# The Influence of Contextual Factors on the Initial Phases of the COVID-19 Outbreak across U.S. Counties

**Wolfgang Messner** ✉
University of South Carolina

**Sarah E. Payson**
University of South Carolina

May 13, 2020

**Objectives**. The COVID-19 pandemic in early 2020 poses an unprecedented threat to the health and economic prosperity of the world's population. Given incomplete reporting of contextual disaggregation in cumulative case data reported by health departments in the U.S., this research links county- and state-level characteristics to the COVID-19 outbreak.

**Methods**. A statistical exponential growth model is estimated to describe the outbreak rate using publicly available county-level outbreak data. County- and state-level effects are simultaneously tested with a multilevel linear model using full maximum likelihood.

**Results**. Mirroring findings from international cultural research, collectivism as a value is positively associated with the outbreak rate. The racial and ethnic composition of counties contributes to differences in the outbreak, with Black/African and Asian Americans being more affected. As expected, counties with a higher median age have a stronger outbreak, and so do counties with more people below the age of 18. Higher income, education, and personal health are generally associated with a lower outbreak. Contrariwise, obesity is negatively and significantly related to the outbreak, in agreement with the value expectancy concepts of the health belief model. Smoking is negatively related, but only directionally informative. Air pollution is another significant contributor to the outbreak, but population density does not give statistical significance.

**Conclusions**. The results show that contextual factors influence the initial outbreak of COVID-19. Because of a high intrastate and intercounty variation in these factors, policy makers need to look at pandemics from the smallest subdivision possible, so that countermeasures can be implemented effectively.

**Keywords:** COVID-19; Novel coronavirus; Outbreak; Pandemic; Regional differences.

**CONTACT**. **Wolfgang Messner**, wolfgang.messner@moore.sc.edu, Darla Moore School of Business, University of South Carolina, 1014 Greene Street, Columbia, SC 29208, U.S. | **Sarah E. Payson**, spayson@email.sc.edu; Darla Moore School of Business, University of South Carolina, 1014 Greene Street, Columbia, SC 29208, U.S.

## Introduction

First reports of a pneumonia of unknown etiology emerged in Wuhan, China, on December 31, 2019. The virus was soon after isolated and identified as severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), but it proved to be extremely contagious, as the outbreak quickly spread beyond Wuhan. In the U.S., the first case of COVID-19, the disease caused by SARS-CoV-2, was reported on January 22, 2020. In the struggle to contain the pandemic, the U.S. Government took unprecedented action, imposing international and domestic travel restrictions, closing businesses, and enacting state-wide stay at home orders and social distancing mandates. However, the number of cases in the U.S. grew to over 593000 as of April 14, and crossed one million on April 28.[1]

The local popular press and epidemiological research alike are reporting differences in the outbreak, sometimes between neighboring counties (see Figure 1 and 2).[2,3] Undoubtedly, a community's susceptibility to any virus is determined by a variety of factors, including but not limited to biological determinants, demographic profiles, and socioeconomic characteristics.[4] Because these factors vary significantly across the U.S., a considerable intra-country variation in the COVID-19 outbreak does not come as a surprise. For instance, COVID-19 fatalities in New York, an epicenter of the outbreak in the U.S., disproportionally affect males and people belonging to older age groups, from Black/African and Hispanic ethnicities, and with certain comorbidities.[5]

As of May 09, 2020, 53.0% of cumulative COVID-19 data reported by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention are missing race and 57.4% ethnicity disaggregation. Because information about many other individual variables is lacking as well, we deploy an ecological analysis using data at both the county- and state-level to determine the risks associated with several contextual factors in contracting the COVID-19 disease. We use a two-level hierarchical linear model with full maximum likelihood to simultaneously test and disentangle county- and state-level effects.

We hope our study contributes to various strands of current COVID-19 research leading to a more thorough understanding of the outbreak. First, we note that contextual factors influence the COVID-19 outbreak in the U.S. at a state- and county-level. Significant variations in the outbreak exist both between states as well as counties within a state.[3] We recommend policy makers to look at pandemics from the smallest population possible for an effective implementation of countermeasures and provision of critical resources. Second, we develop an understanding of how cultural differences within the U.S. relate to regional variations in the outbreak, driven by specific psychological functioning of individuals and the enduring effects of cultural differences on the political processes, governmental institutions, and public policies.[6,7] Third, we debunk rumors propagated in the popular press that a state's leadership, as expressed by the political party in control or the gender of its governor, has a statistically significant influence on the outbreak.[8,9] Fourth, we identify how the virus affects counties differently, depending on their demographic profile. Income and education are especially important confounds in understanding the outbreak. Fifth, while many personal health factors show up as important confounds for the outbreak, we identify the prevalence of obesity and smoking in counties to be negatively related with the outbreak. Sixth, building on previous studies showing that air

pollution is linked to the death rate, we show that air pollution also contributes to the number of cases.

## Methods

In the following, we explain our estimation of the outbreak rate and the reasoning of including certain contextual factors at the U.S. county- and state-levels. Table 1 summarizes our data sources and their provenance.

### Outbreak rate

We obtain COVID-19 outbreak data from USA Facts (as of April 14, 2020).[1] Since January 22, 2020, this database has aggregated data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and state- and local-level public health agencies, confirming them by referencing state and local agencies directly. The 21 cases confirmed on the Grand Princess cruise ship on March 05 and 06, 2020 are not attributed to any counties in California. For our county-level analysis, we discard cases which USA Facts can only allocate at the state, but not at the county level due to a lack of information. On average, the number of unallocated cases is only 308 per state (as of April 14), but a few states have as many as 4866 (New Jersey), 1300 (both Rhode Island and Georgia), or 1216 (Washington State). Following approaches by the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation at the University of Washington[10] and the COVID-19 Modeling Consortium at the University of Texas at Austin,[11] we statistically model the outbreak using the exponential growth equation $\frac{dy}{dt} = b\,y$, where $b$ is a positive constant called the relative growth rate; it has units of inverse time**.** Going forward, we simply refer to $b$ as the outbreak rate. The shape of the trends in case counts enables us to see differences between counties.[12] Solutions to this differential equation have the form $y = a\,e^{bt}$, where $a$ is the initial value of cases $y$. The doubling time $T_d$ can be calculated from the exponential growth rate as $T_d = \frac{\ln(2)}{b}$. We calculate the outbreak rate for 1987 out of 3142 counties in the 50 U.S. states that have a minimum of 10 reported cases as of April 14, 2020. This is a statistical, but not an epidemiological model, that is**,** we are neither trying to model infection transmission nor estimate epidemiological parameters, such as the pathogen's reproductive or attack rate. Instead, we are fitting a curve to observed outbreak data at the county level. A change-point analysis using the Fisher discriminant ratio as a kernel function does not show any significant change points in the outbreak, and therefore justifies modeling the COVID-19 outbreak as a phenomenon of unrestricted population growth.[13] A disadvantage of this statistical approach is that we cannot forecast outbreak dynamics, though we do not require extrapolated data in our work.

### Cultural values

Culture can be defined as a set of values that are shared in a given social group. While these values are often used to distinguish countries,[14,15] more than 80% of cultural variation resides within countries.[16] The original North American colonies were settled by people hailing from various countries, who have spread their influence across mutually exclusive areas. Their distinct cultures are still with us today.[7,17] Although today's U.S. states are not strictly synonymous with these cultural areas, there is abundant evidence that political boundaries can serve as useful proxies for culture.[18]

One of the most useful constructs to emerge from cultural social psychology is the individualism-collectivism bipolarity. It has proven useful in describing cultural variations in behaviors, attitudes, and values. Briefly, individualism is a preference for a loosely knit social framework, whereas collectivism represents a preference for a tightly knit framework, in which its members are interdependent and expected to look after each other in exchange for unquestioning loyalty. While the majority of research on individualism and collectivism involves comparing countries,[15] we use a collectivism index developed at the level of states solely within the U.S.[6] Previous studies have shown that the regional prevalence of pathogens and international differences in the COVID-19 outbreak are positively associated with collectivism.[18,19]

### Institutional confounders

In addition to culture, we include various institutional confounders at the state-level, such as the political affiliation of a state's governor, the gender of the governor, and government spending per capita. Government plays a critical role in policy development and implementation, and the state-level differences could influence growth rates of the pandemic.[8,20]

### Racial composition

First systematic reviews about COVID-19 incidences from China relied on ethnically homogenous cohorts.[21,22] Ethnically diverse populations, such as in the U.K. and U.S., can contribute to our understanding of effects on different ethnic groups, which may exhibit different socioeconomic, cultural, or lifestyle factors, genetic predisposition and pathophysiological differences in susceptibility or response to infection. Certain vitamin or mineral deficiencies, differences in insulin resistance or vaccination policies in countries of birth may also be contributing factors.[22] We include variables measuring the composition of U.S. counties regarding Black/African, Asian, Hispanic, Native American, and Native Hawaiian racial and ethnic groups.

### Income and education

Poverty is arguably the greatest risk factor for acquiring and succumbing to disease worldwide, but has historically received less attention from the medical community than genetic or environmental risk factors. The global HIV crisis brought into sharp relief the vulnerability of financially strapped health systems, and revealed disparities in health outcomes along economic fault lines.[23] We include the median household income to measure potential economic disparities between U.S. counties. In addition, we also measure the percentage of population that is not proficient in English and the average math performance of students. Lower educational levels may result in a lower aptitude as it relates to understanding and effectively responding to the pandemic.

### Other demographics

Age and gender also play a potential role in a population's susceptibility. During the aging process, immune functions decline, rendering the host more vulnerable to certain viruses.[24] We use the percentage of population below 18 years of age and their median age to determine potential effect of differences in mobility, response, and lifestyle factors. We also control for the percentage of the population that is female. In Italy, one COVID-19 study of 1,591 cases of critically ill people who were admitted into intensive care units showed that about 82% of them were men.[25] Other studies have found similar results, all of which point towards the finding that males may be disproportionally affected by COVID-19.[26]

### Personal health

Good overall personal health is a general indicator for disease resistance. Additionally, the health belief model suggests that a person's belief in a personal threat of a disease, together with faith in the effectiveness of behavioral recommendations, predicts the likelihood of the person adopting the behavior.[27] We use the percentage of the population that reports insufficient amount of sleep, is obese (as defined by a body mass index above 30), and smokes daily. Given the latter two are publicized risk factors for COVID-19, there is a potential for greater caution following the value-expectancy concepts of the health belief model. Yet, medicinal nicotine has been identified as a potential protective factor against infection by SARS-CoV-2.[28,29] We also measure the preventable hospitalization rate (that is, the rate of hospital stays for ambulatory-care sensitive conditions) as a potential indicator of poor personal health checkups; higher levels on the social association rate (that is, the average number of membership associations) are generally associated with more positive mental health and happiness.

### External health

Previous studies suggest that exposure to pollution can suppress immune responses and proliferate the transmission of infectious diseases,[30] and that the COVID-19 mortality rate is associated with air pollution.[31] However, the impact of air pollution on the spread of COVID-19 is not yet known.[30] We use the 2014 average daily density of fine particulate matter $PM_{2.5}$ to measure air pollution across U.S. counties, and the percentage of population living in rural areas to account for physical distancing being more prevalent in rural areas. In addition, the food environment index reflects access to grocery stores and healthy foods.

### Other confounders

Population density and overcrowding is significant when considering public health crises, facilitating the spread of diseases in developing and developed countries alike.[32] As the climate is another highly publicized confounder potentially influencing the COVID-19 transmission rate,[33] we also include each county's average temperature during February and March 2020. To control for potential confounding by temporality of the outbreak, we bring in a variable representing the number of days between January 01 and the 10$^{th}$ confirmed case reported.

## Statistical methods and results

To simultaneously test county- and state-level effects of contextual factors on the outbreak rate with cross-level interactions, we estimate a two-level linear model using full maximum likelihood in HLM 7.03 (Figure 3). This accounts for potential similarities in counties within the same state.[30] We center all predictors around the group mean at level 1 and grand mean at level 2.

We first estimate a one-way random effects ANOVA (unconditional model), which has an intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) of 0.243. That is, more than 24% of the variation in the outbreak rate is between states, and about 76% is within the states and between their counties (see Figure 1 and 2). The variation between states is statistically significant ($u_0$ = 4.50E-04, $p < 0.001$). We thus deem it essential to proceed with a multilevel model as follows:

Level 1 (counties): $Outbreak\ rate_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j}[Black\ \&\ African\ American] + \beta_{2j}[Native\ American] + \beta_{3j}[Asian\ American] + \beta_{4j}[Native\ Hawaiian] + \beta_{5j}[Hispanic\ American] + \beta_{6j}[Household\ income] + \beta_{7j}[Nonproficiency\ in\ English] + \beta_{8j}[Math\ grade] + \beta_{9j}[Persons\ under\ 18\ years] + \beta_{10j}[Median\ age] + \beta_{11j}[Female\ persons] + \beta_{12j}[Social\ associations] + \beta_{13j}[Sleep\ deprivation] + \beta_{14j}[Preventable\ hospitalization] + \beta_{15j}[Obesity] + \beta_{16j}[Smoking] + \beta_{17j}[Air\ pollution] + \beta_{18j}[Rural\ area] + \beta_{19j}[Food\ environment] + \beta_{20j}[Outbreak\ date] + \beta_{21j}[Density] + \beta_{22j}[Temperature] + r_{ij}$

Level 2 (states): $\beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}[Party\ control] + \gamma_{02}[Gender\ of\ governor] + \gamma_{03}[Government\ spending] + \gamma_{04}[Collectivism] + u_{0j}; \beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + u_{1j};\ \beta_{2j} = \gamma_{20};\ \beta_{3j} = \gamma_{30};\ \beta_{4j} = \gamma_{40};\ \beta_{5j} = \gamma_{50};\ \beta_{6j} = \gamma_{60};\ \beta_{7j} = \gamma_{70};\ \beta_{8j} = \gamma_{80};\ \beta_{9j} = \gamma_{90};\ \beta_{10j} = \gamma_{100};\ \beta_{11j} = \gamma_{110};\ \beta_{12j} = \gamma_{120};\ \beta_{13j} = \gamma_{130};\ \beta_{14j} = \gamma_{140};\ \beta_{15j} = \gamma_{150};\ \beta_{16j} = \gamma_{160};\ \beta_{17j} = \gamma_{170};\ \beta_{18j} = \gamma_{180}; \beta_{19j} = \gamma_{190} + u_{19j}; \beta_{20j} = \gamma_{200} + u_{20j}; \beta_{21j} = \gamma_{21}; \beta_{22j} = \gamma_{22}$

We provide the inter-item correlation matrix in Table 2, and the results of the multilevel model in Table 3. Additionally, we perform several robustness tests to inform our results.

First, because outbreak rates change over time and their estimation is somewhat sensitive to the starting figure,[34] we alternatively calculate it after 10 and 25 cases in the respective unit, finding a high correlation among the rates. When using the outbreak rate calculated after 10 cases, the outbreak date as a control variable changes its sign and loses significance ($p = 0.065$). Notably, the following coefficients gain significance: government spending ($p = 0.064$); temperature ($p = 0.011$). Conversely, the following coefficients lose significance: household income ($p = 0.989$); food environment ($p = 0.144$); density ($p = 0.709$). More importantly, the signs of the coefficients remain the same. Also, the variable outbreak date controls for temporality of the outbreak in the original model (1.912, [1.322; 2.502], $p < 0.001$).

Second, we iteratively include several other contextual variables and logged versions of the variables to assess the robustness of the results. But because it is nearly impossible to establish a complete list of confounding variables, we quantify the potential impact of unobserved confounds (Table 3; impact threshold).[35] For instance, the necessary impact of such a confound for air pollution would be 0.043, that is, to invalidate the variable's inference on the outbreak rate, a confounding variable would have to be correlated with both the outbreak rate and air pollution at $\sqrt{0.043} = 0.207$. Next, to alleviate concerns that some counties are omitted from the analysis because they are not yet affected by the virus,[30] we ask how many counties would have to be replaced with unobserved cases for which the null hypothesis is true (i.e., the contextual variables have no influence on the outbreak rate) in order to invalidate the inference.[36] As Table 3 (confound threshold) shows, 43.962% of the counties would have to be replaced with counties for which the effect is zero in order to invalidate the influence of air pollution. In summary, it can be claimed that the influence of the identified contextual variables on the pandemic's growth rate is reasonably robust.

Third, a potential omission of relevant variables can lead to multicollinearity issues, which are generally a serious problem in epidemiological studies.[37] Even though HLM 7.03 checks for multicollinearity, we conduct several additional diagnostics to eliminate any potential issues. In the inter-item correlation matrix (Table 2), the average (absolute) correlation is 0.172, and the

highest correlation is 0.754, which is below the typical cutoff of 0.8. Most high correlations exist between racial composition and income and education. Additionally, we conduct a linear regression analysis at level 1 in IBM SPSS 26 ($R^2$ = 0.495; without variable math grade; pairwise exclusion of missing values), and find that the variable inflation factor (VIF) never exceeds the threshold of 5 (highest being nonproficiency in English, 4.024). The variance-decomposition matrix also does not show any groups of predictors with high values.

Fourth, we rerun our model excluding the 23 counties of the New York metropolitan area. As a COVID-19 hotspot, they could unduly influence our analysis. All signs remain the same, and the following coefficients gain significance: household income ($p$ = 0.009); persons under 18 years ($p$ = 0.038).

Fifth, because there is no statistically correct choice for centering decisions in multi-level models,[38] we retest our model with raw values. With the exception of the variable collectivism losing statistical significance ($p$ = 0.711), the results are fully consistent with the group- and grand-mean centered predictors in Table 3.

Lastly, we are aware that an accurate estimation and comparison of the outbreak rate across units depends on similar testing strategies, test sensitivities, specificities, and reporting of tests performed vs. individuals tested.[12,39] Even within the U.S., some states report tests performed and others individuals tested.[39] The number of tests administered and the number of confirmed cases therefore correlates to varying extents across states.[40] By using a multi-level model in our study, we aim to accommodate such differences between states.

## Discussion

In the absence of national-level data controlled for location and disaggregated by race and ethnicity, demographics, information about comorbidity and other personal health variables, an ecological analysis provides an alternative to measure the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 across the U.S. and among segments of Americans. It may be contrary to expectations that the outbreak rate of a new pathogen, which is able to infect virtually anyone, manifests contextual disparities. But for other conditions, such as HIV and cancer, regional health disparities have been reported before,[41,42] and with the current study we show that contextual factors in the U.S. also create a variation in COVID-19 cases.

Our analysis indicates that higher outbreak rates can be found in U.S. states characterized by a higher cultural value of collectivism (coefficient 0.998, confidence interval [0.351; 1.645], $p$ = 0.004). As Table 2 shows, collectivistic values are more prevalent in counties that are warmer (correlation with temperature 0.715, $p < 0.001$) and have a higher percentage of people with a Black/African background (with Black/African American 0.539, $p < 0.001$). This mirrors findings from international cultural research.[15] Conversely, we cannot find any statistical evidence that the government spending, the gender of the governor, or the party in control would be in any way linked to the outbreak. This certainly debunks myths spread by the popular media.[43]

But a disproportionately stronger outbreak of COVID-19 cases can be found in counties with a higher percentage of Black/African (1.158, [0.725; 1.591], $p < 0.001$) and Asian Americans (1.305, [0.166; 2.444], $p$ = 0.025), which supports prior infection and mortality studies in the U.S. and U.K.[22,44] The former counties are also characterized by a higher rate of sleep deprivation (0.568, $p < 0.001$) and warmer temperatures (0.533, $p < 0.001$). The latter have a higher population density

(0.553, $p < 0.001$). While we found sleep deprivation to be associated with a higher outbreak rate (1.557; [0.412; 2.702], $p = 0.008$), a positive influence of population density (0.050, [-0.009; 0.109], $p = 0.095$) and temperature (0.301, [-0.518; 1.120], $p = 0.472$) is only directionally informative, but not statistically significant.

Conversely, counties with more Hispanic Americans are less affected by the pandemic, with borderline statistical significance (-0.447, [-0.915; 0.021], $p = 0.061$). We could not find a significant effect for counties with a higher Native American (0.763, [-0.209; 1.735], $p = 0.124$) or Hawaiian population (1.478, [0.506; 2.450], $p = 0.538$) though.

We see that higher income and education levels are associated with a less aggressive outbreak (household income: -3.854, [-7.437; -0.271]; $p = 0.035$; nonproficiency in English: 2.090; [0.547; 3.633]; $p = 0.008$; math grade: -0.002, [-0.004; 000]; $p < 0.001$). In counties with a higher household income, the obesity rate and the percentage of smokers tends to be lower (-0.518, $p < 0.001$ and -0.666, $p < 0.001$ respectively). Conversely, both are negatively associated with the outbreak rate. The effect of the obesity rate is highly significant (-1.093, [-1.828; -0.358], $p = 0.004$), but the effect of the percentage of smokers is only directionally informative (-0.784, [-3.150; 1.582], $p = 0.516$). Studies report that people with obesity are at increased risk of developing severe COVID-19 symptoms,[45] but, to the best of our knowledge, a link to the infection rate has not yet been established. It could be that people with obesity heed the warnings issued by the CDC, and are extra careful avoiding social contact, in line with the value expectancy concepts of the health belief model.[27] Other studies report that smoking or medicinal nicotine might be a protective factor against infection by SARS-CoV-2;[28,29] our ecological data does not contradict this finding. Many other variables related to good personal health are related to a slower outbreak (social associations: -2.027, [-2.911; -1.143], $p < 0.001$; sleep deprivation: 1.557, [0.412; 2.702], $p = 0.008$; preventable hospitalization: 0.001, [-0.001; 0.003], $p = 0.207$).

Regarding age-related demographics, we confirm early observations that counties with an older population are more affected by the outbreak, with borderline significance (median age: 0.657, [-0.033; 1.347], $p = 0.062$). Notably, the percentage of persons under 18 years is positively associated with the outbreak rate, again with borderline significance (1.066, [-0.014; 2.146], $p = 0.053$). A possible reason is that younger people physically interact more frequently, closer, and longer with their friends, thus contributing to the spread of the virus. Conversely, we find no effect of differences in gender (0.167, [-0.880; 1.214], $p = 0.755$). None of these demographic variables are strongly correlated with any other variable.

Air pollution is a significant contributor to the outbreak rate (3.329, [1.465; 5.193], $p < 0.001$), and, concurrently, counties with a rural environment experience a slower outbreak (-0.443, [-0.574; -0.312], $p < 0.001$). This calls for studies linking air pollution to the lethality of COVID-19[30,31] to include the outbreak rate as a potential confounding variable. Contrariwise, a better food environment is associated with a higher outbreak rate (5.996, [1.286; 10.706], $p = 0.016$). While the food environment index is usually associated with a healthier lifestyle, better access to grocery stores and supermarkets in the vicinity also means more interaction with other people, and thus an increased likelihood of transmission.

As a final point, we want to note that we have presented associations between contextual factors and the COVID-19 outbreak which are consistent with the deliberations leading to our research model. However, these associations, even when statistically significant, are not an inference of

causality. Establishing causal inference is, of course, critical for our understanding of and fight against COVID-19, but this represents a direction for further research using more detailed data at the level of individual patients.

## Conflict of interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

## Human participant protection

No humans participated in this study. The original data sources are referenced in the section Methods and in Table 1.

## Funding and acknowledgement

We gratefully acknowledge support through the Darla Moore School of Business and the Center for International Business Education and Research (CIBER) at the University of South Carolina.

## References


1. USA Facts. Coronavirus locations: COVID-19 map by county and state. https://usafacts.org/visualizations/coronavirus-covid-19-spread-map/. Published 2020. Accessed April 14, 2020.
2. Lang A. Why is the coronavirus death rate higher in Horry County than most of South Carolina? *Myrtle Beach Online*. https://www.myrtlebeachonline.com/news/coronavirus/article241915311.html. Published 2020. Accessed April 22, 2020.
3. Messner W, Payson SE. Variation in COVID-19 outbreaks at U.S. state and county levels. *medRxiv*. 2020:1-9. doi:10.1101/2020.04.23.20076943
4. Chen JT, Kahn R, Li R, et al. U.S. county-level characteristics to inform equitable COVID-19 response. *medRxiv*. 2020:1-38. doi:10.1101/2020.04.08.20058248
5. New York State Department of Health. COVID-19 fatalities. https://covid19tracker.health.ny.gov/views/NYS-COVID19-Tracker/NYSDOHCOVID-19Tracker-Fatalities?%3Aembed=yes&%3Atoolbar=no&%3Atabs=n#/views/NYS%252dCOVID19%25. Published 2020. Accessed May 9, 2020.
6. Vandello JA, Cohen D. Patterns of individualism and collectivism across the United States. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 1999;77(2):279-292. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.77.2.279
7. Lieske J. American state cultures: Testing a new measure and theory. *Publius J Fed*. 2012;42(1):108-133. doi:10.1093/publius/pjr018
8. Abutaleb Y, Dawsey J, Nakashima E, Miller G. The U.S. was beset by denial and dysfunction as the coronavirus raged. *The Washington Post*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/national-security/2020/04/04/coronavirus-government-dysfunction. Published April 4, 2020. Accessed May 13, 2020.
9. Wittenberg-Cox A. What do countries with the best coronavirus responses have in common? Women leaders. *Forbes*. https://www.forbes.com/sites/avivahwittenbergcox/2020/04/13/what-do-countries-with-the-best-coronavirus-reponses-have-in-common-women-leaders. Published April 13, 2020. Accessed May 13, 2020.
10. Murray CJ. Forecasting COVID-19 impact on hospital bed-days, ICU-days, ventilator-days and deaths by US state in the next 4 months. *medRxiv*. 2020:1-26. doi:10.1101/2020.03.27.20043752
11. Woody S, Tec M, Dahan M, et al. Projections for first-wave COVID-19 deaths across the U.S. using social-distancing measures derived from mobile phones measures. The University of Texas at Austin COVID-19 Modeling Consortium. https://www.tacc.utexas.edu/ut_covid-19_mortality_forecasting_model_report. Published 2020. Accessed April 19, 2020.
12. Pearce N, Vandenbroucke JP, VanderWeele TJ, Greenland S. Accurate statistics on COVID-19 are essential for policy guidance and decisions. *Am J Public Heal*. 2020;April:e1-e3. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2020.305708
13. Texier G, Farouh M, Pellegrin L, et al. Outbreak definition by change point analysis: A tool for public health decision? *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*. 2016;16(1):1-12. doi:10.1186/s12911-016-0271-x
14. Schwartz SH. Rethinking the concept and measurement of societal culture in light of empirical findings. *J Cross Cult Psychol*. 2014;45(1):5-13. doi:10.1177/0022022113490830

15. Hofstede G. *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations across Nations*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 2001.
16. Kirkman BL, Lowe KB, Gibson CB. A retrospective on Culture's Consequences: The 35-year journey. *J Int Bus Stud*. 2017;48(1):12-29. doi:10.1057/s41267-016-0037-9
17. Woodard C. *American Nations*. London: Penguin; 2011.
18. Fincher CL, Thornhill R, Murray DR, Schaller M. Pathogen prevalence predicts human cross-cultural variability in individualism/collectivism. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci*. 2008;275(1640):1279-1285. doi:10.1098/rspb.2008.0094
19. Messner W. The institutional and cultural context of cross-national variation in COVID-19 outbreaks. *medRxiv*. 2020:1-13. doi:10.1101/2020.03.30.20047589
20. Adolph C, Amano K, Bang-Jensen B, Fullman N, Wilkerson J. Pandemic politics: Timing state-level social distancing responses to COVID-19. *medRxiv*. 2020:1-19. doi:10.1101/2020.03.30.20046326
21. Li B, Yang J, Zhao F, et al. Prevalence and impact of cardiovascular metabolic diseases on COVID-19 in China. *Clin Res Cardiol*. 2020:531-538. doi:10.1007/s00392-020-01626-9
22. Khunti K, Singh AK, Pareek M, Hanif W. Is ethnicity linked to incidence or outcomes of COVID-19? *BMJ*. 2020;369(April):14-15. doi:10.1136/bmj.m1548
23. Alsan MM, Westerhaus M, Herce M, Nakashima K, Farmer PE. Poverty, global health, and infectious disease: Lessons from Haiti and Rwanda. *Infect Dis Clin North Am*. 2011;25(3):611-622. doi:10.1016/j.idc.2011.05.004
24. Schoggins JW. A phospholipase linkAGE to SARS susceptibility. *J Exp Med*. 2015;212(11):1755. doi:10.1084/jem.21211insight2
25. Grasselli G, Zangrillo A, Zanella A, et al. Baseline characteristics and outcomes of 1591 patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 admitted to ICUs of the Lombardy Region, Italy. *JAMA*. 2020;323(16):1574-1581. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.5394
26. Greenfieldboyce N. The new Coronavirus appears to take a greater toll on men than on women. *NPR*. https://www.npr.org/sections/goatsandsoda/2020/04/10/831883664/the-new-coronavirus-appears-to-take-a-greater-toll-on-men-than-on-women. Published April 10, 2020. Accessed May 13, 2020.
27. Strecher VJ, Rosenstock IM. The health belief model. In: Baum A, Newman S, Weinman J, McManus C, West R, eds. *Cambridge Handbook of Psychology, Health and Medicine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1997:113-117.
28. Changeux J-P. A nicotinic hypothesis for COVID-19 with preventive and therapeutic implications. *Comptes Rendus Biol*. 2020;343(1):1-7. doi:10.5802/crbiol.8
29. Tindle HA, Newhouse PA, Freiberg MS. Beyond smoking cessation: Investigating medicinal nicotine to prevent and treat COVID-19. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2020:1-2. doi:10.1093/ntr/ntaa077
30. Wu X, Nethery RC, Sabath MB, Braun D, Dominici F. Exposure to air pollution and COVID-19 mortality in the United States: A nationwide cross-sectional study. *medRxiv*. 2020:1-35. doi:10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004
31. Travaglio M, Popovic R, Yu Y, Leal NS, Miguel L. Links between air pollution and COVID-19 in England. *medRxiv*. 2020:1-13. doi:10.1101/2020.04.16.20067405
32. Kaneda T, Greenbaum C. How demographic changes make us more vulnerable to pandemics like the Coronavirus. Population Reference Bureau. https://www.prb.org/how-demographic-changes-make-us-more-vulnerable-to-pandemics-like-the-coronavirus/. Published 2020. Accessed May 13, 2020.

33. Chiyomaru K, Takemoto K. Global COVID-19 transmission rate is influenced by precipitation seasonality and the speed of climate temperature warming. *medRxiv*. 2020:1-13. doi:10.1101/2020.04.10.20060459
34. White ER, Hébert-Dufresne L. State-level variation of initial COVID-19 dynamics in the United States: The role of local government interventions. *medRxiv*. 2020:1-14. doi:10.1101/2020.04.14.20065318
35. Frank KA. Impact of a confounding variable on a regression coefficient. *Sociol Methods Res*. 2000;29(2):147-194. doi:10.1177/0049124100029002001
36. Frank KA, Maroulis SJ, Duong MQ, Kelcey BM. What would it take to change an inference? Using Rubin's causal model to interpret the robustness of causal inferences. *Educ Eval Policy Anal*. 2013;35(4):437-460. doi:10.3102/0162373713493129
37. P. Vatcheva K, Lee M. Multicollinearity in regression analyses conducted in epidemiologic studies. *Epidemiology*. 2016;06(2):1-9. doi:10.4172/2161-1165.1000227
38. Kreft IGG, de Leeuw J, Aiken LS. The effect of different forms of centering in hierarchical linear models. *Multivariate Behav Res*. 1995;30(1):1-21. doi:10.1207/s15327906mbr3001_1
39. Roser M, Ritchi H, Ortiz-Ospina E. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) - Statistics and research. OurWorldInData.org. https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus. Published 2020. Accessed March 21, 2020.
40. Kaashoek J, Santillana M. COVID-19 positive cases, evidence on the time evolution of the epidemic or an indicator of local testing capabilities? A case study in the United States. *SSRN*. 2020:1-14. doi:10.2139/ssrn.3574849
41. Ransome Y, Kawachi I, Braunstein S, Nash D. Structural inequalities drive late HIV diagnosis: The role of black racial concentration, income inequality, socioeconomic deprivation, and HIV testing. *Heal Place*. 2016;42:148-158. doi:10.1016/j.healthplace.2016.09.004
42. Fang CY, Tseng M. Ethnic density and cancer: A review of the evidence. *Cancer*. 2018;124(9):1877-1903. doi:10.1002/cncr.31177
43. Altman D. Coronavirus reopening is a risk for Republican governors. Axios. https://www.axios.com/coronavirus-reopening-republican-governors-cases-deaths-c0233fd4-8f92-448e-a11c-ec5bded1def1.html. Published 2020. Accessed May 11, 2020.
44. Millett GA, Jones AT, Benkeser D, et al. Assessing differential impacts of COVID-19 on black communities. *medRxiv*. 2020:1-26. doi:10.1101/2020.05.04.20090274
45. Stefan N, Birkenfeld AL, Schulze MB, Ludwig DS. Obesity and impaired metabolic health in patients with COVID-19. *Nat Rev Endocrinol*. 2020:4-5. doi:10.1038/s41574-020-0364-6

## Figure 1: Epidemic days at county level (South Carolina)




The spaghetti lines trace the COVID-19 outbreak in South Carolina (black dashed line) and the counties (straight lines) as a percentage of the cases reported on April 14, 2020. Cases unallocated to a county due to lack of information are included in the state line; counties with less than 20 reported cases are not shown in the diagram.

## Figure 2: Variation in outbreak rates at U.S. county level




This geo map reveals the larger variation in outbreak rates at U.S. county level (April 14, 2020). Lighter colors signify that the pandemic has a slower relative growth rate, and darker colors point to a faster growth.

**Figure 3: Multilevel research model**




This figure details the multi-level research model and the variables used at state- and county-level.

## Table 1: Variables and descriptive statistics

| Variable | Primary source | Secondary source | N | Year(s) | Median | Minimum; maximum | Std. Dev. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| State institutions | | | | | | | |
| Party control | WIK | | 50 | 2020 | | | |
| Gender of governor | WIK | | 50 | 2020 | | | |
| Government spending | SIP | Census Bureau | 51 | 2015 | 10.059 | 16.553 | 3.186 |
| People cultural values | | | | | | | |
| Collectivism | VAN | | 50 | 1997 | 49.500 | [31; 91] | 11.336 |
| Racial composition | | | | | | | |
| Black & African American | CHR | Census population est. | 3130 | 2018 | 2.251 | [0.512; 85.414] | 14.370 |
| Native American | CHR | Census population est. | 3141 | 2018 | 0.640 | [0.000; 92.515] | 7.600 |
| Asian American | CHR | Census population est. | 3141 | 2018 | 0.736 | [0.000; 43.357] | 2.953 |
| Native Hawaiian | CHR | Census population est. | 3141 | 2018 | 0.063 | [0.000; 48.900] | 1.081 |
| Hispanic American | CHR | Census population est. | 3141 | 2018 | 4.405 | [0.610; 96.360] | 14.273 |
| Income & education | | | | | | | |
| Household income | CHR | Small area income and poverty est. | 3140 | 2018 | 50547.500 | [15.229; 140382] | 14124.747 |
| Nonproficiency in English | CHR | Census population est. | 3141 | 2014-18 | 0.748 | [0.000; 51.77] | 3.720 |
| Math grade | CHR | Stanford education data archive | 2467 | 2016 | 3.013 | [1.654; 68943] | 3107.118 |
| Other demographics | | | | | | | |
| Persons under 18 years | CHR | Census population est. | 3140 | 2018 | 22.063 | [7.069; 41.991] | 3.461 |
| Median age | SCP | American community survey | 3142 | 2012-16 | 41.000 | [21.500; 66.000] | 5.355 |
| Female persons | CHR | Census population est. | 3138 | 2018 | 50.301 | [0.192; 76.208] | 2.659 |
| Personal health | | | | | | | |
| Social associations | CHR | County business patterns | 3141 | 2017 | 11.096 | [0.000; 52.314] | 5.912 |
| Sleep deprivation | CHR | Behavioral risk factor surveillance system | 3141 | 2016 | 32.949 | [8.937; 46.708] | 4.282 |
| Preventable hospitalization | CHR | Mapping Medicare disparities tool | 3098 | 2017 | 4705 | [34; 16851] | 1856.793 |
| Obesity | CHR | United States Diabetes Surveillance System | 3072 | 2016 | 31.300 | [11.800; 47.600] | 4.510 |
| Smoking | CHR | Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System | 3072 | 2020 | 17.409 | [6.546; 41.389] | 11.600 |
| External health | | | | | | | |
| Air pollution | CHR | Environmental public health tracking network | 3107 | 2014 | 9.400 | [2.300; 19.700] | 1.985 |
| Rural area | CHR | Census population est. | 3134 | 2010 | 59.517 | [0.000; 100.000] | 31.437 |
| Food environment | CHR | USDA food environment atlas; Map the meal gap from Feeding America | | 2015-17 | 7.700 | [0.000; 34.5000] | 1.512 |
| Other confounders | | | | | | | |
| Density | SCP | American community survey | 3142 | 2012-16 | 44.967 | [0.384; 71615.813] | 1787.612 |
| Temperature [a)] | NCDC | | 3141 | 2017 | 43.000 | [-14.200; 73.500] | 11.650 |

This table lists the independent variables at both levels of analysis and their provenance.
Notes: CHR: County health rankings, www.countyhealthrankings.org; SCP: Social Capital Project, https://www.jec.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/republicans/2018/4/the-geography-of-social-capital-in-america; NCDC: National Centers for Environment Information, https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/cag/county/mapping/1/tavg/202003/2/value; VAN: Collectivism index proposed by Vandello & Cohen (1997);[6] WIK: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_United_States_governors.
[a)] The NCDCs do not provide temperature mapping for Hawaii; all Hawaiian counties replaced by historical average data from http://holiday-weather.com/hawaii/averages. All websites accessed in May 2020.

## Table 2: Inter-item correlation matrix

| | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k | l | m | n |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a | -0.034 | -0.251 | 0.035 | 0.083 | 0.048 | -0.095 | 0.011 | 0.121 | -0.106 | 0.046 | -0.007 | 0.206 | -0.088 |
| b | | 0.052 | -0.368 | -0.102 | 0.049 | -0.027 | -0.024 | -0.104 | 0.003 | -0.066 | -0.023 | 0.001 | 0.079 |
| c | | | -0.389 | -0.200 | 0.004 | 0.134 | 0.007 | -0.043 | 0.269 | -0.013 | 0.004 | -0.030 | 0.054 |
| d | | | | 0.539 | -0.209 | 0.045 | -0.044 | 0.051 | -0.165 | 0.013 | -0.057 | -0.015 | -0.094 |
| e | | | | | -0.104 | 0.013 | -0.011 | -0.127 | -0.321 | -0.035 | -0.002 | -0.074 | -0.141 |
| f | | | | | | -0.047 | 0.015 | 0.009 | -0.095 | -0.002 | 0.004 | 0.232 | -0.110 |
| g | | | | | | | 0.060 | 0.195 | 0.483 | 0.221 | -0.030 | 0.049 | -0.269 |
| h | | | | | | | | 0.250 | -0.139 | 0.630 | 0.755 | -0.025 | -0.341 |
| i | | | | | | | | | 0.009 | 0.749 | 0.254 | 0.324 | -0.398 |
| j | | | | | | | | | | -0.083 | -0.201 | 0.160 | -0.031 |
| k | | | | | | | | | | | 0.699 | 0.164 | -0.470 |
| l | | | | | | | | | | | | -0.098 | -0.339 |
| m | | | | | | | | | | | | | -0.447 |

| | o | p | q | r | s | t | u | v | w | x | y | z |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a | -0.006 | -0.083 | -0.002 | -0.007 | 0.115 | 0.028 | 0.057 | 0.025 | -0.156 | 0.014 | -0.095 | 0.258 |
| b | 0.014 | 0.173 | -0.178 | -0.113 | 0.108 | -0.054 | -0.089 | 0.066 | 0.017 | 0.042 | -0.062 | -0.237 |
| c | -0.039 | 0.198 | -0.296 | -0.133 | -0.153 | -0.217 | -0.292 | -0.071 | 0.214 | -0.024 | 0.129 | -0.477 |
| d | 0.128 | -0.272 | 0.557 | 0.301 | 0.203 | 0.138 | 0.407 | -0.030 | -0.241 | -0.116 | 0.045 | 0.715 |
| e | 0.154 | -0.123 | 0.568 | 0.278 | 0.404 | 0.360 | 0.230 | -0.045 | -0.442 | -0.128 | 0.119 | 0.533 |
| f | -0.034 | -0.049 | -0.064 | 0.047 | 0.076 | 0.270 | -0.219 | 0.091 | -0.105 | 0.064 | -0.047 | -0.108 |
| g | 0.058 | -0.169 | -0.046 | -0.137 | -0.362 | -0.315 | 0.097 | -0.501 | 0.087 | -0.448 | 0.553 | 0.033 |
| h | -0.338 | -0.070 | -0.228 | -0.150 | -0.014 | 0.014 | -0.130 | -0.033 | 0.516 | -0.064 | 0.012 | -0.018 |
| i | -0.187 | -0.217 | -0.159 | -0.093 | -0.239 | -0.234 | -0.169 | -0.290 | 0.191 | -0.104 | 0.092 | 0.237 |
| j | 0.064 | -0.051 | -0.327 | -0.322 | -0.518 | -0.666 | -0.031 | -0.384 | 0.309 | -0.353 | 0.246 | -0.276 |
| k | -0.188 | -0.171 | -0.235 | -0.143 | -0.140 | -0.109 | -0.167 | -0.203 | 0.494 | -0.131 | 0.153 | 0.116 |
| l | -0.228 | -0.030 | -0.283 | -0.150 | 0.004 | 0.039 | -0.166 | 0.040 | 0.656 | -0.017 | -0.015 | -0.049 |
| m | 0.138 | -0.117 | -0.020 | 0.103 | 0.144 | 0.004 | 0.055 | -0.190 | -0.063 | -0.028 | -0.062 | 0.021 |
| n | 0.079 | 0.276 | -0.046 | -0.007 | -0.014 | -0.118 | -0.039 | 0.440 | -0.107 | 0.239 | -0.145 | -0.108 |
| o | | 0.064 | 0.118 | 0.045 | 0.069 | 0.037 | 0.176 | -0.156 | -0.105 | -0.119 | 0.097 | 0.080 |
| p | | | -0.259 | -0.031 | 0.041 | -0.076 | -0.092 | 0.142 | 0.063 | 0.206 | -0.065 | -0.288 |
| q | | | | 0.436 | 0.456 | 0.568 | 0.501 | -0.018 | -0.510 | -0.046 | 0.098 | 0.514 |
| r | | | | | 0.386 | 0.433 | 0.228 | 0.115 | -0.323 | 0.098 | -0.027 | 0.325 |
| s | | | | | | 0.611 | 0.289 | 0.283 | -0.296 | 0.246 | -0.228 | 0.213 |
| t | | | | | | | 0.227 | 0.248 | -0.372 | 0.203 | -0.118 | 0.222 |
| u | | | | | | | | -0.114 | -0.176 | -0.136 | 0.083 | 0.340 |
| v | | | | | | | | | 0.001 | 0.518 | -0.369 | -0.064 |
| w | | | | | | | | | | -0.070 | 0.029 | -0.360 |
| x | | | | | | | | | | | -0.342 | -0.107 |
| y | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.043 |
| z | | | | | | | | | | | | |

This table shows the inter-item correlations between the variables at both levels of analysis.
Variables: a: Party control; b: Gender of governor; c: Government spending; d: Collectivism; e: Black & African American; f: Native American; g: Asian American; h: Native Hawaiian; i: Hispanic American; j: Household income; k: Nonproficiency in English; l: Math grade; m: Persons under 18 years; n: Median age; o: Female persons; p: Social associations; q: Sleep deprivation; r: Preventable hospitalization; s: Obesity; t: Smoking; u: Air pollution; v: Rural area; w: Food environment; x: Outbreak date; y: Density; z: Temperature.

## Table 3: HLM contextual model

| Fixed effect | Coeffi-cients [a)] | Standard error | Confidence interval | *p* | Effect size [b)] | Relia-bility | Impact threshold | Confound threshold |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Outbreak rate | 154.947 | 0.003 | [148.685; 161.209] | <0.001 | | 0.845 | | |
| State institutions | | | | | | | | |
| Party control [e)] | -2.271 | 0.006 | [-14.382; 9.840] | 0.715 | -4.542 | | 0.187 | 81.775% |
| Gender of governor [f)] | -3.441 | 0.005 | [-15.034; 8.152] | 0.564 | -8.823 | | 0.162 | 71.154% |
| Government spending | 0.820 | 0.001 | [-2.318; 3.958] | 0.611 | 0.314 | | 0.170 | 74.603% |
| People cultural values | | | | | | | | |
| Collectivism | 0.998 | 0.000 | [0.351; 1.645] | 0.004 | 0.088 | | 0.181 | 33.316% |
| Racial composition | | | | | | | | |
| Black & African American | 1.158 | 0.000 | [0.725; 1.591] | <0.001 | 0.242 | | 0.091 | 62.563% |
| Collectivism (cross-level) | -0.049 | 0.000 | [-0.088; -0.010] | 0.014 | | | 0.014 | 19.933% |
| Native American | 0.763 | 0.000 | [-0.209; 1.735] | 0.124 | 0.100 | | 0.011 | 21.581% |
| Asian American | 1.305 | 0.001 | [0.166; 2.444] | 0.025 | 0.441 | | 0.008 | 12.666% |
| Native Hawaiian | 1.478 | 0.000 | [0.506; 2.450] | 0.538 | 1.369 | | 0.034 | 68.554% |
| Hispanic American | -0.447 | 0.000 | [-0.915; 0.021] | 0.061 | -0.031 | | 0.002 | 4.657% |
| Income & education | | | | | | | | |
| Household income [c)] | -3.854 | 0.002 | [-7.437; -0.271] | 0.035 | -2.733 | | 0.004 | 6.957% |
| Nonproficiency in English | 2.090 | 0.001 | [0.547; 3.633] | 0.008 | 0.560 | | 0.019 | 26.133% |
| Math grade [d)] | -0.002 | 0.000 | [-0.004; 0.000] | <0.001 | 0.000 | | 0.001 | 1.895% |
| Other demographics | | | | | | | | |
| Persons under 18 years | 1.066 | 0.001 | [-0.014; 2.146] | 0.053 | 0.305 | | 0.001 | 1.375% |
| Median age | 0.657 | 0.000 | [-0.033; 1.347] | 0.062 | 0.107 | | 0.002 | 4.851% |
| Female persons | 0.167 | 0.001 | [-0.880; 1.214] | 0.755 | 0.054 | | 0.042 | 84.058% |
| Personal health | | | | | | | | |
| Social associations | -2.027 | 0.000 | [-2.911; -1.143] | <0.001 | -0.343 | | 0.070 | 56.354% |
| Sleep deprivation | 1.557 | 0.001 | [0.412; 2.702] | 0.008 | 0.363 | | 0.020 | 26.423% |
| Preventable hospitalization | 0.001 | 0.000 | [-0.001; 0.003] | 0.207 | 0.000 | | 0.024 | 49.022% |
| Obesity | -1.093 | 0.000 | [-1.828; -0.358] | 0.004 | -0.243 | | 0.027 | 32.698% |
| Smoking | -0.784 | 0.001 | [-3.150; 1.582] | 0.516 | -0.221 | | 0.033 | 66.888% |
| External health | | | | | | | | |
| Air pollution | 3.329 | 0.001 | [1.465; 5.193] | <0.001 | 1.707 | | 0.043 | 43.962% |
| Rural area | -0.443 | 0.000 | [-0.574; -0.312] | <0.001 | -0.014 | | 0.127 | 70.332% |
| Food environment | 5.996 | 0.002 | [1.286; 10.706] | 0.016 | 3.945 | 0.284 | 0.015 | 21.384% |
| Other confounders | | | | | | | | |
| Outbreak date | 1.912 | 0.000 | [1.322; 2.502] | <0.001 | 0.205 | 0.622 | 0.121 | 69.119% |
| Density | 0.050 | 0.000 | [-0.009; 0.109] | 0.095 | 0.000 | | 0.007 | 15.037% |
| Temperature | 0.301 | 0.000 | [-0.518; 1.120] | 0.472 | 0.026 | | 0.031 | 63.291% |

| Random effects | Variance | *df* | $\chi^2$ | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Variance between state intercepts ($\tau_{00}$) | 4.00E-04 | 43 | 350.334 | <0.001 |
| Variance within states ($\sigma^2$) | 1.26E-03 | | | |

This table provides the detailed results for the multi-level linear model. Run-time deletion reduced the number of level-1 records from 3118 to 1438, and level-2 from 50 to 48.

Notes: [a)] The coefficients are multiplied with 1000 for more intuitive figures. Ditto for the confidence interval. [b)] The effect size is calculated as coefficient / standard deviation, again multiplied with 1000. [c)] The variable for household income is divided by 10000. [d)] All effects for Math grade are from a separately calculated model because the variable is unavailable for 675 counties across the U.S. Consequently, run-time deletion reduced the number of level-1 records to 1140 and level-2 to 43. This updates some *p*-values, but does not affect the sign of the coefficients. [e)] Party control: 0 = Democratic, 1 = Republican. [f)] Gender of governor: 0 = male, 1 = female.