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The world market has during recent decades become an increasingly globalized arena, in which lowered trade barriers, enhanced technology, worldwide communication and containerization have made internationalization an easily obtainable option for companies. The once dominating multinational enterprises are present day challenged by small- and medium sized enterprises as global actors, and competitiveness is an ever-increasing factor, making the pursuit and exploitation of opportunities essential.

The International Entrepreneurship Theory has during the last two decades emerged as a theory explaining the phenomena of small- and medium sized enterprises internationalizing their operations at an early age; a theory comprehending entrepreneurial behavior, the ability to explore and take advantage of opportunities overlooked by others in order to create value in the organization.

The purpose of this thesis is to create an understanding of the emergence, definition and theoretical framework of the International Entrepreneurship Theory. By implementing a deductive research approach and a quantitative research method, empirical data is collected in order to confront the theoretical framework in the analysis. The analysis will further be the basis for conclusions and recommendations that will conclude our thesis.
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“Probably. From my point of view, globalization has led to that our so called home market has expanded. In our case the Nordic countries increasingly has become our home market” – Company 5

“Dare to venture, nothing is impossible.” – Company 22

“Hardly, it is mainly contacts and coincidences that guided us historically. Today we would be more structured.” – Company 40

“There are different strategy models for different markets due to cultural differences, geographical location, access to capital and skilled at customers.” – Company 37

“...The situation today is totally different and we would be able to approach an internationalization more planned." – Company 14
- Glossary -

IB – International Business
IE - International Entrepreneurship
INV - International New Venture
JIBS – Journal of International Business Studies
MNE - Multinational Enterprise
NW – Network Model
RBT – Resource Based Theory
RBV – Resource Based View
SCA – Sustained Competitive Advantage
SME – Small and Medium sized Enterprise
U-model – Uppsala Internationalization Model
VRIN – (V)aluable (R)are (I)nimitable (N)on-substitutable
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1 Introduction

The following chapter will provide the background to the problem, followed up by a problem discussion leading to the problem definition and the purpose of the thesis. The target group and the delimitations of the study then conclude the chapter.

1.1 Background

During the last two decades International entrepreneurship (IE) has received a vast amount of attention in the research field and has present day its own specialized conferences and journals, as well as being consistently present in established conferences and academic journals worldwide (Zahra et al, 2005). Firstly coined by Morrow in 1988 (Oviatt & McDougall, 2005) and then later recognized to have been defined for the first time by Oviatt & McDougall in 1994: “an international new venture as a business organisation that, from inception, seeks to derive significant competitive advantage from the use of resources and the sale of outputs in multiple countries” (p.49), the IE theory has added a whole new dimension to the international business studies (Johanson et al, 2010; Zahra et al, 2005; Hitt et al, 2001; Butler et al, 2010; Dimitratos, 2010).

International Entrepreneurship emerged initially as a theory describing the very entrepreneurial nature of small and medium-sized enterprises* (SMEs) that internationalized their business from inception, these are referred to as international new ventures (INV) (Zahra, 2005; Wright & Westhead, 2007). The theory became a counterpart to the widely recognized internationalization theories of multinational enterprises (MNEs), e.g. the Uppsala Internationalization theory (Johanson & Vahlne, 1977), which is addressing a field that was previously uncharted. Deriving from the study of international new ventures, the IE theory has been the subject to extensive research all over the world and refinements and development has been an ongoing process, adding up in the e.g. redefining it to address not only international new

* The European Commission’s definition of a SME is a headcount of < two hundred fifty, turnover of ≤ € fifty Million and a balance sheet total of ≤ € forty three million (www.ec.europa.eu, 2011).
ventures but also the internationalization of established SMEs (Oviatt & McDougall, 2005; Zahra et al, 2005).

In year 2000 Oviatt & McDougall presented their widely recognized definition of International Entrepreneurship (Hitt et al, 2001; Mügwe, 2006; O’cass, 2008; Turcan et al, 2004). It was defined as: “international entrepreneurship is a combination of innovative, proactive, and risk-seeking behavior that crosses national borers and is intended to create value in organizations” (Oviatt & McDougall, 2000 p.903). Given this definition it is reasonably important to acquaint oneself with the concepts of internationalization and entrepreneurship. The Journal of International Entrepreneurship pictures that International Entrepreneurship “analyzes internationalization in the context of entrepreneurship” (www.springer.com, 08-04-11) and Johanson et al (2010) denotes that in order to understand IE in its entirety, one must first understand the conceptions of internationalization and entrepreneurship.

### 1.1.1 Internationalization

The internationalization process is expressed to be the outcome of a company’s intentions to expand internationally and subsequently an increasing involvement in international markets with regard to the efforts of doing so (Johanson et al, 2010). Hollensen (2008) explains internationalization as a discrete process, often viewed as being distinct from case to case which occurs when a company decides to expand business activities into international markets.

During the last decades Internationalization has become an increasingly examined field of research; the studies were originally focusing on large corporations but have in recent years shed more light upon the internationalization process of SMEs (O’cass & Weerawardena, 2008; Sommer, 2010). Knight (2001) explains that this increasing interest for SMEs’ internationalization process is driven by the accumulative importance that SMEs plays in international trade. They are now accounting for a significant portion of exports from industrialized countries and the view of international business being a domain of resource-rich multinational companies is
moving as SMEs emerge in large numbers. The confederation of Swedish Enterprise confirms this fact as SMEs represent a ninety nine point nine quota of the total amount of companies in Sweden and the European Commission enhances this by stating that they represent ninety nine percent of all enterprises in the European Union (www.ec.europa.eu, 2011; www.ekonomifakta.se, 2011).

Moreover, Oviatt & McDougall (1995) explains that the increase in internationalization of SMEs is an outcome of globalization that has lowered trade barriers and the rapid development of worldwide communication and transportation. These factors have increased the pursuit of opportunities on foreign markets, therefore also the international competition, forcing companies to internationalize. SMEs are further said to, in contrast to MNEs, not to be troubled with complex bureaucratic procedures and expensive information systems (Knight, 2001).

1.1.2 Entrepreneurship

Jarillo & Stevenson (1990) argues that in order to define entrepreneurship in a useful way one needs to ask oneself “what is an entrepreneur?”. The authors explain that entrepreneurship is seen in some cases as something indistinguishable from innovation, whereas by others as something equivalent to good managerial praxis. They define entrepreneurship as being behavioral and situational dependent, concluding in the view of that “entrepreneurship is a process by which individuals – either on their own or inside organizations – pursue opportunities without regard to the resources they currently control” (Jarillo & Stevenson, 1990, p.23).

However, Butler & Ko (2007) emphasizes that prerequisites for entrepreneurial behavior is that the entrepreneur possess a solid knowledge base, extensive social network, access to significant information, firm commitment and staying alert to opportunities; scanning the environment frequently. Entrepreneurial behavior explained to be linked to the case of some individuals making the connections in the context, “connecting the dots where the links are not obvious” (Butler & Ko, 2007 p.369). By stating this the authors build upon the work of Schumpeter (1934) that in
his studies discovered that the entrepreneur’s ability to innovate was the result of an irregular rather than an even process.

1.2 Problem discussion

In the International Business and Global Marketing course in the spring of 2011 we were for the first time introduced to the IE theory. As we were handed the article: “theoretical milestones in international business: The journey to international entrepreneurship theory” by Bruce Mtigwe (2006), an article that visualized a model of eleven different theories altogether trying to illuminate and work in a symbiosis in order to frame the internationalization of SMEs. Out of the indistinctness deriving from the moment we were first introduced to the International Entrepreneurship theory we felt an urge to study the very phenomenon of International Entrepreneurship, as we were unsure of its theoretical framework, origin and definition.

![Diagram of eleven different theories]
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International Entrepreneurship has risen as a resembling phenomenon in explaining the anteriorly field of SMEs internationalization process. By emphasizing the very nature of international new ventures as well as established firms in a business environment wherein internationalization has become a more viable and less costly
option, due to such factors as the technological development, the internet and falling trade barriers (Knight, 2001; Zahra et al, 2005).

But even as the IE theory has achieved worldwide recognition, e.g. being published in academic journals such as Journal of International Business (JIBS), as well as having its own journal addressing the research field exclusively (the Journal of International Entrepreneurship), the theory is widely criticized to lack a unifying theoretical framework and a founding definition (Mtigwe, 2006; Oviatt & McDougall, 2005; Turcan et al, 2004; Wright et al, 2007).

International Entrepreneurship research is expressed to have been the subject of research in absence of a theoretical foundation as well as a research overshadowed by concepts borrowed from the International Business literature. This resulting in no common accepted paradigm being created in the IE research field (Zahra et al, 2005; Turcan et al, 2004; Hitt et al, 2001). The International Entrepreneurship Theory is considered to be most influenced by three models: the Network Model (NW) (Zahra et al, 2005; Oviatt & McDougall, 2005; Wright et al 2007; Hitt et al, 2001; Mtigwe, 2005; Turcan et al, 2004), the Uppsala Internationalization Model (U-model) (Oviatt & McDougall, 2005; Zahra et al, 2005; Dimitratos, 2010; Turcan et al, 2004; Mtigwe, 2006), the Resource Based View (RBV) (Zahra et al, 2005; Hitt et al, 2007; Turcan et al 2004) and to a lesser extent by the product life-cycle theory and transaction cost theory (Zahra et al 2005; Hitt et al, 2001). Oviatt & McDougall (2005) emphasizes that the broad multidisciplinary field of IE research gives many opportunities to pursue and explore many interesting research questions can be addressed by employing various existing theories. Zahra et al (2005, p.130) on the other hand note that “some IE research has been creative in offering rich insights into complex issues. Other research simply mirrors international business (IB) or strategy research, ignoring IE’s unique territory... we worry that the distinctive and rich IE territory is not fully exploited in theory building, research design and analysis. This has given IE research a mechanical quality that has impoverished theory building and has limited the overall impact of prior findings"
Secondly, the definition of International Entrepreneurship has been the subject of constant modification. Zahra & George (2002) points out that e.g. Oviatt & McDougall have defined International Entrepreneurship differently 1994, 1996 and 2000, which in inclusion to a vast amount of other definitions given by a range of authors, e.g. Wright & Ricks (1994), Mtigwe (2006) Zahra & George (2002), has created a state of contingency. A definition that is causing continuing debate. Even as Oviatt & McDougall’s definition from 2000 has been widely recognized there is still a demand for a more precise definition (Mtigwe, 2006; Turcan et al 2004). The International Entrepreneurship theory, in comparison to the e.g. the Uppsala Internationalization Model (Johanson & Vahlne, 1977), do obviously lack a unanimous theoretical framework and definition to comply with. We want from the following discussion examine the validity of International Entrepreneurship as an internationalization model and also develop a profound understanding of the theories that constitutes its theoretical framework, as well as the origin and definition of the theory.

1.3 Problem Definition

1.3.1 Main Research Problem

To what extent is International Entrepreneurship Theory validated as an internationalization model?

1.3.2 Research Problems

In order to validate the International Entrepreneurship Theory as an internationalization model, it is essential to determine its emergence and definition. Furthermore, what theoretical framework it is constituted of and finally on basis of empirical findings, distinguish the most apparent aspects of the International Entrepreneurship theory for describing the internationalization process.

How has International Entrepreneurship emerged as an internationalization model and how is it defined?
1.4 **Purpose of the thesis**

- Describe the International Entrepreneurship theory’s origin, definition and theoretical framework

- Identify what aspects of International Entrepreneurship that are the most apparent for describing SMEs’ internationalization process

- Conclude the validity of International Entrepreneurship as an internationalization model

1.5 **Target Group**

We find that this thesis can be of interest for both academics and companies. It will for the academics provide an insight to the International Entrepreneurship theory, highlighting the internationalization process of SMEs in the context of a multidisciplinary approach. It will moreover provide an apprehension for the companies of the underlying patterns and the most appreciated features of Swedish SMEs’ internationalization process. Hopefully this study will furthermore help other students to better grasp the very essentials of the International Entrepreneurship when studying internationalization theories.
1.6 Delimitations

The theoretical delimitations that we have implemented in this thesis have its basis in a profound theoretical review of the International Entrepreneurship Theory that we accomplished due to the very many researchers’ criticism towards the theory’s lack of: a founding definition (Oviatt & McDougall, 2005; Turcan et al, 2004; Mtigwe, 2006; Wright et al, 2007) and a unified theoretical framework (Zahra et al, 2005; Turcan et al, 2004; Hitt et al, 2001). We have due to the concern of the mentioned criticism and the time and size limits of this thesis chosen to focus on the theories most utterly expressed to be of importance from the researchers’ point of view. We found, as previously mentioned, that theories argued to have influenced International Entrepreneurship most expressively are the *The Uppsala Internationalization Model, The Network Model and the Resource Based View.*

The International Entrepreneurship Theory is the deeply rooted in the research field of SMEs as it emerged as a contradictory response to the research field of MNEs (Oviatt & McDougall, 1994). On account of this fact our study will naturally be performed on SMEs. We have chosen to not focus on one specific industry but instead performed our study on companies from multiple industries, a cross-sectional study. We are well aware that studying one specific industry may result in collection empirical data that can be used for longitudinal research in the future or contributing cumulative and consistent findings within the field (Zahra & George, 2002; O’cass & Weerwardena, 2008; Dimitratos, 2010). Notwithstanding, the focal point of this study is not a specific industry of interest but instead the validity of the International Entrepreneurship Theory and hence we have chosen to do a cross-sectional study; generalizing the International Entrepreneurship theory validity as an internationalization model on Swedish SMEs rather than those specifically included in one industry.
2 Methodology

In the following chapter the methodological framework used in this thesis will be presented. The chapter contains of explanations for the various research methods that have been implemented as well as how the empirical data has been collected, finalized with the reliability and validity of the study.

2.1 Research Approach

Jacobsen (2002) describes methodology as a tool to analyze reality, either perceived as an objective interpretation or a human construction. Alvesson & Deetz (2000) explains that the method is in very rational terms consisting of design, control, procedure, validity and reliability; forming the keystones for the researchers work with empirical data. There are three research approaches that are frequently used to collect and analyze data; Induction, deduction and abduction (Olsson & Sörensson, 2007). Induction and deduction are considered to be the two main models of explanation whereas abduction is considered an option to the two of them (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2008).

Induction is explained by Jacobsen (2002) to be from empiricism to theory, meaning that theories ideologically are created out of the context from what is observed. Alvesson & Sköldberg (2008) criticizes that the outcome of the inductive approach is the result of multiple particular cases that are in the end forming an understanding of what should be generally validated as a common truth. Jacobsen (2002) does further criticize that all human beings do have some form of preconceptions of what is important when undertaking an empirical study, which will influence what kind of data that will be gathered. There will moreover always be limitations of information gathered; unconsciously or not.

Deduction is expressed to be using general principles to form conclusions, explained by Olsson & Sörensson (2007, p.32) to be “theory telling how relations between different circumstances appear in reality”. Jacobsen (2002) denotes that deduction is the approach of going from theory to empiricism, an approach used best when first
obtaining information and forming expectations about the reality and then subsequently encountering it to observe whether or not the reality matches the expectations. Alvesson & Sköldberg (2008) addresses criticism towards this approach since it is presupposing what is to be explained; the common rule always being valid, consequently in the current case.

Abduction is explained to be a correlation between induction and deduction; induction by describing how the state of the research area is perceived by the researcher and deduction by using already existing theories to increase knowledge (Olsson & Sörensson, 2007). Alvesson & Sköldberg (2008) however stresses that abduction is no simple composition of induction and deduction but rather a specific method, contributing new and completely own moments. It comprehends understanding of the changing environment as the empirical application area gradually develops during the process and theory is adjusted.

We considered the deductive method the foremost choice since we neither sought to take the conversely approach of emanating from discoveries in reality (induction) nor to adjust theory by moving back and forth between theory and empirics (abduction). We have instead in this thesis aimed to attain a better understanding of the IE theory’s theoretical framework, origin, definition and its validity on reality. The deductive method enables us to study and take the perspective of previously conducted research in the field, the approach of presupposing what is to be expected from theory and then testing it on reality; the most significant approach for us since our focal point is the theory itself.

2.2 Research Method

Holme & Solvang (2006) explains that there are no absolute differences between qualitative and quantitative research methods. Both of the methods are used as tools in order to fulfill common purposes; to give a better understanding of society, people, groups and institutions. However the authors denote that there are some characteristic features for the methods distinguishing one form another. The qualitative method having a more explaining purpose, wherein e.g. context, structure
and understanding of the distinctive is emphasized. The quantitative method is gazing more upon the descriptive purpose of what is common, average or representative of broader research (Holme & Solvang, 2006). Olsson & Sörensson (2007) clarifies that qualitative research aims to go gradually in-depth into specific moments, phenomenas and areas, using unstructured formulated questions. Whereas quantitative research uses well-structured question formulations, which are rooted in theories, tested to be discarded or verified.

Alvesson & Deetz (2000) stress that the qualitative method create prerequisites for more deeper and richer descriptions, to reinforce and elaborate new theories and satisfy the researchers interest. Merriam (2009) describes qualitative research as being associated with fieldwork, having interviews and observations as data collective methods and by being flexible achieving a rich and holistic view. Quantitative research is on the other hand based upon empirical data, using questionnaires to collect data in order to achieve precise and numerical findings.

As we aimed to achieve an understanding of the underlying patterns in the IE theory we conducted the quantitative research design to better comprehend the theory with the support of reality-based cases. Jacobsson (2002) and Olsson & Sörensson (2007) express that the deductive method is closely interlinked to the quantitative method and explained to be a withdrawn approach, postulating that the questions are inflexible and the answers are certain; an approach that gives the researcher the prerequisites to design the study in relation to the relevant information. Olsson & Sörensson (2007) does moreover emphasize that the researcher must be neutral, objective and distant to what is studied; something that we have taken with great concern, as we wanted the information collected to be as valid and reliable as possible.

2.3 Research Strategy

Yin (2007) describe that there are different types of strategies that a researcher may use when gathering empirical data, such as case studies, surveys and analysis of source material; each strategy having its pros and cons that the researcher must take into consideration. It is also important to carefully define the problem as it may
contribute insights to which type of research strategy that will be applied.

Denscombe (2009) explains that researchers who choose surveys as a research strategy can use a variety of methods: questionnaires, interviews, observations and documenting. What distinguishes surveys is the combination of a broad coverage; focus on the setting at a given time and the dependence on empirical data. The survey should be designed in order to gather information that then can be used for analysis and also consist of series of predetermined questions so that every participant in the survey will receive the same questions.

2.3.1 Survey as Research Strategy

Bryman & Bell (2005) states that one of the disadvantages with surveys is that the researchers can't help the respondents with interpretation of the questions or ask follow up questions. It is therefore important that the questions are unmistakable and easy to interpret. Furthermore that it is important to keep the survey as short as possible in order to limit the risk of the respondent to grow tired and discontinue. Also, having a design that is easy to follow is of importance, as the respondent should not miss to answer any question. Denscombe (2009) explains that the length of the survey is the most effective way to discourage a respondent not to answer a form. Further stating that a survey is appropriate to use when: there is a large number of respondents in many different places, when it concerns fairly elemental information and when the social climate is sufficiently open to guarantee complete and honest answers.

There are two commonly used inquiries used in surveys: open-ended questions and closed-ended questions. In an open-ended question the respondent answer freely and there are no given alternatives. This provides according to Bryman & Bell (2005) both benefits and disadvantages. Some of the benefits that the authors emphasize are that the open-ended questions give the respondent the option to use his own words and are not forced to use the words of the researcher and not “lead” the respondent’s thoughts in any particular direction. The open-ended questions are a good choice
when studying new or unfamiliar fields of research. The disadvantages are that the researcher must encode the answers and that it can be very time-consuming.

The closed-ended questions are considered as more easily to ask from the researchers point of view and also easier to answer from the respondent's part, as no elaborated answers are needed but rather specific answering alternatives are to be marked. These questions are more simple to process and do also provide a greater comparability. The disadvantages of these questions are that there is room for spontaneity in the respondent's answers. Moreover, the respondents can interpret concepts in many different ways, which can compromise the validity. Close-ended questions may annoy the respondent if no “correct” option is given to a question, which also can result in that the researcher not receiving sufficient data (Bryman & Bell, 2005).

Denscombe (2009) emphasizes that formulating the questions of the survey is one of the most difficult tasks when designing a questionnaire; it is also one of the most important. The questions should be impossible to misinterpret and it is also important that enough answer alternatives are given to the respondents. Furthermore, the researcher should only use a minimum of technical terms and only ask the most necessary questions. The author moreover states that questionnaires are on one hand, economical, easy to arrange and distribute and providing standardized responses; accurate data and eliminating the effect of personal interaction. On the other hand, it can be difficult to check the veracity of the provided answers, pre-encoded response can be frustrating for the respondent and answers can be poorly completed or even incomplete.

We did in our study choose to employ a survey as research strategy due to the large database that was required for our quantitative study. Our survey consisted of sixteen questions, with two additional optional questions not directly connected to the purpose of the thesis. We also attached a text box were the respondents could write any additional comments or ask questions about the survey in addition to the option allowing the respondent to choose to be anonymous or not, was also added.
Methodology

The survey entailed three pages wherein the first contained questions about the respondent; e.g. name and position within the company, general information about the company, number of employees and turnover. The second page consisted of the actual survey questions for the thesis, which all were of the close-ended type although four of them having an additional option wherein the respondent freely could write their answer if the person did not consider the other options sufficient enough. The final page composed of the two optional questions and comment field.

In order to limit misunderstandings the questionnaire was thoroughly elaborated and also reviewed by an external researcher, who has conducted research within the international business research field. Moreover, detailed explanations were provided for each question that contained any type of terminology. In order to facilitate interpretation of data and the respondents answering process, consistent uniform grading scales were implemented in the survey.

2.3.2 Sample Selection

The selection of companies for this study was made on different criteria that were established in order to fulfill the purpose of the thesis and to provide a substantial database, sufficient enough to answer the research questions. In order to distinguish suitable companies three main criteria were developed.

- Firstly, the companies selected should be from Sweden,
- Secondly, they should be classified as SMEs
- Finally, they should have established international operations.

There are two main types of sampling techniques that researchers can utilize: probability sampling and non-probability sampling (Denscombe, 2009). The companies selected to participate in our survey were chosen based upon a probability sampling, which Bryman & Bell (2005) defines as selection based on “random base”. Denscombe (2009) states that this means that the selection of people or phenomena,
literally, is random. The use of random selection is based on the assumption that the subjects studied are likely to provide a sample that constitutes a representative cross-section sample of the whole population. This is based on the conditions of that the chosen sample is of a sufficient number and the selection of studied objects really has been random.

Zahra & George (2002) states that the study by Autio et al (2000) used a sample of 57 Finnish firms, Bloodgood et al (1996) used a sample of 61 ventures and Oviatt & McDougall (1996) used a sample of 62 firms. This worked as a guideline for our research and the amount of samples that was going to be needed for a sufficient database.

In total fifty seven companies participated in our survey, whereas fifty of the companies’ answers where fully usable.

As a majority of the company's wished to be anonymous, we decided to be consistent and keep all companies anonymous, not mentioning any specific company by name. The fact that many companies wished to be anonymous is something we believe not having any negative effect on the study, instead we believe that the option of anonymity made some answers more informative; information which otherwise would have remained concealed.

The samples selected were acquired through a Swedish business search engine, which provides a free database with companies, authorities and organizations. A database consisting of information only collected through reliable and well-renowned sources such as Statistics Sweden, Swedish Companies Registration Office, The Swedish Tax Agency and The Swedish Customs.

### 2.4 Data Collection

According to Yin (1994) are there two main data collection techniques, secondary- and primary data. Secondary data is existing information compiled by someone else than the researcher. Primary data is when the researcher himself assembles the data needed, by performing interviews and observations.
2.4.1 Secondary Data

Merriam (1998) writes that secondary data is information that previously have been published and assembled for different purposes. The main types of secondary data are books, articles and Internet sources. Merriam further denotes that it is important for the researcher to critically review secondary data as it difficult to verify the quality and reliability of these sources.

2.4.2 Primary Data

The data used in our thesis is essentially primary data, which Kylén (2004) explains as firsthand-information, seen as more reliable than secondary data. Furthermore Kylén (2004) emphasizes that it is important to choose the right method of data collection; accessible within reasonable cost and depending on what reliability they provide. The data used in this thesis was collected through an internet based survey. Surveys conducted through the Internet are explained to have the advantage of being able to reach a large number of respondents (Jacobsen, 2002). Furthermore Denscombe (2009) stress that surveys conducted through the Internet are fast and cheap alternatives relative to surveys made via mail, phone or interviews.

Denscombe (2009) highlights that there are three types of questionnaires that can be conducted through the Internet; questionnaires distributed via e-mail, forms as attachments or web-based forms. Furthermore, the author explains that web based questionnaires are designed as webpages in which the respondent can answer the questions. This provides two benefits; the survey can take advantage of all the design elements that are available for web pages, and the respondents can easily answer and submit their answer by simply pushing a button.

We choose to create our survey with the internet based program Adobe FormsCentral; an online form builder that provides an easy platform to create and distribute online surveys. A link to the survey was distributed in an informative email to the selected companies, by which they could open the survey, fill in their answers and submit it.
The data was then automatically saved to a database were each of the respondents individual answer could be viewed.

In order to ensure that the questions asked in the survey were understandable we performed fifteen pilot studies, where we first called the companies on the phone and asked to be put through to the person in charge of the company’s international operations. We explained the purpose of our study and asked if they wanted to participate. If they were interested in participating the email with the link to the internet based survey was send. As the pilot companies answered the questions in the survey, we checked the answers in order to see if they provided answers sufficient and relevant enough to the study and that questions were considered understandable, which they were.

2.5 Research Quality

The quality of the research is one of the most important aspects of a thesis; the insights and conclusions must be presented truthfully to the reader. Regardless of the type of research, it is of immense importance that the authors conduct the research thoroughly in order to ensure validity and reliability. Concerns that should be approached with careful thoughtfulness to conceptualizations, data collecting methods, analyze, interpretation and presentation in the study (Merriam, 2009).

2.5.1 Validity

Bryman & bell (2005) states that the concept of validity concerns the extent of whether one or more indicators, designed in order to measure a specific concept, actually measure what they are intended to measure. There are several ways to determine validity, which are dependent on the research design. The theoretical validity can be divided into five sub-groups:

- Face validity; relevant when developing a new type of measurement, in which it is important for the researcher to be able to prove that the face validity is sufficiently high i.e. that it seems to reflect the content of the issued concepts.
- Concurrent validity; have to be taken into consideration when the studied cases
are different and the researcher is aware of it and that it is relevant for the concept studied.

- Predictive validity; a way of testing validity where the researcher uses future criteria in order measure the result.
- Construct validity; the researcher deduces a hypothesis that is central to the concept in question to see if any connection can be found; it is crucial not to draw undue conclusions from the absence of context.
- Convergent validity; the researcher measures the validity by using alternative methods to see if the validity is convergent e.g. by first preparing the survey through structured interviews.

Bryman & Bell, 2005

As the study is based on quantitative data collected through a questionnaire much effort was put to ensure a high validity. When designing the questionnaire, we began by studying relevant theories and already published studies in the same field of research. Emphasis was put on how the theoretical concepts were operationalized and by studying the measuring instruments used in the already published studies and compared them with the questionnaire we designed. We could by adapting this way of structuring our questionnaire ensure higher relevance of some of our survey questions, which is according to Bryman and Bell (2005) a good way of increasing the validity.

In order to ensure that the answers obtained would be relevant and valid, the respondents were selected by their positions in the companies. Key positions within each company in relation to international business were of outmost importance, respondents that would possess relevant information and be able to answer our questions. Among the respondents, positions in the companies were e.g. chief executive officer, owners, sales and export managers. Each of the companies were also asked to provide information regarding turnover and number of employees in order to ensure that they were relevant for our study; a way of double-checking the information provided by the search engine on the internet from which we initially collected the information about the companies.
2.5.2 Reliability

Reliability concerns the question of how reliable the data collected is and to what extent the results would be the same if the study was to be repeated (Bryman & Bell, 2005). Bryman & Bell (2005) states that reliability consists of three factors, which are important to consider when deciding whether or not the data is reliable: stability, internal reliability and inter-rater reliability.

- Stability; how stable the measurement is over time, so that one can be certain that the result concerns a sample of respondents, which do not fluctuate over time.
- Internal Reliability; how reliable and consequential the indicators are that constitutes the scale or index.
- Inter-rater reliability; how stable or alike the assessment of the respondents answers are if several analysts assess the same subjective questions.

Bryman & Bell, 2005

Denscombe (2009) stress moreover that the reliability of the respondents’ answers can be increased by using easy, understandable, terms when designing the survey questions. Therefore we strived to make sure that the questions were easy to understand when we formulated them in the survey. In order to ensure that the questions were understandable and no misinterpretations were possible, we had an outsider reviewer with no former knowledge of the subject that looked at the survey and supported us with useful feedback before it was distributed to the companies.

2.5.3 Response Rate

Bryman & Bell (2005) emphasizes that a large rate of non-response lowers the reliability of a survey. However, the authors also denote, that it is usually surveys, that more often than not, are characterized by a low response rate. Even though, there are
a vast amount of recognized and published articles building upon a database with a low response rate and the authors emphasizes that researchers should not hesitate to use surveys as long as they are aware of the consequences and limitations that such non-response implicates.

The response rate of our study was twenty eight point five percent as the survey was sent out to two hundred companies and of those companies fifty seven participated in the survey. The large rate of non-response might be explained by the time limit as no reminders were sent to the companies as the empirical data had to be compiled and by the time we received fifty seven answers we felt that the amount of data was sufficient enough for this type of study, as mentioned in the case selection (2.3).
3 Theoretical Framework

In the following chapter the theoretical framework will be presented. Each theory is presented individually with: a background – the theory itself – its relation to International Entrepreneurship. The chapter will also include the International Entrepreneurship Theory itself and finished with criticism towards the theories presented.

3.1 The Uppsala Model

3.1.1 Background

Research of the internationalization process of companies’ centers according to Mtigwe (2006) in the Uppsala Model, also referred to as the Establishment Chain, Incremental Stages Model, the Nordic school or the Stages Model. The starting point for the model was a collection of articles published by researchers at the University of Uppsala, which later on summed up and outlined in what is today knows as the Uppsala Model (U-model) (Björkman, 2000).

The theory emerged in contradiction to the established international business theories at that time, which implied that firms choose a mode of entry based on an analysis of risks and costs in relation to their own resources and market characteristics, in order to pick the optimal mode (Johanson & Vahlne, 1977; 1990; 2009).

The theoretical framework for incremental internationalization was first developed Johanson & Wiedersheim-Paul (1975) in a study of four Swedish firms, where they observed that firms move along a series of incremental steps when they first internationalize. The model has its theoretical base in the behavioral theory of the firm (Cyert & March, 1963; Aharoni, 1966) and is influenced by “the theory of the growth of the firm” (Penrose, 1959).
The process evolves in interplay between the development of knowledge about foreign markets and operations, and increasing commitment of resources to foreign markets (Johanson & Vahlne, 1990). How organizations learn and what impact learning has on organizational behavior is a central issue to the U-model, having its emphasis on experiential learning through ongoing activities (Björkman, 2002).

3.1.2 The Uppsala Model – the four stages and underlying patterns

The U-model explains that there are two patterns in the internationalization process of the firm. The first pattern is that a firm’s engagement in a specific country market is developed through the establishment chain, which is a sequence of small incremental steps that results in extended commitment; a higher degree of commitment for each step taken in the process (Johanson & Vahlne, 1990). Johanson & Wiedersheim-Paul (1975) identified this sequence as the four stages of the establishment chain.

- The first step is that no regular export activities are performed on the foreign market, the firm has no specific commitment of resources to that particular market and established information channels to and from the market are absent.

- The second step is export via independent representatives, so called agents. The firm has now established a channel to the market through which it receives somewhat steady market information from, a step also implying certain commitment to the market.

- The third step is to set up a sales subsidiary that will provide a controlled and steady information channel to the market. This enables the firm the ability to control the type and amount of information flow between the foreign market and the firm. At this stage the firm also receives direct market knowledge and experience.

- The fourth step of the establishment chain is a production/manufacturing facility. This stage implies an even larger resource commitment and a larger information flow, resulting in even greater knowledge and experience of the market.

Johanson & Wiedersheim-Paul (1975).
The second pattern is firms tending to enter markets psychically more distant as they progress in the establishment chain (Johanson & Vahlne, 1990). Psychic distance is defined as “factors preventing or disturbing the flows of information between firm and market” (Johanson & Wiedersheim-Paul, 1975, p.308). Such psychical factors are further expressed by the authors as e.g. differences in language, political systems, culture, level of education and level of industrial development.

In the model it is assumed that the firm strives to increase its long-term profit, simultaneously as it at the same time also strives to keep risk-taking as low as possible, endeavors that characterize decision-making on all levels of the firm. These basal assumptions along with state of economic and business aspects within the company provide the framework from which a decision is taken. It is moreover assumed in the model that the stage on which the company is in the establishment chain influences perceived opportunities and risks, that subsequently influences commitment decisions and current activities (Johanson & Vahlne, 1977).

The U-model furthermore characterized by two change mechanisms. Firstly, firms change by experiential learning from operations and current activities on foreign markets. Secondly, companies change through commitment decisions that are made in order to strengthen their position on the foreign market (Johanson & Vahlne, 2009).

### 3.1.3 The Uppsala Model – state and change aspects

A distinction is made between state and change aspects of the internationalization process, where the state aspects are on one hand the firm’s commitment and knowledge of a specific market. The change aspects are on the other hand present business activities and commitment decisions of the firm (Johanson & Vahlne, 1977). It is moreover explained that these four concepts of commitment, market knowledge, present business activities and commitment decisions are linked together and affect each other, as well as being dependent of each other. “Market knowledge and market commitment are assumed to affect decisions regarding commitment of resources to foreign markets and the way current activities are performed. Market knowledge and
market commitment are, in turn, affected by current activities and commitment decisions.” (Johanson & Vahlne, 1990, p.11).

Further it is stated that this process can be perceived as cyclic:

**Figure 2**

### State Aspects

Johanson & Vahlne (1977) emphasizes that the concept of market commitment is composed of two factors. The first being the degree of commitment of the firm and the second the amount of resources committed. Resources located in a specific market area can be considered as commitment to the market and the degree of commitment is higher if the resources allocated are combined with other parts of the company, a value as a result from these integrated activities. The second part is the amount of resources committed, which are the size of the investment in that particular market. This is according to the authors a broad sense including e.g. investments in marketing, personnel and the organization.

Furthermore, in the U-model the market knowledge is of interest as commitment decisions are based upon several kinds of knowledge. Firstly, it consists of knowledge about opportunities or problems; assumed to initiate the decision-making. Secondly, evaluation of different alternatives is grounded on some kind of knowledge about relevant parts of the market situation and performance of various activities (Johanson & Vahlne, 1977).
Johanson & Vahlne (1977) further emphasizes that market knowledge is an aspect that is divided into two types of knowledge: general market knowledge and market specific knowledge. The general market knowledge concerning marketing methods and common characteristics of certain types of customers, regardless of their geographical location, and the market specific knowledge is about characteristics of the particular national market; "...its business climate, cultural patterns, structure of the market system, and, most importantly, characteristics of the individual customer firms and their personnel." (Johanson & Vahlne, 1977, p28.)

It can also be seen that there is a difference in how the firm obtains the knowledge. Penrose (1995) stress that there are two ways the knowledge can be acquired: either by objective knowledge, which can be taught, or experiential knowledge, which only can be obtained through personal experience. Johanson & Vahlne (1977) emphasizes that the experiential knowledge is critical factor to the U-model, as it is not as easily acquired as objective knowledge.

Both types of knowledge are required when establishing and performing certain operations and activities in a foreign country. The market-specific knowledge is mainly obtained through involvement and experience of the specific market, while general knowledge is transmittable and can be taught. A direct can also be distinguished between market commitment and market knowledge. As knowledge is to be considered a resource; the better knowledge a firm has about a specific market, the more valuable the resources become and the firm will as an outcome induce a stronger commitment to that market (Johanson & Vahlne, 1977).

**Change Aspects**

Current business activities are a firm's main source of gaining experience, however experience can also be gained from external sources; either by hiring personnel with experience or by buying parts of another firm or a whole firm in order to obtain market information. A problem with this way of obtaining information is that it might not be for sale, or even exist, if so, the firm needs to acquire the experience through a long learning process along with its current activities, a factor explaining why internationalization is a slow process (Johanson & Vahlne, 1977).
Another aspect of change is the decision of committing resources to the foreign operations. Explained by Johanson & Vahlne (1977) is that decisions are made in reaction to the perceived difficulties and opportunities on the market. The choices are also to be seen in relation to present market risks and uncertainties, wherein the decision-maker’s inability to estimate current- and future market factors affect the decisions. Moreover, the uncertainty of and commitment to the market are explained to be what specifies the perceived market risks.

The model implies that the company’s commitment to the market will be performed in small incremental steps, if not; the firm do possess a very large resource base or the circumstances on the market are perceived as stable and homogeneous or has acquired general market knowledge or experience through external sources (Johanson & Vahlne, 1990).

3.1.4 The Uppsala Model and International Entrepreneurship

Oviatt & McDougall (2003) states that one of the most recognized models of internationalization to researchers of entrepreneurship is the U-model. The U-model implies that firm’s initial activities were initiated to psychically close markets and with a mode of little commitment towards that market and that firms gain knowledge over time and thereof increase their market commitment; expanding to more psychically distant markets. Oviatt & McDougall (2003) emphasizes that this incremental internationalization process is not used among all firms in the present business environment. Increasing globalization along with the acceleration of technology development has enabled firms to facilitate and undertake a more rapid internationalization process. Oviatt & McDougall (1994) highlighted the cases of new venture firms that leapfrogged some of the steps in the incremental model and that these firms were international virtually from inception.

Johanson et al (2010) emphasizes that opportunities exists in the market and the recognition of these opportunities are related to the firm’s current business activities
rather than with the specific opportunity-seeking activities. Moreover, it is explained that the individual entrepreneur can perceive opportunities as an outcome of previous learning; knowledge that either can be taught or acquired through experience (Penrose, 1995). Knowledge is therefore of utmost importance as it motivates the process of entrepreneurial activity (Johanson et al, 2010). Johanson et al (2010) perceives internationalization as an entrepreneurial process and the environment of the firm as dynamic, wherein the state variable affects the change variables.

Furthermore it is stated that radical changes in the environment will increase the level of uncertainty and ambiguity when pursuing opportunities, something that entrepreneur through experiential learning and acquired knowledge will be able to cope better with.

### 3.2 The Network Theory

#### 3.2.1 Background

The network theory has since its origin received a lot of attention and acknowledgment in the research field of SMEs’ internationalization process; a theory that originates from the Social Exchange Theory, which focuses on the behavior of the firm in the environment of business- and social networks (Gemser et al, 2004; Turcan et al, 2004). It is emphasized that the network approach has existed long within the field of international business but its application to the firm’s internationalization process is new (Mtigwe, 2006).

The Network model is designed, according to Tikkanen (1998), to describe and create a holistic understanding of industrial markets as complex networks built upon relations between actors within them. Furthermore the author states that there are many different approaches to the network model, although the focal point is that firms work in interaction within the network; connecting actors, resources and activities in exchange relationships.

A basic assumption in the network theory is that firms require a specific set of resources, which in turn are controlled by other firms and that can be obtained
through networking (Johanson & Mattson, 1988). Tikkanen (1998) argues that all companies are experiencing limitations in different areas of business and networks therefore exist in order to create and distribution flow of knowledge among the actors within them. Chen & Chen (1998) emphasizes that all companies within networks are in one way or another linked to other actors, which can be both local and international, and how much each firm benefits from the network is dependent on how the actors in the network synchronize its activities.

3.2.2 The Network model

Håkansson & Snehota (2006) describes networks as a complex phenomenon that consists of interactive relationships between both organizations and individuals. A phenomenon that by Ford et al (2006) is explained to be based on actors, activities and resources, forming the foundation of a network. The author continues by stressing that actors within different networks are interconnected by nodes that influence and shape their identities. These nodes reduce the social, cultural and technological distance through communication that is based on mutual learning, credibility and commitment. It is moreover expressed to be of particular importance to reduce the social distance, since it is the relationships that enables interaction and the networks to exist. Networks allow firms to obtain information about the outside world, reducing the time spend and resources allocated in order to collect the information. And if the communication between the actors is continuous and based on mutual commitment it can lead to mutual dependence, in which actors can increase their efficiency of interchange (Ford et al, 2006).

Moreover, Johanson & Mattsson (1988) explains the networks as relationships between different firms that are linked to each other through direct and indirect business relations. A firm’s business network is viewed in relation to the relationships in the network, which are e.g. its customers, distributors, suppliers and competitors and even governments. Anderson et al (1994 p.2) defines a network in such a context as “a set of two or more connected business relationships, in which each exchange relation is between business firms that are conceptualized as collective actors”.
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Johansson et al. (2002) states that the network context is mainly of importance as it covers the most essential business relationships in a company's specific environment, the context works as a basis for continued operations, since it is in collaboration with other firms that development often takes place.

Forsgren et al. (2005) emphasizes that in the network model firms organizes interchanges primarily to develop and coordinate the relations, focusing on developing relationships before and after the international expansion, rather than in purpose for the actual expansion itself. Johansson et al. (2002) highlights that in order to obtain knowledge valuable for their internationalization, firms need to generate knowledge about individual customers and partners and their relationships to other actors in the market; in contrast to the U-model in which it is about creating knowledge about the market itself.

Furthermore, in the Network Model it is expressed that the most significant factor companies’ internationalization process is the relationships between market participants as mutual understanding and commitment between the parties is considered to be of immense importance. Forsgren et al. (2005) believes that each relationship itself is unique and is composed of mutually dependencies in many areas which only the parties involved are aware of; thereof, the only way to gain information this specific information held in the network is to interact with the actors in it. Johansson et al. (2002) however denotes that it is time consuming to build relationships, however these relationships will in the long run be strategic assets, which might be difficult to recognize or see physically, although they are among the variables of greasiest significance for a successful internationalization.

### 3.2.3 Internationalization through Networks

Johanson & Vahlne (2009) emphasizes that a firm’s network relationships have an impact on the foreign market selection as well as mode of. Johanson & Mattson (1988) and Mtigwe (2006) highlights that internationalization is founded on firms utilization of their networks in order to expand to international markets, an internationalization process that often characterizes SMEs. Håkansson & Snehota (2006) emphasizes that
it is the activities and relationships in the networks that allows trade exchange across borders; factors seen as vital for the firm’s internationalization. Mtigwe (2006) moreover stress that the companies through their networks can expand to the international arena, using the skills and knowledge that other actors possess, overbridging some of the otherwise time and resource consuming processes, that slows the speed of internationalization. Networks thus allow a rapid internationalization, in particular for SMEs that are characterized by a limited resource base.

Gemser et al (2004) states that a firm’s internationalization strategy from the network approach emerge as a sometimes unpredictable pattern of behavior, influenced by many formal and informal relationships; the internationalization process becoming an outcome of interaction, development and managing of relationships over a lapse of time. A view supported by Coviello and Munro (1997) as they studied the internationalization process of small software firms, a study in which they concluded that a firm’s initial and subsequent market selection and mode of entry is strongly influenced by a set of formal and informal network relationships.

Coviello & Munro (1997) explains that the network approach moves away from the incremental theory by suggesting that a firm’s internationalization strategy emerge as a pattern of behaviors that is affected by network relations. Johanson & Mattsson (1988) state further on that a firm’s successful expansion on a new market is depending more on the relations on that particular market and the position the company holds in the network, rather than the market itself and its cultural characteristics.

3.2.4 The Network Theory and International Entrepreneurship

Oviatt & Mcdougall (2003) denotes that analysis of the Network Model has been a very useful framework for IE researchers and an important tool for the entrepreneur. The authors stress that networks provide a tool for entrepreneurs to identify international opportunities, create trustworthiness, and do often lead to strategic alliances. It is through their networks firms improve their strategic positions, attain
access to resources, learn new sets of skills and cope with rapid technological changes. Mtigwe (2005) emphasizes that entrepreneurial firms are increasingly capable to obtain foreign market knowledge, financial-, marketing- and managerial resources and also competitive advantages by working together with both foreign and domestic network partners.

Oviatt & McDougall (2003) states that International Entrepreneurship challenges the traditional models of internationalization, using features from the network theory, focusing mainly on the entrepreneur and his extended network. Coviello and Munro (1995) highlights that entrepreneurial firms in the internationalization process can be understood better when the analysis is expanded to include the firms’ role and position within a network of relationships; e.g. the market selection more often emanates from opportunities generated through the network than actual strategies performed by the firm.

Oviatt & McDougall (1994) clarifies that networks can be helpful for founders of born globals or international new ventures when identifying international business opportunities. It can be seen that the networks have more impact on the country choice than the psychic distance. Turcan et al (2004) addresses that in the IE research the NW theory offers a valuable approach when explaining the internationalization of new ventures. IE research does moreover, according to the authors, imply that opportunities are created through network contacts more frequently than by actual strategies performed by the managers of the firm.

Furthermore, a firm’s capability to recognize and acquire external resources to internationalize successfully is important, skills centered within the entrepreneur’s embeddedness in social networks. Skills required to in a successful way enabling the procurement and creation of knowledge, which is to be seen as a key resource in motivating the international growth of many firms (Turcan et al, 2004).
3.3 Resource Based View

3.3.1 Background

Edith Penrose (1995) is considered as the pioneer in the resource based theory (RBT) field as she 1959 distinguished the importance of firms having an “inside” (every firm is different from the other depending on a specific collection of resources). In contrast to the “outside” view of the firm; an organization within an industry (Barney, 1991; Wernerfelt, 1984). Penrose defined the economic function of the firm as by “acquiring and organizing human and other resources in order profitability to supply goods and services to the market... a collection of resources bound together in a an administrative framework” (Penrose, 1995, p.xi). However it was not until the works of Barney (1991) and Wernerfelt (1984) that the RBT was defined and became a recognized field of study (Mathews, 2002; Peng, 2001; Wernerfelt, 1984).

Wernerfelt (1984) emphasized the fact of analyzing the firm from its resource- rather than product side and wanted to create an economic tool in order to do so. He distinguished that looking at a company’s resources can shed new light upon it and show a diversified firm in a whole new way. Also, equivalent to the entry barriers, proposed by Porter (1980), a firm’s resources can yield high profits by having resource position barriers. Proceeding from Porter’s five forces (a tool used to analyze the attractiveness of an industry), Wernerfelt stressed that in order to achieve such resource position barriers the company’s resources must be valuable, not easily substituted (as it can depress returns) and uncommon as “firms need to find those resources which can sustain a resource position barrier, but in which no one currently has one, and where they have a good chance of being among the few who succeed in building one” (Wernerfelt, 1984, p. 175).

As Wernerfelt defined and emphasized the importance of resources, it was not until the work of Barney (1991) in his article of “Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage” that the defining concepts for the theory were stated. On one hand, Wernerfelt (1984) build upon the thought of firms creating resources that constituted in creating resource position barriers, in order to gain higher and longer lasting profit outcomes, Barney on the other hand emphasized the link between firm resources and
how they can create a sustained competitive advantage (SCA); both statements deriving from Porter’s (1980) initial work of the five forces model.

Even though the work of Barney (1991) is influenced by the work of Porter, the author makes some clear distinctions between the internal analysis of the RBV and the external analysis of the environmental five forces model. Barney stress that the external analysis gazes upon the opportunities and threats that emerge in a competitive environment, describing an attractive industry as embodied with great opportunities and low level of threats. The author directs some criticism towards the external analysis as it assumes firms to be identical in terms of strategically relevant resources controlled and strategies pursued. Also, if resource heterogeneity occurs, this heterogeneity is short-lived as the resources creating the heterogeneity are highly mobile and can easily be bought or sold (Barney, 1991).

3.3.2 The Resource Based Theory

Based upon the differentiating view of resources and their capability of creating profitability through SCA, Barney (1991) defined key concepts and created a framework in order to describe the relationship between the resource-based model and SCA.

The key concepts that Barney (1991) developed were: firm resources, competitive advantage and SCA. Firm resources are expressed to be the assets of the firm that bundled together in specialized ways work as fundamental units of value creation (Mathews, 2002). Resources are what could be thought of as strengths and weaknesses of a firm, tangible and intangible assets that are tied long-term to the firm; e.g. assets, knowledge, firm attributes, skilled personnel and capital. Resources used as strengths of the firm in order to enhance efficiency when implementing strategies (Wernerfelt, 1984; Barney, 1991). Barney (1991, p.101) classifies the resources in three categories: physical-, human- and organizational capital resources. “Physical capital resources include the physical technology used in a firm, a firm’s plant and equipment, its geographic location, and its access to raw materials. Human capital resources include the training, experience, judgment, intelligence,
relationships, and insight of individual managers and workers in a firm. Organizational capital resources include a firm’s formal reporting structure, its formal and informal planning, controlling, and coordinating system, as well as informal relations among groups within a firm and between a firm and those in its environment”.

Wernerfelt (1984) emphasizes the importance of sustained resource position barriers; existing when the company’s achieves an advantageous position through a combination of attractive resources that competitors do not currently have nor easily can obtain. Barney (1991) did in consensus to this view emphasize the concepts of competitive advantage and SCA. A firm said to “have a competitive advantage when it is implementing a value creating strategy not simultaneously being implemented by any current or potential competitors. A firm is said to have a SCA when it is implementing a value creating strategy not simultaneously being implemented by any current or potential competitors and when theses other firms are unable to duplicate the benefits of this strategy” (Barney, 1991, p.102).

Moreover, in order to create such competitive advantages the resources cannot be perfectly mobile and homogenous. As earlier mentioned, Barney (1991) directs criticism towards the five forces model’s assumption of high mobility and short life-span of heterogeneous resources. Barney argues that it is reasonably expected to be some sort of heterogeneity and immobility. In an industry characterized by perfectly mobile and homogenous resources every firm would be able to implement or acquire the same strategically relevant physical, human and organizational capital; meaning that a SCA is not possible to achieve. Barney concludes that in order for SCA to exist; strategic resources cannot be evenly distributed and highly mobile, rather they must be heterogeneous and immobile (Barney, 1991).

Furthermore it is explained that in order to understand these heterogeneous, immobile resources and the factors underpinning them, one must first understand the attributes enabling them. The resources must be (V) valuable, (R) rare, (I) Imperfectly imitable and (N) non-substitutable (VRIN) in order to be sources of SCA.
• Valuable Resources: A resource must be valuable in the matter that it allows a firm to understand or realize strategies that improve effectiveness and efficiency.

• Rare resources: A valuable resource is rare when it is not simultaneously implemented by a large number of other firms. If e.g. a bundle of firm resources are not rare, then various other firms have the same possibility to use that resource, resulting in a situation in which no firm will benefit from a competitive advantage.

• Imperfectly imitable resources: A valuable and rare resource is only a source of SCA if those who do not possess the resource nor can obtain it. Casual ambiguity is one of the reasons for why inimitable resources do exist; being the situation in which neither the firm possessing nor the firm attempting to imitate, understands the link between the firm’s resource and its SCA. It is then argued that both parties must be faced with the same level of casual ambiguity, as if the firm possessing the resources do understand the link, it is then possible for other firms to do so by e.g. rigorously studying the firm or by “hiring-away” knowledgeable staff from the company.

• Non-substitutable resources: A valuable resource that is rare and imperfectly imitable cannot have an equivalent substitutable strategic resource that separately can be implemented to fulfill the same strategies. A valuable and rare resource that cannot be imitated can neither be substituted with other resources in order for it to be a source of SCA.

(Barney, 1991)
The purpose of the framework presented by Barney (1991) is expressed to be a tool used in order to determine whether or not a firm resource is source of SCA. Barney concludes that a manager (or a managerial team) may be SCA if the conditions presented in the framework are fulfilled. However, Barney sums up by stressing what instituted his work on the resource based view, criticism towards that resources are easily purchased in the market and if heterogeneous, they will only be so for a short while. “…Firms cannot expect to “purchase” sustained competitive advantages on open markets. Rather, such advantages must be found in the rare, imperfectly imitable, and non-substitutable resources already controlled by a firm” (Barney, 1991, p. 117).

3.3.3 The Resource Based Theory and International Entrepreneurship

Alvarez & Busenitz (2001, p.756) stress the fact that much of the prior work within the entrepreneurship field has been characterized by “work that borrows theories ad hoc from other disciplines”, although the emergence of the RBV has been seen to enclasp this research area and created boundaries. Barney et al (2001) highlight that studies within resource based field have contributed and extended the research on entrepreneurship, consistently with its theoretical development and empirical testing of the theory. Peng (2001) emphasizes that the RBV has contributed vastly to the overall international business research field and has worked as a unifying framework, as it connects and explains phenomena-driven occurrences (e.g. entrepreneurial activities), otherwise obscure fields of research-topics; the RBV expressed by the author to have propelled the studies within IE.
Alvarez & Busenitz’s (2001) extensive work on the relationship between RBT and entrepreneurship theory stress some key aspects that explains this linkage between the two theories. The authors stress the following common denominators: unit of analysis, heterogeneity, casual ambiguity, cognition, opportunity seeking behavior and SCA.

Firstly, the unit of analysis is unanimous, namely the resources possessed by the firm. While the RBV focus on an expatiated level, using all capital resources of human, organizational and physical, the entrepreneurship theory focuses more on the human capital (Alvarez & Busenitz, 2001; Barney et al, 2001). Further, it is stressed that the entrepreneurs’ (the human capitals’) cognitive† capabilities, and possibilities to use heuristic‡ learning, allows it to understand uncertain and complex situations; perceiving new opportunities and enables the entrepreneur to be innovative (Alvarez & Busenitz, 2001; Butler et al, 2010; Barney et al, 2001). It is further denoted that it is the entrepreneurs’ ability to combine resources in new ways, to create new products or services, that distinguishes it; and the combining of homogeneous and heterogeneous resources is a resource itself, identifying overlooked opportunities and act in order to pursue them (Alvarez & Busenitz, 2001; Butler et al 2010; Turcan et al, 2004).

Alvarez & Busenitz (2001, p. 764) explain the entrepreneurs’ ability to recognize opportunities: “since new inventions and opportunities rarely evolve in a logical manner, those with a factually oriented logic tend to become very frustrated by the nonlinearity of opportunity recognition while those with a heuristic-based logic tend to thrive on it.”

Furthermore, Alvarez & Busenitz (2001) emphasizes that it is through the cognitive ability of the entrepreneur that it becomes a heterogeneous resource itself. Barney et

† Cognition is the mental action or process of acquiring knowledge and understanding through thought, experience, and the senses.

‡ Heuristic learning is enabling a person to discover or learn something for itself (www.oxforddictionaries.com, 2011-04-25).
al (2001) emphasizes that not all do possess the requisite cognitive skills of an entrepreneur and both the skills of an entrepreneur and the output created by one are not commonly possessed by firms; meaning that they are to be perceived as heterogeneous resources.

Moreover, Barney et al (2001) express that casual ambiguity is the essence of entrepreneurship and its ability to create SCA. It is explained by Autio et al (2000) to be the simple nature of casual ambiguity that aggravates the ability to imitate a product or a service, even for those familiar with the technology used. When the reasons for a resource's heterogeneity are unclear, they are expressed to frequently be the outcome of entrepreneurial behavior and thus poorly understood; so called casual ambiguities (Butler et al, 2010; Alvarez & Busenitz, 2001).

Finally, it is denoted that “entrepreneurial cognition can be a source of competitive advantage. If the insights and decisions reached with heuristic-based logic are potentially valuable in the market, if they are indeed rare, if they are difficult to imitate, and if the generated ideas are exploited by the entrepreneurs, then these entrepreneurial insights and decisions are a resource that can potentially lead to a competitive advantage” (Alvarez & Busenitz, 2001, p.759). Further emphasized that the owner (wright et al, 2007) or the firm itself (Zahra, 2005) can be perceived as sources of SCA. Turcan et al (2004) further emphasizes that it is the cognitive ability of the entrepreneur that create non-substitutable valuable resources, forming the substratum for SCA.

3.4 International Entrepreneurship

3.4.1 Background

The term “international entrepreneurship” was for the first time mentioned in an article by Morrow in 1988, discussing the age of the firm in relation to cultural awareness and technological advancement that had made once remote markets more accessible (Zahra & George, 2002; Oviatt & McDougall, 2005). Although, the first acknowledged theoretical IE framework was formed by Oviatt & McDougall in 1994 (Johanson et al, 2010; Zahra et al, 2005; Hitt et al, 2001; Butler et al, 2010; Dimitratos,
2010), as they described it: “an international new venture as a business organisation that, from inception, seeks to derive significant competitive advantage from the use of resources and the sale of outputs in multiple countries” (Oviatt & McDougall, 1994, p.49). INV, also referred to as Born Globals§ (Zahra, 2005; Hollensen, 2008), emerged as a response to the large amount of studies that had been performed on the large and mature MNEs that with their vast amount of resources had ruled the world market since the Second World War (Oviatt & McDougall, 1994). However, technological development, along with international business experience being a growing factor among merchants made it immensely more accessible to discover and take advantage of new business opportunities abroad. Resulting in that the global business arena no longer was destined merely for large and mature MNEs but also for the new ventures with limited resources (Oviatt & McDougall, 1994; Zahra et al, 2005; Knight 2001; Hitt et al 2001).

The research field of IE was initially intended to address the phenomenon of INV solely but as explained by Zarah & George (2002) the definition of IE has changed during the years and become increasingly more inclusive. Wright & Ricks (1994) are recognized by the authors to have indicated the importance of including established firms and cross- national analysis in IE theory. Zahra & George (2002, p. 260) moreover explains, “The inclusion of established companies also corrects an oversight in the entrepreneurship field; namely, the presumption that well-established companies are not innovative and refuse to take risks. Many highly regarded well-established companies work hard to foster innovation, support venturing and encourage risk-taking. To ignore these firms automatically precludes an important and vital part of the US and other economies”.

§ Born Global: “companies who have reached a share of foreign sales of at least 25 per cent within a time frame of two to three years after their establishment” (London Business School, http://bsr.london.edu/lbs-article/166/index.html, 2011-05-22)
3.4.2 The theory itself

“International entrepreneurship is a combination of innovative, proactive, and risk-seeking behavior that crosses national borders and is intended to create value in organisations” (Oviatt & McDougall, 2000).

Zahra et al (2005) address that the very essence of IE is based in the recognition and exploitation of opportunities, as some opportunities are localized in foreign markets and others the result of the entrepreneur’s capability to grasp ideas and realize them. Oviatt & McDougall (2005) moreover stress some factors of immense importance that prepossesses the speed of entrepreneurial internationalization. Initially, transportation that is faster, more efficient and less costly has emerged as an outcome of e.g. containerization of freight and computerization are enabling forces for rapid internationalization of companies. Factors creating the possibility of swiftly taking advantage of entrepreneurial opportunities that emerges abroad (Knight, 2001; Zahra et al, 2005).

Furthermore, the motivating force of competition, as an outcome of rapid internationalization, encourages or even forces entrepreneurs to internationalize at an early stage. Even though a company may possess a patented product it is still possible that e.g. an entrepreneur in another country may create a new competing process to this product if the company holding the patent does not move quickly into the market abroad to establish the product there (Oviatt & McDougall, 2005). This argument is furthermore compiled as it is stated that: “technology makes accelerated internationalization feasible, while the presence of competitors or potential competitors motivates or strongly encourages it” (Oviatt & McDougall, 2005, p.542).

Finally, the entrepreneurial actor is told to be central to dynamics of international exploitation. Factors that are central to this actor are e.g. the international experience, the propensity to take risks and the ability to discover new opportunities. It is declared that only by understanding the enabling forces (e.g. containerization and the internet), the motivating forces (competitive pressure) and how the entrepreneur interprets opportunities that one can estimate the speed of entrepreneurial internationalization (Oviatt & McDougall, 2005).
Additionally, Autio et al (2000) introduced the concept “learning advantages of newness” as they in their study of international growth in entrepreneurial firms found out that firms internationalizing at an older age likely had developed learning patterns that would obstruct their ability to be successful on new markets, constraining what they see and how they perceive it.

Autio et al (2000, p.919) concluded that younger firms “…are capable of taking small, incremental steps more rapidly than older firms. In short, we believe that the survival and prosperity of born-global firms may be explained by their ability to adapt and innovate more rapidly in new and dynamic environments than would ordinarily be the case of older firms”. Zahra et al (2000) did in their study of INVs also discover that the new ventures were more capable of learning new technologies in the context of international markets, confirming the learning advantages of new firms.

### 3.5 Criticism of Theories

#### 3.5.1 Criticism: The Uppsala Internationalization Model

Mtigwe (2006) states that many authors have criticized the incremental theory since the introduction, both on the theoretical and practical level. The criticism is directed towards the theoretical and methodological robustness of the U-model, as e.g. the incremental internationalization hypothesis of the study was not empirically evidenced. Moreover, that in latter years the model has been challenged as modern high-technology firms does not follow the “tortuous development process” traditional incremental process, instead the process is rapid due to the experience and resources available through networks (Mtigwe, 2006, p.14).

Hollensen (2011) emphasizes that the model is too deterministic, not taking interdependencies into account and not valid for certain industries. Moreover, that it is criticized since the process of internationalization today seems to have speeded up and firms today prone to skip certain stages in the establishment chain.
3.5.2 Criticism: The Network Theory

The Network Model is criticized for its relative abstractness. The theory's approach, as well as concepts used is criticized to be abstract in their meaning (Tikkanen, 1998).

3.5.3 Criticism: The Resource Based View

There is a notable amount of criticism that has been directed towards the RBV. Kraaijenbrink et al (2011) has in his work distinguished some of the most noteworthy criticism. Firstly, the theory presumes that all firms are seeking to maximize their profits whilst operated by rational managers, in markets that are reasonably predictable; moving towards a state of balance. Moreover, RBV is invoking the thought of total control, overstating the amount to which managers actually can predict the future value of resources as well as to the extent that they can control them. Additionally, Kraaijenbrink et al suggest that SCA cannot last forever, although it does however in short-term works as a powerful strategic concept. Fiol (2001, p.692) criticizes the probability of SCA as: “both the skills/resources, and the way organizations use them, must constantly change, leading to the creation of continuously changing temporary advantages”.

Finally, as suggested by Hoopes et al (2003) only value, inimitability and non-substitution of the VRIN are considerably important. Rareness is on the other hand only considered important if the resource is valuable and does only prevail if competitors cannot imitate it.

3.5.4 Criticism: The International Entrepreneurship Theory

As Zahra & George (2002) have outlined, the definition of IE is under constant modification. The authors recognize that e.g. Oviatt & McDougall have changed their definition three times under the lapse of time of a decade and in 2005 they presented a new definition of the theory even though the authors state that constructing new definitions should be made only with care “International entrepreneurship is the discovery, enactment, evaluation, and exploitation of opportunities-across national borders-to create future goods and services”, a definition that was made as an
outcome of the potential of change and therefor perceived as validated (Oviatt & McDougall, 2005, p.540). Mtigwe (2006) states that although there have been made considerable efforts of defining IE, a precise definition is still absence.

Furthermore, the theory building of IE is criticized for its very unspecific nature as it is expressed to be a theory built upon existing theories; constituting the IE theory in value-adding ways (Hitt et al, 2001). Zahra et al (2005) express anxiety that cross-disciplinary research may neglect the very essence of IE. Turcan et al (2004) confirms this by denoting the overbridging influences from the IB research field that are affecting IE research creates an imbalance in the theory building.
4 Survey Results

In the following chapter the primary data that has been collected will be presented. The data is visualized by illustrations and consistent explanations of what is asked and shown are given for them separately.

4.1 Reactive or Proactive

In order to know whether the internationalization was a proactive or reactive process the companies were asked if the internationalization was planned or the result of an event.
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**Figure 4**

Sixty six percent of the companies considered their internationalization as a planned (proactive) process, whereas only thirty four percent experienced it to be the result of an event (reactive).

4.2 Internationalization Process

In order to know what internationalization process the companies used when going abroad they were asked which of the following alternatives that would best describe the company's internationalization process.
The combination of an incremental and a network internationalization process is the most practiced mode with thirty eight percent. The second most utilized method is establishment through network with thirty four percent, followed by the incremental process at sixteen percent. The least commonly used processes are the born global and the combinations of born global with the incremental process or the network mode; born global at six percent, a combination of born global and incremental mode at four percent and a combination of born global and network at two percent. No company indicated that they used any other process to internationalize, even though the option to do so was given.

4.3 Establishment Strategy

In order to determine what establishment method that has most frequently been used, the companies were asked of which alternative that would best describe the company's establishment abroad.
A whole fifty two percent stated that they export directly to their customers. Twenty eight percent exported via a distributor, twelve percent via an agent whilst two percent used licensing and an additional two percent their own subsidiaries. Other strategies, accounting for four percent, were establishment through customers’ international distributors and original equipment manufacturer**.

4.4 Prior Knowledge

In order to know whether or not the company possessed any knowledge about the new market before entering it the companies were asked if they possessed knowledge about the new market prior to the establishment.

** Original equipment manufacturer, an organization that makes the devices from component parts bought from other organizations (www.Oxforddictionaries.com 2011-05-11).
Sixty four percent of the companies responded that they had prior knowledge about the foreign market before establishing business there, as of thirty six percent declared that they did not.

### 4.5 Obtaining Market Information

In order to understand how the companies got information about the foreign market before entering it the companies were asked of how they acquired the information about the new market.

The majority of the companies, fifty two percent, obtained information about the new market from within their business networks. Thirty percent answered that it was...
through knowledge possessed within the companies and eight percent proclaimed that they bought the information. Other methods used to acquire this information were: trial and error, external sources contacting the company and trade fairs; accounting in total for ten percent.

4.6 Proximate Markets

In order to know if the company first expanded to proximate markets the companies were asked if they first expanded to a geographically nearby market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the company firstly expand its operations to a geographical nearby market?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes 64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9

Sixty four percent of the companies expanded firstly to proximate markets, whereas thirty six percent stated that this was not the case.

4.7 Prior Connections

In order to know if the companies had connections on the market before the establishment they were asked if they had any contacts on the new market prior to the establishment.
The largest quota of the companies, sixty four percent, replied that they did have connections on the foreign market before the establishment of business there. Thirty six percent responded negatively, claiming that they did not have any previous contacts on the market.

### 4.8 Importance of Business Networks

In order to determine the value for the internationalization of having an already established business network on the foreign- and home market the companies were asked how important the business network has been for the internationalization.
On the foreign market thirty six percent answered that the network was of large importance and eighteen percent that it was of very large importance. Ten respectively eighteen percent of the companies’ experienced the foreign business network to have been of small or very small importance when internationalizing.

Business networks on the home market were according to thirty-respectively twenty eight percent of medium respectively large importance. Eighteen percent stated that the networks were of very small importance and sixteen of small importance. Just eight percent of the companies experienced the business networks on the home market to have been of very large importance.

4.9 Reason for Internationalization

In order to determine what specifically motivated the companies to internationalize they were asked what the main reason for the companies’ internationalization was.

As many as forty six percent stated that the main reason for internationalization was new business opportunities abroad. Profit or growth goals were selected by sixteen percent of the participants and fourteen percent stated that the business network was the main reason. Twelve percent mentioned other reasons; following existing customers and none or small market demand on the home market being such reasons.
4.10 Innovative Behavior
In order to determine the impact of innovative behavior on the internationalization process the companies were asked to what extent innovativeness had been characteristic to their internationalization.
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**Figure 13**

Twenty six percent of the companies’ stated that innovativeness has been distinguishing for their internationalization process to a medium and large degree, whereas fourteen percent answered that it was to a very large extent. Moreover, twenty four respectively ten percent stated that innovation have been characteristic to their internationalization to a small respectively very small degree.

4.11 Utilization of Opportunities
In order to determine to what extent making use of opportunities had been distinctive for the companies internationalization process the companies were asked to what degree utilization of opportunities had been characteristic for their internationalization.
A sizeable portion, thirty six percent, of the companies stated that their internationalization had been characterized by utilization of opportunities to a large extent. Only two percent answered that it was to a very small degree and twenty two percent to a small degree. Twelve percent of the companies answered that the utilization of opportunities has been to a very large degree.

4.12 Risk-Taking
In order to perceive whether or not the companies’ internationalization was characterized by risk-taking behavior they were asked if the internationalization embodied large risk-taking.
None of the companies’ in the survey perceived their internationalization to embody a very large risk-taking and only six percent found it to have been of large risk. As much as fifty eight percent stated it as of average risk and fourteen respectively twenty two percent perceived it to have been of very small or small risk-taking.

4.13 Impact of Management’s International Experience
In order to understand the significance of the managements international experience on the companies’ internationalization the companies were asked what impact the management’s international experience had on the internationalization.

A large amount of the companies, thirty six percent, answered that the impact of the management’s international experiences had been large on the companies’ internationalization. The impact was seen by fourteen percent as very large whereas it was perceived by eight percent as very small, ten percent as small and thirty two percent perceived it as of average impact on the internationalization.

4.14 Resource Commitment
In order to know how much resources that was committed to the internationalization the companies were asked how big the resource commitment was for the internationalization.
Forty four percent of the companies thought of their resource commitment when internationalizing as average. Only twelve percent perceived it to have been of a large extent and just four percent as a very large commitment. Thirty percent experienced it to have been of a small degree and ten percent to a very small degree.

4.15 Internationalization Factors
In order to know how important certain influences had been for the companies' internationalization they were asked of what significance the following factors had been for the process: similar market, managements ambition to internationalize, growth opportunities on the new market, company size and similar business culture.
Forty percent claimed that similarity of markets was important, thirty two percent thought of it as of little importance, twenty percent of great importance whereas eight percent found it insignificant.

The management’s ambition to internationalize was seen by fifty percent as significant, twenty six percent perceived it as of little significance, twenty percent as of great significance and four percent thought of it as insignificant.

The possibility of market growth on the new market was by the majority, fifty eight percent, seen as significant. More than a quarter, twenty eight percent, claimed it to be of great significance whereas only twelve percent considered it of little significance and two percent as insignificant.
- Survey Results -

The size of the company was claimed by fifty two percent to be of little significance, twenty four percent perceived it as significant, a fifth, twenty percent, as insignificant and only four percent as of great significance.

When questioned about the importance of similar business culture on the new market thirty eight percent claimed it to be significant, thirty four percent as of little significance, eighteen percent thought of it as insignificant and the business culture was merely seen of great significance by eight percent.

4.16 Internal Resources

In order to determine how the organizational-, human- and physical capital were valued the companies were asked how they appreciated the internal resources of organizational-, human- and physical capital.

![Organizational capital](image)

Figure 19

The organizational capital variables of rareness, inimitability and non-substitutability were all seen as quite moderate. However, a large group of companies think of the resources as valuable.
Figure 20

The majority of the companies perceive the value of the human capital as either large or very large and a considerable amount also think of the resources’ degree of non-substitutability as either large or very large. Although the main body of the companies still considers the rareness, inimitability and non-substitutability as average.

Figure 21
The physical capital is considered of large value to the companies, although they do not consider it rare, nor especially inimitable and non-substitutable; most companies do instead perceive them as generally moderate.

4.17 Born Globals

From the data collected in the internet based survey twenty seven percent of the companies were per definition born globals. Defined as companies internationalizing within the three first years of business and having twenty five percent of their turnover from foreign sales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born Globals</th>
<th>27%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.18 Year of Establishment & Years to Internationalization

In the internet based survey the companies were asked to fill in what year they were established and which year they internationalized their business. Seen in the table below is that the majority of the companies in our study was founded after 1981 and of these companies most of them internationalized within the first six years. Previous to 1981 only one company internationalized within the first six years and the majority after twenty years of business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>20+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900-1909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910-1919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1989</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2009</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2019</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22
5 Analysis

In the following chapter the theoretical framework will be presented vis-à-vis to the empirical data that is collected in order to show the theory in the light of practical appliance. Each section of the chapter consists of a brief introduction to the theory, followed by the collected data applicable to it.

5.1 The Uppsala Internationalization Theory

The Uppsala Internationalization model, first introduced by Johanson & Vahlne (1977), explains how companies internationalize by taking incremental steps, initially into psychically close markets and then onwards into more distant ones as a result of increased market knowledge and resource commitment. Oviatt & McDougall (2003) however stress that this does not correspond to INVs that as a result of globalization along with accelerating technological development are internationalizing more rapidly. The INVs are expressed to leapfrog some of the steps, being international from inception.

In our study it is shown that fifty eight percent of the companies found themselves to be characterized by the incremental internationalization process or a combination of incremental and either network- or born global- internationalization process. Whereas, only twelve percent of the companies consider their internationalization process as either a defined born global- or a combination of born global and either incremental- or network- process. Furthermore to be distinguished is that the majority of the companies, fifty two percent, have applied the initial stage of the U-model, direct export.
Also, the companies’ resource commitment was expressed by three fourths of the respondents to be of moderate (forty four percent) or small (thirty percent) size. Noteworthy is that only a fractional four percent of the companies perceived the resource commitment to have been of large size. Additionally, fifty two percent of the companies perceived the importance of company size to have been of little significance when internationalizing, and a fifth perceived it as insignificant. Only twenty four percent considered the size to have been of significance and four percent of great significance.

Johanson et al (2010) emphasizes that firms may internationalize in small incremental steps in order to cope with uncertainty. Johanson & Wiedersheim-Paul (1975) denotes that by moving to psychically close markets companies may avoid factors preventing the flow of information, such as political, linguistical, degree of industrial development and cultural factors.
The results in the survey indicate that a vast majority, sixty four percent, of the companies expanded initially to proximately close markets. Approximately a third of the companies considered the impact of similar markets to be of little significance as of forty percent perceiving it as significant and twenty percent of great significance.

Moreover, the impact of similar business culture was mainly seen as of little significance (thirty four percent) respectively insignificant (eighteen percent), as merely thirty eight percent considered it of significance and eight percent of great significance.

Johanson & Vahlne (1977) emphasizes that the opportunities created by the individual entrepreneur is an outcome of previous learning that according to Penrose (1995) either can be taught or learned through experience. It is further denoted by Johanson & Vahlne (1977) that the possession of knowledge may lead to opportunity recognition. Knowledge is stressed to be of utmost importance for the process of
entrepreneurial activity as the entrepreneur itself is expressed to cope with uncertainty and ambiguity through experiential learning (Johanson et al, 2010).

In the study it is clearly shown that being proactive and gathering knowledge about the foreign market before entering it are factors essential for the companies’ internationalization process.

The management's ambition to internationalize was seen as significant by half of the respondents and by one-fifth of them as of great significance. It is additionally shown that the managements' international experience is seen to have substantial impact on the companies' internationalization. Fifty percent perceived the impact as greater than moderate, relative to eighteen percent in total considering as of small or very small influence.
5.2 The Network Theory

The NW theory is explained by Johanson & Mattsson (1988) to build upon the assumption that firms enter networks in order to pursue resources that they do not possess but that are controlled by others firms and accessible through networks.
The networks are explained to distribute knowledge and by connecting companies through commitment in collaborations reduce social, cultural and technological distance (Tikkanen, 1998; Ford et al, 2006). It is further expressed that these relations linking actors, resources and activities are not static but dynamic and evolves over time (Håkansson & Snehota, 2006; Ford et al, 2006).

It is explained that the entrepreneurial firms’ internationalization process is better comprehended when it is analyzed from the point of view of the firm’s network of relationships. Additionally, the market selection is often the outcome of opportunities generated through the network rather than actual performed strategies (Coviello & Munro, 1995). McDougall (1994) stress that the network often has more impact on the country choice of INV, than the perceived psychic distance, and Turcan et al (2004) implies that a firm’s capability to recognize and acquire external resources through the network is a prerequisite for a successful internationalization.

As many as thirty four percent of the companies in our study responded that their internationalization process was realized with establishment through the network. A correlation of thirty eight percent using a combination of incremental- and network process and two percent a combination network- and born global process, sums up in three-fourths of the companies using some form of network approach in their internationalization process.
Furthermore, the NW is expressed to be an important tool for the entrepreneur as it enables and facilitates identification of international opportunities, obtaining foreign market knowledge, creating trustworthiness, forming strategic alliances and acquiring managerial resources (Oviatt & McDougall, 2003; Mtigwe, 2005).

The results in our study present that a predominant part of the companies considered their business networks as an important part of their internationalization process. It can clearly be distinguished that firms’ business network on the foreign market has been of great importance when internationalizing, as thirty six percent reckoned it as of large importance and eighteen percent opined it as of very large importance. In contrast to the importance of the network on the home market which was seen as moderate by thirty percent and of large importance by twenty eight percent. It was additionally expressed that sixty four percent had contacts on the new market prior to the establishment.
Concerning the information acquired and possessed by the companies, fifty two percent responded that it was obtained through the network and thirty percent that it was acquired from within the company. Only eight percent answered that they had purchased the information and ten percent that it was obtained from other sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obtaining Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 37

5.3 The Resource Based View

The RBV, conceptualized by Barney (1991) and Wernerfelt (1984), builds upon the thought of resources (e.g. assets, knowledge, firm attributes, skilled personnel and capital) bundled together in specialized ways work as fundamental units of value creation (Mathews, 2002; Wernerfelt 1984; Barney, 1991). Resources that are valuable, rare, inimitable and non-substitutable are possible sources of SCA (Barney, 1991).

RBV and IE are theories seen to share conceptual common denominators such as unit of analysis, heterogeneity, casual ambiguity, cognition, opportunity seeking behavior and SCA (Alvarez & Busenitz, 2001). Although it is stressed that the even though the unit of analysis is the same (firm resources) IE has its focal point more directly on the human capital, the entrepreneur itself. The entrepreneur uses the capabilities of cognition and heuristic based learning to understand complex and uncertain situations; enabling it to perceive opportunities and combine resources in new ways (Alvarez & Busenitz, 2001; Butler et al, 2010; Barney et al 2001).

It is furthermore expressed that the entrepreneur’s cognitive ability makes the entrepreneur a resource itself and the simple nature of casual ambiguity aggravates the ability to imitate such a resource (Alvarez & Busenitz, 2001).
The human capital of the companies is regarded very valuable, and somewhat rare and non-substitutable, although the extent of the capitals' inimitability is seen as moderate.

![Human capital](image)

**Figure 38**

The organizational capital is seen by the greater part of the companies as valuable, whereas approximately forty percent of the companies perceived the capitals' rareness, inimitability and non-substitutability as small or very small. The physical capital is seen as largely (thirty percent) or very largely (twenty percent) valuable. While the rareness, inimitability and non-substitutability are perceived moderate or less.
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**Figure 39**  **Figure 40**
5.4 The International Entrepreneurship Theory

Initially formed by Oviatt & McDougall (1994) as a theoretical framework for the internationalization of INV, the IE theory has throughout the years become increasingly more inclusive; comprehending established firms as well as using IB theories to form its own theoretical substratum. Oviatt and McDougall elaborated their acknowledged definition from 2000 and the latter 2005 definition embodies IE as “International entrepreneurship is the discovery, enactment, evaluation, and exploitation of opportunities-across national borders-to create future goods and services” (Oviatt & McDougall, 2000, p.903). The very essence of IE is further emphasized to be recognition and exploitation of the opportunities; wherein some opportunities are localized in foreign markets and other the result of the entrepreneur’s ability to grasp ideas and realize them (Zahra et al, 2005).

Firstly, in our study it is shown that a large amount of the companies, forty six percent, considered new business opportunities to be the reason for their internationalization and sixteen percent claimed it to be because of profit and growth goals. Moreover, fifty eight percent of the companies perceived the possibilities of growth on the new market to be significant and twenty eight percent considered it as of great significance.

Secondly, a large amount of companies responded that utilization of opportunities were characteristic to their internationalization as thirty six percent thought of it as to a large extent and twelve percent to a very large extent, in relation to twenty four percent who perceived it to be of less than a moderate degree. Moreover, the majority
of the companies, fifty eight percent, thought of the risk taking when internationalizing as moderate and only six percent perceived it as large and none of the companies as very large.
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The concept “learning advantages of newness” introduced by Autio et al (2000) stress that firms that internationalizes at an older age are likely to have developed learning patterns that will obstruct the internationalization process and thereof their ability to be successful on new markets as it constrains what they see and how they see it. Oviatt & McDougall (2005) states that it is furthermore only by understanding the enabling forces (e.g. the internet), the motivating forces (competitiveness) and how the entrepreneur interprets opportunities that one can interpret the speed of entrepreneurial internationalization. Autio et al (2000, p.919) emphasizes that “the survival and prosperity of born-global firms may be explained by their ability to adapt and innovate more rapidly in new and dynamic environments than would ordinary be the case of older firms”.

In our collected data twenty seven percent of the companies classifies as defined born globals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Born Globals</th>
<th>27 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

It can moreover be seen that sixty four percent of the companies in the last three decades have internationalized within the three first year of business, relative to that
none of the companies previous to 1981 internationalized within the three initial years of business. Although only six percent of the companies find their internationalization process to be born global per definition.

Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>1 - 3</th>
<th>4 - 6</th>
<th>7 - 10</th>
<th>11 - 15</th>
<th>16 - 20</th>
<th>20+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1890 - 1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901 - 1910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911 - 1920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921 - 1930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931 - 1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941 - 1950</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951 - 1960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961 - 1970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 - 1980</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981 - 1990</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991 - 2000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 - 2010</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Internationalization process**

- A - Incremental establishment: 16%
- B - Establishment through network: 34%
- C - Born Global: 6%
- Combination of A & B: 16%
- Combination of A & C: 4%
- Combination of b & C: 2%
- Other: 0%

Figure 46
6 Conclusion

In the following chapter the research problems and finally the main research problem will be answered, emanating from the analysis. Moreover, the limitations of the study will be discussed and further research will be proposed.

6.1 International Entrepreneurship’s emergence and definition

How has International Entrepreneurship emerged as an internationalization model and how is it defined?

International Entrepreneurship was for the first time mentioned as a concept by Morrow in 1988 although a framework for the theory was not constituted until 1994 when Oviatt & McDougall described how some companies internationalized their business from inception, so called international new ventures (Zahra et al, 2005; Johanson et al, 2010). The theory was at first the subject solely for international new ventures, however extensive research throughout the world has led to the theory being refined and developed; deriving in the inclusion of established SMEs (Oviatt & McDougall, 2005). The International entrepreneurship is explained to have added a whole new dimension to the international business theory as it addressed a field that was previously uncharted. The theory is seen as a response to the vast amount of studies that have been performed on resources-rich, large and MNEs. An explanation to the contemporary global business environment wherein internationalization has become a more viable option for small- and medium sized enterprises due to factors such as containerization, reduced trade barriers and accelerated technological development (Oviatt & McDougall, 2003).

The definition of international entrepreneurship that has been the most recognized definition in the research field is the Oviatt & McDougall (2000, p.903) definition: “international entrepreneurship is a combination of innovative, proactive, and risk-seeking behavior that crosses national borders and is intended to create value in organizations”.
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6.2 International Entrepreneurship’s theoretical framework

What constitutes the International Entrepreneurship’s theoretical framework?

As formerly denoted in our thesis the International Entrepreneurship Theory has its theoretical framework constituted by the Uppsala Internationalization Model, the Network Model and the Resource Based View.

The Uppsala Internationalization model is one of the most familiar models to international entrepreneurship researchers. It implies that large enterprises with a vast amount of resources initiate their internationalization by entering markets incrementally; first to psychically proximate markets and then as resources are committed and market knowledge is gained, more distant ones. The international entrepreneurship theory appeared as a contradictory theory to the Uppsala model; explaining the internationalization process of international new ventures with limited resources that leapfrogged some of these steps, being international from inception.

It is further emphasized that the Uppsala Internationalization model explains how opportunities are the outcome of the entrepreneurs’ previous learning and that acquiring knowledge both can lead to opportunity recognition and the ability to better cope with uncertainty and ambiguity.

The network model is explaining how companies through commitment in networks can reduce social, cultural and technological distances. Moreover how the market selection often is the outcome of opportunities generated through the network and how the network frequently has more impact on the market choice than perceived psychic distance. The network is explained as a tool of immense importance for the entrepreneur as it facilitates identification of opportunities, obtainment of foreign market knowledge, creates trustworthiness, forms strategic alliances and enhances the firm’s capability to recognize and acquire external resources; a prerequisite for successful internationalization.
In the resource based view the cognitive ability of the entrepreneur, the owner and the firm are expressed to be potential sources of competitive advantage if they indeed are valuable, rare, inimitable and non-substitutable. The Resource Based View is further denoted to be sharing common denominators with the international entrepreneurship theory as the theories share the concepts of unit of analysis, heterogeneity, casual ambiguity, cognition, opportunity seeking behavior and sustained competitive advantage. The human capital, the entrepreneur, can with the capabilities of cognition and heuristic based learning understand complex and uncertain situations, enabling it to perceive opportunities and combine resources in new ways.

6.3 International Entrepreneurship’s most apparent aspects

What aspects of the International Entrepreneurship theory are the most apparent for describing the internationalization process on basis of our study?

From our findings we have distinguished the following aspects as the most applicable for describing the internationalization process. We have chosen to structure the aspects of the international entrepreneurship theory subsequently individual to the models creating the theoretical framework.

The Uppsala Internationalization Model

- Direct export is by the majority used as the establishment strategy
- Internationalization is frequently an incremental process
- Firm size is seen as of little significance for the internationalization process
- A small amount of resources are committed to the internationalization process
- Generally, the companies' initial foreign establishment is on proximate markets
- The internationalization was commonly seen to not involve large risk taking
- The companies had primarily knowledge about the market before entering it
- Two out of three perceived the internationalization as a proactive process
• The management's international experience is important when internationalizing
• The management's ambition to internationalize was of significance

The Network Model
• Establishment through network was used by three out of four as the internationalization process
• Half of the companies obtained information about the new market through the network
• The network on the foreign market is of great importance for the company’s internationalization
• The main body of the companies had contacts on the new market prior to the establishment

The Resource Based View
• The human capital is perceived as very valuable by the companies and also generally rare and non-substitutable
• Both of the organizational and physical capital were seen as valuable

The International Entrepreneurship Theory
• The reason for internationalization was by almost half of the companies due to new business opportunities
• Roughly half of the companies thought of the internationalization as characterized by utilization of opportunities
• Approximately one fourth of the companies are born globals by definition
• The majority of the companies has during the last three decades internationalized their business within the first three years
6.4 Main Research Question;

The validity of International Entrepreneurship

To what extent is International Entrepreneurship validated as an internationalization model?

Based on the presented theoretical framework that we have applied and the results from our survey, we conclude that the International Entrepreneurship Theory to a great extent is validated as an internationalization model. This due to the following conclusion:

In a global business environment distinguished by rapid internationalization, small and medium sized enterprises are increasingly adaptive in order to cope with tougher international competition and accelerating technological development. Firms that when internationalizing are characterized by proactive behavior, no significant risk taking, small resource commitment and a small size dependence, initially exporting their products. They are through their business contacts on foreign markets acquiring valuable knowledge and overbridging social, cultural and technological distances, enabling the possibility of reaching more distant markets from inception. By committing less resources, networks facilitating the internationalization process and being small flexible companies; the fundamental conditions for entrepreneurial behavior are presented. Provided with these prerequisites the entrepreneur can in a more facilitated way exploit opportunities and in pursue of them move easily from one market to another. From our findings we present our view of international entrepreneurship:

IE is the internationalization of SMEs that supported by their flexibility, networks and entrepreneurial behavior act in order to pursue and exploit cross border opportunities in a global environment
6.5 Limitations of the study

The IE theory is as emphasized lacking a founding theoretical framework and is criticized for borrowing theories ad hoc from other disciplines. The theoretical framework that we have conducted in this study is based upon what we have seen as the most contributing theories to IE. This is yet just an attempt in the great number of studies within the research field of IE that tries to enclasp the theory within theoretical boundaries.

Misinterpretations are a possible occurrence in our internet based survey that was send out to the companies. The questions asked were theoretical by nature in order to correspond to our study and thereof certain concepts used may have been difficult to fully understand. However, we believe that the pilot studies and the help of an anonymous reviewer helped us to form a comprehensible and well-formulated questionnaire, which should not to have been abstruse.

Moreover, our study consisted of fifty useable answers, a study including larger number of respondents would have provided a more substantial ground for generalizability. We recognize that this would have been the case, although, due to time limits and the focus of the thesis being to validate the IE theory and not primarily to generalize.

Finally, our study is based on random selection of companies form various industries that fulfill the requirements of being a Swedish SME with current international operations. If the study would have been performed on one specific industry or e.g. a group of companies operating on the same international markets then follow-up studies could have been performed. We recognize that having follow-up studies would benefit the research field more extensively.

6.6 Further research

Throughout this study we have achieved a greater apprehension of the flexibility's importance in SMEs. How companies characterized by entrepreneurial behavior
quickly move in order to pursue and exploit opportunities on foreign markets. MNEs are explained to direct large resource commitments to achieve long-term profit, although this does not seem to be the case for SMEs. Based on this discussion we would like to further address the question of whether there is a correlation between SMEs committing less resources and their ability of moving more rapidly into markets in order to pursue and exploit opportunities.
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8 Appendix

8.1 Questionnaire

Linneuniversitetet
Kalmar
Växjö
En enkät om Internationellt Entreprenörskap

Tack för att just du och ditt företag ställer upp och delta i denna enkätundersökning om internationellt entreprenörskap som är en del i vår kandidatuppsats vt-11.

Vänliga hälsningar,
Daniel Göransson & Simon Svenman
Studerande vid Linneuniversitetet

---

Information om företaget:

Företagets namn:

Grundat år:

Internationaliserade sig år:

Antal anställda i Sverige:

Antal anställda utomlands:

Hur många marknader är företaget aktivt på?

Omsättning:

Hur stor andel av företagets omsättning står den internationella verksamheten för? (Svara i procent)

Önskar att vara anonyma? ☐ Ja
☐ Nej
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1. Vilken var den främsta anledningen till att företaget internationaliserade sig?
- Vinst eller tillväxtmål
- Nya affärsmöjligheter
- Kontaktnät
- Initiativ av ledningen
- Mättad hemmamarknad
- Storskalighetsfördelar
- Annan, var god specificera: 

2. Till vilken grad har nyckelorden innovation varit uttryckande för er internationalisering?
- Mycket liten
- Liten
- Medel
- Stor
- Mycket stor

3. Till vilken grad har tillvaratagande av tillfälligheter varit uttryckande för er internationalisering?
- Mycket liten
- Liten
- Medel
- Stor
- Mycket stor

4. Inderfattade internationaliseringen ett stort risktagande?
- Mycket liten
- Liten
- Medel
- Stor
- Mycket stor

5. Var internationaliseringen planerad eller var den mer oplanerad till följd av en händelse?
- Planerad (proaktiv)
- Händelse (reaktiv)

6. Hur stor inverkan har ledningens tidigare internationella erfarenheter haft på företagets internationalisering?
- Mycket liten
- Liten
- Medel
- Stor
- Mycket stor

7. Hur stor var resursatningen när företaget internationaliserade sig? (I förhållande till företagets egna resurser)
- Mycket liten
- Liten
- Medel
- Stor
- Mycket stor
8. Var god att klassificera hur pass betydande följande faktorer har varit för företagets internationalisering:

Likenande marknad:

Ledningens ambition att verka internationellt:

Möjligheter till tillväxt på den nya marknaden:

Företagets storlek:

Likenande affärskultur på den nya marknaden:

9. Vilket av följande alternativ skulle bäst beskriva företagets internationaliseringsprocess?

- A - Stegvis etablering
- B - Etablering genom kontaktnät
- C - Born Global
- Kombination av A & B
- Kombination av A & C
- Kombination av B & C
- Annan, var god specifika: [ ]

10. Vilken typ av följande etableringsstrategier stämmer bäst överens med företagets etablering utomlands?

- Export direkt till kund
- Export via distributör
- Export via agent
- Licensiering
- Franchising
- Samägt bolag
- Eget dotterbolag
- Förvärv av bolag på den nya marknaden
- Fusion
- Annan, var god specifika: [ ]

11. Hade företaget kunskap om den nya marknaden innan etablering?

- Ja
- Nej

12. Hur införskaffade företaget information om den nya marknaden? Genom...

- Kunskap inom affärsnätverket
- Kunskap inom företaget
- Köpt information (ex. Exportrådet)
- Annan, var god specifika: [ ]

13. Existerade företaget förr till en närliggande marknad geografiskt sett?

- Ja
- Nej

14. Hade företaget kontaktat på den nya marknaden innan etableringen?

- Ja
- Nej
15. Hur viktigt har affärsnätverk varit för företagets internationalisering?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>På den utländska marknaden?</th>
<th>○ Mycket liten</th>
<th>○ Liten</th>
<th>○ Medel</th>
<th>○ Stor</th>
<th>○ Mycket stor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>På hemmamarknaden?</td>
<td>○ Mycket liten</td>
<td>○ Liten</td>
<td>○ Medel</td>
<td>○ Stor</td>
<td>○ Mycket stor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Hur uppfattar företaget följande interna resurser?
Där (1) är mycket liten (2) liten (3) medel (4) stor (5) mycket stor

Organisatoriskt kapital
(Rapporteringstruktur inom företaget, formell/informell planering, kontroll, koordinationssystem, informella relationer inom och utanför företaget)

| - Värdefullt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| - Sällsynt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| - Österhärmligt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| - Oersättningsbart | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Humankapital
(Utbildning, erfarenhet, omdöme, intelligens, kontakter, den enskilde företagledarens arbetarens insikt och förståelse)

| - Värdefullt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| - Sällsynt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| - Österhärmligt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| - Oersättningsbart | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Materiellt kapital
(Avläggning, urutrustning, geografisk placering, tillgång till råmaterial)

| - Värdefullt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| - Sällsynt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| - Österhärmligt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| - Oersättningsbart | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
Valfri - Om företaget skulle internationalisera sig idag, skulle samma internationaliseringsstrategi användas? (Motivera gärna varför)

Valfri - Vilka skulle vara era råd till små- och medelstora företag som står inför internationalisering?

Tack så mycket för er medverkan i denna enkät, era svar är högst uppskattade.

Har ni några frågor eller synpunkter så kan ni nå oss på dg22bj@student.lnu.se alternativt 0733988677 eller lämna en kommentar i fältet till höger.
Linnaeus University – a firm focus on quality and competence

On 1 January 2010 Växjö University and the University of Kalmar merged to form Linnaeus University. This new university is the product of a will to improve the quality, enhance the appeal and boost the development potential of teaching and research, at the same time as it plays a prominent role in working closely together with local society. Linnaeus University offers an attractive knowledge environment characterised by high quality and a competitive portfolio of skills.

Linnaeus University is a modern, international university with the emphasis on the desire for knowledge, creative thinking and practical innovations. For us, the focus is on proximity to our students, but also on the world around us and the future ahead.