

1 Causal Impacts of Teaching Modality on U.S. COVID-19 Spread in Fall 2020 Semester

2

3 Syed Badruddoza*

4 Modhurima Dey Amin**

5

6 * Corresponding author. Assistant Research Professor at Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX 79409,
7 United States. Email: syed.badruddoza@ttu.edu.

8 ** Assistant Professor at Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX 79409, United States. Email:
9 modhurima.amin@ttu.edu.

10

11 Abstract

12 We study the impact of college openings and teaching modality on county-level COVID-19 cases and
13 deaths using the information of 745 U.S. colleges. We group the colleges by their teaching modes in the
14 fall 2020 semester: in-person, online, and hybrid; and employ a logistic model and a gradient boosting
15 algorithm to estimate the propensity scores for the three groups to adjust the pre-treatment imbalances
16 of college and county-level covariates. We find that greater enrollments, individual mask policies, and
17 fewer republican votes in the county are major predictors of adopting online or hybrid modes.
18 Treatment effects provide evidence that college reopenings, especially with in-person teaching
19 elements, increase daily new cases and deaths.

20

21 JEL: I10, I23

22 Keywords: COVID-19, Coronavirus, Mode of teaching, College, Hybrid, Online, Multiple treatment effects

23 Badruddoza, Syed and Amin, Modhurima Dey. 2020. Causal Impacts of Teaching Modality on U.S.
24 COVID-19 Spread in Fall 2020 Semester. medRxiv.

25

26 Causal Impacts of Teaching Modality on U.S. COVID-19 Spread in Fall 2020 Semester

27

28 1. Introduction

29 The COVID-19 pandemic and its containment measures have unprecedentedly affected human health
30 and economic activities (e.g., McKibbin and Fernando, 2020; Atkeson, 2020). Countries across the world
31 have implemented partial or full business and school closures to mitigate the infection spread
32 (Panovska-Griffiths et al., 2020; Di Domenico et al., 2020). Many U.S. colleges temporarily closed or
33 switched to online in the spring semester, and over six out of ten colleges reopened in the fall semester
34 with an in-person or a combination of in-person and online teaching plans (Gallagher and Palmer, 2020;
35 College Crisis Initiative, 2020). College students mainly fall in the age cohort of 18 to 29 years, which has
36 a lower death rate (0.4%) from COVID-19 (Wrighton and Lawrence, 2020), but a greater chance of
37 socialization than the other age cohorts. Although colleges are following best practices—including
38 symptom screening, contact tracing, cleaning and disinfecting, and mandatory mask policies—there is a
39 chance that reopening colleges may spread the virus among faculty and staff serving students, and in
40 the region around the college (Hubler and Hartocollis, 2020).

41 Figure (1) and (2) respectively show daily new COVID-19 cases and deaths grouped by college teaching
42 modality. Both series are shown as percentages of their values on August 10th, 2020 to eliminate the
43 initial differences and make the figures comparable across groups. Median values are plotted to remove
44 the influence of extreme observations. Figure 1 suggests that colleges teaching in- person are located in
45 counties with rapidly increasing COVID-19 cases. Small bumps of cases right before the start dates
46 indicate reopening-induced testing. In Figure 2, new deaths in counties with colleges teaching in person
47 are growing faster than hybrid and online groups. Thus, the figures suggest that both COVID- 19 cases
48 and deaths grow faster in counties where colleges started the fall semester with in-person mode.

49 Given the substantial risk of infection spread from college campuses to the community, a timely policy
50 question is whether colleges should continue with in-person classes or switch to online or hybrid mode.
51 The current study applies a quasi-experimental approach to find the impacts of teaching modality on
52 infection spread onto the neighboring areas. We combine college and county information to predict the
53 chance of a college adopting one of the three modes of teaching: in-person, online, and hybrid; and then
54 estimate the effects of the decision on county COVID-19 outcomes. Results provide evidence that
55 college reopenings, especially with in-person teaching elements, increase daily new cases and deaths.
56 Most studies so far have looked into the impact of elementary and secondary school closure, optimal
57 reopening plan, and teaching strategy (e.g., Di Domenico et al., 2020; Panovska-Griffiths et al., 2020;
58 Gandolfi, 2020; Cohen et al., 2020; Panovska-Griffiths et al., 2020). Walke, Honein, and Redfield (2020)
59 discuss the possible issues of U.S. college reopening and the prevention measures required on
60 campuses. In a study close to ours, Andersen et al. (2020) investigate college openings' association with
61 cellphone-tracked human mobility and COVID-19 cases in the counties of the campuses. Their
62 preliminary results (as of September 23rd, 2020) suggest that reopenings with primarily in-person
63 instruction increased county COVID-19 cases by 0.024 per thousand people, and no significant
64 differences exist between online and in-person instructional modality. However, their study does not
65 consider the fact that the choice of reopening and teaching modality is endogenous to observed cases.
66 We use a matching method derived from multinomial logistic and machine learning to re-weight the
67 sample based on the college's probability of selecting an instructional mode. This approach also unravels
68 the predictors of choosing a particular teaching mode. In addition, Andersen et al. (2020) collect start
69 dates from the fall 2019 semester that may not represent the actual scenario in 2020 because some
70 college opened early to finish the semester before thanksgiving vacation, whereas some colleges
71 delayed opening or opened with an online mode waiting for cases to decrease.

72

73 2. Method

74 We are interested in finding the effects of teaching modality on two COVID-19 outcomes: (1) new daily
75 COVID-19 cases per 100,000 people reported in the county, and (2) new COVID-19 related deaths per
76 100,000 people in the county. We specify the relationship between college reopening in the fall
77 semester and the outcome as below,

$$78 \quad Y_{it} = A_0 + \alpha(\text{Fall})_{it} + \beta X_{it} + A_i + e_{it} \quad (1)$$

79 where, Y_{it} is a COVID-19 outcome, $i = 1, \dots, N$, and $t = 1, \dots, T$ respectively indicate colleges and days,
80 and A_0 is the intercept. Fall is a binary variable that takes value 1 when the college officially reopens for
81 the fall 2020 semester, and zero for all previous dates. The vector X includes observed daily covariates
82 such as population mobility, A_i is college fixed effects. Parameters to be estimated include α and β , and
83 e_{it} stands for the error. Estimating α gives the average difference in Y_{it} between colleges that have
84 reopened and colleges that have not, because different colleges reopened on different dates.

85 To measure the average treatment effects (ATE) of teaching modality, let the set {Online, Hybrid, In-
86 person} denote the options a college can choose from. We re-specify the model as,

$$95 \quad Y_{it} = A'_0 + \alpha_1(\text{Online})_{it} + \alpha_2(\text{Hybrid})_{it} + \alpha_3(\text{In-person})_{it} + \beta' X_{it} + A'_i + e'_{it} \quad (2)$$

87 where, parameters α_1, α_2 and α_3 show the effects of respective treatments on Y_{it} . The parameters in
88 equation (1) and (2) are technically different, hence the prime (') sign, but have a similar interpretation.
89 The intercept A'_0 represents the overall mean of pre-semester Y_{it} . The causal effects of teaching
90 modality on COVID-19 outcomes are identified if colleges were homogeneous and were randomly
91 assigned a teaching mode (Barnow, Cain, and Goldberger, 1981). In practice, the treatment assignment
92 is not random, because colleges choose the mode of teaching based on their distance education
93 capacities, observed COVID-19 cases, and many other characteristics. The probability of adopting a
94 teaching modality, e.g., online, should considerably vary across colleges.

96 Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983, 1984) discuss propensity score matching (PSM) to adjust the probabilities
97 for the differences in pre-treatment variables. A propensity score is the conditional probability of
98 receiving the treatment given the pretreatment variables. In our context, the probabilities of selecting a
99 teaching mode can be obtained from the following specification.

$$100 \quad \{ \text{Online}_i, \text{Hybrid}_i, \text{In-person}_i \} = f(\text{College features}, \text{Regional features}) \quad (3)$$

101 The probabilities of treatments generated from equation (3) are used to create weights that adjust the
102 effects of treatments in estimating equation (2). For example, if a college has a high probability of
103 choosing online, then hybrid, then in-person, greater weights are assigned on in-person, then hybrid,
104 followed by online during the estimation (McCaffrey et al., 2013).

105 The key difference between equation (3) and Rosenbaum–Rubin’s matching model is that their model
106 mainly deals with binary treatments, whereas we have three treatments. Imbens (2000) extends the
107 concept to multiple treatments, and suggests a multinomial or nested logit for multivalued discrete
108 response models where the ordering of the response does not matter (see Lopez and Gutman (2017) for
109 a review). Recent works have also examined the application of machine learning approaches such as
110 bagging or boosting, random forests, other tree-based methods, and neural networks (McCaffrey,
111 Ridgeway, and Morral, 2004; Setoguchi et al., 2008; Lee, Lessler and Stuart, 2010; McCaffrey et al.,
112 2013).

113 We estimate a multinomial logit model for PSM (equation 3) using cross-sectional data of college and
114 county features. The predicted probabilities of adopting a teaching mode for each college are then
115 inverted and used as weights in a panel fixed effects (FE) regression following equation (2). The sources
116 of variation are colleges for the cross-section, and college times days for the panel. For robustness, we
117 repeat the task with a gradient booster model instead of multinomial logit. A logit model provides
118 interpretable coefficient estimates, whereas gradient boosting offers greater predictive accuracy

119 (Ridgeway et al., 2014; Burgette, Griffin and McCaffrey, 2017). McCaffrey, Ridgeway, and Morral (2004)
120 and Mc- Caffrey et al. (2013, 2015) discuss the technical details of the two approaches. In simple words,
121 a gradient booster involves growing decision trees from randomly chosen college and county
122 characteristics to predict the treatment group, and then repeating the process to explain the residuals
123 and re-adjust the importance of predictors to achieve the optimal prediction. The algorithm penalizes
124 complex and large decision trees in order to avoid overfitting (Chen and Guestrin, 2016). The
125 importance factors on predictors from gradient booster are not as interpretable as coefficients from a
126 multinomial logit, so we use the gradient booster to predict PSM only, and do not discuss the
127 importance factors.

128

129 3. Data and Descriptive Statistics

130 We collected characteristics of four-year and two-year undergraduate degree-granting colleges and
131 universities from the National Center for Education Statistics (2020). Most of the colleges available in
132 the data are public or private non-profit. Data on teaching modality in the fall 2020 semester come from
133 the College Crisis Initiative (2020). The College Crisis initiative reports fall reopening plans, which we
134 categorize into three types: (1) in-person, (2) online, and (3) hybrid. Colleges in the “in-person” group
135 conduct classes in person with certain exceptions for online delivery and open residence halls; colleges
136 in the “online” group primarily conduct classes online with some exceptions for lab components and
137 may have some students on campus; and colleges in the “hybrid” group either switch the teaching mode
138 on a rolling basis, or offer courses with both in-person and online access. We manually collected the
139 official start dates of the fall 2020 semester from respective college websites. County characteristics
140 were extracted from the American Community Survey (2020). Merging all these data eventually gives

141 745 colleges in bordering states. Alaska and Hawaii were omitted to avoid large heterogeneity in
142 regional features.

143 We obtain daily new COVID-19 cases and deaths at the county level from the New York Times (2020).

144 The impact of teaching modality is assessed on county-level outcomes (and not on the college level)

145 because students may spread the virus to non-students and immunocompromised people in the

146 community, which is a pressing policy concern. We also merged the data with individual mask policies in

147 county and state from HealthData.gov (2020). Finally, information on county-level shares of republican

148 votes in Presidential Election 2016 is included from McGovern et al. (2017) to take residents' perception

149 of COVID-19 risk into account (e.g., Tyson, 2020).

150 Table (1) provides variable descriptions and sources, and Tables (2) and (3) respectively present

151 summary statistics of variables used in PSM and panel FE. For the panel regression, we chose August 10

152 as the starting point of data to spare two weeks before the start date of the fall semester. Maximum

153 colleges (212 out of 745 in our sample) started the semester on August 24th. September 19th, 2020 was

154 chosen as the endpoint based on data availability. The panel regression use college fixed effects, and

155 controls for the percentage of county population stayed home daily, collected from the Bureau of

156 Transportation Statistics (2020). Omitting stay-home makes the effects of a teaching mode on COVID-19

157 outcomes biased, because COVID-19 outcomes may increase if fewer people stay home regardless of

158 campus reopening or teaching modality.

159 A required condition for estimating treatment effects is distributional similarities of pre-treatment

160 covariates across the treatment groups McCaffrey et al. (2013). Table (2) and table (4) indicate

161 considerable variation across treatment groups. The mean different t-tests are significant especially

162 when variables are compared between online and in-person group. The difference justifies the use of

163 PSM in our analysis. In fact, comparing propensity scores across treatment groups is equivalent to
164 comparing the pre-treatment covariates, which is done in the next section.

165

166 4. Results

167 To calculate the probability of choosing each teaching mode and re-adjust the weights, we use a
168 multinomial logistic regression. The results in table (5) shows that colleges that chose online teaching
169 mode over in-person have greater enrollment, endowment per student, and are public in nature.
170 Online-teaching colleges are located in a county that has more population, on-going mask ordinance,
171 and fewer republican votes. From hybrid and in-person comparison in table (5) column (2), hybrid-
172 adopting colleges have more enrollment, a lower cost of attendance, fewer students per faculty and are
173 located in a county with fewer republican votes. To summarize, greater enrollment, fewer republican
174 supporters in the county, and prevailing individual mask ordinance are common predictors of adopting
175 online or hybrid teaching modality over in-person.

176 We use the multinomial logit model to calculate the propensity scores for each college. The scores need
177 to be sufficiently similar across groups for causal estimation. Figure (3) compares the distributions of the
178 propensity scores using box plots. The distributions are overlapping—an essential feature for causal
179 estimation (McCaffrey et al., 2013). We invert the scores and use them as weights to adjust the
180 difference of college and county characteristics across treatment groups. The maximum Kolmogorov-
181 Smirnov (KS) statistic of distributional equality is 0.33 for the unweighted sample and 0.12 for the
182 weighted sample, with p-values zero and 0.059, respectively. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis of
183 distributional equality for the unweighted sample, but fail to reject the null for the weighted sample.
184 That is, we use PSM to create a weighted sample such that any teaching mode is equally likely to be

185 chosen by a college. We now utilize the weighted sample to estimate the causal effects of teaching
186 modality on COVID-19 cases and deaths.

187 Tables (6) and (7) present the results from the panel fixed effects regression. The dependent variables
188 (1) daily new COVID-19 cases per 100,000 people and (2) daily new COVID-19 deaths per 100,000 people
189 do not have autocorrelation. The adjusted t statistics from Levin, Lin, and Chu (2002) unit-root tests are -
190 59.56 and -71.89 respectively, both significant at 0.01%.

191 Overall, daily new COVID-19 cases increased in the fall 2020 semester, by about 1.87 cases per 100,000
192 population. Cases increased the most where colleges adopted an in-person teaching mode, followed by
193 hybrid, compared to the pre-semester benchmark (table 6 column 2). Online dummy is statistically
194 insignificant— showing no difference in cases between online teaching and pre-semester situation.
195 However, effects on COVID-19 cases become similar for online (+1.8) and hybrid (+1.6) modes when we
196 control for the endogeneity (table 6 column 3). Most importantly, counties where colleges reopened
197 with an in-person mode experienced a statistically significant rise of 2.5 new cases. The results remain
198 robust when we estimate the propensity scores with Gradient Booster (table 6 column 4). Table (7) also
199 show a positive effect of campus reopening on daily new COVID- 19 deaths—about 0.04 per 100,000
200 population. The mean effect is disentangled by teaching modes: in-person teaching mode raises the pre-
201 semester death rate by 0.049, followed by hybrid (0.048), and online (0.035) (table 7 column 2). Online
202 dummy becomes insignificant when PSM weights from multinomial logit are used, but the magnitude of
203 the coefficient is similar to that of the hybrid dummy when weighted by gradient booster propensity
204 scores. The effect of in-person teaching modes remains statistically significant and greater than other
205 modes' in all specifications.

206 We find a mixed result on the effects of online and hybrid modes—none is consistently greater than the
207 other. One explanation is that students might choose online when offered a combination (hybrid) of

208 online and in-person. Finally, a percent increase in the county population who stayed home decreases
209 new COVID-19 cases by about 0.7, and new deaths by 0.035 per 100,000 population. The effect is
210 consistent across the models.

211

212 5. Policy Implications

213 Our findings have several implications for higher education and health policy. First, results from the
214 multinomial logit suggest that colleges with smaller endowments per student are less likely to choose
215 online over in-person teaching mode. Moreover, the treatment effects show adopting an in-person
216 mode instead of an online mode may increase COVID-19 cases and deaths. Therefore, colleges with
217 small endowments need special policy attention to combat a disease-induced pandemic.

218 Second, campus reopening has a positive impact on COVID-19 cases and deaths that is primarily driven
219 by in-person teaching modes, and cannot be avoided completely even when colleges choose online.
220 However, the damage can be partially mitigated with an initiative from the colleges by increasing
221 distance education elements in classes.

222 Third, we found a direct negative association between the percentage of county residents staying home
223 and COVID-19 spread. Policies aimed at individual mask use might have an indirect negative effect on
224 COVID-19 as well. Given other attributes, counties that start mandatory mask use in public places are
225 likely to nudge college administration towards online or hybrid classes, which in turn reduce the virus
226 spread in the community.

227 Finally, counties with more republican votes in Presidential Election 2016 are less likely to choose online
228 or hybrid modes over in-person, *ceteris paribus*. The finding indicates that political affiliation might play
229 a role in the containment of COVID-19.

230

231 References

232 American Community Survey. 2020. "American Community Survey Data." Available
233 <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/data.html>, Accessed 10/01/2020.

234 Andersen, Martin S, Ana I Bento, Anirban Basu, Chris Marsicano, and Kosali Simon. 2020. "College
235 Openings, Mobility, and the Incidence of COVID-19 Cases." medRxiv. (September 23:
236 doi:10.1101/2020.09.22.20196048).

237 Atkeson, Andrew. 2020. "What will be the economic impact of COVID-19 in the us? Rough estimates of
238 disease scenarios." National Bureau of Economic Research. No. w26867.

239 Barnow, Burt S, GS Cain, and Arthur S Goldberger. 1981. "Issues in the Analysis of Selectivity Bias",
240 Evaluation Studies Review Annal" (W. Stromdorfer and G. Farkas, Eds). Pg. 43-59. Sage Press,
241 Beverly Hills.

242 Bureau of Transportation Statistics. 2020. "Daily travel during the COVID-19 public health emergency."
243 Available [https://www.bts.gov/browse-statistical-products-and-data/trips-distance/daily-travel-](https://www.bts.gov/browse-statistical-products-and-data/trips-distance/daily-travel-during-covid-19-pandemic)
244 [during-covid-19- pandemic](https://www.bts.gov/browse-statistical-products-and-data/trips-distance/daily-travel-during-covid-19-pandemic), Accessed 10/01/2020.

245 Burgette, Lane, Beth Ann Griffin, and Dan McCaffrey. 2017. "Propensity scores for multiple treatments:
246 A tutorial for the mnps function in the twang package." R package. Rand Corporation.

247 Chen, Tianqi, and Carlos Guestrin. 2016. "Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system." Proceedings of the
248 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, pages
249 785–794. ACM.

250 Cohen, Jamie A, Dina Mistry, Cliff C Kerr, and Daniel J Klein. 2020. "Schools are not islands: Balancing
251 COVID-19 risk and educational benefits using structural and temporal countermeasures."
252 medRxiv. doi:10.1101/2020.09.08.20190942.

253 College Crisis Initiative. 2020. "Fall 2020 Plans." Available <https://collegecrisis.shinyapps.io/dashboard/>,
254 Accessed 10/01/2020.

255 Di Domenico, Laura, Giulia Pullano, G Pullano, Niel Hens, and Vittoria Colizza. 2020. "Expected impact of
256 school closure and telework to mitigate COVID-19 epidemic in France." Technical Report. Epicx
257 Lab.

258 Gallagher, Sean, and Jason Palmer. 2020. "The pandemic pushed universities online: the change was
259 long overdue." Harvard Business Review, September 29. Available [https://hbr.org/2020/09/the-](https://hbr.org/2020/09/the-pandemic-pushed-universities-online-the-change-was-long-overdue)
260 [pandemic-pushed-universities-online-the-change-was-long-overdue](https://hbr.org/2020/09/the-pandemic-pushed-universities-online-the-change-was-long-overdue), Accessed 10/01/2020.

261 Gandolfi, Alberto. 2020. "Planning of school teaching during COVID-19." Physica D: Nonlinear
262 Phenomena, 415(January 2021): 132753.

263 HealthData.gov. 2020. "COVID-19 state and county policy orders."
264 <https://healthdata.gov/dataset/covid-19-state-and-county-policy-orders>, Accessed: 2020-09-30.

- 265 Hubler, Shawn, and Anemona Hartocollis. 2020. "How colleges be- came the new COVID hot stops." The
266 New York Times, September 11. Available [https://www.nytimes.com/2020/09/11/us/college-](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/09/11/us/college-campus-outbreak-covid.html)
267 [campus-outbreak-covid.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/09/11/us/college-campus-outbreak-covid.html), Accessed 10/01/2020.
- 268 Imbens, Guido W. 2000. "The role of the propensity score in estimating dose- response functions."
269 *Biometrika*, 87(3): 706–710.
- 270 Lee, Brian K, Justin Lessler, and Elizabeth A Stuart. 2010. "Improving propensity score weighting using
271 machine learning." *Statistics in medicine*, 29(3): 337–346.
- 272 Levin, Andrew, Chien-Fu Lin, and Chia-Shang James Chu. 2002. "Unit root tests in panel data: asymptotic
273 and finite-sample properties." *Journal of econometrics*, 108(1): 1–24.
- 274 Lopez, Michael J, and Roe Gutman. 2017. "Estimation of causal effects with multiple treatments: a
275 review and new ideas." *Statistical Science*, 32(3): 432–454.
- 276 McCaffrey, Daniel F, Beth Ann Griffin, Daniel Almirall, Mary Ellen Slaughter, Rajeev Ramchand, and Lane
277 F Burgette. 2013. "A tutorial on propensity score estimation for multiple treatments using
278 generalized boosted models." *Statistics in medicine*, 32(19): 3388–3414.
- 279 McCaffrey, Daniel F, Greg Ridgeway, and Andrew R Morral. 2004. "Propensity score estimation with
280 boosted regression for evaluating causal effects in observational studies." *Psychological*
281 *methods*, 9(4): 403.
- 282 McCaffrey, Daniel F, Lane F Burgette, Beth Ann Griffin, and Craig Martin. 2015. "Propensity scores for
283 multiple treatments: a tutorial for the mnps macro in the twang SAS macros." RAND
284 Corporation. June 16, 2016. TL-169/1-NIDA.
- 285 McGovern, Tony, Stephen Larson, Bill Morris, and Matt Hodges. 2017. "Presidential Election Results."
286 Available https://github.com/tonmcg/US_County_Level_Election_Results_08-16, Accessed
287 2020-09-30.
- 288 McKibbin, Warwick, and Roshen Fernando. 2020. "The economic impact of COVID-19." *Economics in the*
289 *Time of COVID-19*, (Richard Baldwin and Weder di Mauro eds.), p. 45. London: CEPR Press.
- 290 National Center for Education Statistics. 2020. "Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System."
291 Available <https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/use-the-data>, Accessed 10/01/2020.
- 292 New York Times. 2020. "COVID in the U.S.: Latest Map and Case Count."
293 <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/us/coronavirus-us-cases.html>, Accessed: 2020-09-
294 30.
- 295 Panovska-Griffiths, Jasmina, Cliff C Kerr, Robyn M Stuart, Dina Mistry, Daniel J Klein, Russell M Viner, and
296 Chris Bonell. 2020. "Determining the optimal strategy for reopening schools, the impact of test
297 and trace interventions, and the risk of occurrence of a second COVID-19 epidemic wave in the
298 UK: a modelling study." *The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health*, 4(11): 817–827.
- 299 Ridgeway, Greg, Daniel F McCaffrey, Andrew R Morral, Lane F Burgette, and Beth Ann Griffin. 2014.
300 "Toolkit for weighting and analysis of nonequivalent groups: a tutorial for the R TWANG

301 package." RAND Corporation. Available [https://cran.r-](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/twang/vignettes/twang.pdf)
302 [project.org/web/packages/twang/vignettes/twang.pdf](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/twang/vignettes/twang.pdf). Accessed 10/01/2020.

303 Rosenbaum, Paul R, and Donald B Rubin. 1983. "The central role of the propensity score in observational
304 studies for causal effects." *Biometrika*, 70(1): 41–55.

305 Rosenbaum, Paul R, and Donald B Rubin. 1984. "Reducing bias in observational studies using
306 subclassification on the propensity score." *Journal of the American statistical Association*,
307 79(387): 516–524.

308 Setoguchi, Soko, Sebastian Schneeweiss, M Alan Brookhart, Robert J Glynn, and E Francis Cook. 2008.
309 "Evaluating uses of data mining techniques in propensity score estimation: a simulation study."
310 *Pharmacoepidemiology and drug safety*, 17(6): 546–555.

311 Tyson, Alec. 2020. "Republicans remain far less likely than Democrats to view COVID-19 as a major
312 threat to public health." *Fact Tank by Pew Research Center*, 1(1): 1. Available
313 [https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/07/22/republicans-remain-far-less-likely-than-](https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/07/22/republicans-remain-far-less-likely-than-democrats-to-view-covid-19-as-a-major-threat-to-public-health/)
314 [democrats-to-view-covid-19-as-a-major-threat-to-public-health/](https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/07/22/republicans-remain-far-less-likely-than-democrats-to-view-covid-19-as-a-major-threat-to-public-health/), Accessed 10/24/2020.

315 Walke, Henry T, Margaret A Honein, and Robert R Redfield. 2020. "Preventing and responding to COVID-
316 19 on college campuses." *JAMA*, September 29. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.20027.

317 Wrighton, Mark S, and Steven J Lawrence. 2020. "Reopening Colleges and Universities During the
318 COVID-19 Pandemic." *Annals of Internal Medicine*. October. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-4752>.

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330


331

332

333

334 Figures

335




336 Figure 1. Growth of COVID-19 cases by college teaching modality

337 Note: Daily data from August 10th to September 19th 2020. See the data section for details.

338 Source: Cases are obtained from the New York Times (2020), and teaching modality from the College
339 Crisis Initiative (2020).

340



341


342

343 Figure 2. Growth of COVID-19 deaths by college teaching modality

344 *Note:* Daily data from August 10th to September 19th 2020. See the data section for details.

345 *Source:* Deaths are obtained from the New York Times (2020), and teaching modality from the College
346 Crisis Initiative (2020).

347



348

349

350 Figure 3. Overlap assessment of propensity scores by treatment group

351 Note: Horizontal axis shows observed values of treatment, the vertical axis shows the estimated
352 propensity scores, and tabs on the top represent the response variable in the matching model.

353 Source: Estimation of equation (3).

354

355 Tables

356 Table 1. Variable description

Variable	Unit	Source	Details
Time-invariant variables used in cross-sectional matching			
Online	Binary	CCI (2020)	Takes 1 if the college holds classes primarily online for fall 2020, zero otherwise
Hybrid	Binary	CCI (2020)	Takes 1 if the college adopts a combination of online and in-person modes, zero otherwise
In-person	Binary	CCI (2020)	Takes 1 if the college holds classes primarily in person for fall 2020, zero otherwise
Enrollment	Count	IPEDS (2020)	Total student count in fall 2018 semester, including graduate and remote students
Cost of attendance	USD	IPEDS (2020)	Total price for in-state students living on campus for 2019-20
Endowment per student	USD	IPEDS (2020)	Endowment assets per FTE enrollment at the end of 2018
Student-faculty ratio	Ratio	IPEDS (2020)	Enrollment divided by total full-time instructional staff
Public	Binary	IPEDS (2020)	The institution is primarily funded by a state government
Total population	Count	ACS (2020)	Total population in the county where the college is located (2018)
Black population	Percentage	ACS (2020)	Percentage of African American population in the county (2018)
Household income	USD	ACS (2020)	Median real household income in the past 12 months (2018)
Republican votes	Percentage	McGovern et al. (2017)	Percentage of votes for the Republican Party at the county level in Presidential election 2016
Mask ordinance	Binary	HealthData.gov (2020)	The county has an ongoing mandatory mask policy for individuals in public places
Cases in spring	Count	NYTimes (2020)	Total COVID-19 cases in the county by May 15, 2020
Deaths in spring	Count	NYTimes (2020)	Total COVID-19 deaths in the county by May 15, 2020
Time-varying variables used in panel fixed-effects regression			
New cases	Numeric	NYTimes (2020)	Daily new COVID-19 cases per 100,000 population in the county
New deaths	Numeric	NYTimes (2020)	Daily new COVID-19 deaths per 100,000 population in the county
Fall semester	Binary	College websites	Takes 1 when the college officially started fall semester classes
Online	Binary	CCI (2020)	Takes 1 when the college starts classes primarily online for fall 2020, zero otherwise
Hybrid	Binary	CCI (2020)	Takes 1 when the college starts a combination of online and in-person modes, zero otherwise
In-person	Binary	CCI (2020)	Takes 1 when the college holds classes primarily in person for fall 2020, zero otherwise
% stayed home	Percentage	BTS (2020)	Percentage of county population that did not go outside home for longer than 10 minutes
Time	Day		Calendar days from August 10, 2020 to September 19, 2020

357

358

359

360

361 Table 2. Summary statistics of variables used in matching

Variable	(1) Online	(2) Hybrid	(3) In-person	(4) Overall
College features				
Enrollment	8,088 (9,959)	5,715 (7,439)	4,438 (7,107)	6,109 (8,492)
Cost of attendance	45,768 (21,017)	46,196 (19,347)	43,010 (16,237)	44,827 (18,930)
Endowment per student	64,685 (328,815)	77,841 (337,832)	51,170 (366,540)	62,836 (345,508)
Student faculty ratio	26.65 (16.50)	22.40 (12.15)	24.75 (19.94)	24.86 (17.05)
Public	0.35 (0.48)	0.25 (0.43)	0.23 (0.42)	0.28 (0.45)
County features				
Total population	1,377,642 (2,488,077)	560,900 (841,262)	392,161 (781,868)	799,380 (1,702,115)
Black population (%)	15.11 (15.99)	13.20 (14.64)	11.48 (13.49)	13.26 (14.81)
Household income	62,695 (17,270)	59,828 (14,701)	57,620 (15,076)	60,052 (15,968)
Republic votes (%)	40.45 (16.62)	47.38 (17.42)	53.02 (14.64)	46.95 (16.99)
Mask ordinance	0.85 (0.36)	0.81 (0.40)	0.70 (0.46)	0.78 (0.41)
Cases in spring	11,686 (21,383)	5,499 (10,907)	3,412 (8,854)	6,998 (15,553)
Deaths in spring	576.51 (969.17)	304.42 (613.06)	195.70 (502.09)	363.92 (751.41)
Colleges (N)	276	186	283	745

Note: Standard deviations in parentheses. Table (1) provides variable description.

362

363

364

365 Table 3. Summary statistics of variables used in panel fixed effects

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)
	mean	sd
New cases/100,000 population	12.85	18.51
New deaths/100,000 population	0.245	0.732
Fall semester	0.641	0.480
Online	0.223	0.416
Hybrid	0.159	0.366
In-person	0.259	0.438
% stayed home	25.27	4.292
Colleges	745	
Days (t)	41	
Observations (Colleges × Days)	30,545	

Note: Daily data from August 10, 2020 to September 19, 2020.

366

367

368

369 Table 4. Mean difference t-tests of variables used in matching

Variable	Hybrid-Online	In-person-Online	In-person-Hybrid
Enrollment	-2373***	-3649***	-1276
Cost of attendance	428	-2758*	-3186*
Endowment per student	13155	-13515	-26670
Student faculty ratio	-4.25***	-1.89	2.35
Public	-0.10**	-0.11***	-0.02
Total population	-816742***	-985481***	-168738
Black population (%)	-1.91	-3.62***	-1.71
Household income	-2867*	-5075***	-2208
Republican votes (%)	6.92***	12.56***	5.64***
Mask ordinance	-0.04	-0.15***	-0.11***
Cases in spring	-6187***	-8273***	-2086
Deaths in spring	-272***	-380***	-108

Note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Columns show difference between group means.

Observations=745.

370

371

372

373 Table 5. Results from multinomial logistic regression

VARIABLES	(1) Online	(2) Hybrid
Log enrollment	0.328** (0.143)	0.285* (0.147)
Log cost of attendance	-0.425 (0.549)	-0.948* (0.529)
Log endowment per student	0.183** (0.0889)	0.0747 (0.0927)
Log student-faculty ratio	0.184 (0.307)	-0.657* (0.342)
Public	1.022* (0.530)	-0.141 (0.502)
Log total population	0.403** (0.158)	0.0855 (0.148)
Black population (%)	-0.00560 (0.00956)	-0.00116 (0.00924)
Log family income	-0.202 (0.550)	0.229 (0.569)
Republican votes (%)	-0.0382*** (0.00930)	-0.0176* (0.00989)
Mask ordinance	0.591** (0.252)	0.487** (0.247)
Log spring cases	-0.253 (0.165)	-0.187 (0.158)
Log spring deaths	0.176 (0.124)	0.182 (0.128)
Constant	-0.949 (8.178)	6.360 (8.004)
Observations	745	745

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. In-person teaching is the benchmark group.

374

375

376

377 Table 6. Impact of teaching modality on new COVID-19 cases

VARIABLES	Dependent variable			
	Daily new COVID-19 cases per 100,000 population			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Fall semester	1.874*** (0.384)			
Online		0.596 (0.593)	1.847*** (0.696)	1.579*** (0.595)
Hybrid		2.019*** (0.715)	1.595** (0.743)	1.862*** (0.678)
In-person		3.088*** (0.659)	2.515*** (0.666)	2.459*** (0.691)
% stayed home	-0.721*** (0.0775)	-0.719*** (0.0773)	-0.698*** (0.0739)	-0.710*** (0.0691)
Constant	29.88*** (1.915)	29.75*** (1.913)	28.99*** (1.812)	29.21*** (1.704)
PSM weights	No	No	MLogit	GB
College FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	30,545	30,545	30,545	30,545
Colleges	745	745	745	745

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Daily data from August 10 to September 19, 2020. FE=Fixed Effects, PSM=Propensity score matching, MLogit=Multinomial Logistic, GB=Gradient Booster.

378

379

380

381 Table 7. Impact of teaching modality on new COVID-19 deaths

VARIABLES	Dependent variable			
	Daily new COVID-19 deaths per 100,000 population			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Fall semester	0.0440*** (0.0114)			
Online		0.0353** (0.0142)	0.0277 (0.0279)	0.0396** (0.0188)
Hybrid		0.0484*** (0.0162)	0.0450** (0.0207)	0.0369** (0.0178)
In-person		0.0498** (0.0234)	0.0599*** (0.0216)	0.0475** (0.0206)
% stayed home	-0.0353*** (0.00319)	-0.0352*** (0.00318)	-0.0391*** (0.00664)	-0.0341*** (0.00355)
Constant	1.108*** (0.0783)	1.107*** (0.0779)	1.200*** (0.166)	1.070*** (0.0874)
PSM weights	No	No	MLogit	GB
College FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	30,545	30,545	30,545	30,545
Colleges	745	745	745	745


Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Daily data from August 10 to September 19, 2020. FE=Fixed Effects, PSM=Propensity score matching, MLogit=Multinomial Logistic, GB=Gradient Booster.

382


383

384

Median county-level growth of COVID-19 deaths by college reopening and teaching modality



Median county-level growth of COVID-19 cases by college reopening and teaching modality



Overlap assessment of propensity scores by treatment group

