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Abstract

Introduction
Attitudes of those in the homeless population toward testing, particularly during a pandemic, are critical to understand, so that they and their communities may be safely triaged and protected. Homeless persons are more likely to be exposed during viral epidemics, and have greater vulnerability for more severe viral illness, due to greater medical comorbidities. The literature reflects a dearth of published papers describing the perceptions, interest, and motivations of homeless people to seek or receive viral testing, despite their status as a high-risk population.

Methods
A quality improvement project consisting of a cross-sectional survey took place at 8 SARS-CoV-2 infection testing sites (local shelters and drop-in sites) within Duval County, Jacksonville, FL.

Results
The vast majority of homeless individuals approached for testing completed demographic data and a checklist of beliefs and attitudes about testing (N=764) and underwent COVID-19 nasopharyngeal swab testing (n=679). Mean age was 48; 66% were male, and the predominant race was Black (51%) with 89% of non-Hispanic ethnicity. Of the total participants, 59.2% wanted testing and 4.6% declined testing. Attitudes toward testing varied by site and by wanting vs. not wanting to be tested. Top reasons in those wanting testing included curiosity; a belief that faith would protect them from the virus; and having shelter encouragement to be tested. Top attitudes among those not wanting to be tested were: shelter encouraged me; curiosity; and receiving a gift card. For the total group of subjects, being offered a $10 gift card did not affect their desire to be tested. Those who were not faith-influenced were less likely to want testing.

Conclusion
Findings from selected literature and this quality improvement study support the use of a variety of strategies to encourage participation in testing events with large numbers of homeless individuals, including education, gift cards, shelter staff encouragement, involvement of local faith leaders and more broad support by the community. An additional qualitative study would complement these findings, as populations appear to differ in beliefs and attitudes depending on their location and other demographics. Motivational strategies to influence testing rates can be fine-tuned if beliefs, perceptions and attitudes are better understood.
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Introduction
The current SARS-CoV-2 pandemic has raised concerns for the homeless in both social service agencies and medical communities, as the homeless are more likely to be both victims and vectors of disease spread. Homeless individuals historically have greater exposure to viral epidemics (influenza as a prime example), as well as greater vulnerability for more severe viral illness, due in part to comorbidities such as pre-existing respiratory and cardiac disease, drug use and diabetes.\textsuperscript{1,6} Contributory environmental risks include inadequate sanitation, lack of access to healthcare services, crowded living conditions (e.g., shelters, hotels and rooming houses), interactions with legal and penal systems and general lack of personal protective equipment (PPE).\textsuperscript{7} Baggett et al. states that “the high number of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections and the potential for rapid spread in congregate settings support the need for proactive, universal COVID-19 testing strategies” in homeless populations.\textsuperscript{3}

Testing for both active and recent SARS-CoV-2 infection, via reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction or antibody detection, are key components of general community prevention. Testing in 4 major U.S. cities between late March and mid-April 2020 found that up to 66% of San Francisco homeless shelter residents and 16% of homeless shelter staff were positive for SARS-CoV-2.\textsuperscript{8} Community incidence outside of homeless shelters was highest in Boston, at 14.4%, as a comparison. After a rapid outbreak among 3 homeless service sites in King County, Washington State, the Centers for Disease Control stated that rapid interventions, including testing and isolation to identify cases and minimize transmission, were necessary.\textsuperscript{9} A pilot study of COVID-19 testing and support to reduce outbreak risk in Hamilton, Ontario (Canada) used strategies of shelter facility restructuring, daily symptom screening and rapid testing via nasopharyngeal swab (NPS) for those endorsing viral symptoms. These strategies resulted in isolation precautions, but no denominator was given as to whether any residents refused testing or isolation, or what they understood about the virus and how to manage symptoms.\textsuperscript{10}

Kumar Kar et al. note that homeless mentally ill people have a lack of health awareness and poor help-seeking behaviors due to marginalization.\textsuperscript{11} Homeless populations receive preventive screening or test results less often, including for HIV and hepatitis (as well as for cervical and breast cancer in homeless women), despite greater risk.\textsuperscript{3,6,10,12-14} Public health officials and homeless service providers emphasize that homeless persons need to follow virus precautions while maintaining usual ongoing health care due to their high risk for medical and psychiatric decompensation.\textsuperscript{7} To prevent viral outbreaks in homeless communities, work has included: 1) enhanced communication strategies, 2) infection control actions including isolation quarantine methods, 3) resource allocation, to mitigate against illness exposure and environmental immune stresses (such as lack of sleep and nutrition) and 4) planning for future outbreaks.\textsuperscript{15,16} Spirituality is an additional important factor to consider, as a study by Tsai and Rosenheck concluded that religious faith in chronically homeless adults may influence clinical and psychosocial outcomes.\textsuperscript{17} The homeless must have basic knowledge and ideally connections with case managers, outreach staff and faith leaders to partner together in mitigation, infection control and ongoing health maintenance.

It is, therefore, critical to know the attitudes of homeless individuals about COVID-19 testing and their rates of accepting testing, so that the homeless and their communities may be safely triaged for illness, quarantined if exposed or tested and if positive, isolated, protected and appropriately treated. To better understand the testing attitudes, perceptions, and motivations in the Duval County, Jacksonville, FL homeless population, Sulzbacher Center, a Federally Qualified Healthcare Center, undertook a quality improvement (QI) project. The QI project was performed simultaneously to a clinical testing outreach and a collaborative research study with a university medical center to learn more about current health status and the comorbid health conditions in the Duval County homeless population. The QI project consisted of a questionnaire given before and after giving and reviewing a Centers for Disease Control (CDC) fact sheet on COVID-19 and/or NPS testing. The information learned from this project was to immediately inform feasible ways to increase testing and compliance with treatment and infection control strategies in
predicted future waves or new pandemics.

Methods
The Sulzbacher QI Committee approved this project in consultation with Dr. Michael Flynn, HCA South Atlantic Division Director of Research. Nasopharyngeal swabs for SARS-CoV-2 were donated to Sulzbacher Center by Quest Laboratories as part of a clinical initiative to learn the point prevalence of COVID-19 in the Duval County, Jacksonville, FL homeless population. The NPS testing was done in partnership with other local homeless shelters and drop-in centers, and was available to all who wanted it, including shelter residents and staff. NPS testing was performed on May 1, 4, 5, 6 and 7, 2020. The City of Jacksonville provided funds for $10 grocery gift cards to encourage participation.

To coordinate the testing, Sulzbacher Center teamed with Changing Homelessness (a Housing and Urban Development (HUD) grant-funded social service umbrella agency dedicated to advocacy, training, education and communication linkage) and the University of Florida Health-Jacksonville (UF Health; an academic health center located in areas of need in Duval County). The Sulzbacher Center and UF Health performed testing and data collection. Both Sulzbacher and UF Health used their mobile medical bus for the outreach. UF Health also conducted a simultaneous research project collecting clinical data about current health status and medical comorbidities, approved by their Institutional Review Board. A total of 8 testing sites, local shelters and drop-in sites within Duval County, Jacksonville, FL were included: Sulzbacher Center Downtown, Sulzbacher Village, Salvation Army Downtown, City Rescue Mission-McDuff Avenue, City Rescue Mission-Downtown, Trinity/Clara White Missions, Urban Rest Stop-Church Street and Urban Rest Stop-Downtown.

The Bell Homeless Perceptions of COVID-19 Checklist (Figure 1) was given to the shelters and drop-in centers ahead of the testing dates. Those aged 18 years or older, who were homeless residents of the shelters, walk-in homeless or homeless center staff members were asked to participate. Staff members gave a paper form of the Bell Checklist to those who were interested in being tested for COVID-19 before the NPS testing. The form also included non-identifiable demographic information and reasons why they may be agreeing to testing. Clinical staff then reviewed key points of the CDC education form about the COVID virus (see Appendix A) or gave out the CDC education form about the COVID virus. Those who were not considered a staff member were provided with a $10 gift card at the end of the data collection.

Testing and survey collections were performed by staff from Sulzbacher Center, Changing Homelessness, UF Health (including paid, previously furloughed, physical therapists) and Or-
ange Park Medical Center Psychiatry Program residents. Demographic data was collected so testing results could be reported to the individual; also, so they could be notified of testing results by the Duval County Department of Health (as required by law if positive) and the individual’s insurance company billed for the analysis, if applicable. The QI component was not linked to any personal health information (PHI). Each individual was given a unique identifier. Paper data was entered without PHI into an Excel spreadsheet by Dr. Bell. Hard copies of the data were kept in a locked file cabinet in a locked office at Sulzbacher Center. To tabulate and understand the results, hypotheses, percentage data, crosstab and chi-square tests were completed using IBM SPSS Statistics 24. Data that was unknown was left as missing but if a checklist form was completed before or after testing, or without testing, the individual was counted as an active participant.

Results

Demographics

Demographic data are presented in Table 1 by total group and by site. Homeless participants (N=764) in this QI project had a mean age of 48 years with the bulk of participants over age 50 (46.9%). The mean age varied based on location, with the lowest mean age of 39.5 years at Sulzbacher Village, which houses families, and the highest being at CRM McDuff (52.4 years). The majority of participants did not have insurance (66.9%), which again varied based on location (the Salvation Army showed the highest insured rate at 51%). The majority of participants were male (66.0%) with the highest percentage of females being at the Sulzbacher Village (50.0%), and no females being at Sulzbacher Downtown (a men-only campus).

Black/African American was the predominant race identified (51%) with Trinity/Clara White showing the highest percentage of Black/African Americans (59%). Non-Hispanic was the most common ethnicity (89%) with the highest percentage (96%) of non-Hispanic participants tested at the Urban Rest Stop Downtown. (Table 1) Ethnicity is reported separate from race as per 1997 U.S. Office of Management and Budget Revisions to the Standards for the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity (https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/omb/fedreg_1997standards).

Test Acceptance
(N=679; 88.9% of the 764 who completed a Bell Checklist)

Attitudes toward testing

Pre-NPS test attitudes demonstrated that the majority (59.2%) wanted to be tested; 24.7% did not answer; 10.1% did not think they needed to be tested but agreed to it, and 4.6% did not want to be tested and declined testing, with 0.3% tested but declining to answer the Bell Checklist. Post-NPS testing, 53.1% wanted testing, with 20.3% stating they did not want it (though still got it) and 19.6% did not answer (unknown). Sulzbacher Downtown had the most (90.5%) participants wanting the NPS test on the Bell Checklist pre-NPS test, which dropped to 53.6% post-NPS testing (Table 2).

The top reasons all participants as a group wanted to get the NPS testing (beyond believing it would help them or others, which was endorsed when stating a desire to be tested) (Table 2) were: 1) “I’m curious about the test and/or the results” (47.8%), 2) “The shelter encouraged me to go” (37.6%), 3) “My faith will protect me from the virus” (31.3%), 4) “I’ll get a gift card” (24.2%), 5) “My family and/or friends have said I should” (14.1%), and 6) “My healthcare team said I should” (8.1%). Reasons to not be tested included: 1) “I am already isolated from society” (20.3%), 2) “I am afraid it may hurt” (14.8%), 3) “I’m worried about what will be done with my information” (3.3%), 4) “I don’t really care - there are other things that worry me more” (2.9%), and 5) “I don’t really want to know” (0.4%). Of note, at the Urban Rest Stop Downtown location, the number one reason to be tested was the gift card (63.1%), while at CRM McDuff, Trinity/Clara White and CRM State the number one reason was that the “The shelter encouraged me to go” (73.7%, 44.8% and 58.9%, vs. 10.5%, 12.7%, and 18.5% for the gift card, respectively).

For those who wanted testing, the most endorsed attitudes were: 1) “I’m curious about the test and/or the results”; 2) “My faith will protect me from the virus”; and 3) “The shelter encouraged me to go.” (Table 3) For those who didn’t want testing, the top attitudes were: 1) “The shelter encouraged me to go”; 2) “I’m curious about the test and/or the results”; and 3) “I’ll get a gift card.” All the attitude respons-
### Table 1: Demographics of Homeless Participants in SARS-CoV-2 Testing in the Jacksonville Community

| Demographics | Total | SA | USRD | Village | CRM McDuff | Trinity Clara |
|--------------|-------|----|------|---------|------------|---------------|
| Age, mean    | 49.79 | 48.4 | 51.22 | 51.22 | 39.73 | 51.22 |
| 18-34        | 11.4 | 15.4% | 7 | 17.1% | 18 | 13.3% | 21 | 22.1% | 40 | 44.3% |
| >35-49       | 213 | 28.9% | 7 | 17.1% | 34 | 26.9% | 19 | 25.3% | 4 | 7.8% |
| >50          | 365 | 49.4% | 23 | 56.1% | 40 | 47.6% | 70 | 60.0% | 45 | 60.0% |
| Unknown      | 47 | 6.4% | 3 | 7.3% | 2 | 2.4% | 6 | 4.7% | 5 | 6.8% |
| Total        | 741 | 100% | 84 | 100% | 128 | 100% | 95 | 100% | 57 | 100% |

| Table 1: Demographics of Homeless Participants in SARS-CoV-2 Testing in the Jacksonville Community |
|------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|                  | N     | %     | N     | %     | N     | %     |
| **Demographics** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Age, mean        | 49.79 | 41 | 128 | 52 | 165 | 75 |
| 18-34            | 11.4 | 8.4 | 9.4 | 7.5 | 16.4 | 12.4 |
| >35-49           | 213 | 15.2 | 21 | 16.4 | 34 | 26.9 | 19 | 15.2 | 40 | 26.9 |
| >50              | 365 | 26.3 | 23 | 18.2 | 40 | 31.3 | 70 | 27.0 | 45 | 31.3 |
| Unknown          | 47 | 3.4 | 3 | 2.4 | 2 | 1.5 | 6 | 2.3 | 5 | 3.4 |
| Total            | 741 | 100% | 84 | 100% | 128 | 100% | 95 | 100% | 57 | 100% |

| **Race**         |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| White            | 205 | 27.5 | 21 | 25.3 | 39 | 30.5 | 47 | 27.7 | 47 | 27.7 |
| Black            | 316 | 42.6 | 15 | 18.2 | 50 | 39.5 | 42 | 26.2 | 47 | 40.5 |
| Other            | 6 | 0.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.8 |
| Total            | 741 | 100% | 84 | 100% | 128 | 100% | 95 | 100% | 57 | 100% |

| **Ethnicity**    |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Hispanic         | 15 | 2.0% | 2 | 2.4% | 4 | 3.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Non-Hispanic     | 615 | 84.9% | 35 | 41.6% | 81 | 64.4% | 11 | 5.7% | 115 | 90.2% |
| Total            | 630 | 100% | 37 | 100% | 89 | 100% | 11 | 100% | 115 | 100% |

| **Gender**       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Men              | 495 | 67.0% | 21 | 51.2% | 68 | 50.0% | 95 | 52.6% | 173 | 60.0% |
| Women            | 194 | 26.3% | 10 | 24.4% | 31 | 24.6% | 34 | 20.3% | 27 | 9.6% |
| Transgender      | 2 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.8% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.8% |
| Unknown          | 47 | 6.4% | 3 | 7.3% | 2 | 1.6% | 6 | 3.2% | 5 | 8.8% |
| Total            | 741 | 100% | 84 | 100% | 128 | 100% | 95 | 100% | 57 | 100% |

| **Income**       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| No               | 498 | 67.4% | 17 | 41.5% | 84 | 65.6% | 17 | 32.1% | 66 | 49.6% |
| Yes              | 194 | 26.3% | 7 | 17.1% | 32 | 25.0% | 18 | 28.0% | 37 | 28.0%
| Declined         | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.6% |
| Unknown          | 47 | 6.4% | 3 | 7.3% | 2 | 2.4% | 6 | 4.7% | 5 | 8.8% |
| Total            | 741 | 100% | 84 | 100% | 128 | 100% | 95 | 100% | 57 | 100% |

| **Insurance**    |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| No               | 498 | 67.4% | 17 | 41.5% | 84 | 65.6% | 17 | 32.1% | 66 | 49.6% |
| Yes              | 194 | 26.3% | 7 | 17.1% | 32 | 25.0% | 18 | 28.0% | 37 | 28.0% |
| Declined         | 1 | 0.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.6% |
| Unknown          | 47 | 6.4% | 3 | 7.3% | 2 | 2.4% | 6 | 4.7% | 5 | 8.8% |
| Total            | 741 | 100% | 84 | 100% | 128 | 100% | 95 | 100% | 57 | 100% |

| **Race**         |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Asian            | 6 | 0.8% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.8% |
| Pacific Islander | 6 | 0.8% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.8% |
| Declined         | 2 | 0.3% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.8% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.8% |
| Unknown          | 47 | 6.6% | 3 | 7.3% | 2 | 2.4% | 6 | 4.7% | 5 | 8.8% |
| Total            | 741 | 100% | 84 | 100% | 128 | 100% | 95 | 100% | 57 | 100% |
### Table 2. Attitudes of Homeless Participants in SARS-CoV-2 Testing in the Jacksonville Community

| Pre Test attitude                  | Total  | SA      | USRD    | URSC    | Village | Downtown | CRM McDuff | Trinity Clara White | CRM State |
|-----------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|------------|---------------------|-----------|
| N                                 | %      | N       | %       | N       | %       | N        | %          | N                   | %         |
| Want to be tested                 | 444    | 58.1%   | 31      | 75.6%   | 76      | 90.5%    | 104        | 81.3%               | 18        |
| Don’t think it’s needed           | 70     | 9.2%    | 1       | 2.4%    | 3       | 3.6%     | 7          | 5.5%               | 10        |
| Doesn’t want to be tested         | 27     | 3.5%    | 1       | 2.4%    | 1       | 1.2%     | 0          | 0.0%               | 2         |
| Declined to answer                | 2      | 0.3%    | 0       | 0.0%    | 0       | 0.0%     | 0          | 0.0%               | 1         |
| Unknown                           | 185    | 24.2%   | 3       | 7.3%    | 2       | 2.4%     | 5          | 3.9%               | 22        |

| Post Test attitude                |        |         |         |         |         |         |            |         |                  |
|-----------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| N                                 | %      | N       | %       | N       | %       | N        | %          | N                   | %         |
| Wanted testing                    |        |         |         |         |         |         |            |         |                   |
| Yes                               | 404    | 52.9%   | 23      | 56.1%   | 45      | 53.6%    | 80          | 62.5%               | 30        |
| No                                | 154    | 20.2%   | 4       | 9.8%    | 30      | 35.7%    | 25          | 19.5%               | 8         |
| Declined                         | 0      | 0.0%    | 0       | 0.0%    | 0       | 0.0%     | 0          | 0.0%               | 0         |
| Unknown                           | 150    | 19.6%   | 14      | 34.1%   | 9       | 10.7%    | 23          | 18.0%               | 14        |

| Why/Why not testing               |        |         |         |         |         |         |            |         |                  |
|-----------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| N                                 | %      | N       | %       | N       | %       | N        | %          | N                   | %         |
| Family encouraged me              | 105    | 14.1%   | 3       | 7.3%    | 22      | 26.2%    | 30          | 23.4%               | 8         |
| Healthcare Provider               | 62     | 8.1%    | 4       | 9.8%    | 8       | 9.5%     | 16          | 12.5%               | 6         |
| Personally Curious                | 363    | 47.8%   | 21      | 51.2%   | 36      | 42.9%    | 75          | 58.6%               | 27        |
| Gift Card                         | 185    | 24.2%   | 10      | 24.4%   | 53      | 63.1%    | 47          | 36.7%               | 13        |
| Afraid of the test would hurt     | 112    | 14.8%   | 6       | 14.6%   | 9       | 10.7%    | 26          | 20.3%               | 12        |
| Shelter encouraged me             | 284    | 37.6%   | 13      | 31.7%   | 9       | 10.7%    | 22          | 17.2%               | 15        |
| I’m already isolated from society| 154    | 20.3%   | 7       | 17.1%   | 7       | 8.3%     | 37          | 28.9%               | 18        |
| My Faith will protect me           | 239    | 31.3%   | 9       | 22.0%   | 15      | 17.9%    | 64          | 50.0%               | 24        |
| Privacy worries                   | 25     | 3.3%    | 0       | 0.0%    | 0       | 0.0%     | 9           | 7.0%               | 2         |
| Don’t care                        | 3      | 0.4%    | 0       | 0.0%    | 0       | 0.0%     | 1           | 0.8%               | 1         |
| Better things to worry about      | 22     | 2.9%    | 0       | 0.0%    | 0       | 0.0%     | 16          | 12.5%               | 0         |

| Why/Why not testing               |        |         |         |         |         |         |            |         |                  |
|-----------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| N                                 | %      | N       | %       | N       | %       | N        | %          | N                   | %         |
| Family encouraged me              | 105    | 14.1%   | 3       | 7.3%    | 22      | 26.2%    | 30          | 23.4%               | 8         |
| Healthcare Provider               | 62     | 8.1%    | 4       | 9.8%    | 8       | 9.5%     | 16          | 12.5%               | 6         |
| Personally Curious                | 363    | 47.8%   | 21      | 51.2%   | 36      | 42.9%    | 75          | 58.6%               | 27        |
| Gift Card                         | 185    | 24.2%   | 10      | 24.4%   | 53      | 63.1%    | 47          | 36.7%               | 13        |
| Afraid of the test would hurt     | 112    | 14.8%   | 6       | 14.6%   | 9       | 10.7%    | 26          | 20.3%               | 12        |
| Shelter encouraged me             | 284    | 37.6%   | 13      | 31.7%   | 9       | 10.7%    | 22          | 17.2%               | 15        |
| I’m already isolated from society| 154    | 20.3%   | 7       | 17.1%   | 7       | 8.3%     | 37          | 28.9%               | 18        |
| My Faith will protect me           | 239    | 31.3%   | 9       | 22.0%   | 15      | 17.9%    | 64          | 50.0%               | 24        |
| Privacy worries                   | 25     | 3.3%    | 0       | 0.0%    | 0       | 0.0%     | 9           | 7.0%               | 2         |
| Don’t care                        | 3      | 0.4%    | 0       | 0.0%    | 0       | 0.0%     | 1           | 0.8%               | 1         |
| Better things to worry about      | 22     | 2.9%    | 0       | 0.0%    | 0       | 0.0%     | 16          | 12.5%               | 0         |
es differed between those who wanted NPS testing compared to those who did not want the test, based on Pearson Chi-Square Tests (chi-square 130.467, df 11, sig. 0.000; Table 3). Further subanalysis teased apart individual differences in attitudes between the two groups. First, whether or not participants wanted the gift card did not influence their desire to get testing (chi-square 0.45, df 1, sig 0.5). Second, people who wanted testing were more likely to believe that faith would protect them from the virus (chi-square 28.558, df 1, sig. 0.000). People who were not faith-influenced were less likely to want testing.

**Discussion**

This quality improvement project was unique in that it examined perceptions, interest, and motivations of homeless people to seek or receive active viral testing during a pandemic. The Sulzbacher Center undertook this project with the aim not only to test clinically for SARS-CoV-2, but to understand the beliefs and perceptions about why homeless individuals agreed to be tested, with a client-centered, collaborative, quality improvement focus. Too often the homeless population is ignored or directed to comply with edicts. If their attitudes are considered, organizations that serve the homeless will be better informed to approach and partner with homeless individuals on major health crises, such as a pandemic, with true buy-in and informed consent.

The quality improvement study was conducted in Jacksonville, Florida, a state that did not expand Medicaid. It is not surprising therefore that the majority of individuals (66.9%) in this study lacked insurance. Black/African American was the most common race identified in this homeless population, which nationally makes up 40 percent of the homeless population despite representing only 13 percent of the general population, due to factors such as poverty, rental housing discrimination, incarceration and lack of mental health treatment. The percentage of males and females in this study (66.0% and 27.1%, respectively) were in keeping with the annual point-in-time count data for Florida in 2019 (64.8% male and 34.9% female). Although the top reason for the total number of homeless persons to get the nasopharyngeal swab testing was curiosity, for those not wanting testing, the most common attitude was being encouraged by the shelter to go. Some attitudes varied by site, with some sites taking a more mandatory approach to testing (CRM McDuff, Trinity/Clara White and CRM State),

| Attitude                                      | NO   | %     | YES   | %     |
|-----------------------------------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| Family/friends said I should                  | 25   | 23.4% | 82    | 76.6% |
| Healthcare team said I should                 | 15   | 24.6% | 46    | 75.4% |
| Curious about the test and/or the results     | 80   | 22.1% | 282   | 77.9% |
| Gift card or other incentive                  | 66   | 36.1% | 117   | 63.9% |
| Afraid it would hurt                          | 22   | 19.5% | 91    | 80.5% |
| Shelter encouraged me to go                   | 108  | 37.8% | 178   | 62.2% |
| Already isolated from society                 | 44   | 29.1% | 107   | 70.9% |
| Faith will protect me from the virus          | 50   | 21.2% | 186   | 78.8% |
| Worried about what will be done with my information | 9    | 36.0% | 16    | 64.0% |
| Don’t really want to know                     | 2    | 66.7% | 1     | 33.3% |
| Don’t really care, other things worry me more | 12   | 54.5% | 10    | 45.5% |
resulting in a highest value of 73.7% of home-
less endorsing shelter encouragement
versus a low of 10.7% at the Urban Rest Stop-Dow-
town. Faith played an important role with the
perceptions of the homeless clients, with close
to one third (31.3%) of all participants citing it
as a factor in their approach to testing in the
pandemic. Over 75% of those wanting testing
felt faith would protect them. One individu-
al asked a resident volunteer if the question
on faith was “a trick question” and stated, “I
believe in God but I also believe in science.”
Homeless individuals also changed their view
of the testing at the Sulzbacher downtown
site after the NPS, with 90% initially indicating
they wanted testing declining to almost half
after testing; anecdotal comments included:
test discomfort, and invasion of privacy. The
time of day the testing occurred may also
have played a role in the post-testing decline
and responses: often individuals do not stay at
the shelter during the day, and the pre-NPS
checklists were completed in the evening when
more people were on campus. People who only
considered testing in response to a paternalis-
tic approach or a gift card are consistent with
a pre-conventional moral development level
(Kohlberg’s Level 1), where they have an obedi-
ence and punishment or self-interest orienta-
tion. Those homeless who endorsed both faith
and a desire to be tested may be more prosa-
cially oriented toward ‘the greater good’, and
may be representative of Kohlberg’s post-con-
ventional Level 3. Level 2 (conventional) are the
individuals who are conforming to authority.20

Limitations
The number of homeless tested at the Sulz-
bacher Village was lower than expected, as well
as least robust in data collection. Also of note,
the mobile medical bus and internet were expe-
riencing technical difficulties that day.

Other limitations of this project include real-
world behaviors. Different shelter sites had
variable approaches toward encouraging test-
ing by staff; this may reflect the reality that
some staff and sites have more paternalistic or
authoritative attitudes rather than encouraging
self-actualizing behavior, or may themselves
may be fearful of COVID and its complications
for themselves and their clients and under-
standably want their clients tested. Therefore,
bias in attitudes of those completing testing
may be present. The current study did not a
priori characterize or analyze homeless shelter
sites by the subgroups of populations served.
Those in a rest stop may be considerably differ-
ent than those in an overnight shelter. Those in
the Sulzbacher Village were by definition more
likely to be women. Additionally, the project
did not include homeless adolescents. They are
another important subgroup whose attitudes
often differ from adults. The survey itself was
brief and not psychometrically designed or
tested for validity or reliability. It also lacked a
full range of attitudes to inquire about, includ-
ing more positive variables, potentially creating
a bias in valence of response.

There is little literature with which to compare
this project to. The majority of publications
about beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions are
toward the homeless, rather than of the home-
less. The closest comparison is with an influen-
za mobile outreach immunization program for
vulnerable populations in Melbourne, Australia.
Although over half the group had at least one
risk factor for severe influenza, 60% had not
received an influenza vaccine the prior year,
with most reporting that they were ‘not wor-
rried about influenza’ as their reason. Those who
were pregnant listed a health care provider’s
recommendation as the most frequently given
reason for why they desired immunization.21
These results for a potentially similar respirato-
ry viral outbreak indicate that paternalism and
cultural and educational variables affect health
care literacy and promotion and alter percep-
tions of preventive care in vulnerable popula-
tions.

Findings from this quality improvement study
support considering a variety of strategies to
encourage participation in testing events with
large numbers of homeless individuals. These
include: education, gift cards, shelter staff
encouragement (especially for retesting), local
faith leader involvement and increased support
from the community, to encourage self-isola-
tion, when necessary, and to help the home-
less meet self-care and basic needs. The best
strategies may be specific to the shelter and
their staff and clients, as some between-group
differences are noted for site of participation.
Future projects can ideally allow adequate
planning time so that focus groups including
homeless persons, shelter staff and health care workers from a variety of settings may together discuss survey items and how to best test strategies to promote compliance with pandemic recommendations for screening, prevention and treatment.
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