

Patrycja Juszczyk

University of Economics in Katowice

ORCID: 0000-0003-2231-5719

How do they do it? On the mechanisms of setting coopetition strategy among cultural institutions

ABSTRACT

Only few studies consider characterizing the coopetition formation stage, especially from the perspective of cultural institutions. A review of the literature, as well as observation of the functioning of cultural institutions in economic practice, allows us to notice the dichotomy of coopetition strategies, expressed in the simultaneous establishment of coopetition relationships by a given institution in both an emerging and intentional way. This article focuses on mechanisms of setting the intentional and emergent coopetition strategy on the example of cultural institutions (the coopetition strategy is considered here at the interorganizational level). Mechanisms are understood in this paper as causal pathways to the emergence of motivation to coopetition. The article is conceptual in nature and is based on a narrative approach to the literature review within strategic management. As its main contribution, this paper offers conceptualization of the mechanisms of setting the intentional and emergent coopetition strategy on the example of cultural institutions, which are examples of public and non-profit organizations.

Keywords: coopetition strategy, strategy formulation, intentional coopetition, emerging coopetition, cultural institutions

JEL Classification: L310, L320, L890, P130, Z190

Introduction

Interorganizational collaboration is an important part of the strategy of modern organizations aimed at coping with faster dynamics and greater uncertainty of the environment, for example due to the current unstable economic and business development, the repercussions of the COVID-19 pandemic, but also aggressive competition and changing customer preferences [Bouncken et al., 2014, 2022; Zakrzewska-Bielawska et al., 2023]. Importantly, half of cooperative relationships take place between competitors [Harbison, Pekar, 1998], who, in order to achieve their goals more effectively and efficiently, develop new products and markets, increase performance, access and exploit resources, create more value, or gain market strength, knowledge, and innovations [Czakon, 2014; Park, Kim, 2021; Radu, 2010; Seepana et al., 2021] enter into cooperative relationships.

The phenomenon of cooptation, which is constantly gaining popularity in the field of management, is often positioned as an element of the organization's strategy, and cooptation is equally often presented as an individual strategy – cooptation strategy [e.g. Dahl et al., 2016; Dagnino, Rocco, 2009; Mariani, 2007; Nascimento et al., 2021; Osarenkhoe, 2010; Padula, Dagnino, 2008, Walley, 2007]. The strategic perspective of cooptation considers it as a strategy deliberately designed to achieve a higher level of operational efficiency and, ultimately, competitive advantage through cooperation with competitors [Zakrzewska-Bielawska, 2013]. The cooptation strategy is, therefore, understood in the literature as something that can be managed, planned, and targeted at specific goals [Dagnino, Rocco, 2009]. This approach is consistent with the features attributed to the classic approach to strategy [Czakon et al., 2020a; Kopmann et al., 2017; Köseoglu et al., 2021; Mintzberg, 1985]. Meanwhile, as the latest research shows, cooptation reveals its dynamic being, e.g. changing the scope of entities embedded in the cooptation relationship or intensifying competition or cooperation as a result of changing environmental conditions [Meena et al., 2022]. The management literature on cooptation points to spontaneous aspects emerging in rivals' cooperation agreements [Amata et al., 2022], resulting from, among others, uncertainty and variability of the environment (taking advantage of chances and opportunities) [J.M. Crick, D. Crick, 2020], as well as its imposition by political decision-makers and other external forces [Mariani, 2007, 2018]. According to Mariani [2018], the institutional environment and sources of power, such as governments and law-making, may create incentives or even force organizations to adapt to the policies imposed on them, which results in the *ad hoc* establishment of cooptation relationships.

Examples of the simultaneous establishment of intentional and emergent cooptation, expressed in the dichotomy of cooptation strategies, can be observed among cultural institutions [Juszczak, 2023], which are understood as organizations that create and distribute culture products [Wróblewski, 2012]. These organizations, on the one hand, develop long-term strategic documents, taking into account the issues of organizing, conducting, and developing cultural activities [Wróblewski, 2017], and on the other hand, due to electoral cycles (public

organizations), legal and political requirements (non-profit organizations), limited financial and organizational resources, as well as the difficulty in defining current customers/recipients and their changing needs and preferences [Rose, Cray, 2010], often act in response to the 'need of the moment' [Kafel, 2006]. Moreover, many cultural institutions perceive the strategic management of an entity as 'a privilege used only in business' [Świerk, 2018], while coopetition among cultural institutions may take the form of an unintended or unconscious relationship [Juszczak, 2021]. Therefore, it seems reasonable to consider moving from a static to a more dynamic view of coopetition in research on strategic management in the cultural sector and to offer insight into the process of setting coopetition strategy [Bromiley, Rau, 2016].

According to Bonel and Rocco [2007], the operational level of coopetition is not sufficiently researched and - at the same time - the operational level of coopetition is related to the practice and method of cultural institutions activities, hence to the mechanisms of setting coopetition strategies.

Especially in the face of great uncertainty in the environment, it is necessary to look at the mechanisms of the dual strategic orientation of cultural institutions, expressed, on the one hand, by focusing on the future by adopting certain strategies to implement missions and social goals [Mastenitsa, 2015], but, on the other hand, by functioning on the basis of 'here and now' [Juszczak, 2021], where the short-term nature of the implemented projects is accepted as well as taking advantage of opportunities and chances arising from the environment.

What is more, in research on coopetition among cultural institutions, the specificity of the functioning of public or non-profit organizations must be taken into account. This is because for organizations entangled in financing problems and organizational deficiencies, which at the same time are subject to political decisions [Lorgnier, Su, 2017] and have to compete for qualified employees or creating unique offers with entities from the private sector [Mariani, 2007], the mechanisms on coopetition establishment may probably be of a different nature to those which have been identified so far in the private sector.

Additionally, only few studies consider characterizing the coopetition formation stage [Albert-Cromarias, Asselineau, 2022; Efrat et al., 2022; Gernsheimer et al., 2021]. These include research on emergent or deliberate coopetition [Czakon, 2010; Mariani, 2007], intentional versus unintentional establishment of coopetition [Kylänen, Rusko, 2011] or imposed coopetition [Czakon, Rogalski, 2014]. What is important, none of these studies applies to public and non-profit entities such as cultural institutions.

Understanding and conceptualizing the mechanisms of setting coopetition strategy (where mechanisms are perceived as causal pathways to the emergence of motivation to coopetition [Ioannidis, Psillos, 2022]), which consists of two approaches – deliberate and emergent ones – seem to be important and useful both for understanding how cultural institutions, which are public and non-profit sector entities, approach their tasks and identifying a set of tools to address the strategic challenges they face.

In this vein, the paper addresses two research questions: (RQ1): *What are the mechanisms of establishing intentional coopetition among cultural institutions?* (RQ2): *What are the*

mechanisms of establishing emerging coopetition among cultural institutions? Therefore, the aim of this article is to conceptualize the mechanisms of setting the strategy of intentional and emergent coopetition on the example of cultural institutions (the coopetition strategy is considered here at the interorganizational level).

The article is conceptual in nature and is based on a narrative approach to the literature review within strategic management. This type of review critiques and summarizes a body of literature and draws conclusions about the topic in question. What is more, it is useful in gathering together a literature in a specific subject area and summarizing and synthesizing it [Rhodes, Brown, 2005]. The main contribution to the coopetition literature is therefore: (1) a summary and integration of the existing knowledge on the process of setting coopetition strategies from a deliberate and emergent perspective; (2) a conceptualization of the mechanisms of establishing intentional and emergent coopetition, taking into account the specificity of public and non-profit organizations on the example of cultural institutions.

Apart from the introduction, the remainder of the paper is structured as follows. The theoretical part is divided into two main sections. The first discusses previous research findings in the field of coopetition among cultural institutions, taking into account the specificity of this phenomenon among public and non-profit cultural organizations. The second part presents considerations on the mechanisms of establishing intentional and emerging coopetition among cultural institutions based on a narrative literature review. This part is divided into two sections devoted separately to the mechanisms of coopetition-formation for intentional and emergent coopetition. The last part of the paper presents the results of the literature review and conclusions, also indicates limitations and future research directions as well as managerial implications.

Coopetition in specific conditions of the existence of cultural institutions

The volatile environment has created unique challenges for public and nonprofit cultural institutions. They are characterized by the centrality of their mission and social goals as they are committed to serving the population and providing communities with access to culture [Mastenitsa, 2015]. Like other private sector organizations, they cope with change and uncertainty by adapting their strategies and structures to adapt to external forces and practising proactive resource allocation. This requires organizations to be strategically agile – the ability to continually adjust and adjust its strategic direction to balance opportunities over time [Weber, Tarba, 2014]. However, due to their more bureaucratic structure, these organizations often respond to changes in the environment with centralized activities, including in relation to decision-making [Brown et al., 2017]. An example of one such decision is entering into cooperation relationships with competitors.

Coopetition understood as an amalgamation of both competition and cooperation [Gnyawali, Ryan Charleton, 2018; Nalebuff, Brandenburger, 1997], is perceived as a revolutionary way of thinking that opens the way to strategic win-win situations [Brandenburger, Nalebuff, 1996]. This kind of collaboration is underpinned by very similar premises to ‘noncompetitive’ cooperation but differs significantly in the dynamics involved between engaged parties. This is caused by competition, as a result of which the parties involved have divergent interests, because the goal of each organization is to achieve greater profits and benefits, even at the expense of the partner [Padula, Dagnino, 2007]. Coopetition is considered the most effective form of relationships between organizations [Walley, 2007], and increasingly also as the best strategic option [Brandenburger, Nalebuff, 1996; Klimas et al., 2022; Le Roy, Czakon, 2016]. However, it is also a paradoxical interorganizational relationship, carrying great uncertainty in terms of reaping potential benefits [Chiambaretto et al., 2020; Peng et al., 2018].

Fragmentary and rare research conducted among cultural institutions indicates that as a result of, among others, diversification of the roles and functions performed by contemporary cultural institutions in social and cultural life, i.e. their ‘multi-product’ nature [Del Chiappa et al., 2014], increasingly adopted project orientation in activities, emerging new methods of financing (e.g. citizen budgets), or the need to compete with other forms of cultural institutions offering very similar, and sometimes even the same, cultural products [Cheng, 2006], it is needed and even necessary to expand the scope of collaboration between cultural entities, including establishing coopetition relationships [Cortese et al., 2021]. As Herbst [2019] claimed, coopetition plays a fundamental role in achieving social and commercial objectives of public and non-profit organizations.

The literature indicates that coopetition of cultural institutions manifests itself in at least three areas [Cheng 2006; Cortese et al., 2021; Juszczyk, 2021; Scheff, Kotler, 1996]. They are: a) artistic area (e.g. joint organization of cultural and educational events, presenting permanent or temporary collections, conducting research on exhibits, etc.); b) administrative and management area (e.g. cooperation of competitors in the field of HR, administrative services, marketing activity or substantive consulting) and c) social area (related to, among others, building social trust in the institution and creating bonds between recipients and the cultural institution by conducting external pro-social activities together with competitors in the organization’s environment and within the industry, which means maintaining social relationships with representatives of other cultural institutions).

Therefore, it can be argued that cultural sector entities that cooperate with competitors “are more innovative, respond better to changes and are more likely to employ employees, volunteers, guests, and social stakeholders who share their main goal” [Murawski, 2021, p. 13]. The research conducted so far on coopetition between cultural institutions has shown that involvement in coopetition allows cultural institutions to achieve numerous benefits, similar to those usually present in the commercial sector, e.g. achieving a competitive advantage by creating a complementary and diversified cultural offer [Qizi, 2021]. Coopetition is also a way to exchange knowledge, experiences, skills, and abilities, which is very important for

entities dealing with culture, because, unlike entities from the private sector, as public and non-profit organizations, they pay more attention to creative work consisting in providing specific goods and services of a socially useful nature [Finkel et al., 2017; Gainer, Padanyi, 2002; Mastenitsa, 2015]. As Juszczuk [2021] points out, cooperation with competitors also allows cultural institutions to maximize the use of limited resources, increase the dynamics of operation in the implementation of missions and social goals, gives cultural institutions an opportunity to overcome organizational shortcomings, has a positive impact on reducing operating costs, achieving a synergy effect in the area competences, experience and knowledge, i.e. increasing social legitimacy.

Mechanisms of setting intentional and emerging coopetition among cultural institutions

The literature indicates that coopetition can be formed in two very different ways [Efrat et al., 2022]. The first one, referring to the deliberate approach [e.g. Köseoğlu et al., 2021; Osarenkhoe, 2010], aims to eliminate barriers or restrictions related to the organization's environment (e.g. regulations) as well as customers' unfulfilled needs. Organizations are looking for partners who will compensate for the current weaknesses and shortcomings of the organization, e.g. regarding resources. What is more, under high uncertainty of environment, coopetition can be a forced strategy to deliver survival opportunities [Bonel, Rocco, 2007]. The second way of establishing coopetition, resembling the emergent approach [Amata et al., 2022; Kylänen, Rusko, 2011; Mariani, 2007, 2018] is established based on prior knowledge and existing relationships of the organization. It differs from the former in viewing market constraints as opportunities rather than threats, using existing resources.

Hence, coopetition strategy, as a form of interorganizational strategy, on the one hand, includes purposeful, strategic activities in which intentions are the basis for its establishment and implementation [Mintzberg, Waters 1985]. On the other hand, these may be actions undertaken by organizations of an emerging or even unconscious nature, and, therefore, only in retrospect will they develop into some pattern or consistency, which will provide the basis for including them in the term 'strategy' [Dahl et al., 2016; Mintzberg, Waters 1985; Tidström, 2008; Tsoukas, 2010].

As research shows [Juszczuk, 2023], cultural institutions establish coopetition relationships in an unintentional (and sometimes even unconscious) way, as a response to the need of the moment or as a result of reaction to changing conditions, possibilities, and opportunities appearing in the environment (emerging coopetition) [Amata et al., 2022; Kylänen, Rusko, 2011; Mariani, 2007, 2018] and in an intentional manner, as a result of the deliberate formulation and implementation of a coopetition strategy aimed at achieving better results, competitive advantage or a specific result in the long term (intentional coopetition) [Czakov, Czernek, 2016; Le Roy, Czakov, 2016; Mariani, 2016; Wang, Krakover, 2008]. Importantly,

due to environmental conditions and social embeddedness [Dahl et al., 2016], in both cases, i.e. emergent and intentional coopetition, it may take on an incidental, one-off character or be a long-term relationship [Juszczak, 2023].

This research focuses on the stage starting with the coopetition intention before its implementation. To conceptualize the mechanisms of setting coopetition strategies, the focus was on the step of motivations for coopetition [Albert-Cromarias, Asselineau, 2022; Efrat et al., 2022; Gernsheimer et al., 2021], but – what is important – the mechanisms are not understood as motivations but are perceived as causal pathways to the emergence of motivation [Ioannidis, Psillos, 2022]. Therefore, the subsequent phases were not taken into account in the analysis of strategy, i.e. elements such as execution of coopetition, namely interactions and management of tensions in the coopetition relationship [e.g. Raza-Ullah, 2020; Tidström et al., 2018] or its outcomes [e.g. Klein et al., 2020; Xie et al., 2023; Zhu et al., 2020].

It should be emphasized that many scholars have noticed significant differences between the public and private sectors in terms of factors influencing the stage of strategy formation [Drummond et al., 2000; Ferlie 1992; Rose, Cray, 2010], which also refers to the coopetition strategy.

A review of the literature as well as general observation of economic practice indicate that the mechanisms of forming intentional and emergent coopetition strategy among cultural institutions combine in those two cases external and internal aspects [Bovaird, 2008; Efrat et al., 2022]. Hence, the mechanisms of setting intentional and emergent coopetition strategies are embedded in both exogenous and endogenous factors. The first ones are dependent on the environment in which the organizations operate as well as the external pressure to which they are exposed and the second ones are endogenous factors, related to the organization itself [Czakon, Czernek, 2016].

A list of the mechanisms of forming intentional and emergent coopetition strategy deduced from the literature is presented in Table 1. A description and conceptualization of the mechanisms are provided in the following discussion. It should be noted that the presented list of mechanisms of setting strategies mentioned above is not exhaustive, as these mechanisms depend on many contextual, industry, and institutional factors [Bengtsson, Kock, 2014; Chai et al., 2019; Garri et al., 2021]. It is worth emphasizing that coopetition itself is recognized as industry specific and contextual [Czakon et al., 2020b].

Table 1. Intentional and emergent coopetition strategy among cultural institutions: mechanisms of the coopetition-formation stage

Coopetition-formation stage	Intentional coopetition	Emergent coopetition
Source of mechanisms	Mixing endogenous and exogenous factors	
Approach to coopetition	Eliminating barriers or restrictions related to the organization's environment and looking for partners who compensate for the current weaknesses and shortcomings of the organization	Viewing market constraints as opportunities rather than threats Based on usage, the existing resources, prior knowledge, and existing relationships of the organization

cont. Table 1

Coopetion-formation stage	Intentional coopetition	Emergent coopetition
Mechanisms examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • perceived benefits, • coopetition orientation, • institutional environment, • social environment, • partner fit, • reputation and trust, • individual perceptions of managers (cognitive underpinnings). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • election cycles, • leadership change cycle, • legal and political requirements, • top-down decisions, • high uncertainty/crisis situations (e.g. the COVID-19 pandemic), • defining current customers/recipients, • changing needs of customers/recipients, • existing industry relationships, • existing social relationships.

Source: own work.

Intentional coopetition: the mechanism of coopetition formation

When starting to consider the mechanisms of forming intentional coopetition among cultural institutions, it should be pointed out that cultural institutions; especially public ones, are focused on continuous activity – once established, they are rarely liquidated, their purpose of activity and the basis of existence are determined by the statute [Klaś, 2016], and less often – due to its use in practice – also a mission, each time specifying the tasks of a given entity [Modlinski, Pinto, 2020]. Therefore, long-term coopetition relationships of a strategic nature cannot be ruled out, especially in the case of cyclical cultural projects.

The stage of forming purposeful coopetition is associated with rational awareness of the need to enter into cooperation with competitors for various economic and organizational reasons [Chakon, 2014; Hung, Chang, 2012; Radu, 2010; Ritala, 2012; Park, Kim, 2021; Qizi, 2021; Seepana et al., 2021]. Among the mechanisms for forming targeted coopetition, perceived benefits should be indicated, referring to the goals and benefits that can be achieved thanks to coopetition [Bengtsson; Raza-Ullah, 2016; Czakon et al., 2020b]. In the case of cultural institutions, they may include, among others: coordinating activities and preparing complementary, non-duplicating cultural offers, delivering unique and exceptional cultural products to the market, increasing the sales market (attracting and serving a larger number of recipients), or reducing costs resulting from, e.g. joint marketing activities or other forms of combining organizational resources involved in coopetition of cultural institutions. The mentioned benefits refer to improved resource use and increased efficiency by using the cultural institution's own resources and connecting them with partners' resource bases [Ritala, 2012].

In turn, coopetitive orientation refers to past positive or negative experiences in the field of coopetition [Bouncken et al., 2020; Czakon et al., 2020b]. As the literature shows, positive experiences allow cultural institutions to overcome a myopic approach to coopetition, making it more thoughtful and long-term [Gernsheimer et al., 2021]. Moreover, good experiences also allow them to set realistic expectations as to the results of cooperation with competitors [Estrada, Dong, 2020]. As a result, cultural institutions are more willing to adopt coopetition as a permanent strategy based on building certain routines and trust [Raza-Ullah, 2020].

Intentional formation of cooperation may also be stimulated by institutional and social conditions [Czakoń et al., 2020a; Mariani, 2007, 2018; Thomas, 1997] such as an inherent feature of the functioning of cultural institutions – environmental uncertainty [Cuccia, Rizzo, 2016], competition within the sector (offering very similar or the same cultural products by various types of cultural institutions), or the desire to create value for the community and themselves, resulting from the mission of these organizations [J.M. Crick, D. Crick, 2020; Mastenitsa, 2015; Szumowski, 2023]. As the research shows, cooperation allows cultural institutions to increase social legitimacy, i.e. entities engaged in collaboration aimed at a certain social goal obtain a certain degree of social support as a result of the implementation of specific values shared by a given community [Juszczak, 2021]. Moreover, the intentional formation of cooperation is also related to participation in industry circles or projects initiated and run by external institutions, which is related to the positioning of a given institution against the background of others and building prestige [Bagdadli, 2003; Juszczak, 2021].

Partner fit, as a mechanism for setting an intentional cooperation strategy, refers to the specific fit of the partner, which is important for cultural institutions. The cooperation of entities from the cultural sector is explained by isomorphism and mutual support resulting from similarity, reciprocity as well as previously or currently existing social relationships [Hasitschka, et al., 2005]. However, similarity may take on various perspectives, which include, among others: base values and areas of activities resulting from the mission, similar social interest, management method, or geographical proximity [Bagdadli, 2003].

Among the mechanisms for forming intentional cooperation strategies among cultural institutions, we can also point out aspects related to the partner's reputation and trust. These are factors that can be considered particularly important in the specific functioning of cultural institutions [Banks et al., 2000]. The partner's reputation refers to the past behaviour of the competitor and is reflected in recommendations and legitimization from other cultural entities [Czakoń, Czernek, 2016]. Undoubtedly, a positive reputation generates trust that binds competing organizations and promotes purposeful actions in the area of cooperation strategies [Czakoń et al., 2020b; Darbi, Knott, 2016]. Trust leads to mutual maximization of benefits resulting from cooperation in the face of environmental uncertainty [Dagnino, Rocco, 2009], but also stimulates the efforts of competing cultural entities to comply with the cooperation arrangements and causes the partner to be less likely to be suspected of inappropriate market behaviour [Juszczak, 2021]. In this context, trust is considered an antecedent of cooperation [Czakoń, 2016; Czakoń et al., 2020b] and may stimulate intentional cooperation with a market rival.

The last of the mechanisms for forming an intentional strategy identified in the literature concerns the individual perception of managers, more broadly in the literature this mechanism refers to cognitive underpinnings [Czakoń et al., 2020b]. As scholars point out, cooperation is a dynamic process [Jarząbkowski, Bednarek, 2018; Klimas et al., 2022] of interlinked strategic decisions that are made by individuals. Hence, cultural managers, in accordance with their own perception, choose partners for collaboration [Bridoux, Stoelhorst, 2014], based,

for example, on positively emotionally charged social relationships, connecting them with representatives of other cultural institutions. As research shows, social relationships based on sympathy constitute an incentive to establishing coopetition relationships [Juszczuk, 2021], while as the strength of cultural managers' attitude towards cooperation increases, it is more likely that the involved cultural entities will be able to use better the opportunities to create together values [Czakon et al., 2020b]. It should be emphasized, however, that this mechanism may also successfully determine the phase of forming emerging coopetition, because the individual perception of managers may, for various reasons, influence the establishment of spontaneous and unplanned coopetition with rivals.

Emergent coopetition: the mechanism of coopetition formation

For the formation of the emerging coopetition strategy among cultural institutions, which are examples of public and non-profit organizations, the area of organizational goals and the conditions of the organizational environment are of great importance [Sudoł, 2013]. It is worth emphasizing the importance of the complexity and ambiguity of the system of goals of public and non-profit organizations, which results primarily from such conditions as the multiplicity of stakeholders, the primary role of social policy (in this case, the spread and popularization of culture) and the influence of political factors [Mastenitsa, 2015; Rose, Cray, 2010; Szumowski, 2023]. The specificity of the functioning of cultural institutions is related to formal and legal restrictions, external control mechanisms, and – perhaps mainly – a different way of obtaining financial resources necessary for operation (subject and targeted subsidies, budget regulated by the organizer, or sponsoring [Szulborska-Łukaszewicz, 2012], which in turn affects the uncertainty and complexity of the organizational environment. This complexity is important for the incremental and spontaneous establishment of coopetition relationships, which often take the form of an ad hoc relationship resulting from the use of chances and opportunities flowing from the environment [Juszczuk, Wójcik, 2021].

Additionally, it should be noted that some research has shown that among cultural institutions there is a lack of 'tradition' in setting goals [Jenster, Overstreet Jr, 1990], including short-term ones, which has been confirmed by numerous research findings conducted in the public sector and non-profits, clearly indicating that organizations in these sectors do not use strategic planning or do it very rarely [Lapuente, Van de Walle, 2020]. Hofer and Schendel [1978] even point out that some organizations of this type do not even have any strategy, and their direction of activities is determined by the personal goals of the organizers, managers, and employees, as well as budget cycles. Also in this context, coopetition relationships seem to be the result of a flexible way of operating, based on achieving specific benefits from broadly understood opportunities occurring in the environment.

Election cycles, related to leadership change cycles, constitute a significant obstacle to the formation the long-term coopetition strategies among cultural institutions [Montanari, Bracker, 1986; Richardson, 1995]. They involve new leaders introducing significant changes

to the functioning of the institution, usually for the duration of their term of office. Moreover, the leader, who usually functions as the organizer (in the case of public cultural institutions – the state or local government units; in case of non-profit cultural institutions the leader is understood more as a state making legal provisions and regulations) of the cultural institution, not only decides on the amount of funding granted for cultural activities [Matthews, Shulman, 2005], but also supports and promotes creativity, artistic and cultural education, as well as cultural activities and initiatives [Potocki, 2017]. This activity, often not supported by substantive experience, causes changes in the priorities of cultural organizations, their public and social goals, and the way they implement their mission. In turn, these changes force cultural institutions to look for financing opportunities (collecting funds jointly), resources, the ability to overcome their own organizational shortcomings, the possibility of exchanging experiences or substantive support, and spontaneous – and sometimes even ad hoc – partnerships among competitors. Such an emerging cooperation strategy is obviously associated with a sudden need to reduce environmental uncertainty [J.M. Crick, D. Crick, 2020], but also to diversify the resource and financial sources of social activity by combining them with the competitor's resources [Henrich, 2006].

As previous research findings indicate, the institutional environment played a decisive role in the formation of emergent cooperation – cooperation may be forced by legal provisions or top-down pressure from the person financing cultural activities [Juszczak 2021; Mariani, 2007, 2018; Thomas, 1997].

However, spontaneous and sometimes even unconscious decisions regarding cooperation with competitors are also influenced by constant changes in the orientation of cultural institutions [Cuccia, Rizzo, 2016], in the centre of which there is the recipient, his/her needs and expectations. In the face of the dynamic development of the cultural sector causing uncertainty among managers of cultural organizations, the changes taking place in the audience should also be emphasized. Even defining the current recipients of the cultural offer may cause problems, because contemporary recipients treat participation in culture in a highly individualized way, which is manifested by the fact that they consume it in a 'domesticated and privatized' way [Janicka-Olejniak, 2016; Johnson, Garbarino, 2001]. This has to do with the findings of researchers who claim that cultural products must compete not only with each other, but also with products that meet the lower-order needs [Cornelia et al., 2017]. This means that contemporary cultural institutions are somehow forced to identify current recipients, but also to acquire them and establish relationships with them. This state of affairs leads, among others, to inevitable changes in the competitiveness factors of cultural sector organizations, which, if noticed in time, may turn out to be an opportunity for the development of these institutions. The response to this opportunity and changing conditions is cooperation, which not only provides the opportunity to reach new recipients, but also allows them to meet their diverse and changing needs better. Limited budgets are often an obstacle to independently building an attractive, extensive cultural offer that evokes emotions for contemporary recipients [Johnson, Garbarino, 2001; Juszczak, 2021; Ponsignon et al., 2017].

Finally, existing industry and social relationships between representatives of cultural institutions contribute to, or even create the basis for, spontaneous cooperation between competing entities. It can be indicated that interpersonal relationships constitute an incentive to establishing cooperation at the interorganizational level, while the positive emotional character of them more often favours the spontaneous establishment of informal cooperation [Juszczuk, 2021], and, therefore, the initiation of cooperation with a competitor that has not been previously thought out and planned.

Summary

The paper contributes to the development of the cooperation theory in several ways. Firstly, presented considerations integrate the existing knowledge about the process of forming cooperation strategies from a deliberate and emerging perspective, for the first time from the perspective of cultural institutions. The literature review describes the specificity of the functioning of these organizations, which is important for the cooperation strategy's formation stage.

Secondly, based on the described specificity of the functioning of public and non-profit sector entities on the example of cultural institutions, the mechanisms for forming intentional and emergent cooperation were conceptualized, which coupled with only few studies considering the character of the cooperation formation stage [Albert-Cromarias, Asselineau, 2022; Efrat et al., 2022; Gernsheimer et al., 2021], and can be considered as a significant contribution in expanding the theory of cooperation. What is more, the identified mechanisms confirmed the dichotomous nature of cooperation in the cultural sector [Juszczuk, 2023].

Thirdly, it was recognized that the mechanisms determining the formation of intentional cooperation strategies in cultural institutions i.e. perceived benefits [Bengtsson; Raza-Ullah, 2016; Czakon et al., 2020b; Ritala, 2012], cooperation orientation [Bouncken et al., 2020; Czakon et al., 2020b; Estrada, Dong, 2020; Gernsheimer et al., 2021; Raza-Ullah, 2020], institutional environment [Albert-Cromarias, Asselineau, 2022; Cuccia, Rizzo, 2016; Czakon et al., 2020a; Dagnino, Rocco, 2009; Mariani, 2007, 2018; Thomas, 1997], social environment [J.M. Crick, D. Crick, 2020; Juszczuk, 2021; Mastenitsa, 2015; Meena et al., 2022; Szumowski, 2023], partner fit [Bagdadli, 2003; Hasitschka, et al., 2005], reputation and trust [Banks et al., 2000; Czakon, Czernek, 2016; Czakon et al., 2020b; Darbi, Knott, 2016; Juszczuk 2021], and individual perceptions of managers (cognitive underpinnings) [Bridoux, Stoelhorst, 2014; Czakon et al., 2020a; Gernsheimer et al., 2021; Jarzabkowski, Bednarek, 2018], result mainly from barriers and restrictions in the environment [Albert-Cromarias, Asselineau, 2022; Bovaird, 2008; Czakon, Czernek, 2016; Efrat et al., 2022; Meena et al., 2022], that lead to the rationale and calculated formation of cooperation strategy, expressed in long-term forecasting of environmental conditions [Chiambaretto et al., 2020; Dagnino, Rocco, 2009; Peng et al., 2018], often related to formal planning and the strategic coherence of the entities involved [Kopmann et al., 2017].

In turn, the identified mechanisms conditioning the formation of emergent coopetition, i.e. election cycles [Montanari, Bracker, 1986; Richardson, 1995], leadership change cycle [Rose, Cray, 2010], legal and political requirements [J.M. Crick, D. Crick 2020; Rose, Cray, 2010; Szulborska-Łukaszewicz, 2012], top-down decisions [Juszczak 2021; Mariani, 2007, 2018; Thomas, 1997], high uncertainty/crisis situations (e.g. the COVID-19 pandemic) [Bonel, Rocco, 2007; J.M. Crick, D. Crick 2020; Cuccia, Rizzo, 2016; Dagnino, Rocco, 2009; Mastenitsa, 2015], defining current customers/recipients [Cornelia et al., 2017; Janicka-Olejnik, 2016; Johnson, Garbarino, 2001], changing needs of customers/recipients [Bouncken et al., 2014, 2022; Cornelia et al., 2017; Janicka-Olejnik, 2016; Zakrzewska-Bielawska et al., 2023], existing industry relationships and existing social relationships [Czakoń, Czernek, 2016; Juszczak, 2021], are usually embedded in the organization's environment, in which limitations and barriers are treated as chances, opportunities, and possibilities arising from the environment [Albert-Cromarias, Asselineau, 2022; Czakoń, Czernek, 2016; Efrat et al., 2022; Meena et al., 2022]. They lead to a flexible and dynamic formation of a coopetition strategy [Dahl et al., 2016], expressed in a high degree of adaptation to the conditions of the environment (including uncertainty) and the organization.

Cultural institutions are stereotypically perceived as organizations that do not adapt to the changing environment in order to increase their performance [Lehman, 2009; Kafel, 2006; Kłás, 2016], which is, however, a misleading assumption, as there are many reasons to claim that they focus both on fulfilling the mission [Finkel et al., 2017; Mastenitsa, 2015], as well as achieving short-term or even *ad hoc* goals [Hofer, Schendel, 1978; Jenster, Overstreet Jr., 1990; Juszczak, 2023; Lapuente, Van de Walle, 2020] to achieve specific benefits and intended results, as evidenced by the considerations presented in this article. The observable shift towards dynamic and open structures among cultural institutions [Del Chiappa et al., 2014; Ponsignon et al., 2017; Wróblewski, 2017], where improvisation is often important, but also the speed of action and reaction [Dean, Edson, 2013], causes these entities to be influenced by impulses appearing in the environment, but also by dynamic changes taking place in the industry and themselves. Cultural institutions are adopting more flexible ways of managing, financing, and managing assets [Cornelia et al., 2017]. Coopetition, although it does not appear to be one of the key strategies of entities operating in the cultural sector [Herbst, 2019], in fact allows for achieving benefits that no other interorganizational relationship can provide to cultural institutions [Nascimento et al., 2021; Xie et al., 2023].

Limitations and future research directions

The article sheds a new light on the causal paths of motivation for coopetition between public and non-profit organizations on the example of cultural institutions. However, the mechanisms of setting emergent and intended coopetition strategy identified in this study require further in-depth research in the public and non-profit sectors, the same as the phenomenon of the dichotomy of coopetition strategies, which requires operationalization. What seems

particularly interesting in this perspective is the reference to the antecedents of coopetition, especially in relation to the uncertainty of the environment, which is becoming an imminent feature of the modern organizational environment in all sectors. Given the above, I see it reasoned to carry out some further research efforts on mechanisms for shaping emergent and intended coopetition strategies, primarily to expand the knowledge about the operational level of coopetition [Bonel, Rocco, 2007], in particular from the point of view of public and non-profit organizations, including cultural institutions, which are examples of organizations less frequently studied in this context.

Managerial implications

The presented considerations seem to be valuable for practitioners managing public and non-profit organizations, in particular for managers of cultural institutions in the context of forming coopetition strategies. Identified and conceptualized mechanisms of setting intentional and emergent coopetition strategy can help managers understand the process of establishing and developing the cooperation with a rival, and at the same time pay attention to the similarity of values and areas of activities or specific fit of the partner, which in turn may help manage coopetition better and derive more benefits from it. Moreover, cultural managers could treat coopetition as an opportunity from the environment to achieve additional benefits and stimulate the development of cultural organizations. The knowledge about the mechanisms of setting coopetition may also increase managers' efforts, e.g. to build trust, maintain positive social relationships or maintain an appropriate reputation in the industry environment.

References

1. Albert-Cromarias, A., Asselineau, A. (2022). One for All or Everyone for Themselves: Why Is Coopetition So Difficult? The Case of Four Small Vineyards In Central France. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* [in press].
2. Amata, R., Dagnino, G.B., Minà, A., Picone, P.M. (2022). Managing coopetition in diversified firms: Insights from a qualitative case study. *Long Range Planning*, 55(4), p. 102128.
3. Bagdadli, S. (2003). Museum and theatre networks in Italy: determinants and typology. *International Journal of Arts Management*, pp. 19–29.
4. Banks, M., Lovatt, A., O'connor, J., Raffo, C. (2000). Risk and trust in the cultural industries. *Geoforum*, 31(4), pp. 453–464.
5. Bengtsson, M., Kock, S. (2014). Coopetition – Quo vadis? Past accomplishments and future challenges. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 43(2), pp. 180–188.
6. Bengtsson, M., Raza-Ullah, T. (2016). A systematic review of research on coopetition: Toward a multilevel understanding. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 57, pp. 23–39.
7. Bonel, E., Rocco, E. (2007). Coopeting to survive; surviving coopetition. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 37(2), pp. 70–96.

8. Bouncken, R.B., Cesinger, B., Kraus, S. (2014). The role of entrepreneurial risks in the inter-cultural context: a study of MBA students in four nations. *European Journal of International Management*, 8(1), pp. 20–54.
9. Bouncken, R.B., Fredrich, V., Kraus, S. (2020). Configurations of firm-level value capture in cooperation. *Long Range Planning*, 53(1), p. 101869.
10. Bouncken, R.B., Gast, J., Kraus, S., Bogers, M. (2015). Cooperation: a systematic review, synthesis, and future research directions. *Review of Managerial Science*, 9, pp. 577–601.
11. Bouncken, R.B., Kraus, S., de Lucas Ancillo, A. (2022). Management in times of crises: reflections on characteristics, avoiding pitfalls, and pathways out. *Review of Managerial Science*, 16(7), pp. 2035–2046.
12. Bovaird, T. (2008). Emergent strategic management and planning mechanisms in complex adaptive systems: the case of the UK Best Value initiative. *Public Management Review*, 10(3), pp. 319–340.
13. Brandenburger, A.M., Nalebuff, B.J. (1996). *Co-opetition*. London: Harper Collins Business.
14. Bridoux, F., Stoelhorst, J.W. (2014). Microfoundations for stakeholder theory: Managing stakeholders with heterogeneous motives. *Strategic Management Journal*, 35(1), pp. 107–125.
15. Bromiley, P., Rau, D. (2016). Social, behavioral, and cognitive influences on upper echelons during strategy process: A literature review. *Journal of Management*, 42(1), pp. 174–202.
16. Brown, J.A., Gianiodis, P., Santoro, M.D. (2017). Managing co-opetition for shared stakeholder utility in dynamic environments. *California Management Review*, 59(4), pp. 114–139.
17. Chai, L., Li, J., Clauss, T., Tangpong, C. (2019). The influences of interdependence, opportunism and technology uncertainty on interfirm cooperation. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 34(5), pp. 948–964.
18. Cheng, S.W. (2006). Cultural goods creation, cultural capital formation, provision of cultural services and cultural atmosphere accumulation. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 30, pp. 263–286.
19. Chiambaretto, P., Maurice, J., Willinger, M. (2020). Value creation and value appropriation in innovative cooperation projects. *M@n@gement*, 23(2), pp. 61–75.
20. Cornelia, A.H., Putra, H.S.A., Priyambodo, T.K., Widyaningsih, Y.A. (2017). Social media based proposed model for museum marketing strategy in Yogyakarta. *Advanced Science Letters*, 23(11), pp. 10636–10639.
21. Cortese, D., Sinicropi, S., Pollifroni, M., Cantino, V. (2021). “Cooperation” for Cultural Tourism: An Accounting History Perspective. *De Computis, Revista Española de Historia de la Contabilidad*, 18(1), pp. 157–168.
22. Crick, J.M., Crick, D. (2020). Cooperation and COVID-19: Collaborative business-to-business marketing strategies in a pandemic crisis. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 88, pp. 206–213.
23. Cuccia, T., Rizzo, I. (2016). Less might be better. Sustainable funding strategies for cultural producers. *City, Culture and Society*, 7(2), pp. 109–116.
24. Czakon, W. (2014). Koopetycja w rozwoju przedsiębiorstw high-tech. In: A. Zakrzewska-Bielawska (Ed.). *Koopetycja w rozwoju przedsiębiorstw high-tech. Determinanty i dynamika* (pp. 63–89). Warszawa: Placet..
25. Czakon, W. (2016). Antecedencje współpracy strategicznej – poziom diady i sieci. *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu*, (421), pp. 82–89.

26. Czakon, W., Czernek, K. (2016). The role of trust-building mechanisms in entering into network cooperation: The case of tourism networks in Poland. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 57, pp. 64–74.
27. Czakon, W., Rogalski, M. (2014). Cooperation typology revisited – a behavioural approach. *International Journal of Business Environment*, 6(1), pp. 28–46.
28. Czakon, W., Gnyawali, D., Le Roy, F., Srivastava, M.K. (2020a). Cooperation strategies: Critical issues and research directions. *Long Range Planning*, 53(1), p. 101948.
29. Czakon, W., Klimas, P., Mariani, M. (2020b). Behavioral antecedents of cooperation: A synthesis and measurement scale. *Long Range Planning*, 53(1), p. 101875.
30. Dagnino, G.B., Rocco, E. (2009). *Cooperation strategy: theory, experiments and cases* (Vol. 47). Routledge.
31. Dahl, J., Kock, S., Lundgren-Henriksson, E.L. (2016). Conceptualizing cooperation strategy as practice: A multilevel interpretative framework. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 46(2–3), pp. 94–109.
32. Darbi, W.P.K., Knott, P. (2016). Strategising practices in an informal economy setting: A case of strategic networking. *European Management Journal*, 34(4), pp. 400–413.
33. Dean, D., Edson, G. (2013). *Handbook for museums*. Routledge.
34. Del Chiappa, G., Andreu, L., Gallarza, M.G. (2014). Emotions and visitors' satisfaction at a museum. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 8(4), pp. 420–431.
35. Drummond, G., Ensor, J., Laing, A., Richardson, N. (2000). Market orientation applied to police service strategies. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 13(7), pp. 571–587.
36. Efrat, K., Souchon, A.L., Wald, A., Hughes, P., Cai, J. (2022). Mitigating cooperation tensions: The forgotten formation stage. *European Management Review*, 19(4), pp. 527–548.
37. Estrada, I., Dong, J.Q. (2020). Learning from experience? Technological investments and the impact of cooperation experience on firm profitability. *Long Range Planning*, 53(1), p. 101866.
38. Ferlie, E. (1992). The creation and evolution of quasi markets in the public sector: A problem for strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13(S2), pp. 79–97.
39. Finkel, A.M., Walters, D.E., Corbett, A. (2017). Planning for excellence: Insights from an international review of regulators' strategic plans. *Pace Environ. L. Rev.*, 35, p. 240.
40. Gainer, B., Padanyi, P. (2002). Applying the marketing concept to cultural organisations: an empirical study of the relationship between market orientation and performance. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 7(2), pp. 182–193.
41. Garri, M. (2021). Cooperation, value co-creation, and knowledge-enhancement in the UK alpaca industry: A multi-level mechanism. *European Management Journal*, 39(5), pp. 545–557.
42. Gnyawali, D.R., Ryan Charleton, T. (2018). Nuances in the interplay of competition and cooperation: Towards a theory of cooperation. *Journal of Management*, 44(7), pp. 2511–2534.
43. Harbison, J.R., Pekar, P. (1998). *Smart Alliances: A Practical Guide to Repeatable Success*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
44. Hung, S.W., Chang, C.C. (2012). A co-operation perspective of technology alliance governance modes. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 24(7), pp. 679–696.

45. 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), pp. 147–158.
46. Henrich, J. (2006). Cooperation, punishment, and the evolution of human institutions. *Science*, 312(5770), pp. 60–61.
47. Herbst, J.M. (2019). Harnessing sustainable development from niche marketing and cooperation in social enterprises. *Business Strategy & Development*, 2(3), pp. 152–165.
48. Hofer, C.W., Schendel, D. (1978). *Strategy formulation: Analytical concepts*. West, St. Paul MN.
49. Ioannidis, S., Psillos, S. (2022). *Mechanisms in Science. Method or Metaphysics?* Cambridge University Press.
50. Jarzabkowski, P., Balogun, J., Seidl, D. (2007). Strategizing: The challenges of a practice perspective. *Human Relations*, 60(1), pp. 5–27.
51. Jenster, P.V., Overstreet Jr, G.A. (1990). Planning for a non-profit service: A study of US credit unions. *Long Range Planning*, 23(2), pp. 103–111.
52. Johnson, M.S., Garbarino, E. (2001). Customers of performing arts organisations: are subscribers different from nonsubscribers? *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 6(1), pp. 61–77.
53. Juszczak, P., Wójcik, D. (2021). Cooperation in synoptic and incremental approaches. Context of the cultural sector, *Przegląd Organizacji*, 9(980), pp. 12–18.
54. Juszczak, P. (2021). *Relacje społeczne w kooperacji muzeów*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Katowicach.
55. Juszczak, P. (2023). Przyszłość czy terażniejszość? O dychotomii strategii kooperacji wśród instytucji kultury. In: K. Pawlicka, A. Wróblewska, P. Majewski (Eds.). *Strategie zarządzania instytucjami i projektami kulturalnymi*, część 2 (pp. 29–55). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UKSW.
56. Kafel, T. (2006). Strategie organizacji pozarządowych-zarys problemu. *Organizacje Komercyjne i Niekomercyjne wobec Wzmoczonej Konkurencji i Rosnących Wymagań Konsumentów*, 5, pp. 119–128.
57. Kłaś, J. (2016). Misja instytucji kultury na przykładzie muzeum – po co i jak ją tworzyć. *Zarządzanie w kulturze*, 17(1), pp. 1–8.
58. Klein, K., Semrau, T., Albers, S., Zajac, E.J. (2020). Multimarket cooperation: How the interplay of competition and cooperation affects entry into shared markets. *Long Range Planning*, 53(1), p. 101868.
59. Klimas, P., Czakon, W., Fredrich, V. (2022). Strategy frames in cooperation: An examination of cooperation entry factors in high-tech firms. *European Management Journal*, 40(2), pp. 258–272.
60. Kopmann, J., Kock, A., Killen, C.P., Gemünden, H.G. (2017). The role of project portfolio management in fostering both deliberate and emergent strategy. *International Journal of Project Management*, 35(4), pp. 557–570.
61. Köseoglu, M.A., Yick, M.Y.Y., Okumus, F. (2021). Cooperation strategies for competitive intelligence practices-evidence from full-service hotels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 99, p. 103049.

62. Kylänen, M., Rusko, R. (2011). Unintentional coopetition in the service industries: The case of Pyhä-Luosto tourism destination in the Finnish Lapland. *European Management Journal*, 29(3), pp. 193–205.
63. Lapuente, V., Van de Walle, S. (2020). The effects of new public management on the quality of public services. *Governance*, 33(3), pp. 461–475.
64. Le Roy, F., Czakon, W. (2016). Managing coopetition: the missing link between strategy and performance. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 53(1), pp. 3–6.
65. Lehman, K. (2009). Australian museums and the modern public: A marketing context. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 39(2), pp. 87–100.
66. Lorgnier, N., Su, C.J. (2017). Considering coopetition strategies in sport tourism networks: A look at the nonprofit nautical sports clubs on the northern coast of France. *Value Co-creation in Sport Management*, pp. 97–120.
67. Mariani, M. (2018) The role of policy makers and regulators in coopetition. In: Fernandez, A.-S., Chiambaretto, P., Le Roy, F. Czakon, W. (Eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Coopetition Strategies*. Routledge, Abingdon.
68. 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), pp. 97–126.
69. Mariani, M.M. (2016). Coordination in inter-network co-opetition: Evidence from the tourism sector. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 53, pp. 103–123.
70. Mastenitsa, E.N. (2015). *Social functions of the museum in the global world*. Proceedings of the St. Petersburg State University of Culture and Arts, 210, pp. 229–236.
71. Matthews, J., Shulman, A.D. (2005). Competitive advantage in public-sector organizations: explaining the public good/sustainable competitive advantage paradox. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(2), pp. 232–240.
72. Meena, A., Dhir, S., Sushil, S. (2023). A review of coopetition and future research agenda. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 38(1), pp. 118–136.
73. Mintzberg, H., Waters, J.A. (1985). Of strategies, deliberate and emergent. *Strategic Management Journal*, 6(3), pp. 257–272.
74. Modlinski, A., Pinto, L.M. (2020). Managing substitutive and complementary technologies in cultural institutions: Market/mission perspectives. *Management: Journal of Contemporary Management Issues*, 25, pp. 1–10.
75. Montanari, J.R., Bracker, J.S. (1986). The strategic management process at the public planning unit level. *Strategic Management Journal*, 7(3), pp. 251–265.
76. Murawski, M. (2021). *Museums as agents of change: A guide to becoming a changemaker*. New York, London: Lanham, Boulder.
77. Nalebuff, B.J., Brandenburger, A.M. (1997). Co-opetition: Competitive and cooperative business strategies for the digital economy. *Strategy & Leadership*, 25(6), pp. 28–33.
78. Nascimento, L.D.S., da Costa Júnior, J.C., Salazar, V.S., Chim-Miki, A.F. (2021). Coopetition in social entrepreneurship: A strategy for social value devolution. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*.

79. Osarenkhoe, A. (2010). A coopetition strategy – a study of inter-firm dynamics between competition and cooperation. *Business Strategy Series*, 11(6), pp. 343–362.
80. Padula, G., Dagnino, G.B. (2007). Untangling the rise of coopetition: the intrusion of competition in a cooperative game structure. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 37(2), pp. 32–52.
81. Padula, G., Dagnino, G.B. (2008). On the nature and drivers of coopetition. *International Studies of Management and Organization* [forthcoming].
82. Park, B.J., Kim, D. (2021). Coopetition dynamics between giant entrants and incumbents in a new convergent segment: a case in the smartphone industry. *Asian Journal of Technology Innovation*, 29(3), pp. 455–476.
83. Peng, T.J.A., Yen, M.H., Bourne, M. (2018). How rival partners compete based on cooperation? *Long Range Planning*, 51(2), pp. 351–383.
84. Ponsignon, F., Durrieu, F., Bouzdine-Chameeva, T. (2017). Customer experience design: a case study in the cultural sector. *Journal of Service Management*, 28(4), pp. 763–787.
85. Potocki, A. (2017). Zależność samorządowych instytucji kultury w aspektach prawoadministracyjnych. *Studia Administracyjne*, (09), pp. 169–182.
86. Qizi, M.K.I. (2021). The role of museums in the development of tourism. *Academicia: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 11(2), pp. 121–124.
87. Radu, C. (2010). Need and potential risks of strategic alliances for competing successfully. *Economia Seria Management*, 13(1), pp. 165–169.
88. Raza-Ullah, T. (2020). Experiencing the paradox of coopetition: A moderated mediation framework explaining the paradoxical tension – performance relationship. *Long range planning*, 53(1), p. 101863.
89. Rhodes, C., Brown, A.D. (2005). Narrative, organizations and research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 7(3), pp. 167–188.
90. Rose, W.R., Cray, D. (2010). Public-sector strategy formulation. *Canadian Public Administration*, 53(4), pp. 453–466.
91. Seepana, C., Huq, F.A., Paulraj, A. (2021). Performance effects of entrepreneurial orientation, strategic intent and absorptive capacity within coopetitive relationships. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 41(3), pp. 227–250.
92. Sudoł, S. (2013). Nauki o zarządzaniu a zarządzanie publiczne. *Studia Ekonomiczne*, (169), pp. 199–204.
93. Świerk, J. (2018). Zarządzanie strategiczne instytucją kultury. *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu*, (513), pp. 404–414.
94. Szulborska-Łukaszewicz, J. (2012). Instytucje kultury w Polsce-specyfika ich organizacji i finansowania. *Zarządzanie w Kulturze*, 13(4), pp. 305–328.
95. Szumowski, W. (2023). Zarządzanie strategiczne w organizacjach publicznych. In: A. Frączkiewicz-Wronka, M. Ćwiklicki (Eds.). *Zarządzanie publiczne: perspektywa teorii i praktyki*. Praca Naukowa (pp. 145–160)., Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Katowicach.
96. Thomas, C.W. (1997). Public Management as interagency cooperation: testing epistemic community theory at the domestic level. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 7(2), pp. 221–246.

97. Tidström, A. (2008). Perspectives on coopetition on actor and operational levels. *Management Research: Journal of the Iberoamerican Academy of Management*, 6(3), pp. 207–217.
98. Tidström, A., Ritala, P., Lainema, K. (2018). Interactional and procedural practices in managing coopetitive tensions. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 33(7), pp. 945–957.
99. Tsoukas, H. (2010). Practice, strategy making and intentionality: a Heideggerian onto-epistemology for strategy as practice. *Cambridge Handbook of Strategy as Practice*, 3, pp. 47–62.
100. Walley, K. (2007). Coopetition: an introduction to the subject and an agenda for research. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 37(2), pp. 11–31.
101. Wang, Y., Krakover, S. (2008). Destination marketing: competition, cooperation or coopetition? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 20(2), pp. 126–141.
102. Weber, Y., Tarba, S.Y. (2014). Strategic agility: A state of the art introduction to the special section on strategic agility. *California Management Review*, 56(3), pp. 5–12.
103. Wróblewski, Ł. (2012). *Strategie marketingowe w instytucjach kultury*. Warszawa: Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne.
104. Wróblewski, Ł. (2017). Application of marketing in cultural organizations: the case of the Polish Cultural and Educational Union in the Czech Republic. *Cult. Manag. Sci. Educ*, 1, pp. 79–92.
105. Xie, Q., Gao, Y., Xia, N., Zhang, S., Tao, G. (2023). Coopetition and organizational performance outcomes: A meta-analysis of the main and moderator effects. *Journal of Business Research*, 154, p. 113363.
106. Zakrzewska-Bielawska, A. (2013). Koopetycja – strategią sukcesu? Doświadczenia przedsiębiorstw high-tech. *The Journal of Management and Finance*, 11 (4/1), pp. 1–14.
107. Zakrzewska-Bielawska, A., Czakon, W., Kraus, S. (2023). Relational orientation in B2B strategies: Measurement scale development and validation. *Journal of Business Research*, 160, p. 113791.
108. Zhu, Y., Wang, V.L., Wang, Y.J., Nastos, J. (2020). Business-to-business referral as digital coopetition strategy: Insights from an industry-wise digital business network. *European Journal of Marketing*, 54(6), pp. 1181–1203.