

The Concept of Chance Management in Coopetition Among Cultural Institutions

Patrycja Juszczyk

University of Economics in Katowice, Poland
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2231-5719>

Dagmara Wójcik

University of Economics in Katowice, Poland
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9082-8471>

Submitted: 13.04.2023 | Accepted: 29.05.2023

Abstract

Purpose: The aim of the article is to exemplify the chance management concept in coopetition among cultural institutions and determine specific chance attributes.

Design/methodology/approach: The empirical research was exploratory, and the research process used a qualitative, interpretative approach. The study used semi-structured, in-depth individual face-to-face interviews. A total of 42 interviews were conducted with public and private museums.

Findings: Our research revealed that cultural entities take advantage of opportunities so as to achieve not only a competitive advantage, but also a cooperative, or even – as has been shown – a cocompetitive one. Coopetition, in turn, can be analyzed through the lens of the chance management concept, and especially the relational perspective of chance, which views chance as an important element within an organization's environment. Moreover, the specificity of coopetition in cultural institutions has shown the importance of social factors, emphasizing that coopetition is the effect of social construction, individual actions and the motivations of managers. Therefore, the social embeddedness of coopetition should be emphasized in this approach, determining not only the intentional, but also the emergent, nature of coopetition. At the same time, it reveals that the individual cognitive perspective of managers who are able to notice, use or create chance is significant.

Originality/value: In strategic management, coopetition has been considered so far to be a planned, long-term phenomenon and a purposefully, deliberately created relationship. The findings of our research in the cultural sector have revealed that coopetition can also be a temporal, ad hoc relationship that is short-term in nature, as well as being incremental and undertaken spontaneously depending on emerging opportunities.

Correspondence address: University of Economics in Katowice, 1 Maja 50, 40-287 Katowice, Poland;
e-mails: patrycja.juszczyk@uekat.pl, dagmara.wojcik@uekat.pl.

Suggested Citation: Juszczyk, P., & Wójcik, D. (2023). The Concept of Chance Management in Coopetition Among Cultural Institutions. *European Management Studies*, 21(2), 25–50.
<https://doi.org/10.7172/2956-7602.100.2>.

Keywords: coopetition, chance management concept, cultural institutions, museums, qualitative research.

JEL: Z190, L320, L890, P130

Koncepcja Chance Management w kooperacji instytucji kultury

Streszczenie

Cel: celem artykułu jest egzemplifikacja koncepcji chance management w kooperacji instytucji kultury wraz z określeniem specyficznych atrybutów okazji.

Metodologia: badania empiryczne mają charakter eksploracyjny, a proces badawczy opiera się na podejściu jakościowym interpretatywnym. W badaniu wykorzystano półstrukturyzowane, pogłębione indywidualne wywiady bezpośrednie. Przeprowadzono łącznie 42 wywiady wśród muzeów publicznych i prywatnych.

Wyniki: przeprowadzone badania ujawniły, że instytucje kultury wykorzystują okazje, by osiągnąć przewagę nie tylko konkurencyjną, lecz także kooperacyjną, a nawet – jak wykazano – kooperacyjną. Z kolei kooperację można rozpatrywać przez pryzmat koncepcji chance management, w szczególności relacyjnej perspektywy okazji, która ujmuje okazję jako ważny element otoczenia organizacji. Ponadto, specyfika kooperacji w instytucjach kultury ukazała znaczenie czynników społecznych, wskazując, że kooperacja jest efektem konstrukcji społecznej, indywidualnych działań oraz motywacji menedżerów. Dlatego też podkreślić należy zakorzenienie społeczne kooperacji, determinujące zarówno jej intencjonalny, jak i emergentny charakter. Jednocześnie, badania ujawniły jak ważna jest indywidualna perspektywa poznawcza menedżerów potrafiących dostrzec, wykorzystać lub stworzyć okazję.

Oryginalność/wartość: kooperacja rozpatrywana była dotychczas w zarządzaniu strategicznym jako zaplanowane i długoterminowe zjawisko o świadomym i celowym charakterze. Badania w sektorze kultury ujawniły natomiast, iż relacja kooperacji może mieć także charakter czasowy, doraźny, krótkoterminowy, będący działaniem inkrementalnym, podejmowanym spontanicznie, zależnie od pojawiających się okazji.

Słowa kluczowe: kooperacja, koncepcja chance management, instytucje kultury, muzea, badania jakościowe.

1. Introduction

Over recent decades, it has been noticed that organizations can gain benefits by creating relationships with other entities. It can be said that “the great importance of inter-organizational relations in today’s world, their building and development is a challenge for strategic management” (Zakrzewska-Bielawska, 2016, p. 610), and this therefore shapes the need and directions of future research (Clegg et al., 2002). Scholars claim that the overriding paradigm of contemporary management are dynamic relationships that connect the organization with entities in the environment (Cravens et al., 1996). On the basis of the relational approach, the attention of researchers focuses on broadly understood relationships (Klimas et al., 2023), and within them – depending on the choice of partner (competitive or non-competitive) – on cooperation or coopetition as inter-organizational behaviors falling within collaboration as a broader category (Zacharia et al., 2019).

Cooperation takes place today through the building of both long-term and short-term relationships in order to maximize the value of a given

relationship configuration (Reinartz et al., 2004), hence shaping them appropriately becomes important. At the same time, it should be pointed out that in the context of the phenomena analyzed within the framework of collaboration, the relatively rapid development of research has specifically concerned cooptation. However, the high complexity and multidimensionality of this phenomenon have resulted in fragmented research findings that have not been integrated, compared or contrasted, which limits the unified and integrated state of knowledge on this phenomenon (Gernsheimer et al., 2021). As a consequence, there is an observable heterogeneity of theories and research concepts underlying the way of explaining and implementing so-called cooptation strategy (Dorn et al., 2016), emphasizing its planned, intended and long-term nature (Brandenburger & Nalebuff, 1996; Dagnino, 2009). In this approach, entities involved in cooptation relationships are assigned with deliberate strategic intentions, such as learning, supplementing capabilities and strategic resources, or achieving a better market position (Bouncken et al., 2020; Czakon et al., 2020). Meanwhile, it can be seen that in many areas of the operation of entities, cooptation can also be incremental in the case of ad hoc activities, improvisation and spontaneous joint initiatives, or in the use of emerging market opportunities (Czakon, 2010; Monticelli et al., 2023).

An area that has undergone a fundamental transformation in recent years is the arts and culture sector (Ginsburgh & Throsby, 2006), and due to their specificity, cultural institutions seem to be interesting research entities with regard to many phenomena analyzed from the perspective of strategic management (Najda-Janoszka & Sawczuk, 2018), including cooptation (Juszczak & Wójcik, 2021). Based on research conducted in the commercial sector, it can be expected that cooptation will ensure success for organizations from the cultural sector, provided that it is properly prepared and implemented (Zineldin, 2004). However, it should be pointed out that the specificity of entities operating in the field of culture makes it impossible to transpose results from the study of the cooptation phenomenon to business organizations, hence this area needs separate research and analysis. Simultaneously, taking advantage of or even creating opportunities seems to be crucial for many cultural institutions, which may also see chances in establishing and shaping temporary, spontaneous inter-organizational relationships that are beneficial for all parties, including with competitors.

Nowadays, in an extremely dynamic and changeable environment, emerging relationships characterized by greater freedom, dynamics and flexibility of actions are gaining in importance (Mandják et al., 2015). This approach draws from the evolutionary school in strategic management (Mintzberg, 1973), which shows certain dynamics in shaping relationships over time, while emphasizing the importance of strategies and more short-term, time-based activities (Jing & Van de Ven, 2018). The growing uncertainty and turbulence of the environment make long-term plans and

strategies lose importance as determinants of an organization's development. Therefore, the actions taken are a combination of rational intentions and accidental factors. In practice, this means adjusting the previously adopted plans and strategies of the organization's operation due to significant unforeseen events taking place primarily in the environment. Therefore, it can be assumed that the basis for the development of modern organizations are, for example, events in the environment interpreted as opportunities (Krupski, 2008).

The growing unpredictability and turbulence in the environment, which makes it impossible to build reliable forecasts, significantly shortens the planning and strategic action horizon of many organizations. It seems intuitive, therefore, that emerging strategies and incremental relationships are becoming increasingly important in strategic management (Mariani, 2007; Czakon, 2010; Zacharia et al., 2019; Monticelli et al., 2023). Economic practice shows that chance, i.e., various events or a combination of circumstances, creates the possibility of achieving additional benefits (Krupski, 2008), hence the concept of chance management is gaining in importance in the field of management. Contemporary organizations increasingly focus on taking and creating chances to establish mutually beneficial relationships with other entities (Mischkowski & Glöckner, 2016; Opp & Gern, 1993), also characterized by the phenomenon of incremental cooptation (Juszczuk, 2021). At the same time, it should be emphasized that there are no good theoretical proposals for taking advantage of chance in cooptation – especially in cultural institutions – not to mention research in this regard. Hence the aim of the article is to exemplify the concept of chance management in cooptation among cultural institutions, and to determine the specific attributes of chance. Thus we focused on the following research questions: (RQ1): What are the manifestations of the usage of the chance management concept in cooptation among cultural institutions?; (RQ2): What specific attributes of chance can we identify in cooptation of cultural institutions?

The theoretical contribution is focused on the conceptualization and exemplifying the concept of chance in management sciences, in particular with regard to cultural institutions. The paper also draws managers' attention to take advantage of chance in cooptation relationships. The research contribution is based on the results of qualitative research conducted within Polish museums.

2. The Concept of Chance Management in Strategic Management

Although in the field of strategic management chance can be a cognitively valuable construct, there is an open discussion in the academic community on the interpretation of the category of chance and understanding the role it plays in the activities of entities. This state of affairs may result firstly from the coexistence of various concepts, but also from their ambiguity, and thus it is futile to look for a single, coherent definition of chance.

2.1. Conceptualization of the Term “Chance”

With regard to the concept of chance management, several key concepts can be identified, i.e.: *occasion*, *fortune*, *possibility*, *chance*, *opportunity* (PONS, 2023). *Fortune* is connected with good luck. *Occasion* means a particular time when something happens. *Possibility* is a situation where something may or may not happen. *Chance* is defined as an occasion which allows something to be done, but is also an opportunity. *Opportunity* refers to a situation in which it is possible to do something we want to do. Meanwhile, in the literature on management, the following three terms can be found most often: *possibility*, *chance*, *opportunity*. “Chance” comes from the concept of “to fall” in the sense of something unexpected falling upon someone. It was another way to talk of fate; something unpredictable. To take a chance implies being prepared for a positive or a negative result. “Possibility” weighs on the possible; that which can be achieved. It simply states that something can be done or acquired. A fine-tuned definition makes a possibility dependent on how we act ourselves, whereas a chance depends on other people and unpredictable circumstances. Opportunity harbors the word *port*. Originally opportune meant a good time to sail for port; when favorable winds could be expected. Opportunity is a chance or possibility with good odds. To sum up, a chance is something that unpredictably falls upon us, a possibility is something which is possible to be done or acquired in the future, and an opportunity implies that there are good odds for something. What is more, chances offer a possibility, which is an option, a choice, a way to do something (Sandström, 2005). For this reason, it would seem that the main focus should be on the terms chance and possibility. In the literature, some authors distinguish between them, even emphasizing that they should not be used interchangeably and should not be treated as semantically identical concepts (Krupski, 2013). Chance is connected with risk, a piece of luck, a turn of good fortune and also an opportunity, which in turn refers to a favorable option, a good way, moment or point in time (Sandström, 2005). Chance has a wider range of meanings than opportunity, also including opportunity. Chance tends to involve the “possibility” of something, while opportunity involves creating and making an opportunity certain to happen. Moreover, opportunity has

positive connotations (Sebt et al., 2009) while chance has mixed ones – positive and negative – so it seems to involve both negative and positive situations as part of “possibility” (Jarunwaraphan & Mallikamas, 2020).

2.2. Chance in the Scientific Literature

In the scientific literature, in the case of chance, the probability of success is more emphasized, with assessment and evaluation of its level (Hilbert, 2012; Levy, 2003). In the case of opportunity, attention is focused on the events conducive to success, usually without gradation of the potential benefit. In this approach, attention is drawn to the statistical provenance of the category of chance (Denrell et al., 2015). This is understood as expected value in the form of the product of the expected extraordinary effect associated with its use, and the probability of the occurrence of an event to which we attribute a sense of chance (Link & Marxt, 2004). This means that an opportunity – in contrast to chance – is not a chance incident. Chance can be a pleasant or unpleasant situation/effect of taking action, while an opportunity tends to be positive. Therefore, when talking about chance, the circumstances or conditions conducive to success are often emphasized, underlying that the source of opportunity is not only within the organization itself, but also in its environment (Krupski, 2013). Based on perceived chance, people try to match their actions to the rhythm of environmental change (Bandura, 2005). Thus, “chances can determine the directions of the organization’s development” (Krupski, 2013, p. 7), even being an “alternative to the adopted strategic plan” (Krupski, 2011, p. 5). They supplement or update it, or correct it due to significant unforeseen events taking place in the environment (Krupski, 2008), and complexity of the environment drives organizations to changes in strategic orientation (Zakrzewska-Bielawska & Piotrowska, 2021). As a result of the above analyses, it can be indicated that opportunity management is a narrower stream within the concept of chance management.

2.3. Probabilistic and Relational Approaches Towards Chance

In the subject literature, it is possible to find two different perspectives on the concept of chance, that is the probabilistic and relational approaches.

The first perspective – probabilistic – is more popular and based on the paradigm which is especially visible in the Western societies and literature. In this context, Jing and Van de Ven (2018) indicate that the English word “*chance*” comes from its French substitute “*chéance*”, which means “the way the dice fall”. In this perspective, chance means the possibility of a specific outcome in an uncertain situation. Here, the uncertainty of an event occurring at a certain time is indicated. This perspective is derived from the philosophy of positivism, where chance is a random element, inherently unpredictable and impossible to manage (Alvarez & Barney, 2010). The probability of the occurrence of a given phenomenon

is estimated, which is closer to the quantitative approach in management (Krupski, 2013), expressed in determining the impact of random events on the behavior and performance of the organization (Denrell et al., 2015). It is also found in risk management – where chance is perceived as a risk of a positive nature (Massaad, 2021).

The second perspective – which is definitely less well studied, but is also a promising research area – is the relational approach towards chance which is more popular in Eastern countries and literature, e.g. in China (Jullien, 2004; Van de Ven & Jing, 2012). The term for chance in Chinese means “a favourable moment to take a specific action”, indicating taking action in relation to forces in the environment (Tsang, 2004). The relational approach is derived from the philosophy of interpretivism (Zhang et al., 2012), where the emphasis is on adapting the type and moment of action to dynamic forces that are not only internal, but also external.

In the relational approach, the term *chance* – equated here with an opportunity – can be understood as a favorable moment for the organization to take action, bringing benefits to each of the parties involved in the relationship. In addition, it is worth emphasizing that a chance cannot only be used, but also created by the organizations themselves, by entrepreneurs (Sarasvathy, 2001; Venkataraman, 2003), thanks to the competence, knowledge and practice of combining moments from the past, present and future, and building timing strategies (Jing & Van de Ven, 2018). To conclude, in the probabilistic view (positivism), chance is objective and is dependent on uncontrollable contingencies determining the proper actions we should take (what to do), while in the relational view (interpretivism), chance is subjective and dependent on one’s understanding of situational momentum, and so we are responsible for doing the right thing at the right time (what to do and when) (Jing & Van de Ven, 2018). In the article, chance will be understood on the basis of the relational approach.

2.4. Chance in Strategic Management

Although analyzing phenomena in the light of the chance management concept seems to be a relatively new approach, the use of the category of chance in strategic management can be found in its various schools (Eisenhardt & Sull, 2001; Mintzberg et al., 2005; Denrell et al., 2007; Lee et al., 2007; Foss & Foss, 2008), including: (1) the planning school, where chances are an element of assessing the environment and the basis for building an organization’s strategy in relation to the competitive environment; (2) the positional school, where the environment is a reference point in formulating the organization’s strategy, hence emerging events and external conditions are taken into account; (3) the evolutionary school, which indicates that the organization’s strategy includes intentional and emergent strategies, resulting from various adaptive current decisions, including those related to the use of chance; (4) the simple rules school, in which the

achievement of a competitive advantage results from the appropriate use of short-term chances, and therefore also consists of identifying and taking chances; (5) the resource-based view, where access to resources is a condition for taking advantage of chances, including creating relationships with entities from the environment; and (6) the relational view, where attention is focused on creating and shaping relationships, as well as managing their portfolio (long-term strategic relationships and short-term timing relationships) in order to achieve benefits for each of the parties in the relationship.

Simultaneously, research has shown that inter-organizational relationships are the most important resource in the context of organizational flexibility and taking advantage of chances, regardless of the size of the organization (Krupski, 2006). Many researchers have noted that ideally, chance is a fundamental and critical aspect of the activities of entities (Alvarez & Barney, 2007; Buenstorf, 2007), and the importance of chance in the development of organizations is constantly growing (Skat-Rørdam et al., 2003). For example, Collins and Porras (2008) proved that some of the largest American corporations base their development strategies simply on chance. In turn, the conclusions drawn from research carried out on Polish enterprises have shown that in half of all small or medium-sized companies, development is determined by chance, and organizations take advantage of various chances that arise in the environment (Krupski, 2013). In addition, the literature indicates that chance management also plays an important role in cooperation between organizations (Link and Marxt, 2004). At the same time, on the basis of the relational approach in strategic management, research attention is focused on collaboration, and within it on the phenomenon of cooperation between non-competitive or competitive organizations. After all, in gaining a competitive advantage, or when survival or development is at stake, joining forces and cooperating with competitors is an attractive solution for many entities. In economic reality, both types of relationships and behaviors displayed by entities interpenetrate or even dynamically very often replace one another, revealing themselves in cooperation between competing entities, i.e., coopetition.

3. Coopetition Among Cultural Institutions in the Light of the Chance Management Concept

For more than three decades, researchers have been trying to explore the strategic capabilities of organizations to cooperate and compete simultaneously (Hamel et al., 1989; Lado et al., 1997). Coopetition, as a synergistic phenomenon that combines both cooperative and competitive relations between organizations (Brandenburger & Nalebuff, 1996), has been studied mainly from the perspective of enterprises in recent decades (Gernsheimer et al., 2021). It should be pointed out, however, that the concept of coopetition may also have significant implications in other sectors

of the economy. One of them, which is particularly interesting and is also developing dynamically, is the cultural sector.

The cultural sector, especially in recent years, as a result of the development of information technologies, contributes significantly to economic growth due to increasing demand for and supply of cultural products and services (Ghazinoory et al., 2021). It should be noted that since the 1990s, the subject of management in the cultural sector has been attracting more and more interest from researchers and practitioners working in this field. Research interest shown so far in the cultural sector has been, among others, in the so-called cultural industries concept, emphasizing the economic links between popular culture and high culture (mainly associated with the world of art) (Galloway & Dunlop, 2007), and the concept of creative industries, emphasizing in particular such elements as creativity, entrepreneurship and productivity in the management of culture (Ghazinoory et al., 2021).

Organizations providing cultural activities, such as cultural institutions, are responsible for the provision of services in the field of culture and art (Lin et al., 2016). Among the legal forms of activities, the following can be distinguished in particular: theatres, operas, operettas, philharmonics, orchestras, film institutions, cinemas, museums, libraries, community centers, art centers and art galleries, as well as research and documentation centers in various fields of culture (Carr et al., 2004). Cultural institutions, which include entities operating in all three sectors – public, private and non-profit, operate in an environment characterized by high uncertainty caused by changing funding priorities, frequently amended legislation, elections and budget cycles within their industry (Bagdadli & Arrigoni, 2005). The institutions create networks, explained by isomorphism, while an inherent feature of the networks between individual entities is the existence of both cooperation and competition (Hasitschka et al., 2005).

Research has revealed that due to the dynamic development of the cultural sector and the resulting changes, such as the way action programs are managed, created and implemented (also within cultural institutions themselves), and because of limited financial resources and thus development chances, cultural institutions are somehow forced to look for partnerships also among competitors (Towse & Hernández, 2020). So far the rare and fragmentary research on coopetition among cultural institutions has revealed that involvement in coopetition allows cultural institutions to achieve a competitive advantage by creating a complementary and diversified cultural offer (Qizi, 2021). Coopetition is also a way to exchange knowledge, experience, skills and abilities, and allows the use of limited resources to be maximized, increasing the dynamics of action in the implementation of missions and social goals. It thus gives cultural institutions the chance to overcome organizational shortcomings, positively affecting the reduction of operating costs, achieving a synergy effect in the area of competences, experience and knowledge, and increasing social legitimacy (Ver Steeg Jr., 2022).

It is worth noting that recent research on co-competition – also conducted among cultural institutions – draws attention to the social embeddedness of co-competition, determining not only its intentional, but also its emerging character (Zacharia et al., 2019; Garri, 2021; Juszczuk & Wójcik, 2021; Darbi & Knott, 2022; Monticelli et al., 2023). Researchers point to elements of spontaneity in rivals' cooperation agreements (Amata et al., 2022), whose effects are conditioned by influences on many levels, in particular the individual actions of the entities directly involved in it and their context. Therefore, when considering co-competition in cultural institutions, it should be emphasized that the research findings so far indicate that co-competition relationships analyzed at the inter-organizational level are dependent on and specific to the industry or the area in which the entities operate (Czakon, 2010), hence they are contextual in nature (Bengtsson & Raza-Ullah, 2016). Therefore, taking into account the different ways in which cultural institutions function, including their different types of activity, it should be assumed that existing theories in the field of management, including those related to co-competition, should be verified and tested, and consequently supplemented, modified or extended.

One interesting example illustrating co-competition among cultural institutions are museums, which among these institutions appear as a social and relational phenomenon. Museums operate in a relatively small, quite hermetic environment, creating numerous connections with various entities from their environment, in which social relations play a key role (Juszczuk, 2021). The activities of museums concern not only the direct recipients of services – visitors, but also broadly understood stakeholders, including public authorities at various levels, the local community, tourists, tourism enterprises, scientists, local entrepreneurs, associating organizations, history lovers and the media (Frey & Meier, 2006). Museums are responsible for the promotion and development of culture, as well as for meeting a wide range of different social needs in the use of cultural goods. As a result, on the one hand they engage in a competitive struggle for limited resources, including financial resources (e.g., funds from donors or budgetary subsidies), while on the other hand, they also cooperate, e.g., in the field of expanding their offer (exchange of exhibitions and collections), through mutual marketing activities, etc. (Giannini & Bowen, 2019). As a consequence, in order for museums to successfully function on the market and create an attractive and comprehensive cultural offer, they must actually enter into co-competition relationships. Moreover, the institutional environment as well as political and legal conditions – that is relationships rooted in power (government, legal regulations) – may not only create various incentives, but often even force entities from the cultural sector to adapt to policies imposed on them (Mariani, 2007; Towse & Hernández, 2020) in order to achieve the expected benefits. From such a perspective, establishing and developing co-competition, which brings numerous benefits to the entities involved, arises as a chance

that not only spontaneously appears to entities seeking it (chance discovery/recognition), but is also created by these entities (chance creation) (Alvarez & Barney, 2007; Ramoglou & Tsang, 2016). In this approach, coopetition is therefore established and developed in a gradual, often spontaneous way, related to emerging opportunities (Juszczyk & Wójcik, 2021) that create the opportunity to achieve additional benefits.

As a consequence, researchers more and more often point to the incremental nature of the coopetition carried out by contemporary organizations – including cultural and art institutions. This is in contrast to the formulation of actions in a typically strategic way thus enabling better and more effective adaptation to phenomena occurring in the turbulent environment (Juszczyk & Wójcik, 2021; Darbi & Knott, 2022).

4. Research Method

This article presents selected results of the field research conducted¹. The empirical research was exploratory, and the research process used a qualitative, interpretative approach (Silverman, 2016). Exploratory qualitative research enabled a more complete and comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon under study, as well as its description. This made it possible to focus on its features, characteristics, processes and meanings (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018), as they were to be used to identify specific aspects of the problem under study – the importance of the use of the chance management concept among cultural institutions. The methodology used included qualitative research techniques with the use of qualitative research tools (Bouncken et al., 2021).

The study used semi-structured, in-depth individual face-to-face interviews. A total of 42 interviews were conducted – 22 with representatives of public museums and 20 interviews with representatives of private museums (one interview per organization). This number enabled the so-called saturation effect to be achieved (Suddaby, 2006). Due to the adopted research goals, the interviewees were selected deliberately, taking into account such criteria as: (1) legal form of activity, (2) simultaneous occurrence of cooperation and competition relationships in the activity of the museum, (3) importance of the museum in Poland, (4) range of activity, (5) size of entity, and (6) its activity. The snowball technique was used as well. In the case of public museums, the interviewees were mainly directors, their deputies or proxies, and other senior and middle-level managers. In the case of non-public museums, they were the founders, i.e., owners, or presidents of associations or foundations, when the founder of the museum was an association or foundation. Therefore, it should be recognized that in the context of the studied phenomena, the interlocutors were key informants (Kumar et al., 1993).

The field research was iterative and lasted from January to July 2020. However, due to the announcement by the World Health Organization

of the COVID-19 pandemic, and the numerous government restrictions introduced as a result, some of the interviews in March-June 2020 were conducted via online tools (Google Meet, Zoom), each time using audio and video. The total duration of all interviews was approximately 47 hours, and the average interview duration was approximately 1 hour and 15 minutes.

The interviews were recorded and after collecting the data, the research material was written down and transcripts of the interviews were made. The text after transcription had a total of 909 pages. The content of the interviews was then encoded (Atkinson & Delamont, 2010) using NVivo computer software. The coding of the empirical data was made using deductive-inductive logic, so-called abduction (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003). We started with deduction, using the assumptions of the chance management concept taken from the literature to create initial, more general codes. Next, these codes were particularized inductively based on our research results. To increase the level of research trustworthiness (Guba, 1981), all procedures in the research were documented and a detailed protocol was set up. Also, full transcripts, definitions of codes and their applications were created and checked (Saldaña, 2009).

The research used so-called focused coding of categories, expanding the structure of codes and ultimately creating a hierarchy. In the context of the selectively presented research results, this article uses codes related to the following aspects: (1) the importance of identifying, discovering and creating chances in the activities of museums; (2) manifestations of the use of the chance management concept in the activities of museums – in particular in inter-organizational relationships; (3) exemplification of the chance management concept in the activities of museums – in particular in cooperation; and (4) the effects of using the chance management concept for the current activity and development of museums. The findings of the research are presented along with chosen quotations from the interviews so as to give a voice to the interviewees themselves, and at the same time increase the credibility of the qualitative research and allow for a better understanding of the research findings (Czernek-Marszałek & McCabe, 2022).

5. Research Findings

The results of the research revealed that chances are an important component of a flexible way of acting and making decisions on the basis of inter-organizational relationships. As a specific strategy based on trust and the creation and appropriation of value in the long-term perspective (e.g., Chen & Miller, 2015; Devece et al., 2019), cooperation – so far considered on the basis of strategic management – turned out among cultural institutions to be spontaneous, unplanned and also often a relationship based on the use of chances coming from the environment. Among the

researched cultural institutions, involvement in a cooperation relationship often occurred suddenly. Museums established cooperation with competitors in order to take advantage of an emerging chance in favorable conditions, allowing them to achieve specific goals or development benefits:

I think that we choose competitors for cooperation first of all according to our needs, sometimes those that appear suddenly. [5P]

Moderator: *How do you choose your partners for cooperation? How do you rate your competitors? Do you do some kind of interview?*

Interlocutor: *Often by chance. This is always the case with museum workers. [18NP]*

It should be emphasized that due to the specificity of the way cultural institutions function, their dependence on election cycles and external financing, and also due to their creative approach and the nature of the activities they carry out, the importance of the phenomenon of projectization in culture is significant. This involves focusing on one-time activities, as well as on speed and programmatic freedom (Lin & Wan-hua, 2006), which is also typical in cooperation relationships among museums, as evidenced by the following statement by one of the interlocutors:

You know, it's not like we're planning to get married. We have projects to do and then we cooperate, but these projects sometimes end after a month, sometimes after a year, and sometimes it's just a one-time cooperation with a competitor because there is such a need and we need each other just then. And sometimes they and we just have the money to do it, and then we just happen to dive into it together. [7NP]

In culture, actions often take place in an unforeseen way, which results from the influence of the environment. The aforementioned projectization is therefore a phenomenon based on the currently adopted model of cultural policy, promoting one-off events with a strictly defined beginning and end. This design is a natural response to the current way of financing culture and is based primarily on one-off events and temporary activities with a task dimension (Kosińska, 2018). Such aspects were also emphasized by museum representatives:

Our most important cooperations with competitors involve funding activities. These are formal contracts. There are parts of this cooperation that are based on ad hoc contracts, for example the rental of exhibits, the exchange of our collections, creating, in a sense, complementary offers for the public. [14P]

The interlocutors claimed that various events or a combination of circumstances, also related to a specific social context, created the possibility of achieving additional benefits. These were, for example, culture industry events such as conferences for museum professionals and accompanying social meetings. Existing social relationships constituted the *spiritus movens* of establishing cooperation, and thus creating chances to achieve museums'

goals. The actions taken were therefore a combination of both rational intentions and accidental factors, and therefore an example of seizing chances in the implementation of new activities:

During these conferences, many people, including me, have the chance to meet friends, friends of friends, etc. They are used for this, maybe this phrase “are used” sounds bad, but somewhere during these meetings, some idea is thrown out, and a light comes on that this could be another chance to cooperate with someone and achieve some benefits for my museum. [8P]

Economic practice shows that, based on the relational approach among cultural institutions, chances arise as a result of social construction (Baker & Nelson, 2005), and the individual actions and motivation of managers (Wood & McKinley, 2010). Coopetition implemented in this way takes the form of an incremental relationship based on the contextual approach (Bengtsson et al., 2010).

5.1. Attributes of Chance in Museum Coopetition

Prior fragmentary research on the broadly understood concept of chance management has revealed a certain range of attributes² ascribed to chance. Researchers adopt certain division criteria; hence different attributes of chance can be identified (Krupski, 2013; Chang et al., 2019; Lachiewicz et al., 2021). Due to the origin of chance in relation to the boundaries of the organization, internal and external chances can be distinguished, as the organization’s approach to seizing chances can be either active or passive. In turn, taking as a criterion the perception of decision-makers in the decision-making process, conscious and unconscious chances can be distinguished. However, depending the organization’s attitude to exploration and the use of chances in its activities, chances can be discovered, created, brought to fruition or can simply arise.

Interestingly, it is worth emphasizing that although chance has been identified on the basis of research conducted on enterprises – business organizations, they are also relevant in the case of the activities of cultural institutions.

When considering the criterion of origin or source of chances within the organization (Lachiewicz et al., 2021), it should be noted that due to the nature of coopetition, which as an inter-organizational relationship goes beyond the boundaries of one entity, chances will be only external. In museum coopetition, chances considered in terms of the chance management concept take the form of promising situations in museums’ external environment:

I’m just thinking about this institutional cooperation with other museums from the voivodship [...], maybe also a bit utopian, that at this moment we had the chance to exhibit our artist. Sometimes it was even unimportant whether it would be as beneficial

for us as for them, whether we would pay more or not, but it was a reminder of the Watach figure himself. You understand, you have to take advantage of this chance, because we don't know if there will be such a possibility later. [13P]

This also shows that chances are fleeting and transient, hence unused chances may pass forever, which is why it is so important for business entities to notice them in the environment.

In turn, in terms of the organization's attitude to seizing chances, museums show both active and passive approaches to taking a chance in establishing coopetitive relationships (Link & Marxt, 2004; Dimov, 2007).

The active approach includes the desire to establish cooperation with competitors within the hermetic environment represented by museums and with the motive of complementary fulfilment of the needs of the entities involved in coopetition. Importantly, as the interlocutors indicate, coopetition that is the result of taking advantage of emerging chances appears as an unformed relationship that evolves and develops over time:

The beginning of our relationship with rivals, it probably comes from the willingness to cooperate, just like that. I have the impression and probably some experience that people who have similar expectations or similar needs meet somewhere. That is, if there are such mutual needs. Well, this is the beginning of a relationship, and then when there is a common interest, these relationships deepen. [14P]

It should be pointed out that the limited budgets at the disposal of cultural institutions, in particular private museums, naturally push museums into coopetition, considered in the category of chance. An active, but also immediate search for partners is related to the desire to obtain external funds. In the vast majority of cases, the regulations of tenders are structured in such a way that a single entity cannot receive a subsidy. This means that all kinds of partnerships and joint initiatives serving the implementation of a given project receive additional points. These regulations also dominate in various types of EU programs under which subsidies are awarded for cultural activities. It is often the case that museums first find out about a contest under which funds can be obtained, then they become acquainted with its requirements, and in order to meet them, they start an active search for a suitable partner or, in order to meet the contest requirements, establish associations or foundations, even though they had not planned on doing so:

Because most often the funds that could be obtained were transferred to associations, and not to institutions, we had to have an association, and this association was created because of this need [...], but this is only on the basis that the programs are designed in such a way that we, for example, as an association, generally can only act as us. And as part of this association, we support, I don't know, ten museums that precisely meet the conditions of this program, so then a competitor or not a competitor must cooperate and carry out this program in order to settle the accounts. [1NP]

In turn, a passive approach to taking the chances arising from cooptation is manifested mainly among museums when such cooptation is initiated top-down by the organizers who finance their activities. Cooptation relationships are then imposed by local government, provincial or state authorities due to certain political circumstances or social goals guiding the organizers. Museums take into account certain benefits related to access to resources, and treat cooptation as a chance to achieve, for example, an economic goal, such as reducing costs. However, this is a chance that appears in a reactive manner (Link & Marxt, 2004), as evidenced by the following statement:

Sometimes these relationships with competitors, as I observe it for example in our own institution, were born from the fact that someone at the top, i.e., the mayor and the director, came to an agreement, so this cooperation began as one imposed on us by our superiors, and I, in turn, as a superior, imposed this cooperation on our colleagues from the museum. The goal is achieved, and then most often we separate. [8P]

As mentioned earlier, chances can also be of a conscious or unconscious nature (Jackson & Dutton, 1988; Thomas et al., 1993; Gartner et al., 2008). Importantly, the identification of chances results from the perception of decision-makers, and so is related to the use of one's own cognitive framework to explain the decisions made. In the case of museums, it should be emphasized that they often do not treat themselves as competitors, which determines their lack of awareness of participating in a competitive struggle (Klimas et al., 2021), and thus results in engaging in unconscious cooptation. According to one of the interlocutors representing a museum that consciously enters into cooptation relationships, seeing it as a chance to achieve the expected goals or benefits, cooptation may be a chance, for example, to stimulate creative development, inspire each other, exchange information or collections, or create joint exhibitions:

We are people [private museologists] who stimulate each other. When I can see my colleague is on some cool track, I'm attracted to it too, it's just a healthy rivalry, maybe there is a bit of light jealousy in it, some kind of rivalry, but it is healthy so we don't do the dirty on one another, but rather we inspire each other, we stimulate each other. Then we create joint exhibitions, exchange information and it's cool. [5NP]

The last of the criteria identified so far that enables certain attributes to be assigned to chance is the organization's attitude to exploring and taking chances in its activities. In this approach, chances can be discovered, created and brought to fruition or may simply arise (Alvarez & Barney, 2007; Ramoglou & Tsang, 2016). As research results have shown, discovered chances have their sources in various types of changes in the environment, e.g., market or social conditions. At the stage of their identification, decision-makers demonstrate recognition of chances and then proceed to their potential use. When a chance is taken, it becomes a created chance. The use of the chances is related to individual perceptions, when changes in

the environment regarding the attractiveness or feasibility of a given project are perceived as favorable circumstances conducive to the actions taken. As one of the interviewees pointed out, noticing the trend of educational games appearing in museums, and then seizing the chance to obtain a grant for the organization of a game in their own museum, resulted not only in reaching new audiences, but also in expanding the existing cultural offer, which constitutes a created chance:

We have heard that various kinds of educational games are in fashion, but we've never played such a typical educational game, we haven't run workshops for kids or anything like that. Well, some time passed and there was a chance to obtain a special grant to organize an outdoor game in our museum. It wasn't an amazing amount, but why not? And you know, I did it! I figured since there's a demand for it, it's worth trying. Schools came and they continue to come, even from another voivodeship, the kids are engaged, and everyone is happy. Since then, we have offered various such workshops and educational meetings. [16P]

Materialized chances refine the decision maker's existing, intuitive ideas for ventures (Dimov, 2011). Decision-makers take advantage of circumstances appearing in the environment, and follow emerging chances in order to make their aspirations and plans real. This is how one of the interlocutors spoke about a materialized chance, which turned into an additional educational, training and lobbying activity for the museum:

The idea of developing some ecological standards in the activities of museums in Poland has been on my mind for a long time. This topic seems to be completely ignored by museums, and there is much to be done in this area. Three years ago, we cooperated with the [name of the museum] on such a publication, which, among other things, addressed pro-ecological issues in museums. And that's how it all started. Recently, we have jointly developed a manifesto of pro-ecological activities that museums can implement, but for 2 years we have also been doing so-called workshops, training sessions for museologists: the 'Museum think-tank' [...]. In these workshops, we learn a lot about ecology [...]. We are even at the stage of formulating legal provisions for the ministry that could be implemented to realize this ecological path in museums in Poland. [3P]

In turn, arising chances exist regardless of the actions taken by the managers of a given entity, e.g., in the form of unsatisfied or potential increased demand for a given good or service. In contrast to chances that are discovered and created, chances that arise are previously unrecognized by decision-makers and are not used in a purposeful way, i.e., previously planned. Sometimes, however, they are realized in the form of profits (Davidsson et al., 2017) without any active action on the part of the organization. Importantly, due to the non-profit nature of museums' activity, profit is interpreted in non-economic, qualitative terms. An example of an arising chance for one museum was the emergence of another large, widely promoted and competitive museum in a nearby location. As one of the interlocutors pointed out, the emergence of competition, which in

his first assessment would lead to the collapse of the museum, ultimately turned out to be a chance for the development of the institution and the gaining of a new group of recipients of the museum's offer:

Because it's like this, the Museum of the Second World War was built, I heard voices that maybe when the new museum is built, then people will only go to the new museum and stop going to the old one, but it's just the opposite. They go to the new museum and more people also come to us, so this is one more attraction that has made more people come, there is a synergy effect. [12P]

It should be noted that the attributes of chance presented within the concept of chance management relating to the specificity of coepetition in cultural institutions – museums in particular – are not separable, hence individual attributes of chance may occur simultaneously and even dynamically replace one another. For example, an active approach to taking advantage of chances from the environment may also be connected (or change over time to a different type) with creating chances, materializing them and using them in a fully conscious way.

6. Discussion and Conclusion

Our analyses contribute to exemplify the chance management concept in coepetition among cultural institutions and determine specific chance attributes in the context of coepetition phenomenon. The study contributes to contributes to the development of the theory in several ways.

Firstly, considerations presented in the theoretical part of the paper allowed us to systematize and clarify the existing way of understanding the chance in the literature. As a result of the conducted analyses, based on the relational approach, it was assumed that chance can be understood as a favorable moment for the organization to take action, bringing benefits to each of the parties involved in the relationship and what is worth emphasizing – chance cannot only be used, but also created by the organizations themselves (by entrepreneurs). Our results showed chances as promising phenomena or situations occurring dynamically in an organization's environment, and the use of which enables the achievement of specific development benefits. What is more, chances are a component of many theoretical concepts in the field of management sciences.

Secondly, the research in the cultural sector allowed us to identify the attributes of chance according to certain division criteria which are in line with attributes identified so far in the literature – but only fragmentarily so far. Thus the research let us identified indicated few attributes of chance among non-business organizations (public and non-profit museums). They are internal or external due to the origin of chance in relation to the boundaries of the organization, due to the organization's approach to seizing chances can be either active or passive; conscious and unconscious chances

can be distinguished taking as a criterion the perception of decision-makers in the decision-making process and depending the organization's attitude to exploration and the use of chances in its activities, chances can be discovered, created, brought to fruition or can simply arise. Although there is theoretical output regarding the attributes of chances, as well as the effects of their use, the results of our research show, cultural entities use chances on the way to achieving not only a competitive advantage, but also a cooperative, or – as has been shown – a cooperative one.

Thirdly, the research showed how important is the perception of decision makers when it comes to taking advantage of chances in the changing environment. The perception of chances appears to be a key impulse initiating and directing entrepreneurial activities, also in the sphere of strategic management, where they stimulate organizations to implement assumed business projects and enable the achievement of ambitious goals and above-average results (Lachiewicz et al., 2021).

Fourthly, the paper offers a novel view on coopetition from the chance management concept perspective. Coopetition has so far been considered in management and quality sciences mostly as a strategic phenomenon and a long-term, planned and purposeful relationship (Devece et al., 2019; Czakon et al., 2020; Greven, 2022). The research in the cultural sector has revealed that the coopetition relationship usually has temporary, ad hoc, short-term nature, being an incremental action taken spontaneously depending on the occasion, which thus confirms the assumptions researchers have put forward in this regard (Czakon, 2010; Juszczak & Wójcik, 2021). Thus, coopetition seen in this way can be analyzed by taking into account the concept of chance management, and especially the relational approaches towards chances considered within the concept, which sees them in the organization's environment.

What is more, it appears that cultural institutions are becoming more and more flexible in their way of operating, which also makes it possible for them to start cooperation with entities without the need to enter into long-term relationships. The specificity of the way cultural institutions function reveals numerous one-off activities, a focus on speed, activity dynamics and programmatic freedom, as in culture one should work on the basis of enthusiasm, passion, creativity and spontaneity, which is not conducive to establishing rigid, long-term relationships. Therefore, activities are characterized by high flexibility and are shaped depending on the chances currently perceived or created by the entities. This confirms the position of researchers on the contextual approach to the phenomenon of coopetition (Bengtsson and Raza-Ullah, 2016). In the case of cultural institutions, projects financed from public funds, both at the local and national level, enforce ad hoc actions, causing many entities to develop adaptive abilities, ingenuity and speed of response to changes in the environment. In addition, the emphasis on the project or event nature of

many activities undertaken by cultural and art institutions relates to the so-called theory of long duration (fr. *longue durée*), in which, apart from the perspective of the long and medium term, also indicates the short-term nature of the analyzed phenomena (Ames, 1991).

The results of our research also showed the specificity of cooptation in cultural institutions and the importance of social factors (Engwall, 2003). Our research is in line with the other researchers' findings indicated cooptation as the result of social construction (Baker & Nelson, 2005; Czakon & Rogalski, 2014) and individual actions, as well as the motivations of managers (Wood & McKinley 2010; Czakon et al., 2020). Simultaneously, scholars emphasize that in taking advantage of a chance, the individual cognitive perspective of the manager who is able to see, use or create a chance is extremely important. Chances are formed by the entrepreneurs themselves through a chance-creating process (Saravathy, 2001; Venkataraman, 2003). What is more, they are created through a process of social construction, so cannot exist separately from the entrepreneur (Shackle, 1979; Saravathy, 2001; Baker & Nelson, 2005).

To sum up, the research findings so far indicate that cooptation relationships analyzed at the inter-organizational level are dependent on and specific to the industry or the given area in which the entities operate (Czakon, 2014), and therefore are contextual in nature (Bengtsson & Raza-Ullah, 2016). The specificity of the operation of cultural institutions – including its various types – shows that it is not only necessary, but also required to verify and test existing theories, and as a consequence to supplement, modify or expand them in order to better explain and understand the phenomenon of cooptation. This research has shown a completely different aspect of the cooptation relationship – considered on the basis of the chance management concept – which can be perceived as a game changer in the field of strategic management. This concept justifies searching for a deeper understanding of the theoretical lenses of cooptation (i.e., through game theory, the resource-based view, network theory, the paradox concept or governance logic). Thus, cooptation theory still has many gaps in terms of the theoretical underpinnings of the entire concept.

As the representatives of cultural institutions show, curiosity and courage in testing new ways of developing entities in the field of culture can lead to the discovery of completely new, innovative management models. Chance also seems to be the basis for the development of further fascinating research questions, for example because they are sometimes difficult to identify, discover and create. They are also transient, hence they require quick actions and reactions, as well as showing their incremental, spontaneous nature. As a result, some people are more effective in using them than others (Short et al., 2010), which emphasizes the role of organization managers in their effective use, i.e., in a way that ensures the success and survival of organizations on the market.

6.1. Limitations and Future Research Directions

The research has some limitations, mainly related to the use of the interpretive approach and qualitative research to analyze the phenomena. The research was carried out in selected museums, and therefore it is not possible to generalize the results to all such entities. Our choice of sector and interlocutors may have overemphasized a specific mode of cooperative action – ad hoc using chances, which has been noticed in other sectors (Zakrzewska-Bielawska et al., 2022; Oke, 2020), also in competition of institutions (Monticelli et al., 2023), including cultural field (Cortese et al., 2021). The research was also carried out in the current socio-economic conditions in Poland, hence similar research carried out in other countries may yield different results.

Our findings suggest a few directions for future research, some stemming directly from the limitations of this study. Firstly, it is recommended to carry out similar research in other countries in order to verify and supplement the results obtained for Polish cultural institutions. Moreover, it is worth examining other types of cultural institutions in order to verify the results obtained. In the future research, it would be fruitful to explore other types of sectors and informants that contribute to the adoption of a cooperative mindset using the chance management concept. Secondly, the research revealed several attributes of chance, hence it would also seem that extended research using this approach would be recommended in order to identify more characteristic or features of chance. Thirdly, in the longer term, qualitative research could be used to determine which of the attributes most strongly determine competition among cultural institutions and – as the last – it seems justified to extend the current trend of research on competition to include behavioral, cognitive and social aspects (Czakov et al., 2020; Randolph et al., 2020; Meena et al., 2023), which seem to be important in analysis of this phenomenon, taking into account approaches adopted in sociology or social psychology.

6.2. Managerial Implications

On the basis of the presented considerations, some recommendations can be formulated for managers of cultural institutions (and museums in particular), which may help in the strategic management of these entities. However, it should be emphasized that this issue has not been sufficiently explored so far in theory or practice. Managers of cultural institutions should understand that taking advantage of chances on the basis of inter-organizational relationships, e.g., competition, may be necessary for development and survival, as well as being a real time strategy for generating and appropriating value, and transferring it to recipients. Finally, taking into account the developed configuration (taking advantage of chance in competition relationships), managers should also know how to manage

cooperation in the short term, for example by focusing more on the most effective performance possible under given conditions, rather than on emerging tensions.

Funding

This research received no funds.

Endnotes

- ¹ The conducted research project covered a broader issue referring to cooperation among museums, taking into account social contexts; however, due to the issues raised in this article, only selected research results are presented.
- ² We understand them as contextual factors of chance.

References

- Alvarez, S. A., & Barney, J. B. (2007). Discovery and creation: Alternative theories of entrepreneurial action. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 1(1–2), 11–26.
- Amata, R., Dagnino, G. B., Minà, A., & Picone, P. M. (2022). Managing cooperation in diversified firms: Insights from a qualitative case study. *Long Range Planning*, 55(4). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2021.102128>
- Ames, K. (1991). The archaeology of the «longue durée». Temporal and spatial scale in the evolution of social complexity on the Southern Northwest Coast. *Antiquity*, 65(249).
- Atkinson, P., & Delamont, S. (2010). *SAGE qualitative research methods*. Sage.
- Auerbach, C., & Silverstein, L. B. (2003). *Qualitative data: An introduction to coding and analysis*. NYU Press.
- Bagdadli, S., & Arrigoni, L. (2005). Strategic positioning of the Venice Biennial: Analysing the market for periodic contemporary art exhibitions. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 7(3), 22–31.
- Baker, T., & Nelson, R. E. (2005). Creating something from nothing: Resource construction through entrepreneurial bricolage. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(3), 329–366.
- Bandura, A. (2005). The evolution of social cognitive theory. In K. G. Smith & M. A. Hitt (Eds.), *Great minds in management* (pp. 9–35). Oxford University Press.
- Bengtsson, M., & Kock, S. (1999). Cooperation and competition in relationships between competitors in business networks. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 14(3), 178–194.
- Bengtsson, M., & Raza-Ullah, T. (2016). A systematic review of research on cooperation: Toward a multilevel understanding. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 57, 23–39.
- Bengtsson, M., Eriksson, J., & Wincent, J. (2010). Co-opetition dynamics – An outline for further inquiry. *Competitiveness Review: An International Business Journal*.
- Bouncken, R. B., Qiu, Y., Sinkovics, N., & Kürsten, W. (2021). Qualitative research: Extending the range with flexible pattern matching. *Review of Managerial Science*, 15(2), 251–273.
- Brandenburger, A. M., & Nalebuff, B. J. (1996). *Co-opetition*. Harper Collins Business.
- Buenstorf, G. (2007). Creation and pursuit of entrepreneurial opportunities: An evolutionary economics perspective. *Small Business Economics*, 28(4), 323–337.
- Carr, D., Zhang, C., & Cheung, C. F. (2004). *Space, time and culture*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Chen, M. J., & Miller, D. (2015). Reconceptualizing competitive dynamics: A multidimensional framework. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(5), 758–775.
- Chang, C. H., Garnsey, E., & Ruan, Y. (2019). *Opportunity discovery and creation in disruptive innovation*. University of Cambridge.

- Clegg, S. R., Da Cunha, J. V., & e Cunha, M. P. (2002). Management paradoxes: A relational view. *Human Relations*, 55(5), 483–503.
- Collins, J. C., & Porras, J. I. (2008). CMR classics: Organizational vision and visionary organizations. *California Management Review*, 50(2), 117–137.
- Cortese, D., Sinicropi, S., Pollifroni, M., & Cantino, V. (2021). “Coopetition” for cultural tourism: An accounting history perspective. *De Computis-Revista Española de Historia de la Contabilidad*, 18(1), 157–168.
- Cravens, D. W., Piercy, N. F., & Shipp, S. H. (1996). New organizational forms for competing in highly dynamic environments: The network paradigm. *British Journal of Management*, 7(3), 203–218.
- Czakon, W. (2010). Emerging coopetition: An empirical investigation of coopetition as inter-organizational relationship instability. In S. Yami, S. Castaldo, G. B. Dagnino, & F. Le Roy (Eds.), *Coopetition strategy: Winning strategies for the 21st century*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Czakon, W., & Rogalski, M. (2014). Coopetition typology revisited – A behavioural approach. *International Journal of Business Environment*, 6(1), 28–46.
- Czakon, W., Klimas, P., & Mariani, M. (2020). Behavioral antecedents of coopetition: A synthesis and measurement scale. *Long Range Planning*, 53(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2019.03.001>
- Czernek-Marszałek, K., & McCabe, S. (2022). Why qualitative papers get rejected by *Annals of Tourism Research*? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 92.
- Darbi, W. P. K., & Knott, P. (2022). Coopetition strategy as naturalised practice in a cluster of informal businesses. *International Small Business Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026624262210797>
- Davidsson, P., Delmar, F., & Wiklund, J. (2017). Entrepreneurship as growth: Growth as entrepreneurship. In M. A. Hitt, S. M. Camp, D. L. Sexton, & R. D. Ireland (Eds.), *Strategic entrepreneurship: Creating a new mindset* (pp. 328–342). Blackwell Publishers.
- Denrell, J., Fang, C., & Liu, C. (2015). Perspective – Chance explanations in the management sciences. *Organization Science*, 26(3), 923–940.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2008). *The landscape of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Devece, C., Ribeiro-Soriano, D. E., & Palacios-Marqués, D. (2019). Coopetition as the new trend in inter-firm alliances: Literature review and research patterns. *Review of Managerial Science*, 13, 207–226.
- Dimov, D. (2007). From opportunity insight to opportunity intention: The importance of person–situation learning match. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31(4), 561–583.
- Eckhardt, J. T., & Shane, S. A. (2003). Opportunities and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Management*, 29(3), 333–349.
- Eisenhardt, K.M., & Sull, D. (2001). Strategy as simple rules. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(1), 106–16, 176.
- Engwall, M. (2003). No project is an island: linking projects to history and context. *Research Policy*, 32(5), 789–808.
- Foss, K., & Foss, N. J. (2008). Understanding opportunity discovery and sustainable advantage: The role of transaction costs and property rights. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 2(3), 191–207.
- Frey, B. S., & Meier, S. (2006). The economics of museums. In V.A. Ginsburg, D. Throsby (Eds.), *Handbook of the economics of art and culture* (Vol. 1, pp. 1017–1047). Elsevier.
- Galloway, S., & Dunlop, S. (2007). A critique of definitions of the cultural and creative industries in public policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 13(1), 17–31.
- Garri, M. (2021). Coopetition, value co-creation, and knowledge-enhancement in the UK alpaca industry: A multi-level mechanism. *European Management Journal*, 39(5), 545–557.

- Gernsheimer, O., Kanbach, D. K., & Gast, J. (2021). Coopetition research – A systematic literature review on recent accomplishments and trajectories. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 96, 113–134.
- Ghazinoory, S., Malekifar, S., Nasri, S., & Kousari, S. (2021). Visioning for cultural industries: CLA inspired scenario method. *Futures*, 131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2021.102770>
- Giannini, T., & Bowen, J. P. (2019). *Museums and digital culture: New perspectives and research*. Springer.
- Ginsburgh, V. A., & Throsby, D. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of the economics of art and culture* (Vol. 1). Elsevier.
- Greven, A., Fischer-Kreer, D., Müller, J., & Brettel, M. (2022). Inter-firm coopetition: The role of a firm's long-term orientation. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 106, 47–57.
- Guba, E. G. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. *Ectj*, 29(2), 75–91.
- Hamel, G., Doz, Y. L., & Prahalad, C. K. (1989). Collaborate with your competitors and win. *Harvard Business Review*, 67(1), 133–139.
- Hasitschka, W., Goldsleger, P., & Zembylas, T. (2005). Cultural institutions studies: Investigating the transformation of cultural goods. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 35(2), 147–158.
- Hilbert M (2012) Toward a synthesis of cognitive biases: How noisy information processing can bias human decision making. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138(2), 1–27.
- Jarunwaraphan, B., & Mallikamas, P. (2020). A corpus-based study of English synonyms: Chance and opportunity. *REFlections*, 27(2), 218–245.
- Jing, R., & Van de Ven, A. H. (2018). Toward a chance management view of organizational change. *Management and Organization Review*, 14(1), 161–178.
- Jullien, F. (2004). *A treatise on efficacy: Between Western and Chinese thinking*. University of Hawaii Press.
- Juszczyk, P., & Wójcik, D. (2021). Coopetition in synoptic and incremental approaches. Context of the cultural sector. *Przegląd Organizacji*, (9), 12–18.
- Klimas, P., Czakon, W., Kraus, S., Kailer, N., & Maalaoui, A. (2021). Entrepreneurial failure: A synthesis and conceptual framework of its effects. *European Management Review*, 18(1), 167–182.
- Klimas, P., Stańczyk, S., Sachpazidu, K., Stanimir, A., & Kuźmiński, Ł. (2023). The attributes of inter-organizational relationships: Which fifteen of them really matter to software developers? *Industrial Marketing Management*, 110, 1–16.
- Kosińska, O. (2018). Kiedy projekt połyka organizację. Problem projektyzacji w organizacjach pozarządowych w kulturze a zagadnienie wyobraźni organizacyjnej. *Zarządzanie w kulturze*, 19(3), 257–272.
- Krupski, R. (2006). Badania nad oryginalnością zasobów przedsiębiorstwa. In J. Skalik (Ed.), *Zmiana warunkiem sukcesu. Dynamika zmian w organizacji – ewolucja czy rewolucja*. *Prace Naukowe Akademii Ekonomicznej*, (1141). Akademia Ekonomiczna.
- Krupski, R. (2008). Okazje jako przedmiot badań w zakresie zarządzania strategicznego. In A. Kaleta & K. Moszkiewicz (Eds.), *Zarządzanie strategiczne w badaniach teoretycznych i praktyce* (pp. 156–162). *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu*.
- Krupski, R. (2011). Okazje w zarządzaniu strategicznym przedsiębiorstwa. *Organizacja i Kierowanie*, (4), 11–24.
- Krupski, R. (2013). Rodzaje okazji w teorii i w praktyce zarządzania. *Prace Naukowe Wałbrzyskiej Wyższej Szkoły Zarządzania i Przedsiębiorczości*, (21), 5–16.
- Kumar, N., Stern, L. W., & Anderson, J. C. (1993). Conducting interorganizational research using key informants. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(6), 1633–1651.
- Lachiewicz, S., Matejun, M., & Mikolaś, Z. (2021). *Okazje w zarządzaniu innowacjami w firmach sektora MŚP*. CeDeWu.

- Lado, A. A., Boyd, N. G., & Hanlon, S. C. (1997). Competition, cooperation, and the search for economic rents: A syncretic model. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(1), 110–141.
- Lee, S. H., Peng, M. W., & Barney, J. B. (2007). Bankruptcy law and entrepreneurship development: A real options perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(1), 257–272.
- Levy, M. (2003). Are rich people smarter? *Journal of Economic Theory*, 110(1), 42–64.
- Lin, Q. I. N., & Wan-hua, Q. I. U. (2006). An exploration of the organizational framework of large-scale cultural projects. *Journal of Beijing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics Social Sciences Edition*, 19(2), 22.
- Lin, W., Hu, Y., & Jiang, P. (2016). The impact of external environment factors on the growth of cultural enterprises in China. *Journal of Discrete Mathematical Sciences and Cryptography*, 19(5–6), 1091–1107.
- Link, P., & Marxt, C. (2004). Integration of risk-and chance management in the co-operation process. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 90(1), 71–78.
- Mandják, T., Szalkai, Z., Neumann-Bódi, E., Magyar, M., & Simon, J. (2015). Emerging relationships: How are they born? *Industrial Marketing Management*, 49, 32–41.
- Mariani, M. M. (2007). Coopetition as an emergent strategy: Empirical evidence from an Italian consortium of opera houses. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 37(2), 97–126.
- Massaad, C. (2021). *Opportunity management in complex infrastructure projects: An attempt at exploiting complexity*. Delft University of Technology. <https://repository.tudelft.nl/islandora/object/uuid:72d5f88d-acee-44f5-b667-14099ee5bb0f?collection=education>
- Meena, A., Dhir, S., & Sushil, S. (2023). A review of coopetition and future research agenda. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 38(1), 118–136.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). Strategy-making in three modes. *California Management Review*, 16(2), 44–53.
- Mintzberg, H., Ahlstrand, B., & Lampel, J. (2005). *Strategy safari: A guided tour through the wilds of strategic management*. Free Press.
- Mischkowski, D., & Glöckner, A. (2016). Spontaneous cooperation for prosocials, but not for proselfs: Social value orientation moderates spontaneous cooperation behavior. *Scientific Reports*, 6(1), 1–5.
- Monticelli, J. M., Verschoore, J. R., & Garrido, I. L. (2023). The emergence of coopetition in highly regulated industries: A study on the Brazilian private healthcare market. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 108, 35–46.
- Najda-Janoszka, M., & Sawczuk, M. (2018). Museums as a research object in the strategic management field. In A. Nalepka & A. Ujawry-Gil (Eds.), *Business and non-profit organizations facing increased competition and growing customers' demands* (Vol. 17, pp. 51–67). National-Louis University in Nowy Sącz.
- Opp, K. D., & Gern, C. (1993). Dissident groups, personal networks, and spontaneous cooperation: The East German revolution of 1989. *American Sociological Review*, 659–680.
- PONS. (2023). *PONS Dictionary*. Retrieved January 15, 2023, from <https://pl.pons.com>
- Qizi, M. K. I. (2021). The role of museums in the development of tourism. *Academica: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 11(2), 121–124.
- Ramoglou, S., & Tsang, E. W. (2016). A realist perspective of entrepreneurship: Opportunities as propensities. *Academy of Management Review*, 41(3), 410–434.
- Randolph, R. V., Hu, H. F., & Silvernail, K. D. (2020). Better the devil you know: Inter-organizational information technology and network social capital in coopetition networks. *Information & Management*, 57(6). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2020.103344>
- Reinartz, W., Krafft, M., & Hoyer, W. (2004). The customer relationship management process: Its measurement and impact on performance. *Journal of Marketing Research*, XLI, 293–305.

- Saldaña, J. (2014). Coding and analysis strategies. In P. Leavy (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 581–605). Oxford University Press.
- Sandström, K. (2005). *Is an opportunity a possibility and a chance?: A semantic study of three similar nouns*. University of Technology.
- Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001). Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 243–263.
- Sebt, M. H., Gereei, A., & Naghash, T. H. (2009). A comprehensive framework for integrated management of opportunities and threats by using dynamic system. *International Journal of Civil Engineering*, 7(3), 161–169.
- Shackle, G. L. S. (1979). *Imagination and the nature of choice*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Short, J. C., Ketchen Jr, D. J., Shook, C. L., & Ireland, R. D. (2010). The concept of “opportunity” in entrepreneurship research: Past accomplishments and future challenges. *Journal of Management*, 36(1), 40–65.
- Silverman, D. (2016). *Qualitative research*. Sage.
- Skat-Rørdam, P., Muzyka, D. F., & Zagrodzki, M. (2001). *Zmiany decyzji strategicznych: wykorzystanie okazji rynkowych do rozwoju przedsiębiorstwa*. PWN.
- Suddaby, R. (2006). From the editors: What grounded theory is not. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(4), 633–642.
- Towse, R., & Hernández, T. N. (2020). *Handbook of cultural economics*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Tsang, E. W. (2004). Toward a scientific inquiry into superstitious business decision-making. *Organization Studies*, 25(6), 923–946.
- Van de Ven, A. H., & Jing, R. (2012). Indigenous management research in China from an engaged scholarship perspective. *Management and Organization Review*, 8(1), 123–137.
- Venkataraman, S. (2003). Foreword. In S. Shane (Ed.), *A general theory of entrepreneurship: The individual-opportunity nexus* (pp. xi–xii). Edward Elgar.
- Ver Steeg Jr, J. (2022). A mixed-methods study of how university museums use outreach to build community relationships and deliver value to the university. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 37(1), 71–91.
- Wood, M. S., & McKinley, W. (2010). The production of entrepreneurial opportunity: A constructivist perspective. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 4(1), 66–84.
- Zacharia, Z., Plasch, M., Mohan, U., & Gerschberger, M. (2019). The emerging role of cooperation within inter-firm relationships. *The International Journal of Logistics Management*, 30(2), 414–437.
- Zakrzewska-Bielawska, A. (2016). Tworzenie i apropriacja wartości jako cel strategii relacyjnej przedsiębiorstwa. *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu*, (444), 609–622.
- Zakrzewska-Bielawska, A., & Piotrowska, D. (2021). Toward a relational strategic orientation. In *Organizational change and relational resources* (pp. 29–46). Routledge.
- Zhang, X. J., Fu, P. P., Xi, Y. M., Li, L., Xu, L. G., Cao, C. H., Li, G. Q., Ma, L., & Ge, J. (2012). Understanding indigenous leadership research: Explication and Chinese examples. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(6), 1063–1079.
- Zielińska, A. (2016). Formułowanie strategii w organizacji pozarządowej. *Modern Management Review*, 21(23(3)), 229–238.
- Zineldin, M. (2004). Co-opetition: The organisation of the future. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 22(7), 780–790.