Frontiers in Business, Economics and Management
ISSN: 2766-824X | Vol. 25, No. 2, 2026

How Does Macroeconomic News Affect Financial Market Volatility: A Qualitative Comparative Case Analysis

Yongzhe Ni

School of Economics, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

Abstract: Macroeconomic news is widely recognized as an important source of financial-market volatility, yet its effects are not mechanically determined by whether economic information is favorable or unfavorable. This paper develops a qualitative comparative case analysis to examine how macroeconomic news is translated into financial-market volatility through information updating, expectation revision, investor behavior, and policy communication. Four major U.S. episodes are examined: the May 2022 inflation shock, the June 2022 employment report, Federal Reserve Chair Jerome Powell's Jackson Hole speech in August 2022, and the COVID-19 market crisis in March 2020. The cases reveal three interconnected mechanisms. First, markets respond primarily to the unexpected information contained in announcements relative to prior expectations. Second, investors interpret macroeconomic information through its implications for future interest rates, economic growth, corporate earnings, and risk premia, so that favorable economic news can generate negative equity-market reactions. Third, uncertainty and central-bank communication condition the strength of the transmission process. The analysis suggests that financial-market volatility is best understood as the outcome of an interpretive process in which investors continuously reassess what new information implies about the future.

Keywords: Macroeconomic news, financial-market volatility, investor expectations, monetary policy, uncertainty, qualitative case analysis.

1. Introduction

Financial markets react continuously to information about the state of the economy. Inflation, employment, economic growth, and monetary-policy communication can all trigger substantial movements in asset prices. Yet the relationship between macroeconomic news and financial-market volatility is more complicated than a simple distinction between "good" and "bad" news.

A strong employment report, for example, may signal stronger corporate earnings and therefore support stock prices. At the same time, it may increase expectations of monetary tightening and raise discount rates, producing the opposite effect. Boyd, Hu, and Jagannathan (2005) show precisely this ambiguity: unemployment announcements contain information about future interest rates, risk premia, and corporate earnings, and the relative importance of these channels changes with economic conditions.

Existing empirical research has established that financial markets respond particularly strongly to the unexpected component of macroeconomic announcements. Kim, McKenzie, and Faff (2004) show that U.S. financial markets react to the "news" content of macroeconomic announcements rather than simply to the arrival of scheduled information [5]. Andersen et al. (2007) [1] further demonstrate that macroeconomic news can generate immediate price discovery across U.S. stock, bond, and foreign-exchange markets.

However, statistical evidence alone does not fully reveal how investors interpret an information shock. The same macroeconomic signal can generate different market outcomes across economic environments because investors attach different meanings to the information. This paper therefore asks: How does macroeconomic news become financial-market volatility?

To address this question, the paper adopts a qualitative comparative case-analysis approach. Rather than estimating the average statistical effect of macroeconomic announcements, it reconstructs the transmission process within four major U.S. episodes. The analysis focuses on how information changed investor expectations, how those expectations were translated into market behavior, and how uncertainty and policy communication altered the process.

The central argument is that macroeconomic news affects financial-market volatility through a sequence of information updating, expectation revision, investor behavior, and asset-price adjustment. The market response depends not only on the content of the announcement but also on what investors expected beforehand and how they interpret its implications for future economic and monetary conditions.

2. Analytical Framework and Method

2.1. Analytical Framework

The proposed framework treats financial-market volatility as the outcome of an information-transmission process:

Macroeconomic news → information updating → expectation revision → investor behavior → financial-market volatility.

When new information arrives, investors compare it with their existing beliefs and market expectations. An unexpected announcement may change perceptions of inflation, growth, interest rates, corporate earnings, or risk premia. Investors then adjust portfolios in response to these revised expectations, producing changes in asset prices and volatility.

Two factors condition this transmission process.

The first is uncertainty. When investors face considerable uncertainty about future economic conditions, new

information may have a stronger effect because it changes the range of plausible outcomes. Born, Dovern, and Enders (2023) find that fundamental uncertainty can strengthen the market response to macroeconomic news [2].

The second is policy communication. Macroeconomic data are often interpreted through expectations about how central banks will respond. Conversely, central-bank communication can directly change expectations even when no policy instrument is immediately altered. Cieslak and Schrimpf (2019) show that central-bank communication conveys information about monetary policy, economic growth, and financial risk premia.

The framework therefore emphasizes interpretation rather than mechanical reaction. Financial-market volatility arises when new information materially changes investors' beliefs about the future.

2.2. Research Design and Case Selection

This study uses qualitative comparative case analysis. The cases are selected purposively because each represents a distinct mechanism through which macroeconomic information can affect financial-market volatility.

The first two cases involve scheduled macroeconomic releases: inflation and employment. They illustrate how unexpected economic information changes expectations. The third case involves central-bank communication and shows how policy signals can independently generate market repricing. The fourth case concerns the COVID-19 crisis, in which exceptionally high uncertainty amplified the response to both economic and policy information.

Evidence is drawn primarily from official economic releases and Federal Reserve statements, supplemented by contemporary financial-market reporting and established academic research. The analysis does not attempt to establish statistical causality from the cases. Instead, it traces the interpretive sequence within each episode and then compares the mechanisms across cases. Such an approach is appropriate when the research objective is to understand a phenomenon within its real-world context and to identify mechanisms that may be obscured by aggregate statistical relationships.

3. Comparative Case Analysis

3.1. Inflation News: The May 2022 U.S. CPI Shock

The U.S. Consumer Price Index release on June 10, 2022 provides a clear illustration of information updating and expectation revision.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that consumer prices increased 8.6% year over year in May, the highest annual increase since 1981 and above market expectations. The release challenged the belief that U.S. inflation might already be approaching a peak. Investors consequently reassessed both the persistence of inflation and the likely response of the Federal Reserve.

The market response was immediate. The S&P 500 declined 2.9% on the day, while the Nasdaq fell 3.5%. Short-term Treasury yields also rose as investors priced in a more restrictive monetary-policy path.

The important point is that the market did not simply respond to "high inflation." Investors responded to the unexpected implication of the announcement. The data suggested that inflationary pressure remained stronger and more persistent than previously believed. This changed expectations about future interest rates, which in turn affected equity valuations.

The episode therefore illustrates the first stage of the proposed mechanism:

unexpected inflation → revised inflation outlook → revised policy expectations → asset repricing.

This interpretation is consistent with evidence that financial markets respond primarily to the unexpected component of macroeconomic announcements (Kim et al., 2004; Andersen et al., 2007) [5, 1].

3.2. Employment News: When Good News Becomes Bad News for Stocks

The employment report released on June 3, 2022 illustrates the importance of competing interpretations.

Nonfarm payroll employment increased by 390,000 in May, while the unemployment rate remained at 3.6% (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2022) [7]. These figures indicated a remarkably resilient labor market. Nevertheless, the S&P 500 fell 1.6% that day.

The seemingly paradoxical reaction becomes understandable once the information is viewed through investors' monetary-policy expectations. Strong employment supported the outlook for economic activity and corporate earnings. But in an environment of elevated inflation, it also suggested that the Federal Reserve could continue raising interest rates without immediately triggering a severe deterioration in employment.

The interest-rate interpretation therefore dominated the earnings interpretation. Strong economic news became negative news for equities because it reduced expectations of an early policy pivot.

This episode closely reflects Boyd et al. (2005), who show that employment news simultaneously contains information about interest rates, risk premia, and future earnings. The market reaction depends on the economic environment and on which component investors consider most important.

The case thus demonstrates that macroeconomic information has no fixed financial meaning. Its effect depends on how investors translate the information into expectations about future financial conditions.

3.3. Policy Communication: Powell's Jackson Hole Speech

Federal Reserve Chair Jerome Powell's speech at the Jackson Hole Economic Symposium on August 26, 2022 provides a particularly clear example of expectation revision through policy communication.

By late August, U.S. equity markets had recovered significantly from their June lows. Investors had increasingly considered the possibility that the Federal Reserve might moderate its tightening campaign as economic growth weakened. Powell's speech challenged that interpretation. He emphasized the need for continued restrictive policy to restore price stability and acknowledged that reducing inflation would impose economic costs (Powell, 2022) [9].

The market response was substantial. The S&P 500 fell 3.4%, while the Nasdaq declined 3.9% on the day.

The significance of the episode lies in the fact that no new policy rate was announced. The market moved because investors revised their expectations concerning the future path of monetary policy.

The case therefore shows that policy communication can itself function as a macroeconomic information shock.

Cieslak and Schrimpf (2019) demonstrate that central-bank communication contains information not only about monetary policy but also about economic growth and financial risk premia [4].

Powell's speech consequently affected volatility through the same basic mechanism as macroeconomic data: new information altered expectations, expectations changed portfolio decisions, and asset prices were rapidly repriced.

3.4. Extreme Uncertainty: The COVID-19 Market Crisis

The March 2020 U.S. market crisis illustrates the conditioning role of uncertainty.

The COVID-19 pandemic created exceptional uncertainty about the duration of economic restrictions, corporate earnings, employment, and the effectiveness of policy intervention. On March 15, 2020, the Federal Reserve reduced the federal funds target range to 0–0.25% and announced large-scale asset purchases (Federal Reserve, 2020) [8].

Yet the S&P 500 fell approximately 12% on March 16, while the Dow Jones Industrial Average declined 12.9%.

This response demonstrates that policy intervention does not necessarily stabilize markets immediately. Under extreme uncertainty, investors may interpret aggressive policy action both as reassurance and as evidence that policymakers perceive the underlying economic threat to be exceptionally severe. The information therefore carries ambiguous signals.

The episode illustrates how uncertainty can magnify the transmission mechanism. When the range of possible future outcomes is unusually wide, investors may react strongly to relatively small changes in their beliefs. This is consistent with Tong et al. (2023) [6], who find a positive relationship between economic uncertainty and financial volatility, with the strength of the relationship depending on economic conditions and investor risk aversion.

The COVID-19 case therefore represents an important boundary condition: the market effect of news depends not only on what investors learn but also on how uncertain they are about what that information means.

4. Cross-Case Findings

Comparison across the four cases reveals four broader findings.

4.1. Financial Markets Respond to Surprises, Not Simply to Data

The CPI and employment cases demonstrate that the market response depends heavily on the difference between released information and prior expectations. A scheduled announcement that confirms what investors already believe may generate little volatility, whereas an unexpected result can force rapid reassessment.

Thus, the informational value of macroeconomic news is inherently relative.

4.2. The Same News Can Have Opposite Financial Implications

The employment case demonstrates that economic news cannot be classified objectively as positive or negative for financial assets. Strong employment may improve expected earnings while simultaneously increasing expected interest rates. The ultimate market response depends on which effect dominates.

This finding supports the broader argument of Boyd et al. (2005) that macroeconomic announcements contain multiple valuation-relevant signals whose importance changes with the economic environment [3].

4.3. Monetary-Policy Expectations Are a Critical Transmission Channel

The inflation, employment, and Jackson Hole cases all point to the same intermediary mechanism: investors use macroeconomic information to infer the future path of monetary policy.

This explains why financial markets can react strongly even when the current policy rate does not change. What matters is the expected future path of interest rates and its implications for discount rates and risk premia.

4.4. Uncertainty Determines the Intensity of the Response

The COVID-19 case highlights a further dimension. When uncertainty is high, investors have less confidence in their estimates of future outcomes. New information can therefore produce larger revisions in expectations and stronger portfolio adjustments.

Taken together, the cases suggest that volatility should be understood as an interpretive outcome. Macroeconomic information becomes financially consequential when it changes beliefs about the future, particularly when those beliefs concern monetary policy and when uncertainty is elevated.

5. Discussion

The qualitative evidence points to a more nuanced understanding of the news-volatility relationship than a simple "economic news causes market volatility" proposition.

The key mechanism is the interaction between information, expectations, and context. Investors do not respond to macroeconomic statistics in isolation. They interpret those statistics within an existing information environment, compare them with market expectations, and infer their implications for future economic and policy conditions.

This perspective also explains why quantitative estimates of average announcement effects may conceal substantial heterogeneity. An empirical model can identify an average increase in volatility following inflation news, but it may not reveal why a particular inflation announcement generated an unusually large reaction. Qualitative case analysis can make this interpretive process visible.

At the same time, the present approach does not claim that four cases establish universal causal relationships. Their value lies in identifying recurring mechanisms across contrasting contexts. The cases provide convergent evidence that information surprises, policy expectations, and uncertainty repeatedly appear in the transmission from macroeconomic news to market volatility.

The findings also suggest a practical implication for central banks. Economic statistics and policy communication should not be viewed as independent sources of information. Investors interpret economic releases partly through the expected policy response, while subsequent communication can reinforce or reverse that interpretation. Clear and credible communication may therefore reduce unnecessary uncertainty, whereas ambiguous communication can increase

the dispersion of expectations and market volatility.

For investors, the analysis suggests that interpreting macroeconomic news requires moving beyond the question of whether an indicator is above or below expectations. The more relevant questions are: What does the surprise imply for monetary policy? How does it alter expected growth and earnings? And how uncertain are investors about these implications?

6. Conclusion

This paper has examined how macroeconomic news affects financial-market volatility through a qualitative comparative analysis of four major U.S. episodes.

The evidence suggests that macroeconomic news affects financial markets through a sequential process of information updating, expectation revision, investor behavior, and asset-price adjustment. The effect of an announcement depends on its unexpected component, the economic environment, prevailing monetary-policy expectations, and the degree of uncertainty surrounding future outcomes.

The May 2022 CPI shock illustrates how unexpected inflation information can trigger a rapid reassessment of monetary-policy expectations. The June 2022 employment report shows that strong economic news can generate negative equity-market reactions when investors interpret it primarily through the interest-rate channel. Powell's Jackson Hole speech demonstrates that central-bank communication can itself become a powerful information shock by altering expectations about future policy. The March 2020 COVID-19 crisis further shows that extreme uncertainty can magnify the response to both economic and policy information.

The central conclusion is therefore straightforward: financial-market volatility reflects not merely what macroeconomic news says about the present, but what investors believe it implies about the future.

This interpretation contributes to the literature by emphasizing the mechanisms through which macroeconomic information becomes market volatility. Quantitative methods remain essential for measuring the magnitude and persistence of these effects, but qualitative case analysis helps explain the meanings investors attach to information shocks. Future research could combine high-frequency event-study evidence with systematic qualitative case analysis to investigate how the same type of macroeconomic news produces heterogeneous market responses across different economic regimes.

References

[1] Andersen, T. G., Bollerslev, T., Diebold, F. X., & Vega, C. (2007). Real-time price discovery in global stock, bond and foreign exchange markets. Journal of International Economics, 73(2), 251–277.

[2] Born, B., Dovern, J., & Enders, Z. (2023). Expectation dispersion, uncertainty, and the reaction to news. European Economic Review, 154, 104440.

[3] Boyd, J. H., Hu, J., & Jagannathan, R. (2005). The stock market's reaction to unemployment news: Why bad news is usually good for stocks. The Journal of Finance, 60(2), 649–672.

[4] Cieslak, A., & Schrimpf, A. (2019). Non-monetary news in central bank communication. Journal of International Economics, 118, 293–315.

[5] Kim, S.-J., McKenzie, M. D., & Faff, R. W. (2004). Macroeconomic news announcements and the role of expectations: Evidence for US bond, stock and foreign exchange markets. Journal of Multinational Financial Management, 14(3), 217–232.

[6] Tong, C., Huang, Z., Wang, T., & Zhang, C. (2023). The effects of economic uncertainty on financial volatility: A comprehensive investigation. Journal of Empirical Finance, 73, 369–389.

[7] U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2022). The Employment Situation—May 2022.

[8] U.S. Federal Reserve. (2020, March 15). Federal Reserve issues FOMC statement.

[9] Powell, J. H. (2022, August 26). Monetary policy and price stability [Speech]. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City's Economic Policy Symposium, Jackson Hole, Wyoming.