

Discussion of "The Rise of Reddit: How Social Media Affects Belief Formation and Price Discovery" (Hu, Jones, Li, Zhang, Zhang)

Byoung-Hyoun Hwang (NTU)

May 20th, 2024

What does this paper do?



...

10	-	
		20
	2	
10	-1	1

r/**wallstreetbets** u/helloregards • 54m

Literally STFU About the So-Called Alleged Upcoming Market Crash

Market crashes are supposed to be catastrophic. Shocking. UNEXPECTED. If it is expected, it is already priced in. Also everyone's game plan for the market crash is the exact same: IF THE MARKET CRASHES TOMORROW WE ARE...

$\hat{\mathbf{U}}$	Vote	\mathcal{P}	\square	31	\uparrow	Share
--------------------	------	---------------	-----------	----	------------	-------





Overall impression

- Greatly enjoyed reading it.
- Highly recommend people take a look at the paper.



Engagement overview (i) Jan 2024 - Mar 2024 (S) Worldwide 🖘 All Traffic				
Monthly visits (i)	7.658M			
District Monthly Unique Visitors (i)	3.883M			

Engagement overview () Jan 2024 - Mar 2024 & Worldwide	All Traffic	
Monthly visits 🛈	19.51M	Seeking Alpha lpha
Omnthly Unique Visitors	5.602M	
Engagement overview ① Jan 2024 - Mar 2024 & Worldwide 🕤	All Traffic	
Monthly visits 访	13.83M	[≶] Stocktwits
Monthly Unique Visitors	1.288M	



Engagement overview (i) Jan 2024 - Mar 2024 (S) Worldwide 🕤 All Traffic				
Monthly visits (i)	93.87M			
Monthly Unique Visitors (i)	31.41M			

Engagement overview 🛈 🛗 Jan 2024 - Mar 2024 🕲 Worldwide 😼	All Traffic	
Monthly visits 访	19.51M	Seeking Alpha $^{\alpha}$
S Monthly Unique Visitors (i)	5.602M	
Engagement overview 🛈 🛅 Jan 2024 - Mar 2024 🔇 Worldwide 🕤	All Traffic	
Monthly visits 访	13.83M	[≶] Stocktwits
Omega Monthly Unique Visitors	1.288M	







ABSTRACT

Using submission level data from social media platform Reddit, we rely on the theoretical framework of Pedersen (2022) to examine how social media affects belief formation, price discovery and trading dynamics...

Investing Forums differ A LOT in structure



Investing Forums also differ in user base

Gender Distribution ① ⊎ + × Age Distribution ① 난 + 💵 30% 23.52% 20.51% 19.93% 20% 17.63% Male 59.85% 9.91% 8.50% 10% Female 40.15% 0% 45-54 18-24 25-34 35-44 55-64 65+ Gender Distribution O Age Distribution ① x≣ x≣ ⊎ + ⊎ + 30% 24.52% 21.54% 20.32% 20% Male 16.53% 68.38% 10.02% 10% 7.07% Female 31.62% 0% 18-24 25-34 35-44 45-54 55-64 65+ Gender Distribution O Age Distribution ① ⊎ + x≣ ĿI + ⊠∎ 40% 🐨 reddit 33.13% 33.28% Male 20% 64.32% 15.92% 9.24% 5.07% 3.36% Female 35.68% 0% 18-24 25-34 35-44 45-54 55-64 65+

These Differences Likely Matter!

 Structure of social media platform matters A LOT in spread of mis-/disinformation (e.g., Cinelli, Morales, Galeazzi, Quattrociocchi, Starnini, *Proceedings of National Academy of Sciences of the USA*, 2021)

These Differences Likely Matter!

Comparatively few studies looking at how Reddit





BUT quite a few studies out there already looking at Seeking Alpha/StockTwits



Things authors could consider:

- Explain differences in structure/user base between Reddit and other platforms
- Frame paper as evidence on how certain platform features affect investor behavior



 Sample period: January 2020 – February 2021 ("GameStop short squeeze:" January 2021 – March 2021)





<u>"High-Influence" Network</u> Total number of commenters on given firm above 90th percentile <u>"Low-Influence" Network</u> Total number of commenters on given firm below 90th percentile

Some return predictability

		I. Whole sample	II. High influence subsample	subsample
		Return(t)	Return(t)	Return(t)
"Active,	FanaticTone(t-1)	0.0089**	0.0449***	-0.0071
· ·		[1.99]	[4.44]	[-1.58]
pushing one direction"	RationalTone(t-1)	-0.0025	0.0426***	-0.0186***
		[-0.38]	[2.87]	[-2.89]
	NaïveTone(t-1)	0.0060	0.1775***	-0.0121***
		[1.43]	[6.02]	[-3.43]



II. High influence



III. Low influence

Some shorting flow predictability

		I. Whole sample ShortFlow(t)	II. High influence subsample ShortFlow(t)	III. Low influence subsample ShortFlow(t)
	FanaticTone(t-1)	0.0084	-0.0079	0.0205**
"Active, pushing one direction"	RationalTone(t-1)	[1.29] -0.0033	[-0.93] -0.0091	[2.42] 0.0044
	NaïveTone(t-1)	[-0.36] 0.0223***	[-0.79] -0.023	[0.37] 0.0287***
	Naive Folic(t-1)	[2.84]	[-1.52]	[3.48]
Hedge funds + Add to myFT Melvin Capital, GameSter road to disaster	op and the			
	-		M.	

Generally sympathetic to this argument

Since GameStop, there are many websites/vendors actively tracking social media activity



https://www.quiverquant.com/wallstreetbets/

Generally sympathetic to this argument

- Institutions REPORT paying attention to social media activity
- Conducted survey of 435 institutional investors [146 US retail investors]:

\$10m to \$999.9m	136	31%
\$1bn to \$9.99bn	128	29%
\$10bn to \$49.99bn	80	18%
\$50bn+	91	21%

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

[I or my team **regularly monitor social media outlets/blogs/online forums** to gain an understanding of what retail investors are saying about different stocks, either through direct review or by receiving summarized data from a data vendor.]

Only 49% say 'no'

43% for retail investors

Generally sympathetic to this argument

 [The meme stocks phenomenon (i.e. stocks gaining viral popularity due to heightened attention on social media/blogs/online forums) is likely to continue or intensify over the next few years.]

```
Only 33% say 'no'
```

26% for retail investors

 [In the last 12 months, we have made changes to our portfolio (e.g. sold, bought or hedged a stock) as a direct result of information gleaned from online forums.]

19% say 'yes'46% for retail investors



 BUT sample period: January 2020 – February 2021 ("GameStop short squeeze:" January 2021 – March 2021)

Could Short-Sellers Just Be Informed?

	I. Whole sample	II. High influence subsample	III. Low influence subsample
	Return(t)	Return(t)	Return(t)
FanaticTone(t-1)	0.0089**	0.0449***	-0.0071
	[1.99]	[4.44]	[-1.58]
RationalTone(t-1)	-0.0025	0.0426***	-0.0186***
	[-0.38]	[2.87]	[-2.89]
NaïveTone(t-1)	0.0060	0.1775***	-0.0121***
	[1.43]	[6.02]	[-3.43]



	I. Whole sample	II. High influence subsample	III. Low influence subsample
	ShortFlow(t)	ShortFlow(t)	ShortFlow(t)
FanaticTone(t-1)	0.0084	-0.0079	0.0205**
	[1.29]	[-0.93]	[2.42]
RationalTone(t-1)	-0.0033	-0.0091	0.0044
	[-0.36]	[-0.79]	[0.37]
NaïveTone(t-1)	0.0223***	-0.023	0.0287***
	[2.84]	[-1.52]	[3.48]



Things authors could consider:

 Check whether effect becomes more pronounced post-Melvin Capital Meltdown

