

1 **TITLE**

2 Are we ready when COVID-19 vaccine is available? Study on nurses' vaccine hesitancy in Hong

3 Kong

4

5 **AUTHORS**

6 Kin On KWOK^{1,2,3#*}, PhD; Kin Kit LI^{4,#*}, PhD; Wan In WEI¹, MPhil; Arthur TANG⁵, PhD; Samuel

7 Yeung Shan WONG^{1@}, MD, Shui Shan LEE^{1,2@}, MD

8

9 **AFFILIATION**

10 ¹ JC School of Public Health and Primary Care, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

11 Special Administrative Region, China.

12 ² Stanley Ho Centre for Emerging Infectious Diseases, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong

13 Kong Special Administrative Region, China.

14 ³ Shenzhen Research Institute of the Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, China

15 ⁴ Department of Social and Behavioural Sciences, City University of Hong Kong, China

16 ⁵ Department of Software, Sungkyunkwan University, Seoul, South Korea.

17 #Equal contribution

18 *Corresponding author

19 @Joint last authors

20

21

22

23

24 **CORRESPONDENCE I**

25 Name: Kin On Kwok;

26 Email: kkokwok@cuhk.edu.hk

27 Tel: + 852 22528405

28

29 **CORRESPONDENCE II**

30 Name: Kin-Kit Li;

31 Email: ben.li@cityu.edu.hk

32 Tel: +852 34428261

33 **ABSTRACT**

34 **Introduction:** Nurses are considered a trustworthy source of vaccine-related information to build
35 public confidence in vaccination. This study estimated nurses' influenza vaccine uptake and intention
36 to receive COVID-19 vaccine when available, and examined the corresponding psychological
37 antecedents.

38 **Methods :** A cross-sectional online survey among nurses was conducted during the main COVID-19
39 outbreak in Hong Kong between mid-March and late April 2020. Demographics, influenza
40 vaccination, intention to have COVID-19 vaccine, the 5C vaccine hesitancy components (i.e.,
41 confidence, complacency, constraints, calculation, and collective responsibility), work stress and
42 COVID-related work demands (i.e., insufficient supply of personal protective equipment,
43 involvement in isolation rooms, and unfavorable attitudes towards workplace infection control
44 policies) were reported.

45 **Results:** The influenza vaccination coverage and the proportion intending to take COVID-19 vaccine
46 were 49% and 63%, respectively, among 1205 eligible nurses. Influenza vaccine uptake was
47 associated with working in public hospitals and all 5C constructs, whereas stronger COVID-19
48 vaccination intention was associated with younger age, more confidence, less complacency and more
49 collective responsibility towards the vaccine. COVID-19-related demands were associated with
50 greater work stress, and hence stronger COVID-19 vaccination intention.

51 **Conclusion:** Vaccine uptake/intention was well predicted by the 5C constructs. With less work stress
52 among nurses in the post-pandemic period, the intention to take COVID-19 vaccine will likely drop.
53 The 5C constructs should be infused in vaccination campaigns. While a COVID-19 vaccine could be
54 ready soon, communities are not ready to accept it. More research work is needed to boost the uptake.

55 **Word Count: 242**

56 INTRODUCTION

57 Vaccination is considered an effective approach to prevent infection and substantially reduce
58 the mortality of many infectious diseases such as influenza and HPV¹². However, vaccine hesitancy, a
59 behaviour with delay in acceptance or refusal of vaccines despite availability of vaccination services,
60 has depolarized the vaccine-supporters and their anti-vaccine counterparts. The World Health
61 Organization (WHO) considered this phenomenon as one of the ten threats in global health in 2019.
62 Three main factors are contributing to vaccine hesitancy: (i) individuals may lack confidence in and
63 be fearful towards vaccines, especially with the misunderstanding that vaccines pose a risk of
64 infection; (ii) individuals do not perceive a need for a vaccine or do not value the vaccine. For
65 example, the disease severity may be underestimated that individuals hold a complacent attitude
66 towards the need for prophylaxis; and (iii) it may be difficult to access the vaccine³. This
67 phenomenon was most conspicuous in the uptake decision for influenza vaccine in the general
68 population. Ten years since the influenza pandemic in 2009, about half of the population in the
69 United States did not have a seasonal influenza vaccine in 2019⁴.

70 During the epidemic, Health Care Workers (HCWs) in the hospital can be considered as one
71 of the high-risk groups. HCWs' infection risk could be amplified during the ongoing epidemic due to
72 various factors including continuous exposure to patients, shortages of personal protective measure
73 (PPE) supply and inadequate infection control training after immediate response to outbreak among
74 HCWs. During the 2003 severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) epidemic in Hong Kong, the first
75 large transmission cluster occurred in Prince of Wales Hospital where HCWs accounted for a
76 substantial proportion of infection with 43.6% among cases admitted to this hospital⁵. HCWs were
77 consequently responsible for about a quarter of total SARS infections in Hong Kong². While we were
78 noted for SARS-coronavirus (SARS-CoV) in the 2003 epidemic, another five human coronaviruses

79 (OC43, 229E, NL63, HKU1, Middle East Respiratory Syndrome-CoV) had been circulating for
80 decades among human populations⁸. With their large genetic diversity and frequent genome
81 recombination, a new emerging coronavirus- SARS-CoV-2 was first identified in Wuhan, China in
82 late December 2019, and resulted in subsequent Coronavirus COVID-19 infections in other provinces
83 in mainland China, Hong Kong and ultimately all over the world. As of 24 February 2020, 3387
84 HCWs in medical facilities of 77262 COVID-19 laboratory confirmed cases in China (4.4%) were
85 recorded, of which 23 died from the infection⁹. With the challenge of possible resurgence of COVID-
86 19 in the near future, increasing the proportion of immune individuals among HCWs and the general
87 population to the disease by vaccination as the indirect protection would be the only viable option to
88 avoid nosocomial infection. A survey conducted during the period of nationwide lockdown in France
89 showed that a quarter of the adult population (26%) refused to vaccinate against SARS-CoV-2 when
90 it becomes available and were skeptical about its effectiveness¹⁰.

91 Understanding HCWs' vaccine hesitancy has substantial implications on public health
92 administrations during epidemics. HCWs' infections take a direct bow on the healthcare system
93 during epidemics in terms of reducing available healthcare workforce. They are usually at the front
94 end of fighting with epidemics, and some of them are required to routinely perform procedures with
95 high risks of contracting with pathogens. HCWs also serve as potential vectors for nosocomial
96 transmission that protection them from epidemics play a pivotal role in infection control. Besides,
97 HCWs were considered as a trustworthy source of vaccine-related information for patients¹¹. The
98 WHO vaccine advisory group also highlighted that their role in building public confidence in
99 vaccines¹². They convey the message of vaccination benefits and address the worries and concerns of
100 the patients on a new developed vaccine. However, the influenza vaccine coverage among nurses was
101 only slightly greater than 30%¹³. In light of this, improving our understanding of determinants

102 favoring vaccine uptake among nurses, a core group of HCWs, could have broader policy
103 implications for future COVID-19 vaccine acceptability and dissemination.

104 In this study, we first estimated the proportion of nurses with the intention in taking COVID-
105 19 and influenza vaccine uptake coverage. Second, a comparison analysis was conducted to examine
106 how well the vaccine hesitancy domains can predict both vaccines uptake decisions. Third, the
107 association of work stress with vaccine uptake decisions during the COVID-19 pandemic and factors
108 associated with the stress were also investigated.

109

110 **METHOD**

111 A cross-sectional online self-administered survey was conducted among nurses in Hong Kong.
112 The survey collected items including demographics (year of birth, sex, rank, presence of chronic
113 diseases), level of contacts with patients, influenza vaccine uptake and intention to take COVID-19
114 vaccine when available, statements measuring the 5 domains of vaccine hesitancy (see details below),
115 work stress level, supply of PPE, involvement in isolation rooms, and attitudes towards workplace
116 infection control policies.

117 This study was approved by the Survey and Behaviour Research Ethics Committee of The
118 Chinese University of Hong Kong (reference number: SBRE-19-251).

119

120 *Participants*

121 The required sample size to estimate seasonal influenza vaccine coverage and COVID-19
122 vaccine intention was 1049 based on an estimated population of 60000 registered or enrolled nurses
123 in Hong Kong, a 3% margin of error, a 95% confidence interval, and a prevalence rate at 50%. To
124 account for a 30% loss from invalid cases (ineligible or incomplete cases), the sample size required
125 was 1499. The online survey was disabled when the sample size was achieved.

126 In collaboration with the Association of Hong Kong Nursing Staff (AHKNS), registered
127 nurses, enrolled nurses, nursing students and trainees working in public or private medical facilities
128 were recruited in this study in the period from 16 March 2020 to 29 April 29 2020. Among over
129 50000 registered or enrolled nurses in Hong Kong, over 60% were members of AHKNS. A sample
130 recruited via AHKNS would be rather representative of the nurses in Hong Kong. Participants were
131 compensated with a coupon of HKD 25. Nursing students and retired nurses were excluded from this
132 analysis.

133

134 *Measures*

135 Vaccine hesitancy was measured using a 15-item tool developed from a “5C model” of
136 psychological antecedents to vaccination²⁴. Each of the 5 antecedents including confidence,
137 complacency, constraints, calculation, and collective responsibility, was assessed by 3 rating items on
138 a 7-point scale (1=*strongly disagree*; 7=*strongly agree*). Mean scores of items under each domain
139 were computed, with higher average score indicating stronger agreement of the corresponding
140 domain.

141 Work stress was measured by a single item asking participants to self-rate their level of work
142 stress after the outbreak of COVID-19 on an 11-point scale (0=*no stress at all*; 10=*the maximum*
143 *stress*). Insufficient supply of PPE was measured by asking participants to report any shortage of 7
144 PPE and an open option (1=*yes*; 0=*no*). The higher the total score, the more insufficient supply of
145 PPE was. A single item asking participants whether their job duties included work in infection
146 isolation rooms (1=*yes*; 0=*no*). Attitudes towards workplace infection control policies were measured
147 by 3 items stating if the workplace infection control policies were timely, sufficient, and effective,
148 respectively, on a 5-point rating scale (1=*strongly disagree*; 5=*strongly agree*).

149 Seasonal influenza vaccine uptake was measured by self-reported vaccination in 2019/20
150 while COVID-vaccine uptake intention was measured by a single item asking participants how likely
151 they will take the COVID-19 vaccine when available on a 11-point likert scale (0=*definitely no*;
152 10=*definitely yes*).

153

154 *Statistical Analysis*

155 To examine the potential bias on excluded cases, the sample characteristics were compared
156 between those with excluded and analyzed responses. To further examine the sample
157 representativeness, a couple of sample characteristics were compared with those reported in two
158 large-scale Health Manpower Surveys conducted by the Department of Health of the Hong Kong
159 SAR government. We summarized the characteristics of the study participants with descriptive
160 statistics such as mean, frequency, percentage and 95% binomial confidence interval (bCI) and their
161 bivariate correlations. A factor analysis using principal axis factoring approach was conducted to
162 examine the factorial validity of the 5C model in the current population. Multivariate linear and

163 logistic regression models were applied to identify factors associated with COVID-19 vaccine uptake
164 intention and influenza vaccine uptake decision respectively. The mediating effect was also tested
165 using path analysis with 2000 bootstrapped samples. A statistical significance was based on p-value
166 of 0.05. All analyses were conducted in R (v3.6.3) and Stata 16.0.

167

168 **RESULTS**

169 A total of 1660 attempts to complete the survey were recorded, of which 1205 respondents
170 were retained for the analyses. Excluded cases were those who had retired ($n=37$) or full-time nursing
171 students ($n=95$), or provided incomplete responses ($n=323$). No statistically significant difference was
172 found in sex composition, presence of chronic diseases, being a AHKNS member and ever had
173 influenza vaccination between those from complete and incomplete responses. Those with complete
174 responses, however, were more likely to be degree holders, working in the public service run by
175 Hospital Authority, older, have more frequent contact with patients, and a weaker intention to take
176 COVID-19 vaccine than those with incomplete responses. Registered nurses (80%) were slightly
177 overrepresented in our sample as compared with the percentage of registered nurses in the Nursing
178 Council of Hong Kong (75%), $\chi^2(1)=8.62, p=.003$. Nurses in this sample were slightly more likely to
179 be women, degree holders, less likely to work in Hospital Authority, and younger as compared with
180 those in the Health Manpower Survey, $\chi^2(1)=6.89, p=.009$. (**Table S1**)

181 **Table 1** shows sample characteristics and their bivariate associations with influenza vaccine
182 uptake and COVID-19 vaccine intention, respectively. The mean age of the sample was 40.79 years
183 ($SD=10.47$). Most participants were female (90%) and AHKNS members (96%). More than half of

184 the participants worked in the public hospitals (56%). Participants reported high exposure to patients
185 ($M=4.35$ on a scale of 1-5; $SD=1.23$).

186 The influenza vaccine coverage in the 2019-20 winter season was 49% (95% bCI: 47%, 52%).
187 Univariate associated determinants with higher influenza vaccine uptake were older age, presence of
188 chronic diseases, stronger vaccine confidence, collective responsibility, and work stress; and weaker
189 vaccine complacency and constraints. Intention to take COVID-19 vaccine when available was 6.52
190 (on a scale of 0-10; $SD=2.83$), which could be translated to 63% (95% bCI: 60%, 66%) reporting they
191 were likely to vaccinate (scored 6 or above). Univariate factors associated with stronger intention to
192 take COVID-19 vaccine were stronger vaccine confidence, calculation, collective responsibility, and
193 work stress; and weaker complacency and constraints. Correlations among the studied variables and
194 Cronbach's alpha coefficients for composite measures are presented in **Table S2**.

195 The results of a parallel analysis showed that 5 factors should be retained for the vaccine
196 hesitancy measure (**Table S3**). Bartlett's test, $\chi^2(105)=7841.71$, $p<.001$, and KMO measure (.82) also
197 supported the factorability and sufficiency of the data. Using Oblimin rotation, all items conformed to
198 the original factor structure, with factor loadings ranging from .63 to .84, except the only reverse item
199 tapping collective responsibility. It was removed and subsequently increased the Cronbach's alpha
200 coefficient of collective responsibility from 0.62 to 0.82.

201 To explore the relationship between the progression of number of daily confirmed cases and
202 nurses' intention to take COVID-19 vaccine, we overlaid the averaged intention of each reporting day
203 over the epidemic curve of Hong Kong (**Figure S1**). The data collection period covered the main
204 wave of COVID-19 outbreak in Hong Kong. The data reflected that intention was high and stable
205 during the burst of imported cases and local transmissions. A sudden drop in the intention to take

206 COVID-19 vaccine was observed when the number of confirmed cases dropped at the end of the
207 main wave of the outbreak. The level of intention was reinstated and less stable afterward.

208

209 *Validity of 5C model in influenza vaccine uptake and COVID-19 vaccine intention*

210 The reference models to predict influenza vaccine uptake or COVID-19 vaccination intention
211 included only covariates. Adding 5C into the influenza vaccination model increased the pseudo R^2
212 from 0.71% to 29.91%. In the final logistic regression model, influenza vaccination was associated
213 with working in public hospitals, $aOR=1.56$ (95% CI=1.16, 2.10), and having stronger vaccine
214 confidence, $aOR=2.70$ (2.27, 3.22), and collective responsibility, $aOR=1.67$ (1.40, 1.98), and weaker
215 complacency, $aOR=0.69$ (0.60, 0.79), constraints, $aOR=0.83$ (0.73, 0.94), and calculation, $aOR=0.62$
216 (0.51, 0.75). In comparison, adding 5C into COVID-19 vaccination model increased the R^2 from
217 0.27% to 17.70%. In the final multiple regression model, intention to take COVID-19 vaccine was
218 associated with being younger, $\beta=-.07$, $p=.02$, and having stronger vaccine confidence, $\beta=.29$, $p<.001$,
219 and collective responsibility, $\beta=.12$, $p<.001$, and weaker complacency, $\beta=-.11$, $p<.001$. **Table 2**
220 shows the coefficients of the two regression models. When COVID-19 vaccination intention was
221 dichotomized as likely (score 6-10) and not likely (score 0-5), the pseudo R^2 of the model was 10.19%.
222 The coefficients of the dichotomized COVID-19 vaccination intention model are presented in **Table**
223 **S4**.

224

225 *Effects of COVID-19 demands on vaccination intention via work stress*

226 To assess whether work stress mediated the association between COVID-19-related demands
227 and vaccination intention, we conducted a path analysis with 2000 bootstrapped samples (**Figure 1,**
228 **Table S5**). The indirect effects of insufficient supply of PPE, $\beta=.04$, $p<.001$, involvement in isolation
229 rooms, $\beta=.09$, $p=.005$, and attitudes towards control policies of public authorities, $\beta=-.07$, $p=.001$, on
230 COVID-19 vaccination intention via work stress were significant. Insufficient supply of PPE, $\beta=.17$,
231 $p<.001$, involvement in isolated rooms, $\beta=.39$, $p=.001$, and unfavorable attitudes towards control
232 policies of public authorities, $\beta=-.29$, $p<.001$, were associated with work stress. Work stress was
233 subsequently associated with vaccination intention, $\beta=.22$, $p<.001$, controlling for the predictors in
234 the previous COVID-19 vaccination intention model and the influenza vaccination status.

235

236 **DISCUSSION**

237 With the large-scale cross-sectional online survey with more than 1000 respondents during the
238 main wave of outbreak in the early phase of COVID-19 epidemic, this was the first study presenting
239 the uptake behaviour/intention of both influenza and potential COVID-19 vaccine among nurses in
240 Hong Kong. We report the estimates of both influenza vaccine uptake and intention to have COVID-
241 19 vaccine and identify their associated factors.

242 Despite the uncertainty of vaccine attributes such as effectiveness, side effects and duration of
243 protection, more than half of the respondents (63%) indicated that they were likely to opt for COVID-
244 19 vaccine when it becomes available. Younger age, stronger confidence and collective responsibility,
245 and weaker complacency were associated with stronger intention to be vaccinated. Also, COVID-19-
246 related demands including insufficient supply of PPE, involvement in isolated rooms and poorer
247 attitudes towards workplace control policies among nurses in the early phase of the epidemic in Hong

248 Kong were associated with greater work stress which in turn resulted in stronger intention to have
249 COVID-19 vaccine. Similar to a risk perception survey among the general population of Hong
250 Kong¹⁵, the experience of SARS contributing to strong psychological responses, as reflected in nurses'
251 pressure level, underlined their vaccine uptake intention for COVID-19. This also applies to influenza
252 vaccination. About half of the respondents (49%) reported to receive influenza vaccine in the
253 2019/2020 season. This estimate is statistically higher than those observed in similar surveys from the
254 same population in 2013/14, 2014/15, 2015/16, 2016/17 seasons (32%, 28%, 33% and 36%
255 respectively)^{13,16,17}. This high rate may possibly be due to the similarity of COVID-19 symptoms with
256 those observed in influenza or other respiratory diseases¹⁸. Working in the public hospital, more
257 confidence, less complacency, less constraints, less calculation and more collective responsibility
258 were associated with the decision to have influenza vaccine uptake. The 5C model was more
259 predictive of influenza vaccine uptake than intention to take COVID-19 vaccine based on the pseudo
260 R^2 coefficients of the models.

261 Our study has several important public health implications. **First**, identification of
262 determinants associated with COVID-19 vaccine uptake intention and influenza vaccine uptake
263 decision helps inform future vaccination campaigns. Older nurses with less intention to have COVID-
264 19 vaccine may contribute to possible nosocomial infection by their close contact with COVID-19
265 patients in the hospital. As older individuals are more susceptible to COVID-19 than younger
266 individuals¹⁹, in the absence of vaccine uptake, they will very likely be a high-risk group in the next
267 wave of COVID-19 epidemic. Older and experienced nurses are particularly valuable in public health
268 emergency. The protection to this high-risk and highly valuable subgroup is particularly important
269 during an outbreak. With sporadic cases or fewer imported cases after the major epidemic globally
270 and further improvement in infection control practices, nurses will likely have relatively lower work

271 stress. In this connection, they may be less likely to have intention to take COVID-19 vaccine when
272 the vaccine is available. Another challenge is that age is a mortality risk factor for COVID-19
273 infection, but older nurses are less likely to take the vaccine. With their experience, they are likely to
274 be the role models of the junior nurses. Health authorities should tailor a vaccination program to
275 nurses, in particular older nurses, to have COVID-19 vaccination. Future research is also needed in
276 order to investigate why older nurses have a higher vaccination hesitancy, and explore potential
277 strategies in consciousness raising and attitude changing towards vaccination.

278 *Second*, uptake of the safe and effective vaccine could only be considered as an additional
279 measure to help control the COVID-19 pandemic. Assuming the population of COVID-19 vaccine
280 coverage is similar to that observed among nurses in this study with a conservative effectiveness of
281 50%, the spread of infection will be halted if the effective reproductive number R_t , a measure to
282 estimate the number of secondary cases generated by an index case in the presence of interventions, is
283 below 1.45. Apart from vaccination campaigns to boost uptake rate and continuous development of
284 antiviral therapy, the health authority should further consider to conduct the modelling studies to
285 explore the optimal levels of assorted interventions including encouragement of social-distancing
286 adoption, border controls, active case surveillance and contact tracing to maintain the epidemic in a
287 manageable level.

288 *Third*, more emphasis should be put on psychological components when implementing the
289 national-wide vaccination program. Our statistical framework suggested that the variation of
290 psychological constructs in the 5C model contributed a significant proportion to explain both
291 influenza vaccine uptake and COVID-19 vaccine uptake intention. Our findings were consistent with
292 a previous study that the 5C vaccine hesitancy scale could well examine the psychological
293 antecedents of influenza vaccination¹⁴. However, the power of 5C was weaker in predicting COVID-

294 19 vaccine uptake intention. It is not surprising that calculation and constraints in the 5C hesitancy
295 model were found to be not associated with this intention. Given very limited information related to
296 COVID-19 vaccine during the early phase of the epidemic, respondents were not able to perform an
297 extensive information search and evaluate their synonyms for the possible perceived barriers on the
298 new vaccine. The validity of the 5C model may increase as there is more information about the new
299 vaccine. Further validation work of vaccine hesitancy models on COVID-19 vaccine is warranted.
300 When the strongest interventions such as mandatory vaccination or opt-out policies²⁰ are not ethically
301 justified, targeting the 5C components through evidence-informed interventions²¹, health
302 communication approaches²², and new media²³ may be some viable options.

303 This study has a couple of limitations. *First*, a convenience sampling approach may result in
304 potentially biased estimates. *Second*, this was a cross-sectional study which could not infer the causal
305 relationship. *Third*, possible recall bias may occur in self-reporting measurements. *Fourth*, not all
306 components in the 5C vaccine hesitancy model could address the intention to have COVID-19
307 vaccine hesitancy when the vaccine attributes are not available. *Fifth*, the intention to receive
308 COVID-19 vaccine may be sensitive to the time-varying infection and mortality rate of the ongoing
309 pandemic.

310

311 CONCLUSION

312 This study provided additional validity evidence for the 5C vaccine hesitancy model and
313 showed its potential in predicting and promoting COVID-19 vaccine when available. While we are
314 cautiously optimistic that the vaccine will decrease the transmission, its ability to control the
315 pandemic is dependent on multiple factors such as uptake rate and vaccine effectiveness. If only 63%

316 of nurses during the main outbreak in Hong Kong intended to take the COVID-19 vaccine, we
317 anticipate that promoting the vaccine to the general public in the post-pandemic period will be much
318 more challenging. While a vaccine could be ready in a few months, our community and many alike
319 are not ready to accept it. More research work is needed to optimize the uptake of the vaccine, our
320 best hope so far.

321

322 Words count= 3344

323 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

324 We thank the Association of Hong Kong Nursing Staff and Li Ka Shing Institute of Health Sciences,
325 The Chinese University of Hong Kong, for technical support. We also thank Mandy Li Man Wai for
326 administrative support. We acknowledge Research Fund for the Control of Infectious Diseases, Hong
327 Kong (Number: INF-CUHK-1), General Research Fund (Number: 14112818), Health and Medical
328 Research Fund (Ref: 18170312) and Wellcome Trust (UK, 200861/Z/16/Z).

329

330 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

331 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

332

333 **FUNDINGS**

334 This work is supported by the internal funding of The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

335

336 **EXCLUSIVE LICENCE**

337 This manuscript is published under the Creative commons licence (CC BY).

338

339 **CONTRIBUTORSHIP**

340 Kin On KWOK (KOK), Kin Kit LI (KKL), Samuel Yeung Shan WONG (SYSW) and Shui Shan
341 LEE (SSL) conceptualized the study; KOK and KKL analysed the data; KOK and KKL wrote up the
342 first draft of the manuscript; Wan In WEI (WIW), Arthur TANG (AT), SYSW and SSL reviewed and
343 edited the manuscript; SSL acquired funding and performed project administration.

344 **REFERENCES**

- 345 1 Osterholm MT, Kelley NS, Sommer A, Belongia EA. Efficacy and effectiveness of influenza
346 vaccines: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2012; 12: 36–44.
- 347 2 Gallagher KE, LaMontagne DS, Watson-Jones D. Status of HPV vaccine introduction and barriers
348 to country uptake. *Vaccine* 2018; 36: 4761–7.
- 349 3 WHO | SAGE working group dealing with vaccine hesitancy (March 2012 to November 2014).
350 2015; published online July 2.
351 https://www.who.int/immunization/sage/sage_wg_vaccine_hesitancy_apr12/en/ (accessed June 19,
352 2020).
- 353 4 Flu Vaccination Coverage, United States, 2018–19 Influenza Season | FluVaxView | Seasonal
354 Influenza (Flu) | CDC. 2019; published online Sept 25.
355 <https://www.cdc.gov/flu/fluvoxview/coverage-1819estimates.htm> (accessed June 19, 2020).
- 356 5 Lau JTF, Fung KS, Wong TW, *et al.* SARS transmission among hospital workers in Hong Kong.
357 *Emerg Infect Dis* 2004; 10: 280–6.
- 358 6 Kwok KO, Leung GM, Lam WY, Riley S. Using models to identify routes of nosocomial infection:
359 a large hospital outbreak of SARS in Hong Kong. *Proc Biol Sci* 2007; 274: 611–7.
- 360 7 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome - News. <https://www.info.gov.hk/info/sars/en/news.htm>
361 (accessed June 19, 2020).
- 362 8 Kwok KO, Lai F, Wei WI, Wong SYS, Tang JWT. Herd immunity - estimating the level required
363 to halt the COVID-19 epidemics in affected countries. *J Infect* 2020; 80: e32–3.
- 364 9 Zhan M, Qin Y, Xue X, Zhu S. Death from Covid-19 of 23 Health Care Workers in China. *N Engl*
365 *J Med* 2020; 382: 2267–8.

- 366 10 COCONEL Group. A future vaccination campaign against COVID-19 at risk of vaccine hesitancy
367 and politicisation. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020; published online May 20. DOI:10.1016/S1473-
368 3099(20)30426-6.
- 369 11 Larson H. Vaccine Hesitancy Among Healthcare Workers and Their Patients in Europe: A
370 Qualitative Study. ECDC, 2015.
- 371 12 WHO | Improving vaccination demand and addressing hesitancy. 2020; published online June 17.
372 https://www.who.int/immunization/programmes_systems/vaccine_hesitancy/en/ (accessed June 26,
373 2020).
- 374 13 Kwok KO, Li KK, Lee SS, *et al.* Multi-centre study on cultural dimensions and perceived attitudes
375 of nurses towards influenza vaccination uptake. *J Hosp Infect* 2019; 102: 337–42.
- 376 14 Betsch C, Schmid P, Heinemeier D, Korn L, Holtmann C, Böhm R. Beyond confidence:
377 Development of a measure assessing the 5C psychological antecedents of vaccination. *PLoS One*
378 2018; 13: e0208601.
- 379 15 Kwok KO, Li KK, Chan HHH, *et al.* Community Responses during Early Phase of COVID-19
380 Epidemic, Hong Kong. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2020; 26: 1575–9.
- 381 16 Chan DPC, Wong NS, Wong HTH, Lee S, Lee SS. Impact of influenza A (H3N2) seasonal
382 outbreak on the pattern of vaccination uptake in healthcare workers. *J Hosp Infect* 2015; 90: 354–5.
- 383 17 Li K-K, Chan MWH, Lee SS, Kwok KO. The mediating roles of social benefits and social
384 influence on the relationships between collectivism, power distance, and influenza vaccination
385 among Hong Kong nurses: A cross-sectional study. *Int J Nurs Stud* 2019; 99: 103359.
- 386 18 Kwok KO, Wong VWY, Wei WI, Wong SYS, Tang JW-T. Epidemiological characteristics of the
387 first 53 laboratory-confirmed cases of COVID-19 epidemic in Hong Kong, 13 February 2020.
388 *Euro Surveill* 2020; 25. DOI:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.16.2000155.

- 389 19 Niu S, Tian S, Lou J, *et al.* Clinical characteristics of older patients infected with COVID-19: A
390 descriptive study. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* 2020; 89: 104058.
- 391 20 Lytras T, Kopsachilis F, Mouratidou E, Papamichail D, Bonovas S. Interventions to increase
392 seasonal influenza vaccine coverage in healthcare workers: A systematic review and meta-
393 regression analysis. *Hum Vaccin Immunother* 2016; 12: 671–81.
- 394 21 Dubé E, Gagnon D, MacDonald NE, SAGE Working Group on Vaccine Hesitancy. Strategies
395 intended to address vaccine hesitancy: Review of published reviews. *Vaccine* 2015; 33: 4191–203.
- 396 22 Goldstein S, MacDonald NE, Guirguis S, SAGE Working Group on Vaccine Hesitancy. Health
397 communication and vaccine hesitancy. *Vaccine* 2015; 33: 4212–4.
- 398 23 Pedersen EA, Loft LH, Jacobsen SU, Søbørg B, Bigaard J. Strategic health communication on
399 social media: Insights from a Danish social media campaign to address HPV vaccination hesitancy.
400 *Vaccine* 2020; 38: 4909–15.

Table 1. Sample Characteristics, Crude Odds Ratios Predicting Influenza Vaccination, and Correlations with COVID-19 Vaccine Intention (N = 1205)

Predictor (range)	Mean / %	SD	Influenza vaccination	COVID-19 vaccination
			OR (95% CI)	intention <i>r</i>
Age (21-71)	40.79	10.47	1.01 (1.00, 1.02)	-.03
Sex (1 = women)	89.71%		0.98 (0.68, 1.42)	-.02
Chronic diseases (1 = yes)	12.70%		1.54 (1.09, 2.17)	.00
Public hospitals (1 = yes)	56.35%		1.25 (1.00, 1.57)	-.03
Patient contact frequency (1-5)	4.23	1.24	0.98 (0.89, 1.07)	.01
Confidence (1-7)	4.94	1.21	3.25 (2.81, 3.77)	.38***
Complacency (1-7)	3.64	1.24	0.56 (0.51, 0.62)	-.20***
Constraints (1-7)	3.15	1.28	0.69 (0.63, 0.76)	-.06*
Calculation (1-7)	5.61	0.88	1.03 (0.90, 1.17)	.11***
Collective responsibility (1-7)	5.28	1.16	2.43 (2.13, 2.78)	.33***
Work stress (0-10)	7.38	2.06	1.06 (1.00, 1.12)	.21***
Insufficient supply of PPE (0-8)	2.79	1.87	0.96 (0.91, 1.02)	.04
Involvement in isolated rooms (1 = yes)	32.70%		0.98 (0.77, 1.25)	-.03
Attitudes toward control policies (1-5)	2.56	1.05	1.14 (1.02, 1.27)	-.03

* $p < .05$, *** $p < .001$.

PPE: personal protective equipment.

Significant odds ratios (95% confidence interval) are presented in bold face.

Table 2. Effects of the 5C Model of Vaccine Hesitancy on Influenza Vaccination and COVID-19 Vaccination Intention

	Influenza vaccine		COVID-19 vaccination intention	
	Covariates only aOR (95% CI)	Full model aOR (95% CI)	Covariates only β (95% CI)	Full model β (95% CI)
Intercept	0.71 (0.34, 1.51)	0.06 (0.01, 0.29)		
Age (21-71)	1.01 (1.00, 1.02)	0.99 (0.98, 1.01)	-.03 (-.09, .03)	-.07 (-.12, -.01)*
Sex (1 = women)	1.00 (0.69, 1.46)	0.91 (0.57, 1.47)	-.03 (-.08, .03)	-.03 (-.08, .03)
Chronic diseases (1 = yes)	1.43 (1.00, 2.05)	1.01 (0.64, 1.60)	.01 (-.05, .07)	-.03 (-.08, .03)
Public hospitals (1 = yes)	1.27 (1.00, 1.61)	1.56 (1.16, 2.10)	-.03 (-.09, .03)	-.02 (-.08, .03)
Patient contact frequency (1-5)	0.97 (0.88, 1.06)	0.98 (0.87, 1.11)	.01 (-.05, .07)	.02 (-.03, .07)
Confidence (1-7)		2.70 (2.27, 3.22)		.29 (.22, .35)***
Complacency (1-7)		0.69 (0.60, 0.79)		-.11 (-.17, -.05)***
Constraints (1-7)		0.83 (0.73, 0.94)		.03 (-.02, .09)
Calculation (1-7)		0.62 (0.51, 0.75)		.05 (.00, .11)
Collective responsibility (1-7)		1.67 (1.40, 1.98)		.12 (.06, .19)***
Pseudo R^2	0.71	29.91		
R^2			0.27	17.70

* $p < .05$, *** $p < .001$.

Significant odds ratios (95% confidence interval) are presented in bold face.




Figure 1. The effects of 5C and the mediation effect of work stress on COVID-19 vaccination intention.