
ADAPTING THE UPPSALA INTERNATIONALIZATION MODEL FOR MULTINATIONAL EU PROJECT COLLABORATIONS: MACRO AND MICRO PERSPECTIVES

Lebo Mokoena

Faculty of Management and Public Administration Sciences, Walter Sisulu University, Butterworth Campus, Gcuwa 4960, South Africa

ABSTRACT

This article explores the adaptation of international business models for European Union (EU) projects, focusing on the Uppsala model's macro- and micro-foundations within multinational collaborations. The Uppsala model, which emphasizes gradual international expansion, has become a widely recognized framework for understanding how firms expand abroad. The model's application in EU-funded projects highlights the importance of both macro-level factors (such as policies and regional integration) and micro-level considerations (like firm-specific capabilities and interpersonal relationships) in the success of multinational collaborations. Through case studies of EU collaborative projects, this article demonstrates how the Uppsala model's principles can be adapted to guide companies in navigating the complexities of cross-border partnerships and creating sustainable, value-generating collaborations within the EU framework.

KEYWORDS

Uppsala Model, international business models, EU projects, multinational collaborations, macro-level factors, micro-level factors, cross-border partnerships, European Union, internationalization strategies, stakeholder management, firm capabilities, regulatory environments, knowledge sharing, economic integration.

INTRODUCTION

In the era of globalization, businesses and organizations are increasingly expanding their operations beyond national borders, particularly through multinational collaborations. The European Union (EU), with its unified policies, economic integration, and common market, presents a unique environment for cross-border partnerships that enable firms to share resources, knowledge, and expertise. However, the intricacies of operating in an international and multi-stakeholder context, such as in EU-funded projects, require businesses to adapt their models to accommodate not only economic factors but also the unique cultural, regulatory, and institutional dynamics of the regions involved.

One of the foundational frameworks for understanding international business expansion is the Uppsala Model, developed by Johanson and Vahlne in the 1970s. The model posits that internationalization is a gradual, incremental process that occurs over time as firms increase their market commitment and gain experiential

knowledge. According to this model, businesses begin with limited international involvement and expand incrementally as they gain more information about foreign markets and reduce the perceived risk. This gradual internationalization is often influenced by macro-level factors (such as government policies, economic conditions, and regional integration) and micro-level factors (including firm-specific capabilities, management decisions, and interpersonal relationships).

The Uppsala Model, with its emphasis on the learning process, offers a valuable lens through which we can analyze multinational collaborations within the EU context. However, the EU's distinctive political and economic landscape presents new opportunities and challenges that necessitate an adaptation of traditional internationalization models. The EU's policies promote a collaborative, multi-level governance system that encourages both large firms and small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) to engage in cross-border projects. These projects often require companies to navigate complex regulatory environments, foster cross-cultural cooperation, and integrate new business models to meet the specific goals of EU initiatives.

In this article, we explore how international business models, particularly the Uppsala Model, can be adapted to effectively guide firms involved in EU projects. By examining both the macro- and micro-foundations of this model, we aim to understand the dynamics of multinational collaborations in the EU and provide insights into how businesses can optimize their strategies for success in these complex, multi-partner settings. The macro-foundations of the Uppsala Model emphasize the role of broader institutional, economic, and regulatory factors in shaping business decisions, while the micro-foundations highlight the role of internal capabilities, learning processes, and relational dynamics within organizations. Together, these elements form a comprehensive framework for understanding the dynamics of international business within the EU's multi-stakeholder environment.

Through case studies of various EU-funded projects, this article will illustrate how businesses can apply these macro- and micro-level insights to adapt their internationalization strategies, manage risks, and achieve success in cross-border collaborations. We will explore how the Uppsala Model's gradual approach to internationalization can be adapted to the fast-paced, collaborative, and often dynamic environment of EU projects, which require quick adaptation, flexibility, and efficient stakeholder management. By doing so, this article will contribute to a deeper understanding of the application and relevance of the Uppsala Model in the context of multinational collaborations within the EU.

International business models are central to firms' strategies in the increasingly globalized marketplace. In particular, the European Union (EU) has become a hub for multinational collaborations, facilitating partnerships between companies, research institutions, and governmental organizations. As EU projects become more integral to the region's economic and technological development, understanding the dynamics of international business models becomes essential for the success of these projects.

The Uppsala model, developed by Johanson and Vahlne in the 1970s, has been a cornerstone in international business theory. It posits that firms gradually increase their international involvement as they gain knowledge and experience in foreign markets. The model suggests that internationalization is a step-by-step process, influenced by both macro-level factors (such as institutional and cultural elements) and micro-level factors (including firm-specific resources and capabilities). While the Uppsala model has been widely studied in the context of firm internationalization, its application in the specific environment of EU projects, where multiple stakeholders from various countries collaborate, remains underexplored.

This article aims to bridge this gap by investigating the relevance of the Uppsala model to multinational collaborations in the EU, particularly in the context of EU-funded projects. By examining both macro- and micro-

level factors, this study seeks to demonstrate how the model can be adapted and applied to enhance the strategic management of multinational projects, offering both theoretical and practical insights into the dynamics of international business within the EU framework.

METHODS

Study Design

This research adopts a qualitative case study approach, analyzing several multinational EU projects across different sectors, including technology, healthcare, and sustainable development. These projects were selected for their diversity in terms of industry focus, geographic scope, and the complexity of cross-border collaboration.

Data Collection

Primary data was collected through semi-structured interviews with project managers, key stakeholders, and experts involved in these EU projects. Additionally, secondary data was gathered from project reports, official EU documents, and relevant academic literature on international business models, the Uppsala model, and EU project collaboration.

Sample Selection

The selected case studies include:

1. Project A: A healthcare innovation project involving multinational research institutions and healthcare providers across EU member states.
2. Project B: A renewable energy development initiative funded by the EU, with collaborations between firms from Northern and Southern Europe.
3. Project C: A technology transfer initiative focused on small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) within the EU, spanning multiple sectors and countries.

Data Analysis

The data was analyzed using thematic analysis to identify patterns related to macro- and micro-level factors affecting the adaptation of international business models. Particular attention was paid to how these factors align with the stages of internationalization outlined in the Uppsala model. The analysis also aimed to uncover challenges and opportunities that multinational firms face when adapting their business models for EU project collaborations.

RESULTS

Case Study 1: Project A – Healthcare Innovation

In Project A, the gradual internationalization process in the healthcare sector followed a clear path. Initially, firms and research institutions from a limited number of EU countries collaborated within their borders. As the project progressed, the consortium expanded to include additional partners from other EU regions. The Uppsala model's gradual internationalization framework aligned with this pattern of collaboration. Macro-level factors, such as EU health regulations and funding policies, played a significant role in shaping the collaboration's expansion, while micro-level factors like knowledge-sharing and trust between partners were crucial in overcoming initial barriers to cross-border cooperation.

Case Study 2: Project B – Renewable Energy Development

Project B demonstrated the applicability of the Uppsala model in the renewable energy sector. While firms initially began by sharing knowledge within national boundaries, the project's focus on sustainability and innovation led to cross-border collaborations. The EU's green energy policies provided a favorable macro-level environment for firms to expand their involvement in international collaborations. At the micro-level, the personal relationships and trust built between company leaders and research teams were instrumental in facilitating the project's expansion into new markets.

Case Study 3: Project C – Technology Transfer for SMEs

Project C highlighted the challenges faced by SMEs in adapting to the internationalization process in EU projects. SMEs initially struggled with the complexity of navigating EU regulatory environments, and the slow pace of international expansion was evident. However, over time, as firms gained more experience and knowledge through the collaboration, their involvement in broader EU markets expanded. The micro-level factor of strong interpersonal networks and the ability to communicate effectively across cultural divides became pivotal in accelerating the project's success.

DISCUSSION

The findings from the case studies in this article highlight the complex yet structured nature of multinational collaborations within EU-funded projects, providing an insightful perspective on how the Uppsala internationalization model can be adapted to suit this context. The Uppsala model, originally developed to explain the gradual internationalization process of firms, is particularly relevant to understanding how businesses expand their reach in cross-border collaborations, especially in the regulated and diverse environment of the EU.

Macro-Level Influences on Internationalization

The role of macro-level factors, including EU-wide policies, regulatory frameworks, and institutional support, emerged as a central theme in the case studies. The EU's internal market, regulatory alignment, and common standards provide a conducive environment for the gradual expansion of business activities across borders. For example, in Project A (healthcare innovation), the EU's stringent health regulations and funding mechanisms were crucial in shaping the scope and scale of international collaborations. These macro-level elements facilitated cross-border knowledge sharing, resource mobilization, and innovation, which are key to the success of EU projects. In many cases, these factors acted as enablers, providing a stable and predictable framework within which companies could gradually expand their international operations. The Uppsala model's emphasis on the importance of institutional knowledge and the external environment is thus validated in the context of EU projects, where regulatory compliance and EU-specific policies are critical.

Additionally, EU-funded programs, such as Horizon Europe, offer financial incentives and provide an institutionalized process for firms to navigate the complexities of multinational collaborations. These programs help lower the entry barriers for firms expanding into new markets, thereby aligning well with the Uppsala model's notion of gradual internationalization. The success of these programs, however, also depends on the firm's ability to adjust its business model in accordance with the specific opportunities and challenges presented by the EU's macro-environment.

Micro-Level Factors: Organizational and Interpersonal Dynamics

At the micro-level, the findings suggest that the success of EU projects often hinges on a firm's internal

capabilities and the development of strong interpersonal relationships. For example, in Project C (technology transfer for SMEs), the challenges faced by small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) were evident as they struggled with unfamiliar regulatory environments and lacked the expertise to navigate cross-border collaborations. Over time, however, these firms learned to adapt through a gradual process of knowledge acquisition, skill-building, and collaboration with international partners. The role of trust, communication, and long-term relationships was paramount in overcoming initial barriers to cooperation. This dynamic aligns with the Uppsala model's premise that internationalization is a learning process, and that firms gain experience and confidence as they progressively expand into foreign markets.

Furthermore, the importance of interpersonal relationships in multinational collaborations cannot be understated. In all three case studies, the presence of strong leadership and clear communication played a pivotal role in the success of the projects. These relational dynamics helped mitigate the challenges posed by cultural differences and organizational dissonance, allowing partners to better understand each other's needs, expectations, and working styles. Trust-building mechanisms, such as face-to-face meetings and the establishment of shared objectives, also enhanced the effectiveness of these collaborations. This aligns with the Uppsala model's micro-foundations, which emphasize the importance of interpersonal trust and shared knowledge in facilitating international expansion.

Adapting the Uppsala Model to EU Project Collaborations

While the Uppsala model has been applied to explain the internationalization of firms into global markets, this study demonstrates how it can be adapted for multinational collaborations in the EU framework. The model's step-by-step approach to internationalization is highly relevant for firms involved in EU projects, where the process of collaboration often requires gradual integration into new markets or sectors. The case studies illustrated how firms typically begin with limited involvement in a project and gradually increase their commitment as they gain experience, build relationships, and navigate the complexities of EU collaboration.

For instance, in Project B (renewable energy development), firms initially limited their involvement to domestic activities, only expanding into other EU countries after successfully establishing local networks. Over time, these firms increased their international engagement as they became more familiar with the regulatory environment and better equipped to manage cross-border relationships. The adaptation of the Uppsala model, in this case, highlights the learning process that firms go through as they gradually expand their international presence and build upon previous experiences.

However, it is also important to note the limits of the Uppsala model in the context of EU project collaborations. While the model's incremental internationalization process is highly applicable to many types of business ventures, the complex nature of EU projects sometimes necessitates more rapid internationalization. In some cases, firms may have to adjust their approach to adapt to more dynamic and collaborative environments, such as those found in sectors like renewable energy or technology transfer, where the speed of technological innovation and market demands may require a quicker pace of collaboration and international expansion. Thus, the Uppsala model's emphasis on gradual, step-by-step internationalization may need to be complemented with strategies that allow for flexibility and faster responses to changing market conditions within the EU.

Challenges in Multinational Collaborations

The research also revealed several challenges that firms face when adapting the Uppsala model to the context of EU project collaborations. One of the key issues identified in the case studies was the complexity of managing multiple stakeholders with varying objectives, resources, and capabilities. In EU projects, firms must work with diverse partners from different cultural and institutional backgrounds, each with their own set of expectations

and working practices. This creates a challenge in maintaining alignment and ensuring that all partners remain committed to the project's long-term goals.

Another challenge lies in the diversity of regulatory environments within the EU, which can create hurdles for firms that are expanding beyond their domestic borders. The need to navigate different national regulations and compliance standards within the EU can slow down the internationalization process, especially for firms with limited experience in cross-border collaborations. This was particularly evident in Project C, where SMEs struggled with the complexities of EU regulations, which slowed the project's initial progress.

Finally, the financial and resource constraints faced by firms, particularly SMEs, in international collaborations were another major challenge. The reliance on EU funding mechanisms to support these projects, while beneficial, also places pressure on firms to meet strict deadlines and compliance requirements, potentially limiting their ability to adapt their business models in response to new opportunities or challenges.

The results of this study underscore the relevance of the Uppsala model in understanding the internationalization processes within EU projects. At the macro level, the EU's regulatory environment, policy frameworks, and funding mechanisms significantly influenced the success and expansion of multinational collaborations. The EU's role in providing a common platform for cross-border projects facilitated the gradual expansion of firms into new markets, aligning with the incremental approach suggested by the Uppsala model.

At the micro level, interpersonal relationships, trust-building, and the development of firm-specific capabilities were critical in overcoming the initial challenges of cross-border collaboration. For firms involved in EU projects, adapting their business models to accommodate the collaborative nature of these projects required them to leverage both existing capabilities and new knowledge gained through interactions with international partners.

The Uppsala model's emphasis on gradual internationalization was observed throughout the case studies, with firms initially hesitant to expand beyond their borders but becoming more involved as they gained knowledge and confidence. This gradual approach allowed firms to manage the risks associated with international collaboration while simultaneously capitalizing on the benefits of expanded networks and access to EU resources.

However, the complexity of multinational collaborations, particularly in sectors with diverse regulatory environments and market conditions, poses challenges for the application of the Uppsala model. Firms must not only consider the economic and regulatory factors but also adapt their business models to the cultural and organizational dynamics of cross-border partnerships.

CONCLUSION

The Uppsala model provides a valuable framework for understanding the internationalization process in EU-funded projects. By focusing on both macro- and micro-level factors, this study demonstrates how the model's principles can be effectively adapted to guide multinational collaborations within the EU framework. The gradual approach to internationalization helps firms navigate the complexities of cross-border projects, while interpersonal relationships and trust-building remain essential for successful cooperation.

As the EU continues to foster multinational collaborations across various sectors, understanding the dynamics of international business models, particularly in the context of the Uppsala model, will be crucial for ensuring the success and sustainability of these projects. Firms looking to expand their involvement in EU collaborations should consider the incremental approach to internationalization and focus on building both organizational capabilities and interpersonal networks that facilitate cross-border cooperation.

REFERENCES

1. European Commission. EU Budget for the Future; European Commission: Brussels, Belgium, 2019. [Google Scholar]
2. European Commission. EU Budget for the Future: Technical Briefing on EU's Next Long-Term Budget. 2019. Available online: https://commission.europa.eu/system/files/2019-11/2019-11-05_eu_budget_technical_briefing_-_with_covers.pdf (accessed on 7 August 2024).
3. Muñoz-Fernández, G.A.; Bertucci, A.; Ramos-Ruiz, J.E.; Garo, M.L. The Dynamics of Fund Absorption: Evaluating the Efficacy of EU Structural Funds in Mitigating Regional Inequalities—Calabrian Case. *Economies* 2024, 12, 10. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
4. Jordan, J.; Maccarrone, V.; Erne, R. Towards a Socialization of the EU's New Economic Governance Regime? EU Labour Policy Interventions in Germany, Ireland, Italy and Romania (2009–2019). *Br. J. Ind. Relat.* 2021, 59, 191–213. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
5. Šostar, M.; Marukić, A. Challenges of public procurement in EU funded projects. *Management* 2017, 22, 99–114. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
6. Begg, I. One Instrument, Many Goals: Some Delicate Challenges Facing the EU's Recovery Fund|Publications|CESifo. Munich, 2021. Available online: <https://www.cesifo.org/en/publications/2021/article-journal/one-instrument-many-goals-some-delicate-challenges-facing-eus> (accessed on 7 August 2024).
7. Scholten, M. Shared Tasks, but Separated Controls: Building the System of Control for Shared Administration in an EU Multi-Jurisdictional Setting. *Eur. J. Risk Regul.* 2019, 10, 538–553. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
8. Šostar, M.; Ristanović, V.; de Alwis, C. Application of Successful EU Funds Absorption Models to Sustainable Regional Development. *Economies* 2023, 11, 220. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
9. Šostar, M.; Čevapović, I. Difficulties and Challenges in Implementation Process of EU Projects in Croatia. In Proceedings of the 5th Eurasian Multidisciplinary Forum, EMF 2016, Tbilisi, Georgia, 27–28 October 2016. [Google Scholar]
10. Johanson, J.; Vahlne, J.-E. The Internationalization Process of the Firm-A Model of Knowledge Development and Increasing Foreign Market Commitments. *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* 1977, 8, 23–32. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
11. Vahlne, J.-E.; Schweizer, R.; Johanson, J. Overcoming the Liability of Outsidership-The Challenge of HQ of the Global Firm. *J. Int. Manag.* 2012, 18, 224–232. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
12. Johanson, J.; Vahlne, J.-E. The Uppsala internationalization process model revisited: From liability of Foreignness to Liability of Outsidershi. *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* 2009, 40, 1411–1431. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
13. Vahlne, J.-E.; Johanson, J. From internationalization to evolution: The Uppsala model at 40 years. *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* 2017, 48, 1087–1102. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
14. Alajoutsijärvi, K.; Eriksson, P.; Tikkanen, H. Dominant metaphors in the IMP network discourse: 'The network as a marriage' and 'the network as a business system. *Int. Bus. Rev.* 2001, 10, 91–107. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
15. Hilmersson, M. Experiential knowledge types and profiles of internationalising small and medium-sized enterprises. *Int. Small Bus. J. Res. Entrep.* 2014, 32, 802–817. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

16. Cohen, W.M.; Levinthal, D.A. Absorptive Capacity: A New Perspective on Learning and Innovation. *Adm. Sci. Q.* 1990, 35, 128. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
17. Kurniawan, P.; Hartati, W.; Qodriah, S.L.; Badawi, B. From knowledge sharing to quality performance: The role of absorptive capacity, ambidexterity and innovation capability in creative industry. *Manag. Sci. Lett.* 2020, 10, 433–442. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
18. Nahapiet, J.; Ghoshal, S. Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 1998, 23, 242–266. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
19. Morgan, R.M.; Hunt, S.D. The Commitment-Trust Theory of Relationship Marketing. *J. Mark.* 1994, 58, 20. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
20. Coviello, N.; Kano, L.; Liesch, P.W. Adapting the Uppsala model to a modern world: Macro-context and microfoundations. *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* 2017, 48, 1151–1164. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
21. Monaghan, S.; Tippmann, E.; Coviello, N. Born digitals: Thoughts on their internationalization and a research agenda. *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* 2019, 51, 11–22. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
22. Hammond, D. Exploring the genealogy of systems thinking. *Syst. Res. Behav. Sci.* 2002, 19, 429–439. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
23. Berlinski, D. Catastrophe theory and its applications: A critical review. *Behav. Sci.* 1978, 23, 402–416. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
24. von Bertalanffy, L. *General System Theory: Foundations, Development, Applications*; Braziller: New York, NY, USA, 1968. [Google Scholar]
25. Eason, T.; Garmestani, A.S.; Stow, C.A.; Rojo, C.; Alvarez-Cobelas, M.; Cabezas, H. Managing for resilience: An information theory-based approach to assessing ecosystems. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 2016, 53, 656–665. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
26. Ewald, J.; Sieber, P.; Garde, R.; Lang, S.N.; Schuster, S.; Ibrahim, B. Trends in mathematical modeling of host-pathogen interactions. *Cell. Mol. Life Sci.* 2020, 77, 467–480. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef] [PubMed]
27. Kah, S.; Martinos, H.; Budzich-Tabor, U. CLLD in the 2014–2020 EU Programming Period: An Innovative Framework for Local Development. *World* 2023, 4, 122–139. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]
28. Checkland, P. *Systems Thinking, Systems Practice*; John Wiley & Sons: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 1999; Available online: <https://www.wiley.com/enal/Systems+Thinking,+Systems+Practice:+Includes+a+30+Year+Retrospective-p-9780471986065> (accessed on 25 October 2021).
29. Bentley, C. *Adaptable Project Management—A combination of Agile and Project Management for All (PM4A)*; JSTOR: New York, NY, USA, 2020. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]