

1 **Title:** Social inequalities in hostility toward vaccination against Covid-19

2

3 **Authors names and affiliations:**

4 Alexis Spire, PhD<sup>a</sup>, Nathalie Bajos, PhD<sup>a</sup>, Léna Silberzan<sup>a</sup>, for the EPICOV study group\*

5

6 <sup>a</sup>IRIS, Inserm/EHESS/CNRS, Aubervilliers, France

7 \*The EPICOV study group : Nathalie Bajos (co-principal investigator), Josiane Warszawski (co-  
8 principal investigator), Guillaume Bagein, François Beck, Emilie Council, Florence Jusot,  
9 Nathalie Lydie, Claude Martin, Laurence Meyer, Philippe Raynaud, Alexandra Rouquette,  
10 Ariane Pailhé, Delphine Rahib, Patrick Sicard, Rémy Slama, Alexis Spire.

11

12 **Correspondence to :**

13 Dr. Nathalie Bajos, Institut de Recherche Interdisciplinaire sur les enjeux Sociaux - Sciences  
14 sociales, politique, santé, IRIS (UMR 8156 CNRS - EHESS - U997 Inserm) 5 cours des  
15 humanités, 93322 Aubervilliers cedex, France.

16 Tel: +33 (0)6 66 32 30 00. [nathalie.bajos@inserm.fr](mailto:nathalie.bajos@inserm.fr)

17

18 **Abstract**

19 In recent decades, France has appeared as a country particularly hostile to vaccination in  
20 general. When asked in November 2020 about the intention to take the Covid-19 vaccine,  
21 the French public showed, once again, reluctance. Therefore, France appeared as an ideal  
22 case study to analyze whether the hostility toward the Covid-19 vaccine has its own reasons  
23 or whether it is related to the reluctance to the principle of vaccination itself. Our objective  
24 was to determine the specificity of the social determinants of the intention to get the Covid-  
25 19 vaccine. Thanks to the use of a large random sample of the general population in France  
26 (86,000 individuals), the reluctant to Covid-19 vaccine could be clearly distinguished from  
27 the hesitant and the convinced, and thereby thoroughly analyzed. Our analysis highlighted a  
28 gendered reluctance toward vaccination in general but even more so regarding vaccination  
29 against Covid-19. It might refer to women being more concerned about the possible effects  
30 of an injection in their body, especially at the age of maternity and a differentiated  
31 socialization making them more sensitive than men to long-term risks and more

32 apprehensive toward rapid technological change. We also found that people at the bottom  
33 of the social hierarchy, in terms of level of education, financial resources, and immigration  
34 status, were more likely to refuse the Covid-19 vaccine. Nevertheless, this reluctance was  
35 less prominent than for vaccination in general, reflecting the actual spread of the epidemic  
36 in various social milieux. Finally, our analysis showed that trust in the government's actions  
37 was significantly associated with reluctance toward the Covid-19 vaccine, even more than  
38 toward vaccination in general.

39 Specific campaigns should be thought beforehand to reach women and people at the  
40 bottom of the social hierarchy to avoid furthering social inequalities in terms of morbidity  
41 and mortality.

42

#### 43 **Keywords**

44 Covid vaccination reluctance, gender, social class, ethno-racial minorities, trust in  
45 government.

46

47 **Word count:** main text : 4,240 ; abstract : 295

48

## 49        **1. Introduction**

50

51            Long referred to as the land of Pasteur, France has recently acquired the image of a  
52 nation inherently hostile to vaccination, especially since the late 1990's [1]. In 2015, only  
53 52% of French people considered the seasonal flu vaccine to be safe, compared with 85% in  
54 the United Kingdom and 80% in Spain [2]. Surveys launched between October and December  
55 2020 confirmed this reputation when it comes to Covid-19 [3]: only 44% of French people  
56 were willing to be vaccinated against Covid-19 if they had the opportunity, less than in  
57 Germany (65%), Italy (70%), or the United Kingdom (81%), and half as much as in China  
58 (91%). France is therefore both one of the countries with the lowest level of acceptance of  
59 vaccination in general [4] and of the Covid-19 vaccine in particular. It makes it an ideal case  
60 to study whether the hostility to the Covid-19 vaccine has its own reasons or whether it is  
61 related to a reluctance to the principle of vaccination itself.

62

63            In addition to the unprecedented and global nature of this pandemic, the rapid  
64 development of the vaccine was a first characteristic likely to arouse public distrust [5]. It  
65 was, indeed, the first time in the world's vaccine history that a product was developed in  
66 such a short time period, less than a year after the first cases. This contrasted dramatically  
67 with the last major pandemic, HIV-AIDS, for which, despite the stakes, no vaccine is still  
68 available more than three decades after the outbreak. The race for vaccines has resulted in  
69 several competing prototypes. The first one to be available on the market, as of December 8,  
70 2020, was developed using messenger RNA technology, which had never before been used  
71 as a mode of protection against an epidemic. The introduction of this new technology,  
72 whose potential short- and long-term side effects have been widely discussed in the media,

73 may have influenced the willingness to be vaccinated. Another particularity of the Covid-19  
74 vaccine campaign was the strong implication of governments in the procurement of  
75 products and in the choice of the prototype. In France, hostility toward the Covid-19 vaccine  
76 could be explained by distrust in the government's actions [6] and in foreign pharmaceutical  
77 laboratories [7], since no French company produced a vaccine against Covid-19.

78         These specificities of the Covid-19 vaccination may have had a different impact on  
79 vaccination intentions between social groups, which is important to study in order to better  
80 target vaccination campaigns.

81         To study vaccine reluctance, it is important to distinguish vaccine refusal from  
82 vaccine hesitancy, defined as "a kind of decision-making process that depends on people's  
83 level of commitment to healthism/risk culture and on their level of confidence in the health  
84 authorities and mainstream medicine" [8]. Different positions toward vaccination can be  
85 articulated: the same individual can be hesitant about vaccines in general but hostile to  
86 vaccination against Covid-19, or favorable to vaccines in general but hesitant about  
87 vaccination against Covid-19. The challenge here was to account for these different  
88 combinations, by correlating them with people's social characteristics.

89         Our objective was to analyze the social determinants of Covid-19 vaccination  
90 reluctance, distinguishing between what related to vaccine distrust in general and what  
91 related specifically to the Covid-19 vaccine [9]. The analysis was conducted from an  
92 intersectional perspective [10] that simultaneously took into account gender, class, age, and  
93 ethno-racial social characteristics, as well as respondents' level of trust in the government.

94         This study was based on a large-scale random survey of 107,808 people conducted  
95 between October 26 and December 9, 2020, a pivotal time, as Pfizer announced on  
96 November 9, 2020, that it would be able to produce a 90% effective vaccine on a large scale.

## 97        **2. Materials and Methods**

98

### 99        **2.1. The EpiCoV study**

100    The EpiCoV (Epidémiologie et Conditions de Vie) cohort was set-up in April 2020, with the  
101    general aim of understanding the main epidemiological, social and behavioural issues  
102    related to the Covid-19 epidemic in France. The survey was approved by the CNIL (French  
103    independent administrative authority responsible for data protection) on April 25<sup>th</sup> 2020  
104    (ref: MLD/MFI/AR205138) and by the “Comité de protection des personnes” (French  
105    equivalent of the Research Ethics Committee) on April 24<sup>th</sup>. The survey also obtained an  
106    agreement from the “Comité du Label de la statistique publique”, proving its adequacy to  
107    statistical quality standards.

108    Since the cohort protocol is detailed in another publication [11], only the essential  
109    characteristics will be presented. A random sample of 135,000 people aged 15 and over,  
110    drawn from the tax database of the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies  
111    (INSEE), which covers 96% of the population living in France but excludes people living in  
112    institutional settings, participated in a first wave of the study in May 2020. A second wave  
113    was conducted in November 2020, including questions on attitudes toward vaccination. In  
114    all, 107,808 respondents participated in this second wave (81.7% of the respondents of the  
115    first wave of the study). Individuals were invited to answer the questionnaire online, or by  
116    phone for those who did not have Internet access. Furthermore, a random sample of 10% of  
117    people with Internet access was interviewed by phone in order to take into account a  
118    method collection effect. The results published in the study have been adjusted by applying  
119    the weights established by the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE)  
120    to produce estimators that are representative of the population.

121           **2.2. Sample information**

122           We focused on people living in metropolitan France, aged 18 and over and likely to  
123 decide for themselves whether to be vaccinated (N= 101,112). We chose not to include  
124 people who tested positive for Covid-19 (N=4,036) and whose intention to be vaccinated  
125 could be influenced by this fact. We also excluded individuals who did not respond to the  
126 questions concerning attitudes toward the Covid-19 vaccine or toward vaccination in  
127 general, and missing social and health characteristics data (level of formal education level,  
128 social class, standard of living, ethnotracial status, Covid-19 comorbidities). Therefore,  
129 85,855 individuals were included in the analysis.

130

131           **2.3. Outcome measures**

132           To study attitudes toward vaccination in the EpiCoV survey in November 2020, two  
133 questions were available. One was about vaccination in general (*Are you strongly,*  
134 *somewhat, somewhat not, or not at all in favor of vaccinations in general?*) and the other  
135 was specifically about the Covid-19 vaccine (*If a free vaccine against coronavirus was offered*  
136 *by the Sécurité Sociale (the French social security system), would you be willing to get*  
137 *vaccinated? Yes probably, yes maybe, probably not, certainly not, or you do not know).*

138

139           **2.4. Explanatory measures**

140           *Social variables*

141           To describe the sample, six sociodemographic variables were considered: age,  
142 gender, ethno-racial status (based on migration history), social class (based on current or last  
143 occupation), standard of living (based on decile of household income per consumption unit),

144 and formal education level. Ethno-racial status was defined by combining the criteria of  
145 place of birth, nationality, and status of the individual and both parents.

146

## 147 **2.5. Statistical analyses**

148 We first described the cross-tabulation of attitudes toward vaccination in general by  
149 attitudes toward the Covid-19 vaccine. We then presented the distribution of social  
150 characteristics for each attitude toward vaccination in general and toward the Covid-19  
151 vaccine.

152 We then conducted logistic regressions on being "not at all in favor" to vaccination in  
153 general, and on being "certainly not" willing to get vaccinated against Covid-19.

154

155 The percentages presented are weighted to account for the sample design. The figures in  
156 the tables are not weighted. All analyses were performed with the R software (1.3.959). A P-  
157 value <0.05 was considered statistically significant. Given the sample size, the observed  
158 differences were consistently statistically significant. Therefore, no tests are presented for  
159 univariable analyses.

160

161

## 162 **3. Results**

163 When crossing the question regarding vaccination in general with the question  
164 regarding the Covid-19 vaccine, a strong link between the two attitudes emerged, though  
165 not without variations (Table 1).

166

167           Almost three quarters of people who were strongly in favor of vaccination in general  
168 reported they were willing to be vaccinated against Covid-19. Those who were somewhat in  
169 favor of vaccination in general were also more likely to be willing to be vaccinated against  
170 Covid-19: more than two thirds of them reported they would perhaps (“Yes probably” or  
171 “Yes maybe”) get the shot. This was not the case for those who reported they were  
172 somewhat not in favor of vaccination in general: 21.4% of them declared they would most  
173 likely not get vaccinated against Covid-19, and a quarter of them said they did not know.  
174 Those who were not at all in favor of vaccination in general, however, had a stronger  
175 position toward the Covid-19 vaccine: more than half of them were determined not to be  
176 vaccinated against Covid-19.

177  
178 Attitudes toward the Covid-19 vaccine seemed to be more definite and socially  
179 differentiated than toward vaccination in general (Table 2A, Table 2B). Hesitants (those who  
180 were “Somewhat in favor” or “Somewhat not in favor” of vaccination in general) made up  
181 for more 65% of attitudes toward vaccination in general, whereas only 52% of respondents  
182 were unsure of their attitudes toward the Covid-19 vaccine. In both cases, men were more  
183 inclined to vaccination than women, and the gender gap was much wider for the Covid-19  
184 vaccine (39.7% of men *versus* 27.3% of women) than for vaccination in general (26.7% of  
185 men *versus* and 21.3% of women)

186 Overall, age played an important role especially for older adults, but in different ways: in the  
187 25-64 age group, the proportion of people strongly in favor of vaccination in general was  
188 around 20% while the age group 65 and over stood out (32.6% were strongly in favor). In the  
189 case of the Covid-19 vaccine, the age gradient was very regular from the age of 25 onwards,  
190 ranging from 23.3% for the 25-34 age group to 45.1% for people 65 and over.



191 On the whole, other social characteristics - such as education, social class, and standard of  
192 living - played a similar role: the lower in the social hierarchy, the more reluctant one was to  
193 vaccination in general and against the Covid-19 vaccine in particular. In both cases, manual  
194 workers stood out: 17.1% were not at all in favor of vaccination in general (*versus* 5.9% of  
195 the Senior executive professionals) and 17.2% said they would most likely not get vaccinated  
196 against Covid19 (*versus* 8.2% of the senior executive professionals).

197 With regard to ethno-racial status, minorities were always more reluctant to the principle of  
198 vaccination, but in different ways: toward vaccination in general, racialized first-generation  
199 immigrants were the most reluctant (27% claimed they were not at all in favor of vaccination  
200 in general, compared to 10% in the mainstream population); meanwhile, with regard to the  
201 Covid-19 vaccine, it was DOM natives and descendants of DOM who were the most reluctant  
202 (23.7%, compared to 13.3%).

203 Living with a child increased distrust of the vaccine, especially for Covid-19: 17.4% of people  
204 living with at least a child responded certainly not to the question on the Covid-19 vaccine  
205 (versus 12% of people with no child).

206 Finally, it was noted that trust in the government was particularly strongly linked to the  
207 attitude toward the Covid-19 vaccine, whereas it was somewhat less significant in the case  
208 of vaccination in general.

209

210 To better understand the specificity of reluctance to vaccinate against Covid 19, we focused  
211 on people who expressed their intention to not be vaccinated (Table 3).

212

213

214 Women appeared to be more reluctant to vaccination in general than men (OR=1.33  
215 (95% CI: 1.26-1.40)), and even more so with regard to the Covid-19 vaccine (OR=1.88 (95%  
216 CI: 1.79-1.97)). The presence of a child was also not equally important according to the type  
217 of vaccine: it increased the probability of being hostile to Covid-19 vaccine (OR=0.12 (95% CI:  
218 1.06-1.18) but was not significant for vaccination in general.

219 The effects of age were also highly significant: the older the respondents were, the  
220 less likely they were to be fundamentally hostile to vaccination, although variations  
221 remained. It should be noted that while people aged 34 and under were more likely to be  
222 reluctant toward Covid-19 vaccine ((OR=1.32 (95% CI:1.23-1.41)) than toward vaccination in  
223 general ((OR=1.11 (95% CI:1.02-1.21)), the opposite trend was found among those aged 45  
224 and older. Looking at social position, senior executive professionals' attitude is worth  
225 highlighting: their attitude toward vaccination in general was not significant, while the  
226 probability that they refused the Covid-19 vaccine was lower than that of middle-executive  
227 professionals (OR=0.89 (95% CI: 0.82-0.95)).

228 A social gradient was found regarding level of education: the higher the degree, the  
229 lower the likelihood of being hostile to vaccination, with stronger results for vaccination in  
230 general (from OR=1.53 (95% CI:1.38-1.69) for respondents without diploma to OR=0.39 (95%  
231 CI:0.35-0.44) for High school +5 or more years level) than for the Covid-19 vaccine (from  
232 OR=1.22 (95% CI:1.10-1.35) to OR=0.52 (95% CI:0.47-0.57) for the same levels).

233 Vaccine reluctance was also related to financial resources. Being in the lowest  
234 deciles increased the odds of being fundamentally hostile to vaccination in general (from  
235 OR=1.16 (95% CI: 1.08-1.28) down to OR=0.69 (95% CI: 0.62-0.77)) for the richest) ; same  
236 trend was observed for the Covid-19 vaccine.

237           The ethno-racial status played an important role. People who did not belong to the  
238 so-called mainstream population, *i.e.*, those from the French DOM, immigrants and  
239 descendants of immigrants, were all more reluctant to vaccination. Interestingly, hostility to  
240 the Covid-19 vaccine remained higher than that of the mainstream population, but the  
241 differences were less marked (for racialized first-generation immigrants OR= 1.16 (95%  
242 CI:1.04-1.30)) *versus* OR=2.19 (95% CI:1.96-2.43)).

243           Attitudes toward vaccination also depended on a person's perception of both the  
244 disease and the officials in charge of the vaccination policies. As expected, fear of the  
245 disease made people less likely to belong to the Covid-19 vaccine-reluctant group (OR=0.57  
246 (95% CI: 0.54-0.61)). The link between trust in the government and trust in vaccination  
247 should also be highlighted: those who reported not trusting the government were more  
248 likely to be Covid-19 vaccine-reluctant (OR=3.29 (95% CI: 3.13-3.45)) and more likely to be  
249 “not at all in favor” of vaccination in general (OR=2.68(95% CI: 2.54-2.83)) than those who  
250 reported trusting the government.

251

#### 252           **4. Discussion**

253           The EpiCoV survey is the first national randomized socio-epidemiological survey of  
254 this scale to study the specificity of the response to Covid-19 vaccination, taking into account  
255 gender, class, age, and ethno-racial characteristics [12] as well as level of trust in  
256 government actions.

257           Our results showed that Covid-19 vaccine hesitancy was highly, but not totally,  
258 correlated with hostility to vaccination in general and had specific social determinants.  
259 Based on the distinction between vaccine refusal and hesitancy [13], our analyses  
260 highlighted the need to consider reluctants as a specific group, distinct from the hesitant,

261 contrary to what has been done in some recent work [14,15]. Respondents at the bottom of  
262 the social hierarchy were more likely to be reluctant toward Covid-19 vaccination, but to a  
263 lesser extent than toward vaccination in general. An important gender specificity was found:  
264 women were much more reluctant toward Covid-19 vaccination than toward vaccination in  
265 general. Our analyses also showed that trust in government was the variable with the  
266 strongest association with reluctance to vaccination against Covid-19, even stronger than for  
267 the vaccine in general.

268

269 Although France is a country where the prevalence of vaccine reluctance is  
270 particularly high, the social characteristics of French people hostile to the Covid-19 vaccine  
271 are comparable to those found in other countries. First of all, our results confirmed women's  
272 greater reluctance to COVID-19 vaccination, already observed in other surveys in France  
273 [15,16], in the United Kingdom, in China and in the United States [17,18]. Though many  
274 studies have been able to measure women's higher reluctance toward the Covid-19 vaccine,  
275 only few explanations were provided. First, it should be noted that women's critical  
276 discourse toward vaccination is long-standing and already widely documented: in the 1970s  
277 and 1980s, women's movements in the United States demanded more accurate information  
278 and transparency from the government regarding injections offered to their children [19].  
279 Few years ago, a study on anti-vaccination mobilizations on Facebook networks in Australia  
280 and North America revealed the very strong presence of women in these activist groups  
281 [20]. Women's greater reluctance to vaccination could also be linked to their "cultural health  
282 capital" [21], which reflects a gendered bond to the body, partly resulting from a different  
283 socialization process of women and men regarding pain and health [22]. The inclination

284 toward complementary and alternative medicine [23] could thus explain women's greater  
285 reluctance to resort to medical practices over which they have no control.

286 Our results showed for the first time that this gendered reluctance toward Covid-19  
287 vaccine was much stronger than toward vaccination in general.

288 At first glance, one could assume that it reflects a reasoned anticipation of the risk of  
289 complications. Men were proven to be more likely to contract severe forms of the disease;  
290 therefore, women could rightly consider themselves less exposed to the lethality of Covid-19  
291 and therefore less concerned by the need for the vaccine. However, this was not the case.  
292 Women were more apprehensive about the disease: according to our survey, they were  
293 more afraid than men of contracting the virus and being seriously ill and they took a Covid-  
294 19 test more often (data not shown). If we ruled out the idea that women were less afraid of  
295 contracting serious forms, three specific Covid-19 reluctance hypotheses could be  
296 formulated.

297 The first hypothesis was that the vaccine against Covid-19 could pose a threat to  
298 maternity plans. In the 25-34 age group, women were more hostile to vaccines in general  
299 and even more so to the Covid-19 vaccine. At an age range that is socially devoted to  
300 motherhood, women were more concerned about the possible effects an injection of a very  
301 recently-developed product in their body could have on a possible pregnancy. This  
302 reluctance could be linked to their greater aversion to childhood vaccination [24], as they  
303 consider that the intensive mothering practices (feeding, nutrition and natural living) they  
304 provided to their children would be preferable to external medical protection [25], thus  
305 preferring natural immune defenses over those offered by vaccination. In contrast, as of age  
306 45, the probability of women refusing to be vaccinated against Covid-19 decreased  
307 continuously as age increased, which was not the case with vaccination in general. Once past

308 the social age of motherhood, the fear associated with the consequences of a Covid vaccine  
309 injection faded, supporting the hypothesis of gendered reluctance at maternal ages.

310 The second explanation could be found in the relationship that women have to their  
311 social role as caregivers within the family [26]. It was probably for this reason that women  
312 living with a child were, regardless of age, even more reluctant to the new vaccine than to  
313 vaccines in general [27]. Moreover, getting the Covid-19 vaccine could appear both as a  
314 medical intervention and as an external interference in the domestic sphere. Thus, the  
315 assignment of women to domestic tasks, which was accentuated during confinement [28],  
316 may have made them more reluctant than men to accept governmental interference,  
317 particularly marked for the Covid-19 vaccine, in the private sphere.

318 The third hypothesis involved a gendered relationship to health and environmental  
319 risks, which is also the product of primary socializations [29]. In the case of Covid-19, the  
320 large-scale distribution of a messenger RNA vaccine, which was at the centre of daily media  
321 debates in November 2020, may have been a greater concern for women than for men  
322 because of their stronger aversion to technology-related risks [30]. In the short term, it  
323 constituted a guarantee of being protected against Covid-19 for all those who would have  
324 benefited from an injection. However, there was still some uncertainty about the long-term  
325 effects that could emerge on cell transformation if this type of vaccine were to be  
326 generalized every year over a long period of time and to the entire population. The greater  
327 reluctance of women to receive the Covid-19 vaccine might have been due to a  
328 differentiated socialization making them more sensitive than men to long-term risks that  
329 could have a profound effect on the body and health. Conversely, men's greater inclination  
330 toward the Covid-19 vaccine might also have been the result of greater acceptance of  
331 technological innovations in genetics [31].

332

333           Our survey also showed that reluctance toward Covid-19 vaccination was closely  
334 related to other demographic and socioeconomic characteristics.

335           The older people were, the less they refused vaccination. But this age effect was even  
336 more pronounced for the vaccination against Covid-19, reflecting the fact that older people  
337 were much more likely to experience serious complications if contracting the virus.

338           Respondents with lower levels of education were more likely to be reluctant toward  
339 vaccination in general and, to a lesser extent, toward the Covid-19 vaccine. This distrust is  
340 partly explained by what Luc Boltanski [32] called “somatic cultures”: members of the  
341 working classes have a perception of their body and their health which is more distant from  
342 medical diagnoses than in upper classes. The lower magnitude of the social gradient for  
343 Covid-19 vaccination may be due to the pandemic and uncertain nature of the disease,  
344 which affects all social groups.

345           The marked income gradient for vaccination in general, as well as for vaccination  
346 against Covid-19, even though vaccination is free in France, may reflect the fact that the loss  
347 of income in the event of illness would be more important for the rich than for the poor.

348           Ethno-racial minorities appeared to be more hostile than the mainstream group to  
349 vaccination in general which confirmed studies on the greater reluctance of African  
350 Americans in the United States to receive the new vaccine [14]. Numerous studies have  
351 shown that ethno-racial minorities have less confidence in the healthcare system and in  
352 caregivers than the mainstream population [33–35]. In the case of France, this mistrust can  
353 be explained on the one hand by the weight of its colonial history and the associated  
354 pharmaceutical scandals [36], and on the other by discrimination and mistreatment to which  
355 these populations may have been exposed when resorting to the public health system [37].

356 Interestingly, their hostility to the Covid-19 vaccine was less marked than for the vaccine in  
357 general. As immigrants and descendants of immigrants are more often affected by the  
358 disease [38], it is likely that this lesser hostility reflects a greater effective proximity to the  
359 disease.

360 Finally, our analyses showed that trust in government was the variable with the  
361 strongest effect on reluctance to vaccinate against Covid-19, even stronger than for the  
362 vaccine in general. These results confirmed a link between vaccine adherence and trust in  
363 government, demonstrated prior to the Covid-19 pandemic [39]. In a country such as France,  
364 public authorities have close control over the supply and marketing of vaccines. Therefore,  
365 people's propensity to trust the government, leading actor in the country's vaccination  
366 strategy [40], affected attitudes toward vaccination. The French government has been  
367 harshly criticized for failing to anticipate the crisis and for wanting to cover up the lack of  
368 masks, claiming until April 2020 that they were not necessary to protect oneself from the  
369 virus [41]. The link between confidence in the government - or being close to the governing  
370 parties [6] - and vaccination intention was also strengthened when comparing vaccine  
371 supplies available in other countries: the vaccination rate in the United States, Israel and  
372 other European nations has fueled a feeling of downgrading, undoubtedly deteriorating the  
373 citizens' level of confidence in their government and in its ability to lead a successful  
374 vaccination campaign.

375

376 Like all national surveys conducted in the general population, our analysis showed  
377 limitations. First, the study could not reach highly vulnerable groups such as the  
378 undocumented and the homeless, who were particularly affected by the pandemic [42],  
379 especially in France [43]. Furthermore, our analyses did not consider which sources of



380 information people used to learn about vaccination issues. Misinformation campaigns in the  
381 media and on social networks could have influenced vaccination intentions [44,45].  
382 However, the impacts of these discourses were not homogeneous and it could be  
383 hypothesized that their effects varied according to social background and gender, somehow  
384 reinforcing the results we have obtained. Finally, it is important to note that the survey was  
385 conducted shortly before the vaccines were actually made available in France in early  
386 January 2021. Attitudes toward vaccination might have changed according to available  
387 information on each prototype vaccine and might as well have changed over time [46]. As  
388 the number of vaccinated individuals increased, knowing vaccinated people in one's  
389 environment might encourage reluctant individuals to follow suit. However, the scarce  
390 studies on the evolution of vaccination intentions over time showed that it was mainly those  
391 who were hesitant who were likely to be vaccinated [47]. In the case of France, available  
392 data showed that the share of clearly reluctant individuals, those on whom we focused our  
393 analyses, remained relatively stable over time between July 2020 and February 2021  
394 ([https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/etudes-et-enquetes/coviprev-une-enquete-pour-](https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/etudes-et-enquetes/coviprev-une-enquete-pour-suivre-l-evolution-des-comportements-et-de-la-sante-mentale-pendant-l-epidemie-de-covid-19#block-249162)  
395 [suivre-l-evolution-des-comportements-et-de-la-sante-mentale-pendant-l-epidemie-de-](https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/etudes-et-enquetes/coviprev-une-enquete-pour-suivre-l-evolution-des-comportements-et-de-la-sante-mentale-pendant-l-epidemie-de-covid-19#block-249162)  
396 [covid-19#block-249162](https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/etudes-et-enquetes/coviprev-une-enquete-pour-suivre-l-evolution-des-comportements-et-de-la-sante-mentale-pendant-l-epidemie-de-covid-19#block-249162)).

397

398 Finally, our results suggest that the vaccination strategy used in France should be  
399 reconsidered. It is based exclusively on epidemiological criteria, with priority access to  
400 vaccines being reserved initially for the oldest or those with comorbidities. Some groups will  
401 be more difficult to convince than others in the vaccination campaign: women, youth,  
402 working class, ethno-racial minorities. Specific campaigns should be thought beforehand to  
403 reach these people. In particular, ethno-racial minorities are both more exposed to this

404 pandemic and more reluctant to be vaccinated than the majority population, so a major  
405 effort must be made to reach them in this vaccination campaign. Failure to take into account  
406 the social determinants of reluctance to vaccinate could lead to strengthening social  
407 inequalities in terms of morbidity and mortality [48,49], as well as in terms of care work,  
408 mental health, and sexual and reproductive health, which particularly affect women [50].

409 All authors attest they meet the ICMJE criteria for authorship

410 **Declaration of interests**

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

413 **Acknowledgement**

414 The authors warmly thank all the volunteers of the EpiCov cohort ; the DREES and INSEE  
415 teams; the staff of IPSOS, Inserm Santé Publique team and Frédéric Robergeau.

416 **Funding details**

417 This work was supported by Inserm (Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche  
418 Médicale) ; the French Ministry for Research ; and the DREES (Direction de la recherche, des  
419 études, de l'évaluation et des statistiques).

420 The funders facilitated data acquisition but had no role in the design, analysis,  
421 interpretation, or writing.

422 Pr. Bajos has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the  
423 European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No.  
424 [856478])

425

426

427 **References**

- 428 [1] Bertrand A, Torny D. Libertés individuelles et santé collective: Une étude socio-  
429 historique de l'obligation vaccinale. Convention CNRS/ DGS SD5C 03-673: CERMES CNRS  
430 UMR 8559 – INSERM U502 – EHESP; 2004.
- 431 [2] Larson H, de Figueiredo A, Karafillakis E, Rawal M. State of vaccine confidence in the EU  
432 2018. LU: Publications Office (European Commission); 2018.
- 433 [3] Wouters OJ, Shadlen KC, Salcher-Konrad M, Pollard AJ, Larson HJ, Teerawattananon Y, et  
434 al. Challenges in ensuring global access to COVID-19 vaccines: production, affordability,  
435 allocation, and deployment. *The Lancet* 2021;397:1023–34.  
436 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(21\)00306-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00306-8).
- 437 [4] Ward JK, Peretti-Watel P, Bocquier A, Seror V, Verger P. Vaccine hesitancy and coercion:  
438 all eyes on France. *Nat Immunol* 2019;20:1257–9. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41590-019-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41590-019-0488-9)  
439 [0488-9](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41590-019-0488-9).
- 440 [5] Pogue K, Jensen JL, Stancil CK, Ferguson DG, Hughes SJ, Mello EJ, et al. Influences on  
441 Attitudes Regarding Potential COVID-19 Vaccination in the United States. *Vaccines*  
442 2020;8. <https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines8040582>.
- 443 [6] Ward JK, Alleaume C, Peretti-Watel P. The French public's attitudes to a future COVID-19  
444 vaccine: The politicization of a public health issue. *Soc Sci Med* 2020;265:113414.  
445 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113414>.
- 446 [7] Hacquin A-S, Altay S, Araujo E de, Chevallier C, Mercier H. Sharp rise in vaccine hesitancy  
447 in a large and representative sample of the French population: reasons for vaccine  
448 hesitancy. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/r8h6z>.
- 449 [8] Peretti-Watel P, Larson HJ, Ward JK, Schulz WS, Verger P. Vaccine hesitancy: clarifying a  
450 theoretical framework for an ambiguous notion. *PLoS Curr* 2015;7.

- 451 <https://doi.org/10.1371/currents.outbreaks.6844c80ff9f5b273f34c91f71b7fc289>.
- 452 [9] Lunz Trujillo K, Motta M. Many Vaccine Skeptics Plan to Refuse a COVID-19 Vaccine,  
453 Study Suggests. US News World Rep n.d. [//www.usnews.com/news/healthiest-](https://www.usnews.com/news/healthiest-communities/articles/2020-05-04/many-vaccine-skeptics-plan-to-refuse-a-covid-19-vaccine-study-suggests)  
454 [communities/articles/2020-05-04/many-vaccine-skeptics-plan-to-refuse-a-covid-19-](https://www.usnews.com/news/healthiest-communities/articles/2020-05-04/many-vaccine-skeptics-plan-to-refuse-a-covid-19-vaccine-study-suggests)  
455 [vaccine-study-suggests](https://www.usnews.com/news/healthiest-communities/articles/2020-05-04/many-vaccine-skeptics-plan-to-refuse-a-covid-19-vaccine-study-suggests) (accessed April 1, 2021).
- 456 [10] Bauer GR. Incorporating intersectionality theory into population health research  
457 methodology: Challenges and the potential to advance health equity. *Soc Sci Med*  
458 2014;110:10–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.03.022>.
- 459 [11] Warszawski J, Bajos N, Barlet M, Lamballerie X de, Rahib D, Lydié N, et al. A national  
460 mixed-mode seroprevalence random population-based cohort on SARS-CoV-2 epidemic  
461 in France: the socio-epidemiological EpiCov study. *MedRxiv* 2021:2021.02.24.21252316.  
462 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.24.21252316>.
- 463 [12] Milner A, Jumbe S. Using the right words to address racial disparities in COVID-19.  
464 *Lancet Public Health* 2020;5:e419–20. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(20\)30162-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30162-6).
- 465 [13] MacDonald NE, SAGE Working Group on Vaccine Hesitancy. Vaccine hesitancy:  
466 Definition, scope and determinants. *Vaccine* 2015;33:4161–4.  
467 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.04.036>.
- 468 [14] Callaghan T, Moghtaderi A, Lueck JA, Hotez P, Strych U, Dor A, et al. Correlates and  
469 disparities of intention to vaccinate against COVID-19. *Soc Sci Med* 2021;272:113638.  
470 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113638>.
- 471 [15] Schwarzingler M, Watson V, Arwidson P, Alla F, Luchini S. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy  
472 in a representative working-age population in France: a survey experiment based on  
473 vaccine characteristics. *Lancet Public Health* 2021;6:e210–21.  
474 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(21\)00012-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(21)00012-8).

- 475 [16] Peretti-Watel P, Seror V, Cortaredona S, Launay O, Raude J, Verger P, et al. A future  
476 vaccination campaign against COVID-19 at risk of vaccine hesitancy and politicisation.  
477 *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020;20:769–70. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30426-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30426-6).
- 478 [17] Zintel S, Flock C, Arbogast AL, Forster A, von Wagner C, Sieverding M. Gender  
479 Differences in the Intention to Get Vaccinated against COVID-19 - a Systematic Review  
480 and Meta-Analysis. *SSRN Electron J* 2021. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3803323>.
- 481 [18] Robertson E, Reeve KS, Niedzwiedz CL, Moore J, Blake M, Green M, et al. Predictors  
482 of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in the UK Household Longitudinal Study. *Brain Behav*  
483 *Immun* 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi.2021.03.008>.
- 484 [19] Conis E. A Mother's Responsibility: Women, Medicine, and the Rise of Contemporary  
485 Vaccine Skepticism in the United States. *Bull Hist Med* 2013;87:407–35.
- 486 [20] Smith N, Graham T. Mapping the anti-vaccination movement on Facebook. *Inf*  
487 *Commun Soc* 2019;22:1310–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1418406>.
- 488 [21] Shim JK. Cultural health capital: A theoretical approach to understanding health care  
489 interactions and the dynamics of unequal treatment. *J Health Soc Behav* 2010;51:1–15.  
490 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022146509361185>.
- 491 [22] Singh-Manoux A, Marmot M. Role of socialization in explaining social inequalities in  
492 health. *Soc Sci Med* 2005;60:2129–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2004.08.070>.
- 493 [23] Bryden GM, Browne M, Rockloff M, Unsworth C. Anti-vaccination and pro-CAM  
494 attitudes both reflect magical beliefs about health. *Vaccine* 2018;36:1227–34.  
495 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2017.12.068>.
- 496 [24] Gengler AM. “I want you to save my kid!”: Illness management strategies, access, and  
497 inequality at an elite university research hospital. *J Health Soc Behav* 2014;55:342–59.  
498 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022146514544172>.

- 499 [25] Reich JA. Neoliberal Mothering and Vaccine Refusal: Imagined Gated Communities  
500 and the Privilege of Choice. *Gend Soc* 2014;28:679–704.  
501 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243214532711>.
- 502 [26] Meleis AI, Caglia J, Langer A. Women and Health: Women’s Dual Roles as Both  
503 Recipients and Providers of Healthcare. *J Womens Health* 2002 2016;25:329–31.  
504 <https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2015.5717>.
- 505 [27] Benin AL, Wisler-Scher DJ, Colson E, Shapiro ED, Holmboe ES. Qualitative Analysis of  
506 Mothers’ Decision-Making About Vaccines for Infants: The Importance of Trust.  
507 *Pediatrics* 2006;117:1532–41. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2005-1728>.
- 508 [28] Cayouette-Remblière J, Lambert A. L’explosion des inégalités. Classes, genre et  
509 générations face à la crise sanitaire. *L’aube*. 2021.
- 510 [29] Davidson DJ, Freudenburg WR. Gender and Environmental Risk Concerns: A Review  
511 and Analysis of Available Research. *Environ Behav* 1996;28:302–39.  
512 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916596283003>.
- 513 [30] Greenberg MR, Schneider DF. Gender differences in risk perception: effects differ in  
514 stressed vs. non-stressed environments. *Risk Anal Off Publ Soc Risk Anal* 1995;15:503–  
515 11. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.1995.tb00343.x>.
- 516 [31] Siegrist M. The Influence of Trust and Perceptions of Risks and Benefits on the  
517 Acceptance of Gene Technology. *Risk Anal* 2000;20:195–204.  
518 <https://doi.org/10.1111/0272-4332.202020>.
- 519 [32] Boltanski L. Les usages sociaux du corps. *Ann Hist Sci Soc* 1971;26:205–33.  
520 <https://doi.org/10.3406/ahess.1971.422470>.
- 521 [33] Corbie-Smith G, Thomas SB, St George DMM. Distrust, race, and research. *Arch Intern*  
522 *Med* 2002;162:2458–63. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.162.21.2458>.

- 523 [34] Boulware LE, Cooper LA, Ratner LE, LaVeist TA, Powe NR. Race and Trust in the  
524 Health Care System. *Public Health Rep* 2003;118:358–65.  
525 <https://doi.org/10.1093/phr/118.4.358>.
- 526 [35] Halbert CH, Armstrong K, Gandy OH, Shaker L. Racial differences in trust in health  
527 care providers. *Arch Intern Med* 2006;166:896–901.  
528 <https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.166.8.896>.
- 529 [36] Lachenal G. Le médicament qui devait sauver l’Afrique. La Découverte. 2014.
- 530 [37] Gamble VN. Under the shadow of Tuskegee: African Americans and health care. *Am J*  
531 *Public Health* 1997;87:1773–8.
- 532 [38] Papon S, Robert-Bobée I. Une hausse des décès deux fois plus forte pour les  
533 personnes nées à l’étranger que pour celles nées en France en mars-avril 2020. *Insee*  
534 *Focus* 2020.
- 535 [39] Salmon DA, Moulton LH, Omer SB, DeHart MP, Stokley S, Halsey NA. Factors  
536 associated with refusal of childhood vaccines among parents of school-aged children: a  
537 case-control study. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2005;159:470–6.  
538 <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpedi.159.5.470>.
- 539 [40] Marlow LAV, Waller J, Wardle J. Parental attitudes to pre-pubertal HPV vaccination.  
540 *Vaccine* 2007;25:1945–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2007.01.059>.
- 541 [41] Bergeron H, Borraz O, Castel P, Dedieu F. Covid-19: une crise organisationnelle.  
542 *Presses de Sciences Po*; 2020. <https://doi.org/10.3917/scpo.berge.2020.01>.
- 543 [42] Hsu HE, Ashe EM, Silverstein M, Hofman M, Lange SJ, Razzaghi H, et al.  
544 Race/Ethnicity, Underlying Medical Conditions, Homelessness, and Hospitalization Status  
545 of Adult Patients with COVID-19 at an Urban Safety-Net Medical Center - Boston,  
546 Massachusetts, 2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2020;69:864–9.



- 547 <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6927a3>.
- 548 [43] Roederer T, Mollo B, Vincent C, Nikolay B, Llosa AE, Nesbitt R, et al. Seroprevalence  
549 and risk factors of exposure to COVID-19 in homeless people in Paris, France: a cross-  
550 sectional study. *Lancet Public Health* 2021;6:e202–9. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(21)00001-3)  
551 [2667\(21\)00001-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(21)00001-3).
- 552 [44] Islam MS, Sarkar T, Khan SH, Kamal A-HM, Hasan SMM, Kabir A, et al. COVID-19–  
553 Related Infodemic and Its Impact on Public Health: A Global Social Media Analysis. *Am J*  
554 *Trop Med Hyg* 2020;103:1621–9. <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.20-0812>.
- 555 [45] Loomba S, de Figueiredo A, Piatek SJ, de Graaf K, Larson HJ. Measuring the impact of  
556 COVID-19 vaccine misinformation on vaccination intent in the UK and USA. *Nat Hum*  
557 *Behav* 2021;5:337–48. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01056-1>.
- 558 [46] Lin C, Tu P, Beitsch LM. Confidence and Receptivity for COVID-19 Vaccines: A Rapid  
559 Systematic Review. *Vaccines* 2020;9. <https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9010016>.
- 560 [47] Byrne T, Patel P, Shrotri M, Beale S, Michie S, Butt J, et al. Trends, patterns and  
561 psychological influences on COVID-19 vaccination intention: findings from a large  
562 prospective community cohort study in England and Wales (Virus Watch). *MedRxiv*  
563 2021:2021.03.22.21254130. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.22.21254130>.
- 564 [48] Bajos N, Jusot F, Pailhé A, Spire A, Martin C, Meyer L, et al. When lockdown policies  
565 amplify social inequalities in COVID-19 infections. Evidence from a cross-sectional  
566 population-based survey in France. *Public and Global Health*; 2020.  
567 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.07.20208595>.
- 568 [49] Wachtler B, Michalski N, Nowossadeck E, Diercke M, Wahrendorf M, Santos-Hövenner  
569 C, et al. Socioeconomic inequalities and COVID-19 – A review of the current international  
570 literature 2020. <https://doi.org/10.25646/7059>.

571 [50] Connor J, Madhavan S, Mokashi M, Amanuel H, Johnson NR, Pace LE, et al. Health  
572 risks and outcomes that disproportionately affect women during the Covid-19 pandemic:  
573 A review. Soc Sci Med 2020;266:113364.  
574 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113364>.

575

576

577

578

579 Table 1: Attitudes toward vaccination in general by attitudes toward the Covid-19 vaccine

		If a free vaccine against coronavirus was offered by the Sécurité Sociale (the French social security system), would you be willing to get vaccinated?					
		<b>Yes probably</b>	<b>Yes maybe</b>	<b>Probably not</b>	<b>Certainly not</b>	<b>You do not know</b>	<b>Total</b>
Are you strongly, somewhat, somewhat not, or not at all in favor of vaccinations in general?	<b>Strongly in favor</b>	16062 (73.2)	3411(16.6)	468 (2.2)	386 (2.3)	993 (5.7)	21320 (100)
	<b>Somewhat in favor</b>	12607 (29.9)	16190 (38.6)	3901 (8.5)	2705 (6.7)	6324 (16.3)	41727 (100)
	<b>Somewhat not in favor</b>	928 (6.4)	3321 (22.8)	3947 (25)	3242 (21.4)	3408 (24.4)	14846 (100)
	<b>Not at all in favor</b>	227 (3.9)	524 (7.6)	1144 (12.7)	4723 (57.6)	1344 (18.2)	7962 (100)
	<b>Total</b>	29824 (33.2)	23446 (27.2)	9460 (10.3)	11056 (13.9)	12069 (15.4)	85855(100)

580

581 Table 2A: Social characteristics associated with attitudes regarding vaccination in general

	Strongly in favor	Somewhat in favor	Somewhat not in favor	Not at all in favor	Total
Total	21320 (23.9)	41727 (47.6)	14846 (17.3)	7962 (11.2)	85855 (100)
-----Sex:					
Men	11175 (26.7)	18599 (47.2)	6010 (15.9)	3240 (10.2)	39024 (48)
Women	10145 (21.3)	23128 (48)	8836 (18.6)	4722 (12.1)	46831 (52)
-----Age:					
18-24	2253 (24.4)	4293 (48.9)	1423 (16.8)	721 (10)	8690 (10.6)
25-34	2145 (19.6)	4894 (46.6)	2065 (19.9)	1204 (13.9)	10308 (13.3)
35-44	3026 (19)	7549 (49.3)	2668 (18.7)	1536 (13)	14779 (15.7)
45-54	3462 (19.5)	8343 (48.2)	3164 (19.7)	1689 (12.6)	16658 (16.5)
55-64	3589 (20.8)	8051 (50.1)	2845 (18.5)	1404 (10.5)	15889 (15.8)
+ 65	6845 (32.6)	8597 (44.9)	2681 (13.5)	1408 (9)	19531 (28.1)
-----Formal education:					
No diploma	831 (20)	2025 (44.9)	794 (16.4)	769 (18.7)	4419 (10.8)
Primary education	1663 (24.7)	3373 (48.3)	1118 (15.6)	715 (11.4)	6869 (12.4)
Vocational secondary	3053 (18.4)	8225 (47.5)	3314 (19.2)	2320 (14.9)	16912 (21.1)
High school	4002 (21.6)	9141 (47.9)	3585 (19.2)	1877 (11.2)	18605 (20.8)
High school + 2 to 4 years	6233 (24.7)	12585 (49.6)	4374 (17.9)	1745 (7.8)	24937 (23)
High school + 5 or more years	5538 (38.3)	6378 (45.2)	1661 (12.2)	536 (4.3)	14113 (11.9)
-----Social class:					
Farmers	263 (22.1)	616 (50.7)	222 (16.3)	126 (10.9)	1227 (2)
Self-employed and entrepreneurs	1085 (21.9)	2265 (45.9)	950 (19.4)	562 (12.8)	4862 (6.5)
Senior executive professionals	7704 (35.3)	10088 (45.3)	2864 (13.5)	1105 (5.9)	21761 (18.9)
Middle executive professionals	4346 (24.2)	8889 (48.8)	3238 (18)	1420 (9)	17893 (18.3)
Employees	4052 (18.8)	11264 (48.7)	4517 (19.5)	2596 (13)	22429 (27.6)
Manual workers	1551 (17.4)	4713 (47.2)	1910 (18.3)	1531 (17.1)	9705 (16.3)
Never worked and others	2319 (27.5)	3892 (47.9)	1145 (14.6)	622 (10)	7978 (10.5)
-----Standard of living (in deciles):					
D1	1269 (20.1)	2748 (44.1)	1152 (18.3)	887 (17.5)	6056 (8.2)
D2-D3	1979 (19.4)	5012 (46.1)	2104 (18.9)	1480 (15.5)	10575 (18.1)
D4-D5	2528 (19.8)	6743 (48.2)	2667 (18.9)	1618 (13.2)	13556 (20)
D6-D7	3959 (22.4)	9222 (49.5)	3395 (17.9)	1692 (10.1)	18268 (21.4)
D8-D9	6503 (27.1)	12071 (49.1)	3892 (16)	1691 (7.7)	24157 (21.9)
D10	5082 (38.4)	5931 (44.7)	1636 (12.2)	594 (4.7)	13243 (10.5)
-----Ethno-racial status:					
Mainstream population	17924 (24.2)	35201 (48.5)	12221 (17.2)	6117 (10.1)	71463 (79.1)
DOM or descendants of DOM native	194 (18.6)	457 (45)	191 (18.4)	154 (18)	996 (1.3)
Non-racialized second-generation immigrants	1132 (22.9)	2261 (48)	870 (18.7)	442 (10.5)	4705 (5.6)
Racialized second-generation immigrants	585 (19.8)	1315 (44.6)	560 (19.1)	414 (16.4)	2874 (4.1)
Non-racialized first-generation immigrants	840 (29.1)	1200 (43.7)	412 (14.9)	278 (12.4)	2730 (4.1)
Racialized first-generation immigrants	645 (20.4)	1293 (41)	592 (17.9)	557 (20.7)	3087 (5.9)
-----Lives with their children or partner's children:					
At least a child	6987 (19.3)	17033 (49)	6200 (18.8)	3459 (12.8)	33679 (35.5)
No child	14333 (26.4)	24694 (46.8)	8646 (16.5)	4503 (10.3)	52176 (64.5)

582 Table 2B: Social characteristics associated with attitudes regarding the Covid-19 vaccine

	Yes probably	Yes maybe	Probably not	Certainly not	You do not know	Total
Total	29824 (33.2)	23446 (27.2)	9460 (10.3)	11056 (13.9)	12069 (15.4)	85855 (100)
-----Sex:						
Men	16702 (39.7)	10865 (27.9)	3468 (8.7)	3707 (11)	4282 (12.7)	39024 (48)
Women	13122 (27.3)	12581 (26.5)	5992 (11.8)	7349 (16.6)	7787 (17.8)	46831 (52)
-----Age:						
18-24	2892 (31.8)	2276 (25.8)	991 (11)	1440 (18)	1091 (13.4)	8690 (10.6)
25-34	2428 (23.3)	2659 (25.4)	1623 (14.9)	2237 (22.4)	1361 (13.9)	10308 (13.3)
35-44	3972 (25.3)	3971 (26.1)	2135 (13.8)	2550 (18.5)	2151 (16.3)	14779 (15.7)
45-54	5168 (29.3)	4650 (27.6)	2029 (11.6)	2141 (14.4)	2670 (17.2)	16658 (16.5)
55-64	5747 (33.4)	4694 (30.2)	1538 (9.4)	1534 (10.8)	2376 (16.3)	15889 (15.8)
+ 65	9617 (45.1)	5196 (27.1)	1144 (5.8)	1154 (7.3)	2420 (14.7)	19531 (28.1)
-----Formal education:						
No diploma	1273 (28.8)	1198 (27.5)	355 (7.4)	724 (16.1)	869 (20.2)	4419 (10.8)
Primary education	2507 (35.8)	1911 (27.5)	587 (7.6)	746 (10.9)	1118 (18.1)	6869 (12.4)
Vocational secondary	5052 (29.7)	4636 (27)	1619 (9.2)	2495 (15.9)	3110 (18.2)	16912 (21.1)
High school	5867 (30.7)	4952 (26.4)	2273 (12)	2865 (16.1)	2648 (14.8)	18605 (20.8)
High school + 2 to 4 years	8502 (33.1)	6963 (27.8)	3158 (12.5)	3148 (13.5)	3166 (13.1)	24937 (23)
High school + 5 or more years	6623 (45.6)	3786 (26.9)	1468 (10.6)	1078 (8.4)	1158 (8.5)	14113 (11.9)
-----Social class:						
Farmers	430 (35.1)	348 (27.8)	121 (8.4)	140 (10.9)	188 (17.8)	1227 (2)
Self-employed and entrepreneurs	1797 (36.7)	1229 (25.7)	529 (9.7)	652 (13.5)	655 (14.4)	4862 (6.5)
Senior executive professionals	10216 (46)	5861 (26.5)	2103 (9.6)	1626 (8.2)	1955 (9.8)	21761 (18.9)
Middle executive professionals	6065 (33.2)	5115 (28.7)	2075 (11.2)	2230 (13.1)	2408 (13.8)	17893 (18.3)
Employees	5871 (26.7)	6104 (27.2)	2798 (11.5)	3649 (16.6)	4007 (18)	22429 (27.6)
Manual workers	2632 (27.7)	2631 (26.9)	1015 (9.3)	1667 (17.2)	1760 (18.9)	9705 (16.3)
Never worked and others	2813 (33.5)	2158 (26.6)	819 (9.4)	1092 (14.5)	1096 (15.9)	7978 (10.5)
-----Standard of living (in deciles):						
D1	1747 (27.5)	1501 (24.8)	635 (9.2)	1117 (19.4)	1056 (19)	6056 (8.2)
D2-D3	2817 (27.1)	2714 (25.8)	1234 (10.6)	1940 (17.9)	1870 (18.7)	10575 (18.1)
D4-D5	3765 (29)	3659 (26.7)	1655 (10.7)	2273 (16.7)	2204 (16.9)	13556 (20)
D6-D7	5705 (31.6)	5183 (28.6)	2177 (11.1)	2499 (13.4)	2704 (15.4)	18268 (21.4)
D8-D9	9198 (38)	6893 (28.5)	2633 (10.5)	2374 (10)	3059 (12.9)	24157 (21.9)
D10	6592 (49.7)	3496 (26.3)	1126 (8.3)	853 (6.7)	1176 (9)	13243 (10.5)
-----Ethno-racial status:						
Mainstream population	25375 (34.4)	19663 (27.3)	8094 (10.8)	8823 (13.3)	9508 (14.3)	71463 (79.1)
DOM or descendants of DOM native	243 (23.4)	242 (25.6)	129 (12.2)	225 (23.7)	157 (15.2)	996 (1.3)
Non-racialized second-generation immigrants	1591 (32.4)	1251 (27.1)	480 (9.3)	634 (14.3)	749 (16.9)	4705 (5.6)
Racialized second-generation immigrants	751 (24.9)	667 (22.8)	327 (10.8)	588 (21.6)	541 (19.9)	2874 (4.1)
Non-racialized first-generation immigrants	1041 (35.8)	750 (27.9)	189 (5.9)	331 (14)	419 (16.3)	2730 (4.1)
Racialized first-generation immigrants	823 (24.9)	873 (28)	241 (7.4)	455 (14.8)	695 (25)	3087 (5.9)
----- Lives with their children or partner's children:						
At least a child	9684 (26.7)	9220 (26.8)	4372 (12.3)	5292 (17.4)	5111 (16.9)	33679 (35.5)

No child	20140 (36.9)	14226 (27.4)	5088 (9.2)	5764 (12)	6958 (14.6)	52176 (64.5)
-----Regarding the possibility of contracting the virus in the coming months, would you say that you are afraid of contracting it and being seriously ill?						
Yes	8842 (42.4)	5616 (27.6)	1477 (6.8)	1607 (8.9)	2626 (14.2)	20168 (24.1)
No	20982 (30.3)	17830 (27)	7983 (11.4)	9449 (15.5)	9443 (15.7)	65687 (75.9)
-----To limit the spread of the coronavirus, do you trust the government's action? :						
Yes	19254 (42.6)	12656 (29.7)	3663 (7.8)	2764 (6.9)	5064 (12.9)	43401 (49.2)
No	8777 (24.9)	8674 (24.7)	4910 (13.8)	7117 (22.4)	4647 (14.3)	34125 (39.4)
You do not know	1793 (21.5)	2116 (25)	887 (9.3)	1175 (14.8)	2358 (29.5)	8329 (11.5)
-----Do you have any COVID comorbidities <sup>1</sup> ?						
Yes	10456 (38.1)	6945 (26.9)	2288 (8.1)	2773 (11.7)	3542 (15.2)	26004 (33.1)
No	19368 (30.8)	16501 (27.3)	7172 (11.4)	8283 (15)	8527 (15.4)	59851 (66.9)

<sup>1</sup>includes: diabetes, cancer, chronic liver disease, chronic kidney disease, HIV and other autoimmune diseases, asthma and other chronic respiratory diseases, hypertension, chronic heart diseases, obesity.

583

584

585

Table 3: Factors associated with vaccination in general and Covid-19 refusals.

	Covid-19 vaccine: Certainly not				Vaccination in general: Not at all in favor			
	Frequency	OR <sup>1</sup>	95% IC	p-value	Frequency	OR	95% IC	p-value
Total	13.9 (85855)				11.2 (85855)			
-----Sex:								
Men (ref.)	11 (39024)	1		<0.0001	10.2 (39024)	1		<0.0001
Women	16.6 (46831)	<b>1.88</b>	<b>[1.79 - 1.97]</b>		12.1 (46831)	<b>1.33</b>	<b>[1.26 - 1.40]</b>	
-----Age:								
18-24	18 (8690)	1.05	[0.95 - 1.16]	<0.0001	10 (8690)	<b>0.74</b>	<b>[0.65 - 0.84]</b>	<0.0001
25-34	22.4 (10308)	<b>1.32</b>	<b>[1.23 - 1.41]</b>		13.9 (10308)	<b>1.11</b>	<b>[1.02 - 1.21]</b>	
35-44 (ref.)	18.5 (14779)	1			13 (14779)	1		
45-54	14.4 (16658)	<b>0.73</b>	<b>[0.68 - 0.78]</b>		12.6 (16658)	0.95	[0.88 - 1.03]	
55-64	10.8 (15889)	<b>0.59</b>	<b>[0.54 - 0.63]</b>		10.5 (15889)	<b>0.83</b>	<b>[0.76 - 0.90]</b>	
+ 65	7.3 (19531)	<b>0.4</b>	<b>[0.36 - 0.43]</b>		9 (19531)	<b>0.72</b>	<b>[0.66 - 0.79]</b>	
-----Formal education:								
No diploma	16.1 (4419)	<b>1.22</b>	<b>[1.10 - 1.35]</b>	<0.0001	18.7 (4419)	<b>1.53</b>	<b>[1.38 - 1.69]</b>	<0.0001
Primary education	10.9 (6869)	1	[0.91 - 1.10]		11.4 (6869)	<b>1.23</b>	<b>[1.11 - 1.35]</b>	
Vocational secondary	15.9 (16912)	<b>1.15</b>	<b>[1.08 - 1.23]</b>		14.9 (16912)	<b>1.41</b>	<b>[1.31 - 1.51]</b>	
High school (ref.)	16.1 (18605)	1			11.2 (18605)	1		
High school + 2 to 4 years	13.5 (24937)	<b>0.81</b>	<b>[0.77 - 0.87]</b>		7.8 (24937)	<b>0.69</b>	<b>[0.64 - 0.75]</b>	
High school + 5 or more years	8.4 (14113)	<b>0.52</b>	<b>[0.47 - 0.57]</b>		4.3 (14113)	<b>0.39</b>	<b>[0.35 - 0.44]</b>	
-----Social class:								
Farmers	10.9 (1227)	1.1	[0.91 - 1.34]	<0.0001	10.9 (1227)	1.13	[0.92 - 1.38]	<0.0001
Self-employed and entrepreneurs	13.5 (4862)	<b>1.18</b>	<b>[1.07 - 1.30]</b>		12.8 (4862)	<b>1.28</b>	<b>[1.15 - 1.43]</b>	
Senior executive professionals	8.2 (21761)	<b>0.88</b>	<b>[0.82 - 0.95]</b>		5.9 (21761)	1.01	[0.92 - 1.10]	
Middle executive professionals (ref.)	13.1 (17893)	1			9 (17893)	1		
Employees	16.6 (22429)	1.02	[0.96 - 1.09]		13 (22429)	<b>1.09</b>	<b>[1.01 - 1.17]</b>	
Manual workers	17.2 (9705)	<b>1.14</b>	<b>[1.05 - 1.23]</b>		17.1 (9705)	<b>1.28</b>	<b>[1.18 - 1.40]</b>	
Never worked and others	14.5 (7978)	<b>0.66</b>	<b>[0.60 - 0.73]</b>		10 (7978)	<b>0.7</b>	<b>[0.62 - 0.80]</b>	
-----Standard of living (in deciles):								
D1	19.4 (6056)	1.07	[0.98 - 1.16]	<0.0001	17.5 (6056)	<b>1.16</b>	<b>[1.06 - 1.28]</b>	<0.0001
D2-D3	17.9 (10575)	1.02	[0.95 - 1.09]		15.5 (10575)	1.07	[0.99 - 1.16]	
D4-D5 (ref.)	16.7 (13556)	1			13.2 (13556)	1		
D6-D7	13.4 (18268)	0.93	[0.88 - 1]		10.1 (18268)	<b>0.9</b>	<b>[0.83 - 0.97]</b>	
D8-D9	10 (24157)	<b>0.81</b>	<b>[0.76 - 0.87]</b>		7.7 (24157)	<b>0.82</b>	<b>[0.76 - 0.88]</b>	
D10	6.7 (13243)	<b>0.69</b>	<b>[0.63 - 0.76]</b>		4.7 (13243)	<b>0.69</b>	<b>[0.62 - 0.77]</b>	
-----Ethno-racial status:								
Mainstream population (ref.)	13.3 (71463)	1		<0.0001	10.1 (71463)	1		<0.0001
DOM or descendants of DOM native	23.7 (996)	<b>1.66</b>	<b>[1.41 - 1.95]</b>		18 (996)	<b>1.74</b>	<b>[1.45 - 2.08]</b>	
Non-racialized second-generation immigrants	14.3 (4705)	<b>1.17</b>	<b>[1.06 - 1.28]</b>		10.5 (4705)	1.07	[0.96 - 1.19]	
Racialized second-generation immigrants	21.6 (2874)	<b>1.36</b>	<b>[1.23 - 1.51]</b>		16.4 (2874)	<b>1.61</b>	<b>[1.44 - 1.80]</b>	
Non-racialized first-generation immigrants	14 (2730)	<b>1.16</b>	<b>[1.03 - 1.31]</b>		12.4 (2730)	<b>1.28</b>	<b>[1.12 - 1.46]</b>	
Racialized first-generation immigrants	14.8 (3087)	<b>1.16</b>	<b>[1.04 - 1.30]</b>		20.7 (3087)	<b>2.19</b>	<b>[1.96 - 2.43]</b>	
-----Lives with their children or partner's children:								
At least a child	17.4 (33679)	<b>1.12</b>	<b>[1.06 - 1.18]</b>	<0.0001	12.8 (33679)	0.95	[0.89 - 1]	0.07242
No child (ref.)	12 (52176)	1			10.3 (52176)	1		

-----Regarding the possibility of contracting the virus in the coming months, would you say that you are afraid of contracting it and being seriously ill?								
Yes	8.9 (20168)	<b>0.57</b>	<b>[0.54 - 0.61]</b>	<0.0001	7.4 (20168)	<b>0.57</b>	<b>[0.53 - 0.60]</b>	<0.0001
No (ref.)	15.5 (65687)	1			12.4 (65687)	1		
-----To limit the spread of the coronavirus, do you trust the government's action?								
Yes (ref.)	6.9 (43401)	1		<0.0001	6.5 (43401)	1		<0.0001
No	22.4 (34125)	<b>3.29</b>	<b>[3.13 - 3.45]</b>		15.5 (34125)	<b>2.68</b>	<b>[2.54 - 2.83]</b>	
You do not know	14.8 (8329)	<b>1.87</b>	<b>[1.74 - 2.02]</b>		17.1 (8329)	<b>2.31</b>	<b>[2.14 - 2.49]</b>	
-----Do you have any Covid-19 comorbidities <sup>2</sup> ?								
Yes	11.7 (26004)	<b>0.89</b>	<b>[0.84 - 0.93]</b>	<0.0001	10.5 (26004)	<b>0.88</b>	<b>[0.84 - 0.93]</b>	<0.0001
No (ref.)	15 (59851)	1			11.6 (59851)	1		

The regressions were performed on 85,855 individuals who answered both on the intention to get vaccinated against Covid-19 and on vaccination in general, as well as included variables. Both regressions were adjusted on sex, age, level of education, social class, standard of living, ethno-racial status, presence of a child in the household, fear of contracting the virus and being seriously ill, trust in the government's actions, and Covid-19 comorbidities. The regressions were also adjusted on the week of completion of the questionnaire (not shown).

Parameters with a significant odds ratio compared to the reference are in bold.

<sup>1</sup>OR: Odds Ratio

<sup>2</sup>includes: diabetes, cancer, chronic liver disease, chronic kidney disease, HIV and other autoimmune diseases, asthma and other chronic respiratory diseases, hypertension, chronic heart diseases, obesity.

586

587

588