

# Retail investors and media psychology

**Ross Dahlke**

Method	koRpus	stringi
Word count	2592	2614
Character count	17556	17555
Sentence count	141	Not available
Reading time	13 minutes	13.1 minutes

## Abstract

## Introduction

Financial markets were recently upended by massive short squeezes of a cadre of stocks including GameStop, AMC Entertainment Holdings, BlackBerry, and Nokia. The recent events saw historic fluctuations in the prices of these stocks. Individual investors made tens-of-millions of dollars, often with leveraged positions. What is particularly unique about these events is that they were triggered by retail investors. These retail investors, bolstered by financial stimuli and an abundance of free time due to the COVID-19 pandemic, organized collective behavior actions on an internet forum, the Reddit subforum [r/WallStreetBets](#).

Media commentators quickly offered various perspectives on the events. Is this class warfare? A populist movement? Just some bored, lonely young men trying to make money? There is a deep pool of academic literature that explores the psychological motivations of retail investors and personal finance more broadly. For example: how gender, age, marital status, income, and other demographics impact trading behaviors (Kannadhasan 2015); how heuristics are used to build trust between individual and financial advisers (Monti et al. 2014); or how the psychological dimensions of financial anxiety,

optimism, financial security, deliberative thinking, interest in financial issues, and needs for precautionary savings all drive individual financial decisions (Talwar et al. 2021). In addition, there is a small, yet robust and powerful set of research on the impacts of media on financial markets. However, I am interest in the media psychology component of financial decisions. I am interested in how media impact financial markets in-so-much-as how the media effects, and is driven by, individual investors.

More broadly, my research investigates how individuals enter and participate in complex systems. In this case, the totality of the financial markets are beyond comprehension. Investors, particularly small, retail traders, are unlikely to ever fully understand the complex system of global finance. Yet, they do. And as is increasingly common, participants are coordinating activity in order to alter the systems that they participate in. As it pertains to retail investors, I ultimately want to know both *why* they participate in the markets, and more importantly, *how* they participate in the financial markets. What is the media ecology that individual investors are exposed to or seek out? How do novice traders come to trust the financial investment advice of various media outlets, communities, or individuals? What do people do after they lose their life savings in GameStop stock? How much time do retail investors devote to trading financial securities?

### *COVID-19 and Retail Traders*

The COVID-19 global pandemic has spurred a rise in retail investors that rivals the boom of retail investors during the internet bubble after the rise of discount stock brokerages. At the center of the rise in retail investors is Robinhood. Robinhood is a smart phone app and stock trading platform that offers free trading of stocks and other securities. While other trading platforms have since adopted free trading, Robinhood created and maintained a significant following by being the first to offer free trading, it's gamified user interface, and a target demographic of young, new investors. With Robinhood easing barriers of entry for new investors, financial stimuli from the government due to the pandemic, and

newly-found swathes of free-time, these retail investors grew in size and influence during the pandemic.

Retail investors now routinely account for 20% of stock market activity (Pagano et al. 2021) These retail investors on Robinhood significantly impact financial markets, particularly during COVID (Pagano, Sedunov, and Velthuis 2020). Users of Robinhood increased the amount of money they invested on the platform during the pandemic (Welch 2020). Robinhood traders primarily engage in both momentum and contrarian strategies where they invest in stocks that have already demonstrated rising price momentum and “buying the dip” where they buy stocks that have recently fallen in price, respectively (Pagano, Sedunov, and Velthuis 2020). In other words, Robinhood investors did not panic during broad market turmoil during COVID-19 and often used price drops as buying opportunities. However, in aggregate they do not produce an alpha, or “beat the market” by producing larger-than-average returns (Pagano et al. 2021). Their trades ultimately mostly produce noise in financial markets (Pagano et al. 2021). If all Robinhood investors do is create “noise” in the markets, then the noisiest they’ve been is when GameStop stock rose dramatically in early 2021.

### *GameStop*

In January and February 2021, a handful of stocks experienced an extreme “short-squeeze” which effectively sky-rocketed the prices of these stocks that was caused by decentralized retail investors acting in concert (Lyócsa, Baumöhl, and Vÿrost 2021). The largest movement was seen in GameStop which took most of the attention of the saga. Many investors, both individual and institutional, gained and lost significant sums of money. For a full recapping of the sequence of events, I recommend \_\_\_\_\_.

The GameStop saga provides support for the principle that market forces tend to make markets fair, “where fairness is defined as investors ‘getting what they pay for’ rather than investors ‘beating the market’ ” due to the apparent misvaluation of GameStop and

other stocks by institutional investors (Macey 2021). On the other hand, the events also cast doubt as to whether the SEC is achieving its stated goal of maintaining fair, orderly, and efficient markets" (Macey 2021).

The retail investors who caused the short squeeze organized on a subforum of the popular website of Reddit called "Wall Street Bets," or r/wallstreetbets (Lyócsa, Baumöhl, and Vÿrost 2021). As a result, the GameStop saga is seen as battle between Wall Street and small, Robinhood traders who are upset at Wall Street. The members of r/wallstreetbets maintained a sense of unity and purpose throughout the events (Muzio 2021). Regardless of whether the organized behavior of r/wallstreetbets users is a political movement, hopeful acts of "sticking it to hedgefunds" or something else, they have demonstrated their power to move financial markets (Muzio 2021). However, retail investors as whole both bought and "shorted"—or bet that GameStop stock was going to go down—indicating that "the Gamestop frenzy was not a pure digital protest against Wall Street but speculative trading by a group of retail investors, in line with their prior high-risk trading behavior" (Hasso et al. 2021).

#### *r/WallStreetBets*

Wall Street Bets is a subreddit where investors talk about their stock trades. The group is known for their risky "YOLO" (You Only Live Once) trades (Muzio 2021). There is a particular language and meme culture that permeates from the group and potentially helps to create their culture of "degeneracy" (Boylston et al. 2021). For example, they celebrate people with "diamond hands" as those who are prepared to hold to their stocks for a long time and decry "paper hands," those who miss out on profits by selling too a stock too early (Wallstreetbets News 2020). They maintain they are not "dumb," but they are "retarded" or "autists." Although these words are derogatory, they use it as a way to self-deprecate and build unity.

## Information and Media

Scholars have been particularly interested with the role of information on financial markets. Business researchers largely operate under the efficient market hypothesis where markets reflect accurate valuations based on available information. As such, they are primarily interested in whether information being spread about companies is timely or “stale” and the effects of media attention on stocks, media including television, newspaper, digital news, and social media on financial markets. Overall, media attention-driven behavior favors individuals buying stocks opposed to selling stocks (Barber and Odean 2007).

### *Newspapers*

Even though one may think of the stock market reacting to news instantaneously, media attention given to individual stocks via newspapers impact the pricing of the stock. The causal link between newspapers impacting trading prices and volumes was established by leveraging newspaper strikes and observing the subsequent impact on financial markets (Peress 2014). This effect persists for many days after public, and the impact is prolonged during a recession compared to an expansion (Antweiler and Frank 2006). However, not all coverage is good coverage. Stocks with little or no attention in newspapers earn higher returns than high-media-attention stocks (Fang and Peress 2009).

Stock market investors respond differently to new versus stale news—as defined by textual similarity of sequential newspaper stories. The prices of stocks respond less to stale news, but there is a reversal in the movement of a stock’s price after stale news, suggesting that initial movements are overreactions (Tetlock 2011). Further, quantitative information is easier for news readers to process compared to qualitative information (Engelberg 2008).

In addition, it is not just substantive news about a stock that impacts performance,

stock recommendations in the *Wall Street Journal's* "Dartboard" column predicted abnormal positive returns of 4% and double the trading volume over the two days after the column recommended a stock (Barber and Loeffler 1993). These market abnormalities are largely driven by naive investors and are ultimately noise in the financial markets. Price movements from the column were reversed within 15 days, and investors following the "expert" recommendations of the column lost 3.8% on a risk-adjusted basis in the six months following the recommendation (Liang 1999). These findings show that media content has a clear relationship with asset prices and should not be seen as a "sideshow," are consistent with the theoretical models of retail investors acting as noise in the financial ecosystem, and is inconsistent with the theory that media can serve as a proxy for new financial information that informs the efficient market on fundamental asset valuations (Tetlock 2007).

### *Television*

Similar to newspapers, the financial markets react to media content on television, often in real-time. When the TV program "The Morning Call" on *CNBC* reports analyst views on individual stocks, the market reacts within seconds, the price is fully incorporated within one minute, and trading intensity in the stock doubles within that first minute (Busse and Clifton Green 2002). "Mad Money with Jim Cramer" is a popular *CNBC* television show where the host, Jim Cramer, makes a bevy of buy and sell recommendations on stocks. There are significant price movements for stocks that Cramer recommends to buy and sell (Bolster, Trahan, and Venkateswaran 2012; Engelberg, Sasseville, and Williams 2012; Karniouchina, Moore, and Cooney 2009). The effects on the movement of stocks given a "buy" rating from Cramer are quickly reversed, but the effect persists longer for "sell" recommendations (Bolster, Trahan, and Venkateswaran 2012). The viewing ratings of the show even predicts the strength of the price movements (Engelberg, Sasseville, and Williams 2012). Further, traditional advertising variables, such as message length,

recency-primacy effects, information clutter, and source credibility all influence the size of the market reaction to a “buy” recommendation from Cramer (Karniouchina, Moore, and Cooney 2009), which potentially suggests that content consumers process media from financial pundits similarly to other types of advertising. Ultimately, these effects show that the investors taking actions from Cramer’s recommendations are uninformed traders and not experienced investors receiving any new information (Keasler and McNeil 2010).

### *Social Media*

As evidenced by the recent GameStop and r/wallstreetbets saga, social media is playing an increasing role in the way that individual investors collect, share, and process information that results in investment decisions. Literature on social media and the stock market fall into three broad categories: social media as a predictor of stock movements, crowd-sourced financial recommendation, and behavioral contagion/ herding.

First, social media has been used to try to predict fluctuations in individual stocks—with mixed results. The number of posts on TheRagingBull.com, one of the original stock message boards, in 2001 coincided with days with abnormally high trading volume, but they were not predictive of market pricing or volume after controlling for industry-adjusted returns or normal trading volume (Tumarkin and Whitelaw 2001). This result suggests that some other exogenous event is a confounder that drives both social media engagement and stock market volume. However, individual tweets just before a firm’s quarterly earnings announcement is a predictor of the earnings report and subsequent price action (Mohanram 2018). News diffusion on Twitter leads to lower bid-ask spread and price pressure during a news day, but the effect is reversed the next day (Ye 2016). Twitter, like traditional media, spreads stale news, albeit at a higher speed than traditional media (Ye 2016).

Other new media, including Yahoo! stock message boards (Das and Chen 2007) and Google Search Volume (Gao 2011) are all predictive of stock movements. Even disagree-

ments on StockTwits, a Twitter-like stock-based social media, predicts price changes by affecting trading done by uninformed investors and facilitates trading by informed traders who are taking actions aimed at changing corporate policies (Cookson, Fos, and Niessner 2021).

Next, social media have been studied as way to crowd source financial advice. For example, Seeking Alpha is a website where non-professional investors can write articles analyzing a stock. Seeking Alpha articles are predictors of stock market movements (Campbell, DeAngelis, and Moon 2019; Chen et al. 2014; Farrell et al. 2018). Estimote is an open platform that solicits forecasts from contributors. These crowdsourced forecasts are incrementally useful in forecasting earnings, and the higher the volume of forecasts, the more accurate the predictions are (Jame et al. 2016). SumZero.com is a private social networking site that facilitates interaction and information exchange among professional investors. Recommendations offered on this website generate significant returns in the financial markets, particularly, long-term returns are particularly strong for “contrarian” buy recommendations (Crawford et al. 2018).

Finally, social media can create “herding” by which there is behavioral contagion that flows through networks of investors via their connections on social media. Social network links increase disposition effects (Heimer 2016), which is the tendency to sell “winning” assets and hold onto “losing” assets (Shefrin and Statman 1985). Herding is particularly prominent on Robinhood (Barber et al. 2021). And the GameStop saga provides evidence for the idea of behavioral contagion among r/wallstreetbets users (Semenova and Winkler 2021). On StockTwits there is even evidence of echo chambers where users selectively expose themselves to other users who share positive or negative sentiments on specific stocks (Cookson, Engelberg, and Mullins 2020). The herding behavior found in online investor communities also happens in offline networks (Duflo and Saez 2002, 2003; Ivković and Weisbenner 2007; Musciotto et al. 2018; Shiller and Pound 1989). Potentially, this similarity between online and offline social behavioral contagion and add to the digitization



and social network literature.

## **Conclusion & Future Research**

The relationship between media, information, and the stock market is well studied. But approaching the topic from a media psychology angle provides new questions and avenues of study. It is unclear at what time intervals individual investors make trading decisions. How long do retail investors take before purchasing a stock? Does different types of information from sources of varying credibility impact the scale of time in making a decision? Taking a Lemkeian approach (2000) to understanding the temporal dimension of investment decisions could help to answer these questions.

Another area of future of research is into how the design of media and trading platforms impacts financial decisions. There has been a lot of speculation on how Robinhood's gamified interface spurs more and riskier trades. How does the design of financial platforms and financial media alter trading behaviors?

There is a defined relationship between media impacting the markets, but there is little research on the reverse: how do changing market dynamics alter information-seeking behaviors? What do people do when the market is having a good day? A bad day? How do people even go about getting information to make a trading decision? How is trust built between someone like Jim Cramer or a random Reddit user and investors?

Finally, digital technologies have fragmented the media experiences of users. Instead of sitting down at one's computer and intensely trading stocks, many users now pull up a trading app on their phone and casually trade. Are people using the Robinhood app for hours at a time? Unlikely, instead, it is more likely that there are short bursts of attention given to a trading app intertwined with other media. Can interacting with other types of media impact how one trades? Does trading behavior impact the other media that a trader consumes? All of these questions remain unanswered.

Scholars of financial markets have intensely studied the psychology of investing and

personal finance. They have also studied relationships between media and financial markets. But all of their research questions revolve on studying the markets as the outcome. Media psychologists can add to this area of research by studying individual behavior as the dependent variable.

## References

Antweiler, Werner, and Murray Z. Frank. 2006. "Do Us Stock Markets Typically Overreact to Corporate News Stories." In.

Barber, Brad M., Xing Huang, Terrance Odean, and Christopher Schwarz. 2021. "Attention Induced Trading and Returns: Evidence from Robinhood Users." *Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3715077> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3715077>.*

Barber, Brad M., and Douglas Loeffler. 1993. "The "Dartboard" Column: Second-Hand Information and Price Pressure." *The Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 28 (2): 273–84. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2331290>.

Barber, Brad M., and Terrance Odean. 2007. "All That Glitters: The Effect of Attention and News on the Buying Behavior of Individual and Institutional Investors." *The Review of Financial Studies* 21 (2): 785–818. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhm079>.

Bolster, Paul, Emery Trahan, and Anand Venkateswaran. 2012. "How Mad Is Mad Money? Jim Cramer as a Stock Picker and Portfolio Manager." *The Journal of Investing* 21 (2): 27–39. <https://doi.org/10.3905/joi.2012.21.2.027>.

Boylston, Christian, Beatriz Palacios, Plamen Tassev, and Amy Bruckman. 2021. "Wall-StreetBets: Positions or Ban." <http://arxiv.org/abs/2101.12110>.

Busse, Jeffrey A., and T. Clifton Green. 2002. "Market Efficiency in Real Time." *Journal of Financial Economics* 65 (3): 415–37. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-405X\(02\)00148-4](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-405X(02)00148-4).

Campbell, John L., Matthew D. DeAngelis, and James R. Moon. 2019. "Skin in the game: personal stock holdings and investors' response to stock analysis on social media."

*Review of Accounting Studies* 24 (3): 731–79. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11142-019-09498->.

Chen, Hailiang, Prabuddha De, Yu (Jeffrey) Hu, and Byoung-Hyoun Hwang. 2014. “Wisdom of Crowds: The Value of Stock Opinions Transmitted Through Social Media.” *The Review of Financial Studies* 27 (5): 1367–1403. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhu001>.

Cookson, J. Anthony, Joseph E. Engelberg, and William Mullins. 2020. “Echo Chambers.” *SocArXiv* 1, June. <https://doi.org/doi:10.31235/osf.io/n2q9h>.

Cookson, J. Anthony, Vyacheslav Fos, and Marina Niessner. 2021. “Does Disagreement Facilitate Informed Trading? Evidence from Activist Investors.” *Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3765092> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3765092>*.

Crawford, Steven, Wesley Gray, Bryan R. Johnson, and Richard A. Price. 2018. “What Motivates Buy-Side Analysts to Share Recommendations Online?” *Management Science* 64 (6): 2574–89. <https://doi.org/10.287/mnsc.2017.2749>.

Das, Sanjiv R., and Mike Y. Chen. 2007. “Yahoo! for Amazon: Sentiment Extraction from Small Talk on the Web.” *Management Science* 53 (9): 1375–88. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1070.0704>.

Duflo, Esther, and Emmanuel Saez. 2002. “Participation and investment decisions in a retirement plan: the influence of colleagues’ choices.” *Journal of Public Economics* 85 (1): 121–48. <https://ideas.repec.org/a/eee/pubeco/v85y2002i1p121-148.html>.

———. 2003. “The Role of Information and Social Interactions in Retirement Plan Decisions: Evidence from a Randomized Experiment\*.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 118 (3): 815–42. <https://doi.org/10.1162/00335530360698432>.

Engelberg, Joseph. 2008. “Costly Information Processing: Evidence from Earnings Announcements.” *AFA 2009 San Francisco Meetings Paper*, January. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/>

Engelberg, Joseph, Caroline Sasseville, and Jared Williams. 2012. “Market Madness? The Case of “Mad Money”.” *Management Science* 58 (2): 351–64. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41406393>.

Fang, Lily, and Joel Peress. 2009. “Media Coverage and the Cross-Section of Stock

Returns." *The Journal of Finance* 64 (5): 2023–52. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2009.01493.x>.

Farrell, Michael, T. Clifton Green, Russell Jame, and Stanimir Markov. 2018. "The Democratization of Investment Research and the Informativeness of Retail Investor Trading." Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3222841> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3222841>.

Gao, Zhi Da; Joseph Engelberg; Pengjie. 2011. "In Search of Attention." *The Journal of Finance* 66 (5): 1461–99. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2011.01679.x>.

Hasso, Tim, Daniel Müller, Matthias Pelster, and Sonja Warkulat. 2021. "Who Participated in the Gamestop Frenzy?" *TAF Working Paper No. 58*, February.

Heimer, Rawley Z. 2016. "Peer Pressure: Social Interaction and the Disposition Effect." *The Review of Financial Studies* 29 (11): 3177–3209. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhw063>.

Ivković, Zoran, and Scott Weisbenner. 2007. "Information Diffusion Effects in Individual Investors' Common Stock Purchases: Covet Thy Neighbors' Investment Choices." *The Review of Financial Studies* 20 (4): 1327–57. <https://doi.org/10.1093/revfin/hhm009>.

Jame, Russell, Rick Johnston, Stanimir Markov, and Michael C. Wolfe. 2016. "The Value of Crowdsourced Earnings Forecasts." *Journal of Accounting Research* 54 (4): 1077–1110. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-679X.12121>.

Kannadhasan, M. 2015. "Retail Investors' Financial Risk Tolerance and Their Risk-Taking Behaviour: The Role of Demographics as Differentiating and Classifying Factors." *IIMB Management Review* 27 (3): 175–84. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iimb.2015.06.004>.

Karniouchina, Ekaterina V., William L. Moore, and Kevin J. Cooney. 2009. "Impact of "Mad Money" Stock Recommendations: Merging Financial and Marketing Perspectives." *Journal of Marketing* 73 (6): 244–66. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20619072>.

Keasler, Terrill, and Chris McNeil. 2010. "Mad Money stock recommendations: market reaction and performance." *Journal of Economics and Finance* 34 (1): 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12140-010-9101-1>.

//doi.org/10.1007/s12197-008-9033-7.

Lemke, Jay L. 2000. "Across the Scales of Time: Artifacts, Activities, and Meanings in Ecosocial Systems." *Mind, Culture, and Activity* 7 (4): 273–90. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327884MCA0704/\\_03](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327884MCA0704/_03).

Liang, Bing. 1999. "Price Pressure: Evidence from the 'Dartboard' Column." *The Journal of Business* 72 (1): 119–34. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209604>.

Lyócsa, Štefan, Eduard Baumöhl, and Tomáš Vřrost. 2021. "YOLO Trading: Riding the Herd During the Gamestop Episode." *ZBW - Leibniz Information Centre for Economics, Working Paper*. <http://hdl.handle.net/10419/230679>.

Macey, Jonathan R. 2021. "Securities Regulation as Class Warfare." *Columbia Business Law Review, Forthcoming*, February. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3789706>.

Mohanram, Eli Bartov; Lucile Faurel; Partha S. 2018. "Can Twitter Help Predict Firm-Level Earnings and Stock Returns?" *The Accounting Review* 93 (3): 25–57. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2308/accr-51865>.

Monti, Marco, Vittorio Pelligra, Laura Martignon, and Nathan Berg. 2014. "Retail Investors and Financial Advisors: New Evidence on Trust and Advice Taking Heuristics." *Journal of Business Research* 67 (8): 1749–57. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2014.02.022>.

Musciotto, Federico, Luca Marotta, Jyrki Piilo, and Rosario N. Mantegna. 2018. "Long-Term Ecology of Investors in a Financial Market." *Palgrave Communication* 4 (1): 92.

Muzio, Tim Di. 2021. "GameStop Capitalism. Wall Street Vs. The Reddit Rally (Part 1)." *University of Wollongong Working Paper*, 1–13. <http://bnarchives.yorku.ca/673/>.

Pagano, Gregory W., Clifton T. Green, Brian Roseman, and Yanbin Wu. 2021. "Zero-Commission Individual Investors, High Frequency Traders, and Stock Market Quality." Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3776874> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3776874>, January. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3776874>.

Pagano, Michael S., John Sedunov, and Raisa Velthuis. 2020. "How Did Retail In-

vestors Respond to the Covid-19 Pandemic? The Effect of Robinhood Brokerage Customers on Market Quality." *Finance Research Letters, Forthcoming*, November. <https://doi.org/http://dx>

Peress, Joel. 2014. "The Media and the Diffusion of Information in Financial Markets: Evidence from Newspaper Strikes." *The Journal of Finance* 69 (5): 2007–43. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.12179>.

Semenova, Valentina, and Julian Winkler. 2021. "Reddit's Self-Organized Bull Runs." Available at <https://Mpra.ub.uni-Muenchen.de/105630/>.

Shefrin, Hersh, and Meir Statman. 1985. "The Disposition to Sell Winners Too Early and Ride Losers Too Long: Theory and Evidence." *The Journal of Finance* 40 (3): 777–90. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1985.tb05002.x>.

Shiller, Robert J., and John Pound. 1989. "Survey evidence on diffusion of interest and information among investors." *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 12 (1): 47–66. <https://ideas.repec.org/a/eee/jeborg/v12y1989i1p47-66.html>.

Talwar, Manish, Shalini Talwar, Puneet Kaur, Naliniprava Tripathy, and Amandeep Dhir. 2021. "Has Financial Attitude Impacted the Trading Activity of Retail Investors During the Covid-19 Pandemic?" *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* 58: 102341. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2020.102341>.

Tetlock, Paul C. 2007. "Giving Content to Investor Sentiment: The Role of Media in the Stock Market." *The Journal of Finance* 62 (3): 1139–68. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2007.01232.x>.

———. 2011. "All the News That's Fit to Reprint: Do Investors React to Stale Information?" *The Review of Financial Studies* 24 (5): 1481–1512. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhq141>.

Tumarkin, Robert, and Robert F. Whitelaw. 2001. "News or Noise? Internet Postings and Stock Prices." *Financial Analysts Journal* 57 (3): 41–51. <https://doi.org/10.2469/faj.v57.n3.2449>.

Wallstreetbets News. 2020. "Dissecting the Unique Lingo and Terminolgy Used in the

Subreddit R/Wallstreetbets." %22<https://www.wallstreetbets.shop/blogs/news/dissecting-the-unique-lingo-and-terminology-used-in-the-subreddit-r-wallstreetbets%22>.

Welch, Ivo. 2020. "The Wisdom of the Robinhood Crowd." *NBER Working Paper Series*, September. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w27866>.

Ye, Nitesh Chawla; Zhi Da; Jian Xu; Mao. 2016. "Information Diffusion on Social Media: Does It Affect Trading, Return, and Liquidity." *Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/Abstract=2935138> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2935138>*.