Parent’s Perspective towards Child COVID-19 Vaccination: An Online Cross-Sectional Study in Mexico
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Abstract: COVID-19 vaccination programs continue in child populations. Thus, parents' attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination of their children is crucial for these strategies to succeed. The present study derives from the application of an online COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance & Hesitancy Questionnaire (COV-AHQ) in which we measure parent's hesitancy towards children's vaccination (section 4 of the COV-AHQ) and other significant factors. A logistic regression analysis with backward stepwise method was used to quantify the associations between factors and parent's hesitancy. According to the correlation analysis, the most representative factors predicting vaccine hesitancy/acceptance were positive attitude towards vaccination, parents believing that the COVID-19 vaccine will enhance the economic situation of the country, parents actively researching information, having the willingness to obtain the COVID-19 vaccine themselves, and the possibility of their children developing adverse effects. Our findings also showed that parents are highly interested in having their children vaccinated. Nonetheless, parents expressed high levels of concern involving their children developing adverse effects from the vaccine. In addition, obtaining influenza immunization prompted interest in obtaining the COVID-19 vaccine, and younger-aged parents are much more concerned with having their children vaccinated. Therefore, in order to ensure successful vaccination programs, policymakers and health authorities should design strategies to gain confidence and provide security amongst the population, including giving continuous information about the benefits of vaccination and presenting the frequency of side effects to bring parents on board with vaccinating their children.
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1. Introduction

As coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) continues to grow worldwide, several strategies continue to be employed to prevent its spread, such as quarantine, social restrictions, and use of personal protective equipment [1–3]. While uncertainty continues as to the
potential extent of the disease, a crucial step is to help enhance the immune system, hence the need for the development of vaccines to suit such purpose [4–6].

COVID-19’s high infection rates around the world have added pressure to the need to develop vaccines, particularly as new variants of the virus emerge, as well as to enhance distribution and access to them. Given today’s technological advances, leaps are being made to advance and manufacture novel models of vaccine at an unprecedented pace [7,8]. Therefore, we come to the need to enhance vaccine awareness as a critical step in addressing the barriers associated with its comprehension, benefits, and possible adverse effects [9]. The latter is of particular concern, especially when dealing with groups of interest such as children, as research is still in its early stages to understand potential complications and mid- to long-term effects [10–12].

In April 2020, the World Health Organization issued a statement: “Immunization saves millions of lives every year and it is widely recognized as one of the world’s most successful and cost-effective health interventions”. Vaccines and vaccination programs have proven their beneficial effects and efficiency by reducing morbidity and mortality of several preventable diseases and preventing around 2–3 million deaths every year [13]. Vaccines, in particular novel ones for COVID-19, have permitted the earliest return of the workforce to the labor market and have given an added layer of protection to the healthcare sector which continues to work diligently treating patients, regardless of the physical, emotional, and psychological impact COVID-19 has had on them [8,13–15]. Therefore, vaccines not only aid in the economy’s boost but also reduce healthcare costs, promote healthcare equity, and increase the potential caregiver’s productivity [9,16,17]. Despite the benefits vaccination brings, there is still a possibility that after becoming immunized one could develop adverse side effects, such as self-limited local pain, fever, dizziness, tachycardia, muscle ache, and the more uncommon potential to develop Guillain-Barré syndrome and other life-threatening allergic reactions. Recently, the CDC reported that 16:1,000,000 people developed Guillain-Barre syndrome and 2 to 5:1,000,000 people developed anaphylaxis, secondary to vaccination. The risk of presenting any of these symptoms, especially the more uncommon or dangerous such as Guillain-Barré syndrome, may lead to an increase in fear of vaccines in certain parts of the general population [11,18]. Unfortunately, several groups have used some of these conditions to justify not becoming vaccinated. In addition, some individuals have also popularized the idea that children pose no real threat to the public if the rest of the population vaccinates. Ironically, this argument requires that most of the public are vaccinated. Overall, the refusal of vaccination opens channels for viral spread, enhancing the pressure of spread/infection for other individuals. This becomes an important issue, particularly when dealing with children whom, if infected, can easily become vectors for viral spreading [12,19,20].

Vaccine hesitancy has been defined as “a complex and context-specific delay in acceptance or refusal of vaccination despite availability influenced by factors such as complacency, convenience, and confidence”, resulting in delay or refusal of vaccination [7,21,22]. From the parental perspective, hesitancy in vaccinating their children can arise from several key factors, such as their socioeconomic status, education, healthcare access, and attitudes related to vaccination [12,21]. Beliefs such as children’s immune systems being overloaded by the amount of vaccines they receive, thinking the vaccine is more dangerous than the illness, religious beliefs, distrust of public healthcare systems, government manipulation, adverse side effects, costs of vaccination, knowing someone else experiencing a side effect, or misunderstanding of the vaccine components have all been associated with vaccine refusal [23]. As previously mentioned, hesitancy towards vaccination has become a common phenomenon, prompting the WHO Strategic Advisory Group of Experts on Immunization or SAGE to categorize “vaccine hesitancy” as one of the top 10 public health treats [22].

According to recent studies evaluating parents’ attitude towards influenza vaccination in the current pandemic, the fear of COVID-19 in minors can be a prime motivation for vaccinating children. In the studied populations, results showed that the attitude towards
vaccination is comparable to that from influenza H1N1 [10,11]. Therefore, annual vaccination patterns could be comparable to those of COVID-19, given the vaccines availability.

Although a global matter, almost all of the studies evaluating parents’ attitudes towards vaccination have been carried out in the United States, Canada, and United Kingdom [10,24], therefore there is an important need to analyze Latin America. In Mexico, as of 21 November 2021, according to official government COVID-19 records, COVID-19 had afflicted over 3,862,137 confirmed cases, from which there are 289,419 (7.5%) of total cases reported for ages 0 to 19 [25,26]. Given the socioeconomic and cultural similarities of Mexico and the rest of Latin America, we opted to use a Mexican sample of parents as an initial model to understand vaccine acceptance and hesitancy, based on a general COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance & Hesitancy Questionnaire (COV-AHQ) which included many of the factors earlier mentioned, such as religion, socioeconomic status, education, personal beliefs about vaccines, and other importer factors which can contribute to parental hesitancy [12,21,23].

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Questionnaire COV-AHQ

The present study derives from the application of the online COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance & Hesitancy Questionnaire, or COV-AHQ (Cronbach’s alpha > 0.8) [27], which was designed based on the initial and Adapted COVID-19 Stress Scales (CSS and ACSs) [28–30] and the Vaccine Hesitancy Scales (VHS) [22]. For the present study, we took into consideration only the subpopulation of participants with the criteria of answering yes to having children.

The COV-AHQ was written using MS Forms (Microsoft Corporation, Redwood, WA, United States) which conveniently permitted distribution and application via the following web-link https://forms.office.com/r/QhkS5wjzMM We divided the questionnaire into six important sections; an initial sociodemographic section, followed by sections 1 through 4 analyzing four psychometric areas: section 1 (danger and contamination), section 2 (xenophobia), section 3 (fear of vaccination’s adverse effects), section 4 (parent’s hesitancy towards children’s vaccination), and finally, a general COVID-19 questions section. For sections 1 to 4, a Likert-scale format with increasing point value was used to classify answers. Using this system, we classified the resulting scores to the following scales: absent 0 to 4, mild 5 to 8, moderate 9 to 12, severe 13 to 16.

2.2. Participants

To calculate a representative sample size for parents in Mexico, we took into consideration that the probability that parents would have opposing views would be 50% (p value of 0.5), considering that the variable behavior is binomial. Using the classical formula for sample sizes, an interval of confidence of 99% (z value of 2.58) and a margin of error of 5% (delta value of 0.05) was used, which resulted in n = 666 participants [31].

2.3. Answers and Frequencies

We calculated the frequency of answers for each question in the sections and for other sociodemographic variables such as occupation, gender, age, practice of religion, education level, total of habitants in household, total number of rooms in household, comorbidity, knowing someone positive for COVID-19, attitude towards vaccination, previous influenza vaccination for the 2020–2021 season, consideration of a COVID-19 vaccine as a positive to the current socioeconomic situation of the country, willingness to receive the COVID-19 vaccination, and participants actively researching COVID-19 vaccine information.

2.4. Data Analysis

We then followed with a logistic regression analysis using statements of section 4 (directly applicable to child vaccination).
1. I consider that getting my child vaccinated is important for the health of others in my community.
2. I consider that getting my child vaccinated is a good protective measure.
3. I am concerned about my child developing an adverse effect related to the COVID vaccination.

Regression analysis took into consideration sociodemographic variables such as age group, gender, having comorbidities, level of education, and having received the influenza vaccine for the 2020–2021 season. The analysis introduced these selected factors and the sections into a backward stepwise (likelihood ratio) method. Finally, we used the results to quantify the associations between factors and sections to the statements of section 4, obtaining unstandardized regression coefficients (B), odds ratios (ORs), and their 95% confidence intervals (CIs). We further calculated Pearson’s chi-squared and an R ratio of 0.05, all statistical analysis using IBM-SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 23.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA).

2.5. Questionnaire Distribution

The COV-AHQ was distributed to the general population in Mexico through emails and social media such as Twitter, Reddit, and Facebook, from the period of December 2020 to February 2021; the period before the beginning of the official vaccination program in Mexico [25]. To participate, all subjects had to acknowledge being >18 years of age and give consent to participate via the electronic form.

2.6. Institutional Review Board Statement

We conducted the study under the Declaration of Helsinki, and the Ethics Committee of Hospital La Misión, Monterrey NL. México approved the protocol. Protocol # VAC-CAMCVC-01.

3. Results

The results of the COV-AHQ showed 699 participants self-responded as having children. From the cohort of parent participants, in Table 1 we present their sociodemographic profile. Briefly, the data showed respondents were 69.1% females and 27% males. Most participants (66.8%) were in the age group of 34 to 54 years. Interestingly, over 93% of participants reported as being actively working, while 5.3% reported being currently unemployed; albeit participants were not asked if they were looking or were not interested in working. An almost 1:2 ratio of participants answered having a comorbidity (36.2%). Most participants reported as professionally educated, with 51.2% reported as having at least a bachelor’s degree and an additional 35.8% as having graduate studies. House occupancy mostly centered on families of four individuals (34.6%). Finally, most individuals (69.5%) answered as having over four rooms in their house (excluding kitchen and bathroom).

In another section of the survey, participants were asked to answer general questions about COVID-19. One striking fact was that 97.4% answered “yes” to knowing someone with a previous COVID-19 diagnosis; meanwhile, to having had, themselves, a previous COVID-19 positive diagnosis, 84% answered “no”. Over 78% of participants had a positive attitude towards vaccination. This seems to fall in line with the 87.4% of participants answering positively to their willingness to become vaccinated. Another interesting fact was that 87.1% of parents agreed that obtaining the vaccine will enhance the overall economic situation of the country. Additionally, it was asked whether participants had received an influenza vaccine for the 2020–2021 flu season. Here, results showed that 43.5% of participants had received it.

Next, participants answered the four sections of the COV/AHQ, and from the results (Table 2) we can observe for section 1 that 41.1% (n = 287) fell in the “mild” classification, as the most prevalent classification. For section 2, most participants 39.5% (n = 276) fell in the moderate classification, while for section 3, the majority 43.3% (n = 303) fell in the “absent”
classification; finally, in section 4, the grand majority 56.1% \( (n = 392) \) fell under “moderate”. Participants’ responses to individual questions are shown in Table 3 and Figure 1.

### Table 1. Sociodemographic profile.

| Employment            | n   | %    | Gender          | n   | %    | Age          | n   | %    |
|-----------------------|-----|------|-----------------|-----|------|--------------|-----|------|
| Unemployed            | 37  | 5.3  | Male            | 188 | 26.9 | 18 to 34     | 110 | 15.7 |
| Student               | 10  | 1.4  | Female          | 483 | 69.1 | 35 to 54     | 467 | 66.8 |
| Health professional   | 73  | 10.4 | No answer       | 28  | 4.0  | 55+          | 122 | 17.5 |
| Essential Worker      | 132 | 18.9 | Total           | 699 | 100  | Total        | 699 | 100  |
| Nonessential worker   | 83  | 11.9 | Practice of Religion | n | % | Comorbidities | n   | % |
| Commerce              | 48  | 6.9  | No answer       | 6   | 0.9  | No answer    | 9   | 1.3  |
| Academic professional | 136 | 19.5 | No              | 136 | 19.5 | No           | 446 | 63.8 |
| Other                 | 180 | 25.8 | Yes             | 546 | 78.1 | Yes          | 253 | 36.2 |
| Total                 | 699 | 100  | No answer       | 17  | 2.4  | No answer    | 0   | 0    |

### Table 2. Prevalence in the individual sections (classifications).

| Section 1 | Danger and Contamination | n   | %  | Section 2 | Xenophobia | n   | %  | Section 3 | Fear of Vaccinations | Adverse Effects | n   | %  | Section 4 | Parents’ Hesitancy towards Children’s Vaccination | n   | %  |
|-----------|--------------------------|-----|----|----------|------------|-----|----|----------|----------------------|----------------|-----|----|----------|-----------------------------------------------|-----|----|
| Absent    | 148                      | 21.2| 104| 14.9     | 303        | 43.3| 29 | 4.1      |
| Mild      | 287                      | 41.1| 200| 28.6     | 211        | 30.3| 104| 14.9     |
| Moderate  | 198                      | 28.3| 276| 39.5     | 152        | 21.7| 392| 56.1     |
| Severe    | 66                       | 9.4 | 119| 17       | 33         | 4.7 | 174| 24.9     |
| Total     | 699                      | 100 | 699| 100      | 699        | 100 | 699| 100      |
Table 3. Individual question results sections.

| Section 1—Danger and Contamination | Section 2—Xenophobia |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| I Am Worried about Getting the Virus | I Am Concerned That People out of State are Spreading the Virus |
| **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** |
| Never | 23 | 3.3 | Never | 69 | 9.9 |
| Rarely | 83 | 11.9 | Rarely | 115 | 16.5 |
| Moderate | 259 | 37.1 | Moderate | 219 | 31.3 |
| Much | 248 | 35.5 | Much | 211 | 30.2 |
| Extremely | 84 | 12.0 | Extremely | 85 | 12.2 |
| No answer | 2 | 0.3 | No answer | 0 | 0.0 |
| **Total** | **699** | **100** | **Total** | **699** | **100** |

I am worried about being asymptomatic and infecting my loved ones.

| **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** |
| Never | 196 | 28.0 | Never | 85 | 12.2 |
| Rarely | 191 | 27.3 | Rarely | 135 | 19.3 |
| Moderate | 154 | 22.0 | Moderate | 212 | 30.3 |
| Much | 87 | 12.4 | Much | 167 | 23.9 |
| Extremely | 33 | 4.7 | Extremely | 72 | 10.3 |
| No answer | 38 | 5.4 | No answer | 28 | 4.0 |
| **Total** | **699** | **100** | **Total** | **699** | **100** |

I am concerned that social distancing is not enough to keep me safe from the virus.

| **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** |
| Never | 62 | 8.9 | Never | 24 | 3.4 |
| Rarely | 148 | 21.2 | Rarely | 68 | 9.7 |
| Moderate | 220 | 31.5 | Moderate | 190 | 27.2 |
| Much | 189 | 27.0 | Much | 274 | 39.2 |
| Extremely | 55 | 7.9 | Extremely | 126 | 18.0 |
| No answer | 25 | 3.6 | No answer | 17 | 2.4 |
| **Total** | **699** | **100** | **Total** | **699** | **100** |

I am worried that the vaccine runs out before I get vaccinated.

| **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** |
| Never | 106 | 15.2 | Never | 83 | 11.9 |
| Rarely | 122 | 17.5 | Rarely | 88 | 12.6 |
| Moderate | 180 | 25.8 | Moderate | 158 | 22.6 |
| Much | 160 | 22.9 | Much | 217 | 31.0 |
| Extremely | 100 | 14.3 | Extremely | 119 | 17.0 |
| No answer | 31 | 4.4 | No answer | 34 | 4.9 |
| **Total** | **699** | **100** | **Total** | **699** | **100** |

Section 3—Fear of Vaccinations adverse effects

I am concerned to get any type of vaccine

| **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** |
| I consider that getting my child vaccinated is important for the health of others in my community

| **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** |
| I am concerned to hang out with people that does not want to get vaccinated

| **n** | **%** | **n** | **%** |
| Never | 83 | 11.9 | Never | 83 | 11.9 |
| Rarely | 88 | 12.6 | Rarely | 88 | 12.6 |
| Moderate | 158 | 22.6 | Moderate | 158 | 22.6 |
| Much | 217 | 31.0 | Much | 217 | 31.0 |
| Extremely | 119 | 17.0 | Extremely | 119 | 17.0 |
| No answer | 34 | 4.9 | No answer | 34 | 4.9 |
| **Total** | **699** | **100** | **Total** | **699** | **100** |

Section 4—Parent’s hesitancy towards children’s vaccination

I consider that getting my child vaccinated is important for the health of others in my community.
Table 3. Cont.

| Section 1—Danger and Contamination | Section 2—Xenophobia |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| I Am Worried about Getting the Virus | I Am Concerned That People out of State are Spreading the Virus |
| n       | %   | n       | %   |
| Never   | 200  | 28.6   | Never | 45   | 6.4   |
| Rarely  | 138  | 19.7   | Rarely | 20   | 2.9   |
| Moderate | 166  | 23.7   | Moderate | 103  | 14.7  |
| Much    | 131  | 18.7   | Much   | 214  | 30.6  |
| Extremely | 63   | 9.0    | Extremely | 308  | 44.1  |
| No answer | 1    | 0.1    | No answer | 9    | 1.3   |
| Total   | 699  | 100    | Total   | 699  | 100   |

I am worried to develop an adverse reaction related to the COVID-19 vaccine

| n       | %   | n       | %   |
| Never   | 88   | 12.6   | Never | 34   | 4.9   |
| Rarely  | 201  | 28.8   | Rarely | 21   | 3.0   |
| Moderate | 168  | 24.0   | Moderate | 81   | 11.6  |
| Much    | 141  | 20.2   | Much   | 271  | 38.8  |
| Extremely | 85   | 12.2   | Extremely | 268  | 38.3  |
| No answer | 16   | 2.3    | No answer | 24   | 3.4   |
| Total   | 699  | 100    | Total   | 699  | 100   |

I am worried that the vaccine against COVID-19 makes me or my relatives sick

| n       | %   | n       | %   |
| Never   | 127  | 18.2   | Never | 44   | 6.3   |
| Rarely  | 172  | 24.6   | Rarely | 44   | 6.3   |
| Moderate | 144  | 20.6   | Moderate | 136  | 19.5  |
| Much    | 156  | 22.3   | Much   | 263  | 37.6  |
| Extremely | 82   | 11.7   | Extremely | 184  | 26.3  |
| No answer | 18   | 2.6    | No answer | 28   | 4.0   |
| Total   | 699  | 100    | Total   | 699  | 100   |

I am worried about getting vaccinated because I already had COVID-19

| n       | %   | n       | %   |
| Never   | 468  | 67.0   | Never | 84   | 12.0  |
| Rarely  | 53   | 7.6    | Rarely | 94   | 13.4  |
| Moderate | 56   | 8.0    | Moderate | 232  | 33.2  |
| Much    | 32   | 4.6    | Much   | 176  | 25.2  |
| Extremely | 25   | 3.6    | Extremely | 90   | 12.9  |
| No answer | 65   | 9.3    | No answer | 23   | 3.3   |
| Total   | 699  | 100    | Total   | 699  | 100   |

Using the sociodemographic variables such as age group, gender, having comorbidities, level of education, having received the influenza vaccine for the 2020–2021 season, and the individual statements directly related to children’s vaccination of section 4 (1. I consider that getting my child vaccinated is important for the health of others in my community, 2. I consider that getting my child vaccinated is a good protective measure, 3. I am concerned about my child developing an adverse effect related to the COVID vaccination), as they relate to parents’ hesitancy towards children’s vaccination, we performed, using SPSS®
software, a binary logistic regression analysis, as seen in Table 4. By running the algorithm, we could pluck, in a stepwise manner, the variables that did not influence the outcome.

Figure 1. Individual answers by question per section.

Results for “I consider that getting my child vaccinated is important for the health of others in my community” showed that section 2 did not have any effect; meanwhile, the following variables all seem to have an influence: section 1 “absent” ($p < 0.001$, OR:0.189) and “mild” ($p < 0.007$, OR:0.448), section 3 “absent” ($p < 0.001$, OR:24.71), “mild” ($p < 0.007$, OR:5.504), and “moderate” ($p < 0.044$, OR:3.539), and section 4 “absent” ($p < 0.001$, OR:0.007), “mild” ($p < 0.001$, OR:0.014), and “moderate” ($p < 0.001$, OR:0.1), and having had the influenza vaccination during the 2020–2021 season ($p < 0.001$, OR:2.173), all with a Nagelkerke R-Squared of 0.445. Individual step analysis and cross table are shown in Supplemental Table S1.

For “I consider that getting my child vaccinated is a good protective measure”, all four sections and the following variables seem to have an influence: section 1 “absent” ($p < 0.001$, OR:0.252) and “mild” ($p < 0.022$: OR:0.447), section 2 “absent” ($p < 0.001$, OR:0.305), section 3 “absent” ($p < 0.001$, OR:14.195) and “mild” ($p < 0.004$, OR:2.621), section 4 “absent” ($p < 0.001$, OR:0.001), “mild” ($p < 0.001$, OR:0.008), and moderate ($p < 0.001$, OR:0.056), age groups 18 to 34 years ($p < 0.04$, OR:0.35) and 35 to 54 ($p < 0.007$, OR:0.32), and having had the influenza vaccination during the 2020–2021 season ($p < 0.001$, OR:2.744), all with a Nagelkerke R-Squared of 0.528. Individual step analysis and cross table are shown in Supplemental Table S2.

For “I am concerned about my child developing an adverse effect related to the COVID vaccination”, section 1 did not seem to have an effect, while the following variables all seem to have an influence: section 2 “absent” ($p < 0.004$, OR:3.12), “mild” ($p < 0.001$, OR:3.936), and “moderate” ($p < 0.016$, OR:2.223), section 3 “absent” ($p < 0.001$, OR:0.051) and “mild” ($p < 0.001$, OR:0.267), section 4 “absent” ($p < 0.001$, OR:0.011), “mild” ($p < 0.001$, OR:0.03), and “moderate” ($p < 0.001$, OR:106), and age group 18 to 34 years ($p < 0.01$, OR:0.47), all with
The regression model brought attention to the fact that participants categorized as severe, those we thought beforehand would have a great weight in the model, were eliminated after step 1. We further calculated Pearson’s correlation between all four sections (categories), as seen in Supplemental Table S4. Section 1 (severe) seems to have the highest correlation to section 1 (mild) with \( r = -0.270 \) and \( p < 0.001 \), section 2 (severe) correlates the highest with section 2 (moderate) with \( r = -0.366 \) and \( p < 0.001 \), section 3 (severe) correlates the highest with section 3 (absent) \( r = -0.195 \) and \( p < 0.001 \), and finally section 4 (severe) correlates the highest with section 4 (moderate) \( r = -0.651 \) and \( p < 0.001 \).

4. Discussion

Mexico continues with its vaccination programs and public health strategies to prevent the spread of COVID-19 [32], and it is in the early stages of the COVID-19 children’s vaccination programs [33]. As of 21 November 2021, approximately 58% of the total population in Mexico has had at least one vaccine dose [34]. Although Mexico has had a long history of successful massive vaccination programs, distrust and uncertainty in the current vaccines have upsurged [7,11]. This uncertainty could play an important role when parents face the dilemma of having to immunize their children, hence the importance of studying the factors that can drive vaccine hesitancy, particularly in parents.
From a parental perspective, 78.5% of parents seem to have a positive attitude towards vaccination, with 87.1% of parents believing that the COVID-19 vaccine will enhance the economic situation of the country, 73.5% of parents actively researching information on the subject, and 87.4% having the willingness to obtain the COVID-19 vaccine themselves. Yet, only close to half of the surveyed parents (43.5%) had actually been vaccinated for influenza; a potential model for COVID-19 vaccination intention [35,36]. We should state that influenza immunizations during the 2020 season were reported to have tripled in Mexico, under the potential perspective that the vaccine could help reduce COVID-19 symptoms [37]. We could relate work as one potential reason for the results showing less than half of the surveyed population becoming immunized, particularly those with busy schedules, as only 6.7% of individuals reported currently not working as either unemployed or as active students. Another important factor to consider for the lack of vaccinated parents was that there was a limited availability of the influenza vaccine at the beginning of the vaccination season. Mexico had a guidance to prioritize influenza vaccine for children and older adults, leaving 18–64 years old adults without prompt access to the influenza vaccine. Comparably, the recent report for the 2020 influenza season showed that in the US, 52.2% of adults (40% average for the Hispanic population) had been vaccinated [38]. Remarkably, when we take a more in-depth look at parental responses from the survey, 72.6% of responders had “moderate to much” worry of themselves contracting the disease, with 12% being extremely worried, while 58.5% of responders were “moderate to much” concerned that social distancing was not enough to keep one safe, and 48.6% were “moderate to much”, with 14.3% being extremely, worried that they would not obtain the vaccine because of fear it would run out. This, theoretically, separates the notion that influenza vaccination is a good predictor for COVID-19 vaccine acceptance. It is important to note that these questions were directed at the parents, who are the caregivers, hence having direct emotional, social, and economical ties to their children. Could parents be more concerned about being able to support their families, rather than potential effects of the vaccine? Or could they have the thought “if something happens to me, how is my family going to be supported?” Conversely to our expectations, parents responded mostly 52.8% “rarely to moderate” to their worry about developing adverse effects from the vaccines.

Another interesting remark amongst parents was their responses to questions related to xenophobia, as 56.5% of individuals scored “moderate to severe”, meaning there is a notable fear of people from outside the local community to come in and potentially spread the virus. When asked about their concern of people outside their local state bringing in the virus, 54.5% answered “much to moderate”, with an extra 10.3% extremely worried. An additional concern was seen when asked about encountering people outside their local state, with 66.4% of respondents answering “much to moderate,” and an extra 18% being extremely worried. These results mirror the global sentiment which is worrisome given the present harassment towards individuals of Asian descent, as they have been wrongly labeled as primal carriers with severe violent racially motivated violence against them [39,40]. Similar xenophobic behaviors have been observed all over the globe, yet they seem to be reflected mostly in the most liberal economies: Australia, France, Germany, and UK, where antimigration groups founded on social and economic basis feel threatened by the outside labor force [38]. Unfortunately, during the highest peaks of the pandemic, many businesses were affected, and others had to shut down, bringing a sense of unease to the working professional, and as a result many families have been economically affected, potentially adding an extra burden [41,42]. Given this global panorama, and the burdens left by COVID-19, it is understandable that parents can be highly concerned.

In our study, section 4 dedicated to the parents’ hesitancy towards children’s vaccination was studied using a logistic regression model looking at how the social demographic variables, along with the sections themselves, would prove relevant. The model considers all variables and begins a stepwise removal of all nonsignificant and redundant variables. As we have stated, section 4 had three questions directly pertaining to children’s vacci-
nation, which were used independently as anchors to run the regression. From the first statement “I consider that getting my child vaccinated is important for the health of others in my community”, there seems to be no contribution from section 2 (xenophobia), as the question relates to improving the community. We see this result as fascinating, as we had earlier mentioned that parents seem to be highly concerned about people coming with the disease and spreading it; hence, having a layer of protection for their children such as the vaccine would be most desirable. One interesting variable that emerged was having had an influenza immunization, as it is important not only to have the willingness to become vaccinated, but to actually go through it in order to help protect others in the community. For the second statement, “I consider that getting my child vaccinated is a good protective measure”, all sections seem to be relevant, as well as the effect of becoming vaccinated for influenza. Interestingly, we also see that both young (18 to 34 years) and mid-age (35 to 54 years) parents present relevancy. Although older active adults are most likely concerned about child infections, many studies have shown that the initial most-at-risk group was actually the older adults, particularly those with comorbidities [30,38,43–46]. Therefore, it is most likely that older active adults are currently more worried about their own health. Finally, for the statement “I am concerned about my child developing an adverse effect related to the COVID vaccination”, here we see that section 1 (danger and contamination) does not have relevancy, as this section is more about contracting the virus, spreading it, and being asymptomatic; it again becomes understandable that no direct relation is warranted. Young parents (18 to 34 years) have more concerns over the potential adverse effects—a potential fear that parents have [47], and while this fear is not to be dismissed, it is important that more longitudinal studies continue to provide more valuable information on potential adverse effects, as well as long-term ones. We should remember that children’s immune systems are not those of young adults, they are even more vigorous [47,48], and, therefore, we should expect more reactivity to similar amounts of vaccine, prompting more fine-tuning in future studies.

5. Limitations

Because of the COVID-19 quarantine and social distancing restrictions, we applied the COV-AHQ using a digital platform (Microsoft Forms). We could consider this as a limitation as it is not supervised in person. Remote evaluations provide a safe alternative, albeit relying on the inclination to answer.

Currently, online questionnaires have been a valuable tool used by several researchers, particularly in the COVID-19 pandemic, to gather public or selected group information [14,22,35,49–52]. We distributed the questionnaire either by direct email invitation or by popular social media platforms, and we further asked participants to send other colleagues or acquaintances the link to the questionnaire. However, this poses the problem of not being able to calculate a participation rate because of the nature of the distribution in a snowball-like method. In addition, full completion of the questionnaire of participants was optional, as we believe that this might deter some from continuing. Our group distributes well among age groups, gender, types of employment, and other social demographic aspects.

6. Conclusions

At over a year after the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, and with the current technology of vaccines at hand, we face a new dilemma: the parental perspective on having their children vaccinated. As studies have only just begun, there is still much information to be obtained and processed; however, the eminent threat of COVID-19 remains, therefore, both clinical studies and parental input are critical in moving in the right direction.

In Mexico, as of early October, COVID-19 children’s vaccination programs were set in motion. Our current findings showed that parents are highly interested in having their children vaccinated, as this is a good measure for protection for both them and their community. Parents also express high levels of concern involving their children in
developing adverse effects from the vaccine. When the parental hesitancy was broken down into questions and analyzed by regression, we observed the section related to adverse effects was always present as a key variable. Prominent also was the fact that obtaining influenza immunization prompted interest in obtaining the COVID-19 vaccine, and that younger-aged parents are much more concerned with having their children vaccinated.

The lack of vaccination among children can lead them to contract preventable diseases and contribute to viral spread. Thus, the parent's attitude towards general vaccination and COVID-19 vaccination is crucial. Therefore, to improve successful programs, strategies should be designed to gain confidence and provide security among the population; giving continuous information about the benefits of vaccination, as well as presenting the frequency of side effects to bring parents on board with vaccinating their children.
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