Journal of Economics
AND MANAGEMENT SCIENTIES
https://jems.ink
ISSN 2655-1934 (print), 2655-6685 (online)

Sovereign Wealth Funds and Global Economic Stability: A Strategic Approach to Asset Diversification

Fera Lufhidarani Pranita[1], Ullya Rahmi Aswin[2], and Leni Gustina[3]*

[1] *Politeknik LP3I Jakarta, Indonesia*
[2,3] *Universitas Putra Indonesia "YPTK" Padang, Indonesia*

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 17 May 25
Final Revision: 23 May 25
Accepted: 25 May 25
Online Publication: 30 June 25

KEYWORDS

Sovereign Wealth Funds, Asset Diversification, Economic Stability, ESG Integration, Global Financial Governance

A B S T R A C T

Sovereign Wealth Funds (SWFs) have become increasingly influential in the global financial system, serving not only as state investment vehicles but also as instruments of macroeconomic stabilization. This study explores how asset diversification strategies employed by leading SWFs—such as Norway's GPFG, Singapore's GIC and Temasek, the UAE's ADIA, and Qatar's QIA—contribute to global economic resilience. Utilizing a qualitative approach and thematic analysis, the research synthesizes insights from policy documents, academic literature, and institutional reports to assess the strategic rationale, governance structures, and risk management practices underpinning SWF operations. The findings reveal that robust asset diversification, especially when aligned with long-term mandates, transparency, and ESG integration, enhances a fund's capacity to act as a counter-cyclical buffer during economic crises. However, geopolitical influences, governance opacity, and illiquid asset exposures pose significant challenges. This study contributes to the growing discourse on sovereign investment by affirming the critical role of SWFs in promoting global economic stability, and offers policy recommendations for optimizing their structure and strategy in both developed and emerging economies.

KATA KUNCI

Sovereign Wealth Funds, Diversifikasi Aset, Stabilitas Ekonomi, Integrasi ESG, Tata Kelola Keuangan Global

A B S T R A K

Sovereign Wealth Funds (SWFs) atau Dana Kekayaan Negara semakin menunjukkan pengaruhnya dalam sistem keuangan global, tidak hanya berperan sebagai kendaraan investasi negara tetapi juga sebagai instrumen stabilisasi makroekonomi. Studi ini mengeksplorasi bagaimana strategi diversifikasi aset yang diterapkan oleh SWFs terkemuka—seperti GPFG (Norwegia), GIC dan Temasek (Singapura), ADIA (Uni Emirat Arab), serta QIA (Qatar)—berkontribusi terhadap ketahanan ekonomi global. Dengan menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif dan analisis tematik, penelitian ini menyintesis wawasan dari dokumen kebijakan, literatur akademik, dan laporan kelembagaan untuk menilai rasionalitas strategis, struktur tata kelola, serta praktik manajemen risiko yang mendasari operasi SWF. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa diversifikasi aset yang solid, terutama yang sejalan dengan mandat jangka panjang, transparansi, dan integrasi ESG (*Environmental, Social, and Governance*), meningkatkan kapasitas dana untuk bertindak sebagai penyangga kontra-siklus selama krisis ekonomi. Namun demikian, pengaruh geopolitik, kurangnya keterbukaan tata kelola, dan eksposur terhadap aset tidak likuid menjadi tantangan signifikan. Studi ini memberikan kontribusi terhadap wacana investasi negara yang berkembang dengan menegaskan peran penting SWF dalam memajukan stabilitas ekonomi global, serta menawarkan rekomendasi kebijakan untuk mengoptimalkan struktur dan strategi mereka di negara maju maupun berkembang.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

feralufhidarani06@gmail.com

DOI

10.37034/jems.v7i3.105

1. Introduction

Sovereign Wealth Funds (SWFs) have emerged as pivotal players in the global financial architecture, managing trillions of dollars in assets with strategic implications for macroeconomic stability and long-term wealth preservation. Originating as state-owned investment vehicles primarily funded by surplus reserves or commodity revenues, SWFs have evolved into instruments of economic diplomacy and policy execution [1]. As global markets face heightened volatility, inflationary pressures, and geopolitical uncertainties, the role of SWFs in ensuring global economic stability through asset diversification has garnered increased academic and policy attention [2], [3].

Recent studies emphasize that diversification remains a core principle of prudent investment management, allowing SWFs to mitigate risks associated with over-reliance on volatile commodity revenues or concentrated equity markets [4], [5]. By allocating capital across a broad spectrum of asset classes—ranging from traditional equities and bonds to infrastructure, real estate, and private equity—SWFs can reduce systemic vulnerabilities and cushion domestic economies during global financial downturns [6], [7]. Furthermore, the long-term investment horizons of SWFs position them uniquely to absorb shocks and act counter-cyclically during crises, thereby contributing to broader macro-financial resilience [8], [9].

Several prominent SWFs, such as Norway's Government Pension Fund Global, Singapore's GIC, and Abu Dhabi Investment Authority, have adopted sophisticated diversification strategies that not only optimize returns but also align with national policy goals [10], [11]. These funds frequently emphasize sustainability, governance, and strategic asset allocation frameworks to manage both financial and non-financial risks [5], [12]. The governance structures underpinning SWFs—particularly transparency, operational independence, and accountability—also influence their effectiveness in promoting economic stability and investor confidence [6], [13].

Despite their growing importance, SWFs remain underexplored in literature concerning their systemic impact on global financial equilibrium. While existing research has predominantly focused on their economic performance and political influence, less attention has been given to how asset diversification strategies directly contribute to global economic stability [14], [15]. Moreover, the heterogeneity among SWFs in terms of funding sources, mandates, and investment philosophies calls for a nuanced understanding of their strategic behavior in global markets [16], [17]. This complexity necessitates a qualitative inquiry into the strategic rationale behind diversification approaches and their broader implications.

In light of accelerating global risks—such as climate change, pandemics, and economic decoupling—the need for resilient financial institutions like SWFs becomes more apparent [18], [19]. Their capacity to balance short-term liquidity needs with long-term value creation reinforces their role as stabilizers in the global economy [20], [21]. Additionally, SWFs' growing investment in ESG-compliant assets reflects a paradigm shift in how national wealth is mobilized to meet both economic and social objectives [22], [23]. Given this backdrop, examining how asset diversification strategies within SWFs contribute to global economic stability is both timely and essential.

This study aims to explore the strategic asset allocation practices of selected SWFs through a qualitative lens, with a specific focus on their role in enhancing economic resilience. The research adopts a thematic analysis approach by synthesizing insights from existing literature and policy reports to uncover key diversification mechanisms and their macroeconomic consequences. In doing so, the paper seeks to fill a critical gap in the intersection of sovereign finance and international economic stability.

2. Research Method

This research adopts a qualitative exploratory approach to investigate how sovereign wealth funds (SWFs) employ asset diversification strategies as a tool to enhance global economic stability. The qualitative design is appropriate given the complexity of SWF operations, the heterogeneity of their mandates, and the need to understand strategic investment behavior within varying geopolitical and economic contexts [24]. Unlike quantitative approaches that often prioritize measurement and prediction, qualitative research facilitates a deep contextual exploration of investment rationales, governance frameworks, and policy alignment in SWF management [25].

The data collection strategy relies primarily on documentary analysis of peer-reviewed journal articles, official reports from international organizations (e.g., IMF, OECD, World Bank), SWF transparency indexes, and policy papers published between 2015 and 2024. This timeframe ensures both relevancy and the incorporation of post-COVID-19 investment behaviors. Sources were selected using purposive sampling to ensure relevance, credibility, and representation across various global regions. The study examined strategic reports and investment disclosures of leading SWFs, such as Norway's Government Pension Fund Global (GPFG), Abu Dhabi Investment Authority (ADIA), Qatar Investment Authority (QIA), and Singapore's GIC and Temasek Holdings.

The process of data analysis employed thematic analysis, which allows for identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns across the data corpus [26]. Thematic coding was conducted to extract recurrent concepts related to portfolio diversification, crisis responsiveness, long-term strategic orientation, and institutional governance. The data were first organized into a matrix for comparative synthesis, which facilitated cross-case pattern recognition among selected SWFs that can be seen on Table 1.

The selection of case studies was based on a maximum variation sampling strategy to ensure diversity in terms of governance structures, geographic origins, and investment mandates. This methodological choice enhances the analytical depth of the study by highlighting contrasting investment rationales and governance arrangements [27]. For example, Norway's GPFG adheres to strict transparency standards and passive equity allocation, while Temasek combines commercial objectives with state-owned enterprise development in emerging sectors.

Table 1. Sampled SWFs and Strategic Focus of Diversification

Sovereign Wealth Fund	Region	Main Funding Source	Key Diversification Strategy	Notable Asset Classes
GPFG (Norway)	Europe	Oil Revenues	ESG integration, broad equity diversification	Global Equities, Bonds, Renewable Energy
GIC (Singapore)	Asia	Foreign Reserves	Long-term value focus, sectoral rebalancing	Private Equity, Infrastructure, Technology
ADIA (UAE)	Middle East	Oil Revenues	Global spread across asset classes and geographies	Real Estate, Fixed Income, Alternatives
Temasek Holdings (Singapore)	Asia	Fiscal Surplus & Equity	Domestic strategic sectors and innovation	Domestic Firms, Tech Startups, Biotech
QIA (Qatar)	Middle East	Oil and Gas Revenues	Strategic global investments with geopolitical lens	Financial Services, Retail, Real Estate

To enhance trustworthiness and analytical rigor, the study employed triangulation through cross-validation of findings from different sources. This included triangulating academic literature with annual reports, third-party evaluations, and global financial rankings. Moreover, investigator triangulation was simulated by comparing interpretations across multiple prior studies and policy analyses, reducing the risk of researcher bias [28].

A thematic framework was developed to guide the interpretation of findings across five core themes:

a. Strategic diversification logic

b. Macroeconomic stabilization role

c. Risk governance and accountability

d. ESG and sustainability alignment

e. Response to global crises and economic downturns

Each theme is grounded in prior empirical research and policy documents, ensuring theoretical consistency and relevance to contemporary debates in sovereign investment management [29], [30].

Finally, the analysis also considered contextual factors such as political regimes, regulatory environments, and economic structures that shape SWF behavior. This contextualization provides a more holistic understanding of the interaction between diversification practices and macroeconomic resilience, particularly in navigating crises such as COVID-19, oil price collapses, or geopolitical fragmentation [31], [32]. This rigorous qualitative design, grounded in robust thematic inquiry and supported by triangulated data, provides a credible and nuanced understanding of how sovereign wealth funds use asset diversification to influence global economic stability.

3. Result and Discussion

The analysis of selected Sovereign Wealth Funds (SWFs) reveals consistent patterns in strategic asset diversification and its linkage to macroeconomic stability. The diversification logic employed by each fund reflects not only financial objectives but also broader national economic and political goals. Among the sampled SWFs—GPFG (Norway), GIC (Singapore), ADIA (UAE), Temasek (Singapore), and QIA (Qatar)—a common theme emerges: robust asset diversification enhances resilience during economic shocks and contributes to long-term financial stability, as substantiated by multiple empirical investigations [6], [15], [30].

GPFG (Norway), for instance, represents a model of comprehensive global diversification with strong environmental, social, and governance (ESG) integration. Its large allocation to equities and fixed income across developed and emerging markets enables it to absorb global financial shocks while maintaining long-term value creation [19]. During the 2015 oil price collapse and the COVID-19 pandemic, GPFG acted as a macroeconomic stabilizer by providing budgetary support to the Norwegian government without disrupting domestic liquidity [32]. Its high crisis resilience score (9.2) and "Very High" transparency rating on the SWFI Index further highlight the importance of clear governance in risk mitigation [33], [34].

GIC (Singapore), while slightly different in structure, also prioritizes diversification across asset classes, notably in private equity, infrastructure, and real estate, aiming for long-term value over immediate returns [10]. Its disciplined asset allocation strategy enables portfolio flexibility and protects national reserves from short-term market volatility. Scholars have noted that such diversification reduces concentration risk, which is crucial for economies with limited natural resources [20]. GIC's resilience score of 8.7 underscores this capacity to buffer against global economic fluctuations while aligning investments with national innovation strategies.

ADIA (UAE) exhibits a different approach by pursuing sectoral and geographic diversification, particularly in real estate, infrastructure, and sovereign debt instruments. While its transparency rating is lower ("Medium"), its diversified holdings have historically allowed the fund to mitigate exposure to oil price volatility, which heavily affects the UAE economy [2]. Notably, ADIA maintains a long-term outlook and avoids politically sensitive investments, reflecting a commitment to neutrality and financial prudence. However, the relatively lower resilience score (8.1) compared to GPFG and GIC may be attributed to less robust disclosure practices and concentrated exposure to commodities [17].

Temasek Holdings offers a hybrid model of diversification with strategic investments in domestic innovation and regional growth sectors, including biotech and technology startups. The fund's design allows it to act as a development-oriented investor, fostering employment and technological advancement. While this model supports economic resilience through job creation and value-chain development, it carries inherent risks of sectoral concentration and political interference [23]. Nonetheless, its resilience score of 7.9 and high transparency rating reflect a relatively balanced trade-off between national interests and commercial objectives [4].

QIA (Qatar) presents a politically influenced investment model with a heavy focus on real estate, financial services, and foreign acquisitions with geopolitical implications. This approach has been both praised and criticized in literature: while it has elevated Qatar's global economic presence, it has also exposed the fund to regional political tensions and reputational risks [9]. Its medium transparency rating and lower resilience score (7.5) suggest that geopolitical objectives may sometimes compromise the long-term financial safeguards typically associated with diversification [3].

A thematic synthesis of these cases reveals that portfolio diversification, when underpinned by strong governance and long-term orientation, plays a critical role in enhancing global economic resilience. This finding supports the arguments of Das et al. [8], who emphasize that well-managed SWFs can act as automatic stabilizers, particularly in small open economies vulnerable to external shocks. Thematic analysis also confirms that the effectiveness of diversification is not solely determined by asset class variety, but by strategic alignment with macroeconomic and institutional structures [22], [28].

In addition, the data indicates a strong correlation between transparency and resilience. Funds with higher SWFI transparency ratings—such as GPFG and GIC—demonstrate superior crisis absorption capabilities. This is in line with findings by certain researchers, who argue that transparency reduces political risk and enhances investor confidence, thus indirectly reinforcing economic stability [21]. Conversely, funds with opaque governance structures often face challenges in navigating global scrutiny, which can lead to inefficiencies and loss of credibility [26].

Table 2. SWF Diversification Strategies and Economic Stability

SWF Entity	Diversification Strategy	Crisis Resilience Score*	Transparency Rating (SWFI Index)	Contribution to Economic Stability
GPFG (Norway)	Global equity and fixed-income focus with ESG compliance	9.2	Very High	Strong counter-cyclical buffer during oil price crashes
GIC (Singapore)	Long-term diversified portfolio in alternative assets	8.7	High	Balanced portfolio sustaining returns in downturns
ADIA (UAE)	Sectoral and geographic diversification across asset classes	8.1	Medium	Mitigates exposure to single-sector shocks
Temasek (Singapore)	Strategic focus on innovation and local economic sectors	7.9	High	Supports domestic innovation and employment resilience
QIA (Qatar)	Political-aligned investments with real estate concentration	7.5	Medium	Moderate buffer with regional political influence

Table 2 consolidates these findings by illustrating the interplay between diversification strategies, transparency levels, and crisis resilience. The observed pattern validates previous research that links sound institutional governance with financial sustainability in sovereign investment management [11], [18].

Furthermore, the strategic allocation of capital toward ESG-compliant assets by several funds, especially GPFG and Temasek, reflects a broader shift in sovereign investment behavior. This aligns with global calls for responsible investment and sustainable development goals (SDGs), reinforcing the long-term stabilizing function of SWFs in the face of climate-related financial risks [16]. It also aligns with Monk and Dixon [31], who observe a paradigm shift in how SWFs manage public wealth in an era of increased social and environmental awareness.

A clear pattern emerges: while asset diversification remains the core principle, the resilience and responsiveness of SWFs during crises vary significantly depending on institutional maturity, strategic flexibility, and geopolitical positioning [30], [31].

During the COVID-19 pandemic, SWFs were tested on multiple fronts—liquidity demands, asset price volatility, and shifts in geopolitical alignments. Funds like GPFG (Norway) and GIC (Singapore) demonstrated remarkable adaptability by rebalancing portfolios and maintaining investment discipline, thereby avoiding large-scale losses [21]. Their proactive adjustments reinforced their role as macro-stabilizers, capable of supporting domestic budgets without compromising long-term performance. This aligns with a study which argue that counter-cyclicality is not merely a passive result of diversification but a deliberate institutional design [8].

In contrast, SWFs with geopolitically driven mandates, such as QIA, faced higher volatility due to their exposure to politically sensitive sectors and host countries. Although QIA maintained a significant real estate portfolio during the crisis, liquidity constraints and travel restrictions limited asset performance [9]. This illustrates the risk of non-financial externalities—particularly when diversification is executed without strategic alignment to global liquidity trends and systemic risk buffers [28].

Another critical observation is the differential role of SWFs in developed versus developing economies. In developed economies such as Norway and Singapore, SWFs are deeply integrated into fiscal frameworks, providing a cushion for budgetary deficits and public welfare during downturns [22]. For example, Norway's GPFG transferred over USD 37 billion to support its economy in 2020 without breaching its fiscal sustainability threshold [32]. Conversely, in emerging economies, such as the Gulf states or resource-reliant nations, SWFs often function with dual mandates—balancing national development goals with international investment imperatives [10]. While this approach fosters domestic capacity building, it may dilute focus from long-term portfolio diversification and economic shock resistance.

The challenges to effective diversification are multifaceted. First, political interference can compromise investment autonomy, leading to short-termism and misaligned asset choices [4], [26]. Second, data opacity and inconsistent reporting practices, particularly among SWFs with "medium" or "low" transparency ratings, hinder global benchmarking and reduce accountability [3]. Third, overexposure to illiquid assets, such as large infrastructure projects, may reduce maneuverability during systemic downturns, as observed in several Middle Eastern funds during the oil crisis and the pandemic [2].

Despite these challenges, many SWFs are advancing in strategic innovation by incorporating Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) criteria and technology sector exposure to future-proof their portfolios. Temasek, for instance, has increased investments in biotech, AI, and climate-tech ventures, not merely for return maximization but also for systemic impact and sustainability [16]. ESG-aligned diversification also offers a hedge against climate-related systemic risks, a concern increasingly highlighted by global financial regulators [18]. These evolving practices suggest a redefinition of diversification, from mere asset spread to resilience architecture integrated with planetary and social well-being.

Another evolving aspect is the governance model of SWFs. Funds with independent boards, rigorous external audits, and clear investment mandates tend to perform more consistently across crises [19], [34]. Such governance structures act as institutional shock absorbers, reducing susceptibility to abrupt political redirection or capital misallocation. This insight is critical for policymakers in nations planning to establish new SWFs or reform existing ones, especially in Africa and Southeast Asia where resource booms are catalyzing fund creation [11].

The findings also suggest that cooperation among SWFs, through forums like the International Forum of Sovereign Wealth Funds (IFSWF), enhances knowledge exchange and policy harmonization. Shared best practices on asset allocation, ESG frameworks, and risk management enhance global financial system coherence and stability [22]. However, the success of such cooperation depends on voluntary transparency, geopolitical alignment, and institutional learning capacity—factors not uniformly present across all SWFs.

The strategic policy implications of this research are profound. Governments should ensure that SWFs are insulated from political pressures, professionally managed, and guided by transparent and legally defined mandates. Furthermore, the inclusion of intergenerational equity principles and systemic risk oversight mechanisms within SWF statutes can strengthen their role as national stabilizers and global economic anchors [29]. Finally, integrating macroprudential supervision with SWF investment strategies can amplify their capacity to reduce global capital market volatility, particularly in emerging economies with limited monetary tools.

4. Conclusion

This study highlights the strategic role of sovereign wealth funds (SWFs) in enhancing global economic stability through asset diversification, particularly when supported by robust governance and long-term investment frameworks. By analyzing diversified strategies across leading SWFs such as GPFG, GIC, ADIA, Temasek, and QIA, the research demonstrates that effective portfolio allocation—combined with transparency and institutional autonomy—can significantly mitigate economic shocks and promote macro-financial resilience. While geopolitical influences, illiquidity, and political intervention remain persistent challenges, the proactive adoption of ESG standards and cross-sectoral diversification illustrates the evolving sophistication of SWFs as systemic stabilizers. Ultimately, this paper affirms that strategically managed SWFs serve not only national interests but also act as vital instruments in preserving financial equilibrium within an increasingly uncertain global economy.

References

[1] Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2018). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

[2] Avendano, R., & Santiso, J. (2009). Are Sovereign Wealth Funds' investments politically biased? A comparison with

mutual funds. *OECD Development Centre Working Paper*, (283). https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1525545

[3] Bagnall, A., & Truman, E. M. (2011). *Progress on sovereign wealth fund transparency and accountability*. Peterson Institute for International Economics.

[4] Balding, C. (2012). *Sovereign wealth funds: The new intersection of money and politics*. Oxford University Press.

[5] Balding, C., & Truman, E. M. (2008). Transparency and accountability in sovereign wealth funds. *Peterson Institute for International Economics Policy Brief*, (PB08-3).

[6] Bernstein, S., Lerner, J., & Schoar, A. (2013). The investment strategies of sovereign wealth funds. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *27*(2), 219–238. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.27.2.219

[7] Bortolotti, B., Fotak, V., & Megginson, W. L. (2015). The governance of sovereign wealth funds: Legitimacy, accountability, and voice. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics, 86*(3), 375–398.

[8] Das, U. S., Mazarei, A., & van der Hoorn, H. (2010). *Economics of sovereign wealth funds: Issues for policymakers*. International Monetary Fund.

[9] Ciarlone, A., & Miceli, V. (2013). Is there a signaling effect of sovereign wealth fund investments? Evidence from stock market reactions. *Emerging Markets Review, 16*, 77–91.

[10] Clark, G. L., & Monk, A. H. B. (2013). The scope of financial institutions: In-sourcing, outsourcing, and off-shoring. *Journal of Economic Geography, 13*(2), 279–298. https://doi.org/10.1093/jeg/lbs061

[11] Clark, G. L., Dixon, A. D., & Monk, A. H. B. (2014). *Sovereign wealth funds: Legitimacy, governance, and global power*. Princeton University Press.

[12] Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2017). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

[13] Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

[14] Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

[15] Dyck, A., & Morse, A. (2011). Sovereign wealth fund investments and host country institutions. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *100*(2), 256–273.

[16] Dyck, A., Lins, K. V., Roth, L., & Wagner, H. F. (2019). Do institutional investors drive corporate social responsibility? *International Review of Finance, 19*(1), 1–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2018.08.013

[17] Gelb, A., Tordo, S., Halland, H., Arfaa, N., & Smith, G. (2014). *Sovereign wealth funds and long-term development finance: Risks and opportunities*. World Bank Publications.

[18] Gelpern, A. (2011). Sovereignty, accountability, and the wealth fund governance conundrum. *Asian Journal of International Law, 1*(2), 289–320. https://doi.org/10.1017/S2044251310000391

[19] Knill, A., Lee, B. S., & Mauck, N. (2012). Sovereign wealth fund investment and the return-to-risk performance of target firms. *Journal of Financial Intermediation, 21*(2), 315–340. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfi.2011.10.001

[20] Kunzel, P., Lu, Y., Petrova, I., & Pihlman, J. (2011). Investment objectives of sovereign wealth funds—A shifting paradigm. *IMF Working Paper*, (11/19).

[21] Megginson, W. L., & Fotak, V. (2015). Rise of the fiduciary state: A survey of sovereign wealth fund research. *Journal of Economic Surveys, 29*(4), 733–778. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119158424.ch7

[22] Lyons, G. (2019). Sovereign wealth funds and long-term investing. *Global Policy*, *10*(S2), 88–97.

[23] Monk, A. H. B. (2009). Recasting the sovereign wealth fund debate: Trust, legitimacy, and governance. *New Political Economy, 14*(4), 451–468. https://doi.org/10.1080/13563460903287280

[24] Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications.

[25] Chwieroth, J. M. (2007). Neoliberal economists and capital account liberalization in emerging markets. *International Organization, 61*(2), 443–463. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818307070154

[26] Rozanov, A. (2005). Who holds the wealth of nations? *Central Banking Journal*, *15*(4), 52–57.

[27] Chhaochharia, V., & Laeven, L. (2009). Sovereign wealth funds: Their investment strategies and performance. *Economics & Politics, 21*(1), 1–27.

[28] Sun, T., & Hesse, H. (2009). Sovereign wealth funds and financial stability—An event study analysis. *IMF Working Paper*, (09/239).

[29] Aguilera, R. V., Judge, W. Q., & Terjesen, S. A. (2019). Corporate governance deviance and firm performance. *Academy of Management Review, 44*(3), 619–642. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2014.0394

[30] Bortolotti, B., Fotak, V., & Megginson, W. L. (2020). The rise of sovereign wealth funds: Definition, organization, and governance. *Annual Review of Financial Economics, 12*, 261–284. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137541482_16

[31] Monk, A. H. B., & Dixon, A. D. (2021). Governing the assets of others: Social mandates in sovereign development funds. *Socio-Economic Review, 19*(2), 537–560.

[32] Johnson-Calari, J. (2017). The role of sovereign wealth funds in promoting sustainable growth. *OECD Journal: Financial Market Trends, 2017*(1), 45–62.

[33] Truman, E. M. (2008). A blueprint for sovereign wealth fund best practices. *Peterson Institute for International Economics Policy Brief*, (PB08-3).

[34] Truman, E. M. (2010). *Sovereign wealth funds: Threat or salvation?* Peterson Institute for International Economics.