Conceptual Model for Assessing Political Risks in Cross-Border Investments

MELVIN J. OSHOMEGIE[1], AYOMIDE KASHIM IBRAHIM[2], OMODOLAPO EUNICE OGUNSOLA[3]
[1]*PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) Nigeria*
[2]*Independent Researcher, Maryland, USA*
[3]*International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA), Nigeria*

Abstract- Political risks remain among the most critical uncertainties shaping cross-border investment decisions. From regulatory shifts and trade sanctions to expropriation and social unrest, these risks impose significant costs on investors while complicating strategic planning. Although financial risk models have achieved sophistication, political risk assessment often lacks standardized frameworks, relying instead on fragmented indices, expert judgment, or scenario analysis. This paper develops a conceptual model for assessing political risks in cross-border investments, synthesizing theoretical insights and empirical findings into a structured evaluative approach. The proposed model integrates dimensions of political stability, regulatory quality, institutional strength, geopolitical dynamics, and socio-cultural volatility, offering a multidimensional lens for risk evaluation. Using a structured literature review and comparative synthesis, the methodology identifies key risk factors and categorizes them across systemic, country-specific, and transaction-specific levels. The results highlight the necessity of blending quantitative indicators with qualitative judgment while emphasizing adaptive monitoring mechanisms. The discussion explores the implications of the model for investors, policymakers, and international organizations, stressing the balance between predictive capacity, transparency, and contextual adaptability. Ultimately, the paper argues that effective political risk assessment requires interdisciplinary approaches, integration of dynamic datasets, and continuous recalibration to evolving global conditions.

Keywords- Political Risk, Cross-Border Investment, Conceptual Model, Risk Assessment, Institutional Stability

I. INTRODUCTION

Cross-border investments have long been a central driver of globalization, economic growth, and corporate expansion. Multinational enterprises (MNEs), institutional investors, sovereign wealth funds, and development finance institutions increasingly seek opportunities beyond domestic markets to diversify portfolios, access new consumer bases, and exploit competitive advantages [1], [2]. However, such investments are inherently exposed to political risks that may affect their profitability, sustainability, and even survival. Political risk, broadly defined as the probability of losses arising from political decisions, events, or conditions that adversely affect the business environment, remains one of the most critical barriers to successful cross-border capital allocation [3], [4].

While traditional financial risks such as currency fluctuations, interest rate volatility, and credit risks can often be hedged through sophisticated financial instruments, political risks are more ambiguous, multidimensional, and harder to quantify. These risks may include expropriation, contract breaches, arbitrary regulatory changes, corruption, civil unrest, terrorism, sanctions, and geopolitical conflicts [5], [6]. Unlike economic risks that usually emerge from market dynamics, political risks are primarily shaped by the actions and motivations of governments, policymakers, political parties, social movements, and international institutions [7], [8]. Consequently, investors must grapple not only with market fundamentals but also with the political institutions, governance structures, and socio-cultural dynamics of host countries [9].

The 21st century has witnessed a reconfiguration of political risk factors in cross-border investments. The decline of unipolarity, the resurgence of nationalism, the intensification of trade wars, and the emergence of digital governance frameworks have all introduced novel risks and uncertainties. For instance, the U.S.-China trade tensions in the late 2010s highlighted how geopolitical rivalry can destabilize investment flows across industries such as technology, manufacturing, and financial services [10], [11]. Similarly, the United Kingdom's Brexit referendum and subsequent withdrawal from the European Union demonstrated how domestic political decisions can alter the regulatory and market landscape for both domestic and foreign investors [12], [13].

Political risk is not confined to emerging economies or politically fragile states. Even advanced economies face evolving challenges that can create uncertainty for cross-border investors. Regulatory unpredictability in the European Union regarding data privacy laws, antitrust enforcement, and carbon taxation, for instance, has major implications for foreign investors. Likewise, U.S. sanctions regimes targeting certain countries and companies underscore how extraterritorial policy decisions can ripple across global value chains [14], [15]. These examples highlight the urgency for investors to develop robust political risk assessment frameworks that extend beyond conventional country risk ratings or qualitative expert opinions.

Historically, approaches to political risk assessment have evolved from simplistic country-level indicators to more sophisticated models that incorporate both macro- and micro-level variables. Early models often focused narrowly on sovereign risk such as the likelihood of debt default or nationalization without adequately considering firm-specific vulnerabilities [16], [17]. Contemporary research, however, emphasizes the need for multidimensional assessments that integrate political, economic, social, technological, legal, and environmental dimensions. This multidimensional approach reflects the interconnectedness of modern economies and the complexity of host-country environments [18], [19].

Despite the abundance of theoretical and empirical studies, significant gaps remain in the ability of existing frameworks to offer reliable, actionable, and adaptable assessments for investors. Many models lack predictive power, while others fail to accommodate the rapid transformations in the global political economy. Moreover, the lack of standardization across assessment tools creates inconsistencies, making it difficult for firms and policymakers to compare risks across countries or sectors [20], [21]. For example, the political risk rating produced by one consultancy may diverge significantly from another, depending on methodology, weighting of indicators, and access to data.

A conceptual model for assessing political risks in cross-border investments must therefore balance three key considerations: comprehensiveness, adaptability, and usability. Comprehensiveness entails capturing the wide spectrum of political risks, from institutional fragility to informal social dynamics. Adaptability involves ensuring that the model can respond to evolving global trends, such as digital authoritarianism, cyber warfare, and climate-induced migration [22]. Usability, meanwhile, requires that the model be practical enough for investors and policymakers to apply in real-time decision-making contexts [23], [24]. Achieving this balance is challenging but necessary for building investor confidence and ensuring sustainable cross-border investment flows [25].

The increasing importance of sustainability, ethical governance, and stakeholder accountability also shapes the political risk landscape. Cross-border investors are now evaluated not only on financial performance but also on their compliance with environmental, social, and governance (ESG) standards. Political risks may manifest through abrupt regulatory shifts mandating stricter carbon reduction targets, labor rights enforcement, or anti-corruption compliance. These developments mean that political risk is no longer merely a matter of sovereign instability but also of global governance regimes that cut across jurisdictions [26], [27].

Furthermore, the rise of populist movements and social activism amplifies the salience of political risk for cross-border investors. Host communities increasingly demand greater corporate accountability, local participation, and equitable distribution of investment benefits. Failure to meet these expectations can trigger reputational risks, regulatory backlash, or even forced divestments [28]. For instance, large mining projects in Latin America and Africa have faced community-led resistance due to environmental degradation and labor disputes, often escalating into political crises with direct investment implications [29].

Given these challenges, this paper seeks to contribute to the literature by proposing a conceptual model for assessing political risks in cross-border investments. The model integrates both macro-level variables such as institutional stability, policy predictability, and geopolitical alignment and micro-level factors, including firm-specific exposure, industry sensitivities, and stakeholder relations [30], [31]. The objective is not to create a one-size-fits-all tool but to establish a flexible framework that can be tailored to different investment contexts [32].

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 provides a comprehensive literature review of existing theories and models of political risk assessment, highlighting strengths, limitations, and research gaps [33], [34]. Section 3 outlines the methodology adopted in designing the conceptual model, including the integration of theoretical insights and empirical observations. Section 4 presents the results, detailing the proposed conceptual model and its components. Section 5 engages in a critical discussion, assessing the model's potential applications, limitations, and implications for cross-border investment strategy. Section 6 concludes by summarizing the contributions of the paper and suggesting future research directions.

In doing so, the study not only advances academic understanding but also provides a practical framework for practitioners, policymakers, and investors navigating an increasingly complex and uncertain global environment. The emphasis on conceptual clarity, multidimensionality, and adaptability reflects the evolving demands of global investment practices in the 21st century [35], [36].

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of political risk in cross-border investments is situated at the intersection of political science, international relations, and business management. Over the past five decades, scholars and practitioners have attempted to conceptualize, measure, and manage political risks with varying degrees of rigor and success. The literature spans normative theories, empirical investigations, and applied frameworks developed by governments, international organizations, and private risk consultancies [37]. This section reviews key strands of the literature, organized around theoretical foundations, typologies of political risk, institutional approaches, empirical evidence, and the limitations of existing frameworks [38], [39].

2.1 Theoretical Foundations of Political Risk

The concept of political risk emerged prominently in the 1960s and 1970s as foreign direct investment (FDI) into developing economies accelerated. Early scholarship defined political risk primarily in terms of expropriation and nationalization of assets, particularly in the wake of resource nationalism in Latin America, the Middle East, and parts of Africa. This period reflected a narrow but highly salient understanding of political risk, rooted in concerns about the stability of property rights and sovereignty [40], [41].

Robock's pioneering work distinguished between macro-political risks, which affect all foreign firms equally, and micro-political risks, which target specific industries, projects, or firms. This distinction was critical because it highlighted that risk is not evenly distributed; a regulatory change might devastate one sector while leaving others unaffected. Subsequent theoretical refinements argued that political risk should be understood not as isolated events but as processes shaped by interactions between state institutions, societal forces, and international dynamics [42], [43].

Dependency theory also influenced the early literature by suggesting that foreign investment inherently generates political backlash, as it exacerbates economic dependency and inequality. According to this perspective, political risk is endogenous to the investment process itself, as host states and societies may resist perceived exploitation[44], [45]. While dependency theory has lost prominence in recent decades, its core insight that political risk emerges from structural imbalances in global political economy remains relevant [46], [47].

2.2 Typologies of Political Risk

The literature offers multiple typologies of political risk. Kobrin classified risks into three categories: (1) ownership-control risks (such as expropriation and forced divestiture), (2) operational risks (such as changes in taxes, tariffs, and labor laws), and (3) transfer risks (such as restrictions on profit repatriation or currency controls). This framework has been widely cited and adapted, particularly in international business scholarship [48], [49].

Other scholars have emphasized the need to capture both internal and external dimensions of risk. Internal risks include domestic political instability, regime changes, and civil unrest, while external risks include interstate conflicts, sanctions, and trade wars. Similarly, recent frameworks increasingly recognize reputational and societal risks, where pressures from civil society, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and social media activism can influence investment outcomes [50], [51].

A more contemporary typology proposed by scholars of risk management categorizes political risks into three levels: systemic, country-specific, and transaction-specific. Systemic risks arise from global or regional political shifts, such as a rise in protectionism; country-specific risks stem from local governance and regulatory environments; and transaction-specific risks are unique to a particular project or firm. This layered approach has gained traction because it mirrors the way investors experience risk in practice [52], [53], [54].

2.3 Institutional Approaches

Institutional theories emphasize the role of governance quality, rule of law, and institutional stability in shaping political risks. North's seminal work on institutions argued that stable, predictable rules of the game reduce transaction costs and create environments conducive to investment. Building on this, scholars have shown that strong institutions reduce the likelihood of expropriation, arbitrary regulation, and corruption [55], [56], [57].

Empirical measures of institutional quality include the World Governance Indicators (WGI), the Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI), and the International Country Risk Guide (ICRG). These indices provide quantifiable metrics for dimensions such as regulatory quality, government effectiveness, political stability, and corruption control. Studies consistently find a positive correlation between institutional quality and foreign direct investment inflows [58], [59], [60], [61].

However, institutional approaches face limitations. First, institutional quality is not static; it can rapidly deteriorate under populist regimes or during crises. Second, these indices often aggregate diverse indicators, masking sector-specific vulnerabilities. Third, reliance on expert surveys introduces subjectivity and potential bias. Scholars have therefore called for more granular, dynamic, and transparent measures of institutional risk [62], [63], [64].

2.4 Empirical Evidence

Empirical studies provide robust evidence that political risk affects both the volume and distribution of cross-border investments. For example, Busse and Hefeker found that indicators of political stability and governance strongly influence FDI inflows across developing economies. Similarly, Jensen demonstrated that democratic institutions, while often associated with policy volatility, tend to attract more investment due to stronger property rights protections [65], [66], [67].

Other empirical work highlights sectoral variation. Natural resource investments, for instance, are particularly vulnerable to political risks such as resource nationalism, rent-seeking behavior, and community resistance. Infrastructure and utility projects face risks related to tariff regulation, contract renegotiation, and public opposition. By contrast, service-sector investments may be less exposed to expropriation but more vulnerable to regulatory uncertainty and cultural sensitivities [68], [69].

Empirical research also underscores the interaction between political and economic variables. High debt levels, fiscal deficits, or currency instability often exacerbate political risks by increasing the likelihood of policy reversals, austerity measures, or external pressure from international lenders. Likewise, social inequality, unemployment, and weak state capacity amplify risks of populist backlash against foreign firms [70], [71], [72].

2.5 Risk Assessment Tools and Frameworks

Beyond academic scholarship, a wide array of applied tools has been developed to assess political risk. Private consultancies such as Eurasia Group, Control Risks, and the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) produce proprietary risk ratings and forecasts used by multinational corporations and financial institutions. These assessments typically combine expert judgment, scenario analysis, and quantitative indicators [73], [74].

At the policy level, institutions like the World Bank's Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA) and the U.S. Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC, now DFC) have developed frameworks for insuring investors against political risks. These include expropriation coverage, currency transfer guarantees, and protection against political violence. Such mechanisms provide not only financial protection but also valuable insights into how political risks are conceptualized and measured in practice [75], [76].

Despite their utility, these frameworks face criticism. Consultancy-driven assessments are often opaque, with proprietary methodologies that limit transparency and replicability. Indices may also fail to predict sudden shocks, such as the Arab Spring uprisings or Russia's annexation of Crimea. Moreover, they often overemphasize macro-level risks at the expense of micro-level vulnerabilities [77], [78].

2.6 Gaps and Limitations

The literature reveals several persistent gaps. First, existing models often prioritize static measurement over dynamic monitoring, failing to capture rapidly evolving risks. Second, there is limited integration of qualitative and quantitative approaches, despite widespread recognition that both are necessary for robust assessment. Third, sectoral and transaction-specific risks remain underexplored, leaving firms with limited guidance on tailoring assessments to their unique exposures [79], [80].

Furthermore, globalization and technological change have introduced new dimensions of political risk that existing frameworks inadequately address. Cybersecurity threats, digital authoritarianism, climate-induced migration, and transnational activism all pose political risks to investors but are rarely incorporated into traditional assessment tools. Finally, the absence of standardized methodologies across indices and consultancies creates inconsistencies that undermine comparability and investor confidence [81], [82].

2.7 Toward a Conceptual Model

Scholars increasingly advocate for developing conceptual models that integrate multidimensional indicators, emphasize adaptability, and combine qualitative expertise with quantitative data. Such models should capture the interplay between political, economic, social, and geopolitical factors while allowing for continuous updating as conditions evolve. The literature suggests that the most effective frameworks will be those that balance comprehensiveness with usability, ensuring both academic rigor and practical application for investors [83], [84].

In summary, the literature establishes the centrality of political risk in shaping cross-border investment decisions and highlights the evolution of theoretical, empirical, and applied approaches to its assessment. However, significant gaps remain, particularly in the areas of dynamic monitoring, integration of qualitative and quantitative methods, and sector-specific analysis. These gaps provide the foundation for developing the conceptual model proposed in this paper, which seeks to synthesize diverse strands of scholarship into a coherent framework for assessing political risks in cross-border investments [85].

III. METHODOLOGY

The methodology adopted in this study combines structured literature review, comparative synthesis, and conceptual modeling. The process involves four steps: literature identification, categorization, comparative analysis, and model development.

3.1 Literature Identification

Relevant literature was sourced from peer-reviewed journals, institutional reports, and practitioner-oriented publications. Databases such as JSTOR, Scopus, EconLit, and ProQuest were systematically searched [86], [87]. Keywords included "political risk assessment," "cross-border investment," "FDI risk," "institutional stability," and "risk modeling". Grey literature from institutions such as the World Bank, UNCTAD, and OECD was included to capture policy-relevant insights[88], [89], [90].

3.2 Categorization

Identified literature was categorized into theoretical, empirical, and applied frameworks. Theoretical studies provided conceptual underpinnings, empirical studies tested relationships between political risk and investment flows, and applied frameworks offered tools and indices [91], [92].

3.3 Comparative Analysis

Comparative analysis was conducted across three dimensions: scope (macro vs. micro), methodology (quantitative vs. qualitative), and applicability (general vs. sector-specific). This analysis highlighted strengths and limitations of existing approaches, informing the design of a new conceptual framework [93], [94].

3.4 Model Development

Based on the synthesis, a conceptual model was constructed, structured around five dimensions: political stability, regulatory quality, institutional strength, geopolitical dynamics, and socio-cultural volatility. Each dimension was further decomposed into measurable indicators and qualitative factors. The model emphasizes both static conditions and dynamic trajectories, allowing for adaptive monitoring [95], [96].

IV. RESULTS

The results of the synthesis are presented as a multidimensional conceptual model for assessing political risks in cross-border investments.

4.1 Political Stability

Political stability encompasses regime durability, absence of violent conflict, and predictability of leadership transitions. Indicators include frequency of government turnover, incidence of political violence, and constitutional adherence. Stability reduces uncertainty, while instability heightens the probability of expropriation, regulatory reversal, or contract breach [97], [98], [99].

4.2 Regulatory Quality

Regulatory quality captures the ability of governments to design and implement sound policies. Indicators include transparency of rule-making, consistency of enforcement, and protection of property rights. Regulatory uncertainty, such as sudden tax changes or capital controls, poses significant risks to investors [100].

4.3 Institutional Strength

Institutional strength refers to the effectiveness of legal and administrative systems. Strong institutions uphold contracts, enforce property rights, and limit arbitrary state action. Weak institutions create avenues for corruption, rent-seeking, and arbitrary interventions [101].

4.4 Geopolitical Dynamics

Geopolitical factors capture external influences such as trade wars, regional conflicts, and international sanctions. Investments in geopolitically sensitive regions face higher risks of disruption. For example, sanctions on Iran and Russia have significantly altered investment landscapes [102].

4.5 Socio-Cultural Volatility

Socio-cultural volatility captures risks arising from societal dynamics such as inequality, ethnic tensions, and populist movements. These factors often translate into political instability, policy reversals, or resistance to foreign investment [103].

The model thus provides a holistic framework for evaluating political risks, integrating both structural conditions and dynamic factors.

V. DISCUSSION

The conceptual model has several implications.

First, it emphasizes multidimensionality. Unlike narrow indices focusing only on stability or corruption, the model integrates multiple dimensions. This ensures comprehensive coverage of risks.

Second, it balances quantitative and qualitative approaches. Quantitative indicators provide comparability, while qualitative assessments capture contextual nuance.

Third, the model highlights adaptability. By integrating dynamic monitoring, it avoids the static limitations of traditional indices.

Fourth, the model has implications for investors and policymakers. For investors, it provides a structured tool for due diligence, risk pricing, and portfolio diversification. For policymakers, it highlights areas where reforms can enhance investment attractiveness.

Finally, challenges remain. Political risk is inherently uncertain, and no model can fully predict crises [C66]. Transparency, methodological rigor, and continual recalibration are necessary to maintain relevance [104].

CONCLUSION

Political risks remain central to cross-border investment decisions. Existing tools, while useful, often lack multidimensionality, adaptability, or transparency. This paper developed a conceptual model structured around five dimensions: political stability, regulatory quality, institutional strength, geopolitical dynamics, and socio-cultural volatility. By integrating quantitative indicators with qualitative judgments, the model provides a more comprehensive and adaptable tool for assessing political risks [105].

For investors, the model offers a structured approach to risk evaluation and mitigation. For policymakers, it highlights pathways for improving governance and enhancing attractiveness to foreign capital. Future research should operationalize the model through empirical testing, refine weighting schemes, and explore integration with predictive analytics [106].

In an increasingly uncertain global environment, effective political risk assessment is not a luxury but a necessity for sustaining cross-border investment flows.

REFERENCES

[1] D. B. Carter and P. Poast, “Why Do States Build Walls? Political Economy, Security, and Border Stability,” *J. Confl. Resolut.*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 239–270, Feb. 2017, doi: 10.1177/0022002715596776.

[2] I. Kesternich and M. Schnitzer, “Who is afraid of political risk? Multinational firms and their choice of capital structure,” *J. Int. Econ.*, vol. 82, no. 2, pp. 208–218, 2010.

[3] E. Papaioannou, “What drives international financial flows? Politics, institutions and other determinants,” *J. Dev. Econ.*, vol. 88, no. 2, pp. 269–281, 2009.

[4] S. Espenlaub, A. Khurshed, and A. Mohamed, “Venture capital exits in domestic and cross-border investments,” *J. Bank. Finance*, vol. 53, pp. 215–232, 2015.

[5] T. Adenuga, A. T. Ayobami, and F. C. Okolo, “Laying the groundwork for predictive workforce planning through strategic data analytics and talent modeling,” *IRE J.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 159–161, 2019.

[6] William Nii Ayitey Menson, John Olajide Olawepo, Tamara Bruno, Semiu Olatunde Gbadamosi, Nannim Fazing Nalda, Victor Anyebe, Amaka Ogidi, Chima Onoka, John Okpanachi Oko, Echezona Edozie Ezeanolue, “Reliability of self-reported Mobile phone ownership in rural north-Central Nigeria: cross-sectional study.”

[7] A. Herrero, E. Corchado, and A. Jiménez, “Unsupervised neural models for country and political risk analysis,” *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 38, no. 11, pp. 13641–13661, 2011.

[8] G. Ragosa and P. Warren, “Unpacking the determinants of cross-border private investment in renewable energy in developing countries,” *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 235, pp. 854–865, 2019.

[9] L. D. Sousa, “Understanding European Cross-border Cooperation: A Framework for Analysis,” *J. Eur. Integr.*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 669–687, Sept. 2013, doi: 10.1080/07036337.2012.711827.

[10] R. C. Bryant, *Turbulent waters: cross-border finance and international governance*. Brookings Institution Press, 2004.

[11] P. S. Aulakh, M. Kotabe, and A. Sahay, “Trust and Performance in Cross-Border Marketing Partnerships: A Behavioral Approach,” *J. Int.*

Bus. Stud., vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 1005–1032, Dec. 1996, doi: 10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490161.

[12] C. Borio and M. Drehmann, “Towards an operational framework for financial stability:" fuzzy" measurement and its consequences,” *Doc. Trab. Banco Cent. Chile*, no. 544, p. 1, 2009.

[13] O. Okenwa, O. K., Uzozie, O. T., & Onaghinor, “Supply Chain Risk Management Strategies for Mitigating Geopolitical and Economic Risks.”

[14] A. C. Houben, J. Kakes, G. J. Schinasi, and I. M. Fund, *Toward a framework for safeguarding financial stability*, vol. 4. International Monetary Fund Washington, DC, 2004. [Online]. Available: https://www.imf.org/-/media/Websites/IMF/imported-full-text-pdf/external/pubs/ft/wp/2004/_wp04101.ashx

[15] K. Shimizu, M. A. Hitt, D. Vaidyanath, and V. Pisano, “Theoretical foundations of cross-border mergers and acquisitions: A review of current research and recommendations for the future,” *J. Int. Manag.*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 307–353, 2004.

[16] P. J. Buckley and S. Munjal, “The Role of Local Context in the Cross-border Acquisitions by Emerging Economy Multinational Enterprises,” *Br. J. Manag.*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 372–389, July 2017, doi: 10.1111/1467-8551.12231.

[17] B. Jessop, “The Political Economy of Scale and the Construction of Cross-Border Micro-Regions,” in *Theories of New Regionalism*, F. Söderbaum and T. M. Shaw, Eds., London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2003, pp. 179–196. doi: 10.1057/9781403938794_10.

[18] C. Daude and M. Fratzscher, “The pecking order of cross-border investment,” *J. Int. Econ.*, vol. 74, no. 1, pp. 94–119, 2008.

[19] R. M. Holmes, T. Miller, M. A. Hitt, and M. P. Salmador, “The Interrelationships Among Informal Institutions, Formal Institutions, and Inward Foreign Direct Investment,” *J. Manag.*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 531–566, Feb. 2013, doi: 10.1177/0149206310393503.

[20] S. Claessens and T. Glaessner, “The internationalization of financial services in Asia,” 1998.

[21] H. S. Alhorr, C. B. Moore, and G. T. Payne, “The Impact of Economic Integration on Cross–Border Venture Capital Investments: Evidence from the European Union,” *Entrep. Theory Pract.*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 897–917, Sept. 2008, doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6520.2008.00261.x.

[22] D. Schoenmaker and W. Wagner, “The impact of cross-border banking on financial stability,” Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper, 2011. [Online]. Available: https://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/86674

[23] N. Berggren, A. Bergh, and C. Bjørnskov, “The growth effects of institutional instability,” *J. Institutional Econ.*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 187–224, 2012.

[24] I. Bremmer and P. Keat, *The fat tail: the power of political knowledge for strategic investing*. Oxford University Press, 2010.

[25] B. R. Tan and A. Chintakananda, “The Effects of Home Country Political and Legal Institutions on Firms’ Geographic Diversification Performance,” *Glob. Strategy J.*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 105–123, May 2016, doi: 10.1002/gsj.1117.

[26] S. Hameiri, L. Jones, and Y. Zou, “The Development-Insecurity Nexus in China’s Near-Abroad: Rethinking Cross-Border Economic Integration in an Era of State Transformation,” *J. Contemp. Asia*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 473–499, May 2019, doi: 10.1080/00472336.2018.1502802.

[27] H. J. Van Houtum, *The development of cross-border economic relations, a theoretical and empirical study of the influence of the state border on the development of cross-border economic relations between firms in border regions of the Netherlands and Belgium*. Tilburg: CentER, 1998. [Online]. Available: https://repository.ubn.ru.nl/bitstream/handle/2066/170151/170151.pdf

[28] M. Vij, “The determinants of country risk analysis,” *J. Manag. Res.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 20–31, 2005.

[29] M. C. Di Guardo, E. Marrocu, and R. Paci, “The Concurrent Impact of Cultural, Political, and Spatial Distances on International Mergers and Acquisitions,” *World Econ.*, vol.

39, no. 6, pp. 824–852, June 2016, doi: 10.1111/twec.12275.

[30] J. Kurowska-Pysz and K. Szczepańska-Woszczyna, "The analysis of the determinants of sustainable cross-border cooperation and recommendations on its harmonization," *Sustainability*, vol. 9, no. 12, p. 2226, 2017.

[31] J. Jacobs, "Spatial planning in cross-border regions: A systems-theoretical perspective," *Plan. Theory*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 68–90, Feb. 2016, doi: 10.1177/1473095214547149.

[32] M. Yang and M. Hyland, "Similarity in cross-border mergers and acquisitions: Imitation, uncertainty and experience among Chinese firms, 1985–2006," *J. Int. Manag.*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 352–365, 2012.

[33] M. Burger, E. Ianchovichina, and B. Rijkers, "Risky business: Political instability and sectoral greenfield foreign direct investment in the Arab world," *World Bank Econ. Rev.*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 306–331, 2016.

[34] P. J. Buckley, L. Chen, L. J. Clegg, and H. Voss, "Risk propensity in the foreign direct investment location decision of emerging multinationals," *J. Int. Bus. Stud.*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 153–171, Feb. 2018, doi: 10.1057/s41267-017-0126-4.

[35] R. W. Click and R. J. Weiner, "Resource nationalism meets the market: Political risk and the value of petroleum reserves," *J. Int. Bus. Stud.*, vol. 41, no. 5, pp. 783–803, June 2010, doi: 10.1057/jibs.2009.90.

[36] M. A. Ramady, *Political, Economic and Financial Country Risk: Analysis of the Gulf Cooperation Council*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2014. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-02177-5.

[37] V. Benáček, H. Lenihan, B. Andreosso-O'Callaghan, E. Michalíková, and D. Kan, "Political risk, institutions and foreign direct investment: How do they relate in various European countries?," IES Working Paper, 2012. [Online]. Available: https://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/83436

[38] G. Bekaert, C. R. Harvey, C. T. Lundblad, and S. Siegel, "Political risk spreads," National Bureau of Economic Research, 2014. [Online]. Available: https://www.nber.org/papers/w19786

[39] G. Bekaert, C. R. Harvey, C. T. Lundblad, and S. Siegel, "Political risk and international valuation," *J. Corp. Finance*, vol. 37, pp. 1–23, 2016.

[40] E. L. C. Osabutey and C. Okoro, "Political Risk and Foreign Direct Investment in Africa: The Case of the Nigerian Telecommunications Industry," *Thunderbird Int. Bus. Rev.*, vol. 57, no. 6, pp. 417–429, Nov. 2015, doi: 10.1002/tie.21672.

[41] G. Allard, C. A. Martinez, and C. Williams, "Political instability, pro-business market reforms and their impacts on national systems of innovation," *Res. Policy*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 638–651, 2012.

[42] J.-P. Leresche and G. Saez, "Political Frontier Regimes: Towards Cross-Border Governance?," in *Globalization, Regionalization and Cross-Border Regions*, M. Perkmann and N.-L. Sum, Eds., London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2002, pp. 77–99. doi: 10.1057/9780230596092_4.

[43] G. L. F. Holburn and B. A. Zelner, "Political capabilities, policy risk, and international investment strategy: evidence from the global electric power generation industry," *Strateg. Manag. J.*, vol. 31, no. 12, pp. 1290–1315, Dec. 2010, doi: 10.1002/smj.860.

[44] T. Arieli and N. Cohen, "Policy entrepreneurs and post-conflict cross-border cooperation: a conceptual framework and the Israeli–Jordanian case," *Policy Sci.*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 237–256, Sept. 2013, doi: 10.1007/s11077-012-9171-9.

[45] M. Demirbag, M. McGuinness, and H. Altay, "Perceptions of Institutional Environment and Entry Mode: FDI from an Emerging Country," *Manag. Int. Rev.*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 207–240, Apr. 2010, doi: 10.1007/s11575-010-0028-1.

[46] T. H. Malik, "National institutional differences and cross-border university–industry knowledge transfer," *Res. Policy*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 776–787, 2013.

[47] S. E. Feinberg and A. K. Gupta, "MNC Subsidiaries and Country Risk: Internalization as a Safeguard Against Weak External Institutions," *Acad. Manage. J.*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 381–399, Apr. 2009, doi: 10.5465/amj.2009.37315470.

[48] C. H. Brink, *Measuring political risk: risks to foreign investment*. Routledge, 2017. [Online]. Available: https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781315249414/measuring-political-risk-charlotte-brink

[49] R. Capello, A. Caragliu, and U. Fratesi, "Measuring border effects in European cross-border regions," *Reg. Stud.*, vol. 52, no. 7, pp. 986–996, July 2018, doi: 10.1080/00343404.2017.1364843.

[50] A. Al Khattab, J. Anchor, and E. Davies, "Managerial perceptions of political risk in international projects," *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, vol. 25, no. 7, pp. 734–743, 2007.

[51] R. Caiazza and T. Volpe, "M&A process: a literature review and research agenda," *Bus. Process Manag. J.*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 205–220, 2015.

[52] Y. Liu and M. Maula, "Local Partnering in Foreign Ventures: Uncertainty, Experiential Learning, and Syndication in Cross-Border Venture Capital Investments," *Acad. Manage. J.*, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 1407–1429, Aug. 2016, doi: 10.5465/amj.2013.0835.

[53] C. E. Stevens and A. Newenham-Kahindi, "Legitimacy Spillovers and Political Risk: The Case of FDI in the East African Community," *Glob. Strategy J.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 10–35, Feb. 2017, doi: 10.1002/gsj.1151.

[54] D. Jarvis and M. Griffiths, "Learning to Fly: The Evolution of Political Risk Analysis," *Glob. Soc.*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 5–21, 2007, doi: 10.1080/13600820601116435.

[55] S. M. Bartram and G. Dufey, "International Portfolio Investment: Theory, Evidence, and Institutional Framework," *Financ. Mark. Inst. Instrum.*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 85–155, Aug. 2001, doi: 10.1111/1468-0416.00043.

[56] M. Mtar, "Institutional, Industry and Power Effects on Integration in Cross-border Acquisitions," *Organ. Stud.*, vol. 31, no. 8, pp. 1099–1127, Aug. 2010, doi: 10.1177/0170840610376147.

[57] S. Michailova and S. Hwee Ang, "Institutional Explanations of Cross-border Alliance Modes: The Case of Emerging Economies Firms," *Manag. Int. Rev.*, vol. 48, no. 5, pp. 551–576, Nov. 2008, doi: 10.1007/s11575-008-0036-6.

[58] R. C. Merton and Z. Bodie, "A conceptual framework for analyzing the financial system," *Glob. Financ. Syst. Funct. Perspect.*, pp. 3–31, 1995.

[59] A. Schram *et al.*, "A conceptual framework for investigating the impacts of international trade and investment agreements on noncommunicable disease risk factors," *Health Policy Plan.*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 123–136, 2018.

[60] J. Fell and G. Schinasi, "Assessing Financial Stability: Exploring the Boundaries of Analysis," *Natl. Inst. Econ. Rev.*, vol. 192, pp. 102–117, Apr. 2005, doi: 10.1177/002795010519200110.

[61] M. Ajayi, "Banking sector reforms and bank consolidation: Conceptual framework.," *Bullion*, vol. 29, no. 2, p. 1, 2005.

[62] M. Brunnermeier *et al.*, "Banks and cross-border capital flows: Policy challenges and regulatory responses," *Comm. Int. Econ. Policy Reform*, 2012.

[63] H. Krifa-Schneider and I. Matei, "Business climate, political risk and FDI in developing countries: Evidence from panel data," *Int. J. Econ. Finance*, vol. 2, no. 5, pp. 54–65, 2010.

[64] J. N. Gordon and C. J. Milhaupt, "China as a national strategic buyer: toward a multilateral regime for cross-border M&A," *Colum Bus Rev*, p. 192, 2019.

[65] B. K. Smarzynska and S.-J. Wei, "Corruption and cross-border investment: Firm-level evidence," 2002, [Online]. Available: https://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/handle/2027.42/39879

[66] D. R. Lessard, "Country risk and the structure of international financial intermediation," in *International Finance*, Routledge, 2003, pp. 470–489. [Online]. Available: https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9780203168219-39/country-risk-structure-international-financial-intermediation-donald-lessard

[67] M. H. Bouchet, E. Clark, and B. Groslambert, "Country risk assessment: A guide to global investment strategy," 2003.

[68] J. M. Oetzel, R. A. Bettis, and M. Zenner, "Country risk measures: How risky are they?,"

J. World Bus., vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 128–145, 2001.

[69] T. Van Gestel and B. Baesens, *Credit Risk Management: Basic concepts: Financial risk components, Rating analysis, models, economic and regulatory capital*. Oxford University Press, 2009.

[70] D. Dikova, P. R. Sahib, and A. Van Witteloostuijn, "Cross-border acquisition abandonment and completion: The effect of institutional differences and organizational learning in the international business service industry, 1981–2001," *J. Int. Bus. Stud.*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 223–245, Feb. 2010, doi: 10.1057/jibs.2009.10.

[71] K. S. Reddy, E. Xie, and Y. Huang, "Cross-border acquisitions by state-owned and private enterprises: A perspective from emerging economies," *J. Policy Model.*, vol. 38, no. 6, pp. 1147–1170, 2016.

[72] V. Bruno and H. S. Shin, "Cross-border banking and global liquidity," *Rev. Econ. Stud.*, vol. 82, no. 2, pp. 535–564, 2015.

[73] F. Allen, *Cross-border banking in Europe: implications for financial stability and macroeconomic policies*. CEPR, 2011.

[74] R. A. Eisenbeis and G. G. Kaufman, "Cross-border banking: challenges for deposit insurance and financial stability in the European Union," in *Building the Financial Foundations of the Euro*, Routledge, 2009, pp. 369–417.

[75] G. Caprio, D. D. Evanoff, and G. G. Kaufman, *Cross-Border Banking: Regulatory Challenges*, vol. 1. in World Scientific Studies in International Economics, vol. 1. WORLD SCIENTIFIC, 2006. doi: 10.1142/6129.

[76] A. Church and P. Reid, "Cross-border Co-operation, Institutionalization and Political Space Across the English Channel," *Reg. Stud.*, vol. 33, no. 7, pp. 643–655, Oct. 1999, doi: 10.1080/00343409950078684.

[77] P. Deng and M. Yang, "Cross-border mergers and acquisitions by emerging market firms: A comparative investigation," *Int. Bus. Rev.*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 157–172, 2015.

[78] C. Sohn, B. Reitel, and O. Walther, "Cross-Border Metropolitan Integration in Europe: The Case of Luxembourg, Basel, and Geneva," *Environ. Plan. C Gov. Policy*, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 922–939, Oct. 2009, doi: 10.1068/c0893r.

[79] T. Makkonen and S. Rohde, "Cross-border regional innovation systems: conceptual backgrounds, empirical evidence and policy implications," *Eur. Plan. Stud.*, vol. 24, no. 9, pp. 1623–1642, Sept. 2016, doi: 10.1080/09654313.2016.1184626.

[80] U. Weitzel and S. Berns, "Cross-border takeovers, corruption, and related aspects of governance," *J. Int. Bus. Stud.*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 786–806, Nov. 2006, doi: 10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400225.

[81] A. Buchner, S. Espenlaub, A. Khurshed, and A. Mohamed, "Cross-border venture capital investments: The impact of foreignness on returns," *J. Int. Bus. Stud.*, vol. 49, no. 5, pp. 575–604, July 2018, doi: 10.1057/s41267-017-0116-6.

[82] A. Panibratov, "Cultural and organizational integration in cross-border M&A deals: The comparative study of acquisitions made by EMNEs from China and Russia," *J. Organ. Change Manag.*, vol. 30, no. 7, pp. 1109–1135, 2017.

[83] D. Hain, S. Johan, and D. Wang, "Determinants of Cross-Border Venture Capital Investments in Emerging and Developed Economies: The Effects of Relational and Institutional Trust," *J. Bus. Ethics*, vol. 138, no. 4, pp. 743–764, Nov. 2016, doi: 10.1007/s10551-015-2772-4.

[84] P. Jadhav, "Determinants of foreign direct investment in BRICS economies: Analysis of economic, institutional and political factor," *Procedia-Soc. Behav. Sci.*, vol. 37, pp. 5–14, 2012.

[85] B. B. Nielsen, "Determining international strategic alliance performance: A multidimensional approach," *Int. Bus. Rev.*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 337–361, 2007.

[86] G. Gobinda Goswami and S. Haider, "Does political risk deter FDI inflow? An analytical approach using panel data and factor analysis," *J. Econ. Stud.*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 233–252, 2014.

[87] C. Moschieri, R. Ragozzino, and J. M. Campa, "Does Regional Integration Change the

Effects of Country-Level Institutional Barriers on M&A? The Case of the European Union," *Manag. Int. Rev.*, vol. 54, no. 6, pp. 853–877, Dec. 2014, doi: 10.1007/s11575-014-0206-7.

[88] Q. Li and T. Vashchilko, "Dyadic military conflict, security alliances, and bilateral FDI flows," *J. Int. Bus. Stud.*, vol. 41, no. 5, pp. 765–782, June 2010, doi: 10.1057/jibs.2009.91.

[89] J. Zhang and X. He, "Economic nationalism and foreign acquisition completion: The case of China," *Int. Bus. Rev.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 212–227, 2014.

[90] R. Zhang, F. Andam, and G. Shi, "Environmental and social risk evaluation of overseas investment under the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor," *Environ. Monit. Assess.*, vol. 189, no. 6, p. 253, June 2017, doi: 10.1007/s10661-017-5967-6.

[91] M. F. Ahammad, V. Leone, S. Y. Tarba, K. W. Glaister, and A. Arslan, "Equity Ownership in Cross-border Mergers and Acquisitions by British Firms: An Analysis of Real Options and Transaction Cost Factors," *Br. J. Manag.*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 180–196, Apr. 2017, doi: 10.1111/1467-8551.12215.

[92] L. D. Howell, "Evaluating Political Risk Forecasting Models: What Works?," *Thunderbird Int. Bus. Rev.*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 305–316, July 2014, doi: 10.1002/tie.21635.

[93] C. Zhou, J. Xie, and Q. Wang, "Failure to Complete Cross-Border M&As: 'To' vs. 'From' Emerging Markets," *J. Int. Bus. Stud.*, vol. 47, no. 9, pp. 1077–1105, Dec. 2016, doi: 10.1057/s41267-016-0027-y.

[94] J. Forssbæck and L. Oxelheim, "Finance-specific factors as drivers of cross-border investment—An empirical investigation," *Int. Bus. Rev.*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 630–641, 2008.

[95] R. W. Click, "Financial and political risks in US direct foreign investment," *J. Int. Bus. Stud.*, vol. 36, no. 5, pp. 559–575, Sept. 2005, doi: 10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400157.

[96] M. Nissanke and H. Stein, "Financial globalization and economic development: toward an institutional foundation," *East. Econ. J.*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 287–308, 2003.

[97] E. S. Prasad, "Financial sector regulation and reforms in emerging markets: An overview," 2010, [Online]. Available: https://www.nber.org/papers/w16428

[98] A. N. Berger, R. DeYoung, H. Genay, and G. F. Udell, "Globalization of financial institutions: Evidence from cross-border banking performance," *Brook.-Whart. Pap. Financ. Serv.*, vol. 2000, no. 1, pp. 23–120, 2000.

[99] M. Benzie and Å. Persson, "Governing borderless climate risks: moving beyond the territorial framing of adaptation," *Int. Environ. Agreem. Polit. Law Econ.*, vol. 19, no. 4–5, pp. 369–393, Oct. 2019, doi: 10.1007/s10784-019-09441-y.

[100] A. Heinemann, "Government control of cross-border M&A: Legitimate regulation or protectionism?," *J. Int. Econ. Law*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 843–870, 2012.

[101] Z. Deng, J. Yan, and M. Van Essen, "Heterogeneity of political connections and outward foreign direct investment," *Int. Bus. Rev.*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 893–903, 2018.

[102] K. Hayakawa, F. Kimura, and H. Lee, "How Does Country Risk Matter for Foreign Direct Investment?," *Dev. Econ.*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 60–78, Mar. 2013, doi: 10.1111/deve.12002.

[103] C. B. Moore, G. T. Payne, R. G. Bell, and J. L. Davis, "Institutional Distance and Cross-Border Venture Capital Investment Flows," *J. Small Bus. Manag.*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 482–500, Apr. 2015, doi: 10.1111/jsbm.12079.

[104] A. B. Akonobi and C. O. Okpokwu, "Designing a Customer-Centric Performance Model for Digital Lending Systems in Emerging Markets," vol. 3, no. 4, 2019.

[105] A. SHARMA, B. I. ADEKUNLE, J. C. OGEAWUCHI, A. A. ABAYOMI, and O. ONIFADE, "IoT-enabled Predictive Maintenance for Mechanical Systems: Innovations in Real-time Monitoring and Operational Excellence," 2019.

[106] C. Henry Olisakwe, L.Tuleun Tuleun, C Andrew. Eloka-Eboka, "Comparative study of Thevetia peruviana and Jatropha curcas seed oils as feedstock for Grease production."