medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Examining Drivers of COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy in Ghana: The Roles of Political Allegiance, Misinformation Beliefs, and Sociodemographic Factors

K Brackstone*,[1] K Atengble, [1,2] MG Head+,[1] LA Boateng+, [1,]

* Correspondence author, K.Brackstone@soton.ac.uk

+ Joint senior author

1. Clinical Informatics Research Unit, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, Southampton UK

2. PACKS Africa, Accra, Greater Accra, Ghana

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

The vast majority of people in the world who are unvaccinated against COVID-19 reside in LMIC countries in sub-Saharan Africa. This includes Ghana, where only 14.4% of the country is considered fully vaccinated as of March 2022. A key factor negatively impacting vaccination campaigns is vaccine hesitancy, defined as the delay in the acceptance, or blunt refusal, of vaccines. Three online cross-sectional surveys of Ghanaian citizens were conducted in August 2020 (N = 3048), March 2021 (N = 1558), and June 2021 (N = 1295) to observe temporal trends of vaccine hesitancy in Ghana, and to examine key groups and predictors associated with hesitancy. Quantitative measurements of hesitancy and participants' subjective reasons for hesitancy were assessed, including predictors such as misinformation beliefs, political allegiance, and demographic and socioeconomic factors. Descriptive statistics were employed to analyse temporal trends in hesitancy between surveys, and logistic regression analyses were conducted to observe key predictors of hesitancy. Findings revealed that overall hesitancy decreased from 36.8% (95% CI: 35.1%-38.5%) in August 2020 to 17.2% (95% CI: 15.3%-19.1%) in March 2021. However, hesitancy increased to 23.8% (95% CI: 21.5%-26.1%) in June 2021. Key reasons for refusing the vaccine in June 2021 included not having enough vaccine-related information (50.6%) and concerns over vaccine safety (32.0%). Groups most likely to express hesitancy included Christians, urban residents, opposition political party voters, people with more years of education, females, people who received COVID-19 information from internet sources, and people who expressed uncertainty about their beliefs in common COVID-19 misinformation. Groups with increased willingness to vaccinate included elected political party voters and people who reported receiving information about COVID-19 from the Ghana Health Service. This study provides knowledge on Ghanaian population confidence and concerns about COVID-19 immunisations, and can support development of locally-tailored health promotion strategies.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

While high-income settings have achieved relatively high coverage with their COVID-19 vaccination campaigns, as of 1 March 2022 almost 40% of the world's population are yet to receive a single dose of any COVID-19 vaccine [1]. The vast majority of unvaccinated people reside in low- and lower-middle income countries in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). This includes Ghana, a country in West Africa with an estimated population of 30.8 million people. Ghana has reported over 159,000 cases and 1442 deaths, and currently only 14.4% of the country is considered fully vaccinated [2]. With the recent emergence of the highly transmissible Omicron variant [3], large-scale vaccination coverage is fundamental to the national and global pandemic response.

Such is the extent of vaccine inequity, sub-Saharan Africa has received far too few vaccinations across the first year of availability. Three common factors that impact the success of vaccination campaigns include supply and demand issues, social mobilization and logistical issues (challenges often related to underfunded health programmes), and people's [lack of] willingness to be vaccinated once doses arrive in communities. Vaccine hesitancy is defined by the World Health Organization (WHO) as the delay in the acceptance, or blunt refusal of, vaccines. Hesitancy was described by the WHO as one of the top 10 threats to global health in 2019, and has been identified as a growing trend in SSA more generally [4]. Developing a deeper understanding of the factors associated with vaccine hesitancy is crucial toward informing locally-tailored health promotion strategies. Hesitancy in SSA has previously been associated with mistrust, particularly of government messaging, and the presence of misinformation. Examples include a boycott of the polio vaccine in Northern Nigeria in 2003-2004 [5], as well as more recent surveys administered in SSA countries such as Malawi, Mali, and Nigeria, which found that dissatisfaction with the government's response to the COVID-19 pandemic predicted hesitancy [6]. In recent years, vaccine misinformation is amplified and disseminated on social media [7, 8], especially from specific faith institutions, individuals, and other organized groups that have become deeply entrenched in online platforms such as Facebook [9, 10].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

There have been a handful of research describing COVID-19-related vaccine hesitancy in SSA countries [6, 11], but overall, there is still a shortage of insightful research into COVID-19-related vaccine hesitancy in sub-Saharan Africa and within Ghana. This study presents estimates of vaccine hesitancy in Ghana from three nationally representative online samples of Ghanaian citizens that took place between August 2020 and June 2021. The study also considers groups that are most associated with vaccine hesitancy using demographic and socioeconomic variables, including political allegiance and misinformation beliefs.

Methods

Procedures

We administered three cross-sectional surveys. Survey 1 was conducted in August 2020, three months after the first case of COVID-19 was reported in Ghana and prior to any vaccines being globally approved and available. Survey 2 was conducted in March 2021 shortly after the first batch of Oxford AstraZeneca (AZ) vaccines arrived in Ghana through the COVAX initiative and the beginning of vaccine rollout. Survey 3 was conducted in June 2021, three months after vaccine rollout begun in Ghana. Participants were invited to complete a self-administered online survey using Qualtrics XM. Each survey was available online for approximately 4 weeks. Dissemination was conducted using a snowball effect of word-of-mouth (Whatsapp, LinkedIn, email, direct messaging), and Facebook Ads Manager. This technique allowed us to direct the survey toward individuals whose Facebook profile was registered as them being aged 18 and over and residing anywhere in Ghana. Associated study information appeared on individuals' Facebook timelines along with the survey link. In each survey, participants were offered the opportunity to enter a prize draw to win 1 of 25 money vouchers worth 100 Ghana Cedis (approximately 12 GBP) upon full completion of the survey.

We adjusted the survey settings in Qualtrics such that consented participants could only fully complete the survey once from the same IP address. We aimed to recruit at least 1067 participants in each survey, providing approximately 3% margin of error at 95%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

confidence. The surveys were conducted in English, and participants were required to confirm they were 18 years or older before completing.

Ethical approval

The surveys received ethical approvals from University of Southampton Ethics Committee (ERGO ID: 57267). All participants provided informed consent. Information about the study was provided on the first page of the online questionnaire. Respondents provided informed consent by proceeding to complete the survey.

Measures

Vaccine hesitancy. In Survey 1, participants were asked: "When the COVID-19 vaccine becomes available to you, would you like to get vaccinated?" (yes, no, I don't know). In Surveys 2 and 3, participants initially indicated whether they had previously received any doses of the COVID-19 vaccine. Among participants who indicated that they had not, vaccine hesitancy was then assessed using two distinct measurements. First, participants were asked: "When the COVID-19 vaccine becomes available to you, would you like to get vaccinated?" (yes, no, I don't know). Participants who indicated disagreement or indecision about receiving the vaccine subsequently specified reasons for their hesitancy. A list of nine reasons was consequently presented [11] and participants selected the reasons that they agreed with (e.g., "[COVID-19] is not serious enough to need a vaccine"). Second, participants indicated the extent of their agreement to the question: "If a vaccine for COVID-19 were available to me, I would get it." (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*; $M = 4.02$, $SD = 1.33$).

Knowing somebody who had received the COVID-19 vaccine. Participants indicated whether they knew anybody personally who had received the COVID-19 vaccine (yes, no).

Misinformation about COVID-19. We aimed to establish the extent in which respondents were influenced by the various circulating misinformation about the COVID-19, and whether this was associated with hesitancy. Participants indicated whether they believed in seven COVID-19-related misinformation beliefs recorded to be circulating in sub-Saharan Africa by selecting 'yes' if they agreed with the belief, 'unsure' if they were uncertain about

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

the belief, or 'no' if they did not agree with the belief (11; e.g., "To the best of your knowledge… [COVID-19] is designed to reduce or control the population").

Sources of COVID-19 vaccine-related information. Participants selected where they typically retrieved COVID-19 vaccine-related information from a list of eight sources [11]. These included comETHmon social media platforms (Facebook, Whatsapp, Twitter), more traditional news sources (TV/radio, Ghana Health Service [GHS]), government officials, the internet (e.g., news websites), and family members and friends. Participants indicated 'yes' or 'no' to each source.

Political allegiance. Participants selected the political party that they voted for in the Ghanaian election of December 2020 (New Patriotic Party [NPP; elected], National Democratic Congress [NDC; unelected], other, none/I didn't vote). Participants then completed a single item measure of perceived trust in the vaccine ("I would trust the safety of the COVID-19 vaccine when it becomes available to me," 1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*; $M = 3.96$, $SD = 1.29$). Then, using a 2-item measure, confidence in the current government was assessed (e.g., "I have trust in the Ghanaian government's response to the COVID-19 pandemic;" 1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*), which was averaged to form a governmental response index ($r = .80$, $M = 3.62$, $SD = 1.32$).

Demographic variables. Finally, participants indicated their age, gender (female, male), marital status (single, in a relationship, married, separated, widowed), and religion (Christian, Muslim, other, no religion). Socioeconomic variables included employment status (unemployed, self-employed, employed part-time, employed full-time), education (no formal education, primary school, junior school, senior secondary or vocational, or high education), and community type (urban, rural).

Data analysis

The data captured in Qualtrics were examined for errors, cleaned, and exported into IBM SPSS Statistics 28 for further analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize respondents' socio-demographics. Then, inferential statistics were conducted in three phases. First, temporal trends in hesitancy and population prevalence were compared between each survey. For consistency between surveys, hesitancy was coded by dichotomising participants'

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

responses (no, I don't know) to the question: "When the COVID-19 vaccine becomes available to you, would you like to get vaccinated?" Chi-Square χ^2 tests were conducted to assess for categorical differences in hesitancy rates between Surveys 1-2, and 2-3. Descriptive analyses were also conducted to summarize misinformation beliefs and self-reported sources of vaccine-related information.

Next, we aimed to explore predictors of vaccine hesitancy in our most recent dataset. In Survey 3, we first conducted bivariate logistic regressions understand relationships between each of our individual predictors and vaccine hesitancy (S1). A combined logistic regression model was then administered containing all predictors in a single model, providing the strictest test of potential associations with vaccine hesitancy. To account for the level of variance in participants' responses, vaccine hesitancy was coded by dichotomising participants' responses (strongly disagree, somewhat disagree, or undecided) to the statement: "If a vaccine for COVID-19 were available to me, I would get it." Vaccine hesitancy and its associated predictors were rescaled to 0 or 1 in our statistical analyses, which allowed for direct comparison of effect sizes.

Finally, a series of one-way ANOVAS and post-hoc tests were conducted to compare differences in political groups' ratings of (a) trust in the COVID-19 vaccine, and (b) trust in the Ghanaian government's response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Results

Descriptive results

Table 1 shows descriptive statistics of participants from all three surveys. Survey 1 participants were 3048 unvaccinated adults (61.3% male; *Age range* = 18-75; M_{age} = 29.30, *SD* = 7.83), and Survey 2 participants were 1558 unvaccinated adults (69.4% male; *Age range* = 18-76; M_{age} = 28.35, *SD* = 6.58), both of which resided in all 16 regions of Ghana. Finally, Survey 3 participants were 1295 unvaccinated adults (78.3% male; *Age range* = 18-76; M_{age} = 27.99, *SD* = 7.20) residing across all 16 regions of Ghana. Among the largest ethnic groups in this sample were Akan (46.3%) and Ewe (16.4%), and the majority of participants lived in Greater Accra (28.5%) and Ashanti (17.9%) regions. Further, 62.3% had completed higher education, and 37.3% had completed senior secondary education or lower.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

More than 60% of participants reported being single (62.0%) vs. married or in a relationship (37.0%), 58.7% reported living in an urban community (vs. rural; 39.0%), and 45.7% reported being unemployed (vs. 52.0% employed to some degree), while 82.5% reported being Christian (vs. 17.5% Muslim). Finally, 71.7% reported knowing someone personally who had received the vaccine.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of participants from three surveys of data collection

	Combined (N = 5901)	**Survey 1 (N = 3048)**	**Survey 2 (N = 1558)**	**Survey 3 (N = 1295)**
Study variables		**n (%)**		
Gender				
Male	3947 (66.9)	1868 (61.3)	1065 (69.4)	1014 (78.3)
Female	1900 (32.2)	1163 (38.1)	467 (30.0)	270 (20.8)
Age				
< 30	3484 (59.0)	1710 (56.1)	945 (60.7)	829 (64.0)
30 >	2226 (37.7)	1228 (49.3)	572 (36.7)	426 (32.9)
Marital status				
Single	3818 (64.7)	2129 (69.8)	886 (56.9)	803 (62.0)
Married or in a relationship	2040 (34.6)	915 (30.0)	646 (41.5)	479 (37.0)
Community type				
Urban	1761 (63.9)		992 (63.7)	769 (58.7)
Rural	997 (36.1)		485 (31.1)	512 (39.0)
Highest level of education				
Senior secondary or lower	1442 (24.4)	534 (17.5)	426 (27.3)	483 (37.3)
Higher	4452 (75.4)	2513 (82.4)	1132 (72.7)	807 (62.3)
Employment				
Unemployed	2487 (42.1)	1225 (40.2)	670 (43.0)	592 (45.7)
Employed or self-employed	3380 (57.3)	1821 (59.7)	886 (56.9)	673 (52.0)
Religion				
Christian	4870 (82.5)	2604 (85.4)	1245 (79.9)	1021 (82.5)
Muslim	818 (13.9)	343 (11.2)	258 (16.6)	217 (17.5)
Political allegiance*				
NPP	1274 (49.1)		726 (46.6)	548 (42.3)
NDC	381 (14.7)		218 (14.0)	163 (12.6)
Other	210 (8.1)		120 (7.7)	90 (6.9)
Did not vote	729 (28.1)		383 (24.6)	346 (26.7)
Would you like to get vaccinated?				
No	886 (15.0)	563 (18.5)	151 (9.7)	172 (13.3)
I don't know	810 (13.7)	558 (18.3)	116 (7.4)	136 (10.5)
Yes	4203 (71.2)	1928 (63.2)	1288 (82.7)	987 (76.2)
Sources of information				
Facebook	4232 (72.7)	2101 (69.2)	1204 (77.3)	927 (71.6)
Whatsapp	3715 (54.4)	2570 (84.7)	766 (49.2)	379 (29.3)
Twitter	2594 (34.5)	2044 (67.3)	372 (23.9)	178 (13.7)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Mass media (TV/radio)	4367 (75.6)	2078 (68.4)	1332 (85.5)	957 (73.9)
GHS or health workers	2885 (53.1)	1092 (36.0)	1162 (74.6)	631 (48.7)
Government officials	1091 (23.6)	121 (4.1)	640 (41.1)	330 (25.5)
Family members or friends	2473 (41.3)	1295 (42.7)	745 (47.8)	433 (33.4)
Internet	2853 (51.3)	1207 (39.8)	1004 (64.4)	642 (49.6)
When the vaccine becomes available to me, I will get it				
Strongly disagree				137 (10.6)
Somewhat disagree				38 (2.9)
Neither agree nor disagree				195 (15.1)
Somewhat agree				217 (16.8)
Strongly agree				707 (54.6)
Know someone with vaccine				
No				366 (28.3)
Yes				929 (71.7)

Temporal trends in hesitancy were first assessed (Fig 1). A Pearson's Chi-Squared test revealed a significant association between time and vaccine hesitancy ($\chi2$ (1) = 182.687 p < .0001), in which overall hesitancy decreased from 36.8% (CI: 35.1%-38.5%) in Survey 1 (August 2020) to 17.2% (95% CI: 15.3%-19.1%) in Survey 2 (March 2021). There was then a further significant association between time and hesitancy ($\chi2$ (1) = 19.188, p < .0001), in that overall hesitancy increased from 17.2% (95% CI: 15.3%-19.1%) in Survey 2 (March 2021) to 23.8% (95% CI: 21.5%-26.1%) in Survey 3 (June 2021). See Fig 1 for breakdown of yes, no, and unsure responses across the three surveys.

The following analyses derive from our most recent survey (Survey 3). Among participants who indicated 'no' and 'I don't know' that they would take the vaccine when available (308/1295; 23.8%), the most common reasons were: not having enough information about vaccine (156/308; 50.6%), believing that the vaccine would be unsafe or dangerous (99/308; 32.1%), not trusting the government or service departments (66/308; 21.4%), and believing that they would experience side effects and get sick from the vaccine (58/308; 18.8%; Table 2).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Reasons for refusing the vaccine in March 2021 and June 2021

	Survey 2 – March 2021 (N = 267/1558)	Survey 3 – June 2021 (N = 308/1295)
	n (%)	
The vaccine will be dangerous		
Yes	64 (24.0)	99 (32.1)
No	203 (76.0)	209 (67.9)
I will experience side effects and get sick		
Yes	82 (30.1)	58 (18.8)
No	185 (69.3)	250 (81.2)
COVID-19 is not severe enough to need a vaccine		
Yes	15 (5.6)	43 (14.0)
No	252 (94.4)	265 (86.0)
I don't trust the government department		
Yes	61 (22.8)	66 (21.4)
No	206 (77.2)	242 (78.6)
I will be allergic to the vaccine		
Yes	26 (9.7)	22 (7.1)
No	241 (90.3)	286 (92.9)
It is too far to travel to the vaccination centre		
Yes	5 (1.9)	21 (6.8)
No	262 (98.1)	287 (93.2)
The vaccine will not work		
Yes	25 (9.7)	32 (10.4)
No	242 (90.6)	276 (89.6)
I don't have enough information about the vaccine		
Yes		156 (50.6)
No		152 (49.4)
I don't need it		
Yes		40 (13.0)
No		268 (87.0)

In all, 44.2% (573/1295) of participants indicated agreement with at least one of the seven widely circulated misinformation beliefs (i.e., participants ticked 'yes' to indicate agreement; M = 1.38, SD = 1.97; Table 3). The most common misinformation beliefs included: "… is a biological weapon caused by the Chinese government" (316/1295; 24.4%), "… is a result of 5G technology being installed in Ghana" (310/1295; 23.9%), and "… is a biological weapon designed by the U.S. government" (297/1295; 22.9%). Next, 46.4% (601/1295) of participants indicated uncertainty about at least one COVID-19-related

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

misinformation belief (i.e., where participants ticked 'I don't know' to indicate uncertainty; *M* = 1.10, *SD* = 1.55). The most common misinformation beliefs in which participants indicated uncertainty included: "… was designed to reduce or control the population" (347/1295; 26.8%), "… is a biological weapon caused by the Chinese government" (304/1295; 23.5%), and "… is a virus designed by the pharmaceutical industry to sell their drugs" (209/1295; 16.1%).

Table 3. Breakdown of COVID-19 misinformation beliefs

	Survey 2 – March 2021 (N = 1558)	**Survey 3 – June 2021 (N = 1295)**
	n (%)	
A biological weapon designed by the government of China		
No	794 (51.0)	630 (48.6)
Yes	258 (16.6)	316 (24.4)
I don't know	506 (32.4)	304 (23.5)
A virus designed by the pharmaceutical companies to sell their drugs		
No	936 (60.1)	754 (58.2)
Yes	165 (10.6)	288 (22.2)
I don't know	457 (29.3)	209 (16.1)
An exaggeration by news media to cause fear and panic		
No	1163 (74.6)	948 (73.2)
Yes	159 (10.2)	119 (9.2)
I don't know	236 (15.1)	177 (13.7)
A plague caused by sins and disbelief in human beings		
No	1079 (69.3)	926 (71.5)
Yes	151 (9.7)	185 (14.3)
I don't know	328 (21.1)	128 (9.9)
Designed to reduce or control the population		
No	844 (54.2)	633 (48.9)
Yes	255 (16.4)	270 (20.8
I don't know	459 (29.5)	347 (26.8)
A biological weapon designed by the US government		
No	1021 (65.5)	853 (65.9)
Yes	71 (4.6)	297 (22.9)
I don't know	466 (29.9)	95 (7.3)
A result of 5G technology being installed in the country		
No	956 (61.4)	775 (59.8)
Yes	128 (8.2)	310 (23.9)
I don't know	474 (30.4)	161 (12.4)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Analyses also showed that the mass media (e.g., newspapers, radio, TV; 73.9% [957/1295]), Facebook (77.3% [927/1295]), the Internet (e.g., Google, news websites, blogs; 49.6% [642/1295]), and the GHS (48.7% [631/1295]) were the most commonly accessed sources of COVID-19 vaccine-related information. Participants were least likely to retrieve vaccine-related information from Twitter (13.7% [137/1295]), government officials (25.5% [330/1295]), Whatsapp (29.3% [379/1295]), and friends or family (33.4% [433/1295]).

Positive Factors for Vaccine Hesitancy

Figure 2 and Table 4 summarises the odds ratios and the significance levels of predictors of hesitancy. First, we assessed for differences in political groups. Participants consisted of NPP voters (elected; 42.3%), NDC voters (unelected; 12.6%), 'Other' voters (6.9%), and non-voters (26.7%). Analyses showed that NDC voters (opposition) were more likely to be vaccine-hesitant than participants who did not vote (OR: 1.67; 95% CI: 1.07-2.59; p = .022), whereas NPP voters were less likely to be vaccine-hesitant than participants who did not vote (OR: 0.57; 95% CI: 0.40-0.80; p = .001). A one-way ANOVA showed significant differences in ratings of trust in the COVID-19 vaccine between political groups ($F(3,1143) = 16.69$, $p = .0001$). Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that vaccine-related trust was significantly higher among NPP voters ($M = 4.23$, $SD = 1.60$) compared to NDC voters ($M = 3.61$, $SD = 1.39$), 'other' voters ($M = 3.80$, $SD = 1.35$), and non-voters ($M = 3.71$, $SD = 1.35$). There were no significant differences in vaccine-related trust between NPP voters compared to 'other' voters and non-voters. There was also no significant difference between 'other' voters and non-voters.

Table 4. Combined logistic regression model of factors contributing to COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy

	OR	p-value	95% CI
Age – older (40+)	1.095	.591	0.786 – 1.526
Female	1.594	.008	1.130 – 2.250
Urban community	1.479	.010	1.099 – 1.989
Married or In a relationship	0.886	.458	0.644 – 1.219
Higher education (undergrad or postgrad)	1.649	.002	1.210 – 2.248
Being unemployed	0.903	.494	0.674 – 1.210

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Christian beliefs	2.282	<.000	1.486 – 3.506
Political beliefs			
National Democratic Congress (NDC, unelected)	1.674	.022	1.074 – 2.597
New Patriotic Party (NPP, elected)	0.575	.001	0.408 – 0.809
Other political party	0.710	.249	0.396 – 1.272
Personally know somebody who received vaccine (Y)	0.714	.041	0.516 – 0.987
Beliefs in misinformation	1.274	.089	0.864 – 1.683
Uncertainty about misinformation beliefs	1.865	<.000	1.411 – 2.466
Channels of COVID-19 information			
Facebook	0.907	.546	0.660 – 1.246
Whatsapp	1.031	.862	0.728 – 1.461
Twitter	0.956	.842	0.617 – 1.484
Mass media (e.g., radio, newspapers, TV)	1.367	.077	0.966 – 1.935
Ghana Health Service or health workers	0.692	.020	0.508 – 0.943
Government officials	0.734	.096	0.510 – 1.056
Family members or friends	0.864	.383	0.623 – 1.200
Internet (e.g., Google, news websites, blogs)	1.388	.032	1.029 – 1.872
Number of participants			1,138
R^2			0.144

To corroborate the results above, analyses also showed significant differences in ratings of trust in the government's COVID-19 response between political groups as determined by one-way ANOVA ($F(3,1146) = 33.39$, $p = .0001$). Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that governmental trust was significantly higher among NPP voters ($M = 3.98$, $SD = 1.20$) compared to NDC voters ($M = 2.98$, $SD = 1.40$), 'other' voters ($M = 3.53$, $SD = 1.35$), and non-voters ($M = 3.35$, $SD = 1.32$). NPP voters reported the significantly lowest levels of governmental trust out of the four groups. There was no significant difference between 'other' voters and non-voters.

There was a marginal association between misinformation beliefs and vaccine hesitancy. Participants who indicated agreement with at least one misinformation belief (i.e., participants who ticked 'yes' to indicate agreement) predicted marginally greater vaccine hesitancy compared to participants who did not indicate misinformation beliefs (OR: 1.27; 95% CI: 0.86-1.68; $p = .089$). However, participants who expressed uncertainty in at least

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

one misinformation belief (i.e., those who ticked 'I don't know' to indicate uncertainty) were significantly more likely to express vaccine hesitancy compared to participants who did not indicate uncertainty (OR: 1.86; 95% CI: 1.41-2.46; $p < .000$).

There were no significant predictors of vaccine hesitancy among participants who used social media platforms for COVID-19 vaccine-related information, such as Whatsapp (OR: 1.03; 95% CI: 0.72-1.46; $p = .862$) or Facebook (OR: 0.90; 95% CI: 0.66-1.24; $p = .546$) compared to participants who reported not using these platforms. However, participants who reported using Internet webpages (e.g., news websites, blogs) as a source of vaccine-related information were significantly more likely to report hesitancy than those who reported not using the internet (OR: 1.38; 95% CI: 1.02-1.87; $p = .032$). Further, participants who reported using the GHS as a source of vaccine-related information were less likely to report hesitancy compared to participants who did not report consulting the GHS (OR: 0.69; 95% CI: 0.50-0.94; $p = .020$).

There were several significant demographic and socio-demographic factors. Christian participants were more likely to be hesitant than Muslim participants (OR: 2.82; 95% CI: 1.48-3.50; $p = .000$); females were more likely to be hesitant than males (OR: 1.59; 95% CI: 1.13-2.25; $p = .008$); participants who completed higher education were more likely to be hesitant than those who had completed less years of education (OR: 1.64; 95% CI: 1.20-2.24; $p = .002$); participants who lived in urban communities were more likely to be hesitant than those who lived in rural communities (OR: 1.47; 95% CI: 1.09-1.98; $p = .010$); and participants who reported knowing somebody who received the vaccine were less likely to be hesitant than those who reported not knowing somebody who had received it (OR: 0.71; 95% CI: 0.51-0.68; $p = .041$).

Discussion

In this study, we present evidence of changes in overall levels of vaccine hesitancy in Ghana across three points in time. Hesitancy decreased between August 2020 (Survey 1) and March 2021 (Survey 2). This occurred around the time of vaccine availability and rollout, and after the Ghanaian president and other key influencers publically received the vaccine. However, hesitancy increased in June 2021 (Survey 3). Key reasons for refusing the vaccine

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

included not having enough information about the vaccine and concerns about vaccine safety. Among key groups more likely to express hesitancy included Christians, urban residents, opposition party voters, females, and individuals who had completed higher education. It is possible that the increase in hesitancy rates observed in June 2021 may have been, in part, due to the global circulation of negative news stories surrounding the Oxford AZ vaccines at the time. The COVID-19 pandemic has been a global news story, and the actions of countries in the global north are seen and absorbed by those in the global south. Hesitancy rates elsewhere in sub-Saharan Africa vary greatly, ranging from 2.1% in Ethiopia, 17.3% in Malawi, and 35.5% in Mali [6]. However, our findings are comparable to hesitancy in many higher-income settings, including France [12], Israel [13], Italy [14], Portugal [14], South Africa [15], and USA [16]. A pragmatic viewpoint would be that hesitancy in sub-Saharan Africa, including Ghana, is neither higher nor lower than many other parts of the world.

A perceived lack of information about the vaccine was the most common reason for hesitancy. Other reasons related to mistrust in safety and side effects of COVID-19 vaccines [17], including mistrust in the Ghanaian government. Mistrust about vaccine safety and concern about the COVID-19 vaccine side effects have also been found in countries such as Nigeria [11] and Malaysia [18]. Common misinformation beliefs included that COVID-19 is a bioweapon designed by the US or Chinese governments, or was designed to reduce the world population. Similar findings were also found in a nationwide survey conducted in 2020 in Nigeria [11].

Voters of the unelected party (NDC) in the Ghanaian general election were more likely to express hesitancy than both non-voters and voters of the elected political party (NPP). This was combined with lower confidence from NDC supporters in the government's handling of the pandemic response and levels of trust in vaccine safety. Other studies have also demonstrated that political views impact views on vaccination. For example, vaccination rates were significantly lower in counties with a high percentage of US Republican voters [19], and French citizens who indicated voting for a far right candidate in the previous general election were more likely to state that they would refuse the COVID-19 vaccine if offered [20].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Individuals who endorsed misinformation beliefs about COVID-19 contained weak effects on vaccine hesitancy. It is possible that anxiety caused by endorsing such imaginative beliefs are drivers of vaccine acceptance *and* hesitancy. On the other hand, we found that individuals who indicated uncertainty with at least one misinformation belief about COVID-19 were more likely to express vaccine hesitancy compared to those who did not indicate uncertainty. Perhaps uncertainty associated with one's beliefs about the COVID-19 pandemic also translates across to beliefs about other man-made developments associated with the pandemic, such as the vaccine [21]. Nevertheless, these findings should be interpreted with caution; previous research has shown that the relationship between conspiracy theory beliefs and vaccine acceptance is highly complex, with various psychological dimensions mediating such beliefs and the propensity to get vaccinated, such as death anxiety [22].

Social media use was not a significant predictor of vaccine hesitancy despite WhatsApp and Facebook being two of the most widely used social media platforms in Ghana [23], suggesting that Ghanaians may be exposed to a mixture of good and bad information on social media. However, the use of Internet webpages (e.g., news websites, blogs) was associated with hesitancy, suggesting that exposure to websites with potentially sensationalist stories about COVID-19 and vaccines – for example, news outlets that resort to sensationalism and exaggerated superlatives to remain competitive to advertising revenues [24, 25] – could influence individuals' willingness to receive the vaccine [26]. Further, using the GHS as a source of vaccine-related information was negatively associated with hesitancy, suggesting that information from official health sources may be key to building trust, countering misinformation, and reducing vaccine-related hesitancy.

We also found that Christians were more hesitant than Muslims. In Nigeria, a small number of churches have referred to COVID-19 vaccines as being "a mark of the beast" [27], and previously in northern Nigeria, religious leaders developed misconceived perceptions about the polio vaccine [5]. For example, the Christ Embassy, with headquarters in Nigeria and multiple churches in Ghana, are well-known for their heavy anti-vaccination messages [28]. Many communities view religious leaders as a trustworthy and credible source of health advice and information, with research showing that religious leaders' opinions can strongly

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

influence social and behavioural norms [29-31]. However, for some religious individuals – particularly among those with strong beliefs of a controlling god – scientific inventions work against their core beliefs about the world [32, 33] and may highlight potential difficulties of persuading some religious leaders to promote pro-vaccination messaging to their followers. Previous research has also found that Muslims have expressed hesitancy toward the COVID-19 vaccines (e.g., in Bangladesh [34]) indicating that, while our Christian vs. Muslim findings are suggestive, they warrant further investigation in SSA countries.

Females were more likely to be hesitant than males, similar to findings from Nigeria [5], and participants with more years of education were more likely to be hesitant than less educated participants, reflecting how more educated people are less likely to conform to social norms and behaviours [31]. This finding, however, has been mixed in previous surveys. For example, COVID-19 surveys from Uganda [36] and Malaysia [18] found that people with more years of education were more likely to accept the vaccine compared to those with less education, whereas surveys conducted in Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Malawi, and Nigeria found that those with more years of education were significantly less likely to accept the COVID-19 vaccine compared with less educated respondents [6].

Finally, urban residents were more likely to be hesitant than rural residents, previously found in Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, and Malawi [6]. One reason could be because city dwellers may be more exposed to vaccine-related misinformation than rural inhabitants, who may be more cut off from distinct sources where misinformation is rife, such as social media. Thus, urban residents may be more worried about side effects and more likely to avoid vaccination [37, 38]. Conversely, it is also possible that people living in urban areas are less afraid about COVID-19 than people in rural areas due to having more access to information and daily alerts about COVID-19 [39]. Access to testing and public health messaging is likely to be greater in urban areas, so residents are closer to the immediacy of the pandemic.

Limitations and strengths

The core strength of this study relates to its relatively large number of participants, including its comparison with hesitancy rates collected from previous surveys. The three

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

surveys allows capture of changes in temporal trends. However, a significant limitation relates to the representativeness of the sample population, since only individuals with access to the internet could participate. Thus, certain demographic were under-represented, including individuals in rural areas and people of lower socio-economic status. Further, since our recruitment was conducted using cross-sectional convenience sampling methods, the presence of respondent bias (e.g., those who closely follow COVID-19-related news) may limit its findings. The efficiency of data collection, the lower cost to advertise, and the acceptability of online survey recruitment may provide a useful alternative than formal regional or national surveys – especially during a global pandemic where new information from population surveys via remote or virtual methods may be urgently required. This research team completed this same survey via in-person data collection in Nkwanta South (January 2022), a rural district in the Oti region. This will capture different demographics and allow for comparisons between datasets.

Conclusions

Vaccine awareness strategies are sensitive to subpopulation characteristics. For example, strategies could capitalise on locally and nationally trusted knowledge providers (e.g., GHS) and conduct locally tailored community outreach within particular networks and using local trusted individuals — for instance, through religious and political groups – or on media platforms that are utilized by hesitant population groups. Fortunately, many of these groups are reachable through targeted communication strategies, to which campaigns should focus on resolving concerns about vaccine-related side effects, and provide reassurance about the safety of approved COVID-19 vaccines to ensure high uptake and low vaccine hesitancy across Ghana.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Acknowledgements

We thank Kingsley Osei and Kobby Nuamah (Opine World, Ghana), Hervé Akinocho (Center for Research and Opinion Polls, Togo), and Jean-Paul Fantognon (Togo Health Service) for their invaluable insight in this project throughout the past two years. We also thank the survey participants for their time and assistance in these surveys.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

1. Ritchie H, Mathieu E, Rodés-Guirao L, Appel C, Giattino C, Ortiz-Ospina E, Hasell J, Macdonald B, Dattani S, Roser M. Ghana: Coronavirus pandemic country profile. Published online at OurWorldinData.org. 2022. Available from https://ourworldindata.org/covid-vaccinations

2. Ritchie H, Mathieu E, Rodés-Guirao L, Appel C, Giattino C, Ortiz-Ospina E, Hasell J, Macdonald B, Dattani S, Roser M. Ghana: Coronavirus pandemic country profile. Published online at OurWorldinData.org. 2022. Available from https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus/country/ghana

3. Wolter N, Jassat W, Walaza S. et al. Early assessment of the clinical severity of the SARS-CoV-2 omicron variant. MedRxiv. 2021. doi: 10.1101/2021.12.21.21268116

4. Marti M, de Cola M, MacDonald NE, Dumolard L, Duclos P. Assessments of global drivers of vaccine hesitancy in 2014: Looking beyond safety concerns. PLoS One. 2017;12. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0172310.

5. Jegede AS. What led to the Nigerian boycott of the polio vaccination campaign? PLoS Medicine. 2007;4. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.0040073

6. Kanyanda S, Markhof Y, Wollburg P. et al. Acceptance of COVID-19 vaccines in sub-Saharan Africa: evidence from six national phone surveys. BMJ Open. 2021;11. doi: 10.1101/2021.12.21.21268116

7. Dotto C, Cubbon S. Disinformation exports: How foreign anti-vaccine narratives reached West African communities online. (2021). Available from: https://firstdraftnews.org/long-form-article/foreign-anti-vaccine-disinformation-reaches-west-africa/

8. Dereje N, Tesfaye A, Tamene B, Alemeshet D, Haymanot A, Tesfa N, Gedion S., Biruks T, Lakew, Y. COVID-19 Vaccine hesitancy in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: A mixed-methods study. MedRxiv. 2021. doi: 10.1101/2021.02.25.21252443

9. Puri N, & Coomes EA. Social media and vaccine hesitancy: new updates for the era of COVID-19 and globalized infectious diseases. Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutic. 2020;16. doi: 10.1080/21645515.2020.1780846

10. Jennings W, Stoker G, Bunting H, Valgarðsson VO, Gaskell J, Devine D, McKay L, Mills MC. Lack of trust, conspiracy beliefs, and social media use predict COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy. Vaccines, 2021; 9. doi: 10.3390/vaccines9060593

11. Olapegba PO., Ayandele O, Kolawole SO, Oguntayo R, Gandi JC, Dangiwa AL, Ottu IFA, Iorfa SKA. Preliminary Assessment of Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19) Knowledge and Perceptions in Nigeria. Social Sciences and Humanities Open. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3584408

12. Detoc M, Bruel S, Frappe P, Tardy B, Bitelho-Nevers E, Gagneux-Brunon A. Intention to participate in a COVID-19 vaccine clinical trial and to get vaccinated against COVID-19 in France during the pandemic. Vaccines. 2020;38. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.09.041

13. Dror AA, Eisenbach N, Taiber S. et al. Vaccine hesitancy: the next challenge in the fight against COVID-19. Eur J Epidemiol. 2020;35. doi: 10.1007/s10654-020-00671-y

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

14. Neumann-Böhme S, Varghese NE, Sabat I, Barros PP, Brouwer W, van Exel J, Schreyögg J, Stargardt T. Once we have it, will we use it? A European survey on willingness to be vaccinated against COVID-19. Eur J Health Econ. 2020;21. doi: 10.1007/s10198-020-01208-6

15. Lazarus JV, Ratzan SC, Palayew A. et al. A global survey of potential acceptance of a COVID-19 vaccine. Nat Med. 2021;27. doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-1124-9

16. Fisher KA, Bloomstone SJ, Walkder J, Crawford S, Fouayzi H, Mazor KM. Attitudes toward a potential SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine. A survey of U.S. adults. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2020;173. doi: 10.7326/M20-3569

17. Solís-Arce JS, Warren SS, Meriggi NF. et al. COVID-19 vaccine acceptance and hesitancy in low- and middle-income countries. Nat Med. 2021;27. doi: 10.1038/s41591-021-01454-y

18. Marzo RR, Ahmad A, Abid K, Khatiwada AP, Ahmed A, Kyaw TM, Abidin IBW, Srithar S, Sinnathamby S, Sarvasundram AP, Shrestha S. Factors influencing the acceptability of COVID-19 vaccination: A cross-sectional study from Malaysia, Vacunas. 2021; doi: 10.1016/j.vacun.2021.07.007

19. Albrecht D. Vaccination, politics and COVID-19 impacts. BMC Public Health. 2022;22. doi: 10.1186/s12889-021-12432-x

20. Peretti-Watel P. A future vaccination campaign against COVID-19 at risk of vaccine hesitancy and politicisation. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2020;20. doi: 10.1016/ S1473-3099(20)30426-6

21. Bendau A, Plag J, Petzold MB, Ströhle A. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and related fears and anxiety. Int Immunopharmacol. 2021. doi: 10.1016/j.intimp.2021.107724

22. Simione L, Vagni M, Gnagnarella C, Bersani G, Pajardi D. Mistrust and beliefs in conspiracy theories differently mediate the effects of psychological factors on propensity for COVID-19 vaccine. Front. Psychol. 2021;12. Doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.683684

23. Dokua-Sasu, D. Most used social media platforms in Ghana as of the third quarter of 2020. Statista. 2020. Available from https://www.statista.com/statistics/1171534/leading-social-media-platforms-ghana/

24. Arbaoui B, De Swert K, Van der Brug W. Sensationalism in news coverage: A comparative study in 14 television systems. Communication Research. 2016. doi: 0093650216663364

25. Vettehen PH, Zhou S, Kleemans M, D'Haenens L, Lin TTC. Competitive pressure and arousing television news: A cross-cultural study. Asian Journal of Communication, 2012;22. doi: 10.1080/01292986.2011.642394

26. Ottwell R, Puckett M, Rogers T, Nicks S, Vassar M. Sensational media reporting is common when describing COVID-19 therapies, detection methods, and vaccines. Journal of Investigative Medicine. 2021;69. doi: 10.1136/jim-2020-001760

27. Fani-Kayode F. COVID-19 and the mark of the beast. Vanguard news Nigeria. 2020. Available from https://www.vanguardngr.com/2020/04/covid-19-and-the-mark-of-the-beast-femi-fani-kayode/

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

28. Christ Embassy. Available from https://christembassy.org/pastor-chris-questions-the-impact-of-vaccines-on-recipients-in-five-years-time

29. Rivera-Hernandez M. The role of religious leaders in health promotion for older Mexicans with diabetes. J Relig Health. 2015;54: doi: 10.1007/s10943-014-9829-z

30. Kanda K, Jayasinghe A, Silva KT, et al. Religious leaders as potential Advocates for HIV/AIDS prevention among the general population in Sri Lanka. Glob Public Health. 2013;8. doi: 10.1080/17441692.2012.745892

31. Adedini SA, Babalola S, Ibeawuchi C, Omotoso O, Akiode A, Odeu M. Role of religious leaders in promoting contraceptive use in Nigeria: evidence from the Nigerian urban reproductive health Initiative. Glob Health Sci Pract. 2018;6. doi: 10.9745/GHSP-D-18-00135

32. McPhetres J, Zuckerman M. Religiosity predicts negative attitudes towards science and lower levels of science literacy. PLoS One. 2018;13. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0207125

33. Eom K, Saad CS, Kim HS. Religiosity moderates the link between environmental beliefs and pro-environmental support: The role of belief in a controlling god. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin. 2021;47. doi: 10.1177/0146167220948712

34. Hossain MB, Alam MZ, Islam MS, Sultan S, Faysal MM, et al. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among the adult population in Bangladesh: A nationwide cross-sectional survey. PLoS One. 2021;16. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0260821

35. Muthukrishna M, Morgan T, Henrich J. The when and who of social learning and conformist transmission. Evolution and Behavior. 2015. doi: 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2015.05.004

36. Echoru I, Ajambo PD, Keirania E. et al. Sociodemographic factors associated with acceptance of COVID-19 vaccine and clinical trials in Uganda: a cross-sectional study in western Uganda. BMC Public Health. 2021;21. doi: 10.1186/s12889-021-11197-7

37. Islam MS, Siddique AB, Akter R. et al. Knowledge, attitudes and perceptions towards COVID-19 vaccinations: a cross-sectional community survey in Bangladesh. BMC Public Health. 2021;21. doi: 10.1186/s12889-021-11880-9

38. Ferdous MZ, Islam MS, Sikder MT, Mosaddek SM, Zegarra-Valdivia JA, Gozal D. Knowledge, attitude, andpractice regarding COVID-19 outbreak in Bangladesh: anonline-based cross-sectional study. PLoS One. 2020;15. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0239254

39. Kassim MAM, Pang NTP, Mohamed NH, Kamu A, Ho CM, Ayu F., et al. Relationship between fear of COVID-19 psychopathology and sociodemographic variables in Malaysian population. Int J Mental Health Addict. 2021. doi: 10.1007/s11469-020-00444-4

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Fig 1. Breakdown of yes, no, and unsure responses across three surveys in August 2020, March 2021, and June 2021

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.16.22272463; this version posted March 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Fig 2. Summary of odds ratios and significance levels across factors studied (* < .05, ** < .01, *** < .001)