1 **Title:** Unique predictors of intended uptake of a COVID-19 vaccine

2 **Authors and affiliations:**

3 Robert P. Lennon¹, MD, JD

4 Meg L. Small², PhD

5 Rachel A. Smith³, PhD

6 Lauren J. Van Scoy⁴, MD

7 Jessica G. Myrick⁵, PhD

8 Molly A. Martin⁶, PhD

9 Data4Action Research Group

10 1. Department of Family and Community Medicine, Pennsylvania State College of Medicine,
11 Hershey, Pennsylvania.

12 2. College of Health and Human Development, Pennsylvania State University, University Park,
13 Pennsylvania

14 3. Department of Communication Arts and Sciences, Pennsylvania State University, University
15 Park, Pennsylvania

16 4. Department of Medicine, Pennsylvania State College of Medicine, Hershey, Pennsylvania.

17 5. Donald P. Bellisario College of Communications, Pennsylvania State University, University Park,
18 Pennsylvania

18 6. Department of Sociology and Criminology, Pennsylvania State University, University Park,
19 Pennsylvania

20 **Corresponding author:**

21 Robert P. Lennon

22 500 University Drive, Hershey, PA, 17033

23 904 588 2621

24 rlennon@pennstatehealth.psu.edu

25 **Word count:** Abstract: 197 words, Manuscript: 1,200 words, 14 pages, 1 Table, 0 Figures

26 **Conflicts of interest statement:** The authors report no conflicts of interest. Members of the
27 Data4Action Research Group include leaders in each funding source. Those leaders participated
28 in developing the project concept and methodologies and study design. They did were not
29 involved in analysis, interpretation of the data, initial writing, or the decision to submit the report
30 for publication.

31 **Financial disclosure:** No financial disclosures were reported by the authors of this paper.

32 **Abstract:**

33 **Introduction.** An effective vaccine for COVID-19 is only of value if the public has confidence
34 in taking it. There is little data on COVID-19-specific vaccine confidence or its determinants in
35 the United States. The objective of this study was to determine public confidence in a COVID-19
36 vaccine.

37 **Methods.** A cross-sectional survey of Pennsylvanian adults, August-October, 2020, to identify
38 their likelihood of taking an approved, no-cost coronavirus vaccine, general vaccine acceptance,
39 and sociodemographic traits to identify predictors of vaccine acceptance.

40 **Results.** Of the 950 respondents, 55% were “very likely”, 20% “somewhat likely”, 14%
41 “unsure”, 4% “somewhat unlikely”, and 7% “very unlikely” to take a coronavirus vaccine, even
42 though 70% had taken the flu vaccine since September 2019. The strongest predictors of vaccine
43 acceptance were trust in the system evaluating vaccines and perceptions of local COVID-19
44 vaccination norms. The strongest predictors of negative vaccine intentions were worries about
45 unknown side-effects and positive attitudes toward natural infection. Sociodemographic factors,
46 political views, and religiosity did not predict vaccine intentions.

47 **Conclusions.** Fewer adults intend to take a coronavirus vaccine than currently take the flu
48 vaccine. To overcome coronavirus vaccine hesitancy, information campaigns to reinforce
49 positive predictors and overcome negative predictors are indicated.

INTRODUCTION

An effective SARS-CoV-2 vaccine to stop the spread of COVID-19 is only of value if the public has confidence in taking it.¹ Concerns about public refusal to accept a COVID-19 vaccine are widespread² and have raised calls for drastic measures to ensure public confidence in COVID-19 vaccines developed.³ Pre-COVID-19, the most important determinants of vaccine uptake globally were confidence in vaccines and trust in health-care workers, with lesser variations in confidence by science education, age, and gender, and little variation by income or religion.⁴

There is little data on COVID-19-specific vaccine confidence or its determinants in the United States (U.S.). A survey of 672 U.S. adults in May, 2020, found 67% would accept a COVID-19 vaccine, with variations in confidence by demographic status.⁵ A July, 2020 survey of 1,971 U.S. adults found associations between probability of choosing a COVID-19 vaccine and perceived vaccine efficacy, side effect profile, which institution endorsed it, and the national origin of the vaccine.⁶ A more recent public poll in September, 2020, found only 51% of U.S. adults would definitely or probably get a COVID-19 vaccine – down from 72% from the same poll in May, 2020.⁷ That poll identified safety concerns as a primary reason for hesitancy, including concerns about both the development process and approval process of a COVID-19 vaccine, and also found differences in acceptance by race, ethnicity, and political affiliation.⁷

This drop in intended vaccine uptake is concerning and may represent a shift in positive and negative predictors of vaccine confidence. The objective of this study was to explore COVID-19 vaccine confidence in light of these apparent changes.

METHODS

Population

This manuscript reports data from a longitudinal cohort survey at time 1, administered either online or by telephone, of adults in Centre County, Pennsylvania (PA), collected between August and October, 2020. Centre County, PA has approximately 150,000 permanent residents, with an academic year increase in population of approximately 40,000 undergraduate students enrolled to the Pennsylvania State University, University Park campus. Participants were recruited between May and September, 2020 through employers, local government, news coverage and word-of-mouth, with eligibility requirements of age 18 years or older and residence in Centre County, PA. Of 1,590 overall enrollees, 986 were invited to complete this survey, and 950 completed it (96% completion rate; no missing data). This study was approved by the Pennsylvania State University IRB.

Measures

Our primary outcome was COVID-19 vaccination intention. Participants answered, “*If an FDA-approved vaccine to prevent COVID-19 were available today at no cost to you, how likely would you be to get vaccinated?*” on a 5-point scale (1=*very unlikely*, 5=*very likely*).

Independent variables included vaccination attitudes, norms, efficacy, and past behavior.⁸ Positive attitudes toward vaccination (3 items; $\alpha=.77$) and immunity through natural infection (versus vaccination) (3 items; $\alpha=.77$) were measured on a 5-point scale (1=*strong disagree*, 5=*strongly agree*). Perceived vaccine uptake norms were measured by asking participants to estimate what percentage of people living in the county would get the coronavirus vaccine (1

item, 0-20%; 21-40%; 41-60%; 61-80%, 81-100%). Efficacy was measured by asking participants if they worry about unknown side-effects of vaccines (1 item, 1=*strong disagree*, 5=*strongly agree*). Past behavior was measured by asking participants whether they received a flu vaccine since September 1, 2019 (yes, no, wanted to get the flu vaccine, but were unable to for medical reasons; for regression analysis, the latter categories were combined).

Trust has also been associated with vaccine intentions and behaviors, and was measured as whether the respondent trusts the current system for evaluating the safety of coronavirus vaccines (1 item, 1=*strong disagree*, 5=*strongly agree*), and general vaccine cynicism (2 items, $r = .63, p < .001$; e.g., *Authorities promote vaccination for financial gain, not for people's health*). Sociodemographic variables of education, financial standing, political viewpoint (1=*very conservative*, 7=*very liberal*), and religiosity were also measured.

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to describe quantitative data. Multivariate ordinal regression was used to model predictors of vaccine intention. Statistical analysis was completed using SPSS statistical software version 25.

RESULTS

The 950 respondents were characteristically middle age (49 years, $SD = 16.32$), highly educated (87% Bachelor's degree or higher), employed (74%), non-Hispanic (95%), Caucasian (94%), women (68%).

Just over half (55%) reported that they are “very likely,” to take a coronavirus vaccine, while 20% are “somewhat likely,” 14% are “unsure,” 4% are “somewhat unlikely,” and 7% are “very unlikely” to take a coronavirus vaccine, even though 70% had taken the flu vaccine this season.

Multivariate ordinal regression was used to evaluate predictors of vaccine intention (Table 1). The strongest predictors of positive vaccine intentions were trust in the vaccine and perceived county COVID-19 vaccination norms; positive attitudes toward vaccines generally and having received the flu vaccine last year were lesser positive predictors. The strongest predictor of negative vaccine intention, by far, was worries about unknown side-effects; positive attitudes toward natural infection (over vaccination) was a lesser negative predictor. Sociodemographic status, political views, and religiosity did not predict vaccine intentions.

Free-text participant responses were used to illustrate quantitative results.

DISCUSSION

Our data identify a difference between confidence in vaccines in general and confidence in a COVID-19 vaccine, which stems from a primary distrust in the system evaluating the coronavirus vaccine. Free-text responses suggest that those unlikely to take a COVID-19 vaccine are worried that the speed of development indicates a lack of integrity in developing the vaccine, and that politicization of oversight agencies reduces their trustworthiness. This differs from general pre-COVID vaccine hesitancy, which primarily stemmed from negative vaccine beliefs, largely based on misconceptions.⁹ Whereas, historically, the primary emphasis for overcoming vaccine hesitancy was to overcome misconceptions, for COVID-19, these data suggest the

primary emphasis must be on reassuring the public that the integrity of the system for evaluating the vaccine was maintained. This confirms public polling showing distrust in both the development and approval process for the coronavirus vaccine,⁷ and supports prior editorial recommendations for instituting a policy of radical transparency in the COVID-19 vaccine development process.³

Limitations

Limitations to our study include that it is a single point in a cohort study; results at this time may not be generalizable over time. It is also limited by its narrow population sample, which was primarily well educated, Caucasian females.

Strengths of our study include a large sample size compared to prior US COVID-19 studies and timeliness. Capturing intent closer to the potential time of COVID-19 vaccine release is more likely to reflect actual uptake than older studies.

While further research is needed to confirm the generalizability of our results, given their concordance with the national Pew sample,⁷ it is highly likely that fewer US adults intend to take a coronavirus vaccine than currently take the flu vaccine. Further, given changes in positive and negative predictors, to overcome coronavirus vaccine hesitancy, practices, campaigns and policies may need to focus on reinforcing vaccine safety and development integrity over more general historic concerns.

158 **Conclusions**

159 These results are directly relevant to the COVID-19 pandemic. Changing COVID-19 vaccine
160 uptake intent and predictors of intent warrants changes to how COVID-19 public health
161 vaccination campaigns are designed. For messages and messengers to effectively reinforce
162 public uptake of a COVID-19 vaccine, they must emphasize the safety of the vaccine and the
163 integrity of the vaccine development process as priorities.

164 **Acknowledgements**

165 *Contributors*

166 The authors thank the members of the D4A Action Research Group: Dee Bagshaw, Clinical &
 167 Translational Science Institute, Nita Bharti, Dept. of Biology and the Huck Institutes of the Life
 168 Sciences, Cyndi Flanagan, Clinical Research Center, Matthew Ferrari, Dept. of Biology & Huck
 169 Institutes of the Life Sciences, Thomas Gates, Social Science Research Institute, Margeaux Gray,
 170 Dept. of Biobehavioral Health, Suresh Kuchipudi, Animal Diagnostic Lab, Vivek Kapur, Dept.
 171 of Animal Science and the Huck Institutes of Life Sciences, Stephanie Lanza, Dept. of
 172 Biobehavioral Health and the Prevention Research Center, James Marden, Dept. of Biology &
 173 Huck Institutes of the Life Sciences, Susan McHale, Dept. of Human Development and Family
 174 Studies and the Social Science Research Institute, Glenda Palmer, Social Science Research
 175 Institute, Andrew Read, Depts. of Biology and Entomology, and the Huck Institutes of the Life
 176 Sciences, Connie Rogers, Dept. of Nutritional Sciences and the Huck Institutes of the Life
 177 Sciences, Meg Small, Prevention Research Center, Rachel Smith, Dept. of Communication Arts
 178 and Sciences and the Huck Institutes of the Life Sciences, Charima Young, The Penn State
 179 Office of Government and Community Relations.

180 *Funding sources*

181 This research was supported by funding from the Office of the Provost and the Clinical and
 182 Translational Science Institute, Huck Life Sciences Institute, and Social Science Research
 183 Institutes at the Pennsylvania State University.

184 *CRediT author statement*

185 **Robert Lennon:** Methodology, Formal analysis, Writing – Original Draft, Writing – Review
186 and Editing **Meg Small:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation,
187 Writing – Review and Editing **Rachel Smith:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation,
188 Formal analysis, Investigation, Writing – Original Draft, Writing – Review and Editing,
189 Supervision, Funding Acquisition **Lauren Van Scoy:** Methodology, Writing – Review and
190 Editing **Jessica Myrick:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Investigation,
191 Writing – Review and Editing **Molly Martin:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis,
192 Investigation, Writing – Review and Editing **Data4Action Research Group:** Conceptualization,
193 Methodology, Resources, Project Administration, Funding Acquisition, Writing – Review and
194 Editing
195

References

1. PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE KEY TO COVID-19 VACCINE SUCCESS, FAUCI SAYS. *States News Service*. July 29, 2020.
<https://advance.lexis.com/api/document?collection=news&id=urn:contentItem:60G3-XJR1-DYTH-G21Y-00000-00&context=1516831>.
2. Salmon DA, Dudley MZ. It is time to get serious about vaccine confidence. *The Lancet (British edition)*. 2020;396(10255):870-871. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31603-2
3. COVID vaccine confidence requires radical transparency. *Nature (London)*. 2020;586(7827):8-8. doi:10.1038/d41586-020-02738-y
4. de Figueiredo A, Simas C, Karafillakis E, Paterson P, Larson HJ. Mapping global trends in vaccine confidence and investigating barriers to vaccine uptake: a large-scale retrospective temporal modelling study. *The Lancet (British edition)*. 2020;396(10255):898-908. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31558-0
5. Malik AA, McFadden SM, Elharake J, Omer SB. Determinants of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the US. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2020;26:100495. doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100495
6. Factors Associated With US Adults' Likelihood of Accepting COVID-19 Vaccination. *JAMA network open*. 2020;3(10):e2025594-e2025594. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.25594
7. Tyson, A., Johnson, C., & Funk, C. (2020). *U.S. public now divided over whether to get COVID-19 vaccine*. ().Pew Research Center. Retrieved from Policy File Index; Social Science Premium Collection Retrieved from <http://ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/docview/2448789771?accountid=13158>

- 219 8. Fishbein M, Cappella JN. The Role of Theory in Developing Effective Health
220 Communications. *Journal of communication*. 2006;56(suppl_1):S1-S17. doi:10.1111/j.1460-
221 2466.2006.00280.x
- 222 9. Stecula DA, Kuru O, Albarracin D, Jamieson KH. Policy Views and Negative Beliefs
223 About Vaccines in the United States, 2019. *American journal of public health (1971)*.
224 2020;110(10):1561-1563. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2020.305828

Table 1. Multivariate ordinal regression model of predictors of coronavirus vaccination intention with qualitative thematic commentary

Variable	Estimate (SE)	Wald	Free-text illustrations of COVID-19-specific hesitancy
Trust in system evaluating coronavirus vaccine	.57 (.06)	78.66***	<p><i>“I fear the long-term safety and efficacy of a rushed vaccine and think that safeguards may be ignored. . .”</i></p> <p><i>“I think the FDA is being forced to rush things.”</i></p> <p><i>“I am very pro-vaccine, but I am also extremely concerned that political pressures will affect the appropriate vaccine timelines.”</i></p> <p><i>“It seems there is a lack of transparency in how many of the trials are being carried out and evaluated for safety. . .”</i></p>
Vaccine side-effect	-.41 (.06)	46.86***	
Perceived Norm	.54 (.08)	46.3***	
Positive attitudes toward Vaccine	.44 (.14)	10.34**	
Received flu vaccine in past year [†]	.21 (.08)	7.69**	
Positive attitudes toward Natural Infection	-.22 (.10)	4.69*	
Vaccine cynicism	-.22 (.13)	2.72	
Religiosity	-.08 (.07)	1.46	
Financial standing	.02 (.05)	0.17	
Education	.09 (.07)	1.53	
Liberal politics	.01 (.06)	0.04	
Pseudo R^2	.39		

Boldface indicates statistical significance (* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$)

[†] For this regression, answers of, “no” and “could not for medical reasons” were combined.