



Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis in Social Sciences

Volume 4, Issue 1, 2010, 58-82

ISSN: 1752-8925

## Relationship between Different Types of Private Capital Flows to Developing Countries

**Chander Kant<sup>a</sup>**

Seton Hall University

---

### **Abstract**

This paper investigates whether US portfolio and direct investment in developing countries are perfect substitutes as was found in previous work for total US capital outflows. We find that they are not perfect substitutes and could have different effects. The former is complementary to the latter: the marginal effect of a one dollar increase in US direct investment is to increase portfolio investment in developing countries by 54 cents. It follows that developing countries capital markets are not globally well integrated, and/or recent direct and portfolio flows to developing countries are predominantly explained by the same factors.

*JEL Classifications:* F23, F30, F34, G15.

*Keywords:* Direct investment, portfolio investment, developing countries.

---

*Acknowledgements:* The author gratefully acknowledges that the research underlying this paper was supported by a fellowship awarded by the American Institute of Indian Studies, Chicago. Further, travel to Stockholm to present an earlier version of this paper at the 18th Annual Congress of the European Economic Association was partly supported by the Institute of International Business of Seton Hall University.

---

<sup>a</sup> Department of Economics, Institute of International Business, Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ 07079, USA; tel.: +1 973 258 0956, email: kantchan@shu.edu

# 1 Introduction

External finance for developing countries can come from one of the following four sources: (i) official loans and grants, (ii) private debt including commercial bank loans, bonds issued by developing countries' entities/institutions in developed countries, and export credits, (iii) foreign direct investment (FDI), and (iv) foreign portfolio equity investment (PI).<sup>1</sup> Traditionally, official loans and grants had been dominant. However, there have been significant changes in the composition of external finance to developing countries in recent years.

First, FDI flows to developing countries have increased at double digit average annual compound rates since 1986; by 1993 FDI became the largest single source of external finance for developing countries (see World Bank, 1993). Second, foreign portfolio equity investment and bonds issued by developing countries in industrial countries increased sharply during the 1990's: by a factor of three and one half times. At the same time, official flows fell to about a quarter of their earlier level. These developments resulted in private flows being 94.3% of all external finance flows to developing countries during the three year period 1999-2001.<sup>2</sup> These relative magnitudes are unaltered qualitatively for the current decade. (See World Bank's *Global Development Finance*, various issues.)

However, despite their overwhelming importance, not enough attention has been paid to studying the possibly different effects of these types of private capital flows; or to analyze interrelationships between them. Like portfolio investment, FDI is also a financial transaction in the first instance.<sup>3</sup> Still, the control element inherent in FDI ensures that the FDI-investor also takes some real decisions. Since portfolio (equities and bonds) and other inflows (e.g., commercial bank loans and "Eurodollar" deposits) are pure financial investments, there is no presumption of any real investment accompanying them automatically.

The following features and effects of different types of private capital flows have been compared and contrasted: their volatilities and effects on efficiency, growth, and real exchange rate appreciation. Neumann (2003), using an asymmetric information model where foreign lenders have less information about developing countries than foreign equity

---

<sup>1</sup> FDI includes both related-party equity investments and related-party borrowings.

<sup>2</sup> The corresponding proportion during 1989-1991 was 47.5%.

<sup>3</sup> The term portfolio investment as used in this paper includes both portfolio equity and portfolio bond investment. On the other hand, commercial bank loans are assumed to be non-securitized, and are not part of what is termed as portfolio investment.

investors, shows that equity trade is preferable on efficiency grounds to foreign borrowing. Razin and Sadka (2003) study the relative efficiency of direct and portfolio foreign equity investors. They use an international macroeconomic model where foreign direct investors have a hands-on management ability to react in real time to the changing economic environment; and show that direct investors will be more efficient in industries in which they specialize in the source country.

Frankel and Rose (1996) have an agnostic prior about the differential effects of FDI. FDI funds may be fungible so that an observed FDI surplus in BOP accounts is no guarantee of higher investment. Razin, Sadka, and Yuen (1999) model differing degrees of domestic credit market development. They show that the inter-temporal gains from FDI depend on whether the domestic credit market is underdeveloped or well-functioning. In the former, the gains are substantial; in the latter FDI is a loss-generating phenomenon. Soto (2003) estimates a model using Generalized Method of Moments (GMM) on annual observations to analyze the links between GDP growth and different types of capital inflows. He finds bank flows as the sole source of foreign financing that displays a positive and robust correlation with growth.

Regarding the relative volatility of FDI and other inflows, most models/theorizing have concluded that FDI is more stable.<sup>4</sup> Aghion, Bacchetta, and Banerjee (2004), using a dynamic open economy model where firms face tighter credit constraint at lower level of financial development, and Albuquerque (2003) employing an international capital flows model with imperfect enforcement of financial contracts and inalienability of FDI, conclude that non-FDI flows are more volatile and destabilizing. Similarly, Sarno and Taylor (1999) suggest that deregulation, decreasing transaction costs, and lack of depth of their markets make portfolio flows to emerging markets sensitive to short-term return differentials and cyclical conditions in industrial countries.

The empirical evidence on the relative volatility of different kinds of inflows also generally finds that FDI is more stable.<sup>5</sup> Tudela (2004) uses a duration model for OECD countries for the 1970-97 period. He finds that increased portfolio flows increases the probability of crises. Eichengreen (2000) suggests liberalizing FDI first, then stock and bond markets, and finally offshore bank-funding. Sarno and Taylor (1999) analyze monthly

---

<sup>4</sup> The only exception to this assertion seems to be Frankel and Rose (1996) who hypothesize that multinational firms (MNFs) may be able to move funds in and out of a country through transfers between subsidiaries and parent firms with greater ease than can be done outside the corporate walls.

<sup>5</sup> The only exception to this assertion seems to be Claessens, Dooley and Warner (1995) who, using quarterly data from 1976:I to 1992:II for five developing and five industrial countries, suggest that what a flow is labeled, whether FDI or portfolio or short term or long term, has no bearing on its time series properties.

data on equity, bond, and official flows, and quarterly data on bank credit and FDI flows from 1988 to 1997 from the US to the East Asian countries, Japan, and Australia. They find that portfolio (equity and bond) flows were most volatile while FDI was the least volatile capital account item.<sup>6</sup>

Non-sterilized capital inflows of any kind cause real exchange rate appreciation by boosting overall absorption and increasing the relative price of non-tradables. Balance of payments (BOP) statistics record exchange of value between residents and non-residents rather than exchange of payment. Thus, reinvestment of earnings by, say, MNF-subidiaries is considered a capital inflow in the BOP statistics. One way to classify capital inflows may be whether they constitute reinvested earnings or not. Either kind increases domestic absorption. But, an increase in output precedes the increase in absorption for the former (since these earnings are part of the net value-added of such subsidiaries) while there is no such claim to a prior increase in capital-importing country's output from a new capital inflow. The former can hence be expected to cause a smaller increase in the relative price of non-tradables/real exchange rate than the latter. If reinvested earnings are more important than the reported FDI than the reported portfolio investment, then real exchange rate appreciation accompanied by an FDI inflow will also be smaller.<sup>7</sup>

Sachs, Tornell, and Velasco (1996) reported that their most striking finding was that in the large sample of emerging markets considered there was a lack of correlation between the size of capital inflows and real exchange rate behavior. Countries with the largest capital inflows (Colombia, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand) had the least appreciation. One explanation of this anomaly could be that in these countries reinvestment of earnings by MNFs was a larger part of BOP-reported total capital inflows. Kant (1996) analyzes the relationship of one type of inflow, FDI, to a subset of outflows; capital flight, from developing countries. He concludes that FDI inflows are always associated with a reduction in capital flight and the latter is primarily caused by general economic mismanagement rather than by favorable treatment of the former.

The above literature review reveals little work on the interrelationships of different components of private flows to developing countries; e.g., whether and how FDI and portfolio flows to developing countries are themselves related. Any or all of the possible

---

<sup>6</sup> However, the permanent component of the portfolio flow to Japan and Australia was larger.

<sup>7</sup> Feldstein (1994) reports that only about 20% of the value of assets owned by US affiliates abroad is financed by cross-border flows of capital from the US while an additional 18% represents retained earnings attributable to US investors. Similar data for portfolio investment are not available because of the large number of such investors, difficulty in tracking the rebalancing of their portfolios across countries and companies, and the relatively shorter period of such investment.

different effects can exist without dilution only if these flows are not substitutes for each other. Since households do not undertake FDI investments, one cannot build up a theoretical model based on such substitutability at the individual level. Nevertheless, one can examine whether this substitutability exists as an empirical regularity at the macro level. Using such an approach Ruffin and Rassekh (1986) find that FDI and portfolio outflows from the U. S. are perfect substitutes. If so, capital is fully fungible, and one type of capital is indistinguishable from the other. Further, volatility of one component, say, portfolio, need not be a cause for concern since the other flow will be offsetting its volatility.<sup>8</sup>

Ruffin and Rassekh (RR) cited above explain their result by two factors: (a) non-firm-specific MNF capital, and (b) full integration of capital markets in the U. S. and foreign countries. Then, a dollar of FDI investment temporarily disturbs home and foreign capital markets raising interest rates at home and lowering them abroad. To restore equilibrium portfolio investment abroad falls by exactly one dollar.

A somewhat different conclusion is reached by Feldstein (1994). He finds that for major industrial countries of OECD, each dollar of cross-border flow of FDI reduces domestic investment by approximately one dollar. A dollar of FDI investment abroad again raises home interest rates. But, now while FDI (which in this framework presumably consists of specific capital) can cross borders, portfolio flows - in accordance with the famous Feldstein-Horioka (1980) result - are largely segmented into national capital markets. Thus, portfolio and direct investment abroad are not related at all: when FDI increases by a dollar, there is no decrease in portfolio investment abroad by a dollar to restore domestic capital market equilibrium: the latter is achieved solely by a dollar fall in domestic investment.

This paper examines the perfect substitutability results for developing countries. Neither of the Ruffin and Rassekh (1986) assumptions is likely to hold in practice. Ethier (1986) concludes that a firm-specific (or internal) transaction is the singular characteristic distinguishing multinational's transactions from the (usual) inter-firm transactions. Hence, FDI and MNF capital is likely to be firm or industry specific. Second, the Feldstein-Horioka (1980) and Feldstein (1994) result of segmented portfolio capital markets is even more likely to be valid for developing countries due to poor credit ratings, high and variable

---

<sup>8</sup> Claessens, Dooley, and Warner (1995) also make this point. They find that a simple correlation matrix between the various categories of flows show some degree of substitution between most flows for almost all countries.

inflation, lack of high-quality regulatory and accounting framework, dearth of sufficient country funds, and the limited size of some stock markets.

The main task of this study is to empirically examine this result with help of a portfolio-balance model. The specific model employed is the same as that used in Kant (2005). Its differences from Ruffin and Rassekh (1986) will be noted below. The model and hypotheses are described next.

## 2 Model and Hypotheses

A portfolio balance model is used for the following reasons. According to the internalization hypothesis, MNFs come into being to internalize returns to their ownership-specific assets (Hood and Young, 1979). For example, specific inputs like R&D, advertising, marketing, distribution, management, finance, trade secrets, patent and organization could be ownership-specific. In fact, it is the ownership of these inputs that enables the MNF to produce and compete effectively in distant countries with different industrial relations, legal system, culture, and language. Thus, a large number of micro and industrial organization type of factors that are generally unmeasurable explain the establishment of an MNF.

If FDI is a function of many unobserved microeconomic variables that are uncorrelated contemporaneously with the relevant macroeconomic variables, aggregate FDI can be taken as a regressor in a time-series analysis of the portfolio balance model.<sup>9</sup> Thus, if we include FDI as an explanatory variable in an equation that otherwise is for portfolio investment, we can test the relationship, if any, between FDI and portfolio investment.

### 2.1 Model

We start with the assumption that home and foreign investments are imperfect substitutes. Let  $r$  represent the real rate of return to domestic investment, then:

$$r = (i - \pi^e) / (1 + \pi^e), \quad (1)$$

---

<sup>9</sup> As noted below, we only need the right-hand side variables to be predetermined in the sense that they be orthogonal to the current error term. We do not need the regressors to be strictly exogenous, i.e. orthogonal to the past, current, and future error terms. See Hayashi (2000). We will also show below that the Durbin-Wu-Hausman (DWH) test does not show FDI to be endogenous.

where  $i$  is the nominal interest rate and  $\pi^e$  is the expected inflation rate in the home country. Similarly, let  $r^*$  denote the real rate of return domestic residents earn by covered investment in a foreign country. Taking the real interest version of the parity condition permits us to incorporate overshooting effects. Covered investments necessitate the use of the forward exchange rate to calculate the return domestic investors earn in the foreign country since the forward rate takes into account the differential risk/viability of return of investing in the foreign country. Thus,  $r^*$  is

$$r^* = [(1 + i^*)F / (1 + \pi^e)S] - 1, \quad (2)$$

where  $i^*$  is the appropriate foreign nominal interest rate, and  $F$  and  $S$  are forward and spot exchange rates on the date of investment defined as US dollars per foreign currency. The forward rate is for delivery of the foreign currency on the maturity date of foreign investment.

Let  $Z$  denote the real quantity of private assets held by US private agents in developing countries; similarly  $Z^*$  is the real quantity of private assets owned by developing countries' residents in the US and  $W$  is the quantity of US real financial wealth. The version of the portfolio balance model used here is

$$Z = F(r, r^*, W, Z^*). \quad (3)$$

The variable  $r^*$  in equation (3) is a vector and  $Z^*$  is added as an explanatory variable to capture any link between capital imports and capital exports to and from the US.

Money market equilibrium is incorporated in the model as follows. Under the standard theory, the demand for real money balances,  $L$ , depends on real income,  $y$ , and the nominal interest rate,  $i$ . Further, from equation (1),

$$i = \pi^e + r + \pi^e r. \quad (1')$$

Thus, money market equilibrium holds in the home country when

$$m = L(i, y) = L(\pi^e + r + \pi^e r, y), \quad (4)$$

where  $m$  is assumed to be the exogenously determined measure of real money supply. Combining equations (1), (3) and (4) we get

$$Z = \Xi(\pi^e, r^*, m, y, W, Z^*). \quad (5)$$

Equation (5) does not make reference to a specific functional form. However, it can be linearized by taking its total differential, that is,

$$dZ = \Xi_{\pi^e} d\pi^e + \Xi_{r^*} dr^*, \Xi_m dm, \Xi_y dy, \Xi_w dW, \Xi_{Z^*} dZ^*, \quad (6)$$

where the symbols  $\Xi$  with various subscripts represent the partial derivatives with respect to the variable in the subscript, while the  $d$  expressions are the first differences of the respective variables. Further, taking first differences also makes the non-stationary variables stationary.<sup>10</sup>

## 2.2 Specific Hypotheses

The final regression equation that will be estimated can now be stated. Separate  $dZ$  into its two components:  $dZ^p + dZ^d$ , where  $Z^p$  and  $Z^d$  are portfolio and direct investment (respectively) from the US to developing countries; and keep only  $dZ^p$  on the left-hand side. Then, the final form of equation (6), with  $t$  subscripts, can be stated as:

$$dZ_t^p = a_0 + a_1 d\pi_t^e + a_2 dr_t^* + a_3 dm_t + a_4 dy_t + a_5 dW_t + a_6 dZ_t^d + a_7 dZ_t^* + a_8 dG_t^e + a_9 dI_t + u_t. \quad (7)$$

A constant term is added to capture the effects of omitting variables with a time trend;  $u$  is a Gaussian white noise term. The expected real price of gold,  $G^e$ , is added as a variable to serve as a proxy for speculation. The last variable, index of globalization,  $I$ , is added because both direct and portfolio flows may have been influenced by increasing globalization of the world economy during the estimation period.

The coefficient of special interest is  $a_6$ . If it is negative, portfolio flows substitute for FDI flows. Further, the greater its absolute magnitude, the greater is the extent of substitutability. On the other hand, if  $a_6$  is positive the two flows are complementary, and its magnitude measures the strength of the now positive relationship. The expected effects of the other variables are as follows: an increase in US real GDP and/or in the real expected price of gold will decrease US portfolio investment abroad. On the other hand, the effect of each of the other right-hand side variables on  $Z^p$  can be expected to be positive.

---

<sup>10</sup> Although the  $d(\cdot)$  expressions refer to differentials of the respective variables, in the estimation, first differences are taken to approximate the differentials.

### 3 Data and Estimation

The model was estimated using quarterly data from 1979:I to 1998:III.<sup>11</sup> Data on changes in the US international investment position on a quarterly basis by geographical areas as published in the December issue of the *Survey of Current Business* (published by the US Department of Commerce's Bureau of Economic Analysis) were used.

The *Survey of Current Business* presents data on US investments abroad (and foreign investment in the US) by area for the following components of capital flows: (a) FDI outflows (inflows), i.e. changes in claims on (liabilities to) affiliated non-residents; (b) purchase from (sale to) non-residents of domestic and foreign securities, i.e. portfolio investment; (c) changes in claims on (liabilities to) non-residents reported by US banks/depository institutions, brokers, and dealers; and (d) changes in non-banking US institutions' claims on (liabilities to) unaffiliated non-residents. The latter two are called capital flows by banks and non-banks, respectively, in this paper. Quarterly stock numbers were constructed by using the end of 1991 as the benchmark stock and adjusting backward and forward by quarterly flows. Although historical data by developed country regions are also reported, relevant areas for us are the developing countries regions of Eastern Europe, Latin America, Asia (other than Japan, Australia, and New Zealand), Africa, and others. Stock data for these areas are added to yield the developing countries total.

One issue is about the countries included in the vector of foreign real interest rates: we limit ourselves to a few representative developing countries. The following criteria were used to choose such countries: (a) the US had substantial investments in those countries, (b) they did not suffer hyperinflation during the estimation period, (c) they were placed in the category of countries having more flexible exchange rates in the Exchange Rate Arrangements pages of IMF's *International Financial Statistics* (IFS) for this period, and (d) for which forward exchange rate information was available. Based on the above criteria, Mexico, Korea, and Indonesia are chosen.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> A justification for limiting the data to 1998:III is that the Asian Financial Crisis of 1998 caused a dramatic structural break.

<sup>12</sup> Other than tax haven countries (Bahamas, Bermuda, British West Indies, and Netherlands Antilles) the US had also substantial investments in the following developing countries: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Colombia. See various issues of the US Department of Treasury *Bulletin*. Of these countries, Brazil suffered from hyperinflation during this period (its CPI increased from 4 in 1980 to 100 million in 1990, and then to 5100 billion in 1997), Argentina's currency was pegged to US dollar at least since 1993 (see Exchange Rate Arrangements pages of IMF's *International Financial Statistics*), and forward rates for Chile and Columbia were not available.

The information on total private financial wealth in the US is obtained from the *Balance Sheets for the US Economy* published by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (1999). The end of the year data were converted to quarterly data by multiplying changes in the year-end amounts by quarterly savings ratio. Quarterly domestic savings were obtained from various issues of IFS by subtracting private and government consumption from GDP. The rest of the data were obtained from either the IFS or the Federal Reserve website. Forward exchange rate information for Mexico, Korea, and Indonesia was obtained directly from staff in the IMF offices. All relevant variables are measured in real terms.

One variable that is derived from other data is the index of globalization,  $I$ . Following Obstfeld (1998), the variable,  $I$ , is derived by summing the absolute values of the current account balances of the fifteen largest economies divided by the sum of their GDPs. The countries selected, based on having both the highest GDP for the period, 1979-1998 and a consistent set of data are: Australia, Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, India, Italy, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, UK, and the US. As far as we know, this is the first time this index has been used in a regression: it should tell us whether changes in capital account flows (relative to GDP) over the period affected portfolio flows to developing countries.

Estimates of expected inflation and gold price are needed directly in the equation; those of the former are also needed indirectly to calculate the  $r^*$  variables. Inflation rate for each quarter for the 1979:I to 1998:IV period is computed in two ways: (a) with respect to CPI for the previous quarter, and (b) in relation to CPI for the same quarter of the previous year. The augmented Dicky-Fuller test for unit roots is performed on these inflation rates and on the gold price. The test with a constant is applied first and having observed that the series are trendless, the test with trend is redundant. The results are presented in Table 1. The null of a unit root is rejected for annual inflation and the gold price at the 5% significance level; and for quarterly inflation at the 5.6% significance level.<sup>13</sup> Both inflation and the gold price are stationary; so must be expected inflation and expected gold price.

---

<sup>13</sup> As shown in Table 1, the test statistic for quarterly inflation for  $H_0 : \alpha_1 = 0$  is -2.87 while the pro-rata critical value for 80 observations (used in the paper) is -2.91. The pro-rata p-value for test statistic of 2.87 is then .056. Thus, the null of a unit root in quarterly inflation is rejected at 5.6% significance level. Quarterly inflation, rather than annual inflation, is used in further analysis. This is for the following reasons: (a) the nominal interest rate data are on instruments of 90-days maturity. For such investors, expected inflation over the next quarter is more relevant than over the next year. (b) The number of lagged terms,  $p$ , chosen by the ADF tests to ensure that there is no serial correlation is eight and three for the annual and quarterly inflation,

**Table 1: ADF test statistics for inflation and gold price.**

$H_0 : \alpha_1 = 0$			$H_0 : \alpha_0 = \alpha_1 = 0$		
Quarterly $\pi$	Annual $\pi$	Gold Price	Quarterly $\pi$	Annual $\pi$	Gold Price
-2.87	-3.10	-2.93	4.94	5.44	5.69

Notes: The ADF equation is  $\Delta Y_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Y_{t-1} + \sum \beta_i \Delta Y_{t-i} + \varepsilon_t$ , where  $\{Y_t\}$  is the series we are examining for unit roots,  $i$  takes values from 2 to  $p$ , and  $p$  is the number of lagged terms that ensures that the errors are uncorrelated.

Box-Jenkins techniques are used to estimate both the expected inflation rate and expected gold price. Different ARMA models are fitted to the inflation rate since 1979. Following Enders (1994), the model with the lowest SBC (Schwartz Bayesian criterion) and AIC (Akaike information criterion) statistics among the models whose Ljung-Box-Pierce statistic (Q-statistic) was insignificant (indicating no serial correlation) at all meaningful lags is selected.<sup>14</sup> This is the ARMA (1, 3) model:

$$\pi_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \pi_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t + \theta_1 \varepsilon_{t-1} + \theta_2 \varepsilon_{t-2} + \theta_3 \varepsilon_{t-3}, \quad (8)$$

where the sequence  $\{\varepsilon_t\}$  is a white noise process, and we follow the convention of normalizing units so that  $\theta_0$  is always equal to unity. The first three terms on the right-hand side of equation (8) give the autoregressive process AR(1) with  $\alpha_0$  interpreted as the mean of  $\pi_t$ , while the rest of the terms represent the MA component. The Q-statistic with 60 degrees of freedom is 39.83 for the ARMA (1, 3) model (see Table 2) and confirms that the model is generated by a white noise process.

The selected model, ARMA (1, 3), also had  $R^2$  and adjusted  $R^2$  that were among the highest (.77 and .76, respectively).<sup>15</sup> Since we use quarterly data and nominal interest rates on instruments of 90-days maturity to compute real interest rates, the expected inflation rate is defined as the one-step ahead forecasted inflation rate from the fitted time-series model.<sup>16</sup>

---

respectively. For parsimony (and likely better forecasting performance) and to have a lag-length in the model that is consistent with that chosen by the ADF test, we use quarterly inflation to estimate expected inflation.

<sup>14</sup> Between SBC and AIC, SBC will always select a more parsimonious model and has superior large sample properties. However, the selected model had both the lowest SBC and AIC values.

<sup>15</sup> Of the twelve models fitted two, ARMA (1,4) and ARMA (2,3), had both  $R^2$  and adjusted  $R^2$  values quite close to those of the selected model. Nevertheless, their SBC and AIC values were higher. Because of their higher SBC and AIC values and an additional parameter, they are expected to have lower forecasting performance. The results from the three models are presented in Table 2. Note that all the three models are well specified and the Box-Pierce test (Q test) for serial correlation is insignificant for all three models.

<sup>16</sup> One of the differences between our work Ruffin and Rassekh (1986) is that we use a four-step ahead forecast of inflation. Furthermore, we use country risk and covered interest parity while they assume zero risk

Similar Box-Jenkins techniques lead to the selection (on the basis of low SBC and AIC values among models with insignificant Q-statistic at all meaningful lags) of the ARMA (2, 2) model to forecast the expected gold price. The  $R^2$  and adjusted  $R^2$  of this model are .862 and .855, respectively (and its lag length is consistent with that given by the ADF test on gold price).

**Table 2: Estimation of expected inflation.**

	ARMA(1,3)	ARMA(1,4)	ARMA(2,3)
AIC	-1.6550	-1.5935	-1.6374
SBC	-1.5061	-1.4149	-1.4587
$R^2$	0.7682	0.7663	0.7675
Adjusted $R^2$	0.7558	0.7505	0.7518
Q-Statistic	39.83	38.17	47.60
AR(1)	0.98282 (0.02054)	1.0053 (0.004982)	1.2941 (0.08738)
AR(2)			-0.34114 (0.08540)
MA(1)	0.20395 (0.09969)	0.24633 (0.1122)	0.44883 (0.1066)
MA(2)	0.61698 (0.07677)	0.66980 (0.09991)	0.60357 (0.07246)
MA(3)	-0.48286 (0.09670)	-0.53040 (0.09417)	-0.67616 (0.09139)
MA(4)		0.00710 (0.1154)	
Constant	0.023719 (0.04967)	-0.01870 (0.02638)	0.05840 (0.04999)

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses.

premium and uncovered interest parity; we use expected gold price and M2 or M3 as the money supply measures (rather than current gold price and M1), and include the index of globalization. Finally, we restrict the data to developing countries, perform stationarity and co-integration tests, use Durbin-Wu-Hausman test to examine whether endogenous elements in explanatory variables cause estimators to become inconsistent, and use the GMM estimator.

### 3.1 Regression Results

As stated above, each nominal variable was deflated by CPI to get the respective real values. Augmented Dicky-Fuller (ADF) test for stationarity is applied to all variables in our model. This procedure is adopted since  $r^*$  variables may also have unit roots. The ADF test is used both because of its simplicity and because it performs well in Monte Carlo studies.<sup>17</sup> In particular, the ADF test with constant and no trend (random walk with drift) at the 5% significance level is used. As expected, expected inflation and expected gold price are stationary. In addition, the real rate of return in Korea does not have a unit root. The other variables are I(1), i.e., are difference-stationary.<sup>18</sup>

The extended definition of co-integration due to Flôres and Szafarz (1996) is used. Thus, all the variables could be co-integrated even though three are I(0) and the rest are I(1). Three tests of co-integration are performed since Maddala and Kim (1998, p. 218) report that Monte Carlo studies conclude that no co-integration test dominates the others, and strongly recommend that researchers report results from several tests for co-integration. The three tests are: (i) The augmented Engle-Granger (1987), EG, test on the co-integrating regression's residuals<sup>19</sup> with the critical values given by Engle and Yoo (1987) for the case of more than two variables; (ii) The Philips (1987) test on the said residuals with the critical values given by Davidson and MacKinnon (1993); and (iii) The VAR-based test developed by Johansen (1991, 1995). The null of a unit-root in the residuals is not rejected by the EG test. However, as discussed by Davidson and MacKinnon (2004), power of this test diminishes as the number of co-integrating variables increases. The  $R^2$  value of 0.98 and DW statistic of 1.04 for the co-integrating equation is suggestive that some of the variables are co-integrated. This is confirmed by both the Philips and Johansen tests.<sup>20</sup> The estimated co-integrating equation is presented below:

---

<sup>17</sup> See, Haug (1993, 1996).

<sup>18</sup> Unit root tests were also conducted on the logged forms of all variables where taking logs was feasible. Of these variables, only the gold price was found to be I(0). Non-logged variables were also used in the regressions in order to have all the right-hand-side variables in one form: either all logged or all non-logged. In addition, due to the notoriously low power of unit root tests (see, e.g., Kennedy (2003), p. 326 and 350), Maddala and Kim (1998, p. 146) recommend using a significance level of 25% rather than the conventional 5%. Also, the default critical values for unit root and co-integration tests given by Shazam are for the 10% significance level. Nevertheless, using the 10% significance level did not affect our stationarity results.

<sup>19</sup> This procedure is very similar to an ADF test.

<sup>20</sup> The Johansen test showed the presence of 11 co-integrating vectors by both the trace and the maximum eigenvalue tests. Nevertheless, construction of a VEC model is beyond the scope of this paper as its main objective is to examine the relationship between portfolio and direct investment in developing countries.

$$\begin{aligned}
dZ_t^p = & 93590 - 13089d\pi_t^e + 2083.8dr_{It} + 952.72dr_{Mt} - 22958dr_{Kt} - 33.643dm_t \\
& + 41.657dy_t - 1.9745dW_t + 0.89352dZ_t^d + 0.20517dZ_t^* + 15.629dG_t^e + 3187.9dI_t \\
& + 0.13453dZ_t^{nb}, \text{ adjusted } R^2 = 0.98, \text{ DW statistic} = 1.04.
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Co-integration means that the stochastic trends of the variables are linked (i.e., the variables have a long-term or equilibrium relationship) and equation (5) or stock-equilibrium holds. Estimating equation (5) in first difference form, equation (7), could lose valuable information concerning the long-run equilibrium properties of the data. According to the Granger representation theorem, for any set of I(1) variables, error correction and co-integration are equivalent representations. The dynamic paths of these variables (“error correction”) must bear some relation to the current deviation (“error”) from the equilibrium relationship. Alternatively, if the dynamic paths of variables respond to the previous period’s deviations, estimating the equation only in first differences entails a specification error. To avoid this specification error, the “error correction term” must be incorporated in the estimating equation. Accordingly, the equation in first differences must be augmented by the lagged error-correction term (ECT). This ECT-augmented version of equation (7) is estimated in this paper.<sup>21</sup>

The four components of capital outflow from the US for which data are available by area are FDI, portfolio investment, banks outflows, and non-banks outflows (e.g., trade credits). Our assumption is that FDI is orthogonal to the error term. FDI from the US and total investments by developing countries in the US are always kept on the right-hand side. The left-hand-side variable was changed from the most aggregate of other outflows to the least aggregate one. This is explained below.

With FDI always on the right-hand side, the rest of the outflows from the US to the developing countries are portfolio investment, banks outflows, and non-banks outflows. The left-hand side variable used first was initially computed as the sum of these three outflows, i.e., portfolio+banks+non-banks. Second, we took the sum of two out of the three variables to construct the left-hand side variable and used the remaining variable in the right-hand side as a regressor. Finally, each variable was used in turn as the left-hand side variable with either the remaining two added-up and used in the right-hand side or each of the two used separately. It turns out that having portfolio on the left-hand side and none of the other

---

<sup>21</sup> See Kennedy (2003, p. 324) for a general form of the ECM equation, the use of which he recommended to practitioners. This form is employed in this paper.

two, or only non-banks on the right-hand side, had the most significant impact on the FDI relationship. Changing the money measure from M2 to M3 did not change this result.

In the interest of “testing down” the non-banks variable was retained on the right-hand side of the equation explaining US portfolio investment in developing countries. Results at this stage of the analysis are presented in column 2 of Table 3. This table also presents Schwartz Bayesian criterion (SBC) and Akaike information criterion (AIC) statistics, adjusted  $R^2$ , and Jarque-Bera statistic (distributed chi-square with two degrees of freedom) for testing normality of errors. The Jarque-Bera statistic shows that the errors are non-normal. The Breusch-Pagan Lagrange multiplier test statistics for serial correlation at any specific lag-length is presented in Table 4. This test consists of running an auxiliary or artificial regression, called the Gauss-Newton regression, of the residuals on the explanatory variables and the lagged values of the residuals. The coefficient of each lagged residual is asymptotically distributed as standard normal.<sup>22</sup> These statistics show auto-correlation at lag 4.<sup>23</sup>

The regression had 12 variables and a constant as explanatory variables. In the interests of “testing down” and parsimony, SBC and AIC statistics were used for model selection. Of the two, and other model selection criteria, SBC is considered the best because it has performed well in Monte Carlo studies. See, Mills and Prasad (1992), for example. The model without real GDP and real rates of return in Indonesia and Malaysia decreased SBC substantially, and is thus selected. Results from this regression are shown in column 3 of Table 3. Nevertheless, although all model selection statistics improved, both equations still had non-normal errors and auto correlation at lag 4.

In addition, we have to contend with any potential endogeneity in explanatory variables. The variable  $Z^*$  could to be endogenous, and  $r^*$  and  $W$  may have endogenous elements. The Durbin-Wu-Hausman (DWH) test is used to examine whether the potential endogeneity of any of these variables makes the OLS estimators inconsistent. Following Davidson and MacKinnon (1989), this test is described below.<sup>24</sup> Let

$$Y = \Gamma X + \Psi, \quad (10)$$

where  $Y$  is a  $1 \times T$  vector representing the dependent variable,  $\Gamma$  is a  $1 \times k$  vector of

<sup>22</sup> See, Breusch and Pagan (1980), Section 3.2, and Davidson and MacKinnon (2004, p. 275-276).

<sup>23</sup> The computer output for the LM statistic for lags greater than 6 is not reported in Table 4. Nevertheless, this statistic is not significant for any lag-length other than four.

<sup>24</sup> Since the DWH-test is sensitive to several types of mis-specifications, Godfrey and Hutton (1994) recommend testing for general misspecification before applying it. Following their recommendation, we apply the DWH-test at this stage. However, applying it at an earlier stage does not change the qualitative relationship between the FDI and portfolio investment presented in this paper.

coefficients,  $X$  is a  $k \times T$  matrix of explanatory variables some of whom may have endogenous elements, and  $\Psi$  is a  $1 \times T$  vector of the error term. Because of correlation of  $X$  with  $\Psi$ , estimation of equation (10) may not give consistent results.

The DWH test first involves regressing the endogenous elements of  $X$  on a set of instruments. Let  $E$  be an  $h \times T$  matrix of purely exogenous variables in  $X$ , and  $V$  a  $(k-h) \times T$  matrix of variables in  $X$  that contain endogenous elements. The corresponding  $1 \times h$  and  $1 \times (k-h)$  coefficient vectors are  $\Gamma^E$  and  $\Gamma^V$ , respectively. Then,

$$Y = \Gamma^E E + \Gamma^V V + \Psi. \quad (10')$$

The first stage of this test is to regress each variable in  $V$  on  $E$ . Since  $E$  is known to be exogenous, it is an appropriate choice of instruments for each variable in  $V$ . Let the predicted or fitted values of  $V$  from these regressions be  $V^P$  so that the residuals,  $R$ , are

$$R = V - V^P, \quad (11)$$

where  $R$  is a  $(k-h) \times T$  matrix.

The second stage is running an artificial regression of  $Y$  on  $V$  and  $R$ , i.e. using OLS on

$$Y = \Gamma^V V + \Gamma^R R + \Psi, \quad (12)$$

where  $\Gamma^R$  is the  $1 \times (k-h)$  vector of coefficients of residuals from the first stage regressions. Under the null hypothesis, these coefficients should equal zero. Then, the DWH test is simply the  $F$  test for  $\Gamma^R = 0$ . Alternatively, the second stage regression may be run on  $V$  and  $V^P$ , and performing an  $F$  test that all coefficients of  $V^P$  equal zero. The two tests will give identical results since they have the same sum of squared errors.

The three variables suspected of having endogenous elements are  $Z^*$ ,  $r^*$  for Korea, and  $W$ . The DWH test was performed on all three of these variables, all six combinations of two variables at a time, and each of the three variables separately. The null hypothesis of  $\Gamma^R = 0$  (inconsistent estimators) was rejected for  $r^*$  for Korea, but not rejected for  $Z^*$  and  $W$ .<sup>25</sup> Due to the presence of serial correlation, linear 2SLS or linear IV techniques are not suitable for estimating the model. In addition, we want the estimator to be robust to a non-normal distribution of the error term.

We use the Newey-West (1987) estimator to handle estimation under these conditions. This is a generalized method of moments (GMM) estimator under conditions of serial correlation. It is based on the following assumptions: ergodic stationarity of unique and non-constant elements of variables and instruments, orthogonality of the vector of instruments to the current error term, full column rank of the covariance matrix of

<sup>25</sup> The DWH test also rejected endogeneity for  $Z^d$ .

regressors and instruments, and Gordin's condition for ergodicity that delivers asymptotic normality. (See Hayashi, 2000). The Newey-West estimator is consistent and asymptotically normal under these assumptions. With a proper weighting matrix (Bartlett in our case), it achieves minimum variance that is heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent.

Let  $Z^{nb}$  represent US investment in developing countries by non-banking institutions. We use lagged values of  $Z^*$ ,  $W$ ,  $I$ ,  $\pi^e$ ,  $Z^d$ ,  $Z^{nb}$ , and ECT as instruments for  $Z^*$  and  $W$ . The equation satisfies Hansen's (1982) test of over-identifying restrictions. That means it satisfies all the restrictions of the model (which are the assumptions stated in the previous paragraph). This non-linear estimator was actually computed by the iterative linearization method, and t and model detection tests were applied to the linear regression corresponding to the final linearization of the iterative process. Results from this regression are presented in column 4 of Table 3.

The regression equation is highly significant. Like Ruffin and Rassaekh (1986), we find that the interest rate variables and expected inflation are insignificant. Of the twelve variables (other than the constant and the error correction term) used in ECM regressions, all except three, expected inflation, real money supply, and real rate of return in Korea, have correct signs. The error correction term (that gives us a test of co-integration and the long-term relationship) is significant at 10% level. Nevertheless, it is well known that co-integration tests have low power. Thus, it is appropriate to use 10% level of significance for the error-correcting term test of co-integration.<sup>26</sup> The globalization index and total financial wealth in the US are significant at 5% level of significance. In either case, the effect is positive. Thus, both increased globalization and an increase in US real financial wealth increase US portfolio investment in developing countries.

Of all the variables,  $Z^d$  has the most significant and powerful effect on US portfolio investment in developing countries; and is significant at 1%-level all through out. The marginal effect is shown by the estimated coefficient. *Ceteris paribus*, a one million dollar of additional US direct investment in developing countries increases US portfolio investment by .54 million dollars. Ruffin and Rassekh's result that US FDI perfectly substitutes (dollar for dollar) US foreign portfolio investment does not hold for developing countries. FDI is not a substitute for portfolio investment. The two flows are

---

<sup>26</sup> In the other tests of co-integration discussed above, the 10% significance level is also used.

complementary. US FDI has a magnifying effect on developing countries by inducing substantial portfolio investment there.<sup>27</sup>

There are two possible reasons for the different results. The first one is the different geographical region covered. Ruffin and Rassekh estimated the model for total or global US capital outflows; we estimate it for outflows to developing countries only. Outflows to developing countries were an insignificant part of US total capital outflows in the earlier estimation period.<sup>28</sup> The relative extent of outflows going to the two regions matters since the relationship between the two kinds of outflows could be different and some assumptions may not be applicable. Thus, Ruffin and Rassekh's assumption of full integration of capital markets although applicable to the US and European capital markets may not directly and fully apply to the US and developing countries' capital markets. This, and the domination of total outflows by outflows to developed countries, could explain their result.

The second reason is that overriding determinants of the two kinds of outflows may have changed since 1982, the end of Ruffin and Rassekh's period. We may distinguish between two kinds of factors explaining these outflows: distinct or common. The distinct determinants for portfolio investment are as follows. In the US: interest rate and the degree of risk aversion; in developing countries: price-earnings ratio, stock market return, credit rating, secondary market price of debt, regulatory, accounting, and enforcement standards, the extent of correlation between equity returns with the US, the share of domestic capital market in world stock market, etc. Similarly, FDI is distinctly explained by good infrastructure, preferential (for FDI) as well as protectionist (for imports) policies, wage costs, education level, R&D's scale and intensity, and property and sales tax rates.

On the other hand, both portfolio and direct investment could be explained by common factors like the level of US industrial and economic activity, deregulation, bureaucratic efficiency and decreasing transactions costs in developing countries, degree of openness and foreign perceptions of a country, index of economic activity and GDP growth rate, the inflation rate, external debt situation and current account balance, non-diversifiable investment risk, income tax rates etc.<sup>29</sup> For the earlier period used by Ruffin and Rassekh, distinct factors possibly having opposite effects for the two outflows, or two distinct factors changing at the same time in opposite directions, could have been important.

---

<sup>27</sup> This reinforces Kant's (1996) result that FDI has a magnifying effect on the host countries since it reduces capital flight from these countries.

<sup>28</sup> For example, outflows to developing countries were only 10% of the total for the 1979I to 1982IV period, the period used by Ruffin and Rassekh.

<sup>29</sup> See Cheng and Kwan (2000), Sarno and Taylor (1999), and Chuhan, Claessens, and Mamingi (1998) for discussion of these determinants of direct and portfolio investment in developing countries.

**Table 3: Estimation of ECT-augmented equation (7).**

	ECM	$y, r_I, r_M$ excluded	GMM Estimator
AIC	.123E+8	.114E+8	.115E+8
SBC	188E+8	159E+8	.162E+8
Adjusted $R^2$	.4284	.4539	.3532
Jarque-Bera Statistic	18.9169	18.8512	
$dy_t$	-.17459		
$dr_{It}$	113.86		
$dr_{Mt}$	70.257		
$d\pi_t^e$	-1055.4	-1038.4	-97.224 (2965.1)
$dm_t$	-6.0715	-5.5711	-11.974 (18.157)
$dr_{Kt}$	-2182.1	-1976.8	-2325.3 (3669)
$dG_t^e$	-3.882	-3.7350	-3.0693 (6.8685)
$dW_t$	4.2975	4.3982	10.942** (5.467)
$dI_t$	1795.5	1793.3	1738.7** (790.5)
$dZ_t^d$	.69944	.69553	.53969*** (.11917)
$dZ_t^*$	.04557	.04557	-.01176 (.07412)
$dZ_t^{nb}$	.10136	.09793	.14774 (.09816)
ECT $_{t-1}$	-.08010	-.07911	-.07445* (.04115)
Constant	-3125.0	-3120.2	-2553.8** (1091.2)

Notes:  $r_I$ ,  $r_K$ , and  $r_M$  are real rates of return in Indonesia, Korea, and Mexico, respectively. \*, \*\*, and \*\*\* denote coefficients that are significant at 10%, 5%, and 1% levels, respectively.

On the other hand, for this paper's period, the common factors may be dominating, causing the two flows to become complementary.

**Table 4: LM statistic  
for auto-correlation.**

Lag	ECM	$y, r_I, r_M$ excluded
1	1.2738	1.2789
2	1.3333	1.3073
3	0.4393	0.5206
4	2.7285	2.6967
5	1.5821	1.6361
6	0.3908	0.4613

## 4 Summary and Conclusions

We find that direct and portfolio investment from the US to developing countries are not perfect substitutes. The specific composition of private flows is relevant: a decrease in portfolio investment will not be made up by an equal increase in FDI inflows, and vice versa. Consequently, different types of capital flows to developing countries could have different effects. In fact, portfolio investment is complementary to direct investment: the marginal effect of a one dollar increase in US direct investment in developing countries is to increase portfolio investment in these countries by 54 cents. US FDI in developing countries has magnified effects on these economies.

One theoretical implication of this work is that future research on asset-based exchange rate models (at least for developing countries) may benefit by giving some attention to the composition of asset flows. This observation is consistent with Taylor's (1995) conclusion that explaining exchange rate movements solely in terms of macroeconomic fundamentals may not prove successful. On the empirical side, future work could examine the sequence of these two kinds of outflows to developing countries. That is, do direct investors provide signals to portfolio investors, or is it vice-versa? Furthermore, are either of these two

inflows the "follower" and, finally, does that flow remain the "follower" in the outward direction as well? Clearly, this question is not relevant if the two flows are perfect substitutes.

## **Appendix: Variable Definitions and Data Sources**

$Z^p$  = Stock of US portfolio investment in less developed countries, viz. Eastern Europe, Latin America, other Asia and Africa, and Others. Source: Survey of Current Business, various issues. The 1991 benchmark stock numbers were obtained from the June 1993 issue. Units: millions of dollars.

$Z^d$  = Stock of US direct investment in developing countries. Source and units: same as  $Z^p$ .

$Z^*$  = Stock of total investment by developing countries in the US Source and units: as above. Historical quarterly investment flow data from the US to different geographical areas and vice versa were downloaded from the US Commerce Department's web-site.

$G^e$  = Expected gold price. It was obtained by using Box-Jenkins procedures on gold price,  $G$ , as described in the text.

$G$  = London gold bullion price. Source: International Financial Statistics (IFS). Units: dollars per fine ounce.

CPI = US Consumer Price Index, 1999 = 100. This variable is used to deflate the nominal variables and to calculate the US inflation rate. Source: IFS.

$I$  = Globalization index. GDP data in US dollars are available only on an annual basis (from either World Bank's World Development Report or the UN's Statistical Yearbook, various issues), while the current account US dollars numbers are available quarterly from IFS. The current account numbers were annualized to make them comparable to the GDP data. For each quarter, the sum of absolute value of the former was expressed as a percentage of the sum of the latter. The values so obtained were normalized by the 1979 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter value of .9376 to obtain the index. Source: UN Statistical Yearbook and IFS. (For ease of comparison, the values of  $I$  reported in the table that follows are the index as calculated above and that was used in the regression multiplied by 100.)

$m$  = US M2 or M3. Source: IFS. Units = billions of dollars.

$y$  = US GDP in current prices taken from IFS. Units: billions of dollars.

$W$  = Total private financial assets in the US Source: Balance Sheets for the US Economy, and IFS. Units = billions of dollars.

$\pi^e$  = Expected inflation rate = quarterly change in the CPI for the US forecasted over the next quarter. This was obtained by performing Box-Jenkins procedures described more fully in the paper on US inflation rate.

The rest of the data consist of nominal interest rates,  $i$ , spot exchange rates,  $S$ , and forward exchange rates,  $F$ , for Korea, Indonesia, and Mexico. Each of these variables is a period average obtained by averaging two successive quarter-end observations. The nominal interest rates used are as follows: Korea = discount rate, Mexico and Indonesia = deposit rate. The nominal interest rates and expected inflation are stated on an annualized basis. Source for nominal interest rates and spot rates: IFS; for forward exchange rates: IMF staff. Units for spot and forward exchange rates: US dollars per local currency.

Note: In the regressions and the paper, the symbols  $Z^p$ ,  $Z^d$ ,  $Z^*$ ,  $G$ ,  $G^e$ ,  $m$ ,  $y$ , and  $W$  represent real values of these variables.

## References

- [1] Aghion, P., Bacchetta P., and A. Banerjee (2004). Financial Developments and the Instability of Open Economies. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 51, 1077-1106.
- [2] Albuquerque, R. (2003). The Composition of International Capital Flows: Risk Sharing through Foreign Direct Investment. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 61, 353-383.
- [3] Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board (1999). *Balance Sheets for the US Economy*. Washington, D.C.
- [4] Breusch, T. S., and A. R. Pagan (1980). The Lagrange Multiplier Test and its Applications to Model Specification in Econometrics. *Review of Economic Studies*, 47, 239-254.
- [5] Cheng, L. K., and Y. K. Kwan (2000). What are the Determinants of the Location of Foreign Direct Investment? The Chinese Experience. *Journal of International Economics*, 51, 379-400.
- [6] Chuhan, P., Claessens S., and N. Mamingi (1998). Equity and Bond Flows to Latin America and Asia: The Role of Global and Country Factors. *Journal of Development Economics*, 55, 439-463.
- [7] Claessens, S., Dooley M. P., and A. Warner (1995). Portfolio Capital Flows: Hot or Cool? *World Bank Economic Review*, 9, 153-74.
- [8] Davidson, R., and J. G. MacKinnon (1989). Testing for Consistency using Artificial Regressions. *Econometric Theory*, 5, 363-384.
- [9] Davidson, R., and J. G. MacKinnon (1993). *Estimation and Inference in Econometrics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- [10] Davidson, R., and J. G. MacKinnon (2004). *Econometric Theory and Methods*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- [11] Eichengreen, B. (2000). Taming Capital Flows. *World Development*, 28, 1105-1116.
- [12] Enders, W. (1994). *Applied Econometric Time Series*. John Wiley, New York.
- [13] Engle, R. F., and C. W. Granger (1987). Cointegration and Error Correction: Representation, Estimation, and Testing. *Econometrica*, 55, 251-276.
- [14] Engle, R. F., and B. Yoo (1987). Forecasting and Testing in Cointegrated Systems. *Journal of Econometrics*, 35, 143-59.
- [15] Ethier, W. (1986). The Multinational Firm. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 101, 805-33.

- [16] Feldstein, M. (1994). The Effect of Outward Foreign Direct Investment on the Domestic Capital Stock, in 'The Effects of Taxation on Multinational Corporation', M. Feldstein, J. Hines, and R. G. Hubbard (Eds). University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- [17] Feldstein, M., and C. Horioka (1980). Domestic Savings and International Capital Mobility. *Economic Journal*, 90, 314-329.
- [18] Frankel, J. A., and A. K. Rose (1996). Currency Crashes in Emerging Markets: An Empirical Treatment. *Journal of International Economics*, 41, 351-366.
- [19] Flôres, R., and A. Szafarz (1996). An Extended Definition of Cointegration. *Economic Letters*, 50, 193-95.
- [20] Godfrey, L. G., and J. P. Hutton (1994). Discriminating between Errors-in-Variables/Simultaneity and Misspecification in Linear Regression Models. *Economic Letters*, 44, 359-64.
- [21] Haug, A. A. (1993). Residual Based Tests for Cointegration: A Monte Carlo Study of Size Distortions. *Economic Letters*, 41, 345-51.
- [22] Haug, A. A. (1996). Tests for Cointegration: A Monte Carlo Comparison. *Journal of Econometrics*, 71, 89-115.
- [23] Hansen, L. (1982). Large Sample Properties of GMM Estimators. *Econometrica*, 50, 1029-54.
- [24] Hayashi, F. (2000). *Econometrics*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- [25] Hood, N., and S. Young (1979). *The Economics of Multinational Enterprise*. Longman, London.
- [26] International Monetary Fund. *International Financial Statistics*, various issues.
- [27] Johansen, S. (1991). Estimation and Hypothesis Testing of Cointegration Vectors in Gaussian Vector Autoregressive Models. *Econometrica*, 59, 1551-80.
- [28] Johansen, S. (1995). *Likelihood-based Inference in Cointegrated Vector Autoregressive Models*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- [29] Kant, C. (1996). *Foreign Direct Investment and Capital Flight*. Princeton Studies in International Finance, 80, Princeton.
- [30] Kant, C. (2005). Capital Mobility among Advanced Economies. *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 27, 1067-1081.
- [31] Kennedy, P. (2003). *A Guide to Econometrics (5th ed.)*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

- [32] Maddala, G. S., and I-M. Kim (1998). *Unit Roots, Co-integration, and Structural Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [33] Mills, J. A., and K. Prasad (1992). A Comparison of Model Selection Criteria. *Econometric Reviews*, 11, 201-33.
- [34] Newey, W., and K. West (1987). Hypothesis Testing with Efficient Method of Moments Estimation. *International Economic Review*, 28, 777-787.
- [35] Neumann, R. M. (2003). International Capital Flows under Asymmetric Information and Costly Monitoring: Implications of Debt and Equity Financing. *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 36, 674-700.
- [36] Obstfeld, M. (1998). The Global Capital Market: Benefactor or Menace? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12, 9-30.
- [37] Phillips, P. C. B. (1987). Time Series Regression with a Unit Root. *Econometrica*, 55, 277-301.
- [38] Razin, A., and E. Sadka (2003). Gains from FDI with Incomplete Information. *Economic Letters*, 78, 71-77.
- [39] Razin, A., Sadka E., and C. Yuen (1999). An Information-Based Model of Foreign Direct Investment: The Gains from Trade Revisited. *International Tax and Public Finance*, 6, 579-596.
- [40] Ruffin, R. J., and F. Rassekh (1986). The Role of Foreign Direct Investment in US Capital Outflows. *American Economic Review*, 76, 1126-37.
- [41] Sachs, J. D., Tornell A., and A. Velasco (1996). Financial Crisis in Emerging Markets: The Lessons from 1995. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1, 147-215.
- [42] Sarno, L., and M. P. Taylor (1999). Moral Hazard, Asset Price Bubbles, Capital Flows, and the East Asian Crisis: the First Tests. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 18, 637-657.
- [43] Soto, M. (2003). Taxing Capital Flows: An Empirical Investigation. *Journal of Development Economics*, 72, 203-221.
- [44] Taylor, M. P. (1995). The Economics of Exchange Rates. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 33, 13-47.
- [45] Tudela, M. (2004). Explaining Currency Crisis: A Duration Model Approach. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 23, 799-816.
- [46] World Bank (1993). *World Debt Tables*. Washington D.C.