Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect, the company's public news and information website.

Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories, such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source. These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active.
Stock markets’ reaction to Covid-19: Moderating role of national culture

Badar Nadeem Ashraf

School of Finance, Jiangxi University of Finance and Economics, Nanchang (330013), China

ABSTRACT

Recent literature reports stock markets around the world reacted to the Covid-19 pandemic with negative returns. However, this reaction was not uniform across countries. In this paper, we postulate that the national-level uncertainty avoidance, which determines how sensitive members of a nation are to uncertainty, moderates the stock markets’ reaction to the pandemic. Using daily data of Covid-19 confirmed cases and stock market returns from 43 countries, we find robust evidence that the decline in stock market returns in response to one percent increase in growth in confirmed cases is stronger for the countries with higher national-level uncertainty aversion.

1. Introduction

The Covid-19 pandemic has brought unprecedented uncertainty as to how deadly disease really is, when can we get a vaccine, how long do we need economic shutdowns, how governments would respond, what effects government policies will have and how people will behave (Wagner 2020). Because of such huge uncertainty, it has become quite difficult to make predictions. The price changes in asset markets showed this effect. Especially, stock markets around the world reacted to Covid-19 pandemic with unprecedented volatility and strong negative returns (Al-Awadhi et al. 2020; Ashraf 2020b; Baker et al. 2020; Ramelli and Wagner 2020; Zhang et al. 2020). For instance, Alfaro et al. (2020) for the US and Ashraf (2020b) for 64 countries find that stock market returns declined in response to local Covid-19 outbreaks.

However, this market reaction was not uniform across countries and varied by the large extent (World Bank 2020). Markets reaction varied across countries not only because of different levels of expected future economic losses (Gormsen and Koijen 2020) but also due to investors’ sentiment (Zhang et al. 2020). Investor sentiment is defined as the investor opinion about future cash flows and investment risk, or alternatively as the propensity to speculate (Baker and Wurgler 2006). Schmeling (2009) shows that the cross-country differences in cultural values influence investors’ sentiment, which in turn determines investors’ reaction to a news. Building on this literature, we argue that dominant national culture which determines how sensitive individuals are to uncertainty is an important sentimental factor due to which investors in different countries have responded heterogeneously to the Covid-19 crisis.

Fig. 1 graphs the average correlations between stock market returns and growth in Covid-19 confirmed cases in countries with low and high uncertainty avoidance values. The negative 0.2 correlation is quite high for countries with higher uncertainty avoidance values as compared to the correlation of -0.125 for low uncertainty avoidance group.

Culture, in general, is defined as a set of shared values, beliefs and norms which distinguish the members of one society/group from others (Hofstede 1980; House et al. 2004). Culture guides human behaviour and determines what is acceptable or unacceptable in a
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society (Hofstede 2001). National culture is defined as “the collective programming of the mind distinguishing the members of one nation from others” (Hofstede 1980, 2001; Hofstede et al. 2010). Though culture is a ubiquitous concept which is difficult to quantify, however for this study we consider the uncertainty avoidance dimension of national culture. Cultural psychologist (Hofstede 1980; House et al. 2004) found that uncertainty avoidance varies across countries. Recent literature suggests uncertainty avoidance dimension is the most important aspect of national culture for financial sector outcomes (Kwok and Tadesse 2006).

Specifically, we postulate that stock market investors in countries with higher level of uncertainty aversion are more likely to involve in panic selling to avoid uncertainty leading to higher negative market returns as compared to the investors in countries with lower levels of uncertainty aversion who remain calm and tolerant to risk even in the crisis.

To examine above hypothesis, we use a panel dataset of daily Covid-19 confirmed cases and stock market returns from 43 countries over the period January 22, 2020 to April 17, 2020. After controlling for country characteristics, expected future economic losses and systematic risk due to international factors, we find robust evidence that the decline in market returns was more pronounced in countries with higher level of cultural uncertainty avoidance.

We offer two important contributions to the literature: First, we complement recently emerging literature which reports stock market volatility increased and returns declined in response to Covid-19 pandemic (Al-Awadhi et al. 2020; Ashraf 2020b; Baker et al. 2020; Ramelli and Wagner 2020; Zhang et al. 2020). Our findings confirm stock market returns declined in response to Covid-19 pandemic. Second, we add to the studies which provide evidence using data from stock markets that some specific country characteristics such as the implementation of stringent government social distancing measures (Ashraf 2020a), government fiscal capacity (Gerding et al. 2020) and a country’ level of economic freedom (Erdem 2020) have provided immunity against economic losses. We add by finding that stock market reaction to the pandemic also depends on national culture. Third, we also contribute to the literature which argues that national culture is an important missing link in finance (Aggarwal and Goodell 2014; Nadler and Breuer 2019). We add by finding that national culture plays its role in asset pricing in equity markets.

The rest of the paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 introduces sample. Section 3 presents the testable hypothesis. Section 4 outlines empirical methodology. Section 5 reports empirical results. Final section concludes.

2. Sample construction

We started sample construction by collecting the data of daily Covid-19 confirmed cases from the website of John Hopkins University, Coronavirus Resource Centre (JHU-CRC) and daily stock market returns from www.investing.com website over the period from January 22 to April 17, 2020. Next, we collected country-level data of alternative measures of uncertainty avoidance from Hofstede et al. (2010) and House et al. (2004). We also collected data of other country-level control variables. We appended data of country-level cultural and other control variables with daily Covid-19 and stock returns data.

To refine the data, first, we dropped countries with missing required data. This resulted in a sample of 43 countries. Second, we
dropped observations with missing values of stock returns data, especially for weekends or national holidays, for each of the 43 countries. This led to a final dataset of 1,769 daily observations from 43 countries over the period from January 22 to April 17, 2020. We winsorized daily returns at 1% level in both tails to eliminate outliers. Table 1 lists the countries, as well as the main stock market index, the date when first Covid-19 case was confirmed (the data for any specific country in sample starts from this date) and the number of daily data observations for each country.

3. Measurement of uncertainty avoidance and testable hypothesis

3.1. Measurement of national-level uncertainty avoidance

Following recent studies (Ashraf et al. 2016; Ashraf and Arshad 2017), we rely on Hofstede (Hofstede 1980, 2001; Hofstede et al. 2010).

Table 1
Sample information.
This table reports the sample countries, the stock market index the data of which was used for a country, the date when first Covid-19 case was confirmed in a country, the number of daily data observations from each country and the country-level values of two alternative uncertainty avoidance indexes of national culture.

| Sr. No. | Country     | Stock index     | The day when 1st Covid-19 case was confirmed | Observations | Uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede) | Uncertainty avoidance (House) |
|---------|-------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1       | Argentina   | S&P Merval      | Mar 03, 2020                                 | 26           | 86                              | 4.62                           |
| 2       | Australia   | S&P,ASX 200     | Jan 26, 2020                                 | 57           | 51                              | 3.99                           |
| 3       | Austria     | ATX             | Feb 25, 2020                                 | 35           | 70                              | 3.65                           |
| 4       | Brazil      | Bovespa         | Feb 26, 2020                                 | 34           | 76                              | 3.42                           |
| 5       | Canada      | S&P TSX Composite | Jan 26, 2020                         | 56           | 48                              | 3.73                           |
| 6       | China       | Shanghai Composite | Jan 22, 2020                      | 54           | 30                              | 5.34                           |
| 7       | Colombia    | COLCAP          | Mar 06, 2020                                 | 26           | 80                              | 4.92                           |
| 8       | Denmark     | OMX Copenhagen 20 | Feb 27, 2020                        | 32           | 23                              | 4.01                           |
| 9       | Ecuador     | Guayquil Select | Mar 01, 2020                                 | 31           | 67                              | 4.95                           |
| 10      | Egypt       | EGX 70 EWI      | Feb 14, 2020                                 | 44           | 80                              | 5.24                           |
| 11      | France      | CAC 40          | Jan 24, 2020                                 | 58           | 86                              | 4.65                           |
| 12      | Germany     | DAX             | Jan 27, 2020                                 | 56           | 65                              | 3.7                            |
| 13      | Greece      | Athens General Composite | Feb 26, 2020                     | 31           | 100                             | 5.16                           |
| 14      | Hungary     | Budapest SE     | Mar 04, 2020                                 | 28           | 82                              | 4.74                           |
| 15      | India       | BSE Sensex 30   | Jan 30, 2020                                 | 50           | 40                              | 4.58                           |
| 16      | Indonesia   | Jakarta SEC     | Mar 02, 2020                                 | 31           | 48                              | 5.04                           |
| 17      | Ireland     | ISEQ Overall    | Feb 29, 2020                                 | 33           | 35                              | 3.94                           |
| 18      | Israel      | TA 35           | Feb 21, 2020                                 | 34           | 81                              | 4.34                           |
| 19      | Italy       | FTSE MIB        | Jan 31, 2020                                 | 53           | 75                              | 4.52                           |
| 20      | Japan       | Nikkei 225      | Jan 22, 2020                                 | 58           | 92                              | 4.4                            |
| 21      | Korea, South | KOSP           | Jan 22, 2020                                 | 58           | 85                              | 4.74                           |
| 22      | Malaysia    | FTSE KLCI       | Jan 25, 2020                                 | 59           | 36                              | 4.81                           |
| 23      | Mexico      | S&P,BMV IPC     | Feb 28, 2020                                 | 31           | 82                              | 5.18                           |
| 24      | Morocco     | Moroccan All Shares | Mar 02, 2020                      | 33           | 68                              | 5.77                           |
| 25      | Namibia     | FTSE NSX Overall | Mar 14, 2020                          | 21           | 45                              | 5.19                           |
| 26      | Netherlands | AEX             | Feb 27, 2020                                 | 33           | 53                              | 3.34                           |
| 27      | New Zealand | NZX 50          | Feb 28, 2020                                 | 40           | 49                              | 4.17                           |
| 28      | Nigeria     | NSE 30          | Feb 28, 2020                                 | 33           | 55                              | 5.45                           |
| 29      | Philippines | Psei Composite  | Jan 30, 2020                                 | 51           | 44                              | 4.92                           |
| 30      | Poland      | WIG 30          | Mar 04, 2020                                 | 29           | 93                              | 4.75                           |
| 31      | Portugal    | PSI 20          | Mar 02, 2020                                 | 31           | 99                              | 4.5                            |
| 32      | Russia      | MOEX            | Jan 31, 2020                                 | 53           | 95                              | 5.26                           |
| 33      | Singapore   | FTSE Straits Times Singapore | Jan 23, 2020                     | 60           | 8                               | 4.08                           |
| 34      | Slovenia    | Blue-Chip SBITOP | Mar 05, 2020                      | 27           | 88                              | 5.03                           |
| 35      | South Africa | TOP 40         | Mar 05, 2020                                 | 28           | 49                              | 4.785                          |
| 36      | Spain       | IBEX 35         | Feb 01, 2020                                 | 53           | 86                              | 4.8                            |
| 37      | Sweden      | OMX Stockholm 30 | Jan 31, 2020                         | 53           | 29                              | 3.45                           |
| 38      | Switzerland | SMI             | Feb 25, 2020                                 | 35           | 58                              | 3.52                           |
| 39      | Thailand    | SET Index       | Jan 22, 2020                                 | 59           | 64                              | 5.71                           |
| 40      | Turkey      | BIST 100        | Mar 11, 2020                                 | 26           | 85                              | 4.61                           |
| 41      | United Kingdom | FTSE 100   | Jan 31, 2020                                 | 53           | 35                              | 4.17                           |
| 42      | United States | S & P 500   | Jan 22, 2020                                 | 59           | 46                              | 3.99                           |
| 43      | Zambia      | LSE All Share   | Mar 18, 2020                                 | 17           | 50                              | 4.45                           |
|         | Mean/total  |                |                                             | 1769         | 61.47                           | 4.55                           |

* We start sample from the day the issue caught public eye and databases started reporting information, although China had cases well before Jan 22, 2020.
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2010) and GLOBE Project (House et al. 2004)’s frameworks of national cultures to measure national-level uncertainty aversion of investors. Use of alternative measures of uncertainty avoidance from two frameworks would reduce measurement error and help to check the robustness of our results. Last two columns in Table 1 report the country-level values of uncertainty avoidance indexes from both frameworks.

Initially, Hofstede (1980) measured national culture using data of employees’ surveys which was collected from IBM subsidiaries in 40 countries over the period 1967-1973. Later, Hofstede (2001) and Hofstede et al. (2010) validated and updated their data for more countries. In this framework, uncertainty avoidance index for sample countries ranges from 0 to 100, where country index value reflects the relative position of a country versus others, rather than being absolute value.

In contrast, House et al. (2004) collected survey data from middle-level managers working in financial services, food-processing and telecommunication services industries over the period 1994-97 to measure national culture. We use uncertainty avoidance values (should be) variable which is comparable with Hofstede’s variable of uncertainty avoidance.

3.2. Hypothesis

Hofstede (1980) defines uncertainty avoidance as the degree to which members of a culture feel uncomfortable with uncertain/unstructured situations and this feeling, among other things, is expressed through a need for predictability. Individuals from cultures with higher uncertainty avoidance do not accept uncertainty easily and become upset with it (Hofstede 2001). They react quite quickly when their threat-related anxiety deviates from their comfort zone, the variance of which is quite narrow. On the contrary, individuals from lower uncertainty avoidance cultures embrace uncertainty rather easily and can tolerate higher risks in ambiguous situations. They react quite slowly when their threat-related anxiety deviates from their comfort zone, the variance of which is quite wide. Since Covid-19 is a rare event and entails enormous Knightian uncertainty (or ambiguity), where probabilities of different outcomes are unknown. Though stock markets reacted to Covid-19 with negative returns (Ashraf 2020b), however investors in countries with higher uncertainty avoidance would price uncertainty in more negative way and panic sell even at lower stock prices. Conversely, the reaction of investors with lower uncertainty avoidance would not be that strong because of higher tolerance to uncertainty. Based on this discussion our hypothesis is as follows:

H1. : Stock markets’ reaction to the Covid-19 with negative returns is expected to be stronger in countries with higher cultural uncertainty avoidance as compared to the market reaction in countries with lower uncertainty avoidance.

4. Methodology

Following Ashraf (2020a,b), we specify following pooled panel ordinary least squares regression model for empirical analyses.

$$Y_{c,t} = \alpha_c + \beta_1 (COVID - 19_{c,t-1} \times \text{Uncertainty avoidance}_c) + \beta_2 (COVID - 19_{c,t-1})$$

$$+ \beta_3 (\text{Uncertainty avoidance}_c) + \sum_{k=1}^{l} \beta_k X^k_d + \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \epsilon_D + \epsilon_{c,t} \quad (1)$$

Here, c and t subscripts represent country and day, respectively. $\alpha_c$ is a constant term. Y is the dependent variable and represents stock market returns in county c on day t. Specifically, daily stock market return equals $(\text{Indexvalue}_t - \text{Indexvalue}_{t-1}) / \text{Indexvalue}_{t-1}$. Building on the findings of Ashraf (2020b) that stock markets’ negative reaction was significant only to the growth in confirmed cases, but not to the growth in deaths, we measure Covid-19 as the daily growth in confirmed cases. Uncertainty avoidance represents the national-level uncertainty avoidance of investors and is measured with two alternative indexes from Hofstede (2010) and House et al. (2004). The interaction term, $\text{COVID} - 19_{c,t-1} \times \text{Uncertainty avoidance}_c$, is the main variable of interest where the estimated values of coefficient, $\beta_1$, show whether the reaction of stock market investors to Covid-19 depends on national-level of uncertainty avoidance.

$X^k_d$ is a set of country-level control variables including investment freedom, democratic accountability and log (GDP). Since uncertainty avoidance in Eq. (1) mainly represents the uncertainty aversion of investors who are national of a country, however equity markets may also have allowed foreign investors’ participation. To quantify uncertainty avoidance of these foreign investors is quite complicated task, if not impossible, because such investors might have come from different nationalities carrying diverse cultural values (Lucey and Zhang 2010; Aggarwal et al. 2012). Therefore, rather than to directly measure uncertainty avoidance of foreign investors, we add investment freedom index from Heritage Foundation database (Heritage Foundation 2020). This index measures stock market liberalization, including the extent of foreign investors’ participation in local stock market, and acts as an ex-ante proxy to control for foreign investors’ participation in local stock market.

While reacting to the Covid-19, stock market investors may also have priced in institutional and economic capacity of their countries to minimize future expected economic losses. Therefore we include democratic accountability and Log(GDP) as control variables. Democratic accountability index is from the International Country Risk Guide database and measures the quality of political institutions. Log (GDP) equals the natural logarithm of total gross domestic product (GDP) of each country, where the data of GDP is collected from the World Development Indicators of World Bank. Lastly, we include a set of daily fixed-effects dummy variables, $D_d$, to control for stock markets’ reaction to daily international events. These dummy variables equal 1 for a specific day and 0 for all others days, with a total of 70 dummy variables for 70 data days. These dummy variables effectively control for systematic risk due to international factors. $\epsilon_{c,t}$ is an error term. We use heteroskedastic-robust standard errors to estimate p-values in regressions.
5. Empirical analyses

This section reports empirical results. Table 2 reports summary statistics. The -0.35 mean value of stock market returns shows overall stock markets declined over the sample period. Minimum and maximum values of -0.11 and 0.08, respectively, suggest daily market returns experienced wide fluctuations. Likewise, growth in confirmed Covid-19 cases has a mean value of 17 percent with a wide standard deviation of 35 percent. Both uncertainty avoidance indexes also demonstrate considerable variation across mean values. Democratic accountability has a mean value of 4.85 and ranges from 1.5 to 6 where 1.5 indicates the lowest and 6 the highest level of democratic accountability. Similarly, investment freedom has a mean value of 67.53 and ranges from 20 to 90, where higher values represent higher investment freedom and vice versa.

Table 3 reports the Pearson correlations between main variables. The positive 0.35 correlation between uncertainty avoidance indexes indicates that they both, to some extent, represent the same construct. Correlations between other variables are also not quite high suggesting the lower chances of multicollinearity in multivariate analysis.

Table 4 reports main empirical results. As shown, the growth in confirmed cases variable enters significantly negative in model 1 confirming the findings of previous studies such as Ashraf (2020b), Alfaro et al. (2020) and Al-Awadhi et al. (2020) that stock markets responded negatively to Covid-19 outbreaks. Uncertainty avoidance also enters negative, although not significant, suggesting that the decline in stock returns was higher in countries with higher uncertainty aversion. The interaction term, $\text{COVID} - 19_{c,t} \times \text{UncertaintyAvoidance}_c$, enters negative and significant suggesting that the negative impact of growth in confirmed cases on stock market returns strengthens in countries with higher uncertainty avoidance. This result confirms that national culture moderates the relationship between Covid-19 confirmed cases and stock market returns.

To explain the moderating effect with interaction terms, we graph relationship between stock returns and growth in confirmed cases at mean and $\pm$ one standard deviation of mean value of both uncertainty avoidance indexes one-by-one. Graphs 1 and 2 in Fig. 2 are drawn from models 3 and 5, respectively, of Table 4. The downward slopped lines in both graphs indicate that stock returns and growth in confirmed cases are negatively associated. However, lines with different slopes in each graph show that the negative association between stock returns and growth in confirmed cases varies at different levels of uncertainty avoidance. Specifically, the lower steeper lines in both graphs indicate that the decline in stock returns in response to one percent increase in growth in confirmed cases is stronger if the uncertainty avoidance is higher. Together, these results support our hypothesis 1.

We perform several robustness tests. First, stock market reaction tends to be stronger in early days of Covid-19 outbreak (Ashraf 2020b). However, in the above analysis, some sample countries have already passed peaks of local Covid-19 outbreaks, such as China, among others. Therefore, to get a consistent event window across countries we keep data of up to 30 days of local outbreak (starting from the day of first confirmed case) for each country. This reduces sample to 834 observations. We re-estimate Eq. (1) with this data. As shown in Table 5, the interaction terms enter negative and significant, again confirming the above main results. Second, we include additional control variables including stringency and income support indexes from Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker (OxCGRT) database (Hale et al. 2020), anti-self dealing index from Djankov et al. (2008) and regulatory quality index from World Governance Indicators database of World Bank to further eliminate the concern of omitted variables. As shown in Table 6, interaction terms still enter positive and significant after including these additional controls, again confirming the main results. Third, we use panel random-effects model as an alternative estimation method and re-estimate all specifications of Table 4. In unreported results, we observe that findings largely remain same where both interaction terms enter negative and significant.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we examine whether the national-level uncertainty avoidance moderates stock markets’ reaction to Covid-19 pandemic. Using daily data of Covid-19 confirmed cases and stock market returns from 43 countries, we first confirm that overall stock markets responded to the growth in Covid-19 confirmed cases with significant negative returns. Second, we find that the decline in stock returns in response to one percent increase in growth in confirmed cases is stronger if the level of uncertainty aversion of investors is higher. Together our findings suggest that national culture is an important factor which determines the cross-country differences in investors’ response to any news.

The findings of this study have important implications for financial market participants and governments. Our results imply investors overreact to the adverse shock incorporating uncertainty due to cultural biases. Further, although investors try to price in expected economic losses into share prices, however actual decline in stock markets also involves the decline due to investors’ responses to any news.

### Table 2
Summary statistics.

This table reports the summary statistics of main variables.

| Variable                  | Observations | Mean  | Standard deviation | Minimum value | Maximum value |
|---------------------------|--------------|-------|--------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Stock market returns      | 1769         | -0.35 | 3.31               | -10.53        | 7.82          |
| Growth in confirmed cases | 1769         | 0.17  | 0.35               | 0             | 7             |
| Uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede) | 1769 | 61.47 | 23.65              | 8             | 100           |
| Uncertainty avoidance (House) | 1769 | 4.55  | 0.61               | 3.34          | 5.77          |
| Democratic accountability | 1769         | 4.85  | 1.43               | 1.5           | 6             |
| Investment freedom        | 1769         | 67.53 | 18.82              | 20            | 90            |
| Log (GDP)                 | 1769         | 27.40 | 1.39               | 23.33         | 30.60         |
sentiments driven by cultural biases. Buying stocks during market downturn in the countries with higher uncertainty aversion might be a good bet.
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Fig. 2. The relationship between stock market returns and the growth in Covid-19 confirmed cases, depending upon different national-levels of uncertainty avoidance.

Table 5
Moderating effect of national culture on the relationship between Covid-19 and stock market returns: robustness tests with filtered sample.
This table reports the results of robustness tests regarding the moderating impact of uncertainty avoidance on the stock markets’ reaction to Covid-19 with filtered sample. Stock market returns is dependent variable in all models and is measured as the daily change in major stock index of a country. Interaction terms, Growth in confirmed cases × Uncertainty Avoidance (Hofstede) and Growth in confirmed cases × Uncertainty avoidance (House), are main independent variable of interest. Growth in confirmed cases is measured as the daily growth in Covid-19 confirmed cases in a country. Uncertainty Avoidance (Hofstede) is the uncertainty avoidance index from Hofstede et al. (2010)’s framework of national culture. Uncertainty avoidance (House) is the value-based uncertainty avoidance index from House et al (2004)’s framework of national culture. Higher values of both indexes show higher cultural values of uncertainty aversion and vice versa. Democratic accountability is taken from International Country Risk Guide database and represents the quality of political institutions. Investment freedom is taken from Freedom House website and controls for stock market liberalization. Log (GDP) is taken from World Development Indicators (WDI) of World Bank and controls for the level of economic development. Panel pooled ordinary least squares model, with heteroskedasticity robust standard errors, is used for estimations. P-values are given in parenthesis. ***, **, * represent statistical significance at 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively.

| Variables | Stock market returns |
|-----------|----------------------|
|           | (1)      | (2)      | (3)      | (4)      | (5)      |
| Growth in confirmed cases | -0.382** | -0.384** | 0.632 | -0.392** | 1.689* |
| Uncertainty Avoidance (Hofstede) | -0.002 | 0.001 |
| Growth in confirmed cases × Uncertainty Avoidance (Hofstede) | -0.016*** |
| Uncertainty avoidance (House) | -0.202 | -0.081 |
| Growth in confirmed cases × Uncertainty avoidance (House) | -0.489** | |
| Democratic accountability | 0.054 | 0.057 | 0.052 | 0.032 | 0.038 |
| Investment freedom | -0.003 | -0.003 | -0.003 | -0.006 | -0.006 |
| Log (GDP) | 0.020 | 0.027 | 0.024 | 0.002 | 0.005 |
| Daily fixed-effects dummy variables | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Constant | -0.924 | -0.941 | -1.088 | 0.893 | 0.300 |
| Observations | 834 | 834 | 834 | 834 | 834 |
| R-squared | 0.609 | 0.610 | 0.611 | 0.610 | 0.612 |
Table 6
Moderating effect of national culture on the relationship between Covid-19 and stock market returns: robustness tests with additional control variables.

This table reports the results of robustness tests regarding the moderating impact of uncertainty avoidance on the stock markets’ reaction to Covid-19 with additional control variables. Stock market returns is dependent variable in all models and is measured as the daily change in major stock index of a country. Interaction terms, Growth in confirmed cases × Uncertainty Avoidance (Hofstede) and Growth in confirmed cases × Uncertainty avoidance (House), are main independent variable of interest. Growth in confirmed cases is measured as the daily growth in Covid-19 confirmed cases in a country. Uncertainty Avoidance (Hofstede) is the uncertainty avoidance index from Hofstede et al. (2010)’s framework of national culture. Uncertainty avoidance (House) is the value-based uncertainty avoidance index from House et al. (2004)’s framework of national culture. Higher values of both indexes show higher cultural values of uncertainty aversion and vice versa. Democratic accountability is taken from International Country Risk Guide database and represents the quality of political institutions. Investment freedom is taken from Freedom House website and controls for stock market liberalization. Log (GDP) is taken for World Development Indicators (WDI) of World Bank and controls for the level of economic development. Stringency index and Economic support index are taken from Oxford Coronavirus Government Response Tracker. Stringency index represents government announcements regarding social distancing measures such as closure of schools, work places and public places and restrictions on travel. Economic support index represents government announcements of income support and debt/contract relief for households. Anti-self dealing index is from Djankov et al. (2008) and measures legal protection to minority shareholders. Regulatory quality index is from World Governance Indicators of World Bank. Panel pooled ordinary least squares model, with heteroskedasticity robust standard errors, is used for estimations. P-values are given in parenthesis. ***, **, * represent statistical significance at 1%, 5%, and 10% levels, respectively.

| Variables                                           | Stock market returns |
|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
|                                                     | (1)                  |
|                                                     | (2)                  |
|                                                     | (3)                  |
|                                                     | (4)                  |
| Growth in confirmed cases                           | 0.485                |
|                                                     | (0.135)              |
| Uncertainty Avoidance (Hofstede)                    | 0.001                |
|                                                     | (0.799)              |
| Growth in confirmed cases × Uncertainty Avoidance   | -0.015***            |
| (Hofstede)                                          | (0.005)              |
| Uncertainty avoidance (House)                       | -0.077               |
|                                                     | (0.551)              |
| Growth in confirmed cases × Uncertainty avoidance   | -0.397**             |
| (House)                                             | (0.042)              |
| Democratic accountability                            | 0.007                |
|                                                     | (0.880)              |
| Investment freedom                                  | -0.002               |
|                                                     | (0.651)              |
| Log (GDP)                                           | 0.035                |
|                                                     | (0.439)              |
| Stringency index                                    | -0.019               |
|                                                     | (0.198)              |
| Income support index                                 | 0.008                |
|                                                     | (0.366)              |
| Anti-self dealing index                              | -0.114               |
|                                                     | (0.667)              |
| Regulatory quality                                  | 0.135                |
|                                                     | (0.291)              |
| Daily fixed-effects dummy variables                 | Yes                  |
| Constant                                            | -1.235               |
|                                                     | (0.368)              |
| Observations                                        | 1.706                |
| R-squared                                           | 0.594                |
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