ABSTRACT

There are several forms of networking that can be choice for the collaboration between the tourism enterprises – formal, non-formal, public-private, private-private, public-public, horizontal-vertical and other ways each enterprise or the group of enterprises can choose. Within the paper author will include short theoretical background of networking as such as well as application of networking within the service sector more specifically emphasizing networking within the tourism industry. Author of the paper has conducted the study of 80 Latvian tourism enterprises during September - November 2004 that enables to draw conclusions regarding different ways of networking that are used by the tourism enterprises. Validation of findings is based on the calculations with SPSS software. Conclusions and proposals of the paper will be dedicated to each specific sector of the tourism industry in Latvia tacking into account the size of the company, operating duration and its location as well as proposals for networking activities in tourism industry in general which could be applied to other tourism destinations.

INTRODUCTION

Tourism industry in the way we do understand it now, in Latvia has quite short history – a bit more than a decade after the gain of independence, but very rich with interesting phases of the development. The beginning of 90s was very lucrative for the new tourism enterprises – there was big interest in the new country and the local currency exchange rate was favourable for the incoming tourists. With every year the number of the hotels, restaurants, transportation, attractions, and travel agencies increased and so increased the level of competition. It was the beginning of the period of “struggle” between the companies of each tourism sector. In order to create “new demand” they needed to attract tourists that have not yet discovered Latvia, but it was too costly for each separate tourism enterprise and the state dedicated budget for the tourism board was extremely low – more as a symbolic amount of money, so the enterprises carried the mode of highly rival relations that where rich of activities to “steal” the clients from their competitors with variety of fair and not so fair instruments. Extremely high level of competition and price wars alone can not bring advantages neither for the each separate tourism enterprise, nor tourism industry in general. At the beginning it allows to reduce prices and level the market, but in a longer run it creates unhealthy conditions for the tourism enterprises. So
quite logically tendency of collaboration was that needed to take place within the quite new industry with 99% of small and medium size enterprises as it is case for tourism industry of Latvia. Networking allows development of tourism enterprises not only in the capital of Latvia – metropolis of Baltic Republics - Riga, but also in the small towns and villages in countryside.

CONCEPTS OF COOPERATION AND NETWORKING

Cooperation as a very interesting field of research sets some difficulties – the term is so widely used and has omnipresence in all the fields of human and not only human activities. You can find different forms of cooperation in people relations, as well as in relations between different countries. In this paper author will set the borders for cooperation analyses to inter-firm cooperation. From the point of enterprises, cooperation occurs when two or more parties (enterprises) have objectives which are mutually dependent).

There is a list of more or less close synonyms for the word cooperation – like cooperation networks, collaboration, partnerships and others. Here in the article they will be used as close terms that encompass long term relationships between enterprises and organisations. there relationships with customers, suppliers and competitors are resulting in a variety of new organisational forms, called networks and whole process as a networking.

Network describes a number, usually a large number, of enterprises that are connected. Cooperation networks are based on social relations, trust and sharing of complimentary resources. Network is the sum of the interrelationships and the complementary resources that are brought into the network giving it competitive power.

In business cooperation networks inter-firm relationships display following characteristics:
- at least three parties must have commercial relationship,
- partners have some degree of independence,
- management of the network is organised according to the strategic interests of the partners
- enterprise or organisation can be part of more that one network at the same time.

FORMS OF COOPERATION NETWORKS

The cooperation networks can have various forms and they can be structured by different factors:
- formal or in formal,
- horizontal or vertical,
- private, public,
- centralised or de-centralised, and others.

One criterion for division is level of formalization - formal and non-formal or informal cooperation networks. Examples for formal cooperation are - dyadic networks, like ownership, interlocks, formal exchanges, subcontracting, reciprocity, - joint activities in production, sourcing, R&D, promotion, consortia, - investment in third parties, like joint ventures, trade associations.

Informal cooperation networks can include informal transfer of information, social norms and even of people.

Other factors for the cooperation network splitting could be horizontal and vertical networks. Horizontal cooperation networks are between the enterprises that are in the same business field, on the contrary vertical cooperation networks join enterprises that operate in different business fields. Cooperation between different types of sectors has led to development of concepts that are used even in every-day speech, such as public-private partnerships, private-private cooperation, sometimes the academic partnerships are marked out separately.

---
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The structure of the cooperation and the distribution of the power within the network appoints two extremes for networks – centralised cooperation networks or decentralised networks.

SPECIFICS OF COOPERATION IN TOURISM INDUSTRY

Service industry cooperation networking examples mainly include telecommunications, air transportation, computer services, retailing, marketing and management research and consultancy, and financial services. Even though cooperation networks are more analysed in production industries; there are several specifics from the point of view of cooperation networks in tourism as a service sector industry.

Tourism industry is considered as a very heterogeneous sector, it encompasses such diverse sections as accommodation, travel agencies, catering, tourism transportation, tourism information and other sectors. Even WTO highlights that what is surprising is that these cooperation partnerships are quite actively forming in a sector that has traditionally been viewed as fragmented industry\(^6\). Canadian Tourism Commission is listing following types of cooperation partnerships between tourism enterprises – consortium, joint-venture, strategic alliances, cooperative marketing, value-chain relationships, organization networks, outsourcing\(^7\).

Following specifics of tourism product sets additional importance of cooperation networks in this industry. Such main specific qualities of the tourism product as its intangibility, impossibility for exact examination and inconsistency sets to the customer additional need for certainty and necessity for grounded trust. Formation of tourism enterprise cooperation networks gives such possibility to secure quality of the products that are offered by the partners. It can serve as additional marketing tool and guarantee for services offered within the network.

Many tourism products have fixed capacity and overbooking is a common practice that is used not only by accommodation sectors enterprises. Incorporation in networks can facilitate common information system exchange for the partners involved and handling for overbooking.

There some specific characteristics of tourism industry that influences all these forms of cooperation setting some singularities.

In tourism industry it is not so clear vertical cooperation as for other economic areas (the very traditional example – automobile industry), potential tourist has several possibilities how to purchase tourism services – to be self-dependent and to contact suppliers by himself directly; or other extreme – to go to the tourism intermediates, such as travel agencies, as by a whole tourism package with all necessary services included. By all means there are many ways for the tourism product distribution process and purchasing possibilities that have no strict system tourism product development as it is for example for automobile as a product.

COOPERATION BETWEEN LATVIAN TOURISM ENTERPRISES

After a very uncooperative time period in the beginning of 90s, when tourism enterprises where more just purely competing and fighting, nowadays tourism enterprises in Latvia are quite active cooperators. After independence cooperation was based on vertical scale and it was more as an inevitable necessity, but year by year number of associations and different groups of partners started to raise.

Even though that cooperation level is not the only influencing factor of tourism industry development, the period of non-cooperative enterprise strategies as you can see in Figure Nb.1, is characterised by decline or stagnation of number of foreign travellers.

Figure 1. Dynamics of incoming and outgoing travellers in Latvia 1993-2003.\(^8\)

---

\(^7\) WTO “Co-operation and Partnerships in Tourism: A Global Perspective”, p.2.
\(^8\) „Tourism in Latvia”, Statistical newsletters, Latvian Central Statistical Office, Riga 1997-2004
Further in the paper author will analyse more in details cooperation within the tourism industry of Latvia, first of all describing survey and tourism enterprises that were included in the study. There was a list of different questions – direct and indirect - about cooperation modes that where asked to tourism enterprises on base of direct interviews with enterprise representatives. In general there are two types of tourism enterprises – enterprises that are directly connected with tourism industry and those that are indirectly included in the tourism industry, but still are considered as a part of it. Therefore there is a list of different enterprises that needs to be analysed - travel agencies, hotels, guest houses, tourism transportation companies, tourism information centres, museums, palaces, restaurants and others. As it is possible to see in Figure 2, two main tourism sectors that are surveyed are travel agencies and hotels (incl. other accommodation establishments).

Figure 2. Surveyed Latvian tourism enterprises divided by tourism sector.

---

*Survey has been conducted by the author of the paper in October-December 2004.*
From the eighty surveyed Latvian tourism enterprises only two were indicating that had no forms of cooperation with other tourism enterprises – one was so called hotel from “old times” in small town and other was catering establishment. In this way the cooperation level between the tourism enterprises is 97.5%.

Table 1. Cooperation of Latvian tourism enterprises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following up the characterisation of the tourism enterprises included in the survey, we can conclude that the variation of the age of company is 1-50 years of operation, but the average (mean) is about 8 years of operation.

As you can see in Figure 3 and more closer in details in the Appendix 1 and 2 most of enterprises are so called after the independence companies, only few – palace and couple of hotels where from the soviet times establishments.

Most of surveyed enterprises where SMEs as it is the characteristic of Latvian tourism industry with the high level – 99% of SMEs from the total number of tourism enterprises, biggest part still micro and small firms (see Figure 4 and Appendix 3). Only 2 transportation companies where large establishments with over than 250 employees.

Most of the tourism enterprises that where included in the survey where centrally located in the cities of Latvia – Riga, Liepaja, Ventspils, Jelgava, Valmiera, Cesis Sigulda, Jurmala and others. Only few where outside of the city - in countryside (Table 4).

Figure 4. Distribution of the size of the surveyed tourism enterprises.
Table 2. Location of the surveyed tourism enterprise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percent</th>
<th>valid percent</th>
<th>cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>center of the city</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>81,3</td>
<td>81,3</td>
<td>81,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city, outside of the center</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13,8</td>
<td>13,8</td>
<td>95,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside of the city</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following different characteristics of enterprises where correlated with modes of cooperation, but no strong correlation was found (see Appendix 4-7), but there are several connections and regularities that will be analysed in the paper.

The aim of this research was to identify the level and scope of cooperation, therefore authors included in the survey different direct and indirect question about cooperation. In order to make the research more valid, tourism enterprises needed not just simply identify the types of enterprises they cooperate with, but also write names of the partners (at least one) in each field of cooperation.

First of all analysing the range of cooperation author summed up all the different sectors of cooperation. Most of the tourism companies have cooperation partners in 3-4 different tourism sectors including horizontal as well as vertical forms of cooperation.

Table 3. Cooperation sectors together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percent</th>
<th>valid percent</th>
<th>cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none cooperation sector</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 cooperation sector</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11,3</td>
<td>11,3</td>
<td>13,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 cooperation sectors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13,8</td>
<td>13,8</td>
<td>27,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 cooperation sectors</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21,3</td>
<td>21,3</td>
<td>48,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 cooperation sectors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25,0</td>
<td>25,0</td>
<td>73,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 cooperation sectors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13,8</td>
<td>13,8</td>
<td>87,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 cooperation sectors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12,5</td>
<td>12,5</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be more accurate average (mean) of cooperation sectors is 3,46.
Table 4. Statistics and frequencies of cooperation sectors together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Mean</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>2.556</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a clear identification of the number of the partners divided by each tourism sector separately in the Figure 5. The highest possible numbers of cooperation sectors have tourism intermediates - travel agencies, as well as accommodation establishments and tourism information centers.

Figure 5. Number of the Cooperation sectors divided by the tourism enterprise field.

Generality of surveyed companies, 90%, have both types of cooperation – vertical and horizontal in this way cooperating both with similar companies of the field of activity as well as with other sectors. Only 5% from the surveyed companies have only horizontal cooperation in the same way the rest – 5% have only vertical cooperation disclaiming cooperation with competitors.

After summarising all the responses from the different tourism establishments author concludes that the most common cooperation partners are travel intermediates – travel agencies – 56 out of 80 enterprises have cooperation with them. Tourism transportation companies, accommodation establishments, tourism information centers are quite often mentioned as a cooperation partners, but the least active in cooperation with tourism enterprises are the catering establishments.

Table 5. Group cooperation multiple responses sets
In order to see the tendencies in each separate tourism sector author will continue with more specific and detailed analyses of cooperation activities for each type – accommodation establishments, travel agencies, catering establishments, tourism transportation companies tourism information centers and others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperation label</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Pct of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cooperation with accommodation sector</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperation with travel intermediates sector</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperation with catering sector</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperation with tourism transportation sector</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperation with tourism information sector</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperation with other tourism sector</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>360,3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Multiple response set cross-tabulation (number and percents are based on responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperation label</th>
<th>Coop with accommodation sector</th>
<th>Coop with travel agency sector</th>
<th>Coop with catering sector</th>
<th>Coop with tourism transportation sector</th>
<th>Coop with tourism information sector</th>
<th>Coop with other tourism sectors</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>13 68,4%</td>
<td>16 84,2%</td>
<td>7 36,8%</td>
<td>11 57,9%</td>
<td>14 73,7%</td>
<td>9 47,4%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel agency</td>
<td>28 87,5%</td>
<td>30 93,8%</td>
<td>14 43,8%</td>
<td>32 100,0%</td>
<td>20 62,5%</td>
<td>12 37,5%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>1 14,3%</td>
<td>2 28,6%</td>
<td>3 42,9%</td>
<td>2 28,6%</td>
<td>1 14,3%</td>
<td>5 71,4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism transport</td>
<td>2 40,0%</td>
<td>4 80,0%</td>
<td>1 20,0%</td>
<td>5 100,0%</td>
<td>1 20,0%</td>
<td>1 20,0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism information</td>
<td>4 100,0%</td>
<td>3 75,0%</td>
<td>3 75,0%</td>
<td>4 100,0%</td>
<td>3 75,0%</td>
<td>3 75,0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other tourism sectors</td>
<td>2 18,2%</td>
<td>5 45,5%</td>
<td>3 27,3%</td>
<td>1 9,1%</td>
<td>6 54,5%</td>
<td>9 81,8%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64,1</td>
<td>76,9</td>
<td>39,7</td>
<td>70,5</td>
<td>57,7</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For accommodation sector most frequent cooperation partner – for more then 4/5 from respondents - are travel agencies that provide hotels and guest houses with extra customers. Obvious that intermediates will take their commission but at the same time they build an international information channel even for a small hotel in countryside. Accommodation sector is quite active in horizontal cooperation with other establishments of this field, 70% fro all hotels are cooperation with each other either taking part in such formal networks as associations (Hotel and restaurant association, Country Holidays) or cooperating on informal bases between similar hotels for example sending the clients to partner in case of overbooking. Hotels are not too cooperative with catering sector (as there is a restaurant in the most of the hotels) as well as with attractions. Normally there is possibility to obtain information at the hotel, but most of the surveyed accommodation establishments have no closer cooperation.
All surveyed travel agencies cooperate with tourism transportation companies, providing in this way their customers with airline tickets, bus trips, car hire, and journey by the ferry or cruise, or rail; and 88% of all these tourism intermediates cooperate with accommodation establishments. It is also possible to cooperate with tour operators and sell the tour packages without direct contact with different accommodations. Travel agencies are quite passive in cooperation with catering establishments.

Even though catering sector establishments where not so extensively surveyed as the two abovementioned main tourism sectors, survey shows that catering establishments are not so active co-operators with other tourism companies. In the same way they are not so active in horizontal cooperation – less than half are of catering establishments cooperate with similar enterprises.

Unlike catering establishments, transportation sector companies have gained use from horizontal cooperation reaching hundred percent level by having partnerships with similar companies or taking part in transportation associations. Transportation sector establishments though few one in survey clearly show the tendency that are not too active co-operators with tourism information centres and catering establishments.

All surveyed tourism information centers cooperate with accommodation establishments providing to the tourists possibility to book accommodation on the spot. Enough active partnership tourism information centers have with transportation companies (at least they see transportation companies are co-operators), different entertainment establishments, attractions, museums et cetera. Even though there is association for tourism information centers, they are not too active for horizontal cooperation and cooperation with such tourism intermediates are travel agencies.

**MAIN CONCLUSIONS**

Finishing the paper author will gather all the most important ideas and conclusions.
In the new century cooperation has a new level of importance; it is a method that helps to increase the level of the enterprise competitiveness. Accordingly the enterprises need to assess the necessity for the cooperation, cooperation modes, possible benefits as well as every cooperation network or enterprise involved.

Summarising the tourism enterprise investigation authors will make a list of main conclusions regarding tourism enterprise cooperation.

First of all it is possible to conclude that tourism enterprises have high level of cooperation – 97.5%. The range of different tourism partners is amid 3 - 4 out of 6 possible, indicating clear characteristic of wide range of different partners in tourism industry. Mainly surveyed enterprises cooperate both on horizontal as well as vertical level.

The most common cooperation partner for all the tourism enterprises are travel intermediates. Tourism transportation companies, accommodation establishments, tourism information centers are quite often mentioned as a cooperation partners, but the least active in cooperation with tourism enterprises are the catering establishments.

In order to increase the number of sales partner, accommodation establishments do cooperate with tourism intermediates, but at the same time have discovered benefits from horizontal partnerships.

Logically that travel agencies need to cooperate with different types of tourism enterprises especially in such small country as Latvia.

Despite the fact that catering establishments offer services to individual tourists as well as tourist groups, they are the least cooperative category from all surveyed enterprises in Latvia.

Few transportation companies that where included in survey indicate clear tendency of strong horizontal cooperation.
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**APPENDIXES**

Appendix 1. Variation of the age of operation of the surveyed enterprise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12,5</td>
<td>12,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>3,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7,5</td>
<td>7,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15,0</td>
<td>15,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8,8</td>
<td>8,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>3,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16,3</td>
<td>16,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,3</td>
<td>6,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>5,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 2. Statistical characteristics of the years of operation of surveyed tourism enterprises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8,06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Mean</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>6,00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>7,671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>58,844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 3. Frequencies of the size of the surveyed tourism enterprise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>micro</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43,8</td>
<td>43,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>small</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45,0</td>
<td>45,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8,8</td>
<td>8,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>large</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4. Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>type of tourism sector</th>
<th>location of the tourism enterprise</th>
<th>size of the enterprise</th>
<th>cooperation sectors together - number</th>
<th>years of operation of tourism enterprise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>type of tourism sector</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.296</td>
<td>0.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>location of the tourism enterprise</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>-0.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>size of the enterprise</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperation sectors together - number</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.296</td>
<td>-0.294</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years of operation of tourism enterprise</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

### Appendix 5. Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>type of tourism sector</th>
<th>information in the internet portals</th>
<th>marketing cooperation</th>
<th>member of alliances</th>
<th>member of associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>type of tourism sector</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information in the internet portals</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marketing cooperation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>member of alliances</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>member of associations</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

### Appendix 6. Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type of tourism sector</th>
<th>cooperation with accommodation sector</th>
<th>cooperation with travel intermediates sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

### Appendix 7. Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type of tourism sector</th>
<th>cooperation with catering sector</th>
<th>cooperation with tourism transportation sector</th>
<th>cooperation with tourism information sector</th>
<th>cooperation with other tourism sectors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type of tourism sector</th>
<th>cooperation with tourism transportation sector</th>
<th>cooperation with tourism information sector</th>
<th>cooperation with other tourism sectors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type of tourism sector</th>
<th>cooperation with tourism information sector</th>
<th>cooperation with other tourism sectors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type of tourism sector</th>
<th>cooperation with other tourism sectors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).