The Effects of Central Bank Digital Currency Communication and Associated Social Media Sentiment on Cryptocurrency Markets

> Iulia Cioroianu, University of Bath Shaen Corbet, Dublin City University & University of Waikato Charles Larkin, University of Bath & Johns Hopkins University Les Oxley, University of Waikato









CBDCs and cryptocurrencies

- CBDCs seen as key disrupting forces against largely unchallenged cryptocurrency growth and development.
 - Removing channels of illicit behaviour.
 - Reducing non-transparent transactions.
- Does the development of CBDCs also imply increased regulation of cryptocurrency markets?
 - Not necessarily can in fact be seen as a direct and efficient alternative to regulatory provisions and legal enforcement.
- But research papers often link the need for increased regulation of digital money to the successful implementation of CBDCs.
- Also, countries have taken marked regulatory steps which coincided with CBDC pilot releases.
 - The People's Bank of China outlawed the issuance of all private digital currencies before piloting its national digital currency.

Research question and hypotheses

• We therefore expect CBDC announcements to have an impact on cryptocurrency markets.

RQ1: Do central bank announcements generate significant effects in relation to cryptocurrency returns and volatility?

 Based on market participant expectations, which previous research showed to be strongly driven by social media sentiment.

RQ2: Does the sentiment of social media posts about CBDCs have an impact on cryptocurrency products?

- We expect CBDC announcements and the sentiment of social media posts about CBDCs to be associated with:
 - reduced cryptocurrency returns
 - overall increases in volatility

Methodological approach

- Link data from three sources:
 - 210 blockchain and cryptocurrency-related ETF products
 - the release dates of CBDC-based research as circulated by six of the largest international central banks
 - social media coverage relating to CBDCs as measured by the polarity of Twitter posts mentioning CBDCs
- Test the scale and direction of market response in terms of
 - returns
 - volatility

using a generalized autoregressive conditionally heteroscedastic (GARCH) model.

•••••

Cryptocurrency data

- Thomson Reuters Eikon 210 funds based on either blockchain or cryptocurrency investment, 1 January 2017 -30 September 2021
- Returns measured as the daily log changes.
- Volatility measured as the five-day standard deviation.

Fund Type	Mean	Variance	Skewness	Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
Equity ETF	0.0040	0.0011	1.7306	25.1412	-0.2227	0.3178
Exchange-Traded Fund	0.0005	0.0016	-1.7714	8.1630	-0.2608	0.1173
Exchange-Traded Note	0.0045	0.0024	0.0120	13.8792	-0.3572	0.3983
Other Exchange-Traded Product	0.0039	0.0016	-0.6596	7.5798	-0.2675	0.2026
Open-End Fund	0.0037	0.0027	-0.0715	12.3390	-0.3262	0.3573
Geographic Region	Mean	Variance	Skewness	Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
Australia	0.0023	0.0037	-1.3619	9.9994	-0.3679	0.2786
Brazil	0.0033	0.0028	3.2498	27.7896	-0.1369	0.4344
Canada	0.0007	0.0023	1.1965	10.3929	-0.1401	0.3098
Germany	0.0036	0.0020	-0.8217	6.7561	-0.2942	0.2348
Netherlands	0.0024	0.0020	0.0131	1.7053	-0.1416	0.1561
Switzerland	0.0035	0.0018	-0.4419	14.8155	-0.3362	0.2877
United Kingdom	0.0103	0.0044	3.9241	24.1095	-0.1154	0.4815
United States	0.0039	0.0011	2.8285	37.3573	-0.2225	0.3488



Figure 1: Asset performance as separated by fund type



titise stigat stigat wijat wijat titigat titigat titigat titigat

Central bank communication data

- Studied the websites of the U.S. Federal Reserve, the European Central Bank, the Bank of England, the Bank of Japan, the Swiss National Bank, and the Bank of Canada
- Manually coded the dates of all releases relating explicitly to either CBDC or central bank-denoted cryptocurrencies.
- Time series relating to these announcements.

Figure 4: Major central bank mentions with regards to CBDC (2019-2021)



Figure 2: Social media data relating to CBDC



Twitter CBDC posts

- Twitter is one of the main platforms for cryptocurrency related discussion.
- Tweets mentioning the terms "CBDC", "#CBDC" and "central AND bank AND digital AND currency" were computationally collected through the Twitter v2 API
- 761,704 unique tweets
- Data aggregated by date
 - sums of the quantitative variables
 - aggregating the text



•••••

Twitter CBDC sentiment

- Sentiment expressed in the Twitter data measured using
 - Harvard General Inquirer IV-4 lexicon
 - Loughran and McDonald Financial Sentiment lexicon
- Measures computed for the daily-aggregated text of the tweets:
 - polarity number of positive terms minus the number of negative terms divided by the sum of positive and negative terms
 - subjectivity (affect) proportion of negative and positive terms relative to the total number of terms in the text.







i) Loughran and McDonald financial sentiment as separated by positivity and negativity

Econometric model

$$R_{t} = a_{0} + \sum_{j=1}^{5} b_{j}R_{t-j} + b_{2}DJ_{t} + b_{3}S_{t} + D_{reg} + \varepsilon_{t}$$
(1)

$$\varepsilon_t | \Omega_t \sim i.i.d. \quad N(0, h_t)$$
(2)

$$h_t = \omega + \alpha_1 h_{t-1} + \beta_1 u_{t-1}^2 \tag{3}$$

- GARCH (1,1) evaluating the concomitant influence of both sentiment and central banking announcements relating to CBDC.
 - R_{t-j} lagged value of the selected cryptocurrency-based fund returns, j number of periods before R_t
 - D_{reg} announcements made by major central banks
 - *S_t* sentiment.
 - Each of the two lexicons (LM and HI), using both the polarity and subjectivity measures.
 - *DJ_t* Dow Jones Industrial Average
- Identical model for volatility.
- Bonferroni corrections.

Significant estimates

	Returns						Volatility						
Fund Type	LM Pol.	HI Pol.	Reg.	LM Subj.	HI Subj.	Reg.	LM Pol.	HI Pol.	Reg.	LM Subj.	HI Subj.	Reg.	
Equity ETF	40.4%	41.2%	46.7%	48.1%	44.6%	56.9%	49.0%	53.1%	54.2%	55.2%	57.3%	52.1%	
Exchange-Traded Fund	16.7%	33.3%	33.3%	66.7%	16.7%	66.7%	33.3%	16.7%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	83.3%	
Exchange-Traded Note	34.3%	41.1%	46.0%	34.9%	47.6%	60.3%	34.9%	47.6%	60.3%	31.7%	68.3%	54.0%	
Other Exch-Traded Products	61.9%	76.2%	61.9%	78.6%	59.5%	85.7%	78.6%	59.5%	85.7%	59.5%	73.8%	66.7%	
Geographic Region	LM Pol.	HI Pol.	Reg.	LM Subj.	HI Subj.	Reg.	LM Pol.	HI Pol.	Reg.	LM Subj.	HI Subj.	Reg.	
Germany	42.6%	50.0%	63.2%	51.5%	58.8%	77.9%	51.5%	58.8%	77.9%	70.6%	83.8%	72.1%	
Switzerland	81.0%	71.4%	95.2%	95.2%	71.4%	71.4%	95.2%	71.4%	71.4%	61.9%	81.0%	76.2%	
United States	5.6%	7.2%	7.8%	7.8%	7.2%	13.9%	7.8%	7.2%	13.9%	15.6%	14.4%	17.8%	
Other	56.5%	53.2%	65.8%	66.5%	64.5%	77.4%	65.0%	64.5%	59.0%	54.8%	58.2%	87.1%	

- We find a statistically significant response to both returns and volatility at the 1% level in the aftermath of central bank announcements relating to CBDC in over half of all analysed funds.
- For sentiment:
 - highest proportion of statistically significant effects are for returns relating to other types of exchange-traded products, followed by equity ETFs
 - substantial volatility effects throughout.
- Significant regional differentials of response
 - Very large numbers of significant coefficients for Germany and Switzerland
 - Very low numbers of significant coefficients for the United States
 - Perceived weakness of any potential regulatory intervention?

Coefficient values

- Majority of estimates for polarity, as well as central bank announcements in the returns model are negative.
- Stronger observed average effects for central bank announcements.
- Both sentiment and central bank announcements relating to CBDC are found to significantly increase the volatility of analysed ETF-products (6.95% and 6.26%).



Conclusion



The sentiment of social media discussions surrounding CBDCs significantly reduces cryptocurrency-related ETF returns and increases short-term price volatility.



The influence of central bank announcements relating to CBDCs is even more pronounced.



Suggesting that the threat of future regulation, or thirdparty oversight, can generate significant concern among cryptocurrency investors. Central bank coordination and announcements in this space perceived by market participants as a signal that the use of cryptocurrencies for non-transparent transactions may become more difficult.