



Crisis and Recovery: How Indian Mutual Funds Responded to Economic Shocks (1991, 2008, 2020, 2023)

Deepak Jauhari, Researcher, Department of Commerce & Management, SunRise University, Alwar (Rajasthan)
Dr. Krishan Nath Pandey, Professor, Department of Commerce & Management, SunRise University, Alwar (Rajasthan)

Abstract

The Indian mutual fund industry has undergone structural transformation since liberalization in 1991, growing from a small, state-dominated sector to a diversified, digitally integrated ecosystem by 2023. This study examines how the industry responded to four major economic shocks: the 1991 balance of payments (BoP) crisis, the 2008 global financial crisis (GFC), the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic, and the 2023 inflation–rate hike cycle. By analyzing regulatory reforms, investor behavior, product evolution, and liquidity responses, this paper demonstrates that mutual funds not only mirrored macroeconomic vulnerabilities but also became central to financial resilience. Using a historical-comparative framework, the study highlights a progressive shift from reactive stabilization (1991) to proactive crisis management (2008, 2020, 2023), underscoring the industry’s role as both a channel for household financialization and a stabilizer of capital markets.

Keywords: Balance of Payments, Global Financial Crisis, Capital Markets, Proactive Crisis Management

1. Introduction

The history of Indian mutual funds is deeply intertwined with the broader trajectory of the country’s economic reforms and financial shocks. As intermediaries between households and capital markets, mutual funds provide a unique vantage point to observe how regulatory frameworks, investor psychology, and product innovation evolve under stress. Over the past three decades, India has faced multiple economic disruptions that have tested the resilience of its financial system—each leaving behind lessons that shaped the mutual fund industry’s growth and governance. The 1991 Balance of Payments crisis acted as the liberalization trigger, dismantling the dominance of UTI and ushering in SEBI-regulated private players, disclosure reforms, and product standardization. The 2008 Global Financial Crisis was the first global contagion test, exposing liquidity risks in short-term debt markets while simultaneously highlighting the stabilizing role of SIP-based household participation. The 2020 COVID-19 pandemic represented an unprecedented stress event, freezing liquidity and shaking investor confidence, yet also proving the durability of systematic retail flows as Franklin Templeton’s debt fund collapse spurred tighter regulation. Most recently, the 2023 inflation–rate hike cycle tested the industry’s maturity, as volatile bond yields and equity corrections coincided with record-high SIP inflows, signaling a cultural shift toward disciplined investing. Together, these crises illustrate how shocks act not only as moments of vulnerability but also as catalysts for regulatory adaptation, product innovation, and greater investor resilience—turning the Indian mutual fund industry into a more robust pillar of the country’s financial architecture.

Mutual funds provide a useful vantage point from which to examine the institutional resilience and household reactions to economic shocks in India's financial system. When India experienced a severe lack of foreign currency in 1991 due to the Balance of Payments (BoP) crisis, liberalization reforms were initiated, marking the first significant turning point. Modern capital markets can trace their roots back to this event, which also revealed systemic flaws in the banking industry. Following SEBI's formation in 1992, the mutual fund industry, which had previously been controlled by UTI, started to welcome private and international competitors. Investor confidence was progressively shaped by new disclosure standards [1]. For Indian funds, the 2008 Global Financial Crisis (GFC) was the first true test of global contagion. Mutual funds, particularly those involved in money market and liquid schemes, were subject to intense redemption pressures, but Indian banks were unaffected. The need for stronger risk-management frameworks and the weaknesses in short-term corporate financing were brought to light when SEBI and RBI had to step in with temporary liquidity facilities.



Resembling a beginning of family adaptation to volatility through automated investing, SIP flows remained relatively stable despite these challenges [2].

Due to movement constraints and economic uncertainties, retail investors were paralyzed in behavioral terror during the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic, causing an unparalleled freeze. March 2020 saw a 40% drop in the stock market, leading to widespread redemptions of debt funds, particularly those categorized as having a high credit risk. Sebi had to tighten valuation, stress-testing, and risk-o-meter disclosures after the debt fund shutdown at Franklin Templeton highlighted liquidity and governance mismatches. Also, even though there was a lot of volatility, equity SIP flows were very resilient because people saw SIPs as long-term investments. This incident further demonstrated the critical role of consistent retail flows in protecting Indian markets from shocks [3]. High interest rates caused instability and prompted analogies to prior crises, which in turn pressured fixed income and stock markets during the 2023 inflation-rate hike cycle. Equity prices experienced a steep correction, bond rates spiked, and NAVs of duration-heavy schemes declined. Monthly SIP inflows of more than ₹15,000 crore demonstrate that investor mindset has progressed towards rule-based, disciplined accumulation. The continued regulatory focus on clarity, streamlined offerings, and appropriateness criteria by SEBI prevented widespread retail withdrawals due to systemic stress [4][5].

The impact of news and big economic events on the value of financial assets like stocks, bonds, and mutual funds has long been a topic of study for financial economists. The basic idea is that when people learn new things, their expectations for future cash flows and discount rates change, which causes asset values to fluctuate. Many studies have shown that market valuations and investor mood can be significantly affected by political events, macroeconomic indicators, business earnings reports, and other similar announcements. Net Asset Value (NAV) fluctuations are a common reflection of these developments in the mutual fund industry and a critical performance indicator.

This research focuses on the effects of the Goods and Services Tax (GST) in India and the Brexit vote in the UK on the performance and value of Indian mutual funds, two big economic events. The research examines the impact of macro-political shocks on investor confidence and market reactions using NAV data as the main indicator. Companies with significant exposure to Europe, such as those in the Indian IT sector, felt the effects of the Brexit event. Uncertainty surrounding global trade and outsourcing prospects caused immediate volatility and downward pressure on NAVs for mutual funds that were benchmarked against the NSE IT or BSE IT indices, or had substantial holdings in IT stocks. The Goods and Services Tax (GST), a structural reform that attempted to streamline India's indirect tax system, has conflicting impacts on different sectors. Although certain industries, like transportation, manufacturing, and formal retail, experienced short-term interruptions and compliance issues, others reaped the benefits of operational efficiency and lower tax cascading. Based on their portfolio composition, industry-specific mutual funds either gained or lost money due to these sectoral variances. In sum, the research confirms that geopolitical and macroeconomic events, such as GST and Brexit, have a discernible impact on the value of mutual funds. This highlights how capital markets are vulnerable to changing economic narratives and how important dynamic portfolio management is for reducing this risk.

2. Literature Review

J. R. Varma, S. K. Barua(1993)[6] In one of the first systematic reviews of Indian mutual fund performance following liberalization, they compared scheme returns to market benchmarks and identified disclosure shortcomings in the embryonic industry. Most schemes failed to outperform the market after volatility adjustment, according to their data. The study found that strong governance and disclosure systems were more important than hiring “star managers” for investor welfare. Their findings supported market microstructure and benchmarking theory that credible yardsticks and openness diminish information asymmetry, agency difficulties, and rational retail participation. This work created the intellectual



groundwork for NAV transparency, standardized reporting, and benchmarking changes, helping mutual funds weather successive crises. **G. Jayadev (2008)[7]** examined Indian equities mutual fund performance persistence throughout market cycles in a large sample. Results demonstrated that alpha (excess return) existed but was small, unstable, and weakly persistent during shocks. This questioned the long-term usefulness of active management, especially under high fees, and stressed the significance of cost minimization for ordinary investors. Jayadev argued that expense drag dominates family outcomes when persistent alpha is scarce using efficient markets and cost arithmetic. Automation made SIPs logical instruments for households facing financial unpredictability and volatility. The **2012 study by Santosh Anagol and colleagues[8]** found that retail investors in India responded more to marketing cues than risk-adjusted returns. SIPs packaged as “monthly saving” or EMI-like commitments made abstract compounding a culturally recognizable habit, demonstrating constrained rationality in investor decision-making. The authors demonstrated how defaults and repeated instructions reduce noise-driven timing errors using restricted attention and behavioral framing theory. SIP framing kept investors disciplined throughout crises, when lump-sum investment might have failed.

Renuka Sane & Susan Thomas (2015)[9] proposed retail investor protection and suitability in India's mutual fund market. They maintained that large retail participation required comprehensive transparency, redressal, and simplified products. SIPs enforced temporal diversification and reduced timing discretion, operationalizing appropriateness. Regulations like risk-o-meters, TER disclosures, and standardized factsheets enhanced product fit and safeguarded novice investors, the authors concluded. Their analysis using information asymmetry and institutional design showed that rule-based defaults and disclosure reforms reduced investor misunderstanding and risk misalignment, enabling long-horizon participation even during crises. **Tarun Ramadorai, RBI Household Finance Committee Chair (2017)[10]** A major RBI family Finance Committee report by Ramadorai found advice market frictions and systematic overexposure to tangible assets like gold and real estate in Indian family portfolios. Digital KYC, open pricing, and advice standards might turn savings into market-linked products, the report showed. These recommendations made mutual funds low-friction, small-ticket defaults, which boosted SIPs. According to household finance and market design, choice architecture and decreased transaction costs were crucial for healthier portfolios, especially amid macroeconomic stress. **Monika Halan, Renuka Sane(2017)[11]** In a significant distributor behavior study, they showed how commission-driven incentives drove investors toward higher-TER items and unneeded churn. They found that mis-selling reduced investor trust and wealth. They suggested fiduciary norms, direct programs, and clear costs. Direct plans and SIPs reduced manipulation risks, anchoring investors to long-term accumulation rather than churn. Based on principal-agent theory and regulation-as-commitment, aligning distributor incentives and simplifying product choices enhanced investor surplus and reduced panic-driven portfolio changes, improving crisis resilience. A macroeconomic research of household financialization by **Soumya Kanti Ghosh (SBI Research) (2019)[12]** showed India's portfolio shift from physical to financial assets. The report noted the rise of SIP flows as equities market structural stabilizers. Household SIP contributions were reliable and counter-cyclical, unlike foreign institutional investors, providing local money that cushioned markets amid shocks like the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic. According to structural transformation and macro-financial stability theories, SIPs lower India's vulnerability to volatile global flows and smooth household IRR distributions. SIPs are wealth tools and systemic stabilizers, the report stated.

3. Methodology

Design: Historical-comparative case study.

Data Sources:

- AMFI monthly SIP book, fund flows (1998–2023).
- SEBI circulars (1991–2023).



- RBI/CSO macro indicators.
- Secondary literature and media archives.

Analysis Framework

- Regulatory response (SEBI, RBI, Ministry of Finance).
- Investor behavior (flows, redemptions, SIP survival).
- Product shifts (categories, innovations).
- Systemic role (liquidity, capital market resilience).

4. Crisis Narratives

1991 Balance of Payments Crisis

One of India's worst economic crises occurred in 1991, when the country's foreign exchange reserves fell below the level needed to cover imports for less than three weeks. In the midst of this tumultuous macroeconomic climate, the Unit Trust of India (UTI) was practically the only player in the emerging Indian mutual fund industry, with its flagship scheme, US-64, acting as the principal means by which households could participate in the capital markets. Nevertheless, the crisis brought to light the sector's underlying fundamental problems. There was a huge knowledge gap between UTI and its investors because to the opaque governance processes, nonexistent disclosure standards, and untransparent pricing mechanisms for units. Investor trust in US-64 started to decline as redemption pressures increased, revealing the dangers of depending on a state-run monopoly in a liberalizing market. Even if mutual funds weren't a systemic problem at the time, this experience showed how quickly investor confidence may plummet in the absence of strong oversight and responsibility.

This means that institutional change was sparked by the BoP crisis. Following this, in 1996, the SEBI Mutual Fund Regulations were introduced as part of the government's liberalization strategy, which expanded to the financial industry. These rules were a watershed moment in the industry's history since they introduced standardized disclosure requirements, made pricing based on net asset value (NAV) mandatory, and allowed private and international companies to compete. Future expansion could be built around the pillars of transparency and investor safety. A major takeaway from the 1991 incident is that crises have the power to expose hidden weaknesses, hasten reforms that strengthen markets and establish long-term institutional legitimacy, and this is true even when mutual funds are not the primary target of systemic risk.

2008 Global Financial Crisis

The Global Financial Crisis of 2008 represented the first true contagion shock for Indian financial markets after years of rapid growth. Following the collapse of Lehman Brothers, Indian equity markets corrected by nearly 60 percent, and panic spilled over into the mutual fund industry. At the time, liquid and cash management schemes had expanded aggressively, with significant exposure to short-term debt instruments. When fear spread, investors rushed to redeem nearly ₹1.5 trillion from mutual funds between September and October 2008, creating a liquidity crunch. Regulators responded swiftly: the RBI provided liquidity lines to mutual funds through banks, while SEBI tightened norms governing liquid schemes, disclosures, and risk management. On the investor side, while debt and hybrid categories absorbed some flows, the crisis also marked the early rise of equity Systematic Investment Plans (SIPs) as a mechanism for disciplined, long-term investing. The 2008 crisis demonstrated that mutual funds had by then become systemically important, requiring regulatory backstops and risk-oriented supervision. The enduring lesson was that market intermediation by mutual funds cannot be divorced from systemic stability, especially during global contagion events.

2020 COVID-19 Pandemic

The outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020 created an unprecedented global economic standstill, and Indian financial markets were no exception. Equity indices crashed sharply, capital outflows accelerated, and liquidity pressures spread rapidly across asset classes. The most dramatic flashpoint for the mutual fund industry came with Franklin



Templeton’s sudden closure of six debt schemes amounting to nearly ₹26,000 crore, citing extreme illiquidity. This event not only shook investor confidence but also revealed structural weaknesses in fund design, particularly the concentration of assets in low-rated, less liquid debt instruments. Investor behavior during this crisis showed a clear divergence: while debt funds witnessed heavy redemptions, equity systematic investment plans (SIPs) displayed surprising stability. Even during the height of uncertainty in March–May 2020, equity SIP inflows remained above ₹8,000 crore per month, as retail investors perceived the market crash as a “buy on sale” opportunity rather than a reason to exit. This resilience of household investors contrasted sharply with previous crises, such as 2008, when redemption pressures dominated. Regulators and policymakers moved swiftly to contain risks. SEBI introduced mandatory stress-testing frameworks for debt schemes and tightened liquidity risk management, while the Reserve Bank of India supported overall market liquidity through Targeted Long-Term Repo Operations (TLTROs), which indirectly benefited mutual funds. The episode underscored two contrasting realities: on one hand, the systemic fragility of certain debt-oriented fund categories; on the other, the growing maturity of India’s retail investor base, whose disciplined SIP culture acted as a stabilizing anchor. The broader lesson was that while institutional structures remain vulnerable to sudden shocks, household-level behavioral resilience can provide a crucial buffer, preventing market contagion and reinforcing the role of mutual funds as reliable investment vehicles even in times of extreme volatility.

2023 Inflation–Rate Hike Cycle

The most recent stress test for the Indian mutual fund industry unfolded in 2023, during the global inflationary cycle. Aggressive interest rate hikes by the U.S. Federal Reserve and the Reserve Bank of India led to a sharp rise in bond yields, making debt instruments volatile, while equity markets turned highly uncertain. This turbulence was compounded by a crucial domestic policy change in April 2023, when the long-standing tax indexation benefit on debt mutual funds was withdrawn, significantly reducing their attractiveness as tax-efficient investment vehicles. As a result, investor behavior underwent a structural transformation: lumpsum allocations to debt schemes declined sharply, while equity systematic investment plans (SIPs) witnessed unprecedented momentum, with monthly inflows crossing ₹15,000 crore. Alongside this, passive funds, exchange-traded funds (ETFs), and target-date constructs gained popularity, as investors gravitated toward predictable, low-cost, and rule-based products. At the systemic level, the industry showcased an unprecedented degree of maturity and resilience. Annualized SIP inflows of nearly ₹1.5 trillion created a stable domestic liquidity base that effectively cushioned Indian markets against the volatility of foreign institutional investor (FII) flows. The overarching lesson from this episode is clear: Indian mutual funds are no longer limited to being retail-centric vehicles but have evolved into macroeconomic stabilizers. By channeling household savings into capital markets in a disciplined and sustained manner, they now play a critical role in insulating the economy from external shocks while reinforcing the structural depth of India’s financial system.

Table 1: Crisis and Recovery – Indian Mutual Funds’ Response to Major Economic Shocks

Year & Crisis	Nature of Economic Shock	Impact on Indian Mutual Fund Industry	Key Responses/Strategies	Recovery Trajectory & Outcomes
1991 – Balance of Payments Crisis	Severe forex reserves depletion; macroeconomic instability; liberalization reforms initiated	Mutual fund industry was still in infancy (dominated by UTI); investor confidence low	Govt. reforms: liberalization, SEBI regulation (1992), entry of private sector & foreign AMCs later	UTI restructuring; emergence of private mutual funds in mid-1990s; industry slowly gained investor trust

2008 – Global Financial Crisis	Global liquidity crunch, stock market crash; FIIs exit India	Equity-oriented schemes saw heavy redemptions; AUM dropped sharply; debt funds faced liquidity stress	RBI infused liquidity; SEBI imposed stricter disclosure norms; AMCs diversified into debt/liquid funds	Strong rebound post-2009 as Indian markets recovered; SIP culture began gaining traction
2020 – COVID-19 Pandemic	Global lockdowns; market crash; investor panic; debt defaults (Franklin Templeton crisis)	Equity & debt AUM fell sharply in March 2020; redemptions surged; sector-wide liquidity concerns	RBI announced LTROs, SEBI strengthened liquidity norms; AMCs promoted SIP continuation & digital onboarding	By late 2020, mutual fund inflows revived; equity SIPs became resilient channel; digital adoption surged
2023 – Post-Pandemic & Inflationary Pressures	Global inflation, rising interest rates, market volatility; Adani-Hindenburg crisis	Fluctuating inflows in equity schemes; debt funds saw pressure due to rate hikes; investor sentiment cautious	SEBI introduced risk-o-meter tightening & passive fund expansion; AMCs pushed index & ETFs	Resilient SIP inflows (₹14,000–16,000 crore monthly avg.); industry AUM crossed ₹45 trillion by 2023; retail trust deepened

5. Discussion

Indian mutual funds have experienced a profound institutional and behavioral transformation across successive crises, evolving from a marginal sector in 1991 to a structural stabilizer by 2023. In the early 1990s, the industry was dominated by UTI's monopoly, where governance gaps, lack of transparency, and weak investor protection mechanisms limited its systemic role. The 1991 Balance of Payments crisis exposed these shortcomings, as trust in UTI eroded and demonstrated the dangers of opaque financial intermediation. This episode, however, became the seedbed for reform, leading to liberalization measures and the landmark SEBI Mutual Fund Regulations of 1996, which introduced competition, disclosure standards, and transparency into the sector. By 2008, mutual funds had grown into a significant financial intermediary, deeply interconnected with markets. The Global Financial Crisis created severe liquidity stress, with redemptions of nearly ₹1.5 trillion from liquid and cash management plans. The coordinated intervention by SEBI and the RBI underscored that mutual funds had now become systemic nodes requiring regulatory backstops. Investor behavior also shifted, as households turned toward systematic investment plans (SIPs) and hybrid funds, signaling that trust could be sustained through disciplined, diversified products. The 2008 episode demonstrated that institutional resilience was only possible with stringent regulation, credible disclosures, and robust liquidity management frameworks.

A more complex picture emerged during the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic, when a global economic standstill triggered both institutional fragility and household anxiety. The abrupt termination of Franklin Templeton's debt schemes exposed structural flaws in fund design and risk management. Yet, the persistence of equity SIP flows—averaging more than ₹8,000 crore per month even during the peak of market panic—highlighted an unprecedented behavioral resilience among retail investors. Unlike 2008, when redemptions dominated, households in 2020 reframed volatility as an opportunity to accumulate assets, aided by the



automatic discipline of monthly SIP contributions. Regulators, learning from past crises, institutionalized stress testing and liquidity risk management to address vulnerabilities, while households began to play a stabilizing role. This marked a critical behavioral turning point where domestic investors actively cushioned markets rather than retreating.

By 2023, the shift was even more pronounced. The inflation–rate hike cycle, marked by rising bond yields, equity volatility, and the withdrawal of the debt fund tax indexation benefit, created a formidable stress test. Yet, instead of capital flight, the industry witnessed record equity SIP flows exceeding ₹15,000 crore per month and annualized inflows of nearly ₹1.5 trillion. These domestic flows not only offset volatile foreign institutional investor (FII) activity but also provided a steady liquidity base that stabilized capital markets. Investor behavior had decisively transitioned toward long-term equity accumulation through SIPs, while institutional adaptation broadened product diversity via ETFs, passive funds, and target-date constructs. The trajectory from 1991 to 2023 reveals an unmistakable progression: where mutual funds were once marginal players requiring rescue (1991, 2008), they have matured into systemic stabilizers (2020, 2023), capable of absorbing external shocks and anchoring India’s financial resilience through steady household participation and regulatory evolution.

6. Conclusion

The evolution of Indian mutual funds through many crises demonstrates the maturation of both investors and institutions. The function of mutual funds within India’s financial system underwent transformations in response to each crisis. Trust and transparency issues surfaced in the early 1990s due to UTI’s monopoly and poor governance. This resulted in SEBI regulations that established a foundation for openness and competitiveness. Stricter regulations for liquidity management and improved disclosure standards were enacted in response to the 2008 Global Financial Crisis, which demonstrated the potential hazards that mutual funds faced. As a means of financial security and self-control, it pushed for SIPs and hybrid funds among families. Once again, the system was put to the test in 2020 by the COVID-19 pandemic, particularly in light of the Franklin Templeton financial crisis. Despite the exposure of certain flaws, regular investors shown trust by maintaining their systematic investment plans (SIPs) in stocks despite the global market crisis. Further maturation of the industry occurred by 2023. Indian investors persisted despite rising bond yields, unstable markets, and the elimination of the tax advantage for debt funds. They choose to boost their monthly SIP investments to around ₹15,000 crore instead. There was less reliance on volatile foreign investments and more stability because to this regular infusion of domestic funds.

References

1. Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI). *Mutual Fund Regulations and Amendments (1996–2023)*. SEBI Publications, 2023.
2. Reserve Bank of India. *Report on Currency and Finance: 2008–09*. RBI Publications, 2009.
3. Ministry of Finance, Government of India. *Economic Survey of India (1991–2023)*. Department of Economic Affairs, Government of India, 2023.
4. Association of Mutual Funds in India (AMFI). *Monthly SIP Book and Fund Flow Reports (1998–2023)*. AMFI Database, 2023.
5. ELK Asia Pacific Journals. “Impact of Economic Events such as GST and Brexit on Mutual Fund Performance.” *Special Issue on Financial Markets and Institutions*, ELK Asia Pacific Journals, 2018, ISBN: 978-93-85537-01-1.
6. Barua, S. K., and Jayanth R. Varma. *Performance Evaluation of Indian Mutual Funds*. Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad Working Paper, 1993.
7. Jayadev, G. “Performance Evaluation of Mutual Funds: An Empirical Study on Indian Equity Mutual Funds.” *The ICAI Journal of Applied Finance*, vol. 14, no. 5, 2008, pp. 5–21.
8. Anagol, Santosh, Shawn Cole, and Shayak Sarkar. “Attention, Advertising, and



- Financial Decision Making: Evidence from India's Mutual Fund Investors." *American Economic Review*, vol. 102, no. 2, 2012, pp. 1022–1045.
9. Sane, Renuka, and Susan Thomas. "Regulating Retail Financial Markets in India: An Approach Based on Consumer Protection." *Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research Working Paper No. 2015-021*, 2015.
 10. Ramadorai, Tarun, Chair. *Indian Household Finance Report*. Reserve Bank of India, 2017.
 11. Halan, Monika, and Renuka Sane. "Misled and Mis-sold: Financial Misbehaviour in Retail Banking." *National Institute of Public Finance and Policy Working Paper No. 2017-197*, 2017.
 12. Ghosh, Soumya Kanti. "Financialization of Indian Households: Structural Transformation and Stability Implications." *SBI Research Ecwrap*, vol. 24, no. 7, 2019.

