Hetesi, E. – Kürtösi, Zs. (eds) 2011: The diversity of research at the Szeged Institute of Business Studies. JATEPress, Szeged, pp. 97–113.

Different motivations in the network co-operations of the small and medium enterprises

Szabolcs Imreh

It is well known that both small and medium-sized enterprises play significant roles in economic development. One of the main problems of these types of businesses stems from their size, which often causes serious difficulties like relatively high transaction costs and the inability to exploit the economies of scale. Possible ways to approach these challenges are in the different co-operation networks.

In recent research, the motivations that lead to networking are reviewed. There are several explanatory causes why certain enterprises seek the opportunity to cooperate with others. Generally, the main objective of the co-operation is to reach such benefits that can not be independently achieved, or ideally to achieve collective efficiency. The wide-ranging literature of the topic has been systematized to point out those factors that are most commonly mentioned as the benefits of co-operations. In most cases, if these causes arise as explanatory factors of co-operation, it can be assumed that they determine the peculiarities of networks.

The last part of the paper presents the results of two empirical surveys that were conducted in Szeged and its sub-region. They demonstrate the nature and the expected benefits of co-operations.

Keywords: networking, small and medium-sized enterprises, co-operation, motivations

1. Introduction

In today's economy, various networks, clusters and co-operations appear more frequently. In the "vast forest" of different co-operations, it is harder to find their method for both the practitioners and the theoretical experts. According to the simplest approach, the enterprise network can be defined as the system of relationships between companies (Kocsis 2000). The co-operation formed between enterprises can be categorized by the strength of the mutual trust and dependence, and by the impact on the competitiveness; separating several co-operation forms from the quite loose "alliance form" to the common production networks based on close relationships (Malecki 1997, p. 181.). In the real economic life, of course, there may be co-operations that show certain features of every characteristic.

Moreover, it is important to highlight that the network co-operations between enterprises in certain cases can be considered exactly as the antecedents of clustering. It has been observed that very successful clusters often develop on the basis of an operating network. According to the literature classification the network-based clusters form a distinct group (Imreh–Lengyel 2002).[4]

After the brief conceptual delimitation, the more detailed examination of the network relationships is touched upon. However, it has to be noted that a significant proportion of the subsequent findings applies to almost all the co-operation forms to a certain extent. This study focuses on the network-type co-operations because the current economic development level of Szeged and its surrounding area creates an opportunity, especially for such co-operations. The networks can be classified in many ways, but both the number and the organizing principle of the various classifications in literature are practically impossible to survey. In the literature analysis, thoughts are briefly synthesised related to the categorising of network motivations exclusively.

2. Basic types of network based on motivations

There are many explanations why certain enterprises seek the co-operation opportunities with other partners. It is a generalised statement that the main objective of enterprise co-operation is to attain benefits that cannot be achieved by individual efforts (Brito 2001), and more expressively, to attain some kind of collective efficiency (Schmitz 1995). This sphere of thought also includes the realization that in the network co-operation, the enterprises also can use such resources to reach their aims that they do not own individually (Szerb 2003). A similar definition of the enterprise network is that, in fact, it is the entirety of relationships in which the entrepreneur is involved in and which provides him/her with important resources (Drakopoulou et al 2002).

Clearly, the motivations are extremely significant in the creation of networks and in the development of their form and operating characteristic. From the divergent written background, attempts were made to take out the factors which are mentioned the most frequently, such as the advantages for the partners in the co-operation. The wording used in this case was made on the basis of the most often mentioned different motivations, since it is assumed that these causes come up most frequently as the motives of co-operation. The classification is quite similar to the

[4] We hope that the networks of innovative small and medium enterprises organized around the University of Szeged will belong to exactly to this circle, which can be the forerunners of the subsequently developing clusters.

wording formulated by the DG Enterprise (DG ENTR 2004), with the modification that the advantages of decreasing the transaction and the transformation costs – as motivations – are managed in one group. Based on the several classifications in the written research, the following five, substantially different motivations can be separated which can stimulate small and medium enterprises to cooperate (own wording based on DG ENTR 2004, Johannisson 1997, Lechner–Dowling 2003, ADAPT 2001, OECD 2004):

- access to sources, loosening resource-barriers,
- gaining cost advantages,
- better access to the market,
- increasing "being accepted", desire for recognition, and
- Acquiring some kind of new knowledge and understanding.

In addition, of course, there can be many other reasons for the co-operation of enterprises; however, these reasons for co-operation appear in case of almost all the co-operations with certain significance. In the course of the examination, the categories were interpreted in the widest sense; however, we focused on the most important characteristics in the theoretical overview. A more frequent cause, for example, is the "networking as the source of growth", that is, the enterprises cooperate in the interest of their development (Lechner–Dowling 2003). It is basically not a special reason for networking, but one of the prime motivators of all profit-oriented activities. It is due to the desire for development, exactly, why the enterprises want to make use of the above mentioned possibilities; since all the activities, from loosening the resource-barriers to acquiring new knowledge, serve the development, and at least the survival, of the company.

The changing importance of motivations is extremely interesting. In the past, the so-called "hard" factors (the first three mentioned above) were given greater emphasis amongst the reasons for networking. By contrast, in the past few years, the "soft" advantages (which can be hardly or not at all quantified), like "the sense of belonging and the spread of knowledge in some way", have been increasingly appreciated. Of course, it is largely dependent on any given small and medium enterprise and the unique characteristics of the network that specified significance can be attached to each motivation.

2.1. Loosening the barriers

Several studies indicate that the small and medium enterprises meet various barriers in almost all cases during their development. The development of networking is often aimed at breaking down the resource barriers. The networks based on "resource-links" are separated as a distinct type in the literature as well (Ford 2003). These barriers are interpreted in various ways, thus it can often be difficult to

determine what exactly the obstructive factor is the focus of the examination. In the present study, the examination is restricted to reviewing three fundamental "resource-types" which are essential for running successful enterprises. In the classification, these basic resource types in theoretical economics were because they are considered to be the bases of the entire business activity:

- Breaking down the barriers of "infrastructural character" may be one of the movers of the networking of small and medium enterprises.[5]
- One of the most serious problems in the life of small firms is overcoming financing problems, and obtaining especially the sources.[6]
- Finally, the so-called human-factors may be barriers in many cases in the operation of enterprises.[7]

In the national written research, it is an often mentioned factor, and it is outlined in the documents of great significance, that one of the most important objectives of co-operations is breaking down such barriers through sharing available resources (DG ENTR 2004, ADAPT 2001). Often, the fundamental problem is that the small and medium enterprises are not able to acquire the necessary capacities, and if they do manage to obtain them, they mostly cannot exploit them. (It is a general economic statement that the enterprises aim to make the best use of their capacities in any case; the unused capital means a very serious competitive disadvantage). The common use of capacities provides a good solution to both of these problems, because it is able to remedy such disadvantages of firms in both cases. Besides the regular forms of common capacity use (enterprises of similar size and strength use some kind of machine or equipment jointly), extremely interesting solutions have developed as the consequences of market processes. For example, an interesting form, a solution worked out by Furnitrio, is where a larger (integrator) enterprise provides the capital goods necessary for the operation of the smallest firms (Varamäki–Pihkala 1997).

Finally, human factors are included which are extremely important for co-operations. It is also a frequently claimed explanation that one of the greatest barriers of the more productive and more efficient operation of small and medium enterprises is the entrepreneur him/herself. He/she often makes inappropriate

[5] In the research paper, the term "capital" is deliberately avoided since – as a consequence of inaccurate use – it can often lead to misunderstanding. The goal is to separate it clearly from the financing issues.

[6] The issues related to financing significantly go beyond the frame of the study, thus they are not discussed

[7] The human factors are interpreted here in a slightly different way compared to that of the theoretical economics, all the (human) factors are listed here from the professional knowledge to entrepreneurial skills.

decisions, does not have sufficient information about the market challenges, and lacks the necessary experience. Within the co-operations, especially with the help of informal networks, this disadvantage can be moderated. The small enterprise can benefit from the relationship capital existing within the network in several cases. It may help with the identification of business opportunities (Hills et al 1997, Singh et al 1999), and it can often be significant in supplementing the missing skills and capacities (Johannisson 1997). It is particularly important in the early stages of the company's life (Johannisson et al 2001), and there is an increasingly developed literature on the importance of the social networks in acquiring the necessary skills to start an enterprise (Hansen 2000).

2.2. Gaining cost advantages

Every enterprise operating in market circumstances is exposed to the competition. Therefore, it is difficult to imagine a situation in which reducing the costs would not be part of the business strategy. This finding is particularly true to the small and medium enterprise sector, since, for reasons of economies of scale, it is disadvantaged in comparison with the corporate sector. Consequently, it has to pay increased attention to minimizing the costs. The network co-operations implemented in appropriate forms are especially suitable to decrease costs (DG ENTR 2004). Within the reduction of the costs, it is worth separating the moderation of the transactional and the transformational costs, although there is no doubt that the co-operations are suitable for decreasing (saving) both kinds of costs (Mundim et al 2000).

In the life of the small and medium enterprises, the transactional costs are crucial (Kállay–Imreh 2004). These costs can be reduced during the co-operations, this is why, amongst other things, the economics of transactional costs have an important role in the theoretical establishment of the network co-operations (Varamäki 1996). With the help of the co-operations, these necessary costs can be significantly decreased (DG ENTR 2004). The reduction of the transformational costs is also essential for the small and medium enterprises. The network co-operation here is also an "outbreak point", since it provides for the possibility of flexible specialization where everyone can contribute to the activity of the co-operation with the suitable core competence (Salmi et al 2001). This flexible specialization usually reduces the participants' costs because everyone does what they are the "strongest" in. However, it is at least just as important to note the fact that the suitable specialization can also help the cooperating partners to produce products and services of a higher quality. In this sense, it is not only suitable to gain cost advantages, but also there is a substantive competitive factor in networking through quality.

2.3. "Better access" to the market

The "better access" to the market motivation factor is the most complex and the most difficult to define in a precise way. Therefore, instead of specific limitation, the goal is to define the concept with the most important content elements. As a result, all the advantages that make the access to the market and/or remaining on the market easier may fall into this category; from the marketing co-operations to the higher added value that can be created jointly. The most important realizable advantages can be understood through different ways.

As a supplier, an enterprise faces demand that it would not meet otherwise. In this case, the coordination of the access to external markets is often implemented through the integrator firm (Gereffi 1999). The cooperating firms can exert more significant market power both on the demand and the supply side, that is, due to the co-operation, they can complete the purchases under such conditions and reach such markets which they could not attain on their own. In simpler terms, the market opportunities of the firms increase during the co-operation (Elfring–Hulsing 2003). It can receive considerably better and more useful market information. This factor is closely connected to the abovementioned; graphically it is placed between the "increasing opportunities" and the "acquired knowledge". It is commonly known that the various co-operations are suitable for breaking down the information barriers (DG ENTR 2004, ADAPT 2001). During the co-operations, greater added value can be created, which contributes to achieving better market results through selling products of higher quality (Pietrobelli–Rabelotti 2004). The increase of added value through co-operations may be implemented from the product development to the developments created in the co-operations between different sectors (Humphrey–Schmitz 2002).

Consequently, gaining better market opportunities is one of the most important motivators of the co-operation between enterprises. Besides these directly realizable advantages, however, there are several other motivation types, based on so-called soft factors, which can be observed. In such cases, the firms profit from the co-operations in a more indirect way. In the following, the two most significant of these types are reviewed.

2.4. Increasing "being accepted"

It is an increasingly significant motivation factor for enterprises that being involved in networks can contribute to developing the image of the firm. Moreover, it is a more frequent opinion that belonging to "quality" co-operations is almost a brand, which means a positive message to the both potential partners and especially the customers. Particularly in the case of start-up enterprises, these types of the so-called

"reputation networks" appreciate. We have to note that these networks often overlap each other with the KIT-networks discussed later on (Knowledge, Innovation, Technology). In light of experience, they can greatly support the start-up enterprises in overcoming the initial difficulties. More expressively, if a certain firm does not have a high-ranking partner, it often has difficulty in surviving the initial period (Lechner–Dowling 2003). Its additional significance is the guarantee of quality by such partner(s), which is a great help with creating increased relationships for the participants. Such co-operations indicate to the others that a certain firm may be a reliable partner. Empirical surveys prove that the co-operations promote the enterprises attaining both the quality and the quantity possibilities; moreover the lack of such relationships may directly lead to the increase of obstacles (Lechner–Dowling 2003). Under similar considerations, the issue of networks "providing legitimacy" is discussed, which helps especially during the initial start-up for small and medium enterprises to gain recognition and acceptance. In the case of these firms, the co-operation with some kind of higher education institution or research institution provides the legitimacy needed for building additional relationships (Elfring–Hulsink 2003). Considering the nature of today's rapidly changing economy and the practically infinite number of potential partners, the greatest significance of these network types is their help to overcome the completely natural barriers resulting from distrust.

2.5. Acquiring some kind of new knowledge and understanding

There are few areas of examining the co-operations between enterprises which have been emphasized in the research as much as the new knowledge acquirable by networking. Several different names are used in the national and international research literature, from the learning networks to the co-operations marked by the increasingly popular acronym KIT (Knowledge, Innovation, Technology). In the KIT-networks, the basic objective of developing a partnership is always acquiring or creating some kind of new knowledge, skill and competence (Lechner–Dowling 2003). Accordingly, these co-operations mostly develop between innovative enterprises, however, in a broader sense; all the co-operations aimed at acquiring new knowledge can be listed here.

The learning-flow of information processes within the co-operations is influenced by three closely related factors (Vilmányi 2004, Mäkinen 2002, Rickne 2001):

- the characteristics of the organizations involved in the co-operations, from the owned resources to the organization knowledge available,
- the characteristics of the co-operations (their content, innovative character, the closeness of the relationships, the "age" of co-operation),

– Effects on each other during the co-operations, interdependencies, realizable advantages.

Without a detailed discussion of the most important characteristics of learning networks, it is necessary to mention that for the networks, an interesting and quite unique solution is emphasized more frequently, for which perhaps the most appropriate name is the "learning through interactions" (Propis 2002).

After the probable expression of network motivations, the attitude of enterprises in the Szeged region to co-operations is examined in two different researches.

3. Networking in practice – two researches in Szeged

The applied primary researches are both partial subjects of one larger research project. The present study is confined only to selecting the narrowly interpreted relevant parts. These issues were not the central objective of the primary researches, so the findings may also be subject to reservations. In both cases, many interesting discoveries appeared during the evaluation, which provides a typical "snapshot" of existing and potential co-operations in the region of Szeged, and the issues of their stimulation. During research, questionnaires were sent to nearly 700 enterprises between July and October, 2004.[8] In the selection of the enterprises interviewed, many aspects were taken into consideration for the basic objectives of the research. In some cases, the questionnaire was supplemented by a personal interview. In the midst of these interviews, discussion was held with a total of thirty firms on what they have experienced so far, and especially the future opportunities perceived by them. During other research, the questionnaire survey was conducted in 2006 and it studied the knowledge-intensive small enterprises in Szeged.[9] The sample of 401 elements is representative of the local knowledge-intensive enterprise sector. In the limitation of the knowledge-intensive sector, the main activity of the given enterprise according to the TEÁOR and to the methodology of international studies was used. The examined sample was selected by random sampling from the given population of 2300 firms.

[8] Based on empirical survey conducted in "The opportunities of the University of Szeged in the knowledge-based local economy development" titled research. Sincere thanks is offered to Prof. Dr. Lengyel Imre research leader, who involved this team in the research, and also to colleagues Bajmócy Zoltán and Deák Szabolcs, who provided other necessary information.

[9] This research was conducted in the Regional Operative Program's 3.3.1.–05/1.–2005–08–0002/34. Project.

3.1. On the willingness to networking

In the research of 2004, an overall picture was drawn of the enterprises operating in the region, including the examination of their innovation and their relation to business development services. Certain enterprises "acted quite similarly", thus the in depth part of the empirical study included the identification of possible clusters. The goal was to provide the basic characteristics of the enterprises and the typical service demands within the developed clusters. First, 14 large enterprises were removed from the sample of 170, then those enterprises which had not answered a question were removed, forming the base of the cluster analysis. Thus, the work continued with a sample of 146 small and medium enterprises.

Two derivative variables were taken into consideration while forming the clusters: the innovativeness of the enterprise and whether it has ever used a business development service of a county organization qualified for it.[10] Similarly, to the primary evaluation, an enterprise was regarded as innovative if at least one of the following points was fulfilled:

- it has an own R&D section,
- in the past year they gave an assignment to an external firm,
- They permanently cooperate with a foreign partner in product or technology development.

Table 1. Clusters on the base of innovation and participation of enterprise development services

			Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3
			Interested	Innovative	Refusing
Does the enterprise innovative?	Yes	N	0	48	0
		%	0%	100%	0%
	No	N	38	0	60
		%	100%	0%	100%
Did the enterprise use enterprise development services earlier?	Yes	N	38	30	0
		%	100%	62,50%	0%
	No	N	0	18	60
		%	0%	37,50%	100%

Source: own construction

[10] These are: the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Csongrád County, the Progress Business Development Foundation, the DARFT Regional Development Agency, the ITDH, and other organizations providing business development services named by the respondent.

Those enterprises that were taken to the first cluster which are not innovative, but they had already used a business development service (Table 1.) were called "interested". The 38 small and medium enterprises belonging in Cluster 1 are the 26% of the sample enterprises. The "innovative enterprises" were taken to the second cluster and make up the 33% of the sample (48 enterprises). The third cluster includes the firms which are not innovative and did not use a business development service earlier. They were labelled as "refusing" (60 enterprises, 41% of the sample). Of course, the distribution of the enterprises in the clusters refers only to the characteristics of the sample and not their proportion in the real economic structure. Knowing the clusters, the examination of the co-operations is divided into two parts. There was an attempt to map the formal and informal relationships of the enterprises, but inquiries were made to answer the question whether the enterprise cooperates with a partner in connection with introducing an innovation and how often it does so.

Table 2. Formal and informal co-operations

	Inter-ested %	**Inno-vative %**	**Re-fusing %**
Member of enterprise network	15,6	40,0	11,5
Subcontractor	35,3	48,9	53,7
Common marketing activity with other local enterprises on domestic market	16,2	10,6	3,5
Common marketing activity with other enterprises on foreign markets	11,4	9,3	1,9
Since 2000 participated some kind of network organization action	10,5	20,8	8,3
Major of leader colleagues graduated on SZTE	18,4	36,2	12,5
Regular professional connection with university teachers and researchers	32,4	39,6	15,8
Regularly have students from SZTE to practical traineeship	28,9	25,0	13,3
Some leader of the enterprise member of some local committee.	15,8	25,5	12,3

Source: own construction

The primary analysis of the primary data suggested that the innovative firms "have more tendencies" to various co-operations, and they appreciate the advantages of networking more than the average. That is, it is assumed that within the examined circle of enterprises the innovative firms are more interested in the advantages of networking. In this case, the expectations were unambiguously fulfilled; there is a strong indication that these firms may be more suitable for receiving network stimulation interventions. This fact is proven, amongst others, in that the 40% of the enterprises considered innovative reported to be a member of an enterprise group (Table 2). It seems that belonging to an enterprise group is an important source of

innovation, all the more so because the 60% of these firms are not in a strategy-making position in the enterprise group. It is confirmed by the fact that in the case of the two other clusters, considerably fewer enterprises belong to an enterprise group.

A surprisingly high percentage of the enterprises stated that they do participate in supplier activity. However, it does not definitely mean supplying an installable component or module, but rather refers to the existence of a regular buyer-supplier relationship. More than half of the refusing enterprises have these kind of relationships according to their statements, thus it can be assumed that a significant part of the buyer-supplier relationships unambiguously have an effect towards the refusal and against the innovation. As expected, the marketing-co-operations are rather sporadic in the case of every cluster. In the study, particular attention was paid to the university relationships since these kinds of relationships are probable, based on the economic structure of the region. It was already perceptible in the primary analysis that the expectations were not fulfilled. However, it can be assumed that for the innovative firms, this tendency is different. Expectations were only partially fulfilled because according to the data, the innovative firms did not connect too closely to the knowledge centre either. The formal and informal relationships with the university are not too intensive, according to the findings. These relationships of the innovative enterprises are intensive to some extent, while they are more occasional for the refusing cluster. About 40% of the enterprises of the sample that are considered innovative have a regular professional relationship with a university teacher or researcher, which indicates a relationship outside the region in about 20% of the cases. The formal relationships here can be credited to a small extent by personal relationships. This is indicated by the fact that quite a small percentage of the senior staff graduated in Szeged, which is evidence for the lack of a very important element of the local informal relationship network. In a part of the cases in both the refusing and the interested, the received assessments signify that there is lack of any senior staff having a university degree at the company. It is also indicates the lack of co-operation opportunities in that a relatively small percentage of firms are represented in the elected committees of boards[11] having a role in the local economic life. While in the case of the innovative cluster, this means a quarter of the enterprises, and in the other two clusters, the result is close to 10%.

It can be a critical area of the co-operations success if their goal is directed at developing some kind of innovation methodology in this arena. Innovative firms especially can be expected to show increased activity in this area, since their activity is already functionally connected to creating some sort of new knowledge. It was

[11] In the questionnaire the following organizations were presented: Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Csongrád County and the GYOSZ, the KIOSZ and the VOSZ organizations in Csongrád county.

examined in detail with whom the members of the clusters cooperate with in this area. Perhaps this was the most surprising area because the hypothesis was not justified or expected. Although certain co-operations may be observed, basically the regular co-operations related to the development of innovations are simply missing (Table 3).

Table 3. Regular co-operation with some organizations in working out of innovation

	Interested %	**Innovatives %**	**Refusing %**
Competitor	9,7	0,0	6,3
Customer	17,2	20,5	16,7
Advisory enterprise	12,9	4,4	2,2
Subcontractor	17,2	0,0	13,0
Higher education institution	6,7	13,6	4,3
Other research institute	0	9,1	2,2

Source: own construction

Based on the chart it can be stated that the enterprises (even the innovative firms) of the sample are not willing to cooperate regularly in the interest of creating an innovation. Only the relationship with the customer shows considerable value, and the highest value indicates only 20% which was among the innovative cluster. The co-operations with higher education institutes are rare, which confirms the earlier results in which the corporate relationships dominate in the co-operations of the university and the business sphere in Hungary.

3.2. The importance of the certain motivation types in the co-operations

In the research of 2006, it was directly asked specifically about the various network motivations. In the theoretical part, the most important characteristics of the networks in detail were examined, focusing in particular on the possible reasons of co-operations. The various co-operations are especially important for the examined knowledge-intensive small enterprises. For this survey, in accordance with the categories presented in the theoretical part, research was done for the answer to the question of what the firms' specific reasons for the tendency to cooperate.

Evaluations were done on a seven-point scale to what importance the respondent attributes to the realizable advantages of participation in a cooperative network. There are considerable differences between the values of the realizable advantages (Table 4).

Table 4. Motivation of participation in network (1–7 scale)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total	Mean
Enlargement of resource barriers	40,7	9,5	8,8	8,0	9,0	10,1	13,8	100	3,21
Obtain cost benefit	36,5	5,5	7,3	7,8	11,1	11,3	20,4	100	3,67
New ordering and supplying opportunities	20,4	3,0	7,8	6,3	11,3	13,6	37,5	100	4,76
Desire for recognition	19,1	2,3	5,8	10,3	13,9	15,9	32,7	100	4,76
Acquiring new knowledge, understanding	16,1	1,5	4,5	10,1	15,1	16,9	35,8	100	5,00

Source: own construction

The data show an instantaneous picture, in which several (established and not established) conclusions can be drawn. These conclusions were ignored, except it could be highlighted that a significant portion of the enterprises consider obtaining cost advantages and loosening the resource barriers as only slightly important. Reviewing the chart, it can be observed that an extremely sharp result that the "softer network motivations" appreciate. The processes described in the research literature appear also in the case of knowledge-intensive small enterprises. In the past, especially for traditional networks, the tangible advantages lead to co-operation. In the case of knowledge-based relationships, the softer categories appreciate. This is well demonstrated by the results (increasing being accepted, desire for recognition: 4,76; acquiring new knowledge, understanding: 5,00), which indicate the importance attributed to the factors well.

4. Conclusions

Unfortunately, the "snapshots" unequivocally showed that the co-operations experienced in the region are fragmented, unorganized and concern only a smaller portion of the enterprises. Thus, it would be definitely necessary to get familiar with the best practices and to consciously stimulate the co-operations. Because of the variance in types of co-operations, it is quite difficult to outline the individual characteristics. However, for the successful networks, in most cases certain specific features can be observed. The first success factor is the commitment levels and that the partners clearly articulate their objectives and expectations from the beginning of

the co-operation (ADAPT 2001). It is a common experience that in the form of network co-operation, the market view has to prevail. The second success factor is the usefulness of the co-operation is clear to all parties. Resources and knowledge are shared among all members of the co-operation, and this is difficult for many to overcome. Generally, fear of freeloaders and mutual distrust are the most significant obstacles in developing the co-operations. This is why the importance of informal networks in the success of the co-operations cannot be stressed too much (Kingsley–Malecki 2004). Emphasizing the common vision in the co-operation networks is also an important factor. The goal of the co-operation has to be defined clearly, and this objective has to be accepted by all participants. If there is no common goal realized, than there is difficulty in gaining knowledge from each other. Finally, it has to be emphasized that in most cases, there are more than profit-driven enterprises involved in these networks. Various higher education institutions and research institutions also have an important role in the co-operations. Experience shows that these co-operations have to be open to involving additional participants, even those who have to be diligently encouraged (ADAPT 2001). Examining the various motivation-types, it can be stated that basically almost all co-operations in some way, either directly or indirectly, aim at more cost-efficient solutions. The original motivator of co-operations is increasing the competitiveness through the reduction of different costs or through maximising the income. This finding is crucial in deeply understanding the intervention of economy development. The existence of appropriate trust is also essential for any co-operation (Patik 2004). Realizing this fact is a key point because networking has to be based on a relationship of trust. That is exactly why the most successful co-operations develop in an area where the willingness to cooperate is an important part of the entrepreneurial culture (Patik 2006). It is not accidental that the decisive proposals on network development almost always emphasize increasing commitment and building trust (Rosenfeld 2002, Huggins 2000). In the case of stimulating the enterprises' willingness to cooperate, it has to be highlighted that there are direct cost advantages that can be realized in the co-operations. In light of this, if the existence of networking within a group can be shown to be a fair advantage to all participants, then substantive and long-term and successful co-operations develop. Otherwise, it is probable that only the waste of sources dedicated to development happens. That is why it is important that during working out different network organizing activities, it is critical to be both aware of each person's expectations and to be clear on what types of advantages can be realized.

References

ADAPT 2001: *Learning Networks. Small firms co-operating to compete*. ADAPT, Brussels.

Brito, C. M. 2001: Towards an institutional theory of the dinamics of industrial networks. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 3, pp. 150–166.

DG ENTR 2004: *SMEs and co-operation*. DG ENTR, Brussels.

Drakopoulou Dodd, S. – Patra, E. 2002: National differencesin entrepreneurial networking. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 14, pp. 117–134.

Elfring, T. – Hulsink, W. 2003: Networks in Entrepreneurship: The Case of High Technology Firms. *Small business Economics*, 21, pp. 409–422.

Ford, D. 2003: *Business Marketing*. KJK–KERSZÖV, Budapest.

Gereffi, G. 1999: International trade and industrial upgrading in the apparel commodity chain. *Journal of International Economics*, 48, pp. 37–70.

Hancé, B. – Cieply, S. 1996: Bridging the Finance Gap for Small Firms. *Social Science Research Center*, Berlin.

Hansen, E. L. 2000: Resource Acquisition as a Startup Process: Initial Stocks of Social capital and Organizational foundings. In Reynolds, P. – Bygrave, W. – Birley, S. – Butler, J. – Davidsson, P. – Gartner, W. – McDougall, P. (eds): *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research Wellesley*. MA, Babson College.

Hills, G. E. – Lumpkin, G. T. – Singh R. P. 1997: Oppurtunity Recognition: Perceptions and Behaviors of Entrepreneurs. In Reynolds, P. – Bygrave, W. – Birley, S. – Butler, J. – Davidsson, P. – Gartner, W. – McDougall, P. (eds): *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research Wellesley*. MA, Babson College.

Huggins, R. 2000: The success and failure of policy-implanted inter-firm network inititatives: motivations, processes and structure. Enterpreneurship *& Regional Development*, 12, pp. 111–135.

Humphrey, J. – Schmitz, H. 2002: Developing Firms in the World Economy: Governance and Upgrading in Global Value chains. *INEF Report*, University of Duisburg, Duisburg.

Imreh, Sz. – Lengyel, I. 2002: A kis– és középvállalkozások regionális hálózatainak főbb jellemzői. In Buzás, N. – Lengyel, I. (szerk.): *Az ipari parkok fejlődési lehetőségei*. SZTE GTK, JATEPress, Szeged, 154–174. o.

Johannisson, B. 1997: The Dynamics of Entrepreneurial Networks. In Reynolds, P. – Bygrave, W. – Birley, S. – Butler, J. – Davidsson, P. – Gartner, W. – McDougall, P. (eds): *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research Wellesley*. MA, Babson College.

Johannisson, B. – Ramirez - Pasillas, M. 2001: Networking for Entrepreneurship: Building a Topography Model Of Human, Social and Cultural Capital. In

Reynolds, P. – Bygrave, W. – Birley, S. – Butler, J. – Davidsson, P. – Gartner, W. – McDougall, P. (eds): *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research Wellesley*. MA, Babson College.

Kállay, L. – Imreh, Sz. 2004: *A kis– és középvállalkozás-fejlesztés gazdaságtana*. Aula, Budapest.

Kingsley, G. – Malecki, E. J. 2004: Networking for Competitiveness. *Small Business Economics*, 23, pp. 71–84.

Kocsis, É. 2000: Új szervezeti formák a modern kapitalizmusban. In Bara, Z. – Szabó, K. (szerk.): *Gazdasági rendszerek, országok, intézmények: bevezetés az összehasonlító gazdaságtanba*. Aula, Budapest, 467–515. o.

Lechner, C. – Dowling, M. 2003: Firm networks: external relationships as sources for the growth and competitiveness of entrepreneurial firms. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 15, pp. 1–26.

Malecki, E. J. 1997: *Technology and Economic Development: The Dynamics of local, regional and national competitiveness*. Longman, Edinburgh.

Mäkinen, H. 2002: *The Genesis and Development of a New Innovation Network in Finland*. Turku School of Economics and Business Administration, Turku.

Mundim, A. P. F. – Rossi, A. – Stocchetti A. 2000: SMEs in Global Market: Challenges, Oppurtinities and Threats. *Brasilian Electronic Journal of Economics.*

OECD 2004: *Networks, Partnerships, Clusters and Intellectual Property Rights: Opportunities and Challenges for Innovative SMEs in a Global Economy*. OECD, Paris.

Patik, R. 2004: A társadalom és a kultúra hatása a hálózatosodásra. In Garai, L. – Czagány, L. (szerk.): *A szociális identitás, az információ és a piac*. JATEPress, Szeged. 165–168. o.

Patik, R. 2006: „Látható kéz" és innováció – olasz iparági körzetek ma. *Vezetéstudomány*, 11, 22–32. o.

Pietrobelli, C. – Rabelotti, R. 2004: *Competitiveness and Upgrading in Clusters and Value Chains*. The Case of Latin America. DTI/UNIDO Competitiveness Conference, Pretoria.

Propis, L. 2002: Types of Innovation and Interfirm Co-operation. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 14, pp. 337–353.

Rickne, A. 2001: Networking and Firm Performance. In Reynolds, P. – Bygrave, W. – Birley, S. – Butler, J. – Davidsson, P. – Gartner, W. – McDougall, P. (eds): *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research Wellesley*. MA, Babson College.

Rosenfeld, S. A. 2002: *Creating Smart Systems. A guide to cluster strategies in less favoured regions.* EU DG for Regional Policy and Cohesion, Brussels.

Salmi, P. – Blomqvist, K. – Ahola, J. – Kyläheiko, K. 2001: *Industrial districts and regional development: Towards a knowledge-based view*. Lappeenranta University of Technology.

Schmitz, H. 1995: Collective efficiency: Growth path for small-scale industry. *Journal of Development Studies*, 31, pp. 529–566.

Singh, R. P. – Hills, G. E. – Hybels, R. C. – Lumpkin, G. T. 1999: *Oppurtunity Recognition Through Social Network Characteristics of Entrepreneurs*.

Szerb, L. 2003: The Changing Role of Enterpreneur and Entrepreneurship of Network Organisation. In Lengyel, I. (ed.): *Knowledge Transfer, Small and Medium-sized Enterprises, and Regional Development in Hungary.* JATEPress, Szeged, pp. 81–95.

Varamäki, E. 1996: The development process of interfirm co-operation of SME's. In Reynolds, P. – Bygrave, W. – Birley, S. – Butler, J. – Davidsson, P. – Gartner, W. – McDougall, P. (eds): *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research Wellesley*. MA, Babson College.

Varamäki, E. – Pihkala, T. 1997: A hotel of small firms - An oddity of SME-networking. *Journal of Best Papers Proceedings of ICSB Conference*, San Francisco, USA.

Vilmányi, M. 2004: Szervezeti tanulás, hálózati kompetencia, bizalom. In Garai, L. – Czagány, L. (szerk.): *A szociális identitás, az információ és a piac*. JATEPress, Szeged, 186–200. o.