Archetypes of rivalry: Narrative responses of Polish radio station managers to perceived environmental change

Monika Kostera

Krzysztof Obloj

University of Warsaw

Introduction

This paper explores ideas of rivalry and the archetypical characters that the studied managers embraced as a way of making narrative sense of the perceived changes in the environment. As the result of a qualitative study, we have observed that managers make active sense of the changes in their firms environments and the way the response to the change is enacted. Strategists can be seen as storytellers, spinning their tales around central themes, ideas, and protagonists. It is the importance of the latter that is the main finding that this paper is based on. Not identical with any human being, rather having a super-human status, the heroes are the only forces capable of resisting destructive powers in the environment and defending the firm against decline and fall. We believe that these narrative characters have archetypical status. Looking at the managers' narratives through an archetypical lense enables to see the validity of different ways of making sense of turbulent changes in the environment and their various ways of responding to these changes.

In this paper, we first explain central notions, such as market, competition, archetype, and then go on to presenting the findings from our prolonged empirical study. Finally, we discuss the results, interpreting them in archetypical terms.

Markets and rivalry

From a mainstream managerial perspective (Porter, 1980), the market is a limited (in terms of geography or product range) domain where several (similar) firms operate. They compete in two ways. On the input side, they fight for resources like people, money, raw materials, and community support (Pffefer and Salancik, 1978). On the output side, they compete for sources of revenues, i.e. customers (Bergen and Peteraf, 2002; Lynch, 2003). Rivalry leads to homogenization of firms and their behaviours as they imitate optimal moves (Begg *et al.*, 1995). As the growth of a market slows down rivalry becomes more intense, weaker competitors are shaken out and the market's structure stabilizes. The whole process is almost like a zero-sum game and is well described and analyzed in economy and organization theory.

Brunsson and Hägg (1992) present the market as an idea and as a practice, showing how much the two dimensions differ from each other. As an idea, the market is characterized by free actors,

aware of their preferences and having a distinct identity, entering the market in order to negotiate the ownership of goods, coming from the outside of the market. The goods change owners but not their properties. The patterns of interaction between the main actors change often and rapidly, and the crucial factors of these relationships are: the price, the availability of the product, and the costs of transaction. In practice, the actors enter the relationships on the market more or less randomly and acquire their preferences during the interaction. The products change their properties (attractiveness and price) in the process. The actors form strong alliances (that are often popularly seen as a characteristic of the idea of "hierarchy," or "organization" but not the market) and bonds which are only sometimes affected by changes in price. Trust, loyalty and games for power shape the patterns of interaction on the market. Another key relationship is that of rivalry which in practice takes the shape of negotiation. This interaction has a crucial meaning for the actors, as it symbolizes freedom and justice. Brunsson and Hägg conclude that the power of the idea of the market over the imagination of people and the way they construct their reality is immense. It represents an ideology of individual freedom and open economy.

In normative understandings, as well as Brunsson's and Hägg's (1992) empirically based approach, competition, and rivalry tend to be key issues in the ideas and practices of the market. The manager plays a strategic role in that rivalry – it is up to him or her to come up with a strategy that will enable the firm to win and thus secure itself survival (Ohmae, 1983; Porter, 1980, 1996), or effectively make sense of the situation and bring forward ideas about how to act (Smircich and Stubbart, 1985).

Traditional normative models depict the managerial role as similar to a chess player's. Strategists should scan their environment, analyze their competitive moves and potential and develop strategies that would enable their firms win a competitive market place (Lynch, 2003). Thus, they need information about competitors, suppliers, and customers in this process. Without a detailed and extended knowledge base, firms compete blindly and strategic results are chaotic – as if a player who does not see their opponent's moves on the chessboard. Many years ago, Sun Tsu (1994 English translation, p. 135) formulated one of the most important strategic rules while stating:

One who knows the enemy and knows himself will not be endangered in a hundred engagements. One who does not know the enemy but knows himself will sometimes be victorious, sometimes meet with defeat. One who knows neither the enemy nor himself will invariably be defeated in every engagement.

This view, however popular in mainstream perspectives on strategic management, is oversimplified, but gives as good idea about the heroic character of the strategist who is first and foremost a rival and should actively look for ways of winning the game. More current functionalist approaches show a more complex picture, however, it still centers around rivalry and ways of approaching competition (Desmond *et al.*, 2009; Obloj and Pratt, 2005). Environmental scanning plays an important role, but more as a way of active making sense of changes in the environment than the more passive "observation" of mainstream models. Research shows that managers of effective firms scan and analyze an environment more actively than managers of weaker rivals (Boyd and Fulk, 1996). They tend to scan these dimensions of the environment that they perceive as being of crucial importance for the organization is success.

They also tend to limit their scanning with the growing complexity of a particular environmental dimension, i.e. they limit their scanning process in a way they find meaningful for action (Porac and Thomas, 1990; Porac *et al.*, 1995). Research in Poland and Bulgaria partially confirms this pattern of scanning but showed generally lesser interest in scanning of a general environment and competitors in general (Obloj and Thomas, 1996; Elenkov, 1997). An interesting review by Subramanian and Ishak (1988) of competitors' scanning practices shows that managers rarely develop a complex scanning system. Their own research indicated that only 24 percent of analyzed firms intensely collected and analyzed competitive information. Usually, competitor intelligence systems were limited and concentrated on what the managers saw as central aspects of competitive rivalry. Also, smaller firms seem to pay less attention to the collection and exploitation of environmental information. Porac *et al.* (1995) analyzed rivalry perception models in Scottish knitwear producers, especially the importance of such variables as representativity and size of a firm industry in the competitors perception process. Their research shows a joint cognitive model of a rivalry perception consisting of six prototypical competitors, deeply rooted in the economic, cultural and technological conditions of knitwear production in Scotland. The competitive prototypes were developed around several key characteristics: size, location, production method, and product styles. Porac *et al.* (1995, p. 222) underline the importance of this model in the following way:

It provides a straightforward inference system such that knowing a firm's position on any one of the model's dimensions allows a manager to infer its position on the other four and on related noncentral attributes as well. The cognitive economy that the model provides seems a major reason why rivalry coheres around it.

Competition was construed as asymmetrical. Larger firms were cited as rivals by more category members that smaller firms but did not cite more category members as rivals.

The interpretive tradition the picture of the strategist and market differ but the role of the firmer can be just as pivotal. Sandelands and Drazin (1989) point out that the relationships between the organization and the environment are neither based on "selection" not "strategic choice," such labels are linguistic devices misleading for the student of field material. The interactions of the organization participants are, however, strongly contextually determined. Karl Wick came up with an interesting idea of how these interactions play a role in the shaping of the environment with his concept of enacted environment (Wick, 1969/1979, 1995). Organizational environment is conceived of as an intersubjective picture of reality. According to Weick, the map is the terrain; people engaging in organizing choose a certain portion of the environment, on which they decide – consciously or non-consciously to focus their attention (differentiation). This portion becomes their environment. The next stage in the process is selection, or the limiting of the environment's ambiguity by the superposing on it of maps constructed from past experiences – the interpretive schemes. Successful processes of sensemaking are stored in the stage called retention. Karl Weick emphasizes that the stages of organizing (differentiation – selection – retention) are loosely coupled. A consequence of Weick's model is that rationality and meanings are retrospective to organizations, and not prospective. People are able to understand what they do only by interpreting what they have already done. Intuition is of key importance in this process (Dane and Pratt, 2007) and managerial experiences work as a filter of these interpretations (Walsh, 1995). Meaning is made *ex post*; sense is to be found in the past.

Planning, too, is based on such a process of *ex post* rationalization and it often takes the form of storytelling. Smircich and Stubbart (1985, p. 726) claim that the boundaries between the organization and its environment are neither distinct nor definite:

[O]rganization and environment are created together (enacted) through the social interaction processes of key organizational participants […]. Organizations and environments are convenient labels for patterns of activity.

"The environment" means the activity of people and the accompanying striving for the making sense of actions. Reality is ambiguous and intransparent, there is no clear way of separating "the outside" from "the inside" where the decision maker could base his or her analyses for strategic planning. The enacted environment means:

[…] a combination of *attention and action* on the part of organizational members. Processes of action and attention differentiate the organization from the not-the-organization (the environment) (Smircich and Stubbart, 1985, p. 726; italics in original).

In this paper, we are interested in the narrative dimension of the construction of the organizational environment. A story is the transition between two stable states through a phase of turbulence (Czarniawska, 2004). We find stories useful as a way of conceptualization of the process of making sense and constructing of the environment because they have the ability to create spaces independent of the "hegemony of facts and technical rationality" (Gabriel, 2004, p. 71) and so represent the idea of the enacted environment very well indeed. A story, apart from the plot, also needs a protagonist (Czarniawska, 2004). In this paper, we begin with a given plot and seek to depict the protagonist of Polish managers' stories of change and rivalry.

Archetypes

Kostera (2008) notices that myths and stories mythologizing organizations and organizational actors have a strong symbolic impact on people's imagination and organizational cultures because they touch on profound strings rooted in the collective processes of experiencing and interpreting reality. This is due to their being replete with archetypes, which we here understand in the Jung (1968) sense as:

[…] constructs said to exist as common patterns containing hidden images of all human motivations and inspirations. They are concealed in the collective unconscious domain of reality and shared by all humans. They are the substance that myths and symbols are constructed of and because of their universality they have the capacity of turning individuals into a group and can be seen as the underpinning of culture and society (Kostera, 2007, p. 67).

Archetypes are similar to riverbeds (Jung, 1968) waiting for being filled with images and stories, that can have many actual shapes and forms, depending of differing context: epoch, culture, and place. They have all profound common qualities, not easy to point out, but speaking to important and not always conscious parts of the human psyche. Archetypes are deeply rooted in culture and have the capacity to unite individuals and turn them into collectives. They are almost infinitely open to interpretations and reinterpretations and have the ability to make people aware, to wake

up their consciousness, as they seldom leave us unmoved and are not connected to easy solutions or popular values. They often disturb, they make us reflect and consider things perhaps formerly unconsidered. They are very motivating and they inspire artists and everyday men and women alike (Kostera, 2008).

In management and organization studies, they are often used to point to darker sides of business and possible risks and problems, as inspiration for business leaders and to present role patterns and models for various organizational actors (Kostera, 2007). It is in the latter way we use it in this paper – as a way to present key narrative protagonists derived from our interviewees' tales of environmental change.

Local radio stations as competing rivals

In 1989, Poland entered as process of rapid and multidimensional change known as the transition (Kelemen and Kostera, 2002). After the fall of the so-called Communist block intensive and pervasive processes of democratization, privatization, and introduction of a market economy began to take place in Poland. Among the affected were mass media.

Warsaw is the capital of Poland populated by 1.5 million people. From the point of view of radio stations, it is a local, albeit potentially lucrative market. At the time we began our study (1998), there were 19 radio stations audible in the region, thereof five public and the rest was private.

The purpose of the research was exploratory from the beginning, but both its methodology and its theme changed during the period of the field study. From the beginning, the aim of the study was to learn about strategies of local radio stations. Initially, the project was scheduled (by one of us) as a semi-quantitative study, with a structured interview questionnaire (the Appendix), and a pre-defined problem of analyzing firms' strategies in local and transparent market. As the interviews progressed, it turned out that the problem was broader than it was anticipated originally. The field material exceeded the pre-defined limits of the study, and the researcher stood before the problem of either simplifying it to fit the model, or changing the frame to learn as much as possible from the field material. Thus, the other co-author was invited, and the study was reconceptualized as a qualitative one. We allowed the interviewees to express their ideas more in their own terms, even though we provided them with a list of potential questions (the Appendix) before the interview.

The original questionnaire contained 33 questions divided into four parts. The first dealt with the problems of the establishment of organization: how was the radio stations developed and what were the formal arrangements (owners, equity, licenses, cooperation with other radio stations in the Western Europe, etc.). The second part dealt with content and process of strategy development. The third set of questions related to the attributes of the organizations' identities. The fourth part dealt with competitors – which radio stations were considered competitors or non-competitors, how they were defined and why.

The second, qualitative phase of our study, was carried out as in-depth open-ended interviews, inspired by ethnographic methods (on ethnographic methods in organization studies see, e.g. Rosen, 2000; Yanow, 2000; Van Maanen, 1988). The interviews were performed with either

owners-managers or top managers in almost all radio stations. We conducted altogether 18 in-depth interviews with representatives for 15 radio stations during two years. This covers almost the entire organizational field (DiMaggio and Powell, 1991) of radio stations audible in Warsaw. Of the four, we have not spoken to, one radio (a Catholic nation-wide station) repeatedly rejected our request for interview, and three others belong to the public radio group, which was represented by the largest station in our study (the interviewee attempted to speak for all of the stations). The interviews lasted on the average 1.5 hour and were transcribed.

All of our interlocutors expressed a belief that there were important changes going on in the environment that provided us with a common plot for all of the stories we collected. The part of the study that the current paper is based on then went on to look for suitable protagonists of the strategic stories of the managers. We were interested to find out how the managers construct the heroes facing that plot, and how they picture the task that stands before them, i.e. victory in the face of environmental change.

Narratives of heroic quest

All of the managers we spoke to were keenly interested in successful competition; however, they told the story of it in different terms. First, the more mainstream market research notions were not necessarily the most popular. There are three consulting firms in Poland that continuously track the radio market and publish a complex battery of results, mainly in terms of market share in different target groups. All the managers of larger radio stations stressed that they were keenly interested in monthly results, but, at the same time, many of the managers were eager to state that these results were not vitally important. In some of these cases, their radio did not hold as much as 1 percent of the market share. But some of the large stations did that, too.

Even if the idea of competition was so central in the managers narratives, it seems to be a rather nameless dragon, and not other radio stations, existing out there in the neighbourhood. On a local and transparent market with 19 competitors and systematic market share rankings readily available, very few firms named their competitor. Only in three radio stations, managers defined their competitors in concrete terms. Most told us that they kept an eye on the rivals, in an informal way. The following quote reflects a rather typical response to our inquiry about competitors:

We don't have any competitors! Well, perhaps Radio Uranus[1] [second on the market in terms of numbers of listeners], certainly not Radio Neptune [third on the market], they're producing incompetent stuff (Radio Phobos).

The public radio was rejected as a competitor in all the commercial stations, and if any, only private radios are named. Another manager explained competition in the following way:

The local stations that count are Radio Mars, Radio Phobos and a new one – they stared in November 1997 – Radio Ganimede. But Radio Mars is not exactly our competitor because it wants to have a different audience. Radio Phobos changed their listeners recently. And with Radio Ganimede, we will see (Radio Deimos).

In this way, the respondent presented three major players but excluded them one by one from being rivals. The paradoxical role that the managers gave to competitors and competition can be the expression of their narrative sensemaking: competition is a major threatening force in the environment; however, the threat does not come from any specific other radio station. It is oneself that needs to be able to become a valiant rival, a hero able to defend the company from danger. A potent way of doing that is by stressing one's uniqueness. It was often defined against the background of what "others do,", i.e. effectively used in the narrative rivalry between key actors:

[In the environment there dominates] a simple, aggressive and dynamic music that is losing its appeal. It is boring (Radio Earth).

Radio Earth does not play any extreme heavy metal [as others do]. It is not a trash can (Radio Earth).

One of the managers stated that a radio station with the closest format to his own is not a competitor because: "we play for college people and they play for blue-collars – it is an intellectual difference" (Radio Moon). Other name one other radio, the apparently most similar, and then explain why it is much worse at doing the same things as the own radio. For example, it is "simplistic," or "appeals to those already deeply convinced," while the own radio is one for "seekers," is more "sophisticated," etc.

Most of the interviewed managers criticized – and thus narratively constructed as their worthy rival – a newly established radio station and widely successful in terms of a market share, as the newspaper rankings show. The radio station, Radio Ganimede, plays popular music, mainly Polish, from the 1970s and 1980s. A typical comment was as follows:

Radio Ganimede is so tightly formatted that it is not a radio – it is a product of computers (Radio Moon).

Another interlocutor said, after having listed Radio Ganimede as a competitor:

We are not interested in just playing old music like "Radio Ganimede" (Radio Mars).

The new radio was also construed as a more abstract force than a named rival. One manager stated that mainstream market studies were unreliable, and that they were carried out by the owners of Radio Ganimede.

All managers regarded the strengths of their radio stations as the most important arms at the disposal of the hero. It was especially visible in Catholic radio stations, marginal in terms of market share and revenues but strong in terms of unique qualities. Their managers stressed that they were a viable alternative to a loud, commercial radio stations, that they offered something unique and special in terms of lifestyle and values, and thus were really able to reach people. Public radio stations stressed their lack of aggressiveness and tradition:

We are a radio station that is not at the extremes – we are in a centre, where there most of the listeners are […], our major strength is a fact that we are so formal (Radio Earth).

Commercial stations emphasized their professionalism and good position on the market proving that their recipe is valid.

All managers strongly emphasized these aspects of their operations which offer something of a higher social value as the following quotations exemplify:

We want to defend young people (Radio Moon).

We are a radio station for people searching for meaning in their lives (Radio Jupiter).

We want to talk about the truth, in an objective way. Our ratio is a platform for an honest discussion about things that nobody else wants to talk about (Radio Callisto).

We are open, nice and helpful to the people (Radio Jupiter).

We offer a different attitude toward life in this market-oriented place (Radio Mars).

We promote ourselves as an honest radio, as a peaceful radio (Radio Io).

Some managers emphasized that what rational commentators regard as marginalization was part of their response to changes in the environment. They did not think in rationalistic terms, but rather in terms of art and creation. The small Radio Moon declared that its aim was to remain a radio of counterculture – and the counterculture is by definition on the margins of the market. Radio Io emphasized that was educating listeners in the virtues of modern jazz – a kind of music marginalized in the contemporary Polish media. The manager of Radio Mars, accounting for the radio in terms of market shares and ranking placings, emphasized, however, that the radio is more than figures, and that it preferred to see itself in marginal terms, even if it sometimes happened to acquire good mainstream ratings. The personalities of their disc jockeys and speakers were much more important:

We think that every speaker must have a personality and audience must recognize them. Radio Mars is not a music machine (Radio Mars).

Some of the managers told their radios' stories only in terms of the way they worked, their mission and deeper social calling, e.g. old Radio Mars was said to be non-conformist, defying conventions and thus serving people who did not belong to the faceless masses. Catholic stations mentioned that they were barely profitable, but that they were making do. What was most important was being able to reach out: "effective evangelization" of the common Pole and influencing people's attitudes toward the Church (Radio Callisto), get through to people who seek the meaning of life (Radio Jupiter).

However, some managers spoke the language of rationality, based on management textbooks. Radio Deimos claimed that their difference consisted of adaptation to market research results:

We play live music that must be easy to digest. We do not have any personalities, special offerings, cyclical broadcasts or concerts. We do not have even "top twenty". We are just different […]

The radio most extensively using market terminology is Radio Ganimede. Our interlocutors emphasized its specialized structure, the market scanning mechanisms systematically used, its promotion, the fact that they look upon what they do in the terms of market, etc. They were the only ones to actually speak in terms of competition, and they named their main competitors and presented their strategy in relationship to them. They stressed that they were "the radio of scientific methodology," thanks to which they did "exactly what the listener want[ed]." They told us how they hired a Western management consulting firm and how they followed their advice:

The Americans stressed all the time that no nonsense as experience and intuition [was relevant], but research, research, research (Radio Ganimede).

By "research", the managers meant market studies and format construction according to the results of the studies. They were proud of being the "pioneers" in Poland with this approach.

What we believe is a central conclusion deriving from these interviews is that even if the environmental changes are visualized pretty much in the same way by the interviewees, the story of the character responding to them is conceived of in different terms. We will now address these differences and present a typology of the key protagonists.

Archetypes of rivalry

The results of our research point to that our interviewees build perceptual models that define and limit their narratives of competition in the context of turbulent environmental change. The central role in their stories belonged to themselves and their firms, archetypically constructed as heroes of a certain kind, ready to defend and perhaps also attack the dark forces set to damage them and defeat them. We have found that the heroes can be grouped into three main archetypes: Athena, Apollo and Hermes (Table I). Athena was the Greek Goddess of War and Reason. She enjoyed patronizing heroes and was in favour of winners. Born out of the head of Zeus, the King of the Gods, she remained a virgin throughout the whole mythology, possibly because she was unwilling to submit to feelings. In her world, the only respectable and understandable element is that of the rational mind. To Athena, rivalry is similar to strategic warfare. The opponents use their reasoning abilities and try to think ahead of others. The most judicious and with the best grip on reality wins. Apollo was also a son of Zeus and the God of Art and Creativity. He was many sided and temperamental, capable to heal as well as to bring ill health. He was fully able to use reason but he chooses not to: the forms of expression worth the effort are to him not necessarily the clearest and most understandable. He was the patron of poetry and prophecy and in charge of the Delphi oracle, famous for its obscurity and ambiguity. To Apollo, rivalry is contest. The contestants use their talent and inspiration to produce works of art – and the best artist wins. Hermes was a god of many faces: patron of thieves, of trade, messenger of the gods, and holder of mysteries. It is in the capacity of messenger that we are here interested in this archetype, albeit with the understanding that Hermes is all but straightforward. Hermes was the

only one who had access to all of the domains. He carried ideas from one place to another, regardless of whether they were intended for mass usage or, as it happens, of they were hermetic. To Hermes, rivalry is about effectiveness. The message should be promptly conveyed: wits and fitness should be used to fulfil this goal as smoothly as possible. It should also be remembered that Hermes the messenger is also the patron of businessmen and traders. Winning to him means to deliver – and make do.

Each manager had their preferred archetype which they remained faithful to throughout the interviews. The archetypes provided them with a narrative template, without impoverishing the narrative or making it simplistic. They offered a plot, main characters, as well as a framework for interpreting the outside world, but not in an automatic way, characteristic of stereotypes. Their archetypical character manifested itself in the way these narratives had the power to move us and make us interested, in that they did not lose their suspense, even though the outcome was more or less known from the way the main character was shaped.

Each template was different but all were valid on their own terms. The Athenian narrative contained repeatedly key words derived from management textbooks, or imported from the world of business, such as: client, market, market share, competitor, profit, and management. The radio itself was accounted for as a product, one that is sold to clients. Athena, the Goddess of Rationality, fits well the predominantly calculating character that these stories constructed. The importance of winning in ways that were publicly acknowledged and measurable is another typically Athenian trait:

We follow a scientific methodology […] we offer exactly what the listener wants (Radio Ganimede).

The Apollonian narrative was based on terms related to (artistic and/or public) expression, such as: program, content, expression, culture, autonomy, listener, creation, and medium. The radios emphasized their direct contact with the listener, the openness to the listeners and the readiness to relate to those of the listeners who are interested in the type of creativity that is characteristic of the radio. Apollo is fully capable of a rational discourse, something that our Apollonian interlocutors showed also. He is, however, rather contemptuous of it and has a regard only for what he sees as higher art:

Our aim is to educate our listeners, […] make them enjoy modern jazz. Jazz is […] not something you often encounter in Polish media nowadays (Radio Io).

The Hermetic narratives stressed their higher aim, they contained words like mission, reaching – to the listener, presentation of (alternative) values and life-styles, and the radio was depicted as means of communication, and making listeners conscious of and/or sensitive to the radio's key values. Hermes is an ambivalent God, the messenger who is ready to go into the underworld in order to reach the recipient. He is at home among mortals and gods; he speaks their languages if necessary but does not forget to deliver the message:

We are a radio station for people searching for meaning in their lives. […] We want to reach them, they are waiting for us to reach them (Radio Jupiter).

All the managers agreed that a very turbulent change process was taking place and that competition was an important part of the new reality that this change was bringing to their firms. The archetypes helped them to position themselves and to react in a consistent way, without banalizing the response. The stories they told us show how central the characters constructed were in their stories of environmental change and their organizations' responses to it. They came before factors such as: competitors, the market, plans or ideas, and it was from them that the rest of the stories was derived. Furthermore, we believe that the consistency of the narratives makes it possible to reconstruct the stories of change and response to it in mythical terms. How strategic tales can be read as myths is, however, a topic for future research.

Another interesting aspect of our field material is in what way the changes of narratives were presented. We have marked "old" those narratives that were told by our interlocutors in retrospect, i.e. concerning the past archetypes of the radio. Thus, we see that three of the radios currently categorized as Athena-type organizations, that is, representing a rationalist response to rivalry, have been accounted for in terms of Apollonian characters. In two of the cases, the past stories are told with a noticeable nostalgia: those where the good old days. At Radio Phobos, the director liked the old creative format, and he feels that he had betrayed the old listeners. At Radio Uranus, the old radio was the work of the founder, a highly creative and professional person. After his death, the radio had to manage without him, abandoning his creative format and turning to the market for inspiration instead. In one case, at Radio Deimos, we were told a story of "maturation" of the radio: the founders, highly creative, "too intellectual," and eccentric, well known to the public but through their eccentricity and intellectualism inhibiting progress in the terms of market shares, had quit, and market ideas have triumphed. All of these radios have kept their names. One of the radios currently categorized as Athenian was described as having been Hermetic in the past. The story of the past radio, Old Radio Mars, was told with a certain reluctance and almost derogatory – it had a political mission in the past, and was an altogether different radio, in subtext: a worse radio. This radio has changed its name, keeping but the slightest reference to the past, one unknown to the most of the public. It was, in our reading, a story of conversion, almost of the religious kind, even though this radio had never been, and still is not, religious.

Concluding remarks

The responses to environmental change defined by the radio directors corresponded with the rivalry archetype more than with anything else they spoke of. Thus, Athenian radios are expected to grow in terms of market share and profitability, in some cases also in scope. These traits are defined as the measures of success. Apollonian radios are supposed to produce a more high-quality program; their future is accounted in terms of creative ideas and contents. Hermetic radios are prepared for the spreading of the "truth" to more and more people, capturing the attention of new converts.

The strategist in our material is not so much chess player but rather a storyteller, using archetypes to show how the organization should respond to changes in the environment. The "market" is used as part of the Athenian story, thus unnecessary for use of those who identify with Apollonian or Hermetic archetypes. Even for the Athenian radios, it is not seen as a battle

ground, or even in the sense of the idea of "free market," with related ideas such as freedom of speech, or free entrepreneurship.

*Table I**Archetypes of rivalry of different Polish radio stations*

Notes

1. All original names of the radio stations have been replaced by pseudonyms.

References

Begg, D., Fisher, S., Dornbusch, R. (1995), *Ekonomia (Economics)*, PWE, Warszawa, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Bergen, M., Peteraf, M.A. (2002), "Competitor identification and competitor analysis: a broad-based managerial approach", *Managerial and Decision Economics*, Vol. 23 No.405, pp.157-69.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Boyd, B., Fulk, J. (1996), "Executive scanning and perceived uncertainty: a multidimensional model", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 22 No.1, pp.1-21.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

(1992), in Brunsson, N., Hägg, I. (Eds),*Marknadens Makt*, SNS, Stockholm, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Czarniawska, B. (2004), *Narratives in Social Science Research*, Sage, London, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Dane, E., Pratt, M.G. (2007), "Exploring intuition and its role in managerial decision making", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 32 No.1, pp.33-54.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Desmond, N.G., Westgren, R., Sonka, S. (2009), "Competitive blind spots in an institutional field", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 30 No.4, pp.349-69.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

DiMaggio, P.J., Powell, W.W. (1991), "Introduction", in Walter, W., Powell, W.W. and DiMaggio, P.J. (Eds), "The new institutionalism and collective rationality in organizational fields", American Sociological Review, Vol. 48 No. 2, pp. 147-160, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Elenkov, D.S. (1997), "Strategic uncertainty and environmental scanning: the case for institutional influences on scanning behavior", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 18 No.4, pp.287-302.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Gabriel, Y. (2004), "Narratives, stories and texts", in Grant, D., Hardy, C., Oswick, C., Putnam, L. (Eds),*The Sage Handbook of Organizational Discourse*, Sage, London, pp.61-78.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Jung, C.G. (1968), "The archetypes and the collective unconscious", in Read, H. (Eds),*The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, Vol. 9.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

(2002), in Kelemen, M., Kostera, M. (Eds),*Managing the Transition: Critical Management Research in Eastern Europe*, Palgrave Macmillan, London, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Kostera, M. (2007), "Archetypes", in Clegg, S., Bailey, J.R. (Eds),*International Encyclopedia of Organization Studies*, Sage, London, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Kostera, M. (2008), "Open sesame or pandora's box? Concluding remarks on organizing, archetypes and the power of mythmaking", in Kostera, M. (Eds),*Mythical Inspirations for Organizational Realities*, Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp.163-9.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Lynch, R. (2003), *Corporate Strategy*, Pearson, Harlow, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Obloj, K., Pratt, M.G. (2005), "Happy kids and mature losers: differentiating the dominant logics of successful and unsuccessful firms in emerging markets", in Bettis, R. (Eds),*Strategy in Transition*, Blackwell, Oxford, pp.81-104.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Obloj, K., Thomas, H. (1996), "Breaking away from the past: strategies of successful Polish firms", *European Management Journal*, Vol. 14 pp.467-76.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Ohmae, K. (1983), *The Mind of Strategist*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Pffefer, J., Salancik, G.R. (1978), *The External Control of Organizations*, Harper & Row, New York, NY, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Porac, J.F., Thomas, H. (1990), "Taxonomic mental models in competitor definition", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 15 No.2, pp.224-40.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Porac, J.F., Wilson, F., Paton, D., Kanfer, A. (1995), "Rivalry and the industry model of Scottish knitwear producers", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 40 No.2, pp.203-27.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Porter, M. (1980), *Competitive Strategy*, The Free Press, London, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Porter, M. (1996), "What is strategy", *Harvard Business Review*, No.November-December, pp.61-78.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Rosen, M. (2000), *Turning Words, Spinning Worlds: Chapters in Organizational Ethnography*, Routledge, London, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Sandelands, L., Drazin, R. (1989), "On the language of organization theory", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 10 No.4, pp.457-77.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Smircich, L., Stubbart, C. (1985), "Strategic management in an enacted world", *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 10 No.4, pp.724-36.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Subramanian, R., Ishak, S.T. (1988), "Competitor analysis practices of US companies: an empirical investigation", *Management International Review*, Vol. 38 No.1, pp.7-23.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Sun Tsu (1994), *The Art of War*, Barnes and Noble, New York, NY, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Van Maanen, J. (1988), *Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Walsh, J.P. (1995), "Managerial and organizational cognition: notes from a trip down memory lane", *Organization Science*, Vol. 6 No.3, pp.280-320.

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Weick, K.E. (1969/1979), *The Social Psychology of Organizing*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Weick, K.E. (1995), *Sensemaking in Organizations*, Sage, London, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Yanow, D. (2000), *Conducting Interpretive Policy Analysis*, Sage, London, .

[Manual request] [Infotrieve]

Appendix. Questionnaire

1. Who founded the radio and what were the aims of the founder?

2. When did the radio get the concession to operate?

3. What is the legal status of the radio, how did ownership change, how much do the owners influence the radio?

4. Which was the original financial standing?

5. Current financial resources, turnover and profits.

6. What were the technical assets in the beginning, and what are they now?

7. What is the radio's range? Geographically? Hours?

8. What was the human resource policy?

9. Does the radio have specialized units, such as marketing, advertising?

10. How were the original target listeners defined? Were there defined using market studies? Are market studies used for this purpose today?

11. How do you learn about the listeners' opinions?

12. Do you do market research yourselves or outsource it?

13. How do you utilize the results of market research?

14. Does the results of these research correspond to intuitive expectations?

15. How do you want to be perceived by the listeners?

16. How do you perceive yourselves?

17. How do the listeners perceive you?

18. What has been stable and what has change in the radio operations over time?

19. Did the character of the radio get defined? In what way?

20. Was the radio different before? In what way?

21. What dominated in the program? How did it change over the years?

22. Did new elements of the program appear?

23. What are the most stable elements of the radio: names, the tempo, tradition, the program, the format of ads, etc.?

24. Who is most important for the radio?

25. Do you have political preferences?

26. Who is your competitor? How, and in what way, did it change? How do you perceive your competitor?

27. Who is not your competitor? How, in what way, did it change?

28. Please list your competitors and non-competitors.

29. What actions do you take considering the competition?

30. How do you promote yourselves?

31. Whose services do you use/hire for promotion?

32. How do you compete for listener and advertisers?

33. Main turning points in the radio's history and their sources.

Corresponding author

Monika Kostera can be contacted at: monika@kostera.pl