medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 .

Factors Associated with the Acceptance and Willingness of COVID-19 Vaccination among Chinese Healthcare Workers

Xinxin Ye[a,*], MD; Wan Ye[b*], MD; Jinyue Yu[c,*], MD; Yuzhen Gao[d], MD; Ziyang Ren[a], MD; Lanzhen Chen[e], MD; Ao Dong[f], MD; Qian Yi[a], MD; Chenju Zhan[g], MD; Yanni Lin[h], MD; Yangxin Wang[i], PhD; Simin Huang[j], MD; Peige Song[a, k], PhD

[a]School of Public Health, Zhejiang University School of Medicine, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China

[b]Department of Nursing, Xiamen Medical College, Xiamen, Fujian, China

[c] Institute of Child Health, University College London, London, the United Kingdom

[d]Department of Clinical Laboratory, Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China

[e]Department of Nursing, The Second Affiliated Hospital of Xiamen Medical College, Xiamen,Fujian ,China

[f]The Second Clinical School of Beijing University of Chinese Medicine, Beijing University of Chinese Medicine, Beijing, Beijing, China

[g]Department of Nursing, Mindong Hospital of Ningde City, Fuan, Fujian, China

[h]Department of Nursing, No.1 Hospital Of Longhai City, Longhai, Fujian, China

[i]Department of Orthopedic Surgery, the Second Affiliated Hospital, Zhejiang University School of Medicine, Hangzhou City, Zhejiang Province, PR China

[j]Department of Nursing, Fujian University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Fuzhou, Fujian, China

[k]Women's Hospital, Zhejiang University School of Medicine, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China

*** Those authors contributed equally to this article.**

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Peige Song, PhD

School of Public Health

Zhejiang University School of Medicine

866 Yuhangtang Road

Hangzhou, 310058

China

Phone: +86(0)571-88981368

Email: peigesong@zju.edu.cn

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 .

Abstract

Background: Vaccination is a crucial measure in preventing the spread of epidemic. Vaccines targeting coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) have been developed in a wide range of countries.

Objective: This study aims to examine factors influencing vaccination rate and willingness to vaccinate against COVID-19 among Chinese healthcare workers (HCWs).

Methods: From 3rd February to 18th February, 2021, an online cross-sectional survey was conducted among HCWs to investigate factors associated with the acceptance and willingness of COVID-19 vaccination. Respondents were classified into two categories, vaccinated and unvaccinated, and, the willingness of vaccination was assessed in the unvaccinated group. Information on socio-demographics and the psychological process of the participants for accepting the vaccine were evaluated.

Results: A total of 2156 HCWs from 21 provinces in China responded to this survey (response rate: 98.99%)), among whom 1433 (66.5%) were vaccinated at least one dose. Higher vaccination rates were associated with older age (40-50 years vs. less than 30 years, OR=1.63, 95%CI: 1.02-2.58; >50 years vs. 30 years, OR=1.90, 95%CI: 1.02-3.52), working as a clinician (OR=1.54, 95% CI: 1.05-2.27), having no personal religion (OR=1.35, 95%CI: 1.06-1.71), working in a fever clinic (OR=4.50 , 95%CI:1.54-13.17) or higher hospital level(Municipal vs. County, OR=2.01, 95%CI: 1.28-3.16; Provincial vs. County, OR=2.01, 95%CI: 1.25-3.22) and having knowledge training of vaccine (OR=1.67, 95%CI:1.27-2.22), family history for influenza vaccination (OR=1.887, 95%CI:1.49-2.35) and strong familiarity with the vaccine (OR=1.43, 95%CI:1.05-1.95) (All $P<0.05$). Strong willingness for vaccination was related to having a working in midwestern China (OR=1.89, 95%CI:1.24-2.89), considerable knowledge of the vaccine (familiar vs. not familiar, OR=1.67, 95%CI: 1.17-2.39; strongly familiar vs. not familiar, OR=2.47, 95%CI: 1.36-4.49), knowledge training of vaccine(OR=1.61, 95%CI: 1.05-2.48) and strong confidence in the vaccine (OR=3.84 , 95%CI: 2.09-7.07).

Conclusion: Personal characteristics, working environments, familiarity and confidence in the vaccine were related to vaccination rates and willingness to get vaccinated among healthcare workers. Results of this study could provide evidence for the government to improve vaccine coverage by addressing vaccine hesitancy in the COVID-19 pandemic and future public health emergencies.

Keywords

vaccine; COVID-19; online survey; cross-sectional studies; healthcare workers; public health

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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

Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), the virus that causes COVID-19, emerged in late 2019 and has caused a global pandemic. The pandemic has led to more than 90 million cases and 1.9 million deaths worldwide, with disastrous consequences for the world economy and public health.[1] To achieve herd immunity and finally end the pandemic, 60 to 70% of the world population were suggested to be immune, either though natural infection or vaccination.[2]

Vaccination is one of the most effective health interventions to prevent and control the spread of infectious diseases. [1, 3] Safe and effective vaccines against SARS-CoV-2 are necessary to protect populations from COVID-19 and to safeguard global economies from continued disruption.[3, 4] The first human clinical trial of a SARS-CoV-2 vaccine (mRNA-1273) commenced on March 2020 in the United States,[5] and a 94.1% efficacy of this vaccine has been confirmed. [6, 7] However, the global uptake of the SARS-CoV-2 vaccine remains insufficient for herd immunity.[8, 9] To date (1st April 2021), nearly 127 million doses of SARS-CoV-2 vaccine have been administered in China, which is only about 9% of the adult population. [10] Meanwhile, some high-risk, low-income countries, such as Afghanistan, Ethiopia, and Guinea, have not even released vaccination data. [11] One of the reasons for the vaccine hesitancy may be the doubt about its effectiveness and safety; a survey in the United States showed that 31% of adults were not willing to get the vaccine due to a fear of side effects,[12] and another study in France reported the 26% of adults felt resistance toward receiving the vaccine due to doubts of its effectiveness.[13] Furthermore, a survey in China indicates the gap between people's willingness to accept the vaccine and their actual vaccinating activity; about 47.8% of participants expressed "willingness" to receive the vaccine, but they will postpone vaccination until the safety of the vaccine is confirmed.[14]

Healthcare workers (HCWs) are high-risk groups during the COVID-19 pandemic.[15, 16] The infection risk for this group is 9-11 times higher than that of the general population.[17] Once HCWs are infected, the infection risk for patients can consequently increase. Hence,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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 .

understanding the willingness of HCWs to accept the SARS-CoV-2 vaccine and exploring the determinants for vaccinating action can help formulate targeted education and vaccine-promoting policies, which is of great importance in enhancing vaccine uptake and avoiding future outbreaks. Much of the existing literature either focuses on evaluating the explicit reasons for vaccine hesitance and resistance,[5, 18, 19] or investigates the relationship between vaccination intention and sociodemographic factors of the general public by using health belief theory or planning behavior theory. [20-23] There is a number of investigations identifying the psychological processes of people's decision to be vaccinated and distinguishing them from those who have the intention but will not take action.

The multiple health locus of control (MHLC) scale was developed to investigate one's beliefs that the source of reinforcements for their health-related behaviors is primarily internal (determined by their own opinion) or external (determined by a matter of chance, or under the control of powerful persons). [24] Nowadays, the scale has been used as one of the most efficient measures for health-related behaviors. [25-27] The present study aims to use this measurement to investigate whether the decision for accepting the COVID-19 vaccine is controlled by internal or external factors in HCWs. This study also evaluated factors influencing actual vaccination rate and willingness among HCWs in China. Results can be used to make further recommendations for corresponding vaccination strategies and immunization plans, which are of particular importance in increasing the vaccine coverage.

Methods

Recruitment

The inclusion criteria for this study were: (1) age ≥ 18 years old; and (2) hospital HCWs, including any doctors and nurses who worked full time at public hospitals or local clinics. All respondents gave informed consent and voluntarily participated in the survey. The exclusion criteria included (1) interns, student nurses, and medical students in school; and (2) individuals who were employed by private hospitals.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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 .

Questionnaire

The questionnaire contained the following three parts: demographics, vaccination-related intentions and behaviors, and the MHLC scales:

(1) Demographic information (13 items): participants' gender, age, education background, religion, income, living area, field of work, time of employment, clinical occupation, and level of the hospital.

(2) COVID-19 vaccination-related features: vaccination status, willingness to vaccinate, and vaccine-related knowledge.

(3) The MHLC scale: The scale consists of three parts, including the internal health locus of control (IHLC, beliefs that health outcomes are related to one's own ability and effort, Cronbach □=0.61-0.80), powerful other's health locus of control (PHLC, beliefs that health outcomes are related to powerful others such as physicians, Cronbach □=0.56-0.75), and chance health locus of control (CHLC, beliefs that health outcomes are related to chance and fate, Cronbach □=0.55-0.83). [24, 27, 28] Each part has six items (score range: 6-36), and a higher score represents a higher locus of control.[24]

Data collection

This data collection was conducted from 3rd to 18th February, 2021, using a one-time anonymous online questionnaire. A pre-survey was conducted by selecting ten health professionals from different hospitals to finalize the questionnaire. The questionnaire was distributed by invitation through the social media group. Instructions were clearly provided and each questionnaire was completed with the assistance of a trained nurse. Each hospital has one or two training officers for questionnaire distribution and data collection. Details are shown in **Figure S1 in Appendix 1**.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using the R Foundation for Statistical Computing (version 4.0.3). Continuous variables were reported as mean and standard deviation (SD). Dichotomous

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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 .

data were presented as frequency (%) and compared by Chi-square or Fisher's exact test in two groups. Univariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses were performed to determine independent risk factors. Multivariate analysis data were represented on a forest plot for all comparative odds ratio (OR) values with 95% confidence interval (CI). *P* values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant. The bar plots of some potentially related reasons were presented to analyze differences among groups. Main packages including "forest plot," "glm," "ggolot2," "maps," "map data," and "tableone" were applied to visualize and analyze the results and make conclusions.

Results

Sociodemographic characteristics of survey respondents

Between 3rd February and 18th February, 2021, a total of 2178 HCWs were recruited from 21 provinces across China, including 343 doctors and 1814 nurses. After removing 22 invalid questionnaires, 2156 were finally enrolled for data analysis (effective response rate: 98.99%). A total of 1433 participants were vaccinated (66.5%). Individuals were categorized as vaccinated if they had been vaccinated at least one time at the completion of the survey (**Table 1)**. The mean age of participants was 32.91 years (SD=8.29). The sources of vaccine-related information were: work units (84.6%), WeChat (80.1%), network news (79.7%), TV (64.0%), government announcements (62.2%), community/village epidemic prevention pamphlet/bulletin board/campaign (46.4%), SMS (42.3%), other apps (35.5%), informed by others (30.7%), blogs (30.6%), and radio (10.7%) **(as shown in Figure S2 in Appendix 2)**.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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: The characteristics of including Subjects for Vaccines in the Survey

Characteristic and category	Value
Gender, n(%)	
Male	260 (12.1)
Female	1896 (87.9)
Age (year, mean (SD[a]))	32.91 (8.29)
Clinical occupation, n(%)	
Clinical Doctor	343 (15.9)
Nurse	1813 (84.1)
Race, n(%)	
Han	2087 (96.8)
Others	69 (3.2)
Personal religion, n(%)	
No	1520 (70.5)
Yes	636 (29.5)
Education, n(%)	
College or under	811 (37.6)
Bachelor	1241 (57.6)
Master or above	104 (4.8)
Average monthly income of family, CNY[b], n(%)	
≤2000	104 (4.8)
2000-4000	819 (38.0)
4000-6000	664 (30.8)
6000-8000	282 (13.1)
≥8000	287 (13.3)
Time of employment, n(%)	
≤1 year	124 (5.8)
1-2 years	174 (8.1)
3-5 years	361 (16.7)
6-9 years	469 (21.8)
≥10 years	1028 (47.7)
Work Location, n(%)	
Eastern	1291 (59.9)
Midwestern	865 (40.1)
Risk of location, n(%)	
High	1 (0.0)
Median	20 (0.9)
Low	2135 (99.0)
Clinical department, n(%)	
Fever clinics	34 (1.6)
Others	2122 (98.4)
Hospital level, n(%)	
County Level	95 (4.4)
Municipal Level	1117 (51.8)
Provincial Level	944 (43.8)
Family history for influenza vaccination, n(%)	
Yes	625 (29.0)
No	1369 (63.5)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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 .

Characteristic and category	Value
Unknown	162 (7.5)
Familiarity of vaccines, n(%)	
Comprehensive knowledge	331 (15.4)
Sufficient knowledge	1087 (50.4)
General knowledge	657 (30.5)
Limited knowledge	77 (3.6)
Not known at all	4 (0.2)
Obtained training on vaccine, n(%)	
Yes	1873 (86.9)
No	256 (11.9)
Unknown	27 (1.3)
Confidence of vaccines, n(%)	
Yes	1175 (54.5)
No	843 (39.1)
Unknown	138 (6.4)
Health condition, n(%)	
Not well	221 (10.3)
Well	1935 (89.7)

[a]SD: standard deviation.
[b]CNY=Chinese Yuan.

Comparisons in people with different vaccinated status

Compared to HCWs who had not been vaccinated, vaccinated individuals were more likely to report having employment for a long time, working in midwestern China, working in a fever clinic, or a municipal hospital (**as shown in Table S1 in Appendix 3**). Moreover, vaccinated individuals were significantly more familiar and confident in the COVID-19 vaccines than unvaccinated HCWs. Among unvaccinated HCWs, significant differences were also observed in socio-demographics among those with different levels of willingness to vaccinate (**as shown in Table S1 in Appendix 3**). For instance, those who expressed a strong willingness to receive the vaccine appeared to have no personal religion, better health condition, work in midwestern China, have sufficient knowledge about the vaccine, and have strong confidence in the vaccine (all tested $P<0.05$).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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 .

MHLC psychology results for the participants

To detect whether accepting the vaccine was influenced by internal or external factors, the MHLC scale was adopted. No significant difference was found in IHLC and PHLC between vaccinated and unvaccinated populations. However, the PHLC score positively related to vaccination intention in the study population **(as shown in Figure S3 in Appendix 4)**, reflecting that subjects' willingness to accept the vaccine may mainly be influenced by external factors, especially by powerful others, such as endorsements from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) in China or recommendations by physicians during the current circumstances**.**

Determinants of vaccinating action and willingness of vaccination

Based on the results of the MHLC, univariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses were conducted to explore factors influencing the acceptance of vaccines in HCWs (**Table S2 in Appendix 5 and Figure 1**). The unvaccinated population was divided into two groups: willingness (individuals who chose "strong willingness" or "relatively strong willingness" for accepting the vaccine) and not willingness groups (individuals who chose "moderate willingness," "unwillingness," and "very unwillingness" for vaccination).

As shown in **Figure 1**, the vaccination willingness was significantly higher if the HCWs were working in midwestern China, had been trained with the knowledge of vaccines, had strong familiarity with vaccines, had more confidence in vaccines, and had healthy physical condition. Comparatively, subjects with older age (30–40 years vs. less than 30 years, OR=1.626, 95%CI=1.024-2.582) and 40–50 years vs. 30 years, OR=1.896, 95%CI=1.021-3.523), had healthy condition, working in the fever department, and working in higher hospital level (municipal vs. county OR=2.012, 95%CI=1.279-3.164 provincial vs. county, OR=2.01, 95%CI=1.253-3.223) presented higher vaccination rates in the survey. Subjects with religious beliefs, working as a nurse, had been trained with the knowledge of vaccines and were more familiar with the vaccine had lower vaccination rates. A history of influenza vaccination was

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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 .

also positively associated with higher vaccination rates among the HCWs **(Table S2 in Appendix 5 and Figure 1)**.

Subjective opinions on COVID-19 vaccination among HCWs

To better understand the actual concerns of HCWs and to improve their willingness to vaccinate, subjective reasons related to COVID-19 vaccination were explored in the study population. **Figure 2** shows the main reasons why HCWs would accept the vaccine, and, the top five reasons were: they are part of a high-risk group that needs to be vaccinated; they feel responsibility for reducing COVID-19 cases; they want to support national vaccine management; it is a recommendation by the government; safety and effectiveness of the vaccine.

Adverse effects

Of the 1433 people that have been vaccinated, 673 (47.0%) had one dose and 760 (53.0%) had two doses; 1422 (99.2%) chose a domestic vaccine and 11 (0.8%) chose an imported vaccine. A total of 135 adverse effects (9.4%) were reported, including weakness (74, 5.2%) and headache/dizziness (58, 4.0%) (**Figure 3**).

Discussion

This study firstly provides an in-depth analysis of determinants for vaccination acceptance among HCWs from 21 provinces in China. Of the 2156 participants we included; the vaccination rate was 66.5%. A higher vaccination rate was associated with personal characteristics (male participant, older age, work as clinician, no personal religion, bachelor degree and higher, and healthy physical condition), working environment (longer years of clinical work, working in midwestern China, working in a fever clinic), and more familiarity and belief in the vaccine. Of the 723 unvaccinated participants, 10.9% were unwilling or very unwilling to receive the vaccination. Strong willingness to take the vaccine was related to having a healthy physical condition, considerable knowledge of the vaccine, and strong

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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 .

confidence in the vaccine, which are consistent with published literature. [23, 29-31] Moreover, personal religion and obtained training on the vaccine were also associated with self-reported willingness to receive it.

The MHLC results suggest that willingness to receive the vaccine is primarily influenced by powerful others' actions. Multivariate analyses show that people's willingness to receive the vaccine was significantly related to their confidence, familiarity, and training on the vaccine, which may be a consequence of the national CDC's endorsement. A survey in China showed that the public's willingness of vaccination could increase from 62.53% to 85.82% if clinicians recommended it. [32] Similarly, an American survey reported a higher probability of accepting the vaccine if it was endorsed by the CDC of America (coefficient 0.09, 95%CI: 0.07-0.11) and by the WHO (coefficient 0.06, 95%CI: 0.04-0.08). These findings highlight the importance of national CDC and healthcare agencies when promoting vaccination and other health activities.

Moreover, the results show that the willingness to vaccinate was stronger in HCWs from midwestern regions than those from eastern regions. Considering that the vaccines are equally and sufficiently distributed in each province across the country, [33] this difference might reflect the comparatively weaker healthcare system in the midwestern regions of China; [34] specifically, people working in the midwest may be more worried about the result if they are infected, and, consequently, are more willing to be vaccinated. While acceptance of the vaccine was associated with the working location, the imbalanced acceptance rate across the country might be due to the imbalance of medical resources in different regions of China, [35] reflecting that efficient delivery of high-quality healthcare to each province is vital for China's future medical development.

Interestingly, it was found that self-reported willingness to receive the vaccine may not correlated with taking the vaccine. Whilst vaccination willingness did not differ among different age groups, the actual vaccination rate was significantly higher in people aged ≥40 years, which is consistent with the findings in other countries. [23, 36-39] This presumably because

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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 .

the immune function decreases with age and the incidence and mortality of COVID-19 are relatively higher in older adults. [40] Furthermore, young people often do not have a strong demand for vaccines and tend to adopt a wait-and-see attitude. This attitude was likely heightened because the pandemic was effectively controlled in China. Hence, the vaccination behavior of younger individuals was observed to be less than the elderly. A survey conducted among young people and medical students also found a lack of preventive attitudes when facing the COVID-19 epidemic.[41, 42] Lazarus et al. reported that people ≥50 were significantly more favorably disposed to vaccination than younger participants in Canada, Poland, France, Germany, Sweden, and the UK, but not in China, [43] which contrasts with the results of the present study. This may be because at the time of Lazarus' analysis, elderly people were not recommended to be vaccinated in China, since the safety of the Chinese vaccine for people >60 years old had not been confirmed at that time. However, the CDC of China currently recommends vaccination for elderly people in light of increasing evidence about its safety and effectiveness. [44, 45] However, further investigation is needed to confirm this finding in larger clinical trials.

We observed that HCWs from fever clinics were more likely to be vaccinated, whilst most HCWs believed that high-risk groups should have priority. Moreover, Nguyen et al. found that the acceptance of the seasonal influenza vaccine was related to the fear of getting infected (66%). [46] Given these, the mortality and infectivity of the virus might be influencing factors for vaccine acceptance. The participants in this study are HCWs who have better knowledge of the SARS-CoV-2 virus compared to the general public, and, consequently, the vaccination rate and intentions were higher. This shows the importance of raising public's awareness of the SARS-CoV-2 virus when promoting the vaccination throughout the country. The authorities may also need to start educational campaigns much earlier in future public health emergencies.

As reported by the previous research, the most common reason for vaccination resistance was concern about its side effects. [23, 29, 47] One study showed that the adverse reactions of the SARS-CoV-2 vaccine are similar to those of the influenza vaccine after vaccination [48] and the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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 .

normal and systemic reaction rates for the influenza vaccine are 2.7% and 3.0%, respectively. [49] This may help to explain why subjects in this study who reported self or family history of influenza vaccination were more likely to be vaccinated, since they are more familiar with the potential side effects of the SARS-CoV-2 vaccine. Furthermore, Nguyen et al. showed that non-physicians may be more concerned about the vaccine's safety than physicians, [46] suggesting that the general public may be more worried about the vaccine due to their lack of knowledge. Therefore, healthcare agencies need to increase vaccine-related education to the general public, particularly on: (1) the development and manufacturing processes for vaccines; (2) the similarities between the seasonal influenza vaccine and the SARS-CoV-2 vaccine; and (3) the efficiency and safety of vaccines based on the latest clinical trials. Moreover, authorities should strive to publish the true reason for side effects, which could help to distinguish legitimate safety concerns from events that are temporally associated with but not caused by vaccination. The inappropriate assessment of vaccine safety data can severely undermine the acceptance of the vaccine, and, consequently, influence the success of a mass vaccine campaign. [50, 51]

This study has certain limitations. Firstly, at the completion of this survey, China has not recommended the vaccination for people over 60 years old. The vaccination status and associated factors among HCWs in this age group could not be analyzed. However, as most HCWs in China retire when they reach 60, the population in this study is likely to represent HCWs who were working at hospitals during the time of data collection. Secondly, we only conducted a cross-sectional multivariate analysis of the survey data, which can only show the correlation between each factor and vaccination willingness and vaccination behavior, but it cannot prove its causality; therefore, further longitudinal studies are necessary. Finally, as this study was based on self-reported data, it has certain weaknesses that may serve as sources of bias in data interpretation. Despite these limitations, the large sample size of this study and the representative demographics of Chinese HCWs provides relevant information on the vaccination status of HCWs and a reference for the subsequent formulation of vaccination policies.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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 .

Conclusions

Protecting HCWs against COVID-19 is crucial for maintaining the efficacy of the healthcare system during the pandemic. This study suggests that the characteristics of HCWs, working environment, and familiarity and confidence of the vaccine were related to the self-reported willingness to receive the vaccine. Results of this study can not only help to formulate pertinent policies and increase vaccination coverage, they may also provide instructions for future public health emergencies.

Ethics Statement

This study was approved by the Medical Ethics Committee of Xiamen Medical College and passed the audit of China Clinical Trial Registration Center (Registration number: ChiCTR2100042804).

Acknowledgements

Xinxin Ye and Peige Song designed the study. Xinxin Ye, Wan Ye, Yuzhen Gao managed and analysed the data. Xinxin Ye, Wan Ye, Jinyue Yu and Ziyang Ren prepared the first draft. All authors were involved in revising the paper and gave final approval of the submitted versions. No funding received for this study.

Conflicts of Interest

None declared.

Abbreviations

COVID-19: coronavirus disease 2019

SARS-CoV-2: Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)

WHO: World Health Organization

HCWs: healthcare workers

MHLC: multiple health locus of control

IHLC: internal health locus of control

PHLC: powerful others' health locus of control

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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 .

CHLC: chance health locus of control

SD: standard deviation

OR: odds ratio

CI: confidence interval

CDC: Disease Control and Prevention

CNY: Chinese Yuan

References

1. Koff WC, Schenkelberg T, Williams T, et al. Development and deployment of COVID-19 vaccines for those most vulnerable. *Sci Transl Med.* Feb 3 2021;13(579).
2. Bloom BR, Nowak GJ, Orenstein W. "When Will We Have a Vaccine?" - Understanding Questions and Answers about Covid-19 Vaccination. *N Engl J Med.* Dec 3 2020;383(23):2202-2204.
3. Sadoff J, Le Gars M, Shukarev G, et al. Interim Results of a Phase 1-2a Trial of Ad26.COV2.S Covid-19 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med.* Jan 13 2021.
4. Corbett KS, Flynn B, Foulds KE, et al. Evaluation of the mRNA-1273 Vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 in Nonhuman Primates. *N Engl J Med.* Oct 15 2020;383(16):1544-1555.
5. Murphy J, Vallieres F, Bentall RP, et al. Psychological characteristics associated with COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and resistance in Ireland and the United Kingdom. *Nat Commun.* Jan 4 2021;12(1):29.
6. Baden LR, El Sahly HM, Essink B, et al. Efficacy and Safety of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med.* Feb 4 2021;384(5):403-416.
7. Baden LR, El Sahly HM, Essink B, et al. Efficacy and Safety of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med.* Feb 4 2021;384(5):403-416.
8. Lazarus JV, Ratzan SC, Palayew A, et al. A global survey of potential acceptance of a COVID-19 vaccine. *Nat Med.* Feb 2021;27(2):225-228.
9. Wouters OJ, Shadlen KC, Salcher-Konrad M, et al. Challenges in ensuring global access to COVID-19 vaccines: production, affordability, allocation, and deployment. *Lancet.* Mar 13 2021;397(10278):1023-1034.
10. China has steadily promoted the safety and effectiveness of domestic vaccines for COVID-19 vaccination. http://www.chinanews.com/gn/2021/04-03/9447011.shtml.
11. University JH. The race to vaccinate the world. https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/vaccines/international.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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 .

12. 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*. Sep 29 2020;38(42):6500-6507.
13. A future vaccination campaign against COVID-19 at risk of vaccine hesitancy and politicisation. *Lancet Infect Dis.* Jul 2020;20(7):769-770.
14. Wang J, Jing R, Lai X, et al. Acceptance of COVID-19 Vaccination during the COVID-19 Pandemic in China. *Vaccines (Basel).* Aug 27 2020;8(3).
15. Sim MR. The COVID-19 pandemic: major risks to healthcare and other workers on the front line. *Occup Environ Med.* May 2020;77(5):281-282.
16. Xinhua. China to inoculate key groups with COVID-19 vaccines. http://english.scio.gov.cn/m/pressroom/2020-12/20/content_77031816.htm.
17. He Z, Ren L, Yang J, et al. Seroprevalence and humoral immune durability of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in Wuhan, China: a longitudinal, population-level, cross-sectional study. *Lancet.* Mar 20 2021;397(10279):1075-1084.
18. Bedford H, Attwell K, Danchin M, Marshall H, Corben P, Leask J. Vaccine hesitancy, refusal and access barriers: The need for clarity in terminology. *Vaccine*. Oct 22 2018;36(44):6556-6558.
19. Lin Y, Hu Z, Zhao Q, Alias H, Danaee M, Wong LP. Understanding COVID-19 vaccine demand and hesitancy: A nationwide online survey in China. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* Dec 2020;14(12):e0008961.
20. 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. *Ann Intern Med.* Dec 15 2020;173(12):964-973.
21. Guidry JPD, Laestadius LI, Vraga EK, et al. Willingness to get the COVID-19 vaccine with and without emergency use authorization. *Am J Infect Control*. Feb 2021;49(2):137-142.
22. Pogue K, Jensen JL, Stancil CK, et al. Influences on Attitudes Regarding Potential COVID-19 Vaccination in the United States. *Vaccines (Basel)*. Oct 3 2020;8(4).
23. Sherman SM, Smith LE, Sim J, et al. COVID-19 vaccination intention in the UK: results from the COVID-19 vaccination acceptability study (CoVAccS), a nationally representative cross-sectional survey. *Hum Vaccin Immunother*. Nov 26 2020:1-10.
24. Wallston KA, Wallston BS, DeVellis R. Development of the Multidimensional Health Locus of Control (MHLC) Scales. *Health Educ Monogr.* Spring 1978;6(2):160-170.
25. Nexoe J, Kragstrup J, Sogaard J. Decision on influenza vaccination among the elderly. A questionnaire study based on the Health Belief Model and the Multidimensional Locus of Control Theory. *Scand J Prim Health Care*. Jun 1999;17(2):105-110.
26. Paek HJ, Shin KA, Park K. Determinants of caregivers' vaccination intention with respect to child age group: a cross-sectional survey in South Korea. *BMJ Open.* Sep 24 2015;5(9):e008342.
27. Wallston KA. The validity of the multidimensional health locus of control scales. *J Health Psychol.* Sep 2005;10(5):623-631.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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 .

28. Levenson H. Multidimensional locus of control in psychiatric patients. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. Dec 1973;41(3):397-404.
29. Alqudeimat Y, Alenezi D, AlHajri B, et al. Acceptance of a COVID-19 Vaccine and its Related Determinants among the General Adult Population in Kuwait. *Med Princ Pract*. Jan 22 2021.
30. Kwok KO, Li KK, Wei WI, Tang A, Wong SYS, Lee SS. Editor's Choice: Influenza vaccine uptake, COVID-19 vaccination intention and vaccine hesitancy among nurses: A survey. *Int J Nurs Stud.* Feb 2021;114:103854.
31. Wang K, Wong ELY, Ho KF, et al. Intention of nurses to accept coronavirus disease 2019 vaccination and change of intention to accept seasonal influenza vaccination during the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic: A cross-sectional survey. *Vaccine.* Oct 21 2020;38(45):7049-7056.
32. Jiang M, Feng L, Wang W, et al. Knowledge, attitudes, and practices towards influenza among Chinese adults during the epidemic of COVID-19: a cross-sectional online survey. *Hum Vaccin Immunother*. Nov 22 2020:1-8.
33. Wang L, Su XG, Cui Y, Yin WD, He B. Survey on influenza vaccination and cognition of the whole population in 6 provinces in China. *Chinese Journal of Epidemiology*. 2020(03):349-350-351-352-353.
34. Li X, Lu J, Hu S, et al. The primary health-care system in China. *Lancet.* Dec 9 2017;390(10112):2584-2594.
35. Liu H, Liu YX. Construction of a Medical Resource Sharing Mechanism Based on Blockchain Technology: Evidence from the Medical Resource Imbalance of China. *Healthcare*. Jan 2021;9(1).
36. Al-Mohaithef M, Padhi BK. Determinants of COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance in Saudi Arabia: A Web-Based National Survey. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare.* 2020;13:1657-1663.
37. Gerussi V, Peghin M, Palese A, et al. Vaccine Hesitancy among Italian Patients Recovered from COVID-19 Infection towards Influenza and Sars-Cov-2 Vaccination. *Vaccines.* Feb 2021;9(2).
38. Ruiz JB, Bell RA. Predictors of intention to vaccinate against COVID-19: Results of a nationwide survey. *Vaccine.* Feb 12 2021;39(7):1080-1086.
39. Seale H, Heywood AE, Leask J, et al. Examining Australian public perceptions and behaviors towards a future COVID-19 vaccine. *BMC Infect Dis.* Jan 28 2021;21(1):120.
40. Dhama K, Patel SK, Natesan S, et al. COVID-19 in the elderly people and advances in vaccination approaches. *Hum Vaccin Immunother.* Dec 1 2020;16(12):2938-2943.
41. Van Nhu H, Tuyet-Hanh TT, Van NTA, Linh TNQ, Tien TQ. Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices of the Vietnamese as Key Factors in Controlling COVID-19. *J Community Health.* Dec 2020;45(6):1263-1269.
42. Montagni I, Roussel N, Thiébaut R, Tzourio C. Health Care Students' Knowledge of and Attitudes, Beliefs, and Practices Toward the French COVID-19 App: Cross-sectional Questionnaire Study. *J Med Internet Res.* Mar 3 2021;23(3):e26399.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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 .

43. Lazarus JV, Wyka K, Rauh L, et al. Hesitant or Not? The Association of Age, Gender, and Education with Potential Acceptance of a COVID-19 Vaccine: A Country-level Analysis. *Journal of Health Communication.* Oct 2 2020;25(10):799-807.
44. Ramasamy MN, Minassian AM, Ewer KJ, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine administered in a prime-boost regimen in young and old adults (COV002): a single-blind, randomised, controlled, phase 2/3 trial. *Lancet.* Dec 19 2021;396(10267):1979-1993.
45. Xia S, Zhang Y, Wang Y, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of an inactivated SARS-CoV-2 vaccine, BBIBP-CorV: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 1/2 trial. *Lancet Infect Dis*. Jan 2021;21(1):39-51.
46. Nguyen TTM, Lafond KE, Nguyen TX, et al. Acceptability of seasonal influenza vaccines among health care workers in Vietnam in 2017. *Vaccine.* Feb 18 2020;38(8):2045-2050.
47. Kreps S, Prasad S, Brownstein JS. Factors Associated With US Adults' Likelihood of Accepting COVID-19 Vaccination (vol 3, e2025594, 2020). *Jama Network Open.* Nov 23 2020;3(11).
48. Zheng Y, Chen L, Zou J, et al. The safety of influenza vaccine in clinically cured leprosy patients in China. *Hum Vaccin Immunother*. Mar 4 2018;14(3):671-677.
49. Huang LR, Li RC, Li YP, et al. Study on the Safety and Immunogenicity of Domestic Influenza Virus Split Vaccine. Paper presented at: The Fifth National Symposium on Immunodiagnosis and Vaccines, 2011; Yinchuan, Ningxia, China.
50. Black S, Eskola J, Siegrist CA. Importance of background rates of disease in assessment of vaccine safety during mass immunisation with pandemic H1N1 influenza vaccines (vol 374, pg 2115, 2009). *Lancet.* Jan-Feb 2010;375(9712):376-376.
51. Seale H, Kaur R, Wang Q, et al. Acceptance of a vaccine against pandemic influenza A (H1N1) virus amongst healthcare workers in Beijing, China. *Vaccine.* Feb 11 2011;29(8):1605-1610.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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 .

Figures and Figure Legends



Figure 1: Factors analysis for the COVID-19 vaccination and willingness to receive the vaccine.

Notes: IHLC=internal health locus of control; PHLC=powerful other's health locus of control; CHLC=chance health locus of control.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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 2: Subjective opinions on COVID-19 vaccination among HCWs.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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 3: Adverse events of COVID-19 vaccination.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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 .







medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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 .









medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.15.21257094; this version posted May 17, 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 .