ISSN: 2065-0175

Acta

(ECONOMICA



Determinants of Foreign Portfolio Investments: BRICS as a Unit of Analysis

Kunofiwa Tsaurai¹

Abstract: The determinants of foreign portfolio investment in BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa) were examined in this study using panel data (1998-2020) analysis methods such as Fully Modified Ordinary Least Squares (FMOLS), fixed effects and pooled ordinary least squares (OLS). What necessitated the author to undertake this study is that the existing literature on the determinants of foreign portfolio investment is full of gaps. This study is all focused on trying to fill these gaps, already enunciated in the introductory section. Economic growth under the fixed effects had a significant positive influence on foreign portfolio investment. Also, the FMOLS show that savings' impact on foreign portfolio investment was observed to be significantly positive. The pooled OLS also indicates that stock market development had a positive and significant effect on foreign portfolio investment was observed to significantly negative under the FMOLS approach. The study therefore encourages BRICS authorities to implement policies aimed at increasing economic growth, stock market development and savings to attract more foreign portfolio investment.

Keywords: Foreign Portfolio Investments; Panel Data; BRICS

JEL Classification: F21; C23; P2

1. Introduction

Background: According to Errunza (2001), foreign portfolio investment enhances financial resources available in the country thereby lessening the liquidity constraints for the local companies. Harvey (2003) argued that foreign portfolio investment increases the liquidity levels in the economy thereby ensuring the deficit sectors of the economy are well catered for. Moreover, financial liquidity constraints are solved

¹ Professor, Department of Finance, Risk Management and Banking, University of South Africa, Address: P.O. Box 392, UNISA 0003, Pretoria, South Africa, Corresponding author: tsaurk@unisa.ac.za.

through the increase in foreign portfolio investment inflows (Laeven. 2003). Several empirical researches examined the influence of foreign portfolio investment on economic growth and it appears there is a consensus that the economy is enhanced by the foreign portfolio investment. Examples of empirical research which concluded that foreign portfolio investment enhances economic growth include Ndong (2015), Sumanjeet (2009), Kania-Morales and Mroz (2014), Loncan and Caldeira (2015), and Elekwa et al (2016), Nyang'oro (2013), among others.

The weakness concerning the empirical research on the influence of foreign portfolio investment on economic growth is that such studies can not be used to formulate policies aimed at enhancing foreign portfolio investment. As a result, relevant empirical research on policy making purposes should be tailor made at investigating the determinants of foreign portfolio investment. This is the focus of this study. There are several studies which tried to investigate the determinants of foreign portfolio investment. Some of these studies include Al-Smadi (2018), Singhania and Saini (2017), Ngwenya (2019), Khayat (2020), Badawi et al (2019), Chaudhry et al (2014), Nwosa and Adeleke (2017), Oke et al (2020), Syarifuddin (2020), Dua and Garg (2013) and Syarifuddin (2020), among others. They produced mixed, divergent and conflicting results which show that there is no consensus. In other words, a single list of foreign portfolio investment determinants does not exist yet.

Contribution of the study: There are five ways to describe this study's contribution. This study investigated the determinants of foreign portfolio investments using BRICS as a unit of analysis. Earlier empirical research has not focused on the economic bloc, to the best knowledge of the author. This study examined how the complementarity of trade openness and foreign direct investment affected foreign portfolio investment in BRICS. The impact of such a variable on foreign portfolio investment has never been investigated to the author's best knowledge. Unlike this study, majority of empirical research on the determinants of foreign portfolio investment used time series approaches. This study used the most recent data.

Structure of the paper: Section 2 deals with theoretical determinants of foreign portfolio investment, Section 3 summarizes the empirical research on the foreign portfolio investment determinants whilst Section 4 presents and describes the foreign portfolio investment trends for BRICS for a selected period. Section 5 describes the research methodological framework, pre-estimation diagnostics and final data analysis. The conclusion is devoted to Section 6. Section 7 list the bibliography.

2. Theoretical Literature Review

Table 1 provides a summary of theoretical literature on the determinants of foreign portfolio investments.

| Table 1. The Theoretical Relationship between the Dependence | ndent Variable and its |
|--|------------------------|
| Explanatory Variables | |

| Explanatory | Theoretical views | Expected |
|------------------------------|---|----------|
| variables | | sign |
| Stock market development | According to Al-Smadi (2018), higher stock market indices attract foreign portfolio investors as they are more likely to offer higher returns. Liquid stock markets also attract foreign portfolio investments as they enable the investors to pull out their funds at any time. Consistent with Bartels et al (2009), developed stock markets enables easy linkages between local and foreign markets thereby doing away with entry and exit constraints for foreign investors. According to Gordon and Gupta (2004), foreign portfolio investments are negatively affected by stock market development especially when investments are made at a time when the stock market is on a downward spiral with the hope that it will rise. | +/- |
| Economic growth | According to Garg and Dua (2014), high levels of economic growth gives an impression of a very stable economy or country hence attracting foreign portfolio investments. Stable economy enables the domestic firms to make more profits and increase their share prices on the stock exchanges. This attracts foreign portfolio investments, according to Al-Smadi (2018). | +/- |
| Foreign direct investment | According to Hailu (2010), foreign portfolio investments is crowded out by direct foreign investments in an environment characterised by shallow financial markets. The same study done by Hailu (2010) argued the volatility of foreign portfolio investments is stabilised by foreign direct investment through its macroeconomic stabilisation abilities. | +/- |
| Openness to trade | Consistent with Dobbs et al (2013), trade openness enhances mobility of the international capital thereby promoting foreign portfolio investments. High trade openness is a sign to the foreign investors that the government is | + |

ACTA UNIVERSITATIS DANUBIUS

Vol 18, no 3, 2022

| | committed to the implementation of stable macroeconomic enhancement policies (Alesina and Dollar. 2000). | |
|---|--|-----|
| Population | Ahmad et al (2015) argued that market size is enhanced by higher levels of population growth. The latter has got an effect of increasing the demand of securities (investment) in the economy | + |
| Savings | In line with Masood and Mohsin (2002), domestic savings was found to have had a non- significant positive influence on foreign portfolio investments in Pakistan. Abdelhafidh (2013) observed that savings attracted foreign portfolio investments in developing countries. | + |
| Human capital development | Ngwenya (2019) noted that the influence of human capital development on foreign portfolio investments was positive and significant in the context of emerging markets. | + |
| Exchange rates | Al-Smadi (2018) argued that depreciated local currency negatively affects the value of the return on investments, a factor which chases away potential foreign portfolio investments. In contrast, an increase in the value of the local currency scales up the confidence that potential foreign portfolio investors have in the economy (Garg and Dua. 2014). | +/- |
| Inflation | Potential foreign portfolio investors are dissuaded to invest their money in an inflationary environment because they are afraid of losing not only returns but their original investment (Al- Smadi. 2018). | - |
| External debt | In the case of China, external debt had a significant deleterious effect on foreign portfolio investments (Ahmad et al. 2015). | - |
| Complementarity between trade openness and foreign direct investment | Nzete and Akintunde (2019), Mehar and Hasan (2018) and Chaudhry et al (2014) noted that foreign direct investment in an open economy tends to enhance the inflow of foreign portfolio investment. In other words, the more open the economy is, the more that economy attracts foreign direct investment and consequently the inflow of foreign portfolio investment | + |

Source: Author Compilation

3. Empirical Literature Review

Table 2 summarises the recent empirical research work on the determinants of foreign portfolio investments.

| Author | Unit of analysis | Approach | Findings |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Al- Smadi (2018) | Jordan | Granger causality tests (2000-2016) | Stable macro-economic environment, stable financial market, political stability and reasonable liquidity levels were found to be the factors that had a significant influence on foreign portfolio investment. |
| Singhani a and Saini (2018) | Developed and developing countries | Panel generalized methods of moments (GMM), 2004-2013 | Trade openness, stock market development and interest rate differentials were observed to have had a significant impact on foreign portfolio investment in developed countries. The same variables were found to have had a significant influence on foreign portfolio investments in developing countries. |
| Haider et al (2016) | China | Multiple regression analysis | External debt, economic growth, exchange rates and population were found to be the key variables which influenced foreign portfolio investments in China. |
| Ngweny a (2019) | Emerging markets | Dynamic GMM, fixed effects, random effects, fully modified ordinary least squares (FMOLS) | Trade openness, financial development, exchange rates, economic growth, savings and human capital development had a significant positive effect on foreign portfolio investment. |
| Khayat (2020) | Gulf Cooperatio n Council (GCC) group of nations | Fixed effects, GMM methods, random effects | Financial development, infrastructural development and trade openness had a positive influence effect on foreign portfolio investments. |
| Badawi et al (2019) | Saudi Arabia | Regression analysis | Firms with high levels of tangible assets and firms which are privately owned attracted foreign portfolio investments. Firms characterized by high levels of liquidity and or owned by the government repel foreign portfolio investments. |
| Chaudhr y et al (2014) | Pakistan | Time series analysis of data | Financial development, trade openness and the lag of foreign portfolio investments had a positive influence on foreign portfolio |

 Table 2. Related Empirical Research

ACTA UNIVERSITATIS DANUBIUS

Vol 18, no 3, 2022

| | | | investments. Foreign direct investments had a foreign portfolio investments reduction effect. |
|---|--------------------------------|--|---|
| Nwosa and Adeleke (2017) | Nigeria | E-GARCH | Economic growth, financial development and trade openness to a larger extent had a significant impact on foreign portfolio investments in Nigeria. |
| Oke et al (2020) | Emerging markets | Autoregressive distributed lag (ARDL) and error correction model (ECM) | Financial development, economic growth, interest rate and real exchange rate had a positive effect on foreign portfolio investments. |
| Giritli (2020) | South Africa | ARDL | Financial development, exchange rates, economic growth and interest rates had a significant influence on foreign portfolio investments. |
| Syarifud din (2020) | ASEAN group of countries | Descriptive statistics | Inflation rate, interest rate differential, economic growth and government debt attracted foreign portfolio investments |
| Nzete and Akintun de (2019) | Nigeria | GARCH model | High interest rate, foreign direct investment, economic growth, currency depreciation had a positive influence of foreign portfolio investments in Nigeria. |
| Agarwal et al (2020) | China | Descriptive statistics | Information advantages, diversification and comparative advantages played a huge role in influencing foreign portfolio investments in China |
| Dua and Garg (2013) | India | ARDL | Key variables which influenced foreign portfolio investments in India include exchange rates, stock market development and economic growth. |
| Kumar et al (2019) | India | ARDL | Exchange rate, stock market development and foreign exchange reserves were the factors which influenced foreign portfolio investments in India. |
| Jothiraja n (2018) | India | Multi-regression analysis | Stock market development was observed to be a major factor which had a significant influence on foreign portfolio investments in India |
| Kirti and Shahid (2020) | India | Multi-regression analysis | Exchange rates, economic growth, stock market development and interest rates differentials were the key factors which influenced foreign portfolio investments in India |

ISSN: 2065-0175

ŒCONOMICA

| Raghava n and Selvam (2017) | India | | Exchange rate and foreign currency reserves had a significant influence on foreign portfolio investments in India |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| Fagbola et al (2020) | Nigeria | ARDL | Country specific related variables were key determinants of foreign portfolio investments into the Nigerian economy. |
| Mudyaz vivi (2016) | Sub Saharan Africa (SSA) | Panel data analysis | Infrastructural development and economic growth are the two main factors which attracted foreign portfolio investment into the SSA countries. |
| Nxumalo and Makoni (2021) | Emerging markets | GMM approach | Positive determinants of foreign portfolio investments include trade openness, economic growth and stable institutional quality standards. |
| Duruechi (2021) | Nigeria | Vector Error Correction Model (VECM) | Stock market development, economic growth, inflation and interest rates were observed to be the key variables which influenced foreign portfolio investments in Nigeria. |
| Mugable h and Oudat (2018) | Jordan | ARDL | Foreign direct investments, government expenditure, stock market development and money supply growth were all found to be key drivers of foreign portfolio investments. |
| Schnorre nberger and Meurer (2017) | Emerging economies | GMM | Current account balance, real exchange rates and fiscal prudence played a huge role in influencing foreign portfolio investments in emerging economies. |
| Mehar and Hasan (2018) | Pakistan | ARDL | Trade openness, foreign direct investment, stock market development and money supply levels were found to be the major determinants of foreign portfolio investments in Pakistan. |
| Aziz et al (2015) | Pakistan | Multiple regression analysis | Inflation had a negative influence on foreign portfolio investments. On the other hand, economic growth, trade openness and stock market development had a significant positive effect on foreign portfolio investments in Pakistan. |

Source: Author compilation

What is coming out clearly from the empirical research results presented in Table 2 is that there is no mutually agreed list of the determinants of foreign portfolio investments. The empirical research also indicates that there are mixed, conflicting

and or diverging results regarding the findings on the determinants of foreign portfolio investments. In other words, there is an absence of consensus in the literature in as far as foreign portfolio investments determinants is concerned. These gaps prompted this study.



4. Foreign Portfolio Investment Trends in BRICS

Figure 1: Foreign portfolio equity investments net inflows (% of GDP) trend analysis for BRICS

Source: Author

Brazil's net inflow of foreign portfolio investments went up by 1.38 percentage points, from 0.31% in 2004 to 1.71% in 2010. However, the five-year period from 2010 to 2015 saw Brazil's net inflow of foreign portfolio investments going down by 1.16 percentage points (from 1.71% in 2010 to 0.54% in 2015). The subsequent five-year period saw Brazil's net inflow of foreign portfolio investments further going down from 0.54% in 2015 to a negative 0.36% in 2020.

Russia's net inflow of foreign portfolio investments has been on a downward trend from 2004 to 2020. It declined by 0.26 percentage points, from 0.04% in 2004 to a negative 0.22% in 2010 before further plummeting by a further 0.09 percentage points (from a negative 0.22% in 2010 to a negative 0.31% in 2015). The subsequent

five-year period saw Russia's net foreign portfolio investments further going down by 0.72 percentage points (from -0.31% in 2015 to -1.02% in 2020).

India's foreign portfolio investments net inflow trends were mixed during the time period ranging from 2004 to 2020. The period ranging from 2004 to 2010 saw India's net inflow foreign portfolio investments going up by 0.54 percentage points, (from 1.28% in 2004 to 1.82% in 2010). However, India's foreign portfolio investments net inflows plummeted by 1.72 percentage points, from 1.82% in 2010 to 0.09% in 2015. A rebound was experienced during the subsequent five-year time period, which saw India's net inflow foreign portfolio investments going up by 0.84 percentage points (from 0.09% in 2015 to 0.93% in 2020).

In the case of China, foreign portfolio investments net inflows went down from 0.56% in 20004 to 0.52% in 2010, representing a decline by 0.04 percentage points. A further decline by 0.38 percentage points (from 0.52% in 2010 to 0.14% in 2015) was observed during the subsequent five-year period. China's net inflow of foreign portfolio investments increased by 0.30 percentage points during the subsequent five-year timeframe (from 0.14% in 2015 to 0.44% in 2020).

South Africa's foreign portfolio investments trend is also mixed during the 17-year time frame under study. The net inflow of its foreign portfolio investments plummeted from 2.60% in 2004 to 1.40% in 2010. A rebound of South Africa's foreign portfolio investments net inflow was experienced during the five-year time period ranging from 2010 to 2015. It went up by 1.06 percentage points, from 1.40% in 2010 to 2.45% in 2015. A massive 3.99 percentage points decline in South Africa's foreign portfolio investments was observed during the subsequent five-year period. It went down from 2.45% in 2015 to -1.54% in 2020.

BRICS countries' foreign portfolio investments experienced upward and downward trends during the 17-year period under study (see Figure 1). Although Figure 1 shows trends for BRICS' foreign portfolio investments net inflows, its weakness is that it cannot tell the reader the underlying causes of the trends for economic bloc. It is for this reason that the current study investigated the determinants of foreign portfolio investments in BRICS economic bloc.

5. Research Methodology

Data: The determinants of foreign portfolio investments were examined using panel data (1998-2020) analysis methods. The secondary data used was mainly extracted from World Development Indicators. The latter is an international database whose main advantages are that of (1) reliability, (2) transparency, (3) consistency and (4) verifiability.

Pre-estimation diagnostics: This sub-section encompasses correlation analysis and descriptive statistics.

| | FPEI | STOC | OPEN | FDI | POP | HCD | GROWT | SA |
|------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|---------|------|
| | | K | | | | | Н | V |
| FPEI | 1.00 | | | | | | | |
| STOCK | 0.42** * | 1.00 | | | | | | |
| OPEN | 0.05 | 0.38** * | 1.00 | | | | | |
| FDI | -0.21* | - 0.47** * | -0.15 | 1.00 | | | | |
| РОР | 0.46** * | 0.64** * | 0.03 | - 0.34** * | 1.00 | | | |
| HCD | - 0.35** * | - 0.35** * | - 0.24** | 0.23** | - 0.73** * | 1.00 | | |
| GROWT H | - 0.24** | -0.16 | - 0.31** * | 0.09 | - 0.53** * | 0.69** * | 1.00 | |
| SAV | -0.15 | - 0.45** * | 0.29** * | 0.21** | - 0.45** * | 0.002 | -0.25** | 1.00 |

Table 3. Correlation Analysis

***/** represents 1%, 5% and 10% significant level respectively Source: E-Views

Where FPEI, STOCK, OPEN, FDI, POP, HCD, GROWTH and SAV respectively stands for foreign portfolio investment, stock market development, trade openness, foreign direct investment, population growth, human capital development, economic growth and savings.

Table 3 show a significant positive relationship between (1) foreign portfolio investments and stock market development and (2) foreign portfolio investments and population growth. A significant negative relationship was observed between (3) foreign portfolio investments and foreign direct investment, (4) foreign portfolio investments and economic growth. A non-significant positive relationship between foreign portfolio investments and trade openness was observed. A significant negative relationship between savings and foreign portfolio investments was also detected. The maximum size of the correlation was found to be between population and human capital development (-73%), an illustration that there exists a multi-collinearity problem between the two variables. This interpretation resonates with Stead (2007).

ISSN: 2065-0175

ŒCONOMICA

| | FPEI | STOCK | OPEN | FDI | POP | HCD | GROWTH | SAV |
|--------------|-------|--------|-------|------|------|-------|--------|-------|
| Mean | 0.62 | 95.23 | 44.86 | 2.31 | 0.86 | 0.71 | 6 721 | 29.31 |
| Median | 0.44 | 66.00 | 47.15 | 2.13 | 0.89 | 0.72 | 6 797 | 29.79 |
| Maximum | 4.92 | 322.71 | 65.97 | 4.55 | 1.62 | 0.84 | 15 975 | 51.09 |
| Minimum | -1.54 | 17.58 | 22.11 | 0.21 | 0.01 | 0.52 | 627.77 | 15.16 |
| Standard | 1.09 | 75.66 | 11.47 | 1.16 | 0.48 | 0.08 | 3 899 | 10.85 |
| deviation | | | | | | | | |
| Skewness | 0.94 | 1.49 | -0.49 | 0.17 | - | -0.45 | 0.16 | 0.53 |
| | | | | | 0.16 | | | |
| Kurtosis | 4.81 | 4.09 | 2.23 | 2.09 | 1.82 | 2.33 | 2.29 | 2.15 |
| Jarque-Bera | 24.18 | 35.67 | 5.42 | 3.36 | 5.32 | 4.51 | 2.12 | 6.52 |
| Probability | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.06 | 0.19 | 0.07 | 0.11 | 0.35 | 0.04 |
| Observations | 115 | 115 | 115 | 115 | 115 | 115 | 115 | 115 |

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics

Source: E-Views

The range for stock market capitalization and economic growth exceeded 100 whilst the standard deviation for the same variables were greater than 75. Such results show that there exist extreme values in the two variables. The data for foreign portfolio investments, stock market capitalization, foreign direct investment, economic growth and savings were skewed to the right whilst the data for trade openness, population growth and human capital development was skewed to the left. The results are an indication that the data for majority of the variables was skewed to the right (abnormal distribution). The probability of the Jarque-Bera criteria for variables such as stock market capitalization and human capital development, an indication that the data for these two variables was abnormally distributed. Except for foreign portfolio investments, the data for other variables was converted into natural logarithms for the obvious reasons such as managing extreme values and abnormal distribution and the multilinearity problem of the data. Aye and Edoja (2017) did the same to manage these econometric problems associated with data.

Economic model specification: Equations 1 and 2 sums up the economic models used in this study.

FPEI=f (OPEN, FDI, STOCK, POP, HCD, GROWTH, SAV)

Equation 1 above represents a summary of the determinants of foreign portfolio investments, consistent with existing empirical literature (Aziz et al. 2015; Mehar and Hasan. 2018; Mugableh and Oudat. 2018; Duruechi. 2021; Mudyazvivi. 2016; Fagbola et al. 2020; Jothirajan. 2018; Nxumalo and Makoni. 2021).

In econometric terminology, equation 1 is transformed into equation 2 below.

(1)

| $\text{FPEI}_{\text{it}} = \beta_0 + \beta_1$ | |
|--|-----|
| $OPEN_{it} + \beta_2 FDI_{it} + \beta_3 (OPEN_{it} + FDI_{it}) + \beta_4 STOCK_{it} + \beta_5 POP_{it} + \beta_6 HCD_{it}$ | |
| $+\beta_7 \text{GROWTH}_{\text{it}} + \beta_7 \text{SAV}_{\text{it}} + \mu + \varepsilon$ | (2) |

| β_0 | Intercept term |
|------------------------|---|
| β_1 to β_7 | Co-efficient of the explanatory variables |
| μ | Time invariant and unobserved country specific |
| | effect |
| 3 | Error term |
| i | Country |
| t | Time |
| FPEI | Foreign portfolio investments net inflows in |
| 11 | country i at time t |
| STOCK _{it} | Stock market capitalization in country i at time t |
| OPEN _{it} | Trade openness in country i at time t |
| FDI _{it} | Foreign direct investments net inflows in country i |
| | at time t |
| POP _{it} | Population growth in country i at time t |
| HCD _{it} | Human capital development in country i at time t |
| GROWTH | Economic growth in country i at time t |
| | |
| SAV _{it} | Savings in country i at time t |

Table 5. Interpretations of Equation 2 Signs

Source: Author

Consistent with Nzete and Akintunde (2019), Mehar and Hasan (2018) and Chaudhry et al (2014), the complementarity between trade openness and foreign direct investment was introduced in equation 2 as one of the explanatory factors of foreign portfolio investment. The complementarity variable explores if foreign direct investment is a channel through which trade openness enhances foreign portfolio investment in BRICS group of countries. It also examines if the combination between trade openness and foreign direct investment significantly enhances foreign portfolio investment inflows into BRICS. If the complementarity variable is positive and significant, the results means that the combination between the two variables significantly enhances the inflow of foreign portfolio inflows into BRICS. Fully modified ordinary least squares (FMOLS), fixed effects and pooled OLS were used as the econometric estimation methodologies for equation 2.

| Variable | | Measures used | Data sour | rces |
|--------------|------------|--------------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Foreign | portfolio | Foreign portfolio equity net inflows | World | Development |
| equity i | investment | (% of GDP) | Indicator | S |
| (FPEI) | | | | |
| Stock | market | Stock market capitalization (% of | World | Development |
| development | (STOCK) | GDP) | Indicator | S |
| Human | capital | Human capital development index | World | Development |
| development | (HCD) | | Indicators | |
| Population | growth | Population growth (% of annual) | World | Development |
| (POP) | | | Indicator | S |
| Foreign | direct | Net foreign direct investment | World | Development |
| investment (| FDI) | inflows (% of GDP) | Indicator | S |
| Trade | openness | Total of exports and imports (% of | World | Development |
| (OPEN) | | GDP) | Indicators | |
| Economic | growth | Gross domestic product per capita | World | Development |
| (GROWTH) | | | Indicator | S |
| Savings (SA) | V) | Gross domestic savings (% of GDP) | World | Development |
| _ | | | Indicator | 'S |

Table 6. Variables, Measures and the Sources of Data

Source: Author

Mehar and Hasan (2018), Aziz et al (2015), Duruechi (2021), Mugableh and Oudat (2018), Fagbola et al (2020), Mudyazvivi (2016), Nxumalo and Makoni (2021) and Jothirajan (2018) are some of the few empirical researches which informed the choice of the proxies summarized in Table 6. Data availability was also one of the considerations when choosing the proxy to use for each of the variable.

Panel stationarity tests: Levin, Lin and Chu (2002); ADF Fisher Chi Square, Im, Pesaran and Shin (2003) and PP Fisher Chi Square tests are respectively represented by LLC, ADF, IPS and PP. Table 7 indicates that other variables were not stationary whilst the other variables were stationary. However, none of the variables were not stationary at first difference. Such results paved way for panel co-integration tests to be undertaken.

| Level | | | | | | |
|------------------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|--|--|
| | LLC | IPS | ADF | PP | | |
| | -2.79*** | -1.69** | 16.77* | 35.678*** | | |
| FPEI | | | | | | |
| STOCK | -4.50*** | -2.73*** | 25.29*** | 32.58*** | | |
| OPEN | -0.94 | -0.48 | 12.96 | 13.56 | | |
| FDI | -1.53* | -1.37* | 17.92* | 26.72*** | | |
| POP | -2.82*** | -1.22** | -2.88** | -1.28*** | | |
| HCD | -1.64* | -0.98 | 13.09 | 19.17** | | |
| GROWTH | -4.26*** | -2.38*** | 21.75** | 51.91*** | | |
| SAV | -0.47 | 0.22 | 8.11 | 7.61 | | |
| First difference | | | | | | |
| | -11.21*** | -9.52*** | 78.00*** | 117.12*** | | |
| FPEI | | | | | | |
| STOCK | -8.39*** | -6.88*** | 57.25*** | 99.97*** | | |
| OPEN | -5.35*** | -3.53*** | 30.60*** | 65.67*** | | |
| FDI | -5.67*** | -6.19*** | 51.84*** | 96.14*** | | |
| POP | -5.18*** | -4.21*** | -6.43*** | -5.19*** | | |
| HCD | -10.56*** | -9.39*** | 78.14*** | 127.66*** | | |
| GROWTH | -3.02*** | -5.18*** | 101.72*** | 125.34*** | | |
| SAV | -3.15*** | -3.51*** | 31.22*** | 51.88*** | | |

 Table 7. Panel Root Tests – Individual Intercept

Source: E-Views

Panel co-integration tests: The results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Kao's (1999) results

| Series | ADF t-statistic |
|--|-----------------|
| FPEI STOCK OPEN FDI POP HCD GROWTH SAV | -4.8261*** |
| Source: Author | |

The co-integration tests for the foreign portfolio investments function was performed using the Kao (1999) approach. Table 8 produced results which show that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. The null hypothesis in this study is represented by the following statement: A long run relationship exist among the variables under study. According to Guisan (2014), these results cleared room for final data analysis to be undertaken (see results in Table 9).

Main data analysis: Table 9 presents the results for the fixed effects, pooled OLS and the fully modified ordinary least squares.

| | Fixed effects | | Fully | Modified | Pooled OLS | |
|---------------------------|---------------|-------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------|
| | | | Ordinary | Least | | |
| | | - | Squares | | | |
| | Co- | t- | Co- | t-statistic | Co- | t-statistic |
| | efficicent | statistic | efficicent | | efficicent | |
| OPEN | 1.42 | 1.2701 | 0.72 | 0.5934 | 0.58 | 1.1465 |
| FDI | 0.34 | 1.5485 | 0.34 | 1.5620 | 0.28 | 1.5406 |
| | 0.03*** | 4.9593 | 0.45 | 1.4384 | 0.23 | 0.3731 |
| OPEN.FDI | | | | | | |
| STOCK | 0.53 | 1.5480 | 0.32 | 0.8596 | 0.55** | 2.1533 |
| POP | 0.06 | 0.2684 | 0.05 | 0.2162 | 0.1890 | 1.1298 |
| HCD | -3.16 | - | -4.31* | -1.8494 | -0.94 | -0.5679 |
| | | 1.4207 | | | | |
| GROWTH | 0.59* | 1.7194 | 0.32 | 0.7341 | 0.01 | 0.0326 |
| SAV | 2.17 | 1.6440 | 2.52* | 1.9419 | 0.36 | 0.8993 |
| Adjusted R-squared 0.7183 | | Adjusted | R-squared | Adjusted R-squared 0.67 | | |
| F-statistic 121.32 | | 0.5716 | | F-statistic | 92.16 | |
| Prob (F-statistic) 0.0000 | | F-statistic | | Prob | (F-statistic) | |
| | | | 62.94 | | 0.0000 | |
| | | | Prob | (F-statistic) | | |
| | | | 0.0000 | | | |

| Table 9. Main Data Analysis | s on the Determinan | its of Foreign | Portfolio |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------|
| Inv | estments | | |

Source: E-Views

Trade openness's influence on foreign portfolio investments was observed to be positive but non-significant across all the three econometric estimation methodologies. Such results are consistent with a study by Dobbs et al (2013) which explained that trade openness enhances mobility of the international capital thereby promoting foreign portfolio investments. Under the fixed effects, FMOLS and the pooled OLS, foreign direct investment had an insignificant positive effect on foreign portfolio investment. The results are in line with Hailu (2010) whose study argued the volatility of foreign portfolio investments is stabilised by foreign direct investment through its macroeconomic stabilisation abilities. The influence of the complementarity variable (trade openness x foreign direct investment) on foreign portfolio investment was found to be positively significant only under the fixed effects. The pooled OLS and FMOLS noted that the complementarity variable had a non-significant enhancing effect on foreign portfolio investment. These results agree with authors such as Nzete and Akintunde (2019), Mehar and Hasan (2018) and Chaudhry et al (2014) whose studies implied that foreign direct investment in an open economy tends to enhance the inflow of foreign portfolio investment. In other words, the more open the economy is, the more that economy attracts foreign direct investment and consequently the inflow of foreign portfolio investment.

Stock market development was found to have a non-significant positive influence on foreign portfolio investments under the fully modified least squares (FMOLS) and fixed effects whilst the pooled OLS approach noted that stock market development 's impact on foreign portfolio investment was significantly positive. The results resonate with Bartels et al (2009) whose study argued that developed stock markets enable easy linkages between local and foreign markets thereby doing away with entry and exit constraints for foreign investors.

Consistent with Ahmad et al (2015) whose study noted that market size is enhanced by higher levels of population growth, all the three panel data analysis approaches noted that population growth enhanced foreign portfolio investment in a nonsignificant manner. Ahmad et al (2015) further argued that higher market size has got an effect of increasing the demand of securities (investment) in the economy. In contrast to available literature (Ngwenya. 2019), a non-significant negative correlation running from human capital development towards foreign portfolio investment was observed under the fixed effects and pooled OLS approaches. The FMOLS approach also noted that the impact of human capital development on foreign portfolio investment was significantly negative, a finding which also is at variance with the available literature on the subject matter. Economic growth's influence on foreign portfolio investment was observed to be significantly positive under the fixed effects. However, pooled OLS and FMOLS produced results which shows that the influence of economic growth on foreign portfolio investment was not only positive but insignificant. The findings resonate with Garg and Dua (2014) whose study noted that high levels of economic growth give an impression of a very stable economy or country hence attracting foreign portfolio investments. Savings was observed to have had a significantly positive impact on foreign portfolio investments under the FMOLS approach. However, fixed effects and pooled OLS indicated that savings had an insignificant positive effect on foreign portfolio investment in BRICS. These results support the available literature by Masood and Mohsin (2002) and Abdelhafidh (2013) whose research noted that savings attract foreign portfolio investments into developing countries.

6. Conclusion

The determinants of foreign portfolio investment in BRICS was examined in this study using panel data (1998-2020) analysis methods such as Fully Modified Ordinary Least Squares (FMOLS), fixed effects and pooled ordinary least squares (OLS). What necessitated the author to undertake this study is that the existing literature on the determinants of foreign portfolio investment is full of gaps. This study is all focused on trying to fill these gaps, already enunciated in the introductory section. Economic growth under the fixed effects had a significant positive influence on foreign portfolio investment. Also, the FMOLS show that savings' impact on

foreign portfolio investment was observed to be significantly positive. The pooled OLS also indicates that stock market development had a positive and significant effect on foreign portfolio investment. Finally, human capital development's influence on foreign portfolio investment was observed to significantly negative under the FMOLS approach. The study therefore encourages BRICS authorities to implement policies aimed at increasing economic growth, stock market development and savings to attract more foreign portfolio investment.

References

Abdelhafidh, S. (2013). Potential financing sources of investment and economic growth in North African countries: A causality analysis. *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 35(1), pp. 150–169.

Agarwal, I.; Gu, G.W. & Prasad, E. (2020). The determinants of China's international portfolio equity allocations, *IZA Institute of Labour Economics Discussion Paper Series Number 13001*.

Ahmad, F.; Draz, M.U. & Yang, S. (2015). Determinants of foreign portfolio inflows: Analysis and implications for China. *Asian Journal of Finance and Accounting*. 7(2), pp. 66–77.

Alesina, A. & Dollar, D. (2000). Who gives foreign aid to whom and why? *Journal of Economic Growth*, 5(1), pp. 33–63.

Al-Smadi, M.O. (2018). Determinants of foreign portfolio investment: The case of Jordan. *Investment Management and Financial Innovations*, 15 (1), pp. 328-336.

Aye, G.C. & Edoja, P.E. (2017). Effect of economic growth on CO2 emission in developing countries: Evidence from a dynamic panel threshold regression model. *General and Applied Economics*, https://doi.org/10.1080/23322039.2017.1379239

Aziz, B.; Anwar, Z. & Shawnawaz, S. (2015). Determinants of foreign portfolio investment (FPI): Evidence from Pakistan, *Asian Journal of Educational Research and Technology*, 5 (2), pp. 161-169.

Badawi, A.; Qudah, A.A. & Rashideh, W.M. (2019). Determinants of foreign portfolio investment in emerging markets: Evidence from Saudi stock market. *Journal of Economics and Finance*, 37 (4), pp. 1-19.

Bartels, F.L.; Alladina, S.N. & Lederer, S. (2009). Foreign direct investment in Sub-Saharan Africa: Motivating factors and policy issues. *Journal of African Business*, 10(2), pp. 141–162.

Bekaert, G. & Harvey, C.R. (2003). Emerging market finance, *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 10 (1-2), pp. 3-56.

Chaudhry, I.S.; Farooq, F. & Mushtaq, A. (2014). Factors affecting portfolio investment in Pakistan: Evidence from time series analysis. *Pakistan Economic and Social Review*, 52 (2), pp. 141-158.

Dobbs, R.; Oppenheim, J.; Kendall, A.; Thompson, F.; Bratt, M. & Marel, F.V.D. (2013). *Reverse the curse: Maximizing the potential of resource-driven economies*. McKinsey Global Institute, pp. 1–155.

Dua, P. & Garg, R. (2013). Foreign portfolio investment flows to India: Determinants and analysis. *Delhi School of Economics Working Paper Number 225.*

Duruechi, A.H. (2021). *Determinants of foreign portfolio investments in an emerging economy: Evidence from Nigeria*. Imo State University (Finance and Banking Department), Centre of Advanced Research and Development.

Elekwa, P.; Aniebo, C. & Ogu, C. (2016). Does foreign portfolio investment affect employment growth in Nigeria? *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 7 (12), pp. 81-84.

Errunza, V.R. (2001). Foreign portfolio equity investments, financial liberalization and economic development. *Review of International Economics*, 9 (4), pp. 703-726.

Fagbola, O.O.; Oke, O. B. & Esther, O.A. (2020). Drivers of foreign private investment inflows in emerging market: Evidence from Nigeria. *Economic Development, Technological Change and Growth*, 16 (6), pp. 298-313.

Garg, R. & Dua, P. (2014). FPI flows to India: Determinants and analysis. *World Development*, 59 (July), pp. 16–28.

Giritli, B.S.I. (2020). What drives foreign portfolio investment flows in South Africa. *Journal of Yasar University*, 58 (15), pp. 368-380.

Gordon, P. & Gupta, J.P.F. (2004). Understanding India's services revolution. *International Monetary Fund Working Paper* Number 04/171.

Haider, M.; Khan, M. A. & Abdulahi, E. (2016). Determinants of foreign portfolio investment and its effects on China. *International Journal of Economics and Finance*, 8 (12), pp. 143-150.

Hailu, Z. A. (2010). Demand side factors affecting the inflow of foreign direct investment to African countries: Does capital market matter? *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(5), pp. 103–112.

Im, K.S.; Pesaran, M. H. & Shin, Y. (2003). Testing unit roots in heterogeneous panels. *Journal of Econometrics*, 115(1), pp. 53-74.

Jothirajan (2018). Determinants of foreign portfolio investment in India. *Shanlax International Journal of Arts, Science and Humanities*, 5 (3), pp. 151-155.

Kania-Morales, J. & Mroz, R. (2014). Relationship between foreign direct investment stock and foreign portfolio investment stock. Do they really matter for GDP in Poland, Germany and Great Britain. *Ekonomia*, 38 (2), pp. 97-126.

Kao, C. (1999). Spurious regression and residual-based tests for co-integration in panel data, *Journal of Econometrics*, 90 (1999), pp. 247-259.

Khayat, S.H. (2020). Determinants of international foreign portfolio investment flows to GCC countries: An empirical evidence. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 15 (10), pp. 51-59.

Kirti, G. & Shahid, A. (2020). Determinants of foreign portfolio flows to Indian debt market. *Journal of Indian Business Research*, 12 (4), pp. 459-479.

Kumar, P.; Sharma, R. K. & Kumar, S. (2019). An ARDL and co-integration approach for analysing determinants of foreign portfolio investors in India. *International Journal of Monetary Economics and Finance*, 12 (2), pp. 98-117.

Laeven, L. (2003). Does financial liberalization reduce financial constraints? *Financial Management*, 32 (1), pp. 5-34.

Levin, A.; Lin, C.F. & Chu, C.S.J. (2002). Unit root tests in panel data: Asymptotic and finite-sample properties. *Journal of Econometrics*, 108(1), pp. 1-24.

Loncan, T.R. & Caldeira, J.F. (2015). Foreign portfolio capital flows and stock returns: A study of Brazilian listed firms. *Estud Econ*, 45 (4), pp. 859-895.

Masood, A.Q. & Mohsin, H.A. (2002). Foreign capital inflows and domestic savings in Pakistan: Cointegration techniques and error correction modelling. *Pakistan Development Review*, 41(4), pp. 825– 836.

Mehar, M.R. & Hasan, A. (2018). The factors affecting portfolio investment in Pakistan. *International Journal of Family Business and Management*, 2 (1), pp. 1-7.

Mudyazvivi, E. (2016). An analysis of push and pull factors of capital flows in a regional trading bloc. University of Cape Town Graduate School of Business. *Unpublished Masters Thesis*.

Mugableh, M.I. & Oudat, M.S. (2018). Modelling the determinants of foreign portfolio investments: A Bounds testing and causality analysis for Jordan. *Academy of Accounting and Financial Studies Journal*, 222 (4), pp. 1-8.

Ndong, B. (2015). Effect of portfolio equity investment flows on equity returns and economic growth in 11 major African stock markets. *International Journal of Economics and Finance*, 7 (2), pp. 225-240

Ngwenya, R. (2019). Investigating the determinants of foreign portfolio investments in emerging markets. University of South Africa, Unpublished Masters Thesis.

Nwosa, P.I. & Adeleke, O. (2017). Determinants of FDI and FPI volatility: An E-GARCH approach, *CBN Journal of Approach Statistics*, 8 (2), pp. 47-67.

Nxumalo, I.S. & Makoni, P.L. (2021). Determinants of foreign capital inflows in emerging markets: The role of institutional quality. *Journal of Accounting and Finance in Emerging Economies*, 7 (3), pp.683-696.

Nyang'oro O. (2013). Foreign portfolio flows and stock market performance in Kenya: Case of Nairobi Securities exchange. School of Economics, University of Nairobi, Kenya. *Paper presented at the CSAE Conference on Economic Development in Africa*, pp. 1-34.

Nzete, C.A. & Akintunde, Y.W. (2019). Determinants of foreign portfolio investment volatility and macroeconomic stability in Nigeria. *IOSR Journal of Economics and Finance*, 10 (6), pp. 16-23.

Oke, M.O.; Adejayan, A.O.; Kolapo, F.T. & Mokuolu, J.O. (2020). Pull and push factors as determinant of foreign portfolio investment in the emerging market. *Risk Governance and Control: Financial Markets and Institutions*, 10 (4), pp. 33-43.

Raghavan, S. & Selvan, M. (2017). Determinants of foreign portfolio investment and their effects on the Indian stock market. *International Journal of Management*, 8 (3), pp. 105-115.

Schnorrenberger, R. & Meurer, R. (2017). Determinants of foreign portfolio and total investment to emerging economies from 2007 to 2014. *Brazilian Review of Finance*, 15 (4), pp. 605-629.

Singhania, M. & Saini, N. (2017). Determinants of FPI in developed and developing countries. *Global Business Review*, 19 (1), pp. 187-213.

Stead, R. (2007). Foundation quantitative methods for business. Prentice Hall. England.

Sumanjeet, D. (2009). Foreign capital flows into India: Compositions, regulations, issues and policy options. Asia Research Centre in conjunction with Murdoch University (Australia), *Working Paper Number* 155.

Syarifuddin, F. (2020). The dynamics of foreign portfolio investment and exchange rate: An interconnection approach in ASEAN. *Bank Indonesia Working Paper Series Number 8/2020*.