



Journal of Enterprise Strategy & Management Innovation

Volume I, Issue 3, August 2026

ISSN: 3116-4277 (Online)

<https://journal.ijhba.com/index.php/jesmi>

<https://slsiipress.com>

Capital Depth and Entrepreneurial Vitality: Market Capitalization Growth and Cross-Border Investment Flows in the Philippines and ASEAN

¹Shuangxin Chen, ²Ramon George Atento, ³Tong Feng, ¹Qianwei Tan, ²Rey Fernan Refozar and ²Lalaine Manalo

¹Zhengzhou Shengda University of Economics, Business & Management, China

²First Asia Institute of Technology and the Humanities, Philippines

³Qilu University of Technology (Shandong Academy of Sciences), China

Abstract

Entrepreneurship research on Southeast Asia has emphasized institutional, regulatory, and cultural determinants of ecosystem strength while giving comparatively less attention to the role of capital market depth and cross-border investment flows as structural enablers of entrepreneurial activity. This paper addresses that gap through an analytical, secondary-data review examining market capitalization growth and its relationship to entrepreneurial ecosystem strength, alongside the strategic implications of foreign direct investment (FDI) and portfolio investment flows, across the Philippines and five ASEAN comparators (Thailand, Viet Nam, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia) benchmarked against global reference economies. Using World Bank World Development Indicators data extracted for 2010–2024, the analysis finds that ASEAN capital markets moved in structurally divergent directions over the period rather than converging, consistent with documented regional heterogeneity. The Philippines exhibits a distinctive three-channel profile: declining market capitalization (–21.0 percentage points of GDP), the region's strongest relative FDI growth (an 8.78-fold increase in absolute inflows), and the highest portfolio investment volatility among ASEAN comparators, with six net-flow sign reversals and a net outflow position by 2024. These findings suggest that market capitalization functions as an incomplete proxy for entrepreneurial ecosystem strength in frontier and intermediate ASEAN markets, that FDI may operate as a substitute rather than complementary financing channel where domestic capital markets are contracting, and that portfolio investment's capital-access benefits remain inseparable from reversal risk shaped by regional interdependence. The paper concludes that capital market depth, FDI, and portfolio investment should be treated as analytically distinct financing channels in ASEAN entrepreneurship research and practice, with direct implications for entrepreneurial financing strategy and capital market policy in the Philippines specifically. As a descriptive, secondary-data design, the study establishes association rather than causation and identifies firm-level and FDI-composition research as priorities for future work.

Keywords: *Market capitalization; foreign direct investment; portfolio investment; entrepreneurial ecosystem; ASEAN capital markets; Philippines; capital market heterogeneity*

1. Introduction

Southeast Asia's entrepreneurial economies are expanding at a pace that has drawn sustained attention from policymakers, investors, and management scholars alike, yet the financial architecture underpinning this growth remains unevenly understood. While a substantial body of entrepreneurship research has examined regulatory quality,

institutional support structures, and cultural attitudes toward risk-taking as determinants of ecosystem strength, comparatively less scholarly attention has been directed toward the role of capital market depth — proxied here by stock market capitalization — and cross-border investment flows, namely foreign direct investment (FDI) and portfolio investment, as structural enablers of entrepreneurial activity. This gap is consequential: entrepreneurial ventures do not scale, exit, or internationalize in a financial vacuum. They depend on the availability of growth capital, the credibility of exit pathways such as initial public offerings, and the openness of an economy to external capital that can supplement constrained domestic savings pools.

The Philippines offers a particularly instructive vantage point from which to examine this relationship. Its entrepreneurial sector has grown rapidly over the past two decades, driven by a young demographic base, expanding digital infrastructure, and a policy environment increasingly oriented toward micro, small, and medium enterprise (MSME) support. Yet the Philippine Stock Exchange remains comparatively shallow relative to regional peers such as Singapore and Malaysia, and the country's capacity to attract and retain portfolio investment has historically lagged behind its ASEAN counterparts. This asymmetry — a dynamic entrepreneurial sector operating against a comparatively underdeveloped capital market backdrop — raises a central empirical and strategic question: to what extent does capital market depth actually matter for entrepreneurial ecosystem strength, and how do cross-border investment flows mediate or substitute for domestic market shallowness?

The problem is not unique to the Philippines. Across ASEAN, capital market development is markedly heterogeneous. Singapore functions as a mature, internationally integrated financial hub; Malaysia and Thailand occupy an intermediate position with moderately deep equity markets and established regulatory frameworks; Viet Nam and the Philippines remain comparatively frontier markets, characterized by lower market capitalization ratios, thinner trading liquidity, and greater sensitivity to portfolio investment volatility. This heterogeneity matters for entrepreneurship research because it means that any relationship between capital market depth and ecosystem strength cannot be assumed uniform across the region — a pattern strong enough to generalize about Singapore may hold weakly, or not at all, for Viet Nam or the Philippines. Treating ASEAN as a homogeneous capital market bloc, as some prior literature has implicitly done, risks obscuring precisely the variation that matters most for strategic decision-making by entrepreneurial firms and policymakers alike.

This matters urgently in the current context. As global capital has grown more selective and risk-sensitive in the years following the 2020–2022 pandemic disruption, ASEAN economies have found themselves competing more directly for a smaller pool of mobile portfolio capital, while simultaneously courting FDI as a channel for technology transfer, managerial knowledge spillovers, and productive capacity building. For entrepreneurial firms operating within this environment, the practical stakes are direct: the depth of local capital markets shapes whether a venture can realistically pursue a public listing as an exit strategy or growth-financing mechanism, while the openness of the broader economy to FDI and portfolio inflows shapes the availability of alternative financing routes, strategic partnership opportunities, and market entry pathways for both domestic ventures and inbound multinational entrants.

This paper addresses this problem by systematically examining the relationship between stock market capitalization growth and entrepreneurial ecosystem strength, and separately, the strategic implications of FDI and portfolio investment flows for regional entrepreneurial firms, across the Philippines and its ASEAN comparators. In doing so, the paper is guided by three interconnected objectives. First, it seeks to establish how market capitalization trends have evolved across the region over a defined period, and to what extent this evolution corresponds with observable proxies of entrepreneurial ecosystem activity. Second, it examines the trajectory and composition of FDI and portfolio investment inflows across the same country set, distinguishing between capital that is likely to support long-term productive entrepreneurial capacity and capital that is more volatile or extractive in character. Third, it draws out the strategic implications of these financial patterns for entrepreneurial firms — specifically, how capital market depth and investment openness shape financing choices, exit strategy viability, and internationalization pathways available to regional ventures.

An analytical, secondary-data-driven approach grounded in World Bank World Development Indicators is adopted because it enables a systematic, multi-country, multi-year comparative decomposition that primary firm-level data collection across five or more ASEAN economies would not feasibly permit within the scope of a single study. This approach is not without limitation — descriptive macro-financial indicators cannot establish causal mechanisms at the firm level — but it offers a disciplined empirical foundation for identifying structural patterns and generating strategically actionable inference, appropriately hedged against overclaiming.

The paper's relevance extends to both academic and practitioner audiences. For entrepreneurship and strategy scholars, it contributes a macro-financial lens to a literature that has historically emphasized institutional and cultural determinants of ecosystem strength, while explicitly resisting the temptation to treat ASEAN as a monolithic capital market bloc. For policymakers, the findings offer evidence relevant to capital market deepening initiatives and FDI facilitation policy. For entrepreneurial firms and investors operating in the region, the paper offers a comparative strategic map of where capital market depth and investment openness create genuine financing and exit advantages — and where they remain structurally constrained.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Capital Market Development Theory and Entrepreneurial Finance

The relationship between capital-market development and entrepreneurial financing is theoretically established, but it is neither direct nor uniformly linear. Sommer (2024) shows that stock-market development often benefits small and medium enterprises indirectly by improving liquidity, risk sharing, and the wider lending environment rather than by drawing such firms immediately into public-equity issuance. Market capitalization should therefore be understood as part of a broader financial architecture: greater depth may ease financing constraints, but the transmission mechanism frequently runs through banks, intermediaries, and investor confidence rather than direct SME participation.

Evidence on financial deepening further indicates that entrepreneurial gains depend on where an economy sits along the development curve. Gaies et al. (2021) identify a U-shaped association between financial development and nascent entrepreneurship, arguing that below a critical threshold, financial institutions may privilege established firms while financial stability matters more than the nominal availability of banking or venture capital. Related cross-country findings show that indicators such as market capitalization relative to GDP can support SME output, although their effects become stronger when a minimum level of institutional quality is already present (Ehiedu et al., 2022; Sanga & Aziakpono, 2022).

Institutional quality is consequently not a peripheral control but a central conditioning mechanism. Sanga and Aziakpono (2022) report that the contribution of rule of law, regulatory quality, and corruption control to financial deepening becomes substantially stronger at higher levels of financial development. Qadeer and Sarfraz (2025) similarly show that firms in weak institutional environments face higher borrowing costs, shorter maturities, and restricted credit access even when the financial system appears sizeable in aggregate. ASEAN capitalization ratios must therefore be interpreted alongside the institutional credibility that governs contract enforcement, disclosure, and investor protection.

Market-based systems nevertheless retain structural advantages for innovative, intangible-asset, and equity-seeking firms that may be poorly served by collateral-oriented banks (Prokopenko et al., 2025). Boccaletti et al. (2024) find that access to second-tier equity markets and bond issuance can support SME asset and employment growth, although productivity effects are not uniformly positive. Financing constraints also arise on the demand side: Du and Nguyen (2021) demonstrate that entrepreneurs' cognitive perceptions of financing difficulty can suppress firm growth independently of objective supply conditions. Adjacent Philippine evidence similarly indicates that financial

awareness, investment attitudes, and socioeconomic capacity affect whether individuals translate formal-market access into saving and investment participation (Espelita et al., 2025; Lantin-Magana et al., 2026).

Taken together, the literature supports a conditional proposition: capital-market development can widen entrepreneurial financing possibilities, but its effects are mediated by institutional thresholds, financial stability, organizational capability, and the capacity of potential users to interpret and act on available instruments. Comparable organizational research reinforces this capability-based reading, showing that productivity and technology-enabled decision support depend on supportive work environments, governance, traceability, and accountable human judgment rather than on access to tools alone (Espelita & Atento, 2026; Bendal et al., 2026).

2.2 Market Capitalization as an Ecosystem Enabler and Exit-Pathway Determinant

Market capitalization contributes to entrepreneurial ecosystem maturity most visibly by sustaining credible exit pathways. Bernstein (2022) finds that public-market valuations influence both the probability of an initial public offering and the valuation received at exit, while IPO activity strongly predicts venture-capital activity across countries. The mechanism is recursive: liquid public markets make venture exits feasible, successful exits release capital for reinvestment, and the prospect of future liquidity encourages earlier-stage financing. Capitalization therefore operates not merely as a passive measure of ecosystem size but as part of the infrastructure that makes risk capital economically recyclable.

The design of the market matters as much as its aggregate scale. Gao et al. (2026) provide causal evidence that second-tier exchanges created for entrepreneurial firms increase startup IPO probability and valuation, particularly when firms possess stronger financial resources and intellectual-property protection. Public participation can also fill gaps left by thin private markets: Cumming et al. (2024) find that government equity investment raises entrepreneurial exit values, with the largest effects where private capital is scarce. These findings are directly relevant to ASEAN, where exchange tiers, listing requirements, investor bases, and public support mechanisms vary substantially across national systems.

Market capitalization is consequently used as a component of broader ecosystem-finance measures rather than as a complete construct. Kruja and Irimia-Diéguez (2025) include capitalization relative to GDP within an Access to Finance Index that also reflects venture funding and investor protection, while Singh (2024) identifies IPO access, credibility formation, and funding-gap reduction as major channels through which capital markets can support entrepreneurship. Philippine and global valuation studies add an important interpretive caution: observed market depth may coexist with valuation compression, sentiment impairment, horizon-sensitive pricing, and only modest discrimination between future performance tiers (Atento, 2025b; R. G. Atento & A. G. Atento, 2025a, 2025b).

The proxy remains incomplete because capitalization and entrepreneurial exits can decouple. Ewens and Farre-Mensa (2021) document that deep US public markets have coexisted with declining IPO activity as firms remain private longer and raise larger private rounds. Post-listing evidence is also mixed: Gao and Zhao (2021) and Talukdar et al. (2026) find that IPOs may improve valuation and liquidity without producing equivalent operating gains, while Talukdar and Pradhan (2025) report short-run underperformance among venture-capital-backed Indian IPOs. Wurth et al. (2023) further caution that ecosystem research remains dominated by qualitative and cross-sectional designs, limiting causal inference. Firm-level Philippine studies likewise show that issuer fundamentals, leverage, dividends, sentiment, and technical conditions can diverge substantially even within the same national market (Dela Costa & Atento, 2025; Nona & Atento, 2025; Atento & Mangubat, 2025; Del Mundo & Atento, 2025).

The literature therefore supports market capitalization as a meaningful but partial ecosystem indicator. It is most informative when read jointly with listing breadth, IPO activity, private-capital availability, issuer quality, liquidity, and investor behavior. In frontier and intermediate markets, a rising capitalization ratio may reflect the appreciation

of a narrow set of large firms, while a falling ratio may coexist with entrepreneurial activity financed through private, bank, or foreign-investment channels.

2.3 FDI Inflows and Entrepreneurial Ecosystem Strengthening

Foreign direct investment is generally associated with entrepreneurial spillovers in emerging economies, but the magnitude and direction of those effects depend heavily on host-country absorptive capacity. Nguyen (2023), using a 104-country panel and multiple techniques addressing endogeneity, finds that both greenfield investment and cross-border mergers and acquisitions can stimulate domestic entrepreneurship through different mechanisms. Greenfield benefits depend more strongly on market capacity, institutional quality, and human capital, whereas M&A spillovers are driven primarily by human capital. The same study warns that greenfield entry can harm domestic entrepreneurship where host-economy capabilities fall below the threshold required to absorb new technology and competitive pressure.

The developmental contribution of FDI is therefore conditional rather than automatic. Rama et al. (2025) and Contractor et al. (2021) emphasize governance quality, regulatory consistency, and institutional capacity as determinants of whether foreign investment is converted into productive local development. Paul (2025) illustrates the dual effect in India: FDI can support capital formation and new market opportunities while simultaneously crowding out local firms and intensifying competition. Volume alone is thus an insufficient indicator; the quality, sectoral destination, entry mode, and local linkage structure of FDI determine whether entrepreneurial benefits are realized.

Spillover channels also differ across national settings. Arif-Ur-Rahman and Inaba (2021) find that domestic firms in Bangladesh benefit primarily through horizontal, intra-industry linkages, whereas Vietnamese firms gain more through backward supplier relationships. Da Silva-Oliveira et al. (2021) argue that domestic firms require at least an intermediate level of technological development before inward-FDI spillovers become meaningful, while Vujanović et al. (2022) find stronger benefits among knowledge-using than knowledge-creating firms in an emerging-economy context. Such evidence cautions against transferring a single FDI mechanism across ASEAN countries with different technological and institutional capacities.

Firm and sector heterogeneity compounds these cross-country differences. Sugiharti et al. (2022) show that high-technology Indonesian manufacturers benefit from foreign presence because they possess stronger absorption capability, whereas low-technology firms employing less-skilled labor experience inefficiency effects. Workneh and Kumar (2026) identify an even sharper displacement mechanism in Ethiopian manufacturing, where multinational firms bypass domestic suppliers unable to meet required standards. Ahn et al. (2025) further distinguish positive backward spillovers from greenfield investment from negative backward spillovers associated with cross-border M&A. Adjacent Philippine work places the same emphasis on productive absorption: big-data capability can transform managerial intelligence only when embedded in organizational strategy, while FDI-manufacturing relationships must be evaluated through sectoral performance rather than aggregate inflow volume alone (Chen & Atento, 2026a; Refozar et al., 2026).

Collectively, the literature supports a qualified proposition: FDI can strengthen entrepreneurial ecosystems where human capital, technology, institutions, and domestic supplier capability allow foreign investment to generate learning, linkages, and productive upgrading. Philippine and ASEAN evidence on formal business entry and enterprise inclusion likewise suggests that macroeconomic resources become entrepreneurial outcomes only through country-specific structural and institutional channels (Atento, 2026; Menez & Atento, 2026). FDI should therefore be analyzed as a distinct financing and capability-transfer channel, with composition and absorptive capacity treated as central explanatory variables.

2.4 Portfolio Investment Flows and Strategic Implications for Regional Firms

Portfolio investment presents a different financing logic from FDI because it combines rapid capital access with equally rapid reallocation risk. Stulz (2022) finds that first-time access to global capital markets can reduce firms' cost of capital through international risk sharing and can transmit stronger governance practices when firms raise funds in more developed markets. At the macro level, Sohail et al. (2025) document the substantial expansion of foreign portfolio investment into emerging markets, while Qizi and Karimovna (2025) associate such flows with greater liquidity, improved price discovery, and stronger disclosure incentives. These gains make portfolio openness strategically valuable, but they do not eliminate the instability embedded in mobile capital.

The ASEAN evidence makes that instability explicit. Lembong et al. (2025) link foreign portfolio flows to stock-market volatility across the region, with inflows and outflows amplifying shifts in global conditions. Qizi and Karimovna (2025) use the 2013 Taper Tantrum to illustrate how rapid outflows can depreciate currencies and raise borrowing costs, while Subagyo et al. (2024) show that firms with foreign-currency debt or revenues are exposed directly to the exchange-rate movements that often accompany such reversals. Recent sectoral analyses similarly show that geopolitical commodity shocks and differences in earnings quality can produce uneven valuation responses across industries, reinforcing the need to treat aggregate portfolio flows as sectorally differentiated rather than market-wide in effect (Atento et al., 2026a; Reyes et al., 2026).

Volatility also travels across borders through asymmetric regional linkages. Robiyanto et al. (2023) identify Indonesia and Thailand as net transmitters of volatility within ASEAN-5, exposing firms in Malaysia, Singapore, and the Philippines to contagion even when domestic fundamentals have not changed. Horvath and Yang (2024) find that heightened global financial risk raises emerging-market financing costs and depresses equity returns primarily through equity-market transmission. Philippine evidence at the firm and style-factor levels likewise indicates that leverage, valuation, size, and volatility can alter how listed companies absorb market-wide shocks (Atento & Manzana, 2026; Atento et al., 2026b).

The strategic implications extend beyond short-term price movements. Syarifuddin (2022) describes a crowding-out dynamic in which ASEAN economies compete for a finite pool of portfolio capital, making firm access dependent on relative regional attractiveness as well as domestic conditions. Basel et al. (2025) find that emerging-market firms consequently rely more heavily on debt and adaptive financing strategies than firms in developed systems. Lee and Hwang (2025) report that higher net external financing can be followed by lower stock returns, consistent with market timing or misvaluation, while Santos and Cincera (2021) rank equity-investment facilitation among the most important determinants of future financing access. Capital availability and capital quality must therefore be evaluated together.

Portfolio investment offers real liquidity, governance, and cost-of-capital benefits, but these benefits are inseparable from reversal, contagion, currency, and refinancing risks. For ASEAN firms, the relevant question is not simply whether portfolio capital is available, but whether its maturity, investor composition, and volatility are compatible with the firm's financing horizon and risk-bearing capacity.

2.5 ASEAN Capital Market Heterogeneity and Regulatory Divergence

The literature consistently portrays ASEAN capital markets as structurally heterogeneous rather than as a single convergent bloc. Robiyanto et al. (2023) find that equity integration weakened during implementation of the ASEAN Economic Community relative to the preceding post-crisis period. Le et al. (2022) document sharply different exchange trajectories, including modest growth in Singapore and much faster expansion in Viet Nam from a smaller base. Parallel ASEAN studies show that the same heterogeneity appears in governance credibility, macroeconomic conversion into social outcomes, and nonlinear inflation-growth regimes, indicating that common regional indicators can mask fundamentally different national transmission structures (Atento, 2025a; Quinto & Atento, 2025; Chen & Atento, 2026b).

Regulatory fragmentation is one reason formal integration has not produced uniform market outcomes. Karim et al. (2021) characterize the ASEAN Banking Integration Framework as institutionally vague and strongly shaped by domestic political priorities, while Pasaribu et al. (2025) identify uneven venture-capital regulation and the need for substantial reform in Indonesia. Differences in digital reach and consumption also matter because they influence the scale, accessibility, and investor base through which equity-market deepening occurs across ASEAN-5 economies (Lantin-Magana & Atento, 2026).

Heterogeneity extends from regulation to efficiency and connectivity. Susila et al. (2025), applying the Capital Asset Pricing Model to regional financial-sector stocks, find efficient and inefficient market profiles within the same ASEAN comparison. Jacob and Raphael (2021) report incomplete Indonesian integration with other ASEAN-5 exchanges, while Malaysia, Thailand, Singapore, and the Philippines display stronger mutual connections. Qizam (2021) similarly finds strong Indonesia-Malaysia Islamic-market integration but weak Philippine integration with other ASEAN Islamic markets. These results reject any presumption that institutional membership produces equivalent liquidity, information efficiency, or cross-border responsiveness.

Nor can regulatory harmonization alone explain regional outcomes. Mattualy et al. (2025) find no statistically significant effect of regulatory quality on ASEAN-6 stock returns once GDP growth and exchange-rate stability are considered. Prasetya (2022) documents heterogeneous ASEAN+3 reactions to external shocks, and Hariani et al. (2024) argue that post-pandemic protectionist measures further weakened regional integration. C.P. (2022) notes that full capital-market integration was postponed amid persistent concern about the destabilizing consequences of financial deregulation after the Asian financial crisis. Regional convergence is therefore constrained by differences in macroeconomic structure, policy credibility, market depth, and historical risk tolerance.

The appropriate analytical stance is consequently country differentiated. The Philippines, Thailand, Viet Nam, Malaysia, Singapore, and Indonesia represent distinct combinations of capitalization, regulation, integration, liquidity, and shock exposure. Comparative interpretation should begin with national trajectories and only then proceed to cautious regional generalization; pooled ASEAN averages may conceal the very structural differences that explain financing access and entrepreneurial outcomes.

2.6 Synthesis of Literature

Across the five strands reviewed, capital-market development emerges as an enabling but conditional component of entrepreneurial finance. Its principal effects operate through liquidity, risk sharing, credit-market spillovers, investor protection, and exit-pathway credibility rather than through automatic direct access by small firms (Sommer, 2024; Gaies et al., 2021). Market capitalization is most informative when paired with IPO activity, listing breadth, private-capital conditions, and issuer quality, because public-market depth and entrepreneurial dynamism can diverge (Bernstein, 2022; Gao et al., 2026; Kruja & Irimia-Diéguez, 2025).

FDI and portfolio investment display a parallel logic of conditional benefit. FDI can transmit capital, technology, and market access, but the result depends on human capital, absorptive capacity, domestic linkages, and investment composition (Nguyen, 2023; Ahn et al., 2025). Portfolio investment can lower capital costs and deepen liquidity, yet its value is inseparable from volatility, reversal risk, and regional contagion (Robiyanto et al., 2023; Lembong et al., 2025). The three financing channels examined in this paper—domestic equity depth, FDI, and portfolio flows—should therefore be separated analytically rather than collapsed into a single measure of financial development.

ASEAN heterogeneity provides the unifying interpretive framework. National markets differ in scale, regulatory maturity, integration, valuation, and the macroeconomic variables that drive returns (Le et al., 2022; Mattualy et al., 2025). Institutional architecture and firm adaptation also operate jointly: regulatory classification determines which financial models are permitted, while incumbent firms must reconfigure legacy capabilities in response to policy and digital disruption (Geca et al., 2026; A. G. Atento & R. G. Atento, 2025). The literature therefore supports a country-

specific analysis of how capitalization, FDI, and portfolio investment shape entrepreneurial financing choices in the Philippines relative to its ASEAN comparators.

2.7 Gaps in the Literature

Three gaps are evident across the reviewed literature. First, the literature on market capitalization as an ecosystem-maturity proxy is heavily weighted toward EU, US, Chinese, and Indian evidence (Kruja & Irimia-Diéguez, 2025; Ewens & Farre-Mensa, 2021; Talukdar & Pradhan, 2025); comparatively little work directly examines this relationship within the Philippines or ASEAN frontier markets specifically, leaving open how the IPO-driven exit mechanism documented elsewhere actually functions in markets where second-tier entrepreneurial exchanges remain underdeveloped or absent.

Second, the FDI literature substantiates that spillover channels are country-specific — horizontal in Bangladesh, backward in Viet Nam (Arif-Ur-Rahman & Inaba, 2021) — yet no reviewed study isolates which channel dominates for the Philippines, nor compares FDI composition (greenfield versus M&A) across ASEAN comparators in a way that would clarify whether the region's FDI inflows are structurally suited to entrepreneurial spillover generation.

Third, while the portfolio investment and heterogeneity literatures separately establish that ASEAN markets differ structurally and that portfolio flows carry volatility risk, no reviewed study connects these two findings directly to firm-level entrepreneurial strategy — that is, how a Philippine or Vietnamese entrepreneurial venture's actual financing and exit decisions should differ, in practice, given its home market's specific position on the region's capitalization, integration, and volatility-exposure spectrum. This is precisely the connective, strategy-oriented gap this paper is positioned to address.

2.8 Contribution of the Present Paper

This paper contributes to the literature in three ways. First, it applies the market-capitalization-as-ecosystem-enabler and FDI/portfolio-investment frameworks specifically to the Philippines and ASEAN comparators using systematically extracted WDI data, addressing the geographic concentration gap in the existing evidence base. Second, it treats FDI and portfolio investment as analytically distinct pillars — rather than a single undifferentiated "foreign capital" category — consistent with the literature's own finding that these flows carry different risk profiles and spillover mechanisms. Third, it translates macro-financial indicator patterns into strategic implications for regional entrepreneurial firms, explicitly resisting the pooled-ASEAN treatment that the heterogeneity literature identifies as a recurring methodological weakness in prior regional analyses.

3. Methodology

3.1 Design

This paper adopts a non-empirical, secondary-data analytical review design, structured as a multi-indicator decomposition of macro-financial data drawn from the World Bank's World Development Indicators (WDI) database. The design is explicitly descriptive and comparative rather than causal-inferential: it does not employ primary data collection, econometric estimation, or hypothesis testing in the statistical sense. Instead, it systematically extracts, organizes, and analytically interprets time-series indicators of stock market capitalization, foreign direct investment, and portfolio investment across a defined country set, situating the resulting patterns within the theoretical and empirical literature synthesized in Chapter 2. This design was selected because it enables a disciplined, multi-country, multi-year comparative view that primary firm-level data collection across five or more ASEAN economies would not feasibly permit within the scope of a single study, while remaining analytically honest about the descriptive — rather than causal — nature of the resulting inference.

3.2 Source Orientation

The primary data source is the World Bank World Development Indicators bulk CSV release (WDICSV.csv and accompanying metadata files), downloaded directly from the World Bank Open Data portal. WDI was selected over alternative sources (e.g., IMF WEO, national statistical offices) because it provides internationally standardized, cross-nationally comparable series for the specific indicators central to this paper — market capitalization of listed domestic companies (% of GDP), FDI net inflows (% of GDP and current US\$), and portfolio investment (net, current US\$) — extracted using a consistent methodology across all countries, which is essential for the cross-country comparative approach this paper undertakes. Literature synthesis (Chapter 2) is sourced exclusively from peer-reviewed studies retrieved via Consensus, with no citation admitted to the reference list that does not appear in the Consensus documents provided during the literature framework phase.

3.3 Inclusion Logic — Country Selection

Following the two-tier country architecture established for this line of research, the country set comprises a Tier 1 group of global/regional comparators — the United States, Japan, China, India, and Hong Kong SAR — included to contextualize ASEAN capitalization and investment-flow levels against broader global patterns, and a Tier 2 ASEAN spotlight group comprising the Philippines as the paper's focal economy, alongside Thailand, Viet Nam, Malaysia, Singapore, and Indonesia as regional comparators, selected because they represent the structurally distinct positions on the capital-market-maturity spectrum documented in Section 2.5 — from Singapore's mature, internationally integrated market to Viet Nam's frontier market with high growth but low absolute depth.

3.4 Indicator Selection and Thematic Grouping

Indicators are grouped into three analytical clusters aligned with the paper's two substantive pillars: (1) the Market Capitalization Cluster — market capitalization of listed domestic companies (% of GDP) and number of listed domestic companies; (2) the FDI Cluster — foreign direct investment, net inflows (% of GDP and current US\$); and (3) the Portfolio Investment Cluster — portfolio investment, net (current US\$) and portfolio equity, net inflows (current US\$). Where a specific proxy series (e.g., a direct "entrepreneurial ecosystem strength" index) is unavailable in WDI, this paper does not substitute a fabricated or estimated value. Instead, market capitalization and investment-flow trends are interpreted against the qualitative and empirical ecosystem-maturity literature established in Chapter 2, with any inference about ecosystem strength explicitly flagged as literature-grounded interpretation rather than direct measurement.

3.5 Evaluative Criteria

Extracted indicators are evaluated along three dimensions: (a) trend direction and magnitude over the analysis period, calculated from year-over-year and period-over-period change in each indicator per country; (b) cross-country comparative position, benchmarking each ASEAN comparator against both Tier 1 references and against fellow ASEAN economies rather than against a single regional average, consistent with the heterogeneity principle established in Section 2.5; and (c) volatility characteristics, particularly for portfolio investment series, given the literature's emphasis on reversal risk and spillover transmission. No causal claim is derived from any of these three evaluative dimensions in isolation; all analytical claims are hedged using the paper's standard inferential vocabulary — "associated with," "consistent with," "suggests" — rather than causal language.

3.6 Analytical Framework

The analytical framework proceeds in three stages: (1) systematic extraction of the indicator clusters described above from the WDI bulk files using Python, with no manual data entry; (2) construction of Tier 1 and Tier 2 comparative data tables; and (3) narrative synthesis connecting extracted patterns to the literature-derived interpretive framework from Chapter 2, organized around the paper's two pillars.

3.7 Limitations

This design carries several limitations that are acknowledged explicitly rather than minimized. First, as a secondary-data descriptive design, it cannot establish causal relationships between capital market indicators and entrepreneurial ecosystem outcomes; all findings are correlational or associative in character. Second, WDI does not provide a direct, validated measure of “entrepreneurial ecosystem strength,” requiring this paper to rely on literature-grounded interpretation of proxy indicators rather than a single composite measurement — a limitation consistent with the proxy-validity caution raised by Ewens and Farre-Mensa (2021) and Wurth et al. (2023) in Chapter 2. Third, 2024 WDI figures are flagged as preliminary and subject to future revision. Fourth, this design cannot capture firm-level heterogeneity within a given country — aggregate national indicators may mask substantial variation among individual entrepreneurial ventures operating within the same market.

4. Analytical Synthesis / Results

4.1 Market Capitalization Trends: Depth, Divergence, and the Philippine Position

Table 1. Market Capitalization of Listed Domestic Companies (% of GDP), 2010 vs. 2024

Country	2010	2024	Change (pp)
Tier 1 — Global Comparators			
United States	114.8%	212.3%	+97.4
Japan	65.9%	150.6%	+84.7
China	65.0%	62.8%	−2.3
India	105.2%	136.4%	+31.3
Hong Kong SAR	1,185.9%	1,114.1%	−71.7
Tier 2 — ASEAN Spotlight			
Singapore	269.9%	111.3%	−158.6
Malaysia	160.3%	106.5%	−53.8
Thailand	81.4%	98.2%	+16.7
Philippines	75.5%	54.5%	−21.0
Indonesia	47.7%	54.4%	+6.7
Viet Nam	25.0%	43.0%	+17.9

Source: World Bank WDI, series CM.MKT.LCAP.GD.ZS. 2024 figures preliminary.

The market capitalization data reveal a pattern that directly confirms the heterogeneity thesis established in Section 2.5: ASEAN capital markets did not move together over 2010–2024, and several moved in opposite directions entirely. Singapore's capitalization ratio fell by 158.6 percentage points — the single largest contraction across the full eleven-country set, exceeding even Hong Kong's decline — while Viet Nam nearly doubled its ratio from a much lower base (25.0% to 43.0%). This divergence is consistent with Le et al.'s (2022) finding that Singapore's exchange grew only marginally since 2016 while Vietnam's grew over 75%, and it complicates any assumption that Singapore's status as the region's most internationally integrated market translates into continued capitalization growth; rather, the decline is more plausibly associated with a wave of Singapore-listed firm delistings and a broader regional shift of liquidity toward private markets, consistent with the market-versus-private-capital substitution dynamic documented globally by Ewens and Farre-Mensa (2021).

The Philippines' trajectory is a decline of 21.0 percentage points, placing it among the weaker performers in the regional set and notably diverging from Thailand (+16.7pp) and Indonesia (+6.7pp), its closest structural peers by starting capitalization level. This is a pattern the paper's framework anticipates rather than treats as anomalous: consistent with Bernstein's (2022) IPO-driven exit mechanism, the number of Philippine listed companies grew only modestly over the period — from 251 to 280 — a far smaller expansion than Indonesia's (420 to 947, more than doubling) or Thailand's (541 to 860). Indonesia's simultaneous listed-company growth and capitalization growth is

consistent with the exit-pathway literature's prediction that IPO activity and capitalization tend to move together (Bernstein, 2022; Gao et al., 2026); the Philippines' comparatively flat listing count alongside declining capitalization suggests a market that has not generated the second-tier exchange dynamism Gao et al. (2026) identify as a driver of entrepreneurial IPO activity elsewhere. Viet Nam presents a partial counter-case worth flagging rather than smoothing over: its listed-company count actually fell (634 to 393) even as its capitalization ratio nearly doubled, indicating that Vietnamese market depth growth over this period was concentrated in fewer, larger listings rather than broad-based new entrepreneurial listings — a pattern that qualifies rather than confirms a simple capitalization-to-ecosystem-strength reading, and directly illustrates the proxy-validity caution raised by Ewens and Farre-Mensa (2021) and Wurth et al. (2023) in Chapter 2.

4.2 FDI Trends: Composition and Absorptive Capacity in Practice

Table 2. FDI Net Inflows, ASEAN Comparators, 2010 vs. 2024

Country	FDI % GDP 2010	FDI % GDP 2024	FDI US\$Bn 2010	FDI US\$Bn 2024	Multiple
Singapore	23.07%	23.58%	55.32	135.08	2.44×
Viet Nam	5.43%	4.23%	8.00	20.17	2.52×
Thailand	4.32%	2.70%	14.75	14.30	0.97×
Malaysia	4.27%	3.69%	10.89	15.59	1.43×
Indonesia	2.03%	1.74%	15.29	24.28	1.59×
Philippines	0.51%	2.04%	1.07	9.40	8.78×

Source: World Bank WDI, series BX.KLT.DINV.WD.GD.ZS and BX.KLT.DINV.CD.WD. 2024 figures preliminary.

FDI inflows tell a materially different story than market capitalization, and the Philippines emerges here as the standout case rather than the laggard. Philippine FDI inflows grew nearly ninefold in absolute terms (US\$1.07 billion to US\$9.40 billion) and quadrupled as a share of GDP (0.51% to 2.04%) — the largest proportional gain of any country in the comparator set, including Tier 1 benchmarks. This is consistent with Nguyen's (2023) finding that FDI generates positive spillovers largely independent of a country's existing capital market depth, and offers a concrete illustration of Rama et al.'s (2025) point that FDI's developmental contribution is conditional on absorptive capacity and governance quality rather than on market capitalization levels per se — the Philippines' FDI growth occurred despite, not alongside, its declining capitalization ratio.

Singapore's continued dominance as an absolute FDI destination (US\$135.08 billion in 2024, roughly 5.6 times Indonesia's inflow and over 14 times the Philippines') reflects its established role as a regional FDI hub and financial gateway, a pattern consistent with the "dominant financial power" characterization from Karim et al. (2021). Thailand is the clear outlier on the downside: its FDI inflows were essentially flat in absolute terms (US\$14.75 billion to US\$14.30 billion, a 0.97× multiple) and its FDI/GDP ratio fell by nearly 40% (4.32% to 2.70%), a pattern that — read against Section 2.3 — is consistent with either declining absorptive capacity utilization, growing regional competition for mobile FDI (Rama et al., 2025; Contractor et al., 2021), or a compositional shift the WDI aggregate data alone cannot isolate between greenfield and M&A inflows, a limitation flagged explicitly in Section 3.7.

Viet Nam's FDI multiple (2.52×) alongside its earlier-noted decline in listed-company count suggests that Vietnamese entrepreneurial financing over this period leaned more heavily on foreign direct investment than on domestic public equity market expansion — a compositional pattern with direct strategic relevance for Section 5, since it implies materially different financing pathways are available to entrepreneurial firms in Manila versus Ho Chi Minh City despite both being classified as "frontier" ASEAN markets in the literature.

4.3 Portfolio Investment Trends: Volatility as the Defining Characteristic

Table 3. Portfolio Investment, Net Inflows (US\$ Billions), ASEAN Comparators

Country	Minimum	Maximum	2024 Value	Sign Reversals
Singapore	10.01	130.07	84.00	0
Malaysia	−20.68	18.40	18.40	3
Thailand	−6.16	20.10	20.10	3
Viet Nam	−3.02	5.71	5.71	5
Philippines	−4.89	10.24	−3.53	6
Indonesia	−26.07	11.63	−8.24	2

Source: World Bank WDI, series BN.KLT.PTXL.CD. 2024 figures preliminary.

The volatility pattern documented in the literature (Section 2.4) is borne out sharply in the extracted data. The Philippines recorded six sign reversals in net portfolio flows over the fourteen-year window — the most of any ASEAN comparator — swinging between a maximum inflow of US\$10.24 billion and a maximum outflow of US\$4.89 billion, and closing 2024 in outflow territory (−US\$3.53 billion). This instability is directly consistent with Lembong et al.'s (2025) finding that ASEAN portfolio flows are tightly linked to global economic conditions and amplify domestic market volatility, and with the crowding-out dynamic Syarifuddin (2022) identifies among competing ASEAN destinations. Singapore stands in stark contrast: zero sign reversals across the full period and a range that never dipped below positive US\$10 billion, reflecting the stable, deeply liquid portfolio destination status consistent with its role as regional financial hub — though even Singapore's 2024 figure (US\$84.00 billion) represents a substantial decline from its period maximum (US\$130.07 billion), indicating that even the region's most stable portfolio destination is not immune to global reallocation pressure.

Indonesia's data illustrate the reversal-risk severity documented by Qizi and Karimovna (2025): its minimum net portfolio position (−US\$26.07 billion) is the largest single-year outflow in the entire ASEAN comparator set, consistent with the Taper-Tantrum-era vulnerability the literature associates with larger, more liquid emerging markets that had previously attracted the largest inflows. Portfolio equity data reinforces this picture: Viet Nam's 2024 portfolio equity figure is unavailable in the WDI series (a data gap noted rather than estimated, per Section 3.7), while Thailand's portfolio equity position swung from +US\$2.40 billion (2010) to −US\$3.40 billion (2024), the largest directional reversal among ASEAN comparators on this specific measure — a pattern consistent with Robiyanto et al.'s (2023) identification of Thailand as a net volatility contributor within ASEAN-5.

Table 4. Portfolio Equity, Net Inflows (US\$ Billions), Selected Years

Country	2010	2024	Range (Min–Max)
Malaysia	5.59	4.98	−5.64 to 6.05
Singapore	4.25	2.14	−10.45 to 18.91
Thailand	2.40	−3.40	−8.97 to 6.42
Viet Nam	2.38	n/a*	0.25 to 2.38
Indonesia	2.13	−1.03	−4.36 to 3.26
Philippines	0.83	−0.09	−2.54 to 1.76

Source: World Bank WDI, series BX.PEF.TOTL.CD.WD. *Viet Nam 2024 figure not reported in WDI as of extraction date.

4.4 Cross-Indicator Pattern: The Philippine Profile

Read together, the three indicator clusters produce a distinctive Philippine profile that resists a single-direction narrative and instead illustrates precisely the country-differentiated pattern this paper's methodology was designed to surface. On market capitalization, the Philippines underperforms most ASEAN comparators (−21.0pp, against Indonesia's +6.7pp and Thailand's +16.7pp). On FDI, it is the standout performer in relative terms (8.78× absolute

growth, the largest multiple in the comparator set). On portfolio investment, it exhibits the highest volatility (six sign reversals) and ends the period in net outflow. This combination — weak domestic capital market deepening, strong FDI attraction, and high portfolio volatility — is not a contradiction but a coherent structural signature consistent with the literature's separate treatment of these three channels (Sections 2.2–2.4): Philippine entrepreneurial financing over this period appears to have leaned more heavily on foreign direct investment inflows than on public equity market depth or stable portfolio capital, a pattern with direct implications for the strategic discussion developed in Section 5.

5. Discussion of Findings

The results developed in Chapter 4 carry three broad implications for entrepreneurship and strategy theory in the ASEAN context, each of which extends rather than simply confirms the literature synthesized in Chapter 2.

First, market capitalization's role as a proxy for entrepreneurial ecosystem strength requires substantial qualification in frontier and intermediate ASEAN markets. The theoretical literature (Section 2.2) treats capitalization growth and IPO-driven exit activity as mutually reinforcing (Bernstein, 2022; Gao et al., 2026), yet the Philippine and Vietnamese data each depart from this expectation in different directions. The Philippines combined declining capitalization with only modest listed-company growth, suggesting capitalization decline is not being offset by an expanding entrepreneurial-listing pipeline. Viet Nam combined rising capitalization with a falling listed-company count, suggesting its capitalization growth is concentrated among fewer, larger firms rather than distributed across a broadening entrepreneurial base. Neither pattern fits the clean capitalization-as-ecosystem-maturity story found in EU- and US-centered literature (Kruja & Irimia-Diéguez, 2025), which reinforces Wurth et al.'s (2023) methodological caution that ecosystem-mechanism research generalized from mature markets may not transfer cleanly to frontier ASEAN contexts. Theoretically, this suggests entrepreneurship scholars should treat market capitalization and listed-company count as two analytically separable dimensions of capital market depth in emerging Southeast Asia, rather than as co-moving proxies for a single underlying construct.

Second, the Philippine FDI performance offers a theoretically important counter-illustration to capitalization-centered thinking. The country's near-ninefold absolute FDI growth occurred despite declining domestic market capitalization, directly consistent with Rama et al.'s (2025) and Contractor et al.'s (2021) argument that FDI's developmental contribution is governed by absorptive capacity and governance conditions rather than by pre-existing capital market depth. This has a specific theoretical implication for the entrepreneurial ecosystem literature: it suggests that in markets where domestic public equity channels are weak or shrinking, FDI can function as a substitute — not merely a complement — financing channel for entrepreneurial and firm-level capital needs, a possibility the reviewed literature (Section 2.3) does not explicitly theorize, since most FDI-spillover studies condition their analysis on relatively developed absorptive-capacity environments rather than examining FDI as compensating for capital-market contraction specifically.

Third, the volatility asymmetry documented in portfolio flows (Section 4.3) has direct theoretical bearing on how "capital access" should be conceptualized in ASEAN entrepreneurial finance research. The Philippines' six sign reversals and net 2024 outflow, set against Singapore's zero reversals, empirically substantiate Stulz's (2022) and Qizi and Karimovna's (2025) dual-edged framing of portfolio investment — access and instability are not separable benefits and costs but two faces of the same capital flow. For entrepreneurship theory specifically, this implies that "access to capital" as a construct should be disaggregated by capital type (FDI versus portfolio versus domestic equity) when applied to ASEAN contexts, since the three channels examined here moved in different directions for the same country over the same period.

For policy in the Philippines and comparable ASEAN frontier markets, the findings suggest that capital market deepening initiatives — commonly framed around raising market capitalization or listed-company counts — address only one of three financing channels available to entrepreneurial firms, and not necessarily the one currently

functioning best. Given the Philippines' comparatively strong FDI trajectory, policy attention directed at strengthening FDI absorptive capacity (human capital development, regulatory consistency, per Rama et al., 2025 and Contractor et al., 2021) may offer more immediate entrepreneurial-financing returns than capital market reforms narrowly targeted at capitalization or IPO activity, without this implying capital market reform is unnecessary. Given the portfolio volatility findings, macroprudential measures of the kind Qizi and Karimovna (2025) describe — capital flow management tools, diversification toward longer-term institutional investors — appear directly relevant to reducing the reversal risk the Philippine data exhibit most acutely among ASEAN comparators.

For entrepreneurial firms and practitioners, the cross-indicator Philippine profile (Section 4.4) implies a practical strategic conclusion: firms seeking growth capital in the current Philippine environment may find FDI-linked channels (joint ventures, strategic partnerships with multinational entrants, FDI-adjacent supply chain integration) more reliably available than public equity market exit pathways, while firms or investors relying on portfolio-linked capital should plan financing timelines around demonstrated regional volatility rather than assuming Singapore-like stability. This is consistent with Basel et al.'s (2025) finding that emerging-market firms tend toward debt-instrument and adaptive financing strategies shaped by institutional limitations rather than equity-based, shareholder-driven approaches common in developed markets.

What this analysis can and cannot conclude must be stated explicitly. The data support an association between weak domestic capitalization growth, strong FDI attraction, and high portfolio volatility in the Philippine case, interpreted against a literature that independently establishes plausible mechanisms for each relationship. They do not establish that FDI growth caused Philippine entrepreneurial ecosystem strengthening, nor that capitalization decline caused any specific entrepreneurial outcome — the descriptive, secondary-data design precludes causal inference, and no such claim is made. Nor can this analysis identify firm-level heterogeneity masked within the national aggregates, or fully isolate FDI composition (greenfield versus M&A) given WDI's aggregate reporting — a limitation with direct bearing on the third literature gap identified in Section 2.7. The findings are best read as a structural pattern consistent with, and interpretable through, the theoretical mechanisms reviewed in Chapter 2, rather than as independent proof of those mechanisms operating in the Philippine case.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

This paper set out to examine two related questions: how market capitalization growth relates to entrepreneurial ecosystem strength, and what strategic implications FDI and portfolio investment flows carry for regional entrepreneurial firms, across the Philippines and its ASEAN comparators. The strongest and most consistent insight to emerge is that these three capital channels — domestic market capitalization, foreign direct investment, and portfolio investment — do not move together, and in the Philippine case specifically, moved in three different directions over 2010–2024: capitalization declined, FDI grew substantially, and portfolio flows became increasingly volatile and ended in net outflow. This pattern, read against the heterogeneity literature reviewed in Section 2.5, confirms that treating "capital market development" as a single undifferentiated construct obscures the specific financing reality facing entrepreneurial firms in any given ASEAN economy, and that the Philippines' position on this three-channel profile is distinct from, rather than representative of, its regional peers.

A second durable insight concerns the limits of market capitalization as a stand-alone ecosystem-strength proxy in frontier and intermediate ASEAN markets. Both the Philippine case (declining capitalization, flat listed-company growth) and the Vietnamese case (rising capitalization, falling listed-company count) diverge from the capitalization-IPO co-movement pattern documented in more developed capital markets, suggesting this proxy relationship — while theoretically well-grounded — requires empirical verification rather than assumption when applied to individual ASEAN economies, and should not be imported uncritically from EU or US-centered evidence.

Recommendations for practice center on financing-channel diversification awareness among entrepreneurial firms and their advisers: given the Philippines' demonstrated strength in FDI attraction relative to its weaker domestic capitalization trajectory, firms and financial intermediaries may find greater near-term value in cultivating FDI-linked financing and partnership channels than in awaiting domestic public equity market deepening, while remaining attentive to the volatility characteristics documented for portfolio-linked capital specifically.

Recommendations for policy point toward two complementary directions rather than a single prescription: continued support for FDI absorptive capacity (human capital, regulatory predictability) given its demonstrated relative strength in the Philippine data, alongside macroprudential attention to portfolio flow volatility given the Philippines' comparatively high reversal frequency among ASEAN peers. Capital market deepening reforms remain relevant but should not be treated as the sole or primary lever for entrepreneurial ecosystem strengthening, given the weak co-movement this paper documents between capitalization and other entrepreneurial-relevant indicators in the Philippine case specifically.

Recommendations for future research follow directly from the limitations acknowledged in Sections 3.7 and 5. Firm-level and survey-based research is needed to test whether the FDI-substitution pattern suggested by the Philippine aggregate data is actually experienced by entrepreneurial firms as a usable financing channel, or whether FDI benefits accrue primarily to larger incumbent firms rather than new entrants. Research disaggregating FDI composition (greenfield versus M&A) at the country level within ASEAN would help clarify whether the Philippines' strong FDI trajectory carries the entrepreneurial spillover benefits the literature associates with greenfield investment specifically (Nguyen, 2023; Ahn et al., 2025), or is weighted toward acquisition activity with different spillover characteristics. Finally, comparative case research examining why Philippine market capitalization declined over this period — whether through delisting, reduced IPO activity, or valuation effects — would meaningfully extend the descriptive pattern this paper documents into more diagnostic territory that a secondary-data design cannot reach on its own.

Southeast Asia's entrepreneurial economies will continue to depend on capital drawn from multiple, structurally distinct sources. This paper's central contribution is to demonstrate, using the Philippine case set against its ASEAN comparators, that these sources warrant separate strategic and scholarly attention rather than treatment as interchangeable components of a single "capital market development" narrative.

References

- Ahn, J., Aiyar, S., & Presbitero, A. (2025). Productivity spillovers from FDI: A firm-level cross-country analysis. *The World Economy*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/twec.13708>
- Arif-Ur-Rahman, M., & Inaba, K. (2021). Foreign direct investment and productivity spillovers: A firm-level analysis of Bangladesh in comparison with Vietnam. *Journal of Economic Structures*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40008-021-00248-2>
- Atento, A. G., & Atento, R. G. (2025). A case study of Mercury Drug Corporation: Strategic adaptation to universal healthcare and digital disruption in the Philippines. *International Journal of Health & Business Analytics*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.65166/zhw7dd39>
- Atento, R. G. (2025a). The credibility imperative 2025: Governance integrity, economic resilience, and strategic adaptability in Philippine diplomacy. *International Journal of Health and Business Analytics*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.65166/6amaz997>
- Atento, R. G. (2025b). Valuation metrics, market efficiency, and investor sentiment: A descriptive analysis of Philippine Stock Exchange-listed firms. *International Journal of Health & Business Analytics*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.65166/6kbeat87>

- Atento, R. G. (2026). Macroeconomic and structural determinants of formal business entry in ASEAN: Evidence from a linear mixed-effects model using World Development Indicators. *Journal of Enterprise Strategy & Management Innovation*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.65166/bh0gx302>
- Atento, R. G. O., & Atento, A. G. B. (2025a). Global equity valuation dispersion: Evidence from P/E benchmarks, percentile positioning, and trend margins. *International Journal of Health and Business Analytics*, 1(2), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.65166/2pd5k207>
- Atento, R. G. O., & Atento, A. G. B. (2025b). Which fundamentals differentiate Philippine stock winners from laggards? A rank-based multinomial analysis of 2025 price appreciation. *International Journal of Health and Business Analytics*, 1(2), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.65166/n7t3ew73>
- Atento, R. G., & Mangubat, M. (2025). Integrated fundamental-technical evaluation of Jollibee Foods Corporation: Financial performance, market behavior, and investment outlook. *International Journal of Health & Business Analytics*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.65166/azkk2x82>
- Atento, R. G., & Manzana, P. A. S. (2026). Valuation, profitability, and risk assessment of PLDT Inc. (PSE: TEL): A fundamental and technical analysis as of May 2026. *Journal of Enterprise Strategy and Management Innovation*, 1(2).
- Atento, R. G., Atento, A. G., & Espelita, C. A. M. (2026a). Below the trendline: Oil price shocks, the Strait of Hormuz crisis, and the disrupted growth trajectory of global health sector equities (2024-2026). *International Journal of Health & Business Analytics*, 2(1).
- Atento, R. G., Atento, A. G., Espelita, C. A. M., Del Mundo, F., Nona, R. G., ... (2026b). Value and size premiums in the Philippine equity market: Evidence from an extended dataset with volatility analysis. *Asian Financial Economics and Policy*, 1(1).
- Basel, A., Lethabo, L., & Tessema, Z. (2025). Global corporate financing approaches and investment strategy optimization: A comparative study of emerging and developed markets. *Journal of Management and Informatics*. <https://doi.org/10.51903/jmi.v4i2.296>
- Bendal, A., Sabasa, S. A., Espelita, C. A. M. H., & Atento, R. G. O. (2026). Artificial intelligence as disruptive technology in accounting: A qualitative study of practitioner perceptions on automation, judgment, and decision support. *Journal of Enterprise Strategy & Management Innovation*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.65166/0sdayg70>
- Bernstein, S. (2022). The effects of public and private equity markets on firm behavior. *Annual Review of Financial Economics*. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-financial-052021-072939>
- Boccaletti, S., Ferrando, A., Rossi, E., & Rossolini, M. (2024). European SMEs' growth: The role of market-based finance and public financial support. *Small Business Economics*, 64, 691–727. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-024-00918-y>
- C.P, A. (2022). An empirical investigation on capital market integration of Asian countries. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.48175/ijarsct-7813>
- Chen, S., & Atento, R. G. (2026a). Big data as a strategic asset: Competitive advantage, business model transformation, and managerial intelligence in Chinese enterprises. *Journal of Enterprise Strategy and Management Innovation*, 1(2).
- Chen, S., & Atento, R. G. (2026b). Nonlinear inflation regimes and per-capita growth: Comparative evidence from China and the Philippines (1987-2024). *Asian Financial Economics and Policy*, 1(1).
- Contractor, F., Nuruzzaman, N., Dangol, R., & Raghunath, S. (2021). How FDI inflows to emerging markets are influenced by country regulatory factors: An exploratory study. *Journal of International Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intman.2021.100834>

- Cumming, D., Knill, A. M., & Syvrud, K. (2024). Government as a source of equity capital for entrepreneurs: Evidence from entrepreneurial exits. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/corg.12604>
- Da Silva-Oliveira, K. D., De Miranda Kubo, E. K., Morley, M., & Cândido, R. M. (2021). Emerging economy inward and outward foreign direct investment: A bibliometric and thematic content analysis. *Management International Review*, 61, 643–679. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11575-021-00448-9>
- Del Mundo, F., & Atento, R. G. O. (2025). Fundamental and technical indicator analysis of San Miguel Corporation: Financial performance, market behavior, and investment evaluation. *International Journal of Health & Business Analytics*, 1(2), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.65166/6vdtp816>
- Dela Costa, V., & Atento, R. G. O. (2025). Financial performance and market viability of Globe Telecom, Inc.: An integrated fundamental-technical analysis. *International Journal of Health & Business Analytics*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.65166/v5x9d097>
- Du, J., & Nguyen, B. (2021). Cognitive financial constraints and firm growth. *Small Business Economics*, 58, 2109–2137. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-021-00503-7>
- Ehiedu, V., Onuorah, A. C., & Osakwe, F. C. (2022). Financial deepening and small and medium scale enterprises (SMEs) output in Nigeria. *Journal of Economics, Finance and Management Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.47191/jefms/v5-i10-11>
- Espelita, C. A. M. H., & Atento, R. G. O. (2026). Self-efficacy, work environment support, and employee productivity in Philippine trading companies. *Journal of Enterprise Strategy & Management Innovation*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.65166/nwv9wg88>
- Espelita, C. A. M., Atento, R. G., Rao, L. J., & Tian, Y. (2025). Understanding monetary policy: Student awareness, perceptions, and financial behaviors in the Philippine context. *International Journal of Health & Business Analytics*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.65166/f7eayj47>
- Ewens, M., & Farre-Mensa, J. (2021). Private or public equity? The evolving entrepreneurial finance landscape. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/9am4w>
- Gaies, B., Najar, D., Maalaoui, A., Kraus, S., & Tarabishy, A. E. (2021). Does financial development really spur nascent entrepreneurship in Europe? A panel data analysis. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 61, 2440–2487. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2021.1896722>
- Gao, H., Hsu, P.-H., & Wang, Y. (2026). Second-tier stock exchanges and growth of entrepreneurship. *Management Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2024.08619>
- Gao, Q., & Zhao, J. (2021). Are initial public offerings significant to firm performance in an emerging stock market? Evidence from China. *South African Journal of Business Management*. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajbm.v52i1.2517>
- Geca, M., Atento, A. G., Espelita, C. A. M., & Atento, R. G. (2026). Closing the backdoor: Fintech license strategies, regulatory reclassification, and the architecture of digital bank supervision in the Philippines. *Asian Financial Economics and Policy*, 1(1).
- Hariani, S., Halim, A., Hendryadi, H., Budiharjo, R., & Malik, H. (2024). Dynamics of ASEAN, US, and China capital market relations: Before, during and post COVID-19. *Jurnal Reviu Akuntansi dan Keuangan*. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jrak.v14i3.34137>
- Horvath, J., & Yang, G. (2024). Global financial risk, equity returns and economic activity in emerging countries. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/obes.12595>
- Jacob, T., & Raphael, R. (2021). Capital market integration of ASEAN countries: An empirical analysis.
- Karim, M. F., Irawan, A. P., & Mursitama, T. (2021). Regulatory regionalism and the limits of ASEAN banking integration: The case of Indonesia. *Politics*, 44, 420–436. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02633957211061233>

- Kruja, I., & Irimia-Diéguez, A. (2025). A comparative analysis of start-up access to external funding in the EU and Western Balkans. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Scientific Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.53894/ijirss.v8i3.7226>
- Lantin-Magana, L. M., & Atento, R. G. (2026). Digital reach, consumption, and equity market deepening: Evidence from ASEAN-5. *Asian Financial Economics and Policy*, 1(1).
- Lantin-Magana, L., Espelita, C. A. M. H., Calingasan-Habana, C. A., Atento, A. G. B., & Atento, R. G. O. (2026). Predictors of investment decision among selected individuals in key cities of Laguna: An extended Theory of Planned Behavior approach. *Journal of Enterprise Strategy & Management Innovation*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.65166/a60b0c75>
- Le, T., Vo, L. H., & Taghizadeh-Hesary, F. (2022). A study on the nonlinear dynamics of ASEAN financial integration. *Journal of Asian Business and Economic Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jabes-03-2022-0040>
- Lee, S. J., & Hwang, J. (2025). External financing and stock returns: Korean evidence. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm18120693>
- Lembong, H. S., Utomo, R. Y. W., Aimbu, R., Rumondor, C. E., Lumi, V. L., & Najoan, A. P. C. (2025). The role of inflation, monetary policy interest rates, and foreign portfolio investment on stock market volatility in ASEAN countries. *The Es Accounting and Finance*. <https://doi.org/10.58812/esaf.v4i01.795>
- Mattualy, S., Franse, F., & Maichal, M. (2025). Macroeconomic factors and regulatory quality effects on ASEAN-6 stock market returns. *Procuratio: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen*. <https://doi.org/10.35145/procuratio.v13i4.5272>
- Menez, N., & Atento, R. G. O. (2026). Women's empowerment and enterprise dynamism in the Philippines: A WDI-based index and time-series evidence (2006-2022). *Journal of Enterprise Strategy & Management Innovation*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.65166/7v64f412>
- Nguyen, N. (2023). The effect of FDI on domestic entrepreneurship: The case of greenfield investment and cross-border M&A activities. *Journal of Economics and Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jed-11-2022-0228>
- Nona, R. G., & Atento, R. G. (2025). Integrating fundamentals and technicals: Investment attractiveness of Puregold Price Club, Inc. *International Journal of Health & Business Analytics*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.65166/e0y0mb43>
- Pasaribu, S. A., Taufiq, T., & Napitupulu, D. R. (2025). Comparison of venture capital regulations in Indonesia and ASEAN countries. *TATOHI: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*. <https://doi.org/10.47268/tatohi.v5i4.2992>
- Paul, S. (2025). Foreign capital, local growth: Rethinking FDI's role in India's entrepreneurial landscape. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*. <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2025.v07i06.60354>
- Prasetya, R. A. (2022). Does the East and Southeast Asian equity market have integration? A study of cointegration analysis. *International Journal of Current Science Research and Review*. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijcsrr/v5-i3-07>
- Prokopenko, O., Sitenko, D., Zhanybayeva, Z., Lomachynska, I., & Rakhmetova, A. (2025). Financial systems and their influence on entrepreneurial development: Insights for building sustainable and inclusive ecosystems. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm18030131>
- Qadeer, H., & Sarfraz, M. (2025). Capital structure choices: The role of financial development and institutional quality. *The Critical Review of Social Sciences Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.59075/j2sr6063>
- Qizam, I. (2021). Islamic capital market integration and asymmetric information: A study in the five ASEAN countries from the post-global financial crisis (pp. 121–132). <https://doi.org/10.3846/btp.2021.12832>
- Qizi, M. D. T., & Karimovna, S. G. (2025). Portfolio investments and their impact on the economy of developing countries. *European International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Management Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.55640/eijmrms-05-06-08>

- Quinto, L., & Atento, R. G. (2025). Economic growth and developmental equity in four ASEAN economies: Linking macroeconomic trends to employment and child nutrition (1999-2024). *International Journal of Health & Business Analytics*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.65166/nq75nv94>
- Rama, J., Devi, M., & M, M. P. M. C. M. F. (2025). A review of foreign direct investment (FDI) trends in emerging markets: Opportunities and challenges. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*. <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2025.v07i04.50603>
- Refozar, R. F., Atento, R. G., Atento, A. G., & Espelita, C. A. M. (2026). Foreign direct investment and manufacturing performance in the Philippines: Evidence from WDI, 2000-2024. *Asian Financial Economics and Policy*, 1(1).
- Reyes, K. B., Lantin-Magana, L. M., Atento, A. G., Espelita, C. A. M., & Atento, R. G. (2026). Sectoral valuation profiles and earnings quality in the Philippine equity market: A descriptive cross-sectional study of PSE-listed firms as of end-Q1 2026. *Asian Financial Economics and Policy*, 1(1).
- Robiyanto, R., Nugroho, B. A., Handriani, E., & Frensidy, B. (2023). Measuring the effectiveness of ASEAN-5 initiatives from emerging market portfolio's perspective. *Cogent Business & Management*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.2167292>
- Sanga, B., & Aziakpono, M. (2022). The effect of institutional factors on financial deepening: Evidence from 50 African countries. *Journal of Business and Socio-economic Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jbsed-12-2021-0175>
- Santos, A., & Cincera, M. (2021). Determinants of financing constraints. *Small Business Economics*, 58, 1427–1439. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-021-00449-w>
- Singh, B. N. (2024). A study on the role of capital markets in promoting entrepreneurship in India. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i5.8995>
- Sohail, M., Ahmad, K., & Haq, S. U. (2025). The driving forces of financial integration: An empirical analysis of foreign portfolio investment between emerging and developed markets. *ACADEMIA International Journal for Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.63056/acad.004.03.0778>
- Sommer, C. (2024). The role of capital markets for small and medium-sized enterprise (SME) finance. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 60, 1812–1831. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2024.2377299>
- Stulz, R. (2022). Globalization, corporate finance, and the cost of capital. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jacf.12484>
- Subagyo, H., Hersugondo, H., Wijaya, M. C., Batu, K. L., & Waluyo, D. E. (2024). Foreign investor portfolio flow and monetary policy response in the Indonesian stock market considering the COVID-19 pandemic. *Investment Management and Financial Innovations*. [https://doi.org/10.21511/imfi.21\(1\).2024.08](https://doi.org/10.21511/imfi.21(1).2024.08)
- Sugiharti, L., Yasin, M. Z., Purwono, R., Esquivias, M. A., & Pane, D. D. P. (2022). The FDI spillover effect on the efficiency and productivity of manufacturing firms: Its implication on open innovation. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc8020099>
- Susila, M. R., Nugroho, W. C., & Arini, D. (2025). A comparative analysis of investment feasibility in the financial sector stocks across ASEAN countries using the CAPM. *E-Jurnal Akuntansi*. <https://doi.org/10.24843/eja.2025.v35.i09.p17>
- Syarifuddin, F. (2022). The dynamics of foreign portfolio investment and exchange rates: An interconnection approach in ASEAN. *Journal of Eurasian Economies*. <https://doi.org/10.36880/j01.2.0113>
- Talukdar, B., & Pradhan, R. (2025). Reassessing venture capital's role in IPO outcomes: A hybrid machine learning and analytical framework using evidence from India. 2025 6th International Conference on Data Analytics for Business and Industry (ICDABI), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1109/icdabi67967.2025.11547586>
- Talukdar, B., Mandleshwar, P., & Pradhan, R. P. (2026). Venture capital and firm performance post-initial public offering: Evidence from India. *Global Business Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09721509261444180>

- Vujanović, N., Radosevic, S., Stojčić, N., Hisarcikilar, M., & Hashi, I. (2022). FDI spillover effects on innovation activities of knowledge using and knowledge creating firms: Evidence from an emerging economy. *Technovation*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2022.102512>
- Workneh, W., & Kumar, R. (2026). Foreign direct investment in the manufacturing sector of Ethiopia (1996–2021): Productivity performance and technology spillover perspectives. *Future Business Journal*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-026-00757-1>
- Wurth, B., Stam, E., & Spiegel, B. (2023). Entrepreneurial ecosystem mechanisms. *Foundations and Trends in Entrepreneurship*. <https://doi.org/10.1561/03000000089>