medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

**Title Page**

# COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance Among Health Care Workers in the United States

Rahul Shekhar, MD[1]; Abu Baker Sheikh, MD[1]; Shubhra Upadhyay, MD [1]; Mriganka Singh, MD[3]; Saket Kottewar, MD[4]; Hamza Mir[2], Eileen Barrett, MD[1]; Suman Pal, MD[1]

1 - Department of Internal Medicine, University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center, Albuquerque, New Mexico USA

2 – Data Analyst, University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center, Albuquerque, New Mexico US

3 - Department of Geriatrics and Palliative Care, University Hospitals of School of Medicine Case Western University, Cleveland, Ohio USA

4- Department of Hospital Medicine. University of Texas Health San Antonio, San Antonio, Texas USA

**Corresponding author:**

Abu Baker Sheikh

absheikh@salud.unm.edu,

2211 Lomas BLVD, NE,

Albuquerque, NM 87106

Phone – 6316334125

**Funding:** This is a non-funded study

**IRB approval:** University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center

**Key Words:** Covid-19, vaccine, healthcare workers, United States

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

**Conflicts of interest:** All authors do not report any conflict of interest

**ABSTRACT:**

**Title: COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance Among Health Care Workers in the United States**

**Background:**
Acceptance of any COVID-19 vaccine is an important challenge to address and will play a major role in combating the pandemic. Healthcare workers (HCWs) are amongst the first group to receive vaccination, so it is important to consider their attitudes about COVID-19 vaccination to better address barriers to widespread vaccination acceptance.

**Methods:**
We conducted a cross sectional study to assess the attitude of HCWs toward COVID-19 vaccination. Data was collected between October 7th and November 9th, 2020. We received 4080 responses out of which 3479 were complete responses and were included in final analysis.

**Results:**
36% of respondents were willing to take the vaccine as soon as it became available while 56% were not sure or would wait to review more data. Vaccine acceptance increased with increasing age, education, and income level. Lower acceptance was noted in females (31%), Black (10%), Hispanic (30%) and conservative/republican (21%) HCWs, and those working in a rural setting (26%). In the multinomial regression model, direct medical care providers and those with heart disease and cancer had lower likelihood of waiting to review than accepting vaccines. Safety (69%), effectiveness (69%) and rapidity of development/approval (74%) were noted as most common concerns regarding COVID-19 vaccine in our survey.

**Conclusion:**
Acceptance of COVID-19 vaccine is low, with the majority of healthcare workers choosing to wait to review more data before deciding. Overall attitude toward vaccination was positive but specific concerns regarding COVID-19 vaccine are prevalent. Differences in vaccine acceptance were noted along lines of social determinants of health which should be addressed to avoid magnifying health disparities.

**Key Words:**
Covid-19, vaccine, healthcare workers, United States

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

## Introduction:

COVID-19 has rapidly become a major global public health crisis, affecting 79.7 million individuals, and causing 1.7 million deaths. The USA has reported more than 18.5 million cases and 320,000 deaths. To curb this pandemic, apart from effective public health measures such as social distancing, wearing face masks, hand washing and avoidance of crowded indoor spaces, educating the general population, efficacious vaccination is emerging as essential to mitigating disease and death.[2-5].

Uptake of any COVID-19 vaccine is an important challenge to address. In a recent survey, more than one-third of lay respondents were unsure or did not intend to take the vaccine[7]. Clinicians are an important source of information for vaccines and physician communication can improve adherence to vaccination recommendations [8,9,10]. Thus, the role of healthcare workers becomes particularly important in advising patients and communities, and as well as through role modeling behavior. Healthcare workers are being prioritized among the high-risk groups who will be considered as initial candidates for early vaccination. As such, it is important to consider healthcare worker attitudes about COVID-19 vaccination to better address barriers to widespread vaccination.

## Methods:

**Design:** We conducted a cross sectional study to assess the attitude of healthcare workers (HCWs) toward COVID-19 vaccination. An online questionnaire was created using REDCap electronic data capture tools hosted at University of New Mexico. The survey was modified from the general population survey by Fisher et al[7] to capture more information pertinent to healthcare workers. The data was collected anonymously, and no personal identifying information was collected. This study was approved by University of New Mexico Hospitals (UNMH) Institutional review board.

**Sampling:** A snowball sampling was utilized. The survey tool was distributed via links posted on social media platforms in various HCW groups and distributed to administrative leaders at five major hospital systems to disseminate among their employees. Data was collected between October 7th and November 9th, 2020. We received 4080 responses out of which 3479 were complete responses and were included in final analysis.

**Participants:** All adults (>18 years of age) working in a healthcare setting regardless of patient care contact and role in health care settings were eligible to participate in the study. Informed consent was obtained prior to enrollment in the study.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

**Measures:**

Demographic information collected included age, gender, ethnicity, race, state of primary residence in majority of last six months, occupation, marital status, the number of household members excluding participant, annual household income, location of healthcare setting (rural, suburban or urban), education level and political orientation(conservative/ republican, unaffiliated, Democrat/Liberal, or do not wish to answer).

Self-perceived risk of COVID-19 was gauged by the question "Do you think you are at risk of getting COVID-19 in the next 1 year?" The responses allowed for graded self-perceived risk (No I am confident I won't get infected , Yes I am concerned that I will get mild symptoms which will probably not require hospitalization, Yes I am concerned that I will get moderate symptoms which will probably need hospitalization, Yes I am concerned that I will get severe symptom which will probably require admission to the Intensive care unit, I believe I already have the disease and I am immune to it (Not diagnosed by a test ), No, I already have recovered and won't get re-infected (Diagnosed by a test ).

Exposure to COVID-19 was assessed by questions "Have you directly or indirectly taken care of the COVID-19 patients?" and "Have you, your family member or someone you know been diagnosed with COVID-19(Excluding your patients)?"

Acceptance of COVID-19 vaccine was assessed by question - "When COVID-19 vaccination becomes available would you take it? " Participant could choose response from among the options - Yes, as soon as I can get it; Yes, only if it is required by employer; No, I will wait for 3 months to review safety profile; No, I will wait for 6 months to review safety profile; No, I will wait for at least 1 year to review safety profile; I will not get the vaccine; Not sure.

Attitude toward vaccination was assessed by agreement with perception/concern statements. General perception about vaccines were assessed by statements - "I do not believe vaccines work"; "I do not believe vaccines are safe"; "I do not get vaccinated for religious reasons"; "I do not get vaccinated for reasons of personal freedom/choice"; "I do not get vaccinated for a fear of needles/doctors/hospitals". Concerns regarding COVID-19 vaccine were evaluated by statements -"I am worried about the safety / adverse effects of COVID-19 vaccine"; "I am worried about effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccine"; "I am worried about the out of pocket cost/Insurance coverage of the vaccine"; "I am concerned about adverse effect of vaccine on my pre-existing conditions"; "I am worried about the rapidity of the development and approval of COVID-19 vaccine"; "I do not need the vaccine for my risk level"; "I am worried about the rapidity of the development and approval of COVID-19 vaccine". Agreement was measured on Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

**Outcome:**

We have divided HCW into four major categories, Direct medical provider (DMP) which includes If the participant is a Physician/ Resident/Medical students and advanced practice provider including Nurse Practitioner (NP) and / Physician's assistant (PA), Direct patient care provider (DPCP) including Registered Nurse / Patient care tech/ Paramedics/ Rehab services - Respiratory, physical, occupational speech therapist, nutritionist, social workers, case managers care coordinators, administrative staff and others without direct patient care providers. If the participant is DMP their primary specialty was also recorded and is divided into primary medical, primary surgical diagnostic and others.

The primary outcome of the survey was whether HCW are willing to take the potential upcoming COVID-19 vaccine or not. Responses were collected against willingness to take it as soon as it becomes available, yes but only if it is required by employer (grouped into one as yes responses), wait for safety data review for 3 months, 6 months or a year or not sure (grouped into one response wait for review) and not willing to take it.

We performed a multinomial logistic regression due to the overall description of the data. For doing this we split the sample into 3 groups according to the outcome variable, would a participant take the COVID-19 vaccination or not or would wait to review safety data. Due to the variables being categorical and the model being a multinomial logistic regression we used the likelihood-ratio test leading to the derived chi-square and p-values for analysis. We used the R programming language (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. http://www.R-project.org/) to develop the model and analyze its results. The multinomial regression evaluated the prediction of membership into the Covid-19 vaccination acceptance categories (Yes, No, Wait for Review). The reference group here was 'Yes' that the participant would take the vaccination as soon as possible. Statistical significance was assumed for $p<0.05$.

**Results:**

3,479 HCWs completed survey. Most participants were younger than 40 years of age (1877, 54%), female (2598, 75%), White (2803, 81%), completed a bachelor's degree or higher (2788, 80%) identified as Democrat or liberal (1521, 44%) and had no chronic medical conditions (2039, 59%). Most reported working in an urban area (2229, 64%), in primary medical and medical subspecialties (54%) and provided direct patient care (79%). Majority of the participants perceived themselves to be at risk for acquiring COVID-19 (3043, 87%) and 21% think they will acquire serious disease requiring admission to hospital (747, 21%) but less than 80% were confident that they would not get the disease (267, 8%). Roughly Half of the HCW have directly taken care of COVID-19 positive patients (1570, 45%). Most of the participants believed that the COVID-19 vaccination should be voluntary (1665,48%). Additional sample characteristics are shown in Table 1.

Only about one-third (1247, 36%) of respondents were willing to take COVID-19 vaccine as soon as it became available at the time of the survey. Majority of the HCW were not sure or would

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

wait to review safety data before getting vaccinated (1953, 56%). Among the respondents who want to wait, 11% will like to wait for 3 months, 10% will like to wait for six months and 20% will like to wait at least one year. Only 8% (279) of respondents were not willing to take the vaccination at all.

Chi square indicated a significant association was noted between the choice that participants make about receiving the COVID-19 vaccination and multiple predictor variables (Table 2). We note that acceptance for COVID-19 vaccine increased with increasing age. In the 18-30 age group only 34% of respondents were willing to take COVID-19 vaccine as soon as it became available which increased to 47% in the >70 age group. A similar trend was noted with education and income level. Education and income levels represent a higher proportion of HCWs willing to take the vaccine as soon as it becomes available. Differences in vaccine acceptance were noted by gender and racial identity. Female HCWs had lower vaccine acceptance at 31% compared to male HCWs (49%) and trans/non-binary HCWs (43%). Black HCWs had lower acceptance (19%) with majority choosing to wait to review (65%) whereas Asian HCWs had high vaccine acceptance (44%). A majority of Native American HCWs (80%) and all Native Hawaiian/Other pacific islander HCWs (100%) chose to wait to review data for COVID vaccine. Vaccine acceptance was lower among those identifying as Hispanic or Latino (30%). Geographical variation in vaccine acceptance was also noted in our survey with West having the lowest (33%) and South having the highest (48%) vaccine acceptance. HCWs employed in a rural setting had lower acceptance (26%) of the vaccine. Those identifying as democrat/liberal had higher vaccine acceptance (42%). HCWs who believe themselves to be immune to COVID-19 and those who feel confident they won't get infected had the highest rates of refusing COVID -19 vaccine at 22% and 27% respectively. HCWs who had not taken care of COVID-19 patients had higher rates of vaccine refusal (9.2%).

Acceptance of COVID-19 vaccine was also associated with a plan to recommend vaccination to friends and family, and with higher likelihood of wanting COVID-19 vaccine for HCWs to be mandatory. Of note, a large majority of our respondents who plan to not get COVID-19 vaccine would also not recommend the vaccine to friends or family and want vaccination to be voluntary.

The multinomial logistic regression evaluated the prediction of membership into the Covid-19 vaccination acceptance categories (Yes, No, Wait for Review). The reference group here was 'Yes' that the participant would take the vaccination as soon as possible. Analysis revealed that the model as a whole was good for predicting the categories of our outcome variable as the accuracy on the training and testing data predictions was above 80% and the p-value was less than 0.05 for the whole model. Regarding the relative risk comparison in our model regarding variables/categories we have found trends which would be important for future research. DMPs had 53% less likely to wait to review more data than accepting the vaccine as soon as it is made available as compared to HCWs without direct patient contact (RRR-0.47). Participants who had heart disease had 77% lower relative likelihood of waiting to review more data for the vaccine in comparison to taking the vaccine right now (RRR= 0.23). A participant who had cancer had 62% lower relative likelihood of responding "wait for review" versus "yes" to the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

vaccination (RRR = 0.38). Participants who were diagnosed with COVID-19 themselves had nearly 3-fold (Have you, your family member or someone you know been diagnosed with COVID-19 (Excluding your patients) = I was Diagnosed = RRR = 3.4) higher relative likelihood of responding wait for review rather than yes for the vaccination for COVID-19. Participants who thought they had COVID-19 already and were immune to it had a 64% lower relative likelihood of responding "Wait for Review" versus "Yes". (RRR = 0.36).

While overall concerns regarding vaccination were low, concerns regarding COVID-19 vaccines were prevalent (Figure1/Supplementary Table 4). Most HCWs believe in general vaccination works (90%), are safe (86%) and did not mention personal (87%) or religious belief (95%) as a reason for not vaccinating. Most participants endorsed concerns (agree or strongly agree) about vaccine safety/adverse effects (69%), effectiveness (69%), and rapidity of development/approval (74%). Majority of HCWs trust their Doctors and Health care professionals recommending the COVID-19 vaccine (73%) but nearly half of the respondents do not trust information provided by the government about COVID-19 and its severity (46%) and one-third do not trust regulatory authorities like CDC or FDA overseeing the vaccine development and safety (34%).

## Discussion:

Since the announcement of efforts to develop a COVID-19 vaccine, several surveys have been conducted to gauge public perception and acceptance of the vaccine through 2020.Most of the surveys have focused on the general population. However, the rollout of the vaccination is to be tiered to various subgroups of the population based on limited availability in the initial phases. HCWs are likely to be among the first subgroups of the population to have access to the vaccine. HCWs are also likely to be an important source of information about the vaccine for the general population. As such, it is crucial to assess predictors of vaccine uptake among HCWs which will help institutions and policy makers target resources to maximize uptake. To the best of our knowledge, this is the largest survey of HCWs in the USA about COVID-19 vaccination.

In our survey, only one-third of respondents were amenable to COVID-19 vaccination immediately, while more than half of respondents preferred to defer their decision until reviewing more data. This contrasts with the findings of a general population survey in April 2020[7] that reported half the participants were willing to take the vaccine Another study in May 2020reported 67 % acceptance of COVID-19 vaccine among US adults[11]. The high percentage of respondents waiting to review more data in our study is expected as HCWs are more likely to base healthcare decisions on published scientific literature of efficacy and safety which was largely lacking during the time of our study. This also highlights the importance of publication and dissemination of scientific data regarding the vaccine which will be a crucial factor to determine eventual uptake of the vaccine among HCWs. Overall, only 8% respondents said they would refuse the COVID-19 vaccine which shows a potential for high uptake of the vaccine

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

among HCWs. Increasing vaccination acceptance has substantial benefits. To eventually slow down the spread of COVID-19 and its mortality it is imperative to achieve herd immunity by vaccination before immunity by natural infection. With $R_o$ of 3, the threshold herd immunity will be achieved by immunizing at least 70 % of the population assuming the vaccine is 100 % effective [(17)]. With recent EUA of 2 vaccines in the USA claiming to be almost 95 % effective in phase III clinical trials, this number could be even higher. Thus, it is imperative to vaccinate a maximum number of HCWs to prevent infection among HCWs and loss of critical workforce when there is already a critical shortage. Studies have shown that vaccination of HCWs with influenza vaccine decreases mortality and absenteeism[19-22]. It would be reasonable to expect a similar trend with COVID-19 vaccine. It is important to note that 97% of HCWs in our survey had received influenza vaccine in the previous year indicating a generally favorable perception of vaccination.

The low initial acceptance of COVID-19 vaccine among HCWs could also have broader consequences. Studies have shown that HCWs who are vaccinated are more likely to recommend vaccines to friends, family, and their patients[12-14]. This has also been borne out in our study where we see a strong association among HCWs who plan to be vaccinated and plan to recommend the vaccine to friends and family.

COVID-19 vaccine acceptance increased with increasing age, income, and education level. Black race also had lower vaccine acceptance while Asian race had higher vaccine acceptance. Vaccine acceptance was also lower in HCWs identifying as Hispanic or Latino. This mirrors the trends seen with general population surveys [7,11]. The toll of COVID-19 pandemic has disproportionately affected low-income communities and BIPOC [(18)]. Lower vaccine uptake could magnify the health disparities among these communities. Targeting messaging and outreach would be required to achieve higher vaccination rates. It will also be important to understand the factors driving low vaccine uptake which would be instrumental in addressing key concerns and directing resources to increase uptake.

HCWs identifying as conservative or Republican in their political leanings had lower acceptance of the vaccine whereas those identifying as liberal or Democrat had higher vaccine acceptance. . This is in line with other general US population survey[7,15,16]This difference could be in part due to differential messaging regarding vaccines in news and social media targeting these populations and in part due to very divergent responses to the pandemic by political leaders of major parties [23]. A unified and consistent messaging from political leaders will be essential to bridge this gap.

Vaccine acceptance was higher among HCWs involved in direct patient care and in HCWs with chronic medical conditions. This could mirror trends in perceived risk of COVID-19 infection. More HCWs who perceived themselves to be at risk for COVID-19 infection were willing to accept than refuse the vaccine. However, even among HCWs directly involved in patient care, vaccine acceptance was also lower among HCWs identified as DPCP than among DMP. This is concerning since DPCP (such as RNs, RTs, etc) often have more direct and prolonged patient contact. They are, therefore, at high risk of acquiring the disease. DPCP are also one of the key

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

resources of the healthcare system where critical shortages have been noted during the pandemic. They therefore represent a key subgroup whose health is essential to continue our response to the pandemic.

To understand the factors driving vaccine uptake, we assessed HCWs attitude toward vaccination and toward COVID-19 vaccine. Concerns regarding vaccination in general were low in our study, this is in keeping with other studies that show generally positive attitudes of healthcare workers toward vaccination. However, concerns specific to COVID-19 vaccination were prevalent. We noted a high prevalence of concerns regarding vaccine efficacy, adverse effects, and rapidity of development. This was particularly noted among HCWs who do not plan to take the COVID-19 vaccine. Of note, while HCWs who did not want to be vaccinated reported poor trust in regulatory authorities and government, the trust in medical professionals prescribing the vaccine was somewhat higher. This could suggest an important role for dissemination of information through medical agencies and professional societies to increase uptake among HCWs.

A major strength of our study is the large sample of HCWs surveyed. Our survey population is also diverse with representation from different gender, age groups, ethnic and racial backgrounds, and roles in healthcare.

We recognize limitations of our study. Due to sampling methods, our study population may not be representative of all US HCWs. Social desirability bias may also affect the interpretation of our study results, though the responses were anonymized to minimize this. Most importantly, our study was conducted when information regarding COVID-19 vaccines under development were limited and findings of the clinical trials had not been made public. As such, it is possible that with this information now being publicly available, both vaccine acceptance and attitude toward COVID-19 vaccines have changed.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

## References


1. COVID-19 Map - Johns Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center. Johns Hopkins Coronavirus Resource Center. https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html. Published 2020. Accessed December 24, 2020.
2. Adaptive Phase IB-II Randomized Clinical Trial Of Preventive Vaccine Consisting Of Autologous Dendritic Cells Loaded With Antigens From Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2), With Or Without GM-CSF, In Subjects Negative For COVID-19 Infection And Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies. *ClinicalTrials.gov identifier (NCT number): NCT04386252*. https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04386252
3. A Randomized, Double-blind, Placebo-controlled Phase 3 Study to Assess the Efficacy and Safety of Ad26.COV2.S for the Prevention of SARS-CoV-2-mediated COVID-19 in Adults Aged 18 Years and Older. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT04505722. https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04505722
4. A Phase 2a, Randomized, Observer-Blind, Placebo Controlled, Dose-Confirmation Study to Evaluate the Safety, Reactogenicity, and Immunogenicity of mRNA-1273 SARS-COV-2 Vaccine in Adults Aged 18 Years and Older. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT04405076. https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04405076
5. A Phase 1/Phase 2, Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled, Dose-Ranging Trial to Evaluate the Safety, Tolerability and Immunogenicity of V591 (COVID-19 Vaccine) in Healthy Younger and Older Participants. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT04498247. https://www.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04498247
6. Phadke VK, Bednarczyk RA, Salmon DA, Omer SB. Association Between Vaccine Refusal and Vaccine-Preventable Diseases in the United States: A Review of Measles and Pertussis [published correction appears in JAMA. 2016 May 17;315(19):2125] [published correction appears in JAMA. 2016 May 17;315 (19):2125]. *JAMA*. 2016;315(11):1149-1158. doi:10.1001/jama.2016.1353
7. Fisher KA, Bloomstone SJ, Walder J, Crawford S, Fouayzi H, Mazor KM. Attitudes Toward a Potential SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine: A Survey of U.S. Adults [published online ahead of print, 2020 Sep 4]. *Ann Intern Med*. 2020;M20-3569. doi:10.7326/M20-3569
8. Wheeler M, Buttenheim AM. Parental vaccine concerns, information source, and choice of alternative immunization schedules. *Hum Vaccin Immunother*. 2013;9(8):1782-1789. doi:10.4161/hv.25959
9. Salmon DA, Moulton LH, Omer SB, DeHart MP, Stokley S, Halsey NA. Factors associated with refusal of childhood vaccines among parents of school-aged children: a case-control study. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2005;159(5):470-476. doi:10.1001/archpedi.159.5.470
10. Omer SB, Salmon DA, Orenstein WA, deHart MP, Halsey N. Vaccine refusal, mandatory immunization, and the risks of vaccine-preventable diseases. *N Engl J Med*. 2009;360(19):1981-1988. doi:10.1056/NEJMsa0806477
11. Malik, A. A., Mcfadden, S. M., Elharake, J., & Omer, S. B. (2020). Determinants of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the US. *EClinicalMedicine, 26*, 100495. doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100495
12. Paterson P, Meurice F, Stanberry LR, Glismann S, Rosenthal SL, Larson HJ. Vaccine hesitancy and healthcare providers. Vaccine. 2016 Dec 20;34(52):6700–6.
13. Zhang J, While AE, Norman IJ. Nurses' knowledge and risk perception towards seasonal influenza and vaccination and their vaccination behaviours: A cross-sectional survey. Int J Nurs Stud. 2011 Oct 1;48(10):1281–9.
14. LaVela SL, Smith B, Weaver FM, Legro MW, Goldstein B, Nichol K. Attitudes and Practices Regarding Influenza Vaccination Among Healthcare Workers Providing Services to Individuals

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

With Spinal Cord Injuries and Disorders. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol [Internet]. 2004 Nov [cited 2020 Oct 28];25(11):933–40. Available from: /core/journals/infection-control-and-hospital-epidemiology/article/attitudes-and-practices-regarding-influenza-vaccination-among-healthcare-workers-providing-services-to-individuals-with-spinal-cord-injuries-and-disorders/C672BE66C1D0649B3E0FA423C040AC91

15. Reiter PL, Pennell ML, Katz ML. Acceptability of a COVID-19 vaccine among adults in the United States: How many people would get vaccinated? Vaccine. 2020 Sep 29;38(42):6500–7.
16. Pogue K, Jensen JL, Stancil CK, Ferguson DG, Hughes SJ, Mello EJ, et al. Influences on Attitudes Regarding Potential COVID-19 Vaccination in the United States. Vaccines [Internet]. 2020 Oct 3 [cited 2020 Dec 15];8(4):582. Available from: https://www.mdpi.com/2076-393X/8/4/582
17. Fontanet A, Cauchemez S. COVID-19 herd immunity: where are we? [Internet]. Vol. 20, Nature Reviews Immunology. Nature Research; 2020 [cited 2020 Dec 18]. p. 583–4. Available from: https://www.defense.gouv.fr/content/download/583466/9938746/
18. Webb Hooper M, Nápoles AM, Pérez-Stable EJ. COVID-19 and Racial/Ethnic Disparities [Internet]. Vol. 323, JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association. American Medical Association; 2020 [cited 2020 Dec 24]. p. 2466–7. Available from: https://www.chicago.gov/city/en/sites/covid-
19. Lemaitre M, Meret T, Rothan-Tondeur M, Belmin J, Lejonc JL, Luquel L, et al. Effect of influenza vaccination of nursing home staff on mortality of residents: A cluster-randomized trial. J Am Geriatr Soc [Internet]. 2009 Sep [cited 2020 Dec 24];57(9):1580–6. Available from: https://pubmed-ncbi-nlm-nih-gov.libproxy.unm.edu/19682118/
20. Zaffina S, Gilardi F, Rizzo C, Sannino S, Brugaletta R, Santoro A, et al. Seasonal influenza vaccination and absenteeism in health-care workers in two subsequent influenza seasons (2016/17 and 2017/18) in an Italian pediatric hospital. Expert Rev Vaccines [Internet]. 2019 Apr 3 [cited 2020 Dec 24];18(4):411–8. Available from: https://www-tandfonline-com.libproxy.unm.edu/doi/abs/10.1080/14760584.2019.1586541
21. Murti M, Otterstatter M, Orth A, Balshaw R, Halani K, Brown PD, et al. Measuring the impact of influenza vaccination on healthcare worker absenteeism in the context of a province-wide mandatory vaccinate-or-mask policy. Vaccine. 2019 Jul 9;37(30):4001–7.
22. Imai C, Toizumi M, Hall L, Lambert S, Halton K, Merollini K. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the direct epidemiological and economic effects of seasonal influenza vaccination on healthcare workers. Ortiz JR, editor. PLoS One [Internet]. 2018 Jun 7 [cited 2020 Dec 24];13(6):e0198685. Available from: https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0198685
23. Romer D, Jamieson KH. Conspiracy theories as barriers to controlling the spread of COVID-19 in the U.S. Soc Sci Med. 2020 Oct 1;263:113356.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .




FIGURE 1: Attitude of Healthcare Workers toward Vaccines

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| **Table 1: Participant characteristics** | |
|---|---|
| **Variable** | **N = 3,479[1]** |
| **Age** | |
| **18-30 years** | 816 (23%) |
| **31-40 years** | 1,061 (30%) |
| **41-50 years** | 686 (20%) |
| **51-60 years** | 571 (16%) |
| **61-70 years** | 326 (9.4%) |
| **> 70 years** | 19 (0.5%) |
| **Gender** | |
| **Female** | 2,598 (75%) |
| **Male** | 864 (25%) |
| **Trans/ Gender non-binary/ not specified above** | 7 (0.2%) |
| **Do not wish to reply** | 10 (0.3%) |
| **Ethnicity** | |
| **Hispanic or Latino** | 560 (16%) |
| **NOT Hispanic or Latino** | 2,763 (79%) |
| **Unknown / Not Reported** | 36 (1.0%) |
| **Do not wish to answer** | 120 (3.4%) |
| **Race** | |
| **White or Caucasian** | 2,803 (81%) |
| **Asian** | 218 (6.3%) |
| **Black or African American** | 74 (2.1%) |
| **Native Americans/Alaska Native** | 30 (0.9%) |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| | |
|---|---|
| **Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander** | 6 (0.2%) |
| **More Than One Race** | 126 (3.6%) |
| **Unknown / Other** | 70 (2.0%) |
| **Do not wish to answer** | 152 (4.4%) |
| **State of Residence** | |
| **Midwest** | 1,433 (41%) |
| **North East** | 81 (2.3%) |
| **South** | 314 (9.0%) |
| **West** | 1,651 (47%) |
| **Occupation** | |
| **Direct Patient Care Providers (DPCP)** | 1,573 (45%) |
| **Direct Medical Providers (DMP)** | 1,207 (35%) |
| **Administrative staff working in hospital without direct patient contact** | 295 (8.5%) |
| **Others without direct patient contact** | 404 (12%) |
| **Primary Area of Work** | |
| **Primary medical and medical subspecialty** | 1,882 (54%) |
| **Primary surgical and surgical subspecialty** | 363 (10%) |
| **Diagnostic subspecialty** | 246 (7.1%) |
| **Others** | 988 (28%) |
| **Annual Income** | |
| **< $30,000** | 117 (3.4%) |
| **$30,001 - $70,000** | 741 (21%) |
| **$70,001 - $100,00** | 759 (22%) |
| **$100,001 - $150,000** | 796 (23%) |
| **>$150,001** | 1,066 (31%) |
| **Health Care facility in** | |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| | |
|---|---|
| **Rural area** | 293 (8.4%) |
| **Suburban area** | 957 (28%) |
| **Urban area** | 2,229 (64%) |
| **Education** | |
| **No formal education** | 1 (<0.1%) |
| **High school graduate, diploma or the equivalent (for example: GED)** | 46 (1.3%) |
| **Some college credit, no degree** | 169 (4.9%) |
| **Trade/technical/vocational training** | 111 (3.2%) |
| **Associate degree** | 364 (10%) |
| **Bachelor's degree** | 1,046 (30%) |
| **Master's degree** | 606 (17%) |
| **Professional degree** | 297 (8.5%) |
| **Doctorate degree** | 839 (24%) |
| **Political Identification** | |
| **Conservative-Republican** | 746 (21%) |
| **Democrat-Liberal** | 1,519 (44%) |
| **Unaffiliated** | 640 (18%) |
| **Do not wish to answer** | 574 (16%) |
| **Medical comorbidities** | |
| **No Chronic Condition** | 2,039 (59%) |
| **Diabetes Mellitus Type-1/Type-2** | 136 (3.9%) |
| **Heart Disease** | 36 (1.0%) |
| **Hypertension** | 449 (13%) |
| **COPD Asthma - Lung Disease** | 318 (9.1%) |
| **Obesity BMI>30** | 461 (13%) |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| | |
|---|---|
| **Cancer** | 125 (3.6%) |
| **Immuno-compromised/on immunosuppressants** | 110 (3.2%) |
| **Smoking** | 288 (8.3%) |
| **Other Medical Conditions** | 505 (15%) |
| **Have you, your family member or someone you know been diagnosed with COVID-19 (Excluding your patients)** | |
| **I was Diagnosed with COVID-19** | 90 (2.6%) |
| **Family Member was Diagnosed with COVID-19** | 447 (13%) |
| **Someone Personal was Diagnosed with COVID-19** | 1,793 (52%) |
| **No one Personal was Diagnosed with COVID0-19** | 1,400 (40%) |
| **Do you think you are at risk of getting COVID-19 in the next 1 year?** | |
| **I believe I already have the disease and I am immune to it (Not diagnosed by a test)** | 138 (4.0%) |
| **No, I am confident I won't get infected** | 266 (7.6%) |
| **No, I already have recovered and won't get re-infected (Diagnosed by a test)** | 34 (1.0%) |
| **Yes, I am concerned that I will get mild symptoms which will probably not require hospitalization** | 2,294 (66%) |
| **Yes, I am concerned that I will get moderate symptoms which will probably need hospitalization** | 572 (16%) |
| **Yes, I am concerned that I will get severe symptom which will probably require admission to the Intensive care unit** | 175 (5.0%) |
| **Have you directly or indirectly taken care of the COVID-19 patients?** | |
| **No** | 1,263 (36%) |
| **Yes, but no direct patient contact** | 646 (19%) |
| **Yes, I have direct patient contact** | 1,570 (45%) |
| **Would you take the COVID-19 Vaccine** | |
| **No** | 279 (8.0%) |
| **Wait for Review** | 1,953 (56%) |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| | |
|---|---|
| **Yes** | 1,247 (36%) |
| **Would you advise friends and family to get vaccinated for COVID-19?** | |
| **No** | 519 (15%) |
| **Not sure** | 1,376 (40%) |
| **Yes** | 1,584 (46%) |
| **COVID-19 Vaccine for health care workers should be:** | |
| **Mandated by the employer, like Influenza vaccine** | 792 (23%) |
| **Mandated by the Federal government for all health care workers** | 338 (9.7%) |
| **Mandated by the State government for all health care workers** | 99 (2.8%) |
| **Not sure** | 585 (17%) |
| **Voluntary** | 1,665 (48%) |
| **[r]Statistics presented: n (%)** | |
| **Direct Patient Care Provider: Registered Nurse / Patient care technician/ Paramedics/ Rehab services – Respiratory therapist/Physical therapist/Occupation therapist/Speech/ Nutritionist/ social workers/ care coordinators** | |
| **Direct Medical Provider: Physician/ Resident/Medical students and Advanced practice provider (Nurse Practitioner / Physician's assistant** | |
| **Diagnostic Subspeciality: Radiology / Cath/ Endoscopy/ Pulmonary/ Echo/ Sleep Laboratory Technicians** | |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

**Table 2: Participant characteristics by vaccine acceptance**

| Variable | **No**, N = 279[1] | **Wait for Review**, N = 1,953[1] | **Yes**, N = 1,247[1] | **p-value**[2] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Age** | | | | <0.001* |
| **18-30 years** | 72 (8.8%) | 467 (57%) | 277 (34%) | |
| **31-40 years** | 83 (7.8%) | 615 (58%) | 363 (34%) | |
| **41-50 years** | 70 (10%) | 389 (57%) | 227 (33%) | |
| **51-60 years** | 43 (7.5%) | 306 (54%) | 222 (39%) | |
| **61-70 years** | 10 (3.1%) | 167 (51%) | 149 (46%) | |
| **> 70 years** | 1 (5.3%) | 9 (47%) | 9 (47%) | |
| **Gender** | | | | <0.001* |
| **Female** | 240 (9.2%) | 1,540 (59%) | 818 (31%) | |
| **Male** | 37 (4.3%) | 402 (47%) | 425 (49%) | |
| **Trans/ Gender non-binary/ not specified above** | 0 (0%) | 4 (57%) | 3 (43%) | |
| **Do not wish to reply** | 2 (20%) | 7 (70%) | 1 (10%) | |
| **Ethnicity** | | | | <0.001* |
| **Hispanic or Latino** | 55 (9.8%) | 337 (60%) | 168 (30%) | |
| **NOT Hispanic or Latino** | 191 (6.9%) | 1,536 (56%) | 1,036 (37%) | |
| **Unknown / Not Reported** | 8 (22%) | 16 (44%) | 12 (33%) | |
| **Do not wish to answer** | 25 (21%) | 64 (53%) | 31 (26%) | |
| **Race** | | | | <0.001* |
| **White or Caucasian** | 221 (7.9%) | 1,545 (55%) | 1,037 (37%) | |
| **Asian** | 1 (0.5%) | 122 (56%) | 95 (44%) | |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Black or African American** | 12 (16%) | 48 (65%) | 14 (19%) | |
| **Native Americans/Alaska Native** | 3 (10%) | 24 (80%) | 3 (10%) | |
| **Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander** | 0 (0%) | 6 (100%) | 0 (0%) | |
| **More Than One Race** | 4 (3.2%) | 82 (65%) | 40 (32%) | |
| **Unknown / Other** | 9 (13%) | 41 (59%) | 20 (29%) | |
| **Do not wish to answer** | 29 (19%) | 85 (56%) | 38 (25%) | |
| **State of Residence** | | | | 0.003* |
| **Midwest** | 146 (10%) | 776 (54%) | 511 (36%) | |
| **North East** | 2 (2.5%) | 45 (56%) | 34 (42%) | |
| **South** | 11 (3.5%) | 151 (48%) | 152 (48%) | |
| **West** | 120 (7.3%) | 981 (59%) | 550 (33%) | |
| **Occupation** | | | | <0.001* |
| **Direct patient care providers (DPCP)** | 187 (12%) | 969 (62%) | 417 (27%) | |
| **Direct Medical Provider (DMP)** | 30 (2.5%) | 582 (48%) | 595 (49%) | |
| **Administrative staff working in hospital without direct patient contact** | 25 (8.5%) | 170 (58%) | 100 (34%) | |
| **Others without direct patient contact** | 37 (9.2%) | 232 (57%) | 135 (33%) | |
| **Annual Income** | | | | <0.001* |
| **< $30,000** | 19 (16%) | 53 (45%) | 45 (38%) | |
| **$30,001 - $70,000** | 81 (11%) | 420 (57%) | 240 (32%) | |
| **$70,001 - $100,00** | 80 (11%) | 463 (61%) | 216 (28%) | |
| **$100,001 - $150,000** | 60 (7.5%) | 472 (59%) | 264 (33%) | |
| **>$150,001** | 39 (3.7%) | 545 (51%) | 482 (45%) | |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Health Care facility in** | | | | <0.001* |
| **Rural area** | 52 (18%) | 164 (56%) | 77 (26%) | |
| **Suburban area** | 98 (10%) | 523 (55%) | 336 (35%) | |
| **Urban area** | 129 (5.8%) | 1,266 (57%) | 834 (37%) | |
| **Education** | | | | <0.001* |
| **No formal education** | 0 (0%) | 1 (100%) | 0 (0%) | |
| **High school graduate, diploma, or the equivalent (for example: GED)** | 9 (20%) | 26 (57%) | 11 (24%) | |
| **Some college credit, no degree** | 24 (14%) | 94 (56%) | 51 (30%) | |
| **Trade/technical/vocational training** | 18 (16%) | 69 (62%) | 24 (22%) | |
| **Associate degree** | 56 (15%) | 220 (60%) | 88 (24%) | |
| **Bachelor's degree** | 109 (10%) | 627 (60%) | 310 (30%) | |
| **Master's degree** | 40 (6.6%) | 362 (60%) | 204 (34%) | |
| **Professional degree** | 6 (2.0%) | 139 (47%) | 152 (51%) | |
| **Doctorate degree** | 17 (2.0%) | 415 (49%) | 407 (49%) | |
| **Political Identification** | | | | <0.001* |
| **Conservative-Republican** | 93 (12%) | 390 (52%) | 263 (35%) | |
| **Democrat-Liberal** | 42 (2.8%) | 833 (55%) | 644 (42%) | |
| **Unaffiliated** | 48 (7.5%) | 373 (58%) | 219 (34%) | |
| **Do not wish to answer** | 96 (17%) | 357 (62%) | 121 (21%) | |
| **Did you get the Influenza vaccine Last Year?** | | | | <0.001* |
| **No** | 50 (43%) | 56 (48%) | 10 (8.6%) | |
| **Yes** | 229 (6.8%) | 1,897 (56%) | 1,237 (37%) | |
| **If you have Children under 18 years old, Have they been vaccinated for other diseases** | | | | <0.001* |
| **No** | 38 (26%) | 67 (46%) | 41 (28%) | |
| **Not Applicable** | 120 (6.0%) | 1,132 (56%) | 754 (38%) | |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Yes** | 121 (9.1%) | 754 (57%) | 452 (34%) | |
| **Medical Condition = Chronic Condition** | | | | 0.046 |
| **No** | 107 (7.4%) | 819 (57%) | 514 (36%) | |
| **Yes** | 172 (8.4%) | 1,134 (56%) | 733 (36%) | |
| **Diabetes Mellitus Type-1/Type-2** | | | | 0.076 |
| **No** | 272 (8.1%) | 1,876 (56%) | 1,195 (36%) | |
| **Yes** | 7 (5.1%) | 77 (57%) | 52 (38%) | |
| **Heart Disease** | | | | 0.067 |
| **No** | 276 (8.0%) | 1,935 (56%) | 1,232 (36%) | |
| **Yes** | 3 (8.3%) | 18 (50%) | 15 (42%) | |
| **Hypertension** | | | | 0.8 |
| **No** | 253 (8.3%) | 1,701 (56%) | 1,076 (36%) | |
| **Yes** | 26 (5.8%) | 252 (56%) | 171 (38%) | |
| **COPD Asthma - Lung Disease** | | | | 0.701 |
| **No** | 258 (8.2%) | 1,778 (56%) | 1,125 (36%) | |
| **Yes** | 21 (6.6%) | 175 (55%) | 122 (38%) | |
| **Obesity BMI>30** | | | | 0.022* |
| **No** | 250 (8.3%) | 1,671 (55%) | 1,097 (36%) | |
| **Yes** | 29 (6.3%) | 282 (61%) | 150 (33%) | |
| **Cancer** | | | | 0.399 |
| **No** | 274 (8.2%) | 1,882 (56%) | 1,198 (36%) | |
| **Yes** | 5 (4.0%) | 71 (57%) | 49 (39%) | |
| **Immuno-compromised/on immunosuppressants** | | | | 0.354 |
| **No** | 269 (8.0%) | 1,889 (56%) | 1,211 (36%) | |
| **Yes** | 10 (9.1%) | 64 (58%) | 36 (33%) | |
| **Smoking** | | | | 0.013* |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **No** | 262 (8.2%) | 1,778 (56%) | 1,151 (36%) | |
| **Yes** | 17 (5.9%) | 175 (61%) | 96 (33%) | |
| **Other Medical Conditions** | | | | 0.629 |
| **No** | 227 (7.6%) | 1,663 (56%) | 1,084 (36%) | |
| **Yes** | 52 (10%) | 290 (57%) | 163 (32%) | |
| **I was Diagnosed with COVID-19** | | | | 0.009* |
| **No** | 272 (8.0%) | 1,901 (56%) | 1,216 (36%) | |
| **Yes** | 7 (7.8%) | 52 (58%) | 31 (34%) | |
| **Family Member was Diagnosed with COVID-19** | | | | 0.695 |
| **No** | 244 (8.0%) | 1,712 (56%) | 1,076 (35%) | |
| **Yes** | 35 (7.8%) | 241 (54%) | 171 (38%) | |
| **Someone Personal was Diagnosed with COVID-19** | | | | 0.003* |
| **No** | 168 (10.0%) | 924 (55%) | 594 (35%) | |
| **Yes** | 111 (6.2%) | 1,029 (57%) | 653 (36%) | |
| **No one Personal was Diagnosed with COVID-19** | | | | 0.143 |
| **No** | 134 (6.4%) | 1,181 (57%) | 764 (37%) | |
| **Yes** | 145 (10%) | 772 (55%) | 483 (34%) | |
| **Do you think you are at risk of getting COVID-19 in next 1 year?** | | | | <0.001* |
| **I believe I already have the disease and I am immune to it (Not diagnosed by a test)** | 30 (22%) | 68 (49%) | 40 (29%) | |
| **No, I am confident I won't get infected** | 71 (27%) | 128 (48%) | 67 (25%) | |
| **No, I already have recovered and won't get re-infected (Diagnosed by a test)** | 4 (12%) | 18 (53%) | 12 (35%) | |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Yes, I am concerned that I will get mild symptoms which will probably not require hospitalization** | 153 (6.7%) | 1,283 (56%) | 858 (37%) | |
| **Yes, I am concerned that I will get moderate symptoms which will probably need hospitalization** | 15 (2.6%) | 350 (61%) | 207 (36%) | |
| **Yes, I am concerned that I will get severe symptom which will probably require admission to the Intensive care unit** | 6 (3.4%) | 106 (61%) | 63 (36%) | |
| **Have you directly or indirectly taken care of the COVID-19 patients?** | | | | <0.001* |
| **No** | 116 (9.2%) | 714 (57%) | 433 (34%) | |
| **Yes, but no direct patient contact** | 45 (7.0%) | 358 (55%) | 243 (38%) | |
| **Yes, I have direct patient contact** | 118 (7.5%) | 881 (56%) | 571 (36%) | |
| **I would get the vaccine to prevent COVID-19 in myself** | | | | <0.001* |
| **No** | 277 (20%) | 816 (58%) | 324 (23%) | |
| **Yes** | 2 (<0.1%) | 1,137 (55%) | 923 (45%) | |
| **I would get the vaccine to prevent COVID-19 in friends and family members** | | | | <0.001* |
| **No** | 276 (21%) | 723 (56%) | 286 (22%) | |
| **Yes** | 3 (0.1%) | 1,230 (56%) | 961 (44%) | |
| **I would get the vaccine to prevent COVID-19 in community** | | | | <0.001* |
| **No** | 277 (26%) | 560 (52%) | 237 (22%) | |
| **Yes** | 2 (<0.1%) | 1,393 (58%) | 1,010 (42%) | |
| **I would not get the vaccine** | | | | <0.001* |
| **No** | 3 (<0.1%) | 1,787 (59%) | 1,235 (41%) | |
| **Yes** | 276 (61%) | 166 (37%) | 12 (2.6%) | |
| **Would you advise friends and family to get vaccinated for COVID-19?** | | | | <0.001* |
| **No** | 230 (44%) | 272 (52%) | 17 (3.3%) | |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Not sure** | 49 (3.6%) | 1,162 (84%) | 165 (12%) | |
| **Yes** | 0 (0%) | 519 (33%) | 1,065 (67%) | |
| **COVID-19 Vaccine for health care workers should be:** | | | | <0.001* |
| **Mandated by the employer, like Influenza vaccine** | 0 (0%) | 245 (31%) | 547 (69%) | |
| **Mandated by the Federal government for all health care workers** | 0 (0%) | 90 (27%) | 248 (73%) | |
| **Mandated by the State government for all health care workers** | 0 (0%) | 33 (33%) | 66 (67%) | |
| **Not sure** | 5 (0.9%) | 457 (78%) | 123 (21%) | |
| **Voluntary** | 274 (16%) | 1,128 (68%) | 263 (16%) | |

[1]**Statistics presented: n (%)**

[2]**Statistical tests performed: Likelihood-Ratio Test, Chi-Square Test**

**Direct Patient Care Provider: Registered Nurse / Patient care technician/ Paramedics/ Rehab services – Respiratory therapist/Physical therapist/Occupation therapist/Speech/ Nutritionist/ social workers/ care coordinators**

**Direct Medical Provider: Physician/ Resident/Medical students and Advanced practice provider (Nurse Practitioner / Physician's assistant)**

**Diagnostic Subspeciality: Radiology / Cath/ Endoscopy/ Pulmonary/ Echo/ Sleep Laboratory Technicians**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 3: Relative Risk Ratio multinomial regression model

| | RRR = Relative Risk Ratio | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Variable** | **Opinion on Vaccination: No Vs. Yes** | | **Opinion on Vaccination: Wait for Review Vs. Yes** | |
| | **RRR[1]** | **p-value[2]** | **RRR[1]** | **p-value[2]** |
| **Age** | | | | |
| 18-30 years | 0.000 | 0.563 | 0.595 | 0.565 |
| 31-40 years | 0.000 | 0.689 | 0.355 | 0.244 |
| 41-50 years | 0.000 | 0.670 | 0.295 | 0.170 |
| 51-60 years | 0.000 | 0.295 | 0.303 | 0.171 |
| 61-70 years | 0.000 | 0.586 | 0.223 | 0.087 |
| > 70 years | Reference | Reference | Reference | Reference |
| **Gender** | | | | |
| Female | 51.297 | 0.687 | 0.793 | 0.155 |
| Trans/ Gender non-binary/ not specified above | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Do not wish to reply | 28.238 | 0.844 | 3.18E+06 | 0.379 |
| Male | Reference | Reference | Reference | Reference |
| **Ethnicity** | | | | |
| Hispanic or Latino | 1.42E+03 | 0.610 | 1.404 | 0.119 |
| Unknown / Not Reported | 0.147 | 0.946 | 1.141 | 0.878 |
| Do not wish to answer | 1.80E+07 | 0.388 | 1.834 | 0.332 |
| NOT Hispanic or Latino | Reference | Reference | Reference | Reference |
| **Race** | | | | |
| Asian | 0.000 | 0.638 | 1.217 | 0.500 |
| Black or African American | 0.002 | 0.754 | 0.755 | 0.621 |
| Native Americans/Alaska Native | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.587 | 0.524 |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 0.024 | 0.000 | 7.88E+13 | 0.000 |
| More Than One Race | 0.000 | 0.652 | 1.207 | 0.583 |
| Unknown / Other | 0.000 | 0.333 | 0.748 | 0.600 |
| Do not wish to answer | 1.80E+07 | 0.388 | 1.834 | 0.332 |
| White or Caucasian | Reference | Reference | Reference | Reference |
| **State of Residence** | | | | |
| North East | 1.92E+05 | 0.633 | 1.742 | 0.185 |
| South | 0.000 | 0.542 | 0.853 | 0.544 |
| West | 0.418 | 0.916 | 1.183 | 0.308 |
| Midwest | Reference | Reference | Reference | Reference |
| **Occupation** | | | | |
| Direct Patient Care Provider | 48.841 | 0.733 | 0.596 | 0.053 |
| Direct Medical Provider | 260.209 | 0.708 | 0.472 | 0.015* |
| Administrative staff working in hospital without direct patient contact | 2.380 | 0.954 | 0.845 | 0.599 |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Others without direct patient contact | Reference | Reference | Reference | Reference |
| **Annual Income** | | | | |
| < $30,000 | 2.50E+04 | 0.602 | 0.609 | 0.294 |
| $30,001 - $70,000 | 83.987 | 0.620 | 1.063 | 0.789 |
| $70,001 - $100,00 | 6.509 | 0.790 | 0.876 | 0.535 |
| >$150,001 | 4.808 | 0.869 | 1.419 | 0.079 |
| $100,001 - $150,000 | Reference | Reference | Reference | Reference |
| **Health Care facility in** | | | | |
| Rural area | 2.432 | 0.932 | 0.975 | 0.925 |
| Suburban area | 9.203 | 0.737 | 0.785 | 0.152 |
| Urban area | Reference | Reference | Reference | Reference |
| **Education** | | | | |
| Some college credit, no degree | 0.000 | 0.428 | 0.752 | 0.762 |
| Trade/technical/vocational training | 0.000 | 0.344 | 0.340 | 0.264 |
| Associate degree | 0.000 | 0.259 | 0.666 | 0.658 |
| Bachelor's degree | 0.000 | 0.428 | 0.283 | 0.159 |
| Master's degree | 0.000 | 0.353 | 0.362 | 0.261 |
| Professional degree | 0.000 | 0.461 | 0.308 | 0.205 |
| Doctorate degree | 0.000 | 0.270 | 0.298 | 0.188 |
| High school graduate, diploma or the equivalent (for example: GED) | Reference | Reference | Reference | Reference |
| **Political Identification** | | | | |
| Democrat-Liberal | 7.233 | 0.868 | 0.821 | 0.325 |
| Unaffiliated | 23.926 | 0.700 | 0.885 | 0.591 |
| Do not wish to answer | 0.295 | 0.891 | 1.253 | 0.372 |
| Conservative-Republican | Reference | Reference | Reference | Reference |
| **Did you get the Influenza vaccine Last Year?** | 0.000 | 0.290 | 0.295 | 0.091 |
| **If you have Children under 18 years old, Have they been vaccinated for other diseases** | | | | |
| Yes | 0.688 | 0.975 | 3.198 | 0.012* |
| Not Applicable | 0.022 | 0.781 | 1.957 | 0.129 |
| No | Reference | Reference | Reference | Reference |
| **Medical co-morbidities** | | | | |
| **No Chronic Condition** | 0.007 | 0.633 | 0.821 | 0.411 |
| **Diabetes Mellitus Type-1/Type-2** | 0.000 | 0.710 | 1.177 | 0.656 |
| **Heart Disease** | 3.07E+09 | 0.603 | 0.233 | 0.047* |
| **Hypertension** | 0.514 | 0.950 | 0.929 | 0.764 |
| **COPD Asthma - Lung Disease** | 486.848 | 0.677 | 0.947 | 0.849 |
| **Obesity BMI>30** | 0.008 | 0.691 | 0.706 | 0.138 |
| **Cancer** | 0.000 | 0.697 | 0.384 | 0.018* |
| **Immuno-compromised/on immunosuppressants** | 0.000 | 0.690 | 1.046 | 0.912 |
| **Smoking** | 0.000 | 0.669 | 1.611 | 0.096 |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Other Medical Conditions** | 0.003 | 0.682 | 0.896 | 0.638 |
| **Have you, your family member or some one you know been diagnosed with COVID-19(Excluding your patients) ?** | | | | |
| **I was Diagnosed with COVID-19** | 6.46E+06 | 0.641 | 3.407 | 0.019* |
| **Family Member was Diagnosed with COVID-19** | 20.875 | 0.799 | 0.597 | 0.052 |
| **Someone Personal was Diagnosed COVID-19** | 54.754 | 0.844 | 1.122 | 0.723 |
| **No one Personal was Diagnosed COVID-19** | 7.714 | 0.913 | 1.007 | 0.985 |
| **Do you think you are at risk of getting COVID-19 in the next 1 year?** | | | | |
| I believe I already have the disease and I am immune to it (Not diagnosed by a test) | 0.002 | 0.608 | 0.357 | 0.024* |
| No, I already have recovered and won't get re-infected (Diagnosed by a test) | 2.84E+03 | 0.852 | 1.226 | 0.833 |
| Yes I am concerned that I will get mild symptoms which will probably not require hospitalization | 0.587 | 0.966 | 0.697 | 0.260 |
| Yes I am concerned that I will get moderate symptoms which will probably need hospitalization | 5.474 | 0.904 | 1.099 | 0.787 |
| Yes I am concerned that I will get severe symptom which will probably require admission to the Intensive care unit | 0.078 | 0.927 | 1.032 | 0.948 |
| No I am confident I won't get infected | Reference | Reference | Reference | Reference |
| **Have you directly or indirectly taken care of the COVID-19 patients?** | | | | |
| Yes, but no direct patient contact | 0.729 | 0.970 | 1.055 | 0.784 |
| Yes, I have direct patient contact | 0.633 | 0.959 | 1.143 | 0.464 |
| No | Reference | Reference | Reference | Reference |
| **Would you advise friends and family to get vaccinated for COVID-19?** | | | | |
| Yes | 0.000 | 0.679 | 0.082 | 0.000* |
| Not sure | 0.000 | 0.278 | 0.483 | 0.099 |
| No | Reference | Reference | Reference | Reference |
| **COVID-19 Vaccine for health care workers should be:** | | | | |
| Mandated by the employer, like Influenza vaccine | 31.144 | 0.907 | 0.463 | 0.000* |
| Mandated by the Federal government for all health care workers | 6.69E+03 | 0.735 | 0.355 | 0.000* |
| Mandated by the State government for all health care workers | 2.21E+04 | 0.793 | 0.374 | 0.007* |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not sure | 0.004 | 0.709 | 1.322 | 0.179 |
| Voluntary | Reference | Reference | Reference | Reference |
| [1] Statistics presented: Likelihood Ratio Test, RRR (Value) | | | | |
| [2] Statistical tests performed: P-Value - All Options (*<0.05 Sig.) | | | | |
| Direct Patient Care Provider: Registered Nurse/ Patient care technician/ Paramedics/ Rehab service - Respiratory therapist/ Physical therapist/ Occupational therapist/ Speech/ Nutritionist/Social Workers/ Care Coordinators | | | | |
| Direct Medical Provider: Physician/ Residents/ Medical Students and Advanced Practice Providers (Nurse Practitioners/ Physician's Assistant) | | | | |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 4: Attitude of Healthcare workers toward vaccine

| | |
|---|---|
| **I would not get the vaccine because I do not believe they work** | |
| Strongly disagree | 2,493 (72%) |
| Disagree | 85 (2.4%) |
| Indifferent | 630 (18%) |
| Agree | 190 (5.5%) |
| Strongly agree | 81 (2.3%) |
| **I would not get the vaccine because I believe they are not safe** | |
| Strongly disagree | 2,120 (61%) |
| Disagree | 140 (4.0%) |
| Indifferent | 889 (26%) |
| Agree | 251 (7.2%) |
| Strongly agree | 79 (2.3%) |
| **I would not get the vaccine due to religious reasons** | |
| Strongly disagree | 2,974 (85%) |
| Disagree | 28 (0.8%) |
| Indifferent | 315 (9.1%) |
| Agree | 129 (3.7%) |
| Strongly agree | 33 (0.9%) |
| **I would not get the vaccine as its my personal choice/freedom** | |
| Strongly disagree | 2,629 (76%) |
| Disagree | 187 (5.4%) |
| Indifferent | 398 (11%) |
| Agree | 171 (4.9%) |
| Strongly agree | 94 (2.7%) |
| **I would not get the vaccine as I fear needles** | |
| Strongly disagree | 3,001 (86%) |
| Disagree | 23 (0.7%) |
| Indifferent | 372 (11%) |
| Agree | 70 (2.0%) |
| Strongly agree | 13 (0.4%) |
| **I would not get the vaccine as I am worried about the effects of the COVID-19 Vaccine** | |
| Strongly disagree | 293 (8.4%) |
| Disagree | 344 (9.9%) |
| Indifferent | 427 (12%) |
| Agree | 1,441 (41%) |
| Strongly agree | 974 (28%) |
| **I would not get the vaccine as I am worried about the effectiveness of the Vaccine** | |
| Strongly disagree | 215 (6.2%) |
| Disagree | 324 (9.3%) |
| Indifferent | 540 (16%) |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| | |
|---|---|
| Agree | 1,607 (46%) |
| Strongly agree | 793 (23%) |
| **I would not get the vaccine as I am worried about the out of pocket cost coverage of the vaccine** | |
| Strongly disagree | 482 (14%) |
| Disagree | 734 (21%) |
| Indifferent | 1,340 (39%) |
| Agree | 678 (19%) |
| Strongly agree | 245 (7.0%) |
| **I would not get the vaccine due to the adverse effects of the vaccine on pre existing conditions** | |
| Strongly disagree | 1,511 (43%) |
| Disagree | 682 (20%) |
| Indifferent | 596 (17%) |
| Agree | 437 (13%) |
| Strongly agree | 253 (7.3%) |
| **I would not get the vaccine as there is no need for the vaccine for my risk level** | |
| Strongly disagree | 1,823 (52%) |
| Disagree | 939 (27%) |
| Indifferent | 452 (13%) |
| Agree | 167 (4.8%) |
| Strongly agree | 98 (2.8%) |
| **I would not get the vaccine as I have had prior reactions to other vaccinations** | |
| Strongly disagree | 2,316 (67%) |
| Disagree | 736 (21%) |
| Indifferent | 226 (6.5%) |
| Agree | 146 (4.2%) |
| Strongly agree | 55 (1.6%) |
| **I would not get the vaccine as I am worried about the rapidity of the COVID vaccine** | |
| Strongly disagree | 316 (9.1%) |
| Disagree | 288 (8.3%) |
| Indifferent | 319 (9.2%) |
| Agree | 1,238 (36%) |
| Strongly agree | 1,318 (38%) |
| **I would not get the vaccine as I do not trust pharmaceutical companies** | |
| Strongly disagree | 617 (18%) |
| Disagree | 861 (25%) |
| Indifferent | 964 (28%) |
| Agree | 658 (19%) |
| Strongly agree | 379 (11%) |
| **I would not get the vaccine as I do not trust the FDA/CDC** | |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| | |
|---|---|
| Strongly disagree | 586 (17%) |
| Disagree | 727 (21%) |
| Indifferent | 631 (18%) |
| Agree | 903 (26%) |
| Strongly agree | 632 (18%) |
| **I would not get the vaccine as I do not trust the doctors recommending the vaccine** | |
| Strongly disagree | 1,481 (43%) |
| Disagree | 1,046 (30%) |
| Indifferent | 650 (19%) |
| Agree | 201 (5.8%) |
| Strongly agree | 101 (2.9%) |
| **I would not get the vaccine as I do not trust the government about the COVID-19 severity** | |
| Strongly disagree | 666 (19%) |
| Disagree | 594 (17%) |
| Indifferent | 621 (18%) |
| Agree | 792 (23%) |
| Strongly agree | 806 (23%) |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 5: Attitude of US Healthcare workers towards vaccine breakdown by vaccine acceptance

| | **No**, N = 279[1] | **Wait for Review**, N = 1,953[1] | **Yes**, N = 1,247[1] | **p-value**[2] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **I would not get the vaccine because I do not beleive they work** | | | | <0.001 * |
| Strongly disagree | 81 (29%) | 1,351 (69%) | 1,061 (85%) | |
| Disagree | 86 (31%) | 425 (22%) | 119 (9.5%) | |
| Indifferent | 71 (25%) | 99 (5.1%) | 20 (1.6%) | |
| Agree | 23 (8.2%) | 45 (2.3%) | 17 (1.4%) | |
| Strongly agree | 18 (6.5%) | 33 (1.7%) | 30 (2.4%) | |
| **I would not get the vaccine because I believe they are not safe** | | | | <0.001 * |
| Strongly disagree | 61 (22%) | 1,078 (55%) | 981 (79%) | |
| Disagree | 80 (29%) | 610 (31%) | 199 (16%) | |
| Indifferent | 63 (23%) | 160 (8.2%) | 28 (2.2%) | |
| Agree | 40 (14%) | 82 (4.2%) | 18 (1.4%) | |
| Strongly agree | 35 (13%) | 23 (1.2%) | 21 (1.7%) | |
| **I would not get the vaccine due to religious reasons** | | | | 0.161 |
| Strongly disagree | 139 (50%) | 1,668 (85%) | 1,167 (94%) | |
| Disagree | 62 (22%) | 204 (10%) | 49 (3.9%) | |
| Indifferent | 53 (19%) | 56 (2.9%) | 20 (1.6%) | |
| Agree | 13 (4.7%) | 9 (0.5%) | 6 (0.5%) | |
| Strongly agree | 12 (4.3%) | 16 (0.8%) | 5 (0.4%) | |
| **I would not get the vaccine as its my personal choice/freedom** | | | | <0.001 * |
| Strongly disagree | 63 (23%) | 1,452 (74%) | 1,114 (89%) | |
| Disagree | 37 (13%) | 280 (14%) | 81 (6.5%) | |
| Indifferent | 45 (16%) | 98 (5.0%) | 28 (2.2%) | |
| Agree | 71 (25%) | 100 (5.1%) | 16 (1.3%) | |
| Strongly agree | 63 (23%) | 23 (1.2%) | 8 (0.6%) | |
| **I would not get the vaccine as I fear needles** | | | | 0.749 |
| Strongly disagree | 185 (66%) | 1,654 (85%) | 1,162 (93%) | |
| Disagree | 60 (22%) | 243 (12%) | 69 (5.5%) | |
| Indifferent | 24 (8.6%) | 35 (1.8%) | 11 (0.9%) | |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Agree | 8 (2.9%) | 14 (0.7%) | 1 (<0.1%) | |
| Strongly agree | 2 (0.7%) | 7 (0.4%) | 4 (0.3%) | |
| **I would not get the vaccine as I am worried about the effects of the COVID-19 Vaccine** | | | | <0.001 * |
| Strongly disagree | 2 (0.7%) | 47 (2.4%) | 244 (20%) | |
| Disagree | 0 (0%) | 56 (2.9%) | 288 (23%) | |
| Indifferent | 13 (4.7%) | 175 (9.0%) | 239 (19%) | |
| Agree | 40 (14%) | 980 (50%) | 421 (34%) | |
| Strongly agree | 224 (80%) | 695 (36%) | 55 (4.4%) | |
| **I would not get the vaccine as I am worried about the effectiveness of the Vaccine** | | | | 0.11 |
| Strongly disagree | 2 (0.7%) | 49 (2.5%) | 164 (13%) | |
| Disagree | 3 (1.1%) | 103 (5.3%) | 218 (17%) | |
| Indifferent | 31 (11%) | 283 (14%) | 226 (18%) | |
| Agree | 58 (21%) | 996 (51%) | 553 (44%) | |
| Strongly agree | 185 (66%) | 522 (27%) | 86 (6.9%) | |
| **I would not get the vaccine as I am worried about the out of pocket cost coverage of the vaccine** | | | | <0.001 * |
| Strongly disagree | 112 (40%) | 617 (32%) | 611 (49%) | |
| Disagree | 42 (15%) | 418 (21%) | 274 (22%) | |
| Indifferent | 79 (28%) | 437 (22%) | 162 (13%) | |
| Agree | 16 (5.7%) | 318 (16%) | 148 (12%) | |
| Strongly agree | 30 (11%) | 163 (8.3%) | 52 (4.2%) | |
| **I would not get the vaccine due to the adverse effects of the vaccine on pre existing conditions** | | | | 0.155 |
| Strongly disagree | 71 (25%) | 707 (36%) | 733 (59%) | |
| Disagree | 44 (16%) | 387 (20%) | 251 (20%) | |
| Indifferent | 75 (27%) | 388 (20%) | 133 (11%) | |
| Agree | 34 (12%) | 297 (15%) | 106 (8.5%) | |
| Strongly agree | 55 (20%) | 174 (8.9%) | 24 (1.9%) | |
| **I would not get the vaccine as there is no need for the vaccine for my risk level** | | | | <0.001 * |
| Strongly disagree | 24 (8.6%) | 904 (46%) | 895 (72%) | |
| Disagree | 37 (13%) | 649 (33%) | 253 (20%) | |
| Indifferent | 93 (33%) | 288 (15%) | 71 (5.7%) | |
| Agree | 66 (24%) | 81 (4.1%) | 20 (1.6%) | |
| Strongly agree | 59 (21%) | 31 (1.6%) | 8 (0.6%) | |
| **I would not get the vaccine as I have had prior reactions to other vaccinations** | | | | 0.005* |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly disagree | 99 (35%) | 1,202 (62%) | 1,015 (81%) | |
| Disagree | 73 (26%) | 482 (25%) | 181 (15%) | |
| Indifferent | 58 (21%) | 140 (7.2%) | 28 (2.2%) | |
| Agree | 30 (11%) | 98 (5.0%) | 18 (1.4%) | |
| Strongly agree | 19 (6.8%) | 31 (1.6%) | 5 (0.4%) | |
| **I would not get the vaccine as I am worried about the rapidity of the COVID vaccine** | | | | <0.001 * |
| Strongly disagree | 7 (2.5%) | 69 (3.5%) | 240 (19%) | |
| Disagree | 7 (2.5%) | 65 (3.3%) | 216 (17%) | |
| Indifferent | 24 (8.6%) | 143 (7.3%) | 152 (12%) | |
| Agree | 37 (13%) | 714 (37%) | 487 (39%) | |
| Strongly agree | 204 (73%) | 962 (49%) | 152 (12%) | |
| **I would not get the vaccine as I do not trust pharmaceutical companies** | | | | 0.029* |
| Strongly disagree | 5 (1.8%) | 185 (9.5%) | 427 (34%) | |
| Disagree | 15 (5.4%) | 424 (22%) | 422 (34%) | |
| Indifferent | 67 (24%) | 636 (33%) | 261 (21%) | |
| Agree | 66 (24%) | 480 (25%) | 112 (9.0%) | |
| Strongly agree | 126 (45%) | 228 (12%) | 25 (2.0%) | |
| **I would not get the vaccine as I do not trust the FDA/CDC** | | | | 0.019* |
| Strongly disagree | 3 (1.1%) | 161 (8.2%) | 422 (34%) | |
| Disagree | 9 (3.2%) | 367 (19%) | 351 (28%) | |
| Indifferent | 52 (19%) | 397 (20%) | 182 (15%) | |
| Agree | 67 (24%) | 609 (31%) | 227 (18%) | |
| Strongly agree | 148 (53%) | 419 (21%) | 65 (5.2%) | |
| **I would not get the vaccine as I do not trust the doctors recommending the vaccine** | | | | <0.001 * |
| Strongly disagree | 22 (7.9%) | 604 (31%) | 855 (69%) | |
| Disagree | 46 (16%) | 695 (36%) | 305 (24%) | |
| Indifferent | 96 (34%) | 487 (25%) | 67 (5.4%) | |
| Agree | 53 (19%) | 132 (6.8%) | 16 (1.3%) | |
| Strongly agree | 62 (22%) | 35 (1.8%) | 4 (0.3%) | |
| **I would not get the vaccine as I do not trust the governement about the COVID-19 severity** | | | | 0.59 |
| Strongly disagree | 7 (2.5%) | 255 (13%) | 404 (32%) | |
| Disagree | 16 (5.7%) | 334 (17%) | 244 (20%) | |
| Indifferent | 55 (20%) | 374 (19%) | 192 (15%) | |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.03.21249184; this version posted January 4, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Agree | 55 (20%) | 503 (26%) | 234 (19%) | |
| Strongly agree | 146 (52%) | 487 (25%) | 173 (14%) | |