partial Least Squares (PLS) path modeling: Alternative methods and empirical results”, *Advances in International Marketing*, Vol. 113 No. 4, pp.195-218.
- Schoenherr, T. and Swink, M. (2015), “The roles of supply chain intelligence and adaptability in new product launch success”, *Decision Sciences*, Vol. 46 No. 5, pp. 901-936.
- Sheng, S., Zhou, K. Z. and Lessassy, L. (2013), “NPD speed vs. innovativeness: The contingent impact of institutional and market environments”, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 66 No. 11, pp. 2355-2362.
- Sheng, S., Zhou, K. Z. and Li, J. J. (2011), “The effects of business and political ties on firm performance: Evidence from China”, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 75 No. 1, pp. 1–15.
- Shu, C., Wang, Q., Gao, S. and Liu, C. (2015), “Firm patenting, innovations, and government institutional support as a double-edged sword”, *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, Vol. 32 No. 2, pp. 290-305.
- Tellis, G. J., Prabhu, J. C. and Chandy, R. K. (2009), “Radical innovation across nations: The preeminence of corporate culture”, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 73 No. 1, pp. 3-23.
- Un, C. A. and Asakawa, K. (2015), “Types of R&D collaborations and process innovation: The benefit of collaborating upstream in the knowledge chain”, *The Journal of Product Innovation Management*, Vol. 32 No. 1, pp.138-153.
- Walker, R. M. (2004), “Innovation and organizational performance: A critical review and research agenda”, In Best Papers Proceedings from the Academy of Management Meeting, Honolulu, 5-10 August.
- World Intellectual Property Organization, (2015), *WIPO IP facts and figures (2015 edition)*, WIPO Publication, No. 943E/14.
- Wang, L., Yeung, J.H.Y., and Zhang, M. (2011), “The impact of trust and contract on

- 1
2
3 innovation performance: The moderating role of environmental uncertainty”,
4 *International Journal of Production Economics*, Vol 134 No.1, pp.114-122.
5 Wang, Q., Huo, B., Lai, F., Chu, Z. (2010), “Understanding performance drivers of
6 third - party logistics providers in mainland China: A replicated and comparative
7 study”, *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, Vol. 110 No 9, pp.1273 – 1296.
8 Wang, Z., Huo, B., Tian, Y., Hua, Z. (2015), “Effects of external uncertainties and
9 power on opportunism in supply chains: Evidence from China”, *International*
10 *Journal of Production Research*, Vol. 53, No. 20, pp. 6294-6307.
11 Wetzels, M., Odekerken-Schröder, G., and Van Oppen, C. (2009), “Using PLS path
12 modeling for assessing hierarchical construct models: Guidelines and empirical
13 illustration”, *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 177-195.
14 Zhao, M. (2006), “Conducting R&D in countries with weak intellectual property
15 rights protection”, *Management Science*, Vol. 52 No. 8, pp. 1185–1199.
16 Zhou, K. Z. and Poppo, L. (2010), “Exchange hazards, relational reliability, and
17 contracts in china: The contingent role of legal enforceability”, *Journal of*
18 *International Business Studies*, Vol. 41 No. 5, pp. 861-881.
19 Zhang, M., Zhao, X., Voss, C., and Zhu, G. (2015), “Innovating through services,
20 co-creation and supplier integration: Cases from China”, *International Journal of*
21 *Production Economics* DOI: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2015.09.026
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Firm profiles

Variables	Num.	Percentage	
Annual sale (USD)	Fewer than 1 million	1	0.3
	1 to 5 million	12	4.0
	5 to 10 million	27	9.0
	10 to 20 million	59	19.7
	20 to 50 million	88	29.3
	50 to 100 million	51	17.0
	100 to 250 million	36	12.0
	More than 250 million	26	8.7
Number of employees	Fewer than 200	67	22.3
	201 to 300	56	18.7
	301 to 500	69	23.0
	501 to 1000	52	17.3
	1000 or more	56	18.7
Ownership	State-owned	96	32.0
	Privately owned	102	34.0
	Joint venture	46	15.3
	Foreign investment	56	18.7
Industry	Biology and pharmaceuticals	18	6.0
	Computers and telecommunication equipment	34	11.3
	Chemicals	51	17.0
	Medical equipment	28	9.3
	Electronics and electrical equipment	54	18.0
	Industrial machinery	49	16.3
	Transportation equipment	35	11.7
	New materials	31	10.3
Total	300	100.0	

Table 2: Factor loadings of scale items (CFA factor loading)

Measurement	Loading
Dysfunctional competition (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.787$; C.R.=0.858; AVE=0.604)*	
<i>Please indicate the extent to which your principal industry has experienced the following in the last 3 years: (1=not at all, 7=to a great extent)</i>	
1. Unlawful competitive practices such as illegal copying of new products.	0.825**
2. Counterfeiting of your company's own products and trademarks by other companies.	0.57
3. Ineffective market competitive laws to protect your company's intellectual property.	

0.833

0.662

58
59
60

4. Increased unfair competitive practices by other companies in the industry. 0.776

Institutional support (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.855$; C.R.=0.902; AVE=0.697)

Please indicate the extent to which in the last three years government and its agencies have: (1=not at all, 7=to a great extent)

1. Implemented policies and programs that have been beneficial to your company's operations. 0.824

2. Provided needed technology information and technical support to your company. 0.871

3. Played a significant role in providing financial support for your company. 0.862

4. Helped your company to obtain licenses to import technology, manufacturing and other equipment. 0.778

Product innovation (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.773$; C.R.=0.868; AVE=0.687)

Please indicate your degree of agreement with the following statements describing your company's product innovation: (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree)

1. We are the first within the industry to introduce new products. 0.832

2. We keep up with the latest product developments. 0.823

3. We frequently introduce products that are radically different from established products in the industry. 0.832

Process innovation (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.845$; C.R.=0.896; AVE=0.684)

Please indicate your degree of agreement with the following statements describing your company's manufacturing process innovation: (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree)

1. We are learning more about the newest processes than our competitors. 0.872

2. We are the first within the industry to deploy new processes. 0.845

3. We keep up with the latest process developments. 0.836

4. We frequently introduce processes that are radically different from existing processes in the industry. 0.751

Firm performance (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.843$; C.R.=0.895; AVE=0.681)

Please indicate your firm's overall performance compared with major competitors over the past year on: (1=far worse, 7=far better)

1. Total sales of product and service 0.873

2. Profit 0.783

3. Market share 0.863

4. Market share growth 0.775

R&D investment: *Over the last two years, what was your average research and development (R&D) budget as a percentage of total company sales?*

New process investment: *Over the last two years, what was your average investment in new process technologies and equipment as a percentage of total company sales?*

Firm size: *The total number of employees.*

Ownership: *The ownership of your company*

Table 3. Mean, standard deviation, and correlations

Constructs	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
Institutional support (1)	4.526	1.428	0.835				
Dysfunction competition (2)	4.205	1.286	0.013	0.777			
Product innovation (3)	5.300	1.005	0.300***	0.249***	0.829		
Process innovation (4)	5.098	1.013	0.428***	0.119	0.557***	0.827	
Firm performance (5)	4.769	1.035	0.389***	0.042	0.396***	0.431***	0.825

Note: * $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$, *** $P < 0.001$. Square root of average variance extracted for each construct included in the model is given in bold along the diagonal in the table.

Table 4: Statistical comparison of path coefficients between low and high levels of dysfunctional competition

	Low		High		Low vs. High	
	Path coefficient	SE	Path coefficient	SE	ABS	P -value
Institutional support →						
product innovation	0.475	0.067	0.101	0.084	0.375	0.000***
Institutional support →						
process innovation	0.507	0.061	0.345	0.076	0.162	0.043*
Institutional support →						
firm performance	0.227	0.072	0.226	0.073	0.001	0.496
Product innovation						
→ firm performance	0.203	0.103	0.168	0.084	0.035	0.398
Process innovation → firm						
performance	0.254	0.099	0.146	0.094	0.108	0.216

Note: * $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$, *** $P < 0.001$. ABS means the absolute value of difference.

54
55

56
57
58
59
60






Figure 1: Conceptual model



Note: * $P < 0.05$; ** $P < 0.01$; *** $P < 0.001$

Figure 2: Structural model with parameter estimates (pooled sample)



Note: * $P < 0.05$; ** $P < 0.01$; *** $P < 0.001$. The results in the group subject to low (high) levels of dysfunctional competition are shown in italic (parentheses). The bold lines indicate that the path coefficients are significantly different between the two groups at a confidence level of 0.05.

Figure 3: The moderating effects of dysfunctional competition

