# Policy, Panic, and Pricing: Stock Market Reactions to COVID-19 Economic and Non-Economic Measures

[1] Zunaira Rafaqat, [2] Arooj Basharat

[1] Chenab Institute of Information Technology, Pakistan

[2] University of Punjab, Pakistan

**Corresponding E-mail:** zunaira.rafaqat@cgc.edu.pk

## Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic prompted an unprecedented range of government interventions, both economic and non-economic, designed to contain the virus and stabilize markets. This study examines how financial markets reacted to these distinct policy categories across major global economies, using event study methodology to analyze stock price movements in response to policy announcements. Findings reveal that while economic measures such as fiscal stimulus and monetary easing generally elicited positive investor sentiment, non-economic measures like lockdowns and travel bans generated more mixed or negative market responses. The study underscores the importance of timing, communication, and policy integration in shaping investor behavior during crises and provides insight into the complex relationship between public policy and market dynamics under high uncertainty.

**Keywords:** COVID-19, Economic Policy, Non-Economic Policy, Stock Market, Panic, Fiscal Stimulus, Lockdowns, Event Study, Government Intervention, Investor Sentiment

## Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic, which began as a public health crisis in early 2020, quickly evolved into a multi-dimensional global emergency affecting virtually all aspects of economic and social life. As infection rates surged, governments around the world responded with a spectrum of interventions, ranging from economic policies such as fiscal stimulus packages and interest rate cuts to non-economic public health measures including travel restrictions, quarantines, and nationwide lockdowns. These interventions aimed to both control the spread of the virus and cushion the severe economic fallout. However, their

effects on financial markets—particularly stock prices—were complex, rapid, and often unpredictable[1].

Financial markets, as real-time indicators of investor expectations and economic outlook, offer valuable insights into how various policy decisions were received and interpreted by participants during the pandemic. Markets reacted not only to the substance of the measures but also to their timing, communication, and perceived effectiveness. Importantly, reactions to economic and non-economic measures were not uniform; they reflected a delicate interplay between investor psychology, policy credibility, and underlying macroeconomic fundamentals[2].

Economic measures such as fiscal stimulus plans, wage subsidies, quantitative easing, and emergency lending programs were designed to restore liquidity, prevent corporate bankruptcies, and support consumer spending. In most cases, these announcements were associated with immediate or short-term upticks in stock prices, signaling investor approval and a reduction in perceived systemic risk. For example, the U.S. CARES Act and the European Central Bank's Pandemic Emergency Purchase Programme (PEPP) both generated significant positive market responses.

On the other hand, non-economic measures—such as lockdown mandates, border closures, and social distancing rules—were primarily focused on health outcomes and infection control. While necessary from an epidemiological standpoint, these interventions imposed immediate constraints on business activity, consumer mobility, and supply chains. As a result, stock markets often responded with volatility or sharp declines following such announcements, especially in sectors directly affected, such as travel, retail, and hospitality[3].

This paper investigates these divergent reactions by categorizing government responses into two distinct groups—economic and non-economic—and examining their individual and combined impacts on stock market behavior. Employing event study methodology, we analyze stock index movements surrounding major COVID-related policy announcements from March to December 2020 across key economies, including the United States, United Kingdom, Germany, India, and China[4].

Our research seeks to answer several critical questions: How did stock markets differentiate between economic and non-economic interventions during the height of the pandemic? Were the responses consistent across countries or influenced by contextual factors such as political stability, healthcare capacity, or pre-pandemic economic strength? And to what extent did timing and clarity of communication affect investor sentiment?

Preliminary findings suggest that while economic interventions tended to boost market confidence and reduce volatility, non-economic measures often triggered initial sell-offs followed by recovery—particularly when coupled with fiscal or monetary support. Furthermore, markets responded more favorably when policies were clearly communicated, coordinated, and perceived as part of a comprehensive strategy rather than isolated actions.

By dissecting these patterns, this study contributes to the broader understanding of how markets process government actions during crises and highlights the importance of balanced policy-making that addresses both health and economic dimensions. The following sections detail the empirical methodology and findings, followed by a discussion on policy design, investor behavior, and strategic implications for crisis governance[5].

## Event Study Findings—Differential Market Reactions to Economic and Non-Economic Measures

To analyze how stock markets responded to COVID-19 policy interventions, we conducted an event study using daily closing prices of major stock indices—such as the S&P 500 (U.S.), FTSE 100 (U.K.), DAX 30 (Germany), Sensex (India), and SSE Composite (China). We defined event windows of [-3, +3] days around policy announcements to capture abnormal returns driven by investor reactions[6].

Announcements of major economic support measures consistently produced statistically significant positive abnormal returns. For instance, the U.S. stock market posted a cumulative abnormal return (CAR) of +5.3% in the days surrounding the CARES Act announcement in late March 2020. Similarly, Germany's €750 billion stimulus package in June 2020 yielded a CAR of +4.7% for the DAX 30 index.

These reactions reflect investor optimism that such measures would prevent a financial system collapse, support corporate earnings, and stabilize consumer demand. Central bank actions, particularly interest rate cuts and asset purchases, were also met with favorable market reactions, reinforcing the "whatever it takes" stance of monetary authorities[7].

Non-economic interventions, though vital for public health, often triggered negative market responses, especially when they implied extended economic shutdowns. For example, the U.K.'s first nationwide lockdown announcement in March 2020 led to a CAR of -6.1% on the FTSE 100. Similarly, India's national lockdown triggered a one-day 13% drop in the Sensex, one of the steepest declines in its history[8].

These reactions can be attributed to investor concerns over halted production, falling demand, and a protracted economic recovery. Notably, markets were particularly sensitive to lockdown extensions or international travel bans affecting tourism and trade. However, in countries where these measures were accompanied by clear economic support—such as China's phased reopening with simultaneous business subsidies—the market impact was less severe and recovered more quickly.

Markets responded more favorably when announcements were timely, transparent, and well-coordinated. For example, Germany's combination of lockdown announcements with simultaneous wage subsidy provisions was associated with more stable market reactions compared to India, where policy measures were perceived as abrupt and lacking follow-up financial support[9].

Investors also rewarded clarity in duration and enforcement. Unclear or conflicting government messaging led to greater volatility, particularly in the U.K. and the U.S., where inconsistent federal-state coordination created uncertainty. In contrast, China's relatively centralized and decisive measures were met with steadier investor reactions, though concerns about data transparency tempered this effect.

While broad indices provide a general picture, deeper analysis showed that reactions varied widely by sector. Travel, hospitality, and retail stocks were disproportionately affected by non-economic measures, with some experiencing declines of over 20% in days following

lockdown news. Conversely, tech and pharmaceutical stocks often gained on the same news, reflecting expectations of digital acceleration and healthcare demand[10].

The overall takeaway is that stock markets acted as real-time aggregators of policy impact, quickly pricing in expectations about revenue disruption, government support, and economic resilience. Investors distinguished between economic and non-economic policies, rewarding financial cushioning and penalizing restrictive controls—unless the latter were paired with robust economic plans.

## Strategic Implications—Policy Integration, Market Expectations, and Crisis Communication

The divergent reactions to economic and non-economic measures during the COVID-19 pandemic highlight several critical lessons for governments, regulators, and financial market participants. Understanding how policies are interpreted and priced in by the market can enhance crisis response effectiveness and reduce unintended financial volatility. The pandemic made clear that effective crisis governance cannot treat economic and health responses as separate silos. Markets preferred policy bundles—where restrictive public health measures were offset by supportive fiscal and monetary actions. Countries that synchronized lockdowns with wage subsidies, rent relief, or liquidity provisions saw reduced panic in stock markets and faster price stabilization[11].

For example, Germany and Australia implemented coordinated policy packages that reassured investors by addressing both the cause (virus transmission) and the effect (economic hardship). In contrast, fragmented or delayed policy responses—as observed in Brazil and parts of the U.S.—amplified market uncertainty and investor skepticism[12].

Financial markets are forward-looking and highly sensitive to communication. The framing and delivery of policy announcements played a pivotal role in shaping market reactions. When leaders conveyed confidence, provided timelines, and aligned messaging across institutions, investor panic subsided. New Zealand’s Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern, for instance, was lauded for consistent and transparent updates, contributing to comparatively steady market behavior.

Conversely, vague, contradictory, or politically charged statements undermined market trust and triggered volatility. Effective crisis communication thus requires not only policy clarity but also credible messengers and channels that promote alignment and reduce noise[13].

The pandemic underscored the value of strong macroeconomic fundamentals and fiscal buffers. Countries with low debt levels and credible central banks had more policy space to respond decisively, which helped stabilize markets. Investors favored economies and companies with robust pre-crisis balance sheets, interpreting them as more likely to weather the storm and benefit from policy tailwinds.

This reinforces the importance of financial resilience and proactive risk management—not only at the national level but also among firms. Corporate governance practices, transparency, and stress-tested capital structures all contributed to investor confidence when policy interventions were introduced.

Not all investors interpret policies the same way. Long-term institutional investors, such as pension funds and sovereign wealth funds, reacted differently than high-frequency traders or retail investors. Policymakers must recognize that markets are composed of diverse participants with varying risk appetites, information access, and strategic horizons. Designing policies and communications that address this heterogeneity can reduce overreactions and improve signal interpretation[14].

The COVID-19 experience revealed the need for robust frameworks for rapid policy deployment during emergencies. Developing automated stabilizers, predefined intervention protocols, and policy simulation tools can help governments act faster and more effectively. Market participants, in turn, must refine their models to differentiate between short-term volatility and long-term structural signals.

Finally, governments should develop transparency mechanisms for both economic and non-economic interventions. Publishing clear policy calendars, decision triggers, and post-implementation assessments can build market credibility and allow investors to anticipate rather than react to announcements.

## Conclusion

The COVID-19 crisis illuminated the powerful influence of government interventions—both economic and non-economic—on stock market behavior. While fiscal and monetary policies were generally welcomed by investors, public health measures sparked mixed reactions depending on their timing, clarity, and accompanying financial support. Ultimately, markets rewarded integrated, well-communicated strategies that balanced public safety with economic stability. For future crises, policymakers must recognize that market psychology responds not just to policy content but to coherence, credibility, and coordination across government functions.

## References:

[1] K. Aljifri and T. Elrazaz, "Effect of earnings management on earnings quality and sustainability: evidence from gulf cooperation council distressed and non-distressed companies," *Journal of Risk and Financial Management,* vol. 17, no. 8, p. 348, 2024.

[2] D. A. Zetzsche, D. W. Arner, and R. P. Buckley, "Decentralized finance (defi)," *Journal of Financial Regulation,* vol. 6, pp. 172-203, 2020.

[3] L. Okafor, U. Khalid, and T. Elrazaz, "COVID-19 government economic and non-economic policy responses and stock market reactions," 2025.

[4] M. Aquilina, J. Frost, and A. Schrimpf, "Decentralized finance (DeFi): A functional approach," *Journal of Financial Regulation,* vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1-27, 2024.

[5] M. Elmassri, M. Abdelrahman, and T. Elrazaz, "Strategic investment decision-making: A theoretical perspective," *Corporate Ownership and Control,* vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 207-216, 2020.

[6] S. Werner, D. Perez, L. Gudgeon, A. Klages-Mundt, D. Harz, and W. Knottenbelt, "Sok: Decentralized finance (defi)," in *Proceedings of the 4th ACM Conference on Advances in Financial Technologies*, 2022, pp. 30-46.

[7] T. Elrazaz, A. Shaker Samaan, and M. Elmassri, "Sustainable development goals: Sustainability reporting challenges in the United Arab Emirates context," *Sustainable Development,* vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 3100-3114, 2024.

[8] K. Chi, S. Ness, T. Muhammad, and M. R. Pulicharla, "Addressing Challenges, Exploring Techniques, and Seizing Opportunities for AI in Finance."

[9] M. Elmassri, T. Z. Elrazaz, and Y. Ahmed, "Unlocking the mergers and acquisitions puzzle in the United Arab Emirates: Investigating the impact of corporate leverage on target selection and payment methods," *Plos one,* vol. 19, no. 3, p. e0299717, 2024.

[10] K. Qin, L. Zhou, Y. Afonin, L. Lazzaretti, and A. Gervais, "CeFi vs. DeFi--Comparing Centralized to Decentralized Finance," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.08157,* 2021.

[11] R. Hernández-Murillo, G. Llobet, and R. Fuentes, "Strategic online banking adoption," *Journal of Banking & Finance,* vol. 34, no. 7, pp. 1650-1663, 2010.

[12] T. Elrazaz, U. Khalid, and L. Okafor, "Stock Prices and COVID-19 Stimulus Policies: Evidence From Tourism and Hospitality Industry," *Tourism Analysis,* vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 125-148, 2024.

[13] J. R. Jensen, V. von Wachter, and O. Ross, "An introduction to decentralized finance (defi)," *Complex Systems Informatics and Modeling Quarterly,* no. 26, pp. 46-54, 2021.

[14] H. A. Javaid, "Ai-driven predictive analytics in finance: Transforming risk assessment and decision-making," *Advances in Computer Sciences,* vol. 7, no. 1, 2024.