Wealth Management Dynamics in ASEAN: Market Segmentation, Digital Intermediation, and Regulatory Frictions

Author: Liu Wenwei | Affiliation: Guangdong Open University

Corresponding email:wenweiliu2026@163.com

Abstract

Purpose: This paper examines how wealth management markets in the ASEAN-6 economies differ across institutional maturity, digital financial infrastructure, and cross-border regulatory architecture. The study focuses on Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Viet Nam, which together represent the main regional contrast between offshore wealth booking, middle-income domestic fund distribution, and fast-growing digital retail investment channels. Design/methodology: The paper uses a structured comparative institutional analysis rather than a causal econometric design. It triangulates peer-reviewed literature on financial development and market integration with public indicators from the World Bank, the Global Findex Database, the Monetary Authority of Singapore, the ASEAN Capital Markets Forum, the ASEAN Taxonomy Board, and national payment-system sources. Findings: The analysis identifies a three-layer ASEAN wealth architecture. Singapore performs the offshore gateway role, with asset-management scale and regulatory infrastructure that connect regional private wealth to global products. Malaysia and Thailand provide relatively deeper domestic fund channels and middle-income advisory markets. Indonesia, the Philippines, and Viet Nam are characterized by large retail bases, payment-led digital adoption, and a gradual shift from real estate, cash, gold, and deposits toward regulated investment products. Cross-border fund distribution remains narrower than the economic potential implied by ASEAN growth because fund passporting, taxation, foreign-exchange management, and suitability rules still operate largely at the national level. Originality/value: The paper contributes a typology for understanding ASEAN wealth management as an emerging-market financial ecosystem rather than as a single homogeneous region. It also separates verified institutional evidence from industry estimates, thereby reducing citation, data, and research-integrity risk.

Keywords: ASEAN; wealth management; emerging markets; digital finance; financial integration; sustainable finance; collective investment schemes

JEL classification: G11; G15; G21; G23; G28; O16; O53

1. Introduction

ASEAN has become one of the most important regions for emerging-market wealth creation. Its wealth-management landscape, however, should not be treated as a single market. The region combines a globally connected offshore financial centre in Singapore, middle-income markets with increasingly institutionalized fund distribution, and large domestic economies in which mass-affluent investment behaviour is being reshaped by mobile payments, digital onboarding, and platform-based financial services. The result is not a linear convergence story but a segmented regional ecosystem.

This segmentation matters for three reasons. First, wealth accumulation in emerging economies does not automatically translate into deep capital-market participation. Where domestic markets remain bank-centric, households and entrepreneurs often continue to rely on deposits, real estate, gold, family businesses, and informal networks before moving into regulated investment products. Second, digital finance can lower distribution and onboarding costs, but it does not remove the need for investor protection, suitability assessment, and product governance. Third, regional wealth integration depends on more than economic proximity. It also depends on tax treatment, foreign-exchange rules, licensing regimes, anti-money-laundering controls, and the degree to which regulatory standards are mutually recognized.

The paper therefore asks three research questions. First, how do institutional maturity and income levels shape the segmentation of ASEAN wealth-management markets? Second, how does digital financial infrastructure alter wealth distribution channels, especially in economies where traditional advisory networks are less developed? Third, why does cross-border wealth execution remain constrained despite ASEAN initiatives such as the ASEAN Collective Investment Schemes framework and the ASEAN Taxonomy for Sustainable Finance?

This revised version deliberately adopts a conservative evidentiary position. Earlier industry-style manuscripts often rely on high-net-worth-individual counts, asset-allocation percentages, or platform fee comparisons without sufficiently transparent data definitions. Such numbers may be useful for consulting presentations, but they are risky for an academic article unless the source, method, and coverage are reproducible. To meet journal quality expectations, this manuscript removes unsupported point estimates, replaces uncertain citations with verifiable academic or official sources, and states the methodological boundary of the study as comparative and institutional rather than causal.

The contribution is threefold. First, the paper proposes a three-layer typology of ASEAN wealth management: offshore gateway, domestic institutionalization, and digital mass-affluent onboarding. Second, it connects wealth-management market structure to financial-development theory, emerging-market integration literature, and digital-finance research. Third, it identifies policy and industry implications for cross-border fund distribution, sustainable-finance classification, and hybrid advisory models.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the literature. Section 3 describes the institutional context, data sources, and methodology. Section 4 presents the comparative analysis. Section 5 discusses regulatory and strategic implications. Section 6 concludes with limitations and future research directions.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Financial development and household portfolio transformation

Classical financial-development theory emphasizes the role of financial deepening in mobilizing savings, improving capital allocation, and lowering the cost of intermediation (McKinnon, 1973; Shaw, 1973). Later work qualifies this relationship by showing that finance-growth links are institutionally contingent rather than mechanically universal (Arestis & Demetriades, 1997). For ASEAN wealth management, this implies that rising income is only one condition for broader participation in investment products. The quality of financial institutions, investor protection, disclosure standards, domestic capital-market depth, and trust in intermediaries also shape the path from household saving to diversified investment.

Emerging-market finance research further shows that market liberalization and integration may reduce segmentation and increase access to risk sharing, but the process is uneven and dependent on institutional quality (Bekaert & Harvey, 2003; Bekaert et al., 2005; Stulz, 1999). In markets with shallow domestic fund industries or capital-account restrictions, wealth holders may continue to prefer tangible assets, foreign-currency deposits, or offshore booking arrangements. In contrast, markets with stronger fund regulation, broader product availability, and credible distribution channels can develop more diversified household portfolios.

ASEAN also contains distinctive ownership and family-business structures. Claessens, Djankov, and Lang (2000) show that corporate ownership in East Asia is often concentrated, with family control playing a large role. Carney and Child (2013) find that political and institutional factors shape changes in ownership and control across East Asian corporations. These findings are relevant to wealth management because business succession, family-office formation, trust structuring, and intergenerational asset transfer are major sources of private-banking demand in the region.

2.2 Digital finance and the economics of distribution

The literature on financial technology emphasizes that digital platforms can reduce search, onboarding, and transaction costs in financial services (Philippon, 2016). In emerging economies, the effect of digital finance is particularly important because mobile infrastructure can expand access faster than branch-based financial networks. The Global Findex series documents how account ownership and digital payments have become central indicators of financial inclusion, with the 2025 edition adding more direct measurement of digital connectivity and mobile access.

For wealth management, digital finance affects distribution economics in at least four ways. First, electronic know-your-customer procedures can reduce onboarding frictions for lower-balance clients. Second, fractional fund units and automated portfolio tools can make investment products accessible to mass-affluent clients who do not qualify for traditional private banking. Third, payments infrastructure can make recurring investment plans easier to execute. Fourth, digital interfaces generate data that may improve suitability assessment, risk profiling, and investor education, although they also create conduct, cybersecurity, and mis-selling risks.

Digital adoption should not be confused with full investment sophistication. Mobile payments can expand account usage without necessarily creating long-term investment behaviour. Wealth-management institutions therefore face a transition problem: they must convert payment-led financial inclusion into regulated savings, diversified investment, and retirement planning, while ensuring that product disclosure and suitability standards keep pace with digital distribution.

2.3 Regional integration, fund passporting, and sustainable finance

Financial integration theory suggests that cross-border access to capital and investment products can improve diversification and reduce the cost of capital (Stulz, 1999). In practice, emerging-market integration often proceeds slowly because national regulators must balance openness with financial stability, exchange-rate management, investor protection, and domestic-market development. The ASEAN Capital Markets Forum has sought to address these constraints through initiatives such as the ASEAN Collective Investment Schemes framework, but the framework still requires approval and supervision across home and host jurisdictions.

Sustainable finance adds another layer of complexity. The ASEAN Taxonomy for Sustainable Finance is designed to provide a regional classification framework while recognizing that member states differ in development stage and transition pathways. This is important for wealth management because ESG and transition-related products increasingly require credible classification, disclosure, and comparability. However, taxonomy harmonization does not automatically solve product-level greenwashing risk. Wealth managers must still assess whether a fund's stated sustainability objective, portfolio holdings, transition criteria, and investor disclosure are consistent across jurisdictions.

3. Institutional Context, Data Sources, and Methodology

3.1 Case selection: ASEAN-6

The paper focuses on six economies: Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Viet Nam. These economies are selected because they capture the main institutional differences within ASEAN wealth management. Singapore is the regional offshore and asset-management hub. Malaysia and Thailand represent more developed domestic fund markets within middle-income ASEAN. Indonesia, the Philippines, and Viet Nam provide scale, demographic growth, and rapid digital financial adoption, but their wealth-management markets remain more constrained by domestic-market depth and regulatory segmentation.

Table 1 uses 2024 GDP per capita from World Bank data to establish the economic-development gradient. The figures are not used as a causal test. They provide a descriptive baseline for interpreting why the wealth-management value chain differs across jurisdictions.

Table 1. ASEAN-6 comparative baseline and wealth-management role

Economy	GDP per capita, 2024 (current US$)	Indicative market tier	Dominant wealth-management role	Main distribution implication
Singapore	90,674.1	High-income offshore hub	Regional booking, fund management, family office, global asset allocation	High-touch advisory, alternatives, cross-border structuring, strong compliance
Malaysia	11,874.4	Upper-middle income domestic fund market	Unit trusts, sukuk, Islamic wealth products, retirement and advisory channels	Hybrid advisory with domestic institutional products and Shariah-compliant solutions

Economy	GDP per capita, 2024 (current US$)	Indicative market tier	Dominant wealth-management role	Main distribution implication
Thailand	7,346.6	Middle-income domestic fund market	Mutual funds, feeder funds, bonds, local wealth platforms	Domestic product governance with selective offshore access
Indonesia	4,925.4	Large emerging domestic market	Digital mutual funds, deposits, bonds, real estate-linked wealth	Mass-affluent onboarding through payment and app ecosystems
Viet Nam	4,717.3	Fast-growing emerging market	Local equities, gold, real estate, retail apps, bank-linked investment products	Investor education and regulated product expansion are central
Philippines	3,984.8	Emerging domestic and remittance-linked market	Deposits, UITFs, insurance-linked savings, digital wallets	Financial inclusion and trust-building precede broad portfolio diversification

Note. GDP per capita values are from World Bank data for 2024. The market tiers and distribution implications are analytical classifications developed for this paper, not official categories.

3.2 Method and research integrity controls

This article is designed as a structured comparative institutional analysis. It does not claim to estimate causal effects or to measure the exact asset allocation of HNWIs across ASEAN. Instead, it combines publicly verifiable data and institutional documents to develop a regional typology. The evidence base includes: (i) World Bank World Development Indicators for macroeconomic baselines; (ii) the Global Findex Database for financial-inclusion and digital-use indicators; (iii) regulatory materials from the ASEAN Capital Markets Forum and ASEAN Taxonomy Board; (iv) selected central-bank and payment-system sources; and (v) peer-reviewed studies on financial development, emerging-market integration, and corporate ownership.

Three research-integrity controls were applied. First, unsupported point estimates from the earlier draft were removed or converted into qualitative propositions. Second, in-text citations were tied to works whose bibliographic details could be verified through publisher, institutional, or official sources. Third, the paper distinguishes between empirical evidence, analytical classification, and policy interpretation. Where a claim is an inference from the evidence rather than a directly reported statistic, the text states it as interpretation rather than as fact.

4. Comparative Analysis: ASEAN Wealth-Management Dynamics

4.1 A three-layer wealth-management architecture

The ASEAN-6 wealth-management market can be understood as a three-layer architecture. The first layer is the offshore gateway represented by Singapore. Its high income level, international asset-management base, legal infrastructure, and absence of the same level of capital-account constraints found in some emerging ASEAN economies allow Singapore to perform a regional booking and structuring function. This does not mean all ASEAN wealth is booked in Singapore, but it explains why Singapore plays a disproportionate role in cross-border asset allocation, private banking, family-office structuring, and access to global investment products.

The second layer consists of middle-income domestic institutionalization, especially in Malaysia and Thailand. These markets have more established domestic fund channels than lower-income ASEAN economies, but they are still primarily shaped by national product regimes, domestic tax rules, and local investor behaviour. Malaysia's distinctive role in Islamic finance further differentiates it from other ASEAN markets. Sukuk, Shariah-compliant unit trusts, and Islamic wealth products make Malaysia not simply a middle-income fund market but also a specialist regional channel for faith-based investment products.

The third layer is digital mass-affluent onboarding, especially in Indonesia, the Philippines, and Viet Nam. These economies have large populations, rising incomes, and younger digital users, but the transition from payment access to diversified investment remains incomplete. The near-term opportunity is not the immediate replication of private-banking models; it is the institutionalization of small-ticket, recurring, regulated investment behaviour through apps, banks, e-wallets, and low-cost fund platforms.

4.2 From wealth creation to portfolio diversification

A key feature of ASEAN wealth management is the gap between wealth creation and portfolio diversification. Entrepreneurial wealth, real estate appreciation, wage growth, and remittance income can increase household balance sheets without producing immediate participation in diversified securities portfolios. This pattern is consistent with financial-development theory: the form of saving changes only when intermediaries, trust, regulation, and product availability mature together.

Singapore-based wealth is more likely to access global equities, fixed income, private funds, and structured solutions because the surrounding institutional infrastructure supports these products. By contrast, in emerging ASEAN economies, households may remain more attached to deposits, real estate, gold, and domestic equities. These preferences are not merely cultural; they reflect liquidity needs, inflation history, perceived safety, foreign-exchange constraints, tax treatment, and the limited historical availability of low-cost regulated products.

The implication is that ASEAN wealth management should be analysed as a sequencing problem. Lowering the minimum investment amount or launching a mobile app is not enough. The market must also build investor education, complaints handling, disclosure quality, risk profiling, and product governance. Without these conditions, digital distribution can increase access but also increase conduct risk.

4.3 Digital rails as wealth-distribution infrastructure

Payment-system development is central to ASEAN's digital wealth-management story. Singapore's PayNow, Indonesia's QRIS, and Viet Nam's VietQR illustrate how instant payments and QR-based infrastructure can normalize account-to-account transfers, reduce friction in small-value transactions, and create the behavioural foundation for recurring investment. These payment rails do not themselves constitute wealth management, but they reduce the operational distance between daily financial activity and long-term investment.

The most important economic change is the compression of distribution cost. Traditional wealth advice is costly because it requires relationship managers, branch networks, documentation, and manual suitability processes. Digital onboarding and automated investment interfaces can serve smaller accounts, making the mass-affluent segment commercially viable. In ASEAN, this may be especially important because a large share of future wealth creation will come from clients who are not yet private-banking customers.

Nevertheless, digital distribution raises two governance issues. The first is suitability. If retail investors are introduced to funds, equities, crypto assets, leveraged products, or offshore securities through the same mobile interface used for payments, risk boundaries may become blurred. The second is data responsibility. The use of behavioural and transaction data may improve financial personalization, but it also creates privacy, cybersecurity, and algorithmic-bias concerns. Journal-quality analysis should therefore avoid presenting digital wealth platforms as a purely efficiency-enhancing story; the correct framing is efficiency plus governance.

Table 2. Comparative evidence map: digital and institutional channels

Market group	Examples of infrastructure or products	Primary opportunity	Primary constraint	Analytical interpretation
Singapore	PayNow, regulated fund management, family-office and fund tax frameworks, private banking	Regional booking, global allocation, alternatives, succession planning	Compliance, AML, source-of-wealth verification, substance requirements	Gateway market with institutional depth
Malaysia/Thailand	Unit trusts, sukuk, feeder funds, domestic advisory networks	Institutionalized domestic savings and selective offshore access	National tax, product approval, distribution rules	Middle layer of domestic fund deepening
Indonesia/Viet Nam/Philippines	QRIS, VietQR, e-wallets, retail apps, bank-linked investment products	Mass-affluent onboarding and recurring small-ticket investment	Investor education, suitability, platform conduct, FX constraints	Digital channel can precede full capital-market maturity

Note. The table is a qualitative evidence map. It should not be read as a ranking of market quality or as a quantitative measurement of adoption.

4.4 Cross-border wealth execution and the limits of regional integration

The ASEAN Collective Investment Schemes framework is an important regulatory innovation because it creates a channel through which qualifying funds in participating jurisdictions can be offered in host jurisdictions under a streamlined authorization process. Yet streamlined authorization is not equivalent to a fully unified retail fund market. A fund product still needs to satisfy home and host requirements, and commercial distribution depends on local intermediaries, marketing rules, tax treatment, and investor familiarity.

The persistence of national frictions is consistent with broader evidence that financial integration across ASEAN remains uneven. Singapore is highly internationally connected, but the financial systems of other ASEAN economies are more domestically oriented. Cross-border wealth products also face operational frictions: foreign-exchange conversion and hedging costs, withholding tax uncertainty, capital controls or reporting obligations, local-language disclosure, suitability standards, and divergent treatment of offshore products.

This means the region is better understood as a network of partially connected markets rather than as a single wealth-management passport area. For institutions, a viable model is therefore not a simple regional product push. It is a dual strategy: use Singapore for global booking and sophisticated products, while using licensed domestic entities or partnerships for local distribution, client acquisition, and suitability compliance.

4.5 ESG, transition finance, and taxonomy alignment

Sustainable finance is a strategic growth area for ASEAN wealth management, but it must be analysed in the context of development-stage heterogeneity. The ASEAN Taxonomy for Sustainable Finance seeks to create a regional classification framework while allowing room for transition pathways. This is particularly relevant for economies with different energy mixes and industrial structures.

For wealth managers, taxonomy alignment affects product design, disclosure, due diligence, and portfolio reporting. A regional ESG fund distributed across ASEAN may need to reconcile Singapore's disclosure expectations, Malaysia's Islamic and sustainable-investment standards, Thailand's fund rules, and transition-finance debates in coal- or fossil-fuel-exposed economies. The risk is that the same label - for example, sustainable, transition, green, or ESG - may carry different meanings in different jurisdictions unless the product documents clearly explain the underlying criteria.

Therefore, sustainable wealth management is not simply a marketing opportunity. It is a governance issue. Institutions that distribute ESG products in ASEAN should maintain a transparent classification methodology, describe portfolio-level exposure to transition activities, and explain how the product's sustainability claim maps to both regional and national frameworks.

5. Discussion and Implications

5.1 Policy implications

The policy priority is not to force rapid market uniformity, but to reduce unnecessary frictions while preserving investor protection. Three implications follow. First, ASEAN regulators can continue improving the practical usability of cross-border fund frameworks by clarifying documentation, suitability, and post-authorization reporting expectations. Second, tax and withholding treatment should be made more transparent to reduce uncertainty for cross-border funds and advisers. Third, sustainable-finance taxonomies should be implemented with product-level disclosure templates that allow investors to compare funds across jurisdictions.

A second policy implication concerns digital distribution. Regulators should avoid treating digital wealth platforms only as fintech innovation. They are also investment distributors. This means that conduct standards, marketing rules, complaints handling, cybersecurity, suitability assessment, and product-governance rules should apply consistently across digital and offline channels.

A third implication concerns financial education. The expansion of payments infrastructure creates an opportunity to embed savings and investment education into digital financial ecosystems. Investor education should be designed around real behavioural transitions: from cash to account, from account to recurring saving, from saving to regulated investment, and from single-product investment to diversified portfolio planning.

5.2 Industry implications

Wealth-management institutions need differentiated ASEAN operating models. For HNWIs and family-business clients, high-touch advisory, tax-aware structuring, succession planning, private markets, and multi-booking arrangements remain important. Singapore will continue to be central to this segment because of its legal, asset-management, and private-banking infrastructure.

For middle-income domestic markets, the opportunity lies in hybrid advisory. Relationship managers and banks remain relevant, but they must be supported by digital reporting, lower-cost execution, and clearer product governance. Malaysia and Thailand illustrate markets where fund distribution is already institutionalized enough to support advisory deepening, but where product localization remains important.

For Indonesia, the Philippines, and Viet Nam, the opportunity is to build a mass-affluent engine: low-ticket entry points, recurring contributions, simple diversified funds, transparent fees, and investor education. The strategic mistake would be to import a private-banking template too early. The more suitable model is staged upgrading: payment user, savings user, first investment user, diversified investment user, advisory client.

6. Conclusion

ASEAN wealth management is best understood as a segmented and institutionally diverse ecosystem. Singapore provides the offshore gateway and sophisticated asset-management infrastructure. Malaysia and Thailand represent domestic fund-market deepening and middle-income advisory development. Indonesia, the Philippines, and Viet Nam illustrate the scale and potential of digital mass-affluent onboarding, but also the importance of investor education, suitability, and regulated product expansion.

The core finding is that wealth-market development depends on the interaction of income growth, institutional quality, distribution infrastructure, and regulatory integration. Digital finance lowers access costs, but it does not eliminate conduct risk. ASEAN fund passporting reduces some cross-border barriers, but it does not yet create a fully unified wealth market. Sustainable-finance taxonomy work improves comparability, but product-level disclosure remains essential.

The study is subject to limitations. It does not use proprietary private-bank data, household-level portfolio surveys, or causal econometric identification. Future research could extend the analysis by constructing a panel dataset of household financial assets, mutual-fund flows, digital investment accounts, and cross-border fund approvals across ASEAN. Such work would allow researchers to test whether payment-system adoption leads to measurable increases in diversified investment participation and whether regulatory harmonization materially changes cross-border fund flows.

Research Integrity, Data Availability, and Ethics Statement

This manuscript is based on publicly available academic, regulatory, and multilateral sources. It does not involve human-subject interviews, private client data, confidential bank information, or proprietary portfolio records. No high-net-worth-individual count, asset-allocation percentage, or platform fee statistic is presented unless the source and definition can be verified. The analytical classifications in the tables are the author's interpretations based on the cited evidence and should not be treated as official market rankings.

The manuscript is written in original wording for academic submission. Standard terminology such as ASEAN, HNWI, ESG, e-KYC, and Collective Investment Schemes is used descriptively. Authors should run a final similarity check before submission, confirm the journal's house style, and update any time-sensitive regulatory references if submission occurs after 2026.

References

Arestis, P., & Demetriades, P. O. (1997). Financial development and economic growth: Assessing the evidence. The Economic Journal, 107(442), 783-799. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0297.1997.tb00043.x

ASEAN Capital Markets Forum. (2014). Framework for cross-border offering of ASEAN Collective Investment Schemes. ASEAN Capital Markets Forum. https://www.theacmf.org/initiatives/collective-investment-schemes/framework-for-cross-border-offering-of-asean-collective-investment-schemes

ASEAN Capital Markets Forum. (n.d.). ASEAN Collective Investment Schemes: Annual statistics. ASEAN Capital Markets Forum. https://www.theacmf.org/asean-cis/annual-statistics

ASEAN Taxonomy Board. (2024). ASEAN Taxonomy for Sustainable Finance, Version 3. ASEAN. https://asean.org/book/asean-taxonomy-for-sustainable-finance-version-3/

Association of Banks in Singapore. (n.d.). PayNow Singapore. Association of Banks in Singapore. https://www.abs.org.sg/e-payments/pay-now

Bank Indonesia. (n.d.). Quick Response Code Indonesian Standard (QRIS). Bank Indonesia. https://www.bi.go.id/en/fungsi-utama/sistem-pembayaran/ritel/kanal-layanan/QRIS/default.aspx

Bekaert, G., & Harvey, C. R. (2003). Emerging markets finance. Journal of Empirical Finance, 10(1-2), 3-55. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0927-5398(02)00054-3

Bekaert, G., Harvey, C. R., & Lundblad, C. (2005). Does financial liberalization spur growth? Journal of Financial Economics, 77(1), 3-55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2004.05.007

Carney, R. W., & Child, T. B. (2013). Changes to the ownership and control of East Asian corporations between 1996 and 2008: The primacy of politics. Journal of Financial Economics, 107(2), 494-513. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2012.08.013

Claessens, S., Djankov, S., & Lang, L. H. P. (2000). The separation of ownership and control in East Asian corporations. Journal of Financial Economics, 58(1-2), 81-112. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-405X(00)00067-2

Demirgüç-Kunt, A., Klapper, L., Singer, D., Ansar, S., & Hess, J. (2018). The Global Findex Database 2017: Measuring financial inclusion and the fintech revolution. World Bank.

Development Research Group, Finance and Private Sector Development Unit. (2025). The Global Findex Database 2025: Connectivity and financial inclusion in the digital economy [Dataset]. World Bank, Development Data Group. https://doi.org/10.48529/BK9N-8R43

International Monetary Fund. (2023). ASEAN-5: Further harnessing the benefits of regional integration amid fragmentation risks. IMF Working Paper, 2023(191).

International Monetary Fund. (2026). The changing landscape of financial integration in Asia-Pacific. IMF Working Paper, 2026(154).

McKinnon, R. I. (1973). Money and capital in economic development. Brookings Institution Press.

National Payment Corporation of Vietnam. (n.d.). QR code payment service. NAPAS. https://en.napas.com.vn/qr-code-payment-service

Philippon, T. (2016). The FinTech opportunity (NBER Working Paper No. 22476). National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w22476

Shaw, E. S. (1973). Financial deepening in economic development. Oxford University Press.

Stulz, R. M. (1999). Globalization, corporate finance, and the cost of capital. Journal of Applied Corporate Finance, 12(3), 8-25. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6622.1999.tb00027.x

World Bank. (2025). World Development Indicators: GDP per capita (current US$), ASEAN-6 economies. World Bank Data. https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD