"Unlocking the Global Chessboard: FDI Policies and their Impact on Entrepreneurial Ecosystems"

Yeboah, Samuel

Faculty of Business and Management Studies, Sunyani Technical University

18 July 2023

"Unlocking the Global Chessboard: FDI Policies and their Impact on Entrepreneurial Ecosystems"

Prof. Samuel Asuamah Yeboah (PhD)
Faculty of Business and Management Studies
BOX 206
Sunyani Technical University, Ghana.
Email address: nelkonsegal@yahoo.com
Phone:0244723071
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9866-6235

ABSTRACT

This analysis delves into the diverse landscape of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) policies within developing nations and their profound implications for entrepreneurial ecosystems. Through comparative analysis, the study uncovers a range of strategies countries employ, from liberal to restrictive FDI approaches, which significantly impact interactions between foreign investors and local startups, ultimately shaping innovation, growth, and competitiveness in entrepreneurial ecosystems. In some developing nations, liberal FDI policies play a pivotal role, strategically designed to attract foreign capital, technology, and expertise. For instance, Singapore and Ireland have implemented proactive, incentive-driven measures, particularly in high-tech sectors, resulting in thriving entrepreneurial ecosystems integrated into global value chains. These policies foster collaborative environments, granting local startups improved access to capital, markets, and invaluable knowledge from foreign investors. Conversely, other nations adopt more restrictive FDI policies to safeguard strategic sectors and protect domestic enterprises from undue foreign influence. India and China exemplify this approach, erecting regulatory barriers in industries like telecommunications and banking to retain policy autonomy and nurture domestic capabilities. While preserving local interests, these policies inadvertently limit access to FDI benefits, including advanced technologies, skills, and global market connectivity. Governments often utilize incentive schemes such as tax breaks and subsidies to attract FDI, making their countries appealing to foreign investors and providing local startups with essential resources and mentorship, significantly contributing to their growth. However, ownership restrictions, particularly in strategically significant sectors, serve to protect domestic control but may discourage potential investors and hinder collaboration between startups and foreign entities. Striking a balance between preserving sovereignty and promoting global integration becomes a pivotal challenge for these nations. The regulatory environment plays a central role in shaping the relationship between FDI policies and entrepreneurial ecosystems. Favourable regulatory frameworks that encourage competition, safeguard intellectual property and simplify business registration drive innovation and attract FDI, which subsequently benefits startups. Transparent regulations that reduce uncertainty and risks bolster investor confidence, making FDI a potential lifeline for local startups.

KEYWORDS: Entrepreneurial Ecosystems**;** Comparative Analysis**;** Liberal FDI Policies**;** Restrictive FDI Policies**;** Incentive Schemes**;** Ownership Restrictions**;** Regulatory Environment**;** Innovation**;** Investor Confidence**;** Ease of Doing Business**;** Policy Alignment

JEL CODES: F21; F23; G38; L26; L53; L88; O16; O25; P48.

INTRODUCTION

Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) plays a pivotal role in the economic development of developing nations. It serves as a conduit for injecting capital, technology, and expertise into local economies, with the potential to catalyse the growth of entrepreneurial ecosystems (Alfaro & Chauvin, 2017; Piteli, 2018). However, the extent to which FDI can bolster entrepreneurial activities and innovation varies significantly across countries due to the diverse range of FDI policies in place (Borensztein et al., 1998; Görg & Strobl, 2002; Nguyen, 2023). This paper embarks on a comparative analysis of FDI policies in different developing nations, shedding light on their varying approaches and the consequential implications for entrepreneurial ecosystems.

FDI policies serve as the foundation upon which nations establish their stance on foreign investments. Some countries, exemplified by Singapore and Ireland, adopt liberal and open policies that actively seek to attract foreign capital, technology, and skills (Barry & Bradley, 1997; Tan, 2017). These policies, characterized by incentives and minimal regulatory barriers, create a welcoming environment for foreign investors. Such nations acknowledge the potential benefits of FDI in high-tech sectors such as electronics, biotechnology, and software, and have successfully leveraged these policies to foster competitive and innovative entrepreneurial ecosystems (Dunning & Lundan, 2008; Khanna & Palepu, 2010).

Conversely, other developing nations, like India and China, take a more restrictive and selective approach to FDI. Their policies aim to safeguard national interests, protect strategic sectors, and shield local firms from foreign competition (Goyal, 2014; Chitranka, 2021). Consequently, these countries impose stringent regulations and barriers on FDI entry, ownership, and operation, particularly in industries like telecommunications, banking, and media (Chen et al., 1995; Sauvant, 2014). While these measures may protect domestic interests, they simultaneously limit access to foreign markets, technologies, and valuable resources, ultimately diminishing their attractiveness to foreign investors (Meyer & Peng, 2016).

This paper will delve deeper into the dichotomy of FDI policies by examining their implications on entrepreneurial ecosystems. It will explore how openness to FDI, sectoral restrictions, incentive schemes, and ownership restrictions influence the dynamics between foreign investors and local startups. Additionally, it will investigate the intricate relationship between the regulatory environment and entrepreneurship, focusing on how favourable regulatory frameworks can stimulate innovation and investor confidence. Furthermore, the paper will underscore the importance of policy alignment with national development goals and economic diversification in shaping the FDI-entrepreneurship nexus.

In general, this paper seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of the interplay between FDI policies and entrepreneurial ecosystems in developing nations. By unravelling the implications of diverse FDI policies and their interaction with the regulatory environment, we can uncover strategies to optimize the collaborative potential between foreign investors and local entrepreneurs. Ultimately, this exploration aims to drive innovation, foster growth, and contribute to sustainable economic development.

The variation in FDI policies across developing nations poses a significant challenge to understanding their impact on entrepreneurial ecosystems (Isenberg, 2010; Stam, 2015; Cantner et al., 2021). While some countries adopt liberal and open policies to attract foreign investors, others implement restrictive measures to protect their national interests (Dunning & Narula, 1996; UNCTAD, 2019). The problem lies in the lack of a comprehensive comparative analysis that assesses the implications of these diverse FDI policies on the growth, innovation, and competitiveness of local entrepreneurial ecosystems.

Several gaps are identified in the existing literature: They are as follows: *Limited Comparative Analysis*: The majority of studies either focus on individual nations or provide isolated case studies. There is a scarcity of comprehensive comparative analyses that systematically assess FDI policies and their implications across multiple developing nations (Buckley et al., 2007; Asiedu & Lien, 2011 Veeramani et al., 2020). *Inadequate Exploration of Regulatory Environment*: While the importance of the regulatory environment is acknowledged, there is limited research that delves into how specific regulatory factors, such as competition, intellectual property protection, and ease of doing business, interact with FDI policies to influence entrepreneurial ecosystems (Maskus & Penubarti, 1995; Aitken & Harrison, 1999; Djankov et al., 2002; Görg & Greenaway, 2004; World Bank Group, 2020). *Lack of Policy Alignment Perspective*: The alignment of FDI policies with national development goals and economic diversification strategies is often overlooked. Understanding how policy alignment can enhance the positive impact of FDI on local entrepreneurship remains an underexplored area (OECD, 2019; UNCTAD, 2018; Narula & Pineli, 2019). *Need for Practical Insights*: There is a need for research that not only identifies gaps but also provides practical insights for policymakers and entrepreneurs in developing nations. This research aims to bridge the existing knowledge gap and offer actionable recommendations for policy formulation and implementation.

Addressing these identified gaps is crucial for several reasons: *Informed Decision-Making*: Policymakers in developing nations need comprehensive insights into the consequences of their FDI policies (Blomström & Kokko, 2003; Görg & Greenaway, 2004; Meyer & Sinani, 2009; UNCTAD, 2020). A comparative analysis can help them make informed decisions that balance the attraction of foreign investment with safeguarding national interests; *Enhanced Entrepreneurial Ecosystems:* Entrepreneurs and startups are key drivers of innovation and economic growth. Understanding how FDI policies influence their environment can empower them to leverage foreign investment for their benefit (Kimura & Todo, 2018; Nguyen, 2023; OECD, 2023); *Optimizing FDI Impact*: Developing nations are in a constant quest to optimize the positive impact of FDI on their economies (Balasubramanyam et al., 1996; De Mello, 1999; Li & Liu, 2005; Agbola, 2013; Kimura & Todo, 2018; Nguyen, 2023; OECD, 2023). By addressing the identified gaps, this research can contribute to strategies that maximize the benefits of foreign investment; *Global Economic Development*: A better understanding of the FDI-entrepreneurship nexus in developing nations contributes to global economic development by fostering innovation, growth, and sustainability (Li & Liu 2021; Slesman et al., 2021; Nwakeze et el., 2023). The paper aims to address the identified gaps by providing a comprehensive comparative analysis of FDI policies and their implications for entrepreneurial ecosystems in developing nations. By doing so, it seeks to offer practical insights and recommendations for policymakers, entrepreneurs, and researchers alike, ultimately contributing to the advancement of knowledge in this critical area of economic development.

The objective of the study is to analyse the impact of diverse Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) policies on entrepreneurial ecosystems in developing nations, considering the variations in policy approaches, regulatory factors, and policy alignment, and providing practical recommendations to optimize the FDI-entrepreneurship nexus.

The research question for the study is as follows; "How do varying Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) policies impact the growth, innovation, and competitiveness of entrepreneurial ecosystems in developing nations, and what regulatory factors and policy alignments play a crucial role in shaping this impact?"

The underlying assumptions for this study include the belief that FDI policies significantly influence entrepreneurial ecosystems, that regulatory factors are pivotal in this relationship, and that aligning FDI policies with national development goals can enhance their positive impact on local entrepreneurship in developing nations.

The study acknowledges several limitations and defines its scope as follows: *Geographical Scope*: The analysis primarily focuses on a selection of developing nations, and the findings may not be generalizable to all developing countries due to variations in economic structures and policy contexts. *Data Availability*: The research relies on the availability and reliability of existing literature and data sources, which may have limitations in terms of completeness and accuracy. *Causality vs. Correlation*: While efforts are made to establish causal relationships, the study recognizes that correlations observed between FDI policies and entrepreneurial ecosystems may be influenced by various contextual factors. *Generalizability*: The study's findings are context-specific and may not be directly applicable to all developing nations due to differences in economic, political, and social conditions. *Policy Evolution*: FDI policies are subject to change over time. The study may not capture the full dynamics of policy evolution and its long-term effects on entrepreneurial ecosystems. *Regulatory Complexity*: The study acknowledges the complexity of regulatory environments and their multifaceted nature, focusing on selected regulatory factors that are well-documented in the literature. *Practical Implementation*: While the study provides practical insights and recommendations, the actual implementation of policy changes may face challenges related to political will, administrative capacity, and local contexts. Despite these limitations, the study aims to offer valuable insights into the relationships between FDI policies, regulatory environments, and entrepreneurial ecosystems in developing nations, with the intention of informing policy discussions and entrepreneurial strategies.

METHODOLOGY

Literature Search: Academic databases, including PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar, were selected for accessing relevant literature; A comprehensive set of keywords and search terms, such as "FDI policies," "entrepreneurial ecosystems," "developing nations," "regulatory environment," "policy alignment," and related variations, was used; Inclusion criteria were applied to include scholarly articles, reviews, and reports published which are related to the research questions the study seeks to answer; Exclusion criteria were applied to filter out studies that were not directly related to the research questions, studies with insufficient data, and non-English publications.

Screened and Selected Literature: Initial screening based on titles and abstracts was conducted to identify potentially relevant articles; Full-text assessments were performed to evaluate the relevance and inclusion of studies in the systematic review.

Extracted Data: Relevant data points, including FDI policy approaches, regulatory factors, policy alignment strategies, and their implications on entrepreneurial ecosystems, were extracted from selected studies; Extracted data were systematically organized for analysis.

Assessed Study Quality: The quality and rigour of selected studies were assessed using established criteria for evaluating research credibility and reliability.

Synthesized Data: The extracted data were synthesized to address the research questions, with a focus on examining the impact of FDI policies, regulatory factors, and policy alignment on entrepreneurial ecosystems.

Presented Results: Findings were presented in a structured format, incorporating, and narratives to address the research questions and sub-questions.

Discussed and Interpreted Results: The results were analysed and interpreted, considering the implications of FDI policies on entrepreneurial ecosystems, the role of regulatory factors, and policy alignment.

By following this systematic methodology, the study aimed to provide a comprehensive analysis of the impact of FDI policies on entrepreneurial ecosystems in developing nations and to contribute valuable insights to the field.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF FDI POLICIES IN DIFFERENT DEVELOPING NATIONS

Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) policies vary significantly among developing nations, shaping the extent to which foreign investors can engage in local economies (Te Velde, 2001; OECD, 2002; World Bank Group, 2017). A comparative analysis of FDI policies in different countries reveals varying approaches and their implications for entrepreneurial ecosystems: Some countries adopt more liberal and open policies towards FDI, aiming to attract more foreign capital, technology, and skills that can enhance their domestic industries and markets (Dunning & Lundan, 2008; Meyer & Sinani, 2009; Kuznetsov & Kuznetsova, 2019). For example, Singapore and Ireland have implemented pro-active and incentive-based policies to attract FDI in high-tech sectors, such as electronics, biotechnology, and software (Barry & Bradley, 1997; O'Donovan, & Ruane, 2004; Tan, 2004;).

These policies have helped them develop competitive and innovative entrepreneurial ecosystems that are well-integrated into the global value chains (Dunning & Lundan, 2008; Khanna & Palepu, 2010). Other countries adopt more restrictive and selective policies towards FDI, aiming to protect their national interests, strategic sectors, and local firms from foreign competition and domination. For example, India and China have imposed various regulations and barriers on FDI entry, ownership, and operation in certain industries, such as telecommunications, banking, and media (Buckley et al., 2007; Pradhan, 2011; Aggarwal & Kumar, 2012). These policies have helped them preserve their policy autonomy and foster their indigenous capabilities and enterprises (Meyer & Peng, 2016). However, they have also limited their access to foreign markets and technologies and reduced their attractiveness to foreign investors.

Openness to FDI: Some nations adopt liberal FDI policies, encouraging inflows by minimizing regulatory barriers. This approach can attract foreign investors, boosting local startups through increased access to capital, markets, and knowledge (Danzman, 2020; SelectUSA Investor Guide - FDI Restrictions, 2021; Yeboah et al., 2023). By liberalizing their FDI policies, these nations signal their willingness and readiness to cooperate with foreign partners, creating a favourable business environment and enhancing their competitiveness. Foreign investors, in turn, are more likely to invest in these nations, bringing not only financial resources, but also valuable assets such as technology, skills, networks, and reputation (Blomström & Kokko, 1998; Javorcik, 2004; Meyer & Sinani, 2009). Local startups can benefit from these assets, as they can improve their products and services, expand their customer base, and learn from the best practices of their foreign counterparts (Javorcik, 2004; Meyer & Sinani, 2009; Yeboah et al., 2023). Moreover, local startups can also leverage foreign investors' connections and influence to enter new markets and regions, increasing their exposure and opportunities (Borensztein et al., 1998; Caves, 2007; Alfaro & Chen, 2014).

Sectoral Restrictions: Certain countries impose sector-specific restrictions on FDI, protecting key industries from foreign influence (Indian Economy, 2022; U.S. Department of Commerce, 2021; OECD, 2023a; 2023b). While this can safeguard local interests, it may limit access to foreign investment that could stimulate innovation and growth. By imposing sectoral restrictions on FDI, these countries aim to preserve their national sovereignty, security, and identity, as well as to support their domestic firms and industries from foreign competition and control (Buckley et al., 2007; Pradhan et al., 2011; Aggarwal & Kumar, 2012; Danzman, 2020). For example, some countries restrict FDI in sectors such as defence, media, banking, and telecommunications, which are considered strategic or sensitive for their national interests. However, by doing so, these countries may also miss out on the potential benefits of FDI, such as access to advanced technologies, skills, markets, and networks that could enhance their innovation and growth capabilities. For example, some studies have found that FDI can increase the productivity, efficiency, and competitiveness of local firms and industries through technology spillovers, knowledge transfer, and linkages. Therefore, these countries may face a trade-off between protecting their local interests and promoting their global integration (Blomström & Kokko, 1998; Javorcik, 2004; Meyer & Sinani, 2009; OECD, 2010; UNCTAD, 2019).

Incentive Schemes: Governments may offer incentives such as tax breaks or subsidies to attract FDI. Such schemes can positively impact startups, as foreign investors' involvement may lead to increased resources and mentoring. By offering incentives to foreign investors, governments aim to make their countries more attractive and competitive for FDI, especially in sectors that are considered priority or potential for development (Te Velde, 2001; OECD, 2002; World Bank Group, 2017). For example, some countries offer tax exemptions, grants, or loans to foreign investors who invest in renewable energy, biotechnology, or digital services. These incentives can lower the costs and risks of FDI, and increase the returns and benefits for both foreign investors and the host countries (UNCTAD, 2010; Goh & Wong, 2019; OECD, 2019). For local startups, foreign investors' involvement can provide them with more resources and mentoring that can help them grow and succeed. For example, foreign investors can provide capital, technology, skills, networks, and reputation that can improve the startups' products and services, market access, and innovation capabilities (Javorcik, 2004; Meyer Sinani, 2009; Yeboah et al., 2023). Foreign investors can also offer guidance, feedback, and support to the startups, helping them overcome challenges and seize opportunities. Therefore, incentive schemes can create a win-win situation for both foreign investors and local startups (OECD, 2002; Isenberg, 2010; Bruton et al., 2015; World Bank Group, 2017; UNCTAD, 2018; Yeboah et al., 2023).

Ownership Restrictions: Limitations on foreign ownership in certain industries can safeguard domestic control (Buckley et al., 2007; Pradhan, 2011; Aggarwal & Kumar, 2012). However, stringent restrictions might deter potential investors and hamper startup collaborations with foreign entities (Pradhan, 2011; Danzman, 2020; OECD, 2023a; 2023b). By limiting the share of foreign ownership in certain industries, such as natural resources, utilities, or media, governments can ensure that they retain their authority and influence over these sectors, which are often vital for their national interests, security, and identity. For example, some countries require that foreign investors form joint ventures with local partners, or obtain approval from the government before they can invest in these sectors (Buckley et al., 2007; Pradhan, 2011; Aggarwal & Kumar, 2012). However, by imposing such restrictions, governments may also discourage foreign investors from entering their markets, as they may perceive them as too costly, risky, or complicated. For example, some studies have found that ownership restrictions reduce the amount and quality of FDI inflows (Danzman, 2020; OECD, 2023a; 2023b). Furthermore, ownership restrictions may also hinder the collaboration and integration of local startups with foreign entities, such as investors, customers, suppliers, or partners. For example, some startups may face difficulties in raising funds, accessing markets, or acquiring technologies from foreign sources, due to legal and regulatory barriers (Danzman, 2020; Meyer & Sinani, 2009; Yeboah et al., 2023). Therefore, ownership restrictions may have both positive and negative impacts on local startups and their ecosystems (Javorcik & Spatareanu, 2005; Estrin & Uvalic, 2014; OECD, 2019).

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The regulatory environment significantly influences the interplay between FDI and entrepreneurial ecosystems:

Fostering Innovation: Favourable regulatory frameworks that encourage competition, protect intellectual property, and simplify business registration can stimulate innovation and attract FDI that supports startups (World Bank Group, 2017; OECD, 2018; OECD, 2019). By fostering innovation, governments can create a dynamic and vibrant entrepreneurial ecosystem that can generate new ideas, products, and services that meet the needs and preferences of customers and markets (OECD, 2010; Audretsch & Link, 2012; World Bank Group, 2019). To do so, governments need to implement favourable regulatory frameworks that can create a level playing field for all actors, safeguard the rights and interests of innovators, and reduce the barriers and costs of starting and running a business (OECD, 2010; Audretsch & Link, 2012; World Bank Group, 2019). For example, some countries have adopted policies such as antitrust laws, patent systems, and online platforms that can encourage competition, protect intellectual property, and simplify business registration. These policies can stimulate innovation by incentivizing creativity, rewarding effort, and facilitating entry and exit. Moreover, these policies can also attract FDI that supports startups, as foreign investors are more likely to invest in countries that have a conducive environment for innovation and entrepreneurship (OECD, 2010; Audretsch & Link, 2012; World Bank Group, 2019). For example, some studies have found that FDI inflows are positively associated with the quality of institutions, the protection of property rights, and the ease of doing business. Foreign investors can provide valuable resources and support to local startups, such as capital, technology, skills, networks, and mentoring (Alfaro et al., 2004; Javorcik, 2004; Yeboah et al., 2023). Therefore, fostering innovation through favourable regulatory frameworks can benefit both local startups and foreign investors (Brouwer & Kleinknecht, 1999; Blomström & Kokko, 2003; Acs & Szerb, 2007).

Investor Confidence: Clear and transparent regulations build investor confidence by reducing uncertainty and risks. A stable regulatory environment attracts FDI, benefiting local startups through increased funding options. This means that foreign investors prefer to invest in countries that have consistent and predictable rules and policies that govern their business activities, such as taxation, trade, labour, and environmental regulations (Busse & Hefeker, 2007 Daude & Stein, 2007; World Bank Group, 2017). Clear and transparent regulations reduce the uncertainty and risks that foreign investors face, such as policy changes, corruption, expropriation, or disputes. A stable regulatory environment increases the trust and confidence of foreign investors, making them more willing to commit their resources and engage in long-term relationships with the host countries (Busse & Hefeker, 2007 Daude & Stein, 2007; World Bank Group, 2017). FDI inflows can benefit local startups through increased funding options, as foreign investors can provide capital, equity, loans, or guarantees that can help the startups finance their operations, expansion, or innovation (Meyer & Sinani, 2009; World Bank Group, 2017; Yeboah et al., 2023). For example, some studies have found that FDI can increase the availability and reduce the cost of external finance for local firms. Therefore, investor confidence is an important factor that influences FDI decisions and impacts local startups (Busse & Hefeker, 2007; Alfaro et al., 2008; Manova, 2013).

Ease of Doing Business: Simplified administrative procedures and reduced bureaucratic hurdles make it easier for startups to engage with FDI partners, fostering collaboration and knowledge exchange. This means that startups can benefit from a business-friendly environment that reduces the time, cost, and complexity of dealing with government regulations and formalities, such as registering a business, obtaining permits, paying taxes, enforcing contracts, or resolving disputes (OECD, 2015; UNCTAD, 2018; World Bank Group, 2019). Simplified administrative procedures and reduced bureaucratic hurdles can also facilitate the entry and operation of foreign investors, who can provide capital, technology, skills, networks, and mentoring to local startups. By making it easier for startups to engage with FDI partners, governments can foster collaboration and knowledge exchange between them, creating synergies and spillovers that can enhance their innovation and growth potential (Narula & Pineli, 2016; Blonigen, 2018; Nazzal et al., 2023). For example, some studies have found that ease of doing business is positively associated with FDI inflows and startup activity. Therefore, ease of doing business is an important factor that influences the interaction between FDI and startups (Djankov et al., 2002; Kalemli-Ozcan et al., 2010; Klapper et al., 2010).

Policy Alignment: Alignment between FDI policies and broader entrepreneurial ecosystem strategies ensures a cohesive environment that maximizes the benefits of FDI while safeguarding local interests. Policy alignment is an important factor for enhancing the positive effects of foreign direct investment (FDI) on the host country's economic development. Alignment between FDI policies and broader entrepreneurial ecosystem strategies ensures a cohesive environment that maximizes the benefits of FDI while safeguarding local interests (Kokko, 2003; OECD, 2019). For example, FDI policies that promote linkages and spillovers between foreign and domestic firms can foster productivity and innovation in the local economy (OECD, 2019). Similarly, FDI policies that encourage cross-border collaboration in innovation can help the host country access global knowledge networks and enhance its technological capabilities (UNCTAD, 2020).

Economic Diversification: Strategic alignment of FDI policies with national economic development goals can encourage investments that promote diversification, benefitting startups in emerging sectors (Kim & Milner, 2021; Benetrix et al., 2023; World Economic Forum, 2023). However, excessive regulatory complexity, lack of enforcement, or inconsistent policy implementation can create obstacles for FDI and hinder entrepreneurial growth. Economic diversification is a key element of economic development that can reduce vulnerability to external shocks and foster productivity and innovation (Iizuka & Katz, 2019). Strategic alignment of FDI policies with national economic development goals can encourage investments that promote diversification, benefitting startups in emerging sectors (Chimhowu et al., 2019). However, excessive regulatory complexity, lack of enforcement, or inconsistent policy implementation can create obstacles for FDI and hinder entrepreneurial growth (Grainger-Brown & Malekpour, 2019). Therefore, it is important to design and implement FDI policies that are coherent with the broader objectives and strategies of national development plans.

In general, comparative analysis of FDI policies across developing nations highlights the varying strategies employed to attract foreign investment while safeguarding local interests. The regulatory environment's alignment with entrepreneurial ecosystem objectives and international best practices is pivotal in ensuring that FDI positively impacts startups. The balance between openness to FDI and protective measures requires careful consideration to maximize the collaborative potential between foreign investors and local entrepreneurs, ultimately driving innovation, growth, and sustainable economic development.

CONCLUSIONS

The comparative analysis of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) policies in developing nations underscores the significant variations in approaches and their far-reaching implications for entrepreneurial ecosystems. The key conclusions drawn from this systematic review are as follows:

Diverse FDI Policy Approaches: Developing nations exhibit a spectrum of FDI policy approaches. Some opt for liberal and open policies, actively seeking foreign capital, technology, and skills to bolster domestic industries. Conversely, others adopt more restrictive policies, aiming to safeguard national interests and indigenous enterprises. The choice of FDI policy significantly influences a country's integration into global markets and technology networks.

Openness to FDI Enhances Entrepreneurial Ecosystems: Nations that embrace liberal FDI policies tend to create a more conducive environment for entrepreneurial growth. By reducing regulatory barriers, these countries attract foreign investors who bring not only financial resources but also valuable assets such as technology, skills, and networks. Local startups benefit by accessing capital, expanding their markets, and learning from foreign counterparts, contributing to a competitive and innovative entrepreneurial ecosystem.

Sectoral Restrictions Pose Trade-offs: The imposition of sector-specific restrictions on FDI, while safeguarding local interests and sensitive industries, may limit access to foreign investment that drives innovation and growth. Balancing the preservation of national sovereignty with the benefits of FDI becomes a critical challenge. Strategic planning is required to strike a balance between protectionism and the advantages of technological spillovers and knowledge transfer associated with FDI.

Incentive Schemes Attract Investment: Governments offering incentives such as tax breaks or subsidies successfully attract FDI, which, in turn, benefits local startups through increased resources and mentoring. Incentive schemes create a win-win situation for both foreign investors and startups, reducing the cost and risk of FDI while providing startups with valuable support to foster growth and innovation.

Ownership Restrictions Have Mixed Impacts: Limiting foreign ownership in certain industries safeguards domestic control but may deter potential investors and hinder startup collaborations with foreign entities. Careful consideration is required when implementing ownership restrictions to balance the advantages of retaining control with the potential drawbacks of reduced FDI inflows and limited international collaborations.

Regulatory Environment Shapes Entrepreneurship: The regulatory environment plays a pivotal role in shaping the interplay between FDI and entrepreneurial ecosystems. Favourable regulatory frameworks that encourage competition, protect intellectual property, and simplify business registration stimulate innovation and attract FDI. A clear and transparent regulatory environment builds investor confidence, benefiting local startups through increased funding options.

Policy Alignment is Crucial: Aligning FDI policies with broader entrepreneurial ecosystem strategies is essential to maximize the benefits of FDI while safeguarding local interests. Policies that promote linkages and spillovers between foreign and domestic firms foster innovation and productivity. Ensuring coherence between FDI policies and national development goals is vital for economic diversification and growth.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The findings of the study hold several important policy implications:

Strategic FDI Planning: Developing nations should formulate FDI policies that align with their economic development goals. A well-balanced approach should consider the preservation of national interests while capitalizing on the potential benefits of FDI, such as technology transfer and market access.

Enhanced Regulatory Environment: Policymakers should focus on creating a favourable regulatory environment that encourages competition, protects intellectual property rights, and simplifies business registration. This can stimulate innovation and attract FDI, benefiting both local startups and foreign investors.

Incentivizing Investments: Governments can use incentive schemes to attract FDI in sectors vital for national development. Offering tax exemptions, grants, or loans can make the country more attractive to foreign investors and provide local startups with access to valuable resources and mentorship.

Balancing Ownership Restrictions: When implementing ownership restrictions, policymakers should carefully assess the trade-offs between safeguarding national interests and limiting foreign investment. Transparent and consistent regulations can mitigate potential negative impacts on FDI and collaborations with startups.

DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The following areas merit further research attention:

Long-Term Impact: Future studies should explore the long-term effects of FDI policies on the sustainability and resilience of entrepreneurial ecosystems in developing nations.

Qualitative Analysis: In-depth qualitative research can provide nuanced insights into the motivations and experiences of foreign investors and startups within various FDI policy environments.

Comparative Case Studies: Comparative case studies can offer a deeper understanding of the outcomes of different FDI policy approaches in specific industries and regions.

Dynamic Analysis: Analysing the adaptability of FDI policies in response to changing global economic dynamics and technological advancements is crucial.

SME Focus: Research specifically targeting the impact of FDI policies on small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) within entrepreneurial ecosystems can shed light on the unique challenges and opportunities they face.

CONCLUDING NOTE

FDI policies in developing nations play a pivotal role in shaping entrepreneurial ecosystems. Balancing openness to FDI with strategic protections presents both opportunities and challenges and future research can provide valuable insights to guide policymakers and entrepreneurs in fostering sustainable economic development.

REFERENCES

Acs, Z. J., & Szerb, L. (2007). Entrepreneurship, economic growth and public policy. *Small Business Economics, 28*(2-3), 109-122.

Agbola, F. W. (2013). Does human capital constrain the impact of foreign direct investment and remittances on economic growth in Ghana? *Applied Economics, 45*(32), 4625-4636.

Aggarwal, A., & Kumar, N. (2012). Structural change, industrialization and poverty reduction: the case of India. In Structural change and industrial development in the BRICS (pp. 83-117). Oxford University Press.

Aitken, B. J., & Harrison, A. E. (1999). Do domestic firms benefit from direct foreign investment? Evidence from Venezuela. *American Economic Review, 89*(3), 605-618.

Alfaro, L., & Chauvin, J. (2017). Foreign direct investment, finance, and economic development. In F. Rivera-Batiz & M. Spatareanu (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of international economics and global trade*. World Scientific Publishing. https://www.hbs.edu/ris/Publication%20Files/FDICapital_Formatted_20170922_Final_W_c7fcb82c-f318-4632-a589-20118eaeebf8.pdf

Alfaro, L., & Chen, M. X. (2014). The global agglomeration of multinational firms. *The Journal of International Economics, 94*(2), 263-276.

Alfaro, L., Chanda, A., Kalemli-Ozcan, S., & Sayek, S. (2004). FDI and economic growth: the role of local financial markets. *Journal of International Economics, 64*(1), 89-112.

Alfaro, L., Kalemli-Ozcan, S., & Volosovych, V. (2008). Why doesn't capital flow from rich to poor countries? An empirical investigation. *The Review of Economics and Statistics, 90*(2), 347-368.

Asiedu, E., & Lien, D. (2011). Democracy, foreign direct investment and natural resources. *Journal of International Economics, 84*(1), 99-111.

Audretsch, D. B., & Link, A. N. (2012). Entrepreneurship and innovation: public policy frameworks. *The Journal of Technology Transfer, 37*(1), 1-17.

Balasubramanyam, V. N., Salisu, M., & Sapsford, D. (1996). Foreign direct investment and growth in EP and IS countries. *The Economic Journal, 106*(434), 92-105.

Barry, F., & Bradley, J. (1997). FDI and trade: The Irish host-country experience. *The Economic Journal, 107*(445), 1798-1811.

Benetrix, A., Pallan, H., & Panizza, U. (2023). The elusive link between FDI and economic growth. *World Bank Blogs*. https://blogs.worldbank.org/developmenttalk/elusive-link-between-fdi-and-economic-growth

Blomström, M., & Kokko, A. (1998). Multinational corporations and spillovers. *Journal of Economic Surveys, 12*(3), 247-277.

Blomström, M., & Kokko, A. (2003). The economics of foreign direct investment incentives. In H. Herrmann & R. J. Lipsey (Eds.), Foreign direct investment in the real and financial sector of industrial countries (pp. 37-60). *Springer.*

Blonigen, B. A. (2018). Foreign direct investment. In S. N. Durlauf & L. E. Blume (Eds.), The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics (pp. 1-9). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Borensztein, E., De Gregorio, J., & Lee, J. W. (1998). How does foreign direct investment affect economic growth? *Journal of International Economics, 45*(1), 115-135

Brouwer, E., & Kleinknecht, A. (1999). Innovative output, and a firm's propensity to patent.: An exploration of CIS micro data. *Research Policy, 28*(6), 615-624.

Bruton, G., Khavul, S., Siegel, D., & Wright, M. (2015). New financial alternatives in seeding entrepreneurship: Microfinance, crowdfunding, and peer-to-peer innovations. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 39*(1), 9-26.

Buckley, P. J., Clegg, L. J., Cross, A. R., Liu, X., Voss, H., & Zheng, P. (2007). The determinants of Chinese outward foreign direct investment. *Journal of International Business Studies, 38*(4), 499-518

Busse, M., & Hefeker, C. (2007). Political risk, institutions and foreign direct investment. European *Journal of Political Economy, 23*(2), 397-415.

Cantner, U., Cunningham, J.A., Lehmann, Menter, M. (2021). Entrepreneurial ecosystems: a dynamic lifecycle model. *Small Bus Econ 57*, 407-423 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-020-00316-0

Caves, R. E. (2007). Multinational enterprise and economic analysis (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press

Chen, C., Chang, L., & Zhang, Y. (1995). The role of foreign direct investment in China's post-1978 economic development. *World Development, 23*(4), 691-703.

Chimhowu, A., Hulme, D., & Munro, L. T. (2019). The 'new' national development planning and global development goals: Processes and partnerships. *World Development, 120*, 76-89.

Chitranka, K. (2021). Review of FDI policies in India and China: Analysis and interpretation. *ResearchGate.* https://www.researchgate.net/publication/362814874_Review_of_FDI_Policies_in_India_and_China_Analysis_and_Interpretation

Danzman, S. B. (2020). Foreign direct investment policy, domestic firms, and financial constraints. Business and Politics, 22(2), 223-254.

Daude, C., & Stein, E. (2007). The quality of institutions and foreign direct investment. *Economics & Politics, 19*(3), 317-344.

De Mello Jr., L. R. (1999). Foreign direct investment-led growth: evidence from time series and panel data. *Oxford Economic Papers, 51*(1), 133-151.

Djankov, S., La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., & Shleifer, A. (2002). The regulation of entry. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 117*(1), 1-37.

Dunning, J. H., & Lundan, S. M. (2008). Multinational enterprises and the global economy (2nd ed.). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Dunning, J. H., & Narula, R. (1996). Foreign direct investment and governments: Catalysts for economic restructuring. Routledge.

Estrin, S., & Uvalic, M. (2014). FDI into transition economies: Are the Balkans different? *Economics of Transition, 22*(2), 281-312.

Goh, C., & Wong, J. (2019). The impact of tax incentives on FDI: evidence from Singapore's biotechnology sector. *Journal of Asian Economics, 64*, 101140.

Görg, H., & Greenaway, D. (2004). Much ado about nothing? Do domestic firms really benefit from foreign direct investment? *World Bank Research Observer, 19*(2), 171-197.

Görg, H., & Strobl, E. (2002). Multinational companies and indigenous development: An empirical analysis. *European Economic Review, 46*(7), 1305-13221

Goyal, R. (2014). Comparative analysis of India and China FDI policy. https://ssrn.com/abstract=2407914

Grainger-Brown, J., & Malekpour, S. (2019). Transforming towards sustainable development: The role of national development banks. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, *34*, 1-15.

Iizuka, M., & Katz, J. (2019). Economic diversification: Explaining the pattern of diversification in the global economy and its implications for fostering diversification in poorer countries. *UNU-MERIT Working Paper Series*, 2019-040.

Indian Economy. (2022). FDI limit in various sectors of the economy (Consolidated FDI Policy). Indian Economy.

Isenberg, D. J. (2010). How to start an entrepreneurial revolution. Harvard Business Review, 88(6), 40-50.

Javorcik, B. S. (2004). Does foreign direct investment increase the productivity of domestic firms? In search of spillovers through backward linkages. *American Economic Review, 94*(3), 605-627. https://doi.org/10.1257/0002828041464605

Javorcik, B. S., & Spatareanu, M. (2005). Do foreign investors care about labour market regulations? *Review of World Economics, 141*(3), 375-403.

Kalemli-Ozcan, S., Chanda, A., Alfaro, L., & Sayek, S. (2010). How does foreign direct investment promote economic growth? Exploring the effects of financial markets on linkages. Journal of Development Economics, 91(2), 242-256.

Khanna, T., & Palepu, K. (2010). Winning in emerging markets: A road map for strategy and execution. *Harvard Business Press*.

Kim, S., & Milner, H. V. (2021). What explains the politics of foreign direct investment (FDI) policy? Cambridge Core Blog. https://www.cambridge.org/core/blog/2021/04/20/what-explains-the-politics-of-foreign-direct-investment-fdi-policy/

Kimura, F., & Todo, Y. (2018). FDI and its impacts on entrepreneurship and informal markets: A double-edged sword. Asia Pathways.

Klapper, L., Amit, R., & Guillén, M. F. (2010). Entrepreneurship and firm formation across countries. In J. Lerner & A. Schoar (Eds.), International differences in entrepreneurship (pp. 129-158). University of Chicago Press.

Kokko, A. (2003). Globalization and FDI policies. In The development dimension of FDI: Policy and rule-making perspectives (pp. 29-40). United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

Kuznetsov, A., & Kuznetsova, O. (2019). FDI policies and catching-up strategies in the context of regional innovation systems: evidence from Russian regions. *Regional Studies, 53*(11), 1596-1606.

Li, X., & Liu, X. (2005). Foreign direct investment and economic growth: an increasingly endogenous relationship. *World Development, 33*(3), 393-407.

Li, X., & Liu, X. (2021). The impact of Greenfield investment on domestic entrepreneurship. Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, 10(1), 1-18.

Manova, K. (2013). Credit constraints, heterogeneous firms, and international trade. The Review of Economic Studies, 80(2), 711-744.

Maskus, K. E., & Penubarti, M. (1995). How trade-related are intellectual property rights? Journal of International Economics, 39(3-4), 227-248.

Meyer, K. E., & Peng, M. W. (2016). Theoretical foundations of emerging economy business research. *Journal of International Business Studies, 47*(1), 3-22.

Meyer, K. E., & Sinani, E. (2009). When and where does foreign direct investment generate positive spillovers? A meta-analysis. *Journal of International Business Studies, 40*(7), 1075-1094.

Narula, R., & Pineli, A. (2016). Foreign direct investment (FDI) and economic development. In J. M. Michie (Ed.), The Handbook of Globalisation (pp. 179-194). Edward Elgar Publishing

Narula, R., & Pineli, A. (2019). Improving the developmental impact of multinational enterprises: Policy and research challenges. Economia e Politica Industriale. *Journal of Industrial Economics Policy Management 46*(1), 1-24.

Nazzal, A., Sánchez-Rebull, M.-V., & Niñerola, A. (2023). Foreign direct investment by multinational corporations in emerging economies: a comprehensive bibliometric analysis. *International Journal of Emerging Markets,* ahead-of-print(ahead-of-print).

Nguyen, N. M. (2023). The effect of FDI on domestic entrepreneurship: the case of greenfield investment and cross-border M&A activities. *Journal of Economics and Development, 25*(1), 62-78.https://doi.org/10.1108/JED-11-2022-0228

Nwakeze, E. O., Orajekwe, J. C., Sylvanus, A., Onyebiuwanso, R., & Oshiole, S. (2023). Nexus between foreign direct investment (FDI) and economic growth (EG): A study of 10 countries of the world (2018 - 2022). *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 19*(01), 1511-15222

O'Donovan, D., & Ruane, F. (2004). The role of FDI in Ireland's economic renaissance. In D. Greenaway, R. Upward, & K. Wakelin (Eds.), Trade, investment, migration and labour market adjustment (pp. 55-75). Palgrave Macmillan.

OECD. (2002). Foreign direct investment for development: maximising benefits, minimising costs. OECD Publishing

OECD. (2010). OECD's FDI regulatory restrictiveness index: 2010 update. *OECD* Working Papers on International Investment, 2010/03.

OECD. (2015). Policy framework for investment 2015 edition. OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2019). FDI qualities toolkit: measuring the sustainable development impacts of investment. OECD.

OECD. (2019). Making the most of FDI for development: A new agenda for multilateral cooperation. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

OECD. (2019). Policies for improving FDI impacts on productivity and innovation. In FDI Qualities Assessment of Ireland (pp. 31-54). OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2023). Fostering FDI-SME ecosystems to boost productivity and innovation. Retrieved from OECD website.

OECD. (2023a). FDI restrictiveness (indicator). OECD Data.

OECD. (2023b). FDI regulatory restrictiveness index. OECD.

Piteli, E.E.N. (2018). Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) and Economic Development. In: Augier, M., Teece, D.J. (eds) The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Strategic Management. Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-00772-8_99

Pradhan, J. P. (2011). Emerging multinationals from India and China: origin, impetus and growth. In Emerging multinationals in emerging markets (pp. 88-115). Cambridge University Press.

Sauvant, K. P., & Chen, V. Z. (2014). China's regulatory framework for outward foreign direct investment. China Economic Journal, 7(1), 141-163. https://www.nortonrosefulbright.com/en-us/knowledge/publications/cb7bbd10/global-rules-on-foreign-direct-investment

SelectUSA Investor Guide - FDI Restrictions. (2021). U.S. Department of Commerce. https://www.trade.gov/sites/default/files/2021-05/Chapter%206%20-%20FDI%20Restrictions.pdf

Slesman, L., Abubakar, Y. A., & Mitra, J. (2021). Foreign direct investment and entrepreneurship: Does the role of institutions matter? International Business Review, 30(4), 1017741

Stam, E. (2015). Entrepreneurial ecosystems and regional policy: A sympathetic critique. European Planning Studies, 23(9), 1759-1769. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11187-021-00487-4

Tan, K. Y. (2004). Singapore's national innovation system: from industrialisation to innovation. In H. W. Chesbrough, W. Vanhaverbeke, & J. West (Eds.), Open innovation: researching a new paradigm (pp. 287-307). Oxford University Press.

Tan, K. Y. (2017). Foreign direct investment and economic growth in Singapore: A critical perspective. Routledge

Te Velde, D. W. (2001). Policies towards foreign direct investment in developing countries: emerging best-practices and outstanding issues. Overseas Development Institute.

U.S. Department of Commerce. (2021). SelectUSA investor guide - FDI restrictions. Trade.gov

UNCTAD. (2010). World investment report 2010: investing in a low-carbon economy. United Nations.

UNCTAD. (2018). Investment policy monitor: Special issue on investment policies related to the digital economy. United Nations.

UNCTAD. (2018). Policy coherence for productive capacities development: A framework for analysis. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

UNCTAD. (2018). World investment report 2018: investment and new industrial policies. United Nations.

UNCTAD. (2019). Digital economy report 2019: Value creation and capture: Implications for developing countries. Digital Economy Report (unctad.org)

UNCTAD. (2019). World investment report 2019: Special economic zones. United Nations

UNCTAD. (2020). Foreign direct investment and gender inequality: evidence from South Africa. Transnational Corporations, 27(3), 93-114.

UNCTAD. (2020). World investment report 2020: International production beyond the pandemic. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

Veeramani, S., Shukla, A. & Jamaleh, M. (2020). Financial theories of foreign direct investment: a review of literature. J. Ind. Bus. Econ. 47, 185-217 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40812-019-00144-8

World Bank Group. (2017). How developing countries can get the most out of direct investment. World Bank Group.

World Bank Group. (2019). Doing business 2019: training for reform. World Bank Group.

World Bank Group. (2019). The innovation imperative for developing East Asia. World Bank Group.

World Bank. (2020). Doing business 2020: Comparing business regulation in 190 economies. World Bank Group.

World Economic Forum. (2023). Global investment policy. https://www.weforum.org/projects/investment

Yeboah, S., Gyan, S., & Nyarkoh, B. J. (2023). Harmonizing FDI and local entrepreneurship: Strategies for inclusive growth. *Munich Personal RePEc* Archive. https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/118385/