Dean&Francis
ISSN 2959-6130

From "Flash Crashes" to "GameStop": Paradigm Shift in Algorithm-Driven Market Crises

Hongyi Han

Abstract:

This paper examines the paradigm shift in financial market crises during the era of algorithms and social media, using the 2010 "Flash Crash" and the 2021 "GameStop" incident as comparative case studies. The research reveals that the driving mechanisms of market crises have evolved from the old paradigm dominated by technical failures in institutional algorithms to a new paradigm fueled by retail algorithmic trading and emotional resonance amplified by social media. This paradigm shift is driven by three structural forces: technological democratization, the information dissemination revolution, and cultural paradigm shifts. It manifests in fundamental transformations: crisis agents shifting from institutions to retail investors; core drivers transitioning from mathematical logic to social psychology; communication channels evolving from specialized networks to public squares; and crisis forms changing from systemic shocks to targeted explosions. This paradigm shift poses profound challenges to financial stability: it leads to the "diffusion" of risk sources, the 'malfunction' of classical theories, and the "defocusing" of traditional regulation. To address these challenges, this paper constructs a multi-dimensional agile governance framework based on three pillars: technology empowerment, platform accountability, and mechanism reconstruction. This framework aims to tackle new market risks and provides theoretical insights and practical pathways for regulating financial markets in the digital age.

Keywords: Algorithmic Trading; Social Media; Market Crisis; Paradigm Shift; Financial Stability

1. Introduction

Since the 21st century, the ecosystem and structure of financial markets have undergone profound transformations driven by information technology. This has not only reshaped the fundamental logic of trading

behavior, information dissemination, and investor interactions but has also fundamentally undermined traditional financial theories' assumptions about market efficiency, rational expectations, and regulatory boundaries. Among these changes, the proliferation of algorithmic trading and the rise of social media have emerged as two core forces reshaping market operating models. On one hand, algorithmic trading has become deeply embedded within modern financial infrastructure, leveraging its ultra-high execution speeds, millisecond-level responsiveness, and real-time processing of massive datasets [1]. Techniques such as high-frequency trading (HFT), statistical arbitrage, and machine learning-driven predictive models have significantly enhanced market liquidity and altered the fundamental characteristics of price discovery mechanisms. Traditional "human-to-human" trading has been supplanted by "machine-to-machine" interactions, making the triggers and transmission pathways of market volatility more complex and unpredictable. This algorithm-dominated trading ecosystem has propelled financial markets into an "ultra-high-speed microstructure era" measured in milliseconds or even microseconds. Concurrently, decentralized, open-participation, and virally spreading global information networks built by social media platforms have shattered the traditional media and professional institutions' monopoly on financial discourse. They have also granted ordinary retail investors unprecedented access to information, freedom of expression, and organizational mobilization capabilities. Investors have become active participants who form consensus, coordinate actions, and even proactively shape market narratives through online communities. New interactive mechanisms rooted in emotional resonance, group identity, and collective belief have spawned "networked retail force"—one capable of exerting disruptive influence on markets under specific conditions through information aggregation and emotional resonance.

The 2010 Flash Crash and the 2021 GameStop incident stand as two landmark financial phenomena defining their eras. The former triggered nearly 1,000-point plunge in the Dow Jones Industrial Average within minutes, causing trillions in market value to evaporate and then rebound rapidly, exposing the vulnerability of algorithmic trading systems and the risks of negative feedback loops under extreme conditions [2]. The latter witnessed retail investors, centered around Reddit's r/WallStreetBets community, collectively purchasing heavily shorted GameStop stock via social media [3]. This coordinated effort successfully forced short squeezes on multiple hedge funds, causing the stock price to surge over 20-fold in short period and sparking global financial and social movement that dominated public discourse. Although both events manifested as extreme asset price volatility, their underlying driving logic, participants, information dissemination mechanisms, and institutional responses revealed fundamental differences.

These two extreme events, separated by decade and differing in form, compel us to ponder deeper theoretical question: Do they collectively reveal fundamental paradigm shift in the driving mechanisms of financial market crises? If such shift exists, what are its specific dimensions and manifestations? What are the underlying causes driving this historic transformation? Furthermore, what unprecedented challenges does it pose to existing financial regulatory theory and practice? This study systematically compares the "flash crash" and "GameStop" events within unified analytical framework, revealing the coherent, directional evolutionary patterns underlying them. It seeks not only to clarify the new logic governing the evolution of contemporary financial market crises but also to provide theoretical underpinnings and policy insights for building more resilient, inclusive, and forward-looking financial governance system.

2. Relevant Theory and Technical Foundations

2.1 Theoretical Divide Between Algorithmic Trading and Market Stability

As algorithmic trading has gradually become the dominant trading method in major global financial markets, academic research on its market effects has formed theoretical divide. From the perspective of market quality, algorithmic trading significantly enhances liquidity supply by continuously providing two-way quotes and instantaneous execution capabilities. This manifests as systematic narrowing of bid-ask spreads and substantial improvement in order book depth, thereby effectively reducing transaction execution costs [1]. Regarding price discovery mechanisms, algorithmic trading accelerates the incorporation of information into asset prices through millisecond-level cross-market arbitrage activities, thereby enhancing market informational efficiency. Its price discovery function partially mitigates momentum effects and overreactions prevalent in traditional trading, strengthening the stability foundation of the financial system at the market microstructure level [2]. Another body of literature, grounded in complex systems theory, reveals the systemic risks algorithmic trading may trigger. The tendency toward homogeneity in algorithmic strategies can induce behavioral resonance under market stress—where numerous algorithmic programs respond with consistent stress reactions to market signals—leading to instantaneous liquidity depletion [3]. This forms potent positive feedback loop through the networked structure of modern financial markets, rapidly amplifying localized price shocks into

ISSN 2959-6130

global market volatility [4]. Particularly noteworthy is how algorithm-dominated markets may exacerbate information asymmetry, making markets more susceptible to abrupt crashes during extreme events. Thus, while enhancing daily market efficiency, algorithmic trading creates novel vulnerabilities, making flash crash-like extreme events signature systemic risk of the algorithmic era.

2.2 Research Advances on Social Media and the Transformation of Financial Behavior Paradigms

The rise of social media platforms has not only transformed information dissemination but also profoundly reshaped participation patterns and decision-making mechanisms in financial markets. Cognitive biases identified by traditional behavioral finance exhibit new evolutionary characteristics within social media environments. The anonymity and instant feedback mechanisms of online communities significantly amplify the intensity and speed of traditional herd behavior. The formation of digital herd behavior no longer relies on face-to-face information transmission but spreads virally through the network structures of social media [5]. Simultaneously, the inherent echo chamber effects and information silos on social media platforms accelerate group polarization, causing community members' beliefs about specific investment targets to reinforce themselves, ultimately forming highly consistent collective cognition. This network-based collective cognition amplifies individual investors' overconfidence tendencies, providing the psychological foundation and organizational conditions for large-scale coordinated trading behavior. Recent research has begun examining how the interaction between trading technology innovations and social media platforms reshapes market power dynamics [6]. Zero-commission trading platforms democratize trading tools through gamified interfaces and simplified processes, making complex strategies traditionally reserved for professionals accessible to retail investors [7]. The convergence of technological empowerment and information-driven social media has spawned novel market participation model: social media serves dual functions of information aggregation and action coordination, while trading platforms provide the conduit to translate collective decisions into market impact. The platform-community linkage mechanism has empowered retail forces to influence or even dominate the price movements of specific assets, signaling profound transformation in the power structure of financial markets.

2.3 Research Review and Theoretical Expansion Opportunities

A systematic review of existing literature reveals significant theoretical divisions and methodological limitations in current research. First, algorithmic trading studies are primarily rooted in financial engineering and market microstructure theory, relying on high-frequency data and econometric models for quantitative analysis. Conversely, social media finance research draws more heavily on behavioral economics and social network theory, emphasizing qualitative analysis and text mining methods. The two fields lack effective dialogue regarding problem awareness, theoretical frameworks, and methodologies, resulting in isolated research systems. Second, algorithmic trading literature often examines market stability impacts from technical perspective, overlooking the reciprocal influence of social factors on algorithm design and trading strategies. Conversely, social media research focuses on psychological and social dimensions without sufficiently considering how these novel behavioral patterns ultimately affect market stability through modern trading technologies. This prevents comprehensive grasp of the complex financial realities shaped by the combined effects of algorithms and social media. Therefore, there is an urgent need to establish an integrated analytical framework that bridges technical and social logics. This paper treats the "flash crash" and "GameStop" events as ideal types representing two distinct crisis paradigms. Through systematic comparative case study, it breaks through the theoretical limitations of existing research to reveal the deep evolutionary patterns of contemporary financial market crisis paradigms.

3. Comparative Analysis of Paradigm Cases: From "Technical Stall" to "Social Uprising"

By juxtaposing the "Flash Crash" and "GameStop" paradigmatic cases, this study reveals structural shifts in financial market crisis paradigms across key dimensions—driving agents, core dynamics, transmission channels, and crisis manifestations.

3.1 Shift in Crisis Drivers

Regarding driving forces, both crises demonstrate structural transition from specialized financial institutions to retail investor communities. The 2010 "Flash Crash" fundamentally exemplified disordered algorithmic interactions among professional financial institutions. Its drivers were institutional investors equipped with advanced technology and expertise—high-frequency traders, quantitative hedge funds, and other specialized market participants [8]. Institutional trading behavior, reliant on highly complex algorithmic models, strictly adheres to pre-set profit-maximization and risk-control logic. During the crash, algorithmic systems across major institutions executed massive sell orders nearly simultaneously based

on similar market signals and risk parameters, creating an "inter-institutional collective action dilemma." In contrast, the 2021 "GameStop" incident signaled fundamental shift in driving agents. The core drivers were retail investor communities organized through digital platforms. These groups shared information and coordinated actions via social media, executing trading decisions through fintech applications. Their motivations exhibited dual nature: pursuing financial gains while harboring strong socio-emotional demands—particularly antagonism toward traditional Wall Street institutions and anti-establishment sentiment. This compound financial-emotional motivation fueled sustained and highly synchronized collective action, demonstrating the novel market influence of retail power in the digital age.

3.2 Shift in Core Crisis Drivers

At the core-driver level, the two crises respectively illustrated distinct operational mechanisms of technological rationality and social emotion in driving market volatility. The "flash crash" mechanism was fundamentally technology-driven process governed by algorithmic logic. The crisis was triggered when large sell order for an E-mini S&P 500 futures contract was rapidly identified and acted upon by high-frequency algorithmic systems across the market. Significant homogeneity in algorithm design and risk parameter settings among institutional investors led numerous algorithmic programs to execute similar sell strategies simultaneously, creating powerful "algorithmic resonance" effect [9]. This algorithmic resonance continuously amplified itself through the market's positive feedback loop, ultimately escalating into systemic liquidity crisis. In contrast, the core driver of the "GameStop" incident was rooted in the social-psychological realm. Its outbreak stemmed from the emotionally charged collective narrative of "taking on Wall Street." Viral dissemination across social media platforms rapidly galvanized widespread societal resonance, forming an emotionally cohesive community with strong sense of shared identity. Thus, trading behavior transcended traditional financial decision-making, transforming into form of social expression and identity affirmation.

3.3 Shift in Crisis Transmission Media

In terms of transmission media, both crises demonstrated marked transition from specialized closed systems to public open platforms. Information dissemination during the "flash crash" relied entirely on specialized financial market infrastructure. Crisis propagation primarily occurred through private high-speed data feeds and inter-institutional order flows. These professional channels feature extremely high transmission speeds and strict access restrictions, enabling near-instantaneous information dissemination solely among specialized market participants. While this ensures efficiency in routine market operations, it also leads to synchronized behavior among professional investors during crises, amplifying market resonance effects. In contrast, information dissemination during the "GameStop" incident primarily relied on fully open public social media platforms (such as Reddit and Twitter) and fintech applications [10]. The low barriers and high openness of these platforms enabled relevant information to ferment and spread asynchronously among millions of retail investors. While this open, asynchronous dissemination model was relatively slower, it provided temporal dimension for the event to continuously brew and intensify. Simultaneously, it allowed more non-professional investors to participate, ultimately forming an unprecedented scale of retail-driven collective action.

3.4 Shift in Crisis Form and Impact

In terms of crisis form and impact, the two events exhibited starkly different characteristics and consequences. The "flash crash" triggered an unprecedented sharp decline and rapid rebound in U.S. stock markets within an extremely short timeframe (approximately 36 minutes). The Dow Jones Industrial Average plummeted nearly 1,000 points at one point, while numerous individual stocks experienced instantaneous extreme price volatility. The shock was distinctly comprehensive and indiscriminate, affecting stocks across nearly all sectors and market capitalizations. Although the market recovered relatively quickly, this incident profoundly exposed new systemic risks facing the modern financial system under algorithmic trading dominance, prompting regulators to comprehensively reassess and refine market microstructure [11]. The "GameStop" incident, however, was highly concentrated on small number of heavily shorted stocks (primarily GameStop, but also other meme stocks like AMC), failing to significantly impact overall market indices. Yet beneath this apparent locality lay profound structural implications: On one hand, the event triggered extreme price volatility and surging trading volumes in related stock and options markets. On the other, it fundamentally challenged the core assumption of traditional finance—the "rational actor" hypothesis—sparking widespread questioning and reflection among market participants on deep structural issues like short-selling mechanisms, order flow payments, and platform governance.

A systematic comparison across these four dimensions clearly reveals structural shift in financial crisis paradigms—from "technical stalls" to "social uprisings." This transition not only reflects technological progress reshaping market structures but also embodies the increasingly intertwined influence of sociocultural factors on financial behavior, offering crucial theoretical insights for understanding and managing novel market risks in the digital

ISSN 2959-6130

age.

4. Drivers and Far-Reaching Impacts of Paradigm Shifts

4.1 Structural Drivers of Paradigm Shifts

The deep structural drivers propelling market crises from "technical slowdowns" to "social uprisings" exhibit complexity. First, the widespread accessibility of trading tools has fundamentally reshaped the barriers and landscape of financial market participation. Zero-commission trading platforms (e.g., Robinhood, Webull) have substantially eliminated transaction cost barriers for individual investors through innovative Pay-for-Order-Flow (PFOF) business models. Simultaneously, mobile applications' streamlined interface designs and gamified interactions have significantly lowered the operational threshold for complex financial instruments (e.g., options, derivatives). The open availability of programmatic trading interfaces (APIs), the proliferation of visual quantitative strategy-building tools, and the democratized pricing of real-time market data services collectively constitute profound technological democratization revolution. This has laid the technical foundation for large-scale coordinated trading by retail investors. Second, the information dissemination revolution sparked by social media platforms has fundamentally altered how financial information is generated, transmitted, and received [12]. The decentralized, networked, and viral information diffusion mechanisms established by social media exhibit three distinct characteristics: the time lag between information generation and dissemination has shortened from hours in traditional media to mere seconds; emotional content spreads more effectively than rational analysis, readily fostering collective emotional resonance; and geographical boundaries have been completely dismantled, enabling global investors to participate in real-time discussions and actions around the same financial topics. This new information ecosystem rooted in social networks enables market sentiment to rapidly spread among individual investors, creating synergistic effects. Ultimately, contemporary investment culture is undergoing profound paradigm shift. Platforms create shared cultural symbols and group identity by symbolizing and narrativizing investment targets; anti-establishment sentiment frames investment behavior as cultural resistance against traditional financial elites, where purchasing specific stocks becomes an identity statement and expression of values. This cultural shift increasingly influences investment decisions through community identification, cultural symbols, and emotional resonance, giving rise to new investor groups united by shared cultural identity. Their behavioral logic transcends the rational expectations framework of traditional finance.

4.2 Profound Impact on Financial Stability and Theoretical Foundations

This paradigm shift fundamentally alters the origins of systemic risk. In traditional financial systems, risk primarily concentrated in "too big to fail" institutions with relatively clear risk characteristics and identifiable regulatory levers. Under the new paradigm, risk sources diffuse into the collective psyche of "too numerous to measure" retail investors, exhibiting classic dispersion traits. Risk bearers have shifted from few large institutions to vast number of individual retail investors; risk transmission pathways have evolved from clear balance sheet linkages to ambiguous emotional contagion through social networks; risk triggers have transformed from quantifiable financial deterioration to unpredictable collective emotional shifts [13]. This structural transformation poses severe challenges to traditional risk prevention systems based on institutional supervision.

Classic theories like the Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH) and behavioral finance reveal significant explanatory gaps under this new paradigm. Traditional economic models, built on the rational actor assumption and probabilistic predictability, struggle to capture and quantify price movements driven by collective narratives and emotional resonance. Under the new paradigm, market participants' utility functions have expanded to encompass multiple objectives—social recognition, entertainment value, moral satisfaction—fundamentally challenging the microfoundations of neoclassical finance.

Traditional regulatory frameworks face multiple dilemmas in this new paradigm: First, regulatory lag—the pace of oversight, reliant on quarterly reports and post-event investigations, cannot match the speed of crisis outbreaks in the social media era. Second, regulatory focus is blurred—the boundaries of oversight are difficult to define. Should platforms like Reddit forums and Discord groups, which aggregate information in novel ways, be regulated, and if so, how? Finally, there is difficulty in legal characterization. Under traditional legal frameworks, it is challenging to legally define actions like "publicly discussing stock investment views," blurring the line between collective enthusiasm for stock and market manipulation. This adaptive crisis in regulation exposes the structural mismatch between traditional command-and-control regulatory models and rapidly evolving techno-social composite systems.

5. New Paradigm of Diverse and Agile Governance

To address structural challenges, governance framework

adapted to this new paradigm must effectively manage emerging market risks. First, the complexity and dynamism of these risks preclude any single regulator from bearing full responsibility alone. multi-stakeholder ecosystem must be established, involving regulators, financial institutions, technology platforms, and investors. All stakeholders must redefine their roles and assume corresponding responsibilities: regulators must shift from pre-approval to in-process monitoring and post-event accountability; financial institutions must deepen their focus from mere compliance to risk early warning and client suitability management; technology platforms must transition from technological neutrality to responsible innovation; and investors must evolve from passive protection to responsible investment and risk self-awareness. This multi-stakeholder governance model can more effectively address the diffuse nature of new risks by establishing multi-layered, networked governance structure. Second, RegTech must evolve from an auxiliary tool to core infrastructure by establishing real-time dual monitoring systems powered by AI and natural language processing. These systems should simultaneously analyze market order flows and trading patterns to detect algorithmic resonance and liquidity anomalies, while dynamically tracking social media sentiment and trending topics to warn of potential sentiment-driven risks. Concurrently, clarifying technology platforms' primary responsibility in managing emerging risks is crucial. Fintech platforms should assume extended responsibilities for investor suitability management, while social media platforms must establish specialized governance rules for financial content. Differentiated responsibility allocation based on platform characteristics can effectively counteract the trend of dispersed risk sources. Finally, traditional regulatory frameworks require systemic reconstruction to align with the new paradigm. Regarding market stabilization mechanisms, circuit breaker systems must be optimized to address extreme volatility in single assets, and more sophisticated market stabilization tools should be developed. For investor protection, educational content must incorporate behavioral finance knowledge and social media risk awareness to cultivate digital financial literacy. Within the legal framework, urgent exploration is needed to redefine core concepts like market manipulation, clarify boundaries between legitimate investment communication and illegal solicitation in social media environments, and establish new behavioral norms system adapted to the digital age. diverse and agile governance framework, through the synergistic evolution of technology, responsibility, and rules, can form governance ecosystem capable of continuous learning, dynamic adaptation, and effective response to novel market risks, providing institutional safeguards for financial stability in the digital age.

6. Conclusion

Through systematic comparative analysis of the "flash crash" and "GameStop" incidents, this study establishes the core argument that fundamental paradigm shift has occurred in financial market crises. Specifically, the paper draws the following conclusions: First, empirically, the two events exhibit diametrically opposed characteristics in terms of driving forces, core dynamics, transmission channels, and crisis forms. Crises under the old paradigm were endogenous to market microstructure—technical failures dominated by machine logic. Crises under the new paradigm, however, are exogenous to traditional markets—cultural phenomena and collective actions driven by social psychology and collective narratives. Second, at the causal level, the paradigm shift was not triggered by single technological factor but resulted from the synergistic interplay of technological, social, and cultural forces. The democratization of trading technology provided the "weapons" for action, social media's viral dissemination offered the 'network' for organization, while meme culture and anti-elite sentiment supplied the "meaning" for action—collectively reconfiguring the genesis of market crises. Finally, at the theoretical level, the paradigm shift exerts profound "deconstructive" effect on traditional finance's theoretical foundations and regulatory practices. This undermines the foundations of the Efficient Market Hypothesis and exposes the structural lag and inadequacy of conventional regulatory theories in addressing diffuse, emotional, and rapidly evolving risks. To this end, this paper constructs multi-dimensional agile governance framework comprising three pillars: technological empowerment, platform accountability, and institutional restructuring—designed to counter new market risks. This study not only vividly captures the essence of the phenomenon but also provides novel and compelling explanatory framework for understanding how algorithms and social media synergistically reshape financial stability.

Future research could further leverage computational social science tools such as natural language processing and social network analysis to conduct sentiment analysis, topic modeling, and network structure measurement on vast social media texts. This would enable the construction of more predictive quantitative models linking "social sentiment" to "market volatility."

References

[1] Hendershott, T., Jones, C. M., & Menkveld, A. J. (2011). Does algorithmic trading improve liquidity?. The Journal of finance, 66(1), 1-33.

[2] Brogaard, J., Hendershott, T., & Riordan, R. (2014). High-frequency trading and price discovery. The Review of Financial Studies, 27(8), 2267-2306.

ISSN 2959-6130

[3] Menkveld, A. J. (2013). High frequency trading and the new market makers. Journal of financial Markets, 16(4), 712-740.

[4] Zhang, F. (2010). High-frequency trading, stock volatility, and price discovery. Available at SSRN 1691679.

[5] Fu, S. M., Alexakis, C., Pappas, V., Skarmeas, E., & Verousis, T. (2024). Does algorithmic trading induce herding?. International Journal of Finance & Economics.

[6] Bookstaber, R. (2017). The end of theory: Financial crises, the failure of economics, and the sweep of human interaction.

[7] Arnal, J. T. (2015). Financial crisis and the failure of economic theory. Routledge.

[8] Easley, D., De Prado, M. M. L., & O'Hara, M. (2011). The microstructure of the" flash crash": Flow toxicity, liquidity crashes, and the probability of informed trading. Journal of Portfolio Management, 37(2), 118.

[9] Naderi, M. (2022). Market Agents and Flash Crashes (Doctoral dissertation, UCL (University College London)).

[10] Barber, B. M., Huang, X., Odean, T., & Schwarz, C. (2022). Attention-induced trading and returns: Evidence from Robinhood users. The Journal of Finance, 77(6), 3141-3190.

[11] Chapkovski, P., Khapko, M., & Zoican, M. (2024). Trading gamification and investor behavior. Management Science.

[12] Joshi, R., Samnani, M. B., & Khajanchi, M. I. (2024). Gamified Investing: An Analysis of Investment Behaviour of Retail Investors Using Financial Applications.

[13] K Robert, Y. (2018). Case study research and applications design and methods. Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.