American Journal of Financial Technology and Innovation (AJFTI)

ISSN: 2996-0975 (ONLINE)

VOLUME 4 ISSUE 1 (2026)

PUBLISHED BY
E-PALLI PUBLISHERS, DELAWARE, USA

American Journal of Financial Technology and Innovation (AJFTI)

Volume 4 Issue 1, Year 2026
ISSN: 2996-0975 (Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.54536/ajfti.v4i1.5506
https://journals.e-palli.com/home/index.php/ajfti

From Decentralization to "Quasi-Centralization": Institutional Challenges and Regulatory Reconfiguration in the Governance Shift of Cryptocurrencies

Jia-Ying Lyu[1*]

Article Information

Received: March 25, 2025

Accepted: July 17, 2025

Published: March 26, 2026

Keywords

Cryptocurrency, FTX, Decentralization, Blockchain

ABSTRACT

Since the advent of blockchain technology, cryptocurrencies have emphasized core values such as decentralization, ontological autonomy, and resistance to censorship. However, in practice, the mechanisms of transaction and platform governance have increasingly exhibited characteristics of "quasi-centralization." This article takes the collapse of FTX as a point of departure to examine how cryptocurrencies, amid governance failures of centralized exchanges and a breakdown of market trust, have been reintegrated into emerging regulatory frameworks raising complex issues regarding institutional asset classification, governance structures, and risk management. Employing literature review and comparative legal analysis, this study investigates key dimensions including the misuse of exchange funds, regulatory discrepancies, the blurred boundary between investment and speculation, the centralization of governance, and the erosion of anonymity in crypto assets. The findings reveal that cryptocurrency governance lies at the intersection of technological ideals and institutional realities, and that neither a single-state legal system nor traditional financial norms is sufficient to address the cross-border and technically self-referential nature of crypto systems. Future governance frameworks should shift toward function-oriented, tiered regulatory architectures, integrating verifiable technical standards, investor suitability classification mechanisms, and cross-agency collaborative platforms. The objective is to establish a regulatory paradigm for crypto assets that ensures transparency, flexibility, and foresight without undermining the innovative momentum of blockchain. Such a framework would reinforce market order, asset security, and user trust, while offering theoretical insights and policy guidance for the sustainable development of blockchain technology in both financial and institutional contexts.

INTRODUCTION

Since the introduction of Bitcoin in 2008, cryptocurrencies have developed into a decentralized financial architecture that poses significant challenges to conventional monetary systems and regulatory frameworks. Built on blockchain technology, these digital assets are defined by distributed consensus mechanisms, cryptographic immutability, and transactional transparency. Unlike fiat currencies, cryptocurrencies operate independently of centralized authorities for issuance and verification, relying instead on peer-to-peer networks. These technological and ideological features have attracted a growing global user base, driven by the appeal of financial autonomy and resistance to institutional oversight.

Despite these ideals, the operational reality of the cryptocurrency ecosystem reveals a significant divergence from the principle of decentralization. Centralized exchanges have become the dominant infrastructurefor cryptocurrency circulation, providing liquidity, asset management, and user interface solutions to compensate for users' technical limitations. In practice, these platforms have reintroduced hierarchical control, custodial risk, and governance models resembling those found in traditional financial institutions. By facilitating core functions such as asset custody, margin lending, and liquidity provision, centralized exchanges accumulate systemic influence and become susceptible to institutional fragility.

The bankruptcy of FTX in November 2022, which was then the third-largest cryptocurrency exchange by volume, marked a watershed moment for the industry. The collapse exposed serious structural deficiencies, including lack of transparency, poor internal governance, and the absence of regulatory oversight. Subsequent investigations revealed that FTX had allegedly misused customer funds to conduct high-risk proprietary trading through its affiliated firm Alameda Research. This mismanagement led to a liquidity crisis, triggered contagion effects across the market, and caused investor losses totaling billions of US dollars. The incident not only destabilized user confidence but also undermined the credibility of the broader digital asset infrastructure.

Following the FTX collapse, public and institutional attention shifted toward the need for effective regulation. While conventional financial institutions operate under national legal regimes, including capital requirements, anti-money laundering procedures, and corporate accountability laws, cryptocurrencies present unique challenges due to their transnational, pseudonymous, and technological nature. Regulatory proposals have included mandatory Know Your Customer compliance, disclosure

[1] School of Finance and Accounting, Fuzhou University of International Studies and Trade, China
[*] Corresponding author's e-mail: m0227118@gmail.com

of asset reserves, transparency in governance structures, and the application of securities legislation to crypto-asset operations.

Nonetheless, the introduction of external regulation into a system originally designed to eliminate intermediaries creates a fundamental tension. Although regulatory intervention may enhance investor protection and systemic integrity, it simultaneously risks eroding the decentralized foundations of cryptocurrency innovation. The imposition of state oversight could further consolidate control within a few centralized actors, resulting in a quasi-centralized structure that mirrors traditional finance. This trajectory not only diminishes the disruptive potential of blockchain-based technologies but also raises concerns regarding concentration of power, exclusion, and loss of user sovereignty.

Academic scholarship presents a wide spectrum of perspectives on this evolving dilemma. Some scholars advocate for comprehensive regulatory frameworks that align crypto exchanges with existing financial institutions to mitigate risks of fraud and instability. Others emphasize the preservation of decentralized autonomy by promoting self-regulation, open-source governance, and community-based accountability structures. In response to these divergent views, hybrid regulatory models have been proposed, such as co-regulatory mechanisms, sandbox environments, and adaptive legal infrastructures that attempt to balance innovation with institutional safeguards.

This study employs the collapse of FTX as an analytical entry point to examine whether cryptocurrency governance is trending toward a quasi-centralized configuration as a response to exchange failures. Through comparative analysis and an interdisciplinary review of existing literature, this paper investigates three key dimensions: the structural role of exchanges within the crypto-financial ecosystem, the institutional constraints imposed by emerging regulatory frameworks, and the implications of quasi-centralization as a transitional model for digital asset governance in the context of global technological and policy developments.

By engaging with these issues, the study aims to contribute a theoretically informed and policy-relevant analysis of the evolving regulatory landscape. It argues for a governance model that maintains a dynamic equilibrium between regulatory oversight and technological innovation. Such a framework would not only reinforce trust and stability within the cryptocurrency sector but also preserve the foundational ethos of decentralization that underpins the broader movement toward financial democratization.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The rapid evolution of blockchain technology and the proliferation of cryptocurrencies have generated a novel financial infrastructure that increasingly transcends the boundaries of traditional institutions. Central to this transformation is the rise of decentralized finance (DeFi), which seeks to eliminate financial intermediaries, reduce transaction costs, and enhance the autonomy of digital assets. These features position DeFi as a key driver of contemporary financial innovation and institutional restructuring. Through mechanisms such as smart contracts, self-executing transactions, and open-source protocols, DeFi platforms offer a transparent and verifiable transactional environment. This model challenges the monopolistic dominance of conventional financial intermediaries while promoting inclusivity and operational efficiency (Makarov & Schoar, 2022; Ferreira, 2024; Azara, 2024).

Nevertheless, empirical evidence suggests that decentralization in its technical architecture has not translated into equitable resource distribution or democratic governance. Valdivia *et al.* (2019) highlight a critical disjuncture between the ideological commitment to decentralization and the observed concentration of control in a limited number of nodes and mining communities. Comparative studies by Ivanov and Johnson (2024) and Martin (2024) analyze the network structures and consensus algorithms of major platforms such as Bitcoin, Ethereum, and Solana. While these systems are decentralized in principle, they exhibit significant concentration in computational power, token distribution, and governance influence. Juodis *et al.* (2024) provide further empirical data on token allocation, demonstrating high levels of wealth inequality within blockchain ecosystems, thereby calling into question the normative assumptions underpinning decentralization.

Privacy remains another core technical and institutional challenge. Although blockchain systems often incorporate privacy-enhancing technologies and pseudonymity, they are not immune to surveillance. Mišić *et al.* (2024) provide a detailed examination of deanonymization strategies within the Ethereum ecosystem, revealing that transaction-linking, frequency analysis, and cross-chain data comparison can compromise user anonymity. Their analysis also contrasts the privacy-performance trade-offs between the Unspent Transaction Output (UTXO) model and account-based structures. In efforts to address these constraints, Khan, B. U. I. *et al.* (2024) propose a graph-based consensus architecture tailored for scalable and privacy-preserving transactions in Internet of Things (IoT) environments, suggesting an alternative model suited for distributed digital ecosystems.

From a legal and policy standpoint, the transnational and pseudonymous nature of cryptocurrencies presents significant enforcement challenges. Longa (2025) and Khan, R. U. *et al.* (2024) assess the limitations of existing legal frameworks in tracing illicit activities and enforcing compliance within decentralized systems. Their analyses reveal critical gaps, including the absence of mutual legal assistance treaties, limited cross-border regulatory cooperation, and ambiguous asset classifications. These deficiencies create regulatory blind spots that facilitate the misuse of cryptocurrencies for money laundering, tax evasion, and capital outflows. To address these challenges, the authors recommend the development of transnational

regulatory regimes, standardized data-sharing protocols, and context-specific legal taxonomies for digital assets.

Governance asymmetry constitutes a further area of concern. Although DeFi platforms often claim to operate through decentralized, community-driven decision-making processes, the actual governance structure tends to be dominated by early investors, developers, and token holders with disproportionate influence. Abadi (2024) critiques the myth of community governance, identifying centralized power concentrations that undermine democratic participation. Harvey and Rabetti (2024) echo these concerns, arguing that unless transparency, verifiability, and institutional adaptability are embedded into governance design, decentralization risks becoming a rhetorical device rather than a meaningful institutional innovation.

Beyond core issues of regulation and governance, recent scholarship has expanded its focus to the application of blockchain technologies across a variety of sectors. In the context of the sharing economy, Raza *et al.* (2024) construct a decentralized platform for accommodation services based on the Ethereum network, which reduces dependence on intermediaries and trust-based transaction costs. Fachrian *et al.* (2024) explore the integration of blockchain with the InterPlanetary File System (IPFS) to develop tamper-resistant digital payment systems, addressing data integrity issues prevalent in centralized infrastructures.

In Islamic finance, scholarly discourse has increasingly engaged with the compatibility of cryptocurrencies and blockchain technologies with Shariah principles. Zaman *et al.* (2025) and Hassan *et al.* (2025) examine the normative alignment of Islamic crypto assets, arguing that these innovations can offer interest-free and ethically compliant alternatives within Islamic economic systems. Their findings emphasize the potential for convergence between crypto-technical systems and Islamic values such as asset-backed trading, financial stability, and avoidance of speculative behavior.

The intersection of blockchain technology and emerging digital economies has also become a focus of academic inquiry, particularly in relation to the metaverse. Hanneke *et al.* (2025) analyze over 4.5 million transactions in The Sandbox metaverse to examine token adoption, economic engagement, and value creation. Their results underscore the centrality of scarcity, user incentives, and symbolic valuation in shaping digital economies. These insights provide an analytical basis for further exploration of regulatory design and monetary architecture within virtual environments.

Recent studies have also investigated the implications of blockchain technology for educational systems and economic institution building. Tommerdahl (2024) advocates for the integration of blockchain into higher education curricula, emphasizing the importance of multidisciplinary perspectives that incorporate legal, technological, and sociopolitical dimensions. Mu'amar (2024), through a SWOT framework, evaluates the sustainability of blockchain startups, identifying scalability, governance, and legal uncertainties as persistent obstacles that require coordinated policy solutions and academic collaboration.

In summary, the academic discourse has shifted from evaluating the technical feasibility of blockchain systems to critically engaging with their institutional, legal, and governance implications. Although decentralization remains a foundational tenet of blockchain design, its practical realization depends on addressing a set of interrelated challenges. These include unequal resource allocation, inadequate regulatory frameworks, limited user privacy, and governance asymmetries. Whether decentralized systems can be effectively integrated into broader social and legal frameworks remains a central question for future research and policy development.

Decentralization Or Quasi-Centralization? Rethinking Cryptocurrency Governance

Decentralization has traditionally served as the foundational principle underlying blockchain technology and the broader cryptocurrency ecosystem. Rooted in distributed ledger technology and consensus algorithms, the decentralization paradigm was designed to eliminate the need for centralized intermediaries within financial systems. This architecture enables transactions to occur among participants without reliance on a singular authoritative entity, thereby posing a fundamental challenge to the normative and institutional logic of centralized financial governance. The conceptual appeal of decentralization has been instrumental in shaping the technical design and ideological momentum of early blockchain communities.

However, the operational realities of cryptocurrency markets increasingly reflect a departure from this ideal. The emergence and subsequent collapse of major centralized trading platforms, including the high-profile case of FTX, illustrate how real-world implementations of digital asset governance have progressively converged on a quasi-centralized configuration. This structural evolution is marked by the concentration of asset custody, privatized control over platform governance, and the opacity of transactional and organizational processes. These features have reintroduced trust dependencies akin to those embedded in conventional financial institutions, thereby eroding the disintermediated model originally envisioned by blockchain developers and advocates.

Rather than constituting a wholesale contradiction of decentralized logic, the quasi-centralized model can be understood as an adaptive compromise forged under the intersecting pressures of user expectations, operational scalability, and regulatory scrutiny. As Buterin (2021) notes, while decentralization promotes network autonomy and resistance to censorship, it also introduces significant limitations in the form of governance fragmentation, information asymmetry, and diffuse accountability. In the absence of formalized institutional safeguards, decentralized systems may fail to ensure collective

decision-making, resilience, and coordination.

In this context, selected centralizing mechanisms have emerged as instruments of pragmatic stabilization. Governance tools such as multisignature authorization, delegated proof-of-stake consensus protocols, and formalized on-chain voting systems reflect attempts to mitigate systemic risk without fully undermining decentralized structures. These mechanisms represent limited forms of delegation that aim to enhance operational efficiency, accountability, and procedural transparency, suggesting that decentralization and centralization need not be treated as mutually exclusive categories but rather as interacting forces within a broader governance continuum.

This study seeks to interrogate whether the cryptocurrency ecosystem is undergoing a structural transformation in governance logic, moving toward a hybrid institutional model that integrates elements of both state-based regulation and decentralized technical autonomy. The research focuses on assessing whether quasi-centralized governance is becoming a functional response to declining user trust and intensifying global regulatory demands. Such a model may serve as an intermediate configuration in which regulatory oversight coexists with algorithmic authority, enabling digital asset systems to reconcile competing imperatives of legitimacy, efficiency, and technological sovereignty.

The analysis proceeds from the recognition that governance within decentralized infrastructures cannot be fully understood through binary oppositions. Instead, it must be conceptualized as a dynamic spectrum in which institutional arrangements evolve in response to changing technological capabilities, policy interventions, and socio-economic expectations. By exploring the contours of this transformation, the study aims to clarify the normative, operational, and institutional implications of quasi-centralized governance and its potential impact on the long-term trajectory of the cryptocurrency sector.

To Regulate or Not to Regulate: Rethinking Oversight in the Cryptocurrency Ecosystem

The proliferation of cryptocurrencies presents a profound challenge to the structural foundations of traditional financial regulatory regimes. Core technical features of cryptocurrencies such as anonymity, cross-jurisdictional operability, and decentralized control significantly weaken the effectiveness of conventional supervisory instruments. Within this regulatory vacuum, the debate over whether and how to regulate crypto-assets has become a focal point in both academic and policy discussions. The absence of regulatory oversight risks facilitating market disorder, financial fraud, and the propagation of systemic vulnerabilities. Conversely, the wholesale integration of cryptocurrencies into legacy financial oversight systems may erode the foundational logic of decentralization and suppress technological innovation. This dilemma resists binary categorization and instead reflects a dynamic tension located at the intersection of technological transformation, legal institutionalization, and state authority.

From the perspective of risk prevention, the cryptocurrency market has long been associated with high volatility, speculative excess, and a lack of investor protections. Catalini and Tucker (2018) argue that information asymmetries in crypto markets are significantly more pronounced than in traditional financial instruments, particularly for retail investors who often lack access to reliable due diligence tools. The prevalence of fraudulent activities, including deceptive Initial Coin Offerings and manipulative price schemes, has generated substantial economic harm. The implementation of minimal regulatory frameworks could provide baseline safeguards for market participants, thereby enhancing transparency, improving investor confidence, and supporting sustainable market development.

In addition to retail protection, systemic risk represents a critical rationale for regulatory intervention. Centralized exchanges have emerged as infrastructural linchpins within the broader crypto ecosystem, performing functions such as asset custody, liquidity provision, and inter-token conversion. Schär (2021) notes that although these entities operate within decentralized technological ecosystems, their governance structures and risk management models are often highly centralized. This concentration introduces systemic fragility, as evidenced by the cascading effects of exchange failures, which bear resemblance to the institutional collapse observed during the 2008 global financial crisis. To mitigate such risks, regulatory authorities are encouraged to adopt preventive oversight models that prioritize capital adequacy requirements, real-time auditability, and liquidity risk controls across blockchain networks.

Nevertheless, from the standpoint of decentralized systems theory, regulatory imposition is often construed as a violation of core technological values. De Filippi and Wright (2018) conceptualize blockchain as a self-regulating ecosystem governed by programmable rules rather than coercive legal mandates. Within this framework, the principle of "code as law" is intended to foster autonomy, self-enforcement, and procedural neutrality. The imposition of state-based regulatory logic risks disrupting these principles by reintroducing discretionary power, hierarchical oversight, and legal asymmetries. This could undermine the very institutional alternatives that decentralized technologies are designed to create.

The global and borderless nature of cryptocurrency operations further complicates the implementation of effective regulatory mechanisms. Jurisdictional inconsistencies in policy regimes have resulted in a fragmented global regulatory landscape. For instance, while El Salvador has formally adopted Bitcoin as legal tender, other countries have implemented prohibitions or severe restrictions on crypto-related activities. Such divergences foster regulatory arbitrage, allowing crypto enterprises and actors to operate within minimally

regulated environments while circumventing compliance obligations in stricter jurisdictions. Fernandez-Villaverde (2022) warns that without international coordination and legal harmonization, decentralized technologies may be appropriated for illicit finance, tax avoidance, and off-grid capital flows, thereby undermining both monetary sovereignty and global financial stability.

To reconcile the normative and operational tensions inherent in cryptocurrency regulation, scholars have proposed the use of regulatory technologies that embed compliance directly into blockchain systems. Gomber *et al.* (2018) outline a model in which Know Your Customer protocols, Anti-Money Laundering mechanisms, and auditing functions are encoded into smart contracts. This approach reduces reliance on human discretion, enhances transparency, and enables real-time compliance verification. The integration of such mechanisms could allow regulatory objectives to be achieved without dismantling the structural features of decentralization, offering a pathway toward technologically adaptive governance.

In summary, the question of regulating cryptocurrencies entails complex trade-offs across legal, technological, and political dimensions. The absence of regulation exacerbates information asymmetries and increases exposure to systemic shocks, while overregulation risks nullifying the innovative and disintermediated potential of blockchain systems. Future regulatory paradigms must move beyond dichotomous thinking and embrace hybrid models that combine procedural transparency, technical autonomy, and international legal cooperation. Such frameworks have the potential to align public interest with decentralized innovation, while also addressing broader challenges related to institutional legitimacy, monetary authority, and the evolving architecture of global financial governance.

The Misappropriation of Funds by Cryptocurrency Exchanges

Cryptocurrency exchanges, though often described as technical intermediaries, serve multiple institutional roles within digital markets. These include custodial management of user assets, facilitation of market liquidity, and provision of price discovery functions. Centralized exchanges have historically dominated trading volumes due to their transactional efficiency, user-friendly interfaces, and access to fiat currency gateways. However, the structural concentration of assets and decision-making authority within these platforms has introduced considerable systemic risk, particularly with respect to the unauthorized use of customer funds. Fund misappropriation refers to the deployment of user assets by exchanges for proprietary investments, margin trading, or internal capital reinforcement without explicit consent. Such practices can precipitate liquidity crises, asset disappearance, and broader market destabilization.

One of the primary drivers of fund misappropriation is the lack of robust internal governance and institutional transparency. Many centralized exchanges operate beyond the jurisdictional scope of conventional financial regulators and are not subject to routine auditing requirements. Financial disclosures, including reserve ratios, balance sheet exposures, and capital-liability alignment, are often opaque or entirely absent. This regulatory vacuum permits exchanges to comingle client-held assets with proprietary capital. Lee (2021) notes that some exchanges treat customer deposits as operational capital and deploy them in high-risk financial instruments. When liquidity stress emerges, these platforms are unable to fulfill withdrawal obligations, resulting in insolvency events akin to bank runs. The collapse of FTX illustrates the severity of this risk, where user assets were redirected to an affiliated entity, Alameda Research, for leveraged trading purposes. This ultimately led to an unrecoverable liquidity deficit and institutional failure.

Beyond direct asset misuse, indirect forms of misappropriation also pose substantial threats to market integrity. These include the inflation of trading volumes through wash trades, engagement in insider transactions, and the facilitation of money laundering. Houben and Snyers (2018) identify wash trading as a prevalent mechanism by which exchanges simulate market activity using internal accounts to manipulate volume statistics. This behavior distorts price discovery processes and deceives market participants by projecting false signals of demand and liquidity. In the absence of mandatory reporting standards and real-time oversight, such practices are rarely identified or penalized in a timely manner.

A further dimension of misappropriation involves collusive arrangements between exchanges and token issuers. In certain instances, exchanges list unverified or low-quality tokens in return for listing fees or preferential terms. Some platforms accumulate large quantities of tokens prior to their public listing and divest them following short-term price surges, a practice commonly described as "pump and dump." Empirical research by Bailey *et al.* (2022) demonstrates that a significant proportion of newly listed tokens experience rapid devaluation, with average losses exceeding 60 percent within a short post-listing period. These findings highlight a structural asymmetry in which exchanges and issuers profit from market manipulation while retail investors bear the financial consequences.

In extreme cases, fund misappropriation has escalated into outright fraud and asset stripping. Chainalysis (2022) reports that user losses related to exchange-based misappropriation surpassed 3.2 billion US dollars in 2021 alone, with particularly severe cases emerging in Asia and the Middle East. The absence of legal clarity in these jurisdictions regarding the classification and protection of digital assets complicates judicial recourse and enforcement. Moreover, transnational regulatory fragmentation enables exchanges to evade accountability through jurisdictional arbitrage, reinforcing the role of centralized platforms as potential facilitators of financial crime.

In response to these systemic deficiencies, some regulatory authorities have promoted the implementation of Proof of Reserves protocols and custodial segregation mandates. These require exchanges to disclose wallet balances and undergo periodic third-party verification. However, the Proof of Reserves model is limited in scope. It typically provides a snapshot of asset holdings without validating liabilities, which restricts its ability to detect whether user funds have been diverted. Griffin and Shams (2020) argue that unless reserve disclosures are cross-referenced with off-chain liabilities and corporate ownership structures, such audits function as symbolic compliance mechanisms rather than substantive accountability tools.

The emergence of decentralized exchanges presents an alternative governance model that reduces custodial risk. Through the use of smart contracts, decentralized platforms enable users to retain control of their assets throughout the transaction process. While this architecture mitigates the risk of direct fund misappropriation, decentralized exchanges face ongoing challenges related to user accessibility, transaction latency, and platform security. As observed by Serrao *et al.* (2021), users continue to favor centralized platforms due to their superior liquidity, fiat integration, and interface design. Accordingly, decentralized mechanisms alone are insufficient to address the full spectrum of governance failures observed in centralized exchanges.

In conclusion, fund misappropriation within cryptocurrency exchanges is not merely a series of isolated management failures but a reflection of deeper structural and institutional deficiencies. Although blockchain systems are theoretically predicated on transparency and immutability, the discretionary power retained by centralized intermediaries undermines these foundational principles. The persistence of such vulnerabilities necessitates the development of comprehensive institutional safeguards. These should include legally enforceable accountability mechanisms, technical verification architectures, and international cooperation protocols. Clarifying the role of exchanges within the evolving architecture of decentralized finance is essential for ensuring equitable market participation, financial stability, and the realization of blockchain's transformative potential. Without such clarification, quasi-centralized exchange models risk reproducing the same hierarchical imbalances that blockchain technologies were originally designed to eliminate.

Investment or Speculation? Reframing the Nature of Cryptocurrencies

The emergence of cryptocurrencies has generated a financial domain that diverges markedly from the structural norms and valuation logics of traditional capital markets. Characterized by extreme price volatility, limited transparency, and the absence of intrinsic valuation benchmarks, cryptocurrencies have prompted considerable debate regarding their classification as either investment vehicles or speculative instruments. Investment is conventionally understood as the allocation of capital based on long-term value expectations and fundamental analysis, with an emphasis on risk management and return optimization. Speculation, in contrast, is defined by the pursuit of short-term price differentials, often driven by behavioral biases, market sentiment, and herd dynamics. In the absence of standardized valuation frameworks, cryptocurrencies occupy an ambiguous space in which the boundaries between investment and speculation remain fluid and contested.

From an asset valuation perspective, most cryptocurrencies lack the stable cash flows, income-generating mechanisms, or productive functions that underpin traditional valuation models. The application of discounted cash flow techniques, commonly used in equity and bond markets, is largely infeasible in the context of crypto-assets. Yermack (2015) argues that cryptocurrencies such as Bitcoin fail to meet core monetary functions, including price stability and supply elasticity, thereby reducing their utility as either a store of value or a medium of exchange. Instead, they exhibit characteristics more akin to speculative commodities or investment contracts. Price formation is primarily influenced by supply-demand imbalances, regulatory developments, media narratives, and network dynamics. Cheah and Fry (2015), through econometric analysis, show that the return distributions of cryptocurrencies display fat-tailed asymmetry, suggesting that speculative behavior is a dominant force in market activity.

The behavioral dimensions of speculation in cryptocurrency markets are reinforced by information cascades and emotional contagion. Empirical studies rooted in behavioral finance have demonstrated the salience of non-fundamental signals in crypto price movements. Kristoufek (2013) establishes a strong correlation between Bitcoin prices and search engine query volumes, particularly from platforms such as Google and Wikipedia. These findings indicate that investor behavior is significantly influenced by attention-based heuristics, social media trends, and news cycles. The resulting market dynamics frequently give rise to speculative bubbles, characterized by rapid price appreciation driven by fear of missing out, followed by sharp corrections and widespread panic selling. These patterns diverge from rational investor behavior grounded in valuation metrics or long-term growth projections.

The prevalence of speculative tendencies in crypto markets is not solely a behavioral phenomenon but also an institutional outcome. Corbet *et al.* (2018) examine how structural features such as weak regulatory oversight, opaque information environments, and rapid capital inflows during events like the 2017 ICO boom have facilitated speculative activity. The subsequent rise of decentralized finance protocols and non-fungible token marketplaces further intensified these dynamics by enabling short-term arbitrage strategies across fragmented liquidity pools. These conditions have blurred the conceptual line between investment and speculation, and

in some instances, scholars have posited the emergence of "rational speculation" as a new interpretive framework for crypto-asset engagement under conditions of extreme uncertainty.

Nonetheless, certain cryptocurrencies are beginning to demonstrate characteristics more commonly associated with investment assets. Ethereum, for instance, is increasingly viewed as a platform-based utility asset due to its role in smart contract execution, decentralized application deployment, and gas fee settlement. Hayes (2019) employs metrics such as network value-to-transaction ratios and endogenous supply-demand models to argue that Ethereum's economic architecture provides a partial foundation for intrinsic valuation. The expansion of decentralized finance and digital asset ecosystems anchored on Ethereum supports this view, suggesting that asset classification should be determined not only by volatility profiles but also by underlying technological utility and application context.

Another important consideration concerns the relationship between cryptocurrencies and traditional financial instruments. Baur *et al.* (2018) provide empirical evidence that Bitcoin exhibits low correlation with conventional asset classes such as equities, gold, and crude oil. This statistical independence has led some institutional investors to consider cryptocurrencies as portfolio diversifiers or inflation hedges, particularly in periods of macroeconomic volatility. However, the long-term sustainability of this function remains subject to regulatory developments, macro-financial cycles, and market maturity. These variables influence whether crypto-assets will be integrated into institutional investment frameworks or relegated to high-risk speculative domains.

The classification of cryptocurrencies as either investment or speculative instruments has significant legal and regulatory implications. Asset classification informs tax policy, disclosure obligations, investor protection standards, and the applicability of securities laws. If treated as investment assets, cryptocurrencies would be subject to oversight regimes that ensure fairness, transparency, and risk mitigation. If considered speculative instruments, they may fall under gambling laws, commodity regulations, or derivative trading frameworks. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2020) observes that there is currently no global consensus on crypto-asset classification. While some jurisdictions adopt a principles-based approach, others employ case-specific determinations, resulting in legal fragmentation and enforcement asymmetries, particularly in cross-border contexts.

In summary, cryptocurrencies defy conventional asset classification due to their hybrid attributes and evolving functional roles. Their valuation dynamics, behavioral drivers, technological applications, and legal interpretations intersect to produce a fluid typology that resists reduction to binary categories. Effective governance of the crypto-asset sector requires the development of adaptive regulatory frameworks that reflect the distinct economic functions and systemic implications of different types of digital assets. In parallel, enhanced investor education and behavioral safeguards are essential to mitigate irrational market behavior and preserve the long-term viability of decentralized financial systems.

CONCLUSION

Over the past decade, the cryptocurrency ecosystem has undergone a significant transformation, shifting from a decentralized ideal toward a quasi-centralized operational reality. This evolution has revealed persistent systemic challenges, including the misappropriation of user funds by exchanges, the persistence of regulatory vacuums, and the proliferation of speculative trading practices. Existing oversight models, whether based on legacy financial governance or strictly technology-neutral approaches, have proven inadequate in addressing the complex, cross-sectoral, and innovation-driven nature of crypto-assets. In response to these structural limitations, future governance must prioritize integrated supervisory frameworks that combine institutional coordination with technically embedded regulatory mechanisms. Such frameworks must be dynamic, transparent, and preventive in nature.

A foundational step in this direction involves the development of a function-based classification framework for cryptocurrency exchanges. Regulatory standards should be stratified based on transaction types, such as spot trading, leveraged operations, or stablecoin issuance. Each category should be subject to distinct risk assessments, custodial responsibilities, and financial transparency requirements. The implementation of best practices including cold and hot wallet segregation, regular reserve verification, and real-time solvency auditing would enhance institutional trust while maintaining the operational autonomy of decentralized systems. This approach does not negate the decentralized ethos of blockchain technologies, but rather introduces necessary safeguards for transaction-critical infrastructures that demand higher degrees of institutional accountability.

Enhancing governance transparency is another critical dimension of regulatory reform. All exchange operators should be subject to uniform technical disclosure obligations. A mandatory disclosure registry should be established, requiring documentation of order-matching algorithms, custody architectures, pricing logic, clearing protocols, and cybersecurity mechanisms. In addition, platforms must publicly report their capital structures, ownership affiliations, and any financial ties with token issuers. The integration of on-chain verifiability with off-chain disclosure regimes would strengthen institutional legitimacy by ensuring that technical operations remain subject to broader legal, social, and market-based scrutiny.

At the national level, governments should establish interagency regulatory coordination platforms tailored to the governance of crypto-assets. These platforms should consolidate expertise from financial supervision,

anti-money laundering enforcement, securities regulation, technology policy, and tax administration. Institutional coordination would reduce policy fragmentation and jurisdictional gaps, ensuring that crypto-related risks are managed comprehensively. These platforms should also incorporate technical advisory bodies responsible for monitoring blockchain network trends, identifying emerging vulnerabilities, and issuing early risk alerts. Such a forward-looking model of supervision would support regulatory adaptability in a rapidly evolving technological landscape.

The institutionalization of independent third-party verification mechanisms should also be encouraged. These entities would be tasked with auditing smart contracts, verifying exchange reserves, and evaluating governance procedures. A public–private partnership model could be employed, wherein governments establish the legal framework and enforcement authority, while private actors contribute technical innovation and real-time market knowledge. This hybrid structure would facilitate the emergence of a credible verification ecosystem that ensures procedural accountability without impeding technological progress.

Investor protection measures must likewise be recalibrated through a tiered suitability framework. Access to trading functions should be determined by users' financial literacy, risk exposure, and investment background. Mandatory risk disclosures, eligibility screenings, and educational modules should be implemented to protect retail participants and reduce the incidence of impulsive or uninformed trading. A differentiated market entry system would serve to align investor behavior with asset complexity, thereby reinforcing systemic stability and trust.

In sum, the governance of crypto-assets should not be conceived as a binary choice between unregulated autonomy and wholesale absorption into traditional financial systems. Instead, a more nuanced and forward-compatible model is needed one that integrates functional differentiation, technical transparency, risk stratification, and institutional collaboration. A sustainable regulatory architecture must be both enforceable and adaptable, capable of aligning the structural features of digital innovation with the broader goals of financial integrity, public interest, and global policy coherence. Through structural innovation and cross-sectoral coordination, regulatory institutions can play a meaningful role in shaping a resilient and equitable global crypto-asset governance regime.

REFERENCES

Abadi, J. (2024). Making sense of decentralized finance. *Economic Insights, 9*(1), 18–24.

Arner, D. W., Barberis, J., & Buckley, R. P. (2017). Fintech and regtech: Impact on regulators and banks. *Journal of Banking Regulation, 19*(4), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41261-017-0038-3

Azara, H. (2024). Blockchain technology in banking: Exploring decentralized finance and cryptocurrency. *Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce, 29*(1), 1–4.

Bailey, A., Holden, H., & Carstens, A. (2022). Crypto trading and token listings: Market manipulation concerns. *Journal of Financial Regulation and Compliance, 30*(3), 421–437. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFRC-05-2022-0065

Baur, D. G., Hong, K., & Lee, A. D. (2018). Bitcoin: Medium of exchange or speculative assets? *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money, 54*, 177–189. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intfin.2017.12.004

Buterin, V. (2021). *The meaning of decentralization*. Ethereum Foundation Blog. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5738521

Catalini, C., & Gans, J. S. (2016). *Some simple economics of the blockchain* (NBER Working Paper No. 22952). National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w22952

Catalini, C., & Tucker, C. (2018). *Antitrust and market power in the platform economy* (NBER Working Paper No. 24587). National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w24587

Chainalysis. (2022). *The 2022 crypto crime report*. Chainalysis Inc. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7083075

Cheah, E. T., & Fry, J. (2015). Speculative bubbles in Bitcoin markets? An empirical investigation into the fundamental value of Bitcoin. *Economics Letters, 130*, 32–36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2015.02.029

Corbet, S., Lucey, B., Urquhart, A., & Yarovaya, L. (2018). Cryptocurrencies as a financial asset: A systematic analysis. *International Review of Financial Analysis, 62*, 182–199. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2018.09.003

De Filippi, P., & Loveluck, B. (2016). The invisible politics of Bitcoin: Governance crisis of a decentralised infrastructure. *Internet Policy Review, 5*(3). https://doi.org/10.14763/2016.3.427

De Filippi, P., & Wright, A. (2018). *Blockchain and the law: The rule of code*. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674988351

Fernandez-Villaverde, J. (2022). Cryptocurrencies and the future of global finance. *Annual Review of Economics, 14*(1), 273–297. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-051420-023123

Ferreira, A. (2024). Decentralized finance (DeFi): The ultimate regulatory frontier? *Capital Markets Law Journal, 19*(3), 242–259.

Foley, S., Karlsen, J. R., & Putniņš, T. J. (2019). Sex, drugs, and Bitcoin: How much illegal activity is financed through cryptocurrencies? *The Review of Financial Studies, 32*(5), 1798–1853. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhz015

Gomber, P., Kauffman, R. J., Parker, C., & Weber, B. W. (2018). On the fintech revolution: Interpreting the forces of innovation, disruption, and transformation in financial services. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 35*(1), 220–265. https://doi.org/10.1080/074

21222.2018.1440766

Griffin, J. M., & Shams, A. (2020). Is Bitcoin really untethered? *The Journal of Finance, 75*(4), 1913–1964. https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.12903

Hanneke, B., Heß, M., & Hinz, O. (2025). Foundations of decentralized Metaverse economies: Converging physical and virtual realities. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 42*(1), 238–272.

Harvey, C. R., & Rabetti, D. (2024). International business and decentralized finance. Journal of International Business Studies, 55(7), 840–863.

Hassan, M. K., Muneeza, A., & Mohamed, I. (2025). Cryptocurrencies from Islamic perspective. *Journal of Islamic Accounting and Business Research, 16*(2), 390–410.

Hayes, A. S. (2019). Bitcoin price and its marginal cost of production: Support for a fundamental value. *Applied Economics Letters, 26*(7), 554–560. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504851.2018.1488040

Houben, R., & Snyers, A. (2018). *Cryptocurrencies and blockchain: Legal context and implications for financial crime, money laundering and tax evasion*. European Parliament. https://doi.org/10.2861/593568

Ivanov, M., & Johnson, E. (2024). A comprehensive review of decentralization technologies in Bitcoin, Ethereum, and Solana. *Advances in Computer Sciences, 7*(1), 1–8.

Juodis, M., Filatovas, E., & Paulavičius, R. (2024). Overview and empirical analysis of wealth decentralization in blockchain networks. *ICT Express, 10*(2), 380–386.

Kristoufek, L. (2013). Bitcoin meets Google Trends and Wikipedia: Quantifying the relationship between phenomena of the Internet era. *Scientific Reports, 3*, 3415. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep03415

Lee, C. K. (2021). Crypto-exchanges and the illusion of decentralization. *Journal of Financial Crime, 28*(4), 1002–1017. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-09-2020-0175

Longa, F. E. A. (2025). Cryptocurrency and money laundering. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management, 15*(2), 362–371.

Makarov, I., & Schoar, A. (2022). *Cryptocurrencies and decentralized finance* (DeFi). Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, 2022, 141–215.

Martin, S. (2024). Decentralized frontiers: A comparative study of Bitcoin, Ethereum, and Solana technologies and challenges. *Journal of Innovative Technologies, 7*(1), 1–5.

Mišić, V. B., Naderi Mighan, S., Mišić, J., & Chang, X. (2024). Decentralization is good or not? Defending consensus in Ethereum 2.0. *Blockchains, 2*(1), 1–19.

Mu'amar, A. (2024). Economic decentralization through blockchain: Opportunities, challenges and new business models. *Journal of Current Research in Blockchain, 1*(2), 112–123.

OECD. (2020). *Taxing virtual currencies: An overview of tax treatments and emerging tax policy issues*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/a0c1d65b-en

Raza, H., Ali, R., Iqbal, J., & Awais, M. (2024). Secure room-sharing decentralized app development on Ethereum blockchain using smart contracts. *Journal of Informatics and Web Engineering, 3*(2), 146–158.

Schär, F. (2021). Decentralized finance: On blockchain- and smart contract-based financial markets. *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review, 103*(2), 153–174. https://doi.org/10.20955/r.103.153-74

Serrao, A., Reiffers-Masson, A., & Zeume, S. (2021). Centralized versus decentralized exchanges: Trust, transparency, and tradeoffs. *Journal of Corporate Finance, 70*, 102037. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2021.102037

Tommerdahl, J. (2024). Introduction to the blockchain, Bitcoin, and other cryptocurrencies for educators. *Neural Computing and Applications, 36*(32), 20527–20536.

Valdivia, L., Del-Valle-Soto, C., Rodríguez, J., & Alcaraz, M. (2019). Decentralization: The failed promise of cryptocurrencies. *IT Professional, 21*, 33–40.

Walch, A. (2019). Deconstructing "Decentralization": Exploring the core claim of crypto systems. In C. Brummer (Ed.), *Cryptoassets: Legal, regulatory, and monetary perspectives* (pp. 39–68). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190077310.003.0003

Wright, A., & De Filippi, P. (2015). *Decentralized blockchain technology and the rise of lex cryptographia*. SSRN. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2580664

Xu, J. J. (2019). Are blockchains immune to all malicious attacks? *Financial Innovation, 5*(1), 13. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40854-019-0124-2

Yermack, D. (2015). Is Bitcoin a real currency? An economic appraisal. In D. Lee Kuo Chuen (Ed.), *Handbook of Digital Currency* (pp. 31–43). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-802117-0.00002-3