

1 **Exploring the Behavioral Determinants of COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance among an Urban**
2 **Population in Bangladesh: Implications for Behavior Change Interventions**

3 **Authors:** Md Abul Kalam*¹, Thomas P. Davis Jr.², Shahanaj Shano^{3,4}, Nasir Uddin³, Md. Ariful Islam⁵,
4 Robert Kanwagi², Ariful Islam⁴, Mohammad Mahmudul Hassan⁶, Heidi J. Larson^{7,8}.

5 1. Bangladesh Country Office, Helen Keller International, Dhaka, Bangladesh.

6 2. World Vision International,

7 3. Institute of Epidemiology, Disease Control and Research (IEDCR), Dhaka, Bangladesh.

8 4. EcoHealth Alliance, New York, USA.

9 5. Bangladesh Country Office, SNV Netherlands Development Organisation.

10 6. Chittagong Veterinary and Animal Science University, Chattogram, Bangladesh.

11 7. Vaccine Confidence Project, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK.

12 8. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA.

13 * Author to whom correspondence.

14

15 **Abstract**

16 **Background:** While vaccines ensure individual protection against COVID-19 infection, delay in receipt
17 or refusal of vaccines will have both individual and community impacts. The behavioral factors of
18 vaccine hesitancy or refusal are a crucial dimension that need understanding to implicate appropriate
19 interventions. The aim of this study was to assess the behavioral determinants of COVID-19 vaccine
20 acceptance and to provide recommendations to increase the uptake of COVID-19 vaccines in Bangladesh.

21 **Methods:** We employed a Barrier Analysis (BA) approach to examine twelve potential behavioral
22 determinants (drawn from the Health Belief Model and Theory of Reasoned Action [TRA]) of intended
23 vaccine acceptance. We conducted 45 interviews with those who intended to take the vaccine (Acceptors)
24 and another 45 interviews with those who did not have that intention (Non-acceptors). We performed data
25 analysis to find statistically significant differences and to identify which beliefs were most highly
26 associated with acceptance and non-acceptance with COVID-19 vaccines.

27 **Results:**

28 COVID-19 vaccine Acceptors in Dhaka were different from Non-acceptors in terms of many of their
29 beliefs and responses. The behavioral determinants associated with the behavior included perceived
30 social norms, perceived safety of COVID-19 vaccines and trust in them, perceived risk/susceptibility,
31 perceived self-efficacy, perceived positive and negative consequences, perceived action efficacy,
32 perceived severity of COVID-19, access, and perceived divine will. In line with the Health Belief Model,
33 beliefs about the disease itself were highly correlated with vaccine acceptance, although not the only
34 determinant. Other responses of Acceptors provide clues such as providing vaccination through
35 government health facilities, schools, and kiosks, and having vaccinators maintain proper COVID-19
36 health and safety protocols as to ways to make it easier to boost acceptance.

37 **Conclusion:**

38 An effective behavior change strategy for COVID-19 vaccines uptake will need to address multiple
39 beliefs and behavioral determinants, reducing barriers and leveraging enablers identified in this study.
40 The national plans on COVID-19 vaccination should adopt culturally and community label acceptable
41 and appropriate evidence-based behavior change interventions strategies to promote high vaccination
42 coverage and acceptance in all societal structures across the country.

43 Key words: COVID-19, Vaccine, Acceptance, Refusal, Behavioral Determinants, Bangladesh.

44

45

46 **Introduction**

47 The severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) pandemic, popularly known as
48 COVID-19, has infected more than 14 million people with more 3 million deaths in 224 countries (1).
49 The pandemic poses an immense threat to the global public health system and is causing social and
50 cultural disruptions (2,3). Bangladesh reported its first clinically-confirmed COVID-19 case on March 8,
51 2020, and as of 19 April 2021, Bangladesh has reported 718,950 COVID-19 cases with 10,385 deaths (4)
52 and the counts are increasing with the passage of time. The social and economic costs of COVID-19 have
53 been significant in the developing countries like Bangladesh (5). As the pandemic is expected to continue
54 to impose enormous burdens of morbidity and mortality, and to severely disrupt societies and economies,
55 the introduction of effective COVID-19 vaccines is the only clinical preventive measure (6). As of 22
56 April 2021, Bangladesh has administered 7 080 699 doses of Oxford/AstraZeneca (COVISHIELD)
57 vaccine were administered in the whole country, out of which, 5 714 090 population received their 1st
58 dose, and 1 366 609 completed for their two doses schedule (7). However, like many other countries, the
59 government has focused the vaccination administration to very specific group of people and general
60 public expected to include in the vaccination program subsequently.

61 Nevertheless, vaccine hesitancy or refusal around COVID-19 vaccines is a growing concern worldwide.
62 The World Health Organization (WHO) identified vaccine hesitancy as one of the top ten global health
63 threats in 2019 (8) and this is not exceptional in the case of COVID-19 vaccines. In Bangladesh, a survey
64 reported that 81% of urban (metropolitan, district and municipalities) people would get vaccinated when a
65 COVID-19 vaccine is available (9). In a multi-country survey, it was found that only 71.5% of
66 participants reported that they would be very or somewhat likely to take a COVID-19 vaccine (10). A
67 rapid systematic review of 23 peer-reviewed studies and 103 additional syndicated surveys around
68 COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in the US and globally showed that perceived risk, concerns over vaccine
69 safety and effectiveness, doctors' recommendations, and inoculation history were common factors
70 influencing hesitancy around vaccination (11). Covid-19 vaccine hesitancy was found to be growing

71 between March and November 2020 (12), but improvements in vaccine acceptance have been noted in
72 some parts of the world since November (13). A growing number of studies have identified demographic,
73 socioeconomic, and behavioral factors that are linked with levels of vaccine acceptance (10,14,15). These
74 factors include age and marital status (16,17), level of education and ethnic origin (17–19), previous
75 vaccination with the influenza vaccine (15,20), and gender (16). Moreover, trust, misconceptions,
76 misinformation, and lack of knowledge among the community on vaccine-preventable diseases have been
77 considered influential determinants of the lower level of acceptance (10,11,14,15,21). These factors have
78 influenced vaccine uptake during previous pandemics and outbreaks caused by H1N1, MERS, SARS, and
79 Ebola virus (22–25).

80 A meta-analysis demonstrated that the use of social psychological health behavioral change models (e.g.
81 the HBM and Theory of Planned Behavior) would be useful for identifying the influencing determinants
82 of vaccine acceptance (21). The use of economic models when studying vaccine acceptance or hesitancy
83 exhibit some shortcomings in describing the determinants (21,26,27). Behavioral studies have shown that
84 the decision to vaccinate is often based on perceived benefits, effectiveness, and perceived risk of vaccine
85 side-effects versus infection (28). Systematic reviews on behavioral determinants of health have shown
86 that the HBM was useful in identifying determinants associated with the acceptance of Human
87 Papillomavirus (HPV) (26) and influenza vaccination uptake (29). This model has also been found to be
88 effective in predicting intention to vaccinate against influenza among health care workers in Jordan (30).
89 Similarly, a study using Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) (which was developed from the TRA)
90 showed that vaccine intentions were determined by attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral
91 control regarding vaccinations among the college students (31). In a comparative study of TPB and TRA,
92 it was found that attitudes and perceptions of social support were determinants for HPV vaccination
93 uptake (27).

94 Vaccine hesitancy and acceptance are complex in nature, and vaccine decisions can vary according to
95 context, time and place (32). Global studies on demographic determinants can have limited value when

96 looking at determinants of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in a given country, time, and geographical area.
97 The Technical Advisory Group on Behavioral Insights and Sciences for Health of WHO has identified a
98 number of behavioral drivers including enabling environment, social influences and motivation and
99 recommended to contextualize these drivers into national plans of COVID-19 vaccination (33).
100 Understanding how different behavioral attributes affect individual preferences about vaccination at as
101 granular level as feasible can help inform public health authorities about the actionable activities and
102 messages that will be necessary to achieve broader community uptake of vaccines. Therefore, the primary
103 objective of this study was to explore the behavioral determinants of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance
104 among people of different societal structures in urban communities in Bangladesh. The secondary
105 objective of this study is to provide policy recommendation of culturally acceptable behavioral change
106 intervention points to address these determinants to improve COVID-19 vaccine uptake.

107 **Materials and methods**

108 **Study site and context**

109 This Barrier Analysis study was conducted in different urban areas of Dhaka – the capital city in
110 Bangladesh – from January 09-15 2021. Dhaka is the residence of more than 10.3 million people – 6.29
111 percent of total population of the country (34). Between 8 March 2020 and 19 April 2021, there were
112 736,074 COVID-19 confirmed cases with 10,781 reported death (4). While Dhaka makes up about 6.29%
113 of the total population of Bangladesh, almost 71% of the COVID-19 cases in Bangladesh reported as of
114 19 April in Dhaka (61% in Dhaka city alone) (4) and which found as one of the largest hotspots of
115 spreading COVID-19 (35).

116 **Study tool**

117 A Barrier Analysis (BA) study was conducted to better understand the behavioral determinants of
118 COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in Dhaka. BA is a research tool that was developed in 1990 by Davis (36).
119 Based on HBM and TRA, BA studies explore respondents' beliefs about a behavior. Sometimes certain
120 beliefs about a behavior (e.g., possible COVID-19 vaccination side effects) are common in a population,

121 but are not necessarily associated with vaccine acceptance. BA is meant to , identify the most likely
122 determinants of that behavior(37) . A key feature of BA is that responses from those accepting a behavior
123 (‘Doers’ or ‘Acceptors’) are compared with those who are not (the ‘Non-doers’ or ‘Non-acceptors’) to
124 identify behavioral determinants associated with a particular behavior (e.g., handwashing with soap,
125 getting a vaccine) so that practitioners can develop more effective behavior change messages and
126 activities. BA has been used in more than 40% of low-to-middle-income countries and used extensively
127 by World Vision and other organizations during both the Ebola (38) and COVID-19 pandemics (39). The
128 beliefs and other responses regarding behavioral determinants assessed during BA (see Box 1), are
129 identified with a focus on the most actionable findings. The other details of BA approach can be found
130 elsewhere (40–45). There are BA studies in the peer-reviewed literature on exclusive breastfeeding (46)
131 HWWS among internally displaced women in the Kurdistan region of Iraq (40) timely oral polio
132 vaccination agricultural extension behaviors in India (47), dietary salt reduction in Nepal (48) transition
133 from the lactational amenorrhea method to other modern family planning methods in Bangladesh (36) and
134 cervical cancer screening in Senegal (49).

135 **Questionnaire development**

136 This study modified the standardized Barrier Analysis questionnaire from the *Designing for Behavior*
137 *Change* (DBC) training manual (45).

138 Box 1: Key definitions based on Barrier Analysis approach

Behavioral determinants	
Perceived self-efficacy	An individual’s belief that he/she can get a COVID-19 vaccine when it is available given his/her current knowledge and skills. Things that make it easier and more difficult to get a COVID-19 vaccine are also assessed under this determinant.
Perceived social norms	The perception that people important to an individual think that he/she should get a COVID-19 vaccine when it is available. Questions on who

	<p>approves and disapproves of the respondent getting a COVID-19 vaccine</p> <p>are also assessed under this determinant.</p>
Perceived positive consequences	<p>The positive things a person thinks will happen as a result of getting a COVID-19 vaccine (including the perceived advantages of getting a COVID-19 vaccine).</p>
Perceived negative consequences	<p>The negative things a person thinks will happen as a result of getting vaccine (including the perceived disadvantages of getting a COVID-19 vaccine).</p>
Access	<p>The availability of the needed services required for getting a COVID-19 vaccine. This includes perceived barriers related to the cost of transportation, distance to vaccination posts, queue time, etc.</p>
Perceived susceptibility	<p>A person’s perception of how vulnerable or at risk they are to getting a disease or problem that the behavior is meant to prevent (i.e., COVID-19 disease in this study).</p>
Perceived severity	<p>The extent to which a person believes it would be serious if they (or members of their family got) the disease or problem that the behavior is meant to prevent (i.e., COVID-19 disease in this study).</p>
Perceived action efficacy	<p>The extent to which a person believes that doing the behavior will prevent the disease/problem that the behavior is meant to prevent (in this study, that getting a COVID-19 vaccine will prevent COVID-19 infection).</p>
Perceived divine will	<p>The extent to which a person believes that it is Allah approves (or God or the gods’ will) for him/her to do the behavior (e.g. to get a COVID-19 vaccine). Beliefs about personal agency and “God’s will” are also explored under this determinant.</p>
Policy	<p>The presence of laws and regulations that may affect whether people do</p>

	the behavior (i.e., going for a COVID-19 vaccine in this study).
Culture	The extent to which cultural rules or taboos that may affect whether people do the behavior (e.g., cultural and religious beliefs about COVID-19 vaccination).

139

140 The BA questionnaire is divided into three parts. The first part includes a set of screening questions to
141 identify whether the participant as either an ‘Acceptor’ or a ‘Non-acceptor’. In the screening section of
142 the questionnaire, self-reported intention questions were used. (Please see Supplementary file 1.) In the
143 second part of the questionnaire, information on the respondents’ age, gender, level of education and
144 profession are obtained. In order to assess 11 of the usual 12 determinants assessed with BA (see Box 1),
145 the third section consists of a set of open- and closed-ended questions (37,44). Based on input and a
146 literature review from NGO experts who worked on increasing vaccine acceptance in the Ebola Vaccine
147 Deployment and Compliance Project, several questions were also added to the standard BA questionnaire
148 to explore respondent’s beliefs on the safety and effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines, trust in vaccine
149 information provided by both community and religious leaders, exposure to misinformation, and level of
150 education. Based on local social media listening, one question was added on perceptions around herd
151 immunity. The questionnaire was developed in English and then was translated into Bengali and back-
152 translated into English to check for accuracy.

153 **Sampling**

154 We interviewed adult men and women for this BA study and selected them randomly through a
155 convenience sampling strategy from five different areas of Dhaka – the capital city of Bangladesh. The
156 Barrier Analysis approach recommends a minimum sample size of 45 Doers (Acceptors) and 45 Non-
157 doers (Non-acceptors) in order to detect statistically-significant Odds Ratios of 3.0 or higher, an alpha
158 error of 5%, and a power of 80% (37). The data collection team approached adult men and women until
159 they reached 90 respondents (45 Acceptors and 45 Non-acceptors).

160 **Data collection, management and analysis**

161 We collected data between 9 to 13 January 2021 through individual interviews with responses recorded
162 on paper-based questionnaires by two teams composed of one female and one male member. Male
163 enumerators interviewed male respondents, and female enumerators interviewed female respondents. A
164 research supervisor assured the quality of data. Following data collection, the data collection team and the
165 lead author coded the open-ended responses thematically, using both an inductive and deductive coding
166 process. At the end of this process, the team quantified the responses in each category for Acceptors and
167 Non-acceptors separately. These categories and the number of responses registered for each were then
168 entered into a standardized BA tabulation sheet that revealed whether differences in the proportion of
169 Acceptors and Non-acceptors providing each response were statistically significant and should be
170 addressed through the behavior change strategy. For each question and category of responses, the BA
171 tabulation calculates the percentage of responses for both Acceptors and Non-Acceptors; the Odds Ratio,
172 the Standard Error, and its confidence interval; the Estimated Relative Risk (ERR); and p-values (see
173 supplementary file 2). This allows identify those differences between Acceptors and Non-acceptors that
174 are statistically significant (at $p < 0.01$) and to see the strength of the associations between each response
175 and the behavior (based on the ERR).

176 **Ethical considerations**

177 We performed all procedures in studies in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or
178 national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki Declaration and its later amendments or
179 comparable ethical standards. The study protocol was approved by the institutional Ethics Committee of
180 the Chattogram Veterinary and Animal Sciences University, Bangladesh (permit ref. no. CVASU/Dir (R
181 and E) EC/2020/169). We informed respondents about the study objectives, and obtained their written
182 consent before conducted interview. The data collection activities have performed following the COVID-
183 19 safety protocols in Bangladesh that enacted by Directorate General of Health Services in Bangladesh
184 (50) .

185

186 **3. Results**

187 The statistically significant differences in responses and beliefs were found between Acceptors and Non-
188 acceptors of COVID-19 vaccine are shown below. The categories of determinants are organized from
189 higher to lower estimated relative risk ratios (ERR).

190 **3.1 Perceived Social Norms:**

191 Some of the strongest predictors of vaccine acceptance in this population are beliefs around both
192 injunctive and descriptive social norms, who the respondent thinks approve or disapproves of COVID-19
193 vaccination, and the proportion of people that they think will go for a COVID-19 vaccine when it is
194 available. The results are shown in Table 1. Specifically, Acceptors were 3.2 times more likely to say
195 they would be “very likely” to get a COVID-19 vaccine if a doctor or nurse approved ($p<0.001$), while
196 Non-acceptors were 2.6 more likely to say it would be “not likely” that they would get a vaccine if a
197 doctor or nurse recommended it ($p<0.001$). Acceptors were twice as likely to say that “most people” they
198 know will get a vaccine ($p<0.001$), and 1.3 times more likely to say that “most close family and friends”
199 will get a vaccine ($p=0.003$), while conversely, Non-acceptors were 3.5 times more likely to say that
200 “very few people” they knew would get a vaccine ($p<0.001$) and 1.3 times more likely to say that “most
201 of their close family and friends” would not get a COVID-19 vaccine ($p=0.003$). In terms of respondents’
202 impressions concerning who disapproves of their getting a COVID-19 vaccine, Acceptors were 1.7 times
203 more likely (than Non-acceptors) to say that “no one” would disapprove ($p<0.001$). Non-acceptors were
204 1.5 times more likely to say that “my mother” ($p<0.004$), 1.4 times more likely to say “elderly people”
205 ($p=0.009$), and 1.7 times more likely to say “people who will not get the vaccine” ($p=0.006$) would
206 disapprove of their getting a COVID-19 vaccine. In addition, Acceptors were and more likely to say their
207 mother would approve of their getting a COVID-19 vaccine ($p<0.001$). With regards to community and
208 religious leaders’ influence on the decision to get a COVID-19 vaccine, Acceptors were 1.3 times more
209 likely to say that “most community and religious leaders” would want them to get a vaccine ($p=0.007$),
210 while Non-acceptors were 1.5 times more likely to say that most community leaders and religious leaders
211 would not want them to get a COVID-19 vaccine ($p=0.002$).

212 **3.2 Perceived Safety of COVID-19 Vaccines:**

213 As in many places in the world, concerns about safety of COVID-19 vaccines are affecting intention to
214 accept vaccination in this population. When asked how safe the COVID-19 vaccines are, Non-acceptors
215 were 1.8 times more likely to say that COVID-19 vaccines are “not safe at all” ($p<0.001$) while Acceptors
216 were 1.4 times more likely to say that COVID-19 vaccines are “mostly safe” ($p<0.001$) (Table 2).

217 **3.3 Perceived Risk / Susceptibility (to COVID-19):**

218 Perceived risk of getting COVID-19 – and the level of emotional concern about getting COVID-19 – also
219 appears to be driving intended vaccine acceptance in Dhaka. Acceptors were 1.4 times more likely to say
220 they it was “very likely” that someone in their household would get COVID-19 over the next 3 months
221 ($p<0.001$) while Non-acceptors were 1.3 times more likely to say that was only “somewhat likely”
222 ($p=0.005$). When respondents were asked how concerned they were about getting COVID-19 (or
223 someone in their household getting COVID-19), Acceptors were 1.3 times more likely to say that they
224 were “very concerned” ($p=0.002$) while Non-acceptors were 1.7 times more likely to say that they were
225 only “a little concerned” ($p<0.001$). Additionally, Non-acceptors were 1.7 times more likely to say that
226 “very few people” have had COVID-19 in their communities ($p<0.001$) (Table 2).

227 **3.4 Perceived Self-efficacy:**

228 The respondents were asked two open-ended questions to understand what would make it easier or more
229 difficult to get a COVID-19 vaccine. From the results (Table 3), factors related to *how* and *where* the
230 vaccine would be given affects intention to vaccinate, including whether or not proper COVID-19 social
231 distancing and prevention measures are maintained during vaccination.

232 Concerning what made it **easier**, Acceptors were 1.4 times more likely to say “if vaccination is provided
233 by government health care facilities” ($p=0.000$), 1.2 times more likely to say “school-based vaccination”
234 ($p=0.003$), 1.3 times more likely to say “if the vaccines are provided by establishing kiosks” ($p=0.001$)
235 and 1.2 times more likely to say “if proper health & safety (COVID-19) protocols are maintained while
236 giving the vaccine” ($p=0.006$) all would make it easier to get a COVID-19 vaccine. Conversely – and

237 interestingly – Non-acceptors were 1.2 times more likely to say “when vaccines are given at home”
238 ($p=0.010$), and 1.7 times more likely to say “when the vaccine has no side effects” ($p=0.002$) would make
239 it easier for them to get a COVID-19 vaccine.

240 When asked what would make it more difficult to get a COVID-19 vaccine, Acceptors were 1.3 times
241 more likely to say either “if there are no health measures in the vaccination center due to overcrowding”
242 or “risk of getting infected with COVID-19 while vaccinating” ($p=0.001$), and 1.2 times more likely to
243 say “if the vaccinator does not follow proper COVID-19 preventive measures” ($p=0.005$) would make it
244 difficult to get a COVID-19 vaccine. Non-acceptors were 2.4 times more likely to say “when the vaccine
245 has severe side-effects” ($p<0.001$) and 2 time more likely to say “if there is bribery” ($p=0.004$) would
246 make it difficult to get a COVID-19 vaccine.

247 **3.5 Perceived Positive Consequences and Perceived Negative Consequences:**

248 Respondents were also asked what the positive and negative consequences (e.g., advantages and
249 disadvantages) would be of getting a COVID-19 vaccine. While reducing the reduced risk of infection
250 was important, Acceptors were more likely to point out benefits related to livelihood and economic
251 benefits and life getting back to normal. Specifically (Table 4), Acceptors were 1.3 times more likely to
252 say that reducing the risk of COVID-19 infection ($p=0.003$), 1.3 times more likely to say “we can attend
253 social and cultural activities” ($p=0.003$), 1.2 times more likely to say “children can start school again”
254 ($p=0.003$), 1.3 times more likely to say “reduction in COVID-19 related costs” (e.g. masks, hand
255 sanitizer, tests; $p<0.001$), 1.3 times more likely to say “employment and income opportunities will be
256 increased” ($p<0.001$), and 1.3 times more likely to say “attending prayers in congregation” ($p<0.002$)
257 were all reported advantages of getting a COVID-19 vaccine.

258 When asked about the negative consequences (disadvantages), Acceptors were 1.3 times more likely to
259 mention mild side effects of vaccination such as “weakness” ($p<0.002$) and 1.3 times more likely to say
260 “itching and skin problems” ($p<0.001$) were disadvantages of getting a COVID-19 vaccine. Meanwhile,
261 Non-acceptors were 1.6 times more likely (than Acceptors) to mention life-threatening side effects

262 (p<0.001), 1.5 times more likely to say “unknown/new diseases” (p<0.004), and 1.9 times more likely to
263 say “infertility” (p<0.001) were all disadvantages of getting a COVID-19 vaccine.

264 **3.6 Perceived Action Efficacy:**

265 Counter-intuitively, Acceptors were 1.3 times more likely to say they were “somewhat likely” to get
266 COVID-19 once they were vaccinated against it (p<0.001) while Non-acceptors were 2.8 times more
267 likely to say that they were “not likely at all” to get COVID-19 once one was vaccinated against it
268 (p<0.001) (Table 5). Focus group discussions may be used at a later point in time to explore this finding.
269 Related to perceived action efficacy, respondents were asked if they agreed or disagreed with the
270 statement “Most people will eventually get infected with COVID-19, so getting a COVID-19 vaccine is
271 unnecessary.” Non-acceptors were 1.7 times more likely to say that they “agree a little” or “agree a lot”
272 with the statement (p<0.001) while Acceptors were 1.5 times more likely to “disagree a lot” with the
273 statement (p<0.001).

274 **3.7 Trust in COVID-19 vaccines:**

275 As expected, trust in COVID-19 vaccines is a key driver of intended vaccine acceptance in Dhaka.
276 Acceptors were twice as likely to say that they trust the COVID-19 vaccines “a lot” or a “moderate
277 amount” (p<0.001). Conversely, Non-acceptors were 1.7 times more likely to say that they “trust them a
278 little” (p<0.001) and 2.3 times more likely to say that they “do not trust [COVID-19 vaccines] at all”
279 (p=0.001) (Table 6).

280 **3.8 Perceived Severity (of COVID-19)**

281 The **perceived severity** of COVID-19 was also highly correlated with intended vaccine acceptance.
282 Respondents were asked how serious it would be if they or someone else in their household got COVID-
283 19. Acceptors were 1.3 times more likely (than Non-acceptors) to say that it would be “very serious”
284 (p=0.001) (Table 6).

285 **3.9 (Perceived) Access:**

286 Perceived difficulty in reaching clinics that normally provide vaccines is associated with intended
287 COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in Dhaka. Non-acceptors were 1.6 times more likely to say that it was
288 “very difficult” to get to the facility that normally provides vaccines ($p=0.000$), while Acceptors were 1.3
289 times more likely to say it was “somewhat difficult” to get to that facility ($p=0.000$) (Table 6).

290 **3.10 Perceived Divine Will**

291 Personal agency and religious beliefs often come into play with vaccine acceptance. In this study (Table
292 7), we asked for respondents’ degree of agreement or disagreement with the statement: “Whether I get
293 COVID-19 or not is purely a matter of God’s will or chance -- The actions I take will have little bearing
294 on whether or not I get COVID-19.” Personal agency was correlated with intended vaccine acceptance:
295 Acceptors were 1.2 times more likely to say that they “disagree a lot” ($p=0.005$) that “whether I get
296 COVID-19 or not is purely a matter of God's will or chance” ($p<0.001$). Respondents were also asked
297 whether they believed that Allah (or God or the gods) approves or disapproves of people getting COVID-
298 19 vaccines. While 80% of Acceptors and 78% of Non-acceptors said that a deity approves, there were no
299 statistically significant differences between Acceptors and Non-acceptors for this question.

300 **3.11 Rumors/ Culture**

301 Respondents were asked if there were any cultural or religious reasons that they would not get a COVID-
302 19 vaccine (results are in Table 7). Acceptors were 1.2 times more likely to say that there were no
303 cultural or religious reasons they would not get a COVID-19 vaccine ($p=0.01$), while Non-acceptors were
304 1.3 more likely to say that there were reasons ($p=0.002$). When asked what those reasons were, Non-
305 Acceptors were 1.6 more likely to say that they had heard that ‘the vaccines were made with pork fat
306 which is not allowed (*haram*) by Islam’ ($p=0.001$) and 1.4 times more likely to say that ‘vaccines were
307 made with haram ingredients’ ($p=0.003$). Respondents were also asked if they had seen or heard of
308 anything that would stop them or others from seeking to get a COVID-19 vaccine. If they said yes, they
309 were asked a follow-up question on what would stop them or others from seeking the vaccine. Regarding
310 that question, Acceptors were 1.3 more likely to say that producers’ “hide and seek activities” related to

311 vaccine accuracy in the clinical testing would stop them or their peers from getting a COVID-19 vaccine
312 ($p < 0.002$).

313

314

315 **4. Discussion**

316 This Barrier Analysis study on intended acceptance of COVID-19 vaccines revealed important
317 differences in responses and beliefs between Acceptors and Non-acceptors regarding behavioral
318 determinants of vaccine acceptance in this urban setting of Bangladesh. One important finding is that
319 even if one or two determinants or barriers are addressed, there are a multitude of important determinants
320 and barriers that may affect vaccine acceptance, and deserve attention. Access, for instance, was among
321 other determinants found to be important in our study in along with perceived social norms (75% of the
322 studies) and positive/negative consequences of the behavior (56%) (51).

323 The largest behavioral driver in this population, based on responses to questions on the 11 determinants
324 studied, was around perceived social norms. Perceived social norms, depending on the context, may
325 hinder or inspire one to get a vaccine (52). In this study, Acceptors were more likely (than Non-
326 acceptors) to say that most people they know and most of their close family and friends will get the
327 COVID-19 vaccine, that no one would disapprove of their getting a vaccine, and that they would be very
328 likely to get a vaccine if a doctor or nurse recommended it. Similarly, one systematic review showed
329 health care professionals are influential in promoting vaccinations (53). Acceptors were also more likely
330 to say that most of their community and religious leaders will want them to get a vaccine.

331 Other beliefs, for example safety and trust, about the vaccines themselves were important, as well (54,55).
332 In this study, Non-acceptors were much more likely to say that COVID-19 vaccines are “not safe at all”
333 and to say that they only “trust them a little.” Conversely, Acceptors were more likely to say that the
334 COVID-19 vaccines are “mostly safe” and to say that they trust them “a lot.”

335 In line with the Health Belief Model, beliefs about the disease itself were highly correlated with vaccine
336 acceptance (26). Acceptors were much more likely (than Non-acceptors) to say it was “very likely” that
337 someone in their household would get COVID-19 over the next three months and to be “very concerned”
338 about getting COVID-19. Conversely, Non-acceptors were much more likely to say that it would be only
339 “somewhat likely” that someone in their household would get COVID-19 and that “very few people”
340 have had COVID-19 in their community. In alignment with what Patrick et al (56) showed regarding
341 perceived risk as structural feature of vaccine decision, Acceptors of this study were also more likely to
342 believe that it would be “very serious” if someone in their household got COVID-19.

343 Perceived behavioral control (which is influenced by things that make it difficult or easy to perform the
344 behavior) also influence vaccine uptake (31). The barriers and enablers which were mentioned more often
345 by Acceptors provide clues as to ways to make it easier to boost acceptance. When asked what would
346 make it easier to get a COVID-19 vaccine, Acceptors were more likely (than Non-acceptors) to mention
347 providing vaccination through government health facilities, schools, and kiosks, and having vaccinators
348 maintain proper COVID-19 health & safety protocols. Responding to the question about what would
349 make it difficult to get a COVID-19 vaccine, Non-acceptors were much more likely say “when the
350 vaccine has severe side effects.” Personal agency also came into play: Acceptors were much more likely
351 to say that they disagreed a lot with the statement, “whether I get COVID-19 or not is purely a matter of
352 God’s will or chance – the actions I take will have little bearing on whether or not I get COVID-19.”

353 Aligned with other studies on vaccination uptake (57,58), the results of this study showed that perceived
354 effects of vaccines are a key factor in the vaccine decision. Acceptors named several positive
355 consequences of getting a COVID-19 vaccine more often than Non-acceptors including (1) reduced the
356 risk of Covid-19 infection, (2) being able to attend social and cultural activities, (3) children being able to
357 start school again, (4) reduction in COVID-19 related costs, (5) increased employment and income
358 opportunities, and (6) being able to attend prayers in a group setting. Conversely, Non-acceptors asked
359 about negative consequences of getting a COVID-19 vaccine were more likely to say (than Acceptors)
360 that (1) life-threatening side effects, (2) unknown / new diseases, and (3) infertility were all disadvantages

361 that they would expect if they were to get a COVID-19 vaccine. Surprisingly, Acceptors were 1.3 times
362 more likely to say they were “somewhat likely” to get COVID-19 once they were vaccinated against it
363 ($p < 0.001$) while Non-acceptors were 2.8 times more likely to say that they were “not likely at all” to get
364 COVID-19 if they were vaccinated.
365 Lastly, Non-acceptors were more likely to hold beliefs about herd immunity that could reduce acceptance,
366 saying that they agree a little or a lot with the statement that “most people will eventually get infected
367 with COVID-19, so getting a COVID-19 vaccine is unnecessary.”

368 **Implications for Behavior Change Interventions**

369 Aligned with WHO’s Technical Advisory Group on Behavioral Insights and Sciences for Health
370 recommendation on social and behavioral drivers on COVID-19 vaccination (33), our study identified
371 important beliefs and responses associated with different determinants of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance
372 among urban population in Bangladesh which could be valuable to informing contextualized behavioral
373 intervention and engagement strategies to support COVID-19 vaccination. For example, to increase
374 perceived positive social norms, especially for those who found to be important influencers of this
375 behavior (e.g., medical staff and mothers), videotaping individuals giving testimonials in each
376 neighborhood on why they plan to get the vaccine, and distributing them over media is one possible
377 approach. Other activities can be used to make acceptance more visible (e.g., stickers on households that
378 say, “We plan to vaccinate!” or lapel pins with the same message). To increase the perception that
379 COVID-19 is serious (to address perceived severity), testimonials by people who have lost or almost lost
380 family members due to COVID-19 disease could be used. To address perceived divine will, religious
381 leaders can be assisted in creating sermon outlines on maintaining one’s health (and linking that with
382 COVID-19 vaccines), and supported in creating radio spots to promote COVID-19 vaccines. In addition
383 to the COVID-19 prevention, other positive consequences of immunization mentioned by Acceptors
384 should be disseminated. While not repeating any misinformation, it will be important to provide clear
385 information on the known minor risks of COVID-19 vaccination as a way to combat misinformation on

386 side effects that were mentioned more often by Non-acceptors (e.g., life-threatening conditions, new
387 diseases, infertility). Information on how vaccines are made should be disseminated to counter
388 misinformation (e.g., that vaccines are made with pork fat or other haram ingredients). Stakeholders
389 should also take into account the findings on things that may make vaccination easier for people, such as
390 providing the vaccine in schools and kiosks (in addition to government health facilities) and to assure that
391 the population understands that proper COVID-19 health and safety protocols will be maintained in
392 places where vaccines are given.

393 **Limitations of the Study**

394 This study has a number of limitations. First, given that this study was only done in a limited urban area,
395 the results should not be generalized to the rest of Bangladesh or other countries. Second, by design (as a
396 means to make the analysis easier for practitioners and the method replicable by more practitioners), the
397 BA approach does not consider respondents' socio-economic information including level of income,
398 living conditions, or other factors which may lead to some confounding or interaction of variables.
399 Finally, while many studies these days recognize that there is a spectrum of acceptance between those
400 who accept, those who are undecided or hesitant, and those who refuse, for the purposes of this study and
401 for ease of analysis, we defined vaccine acceptance in a binary way

402 **Conclusion**

403 This BA study revealed a host of important behavioral determinants associated with intended COVID-19
404 vaccine acceptance among the study population in Dhaka, Bangladesh. Particularly, social norms, beliefs
405 on safety and trust about the vaccines, perceived risk of getting COVID-19, perceived severity, perceived
406 action efficacy and behavioral control. The responses were significantly varied between Acceptors and
407 Non-acceptors which urges to address these behavioral drivers. The study also revealed some important
408 beliefs on the positive consequences from both Acceptors and Non-acceptors, which could be used in
409 developing behavior change messages. The results from the present study suggest that an integrated

410 behavior change strategy needs to be incorporated into existing COVID-19 vaccination plans to increase
411 the uptake.

412

413

414

415

416

417 **Author Contribution**

418 Conceptualization, MAK; TD, SS; methodology, MAK, TD, MMH; software, TD, MAK; validation,
419 MAK, TD; formal analysis, MAK, TD, SS; investigation, MAK; resources, MAK, MMH, SS; data
420 curation, TD, SS, NU, MAI; writing—original draft preparation, MAK, TD, SS; writing—review and
421 editing, HL, TD, MAK, AI, SS, RK, MMH; supervision, TD, MMH, HL; project administration, MAK,
422 MMH, NU, SS. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

423 **Acknowledgments:**

424 The authors would like to acknowledge Chattogram Veterinary and Animal Sciences University for
425 permitting to conduct this perception study. Our entire research team also grateful to all the respondents
426 (poultry drug and feed sellers) for their kind cooperation during the interviews.

427 **Supporting information captions (if applicable)**

428 **References**

- 429 1. WHO. Weekly Operational Update on COVID-19. 2021;(47):1–16.
- 430 2. Zhang YN, Chen Y, Wang Y, Li F, Pender M, Wang N, et al. Reduction in healthcare services
431 during the COVID-19 pandemic in China. *BMJ Glob Heal* [Internet]. 2020 Nov 12 [cited 2021 Jan
432 28];5(11):3421. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003421>
- 433 3. Kaye AD, Okeagu CN, Pham AD, Silva RA, Hurley JJ, Arron BL, et al. Economic impact of
434 COVID-19 pandemic on healthcare facilities and systems: International perspectives. *Best Practice*

- 435 and Research: Clinical Anaesthesiology. Bailliere Tindall Ltd; 2020.
- 436 4. WHO. Bangladesh Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Update: 19 April 2021 [Internet]. [cited 2021
437 Apr 23]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/bangladesh/emergencies/coronavirus-disease->
- 438 5. Bodrud-Doza M, Shammi M, Bahlman L, Islam ARMT, Rahman MM. Psychosocial and Socio-
439 Economic Crisis in Bangladesh Due to COVID-19 Pandemic: A Perception-Based Assessment.
440 Front Public Heal. 2020;8(June).
- 441 6. Bhattacharya M, Sharma AR, Patra P, Ghosh P, Sharma G, Patra BC, et al. Development of
442 epitope-based peptide vaccine against novel coronavirus 2019 (SARS-CoV-2):
443 Immunoinformatics approach. J Med Virol [Internet]. 2020 Jun 5 [cited 2021 Jan 28];92(6):618–
444 31. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/jmv.25736>
- 445 7. World Health Organization. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Update (MMWU) N 50. 2021.
- 446 8. WHO. Ten threats to global health in 2019 [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jan 28]. Available from:
447 <https://www.who.int/news-room/spotlight/ten-threats-to-global-health-in-2019>
- 448 9. Business Insider. 81% urban, 64% rural people interested in Covid-19 inoculation: Study. 2021
449 [cited 2021 Feb 9]; Available from: [https://www.businessinsiderbd.com/national/news/1991/81-](https://www.businessinsiderbd.com/national/news/1991/81-urban-64-rural-people-interested-in-covid-19-inoculation-study)
450 [urban-64-rural-people-interested-in-covid-19-inoculation-study](https://www.businessinsiderbd.com/national/news/1991/81-urban-64-rural-people-interested-in-covid-19-inoculation-study)
- 451 10. Lazarus J V., Ratzan SC, Palayew A, Gostin LO, Larson HJ, Rabin K, et al. A global survey of
452 potential acceptance of a COVID-19 vaccine. Nat Med [Internet]. 2020 Oct 20 [cited 2021 Jan
453 28];1–4. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-1124-9>
- 454 11. Lin C, Tu P, Beitsch LM. Confidence and Receptivity for COVID-19 Vaccines: A Rapid
455 Systematic Review. Vaccines [Internet]. 2020 Dec 30 [cited 2021 Jan 28];9(1):16. Available from:
456 <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-393X/9/1/16>
- 457 12. Mega ER. Trust in COVID vaccines is growing. Nature [Internet]. 2021 Feb 10 [cited 2021 Feb

- 458 22]; Available from: <http://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-021-00368-6>
- 459 13. Imperial College London. COVID-19 Behaviour Tracker [Internet]. [cited 2021 Feb 22].
460 Available from:
461 [https://ichpanalytics.imperialcollegehealthpartners.com/t/BDAU/views/YouGovICLCOVID-](https://ichpanalytics.imperialcollegehealthpartners.com/t/BDAU/views/YouGovICLCOVID-19BehaviourTracker/4Allbehaviorsovertime?%3Aiid=1&%3AisGuestRedirectFromVizportal=y&%3Aembed=y)
462 [19BehaviourTracker/4Allbehaviorsovertime?%3Aiid=1&%3AisGuestRedirectFromVizportal=y&](https://ichpanalytics.imperialcollegehealthpartners.com/t/BDAU/views/YouGovICLCOVID-19BehaviourTracker/4Allbehaviorsovertime?%3Aiid=1&%3AisGuestRedirectFromVizportal=y&%3Aembed=y)
463 [%3Aembed=y](https://ichpanalytics.imperialcollegehealthpartners.com/t/BDAU/views/YouGovICLCOVID-19BehaviourTracker/4Allbehaviorsovertime?%3Aiid=1&%3AisGuestRedirectFromVizportal=y&%3Aembed=y)
- 464 14. Bhopal S, Nielsen M. Vaccine hesitancy in low- and middle-income countries: potential
465 implications for the COVID-19 response. Arch Dis Child [Internet]. 2021 Feb 1 [cited 2021 Jan
466 28];106(2):113–4. Available from: <https://www.>
- 467 15. Malik AA, McFadden SAM, Elharake J, Omer SB. Determinants of COVID-19 vaccine
468 acceptance in the US. EClinicalMedicine [Internet]. 2020 Sep 1 [cited 2021 Jan 28];26:100495.
469 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100495>
- 470 16. Szilagyi PG, Thomas K, Shah MD, Vizueta N, Cui Y, Vangala S, et al. National Trends in the US
471 Public’s Likelihood of Getting a COVID-19 Vaccine - April 1 to December 8, 2020 [Internet].
472 Vol. 325, JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association. American Medical Association;
473 2021 [cited 2021 Jan 28]. p. 396–8. Available from: <https://jamanetwork.com/>
- 474 17. Al-Mohaithef M, Padhi BK. Determinants of COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance in Saudi Arabia: A
475 Web-Based National Survey. J Multidiscip Healthc [Internet]. 2020 Nov 20 [cited 2021 Jan
476 28];Volume 13:1657–63. Available from: [https://www.dovepress.com/determinants-of-covid-19-](https://www.dovepress.com/determinants-of-covid-19-vaccine-acceptance-in-saudi-arabia-a-web-base-peer-reviewed-article-JMDH)
477 [vaccine-acceptance-in-saudi-arabia-a-web-base-peer-reviewed-article-JMDH](https://www.dovepress.com/determinants-of-covid-19-vaccine-acceptance-in-saudi-arabia-a-web-base-peer-reviewed-article-JMDH)
- 478 18. Bell S, Clarke R, Mounier-Jack S, Walker JL, Paterson P. Parents’ and guardians’ views on the
479 acceptability of a future COVID-19 vaccine: A multi-methods study in England. Vaccine. 2020
480 Nov 17;38(49):7789–98.
- 481 19. Malik AA, McFadden SAM, Elharake J, Omer SB. Determinants of COVID-19 vaccine

- 482 acceptance in the US. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2020 Sep 1;26:100495.
- 483 20. Alqudeimat Y, Alenezi D, AlHajri B, Alfouzan H, Almokhaizeem Z, Altamimi S, et al.
484 Acceptance of a COVID-19 Vaccine and its Related Determinants among the General Adult
485 Population in Kuwait. *Med Princ Pract* [Internet]. 2021 Jan 22 [cited 2021 Jan 28]; Available
486 from: <https://www.karger.com/Article/FullText/514636>
- 487 21. Xiao X, Wong RM. Vaccine hesitancy and perceived behavioral control: A meta-analysis. Vol. 38,
488 Vaccine. Elsevier Ltd; 2020. p. 5131–8.
- 489 22. Nichol KL, Zimmerman R. Generalist and subspecialist physicians' knowledge, attitudes, and
490 practices regarding influenza and pneumococcal vaccinations for elderly and other high-risk
491 patients. *Arch Intern Med* [Internet]. 2001 Dec 10 [cited 2021 Feb 9];161(22):2702–8. Available
492 from: <https://jamanetwork.com/>
- 493 23. Mesch GS, Schwirian KP. Vaccination hesitancy: fear, trust, and exposure expectancy of an Ebola
494 outbreak. *Heliyon* [Internet]. 2019 Jul 1 [cited 2021 Feb 9];5(7). Available from:
495 [/pmc/articles/PMC6646874/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/6646874/)
- 496 24. Setbon M, Raude J. Factors in vaccination intention against the pandemic influenza A/H1N1. *Eur*
497 *J Public Health* [Internet]. 2010 Oct 1 [cited 2021 Feb 9];20(5):490–4. Available from:
498 <https://academic.oup.com/eurpub/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/eurpub/ckq054>
- 499 25. Li Y Der, Chi WY, Su JH, Ferrall L, Hung CF, Wu TC. Coronavirus vaccine development: from
500 SARS and MERS to COVID-19 [Internet]. Vol. 27, *Journal of Biomedical Science*. BioMed
501 Central Ltd; 2020 [cited 2021 Feb 9]. p. 104. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12929-020-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12929-020-00695-2)
502 [00695-2](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12929-020-00695-2)
- 503 26. Batista Ferrer H, Audrey S, Trotter C, Hickman M. An appraisal of theoretical approaches to
504 examining behaviours in relation to Human Papillomavirus (HPV) vaccination of young women.
505 Vol. 81, *Preventive Medicine*. Academic Press Inc.; 2015. p. 122–31.

- 506 27. Fisher WA, Kohut T, Salisbury CMA, Salvadori MI. Understanding human papillomavirus
507 vaccination intentions: Comparative utility of the theory of reasoned action and the theory of
508 planned behavior in vaccine target age women and men. *J Sex Med* [Internet]. 2013 [cited 2021
509 Feb 2];10(10):2455–64. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23745833/>
- 510 28. Guo N, Wang J, Nicholas S, Maitland E, Zhu D. Behavioral Differences in the Preference for
511 Hepatitis B Virus Vaccination: A Discrete Choice Experiment. *Vaccines* [Internet]. 2020 Sep 14
512 [cited 2021 Feb 2];8(3):527. Available from: <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-393X/8/3/527>
- 513 29. Corace KM, Srigley JA, Hargadon DP, Yu D, MacDonald TK, Fabrigar LR, et al. Using behavior
514 change frameworks to improve healthcare worker influenza vaccination rates: A systematic
515 review. Vol. 34, *Vaccine*. Elsevier Ltd; 2016. p. 3235–42.
- 516 30. Alhalaseh L, Fayoumi H, Khalil B. The Health Belief Model in predicting healthcare workers'
517 intention for influenza vaccine uptake in Jordan. *Vaccine*. 2020 Oct 27;38(46):7372–8.
- 518 31. Britt RK, Englebert AM. Behavioral determinants for vaccine acceptability among rurally located
519 college students. *Heal Psychol Behav Med* [Internet]. 2018 Jan 1 [cited 2021 Feb 2];6(1):262–76.
520 Available from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21642850.2018.1505519>
- 521 32. Jarrett C, Wilson R, O'Leary M, Eckersberger E, Larson HJ, Eskola J, et al. Strategies for
522 addressing vaccine hesitancy - A systematic review. Vol. 33, *Vaccine*. Elsevier Ltd; 2015. p.
523 4180–90.
- 524 33. World Health Organization; Behavioural considerations for acceptance and uptake of COVID-19
525 vaccines: WHO Technical Advisory Group on Behavioural Insights and Sciences for Health,
526 meeting report, 15 October 2020. [Internet]. 2020. Available from:
527 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/337335>
- 528 34. Worldometer. Bangladesh Population (2021) [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Mar 29]. Available
529 from: <https://www.worldometers.info/world-population/bangladesh-population/>

- 530 35. Islam A, Sayeed MA, Rahman MK, Ferdous J, Shano S, Choudhury SD, et al. Spatiotemporal
531 patterns and trends of community transmission of the pandemic COVID-19 in South Asia:
532 Bangladesh as a case study. *Biosaf Heal*. 2021 Feb 1;3(1):39–49.
- 533 36. Kouyaté RA, Ahmed S, Haver J, McKaig C, Akter N, Nash-Mercado A, et al. Transition from the
534 Lactational Amenorrhea Method to other modern family planning methods in rural Bangladesh:
535 Barrier analysis and implications for behavior change communication program intervention
536 design. *Eval Program Plann*. 2015;50:10–7.
- 537 37. Kittle BL. *A Practical Guide to Conducting a Barrier Analysis*. 2017;1–186. Available from:
538 [http://www.coregroup.org/storage/barrier/Practical_Guide_to_Conducting_a_Barrier_Analysis_O](http://www.coregroup.org/storage/barrier/Practical_Guide_to_Conducting_a_Barrier_Analysis_Oct_2013.pdf)
539 [ct_2013.pdf](http://www.coregroup.org/storage/barrier/Practical_Guide_to_Conducting_a_Barrier_Analysis_Oct_2013.pdf)
- 540 38. Tom D, Srinivasan A. *Ebola Barrier Analysis Compendium: Summary of Barrier Analysis Studies*
541 *on Ebola-Related Behaviors*. 2016.
- 542 39. World Vision. *Capacity Statement: World Vision 's COVID-19 Vaccine Response*.
- 543 40. Zangana A, Shabila N, Heath T, White S. The determinants of handwashing behaviour among
544 internally displaced women in two camps in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. Moore G, editor. *PLoS*
545 *One* [Internet]. 2020 May 8 [cited 2020 Dec 27];15(5):e0231694. Available from:
546 <https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0231694>
- 547 41. Kouyaté RA, Ahmed S, Haver J, McKaig C, Akter N, Nash-Mercado A, et al. Transition from the
548 Lactational Amenorrhea Method to other modern family planning methods in rural Bangladesh:
549 Barrier analysis and implications for behavior change communication program intervention
550 design. *Eval Program Plann* [Internet]. 2015 Jun 1 [cited 2018 Oct 1];50:10–7. Available from:
551 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S014971891400130X>
- 552 42. Moyo G, Magaisa T, Pagiwa A, Kandawasvika R, Nyanga L, Gomora Z, et al. Identifying Barriers
553 and Enablers to Exclusive Breastfeeding in Mwenezi and Chiredzi Districts, Zimbabwe. *Curr Dev*

- 554 Nutr [Internet]. 2020 Jun 1 [cited 2020 Dec 27];4(Supplement_2):249–249. Available from:
555 https://academic.oup.com/cdn/article/4/Supplement_2/249/5844868
- 556 43. Daniel S, Subramanian J, Sharmin E, Williams R, Efraim S, Abhishek S, et al. Barriers to latrine
557 use for defecation among mothers of children less than 59 months. 2017;4(2):565–71.
- 558 44. Davis T. Barrier Analysis Facilitator’s Guide: A Tool for Improving Behavior Change
559 Communication in Child Survival and Community Development Programs. 2010;1–110.
560 Available from: http://www.coregroup.org/storage/Tools/Barrier_Analysis_2010.pdf
- 561 45. The TOPS Program. Designing for Behavior Change: For Agriculture, Natural Resource
562 Management, and Gender. 2016;(November). Available from: www.thetopsprogram.org
- 563 46. Moyo G, Magaisa T, Pagiwa A, Kandawasvika R, Nyanga L, Gomora Z, et al. Identifying Barriers
564 and Enablers to Exclusive Breastfeeding in Mwenezi and Chiredzi Districts, Zimbabwe. Curr Dev
565 Nutr [Internet]. 2020 Jun 1 [cited 2021 Mar 1];4(Supplement_2):249–249. Available from:
566 https://academic.oup.com/cdn/article/4/Supplement_2/249/5844868
- 567 47. Choudhary M, Solomon R, Awale J, Dey R. Demand-side determinants of timely vaccination of
568 oral polio vaccine in social mobilization network areas of CORE Group polio project in Uttar
569 Pradesh, India. BMC Infect Dis [Internet]. 2018 May 16 [cited 2020 Dec 27];18(1):222. Available
570 from: <https://bmcinfectdis.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12879-018-3129-2>
- 571 48. Ghimire S, Shrestha N, Callahan K. Barriers to Dietary Salt Reduction among Hypertensive
572 Patients - PubMed. J Nepal Heal Res Counc [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2020 Dec 27];16(39)(Apr-
573 Jun):124–30. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29983423/>
- 574 49. Aspros N, Komarek T, Dibaya C, Dioukhane M, Traore F, Schuh T, et al. Barrier analysis to
575 improve utilization of a novel cervical cancer screening program in rural Senegal. Ann Glob Heal
576 [Internet]. 2016 Aug 20 [cited 2020 Dec 27];82(3):384. Available from:
577 <https://annalsofglobalhealth.org/articles/10.1016/j.aogh.2016.04.625>

- 578 50. DGHS. Bangladesh Preparedness and Response Plan for COVID - 19. 2020;(July).
- 579 51. Davis T and Srinivasan A. Ebola Barrier Analysis Compendium: Summary of Barrier Analysis
580 Studies on Ebola-related Behaviors. [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2020 Dec 27]. Available from:
581 https://www.fsnnetwork.org/sites/default/files/BA_Ebola_Compendium.pdf
- 582 52. Oraby T, Thampi V, Bauch CT. The influence of social norms on the dynamics of vaccinating
583 behaviour for paediatric infectious diseases. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* [Internet]. 2014 Feb 12 [cited
584 2021 Feb 22];281(1780). Available from: <http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org>.
- 585 53. Paterson P, Meurice F, Stanberry LR, Glismann S, Rosenthal SL, Larson HJ. Vaccine hesitancy
586 and healthcare providers. *Vaccine*. 2016 Dec 20;34(52):6700–6.
- 587 54. Larson HJ, Jarrett C, Eckersberger E, Smith DMD, Paterson P. Understanding vaccine hesitancy
588 around vaccines and vaccination from a global perspective: A systematic review of published
589 literature, 2007-2012. Vol. 32, *Vaccine*. Elsevier BV; 2014. p. 2150–9.
- 590 55. Karafillakis E, Dinca I, Apfel F, Cecconi S, Würz A, Takacs J, et al. Vaccine hesitancy among
591 healthcare workers in Europe: A qualitative study. *Vaccine*. 2016 Sep 22;34(41):5013–20.
- 592 56. Peretti-Watel P, Larson HJ, Ward JK, Schulz WS, Verger P. Vaccine hesitancy: Clarifying a
593 theoretical framework for an ambiguous notion. *PLoS Curr* [Internet]. 2015 Feb 25 [cited 2021
594 Feb 22];7(OUTBREAKS). Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC4353679/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26141441/)
- 595 57. Gauld NJ, Braganza CS, Babalola OO, Huynh TT, Hook SM. Reasons for use and non-use of the
596 pertussis vaccine during pregnancy: an interview study. *J Prim Health Care* [Internet]. 2016 Dec 1
597 [cited 2021 Feb 22];8(4):344. Available from: <http://www.publish.csiro.au/?paper=HC15049>
- 598 58. Wiley KE, Cooper SC, Wood N, Leask J. Understanding pregnant women’s attitudes and behavior
599 toward influenza and pertussis vaccination. *Qual Health Res* [Internet]. 2015 Mar 13 [cited 2021
600 Feb 22];25(3):360–70. Available from:
601 <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1049732314551061>

602

603

604

605

606

607

608 **Tables**

609 **Table 1: Perceived Social Norms**

Determinants/response	Doers n (%)	Non- Doers n (%)	Diff.	Odds Ratio	95% CI	ERR	p-value
Perceived Social Norms: Proportion of people you know will get vaccine?							
a. Most people would get the vaccine	38 (84)	12 (27)	58%	14.93	5.26- 42.33	1.96	0.000
b. About half of people would get it	7 (16)	17 (38)	-22%	0.3	0.11-0.83	0.75	0.015
c. Very few people would get it	1 (2)	13 (29)	-27%	0.06	0.01-0.45	0.29	0.000
d. Don't know / won't say	0	3 (7)	-7%	0		0	0.121
Perceived Social Norms: Who approves?							
Father	23 (51)	12 (27)	24%	2.88	1.19-6.95	1.2	0.015
Mother	18 (40)	5 (11)	29%	5.33	1.77-16.1	1.27	0.002
Spouse	12 (27)	12 (27)	0%	1	0.39-2.55	1	0.594
Other family members	14 (31)	7 (16)	16%	2.45	0.88-6.82	1.15	0.067
Son	12 (27)	8 (18)	9%	1.68	0.61-4.62	1.09	0.224
Daughter	11 (24)	5 (11)	13%	2.59	0.82-8.19	1.15	0.083

Friends	28 (62)	17 (38)	24%	2.71	1.16-6.36	1.21	0.017
Neighbors	8 (18)	8(18)	0%	1	0.34-2.95	1	0.608
Teachers	7 (16)	1 (2)	13%	8.11	0.95-68.88	1.23	0.029
Colleagues	16 (36)	9 (20)	16%	2.21	0.85-5.72	1.14	0.079
Social Norms: Who disapproves?							
No one disapproves	32 (71)	3 (7)	64%	34.46	9.05-131.22	1.72	0.000
Father	9 (20)	11 (24)	-4%	0.77	0.28-2.1	0.95	0.400
Mother	6 (13)	18(40)	-27%	0.23	0.08-0.66	0.68	0.004
Spouse	4 (9)	9 (20)	-11%	0.39	0.11-1.38	0.79	0.115
Elderly member/relatives	7 (16)	18 (40)	-24%	0.28	0.1-0.75	0.73	0.009
Son	0	3 (7)	-7%	0		0	0.121
Daughter	1 (2)	5 (11)	-9%	0.18	0.02-1.62	0.56	0.101
Friends	7 (16)	14 (31)	-16%	0.41	0.15-1.14	0.81	0.067
The people who will not take the vaccine	3 (7)	13 (29)	-22%	0.18	0.05-0.67	0.58	0.006
Perceived Social Norms: Will most of your close family and friends would want you to get a COVID-19 vaccine?							
A. Yes	32 (71)	18 (40)	31%	3.69	1.53-8.89	1.31	0.003
B. No.	10 (22)	22 (49)	-27%	0.3	0.12-0.75	0.76	0.007
C. Don't know / won't say	3 (7)	5 (11)	-4%	0.57	0.13-2.55	0.88	0.357
Perceived Social Norms: Will most of your community leaders and religious leaders want you to get a COVID-19 vaccine?							
A. Yes	35 (78)	23 (51)	27%	3.35	1.34-8.35	1.31	0.007
B. No.	6 (13)	19 (42)	-29%	0.21	0.07-0.6	0.66	0.002
C. Don't know / won't say	4 (9)	3 (7)	2%	1.37	0.29-6.48	1.05	0.500
Social Norms: Get it if doctor or nurse recommends?							
a. Very likely	42 (93)	14 (31)	62%	31	8.19-117.28	3.18	0.000

b. Somewhat likely	3 (7)	20 (44)	-38%	0.09	0.02-0.33	0.44	0.000
c. Not likely	1 (2)	9 (20)	-18%	0.09	0.01-0.75	0.38	0.008
D. Don't know / won't say	1(2)	2 (4)	-2%	0.49	0.04-5.59	0.84	0.500

610

611

612

613

614

615 **Table 2: Perceived safety and risk**

Determinants/response	Doers n (%)	Non- Doers n (%)	Diff.	Odds Ratio	95% CI	ERR	p-value
Safety: How safe would it be for you to get a COVID-19 vaccine?							
a. Not safe at all	7 (16)	28 (62)	-47%	0.11	0.04-0.31	0.57	0.000
b. Mostly safe	26 (58)	8 (18)	40%	6.33	2.41-16.6	1.36	0.000
c. Very safe	11 (24)	3 (7)	18%	4.53	1.17-17.6	1.21	0.019
d. Don't know / won't say	1 (2)	6 (13)	-11%	0.15	0.02-1.28	0.5	0.055
Perceived Risk / Susceptibility - Likelihood of someone in your HH getting COVID-19 over next 3 months?							
a. Very likely	25 (56)	4 (9)	47%	12.81	3.92- 41.83	1.43	0.000
b. Somewhat likely	11 (24)	24 (53)	-29%	0.28	0.12-0.69	0.76	0.005
c. Not likely at all	7 (16)	15 (33)	-18%	0.37	0.13-1.02	0.79	0.042
d. Don't know / won't say	2 (4)	2 (4)	0%	1	0.13-7.43	1	0.692
Perceived Risk / Susceptibility - How concerned are you about getting COVID-19?							
a. Not concerned at all	5 (11)	1 (2)	9%	5.5	0.62-	1.2	0.101

					49.11		
b. A little concerned	5 (11)	21 (47)	-36%	0.14	0.05-0.43	0.57	0.000
c. Moderately concerned.	13 (29)	15 (33)	-4%	0.81	0.33-1.99	0.96	0.410
d. Very concerned	22 (49)	8 (18)	31%	4.42	1.69-11.6	1.27	0.002

616

617

618

619

620

621 **Table 3: Perceived self-efficacy**

Determinants/response	Doers n (%)	Non- Doers n (%)	Diff.	Odds Ratio	95% CI	ERR	p-value
Self-Efficacy: What would make it easier?							
If vaccine is provided by government health centers or hospitals	23 (51)	5 (11)	40%	8.36	2.79- 25.08	1.36	0.000
School-based vaccination centers	21 (47)	8 (18)	29%	4.05	1.55- 10.60	1.25	0.003
If proper health and safety (COVID-19) protocols are maintained while giving vaccine	20 (44)	8 (18)	27%	3.7	1.41-9.70	1.23	0.006
If the vaccines are given at home	15 (33)	27 (60)	-27%	0.33	0.14-0.79	0.8	0.010
If the vaccines are provided by establishing kiosks	18 (40)	4 (9)	31%	6.83	2.08- 22.40	1.29	0.001
When the vaccine is truly effective	12 (27)	15 (33)	-7%	0.73	0.29-1.80	0.94	0.323
If the vaccines are provided in every house	15 (33)	27 (60)	-27%	0.33	0.14-0.79	0.8	0.010

If vaccines are given by experienced health workers	14 (31)	9 (20)	11%	1.81	0.69-4.74	1.11	0.167
Community/Para-based vaccination campaign	10 (22)	5 (11)	11%	2.29	0.71-7.33	1.13	0.129
Awareness raising on the positive aspects through social media, TV, mike	9 (20)	16 (36)	-16%	0.45	0.17-1.17	0.84	0.079
When the vaccines do not have any side effects	4 (9)	16 (36)	-27%	0.18	0.05-0.58	0.6	0.002
Mosque-based vaccination program	8 (18)	5 (11)	7%	1.73	0.52-5.76	1.09	0.275
Prior notice on the schedule and maintaining that schedule	16 (36)	7 (20)	20%	3	1.09-8.23	1.19	0.026
Equal opportunity	8 (18)	6 (13)	4%	1.41	0.44-4.44	1.06	0.386
Vaccine distribution by NGO	8 (18)	4 (9)	9%	2.22	0.62-7.97	1.13	0.176
Enough human resources	12 (27)	10 (22)	4%	1.27	0.49-3.34	1.04	0.403
Having vaccine at the workplace	3 (7)	5 (11)	-4%	0.57	0.13-2.55	0.88	0.357
Self-Efficacy: What would make it Difficult?							
If the vaccinators are not skilled	16 (36)	6 (13)	22%	3.59	1.25-103	1.21	0.013
If there are no health measures in the vaccination center due to overcrowd (Risk of getting infected with COVID-19 while vaccinating)	18 (40)	4 (9)	31%	6.83	2.08-22.4	1.29	0.001
If the vaccine is not effective	13 (29)	22 (49)	-20%	0.42	0.18-101	0.84	0.041
If the vaccinator does not follow proper COVID-19 preventive measures	19 (42)	7 (16)	27%	3.97	1.46-10.8	1.24	0.005
If there is corruption, syndicate and misuse of power while distribution	13 (29)	19 (42)	-13%	0.56	0.23-1.33	0.89	0.135
If the vaccines are provided by organizations other than government hospitals or health centers	6 (13)	9 (20)	-7%	0.62	0.2-1.9	0.9	0.286
If it requires more time to get vaccinated	4 (9)	9 (20)	-11%	0.39	0.11-1.38	0.79	0.115
If the vaccination center is far from home	12 (27)	8 (18)	9%	1.68	0.61-4.62	1.09	0.224
When the vaccine has severe side-effects	3 (7)	22 (49)	-42%	0.07	0.02-0.28	0.41	0.000

If there is bribery	2 (4)	12 (27)	-22%	0.13	0.03-0.61	0.49	0.004
If political leaders influence to get vaccine to their favorite people	5 (11)	8 (18)	-7%	0.58	0.17-1.93	0.88	0.275

622

623 **Table 4: Perceived positive and negative consequences**

Determinants/response	Doers n (%)	Non- Doers n (%)	Diff.	Odds Ratio	95% CI	ERR	p-value
Perceived Positive Consequences (Advantages)							
Reduce the risk of COVID infection	30 (67)	16 (36)	31%	3.63	1.52-8.65	1.29	0.003
Our health will be protected	18 (40)	9 (20)	20%	2.67	1.04-6.85	1.17	0.032
Can move easily	14 (31)	15 (33)	-2%	0.9	0.37-2.19	0.98	0.500
Will get fearless life	17 (38)	14 (31)	7%	1.34	0.56-3.22	1.06	0.329
We can attend social and cultural activities	14 (31)	3 (7)	24%	6.32	1.67-23.9	1.25	0.003
Elderly and children can easily move here and there	8 (18)	3 (7)	11%	3.03	0.75-12.3	1.16	0.098
Children can start their school again	17 (38)	5 (11)	27%	4.86	1.6-14.7	1.25	0.003
All economic activities will get back to normal and increase	19 (42)	9 (20)	22%	2.92	1.14-7.48	1.19	0.020
Reduction in COVID-19-related costs (mask, hand sanitizer, detergents, primary medicine, COVID-19 test etc).	16 (36)	3 (7)	29%	7.72	2.06-28.9	1.28	0.001
Anxiety free life	9 (20)	2 (4)	16%	5.38	1.09-26.5	1.22	0.025
New Employment/income source will be increased	17 (38)	3 (7)	31%	8.5	2.28-31.7	1.3	0.000
Use of public transportation	5 (11)	2 (4)	7%	2.69	0.49-14.6	1.14	0.217
Family members will be safe	12 (27)	8 (18)	9%	1.68	0.61-4.62	1.09	0.224
Attend prayers in congregation	16 (36)	4 (9)	27%	5.66	1.71-18.7	1.26	0.002

Won't need to follow health measures (social distance, wear mask and frequent handwashing)	23 (51)	12 (27)	24%	2.88	1.19-6.95	1.2	0.015
No positive outcome	0	5 (11)					
Perceived Negative Consequences (Disadvantages)							
Weakness	23 (51)	9 (20)	31%	4.18	1.64-10.7	1.27	0.002
Body ache	15 (33)	5 (11)	22%	4	1.31-12.2	1.22	0.010
Women may get beard and moustache	4 (9)	13 (29)	-20%	0.24	0.07-0.81	0.67	0.015
Fever	18 (40)	12 (27)	13%	1.83	0.75-4.46	1.11	0.132
Itching and skin problem	17 (38)	3 (7)	31%	8.5	2.28-31.7	1.3	0.000
Life threatening side effects	7 (16)	24 (53)	-38%	0.16	0.06-0.44	0.63	0.000
Unknown diseases	6 (13)	18 (40)	-27%	0.23	0.08-0.66	0.68	0.004
Different chronic diseases (Cancer, Kidney, diabetes)	9 (20)	19 (42)	-22%	0.34	0.13-0.88	0.78	0.020
Infertility	3 (7)	15 (33)	-27%	0.14	0.04-0.54	0.54	0.001
Convulsion	4 (9)	11 (24)	-16%	0.3	0.09-1.03	0.73	0.044
Hormonal imbalance	5 (11)	7 (16)	-4%	0.68	0.2-2.32	0.92	0.379
Vomiting and dizziness	8 (18)	4 (9)	9%	2.22	0.62-7.97	1.13	0.176
People would get reluctant on following health measures	9 (20)	3 (7)	13%	3.5	0.88-13.92	1.18	0.059
Perceived Social Norms: Proportion of people you know will get vaccine?							
a. Most people would get the vaccine	38 (84)	12 (27)	58%	14.93	5.26-42.33	1.96	0.000
b. About half of people would get it	7 (16)	17 (38)	-22%	0.3	0.11-0.83	0.75	0.015
c. Very few people would get it	1 (2)	13 (29)	-27%	0.06	0.01-0.45	0.29	0.000
d. Don't know / won't say	0	3 (7)	-7%	0		0	0.121

624

625 **Table 5: Perceived action efficacy and trust in COVID-19 vaccine.**

Determinants/response	Doers n (%)	Non- Doers n (%)	Diff.	Odds Ratio	95% CI	ERR	p-value
Action Efficacy - Likelihood of getting COVID-19 after getting COVID-19 vaccine?							
a. Very likely	11 (24)	3 (7)	18%	4.53	1.17-17.6	1.21	0.019
b. Somewhat likely	22 (49)	6 (13)	36%	6.22	2.2-17.6	1.31	0.000
c. Not likely at all	2 (4)	19 (42)	-38%	0.06	0.01-0.3	0.35	0.000
d. Don't know / won't say	10 (22)	17 (38)	-16%	0.47	0.19-1.19	0.85	0.083
Trust (in information) - How much would you trust a COVID-19 vaccine?							
a. Not trust it at all	2 (4)	14 (31)	-27%	0.1	0.02-0.49	0.44	0.001
b. Trust it a little	6 (13)	23 (51)	-38%	0.15	0.05-0.42	0.6	0.000
c. Trust it a moderate amount	19 (42)	6 (13)	29%	4.75	1.67-13.5	1.26	0.002
d. Trust it a lot	18 (40)	2 (4)	36%	14.33	3.08-66.7	1.34	0.000

626

627

628

629

630 **Table 6: Perceived severity and perceived access.**

Determinants/response	Doers n (%)	Non- Doers n (%)	Diff.	Odds Ratio	95% CI	ERR	p-value
Severity - How serious if someone in your HH got COVID-19?							
a. Very serious	27 (60)	12 (27)	33%	4.13	1.69-10.1	1.3	0.001
b. Somewhat serious	10 (22)	11 (24)	-2%	0.88	0.33-2.35	0.98	0.500
c. Not serious at all	8 (18)	16 (36)	-18%	0.39	0.15-1.04	0.81	0.047
d. Don't know / won't say	0	6 (13)	-13%	0		0	0.013

Access - How difficult for you to get to the clinic where vaccines are normally offered?							
A. Very difficult	8 (18)	28 (62)	-44%	0.13	0.05-0.35	0.61	0.000
B. Somewhat difficult	20 (44)	5 (11)	33%	6.4	2.13-19.23	1.3	0.000
C. Not difficult at all	17 (38)	12 (27)	11%	1.67	0.68-4.08	1.1	0.184
Access - Expected queue time							
A. 0-30 mins	7 (16)	7 (16)	0%	1	0.32-3.13	1	0.614
B. 31-60 mins	1 (2)	4 (9)	-7%	0.23	0.02-2.17	0.63	0.180
C. 1 hr - 1.5 hrs	3 (7)	6 (13)	-7%	0.46	0.11-1.98	0.83	0.242
D. 1.5 - 2.0 hrs	12 (27)	3 (7)	20%	5.09	1.33-19.54	1.23	0.011
E. 2-3 hrs	22 (49)	25 (56)	-7%	0.77	0.33-1.75	0.95	0.337

631 **Table 7: Perceived divine will and culture/rumors.**

Determinants/response	Doers n (%)	Non- Doers n (%)	Diff.	Odds Ratio	95% CI	ERR	p-value
Divine Will - Does God/Allah/the gods approve or disapprove of people getting COVID-19 vaccine?							
a. Believe God/Allah/gods approve	36 (80)	35 (78)	2%	1.14	0.41-3.15	1.03	0.500
b. Believe God/Allah/gods does not approve	1 (2)	0	2%			1.24	0.500
c. Believe God/Allah/gods does not approve or disapprove	0	3 (7)	-7%	0		0	0.121
d. Don't know / won't say	8 (18)	7 (16)	2%	1.17	0.39-3.56	1.03	0.500
Divine Will - Agree/disagree with "whether I get COVID-19 or not is purely a matter of God's will or chance.							
a. Agree a little	10 (22)	15 (33)	-11%	0.57	0.22-1.46	0.89	0.173
b. Agree a lot	2 (4)	4 (9)	-4%	0.48	0.08-2.74	0.83	0.338

c. Disagree a little	7 (16)	13 (29)	-13%	0.45	0.16-0.83	0.83	0.102
d. Disagree a lot	26 (58)	13 (29)	29%	3.37	1.4-8.08	1.25	0.005
Culture - Any cultural or religious reasons you would not get COVID-19 vaccine?							
a. Yes	11 (24)	25 (56)	-31%	0.26	0.11-0.64	0.74	0.002
b. No	30 (67)	18 (40)	27%	3	1.27-7.09	1.25	0.010
c. Don't know / won't say	1 (2)	2 (4)	-2%	0.49	0.04-5.59	0.84	0.500
(If yes to Culture) What reasons							
Use of pork fat while making vaccine- Islam does not allow this.	5 (11)	19 (42)	-31%	0.17	0.06-0.51	0.61	0.001
Use of haram ingredients in the vaccine	8 (18)	21 (47)	-29%	0.25	0.09-0.65	0.71	0.003
Have you seen or heard of anything that would stop you or others from seeking to get the COVID-19 vaccines?							
a. Yes	33 (73)	28 (62)	11%	1.67	0.68-4.08	1.11	0.184
b. No	12 (27)	17 (38)	-11%	0.6	0.24-1.46	0.9	0.184
If Yes to rumors) What would stop you or others from seeking the vaccine?							
Producers' hide and seek activities related to vaccine accuracy in the clinical test	16 (36)	4 (9)	27%	5.66	1.71-18.7	1.26	0.002
The virus will infect us even if we get vaccinated.	3 (7)	9 (20)	-13%	0.29	0.07-1.14	0.7	0.059
Some Islamic leader may prohibit getting the vaccine	4 (9)	7 (16)	-7%	0.53	0.14-1.95	0.86	0.261
It is not possible to produce a vaccine within a year. So, this vaccine may not work	3 (7)	12 (27)	-20%	0.2	0.05-0.75	0.61	0.011
Vaccine may not work against other strains [variants]	23 (51)	12 (27)	24%	2.88	1.19-6.95	1.2	0.015
Concern about the efficacy as many volunteers got sick/died as a result of getting the vaccines	16 (36)	26 (58)	-22%	0.4	0.17-0.94	0.84	0.028
There is no proper cold chain to preserve the vaccine, so vaccine may loss its efficacy	7 (16)	2 (4)	11%	3.96	0.78-20.2	1.19	0.079

633

634

635