Management Letters / Cuadernos de Gestión (2026) 1-14

FESIDE
Fundación Emilio Soldevilla para la Investigación y Desarrollo de la Economía de la Empresa

enpresa institutua
Instituto de Economía Aplicada a la Empresa

Management Letters / Cuadernos de Gestión

journal homepage: https://ojs.ehu.eus/index.php/CG
ISSN: 1131-6837 / e-ISSN: 1988-2157



Strategic Chess Thinking as a Model for Business Internationalization: A Conceptual Framework and Application to a Case Study

El Pensamiento Ajedrecístico Estratégico como Modelo de Internacionalización Empresarial: Marco Conceptual y Aplicación a un Estudio de Caso

Miriam Parkhurst Casas*, Oskar Villarreal Larrinaga[a]

[a] *University of the Basque Country (EHU) – oskar.villarreal@ehu.eus – https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5698-7690*

* ***Corresponding author:*** *University of the Basque Country (EHU) – miriamparkhurst@hotmail.com – https://orcid.org/0009-0000-2984-8249*

ARTICLE INFO

Received 22 October 2025,
Accepted 21 April 2026

Available online 22 September 2026

DOI: 10.5295/cdg.252496mp

JEL: F23, M16

ABSTRACT

Chess plays a significant role in the development of structured strategic thinking, an analytical mindset, and the ability to solve complex problems. These capabilities are essential for firms seeking to expand and compete strategically in international markets while facing socio-cultural, economic, political-legal, and commercial challenges. Its universal character also facilitates intercultural connections and the development of strong and reliable business relationships. With this in mind, the aim of our research is to develop a new perspective for analyzing business internationalization through the lens of chess. To this end, we propose the Model of Internationalization through Strategic Chess Thinking (MIPAE), designed as a framework that translates the complexity of business internationalization into the language of chess. The model builds upon the Ten Strategies for Internationalization Model (Villarreal, 2008) and the Dodecagon of Internationalization (Villarreal, 2010), which are reinterpreted through "bridges of coherence" that connect the chessboard with the marketplace, thereby providing decision-makers with an analytical tool and a transferable decision-making model for the global arena. This paper illustrates the empirical validation of MIPAE using the case of Ormazabal (Velatia), a family-owned business group based in the Basque Country, whose internationalization in France during the 1990s constitutes a key operation for analysis. By drawing analogies between chess moves and strategic decisions, this study examines the maneuvers that distinguished a defensive reaction from a deliberate expansion, integrating classical tools of International Strategic Management into a chess-based analytical perspective.

Keywords: Internationalization; Strategic Management; Chess; Decision-Making Model; Global Environment; Case Study.

This article is distributed under the terms of the *Creative Commons Atribution 4.0 Internacional* License

R E S U M E N

El ajedrez desempeña un papel importante en el desarrollo de una estructura de pensamiento estratégico, de un enfoque analítico y de la habilidad para resolver problemas complejos. Estas capacidades son esenciales para las compañías que, estratégicamente, buscan expandirse y competir en mercados internacionales, enfrentando desafíos socio-culturales, económicos, político-legales y comerciales. Su carácter universal facilita, además, conexiones interculturales y la construcción de lazos comerciales sólidos y confiables. En este contexto, el objetivo de esta investigación es desarrollar una nueva perspectiva para el análisis de la internacionalización empresarial mediante el ajedrez. Para ello, se propone el Modelo de Internacionalización a través del Pensamiento Ajedrecístico Estratégico (MIPAE), concebido como un modelo que traduce la complejidad de la internacionalización empresarial al lenguaje del ajedrez. El modelo se fundamenta en el Modelo de las Diez Estrategias de Internacionalización (Villarreal, 2008) y en el Dodecágono de la Internacionalización (Villarreal, 2010), reinterpretados mediante puentes de coherencia que vinculan tablero y mercado, permitiendo a los tomadores de decisiones una herramienta analítica y un modelo decisional transferible al ámbito global. La validación empírica del MIPAE se presenta a través del caso Ormazabal (Velatia), grupo empresarial familiar del País Vasco, cuya internacionalización en Francia durante los años noventa constituye una operación clave de análisis. Mediante la analogía entre jugadas ajedrecísticas y decisiones estratégicas, se examinan los movimientos que diferenciaron una reacción defensiva de una expansión deliberada, integrando herramientas clásicas de la Dirección Estratégica Internacional bajo una óptica ajedrecística.

Palabras clave: Internacionalización; Gestión estratégica; Ajedrez; Modelo de toma de decisiones; Entorno global; Estudio de caso.

1. INTRODUCTION

Business internationalization is defined as a corporate growth strategy based on international geographical diversification through a long-term evolutionary and dynamic process that gradually affects the different activities of the value chain and the organizational structure of the company. It involves an increasing commitment of the company's resources and capabilities to the international environment and is grounded in cumulative knowledge (Villarreal, 2005). Business internationalization constitutes one of the most complex and decisive decisions in an organization's trajectory. As Fong (2017) notes, "explaining a company's competitive behavior of the firm is a complex task because this object of study is constantly changing." Far from being a linear process, internationalization entails managing shifting environments, diverse regulatory systems, technological demands, and cultural challenges that require profound strategic interpretation. Moreover, in the post-pandemic world, global economies are expected to demand even more internationalization processes, as Contractor (2021) argues. However, this drive towards deeper global economic integration is unfolding in a context marked by geopolitical tensions and emerging protectionism that are reshaping the chessboard of international trade. The resurgence of trade conflicts between the United States and China, the war in Ukraine, and instability in the Middle East reflect a transition towards a more fragmented system, in which security and strategic power carry greater weight than the efficiency of the free market. In this context, business internationalization resembles a complex chess game, in which economic moves must also anticipate the political and diplomatic moves that redefine the balance of the global chessboard (Auray *et al.*, 2025; Fan *et al.*, 2025; Ma & Ning, 2024). Chess (see Figure 1 in the Supplementary file), one of the oldest and most universal games, has evolved across different civilizations and has served as a bridge between cultures, symbolizing interconnection and adaptability. As in chess, companies must adjust their strategies in order to compete effectively across different contexts. The board thus represents the competitive environment, while the pieces represent internal resources and external forces.

Shiller (2019, as cited in Begović, 2020, p. 257) defines an economic narrative as *"a contagious story that has the potential to change how people make economic decisions, such as the decision to hire a worker or to wait for better times, to stick one's neck out or to be cautious in business, to launch a business venture, or to invest in a volatile speculative asset."* In this sense, narratives —like strategic metaphors such as chess— shape how economic actors interpret their environment and decide how to act within it.

On this basis, we propose the Model of Internationalization through Strategic Chess Thinking (MIPAE[1]), which draws on the Ten Strategies for Internationalization Model (Villarreal, 2008) and the Dodecagon of Internationalization (Villarreal, 2010). This model seeks to reinterpret international decision-making as a chess game played on a global scale. As De Diego (2023, p. 45) states, *"if strategic planning is the chess of the business world, then strategic agility is its dance floor."*

MIPAE also makes it possible to recast classic Strategic Management tools through a chess-based analytical lens. These tools include PESTEL analysis (Johnson *et al.*, 2006), the Diamond model (Porter, 1990), the Five Competitive Forces framework (Porter, 1980), resource and capability analysis (Barney, 1991; Peteraf, 1993; Wernerfelt, 1984), the Value Chain (Bales *et al.*, 1980; Porter, 1985), and SWOT analysis (Learned *et al.*, 1965; Mintzberg, 1990). In the words of John Holland, as cited by Docio (2012, p. 31), *"the true essence of competitive advantage, whether in chess or in economic activity, lies in the discovery and execution of moves within a fictitious scenario."*

In this paper, we use the case of Ormazabal (Velatia) (Villarreal & Ruiz, 2015) to empirically validate the model, interpreting the company's entry into the French market in the 1990s as a strategic chess game: the white king represents the company and its capabilities, while the black pieces symbolize entry barriers, competition, and external uncertainties. This study does not seek to replace traditional approaches, but rather to complement them by providing a rigorous and visually compelling perspective that brings together complex thinking, business analysis, and chess discipline on a single chessboard. MIPAE is both an illustrative metaphor and a structured analytical framework that introduces an alternative and complementary way of organizing knowledge on business internationalization.

From a theoretical standpoint, the model proposes a unified cognitive architecture that structurally integrates the main approaches to business internationalization. Although the literature has advanced in explaining specific dimensions —using approaches such as the resource-based view, the logic of internalization, sequential strategies, and competitive analysis— conceptual fragmentation still persists, making it difficult to visualize the process as a dynamic whole. MIPAE does not replace these frameworks; rather, it brings them together within a synthetic scheme that enables internationalization to be understood as an interdependent strategic sequence of decisions, resources, and external forces.

With regard to methodology, this study introduces structured analogy as a rigorous analytical tool. In addition to employing chess as an illustrative resource, the model establishes systematic "bridges of coherence" between strategic concepts and elements of the board, translating complex competitive dynamics into observable spatial, temporal, and relational configurations. In this way, chess operates as a cognitive device that enhances strategic anticipation and a systemic reading of the international environment.

At the empirical level, the application of the model demonstrates that it works as an interpretive framework for discussing a real case, showing how the coordination between internal capabilities and external pressures can be analyzed as a coherent strategic sequence. This, in turn, opens up the possibility of comparative replication in future studies.

This approach has implications for academic research, as it offers an integrative framework that can be empirically tested, and for managerial practice, as it provides a mental structure that favors anticipatory planning in environments characterized by geopolitical uncertainty and increasing competitive complexity.

[1] MIPAE stands for *Modelo de Internacionalización a través del Pensamiento Ajedrecístico Estratégico*, the name of the model in the original Spanish. This acronym will be used throughout the article in order to maintain terminological consistency and preserve the conceptual identity of the model.

2. CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The Model of Internationalization through Strategic Chess Thinking (MIPAE) is grounded in two conceptual pillars. The Dodecagon of Internationalization (Villarreal, 2010) provides an integrative framework for the main theoretical currents that explain the phenomenon under study (see Figure 2 in the Supplementary file), and the Ten Strategies for Internationalization Model (MEI) (Villarreal, 2008) defines the phases and strategic decisions of the internationalization process and makes it possible to build the Bridge of Coherence I towards MIPAE (see Table 1 in the Supplementary file).

The Dodecagon of Internationalization provides an architecture of theoretical integration that brings economic, organizational, and strategic approaches together in a systemic view of the phenomenon, while the Ten Strategies for Internationalization Model (MEI) offers a sequential logic that organizes the process into analysis, formulation, implementation, and strategic evaluation. MIPAE does not replace these models; rather, it articulates them through a chess-based translation that turns this conceptual and processual integration into a visualizable cognitive-strategic structure.

Building on this foundation, MIPAE introduces two complementary chess dodecagons: (i) the Chess Dodecagon of Strategic Integration (see Figure 3 in the Supplementary file), which represents the positional environment in which internationalization unfolds, and (ii) the Cognitive-Decisional Chess Dodecagon (see Figure 4 in the Supplementary file), which describes the decision-maker's mental structure. The distinction between the two reflects a fundamental principle of professional chess: the objective position on the board is not equivalent to the cognitive process through which the player interprets it. In business terms, this difference helps explain why organizations exposed to similar conditions may adopt divergent international paths.

This study incorporates the retrospective perspective required in a scientific article by including the key theoretical frameworks of internationalization that were used to form the original dodecagon (Villarreal, 2010) and updating them with recent references. The updated version is presented in Table 2 (see Supplementary file), offering a synthesis of the internationalization frameworks that served as the foundation for the development of MIPAE.

Building on this theoretical architecture, MIPAE proposes that the internationalization process be represented as a structural configuration analogous to a chess position (see Figures 5 and 6 in the Supplementary file). The board represents the market and is divided into two interrelated domains: the white zone, which symbolizes the company's internal environment —resources, capabilities, organizational culture, logistical structure, and accumulated knowledge— and the black zone, which represents the external environment —regulatory barriers, competition, institutional conditions, macroeconomic dynamics, and geopolitical tensions.

Consistent with this cognitive-spatial logic, MIPAE incorporates a methodological color-coding system that reinforces the model's analytical rigor. Green represents the external environment and international challenges; pink represents the company's conscious strategic decisions; grey represents processes of analysis, structure, and learning; and black represents the structural logic connecting the different elements of the model. This color-coding serves more than just an aesthetic purpose. It helps distinguish between position, decision, and interpretation, thereby strengthening the decision-maker's cognitive clarity at both the strategic-contextual and cognitive-decisional levels.

The white pieces (see Table 3 in the Supplementary file) embody organizational resources and capabilities, while the black pieces (see Table 4 in the Supplementary file) represent external forces, structural constraints, and process-related challenges. Within this framework, the concept of position becomes central to the analysis: success depends not only on possessing superior resources, but also on understanding their relative configuration, how they are coordinated, and how they interact with external pressures.

Within this structural dimension, MIPAE incorporates a chess-based reinterpretation of classic strategic management tools. These tools do not operate as independent illustrative elements, but as operational instruments embedded within the model's positional logic, and they are particularly relevant during the preparatory phase.

First, MIPAE adapts the PESTEL model (Johnson *et al.*, 2006) to a chess-based framework (see Figure 7 in the Supplementary file), in which each dimension of the macro-environment —political, economic, socio-cultural, technological, ecological, and legal dimensions— is conceptualized as a set of black forces that delimit the player's field of action. This adaptation does not alter the essence of the instrument; rather, it formalizes its function spatially: the environment becomes an active part of the board, conditioning strategic moves before the international game even begins.

Second, MIPAE incorporates Porter's Diamond of Competitiveness (1990) while preserving its original unit of analysis —the country-sector nexus— (see Figure 8 in the Supplementary file). The model proposes a chess-based reworking of the Diamond (see Figure 9 in the Supplementary file), in which the structural determinants of the national environment are reinterpreted as positional variables that influence the player's strategic configuration. Rivalry, resources, regulations, and competitive pressures are thus understood as dynamic forces that shape the competitive space in which the game unfolds.

Third, MIPAE reinterprets the Value Chain (Porter, 1985) as a Chess Value Chain (see Figure 10 in the Supplementary file). In this representation, primary and support activities are associated with white pieces that are assigned differentiated functions, thereby allowing the company's internal structure to be visualized as a coordinated arrangement of strategic resources. The Queen represents the functions of Marketing and Sales, as well as Innovation, owing to its transversal capacity for influence; the Bishops embody Technological Development and Human Resource Management; the Rooks symbolize logistics; the Knights reflect tactical functions of adaptation; and the Pawns consolidate operational execution and service.

Incorporating these tools into the architecture of MIPAE makes it possible to bring environment, internal structure, and competitive dynamics together within a single cognitive-spatial logic. Thus, the model is not simply a narrative metaphor; rather,

it analytically formalizes traditional strategic instruments within a coherent structure of positional interpretation.

Check has a bidirectional meaning in MIPAE. When the white pieces put the black pieces in check, this represents the effective implementation of a strategy or innovation that generates competitive advantage and compels the environment to respond. Conversely, when the black pieces put the white pieces in check, this symbolizes the emergence of external pressures or critical vulnerabilities that require an immediate response in order to avoid positional deterioration.

Checkmate likewise has two different interpretations. If White delivers checkmate, this is understood as the successful culmination of a strategic project —for instance, the consolidation of an internationalization process— potentially opening up a new phase of expansion (that is, a new game). If checkmate is delivered by Black, this reflects the failure of the project on its intended terms; however, it does not imply the end of the organization, but rather the conclusion of a specific game within a broader and continuous strategic process.

Consistent with this logic, Fong (2017) argues that superior resources are characterized by high productivity, differentiation, and the capacity to protect competitive advantage. In MIPAE, these qualities are illustrated on the board: active and well-coordinated pieces symbolize productive resources; their harmonious coordination reflects strategic differentiation; and the protection of the king symbolizes the preservation of competitive advantage. Thus, success in internationalization depends not only on the availability of resources, but also on their strategic placement and coordination within a structured plan. While the Resource-Based View (RBV) and the Knowledge-Based View (KBV) have been central to explaining competitive advantage, recent authors point to the need to extend these approaches to new contexts, including internationalization and innovation in dynamic environments (Cooper *et al.*, 2023). MIPAE belongs to this line of reconceptualization, as it translates these approaches into strategic chess thinking.

Moving beyond the static configuration of the board, the model has a temporal dimension that links the phases of chess to the phases of MEI. As shown in Table 1 (see Supplementary file), there is a functional correspondence (Bridge of Coherence I) between the preparatory phase in chess and international strategic analysis in MEI, the opening and objective setting, the middlegame and strategy formulation, the endgame and implementation, and post-game analysis and continuous evaluation. This equivalence is not merely metaphorical; it is also structural: each phase entails different levels of calculation, coordination, resource allocation, and risk management.

In line with this temporal dimension, MIPAE incorporates a dynamic system of strategic objectives inspired by the progression of the chess game from the opening to the middlegame and the endgame. Figure 11 (see Supplementary file) synthesizes how objectives vary according to the phase of the game: central control and initial coordination in the opening, creating and exploiting imbalances in the middlegame, and simplification and technical conversion in the endgame. This logic is not merely illustrative; it is also structural. In MIPAE, each phase of the internationalization process demands different priorities —analysis, formulation, implementation, or consolidation— and clarity in the progressive redefinition of objectives is crucial to avoid strategic incoherence in decision-making.

Figures 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 (see Supplementary file) represent the five phases of the MIPAE model —the preparatory phase, the opening, the middlegame, the endgame, and post-game analysis— and thus formalize the processual sequence that structures the model. Table 5 (see Supplementary file), in turn, introduces the operational elements of chess thinking —strategy, tactics, calculation, technique, adaptability, and intuition— as dimensions that are transferable to the international decision-making process (Bridge of Coherence II). In this way, MIPAE simultaneously combines three analytical levels: (i) the structural or positional level; (ii) the processual or sequential level; and (iii) the cognitive level of strategic reasoning.

The model understands internationalization not as a war-like confrontation against an adversary, but rather as a continuous exercise in anticipation and positioning in relation to a changing environment. Each piece fulfills a specific role within a relational architecture, and each move corresponds to deliberate decisions aimed at occupying strategic spaces under conditions of uncertainty. Consequently, MIPAE is not a rigid manual or a prescriptive recipe, but rather a dynamic tool designed to strengthen the capacity for analysis, planning, and strategic execution in situations of risk. Its purpose is to structure strategic thinking in complex international contexts by integrating environment, resources, and cognition within a single conceptual architecture.

This view is consistent with what Shiller (2019, as cited in Begović, 2020, p. 257), argues, namely that narrative economics, defined as the "*study of the viral spread of popular narratives that affect economic behavior, can improve our ability to anticipate and prepare for economic events. It can also help us structure economic institutions and policy*." Similarly, MIPAE maintains that translating international strategy into a structured chess-based logic —understood as a formalized narrative of strategic positioning— can strengthen companies' ability to anticipate, interpret, and adapt to international dynamics in highly volatile global environments.

In order to establish this analogical relationship rigorously, the model incorporates the analysis and decision-taking technique developed in high-level chess (Dvoretsky & Yusupov, 1998), transferring its principles of positional evaluation, variation calculation, and strategic planning to the field of business internationalization.

3. METHODOLOGY

The aim of this study is to develop and examine a new perspective for analyzing business internationalization using the Model of Internationalization through Strategic Chess Thinking (MIPAE).

To empirically validate the model, we employ a qualitative methodology that is descriptive, exploratory, and potentially explanatory and adopt a case study approach (Eisenhardt, 1989; Villarreal, 2017; Yin, 2018), which has been widely used in the analysis of internationalized companies (Fong, 2017; Rialp *et al.*, 2005a; Villarreal & Landeta, 2010). More specifically, we use a single holistic case study (Calvo & Villarreal, 2019; Villarreal &

Calvo, 2015; Yin, 2018) whose technical profile is presented in Table 6 (see Supplementary file).

The case under study is Ormazabal (Velatia) (Villarreal & Ruiz, 2015), a family-owned Basque company with a strong technological focus and a well-established internationalization trajectory. We selected this case because it has all the necessary characteristics required for the unit of analysis, as outlined in the technical profile: it is a highly internationalized company with known behavioral variety across sectoral and geographical contexts, allowing it to be represented using MIPAE. In this regard, the definition of the unit of analysis and the selection of the case meet several of the criteria recommended by Patton (1990). We used both theory-based or operational construct sampling and criterion sampling according to the subject matter under study. This study also meets the criteria for information-rich case intensity sampling, as the selected case clearly illustrates the phenomenon under investigation, as well as the phenomenon of maximum variation, given the organization's behavioral variety in its internationalization strategy. We also used other criteria, namely the identification of the relevant context from both sectoral and geographical perspectives and combination or multiple-purpose sampling based on methodological and data triangulation from different sources of evidence.

In connection with the company's aforementioned behavioral variety, this study focuses on a key strategic operation within the broader context of Velatia's international trajectory: Ormazabal's entry into the French market during the 1990s and its subsequent development in this market. Our decision to focus on this operation is justified by the role it played in shaping the company's international evolution. It involved a significant reconfiguration of resources, technological adaptation, organizational learning, and direct confrontation with established competitors in a different institutional environment. By analyzing this operation, we can observe the interaction between internal capabilities and external pressures, as well as the sequence of strategic decisions adopted, within a clearly delimited episode.

With regard to information sources (data collection), this study draws on multiple forms of evidence (triangulation), including internal documentation (annual reports, internal reports, and corporate archives), multiple in-depth interviews, and external sources, such as specialized publications, sectoral databases, and institutional reports. We carried out open and semi-structured interviews with five senior managers who were actively involved in the internationalization process. These interviews were conducted face-to-face, as well as by telephone and email, with a confirmatory perspective. We also employed direct observation techniques by making on-site visits to several Velatia facilities. The use of these diverse sources of evidence made it possible to apply the principle of triangulation, thereby strengthening the study's construct validity.

We analyzed the evidence (data analysis) by structurally classifying relevant dimensions, chronologically reconstructing the selected strategic operation, and analytically interpreting critical decisions using MIPAE. This process made it possible to break down the company's logic into tactical and strategic sequences, assigning roles to the white pieces (resources and capabilities) and the black pieces (external forces).

Finally, we applied criteria of methodological rigor that are consistent with the case study literature (Villarreal & Landeta, 2010; Villarreal, 2017; Yin, 2018) to ensure the validity, reliability, and consistency of our analysis. To this end, we employed theoretical triangulation (the use of competing theories in the original model) and the triangulation of informants and sources of evidence; developed a study protocol; built a database to organize, integrate, and synthesize the information obtained from different sources of evidence; rigorously assessed ethical issues in collecting and analyzing evidence; ensured traceability between the empirical evidence used in our study and its conceptual interpretation; and paid attention to contextual elements (both micro and macro) that are relevant to the case study. We were sure to apply our proposed analytical framework in a systematically coherent way.

The methodological design of this study enables the applicability of MIPAE to be examined in a real-world business context —not merely as an illustrative metaphor, but as an analytical framework for the structured interpretation of internationalization processes.

4. CASE STUDY BACKGROUND

Ormazabal[2] was founded in 1967 in the Basque Country as a small family company "dedicated to the manufacture and installation of equipment for electric grids." It is the origin of what is now Velatia, a family-owned, technological, and industrial multinational group and a global leader in solutions that integrate smart products, systems, and services in the energy and communications sectors. Ormazabal developed and grew to become one of the world's leading suppliers of protection and switching equipment for medium-voltage electric grids. After modest beginnings in the 1980s and 1990s, when exporting was the company's main mode of internationalization, the steps it took in subsequent decades propelled its multinational expansion across six continents. In its international expansion process, the group has relied on both organic and inorganic growth, making acquisitions in countries including Germany, the United States, and Mexico and achieving steady and manageable growth. Moreover, the creation of Centres of Excellence and new business lines has given the group a broad degree of diversification.

Ormazabal's entry into France was driven by both defensive motives and the recognition of an opportunity. The entry of the French manufacturers Schneider and Alstom into the Spanish market at the end of the 1980s had a significant impact on Ormazabal's performance in its home market and even prompted a regulatory change in Spanish legislation in their favor. This factor led to the selection of France as the first location for international expansion ("The best defense is a good offense"). Nevertheless, the company's entry into France took place gradually. Indeed, it was not until 1995 that its first significant contract emerged. EDF, the leading French electric company, raised the possibility of developing a type of product that its two tradition-

[2] For the sake of brevity, we will use the name "Ormazabal" in the rest of this article, after explaining that it is now part of the Velatia Group and played a leading role in the internationalization strategy in France examined in this study.

al suppliers (Schneider and Alstom) were unwilling to produce. EDF decided to launch an international tender, and Ormazabal, through a standout performance, earned EDF's trust, gaining considerable recognition and reputation in the French market. This development even led to a change in French regulations, resulting in the homologation of the new product. Ormazabal's success in France was due to both the sound choice made by the person responsible for leading the process and the commitment of the organization as a whole. Supplying EDF gave the company a highly significant international reputation. It was only a matter of time before the company would need to open a plant in France, in order to be closer to the customer and produce the necessary volume. Ormapost was founded in 2003 to manufacture enclosures and has supplied the French market ever since.

5. APPLYING THE MIPAE MODEL TO ORMAZABAL

Having laid out the conceptual framework of MIPAE in Section 2, we will now illustrate its empirical application to the case of Ormazabal in this section, focusing our analysis on the company's entry process into the French market in the 1990s.

Applying the model makes it possible to structure the firm's international trajectory into five analytical phases the preparatory phase, the opening, the middlegame, the endgame, and postgame analysis. This is not an abstract metaphorical description, but a strategic reconstruction of the decisions, tensions, and positioning adopted in a specific competitive environment.

Table 7 (see Supplementary file) presents Ormazabal's key resources and capabilities prior to its internationalization into France, which are represented as white pieces in line with the conceptual architecture of MIPAE. Table 8 (see Supplementary file) synthesizes the main external forces and threats of the competitive environment, conceptualized as black pieces conditioning the strategic board.

5.1. MIPAE Phase 1: the Preparatory Phase

In chess terms, the preparatory phase involves not developing pieces on the board, but studying one's opponent before sitting down to play. In professional classical tournaments, a player usually knows the name of the opponent beforehand. They have time to analyze the opponent's repertoire, as well as their own, identify recurrent patterns and detect vulnerabilities, and select a line that maximizes their own strengths against this specific profile. The quality of this preparation shapes the nature of the game that follows: a superficial assessment leads to reactive decisions, whereas a rigorous assessment enables a player to choose the most favorable strategic terrain.

Ormazabal's entry into the French market followed this same logic. It was not a matter of abstract expansion into "an international market," but of strategic confrontation with concrete actors: a highly centralized electricity system organized around EDF, established domestic competitors, and a demanding and highly structured regulatory framework. Preparation could not be generic; it had to be directed and selective, just as it is when a chess player is preparing to face an opponent whose identity and style are already known.

A. Analysis of the internal and external domains

In chess, studying the opponent involves reviewing their recent games, understanding their style —whether it is positional, tactical, conservative, or aggressive— and anticipating which structures they tend to accept or avoid. Similarly, Ormazabal analyzed the institutional and competitive architecture of the French market before committing significant resources.

The environment had clearly defined features: highly concentrated demand, a rigorous technical culture, a preference for certified suppliers, and a regulatory framework that left no room for improvisation. These characteristics were not merely external variables, but structural elements of the market's "playing style." Ormazabal needed to understand how local actors reacted to new entrants, which conditions were non-negotiable, and according to what criteria technical legitimacy was assessed. The analysis of the international context —summarized in Table 9 (see Supplementary file)— makes it possible to identify the political, economic, socio-cultural, technological, ecological, and legal factors that delimited room for maneuver. It was not a matter of observing isolated variables, but of interpreting systemic patterns that conditioned the viability of each strategic move.

The use of the chess-based Diamond model (see Figure 17 in the Supplementary file) also makes it possible to understand how the structural conditions of the Spanish environment had previously helped consolidate the company's competitive advantages. Technical and industrial expertise, the development of specialized human capital, and the presence of related and supporting industries had given it a solid foundation in the domestic market. Local rivalry and pressure to innovate encouraged continuous refinement, helping the company develop a cohesive internal structure. This assessment was essential in determining which strengths were transferable to the French market and which required adaptation.

Similarly, using the chess-based adaptation of Porter's Five Forces (see Figure 18 in the Supplementary file), the French position can be interpreted as a structure in which sectoral rivalry was intense, the dominant buyer's bargaining power constrained negotiating margins, and barriers to entry were closely associated with technical requirements and certifications. In chess terms, the position did not allow for impulsive moves: each advance had to be calculated prophylactically, anticipating responses and avoiding structural weaknesses.

At the same time, the preparatory phase required an honest analysis of the company's own structure. Knowing the opponent is insufficient if one does not understand one's own limitations. Ormazabal possessed clear strengths: technological expertise in medium-voltage solutions, highly specialized human capital, and a coordinated value chain. The configuration of this value chain —represented in Figure 10 (see Supplementary file)— was based not only on operational efficiency criteria, but also on a coherent strategic positioning logic.

The company's initial position can be clearly visualized from the resulting strategic profile —which we have reinterpreted using a chess-based logic in Figure 19 (see Supplementary file). It had a solid internal structure but needed to adapt to highly regulated and competitive environment. The coding of the SWOT factors (A, B, C…X) has been included in order to facilitate their

identification on the chessboard. Some of these letters will be used later in this paper to indicate the moments or positions in Ormazabal's symbolic game of internationalization that represent a given strength, weakness, opportunity, or threat.

At times, a chess player faces an opponent for whom little prior game history is available. In such situations, preparation cannot rely exclusively on specific analysis. Instead, the player must strengthen their own repertoire and choose structures they have mastered in depth. Similarly, although the French market had identifiable actors, there was no fully comparable precedent for the specific dynamics of entry by a foreign supplier. Faced with this uncertainty, Ormazabal's strategic preparation combined external analysis with internal consolidation: the company reinforced its technical capabilities, examined regulatory requirements in greater depth, and avoided precipitous action.

The company's decision not to enter this new market immediately, but to instead mature over several years before committing to a more solid structural presence there, reflects this logic of rigorous preparation. As in professional chess, the game does not begin when the first piece is moved, but when one has understood the nature of the opponent and assessed one's own position with precision. Only after this phase did it become possible to plan the subsequent development of the company's internationalization strategy in proactive and sustainable terms.

B. Psychological preparation (Psychic distance)

In chess, prior preparation is not solely technical; it also includes a psychological dimension. Knowing the opponent's style may make a player feel pressure or cause them to become overconfident. They must manage expectations, avoid anxiety, and maintain strategic clarity.

In the MIPAE model, psychological preparation serves a strategic function equivalent to psychic distance. MIPAE transforms this common perception of a perceptual barrier in the face of the unknown into a trainable dimension: emotional management as a tool for anticipating and adapting to a culturally distinct competitive environment.

In Ormazabal's case, entry into the French market was not immediate, but rather the product of a three-year maturation process. This wait is indicative not only of the company's technical strategy, but also of psychological preparation to face an opponent characterized by a rigorous, centralized business culture and strong regulatory standards (such as EDF). In chess terms, this meant facing an opponent with a solid, structured playing style and a high demand for precision. The company needed not only to know the opponent, but also to achieve an internal state of calm, confidence, and resilience.

Ormazabal, as the player of the white pieces, needed to transform uncertainty into emotional mastery. Rather than rushing forward, it chose to wait for the right position, study the terrain, anticipate cultural barriers, and prepare its strategic pieces. This attitude of active restraint, far from being passive, was a key psychological move: it was a psychologically sound opening for tackling a complex game.

Thus, MIPAE does not merely identify cultural distance as an obstacle. It also encourages its utilization as an internal resource. Psychological preparation does not seek to eliminate risk, but to put the company in position from which it can convert this risk into an advantage.

5.2. MIPAE Phase 2: Opening

A. Ormazabal's mission and vision (The style and personality of the Ormazabal player)

In chess, a player's style and personality are apparent from their very first move and reflect their mindset, preparation, and attitude towards the uncertainty of the board. In the context of MIPAE, Ormazabal can be characterized as a positional, methodical player with a strong identity.

Ormazabal was a player that had consolidated its style on the domestic board (Spain) and was seeking to replicate this identity in foreign markets without losing its essence. As in chess, its success did not depend solely on winning games, but also on playing coherently and consistently in a way that reflected its principles.

B. The System of International Objectives in the Opening Phase (MIPAE applied to France)

In Ormazabal's entry into the French market, the opening phase required that strategic objectives be precisely formulated to guide every move. This stage is comparable to the beginning of a chess game, when one does not play impulsively, but according to a defined plan that combines vision, values, and tactical and strategic objectives.

A priori function – Objectives established from the outset of the game

— Control of the center = Positioning in key French electricity networks.
  During the opening phase in chess, one of the principal objectives is to control the center of the board in order to dominate the game. Figure 20 (see Supplementary file) shows how Ormazabal sought to occupy a strategic space within the French energy system, drawing on its experience in medium- and high-voltage solutions. The objective was to achieve a significant market share and establish an operational presence in areas with high expansion potential.
— Development of pieces = Initial activation of the company's branch office and distributor partners.
  In Figure 21 (see Supplementary file), the developed white knights represent purchasing and production. Ormazabal first entered the French market through distributor partners, with the aim of achieving a positive margin and gaining familiarity with the regulatory environment before scaling up to more complex structures.
— King safety = Active leadership and strategic centralization.
  In simplified positions, safety may lie in the center, rather than on the flank. Ormazabal did not castle: it advanced its "king" into the heart of the French board, assuming operational leadership and direct supervision.
  This active presence strengthened structural coordination and accelerated progress.
  A well-placed king supports, connects, and guides the path to victory.

— Pawn structure = A coherent operational network in French territory.
  The company's strategy sought to avoid disorderly expansion or expansion marked by structural weaknesses. A progressive yet solid advance of resources and capabilities was prioritized in order to avoid duplication, operational conflicts, and saturating distribution channels.
— Piece coordination = Alignment between the French branch and the Spanish parent company.
  Each piece must work in concert with the others. Thus, the objectives that Ormazabal defined for France were not isolated. They were a part of an international strategic orchestra, in which each country reinforced the group's broader symphony.

Permanent and a posteriori function – Dynamic evaluation in the French market

— Evaluating the position on the board = Constant analysis of performance in France.
  Just as the position is evaluated after each move in chess, Ormazabal monitored its commercial progress in France using indicators such as volume, market share, margin, and profitability. Continuous analysis makes it possible to adjust plans in accordance with market response.
— Formulating a plan = Defining a progressive escalation path.
  From the outset, a sequence was envisaged: distributor → branch office → joint venture → acquisition. This logic reflects a structure of planned moves, in which each phase opens the way to a more advanced one depending on the results obtained.
— Candidate moves = Exploring local variations and strategic alliances.
  The company continuously assessed new alliances, entry channels, regulatory changes, and synergies with local actors that could facilitate or accelerate its consolidation in France.
— Calculation = Projecting risks and return horizons.
  Each move in France entailed a thorough evaluation of costs, expected returns, impact on the company's global structure, and compatibility with its operating model. Nothing is improvised; everything is calculated.
— Execution and re-evaluation = Adjusting after each advance or setback.
  After each move (opening a branch, reaching an agreement, or making a technical adaptation), its impact was assessed and the next step was redefined. The French board was not static; it demanded tactical versatility and continuous strategic thought.

C. The beginning of the game: Ormazabal's opening

Note: The following sequence uses standard algebraic chess notation as an analytical device. In this notation, each piece is represented by a letter (Q = queen, N = knight, B = bishop, R = rook, K = king). Pawns are identified only by file and destination square (for example, h4), not by a letter. The symbol "x" indicates a capture, "?" a chess error or inaccuracy, and "+" check.

Tournament: Ormazabal's Internationalization
White: Ormazabal (Velatia)
Black: External Forces and Challenges (The French Market)

1.e4 c5 2.Nf3 a6 3.c4 e6 4.Nc3 Nc6 5.d4 cxd4 6.Nxd4 Bb4 7.Qd3 Nf6 8.Nxc6 bxc6 9.a3 Bxc3+ 10.Qxc3 Nxe4?

Ormazabal's entry into the French market followed a structural logic comparable to a game in which White opens with 1.e4 (the king's pawn). The company asserted central control from a previously consolidated domestic position: technological leadership in medium-voltage systems, an extensive industrial network, and sustained growth throughout the 1980s. The environment, however, does not allow for symmetrical development and responds with an O'Kelly Sicilian (1...c5 2...a6), an asymmetrical and flexible structure that avoids early head-on confrontation and shifts tension into the middlegame. Ormazabal's high dependence on Iberduero/Iberdrola as its principal customer had already created a latent weakness, and Spain's accession to the European Economic Community in 1986 removed competitive barriers, facilitating the entry of French players such as Schneider and Alstom into the domestic market. The board thus expands, but it also becomes more unstable.

The sequence culminates in 10...Nxe4 (see Figure 22 in the Supplementary file), a move that, from a chess-analytical perspective, is objectively questionable: it appears to immediately seize the initiative, yet it exposes the structure and concedes dynamic counterplay to White. In strategic terms, this moment symbolizes the economic crisis of 1992, an exogenous shock that contracted the Spanish electricity market and abruptly altered the existing conditions of equilibrium. This episode functions as a genuine black swan: a high-impact event that was difficult to anticipate in its full magnitude and transformed a contingent threat into a structural catalyst for change. Rather than inducing defensive retrenchment, this disruption redefined the company's strategic incentives and accelerated its internationalization as a rational response to a domestic environment that no longer offered sufficient stability to sustain long-term growth.

5.3. MIPAE Phase 3: the Middlegame

11.Qxg7 Qf6 12.Qxf6 Nxf6 13.b4 Rg8 14.Bb2 Ke7 15.g3 a5 16.Bd3 h5 17.h3 d6 18.Ke2 e5 19.c5 axb4 20.axb4 Rxa1 21.Rxa1 Bxh3 22.Ra7+ Bd7

Having overcome the structural shock that brought the opening to a close, Ormazabal entered the middlegame by deploying a gradual positioning sequence in the French market. Its initial entry by means of exports supported by local distributors activated both the location strategy and the entry and permanence strategy. This enabled the company to reduce frictions and build technical legitimacy in an environment dominated by EDF and established incumbents. This initial approach did not unfold in a vacuum; rather, it developed within a strategic position characterized by institutional requirements, established industrial networks, and sophisticated technological competition. In terms of the Chess Dodecagon of Strategic Integration (see Figure 3 in the Supplementary file), the company begins to operate on a board where logics of innovation, relational networks, sectoral structure, and contextual adaptation converge. These dimensions, in turn, refer back to the Dodecagon of Internationalization (see Figure 2 in the Supplementary file), as the integrative framework of theories that explains the complexity of the competitive environment.

As the position evolved, expansion was articulated through an organic growth strategy accompanied by a clear coexistence strategy: Ormazabal chose to compete independently in France, rather than entering into alliances with dominant players, accepting coexistence with them in a highly concentrated market without diluting its own technological identity. At the same time, corporate strategy guided resource allocation and the prioritization of strategic business units, ensuring coherence between the parent company and the subsidiary and aligning internationalization with the group's overall vision. The gradual consolidation of Ormazabal's operations in France culminated in the creation of Ormapost in 2003. The company explicitly activated both the internalization strategy and the structure strategy by selectively relocating those activities whose proximity to the customer would reduce logistical frictions and facilitate regulatory compliance. In parallel, the company's technological differentiation from traditional competitors reflected a coherent competitive strategy, while its specific adaptation to EDF's requirements shows that it had a clearly defined multidomestic focus strategy. The temporal coherence between 1992 and 2003 ultimately demonstrates that the company's expansion into France followed a robust sequencing strategy grounded in staged decisions, cumulative learning, and increasing commitment.

The interpretation of this middlegame cannot be limited to the structural level. The simultaneous activation of these ten strategies requires taking into account the decision-maker's internal state. From the perspective of the Cognitive-Decisional Chess Dodecagon (see Figure 4 in the Supplementary file), the processes involved in internationalization include global position-reading, identifying competitive patterns, deliberately creating imbalances, plan selection, and risk management under conditions of uncertainty. The coordination between technological innovation, regulatory adaptation, and organizational commitment is not merely the result of the environment, but also of how management cognitively interprets and processes this environment. In chess terms, the sequence culminates in 22.Ra7+ Bd7 (see Figure 23 in the Supplementary file): Ormazabal advanced slowly but surely, consolidating its industrial presence in France and establishing the structure that would set the tone for its future internationalization.

5.4. MIPAE Phase 4: the Endgame

23.b5 Rb8 24.cxd6+ Ke6 25.f4 e4 26.Bc4+ Nd5 27.Ba3 Rd8 28.b6 Kf5 29.b7 Rb8 30.Ba6 Nc3+ 31.Ke1 h4 32.gxh4 Rg8 33.Ra8 Rg1+ 34.Kf2 Ra1 35.b8=Q Ra2+ 36.Ke1 e3 37.Bb2 1–0 (White wins, as Black resigned after 37.Bb2)

The endgame represents the strategic conversion phase: the positional advantage accumulated in the middlegame is transformed into structural consolidation. The sequence beginning with 23.b5 reflects Ormazabal's operational penetration into and establishment of a structure in the French market. The capture on d6 and the advance of the b-pawn represent technical adaptation and industrial stabilization. This consolidation can be seen in Figure 24 (see Supplementary file): the rook on the seventh rank symbolizes operational control, while White's structure imposes superior coordination. In terms of the Chess Dodecagon of Strategic Integration (see Figure 3 in the Supplementary file), the institutional, competitive, and technological dimensions ceased to function as external tensions and instead became integrated into the company's own organizational equilibrium.

The intermediate stage of the endgame (25.f4 – 31.Ke1 h4) introduces a critical dimension: the existence of "mined squares." The advance of Black's h-pawn, which can be seen in Figure 25 (see Supplementary file), symbolizes regulatory, cultural, and financial risks that remained latent. Even in advantageous positions, peripheral threats may generate counterplay if they are not neutralized in time. From the cognitive-decisional perspective of MIPAE (see Figure 4 in the Supplementary file), this stage demands precise calculation, error control, and risk management under pressure. The threat activated by 36...e3 (see Figure 26 in the Supplementary file) shows that, even in favorable positions, adverse tactical sequences may emerge if coordination is relaxed. The endgame, therefore, is not a premature celebration, but a phase of maximum strategic concentration.

The move 37.Bb2 seals the conversion. The bishop blocks counterplay and consolidates the accumulated advantage, allowing the position to be simplified without losing control. In business terms, Ormazabal's internationalization in France achieved structural stability: the company consolidated its institutional legitimacy and established productive capacity, and its technological advantage was recognized. The coordination between the environment, resources, and the decision-making process —integrated through the Dodecagon of Internationalization (see Figure 2 in the Supplementary file) and its chess-based translations— resulted in sustainable control of the competitive board.

The 1-0 result (White wins) does not symbolize the defeat of the French system, but Ormazabal's strategic consolidation within it. The endgame is not rupture, but integration with advantage.

5.5. MIPAE Phase 5: Post-game analysis

The post-game analysis phase constitutes an exercise in strategic evaluation, rather than a celebration of the result. In professional chess (see Figure 27 in the Supplementary file), post-game review enables players to identify not only the correct moves, but also the critical moments at which the position might have deviated. Similarly, Ormazabal's consolidation in France —symbolized by the promotion of the passed pawn— represents the materialization of a stable strategic unit, but also invites an examination of the conditions that made this conversion possible.

From the perspective of the Chess Dodecagon of Strategic Integration (see Figure 3 in the Supplementary file), our analysis shows that the company's advantage was not built on a single factor, but on the coherent interaction between technological innovation, institutional adaptation, organizational structure, and relational networks. The coordination between technological development and human capital —analogous to the pair of bishops in chess— proved decisive in correctly interpreting the French environment and adjusting value proposition without losing strategic identity. This complementarity enabled the company to turn technical differentiation into operational legitimacy.

At the internal level, the Cognitive-Decisional Chess Dodecagon (see Figure 4 in the Supplementary file) illustrates how the direct involvement of top management —metaphorically

represented by the activation of the king— facilitated coherent decision-making during phases of high regulatory and competitive uncertainty. The temporary centralization of leadership stemmed not from a logic of defensive control, but from the need to supervise the transition towards a more complex international structure. Internationalization was not improvised: it was sustained by a deliberate sequence of evaluation, learning, and strategic adjustment.

Nevertheless, our analysis identified vulnerabilities. "Mined squares" persisted in connection with homologation processes that were slower than expected, significant dependence on a dominant customer (EDF), and limited initial experience in managing complex projects in Francophone environments. These elements did not prevent consolidation, but they do show that positional advantage coexisted with structural risks that required continuous vigilance. In chess, a winning position that is poorly managed may be reversed; in internationalization, strategic complacency may erode accumulated advantages.

Our review of Ormazabal's internationalization process also detected partially exploited opportunities. The relational network the company built in France could have been used as a more intensive entry platform into neighboring markets such as Belgium or Switzerland, and brand positioning required more systematic development in order to strengthen international recognition. These observations do not invalidate the result the company achieved. Rather, they underline the dynamic nature of the competitive process.

Taken together, the post-game analysis confirms that Ormazabal's internationalization in France was not the product of an abrupt disruption of sectoral equilibrium, but of the coherent integration of the environment, resources, and the decision-making process, articulated through the Dodecagon of Internationalization (see Figure 2 in the Supplementary file) and its chess-based translations. Symbolic victory does not consist of "defeating" a new national market, but of repositioning oneself within it, achieving stability and a sustainable advantage.

5.6. Results

By applying the Model of Internationalization through Strategic Chess Thinking (MIPAE) to the case of Ormazabal, we were able to structure the process of the company's entry into the French market as a coherent strategic sequence divided into five interdependent phases. The model facilitated the explicit identification of critical decision points, the progressive activation of the ten strategies of the MEI, and dynamic interaction between the environment, resources, and leadership. Unlike a traditional chronological account, MIPAE makes the internal logic linking structural vulnerability, incremental learning, and operational consolidation visible.

At the strategic-contextual level, we were able to integrate institutional, competitive, technological, and organizational factors within a single analytical architecture using the Dodecagon of Internationalization and its chess-based translation. This shows that the advantage Ormazabal achieved in France was not the result of a single variable, but of a systemic configuration that was neither exclusively technological nor exclusively institutional. At the cognitive-decisional level, the model enabled us to analyze how the company's management interpreted the 1992 shock, managed the sequence of entry into France, and calibrated the degree of structural commitment, showing that similar decisions in comparable environments might have generated different outcomes under different cognitive schemes.

Empirically, the application of MIPAE to this case confirmed three relevant findings: (1) the importance of strategic sequencing in gradual internationalization processes; (2) the need for coherence between technological differentiation and selective internalization; and (3) the decisive role of leadership in contexts of high uncertainty. Taken together, the results suggest that MIPAE does not function solely as a pedagogical metaphor. It is a structural analytical tool capable of mapping complex internationalization processes from an integrative and dynamic perspective.

6. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This study proposes MIPAE as an analytical architecture that integrates strategic chess thinking with business internationalization theory. Unlike exclusively descriptive or static approaches, this model introduces a processual structure divided into five interdependent phases and makes it possible to map the sequence of decisions under conditions of competitive uncertainty. The application of MIPAE to the case of Ormazabal shows that this model is not merely an illustrative metaphor. It is a conceptual integration tool that links the environment, resources, leadership, and strategic temporality within a systemic logic.

At the theoretical level, the model engages with the Dodecagon of Internationalization by translating its dimensions into a dynamic decisional language. The incorporation of the strategic-contextual and cognitive-decisional chess dodecagons makes it possible to distinguish between the objective structure of the competitive position and the decision-maker's subjective process of interpretation. This distinction is particularly relevant in internationalization studies, as companies exposed to similar conditions may obtain divergent results owing to differences in strategic reading, the sequencing of commitments, or risk management. MIPAE provides an integrative framework that combines structural analysis and cognitive analysis within a single interpretative scheme.

The model has practical applications, offering managers and internationalization teams a structured tool for planning and evaluating international expansion processes. Its emphasis on sequencing, resource coordination, and managing vulnerabilities makes it possible to approach internationalization not as an isolated event, but as a process of progressive strategic accumulation.

MIPAE has renewed value today, at a time when the international game board is marked by trade wars, energy tensions, and geopolitical conflict. The war in Ukraine, the conflict in the Middle East, and the strategic rivalry between the United States and China have reshaped the rules of international trade, affecting supply chains, energy flows, sanctions regimes, and global financial stability. In this environment characterized by exogenous shocks and high systemic volatility, strategic chess thinking operates as a cognitive tool of anticipation: it makes it possible to

interpret interdependencies, evaluate second-order effects, and design sequences of decision under conditions of structural uncertainty. Economics, politics, and diplomacy can no longer be analyzed in isolation; they advance as interrelated pieces on the same geopolitical-economic board.

In the educational sphere, MIPAE has relevant implications for training in international management. Its visual and structural dimension facilitates the understanding of complex processes, making it possible to represent multiple strategic variables simultaneously without losing analytical coherence. Far from simplifying reality, the model fosters an integrated understanding of it, helping boost strategic reasoning capacities among graduate students and executives in training.

Nevertheless, this study has limitations. The principal one is that MIPAE is an emerging model that is still at an early stage of conceptual and empirical development. It requires further validation through comparative studies across different sectors and geographical contexts. Future research could adopt hybrid deductive and inductive approaches to test the model's propositions using historical case studies and rigorously structured strategic simulations. This would make it possible to assess its explanatory capacity, its predictive potential, and its robustness in highly complex environments.

In summary, MIPAE is designed as an innovative prism that facilitates understanding of the internationalization process from an integrative, processual, and cognitive perspective. It contributes to the study of business internationalization not only by proposing a chess analogy, but also by systematizing the strategic sequence as an object of analysis. On an increasingly unstable international game board, the capacity to interpret positions, anticipate moves, and coordinate resources within a structured logic constitutes a source of sustainable competitive advantage. MIPAE provides precisely this architecture of strategic thought.

7. SUPPLEMENTARY FILE

A supplementary file with material related to the article can be accessed at the following URL: https://ojs.ehu.eus/index.php/CG/libraryFiles/downloadPublic/238

8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The first author acknowledges the support of the University of Guadalajara (Mexico), which enabled her to pursue her doctoral studies at the University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU).

The authors acknowledge the support they received from FESIDE and Grant PID2021-122846NB-I00, funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033, ERDF – A way of making Europe.

9. DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The first author reports a potential future commercial interest related to the MIPAE model. The authors declare that this did not influence the conduct, analysis, and reporting of the present study.

10. AUTHORSHIP

Miriam Parkhurst Casas: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis and investigation, Writing - original draft preparation, Writing - review and editing, Funding acquisition. Oskar Villarreal Larrinaga: Methodology, Writing - review and editing, Funding acquisition, Resources, Supervision, Project administration.

11. REFERENCES

Acemoglu, D., Kong, F., & Restrepo, P. (2024). Tasks at work: comparative advantage, technology and labor demand (NBER Working Paper No. 32872). *National Bureau of Economic Research*. https://www.nber.org/papers/w32872

Adarkwah, G. K., & Malonæs, T. P. (2022). Firm-specific advantages: a comprehensive review with a focus on emerging markets. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 39*(2), 539-585. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-020-09737-7

Aharoni, Y. (1966). *The Foreign Investment Decision Process*. Harvard University, Boston, MA.

Ahlstrom, D., Arregle, J. L., Hitt, M. A., Qian, G., Ma, X., & Faems, D. (2020). Managing technological, sociopolitical, and institutional change in the new normal. *Journal of Management Studies, 57*(3), 411-437. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12569

Auray, S., Devereux, M. B., & Eyquem, A. (2025). Trade wars, nominal rigidities, and monetary policy. *Review of Economic Studies*, *92*(4), 2228-2270. https://doi.org/10.1093/restud/rdae075

Autio, E., Sapienza, H. J., & Almeida, J. G. (2000). Effects of Age at Entry, Knowledge Intensity, and Imitability on International Growth. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(5), 909-924. https://doi.org/10.5465/1556419

Bain, J. S. (1956). *Organización Industrial*. Omega, México.

Bakar, A. H. A., Sinnappan, P., Salim, F. A. A., & Teo, P. C. (2022). Factors influencing foreign direct investment (FDI) location selection: a review of the literature. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 12*(7), 1271-1291.

Bales, C. F., Chatterjee, P., Gluck, F. W., Gogel, D. & Puri, A. (1980). The business system: A new tool for strategy formulation and cost analysis. McKinsey Staff Papers. Reprinted in *McKinsey on strategy* (McKinsey & Company, 2000).

Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage. *Journal of Management*, *17*(1), 99-120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108

Begović, B. (2020). Narrative Economics: How Stories Go Viral & Drive Major Economic Events by Robert J. Shiller. *Panoeconomicus*, *67*(2), 257-263. https://panoeconomicus.org/index.php/jorunal/article/view/1135

Bellandi, M., De Propris, L., & Torre, A. (2025). From Marshall's external economies to external economies of transformation in contemporary industrial spaces. *Cambridge Journal of Economics, 49*(3), 559-579.

Bilkey, W. J., & Tesar, G. (1977). The Export Behaviour of Smaller-sized Wisconsin Manufacturing Firms. *Journal of International Business Studies, 8*(1), 93-98. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490783

Bourgeois, L. J. (1984). Strategic management and determinism. *Academy of Management Review, 9*(4), 586-596. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1984.4277347

Buckley, P. J., & Casson, M. (1976). *The Future of the Multinational Enterprise*. McMillan, London.

Buckley, P. J., & Casson, M. (2020). The internalization theory of the multinational enterprise: Past, present and future. *British Journal of Management*, *31*(2), 239-252. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12344

Calvo, N., & Villarreal, O. (2019). Internationalization as process of value distribution through innovation: polyhedral diagnosis of a "born global" firm. *Journal of Business &* Industrial Marketing, *34*(3), 561-574. https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-03-2017-0060

Cantner, U., Cunningham, J. A., Lehmann, E. E., & Menter, M. (2021). Entrepreneurial ecosystems: a dynamic lifecycle model. *Small Business Economics, 57*(1), 407-423.

Caves, R. E. (1971). International Corporations: the Industrial Economics of Foreign Investment. *Economica, 38*(149), 1-27. https://doi.org/10.2307/2551748

Caves, R. E. (1982). *Multinational Enterprise and Economic Analysis.* Cambridge University Press.

Cavusgil, S. T. (1980). On The Internationalization Process of Firms. *European Research, 8*, 273-281.

Chamberlin, E. H. (1933). *The Theory Of Monopolistic Competition*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Coase, R. H. (1937). The nature of the firm. *Económica, 4,* 386-405.

Contractor, F. J. (2021). The world economy will need even more globalization in the post-pandemic 2021 decade. *Journal of international business studies*, *53*(1), 156. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-020-00394-y

Cooper, C., Pereira, V., Vrontis, D., & Liu, Y. (2023). Extending the resource and knowledge based view: Insights from new contexts of analysis. *Journal of Business Research, 156*, 113523. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.113523

Cyert, R. M., & March, J. G. (1963). *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*. Prentice Hall, New York.

De Diego, E. (2023). Del tablero de ajedrez a la pista de baile: Repensando la planificación y la agilidad estratégica. *Harvard Deusto Business Review*, *339*, 42-48.

Docio, L. (2012). El ajedrez de la internacionalización. *Harvard Deusto Business Review*, *213*, 30-34.

Dunning, J. H. (1980). Toward an Eclectic Theory of International Production: Some Empirical Tests. *Journal of International Business Studies, 11*(1), 9-31.

Dunning, J. H. (1992). *Multinationals enterprises and the global economy*. Addison-Wesley, Suffolk.

Dunning, J. H. (1995). Reappraising the Eclectic Paradigm in an Age of Alliance Capitalism. *Journal of International Business Studies, 26*, 461-491.

Dunning, J. H., & Narula, R. (1996). The Investment Development Path Revisited: Some Emerging Issues. In Dunning, J. H. & Narula, R. (Eds.), *Foreign Direct Investment and Government: Catalyst for Economic Restructuring*. Routledge, UK.

Dvoretsky, M. & Yusupov, A. (1998). *Attack and Defense*. Batsford.

Eichengreen, B. (2021). *La globalización del capital: historia del sistema monetario internacional*. Antoni Bosch Editor.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building Theories from Case Study Research. *Academy of Management Review*, *14*(4), 532-550. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1989.4308385

Erramilli, M. K. (1990). Entry mode choice in service industries. *International Marketing Review, 7*(5), 50-62.

Erramilli, M. K. (1991). The Experience Factor in Foreign Entry Behavior of Service Firms. *Journal of International Business Studies, 22*(3), 479-501.

Fan, T., Wo, M., & Xiang, W. (2025). Geopolitical Barriers to Globalization. *arXiv preprint* arXiv:2509.12084. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2509.12084

Fong, C. (2017). *Competitividad e internacionalización de la PyME en México: análisis sectorial y empresarial*. Universidad de Guadalajara.

Ghauri, P., Strange, R., & Cooke, F. L. (2021). Research on international business: The new realities. *International Business Review, 30*(2), 101794. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2021.101794

Grant, R. M. (1991). The Resource Based Theory of Competitive Advantage: Implications for Strategy Formulations. *California Management Review, 33*(3), 114-135.

Greve, H. R., & Zhang, C. M. (2022). Is there a strategic organization in the behavioral theory of the firm? Looking back and looking forward. *Strategic Organization, 20*(4), 698-708. https://doi.org/10.1177/14761270221115032

Hanelt, A., Bohnsack, R., Marz, D., & Antunes Marante, C. (2021). A systematic review of the literature on digital transformation: Insights and implications for strategy and organizational change. *Journal of management studies, 58*(5), 1159-1197. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12639

Hörnell, E., Vahlne, J. E. & Wiedersheim-Paul, F. (1973). *Export och Utlandsetableringar*. Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm.

Hume, D. (1898). Of the balance of trade. In R. N. Cooper (Ed.), *International Finance* (pp. 25-37). Penguin.

Hymer, S. H. (1960/1976). *The International Operations of National Firms: A Study of Direct Foreign Investment.* Doctoral thesis, 1960, University of Cambridge (MIT Press, Boston, MA).

Hymer S. H. (1990). The large multinational corporation: An analysis of some motives for international integration of business. In M. C. Casson (Ed.), *The multinational enterprise: Selected readings* (pp. 949-973). Edward Elgar.

Johanson, J. & Wiedersheim-Paul, F. (1975). The Internationalization of the Firm: Four Swedish Cases. *Journal of Management Studies, 12*(3), 305-322.

Johanson, J. & Mattson, L. G. (1988). Internationalization in industrial systems: a network approach. In N. Hood & J. E. Vahlne (ed.), *Strategies in Global Competition* (pp. 287-314). Croom Helm, London.

Johanson, J. & Vahlne, J. E. (1990). The Mechanism of Internationalization. *International Marketing Review, 7*(4), 11-24.

Johnson, G., Scholes, K. & Whittington, R. (2006). *Dirección Estratégica* (7.ª ed.). Pearson Educación.

Knickerbocker, F. T. (1973). *Oligopolistic Reaction and the Multinational Enterprises*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Knight, G. A., & Cavusgil, S. T. (1996). The born-global firm: A challenge to traditional internationalization theory. In S. T. Cavusgil & T. K. Madsen (Eds.), *Export internationalizing research-Enrichment and challenges* (Advances in International Marketing, Vol. 8, pp. 11-26). JAI Press.

Kogut, B. & Zander, U. (1993). Knowledge of the firm and the evolutionary theory of the multinational corporation. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *24*(4), 625-645.

Kojima, K. (1973). A Macroeconomic Approach to Foreign Direct Investment. *Hitotsubashi Journal of Economics, 14*(1).

Kojima, K. (1978). Direct Foreign Investment. (Croom Helm, London).

Krugman, P. R. (1979). Increasing Returns, Monopolistic Competition, and International Trade. *Journal of International Economics, 9,* 469-479.

Learned, E. P., Christensen, C. R., Andrews, K. R. & Guth, W. (1965). *Business policy: Text and cases*. Richard D. Irwin.

Lewin, A. Y. & Volberda, H. W. (1999). Prolegomena on coevolution: a framework for research on strategy and new organizational forms. *Organization Science, 10*(5), 519-531. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.10.5.519

Li, W., Ahmad, A., & Tham, J. (2023). Cultural industry competitiveness based on the diamond model: Literature review. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications*, *5*(8), 5-12.

Lin, W. T., Chen, Y. Y., Ahlstrom, D., & Wang, L. C. (2021). Does international expansion constrain growth? Business groups, internationalization, institutional distance, and the Penrose effect. *Multinational Business Review, 29*(1), 70-95. https://doi.org/10.1108/MBR-11-2019-0163

Linder, S. B. (1961). *An Essay on Trade and Transformation*. Wiley, New York.

Ma, H., & Ning, J. (2024). The return of protectionism: Prospects for Sino-US trade relations in the wake of the trade war. *China Economic Quarterly International, 4*(3), 182-211. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ceqi.2024.09.003

Madhok, A. & Liu, C. (2006). A coevolutionary theory of the multinational firm. *Journal of International Management, 12*(1), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intman.2006.01.001

Madhok, A. (1997). Cost, value and foreign market entry mode: The transaction and the firm. *Strategic Management Journal, 18*(1), 39-61. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199701)18:1<39::AID-SMJ841>3.0.CO;2-J

March, J. G. (1994). The evolution of evolution. *Evolutionary Dynamics of Organizations*, *39*, 49.

Marshall, A. (1923). *Industry of trade.* (Macmillan, London).

Massa, S., Annosi, M. C., Marchegiani, L., & Messeni Petruzzelli, A. (2023). Digital technologies and knowledge processes: new emerging strategies in international business. A systematic literature review. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 27*(11), 330-387. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-12-2022-0993

Mill, J. S. (1848/1917). *Principles of Political Economy*. Longmans. Green, Londres, 1917.

Mintzberg, H. (1990). The design school: reconsidering the basic premises of strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, *11*, 171-195. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250110302

Mohammad Shafiee, M., Warkentin, M., & Motamed, S. (2024). Do human capital and relational capital influence knowledge-intensive firm competitiveness? The roles of export orientation and marketing knowledge capability. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 28*(1), 138-160. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-11-2022-0921

Munn, T. (1664/1928). *England´s Treasure by Foreing Trade.* Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Nelson, R. R. & Winter, S. G. (1982). *An Evolutionary Theory of the Economic Change*. Belknap Press, Cambridge.

Ohlin, B. (1933). *Interregional and International Trade*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Oviatt, B. M. & McDougall, P. P. (1994). Toward a theory of international new ventures. *Journal of International Business Studies, 25*(1), 45-64.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods.* 2.ª ed., Sage Publications, Newbury Park, California.

Pellegrino, B. (2025). Product differentiation and oligopoly: A network approach. *American Economic Review, 115*(4), 1170-1225. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20201425

Penrose, E. T. (1959). *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*. Ed. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Pereira, V., & Bamel, U. (2021). Extending the resource and knowledge based view: A critical analysis into its theoretical evolution and future research directions. *Journal of Business Research, 132*, 557-570. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.04.021

Peteraf, M. A. (1993). The Cornerstones of Competitive Advantage: A Resource-Based View. *Strategic Management Journal*, *14*(3), 179-191.

Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analyzing Industries and Competitors*. The Free Press.

Porter, M. E. (1985). *Competitive Advantage: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance*, The Free Press.

Porter, M. E. (1990). *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*, The Free Press.

Posner, M. V. (1961). *International Trade and Technical Change.* Oxford Economic Papers, 323-341.

Puigcerver, J. M. M. (2021). Teorías clásicas del comercio internacional y sus antecedentes: de Aristóteles a Rybczynski. *Revista Compás Empresarial, 12*(33), 124-149. https://doi.org/10.52428/20758960.v11i33.155

Ráez, R. N., Jiménez, W. G., & Buitrago, J. D. (2021). Las teorías de la competitividad: una síntesis. *Revista republicana, 31*, 119-144.

Rialp, A., Martínez, P. C. & Rialp, J. (2005a). El Desarrollo Exportador de las PYMES Industriales Españolas Participantes en un Consorcio de Exportación: un Estudio de Caso. *Cuadernos de Gestión, 5(*2), 95-116.

Rialp, A., Rialp, J. & Knight, G. A. (2005b). The Phenomenon of Early Internationalizing Firms: What Do We Know After a Decade (1993-2003) of Scientific Inquiry?. *International Business Review, 14* (2), 147-166.

Ricardo, D. (1817/1955). *The Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*. J. Murray, Londres. Versión en castellano en Ricardo, D. (1955). *Principios de Economía Política y de Tributación*. Aguilar, Madrid.

Samuelson, P. A. (1948). International Trade and the Equalization of Factor Prices. *Economic Journal, 58*, 165-184. https://doi.org/10.2307/2225933

Shen, J. H., Long, Z., Lee, C. C., & Zhang, J. (2022). Comparative advantage, endowment structure, and trade imbalances. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, *60*, 365-375. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.strueco.2021.12.012

Shepherd, D. A., Souitaris, V., & Gruber, M. (2021). Creating new ventures: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management, 47*(1), 11-42. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206319900537

Smith, A. (1776/1937). *The Wealth of Nations.* Book I, chapter 3; book IV, chapter 1-3,6-8 (The Modern Library, New York).

Suddaby, R., Coraiola, D., Harvey, C., & Foster, W. (2020). History and the micro-foundations of dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal, 41*(3), 530-556. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3058

Vahlne, J. E., & Johanson, J. (2020). The Uppsala model: Networks and micro-foundations. *Journal of International Business Studies, 51*(1), 4-10. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-019-00277-x

Vernon, R. (1966). International Investment and International Trade in the Product Cycle. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 80*(2), 190-207. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-444281-8.50024-6

Vernon, R. (1979). The Product Cycle Hypothesis in a New International Environment. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics, 41*, 255-267.

Villarreal, O., & Calvo, N. (2015). From the triple helix model to the global open innovation model: A case study based on international cooperation for innovation in Dominican Republic. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, *35*(1), 71-92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jengtecman.2014.10.002

Villarreal, O. & Landeta, J. (2010). El estudio de casos como metodología de investigación científica en dirección y economía de la empresa. Una aplicación a la internacionalización. *Investigaciones Europeas de dirección y economía de la empresa, 16*(3), 31-52. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1135-2523(12)60033-1

Villarreal, O. & Ruiz, S. (2015). *La internacionalización de una gran empresa familiar*, Velatia. Universidad del País Vasco.

Villarreal, O. (2005). La internacionalización de la empresa y la empresa multinacional: una revisión conceptual contemporánea. *Cuadernos de Gestión*, *5*(2), 55-73. https://doi.org/10.5295/cdg.19179ov

Villarreal, O. (2008). La internacionalización de la empresa: el modelo de las diez estrategias. *Revista Internacional Administración y Finanzas*, *1*(1), 67-82.

Villarreal, O. (2010). The Dodecagon of Internationalisation: A Theoretical Integration Model, *European Research Studies Journal*, *13*(1), 3-24. https://doi.org/10.35808/ersj/254

Villarreal, O. (2017). Is it desirable, necessary and possible to perform research using case studies? *Cuadernos de Gestión, 17*(1), 147-172. https://doi.org/10.5295/cdg.140516ov

Vissak, T., Francioni, B., & Freeman, S. (2020). Foreign market entries, exits and re-entries: The role of knowledge, network relationships and decision-making logic. *International Business Review, 29*(1). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2019.101592

Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A Resource-based View of the Firm. *Strategic Management Journal, 5*(2), 171-180. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250050207

Williamson, O. E. (1975). *Markets and Hierarchies: Analysis and Antitrust Implications*. Free Press, New York.

Xiao, T., Makhija, M., & Karim, S. (2022). A knowledge recombination perspective of innovation: review and new research directions. *Journal of management, 48*(6), 1724-1777. https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063211055982

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods (6th ed.)*. Sage Publications.