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Collaboration or collaborative behaviour presents an important aspect of company success that may also be visible in the way the level of internal integration is perceived. Due to the fact that successfully implemented internal integration is linked to the success of the company, influencing factors need to be further explored. As such, collaboration is a known factor that influences the level of internal integration. In the following paper, its connection with internal integration will not only be proven but is of key importance. Defining internal integration and its level and connection with the level of collaborative behaviour forms the basis of the research part of this paper. The research is not limited from the viewpoint of analysing just two functions or sectors in a company. This paper further investigates a general connection between collaboration and integration, that is, independently from the functions. The quantitative research part investigates whether and to what extent the level of collaborative behaviour influences the level of internal integration. Research is based on quantitative analysis of data, collected from Slovenian companies.
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INTRODUCTION

On the development scale, success of the company nowadays depends on various factors. Some are better researched than others and it is the less frequently researched ones that “hold the key” to potential success of each company. The increased level of competitiveness is forcing companies to restructure their businesses, thus encouraging them to focus on those processes that add value for consumers (Kingman-Brundage et al., 1995; Majchzak and Wang, 1996). Increased level of integration between different function areas within the scope of the company may also create added value. Moreover, research shows that companies with specialized function areas are more efficient if resources are shared between co-workers who implement multi-function activities that present an intersection of activities resulting from connected functions (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967; Liedtka, 1996).

It is very difficult to define how integration influences the success of the company as scholars do not agree on this. Pondy (1970) argues that company profits may increase if two interdependent departments operate co-ordinately. Rho et al. (1994), on the other hand suggest that internal integration is a prerequisite for company success, which emphasizes how important “little” things are for the greater success of the company.

One of key statements for the following research is that no individual function in a company is fully efficient if it operates in isolation. Business processes and its implementers in various function departments need to be based on and implemented so as to contribute to and meet the needs of consumers. As a result, companies can no longer have a closed system of individual functions and departments.

Lack of understanding regarding the way employees of one function view employees of another function and identification of behavioural factors that either facilitate or hinder collaborative operations between individual functions in a company present the basis of this research. The fundamental area of research is based on the presented problems, that is, how collaborative behaviour...
influences the level of integration. Very little research may be found in the literature that could contribute to a general understanding of behavioural dimension of internal integration. Therefore, the following research aims to fill this gap by investigating behavioural dimensions of internal integration, which also presents collaboration or collaborative behaviour.

Objectives and hypothesis

The main objective is to investigate the influence of collaboration or collaborative behaviour on the level of internal integration. The main aim is to research the impact of the level of collaboration or collaborative behaviour on the level of internal integration between various functions in a company. Based on data on relations between employees in individual sectors or functions that were collected from selected Slovenian companies using questionnaires, the influence of collaboration on the level of internal integration will be investigated. The objective is to confirm the hypothesis concerning the link between the level of collaboration or collaborative behaviour and the level of internal integration, independently from individual sector of the company. The hypothesis is that “the level of internal integration in a company depends on the level of collaboration or collaborative behaviour.”

The proposed hypothesis is based on previous research (Topolšek et al., 2010) that called for a broader understanding of the connection between collaboration and internal integration.

The hypothesis will be tested using statistical data analysis. More specifically, a bivariate correlation between both variables will be applied. The correlation system will prove or disprove the connection between variables. Moreover, in order to determine the extent to which both variables are interconnected with each other, regression analysis will be used.

Characteristics of internal integration and collaboration

Internal integration is a field that has fascinated scientists for decades. It presents a central spot in various domains including management, strategy, organizational theory, management of production, and information systems (Barki and Pinsonncault, 2005). Conceptual roots of integration may be traced in Fayol’s (1949) idea on cooperation and coordination and in Lawrence and Lorsch’s (1967) definition of integration as a process of achieving unity of efforts between various subsystems in achieving organizational tasks.

Integration, for example, may be found when specialized functions or departments in a company are interdependent or when processes or procedures are implemented that allow interaction (Brown, 1983). Hart and Service (1993) define integration as “a unity of effort, which has been further operationalized as continuous exchange of information between parties, who agree on decisions and on decision-making authority.”

Theorists who study organizations and their organizational operations suggest that interdependence is a catalyst for internal integration (Brown, 1983; Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978). Theory of interdependence further postulates that relations between two working units may be described as individual or collective, or as behaviour or an individual or a group (Ellinger, 1997).

Some literature characterizes internal integration as interaction or as communication or defines it as collaboration or a result of interaction and collaboration (Topolšek et al., 2010).

Souder and Sherman (1993) define integration as a state of high level of dispersed values, common objectives and collaborative behaviour. Lorsch (1965) defines it as a process of unified investment of efforts between various subsystems for the purpose of optimal achievement of organizational tasks. In his research on integration of the research and development and marketing department, Song (1991) found out that the desired level of integration was only partly achieved. O’Leary-Kelly and Flores (2002) stated that integration refers to the level to which separate functions work together in a cooperative sense and hence meet the set objectives.

Collaboration is thus an important aspect of integration, hence one of the elements of company’s success. In order to better understand its meaning, its main features will be further analysed.

From our perspective, it would make sense to define collaboration and to successfully distinguish it from other synonyms. Some authors define coordination, cooperation and collaboration according to technical and non-technical viewpoint. The difference may be found between coordination which is defined by the technical aspect and collaboration which is defined by the non-technical aspect. Cooperation lies somewhere in-between. The presented system and connectivity of coordination, cooperation and collaboration are interpreted differently by different authors. That is why further systemic thinking is needed regarding their meaning and dependence. Denise (2007) discusses collaboration and its connectivity with cooperation, coordination and communication. Furthermore, Denise (2007) defines coordination as a system of effective cooperation. Contrary to coordination, Denise defines cooperation as a sign for corporate culture and describes it as “teamwork” whereas “collaboration is neither consent nor an agreement”.

Hickey (1986) defines coordination as a harmonious functioning of individual parts for achieving effective results, cooperation as a union of people that strive towards mutual results and collaboration as mutual work.
Collaborative-behavioural dimension of internal integration presents a system of common visions, mutual decision making and collective responsibility for the end result, service or product (Mohr et al., 1996; Schrage, 1990).

Collaborative behaviour is based on cooperation and rewards it. The success of collaborative behaviour is based on the skills of individuals in interdependent functions that aim to create important interpersonal relations (Tjosvold, 1988).

The philosophy of collaboration deviates from the philosophy of interaction yet it is linear with the philosophy of relationship marketing.

Contrary to interactional communication approach to management of interfunctional relations, collaboration is a behavioural approach. The purpose of collaboration is not to establish information links but to create a feeling of belonging between individual functions (Kahn and Mentzer, 1996).

Commitment to the philosophy of collaboration may call for dramatic changes in the climate and culture of a company.

As collaboration is a complex process, it may occur that employees from particular functional departments will not be productive due to time spent for participating in interfunctional activities as well as due to potential lack of understanding of the individual roles in the entire collaboration process. This may further lead to disappointment and employees’ reduced interest in complementary functions.

Collaboration may thus be defined as the want of function departments to cooperate and thus, strives to achieve teamwork, mutual understanding, common visions, resource sharing and achieving mutual objectives.

That is why collaboration is characterized as a behavioural aspect of interfunctional relations and presents an efficient, voluntary and mutual process. Activities of collaboration are normally intangible and difficult to regulate and maintain without mutual efforts and thus present a higher level of interpersonal relations (Kahn and Mentzer, 1996).

To this end, collaboration tends to be a sociological (non-technical) aspect and thus difficult to be defined precisely and numerically classified into a subsystem.

Literature review suggests collaboration or collaborative behaviour to be an important aspect of internal integration. The link between them remains to be, at least generally speaking – that is, independent from individual function areas – under researched.

Further development of this methodology includes the search for the link between the operationalized variables, that is, between the level of internal integration and the level of collaboration.

Therefore, the basis of research is to find the arithmetic mean of the findings, derived from the questionnaires which refer to the level of internal integration. The research will subsequently continue with the analysis of results and independent variables that refer to the search for the existing level of collaboration or collaborative behaviour in selected companies. The findings of both areas of research serve as the basis for the evaluation of existence or non-existence of the connection between the level of internal integration and the level of collaboration.

The research methodology finally outlines the research of regression models of the link between the level of internal integration and the level of collaboration. The research model is shown in Figure 1.

**Data analysis**

All data derive from the questionnaires. They were registered into the computer database programme for the analysis. Basic data analysis was conducted using Microsoft Excel; Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows was used to conduct statistical data analysis. This way, it was possible to search for the links between the said variables.

**RESULTS**

In the research findings, the operationalization and the results of each of the terms or concepts mentioned in the hypothesis was first presented. Subsequently, the hypothesis entitled “the level of internal integration in a company depends on the level of collaboration or collaborative behaviour” was tested.
The level of internal integration

The basis for further research of the link between collaboration and internal integration was to determine the existing level of collaboration and integration.

Internal integration was defined as a process of interaction and collaboration where functions cooperate to achieve mutually beneficial results.

Activities that present the basis for determining the existing level of internal integration in analysed companies comprise of interactional and collaborative aspect or their result (Kotler and Mentzer). Within the scope of this research, the level of internal integration was operationalized with the set of questions which include a variety of activities. Moreover, the interviewees determined the rate or the frequency of mutual cooperation with the compared sector, that is they rated their cooperation with the sector they most frequently work with. In order to determine the existing level of internal integration the interviewees were asked to rate the frequency regarding the operation or implementation of certain activities such as formal meetings, telephone conversations, e-mails, etc., by choosing one of the following answers: never (1), yearly (2), monthly (3), weekly (4) and daily (5).

The research procedure is depicted in Figure 2 which also shows the findings of the first part of the research. Shares of answers provided by the interviewees are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 presents the frequency of the implementation of a particular activity that indirectly measures the level of internal integration.

With the majority of activities the shares are relatively high, as they present the share of the category at least once a month or frequently. In 9 out of 16 activities, the interviewees rated that the said activities were undertaken at least once a week or more frequently.

The interviewees are said to exchange emails in a company on a daily basis. Overall, the exchange of faxes and the exchange of messages occur least frequently.
Independent variables present basic activities which characterise internal integration, i.e. activities of interaction and collaboration:
- Telephone conversation
- E-mail
- Achieving common goals of the company
- Mutual goal achievement
- Sharing information and other resources
- Reaching mutual understanding
- Developing common understanding of responsibility
- Group decision making
- Exchanging forms
- Exchanging reports
- Informal teamwork
- Supervised group planning
- Formal meetings
- Sharing of ideas
- Teamwork

Defining the existing level of internal integration:

\[
\text{Level of Internal integration} = \frac{\text{arithmetic mean of all activities}}{100} \times 100
\]

Figure 2. Arithmetic mean of activities of interactional and collaborative aspect of internal integration.

of all activities (3.2 or just 64%) and (6.5 or 69%), respectively.

The frequency of implementing activities is of no interest to our research. However, it is still important for determining the correlation between variables. From the content viewpoint or the viewpoint of the hypothesis we are interested in the indicator of the level of internal integration.

The latter term is operationalized as a total relative sum of variables or activities, presented in Table 1. Total relative sum presents the arithmetic mean of all variables that was first calculated at the level of each individual interviewee and subsequently at the level of the sample, whereby the said arithmetic mean is multiplied with the factor 100. As the same number of interviewees rated all activities from Table 1, the said indicator could be calculated as the arithmetic mean of the percentages from columns. Percentage value is calculated by multiplying the values with factor 100.

From the data from the lowest row it is evident that the degree of internal integration is 82.7 or 83%. Standard deviation of the data set amounts to 0.38262 and indicates normal distribution. Standard deviation of arithmetic mean is 0.106. Within the framework of data analysis the procedure One-Sample T Test was conducted with the aim to compare the sample rate of arithmetic mean and value of arithmetic mean that is considered in null hypothesis. This analysis has shown a statistical significance of the test, as significance = 0.000 and is lower than the limit value of 0.050.

In order to simplify the understanding of factors that influence the level of internal integration, a short diagram is shown in Figure 2 that will be further supplemented with other factors that refer to the hypothesis. Figure 2 shows the influence of continuous implementation of individual activities on the level of internal integration. Activities that influence the level of internal integration encompass activities that characterize the result of interactional and collaborative aspect. Total degree or the level of internal integration in Slovenian large companies that participated in the research equals the value 83 of 100. This result indicates a high level of internal integration (at least two thirds of all activities are implemented in continuous timing) in analysed companies. Determining the level of internal integration results from the 1 to 5 scale designed by Topolšek et al. (2010):
- zero level of internal integration indicates the non-existence of internal integration (overall frequency of implemented activities is less than one tenth);
- low level of internal integration indicates partial presence of the implementation of the said activities (overall presence of factors is less than one third);
- medium level of internal integration indicates relative frequency regarding the implementation of the said activities (overall presence of factors is less than two thirds);
- high level of internal integration indicates high frequency regarding the implementation of the said activities (at least two thirds of all said activities are implemented in a specific time period);
- complete level of internal integration indicates continuous implementation of all activities.

Level of collaborative behaviour

The research hypothesis refers to the search for the connection between the level of internal integration and the level of collaborative behaviour.

For this purpose, an existing level of collaborative behaviour in analysed companies will be determined which will help us search for the link with the level of internal integration.
Table 1. The degree of mutual cooperation with chosen sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal meeting</td>
<td>3.6154</td>
<td>0.50637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone conversation</td>
<td>4.8462</td>
<td>0.37553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mails</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange of forms</td>
<td>3.7692</td>
<td>0.92681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange of messages</td>
<td>3.4615</td>
<td>0.77625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange of faxes</td>
<td>3.2308</td>
<td>1.42325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual goal achievement</td>
<td>3.8462</td>
<td>0.80064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving mutual understanding</td>
<td>4.1538</td>
<td>0.68874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal team work</td>
<td>4.4615</td>
<td>0.66023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing ideas</td>
<td>4.4615</td>
<td>0.77625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing information and other resources</td>
<td>4.6154</td>
<td>0.65044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving mutual goals of the company</td>
<td>4.3077</td>
<td>0.75107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team work</td>
<td>4.6923</td>
<td>0.63043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing mutual understanding of responsibility</td>
<td>4.6154</td>
<td>0.50637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned mutual planning for forecasting and problem solving</td>
<td>3.6154</td>
<td>0.76795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting mutual decisions regarding the ways for improving the entire cost efficiency</td>
<td>3.5385</td>
<td>0.66023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic mean of all activities</td>
<td>4.139423</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator of the level of internal integration [0..100] 82.78846 /

On the scale from 1 to 5, 1 indicates that the activity is not implemented at all, 2 indicates that the activity is implemented at least once a year, 3 indicates that the activity is implemented at least once a month, 4 indicates that the activity is implemented at least once a week, whereas 5 indicates that the activity is implemented at least once a day. a=significant value

Within the framework of this research and in order to confirm the hypothesis, the level of collaborative behaviour was operationalized using questionnaires. More specifically, from a set of questions interviewees rated 15 different activities on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 indicates that the activity in question is not implemented, 2 indicates the activity is implemented at least once a year, 3 means that the activity is implemented at least once a month, 4 once a week and 5 on a daily basis. The findings or the arithmetic mean are shown in Table 2. Moreover, standard deviation is also shown.

Due to the connection with the level of internal integration or the indicator of the level of internal integration, the indicator of the level of collaborative behaviour was determined through a transfer of results of the arithmetic mean from the scale from 1 to 5 to a scale 0 to 100.

Based on all 14 activities from Table 2 a common indicator of the level of collaborative behaviour was calculated. The indicator was calculated as an average of all said 14 variables (at the individual level) whereby the values of the said indicator were subsequently projected from the scale from 1 to 5 onto a scale from 0 to 100. The higher the value of the indicator the higher the interviewees rated the activities and vice versa. The average value of the calculated mutual indicator of the level of collaborative behaviour is shown in the lowest row of Table 2. The table shows that the value of this indicator is 82 (on the scale from 0 to 100). This result indicates a high level of collaborative behaviour (total presence of factors exceeds two thirds).

Determining the level of internal integration results from the 1 to 5 scale designed by Topolšek et al. (2010): zero level of collaborative behaviour indicates the non-existence of collaborative behaviour (overall frequency of implemented activities is less than one tenth); low level of collaborative behaviour indicates partial presence of the implementation of the said activities (overall presence of factors is less than one third); medium level of collaborative behaviour indicates a relative frequency regarding the implementation of the said activities (overall presence of factors is less than two thirds); high level of collaborative behaviour indicates high frequency regarding the implementation of the said activities (at least two thirds of all said activities are implemented in a specific time period); complete level of collaborative behaviour indicates continuous implementation of all activities. Procedure of statistical data analysis is shown in Figure 3.

The level of internal integration and its dependence on the level of collaborative behaviour or the level of collaboration

As already mentioned in the introductory part, the hypothesis is focused on the connection between the level of collaborative behaviour and the level of internal...
Table 2. Frequency of implementing activities between sectors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal team work between sectors</td>
<td>4.3846</td>
<td>0.65044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal approach to work linked to both sectors</td>
<td>4.3846</td>
<td>0.76795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation of both sectors</td>
<td>4.3077</td>
<td>0.85485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving mutual objectives of the company</td>
<td>3.8462</td>
<td>0.68874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing information and resources between sectors</td>
<td>4.5385</td>
<td>0.66023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of necessity and obligation to implement activities linked to both sectors</td>
<td>4.1538</td>
<td>0.80064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of commitment to the company</td>
<td>4.0769</td>
<td>1.03775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open communication between sectors</td>
<td>4.4615</td>
<td>0.51887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual trust and respect between sectors</td>
<td>4.5385</td>
<td>0.51887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange of knowledge between sectors</td>
<td>3.9231</td>
<td>0.75955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional, diverse knowledge and skills</td>
<td>3.7692</td>
<td>0.83205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of diverse knowledge between sectors</td>
<td>3.3846</td>
<td>1.26085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of diverse skills between sectors</td>
<td>3.6923</td>
<td>1.10940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient use of know-how of the sector</td>
<td>3.6154</td>
<td>1.04391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic mean of all activities</td>
<td>4.076923</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator of the level of collaborative behaviour [0..100]</td>
<td>81.53846</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the scale from 1 to 5, 1 indicates that the activity is not implemented, 2 indicates that the activity is implemented at least once a year, 3 indicates that the activity is implemented at least once a month, 4 indicates that the activity is implemented at least once a week and 5 indicates that the activity is implemented daily.

Independent variables present detailed activities which characterise collaborative behaviour:

- Commitment to the company
- Existence of diverse know-how between sectors
- Existence of different competences between sectors
- Achieving common goals of the company
- Open communication between the sectors
- Mutual trust and respect between the sectors
- Efficient use of sector’s know-how
- The feeling of necessity and responsibility for implementing activities connected to both sectors
- Cooperation of both sectors
- Sharing information and resources between sectors
- Informal team work between sectors
- Informal approach to work connected to both sectors
- Consolidation of knowledge between sectors
- Additional, differential knowledge and competences

Defining the existing level of collaborative behaviour = arithmetic mean of all activities

Level of collaborative behaviour = 81.7 (from 100)

Figure 3. Influence of individual activities on the level of collaborative behaviour.

integration. Both terms were already operationalized and presented, what follows is a detailed analysis of the link between them whereby the hypothesis states that the level of collaborative behaviour influences the level of internal integration.

Both variables from the hypothesis are normally distributed. This means that the values increase from lower to middle values, whereas on the other end they fall. Because of this, Pearson’s correlation coefficient may be used to test the main hypothesis. Dependence of the level of internal integration on the level of collaborative behaviour is shown in Figure 4.

Statistical analysis of variables of the level of collaborative behaviour and the level of internal integration indicated – using bivariance correlation – a link between variables as Pearson’s correlation coefficient
was 0.781 and is thus statistically significant (significance = 0.002) lower than the limit value of 0.050. The value of correlation coefficient is still on a scale (-1, +1) and, as in our case, this value equals 0.781, it is thus closer to 1 than 0, a strong connection may be assumed. The positive sign of the correlation coefficient indicates that as the level of collaborative behaviour increases, the level of internal integration also increases. Based on this result, the hypothesis may be confirmed.

As the number of questionnaires is relatively small, Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient was used, which also confirmed the hypothesis. The value of this coefficient is slightly smaller (0.660) but still indicates a statistically significant link (significance = 0.014).

The correlation coefficient as such states that there is a link between analysed variables, however fails to inform how the two variables are linked. The latter may be investigated using regression analysis as the models may either be used to forecast or describe the links between the dependent variable and the higher number of independent variables.

Within the framework of regression analysis two things may be assumed, whether analysed variables are linked in a linear or non-linear way, whereby the former link means that the increased value of one variable causes the other variable to change in a linear fashion. Assuming that variables have a linear connection, using regression analysis or a regression model the following issue $y = a + b \times x$ may be determined, where $a$ means a constant of model and $b$ is directional coefficient of the line. Such regression analysis gives an already known correlation coefficient of 0.781 (Pearson’s correlation coefficient) and determination coefficient of 0.611. Linear regression model as a whole is statistically significant ($F = 17.253$, significance $F = 0.002$) and the level of internal integration explains 61% of variability of the level of collaborative behaviour (determination coefficient $R^2 = 0.611$), directional coefficient of the line B equals 0.517, its positive sign indicates a positive link between variables, its value indicates a number of units that on average change the value of dependent variable of the level of internal integration, provided the value of the level of collaborative behaviour increases by one unit. The constant of the model is 2.033 and indicates a value of the level of internal integration, provided the value of the level of collaborative behaviour is 0.

Figure 4 presents a linear regression model of the link between the level of collaborative behaviour and the level of internal integration.

Based on the regression analysis findings, a regression model may be shown that in the case of linear connectivity indicates a dependency of the dependent variable from independent variable:

$$\text{Level of internal integration} = 2.033 + 0.517 \times \text{level of collaborative behaviour}$$

The procedure of data analysis is also presented on a model (Figure 5) that shows the course of action and the findings of the analysis.

The explained variance of the said linear dependence of the dependent variable with regard to the independent one is 61% which is still acceptable. Using various transformations such as cubic, the said explained variance may somewhat increase, that is, to 68% which is not much more than it is for example in an assumption that the link is linear (61%), as the difference is just additional 7% points of the explained variance.
Apart from cubic transformation, others were also tested such as: logarithmic, inverse, square, exponent and s-curve, yet the explained variance was highest with the cubic transformation.

With the explanation of the link between the level of collaborative behaviour and the level of internal integration it has been established that the said notions are linked with each other, whereby the hypothesis was confirmed.

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the problem discussed and the set objective, the introductory part designed a hypothesis entitled: “the level of internal integration in a company depends on the level of collaboration or collaborative behaviour.” The aim of the hypothesis was to determine the link between the level of internal integration and the level of collaboration or collaborative behaviour in the field of all complementary-oriented functions, that is functions or sectors that cooperate most frequently.

The hypothesis was to be confirmed using Pearson’s correlation coefficient.

As variables, the level of internal integration and the level of collaborative behaviour were normally distributed; the test was first conducted using Pearson’s correlation coefficient that determined the link between the variables as the value of 0.781 shows strong statistical significance.

To this end, the hypothesis may be confirmed. However, the study was further interested in another link between variables for which regression analysis was used and linear link was determined.

Based on the findings we may conclude that the level of internal integration in a company depends on the level of collaboration or collaborative behaviour. In this case we followed the calls of some researchers from this area of research and confirmed that independent from two interlinked functions in a company we may argue that the level of integration between these functions or sectors depends on the level of collaborative behaviour of managers from these functions.
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