medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.20.21255821; this version posted May 6, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Title: COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy January-March 2021 among 18-64 year old US adults by employment and occupation

Author names and affiliations:

Wendy C King, PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Epidemiology, Graduate School of Public Health University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, kingw@edc.pitt.edu

Max Rubinstein, MPP, PhD Student, Heinz College and Department of Statistics & Data Science, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, mrubinst@andrew.cmu.edu

Alex Reinhart, PhD, Assistant Teaching Professor, Department of Statistics & Data Science, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, areinhar@stat.cmu.edu

Robin J. Mejia, PhD, Special Faculty, Department of Statistics & Data Science, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, rmejia@andrew.cmu.edu

Corresponding author information:

Robin Mejia, PhD, MPH

Carnegie Mellon University

5000 Forbes Avenue

Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Telephone: 831-252-3034

Email: rmejia@andrew.cmu.edu

Report word count: 1807/2000; Abstract word count: 248/250; Number of tables: 2/2; Number of references: 19/20.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2021.04.20.21255821; this version posted May 6, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract

COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy increased among US adults April-December, 2020, and threatens efforts to end the pandemic. Among US adults 18-64 years, we report prevalence of and reasons for vaccine hesitancy, overall and by employment and occupation, during the COVID-19 vaccine rollout. The Delphi Group at Carnegie Mellon University conducted a COVID-19 survey administered by Facebook. In January, February, and March, 2021 791,716, 710,529, and 732,308 US residents from the Facebook Active User Base, respectively, reported age 18-64 years and answered a vaccine acceptance question. Weights matched the sample to the US population age, gender, and state profile. Weighted percentages were calculated and risk ratios (RR) for vaccine hesitancy estimated using a weighted Poisson regression; 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated. Vaccine hesitancy decreased among adults 18-64 years from January (27.5% [95%CI, 27.3-27.6]) to March (22.1% [95%CI, 21.9-22.2]). Vaccine hesitancy varied widely by occupation category: 9.6%, (95%CI, 8.5-10.7) in life/physical/social sciences to 46.4% (95%CI, 45.1-47.7) in construction/extraction. Almost half (47.9%, 95%, 47.6-48.3) of hesitant participants indicated concern about side effects, and over a third didn't believe they needed the vaccine, didn't trust the government, were waiting to see if it was safe, and/or didn't trust COVID-19 vaccines (versus 14.5% [95%CI, 14.3-14.8] who didn't like vaccines in general). In this nationally representative survey of adults 18-64 years, vaccine hesitancy decreased to 22% by March, 2021. Still, hesitancy, which varies widely by occupation, remains a barrier to pandemic control. Reasons for hesitancy indicate messaging about safety and addressing trust are paramount.

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, United States, workforce, profession, vaccination

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.20.21255821; this version posted May 6, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

Vaccine hesitancy (i.e., a refusal or reluctance to be vaccinated) is a barrier to ending the COVID-19 pandemic.[1] Despite the increasing COVID-19 death toll,[2] COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy increased among US adults April-December, 2020.[3] In early December, only 56.2% reported they were likely to get vaccinated[1]. The likelihood was similar among healthcare workers (55.3%)[4]. Working-age adults (<65 years) were less likely to get vaccinated versus older adults[1]. Workplace outbreaks, spread of infection from healthcare workers to patients and from workers to customers are public health threats.[5,6]

The extent to which vaccine hesitancy changed during the first three months of the US COVID-19 vaccine rollout, and if and how current vaccine hesitancy varies by employment and occupation is unknown. Among a large representative sample of US adults 18-64 years, we report vaccine hesitancy by month, January-March, 2021. For March, we also report cumulative COVID-19 vaccine uptake and current prevalence of and reasons for vaccine hesitancy, overall and by employment status and occupation category.

Materials and Methods

Since April, 2020, the Delphi Group at Carnegie Mellon University has been conducting an ongoing national COVID-19 survey in collaboration with the Facebook Data for Good group. Each month the survey is offered to a random sample, stratified by geographic region, of ≈100 million US residents from the Facebook Active User Base who use one of the supported languages (English [American and British], Spanish [Spain and Latin American], French, Brazilian Portuguese, Vietnamese, and simplified Chinese) via a link

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.20.21255821; this version posted May 6, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

at the top of their Facebook News Feed to yield ≈1.3 million responders, which allows for evaluation of local trends. The Carnegie Mellon University Institutional Review Board approved the survey protocol and instrument (STUDY2020_00000162).

Study sample. Facebook users may be offered the survey from once a month to once every six months, depending on their geographic strata. To show trends over time in vaccine hesitancy, we used data from January 6 (date the vaccine acceptance question was initially asked in its current form) to March 31, 2021 aggregated by month. While is possible there are repeat respondents across months, respondents cannot be linked longitudinally, so data was treated as repeat cross-sectional surveys. Only March data was used in the analysis of vaccine uptake and hesitancy by occupational category/profession and reasons for hesitancy, avoiding repeat respondents and focusing on the most current data.

In March, 104,768,154 Facebook users were offered the survey, of whom 1,291,957 completed at least two survey questions. Respondents were excluded if they did not report age 18-64 (n=558,972) or did not answer the vaccine acceptance question (n=677), leaving 732,308 participants. Applying the same criteria, the January and February samples had 791,716 and 710,529 participants, respectively.

Measures. The survey questions and response sets utilized in this report are provided in an **appendix** (supplemental material). Participants age 18-64 were categorized as vaccine hesitant if they answered that they probably or definitely would not choose to get vaccinated if offered a vaccine to prevent COVID-19 today (versus probably or definitely would choose to get vaccinated or were vaccinated). Participants were categorized by employment status in the past 4 weeks, and if employed, by occupation category and profession.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.20.21255821; this version posted May 6, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Statistical analysis. Percentage vaccine hesitant by month was calculated using Facebook-provided weights, which account for the sampling design, non-response, and differences between the demographics of survey respondents and the US adult population.[7] Among the March sample, weighted percentages for worked outside the home, vaccinated, and vaccine hesitant were calculated, overall and by employment variables. Additionally, risk ratios (RR) for vaccine hesitancy by employment status and occupation category were estimated using a weighted Poisson regression. Finally, weighted percentages for reasons for hesitancy were calculated among vaccine hesitant participants overall and among occupation categories with the highest hesitancy. For all parameters, 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated using robust standard errors.[8] Analyses were conducted in R (Version 4.0.2, R Core Team, Vienna, Austria).

Results

March participants (N=732,308) had a median age range of 35-44 years, 45.0% were male, 51.1% female, 3.8% other/unknown gender; 18.9% were Hispanic, 63.8% non-Hispanic white, 6.8% non-Hispanic black, 3.2% non-Hispanic Asian, and 7.3% mixed/other/unknown race; 76.6% had at least some college. Two-thirds (66.4%, 95%CI, 66.3-66.5) worked for pay; half (50.8%, 95%CI, 50.6-50.9) worked outside the home. Demographics were similar in January and February (data not shown).

Vaccine hesitancy decreased among adults 18-64 years each month from January (27.5% [95%CI, 27.3-27.6]) to February (25.7 [95%CI, 25.6, 25.8]) to March (22.1% [95%CI, 21.9-22.2]). The time trend was similar among those who worked outside the home (January: 29.5% [95%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.20.21255821; this version posted May 6, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

CI, 29.3-29.7] to March: 24.8% [95%CI, 24.6-24.9]) and those who worked from home (January: 15.1% [95% CI, 14.9-15.3] to March: 11.4% [95%CI, 11.2-11.6]).

March cumulative vaccination uptake and current hesitancy by employment status and occupation category are reported in **Table 1**. Healthcare workers (78.3% [95%CI, 77.8-78.7] practitioners/technicians; 67.7% [95%CI, 67.0-68.3] support) and educators (68.5%, 95%CI, 68.0-69.0) led vaccine uptake, which was 38.0% (95%CI, 37.9-38.1) overall.

Vaccine hesitancy varied widely by occupation category, from approximately 10% in people working in life, physical or social sciences, education, legal professions and computer and mathematical careers, to greater than 40% among people working in installation, maintenance or repair, farming, fishing, or forestry and construction, oil and gas extraction or mining (**Table 1**). Vaccine hesitancy was also relatively high (approximately one-third) among those in production, which includes food processing and meat packing, and transportation and material moving.

There was also a range in COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among healthcare workers, which was 14.1% (95%CI, 13.7-14.5) in practitioners/technicians and 15.9% (95%CI, 15.4-16.4) in support professions. Pharmacists had the lowest hesitancy (range 8.5%, 95%CI, 6.8-10.2). Physicians (12.2% [95%CI, 11.2-12.3]) and registered nurses/nurse practitioners (11.7% [95%CI, 10.6-13.9]) had relatively low hesitancy versus licensed practical/vocational nurses (19.0% [95%CI, 17.6-20.4]). Home health/personal-care aids, medical assistants, emergency medical technicians/paramedics, and nursing assistants/psychiatric aides had the highest hesitancy (range: 20.5% [95%CI, 19.2-21.8] to 23.1% [95%CI, 21.2-25.0]).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.20.21255821; this version posted May 6, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Reasons for vaccine hesitancy are reported in **Table 2** overall and by occupation categories in occupation categories with the highest hesitancy. Almost half (47.9%, 95%, 47.6-48.3) of hesitant participants indicated concern about side effects, and over a third identified one or more of the following reasons: didn't believe they needed the vaccine, didn't trust the government, were waiting to see if the vaccine was safe, and didn't trust COVID-19 vaccines (versus 14.5% [95%CI, 14.3-14.8] who didn't like vaccines in general). More than one fifth of participants indicated allergic reaction risk, unknown efficacy and other people need a COVID-19 vaccine more as reasons. In high hesitancy occupation categories, worry about side effects, an allergic reaction and waiting to see if the vaccine was safe were reported less frequently, whereas lack of trust in the COVID-19 vaccine and the government, disbelief of need and dislike of vaccines were reported more frequently compared to all hesitant participants (**Table 2**).

Discussion

In this nationally representative survey of adults 18-64 years, COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy decreased from 28% to 22% January-March, 2021. Still, hesitancy remains a barrier to pandemic control, particularly among the workforce; in March, one in four adults working outside the home reported they would probably or definitely not get vaccinated if offered a vaccine to prevent COVID-19 today.

This data highlights the disparity in vaccine hesitancy among the workforce, by occupation. Occupation categories with the highest hesitancy (construction/extraction, installation/maintenance/repair, farming/fishing/forestry, transportation/material moving, and production), include some that have suffered workplace outbreaks, such as meat packing plants and agriculture.[5, 9]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.20.21255821; this version posted May 6, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Reasons for hesitancy among these high-hesitancy occupational groups indicate a need for public health campaigns to increase trust in the COVID-19 vaccine and the government, and to address the belief that some individuals do not need a COVID-19 vaccine. Given the variation in hesitancy by occupational groups, public health and medical workers could seek to understand and address reasons for hesitancy in specific workplace communities by building partnerships in occupations with high vaccine hesitancy.

Workplace vaccination clinics have the potential to address several potential barriers to COVID-19 vaccination, e.g., difficulty scheduling, transportation, travel and time requirements, including unpaid time off of work, and of going to an unfamiliar location[10-12]. In addition, workplace efforts can address poor understanding of the risks and benefits, and lack of vaccination being the norm, by providing population-specific educational messaging and positive peer pressure[10-12]. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) provides COVID-19 vaccination audience-specific toolkits to promote vaccine acceptance, including an essential workers toolkit[13]. The CDC also provides guidance to employers on hosting workplace vaccination clinics[14] . They advise including management, human resources, employees and labor representatives, as appropriate, in the planning process, and using multiple strategies to promote and encourage participation in the vaccination clinics, e.g., encouraging managers and leaders to get vaccinated first. Just as celebrities have promoted vaccination to the public and Black health care workers have had success engaging Black communities[15], workplace-focused campaigns could feature prominent and ordinary figures from specific workplaces or occupations discussing why they got vaccinated[16].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.20.21255821; this version posted May 6, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Among healthcare workers, several professions with high patient contact (e.g., nursing assistants/psychiatric aides) reported hesitancy >20%. This is concerning as patients are often at higher risk of hospitalization or death from COVID-19 than the general population, based on their age or health status. Published guidance on promoting vaccinations among healthcare workers[17,18] may serve as a starting point for COVID-19 specific efforts.

Study limitations and strengths. Cross-sectional samples were used to evaluate time trends, and the sample representativeness may have been affected by the recruitment method and response rate, addressed with weighting.[7] Compared to the American Community Survey 2015-2019 5-year 2 Data Release[19], demographics of the weighted sample are similar to the US population, but white race and higher education are slightly over-represented. Thus, overall hesitancy prevalence estimates might be underestimated.[3] This should have minimal effects on time trends or comparisons between occupation categories.

Study strengths include the timing of our study (i.e., during the first three months of the COVID-19 vaccine rollout) and our large geographically and occupationally diverse sample, which allowed for precise vaccine hesitancy estimates by month and occupation. Another strength of our study was that the vaccination question assessed vaccine hesitancy independent of vaccine access by asking if respondents would choose to get vaccinated if a vaccine to prevent COVID-19 were offered to them that day.

Conclusions

Vaccine hesitancy among US adults 18-64 years decreased in the first three months of the US COVID-19 vaccine rollout. However, with 22% of workers hesitant in March, 2021, and some

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.20.21255821; this version posted May 6, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

occupational categories reporting hesitancy of twice this rate, vaccine hesitancy remains a barrier to ending the COVID-19 pandemic. This report identified occupations with high rates of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and reasons for hesitancy overall and specific to these occupations to help public health and the health care practitioners target interventions and address concerns to increase vaccination rates, potentially via workplace-focused campaigns and onsite vaccination clinics. Messaging about safety, addressing trust, and clarifying the value of vaccinations to prevent COVID-19 is needed.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.20.21255821; this version posted May 6, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 1. SARS-CoV-2 cumulative vaccination uptake and current vaccine hesitancy, overall and by employment status and occupation category[a], in March, 2021, among 18-64 year old US adults.

		% (95% CI)			
	N	**Work outside home**	**Vaccinated**	**Hesitant**	**RR (95% CI) Hesitant**
Total sample	732308	50.8 (50.6, 50.9)	38.0 (37.9, 38.1)	22.1 (21.9, 22.2)	-
Employment status					
Does not work for pay	246285	-	29.8 (29.6, 30.0)	22.5 (22.3, 22.7)	Reference
Work for pay	478848	76.9 (76.7, 77.0)	42.3 (42.1, 42.4)	21.8 (21.6, 21.9)	0.97 (0.96, 0.98)
Work outside home	351622	100%	43.2 (43.0, 43.4)	24.8 (24.6, 24.9)	1.10 (1.09, 1.11)
Work at home	120472	0%	39.7 (39.4, 40.0)	11.4 (11.2, 11.6)	0.51 (0.49, 0.52)
No response	13929	-	33.8 (32.9, 34.7)	27.3 (26.4, 28.3)	1.21 (1.17, 1.26)
Employment category					
Life, physical, or social science	4299	63.3 (61.6, 65.0)	44.9 (43.2, 46.7)	9.6 (8.5, 10.7)	0.68 (0.60, 0.76)
Education, training, or library	53766	76.5 (76.0, 76.9)	68.5 (68.0, 69.0)	9.7 (9.4, 10.1)	0.69 (0.66, 0.72)
Legal	6392	56.6 (55.2, 58.0)	49.1 (47.7, 50.5)	10.0 (9.1, 11.0)	0.71 (0.64, 0.78)
Computer and mathematical	15982	25.6 (24.8, 26.4)	33.4 (32.6, 34.3)	10.3 (9.7, 10.9)	0.73 (0.68, 0.78)
Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media	14170	51.2 (50.2, 52.2)	33.5 (32.5, 34.4)	12.8 (12.1, 13.6)	0.91 (0.85, 0.97)
Community and social service[b]	22573	79.1 (78.6, 79.7)	64.7 (64.0, 65.5)	14.0 (13.4, 14.6)	0.99 (0.94, 1.04)
Healthcare practitioners and technicians	44528	94.0 (93.8, 94.3)	78.3 (77.8, 78.7)	14.1 (13.7, 14.5)	Reference
Business and finance operations	14154	37.0 (36.1, 38.0)	32.8 (31.9, 33.7)	15.3 (14.6, 16.1)	1.09 (1.03, 1.15)
Healthcare support	29718	79.1 (78.6, 79.6)	67.7 (67.0, 68.3)	15.9 (15.4, 16.4)	1.13 (1.08, 1.17)
Office and administrative support	60460	62.6 (62.1, 63.0)	39.8 (39.3, 40.2)	16.1 (15.7, 16.4)	1.14 (1.10, 1.18)
Management	17613	55.5 (54.7, 56.4)	40.0 (39.1, 40.8)	17.5 (16.8, 18.2)	1.24 (1.18, 1.30)
Architecture and engineering	5747	64.2 (62.8, 65.6)	32.6 (31.2, 33.9)	18.3 (17.1, 19.5)	1.29 (1.20, 1.39)
Food preparation and serving related	26940	96.1 (95.8, 96.4)	28.8 (28.2, 29.5)	24.6 (23.9, 25.2)	1.74 (1.67, 1.80)
Personal care and service (not healthcare)	9515	82.2 (81.2, 83.1)	35.1 (33.9, 36.2)	24.6 (23.6, 25.7)	1.74 (1.66, 1.83)
Sales and related	35213	77.9 (77.4, 78.4)	26.5 (25.9, 27.0)	26.9 (26.3, 27.4)	1.90 (1.83, 1.97)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.20.21255821; this version posted May 6, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Military	2383	91.2 (90.0, 92.4)	48.7 (46.1, 51.2)	27.6 (25.2, 30.1)	1.96 (1.77, 2.14)
Building or grounds cleaning/maintenance	8425	94.3 (93.7, 94.9)	29.2 (28.1, 30.3)	28.4 (27.1, 29.6)	2.01 (1.91, 2.11)
Protective service	6256	95.8 (95.3, 96.3)	49.0 (47.6, 50.5)	30.3 (28.9, 31.7)	2.14 (2.03, 2.26)
Production[c]	11123	95.7 (95.3, 96.2)	25.6 (24.7, 26.5)	32.7 (31.6, 33.8)	2.31 (2.22, 2.41)
Transportation and material moving	15890	95.7 (95.4, 96.1)	26.3 (25.5, 27.1)	34.0 (33.1, 34.9)	2.41 (2.32, 2.50)
Farming, fishing, and forestry	2762	87.8 (86.4, 89.2)	27.3 (25.4, 29.3)	41.2 (38.9, 43.5)	2.92 (2.74, 3.10)
Installation, maintenance, repair	11068	96.1 (95.7, 96.5)	20.5 (19.7, 21.3)	42.6 (41.5, 43.7)	3.01 (2.90, 3.13)
Construction and extraction[d]	7866	95.8 (95.3, 96.3)	18.4 (17.5, 19.4)	46.4 (45.1, 47.7)	3.28 (3.15, 3.41)
Any other occupation category	42834	78.8 (78.3, 79.2)	27.8 (27.3, 28.3)	30.9 (30.3, 31.4)	2.19 (2.11, 2.26)
No response	16346	64.0 (62.0, 66.0)	31.6 (30.8, 32.4)	28.6 (27.7, 29.5)	2.02 (1.94, 2.11)

[a]Occupation categories were adapted from the Bureau of Labor Statistics Standard Occupational Classification.
[b]Including counselor, school counselor, mental health worker, social worker, or religious worker.
[c]Including food processing, meat packing, laundry, and dry cleaning workers.
[d]Including oil, gas, mining, or quarrying.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.20.21255821; this version posted May 6, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2. Reasons 18-64 year old US adults reported vaccine hesitancy overall, and by occupation categories with the highest percentage hesitant.

	Total N=143297	**Construction, extraction[a] N=3381**	**Installation, maintenance, repair N=4409**	**Farming, fishing, forestry N=1018**	**Transportation, material moving, delivery N = 5024**
Side effects	47.9 (47.6, 48.3)	43.4 (41.4, 45.4)	44.0 (42.3, 45.8)	45.1 (41.3, 48.9)	45.4 (43.8, 47.0)
Don't trust COVID-19 vaccine	42.3 (41.9, 42.6)	51.0 (49.0, 53.0)	47.4 (45.6, 49.1)	48.7 (44.9, 52.6)	46.1 (44.4, 47.7)
Wait to see if safe then maybe later	37.6 (37.3, 37.9)	25.0 (23.3, 26.8)	28.0 (26.4, 29.5)	24.9 (21.7, 28.1)	30.9 (29.4, 32.4)
Don't trust government	36.6 (36.3, 36.9)	51.9 (49.9, 53.9)	46.7 (44.9, 48.4)	46.6 (42.8, 50.4)	46.3 (44.6, 47.9)
Don’t believe I need	33.6 (33.2, 33.9)	49.4 (47.4, 51.4)	48.0 (46.3, 49.8)	51.3 (47.5, 55.1)	42.0 (40.4, 43.7)
Allergic reaction	22.9 (22.7, 23.2)	15.6 (14.2, 17.1)	17.7 (16.4, 18.9)	16.8 (14.3, 19.4)	20.1 (18.8, 21.4)
Don't know if it will work	22.6 (22.4, 22.9)	24.1 (22.3, 25.8)	23.3 (21.8, 24.8)	25.0 (21.5, 28.4)	22.5 (21.2, 23.8)
Other people need more	22.5 (22.2, 22.7)	18.6 (17.0, 20.2)	21.4 (19.9, 22.8)	20.1 (17.2, 22.9)	21.8 (20.4, 23.2)
Don't like vaccines	14.5 (14.3, 14.8)	17.1 (15.6, 18.7)	17.6 (16.3, 19.0)	17.1 (14.0, 20.2)	16.3 (15.1, 17.5)
Safety concern because of health condition	9.9 (9.7, 10.1)	3.8 (3.1, 4.5)	4.7 (4.0, 5.4)	4.0 (2.8, 5.1)	6.2 (5.5, 6.9)
Doctor not recommended	8.1 (8.0, 8.3)	7.5 (6.4, 8.6)	7.1 (6.2, 8.0)	8.4 (5.9, 11.0)	6.9 (6.0, 7.7)
Currently/planning to be pregnant/ breastfeeding	6.8 (6.6, 6.9)	1.8 (1.3, 2.4)	1.4 (1.0, 1.8)	3.0 (1.9, 4.0)	2.3 (1.8, 2.7)
Against religion	6.7 (6.5, 6.8)	8.4 (7.2, 9.6)	7.0 (6.1, 7.9)	6.6 (5.0, 8.3)	6.7 (5.9, 7.6)
Cost	4.3 (4.1, 4.4)	3.4 (2.6, 4.1)	3.6 (2.9, 4.2)	2.9 (1.8, 3.9)	4.1 (3.4, 4.8)
Other	13.6 (13.3, 13.8)	16.4 (14.9, 17.9)	17.0 (15.8, 18.3)	15.5 (12.9, 18.2)	15.2 (14.0, 16.4)

[a]Including oil, gas, mining, or quarrying.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.20.21255821; this version posted May 6, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank the Delphi Group at Carnegie Mellon University for input and support on the survey instrument. Wichada La Motte-Kerr, MPH, of Delphi contributed to the development and deployment of the survey and received compensation for her contributions to the study. We thank Sarah LaRocca, PhD and Katherine Morris, PhD of Facebook for contributions to the survey instrument design.

References

1. Schaffer DeRoo S, Pudalov NJ, Fu LY. Planning for a COVID-19 vaccination program. *JAMA*. 2020;323(24):2458-2459. doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.8711

2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Trends in number of COVID-19 cases and deaths in the United States reported to CDC, by state/territory. Atlanta, GA: CDC. https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#trends_dailytrendscases. Accessed April 30, 2022.

3. Szilagyi PG, Thomas K, Shah MD, et al. National trends in the US public's likelihood of getting a COVID-19 vaccine-April 1 to December 8, 2020. *JAMA.* 2020;325(4):396-398. doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.26419.

4. Meyer MN, Gjorgjieva T, Rosica D. Trends in health care workers intentions to receive a COVID-19 vaccine and reasons for hesitancy. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(3):e215344. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.5344.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.20.21255821; this version posted May 6, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

5. Althouse BM, Wenger EA, Miller JC, et al. Superspreading events in the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2: Opportunities for interventions and control. *PLoS Biol.* 2020;18(11):e3000897. doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.3000897.

6. Gold JAW, Gettings JR, Kimball A, et al. Clusters of SARS-CoV-2 infection among elementary school educators and students in one school district - Georgia, December 2020-January 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2021;70(8):289-292. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm7008e4.

7. Barkay N, Cobb C, Eilat R, et al. Weights and methodology brief for the COVID-19 symptom survey by University of Maryland and Carnegie Mellon University, in partnership with Facebook. 6 Oct 2020, arXiv preprint https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.14675

8. Freedman, D. A. On the so-called "Huber sandwich estimator" and "robust standard errors". *The American Statistician*. 2006;60(4):299-302. doi: 10.1198/000313006X152207

9. Waltenburg MA, Rose CE, Victoroff T, Butterfield M, Dillaha JA, Heinzerling A, et al. Coronavirus Disease among Workers in Food Processing, Food Manufacturing, and Agriculture Workplaces. Emerg Infect Dis. 2021;27(1):243-249. doi: 10.3201/eid2701.20382

10. Graves MA, Harris JR, Hannon PA, Hammerback K, Ahmed F, Zhou C.J Workplace-based influenza vaccination promotion practices among large employers in the United States. *Occup Environ Med*. 2014;56(4):397-402. doi: 10.1097/JOM.0000000000000115.

11. Luthy KE, Bainum JL, Beckstrand RL, Macintosh JL, Eden LM, Saunders B. Promoting Adult Pertussis Vaccination in the Workplace. *Workplace Health Saf*. 2016 Jun;64(6):269-78. doi: 10.1177/2165079916628883

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.20.21255821; this version posted May 6, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

12. Guide to Community Preventive Services. Worksite Health: Seasonal Influenza Vaccinations Using Interventions with On-Site, Reduced Cost, Actively Promoted Vaccinations – non-Healthcare Workers (2013). Taskforce Finding and Rationale Statement. https://www.thecommunityguide.org/sites/default/files/assets/Worksite-Influenza-Vaccinations-non-Healthcare-Workers-On-Site.pdf. Atlanta, GA: CDC. Accessed April 30, 2021.

13. National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases (NCIRD), Division of Viral Diseases https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/toolkits/essential-workers.html. Atlanta, GA: CDC. Accessed April 30, 2021.

14. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases (NCIRD) https://www.cdc.gov/flu/business/promoting-vaccines-workplace.htm. Atlanta, GA: CDC. Accessed April 30, 2021.

15. Lopez-Villafana A. Black nurses bring vaccine to community centers, churches to target under-served people. San Diego Union Tribune. March 17, 2021. https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/communities/san-diego/story/2021-03-17/san-diegos-black-nurses-focus-on-vaccinating-black-residents-in-southeastern-san-diego. Accessed April 30, 2021.

16. Burden S, Henshall C, Oshikanlu R. Harnessing the nursing contribution to COVID-19 mass vaccination programmes: Addressing hesitancy and promoting confidence. *J Adv Nurs*. 2021 Apr 7. doi: 10.1111/jan.14854. Online ahead of print.

17. Yue X, Black C, Ball S, Donahue S, de Perio MA, Laney AS, Greby S.J Workplace Interventions and Vaccination-Related Attitudes Associated With Influenza Vaccination Coverage Among

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.20.21255821; this version posted May 6, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Healthcare Personnel Working in Long-Term Care Facilities, 2015-2016 Influenza Season. *Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2019;20(6):718-724. doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2018.11.029. Epub 2019 Jan 30.

18. Guide to Community Preventive Services. Worksite Health: Seasonal Influenza Vaccinations Using Interventions with On-Site, Reduced Cost, Actively Promoted Vaccinations –Healthcare Workers (2013). Taskforce Finding and Rationale Statement. Worksite Health: Flu Vaccine On-Site Healthcare | The Community Guide. Atlanta, GA: CDC. Accessed April 28, 2021.

19. United States Census Bureau. American Community Survey 5-year 2019 Data Release. Version: December 10, 2020. American Community Survey 5-Year Data (2009-2019) (census.gov). Accessed April 7, 2021.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.20.21255821; this version posted May 6, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Funding/Support: This material is based upon work supported by Facebook (unrestricted gift) and a cooperative agreement from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (U01IP001121). Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of Facebook or the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Role of the Funder: Facebook was involved in the design and conduct of the study. The CDC provided funding only. Neither Facebook nor the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention had a role in the collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; or decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.04.20.21255821; this version posted May 6, 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Appendix. Carnegie Mellon University Delphi Group's COVID-19 Survey: select questions and response sets.