

COVID-19 vaccination uptake among healthcare workers in Ghana: A comprehensive analysis of knowledge, attitude, perceived vaccine effectiveness, and health belief model constructs

Whiteson Mbele^{1,2,*}, Phyllis Dako-Gyeke^{1,¶}, Andreas Ndapewa Frans^{1,¶}

¹ Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences, School of Public Health, College of Health Sciences, University of Ghana, Accra, Ghana

² Kasiya Mission Hospital, Pemba District Health Office, Southern Province, Zambia

* whitesonmbele@gmail.com (WM)

¶ These authors contributed equally to this work

10 Abstract

11 The novel Coronavirus Disease 19 (COVID-19) caused devastating effects globally, and healthcare
 12 workers were among the most affected by the pandemic. To mitigate this impact, healthcare workers
 13 were prioritized in COVID-19 vaccination globally and in Ghana. However, hesitancy by healthcare
 14 workers to receive the vaccination resulted in delayed control of the pandemic. In Ghana, vaccine
 15 acceptance rate among healthcare workers was estimated to be 39.3% in the pre-vaccine rollout
 16 period. Consequently, this study assessed uptake of COVID-19 vaccination and associated factors
 17 among healthcare workers in Ghana in the post-vaccine roll-out period.

18 This was an analytical cross-sectional study that used a semi-structured questionnaire to collect data
 19 on COVID-19 vaccination uptake and influencing factors from randomly selected 256 healthcare
 20 workers in Ayawaso West Municipality, Ghana. Bivariable and Multivariable logistic regression was
 21 performed using IBM SPSS version 22 to identify predictors of vaccine uptake and a statistical
 22 significance was declared at $p < 0.05$.

23 More than three-fourths of participants 220 (85.9%) had received at least one dose of the COVID-19
 24 vaccination, while 36 (14.9%) were hesitant. More than half 139 (54.3%) had adequate knowledge
 25 about COVID-19 vaccination and the majority 188 (73.4%) had positive perceptions about its
 26 effectiveness. Moreover, 218 (85.2%) of HCWs had a positive attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination.
 27 Positive attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination (AOR = 4.3; 95% CI: 1.4, 13.0) and high cues to action
 28 (AOR = 5.7; 95% CI: 2.2, 14.8) were the factors that significantly predicted uptake of COVID-19
 29 vaccination among healthcare workers.

30 COVID-19 vaccination among HCWs in Ghana is promising. However, hesitancy to receive the
 31 vaccination among a significant proportion of HCWs raises concerns. To ensure vaccination of all
 32 healthcare workers, interventions to promote vaccination should target key determinants of
 33 vaccination uptake, such as attitude towards the vaccination and cues to action.

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49 Introduction

50 Coronavirus disease 19 (COVID-19) is caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome Corona virus 2
 51 (SARS-CoV-2)[1]. COVID-19 was first detected in China in the city of Wuhan in 2019 and the disease
 52 was declared a pandemic by the World health organization (WHO) in March 2020 [2]. This was the first
 53 documented pandemic caused by a Coronavirus in history [3]. Since identification of the outbreak, over
 54 750 million cases have been reported worldwide with over 6.8 million deaths as of February 2023 [4].
 55 COVID-19 has caused many social and economic disruptions, and the impact was felt across all
 56 countries worldwide. To prevent infection and minimize the impact of COVID-19, countries across the
 57 world developed emergency response mechanisms such as social distancing; face masking, shut down
 58 of public facilities, ban of public gatherings, lock downs and COVID-19 vaccination [5]. The
 59 implementation of these measures varied in different countries and was mainly determined by country
 60 specific burden of the disease and availability of resources. These measures were critical in mitigating
 61 the impact of the disease[5]. The burden of COVID-19 was much higher in developing than in
 62 developed countries [6].

63 Healthcare workers (HCWs) were unavoidably exposed to the virus due to direct contact with patients
 64 [7]. This places them at increased risk of infection and mortality. Several studies have indicated high
 65 infection rate and mortality among HCWs [8–12]. As of May 2020, a total of 152,888 COVID-19
 66 infections were reported among HCWs globally with 1413 deaths [13]. The impact of the pandemic was
 67 higher in Africa, with a prevalence of infection among HCWs of up to 45% in some countries [14]. A
 68 study in Ghana demonstrated a high burden of the pandemic among medical doctors with a prevalence
 69 of 8.9% and mortality of 1.7% [15].

70 Infection of HCWs led to shortage of workforce due to isolation, quarantine, hospitalization, and death
 71 of frontline HCWs and this caused a significant human resource shortage, placing additional burden on
 72 already struggling health care systems [16,17]. COVID-19 vaccines have been highly effective in
 73 reducing mortality and morbidity in countries with high vaccine acceptability rates (Alhassan, Aberese-
 74 Ako, et al., 2021; Solante et al., 2023). As of February 2023, over 13 billion COVID-19 vaccines have
 75 been administered globally [20]. WHO developed guidelines to COVID-19 vaccination and
 76 recommended that health workers should be prioritized for vaccination due to their high risk of
 77 infection. In response, several countries prioritized healthcare workers in vaccination [21]. Despite
 78 COVID-19 vaccine availability, there has been a global hesitancy to receive the vaccine among the
 79 general population, with vaccine acceptability as low as 23% in some countries[22]. Vaccine hesitancy
 80 refers to delay in accepting the vaccine or refusing safe vaccines despite its availability [23]. COVID-19
 81 vaccine hesitancy is prevalent even among healthcare workers, with a global vaccine acceptance
 82 ranging from 27.7% to 77.3% [24]. In Africa, vaccine acceptance has been worryingly low, with some
 83 countries reporting acceptance as low as 6.9% [25]. As of February 2023, only 35.4% of the African
 84 population had been fully vaccinated [26]. This is despite the availability of COVID-19 vaccines in Africa
 85 through initiatives such as the Vaccine Global Access [27]. Globally, healthcare workers have generally
 86 adequate knowledge and positive attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination [28–32].

87 Despite the possession of good knowledge and a positive attitude about COVID-19 vaccination among
 88 HCWs, the challenge of vaccine hesitancy is still prevalent, with only 48% of HCWs in Africa reported to
 89 have accepted the vaccine [33]. Targeted vaccination of healthcare workers who are at increased risk
 90 of acquiring infection is an effective infection control measure. During the rollout of the COVID-19
 91 vaccines, countries across the world prioritized healthcare workers in receiving the vaccines [21].

92 However, vaccine hesitancy among healthcare workers across the world stunted the uptake of this
 93 intervention. Globally, vaccine acceptance among healthcare workers ranged from 23% to 97% [22]. In
 94 Ghana, the situation was alarming as only 39.3% of healthcare workers had intentions to receive the
 95 COVID-19 vaccine before the rollout [34].

96 At present, there is inadequate data on the actual uptake of COVID-19 vaccines among HCWs in Ghana
 97 after the vaccines were rolled out. This limitation hinders the ability to develop targeted policies aimed
 98 at enhancing future vaccination rates within this crucial group. HCWs are the main sources of health
 99 information to communities and role models of health-related behaviors; hence their hesitancy to
 100 receive vaccinations has a negative influence on the general population. Consequently, this study
 101 assessed the uptake of COVID-19 vaccination and influencing factors among HCWs in Ayawaso West
 102 District, Ghana after the vaccines were rolled out. Ayawaso West District was the epicenter of the
 103 pandemic with the highest recorded number of COVID-19 cases (63.9%) in Ghana during the first wave
 104 of the pandemic [35]. Results from this study can aid in developing effective health promotion
 105 interventions to boost COVID-19 vaccination uptake among HCWs in Ghana and beyond.

106

107

108

109

110

Conceptual framework

Behavior change theories and models are important tools that have been applied in public health to understand factors that influence health-related behavior [36]. The Health Belief Model (HBM) has widely been used successfully in understanding the vaccination behavior of populations against Influenza and COVID-19 viruses respectively [37–39]. This model states that health-related behavior is dependent on several factors, namely, perceived susceptibility, perceived severity, perceived benefits, perceived barriers, cues to action, and self-efficacy [40].

Perceived susceptibility refers to the extent that an individual believes they are at risk of acquiring the disease. Individuals who believe they are vulnerable to getting infected with COVID-19 have perceived susceptibility. Perceived severity refers to individual beliefs about the consequences of getting the disease. Individuals who feel threatened with the consequences of getting infected with COVID-19 have a high perception of risk. With regards to COVID-19 vaccination, Perceived benefit refers to the belief that receiving the vaccine will reduce the risk of getting infected with COVID-19 or the seriousness of the disease threat. Perceived barriers to COVID-19 vaccination refer to individual beliefs about restrictions to vaccination, and these are related to psychological, physical, or financial factors. Cues to action, with regards to COVID-19 vaccination refer to factors that are considered necessary or triggers to receiving the vaccine [41].

The HBM has been useful in explaining and predicting behavior related to COVID-19 vaccination acceptance. Several studies globally have found significant associations between HBM constructs and acceptance of COVID-19 vaccination [37]. Perceived susceptibility, perceived severity, perceived benefits, and cues to action have positively been associated with vaccine acceptance, while perceived barriers have inversely been associated with vaccine acceptance. In this current study, the HBM

provided the theoretical framework that was used to assess determinants of COVID-19 vaccination uptake among HCWs (Fig 1). Five Constructs of the HBM (Perceived susceptibility, perceived severity, perceived benefits, perceived barriers, and cues to action) guided the development of the questionnaire. Socio-demographic characteristics such as age, profession, marital status, previous experience with COVID-19 infection, and knowledge about COVID-19 vaccination can influence an individual's perception of susceptibility to and severity of COVID-19 infection. Awareness of COVID-19 vaccination and its benefits may influence adoption of the vaccination.

Fig 1. Conceptual framework

Materials and methods

Study design, setting, and population.

This study was conducted in Ayawaso West municipal district, which is one of the 29 administrative districts in the greater Accra region of Ghana. The district has a population of 75,303 based on the 2021 population and housing census, of which 38,164 are males and 36,689 are females. The most reported diseases in the area are malaria, typhoid, and diarrhea [36]. The first index case of COVID-19 in Ghana was reported in this district [35]. Currently, the district has 2 public hospitals; Legon hospital and the University of Ghana Medical Center (UGMC), and 5 community health planning and services (CHPS) zones located in the five sub-municipalities, namely, Abelemkpe, Dzorwulu, Legon, Roman Ridge and Westland. This cross-sectional study involved healthcare workers from Legon Hospital, UGMC, and from the 5 CHPS zones. Healthcare workers comprised workers who provided direct and indirect care to clients and included medical doctors, nurses, midwives, pharmacists, laboratory technologists, radiographers, dentists, dieticians, optometrists, and administration staff.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

healthcare workers from the two public hospitals (UGMC and Legon Hospital) and all healthcare workers from the 5 CHPS zones in Ayawaso West district who consented to participate in the study were included. Healthcare workers who met the inclusion criteria but were on leave from work and not present during the time of data collection, sick and unable to participate in the study, disagreed to participate in the study, or failed to sign the consent form were excluded from the study.

Sample size calculation and sampling method

The sample size was calculated using the Yamane formula [37]. A confidence level of 95% and a level of precision of 5% were assumed in this study. The formula is as follows.

$$n = N/[1 + N(e)^2]$$

Where n is the desired sample size, N is the estimated population of healthcare workers in Ayawaso West Municipality, and e is the level of precision. Ayawaso West Municipality is in the Greater Accra region, which had an estimated 20,344 healthcare workers as of 2018 [38]. The estimated total number of healthcare workers in Ayawaso West municipality was 702. Using the formula, the sample size was calculated as follows.

$$n = 702/[1 + 701(0.05)^2]$$

$$n = 255$$

To account for the possibility of non-response and incomplete questionnaires, an additional 10% was added to the sample size[39], giving a sample size of $255 + 10\% \text{ of } 255 = 280.5 \sim 281$.

Proportionate Stratified random sampling was used to select study participants. This provided a more representative sample of the study population. Firstly, the sample size for each health facility was proportionally allocated based on the number of health workers. Thus, 135 participants were allocated to UGMC, 132 to Legon Hospital, and 14 to CHPS zones. Secondly, stratification was done by profession type, and the sample size to be recruited from each profession was proportionally allocated. Thereafter, lists of healthcare workers were obtained from the human resource offices of each health facility, and a simple random sampling technique procedure using R software was used to select participants from each stratum of healthcare workers. Selected participants were contacted and those who consented to participate in the study were issued with a questionnaire.

Data collection tool and quality control

Data was collected using a self-administered questionnaire adapted from previously published studies on COVID-19 [40–43]. The tool was designed in English, the official working language of the study setting, and was divided into six sections. Section 1 assessed socio-demographic characteristics, section 2 assessed knowledge about COVID-19 vaccination, section 3 assessed attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination, section 4 assessed perceived effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines, and Section 5 assessed five domains of the health belief model (HBM), including perceived susceptibility, perceived severity, perceived benefits, perceived barriers, and cues to action. The adapted questionnaire was reviewed for face and content validity by an expert from the University of Ghana, School of Public Health. The resultant questionnaire was pilot-tested among 20 HCWs at Legon Hospital to verify its simplicity and feasibility. Modifications were made to the questionnaire based on the pre-test results. Those who participated in the pilot test were excluded from the final analysis.

We assessed the internal consistency of the adapted questionnaire using Cronbach's alpha, and a measure of ≥ 0.7 was considered a satisfactory measure of internal consistency [44]. Knowledge about COVID-19 vaccination was assessed by asking 10 questions related to vaccination and each question had answer options of true, false and I don't know. The correct option was assigned a score of 1 and all other options were assigned a score of 0. The score for this section therefore ranged from 0 to 10. To categorize participants as having good knowledge and poor knowledge, bloom's cut-off point of $\geq 80\%$ (8 or more correct responses) was used and participants who scored $\geq 80\%$ were considered to have good knowledge and otherwise have poor knowledge [45]. Attitude toward the COVID-19 vaccination was assessed with six attitude-based questions, while perceived vaccine effectiveness was assessed based on three questions. For the HBM, five dimensions were assessed, which included perceived

215 susceptibility (five questions), perceived severity and seriousness (five questions), perceived benefits of
 216 the vaccine (seven questions), perceived barriers to vaccination (twelve questions), and cues to action
 217 (eight questions). Items on Attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination, perceived vaccination
 218 effectiveness, and HBM constructs were measured on a five-point Likert scale, in which a score ranging
 219 from 1 to 5 was given from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” (1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree,
 220 3=neutral, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree). To minimize acquiescence bias, some questions were reverse
 221 asked. These were reverse-coded during the analysis. The total score for each dimension was
 222 computed and the mean score for each domain was calculated. Scores above the mean indicated
 223 greater levels of the specific domain and otherwise lower levels [46].

224 Data was collected from 24th July 2023 to 31st August 2023 with the help of three trained assistants,
 225 who are healthcare workers. One research assistant was recruited from each of the two public
 226 hospitals (UGMC and Legon Hospital) and the third research assistant was recruited from the CHPS
 227 zone to assist with the recruitment of study participants, distribution, and collection of completed
 228 questionnaires from the two hospitals and at the CHPS zones respectively. The research assistants
 229 were trained on the objectives of the study, contents of the questionnaire, and ethical considerations
 230 through a one-day workshop.

231 **Outcome measure**

232 The outcome variable was COVID-19 vaccine uptake, which was defined as having received at least one
 233 dose of any of the current available COVID-19 vaccines. This was assessed by asking whether the
 234 participants received the vaccine or not with ‘yes, one dose’, ‘yes, two doses’, and ‘No’ response
 235 options. A binary variable was created and those who received at least one dose of the vaccine were

236 categorized as having accepted the vaccination while those who had not received any dose of the
237 vaccine were considered hesitant.

238 **Data management and analysis**

239 Completed questionnaires were coded and data was entered into Microsoft Excel after a manual check
240 for completeness. The entered data was imported into IBM SPSS version 22 for analysis. The study
241 population was characterized using descriptive statistical analyses (mean, standard deviation, and
242 frequency). Bivariate analysis was performed between socio-demographic characteristics and the
243 outcome variable (uptake of COVID-19 vaccination) using the Chi-square test to determine potential
244 confounding variables to include in logistic regression. Variables found to have significant associations
245 at $p < 0.05$ with the outcome variable were included in logistic regression analysis. Univariable logistic
246 regression analysis was performed to identify variables to include in multivariable logistic regression
247 with a statistical significance set at $p < 0.2$. In multivariable logistic regression analysis, a statistically
248 significant association was considered at $p < 0.05$. The model was assessed for goodness of fit using the
249 Hosmer and Lemeshow test, and we ensured that multicollinearity was not problematic by checking
250 the variation inflation factor (VIF). Crude odds ratios (COR) and adjusted odds ratios (AOR) with a 95%
251 confidence interval (95% CI) are reported.

252 **Ethical considerations**

253 This study was approved by the Ghana Health Service Ethics Review Committee (GHS-ERC) with
254 protocol ID: GHS-ERC 052/05/23 and by the University of Ghana Medical Center Institutional Review
255 Board (UGMC-IRB) with protocol ID: UGMC-IRB/MSRC/050/2023. Additionally, clearance to collect data
256 from health facilities was obtained from Ayawaso West Municipal Health Directorate and from
257 managements of selected hospitals. Written and informed consent was obtained from participants

prior to collecting data. The collected data was anonymous, and the information obtained in this study was kept confidential. No name or any identifying information was asked or taken during the data collection process. Participants were free to withdraw from the study at any point and only those participants who consented were recruited in the study. COVID-19 protocol was adhered to during the data collection process.

Results

Socio-demographic characteristics of participants

Table 1 provides descriptive characteristics of the participants. To have a more representative sample, the study involved diverse categories of health workers (i.e., Nurses, Doctors, Midwives, Hospital administrators, and Allied health workers including physiotherapists, dentists, pharmacists, radiographers, opticians among others) and from different levels of care (i.e., Hospitals and CHPS Zones). We recruited participants from two public hospitals (UGMC, and Legon Hospital) and from five CHPS zones. Almost equal numbers of participants were recruited from UGMC 123 (48.0%) and Legon Hospital 120 (46.9%) while 13 (5.1%) were recruited from CHPS zones. Overall, 281 healthcare workers completed the survey, of which 256 (91.1%) were included in the final analysis (the rest were excluded due to unanswered or incompletely answered questionnaires). The mean age of participants was 31 years (SD=6.2), and the majority were females 163 (63.7%).

About one-third 77 (30.1%) of the participants were nurses and allied health workers made up a quarter 65 (25.3%) of the participants. A large proportion of participants 160 (62.5%) were not married and more than half 146 (57%) were frontline healthcare workers. Close to half 121 (47.3%) of the participants had 1-4 years of working experience. Only a small proportion of 96 (37.5%) of participants had previously tested positive for COVID-19. We have recorded a high rate of 220 (85.9%) of COVID-19 vaccination among healthcare workers in Ghana (**Table 1**).

298 **Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of healthcare workers in Ayawaso west Municipality (n=256)**

Variables	Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)
Age group		
Less than 30 years	101	39.5
30 to 35 years	89	34.8
Above 35 years	66	25.7
Sex		
Male	93	36.3
Female	163	63.7
Profession type		
Nurses	77	30.1
Midwives	45	17.6
Medical doctors	23	9
Allied health workers ^b	65	25.3
Administration staff	46	18
Years of practice		
<5 years	121	47.3
5-10 years	79	30.9
>10 years	56	21.8
Marital status		
Married	96	37.5
Not married	160	62.5
Frontline health worker		
Yes	145	56.6
No	111	43.4
Previous diagnosis of COVID-19		
Yes	96	37.5
No	160	62.5
COVID-19 vaccination status		
Vaccinated	220	85.9
Not vaccinated	36	14.1
Health Facility		
UGMC	123	48.0
Legon hospital	120	46.9
CHPS	13	5.1

299 ^b Physiotherapists, radiographers, dieticians, opticians, pharmacists, laboratory technologists, dental therapists

300 **Knowledge about COVID-19 vaccination**

301 **Table 2** shows the responses of participants to questions related to knowledge about COVID-19

302 vaccination. The majority of participants 234 (91.4%) were aware of the vulnerability of elderly people

303 and those with chronic diseases to COVID-19 infection and hence the need for them to get vaccinated.

304 More than three-quarters 223 (87.1%) of participants knew that vaccines work by allowing the immune

305 system to build a memory against infectious agents and close to two-thirds 161 (62.9%) were aware

that RNA and DNA vaccines give genetic codes that enable the immune system to produce a memory against infectious agents. Additionally, the majority 208 (81.3%) of participants were aware that people with chronic diseases such as diabetes, hypertension, and heart diseases are eligible to receive the COVID-19 vaccines. Participants had low levels of awareness 100 (39.1%) on whether pregnant and lactating mothers are eligible to receive the COVID-19 vaccines or not. The mean knowledge score for this scale was 7.4 (SD=1.8). More than half 139 (54.3%) of participants had good knowledge about COVID-19 vaccination at a cut-off of 80% of the total score of 10, whereas 117 (45.7%) had poor knowledge. The Cronbach alpha (α) for this scale was 0.52.

Table 2. Knowledge about COVID-19 Vaccination among HCWs in Ayawaso West Municipality of Greater Accra, Ghana, 2023 (n=256)

Question	Correct Response n (%)	Incorrect Response n (%)	Do not know. n (%)
Vaccines are effective in combating highly contagious diseases ^t	212 (82.8)	14 (5.5)	30 (11.7)
Traditionally, vaccines create immunity by introducing a weak form of an infectious agent that allows the immune system to build a memory against this agent ^t	223 (87.1)	10 (3.9)	23 (9.0)
The RNA and DNA vaccines give our bodies the genetic code it needs to allow our immune system to produce the antigen on its own ^t	161 (62.9)	23 (9.0)	72 (28.1)
Covid-19 vaccines are being developed as quickly as possible, but they were required to receive the necessary regulatory licenses ^t	172 (67.2)	16 (6.3)	68 (26.6)
The flu vaccine protects against covid-19 ^f	136 (53.1)	32 (12.5)	88 (34.4)
People with chronic diseases and elderly are more likely to have the disease and its complications, so they should get the vaccine ^t	234 (91.4)	11 (4.3)	11 (4.3)
Young people are healthy and therefore do not need to follow preventive measures and to get the vaccine in order to protect themselves against Covid-19 ^f	235 (91.8)	17 (6.6)	4 (1.6)
Patients with chronic diseases like diabetes, hypertension and heart diseases are eligible to take the COVID-19 Vaccine ^t	208 (81.3)	15 (5.9)	33 (12.9)
Pregnant and lactating mothers are eligible to take the COVID-19 vaccine ^t	100 (39.1)	94 (36.7)	62 (24.2)
Until the readiness and the availability of COVID-19 vaccine, we cannot do anything to tackle the disease ^f	212 (82.8)	29 (11.3)	15 (5.9)

^t True statement, ^f False statement

Attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination

Table 3 shows responses of participants to questions related to attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination.

The mean attitude score was 20.9 (SD=4.6). The Cronbach alpha for this scale was 0.84. Of the total participants, 218 (85.2%) had positive attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination whereas 38 (14.8%) had negative attitude.

Table 3. Attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination among HCWs in Ayawaso West Municipality of Greater Accra, Ghana, 2023 (n=256)

Question	Strongly Disagree n (%)	Disagree n (%)	Neutral n (%)	Agree n (%)	Strongly Agree n (%)
Do you think that many diseases prevented by vaccination are serious ones, mainly infectious?	9 (3.5)	30 (11.7)	35 (13.7)	123 (48.0)	59 (23.0)
Do you think that the immunity acquired after contracting the disease is better than after vaccination? *	25 (9.8)	87 (34.0)	95 (37.1)	42 (16.4)	7 (2.7)
Do you think that it is better to wait for the next emerging vaccines than to get one of those developed in the first stage? *	37 (14.5)	94 (36.7)	87 (34.0)	28 (10.9)	10 (3.9)
Would you make a decision not to vaccinate for reasons other than illness or allergy? *	49 (19.1)	108 (42.2)	55 (21.5)	32 (12.5)	12 (4.7)
Would you delay getting vaccinated for reasons other than illness or allergy? *	48 (18.8)	113 (44.1)	39 (15.2)	45 (17.6)	11 (4.3)
Do you think that opinions on vaccines are primarily governed by the opinions and benefits of pharmaceutical companies? *	30 (11.7)	80 (31.1)	93 (36.3)	42 (16.4)	11 (4.3)

* Scoring was reversed for these items

Perceived COVID-19 Vaccine Effectiveness

Table 4 shows the responses of participants to questions related to the perception of the effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccination. The mean perceived COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness score was 9.7 (SD=3.1). The Cronbach alpha for this scale was 0.74. More than two-thirds of participants, 188 (73.4%) had a positive perception of COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness whereas 68 (26.6%) had a negative perception.

Table 4. Perceived COVID-19 Vaccination effectiveness among HCWs in Ayawaso West Municipality of Greater Accra, Ghana, 2023 (n=256)

Statement	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
Do you think that vaccination against COVID-19 can protect you from contracting COVID-19?	50 (19.5)	61 (23.8)	38 (14.8)	64 (25.0)	43 (16.8)
Do you think that COVID-19 vaccination can prevent people from getting infected due to herd immunity?	36 (14.1)	52 (20.3)	49 (19.1)	89 (34.8)	30 (11.7)
Do you think mass vaccination against COVID-19 is justified?	14 (5.5)	22 (8.6)	72 (28.1)	87 (34.0)	61 (23.8)

Health Belief Model Constructs

Table 5 shows the responses of participants to questions relating to the HBM constructs. The majority of participants scored above the calculated mean scores on all five domains of the HBM. More than three-quarters 226 (88.3%) of participants had a high perception of susceptibility to COVID-19 infection. The Cronbach alpha for the perceived susceptibility scale was 0.82. Again, the majority (81.3%) of participants had a high perception of the severity and seriousness of COVID-19 infection. The calculated Cronbach alpha for the perceived severity and seriousness scale was 0.81. The majority 228 (89.1%) of participants had a high perception of COVID-19 vaccination benefits. The Cronbach alpha for the perceived vaccine benefit scale was 0.91. Additionally, 239 (93.4%) of participants had a high perception of barriers to vaccination. The Cronbach alpha for perceived vaccination barriers was 0.83. With regards to cues to action, 203 (79.3%) had high cues to action and the Cronbach alpha for this scale was 0.83.

349

Table 5. HBM constructs of HCWs in Ayawaso West Municipality of Greater Accra, Ghana, 2023 (n=256)

Variable	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	Cronbach alpha
Perceived susceptibility						0.82
I am susceptible of getting infected due to my occupational exposure.	10 (3.9)	24 (9.4)	22 (8.6)	81 (31.6)	119 (46.5)	
There is a great chance to get infected by COVID-19 in the next coming months, especially during the cold season.	12 (4.7)	28 (10.9)	88 (34.4)	95 (37.1)	33 (12.9)	
Healthy people can get COVID-19.	8 (3.1)	17 (6.6)	22 (8.6)	117 (45.7)	92 (35.9)	
My status as a health worker makes me more susceptible to contract COVID-19.	16 (6.3)	31 (12.1)	80 (31.3)	82 (32.0)	47 (18.4)	
I believe that I can protect myself against COVID-19 better than other people.	10 (3.9)	31 (12.1)	58 (22.7)	114 (44.5)	43 (16.8)	
Perceived severity and seriousness						0.81
Although for most people, COVID-19 causes mild illness, it makes some people very ill and can be fatal.	10 (3.9)	26 (10.2)	31 (12.1)	75 (29.3)	114 (44.5)	
I think COVID-19 is more serious than any other Flu like illness	9 (3.5)	31 (12.1)	60 (23.4)	103 (40.2)	53 (20.7)	
I would be very sick if I get COVID-19	14 (5.5)	46 (18.0)	94 (36.7)	82 (32.0)	20 (7.8)	
If I get COVID-19, I might require hospitalization.	19 (7.4)	47 (18.4)	82 (32.0)	82 (32.0)	20 (7.8)	
If I get COVID-19, I might die.	52 (20.3)	59 (23.0)	60 (23.4)	56 (21.9)	29 (11.3)	
Perceived benefits of vaccination						0.91
Vaccination is a good idea because it makes me feel less worried about catching COVID-19.	12 (4.7)	29 (11.3)	46 (18.0)	132 (51.6)	37 (14.5)	
Vaccination decreases my chance of getting COVID-19 or its complications.	8 (3.1)	31 (12.1)	35 (13.7)	137 (53.5)	45 (17.6)	
Vaccines are considered between the most tested and safe medical products.	10 (3.9)	23 (9.0)	76 (29.7)	122 (47.7)	25 (9.8)	

When I get vaccinated, I protect my patients, family, and friends from infection.	8 (3.1)	24 (9.4)	25 (9.8)	120 (46.9)	79 (30.9)	
When I get vaccinated, the whole community benefits by preventing the spread of COVID-19	18 (7.0)	24 (9.4)	36 (14.1)	109 (42.6)	69 (27.0)	
COVID-19 vaccination is an effective way to prevent and control COVID-19.	8 (3.1)	20 (7.8)	39 (15.2)	114 (44.5)	75 (29.3)	
High vaccination coverage globally is required to stop COVID-19 pandemic.	9 (3.1)	32 (12.5)	39 (15.2)	101 (39.5)	75 (29.3)	
Perceived barriers						0.83
I am concerned that the vaccine is new and has not been used before.	13 (5.1)	46 (18.0)	61 (23.8)	111 (43.4)	25 (9.8)	
I am concerned about the side effects of COVID-19 vaccine.	3 (1.2)	19 (7.4)	30 (11.7)	144 (56.3)	60 (23.4)	
I am concerned about the efficacy of COVID-19 vaccine. 0	6 (2.3)	23 (9.0)	42 (16.4)	145 (56.6)	40 (15.6)	
I am concerned about the safety of COVID-19 vaccine.	9 (3.5)	14 (5.5)	44 (17.2)	140 (54.7)	49 (19.1)	
I am concerned about the accessibility of COVID-19 vaccines (geographical distribution of vaccination centers)	7 (2.7)	34 (13.3)	62 (24.2)	119 (46.5)	34 (13.3)	
I am concerned about the availability of COVID-19 vaccine in limited quantities for limited categories of the population.	6 (2.3)	31 (12.1)	67 (26.2)	124 (48.4)	28 (10.9)	
I am concerned whether if the COVID-19 vaccine is allowed by my religion.	62 (24.2)	88 (34.4)	47 (18.4)	44 (17.2)	15 (5.9)	
I am concerned about the reliability of the manufacturer and the source of supply.	13 (5.1)	21 (8.2)	55 (21.5)	129 (50.4)	38 (14.8)	
I am concerned about Ghana health system, and the strategy of distribution of the vaccines	9 (3.5)	21 (8.2)	69 (27.0)	115 (44.9)	42 (16.4)	
I am concerned about vaccine mode of administration (Injection)	22 (8.6)	65 (25.4)	63 (24.6)	79 (30.9)	27 (10.5)	
I am concerned about the number of doses of the vaccine that I have to take.	14 (5.5)	39 (15.2)	63 (24.6)	105 (41.0)	35 (13.7)	

I am concerned about the duration of immunity for the vaccine (how much time I will be protected)	7 (2.7)	15 (5.9)	70 (27.3)	115 (44.9)	49 (19.1)	
Cues to action						0.82
Adequate and reliable information was necessary for me before taking the vaccine.	4 (1.6)	23 (9.0)	19 (7.4)	138 (53.9)	72 (28.1)	
I took the vaccine because it was recommended by the health facilities.	21 (8.2)	46 (18.0)	27 (10.5)	113 (44.1)	49 (19.1)	
I took the COVID-19 vaccine because it was recommended by a family member.	50 (19.5)	133 (52.0)	44 (17.2)	22 (8.6)	7 (2.7)	
I took the COVID-19 vaccine because it was recommended by the health authorities.	18 (7.0)	38 (14.8)	42 (16.4)	101 (39.5)	57 (22.3)	
I took the COVID-19 vaccine because it was widely recommended by the media.	37 (14.5)	102 (39.8)	45 (17.6)	53 (20.7)	19 (7.4)	
I took the COVID-19 vaccine after recommendations at my work.	26 (10.2)	72 (28.1)	30 (11.7)	93 (36.3)	35 (13.7)	
I took the COVID-19 vaccine because it was taken by many in the public.	44 (17.2)	128 (50.0)	45 (17.6)	28 (10.9)	11 (4.3)	
I took the vaccine because it was a requirement by my employers.	38 (14.8)	102 (39.8)	31 (12.1)	55 (21.5)	30 (11.7)	

350

351 **Bivariate analysis between socio-demographic characteristics and COVID-19** 352 **vaccination uptake among HCWs**

353 To identify candidate confounding socio-demographic variables for inclusion in multivariable logistic
354 regression analysis, a Chi-square test was performed between potential confounders and the outcome
355 variable (uptake of COVID-19 vaccination). However, no significant associations were found between
356 socio-demographic factors and uptake of COVID-19 vaccination. The results of the bivariate analysis are
357 displayed in Table 6.

Table 6. Bivariate association between socio-demographic characteristics of health workers in Ayawaso West municipality and uptake of COVID-19 vaccination

Variable	COVID-19 vaccination			
	Vaccinated N=220 (85.9%) n (%)	Not vaccinated N=36 (14.1%) n (%)	Chi-square (χ^2)	P-value
Age group			1.78	0.410
Less than 30 years	85 (84.2)	16 (15.8)		
30 to 35 years	80 (89.9)	9 (10.1)		
Above 35 years	55 (83.3)	11 (16.7)		
Sex			2.15	0.143
Male	76 (81.7)	17 (18.3)		
Female	144 (88.3)	19 (11.7)		
Profession type			7.78	0.098**
Nurses	72 (93.5)	5 (6.5)		
Midwives	37 (82.2)	8 (17.8)		
Medical doctors	21 (91.3)	2 (8.7)		
Allied Health workers ^b	51 (78.5)	14 (21.5)		
Hospital administration staff	39 (84.8)	7 (15.2)		
Years of Practice			0.32	0.854
<5 years	104 (86.0)	17 (14.0)		
5-10 years	69 (87.3)	10 (12.7)		
>10 years	47 (83.9)	9 (16.1)		
Marital Status			0.03	0.853
Married	82 (85.4)	14 (14.6)		
Not married	138 (86.2)	22 (13.8)		
Frontline health worker				
Yes	130 (89.7)	15 (10.3)	3.83	0.051
No	90 (81.1)	21 (18.9)		
Previous COVID-19 infection			0.86	0.353
Yes	85 (88.5)	11 (11.5)		
No	135 (84.4)	25 (15.6)		

**Fishers Exact test conducted, ^b Includes pharmacists, physiotherapists, dentists, lab technicians, opticians, radiographers, dieticians.

Predictors of COVID-19 vaccination uptake

Univariable binary logistic regression models were used to determine the crude odds ratios (COR).

Thereafter, variables found statistically significant at $p < 0.2$ were entered simultaneously into the model to determine the adjusted odds ratios (AOR). To ensure there was no multicollinearity between variables, the variation inflation factor (VIF) was checked, and no multicollinearity was found between variables ($VIF < 5$). The model was further assessed for goodness of fit using the Hosmer and Lemeshow test. The model was considered fit since it was insignificant at $p < 0.05$ with the Hosmer-Lemeshow test.

370 The model explained 42.7% (Nagelkerke R square) of the variance in the dependent variable and
371 correctly classified 91.8% of the cases.

372 In the univariable logistic regression model, healthcare workers with good vaccination knowledge (COR
373 = 3.7; 95% CI: 1.7, 8.0), those with a positive attitude towards the COVID-19 vaccine (COR = 10.2; 95%
374 CI: 4.4, 23.4), and positive perception of vaccine effectiveness (COR = 5.9; 95% CI: 2.8, 12.5), those with
375 high perception of susceptibility to COVID-19 infection (COR = 11.0; 95% CI: 4.5, 26.8), and high
376 perception of vaccine benefits (COR = 13.3; 95% CI: 5.1, 34.4) and those with high cues to action (COR =
377 9.6; 95% CI: 4.4, 20.7) were significantly more likely to have received the COVID-19 vaccination.

378 However, after accounting for the effects of other variables in the adjusted model, only attitude
379 towards vaccination and cues to action were independent predictors of COVID-19 vaccination uptake.

380 Healthcare workers with positive attitudes towards the vaccine were 4.3 times more likely to have
381 received the COVID-19 vaccine compared to those with negative attitudes (AOR = 4.3; 95% CI: 1.4,
382 13.0), and those with high cues to action were 5.7 times more likely to have been vaccinated against
383 COVID-19 compared to those with low cues to action (AOR = 5.7; 95% CI: 2.2, 14.8) (Table 7).

384

385

386

387

388

389

390 **Table 7. Univariable and Multivariable Logistic regression for factors associated with uptake of COVID-19 vaccination**
391 **among health workers in Ayawaso West Municipality**

Variable	COR ^a (95% CI)	p-value	AOR ^b (95% CI)	p-value
Knowledge about COVID-19 Vaccination		0.001**		0.115
Poor knowledge	1		1	
Good knowledge	3.7 (1.7-8.0)		2.1 (0.8-5.6)	
Attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination		<0.001**		<0.01*
Negative attitude	1		1	
Positive attitude	10.2 (4.4-23.4)		4.3 (1.4-13.0)	
Perceived COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness		<0.001**		0.299
Low perception	1		1	
High Perception	5.9 (2.8-12.5)		1.8 (0.6-5.1)	
Perceived susceptibility to COVID-19		<0.001**		0.165
Low perception	1		1	
High perception	11.0 (4.5-26.8)		2.6 (0.7-10.4)	
Perceived severity and seriousness of COVID-19		0.138		0.567
Low perception	1		1	
High perception	1.9 (0.8-4.4)		0.7 (0.2-2.6)	
Perceived COVID-19 vaccine benefits	1	<0.001**	1	0.245
Low Perception	1		1	
High Perception	13.3 (5.1-34.4)		2.5 (0.5-11.2)	
Perceived barriers to COVID-19 Vaccination		0.335		
High Perception	1			
Low Perception	2.7 (0.4-21.4)			
Cues to action		<0.001**		<0.001*
Low cues	1		1	

High cues	9.6 (4.4-20.7)		5.7 (2.2-14.8)	
-----------	----------------	--	----------------	--

COR-Crude Odds Ratio, AOR-Adjusted Odds Ratio, *-Statistically significant at p<0.01, **-Statistically significant at p<0.001 ^a
-Univariable logistic regression analysis, ^b -Multivariable logistic regression analysis

Discussion

COVID-19 vaccination has remained a complex matter influenced by social, cultural, geographical, and political factors [47,48]. The pandemic resulted in the death of thousands of HCWs [13], which could have been prevented through vaccination [49,50]. However, hesitancy to receive the COVID-19 vaccination was prevalent among HCWs [51–54], and this impeded efforts to curb the pandemic. To address the challenge of vaccine hesitancy among HCWs, it is crucial to identify influencing factors as this will aid in formulating targeted vaccination campaign strategies. Therefore, this current study assessed the uptake of COVID-19 vaccination and determining factors among HCWs in Ghana after rolling out of the vaccination.

Uptake of COVID-19 vaccination among HCWs

This study found an outstanding vaccine uptake among HCWs, with more than three-quarters (85.9%) of participants having received at least one dose of the COVID-19 vaccine. The high COVID-19 vaccination rate among HCWs in Ghana is similar to high rates reported by other researchers, such as a vaccination rate of 72.1% in Zambia [55], 77.0% in China [56], 82.5% in Malawi [57], and 70.5% in Egypt [58]. In contrast to these findings, formative studies conducted before the COVID-19 vaccines were rolled out reviewed that most HCWs had concerns about the vaccines and were not willing to get vaccinated once vaccines were made available. In Ghana for example, a study conducted before the availability of the COVID-19 vaccines found that only 39.3% of HCWs expressed willingness to receive the vaccine [59]. Similarly, an acceptance of 27.7% among HCWs was reported in the Democratic Republic of Congo [60]. Similar trends have been reported in several other formative studies [54,61–63]. We attribute this inconsistent finding to the nature in which formative studies were conducted. Most were rapid assessments of the situation and employed non-probability sampling techniques,

justifiably due to lockdowns, with a high possibility of selection bias. Moreover, our study was conducted during the implementation phase of the vaccination when most HCWs had already been exposed to accurate messages about the vaccines. This exposure to accurate information may have positively influenced their earlier vaccination decisions. Additionally, the influence of peers and colleagues who had received the vaccines within the healthcare community could have played a role in shaping individual choices.

Knowledge about and attitude toward COVID-19 vaccination among HCWs

HCWs were highly knowledgeable about COVID-19 vaccination. These results are consistent with findings from similar prior studies such as in Nigeria, where health workers were found to be highly knowledgeable about COVID-19 vaccines [31], in Ethiopia where the majority of health workers had more than average knowledge about the vaccines [64] and in Sierra Leone [43]. Most participants had a positive attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination. Similar trends have been reported by Kanu et al among Sierra Leonian health workers [43] and by Tolossa et al among Ethiopian health workers [65]. Contrary to these findings, Alle et al in a study among health workers at a specialized hospital in Ethiopia reported that majority of health workers had an overall negative attitude toward the COVID-19 vaccine [66]. This inconsistency could partly be attributed to the fact that the later study recruited participants from one health facility, hence the results may not be representative of the views of HCWs in Ethiopia.

Perceived COVID-19 vaccination effectiveness among HCWs

Furthermore, we established that the majority of HCWs perceived the COVID-19 vaccination to be effective in preventing COVID-19 infection. These results were supported by a global survey of twenty countries among the general adult population in which perceived COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness ranged from 67.8% in Egypt to 95.9% in Malaysia [67]. Contrary to our findings, which conform with

findings among the general adult population, a study in Egypt among HCWs found higher levels (67.8%) of disbelief about COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness [68]. This is attributed to the rampant spread of misinformation about the COVID-19 vaccination across the media in Egypt after the vaccine was rolled out, as reported in previous studies [69,70].

Determinants of COVID-19 vaccination uptake

Our study established a significant relationship between knowledge about COVID-19 vaccination and uptake of the vaccination in the univariable analysis. Knowledge about vaccination among HCWs has previously been established to be an important determinant of vaccination [71,72]. With regard to COVID-19, significant associations have been found between knowledge about COVID-19 vaccination and acceptance of the vaccine among health workers in Greece [73], Italy [74], and China [29]. Our study aligns with these findings, as we observed similar trends and patterns, substantiating the conclusions drawn in prior studies. This study further established that attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination was an important determinant of vaccine uptake. Increased positive attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination independently predicted vaccine uptake. The observed association was documented in prior studies [75–78].

The HBM has widely been used in determining vaccination behavior, particularly COVID-19 vaccination. Most HBM constructs have significantly been associated with COVID-19 vaccine acceptance [46,76,78,79]. In this current study, five constructs of the HBM provided a framework for assessing determinants of COVID-19 vaccination uptake among HCWs. Those who perceived themselves to be at high risk of getting infected with COVID-19, those who perceived the COVID-19 vaccination to be beneficial, and those with high cues to action were significantly more likely to have received the COVID-19 vaccine in the univariable analysis. Similar findings were reported among HCWs in China [80] and

Ethiopia [46] and among the general population in Malawi [81], Israel [82] and Bangladesh [79]. These findings provide an evidence-based formulation of vaccination strategies.

Factors independently associated with COVID-19 vaccination uptake.

After adjusting for the effects of other variables in the adjusted model, cues to action and attitude toward COVID-19 vaccination were the only significant predictors of COVID-19 vaccine uptake. Cues to action and attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination had a direct influence on vaccine uptake, while knowledge about COVID-19 vaccination, perceived susceptibility, perceived vaccine effectiveness, and benefit might have influenced vaccine uptake through attitude towards vaccination and cues to action. Previous studies established that cues to action have the most significant effect on vaccine acceptance [80,83], which makes our observation not surprising. In China, a study found that HCWs with high cues to action were 23 times (AOR = 23.66, 95% CI: 9.97–56.23) more likely to accept the COVID-19 vaccine compared to those with low cues to action [83]. Similar conforming results were reported by other researchers in China [80] and Malawi [84]. Cues to action work as “triggers” that prompt individuals to change their behavior [85]. In the context of COVID-19 vaccination, governments, and experts’ provision of accurate information about the vaccine acts as triggers to encourage active participation in vaccination initiatives [86]. Ghana employed a combination of informative, motivational, and coercive strategies to address vaccine hesitancy [87]. This strategy could have resulted in high cues to action among HCWs, explaining our findings in this study, and this could have resulted in the higher vaccine uptake reported in this study. This suggests the important role of dissemination of information through government institutions to increase the uptake of COVID-19 vaccination among HCWs.

Socio-demographic factors associated with COVID-19 vaccination uptake.

In this study, several sociodemographic factors that have previously been associated with COVID-19 vaccine acceptability were considered, such as age [88], Sex [89] profession type [63], marital status [90], and working in the frontline [42]. However, no significant associations between sociodemographic factors and uptake of the COVID-19 vaccination were found. Similar insignificant associations were reported among Israelites [82].

Limitations of the study

We recognize a few limitations to this study. Our study relied heavily on hospital records to recruit a representative sample of HCWs. While this may be considered a strength, we recognize that not all HCWs were documented in the hospital registers, which meant that those omitted from registers were automatically excluded from the study. This may have led to undercoverage. Another limitation lies in self-reported vaccination status among HCWs, with a high risk of social desirability bias. We, however, minimized this risk by assuring our participants of confidentiality and anonymizing all questionnaires. Moreover, our scale for measuring knowledge about COVID-19 vaccination had a low internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.52, which is lower than the satisfactory criteria of ≥ 0.7 [91]. This raises concerns about the reliability of our knowledge scale. We therefore interpret this scale with caution. Despite these limitations, we still believe that our study provides valuable insights that are crucial for promoting COVID-19 vaccination among HCWs in Ghana.

Conclusion

COVID-19 vaccination among health workers in Ghana is promising. We found a high vaccination rate among HCWs in Ghana. Attitude towards vaccination and cues to action were the two most important factors affecting the uptake of the vaccination. Despite the high uptake of the COVID-19 vaccination among HCWs in Ghana, there is a significant proportion that is still hesitant. To ensure that all HCWs are vaccinated, Interventions to promote vaccination should target key determinants of vaccination uptake, such as attitude towards the vaccination and cues to action.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank healthcare workers who participated in this study. Additionally, we are grateful to Ayawaso West municipal directorate of health for accepting our request to collect data in the district.

References

1. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020;382: 727–733. doi:10.1056/nejmoa2001017
2. World Health Organization. COVID-19 UPDATE-11 MARCH. 2020 [cited 5 May 2023]. Available: <https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020>
3. Liu YC, Kuo RL, Shih SR. COVID-19: The first documented coronavirus pandemic in history. *Biomedical Journal*. Elsevier B.V.; 2020. pp. 328–333. doi:10.1016/j.bj.2020.04.007
4. World Health Organization. COVID-19 weekly epidemiological update. World Health Organization. 2022.
5. Ayouni I, Maatoug J, Dhouib W, Zammit N, Fredj S ben, Ghammam R, et al. Effective public health measures to mitigate the spread of COVID-19: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health*. 2021;21. doi:10.1186/s12889-021-11111-1
6. Levin AT, Owusu-Boaitey N, Pugh S, Fosdick BK, Zwi AB, Malani A, et al. Assessing the burden of COVID-19 in developing countries: Systematic review, meta-Analysis and public policy implications. *BMJ Global Health*. BMJ Publishing Group; 2022. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2022-008477
7. Sahu AK, Amrithanand VT, Mathew R, Aggarwal P, Nayer J, Bhoi S. COVID-19 in healthcare workers – A systematic review and meta-analysis. *American Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2020;38: 1727–1731. doi:10.1016/j.ajem.2020.05.113
8. Dzinamarira T, Murewanhema G, Mhango M, Iradukunda PG, Chitungo I, Mashora M, et al. COVID-19 prevalence among healthcare workers. A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. MDPI; 2022. doi:10.3390/ijerph19010146
9. Erdem H, Lucey DR. Healthcare worker infections and deaths due to COVID-19: A survey from 37 nations and a call for WHO to post national data on their website. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2021;102: 239–241. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2020.10.064
10. Ing EB, Xu QA, Salimi A, Torun N. Physician deaths from corona virus (COVID-19) disease. *Occup Med (Chic Ill)*. 2020;70: 370–374. doi:10.1093/occmed/kqaa088
11. Nagesh S, Chakraborty S. Saving the frontline health workforce amidst the COVID-19 crisis: Challenges and recommendations. *Journal of Global Health*. University of Edinburgh; 2020. doi:10.7189/jogh.10.010345
12. Papoutsis E, Giannakoulis VG, Ntella V, Pappa S, Katsaounou P. Global burden of COVID-19 pandemic on healthcare workers. *ERJ Open Res*. 2020;6: 00195–02020. doi:10.1183/23120541.00195-2020
13. Bandyopadhyay S, Baticulon RE, Kadhum M, Alser M, Ojuka DK, Badereddin Y, et al. Infection and mortality of healthcare workers worldwide from COVID-19: A systematic review. *BMJ Global Health*. BMJ Publishing Group; 2020. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003097

- 569 14. Muller SA, Wood RR, Hanefeld J, El-Bcheraoui C. Seroprevalence and risk factors of COVID-19 in
570 healthcare workers from 11 African countries: a scoping review and appraisal of existing evidence. Health
571 Policy and Planning. Oxford University Press; 2022. pp. 505–513. doi:10.1093/heapol/czab133
- 572 15. Beyuo TK, Lawrence ER, Selormey R, Fosu SE, Ankobea FK. The burden of COVID-19 infection on medical
573 doctors in the first year of the pandemic in Ghana. Ghana Med J. 2022;56: 71–77.
574 doi:10.4314/gmj.v56i2.3
- 575 16. Mhango M, Dzobo M, Chitungo I, Dzinamarira T. COVID-19 Risk Factors Among Health Workers: A Rapid
576 Review. Safety and Health at Work. Elsevier B.V.; 2020. pp. 262–265. doi:10.1016/j.shaw.2020.06.001
- 577 17. Chitungo I, Dzobo M, Hlongwa M, Dzinamarira T. COVID-19: Unpacking the low number of cases in Africa.
578 Public Health in Practice. 2020;1: 100038. doi:10.1016/j.puhip.2020.100038
- 579 18. Solante R, Alvarez-Moreno C, Burhan E, Chariyalertsak S, Chiu NC, Chuenkitmongkol S, et al. Expert
580 review of global real-world data on COVID-19 vaccine booster effectiveness and safety during the
581 omicron-dominant phase of the pandemic. Expert Review of Vaccines. Taylor and Francis Ltd.; 2023. pp.
582 1–16. doi:10.1080/14760584.2023.2143347
- 583 19. Alhassan RK, Aberese-Ako M, Doegah PT, Immurana M, Dalaba MA, Manyeh AK, et al. COVID-19 vaccine
584 hesitancy among the adult population in Ghana: evidence from a pre-vaccination rollout survey. Trop
585 Med Health. 2021;49. doi:10.1186/s41182-021-00357-5
- 586 20. World Health Organization. COVID-19 Dashboard. 2023 [cited 5 May 2023]. Available:
587 <https://covid19.who.int/>
- 588 21. World Health Organization. COVID-19 vaccine plan. 2021 [cited 5 May 2023]. Available:
589 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-Vaccine-deployment-2021.1-eng>
- 590 22. Sallam M. Covid-19 vaccine hesitancy worldwide: A concise systematic review of vaccine acceptance
591 rates. Vaccines. MDPI AG; 2021. pp. 1–15. doi:10.3390/vaccines9020160
- 592 23. MacDonald NE, Eskola J, Liang X, Chaudhuri M, Dube E, Gellin B, et al. Vaccine hesitancy: Definition,
593 scope and determinants. Vaccine. 2015;33: 4161–4164. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.04.036
- 594 24. Li M, Luo Y, Watson R, Zheng Y, Ren J, Tang J, et al. Healthcare workers’ (HCWs) attitudes and related
595 factors towards COVID-19 vaccination: A rapid systematic review. Postgraduate Medical Journal. BMJ
596 Publishing Group; 2021. doi:10.1136/postgradmedj-2021-140195
- 597 25. Ackah BBB, Woo M, Stallwood L, Fazal ZA, Okpani A, Ukah UV, et al. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in Africa:
598 a scoping review. Global Health Research and Policy. BioMed Central Ltd; 2022. doi:10.1186/s41256-022-
599 00255-1
- 600 26. Our World in Data. COVID-19 Vaccinations. 2023 [cited 5 May 2023]. Available:
601 <https://ourworldindata.org/covid-vaccinations>
- 602 27. UNICEF. COVID-19 COVAX vaccine Update. 2020 [cited 5 May 2023]. Available:
603 <https://www.unicef.org/press-releases/first-covid-19-covax-vaccine-doses-administered-africa>

- 604 28. Amiel Estrada CM, Palatino MC, Fe Theresa Lomboy MC, Roxas EA, Teresita Ramos-Mortel BM, Gregorio
605 ER. COVID-19 vaccination knowledge, attitudes, risk perception, and intention among health workers in a
606 district in. 2022.
- 607 29. Li XH, Chen L, Pan QN, Liu J, Zhang X, Yi JJ, et al. Vaccination status, acceptance, and knowledge toward a
608 COVID-19 vaccine among healthcare workers: a cross-sectional survey in China. *Hum Vaccin Immunother.*
609 2021;17: 4065–4073. doi:10.1080/21645515.2021.1957415
- 610 30. Regazzi L, Marziali E, Lontano A, Villani L, Paladini A, Calabrò GE, et al. Knowledge, attitudes, and
611 behaviors toward COVID-19 vaccination in a sample of Italian healthcare workers. *Hum Vaccin*
612 *Immunother.* 2022;18. doi:10.1080/21645515.2022.2116206
- 613 31. Ekwebene OC, Obidile VC, Azubuike PC, Nnamani CP, Dankano NE, Egbuniwe MC. COVID-19 Vaccine
614 Knowledge and Acceptability among Healthcare Providers in Nigeria. *Int J Trop Dis Health.* 2021;42: 51–
615 60. doi:10.9734/ijtdh/2021/v42i530458
- 616 32. Hajure M, Tariku M, Bekele F, Abdu Z, Dule A, Mohammedhussein M, et al. Attitude towards covid-19
617 vaccination among healthcare workers: A systematic review. *Infection and Drug Resistance.* Dove
618 Medical Press Ltd; 2021. pp. 3883–3897. doi:10.2147/IDR.S332792
- 619 33. Ackah M, Ameyaw L, Salifu MG, Asubonteng DPA, Yeboah CO, Annor EN, et al. COVID-19 vaccine
620 acceptance among healthcare workers in Africa: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS ONE. Public*
621 *Library of Science;* 2022. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0268711
- 622 34. Agyekum MW, Frempong Afrifa-Anane G, Kyei-Arthur F, Addo B, Author C. Acceptability of COVID-19
623 vaccination among healthcare workers in Ghana. doi:10.1101/2021.03.11.21253374
- 624 35. Kenu E, Odikro MA, Malm KL, Asiedu-Bekoe F, Noora CL, Frimpong JA, et al. Epidemiology of COVID-19
625 outbreak in Ghana, 2020. *Ghana Med J.* 2020;54: 5–15. doi:10.4314/GMJ.V54I4S.3
- 626 36. Ayawaso West Municipal Assembly. 2019-2022 Budget Report. 2019.
- 627 37. Yamane. Yamane, Taro (1967) *Statistics an Introductory Analysis.* 2nd Edition, New York. 1967 [cited 22
628 Nov 2023]. Available:
629 [https://www.scirp.org/\(S\(351jmbntvnsjt1aadkposzje\)\)/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=1](https://www.scirp.org/(S(351jmbntvnsjt1aadkposzje))/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=1699497)
630 699497
- 631 38. Ghana Statistical Serivce, Ministry of Health Ghana. Overview of the Health System in Ghana. Ghana
632 Service Provision Assessment Survey 2002. 2003.
- 633 39. Suresh K, Chandrashekara S. Sample size estimation and power analysis for clinical research studies. *J*
634 *Hum Reprod Sci.* 2012;5: 7–13. doi:10.4103/0974-1208.97779
- 635 40. Jankowska-Polańska B, Sarzyńska K, Czwojdzinski E, Świętoniowska-Lonc N, Dudek K, Piwowar A. Attitude
636 of Healthcare workers and Medical Students towards Vaccination against COVID-19. *Vaccines (Basel).*
637 2022;10: 1–15. doi:10.3390/vaccines10040535
- 638 41. Kumari A, Ranjan P, Chopra S, Kaur D. Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource
639 centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID- 19 . The COVID-19
640 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect , the company ’ s public news and information . 2020.

42. Youssef D, Abou-Abbas L, Berry A, Youssef J, Hassan H. Determinants of acceptance of Coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19) vaccine among Lebanese healthcare workers using health belief model. *PLoS One*. 2022;17: 1–17. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0264128
43. Kanu S, James PB, Bah AJ, Kabba JA, Kamara MS, Elleanor CE, et al. Healthcare workers' knowledge, attitude, practice and perceived health facility preparedness regarding covid-19 in sierra leone. *J Multidiscip Healthc*. 2021;14: 67–80. doi:10.2147/JMDH.S287156
44. Taan S, Hajjar EL. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS: INTERNAL-CONSISTENCY RELIABILITY AND CONSTRUCT VALIDITY. *International Journal of Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods*. 2018. Available: www.eajournals.org
45. Sisson PW, Mazzuchi T. Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives: A template for primary school KM education. *Proceedings of the European Conference on Knowledge Management, ECKM*. 2019;2: 949–957. doi:10.34190/KM19.059
46. Getachew T, Lami M, Eyeberu A, Balis B, Debella A, Eshetu B, et al. Acceptance of COVID-19 vaccine and associated factors among healthcare workers at public hospitals in Eastern Ethiopia using the health belief model. *Front Public Health*. 2022;10. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2022.957721
47. Roy DN, Biswas M, Islam E, Azam MS. Potential factors influencing COVID-19 vaccine acceptance and hesitancy: A systematic review. *PLoS ONE. Public Library of Science*; 2022. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0265496
48. Albrecht D. Vaccination, politics and COVID-19 impacts. *BMC Public Health*. 2022;22. doi:10.1186/s12889-021-12432-x
49. Hernández Bautista PF, Grajales Muñiz C, Cabrera Gaytán DA, Rojas Mendoza T, Vallejos Parás A, Santacruz Tinoco CE, et al. Impact of vaccination on infection or death from COVID-19 in individuals with laboratory-confirmed cases: Case-control study. *PLoS One*. 2023;18. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0265698
50. Yamana TK, Galanti M, Pei S, Di Fusco M, Angulo FJ, Moran MM, et al. The impact of COVID-19 vaccination in the US: Averted burden of SARS-COV-2-related cases, hospitalizations and deaths. *PLoS One*. 2023;18. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0275699
51. Peterson CJ, Lee B, Nugent K. COVID-19 Vaccination Hesitancy among Healthcare Workers—A Review. *Vaccines*. MDPI; 2022. doi:10.3390/vaccines10060948
52. Hajure M, Tariku M, Bekele F, Abdu Z, Dule A, Mohammedhussein M, et al. Attitude towards covid-19 vaccination among healthcare workers: A systematic review. *Infection and Drug Resistance*. Dove Medical Press Ltd; 2021. pp. 3883–3897. doi:10.2147/IDR.S332792
53. Zewude B, Belachew A. Intention to receive the second round of COVID-19 vaccine among healthcare workers in eastern Ethiopia. *Infect Drug Resist*. 2021;14: 3071–3082. doi:10.2147/IDR.S326055
54. N. Asumah M, Abubakari A, Fosu B, K. Dzantor E, D. Agyapong P, B.E. Harrison S, et al. Determinants of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance and hesitancy among healthcare professionals in the Kintampo North Municipality, Bono East Region, Ghana. *Ghana Med J*. 2022;56: 152–159. doi:10.4314/gmj.v56i3.4

- 677 55. Mudenda S, Daka V, Matafwali SK, Skosana P, Chabalenge B, Mukosha M, et al. COVID-19 Vaccine
678 Acceptance and Hesitancy among Healthcare Workers in Lusaka, Zambia; Findings and Implications for
679 the Future. *Vaccines (Basel)*. 2023;11. doi:10.3390/vaccines11081350
- 680 56. Wang MW, Wen W, Wang N, Zhou MY, Wang CY, Ni J, et al. COVID-19 Vaccination Acceptance Among
681 Healthcare Workers and Non-healthcare Workers in China: A Survey. *Front Public Health*. 2021;9.
682 doi:10.3389/fpubh.2021.709056
- 683 57. Moucheraud C, Phiri K, Whitehead HS, Songo J, Lungu E, Chikuse E, et al. Uptake of the COVID-19 vaccine
684 among healthcare workers in Malawi. *Int Health*. 2023;15: 77–84. doi:10.1093/inthealth/ihac007
- 685 58. Tharwat S, Nassar DK, Nassar MK, Saad AM, Hamdy F. Attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination among
686 healthcare workers: a cross sectional study from Egypt. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2022;22: 1–12.
687 doi:10.1186/s12913-022-08751-3
- 688 59. Agyekum MW, Afrifa-Anane GF, Kyei-Arthur F, Addo B. Acceptability of COVID-19 Vaccination among
689 Healthcare workers in Ghana. *Adv Public Health*. 2021;2021. doi:10.1155/2021/9998176
- 690 60. Kabamba Nzaji M, Kabamba Ngombe L, Ngoie Mwamba G, Banza Ndala DB, Mbidi Miema J, Luhata
691 Lungoyo C, et al. <p>Acceptability of Vaccination Against COVID-19 Among Healthcare Workers in the
692 Democratic Republic of the Congo</p>. *Pragmat Obs Res*. 2020;Volume 11: 103–109.
693 doi:10.2147/por.s271096
- 694 61. Ackah M, Ameyaw L, Salifu MG, Asubonteng DPA, Yeboah CO, Annor EN, et al. COVID-19 vaccine
695 acceptance among healthcare workers in Africa: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS ONE. Public*
696 *Library of Science*; 2022. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0268711
- 697 62. Agha S, Chine A, Lalika M, Pandey S, Seth A, Wiyeh A, et al. Drivers of covid-19 vaccine uptake amongst
698 healthcare workers (Hcws) in nigeria. *Vaccines (Basel)*. 2021;9. doi:10.3390/vaccines9101162
- 699 63. Konje ET, Basinda N, Kapesa A, Mugassa S, Nyawale HA, Mirambo MM, et al. The Coverage and
700 Acceptance Spectrum of COVID-19 Vaccines among Healthcare Professionals in Western Tanzania: What
701 Can We Learn from This Pandemic? *Vaccines (Basel)*. 2022;10: 1–13. doi:10.3390/vaccines10091429
- 702 64. Adane M, Ademas A, Kloos H. Knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions of COVID-19 vaccine and refusal to
703 receive COVID-19 vaccine among healthcare workers in northeastern Ethiopia. *BMC Public Health*.
704 2022;22: 1–14. doi:10.1186/s12889-021-12362-8
- 705 65. Tolossa T, Wakuma B, Turi E, Mulisa D, Ayala D, Fetensa G, et al. Attitude of health professionals towards
706 COVID-19 vaccination and associated factors among health professionals, Western Ethiopia: A cross-
707 sectional survey. *PLoS One*. 2022;17: 1–14. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0265061
- 708 66. Alle YF, Oumer KE. Attitude and associated factors of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance among health
709 professionals in Debre Tabor Comprehensive Specialized Hospital, North Central Ethiopia; 2021: cross-
710 sectional study. *Virusdisease*. 2021;32: 272–278. doi:10.1007/s13337-021-00708-0
- 711 67. Marzo RR, Ahmad A, Islam MS, Essar MY, Heidler P, King I, et al. Perceived COVID-19 vaccine
712 effectiveness, acceptance, and drivers of vaccination decision-making among the general adult
713 population: A global survey of 20 countries. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2022;16: e0010103.
714 doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PNTD.0010103

68. Nemr N, Kishk RM, Soliman NH, Farghaly RM, Kishk SM, Louis N. Perception of COVID-19 and Vaccine Acceptance among Healthcare Workers. *Int J Microbiol.* 2022;2022. doi:10.1155/2022/1607441
69. Saied SM, Saied EM, Kabbash IA, Abdo SAEF. Vaccine hesitancy: Beliefs and barriers associated with COVID-19 vaccination among Egyptian medical students. *J Med Virol.* 2021;93: 4280–4291. doi:10.1002/jmv.26910
70. El-Sokkary RH, El Seifi OS, Hassan HM, Mortada EM, Hashem MK, Gadelrab MRMA, et al. Predictors of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among Egyptian healthcare workers: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2021;21. doi:10.1186/s12879-021-06392-1
71. Riccò M, Cattani S, Casagrande F, Gualerzi G, Signorelli C. Knowledge, attitudes, beliefs and practices of Occupational Physicians towards seasonal influenza vaccination: a cross-sectional study from North-Eastern Italy. *J PREV MED HYG.* 2017.
72. Loulergue P, Moulin F, Vidal-Trean G, Absi Z, Demontpion C, Menager C, et al. Knowledge, attitudes and vaccination coverage of healthcare workers regarding occupational vaccinations. *Vaccine.* 2009;27: 4240–4243. doi:10.1016/J.VACCINE.2009.03.039
73. Fotiadis K, Dadouli K, Avakian I, Bogogiannidou Z, Mouchtouri VA, Gogosis K, et al. Factors associated with healthcare workers' (HCWs) acceptance of COVID-19 vaccinations and indications of a role model towards population vaccinations from a cross-sectional survey in Greece, may 2021. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2021;18. doi:10.3390/ijerph181910558
74. Regazzi L, Marziali E, Lontano A, Villani L, Paladini A, Calabrò GE, et al. Knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors toward COVID-19 vaccination in a sample of Italian healthcare workers. *Hum Vaccin Immunother.* 2022;18. doi:10.1080/21645515.2022.2116206
75. Hajure M, Tariku M, Bekele F, Abdu Z, Dule A, Mohammedhussein M, et al. Attitude towards covid-19 vaccination among healthcare workers: A systematic review. *Infection and Drug Resistance.* Dove Medical Press Ltd; 2021. pp. 3883–3897. doi:10.2147/IDR.S332792
76. Limbu YB, Gautam RK, Pham L. The Health Belief Model Applied to COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy: A Systematic Review. *Vaccines (Basel).* 2022;10. doi:10.3390/vaccines10060973
77. Mehta P, Sharma M, Lee R. Using the health belief model in qualitative focus groups to identify HPV vaccine acceptability in college men. *Int Q Community Health Educ.* 2012;33: 175–187. doi:10.2190/IQ.33.2.f
78. Zampetakis LA, Melas C. The health belief model predicts vaccination intentions against COVID-19: A survey experiment approach. *Appl Psychol Health Well Being.* 2021;13: 469–484. doi:10.1111/aphw.12262
79. Hossain MB, Alam MZ, Islam MS, Sultan S, Faysal MM, Rima S, et al. Health Belief Model, Theory of Planned Behavior, or Psychological Antecedents: What Predicts COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy Better Among the Bangladeshi Adults? *Front Public Health.* 2021;9. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2021.711066
80. Wang H, Huang YM, Su XY, Xiao WJ, Si MY, Wang WJ, et al. Acceptance of the COVID-19 vaccine based on the health belief model: a multicenter national survey among medical care workers in China. *Hum Vaccin Immunother.* 2022;18. doi:10.1080/21645515.2022.2076523

- 753 81. Ao Q, Egolet RO, Yin H, Cui F. Acceptance of COVID-19 Vaccines among Adults in Lilongwe, Malawi: A
754 Cross-Sectional Study Based on the Health Belief Model. *Vaccines (Basel)*. 2022;10: 1–21.
755 doi:10.3390/vaccines10050760
- 756 82. Shmueli L. Predicting intention to receive COVID-19 vaccine among the general population using the
757 health belief model and the theory of planned behavior model. *BMC Public Health*. 2021;21: 804.
758 doi:10.1186/s12889-021-10816-7
- 759 83. Qin C, Wang R, Tao L, Liu M, Liu J. Acceptance of a Third Dose of COVID-19 Vaccine and Associated
760 Factors in China Based on Health Belief Model: A National Cross-Sectional Study. *Vaccines (Basel)*.
761 2022;10. doi:10.3390/vaccines10010089
- 762 84. Ao Q, Egolet RO, Yin H, Cui F. Acceptance of COVID-19 Vaccines among Adults in Lilongwe, Malawi: A
763 Cross-Sectional Study Based on the Health Belief Model. *Vaccines (Basel)*. 2022;10.
764 doi:10.3390/vaccines10050760
- 765 85. Berni I, Menouni A, Zegzouti YF, Kestemont MP, Godderis L, El Jaafari S. Factors Associated with COVID-
766 19 Vaccine Acceptance in Morocco: Applying the Health Belief Model. *Vaccines (Basel)*. 2022;10.
767 doi:10.3390/vaccines10050784
- 768 86. Wong MCS, Wong ELY, Huang J, Cheung AWL, Law K, Chong MKC, et al. Acceptance of the COVID-19
769 vaccine based on the health belief model: A population-based survey in Hong Kong. *Vaccine*. 2021;39:
770 1148–1156. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.12.083
- 771 87. McCarthy RNE, Donkoh ET, Arthur DDG, Dassah ET, Boadu KO, Otoo JE, et al. Public relations strategies
772 employed by the Ghana Health Service to address COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy: a qualitative inquiry. *Trop*
773 *Med Health*. 2023;51. doi:10.1186/s41182-023-00519-7
- 774 88. Papagiannis D, Rachiotis G, Malli F, Papathanasiou I V., Kotsiou O, Fradelos EC, et al. Acceptability of
775 covid-19 vaccination among greek health professionals. *Vaccines (Basel)*. 2021;9: 1–7.
776 doi:10.3390/vaccines9030200
- 777 89. Shekhar R, Sheikh AB, Upadhyay S, Singh M, Kottewar S, Mir H, et al. COVID-19 vaccine acceptance
778 among healthcare workers in the united states. *Vaccines (Basel)*. 2021;9: 1–18.
779 doi:10.3390/vaccines9020119
- 780 90. Berni I, Menouni A, Zegzouti YF, Kestemont MP, Godderis L, El Jaafari S. Factors Associated with COVID-
781 19 Vaccine Acceptance in Morocco: Applying the Health Belief Model. *Vaccines* 2022, Vol 10, Page 784.
782 2022;10: 784. doi:10.3390/VACCINES10050784
- 783 91. Taan S, Hajjar EL. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS: INTERNAL-CONSISTENCY RELIABILITY AND CONSTRUCT
784 VALIDITY. *International Journal of Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods*. 2018. Available:
785 www.eajournals.org

786

787

788

789


Supporting information

790

S1 File. Questionnaire

791

792



Figure