

The Role of Testing Availability on Intentions to Isolate during the COVID-19 Pandemic:

A Randomized Trial

Justin C. Zhang, BS, David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA

Katherine L. Christensen, MBA, Anderson School of Management at UCLA

Richard K. Leuchter, MD, UCLA Health Department of Medicine

Sitaram Vangala, MS, UCLA Health Department of Medicine

Maria Han, MD MBA MS, UCLA Health Department of Medicine

Daniel M. Croymans, MD MBA MS, UCLA Health Department of Medicine

Corresponding Author

Daniel M. Croymans MD MBA MS

UCLA Health Department of Medicine

100 Medical Plaza Driveway, Los Angeles, CA 90095

Email: dcroymans@mednet.ucla.edu

Office: (310) 206-8000

Funding Source

The Morrison Center for Marketing and Data Analytics

Abstract

Background: Little information exists on how COVID-19 testing availability influences intentions to engage in risky behavior. Understanding the behavioral effects of testing availability may provide insight into the role of adequate testing on controlling viral transmission.

Objective: To evaluate the impact of testing availability on behavioral intention to self-isolate in a simulated scenario with participants who have been clinically diagnosed with COVID-19.

Methods: A total of 1400 participants were recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) through a national, online, opt-in survey. Participants were randomized to one of three hypothetical scenarios. Each scenario asked participants to imagine having symptoms consistent with COVID-19 along with a clinical diagnosis from their physician. However, scenarios differed in their testing result: testing unavailable, positive test, or negative test. The primary outcome was intention to engage in high-risk COVID-19 behaviors, measured using an 11-item mean score (range 1-7) that was pre-registered prior to data collection. The randomized survey was conducted between July 23rd to July 29th, 2020.

Results: Out of 1194 respondents (41.6% male, 58.4% female) with a median age of 38.5 years, participants who had no testing available in their clinical scenario showed significantly greater intentions to engage in behavior facilitating COVID-19 transmission compared to those who received a positive confirmatory test result scenario (difference (SE): 0.14 (0.06), $P=0.016$), equating to an 11.1% increase in mean score risky behavior intentions. Intention to engage in behaviors that can spread COVID-19 were also positively associated with male gender, poor health status, and Republican party affiliation.

Conclusion: Testing availability appears to play an independent role in influencing behaviors facilitating COVID-19 transmission. Such findings shed light on the possible negative externalities of testing unavailability.

Trial Registration: *Effect of Availability of COVID-19 Testing on Choice to Isolate and Socially Distance*, NCT04459520, <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04459520>

Keywords: COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2; cross-sectional survey; testing; risky behavior; gender; health status; political affiliation

Introduction/Background

In the first six months of the coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, the U.S. has reported more cases of COVID-19 than any other country in the world [1]. One of the factors contributing to the spread of the SARS-Cov-2 virus has been inadequate self-isolation fueled by widespread testing unavailability affecting 40 of the 50 U.S. states [2]. Control of the virus has been further complicated by a polarized political landscape and longstanding sociodemographic disparities that limit access to healthcare [3,4].

While previous studies conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic as well as other infectious outbreaks have identified a number of factors associated with self-isolation behavior (e.g., demographics, vulnerability, political beliefs, fear), few studies have explored how COVID-19 confirmatory testing availability directly influences intentions to engage in behaviors which facilitate viral transmission [5-7]. Insight into this relationship would inform the public health response to future outbreaks. To this end, we conducted a web-based survey with randomized, hypothetical vignettes evaluating the impact of different testing scenarios on risky behavioral intentions in those presumed to have COVID-19.

Methods

Study Participants

Study participants were recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk), an online survey platform found to yield results comparable to that of traditional sampling means [8]. Participants were eligible if they were U.S. residents (defined by zip code), over 18 years of age, and passed

all attention checks. Surveys were completed in Qualtrics. This randomized trial was exempted by the UCLA Institutional Review Board.

Design

Eligible participants were invited to complete a 5-question, pre-test survey on Amazon Mechanical Turk, assessing Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) construct response (**Supplemental eFigure 1**) and were compensated \$0.10 for their time [9]. These questions assessed: individual attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control regarding COVID-19 self-isolation and protective behaviors. An additional four questions were included for attention check purposes (**Supplemental eFigure 1**). Participants who successfully completed the pre-test survey were invited to complete the full survey. To contact prior participants, we used the behavioral research tool, TurkPrime [8].

The survey instructed participants to imagine they were in one of three hypothetical scenarios. Each scenario began with the participant experiencing symptoms commonly associated with COVID-19 (fever and cough) and a physician clinically diagnosing them with COVID-19 and advising the participant to self-isolate. Each scenario differed in testing result: in arm 1 COVID-19 confirmatory testing was not available, in arm 2 the participant received a positive confirmatory test for the COVID-19 virus, and in arm 3 the participant received a negative confirmatory test for the COVID-19 virus.

After being presented with their respective scenarios, participants were then asked about their likelihood to engage in a number of behaviors over the following two weeks. These behaviors were primarily selected from those that the CDC identified as increasing the risk for contracting COVID-19 (hereinafter referred to as “risky behaviors”) [10,11]. Demographic questions and other risky behaviors of interest were included *a priori* (**Supplemental eFigure 2**) [12-16]. All main survey participants were compensated \$0.60 for their time following survey completion.

Two pilot studies were run prior to launching the main survey to estimate power and effect size, as well as validate the internal consistency of the subscales (**Supplement eTable 1**). The first pilot study results were used to develop an aggregate, 11-item risky behavior score, along with personal decisions and social expectations subscores. Three additional items (voting, protesting/counter-protesting, public transportation) were evaluated as individual scores. The second pilot was used to estimate an effect size (Cohen’s *d*) for comparing the testing not available condition with the testing positive condition in terms of the 11-item total score. The sample size of 1,194 (398 per condition) was chosen so as to provide 80% power to detect the estimated effect size of 0.23, assuming a two-sample t-test and a two-sided significance level of 0.017 (3-fold Bonferroni correction for pairwise comparison of study arms). Survey responses for the main study were collected between July 23rd, 2020 to July 29th, 2020.

Participants were excluded from the main study analysis if they were unable to complete the English language consent form, did not list a proper U.S. zip code, failed any one of the attention check questions in either the pre-test or the main survey, or completed the main survey in under

120 seconds—a threshold determined by the study team after pre-testing 15 college-educated individuals (**Supplemental eFigure 3**).

Statistical Analysis

Survey responses were summarized for the full sample and stratified by testing scenario.

Quantitative responses were summarized using means, standard deviations and quartiles, and categorical and ordinal responses were summarized using frequency distributions. Comparisons between scenarios were performed using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for quantitative variables, Kruskal-Wallis tests for ordinal variables, and chi-squared or Fisher's exact tests as appropriate for categorical variables.

The primary outcome was the 11-item mean score, ranging from 1 (minimal intention to engage in high-risk behavior) to 7 (maximal intention). Secondary outcomes were the personal decisions and social expectations subscales (each also ranging from 1 to 7), as well as the likelihood of voting, protesting/political gathering, and public transportation 1-item questions. Each outcome was analyzed using a pair of linear regression models. A pre-registered model included as covariates age, sex, race/ethnicity, political affiliation, education level, location, and type of residence. A post-hoc model included as additional covariates self-rated health status, the Consumer Finance Protection Bureau's financial well-being score (financial well-being score), composite TPB score, region (metro adjacent v. not), and household risk. The financial well-being score is a 5-item score utilized by the U.S. government's Consumer Finance Bureau to evaluate financial well-being [17]. Construct questions evaluating attitudes, subjective norms,

and perceived behavioral control were adapted from a number of survey studies since no validated questionnaires specific to COVID-19 were available during the survey development period [9,18-19]. Because construct covariates had excellent internal consistency ($\alpha=0.83$), they were aggregated into a single composite we refer to as the composite TPB score. For the pre-registered analysis of the primary outcome, pairwise comparisons of the 3 scenarios were performed using an 0.017 significance level (3-fold Bonferroni correction for an overall alpha of 0.05). All other analyses applied an 0.05 significance level. All analyses were performed using R v. 3.6.2 (<http://www.r-project.org>).

Results

Table 1: Participant Demographics

Participant Demographics					
		All Respondents (N=1194)	Arm 1 - Testing Unavailable (N=401)	Arm 2 - Positive Test (N=390)	Arm 3 – Negative Test (N=403)
Gender					
	Male	497 (41.6%)	159 (39.7%)	169 (43.3%)	169 (41.9%)
	Female	682 (57.1%)	237 (59.1%)	216 (55.4%)	229 (56.8%)
	Prefer to self-describe	10 (0.8%)	3 (0.7%)	4 (1.0%)	3 (0.7%)
	Prefer not to say	5 (0.4%)	2 (0.5%)	1 (0.3%)	2 (0.5%)
Hispanic Ethnicity					
	Yes	110 (9.2%)	38 (9.5%)	39 (10.0%)	33 (8.2%)
	No	1069 (89.5%)	358 (89.3%)	346 (88.7%)	365 (90.6%)
	Prefer not to say	15 (1.3%)	5 (1.2%)	5 (1.3%)	5 (1.2%)
Race					
	White	911 (79.0%)	295 (76.6%)	303 (80.2%)	313 (80.3%)
	Black or African American	91 (7.9%)	37 (9.6%)	27 (7.1%)	27 (6.9%)
	Asian	105 (9.1%)	39 (10.1%)	33 (8.7%)	33 (8.5%)
	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	2 (0.2%)	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.3%)	0
	American Indian or Alaskan	10 (0.9%)	2 (0.5%)	2 (0.5%)	6 (1.5%)

	Native				
	Some other race, ethnicity, or origin	20 (1.7%)	6 (1.6%)	8 (2.1%)	6 (1.5%)
	Prefer not to say	14 (1.2%)	5 (1.3%)	4 (1.1%)	5 (1.3%)
	Missing	41	16	12	13
Political Affiliation					
	Republican	277 (23.2%)	86 (21.4%)	78 (20.0%)	113 (28.0%)
	Democrat	528 (44.2%)	177 (44.1%)	175 (44.9%)	176 (43.7%)
	Independent	389 (32.6%)	138 (34.4%)	137 (35.1%)	114 (28.3%)
Level of Education					
	8th grade or less	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.2%)	0	0
	Some high school, but did not graduate	8 (0.7%)	4 (1.0%)	3 (0.8%)	1 (0.2%)
	High school graduate or GED	131 (11.0%)	49 (12.2%)	42 (10.8%)	40 (9.9%)
	Some college or 2-year degree	355 (29.7%)	109 (27.2%)	124 (31.8%)	122 (30.3%)
	4-year college degree	451 (37.8%)	155 (38.7%)	130 (33.3%)	166 (41.2%)
	More than 4-year college degree	248 (20.8%)	83 (20.7%)	91 (23.3%)	74 (18.4%)
Type of Residence					
	House/condo/townhouse	910 (76.2%)	313 (78.1%)	298 (76.4%)	299 (74.2%)
	Apartment	271 (22.7%)	83 (20.7%)	88 (22.6%)	100 (24.8%)
	Dormitory	1 (0.1%)	0	0	1 (0.2%)
	Assisted living facility	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.2%)	0	0
	Other	11 (0.9%)	4 (1.0%)	4 (1.0%)	3 (0.7%)
Shared Living Space					
	I live by myself	186 (15.6%)	66 (16.5%)	62 (15.9%)	58 (14.4%)
	2 people	406 (34.0%)	127 (31.7%)	150 (38.5%)	129 (32.0%)
	3 people	243 (20.4%)	84 (20.9%)	75 (19.2%)	84 (20.8%)
	4 people	212 (17.8%)	74 (18.5%)	57 (14.6%)	81 (20.1%)
	5 people	97 (8.1%)	28 (7.0%)	32 (8.2%)	37 (9.2%)
	6 or more people	50 (4.2%)	22 (5.5%)	14 (3.6%)	14 (3.5%)
Overall Health					
	Excellent	183 (15.3%)	73 (18.2%)	48 (12.3%)	62 (15.4%)
	Very good	491 (41.1%)	166 (41.4%)	173 (44.4%)	152 (37.7%)

	Good	382 (32.0%)	111 (27.7%)	126 (32.3%)	145 (36.0%)
	Fair	119 (10.0%)	46 (11.5%)	36 (9.2%)	37 (9.2%)
	Poor	19 (1.6%)	5 (1.2%)	7 (1.8%)	7 (1.7%)
Household Member under 18					
	Yes	419 (35.1%)	147 (36.7%)	117 (30.0%)	155 (38.5%)
	No	775 (64.9%)	254 (63.3%)	273 (70.0%)	248 (61.5%)
Household Vulnerability					
	Yes	353 (29.6%)	128 (31.9%)	112 (28.7%)	113 (28.0%)
	No	829 (69.4%)	268 (66.8%)	274 (70.3%)	287 (71.2%)
	Do not know	7 (0.6%)	3 (0.7%)	3 (0.8%)	1 (0.2%)
	Prefer not to say	5 (0.4%)	2 (0.5%)	1 (0.3%)	2 (0.5%)

Study participant breakdown according to demographic factors and a number of other variables. Proportion of participants relative to the total number of participants is listed in parentheses. Questions corresponding to variables can be found in **Supplemental: Figure 4**.

Participants


Out of 1400 participants who completed the questionnaire, 1194 (85.3%) met all inclusion criteria and were included in the analysis. Basic demographic information presented in **Table 1** show that age, gender, race, and political affiliation were similar to national averages [20].

Participants were on average more educated than the national average. Arm 1 (testing unavailable group) contained 401 participants, arm 2 (positive confirmatory test group) contained 390 participants, and arm 3 (negative confirmatory test group) contained 403 participants.

Relationship of COVID-19 Test Result to Behavioral Intentions: Primary Outcome

The analysis of the primary outcome (**Table 2**) indicated that testing unavailability resulted in a significantly greater self-reported intention to engage in risky behavior compared to those with a positive test (arm 2) (difference (SE): 0.14 (0.06), $P=0.016$). This difference corresponds to an 11% relative increase in risky behavior intentions based on mean intention scores (**Figure 1**). Participants with negative tests demonstrated the greatest intention to engage in risky behavior compared to those without available testing (difference (SE): 0.35 (0.06), $P<0.001$) and positive tests (difference (SE): 0.49 (0.06), $P<0.001$), respectively. Relative to positive test group's mean score, those who received a negative test were 39% more likely to engage in risky behavior. Similar significant differences were noted when comparing the personal decisions and the social expectations subscores.

Figure 1: Adjusted Mean Scores for Total Score, Personal Decisions Subscore, and Social Expectations Subscore Across All Three Study Arms



The diamond represents mean behavioral intention scores based on primary, personal decision, and social expectations subscores. Bars represent Standard Errors. Y-axis depicts specific scenarios and x-axis depicts mean behavioral intentions based on 7-point Likert scale. "Relative Difference" refers to the relative difference in mean behavioral intention scores with Arm 2's mean score as a reference. Asterisks after the "Relative Difference" number indicate that the mean difference was found to be statistically significant compared to Arm 2 (indicated by adjacent p-values).

Linear Regression Modelling

The pre-registered model (**Table 2**) included several pre-specified covariates: gender, race, ethnicity, political affiliation, level of education, and type of residence. This model explained only 11% of the variance in the primary outcome. As a result, a post-hoc model (**Table 3**) incorporating several additional covariates (health status, financial well-being, composite TPB score, metro code, and household risk) was developed and found to explain 35% of the primary outcome variance. Exploratory analyses suggest that the R^2 of the pre-specified model was largely driven by scenario differences and political affiliation, while the R^2 for the post-hoc model was largely driven by scenario differences, political affiliation, and composite TPB scores.

Table 2: Linear Regression Model Evaluating Associations between Behavioral Intentions and Pre-Specified Covariates

Effect	Total Score ($R^2 = 0.11$)			Personal Score ($R^2 = 0.10$)			Social Score ($R^2 = 0.10$)		
	Estimate	SE	P	Estimate	SE	P	Estimate	SE	P
Scenario 2 v. 1	-0.14	0.06	0.016	-0.12	0.06	0.045	-0.18	0.07	0.011
Scenario 3 v. 1	0.35	0.06	<0.001	0.31	0.06	<0.001	0.42	0.07	<0.001
Scenario 3 v. 2	0.49	0.06	<0.001	0.42	0.06	<0.001	0.60	0.07	<0.001
Age (+1y)	0.00	0.00	0.036	0.00	0.00	0.177	-0.01	0.00	0.006
Gender (Ref = Male)			0.024			0.011			0.137
Female	-0.13	0.05	0.009	-0.15	0.05	0.002	-0.09	0.06	0.147
Prefer to self-describe	-0.34	0.29	0.228	-0.25	0.28	0.371	-0.50	0.35	0.157
Prefer not to say	-0.65	0.42	0.124	-0.59	0.42	0.162	-0.75	0.52	0.148
Race/Ethnicity (Ref = White)			0.854			0.316			0.897
Hispanic	-0.06	0.09	0.458	-0.09	0.09	0.289	-0.02	0.11	0.875
Black or African American	0.04	0.09	0.633	0.10	0.09	0.266	-0.06	0.12	0.613
Asian	-0.04	0.09	0.607	-0.12	0.09	0.150	0.09	0.11	0.376
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.42	0.80	0.596	0.94	0.79	0.239	-0.47	0.99	0.632
American Indian or Alaskan Native	-0.37	0.33	0.261	-0.34	0.33	0.291	-0.41	0.41	0.313
Some other race, ethnicity, or origin	-0.06	0.30	0.837	0.00	0.30	0.995	-0.17	0.38	0.654
Prefer not to say	0.21	0.27	0.447	0.23	0.27	0.385	0.16	0.34	0.641
Political Affiliation (Ref = Republican)			<0.001			<0.001			<0.001
Democrat	-0.36	0.06	<0.001	-0.32	0.06	<0.001	-0.42	0.08	<0.001

Independent	-0.13	0.07	0.041	-0.15	0.07	0.021	-0.10	0.08	0.197
Education (Ref = 8th grade or less)			0.587			0.445			0.861
Some high school, but did not graduate	0.07	0.85	0.935	-0.20	0.84	0.816	0.53	1.05	0.611
High school graduate or GED	0.07	0.80	0.929	-0.17	0.80	0.835	0.49	0.99	0.623
Some college or 2-year degree	0.16	0.80	0.838	-0.07	0.79	0.930	0.57	0.99	0.562
4-year college degree	0.14	0.80	0.865	-0.11	0.79	0.891	0.56	0.99	0.568
More than 4-year college degree	0.23	0.80	0.775	0.00	0.80	0.999	0.62	0.99	0.528
Residence (Ref = House/condo/townhouse)			0.807			0.600			0.931
Apartment	-0.07	0.06	0.228	-0.09	0.06	0.111	-0.03	0.07	0.661
Dormitory	-0.24	0.80	0.770	0.10	0.80	0.901	-0.82	1.00	0.410
Assisted Living Facility	-0.10	0.80	0.898	-0.16	0.80	0.843	-0.01	0.99	0.995
Other	-0.08	0.26	0.747	-0.12	0.26	0.641	-0.02	0.32	0.952

Pre-registered linear regression analysis based on the pre-specified covariates. Estimate refers to mean estimate difference compared to the reference group, and SE refers to Standard Error. Statistically significant differences were shown through bolded p-values.

Gender

Our pre-specified model found that gender identification was significantly associated with risky behavior intentions across the primary outcome and the two subscores. When compared to those who identify as men, those identifying as women reported significantly decreased risky behavior intentions (difference (SE): -0.13 (0.05), $P=0.009$) as measured by the primary outcome (**Table 2**). However, in the post-hoc model that included a control for pre-existing attitudes about the disease (the composite TPB score), this gender difference in behavior intentions was non-significant (difference (SE): -0.06 (0.04), $P=0.163$) (**Table 3**).

Table 3: Post-Hoc Linear Regression Model Evaluating Associations between Behavioral Intentions (Total Score, Subscores, Voting, and Protest) and Additional Covariates

Effect	Total Score (R ² = 0.35)			Personal Score (R ² = 0.32)			Social Score (R ² = 0.29)			Voting (R ² = 0.16)			Protest (R ² = 0.15)		
	Estimate	SE	P	Estimate	SE	P	Estimate	SE	P	Estimate	SE	P	Estimate	SE	P
Scenario 2 v. 1	-0.17	0.05	<0.001	-0.15	0.05	0.003	-0.22	0.06	<0.001	-0.33	0.12	0.006	-0.11	0.04	0.012
Scenario 3 v. 1	0.32	0.05	<0.001	0.28	0.05	<0.001	0.38	0.06	<0.001	0.39	0.12	0.001	0.11	0.04	0.011
Scenario 3 v. 2	0.50	0.05	<0.001	0.44	0.05	<0.001	0.60	0.06	<0.001	0.73	0.12	<0.001	0.22	0.04	<0.001
Age (+1y)	0.00	0.00	0.792	0.00	0.00	0.596	0.00	0.00	0.199	0.01	0.00	0.091	0.00	0.00	0.408
Gender (Ref = Male)			0.130			0.105			0.213			0.534			0.788
Female	-0.06	0.04	0.163	-0.08	0.04	0.047	-0.01	0.05	0.798	-0.13	0.10	0.191	0.03	0.04	0.348
Prefer to self-describe	-0.38	0.25	0.121	-0.29	0.25	0.243	-0.55	0.32	0.088	-0.27	0.60	0.651	0.09	0.21	0.688
Prefer not to say	-0.54	0.38	0.157	-0.49	0.38	0.203	-0.63	0.49	0.202	-0.67	0.93	0.473	-0.07	0.33	0.836
Race/Ethnicity (Ref = White)			0.725			0.176			0.798			0.957			0.798
Hispanic	-0.07	0.07	0.346	-0.10	0.08	0.208	-0.03	0.10	0.773	-0.20	0.18	0.281	0.04	0.07	0.546
Black or African American	0.05	0.08	0.554	0.11	0.08	0.192	-0.05	0.10	0.602	-0.05	0.19	0.783	0.01	0.07	0.919
Asian	0.00	0.07	0.963	-0.07	0.07	0.322	0.14	0.10	0.147	-0.15	0.18	0.397	0.02	0.06	0.716
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.84	0.69	0.220	1.35	0.69	0.052	-0.04	0.89	0.961	-0.43	1.67	0.797	0.10	0.60	0.864
American Indian or Alaskan Native	-0.34	0.28	0.226	-0.34	0.29	0.238	-0.35	0.37	0.335	-0.28	0.69	0.688	0.06	0.25	0.804
Some other race, ethnicity, or origin	0.06	0.26	0.817	0.13	0.26	0.618	-0.06	0.34	0.852	0.06	0.64	0.926	0.13	0.23	0.557
Prefer not to say	0.03	0.24	0.894	0.05	0.24	0.841	0.00	0.30	0.991	0.17	0.57	0.760	0.37	0.20	0.074
Political Affiliation (Ref = Republican)			0.082			0.364			0.014			0.437			0.135
Democrat	-0.10	0.06	0.089	-0.07	0.06	0.199	-0.14	0.07	0.061	-0.10	0.14	0.452	0.00	0.05	0.958
Independent	0.00	0.06	0.960	-0.02	0.06	0.737	0.04	0.07	0.572	-0.18	0.14	0.199	0.08	0.05	0.113
Education (Ref = 8th grade or less)			0.234			0.233			0.423			0.208			0.848
Some high school, but did not graduate	0.69	0.73	0.348	0.39	0.74	0.602	1.22	0.95	0.199	1.21	1.78	0.497	0.49	0.64	0.445
High school graduate or GED	0.53	0.69	0.445	0.26	0.70	0.705	0.99	0.90	0.268	1.03	1.68	0.542	0.45	0.60	0.458
Some college or 2-year degree	0.66	0.69	0.339	0.39	0.70	0.579	1.14	0.90	0.202	1.27	1.68	0.449	0.40	0.60	0.504
4-year college degree	0.61	0.69	0.376	0.33	0.70	0.639	1.11	0.90	0.214	1.33	1.68	0.428	0.40	0.60	0.503
More than 4-year college degree	0.70	0.69	0.317	0.44	0.70	0.533	1.17	0.90	0.193	1.50	1.68	0.372	0.45	0.60	0.457
Health Status (Ref = "Excellent")			0.037			0.028			0.033			0.026			0.947
Very good	-0.13	0.06	0.037	-0.06	0.06	0.330	-0.25	0.08	0.002	-0.46	0.15	0.002	0.03	0.05	0.613
Good	-0.15	0.07	0.021	-0.11	0.07	0.104	-0.23	0.08	0.007	-0.37	0.16	0.018	0.03	0.06	0.649
Fair	-0.09	0.09	0.307	-0.03	0.09	0.739	-0.20	0.11	0.086	-0.44	0.21	0.040	-0.01	0.08	0.897
Poor	-0.45	0.17	0.008	-0.52	0.17	0.003	-0.33	0.22	0.135	-0.81	0.42	0.051	-0.04	0.15	0.782
CFPB Score (+1)	0.00	0.00	0.635	0.00	0.00	0.431	0.00	0.00	0.947	0.00	0.00	0.555	0.00	0.00	0.342
Construct Score (+1)	-0.12	0.01	<0.001	-0.11	0.01	<0.001	-0.12	0.01	<0.001	-0.16	0.01	<0.001	-0.06	0.01	<0.001
Description (Ref = Metro)			0.025			0.082			0.022			0.562			0.220
Nonmetro - metro adjacent	0.21	0.08	0.007	0.17	0.08	0.029	0.28	0.10	0.006	0.20	0.19	0.309	0.11	0.07	0.109
Nonmetro - not metro adjacent	0.06	0.10	0.534	0.07	0.10	0.516	0.06	0.13	0.661	0.11	0.25	0.670	0.07	0.09	0.419
Household Risk (Ref = Yes)			0.110			0.113			0.190			0.476			0.884
No	0.09	0.05	0.054	0.07	0.05	0.132	0.13	0.06	0.040	-0.14	0.12	0.226	0.00	0.04	0.927
Do not know	0.36	0.27	0.179	0.48	0.27	0.078	0.16	0.35	0.646	0.56	0.65	0.393	-0.09	0.23	0.686
Prefer not to say	0.43	0.34	0.210	0.43	0.34	0.206	0.42	0.44	0.345	-0.16	0.83	0.842	-0.21	0.30	0.479
Residence (Ref = House/condo/townhouse)			0.200			0.097			0.684			0.182			0.589
Apartment/assisted living facility/dormito	-0.09	0.05	0.078	-0.11	0.05	0.033	-0.06	0.07	0.393	-0.20	0.12	0.108	-0.04	0.04	0.411
Other	-0.09	0.22	0.674	-0.11	0.23	0.619	-0.06	0.29	0.827	-0.54	0.54	0.317	-0.13	0.19	0.506

Post-hoc linear regression analysis, which includes additional covariates (health status, zip code density, CFPB, and composite TPB score) compared to the pre-registered model. Estimate refers to mean estimate difference compared to the reference group, and SE refers to Standard Error. Statistically significant differences were shown through bolded p-values.

Health Status

After controlling for other variables in the post-hoc model, self-identified health status was found to be significantly associated with behavioral intentions. Compared to those who reported “excellent” health status, those who reported a “poor” health status expressed the lowest intentions to engage in risky behavior (difference (SE): -0.45 (0.17), $P=0.008$) (**Table 3**).

Political Affiliation

In the pre-specified model, Republicans reported higher intentions to engage in risky behavior than either Democrats (difference (SE): 0.36 (0.06), $P<0.001$) or Independents (difference (SE): -0.13 (0.07), $P=0.041$), respectively. In other words, Republicans showed a 27% relative increase in mean intention score to engage in risky behavior compared to Democrats. Republicans were also less likely than Democrats and Independents to agree with the statement that “COVID-19 could have severe consequences on other peoples’ lives”. In the post-hoc model that included a control for pre-existing attitudes about the severity of the disease, the effect of political identity on intention to self-isolate was no longer significant.

Voting and Rally / Protest Intentions

Since in-person voting for the United States presidential election will occur this November, we assessed voting intentions and intention to participate in a large-scale political event (a rally or a protest). Participants who received a positive test result indicated a lower intention to vote in person than participants who had not received confirmatory testing (difference (SE): -0.30 (0.13), $P=0.018$). Participants who tested negative indicated higher intentions to participate in a rally or protest than both participants who tested positive (difference (SE): 0.21 (0.05), $P<0.001$) and participants who did not receive a test result (difference (SE): 0.13 (0.05), $P=0.005$).

Political affiliation also affected intention to vote in-person and intention to attend a rally or protest. Democrats reported decreased intentions to cast a ballot at a voting station (difference (SE): -0.43 (0.14), $P=0.002$) and attend a rally, protest or counter-protest (difference (SE): -0.13 (0.05), $P=0.008$) compared to Republican respondents. In other words, Democrats demonstrated

a 33% and 12% relative decrease in mean intention scores to vote in-person and attend a protest/political rally respectively. Those identifying as politically independent indicated significantly decreased intentions to vote in-person (difference (SE): -0.34 (0.14), $P=0.017$) compared to their Republican counterparts, but were not significantly less likely to attend a rally or a protest.

The Theory of Planned Behavior

The notable difference in R^2 between the pre-registered ($R^2=0.11$) and post-hoc ($R^2=0.36$) linear regression models suggest that the composite TPB score plays a significant role in explaining the variance seen with the total score. When evaluated within the post-hoc model, the first subjective norms question, “*People with COVID-19 should self-isolate*” showed the largest negative association with risky behavioral intentions (difference (SE): -0.27 (0.05), $P<0.001$)

(**Supplemental eTable 3**). Both attitudes questions demonstrated significant, yet smaller effect sizes (difference (SE): -0.12 (0.05), $P=0.009$) (difference (SE): -0.15 (0.03), $P<0.001$), and perceived behavioral control demonstrated a weaker, but nonetheless significant effect (difference (SE): -0.05 (0.02), $P=0.022$).

Discussion

Controlling for key demographic variables, participants who were clinically diagnosed with COVID-19 but had no testing available to them exhibited an 11% relative increase in intention to engage in risky behavior compared to those with a positive confirmatory test. Additionally, clinically symptomatic participants who received a negative test reported higher intentions to

engage in risky behavior than any other group. The present findings are relevant to both the outbreak and continued transmission of COVID-19 given that a majority of states do not have sufficient testing availability [2]. This study is the first to demonstrate how testing unavailability independently decreases intention to isolate in patients clinically diagnosed with COVID-19. While increasing testing availability alone will not fully eliminate viral transmission, recent evidence indicates that relatively small degrees of behavioral change (e.g., decreasing visits to non-essential businesses, wearing masks) may result in major decreases in viral transmission [21,22]. Thus, while the magnitude of behavior intention change reported in this study is small on an absolute level, our findings nonetheless suggest a clear role that testing availability could play in curbing viral transmission. These findings are particularly timely as the U.S. experiences a resurgence of cases [1].

In addition to the impact of testing unavailability, it is interesting to note the impact a negative test has on increasing risky behavior intentions. Despite a clinical diagnosis, those with a negative confirmatory test were significantly more likely to engage in behaviors facilitating viral transmission, likely because they believed that they could not transmit the virus to others. However, the larger magnitude of increased intention to engage in risky behavior among those with negative confirmatory tests relative to the other groups may be clinically relevant given reports of false negatives and testing uncertainty throughout the lifecycle of the virus [23,24].

The present results are also notable for the effect that political leanings have on the intention to self-isolate. Prior studies have found a correlation between mistrust of government-issued guidelines and partisan affiliation [25]. This study finds that Republicans are not only less likely

to agree that “*COVID-19 could have severe consequences on other peoples’ lives,*”, but also are 27% more likely to engage in risky behaviors compared to Democrats based on mean intention scores. These findings indicate that decreased belief in the dangers of the disease may play a role in Republicans’ decision to self-isolate and may suggest a potential pathway by which partisan beliefs influence behavioral intentions.

The results presented here also suggest that political leanings affect both intentions to vote in-person and intentions to attend political events that involve crowds (e.g., rally, protest). Regardless of testing availability, Democrats with a presumed COVID-19 diagnosis indicated a remarkable 33% lower likelihood to engage in in-person voting based on their respective mean intention scores. One downstream implication of these exploratory results may be that communities burdened with high rates of COVID-19 infections during Election Day might have significantly lower Democratic than Republican on-site turnout.

We found that those with poorer health revealed greater intentions to self-isolate. While several studies have shown that increased risk perception is associated with adopting self-protective behaviors, none of them evaluated the effect on behaviors post-infection [26-28]. It may be possible that those with greater comorbidities are particularly sensitive to the negative impact of transmitting the infection to others within their community. If so, these findings suggest that healthy people may inadvertently view social isolation and protective behaviors as an individual choice as opposed to those in poor health who may view it instead as a social obligation.

The fact that the Theory of Planned Behavior explains a significant amount of variance within our models suggests that changing public perception regarding the severity of the virus, subjective norms, or the perceived self-efficacy to engage in protective behavior can serve as a strategy to decrease risky behavior.

Although not directly evaluated here, it may be interesting to consider the effect of waiting to receive a definitive result on intention to engage in risky behaviors. While we hypothesize that a delay in test results might lead patients to behave similarly to respondents assigned to arm 1, further studies are necessary to evaluate the effect of testing delay on self-isolation behavior.

Limitations

There are several limitations to our study. First, survey respondents were recruited using MTurk, an online platform that—while as effective as traditional survey sampling methods—skews towards younger, more well-educated individuals [29]. Thus, our participant cohort cannot be interpreted as a nationally representative sample. Nonetheless, given the current pandemic and the need to minimize viral exposure for both researchers and participants, surveying study participants remotely using a well-established, online platform seemed the most reasonable and ethical means to conduct our study.

Study findings may also be limited by the hypothetical nature of the survey design, where we asked participants to imagine how they would react in such a scenario. However, survey scenarios were designed to be easily readable and were repeated on several pages in order to

facilitate participant comprehension and immersion (**Supplement eFigure 4**). To further reduce the number of participants who did not take an appropriate amount of time to imagine the scenario, we restricted analysis to participants who spent at least 2 minutes on the survey and passed all attention checks.

External validity of this study is limited by the fact that the study only evaluated behavioral intentions. A large body of prior research has noted that behavioral intentions do not immediately translate to behavioral engagement but are rather attenuated or enhanced by other factors. Nevertheless, behavioral intentions are commonly acknowledged as one of the best predictors of behaviors themselves, so it is likely that differences in behavior between the different groups would still exist [30,31].

Lastly, given the dynamic nature of the global pandemic and the recent shifts in public opinion towards both the global pandemic and self-protective measures, public opinion on this subject will likely continue to shift over time [32]. Despite these limitations, these significant differences in behavioral intentions are novel findings providing evidence that increased testing capacity may ultimately translate into fewer infections and fewer deaths.

Conclusion

Testing availability independently influences patients' intentions to engage in COVID-19 risky behaviors, even when controlling for a clinical diagnosis of COVID-19. Such findings shed light on the possible negative externalities of testing unavailability and thus highlight how increased testing availability might directly translate to decreased infections and deaths.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank The Morrison Center for Marketing and Data Analytics and UCLA Health Department of Medicine for providing financial funding allowing for us to conduct this survey study.

Author Contributions: Dr. Daniel M. Croymans, Dr. Richard K. Leuchter, Justin C. Zhang, Sitaram Vangala, Katherine L. Christensen, and Maria Han had full access to all of the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Concept and design: All authors.

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: Justin C. Zhang, Daniel M. Croymans, Katherine L. Christensen, Richard K. Leuchter

Drafting of the manuscript: All authors.

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Justin C. Zhang, Daniel M. Croymans, Katherine L. Christensen, Richard K. Leuchter

Statistical analysis: Sitaram Vangala

Obtained funding: Katherine L. Christensen, Daniel M. Croymans

Administrative, technical, or material support: Sitaram Vangala

Supervision: Daniel M. Croymans


References

1. Johns Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center. 2020. COVID-19 Map - Johns Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center. [online] Available at: <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html> [Accessed 6 October 2020].
2. Collins, K., 2020. Is Your State Doing Enough Coronavirus Testing?. [online] Nytimes.com. Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/us/coronavirus-testing.html> [Accessed 6 October 2020].
3. Lieberman-Cribbin W, Tuminello S, Flores RM, Taioli E. Disparities in COVID-19 Testing and Positivity in New York City. *Am J Prev Med.* 2020 Sep;59(3):326-332.
4. Moreland A, Herlihy C, Tynan MA, et al. Timing of State and Territorial COVID-19 Stay-at-Home Orders and Changes in Population Movement — United States, March 1–May 31, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020;69:1198–1203.
5. Li S, Feng B, Liao W, Pan W. Internet Use, Risk Awareness, and Demographic Characteristics Associated With Engagement in Preventive Behaviors and Testing: Cross-Sectional Survey on COVID-19 in the United States. *J Med Internet Res.* 2020;22(6):e19782. Published 2020 Jun 16.
6. Harper CA, Satchell LP, Fido D, Latzman RD. Functional Fear Predicts Public Health Compliance in the COVID-19 Pandemic [published online ahead of print, 2020 Apr 27]. *Int J Ment Health Addict.* 2020;1-14.
7. Grossman G, Kim S, Rexer JM, Thirumurthy H. Political partisanship influences behavioral responses to governors' recommendations for COVID-19 prevention in the United States [published online ahead of print, 2020 Sep 15]. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2020;202007835.
8. Litman L, Robinson J, Abberbock T. TurkPrime.com: A versatile crowdsourcing data acquisition platform for the behavioral sciences. *Behav Res Methods.* 2017;49(2):433-442.
9. Ajzen, I., 1991. The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), pp.179-211.
10. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2020. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) - Daily Activities And Going Out. [online] Available at: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/daily-life-coping/going-out.html>
11. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2020. *When To Quarantine: Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)*. [online] Available at: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/if-you-are-sick/quarantine.html>
12. Pasterny, L., 2020. *Do Ask, Do Tell: Capturing Data On Sexual Orientation And Gender Identity Globally*. [ebook] Stonewall, pp.18-21. Available at:

- <https://www.stonewall.org.uk/sites/default/files/do_ask_do_tell_guide_2016.pdf>
[Accessed 15 October 2020].
13. Hcahpsonline.org. 2020. *HCAHPS Quality Assurance Guidelines V15.0 Survey Instruments*. [online] Available at: <<https://hcahpsonline.org/en/survey-instruments/>> [Accessed 15 October 2020].
 14. Gallup.com. 2020. *Party Affiliation*. [online] Available at: <<https://news.gallup.com/poll/15370/party-affiliation.aspx>> [Accessed 15 October 2020].
 15. Seattle Flu Study. 2020. *Seattle Flu Study*. [online] Available at: <<https://seattleflu.org/welcome>> [Accessed 15 October 2020].
 16. Bults M, Beaujean DJ, de Zwart O, et al. Perceived risk, anxiety, and behavioural responses of the general public during the early phase of the Influenza A (H1N1) pandemic in the Netherlands: results of three consecutive online surveys. *BMC Public Health*. 2011;11:2. Published 2011 Jan 3.
 17. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. 2020. *Measure And Score Financial Well-Being / Consumer Financial Protection Bureau*. [online] Available at: <<https://www.consumerfinance.gov/practitioner-resources/financial-well-being-resources/measure-and-score/>> [Accessed 11 October 2020].
 18. Zhang X, Wang F, Zhu C, Wang Z. Willingness to Self-Isolate When Facing a Pandemic Risk: Model, Empirical Test, and Policy Recommendations. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2019;17(1):197. Published 2019 Dec 27.
 19. Schmid P, Rauber D, Betsch C, Lidolt G, Denker ML. Barriers of Influenza Vaccination Intention and Behavior - A Systematic Review of Influenza Vaccine Hesitancy, 2005 - 2016. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(1):e0170550. Published 2017 Jan 26.
 20. Census Bureau QuickFacts. 2020. U.S. Census Bureau Quickfacts: United States. [online] Available at: <<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045219>> [Accessed 6 October 2020].
 21. Rubin D, Huang J, Fisher BT, et al. Association of Social Distancing, Population Density, and Temperature With the Instantaneous Reproduction Number of SARS-CoV-2 in Counties Across the United States. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(7):e2016099.
 22. Ngonghala CN, Iboi E, Eikenberry S, et al. Mathematical assessment of the impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions on curtailing the 2019 novel Coronavirus. *Math Biosci*. 2020;325:108364.
 23. Arevalo-Rodriguez I, Buitrago-Garcia D, Simancas-Racines D, et al. False-negative results of initial RT-PCR assays for COVID-19: a systematic review. April 21, 2020 (<https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.16.20066787v1>). preprint.

24. Woloshin S, Patel N, Kesselheim AS. False Negative Tests for SARS-CoV-2 Infection - Challenges and Implications. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;383(6):e38.
25. Long, Elisa and Chen, Keith and Rohla, Ryne, Political Storms: Emergent Partisan Skepticism of Hurricane Risks (October 14, 2019). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3339723> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3339723>
26. Tooher R, Collins JE, Street JM, Braunack-Mayer A, Marshall H. Community knowledge, behaviours and attitudes about the 2009 H1N1 Influenza pandemic: a systematic review. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses*. 2013;7(6):1316-1327.
27. Bruine de Bruin W, Bennett D. Relationships Between Initial COVID-19 Risk Perceptions and Protective Health Behaviors: A National Survey. *Am J Prev Med*. Aug 2020;59(2):157-167.
28. Teasdale E, Yardley L, Schlotz W, Michie S. The importance of coping appraisal in behavioural responses to pandemic flu. *Br J Health Psychol*. 2012;17(1):44-59.
29. Mortensen K, Hughes TL. Comparing Amazon's Mechanical Turk Platform to Conventional Data Collection Methods in the Health and Medical Research Literature. *J Gen Intern Med*. Apr 2018;33(4):533-538.
30. Webb TL, Sheeran P. Does changing behavioral intentions engender behavior change? A meta-analysis of the experimental evidence. *Psychol Bull*. Mar 2006;132(2):249-68.
31. Callow MA, Callow DD, Smith C. Older Adults' Intention to Socially Isolate Once COVID-19 Stay-at-Home Orders Are Replaced With "Safer-at-Home" Public Health Advisories: A Survey of Respondents in Maryland. *J Appl Gerontol*. Jul 22 2020:733464820944704.
32. Fisher KA, Barile JP, Guerin RJ, et al. Factors Associated with Cloth Face Covering Use Among Adults During the COVID-19 Pandemic - United States, April and May 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. Jul 17 2020;69(28):933-937.

Adjusted Mean Scores for Total Score, Personal Decisions Subscore, and Social Expectations Subscore Across All Three Study Arms



The diamond represents mean behavioral intention scores based on primary, personal decision, and social expectations subscores. Bars represent Standard Errors. Y-axis depicts specific scenarios and x-axis depicts mean behavioral intentions based on 7-point Likert scale. "Relative Difference" refers to the relative difference in mean behavioral intention scores with Arm 2's mean score as a reference. Asterisks after the "Relative Difference" number indicate that the mean difference was found to be statistically significant compared to Arm 2 (indicated by adjacent p-values).