Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antoniou Doukas, Subrahmanyam

# Cognitive Dissonance, Sentiment, and Momentum

Antoniou, Doukas, Subrahmanyam

April 5, 2019

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antoniou Doukas Subrahmanyan

**Key Question**: Do variations in profitability from momentum stem from variations in sentiment?

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antoniou Doukas, Subrahmanyam

#### Definition

**Sentiment** refers to whether an individual, for whatever extraneous reason, feels excessively optimistic or pessimistic about a situation.

#### Definition

Newswatchers documented by Hong and Stein (1999) are different groups who react to news, creating a slow dispersion of news and thus momentum.

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antoniou Doukas, Subrahmanyam

### Hypothesis

- Newswatchers will underreact more strongly whent they receive information that contradicts their sentiment due to cognitive dissonance.
- This implies bad (good) news among (loser) winner stocks will diffuse slowly when sentiment is optimistic (pessimistic).
- This will lead to momentum, driven by the loser portfolio in optimistic sentiment periods and the winner portfolio in pessimistic sentiment periods.

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antoniou Doukas, Subrahmanyam

#### Main Results

- Strong momentum in optimistic periods controlloing for market returns, analyst coverage, size, and CAPM/FF
- No momentum in pessimistic periods
- Small investors are slow to sell losers during the optimistic periods in intraday transactions
- Momentum profits reverse significantly after optimistics periods (but not in pessimistic periods)

### Previous Work

Cognitive Dissonance, Sentiment, and Momentum

- Hong and Stein (1999): Newswatchers react to news and create momentum
- Cooper, Guitierrez, Hameed (2004): investor biases more accentuated after gains - momentum profits follow only market increases
- Chordia and Shivakumar (2002): Momentum profits are significant only in expanding economy
- Livnat and Petrovic (2008): investor sentiment linked to post-earnings announcement drift
  - Others also show fund flows, value effect, corporate disclosure, IPO, size effect

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

- All common stocks of NYSE and AMEX from 1967 to 2008
- Construct momentum portfolios using method of Jegadeesh and Titman (1993)
  - Each month t sort stocks based on returns of past J months, create 10 portfolios
  - Winners at the top, losers on the bottom
  - Each month, hold winner portfolio and short loser portfolio, holding for *K* months
  - Portfolios are overlapping, close position in month t-K and take new position using winners and losers of month t
  - As is standard, allow 1 month between end of the formation period and beginning of holding period
- Delete all stocks less than \$1

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antoniou Doukas, Subrahmanyam

#### Investor Sentiment Measure

- Monthly time series of consumer confidence sentiment constructed by the Conference Board (CB).
- Begins in 1967 for bimonthly measures, and 1977 has monthly measures
- Sent to 5000 randomly selected households in United States
- Asks 5 questions about outlook for the economy
- Sum favorable replies, divided by total replies

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antoniou Doukas, Subrahmanyam

#### Investor Sentiment Measure

- Purge Macroeconomics by regressing index on:
  - growth in industrial production
  - real growth in durable ocnsumption
  - nondurable consumption
  - services consumption
  - growth in employment
  - NBER recession indicator
- Take residuals and use them as the sentiment proxy

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antoniou, Doukas, Subrahmanyam

#### Investor Sentiment Measure

For discovering optimism/pessimism:

- caluctate weighted-rolling average of the setiment level for the 3 moths prior to the end of the formation period
- give weight of 3 to sentiment in prior mornth, 2 to the one in month prior to that, and 1 beyond that
- Classify as optimistic (pessimistic) if the 3-month rollowing average ending in month t belongs in the top (bottom) 30% of the 3-month rolling average in the time series

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antoniou Doukas, Subrahmanyam

### Hypothesis

Negative (positive) information about stocks when sentiment is optimistic (pessimistic) will conflict with investors' prior beliefs and cause cognitive dissonance.

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antoniou Doukas, Subrahmanyam

#### First Test

- Examine profitability of the momentum stratedgy conditioning on pessimistic and optimistic investor sentiment states
- Look at strategies based on J=6 month ranking period and holding periods of K=3,6,12 months sorted by investor sentiment

#### Result

- Average monthly profits in optimistic periods are highly signficant, decrease as optimism decreases
- Higher momentum profits in optimistic periods arise because loser stocks continue to underperform in subsequent periods
  - bad news diffuses slowly when investors are optimistic cognitive dissonance

Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	-						N	lomen	tum Po	ortfolio				
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Sentiment State	1	Sell 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9			[t-Stat.]
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Panel A. 30%-3	30% Sentimer	nt States											
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Donal Ad J. d	2 K 2												
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			_0.85	_0.05	0.36	0.53	0.68	0.78	0.96	0.90	1.09	1.42	2 27	[5.06]
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$														[4.67]
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						2.14		1.97	1.91	1.84				[0.56]
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$												Opt Pes.	1.98	[2.90]
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Panel A2, J. K =	- 6												
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		(n - 121)	-0.48	0.17	0.52	0.67		0.95	1.10	1.10	1.26	1.51	2.00	[5.66]
$ \begin{array}{c} Panel A3 J = 6, K = 12 \\ OPTIMISTIC & (n = 109) & -0.27 \\ MILD & (n = 537) & 0.38 \\ MID & (n = 547) & 0.38 \\ MID & (n = 548) & 2.08 \\ MID & (n = 149) & 2.06 \\ MID & (n = 172) & -1.51 \\ MID & (n = 172) & -1.51 \\ MID & (n = 172) & -1.51 \\ MID & (n = 172) & -0.53 \\ MID & (n = 188) & 1.88 \\ MID & (n = 172) & -1.51 \\ MID & (n = 188) & 1.81 \\ MID & (n = 188) & 1.88 \\ MID & (n = 227) & 0.52 \\ MID & (n = 227) & 0.52 \\ MID & (n = 248) & 1.88 \\ MID & (n = 128) & -0.28 \\ MID & (n = 248) & -0.28 \\ MID & (n = 249) & -0.65 \\ MID & (n = 249) $														[5.66]
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	PESSIMISTIC	(n = 93)	2.12	2.41	2.45	2.31	2.24	2.21	2.11	2.13	2.21			
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$												Opt. – Pes.	1.66	[2.96]
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$														
PESSIMISTIC $(n=54)$ 2.05 2.25 2.21 2.12 2.11 2.05 2.00 2.00 2.06 2.14 0.09 [0.22] $\rho_{11} = \rho_{11} = \rho_{12} = \rho_{11} = \rho_{12} = \rho_{11} = \rho_{12} = \rho_{12} = \rho_{11} = \rho_{12} =$														[3.50]
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$														
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	PESSIMISTIC	(n = 54)	2.05	2.25	2.21	2.12	2.11	2.05	2.00	2.00	2.06			
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$												Opt. – Pes.	1.10	[2.20]
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Panel B. 40%-4	10% Sentimer	nt States											
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Panal Rt .I — i	3 K — 3												
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$			-1.51	-0.53	-0.07	0.12	0.29	0.39	0.57	0.52	0.65	0.87	2.38	[6.09]
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	MILD													[2.97]
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	PESSIMISTIC	(n = 158)	1.63	1.88	2.00	1.94	1.89	1.81	1.75	1.71	1.83		0.45	[1.05]
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$												Opt. – Pes.	1.93	[3.33]
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Panel B2, J, K=	- 6												
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	OPTIMISTIC	(n = 149)	-0.99	-0.23	0.17	0.36	0.58	0.68	0.85	0.90	1.05	1.26	2.25	[6.83]
Panel B3. $J = 6$ , $K = 12$ OPTIMSTIC $(n = 124)$ $-0.65$ $-0.08$ $0.24$ $0.38$ $0.57$ $0.66$ $0.76$ $0.79$ $0.82$ $0.80$ $0.145$ $1.39$ $1.04$ $1.11$ $1.18$ $1.20$ $1.26$ $1.30$ $1.32$ $1.31$ $0.81$ $1.31$		(n = 227)	0.05							1.18				[4.12]
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	PESSIMISTIC	(n = 124)	1.56	1.82	1.89	1.82	1.83	1.85	1.80	1.85	1.93			[1.83]
OPTIMISTIC (n = 124) -0.65 -0.08 0.24 0.38 0.57 0.66 0.76 0.79 0.82 0.80 1.45 [3.91 MILD (n = 304) 0.50 0.83 1.04 1.11 1.18 1.20 1.26 1.30 1.32 1.31 0.81 [3.71												Opt. – Pes.	1.60	[3.29]
MILD (n = 304) 0.50 0.83 1.04 1.11 1.18 1.20 1.26 1.30 1.32 1.31 0.81 [3.71														
														[3.91]
														[3.71]
	PESSIMISTIC	(n = 72)	1.96	2.13	2.06	1.95	1.93	1.89	1.84	1.84	1.89			[0.14]

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antoniou Doukas, Subrahmanyam Consitent with Cooper et al. (2004) consider market states

### Design

- Classify each formation period into UP or DOWN market states independent of investor sentiment
  - CRSP value-weighted index return for 36, 24, and 12 month period
- Derive momentum profits for optimistic and pessimistic periods during UP and DOWN markets

### Results

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

- Most (87.2%) significant momentum profits occur in UP markets
- Momentum strategies in DOWN markets

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Table 3 U	Table 3 UP states														
							Mome	ntum l	Portfoli	o					
Sentiment State		Sell 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Buy 10	Buy – Sell	[t-Stat.]		
Panel A. UP Ma	rkets			_	_		_		_	_					
Panel A1. 36-Mo OPTIMISTIC MILD PESSIMISTIC  Panel A2. 24-Mo OPTIMISTIC MILD PESSIMISTIC	(n = 113) (n = 254) (n = 69)	-0.60 -0.27 1.15 -0.75 -0.34 1.50	0.11 0.39 1.74 -0.02 0.37 1.94	0.48 0.70 1.88 0.36 0.69 2.00	0.63 0.83 1.80 0.54 0.83 1.91	0.82 0.95 1.75 0.75 0.95 1.86	0.90 1.00 1.73 0.82 1.01 1.84	1.05 1.06 1.61 0.98 1.09 1.74	1.08 1.14 1.62 1.01 1.18 1.74	1.24 1.22 1.74 1.18 1.29 1.89	1.52 1.28 2.01 Opt. – Pes. 1.45 1.40 2.16 Opt. – Pes.	2.12 1.55 0.87 1.25 2.21 1.74 0.66 1.55	[4.73] [5.18] [1.51] [1.72] [4.86] [6.01] [1.25] [2.22]		
Panel A3. 12-Mo OPTIMISTIC MILD PESSIMISTIC	onth Market (n = 87) (n = 206) (n = 86)	-0.50 0.06 1.81	0.30 0.69 2.22	0.71 0.93 2.29	0.85 1.00 2.16	1.08 1.09 2.11	1.15 1.12 2.10	1.34 1.17 2.01	1.42 1.24 2.01	1.62 1.36 2.14	2.03 1.49 2.42 Opt. – Pes.	2.53 1.43 0.61 1.92	[6.16] [5.36] [1.49] [3.29]		

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antoniou Doukas, Subrahmanyam

### Table 3 DOWN states

#### TABLE 3 (continued)

#### Momentum Profits Conditional on Different Market States and Investor Sentiment

		Momentum Portfolio												
Sentiment State		Sell 1	_2_	_3_	_4_	_5_	_6_	_7_	8_	9	Buy 10	Buy – Sell	[t-Stat.]	
Panel B. DOWN	l Markets													
Panel B1. 36-Mo OPTIMISTIC MILD PESSIMISTIC	onth Market (n = 8) (n = 32) (n = 24)	1.20 -0.36 4.91	0.95 -0.11 4.33	1.00 0.02 4.09	1.31 0.37 3.78	1.43 0.22 3.65	1.57 0.24 3.60	1.80 0.38 3.55	1.39 0.35 3.59	1.53 0.29 3.55	1.46 0.40 3.72 Opt. – Pes.	0.26 0.76 -1.20 1.46	[0.10] [0.60] [-0.82] [0.50]	
Panel B2. 24-Me	onth Market	t												
OPTIMISTIC MILD PESSIMISTIC	(n = 18) (n = 34) (n = 17)	1.06 0.17 4.88	1.27 0.11 4.52	1.40 0.18 4.47	1.44 0.38 4.11	1.49 0.21 3.93	1.66 0.19 3.86	1.79 0.25 3.77	1.59 0.05 3.86	1.71 -0.19 3.65	1.87 -0.45 3.75	0.80 -0.62 -1.12	[0.45] [—0.48] [0.61]	
Panel B3. 12-Me	onth Market	t									Opt. – Pes.	1.92	[0.75]	
OPTIMISTIC MILD	(n = 34) (n = 80)	-0.45 -1.17	-0.16 $-0.58$	0.03 -0.15	0.22	0.32	0.43	0.49	0.27	0.33	0.18 0.37	0.63 1.54	[0.47]	
PESSIMISTIC	(n = 30)	5.95	4.67		4.15	3.81	3.60	3.41	3.54	3.02	2.86 Opt. – Pes.	-3.09 3.72	[-1.03] [1.13]	

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antonio Doukas Subrah manyai

# Model

# $PROFITS = b_0 + b_1 SENTIMENT + b_2 MARKET + b_3 MARK$

#### Where:

- PROFITS is the time series of average monthly MOM profits at t
- *MARKET* is lagged market return of the value-weighted index incluyding divedends

### Results

- Momentum Profits increase with the market return but decrease with the squared market term (nonlinear
  - supports Cooper et al (2013)).

    Sentiment predicts momentum profits independently of

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Table 4													
		12-Mon	Part 1: th Market	Return	24-Mon	Part 2: th Market	Return	36-Mon	Part 3: ith Market	Return			
	Parameter	Est.	t-Stat.	Adj. R <sup>2</sup>	Est.	t-Stat.	Adj. R <sup>2</sup>	Est.	t-Stat.	Adj. R <sup>2</sup>			
Panel A. Cooper et al. Regression with SENTIMENT: Mom. PROFITS = b <sub>0</sub> + b <sub>1</sub> SENTIMENT + b <sub>2</sub> MARKET													
+ b <sub>3</sub> MARKET <sup>2</sup>	+ u												
Constant SENTIMENT	b <sub>0</sub>	0.014 0.327	5.03 3.33	1.80%	0.0143 0.309	4.76 3.37	3.06%	0.011 0.272	3.39 2.95	3.34%			
Market Market <sup>2</sup>	b2 b3	0.061 0.447	1.69 1.52		0.083 0.470	2.37 -2.53		0.109 -0.378	3.53 -3.36				
Panel B. Regre	ession with M	arket Retur	ns and St	NTIMENT	Mom. PROF	$ITS = b_0$	+ b <sub>1</sub> MAR	KET+ b <sub>2</sub> SE	NTIMENT	+ u			
Constant SENTIMENT MARKET	b <sub>0</sub> b <sub>1</sub> b <sub>2</sub>	0.012 0.338 0.047	4.39 3.39 1.44	1.60%	0.01 0.300 0.046	2.99 3.15 1.74	1.87%	0.008 0.270 0.043	2.29 2.86 2.00	1.96%			
Panel C. Coop	er et al. Regr	ession (as	in Panel A	A) with SEN	ITIMENT Orti	hogonal to	Market R	eturns					
Constant SENTIMENT	b <sub>0</sub> b <sub>1</sub>	0.014 0.328	5.04 3.34	1.82%	0.013 0.297	4.46 3.21	2.92%	0.010 0.264	2.98 2.80	3.26%			
Market <sup>2</sup>	b <sub>2</sub> b <sub>3</sub>	0.060 0.448	1.67 -1.53		0.094 0.469	2.66 -2.51		0.122 -0.380	3.98 -3.36				

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antoniou Doukas, Subrahmanyam

### Analyst Coverage

- Previous research suggests momentum is stronger for stocks with low analyst coverage
- Using IBES, get 1-year-ahead earnings per share forecasts as proxy for analyst coverage
- Isolate role of analyst following size by regressing log one plus ANALYSTS = a + b\*SIZE + e
  - get ranked residuals and separate in three equal weighted portfolios
  - $\blacksquare$  Makes low-, mid-, and high-residual coverage stocks.

#### Results

- Difference in momentum profits between optimistic and pessimistic perdios is simlare across all groups
- Retain insignificance in pessimistic periods

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Table 5													
							Mom	entum	Portfol	io			
Sentiment State		Sell 1	2	3	4	5_	_6_	7	8_	9_	Buy 10	Buy – Sell	[ <i>t</i> -Stat.]
Panel A. Low Coverage (mean = 2.57 analysts)													
OPTIMISTIC MILD PESSIMISTIC	(n = 77) (n = 200) (n = 71)	-0.94 -0.83 1.56	0.05 0.12 2.20	0.65 0.45 2.24	0.79 0.66 2.16	0.86 0.85 2.03	0.98 0.94 2.11	1.04 0.97 1.84	0.96 1.04 1.94	1.15 1.08 2.13	1.26 1.20 2.05 Opt. – Pes.	2.19 2.03 0.49 1.70	[4.32] [6.62] [0.92] [2.37]
Panel B. Mid C	Coverage (me	ean = 6.4	18 anal	ysts)									
OPTIMISTIC MILD PESSIMISTIC	(n = 77) (n = 200) (n = 71)	-0.48 -0.43 2.11	0.41 0.25 2.18	0.79 0.65 2.25	0.78 0.80 2.15	1.02 0.94 2.07	0.97 1.01 1.98	1.03 1.04 2.01	1.08 1.09 1.97	1.17 1.07 2.01	1.53 0.93 2.46 Opt. – Pes.	2.01 1.35 0.35 1.66	[4.28] [4.31] [0.70] [2.44]
Panel C. High	Coverage (n	nean = 1	0.42 ar	alysts)									
OPTIMISTIC MILD PESSIMISTIC	(n = 77) (n = 200) (n = 71)	-0.17 -0.36 2.42	0.51 0.33 2.51	0.67 0.64 2.48	0.78 0.67 2.23	0.93 0.82 2.29	0.97 0.89 2.21	1.21 0.91 2.08	1.24 0.99 2.06	1.28 1.10 2.16	1.66 1.30 2.43 Opt. – Pes.	1.83 1.66 0.02 1.81	[3.37] [5.20] [0.03] [2.26]

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antoniou Doukas, Subrahmanyam

#### Size

 Previous Research shows that return predictability is stronger for smaller companies

#### Method

Separate firms into small and large market capitalization using Kenneth French's size breakpoints

#### Result

- Momentum is generally larger for smaller compaines
- Sentiment is more dramatic in smaller compaines (probably diffuses more slowly

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antoniou Doukas, Subrahmanyam

#### Is it Risk?

• Are higher/lower returns of the winner/loser portfolio during periods of optimism load more/less strongly on economic risk factors?

#### Method

- Use CAPM, FF, and Conditional CAPM
- Perform risk adjustment to get risk-adjusted profits

$$r_{kt}^{ADJ} = r_{kt} - \sum_{t} \beta_{ik} f_{it}$$

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antoniou Doukas, Subrahmanyam

#### Is it Risk? - Method

Also use a CCAPM robustness check, allow covariance between returns of mom portfolios with excess market return to vary with investor sentiment:

$$r_{kt}^{ADJ} = r_{kt} - (\beta_{ik} - \beta_{ik}^{SENT} \times SENTIMENT_{t-j})(R_m - R_f)$$

- $r_{kt}$  is the raw returns of each MOM portfolio for the strategy in the holding period month K in month t
- $\beta_{ik}$  is the estimated factor lading in month K on excess the market return
- $\beta_{ik}^{SENT}$  is the factor landing in month K on the interaction between excess market return and investor sentiment

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Table 7													
Table 1													
							Mome	ntum P	ortfolio				
Sentiment State		Sell 1	2	_3_	_4_	_5_	_6_	_7_	_8_	9_	Buy 10	Buy – Sell	[t-Stat.]
Panel A. CAPM													
MILD	(n = 121) (n = 286) (n = 93)	-0.83 -0.52 0.72	-0.13 0.14 1.22	0.24 0.44 1.34	0.41 0.60 1.25	0.61 0.69 1.22	0.69 0.75 1.20	0.85 0.82 1.10	0.84 0.87 1.09	0.98 0.93 1.11	1.20 0.97 1.21 Opt. – Pes.	2.03 1.49 0.48 1.55	[5.46] [5.93] [1.10] [2.68]
Panel B. FF													
MILD	(n = 121) (n = 286) (n = 93)	-0.87 -0.82 -0.46	-0.25 -0.14 0.18	0.10 0.19 0.39	0.26 0.35 0.36	0.47 0.47 0.39	0.55 0.53 0.42	0.71 0.61 0.33	0.72 0.67 0.35	0.90 0.74 0.40	1.21 0.80 0.51 Opt. – Pes.	2.08 1.61 0.96 1.12	[5.39] [6.83] [2.30] [1.95]
Panel C. Condit	tional CAPN	1											
MILD	(n = 121) (n = 286) (n = 93)	-0.83 -0.52 0.64	-0.12 0.13 1.09	0.25 0.43 1.19	0.41 0.59 1.09	0.61 0.68 1.06	0.70 0.74 1.04	0.85 0.81 0.95	0.84 0.87 0.95	0.99 0.92 0.98	1.20 0.96 1.11 Opt. – Pes.	2.03 1.48 0.47 1.56	[5.46] [5.92] [1.07] [2.70]

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antoniou Doukas, Subrah-

# Controlling for future macro events with VIX and one period ahead macro variables

			Momentum Portfolio										
Sentiment State		Sell 1	2	_3_	_4_	_5_	_6_		_8_	9	Buy 10	Buy – Sell	[t-Stat.]
OPTIMISTIC MILD PESSIMISTIC	(n = 54) (n = 167) (n = 51)	-1.44 -0.53 1.88		0.06 0.58 1.82	0.68	0.79	0.86	0.72 0.88 1.61	0.68 0.88 1.67	0.84 0.90 1.82	0.98 0.99 2.15 Opt. – Pes.	2.42 1.51 0.27 2.15	[4.34] [4.73] [0.43] [2.52]

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antoniou Doukas, Subrahmanyam

#### An Alternate Sentiment Index

Following Baker and Wurgler (2006, 2007): - Make time series of six sentiment proxies: (1) Trading Volume (2) Premium for dividend-paying stocks (3) Closed-End Fund Discount (4) Number of IPOs (5) Mean 1st-day IPO Returns (6) Equity share in new issues

- Regress against macro variables. Take residuals from each.
- Take first principle component of residuals

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Table 9													
			Momentum Portfolio										
Sentiment State		Sell 1	2	3	_4_	5	_6_	7	8	9_	Buy 10	Buy – Sell	[t-Stat.]
OPTIMISTIC PESSIMISTIC	(n = 387) (n = 120)	-0.18 2.31	0.47 2.34	0.76 2.29	0.88 2.21	0.98 2.11	1.04 2.04	1.1 2.1	1.14 2.15	1.25 2.28	1.4 2.61 Opt. – Pes.	1.59 0.30 1.29	[7.69] [0.21] [2.86]

# Cognitive Dissonance, Short Sale Constraints, and Momentum Profits

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antoniou Doukas, Subrahmanyam Authors have shown that momentum is stronger in optimistic sentiment periods, driven by continued underperformance in loser portfolio. \

They claim cognitive dissonance toward negative news during optimistic period is the cause

#### Left to Show

- **1** Examine market's response to negative earnings surprises for loser stocks, conditional on sentiment
- 2 Short-selling constraints a part of the reason that congnitive dissonance subsists
- 3 Effect of smaller vs big investors
- 4 Reversion in the long-run

## Congnitive Dissonance and Momentum Profits

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antoniou Doukas, Subrahmanyam

#### Method

- Identify winners and losers, based on 6-month cumulative returns
- Look at SUE for month t+1
- Rank firms in deciles based on SUE, calculate cumulative returns in impact and adjustment

#### Result

- Short-term absolute reaction for negative earnings during optimistic periods is highre than that for pessimistic ones
- Post-earnings announcement drift after negative surpries is stronger when sentiment is optimistic

## Congnitive Dissonance and Momentum Profits

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Table 10					
				Horizon	
Sentiment State			(-1, 1)		(2, 60)
Panel A. Post-Earnings	Announcement Drift fo	or Loser Stocks with	Low SUE		
OPTIMISTIC MILD PESSIMISTIC			-1.72 -1.61 -1.11		-2.08 1.29 8.65
OPTIMISTIC – PESSIM [t-statistic]	ISTIC		-0.62 [-2.26]		-10.73 [-12.73]
Sentiment State		Losers	Winners	Profits	[t-Stat.]
Panel B. Momentum P	rofits				
Panel B1. All Stocks OPTIMISTIC MILD PESSIMISTIC	(n = 77) (n = 280) (n = 100)	-0.44 -0.19 2.89	1.49 1.17 2.48	1.93 1.36 0.55	[4.17] [5.25] [—0.64]
Panel B2. Excluding LO OPTIMISTIC MILD PESSIMISTIC	osers with Low SUE (n = 77) (n = 280) (n = 100)	0.57 0.44 3.37	1.49 1.17 2.48	0.92 0.73 -1.03	[2.34] [3.18] [—1.34]

# Short-Selling Constraints on Momentum

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

	$\operatorname{Tabl}\epsilon$	e 11												
Ī							ı	Momer	nturn P	ortfolic	,			
	Sentiment State		Sell 1	2	3	4	5	6_	7	8	9	Buy 10	Buy - Sell	[t-Stat.]
	Panel A. By In.	stitutional O	wnership											
	Low Institution													
	OPTIMISTIC MILD	(n = 74) (n = 147)	-1.09 -1.07	-0.09 0.06		0.70				1.09		1.30	2.39	[5.67]
	PESSIMISTIC		1.81	2.13						2.02		2.44 Opt. – Pes.	0.62 1.77	[7.05] [1.18] [2.63]
	High Institution													
	OPTIMISTIC MILD	(n = 74) (n = 147)	0.28 -0.19	0.72	0.84	0.81	0.93	1.00	1.10	1.18	1.24	1.83	1.54	[2.64]
	PESSIMISTIC		1.88	2.03		2.02	1.79		1.79	1.68	1.80	2.04 Opt. – Pes.	0.16 1.38	[0.31] [1.76]
	Panel B. By O	ptions Listin	g Status											
	No Listed Opti													
	OPTIMISTIC MILD	(n = 58) (n = 85)	-0.86 $-1.39$	-0.13 $-0.52$	0.48 -0.10	0.66	0.79		0.98	1.03 0.64	1.14	1.44 0.40	2.30 1.79	[5.06] [4.68]
	PESSIMISTIC		4.55	3.26		3.10				3.59		2.36 Opt. – Pes.	-2.20 4.50	[-1.38] [2.72]
	With Listed Op													
	OPTIMISTIC MILD	(n = 58) (n = 85)	0.79 -0.57	0.96 -0.21	1.02 -0.04	0.96				0.37	0.40	2.06 0.57	1.27	[1.61]
	PESSIMISTIC		5.92	4.54	3.90					2.88		3.14	-2.78	[-1.49]
												Opt Pes.	4.05	[2.00]
	Panel C. By Di	isagreement	!											
	High Disagree													
	OPTIMISTIC MILD	(n = 77) (n = 246)	-0.57 -0.36	0.54	0.68	0.75			1.12 0.86	0.97	1.23	1.78 1.29	2.35 1.65	[4.41] [5.00]
	PESSIMISTIC		1.88	2.23		2.18				1.88	1.85	2.14	0.26	[0.40]
												Opt Pes.	2.09	[2.46]
	Low Disagreer OPTIMISTIC	ment (n = 77)	0.46	0.94	0.99	1.10	1.07	1.16	1.19	1.15	1.34	1.47	1.01	[2.23]
	MILD	(n = 246)	0.41	0.83		0.99	1.06	1.04	1.08	1.10	1.20	1.36	0.95	[4.77]
	PESSIMISTIC	(n = 71)	1.77	1.99	1.97	1.98	1.77	1.71	1.69	1.76	1.79	2.12 Opt. – Pes.	0.35 0.67	[0.63] [0.94]

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antoniou Doukas, Subrahmanyam ■ Categorize small and large investor net OIB (order imbalances) using intraday data

#### Result

- small investor order flow for loser portfolio during optimistic periods is positive and significant in 5 of 6 months in formation period
  - turns negative in holding period
- Supports idea that unsophisticated investors are slow to sell losers during optimistic periods, prolonging pricing of bad news

Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Table	e 12											
		Fo	rmation-f	Period Mo	nth			Н	lolding-Po	eriod Mon	th	
Sentiment State	6_	_5_	_4_	_3_	_2	_1_	1	2	3	4	5	6
Panel A. C	Optimistic											
A1. Small Losers [t-stat.]	Investors 2.78 [2.76]	3.19 [3.47]	2.85 [3.07]	2.48 [2.81]	1.79 [2.08]	0.54 [0.63]	0.66 [0.6]			-2.53 [-2.04]		
	-2.28 [-3.12]			-0.97 [-1.18]	-0.92 [-1.11]	0.16 [0.20]	-0.58 [-0.83]	0.83 [1.21]	1.48 [2.07]	2.15 [3.31]	2.43 [3.81]	2.78 [4.61]
A2. Large Losers [t-stat.]	-7.34	-7.02		-6.51 [-7.29]						-2.45 [-2.12]		
Winners [t-stat.]	2.63 [3.48]	2.65 [3.47]	2.99 [3.83]	3.14 [3.99]	3.02 [3.78]					-1.34 [-1.71]		
Panel B. F	Pessimisti	c										
B1. Small Losers [t-stat.]	Investors 0.81 [0.94]	0.60 [0.74]	0.78 [0.96]							-3.46 [-4.07]		
Winners [t-stat.]	-2.16 [-2.25]	-1.92 [-2.22]		-2.10 [-2.56]							0.2 [0.24]	0.45 [0.56]
B2. Large Losers [t-stat.]	Investors —1.39 [—1.54]	-0.59	0.14 [0.16]	0.65 [0.71]	1.41 [1.43]	1.65 [1.68]	3.79 [3.53]	4.52 [3.98]	5.13 [4.65]	5.64 [5.08]	6.38 [5.62]	6.59 [5.85]
Winners [t-stat.]	9.5 [7.38]	9.78 [7.59]	9.89 [7.65]	9.77 [7.3]	10.12 [7.3]	9.84 [7.23]	5.9 [4.86]	6.22 [5.46]	6.24 [5.58]	6.11 [5.36]	6.31 [5.67]	6.6 [6.14]

Dissonance, Sentiment, and Momentum

Cognitive

- Authors calculate avewrage daily OIB for large and small investors following strong negative earnings surprises
- Selling pressure during event period for small investors is stronger when sentiment is pessimistic (not statistically significant)
- Small investors exert delayed selling pressure in adjustment period, suggesting cognitive dissonance
- Large investors sell losers with bad news four times more heave when sentiment is optimistic

Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Table 13				
	Hor	izon		
Sentiment State	(-1, 1)	(2, 60)	Dif.	[t-Stat.]
Panel A. OIB for Small Investors				
OPTIMISTIC MILD PESSIMISTIC	-1.70 -1.80 -4.10	-7.00 -3.00 -6.30	5.30 1.20 2.20	[5.71] [1.22] [1.75]
OPTIMISTIC – PESSIMISTIC [t-statistic]	2.40 [1.40]	-0.70 [-0.88]		
Panel B. OIB for Large Investors				
OPTIMISTIC MILD PESSIMISTIC	-9.00 -9.00 -2.00	-8.00 -4.00 0.00	-1.00 -5.00 -2.00	[-0.80] [-3.98] [-0.74]
OPTIMISTIC – PESSIMISTIC  [t-statistic]	-7.00 [-3.34]	-8.00 [-9.59]		

### Reversals

Cognitive
Dissonance,
Sentiment,
and
Momentum

Antoniou Doukas, Subrahmanyam

#### Table 14

#### TABLE 14

#### Long-Run Profits of Momentum Portfolios Conditional on Investor Sentiment

Table 14 presents long on event time returns for momentum portfolios formed after optimistic and pessimistic periods. For each momentum portfolio we define an event price of 13 months after the initial formation period of 6 months. From this event date month onward we compute the everage monthly return of this portfolio in the following 5 years. The final return of each portfolio is the generative arrange of these monthly wereap portiols. Prend 4 was server terms, Panel B CAPM-adjusted returns, and Panel C returns adjusted according to the FF (1993) 3 factor model. Sentiment is defined as in Table 2. In this table we use 50% 50% cutoff points for optimistic and pessimistic sentiment. To test whether momentum profits on each sentiment state, respectively, are equal to 0, we regress the time series of everage monthly momentum profits on eACPMISMISTIC, and the periment charges visible, with only temperative profits on the Company of the periment charges o

		Momentum Portfolio											
Sentiment State		Sell 1	2	_3_	4_	_5_	_6_	_7_	_8_	9_	Buy 10	Buy – Sell	[t-Stat.]
Panel A. Raw													
OPTIMISTIC MILD PESSIMISTIC	(n = 121) (n = 233) (n = 91)	0.81 1.36 1.13	0.73 1.36 1.28	0.70 1.37 1.29	0.68 1.35 1.29	0.67 1.36 1.30	0.65 1.34 1.27	0.62 1.34 1.27	0.57 1.32 1.24	0.49 1.30 1.20	0.32 1.20 1.06 Opt. – Pes.	-0.49 -0.17 -0.06 -0.43	[-5.79] [-1.86] [-0.54] [-2.90]
Panel B. CAPI	И												
OPTIMISTIC MILD PESSIMISTIC	(n = 121) (n = 233) (n = 91)	0.96 0.78 0.37	0.85 0.83 0.59	0.80 0.86 0.63	0.77 0.86 0.65	0.76 0.87 0.67	0.73 0.85 0.65	0.71 0.84 0.65	0.66 0.82 0.60	0.60 0.77 0.53	0.48 0.62 0.33 Opt. – Pes.	-0.49 -0.17 -0.04 -0.45	[-6.26] [-1.83] [-0.33] [-3.12]
Panel C. FF													
OPTIMISTIC MILD PESSIMISTIC	(n = 121) (n = 233) (n = 91)	0.60 0.36 0.10	0.47 0.42 0.29	0.42 0.48 0.33	0.41 0.49 0.36	0.41 0.52 0.39	0.39 0.51 0.38	0.38 0.52 0.40	0.35 0.51 0.37	0.31 0.48 0.33	0.21 0.37 0.22 Opt. – Pes.	-0.38 0.01 0.13 -0.51	[-4.34] [0.14] [1.13] [-3.58]