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ABSTRACT

International capital movement in the form of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) by multinational enterprises (MNEs) signifies a widely researched phenomenon in comprehensive review of the FDI literature. Its vastness makes it impossible to fathom its depth, as such the paper highlights what the author considers to be mainstream theories in the domain of empirical studies on FDI. This study critically reviews (FDI) literature over a period of 70 years from 1950 to 2020 to provide a theoretical lens for future research beyond the established models. The discussion covers the mode of FDI inflows, statistical methods applied, theoretical models, contributions to paradigms and empirical papers investigating FDI. Furthermore, the papers selected cover heterogenous geographical regions, while in certain papers FDI has been studied as a dependent variable in others as an independent one. The focus lies on the FDI and its resultant activities of MNEs in the form of subsidiaries to carry out market seeking, strategic asset-seeking and efficiency seeking activities. Though, most researchers have narrowed down to four determinants of FDI i.e., motives of MNEs for undertaking FDI, size of MNEs, entry modes into host country and investments sector recently, many works have applied formal theories to provide a framework for market failure such as holdup problems, non-fulfillment of contracts and related agency costs. It is concluded that FDI has evolved into a significant area of empirical investigation. Overall, the gaps and opportunities in existing literature are identified thereby directions for further research emerge.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The emerging real-world economic scenario has led economic literature to investigate the influence and orientation of research undertaken over the past seven decades. Since the volume of FDI literature is humongous it is not possible to conduct an exhaustive review, however despite constraints the study is a major contributor to its field. The focus lies on the FDI and its resultant activities of MNEs in the form of subsidiaries to carry out market seeking, strategic asset-seeking and efficiency seeking activities (Dunning 1993, 1998).

The study contributes significantly to the investigation of FDI. Firstly, it is the first of its kind that covers such a wide and significant range of empirical studies over such a large time, since previous studies have restricted time periods. (Almfraji & Almsafri, 2014). Earlier research exhibits the link between different variables such as corporate governance, foreign market entry and establishment modes, ownership, location, and internalisation choices. (Dikova, 2009; Dikova and Sahib, 2013; Lien et al., 2005; Filatotchev et al., 2007; Ambos et al., 2006, 2011, Dikova and Van Witteloostuijn, 2007; Hertensstein et al., 2017). Secondly, the present paper focuses on heterogenous geographical...
regions rather than past homogenous case studies e.g. (Kurtishi-Kastrati, 2013). Thirdly, the present study is not limited to FDI determinants alone but the interaction of economic growth, economic and structural reforms, increase in competitiveness and deregulation and impact of FDI in the host country. The review also covers the dominant theories that have evolved over the last seven decades including the OLI paradigm and Internalisation theory.

After introduction the literature review focusses on FDI literature, methodology section describes the research approach and thereafter critique of theories and variables. Finally, limitations and gaps are highlighted, and suggestions are given for selecting theories and content.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

A brief construct of the mainstream FDI theoretical paradigm is divided into perfectly competitive and imperfectly competitive theories. FDI theories emerged during mercantilism when capital and wealth accumulation was reflected in gold reserves (Carbaugh, 2004). Thereafter, the quest for natural resources, establishing colonies and spreading religion led to the flow of FDI to colonies (Sage, 2010).

The content exploration of prior reviews of FDI literature reveal that the origins of FDI are quite old with many schools of thought with new theories embedded. There appears to be a lack of consensus amongst them e.g. based on modes of foreign market entry i.e. export mode, intermediate mode, and hierarchical mode of entry. (Cullen, 2002; Hollensen, 2001; Kim et al, 2002; Marshall, 2003). The review also identified some widely used variables in FDI studies such as Inward FDI, Outward FDI, locational determinants, FDI spillover, entry modes etc.

Foreign firms chose either investment mode or ownership mode to enter foreign markets. The investment mode involved a trade-off between a Greenfield investment or Merger & acquisition while ownership mode comprised opportunity cost between owning a subsidiary and joint venture (JV).

Figure 1. Foreign entry market mode.

![Figure 1. Foreign entry market mode.](source: adapted from ‘A Summary of studied Entry modes’, Cullen (2002).)
While making their choice of entry mode, MNEs, trade-off between risks and returns or resource availability and need for control (Cespedes, 1988). Agarwal & Ramaswami (1992) opined that the choice of an entry mode is often a compromise among these attributes. A high investment requires the ability of an MNE to secure financial resources and is associated with high risk/return.

3. METHODOLOGY

We conducted a keyword search across online databases and journals like Business Source Premier, JSTOR, ScienceDirect, ProQuest, Elsevier database, Scopus, SpringerLink and Google Scholar for publications in the last seven decades. Keywords included inward FDI, outward FDI, MNE etc. to retrieve relevant studies with a holistic approach and a minimum citation of 500 counts that contained the terms FDI in the title, abstract or keywords list were also analyzed. The PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses) method was used to validate the research process.

By deploying a structured PRISMA, the titles and abstracts of the review literature were screened independently for any discrepancies. Limited by publication dates, full text, citation counts etc. records were obtained and entered in the flowchart. This study has been divided into three parts (1950-74), (1975-99) and (2000-20). The classification of the time-period identifies the effect of MNE-FDI research literature publications over a period of seven decades (1950-2020).
The PRISMA flow diagram was completed, and the systematic review revealed that, overall, 85 theories with high impact theoretical research as evidenced by a minimum of 500 citations, to identify key contributions to theory were selected. Altogether, 20 theories were published between 1950-74, 30 theories between 1975-99 and 35 during 2000-20.

4. DISCUSSION - COMPARISON AND CRITIQUE

The first period of review, (1950-74), is a period of economic uncertainty marked by raging cold war between USA and USSR, birth of European Economic Community and emerging oil crisis. Empirical data revealed that during this period of 1950-74 ‘multiple regression’ analysis is
applied as a common tool of statistical method. Since the global economies were more focused on economic growth, most authors conducted research on FDI and its productivity in host nations as a dependent or independent variable.

The second period of review, (1975-99), is a period of severe energy crisis (OPEC oil embargo) and economic uncertainty marked by Balkan war in Europe and first Gulf war in Middle East. Empirical data revealed that during this period of 1975-99 ‘Ordinary Least Square and multiple regression’ analysis is applied as a common tool of statistical method and FDI was studied as an independent variable.

The third period of publications review, (2000-20), marked by the second Gulf War and expansion of the European Union. Europe was hit by challenges arising from the enlargement of the EU market and adoption of Euro in the Schengen area, persistent threats to internal security, illegal migration through porous external borders, Balkan wars, and coronavirus pandemic. The period culminated in global financial crisis, rise in liquidity crunch, collapse of banks worldwide and covid lockdowns. Empirical data revealed that during this period of 2000-20 'OLI paradigm' and 'Internalisation theory' are applied as a common tool of statistical method to study FDI determinants.

**Mainstream FDI Theory Publications (1950-2020)**

Table 1. Empirical studies on FDI published (1950-74).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S no</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Analysis unit (Tests)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Barlow &amp; Wender</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>Regression analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MacDougall-Kemp</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Marginal rate of Productivity</td>
<td>Regression analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hymer</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>Multiple regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>Multiple regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Krainer</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>Multiple regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Scaperlanda</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>FDI from US</td>
<td>Multiple regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Cross-sectional analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bandera &amp; White</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>FDI, size of market</td>
<td>Multiple regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>D'Arge</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>Multiple regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Schmitiz</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>OLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Erbe</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>Multiple regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Aliber</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Financial flows</td>
<td>Regression analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Caves</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>FDI gravity model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Weiskoff</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Domestic savings / Gross investment</td>
<td>Pooled OLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pesmazoglou</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Multiple regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Gross fixed capital formation</td>
<td>OLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Christian &amp; Pagoulatoes</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>GDP, Gross fixed capital formation</td>
<td>Cross-sectional analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Healey</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Multiple regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Knickerbocker</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>Entry concentration index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kouri &amp; Porter</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Private FDI</td>
<td>OLS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author's compilation.
Table 2. Empirical studies on FDI published (1975-99).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S no</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stoneman</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>EG</td>
<td>Multiple regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kouri</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>OLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Johanson &amp; Wiedersheim-Paul</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>FDI &amp; psychic distance</td>
<td>Time series data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Buckley &amp; Casson</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>Regression analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hymer</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>International production</td>
<td>Time series data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hirsch</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Trade investment</td>
<td>Regression analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Johanson &amp; Vahlne</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>FDI internalisation</td>
<td>Time series data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Magee</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>FDI &amp; Skills</td>
<td>Analysis of capital flows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kojima</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>FDI comparison</td>
<td>Regression analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Krugman Paul</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>FDI &amp; EOS</td>
<td>Cost analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dunning</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Eclectic paradigm</td>
<td>OLI approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Blomstrom &amp; Pearson</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Value added per employee</td>
<td>OLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>FDI &amp; technology</td>
<td>Time series data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Helpman</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Trade equilibrium</td>
<td>Variation analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Meyer</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>FDI spillovers</td>
<td>Curvilinear analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Blomstrom</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Market concentration</td>
<td>OLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>Stepwise regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Culem</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>OLS, GLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kharas &amp; Levinsohn</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Total consumption</td>
<td>2SLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Rothgeb</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Multiple regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Smiths</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Exports</td>
<td>OLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Krugman Paul</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>FDI location</td>
<td>Multiple regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Drake &amp; Caves</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>OLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Pastor &amp; Hilt</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Private FDI</td>
<td>OLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Metwally &amp; Tamaschke</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Debt service, debt stock, capital inflow, GDP</td>
<td>OLS, 2SLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Aitken et al</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Wage</td>
<td>2SLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Kumar</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>R&amp;D expenditure</td>
<td>OLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Markusen et al</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Knowledge-capital</td>
<td>Linear regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Borenszteim</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>EG</td>
<td>2SLS, 3SLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Wilhelms &amp; Witter</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>FDI fitness</td>
<td>OLS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author's compilation.
Table 3. Empirical studies on FDI published (2000-20).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S no</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Analysis (Test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noorbakhsk</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>WLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ghemawat</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>Not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Choi</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>OLS, WLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fung et al</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>GLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bevan and Estrin</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bevan et al</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>Cross-section analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>EG</td>
<td>OLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nocke &amp; Yeaple</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Heterogeneous FDI</td>
<td>Equilibrium analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Li &amp; Liu</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>FDI, GDP</td>
<td>3SLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>GDP, innovation rate</td>
<td>OLS, FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Alsan et al</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>OLS, RESET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ramman &amp; Zurbuegg</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>FE, RE, cross section analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hansen &amp; Rand</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>FE, VAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Asiedu</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Panel data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kasugalluo</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>FDI, gross fixed capital formation</td>
<td>OLS, FE, RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mina</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>GLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Te Velde &amp; Xenogian</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Literacy ratio</td>
<td>OLS, RE, FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rugman A.</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>FDI internalisation</td>
<td>FSA-CSA matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Luo &amp; Thung</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Internationalisation of EM MNEs</td>
<td>Theory construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Azemar &amp; Desbordes</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>OLS, FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Suliman &amp; Mollick</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Vijayakumar et al</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>Panel analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Azman, Saini et al</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>EG</td>
<td>PTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ali et al</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>IPR</td>
<td>OLS, GMM, Panel analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tiwari &amp; Murascu</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Pooled OLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Jadhav</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>Panel analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Morrissey &amp; Udomkerdmongkol</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Pvt investment</td>
<td>GMM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Tintin</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>OLS, FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Masron &amp; Nor</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>Panel analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Kashcheeva</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>EG</td>
<td>OLS, GMM, FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Kaur et al</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>Panel analysis, FE, RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Lessmann</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Regional inequalities</td>
<td>OLS, LIML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Fereidouni</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>CO2 emissions</td>
<td>GMM, FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Goswami &amp; Haider</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>Panel and factor analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Paul &amp; Sanchez-Morcillo</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>Multiple regression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author's compilation.
4.1. PERFECT MARKETS

It is a theoretical concept that assumes a perfectly competitive market and absence of informational asymmetries.

4.1.1 FDI CAPITAL/RATE OF RETURNS

(MacDougal, 1958) assumed perfectly competitive market conditions, in a two-country model, to explain his FDI construct. The underlying assumption was that capital out-flows from a low-rate to a high-rate return country. (Gamal, 2008). It was argued that the driver for undertaking FDI is to invest in countries where the marginal rate of productivity is equal to or higher than the marginal costs, thereby giving birth to import substitution efforts. Kemp (1964) assumed that marginal productivity of capital and its prices, in any two countries were equal. However, similarity of argument that free mobility of capital leads to equalization of the marginal productivity of capital between any two countries, defeated its revised objectives.

Similar theories were put forward by (Simpson 1962, Frankel, 1965), (Pearce & Brown, 1966) and (Caves, 1971). (1969) argued that if the economies were perfectly competitive, FDI was not necessitated. The need for FDI exists due to market distortions. Hymer rejected the perfect competition concept and built his theory based on imperfect market setup (Hymer, 1976). Empirical research undertaken by (Agarwal, 1980) and (Bandera & White, 1968) disapproved the FDI Capital theory on three fronts. Firstly, human capital plays a major role in ironing out the differences in return on capital. Secondly, rate of return is an imperfect precondition for explaining prospective FDI flows. Thirdly, capital flows may not necessarily occur from low-income countries to high income countries.

4.1.2 FDI MARKET

(Bandera & White, 1968) tried to establish a link between efficiency seeking FDI and size of market as measured by a firm's sales or GDP. Assuming prices as constant, an increase in market size will generate more profits, thereby pushing the GDP per capita and economic welfare up. (Asiedu, 2006) and (Mughal & Akram, 2011) further improvised this theory. But it suffers from universal appeal and does hold true for FDI flows from some countries but not all countries. If FDI were to exist based on perfectly competitive markets, then barriers to access to knowledge and trade etc. would not exist. (Calvet 1981 & Kindleberger 1969). If political conditions are included, then FDI theories can be defended better by theories of Imperfect markets.

4.2. IMPERFECT MARKETS

Imperfect competition is a market situation that assumes market inefficiency and market failure arising from informational asymmetries, government interference and entry and exit barriers. It leads to collusion amongst firms and unethical business practices leading to above normal profits and concentration of wealth. (Vasyechko, 2012).

(Kindleberger, 1969) argued that imperfections in a market were the outcome of violations of features of Perfect competition. Therefore, it involves strategic decision making on the part of firms to undertake FDI knowing the risk factors. (Mankiw, 2009).

4.2.1 INTERNAL FINANCING

(Barlow & Wender, 1955) based their theory on the ‘Gambler’s Earnings theory.’ Initially, multinational enterprises undertake minor investments overseas. As the subsidiary firm grows,
reinvestment of its profits from operations in the host country becomes the source of financing. (Anderson, 1983) showed that growing cash flows act positively with investment outlays due to lower costs of financing. (Froot & Stein, 1991) also showed that multinationals prefer internal financing in future because external financing is costly due to information asymmetries in capital markets. Restrictions on profit repatriation by multinationals mandate reinvestment of their earnings in the subsidiary.

4.2.2. INTERNALISATION/TRANSACTION COST

Hymer, Kindleberger and Caves gave valuable inputs to internalization concept, however, they only re-worked their construct based upon the theory of firm (Coase, 1937). (Buckley & Casson, 1976) in their book ‘The Future of Multinational Enterprises’ looked at firms as an alternate institution to markets, hence market imperfections were the basis for internalisation. Internalisation of markets refers to replacement of arm’s length contract relationship (open market transactions) by managerial coordination within the firm. (Aliber, 1993) & (Kindleberger, 1984); both through (Rugman, 1986) argued that Hymer was aware of the existence of the transaction cost angle though, at no point, he mentioned it. Other researchers opined that it was born out of the (Coase, 1937) Transaction Cost theory.

Firms that spend on R&D develop new input processes. The higher cost of conducting market transactions acts as barriers to sell inputs or transfer technology to unrelated firms. In such scenarios firms internalize their transaction costs through backward or forward integration. A major limitation of this theory was the risk of the host government intervention. However, Buckley and Casson, both, were indifferent to risks across industries. For example, utility services like telecommunications, electricity, and water supply face greater risk of government intervention due to fear of social considerations being sacrificed.

The “Transaction Cost analysis” turned out to be a big success since it explained the tradeoff between the wholly owned enterprises (WOE) and equity joint ventures (EJVs) (Anderson & Gatignon, 1986; Hennart & Larimo, 1998; Chen & Hu, 2002).

4.2.3. UPPSALA SCHOOL/NORDIC INTERNATIONALIZATION MODEL

Researchers at the University of Uppsala, Sweden (Johanson & Wiedersheim Paul, 1975) & (Johanson & Vahlne, 1977) propounded a FDI model known as “The Uppsala School Approach” or the “Nordic Internationalization Model” or the “Scandinavian Stages Model.” Internationalization in Swedish firms was defined as, “a journey of a firm’s movement of its operations beyond the boundaries of home country”. (Dima, 2010). The process of internationalization involved steady acquisition, integration, and use of business knowledge in foreign markets and operations. (Johanson & Vahlne, 1977).

The Uppsala model focused on four core concepts i.e. knowledge of market conditions, market commitment, current activities and uncertainty decisions. The two variables i.e. state factors (comprising market knowledge and market commitment) and change factors (comprising commitment and current activities) are the drivers for the model. (Masum & Fernandez, 2008) differed that market knowledge is the driver for a firm’s ability to identify opportunities and challenges. Market knowledge and market commitment combine to represent resource commitment.

Later, a new phenomenon “Psychic distance” was identified as the sum of factors (variances in language, work culture, education, cultural and industrial development) preventing the flow of information from and to the market”. (Johanson & Vahlne, 1977). Psychic distance gives priority to countries with similar market conditions and cultural environments. The model “focused on the gradual acquisition, integration and use of knowledge about foreign markets and operations, and on the incrementally increasing commitments to foreign markets”
4.2.4. APPROPRIABILITY THEORY

Appropriability refers to excludability of technology or an asset from other firms as a means of rewarding the innovator through protectionist measures (Magee, 1977). The theory is based on the ability of multinational firms to utilize FDI to earn more revenues from their advanced technology and competencies in five stages i.e., discovering new product, product development, product creation, market creation and appropriability. The model focused on four variables i.e. knowledge of market, decision making in market, and current activities. Innovations give rise to product acceptability in the market and standardized production shifts to developing countries. Thus, capital flows take place from developed to developing countries. Despite the weaknesses the model laid the foundation for Internalization theory.

4.2.5. MONOPOLISTIC POWER ADVANTAGE

In 1960, Hymer’s Ph.D. dissertation titled “The International Operations of National Firms: A Study of Direct Foreign Investment”, posed a fresh challenge on the international operations of multinationals. He argued that the traditional international trade theories of the times i.e. “Global Trade Theory” or “Neoclassical Financial Theory of Portfolio Flows”, presented by (Heckscher, 1919) & (Ohlin’s, 1933) “Factor Endowment Theory”, to explain flows of capital between countries were inadequate to explain the motives of multinational engagement in FDI. Hymer assumed imperfect markets and information asymmetry as the theoretical basis and used ‘Industrial Organization approach’ to study FDI activities undertaken by multinationals (Parry, 1977). He propounded that capital flows arose from the variances in rates of return on investment (interest rate) between different countries. The rate of return on investment in “capital-abundant” countries or developed nations was less than that in developing nations without abundant capital resources, leading to developed countries undertaking investment in developing countries. (Kindleberger, 1969), expanded the work of Hymer to augment FDI in monopolistically competitive markets. Pareto optimality cannot be achieved until constraints in the working of perfect competition were removed. Market imperfections that encourage overseas investment comprise asymmetric information about markets, cost leadership, superior technology, managerial expertise, patents, barriers to entry of firms etc. Later, (Pitelis, 1991) and (Cowling & Sugden, 1987) gave the ‘Monopolistic Advantage theory’ that dealt with the lack of aggregate demand in monopolistic markets and its impact on the growth of GDP. Once a firm established its superior knowledge, it used it overseas at no extra costs. It was simply an extension of the work of Kindleberger and Hymer.

4.2.6. OLIGOPOLISTIC REACTION

(Knickerbocker, 1973) came up with his FDI theory based on Oligopolistic reactions arising from market imperfections. Knickerbocker argued that there are three reasons that motivate firms to undertake FDI i.e. location advantages, ownership advantages and imitative behaviour to match a rival firm’s move (Head et al., 2008).
Since interdependence amongst oligopoly firms creates uncertainty in the production costs in the
country to which they are currently exporting, they are vulnerable to the risk of being undercut by rival firms switching from exporting to setting up a manufacturing base in the host country. Thus, by replicating rival’s FDI, the firm can avoid being underpriced (Altomonte & Pennings, 2003). If there are cost uncertainties in the host country then oligopolistic interdependence is held up, but if certainty in costs prevails, then the incentive to produce overseas decreases with rival firms’ investment.

4.2.7. PRODUCT LIFE CYCLE

While (Joel Dean, 1950) originally introduced the ‘PLC theory’ the concept was never fully clarified. (Polli & Cook, 1969) Later, in 1851, Herbert Spencer introduced the thought of “survival of the fittest” after analyzing business firms in a free market. In 1966, Vernon propounded the theory of “Product Life Cycle” based on the US manufacturing firms. The theory suggested that firms undertake FDI at a stage in the life cycle of products they have pioneered.

The argument was that FDI occurs as a response to the fear of losing markets as products matured and the desire for cheaper factor endowments arising from competition (Latorre, 2008). (Vernon 1966, 1979) argued rising competitive conditions in home markets makes the demand elastic. Therefore, it is more remunerative to shift a firm’s production line to a less developed country. As these countries expand enough for large-scale production, products can be exported to the original domestic market. However, Vernon’s theory did not give any insight on whether FDI was more efficient than exporting or licensing for expanding abroad.

Later, (Vernon, 1979) admitted that the theoretical conditions had changed rapidly, and that the theory’s predictive capacity had diminished significantly as a result (Latorre, 2008). Nonetheless, the “Product-cycle Theory” continues to provide a framework within which scholars like (Hirsch, 1976) and (Helpman et al., 1984 and 2004) investigated whether to follow the FDI or export route. (Hakansson 1982; Hakansson & Snehota 1995; Blankenburg Holm, Eriksson & Johanson, 1999; Blomstermo & Sharma, 2003) claimed that market knowledge can be established through networks of interconnected commercial contacts.

(Knickerbocker, 1973) improved the PLC model by evaluating the divergence between a firm’s actual choice of FDIs and the proposals derived under the PLC-model. Risk and uncertainty variables for enterprises were identified as the key sources of variations.

4.2.8. INDUSTRIAL ORGANISATION APPROACH

(Hymer, 1976) work focused on international production in imperfectly competitive markets. (Lemfalussy, 1961), (Kindleberger, 1969), (Knickerbocker, 1973), (Caves, 1974), (Dunning, 1974), (Graham & Krugman, 1989) and (Cohen, 1975) supported this construct. (Sodersten, 1970) also claimed that firms undertook FDI to maximize profit margins by exploiting technology or organizational dominance. Simultaneously, (Robock & Simmond, 1983) contended that having firm-specific advantages did not necessitate foreign investment because firms could utilize their advantages through exporting or licensing as evident in the post war period from 1940s to 1960s.

The sources of market dominance i.e. technology patents, brand value, marketing and management expertise, economies of scale, and low-cost financing were dubbed firm-specific advantages by Hymer and monopolistic advantages by Kindleberger. The fear of technology being hacked by competitors is a big source of concern for businesses (Sodersten & Reed, 1994).

The theory proposes that advantages are efficiently conveyed from one unit of a commercial entity to another unit of that firm, regardless of whether they are shared in a country or in more than one country (Caves, 1971). However, Hymer failed to present a complete explanation for FDI in his thesis. Consequently, when, and why FDI takes place was attempted by Vernon’s (1966) PLC
theory, the eclectic approach by (Dunning, 1977, 1979 and 1988) and the Internalization theory by (Buckley and Casson, 1976).

4.2.9. FINANCIAL FLOWS

(Aliber, 1970) explained FDI in terms of purchasing power of a currency. The strength of the various currencies in the host and source countries was the basis for the investment hypothesis. Weaker currencies had a greater potential to attract FDI due to variations in market capitalization rates as compared to stronger investing country currencies. Countries with high entry barriers attract FDI because MNEs bypass trade obstacles this way. Despite Aliber's contention that it was an alternate hypothesis and hence a valid basis for direct venture in developed countries, it does not appear to be particularly applicable to less developed countries where markets are imperfect, run-on baby capital, and tightly controlled foreign currency (Lall, 1978). (Caves, 1988), (Froot & Stein, 1991), and (De Mello, 1997) are among the other notable works in the same class. Even though Aliber's idea was widely accepted, neither it explained why two developed countries with equal parity currencies would invest nor why MNCs from emerging countries (with weaker currencies) speculate in rich countries (stronger currency).

4.2.10. FDI INTERNATIONAL TRADE

(Adam Smith, 1776) and David Ricardo (1817) developed a theory that clarified international trade flows. But in modern times, foreign direct investment has overtaken international trade as the most important factor (Graham, 1996; and Helpman & others, 2003). (Adam Smith, 1776) formulated his thesis based on total cost disparities, or ‘Absolute advantage.’ It was like mercantilist notions that ignored the role of FDI in production. Ricardo developed his theory on ‘comparative advantage,’ which broadened Smith’s idea. Since it assumed only labour as one factor of production i.e. labour, differences in production technology explained the costs that motivated trade. However, the classical theories failed to explain the global movement of capital since they assumed immobility of labour across the borders. (Morgan & Katsikeas, 1997).

4.2.11. INTERNATIONAL TRADE & INVESTMENT

Hirsch (1976) analyzed FDI using industrial organization and location theory models. He focused on two characteristics: (a) a profit-maximizing firm choosing to serve an overseas market, and (b) the conditions under which a firm enters an overseas market, either through exports or as a local manufacturer due to direct investment. Assuming the transport and marketing costs to be zero, multinational FDI can only take place in an environment that accepts firm-specific productive output determinants on one hand, and rising information, communications, and transaction costs as economic distance increases on the other.

4.2.12. MARGINAL INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

In his work ‘Foreign Direct Investment’, (Kojima, 1978) propounded the marginal industrial expansion theory. He analyzed “Japanese-type Direct Investment” and “American-type Direct Investment”. (Kojima, 1973, 1975 and 1985) equated the trade theories with direct investment theories. He argued that FDI was necessary for factor markets to become more competitive and efficient globally. The theory suffered from a major limitation i.e., it was relevant to Japan’s FDI situation during the
1970s. (Geroski, 1979) criticized it to be an immature model for explaining the FDI activities of multinational firms. None of the works cited above consider the modes of FDI i.e., either vertical or horizontal. (Helpman, 1984) and (Helpman et.al., 2003 and 2004), linked international trade to vertical and horizontal FDI.

4.2.13. INTERNATIONAL TRADE EQUILIBRIUM

Helpman (1984), developed an international trade equilibrium model which combined the elements of ownership and locations with reference to vertically integrated firms dealing with production of a single product. The theory tested firms that enjoyed a single production facility, located far away from headquarters. It assumed that zero tariffs and transport costs negated the incentive for a vertically integrated firm to open multiple production facilities.

(Helpman et al., 2004) studied the choice faced by a firm either to export or form a horizontal FDI. (Helpman, Melitz & Yeaple, 2003) developed a model of international trade in which firms chose either to cater to the domestic market or exported or engaged themselves in FDI to serve markets overseas. They argued that every industry had heterogeneous features; therefore, the firms differed in their output. The results supported the hypothesis that overseas markets are better catered to by exports relative to FDI sales when trade asymmetries are less, or economies of scale are more.

4.2.14. FDI MODE

(Nocke & Yeaple, 2004) studied the underlying differences amongst countries, thereby giving rise to vertical form of FDI. Greenfield investment is establishing new plants in a foreign market, whereas Brownfield investment entails entering a foreign market through mergers and acquisitions. It was asserted that if the two FDI modes were indeed perfect substitutes then all the firms would be indifferent between the two modes leading to no variation in the mode of choices across firms within the same industry. However, government policies too view them as separate in many host countries.

Mergers and acquisitions permit heterogeneous organizations to take complementary factor endowments in their firm-specific assets (Maksimovic & Phillips, 2001). Greenfield investments, on the other hand, entail the development of a production capacity plant in a foreign country to allow a company to deploy its assets there. Assuming, ceteris paribus, that there were no trade barriers and zero trading costs between any two countries. (Nocke & Yeaple, 2004) projected that differences in factor costs among countries lead to Greenfield FDI (from a high-cost to a low-cost country) and cross-border acquisitions (from one country to the other). Cross-country diversion would lead to Greenfield FDI (from one country to the other), while cross-country differences in entrepreneurial competencies give rise to mergers and acquisitions (from each country to the other). This model showcased two-way FDI flows.

Differences in production costs were the cause for undertaking greenfield FDI and cross-border acquisitions by multinational enterprises. Hence, firms undertaking greenfield investments were more efficient than those going in for acquisition and mergers. In the long run as production cost differentials level out all FDI takes the form of cross-border acquisitions. However, the hypothesis failed to explain the enormous expansion of FDI from less developed host countries to developed countries.

4.2.15. SMALL SCALE TECHNOLOGY

(Wells, 1983) propounded the theory based on three characteristics of outward FDI –

(i) Multinational firms in developing countries form joint ventures than those from
industrialized countries.

(ii) Developing-country investments are concentrated in another developing-country or its vicinity.

(iii) A host country’s economic development is typically lower than that of the home country.

However, rather than interpreting the expanding FDI flows from developing countries to developed countries, this study could only explain the likely characteristics of outbound FDI from developing countries in the early stages (Lindsey, 1984).

4.2.16. INSTITUTIONAL FITNESS

(Wilhems & Witter, 1988) argued that a country’s ability to attract, absorb, and retain foreign direct investment should match the expectations of the prospective investors. The government’s legal and regulatory framework overruled determinants like market size, low labour costs etc. (Popovici & Calin, 2012, 2013). A government’s active role is envisaged through the four pillars i.e., government, markets, education system and socio-cultural environment. (Wilhems & Witter, 1998). While (Assuncao, 2011) suggested that governments decide the rule of FDI flows, (Benassy-Quere et al., 2007) highlighted the dominant role of institutions in attracting FDI. (Popovici & Calin, 2014) added that government fitness included economic freedom, minimal trade and exchange rate interventions, low level of corruption, and greater transparency level. Unfavourable economic policies discourage investors from investing in such countries for fear of losing returns on investments (Wilhelms & Witter, 1998).

A country’s competitive advantage in the international FDI markets is determined by its institutions, policies, and implementations rather than by general inflexible characteristics. (Wilhelms & Witter, 1998).

4.2.17. FSA-CSA MATRIX

(Rugman, 2007) developed the FSA-CSA matrix as model paradigm based on a manager-oriented approach. His ‘internalization hypothesis,’ centered on a single firm’s firm-specific advantages (FSA) and location in the form of country specific benefits, as consideration for FDI (Narula & Verbeke, 2015). The concept was based on the behaviour of a firm that decides to go in for an external market to take advantage of its specific competencies. (Rugman, 2007).

FSA comprise unique factor endowment like competencies in innovation or marketing and managerial abilities. Transactional advantages refer to the capabilities of business firms to economize on business transaction costs because of multinational coordination and control of assets. (Rugman & Verbeke, 1992; Buckley & Casson, 1976; Dunning & Rugman, 1985; Rugman & Rugman, 1985). The CSA are country-specific benefits such as factor endowments, demand for local products, and favorable politico-economic rules. (Rugman & Collinson, 2008; Rugman & Verbeke, 1990; Verbeke, 2013) (Dunning & Lundan, 2008; Hennart, 2009). (Rugman & Collinson, 2008; Rugman & Verbeke, 1990; Verbeke, 2013). (Rugman, 1981, 1988) and (Rugman, Lecraw & Booth, 1985), provided the conceptual framework for the FSA/CSA matrix. The matrix analyzed the situation between strong and weak options against its competitors. The entire CSA/FSA paradigm considers demand side resource endowments and supply side potential development of the firm. (Rugman and Verbeke, 2008; Rugman, 2010). However, the CSA/FSA theory was overshadowed by Dunning’s OLI paradigm which appeared at the same time.

4.2.18. NEW TRADE CONCEPT

(Krugman, 1979) built an industrial-organization model of non-comparative trade. A critical
factor as envisaged in the new trade theory of FDI was the existence of economies of scale and networking effects that occur across industries. The existence of these economies of scale and network competencies outweighed the theory of Comparative advantage of Ricardo. Large scale economies in production, operations and marketing create barriers for new firms to enter markets, since they cannot compete with existing firms due to competitive advantages in technology, large scale production and supplier networks enjoyed by incumbent firms. (Markusen, 1984) and (Helpman, 1984) extended the ‘New Trade theory’ model to include FDI and multinational firms. The theoretical construct says that foreign trade may not necessarily arise out of international differences in factor resources or technology but as a means of exploiting economies of scale and expanding the markets.

4.2.19. KNOWLEDGE CAPITAL MODEL

Markusen incorporated a third factor into his two previous models to postulate the FDI theory. (Markusen, 1996, 1997). While the first two earlier assumptions created a framework for vertical fragmentation of the production function the third assumption created economies of scale at individual firm level. Firms are motivated to integrate horizontally and undertake production of similar goods and services at multiple locations. The model framework included knowledge, as an asset that is available to geographically separate production units, requiring a skilled manpower and is highly mobile (Markusen & Maskus, 2002).

Though, an improvement over other FDI theories like ‘transaction-cost approach’ to multinational enterprises, it assumed a model both horizontally and vertically, hence difficult to work on. Another assumption that the national market for goods is segmented and transport costs use unskilled labour is also a weakness. (Geishecker, 2004), criticized the non-existence of institutional and risk determinants in the model, that affect the distribution of FDI. Subsequent theoretical research focused on horizontal models because they are more prevalent globally.

4.2.20. NEW ECONOMIC GEOGRAPHY

Krugman (1991) new theory was an improvisation over (Heckscher-Ohlin, Helpman & Krugman, 1985). Since certain geographical areas benefit from first mover advantages over others due to natural resource endowments, the concept of distance, space, transport costs etc. gained momentum. (Dixit & Stiglitz, 1977) assumed monopolistically competitive markets where generality is sacrificed for tractability. The new model helped in better understanding of ‘International Trade theory’, thereby surpassing its most intelligent ancestor (Ohlin, 1933). Other scholars argue that the relationship between intermediary producers and consumers (upstream and downstream) is the focus of ‘New Economic Geography’ theory (Hildebrandt & Worz, 2004). The theory emphasized the importance of economic clusters as a region capable of attracting new enterprises and skilled labour by leveraging economies of scale (Antonescu, 2011).

(Kottaridi & Thomakos, 2007), examined the validity of the theory but couldn't discover any indication of the “core-periphery” pattern in FDI stocks per capita, thereby negating its universality.

4.2.21. ECLECTIC PARADIGM

In the year 1979, Dunning came up with the idea of ownership structures, location advantages and internalisation advantages. The views were borne out of dissatisfaction arising from the existing production theories of Hymer-Kindleberger approach, Product Life cycle theory and all the internalisation theories given by (Heckscher's, 1919) and (Ohlin's, 1933) Factor endowment theory, (Hymer's, 1960) Monopolistic advantage theory, (Coase's, 1937) Transaction cost theory, (Buckley
and Casson's, 1976) Internalization theory. The theory revealed host country economic policies, economic fundamentals, business strategy to undertake investment in foreign lands. In 1993 he added a fourth condition to the earlier three given in eclectic paradigm given in 1979 i.e. the belief by a business firm that its overseas production plan is consistent with long term management strategy. Critics pointed out that the theory suffered from too many variables and its operationality was confusing. However, as of today, all over the world, Dunning's (OLI) Eclectic Paradigm is regarded as the basis of all classic theories to explain a multinational firm’s internationalization activities.

4.2.22. RECENT MODELS/FRAMEWORKS

Newly developed models and frameworks that are being or could be used in future research on FDI inflows and outflows are:

4.2.22.1. LINKAGE, LEVERAGE, LEARNING (LLL) MODEL

The LLL framework, (Meier, 1984, Meyer, 2003) extended the Dunning’s Ownership, Location, and Internalisation (OLI) framework to link it with strategic asset-seeking FDI. The LLL framework explained how emerging multinational enterprises develop globalization, leapfrogging internalizing patterns strategy in pursuit of new capabilities than FDI meant to exploit existing capabilities. (Narula, 2006) argued that the doctrines of the LLL model are more convincing when compared to Dunning's OLI paradigm.

4.2.22.2. SPRINGBOARD THEORY

(Luo & Tung, 2007) explained the reasons for acquiring critical resources and reducing vulnerability to institutions and markets at home, motivations, and processes behind outward FDI. The global expansion factors are assumed to act as 'Springboard' since they are critical to acquisition of resources for competition in their home markets with foreign MNEs from developed markets. 'Springboards' are a tool based on amalgamation, versatility, and adjustment advantages that distinguish springboard emerging enterprises from more established multinational ones from developed countries (Luo & Tung, 2010).

4.2.22.3. CAGE DISTANCE FRAMEWORK

Internalisation amongst emerging multinational enterprises is widely recognized in CAGE framework developed by (Ghemawat, 2001, 2003). CAGE represents (Cultural, Administrative, Geographic, Economic distance) framework for calculating FDI distance. Recently many authors have used the CAGE framework in their empirical research to analyse distance factors as determinants of FDI by multinational enterprises.

4.2.22.4. CPP MODEL

(Paul & Sanchez-Morcillo, 2019) presented the Conservative, Predictable and Pacemaker (CPP) model, for analyzing the internationalization of firms. The pattern and location of FDI in a single country context or cross-country context can be categorized as Conservative, Predictable and Pacemakers. An advantage of this model is that it can measure global competitiveness.
5. FINDINGS

Globalization has been a key driver for the emergence of the worldwide knowledge economy as an alternative to manufacturing that has steered this transition. (Teagarden & Schotter, 2013). The process of internationalization and globalization are the key to value addition to international firms. Foreign direct investment data shows that there has been a quantum leap in conceptual renewal and research publications in the last 20 years. This can be judged from the fact that out of a population of 85 in our sample, 20 empirical papers were published between 1950-1974, 30 were published between 1975-1999, and 35 from 2000 to 2020.

Despite new frameworks and constructs (Dunning’s, 1980) OLI paradigm continues to be a dominant theory. Ownership of assets such as technology, innovation, management skills etc. are intangible specifics to a firm. Similarly, the optimal decision for internalization of market transactions gives rise to transaction costs that may be inherently unobservable. Thus, empirical research irrefutably cannot confirm the internalization hypothesis.

Advances in empirical research techniques, new theoretical underpinnings, improved availability of accurate data and evolution in internalisation features; all have contributed to FDI study. The race to attract FDI is an existential struggle between developed and developing countries. A host country’s policy framework, economic environment and ‘ease of doing business’ influence the outcome and flow of capital.

6. LIMITATIONS

This study suffers from the possible exclusion of some research on FDI as it is highly diverse. New theory development should incorporate changes and consider potential processes, patterns and problems associated with the MNEs and FDI. Emerging changes are driven by developments at the national level, international level and at MNE level. Over a period, (Dunning’s, 1980) OLI paradigm has been recycled thereby restricting the emergence of new theories.

There exist gaps between country level outcomes and firm-level outcomes. Research on the outcomes of technology transfer for FDI intensity is missing to the extent to which the existing literature is arbitrary and fragmentated. Researchers should switch over from current cross-sectional studies to longitudinal FDI patterns. Another area that needs attention is the existence of sub-contractual relationships linking business groups and modes of FDI entry.

Only a limited number of studies have investigated how entry modes influence the evolution of post FDI strategy. (Anderson, Forsgren & Holm, 2002). Another gap in the existing literature is lack of comparative analysis between developed countries and developing countries with similar and dissimilar characteristics. Most study models rest on the idea that FDI is guided towards markets having homogenous features. Today, the heterogenous emerging markets with similar or dissimilar features offer lots of opportunities.

There is also a need to develop a propensity score to measure outward FDI. (Hayakawa Matsura, Motohashi & Obashi, 2013). Multiple regression techniques with control should be replaced by structural equation modelling techniques. Continued pursuit of FDI research can provide better insights for decision makers.
7. CONCLUSION

It can be said that researchers have used a plethora of statistical methods, samples, and models in their empirical studies. Institutional factors versus socio-political factors both appear significant. Since the global economic environment is dynamic the range of independent variables that affect FDI has changed in the last five decades. Recent literature shows that emerging economies with better economic prospects, offer a greater potential to attract FDI, although, determinants are only firm-level considerations, but critical is host nation’s influence.

Future scholarly work should cover corporate determinants of FDI like labour disputes, role of diaspora, labour mobility among expatriates in emerging economies. In conclusion, future evolution of economic theories such as capitalism and their correlation to FDI should also form part of future scholarly work.
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