

A CRITIQUE OF THE META-THEORETICAL EXPLANATIONS AND ANALYSES OF THE PRE-CONDITIONS FOR THE STIMULATION AND ATTRACTION OF FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENTS

<https://doi.org/10.47743/jopafl-2022-24-20>

Adebayo T. SALAMI

Department of Political Science, Olabisi Onabanjo University

Ago-Iwoye, Nigeria

salami.adebayo@oouagoiwoye.edu.ng

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4160-1721>

Abstract: *Is it correct to assert that Foreign Direct Investments (FDI) stimulation and attraction are based on certain preconditions? To what extent should the preconditions be allowed to determine the content, character and method of studying and analyzing FDI? Should research efforts be focused on these preconditions? Are the preconditions the necessary determinants of FDI stimulation and attraction? What are these preconditions, and to what extent are they fundamental and critical to the stimulation and attraction of FDI? Do the preconditions only exist in an economy? Do they exist in the polity as well? How can their existence and totality be explained, analyzed and interpreted? To what extent have existing efforts been able to accurately explain, analyze and interpret these preconditions? What conclusions that can be drawn from these existing efforts and initiatives? Finally, what are the implications for theory construction and formulation? Approached from the angle of critique as a method of social inquiry, the article interrogates these efforts and initiatives to reveal their bogus intellectual claims and logical inconsistencies. The methodology of research is rooted in the very eclectic sources in which these explanations and analyses are contained and accomplished within carefully formulated steps as indicated in the provided critique as a method of social inquiry. The overall objective is to determine the extent to which these explanations and analyses are able to sufficiently account for, and capture the critical forces, processes and factors that tend to shape the movement of capital globally. The paper concludes that the existing initiatives and efforts still remain inadequate in helping to concretely address how well the assumed preconditions are indeed the needed prerequisites for FDI stimulation and attraction. The paper recommends that the existing explanations on the subject matter of FDI stimulation and attraction still require careful formulation within established testable propositions.*

Keywords: *Meta-theoretical explanations and analyses. Foreign Direct Investments. Foreign Direct Investments Analyses. Foreign Direct Investments Preconditions.*

Introduction

How is the knowledge of any subject matter advanced? Put in another way, what helps in the advancement of our knowledge of subject matters? How have the social sciences in particular approached the advancement of the knowledge of the embedded subject matters? With specific reference to the discourse of foreign direct investments (FDI), what is the scholarship on the subject matter like? What and what constitute the propelling force, and by what changing dynamics? What is the relationship between the discourse on the subject matter and other discourses in relation to the pursuit, enthronement and sustenance of development? The social sciences, notwithstanding the methodological advancements of the 1960s, still lag behind in theoretical sophistication and yet still with

certain defining and specific traits especially in relation to the understanding, patterning and projection of the accompanying scholarship. Just as theories are critical to the intellectual responsibility of advancing our knowledge of the universe, the field of social science is however quick at noting that these theories require certain degrees of sophistication to enable their deployment as tools of academic engagements. Theories in the social science consequently reflect their abilities to reliably describe, explain and predict social phenomena. The assessment of theories is further based on, and determined by, the extent to which they generate knowledge of critical consequences especially in relation to the sustenance of scholarship. This therefore explains the description and characterization of theories as meta-theoretical frameworks of explanations especially in relation to the understanding of social phenomena and their labeling as low-level, middle-level and over-arching. The subject matter of FDI is hence shaped and influenced by the existing treatises in extant literature on international political economy (IPE).

IPE is hence replete with contending explanations and analyses of the pre-conditions necessary for the stimulation and attraction of FDI leading to outpourings of different degrees of sophistication thus justifying the reference to them as meta-theories. To be specific, literature on the subject matter can be divided into two. The first group entails those works confirming the affinity of FDI to either democracy or authoritarianism and in the process develops the criteria and empirical indicators with which to measure the affinity. The second group looks at the extent to which efficient and functional physical infrastructure help to stimulate and attract FDI. Each group, it must be mentioned, has subsets and sub-divisions. Their different conclusions, it must be mentioned further, remain contradictory and confusing, yet provocative and stimulating. The works of Jensen (2003), Barrell and Pain (1999), Mello (1999), Feder and Lily (1985), Gaubatz (1996), Henisz (2000), Lee (1993), Leeds (1999), North (1990), among others, within the first group, confirm the affinity of FDI to democracy/political stability and emphasized the inseparability between economic performance and the stimulation of FDI. The work of Jensen (2003), it is instructive to note, stands out distinctly in the category of works that either support or confirm the affinity of FDI to democracy or democratic rule. The works of Li and Resnick (2003), Chan and Mason (1992), Crenshaw (1991), de Soysa and Oneal (1999), Feng (2001), Gastanaga, Nugent and Pashamova (1998), among others, support the affinity of FDI to authoritarianism or authoritarian rule. Mention must be made of the fact that the work of Choi and Samy (2008) holds quite remarkable findings. According to them: "Empirical results reveal that democratic institutions are, at least, weakly associated with increase in FDI flows (measured by FDI/GDP ratios). While multiple veto players (and, counter intuitively, democratic hindrance) may be positively associated with increases in FDI, audience costs are not linked to FDI activities" (Ibid: 83). The two findings, quite instructively, have their uniqueness expressed in the evolving new terminologies and concepts with respect to the understanding of the research relationship between democracy and FDI stimulation and attraction. The concepts of veto players, audience costs and democratic hindrance have no doubt added elegance and sophistication to the FDI debate and research.

The second group of works examined how the availability and functionality of physical infrastructure and other lubricating forces and processes of any domestic economy provide the necessary preconditions for the stimulation and attraction of FDI without necessarily engaging themselves in polemics and debates. Standing out distinctly in this

category are the works of Dunning (1977, 1981) and Obadan (2004). It must be emphasized that the two sets of literature have no doubt contributed immensely to the understanding of the movement of capital across borders and regions of the world. However, the understanding still remains sketchy, terrestrial, and stunted. The lacuna forms the focus and body of the present effort and initiative. It is apposite to ask: Of what importance are explanations and analyses to social science discourse, especially as the discourse relates to the preconditions necessary for the stimulation and attraction of FDI? Three things require immediate substantiation for the question to adequately serve its purpose and objective. They are: (1) explanations, (2) analyses and (3) social science discourse. To begin with, how are they related to the subject matter of research to the extent of shaping and influencing the accompanying title? Explanations, within the context of the broad and specific objectives of scholarship, hope to present integrated and coherent ideas with respect to the understanding of a subject matter. Explanations hence have the embedded elements and capabilities of pushing our understanding and knowledge of an event/subject matter to a higher level of cognition made possible by helping us to appreciate how the co-variables relate and interact to give detailed and comprehensive information about its existence, and help to appreciate further the effect of time and other changing dynamics. Analyses help to push further our understanding and knowledge of a subject matter in such a way that allows for the development of a pattern with which to make reliable predictions about social occurrences and phenomena. Analyses specifically provide the relevant academic framework and intuition with which to integrate the many dimensions of events and the contained changing dynamics in both time and space. Analyses finally allow for comparative knowledge and understanding of social events and occurrences made possible by enabling our cognition of the differences and similarities over time and of the various controlling circumstances exerting their influences. Social science discourse in relation to the subject matter of FDI, here accomplished, seeks the integration of explanations and analyses with the view to providing standard instructional knowledge and information about FID stimulation and attraction as they currently exist in literature.

With respect to the global movement of capital or FDI, what are the existing explanations and analyses that help to answer the fundamental question: What and what influence or shape investment decisions across the globe? In other words, what do foreign investors consider as fundamental to investment decisions? Fundamental and critical as the questions are, they are not all that totally new. This must be admitted. Ever since the birth of economics as a discipline/area of human inquiry, and since ages past, economists of different methodological persuasions have not only tried to provide answers to the questions, they have as well developed theories explaining investment decisions. There is however, a problem. And this relates to the assumptions of either perfect or imperfect markets in which such investment decisions were/are (being) taken. These assumptions, it must be pointed out, are at best heuristic and the claims that they develop from daily-life experiences can be easily faulted not only on the ground of daily-life diversity alone, but on the changing nature of life and the interpretation we give to it as well. The article is hence divided into four parts. Part one gives definitions and meanings to the concepts of meta-theoretical explanations and analyses, foreign direct investments, foreign direct investments analyses, and foreign direct investments preconditions within a perspective that helps to give the required and appropriate understandings to their applications in the paper. Part two explores the purposes and objectives of critique in social science discourse

and further helps to situate the paper within the intellectual contexts that informed its investigation and research. Part three focuses on methodology and related subject matters. Part four examines critically some of the meta-theoretical explanations and analyses of FDI in literature and provides as well their critiques. Part five serves as the conclusion.

Clarification of Concepts: Contextualizing the Definitional Indices and Parameters

The concepts of meta-theoretical explanations and analyses (MTEA), foreign direct investments (FDI), foreign direct investments analysis (FDIA), and foreign direct investments preconditions (FDIP) need immediate amplifications and clarifications. First, what is meant by the preconditions for the stimulation and attraction of FDI? Preconditions, in the ordinary semantic parlance, are the basic requirements and fundamentals that are important for certain events to occur. In relation to the academic and intellectual discussion and analysis of the subject matter of FDI, preconditions are the basic infrastructures that help to promote the inflow of FDI into any domestic economy that desires it. In other words, preconditions are the totality of physical infrastructure (such as roads, telecommunications, electricity, etc.) legal framework (such as enabling laws, due process of law, independent judiciary, etc.), administrative framework (transparency, established bureaucratic procedures and processes, etc) and democratic/political framework (such as the legislature, existing policy on FDI stimulation and attraction, etc). Preconditions do not only emphasize the existence of these frameworks operating side-by-side, but the fact that they operate excellently well. The idea of preconditions also means that there exists in any domestic economy a 'system' of FDI stimulation and attraction. Finally, preconditions refer to the totality of the processes and procedures in which foreign investments are guaranteed and protected either by domestic laws or commitment to certain international obligations and treaties.

Foreign direct investments analysis (FDIA) is the sum total of the modes, means, and mechanisms of presenting FDI facts and information. The modes, means and mechanisms are in turn the outcomes of researches of both qualitative and quantitative bases. Jointly, they are patterned along the use of logic and testable propositions in the standard fashion of discovering the relationships between and among the coexistence of variables. Beyond the discovery and determination of the empirical relationships between variables, the modes, means and mechanisms of presenting FDI can as well be rooted in the specific and broad historical processes of the integration of the domestic economy into global capitalism through the activities of the multi-national enterprises (MNEs). Finally, FDIA can appear in the form of existing thoughts, ideas and theories that seek to offer cogent description, explanation and prediction of FDI in terms of volume, sectoral allocation and country of origin.

Foreign direct investments (FDI), as used in the paper, refers to the volume, form/character, region of the world/country of origin, of all investments in private hands that are imported into a country. It excludes grants, aid, assistance (technical and financial), loans and donations made by one government to the other. Putting it clearly, it is the summation of portfolio and other investments which individuals in their private capacities make through the activities of MNEs over a period of time. Consequently, FDI exhibits patterns and trends that reflect on the interacting forces, factors, and processes (both domestic and international) shaping it at every point in time. As private investments, they

are generally governed by the rule and logic of economic theory as profits are maximized and losses minimized in the standard fashion of the accounting system that is peculiar to it.

Meta-theoretical explanations and analyses (MTEA) are the whole body of ideas, thoughts and expressions which try to describe, explain and predict the movement and direction of FDI overtime and in space. Because of the fact that they await rigorous and established procedures and processes of scientific testing, the type of prediction that they provide fall short of the standards of theories and the contained functions. They therefore can be best characterized as hypotheses in the standard fashion of social science research rules and procedures. Their methodologies are incomplete and also fall short of the confirmed procedures and processes of scientific testing. As ideas and thoughts, they remain internally inconsistent in their abilities to offer description and explanation of social phenomena.

The Role of Critique in Social Science Discourse and in the Understanding of the FDI Debate

Critique ordinarily helps in our understanding of a subject matter and especially in the understanding of the relationship between it and other subject matters. Critique provides most distinctly the required body of systematized knowledge necessary for thorough comprehension of subject matters. It is the hallmark of thorough and critical engagement with the academic profiles of subject matters. Critique, especially of the social science genre and classification, provides the much needed mental capability to rigorously interrogate subject matters with the view to identifying the differences and similarities between and among them in such a way as to formulate and develop further ideas with respect to the arrangement of our universe. Important and useful as critiques are to scholarship, their deployment and application particularly require special skills and procedures anchored in openness and objectivity of purpose. Undertaking a critique of the meta-theoretical explanations and analyses of the series of the factors, forces and processes shaping FDI without first engaging ourselves with the role which critique serves in social science discourse, it is here reasoned, might deride the paper its important place in the body of growing literature on IPE. It has become imperative to not only critically examine the role of critique in contemporary social science discourse, but to as well shed light on the link between the role and the advancement of the understanding of the FDI debate i.e. how the role can aid our understanding of the debate surrounding the affinity of FDI to either democracy or authoritarianism. The above two academic responsibilities as mentioned hereby compel our immediate attention/engagement.

The role of critique in the advancement and growth of knowledge in social science discourse is best exemplified in the works of Popper (1959), Lakatos (1968), Lakatos and Musgrave (1970), and Khun (1970). However, the work of Popper (1959) stands out distinctly. According to Adekanye (1993:43): “Popper’s discovery that knowledge is advanced by a critical discussion of alternative views, is one that is generally shared by even Popper’s own critics...”. He continues: “Discussion of alternatives means that the critic is not just engaged in mere refutation’s sake, but also interested in constructive criticism. Discussion of alternatives also gets the critic necessarily involved in comparative (empirical) appraisal of a given theory vis-à-vis its rivals. Such comparative appraisals,

“... are not a once-and-for-all task, but a series of continuous and never-ending processes” (Ibid: 43). Critique, as a method of social inquiry, practically involves the rigorous identification of the strengths and weakness of ideas and theories in relation to the subject of explanation, discussion and analysis. It is capped up by bringing out how the critic’s own ideas can help in overcoming the observed lacunae. Therefore, according to Meehan (1988: 133), “...developing some capacity for systematic criticism of theories and applications is an essential part of the intellectual training”.

Relating the role of critique to the advancement of the knowledge of FDI stimulation and attraction debate both compels and necessitates the question: What is the relationship between critique as a method of social inquiry and the understanding of the meta-theoretical explanations and analyses of FDI? In other words, how does the idea of critique as a method of social inquiry help in the understanding of the arguments and postulations in which FDI debates are anchored? The answers to the questions have relevance of meaning and application only within the basis of socio-scientific inquiries. Critique as a method of social inquiry enjoins clear, specific, objective and systematic process of the identification of the strengths and weaknesses of ideas in relation to the understanding of a subject matter and ensuring the presentation, arrangement and analysis of same within a template that seeks the advancement of knowledge most objectively. A critique of the meta-theories in which the FDI stimulation and attraction debate is anchored, consequently requires rigorous examination, discussion and analysis of individual meta-theories and placing them within the broad knowledge which they intend to provide. This has to be because socio-scientific inquiries are generally directed at formulating and developing broad theories with which to accurately and suitably describe, explain and predict social phenomena. The emphasis on the discussion of alternatives is to help enhance the scientific cogency of the choice of method in such a way that its preferred supremacy over other methods is guaranteed at regular intervals. Therefore, the answer to the question: which of the explanations and analyses of the affinity of FDI to either democracy or authoritarianism best capture the critical forces, factors and processes of capital movement across international borders and boundaries should be approached carefully and by the regular testing of the contained logic and hypotheses in such a way that whatever is arrived at in turn provides basis for further testing now and in the future to come.

Methodology, Findings and Discussion

The paper adopted the qualitative type of methodology that is specific to the study. This is unarguably analytical and focuses on careful scrutiny and perusal of the ideas represented by, and here labelled as, “meta-theoretical explanations and analyses” within the context of critique as a method of social inquiry. The meta-theories as further called are seven (7) in all with five (5) described as hypotheses and two (2) representing what the paper described as “protectionist policies” and “other factors”. Their reviews took the following essential steps: (a) re-arranging the discourse on the subject matter of the debates in relation to the stimulation and attraction of FDI along certain formulated themes to enable the identification of the specific forces, factors and processes of politics and economy in which the knowledge and understanding of the debates remain embedded; (b) further locating the themes as formulated within the epistemological assumptions that are specific to each of the seven (7) identified meta-theories to enable the knowledge and

understanding of their individual uniqueness and identity; (c) undertaking deep, critical and comparative study of the meta-theories and pinpointing the salient differences and similarities between and among them; and (d) using the knowledge and understanding of the accompanying differences and similarities to undertake the assessment and evaluation of the meta-theories as called in the paper. The methodology, as specified above, produced the following results and findings: (a) that the existing explanations in literature on the subject matter of investigation are indeed meta-theories; (b) that they individually and jointly provide further research on the subject matter under reference; (c) notwithstanding the fact that the explanations and meta-theories, they yet differ in degrees of sophistication and technicalities of knowledge; and (d) that relationships of knowledge and understanding still exist between and among them notwithstanding their known differences and similarities. What is the emerging discussion like? The critique of the meta-theories specifically took the pattern of (a) clear identification and articulation of the individual thrust and ensuring further amplification within the body of knowledge on the subject matter; (b) juxtaposing the individual thrust within the experiences gained from reality; and (c) engaging the embedded ideas and logic through the identification and articulation of the lacunae with special emphasis on both the accompanying strengths and weaknesses.

Meta-theoretical Explanations and Analyses of the Preconditions for FDI Stimulation and Attraction: A Critique

Meta-theoretical explanations, here defined, captured the range of low-level, middle-level and high-level/over-arching ideas/arguments targeted at providing the required interrogation of the debates with respect to the stimulation and attraction of FDI. They are intellectually diverse and competitive in presentations and unarguably reflect the extent to which their embedded assumptions and thrusts derive cogency from empirical validity and testing. Largely labelled as hypothesis and further formulated around important public policies with respect to encouraging the inflow of FDI, these meta-theoretical explanations as called acquire the general characteristic of enabling the understanding of the debates and consequently point research direction to the comprehension of the specific forces, factors and processes within the interplay of politics and economy of any country just as governmental actions are initiated for the purpose of attracting and stimulating FDI. What really these meta-theoretical explanations are derive their scholarly relevance from the perspective of facilitating and sustaining the debates around the broad thematic concern especially in relation to aiding the existing expositions of the determinants of FDI. The explanations therefore represent in their individual and collective forms the existing academic issues in relation to the amplifications of what these determinants really are, and as differently presented and analyzed by authors using different indices of assessment and evaluation. The explanations include: (1) differential returns hypothesis, (2) size-of-market hypothesis, (3) growth hypothesis, (4) protectionist policies, (5) need-for-raw materials hypothesis, (6) investment climate and (7) other factors.

1.) The differential returns hypothesis: What really is this hypothesis all about, and to what extent is it indeed a meta-theoretical explanation with respect to the understanding of the discourse in relation to the stimulation and attraction of FDI? What are its fundamental assumptions? And what is meant by “differential returns”? According to this hypothesis,

the flow of FDI is affected where differential returns exist between investing abroad and at home. As the basis for investment is determined largely by the concern for profit or profit motivation desire, FDI inflow will respond to where the rates of differential returns are higher. According to Obadan (2004: 406) “Differential profit rates, which indicate differences in marginal production of capital, will create an inducement for foreign capital”. The assumption here is that the success of investible capital is measured largely by the amount of returns it has generated. Therefore, areas that tend to support further growth of capital in terms of large profit rates are usually sought for by the owners of capital all over the world. It is further assumed that capital has different areas of potential growth, and that areas of high growth potentials are areas of capital attraction.

To what extent, the question can now be asked, does the hypothesis capture the flow of FDI? First, is it always true that capital chases favourable and attractive areas? Some scholars will no doubt argue in favour of the logic. The logic is however, faulty. It is implicitly held, which is wrong, that equal factors exist in the invisible world, and that they jointly determine the returns on capital. The premise of the assumption is anti-reality. A factor or group of factors working in isolation cannot likely determine the rate of returns on capital. It is also unlikely that all the factors have equal weight and that the socio-economic and socio-political environment is also the same thing. Second, implicit in the assumption is also that investible capital enjoys equal access to market opportunities. This is also fallacious. The reality is the existence of unequal opportunities. The realities of some countries of the world puncture the central assumption of the hypothesis. For example, all the assumed factors that are held to have accounted for high returns on marginal productivity of capital exist in some countries, but without necessarily leading to inflow of FDI. What this experience has suggested is perhaps a reconstruction of some of the assumptions of the hypothesis. Accepted that the assumptions are not in themselves problematic, what value-free instruments best measure the rates of returns on capital. Related to this problem, are the differences in the values of national currencies. The value of money differs all over the world; these differences are in themselves hindrances to the evolution of a common standard of assessment or measurement. That the rate of returns on capital is higher in country A than B might not have provided sufficient and adequate information because country B might turn out to have a highly valued national currency in the international market. This type of a situation is least accommodated in the hypothesis. The parameters and indices for the calculation of marginal productivity of capital lend themselves to multiple means of calculation which are bound to provide all kinds of results. Countries of the world differ in accounting procedures and practices. For example, interest rates are charged differently and perhaps according to national laws. A capital that is secured through borrowing and has not any interest is most likely to yield higher profits than that which attracts rates, especially very high interest rates. Such comparison is important if the differential return hypothesis is to serve a meaningful explanation of the flow of FDI. Third, the hypothesis tends to reduce the value of corporate social responsibility which is now being increasingly recognized outside the bourgeois logic of capital investment. The interconnections which the problems of the environment pose for global peace, security and development require that initiatives at resolving them should go beyond governmental interventions, either regional or continental. As we now speak of growing inter-linkages and interconnections, emerging theoretical and hypothetical formulations should be such that advance and reflect the new thinking and mentality.

2.) The size-of-market hypothesis: The understanding of the hypothesis is built around the idea of “size-of-market”. Consequently, how does the idea of “size-of-market” help in its understanding and in the amplification of the accompanying theoretical thrust? Size-of-market indicates the existence and availability of potentialities which, from economic term, provide the instant impetus for the attraction of FDI. According to Obadan (2004:406) “...this hypothesis states that foreign investment will take place as soon as the market size is large enough to permit the reaping of economies of scale”. The assumption here is that the existence of a market stimulates the inflow of FDI. A market is no doubt an essential precondition for economic activity to be so described. Capital can only multiply and grow where it is assured that products from an investment undertaking are regularly purchased so as to be able to stimulate the rate of turn-over, which is in turn facilitated by the economics of scale of production.

The hypothesis, it is here observed, requires a detailed critique. To begin with, how cogent is it? First, for the purpose of stimulating FDI, the hypothesis is silent on the appropriate market size. Second, market size, whether appropriate or not, is difficult to determine. The question can be asked: what constitutes or make a market size? More seriously, what is a market size? What seems to be important in real life is not the market size per se but the purchasing power of the market. Market, in the real sense, can be taken to be in existence only in relation to the preparedness of economic actors to always wanting to purchase goods and services. This, again, is a function of standard of living of the people. The size-of-market is therefore a relative term. This relativity makes the testing of the hypothesis difficult thereby compounding the epistemological utility of the idea. The essence of hypothesis and by extension hypothesis-testing is to enable the building of a generalization. However, where the properties and assumptions of hypotheses are inimical to scientific advancement and attainment, their essence for the purpose of advancing knowledge becomes questionable.

Furthermore, the expression “...as soon as the market is large enough to permit the reaping of economies of scale”, is vague (Ibid: 406). One condition or requirement of a good hypothesis is the fact that it should not be vaguely formulated or expressed. When do we for instance, know that the market size is large enough? This essentially requires some econometrics. But the good question remains: What are those things that should and should not be calculated? And what are the problems involved in the selection of choices of items for the purpose of the exercise? What do we lose by the inclusion or non-inclusion of some items? All these are important to any statistical calculation. Market size, it is important to also emphasize, is as well determined by factors internal and external to an economy. Related to this is also the issue of the value of currencies. These two points play significant roles in how for instance a market size is determined. The quoted expression suggests crudely that there is a minimum market size situation or condition, and that it can be linearly expressed. The properties of the linear equation, it is here noted, are not implied or explicitly stated. When do we for instance know that the minimum market size is already in place and for how long should we wait to be able to know that the market size can “permit the reaping of economies of scale”?

Finally, “market size” either as econometric expression for the purpose of building or generating reliable statistical bases, or as value preferences, cannot be determined alone unless in relation to some other factors and processes which, interestingly, might exist beyond the geographical coverage of an area. It is practically wrong for instance to restrict

the market size indices of Nigeria to its geographical area. The entire West African region plays a significant role in Nigeria's market size. The point here is that regional integrative efforts have helped to increase market size and therefore tend to extend the definition of market size beyond a political boundary or country. All the issues raised tend to compound the utility of the hypothesis as a plausible explanation of the inflow of FDI.

3.) The growth hypotheses: What is its kernel point? What is the relationship between it and other similar hypotheses? How does the knowledge of the relationship enhance its uniqueness and identity? According to Obadan (2004), the hypothesis is: "...closely related to the market's rate of growth" (Ibid: 406). The hypothesis, according to him: "...emanates from the relation between the level of aggregate demand and the stock of capital requires to satisfy it" (Ibid: 406). He continues: "As aggregate demand increases, a higher level of FDI will be stimulated to support a higher level of output" (Ibid: 406). The assumption of the hypothesis is that as aggregate demand increases, there will be a corresponding increase in capital to be able to meet the required output for the purpose of satisfying the increase in aggregate demand. The logic is however, doubtful. Increase in capital is most likely to depend on the establishment of correlation between the factors and forces that brought about the increased demand in the first instance. In other words, increased in capital is most likely where the factors and forces that brought it about correlate with those that brought about the increase in aggregate demand. Where no relationship or correlation exists, the probability is either way. In real life situation, remarkable distinctions can be made in the composition of aggregate demand i.e. aggregate demand for civilian goods and aggregate demand for capital goods. A much more sustainable FDI inflow is most likely that which is brought about as a result of increase in aggregate demand for civilian goods. This is because increase in aggregate demand for capital goods heightens insecurity, and security, we know, is an important determinant of the flow of FDI.

There is also the problem of determining statistically the composition of the aggregate demand. Countries differ in the processes and procedures of estimating their gross domestic and gross national products (GDP and GNP). Not only that, they also differ in sophistication, especially with respect to the gathering and generation of data. Data dependability is another problem. What the above suggests is that data on increase in aggregate demand might be overestimated or underestimated, and either result produced might be sending information which might prove to be undependable. Finally, the utility of the growth hypothesis is further compounded by the simple fact that increased in aggregate demand as basis for capital response is in itself misleading. More study needs be done on the identification of the causes of the increase in aggregate demand, and determine whether or not they can be sustained. A focus on the likely hypothesis that should be able to identify what these factors are and how they co-relate, should rather serve as the likely explanation of FDI inflow. In its present form, the growth hypothesis is poorly focused.

4.) Protectionist policies: The assumption here is that a protected market naturally attracts FDI. Foreign investors, it is generally believed, respond favourably to protected markets. Market protections take different focus and are sustained by different policies. According to Obadan (2004:406), "these policies, which take the form of a variety of tariff and non-tariff barriers, are expected to encourage foreign investors to undertake direct investments in the protected market to which they earlier exported their products". He concludes "...increasing custom duties thus constitute a major factor in FDI flows" (Ibid: 406). This form of explanation seems to be at variance with what operates in reality. It is

hard to find protected markets for the purpose of attracting FDI only. What exists is usually a protected market against foreign imports. It is both practiced by developed and developing economies irrespective of economic ideologies for the purpose of achieving different and competing political and economic objectives. The developing nations usually protect their economies so as to keep in business the home-grown, infant industries and bring about employment. The developed economies as well protect their markets largely as a retaliatory measure to prosecute political goals in foreign policy actions or for health reasons, among others. The argument of this form of explanation might also not have a place in this era of globalization. Protectionist policies, save on health grounds and other emergency measures, are fast becoming outmoded and archaic. Efficiency is the watchword and is to be encouraged through openness and competitive (not protectionist) practices. As hindrances induced boundaries are discouraged, and as restrictions are discouraged too, globalization seeks to integrate every aspect of the world together and create a “global village”. Protectionist policies will hinder electronic-mail (e-mail) trading, stir up retaliatory actions and reactions, inject insecurity, panic and confusion into the global economy with attendant negative implications on the stimulation of FDI.

5.) The need-for-raw-materials hypothesis: The argument here is that foreign investors seek to invest in areas of the world that have the needed raw materials for the home industries. Stern (1973) reported that the emphasis of United States direct investment had been in extractive industries –mining, smelting and petroleum. The hypothesis is historically supported. The “Scrambled for Africa” was associated with the growth and development of FDI in the extractive industries. Foreign investment then was facilitated by the need for raw-materials to help sustain the tempo of the industrial revolution in Europe. This hypothesis is however, not without its problems. The first problem has to do with the fact that the conceptualization that has informed its formulation suggests some elements of obsolescence. The fact that it tends to reinforce the division of the world into two, the developed and the developing, limits its contemporary utility given the ongoing globalization and its associated implications. Globalization, from an epistemological view point, seeks to develop an all-encompassing, integrated framework for the purpose of describing, explaining and predicting social phenomena of which the flow of FDI is a part. Finally, the hypothesis conceals the genuine intention and real motive of FDI. Foreign Investment exists for the purpose of profit.

6.) The investment climate hypothesis: As a term, investment climate, according to the World Bank (2002:59), “...refers to the numerous ways in which government policies affect the productivity of investment by fostering openness to trade and FDI, macro-economic stability, fair and efficient public sector administration, low corruption and effective law enforcement, strong financial institutions, the provision of effective infrastructure, sound regulation, and measures to ensure the health and education of the work force.” In the opinion of Obadan (2004:407): “In empirical studies, the elements of the investment climate covered include macro-economic policy, the legal framework, political instability, infrastructure and health and education services”. He asserts that: “Poor macro-economic policies resulting in, for example, inflation, uncertainty, real exchange rate volatility etc, have a negative impact on the level of investment while an appropriate legal framework and its fair enforcement have an important positive impact (Ibid: 407). He concludes thus: “Political instability has a significant negative effect on

investment. Inadequate infrastructure constitutes one of the major obstacles to doing business". (Ibid: 407).

As a factor accounting for the explanation of the inflow of FDI, the "investment climate" argument is premised on the logic that the inflow of FDI is basically determined, positively or negatively, by the presence or absence of certain requirements. These requirements are considered vital to the movement of international capital across borders and continents. These basic requirements are further considered important not only for the attraction of FDI, but also in the maximization of the benefits that are usually associated with FDI. Pools of empirical evidence have either confirmed or refuted the logic of the argument. Under high dictatorship and authoritarianism, countries of the world have successfully attracted FDI, while less authoritarian and dictatorial ones have not been able to attract meaningful FDI in spite of the fact that the necessary socio-economic infrastructure are also in place. What this evidence suggests is that all the basic requirements and ingredients are at different levels of importance. The question then becomes: How can they be so rated in such a way as to be accorded necessary policy priorities? In other words, what percentage of policy priority attention should a requirement enjoy in the implementation of the entire policy package?

Apart from the above, there is also the problem of being able to establish the necessary theoretical and pragmatic linkages among the requirements. What theory, for instance, should connect political stability with the existence of either sound legal framework or sound financial institutions regulations? This question has become important in view of the fact that what the factors seek to analyze and hope to achieve are the development of an holistic and integrated approach to the attraction of FDI. Knowing the point of theoretical connection will no doubt help in the formulation of appropriate policies and other policy stimulating mechanisms for the achievement of the overall policy objectives. Because the above is difficult, the argument of "investment climate" is again weakened. Finally, because these requirements enjoy different levels of importance, and because the theoretical and pragmatic linkages among them might be difficult to determine, there is the problem of determining how best they can be sustained either singularly or in a relationship. This is a major policy problem.

7.) Other factors: Some of these other factors according to Obadan (2004:407), "...are international product differential domestic investment, low labour and production costs abroad, need to maintain supplier relationships with customers and adequacy of information about opportunities in foreign markets". The argument here is that beyond protectionist policies, the "investment climate", and the various hypotheses explained above, FDI inflow can also be stimulated by some of the other factors mentioned above. These "other factors", are critical and crucial to the analysis and investigation of the forces and factors that do propel FDI. To try to belittle them or present them as if they do not matter or that they acquire only very insignificant percentage contribution, is to run the risk of scientific reductionism. What the study of the factors and forces that determine FDI inflow has revealed, either in the present hypotheses or as an explanatory point of reference is that they will only be useful if their claimed validity can be tested empirically over a period of time in different economies. This will no doubt form the basis for generalization and theory development.

Conclusion

How have the meta-theoretical explanations and analyses accounted for the flow of FDI across regions and international borders of the world? Pre-occupying itself with concepts that are important to the understanding of the growing literature on FDI component of IPE, the article goes further to situate the understanding of the concepts in social science discourse and in the understanding of FDI debate as well. Useful as these meta-theoretical explanations and analyses are in terms of helping to develop in the future testable propositions and ideas on the movement of international capital, they still remain inadequate in helping to concretely address how well the assumed preconditions are indeed the needed prerequisites for FDI stimulation and attraction.

References

1. Adekanye, J. B. (1993). "Military Occupation and Social Stratification", Inaugural Lecture, University of Ibadan, Ibadan: Vantage Publishers (Int.) Ltd.
2. Barrel, R. and Nigel, P. (1999). Domestic Institutions, Agglomerations and Foreign Direct Investments in Europe, *European Economic Review*, 43 (4-6): 925-34 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0014-2921\(98\)00105-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0014-2921(98)00105-6)
3. Chan, S. and Mason, M. (1992). Foreign Direct Investment and Host Country Conditions: Looking from the other side now, *International Interactions*, 17(3): 215 – 32 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050629208434780>
4. Choi, S. W. and Samy, T. (2008). Reexamining the Effect of Democratic Institutions on inflows of Foreign Direct Investment in Developing Countries, *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 4:82-103 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1743-8594.2008.00059.x>
5. Crenshaw, E. (1991). Foreign Investment as Dependent Variable: Determinants of Foreign Investment and Capital Penetration in Developing Nations, 1967 – 1979, *Social Forces*, 69 (4): 1169 – 1182 <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/69.4.1169>
6. Dunning, J.H. (1977). Trade, Location of Economic Activity and MNE: A Search for an Eclectic Approach, in Ohlin, B., Hessel-born, P. O. and Wijkman, P. M (eds), *The International Allocation of Economic Activity*, London: Macmillan
7. Dunning, J. H. (1981). *International Production and the Multinational Enterprise*. Boston: Allen and Urwin
8. Feder, G. and Lily, U. (1985). The Determinants of International Creditworthiness and Their Policy Implications, *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 7 (1): 133 – 56 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0161-8938\(85\)90032-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0161-8938(85)90032-8)
9. Feng, Y. (2001). Political Freedom, Political Instability, and Policy Uncertainty: A Study of Political Institutions and Private Investment in Developing Countries, *International Studies Quarterly*, 45 (2): 271 – 94 <https://doi.org/10.1111/0020-8833.00191>
10. Gastanaga, V. M., Nugent, J.B. and Pashamova, B. (1998). Host Country Reforms and FDI Inflows: How Much Difference Do They Make? *World Development*, 26 (7): 1299 – 34 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X\(98\)00049-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(98)00049-7)
11. Gaubatz, K.T. (1996). Democratic States and Commitment in International Relations, *International Organization*, 50 (1):109 –139 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300001685>
12. Henisz, W. J. (2000). The Institutional Environment for Multinational Investment, *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization*, 16 (2): 334 – 364 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jleo/16.2.334>
13. Jensen, N.M. (2003). Democratic Governance and Multinational Corporations: Political Regimes and Inflows of Foreign Direct Investment, *International Organization*, 57 (Summer): 587 – 616 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818303573040>
14. Khun, T. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
15. Lakatos, L. and Musgrave, A. (1970). *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
16. Less, S.H. (1993). Relative Importance of Political Instability and Economic Variables on Perceived Country Creditworthiness, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 24 (4): 801-812 <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490256>

17. Leeds, B.A. (1999). Domestic Political Institutions, Credible Commitments, and International Cooperation, *American Journal of Political Science*, 43 (4): 979-1002 <https://doi.org/10.2307/2991814>
18. Li, Q. and Resnick, A. (2003). Reversal of Fortunes: Democratic Institutions and Foreign Direct Investment Inflows to Developing Countries, *International Organization*, 57 (Winter): 175 – 211 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818303571077>
19. Mello, L.R. (1999). Foreign Direct Investment-Led Growth: Evidence from Time-Series and Panel Data, *Oxford Economic Papers*, 51 (1): 133 – 51 <https://doi.org/10.1093/oeq/51.1.133>
20. Michael, E., Cheibub, J.A. and Limongi F. (2000). *Democracy, and Development: Political Institutions and Material Well-Being in the World, 1950 – 1990*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
21. North, D.C. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
22. Obadan, M. I. (2004). *Foreign Capital Flows and External Debt: Perspective on Nigeria and the LDC Group*. Lagos: Broadway Press Ltd.
23. Popper, K. (1959). *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. London: Hutchinson
24. Sobel, A. C. (1999). *State Institutions, Private Incentives, Global Capital*. Ann. Arbor: University of Michigan Press.



This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution - Non Commercial - No Derivatives 4.0 International License.