

Analysis on performance of mutual funds towards the achievement of sustainable development goals

Dr. Vinitha K*

Assistant Professor
SRM Institute of Science and Technology
vinithak@srmist.edu.in

Article Type: Article

Article Citation: Dr. Vinitha K, Analysis on performance of mutual funds towards the achievement of sustainable development goals. M.S. Ramaiah Management Review. 2024; 15(03), 70-82. DOI: 10.52184/msmr.v15i03.000

Received date: June 01, 2024

Accepted date: September 01, 2024

***Author for correspondence:**

Dr. Vinitha K  vinithak@srmist.edu.in  SRM Institute of Science and Technology

Abstract

The research paper explored the overall effect of sustainable investments on Mutual fund's and to analyse the financial outcome it could deliver. An analytical sampling of 64 Mutual Funds were taken and the ratings given by Morningstar in April 2022 are taken. A cross-sectional regression analysis is done with the data. The outcome indicated Mutual Fund portfolio with high social aspect of sustainable investments found to be good enough to perform. The result could be beneficial for investor, business, and stakeholder at large. The sustainable investments are on the trajectory of resilience and ESG scores has proven to be a lens which can aid business leader to come up with greater number of business which could be resilient. This research focussed on mutual funds by analysing the ESG scores on the cash flow. In this study explanatory research is done as it delivers added information about the observed object and its relation with the environment. The focus is to find out whether ESG reporting have negative impact on the Mutual Fund's financial outcomes and to study the impact of sustainability score in Mutual Fund's volatility. Suggestion of certain measures which could help to improve Mutual Fund's performance through ESG score is inevitable and is done through this research.

Keywords: Sustainable investments, ESG risks, Mutual Funds, Cross-sectional regression analysis.

1. Introduction

Adversities happening in the world have brought significance for the need for taking actions to safeguard the business and society from long tenure sustainable threat. Crisis quickens nascent ESG trends, and the enhanced concentration on company's environmental and social impact may ever

lasting even after the happening of any crisis. Three fundamental concepts that guided on investments on the basis of environment, societal and governance factor for sustainable investments are taken. It takes us to a sound investment rather than an individual investment. When ESG variables are taken into consideration focus should be given on long-term returns. Investments

are based on the goals and interests of the investors, which may give the investors a reply to the yes or no question. Focus is also given to short-term and long term returns to achieve the objective. This research will help businesses to attract and obtain finance which may also assist the leaders to clarify the effect of ESG on the investment criteria of an organization. Research was taken by the CFA society which has taken the comparison of the recommendation put forward by SEBI's consultation paper which had the international regulation such as the SFDR and voluntary initiative such as the CFA Institute's ESG Disclosure Standard for Investment product and came up with the recommendation which aligned in all respect.

A most promising challenge for fund manager is the hardness to demonstrate the actual world the effect and the outcome of the ESG product. Almost all funds take ESG risk and opportunity which they create investment portfolio, but they don't take the effect of portfolio company on environment and society. Even though they may be interlinked, fund manager may find it easier to report on the former than on the latter. More over SEBI has acknowledged this kind of distinction in the recent paper on ESG rating, where a distinct among ESG risk rating and impact rating are seen. ESG risk ratings dealt with the effect of social or environmental issue on the company value and the impact rating deal with effect in the next direction. Secondly the challenged aspect by the participant is the probable duplicate of disclosure, especially around stewardship reports.

Over the previous years, sustainable investments were able to catch the eye of investors on a world-wide, as people look for investments on and on . Sustainable investments which is also called as impact

investments otherwise socially responsible investments. This method of investment takes into consideration both finance return and environment oriented return, and it also incorporate social and corporate governance objective. Environment feature targets the carbon fuel, the social feature focus on work environment characteristics such as tobacco avoidance, weapon produce so on. The goal is to bring in competing monetary results constantly; and to give a helping hand for companies to come up with a stakeholder-oriented model of corporate behaviour in a longterm basis. ESG Investments are more demanded in current scenario in India as well as in other countries due to the surge of climate change inferences and the societal consequence caused due to Covid-19.

Vidhu Shekhar, of CFA Institute, found that the world wide sustainable investment is found to be in a robust up surge and attained \$35 trillion or 36% of the overall assets in management in 2020. India had shown that every sustainable investment product which has been plunged in the previous 2 years, had highlighted incredible surge potential. ESG fund are showing up surge in India in mutual fund sector as asset management company has launched equity schemes in the ESG space. They also have launched exchange traded funds. Currently it has been reported to have 12 mutual fund schemes in India which have ESG as target and they consider the insights of the stakeholders. Sebi projected that credit rating agencies and research analysts, who have a minimum net worth of Rs 10 crore have the eligibility for accreditation for ESG rating

1.2 Theoretical framework

1970 was a time where numerous CEOs showed favouritism towards Fried man's

doctrine – which was about the significance of shareholder. Friedman (1970) argued about execution of corporate social responsible principle which imposed cost on shareholder, which showed to be baseless, not only that it has also impacted unfair tax on shareholder. Bowen (1953) suggested, corporate resource to be utilised to meet social needs, corporate charity and volunteer activism; business have to take decision with the base on the value of society. Freeman came up with stakeholders theory there by a theory oriented basis for ideas which included corporate social responsibility, socially responsible investments, combined reports, sustainable investments and ESG reports. With regard to the stakeholder theory, corporate social responsibility paved the way for firm's prolonged monetary gain, as it is more towards building a trust among worker community, customer relationship, society at large, environmentalists and so on. An organization which has connectivity with lots of elements, which is the stakeholder who had or can claim to be owner, right, or interest in a corporate and its activism, whether it is in pastime, current, or may be about to come (Clarkson, 1995, page 106), that can be proven to be the significant factor to a corporate's monetary affairs to perform. The stakeholder theory tells that poor ESG performance move to get higher incentive for sustainability disclosure for enhancing legitimacy and to direct an action to stakeholder which organizations were really good than actually professed. Mathews (1997) argued, sustainable report has to be looked as 'socially contractual' firm which utilise sustainable reports for surging legality with a view to operate in such a way which is respectable to the humanity. Clarkson et al. (2008) suggested, firm which have low ability to perform in the

environment as per the media show likeness to pursue legality through sustainable disclosure. In the recent days societal, employees and environment grabbed more focus. Manes Rossi et al. (2018) explored, company show a general cognizance towards societal, environment revelation for maintaining legitimate and in order to come up with investor and stakeholder expectations. Active firms volunteer and give extra ESG inputs in annual reports for giving an image of incorporating well doing and operating criteria have undergone to go beyond stakeholders estimations. Dyllick and Hockerts (2002) suggested that corporates socially responsible report conveyed significant inputs to stakeholder as to there might be business activities which can sustain in the maintenance of environment, societal and economical targets. Brammer and Pavelin (2006) argued, corporates revelation of sustainable reports don't denote corporate's commitments in the reduction of environment aspects nor societal risk, in its place the goal to disclose is to impact stakeholder perceptions with regard to firm's forthcoming monetary probabilities.

Topping (2012) suggested, ESG indicator build enterprise activity in incorporating corporate socially responsible aspects which is assessable and explicit to external stakeholders. Al Amosh and Mansor (2021) suggested, combined reports enhance the informational quality and the move for a world-wide acceptance of combined reports which in fact reflect the expectation of stakeholder. Firm which do not do well in environment and societal aspect and doesn't have disclosed, might be subjected to contrary publicities, awareness raising, or boycotting camps by consumers and stakeholders group (Gozlan, 2003).

1.3 Objective of the study

1. To find out whether ESG reporting having negative impact on the Mutual Fund's financial outcomes.
2. To study the impact of sustainability score in Mutual Fund's volatility.
3. To suggest certain measures which could help to improve Mutual Fund's performance through ESG score.

1.4 Literature review and hypothesis development

ESG reporting states that it could deliver beneficial informations to investor, supplier, employee, customer, regulator, society and so on (Al Amosh and Mansor, 2021). So sustainable investment may outclass, and it is the explicit for the virtuous circle where firm "do well by doing good".

1.4.1 Sustainability and returns make positive return from investments in sustainable firm, mutual fund and ETF. Duc cuong pham et.al., (2021) indicated a positive association among corporate sustainable investments and financial performance. The study explored the impact of sustainable practice on the monetary performance of 116 swedan company in the year 2019. Knut Haanaes (2016) stated that focus on environment, societal and governance (ESG) issue has become surging crucial for all company in overall industries. Recent -Suite Mckinsey Global Survey, 83% of C-suite executive and investments professional has belief which is said to be ESG program may give lot of shareholder value in 5 years. And in Accenture research on responsibility on leaders, company with higher rating for ESG performance had an average operational margin 3.7 time greater. Shareholder from many companies

could enjoy greater annual total return, than other ESG performers by 2.6 times.

Guido Abate et.al.,(2021) aimed to check if the fund with higher ESG rating outperformed fund with lower ESG ratings, after taking into consideration the risk which included the high moment, and costs taken by the investor. Their analysis was done on a survey of 634 Europe mutual fund. Making use of data envelopment analysis, it provided proof on the greater efficient funds are by investments with high ESG security.

Kwak D et.al.,(2022) explored the sensitivity among funds flow and fund performances with Korea fund, if there is any change in the sensitivity among environment, societal and governance fund and non-ESG fund and if there is a change in sensitivity in accordance with the kind of previous fund perform analysis. The outcome of the finding is foremost, the analytical part of the fund-flow in correlation to Korea fund disclosed a minus correlative aspect and the ESG didn't affect fund flow. When the analysis is carried out it revealed that there is a negative correlation apart from the performance measuring method and ESG. Lastly, when compared among funds flow and performances sensitivity as per the kind of previous funds performance disclosed apart from constant irregularity, recorded a small change in sensitivity irregularity between ESG funds and non-ESG funds. The outcome revealed that apart from the expectations which the investor in Korea ESG fund could aim greater on non-financial property such as the need of investments than to gain, they give the similar significance to funds to perform as well.

Lelasi et.al.,(2018) aimed to explore the feature of portfolio and the measure of performance of sustainable-them mutual fund, in comparison with ethical mutual

fund which could get into implementation of various sustenance and responsive investment strategy. This paper referred to an Europe survey of 106 ethically funded one and 51 sustainable-theme fund. Here, all funds statistics of month base performances were taken from Bloomberg for a tenure of first month of 1996 to last month of 2015. Fama and French (1993) three-factors model, was applied, to go beyond the limitations of capital asset pricing model for comparison of the performance of the two category of fund. The outcome stated that the Sustainable-themed fund does not vary significantly from ethical fund with regard to portfolio attribute, excluding markets capitalized index, aging factor and net assets valuation.

Morningstar replaced the ESG score with ESG risk score, ESG risk score with low value identified ESG leader with low ESG risk to the investment universality. Stakeholders view states that a companies which focus societal aspects could receive good public perceptions, employee loyalties, innovative product; customer growth; higher revenue and low cost and penalty which may direct to higher share price. Expectations state that funds which are sustained can prove resilience to markets recession and could render good monetary return, and so the prediction that Mutual Fund's with greater sustainable score could render higher return. Predictions also insists that Mutual fund's with low environment risk, societal risk could offer high return. So the hypothesis is:

H1: The environment risk, societal risk and governance risk have impact on Mutual Fund's return.

1.4.2 The relation among sustainability and risk

Sustainable Mutual fund portfolios are not stable with advanced Portfolio Theory, in which the theme is investment in various asset classes. Other argument states that sustainable fund have limit on their asset choice, so there is higher risk due to the minimal diversified assets. Older studies utilised risk adjustment performance metrics to measure monetary effect of ESG, but does it had an effect on lower side risk was not found completely. Today management of risk is one among the most challengeable task for the firm, and their attention is towards risk and sustenance for avoidance of risk. Haitham Nobanee (2020) focused on risk and sustenance for avoidance of risk, especially in financial management. For attaining this objective, a methodology on secondary data was taken where 25 articles were taken from Scopus and five from SSRN. The outcome revealed the significance of risk management and sustenance for organization. But in these papers the risk and sustenance were not taken together for studies. Hence new methods were developed for avoidance of risk to have sustenance. Olitzky and Benjamin's (2001) meta-analysis explored significance of negative correlation among corporate societal perform metrics and risk and, the association is strong for markets-basis measure of risks versus accounting-oriented measure.

Jesco schulte and Soren knuts (2022) outcome indicated how effective the tool was, in order to identify and analyse sustainable risk and to derive and monitor strategy thereby in order to lead to an increase in awareness of the connections among societal, ecological and sustainable aspect and business implication. Hence it

renders backing for company in the ways to work with developing the product so that it can contribute to transition of society for sustainability, in a way it benefits the organization.

Joris-Johann Lenssen et.al (2014) described the significance to have a united approach to report on sustainable risk, with an answer at all levels including individual wise, sector wise and in governance. Hence the research contribution advanced to governance in order to minimise risk in bringing in business sustainability. Hence the following hypotheses can be formulated:

H2: The sustainable score have positively association with Mutual Fund's volatile movement.

H3: The environment risk, societal risk, governance risk have positive association with Mutual Funds' volatility.

2. Data Description

In this study explanatory research is done as it delivers added informations about the observed object and its interaction with the environment. Here in this paper the effect of sustainable scores on the monetary perform analytics of Mutual fund is observed by making use of a sample of 64 Mutual Funds, in which the ratings given by Morningstar in April 2022, and cross-sectional regression analysis is done.

3. Materials and methods

In this paper cross-sectional differentiation in Mutual Fund's monetarty performance in association to sustainability during 2021- 2022 is examined. The initial model developed consists of Mutual fund's return as a function and assessed ESG pillars and

Net Asset value. And the second model consisted of Volatility as a function and assessed ESG pillars and Net Asset value.

$$\text{Return}_i = \alpha_i + \beta_1 \text{EnvScore}_i + \beta_2 \text{SocScore}_i + \beta_3 \text{GovScore}_i + \beta_3 \text{Net Assets}_i + \epsilon_i \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Volatility}_i = \alpha_i + \beta_1 \text{EnvScore}_i + \beta_2 \text{SocScore}_i + \beta_3 \text{GovScore}_i + \beta_3 \text{Net Assets}_i + \epsilon_i \quad (2)$$

Returns specified here states the 3 months return, which is taken as month wise average rate of return for Mutual funds; 6 months return is taken the month wise average rate of return for Mutual fund in the previous 6 months; one-year return, is taken as the annual rate of return for Mutual fund for the previous 1 year; 3 years return, is taken as the annual rate of return for Mutual fund for the previous 3 years. Here 3 years standard deviation and 3 years beta is used to assess volatile index. 3 years standard deviation for Mutual funds on the basis of month wise return for the previous 3 years and 3 year beta is the beta coefficient for Mutual fund based on the regression of a fund's month wise return on Standard & Poor 500 stock index month wise return. The sustainable levels (SusScore), a Morningstar's score range 0 – 100, assess the portfolio to perform i in relation to the level of sustainable indexes. The environment risk (EnvScore), societal risk (SocScore), governance risk are Morningstar's scores from 0 – 100, assess the portfolio to perform i in relation to environment risk societal risk and governance risk. All variables are disclosed by Morningstar in April 2022.

3.1. Sample

A sample of 64 Mutual Funds rated by Morningstar in April 2022 is depicted below. Table 1 states the statistical indexes.

TABLE 1 : Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation
Susscore	64	29.68	28.58	3.08
Envscore	64	4.264	4.205	1.58
Socscore	64	7.593	7.63	1.38
Govscore	64	7.007	6.82	0.88
Susrating	64	71.2	73	18.99
Returnthreemonths	64	-3.165	-2.6	3.62
Returnsixmonths	64	-0.43	0.59	4.96
Returnoneyear	64	11.564	7.1	11.77
Returnthreeyearfund	64	12.112	9.705	8.08
Alphathreeyearindex	64	3.878	0.98	5.75
Sharpethreeyear	64	1.007	0.55	0.50
SDthreeyear	64	11.795	15.62	9.50
Betathreeyear	64	1.743	1.05	2.83
NetAssets	64	6063.64	4000	8331.59

The SusScore has a mean value of 29.6800 point, scores are brought to a normal value of 0 – 100 scale on a mean of 50, the sustainable level of Mutual fund is some what lower than the average score. The mean for EnvScore, Soc Score and Gov Score are 4.2640 points, 7.5930 points, and 7.0070 points. It implies Mutual fund portfolio and the company where investments done show a high social risk in relation to environment and governance risk.

4. Results & Discussion

Table 2 depicts the cross-sectional regression outcomes which doesn't show any impact for concluding sustainability has impact in the instant tenure of up to April 2022. Hence the hypothesis

H1: The environment risk, societal risk and governance risk have impact on Mutual Fund's return, is rejected . Francisco Climent and Pilar Soriano (2011)

analyzed, perform relate analysis with various Investments of social responsibility mutual funds. For implementation of the said analysis they have applied a Capital Asset Pricing Model base and found that in 1987 – 2009 tenure, the environment fund had low permed in comparison with conventional fund with the same characteristic. The result of this study aligned with the current outcome of the research through cross sectional regression.

Table 3 showed the impact of sustainability score and mutual fund volatility depicted that a positive significance in association among sustainability score, societal risk (SocScore) and GovScore return in long term 3 years return. The result depicted that the coefficients on susscore are positive and showed significance at 5% level, suggested for each one point hike in Mutual Funds' sustainability score the three years standard deviation is increased by 0.548% . Hence the hypothesis

H2: The sustainability score have positive association with Mutual Funds' volatile movement is accepted.

Pablo Duran Santomil et.al., (2019) as sustainable investments contributed majorly over the world wide, in 2016 Morning star started to report sustainability score. Using 2016 – 2018 score the effect of social responsible investment in Europe equity fund performance are studied. Sustainability score had a positive impact on performance, and it was constant with the mutual fund investments in company with good score which generated good risk-adjusted and non-risk adjusted performance. Tests were also done on mutual fund flow and risk. Sustainable score for previous year was evident in the flow and high rate fund received a higher volume of fund.

The coefficients on SocScore are positive and have significance at 1% level, suggested for each one point hike in Mutual Funds' societal risk three years standard deviation is increased by 1.774%. This states that social risk have positive association with 3 year standard deviation, significant at 1% level. This implied that Mutual Fund's investment in portfolio with higher social risk tend to show high volatility indexes in stock return where as the environmental risk score and governance risk score does not depict any impact on mutual fund's volatility and hence the hypothesis

H3: The environment risk, societal risk, governance risk is positively associated with Mutual Funds' volatility, is rejected. This has aligned with the study conducted by Sudha srinivasan(2014), who focussed on environment and social sustainable indexes and found that it is a win-win situation for company, investor and the community. There showed an evident volatile cluster in every three index. The ESG India Index has shown low volatility

in comparison with the Nifty during the tenure. The outcome had corporate implication to concentrate on ESG parameter with regard to get advantage from the sensitivity in the stock market. It also reflected the investor acceptance and the probability for the advancement of social responsible investment.

According to the report of Dhiraj Relli (2021) A change of trend in investor value and sentiment on socially responsible investment is observed. Apart from this a bigger attention is being given on Climate change and the effect it throws to the world. Inputs from the World wide fund-flow tracker, EPFR, stated that equity fund which offered ESG investments has recorded inflow of \$168.74 billion in 2020, a massive surge from the \$63.35 billion recorded in 2019. Apart from that a BlackRock survey in December 2020, done on 425 investor throughout 27 country which represented estimate of \$25 trillion in Assets under management, disclosed that investor propose to make ESG investment twice times for the forth coming 5 years, which might cause ESG Assets Under Management from 18 percent in 2020 to 37 percent by 2025. Until 2019 a minimal ESG- concentrated mutual fund was there in India. In 2020 6 ESG funds were brought by giant companies, which included Aditya Birla Sun Life, Axis Mutual Fund and ICICI Prudential. March 2021, showed net inflow into the funds were near to ₹678 crore, in comparison to ₹68 crore in March 2020. Investor's curiosity is utilised by the multinational companies Reliance, Tata and Adani. They announced green plans. Example, Reliance intended to secure net-zero carbon emission by 2035, granted ₹75,000 crore. Equity funds which could offer ESG investments attained recorded inflow of \$168.74 billion in 2020, high surge from \$63.35 billion recorded in 2019.

Sustainability and Mutual Fund's Performance:

TABLE 2

Panel A – Short term

Return_three months		Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	Tvalue	Significance
1	(Constant)	-10.861	27.016		-.402	.708
	Susscore	-.037	.662	-.031	-.055	.958
	Envscore	-.430	1.252	-.188	-.344	.748
	Socscore	-3.141	1.592	-1.200	-1.973	.120
	Govscore	4.858	2.022	1.192	2.403	.074
	NetAssets	7.055E-005	.000	.162	.481	.656

Return six months		Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	Tvalue	Significance
1	(Constant)	-49.089	57.279		-.857	.440
	Susscore	1.261	1.405	.785	.897	.420
	Envscore	-2.310	2.654	-.738	-.870	.433
	Socscore	1.429	3.376	.399	.423	.694
	Govscore	1.555	4.287	.279	.363	.735
	NetAssets	.000	.000	-.180	-.344	.748

Panel B - Long Term

Return One year		Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	Tvalue	Significance.
1	(Constant)	-60.363	88.440		-.683	.532
	Susscore	2.785	2.169	.731	1.284	.268
	Envscore	-3.364	4.098	-.453	-.821	.458
	Socscore	13.593	5.212	1.599	2.608	.060
	Govscore	-13.886	6.619	-1.049	-2.098	.104
	NetAssets	.000	.000	-.271	-.797	.470

Sustainability and Mutual Funds Volatility

TABLE 3

II Panel A - Long Term – SD Three Years

Model	Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient		
Long term – SD Three years					
	B	Std. Error	Beta	Tvalue	Significance
(Constant)	-32.724	22.004		-1.487	.211
Susscore	1.687	.540	.548	3.127	.035
Envscore	-2.359	1.020	-.393	-2.314	.082
Socscore	12.181	1.297	1.774	9.393	.001
Govscore	-12.496	1.647	-1.169	-7.588	.002
NetAssets	-7.136E-005	.000	-.063	-.597	.582
Model	Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient		
Beta Three years					
B	Std. Error	Beta		Tvalue	Significance
(Constant)	43.959	28.544		1.540	.198
Susscore	-.997	.700	-1.087	-1.424	.228
Envscore	1.551	1.323	.867	1.173	.306
Socscore	-.720	1.682	-.352	-.428	.691
Govscore	-1.843	2.136	-.578	-.863	.437
NetAssets	.000	.000	-.419	-.920	.410

5. Conclusion

Investments are usually made on the basis of risk appetite and taking into consideration the previous performance or it can be said that the investors anticipate positivity correlational aspect among the fund past return and flow of funds. Any way ESG investor makes a significant impact when compared with the other non-finance factor such as the need for the investments, the sizable portion which they are allocating for their investments, aging factor, return volatility, and the fee charged instead of relying on merely the past return of the fund. So it is anticipated that ESG investor may have to perform on a weaker base when

compared with non- ESG fund investor. This paper examined the impact of performance of mutual funds towards achieving sustainable development goals. Making use of a sampling comprising 64 Mutual Funds rating given from Morningstar in April 2022, cross-sectional regression analysis is done, outcome states, Mutual Funds invested in portfolios with social risks, tend to show higher volatile index stock return. While company come up with additional step to safeguard worker in the front end, safeguards customer, enhance healthcare beneficiaries for employee, and sacrifice executive bonus which can aid for avoidance of layoff, there by getting advantage of having engaging and production oriented

workforce and loyalty in customers. Results will help for investor, business people, and wider stakeholder all over the world.

Technology company when compared with energy based sectors stock may display higher social risk. This is in comparison to other sector when this period was a period of recovery from coronavirus and so they could have experience sharp plunge in stock price, and here the technology sector stock comparatively high social risk has performed well. Before the spread of coronavirus investor focussed on the 'environment' element of ESG score. Maximum investor might have the taboo that sustainable investments were more into the changes caused for the climatic version in the planet. As depicted in table 2 environment risk, governance risk, social risk doesn't show any impact in the mutual fund performance immediately the period of recovery period of covid -19. This implied that ESG scores does not have any impact on mutual fund performance immediately during the period of recovery of covid -19.

Table 3 indicated that sustainability score and social risk showed impact on mutual fund's volatility, where as environmental risk and governance risk did not show any impact as the pvalue is greater than .001 and p value greater than .05. This depicts those investments in portfolio with higher sustainability score and social risk can be experienced with a higher volatility in stock return. This resonated, Sharfman and Fernando (2008) who supported the findings which told best ESG performed index would minimise volatile tendencies. Business which is stakeholder's centric will be resilient to face the crisis and the company could have a stability in sales, labour turnover and so on which could pave to a higher certainty in business.

5.1 Limitations

The study faced certain limitations where sampling numbers taken are comparatively smaller for the cross-sectional analysis. Sustainability score has a chance of getting biased as bigger firm when they publish enormous data, they could get high score.

5.2 Future Research

It is found that there is a research gap in which there is scope to examine the reason a firm could chose a decision among various types of investment and also the ways a firm chose for making the various types of disclosure for those investment. It is found that the major portion of ESG data for all industry is irrelevant for monetary performance based criteria and the relevant information it differs within various industries. So it can be concluded that there should be clarity with regard to the material information which usually vary among the countries, various sector of industry and the strategy the firm take and so on and not only that it should be given vital significance as well.

5.3 Originality

This research is the pioneer to wide the study in order to find out the impact mutual fund perform towards sustainable development goals. Here only a few set of ESG metrics were taken and here the study finally focussed towards the social and sustainability score parameter, as the end result of the study has turned towards those parameters to be specifically focussed to enrich resilience.

5.4 Practical Implications

This study will be taken in a positive aspect by the financial sector. Even though there are lot of huddlers swirling around the sustainable investment which limit the probable investor community to secure the actual performance and the investors are more concerned about the policy making and public finance tool which need to deliver sustainable investment feasible, this paper will prove to be beneficial for the investing community at large.

References

1. RajeevKumar(November2021)Tremendous growth potential for ESG investing in India <https://www.financialexpress.com/money/tremendous-growth-potential-for-esg-investing-in-india-says-cfa-institutes-vidhu-shekhars-interview/2376584/>
2. Kaustubh Belapurkur (April 2021) <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/company/corporate-trends/sustainable-funds-see-rs-315-crore-outflow-in-fy21-22/articleshow/91045126.cms>
3. Duc Cuong Pham, Thi Ngoc Anh Do, Thanh Nga Doan, Thi Xuan Hong Nguyen () The impact of sustainability practices on financial performance: empirical evidence from Sweden.
4. Knut Haanaes (May 2022) why all business should embrace sustainability <https://www.imd.org/research-knowledge/articles/why-all-businesses-should-embrace-sustainability/>
5. Haitham Nobanee (2020) Sustainability and risk – A Mini Review DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.3539058
6. Joris Johann Lennsen et.al., Sustainability, Risk Management and governance : towards an integrative approach Corporate Governance International Journal of Business in Society 14(5): 670-684 DOI: 10.1108/CG-07-2014-0077.
7. Dhiraj Relli (2021) ESG Mutual Funds <https://www.moneycontrol.com/news/business/personal-finance/esg-mutual-funds-all-set-for-higher-inflows-and-greater-investor-interest-7621861.html>
8. Friedman, F. (1970), A Friednzan Doctrine, The New York Times.
9. Bowen, H.R. (1953), Social Responsibilities of the Businessmen. New York: Harper & Brothers
10. Clarkson, M. E. (1995). A Stakeholder Framework for Analyzing and Evaluating Corporate Social Performance, Academy of Management Review, 20(1), pp.92–117
11. Dyllick, T. and Hockerts, K. (2002), Beyond the Business Case for Corporate Sustainability Business Strategy and the Environment, 11, pp. 130–141
12. Brammer, S. and Pavelin, S. (2006), Voluntary Environmental Disclosures by Large UK Companies, Journal of Business Finance and Accounting, 33(7&8), pp.1168–1188
13. Topping, N. (2012), How Does Sustainability Disclosure Drive Behavior Change? Journal of Applied Corporate Finance, 24(2), pp.45–48
14. Roberts, R.W. (1992) Determinants of Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure, Accounting, Organizations and Society, 17(6), pp. 595–612.
15. Orlitzky, M., and Benjamin, J. D. (2001), Corporate Social Performance and Firm Risk: A meta-analytic review, Business and Society, 40(4), pp. 369–396
16. Guido Abate et.al.(2021)., The level of sustainability and mutual fund performance in Europe : An empirical analysis using ESG ratings Corporate Socail responsibility and environmental management volume 28 Issue 5 pg 1446-1455.
17. Kwak D, Kim YK and Kwon IS (2022) A Study on Environmental, Social and Governance Fund Performance and Fund Flow: Evidence From Korea Stock Exchange. *Front. Psychol.* 12:811099. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.811099

18. Lelasi et.al.,(2018) Sustainability-themed mutual funds: an empirical examination of risk and performance *The Journal of Risk Finance* 2018/05/21 volume - 19 do - 10.1108/JRF-12-2016-0159 pg- 247- 261 .
19. Francisco Climent and Pilar Soriano (2011) Green and Good? The investment performance of US Environmental Mutual Funds *Journal of Business Ethics* 103(2): 275-287 DOI: 10.1007/s10551-011-0865-2.
20. Pablo Duran Santomil et.al., (2019) Does Sustainability score Impact Mutual Fund performance? *Sustainability* Doi :10.3990/su11102972
21. Sudha Srinivasan (2014) Risk-return and volatility analysis of sustainability Index in India *Environment Development and Sustainability* DOI: 10.1007/s10668-014-9608-8
22. Orlitzky, M., and Benjamin, J. D. (2001), Corporate Social Performance and Firm Risk: A meta-analytic review, *Business and Society*, 40(4), pp. 369–396.
23. Sharfman, M. P., and Fernando, C. S. (2008), Environmental Risk Management and the Cost of Capital, *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(6), pp. 569–592