



1 Article

2 **Correlates of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance, hesitancy and re-**
3 **fusal among employees of a safety net California county health**
4 **system with an early and aggressive vaccination program: Re-**
5 **sults from a cross-sectional survey**

6 Nicole M. Gatto^{1*}, Jerusha E. Lee³, Donatella Massai¹, Susanna Zamarripa², Bijan Sasaninia², Dhruv Khurana²,
7 Kelsey Michaels², Deborah Freund^{1,3}, Judi Nightingale², Anthony Firek²; for the Riverside University Health Sys-
8 tem (RUHS) Comparative Effectiveness and Clinical Outcomes Research Center (CECORC)-Claremont Graduate
9 University (CGU) COVID-19 Research Group

Citation: Gatto, NM; Lee, JE; Massai, D; Zamarripa, S; Sasaninia, B; Khurana, D; Michaels, K; Freund, D; Nightingale, J; Firek, A; for the Riverside University Health System (RUHS) Comparative Effectiveness and Clinical Outcomes Research Center (CECORC)-Claremont Graduate University (CGU) COVID-19 Research Group Corre-

lates of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance, hesitancy and refusal among employees of a safety net California county health system with an early and aggressive vaccination program: Results from a cross-sectional survey. *Vaccines* 2021, 9, x. <https://doi.org/10.3390/xxxxx>

Academic Editor: Brian Poole

Received: date

Accepted: date

Published: date

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2021 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

¹ School of Community and Global Health, Claremont Graduate University

² Riverside University Health System, Comparative Effectiveness and Clinical Outcomes Research Center

³ Department of Economic Sciences, Claremont Graduate University

*Correspondence: N.M.G. School of Community and Global Health, Claremont Graduate University, 150 E 10th St, Claremont, CA 91711 nicole.gatto@cgu.edu

Abstract: Information on vaccine acceptance among healthcare workers is needed as health professionals provide front line care to COVID-19 patients. We developed and implemented an anonymous internet-based cross-sectional survey with direct solicitation among employees of a safety net health system. Items queried demographic and health-related characteristics, experience with and knowledge of COVID-19, and determinants of decisions to vaccinate. COVID-19 vaccine acceptance groups (acceptors, hesitant, refusers) were defined; an adapted version of the WHO vaccine hesitancy scale was included. The survey demonstrated good reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.92 for vaccine hesitancy scale; 0.93 for determinants). General linear and logistic regression methods examined factors which were univariately associated with vaccine hesitancy and vaccine acceptance, respectively. Multivariable models were constructed with stepwise model-building procedures. Race/ethnicity, marital status, job classification, immunocompromised status, flu vaccination and childhood vaccination opinions independently predicted hesitancy scale scores. Gender, education, job classification and BMI independently predicted acceptance, hesitancy and refusal groups. Among hesitant employees, uncertainty was reflected in reports of motivating factors influencing their indecision. Despite a strong employee-support environment and job protection, respondents reported physical and mental health effects. Appreciation of varied reasons for refusing vaccination should lead to culturally sensitive interventions to increase vaccination rates in healthcare workers.

Keywords: vaccine hesitancy, COVID-19, pandemic, SARS-CoV-2, healthcare workers, vaccine acceptance, physicians, nurses, determinants

1. Introduction

The success of any vaccination program is dependent on a number of interconnected and interdependent actions. These include development of vaccine, testing for efficacy and safety, rapid distribution to the population and acceptance by

42 recipients. The latter issue of vaccine uptake [1] is critical, and can be characterized as
43 vaccine acceptance, refusal or hesitancy. Vaccine hesitancy is formally defined as a
44 “delay in acceptance or refusal of vaccines despite availability of vaccine services”[2],
45 and is acknowledged as complex and context-specific with the potential to vary across
46 time and place. Factors that may influence vaccine acceptance include complacency,
47 access to vaccination sources, confidence in the safety and efficacy and perceived intent
48 of the agencies providing the vaccine[3].

49 Historically, themes have characterized perspectives among individuals who are
50 vaccine hesitant in the United States (US)[4-6] and are not mutually exclusive. One is a
51 distrust of government and a desire to retain individual liberties including the right to
52 make their own decisions versus governmental-imposed actions [4,6]. Second, are
53 philosophical beliefs that stress the purity of the human body [7,8], and further, are fears
54 and controversies related to vaccine safety [6]. The spread of the more infectious
55 SARS-CoV-2 delta variant in the US and the surge in new cases mainly in the
56 unvaccinated demonstrates the liability of personal decisions on vaccine acceptance.
57 Vaccine hesitancy is global and not limited to the current COVID-19 pandemic; it has, in
58 part, been blamed for international resurgences of infectious disease outbreaks such as
59 measles, which had previously been brought under control [7].

60 Since the emergence of the SARS-CoV-2 virus in late 2019 in Wuhan, China,
61 there have been an excess of 216 million confirmed cases and 4.5 million deaths
62 globally[9], with the US having the highest number of deaths at approximately 640,000
63 as of September 1, 2021 [10]. The pandemic has strained public health and medical
64 systems, caused severe illness and death among a proportion of those infected
65 overwhelming hospitals and healthcare workers, and caused major disruptions of daily
66 life[11]. While non-pharmaceutical public health interventions (NPIs) aimed at slowing
67 the spread of SARS-CoV-2 were key components of the early pandemic response, the
68 availability of vaccines against COVID-19 beginning in January 2021 in the US has
69 enhanced and strengthened primary prevention strategies. As such, vaccine uptake
70 among populations eligible for vaccination is essential to ending the pandemic.

71 A consequence of the rapid development of successful vaccines during the
72 COVID-19 pandemic has brought into refocus the issue of vaccine hesitancy, which the
73 WHO has previously identified as one of the top ten global health threats of 2019
74 [12]. Surveys of the general US population between November 2020 and March 2021
75 prior to when the current study was conducted showed that the proportion who plan to
76 be vaccinated has increased during this time. However, depending on the survey, 14-17%
77 have expressed hesitancy and 10-15% report that they definitely won't get
78 vaccinated[13-16]. This raises concerns as to whether reaching herd immunity in the US
79 will be achievable.

80 While the US population has been surveyed recurrently and assessments
81 provide insights into factors influencing a person's decision to accept vaccination [17-21],
82 fewer studies of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy have focused on healthcare workers and
83 health system employees [22-24]. One survey between September and October 2020

84 found that 35% of health system employees expressed apprehension concerning the
85 possibility of serious adverse events from vaccines, with 67% reporting they would
86 delay COVID-19 vaccination if a vaccine became available[22]. A Kaiser Family
87 Foundation/Washington Post survey in March 2021 indicated that 48% of healthcare
88 workers surveyed had not been vaccinated with 12% undecided about vaccination and
89 18% not planning to get vaccinated[25]. A review of studies among healthcare workers
90 which included several from the US identified common reasons provided by hesitant
91 employees [26]. However, all surveys were conducted prior to vaccines becoming
92 available in the US or within the first month after they were administered and suggested
93 that the fraction of the population that is hesitant may have decreased over the one-year
94 period covered by the review, indicating as did another study [27] that timing may have
95 had an effect on hesitancy.

96 Information on vaccine acceptance, hesitancy and refusal among healthcare
97 workers is needed as doctors, nurses, physician assistants, pharmacists and other
98 health professionals provide front line care to COVID-19 patients. Frontline workers
99 directly interact with patients, thereby having a high potential for exposure to the
100 SARS-CoV-2 virus, emphasizing the essential need for protection through vaccination.
101 In fact, healthcare workers were among the first groups to be eligible for COVID-19
102 vaccination in the US and California [11]. Additionally, health professionals serve as a
103 direct and trusted source of information for patients [28], raising the question as to
104 whether their opinions on vaccination could indirectly influence the medical advice
105 they provide. Illustrating this concern, research among French physicians
106 demonstrated high vaccination hesitancy translated into lower vaccine
107 recommendations to their patients [29].

108 There is a present and unmet need to better understand vaccine uptake in
109 healthcare workers and influences underlying their decisions. This is critical so that
110 actions can be taken to both persuade them to be vaccinated and to retain their
111 employment given potential shortages during times of spikes in the demand for hospital
112 care. In response to this need, many states have begun to mandate vaccination among
113 health workers [30]. As determined by earlier studies, vaccine acceptance or refusal
114 among healthcare workers may or may not have distinct determinants from those for
115 other populations and other types of vaccines [23,26,31]. Understanding determinants
116 among healthcare workers and health system employees could lead to more focused
117 worker- and patient-centered educational and other interventions, as employment
118 retention and achieving herd immunity are critical to “ending” COVID-19 pandemic in
119 these populations. This is particularly true in safety net medical centers that treat the
120 most vulnerable who are at higher risk for COVID-19 complications and death. The
121 Riverside University Health System (RUHS) medical center serves a large and highly
122 disadvantaged predominantly multi-ethnic population. An early and aggressive
123 COVID-19 vaccination program was initiated that virtually assured any employee access
124 to the first vaccines. As such, this program essentially eliminated issues with employee
125 access which have been acknowledged as barriers to vaccination [32]. Nevertheless,

126 concern over continued hesitancy and refusal in this group remains significant
127 particularly in light of SARS-CoV-2 variant surges.

128 We formed an interdisciplinary team of health professionals and designed a study
129 with a two-fold objective. First, we assessed levels of vaccine uptake categorized as ac-
130 ceptance, refusal or hesitancy in RUHS employees using an anonymous internet-based
131 cross-sectional survey with direct employee solicitation. Second, we sought to under-
132 stand determinants of decisions to vaccinate and of vaccine hesitancy and refusal. We
133 focused on potential factors for which educational and other interventions could be tar-
134 geted. This research paper offers results of a survey of healthcare workers fielded after
135 the emergency use authorization (EUA) and use of the Pfizer, Moderna and Johnson &
136 Johnson vaccines in the US.

137 **2. Materials and Methods**

138 *2.1 Study Design and Population*

139 Beginning in November 2020, a collaboration was established between the
140 Comparative Effectiveness and Clinical Outcomes Research Center (CECORC) at
141 Riverside University Health System (RUHS) and Claremont Graduate University (CGU).
142 RUHS is an integrated health network in Riverside County, California that includes a
143 439-bed county Medical Center, 10 federally qualified health centers, several primary and
144 specialty clinics, and the departments of Behavioral and Public Health. RUHS is a safety
145 net California county health system which serves the over 2.3 million residents of
146 Riverside County.

147 A cross-sectional survey to assess vaccine hesitancy among RUHS Medical
148 Center employees was developed using survey information from previously published
149 surveys of US and Canadian adults [19-22]. The RUHS-CECORC/CGU team met
150 regularly to review and revise the survey and to plan for its administration. The finalized
151 survey instrument was adapted for administration via Survey Monkey and took about 10
152 minutes to complete (available in Supplemental Materials). All responses and
153 demographic data were collected from the survey participants directly and we did not
154 use any hospital, medical or employee records.

155 RUHS Medical Center employees were eligible and invited to participate in the
156 survey by an initial email followed by three subsequent reminder emails.
157 RUHS-CECORC staff and volunteers distributed recruitment flyers in person at the
158 medical center three mornings a week as workers entered their place of work. A total of
159 2,983 employees were eventually provided the survey. All respondents consented to
160 participate in the survey by clicking “next” after introductory text and instructions on
161 how to complete the survey.

162 The study was reviewed by the RUHS Institutional Review Board and classified as
163 exempt as all responses were collected in a de-identified manner.

165 *2.2 Survey Development and Measures*

166 *2.1.1. Demographic and health-related characteristics*

167 Questions on demographic characteristics used common US Census formats for
168 response categories. Information on current job status at RUHS was self-reported.
169 Respondents were asked if they had ever been told by a doctor or other health care
170 provider if they had one or more underlying health conditions which would put them at

171 higher risk for severe COVID-19 including diabetes, hypertension, asthma, serious heart
172 conditions, chronic lung disease, chronic kidney disease, liver disease or a weakened
173 immune system [14,15]. Individual conditions were summed to calculate total number of
174 underlying health conditions/comorbidities. We used self-reported height and weight to
175 calculate body mass index (BMI) and categorize participants into underweight/normal,
176 overweight or obese.

177 2.1.2. Experience with COVID-19

178 Our survey assessed employees' perception of their exposure to COVID-19 on a
179 weekly basis (no direct exposure, minimal, moderate or high exposure). Items asked
180 whether the respondent or anyone they knew had ever tested positive for COVID-19.
181 Given the relationship to the person, participants were asked to describe the severity of
182 their symptoms [No Symptoms, Mild (symptoms but no shortness of breath), Moderate
183 (visited doctor but no hospital stay), Severe/Critical (hospital stay), Death]. The impact of
184 the pandemic on the respondent's employment/income, mental and physical health, and
185 ability to carry out normal activities was evaluated using a Likert scale with response
186 options "severely decreased", "decreased", "no effect", "improved", "don't know".

187 Two sets of items assessed knowledge of COVID-19. Each correct response to a
188 question which included six true/false items about COVID-19 disease was summed to
189 create a disease knowledge scale (possible range 0-6). A second question asked
190 respondents to identify common symptoms of COVID-19 from among 14 presented; each
191 of ten correctly selected items were summed to create a symptom knowledge scale
192 (possible range 0-10). For both scales, a higher score indicated greater knowledge.

193 2.1.3. COVID-19 vaccine acceptance groups

194 Based on responses to three items about intent to receive a COVID-19 vaccination,
195 we defined three groups (vaccine acceptors, hesitant, refusers) as follows. Respondents
196 who reported having been vaccinated against COVID-19 (either fully or partially) or who
197 planned to be vaccinated were categorized as vaccine acceptors. Those who reported not
198 currently being vaccinated and were uncertain whether they would be vaccinated when
199 an opportunity arises either now or at a future date were categorized as vaccine hesitant.
200 Respondents who reported not currently being vaccinated, did not plan to be vaccinated
201 when an opportunity arises, and would not consider vaccination at a later date were
202 categorized as vaccine refusers.

203 2.1.4. Vaccine hesitancy

204 To measure vaccine hesitancy, we included an adapted [22] version of the
205 validated WHO SAGE working group vaccine hesitancy scale [2] for use in adults and
206 implemented among health system workers [22]. The vaccine hesitancy scale is
207 constructed using responses to eleven items which asked participants to rate their
208 opinion on a Likert scale with response options "strongly disagree", "disagree", "neutral",
209 "agree", "strongly agree". For three items, a "strongly agree" response indicated a higher
210 level of vaccine hesitancy. Other items were reverse-coded so as for their interpretation to
211 be consistent. Scores on the scale ranged from 11-55 with higher scores indicating greater
212 vaccine hesitancy.

213 2.1.5. Determinants of vaccination

214 Depending on responses to the three items querying COVID-19 vaccination
215 intention, participants were directed in the survey to a slightly different version of
216 questions asking them about influences or potential influences of their decision to be
217 vaccinated. Participants were presented with seventeen different determinants ranging
218 from contextual influences (i.e., historical, socio-cultural, political, economic or health
219 system/institutional factors), to individual and group influences (i.e., personal perception
220 or social/peer environment), to vaccine-specific issues (i.e., directly related to COVID-19
221 vaccination). Determinants related to financial incentives were formulated based on prior
222 studies [33-36]. All other items were modeled after Reiter et al. 2020 [20]; Pogue et al. 2020
223 [19]; Taylor et al. 2020 [21]. Respondents were asked to rank the level of influence on their
224 decision to be vaccinated using a Likert Scale with response options “definitely would
225 not”, “probably would not”, “not sure”, “probably would”, “definitely would”.

226 2.1.6. Other items

227 We believed it likely that individuals who did not get a flu vaccine or have their
228 children vaccinated [37,38] were also more likely to be vaccine refusers. Thus, questions
229 about annual influenza vaccination were included for comparison to determine whether
230 respondents took the flu vaccine as recommended (yes, no, skip some years).
231 Respondents were asked to rank in order of importance a series of reasons understood to
232 motivate flu vaccination including the safety and effectiveness of the vaccines; allergies to
233 the vaccine; desire not to infect co-workers, patients or family members. In addition,
234 opinions about the importance of childhood vaccinations were collected among
235 participants with children.

236 2.3 Reliability of survey

237 Constructed scales for knowledge of COVID-19 in the final survey were assessed
238 for intra-rater reliability using test-retest data from five non-survey participants to
239 calculate intraclass correlations (ICCs) of averaged scale values for each rater. The ICC
240 for the COVID-19 symptom knowledge scale was very good (ICC = 0.87) and for the
241 COVID-19 disease knowledge scale was excellent (ICC > 0.99).

242 We examined the internal consistency of the vaccine hesitancy scale and the
243 determinants of vaccination items by calculating Cronbach’s alpha among all
244 respondents who completed the survey. Both the vaccine hesitancy scale and the
245 determinants items demonstrated excellent internal consistency (standardized alpha =
246 0.92 and 0.93, respectively).

247 2.4 Statistical Analysis

248 Descriptive statistics (means, frequencies) for survey participants were
249 summarized overall and compared between groups (vaccine acceptors, hesitant, refusers)
250 using chi-square tests, Fisher’s exact test for categorical and t-tests or ANOVAs for
251 continuous variables. Statistical tests were two-tailed.

252 We used general linear regression models to examine factors that were associated
253 with vaccine hesitancy; in these models, the score on the vaccine hesitancy scale was the
254 dependent outcome variable. Estimated β coefficients and standard errors (SE) of β

255 expressed the average point difference in the vaccine hesitancy scale associated with a
 256 given variable compared to the reference group of that variable. β coefficients > 1
 257 indicated greater hesitancy for the group compared with the reference; β coefficients < 1
 258 indicated less hesitancy. We used multinomial logistic regression to identify predictors of
 259 COVID-19 vaccine acceptance comparing refusers and (separately) hesitant employees to
 260 acceptors. Estimated odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) expressed the
 261 increased or decreased likelihood associated with a given variable of being vaccine
 262 hesitant or a vaccine refuser compared with being an acceptor. Some variables were
 263 re-categorized due to small numbers of responders to that question. In model building
 264 approaches, all variables with global $p < 0.10$ in univariate analyses or for which the
 265 literature supported a relationship with vaccine hesitancy [6,8] were entered into a
 266 preliminary multivariable model. We then used stepwise procedures to retain variables
 267 with $p < 0.05$ in final multivariable linear and logistic models.

268 Responses to each of the seventeen different determinants influencing partici-
 269 pants' decision to be vaccinated were compared between the three groups of participants
 270 (vaccine acceptors, hesitant, refusers) using Kruskal-Wallis tests with Bonferroni adjust-
 271 ment to account for multiple testing (with the adjusted α set at 0.003). Effects of the
 272 COVID-19 pandemic on employment, income and health were similarly compared be-
 273 tween the three groups without Bonferroni adjustment. Analyses used SAS version 9.4
 274 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA) or RStudio version 1.3 1093 (2009-2020 RStudio, PBC,
 275 Boston, MA, USA).

276 3. Results

277 The survey was administered from March 15 – April 26, 2021 to 2,983 RUHS
 278 Medical Center employees; 791 surveys were returned for a 27% response rate. After
 279 excluding 2 records because most responses were blank or in one case, appeared to be
 280 fictitious, 789 remained. Respondents were predominantly female (79.2%), between the
 281 ages of 30-64 (83.7%), non-Hispanic white (37.7%) or Hispanic (36.8%) and had a
 282 self-reported education level of a college degree or higher (59.7%). Of those responding to
 283 the survey, 755 (95.6%) answered questions enabling a categorization into groups of
 284 vaccine acceptors, hesitant, or refusers. Vaccine hesitant and refusers were more likely to
 285 be women and to have an annual household income of less than \$50,000. Refusers were
 286 more likely to be in the 30-49-year age range. A greater proportion of vaccine hesitant had
 287 less than a college degree, and both hesitant and refusers had lower proportions with a
 288 college degree or higher (Table 1).

289 **Table 1. Characteristics of RUHS Medical Center Employees (n=789) who**
 290 **Participated in COVID-19 Vaccine Survey, by Vaccine Acceptance Status (Acceptors,**
 291 **Hesitant, Refusers)**

| Characteristic [Mean \pm SD or n (%)] | Overall n = 789 | Acceptors n = 644 (85.3%) | Hesitant n = 71 (9.4%) | Refusers n = 40 (5.3%) | p-value ² |
|---|--------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| Age | | | | | 0.03 |
| 18-29 | 106 (13.5) | 87 (13.6) | 6 (8.5) | 8 (20.0) | |
| 30-49 | 412 (52.4) | 322 (50.2) | 50 (70.4) | 21 (52.5) | |
| 50-64 | 246 (31.3) | 210 (32.8) | 15 (21.1) | 11 (27.5) | |

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| | 65+ | 22 (2.8) | 22 (3.4) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | |
| Gender | | | | | | <0.0001 |
| | Female | 624 (79.2) | 500 (77.8) | 66 (93.0) | 37 (92.5) | |
| | Male | 153 (19.4) | 138 (21.5) | 3 (4.2) | 2 (5.0) | |
| | Non-Binary | 1 (0.1) | 1 (0.2) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | |
| | Prefer Not to Answer | 10 (1.3) | 4 (0.6) | 2 (2.8) | 1 (2.5) | |
| Marital Status | | | | | | 0.7 |
| | Single | 191 (24.4) | 157 (24.5) | 13 (18.6) | 12 (30.0) | |
| | Married, civil union, living with a partner | 495 (63.2) | 404 (63.1) | 49 (70.0) | 23 (57.5) | |
| | Previously married (divorced, separated, widowed) | 97 (12.4) | 79 (12.3) | 8 (11.4) | 5 (12.5) | |
| Race/Ethnicity | | | | | | 0.16 |
| | Non-Hispanic White | 282 (37.7) | 239 (38.1) | 22 (36.7) | 14 (40.0) | |
| | Asian | 97 (13.0) | 91 (14.5) | 2 (3.3) | 2 (5.7) | |
| | Black | 66 (8.8) | 51 (8.1) | 7 (11.7) | 1 (2.9) | |
| | Hispanic | 275 (36.8) | 221 (35.3) | 27 (45.0) | 17 (48.6) | |
| | Other (Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Native American/Alaskan Native, mixed race, other) | 28 (3.7) | 25 (4.0) | 2 (3.3) | 1 (2.9) | |
| Educational level | | | | | | <0.0001 |
| | Less than college | 315 (40.3) | 234 (36.6) | 46 (65.7) | 18 (45.0) | |
| | College degree | 245 (31.3) | 210 (32.8) | 13 (18.6) | 16 (40.0) | |
| | Higher than college degree | 222 (28.4) | 196 (30.6) | 11 (15.7) | 6 (15.0) | |
| Annual Household Income | | | | | | 0.025 |
| | Less than \$50,000 | 123 (16.4) | 84 (13.6) | 18 (26.9) | 11 (28.9) | |
| | \$50,000 to \$89,000 | 176 (23.4) | 150 (24.3) | 13 (19.4) | 7 (18.4) | |
| | \$90,000 to \$119,000 | 146 (19.4) | 118 (19.1) | 13 (19.4) | 8 (21.1) | |
| | \$120,000 or above | 307 (40.8) | 265 (43.0) | 23 (34.3) | 12 (31.6) | |
| Job Classification | | | | | | 0.003 |
| | Nurse, Nursing Assistant, Medical Assistants | 296 (38.1) | 245 (38.4) | 27 (39.7) | 18 (45.0) | |
| | Doctor, PA, NP | 66 (8.5) | 61 (9.6) | 0 (0) | 2 (5.0) | |
| | Allied Health Personnel; Laboratory, respiratory therapy, radiology personnel | 102 (13.1) | 95 (14.9) | 3 (4.4) | 3 (7.5) | |
| | Administration or non-direct clinical support/Admissions and Collections Clerk | 272 (35.1) | 200 (31.4) | 37 (54.4) | 16 (40.0) | |
| | Pharmacist, Pharm Tech | 31 (4.0) | 28 (4.4) | 1 (1.5) | 1 (2.5) | |
| | Other | 9 (1.2) | 9 (1.4) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | |
| Exposure to COVID on weekly basis | | | | | | 0.14 |
| | no direct exposure | 177 (22.7) | 141 (22.1) | 19 (27.1) | 8 (20.0) | |
| | minimal exposure | 228 (29.2) | 172 (26.9) | 25 (35.7) | 17 (42.5) | |
| | moderate exposure | 200 (25.6) | 176 (27.5) | 12 (17.1) | 7 (17.5) | |
| | high exposure | 176 (22.5) | 150 (23.5) | 14 (20.0) | 8 (20.0) | |
| They or someone they know tested positive for COVID-19 | | | | | | 0.09 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|---------|
| | Yes | 604 (89.0) | 518 (89.5) | 58 (90.6) | 28 (77.8) | |
| | No | 75 (11.1) | 61 (10.5) | 6 (9.4) | 8 (22.2) | |
| Number of Chronic Conditions¹ | | | | | | 0.72 |
| | 0 | 470 (64.1) | 378 (62.6) | 39 (60.0) | 29 (76.3) | |
| | 1 | 198 (27.0) | 172 (28.5) | 19 (29.2) | 6 (15.8) | |
| | 2 | 44 (6.0) | 36 (6.0) | 5 (7.7) | 2 (5.3) | |
| | >=3 | 21 (2.9) | 8 (3.0) | 2 (3.1) | 1 (2.6) | |
| Hypertension | | | | | | 0.01 |
| | Yes | 186 (24.5) | 168 (26.8) | 12 (18.2) | 3 (7.7) | |
| | No | 573 (75.5) | 458 (73.2) | 54 (81.8) | 36 (92.3) | |
| Diabetes | | | | | | 0.99 |
| | Yes | 56 (7.5) | 48 (7.8) | 5 (7.5) | 3 (7.7) | |
| | No | 695 (92.5) | 571 (92.3) | 62 (92.5) | 36 (92.3) | |
| Asthma | | | | | | 0.05 |
| | Yes | 126 (16.7) | 99 (16.0) | 19 (27.1) | 5 (12.8) | |
| | No | 628 (83.3) | 519 (84.0) | 51 (72.9) | 34 (87.2) | |
| BMI | | | | | | 0.22 |
| | Underweight/Normal (<24.9) | 202 (28.0) | 168 (28.1) | 20 (31.7) | 11 (31.4) | |
| | Overweight (25-29.9) | 244 (33.8) | 198 (33.1) | 27 (42.9) | 9 (25.7) | |
| | Obese (30 and above) | 276 (38.2) | 233 (38.9) | 16 (25.4) | 15 (42.9) | |
| Receive Flu Vaccine Annually | | | | | | <0.0001 |
| | Yes | 540 (78.7) | 501 (85.5) | 33 (51.6) | 6 (16.7) | |
| | No | 62 (9.0) | 25 (4.3) | 16 (25.0) | 21 (58.3) | |
| | Skip some Years | 84 (12.2) | 60 (10.2) | 15 (23.4) | 9 (25.0) | |
| Important to have children vaccinated against childhood diseases²⁵ | | | | | | <0.0001 |
| | No | 14 (2.8) | 6 (1.4) | 0 (0) | 8 (27.6) | |
| | Yes | 474 (93.1) | 412 (96.9) | 47 (85.5) | 15 (51.7) | |
| | Not Sure | 21 (4.1) | 7 (1.7) | 8 (14.5) | 6 (20.7) | |
| COVID Symptom Knowledge (score, range 0 - 10)³ | | 8.8 ± 1.6 | 8.8 ± 1.5 | 8.8 ± 1.8 | 9.0 ± 2.0 | 0.77 |
| COVID Disease Knowledge (score, range 0 - 6)³ | | 5.3 ± 0.7 | 5.4 ± 0.7 | 5.0 ± 1.0 | 5.3 ± 0.6 | 0.0003 |
| Vaccine Hesitancy Scale (score, range 11 - 55)⁴ | | 21.7 ± 7.9 | 19.8 ± 6.4 | 29.8 ± 6.0 | 37.2 ± 7.4 | <0.0001 |

292 ¹including diabetes, hypertension, asthma, serious heart conditions, chronic lung disease, chronic kidney disease, liver disease, weakened immune
293 system

294 ²p-value for difference between groups from Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test; Pearson's Chi-squared test; Fisher's exact test

295 ³higher score indicates better knowledge

296 ⁴higher score indicates more hesitancy

297 ⁵among respondents with children

298

299 Job classifications of survey respondents were generally reflective of the overall
300 make-up of medical center employees of 45% nurses, 5% physicians, 19% ancillary and 30%

301 non-medical personnel, based on RUHS human resources data. Higher proportions of
302 nurses, nursing assistants and medical assistants were among the vaccine refusers and
303 higher proportions of administrative, non-clinical staff were among the vaccine hesitant.
304 Physicians and allied health personnel were more likely to be in the vaccine acceptor
305 group. Respondents were approximately evenly distributed by level of exposure to
306 COVID-19 on a weekly basis (Table 1). Eighty-nine percent either had themselves or knew
307 someone who had tested positive for COVID-19.

308 Twenty-seven percent of respondents reported having one chronic condition, with
309 hypertension being the most common (24.5%), followed by asthma (16.7%) and diabetes
310 (7.5%), and 72% had BMIs in the overweight or obese range, based on self-reported height
311 and weight. Vaccine hesitant and refusers were less likely to have hypertension than
312 vaccine acceptors ($p = 0.01$), but individuals who were vaccine hesitant were more likely to
313 have asthma ($p = 0.05$).

314 Seventy-nine percent of respondents received the flu vaccine each year, which
315 differed markedly between groups, with 85% of acceptors, 52% of hesitant and 17% of
316 refusers reporting flu vaccination annually. Among respondents with children, 93%
317 overall reported believing in the importance of having their children vaccinated against
318 childhood diseases. This differed significantly between groups with nearly all of vaccine
319 acceptors (97%), 86% of vaccine hesitant, yet just over half (52%) of vaccine refusers
320 reporting affirmatively.

321 Respondents as a group were knowledgeable about both COVID-19 symptoms
322 and disease, with average scores on corresponding scales near the upper bound of the
323 total possible. Vaccine hesitant had lower knowledge of COVID-19 disease compared with
324 acceptors and refusers ($p=0.0003$).

325 Scores on the vaccine hesitancy scale tracked, as anticipated, based on the three
326 categories of respondents. Overall, respondents' scores on the vaccine hesitancy scale
327 were 21.7 out of 55, with scale scores differentiating well between the three groups
328 (acceptors, hesitant, refusers) (Table 1). Scores were lowest among vaccine acceptors, while
329 vaccine refusers had the highest scores, indicating the greatest hesitancy. An average of 10
330 points separated the vaccine hesitant from the vaccine acceptors, and an average of 18
331 separated the vaccine refusers from the vaccine acceptors ($p < 0.0001$).

332 Eleven of the 23 characteristics were individually associated with vaccine
333 hesitancy as assessed with the vaccine hesitancy scale: gender, race/ethnicity, marital
334 status, educational level, annual household income, job classification, weekly exposure to
335 COVID-19, annual flu vaccination, importance of childhood vaccinations and COVID-19
336 disease knowledge (Table 2). Interestingly, several factors were not correlated with
337 hesitancy including age, testing positive or knowing someone who tested positive for
338 COVID-19, BMI, or knowledge of COVID-19 symptoms. Despite well-characterized
339 associations with medical complications and poor outcomes [39], no specific chronic
340 condition nor the total number of chronic conditions were associated with vaccine
341 hesitancy in our healthcare worker population. In multivariable models, race/ethnicity,
342 marital status, job classification, immunocompromised status, annual flu vaccination and

343 importance of childhood vaccinations were significant independent predictors of vaccine
 344 hesitancy. Asian respondents were more likely to be hesitant than non-Hispanic whites (β
 345 = 1.63; $p = 0.06$) and immunocompromised persons were more hesitant than those who
 346 were not ($\beta = 2.36$; $p = 0.03$). Compared to doctors, physician assistants and nurse
 347 practitioners, all other job classifications had higher vaccine hesitancy scores.

348 **Table 2. Univariate and multivariate associations (β [SE (β); p-value) between potential**
 349 **predictors of the vaccine hesitancy scale from general linear regression models**

| Characteristic | Univariate (unadjusted) | | Multivariate (adjusted) | |
|--------------------------------|---|--------------|--------------------------|-------------------|
| | β [SE (β)] | p-value | β [SE (β)] | p-value |
| Age | | [0.35] | - | - |
| | 18-29 | <i>Ref</i> | - | - |
| | 30-49 | 0.16 (0.93) | 0.86 | - |
| | 50-64 | -0.38 (0.99) | 0.70 | - |
| | 65+ | -3.16 (1.96) | 0.11 | - |
| Gender | | [<0.0001] | - | - |
| | Female | <i>Ref</i> | - | - |
| | Male | -2.77 (0.77) | 0.0003 | - |
| Race/Ethnicity | | [0.05] | | [0.09] |
| | Non-Hispanic White | <i>Ref</i> | <i>Ref</i> | |
| | Asian | 0.55 (0.98) | 0.57 | 1.63 (0.87) 0.06 |
| | Black | 1.41 (1.16) | 0.23 | -0.57 (1.08) 0.60 |
| | Hispanic | 2.01 (0.70) | 0.004 | 0.84 (0.62) 0.17 |
| | Other (Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Native American/Alaskan Native, mixed race, other) | 2.34 (1.57) | 0.14 | 2.71 (1.40) 0.05 |
| Marital Status | | [0.09] | | [0.05] |
| | Single | <i>Ref</i> | <i>Ref</i> | |
| | Married, civil union, living with a partner | -0.70 (0.73) | 0.34 | -0.39 (0.69) 0.57 |
| | Previously married (divorced, separated, widowed) | -2.33 (1.06) | 0.03 | -2.35 (0.96) 0.02 |
| Educational level | | [<0.0001] | - | - |
| | Less than college | <i>Ref</i> | - | - |
| | College degree | -1.68 (0.71) | 0.02 | - |
| | Greater than college degree | -4.24 (0.74) | <0.0001 | - |
| Annual Household Income | | [<0.0001] | - | - |
| | Less than 49,999 | <i>Ref</i> | - | - |
| | \$50,000 to \$89,000 | -3.14 (1.01) | 0.002 | - |
| | \$90,000 to \$119,000 | -2.13 (1.07) | 0.05 | - |
| | \$120,000 or above | -4.01 (0.93) | <0.0001 | - |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------|---------|-----------|-------------|---------|
| Job Classification | | | [<0.0001] | | [0.004] |
| Doctor, physician assistant, nurse practitioner | <i>Ref</i> | | | <i>Ref</i> | |
| Nurse, nursing assistant, medical assistant | 4.68 (1.15) | <0.0001 | | 3.42 (1.01) | 0.001 |
| Allied health personnel; laboratory, respiratory therapy, radiology personnel | 3.83 (1.32) | 0.004 | | 3.16 (1.18) | 0.008 |
| Administration or non-direct clinical support, admissions and collections clerk | 6.85 (1.16) | <0.0001 | | 4.34 (1.05) | <0.0001 |
| Pharmacist, pharmacy technician | 2.72 (1.80) | 0.13 | | 2.92 (1.61) | 0.07 |
| Other | 4.48 (2.78) | 0.11 | | 5.05 (2.62) | 0.05 |
| Exposure to COVID-19 on a weekly basis | | | [0.003] | - | - |
| no direct exposure | <i>Ref</i> | | | - | - |
| minimal exposure | 0.64 (0.85) | 0.45 | | - | - |
| moderate exposure | -1.69 (0.87) | 0.04 | | - | - |
| high exposure | -1.90 (0.90) | 0.03 | | - | - |
| They or someone they know tested positive for COVID-19 | | | [0.84] | - | - |
| Yes | <i>Ref</i> | | | - | - |
| No | 0.20 (0.98) | | | - | - |
| BMI | | | [0.41] | - | - |
| Underweight/Normal (<24.9) | <i>Ref</i> | | | - | - |
| Overweight (25-29.9) | 0.32 (0.80) | 0.69 | | - | - |
| Obese (30 and above) | 1.00 (0.78) | 0.20 | | - | - |
| Number of Chronic Conditions¹ | 0.25 (0.42) | | [0.56] | - | - |
| Diabetes | | | [0.31] | - | - |
| No | <i>Ref</i> | | | - | - |
| Yes | 1.18 (1.16) | | | - | - |
| Hypertension | | | [0.28] | - | - |
| No | <i>Ref</i> | | | - | - |
| Yes | -0.77 (0.71) | | | - | - |
| Asthma | | | [0.16] | - | - |
| No | <i>Ref</i> | | | - | - |
| Yes | 1.15 (0.81) | | | - | - |
| Serious heart condition | | | [0.94] | - | - |
| No | <i>Ref</i> | | | - | - |
| Yes | -0.19 (2.44) | | | - | - |
| Chronic lung disease | | | [0.63] | - | - |
| No | <i>Ref</i> | | | - | - |
| Yes | -1.75 (3.60) | | | - | - |
| Chronic kidney disease | | | [0.42] | - | - |

| | | | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|
| | No | <i>Ref</i> | - | - |
| | Yes | 2.70 (3.28) | - | - |
| Liver disease | | | [0.68] | - |
| | No | <i>Ref</i> | - | - |
| | Yes | 1.34 (3.27) | - | - |
| Weakened immune system (immunocompromised) | | | [0.24] | [0.03] |
| | No | <i>Ref</i> | <i>Ref</i> | |
| | Yes | 1.50 (1.28) | 2.36 (1.10) | |
| Receive flu vaccine annually | | | [<0.0001] | [<0.0001] |
| | Yes | <i>Ref</i> | <i>Ref</i> | |
| | No | 12.13 (0.93) | <0.0001 | 8.23 (1.04) <0.0001 |
| | Skip some Years | 6.28 (0.82) | <0.0001 | 4.49 (0.84) <0.0001 |
| Important to have children vaccinated against childhood diseases?³ | | | [<0.0001] | |
| | Yes | <i>Ref</i> | <i>Ref</i> | |
| | No | 17.25 (1.94) | <0.0001 | 12.98 (1.99) <0.0001 |
| | Not Sure | 13.04 (1.59) | <0.0001 | 9.21 (1.76) <0.0001 |
| Knowledge of COVID Symptoms, score² | | -0.03 (0.19) | [0.88] | - |
| Knowledge of COVID Disease, score² | | -2.23 (0.45) | [<0.0001] | - |

¹including diabetes, hypertension, asthma, serious heart conditions, chronic lung disease, chronic kidney disease, liver disease, weakened immune system

²higher score indicates better knowledge

³among respondents with children

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

Acceptance of the flu vaccine was predictive of vaccine hesitancy, as employees who reported regularly receiving the flu vaccine scored an average of 8.23 points higher on the vaccine hesitancy scale ($p < 0.0001$) compared to those that did not, and persons who skipped some years scored an average of 4.49 points higher ($p < 0.0001$).

Employees who did not believe it was important to have their children vaccinated against childhood diseases scored nearly 13 points higher on the vaccine hesitancy scale compared to those who did have this belief ($p < 0.0001$), and those who were not sure about childhood vaccinations scored over 9 points higher ($p < 0.0001$). Respondents who were previously married were less likely to be hesitant than those who were currently single ($\beta = -2.35$; $p = 0.02$).

Several characteristics were individually associated with vaccine acceptance status including age, gender, educational level, job classification, BMI, testing positive or knowing someone who tested positive for COVID-19, hypertension, asthma, COVID-19 disease knowledge, annual flu vaccination, and importance of childhood vaccinations (Table 3). ORs estimated for the latter two had very wide confidence intervals due to the small number of observations in cells despite re-categorizing; as such, these variables were not further pursued in models building approaches. In multivariable models,

368 gender, educational level, job classification and BMI were significantly independently
 369 predictive of vaccine acceptance, hesitancy and refusal. Compared with women, men
 370 were significantly less likely to be vaccine hesitant (OR = 0.12; 95% CI = 0.02, 0.91).
 371 Persons with a college degree or higher were 55% less likely to be vaccine hesitant
 372 compared to those with less than a college degree (OR = 0.44; 95% CI = 0.22, 0.89) and
 373 employees with a BMI classified as obese were 65% less likely to be vaccine hesitant
 374 compared to those with a BMI in the normal/underweight range (OR = 0.35; 95% CI = 0.14,
 375 0.90). Non-clinical staff were more than twice as likely to be vaccine hesitant than clinical
 376 employees (OR = 2.31; 95% CI = 1.16, 4.59). Associations for these characteristics were
 377 apparent and in the same direction for vaccine refusers with the exception of BMI but did
 378 not achieve statistical significance likely because of the small numbers of refusers.

379 **Table 3. Univariate and multivariate associations (ORs, 95% CIs) between**
 380 **potential predictors of the vaccine acceptance, hesitancy or refusal from multinomial**
 381 **logistic regression models**

| Characteristic | Univariate/Unadjusted OR (95% CI) | | | | Multivariate/Adjusted OR (95% CI) | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|------------|----------|------------|-----------------------------------|------------|----------|------------|--|
| | Hesitant | | Refusers | | Hesitant | | Refusers | | |
| Age | | | | | | | | | |
| 18-29 | Ref | | Ref | | - | - | - | - | |
| 30-49 | 2.23 | 0.92, 5.37 | 0.72 | 0.31, 1.67 | - | - | - | - | |
| 50+ | 0.88 | 0.33, 2.36 | 0.47 | 0.18, 1.23 | - | - | - | - | |
| Gender | | | | | | | | | |
| Female | Ref | | Ref | | Ref | | Ref | | |
| Male | 0.17 | 0.05, 0.53 | 0.2 | 0.05, 0.82 | 0.12 | 0.02, 0.91 | 0.17 | 0.02, 1.29 | |
| Race/Ethnicity | | | | | | | | | |
| Non-Hispanic White | Ref | | Ref | | - | - | - | - | |
| Hispanic | 1.33 | 0.74, 2.41 | 1.32 | 0.64, 2.74 | - | - | - | - | |
| Others | 0.72 | 0.34, 1.53 | 0.41 | 0.13, 1.27 | - | - | - | - | |
| Marital Status | | | | | | | | | |
| Single | Ref | | Ref | | - | - | - | - | |
| Married /Civil Union/Living with a partner | 1.45 | 0.76, 2.75 | 0.75 | 0.37, 1.55 | - | - | - | - | |
| Previously married (divorced, separated, widowed) | 1.22 | 0.49, 3.07 | 0.66 | 0.21, 2.12 | - | - | - | - | |
| Educational level | | | | | | | | | |
| Less than college | Ref | | Ref | | Ref | | Ref | | |
| College degree or higher | 0.31 | 0.18, 0.52 | 0.74 | 0.39, 1.43 | 0.44 | 0.22, 0.89 | 0.92 | 0.40, 2.13 | |
| Annual Household Income | | | | | | | | | |
| Less than \$89,000 | Ref | | Ref | | - | - | - | - | |
| \$90,000 and above | 0.71 | 0.43, 1.18 | 0.72 | 0.37, 1.40 | - | - | - | - | |
| Job Classification | | | | | | | | | |
| Clinical | Ref | | Ref | | Ref | | Ref | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|-------------|-------|--------------|------|------------|------|------------|
| Non-clinical | 2.36 | 1.42, 3.92 | 1.27 | 0.65, 2.47 | 2.31 | 1.16, 4.59 | 1.16 | 0.50, 2.71 |
| Exposure to COVID-19 on a weekly basis | | | | | | | | |
| no direct exposure | Ref | | Ref | | - | - | - | - |
| minimal exposure | 1.15 | 0.60, 2.20 | 2.01 | 0.81, 5.0 | - | - | - | - |
| moderate exposure | 0.53 | 0.25, 1.15 | 0.8 | 0.28, 2.34 | - | - | - | - |
| high exposure | 0.74 | 0.36, 1.55 | 1.09 | 0.39, 3.08 | - | - | - | - |
| They or someone they know tested positive for COVID-19 | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | Ref | | Ref | | - | - | - | - |
| No | 0.91 | 0.37, 2.19 | 2.41 | 1.05, 5.53 | - | - | - | - |
| BMI | | | | | | | | |
| Underweight/Normal (<24.9) | Ref | | Ref | | Ref | | Ref | |
| Overweight (25-29.9) | 1.14 | 0.62, 2.10 | 0.76 | 0.30, 1.91 | 1.25 | 0.57, 2.74 | 1.51 | 0.51, 4.45 |
| Obese (30 and above) | 0.54 | 0.27, 1.09 | 1.08 | 0.47, 2.46 | 0.35 | 0.14, 0.90 | 1.36 | 0.47, 3.97 |
| Number of Chronic Conditions¹ | 1.08 | 0.79, 1.48 | 0.73 | 0.42, 1.24 | - | - | - | - |
| Diabetes | | | | | | | | |
| No | Ref | | Ref | | - | - | - | - |
| Yes | 0.78 | 0.27, 2.22 | 1.01 | 0.30, 3.41 | - | - | - | - |
| Hypertension | | | | | | | | |
| No | Ref | | Ref | | - | - | - | - |
| Yes | 0.62 | 0.33, 1.20 | 0.23 | 0.07, 0.76 | - | - | - | - |
| Asthma | | | | | | | | |
| No | Ref | | Ref | | - | - | - | - |
| Yes | 2.02 | 1.14, 3.57 | 0.79 | 0.30, 2.07 | - | - | - | - |
| Receive flu vaccine annually | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | Ref | | Ref | | - | - | - | - |
| No/Skip some years | 5.49 | 3.17, 9.51 | 29.29 | 11.84, 72.48 | - | - | - | - |
| Important to have children vaccinated against childhood diseases?³ | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | Ref | | Ref | | - | - | - | - |
| No/Not sure | 4.8 | 1.82, 12.64 | 29.44 | 11.80, 73.42 | - | - | - | - |
| COVID Symptom Knowledge, score² | 1.02 | 0.87, 1.19 | 1.07 | 0.86, 1.34 | - | - | - | - |
| COVID Disease Knowledge, score² | 0.56 | 0.41, 0.76 | 0.84 | 0.53, 1.33 | - | - | - | - |


¹including diabetes, hypertension, asthma, serious heart conditions, chronic lung disease, chronic kidney disease, liver disease, weakened immune system

²higher score indicates better knowledge

³among respondents with children

382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396

Employees at RUHS Medical Center who accepted COVID-19 vaccination reported several influences of their decision to be vaccinated, including protection of the vulnerable, encouragement from family members or colleagues, and advice from a health care worker. They also prioritized safety and efficacy of the vaccine and job or other requirements as determining factors. For those employees who accepted vaccination, financial incentives, raffles, social media and religious leaders were not motivating factors (Figure 1). Among RUHS employees who were hesitant, uncertainty was also prevalent in their reports of motivating factors influencing their indecision to accept or refuse vaccination, with many responses tending to concentrate along the middle of the Likert scale. Employees who refused vaccination, on the other hand, showed a very different pattern in their responses. In this group, all possible reasons were ranked as not impacting a potential decision to be vaccinated. Additionally, refusers indicated that financial incentives would not increase their likelihood of being vaccinated.



397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405

Figure 1. Influences of Decision for COVID-19 Vaccination with Average Score on Likert Scale for Each Response, by Group.

Despite a strong employee-support environment and job protection, respondents reported that the COVID-19 pandemic had affected their physical and mental health and well-being as well as their ability to carry out normal activities (Figure 2). Paradoxically, vaccine refusers reported their physical health was less affected than that reported by acceptors or hesitant. Both family income and employment were less impacted for all groups.

406




Figure 2. Reported effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on employment, income, health and normal activities, by group.

407

4. Discussion

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

In our comprehensive survey of employees of a large safety net county health system conducted between March and April 2021 when COVID-19 vaccinations were being administered in the US, we found that 9.4% overall were hesitant and 5.3% refused to be vaccinated, which is consistent with studies that have estimated 8-18% hesitancy [3]. These proportions contrast markedly from general population estimates of 20-30% resistant or refusing vaccination [13-16,23].

Similar to previous research among US healthcare workers [22,40-45], our data suggest that employees who hesitated or refused to be vaccinated against COVID-19 were more likely to be women, of younger ages, and to have lower levels of education and income. Also analogous to other studies that found less hesitancy among healthcare workers in direct patient care roles [22,42-45], we observed that employees with high or moderate weekly exposure to COVID-19 such as from working in the COVID ward or ICU in any capacity were less likely to be hesitant. Unlike some previous surveys [22,42-45] [46] we did not find lower hesitancy among Asian healthcare workers. One possible explanation for this difference is that the makeup of our study population within the Asian racial group is not comparable to those of previous research, which may be supported by another California-based study [23]. Our survey did not query the specific Asian designation i.e., Filipino, Chinese etc. nor did previous studies provide data to assess this.

One of our objectives was to potentially identify reasons underlying vaccine hesitancy and refusal in healthcare workers which could be targeted by interventions. As suggested by others [47], our findings provide the assessment of barriers to

430 vaccination adoption in an organizational setting which can be used to identify
431 evidence-based strategies to increase COVID-19 vaccine uptake. Based on responses
432 from employees who were hesitant to be vaccinated, we suggest campaigns which
433 focus on providing information and reassurances[48] regarding the safety and efficacy
434 of COVID-19 vaccines. Efforts directed at building trust in vaccine manufacturers
435 could also be useful as well as vaccine mandates as a condition of employment. We
436 see an opportunity in educational programs given that employees who were vaccine
437 hesitant had lower knowledge of COVID-19 disease, despite employment within a
438 health system. Our data further suggest that messaging from colleagues or family
439 members, within social media networks or by religious leaders is less likely to sway
440 hesitant health system employees to be vaccinated. This finding can be supported by a
441 similar study [41] which found that social media is not perceived a valuable source of
442 vaccine information for healthcare workers given social media networks are platforms
443 found to disseminate extensive vaccine misinformation[49]. The response pattern
444 among those who refused to be vaccinated indicates that converting these persons will
445 likely be more challenging as no one reason emerged as a potential candidate for a
446 targeted intervention. Similar to previous research [42,45,46], acceptance of annual flu
447 vaccination and the importance of childhood vaccination were significant predictors of
448 COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and refusal in our population. These likely reflect longer
449 standing beliefs which may be more difficult to modify. Therefore, in order to address
450 vaccine hesitancy and increase COVID-19 vaccine uptake, it will be important to
451 examine beliefs of healthcare workers with pre-existing concerns about vaccines in
452 general.

453 Response bias may be a consideration as participants in the survey did so
454 voluntarily. We suspect that both vaccine hesitant and refusers are higher within our
455 employees as these groups may not have responded to the survey since they may hold
456 underlying concerns and suspicions related to the intention of the questions despite
457 reassurance of anonymity. Additionally, these two groups may not have completed a
458 survey because of perceived stigmas associated with or the social undesirability of
459 their responses. On the other hand, those that have accepted vaccination may find
460 little personal value in completing a survey that largely has no direct relevance to their
461 decision. In sum, it is likely that vaccine hesitant and refusers are underestimated in
462 our study, and those who did participate may not be representative of all RUHS health
463 system employees.

464 It is important to contextualize the survey with the historical events occurring
465 contemporaneously with when data were being collected in March and April 2021.
466 Globally, countries marked the 1-year anniversary of the COVID-19 pandemic and the
467 WHO released a report on the potential origin of the virus in China [2]. Debate about
468 the origin of the SARS-CoV-2 virus continued to evolve and was driven by
469 deep-seated political beliefs. In the US, three vaccines had EUA by the FDA, two had
470 been in use since January 2021. The Biden administration announced the purchase of
471 additional Johnson & Johnson vaccines in order to expand supply to have sufficient

472 vaccines for all US adults by the end of May 2021. This preceded the pause in use of
473 their vaccine over concerns of blood clotting. Pfizer & Moderna mRNA vaccines were
474 found to prevent infection not just illness, and both manufacturers began trials on
475 children aged 6 months – 11 years. In California, vaccine eligibility was expanded to
476 additional groups, and some “lockdown” measures were relaxed as some counties
477 moved into less restrictive tiers. Changing public health recommendations as well as
478 the scientific complexity related to the novel coronavirus and our understanding as to
479 how the virus adapts impacted the perceived confidence of the general population for
480 vaccination. Different from previous studies among healthcare workers, by the time
481 our survey was administered, vaccination against COVID-19 was not a hypothetical.
482 The majority of published US studies[22,24,42,44,45] that surveyed healthcare workers
483 were during periods when vaccines were still under development; others coincided
484 with early vaccination efforts of healthcare workers and nursing home
485 residents[40,41,43,46]. Moreover, our Medical Center had an early and robust
486 employee focused vaccination program at the time the survey was administered.

487 The findings of this study should be interpreted cautiously given that they are based
488 on data from 71 employees whose survey responses indicated they were hesitant to be
489 vaccinated and 40 whose responses indicated they refused vaccination. As with other
490 cross-sectional surveys, we do not have longitudinal data to examine if positions about
491 COVID-19 vaccination changed over time among our health system employee cohort.
492 Thus, the survey responses reflect a “snapshot” of opinions at one point in time and
493 should be contextualized as described above. We plan a follow-up survey of employees
494 to examine change in vaccine acceptance. One major strength of our study over previ-
495 ous research is our multivariable modeling approach which identifies factors that are
496 independent predictors of vaccine hesitancy and refusal. This is useful because individ-
497 ual factors are often correlated, eg., education, income, and job title, and may be reflective
498 of a common underlying construct. An additional strength of our work is our imple-
499 mentation of two measures of vaccine hesitancy, one derived from survey items and a
500 second from a validated vaccine hesitancy scale [2]. Furthermore, we demonstrated that
501 essential components of our survey instrument were reliable.

502 **5. Conclusions**

503 Vaccine hesitancy including refusing vaccination is a major global concern and
504 is not novel to the COVID-19 pandemic [4-6]. Continued attempts to reassure people of
505 the efficacy and safety of vaccines and to accept vaccination for influenza and other
506 seasonal virus infections has been an ongoing public health effort for decades [50]. This
507 study demonstrates that healthcare workers are not immune to concerns related to
508 vaccination. A troubling finding of our study is the effect of the pandemic on wellbeing
509 and work performance within health system employees despite strong benefit support,
510 salary protection, healthcare benefits and continued employment assurance.
511 Implications of the reported short-term effects and potential for long-term consequences
512 merit further investigation.

513 Unvaccinated persons are both victims and culprits of SARS-CoV-2. The notion that
514 the virus would be completely controlled with high vaccination rates has been chal-
515 lenged by the emergence of more infectious variants like delta together with significant
516 proportions of vaccine hesitant persons in populations. This further raises concerns that
517 additional variants may challenge the immune protection now afforded by current vac-

518 cines. Therefore, it is important to understand the motivations and beliefs of those not
519 accepting vaccinations and to develop interventions that may increase acceptance, par-
520 ticularly among healthcare workers who are in positions to influence others. We point to
521 our observation that diverged from most previous work, of greater hesitancy among
522 Asian health system employees as a reason why a “one-size fits all” approach will not
523 suffice as others similarly advocate [51]. Future research surveys and other quantitative
524 analyses should be accompanied by qualitative research aimed at discovering more in-
525 formation on why individuals have refused vaccinations and more importantly, what can
526 be done about it. We recommend that focus groups of refusers and vaccine hesitant
527 healthcare workers lead to a thoughtful and deep probing of reasons and a full discus-
528 sion of strategies suggested by participants that could result in their being vaccinated.
529 Consideration should be given to the diversity within ethnic and racial groups as relates
530 to cultural practices and beliefs about vaccination. An appreciation that there may be
531 varied reasons for refusing vaccination should lead to more particularized culturally
532 sensitive interventions to successfully increase vaccination rates.

533 **Supplementary Materials:** The following are available online at www.mdpi.com/xxx/s1, Survey
534 Instrument.

535 **Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, N.M.G., J.E.L., S.Z., B.S., D.F., A.F.; methodology,
536 N.M.G., J.E.L., S.Z., B.S., D.K., D.F., A.F.; software, N.M.G., D.M., J.E.L., D.K., S.Z., B.S.; validation,
537 N.M.G., formal analysis, N.M.G., D.M., J.E.L., D.K.; resources, J.N., A.F.; data curation, S.Z., D.K.;
538 writing—original draft preparation, N.M.G., A.F.; writing—review and editing, N.M.G., J.E.L.,
539 D.M., B.S., D.K., K.M., D.F., J.N., A.F.; visualization, N.M.G.; supervision, N.M.G., D.F., A.F. All
540 authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

541 **Funding:** This research received no external funding.

542 **Institutional Review Board Statement:** The study was reviewed by the RUHS Institutional Review
543 Board and classified as exempt as all responses were collected in a de-identified manner.

544 **Informed Consent Statement:** Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the
545 study.

546 **Data Availability Statement:** The data presented in this study are available on request from the
547 corresponding author.

548 **Acknowledgments:** We thank employees of RUHS for their participation in this study.

549 **Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

553 References

- 554 1. Piltch-Loeb, R.; DiClemente, R. The Vaccine Uptake Continuum: Applying Social Science Theory to Shift Vaccine
555 Hesitancy. *Vaccines* **2020**, *8*, doi:10.3390/vaccines8010076.
- 556 2. World Health Organization. *Report of the SAGE Working Group on Vaccine Hesitancy* WHO: GENEVA, 01 October 2014.
- 557 3. Larson, H.J.; Jarrett, C.; Eckersberger, E.; Smith, D.M.D.; Paterson, P. Understanding vaccine hesitancy around vaccines
558 and vaccination from a global perspective: A systematic review of published literature, 2007–2012. *Vaccine* **2014**, *32*,
559 2150–2159, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2014.01.081>.
- 560 4. Gostin, L.O. Jacobson v Massachusetts at 100 years: police power and civil liberties in tension. *Am J Public Health* **2005**, *95*,
561 576–581, doi:10.2105/AJPH.2004.055152.
- 562 5. Schwartz, J.L. New media, old messages: themes in the history of vaccine hesitancy and refusal. *Virtual Mentor* **2012** Jan 1,
563 50–55, doi: doi: 10.1001/virtualmentor.2012.14.1.mhst1-1201. .
- 564 6. Wolfe, R.M.; Sharp, L.K. Anti-vaccinationists past and present. *BMJ* **2002**, *325*, 430, doi:10.1136/bmj.325.7361.430.

- 565 7. Benecke, O.; DeYoung, S.E. Anti-Vaccine Decision-Making and Measles Resurgence in the United States. *Global pediatric health* **2019**, *6*, 2333794x19862949, doi:10.1177/2333794x19862949.
- 566
- 567 8. Pelčić, G.; Karačić, S.; Mikirtichan, G.L.; Kubar, O.I.; Leavitt, F.J.; Cheng-Tek Tai, M.; Morishita, N.; Vuletić, S.; Tomašević, L. Religious exception for vaccination or religious excuses for avoiding vaccination. *Croat Med J* **2016**, *57*, 516-521, doi:10.3325/cmj.2016.57.516.
- 568
- 569
- 570 9. World Health Organization. Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Situation Report - 22. **2020**.
- 571 10. Johns Hopkins University & Medicine. Coronavirus Resource Center. Available online: <https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/> (accessed on March 2020).
- 572
- 573 11. Cooper, M. Tracking the Impact of the Coronavirus on the U.S. *The New York Times* Last Updated March 15, 2020, 9:37 p.m. ET 2020.
- 574
- 575 12. World Health Organization. Ten threats to global health in 2019. Available online: <https://www.who.int/news-room/spotlight/ten-threats-to-global-health-in-2019> (accessed on August 1).
- 576
- 577 13. File, T.M., Abinash. Around Half of Unvaccinated Americans Indicate They Will “Definitely” Get COVID-19 Vaccine. *America Counts: Stories Behind the Numbers* **2021**.
- 578
- 579 14. Funk, C.T.A. Growing Share of Americans Say They Plan To Get a COVID-19 Vaccine – or Already Have. *Pew Research Center* **2021**.
- 580
- 581 15. Huetteman, E. Covid Vaccine Hesitancy Drops Among All Americans, New Survey Shows. *Kaiser Health News* **2021**.
- 582 16. Stobbe, M.F., H. . AP-NORC poll: A third of US adults skeptical of COVID shots. *AP News* **2021**.
- 583 17. Fisher, K.A.; Bloomstone, S.J.; Walder, J.; Crawford, S.; Fouayzi, H.; Mazor, K.M. Attitudes Toward a Potential SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine : A Survey of U.S. Adults. *Annals of internal medicine* **2020**, *173*, 964-973, doi:10.7326/m20-3569.
- 584
- 585 18. Kreps, S.; Prasad, S.; Brownstein, J.S.; Hswen, Y.; Garibaldi, B.T.; Zhang, B.; Kriner, D.L. Factors Associated With US Adults' Likelihood of Accepting COVID-19 Vaccination. *JAMA network open* **2020**, *3*, e2025594, doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.25594.
- 586
- 587
- 588 19. Pogue, K.; Jensen, J.L.; Stancil, C.K.; Ferguson, D.G.; Hughes, S.J.; Mello, E.J.; Burgess, R.; Berges, B.K.; Quaye, A.; Poole, B.D. Influences on Attitudes Regarding Potential COVID-19 Vaccination in the United States. *Vaccines* **2020**, *8*, doi:10.3390/vaccines8040582.
- 589
- 590
- 591 20. Reiter, P.L.; Pennell, M.L.; Katz, M.L. Acceptability of a COVID-19 vaccine among adults in the United States: How many people would get vaccinated? *Vaccine* **2020**, *38*, 6500-6507, doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.08.043.
- 592
- 593 21. Taylor, S.; Landry, C.A.; Paluszek, M.M.; Rachor, G.S.; Asmundson, G.J.G. Worry, avoidance, and coping during the COVID-19 pandemic: A comprehensive network analysis. *Journal of anxiety disorders* **2020**, *76*, 102327, doi:10.1016/j.janxdis.2020.102327.
- 594
- 595
- 596 22. Gadoth, A.; Halbrook, M.; Martin-Blais, R.; Gray, A.; Tobin, N.H.; Ferbas, K.G.; Aldrovandi, G.M.; Rimoim, A.W. Cross-sectional Assessment of COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance Among Health Care Workers in Los Angeles. *Annals of internal medicine* **2021**, *174*, 882-885, doi:10.7326/m20-7580.
- 597
- 598
- 599 23. Grumbach, K.; Judson, T.; Desai, M.; Jain, V.; Lindan, C.; Doernberg, S.B.; Holubar, M. Association of Race/Ethnicity With Likelihood of COVID-19 Vaccine Uptake Among Health Workers and the General Population in the San Francisco Bay Area. *JAMA internal medicine* **2021**, *181*, 1008-1011, doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2021.1445.
- 600
- 601
- 602 24. Meyer, M.N.; Gjorgjieva, T.; Rosica, D. Trends in Health Care Worker Intentions to Receive a COVID-19 Vaccine and Reasons for Hesitancy. *JAMA network open* **2021**, *4*, e215344, doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.5344.
- 603
- 604 25. KFF/Post Survey of Frontline Health Care Workers Finds Nearly Half Remain Unvaccinated. *Kaiser Family Foundation/The Washington Post* **2021**.
- 605

- 606 26. Biswas, N.; Mustapha, T.; Khubchandani, J.; Price, J.H. The Nature and Extent of COVID-19 Vaccination Hesitancy in
607 Healthcare Workers. *Journal of community health* **2021**, *1*-8, doi:10.1007/s10900-021-00984-3.
- 608 27. Halbrook, M.; Gadoth, A.; Martin-Blais, R.; Gray, A.N.; Kashani, S.; Kazan, C.; Kane, B.; Tobin, N.H.; Ferbas, K.G.;
609 Aldrovandi, G.M.; et al. Longitudinal assessment of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance and uptake among frontline medical
610 workers in Los Angeles, California. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of*
611 *America* **2021**, doi:10.1093/cid/ciab614.
- 612 28. Katzman, J.G.; Katzman, J.W. Primary Care Clinicians as COVID-19 Vaccine Ambassadors. *Journal of primary care &*
613 *community health* **2021**, *12*, 21501327211007026, doi:10.1177/21501327211007026.
- 614 29. Wilson, R.J.I.; Vergélys, C.; Ward, J.; Peretti-Watel, P.; Verger, P. Vaccine hesitancy among general practitioners in
615 Southern France and their reluctant trust in the health authorities. *International journal of qualitative studies on health and*
616 *well-being* **2020**, *15*, 1757336, doi:10.1080/17482631.2020.1757336.
- 617 30. Newitt, P. 8+ states mandating vaccines for healthcare workers, state employees. *Becker's ASC Review* **2021**.
- 618 31. Karafillakis, E.; Larson, H.J. The paradox of vaccine hesitancy among healthcare professionals. *Clinical microbiology and*
619 *infection : the official publication of the European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases* **2018**, *24*, 799-800,
620 doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2018.04.001.
- 621 32. World Health Organization WHO technical advisory group on behavioural insights and sciences for health. *Behavioural*
622 *considerations for acceptance and uptake of covid-19 vaccines. Meeting Report.*; WHO: Geneva, 15 October 2020.
- 623 33. Achat, H.; McIntyre, P.; Burgess, M. Health care incentives in immunisation. *Australian and New Zealand journal of public*
624 *health* **1999**, *23*, 285-288, doi:10.1111/j.1467-842x.1999.tb01257.x.
- 625 34. Higgins, S.T.; Klemperer, E.M.; Coleman, S.R.M. Looking to the empirical literature on the potential for financial
626 incentives to enhance adherence with COVID-19 vaccination. *Preventive medicine* **2021**, *145*, 106421,
627 doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2021.106421.
- 628 35. Lin, C.J.; Nowalk, M.P.; Zimmerman, R.K. Estimated costs associated with improving influenza vaccination for health care
629 personnel in a multihospital health system. *Joint Commission journal on quality and patient safety* **2012**, *38*, 67-72,
630 doi:10.1016/s1553-7250(12)38009-4.
- 631 36. Wilson, F.A.; Wang, Y.; Stimpson, J.P. Universal paid leave increases influenza vaccinations among employees in the U.S.
632 *Vaccine* **2014**, *32*, 2441-2445, doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2014.02.084.
- 633 37. Paterson, P.; Chantler, T.; Larson, H.J. Reasons for non-vaccination: Parental vaccine hesitancy and the childhood
634 influenza vaccination school pilot programme in England. *Vaccine* **2018**, *36*, 5397-5401, doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2017.08.016.
- 635 38. Santibanez, T.A.; Nguyen, K.H.; Greby, S.M.; Fisher, A.; Scanlon, P.; Bhatt, A.; Srivastav, A.; Singleton, J.A. Parental
636 Vaccine Hesitancy and Childhood Influenza Vaccination. *Pediatrics* **2020**, *146*, doi:10.1542/peds.2020-007609.
- 637 39. Kompaniyets L, P.A., Goodman AB, Rosenblum HG, Belay B, Ko JY, et al. . Underlying Medical Conditions and Severe
638 Illness Among 540,667 Adults Hospitalized With COVID-19, March 2020–March 2021. . *Prev Chronic Dis* **2021**, *18*,
639 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.5888/pcd18.210123>.
- 640 40. Amin, D.P.; Palter, J.S. COVID-19 vaccination hesitancy among healthcare personnel in the emergency department
641 deserves continued attention. *The American journal of emergency medicine* **2021**, doi:10.1016/j.ajem.2021.01.089.
- 642 41. Kociolek, L.K.; Elhadary, J.; Jhaveri, R.; Patel, A.B.; Stahulak, B.; Cartland, J. Coronavirus disease 2019 vaccine hesitancy
643 among children's hospital staff: A single-center survey. *Infection control and hospital epidemiology* **2021**, *42*, 775-777,
644 doi:10.1017/ice.2021.58.
- 645 42. Kuter, B.J.; Browne, S.; Momplaisir, F.M.; Feemster, K.A.; Shen, A.K.; Green-McKenzie, J.; Faig, W.; Offit, P.A. Perspectives
646 on the receipt of a COVID-19 vaccine: A survey of employees in two large hospitals in Philadelphia. *Vaccine* **2021**, *39*,
647 1693-1700, doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2021.02.029.

- 648 43. Schradling, W.A.; Trent, S.A.; Paxton, J.H.; Rodriguez, R.M.; Swanson, M.B.; Mohr, N.M.; Talan, D.A. Vaccination rates and
649 acceptance of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination among U.S. emergency department health care personnel. *Academic emergency*
650 *medicine : official journal of the Society for Academic Emergency Medicine* **2021**, *28*, 455-458, doi:10.1111/acem.14236.
- 651 44. Shaw, J.; Stewart, T.; Anderson, K.B.; Hanley, S.; Thomas, S.J.; Salmon, D.A.; Morley, C. Assessment of U.S. health care
652 personnel (HCP) attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination in a large university health care system. *Clinical infectious*
653 *diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America* **2021**, doi:10.1093/cid/ciab054.
- 654 45. Shekhar, R.; Sheikh, A.B.; Upadhyay, S.; Singh, M.; Kottewar, S.; Mir, H.; Barrett, E.; Pal, S. COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance
655 among Health Care Workers in the United States. *Vaccines* **2021**, *9*, doi:10.3390/vaccines9020119.
- 656 46. Ciardi, F.; Menon, V.; Jensen, J.L.; Shariff, M.A.; Pillai, A.; Venugopal, U.; Kasubhai, M.; Dimitrov, V.; Kanna, B.; Poole,
657 B.D. Knowledge, Attitudes and Perceptions of COVID-19 Vaccination among Healthcare Workers of an Inner-City
658 Hospital in New York. *Vaccines* **2021**, *9*, doi:10.3390/vaccines9050516.
- 659 47. Finney Rutten, L.J.; Zhu, X.; Leppin, A.L.; Ridgeway, J.L.; Swift, M.D.; Griffin, J.M.; St Sauver, J.L.; Virk, A.; Jacobson, R.M.
660 Evidence-Based Strategies for Clinical Organizations to Address COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy. *Mayo Clinic proceedings*
661 **2021**, *96*, 699-707, doi:10.1016/j.mayocp.2020.12.024.
- 662 48. Goldstein, S.; MacDonald, N.E.; Guirguis, S. Health communication and vaccine hesitancy. *Vaccine* **2015**, *33*, 4212-4214,
663 doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.04.042.
- 664 49. Puri, N.; Coomes, E.A.; Haghbayan, H.; Gunaratne, K. Social media and vaccine hesitancy: new updates for the era of
665 COVID-19 and globalized infectious diseases.
- 666 50. Schmid, P.; Rauber, D.; Betsch, C.; Lidolt, G.; Denker, M.L. Barriers of Influenza Vaccination Intention and Behavior - A
667 Systematic Review of Influenza Vaccine Hesitancy, 2005 - 2016. *PloS one* **2017**, *12*, e0170550,
668 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0170550.
- 669 51. Chou, W.S.; Budenz, A. Considering Emotion in COVID-19 Vaccine Communication: Addressing Vaccine Hesitancy and
670 Fostering Vaccine Confidence. *Health communication* **2020**, *35*, 1718-1722, doi:10.1080/10410236.2020.1838096.
- 671