

Understanding the impact of a social support program in Immokalee, FL, during the COVID-19 pandemic

Lindsay Richards^{1*}, Leping Wang², Joashilia Jeanmarie³, Shirin Shafazand¹, Daniel Palazuelos^{4,5,6}, Vitina Monacello⁷

1. Miller School of Medicine, University of Miami, Miami, FL
2. Department of Sociology, Boston University, Boston, MA
3. Department of Sociology, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL
4. Department of Global Health and Social Medicine, Harvard University, Boston, MA
5. Division of Global Health Equity, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA
6. Partners In Health, Boston, MA
7. Department of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, NY

*Corresponding author:

Email: richards.lindsay@med.miami.edu (LR)

1 **Abstract**

2
3 From December 2020 to July 2021, \$700,000 was distributed in direct cash transfers to residents
4 of Immokalee, FL who tested positive for COVID-19. The goal of this study is to evaluate the
5 impact of this cash transfer program. We conducted 157 structured interviews with program
6 beneficiaries via phone call or home visit and asked about sociodemographic variables, how the
7 money was used, whether the money was sufficient for two weeks' financial needs, and participant
8 ability to self-isolate. A logit regression model was then used to explore the relationships between
9 sociodemographic variables and whether the respondent thought the money was enough for two
10 weeks of financial needs. A majority of respondents (83.7%) reported spending the check
11 exclusively on living expenses, and 99.3% reported that the money helped them stay home and
12 quarantine while having COVID-19. Offering direct cash transfers of \$800-\$1200 to residents of
13 Immokalee, FL who tested positive for COVID-19 was effective in reducing COVID-associated
14 financial burden, and this money was most likely to be spent on living necessities rather than
15 temptation goods. People with housing insecurity and without a high school degree were
16 significantly less likely to report that the money was enough for two weeks' financial needs,
17 indicating that these characteristics mark those in the population who may have needed more
18 support. Given that the COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated pre-existing health disparities, it is
19 important to understand the role of cash transfers as a public health tool and their potential impact
20 on community mitigation efforts.

21

22 **Introduction**

23
24 According to the Mixteco Indigena Community Organizing Project (MICOP) and Central Coast
25 Alliance for a Sustainable Economy (CAUSE), “farm workers remain the disposable essential
26 worker” [1]. From plantation economies to the present-day farm work industry, agribusiness in
27 Florida has relied on extracting wealth from workers who are deemed expendable and excluded
28 from rights and protections offered to the rest of the population. These fault lines can be
29 exacerbated by disaster, as was the case when the COVID-19 pandemic arrived in Immokalee.
30 Immokalee, FL, is an agricultural community located in Collier County of Southwest Florida
31 known for its tomato and citrus production. The number of residents changes from
32 approximately 14,000 during the off-season to between 20,000 and 30,000 during the tomato
33 picking season, which runs from September to June [2]. Its population is composed largely of
34 Mexican, Guatemalan, and Haitian immigrants, with nearly 40% of residents living below the
35 poverty line [3]. Farmworkers face many structural inequities that make them especially
36 vulnerable to the health and economic consequences of COVID-19 – crowded housing
37 conditions, poor labor protections, financial precarity, and documentation status, among others
38 [4]. By mid-June of 2020, Immokalee had reported 899 positive cases out of 2500 tests
39 conducted, while in neighboring Naples - a wealthier zip code but within the same county - there
40 had been only 76 cases [5]. Driven by advocacy from the Coalition of Immokalee Workers
41 (CIW), a worker-based human rights organization, many different not-for-profit groups stepped
42 in to respond to this crisis, including a local nonprofit called Misión Peniel. Misión Peniel’s
43 response focused on addressing the financial burden of missing two weeks of work for
44 quarantine purposes by implementing a cash transfer program for individuals who tested positive
45 for COVID-19. The aim of this cash distribution was to facilitate self-isolation while COVID-19

46 positive, incentivize testing, and help alleviate the disproportionate impact of the virus in the
47 Immokalee community. Residents of Immokalee were able to apply for this funding in two ways.
48 The first is that individuals were referred directly from COVID-19 testing events and their
49 applications were processed onsite after they received counseling regarding positive results and
50 public health recommendations. The second way to apply was to call a hotline number that was
51 set up for individuals who were tested elsewhere but lived in Immokalee. A team member would
52 then return their call to assist with completing an application over the phone. The eligibility
53 requirements for the cash transfer program were that recipients must be Immokalee residents and
54 must provide proof of current COVID-19 infection documented by a positive test in the past 10
55 days (per CDC guideline at the time). Applications were tracked in a spreadsheet and were
56 evaluated in the order in which they were entered on an ongoing basis. Applications were
57 reviewed by Mission Peniel staff to verify proof of eligibility namely address/ID provided and
58 documentation of positive test results. Less than 5% of applicants were denied. Reasons for
59 being denied included falsifying information on the application, not submitting proof of
60 address/residency in Immokalee, or lack of verification of positive test results. From December
61 2020 to July 2021, Misión Peniel distributed one-time checks of \$800 for single applicants and
62 \$1000 or \$1200 for applicants with children. The initial amount for families, defined as a parent
63 caring for a minor child/children, was set at \$1200. However, within a few weeks of the program
64 the amount was reduced to \$1000 in order to stretch limited funding during a surge in cases. A
65 total of 778 checks were distributed during this time period. Most participants received a check
66 within 7 days of applying, but some applications experienced additional administrative delays.
67 Checks were distributed one to two times a week and were available for pick-up outside of
68 Misión Peniel's office or delivered to recipients' homes. Given that many individuals were

69 quarantining at the time of distribution, a family member or friend was able to pick up the check
70 for them. Assistance was provided in the form of checks because this was the most accessible
71 means of receiving funds for the community.

72 **Methods**

73 **Study Overview**

74 The aim of this study was to evaluate the social and economic impact of Misión Peniel’s cash
75 transfer program, specifically with regards to understanding how this money was spent and
76 whether it was enough to support recipients during a two-week quarantine. From July 2021 to
77 mid-August 2021, we surveyed residents in Immokalee who had received a direct cash transfer
78 between December 2020 to July 2021 from the local social support program developed by
79 Misión Peniel. We conducted a structured interview where we asked a predefined list of
80 questions, presented in the same order, with most questions being close-ended in nature with
81 multiple options to choose from, and two open-ended follow-up questions to provide flexibility
82 for answers that might not be covered by the pre-coded choices. The survey included questions
83 on demographics (age, gender, race and ethnicity, marital status, education), employment
84 (status, industry), food insecurity, housing insecurity (eviction notice, behind on
85 rent or mortgage payment), transportation insecurity, income, financially supporting others, what
86 the check was used for, whether the money was enough to meet 2 weeks’ financial needs,
87 whether the money helped with quarantine in response to positive COVID-19 testing, whether
88 the respondent quarantined for the recommended 10 days, whether the respondent required
89 hospitalization, whether there were any difficulties and/or fees for cashing the check, preference
90 for lump-sum distribution versus spaced distributions, previous experiences with cash transfer

91 programs, etc. For respondents who responded “Other” to any given questions, we asked them to
92 specify with details.

93 Study participants were contacted first by phone to explain the study and ask if they would like
94 to participate. If we were not able to contact individuals by phone after two attempts, we also
95 attempted two visits to the home address provided by Misión Peniel. If both phone and home
96 visit contact were unsuccessful, we removed these individuals from the study. If someone could
97 not be reached or chose not to participate, we pulled another individual from the list. Once
98 contacted and verbally consented participants were read the survey questions either via phone or
99 in person at their homes. The survey was administered in either English, Spanish, or Haitian
100 Creole, depending on the respondent’s stated preference. Answers were entered into RedCap by
101 the study investigators. This protocol was submitted to the University of Miami IRB office and
102 deemed Not Human Research (IRB Submission 20210510).

103 **Eligibility Criteria**

104 Participants who had been enrolled in Misión Peniel’s social support program and received a
105 direct cash transfer were eligible for study participation. Only individuals ages 18 and older were
106 included in this study. Individuals were excluded if they could not be contacted by either phone
107 call or home visit. Misión Peniel provided a list of social support program recipients and their
108 contact information. Each participant from the database was assigned a number, and a random
109 number generator was used to select 275 individuals from this list out of 778 potential
110 participants. This number was chosen by the researchers based on an anticipation of the
111 maximum number of surveys that could be completed within the time frame of the study.
112 The final study sample consisted of 153 randomly selected Immokalee adult residents who either
113 tested positive for COVID-19 and/or had a child living with them who tested positive for

114 COVID-19, and who received a direct cash transfer from Misión Peniel during the time period of
115 December 2020 to July 2021. The analysis sample is restricted to complete cases.

116 **Study Variables**

117 **Outcome Variable**

118 The primary outcome variable was a dichotomous measure of whether the respondent reported
119 the money was enough to cover their financial needs for two weeks.

120 **Independent Variables**

121 *Food insecurity.* During the interview, the respondents were asked whether they had experienced
122 food insecurity; either not knowing where the next meal was coming from, or involuntarily
123 eating less than they need, on a regular basis, for a period of time lasting more than a month) in
124 the past 12 months.

125 *Housing insecurity.* During the interview, the respondents were asked two questions regarding
126 housing insecurity. The first question was whether they received an eviction notice in the past 12
127 months; the second question was whether they had been behind on paying for rent or mortgage in
128 the past 12 months.

129 *Transportation insecurity.* Respondents were also asked whether they experienced difficulty
130 getting needed services because they did not have transportation in the past 12 months.

131 *Income group.* Respondents were asked about their average weekly income range, classified into
132 five ordered categories including: 1) Less than \$250; 2) \$250-\$400; 3) \$400-\$550; 4) \$550-\$700;
133 and 5) More than \$700. We created 3 income categories according to whether the converted
134 annual income was below the 2021 national poverty line of \$12,880 (approximately \$12,900) for
135 a household of one, between the poverty line and 2.2 times of the poverty line, or whether it
136 exceeded 2.2 times of the poverty line. The value 2.2 is used here because the cut-off line

137 between the third and fourth income category, which is a weekly income of \$550, when
138 converted into annual income, equals \$12880, which is 2.2 times the federal poverty line.
139 *Employment status.* Self-identified employment status was measured including 1) Employed
140 (including full-time and part-time) or 2) Not working for pay/Unemployed.

141 **Covariates**

142 A set of covariates including whether the check was used for purposes other than necessities,
143 whether the respondent was family caregiver, and demographic factors including gender, age,
144 ethnicity, marital status, and educational level were controlled for in the model to sort out
145 confounding relationships.

146 **Modeling Strategy**

147 We fit a logit regression model on the data, in which food insecurity, housing insecurity,
148 transportation insecurity, employment status, and income group are used to predict whether the
149 money was enough for two weeks' financial needs. We also include use of check, whether the
150 respondent was currently financially supporting other individuals, and demographic indicators
151 including gender, age, marital status, educational level, and race and ethnicity.

$$152 \quad \ln \frac{\text{Pr}(\text{Enough_Money}_i)}{1 - \text{Pr}(\text{Enough_Money}_i)} = X_i\gamma + Z_i\delta$$

153 In the equation, Enough_Money_i indicates the binary outcome of whether the respondent

154 thought the money was enough for two weeks' financial needs. $\frac{\text{Pr}(\text{Enough_Money}_i)}{1 - \text{Pr}(\text{Enough_Money}_i)}$ denotes the

155 odds of the money being enough. $\text{Logit}(\text{Pr}(\text{Enough_Money}_i)) = \ln \frac{\text{Pr}(\text{Enough_Money}_i)}{1 - \text{Pr}(\text{Enough_Money}_i)}$ is the

156 link function to convert the odds to the 0-1 interval. X_i is the matrix of predictors of respondent i ;

157 Z_i is the matrix of covariates of respondent i ; γ and δ are vectors of regression coefficients.

158 Subscript i indexes each individual observation.

159 Results

160 A total of 157 Immokalee adult residents were surveyed out of 275 residents contacted (response
 161 rate of 57.1%). Of those surveyed, four respondents were excluded from the analysis due to
 162 missing income data. Table 1 represents all participant characteristics as well as two subgroups,
 163 created according to whether or not the money received met financial needs.

164 **Table 1. Participant Characteristics**
 165

Variable	Full sample (N=153)	Whether the money was enough for 2 weeks	
		Yes (N=117)	No (N=36)
Age, mean [SD], years	41 [14]	41 [14]	43 [13]
Male sex, N (%)	97 (63.4)	76 (65.0)	21 (58.3)
Ethnicity, N (%)			
Hispanic	141 (92.2)	108 (92.3)	33 (91.7)
Non-Hispanic	12 (7.8)	9 (7.7)	3 (8.3)
Married or cohabitated, N (%)	73 (47.7)	54 (46.2)	19 (52.8)
Educational level, N (%)			
Middle school or below	75 (49.0)	51 (43.6)**	24 (66.7)**
High school or above	78 (51.0)	66 (56.4)**	12 (33.3)**
Employment status, N (%)			
Employed	100 (65.4)	74 (63.2)	26 (72.2)

Not working for pay/unemployed	53 (34.6)	43 (36.8)	10 (27.8)
Income group, N (%)			
Income \leq poverty line	42 (27.5)	33 (28.2)	9 (25.0)
Income \leq 2.2*poverty line	81 (52.9)	60 (51.3)	21 (58.3)
Income $>$ 2.2*poverty line	30 (19.6)	24 (20.5)	6 (16.7)
Currently financially supporting other individuals, N (%)	108 (70.6)	79 (67.5)	29 (80.6)
Food insecurity, N (%)	26 (17.0)	15 (12.8)**	11 (30.6)**
Housing insecurity, N (%)	48 (31.4)	29 (24.8)***	19 (52.8)***
Transportation insecurity, N (%)	26 (17.0)	16 (13.7)**	10 (27.8)**
Check use for purposes other than necessities, N (%)	25 (16.3)	22 (18.8)	3 (8.3)

The results of Chi-square tests for the differences in means of each variable for respondents who reported the money was or was not enough for two weeks' financial needs are denoted as asterisks next to the summary statistics.

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

166 A majority of respondents (83.7%) reported spending the check exclusively on living expenses,
 167 including utilities (50.3%), food (45.9%), housing (44.6%), transportation (10.2%), and
 168 healthcare (8.9%). Of the recipients surveyed, 98.7% reported quarantining for ten days after
 169 their positive COVID-19 test, and 99.3% reported that the money helped them stay home and
 170 quarantine while having COVID-19. A total of 76.5% of respondents reported that the check was
 171 enough to cover their financial needs for two weeks. Table 2 presents the results from the logistic
 172 regression model in which employment status, income group, food insecurity, housing

173 insecurity, and transportation insecurity are used as predictors of whether the respondent thought
 174 the money was enough for two weeks' financial needs.

175 **Table 2. Odds ratios of participant characteristics and whether the check was enough for 2**
 176 **weeks' financial needs**

177

Variables	Odds Ratio (95% CI)
Age	1.01 (0.97, 1.05)
Male	0.78 (0.32, 1.86)
Hispanic	1.11 (0.22, 5.68)
Married or cohabitated	0.79 (0.29, 2.15)
High school education or above	2.98** (1.03, 8.63)
Employed	0.43 (0.13, 1.47)
Income group	
Poverty line<Income≤2.2*Poverty line	1.24 (0.32, 4.79)
Income>2.2*Poverty line	1.12 (0.24, 5.31)
Experienced food insecurity in past 12 months	0.42 (0.13, 1.34)
Experienced housing insecurity in past 12 months	0.35** (0.15, 0.81)
Experienced transportation insecurity in past 12 months	0.80 (0.24, 2.67)
Used check for purposes other than living necessities	2.40 (0.65, 8.85)
Currently financially supporting individuals other than themselves	0.88 (0.29, 2.72)

Note: Estimates displayed in the form of odds ratios.

Confidence intervals are provided in parentheses.

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

178 Housing insecurity is negatively associated with the odds of reporting the money was enough for
 179 two weeks' financial needs. Respondents who experienced housing insecurity in the past 12
 180 months had a 65% decreased odds of reporting that the money was enough versus for
 181 respondents who did not experience housing insecurity. There was a significantly positive

182 correlation between having a high school degree or above and the odds of reporting the money
183 was enough. Respondents with a high school degree or above are 1.98 times more likely than
184 respondents with middle school degree or less to report that the money was enough.

185 **Discussion**

186 A common concern of policymakers with regards to cash transfers is that poor households will
187 misuse the cash. This may explain why many governments and non-profit agencies opt for in-
188 kind social assistance despite economic reasoning which suggests that cash transfers may be
189 more efficient for beneficiaries [6]. This concern, however, is not supported by our data, wherein
190 a vast majority of respondents (83.7%) reported spending the check exclusively on living
191 necessities such as utilities, food, housing, transportation, and healthcare. These findings are
192 supported by a literature review by Evans and Popova [7], which found a negative relationship
193 between cash transfers and expenditures on temptation goods. Similar findings were seen also in
194 another study examining one-time cash transfers of \$1000 to individuals who tested positive for
195 COVID-19 in New York from May 2020 to May 2021. The authors concluded that after
196 receiving a cash transfer, individuals made “rational decisions to support their health and well-
197 being rather than “misusing” funds on temptation goods such as alcohol” [8]. Additionally, our
198 study revealed that nearly all recipients surveyed were able to self-isolate for 10 days as advised,
199 which suggests that individuals in our sample had an awareness of and desire to comply with
200 public health measures within their community.

201 Another measure in this study which may inform future programs was evaluating the quantity of
202 cash support provided, which ranged from \$800 to \$1200. A majority of respondents (76.5%)
203 reported that this amount was enough to cover their financial needs for two weeks. However,
204 when examining these responses stratified by demographic variables, we found that people with

205 housing insecurity and people without a high school degree were significantly less likely to
206 report that the money was enough for two weeks' financial needs ($p < 0.05$). Therefore, these
207 characteristics may mark those in the population who are especially vulnerable and could have
208 benefitted from more support. One explanation is that housing insecurity may be one of the
209 primary risk factors that prevents people from being able to self-isolate and stop spreading
210 COVID-19 after getting a positive test. Some cash transfer programs have previously attempted
211 to address disparities among recipients by creating targeted programs with varying eligibility
212 requirements [9]. However, other studies have revealed that residency-based cash transfer
213 programs may be more effective in practice than targeted programs, particularly during a
214 pandemic, because they can act quickly without requiring the time and resources to verify who
215 qualifies [10]. Therefore, we conclude that another way future cash transfer programs may
216 increase the likelihood of adequately supporting vulnerable members of a population is by
217 increased generosity in transfer amount.

218 One additional note is that a high number (81.7%) of respondents in our study answered "other"
219 for the survey question regarding race. Race and ethnicity questions in this survey were based on
220 the U.S. Census Bureau categories. This suggests that current census options exclude significant
221 identities and may not be accurately capturing the race-ethnic composition of respondents, which
222 has many implications for research utilizing these demographic measures.

223 **Limitations**

224 One important limitation is that responses to questions about self-isolating and benefitting from
225 the cash transfer may have been influenced by the social desirability bias, in which respondents
226 may tend to offer answers that they believe will be viewed desirably by others rather than
227 responses that are reflective of their true feelings or behaviors [11]. This is a significant concern,

228 given that participants may have associated surveyors with those who provided the cash transfer.
229 To mitigate the impact of this bias, it was explained prior to each survey that participant answers
230 would not affect eligibility for future cash transfers, and that one aim of the survey was to
231 identify areas of improvement within the program. Future studies should seek to evaluate these
232 measures in comparison with a control group who did not receive funding. An additional
233 limitation was the low response rate (57.1%). Many individuals were unable to be contacted even
234 after two phone calls and two home visits, which may have been influenced in part by seasonal
235 migration for work, as this study was conducted during the off-season for tomatoes in
236 Immokalee. Our hypothesis is that this introduced a bias that over-sampled people who had
237 fewer employment opportunities.

238 **Conclusion**

239 As the COVID-19 pandemic continues to evolve it is essential to utilize best practices and
240 policies to strategically address gaps in our public health response. It is indisputable that the
241 pandemic has had a disproportionate impact on vulnerable and marginalized groups, particularly
242 racial and ethnic minorities, and has exacerbated pre-existing disparities in the social
243 determinants of health. Our study revealed that offering direct cash transfers of \$800-\$1200 to
244 residents of Immokalee, FL who tested positive for COVID-19 was effective in reducing
245 COVID-associated financial burden and demonstrated that money was most likely to be spent on
246 living necessities rather than temptation goods. Therefore, we conclude that cash transfers may
247 be one effective tool to strengthen community COVID-19 mitigation efforts and address health
248 disparities and inequities.

249 **References**

- 250 1. Orleck A. And the virus rages on: “Contingent” and “essential” workers in the time of
251 COVID-19. *International Labor and Working-Class History*. 2021;99:1-4.
- 252 2. Walsh JM. Migrant mobilization: Factors contributing to the success of the Coalition of
253 Immokalee Workers. Duquesne University; 2005.
- 254 3. U.S. Census Bureau. QuickFacts. Florida: Immokalee CDP; 2019.
- 255 4. Partners In Health. “Florida Migrant Workers Among Hardest Hit by COVID-19.”
256 Partners In Health; 2020 July 30.
- 257 5. Reiley, Laura. “Migrant Farmworkers, Many Coronavirus Positive, Move North from
258 Florida to Other States.” *Washington Post*; 2020 June 11.
- 259 6. Banerjee A, Mullainathan S. The shape of temptation: Implications for the economic
260 lives of the poor. *National Bureau of Economic Research*; 2010 May 6.
- 261 7. Evans DK, Popova A. Cash transfers and temptation goods. *Economic Development and
262 Cultural Change*. 2017 Jan 1;65(2):189-221.
- 263 8. Kumar SL, Calvo-Friedman A, Clapp J, Brookover C, Davis NJ. Direct cash transfers for
264 patients with Covid-19 served by New York City’s safety-net health system. *NEJM
265 Catalyst Innovations in Care Delivery*. 2021 Jun 21;2(3).
- 266 9. Tabor SR. Assisting the poor with cash: Design and implementation of social transfer
267 programs. *World Bank Social Protection Discussion Paper*. 2002 Sep 30;223:79-97.
- 268 10. Braun RA, Ikeda D. Why cash transfers are good policy in the covid-19 pandemic. *Policy
269 Hub*. 2020 May 14;4.
- 270 11. Grimm P. Social desirability bias. *Wiley international encyclopedia of marketing*. 2010
271 Dec 15.

272 **Supporting information**

273 **S1 Table. Raw survey data.**