

45 Julie Mayo Lamberte, MSPH
46 Epidemiology Prevention Branch, Influenza Division, Centers of Disease Control and
47 Prevention, Atlanta, GA
48
49 Khaila Prather, MPH
50 Abt Associates, Atlanta, GA
51
52 Matthew S. Thiese, PhD, MSPH
53 Occupational and Environmental Health, School of Medicine, University of Utah, Salt Lake
54 City, UT
55
56 Zoe Baccam
57 Epidemiology and Biostatistics, College of Public Health, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ
58
59 Harmony Tyner, MD, MPH
60 St. Luke's Infectious Disease Associates, St. Luke's Hospital, Duluth, MN
61
62 Sarang Yoon, DO, MOH
63 Occupational and Environmental Health, School of Medicine, University of Utah, Salt Lake
64 City, UT
65

66
67 **ABSTRACT**

68 **Introduction:** In a multi-center prospective cohort of essential workers, we assessed
69 knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) by vaccine intention, prior SARS-CoV-2 positivity,
70 and occupation, and their impact on vaccine uptake over time.

71 **Methods:** Initiated in July 2020, HEROES-RECOVER cohort provided socio-
72 demographics and COVID-19 vaccination data. Using follow-up two surveys approximately
73 three months apart, COVID-19 vaccine KAP, intention, and receipt was collected; the first
74 survey categorized participants as reluctant, reachable, or endorsers.

75 **Results:** A total of 4,803 participants were included in the analysis. Most (70%) were
76 vaccine endorsers, 16% were reachable, and 14% were reluctant. By May 2021, 77% had
77 received at least one vaccine dose. KAP responses strongly predicted vaccine uptake, particularly
78 positive attitudes about safety (aOR=5.46, 95% CI: 1.4-20.8) and effectiveness (aOR=5.0, 95%

79 CI: 1.3-19.1). Participants prior SARS-CoV-2 infection were 22% less likely to believe the
80 COVID-19 vaccine was effective compared with uninfected participants (aOR 0.78, 95% CI:
81 0.64-0.96). This was even more pronounced in first responders compared with other occupations,
82 with first responders 42% less likely to believe in COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness (aOR=0.58,
83 95% CI 0.40-0.84). KAP responses shifted positively, with reluctant and reachable participant
84 scores modestly increasing in positive responses for perceived vaccine effectiveness (7% and
85 12%, respectively) on the second follow-up survey; 25% of initially reluctant participants
86 received the COVID-19 vaccine.

87 **Discussion:** Our study demonstrates attitudes associated with COVID-19 vaccine uptake
88 and a positive shift in attitudes over time. First responders, despite potential high exposure to
89 SARS-CoV-2, and participants with a history of SARS-CoV-2 infection were more vaccine
90 reluctant.

91 **Conclusions:** COVID-19 vaccine KAP responses predicted vaccine uptake and
92 associated attitudes improved over time. Perceptions of the COVID-19 vaccine can shift over
93 time. Targeting messages about the vaccine's safety and effectiveness in reducing SARS-CoV-2
94 virus infection and illness severity may increase vaccine uptake for reluctant and reachable
95 participants.

96

97

98

99 INTRODUCTION

100 The SARS-CoV-2 pandemic has resulted in high levels of morbidity and mortality in the
101 US.¹ In response, a global effort to develop COVID-19 vaccines generated evidence leading to
102 the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) authorizing COVID-19 vaccines under an
103 Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) mechanism, beginning in mid-December 2020.² Essential
104 workers, including healthcare personnel (HCP), first responders, and other frontline workers
105 (FW), may be at an increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection because of their high rates of
106 contact with patients, coworkers, or the general public³⁻⁷ and were prioritized to receive COVID-
107 19 vaccines by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Advisory Committee on
108 Immunization Practices during initial, staggered distribution.

109 The COVID-19 vaccines have been shown to be safe and effective in adults and children
110 ages 12 and older, but the initial high demand for vaccination has decreased.⁸ Prior to COVID-19
111 vaccine authorization and availability in December 2020, early studies in the United States (US)
112 reported rates of willingness to receive the COVID-19 vaccine ranging widely from 40% to
113 75%.⁹⁻¹⁸ Additionally, first responders and FW have reported lower rates of vaccine acceptance
114 than HCP.^{12,14} Common reasons for vaccine hesitancy included the novelty of the COVID-19
115 vaccines, concerns about potential adverse effects, and/or a distrust in government.⁹⁻¹⁴

116 There is some indication that COVID-19 vaccine acceptance has changed over time in
117 cross-sectional surveys.^{12,19} It is unclear how individual vaccination intention has evolved as the
118 public, has gained more information regarding symptoms and outcomes of COVID-19 disease
119 and risks and benefits of vaccinations.

120 Knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) toward vaccination are often examined to
121 understand factors associated with the acceptability of vaccines and inform strategies for

122 increasing vaccine uptake.²⁰ We have addressed these knowledge gaps with a multi-center
123 prospective cohort of essential workers with the following objectives: 1) assess differences in
124 KAP by vaccine intention, prior SARS-CoV-2 positivity, and occupation group; 2) examine
125 KAP as predictors of vaccine uptake; and 3) assess individual-level change in KAP over time.

126

127 **METHODS**

128 *Study Design & Population*

129 The HEROES-RECOVER studies represent a national network of prospective cohorts,
130 including Arizona Healthcare, Emergency Response and Other Essential Workers Surveillance
131 Study (HEROES) and Research on the Epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2 in Essential Response
132 Personnel (RECOVER) funded by the CDC with sites in Phoenix, Tucson, and other areas in
133 Arizona; Miami, Florida; Duluth, Minnesota; Portland, Oregon; Temple, Texas; and Salt Lake
134 City, Utah. Details of the protocols of the studies have been previously published.²¹ Ongoing
135 enrollment began in July 2020 and included HCP, first responders, and FW who worked at least
136 20 hours per week and had routine occupational exposure to coworkers or the public.

137 Participants completed detailed epidemiologic surveys at enrollment and at
138 approximately three-month intervals (Follow-up surveys 1 and 2); text message-based surveys
139 were completed weekly and monitored illness or potential COVID-19 contact in the past 7 days.
140 The study is ongoing, but for this analysis participants actively enrolled during the Follow-up 1
141 survey distribution were included, with their prior SARS-CoV-2 infection, COVID-19
142 vaccination, and KAP data through May 19, 2021 utilized for analysis.

143 To identify SARS-CoV-2 infections, participants self-collected mid-turbinate nasal swabs
144 weekly for SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR testing and provided blood specimens at enrollment and every

145 subsequent three months (supplemental Figure 1 for study timing). Beginning in December 2020,
146 participants were prompted to report uptake of COVID-19 vaccine; vaccine survey distribution
147 was based on vaccine availability data from state and county health departments. Vaccination
148 was verified by participant-provided vaccine cards, electronic medical records, or State
149 Immunization Information Systems. All protocols were reviewed and approved by each site's
150 Institutional Review Boards; study participants provided informed consent for all study
151 activities.

152 *Primary Outcomes*

153 Vaccine intention and KAP questions were in two follow-up surveys: Follow-up survey 1
154 was distributed from late December 2020-February 2021, and Follow-up survey 2 -- from March
155 2021-May 2021. New enrollees during each follow-up period received the KAP questions at the
156 time of enrollment.

157 Vaccine intention was derived using participants' first response to the question, "What
158 are the chances that you will get a COVID-19 vaccination?" and vaccination status at the time of
159 Follow-up survey 1. Participants were grouped into three intention categories: 1) reluctant as
160 those who answered, "almost zero chance", or "very small chance", and were unvaccinated, 2)
161 reachable as those who answered "small chance", "do not know", or "moderate" and were
162 unvaccinated, or 3) endorser as those who answered, "large chance", "very large chance", or
163 "almost certain", or were vaccinated at Follow-up survey 1. New vaccine receipt after Follow-up
164 survey 1 was monitored and the participants' vaccine intention group did not change based upon
165 Follow-up survey 2 KAP responses.

166 Participants were asked six questions to assess the KAP constructs regarding COVID-19:
167 knowledge of SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19 vaccines; attitudes about safety, effectiveness, trust

168 in the government, and perceived risk of becoming ill if they were not vaccinated (Table /Table
169 I). Responses to each question were rated on a 5- to 7-level Likert scale indicating lowest to
170 highest ranking.

171 *Predictors and Confounders*

172 For models examining KAP differences and predictors of vaccination, socio-
173 demographics, including gender, age, race, ethnicity, education, household income, occupation
174 and occupational setting, and participant health status, including SARS-CoV-2 infection status,
175 COVID-19 vaccination status, and medical history were included. HCP occupation categories
176 are categorized as any individual that works in a hospital as “HCP inpatient”, any individual that
177 works in any outpatient healthcare facility or long-term care facility as “HCP other”. We created
178 two first responder categories: 1) firefighter (firefighters/EMS) and 2) other first responders (law
179 enforcement, correctional officers, and border patrol). FW public-facing included individuals
180 that work in education settings, retail, food service, and hospitality. Other FW include
181 individuals that work in infrastructure, manufacturing, warehouse, utility, and transportation.

182 In models examining Objectives 1 and 2, COVID-19 contact data were reported as the
183 number of hours spent at work (1) in any setting and in direct contact with individuals with
184 suspected or confirmed COVID-19 and (2) the general public in the past 7 days. They also
185 indicated the percent of time protective equipment (PPE) was used during this contact.

186 Participants were categorized as having had a SARS-CoV-2 infection prior to Follow-up
187 survey 1 if they reported detection by antibody, antigen, or RT-PCR assay prior to enrollment, or
188 if SARS-CoV-2 was detected by RT-PCR or an antibody test during the study.

189 For Objectives 2 and 3 (KAP change over time), KAP responses (defined above) were
190 used as the primary predictors of interest.

191 *Statistical Analysis*

192 We included all participants who completed the Follow-up 1 survey. Continuous
193 measurements were expressed as means and standard deviations or median and interquartile
194 range, as appropriate. Counts and percentages were used for categorical variables. Likert scores
195 were dichotomized for each KAP question, using responses greater than midpoint as positive
196 associations and midpoint and lower than the midpoint as neutral/negative associations (Table 1).

197 We stratified socio-demographics, occupation and occupational setting, previous
198 positivity, KAP responses by vaccine intention, and utilized chi-squared tests or one-way
199 ANOVA tests to examine family-wise differences between the vaccine intention groups, with
200 statistical significance based on p-values <0.05.

201 To examine KAP differences (Objective 1), we used unadjusted ordinal logistic
202 regression to examine the relationship between each KAP question in the Follow-up 1 survey
203 and vaccine intention, each occupation, and prior positivity. Bonferroni corrections adjusted for
204 multiple comparisons and statistical significance based on 95% confidence intervals. We also
205 used a difference in proportion test to test pair-wise differences in answers to KAP questions.

206 For KAP predictors (Objective 2), we utilized adjusted ordinal logistic regression to test
207 the effect of each KAP on vaccine uptake when including socio-demographics, occupation and
208 occupational setting, vaccine intention, and prior positivity together. Bonferroni corrections
209 adjusted for the multiple comparisons and statistical significance based on 95% confidence
210 intervals.

211 For KAP change (Objective 3), we tested differences in answers to KAP questions in
212 Follow-up 2 compared to Follow-up 1 on a subset that completed both surveys. Chi-squared tests
213 were used to determine statistically significant differences in each KAP question at Follow-up 2

214 compared to Follow-up 1, with significance based on p-values <0.05. We descriptively examined
215 vaccine uptake and KAPs over time for each vaccine intention group. All statistical analyses
216 were completed using R (version 4.0.4; R Foundation for Statistical Computing) and SAS
217 (version 9.4; SAS Institute).

218

219 **RESULTS**

220 **Overall Participants.** December 2020 -February 2021, 4,803 (87%) of 5,527 participants
221 responded to Follow-up survey 1; 1,105 (23%) HCP inpatient, 1,323 (28%) other HCP, 729
222 (15%) first responder firefighter, 255 (5%) other first responders, 990 (21%) FW Public, and 285
223 (6%) other FW (Table 2). Most participants were female (62%) and aged <45 years (58%).
224 Additionally, 72% were non-Hispanic White, 14% Hispanic, 9% other, 3% Asian
225 American/Pacific Islander, and 2% African American. Participants were highly educated,
226 including 76% with at least a college degree, and only 15% percent reporting annual income less
227 than \$50,000. Participants were healthy, with only 24% reporting an underlying condition, most
228 commonly hypertension (12%), asthma (9%), and diabetes (3%). At the time of the Follow-up 1
229 survey, 960 (20%) of participants had previously been infected with SARS-CoV-2. Total
230 positive rates amongst FW and HCP were similar (25% and 22% respectively), with higher rates
231 amongst first responders (32%). Thirty-six percent had received a COVID-19 vaccination at the
232 time of the Follow-up 1 survey.

233 **Vaccination Intent.** Most participants were categorized as endorsers (70%), having
234 either indicated a high likelihood of intent to receive the COVID-19 vaccine (35%) or having
235 already received it at the time of Follow-up 1 survey (36%); 16% of participants were considered
236 reachable, and 14% reluctant. Prior SARS-CoV-2 infection was more common among reluctant

237 (35%) and reachable participants (25%) compared with endorsers (16%). By May 19, 2021, 72%
238 of participants have received at least one dose of a COVID-19 vaccine (Table 2). Vaccine uptake
239 varied by intention group, including reported COVID-19 vaccine receipt among 86% of
240 endorsers, 53% of reachable, and 25% of reluctant.

241 *Objective 1: KAP as predictor for vaccine uptake*

242 After adjusting for socio-demographic factors, health status, and hours of direct contact
243 with the public, KAP responses strongly predicted vaccine uptake. Participants reporting more
244 positive attitudes about COVID-19 vaccine safety were 5.5 times more likely to receive a
245 COVID-19 vaccine compared with those reporting more negative attitudes (aOR=5.46, 95% CI:
246 1.43-20.82) and 5 times as likely to receive a COVID-19 vaccine among participants reporting a
247 belief that the vaccine is effective (aOR=4.98 95% CI: 1.30-19.14) (Table 3).

248 *Objective 2: KAP responses by intention group, prior SARS-CoV-2 infection and occupation*

249 **Vaccine Intention Groups.** Only 17% of reluctant (n=109) and 33% of reachable
250 participants (n=252) reported concern about getting sick if unvaccinated compared with 48% of
251 endorsers (n=1624) (Table 2). Similarly, reluctant and reachable participants were more likely to
252 report negative attitudes about vaccine safety (82% and 56%, respectively), vaccine effectiveness
253 (76% and 51%, respectively), and trust in the government (79% and 58%, respectively).

254 Reachable participants were about half as likely and reluctant participants were
255 substantially less likely to perceive the COVID-19 vaccines as safe compared to endorsers (aOR
256 =0.56, 95% CI 0.31-1.00 and aOR=0.33, 95% CI: 0.28-0.38, respectively) (**Error! Reference**
257 **source not found.**). Similarly, reluctant participants were 68% (aOR=0.32, 95% CI: 0.22-0.48)
258 less likely than endorsers to perceive that the vaccine was effective. Interestingly, reachable

259 participants were less likely to report knowledge about the COVID-19 vaccine than reluctant
260 participants (aOR=0.53, 95% CI: 0.30-0.96 and aOR=0.49 95% CI: 0.34-0.75, respectively).

261 **Prior SARS-CoV-2 Infection.** Among 960 (20%) participants who reported SARS-
262 CoV-2 infection prior to enrollment, 24% (n=229) were categorized as reluctant, 20% as
263 reachable (n=194), and 56% (n=537) as endorsers (Table 2). COVID-19 vaccination through the
264 study period was less common among participants with prior SARS-CoV-2 infection (n=576,
265 59%) compared to those without prior infection (n=3188, 82%). In the adjusted models,
266 participants with prior SARS-CoV-2 infection were 32% less likely to be concerned about
267 getting sick if not vaccinated (aOR 0.68, 95% CI: 0.56-0.84) and 22% less likely to believe the
268 COVID-19 vaccine was effective (aOR 0.78, 95%CI: 0.64-0.96) compared with uninfected
269 participants. Interestingly, there were no significant differences in perceived virus knowledge,
270 vaccine safety, or trust in government by infection status in the adjusted models (Table 3).

271 **Occupation.** Overall, few HCP were COVID-19 vaccine reluctant, including 9% of HCP
272 inpatient and 11% other HCP. Among first responders, subcategorization showed slight
273 differences, with 16% of firefighters reluctant compared with 21% of other first responders.
274 Similarly, 16% of public-facing FW and 20% of other FW were reluctant. Responses to KAP
275 questions differed across occupations but were aligned with overall responses for vaccine intent
276 groups that combine participants.

277 There was little difference between occupational subcategories of HCP or first responders
278 in the adjusted models (Table 3**Error! Reference source not found.**). Firefighters and other first
279 responder were each approximately 40% less likely than inpatient HCP to believe the COVID-19
280 vaccine was effective (aOR=0.58, 95% CI 0.40-0.84 and aOR=0.61, 95% CI 0.49-0.76,
281 respectively). The other FW category was 51% more likely to believe the COVID-19 vaccine

282 was effective compared to inpatient HCP (aOR=1.49, 95% CI 1.26-1.77), followed by public-
283 facing FW (aOR=1.25, 95% CI 1.02-1.53) (**Error! Reference source not found.**).

284 *Objective 3. KAP change over time*

285 To evaluate change in KAP over time, 2017 (49%) participants that completed both
286 Follow-up 1 and 2 surveys were included. Among initially 383 reluctant participants, 94 (25%)
287 received COVID-19 vaccine; 195 (56%) reachable and 1,232 (83%) endorsers were also
288 vaccinated. Demographic characteristics among reluctant and reachable participants who were
289 vaccinated after initial categorization did not differ from unvaccinated participants. Among
290 endorsers, unvaccinated participants were more likely to be male (p=0.017), younger (p=0.014),
291 and firefighters (p<0.001) than endorsers that were vaccinated (

292 Table).

293 When evaluating KAP over time, reluctant participants that did not get vaccinated had a
294 9% decrease in positive responses to questions about their knowledge of the virus between
295 Follow-up survey 1 and 2 (**Error! Reference source not found.**). The change in positive
296 response to vaccine knowledge increased by 20% and 21% for the non-vaccinated and
297 vaccinated, respectively. However, there was a 7% increase in positive response toward vaccine
298 effectiveness in those that were not vaccinated compared to a 31% increase for vaccinated
299 participants.

300 Participants in the reachable and endorser vaccine intent groups also showed decreases in
301 positive responses for knowledge about the virus between the two time points (-19% and -22%,
302 respectively), with higher percentages of participants reporting negative/neutral responses during
303 Follow-up Survey 2 (**Error! Reference source not found.**). The reachable group had large
304 increases in positive responses for questions about vaccine knowledge (25% of vaccinated, 25%
305 of unvaccinated), vaccine safety (10% of vaccinated, 34% of unvaccinated), and vaccine
306 effectiveness (12% of vaccinated, 27% of unvaccinated).

307

308 **DISCUSSION**

309 The HEROES-RECOVER prospective cohort provided a unique opportunity to examine
310 COVID-19 vaccine knowledge, attitudes, and practices longitudinally in a large population of
311 essential workers with high occupational COVID-19 exposure. The prospective design allowed
312 for assessment of vaccination intent as well as vaccine uptake.

313 We found KAP responses were strongly associated with vaccine uptake. Our cohort
314 largely reported more positive attitudes toward the COVID-19 vaccine than other national

315 cohorts,¹²⁻¹⁵ with more than two-thirds of participants expressing strong intent to be vaccinated.
316 We also found strong associations between KAP responses and vaccine intention groups, with
317 vaccine reluctant participants more likely to have negative attitudes towards safety and
318 effectiveness and less likely to be vaccinated. While we found that a substantial proportion of our
319 high-risk cohort population reported an initial reluctance to receive COVID-19 vaccine,
320 ultimately one quarter of those reluctant were vaccinated by May 19, 2021.

321 **Vaccine Reluctance.** First responders and participants with prior SARS-CoV-2 infection
322 were more likely to be reluctant to receive the COVID-19 vaccine than other groups. First
323 responders had the highest percentage of vaccine reluctant participants, especially the non-
324 firefighter subcategory. Among endorsers, other first responders also had the lowest vaccination
325 rates. This hesitancy towards the vaccine was also represented in lower perceptions of vaccine
326 safety, effectiveness, and trust in government.

327 Participants with prior SARS-CoV-2 infection were less likely to receive the COVID-19
328 vaccine and make up more than one-third of the vaccine reluctant group and one-quarter of the
329 reachable group. It is not surprising that participants previously positive for COVID-19 are less
330 concerned about getting sick again, but better understanding why they report fewer positive
331 attitudes toward vaccine safety and effectiveness will be important in persuading them to get
332 vaccinated.^{22,23} Additional studies highlighting the benefits of vaccination for those with prior
333 infection, may help to stress the importance of vaccination among this group.²⁴

334 These findings are consistent with other vaccine acceptability studies done nationally^{14,19}
335 and suggest that these negative attitudes persisted even after more data became available on the
336 safety and efficacy of available vaccines.

337 **KAPs and Vaccine Uptake.** Across intent to vaccinate, demographics, occupation, and
338 prior SARS-CoV-2 infection groups, three KAP domains were consistently correlated with intent
339 to vaccinate and vaccine uptake: safety, effectiveness, and the chance of getting sick if not
340 vaccinated. We found knowledge about the SARS-CoV-2 virus, or the COVID-19 vaccine had
341 no association with vaccine uptake. It is difficult to ascertain whether participants who perceive
342 themselves to be knowledgeable are truly informed, but attitudes about vaccine safety and
343 effectiveness appear to be more informative of individual intentions to vaccinate. Vaccination
344 efforts that highlight vaccine safety and effectiveness may have a stronger influence on
345 vaccination uptake than general or historical information. We found positive attitudes align with
346 vaccine uptake and imply that KAP assessments to gauge a population's intentions or concerns
347 in advance of vaccination campaigns is critical.

348 Unsurprisingly, the majority of HCP were endorsers of the vaccine, and the vast majority
349 received the COVID-19 vaccine. Some HCP occupational groups have low vaccination coverage
350 nationally,^{17,18} and so our study population may not be representative of those groups. Other
351 frontline workers, which for this study included teachers, retail workers, and manufacturing were
352 not as positive towards the vaccine as HCP, though the vast majority were still considered
353 endorsers and reachable and were vaccinated at higher rates than first responders. The COVID-
354 19 pandemic has clearly demonstrated the critical nature of the essential worker role and need for
355 additional investigations.

356 **KAP Change Over Time.** Utilizing the prospective cohort, we were able to examine
357 shifts in KAP over time, subgrouping vaccinated versus unvaccinated participants. The KAP
358 factors that were most connected to vaccination remained influential over time. We identified
359 more positive shifts in responses between the two time points in those participants ultimately

360 vaccinated, specifically in response to perceived safety and effectiveness across all intention
361 groups. Interestingly, even those participants that were not vaccinated demonstrated a positive
362 increase in perceived vaccine safety and effectiveness over the three-month period.

363 Our findings are consistent with other studies conducted prior to COVID-19 vaccine
364 authorization and availability.^{14,16} While vaccine intent was assessed in our study after the FDA
365 granted EUA, our findings capture an initial uncertainty that was seemingly overcome with time
366 and positive findings for vaccine safety and effectiveness.¹²

367 **Limitations.** This study is subject to several limitations. First, the follow-up surveys
368 were spread out over about six weeks due to site's individual IRB timelines. As the level of
369 information available evolved quickly during the study period, participants at sites where the
370 follow-up surveys were administered later may have had access to a meaningfully different
371 amount, or quality, of information. Secondly, all KAPs are self-reported and there may be a
372 disconnect between perceived knowledge and actual level of knowledge. Next, while we are
373 confident KAPs are successfully captured in our cohorts at the time of administration, due to the
374 novelty of the COVID-19 vaccine, KAPs will likely continue to change and evolve past this
375 analysis period. Finally, the mechanism prompting change in KAPs is not captured, so it is
376 difficult to know why certain KAPs changed as they did over time, e.g., the change in certain
377 KAPs between the two follow-up surveys may have been due to increased numbers of
378 participants receiving the vaccine with few documented serious adverse event rates, increased
379 access to information and disease/vaccine literacy, changes in national and local COVID-19
380 incidence. The demographic characteristics of the group that answered Follow-up 2 differed
381 slightly from those that completed Follow-up 1: there were more female participants (64% vs
382 60%), they were older (45% 40-65 years of age compared to 36%), and there were higher

383 percentages of FW (36% vs 20%) and lower percentages of HCP (44% vs 58%). Race/ethnicity,
384 education, and income were similar between the two groups. We did not differentiate between
385 individual COVID-19 vaccine products in this analysis.

386

387 **PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATION**

388 The HEROES-RECOVER cohort provides valuable insight into the perceptions and
389 intentions of essential workers receiving the COVID-19 vaccine. With the current increase in
390 cases, encouraging high-risk occupational groups to receive the COVID-19 vaccine is a critical
391 next step. Our findings indicate that perceptions of the COVID-19 vaccine can shift over time
392 and suggest that focusing on clear messages about the vaccine's safety and effectiveness in
393 reducing SARS-CoV-2 virus infection and illness severity may increase vaccine uptake for
394 reluctant and reachable participants. Targeted messaging by key stakeholders and healthcare
395 providers for participants with prior infection and in occupations with low vaccine coverage and
396 low trust in the government (like first responders) would be especially useful.

397

398 **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

399 **FDA** U.S. Food and Drug Administration

400 **CDC** Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

401 **EUA** Emergency Use Authorization

402 **KAP** Knowledge, attitudes, and practices

403 **HEROES** Arizona Healthcare, Emergency Response and Other Essential Workers Surveillance

404 **RECOVER** Study and Research on the Epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2 in Essential Response

405 Personnel

406 **H-R** HEROES-RECOVER

407 **HCP** Health care personnel

408 **FW** Frontline workers

409 **PPE** Personal protective equipment

410

411 **Disclosures:** The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not
412 necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

413 Allison L. Naleway reported funding from Pfizer for a meningococcal B vaccine study unrelated
414 to the submitted work.

415

416 **Statement of Contributions:** K Lutrick, H Groom, A Fowlkes, K Groover, P Rivers, K Nguyen,
417 M Herring, J Mayo Lamberte, K Prather, and S Yoon conceptualized the study and drafted the
418 manuscript with the help of Z Baccam. J Parker and P Rivers conducted the statistical analysis.
419 M Gaglani, A Naleway, K Dunnigan, A Phillips, M Thiese, and H Tyner were responsible for
420 review and revision of the manuscript. All authors read and approved of the final manuscript.

421

422 **Acknowledgements:** Supported by the National Center for Immunization and Respiratory
423 Diseases and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (contracts 75D30120R68013 to
424 Marshfield Clinic Research Institute, 75D30120C08379 to the University of Arizona, and
425 75D30120C08150 to Abt Associates).

426

427 Mark G. Thompson, Lauren Grant, Young M. Yoo, Gregory Joseph, Josephine Mak, Monica
428 Dickerson, Suxiang Tong, John Barnes, Eduardo Azziz-Baumgartner, Melissa L. Arvay, Preeta

429 Kutty, Alicia M. Fry, Lenee Blanton, Jill Ferdinands, Anthony Fiore, Aron Hall, Adam MacNeil,
430 L. Clifford McDonald, Mary Reynolds, Sue Reynolds, Stephanie Schrag, Nong Shang, Robert
431 Slaughter, Matthew J. Stuckey, Natalie Thornburg, Jennifer Verani, Vic Veguilla, Rose Wang ,
432 Bao-Ping Zhu, William Brannen , Stephanie Bialek, CDC; Jefferey L. Burgess, Shawn Beitel,
433 Patrick Rivers, Xiaoxiao Sun, Joe K. Gerald, Katherine Ellingson, Ed Bedrick, Janko Nikolich-
434 Žugich, Genesis Barron, Dimaye Calvo, Esteban Cardona, Andrea Carmona, Alissa Coleman,
435 Emily Cooksey, Kiara Earley, Natalie Giroux, Sofia Grijalva, Allan Guidos, Adrianna
436 Hernandez, James Hollister, Theresa Hopkins, Rezwana Islam, Krystal Jovel, Olivia Kavanagh,
437 Jonathan Leyva, Sally Littau, Amelia Lobos, James Lopez, Veronica Lugo, Jeremy Makar,
438 Taylor Maldonado, Enrique Marquez, Allyson Munoz, Assumpta Nsengiyunva, Joel Parker,
439 Jonathan Perez Leyva, Alexa Roy, Saskia Smidt, Isabella Terrazas, Tahlia Thompson, Heena
440 Timsina, Erica Vanover, Mandie White, April Yingst, Kenneth Komatsu, Elizabeth Kim, Karla
441 Ledezma, University of Arizona, Arizona Department of Health Services; David Engelthaler,
442 Translational Genomics Research Institute; Lauren E.W. Olsho, Danielle R. Hunt, Laura J.
443 Edwards, Meredith G. Wesley, Tyler C. Morrill, Brandon P. Poe, Brian Sokol, Andrea
444 Bronaugh, Tana Brummer, Hala Deeb, Rebecca Devlin, Sauma Doka, Tara Earl, Jini Etolue,
445 Deanna Fleary, Jessica Flores, Chris Flygare, Isaiah Gerber, Louise Hadden, Jenna Harder,
446 Lindsay LeClair, Nancy McGarry, Peenaz Mistry, Steve Pickett, Khaila Prather, David Pulaski,
447 Rajbansi Raorane, Meghan Shea, John Thacker, Matthew Trombley, Pearl Zheng, Chao Zhou,
448 Abt Associates; Spencer Rose, Tnelda Zunie, Michael E. Smith, Kempapura Murthy, Nicole
449 Calhoun, Claire Mathenge, Arundhati Rao, Manohar Mutnal, Linden Morales, Shelby Johnson,
450 Alejandro Arroliga, Madhava Beeram, Joel Blais, Jason Ettlinger, Angela Kennedy, Natalie
451 Settele, Rupande Patel, Elisa Priest, Jennifer Thomas, Baylor Scott & White Health; Jennifer L.

452 Kuntz, Yolanda Prado, Daniel Sapp, Mi Lee, Chris Eddy, Matt Hornbrook, Danielle Millay,
453 Dorothy Kurdyla, Ambrosia Bass, Kristi Bays, Kimberly Berame, Cathleen Bourdoin, Carlea
454 Buslach, Jennifer Gluth, Kenni Graham, Tarika Holness Enedina Luis, Abreeanah Magdaleno,
455 DeShaun Martin, Joyce Smith-McGee, Martha Perley, Sam Peterson, Aaron Piepert, Krystil
456 Phillips, Joanna Price, Sperry Robinson, Katrina Schell, Emily Schield, Natosha Shirley, Anna
457 Shivinsky, Britta Torgrimson-Ojerio, Brooke Wainwright, Shawn Westaway, Kaiser Permanente
458 Northwest; Jennifer Meece, Elisha Stefanski, Lynn Ivacic, Jake Andreae, Adam Bissonnette,
459 Krystal Boese, Michaela Braun, Cody DeHamer, Timothy Dzedzic, Joseph Eddy, Heather
460 Edgren, Wayne Frome, Nolan Herman, Mitchell Hertel, Erin Higdon, Rosebud Johnson, Steve
461 Kaiser, Tammy Koepel, Sarah Kohn, Taylor Kent, Thao Le, Carrie Marcis, Megan Maronde,
462 Isaac McCready, Nidhi Mehta, Daniel Miesbauer, Anne Nikolai, Brooke Olson, Lisa Ott, Cory
463 Pike, Nicole Price, Christopher Reardon, Logan Schafer, Rachel Schoone, Jaclyn Schneider,
464 Tapan Sharma, Melissa Strupp, Janay Walters, Alyssa Weber, Reynor Wilhorn, Ryan Wright,
465 Benjamin Zimmerman, Marshfield Clinic Research Laboratory; Angela Hunt, Jessica
466 Lundgreen, Karley Respet, Jennifer Viergutz, Daniel Stafki, St. Luke's Regional Health Care
467 System; Alberto J. Caban-Martinez, Natasha Schaefer-Solle, Paola Louzado Feliciano, Carlos
468 Silvera, Karla Montes, Cynthia Beaver, Katerina Santiago, University of Miami; Rachel T.
469 Brown, Camie Schaefer, Arlyne Arteaga, Matthew Bruner, Daniel Dawson, Emilee Eden, Jenna
470 Praggastis, Joseph Stanford, Jeanmarie Mayer, Marcus Stucki, Riley Campbell, Kathy Tran,
471 Madeleine Smith, Braydon Black, Madison Tallman, Chapman Cox, Derrick Wong, Michael
472 Langston, Adrielle Fugal, Fiona Tsang, Maya Wheeler, Gretchen Maughan, Taryn Hunt-Smith,
473 Nikki Gallacher, Anika DSouza, Trevor Stubbs, Iman Ibrahim, Ryder Jordin, University of Utah;
474 Marilyn J. Odean, Whiteside Institute for Clinical Research; Allen Bateman, Erik Reisdorf,

475 Kyley Guenther, Erika Hanson, Wisconsin State Laboratory of Hygiene; the HEROES-
476 RECOVER participants.

477

478

479 REFERENCES

- 480
- 481 1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. COVID-19.
482 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/index.html>. Accessed May 25, 2021.
- 483 2. US Food & Drug Administration. Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine.
484 [https://www.fda.gov/emergency-preparedness-and-response/coronavirus-disease-2019-](https://www.fda.gov/emergency-preparedness-and-response/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19/pfizer-biontech-covid-19-vaccine)
485 [covid-19/pfizer-biontech-covid-19-vaccine](https://www.fda.gov/emergency-preparedness-and-response/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19/pfizer-biontech-covid-19-vaccine). Accessed May 25, 2021.
- 486 3. Cheng VC, Wong SC, Yuen KY. Estimating Coronavirus Disease 2019 Infection Risk in
487 Health Care Workers. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(5):e209687.
- 488 4. Nguyen LH, Drew DA, Graham MS, et al. Risk of COVID-19 among front-line health-
489 care workers and the general community: a prospective cohort study. *The Lancet Public*
490 *Health*. 2020;5(9):e475-e483.
- 491 5. Rao A, Ma H, Moloney G, et al. A disproportionate epidemic: COVID-19 cases and
492 deaths among essential workers in Toronto, Canada. *medRxiv*. 2021.
- 493 6. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Interim List of Categories of Essential
494 Workers Mapped to Standardized Industry Codes and Titles.
495 <https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/covid-19/categories-essential-workers.html>. Accessed June
496 1, 2021.
- 497 7. Dooling K, McClung N, Chamberland M, et al. The Advisory Committee on
498 Immunization Practices' Interim Recommendation for Allocating Initial Supplies of
499 COVID-19 Vaccine - United States, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*.
500 2020;69(49):1857-1859.
- 501 8. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. COVID data tracker: COVID-19
502 vaccinations in the United States. <https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#vaccinations>.
503 Published 2021. Accessed May 10, 2021.
- 504 9. Wood S, Schulman K. Beyond Politics - Promoting Covid-19 Vaccination in the United
505 States. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;384(7):e23.
- 506 10. Kaiser Family Foundation. Coronavirus (COVID-19). KFF COVID-19 vaccine monitor:.
507 Kaiser Family Foundation. [https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/report/kff-covid-](https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/report/kff-covid-19-vaccine-monitor-december-2020/)
508 [19-vaccine-monitor-december-2020/](https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/report/kff-covid-19-vaccine-monitor-december-2020/). Published 2020. Accessed May 10, 2021.
- 509 11. Funk C TA. Intent to Get a COVID-19 Vaccine Rises to 60% as Confidence in Research
510 and Development Process Increases. Pew Research Center.
511 [https://www.pewresearch.org/science/2020/12/03/intent-to-get-a-covid-19-vaccine-rises-](https://www.pewresearch.org/science/2020/12/03/intent-to-get-a-covid-19-vaccine-rises-to-60-as-confidence-in-research-and-development-process-increases/)
512 [to-60-as-confidence-in-research-and-development-process-increases/](https://www.pewresearch.org/science/2020/12/03/intent-to-get-a-covid-19-vaccine-rises-to-60-as-confidence-in-research-and-development-process-increases/). Published 2020.
513 Accessed May 25, 2021.
- 514 12. Nguyen KH, Srivastav A, Razzaghi H, et al. COVID-19 Vaccination Intent, Perceptions,
515 and Reasons for Not Vaccinating Among Groups Prioritized for Early Vaccination -
516 United States, September and December 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*.
517 2021;70(6):217-222.
- 518 13. Ruiz JB, Bell RA. Predictors of intention to vaccinate against COVID-19: Results of a
519 nationwide survey. *Vaccine*. 2021;39(7):1080-1086.
- 520 14. Caban-Martinez AJ, Silvera CA, Santiago KM, et al. COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptability
521 Among US Firefighters and Emergency Medical Services Workers: A Cross-Sectional
522 Study. *Journal of occupational and environmental medicine*. 2021;63(5):369.

- 523 15. Pogue K, Jensen JL, Stancil CK, et al. Influences on attitudes regarding potential
524 COVID-19 vaccination in the United States. *Vaccines*. 2020;8(4):582.
- 525 16. Biswas N, Mustapha T, Khubchandani J, Price JH. The Nature and Extent of COVID-19
526 Vaccination Hesitancy in Healthcare Workers. *J Community Health*. 2021.
- 527 17. Shaw J, Stewart T, Anderson KB, et al. Assessment of US health care personnel (HCP)
528 attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination in a large university health care system. *Clinical*
529 *Infectious Diseases: An Official Publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of*
530 *America*. 2021.
- 531 18. Gadoth A, Halbrook M, Martin-Blais R, et al. Assessment of COVID-19 vaccine
532 acceptance among healthcare workers in Los Angeles. *Medrxiv*. 2020.
- 533 19. Halbrook M, Gadoth A, Martin-Blais R, et al. Longitudinal assessment of COVID-19
534 vaccine acceptance and uptake among frontline medical workers in Los Angeles,
535 California. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2021.
- 536 20. Akarsu B, Canbay Ozdemir D, Ayhan Baser D, Aksoy H, Fidanci I, Cankurtaran M.
537 While studies on COVID-19 vaccine is ongoing, the public's thoughts and attitudes to the
538 future COVID-19 vaccine. *Int J Clin Pract*. 2021;75(4):e13891.
- 539 21. Lutrick K EK, Baccam Z, Rivers P, Beitel S, Parker J, Hollister J, Sun X, Gerald JK,
540 Komatsu K, Kim E, LaFleur B, Grant L, Yoo YM, Kumar A, Mayo Lamberte J, Cowling
541 BJ, Cobey S, Thornburg NJ, Meece JK, Kutty P, Nikolich-Zugich J, Thompson MG,
542 Burgess JL. COVID-19 Infection, Reinfection, and Vaccine Effectiveness in a
543 Prospective Cohort of Arizona Frontline/Essential Workers: The AZ HEROES Research
544 Protocol. *JMIR research protocols*. 2021;26/05/2021:28923.
- 545 22. Taylor S, Landry CA, Paluszek MM, Groenewoud R, Rachor GS, Asmundson GJ. A
546 proactive approach for managing COVID-19: the importance of understanding the
547 motivational roots of vaccination hesitancy for SARS-CoV2. *Frontiers in psychology*.
548 2020;11:2890.
- 549 23. Goldberg Y, Mandel M, Woodbridge Y, et al. Protection of previous SARS-CoV-2
550 infection is similar to that of BNT162b2 vaccine protection: A three-month nationwide
551 experience from Israel. *medRxiv*. 2021.
- 552 24. Krammer F, Srivastava K, Alshammery H, et al. Antibody responses in seropositive
553 persons after a single dose of SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine. *New England Journal of*
554 *Medicine*. 2021;384(14):1372-1374.
- 555
556
557

558 **TABLES & FIGURES**

559 **Table 1. Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice (KAP) Questions**

560

| Topic | Question Text | Range |
|---|--|--|
| Vaccine Intention | What are the chances that you will get a COVID-19 vaccination? | 8-point Likert (1=Don't know, 8=Almost certain) |
| Chance of getting sick if not vaccinated | If you are unable to or don't get a COVID-19 vaccination, what do you think your chance of getting sick with COVID-19 this year will be? | 7-point Likert (1=Almost zero, 8=Almost certain) |
| Virus Knowledge | How much do you know about the SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) virus and the illness it causes? | 5-point Likert (1=Nothing at all, 5=A great deal) |
| Vaccine Knowledge | How much do you know about the COVID-19 vaccine? Would you say...? | 5-point Likert (1=Nothing at all, 5=A great deal) |
| Vaccine Safety | How safe do you think the COVID-19 vaccine is? | 5-point Likert (1=Not at all, 5=Extremely safe) |
| Vaccine Effectiveness | How effective do you think the COVID-19 vaccine is in preventing you from getting sick with COVID-19? | 5-point Likert (1=Not at all, 5=Extremely effective) |
| Trust in government | I trust what the government says about the COVID-19 vaccine | 5-point Likert (1=Strongly disagree, 5=Strongly agree) |

561

562

563 Table 2. Descriptive Statistics, Stratified by Vaccine Intent Group in a Survey of Essential
 564 Workers December 2020 through May 2021
 565

| | TOTAL N (%) | Reluctant N (%) | Reachable N (%) | Endorser^a N (%) | P-value |
|---|------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|
| Totals | 4803 (100%) | 653 (13.6%) | 770 (16.0%) | 3380 (70.4%) | |
| Socio-demographic Characteristics | | | | | |
| Gender* | | | | | 0.03 |
| Female | 2960 (61.3%) | 387 (59.3%) | 513 (66.6%) | 2060 (60.9%) | |
| Male | 1827 (37.8%) | 265 (40.6%) | 255 (33.1%) | 1307 (38.7%) | |
| Age (years) | | | | | <0.01 |
| 18-24 | 143 (3.0%) | 24 (3.7%) | 32 (4.2%) | 87 (2.6%) | |
| 25-44 | 2651 (54.9%) | 358 (54.8%) | 449 (58.3%) | 1844 (54.6%) | |
| 45-64 | 1908 (39.5%) | 259 (39.7%) | 265 (34.4%) | 1384 (40.9%) | |
| 65+ | 101 (2.1%) | 12 (1.8%) | 24 (3.1%) | 65 (1.9%) | |
| Race/Ethnicity* | | | | | <0.001 |
| Non-Hispanic-White | 3449 (71.4%) | 431 (66.0%) | 525 (68.2%) | 2493 (73.8%) | |
| African American | 90 (1.9%) | 18 (2.8%) | 23 (3.0%) | 49 (1.4%) | |
| Asian Am./Island Pacific | 141 (2.9%) | 14 (2.1%) | 13 (1.7%) | 114 (3.4%) | |
| Hispanic-White | 694 (14.4%) | 117 (17.9%) | 121 (15.7%) | 456 (13.5%) | |
| Multi-Racial/Other | 429 (8.9%) | 73 (11.2%) | 88 (11.4%) | 268 (7.9%) | |
| Education* | | | | | <0.001 |
| Less than college | 154 (3.2%) | 35 (5.4%) | 40 (5.2%) | 79 (2.3%) | |
| Some college | 856 (17.7%) | 186 (28.5%) | 201 (26.1%) | 469 (13.9%) | |
| College degree or above | 3685 (76.3%) | 413 (63.2%) | 513 (66.6%) | 2759 (81.6%) | |
| Annual Income* | | | | | <0.001 |
| < 50 k | 702 (14.6%) | 128 (19.6%) | 152 (19.7%) | 422 (12.5%) | |
| 50k-100k | 1955 (40.7%) | 244 (37.4%) | 280 (36.4%) | 898 (26.6%) | |
| 100k+ | 2000 (41.6%) | 261 (40.0%) | 317 (41.2%) | 1965 (58.1%) | |
| Occupation | | | | | <0.001 |
| HCP inpatient | 1105 (22.9%) | 100 (15.3%) | 115 (14.9%) | 890 (26.3%) | |
| HCP other | 1323 (27.4%) | 148 (22.7%) | 163 (21.2%) | 1012 (29.9%) | |
| First responder firefighter | 729 (15.1%) | 119 (18.2%) | 78 (10.1%) | 532 (15.7%) | |
| First responder other | 255 (5.3%) | 54 (8.3%) | 41 (5.3%) | 160 (4.7%) | |
| FW public | 990 (20.5%) | 156 (23.9%) | 261 (33.9%) | 573 (17.0%) | |
| FW other | 285 (5.9%) | 57 (8.7%) | 80 (10.4%) | 148 (4.4%) | |
| Underlying Medical Conditions | | | | | |
| Asthma | | | | | 0.990 |
| No | 4292 (88.9%) | 578 (88.5%) | 685 (89.0%) | 3029 (89.6%) | |
| Yes | 446 (9.2%) | 59 (9.0%) | 72 (9.4%) | 315 (9.3%) | |
| Diabetes | | | | | 0.920 |
| No | 4576 (94.7%) | 615 (94.2%) | 733 (95.2%) | 3228 (95.5%) | |
| Yes | 162 (3.4%) | 22 (3.4%) | 24 (3.1%) | 116 (3.4%) | |
| Hypertension | | | | | 0.710 |
| No | 4158 (86.1%) | 556 (85.1%) | 659 (85.6%) | 2943 (87.1%) | |
| Yes | 580 (12.0%) | 81 (12.4%) | 98 (12.7%) | 401 (11.9%) | |
| Any above condition* | | | | | 0.869 |
| No | 3176 (66.1%) | 425 (65.1%) | 502 (65.2%) | 2249 (66.5%) | |
| Yes | 1562 (32.5%) | 212 (32.5%) | 255 (33.1%) | 1095 (32.4%) | |
| SARS-CoV-2 Infection Prior to Follow-Up 1 Survey | | | | | |
| No | 3843 (79.6%) | 424 (64.9%) | 576 (74.8%) | 2843 (84.1%) | <0.001 |
| Yes | 960 (19.9%) | 229 (35.1%) | 194 (25.2%) | 537 (15.9%) | |

COVID-19 Vaccine received during the study

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------|
| Received Covid-19 Vaccine, Follow-up 1 | | | | | |
| No | 3083 (64.2%) | 653 (100%) | 770 (100%) | 1660 (49.1%) | |
| Yes | 1720 (35.8%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1720 (50.9%) | |
| Received Covid-19 Vaccine, Follow-up 2 | | | | | <0.001 |
| No | 1332 (27.7%) | 489 (74.9%) | 366 (47.5%) | 477 (14.1%) | |
| Yes | 3471 (72.3%) | 164 (25.1%) | 404 (52.5%) | 2903 (85.9%) | |

Responses to KAP questions

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------|
| Chances of getting sick if not vaccinated | | | | | <0.001 |
| Negative/Neutral | 2693 (55.8%) | 544 (83.3%) | 515 (66.9%) | 1634 (48.3%) | |
| Positive | 1985 (41.1%) | 109 (16.7%) | 252 (32.7%) | 1624 (48.0%) | |
| Virus Knowledge | | | | | <0.001 |
| Negative/Neutral | 1575 (32.8%) | 282 (43.2%) | 322 (41.8%) | 971 (28.7%) | |
| Positive | 3191 (66.4%) | 371 (56.8%) | 442 (57.4%) | 2378 (70.4%) | |
| Vaccine Knowledge | | | | | <0.001 |
| Negative/Neutral | 2838 (58.8%) | 505 (77.3%) | 582 (75.6%) | 1751 (51.8%) | |
| Positive | 1935 (40.1%) | 148 (22.7%) | 187 (24.3%) | 1600 (47.3%) | |
| Vaccine Safety | | | | | <0.001 |
| Negative/Neutral | 1825 (37.8%) | 535 (81.9%) | 427 (55.5%) | 863 (25.5%) | |
| Positive | 2945 (61.0%) | 114 (17.5%) | 343 (44.5%) | 2488 (73.6%) | |
| Vaccine Effectiveness | | | | | <0.001 |
| Negative/Neutral | 1825 (37.8%) | 498 (76.3%) | 392 (50.9%) | 935 (27.7%) | |
| Positive | 2944 (61.0%) | 152 (23.3%) | 375 (48.7%) | 2417 (71.5%) | |
| Trust in the Government | | | | | <0.001 |
| Negative/Neutral | 2371 (49.1%) | 513 (78.6%) | 443 (57.5%) | 1415 (41.9%) | |
| Positive | 2404 (49.8%) | 140 (21.4%) | 327 (42.5%) | 1937 (57.3%) | |

Reluctant participants indicated low likelihood of being vaccinated, Reachable participants mentioned a moderate likelihood of being unvaccinated, and Endorser participants indicated a high likelihood of being vaccinated or were already vaccinated; ^a People who answered the KAP questions after being vaccinated were considered endorsers to get vaccinated; ^b Only asked to unvaccinated participants in non-AZ sites; Likert responses were condensed from 5 to 8 categories (depending on the question) to negative/neutral and positive
 * Proportions may differ due to missing data not shown or small numbers sequestered

566

567

568 Table 3. Difference in Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice (KAP) Questions Stratified by
 569 Vaccination Status, Intention Group, Occupation, and Prior SARS-CoV-2 Positivity in a Cohort
 570 of Essential Workers (N=4803)^a

571
 572

| | Unadjusted | | Adjusted ^b | |
|--|------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | OR | 95% CI | OR | 95% CI |
| Vaccinated during the study (not vaccinated is the reference group) | | | | |
| Virus Knowledge | 1.58 | 1.40 – 1.79 | | |
| Vaccine Knowledge | 2.49 | 2.17 – 2.87 | | |
| Vaccine Safety | 9.81 | 8.42 – 11.44 | 5.46 | 1.43 – 20.82 |
| Vaccine Effectiveness | 8.29 | 7.10 – 9.67 | 4.98 | 1.30 – 19.14 |
| Trust in government | 4.40 | 3.87 – 5.00 | | |
| Chances of getting sick | 4.15 | 3.58 – 4.81 | | |
| By Intention Group (Endorser is the reference Group) | | | | |
| Reluctant | | | | |
| Virus Knowledge | 0.53 | 0.45 – 0.62 | | |
| Vaccine Knowledge | 0.30 | 0.26 – 0.35 | 0.49 | 0.34 – 0.72 |
| Vaccine Safety | 0.08 | 0.06 – 0.09 | 0.23 | 0.15 – 0.33 |
| Vaccine Effectiveness | 0.12 | 0.10 – 0.14 | 0.32 | 0.22 – 0.48 |
| Trust in government | 0.20 | 0.17 – 0.23 | 0.43 | 0.30 – 0.61 |
| Chances of getting sick | 0.23 | 0.20 – 0.27 | 0.48 | 0.32 – 0.74 |
| Reachable | | | | |
| Virus Knowledge | 0.52 | 0.45 – 0.60 | | |
| Vaccine Knowledge | 0.34 | 0.30 – 0.40 | 0.53 | 0.30 – 0.96 |
| Vaccine Safety | 0.33 | 0.28 – 0.38 | 0.56 | 0.31 – 1.00 |
| Vaccine Effectiveness | 0.40 | 0.35 – 0.47 | | |
| Trust in government | 0.58 | 0.51 – 0.67 | | |
| Chances of getting sick | 0.59 | 0.51 – 0.68 | | |
| Occupation (HCP inpatient is the reference group) | | | | |
| HCP other | | | | |
| Virus Knowledge | 0.81 | 0.70 – 0.94 | | |
| Vaccine Knowledge | 0.97 | 0.84 – 1.12 | | |
| Vaccine Safety | 0.91 | 0.79 – 1.06 | | |
| Vaccine Effectiveness | 1.02 | 0.87 – 1.18 | | |
| Trust in government | 0.98 | 0.85 – 1.13 | | |
| Chances of getting sick | 0.89 | 0.77 – 1.03 | | |
| First responder firefighter | | | | |
| Virus Knowledge | 0.37 | 0.31 – 0.44 | 0.48 | 0.39 – 0.59 |
| Vaccine Knowledge | 0.43 | 0.36 – 0.51 | 0.57 | 0.46 – 0.71 |
| Vaccine Safety | 0.43 | 0.36 – 0.51 | 0.60 | 0.48 – 0.74 |
| Vaccine Effectiveness | 0.41 | 0.34 – 0.49 | 0.61 | 0.49 – 0.76 |
| Trust in government | 0.62 | 0.52 – 0.73 | | |
| Chances of getting sick | 0.72 | 0.61 – 0.85 | | |
| First responder other | | | | |
| Virus Knowledge | 0.20 | 0.15 – 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.18 – 0.36 |
| Vaccine Knowledge | 0.19 | 0.15 – 0.25 | 0.34 | 0.24 – 0.49 |
| Vaccine Safety | 0.34 | 0.26 – 0.43 | 0.46 | 0.32 – 0.67 |
| Vaccine Effectiveness | 0.41 | 0.32 – 0.53 | 0.58 | 0.40 – 0.84 |
| Trust in government | 0.48 | 0.37 – 0.60 | 0.67 | 0.47 – 0.95 |
| Chances of getting sick | 0.71 | 0.56 – 0.91 | | |
| FW Public | | | | |
| Virus Knowledge | 0.30 | 0.26 – 0.36 | 0.41 | 0.34 – 0.50 |
| Vaccine Knowledge | 0.30 | 0.25 – 0.35 | 0.41 | 0.33 – 0.50 |
| Vaccine Safety | 0.65 | 0.55 – 0.76 | | |
| Vaccine Effectiveness | 0.75 | 0.64 – 0.88 | 1.25 | 1.02 – 1.53 |
| Trust in government | 0.95 | 0.82 – 1.11 | 1.38 | 1.14 – 1.68 |
| Chances of getting sick | 0.94 | 0.81 – 1.10 | 1.33 | 1.13 – 1.56 |
| FW other | | | | |
| Virus Knowledge | 0.28 | 0.22 – 0.35 | 0.41 | 0.35 – 0.49 |

| | | | | |
|---|------|-------------|------|-------------|
| Vaccine Knowledge | 0.36 | 0.28 – 0.45 | 0.49 | 0.41 – 0.57 |
| Vaccine Safety | 0.59 | 0.47 – 0.75 | | |
| Vaccine Effectiveness | 0.72 | 0.56 – 0.91 | 1.49 | 1.26 – 1.77 |
| Trust in government | 0.86 | 0.68 – 1.08 | | |
| Chances of getting sick | 0.52 | 0.41 – 0.65 | | |
| Prior SARS-CoV-2 Infection (No known prior infection as the reference group) | | | | |
| Virus Knowledge | 0.91 | 0.85 – 0.98 | | |
| Vaccine Knowledge | 0.62 | 0.57 – 0.68 | 0.78 | 0.64 – 0.95 |
| Vaccine Safety | 0.51 | 0.47 – 0.55 | | |
| Vaccine Effectiveness | 0.48 | 0.44 – 0.52 | 0.78 | 0.64 – 0.96 |
| Trust in government | 0.62 | 0.58 – 0.67 | | |
| Chances of getting sick | 0.46 | 0.42 – 0.51 | 0.68 | 0.56 – 0.84 |

^a P-values not reported due to inconsistencies that occur with multi-level categorical variables.

Statistical significance based on 95% confidence intervals.

^b Non-significant adjusted point estimates and confidence intervals not reported. Bonferroni corrections were used for each of vaccination status, intention group, occupation, and prior positivity. The model was adjusted for socio-demographics, occupation and occupational setting, vaccine intention, and prior positivity for SARS-CoV-2 infection.

573

574

Table 4. Demographics of Vaccine Intention Groups, Stratified by Vaccination Status at Time of Follow-up Survey 2 in a Cohort of Essential Workers

| | Reluctant | | | Reachable | | | Endorser | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|---------|------------------------|--------------------|---------|------------------------|---------------------|---------|
| | Not Vaccinated (N=289) | Vaccinated (N=94) | p-value | Not Vaccinated (N=152) | Vaccinated (N=195) | p-value | Not Vaccinated (N=246) | Vaccinated (N=1232) | p-value |
| Gender | | | 0.624 | | | 0.475 | | | 0.017 |
| Female | 168 (58.1%) | 58 (61.7%) | | 104 (68.4%) | 138 (70.8%) | | 133 (54.1%) | 783 (63.6%) | |
| Male | 121 (41.9%) | 36 (38.3%) | | 47 (30.9%) | 56 (28.7%) | | 112 (45.5%) | 445 (36.1%) | |
| Age (years) | | | 0.439 | | | 0.372 | | | 0.014 |
| 18-24 | 11 (3.8%) | 3 (3.2%) | | 9 (5.9%) | 11 (5.6%) | | 10 (4.1%) | 19 (1.5%) | |
| 25-44 | 158 (54.7%) | 44 (46.8%) | | 89 (58.6%) | 100 (51.3%) | | 132 (53.7%) | 596 (48.4%) | |
| 45-64 | 111 (38.4%) | 45 (47.9%) | | 50 (32.9%) | 73 (37.4%) | | 99 (40.2%) | 579 (47.0%) | |
| 65+ | 9 (3.1%) | 2 (2.1%) | | 4 (2.6%) | 11 (5.6%) | | 5 (2.0%) | 38 (3.1%) | |
| Race/Ethnicity | | | 0.975 | | | 0.310 | | | 0.241 |
| Non-Hispanic-White | 188 (65.1%) | 60 (63.8%) | | 99 (65.1%) | 125 (64.1%) | | 169 (68.7%) | 883 (71.7%) | |
| African American | 8 (2.8%) | 3 (3.2%) | | 7 (4.6%) | 2 (1.0%) | | 4 (1.6%) | 13 (1.1%) | |
| Asian American | 6 (2.1%) | 2 (2.1%) | | 2 (1.3%) | 3 (1.5%) | | 4 (1.6%) | 30 (2.4%) | |
| Hispanic-White | 54 (18.7%) | 16 (17.0%) | | 26 (17.1%) | 34 (17.4%) | | 48 (19.5%) | 186 (15.1%) | |
| Multi-Racial | 13 (4.5%) | 4 (4.3%) | | 7 (4.6%) | 16 (8.2%) | | 8 (3.3%) | 69 (5.6%) | |
| Other | 20 (6.9%) | 9 (9.6%) | | 11 (7.2%) | 15 (7.7%) | | 13 (5.3%) | 51 (4.1%) | |
| Education | | | 0.906 | | | 0.313 | | | <0.001 |
| Less than High school | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | | 2 (1.3%) | 0 (0%) | | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.1%) | |
| HS diploma/GED | 15 (5.2%) | 6 (6.4%) | | 8 (5.3%) | 8 (4.1%) | | 11 (4.5%) | 26 (2.1%) | |
| Some college | 78 (27.0%) | 25 (26.6%) | | 45 (29.6%) | 50 (25.6%) | | 59 (24.0%) | 140 (11.4%) | |
| College degree/above | 187 (64.7%) | 60 (63.8%) | | 95 (62.5%) | 131 (67.2%) | | 172 (69.9%) | 1041 (84.5%) | |
| Annual Income | | | 0.177 | | | 0.308 | | | <0.001 |
| < 50 k | 63 (21.8%) | 10 (10.6%) | | 33 (21.7%) | 32 (16.4%) | | 46 (18.7%) | 108 (8.8%) | |
| 50k-100k | 104 (36.0%) | 40 (42.6%) | | 47 (30.9%) | 78 (40.0%) | | 74 (30.1%) | 389 (31.6%) | |
| 100k-150k | 62 (21.5%) | 22 (23.4%) | | 45 (29.6%) | 46 (23.6%) | | 62 (25.2%) | 328 (26.6%) | |
| 150k-200k | 27 (9.3%) | 8 (8.5%) | | 16 (10.5%) | 20 (10.3%) | | 35 (14.2%) | 173 (14.0%) | |
| 200k+ | 20 (6.9%) | 9 (9.6%) | | 9 (5.9%) | 8 (4.1%) | | 23 (9.3%) | 194 (15.7%) | |
| Previously Tested Positive | | | 0.405 | | | 0.003 | | | <0.001 |
| No | 181 (62.6%) | 64 (68.1%) | | 96 (63.2%) | 153 (78.5%) | | 166 (67.5%) | 1046 (84.9%) | |
| Yes | 108 (37.4%) | 30 (31.9%) | | 56 (36.8%) | 42 (21.5%) | | 80 (32.5%) | 186 (15.1%) | |
| Occupation | | | 0.749 | | | <0.001 | | | <0.001 |
| HCP Inpatient | 45 (15.6%) | 17 (18.1%) | | 30 (19.7%) | 22 (11.3%) | | 50 (20.3%) | 268 (21.8%) | |
| HCP Other | 63 (21.8%) | 16 (17.0%) | | 46 (30.3%) | 28 (14.4%) | | 42 (17.1%) | 321 (26.1%) | |


| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|------------|-------|-------------|-------------|-------|-------------|--------------|-------|
| First responder firefighter | 55 (19.0%) | 15 (16.0%) | | 20 (13.2%) | 16 (8.2%) | | 62 (25.2%) | 121 (9.8%) | |
| First responder other | 29 (10.0%) | 9 (9.6%) | | 5 (3.3%) | 19 (9.7%) | | 16 (6.5%) | 89 (7.2%) | |
| FW Public | 67 (23.2%) | 28 (29.8%) | | 36 (23.7%) | 90 (46.2%) | | 40 (16.3%) | 365 (29.6%) | |
| FW other | 22 (7.6%) | 7 (7.4%) | | 10 (6.6%) | 17 (8.7%) | | 27 (11.0%) | 68 (5.5%) | |
| Asthma | | | 0.873 | | | 0.418 | | | 0.718 |
| No | 259 (89.6%) | 85 (90.4%) | | 141 (92.8%) | 173 (88.7%) | | 221 (89.8%) | 1091 (88.6%) | |
| Yes | 22 (7.6%) | 6 (6.4%) | | 9 (5.9%) | 17 (8.7%) | | 22 (8.9%) | 122 (9.9%) | |
| Diabetes | | | 0.565 | | | 0.217 | | | 0.409 |
| No | 274 (94.8%) | 87 (92.6%) | | 148 (97.4%) | 182 (93.3%) | | 237 (96.3%) | 1167 (94.7%) | |
| Yes | 7 (2.4%) | 4 (4.3%) | | 2 (1.3%) | 8 (4.1%) | | 6 (2.4%) | 46 (3.7%) | |
| Hypertension | | | 0.571 | | | 0.835 | | | 0.541 |
| No | 252 (87.2%) | 79 (84.0%) | | 129 (84.9%) | 166 (85.1%) | | 216 (87.8%) | 1058 (85.9%) | |
| Yes | 29 (10.0%) | 12 (12.8%) | | 21 (13.8%) | 24 (12.3%) | | 27 (11.0%) | 155 (12.6%) | |

Table 5. Change in Positive Response to Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice (KAP) Questions by Intention and Actual Vaccination from Follow-up Survey 1 to Follow-up Survey 2


| | Virus Knowledge | | Vaccine Knowledge | | Vaccine Safety | | Vaccine Effectiveness | | Trust in government | |
|------------------|-----------------|---------|-------------------|---------|----------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|---------------------|---------|
| | n(%) | p-value | n(%) | p-value | n(%) | p-value | n(%) | p-value | n(%) | p-value |
| Reluctant | | | | | | | | | | |
| Never Vaccinated | -26 (-9.0%) | 0.044 | 58 (20.0%) | <0.001 | 13 (4.5%) | 0.170 | 21 (7.2%) | 0.032 | -5 (-1.7%) | 0.635 |
| Vaccinated | -8 (-8.5%) | 0.305 | 20 (21.2%) | 0.002 | 25 (26.6%) | <0.001 | 29 (30.9%) | <0.001 | 13 (13.8%) | 0.049 |
| Reachable | | | | | | | | | | |
| Never Vaccinated | -29 (-19.0%) | 0.001 | 38 (25.0%) | <0.001 | 15 (9.9%) | 0.044 | 18 (11.9%) | 0.035 | 0 (0.0%) | 1.000 |
| Vaccinated | 2 (1.0%) | 0.876 | 49 (25.2%) | <0.001 | 67 (34.4%) | <0.001 | 52 (26.6%) | <0.001 | 26 (13.3%) | 0.011 |
| Endorser | | | | | | | | | | |
| Never Vaccinated | -53 (-21.5%) | <0.001 | 53 (21.5%) | <0.001 | 8 (3.2%) | 0.476 | 6 (2.4%) | 0.585 | 11 (4.4%) | 0.303 |
| Vaccinated | 13 (1.1%) | 0.596 | 235 (19.1%) | <0.001 | 147 (11.9%) | <0.001 | 136 (11.1%) | <0.001 | 117 (9.5%) | <0.001 |

Supplemental Appendix

Supplemental Figure 1. Timeline of key HEROES and RECOVER study activities July 2020-May 2021



Supplemental Figure 2. Change in Positive Response to Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice (KAP) Questions from Follow-Up Survey 1 to Follow-Up Survey 2, by Intention and Actual Vaccination



Supplemental Table 1. KAP by Intention group, Occupation, and prior SARS-CoV-2 Infection

| | Chance of getting sick if not vaccinated | Virus Knowledge | Vaccine Knowledge | Vaccine Safety | Vaccine Effectiveness | Trust in government |
|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) |
| COVID-19 Vaccine Intention | | | | | | |
| Reluctant | 3.47 (1.40) | 3.66 (0.876) | 2.97 (0.919) | 2.83 (0.846) | 2.98 (0.849) | 2.56 (1.19) |
| Reachable | 4.23 (1.37) | 3.64 (0.851) | 2.98 (0.843) | 3.50 (0.805) | 3.54 (0.774) | 3.32 (1.14) |
| Endorser | 4.62 (1.47) | 3.95 (0.839) | 3.57 (0.886) | 3.93 (0.794) | 3.88 (0.775) | 3.64 (1.20) |
| Occupation | | | | | | |
| HCP inpatient | 4.54 (1.48) | 4.14 (0.766) | 3.62 (0.882) | 3.87 (0.838) | 3.83 (0.798) | 3.54 (1.22) |
| HCP other | 4.44 (1.47) | 4.04 (0.805) | 3.60 (0.898) | 3.82 (0.884) | 3.82 (0.868) | 3.52 (1.26) |
| First responder firefighter | 4.26 (1.52) | 3.71 (0.833) | 3.20 (0.896) | 3.48 (0.907) | 3.43 (0.843) | 3.20 (1.24) |
| First responder other | 4.26 (1.52) | 3.40 (0.873) | 2.84 (0.869) | 3.35 (0.913) | 3.43 (0.860) | 3.02 (1.24) |
| FW public | 4.49 (1.51) | 3.61 (0.861) | 3.04 (0.859) | 3.68 (0.875) | 3.70 (0.812) | 3.50 (1.22) |
| FW other | 4.00 (1.46) | 3.57 (0.868) | 3.11 (0.840) | 3.66 (0.845) | 3.70 (0.800) | 3.43 (1.25) |
| Prior SARS-CoV-2 Infection | | | | | | |
| No | 4.52 (1.43) | 3.87 (0.848) | 3.40 (0.912) | 3.78 (0.867) | 3.77 (0.813) | 3.51 (1.23) |
| Yes | 3.91 (1.67) | 3.82 (0.885) | 3.17 (0.935) | 3.46 (0.916) | 3.44 (0.897) | 3.18 (1.25) |

All relationships were tested by Chi-square test and are statistically significant at $p < 0.001$ so omitted for clarity