

1 **COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and resistance: Correlates in a nationally**
2 **representative longitudinal survey of the Australian population**

3
4
5 Associate Professor Ben Edwards¹, Professor Nicholas Biddle¹, Professor Matthew Gray¹ and
6 Kate Sollis¹

7
8 1. ANU Centre for Social Research and Methods, Australian National University

9
10 Corresponding author:

11 Associate Professor Ben Edwards

12 ANU Centre for Social Research & Methods

13 ANU College of Arts & Social Sciences

14 The Australian National University, Lvl 3 RSSS Building, 146 Ellery Crescent Canberra ACT 2601

15 Australia E: ben.edwards@anu.edu.au

16 T: +61 0410 601 554

17

18

19

20

Abstract

21 *Background:* High levels of vaccination coverage in populations will be required even with
22 vaccines that have high levels of effectiveness to prevent and stop outbreaks of coronavirus.
23 The World Health Organisation has suggested that governments take a proactive response to
24 vaccine hesitancy ‘hotspots’ based on social and behavioural insights.

25 *Methods:* Representative longitudinal online survey of over 3000 adults from Australia that
26 examines the demographic, attitudinal, political and social attitudes and COVID-19 health
27 behavior correlates of vaccine hesitance and resistance to a COVID-19 vaccine.

28 *Results:* Overall, 59% would definitely get the vaccine, 29% had low levels of hesitancy, 7%
29 had high levels of hesitancy and 6% were resistant. Females, those living in disadvantaged
30 areas, those who reported that risks of COVID-19 was overstated, those who had more
31 populist views and higher levels of religiosity were more likely to be hesitant or resistant
32 while those who had higher levels of household income, those who had higher levels of
33 social distancing, who downloaded the COVID-Safe App, who had more confidence in their
34 state or territory government or confidence in their hospitals, or were more supportive of
35 migration were more likely to intend to get vaccinated.

36 *Conclusions:* Our findings suggest that vaccine hesitancy, which accounts for a significant
37 proportion of the population can be addressed by public health messaging but for a
38 significant minority of the population with strongly held beliefs, alternative policy measures
39 may well be needed to achieve sufficient vaccination coverage to end the pandemic.

40 *Keywords:* Coronavirus, COVID-19, Vaccine, Adults

41

42

43

44 **1 Introduction**

45 For most countries the development of a safe and effective vaccination for COVID-19 is seen
46 as the long-term solution to the COVID-19 pandemic. A critical step in extinguishing the
47 pandemic will be vaccination of a high proportion of the population in the context of
48 increasing misinformation, vaccine hesitancy and lack of trust in science. In this paper we
49 present evidence from a large nationally representative survey of vaccination intentions to a
50 safe and effective COVID-19 vaccine. We document the demographic, attitudinal, political
51 and social attitudes and COVID-19 health behaviour correlates of vaccine hesitance and
52 resistance to a COVID-19 vaccine. We focus on lower and higher levels of hesitancy and
53 resistance to vaccination, as tailored public health information campaigns may well be more
54 effective for those who are less hesitant.

55

56 Herd immunity of populations is a product of several factors, the infectivity of the
57 coronavirus ($R_0 = 3.1$) [1], the effectiveness of the vaccine and the percentage of the
58 population vaccinated. Estimates of infectivity of the coronavirus suggest that with a 100 per
59 cent effective vaccine, 67 per cent of the population needs to be vaccinated [2] but that
60 vaccination coverage needed varies by infectivity (55 per cent when $R_0 = 2.2$ to 82 per cent
61 when $R_0 = 5.7$ [3]. Simulations suggest that solely relying on a vaccine to extinguish a
62 COVID-19 epidemic would require vaccination coverage of 100 per cent with vaccine
63 effectiveness of 60 per cent [4]. For 80 per cent effectiveness of a vaccine, coverage of 75
64 per cent of the population would be required [4]. Assuming that initial vaccines are less than
65 80 per cent effective (flu has been found to have an average effectiveness of 67 per cent) [5]
66 then very high vaccination rates are needed to ensure eradication or control of the
67 coronavirus in populations.

68

69 Research to date suggests that COVID-19 vaccination intentions vary substantially between

70 countries [6]. Vaccine hesitancy (being unsure about getting a vaccine) usually accounts for a
71 more substantial share of the population who will not be vaccinated than vaccine resistance
72 (those who object to vaccines). For instance, in the United States 21 per cent were probably
73 willing and 31 per cent were not willing to have the COVID-19 vaccine [7] while nationally
74 representative surveys in the United Kingdom reported 25-27 per cent were hesitant, and 6-9
75 per cent resistant [8, 9] and in Canada reported 19 per cent somewhat likely, 9 per cent did
76 not know and 14 per cent unlikely to get the COVID-19 vaccine when available [10]. A
77 cross-national representative survey of over 7,000 participants in seven European countries
78 (Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Portugal, the Netherlands, and the UK) reported that
79 across these countries 19 per cent were hesitant (not sure) and 7 per cent would not get
80 vaccinated [6]. However there was substantial variation between countries with vaccine
81 hesitancy 12-28 per cent while resistance ranged from 5-10 per cent [6]. In Australia vaccine
82 hesitancy to a COVID-19 vaccine has been reported at 9 per cent and vaccine resistance 5 per
83 cent however this evidence was from a non-representative online survey [11].

84

85 The World Health Organisation's Strategic Advisory Group of Experts (SAGE) have
86 suggested governments take a proactive response to vaccine hesitancy 'hotspots' based on
87 social and behavioural insights [12]. Therefore, nationally representative information is
88 important for an agile response to COVID-19 vaccination. Using a representative
89 longitudinal survey of over 3000 participants from Australia we examine the demographic,
90 attitudinal, political and social attitudes and COVID-19 health behaviour correlates of
91 vaccine hesitance and resistance to a COVID-19 vaccine. We distinguish between those who
92 may get the vaccine but are not sure (hesitant) from those who will definitely get the vaccine
93 because they are usually a large percentage of the population, and unlike vaccine resistant
94 individuals, are likely to be convinced about public health messaging and information about

95 vaccine safety [13]. We also examine those who will not get the vaccine (resistant). Given the
96 Australian government has indicated that the COVID-19 vaccine would be provided free to
97 the population, consistent with previous research on vaccine hesitancy [8, 14] we hypothesise
98 that confidence in government and science, attitudes towards COVID-19 and adherence with
99 public health messages, conservative and authoritarian political attitudes will be more
100 important than demographic characteristics [8, 9, 14]. We also test whether downloading the
101 COVID-Safe app was related to vaccine hesitancy or resistance.

102

103 The remainder of the paper is as follows, Section 2 outlines the methodology including the
104 study design and participants, survey questions and statistical analyses. Section 3 shows the
105 results and Section 4 discusses the results in the context of previous research and their
106 implications.

107

108 **2 Methods**

109 *2.1 Study design and participants*

110 The primary source of data for this paper is the August ANUpoll, which collected data from
111 3,061 respondents aged 18 years and over across all eight States/Territories in Australia, and
112 is weighted to have a similar distribution to the Australian population across key
113 demographic and geographic variables. Data for the vast majority of respondents was
114 collected online (94.1 per cent), with a small proportion of respondents enumerated over the
115 phone. A limited number of telephone respondents (17 individuals) completed the survey on
116 the first day of data collection, with a little under half of respondents (1,222) completing the
117 survey on the 11th or 12th of August.

118

119 The contact methodology for offline Life in Australia™ members was an initial SMS (where
120 available), followed by an extended call-cycle over a two-week period. A reminder SMS was
121 also sent in the second week of fieldwork. Taking into account recruitment to the panel, the
122 cumulative response rate for the most recent survey is 7.8 per cent, a slight decline from
123 previous waves of data collection in 2020.

124 Unless otherwise stated, data in the paper is weighted to population benchmarks. For Life in
125 Australia™, the approach for deriving weights generally consists of the following steps:

- 126 1. Compute a base weight for each respondent as the product of two weights:
 - 127 a. Their enrolment weight, accounting for the initial chances of selection and
128 subsequent post-stratification to key demographic benchmarks
 - 129 b. Their response propensity weight, estimated from enrolment information
130 available for both respondents and non-respondents to the present wave.
- 131 2. Adjust the base weights so that they satisfy the latest population benchmarks for
132 several demographic characteristics.

133

134 We make use of a limited amount of longitudinal data in this paper. Of those who completed
135 the August 2020 wave of data collection, 2,916 individuals (95.3 per cent) also completed the
136 May 2020 ANUpoll, 2,833 individuals (92.6 per cent) also completed the April 2020
137 ANUpoll, 2,828 individuals (92.4 per cent) also completed the February 2020 Life in
138 Australia™ surveyⁱ, and finally, 2,790 individuals (91.1 per cent) also completed the January
139 2020 ANUpoll (during the height of the Black Summer Bushfire crisis).

140

141 The ethical aspects of the ANUpolls have been approved by the ANU Human Research
142 Ethics Committee (2014/241). Data is available through the Australian Data Archive.ⁱⁱ

143

144 **2.2 Survey questions**

145

146 **Dependent variable:** Vaccine intention was measured by the following question: ‘The next
147 questions ask about your views on a vaccine for COVID-19’ and then we ask ‘If a safe and
148 effective vaccine for COVID-19 is developed, would you...’ with the following four
149 response categories, alongside the weighted percentage of respondents:

- 150 • Definitely not (5.5 per cent);
- 151 • Probably not (7.2 per cent);
- 152 • Probably (28.7 per cent); and
- 153 • Definitely (58.5 per cent)

154

155 Consistent with previous literature on vaccine acceptability, we define those who are
156 definitely not going to get the vaccine as vaccine resistant [8]. High levels of hesitancy was
157 defined as those who would probably not get vaccinated while low levels of vaccinated was
158 categorised as low levels of hesitancy because of the uncertainty given that the decision was
159 about a vaccine would be safe and effective [8].

160

161 **Independent variables:** Detailed descriptions of independent variables included in the
162 analyses are provided in the Appendix. Demographic variables included sex, age, indigenous
163 status, born overseas (English speak or non-English speaking country), speaks a language
164 other than English at home, education, socio-economic status of the area, capital or non-
165 capital city, employed, and household income. The state of Victoria was experiencing an
166 outbreak in August 2020 marked by a score of 79.7 on COVID-19 Stringency index
167 compared to 52.3 and we identified participants living in Victoria through a dummy variable
168 [15]. As a point of comparison the COVID-19 Stringency index was 67.1 in the United
169 States and 69.9 in the United Kingdom on 12 August 2020. Health related variables included

170 self-rated health and disability or chronic illness. COVID-19 related variables included been
171 tested for COVID-19, worried about yourself or family or friends contracting COVID-19,
172 extent of social distancing behavior, downloaded the COVID-Safe app and considering that
173 there was too much worry about COVID-19. Political, and social attitudes included voting
174 intentions, populism, authoritarianism, religiosity, attitudes towards immigration, social trust,
175 altruism, confidence in Federal government, state government or hospital and health system.

176

177 **2.3 Statistical analyses**

178 We estimated an ordinal probit model using oprobit command in STATA 15.1. Given the
179 large number of independent variables we estimated several models. Model 1 included
180 demographic variables. Model 2 included demographic and health variables. Model 3
181 included demographic and COVID-19 related variables. Model 4 included demographic and
182 political and social attitudes. To understand the relative importance of the variables included
183 in the models, Model 5 included demographic variables and statistically significant variables
184 ($p < 0.05$) from models 2-4. We weighted to population benchmarks in all analyses to account
185 for survey design and non-response.

186

187

188 **3 Results**

189 *3.1 Vaccine hesitancy and resistance*

190 Almost three-in-five Australians (58.5 per cent) would definitely get the vaccine. We divided
191 vaccine hesitancy into two levels. Low levels of vaccine hesitancy were those who indicated
192 they were likely to get the vaccine but not certain (28.7 per cent) and high levels of vaccine
193 hesitancy those who will probably not get the vaccine (7.2 per cent). We defined those who

194 were resistant as those who indicated that they were definitely not going to get the vaccine
195 (5.5. per cent).

196

197 *3.2 Correlates of vaccine hesitancy and resistance*

198 Descriptive statistics for covariates in the statistical modelling can be found in the Appendix.

199 Table 1 shows the marginal effects from model 1, which included demographic,

200 socioeconomic and geographic variables.

201

202 Females were less likely than males to intend to get the vaccine, and more likely to be
203 hesitant and resistant. Those who were older (55-64, 65-74 and those over 75 years) were less
204 likely to be resistant or hesitant and more likely to intend to get vaccinated when it became
205 available than those aged 35-44 years old. Compared to those had Year 12 only, those with
206 an undergraduate or postgraduate university degree were less likely to be resistant or hesitant
207 and more likely to intend to be vaccinated.

208

209 There were neighbourhood differences, those living in the 4th most disadvantaged quintile of
210 disadvantage were less likely to intend to get vaccinated when compared to those living in the
211 3rd quintile. Individuals living in households with more household income were less likely to
212 be resistant or hesitant and more likely to intend to get vaccinated. All other demographic
213 variables were not statistically significant.

214

215 **INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE**

216

217 Health and disability status were not associated with vaccine intentions (model 2, see
218 Appendix).

219

220 In model 3 COVID-related variables were included as well as demographic variables (see
221 Appendix). Contrary to other research on the likelihood of getting vaccinated to COVID-19
222 [14] individual concerns or concerns about relatives or friends contracting COVID-19 were
223 not related to vaccination intentions. Being tested for coronavirus was also not related to
224 vaccination intentions.

225

226 People who reported greater levels of social distancing behaviour were less likely to be
227 resistant and more likely to intend to get vaccinated. Similarly, those that had downloaded the
228 COVID-Safe App were less likely to be resistant (-3.0 percentage points lower) or hesitant
229 (high: -2.7 percentage points and low: -5.1 percentage points) and more likely to intend to get
230 vaccinated (+10.8 percentage points). Those who thought too much fuss had been made about
231 COVID-19 were more likely to be resistant (8.1 percentage points) or have high levels of
232 hesitancy (4.2 percentage points) and less likely to intend to get vaccinated (-14.9 percentage
233 points less likely).

234

235 In Model 4 we added political and social attitudes to demographic characteristics (see
236 Appendix). There were no statistically significant differences by levels of social trust,
237 altruism or support for authoritarianism. Compared to those who voted for the Coalition,
238 those who voted for Labor were less likely to be resistant (-1.6%, $p < 0.10$), hesitant (high: -
239 1.5%; low: -3.2%) and more likely to intend to get vaccinated (6.3%, $p = 0.05$).

240

241 Those who had confidence in their state or territory government or in their hospitals and
242 health system were less likely to be resistant (-3.4 and -4.4 percentage points respectively) or
243 have high levels of hesitancy (-2.8 and -3.4 percentage points respectively) or have low levels

244 of hesitancy (-4.8 and -5.2 percentage points respectively) and more likely to intend to get
245 vaccinated (11.1% and 13.0% respectively).

246

247 Those who were more religious were less likely to intend to get vaccinated. People who had
248 more populist views were more likely to be resistant or hesitant (at high or low levels) and
249 less likely to intend to get vaccinated. Finally, those who were more likely to support
250 migration were less likely to be resistant and more likely to intend to get vaccinated.

251

252 The final model included statistically significant variables from models 2 to 4 and
253 demographic variables (Table 2). Females were less likely to intend to get vaccinated while
254 those aged 55 and over were more likely to intend get vaccinated. Those with higher
255 household income were less likely to be resistant and more likely to intend to get vaccinated.
256 Differences by levels of education observed in model 1 were explained by other variables.
257 Neighbourhood differences by socio-economic index for areas were evident with those living
258 in the most disadvantaged area more likely to be resistant or hesitant (at high levels) and less
259 likely to intend to get vaccinated.

260

261 People exercising greater levels of social distancing were less likely to be resistant and more
262 likely to be vaccinated. Those who downloaded the COVID-Safe App were less likely to be
263 resistant or hesitant and more likely to intend to get vaccinated. Those who reported too
264 much fuss had been made about COVID-19 were still more likely to be resistant or hesitant
265 and less likely to intend to get vaccinated.

266

267 Those who had confidence in their state or territory government or confident in their
268 hospitals and health system were less likely to be resistant or hesitant (at high or low levels)

269 and more likely to intend to get vaccinated. People who were more supportive of migration
270 were more likely to get vaccinated.

271

272 Those who reported more populist views were more likely to be resistant or hesitant (at high
273 or low levels) and less likely to intend to get vaccinated. This pattern of results was also
274 evident in terms of level of religiosity although this finding should be treated with caution as
275 there was a higher level of uncertainty around the estimates (statistical significance was only
276 at the 90% level). Similarly, those living in Victoria, with by far the highest numbers of
277 COVID-19 infections in Australia in August 2020, were significantly less likely than
278 Australians from other states to get vaccinated but this was not evident in other statistical
279 modelling, bivariate analyses and should not be considered a robust finding.

280

281

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

282

283 **4 Discussion**

284 In August 2020 36 per cent of Australians are hesitant and 6 per cent resistant to being
285 vaccinated with a safe and effective vaccine for COVID-19 if one was available. Given
286 previous research suggests that the factors associated with vaccine resistance might be
287 different to vaccine hesitancy, we examined demographic, health, COVID-19 related health
288 behaviour and attitudes, and political and social attitudinal correlates.

289

290 Many factors were associated with vaccine resistance and hesitancy. Consistent with previous
291 research, females, those with lower levels of household income and living in disadvantaged
292 areas were associated with increased likelihood of vaccine resistance or hesitancy [8, 14].

293 However, in contrast to previous research, younger people were not less likely to intend to
294 get vaccinated than those aged 35-44 years.

295

296 Less adherence to COVID-19 health behaviours was consistently associated with lower
297 likelihood of being vaccine resistant or hesitant (social distancing and downloading the
298 COVID-Safe app) and these were strongly related to vaccine intentions [14]. For example,
299 downloading the COVID-Safe app was associated with an increase of 11 percentage points in
300 the likelihood of being vaccinated. Similarly, there was a seven-percentage point increase in
301 the likelihood of intending to be vaccinated for COVID-19 if an individual moved from the
302 16th percentile in terms of social distancing to the 50th percentile (a one standard deviation
303 increase). Given that many governments have tracking surveys about social distancing, this
304 information could be used to support targeted campaigns to encourage vaccination in areas of
305 low social distancing.

306

307 Consistent with other studies of COVID-19 several variables that could be considered
308 associated with broader societal dissatisfaction and anti-establishment sentiments were also
309 associated with vaccine resistance or hesitancy. Specifically in this study, attitudes about too
310 much fuss being made about COVID-19, lack of confidence in state or territory government,
311 and having more populist sentiments [8, 16]. Other studies have also independently reported
312 that religious beliefs associated with declining a COVID-19 vaccine [14].

313

314 For many with low levels of hesitancy, providing information about the safety and efficacy of
315 the COVID-19 vaccine will be critical as other studies have highlight this as important
316 hesitancy [14]. Our analyses suggest that those with resistance or hesitancy are likely to lack
317 trust in those providing health services (e.g. state governments or health systems) and

318 therefore the misinformation about the COVID-19 vaccine that will occur may be even more
319 effective for these groups. Pre-emptively using cognitive inoculation techniques and pre-
320 bunking techniques [17] to actively work against the likely misinformation that will be
321 generated in the development and preparation phase of a vaccine for COVID-19 will be
322 important but probably requires more targeted and nuanced public health messages by trusted
323 members of the community (e.g. community or religious leaders).

324

325 Those with higher vaccine resistance or hesitancy are more likely to have a set of strongly
326 held beliefs, a lack of trust in those responsible for health (state or territory government and
327 hospitals or health systems) and lower levels of compliance with public health advice for
328 COVID-19 (e.g. lower levels of social distancing, not downloading the COVID-Safe App). If
329 large scale surveys collect information on the extent of compliance with health advice,
330 further nuanced targeting could be employed. Beyond more sophisticated and nuanced public
331 health messaging, it should be noted that a systematic review of research on compulsory
332 vaccination policies suggests that the majority of the population supports these programs
333 [18]. However, none of the studies in the systematic review were conducted during a
334 pandemic where civil liberties were restricted due to lockdowns [18] and a staged approach
335 may well be more proportional [19].

336

337 While we used a rich set of variables to predict vaccine intentions some factors were not
338 collected in our surveys. In particular, we did not collect information about concerns about
339 vaccine safety which may be important determinant of vaccine hesitancy and may also
340 explain why females were more likely to be hesitant or resistant than males. Another robust
341 correlate in other studies of vaccine intentions is previous vaccination such as for influenza
342 [14]. Vaccine safety and public discourse will likely be particularly important as media and

343 public scrutiny of vaccine trials is unprecedented for COVID-19 vaccines and further
344 monitoring of public sentiment [8].

345

346 Another issue that we did not address in this paper is if there are initial shortages of a vaccine
347 how would these be distributed? A survey experiment using these participants suggests that
348 essential health workers, those with a health condition, those in areas with high levels of
349 COVID-19 and with caring responsibilities should get priority [20]. Moreover, vaccine
350 intentions of respondents did not change these priorities.

351 **5 Conclusion**

352 Given that over 75 per cent of the population are likely to need to be vaccinated with a highly
353 effective vaccine to extinguish the epidemic (Bartsch et al., 2020) our findings that only 59
354 per cent of Australians will definitely get vaccinated is sobering and suggests that as noted by
355 WHO (Hickler et al., 2020), proactive measures need to be adopted by countries to encourage
356 vaccination in the community. Our findings suggest that vaccine hesitancy, which accounts
357 for a further significant proportion of the population, and can be addressed by public health
358 messaging. However for a significant minority of the population with strongly held beliefs
359 that are the likely drivers of vaccination intentions, alternative policy measures may well be
360 needed to achieve sufficient vaccination coverage.

361 **Funding**

362 The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) provided financial support for the
363 analysis of the August ANUpoll data presented in this paper.

364

365 **Declaration of competing interest**

366 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal
367 relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

368 **Credit Author Statement**

369

370 **Ben Edwards:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Analysis, Writing-Original draft
371 preparation **Nicholas Biddle:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Data curation, Writing-
372 Reviewing and Editing, Funding acquisition. **Matthew Gray:** Conceptualization, Writing-
373 Reviewing and Editing. **Kate Sollis:** Writing- Reviewing and Editing.

374

375 **References**

- 376 [1] Yadav, S., & Yadav, P. K. Basic reproduction rate and case fatality rate of COVID-19:
377 Application of meta-analysis. medRxiv, <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.13.20100750>
- 378 [2] Randolph H, Barreiro L. Herd immunity: understanding COVID-19. *Immunity* 2020; 52:
379 737–41.
- 380 [3] Sanche, S., Lin, Y. T., Xu, C., Romero-Severson, E., Hengartner, N., Ke, R. (2020). High
381 contagiousness and rapid spread of severe acute respiratory syndrome Coronavirus 2.
382 *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 26(7), 1470-1477. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2607.200282>
- 383 [4] Bartsch, S. M., O’Shea, K. J., Ferguson, M. C., Bottazi, M. E., Wedlock, P. T., Strych, U.,
384 McKinnell, J. A., Siegmund, S. S., Cox, S. N., Hotez, P. J., & Lee, B. Y. (2020). Vaccine
385 efficacy needed for a COVID-19 Coronavirus vaccine to prevent or stop an epidemic as the
386 sole intervention. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 59(4), 493-503.
- 387 [5] Osterholm MT, Kelley NS, Sommer A, Belongia EA (2012). "Efficacy and effectiveness
388 of influenza vaccines: a systematic review and meta-analysis". *The Lancet. Infectious*
389 *Diseases*. 12 (1): 36–44. [doi:10.1016/s1473-3099\(11\)70295-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1473-3099(11)70295-x)
- 390 [6] Neumann-Bohme, S., Varghese, N. E., Sabat, I., Barros, P. P., Brouwer, W., van Exel, J.,
391 Schreyogg, J., Stargardt, T. (2020). Once we have it, will we use it? A European survey on
392 willingness to be vaccinated against COVID-19. *The European Journal of Health Economics*,
393 21, 977-982. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10198-020-01208-6>
- 394 [7] Reiter, P. L., Pennell, M. L., & Katz, M. L. (2020). Acceptability of a COVID-19 vaccine
395 among adults in the United States: How many people would get vaccinated? *Vaccine*,
396 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.08.043>
- 397 [8] Murphy, J., Vallieres, F., Bentall, R. P., Shevlin, M., McBride, O., Hartman, T. K.,
398 McKay, R., Bennett, K., Mason, L., Gibson-Miller, J., Levita, L., Martinez, A. P., Stocks, T.

- 399 V. A., Karatzias, T., & Hyland, P. (2020). Preparing for a COVID-19 vaccine: Identifying
400 and psychologically profiling those who are vaccine hesitant or resistant in two general
401 population samples. PsyArXiv preprint, DOI: [10.31234/osf.io/pev2b](https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/pev2b)
- 402 [9] Sherman, S. M., Smith, L. E., Sim, J., Amlot, R., Cutts, M., Dasch, H., Rubin, G. J.,
403 Sevdalis, N. (2020). COVID-19 vaccination intention in the UK: Results from the ‘COVID-
404 19 Vaccination Acceptability Study’ (CoVAccS), a nationally representative cross-sectional
405 survey. MedArXiv preprint, <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.13.20174045>
- 406 [10] Frank, K., & Arim, R. (2020). Canadians’ willingness to get to a COVID-19 vaccine:
407 Group differences and reasons for vaccine hesitancy. Statistics Canada Catalogue No.
408 45280001. No. 00043. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- 409 [11] Dodd, R. H., Cvejic, E., Bonner, C., Pickles, K., McCaffery, K. J. and Sydney Health
410 Literacy Lab COVID-19 group. Willingness to vaccinate against COVID-19 in Australia.
411 *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020; published online June 30. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30559-4)
412 [3099\(20\)30559-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30559-4).
- 413 [12] Hickler B, Guirguis S, Obregon R. (2015). Vaccine special issue on vaccine hesitancy.
414 *Vaccine*, 34(33): 4155-4156.
- 415 [13] Dubé E. , Vivion M. , MacDonald N.E. (2015). Vaccine hesitancy, vaccine refusal and
416 the anti-vaccine movement: influence, impact and implications. *Expert Reviews Vaccines*,
417 14(1), pp. 100-117.
- 418 [14] Thunstro m, L., Ashworth, M., Finnoff, D., Newbold, S. (2020) Hesitancy Towards a
419 COVID-19 Vaccine and Prospects for Herd Immunity, *Covid Economics*, 35, 7, 1-50. July
420 2020.
- 421 [15] Hale, T., Angrist, N., Cameron-Blake, E., Hallas, L., Kira, B., Majumdar, S., Petherick,
422 A. Phillips, T., Tatlow, H., Webster, S. (2020). *Oxford COVID-19 Government Response*
423 *Tracker, Blavatnik School of Government*.

- 424 [16] Rozbroj T, Lyons A, Lucke J. (2019). Psychosocial and demographic characteristics
425 relating to vaccine attitudes in Australia. *Patient education and counselling*. 102(1): 172-179.
- 426 [17] Habersaat, K. B., Betsch, C., Danchin, M., Sunstein, C. R., Böhm, R., Falk, A., . . .
427 Butler, R. (2020). Ten considerations for effectively managing the COVID-19 transition.
428 *Nature Human Behaviour*, 4, 677–687.
- 429 [18] Gualano, M. R., Olivero, E., Voglino, G., Corezzi, M., Rossello, P., Vicentini, C., Bert,
430 F., & Siliquini, R. (2019). Knowledge, attitudes and beliefs towards compulsory vaccination:
431 a systematic review. *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics*, 15(4), 918-931.
- 432 [19] Mello MM, Silverman RD, Omer SB. Ensuring uptake of vaccines against SARSCoV-
433 2. *N Engl J Med* 2020;383:1296–9. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp2020926>.
- 434 [20] Biddle, N., Edwards, B., Gray, M., & Sollis, K. (2020). Public attitudes on vaccine
435 distribution. Centre for Social Research and Methods (ANU).

436

437

438

Table 1 Demographic correlates of vaccine resistance and hesitancy, marginal effects

Explanatory variables	Resistant		Hesitant -High		Hesitant - Low		Likely	
	Marginal effect	Signif.						
Victoria	-0.003		-0.003		-0.006		0.012	
Female	0.011	*	0.010	*	0.021	*	-0.042	*
Aged 18 to 24 years	-0.013		-0.012		-0.026		0.052	
Aged 25 to 34 years	0.006		0.005		0.010		-0.021	
Aged 45 to 54 years	0.007		0.006		0.011		-0.025	
Aged 55 to 64 years	-0.021	**	-0.020	**	-0.047	**	0.089	**
Aged 65 to 74 years	-0.030	***	-0.030	***	-0.075	***	0.134	***
Aged 75 years plus	-0.038	***	-0.041	***	-0.112	***	0.191	***
Indigenous	0.003		0.003		0.006		-0.013	
Born overseas in a main English speaking country	0.009		0.007		0.013		-0.029	
Born overseas in a non-English speaking country	0.003		0.003		0.005		-0.011	
Speaks a language other than English at home	0.015		0.012		0.022		-0.049	
Not completed Year 12 or post-school qualification	0.009		0.008		0.014		-0.031	
Has a post graduate degree	-0.024	**	-0.024	**	-0.056	**	0.105	**
Has an undergraduate degree	-0.019	*	-0.018	**	-0.041	**	0.079	**
Certificate III/IV, Diploma or Associate Degree	0.001		0.001		0.002		-0.005	
Lives most disadvantaged areas (1st quintile)	0.024	*	0.019	**	0.032	*	-0.075	*
Lives next most disadvantaged areas (2nd quintile)	0.001		0.002		0.003		-0.006	
Lives in next most advantaged areas (4th quintile)	0.022		0.017		0.029		-0.068	*
Lives in the most advantaged areas (5th quintile)	0.002		0.002		0.004		-0.008	
Lives in a non-capital city	0.009		0.007		0.013		-0.029	
Employed	0.001		0.001		0.001		-0.002	
Household income	-.00003	***	-.00003	***	-.00005	***	0.0001	***
Proportion	0.051		0.070		0.298		0.593	

439

Source: ANUpoll, April, May and August 2020.

440 Notes: Ordered probit model. N = 2,717. Base case is estimated from Victorian, female, 35-44 year old, non-indigenous, Australian born, speaks English at
 441 home, Year 12 education, 3rd SEIFA neighbourhood quintile, capital city, not employed and mean household income at the mean (\$670.81)
 442 Marginal effects that are statistically significant at the 1 per cent level of significance are labelled ***; those significant at the 5 per cent level of
 443 significance are labelled **, and those significant at the 10 per cent level of significance are labelled *.

444
445
446

Table 2 Correlates of vaccine resistance and hesitancy – Final model, marginal effects

Explanatory variables	Resistant		Hesitant - High		Hesitant - Low		Likely	
	Marginal effect	Sig						
Victoria	0.023		0.020	*	0.036	**	-0.079	*
Female	0.018	*	0.016	**	0.027	*	-0.061	**
Aged 18 to 24 years	-0.024		-0.022		-0.039		0.085	
Aged 25 to 34 years	0.001		0.000		0.001		-0.002	
Aged 45 to 54 years	0.005		0.004		0.005		-0.013	
Aged 55 to 64 years	-0.030	**	-0.028	**	-0.052	**	0.110	**
Aged 65 to 74 years	-0.039	**	-0.037	***	-0.077	***	0.153	***
Aged 75 years plus	-0.049	**	-0.050	***	-0.116	***	0.216	***
Indigenous	-0.010		-0.008		-0.013		0.032	
Born overseas in a main English speaking country	0.019		0.014		0.018		-0.050	
Born overseas in a non-English speaking country	0.000		0.000		0.000		-0.001	
Speaks a language other than English at home	0.019		0.014		0.018		-0.052	
Not completed Year 12 or post-school qualification	0.014		0.011		0.014		-0.038	
Has a post graduate degree	-0.022		-0.019		-0.034		0.075	
Has an undergraduate degree	-0.018		-0.016		-0.027		0.061	
Has a Certificate III/IV, Diploma or Associate Degree	0.014		0.011		0.014		-0.040	
Lives most disadvantaged areas (1st quintile)	0.033	*	0.023	*	0.027		-0.084	*
Lives next most disadvantaged areas (2nd quintile)	0.001		0.001		0.001		-0.002	
Lives in next most advantaged areas (4th quintile)	0.025		0.018		0.022		-0.066	
Lives in the most advantaged areas (5th quintile)	0.010		0.008		0.011		-0.029	
Lives in a non-capital city	0.006		0.005		0.007		-0.018	
Employed	-0.004		-0.003		-0.004		0.011	
Household income	-.00003	**	-.00002	***	-.00004	**	-.00009	***

Too much fuss made about COVID-19	0.059	**	0.038	***	0.037	**	-0.135	***
Social distancing behaviour	-0.023	**	-0.018	***	-0.027	***	0.069	**
Downloaded the COVID-Safe App	-0.031	**	-0.028	***	-0.053	***	0.112	***
Voting intention: Labor	-0.022	*	-0.019	**	-0.034	**	0.076	**
Voting intention: Greens	-0.004		-0.004		-0.005		0.013	
Voting intention: Other	-0.020		-0.017		-0.030		0.067	
Voting intention: Don't know	0.005		0.004		0.005		-0.013	
Confident in state or territory government	-0.029	**	-0.021	**	-0.025	*	0.021	
Confident in hospitals and health system	-0.044	**	-0.030	***	-0.032	*	0.075	**
Support for migration	-0.005		-0.003		-0.004		0.106	***
Populism	0.003	*	0.002	**	0.004	**	-0.009	**
Religiosity	0.003	*	0.002	*	0.004	*	-0.009	*
Proportion	0.070		0.088		0.355		0.487	

447

448

Source: ANUpoll, April, May and August 2020.

449

Notes: Ordinal probit model. N = 2,261. Base case is estimated from Victorian, female, 35-44 year old, non-indigenous, Australian born, speaks English at home, Year 12 education, 3rd SEIFA neighbourhood quintile, capital city, not employed and mean household income at the mean (\$670.81), Coalition voter, has confidence in their state/territory government, has confidence in hospitals and health system. Other variables estimated at the sample means (social distancing behaviour, support for migration, populism, religiosity). Coefficients that are statistically significant at the 1 per cent level of significance are labelled ***; those significant at the 5 per cent level of significance are labelled **, and those significant at the 10 per cent level of significance are labelled *.

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

ⁱ The February wave of data collection was conducted as Australian Social Survey, in parallel with the European social Survey

ⁱⁱ <https://dataverse.ada.edu.au/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=doi%3A10.26193%2FZFGFNE>