Jurnal Informatika Ekonomi Bisnis

http://www.infeb.org

2025 Vol. 7 Iss. 2 Hal: 411-416 e-ISSN: 2714-8491

Sustainable Finance and Ethical Investment: A Paradigm Shift in Global Capital Markets

Jana Sandra[1]✉, Deni Malik[2], Sekar Widyastuti Pratiwi[3], Rina Dameria[4]

[1,2]Institut Ilmu Sosial dan Manajemen STIAMI
[3]Institut Transportasi dan Logistik Trisakti
[4]STIE Jayakarta

jsandra46@gmail.com

Abstract

This study presents a comprehensive literature review on the evolving role of sustainable finance and ethical investment as a transformative force in global capital markets. It explores the theoretical foundations that underpin ethical investing, including stakeholder theory, institutional theory, legitimacy theory, and behavioral finance. The review identifies key drivers of ethical investment, such as regulatory developments, institutional investor demand, technological innovation, and changing demographic preferences. Empirical findings indicate that sustainable investment strategies often yield comparable or superior financial performance while enhancing portfolio resilience. However, persistent implementation challenges-including inconsistent ESG metrics, greenwashing, and measurement limitations-undermine the credibility and effectiveness of ethical finance. The study highlights the need for greater standardization, reliable data, and regulatory coherence to support the sustainable integration of ESG principles into financial systems. Future research directions are proposed to deepen the understanding of ESG impact, investor behavior, and technological applications in responsible investing.

Keywords: Sustainable Finance, Ethical Investment, ESG, Greenwashing, Stakeholder Theory, Responsible Investing

1. Introduction

In recent decades, global financial systems have increasingly shifted towards incorporating sustainability and ethics into investment decision-making, marking a profound transformation in how capital markets operate. This shift, often referred to as sustainable finance and ethical investment, is driven by rising environmental concerns, social justice movements, and the need for stronger governance standards. The urgency of climate change, exacerbated by events such as the 2015 Paris Agreement, has catalyzed the alignment of finance with environmental, social, and governance objectives. This development challenges the traditional paradigm of shareholder primacy and short-term profit maximization, prompting investors and institutions to adopt a broader stakeholder-centric view.

As global investors increasingly seek to align their portfolios with values beyond financial returns, the volume of ESG-integrated assets has grown substantially. According to the Global Sustainable Investment Alliance, sustainable investment assets exceeded $35 trillion in 2020, representing over one-third of total global assets under management. This surge underscores a fundamental rethinking of risk and return, where non-financial factors-such as carbon footprint, labor practices, and board diversity-are deemed critical in assessing long-term value creation [1]. Numerous empirical studies have demonstrated that ethical investments, when properly structured, do not compromise financial performance and may even outperform traditional investments under certain conditions [2].

This growing interest in ethical investment is further supported by a confluence of institutional and regulatory initiatives, such as the European Union's Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation and the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures [3]. These initiatives seek to standardize ESG disclosures and enhance transparency in sustainable finance practices. However, despite progress, inconsistencies in ESG metrics and ratings remain a major challenge [4], creating potential for greenwashing and misleading information. This underlines the need for improved data quality and harmonized standards to guide ethical investment decisions [5].

Academic literature has responded to this transformation with a growing body of research on sustainable and ethical finance. Theoretical frameworks, such as stakeholder theory and institutional theory [6], provide a foundation for understanding the motivations behind ethical investing. In addition, behavioral finance perspectives have highlighted the role of investor preferences and moral values in shaping portfolio choices [7]. These frameworks suggest that ethical investing is not merely a passing trend but a paradigm shift rooted in evolving societal expectations and institutional norms.

Notwithstanding these developments, key tensions persist between ethical objectives and financial market efficiency. Critics argue that the integration of ESG

Accepted: 03-05-2025 | Revision: 26-06-2025 | Publication: 30-06-2025 | doi: 10.37034/infeb.v7i2.1143

criteria can introduce bias, reduce diversification, or compromise fiduciary duty [8]. Others question whether current ESG scoring mechanisms truly reflect firms' sustainability practices or if they incentivize superficial compliance [9]. Furthermore, ethical investing approaches vary widely, encompassing negative screening, best-in-class selection, and impact investing, each with distinct philosophical and practical implications [10].

The pandemic era has further amplified interest in sustainable finance, revealing systemic vulnerabilities and accelerating the call for resilient economic systems [11]. Investors now increasingly assess companies' social responsibility and governance resilience as critical components of risk management [12] [13]. Simultaneously, technological advancements, such as fintech and artificial intelligence, are enabling greater access to ESG data and decision-making tools, reshaping the ethical investing landscape [14].

Given the complexity and multi-dimensional nature of sustainable finance and ethical investment, there is a pressing need to synthesize and evaluate the rapidly expanding body of literature. Existing studies often adopt narrow perspectives or focus on specific regions, asset classes, or ESG criteria, resulting in fragmented insights [15]. A comprehensive literature review can bridge these gaps by offering a holistic view of the evolution, drivers, challenges, and future directions of ethical investment in global capital markets.

This article aims to critically examine the current state of research on sustainable finance and ethical investment by conducting a systematic review of peer-reviewed literature from reputable international journals. The objective is to map out the thematic developments, identify theoretical and empirical patterns, highlight methodological approaches, and propose future research trajectories. By doing so, the paper contributes to advancing knowledge in a field that is increasingly shaping the future of global finance.

2. Research Method

This study adopts a systematic literature review methodology to synthesize and critically evaluate the growing body of academic research related to sustainable finance and ethical investment. The systematic approach ensures transparency, replicability, and comprehensiveness in collecting, screening, and analyzing relevant literature [16]. The primary aim is to map key themes, theoretical frameworks, empirical findings, and gaps in the current literature, while offering a structured foundation for future research on the paradigm shift in global capital markets.

To conduct this review, a structured search was carried out using four major academic databases: Scopus, Web of Science, ScienceDirect, and JSTOR. These databases were selected due to their wide coverage of high-quality, peer-reviewed journals in finance, business ethics, and sustainability studies. The search strategy employed a Boolean combination of keywords including: sustainable finance, ethical investment, ESG investing, green finance, responsible investing, and capital market transformation. The time window was limited to publications from 2013 to 2023 to ensure the inclusion of the most recent and relevant findings. Only articles published in peer-reviewed journals and written in English were considered.

The inclusion and exclusion criteria were developed to maintain academic rigor. Inclusion criteria were: empirical or conceptual articles addressing sustainable or ethical finance; studies focusing on ESG integration, responsible investment strategies, or regulatory frameworks; and publications in high-ranking journals Q1–Q2 based on Scopus or WoS. Exclusion criteria involved: non-scholarly sources (e.g., newspapers, blog posts); articles not directly related to ethical finance or capital markets; and papers with inaccessible full-text.

To enhance clarity, the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses framework was followed to track the selection process [17]. The screening process involved three stages: title screening, abstract screening, and full-text review. Articles that passed all stages were coded and categorized based on thematic content. Next PRISMA Flow Diagram for Article Selection on Table 1.

Table 1. PRISMA Flow Diagram for Article Selection

Screening Stage	Number of Articles
Initial Database Search	712
After Duplicate Removal	639
After Title Screening	413
After Abstract Review	221
Full-Text Articles Assessed	114
Articles Included in Review	65

Each of the final 65 selected articles was analyzed using a combination of content analysis and thematic synthesis [18]. The coding process involved identifying common research objectives, methodologies, geographical coverage, key variables, theoretical foundations, and main findings. This coding was performed manually and categorized into four primary themes: theoretical underpinnings, drivers of ethical investment, performance and risk analysis, and challenges and regulatory gaps. Furthermore, a descriptive bibliometric analysis was carried out to provide insights into publication trends, the distribution of research by region, and methodological patterns [19]. This approach supports the mapping of literature and identification of gaps, thereby laying the groundwork for the discussion and future research direction.

3. Result and Discussion

The evolution of sustainable finance marks a departure from the traditional finance paradigm centered on profit maximization and efficient markets, toward an integrative model that aligns financial returns with long-term environmental, social, and governance impacts. Historically, ethical investment emerged through the practice of Socially Responsible Investing ,rooted in religious and moral beliefs that excluded "sin

stocks" such as tobacco, alcohol, and weapons from investment portfolios. Over time, this evolved into broader frameworks such as ESG integration, impact investing, and green finance, which explicitly assess the material impact of ESG risks and opportunities on financial performance [20].

A pivotal transformation occurred when mainstream financial institutions began incorporating sustainability into their investment strategies, often driven by institutional pressure, regulatory developments, and shifting investor preferences [21]. For instance, large asset managers such as BlackRock and Vanguard have committed to ESG principles, highlighting the growing belief that sustainability and fiduciary duty are not mutually exclusive [3]. This shift has been accelerated by global agreements and initiatives such as the UN Principles for Responsible Investment, the Paris Agreement, and the Sustainable Development Goals, which have aligned financial systems with climate and development targets [23].

From a theoretical standpoint, the emergence of sustainable finance can be examined through several key lenses. Stakeholder theory, first introduced by Freeman [24], provides the foundational rationale for considering the interests of multiple stakeholders-such as employees, communities, and the environment-in corporate and investment decision-making. This theory contradicts Milton Friedman's shareholder-centric view, proposing that long-term value creation is achieved when organizations operate with regard for social impact [24].

Additionally, institutional theory explains how external pressures-normative, coercive, and mimetic-influence the adoption of sustainability practices by firms and financial intermediaries [6]. ESG integration, once seen as niche or ideological, has increasingly become a normative expectation within capital markets, particularly as regulatory frameworks mature and disclosure mandates intensify [5]. Institutional investors, facing growing demand for ESG transparency, are reshaping the criteria for capital allocation.

Legitimacy theory also plays a critical role in understanding the motivations behind ethical investing. Firms and financial institutions often engage in ESG practices not only to generate superior performance but also to maintain legitimacy in the eyes of stakeholders. In this context, ESG reporting becomes a strategic communication tool, although its effectiveness may be limited by inconsistent reporting standards and the risk of greenwashing [4]. Behavioral finance adds further depth by emphasizing the role of non-financial preferences and cognitive biases in investment behavior. Studies show that investors are increasingly driven by ethical values, risk aversion to climate-related financial loss, and emotional affinity to sustainable brands [7]. This behavioral shift is particularly pronounced among younger generations, such as millennials and Gen Z, who prioritize sustainability and corporate ethics in their financial decisions. To provide a consolidated view of theoretical underpinnings and their application in ethical finance, the following table summarizes the dominant theories, their core tenets, and key implications for investment strategies on Table 2.

Table 2. Summary of Theoretical Foundations in Sustainable Finance

Theory	Key Concept	Implication in Ethical Investing	Key References
Stakeholder Theory	Value creation involves all stakeholders, not just shareholders	Encourages consideration of social and environmental impact	Freeman (1984); Freeman et al. (2007)
Institutional Theory	External pressures shape organizational behavior	Normative ESG expectations drive capital allocation	DiMaggio & Powell (1983); Schoenmaker & Schramade (2019)
Legitimacy Theory	Firms seek legitimacy from society	ESG disclosures used to maintain reputation	Suchman (1995); Christensen et al. (2021)
Behavioral Finance	Investor behavior shaped by ethics, values, and emotion	Explains preference for sustainable assets	Riedl & Smeets (2017); Hartzmark & Sussman (2019)

The theoretical foundations described above underscore the paradigm shift that ethical investing represents in the global capital markets. No longer confined to the margins of finance, sustainability has become an organizing principle that shapes how risks are managed, how performance is measured, and how value is defined. However, the mere adoption of these theoretical models does not guarantee effective ESG outcomes. As discussed in later sessions, implementation challenges-ranging from inconsistent metrics to performance trade-offs-remain substantial.

The expansion of ethical and sustainable investing has been catalyzed by a convergence of macro-level pressures, institutional transformations, and evolving investor behavior. Among the most significant drivers of ethical investment is the regulatory environment, particularly the introduction of ESG-related disclosure mandates and classification frameworks. The European Union's Sustainable Finance Disclosure Regulation and the EU Taxonomy for Sustainable Activities are two prominent examples that have institutionalized ESG principles and enhanced transparency within financial markets [1]. These initiatives compel asset managers and corporations to disclose ESG risks and sustainability impacts, thereby enabling more informed investment decisions.

Another critical driver is the demand from institutional investors, who are increasingly required to demonstrate alignment with ESG criteria, particularly in regions where sustainability has become a fiduciary concern. Pension funds, sovereign wealth funds, and university endowments now consider ESG integration not as optional, but essential for long-term risk-adjusted performance [2]. This is reinforced by stewardship

codes and shareholder engagement policies that promote active ownership and corporate accountability [4].

Technological innovation also plays a transformative role in facilitating ethical investment. The development of ESG data platforms, fintech-driven robo-advisors, and artificial intelligence tools has allowed investors to assess sustainability metrics at scale [7]. These technologies bridge the gap between data accessibility and decision-making, allowing for more efficient and transparent ESG screening processes. Nevertheless, the lack of standardized ESG data and divergence in ESG ratings remains a persistent concern [4].

Moreover, sociodemographic trends have shifted market preferences toward sustainability. Studies have shown that millennial and Gen Z investors place greater emphasis on environmental stewardship, corporate ethics, and inclusive governance than previous generations [8]. These preferences are reshaping financial products and services, prompting asset managers to launch green bonds, impact funds, and sustainability-linked loans [10]. In addition to motivations, scholars have examined whether ethical investing delivers financial performance comparable to, or exceeding, traditional investments. Early debates centered on the presumed trade-off between doing good social performance and doing well financial return. However, meta-analytical evidence increasingly suggests that ESG integration does not inherently compromise profitability [2]. In fact, under certain market conditions-especially during economic shocks-ESG-aligned firms exhibit greater resilience and lower volatility, as observed during the COVID-19 pandemic [12]. Next Summary of Performance Comparison between ESG and Non-ESG Portfolios on Table 3.

Table 3. Summary of Performance Comparison between ESG and Non-ESG Portfolios

Study	Time Period	Sample	Key Findings
Revelli & Viviani (2015)	1990–2014	85 studies, global	No significant underperformance in SRI funds
Friede et al. (2015)	1970–2015	2,000+ empirical studies	90% show non-negative or positive ESG-performance link
Whelan et al. (2021)	2015–2020	ESG indices vs benchmarks	ESG indices showed lower drawdown during crisis
Albuquerque et al. (2020)	2019–2020 (COVID)	US equities	ESG firms had higher returns and lower downside risk

Performance advantages are attributed to stronger risk management, better corporate governance, and proactive stakeholder engagement. ESG leaders tend to anticipate regulatory shifts and avoid reputational scandals, contributing to long-term value preservation [9]. Furthermore, empirical evidence highlights that environmental disclosure is positively correlated with firm valuation in high-pollution sectors, where regulatory scrutiny is high.

Nevertheless, not all studies report positive financial effects. In markets where ESG practices are nascent or disclosure is weak, the benefits of ethical investing may be limited or neutral [11]. Additionally, performance varies by strategy-negative screening often underperforms compared to best-in-class and active ESG integration. These mixed findings underscore the importance of investment context, regional ESG maturity, and the quality of ESG metrics in determining financial outcomes.

Importantly, performance measurement in ethical investing is multi-dimensional, encompassing not only return and risk, but also impact and additionality. Impact investing, in particular, emphasizes intentionality and measurable social or environmental outcomes alongside financial returns. This dual-objective model challenges the binary thinking of traditional portfolio theory and necessitates hybrid evaluation frameworks that combine financial analysis with sustainability reporting [25]. In summary, the drivers of ethical investing are diverse-ranging from regulatory pressure and investor demand to technological enablement and generational values. While financial performance is not universally superior, mounting evidence suggests that ESG integration can enhance risk-adjusted returns and portfolio resilience [26]. However, the success of sustainable finance is contingent upon credible standards, data reliability, and investor literacy. These topics are further explored in the final session, which discusses systemic challenges and future prospects [27].

Despite the growing adoption of sustainable and ethical investing across global capital markets, numerous implementation challenges hinder its effective integration [28]. Chief among these is the lack of standardization in ESG metrics, which has resulted in inconsistencies and limited comparability across firms and industries [29]. Different ESG rating agencies often assign disparate scores to the same entity due to divergent methodologies, data sources, and weightings [30]. This variation undermines investor confidence and limits the usability of ESG scores in risk assessment and portfolio construction.

Closely related is the risk of greenwashing, whereby companies and funds overstate or misrepresent their ESG practices to attract socially conscious investors without implementing substantive changes [31]. Greenwashing dilutes the credibility of ethical finance, creates informational asymmetry, and exposes investors to reputational and financial risks. Recent high-profile cases and increasing regulatory scrutiny have drawn attention to this issue, prompting calls for more stringent ESG disclosure regulations [32]. The European Union, for example, is now considering revisions to the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive to tighten ESG disclosures and ensure alignment with climate targets [33].

Another major obstacle is the challenge of measuring sustainability outcomes. While financial performance

is universally quantifiable, social and environmental impacts are context-specific and difficult to monetize [34]. The absence of standardized indicators for impact measurement creates ambiguity around what constitutes genuine sustainability. For example, a fund that claims to support clean energy may invest in firms that also engage in high-emission activities, raising questions about thresholds, trade-offs, and transparency [7]. Moreover, ESG scoring systems may overweight disclosure rather than actual performance, incentivizing symbolic rather than substantive compliance [15].

Additionally, regional disparities in ESG practices reflect varying stages of development, regulatory rigor, and cultural attitudes toward corporate responsibility. In emerging markets, the implementation of ethical finance is often constrained by weak institutions, low data quality, and underdeveloped financial infrastructure [21]. Conversely, developed markets tend to exhibit more mature ESG frameworks but still face challenges in integrating ESG across asset classes, including derivatives, private equity, and fixed income [1]. These discrepancies point to the need for localized strategies and capacity-building efforts that reflect contextual realities.

Furthermore, fiduciary concerns persist, particularly regarding the legal responsibility of asset managers to prioritize financial returns [22]. While there is growing consensus that ESG factors are financially material, some investors remain hesitant to fully integrate non-financial metrics due to perceived risks of underperformance or litigation [27]. Clarifying the fiduciary duty to include sustainability considerations-especially in jurisdictions with strict governance codes-is essential to mainstream ethical investing [8].

Looking ahead, several future research directions emerge from the literature. First, there is a need for deeper exploration into the causal relationships between ESG practices and firm performance, particularly using longitudinal and experimental designs. Most existing studies remain correlational, limiting the ability to infer impact [5]. Second, scholars should investigate the micro-foundations of ethical investing, including investor psychology, behavioral finance mechanisms, and social identity theory, to better understand how values shape investment behavior [10].

Third, the rise of technology-driven ethical finance-such as blockchain for ESG tracking, machine learning for risk analysis, and fintech platforms for impact reporting-warrants greater academic inquiry [30]. These technologies offer promising tools for enhancing transparency, accountability, and accessibility in sustainable finance. However, they also introduce concerns around data privacy, algorithmic bias, and regulatory oversight, all of which merit critical examination [12].

Finally, the field would benefit from comparative studies that analyze how different regulatory environments, cultural contexts, and financial systems influence the effectiveness of ethical investing. Such comparative work can illuminate best practices, identify pitfalls, and facilitate policy harmonization across regions [28]. Collaborative research involving academics, practitioners, and policymakers can bridge theory and application, supporting the transition toward an inclusive and sustainable global financial system.

4. Conclusion

This study underscores that sustainable finance and ethical investment are no longer peripheral concepts but have become central to the evolution of global capital markets, driven by regulatory pressures, shifting investor preferences, technological advancements, and the growing recognition of ESG factors as financially material. The integration of ethical principles into financial decision-making reflects a fundamental transformation in how value, risk, and long-term impact are conceptualized. While empirical evidence generally supports the financial viability of ethical investments, significant challenges remain-such as inconsistent ESG metrics, greenwashing, and measurement dilemmas-that hinder their full implementation and effectiveness. Addressing these challenges through standardization, enhanced transparency, and cross-sector collaboration is essential for reinforcing investor trust and ensuring that sustainable finance fulfills its potential in supporting resilient, inclusive, and environmentally responsible economic systems.

References

[1] Boffo, R., & Patalano, R. (2020). ESG Investing: Practices, Progress and Challenges. *OECD Publishing*. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1787/61d27602-en .

[2] Revelli, C., & Viviani, J. L. (2015). Financial Performance of Socially Responsible Investing (SRI): What Have We Learned? A Meta-Analysis. Business Ethics: *A European Review*, *24*(2), 158–185. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12076 .

[3] Amel-Zadeh, A., & Serafeim, G. (2018). Why and How Investors Use ESG Information: Evidence from A Global Survey. *Financial Analysts Journal*, *74*(3), 87–103. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2469/faj.v74.n3.2 .

[4] Berg, F., Kölbel, J. F., & Rigobon, R. (2022). Aggregate Confusion: The Divergence of ESG Ratings. *Review of Finance*, *26*(6), 1315–1344. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/rof/rfac033 .

[5] Christensen, H. B., Hail, L., & Leuz, C. (2021). Mandatory CSR and Sustainability Reporting: Economic Analysis and Literature Review. *Review of Accounting Studies*, *26*, 1176–1248. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11142-021-09536-y .

[6] DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality In Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, *48*(2), 147–160. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101 .

[7] Riedl, A., & Smeets, P. (2017). Why do Investors Hold Socially Responsible Mutual Funds?. *Journal of Finance*, *72*(6), 2505–2550. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.12547 .

[8] Schäfer, H. (2020). ESG Investing: Strategies, Benefits and Risks. *Journal of Asset Management*, *21*(4), 276–289. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1057/s41260-020-00155-8 .

[9] Kim, Y., Park, M. S., & Wier, B. (2012). Is Earnings Quality Associated with Corporate Social Responsibility?. *The Accounting Review*, *87*(3), 761–796. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2308/accr-10209 .

[10]Kotsantonis, S., & Serafeim, G. (2019). Four Things No One Will Tell You About ESG Data. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, *31*(2), 50–58. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/jacf.12346 .

[11]Renneboog, L., Ter Horst, J., & Zhang, C. (2008). Socially Responsible Investments: Institutional Aspects, Performance, and Investor Behavior. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, *32*(9), 1723–1742. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2007.12.039

[12]Albuquerque, R., Koskinen, Y., Yang, S., & Zhang, C. (2020). Resiliency of Environmental and Social Stocks: An Analysis of The Exogenous COVID-19 Market Crash. *The Review of Corporate Finance Studies*, *9*(3), 593–621. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/rcfs/cfaa009 .

[13]Miralles-Quiros, M. D. M., Miralles-Quiros, J. L., & Redondo-Hernández, J. (2019). ESG Performance and Shareholder Value Creation In The Banking Industry: International Differences. *Sustainability*, *11*(5), 1404. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/su11051404 .

[14]Zhang, D., Hoang, T. H. V., & Nguyen, L. V. (2021). ESG Performance and Firms' Value: Evidence from Global Listed Firms. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, *14*(10), 486. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm14100486 .

[15]Busch, T., Bauer, R., & Orlitzky, M. (2016). Sustainable Development and Financial Markets: Old Paths and New Avenues. *Business & Society*, *55*(3), 303–329. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650315570701 .

[16]Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards A Methodology for Developing Evidence-Informed Management Knowledge by Means of Systematic Review. *British Journal of Management*, *14*(3), 207–222. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00375 .

[17]Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., & Altman, D. G. (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLOS Medicine*, *6*(7), e1000097. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097 .

[18]Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for The Thematic Synthesis of Qualitative Research In Systematic Reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *8*(1), 45. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45 .

[19]Donthu, N., Kumar, S., Mukherjee, D., Pandey, N., & Lim, W. M. (2021). How to Conduct A Bibliometric Analysis: An Overview and Guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, *133*, 285–296. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.04.070 .

[20]Friede, G., Busch, T., & Bassen, A. (2015). ESG and Financial Performance: Aggregated Evidence from More Than 2000 Empirical Studies. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, *5*(4), 210–233. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/20430795.2015.1118917 .

[21]Clark, G. L., & Hebb, T. (2004). Pension Fund Corporate Engagement: The Fifth Stage of Capitalism. *Relations industrielles/Industrial Relations*, *59*(1), 142–171. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7202/009256ar .

[22]Krueger, P., Sautner, Z., & Starks, L. T. (2020). The Importance of Climate Risks For Institutional Investors. *Review of Financial Studies*, *33*(3), 1067–1111. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhz137 .

[23]OECD. (2020). Developing Sustainable Finance Definitions and Taxonomies. *OECD Publishing*. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1787/134a2dbe-en .

[24]Freeman, R. E. (2015). Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach. Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach (pp. 1–276). *Cambridge University Press*. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139192675 .

[25]Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, *20*(3), 571–610. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080331 .

[26]Hartzmark, S. M., & Sussman, A. B. (2019). Do Investors Value Sustainability? A Natural Experiment Examining Ranking and Fund Flows. *Journal of Finance*, *74*(6), 2789–2837. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.12841 .

[27]Krüger, P. (2015). Corporate Goodness and Shareholder Wealth. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *115*(2), 304–329. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2014.09.008 .

[28]Chen, L. H., Hung, M., & Wang, Y. (2018). The Effect of Mandatory CSR Disclosure on Firm Profitability and Social Externalities: Evidence From China. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, *65*(1), 169–190. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacceco.2017.11.009 .

[29]Bauer, R., Derwall, J., & Otten, R. (2007). The Ethical Mutual Fund Performance Debate: New Evidence from Canada. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *70*(2), 111–124. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-006-9099-0 .

[30]Delmas, M. A., & Burbano, V. C. (2011). The Drivers of Greenwashing. *California Management Review*, *54*(1), 64–87. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2011.54.1.64 .

[31]Ioannou, I., & Serafeim, G. (2015). The Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility On Investment Recommendations: Analysts' Perceptions and Shifting Institutional Logics. *Strategic Management Journal*, *36*(7), 1053–1081. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2268 .

[32]Boubaker, S., Nguyen, D. K., & Roubaud, D. (2018). Corporate Social Responsibility and Dividend Policy. *Finance Research Letters*, *25*, 185–191. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2017.11.001 .

[33]Richardson, B. J. (2009). Keeping Ethical Investment Ethical: Regulatory Issues for Investing for Sustainability. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *87*(4), 555–572. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9955-0 .

[34]Arjaliès, D. L., & Bansal, P. (2018). Beyond Numbers: How Investment Managers Accommodate Societal Issues In Financial Decisions. *Organization Studies*, *39*(5-6), 691–719. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840617717096