

Contents

1	Introduction and Hypothesis	1
2	Data and Economic Setup	1
3	Initial Results	2 2 2
4	Revision To the Initial Model	3 3
5	Choosing the Model	4
6	Dummy Variable: OECD Countries 6.a Dummy as an Intercept Shifter 6.a.i For Case Rates 6.a.ii For Death Rates 6.b Dummy as a Slope Shifter 6.b.i For Case Rates 6.b.ii For Death Rates 6.c. Dummy as an Intercept and Slope Shifter 6.c.i For Case Rates 6.c.ii For Death Rates	4 5 5 5 6 6 7 7 8 8
7	Instrumental Variables: Daily Caloric Intake and Life Expectancy 7.a For Case Rates	9 9 10
8	Estimation Issues	10
9	Results	11
10	Conclusion	12
11	11.a For Case Rates	12 13 13 13
A	Appendix	15

1 Introduction and Hypothesis

COVID-19 has affected social norms and the economy. The purpose of this project is to see whether or not economic freedom, GDP per capita, income inequality, and the perception of political corruption has had any effect on the deaths and cases of COVID-19. Initially, from economic theory, I would predict countries with greater economic freedom and GDP per capita would fare better over a pandemic (lower COVID-19 cases and deaths per million) while, on the other hand, greater income inequality and perception of political corruption would lead to higher COVID-19 cases and deaths per million. This is because wealthier and economically freer countries would have more money for research, medical supplies, and more wealth saved up in order to work less and more quickly and efficiently change behavior to mitigate the spread of the disease. Countries with higher corruption perception levels could mean citizens not following the mandates or suggestions of governments in order to mitigate the spread of COVID-19, which could potentially cause higher COVID-19 case and death rates.

2 Data and Economic Setup

For my data, I will be using the 2020 Economic Freedom Index from the Fraser Institute, the GDP per capita (in current USD) and the GINI coefficients from the World Bank, and corruption perception index from Our World Data. Equation (1) shows the model with **cases** as the output and equation (2) shows the model with **deaths** as the output

$$cases_{c,t} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 EF_{c,t} + \beta_3 GDP_{c,t} + \beta_4 GINI_{c,t} + \beta_5 CPI_{c,t} + e_{c,t}$$
(1)

$$deaths_{c,t} = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 EF_{c,t} + \alpha_3 GDP_{c,t} + \alpha_4 GINI_{c,t} + \alpha_5 CPI_{c,t} + e_{c,t}$$
(2)

where the subscripts *c* and *t* refer to country and time, EF is the economic freedom index, GDP is the real GDP per capita, GINI is the GINI coefficient, and CPI is the perceived corruption. However, since the GINI index is calculated sporadically, I will be using the GINI coefficients from 2015, GDP per capita numbers from 2019, the economic freedom index from 2020, the CPI from 2018, and the COVID-19 cases and deaths on November 1st, 2020. Unfortunately, because the GINI coefficient and the CPI are not calculated for every country in 2015, I had to limit the number of countries to those that did have a GINI coefficient or a CPI. This resulted in a reduction from 195 countries to 70.

3 Initial Results

3.a For Case Rates

	Coefficients	Stand	ard Error	t Stat	P-value	Regression Statistic	CS .
Intercept	-23498.63351	14123	.72663	-1.66377	0.100973	Multiple R	0.426382219
EF	5323.346989	2028.247284		2.624605	0.010802	R Square	0.181801797
GDP	0.139316045	0.0848	395147	1.641037	0.10562	Adjusted R Squar	e 0.131451138
GINI	15.25745872	150.38	150.3803198		0.919498	Standard Error	8944.649522
CPI	-148.4023636	115.39	911906	-1.28608	0.202977	Observations	70
		df	SS	Λ	4S	F Significance F	,
	Regression	1 4	1155525	843 2.89	E+08 3.61	.0713 0.010169261	
	Residual	65	5200439	080 8000	06755		
	Total	69	6355964	923			

We see that for every point increase in overall economic freedom, COVID-19 case rates increase by about 5323 per million, ceteris paribus. For every thousand current USD increase in GDP per capita, we see an increase in 0.1393 COVID-19 cases per million, ceteris paribus. For every point increase in the GINI coefficient, we see an increase in 15.257 COVID-19 cases, per million, ceteris paribus. And, findally, for every point increase in the CPI, we see a 148.402 decrease in COVID-19 cases per million. Using $\alpha = 0.05$, we see that none of my variables are significant except for economic freedom. Furthermore, looking at R^2 , the variation in EF, GDP, GINI, and CPI only explains 18.18% of the variation in COVID-19 case rates.

3.b For Death Rates

	Coe	efficients	Sta	ındarı	d Error	t	Stat	F	P-value	Regression Statistics	
Intercept	-540	.1858825	419	9.8732	2	-1.	.28655	0.	202816	Multiple R	0.277813032
EF	90.9	9257703	60.	.29618	3	1.5	509094	0.	136121	R Square	0.077180081
GDP	0.002590403		0.002524		1.0	026397	0.	308509	Adjusted R Square	0.020391163	
GINI	5.417279912		4.470539		1.2	211773	0.	229986	Standard Error	265.9085039	
CPI	-2.527609133		3.430375		5	-0.	73683	0.	463876	Observations	70
				df	SS		MS		F	Significance F	
	Regressi		on	4	384384	.7	96096.	17	1.35906	69 0.257872	
	Residual		l	65	459597	7	70707.3	33			
	Total			69	498036	1					

We see that for every point increase in overall economic freedom, COVID-19 deaths increase by

about 91 per million, ceteris paribus. For every thousand current USD increase in GDP per capita, we see an increase in 0.00259 COVID-19 deaths per million, ceteris paribus. For every point increase in the GINI coefficient, we see a 5.4172 increase in COVID-19 deaths per million, ceteris paribus. Finally, for every point increase in the CPI, we see see a degrees in 2.527 COVID-19 deaths per million, ceteris paribus. Using $\alpha = 0.05$, we see that none of my variables are significant. Furthermore, looking at R^2 , the variation in EF, GDP, GINI, and CPI only explains 7.71% of the variation in COVID-19 death rates.

4 Revision To the Initial Model

Perhaps a good revision to my initial model would be to use the logarithm of GDP per capita:

$$cases_{c,t} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 EF_{c,t} + \beta_3 log(GDP_{c,t}) + \beta_4 GINI_{c,t} + \beta_5 CPI_{c,t} + e_{c,t}$$
(1)

$$deaths_{c,t} = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 EF_{c,t} + \alpha_3 log(GDP_{c,t}) + \alpha_4 GINI_{c,t} + \alpha_5 CPI_{c,t} + e_{c,t}$$
(2)

Doing this, we get the following

4.a For Case Rates

	Са	efficients	Stand	lard Erro	or	t Stat	P-value	Regression Statistics	
Intercept	-47	147.38532	1526	7.63	-	-3.08806	0.002962	Multiple R	0.48894051
EF	266	2.654441	2203	929	1	1.20814	0.231371	R Square	0.239062822
log(GDP)	117	79.73992	4221	358	2	2.79051	0.0069	Adjusted R Square	0.192235919
GINI	71.7	71412252	147.0928		(0.487543	0.627514	Standard Error	8625.980443
CPI	-22	1.1712806	108.0	683	-	2.04659	0.044747	Observations	70
			df	S	S	MS	F	Significance F	
		Regression		on 4 1.52E+0		3.8E+08	5.1052	45 0.001221	
		Residual	65	4.841	E+09	7440753	39		
		Total		6.36I	E+09				

Using $\alpha = 0.05$, we see that none of my variables are significant except for GDP per capita. Furthermore, looking at R^2 , the variation in EF, GDP, GINI, and CPI has increased from my initial model of 18.18% to 23.9% for explaining the variation in COVID-19 cases. The coefficients for both case rates and death rates in this section will be discussed later in the results section.

4.b For Death Rates

	Со	efficients	St	andar	d Error		t Stat		P-value	Regression Statistics	
Intercept	-122	26.464176	44	5.545	i	-2	2.75273	0	.007653	Multiple R	0.415923808
FE	6.55	56921952	64	.3157	9	0.	.101949	0.919111 R Square		R Square	0.172992614
log(GDP)	363.4825944		123.1891		2.	.950608	0.004406		Adjusted R Square	0.122099852	
GINI	7.749605143		4.29251		1.	.805378	0	.075647	Standard Error	251.726212	
CPI	-6.414336372		3.153684		34	-2	2.03392	0	.046045	Observations	70
				df	SS		MS		F	Significance F	
		Regression		4	861565	.7	215391	.4	3.39915	9 0.013806	
	Residual			65	411879	6	63366.0)9			
		Total		69	498036	1					

Using $\alpha = 0.05$, we see that none of my variables are significant except for GDP per capita and CPI. Furthermore, looking at R^2 , the variation in EF, GDP, GINI, and CPI has increased from my initial model of 7.71% to 17.3% for explaining the variation in COVID-19 deaths.

5 Choosing the Model

This seems, then, that using the logarithm of GDP per capita results in a more explanatory model, though the R^2 is still low. To formally check to see which model I should use, I can calculate the Akaike and Bayesian information criterion (AIC and BIC):

	AIC	BIC	R^2	\bar{R}^2
Cases	18.23779937	18.36628481	0.181801797	0.131451138
Cases log(GDP)	18.16524556	18.293731	0.239062822	0.192235919
Deaths	11.2064823	11.33496774	0.077180081	0.020391163
Deaths log(GDP)	11.09686181	11.22534726	0.172992614	0.122099852

As we can see, for both cases with $\log(\text{GDP})$ and deaths with $\log(\text{GDP})$, the AIC and BIC were lower while at the same time, the corresponding R^2 and \bar{R}^2 were higher. Therefore, I should choose my revised model with the $\log(\text{GDP})$.

6 Dummy Variable: OECD Countries

To see if being an OECD country has any effect on COVID-19 case and death rates, we can include a dummy variable such that:

$$D = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if OECD country} \\ 0 & \text{if otherwise} \end{cases}$$

¹I should have tested an additional model with the logarithm of COVID-19 case and death rates. See section 11 Addendum to view what I should have done. Unfortunately, this occurred to me only after doing most of the project.

Doing so, I will examine the effect of an OECD country as an intercept shifter, a slope shifter, and as an intercept and a slope shifter in my model in the following subsections, respectively.

6.a Dummy as an Intercept Shifter

My models with an OECD dummy as an intercept shifter would be:

$$cases_{c,t} = \beta_1 + \delta_1 D_{OECD} + \beta_2 EF_{c,t} + \beta_3 log(GDP_{c,t}) + \beta_4 GINI_{c,t} + \beta_5 CPI_{c,t} + e_{c,t}$$
(1)

$$deaths_{c,t} = \alpha_1 + \gamma_1 D_{OECD} + \alpha_2 EF_{c,t} + \alpha_3 log(GDP_{c,t}) + \alpha_4 GINI_{c,t} + \alpha_5 CPIS_{c,t} + e_{c,t}$$
(2)

The results are as follows:

6.a.i For Case Rates

	Coefficients	Standa	ard Error	t Stat	P-value	Regression Statistics	
Intercept	-44429.9	15572	.36	-2.85313	0.005825	Multiple R	0.498894
EF	3017.064	2240.399		1.346664	0.182838	R Square	0.248895
log(GDP)	10641.53	4405.775		2.41536	0.018586	Adjusted R Square	0.190215
GINI	77.80077	147.42	267	0.527725	0.599515	Standard Error	8636.766
CPI	-263.425	117.63	396	-2.23925	0.028622	Observations	70
OECD	3156.953	3449.1	.14	0.915294	0.363473		
		df	SS	MS	F	Significance F	
	Regression	n 5 1.58E+09		3.16E+0	8 4.24155	55 0.002155	
	Residual	64 4.77E+09		7459372	21		
	Total	69	6.36E+09)			

6.a.ii For Death Rates

	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Regression Statistics	
Intercept	-1096.936788	449.4499	-2.44062	0.01744	Multiple R	0.448887439
EF	23.44974342	64.66245	0.362649	0.718062	R Square	0.201499933
log(GDP)	309.230229	127.1596	2.431828	0.017832	Adjusted R Square	0.139117115
GINI	8.039723372	4.255034	1.889461	0.063362	Standard Error	249.2745358
CPI	-8.428342892	3.395318	-2.48234	0.015686	Observations	70
OECD	150.4752384	99.54841	1.511578	0.135563		

	df	SS	MS	F	Significance F
Regression	5	1003542	200708.5	3.230055	0.011583
Residual	64	3976819	62137.79		
Total	69	4980361			

6.b Dummy as a Slope Shifter

My models with an OECD dummy as a slope shifter would be:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cases}_{c,t} &= \beta_1 + (\beta_2 + \delta_2 D_{OECD}) \text{EF}_{c,t} + (\beta_3 + \delta_3 D_{OECD}) log(\text{GDP}_{c,t}) + (\beta_4 + \delta_4 D_{OECD}) \text{GINI}_{c,t} \\ &+ (\beta_5 + \delta_5 D_{OECD}) \text{CPI}_{c,t} + e_{c,t} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ (\beta_5 + \delta_5 D_{OECD}) \text{CPI}_{c,t} + e_{c,t} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{deaths}_{c,t} &= \alpha_1 + (\alpha_2 + \gamma_2 D_{OECD}) \text{EF}_{c,t} + (\alpha_3 + \gamma_3 D_{OECD}) log(\text{GDP}_{c,t}) + (\alpha_4 + \gamma_4 D_{OECD}) \text{GINI}_{c,t} \\ &+ (\alpha_5 + \gamma_5 D_{OECD}) \text{CPI}_{c,t} + e_{c,t} \end{aligned}$$

Here and for the next subsection, I will be using β_1, \ldots, β_5 and $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_5$ for the corresponding intercept, EF, and so on. I will also do so with $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_5$ and $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_5$ for the corresponding OECD dummy variable interaction since this way, I believe, it will be less confusing. The results are as follows:

6.b.i For Case Rates

	Coefficients	Stand	lard Er	ror t St	at	P-val	ие	Regre	ession Statistics	
β_1	-44444.4	15965	5.51	-2.78	378	0.0071	144	Mult	iple R	0.505476
β_2	3159.344	2559.	415	1.234	401	0.2217	788	R Square		0.255506
β_3	11061.9	5042.	699	2.193	648	0.0320)81	Adjusted R Square		0.157867
eta_4	91.01537	167.2	208	0.544	283	0.5882	38231 Star		dard Error	8807.579
β_5	-340.657	165.7	405	-2.05	536	0.044132		Obse	ervations	70
δ_2	-1167.63	5286.	39	-0.22	087	0.8259	928			
δ_3	-288.436	8848.	74	-0.03	26	0.9741	103			
δ_4	93.5137	385.1	385.1331		809	0.8089	968			
δ_5	177.7339	273.3	376	0.650	236	0.5179	981			
			df	SS	i	MS		F	Significance F	
	Regre	ession	8	1.62E+09	2.03	3E+08	2.6	1685	0.015683	
	Resid	ual	61	4.73E+09	775	73445				
	Total		69	6.36E+09						

6.b.ii For Death Rates

	Coeffi	cients	Stand	lard E	rror t	Stat	P-v	alue	Regr	ression Statistics	
α_1	-1082	.07	445.8	509	-2.4	12698	0.01	8194	Mul	tiple R	0.508958
α_2	13.70	796	71.47	393	0.1	9179	0.84	8544	R Sc	_l uare	0.259038
α_3	384.80	053	140.8	218	2.7	2.732568		0.00821		usted R Square	0.161863
α_4	8.217	03	4.669788		1.7	1.759615		0.083487		dard Error	245.9594
α_5	-14.3239		4.628449		-3.0	-3.09476		0.002972		ervations	70
γ_2	-20.5767		147.6	271	-0.2	13938	0.88	9607			
γ_3	-233.773		247.1089		-0.9	94603	0.34	7864			
γ_4	11.45	103	10.75518		1.0	64699	0.29	1208			
γ_5	16.098	848	7.633	194	2.1	2.10901		0.039057			
				df	SS	\mathcal{N}	1S	I	=	Significance F	
	Regre		ession	ession 8 129		0103 1612		2.66	5678	0.01406	
		Resid	ual	61	3690258	6049	96.03				
		Total		69	4980361						

6.c Dummy as an Intercept and Slope Shifter

My models with an OECD dummy as an intercept and slope shifter would be:

$$\begin{split} \text{cases}_{c,t} &= (\beta_1 + \delta_1 D_{OECD}) + (\beta_2 + \delta_2 D_{OECD}) \text{EF}_{c,t} + (\beta_3 + \delta_3 D_{OECD}) log(\text{GDP}_{c,t}) \\ &+ (\beta_4 + \delta_4 D_{OECD}) \text{GINI}_{c,t} + (\beta_5 + \delta_5 D_{OECD}) \text{CPI}_{c,t} + e_{c,t} \\ \text{deaths}_{c,t} &= (\alpha_1 + \gamma_1 D_{OECD}) + (\alpha_2 + \gamma_2 D_{OECD}) \text{EF}_{c,t} + (\alpha_3 + \gamma_3 D_{OECD}) log(\text{GDP}_{c,t}) \\ &+ (\alpha_4 + \gamma_4 D_{OECD}) \text{GINI}_{c,t} + (\alpha_5 + \gamma_5 D_{OECD}) \text{CPI}_{c,t} + e_{c,t} \end{split}$$

6.c.i For Case Rates

	Coefficients	Stand	dard E	rror t S	tat	P-va	lue	Regre	ssion Statistics	
β_1	-44465	1677	0.19	-2.65	143	0.010	237	Multi	iple R	0.505476
β_2	3160.525	2594	.696	1.218	3071	0.227	965	R Squ	ıare	0.255506
β_3	11064.75	5125	.725	2.158	2.15867		0.034886		sted R Square	0.143832
eta_4	91.10906	169.9	169.9594		6064	0.593896		Stand	lard Error	8880.671
eta_5	-340.71	167.5	5493	-2.03	349	0.046	433	Obse	rvations	70
δ_1	262.1252	5983	3.15	0.004	1381	0.996	519			
δ_2	-1180.23	.23 6056		-0.19	487	0.846	154			
δ_3	-327.884	1267	6.2	-0.02	587	0.979	45			
δ_4	92.54509	446.8	3591	0.207	7101	0.836	632			
δ_5	178.377	312.2	2554	0.571	1253	0.569	962			
			df	SS	Λ	ЛS		F	Significance F	_
	Regression		9	1.62E+09	1.8E	E+08	2.28	87959	0.027911	
	Residu	ıal	60	4.73E+09	7886	66311				
	Total		69	6.36E+09						

6.c.ii For Death Rates

	Coefficients	Stand	ard Ei	rror t S	tat	P-v	alue	Regression S	tatistics	
α_1	-1063.23	468.2	421	-2.27	7069	0.02	6769	Multiple R		0.509208
α_2	12.62758	72.44	675	0.17	4302	0.86	2215	R Square		0.259292
α_3	382.2066	143.1	158	2.67	061	0.00	973	Adjusted R	Square	0.148186
α_4	8.131317	4.745	452	1.71	3497	0.09	1784	Standard Er	ror	247.958
α_5	-14.2757	4.678	16	-3.05	5156	0.00	3389	Observation	าร	70
γ_1	-239.801	1670.	607	-0.14	1354	0.88	6344			
γ_2	-9.05118	169.10	052	-0.05	5352	0.95	7492			
γ_3	-197.685	353.93	334	-0.55	5854	0.57	8557			
γ_4	12.33715	12.47	679	0.98	8808	0.32	6728			
γ_5	15.51021	8.718	513	1.77	8997	0.08	0306			
			df	SS	N	1S	I	Signifi	cance F	
	Regre	ession	9	1291370	1434	85.6	2.333	3737 0.0250	4	
	Resid	ual	60	3688991	6148	3.18				
	Total		69	4980361						

7 Instrumental Variables: Daily Caloric Intake and Life Expectancy

For this section, I will explore instrumental variables for economic freedom. In this case, I will use daily caloric consumption from 2017 and life expectancy from 2019 obtained from Our World Data as such instrumental variables. Of course, these are not perfect instrumental variables since they will be correlated with the error term in my model, however, they will be used for demonstrative purposes only.

Thus, the matrix for my model would be:

$$Z_{1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & EF_{1} & log(GDP)_{1} & GINI_{1} & CPI_{1} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$Z_{2} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & EF_{2} & log(GDP)_{2} & GINI_{2} & CPI_{2} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\vdots$$

$$Z_{70} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & EF_{70} & log(GDP)_{70} & GINI_{70} & CPI_{70} \end{bmatrix}$$

and my matrix with the replacement of economic freedom (EF) with the instrumental variables of daily caloric intake (DCI) and life expectancy (LE) would be:

$$X_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & DCI_1 & LE_1 & log(GDP)_1 & GINI_1 & CPI_1 \end{bmatrix}$$
 $X_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & DCI_2 & LE_2 & log(GDP)_2 & GINI_2 & CPI_2 \end{bmatrix}$
 \vdots
 $X_{70} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & DCI_{70} & LE_{70} & log(GDP)_{70} & GINI_{70} & CPI_{70} \end{bmatrix}$

where 1, 2, . . ., 70 correspond with each of the countries in my data set. Since I have over-identified the number of instrumental variables, I must calculate b_{2SLS} rather than b_{IV} .

7.a For Case Rates

$$b_{2SLS}^{cases} = \begin{bmatrix} -49216.6913924579 \\ 3347.51293308166 \\ 11171.6093660121 \\ 63.0133882562653 \\ -223.707753562140 \end{bmatrix}$$

For the Hausman test, I obtain m = -0.0042 with an OIR = 3.7871.

 H_0 : Daily caloric intake and life expectancy are valid

 H_1 : At least one is not valid

Since $OIR < \chi_c^2$, we fail to reject the null hypothesis that the instruments are invalid at $\alpha = 0.05$.

7.b For Death Rates

$$b_{2SLS}^{deaths} = \begin{bmatrix} -2106.11483110898 \\ 297.686509127318 \\ 104.969633002205 \\ 4.05097072458978 \\ -7.49257712557724 \end{bmatrix}$$

For the Hausman test, I obtain m = -0.8836 with an OIR = 4.0146.

 H_0 : Daily caloric intake and life expectancy are valid

 H_1 : At least one is not valid

Since $OIR < \chi_c^2$, we fail to reject the null hypothesis that the instruments are invalid at $\alpha = 0.05$.

8 Estimation Issues

There are plenty of estimation issues in this project, some of which stems from the collection and availability of data and other issues from my own limited skills in statistical and econometric techniques. Specifically, because I can only do regressions with complete data sets, I had to remove countries that did not have a GINI coefficient from 2015, who did not report their GDP per capita in 2019, who did not have a CPI, and who did not collect data on COVID-19 case and death rates. This meant I could only run regressions on 70 out of the 195 countries in the world. Moreover, it is wealthier countries who are more able to collect and more willing to share such data consistently. This point is exemplified by the fact that 27 out of the 37 OECD countries are included in my data sample, which is a large over-representation of countries who are, for the most part, democratic and consisting of large and stable economies. Wealthier countries also have more of the population living in dense urban areas, which would allow COVD-19 to spread more easily.

As a result, my models are subject to heavy omission bias, since I could not include most countries from Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. This meant there is an over-representation of Europe in my model. Related to this, some governments are so corrupt that the CPI cannot be estimated, such as North Korea and Russia, and this, again, further biases my data towards democratic and liberal countries.

Additionally, there could be multicollinearity issues with my models. Economic freedom is highly

correlated with GDP and even potentially with perceived corruption since the criterion for economic freedom relies on the size of government, legal system and property rights, sound money, free trade, and regulation, all of which are, of course, tied to the role of the government. Yet another problem my model may have is heteroskedasticity. The error terms between each country may vary and therefore, every continent and even every country could have differing variances. Because of this problem, I would need to estimate the errors of each country. In the beginning, I was considering of conducting a time-series analysis from March until November, which would be an attempt to see if whether or not economically freer countries

Lastly, the final problem my models have is the level of aggregation. Although the USA was not included in my data set, but using it as an example, between states, there are differences in economic freedoms, age and other demographics, regulations, and pandemic mandates which would affect COVID-19 cases and deaths, for instance, between Texas and New York. Switzerland, which is in my data set, may have cantons that have dealt with and are dealing with COVID-19 differently and by aggregating data at a country level, the effects of different governance intrastate are lost.

9 Results

My economic models would be

$$ca\$es = -47147.385 + 2662.654EF + 11779.74log(G\hat{D}P) + 71.714GI\hat{N}I - 221.171C\hat{P}I$$
 (1)

$$deaths = -1226.464 + 6.557EF + 363.483log(GDP) + 7.75GINI - 6.414CPI$$
 (2)

As we can see, the results are almost the opposite of what I hypothesized. For each additional score of economic freedom, cases increases by 2662 per million and deaths increase by 6.55 per million, ceteris paribus. While for every addition percentage increase in GDP per capita increases cases by 11,779 per million and deaths by 363 per million, ceteris paribus. For every additional point gained in the GINI coefficient, this increases cases by 71 per million and deaths by 7.75 per million, ceteris paribus. Lastly, for every additional point in the CPI, cases decrease by 221 per million and deaths decrease 6.4 per million, ceteris paribus. Only the GINI coefficient came out from what I expected: that higher income inequality leads to greater COVID-19 cases and deaths.

The inclusion of an OECD dummy variable, surprisingly, was not statistically significant as an intercept shifter, a slope shifter, or an intercept and a slope shifter. My OECD dummy models as an intercept

shifter are:

$$ca\hat{s}es = -44429.9 + 3156.953\hat{D}_{OECD} + 3017.064\hat{EF} + 10641.53log(G\hat{D}P) + 77.801G\hat{I}NI - 263.425\hat{CPI}$$
 (1)

$$deaths = -1096.937 + 150.475\hat{D}_{OECD} + 23.45\hat{E}F + 309.23LOG(G\hat{D}P) + 8.04G\hat{I}NI - 8.428\hat{C}PI$$
 (2)

This means being an OECD country increases case rates by 3157 per million, ceteris paribus, and death rates by 150.475 per million, ceteris paribus. This, again, however, is not significant at $\alpha = 0.05$.

10 Conclusion

Overall I find that economic freedom, GDP per capita, and increased income inequality (the GINI coefficient) contributes to the case and death rates of COVID-19. This may, however, be due to the choice of variables, the multicollinearity of these variables, my limitations in econometrics techniques, and the other correlated factors that wealthier, developed countries have. With wealthier countries more likely to travel and to live in more densely populated metropolitan areas, this creates an environment for contagious diseases to more easily spread. Surprisingly, we see countries with high corruption perception indices actually decrease COVID-19 case and death rates. However, it should be noted that the most corrupt countries do not have a CPI due to the difficulty of even ranking and placing these countries.

The R^2 and \bar{R}^2 are both low, however at around 0.2, which means the variation from my model explains little of the variation in COVID-19 cases and deaths per million. I would need to incorporate more relevant variables, try nonlinear regression models, obtain additional and more complete data, and attempt other econometric techniques and tests. The F-tests in both case rates and death rates were significant at a 95% significant level, however, it seems my variables are not very robust, especially economic freedom, which is not significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ in both COVID-19 cases and deaths. In short, I would need to include many more variables in order to see if economic freedom does indeed affect COVID-19 case and death rates. From this term project, it remains inconclusive whether or not greater economic freedom harms or helps in terms of cases and deaths during a pandemic.

11 Addendum

Unfortunately, for whatever reason, I did not think to use the logarithm of COVID-19 cases and deaths for the following models:

$$log(cases_{c,t}) = \beta_1 + \beta_2 EF_{c,t} + \beta_3 log(GDP_{c,t}) + \beta_4 GINI_{c,t} + \beta_5 CPI_{c,t} + e_{c,t}$$
(1)

$$log(deaths_{c,t}) = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 EF_{c,t} + \alpha_3 log(GDP_{c,t}) + \alpha_4 GINI_{c,t} + \alpha_5 CPI_{c,t} + e_{c,t}$$
 (2)

Doing so, I obtain

11.a For Case Rates

	Coefficients	Standard Error		t Stat	P-value	Regression Statistics	
Intercept	-0.500620326	0.9	19505	-0.54445	0.587998	Multiple R	0.585151246
Overall Score	0.301441858	0.1	32733	2.271033	0.026465	R Square	0.342401981
loggpd2019	0.706447373	0.2	54235	2.778722	0.007127	Adjusted R Square	0.30193441
gini2015	-0.00076452	0.0	08859	-0.0863	0.931493	Standard Error	0.519506533
cpi2018	-0.014294284	0.0	06508	-2.19625	0.031648	Observations	70
		df	SS	MS	F	Significance F	
	Regression	4	9.134213	2.283553	8.461145	1.47E-05	
	Residual	65	17.54266	0.269887			
	Total	69	26.67687				

11.b For Death Rates

	Coefficients	Sta	ndard Error	t Stat	P-value	Regression Statistics	
Intercept	-2.60671841	1.0	70227	-2.43567	0.017615	Multiple R	0.529061294
Overall Score	0.239642525	0.1	54491	1.551179	0.125715	R Square	0.279905853
loggpd2019	0.928230914	0.2	95908	3.136891	0.002565	Adjusted R Square	0.235592367
gini2015	0.004796048	0.0	10311	0.465144	0.643383	Standard Error	0.604662365
cpi2018	-0.020046977	0.0	07575	-2.64634	0.010195	Observations	70
		df	SS	MS	F	Significance F	
	Regression	4	9.237659	2.309415	6.316494	0.000234	
	Residual	65	23.76508	0.365617			
	Total	69	33.00274				

11.c New AIB and BIC

	AIC	BIC	R^2	\bar{R}^2
Cases	18.23779937	18.36628481	0.181801797	0.131451138
Cases log(GDP)	18.16524556	18.293731	0.239062822	0.192235919
Log(Cases) log(GDP)	-1.269574042	-1.1410886	0.342401981	0.30193441
Deaths	11.2064823	11.33496774	0.077180081	0.020391163
Deaths log(GDP)	11.09686181	11.22534726	0.172992614	0.122099852
Log(Deaths) log(GDP)	-0.965992362	-1.080278076	0.279905853	0.235592367

As we can see, when I use the logarithm of both case and death rates along with the logarithm of GDP, the AIC and BIC are lower while R^2 and \bar{R}^2 are higher. Therefore, the model I should have used in this paper is:

$$log(cases_{c,t}) = \beta_1 + \beta_2 EF_{c,t} + \beta_3 log(GDP_{c,t}) + \beta_4 GINI_{c,t} + \beta_5 CPI_{c,t} + e_{c,t}$$
(1)

$$log(deaths_{c,t}) = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 EF_{c,t} + \alpha_3 log(GDP_{c,t}) + \alpha_4 GINI_{c,t} + \alpha_5 CPI_{c,t} + e_{c,t}$$
(2)

and the dummy variable and instrument variable techniques I used should have been with these models rather than just the logarithm of GDP alone. Unfortunately, this only occurred to me after I had done most of the work with the less explanatory model.

A Appendix

Deaths Per Million 176.871 121.802 1102.467 1102.467 1102.467 1102.467 1102.467 1102.467 1102.467 1102.467 1102.467 1102.467 1102.467 1103.711 140.72 1188 118.407 110.3711 110.418 110.3711 110.418 110.3711 110.418 110.3711 110.418 110.372 110.373 110.373 110.373 110.373 110.373 110.418
Cases Per Million 7255.885 3113.2877 3113.2877 3113.2877 3113.2877 3113.2877 3113.2877 3208.444 3208.127 3208.237 320.253
HE CO19 78.573 78.573 78.573 88.574 74.704 74.704 77.287
and day of the control of the contro
dummyycpi
dummygini 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
dummygdp 4.701372 4.663858 4.701372 4.663858 4.9137811 4.173083 0.001 0
dummyef dummyef 17.8 17.8 17.8 18.43 17.86 18.13 1
O O O C O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O
013018 33 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3
23.2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
3.728386 3.086385 3.086385 3.086385 3.086385 3.086385 3.086385 3.086385 3.086385 3.09036 4.701378 4.107381 4.107381 4.107381 4.107381 4.107381 4.107381 4.107381 4.107381 4.107381 4.107381 4.10829 4.20333 4.6063 4.20333 4.2033
П — Н — Н — Н — Н — Н — Н — Н — Н — Н —
\$592.87 \$592.87 \$102.73 \$102.73 \$102.73 \$102.73 \$102.73 \$102.18 \$102.13 \$102.7
A A Lib A
Albania Armenia Armenia Armenia Armenia Armenia Armenia Armenia Belgium Belgium Belgium Belgium Beldius Belarus Belvius Cote d'Ivoire Colombia Cote d'Ivoire Belvius Demmark Demmark Demmark Demmark Heland Finland Heland Heland Heland Heland Montenegro Moldova Mol

Table 1: Master Data Set