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## 1 Introduction

One of the basic questions of the macro-finance literature is the extent to which asset price movements can be explained by the arrival of fundamental information. Ross (1989) showed that in a no-arbitrage framework asset price volatility should be determined by fundamental news flow relating to the asset value. However, empirical work had trouble explaining asset price volatility by fundamental news only, both on the corporate and on the aggregate macroeconomic level (Officer, 1973; Roll, 1988; Schwert, 1989). This has led to considerable efforts in research to develop theories for non-fundamental sources of price fluctuations. ${ }^{1}$

Our paper relates to this general discussion with respect to the pricing of sovereign credit spreads: sovereign bond spreads and sovereign credit default swap (CDS) spreads. Both spreads include a default risk component, which compensates holders of risky sovereign bonds and CDS protection sellers for potential losses incurred in case the sovereign defaults. Default risk is partly rooted in domestic fundamentals as argued by theory ${ }^{2}$ and confirmed by findings of the empirical literature beginning with Edwards (1983). However, both the default risk component and sizable risk premia in sovereign spreads have been shown to be strongly related to external shocks, liquidity and risk pricing, which have weaker ties to fundamentals. ${ }^{3}$

The relative role that empirical papers attribute to fundamentals has varied by the data sample and empirical methodology used. Domestic fundamentals were usually found important in studies examining the variation of levels of sovereign spreads, whereas global factors and nonfundamentals appeared to be more important in explaining their changes. Our data corroborate these findings: even at the low, quarterly, frequency the macroeconomic variables commonly used to proxy fundamentals explain a minor, less than 10 percent, share of both sovereign CDS and bond spread changes.

We claim that the small explanatory power attributed to fundamentals could be a consequence of the inadequacy of such proxies to fully account for fundamentals. ${ }^{4}$ Some aspects of

[^0]fundamentals cannot well be measured (e.g. economic policy announcements, government funding liquidity), and most available proxies of fundamentals are backward-looking in nature and do not recover the expectations elements (neither baseline expectations nor tail risks) that are central to asset pricing.

To address this claim, in this paper we investigate the effect of fundamentals on sovereign credit spread changes by augmenting the traditional proxy set with text-based measures of the fundamental information flow created directly from articles of the Reuters news archive between 2007 and 2016. Financial news agencies, competing to serve their audience of investors, arguably write about all aspects of fundamentals that they perceive relevant for asset pricing. Hence, the news flow they generate is likely to contain information about asset prices missing from traditional macro variables. News coverage extends to both real and potential policy announcements, expectations regarding the outlook for fundamentals including possible adverse scenarios.

The idea of extracting information from financial media and using these to explain prices in various asset markets is not new (e.g. Roll, 1988, already used Dow Jones News Wire and Wall Street Journal stories between 1982 and 1987 to control for firm-specific fundamentals). In the past decade, however, increasing computational capacity and availability of text resources triggered a boom in research analyzing textual data using automated text mining techniques.

There are two key types of information extracted by textual analysis: topics (i.e. what is the text about) and tonality (whether the text reflects optimism/pessimism) both of which we need to explain asset price changes (topics to identify which country fundamentals are mentioned and tonality to identify its improvement or deterioration). ${ }^{5}$

It is easier to create topical indices, because most topics can be grasped by a few characteristic keywords. Consequently, the common approach runs search queries for these topical keywords and aggregates query matches into topical time series indices. ${ }^{6}$

Extracting the tonality of texts is more difficult. The widespread methodological approach is to use large, predefined dictionaries that classify adjectives into positive/negative categories. Documents can then be assigned a tonality score based on the particular set of words appearing within the document (the seminal paper in finance is Tetlock (2007) in this regard). ${ }^{7}$ One

[^1]problem with such full text tonality measures is that they become ambiguous if there are several relevant topics within a text (e.g. an article discussing an improving US real economy may also refer to a worsening current account or contrast the US improvement with a deteriorating economy elsewhere). Another basic and often noted problem with predefined dictionaries is that tonality words are context-specific: some words may have a positive connotation in one context but may be irrelevant in others. ${ }^{8}$ Moreover, some of the most important verbs and adjectives that determine tonality signs depend on the specific topical expression (e.g. 'increase' and 'high' denote improvement of real economy fundamentals if the topical expressions is 'employment' but a deterioration if it is 'unemployment').

Our approach aims to provide a remedy for these problems. Namely, we define search queries that jointly match topical and tonality keywords within articles relying on a technique using so-called regular expressions. We use this method to identify fundamental topic expressions, assign each a tonality score based on tonality expressions close by and link such topic - tonality pairs to the closest geographical keyword. We explicitly define and search for topic and tonality expression pairs, which ensures taking into account the context- and expression-dependence of word tonality. Extracting expressions this way also overcomes the ambiguity problem, because it permits identifying several topic-tonality pairs within each text. The method is detailed in Section 3 and appendices.

We use this approach to find fundamental expression matches within news articles, each such match being a triplet of fundamental topic - tonality score - geography. We aggregate the tonality scores of these triplets to construct time series indices of seven different fundamental topics (real economy; external position; fiscal solvency; government funding liquidity; financial sector health; political-institutional strength; monetary policy stance) for a large cross-section of geographical units ( 88 countries and 11 regions). ${ }^{9}$

Our news indices are by construction related to fundamentals because each expression contains topical keywords identifying one of the seven fundamental categories. The only way the indices will differ from zero is having articles in which (topical) keywords related to fundamentals are matched. ${ }^{10}$ Nevertheless it is still an empirical issue to test, whether the indices are successful

[^2]in picking up enough fundamental expressions within texts and that they correctly return tonality information. In Section 5 we document that the constructed news indices are significantly correlated with other proxies of fundamentals derived from a large data set on macroeconomic announcements and surveys available from Bloomberg. Further, to show that it is really fundamental information that our indices measure, we examine the correlations between our news indices and two proxies of non-fundamental sources of price variation identified in the literature, the noise index proposed by Hu, Pan and Wang (2013) and the sentiment index of Baker and Wurgler (2006) and we find them to be insignificant.

Returning to our primary research question, we test the explanatory power of our news indices in panel regressions of sovereign credit spread changes in the 2007-2016 period on a cross-section of 58 emerging market and developed countries. Our key finding is that allowing for news dramatically increases the proportion of spread changes that can be explained by fundamentals. This suggests that the underestimation of the fundamental information flow when one only uses traditional macro variables is quantitatively significant. Further, we find that the relationship between fundamental news and CDS spread changes is mainly expressed through the global component of news. We also find that fundamental news can account for a significant fraction of the covariation between sovereign CDS spread changes and the VIX index, previously documented in the literature. ${ }^{11}$

The paper is structured as follows. The next section presents the data used including some basic properties of the news data set. Section 3 provides more details on our methodology through several working examples. Section 4 describes properties of the constructed news indices. Section 5 assesses the validity of the constructed news indices as proxies for fundamentals. In Section 6 we test the explanatory power of our news indices in panel regressions of sovereign credit spreads. The last section summarizes the contributions of our research.

## 2 Data

We use several data sets in our analysis:

- news article texts (Reuters)
- traditional macroeconomic data (World Bank, IMF)

[^3]- macroeconomic announcements and economist surveys (Bloomberg)
- financial indicators (Bloomberg and Datastream)
- various other indices compiled by other researchers

We first describe macroeconomic and financial data sources and turn to news article texts in the second part of this section. Other indices used are described in later sections when they are used.

### 2.1 Macroeconomic and financial data

We use the three types of sovereign credit spread indicators that have most often been used in the empirical literature. Our primary measure are CMA sovereign CDS spreads sourced from Bloomberg. These have the benefit that they are available for a large cross-section of countries. A drawback is that, for several sovereigns including many developed countries CDS spread time series quotes began later than the start of our news sample (notably during 2007 or early 2008). For robustness purposes therefore, we also estimate each panel regression on dollar- or eurodenominated bond spreads which are based on the JP Morgan EMBI Global bond spreads (sourced from Datastream) for emerging markets and interest rate spreads compared to the German Bunds for eurozone countries (sourced from Bloomberg).

We choose (traditional) macroeconomic variables in line with the empirical sovereign risk literature beginning with the paper of Edwards (1983), which first used regressions of sovereign credit spreads on macroeconomic variables ${ }^{12}$, and followed by a vast number of studies since. We use a quarterly frequency, because some of the most important variables are available at this frequency.

In particular, we use panel data on real GDP growth; current account to GDP ratios; reserves to GDP ratios; IMF WEO 1-year-ahead projected fiscal balance to GDP ratios; public debt ratios and per capital GDP. As a measure of the global economic outlook we use IMF WEO 1-yearahead world real GDP growth rate projections. IMF World Economic Outlook projections are available bi-annually, per capita GDP levels are available annually: these are interpolated to quarterly frequency.

We also added Bloomberg macroeconomic announcements and survey data to our analysis (data of 'ECO' screens). This is useful to gauge the daily surprises in macroeconomic announcements in comparisons with our news index measures. To make Bloomberg published indicators comparable across countries and indicators, we use their normalized form, i.e. subtracting the 2007-2016 sample means and scaling by standard deviation. When we form the surprise component (actual value minus survey), the means drop out. Formally, for an indicator type $j$, country $i$, the surprise value on day $t$, is calculated according to:

[^4]\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{i j t}^{(\text {surprise })}=S I G N_{X j} \frac{X_{i j t}^{(\text {actual })}-X_{i j t}^{(\text {survey })}}{\sigma_{X_{i, 22007-2016}}} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

The nominal value of the surprise (actual minus survey value) is scaled by the 2007-2016 standard deviation of the given indicator of the given country. The surprises are adjusted for the sign $\left(S I G N_{X j}\right)$ to be in line with our news tonality indicators: an increase denoting improvements, a decrease denoting deterioration.

We use aggregates of the so-created daily series for two categories: REAL (relating to real economic growth) and EXTERN (external position). When no BBG publications (with surveys) are available for a given country and category, the surprise index takes the value of zero.

Regarding global financial indicators we again refer to the empirical literature and two financial market indicators, the CBOE VIX index and the CSI US corporate BBB/Baa yield to Treasury spreads (high yield spreads), which have often been used in empirical research to proxy fluctuations in risk pricing and investor sentiment.

Appendix A lists macroeconomic and financial data sources.

### 2.2 The news data set

The news indices we create are based on the body of news article items in the Reuters news archives. At the time of writing the Reuters news archives is publicly available online ${ }^{13}$ and spans the period between the beginning of 2007 up to the current date. The news sample we use ends on 31 October 2016. The news data set contains about 3.9 million articles in this period after removing articles without date stamps or text bodies.

The reason that we chose the Reuters news archives is that it contains a large, publicly accessibly, edited text corpus with news items that target and reach global investors. Reuters has a large number of news items relevant in terms of containing information about country fundamentals, which is important for the construction of meaningful news indices. Google search or social media (Facebook, Twitter) data may be magnitudes larger in gross size but they have the disadvantage of a very low hit ratio of relevant information for institutional investors. ${ }^{14}$ Among the relevant large financial media outlets, Reuters is one of the most read news agencies. Reuters - along with Bloomberg and CNBC - are more focused on the interests of non-retail,

[^5]Table 1: Descriptive statistics of filtered news data

|  | Subsamples | Number of news items | Daily average of news items | Standard deviation of daily news items | Std.dev.of daily news items based on weekly moving averages ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Total Reuters news / filtered news |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  | 1042109 | 290 | 161 | 61 | 3.75 |
| years | 2007 | 83952 | 230 | 119 | 34 | 4.53 |
|  | 2008 | 120607 | 330 | 176 | 64 | 3.46 |
|  | 2009 | 119972 | 329 | 177 | 53 | 3.73 |
|  | 2010 | 106940 | 293 | 153 | 36 | 3.60 |
|  | 2011 | 120454 | 330 | 171 | 44 | 3.41 |
|  | 2012 | 130448 | 356 | 192 | 51 | 3.25 |
|  | 2013 | 102956 | 282 | 150 | 39 | 3.49 |
|  | 2014 | 94335 | 258 | 130 | 33 | 3.91 |
|  | 2015 | 91265 | 250 | 136 | 39 | 4.05 |
|  | 2016 | 71180 | 233 | 123 | 28 | 4.86 |
| months | January | 85097 | 275 | 157 | 66 | 3.67 |
|  | February | 85693 | 303 | 156 | 55 | 3.84 |
|  | March | 94303 | 304 | 164 | 58 | 3.64 |
|  | April | 86281 | 288 | 160 | 57 | 3.89 |
|  | May | 86626 | 279 | 154 | 50 | 4.07 |
|  | June | 89024 | 297 | 162 | 58 | 3.61 |
|  | July | 85196 | 275 | 151 | 51 | 3.91 |
|  | August | 81302 | 262 | 144 | 46 | 4.02 |
|  | September | 90584 | 302 | 163 | 56 | 3.55 |
|  | October | 98408 | 317 | 173 | 67 | 3.75 |
|  | November | 84634 | 313 | 170 | 57 | 3.73 |
|  | December | 74961 | 269 | 164 | 78 | 3.33 |
| days | Monday | 173285 | 337 | 85 | 61 | 3.65 |
|  | Tuesday | 194056 | 378 | 101 | 61 | 3.65 |
|  | Wednesday | 204598 | 399 | 88 | 61 | 3.65 |
|  | Thursday | 209248 | 408 | 95 | 61 | 3.69 |
|  | Friday | 187739 | 366 | 91 | 61 | 3.63 |
|  | Saturday | 34000 | 66 | 19 | 61 | 5.23 |
|  | Sunday | 39183 | 76 | 22 | 61 | 4.85 |

Sources: Reuters news archives and authors' calculations.
Notes: Descriptive statistics of news items filtered by relevance and duplication.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Weekly moving average applied to the filtered daily news count series. This removes intra-week variation but still accounts for inter-week variations.
global investors (the investor group relevant in sovereign credit markets) than other popular financial media sources such as the Financial Times or The Wall Street Journal.

Even the Reuters news data set has only about one in five articles that contain relevant information about country fundamentals. Much of the remaining articles are about individual companies that are not relevant on the macroeconomic scale or about non-economics topics such as sports, entertainment, technology, etc. After preprocessing the data we remove irrelevant news items as well as duplicate versions of news as described in Appendix B. The removal of irrelevant and duplicate items reduces the number of articles to roughly a million news items or about 300 items a day, 2000 a week.

Descriptive analysis of the news data set reveals some important features (see Table 1). There is a considerable seasonality in published news items according mainly to the day of the week: daily news counts on weekends are about a fifth of those on working days (there is no considerable heterogeneity between working days or the two days of the weekend - reported in the
bottom panel of the table). There are relatively more relevant items on weekdays, as sports and entertainment make up a larger share of news on weekends. A weekly moving average reduces variance significantly due to this seasonality. The moving average has a standard deviation of 61 news items in contrast to the raw series standard deviation of 161 items.

Both the number of total published news and relevant news items related are affected by holiday seasons (news counts decrease in December and in summer months), however, as Table 1 reveals, this is of a considerably smaller source of variation. News publication aggregates have fluctuated across the years, with news counts increasing during the crisis years, 2008-2009 and 2011-2012. Most of the increase in total news in these periods is due to the increase in relevance filtered news items (in these periods the ratio of total/filtered news decreases, see last column of Table 1). Presuming that Reuters closely follows changing investor interests, investors have spent more of their time in these periods trying to stay informed about news on macro fundamentals relative to company-specific news and news related to leisure.

## 3 News index methodology

To construct the fundamental news indices we proceed in two steps. In the first step (discussed next), we identify fundamental expression matches within all news articles. Each of these expressions are a triplet of a fundamental topic, a tonality score and a geographic reference. In the second step (discussed at the end of the section), we aggregate tonality scores to recover news index time series for each fundamental of each geographical unit.

### 3.1 Matching fundamental expressions

The triplets of fundamental news expressions contain a tonality score (integers in the range [$3,3]$ ), a geographic reference (one of 88 countries and 11 regions, see Appendix table C. 3 for a listing), and fundamental topic reference to one of the following seven concepts:

- REAL: real economic growth and level of development (e.g. real GDP growth, GDP per capita, industrial output, housing market, household consumption, retail sales, labor market developments, references to recession, economic crisis)
- EXTERN: external position (e.g. exports, imports, current account balance, currency reserves, external debt stock to GDP)
- FISCAL: fiscal sustainability (e.g. taxes, government spending, fiscal balance, public debt ratio)
- FUND_LIQ: government funding liquidity (e.g. demand at bond auctions, oncoming debt obligations, repayments, roll over risk, maturity structure and FX share of debt, availability of international official lending and disbursements of foreign aid)
- BANK: financial sector health (e.g. capital adequacy, ROA, ROE, NPLs, balance sheet mismatches, funding liquidity, liquidity injections, bank bailouts)
- POL_INST: political stability, institutional strength (e.g elections, minority government, government or coalition breakdowns, political crisis, coups, revolution, terrorism; strength of market institutions and democratic institutions, rule of law, transparency, corruption)
- MON_POL: monetary policy stance (e.g. central bank rate changes, hawkish-dovish stance, quantitative easing, liquidity injections, FX market interventions)

Regarding tonality, a positive sign denotes improvement in each of the first six categories. Regarding monetary policy, positive sign is defined as easing monetary conditions (increasing quantitative easing, but decreasing interest rates). Conversely, tonality is negative for deterioration of fundamentals and it is zero in case of expressions where the tone is ambiguous or neutral. ${ }^{1516}$

Fundamental expression definitions specify the topic and tonality keywords and their joining rules. Each fundamental expression definition consists of 1-4 expression elements (usually one refers to tonality the others identify the topic) and an expression rule that specifies how far the expression elements can be from each other and whether or not the order that expression elements appear in matters. Definitions of all fundamental expressions are listed in Tables C.5 and C. 6 of Appendix C.

We present the procedure of matching fundamental topics and tonality in news articles on a couple of working examples. We turn to adding geographic references later.

### 3.2 Example 1: simple expression on the housing market

The first fundamental expression in Table C. 5 aims to match sentences that refer to a housing market bubble bursting. Whenever such an expression is found in an article, this registers a negative score for the REAL fundamental of the respective country, since housing market busts represent an adverse development in the real economy.

The expression has two elements (1) 'N_HOUSE' which is a synonym label (explained below) and (2) 'bust|burst' which represents either of the words 'bust' or 'burst'. The expression also has an expression rule that specifies that 'N_HOUSE' and 'bust|burst' can be a maximum of three words apart. ${ }^{17}$

[^6]The example highlights the two key ideas of our methodology with which we aim to accommodate the flexibility of language:

- First, we operate with a large set of synonym labels, such as 'N_HOUSE' in the example. These labels represent synonymous words or n-grams that are often used interchangeably in financial news. The labels are inserted into news articles in front of the synonyms that they represent. For example, the label 'N_HOUSE' would be inserted in front of the nouns 'house', 'housing', 'dwelling', 'property' and the bi-gram 'real estate' and plural forms of these, thus representing a total of 9 n -grams. This is useful because 'N_HOUSE' can then be a shorthand for 'house | houses | housing | dwelling ...' in expression rules. The complete enumeration of the 9 n -grams is impractical and all the more so, because these synonyms are part of several other expressions as well. Further, many verbal and adjective synonym lists are much longer then the list encompassed by 'N_HOUSE' and are more frequent elements of fundamental expressions. ${ }^{18}$ All synonym labels are listed in Table C. 1 and their elements in Table C. 2 and Table C.3.
- The second idea is to have distance rules for expression elements, which is the key to linking fundamental topics (e.g. reference to the housing market) to their tonality expressions (e.g. bust or burst: as being an adverse development). These rules are flexible enough to capture expressions even when there are other words that wedge in between expression elements (it will match phrases 'housing (bubble has|will) burst', 'property (market) bust' and so on) without the need to specify such interim words. For this simple example explicit listing is perhaps only cumbersome. However, for expressions that involve 3-4 elements and possibly span long sentences, explicitly defining exact phrases becomes infeasible. On the other hand, expression rules provide a limit to the maximum distance that expression elements can be. This is important because the closer expression elements are to each other the more probable that they are in the proper semantic relationship: e.g that the words 'bust' or 'burst' really appear in the text referring to the housing market.


### 3.3 Example 2: more complex expression on the housing market

A more complex expression, and one that is more representative of most fundamental expressions that we use, is shown in Figure 1. In contrast to the previous example, this expression aims to
order possible); and the fourth argument specifies maximum distance ( 0 : Maximum three words in between and no commas, no full stops, no paragraph breaks. 1: Maximum ten words in between and no full stops, no paragraph breaks. 2: Maximum fifteen words in between and no full stops, no paragraph breaks. 3: any number of words in between but no paragraph breaks.).
For this example the expression code is ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) which stands for p 1 : ' $\mathrm{N} \_$_HOUSE', p 2 : 'bust|burst', 1 : only this order, 0 : maximum three words and no punctuation marks in between. Technically this code is converted into the regular expression:
"(N_HOUSE) $\left(\left([A-O Q-z] \backslash w^{*} \backslash s\right)\{0,3\} ?\right)$ (bust|burst)".
${ }^{18}$ Consider for instance synonyms of the verb 'increase' that are captured by the synonym label 'V_RISE'. 'Increase' and its synonyms are very frequent in financial news and may denote tonality for several fundamental topics from GDP growth rates to central bank rates, government debt or political instability to name just a few.

Figure 1: Example of a positive real economy expression


Notes: This specific example refers to an improvement in the housing market. The first two components of the expression encompass a variety of ways to refer to the housing market and its indicators, whereas the third component represents ways to refer to an improvement, increase (verbs) or an improved, increased state (adjectives).
This fundamental expression is matched in articles where each of the three components are found (within the specified word distance bounds and in the given word ordering). Namely, the first component (the label 'N_HOUSE') has to be a maximum three words away from any of the 7 elements of the second component and either of the first two components has to be maximum 10 words away from any elements of the third component.
As seen here, expression elements may be words (e.g. 'construction', 'market') or they may be labels (e.g. 'N_HOUSE', 'V_RISE', 'A_BETTER'). Labels are inserted into the text in front of synonymous words. Labels serve to condense such synonym lists and thus make expression rules simpler. The figure shows the synonym lists for four labels.
recover more general references to the housing market or its indicators improving, increasing or generally being mentioned together with adjectives that reflect an improved or increased state. To arrive at specific statements about favorable conditions in the housing market we need references to the housing market or its indicators (accomplished by components 1 and 2) and adjectives or verbs that refer to their state (component 3).

Again we use synonym labels to cut the list of synonymous ways to refer to housing indicators shorter: we insert the synonym labels 'N_HOUSE' in front of the words mentioned above and 'N_NUMBER' in front of words referring to synonyms of indicators (see figure). Seven other synonym labels for verb lists and seven more for adjective lists are used in the expression. For
example, 'V_ACCELERATE' is a synonym label for 8 n -grams (see figure) and their conjugated forms (e.g. 'accelerates', 'accelerated', 'accelerating'). Since these synonym labels are inserted into the text in front of the words they represent, instead of referring to original words, we can just use their synonym labels as shorthand in the expression rules. ${ }^{19}$

Another important benefit of using labels for synonyms is that many synonym labels are appropriate to use in many different expressions. This is especially the case for popular verbs and adjectives, examples of which are represented as component 3 in Figure 1. Because synonym groups need to be defined only once and their labels can be reused in many expression definitions, this approach substantially reduces both computer code and runtime. Notably, both are reduced from unfeasible to feasible ranges. ${ }^{20}$

Appendix tables list all synonym labels used (Table C.1) and their constituent n-grams (Table C. 2 and C.3).

### 3.4 Using intermediate expressions to represent more complex structures

Although expressions such as the ones in the previous example make up most of the fundamental expressions we match, a significant shortcoming of these is that they cannot capture information within phrases that refer to concerns, surprises, expectations. First, this information is potentially highly important for asset pricing and therefore our particular application. Second, not accounting for these increases noise in tonality identification, because verbs may be attached to these phrases instead of the fundamental topic (e.g. 'concerns increased about economic growth').

The methodology for identifying fundamental expressions can be applied for intermediate expressions. Intermediate expressions are defined via similar expression rules (e.g one such rule would require synonyms of concern and increase, labels 'N_CONCERN' and 'V_RISE', close to each other). All intermediate expression definitions are listed in Appendix Table C.4.

Searching through all articles, we insert an intermediate expression label for each match, i.e where the intermediate expression rule is satisfied. Having these in the text, then, we can use intermediate expression labels just like synonym labels in fundamental expressions.

[^7]Figure 2: Examples of intermediate expressions


Notes: The figure shows the construction and use of eight sample intermediate expressions (bottom panel left column). Intermediate expression are matched in the text where relevant noun and adjective/verb synonym labels (component 1 and component 2) are within tight proximity bounds of each other. The upper part of the figure lists n-grams that the labels represent (without conjugation). The bottom panel shows the sample applications of the intermediate expressions within fundamental expressions.

Figure 2 lists eight intermediate expressions each composed of a noun label (component 1) and an adjective or verb label (component 2). The goal of these intermediate expressions are the same as those of synonym labels, to condense the many possible ways of expressing similar semantic content into a few expression labels. These expression labels can then be used in various contexts relating to all fundamental expressions, as some examples in the figure show.

These intermediate expressions alone do not form fundamental expressions. They have to be linked to n-grams or labels that relate to fundamental concepts. For instance, increasing worries about high levels (or increases) of credit spreads or mounting concerns about Greece would not qualify as fundamental expressions without a valid reference to fundamentals. They would however qualify, if references to the banking sector, government finances or political instability were within the word distances imposed by proximity rules. This is important, because we want to extract textual information which relate to fundamentals and avoid recovering those referring to price changes induced by non-informational trading.

### 3.5 Adding geographic labels to matched fundamental expressions

Finally, fundamental expressions are completed by matching geographic labels to the extracted fundamental topic and tonality pairs using the following rule. If there is a geographic label within the expression (the text running from the first constituent to the last constituent of the fundamental expression), we use that one. If this is not available, then we check the last geographic label in the text preceding the expression. This rests on the observation that articles usually mention the reference to the country name they write about at the outset and in most cases there are rarely repeated references to the country afterwards. If there is no geographic label before the expression, we check for the first one following it. If no geographic label is found, the fundamental expression is discarded. ${ }^{21}$

### 3.6 Constructing news indices from matched expressions

Our news indices are time series of tonality scores for seven fundamentals of 99 geographic units. For a given time period each index aggregates fundamental expression tonality scores for the respective fundamental topic and respective country/region:

$$
\begin{equation*}
N_{i j t}=\sum_{d \in D_{t}} \sum_{k} S_{i j d k} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $N_{i j t}$ denotes the news index for fundamental $j$ of country $i$ in period $t$ and $S_{i j d k}$ are tonality scores of fundamental expressions within news items. The inner sum aggregates the tonality scores of all fundamental expressions, $k$, within an article $d$. The outer sum aggregates these article tonality scores across all articles published on the given day, $D_{t}$.

We also construct four types of subindices (for each fundamental and each geographic unit) that we use in some applications in the paper. These subindices aim to group fundamental expressions on the basis of how they relate to fundamentals. The first (CHANGE) comprises expressions that contain verbs or intermediate expressions that convey the change in fundamentals (e.g. 'unemployment rose'). The second groups expressions that contain reference to expectations, predictions of fundamentals (EXPECT: e.g. 'unemployment is expected to rise'). The third collects expressions that relate fundamentals to previous expectations (SURPRISE: e.g. 'unemployment rose more than expected'). The fourth groups expressions involving intermediate expressions relating to concerns, hopes, probabilities, risks of fundamental scenarios (CONCERN: e.g. 'decreasing concerns about the rise in unemployment'). Most occurrences belong to the first (CHANGE) and fourth (CONCERN) groups. Table C. 7 reports expression occurrences in the text based on the these groupings for each fundamental category. About half of all identified fundamental expressions do not belong to any of the above groups. These usually

[^8]express the state of the fundamental as they were at the time of writing or refer to the history of fundamentals.

Finally, we also create time series (for each fundamental and geographic unit) that we refer to as news counts and which aggregate the number of fundamental expressions, instead of their tonality scores. These are similar to topical indices that are frequent in the literature. They show which fundamentals and countries the media paid attention to at a given point in time, but do not reveal anything about the "sign" of the fundamental.

## 4 Properties of news indices

Table 2 reports basic descriptive statistics of weekly fundamental news indices and news counts. ${ }^{22}$ Weekly news indices were always negative for the politics-institutions category (aggregated for all countries) and most of the time for government liquidity news. Regarding these fundamentals, it could be said that "no news is good news". Monetary policy news tonality was tilted more toward the positive side (which denotes easy conditions by our definition). Weekly indices of other fundamentals were more evenly divided between positive and negative tone periods.

Based on news counts (right panel) most fundamental expressions were related to the real economy and politics-institutions categories, whereas we extracted the least fundamental expressions on government funding liquidity, the banking system ${ }^{23}$ and the external position. This masks a large positive skew in the distribution for news counts of banking sector and government liquidity position fundamentals, though. The maxima reveal that there were several weeks when these latter fundamentals appeared to be highly important.

In terms of geographies, US news indices were by far the most frequent in the sample. Fundamental news counts about the UK, China and Japan followed. Regarding the eurozone, references to the fundamentals of the whole region was more frequent than references to any single member countries. Greek news stands out from the latter, single country news counts. Distribution of news indices were positively skewed for most countries: for most weeks the fundamental information flow was well below average with rare spikes of attention. This was especially true of news counts of smaller countries and crisis countries, which rarely came into the spotlight, but there was a deluge of news about them in those moments.

Table 3 reports the shares of fundamental expressions. In panel A, consistent with the weekly statistics seen in Table 2, real economy and politics-institutions comprised most expression matches. On the full sample of the Reuters archive these two categories together took up about 60 percent of all matched expressions. As mentioned in Section 2, there was a substantial

[^9]Table 2: Descriptive statistics of weekly news indices and news counts

|  | News indices |  |  |  | News counts |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | mean | std | min | max | mean | std | min | max |
|  | by fundamental category |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REAL | -29.0 | 1033.6 | -4018.0 | 2731.0 | 4638.9 | 1771.0 | 1059.0 | 10110.0 |
| EXTERN | 44.8 | 127.9 | -431.0 | 996.0 | 938.2 | 371.3 | 244.0 | 2724.0 |
| FISCAL | 3.4 | 243.0 | -1158.0 | 1109.0 | 1519.1 | 1003.9 | 176.0 | 7059.0 |
| FUND_LIQ | -131.8 | 185.9 | -1630.0 | 28.0 | 236.0 | 255.0 | 10.0 | 2062.0 |
| BANK | -64.3 | 251.8 | -1128.0 | 649.0 | 836.7 | 577.2 | 11.0 | 4757.0 |
| POL_INST | -2091.5 | 929.8 | -7304.0 | -580.0 | 2982.7 | 1156.4 | 896.0 | 8476.0 |
| MON_POL | 373.0 | 592.4 | -1483.0 | 3448.0 | 1490.0 | 686.0 | 259.0 | 4664.0 |
|  | by geography |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GLOBAL | -140.7 | 251.2 | -1981.0 | 495.0 | 884.9 | 530.9 | 116.0 | 4639.0 |
| EUROZONE | 59.5 | 254.5 | -884.0 | 1821.0 | 669.7 | 559.4 | 8.0 | 3633.0 |
| US | -91.8 | 719.7 | -3822.0 | 2037.0 | 3505.2 | 1583.0 | 607.0 | 7966.0 |
| CHINA | -35.4 | 179.2 | -884.0 | 1664.0 | 691.4 | 437.9 | 31.0 | 3614.0 |
| JAPAN | 105.6 | 171.9 | -466.0 | 751.0 | 498.6 | 296.6 | 15.0 | 1931.0 |
| UK | -44.3 | 233.2 | -2035.0 | 907.0 | 817.3 | 444.0 | 72.0 | 3517.0 |
| GERMANY | 2.8 | 73.8 | -434.0 | 380.0 | 217.9 | 142.0 | 2.0 | 1090.0 |
| SPAIN | -37.8 | 82.6 | -888.0 | 97.0 | 180.6 | 273.0 | 0.0 | 2248.0 |
| ITALY | -24.8 | 62.4 | -972.0 | 107.0 | 141.8 | 177.9 | 0.0 | 1964.0 |
| GREECE | -77.3 | 218.3 | -2769.0 | 190.0 | 370.5 | 590.1 | 0.0 | 5001.0 |
| ARGENTINA | -11.6 | 30.0 | -262.0 | 46.0 | 47.0 | 48.8 | 0.0 | 434.0 |
| ICELAND | -1.7 | 19.4 | -275.0 | 64.0 | 10.9 | 31.8 | 0.0 | 367.0 |
| CYPRUS | -1.1 | 15.5 | -280.0 | 38.0 | 18.3 | 85.7 | 0.0 | 1552.0 |
| BRAZIL | -18.2 | 65.1 | -910.0 | 172.0 | 151.3 | 109.4 | 0.0 | 1098.0 |
| RUSSIA | -112.1 | 145.0 | -1082.0 | 78.0 | 259.2 | 202.6 | 20.0 | 1328.0 |
| INDIA | -9.7 | 89.3 | -447.0 | 271.0 | 194.4 | 114.4 | 8.0 | 683.0 |
| TURKEY | -56.1 | 92.3 | -1054.0 | 57.0 | 119.1 | 123.3 | 0.0 | 1446.0 |

Sources: Reuters news archives and authors' calculations.
Notes: News indices are constructed by summing tonality scores of all fundamental expressions matched within the period (each week). News counts are constructed by summing the number of fundamental expression matches within the period (each week). The upper panel displays the fundamental category news indices/news counts aggregated across all geographies. In the lower panel the geography category news indices/news counts are aggregated across all fundamentals.
difference in the structure of incoming fundamental news between weekdays and weekends. Fundamental news expressions were relatively more frequent on weekdays when published macroeconomic data and announcements are more characteristic (real economy, external position and monetary policy), whereas politics-institutions took center stage on weekends. About half of all extracted expressions belonged to this latter category on weekends, in contrast with every fourth on weekdays.

News flow on subsamples comprising the financial and sovereign crisis support intuition. In the sample of the financial crisis, relatively more fundamental expressions were matched on the health of the banking system, on the real economy, and monetary policy. By contrast, in the sovereign crisis subsample, fundamental news about the fiscal stance and government liquidity had a larger share compared with the full time sample.

Table 3: News count shares

| PANEL A: Full sample share of fundamental category (percentage) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | REAL | EXTERN | FISCAL | FUND_LIQ | BANK | POL_INST | MON_POL |  |
| FULL sample | 36.7 | 7.4 | 12.0 | 1.9 | 6.6 | 23.6 | 11.8 |  |


|  | REAL | EXTERN | FISCAL | FUND_LIQ | BANK | POL_INST | MON_POL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | by time sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| weekdays | 1.3 | 0.2 | -0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | -2.3 | 0.6 |
| weekends | -16.0 | -2.7 | 0.3 | -0.2 | -2.5 | 27.9 | -6.9 |
| FIN CRISIS ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 3.0 | -1.0 | -4.3 | -1.1 | 3.8 | -1.2 | 0.8 |
| SOV CRISIS ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | -0.6 | -0.6 | 4.0 | 0.9 | -0.5 | -1.4 | -1.7 |
|  | by subindex ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHANGE | 2.1 | 1.7 | 3.9 | -1.2 | -0.3 | -13.7 | 7.5 |
| CONCERN | 2.1 | -3.2 | -3.0 | 3.2 | 3.0 | -3.8 | 1.7 |
| EXPECT | 34.0 | 3.0 | -2.7 | -1.6 | -2.4 | -23.4 | -6.8 |
| SURPR | 48.9 | 0.7 | -7.5 | -1.8 | -5.2 | -23.6 | -11.4 |
| by geography |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GLOBAL | 18.7 | 0.9 | -2.6 | -0.8 | 3.0 | -13.6 | -5.6 |
| Eurozone | -8.9 | -4.6 | -1.1 | 0.8 | 9.3 | -17.9 | 22.5 |
| US | 16.4 | -3.6 | -0.3 | -0.6 | 0.6 | -16.6 | 4.0 |
| CHINA | 9.4 | 13.7 | -5.9 | -1.2 | -3.1 | -16.2 | 3.2 |
| JAPAN | -0.3 | 3.1 | 3.3 | -1.3 | -1.3 | -19.5 | 16.0 |
| UK | 6.4 | -4.0 | 3.1 | -1.4 | 3.3 | -10.5 | 3.0 |
| GERMANY | 15.1 | 2.9 | 2.2 | -0.3 | 0.3 | -12.6 | -7.6 |
| SPAIN | -4.4 | -5.1 | 11.6 | 3.3 | 7.9 | -3.4 | -9.9 |
| ITALY | -9.0 | -5.1 | 13.6 | 0.7 | 3.6 | 6.0 | -9.7 |
| GREECE | -21.0 | -5.6 | 14.8 | 14.1 | -0.6 | 8.6 | -10.3 |
| ARGENTINA | -17.8 | 15.5 | 3.7 | 19.0 | -5.5 | -5.8 | -9.0 |
| ICELAND | -5.7 | -3.1 | 0.6 | 2.3 | 9.1 | 2.3 | -5.6 |
| CYPRUS | -19.6 | -4.8 | 13.7 | 6.4 | 13.3 | 0.4 | -9.4 |
| BRAZIL | 1.8 | 3.4 | 8.4 | -1.2 | -3.5 | -8.5 | -0.4 |
| RUSSIA | -21.4 | 8.7 | -4.0 | -0.5 | -2.9 | 28.2 | -8.1 |
| INDIA | -13.4 | 6.8 | -1.0 | -1.2 | -3.3 | -0.2 | 12.3 |
| TURKEY | -27.0 | 0.2 | -8.0 | -1.4 | -4.5 | 43.0 | -2.4 |

Sources: Reuters news archives and authors' calculations.
Notes: Panel A reports the share of expression matches for the respective category relative to all fundamental expression matches. Panel B reports deviations from these fundamental shares in percentage points for subsamples of matched fundamental expressions. Deviations greater than 5 percentage points in absolute value are shaded for better visualization.
${ }^{a}$ Financial crisis sample: 1 Jul 2007-31 Mar 2009; Sovereign crisis sample: 1 Jan 2010-31 Dec 2012. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ See Section 3.4. These subindices relate to fundamental expressions which have as an expression element (i) a verb that denotes a change in fundamentals (CHANGE); (ii) an intermediate expression label that relates to concerns, hopes, risks about fundamentals (CONCERN); (iii) an intermediate expression label that relates to expectations about future fundamentals (EXPECT); (iv) an intermediate expression label that relates to changes relative to expectations about fundamentals (SURPR).

The second block of Table 3 Panel B reports fundamental expression shares for news subindices. Expressions relating to changes in fundamentals appeared to be relatively more important in the case of monetary and fiscal policy stance. Deliberations about concerns, probabilities, risks of various scenarios was relatively more frequent in the government liquidity and banking sector fundamentals. This is likely a consequence of bailout measures falling into these fundamental categories, where deliberations about the timing or type of measures taken could be more important on the whole than reports about an action being taken. Fundamental expressions related to expectations and surprises were predominantly captured relating to the real economy. This is intuitive, as most indicators where surveys, polls are available fall into this category.

Regarding geographic subsamples, a key divide between countries was in terms of the share of politics-institutions. Notably, this fundamental category was more characteristic of news about emerging markets than developed countries. This may be a result of two factors. On one hand, smaller countries and emerging markets may have less macroeconomic publications, economic policy statements relative to developed countries. On the other hand, it may also suggest that incidence of political risks and their impact on asset prices may be much more important in emerging markets than macroeconomic factors given the natural assumption that Reuters endeavours to report news that is important for investors.

Most of the large developed countries had a relative higher share of real economy expressions. Again, this may be a consequence of more indicators published regularly for this group of countries. For the eurozone, monetary policy was relatively more important; a plausible result given that the references to the ECB fall into this regional category, whereas much of the real economy news expressions are reported at the country level. Additionally, the banking sector and government liquidity fundamentals had relative higher shares in the eurozone, as could be expected considering the sovereign crisis of the region. Fiscal policy and sustainability appeared to be a country-level rather than a regional phenomenon.

For smaller countries, deviations in the share of fundamental indicators reflected the countryspecific fundamental stories of the sample. For China, Russia and Argentina the external position was relatively more important due to the significance of foreign trade, but also foreign currency reserves and foreign currency management in these countries. Fiscal policy was relatively more important in periphery eurozone countries as would be expected. Expressions of government funding liquidity were more frequent for Greece and Argentina, which struggled with default in the period. Fundamental expressions about the banking sector had higher shares in Spain, Cyprus, Iceland, where the banking sector was undergoing periods of severe stress. Again, as would be expected, fundamental indicators on politics and institutions had a higher than average share in Russia and Turkey.

### 4.1 Case studies: US and Greek news indices

To provide an intuition on how our news indices look like, Figures 3 and 4 plot the time series of several US and Greek news indices and subindices.

The top and bottom panels of Figure 3 display US REAL and US MON_POL indices, respectively. The CHANGES subindex of US REAL fundamentals appears to follow general tendencies in the real economy as measured by the Markit Purchasing Managers Index and higher frequency news fluctuations in economic surprises as measured by Bloomberg. More formal tests of the relationship between economic announcements and news indices are reported in the next section.

The US REAL CONCERN subindex follows a somewhat different path. As we argued in the Introduction there are no standard proxies of perceived economic tail risks. It is suggestive of this index, however, that it reached most pessimistic levels at the turn of 2007-2008, a time
when concerns about the financial crisis unfolded. At this time indicators were still at much better levels than one year later as suggested by both PMI and Bloomberg economic surprises data (as well as our own CHANGE subindex). It seems intuitive that the CONCERN subindex grasped larger fears surrounding the economy before the recession. When recession actually hit, the CONCERN index moderated (to still very pessimistic levels) plausibly because the previous tail risk scenario already materialized and this left less fear of an additional deterioration in conditions.

Figure 3: US real economy and monetary policy news indices
Panel A: US REAL news indices


Panel B: US MON_POL news indices


Sources: Reuters news archives, Bloomberg (Markit), US Federal Reserves and authors' calculations. Notes: News indices reported at weekly frequency. The CHANGE subindex aggregates tonality scores of fundamental expressions referring to changes in fundamentals. The CONCERN subindex aggregates tonality scores of fundamental expressions that contain reference to concerns about fundamentals. PMI refers to Markit Purchasing Managers Index data, the Wu-Xia shadow rates estimate where short-rates would be in absence of the zero lower bound based on yield curve dynamics (Wu and Xia, 2016). Taper talk refers to a series of speeches by Fed officials that signalled QE3 bond purchases will soon be levelled off.

Figure 4: Greek fiscal and political news indices
Panel A: GREECE news indices (main indices)


Panel B: GREECE news indices (CONCERN subindices)


Sources: Reuters news archives and authors' calculations.
Notes: News indices reported at weekly frequency. Panel A aggregates tonality scores of Greek fundamental expressions referring to the fundamentals: fiscal position (FISCAL), government funding liquidity (FLIQ) and politics-institutions (POLINST). Panel B plots CONCERN subindices of the same fundamentals. These subindices aggregates tonality scores of fundamental expressions that contain reference to concerns about fundamentals.

The US monetary policy indices highlight the differences between the two subindices even more. The CHANGE subindex reacted to actual events, announcements taking place in monetary policy. The large spikes in 2007-2008 captured interest rate cuts, liquidity injections, while later on announcements of quantitative easing (QE) phases increased the index. ${ }^{24}$ As monetary conditions gradually turned more and more restrictive (QE ended, expected future interest rate path increased), our index turned negative after 2014.

Again, the US MON_POL CONCERN subindex takes a different path. In general it is much more symmetric than the other index. We think of this being a consequence of the CONCERN subindex identifying potential deviations from an expected consensus path of monetary policy (which is plausibly reflected by the other, CHANGE subindex), which may be of either sign whether or not policy is restrictive. Again, we do not have objective tools to test this, but the large negative spike around the tapering talk appears to support our view. (In 2013 May and June several high level speeches by the Fed signalled that QE3 purchases could be levelled off, which was commonly referred to as the "taper talk".) There were no immediate steps announced or taken at this point ${ }^{25}$, but there was a sudden and widely held perception that monetary policy stance was turning more restrictive.

Figure 4 depicts evolution of three Greek news indices: fiscal position (FISCAL), government funding liquidity (FUND_LIQ) and politics-institutions (POL_INST). As seen in the top panel the main FISCAL news index had spikes into positive values that were associated with austerity package announcements. In contrast, the Greek CONCERN subindex (bottom panel) was more often negative, perhaps reflecting worries either about debt sustainability or about austerity steps implementation.

The main index and the CONCERN subindex for government funding liquidity identify the 2010 May financing crisis and worries about bailout disbursements and restructuring in 2011 and early 2012. The restructuring in March 2012 appears to grasp hopes of a better financing position, but in general most of the spikes in these indices were negative.

Political-institutional indices spiked around the May 2012 elections and the repeat elections in June. At this time the more general eurozone breakup fears (defined as negative politicsinstitutions for both Greece and the eurozone) led to ECB Governor Mario Draghi to announce the intent of the ECB to do whatever it takes to save EMU integrity, which reduced these concerns.

### 4.2 Correlations with Economic Policy Uncertainty indices

The Economic Policy Uncertainty (EPU) indices of Baker, Bloom and Davis (2016) are probably the most popular indices in the field of economics derived from text-based (news) input. The EPU has been used in numerous economics and finance applications. ${ }^{26}$ It is natural therefore to

[^10]evaluate our news indices in relation to these indices.
The EPU indices are based on article hits, where keywords about the economy, policy and uncertainty are matched. For an article to be called a match, the article has to contain: (i) at least one word from a list of policy related keywords, (ii) either the word 'economy' or 'economic' and (iii) either the word 'uncertain' or 'uncertainty'. The number of articles that match at least one instance of all three types of keywords are then aggregated for the given time period (most indices are monthly; a few are daily) and the resulting time series are standardized.

There are several differences with respect to data, methodology and concept, which limits the correspondence between EPU indices and our news indices. Regarding data, our indices are based on the UK edition of Reuters in the period 2007-2016, whereas the EPU is based on a much larger set of textual data that ranges over many countries and collects information from a large set of periodicals (ten periodicals only in the US) and also has a longer history than our data set. A methodological difference is that we only match expressions when expression elements are close to each other within the text, whereas Baker, Bloom and Davis (2016) do not have such word distance restrictions. Consequently, EPU indices will be tilted towards false positives (identifying more matches than truly in the text), whereas our measures will be more balanced between false negatives (identifying less matches than truly in the text) and false positives. There are conceptual differences regarding our fundamental categories and the policy categories of the EPU indices, so indices would not align exactly even if we worked on the same data and with the same methodology. We also do not require mentions on uncertainty, although the CONCERN subindex may somewhat be related to this concept. Finally, whereas the EPU indices are topical indices only, our news indices also include information on tonality.

We can still do some comparisons based on our news count measures (number of fundamental expression matches) and calculate correlations with EPU indices. To avoid spurious correlations due to common trends we work on (monthly) changes in both our news counts and EPU time series.

Table 4: Correlations with EPU indices

|  |  | EPU indices |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| News counts | US main | UK | China | US MON_POL |  |
| US main | 0.412 | -0.018 | -0.088 | 0.552 | 0.171 |
| UK | 0.273 | 0.460 | 0.152 | 0.015 | 0.427 |
| China | 0.019 | 0.027 | 0.039 | 0.122 |  |
| US MON_POL | 0.092 | -0.130 | -0.179 | -0.049 |  |
| US FISCAL | 0.231 | 0.018 | 0.034 | 0.155 | 0.050 |

Sources: http://www.policyuncertainty.com, Reuters news archives, and authors' calculations.
Notes: Pearson's bivariate correlations between monthly changes of news counts and EPU indices. Correlations are shaded according to $5 \%$ (light) and $1 \%$ (dark) levels calculated based on 1000 bootstrap samples.

Table 4 shows correlations between five selected indices, which are thematically closest in the two data sets (aggregate indices on the US, UK and China and two policy-related indices for the US). For four of the five indicators the diagonals indicate a significant positive correlation between the EPU indices and our measures. For China, the correlation is insignificant.

Overall, given the methodological, thematic and sample differences between the two indicator sets, these weak, but positive and statistically significant correlations appear reasonable.

## 5 Validation: Do News Indices Extract Fundamental Information?

We have argued that our news indices represent fundamentals by construction: news indices aggregate tonality scores of fundamental expressions and each fundamental expression has topical expression element(s) that refer to one of the seven fundamentals. This, however, does not guarantee that our expression rules will efficiently pick up many occurrences of fundamental mentions in the text, nor does it guarantee that it will correctly identify the tonality related to the fundamental topical expressions that it manages to identify. In case that expression rules did not manage to pick up enough fundamental expressions, we would recover sparse news indices with small cross-sectional and time series variation. (In the previous section we have already seen this not to be the case.) In case that tonality scores were wrongly matched with topical expressions, we would recover news indices, whose time series and cross-sectional variation had no relation to variation in other proxies of fundamentals.

To go into the possible caveats in more detail, logically, there are two things that may go wrong. One possibility is that expression rules are inefficient to extract enough fundamental information from the text. Whether expression rules seem reasonable at all may be directly checked by glancing through the list of expression definitions in Appendix Table C. 5 and C.6. These tables are organized by fundamentals and thematic topics within each fundamental concept to facilitate such a review. ${ }^{27}$ The other way to check whether there are enough such expression rules and that these rules are efficient in capturing fundamental information, is to examine whether news indices correlate with other, objective proxies of fundamentals, which is what we are set to do in this section.

The other possible caveat is that even if expression rules recovered many fundamental topical expressions and their tonality pairs, the rules for maximum word distances could be inefficient in identifying topic - tonality pairs with sufficient precision. Proximity rules between expression elements (topic and tonality keywords) may not prevent them from being unrelated to each other. In particular, a distance rule that is set too wide may confound the expression and result in false positive cases (e.g. the tonality verbs or adjectives may refer to another noun not the one representing the fundamental topic). Distance rules do help, but setting a distance rule that is too strict results in a large number of false negatives: it will not return fundamental expression matches even when there is one in the text.

This trade-off is common to all automated text mining approaches. The false negative problem is most acute in the extreme method that restricts expression elements to be neighboring each other (e.g. searching for matches of 'housing market bust', 'housing bubble burst'). The false positive problem is most relevant in the other extreme case, which only requires that all expression

[^11]elements be present in the text irrespective of their relative location (e.g. searching for 'housing' and 'bust' separately and calling the article a match if both are found). Our approach balances in between these extremes. Nonetheless, being a statistical approach it is still subject to these problems. Therefore our news indices will be noisy measures of fundamentals even if expression rules are valid. The question is a matter of precision: whether the magnitude of this noise is such that it swamps all information in our indices or it is relatively small and relevant information dominates the indices.

### 5.1 News indices vs Bloomberg economic announcements

In the Introduction we claimed that since news agencies compete for investor attention, they will include information about fundamentals (e.g. tail risk scenarios, expectations) over and above that contained in traditional macroeconomic variables and would underweight information in published indicators that is uninteresting for investors. Because both traditional indicators and news do contain information about fundamentals, however, we would expect a positive association between them even if it is weak.

The most direct test that we can think of is to look at the association between changes in our news indices and the surprise components of macroeconomic announcements. We first carry out such tests for the five largest economies (US, UK, China, Japan and Germany) in terms of news indices and pertaining to the REAL fundamental category. News is frequent for these countries and this fundamental category even on the daily level and Bloomberg also regularly publishes several indicators of these countries related to the real economy (GDP growth rates, industrial production, retail sales, to name a few) and analyst surveys on expected data prior to publication for several of these. Transforming surprises within different Bloomberg macroeconomic announcements into a comparable format we can assess whether the surprise content of these announcements is significantly and positively correlated with (daily) changes in our REAL news index. ${ }^{28}$

Table 5 reports correlations. The top panel of the table shows that Bloomberg surprises were significantly and positively correlated with news indices for all five countries (panel A, diagonal elements). Off-diagonal elements were not significant however, so that a positive surprise in one country did not result in improved news indices for the other four.

Panel B examines correlations between Bloomberg announcements and news counts. Correlations appear large on the diagonal meaning that days with Bloomberg announcements was strongly associated with an increased number of REAL fundamental expressions in the respective

[^12]Table 5: Correlations between Bloomberg announcements and news indices (REAL fundamental category)

| News indices/ news counts | Bloomberg surprises / Bloomberg number of announcements |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | US | CHINA | UK | JAPAN | GERMANY |
| PANEL A: Bloomberg surprises and news indices |  |  |  |  |  |
| US | 0.121 | -0.08 | 0.023 | 0.013 | -0.013 |
| CHINA | 0.020 | 0.268 | -0.013 | -0.010 | -0.007 |
| UK | 0.019 | 0.07 | 0.218 | 0.019 | 0.050 |
| JAPAN | 0.009 | 0.075 | -0.024 | 0.139 | 0.107 |
| GERMANY | -0.044 | 0.001 | 0.041 | -0.003 | 0.303 |
| PANEL B: Bloomberg announcements and news counts |  |  |  |  |  |
| US | 0.629 | 0.124 | 0.046 | -0.018 | 0.119 |
| CHINA | 0.110 | 0.574 | 0.065 | 0.041 | 0.046 |
| UK | 0.108 | 0.109 | 0.525 | 0.009 | 0.029 |
| JAPAN | 0.027 | -0.018 | 0.057 | 0.476 | 0.043 |
| GERMANY | 0.101 | 0.000 | 0.021 | -0.048 | 0.554 |
| PANEL C: Bloomberg surprises and news SURPRISE subindex |  |  |  |  |  |
| US | 0.181 | -0.040 | -0.022 | 0.041 | -0.035 |
| CHINA | 0.016 | 0.405 | -0.015 | 0.005 | -0.005 |
| UK | 0.017 | 0.196 | 0.232 | 0.000 | 0.023 |
| JAPAN | 0.030 | 0.070 | 0.049 | 0.288 | 0.089 |
| GERMANY | -0.045 | 0.076 | 0.098 | 0.013 | 0.318 |

Sources: Reuters news archives, Bloomberg and authors' calculations.
Notes: Pearson's bivariate correlations between daily changes of news indices (or news counts) and Bloomberg surprises (or number of announcements). Surprises are calculated as the published data (actual) minus the analyst survey corrected for sign and variance of the series (see Section 2.2). Days without a Bloomberg announcement or fundamental expression are eliminated from the sample since these may spuriously increase correlations. Note that different number of eliminated observations across countries and fundamental category influences critical values. Correlations are shaded according to $5 \%$ (light) and $1 \%$ (dark) levels calculated based on 1000 bootstrap samples.
country. The larger correlations compared to panel A could be a consequence of two factors. On one hand, it may suggest that fundamental topics are much easier to pin down than topics and tonality jointly. Obviously there is more noise in our tonality-included news indices than in simple fundamental expression news counts. An alternative explanation is that news index correlations are lower because of the extra information carried within the media discussion relative to macroeconomic announcements. Similar values of surprises may be assessed quite differently by the media depending on the concrete circumstances (e.g. what type of indicators were published, whether the index is close to perceived threshold values, whether the surprise of the day matches previous tendencies). News counts, though clearer measures, lose all information related to these deliberations.

The bottom panel reports correlations between Bloomberg announcement surprises and news indices similar to panel A with the difference that instead of the main news indices, the SURPRISE subindices are considered. As discussed in Section 3.4, this subindex aggregates fundamental expressions that refers to changes of fundamentals compared to expectations ('GDP unexpectedly increased', 'GDP increased more than anticipated', etc.). As expected, the SURPRISE subindices have larger correlations with Bloomberg surprises than the main news indices,

Table 6: Correlations between Bloomberg announcements and news indices (various fundamentals)

| News indices | Bloomberg surprises |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | US | CHINA | UK | JAPAN | GERMANY |
| PANEL A: Bloomberg (REAL) surprises and news indices |  |  |  |  |  |
| REAL | 0.121 | 0.268 | 0.218 | 0.139 | 0.303 |
| EXTERN | 0.025 | -0.057 | -0.010 | -0.017 | 0.059 |
| FISCAL | -0.030 | -0.107 | 0.005 | 0.023 | -0.026 |
| FUND_LIQ | -0.037 | 0.016 | -0.051 | -0.065 | 0.019 |
| BANK | 0.001 | 0.035 | 0.041 | 0.020 | 0.034 |
| POL_INST | 0.013 | 0.106 | -0.042 | 0.036 | 0.017 |
| MON_POL | 0.018 | -0.113 | 0.047 | 0.002 | -0.063 |
| PANEL B: Bloomberg (EXTERN) surprises and news indices |  |  |  |  |  |
| REAL | 0.081 | 0.082 | -0.048 | -0.029 | -0.004 |
| EXTERN | 0.413 | 0.110 | 0.367 | 0.115 | 0.154 |
| FISCAL | 0.341 | 0.194 | 0.126 | 0.019 | 0.000 |
| FUND_LIQ | -0.017 | 0.035 | -0.095 | -0.094 | -0.183 |
| BANK | -0.009 | -0.099 | 0.027 | -0.079 | -0.025 |
| POL_INST | -0.011 | 0.025 | 0.001 | 0.002 | -0.076 |
| MON_POL | 0.048 | -0.086 | -0.061 | -0.053 | 0.146 |

Sources: Reuters news archives, Bloomberg and authors' calculations.
Notes: Pearson's bivariate correlations between daily changes of news indices (main index) and Bloomberg surprises of the same country. Surprises are calculated as the published data (actual) minus the analyst survey corrected for sign and variance of the series (see Section 2.2). Days without a Bloomberg announcement or fundamental expression are eliminated from the sample, since these may spuriously increase correlations. Note that different number of eliminated observations across countries and fundamental category influences critical values. Correlations are shaded according to $5 \%$ (light) and $1 \%$ (dark) levels calculated based on 1000 bootstrap samples.
consistent with their more immediate connection.
Table 6 expands the analysis to other fundamentals. Bloomberg macroeconomic fundamentals were available for the REAL and EXTERN categories ${ }^{29}$ and correlations of their surprises were examined in light of all seven fundamental news indices for the same five countries.

The results support the idea that macroeconomic announcement surprises resulted in changes in the appropriate fundamental news index. Positive surprises in REAL macroeconomic indicators were consistent with improvements in the REAL news indices of the respective country (significant at the $1 \%$ level), but did not materially change other fundamental news indices of the country. Similarly, for each country except China, unexpected improvements in Bloomberg external trade reports were associated with improvements in the EXTERN news index. Even in China however, although insignificant, the correlation coefficient was positive. Again, macro surprises related to external trade correlated primarily with the EXTERN news indices and left other fundamental indices unmoved. Exceptions in the US and UK were that trade surprises also significantly correlated with fiscal policy deliberations in the news, perhaps a consequence of media attention about twin deficits.

[^13]
### 5.2 News indices vs non-fundamental proxies

Because we claim that our news indices are noisy aggregates of fundamental information, it is worth running a sort of placebo test to check whether our indices are correlated with measures of non-fundamental information.

Table 7: Correlations of news indices and non-fundamental information proxies

| PANEL A: News (main) index |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HPW Noise index ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | BW SENT index ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |
|  | correl.coef. | p-value | correl.coef. | p-value |
| REAL | -0.018 | 0.390 | 0.093 | 0.338 |
| EXTERN | 0.013 | 0.515 | -0.029 | 0.796 |
| FISCAL | 0.010 | 0.693 | -0.035 | 0.718 |
| FUND_LIQ | -0.027 | 0.415 | -0.081 | 0.404 |
| BANK | -0.031 | 0.308 | -0.013 | 0.851 |
| POL_INST | 0.013 | 0.566 | 0.065 | 0.382 |
| MON_POL | -0.007 | 0.790 | 0.002 | 0.937 |
| PANEL B: News CONCERN subindex |  |  |  |  |
|  | HPW No |  | BW SEN |  |
|  | correl.coef. | p-value | correl.coef. | p-value |
| REAL | -0.017 | 0.468 | -0.121 | 0.162 |
| EXTERN | 0.003 | 0.933 | 0.160 | 0.097 |
| FISCAL | 0.042 | 0.163 | -0.044 | 0.623 |
| FUND_LIQ | -0.036 | 0.159 | -0.032 | 0.736 |
| BANK | -0.044 | 0.175 | 0.191 | 0.153 |
| POL_INST | 0.000 | 0.981 | 0.163 | 0.051 |
| MON_POL | 0.018 | 0.654 | 0.018 | 0.689 |

Sources: Websites of Jun Pan and Jeffrey Wurgler, Reuters news archives, and authors' calculations.
Notes: Pearson's bivariate correlations between daily changes of US news indices and the HPW noise index and monthly changes of US news indices and the BW sentiment index. Panel A reports correlations for the seven fundamental main indices, panel B reports correlations for seven fundamental CONCERN subindices. P-values of correlations are calculated based on 1000 bootstrap samples.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ The HPW noise index (Hu, Pan and Wang, 2013) is a measure of US bond market liquidity.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ The BW SENTIMENT index (Baker and Wurgler, 2006) is the principal component of six popular investor sentiment proxies.

We test our indices against two such measures: the Hu, Pan and Wang (2013) (HPW) noise measure and the Baker and Wurgler (2006) (BW) SENTIMENT sentiment proxy. The HPW noise index is in effect a measure of funding liquidity in the US government securities market and is computed from the difference between bond yields and yields implied by fitted yield curves. Hu, Pan and Wang (2013) argue and empirically demonstrate that this error is large when bond market funding liquidity is lower, because this hinders arbitrage and the yield curve will be more jagged across the maturity spectrum. Although liquidity may have a distant relation to US fundamentals, we would expect for these to play out over longer horizons, and would not expect daily changes in such a measure to be related to our indices. The BW SENTIMENT index of Baker and Wurgler (2006) is a monthly index and is the principal component of five underlying proxies for investor sentiment including average discounts on closed-end funds, number of IPOs, first-day returns of IPOs, equity-to-debt issuance ratio, market-to-book ratio difference of payers
and defaulters. We consider this indicator as a proxy of a different aspect of non-fundamentals than the HPW index.

Table 7 displays correlations between these measures and our US news indices. Panel A reports correlations with the main indices, panel B with the CONCERN subindex. Bootstrapped sampling of correlation coefficients show that observed correlations are statistically insignificant regarding both the HPW and the BW non-fundamental proxies. All correlations with the CONCERN subindices are also insignificant. This is important especially in light of the BW SENTIMENT measure because one could think that a possible failure of this subindex would be for it to pick up general concerns, worries of investors and not the specific type of concerns that are only related to fundamentals.

## 6 News indices in sovereign credit spread regressions

Returning to our original research question, we are interested in whether our constructed news indices have additional explanatory power about sovereign credit spreads when controlling for variables customarily used as proxies for fundamentals.

The empirical literature has been versatile regarding model specifications. The literature provided evidence of local macroeconomic factors being important in the cross-sectional variation of levels of credit spreads. Such a relationship is however not obvious on the changes of spreads, where a common systemic factor appears more important (Ang and Longstaff, 2011; Longstaff et al., 2011), therefore we choose this latter, first differences, specification. ${ }^{30}$

Studies have also been split over choosing sovereign CDS spreads and bond spreads as the dependent variable and whether to model these in a linear or a logarithmic specification. We choose the logaritmic specification ${ }^{31}$ and report all results on the CDS spreads. A key benefit of CDS spreads is that they allow a larger cross-section than bond spreads. We also carry out all analysis on euro- and dollar-denominated bond spreads (EMBI Global spreads and 5 -year spreads between bond yields of eurozone countries and the same maturity German benchmark). The main results are reported for bond spread regressions as well. Other, not published results on these variables are in line with CDS spreads and are available to the reader upon request.

Our panel regression specification is as follows:

[^14]\[

$$
\begin{align*}
\Delta l o g\left(S_{i t}\right) & =\alpha+\beta^{N G} \Delta\left(N G_{t}\right)+\beta^{N L} \Delta\left(N L_{i t}\right)+\beta^{X} \Delta X_{i t}+\epsilon_{i t} \\
N G_{t} & =\sum_{i=1}^{N} N L_{i t} \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$
\]

where $\alpha$ represents a constant ${ }^{32}, \beta$ are parameters denoting sensitivities to exogenous variables. $\Delta\left(N L_{i t}\right)$ and $\Delta X_{i t}$ are vectors that represent local news indices and macroeconomic data of country $i$ and time period $t$. The vector $N G_{t}$ in turn denotes news indices aggregated across all countries in the news database and are intended proxies for global fundamentals at the given point in time. Throughout the paper we use double-clustered robust standard errors (see Thompson, 2011) that allow for arbitrary forms of cross-sectional and time series dependence in the residuals, $\epsilon_{i t}$.

Table 8 reports our main estimation results. In the first column (specification A) we only include traditional macro variables (real GDP growth, current account and expected fiscal balance changes, and changes in key stock measures: the government debt ratio and central bank reserves). Most variables have the expected negative sign, but overall the estimates confirm that these variables only explain a small portion of spread variation, with an $R^{2}$ of only around 5 percent. In contrast, the second column (specification B) that includes only changes in our main news (both global and local) indices explains around 35 percent of variation in the data. Global news indices have the expected negative sign (increase in news index denotes improvement) with the exception of monetary policy (recall that a decrease here denotes monetary expansion), while local news indices are mostly insignificant.

The third column (specification C) includes traditional and global macro variables as well as news indices (global macroeconomic variables are the world real GDP growth rate and first principal components of domestic macro variables). ${ }^{33}$ Together, these variables explain around 40 percent of the variance. Again, most global news indices appear statistically important and have an intuitive sign, while local news indices are largely insignificant. These results suggest that once we use our fundamental news indices, a substantial amount of spread variation can indeed be linked to fundamental information. Further, the effect of news indices mainly seems to be exerted through its global component.

[^15]Table 8: Regressions of sovereign CDS spread changes

| Model specification: Dependent variable: | $\begin{gathered} \text { (A): Macro only } \\ \Delta \log (\mathrm{CDS}) \end{gathered}$ |  | (B) News only $\Delta \log (\mathrm{CDS})$ |  | (C) Macro and News $\Delta \log (\mathrm{CDS})$ |  | (D) add CONCERN $\Delta \log$ (CDS) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Explanatory | coef. | std.err. | coef. | std.err. | coef. | std.err. | coef. | std.err. |
| Main indices (Global) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle$ REAL |  |  | -0.070* | (0.041) | -0.080 | (0.063) | 0.047 | (0.080) |
| $\triangle$ EXTERN |  |  | $-0.942^{* *}$ | (0.382) | -1.010* | (0.526) | $-1.260^{* * *}$ | (0.458) |
| $\triangle$ FISCAL |  |  | $-0.610^{* * *}$ | (0.154) | -0.502** | (0.198) | -0.180 | (0.201) |
| $\triangle$ FUND_LIQ |  |  | -0.595** | (0.232) | $-0.563^{* *}$ | (0.250) | -0.032 | (0.298) |
| $\triangle$ BANK |  |  | -0.280 | (0.407) | -0.579 | (0.631) | 1.080* | (0.573) |
| $\triangle \mathrm{POL}$ _INST |  |  | -0.129** | (0.059) | -0.132* | (0.076) | -0.020 | (0.065) |
| $\triangle \mathrm{MON}$ _POL |  |  | $0.173^{*}$ | (0.097) | $0.260^{*}$ | (0.133) | -0.096 | (0.124) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle$ REAL |  |  | $-0.184^{* * *}$ | (0.049) | $-0.150^{* * *}$ | (0.031) | -0.147 | (0.117) |
| $\triangle$ EXTERN |  |  | 0.057 | (0.259) | 0.366 | (0.840) | -0.190 | (0.234) |
| $\triangle$ FISCAL |  |  | 0.462 | (0.394) | 0.539 | (0.383) | 0.525 | (0.344) |
| $\triangle$ FUND_LIQ |  |  | -0.323 | (0.690) | -0.377 | (0.688) | -0.881 | (1.404) |
| $\triangle$ BANK |  |  | -0.681 | (0.456) | -0.535 | (0.529) | -0.049 | (0.764) |
| $\triangle \mathrm{POL}$ INST |  |  | -0.197 | (0.154) | -0.074 | (0.147) | -0.111 | (0.106) |
| $\triangle \mathrm{MON}$ _POL |  |  | 0.016 | (0.073) | -0.018 | (0.145) | -0.098 | (0.125) |
| CONCERNS subindices (Global) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle$ REAL |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.775 ${ }^{*}$ | (0.407) |
| $\triangle$ EXTERN |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1.910 | (1.698) |
| $\triangle$ FISCAL |  |  |  |  |  |  | -3.230 | (2.206) |
| $\triangle$ FUND_LIQ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $-1.370$ | (1.118) |
| $\triangle$ BANK |  |  |  |  |  |  | -2.940 * | (1.636) |
| $\triangle \mathrm{POL}$ INST |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.292 | (0.530) |
| $\triangle \mathrm{MON}$ _POL |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.674 | (1.060) |
| CONCERNS subindices (Local) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle$ REAL |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.140 | (0.475) |
| $\triangle$ EXTERN |  |  |  |  |  |  | -3.910 | (7.541) |
| $\triangle$ FISCAL |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.807 | (2.006) |
| $\triangle$ FUND_LIQ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.130 | (2.828) |
| $\triangle$ BANK |  |  |  |  |  |  | -2.770 | (1.810) |
| $\triangle \mathrm{POL}$ INST |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.536 | (1.930) |
| $\triangle \mathrm{MON}$ _POL |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.972 | (0.847) |
| Traditional macro var's |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GDP growth | -1.008 | (0.756) |  |  | $-0.424^{*}$ | (0.239) | -0.375 | (0.247) |
| $\Delta$ Current Acc | $-2.053$ | (1.268) |  |  | -0.783 | (0.950) | -0.827 | (0.831) |
| $\Delta$ Reserves | $-2.567^{* *}$ | (1.136) |  |  | $-1.319^{* *}$ | (0.626) | -0.844** | (0.417) |
| $\Delta$ Fiscal Bal | $-1.200^{* *}$ | (0.489) |  |  | -0.731 | (0.677) | -0.840 | (0.661) |
| $\Delta$ Gov't Debt | $-0.656$ | (0.759) |  |  | 0.281 | (0.201) | $0.375{ }^{* * *}$ | (0.121) |
| Global macro var's |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| World GDP growth |  |  |  |  | -0.054 | (3.784) | 5.934 | (5.775) |
| PC GDP growth |  |  |  |  | -0.086 | (0.248) | -0.173 | (0.177) |
| $\triangle \mathrm{PC}$ Current Acc |  |  |  |  | 2.034 | (4.409) | 4.742 | (3.354) |
| $\triangle \mathrm{PC}$ Reserves |  |  |  |  | -0.464 | (0.830) | -0.805 | (0.901) |
| $\Delta \mathrm{PC}$ Fiscal Bal |  |  |  |  | -0.241 | (0.636) | 0.724 | (0.621) |
| $\Delta \mathrm{PC}$ Gov't Debt |  |  |  |  | -0.018 | (0.184) | -0.310 | (0.352) |
| R-squared | 0.053 |  | 0.356 |  | 0.422 |  | 0.541 |  |
| Adj. R-squared | 0.050 |  | 0.351 |  | 0.411 |  | 0.528 |  |
| No. time periods | 31 |  | 33 |  | 30 |  | 30 |  |
| No. cross-sections | 49 |  | 58 |  | 49 |  | 49 |  |
| No. observations | 1463 |  | 1867 |  | 1416 |  | 1416 |  |

Sources: News indices based on Reuters news archives and authors' calculations. Other variable sources listed in Appendix A. Notes: Pooled regressions (constant only, no fixed effects) of sovereign CDS spread log changes on news indices (main index and CONCERN subindices) and macroeconomic variables. Global news indices aggregate news indices across all geographies, local news indices are specific to the respective country. News indices are specified in quarterly changes. Traditional macro variables: quarterly real GDP growth rates, changes in current account balance to GDP, changes in official reserves to GDP, changes in (IMF 1-year ahead projected) fiscal balance to GDP, changes in the public debt to GDP. Global macro variables: the annual world GDP growth rate and first principal components of traditional variables. For visualization purposes data are scaled: all news indices multiplied by 10000 , macro variables are multiplied by 100 . Double-clustered standard errors and usual significance levels are reported.

Table 9: Regressions of sovereign bond spread changes

| Model specification: <br> Dependent variable. <br> Explanatory | (A): Macro only $\Delta \log (\mathrm{FXB}+\mathrm{c})$ |  | (B) News only $\Delta \log (\mathrm{FXB}+\mathrm{c})$ |  | (C) Macro and News $\Delta \log (\mathrm{FXB}+\mathrm{c})$ |  | (D) add CONCERN $\Delta \log (\mathrm{FXB}+\mathrm{c})$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | coef. | std.err. | coef. | std.err. | coef. | std.err. | coef. | std.err. |
| Main indices (Global) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle$ REAL |  |  | -0.047 | (0.033) | -0.048 | (0.046) | 0.075 | (0.055) |
| $\triangle$ EXTERN |  |  | $-0.662^{* *}$ | (0.321) | -0.570 | (0.385) | $-0.676^{* * *}$ | (0.248) |
| $\triangle$ FISCAL |  |  | $-0.373^{* * *}$ | (0.135) | $-0.333^{* * *}$ | (0.128) | -0.128 | (0.154) |
| $\triangle$ FUND_LIQ |  |  | $-0.394^{* *}$ | (0.175) | $-0.338^{*}$ | (0.181) | 0.033 | (0.206) |
| $\triangle$ BANK |  |  | -0.178 | (0.135) | -0.084 | (0.166) | $0.329{ }^{*}$ | (0.183) |
| $\triangle \mathrm{POL}$ _INST |  |  | $-0.103^{* *}$ | (0.048) | -0.089 | (0.057) | -0.039 | (0.054) |
| $\triangle \mathrm{MON}$ _POL |  |  | $0.097^{* *}$ | (0.048) | 0.074 | (0.049) | -0.040 | (0.046) |
| Main indices (Local) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle$ REAL |  |  | -0.751 | (0.529) | $-3.980^{* * *}$ | (0.914) | $-3.210^{* * *}$ | (0.909) |
| $\triangle$ EXTERN |  |  | -0.086 | (0.502) | 0.724 | (1.096) | -0.055 | (0.592) |
| $\triangle$ FISCAL |  |  | -0.086 | (0.412) | 0.832 | (0.800) | 0.076 | (0.964) |
| $\triangle$ FUND_LIQ |  |  | -0.620 | (0.450) | -0.431 | (0.408) | $1.830^{* * *}$ | (0.568) |
| $\triangle$ BANK |  |  | -0.468 | (2.557) | 2.680 | (2.392) | 2.360 | (2.161) |
| $\triangle \mathrm{POL}$ _INST |  |  | -0.134 | (0.221) | 0.066 | (0.249) | $0.227^{* *}$ | (0.105) |
| $\triangle \mathrm{MON}$ _POL |  |  | -0.657 | (0.634) | $-2.030^{* *}$ | (0.903) | -1.370 | (1.039) |
| CONCERNS subindices (Global) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle$ REAL |  |  |  |  |  |  | $-0.620^{* * *}$ | (0.170) |
| $\triangle$ EXTERN |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.845 | (1.192) |
| $\triangle$ FISCAL |  |  |  |  |  |  | $-2.590^{* *}$ | (1.033) |
| $\triangle$ FUND_LIQ |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.454 | (0.835) |
| $\triangle$ BANK |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.853 | (0.856) |
| $\triangle \mathrm{POL}$ INST |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.062 | (0.349) |
| $\triangle \mathrm{MON}$ _POL |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.151 | (0.567) |
| CONCERNS subindices (Local) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle$ REAL |  |  |  |  |  |  | -8.940 | (5.639) |
| $\triangle$ EXTERN |  |  |  |  |  |  | $10.250^{* *}$ | (4.085) |
| $\triangle$ FISCAL |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.870 | (1.333) |
| $\triangle$ FUND_LIQ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $-7.160^{* *}$ | (3.149) |
| $\triangle$ BANK |  |  |  |  |  |  | $7.830^{* * *}$ | (3.006) |
| $\triangle$ POL_INST |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1.980 | (1.209) |
| $\triangle \mathrm{MON}$ _POL |  |  |  |  |  |  | -4.470 | (6.797) |
| Traditional macro var's |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GDP growth | -0.406 | (0.424) |  |  | -0.288 | (0.261) | -0.345 | (0.275) |
| $\Delta$ Current Acc | -2.071 | (1.339) |  |  | -0.704 | (0.619) | -0.692 | (0.550) |
| $\Delta$ Reserves | -4.361*** | (1.004) |  |  | -3.244*** | (0.642) | $-2.724^{* * *}$ | (0.437) |
| $\Delta$ Fiscal Bal | 0.170 | (1.195) |  |  | 0.997 | (0.861) | $1.370^{* *}$ | (0.667) |
| $\Delta$ Gov't Debt | -0.060 | (0.409) |  |  | 0.324 | (0.222) | 0.176 | (0.254) |
| Global macro var's |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| World GDP growth |  |  |  |  | 1.974 | (1.917) | $7.120^{* *}$ | (1.594) |
| PC GDP growth |  |  |  |  | 0.110 | (0.155) | -0.046 | (0.143) |
| $\Delta \mathrm{PC}$ Current Acc |  |  |  |  | 2.487 | (3.164) | 3.953* | (2.225) |
| $\triangle \mathrm{PC}$ Reserves |  |  |  |  | -0.326 | (0.528) | -0.439 | (0.563) |
| $\Delta \mathrm{PC}$ Fiscal Bal |  |  |  |  | $-0.666^{* * *}$ | (0.217) | -0.056 | (0.357) |
| $\Delta \mathrm{PC}$ Gov't Debt |  |  |  |  | -0.022 | (0.118) | -0.328* | (0.168) |
| R-squared | 0.082 |  | 0.287 |  | 0.369 |  | 0.482 |  |
| Adj. R-squared | 0.078 |  | 0.279 |  | 0.352 |  | 0.460 |  |
| No. time periods | 36 |  | 37 |  | 34 |  | 34 |  |
| No. cross-sections | 30 |  | 37 |  | 30 |  | 30 |  |
| No. observations | 1011 |  | 1311 |  | 956 |  | 956 |  |

Sources: News indices based on Reuters news archives and authors' calculations. Other variable sources listed in Appendix A.
Notes: Pooled regressions (constant only, no fixed effects) of euro- and dollar-denominated sovereign bond spread (FXB) log changes on news indices (main index and CONCERN subindices) and macroeconomic variables. Bond spreads are EMBI Global spreads and 5 -year eurozone interest rate spreads over Bunds. Regressors are as described in Table 8. Double-clustered standard errors and usual significance levels are reported.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ A correction of 50 basis points is made to all bond spreads to avoid non-positive cases.

Table 10: Global and local determinants of sovereign CDS spread changes

| Model specification: <br> Dependent variable: <br> Explanatory | (A): Local Macro $\Delta \log$ (CDS) |  | (B) Add Local News $\Delta \log (\mathrm{CDS})$ |  | (C) Global Macro $\Delta \log$ (CDS) |  | (D) add Global News $\Delta \log$ (CDS) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | coef. | std.err. | coef. | std.err. | coef. | std.err. | coef. | std.err. |
| Main indices (Global) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle$ REAL |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.032 | (0.074) |
| $\triangle$ EXTERN |  |  |  |  |  |  | $-1.170^{* * *}$ | (0.429) |
| $\triangle$ FISCAL |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.118 | (0.188) |
| $\triangle$ FUND_LIQ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.009 | (0.284) |
| $\triangle$ BANK |  |  |  |  |  |  | $1.010^{*}$ | (0.529) |
| $\triangle \mathrm{POL}$ INST |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.028 | (0.065) |
| $\triangle \mathrm{MON}$ _POL |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.093 | (0.114) |
| Main indices (Local) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle$ REAL |  |  | $-0.563^{* * *}$ | (0.100) |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle$ EXTERN |  |  | -0.661 | (1.370) |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle$ FISCAL |  |  | 0.282 | (0.439) |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle$ FUND_LIQ |  |  | -0.927 | (1.480) |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle$ BANK |  |  | 0.571 | (1.393) |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle \mathrm{POL}$ _INST |  |  | -0.177 | (0.175) |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle \mathrm{MON}$ _POL |  |  | $0.283 *$ | (0.156) |  |  |  |  |
| CONCERNS subindices (Global) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle$ REAL |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.751** | (0.373) |
| $\triangle$ EXTERN |  |  |  |  |  |  | -2.000 | (1.664) |
| $\triangle$ FISCAL |  |  |  |  |  |  | -3.210 | (2.070) |
| $\triangle$ FUND_LIQ |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1.410 | (1.090) |
| $\triangle$ BANK |  |  |  |  |  |  | $-2.890 *$ | (1.530) |
| $\triangle$ POL_INST |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.356 | (0.500) |
| $\triangle \mathrm{MON}$ _POL |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.673 | (0.993) |
| CONCERNS subindices (Local) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle$ REAL |  |  | 0.670 | (0.573) |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle$ EXTERN |  |  | -21.070 | (13.210) |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle$ FISCAL |  |  | -0.614 | (2.888) |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle$ FUND_LIQ |  |  | $2.560^{* *}$ | (1.050) |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle$ BANK |  |  | $-9.670^{* * *}$ | (3.494) |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle \mathrm{POL}$ INST |  |  | $-0.293$ | (2.594) |  |  |  |  |
| $\triangle \mathrm{MON}$ _POL |  |  | $3.160 * *$ | (1.489) |  |  |  |  |
| Traditional macro var's |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GDP growth | -1.008 | (0.756) | -0.977 | (0.711) |  |  |  |  |
| $\Delta$ Current Acc | -2.053 | (1.268) | -1.875 | (1.214) |  |  |  |  |
| $\Delta$ Reserves | $-2.567^{* *}$ | (1.136) | -2.538** | (1.110) |  |  |  |  |
| $\Delta$ Fiscal Bal | $-1.200^{* *}$ | (0.489) | -1.042* | (0.532) |  |  |  |  |
| $\Delta$ Gov't Debt | -0.656 | (0.759) | -0.544 | (0.685) |  |  |  |  |
| Global macro var's (0.s |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| World GDP growth |  |  |  |  | 4.491 | (4.805) | 6.315 | (5.337) |
| PC GDP growth |  |  |  |  | -0.280 | (0.330) | -0.233 | (0.166) |
| $\Delta \mathrm{PC}$ Current Acc |  |  |  |  | 1.110 | (3.476) | 4.689 | (3.164) |
| $\triangle \mathrm{PC}$ Reserves |  |  |  |  | -0.770 | (1.033) | -0.968 | (0.894) |
| $\Delta \mathrm{PC}$ Fiscal Bal |  |  |  |  | -0.141 | (1.322) | 0.723 | (0.597) |
| $\Delta \mathrm{PC}$ Gov't Debt |  |  |  |  | -0.392 | (0.277) | -0.305 | (0.332) |
| R-squared | 0.053 |  | 0.082 |  |  |  | 0.51 |  |
| Adj. R-squared | 0.050 |  | 0.070 |  |  |  | 0.51 |  |
| No. time periods | 31 |  | 31 |  |  |  | 30 |  |
| No. cross-sections | 49 |  | 49 |  |  |  | 58 |  |
| No. observations | 1463 |  | 1463 |  |  |  | 1699 |  |

Sources: News indices based on Reuters news archives and authors' calculations. Other variable sources listed in Appendix A. Notes: Notes: Pooled regressions (constant only, no fixed effects) of sovereign CDS spread log changes on news indices (main index and CONCERN subindices) and macroeconomic variables. Bond spreads are EMBI Global spreads and 5 -year eurozone interest rate spreads over Bunds. Regressors are as described in Table 8. Double-clustered standard errors and usual significance levels are reported.

Standard finance theory asserts that asset prices weigh the distributions of future expected outcomes. A particular strength of our method compared to traditional macro news or survey expectations is that we can create news indices that are likely to identify concerns of investors about fundamentals, which are likely to be related to tail risks. A line of research (Barro, 2006; Gabaix, 2012; Wachter, 2013) suggests that low probability high impact scenarios, rare disasters, must be important in asset pricing. As discussed in Section 3 our CONCERN subindices try to pick up such concerns. Hence, the fourth column (Specification D) conveys the additional explanatory power of these subindices, which we think of as proxies for tail risk scenarios regarding future fundamentals. Overall the results seem to support the importance of tail risk considerations for sovereign spreads. The overall explanatory power of the regression goes up substantially, from 42 to over 54 percent. The significance levels of individual regressors however decrease due to collinearity between the main news index and subindices.

To ensure that our results are not specific to the CDS market, Table 9 reports similar specifications for bond spread regressions. Note that here we have added 50 basis points to all spreads before taking logarithms to deal with negative spreads. The results are qualitatively similar to the CDS regressions, with the only notable difference that traditional macro variables explain a bit more of the bond spread variation compared to CDSs.

Table 10 investigates whether global or local fundamentals appear more important in sovereign spread variation. The first two columns explore the effects of local fundamentals, while the last two columns assess the effects of global fundamentals. As already seen in Table 8, traditional domestic fundamental variables explain only a marginal part of the information in CDS spread changes. Our local news indices (both the main index and CONCERNS subindex series) do not add much additional information and only marginally lift the share of explained variance.

In contrast, global fundamentals appear much more important especially when our news indices are included in the specification. Global proxies based on macroeconomic variables explain 10 percent of the CDS spread variation, already double the amount grasped by local macro factors. However this is still just a fraction of the overall variation that we may attribute to global fundamentals once we include global news indices. Together with our news indices, the $R^{2}$ statistic jumps four-fold to over 50 percent.

These results speak to the debate in the sovereign credit risk literature about whether global or local factors are more important in explaining sovereign spread variation (see Augustin, 2014). Our results strongly support the majority view that within changes of sovereign credit spreads, global factors appear much more important than local factors.

We view our key addition to this debate in that we relate directly to the fundamental component of these spreads and find that the global factors still keep their dominance over local factors. The empirical literature that studied the variance shares attributable to global versus local factors customarily used financial indicators to proxy the global component (the VIX index, corporate spreads and composite indices or the principal components of sovereign spreads themselves). Because financial indicators have both a fundamentals-related component and a component related
to risk pricing and liquidity, it is not clear from other papers, which of these two components is responsible for explaining the large systemic co-movement found in sovereign credit spread dynamics. Notably, it could be that non-fundamentals, such as general investor sentiment are behind all these movements. Our analysis suggests that much of the common variation is due to factors related to fundamentals. In the following, we estimate a more explicit decomposition of two key systemically important financial variables along the fundamentals/non-fundamentals dimension.

### 6.1 Drivers of the VIX index and implications for sovereign credit risk

Last, we turn to a common specification in the empirical literature, which includes both traditional macroeconomic variables and financial variables. Namely, we include two such US financial variables, the CBOE VIX index (the 3-month ATM implied volatility of options on the US S\&P500 stock index) and the CSI US corporate high yield index, which is the spread between the yield of a portfolio of BBB/Baa-rated corporate bonds and the 10-year US Treasury bond.

The interpretation of global (or globally important US) financial variables are somewhat vague in the literature and in the media, though they are generally thought of as related to global investor concerns. (In business parlance the VIX index is often referred to as the "fear gauge", for instance.) Whether this does include concerns about future possible paths of fundamental variables or it rather refers to investor sentiment unrelated to fundamentals is not clear. Our news index measures provide a tool to investigate this issue.

Table 11 shows results of regressions of changes of sovereign CDS spreads with changes in the VIX index and the US high-yield spread (or its components) in the regressor list. The two variables explain about 50 percent of the variation (specification A). In specification B, we add macroeconomic variables, which barely raises explanatory power. Recall that in Tables 8 and 9 we estimated a specification with macroeconomic variables only (specification A) and we found that macroeconomic variables alone accounted for a meagre 5 and 8 percent of the variation in sovereign CDS and bond spreads, respectively. All this supports the usual result of the empirical literature that global fluctuations rooted in financial markets are responsible for much of the time series variation in spreads.

Next, we decompose US financial indicators into a fundamental and a non-fundamental component. We regress both the VIX index and the high yield spread on our seven CONCERN subindices. We use the projections based on news indices as the fundamental component and the regression residuals as the non-fundamental component. ${ }^{34}$

Specifications C1-C3 includes these components in sovereign CDS spread regressions. The estimates convey the message that more than half of the explanatory power of US financial indicators derive from expectations and concerns about the future of global fundamentals. Non-

[^16]Table 11: Sovereign CDS Regressions with US financial variables and its components

| Model spec Dependent <br> Exploratory | (A) Financials $\Delta \log (\mathrm{CDS})$ | (B) add Macro $\Delta \log$ (CDS) |  | (C1) Decomp1 $\Delta \log (\mathrm{CDS})$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { (C2) Decomp2 } \\ \Delta \log (\mathrm{CDS}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (C3) Decomp3 } \\ & \Delta \log \text { (CDS) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | (D) Fundam. content $\Delta \log (\mathrm{CDS})$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | coef. s.e. | coef. | s.e. | coef. s.e. | coef. | s.e. | coef. | s.e. | coef. | s.e. |
| US financials |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\Delta \mathrm{VIX}$ | $0.864^{* * *}$ (0.227) | $0.863^{* *}$ | *** (0.260) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\Delta \mathrm{HY}$ | $32.374^{* * *}(2.298)$ | 33.173 | $3^{* * *}(2.587)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| US financials: fundamental content |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\widehat{\triangle V I X}$ |  |  |  | $1.618^{* * *}$ (0.465) | $1.657^{* *}$ | * (0.665) |  |  | 1.782*** | (0.663) |
| $\widehat{\Delta H Y}$ |  |  |  | $27.471^{* * *}(7.065)$ | $24.010^{* *}$ | ** (11.820) |  |  | $23.455^{* *}$ | (11.060) |
| US financials: non-fundamental content |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\Delta V I X-\widehat{\triangle V I X}$ |  |  |  | 0.305 (0.307) |  |  | 0.360 | (0.899) |  |  |
| $\Delta H Y-\widehat{\Delta H Y}$ |  |  |  | $31.194^{* * *}(1.998)$ |  |  | 29.502 | $2^{* * *}$ (8.476) |  |  |
| Traditional macro var's |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GDP growth |  | -0.293 | (0.216) |  |  |  |  |  | -1.008* | (0.547) |
| $\Delta$ Current Acc |  | 0.064 | (1.202) |  |  |  |  |  | $-1.126$ | (1.052) |
| $\Delta$ Reserves |  | -0.454 | * (0.348) |  |  |  |  |  | $-2.020^{* *}$ | $(0.799)$ |
| $\Delta$ Fiscal Bal |  | $-0.437^{*}$ | $7^{*}(0.257)$ |  |  |  |  |  | -0.975** | (0.445) |
| $\Delta$ Gov't Debt |  | 0.167 | (0.312) |  |  |  |  |  | 0.054 | (0.486) |
| R-squared | 0.509 |  | 0.530 | 0.531 |  | . 299 |  | 0.200 |  | 0.355 |
| Adj. R-squared | 0.509 |  | 0.528 | 0.530 |  | . 298 |  | 0.199 |  | 0.351 |
| No. time periods | 31 |  | 29 | 31 |  | 32 |  | 31 |  | 30 |
| No. cross-sections | 58 |  | 49 | 58 |  | 58 |  | 58 |  | 49 |
| No. observations | 1753 |  | 1367 | 1753 |  | 810 |  | 1753 |  | 1415 |

Sources: News indices are based on Reuters news archives and authors' calculations. Other variable sources are listed in Appendix A. Notes: Pooled regressions (constant only, no fixed effects) of sovereign CDS spread log changes on US financial indicators (CBOE VIX index, CSI High yield index) and traditional macroeconomic variables. In specifications C1-D components of US financial indicators are used: financial indicators are regressed on CONCERN news subindices. Linear projections based on such regressions are referred to as the fundamental content of financial indicators, whereas regression residuals are referred to as their non-fundamental content. Macroeconomic variables included are quarterly real GDP growth rates, changes in the current account balance to GDP, changes in central bank reserves to GDP, changes in (IMF 1 -year ahead projected) fiscal balance to GDP and changes in the public debt to GDP ratio.
fundamentals are still statistically and economically important in CDS spreads comprising about 20 percent of the variation. Specification D collects all explanatory variables of fundamental content (traditional macroeconomic variables and the fundamental components of financial indicators) and finds that these explain 35 percent of the sovereign spread variation.

In sum, a significant part of sovereign credit spread changes can be explained by fundamentals as reflected by the explanatory power of specifications with news-based measures of fundamentals even though much of this explained variance relates to global and not local fundamentals. US financial variables often used as explanatory variables of systematic movements in sovereign spreads derive a larger part of their significance from the outlook and risks surrounding global fundamentals, whereas a smaller part of their significance may reflect general investor sentiment unrelated to fundamentals.

## 7 Conclusions

Estimates on the role that fundamentals play in asset prices depend on the quality of proxies used for fundamentals. We argued that traditional macroeconomic indicators are imperfect, because they are backward-looking in nature, are not available for many aspects of country fundamentals
including the possibility of tail risk scenarios that may be important for pricing. We also claimed that news articles contain information on such omitted factors, because journalists gather and summarize available information on these matters.

The first contribution of our research is a novel method that enables better extraction of such information. The extant literature proposes adequate methods to extract topical information from texts, which can gauge the importance of various fundamentals or countries at a given point in time. However topical expressions do not measure tonality, which is crucial if one wants to investigate how changing market perceptions about fundamentals affect asset prices. Popular methods of tonality extraction, on the other hand, are restricted to gauging tones of full documents, leading to difficulties when there are more topics within a document. Moreover, tonality of words depend on the particular topical expression, which current methods cannot handle.

Our method uses regular expressions to jointly extract topical and related tonality information from textual data. This allows us to create indices from news articles which can tell us information about the level of fundamentals, the direction of their changes and possibly the risks surrounding their future. We think the general idea underlying our method is a useful addition that could be used in many future applications relying on textual input in economics and finance.

The second contribution of the paper relates to an ongoing discussion in finance about the role of fundamentals within asset pricing and, in particular, sovereign credit spreads. To add to this discussion we extract news indices on seven fundamentals of a large cross-section of countries and provide empirical evidence that these indices do indeed recover information about country fundamentals.

These constructed news indices are then shown to explain a significant variation in sovereign credit spreads that are not captured by traditional indicators of fundamentals. Using traditional macro variables we find a very limited role for fundamentals with respect to changes of sovereign spreads: explaining less than a tenth of total variation. Together with our news indices, however, this share increases to the 40-50 percent range.

Fundamentals of globally important countries explain most of this additional variation in sovereign spreads. This provides empirical support for the view that common fluctuations in sovereign credit spreads are partly rooted in fundamentals or their expectations (e.g. Benzoni et al., 2015; Augustin and Tédongap, 2016). It also shows that the often found explanatory power of globally important financial variables (such as the VIX index and corporate high yield spreads) in sovereign spread regressions is partly a result of fundamentals and should not all be attributed to non-fundamental factors.

Because a significant part of systemic fluctuations in asset prices are common not only across countries but also across asset classes, our results may generalize to assets outside of sovereign credit. Hence an interesting avenue for future research would be to revisit the existing evidence on the sources of asset price fluctuations more generally using our news indices.
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## A Macroeconomic and financial data

Table A1: Data sources

| Data | Download Source (original source/MNEMONIC) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Sovereign credit risk pricing data ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Sovereign 5-year Credit Default Swap premia | Bloomberg (CMA) |
| (Eurozone) benchmark 5-year bond yields | Bloomberg (generic rates) |
| EMBI Global spreads | Datastream (JP Morgan) |
| (Traditional) Macroeconomic and financial data ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |
| World real GDP annual growth rate | IMF WEO (NGDP_RPCH) |
| Real GDP annual growth rate | WB WDI (NY_GDP_MKTP_KD_ZG) |
| GDP constant prices, national curr., seas.adj. | WB GEM (NYGDPMKTPSAKN) |
| GDP current prices, USD, seas.adj. | WB GEM (NYGDPMKTPSACD) |
| Current account balance, current USD | IMF IFS (BGS_BP6_USD) |
| Official reserves, current USD | WB GEM (TOTRESV) |
| Fiscal balance/GDP | IMF WEO (GGXCNL_NGDP) |
| Gross public debt/GDP | IMF HIST (GGXWDG_GDP) |
| VIX index (3-mo ATM implied vol, S\&P500) | Bloomberg (CBOE, VIX index) |
| US Corp.spec.grade bond spread over 10-year Treasury notes | Bloomberg (CBOE, VIX index) |
| Other macroeconomic data |  |
| US macroeconomic announcements and surveys | Bloomerg ECO ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |
| UK macroeconomic announcements and surveys | Bloomerg ECO ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| China macroeconomic announcements and surveys | Bloomerg ECO ${ }^{\text {e }}$ |
| Germany macroeconomic announcements and surveys | Bloomerg ECO ${ }^{\text {f }}$ |
| Japan macroeconomic announcements and surveys | Bloomerg ECO ${ }^{\text {g }}$ |

Notes: Descriptive statistics of news items filtered by relevance and duplication.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Country lists: CDS spreads were available for: ARGE (Argentina), AUSL (Australia), AUT (Austria), BELG (Belgium), BRAZ (Brazil), BULG (Bulgaria), CHIL (Chile), CHIN (China), COLO (Colorado), CROA (Croatia), CZEC (Czech Republic), DENM (Denmark), EGYP (Egypt), ESTO (Estonia), FINL (Finland), FRAN (France), GERM (Germany), GREE (Greece), HONG (Hong Kong), HUNG (Hungary), ICEL (Iceland), INDO (Indonesia), IREL (Ireland), ISRA (Israel), ITAL (Italy), JAPA (Japan), KAZA (Kazakhstan), KORE (South Korea), LATV (Latvia), LEBA (Lebanon), LITH (Lithuania), MALA (Malaysia), MEXI (Mexico), NETH (Netherlands), NZ (New Zealand), NORW (Norway), PAKI (Pakistan), PANA (Panama), PERU (Peru), PHIL (Phillippines), POLA (Poland), PORT (Portugal), ROMA (Romania), RUSS (Russia), SOAF (South Africa), SPAI (Spain), SRIL (Sri Lanka), SWED (Sweden), SWI (Switzerland), THAI (Thailand), TUNE (Tunesia), TURK (Turkey), UK (United Kingdom), UKRA (Ukraine), URUG (Uruguay), US (United States), VENE (Venezuela), VIET (Vietnam). EMBI Global spreads available for: ARGE, BRAZ, BULG, CHIL, CHIN, COLO, EGYP, HUNG, INDO, KAZA, LEBA, MALA, MEXI, PAKI, PANA, PERU, PHIL, POLA, ROMA, RUSS, SOAF, SRIL, TUNE, TURK, UKRA, URUG, VENE, VIET. Eurozone benchmark yields: AUT, BELG, ESTO, FINL, FRAN, GERM, GREE, IREL, ITAL, NETH, PORT, SPAI. ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ IMF WEO: International Monetary Fund World Economic Outlook; IFS: International Financial Statistics; HIST: Historical Public debt; WB WDI: World Bank World Development Indicators; GEM: Global Economic Monitor; CBOE: Chicago Board of Exchange.
${ }^{c}$ US Bloomberg tickers: REAL: ADP CHNG Index, AWH TOTL Index, CFNAI Index, CGNOXAI\% Index, CHPMINDX Index, CNSTTMOM Index, CONCCONF Index, CONSCURR Index, CONSEXP Index, CONSPXMD Index, CONSSENT Index, CPTICHNG Index, DFEDGBA Index, DGNOCHNG Index, ECI SA\% Index, ECONGECC Index, EMPRGBCI Index, ETSLMOM Index, ETSLTOTL Index, GDP CQOQ Index, GDP PIQQ Index, GDPCTOT\% Index, HPI PURQ Index, HPIMMOM\% Index, INJCJC Index, INJCSP Index, IP CHNG Index, IPMGCHNG Index, KCLSSACI Index, LEI CHNG Index, MPMIUSCA Index, MPMIUSMA Index, MPMIUSSA Index, MTIBCHNG Index, MWSLCHNG Index, NAPMPMI Index, NFP PCH Index, NFP TCH Index, NHCHATCH Index, NHCHSTCH Index, NHSLCHNG Index, NHSLTOT Index, NHSPATOT Index, NHSPSTOT Index, NWORCHNG Index, OUTFGAF Index, PCE CHNC Index, PCE CRCH Index, PITLCHNG Index, PRUSTOT Index, RSTAMOM Index, RSTAXAG\% Index, RSTAXAGM Index, RSTAXMOM Index, SAARDTOT Index, SAARTOTL Index, SBOITOTL Index, TMNOCHNG Index, TMNOXTM\% Index, USMN H Index, USHBMIDX Index, USMMMNCH Index, USPHTMOM Index, USPHTYOY Index, USUDMAER Index, USURTOT Index; EXTERN: IMP1CHNG Index, IMP1YOY\% Index, USCABAL Index, USTBTOT Index, USTGTTCB Index
${ }^{\text {d}}$ UK Bloomberg tickers: REAL: DTSDD1RB Index, DTSRRIRB Index, ITSRIB Index, KPRSLFLS Index, LTSBBSBX Index, MPMIGBCA Index, MPMIGBMA Index, MPMIGBSA Index, MPMIGBXA Index, MTEF1C Index, UKBINPEQ Index, UKBINPEY Index, UKCCI Index, UKCNALSM Index, UKCNALSY Index, UKDHUKY Index, UKEGESIG Index, UKGEABRQ Index, UKGENMYQ Index, UKGRABIQ index, UKGRABIY Index, UKHB3MYR Index, UKHBSAMM Index, UKIPIMOM Index, UKIPIYOY Index, UKLFEMCH Index, UKMLMNHP Index, UKMPIMOM Index, UKMPIYOY Index, UKNBAAMM Index, UKNBANYY Index, UKRMNAPM Index, UKRMNAPY Index, UKRVAMOM Index, UKRVAYOY Index, UKRVINFM Index, UKRVINFY Index, UKRXPBAL Index, UKUEILOR Index, UKUEMOM Index, UKUER Index, UKVHRYY Index; EXTERN: UKCA Index, UKCR Index, UKGEIKKQ Index, UKGEIKLQ Index, UKTBALEE Index, UKTBLGDT Index, UKTBTTBA Index
${ }^{e}$ China Bloomberg tickers: REAL: CHBNINDX Index, CHVAICY Index, CHVAIOY Index, CNCILI Index, CNDIINRY Index, CNGDPC\$Y Index, CNGDPQOQ Index, CNGDPYOY Index, CNPRETLY Index, CNRSACMY Index, CNRSCYOY Index, CPMINDX Index, CPMINMAN Index, MNCCINDX Index, MPMICNCA Index, MPMICNMA Index, MPMICNSA Index; EXTERN: CNFRBAL\$ Index, CNFREXPY Index, CNFRIMPY Index, CNGFOREX Index, CNTSECNY Index, CNTSICNY Index, CNTSTCN Index.
${ }^{\text {f }}$ Germany Bloomberg tickers: REAL: ECO1GFKC Index, GDPB95YY Index, GEINYY Index, GEIOYY Index, GRFIFINB Index, GRFRIAMM Index, GRFRINYY Index, GRGDARCL Index, GRGDGCIQ Index, GRGDGCQ Index, GRGDICQ Index, GRGDPCQ Index, GRGDPPGQ Index, GRGDPPGY Index, GRIFPBUS Index, GRIFPCA Index, GRIFPEX Index, GRIORTMM Index, GRIPIMOM Index, GRUECHNG Index, GRUEPR Index, GRZECURR Index, GRZEWI Index, MPMIDECA Index, MPMIDEMA Index, MPMIDERA Index, MPMIDESA Index, MPMIDEXA Index; EXTERN: GRBTEXMM Index, GRBTIMMM Index, GRCAEU Index, GRGDEXQ Index, GRGDIMQ Index, GRIMP95M Index, GRIMP95Y Index, GRTBALE Index
${ }^{\text {g }}$ Japan Bloomberg tickers: REAL: JBLDHFOY Index, JBSIBCLA Index, JBSIBCLM Index, JCOMSHCF Index, JGDOQOQ Index, JGDPAGDP Index, JGDPCIQ Index, JGDPPCQ Index, JGDPQGDP Index, JHHSLERY Index, JNC SALE Index, JNCAPMOM Index, JNCICLEI Index, JNCVSSY Index, JNCSTOTY Index, JNDSNYOY Index, JNDSTYOY Index, JNHSAN Index, JNHSYOY Index, JNIPMOM Index, JNIPYOY Index, JNMOCHNG Index, JNMOYOY Index, JNMTOY Index, JNNETYOY Index, JNRETMOM Index, JNRSYOY Index, JNSASYOY Index, JNSBALLI Index, JNSMTYOY Index, JNTEMFG Index, JNTENMFG Index, JNTIAIAM Index, JNTIAMOM Index, JNTSMFG Index, JNTSNMFG Index, JNUE Index, JNVHPYOY Index, JNVHSYOY Index, JNVNIYOY Index, JNVNYOYS Index, JPTFLMFG Index, JPTFLNMF Index, JPTFSMFG Index, JPTFSNMF Index, JTFIFILA Index, MPMIJPCA Index, MPMIJPMA Index, MPMIJPSA Index; EXTERN: JNBPAB Index, JNBPABA Index, JNBPTRD Index, JNFRTOTL Index, JNTBAL Index, JNTBALA Index, JNTBEXPY Index, JNTBIMPY Index.

## B Creating the news database

Preparing the news data for analysis consisted of the following steps:

1. downloading and parsing html content to obtain article title, text bodies, date stamps;
2. formatting and cleaning text from html tags, company tickers, etc., inserting paragraph identifiers;
3. removing irrelevant news items;
4. removing duplications of news items;
5. inserting labels representing synonyms;
6. inserting labels representing simple expressions;
7. inserting labels representing fundamental expressions;

One advantage of the Reuters data set is that article html sources codes have a standardized structure, therefore the same extraction and parsing code can be used for all items in the data set. After parsing the html code for article id, title, date stamp, article text, we used regular expressions to clean the text from html tags left within the article and to remove meta-information items at the beginning and end of articles. Text was transformed to lowercase (before this action keywords were inserted into the text where lowering case would lose information, e.g keyw_us before 'US', keyw_cds before 'CDS', keyw_fed before 'Fed'), so that we could easily differentiate later inserted identifiers which would enter with upper case characters. Most non-alphanumeric characters were either removed or replaced with remaining separator characters: comma and period and the identifier ' P ' inserted to represent paragraph shift. These separators were left in the text, which could later be used as proximity criteria to restrict elements of fundamental expressions to belong into the same unit of text (clause, sentence, paragraph).

Removing irrelevant news at this stage served to reduce the size of the data set to make later calculations more computationally efficient. We rather wanted to err on the side of caution, so that we aimed to keep more of the relevant articles at the expense of throwing away less of the likely irrelevant articles. We randomly selected 6000 news articles and labelled them based only on the article titles into the classes: 'not relevant', 'relevant', 'not obvious'.

The support vector machine (SVM) supplied by Oracle Text was then trained using the standard bag-of words approach on the binary 'relevant' - 'not relevant' cases (not obvious cases were not included in the estimation). First, we trained the SVM on two-thirds of the sample and used the other one-third, 1415 news items, to test the method and choose an appropriate posterior probability cutoff value for discriminating between relevant and irrelevant classes. Figure 1 shows how increasing the posterior probability cutoff for relevance (positives) cutoff increases predictions of belonging into the irrelevant (negative) class. True negative predictions rise much
faster than false negatives demonstrating the efficiency of the learning algorithm. The probability value of 0.28 (SVM score 28) maximizes the Matthews correlation coefficient, but we chose a lower cutoff of 18 that had only 19 false negatives compared with 33 false negatives at the 28 cutoff. The chosen cutoff still identified 964 true negative cases (about 100 less than the 28 cutoff).

Figure B.1: True and false negatives at chosen SVM cutoff


Source: authors' calculations.
Notes: In a test sample of 1415 news items 1178 news items were labelled as not having relevant fundamental information. The figure shows the results of predictions of a support vector machine (SVM) trained on a separate set of news articles. As the posterior probability cutoff increases (X axis) more items are classified as irrelevant either correctly (true negatives) or incorrectly (false negatives). It shows the efficiency of the algorithm that at any cutoff correct filtering (primary axis) significantly exceeds Type II errors (secondary axis).

The last step in data preparation that further reduced our news data set is a filtering of duplicate or close to duplicate news. This is important, because the number and ratio of duplicate news is seen to vary greatly across different time periods, which would distort our measure of daily relevant news. Even a quick inspection of lists of daily titles on the Reuters website calls attention to duplicates by observing consecutive items with the same titles. For instance, the first date in the archive ${ }^{35}$ lists 173 items of which 30 have the same title as the subsequent news item. While perfect matches in the title are a good indication of duplicates, it is neither a sufficient nor a necessary condition for matching text bodies. Computationally, the perfect matches on the same date are easy to find. However, this leaves out many more articles that are only close

[^17]matches, such as article pairs of which one is an update, expansion or correction of a previously published news item. Spotting these requires more computational effort.

Table B.1: Filtering news items by relevance

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SVM } \\ & \text { relevance } \\ & \text { score } \end{aligned}$ | title | url |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEAST RELEVANTS (SVM 0-3) |  |  |
| 0 | tennis-adelaide international men's singles round robin results | http://UK.reuters.com/article/UK_TENNIS/idUKISS66050620070101 |
| 1 | press digest - new york times - jan 1 | http://UK.reuters.com/article/governmentFilingsNews/idUKBNG13770420070101 |
| 1 | text-internet gold completes 012 golden lines purchase | http://UK.reuters.com/article/governmentFilingsNews/idUKL0189775620070101 |
| 2 | brisa says to invest 393 mln euros in 2007 | http://UK.reuters.com/article/basicIndustries/idUKL2983318020070101 |
| 2 | golf-revamped tour seeks excitement to last tee | http://UK.reuters.com/article/golfNews/idUKL0187483820070101 |
| 2 | update 4 -tennis-auckland open women's singles round 1 results | http://UK.reuters.com/article/UK_TENNIS/idUKISS65674420070101 |
| 2 | update 1-tennis-hopman cup singles results | http://UK.reuters.com/article/UK_TENNIS/idUKISS65702220070101 |
| 2 | nissan to build 200,000 -unit plant in india-paper | http://UK.reuters.com/article/governmentFilingsNews/idUKT14803520070101 |
| 2 | soccer-israeli championship results and standings | http://UK.reuters.com/article/UK_SOCCER/idUKISS65887920070101 |
| , | pope says peace depends on respecting human rights | http://UK.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idUKL0189313020070101 |
| 2 | factbox-golf-inaugural fedexcup cup | http://UK.reuters.com/article/golfNews/idUKL0188151720070101 |
| 2 | update 1-soccer-buchwald completes double with reds in send-off | http://UK.reuters.com/article/UK_SOCCER/idUKSP13728020070101 |
| 3 | update 1-tennis-chennai open men's singles round 1 results | http://UK.reuters.com/article/UK_TENNIS/idUKISS65930520070101 |
| 3 | update 4 -tennis-qatar open men's singles round 1 results | http://UK.reuters.com/article/UK_TENNIS/idUKISS65928820070101 |
| 3 | update 4-tennis-australian women's hardcourts women's singles round 1 results | http://UK.reuters.com/article/UK_TENNIS/idUKISS65700520070101 |
| 3 | cricket-rain delays start of final ashes test | http://UK.reuters.com/article/UK_CRICKET/idUKSP14824120070101 |
| 3 | update 1-tennis-australia's luczak stuns hrbaty in adelaide | http://UK.reuters.com/article/UK_TENNIS/idUKSP13109820070101 |
| 3 | japan tv apologises for "topless" new year's eve shock | http://UK.reuters.com/article/oddlyEnoughNews/idUKT13300820070103 |
| 3 | gene-engineered cattle resist mad cow disease: study | http://UK.reuters.com/article/scienceNews/idUKN3126493620070104 |
| 3 | diary - global environment | http://UK.reuters.com/article/oilRpt/idUKENVIRO20070101 |
| 3 | temis-myskina loses in auckland, may miss australian open | http://UK.reuters.com/article/UK_TENNIS/idUKSP14629720070101 |
| CLOSE TO RELEVANCE (SVM 13-18) |  |  |
| 13 | soccer-results/standings from australian a-league | http://UK.reuters.com/article/UK_WORLDFOOTBALL/idUKSP14587420070101 |
| 13 | latin balladeers, reality stars eye breakthrough | http://UK.reuters.com/article/musicNews/idUKN3146991620070102 |
| 14 | iraqis ponder lessons of history after saddam hangs | http://UK.reuters.com/article/featuresNews/idUKPAR15182820070103 |
| 14 | repeat-cricket-one-day international series new zealand v sri lanka line-ups | http://UK.reuters.com/article/UK_CRICKET/idUKISS66382220070101 |
| 14 | eu newcomers hopeful, anxious about membership | http://UK.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idUKL0185119420070101 |
| 14 | farewells fuel bid for ashes clean sweep | http://UK.reuters.com/article/UKNews1/idUKSP13321520070101 |
| 14 | somali government vows to pursue fleeing islamists | http://UK.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idUKL0186366220070101 |
| 14 | chrysler signs small-car deal with china's chery | http://UK.reuters.com/article/basicIndustries/idUKN2925438120070101 |
| 15 | update 1-china auto exports hit record in 2006 | http://UK.reuters.com/article/governmentFilingsNews/idUKPEK13212620070101 |
| 15 | update 1-tennis-baghdatis defeats kohlschreiber in qatar | http://UK.reuters.com/article/UK_TENNIS/idUKL0189818420070101 |
| 15 | tv shows restraint with limited saddam footage | http://UK.reuters.com/article/televisionNews/idUKN2821679420070101 |
| 16 | romanian and bulgaria celebrate eu entry | http://UK.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idUKL2977273320070101 |
| RELEVANTS (SVM 18-100) |  |  |
| 18 | storms wash out new year parties across britain | http://UK.reuters.com/article/UKNews1/idUKL0189036120070101 |
| 18 | minimum cigarette buying age to rise to 18 | http://UK.reuters.com/article/UKNews1/idUKL3080853820070101 |
| 20 | stay off bangkok streets -foreign governments | http://UK.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idUKBKK14142020070101 |
| 21 | soccer-australian championship results and standings | http://UK.reuters.com/article/UK_WORLDFOOTBALL/idUKISS65889520070101 |
| 21 | golf-world ranking standings | http://UK.reuters.com/article/golfNews/idUKISS66242520070101 |
| 22 | horse meat, kale and crickets on menu at bronx zoo | http://UK.reuters.com/article/featuresNews/idUKN2821130020070102 |
| 22 | thai pm blames ex-politicians for bombs | http://UK.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idUKBKK14460620070101 |
| 22 | saddam's daughter attends protest in jordan | http://UK.reuters.com/article/breakingNews/idUKL0186083720070101 |
| 24 | eu newcomers hopeful, anxious about membership | http://UK.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idUKL0185119420070101 |
| 28 | hyundai heavy 2006 sales up 22 pct on orders | http://UK.reuters.com/article/basicIndustries/idUKSEO14750020070101 |
| 30 | mild jobs may lift stocks as ' 07 starts | http://UK.reuters.com/article/pressReleases/idUKN2925725620070102 |
| 31 | rpt-wall st week ahead: mild jobs may lift stocks as ' 07 starts | http://UK.reuters.com/article/oilRpt/idUKN3126282720070101 |
| 32 | russia, belarus sign gas deal | http://UK.reuters.com/article/businessNews/idUKL2978817720070101 |
| 40 | iraq to probe filming of saddam hanging | http://UK.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idUKPAR96599620070101 |
| 41 | thailand says thaksin backers may be behind blasts | http://UK.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idUKBKK14775120070101 |
| 47 | chronology of somalia's collapse, conflict | http://UK.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idUKL0188726320070101 |
| 48 | dead leaders drive lebanese political life | http://UK.reuters.com/article/featuresNews/idUKL2215259520070103 |
| 49 | somali islamists flee towards kenya and to the hills | http://UK.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idUKL2859346720070101 |
| 56 | web wishes show contrasting french election styles | http://UK.reuters.com/article/technologyNews/idUKL0178602420070102 |
| 57 | brazil's lula pledges economic growth in 2nd term | http://UK.reuters.com/article/governmentFilingsNews/idUKN2838881720070101 |
| 58 | somalis stroll mogadishu under eye of govt victors | http://UK.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idUKL0189682420070101 |
| 70 | weekahead-emerging debt to start 2007 eyeing brazil, keyw_us data | http://UK.reuters.com/article/marketsNewsUS/idUKN3134666220070101 |
| 73 | dollar a shade softer, yen stays subdued | http://UK.reuters.com/article/hotStocksNewsUS/idUKN2941694320070101 |
| 73 | slovenia joins euro to crown ex-communist reform | http://UK.reuters.com/article/businessNews/idUKL3185272820070101 |
| 90 | update 1-peru consumer prices rose 1.14 percent in 2006 | http://UK.reuters.com/article/marketsNewsUS/idUKN0116566320070101 |

Notes: News items are considered relevant in terms of fundamental information if the SVM score is at least 18 . Based on the news sample of January 1, 2007

The methodology we found to be accurate and computationally feasible is the following. For computational feasibility we needed to first reduce the number of news item pairs to investigate. We achieved this by inspecting all pairs of news titles on a given day checking whether the longer title of the two contained 60 percent of words (rounded up to the nearest integer) in the shorter title. This produced a lot of false negatives, but it also drastically reduced the number of article pairs to compare. All permutations were then checked within each group whether the longer article of a pair largely encompassed the shorter article or not. We defined the encompassing

Table B.2: Filtering news items - the first 40 items of the Jan 1, 2007 sample

| title | url | $\begin{gathered} \text { SVM } \\ \text { relevance } \\ \text { score } \end{gathered}$ | is_relevant | is_duplicateis_ | included |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Newcomer a "Rae" of light at Grammys | http://UK.reuters.com/article/entertainmentNews/idUKN0126427220070101 | 5 | 0 |  | 0 |
| physical abuse leads to adult depression -study | http://UK.reuters.com/article/UKNews1/idUKN2924492920070101 | 5 | 0 |  | 0 |
| repeat-cricket-one-day international series new zealand v sri lanka line-ups | http://UK.reuters.com/article/UK_CRICKET/idUKISS66382220070101 | 14 | 0 |  | 0 |
| somalis stroll mogadishu under eye of govt victors | http://UK.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idUKL0189682420070101 | 58 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| hoggard ruled of fifth test | http://UK.reuters.com/article/sportsNews/idUKSP13634320070101 | 10 | 0 |  | , |
| airasia no comment on easyjet, virgin tie-up report | http://UK.reuters.com/article/businessNews/idUKL0174299720070101 | 7 | 0 |  | 0 |
| cricket-rain delays start of new zealand v sri lanka one-dayer | http://UK.reuters.com/article/UK_CRICKET/idUKSP13543120070101 | 8 | 0 |  | 0 |
| dollar a shade softer, yen stays subdued | http://UK.reuters.com/article/hotStocksNewsUS/idUKN2941694320070101 | 73 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| romanian and bulgaria celebrate eu entry | http://UK.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idUKL2977273320070101 | 16 | 0 |  | 0 |
| iraq to probe filming of saddam hanging | http://UK.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idUKPAR96599620070101 | 40 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| eu newcomers hopeful, anxious about membership | http://UK.reuters.com/articl/worldNews/idUKL0185199420070101 | 14 | 0 |  | 0 |
| eu newcomers hopeful, anxious about membership | http://UK.reuters.com/article/featuresNews/idUKL0185119420070102 | 24 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| eu newcomers hopeful, anxious about membership | http://UK.reuters.com/article/featuresNews/idUKL0185119420070103 | 24 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| australian lexicon can leave you a few roos loose | http://UK.reuters.com/article/featuresNews//dUKSYD13951520070101 | 8 | 0 |  | 0 |
| cricket-rain delays start of final ashes test | http://UK.reuters.com/article/UK_CRICKET/idUKSP14824120070101 | 3 | 0 |  | 0 |
| hyundai motor says missed sales target amid strike | http://UK.reuters.com/article/basicIndustries/idUKSEO17075520070101 | 8 | 0 |  | 0 |
| delta loses $\$ 49 \mathrm{mln}$ in november | http://UK.reuters.com/article/basicIndustries/idUKN2923590820070101 | 7 | 0 |  | 0 |
| goodyear workers ratify three-year contract | http://UK.reuters.com/article/basicIndustries/idUKN2923964120070101 | 7 | 0 |  | 0 |
| brisa says to invest 393 mln euros in 2007 | http://UK.reuters.com/article/basicIndustries/idUKL2983318020070101 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 |
| italy opens for bidding for unprofitable alitalia | http://UK.reuters.com/article/basicIndustries/idUKL2928824420070101 | 12 | 0 |  | 0 |
| ace says initial aeroplan payout worth $¢ 8856 \mathrm{mln}$ | http://UK.reuters.com/article/basicIndustries/idUKN2817860220070101 | 6 | 0 |  | 0 |
| hyundai heavy 2006 sales up 22 pet on orders | http://UK.reuters.com/article/basicIndustries/idUKSEO14750020070101 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| chrysler signs small-car deal with china's chery | http://UK.reuters.com/article/basicIndustries/idUKN2925438120070101 | 14 | 0 |  | 0 |
| vw brand head bernhard set to leave - paper | http://UK.reuters.com/article/basicIndustries/idUKL2982699320070101 | 8 | 0 |  | 0 |
| in kidnapping, finesse works best | http://UK.reuters.com/article/featuresNews/idUKN1130230420070104 | 6 | 0 |  | 0 |
| in kidnapping, finesse works best | http://UK.reuters.com/article/featuresNews/idUKN1130230420070103 | 6 | 0 |  | 0 |
| in kidnapping, finesse works best | http://UK.reuters.com/article/featuresNews/idUKN1130230420070102 | 6 | 0 |  | 0 |
| in kidnapping, finesse works best | http://UK.reuters.com/article/featuresNews/idUKN1130230420070101 | 6 | 0 |  | 0 |
| india's forgotten tribes gain rights over forests | http://UK.reuters.com/article/featuresNews/idUKDEL25463820070101 | 12 | 0 |  | 0 |
| greying workers wanted for hire in aging japan | http://UK.reuters.com/article/featuresNews/idUKT13946420070102 | 11 | 0 |  | 0 |
| greying workers wanted for hire in aging japan | http://UK.reuters.com/article/featuresNews/idUKT13946420070101 | 11 | 0 |  | 0 |
| photographer, palestinian gunmen abducted in gaza | http://UK.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idUKL0188700420070101 | 10 | 0 |  | 0 |
| priest's death shows russia's rural rot | http://UK.reuters.com/article/featuresNews/idUKL2733377520070102 | 4 | 0 |  | 0 |
| priest's death shows russia's rural rot | http://UK.reuters.com/article/featuresNews/idUKL2733377520070101 | 4 | 0 |  | 0 |
| horse meat, kale and crickets on menu at bronx zoo | http://UK.reuters.com/article/featuresNews/idUKN2821130020070102 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| horse meat, kale and crickets on menu at bronx zoo | http://UK.reuters.com/article/featuresNews/idUKN2821130020070101 | 22 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| dead leaders drive lebanese political life | http://UK.reuters.com/article/featuresNews/idUKL2215259520070103 | 48 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| dead leaders drive lebanese political life | http://UK.reuters.com/article/featuresNews/idUKL2215259520070102 | 48 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| dead leaders drive lebanese political life | http://UK.reuters.com/article/featuresNews/idUKL2215259520070101 | 48 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| celebrating new year in deadly safrican hotspot | http://UK.reuters.com/article/featuresNews/idUKL0160780920070101 | 11 | 0 |  | 0 |

Sources: Reuters news archives and authors' calculations.
Notes: News items considered restal information (SVM score> $=18$ ) are flagged in column 4 , duplicate filtering is then carried out on these items.
rule as having at least 2 matched paragraphs (perfect string match after removing preceding and trailing non-alphanumeric characters). When so defined duplicates were found, the shorter article was flagged for removal.

Several types of keywords were inserted into the text that later formed parts of the fundamental expressions that we were looking for. At the beginning of the section, we referred to these as synonyms for simplicity, but in fact the groups of words or simple expressions identified often had wider differences in meaning than what could be labelled as synonyms. Our idea was to identify words or expressions that referred to similar concepts and which would be close substitutes within fundamental expressions.

Our list therefore was not intended to be a general-purpose thesaurus. It is specific to the context and language of the economic-financial media that we are dealing with and it is restricted to the expressions and phrases of fundamentals that are of interest for this specific research project.

## C Additional information on news indices

Table C.1: Synonym labels

| geography | geography | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { negation } \\ & \text { adjectives } \end{aligned}$ | currency names | nouns | nouns | nouns | verbs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G1_ARGE | G2_AFGH | NEG | N_FX N_USD | N_CB G1_UK N_BOE | N_DEBT | N_PANIC | V_ACCELERATE |
| G1_AUSL | G2_AFR | NEG2 | N_FX N_EUR | N_CB G1_EZ N_ECB | N_AID | N_TROUBLE | V_DECELERATE |
| G1_AUT | G2_ALGE | A_GOOD2 | N_FX N_GBP | N_CB G1_US N_FED | N_GOVT | N_RISK | V_RISE |
| G1_BELG | G2_ASIA | A_GOOD1 | N_FX N_CHF | N_CB G1_SWED N_RIKSBANK | N_FISCAL | N_HOPE | V_FALL |
| G1_BRAZ | G2_BOLI | A_GOOD0 | N_FX N_JPY | N_CB G1_GERM N_BUNDESBANK | N_DEFICIT | N_CONCERN | V_RAISE |
| G1_BULG | G2_CHIL | A_BAD2 | N_FX N_CNY | N_CB G1_JAPA N_BOJ | N_SURPLUS | N_CHANCE | V_CUT |
| G1_CANA | G2_COLO | A_BAD1 | N_FX N_ARS | G1_UK N_SLS | N_BALANCE | N_FORECAST | V_IMPROVE |
| G1_CHIN | G2_DEV | A_BAD0 | N_FX N_AUD | N_BRATE | N_REVENUE | N_THAN | V_WORSEN |
| G1_CROA | G2_ECUA | A_LARGE2 | N_FX N_BRL | N_ZLB | N_SPENDING | N_UPTURN | V_TIGHTEN |
| G1_CYPR | G2_EGYP | A_LARGE1 | N_FX N_CAD | N_QE | N_INVEST | N_ACTUAL | V_EASE |
| G1_CZEC | G2_EM | A_SMALL1 | N_FX N_CLP | G1_US N_TAPER | N_SOCIAL | N_NUMBER | V_STRENGTHEN |
| G1_DENM | G2_GEOR | A_SMALL2 | N_FX N_HRK | G1_EZ N_OMT | N_DEFENSE | N_IMPROVEMENT | V_WEAKEN |
| G1_EMEA | G2_HONG | A_BETTER | N_FX N_CZK | G1_EZ N_SMP | N_GUARANTEE | N_DETERIORATION | V_BEGIN |
| G1_ESTO | G2_INDO | A_WORSE | N_FX N_HKD | G1_EZ N_ELA | N_BANKS | N_INCREASE | V_END |
| G1_EU | G2_IRAN | A HIGHER | N_FX N_hUF | G1_EZ N_LTRO | N_BAILOUT | N_DECREASE | V_CRUSH |
| G1_EZ | G2_IRAQ | A_LOWER | N_FX N_KRW | G1_US N_TAF | N_RECAPITAL | N_LABORM | V_SURPASS |
| G1_FINL | G2_ISRA | A_INSTABLE | N_FX N_LVL | G1_US N_TALF | N_NPL | N_RULELAW | V_TRAIL |
| G1_FRAN | G2_JAMA | A_STABLE | N_FX N_LTL | N_CB | N_PORTFOLIO | N_PROPRIGHTS | V_ACHIEVE |
| G1_GERM | G2_KAZA | A_AMPLE | N_FX N_EEK | N_REQRESERVES | N_CAPADEQ | N_FREEDOM | V_BECOME |
| G1_GLOB | G2_KORE | A_SCARCE | N_FX N_MYR | N_GDP | N_CAPITAL | N_CONTROLS | V_HISTORY |
| G1_GREE | G2_LEBA | A_FAILED | N_FX N_IDR | N_HHI | N_TOXIC | N_REGULATIONS | V_GO |
| G1_HUNG | G2_LYBI | A_SEVERE | N_FX N_INR | N_CONS | N_PROFITS | N_INSTITUTIONS | V_PERCEIVE |
| G1_ICEL | G2_MALA | A_MATURING | N_FX N_ISK | N_BCONF | N_BFUNDING | N_STRUCTURES | V_PREDICT |
| G1_INDI | G2_MORO | A_RIGID | N_FX N_MXN | N_CCONF | G1_EZ N_ESM | N_FLEXIBILITY | V_THINK |
| G1_IREL | G2_NIGE | A_FLEXIBLE | N_FX N_NZD | N_PMI | G1_EZ N_BANKUNION | N_RIGIDITY | V_CONVEY |
| G1_ITAL | G2_NKOR | A_UNSUSTAIN | N_FX N_NOK | N_INDU | N_LIQCRUNCH | N_RULING | V_ANNOUNCE |
| G1_JAPA | G2_PAKI | A_PROLONGED | N_FX N_SEK | N_MANUF | N_MACROPRUD | N_STABILITY | V_SUSTAIN |
| G1_LATAM | G2_PALE | A_RECURRING | N_FX N_DKK | N_CONSTR | N_ELECT | N_INSTABILITY | V_BLOCK |
| G1_LATV | G2_PANA | A_CONCERNED | N_FX N_PLN | N_EARN | N_PROTEST | G1_UK N_BREXIT | V_CHANGE |
| G1_LITH | G2_PERU |  | N_FX N_RON | N_UNEMP | N_CONFVOTE | G1_GREE N_GREXIT | V_EXIT |
| G1_LUXE | G2_PHIL |  | N_FX N_RUB | N_EMPL | N_PEACEK | N_CONFLICT | V_ENTER |
| G1_MALT | G2_SAUD |  | N_FX N_SGD | N_CPI | N_COUP | N_SUSTAIN | V_BREAKUP |
| G1_MEXI | G2_SERB |  | N_FX N_SKK | N_PPI | N_REBEL | G1_US N_FISCALCLIFF | V_ADOPT |
| G1_NETH | G2_SING |  | N_FX N_SIT | N_HOUSE | N_REVOL | N_DEBTCEIL | V_WITHDRAW |
| G1_NORW | G2_SOAF |  | N_FX N_ZAR | N_PRICE | N_PRIVATIZE | G1_US N_AUTOCUTS | V_RELAX |
| G1_NZ | G2_SRIL |  | N_FX N_TWD | N_BREAKUP | N_NATIONALIZE |  | V_WIDEN |
| G1_PIIGS | G2_SYRI |  | N_FX N_THB | N_ETRADE | N_WAR |  | V_LIMIT |
| G1_POLA | G2_TAIW |  | N_FX N_TRY | N_EXPORTS | N_ASSASS |  | V_REVALUE |
| G1_PORT | G2_THAI |  | N_FX N_UAH | N_IMPORTS | N_TERROR |  | V_DEVALUE |
| G1_ROMA | G2_TUNE |  | N_FX N_VND | N_EDEBT | N_CORRUPT |  | V_MISS |
| G1_RUSS | G2_UAE |  | N_FX N_VEF | N_FDI | N_POPULISM |  | V_DEPLETE |
| G1_SLOVAK | G2_URUG |  | N_FX N_COP | N_RES | N_CRISIS |  | V_REGAIN |
| G1_SLOVEN | G2_VENE |  | N_FX N_BGN | N_LIQUIDITY | N_PEACE |  | V_REJECT |
| G1_SPAI | G2_VIET |  | N_FX N_EGP | N_LENDING | N_ACCESSION |  | V_AGREE |
| G1_SWED | G2_YEME |  | N_FX N_ILS | N_PSI | N_COMMUNICATION |  | V_FAIL |
| G1_SWI | G3_AFR |  | N_FX N_KZT | N_INTLEND | N_TALKS |  | V_RECAPITAL |
| G1_TURK | G3_ASI |  | N_FX N_PEN | N_AUCTION | N_CHANGE |  | V_SAVE |
| G1_UK | G3_EUR |  | N_FX N_TND | N_CDS | N_AGREEMENT |  | V_PROTECT |
| G1_UKRA | G3_LAT |  | N_FX N_PAB | N_DEFAULT | N_STRAIN |  | V_EXPROP |
| G1_US |  |  | N_FX N_LKR | N_BONDS | N_FAILURE |  | V_IMPEACH |
|  |  |  | N_FX N_UYU |  |  |  | V_IMPOSE |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | V_Prevent |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | V_RESOLVE |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | V_IMPLEMENT |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | V_BREACH |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | V_PLEDGE |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | V_NEED |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | V_DISAPPEAR |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | V_REQUEST |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | V_RECEIVE |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | V_UNLOCK |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | V_ALLEVIATE |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | V_DEFAULT |

Notes: Synonym labels that are inserted into the text where instances of tokens (or n-grams) are found, which belong to the given synonym group. For a detailed list of tokens and n-grams for each group, see Tables.

Table C.2: Synonym labels and associated tokens, n-grams

| SYN_KEYS | TOKENS, N-GRAMS | N (000s) |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| NEG | doesnt, not, cant, didnt, wont, cannot, shouldnt, couldnt, no, wouldnt, nor, isnt, wasnt |  |
| NEG2 | despite, in spite of, regardless, although, albeit, notwithstanding | 1765.178 |
| N_FX N_USD | usd, keyw_us us dollar, keyw_us dollar, keyw_us us currency, keyw_us currency |  |
| N_FX N_EUR | eur, single currency, european currency |  |
| N_FX N_GBP | gbp, pound sterling, british pound, poundsterling, british currency, keyw_uk currency | 92.586 |
| N_FX N_CHF | chf, swiss franc, swiss currency |  |
| N_FX N_JPY | jpy, japanese yen, yen, japans currency, japanese currency | 9.265 |
| N_FX N_CNY | cny, yuan, renminbi, chinese currency | 25.104 |
|  |  |  |


| SYN_KEYS | TOKENS, N-GRAMS | N (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N_FX N_ARS | ars, argentinas currency, argentin peso, argentinian peso | 2.443 |
| N_FX N_AUD | aud, australias currency, australian dollar, australian currency | 20.825 |
| N_FX N_BRL | brl, brazils currency, brazilian currency, brazilian peso, brazil peso | 3.653 |
| N_FX N_CAD | canadas currency, canadian currency, canadian dollar, canada dollar | 32.841 |
| N_FX N_CLP | clp, chiles currency, chilean currency, chilean peso, chile peso | 3.058 |
| N_FX N_HRK | hrk, croatias currency, croatian currency, croatian kuna, kuna | 1.952 |
| N__FX N_CZK | czk, czechs currency, czech koruna, czech krona | 0.296 |
| N_FX N_HKD | hkd, hong kongs currency, hong kong dollar | 1.356 |
| N_FX N_HUF | huf, hungarys currency, hungarian forint, hungarian currency, forint | 8.629 |
| N_FX N_KRW | krw, koreas currency, korean won | 4.880 |
| N_FX N_LVL | lvl, latvias currency, latvian lat, latvian currency, lat | 0.673 |
| N_FX N_LTL | ltl, lithuanias currency, lithuanian lita, lithuanian currency, lita | 0.316 |
| N_FPX N_EEK | estonias currency, estonian kroon, estonian currency | 0.023 |
| N_FX N_MYR | myr, malaysias currency, malaysian ringgit, malaysian currency, ringgit | 11.919 |
| N_FX N_IDR | idr, indonesias currency, indonesian rupiah, indonesian currency, rupiah | 53.502 |
| N_FX N_INR | inr, indias currency, indian rupee, indian currency | 4.907 |
| N_FX N_ISK | isk, icelands currency, icelandic krona, icelandic currency | 0.090 |
| N_FX N_MXN | mxn, mexicos currency, mexican currency, mexican peso | 4.030 |
| N_FX N_NZD | nzd, new zealands currency, new zealand dollar | 8.107 |
| N_LFX N_NOK | nrw, norways currency, norwegian krone, norwegian currency | 0.802 |
| N_FX N_SEK | sek, swedens currency, swedish krona, swedish currency | 1.011 |
| N_FX N_DKK | dkk, denmarks currency, danish krone, danish currency | 0.302 |
| N_FX N_PLN | pln, polands currency, polish zloty, polish currency, zloty | 10.354 |
| N_FX N_RON | ron, romanias currency, romanian leu, romanian currency, leu | 5.909 |
| N__FX N_RUB | russias currency, russian rubel, russian currency, rubel | 0.479 |
| N_FX N_SGD | sgd, singapores currency, singapore dollar | 1.824 |
| N_FX N_SKK | skk, slovakias currency, slovakian koruna, slovak koruna | 0.305 |
| N_FX N_SIT | slovenias currency, slovenian tolar, tolar | 0.014 |
| N_FX N_ZAR | zar, south africas currency, south african rand, south african currency, rand | 14.988 |
| N_FX N_TWD | twd, taiwans currency, taiwanese dollar, taiwanese currency | 0.065 |
| N_FX N_THB | thb, thailands currency, thai baht, thai currency, baht | 17.169 |
| N__FX N_TRY | turkeys currency, turkish lira, turkish currency | 1.804 |
| N_FX N_UAH | uah, ukrains currency, ukrainian hryvnia, ukrainian currency, hrivnya, hryvnia | 2.427 |
| N_FX N_VND | vnd, vietnams currency, vietnamese dong, vietnamese currency | 0.183 |
| N_FX N_VEF | vef, venezuelas currency, venezuelan bolivar, venezuelan currency | 0.169 |
| N_FX N_COP | colombian peso, colombias peso, colombian currency, colombias currency | 0.973 |
| N_FX N_BGN | bulgarian lev, bulgarias lev, bulgarian currency, bulgarias currency | 0.177 |
| N_FFX N_EGP | egyptian pound, egypts pound, egyptian currency, egypts currency | 3.164 |
| N_FFX N_ILS | israeli sekel, israels sekel, israeli currency, israels currency | 0.245 |
| N_FPX N_KZT | kazakhstani tenge, kazakh tenge, kazakhstani currency, kazakh currency | 0.175 |
| N_FX N_PEN | peruvian peso, perus peso, peruvian currency, perus currency | 0.057 |
| N_FX N_TND | tnd, tunisian dinar, tunisias dinar, tunisian currency, tunisias currency | 0.072 |
| N_FX N_PAB | panamanian balboa | 0.000 |
| N_FX N_LKR | sri lankan rupee, sri lankas rupee, sri lankan currency, sri lankas currency | 2.138 |
| N_FX N_UYU | uruguayi peso, uruguays peso, uruguayi currency, uruguays currency | 0.006 |
| N_CB G1_UK | boe, bank of england, mervyn king, mark carney | 91.259 |
| N_BOE |  |  |
| N_CB G1_EZ | ecb, european central bank, trichet, draghi | 206.359 |
| N_ECB |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { N_CB G1_US } \\ & \text { N_FED } \end{aligned}$ | keyw_fed, fomc, federal reserve, yellen, bernanke, feds | 512.164 |
| N_CB G1_SWED | riksbank | 2.998 |
| N_RIKSBANK |  |  |
| N_CB G1_GERM | bundesbank | 7.670 |
| N_BUNDESBANK |  |  |
| N_CB G1_JAPA | boj, bank of japan | 88.625 |
| N_BOJ |  |  |
| G1_EZ | banking union, single resolution, bank resolution, single supervisory mechanism, european deposit | 7.117 |
| N_BANKUNION | insurance |  |
| G1_EZ N_ELA | ela, emergency liquidity assistance | 1.727 |
| G1_EZ N_EESM | efsf, esm, european stability mechanism, european financial stability facility | 20.444 |
| G1_EZ N_LTRO | ltro, long term refinancing, longterm refinancing, targeted longterm, targeted long term, tltro | 4.058 |
| G1_EZ N_OMT | omt, outright monetary transaction, whatever it takes | 3.470 |
| G1_EZ N_SMP | smp, securities markets programme, securities markets program, securities market program, securities market programme | 0.957 |
| G1_GREE | grexit | 1.204 |
| N_GREXIT |  |  |
| G1_UK | brexit | 10.755 |
| N_BREXIT |  |  |
| G1_UK N_SLS | special liquidity scheme, sls | 0.279 |
| G1_US | sequester, automatic spending cuts | 3.100 |
| N_AUTOCUTS |  |  |
| G1_US | fiscal cliff | 10.341 |
| N_FISCALCLIFF |  |  |
| G1_US N_LTAF | term auction facility, taf | 0.776 |
| G1_US N_TALF | term asset-backed securities, term assetbacked securities, talf | 1.622 |


| SYN_KEYS | TOKENS, N-GRAMS | N (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G1_US | tapering, taper tantrum | 8.889 |
| N_TAPER |  |  |
| N_ACTUAL | actual, published, announced, announcement | 202.472 |
| N_AGREEMENT | agreement, approval, deal, accord | 458.681 |
| N_AID | aid, financial support, financial assistance, help | 297.960 |
| N_ASSASS | assassin, assassination | 4.834 |
| N_AUCTION | bond auction, debt auction, debt sale, bond sale, bond issuance, debt issuance | 30.412 |
| N_BAILOUT | bailout, bail out, financial help, financial assistance, rescue | 171.300 |
| N_BALANCE | balance, position | 227.182 |
| N_BANKS | banks, banking system, financial institutions, financial intermediaries, banking sector, financial sector, financial system, banking system, financial industry | 795.424 |
| N_BCONF | economic confidence, business confidence, business survey, investor confidence, investors confidence, business sentiment, business climate index, economic confidence | 25.969 |
| N_BONDS | bonds, securities | 411.405 |
| N_BRATE | policy rate, base rate, central bank rate, refinancing rate, repo rate | 26.937 |
| N_CAPADEQ | capital adequacy, capital position | 7.337 |
| N_CAPITAL | capital, equity | 513.418 |
| N_CB | central bank, monetary authorities | 1346.342 |
| N_CCONF | consumer confidence, consumer survey, consumer sentiment | 35.607 |
| N_CDS | keyw_cds, credit default swap, protection against default, insure against default, protect against default | 18.775 |
| N_CHANCE | chance, probability, possibility, likelihood, odds | 133.292 |
| N_CHANGE | change, modification, alteration, shift, adjustment, revision, adaptation, adopt | 304.565 |
| N_COMMUNICATIONsignal, communication, statement, message, stance, rhetoric |  | 310.954 |
| N_CONCERN | concern, worry, worries, anxiety, fear, unease | 483.362 |
| N_CONFLICT | conflict, standoff, tension, clash, struggle, impasse, deadlock, stalemate, faceoff, row | 214.548 |
| N_CONFVOTE | vote of confidence, confidence vote | 5.463 |
| N_CONS | consumption, consumer demand, personal expenditure, household expenditure, durable goods, retail sale, consumer spending, household spending | 94.231 |
| N_CONSTR | constructions, construction ouptut, construction activity, construction sector | 4.458 |
| N_CONTROLS | controls, hurdles, restrictions, constraints, curbs, limits | 83.560 |
| N_CORRUPT | corruption, corrupt, nepotism, crony, cronies | 39.114 |
| N_COUP | coup, overthrow, rebellion, government takeover | 35.451 |
| N_CPI | consumer price index, cpi | 27.423 |
| N_CRISIS | crisis, turmoil, turbulence, chaos, disorder, disarray, mayhem, meltdown, mess, distress | 426.381 |
| N_DEBT | debt, liabilities, obligations | 646.659 |
| N_DEBTCEIL | debt ceiling | 10.137 |
| N_DECREASE | reduction, shrinkage, loss, cutback, waning, descent, deceleration | 142.362 |
| N_DEFAULT | credit event, debt swap, default, restructuring, moratorium, arrear, bankruptcy | 168.655 |
| N_DEFENSE | defense, military | 161.646 |
| N_DEFICIT | deficit, shortfall, gap | 190.216 |
| N_DETERIORATION deterioration, worsening, fading, weakening, disappointment |  | 67.062 |
| N_EARN | earnings season, corporate earnings, earning announcements, earning season, earnings announcements | 19.964 |
| N_EDEBT | external debt, external liabilities, foreign liabilities, foreign debt | 3.087 |
| N_ELECT | election, referendum, presidential campaign | 304.383 |
| N_EMPL | employment, payrolls, payroll count, payroll number, payroll figure, employment figure, employment number, employment count, jobs creation, job growth, jobs growth | 93.533 |
| N_ETRADE | trade, current account, balance of payment, bop, balanceofpayment | 318.005 |
| N_EXPORTS | exports, export growth, export number, export figure, export | 181.067 |
| N_FAILURE | failure, shutdown, breakdown, collapse | 105.523 |
| N_FDI | foreign direct investment, fdi, direct investment | 8.280 |
| N_FORECAST | outlook, forecast, expectation, prediction, prognosis, prognoses, projection, estimate, consensus, speculation | 778.244 |
| N_FREEDOM | free, liberalize, liberalise, liberalization, liberalisation, freedom, deregulate, deregulation | 77.118 |
| N_GDP | gdp, gross domestic product, gni, nni, national income, national output, economic growth, economic output, economic activity, economic conditions, economic indicators, real growth, potential output | 260.856 |
| N_GOVT | public, fiscal, budget, budgetary, government, sovereign, state | 2129.147 |
| N_HHI | disposable income, personal income, household income | 7.631 |
| N_HOPE | hope, prospect | 223.750 |
| N_HOUSE | house, housing, real estate, home, dwelling, property | 682.725 |
| N_IMPORTS | imports, import growth, import number, import figure, import | 87.955 |
| N_IMPROVEMENT | improvement, enhancement, advance, progress, strengthening | 98.640 |
| N_INCREASE | upsurge, escalation, expansion, quickening, acceleration | 342.893 |
| N_INDU | industrial output, industrial production, industrial activity, factory output, factory orders, capacity utilisation, capacity utilization, industrial orders, factory activity, factory sector | 52.660 |
| N_INSTABILITY | instability, weakness, fragility, uncertainty, vulnerability | 151.580 |
| N_INTLEND | troika, international lenders, official lenders, imf, international monetary fund, world bank, international creditors, official creditors | 146.752 |
| N_LABORM | labor market, employment, working hours, labour market, hiring, firing, sacking, laying off, lay off, severance, notice period | 109.152 |
| N_LENDING | disbursement, facility, tranch, instalment | 583.232 |
| N_LIQCRUNCH | credit crunch, liquidity crunch, liquidity squeeze, credit squeeze | 21.147 |
| N_LIQUIDITY | liquidity, financing, funding, cash reserves | 279.693 |
| N_MACROPRUD | macroprudential, macro prudential | 1.805 |
| N_MANUF | manufacturing output, manufacturing production, manufacturing activity, manufacturing sector | 21.363 |
| N_NATIONALIZE | nationalise, nationalised, nationalisation, nationalize, nationalized, nationalization | 11.192 |


| SYN_KEYS | TOKENS, N-GRAMS | N (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N_NPL | npl, nonperforming, non performing, arrear | 18.548 |
| N_NUMBER | figure, number, data, statistics | 884.022 |
| N_PANIC | panic, alarm, terror, horror, fright, shock | 40.268 |
| N_PEACE | peace, truce, ceasefire | 79.490 |
| N_PEACEK | peace keeping, peacekeeping, peace keeper, peacekeeper | 11.986 |
| N_PMI | purchasing manager, pmi | 42.077 |
| N_POPULISM | populism, populist | 5.718 |
| N_PORTFOLIO | portfolio, balance sheet, asset quality | 114.728 |
| N_PPI | producer price index, ppi | 7.661 |
| N_PRICE | value, valuation | 145.163 |
| N_PRRIVATIZE | privatise, privatised, privatisation, privatize, privatized, privatization | 16.503 |
| N_PROFITS | profitability, profits, earnings, income, roe, roa | 346.737 |
| N_PROPRIGHTS | property rights, private property, private ownership, ownership rights | 1.874 |
| N_PROTEST | protests, demonstrations, general strike, mass demonstration, protester, demonstrator | 126.787 |
| N_PSI | psi, private sector involvement | 2.195 |
| N_QE | qe, quantitative easing, largescale asset purchase, large scale asset purchase, qe1, qe2, qe3, qe4, operation twist, bond buying programme, bond buying program, asset purchase programme, asset purchase program, asset purchases, bond purchases, bondbuying | 92.583 |
| N_REBEL | rebel, militant, separatist, insurgent | 200.573 |
| N_RECAPITAL | recapitalization, recapitalisation | 7.693 |
| N_REGULATIONS | rules, regulations, directives, laws | 127.733 |
| N_REQRESERVES | reserve requirement, required reserve | 9.169 |
| N_RES | currency reserve, official reserve, central bank reserve, international reserve, foreign exchange reserve, fx reserve | 12.729 |
| N_REVENUE | revenue, income | 236.122 |
| N_REVOL | revolution, uprising, civil war, civil conflict, anarchy, hostilities, insurgency, civil unrest | 65.097 |
| N_RIGIDITY | rigidity, stiffness, bureaucracy | 2.955 |
| N_RISK | risk, threat | 390.709 |
| N_RULELAW | rule of law, legal system, judicial system, regulatory framework, legal framework, judicial framework | 7.131 |
| N_SOCIAL | safety net, social net, pension, health | 127.054 |
| N_SPENDING | expenditure, outlay, spending | 217.329 |
| N_STABILITY | stability, strength, certainty, firmness | 132.018 |
| N_STRAIN | challenge, stress, headwind, strain, pressure | 317.427 |
| N_STRUCTURES | pension, labor market, labour market, health care, tax system | 98.740 |
| N_SUSTAIN | sustainability, sustainable | 27.122 |
| N_TALKS | negotiation, talks, diplomatic effort, diplomacy | 240.238 |
| N_TERROR | terrorist attack, bomb attack, bombing, terrorists, terrorist incident | 23.649 |
| N_THAN | than, compared to, compared with, relative to | 935.455 |
| N_TOXIC | toxic asset, illiquid asset, troubled asset, toxic mortgage asset | 7.981 |
| N_TROUBLE | difficulties, problem, trouble | 206.393 |
| N_UNEMP | unemployment, jobless claim, continuing claims, initial claims, jobless rate, new jobless, jobs claims | 128.875 |
| N_WAR | military conflict, hostilities, warfare | 11.433 |
| N_ZLB | zlb, zero bound, zero lower bound | 0.313 |
| V_ACCELERATE | quicken, accelerate, fasten, rapid, hasten, speed, heat, perk up, gather steam | 107.426 |
| V_ACHIEVE | achieve, accomplish, arrive at, reach, broker, restore | 295.952 |
| V_ADOPT | adopt | 26.273 |
| V_AGREE | agree, approve, authorize, authorise | 299.637 |
| V__ALLEVIATE | soothe, alleviate, calm | 8.288 |
| V_ANNOUNCE | announce, reveal, publish, broadcast, distribute, issue, print, post, disclose | 682.545 |
| V_BECOME | become, get, grow, turn out | 608.393 |
| V_BEGIN | begin, initiate, start, commence, instigate, create, open, launch, embark, prompt, rebuild, set off, introduce, create | 856.585 |
| V_BLOCK | bar, block, obstruct, obstruct, impede, thwart | 69.928 |
| V_BREACH | breach, violate, renege | 25.907 |
| V_BREAKUP | break up, disintegrate, dissolve | 10.127 |
| V_CHANGE | change, alter, modify, shift, adjust, amend, transform, revise, overhaul | 476.796 |
| V_CONVEY | say, speak, mention, declare, articulate, convey, communicate, answer, reply, express, voice, state, confirm, affirm, insist, acknowledge, tell | 5291.492 |
| V_CRUSH | abolish, terminate, extinguish, obliterate, devastate, wipe out, break, wreck, crush, subdue, defeat | 159.422 |
| V_CUT | reduce, cut, lower, dampen, moderate, curb, lessen, slash, scale back, drag down, halve, erode, bring down | 1099.152 |
| V__DECELERATE | decelerate, slow, brake, cool | 167.504 |
| V_DEFAULT | default, restructure, reschedule | 152.293 |
| V_DEPLETE | deplete, drain, exhaust | 13.678 |
| V_DEVALUE | devaluation, devalue | 11.676 |
| V_DISAPPEAR | disappear, evaporate, vanish | 9.345 |
| V_EASE | ease, cut | 673.057 |
| V_END | end, finish, terminate, stop, cease, interrupt, cancel, break, remove | 708.229 |
| V_ENTER | enter, join, accede, accession, entrance | 99.779 |
| V_EXIT | exit, leave, secede | 134.787 |
| V_EXPROP | expropriate, seize, confiscate | 27.494 |
| V_FAIL | break down, fail, collapse, disappoint | 208.368 |
| V_FALL | decrease, fall, drop, lower, reduce, slacken, decline, wane, fade, shrink, sink, dwindle, diminish, contract, moderate, narrow, subtract, dip, plunge, slide, plummet, lose, shed, shrink, halve | 2472.326 |
| V_GO | drift, pull, push, go, move, shift, step, trend, edge | 1118.052 |
| V_HISTORY | used to, had been, historically, in the past, past year, past years, past decade, past decades, long ago, last year, chronology | 411.142 |


| SYN_KEYS | TOKENS, N-GRAMS | N (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| V_IMPEACH | impeach | 1.184 |
| V_IMPLEMENT | implement, carry out, fulfill, execute, undertake, accomplish | 69.477 |
| V_IMPOSE | impose, enforce, enact, levy | 78.849 |
| V_IMPROVE | improve, better, upgrade, recover, mend | 332.139 |
| V_LIMIT | limit, restrain, constrain, curb, restrict, curtail, trim | 239.790 |
| V_MISS | miss, fail | 152.391 |
| V_NEED | need, require | 422.763 |
| V_PERCEIVE | perceive, feel, sense | 95.696 |
| V_PLEDGE | pledge, promise, vow | 134.274 |
| V_PREDICT | predict, forecast, foresee, envisage, calculate, foretell, anticipate, expect, estimate, project, speculate | 1278.910 |
| V_PREVENT | prevent, avert, avoid, offset | 183.397 |
| V_PROTECT | protect, defend, guard, safeguard, preserve, support, endorse | 506.940 |
| V_RAISE | increase, raise, boost, lift, hike, advance, intensify, double | 1225.850 |
| V_RECAPITAL | recapitalize, recapitalise | 7.677 |
| V_RECEIVE | receive, acquire, obtain, clinch, secure | 176.271 |
| V_REGAIN | regain, gain, return | 446.540 |
| V_REJECT | reject, deny, refuse | 119.345 |
| V_RELAX | relax, slacken, loosen, unwind | 31.613 |
| V_REQUEST | request, turn to, ask for, seek | 180.964 |
| V_RESOLVE | resolve, solve, tackle, address | 127.061 |
| V_REVALUE | revaluation, revalue | 3.373 |
| V_RISE | increase, rise, lift, boost, elevate, augment, expand, soar, swell, pick up, add, gain, climb, rebound, surge, intensify, jump, double, triple | 2636.574 |
| V_SAVE | save, bail, rescue | 105.085 |
| V_STRENGTHEN | strengthen, bolster, boost, reinforce, support, aid, assist, promote, prop up, encourage, shore up | 982.240 |
| V_SURPASS | surpass, exceed, beat, outshine, outstrip, top, transcend, trounce, above | 510.007 |
| V_SUSTAIN | sustain, maintain, stay, hold, keep | 758.408 |
| V_THINK | think, believe, assume, presume, guess, reckon, suspect, suppose, imagine | 534.059 |
| V__TIGHTEN | tighten, hike | 163.944 |
| V_TRAIL | trail, lag, below, lag | 202.378 |
| V__UNLOCK | unlock, release, disburse, pay out | 175.678 |
| V_WEAKEN | weaken, impair, undermine, dent, exhaust, sap, damage, harm, injure, wane, fade, sway | 222.325 |
| V_WIDEN | widen, extend, expand, broaden, add to, spread, deepen | 400.074 |
| V_WITHDRAW | withdraw | 22.180 |
| V_WORSEN | worsen, deteriorate, downgrade, crumble | 132.393 |
| A_AMPLE | plenty, sufficient, abundant, ample | 34.310 |
| A_BAD0 | mediocre, middling, unexceptional, modest | 32.931 |
| A_BAD1 | bad, negative, disappointing, adverse, unsatisfactory, poor, inadequate, unfavorable, unfavourable, troubling, worrying, discouraging, sour, unpleasant, meagre, meager, gloomy, woeful, dark, pessimistic, weak, ailing, struggling, troubled, dim | 497.892 |
| A_BAD2 | terrible, horrible, awful, dismal, abysmal, dreadful, appalling, horrifying, horrific, frightful, harrowing, depressing, upsetting, disillusioning, disheartening, frustrating, disenchanting, disconcerting, shocking, distressing, disturbing, worst | 87.106 |
| A_BETTER | better, nicer, sounder, safer, superior, stronger, brighter, more normal | 155.873 |
| A_CONCERNED | afraid, worried, concerned | 78.650 |
| A_FAILED | failed, vain, unsuccessful, abortive, fruitless, futile, ineffective | 75.287 |
| A_FLEXIBLE | flexible | 0.000 |
| A_GOODO | adequate, reasonable, suitable, appropriate, satisfactory, acceptable | 52.758 |
| A_GOOD1 | good, positive, decent, upbeat, favorable, promising, encouraging, reassuring, benign, pleasing, sound, favourable, strong | 529.792 |
| A_GOOD2 | excellent, brilliant, outstanding, superb, exceptional, splendid, ideal, perfect, astonishing, fantastic, amazing, breathtaking, best, top | 359.174 |
| A_HIGHER | larger, higher, increased, greater, elevated, excessive, bigger | 516.944 |
| A_INSTABLE | shaky, wobbly, instable, fragile, delicate, flimsy, breakable, brittle, unstable, uneven, unsteady, volatile, erratic, weak, feeble, vulnerable, uncertain | 246.788 |
| A_LARGE1 | large, sizable, big, great, considerable, significant, substantial, sizeable, high, major, mounting | 987.641 |
| A_LARGE2 | huge, enormous, extreme, intense, excessive, vast, colossal, gigantic, massive, oversized, soaring, highest, largest, immense, most | 717.769 |
| A_LOWER | lower, decreased, reduced, lesser, smaller, short of, dim | 389.732 |
| A_MATURING | maturing, oncoming, coming due | 15.781 |
| A_PROLONGED | continuing, prolonged, protracted, lingering, lasting, persistent, recurring, frequent, remaining, persisting, returning, reappearing, relapsing, periodic | 115.026 |
| A_RECURRING | recurring, frequent, remaining, returning, reappearing, relapsing, periodic | 48.280 |
| A_RIGID | rigid, bureaucratic, stiff | 6.243 |
| A_SCARCE | scarce, inadequate, lacking, short supply, scarcity, shortage, starved of | 20.533 |
| A_SEVERE | severe, serious, grave, harsh, stark, critical, acute, sharp | 167.896 |
| A_SMALL1 | small, minor, insignificant, unimportant, lesser, slight, trivial, little, low, muted, subdued, tepid | 600.337 |
| A_SMALL2 | tiny, undersized, miniature, mini, diminutive, minuscule, smallest, bottom, lowest, least | 261.374 |
| A_STABLE | stable, strong, longstanding, unwavering, steady, enduring, balanced, certain, resilient, solid | 461.030 |
| A_UNSUSTAIN | unsustainable, unmanageable, unmaintainable | 6.460 |
| A_WORSE | worse, inferior, poorer, weaker, gloomier, darker | 85.811 |

Notes: Number of matches (last column; thousands) are based on the relevance filtered news data set aggregated across tokens and n -grams for each synonym group.

Table C.3: Geographic group labels and associated tokens, n-grams

| GEO_KEYS | TOKENS, N-GRAMS | N (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G1_ARGE | argentina, argentine, argentinian, buenos aires | 61.515 |
| G1_AUSL | sydney,melbourne,australia,australian, canberra | 151.876 |
| G1_AUT | austria,vienna | 29.590 |
| G1_BELG | belgium, belgian, brussels | 80.904 |
| G1_BRAZ | brazil, brazilian, brasília,brasilia,rio de janeiro,sao paulo | 188.422 |
| G1_BULG | bulgaria,bulgarian,sofia | 21.048 |
| G1_CANA | canada,canadian,ottawa,toronto, montreal,quebec | 328.488 |
| G1_CHIN | china, chinese, beijing,shanghai,shenzhen, guangzhou | 880.419 |
| G1_CROA | croatia,croatian,zagreb | 14.276 |
| G1_CYPR | cyprus, cypriot, nicosia | 34.423 |
| G1_CZEC | czech, prague | 42.140 |
| G1_DENM | denmark, danish, copenhagen | 29.994 |
| G1_EMEA | emea,cee,ceemea,eastern europe,eastern european,postsocialist,post socialist,postcommunist,post communist,transition countries | 21.490 |
| G1_ESTO | estonia, estonian, tallinn | 6.649 |
| G1_EU | eu, european union, keyw_eu | 360.588 |
| G1_EZ | eurozone, euro zone, euro area, euroarea, eurobloc, european monetary union, euro bloc,emu | 797.020 |
| G1_FINL | finland,finnish, helsinki | 19.089 |
| G1_FRAN | france, french, paris, marseille | 318.527 |
| G1_GERM | german, berlin, munich,hamburg,stuttgart,germany | 377.956 |
| G1_GLOB | global, world | 963.378 |
| G1_GREE | greece,greek,athens | 458.670 |
| G1_HUNG | hungary, hungarian, budapest | 52.571 |
| G1_ICEL | iceland,icelandic,reykjavik | 18.146 |
| G1_INDI | india,indian,mumbai, delhi | 206.309 |
| G1_IREL | ireland,irish,dublin | 131.547 |
| G1_ITAL | italy,italian,rome,milan | 242.246 |
| G1_JAPA | japan,japanese, tokyo, kyoto | 581.207 |
| G1_LATAM | latin america,south america, latin american,south american | 55.139 |
| G1_LATV | latvia,latvian,riga | 10.596 |
| G1_LITH | lithuania, lithuanian, vilnius | 8.666 |
| G1_LUXE | luxembourg | 11.553 |
| G1_MALT | malta, maltese, valletta | 3.881 |
| G1_MEXI | mexico,mexican | 120.766 |
| G1_NETH | netherlands, dutch,amsterdam | 51.727 |
| G1_NORW | norway, norwegian,oslo | 35.500 |
| G1_NZ | new zealand, new zealander,oakland | 38.781 |
| G1_PIIGS | piigs,giips,gips, periphery countries, euro periphery,zone periphery, euro peripheral,zone peripheral | 2.894 |
| G1_POLA | poland, polish,warsaw | 63.765 |
| G1_PORT | portugal, portuguese, lisbon | 82.590 |
| G1_ROMA | romania,romanian | 23.563 |
| G1_RUSS | russia,russian, moscow,saint petersburg | 502.342 |
| G1_SLOVAK | slovakia,slovakian, bratislava | 18.633 |
| G1_SLOVEN | slovenia,slovenian, ljubljana | 16.080 |
| G1_SPAI | spain,spanish,madrid,barcelona | 247.283 |
| G1_SWED | sweden,swedish,stockholm | 45.721 |
| G1_SWI | switzerland,swiss,bern | 99.506 |
| G1_TURK | turkey, turkish, ankara, istanbul | 169.543 |
| G1_UK | keyw_uk,united kingdom, britain, british,wales,scotland, england, english,london,scotch,scottish,welsh | 967.911 |
| G1_UKRA | ukraine, ukrainian, kiev | 178.469 |
| G1_US | united states,keyw_us,usa,washington, new york,chicago,san francisco,los angeles, boston,miami, houston, philadelphia | 3532.952 |
| G2_AFGH | afghanistan, afghan, kabul | 72.624 |
| G2_AFR | africa,african | 191.799 |
| G2_ALGE | algeria,algerian,algiers | 17.317 |
| G2_ASIA | asia,asian | 210.368 |
| G2_BOLI | bolivia, bolivian, la paz | 7.412 |
| G2_CHIL | chile, chilean,santiago | 49.385 |
| G2_COLO | colombia, colombian, bogota | 45.241 |
| G2_DEV | advanced economies, oecd countries, developed countries | 9.958 |
| G2_ECUA | ecuador, ecuadorian,quito | 11.534 |
| G2_EGYP | egypt,egyptian,cairo | 115.858 |
| G2_EM | emerging market,emerging world,third world, developing country, developing countries, developing world,emerging economies | 90.344 |
| G2__GEOR | georgia,georgian,tbilisi | 37.603 |
| G2_HONG | hong kong | 51.050 |
| G2_INDO | indonesia, indonesian, jakarta | 69.237 |
| G2_IRAN | iran, iranian, tehran | 153.997 |
| G2_IRAQ | iraq,iraqi, baghdad | 95.007 |
| G2_ISRA | israel, israeli,jerusalem,tel aviv | 35.369 |
| G2_JAMA | jamaica,jamaican, kingston | 2.612 |
| G2_KAZA | kazakhstan, kazakh, astana | 21.087 |
| G2_KORE | south korea,south korean, seoul | 83.711 |


| GEO_KEYS | TOKENS, N-GRAMS | N (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G2_LEBA | lebanon,lebanese, beirut | 29.243 |
| G2_LYBI | libya,libyan,tripoli | 119.487 |
| G2_MALA | malaysia,malaysian,malay, kuala lumpur | 55.715 |
| G2_MORO | morocco, moroccan,rabat | 10.183 |
| G2_NIGE | nigeria, nigerian, abuja,lagos | 57.160 |
| G2_NKOR | north korea, north korean, pyongyang | 22.951 |
| G2_PAKI | pakistan, pakistani,islamabad,karachi | 79.664 |
| G2_PALE | palestinian, palestine,gaza,ramallah | 22.613 |
| G2_PANA | panama | 6.084 |
| G2_PERU | peru, peruvian,lima | 24.960 |
| G2_PHIL | philippines, manila | 26.942 |
| G2_SAUD | saudi,saudi arabia,riyadh | 116.649 |
| G2_SERB | serbia,serbian, belgrade | 26.079 |
| G2_SING | singaporean, singapore | 64.368 |
| G2_SOAF | south africa,south african, pretoria, cape town, johannesburg | 58.213 |
| G2_SRIL | sri lanka, colombo | 27.859 |
| G2_SYRI | syria,syrian, damascus | 193.976 |
| G2_TAIW | taiwan, taiwanese, taipei | 32.904 |
| G2_THAI | thailand, thai, bangkok | 100.592 |
| G2_TUNE | tunisia,tunisian,tunis | 25.021 |
| G2_UAE | uae, dubai,abu dhabi,arab emirates | 72.079 |
| G2_URUG | uruguay,montevideo | 3.862 |
| G2_VENE | venezuela, venezuelan, caracas | 51.888 |
| G2_VIET | vietnam, vietnamese, hanoi | 31.045 |
| G2_YEME | yemen, yemeni,sanaa | 43.090 |
| G3_AFR | ethiopia, ethiopian, addis ababa, congo, congolese, kinshasa, tanzania, tanzanian, kenya, kenyan, nairobi, uganda, ugandan, kampala, sudan, sudanese, khartoum, ghana, accra, mozambique, maputo, madagascar, antananarivo, cote divoire, abidjan, cameroon, burkina faso, ouagadougou, niamey, malawi, lilongwe, senegal, dakar, angola, luanda, mali, bamako, zambia, lusaka, zimbabwe, harare, rwanda, kigali, chad, guinea, conakry, somalia, mogadishu, burundi, bujumbura, sierra leone, eritrea, asmara, bangui, liberia, monrovia, mauritania, nouakchott, lesotho, namibia, windhoek, botswana, gaborone, gambia, bissau, gabon, libreville, mauritius, port louis, swaziland | 341.565 |
| G3_ASI | bangladesh, dhaka, burma, naypyidaw, nepal, kathmandu, uzbek, tashkent, cambodia, phnom penh, azerbaijan, baku, tajik, dushanbe, laos, vientiane, jordan, amman, kyrgyz, bishkek, turkmen, ashgabat, mongolia, muscat, armenia, yerevan, kuwait, qatar, doha, bahrain, manama, east timor, bhutan, brunei, bandar seri begawan, maldives | 129.531 |
| G3_EUR | albania, tirana, belarus, minsk, bosnia, sarajevo, gibraltar, guernsey, jersey, saint helier, kosovo, pristina, liechtenstein, vaduz, macedonia, skopje, moldova, chisinau, monaco, montenegro, podgorica, transnistria, tiraspol, vatican | 76.196 |
| G3_LAT | antigua, bahamas, nassau, barbados, costa rica, costa rican, cuba, cuban, havana, dominica, dominican republic, santo domingo, el salvador, san salvador, grenada, guatemala, guyana, georgetown, haiti, portauprince, honduras, tegucigalpa, nicaragua, managua, paraguay, asuncion, suriname, trinidad | 64.082 |

Notes: Number of matches (last column; thousands) are based on the relevance filtered news data set aggregated across tokens and n-grams for each geography group.

Table C.4: Intermediate expressions

| EXPR_KEYS | EXPR CODE | p1 | p2 | p3 | N (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E_EXPECT | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | N_THAN | N_FORECAST \| V_PREDICT | <br> thought \| perceived | assumed | presumed | believed | guessed | reckoned | suspected | supposed | imagined | hoped |  | 90.478 |
| E_SURP | p1 | (surprisingly \| unexpectedly | shockingly) |  |  | 31.824 |
| E_BEtTER1 | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | A_BETTER \| A_GOOD1 | E_EXPECT |  | 79.321 |
| E_BETtER2 | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | A_GOOD2 | E_EXPECT |  | 0.013 |
| E_BEtTER1 | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | v_SURPASS \| overshot | overshooting | overshoots | N_FORECAST |  | 79.321 |
| E_WORSE1 | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | A_WORSE \| A_BAD1 | E_EXPECT |  | 37.258 |
| E_WORSE2 | (p1, $\mathrm{p}^{2,1,0}$ ) | A_BAD2 | E_EXPECT |  | 0.023 |
| E_WORSE1 | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | V_TRAIL \| undershot | <br> undershooting \| undershoots | N_FORECAST |  | 37.258 |
| E_HIGHER1 | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | A_HIGHER \| A_LARGE1 | E_EXPECT |  | 38.002 |
| E_HIGHER2 | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | A_LARGE2 | E_EXPECT |  | 0.116 |
| E_LOWER1 | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | A_LOWER \| A_SMALL1 | E_EXPECT |  | 30.287 |
| E_LOWER2 | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | A_SMALL2 | E_EXPECT |  | 0.060 |
| E_improvemento | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | A_SMALL1 \| A_SMALL2 | N_IMPROVEMENT |  | 1.676 |
| E_IMPROVEMENT2 | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | A_LARGE2 | N_IMPROVEMENT |  | 0.650 |
| E_DETERIORATION2 | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | A_LARGE2 | N_DETERIORATION |  | 0.240 |
| E_DETERIORATIONO | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | A_SMALL1 \| A_SMALL2 | N_DETERIORATION |  | 0.363 |
| E_INCREASE2 | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | A_SMALL1 \| A_SMALL2 | N_increase |  | 2.236 |


| EXPR_KEYS | EXPR CODE | p1 | p2 | p3 | N (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E_increaseo | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | A_LARGE2 | N_increase |  | 1.816 |
| E_DECREASE2 | (p1, ${ }^{2}$ 2,1,0) | A_LARGE2 | N_DECREASE |  | 1.292 |
| E_decreaseo | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | A_SMALL1 \| A_SmALL2 | N_DECREASE |  | 0.769 |
| v_Rise | (p1, ${ }^{2}, 1,0$ ) | V_GO | higher \\| up |  | 2636.574 |
| V_FALL | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | v_GO | lower \| down |  | 2472.326 |
| v_WORSEN | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | v_BECOME | A_WORSE |  | 132.393 |
| V_improve | (p1, p $2,1,0$ ) | v_BECOME | A_better |  | 332.139 |
| E_BETTER1 | p1 | (betterthanexpected । |  |  | 79.321 |
|  |  | strongerthanexpected) |  |  |  |
| E_WORSE1 | p1 | (worsethanexpected \| |  |  | 37.258 |
|  |  | weakerthanexpected) |  |  |  |
| E_HIGHER1 | p1 | (higherthanexpected । |  |  | 38.002 |
|  |  | largerthanexpected \| <br> morethanexpected \| revised up | revise up | revising up | revises up) |  |  |  |
| E_LOWER1 | p1 | (lowerthanexpected \| |  |  | 30.287 |
|  |  | smallerthanexpected \| |  |  |  |
|  |  | lessthanexpected \| revised down |  |  |  |
|  |  | \| revise down | revising down | revises down) |  |  |  |
| E_HIGHER1 | ((p1, p2,1,0), p3,1,0) | v_Rise | more | E_EXPECt | 38.002 |
| E_LOWER1 | ((p1,p2,1,0), p3,1,0) | V_fall | more | E_ExPECT | 30.287 |
| E_highero | ((p1, p2,1,0), p3,1,0) | v_rise | less | E_EXPECT | 1.868 |
| E_LOWER0 | ((p1, p2,1,0), p3,1,0) | V_fall | less | E_ExPECT | 2.077 |
| E_BETTER1 | ((p1, p2,1,0), p3,1,0) | V_STRENGTHEN । | more | E_EXPECT | 79.321 |
|  |  | v_improve |  |  |  |
| E_WORSE1 | ((p1, p2,1,0), p3,1,0) | v_WEAKEN \| V_WORSEN | more | E_EXPECT | 37.258 |
| E_BETTER1 | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | E_SURP | A_GOOD1 A A BETTER |  | 79.321 |
| E_WORSE1 | (p1, ${ }^{2,2,0 \text { ) }}$ | E_SURP | A_BAD1 A A_WORSE |  | 37.258 |
| E_BETTER2 | (p1, ${ }^{2}, 2,0$ ) | E_SURP | A_GOOD2 |  | 0.013 |
| E_WORSE1 | (p1, ${ }^{2}, 2,0$ ) | E_SURP | A_BAD2 |  | 37.258 |
| E_HIGHER2 | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | E_SURP | A_LARGE2 |  | 0.116 |
| E_LOWER2 | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | E_SURP | A_SMALL2 |  | 0.060 |
| E_HIGHER1 | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | E_SURP | A_LARGE1 |  | 38.002 |
| E_LOWER1 | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | E_SURP | A_SmALL1 |  | 30.287 |
| E_HIGHER1 | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | short of \| below | under | N_FORECAST |  | 38.002 |
| E_LOWER1 | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | in excess of \| over | above | N_FORECAST |  | 30.287 |
| E_PRED_RISE1 | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_FORECAST \| V_PREDICT | E_UP \| N_INCREASE | |  | 57.400 |
|  |  |  | E_INCREASEO \| |  |  |
|  |  |  | E_INCREASE2 \| V_RISE |  |  |
| E_PRED_FALL1 | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_FORECAST \| V_PREDICT | E_DOWN \| E_DECREASEO | |  | 73.461 |
|  |  |  | N_DECREASE \| |  |  |
|  |  |  | E_DECREASE2 \\| V_FALL | |  |  |
|  |  |  | v_Cut |  |  |
| E_PRED_IMPROVE | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_FORECAST \| V_PREDICT | v_Strengthen \| |  | 25.638 |
|  |  |  | v_improve |  |  |
| E_PRED_WORSEN | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_FORECAST \| V_PREDICT | v_WEAKEN \| V_WORSEN |  | 8.734 |
| E_PRED_HIGH | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_FORECAST \| V_PREDICT | A_LARGE2 |  | 11.440 |
| E_PRED_LOW | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_FORECAST \| V_PrEDICT | A_SMALL2 |  | 2.198 |
| E_PRED_HIGH2 | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_FORECAST \| V_PREDICT | A_LARGE2 |  | 0.002 |
| E_PRED_LOW2 | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_FORECAST \| V_PREDICT | A_SMALL2 |  | 0.000 |
| E_PRED_GOOD | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_FORECAST \| V_PREDICT | A_GOOD1 |  | 9.503 |
| E_PRED_BAD | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_FORECAST \| V_PREDICT | A_BAD1 |  | 20.348 |
| E_PRED_GOOD2 | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_FORECAST \| V_PREDICT | A_GOOD2 |  | 1.913 |
| E_PRED_BAD2 | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_FORECAST \| V_PREDICT | A_BAD2 |  | 0.932 |
| E_PROB_HIGH | p1 | (probably \| in all probability | |  |  | 38.272 |
|  |  | likely \| almost certainly | |  |  |  |
|  |  | doubtless \| undoubtedly | no |  |  |  |
|  |  | doubt \| without a doubt | definitely) |  |  |  |
| E_PROB_MED | p1 | (perhaps \| maybe | uncertain | |  |  | 42.863 |
|  |  | possibly \| uncertain | questionable) |  |  |  |
| E_PROB_LOW | p1 | (unlikely \| doubtful | |  |  | 7.083 |
|  |  | improbable) |  |  |  |
| E_PROB_HIGH | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_CHANCE | A_HIGHER \| A_LARGE1 | |  | 38.272 |
|  |  |  | A_LARGE2 |  |  |
| E_PROB_LOW | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_CHANCE | A_LOWER \| A_SMALL1 | |  | 7.083 |
|  |  |  | A_SMALL2 |  |  |
| E_PROB_RISE | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_Chance | E_UP \\| V_RISE | V | RAISE |  | 4.617 |
| E_PROB_FALL | (p1,p2,2,0) | N_CHANCE | E_DOWN \| V_FALL | V_CUT | |  | 5.148 |
|  |  |  | V _Limit |  |  |
| E_RISK_HIGH | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | A_HIGHER \| A_LARGE1 | | risk of \| threat of | risk regarding |  | 2.588 |
|  |  | A_LARGE2 | \| risk concerning | risk relating |  |  |
|  |  |  | to \| risk related to | risks |  |  |
|  |  |  | regarding \| risks concerning | |  |  |
|  |  |  | risks relating to \| risks related to |  |  |


| EXPR_KEYS | EXPR CODE | p1 | p2 | p3 | N (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E_RISK_LOW | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A_LOWER \| A_SMALL1 \| } \\ & \text { A_SMALL2 } \end{aligned}$ | risk of \| threat of \| fear of \| risk that | fears that | risk regarding | threat regarding | fear regarding | risk concerning | threat concerning | fear concerning |  | 1.203 |
| E_RISK_RISE | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | E_UP \| V_RISE | V | RAISE | risk of \| threat of | risk regarding | risk concerning | risk relating to | risk related to | risks regarding | risks concerning | risks relating to $\mid$ risks related to |  | 0.495 |
| E_RISK_FALL | (p1,p2,1,0) | E_DOWN \| V_FALL | V_CUT | <br> v_LIMIT \| V_ALLEVIATE | risk of \| threat of | fear of | risk that | fears that | risk regarding | threat regarding | fear regarding | risk concerning | threat concerning | fear concerning |  | 2.561 |
| E_CONCERN_CONT | (p1, p2, 2, 0) | N_CONCERN \| N_TROUBLE | N STRAIN | A_PROLONGED \| <br> A_RECURRING |  | 84.475 |
| E_CONCERN_HIGH | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_CONCERN \| N_TROUBLE | N_STRAIN | A_HIGHER \| A_LARGE1 | <br> A_LARGE2 |  | 37.644 |
| E_CONCERN_LOW | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_CONCERN \| N_TROUBLE | N_STRAIN | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A_LOWER \| A_SMALL1 \| } \\ & \text { A_SMALL2 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 5.848 |
| E_CONCERN_RISE | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_CONCERN \| N_TROUBLE | N_STRAIN | E_UP \\| V_RISE | V | RAISE | v_begin |  | 40.595 |
| E_CONCERN_FALL | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_CONCERN \| N_TROUBLE | N_STRAIN | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E_DOWN \| V_FALL \| V_CUT \| } \\ & \text { V_EASE \| V_LIMIT \| V_END \| } \\ & \text { V_ALLEVIATE } \end{aligned}$ |  | 47.615 |
| E_CONCERN_FALL | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_Trouble | V_RESOLVE |  | 47.615 |
| E_HOPE_CONT | (p1,p2,2,0) | N_HOPE | A_PROLONGED \| <br> A_RECURRING |  | 0.283 |
| E_HOPE_HIGH | (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_HOPE | A_HIGHER \| A_LARGE1 | <br> A_LARGE2 |  | 3.341 |
| E_HOPE_LOW | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_HOPE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A_LOWER \| A_SMALL1 \| } \\ & \text { A_SMALL2 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 3.394 |
| E_HOPE_RISE | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | N_HOPE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E_UP \| V_RISE \| V \| RAISE \| } \\ & \text { V_BEGIN } \end{aligned}$ |  | 6.577 |
| E_HOPE_FALL | (p1,p2,2,0) | N_HOPE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E_DOWN \| V_FALL \| V_CUT \| } \\ & \text { V_EASE \| V_LIMIT \| V_END } \end{aligned}$ |  | 7.556 |
| v_AGREE | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | sign \| signing | signed | signs | <br> V_ACHIEVE | N_AGREEMENT |  | 299.637 |
| V_REJECT | ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0$ ) | fail to \| failure to | fails to | failing to | V_AGREE \| V_IMPOSE | <br> v_implement |  | 119.345 |
| E_CONCERN_CONT | p1 | A_CONCERNED |  |  | 84.475 |

Notes: EXPR_KEYS are intermediate expression labels inserted into the text.
EXPR CODE defines the proximity and ordering rules of expression elements and are functions with four arguments
the first two arguments are expression elements (can be tokens, n-grams or intermediate expressions or a list of these), the third is a binary indicating if ordering should (value of 1) be preserved or is flexible (value of 2), the fourth identifies proximity ( 0 : distance of maximum three tokens no punctuation marks allowed; 1: distance of maximum 10 tokens comma allowed; 2: distance of maximum 15 words, comma allowed 3: distance restricted only by full stop or paragraph break)
Number of matches (last column; thousands) are based on the relevance filtered news data set aggregated across tokens and $n$-grams for each geography group.
Table C.5: Fundamental expression structures

| EXPR_CODE | MOD | SIGN | p1 | p2 | p3 | p4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| REAL (+) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (p1, p2,1,0) | CH | - | N_HOUSE | bust \| burst V WIDEN |  |  |
| (p1, p2, 2, 1) | CH | + | recoveryinto recession $\quad$ V_WIDEN |  |  |
| p1 | CH | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| p1 | CH | + | out of recession \| out from recession |  |  |  |
| (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) | CH | - | recession | enter \| enters | entered | entering | <br> V_BEGIN \| V_WIDEN |  |  |
| (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) | CH | + | recession | exit \| exits | V_END | V_PREVENT |  |  |
| (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) | CH | - | recession | v_WIDEN |  |  |
| p1 |  | - | depression \| depressed economy |  |  |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)$ | CH | + | economic | N_CRISIS | V_EASE \| V_LImit | V_END |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)$ | CH | - | economic | N_CRISIS | V_WIDEN \\| V_PREVENT |  |
|  |  |  |  | EXTERN(+) |  |  |
| (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) | CH | 0 | capital inflows | V_ACCELERATE <br> V_DECELERATE \| V_FALL | <br> V_RISE \\| V_BEGIN | V_END | <br> A_LARGE2 \| A_SMALL2 | <br> A_LARGE1 \| A_SMALL1 | <br> E_GO_DOWN \| E_GO_UP |  |  |
| (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) | CH | 0 | capital outflows | v_Accelerate \| <br> V_DECELERATE \| V_FALL | <br> V_RISE \| V_BEGIN | V_END | <br> A_LARGE2\|A_SMALL2 | <br> A_LARGE1\|A_SMALL1 | <br> E_GO_DOWN \| E_GO_UP |  |  |
| (p1, (p2, $\mathrm{p} 3,2,0$ ), 1,1) | CH | - | sanctions | ```impose \| imposed | imposing | G/d/w+ V_WIDEN``` |  |  |
| (p1, (p2, p3, 2, 0), 1, 1) | CH | + | sanctions | lift \| lifting | lifted | remove G/d/w+ |  |  |
| (p1, p2,2,1) | CH | + | currency N_CRISIS | V_EASE \| V_LIMIT | V_END |  |  |
| (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) | CH | - | currency N_CRISIS | V_WIDEN \| V_PREVENT |  |  |
| EXTERN,MONPOL(+,+) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ((p1, p2,1,0), p3, 2, 2) |  | 0 | currency \| fx | verbal | intervention N_CB \| official <br> intervene \| intervenes | intervened currency market \| FX market <br> talk down \| talked down | talks down N_FX <br> \| talking down | weaken | weakens |  <br> weakened \| weakening  |  |  |
| ( $\mathrm{p} 1,(\mathrm{p} 2, \mathrm{p} 3,2,0), 1,2)$ | CH | 0 | N_CB |  |  |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,1), \mathrm{p} 3,1,1)$ | CH | + | N_CB |  |  |  |
| ((p1, p2,1,0), p3, 2, 1) | CH | 0 | currency $\|\mathrm{FX}\|$ exchange rate | regime | V_CHANGE \| N_CHANGE |  |
| (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) | CH | - | N_FX \| currency | V_REVALUE |  |  |
| (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) | CH | + | N_FX \| currency | V_DEVALUE |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | MONPOL(+) |  |  |
| ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,1$ ), $\mathrm{p} 3,2,1$ ) |  | 0 | N_CB | v_SUSTAIN | rate \| rates |  |
| ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) | CH | - | policy \| cycle | monetary | N_CB | N_BRATE | V_TIGHTEN \| tight | tighter |  |  |

Fundamental expression structures (continued)

| EXPR_CODE | MOD | SIGN | p1 | p2 | p3 | p4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (p1, p2, 2, 1) | CH | + | policy \| cycle | monetary | N_CB | N_BRATE | V_EASE \| V_RELAX | looser | accommodative | loose | expansionary | accommodation |  |  |
| ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | CH | - | N_CB | V_tighten \| V_RAISE |  |  |
| ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | CH | + | N_CB | v_EASE \| V_CUT |  |  |
| ( $\mathrm{p} 1,(\mathrm{p} 2, \mathrm{p} 3,1,0$ ) , 2, 1) | CH | - | N_CB \| monetary | V_LIMIT \| V_WITHDRAW | stimulus |  |
| ( $\mathrm{p} 1,(\mathrm{p} 2, \mathrm{p} 3,1,0), 2,1$ ) | CH | + | N_CB \| monetary | V_RAISE \| V_Strengthen | stimulus |  |
| ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) | CH | - | N_REQRESERVES | V_Limit \| V_cut |  |  |
| (p1, p $2,2,1$ ) | CH | + | N_REQRESERVES | V_TIGHTEN \| V_RAISE |  |  |
| (p1, p $2,2,1$ ) | CH | - | hawk \| hawkish | N_COMMUNICATION \| monetary | policy | N_CB |  |  |
| (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) | CH | + | dove \\| dovish | policy \| N_CB <br> N_COMMUNICATION \| monetary | |  |  |
| (p1,(p2, p3, 2, 0) , 2, 1) | CH | - | N_Cb | print \| printing | prints | create | creates | creating | creation | money |  |
| POLINST, MONPOL(+,0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (p1, (p2, p3, 2, 1) , 1, 1) | CH | - | G/d/w+ | v_Exit | G1_EZ \| euro |  |
| (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ) | CH | - | V_BREAKUP \| disintegration | dissolution | G1_EZ |  |  |
|  | CH | + | G/d/w+ | V_ENTER \\| N_ACCESSION | G1_EZ \| euro |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,1), \mathrm{p} 3,1,1)$ | CH | + | G/d/w+ | V_ADOPT | euro \| N_EUR |  |
| MONPOL,BANK(+,+) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (p1, p2, 2, 1) | CH | + | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N_SLS \| N_QE\|N_OMT \| N_SMP } \\ & \text { \| N_ELA \| N_LTRO\|N_TAF \| } \\ & \text { N_TALF } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V_WIDEN \| V_AGREE \| } \\ & \text { V_PLEDGE } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) | CH | - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N_SLS \| N_QE \| N_OMT \| N_SMP } \\ & \text { \| N_ELA \| N_LTRO \| N_TAF \| } \\ & \text { N_TALF } \end{aligned}$ | V_LIMIT \\| V_DISAPPOINT |  |  |
| (p1, (p2, p3, 2, 1) , 1, 1) | CH | - | N_Cb | V_Limit | collateral |  |
| (p1, (p2, p3 , 2, 1) , 1, 1) | CH | + | N_CB | V_EASE \| V_RELAX | V_WIDEN | wider | broader | collateral |  |
| (p1, (p2, p3, 2, 1) , 1, 1) | CH | + | N_CB | inject \| injects | injecting | injection | provision | provide | providing | provides | pump | pumps | pumped | liquidity \| cash |  |
| ( $\mathrm{p} 1,(\mathrm{p} 2, \mathrm{p} 3,1,1), 1,1)$ | CH | + | N_CB | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V_STRENGTHEN \| N_BAILOUT \| } \\ & \text { v_SAVE } \end{aligned}$ | N_BANKS |  |
| ( ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0),(\mathrm{p} 3, \mathrm{p} 4,2,0), 1,1)$ | CH | + | N_BANKS | v_RECEIVE | N_CB | liquidity \| cash | N_AID | money |
| ( (p1, p2, 1, 1), (p3,p4, 2, 1) , 1, 1) | CH | + | N_CB | V_AGREE \\| V_PLEDGE | <br> V_UNLOCK \| V_IMPLEMENT | N_BAILOUT \| N_AID | V_SAVE | N_LIQUIDITY | N_BANKS |
| ( (p1, p2, 1, 1), (p3,p4, 2, 1) , 1, 1) | CH | - | N_CB | V_REJECT \| V_FAIL | V_BLOCK | ```N_BAILOUT \| N_AID | V_SAVE | N_LIQUIDITY``` | N_BANKS |
| FISCAL, BANK (+,-) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ((p1, p $2,1,0), \mathrm{p} 3,1,1)$ | CH | - | G/d/w+ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V_STRENGTHEN \| N_BAILOUT \| } \\ & \text { V_SAVE \| N_AID } \end{aligned}$ | N_BANKS |  |

Fundamental expression structures (continued)

| EXPR_CODE | MOD | SIGN | p1 | p2 | p3 | p4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (p1, (p2, p3, 1, 1) , 1, 1) | CH | - | N_GOVT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V_STRENGTHEN \| N_BAILOUT \| } \\ & \text { v_SAVE \| N_AID } \end{aligned}$ | N_BANKS |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1,(\mathrm{p} 2, \mathrm{p} 3,2,0), 1,1), \mathrm{p} 4,1,2)$ | CH | - | N_GOVT | inject \| injects | injecting | injection | provision | provide | providing | <br> provides \| pump | pumps | pumped | liquidity \| cash | capital| guarantee | guarantees | N_BANKS |
| ( (p1,p2,1,0), (p3,p4, 2,0), 1, 2) | CH | - | N_BANKS | V_RECEIVE | N_GOVT \| taxpayer | taxpayers | liquidity \| cash | capital | guarantee | guarantees | N_AID | money |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,1),(\mathrm{p} 3, \mathrm{p} 4,2,1), 1,2)$ | CH | - | N_Govt | V_AGREE \| V_PLEDGE | <br> V_UNLOCK \| V_IMPLEMENT | N_BAILOUT \| N_AID | V_SAVE | N_BANKS |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,1),(\mathrm{p} 3, \mathrm{p} 4,2,1), 1,2)$ | CH | + | N_GOVT | V_REJECT \| V_FAIL | V_BLOCK | N_BAILOUT \| N_AID | V_SAVE | N_BANKS |
| (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) | CH | - | V_RECAPITAL \| N_RECAPITAL | N_BANKS |  |  |
| (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) | CH | - | bad bank | V_BEGIN \| V_AGREE |  |  |
| (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) | CH | - | deposits | guarantee \| guarantees | guaranteeing | guaranteed |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | FISCAL( + ) |  |  |
| ((p1,p2,2,1), p3, 2, 1) | CH | + | N_GOVT | stimulus | V_LIMIT \| V_WITHDRAW |  |
| ( (p1, p2,2,1), p3, 2, 1) | CH | + | N_GOVT | stimulus | V_RAISE \\| V_Strengthen |  |
| ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) |  | - | N_GOVT \| G/d/w+ | debt trap \| debt spiral |  |  |
| (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) |  | - | N_Govt | insolvent \| insolvency |  |  |
| (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) |  | + | N_Govt | solvent |  |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)$ |  | - | $\mathrm{G} / \mathrm{d} / \mathrm{w}+$ | N_DEBT | A_unsustain |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)$ |  | + | G/d/w+ | N_DEBT | sustainable |  |
| (p1, (p2, p3, 2, 1), 2, 1) |  | - | N_GOVT | N_DEBT | A_unsustain |  |
| (p1, $(\mathrm{p} 2, \mathrm{p} 3,2,1), 2,1)$ |  | + | N_GOVT | N_DEbT | sustainable |  |
| ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) |  | - | fiscal \| budget | A_UNSUSTAIN |  |  |
| ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) |  | + | fiscal \| budget | sustainable |  |  |
| (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) | CH | + | austerity | V_PLEDGE \| V_AGREE | <br> V_IMPOSE \| V_IMPLEMENT |  |  |
| (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) | CH | - | austerity | v_LIMIT \| V_REJECT | <br> v_WITHDRAW |  |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)$ | CH | + | fiscal \| budget | rules \| reforms | consolidation | V_AGREE \| V_PLEDGE | <br> V_IMPLEMENT \| V_IMPOSE |  |
| ( (p1, p2, 1,0) , p3, 2, 1) | CH | - | fiscal \| budget | rules \| reforms | consolidation | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V_REJECT \| V_LIMIT \| } \\ & \text { V_BREACH } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)$ | CH | + | fiscal \| budget | deficit | targets | V_PLEDGE \| V_ACHIEVE | meet | meeting | meets | met | stick to | sticks to | sticking to | adhere | adhering | adheres |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)$ | CH | + | fiscal \| budget | deficit | targets | V_MISS \| V_Breach |  |
| (p1, p2, 2, 1) | CH | + | fiscal \| budget | policy | V_TIGHTEN \| tight | tighter | strict <br> \| prudent | stringent |  |
| (p1, $\mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) | CH | - | fiscal \| budget | policy | loose \| looser | accommodative | expansionary | V_EASE \| V_RELAX |  |
|  |  |  |  | FUNDLIQ(+) |  |  |
| (p1, (p2, p3, 1,0), 2, 1) |  | - | N_GOVT | funding \| financing | $\begin{aligned} & \text { need \| requirements \| requirements \| } \\ & \text { needs } \end{aligned}$ |  |

Fundamental expression structures (continued)

| EXPR_CODE | MOD | SIGN | p1 | p2 | p3 | p4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (p1, (p2, p3, 1,0), 2, 0) |  | - | G/d/w+ | funding \| financing | need \| requirements | requirements | needs |  |
| (p1, (p2, p3, 1,0), 2, 1) | CH | - | N_GOVT | V_MISS \\| V_REJECT | payment \| obligation | repayment | <br> payments \| obligations | repayments | <br> repay \| repaying |  |
| (p1, (p2, $\mathrm{p} 3,2,1), 2,1)$ |  | - | N_GOVT | N_DEBT | N_DEFAULT \| V_DEFAULT |  |
| (p1,p2,2,0) |  | - | N_GOVT | N_DEFAULT \| V_DEFAULT |  |  |
| (p1, (p2, p3, 1,0), 1,0) | CH | - | G/d/w+ | V_MISS \\| V_REJECT | payment \| obligation | repayment | payments | obligations | repayments | repay | repaying |  |
| ( $\mathrm{p} 1,(\mathrm{p} 2, \mathrm{p} 3,2,1), 2,0$ ) |  | - | G/d/w+ | N_DEBT | N_DEFAULT \| V_DEFAULT |  |
| (p1, (p2, $\mathrm{p} 3,2,1), 2,0$ ) |  | - | G/d/w+ | N_GOVT | N_DEFAULT \| V_DEFAULT |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1,(\mathrm{p} 2, \mathrm{p} 3,2,1), 2,1), \mathrm{p} 4,2,1)$ |  | + | N_GOVT \| G/d/w+ | N_AUCTION | demand | A_AMPLE \| A_Stable |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1,(\mathrm{p} 2, \mathrm{p} 3,2,1), 2,1), \mathrm{p} 4,2,1)$ |  | - | N_GOVT \| G/d/w+ | N_AUCTION | demand | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A_SCARCE \| } \\ & \text { v_DISAPPEAR । } \\ & \text { A_INSTABLE } \end{aligned}$ |
| (p1, (p2, $33,2,0), 2,1$ ) |  | + | N_GOVT \| G/d/w+ | N_AUCTION | successful |  |
| (p1,( $\mathrm{p} 2, \mathrm{p} 3,2,0$ ), 2, 1) |  | - | N_GOVT \| G/d/w+ | N_AUCTION | N_FAILURE \\| V_FAIL | A_FAILED |  |
| (p1, ((p2, $3,2,0), \mathrm{p} 4,2,1), 1,1)$ | CH | - | N_GOVT \| G/d/w+ | access | market | lost \| loses | losing |
| (p1,( (p2, p3,2,0), p4, 2, 1), 1, 1) | CH | + | N_GOVT \| G/d/w+ | access | market | V_REGAIN |
| (p1, (p2, p3, 1,0), 1, 1) | CH | + | N_GOVT \| G/d/w+ | returns to \| returning to | returned to | return to | market |  |
| (p1, ( $\mathrm{p} 2, \mathrm{p} 3,2,0$ ) $\mathrm{p} 4,2,1), 1,1)$ | CH | - | N_GOVT \| G/d/w+ | access | official\| N_AID | N_BAILOUT | <br> N_LENDING | lost \| loses | losing |
| (p1,((p2,p3,2,0), p 4, 2, 1), 1, 1) | CH | + | N_GOVT \| G/d/w+ | access | official\| N_AID | N_BAILOUT | N_LENDING | v_REGAIN |
| (p1, (p2, $\mathrm{p} 3,1,0), 2,1$ ) | CH | - | V_deplete | treasury \| N_GOVT | coffers \| funds \| reserves |  |
| (p1, (p2, p3, 2, 0), 1, 1) |  | + | N_GOVT | N_LIQUIDITY | A_AMPLE |  |
| (p1,( $\mathrm{p} 2, \mathrm{p} 3,2,0$ ), 1, 1) |  | - | N_GOVT | N_LIQUIDITY | A_SCARCE |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,1),(\mathrm{p} 3, \mathrm{p} 4,2,0), 1,1)$ | CH | + | N_ECB \| N_INTLEND | V_AGREE \| V_PLEDGE | <br> V_UNLOCK \| breakthrough | <br> N_AGREEMENT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N_BAILOUT \| N_LENDING \| } \\ & \text { N_AID } \end{aligned}$ | G/d/w+ |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,1),(\mathrm{p} 3, \mathrm{p} 4,2,0), 1,1)$ | CH | - | N_ECB \| N_INTLEND | V_REJECT \| V_FAIL | V_BREACH | V_BLOCK | delays | delayed | delaying । delay | N_BAILOUT \| N_LENDING | N_AID | G/d/w+ |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,1),(\mathrm{p} 3, \mathrm{p} 4,2,1), 1,1)$ |  | + | G/d/w+ | V_RECEIVE \| secure | secures | securing \| secured \| V_ACHIEVE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N_BAILOUT \| N_LENDING \| } \\ & \text { N_AID } \end{aligned}$ | N_ECB \| N_INTLEND |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,1),(\mathrm{p} 3, \mathrm{p} 4,2,1), 1,1)$ | CH | - | G/d/w+ | V_REQUEST \\| V_NEED | N_ECB \| N_INTLEND | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N_BAILOUT \| } \\ & \text { N_LENDING \| N_AID } \end{aligned}$ |
| BANK (+) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (p1, p2, 2, 1) |  | - | funding markets \| funding market | shadow banking | credit market | credit markets | funding liquidity | N_BANKS | N_CRISIS |  |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)$ | CH | + | funding markets \| funding market | shadow banking | credit market | credit markets | funding liquidity | N_BANKS | N_CRISIS | V_EASE \| V_LIMIT | V_END |  |

Fundamental expression structures (continued)

| EXPR_CODE | MOD | SIGN | p1 | p2 | p3 | p4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0$ ), p3, 2, 1) | CH | - | funding markets \| funding market | shadow banking | credit market | credit markets | funding liquidity | N_BANKS | N_CRISIS | V_WIDEN \\| V_Prevent |  |
| p1 |  | - | N_LIQCRUNCH |  |  |  |
| (p1, p2, 2,1) |  | - | funding markets \| funding market | shadow banking | credit market | credit markets | funding liquidity | freeze \| freezes | locks up | lockup |  |  |
| ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ), p3,2,1) | CH | - | N_BANKS | liquidity \| funding | V_DISAPPEAR |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,1), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)$ |  | + | N_BANKS | A_AMPLE | N_LIQUIDITY |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,1), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)$ |  | - | N_BANKS | A_SCARCE | N_LIQUIDITY |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,1), \mathrm{p} 3,1,1)$ | CH | - | N_BANKS | V_REQUEST \| V_NEED | liquidity \| cash | capital| guarantee | guarantees \| N_AID | money |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,1), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)$ |  | + | N_INTLEND | N_BAILOUT \\| N_AID | N_BANKS |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,1), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)$ | CH | + | N_BANKS | V_RECEIVE | N_BAILOUT \| N_AID |  |
| (p1, p2, 2, 1) | CH | + | N_BANKUNION | V_BEGIN \| V_AGREE |  |  |
| (p1,p2,2,1) | CH | + | N_MACROPRUD | V_IMPLEMENT |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | POLINST(+) |  |  |
| (p1, p2, 2, 0) |  | - | market \| price \| prices | trade | investment | A_RIGID |  |  |
| (p1, p 2, 2, 0) |  | + | market \| price | prices | trade | investment | N_FREEDOM |  |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)$ | CH | + | market \| price \| prices | trade | investment | N_CONTROLS | V_RELAX \| V_LIMIT | V_END |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)$ | CH | - | market \| price \| prices \| trade | investment | N_CONTROLS | V_WIDEN \| V_StRENGTHEN |  |
| (p1,p2,2,1) | CH | + | market institutions | V_STRENGTHEN \| V_Protect |  |  |
| (p1, p2,2,1) | CH | - | market institutions | V_WEAKEN \\| V_LIMIT | V_FAIL |  |  |
| (p1, p2, 2, 1) | CH | + | N_PROPRIGHTS | V_STRENGTHEN \| V_PROTECT |  |  |
| (p1, p2, 2, 1) | CH | - | N_PROPRIGHTS | V_WEAKEN \| V_LIMIT |  |  |
| p1 | CH | - | N_NATIONALIZE |  |  |  |
| p1 | CH | + | N_PRIVATIZE |  |  |  |
| ( $\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,1$ ) | CH | - | N_GOVT | V_EXPROP |  |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)$ |  | - | N_LABORM | N_REGULATIONS \| N_CONTROLS | A_RIGID |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)$ |  | + | N_LABORM | N_REGULATIONS I N_CONTROLS | flexible \| V_RELAX | V_LIMIT |  |
| (p1, p 2, 2, 1) | CH | + | N_RULELAW | V_STRENGTHEN \| V_PROTECT |  |  |
| (p1, p2, 2, 1) | CH | - | N_RULELAW | V_WEAKEN \| V_LIMIT | V_FAIL |  |  |
| (p1, p2, 2, 1) | CH | + | democratic institutions \| democracy | V_STRENGTHEN \\| V_Protect |  |  |
| (p1,p2,2,1) | CH | $+$ | democratic institutions \| democracy | V_WEAKEN \| V_LIMIT | V_FAIL |  |  |
| (p1, p2, 2, 0) |  | + | government \| N_ELECT | transparent |  |  |
| p1 |  | + | structural reform \| structural reforms |  |  |  |
| (p1, p2, 2, 1) | CH | + | structural reform \| structural reforms | V_AGREE \| V_IMPLEMENT | <br> Pledge \| V_ACHIEVE |  |  |
| (p1, p 2, 2, 1) | CH | - | structural reform \| structural reforms | V_FAIL \| V_REJECT |  |  |
| (p1, p2, 2, 1) |  | + | N_STRUCTURES | reform \| reforms | reformed | <br> reforming \| overhaul | overhauled | overhauls |  |  |

Fundamental expression structures (continued)

| EXPR_CODE | MOD | SIGN | p1 | p2 | p3 | p4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (p1,p2,2,1) |  | - | N_STRUCTURES | reform \| reforms | reformed | reforming | overhaul | overhauled | overhauls |  |  |
| (p1,p2,2,0) | CH | + | N_ELECT | landslide |  |  |
| (p1,p2,2,0) | CH | - | N_ELECT | inconclusive |  |  |
| (p1,p2,2,0) | CH | - | government \| coalition | ruling party | governments | coalitions | N_FAILURE \| V_FAIL | A_FAILED |  |  |
| (p1,p2,2,0) |  | - | political \| government | N_CRISIS |  |  |
| (p1,p2,2,0) |  | - | political | N_CONFLICT |  |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)$ | CH | + | political\| government | N_CRISIS | V_EASE \| V_LIMIT | V_END |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)$ | CH | - | political\| government | N_CRISIS | V_WIDEN \\| V_PREVENT |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)$ | CH | + | political\| government | N_CONFLICT | V_EASE \\| V_LIMIT | V_END |  |
| ( $(\mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,0), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)$ | CH | - | political \| government | N_CONFLICT | V_WIDEN \| V_Prevent |  |
| p1 |  | - | minority government |  |  |  |
| (p1,p2,2,1) |  | + | majority government \| clear majority | N_ELECT |  |  |
| p1 |  | - | fragmented coalition |  |  |  |
| p1 |  | - | N_PROTEST |  |  |  |
| p1 |  | - | N_COUP |  |  |  |
| p1 |  | - | N_REBEL |  |  |  |
| p1 |  | - | N_REVOL |  |  |  |
| p1 |  | - | N_WAR |  |  |  |
| p1 |  | - | N_ASSASS |  |  |  |
| p1 |  | - | N_TERROR |  |  |  |
| (p1, p2, 2, 1) | CH | + | N_PEACE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V_AGREE \| V_IMPLEMENT \| } \\ & \text { PLEDGE } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| (p1, p2, 2, 1) | CH | - | N_PEACE | V_FAIL \| V_Breach |  |  |
| (p1,(p2, p3, 2, 0), 2, 1) | CH | - | G/d/w+ | V_EXIT | G1_EU |  |
| (p1,( $\mathrm{p} 2, \mathrm{p} 3,2,0$ ), 2, 1) | CH | + | G/d/w+ | V_ENTER \| accession | G1_EU |  |

Table C.6: Fundamental expression structures with complex endings

| Expr_code | TYPE | p1 | p2 | p3 | $\begin{gathered} (-) ; \\ (+): \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Prob_Down } \\ & \text { PROB_UP? } \end{aligned}$ | RISK UPa RISK_DOWN | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CONCERN_UP" } \\ & \text { ne CONCERN_DOWN } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { V_END } \\ & \text { V_BEGIN } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A__INSTABLE } \\ & \text { A_STABLE } \end{aligned}$ | V DECELERATE <br> V ACCELERATE |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { v-CuT } \\ & \text { v—RAISE } \end{aligned}$ | V__WORSEN ${ }^{c}$ <br> V IMPROVE | $\begin{gathered} \text { v-DISAPPOINT } \\ \text { v_PLEASE } \end{gathered}$ | V_WEAKEN V_STRENGTHEN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| REAL(+) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (p1, p2, 2, 1) | data | N_GDP |  |  |  |  | + | + |  | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| (p1, p2, 2, 1) | data | N_HHI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| ${ }_{\substack{\text { a }}}^{(p 1, p 2,2,2,1)}$ | ${ }_{\text {data }}^{\text {data }}$ | $\stackrel{\text { N-CoNs }}{\sim}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| (p1, p2, 2, ) | data | N -cconf |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | + | + | + | + | + |
| (p1, pr 2, 2, ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | data | N-PMI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\pm$ | $\pm$ | + | + | + | + | + |
|  | data data | $\underset{\substack{\text { N_Indu } \\ \mathrm{N} \text { MANUF }}}{ }$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | + | $\pm$ | + | + | + | + | + |
|  | data | car \| auto $\mid$ vehicle | sales \| registrations |  |  |  |  |  |  | + | + | + | + | $+$ | + | + |
| ${ }_{(\text {(pl } 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)}$ | data | durable goods | sales 4 orders |  |  |  |  |  |  | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
|  | data data | ${ }_{\text {manufacturing }}^{\text {N_Constr }}$ | n_number |  |  |  |  |  |  | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| ${ }_{(\text {(plp } 1,2,1,0), ~ p 3,2,1)}$ | data | construction | n_number |  |  |  |  |  |  | $+$ | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| (p1, $\mathrm{p}^{2}, 2,1$ ) | data | productivity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
|  | data data | $\xrightarrow{\text { N-EARN }} \mathrm{N}$ |  |  |  |  | + |  |  | + | + | $\pm$ | $\pm$ | + | + | + |
| ${ }_{(\text {( } \mathrm{p} 1, \mathrm{p}, 2,1,0, \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)}$ | data | job | cuts \| losees |  |  |  | + |  |  |  |  |  | : |  | + |  |
| ${ }_{(01}^{(p 1, p 2,2,1)}$ | data | N_EMPL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | + | + | + |  | + | + | + |
|  | data | N_house | constructions \| <br> building \| sales | |  |  |  |  |  |  | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| ${ }_{\left.\left(\text {( } p^{1}, \mathrm{p} 21,0\right), \mathrm{p}^{3}, 2,1\right)}$ | data | N_HOUSE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { starts } \\ & \text { market \| sector \| } \\ & \text { markets \| sectors \| } \\ & \text { N_NUMBER } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | + | + |  | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
|  |  | N_house | bubble |  |  |  |  | + |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | data | ${ }_{\text {N-HOUSE }}^{\text {Nocomy }}$ | bust \| burst |  |  | - | + | + |  | + | + |  |  | + | + | + |
|  |  | oconomic | upturn \| expansion |  |  | + |  |  | + | + | + |  |  | + |  | + |
| ${ }_{(101 . p 2,2,1)}$ |  |  |  |  |  | + | + | + | + | + | + |  |  | + |  | + |
|  |  | $\underset{\substack{\text { ci_CHIN }}}{\text { economic }}$ | hard landing downturn \| |  |  | : | + | + | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | slowdown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{\substack{\text { recession } \\ \text { economic }}}{\text { cen }}$ | N_Crisis |  |  | : | + | + | : |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EXTERN(+) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underset{\substack{\text { (p1,p2, } 2,1) \\\left(p 1, p p_{2}, 2,1\right)}}{ }$ | ${ }_{\text {data }}^{\text {data }}$ |  |  |  |  |  | + | + |  | + | $\pm$ | + | + | + | + | + |
|  | data | n_etrade | surplus |  |  |  |  | + |  | + |  | + | + | + | + | + |
|  | data | N-Etrade | N-DEFICIT |  |  |  |  | + |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }_{\text {data }}^{\text {data }}$ | $\underset{\text { N-ETRADE }}{\text { Nemittances }}$ | n_balance |  |  |  | + | + |  | + |  | + | + | + | + | + |
| (p1, p2, 2, 1 ) | data | N_Res |  |  |  |  | + | + |  | + |  |  | + | + | + |  |
| ${ }_{(010}^{(p 1, p 2,2,1)}$ | data | ${ }_{\text {N-FDI }}$ |  |  |  |  | + | + |  | + |  | + | + | + | + |  |
|  | data |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | data | N_edebt |  |  |  |  | + | + |  |  |  | - | . |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{(0)}^{(\mathrm{pp} 1,(\mathrm{p} 2, \mathrm{p}, 2,2,1), 2,1)}$ |  | ${ }_{\sim}^{\text {N-RES }}$ | $\mathrm{V}^{\text {deneplete }}$ |  |  | : | + + | ${ }_{+}^{+}$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (p1, p2, 2, 2) |  | currency N CRISIS | A_scarce |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (p1, p2, 2, ${ }^{\text {P }}$ |  | sudden V_END stop \| |  |  |  | . | + | + | . |  |  | - | - |  |  | - |
| (p1, p2, 2, ${ }^{\text {P }}$ |  | captal Ifight dollarization |  |  |  | - |  | + | - |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |
| (p1, p2, 2, ${ }^{\text {l }}$ | data | external N -balance |  |  |  |  | + | + |  | + |  |  |  |  | + | + |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | + | + |  |  |  | + |  | + | + | $\pm$ |
| (p1, p2, 2, 1) |  | terms of E_TRADE trade \| termsoftrade |  |  |  |  | + | + |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EXTERN,POLINST(0,+) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (p1,p2, 2, 1) |  | protectionium |  |  |  | - | + | + | - |  |  | - | - |  |  | - |
| EXTERN,MONPOL(+,+) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Fundamental expression structures with complex endings (continued)

| EXPr_code | TYPE | p1 | p2 | p3 | $\underset{\substack{(-)!\\(+)}}{ }$ | PROB_DOWN PROB ${ }^{a}$ <br> PROB__UP ${ }^{a}$ | RISK UP RISK_DOWN | CONCERN_UPa ${ }^{4}$ CONCERN__DOWN | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V_EEND } \\ & \text { V_BEGIN } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A__INSTABLE } \\ & \text { A_STABLE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { v_DECELERATE V_FALLb } \\ & \text { v_ACCELERATE } \text { V_RISE }^{b} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { v_CUT } \\ & \text { v_RAISE } \end{aligned}$ | V_IMPROVE ${ }^{c}$ V_PLEASE <br> v_worsene v_disappoint | $\begin{gathered} \text { V__WEAKEN } \\ \text { V__STRENGTHEN } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\underset{\substack{\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{FX}}}{\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{FX} \mid \text { currency }}$ currency | $\underset{\substack{\text { V } \quad \text { Revalue } \\ \mathrm{V}-\text { devalue }}}{ }$ |  |  | + |  |  | ; |  |  |  |  |  |
| MONPOL(+) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{(\text {( } p 1, p 2,1,0) \text { ). } 3,2,1)}$ | data | N_cb | rate \| rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |
| (p1, p2, 2, 1) | data | n_brate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\underset{\text { V-tighe }}{\mathrm{V} \text {-tigen }}$ |  |  | + | $\pm$ | + | ; |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }_{\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{CB}}^{\text {rates }}$ | ${ }_{\text {rate }}^{\text {Vatese }}$ | n_increase |  | + | + | + | + |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N_CB |  | N_Decrease |  | + | - | + | + |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\underset{\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{Brate}}{\mathrm{N} \_ \text {brate }}$ | $\xrightarrow{\text { N_INCREASE }} \mathrm{N}$ |  |  | + | $\pm$ | + | + |  |  |  |  |  |
| ((plp $\mathrm{p} 2,2,1), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)$ |  | policy \| cycle | monetary | | v - TIGHTEN / tight |  |  | . | + | + | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| ((p1, p2, 2, 1) . $\left.\mathrm{p}^{2}, 2,1\right)$ |  |  |  |  |  | + | . | + | + |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N_CB\| $\mid$ - BRATE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V__RELAX \| looser } \\ & \text { accommodative \| } \\ & \text { loose \| expansionary } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | + | - | + | + |  |  |  |  |  |
| ((p1,p2,2,1).p3,2,1) |  | N_CB | \| aceommodation |  |  | . | + | + |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{v}_{\square}^{\text {Raise }}$ |  |  |  |  | $+$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{(\text {( } 1 / 1, \mathrm{p} 2,2,1), \mathrm{p}, 2,2,1)}$ |  | N-Cb | V-Ease V_cut |  |  | + | - | + | + |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{((p p 1, p 2,2,2), p 3,2,1), p 4,2,2)}$ |  | N_CB \| monetary | $\underset{\text { v_limit }}{\text { v_withinaw }}$ | stimulus |  | . | + | + | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{((p 1, p 2,2,2,0), p 3,2,1), \mathrm{p} 4,2,2)}$ |  | N_CB \| monetary |  | stimulus |  | + | - | + | + |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{(\text {( } p 1, p 2,2,1), \mathrm{p} 3,2,1)}$ |  | n_reqreserves |  |  |  | - | + | + | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{(\text {(p1, p } 2,2,1), p 3,2,1)}$ |  | N_REqRESERVES | $\underset{\substack{\text { V_Tighten } \\ \text { V_RAISE }}}{\text { \| }}$ |  |  | + | - | + | + |  |  |  |  |  |
| POLINST, MONPOL(+,0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\left.(\text {(pl } 1,(\mathrm{p} 2, \mathrm{p}, 2,2,1), 1,1) \text { ) } \mathrm{p}^{4}, 2,2\right)}$ |  | C/d/w+ | V_Exit | ${ }_{\text {G1_ EZ }}$ euro |  | - | + | + |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | v breakup | ${ }^{\text {G1_EZ }}$ |  |  | - | + | + |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\left.(0101,(p 2, p 3,2,1), 1,1) \text {, } \mathrm{p}^{4}, 2,2\right)}$ |  | G/d/w+ | V-Enter | G1_EZ \| ouro |  | + | + | + |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | V_ADOPT | euro \| N_EUR |  | + | + |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }_{\text {N_Grexit }}^{\text {c/aw }}$ | -adot | ouro N-EuT |  | + | + | + |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MONPOL, $\operatorname{BANK}(+,+$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | data | N_CB | inject \| injects injecting | injection | provision | provide provides | pumps | pumped | ${ }^{\text {Hiquidity }}$ \| cash |  | + | $+$ | + | + |  | + | + |  |  |
| (p1,p2,2,1) | DATA |  |  |  |  | + | + | + | + |  | + | + |  |  |
| (p1,(p2, p3, 2, ) , 2, 1) |  | N_Cb | collateral |  |  |  | + | + |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N_Cb | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V_STRENGTHEN \| } \\ & \text { N_BALOUT । } \\ & \text { V SAVE } \end{aligned}$ | n_banks |  | + | + | + |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (p1, p2, 2, 1) |  | lender of last reort \| lendereflastresort |  |  |  |  | + | + |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underline{(p 1, p 2,2,1)}$ |  |  |  |  |  | - | + | + | . |  |  |  |  |  |
| FISCAL, BANK (+,-) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{((1 \mathrm{P} 1, \mathrm{p} 2,1,0), \mathrm{p} 3,1,1) \text {, } 4.2,2)}$ |  | G/d/w+ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V_STRENGTHEN } \\ & \text { N_BAILOUT \| } \end{aligned}$ | n_banks |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N_govt |  | N_banks |  | - |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Fundamental expression structures with complex endings (continued)
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Fundamental expression structures with complex endings (continued)


Table C.7: Number of fundamental expressions by category (000s)

|  | sign | REAL | EXTERN | FISCAL | FUND_LIQ | BANK | POL_INST | MON_POL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALL | positive | 570.920 | 120.533 | 202.081 | 15.052 | 94.804 | 111.817 | 236.119 |
|  | neutral | 9.512 | 4.012 | 0.231 | 0.045 | 1.126 | 0.001 | 43.624 |
|  | negative | 574.670 | 111.189 | 203.257 | 57.792 | 113.048 | 639.401 | 141.549 |
| CHANGE | positive | 347.594 | 80.280 | 137.928 | 5.697 | 68.879 | 67.168 | 208.545 |
|  | neutral | 0.507 | 2.740 | 0.073 | 0.001 | 0.044 | 0.000 | 11.126 |
|  | negative | 289.029 | 69.824 | 124.722 | 4.942 | 33.852 | 84.907 | 109.511 |
| EXPECT | positive | 10.152 | 1.423 | 1.258 | 0.026 | 0.506 | 0.034 | 0.707 |
|  | neutral | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
|  | negative | 8.183 | 1.299 | 1.181 | 0.031 | 0.586 | 0.019 | 0.589 |
| SURPRISE | positive | 21.626 | 1.853 | 0.988 | 0.009 | 0.464 | 0.000 | 0.085 |
|  | neutral | 1.426 | 0.193 | 0.028 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
|  | negative | 13.746 | 1.487 | 0.885 | 0.002 | 0.131 | 0.000 | 0.059 |
| CONCERNS | positive | 36.361 | 3.135 | 9.937 | 4.419 | 8.639 | 18.082 | 17.686 |
|  | neutral | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 2.301 |
|  | negative | 103.020 | 11.808 | 22.328 | 13.583 | 25.688 | 52.762 | 30.480 |

Notes: The category ALL comprises total matches; CHANGE: fundamental expressions that refer to changing state of fundamentals; EXPECT: fundamental expressions that refer to expected/predicted state of fundamentals; SURPRISE: fundamental expressions that refer to the state of fundamentals related to previous expectations; CONCERN: fundamental expressions that refer to concerns, threats, risks, hopes, probabilities regarding the future state of fundamentals;
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Non-fundamental price movements may originate from self-fulfilling beliefs about other investors (Diamond and Dybvig, 1983; Calvo, 2002), liquidity shocks (Allen and Gale, 2000; Brunnermeier and Pedersen, 2008) or other factors resulting in rational and speculative bubbles (see Shiller et al., 2014, for further references).
    ${ }^{2}$ A central prediction of this literature beginning with Eaton and Gersovitz (1981) is that a deterioration in the fiscal position (higher debt) and real economic growth both provide incentives for governments to choose default over debt repayment. A weak external position (low currency reserves, high current account deficits and foreign exchange debt) increases vulnerability to self-fulfulling funding crises (Calvo and Mendoza, 1996; Cole and Kehoe, 1996; Sachs, Tornell and Velasco, 1996). Fundamentals of the domestic banking system are important due to potential bailout costs (Dieckmann and Plank, 2011; Acharya, Drechsler and Schnabl, 2014). Politicalinstitutional fundamentals also have an effect on fiscal conduct and sovereign credit risk as discussed by a vast literature strand (see Gaspar, Gupta and Mulas-Granados, 2017).
    ${ }^{3}$ External shocks may originate from both fundamentals or non-fundamentals (categorizations and empirical reviews are provided in Moser, 2003; Corsetti, Pericoli and Sbracia, 2005). Empirical findings of fundamental links due to trade spillovers and US interest rates have been mixed. Some recent papers however reported significant spillover effects from the US real economy (Dooley and Hutchison, 2009; Augustin and Tédongap, 2016). (Augustin (2014) provides further discussion and references.) Studies investigating liquidity and risk pricing (also referred to as risk appetite or investor sentiment) within spreads usually defined these factors as being distinct from fundamentals (see e.g. Beber, Brandt and Kavajecz (2008) and Favero, Pagano and Von Thadden (2010) in case of liquidity risk and Eichengreen and Mody (1998), Baek, Bandopadhyaya and Du (2005), González-Rozada and Yeyati (2008) with regard to risk pricing.)
    ${ }^{4}$ We define the fundamental component as the component relating to the future expected path of country

[^1]:    and global fundamentals, including the distributional assumptions about this path. This definition incorporates elements of uncertainty (about fundamentals) including tail risk scenarios. Non-fundamentals are then restricted to time-variations in pricing of risks, and non-informational trading due to liquidity shocks or expectations rooted in reasons independent of fundamentals.
    ${ }^{5}$ We use tonality in a wider sense than sometimes seen in the literature. Instead of denoting a general sentiment of the text, we define tonality as the textual information that identifies the direction of change of fundamentals.
    ${ }^{6}$ An influential example is the Economic Policy Uncertainty index of Baker, Bloom and Davis (2016) extracted from US news archives, which has been used in several finance applications as an indication of uncertainty concerning the economy and policymaking. In the sovereign credit literature, several authors have used keyword searches to grasp various aspects of the eurozone crisis (Cesare et al., 2012; Mohl and Sondermann, 2013). In an application related to ours Gomes and Taamouti (2016) extract fundamental indices from Google searches.
    ${ }^{7}$ A series of papers on equity markets used such tonality indices to examine whether their predictive ability is temporary (indicative of no fundamental information) or persistent (indicating fundamental content). The findings were mixed: Tetlock, Saar-Tsechansky and Macskassy (2008) and Ferguson et al. (2015) found persistent effects, whereas results of Tetlock (2007) and Da, Engelberg and Gao (2011) pointed to news mostly representing market sentiment. Looking at sovereign yields, Dergiades, Milas and Panagiotidis (2014) found that social media hits on the keywords related to the Greek crisis had short-run predictive power.

[^2]:    ${ }^{8}$ Realizing this caveat, several authors created dictionaries, which were more customized to their specific applications. Loughran and McDonald (2011) created a dictionary for finance contexts. Other papers used word sets designed for the areas of monetary policy and financial stability (Lucca and Trebbi, 2009; Hansen and McMahon, 2016; Correa et al., 2017).
    ${ }^{9}$ Some papers in the finance literature have simultaneously extracted tonality and topic information, but using other methods. Beetsma et al. (2013) and Ehrmann et al. (2014) manually labelled tonality after filtering news for relevant topics, which was possible as these studies worked with a relatively small news sample. Born, Ehrmann and Fratzscher (2014) and Liu (2014) instead used automatic tonality classification methods, however, tonality in these cases was again linked to full articles. Closest to our approach are Lucca and Trebbi (2009), Hansen and McMahon (2016) and Tobback, Nardelli and Martens (2017), which first match sentences that are relevant by topic, and then value the tonality of sentences based on learning algorithms. Although these papers do adapt tonality words that are specific to the context they analyze, these tonality words are not linked to the specific topical keywords. Our approach is more appropriate in applications (certainly our case), where tonality keywords receive their sign subject to the topical keywords they connect with.
    ${ }^{10}$ This is crucial for identifying the motives behind asset price changes. Journalists will write news articles about changing fundamentals if that is interesting for investors, i.e. if it is relevant for asset pricing. However they will also write news stories about changing asset prices even if there was no identifiable fundamental explanation

[^3]:    for these. Even if the article mentions some background to observed price changes, these could still be nonfundamental in nature (some often seen examples are: references to general risk aversion/risk appetite: e.g 'dollar stronger on investor fears'; references to price changes in other asset classes: e.g 'increasing Greek spreads hit the euro'; 'prices reversing previous movements'; investor profit-taking; investors closing out or opening new positions; interviewing traders who refer to technical trading rules). The problem is that these non-fundamental stories can contain verbs and adjectives that relate to positive or negative tonality in a more general sense. Our method avoids (false positive) matches in these cases, because fundamental topic keywords are missing from these non-fundamental statements. Our approach only takes tonality keywords into account, when they are sufficiently close to keywords identifying fundamental topics.
    ${ }^{11}$ The VIX index displays strong correlations with the common component of sovereign spreads (e.g. McGuire and Schrijvers, 2003; Ang and Longstaff, 2011) and their coefficient estimates are usually significantly positive in sovereign spread regressions (Hilscher and Nosbusch, 2010; Alper, Forni and Gerard, 2013; Paniagua, Sapena and Tamarit, 2016, to cite just a few).

[^4]:    ${ }^{12}$ Earlier empirical papers on sovereign credit risk used observations of debt restructuring as dependents in logistic regressions (see McFadden et al., 1985, and references therein).

[^5]:    ${ }^{13}$ http://uk.reuters.com/resources/archive/uk/
    ${ }^{14}$ Several authors use such data sets for analyzing retail investments in corporate shares (e.g. Da, Engelberg and Gao, 2011; Joseph, Wintoki and Zhang, 2011). A natural filtering choice in those papers is to only consider search/text items that mention a given corporate name or identifier. The analogous mentioning of country names to proxy sovereign risk would not be as efficient a filter in social media or Google search data (e.g. searches on Greece could reflect seasonal effects of summer holidays). Further, those studies primarily target local retail investors, which is appropriate in equity markets, however, for our purposes non-retail, global investors matter more since they constitute the relevant investor group on both sovereign CDS and international bond markets. There have been attempts to use such textual inputs in sovereign credit applications (Dergiades, Milas and Panagiotidis, 2014; Cesare et al., 2012), but news texts have been more popular in this area.

[^6]:    ${ }^{15}$ Most fundamental expressions have a tonality score of either +2 or -2 , but we use some modifiers to differentiate between less and more intensive expressions for tone (e.g. reference to a small increase in GDP would receive ' +1 ' vs ' +3 ' for a huge increase).
    ${ }^{16}$ Precise definitions of fundamental categories expressions and their signs are provided in our Coding Guide, which is available in the online appendix. We developed these definitions through several rounds of iterations of independently, manually labelling documents with research assistants and discussing ambiguities when checking inconsistencies between manual labels. The definitions of fundamentals also form the basis for our fundamental expression rules.
    ${ }^{17}$ These rules are coded as four argument functions: the first two arguments specify the expression elements; the third represents constituent ordering (either 1: elements only in the order of function arguments or 2: reverse

[^7]:    ${ }^{19}$ For instance the simple combination of words listed for the first two components and 'V_ACCELERATE' (also counting plural and conjugated forms) represent roughly 3000 combinations ( $9 \times 11 \times \overline{33}$ ) of their constituent n-grams. If we account for synonyms of other verbs and adjectives in the third component, the number of combinations are boosted into the 10-100 thousand range for only this one particular type of expression about the housing market. In contrast, our approach of synonym labelling is easily implemented by a few lines of code relying on 8 synonym group definitions in Table C. 3 and 2 expression definitions in Table C.6.
    ${ }^{20}$ Some notes are in place, here. First, synonyms, as we call them, are not synonyms in a strict sense, but rather loose, context-specific semantic matches. Second, labels beginning with ' $\mathrm{N}_{-}$', 'A_,', 'V_' mostly represent nouns, adjectives and verbs, respectively, but this is not necessary. The key idea is that the n-grams belonging to a label should be words, phrases that are used interchangeably as constituents of specific expressions in the particular context of the expressions. The n -grams 'gather steam' and 'rapid' are not verbs, but they do add the same tonality meaning when referring to economic growth, for example. Third, some word combinations represented by synonym labels do not make sense and thus almost never arise in the text, e.g. 'house' together with 'sector', 'house' with 'indicator'. Nonetheless if in other contexts 'house' is a valid substitute for 'housing' and its several synonyms, e.g. in the case of 'starts, 'constructions', 'building', then it still makes sense to have it in the list of synonyms.

[^8]:    ${ }^{21}$ Although not error-proof, this method is much more precise than methods which identify the most frequently cited geography reference in the text (with or without correction for their unconditional expectation).

[^9]:    ${ }^{22}$ We report aggregates at the weekly frequency, because there is considerable heterogeneity in the structure of fundamental news with respect to the weekday/weekend divide as already seen in Table 1. Also, when considering expressions broken down to fundamental categories and perhaps index types, daily aggregates are sparse for all but the largest countries.
    ${ }^{23}$ We were careful to have fundamental expressions here that only refer to the banking system as a whole and disregard information on individual banks on the basis that these should be less relevant on a macroeconomic scale.

[^10]:    ${ }^{24}$ Note that we define increases in monetary policy indices as pertaining to easing monetary conditions.
    ${ }^{25}$ Tapering was eventually announced in December that year and QE3 ended in October 2014.
    ${ }^{26}$ The website of the authors, http://www.policyuncertainty.com, publishes indices for several countries and several topics along with related research and description of methodology.

[^11]:    ${ }^{27}$ The background to our fundamental definitions are available in our Coding Guide (online appendix).

[^12]:    ${ }^{28}$ See Appendix B and Section 2 for data used and calculation method. Note that we could have also looked at levels of published macro data relative to time series averages or compared to previous months' values. Levels data are very persistent. Taking first differences however introduces noise with respect to which macroeconomic indicator was published on different days (for example even when normalized for indicator-specific variance, the relative level of employment data could be far from the relative level of housing market data, therefore daily changes would be influenced by selection on which of these were published). Changes compared to the previous values would need to be compared to changes of news indices on the same time scale. But some indicators are weekly, some are monthly, some are quarterly, which makes such comparisons less straightforward.

[^13]:    ${ }^{29}$ Announcements are also available for budget balances but these are so infrequent that number of observations are severely limited. Monetary policy rate announcements were also available, but were uninformative as interest rates and their expectations have been constant in most of the sample.

[^14]:    ${ }^{30}$ Augustin (2014) reviews the literature with respect to global versus local determinants of sovereign CDS spreads and claims that global factors are more important on higher trading frequencies. He also asserts that the relationship is time-varying: local factors, especially those related to the sovereign-banking nexus, have become more important as of the financial crisis. Kocsis and Monostori (2016) compare the role of domestic and global factors with respect to modelling the relationship between spreads and determinants in levels or first differences.
    ${ }^{31}$ Emerging market studies initially followed the tradition of Edwards (1983) in using logarithms on the grounds of a hazard model between fundamentals and probability of default. The literature dealing with eurozone countries (convergence prior to the financial crisis and sovereign risk concerns afterwards) however chose the linear format, probably because of the occurrences of negative spreads: several countries had interest rates below the benchmark German Bunds used to proxy risk-free rates. In our data set, taking logarithm seems to result in a specification with less heteroscedasticity in the error terms as the volatility of sovereign spreads is strongly associated with spread levels.

[^15]:    ${ }^{32}$ Note that there is no need for cross-section fixed effects, theoretically there is no reason to assume (heterogenous) trends in sovereign spreads.
    ${ }^{33}$ Since there are no commonly used proxies for common trends in external and fiscal balances, we simply extract the first principal components of the traditional macroeconomic variable series.

[^16]:    ${ }^{34}$ This method underestimates the fundamental content in these financial indicators due to the noise in the news indices. Regression residuals understood here as non-fundamentals may still have further fundamentalrelated content.

[^17]:    ${ }^{35}$ http://uk.reuters.com/resources/archive/uk/20070101.html

