

1 **Predicting willingness to be vaccinated for Covid-19:**

2 **evidence from New Zealand**

3

4 Geoff Kaine<sup>1\*</sup>, Vic Wright<sup>2</sup> and Suzie Greenhalgh<sup>3</sup>

5

6 <sup>1</sup> Manaaki Whenua – Landcare Research, Hamilton, New Zealand

7 <sup>2</sup> University of New England, Armidale, New South Wales, Australia

8 <sup>3</sup> Manaaki Whenua – Landcare Research, Auckland, New Zealand

9

10 \* Corresponding author.

11 Email: [kaineg@landcareresearch.co.nz](mailto:kaineg@landcareresearch.co.nz) (GK)

12

13 These authors contributed equally to this work.

14

## 15 **Abstract**

16 Governments around the world are seeking to slow the spread of Covid-19 and reduce  
17 hospitalisations by encouraging mass vaccinations for Covid-19. The success of this policy  
18 depends on most of the population accepting the vaccine and then being vaccinated.  
19 Understanding and predicting the motivation of individuals to be vaccinated is, therefore,  
20 critical in assessing the likely effectiveness of a mass vaccination programme in slowing the  
21 spread of the virus.

22

23 In this paper we draw on the I<sub>3</sub> Response Framework to understand and predict the  
24 willingness of New Zealanders to be vaccinated for Covid-19. The Framework differs from  
25 most studies predicting willingness to be vaccinated because it is based on the idea that the  
26 willingness to adopt a behaviour depends on both involvement (a measure of motivational  
27 strength) with the behaviour and attitudes towards the behaviour. We show that predictions of  
28 individuals' willingness to be vaccinated are improved using involvement and attitudes  
29 together, compared to attitudes alone. This result has important implications for the  
30 implementation of mass vaccination programmes for Covid-19.

31

32

## 33 **Introduction**

34 The success of measures to slow or stop the spread of Covid-19, such as wearing masks,  
35 using tracer apps, and mass vaccination, depends on the commitment and capacity of  
36 individuals to accept them and change their behaviour accordingly. For example, failure to  
37 achieve high rates of vaccinations for Covid-19 may mean the recurrent imposition of  
38 lockdowns (which cause economic, social, and psychological damage) and continued

39 investment of considerable resources in contact tracing, community testing, operating  
40 quarantine facilities, and the diversion of medical infrastructure and services to combat  
41 increased rates of infection and hospitalisation from Covid-19. Hence, understanding and  
42 predicting the extent to which individuals are motivated to participate in a mass vaccination  
43 programme is critical in assessing the likely effectiveness of the programme.

44

45 There is an extensive literature on people's willingness to be vaccinated, especially in regard  
46 to vaccine hesitancy [1, 2, 3, 4], which shows that beliefs about, and attitudes towards,  
47 vaccines are fundamental to people's acceptance of vaccines and their willingness to be  
48 vaccinated. This literature has culminated in the development of models such as the 5C  
49 model [5, 6] to explain vaccine hesitancy. In the 5C model vaccine hesitancy is decomposed  
50 into five components: confidence, complacency, constraints, calculation, and collective  
51 responsibility [5]. According to Wismans et al. [6]:

- 52 • confidence relates to trust in the effectiveness and safety of vaccines, in the system  
53 that delivers them, and in the motivations of policymakers;
- 54 • complacency reflects the perceived risk and perceived level of threat of vaccine-  
55 preventable diseases;
- 56 • constraints are psychological and physical barriers, such as accessibility, health  
57 literacy, and affordability;
- 58 • calculation relates to individuals' engagement in extensive information searching; and
- 59 • collective responsibility reflects a willingness to protect others by getting vaccinated.

60 Since confidence and complacency, and potentially constraints and collective responsibility,  
61 depend on awareness and beliefs, education and promotion are key strategies for changing  
62 awareness, beliefs, and attitudes to vaccine hesitancy and encouraging participation in  
63 vaccination programmes [3, 6, 7, 8]. The success of these strategies depends on how

64 malleable people's attitudes are [9] and how attentive they are to education and promotion  
65 activities [10, 11, 12].

66

67 In this paper we draw on the I<sub>3</sub> Response Framework [6] to predict how strongly New  
68 Zealanders are motivated to be vaccinated for Covid-19, and investigate differences in the  
69 strength and stability of New Zealanders' attitudes towards being vaccinated for Covid-19.  
70 We then draw out implications for how attentive New Zealanders might be to education and  
71 promotion activities that encourage their participation in a mass vaccination programme for  
72 Covid-19.

73

74 Fundamentally, the Framework differentiates the strength of individuals' motivation and their  
75 beliefs about the advantages and disadvantages of policy outcomes and policy measures. We  
76 found this differentiation useful in predicting an individual's possible behavioural responses  
77 to a measure, which could assist government agencies to develop strategies to enhance  
78 compliance. With respect to preventing the spread of Covid-19 in New Zealand, we found  
79 that people's willingness to be vaccinated depended on the strength of their involvement  
80 (motivation) with, as well as their attitudes towards, both the policy outcome (preventing the  
81 spread of Covid-19) and the policy measure itself (a mass vaccination programme for Covid-  
82 19).

83

84 The results highlight the importance of distinguishing failure to be vaccinated because of lack  
85 of interest from deliberately choosing not to be vaccinated, and then tailoring participation  
86 strategies appropriately. The results also highlight the difficulty of communicating effectively  
87 through mass media with those who have low involvement with preventing the spread of  
88 Covid-19 and with being vaccinated. Finally, they draw attention to the importance of

89 distinguishing between those with low and high involvement when considering the possible  
90 effects on vaccine hesitancy of the dissemination of misinformation about Covid-19 through  
91 social media.

92

## 93 **Theory**

94 Kaine et al. [13] proposed that theories about people's responses to policy measures  
95 implicitly presume that the measures are inherently important enough to people that they  
96 devote considerable cognitive effort to gathering information about the measure, processing  
97 that information, formulating attitudes towards the measure, and reaching a decision about  
98 whether to comply (in the broadest sense of the word) with the measure or not. Kaine et al.  
99 [13] suggested that these theories cannot be expected to predict behaviour accurately when  
100 this presumption is invalid, and when the subject is not perceived to be important enough (i.e.  
101 sufficiently relevant to people's personal goals) to trigger the effort required to form an  
102 attitude that has the power to influence their behaviour. Consequently, to predict how people  
103 may or may not respond to any given policy measure it is necessary to understand whether  
104 they are likely to invest effort in decision-making regarding that measure.

105

106 As explained in detail in Kaine et al. [13], the effort people will devote to decision-making  
107 about complying with a policy measure will depend on their *involvement* with the policy  
108 *issue* (in this case, the policy outcome of eliminating Covid-19 from New Zealand) and the  
109 *intervention* (the policy measure, such as being vaccinated for Covid-19), with the former  
110 being an important component of the context for the latter. These concepts underpin the I<sub>3</sub>  
111 Response Framework<sup>1</sup> used in this analysis.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Involvement*, *issue*, and *intervention*, hence I<sub>3</sub> Response Framework.

112

113 The behaviour changes to be analysed with the I<sub>3</sub> Framework occur in a public policy rather  
114 than a commercial context. This means the outcome(s) sought are typically declared, and  
115 government, or its agencies, intervene with measures designed to modify behaviour in pursuit  
116 of the outcome(s). Either compulsion or voluntary responses may be involved, but  
117 compliance is central to achieving outcomes. In what follows in this section we have drawn  
118 extensively on the discussion of the interpretation of Framework findings from Kaine et al.  
119 [13] to make it readily accessible for the reader.

120

### 121 **The I<sub>3</sub> Framework**

122 Kaine et al. [13] proposed that people's responses to policy measures can be inferred from  
123 their:

- 124 • involvement with the relevant policy outcome (preventing the spread of Covid-19)
- 125 • involvement with, and attitude towards, the policy measure itself (getting vaccinated).

126

127 Involvement with the policy measure signals the degree to which the measure itself is a  
128 source of motivation for the individual, irrespective of the policy issue [14, 15]. This allows  
129 for the possibility that individuals are motivated to act in response to a measure even though  
130 they do not perceive that the policy outcome the measure addresses is relevant to them. In  
131 such situations it may be that the wish to comply is motivated by involvement with some  
132 other outcome, such as conforming with social norms [16].

133

134 However, the perceived relevance of a policy outcome is relevant to an individual's  
135 cognitions about related measures. One would normally expect a positive correlation between  
136 involvement with the outcome and the measure while recognising the possibility of variation

137 in involvement across various measures. The value of the Framework is that it enables a  
138 decomposition of overall involvement with a policy outcome and corresponding measures, as  
139 well as distinguishing between involvement with different measures and closer analysis of the  
140 role of beliefs held by individuals, as informational contexts for attitudes. This has  
141 implications for the relevance of the various components of vaccination hesitancy, as  
142 explained below.

143

144 The two dimensions of involvement with the policy outcome and involvement with the policy  
145 measure mean that the responses of people to a policy measure can be classified into four  
146 quadrants, as shown in Fig 1.

147

148 **Fig 1. Map and explanation of quadrants in the I<sub>3</sub> Response Framework.**

149

150 People in quadrant 1 exhibit low involvement with both the policy outcome and the policy  
151 measure. Consequently, these people are hypothesised to have little knowledge, or even  
152 awareness, of the policy outcome and are likely to have limited knowledge of the policy  
153 measure, and to have weak attitudes towards it, if any at all. These people may be either  
154 detached because they have other interests and concerns, or are ‘know-nothings’: they do not  
155 particularly care about or have any interest in the outcome [17]. Chaffee and Roser [18, p.  
156 376] describe this behaviour as being ‘a direct response to situational constraints and not  
157 especially reflective of one’s attitudes or knowledge.’ Therefore, for these people, non-  
158 compliance with the measure is largely unintentional [19].

159

160 Applying the 5C model [6] with respect to vaccine hesitancy, people in quadrant 1 could be  
161 expected to be indifferent with respect to confidence in vaccines, complacent with respect to

162 personal risk, sensitive to constraints on being vaccinated, unengaged with calculation, and  
163 indifferent to collective responsibility.

164

165 If the proportion of people in quadrant 1 is low enough to present little threat to achieving the  
166 aggregate policy outcome of preventing the spread of Covid-19, they can be ignored [13].

167 Otherwise, their compliance with the measure (getting vaccinated) may be encouraged by:

- 168 • linking the policy outcome to a subject they find more involving (e.g. concern for  
169 family, employment, recreation, international travel);
- 170 • reducing the effort required to be compliant (e.g. offering vaccinations in convenient  
171 locations such as shopping malls, churches, and sports venues, or offering free  
172 vaccinations);
- 173 • offering incentives (e.g. cash and other rewards);
- 174 • promoting awareness of, and building knowledge about, the policy outcome and the  
175 policy measure.

176 However, because people in this quadrant are uninterested, they are unlikely to pay attention  
177 to promotional and educational messaging, so the final strategy of promoting awareness is  
178 likely to be problematic. Kim [14] suggests that an affect-evoking strategy (i.e. one that  
179 evokes an emotional response) should be the most effective means of attracting people's  
180 attention under these circumstances. This is likely to be achieved by focusing the affect-  
181 evoking strategy on the policy outcome, as greater involvement with the outcome is likely to  
182 engender greater involvement with individual measures.

183

184 People in quadrant 2 exhibit high involvement with the policy outcome but low involvement  
185 with the measure. Consequently, they would be aware of the outcome and invest time and  
186 energy in processing information, decision-making, and responding to the outcome [18, 20].



187 They may have limited knowledge of the policy measure and may have weak or ambivalent  
188 attitudes towards it. Any non-compliance with the measure is largely unintentional [13].

189

190 Regarding vaccine hesitancy [6], people in quadrant 2 could be expected to be unsure or  
191 indifferent with respect to confidence in vaccines, may be complacent with respect to  
192 personal risk, somewhat sensitive to constraints on being vaccinated, modest on calculation,  
193 but have some sense of collective responsibility.

194

195 If people in quadrant 2 represent little risk in terms of achieving the policy outcome, they can  
196 be ignored. If their compliance is important to achieving the policy outcome, reducing the  
197 effort required for compliance [21] and promoting awareness of the policy measure may be  
198 worthwhile. This can be done by taking advantage of the intensity of their involvement with  
199 the policy outcome, particularly when this is accompanied by favourable attitudes towards  
200 the measure.

201

202 People in quadrant 3 exhibit high involvement with both the policy outcome and the measure.  
203 These people are likely to have extensive and detailed knowledge of the policy outcome.  
204 They are also likely to have extensive knowledge of the policy measure and strong attitudes  
205 towards it [20]. If their attitude towards the policy measure is favourable, they will comply  
206 with the measure and may even advocate for it [13]. Consequently, a strategy for promoting  
207 compliance among individuals in this quadrant with a favourable attitude might focus on self-  
208 regulation, using mechanisms such as voluntary codes of conduct. Promotion and monitoring  
209 may also be worthwhile to ensure awareness and knowledge of obligations, ensure desirable  
210 behaviours are maintained, and identify at an early stage any changes in their attitude [13].

211

212 Apropos of vaccine hesitancy [6], people in quadrant 3 could be expected to be polarised.  
213 People in this quadrant with a favourable attitude towards vaccines can be expected to have  
214 high confidence in vaccines, be non-complacent with respect to personal risk, be insensitive  
215 to constraints on being vaccinated, be thoroughly engaged with calculation, and have a strong  
216 sense of collective responsibility. People in this quadrant with an unfavourable attitude  
217 towards vaccines could be expected to have low confidence in vaccines, be non-complacent  
218 with respect to personal risk, be insensitive to constraints on being vaccinated, be thoroughly  
219 engaged with calculation, and have a weak sense of collective responsibility.

220

221 If people in quadrant 3 have an unfavourable attitude towards the policy measure, they may  
222 comply, but reluctantly [13]. Non-compliance with the measure will be intentional. Most  
223 likely they will prefer – and even advocate for – an alternative policy measure. Where  
224 practical, incorporating these changes may encourage compliance among these people [22].  
225 Alternatively, offering incentives to reduce compliance costs may neutralise unfavourable  
226 reactions.

227

228 Another strategy for promoting compliance among people in this quadrant with an  
229 unfavourable attitude is to change their attitude towards the measure. This may be possible by  
230 reframing the benefits about the measure in terms of another subject that is more involving  
231 for them [13], thus provoking a recalculation of net costs and benefits. Alternatively, a  
232 promotional programme could be implemented with the outcome of persuading these people  
233 that they are mistaken, and that the behaviour required by the policy measure (being  
234 vaccinated) is superior to any alternatives. This strategy is likely to fail if people in this  
235 quadrant hold strongly favourable, or unfavourable, attitudes as they are likely to engage in  
236 motivated reasoning [11, 12]; i.e., filtering information that challenges their beliefs and

237 attitudes. Finally, compliance among these individuals might be increased by investing  
238 resources in enforcement, to increase the likelihood of detection and prosecution, and  
239 legislating severe penalties for non-compliance.

240

241 Note that if the causes of non-compliance relate to unpredictable variations in the  
242 environment, or to unforeseeable technical problems, then enforcement and general  
243 deterrence may be ineffective. A more appropriate strategy in these circumstances may be to  
244 focus on the provision of technical assistance [23, 24].

245

246 People in quadrant 4 exhibit low involvement with the policy outcome but high involvement  
247 with the measure. People in this quadrant are likely to have limited knowledge of the policy  
248 outcome. They are likely to have detailed knowledge of the policy measure and have strong  
249 attitudes towards it [20]. If their attitude towards the measure is favourable, they will comply  
250 with the measure [13]. In these circumstances the government agency may play a monitoring  
251 role to check that the conditions promoting compliance do not change. A promotional  
252 strategy to support and reinforce compliance behaviour may also be worthwhile.

253

254 On the other hand, if the members of this quadrant have an unfavourable attitude towards the  
255 policy measure, they will only comply reluctantly, or may intentionally refuse to comply at  
256 all. These people will regard the measure as intrusive and as imposing unwarranted costs  
257 upon them. Most likely they will agitate against the policy measure [13] because they are not  
258 committed to the outcome. One strategy for promoting compliance among these individuals  
259 is to change their attitude towards the measure. This may be possible by reframing it in terms  
260 of another, more involving subject [13]. Offering incentives to offset compliance costs, or  
261 delaying or staging the introduction of policy measures, may neutralise unfavourable

262 reactions [22]. Finally, compliance among these individuals might be increased by investing  
263 resources to increase the likelihood of detection and prosecution of non-compliance, and by  
264 introducing severe penalties.

265

266 Regarding vaccine hesitancy [6], people in quadrant 4 could be expected to be polarised.  
267 People in this quadrant with a favourable attitude towards vaccines could be expected to have  
268 high confidence in vaccines, be variably complacent with respect to personal risk, be  
269 insensitive to constraints on being vaccinated, be thoroughly engaged with calculation, and  
270 have a strong sense of collective responsibility. People in this quadrant with an unfavourable  
271 attitude towards vaccines could be expected have low confidence in vaccines, be variably  
272 complacent with respect to personal risk, be insensitive to constraints on being vaccinated, be  
273 thoroughly engaged with calculation, and have a weak sense of collective responsibility.

274

275 In summary, Kaine et al. [13] hypothesised that individual responses to policy measures will  
276 depend on the intensity and source of involvement of the individual with the measure and,  
277 where that involvement is sufficiently intense to form an attitude, on whether that attitude is  
278 favourable or unfavourable. In a specific applied setting, such as a policy to control the  
279 spread of Covid-19, the I<sub>3</sub> Framework enables the prediction of people's likely compliance  
280 with measures such as willingness to participate in a mass vaccination programme and, given  
281 the reasons for their involvement and their attitudes, the best ways to enhance that  
282 compliance. The I<sub>3</sub> Framework has been employed to understand and predict compliance  
283 behaviour in a variety of contexts in agriculture [19, 23, 25,26], rural and urban predator  
284 control [27, 28], and community support for predator control [29].

285

286

## 287 **Covid-19 in New Zealand**

288 Covid-19 was first detected in New Zealand on 28 February 2020 [31]. Within 3 weeks the  
289 central government had closed New Zealand's international border to all except returning  
290 citizens and permanent residents. The government began pursuing a restrictive strategy [32]  
291 of eliminating Covid-19 and applied a range of control measures to stop the transmission of  
292 Covid-19 in New Zealand [33]. Elimination did not necessarily mean eradicating the virus  
293 permanently from New Zealand; rather, that central government was confident chains of  
294 transmission in the community had been eliminated for at least 28 days, and any cases  
295 imported from overseas in the future could be effectively contained [33].

296

297 The central government commenced a mass vaccination programme for Covid-19, starting  
298 with border and managed isolation and quarantine workers, in February 2021 [49]. The  
299 programme was accompanied by an extensive, government-funded publicity campaign using  
300 traditional and social media. The survey in this study was completed during the first and  
301 second week of March 2021.

302

## 303 **Materials and methods**

304 A questionnaire seeking information from the public on their beliefs about, attitudes towards,  
305 and willingness to be vaccinated against, Covid-19 was designed based on the I<sub>3</sub> Response  
306 Framework [13]. Involvement was measured using a condensed version of the Laurent and  
307 Kapferer [34] involvement scale developed by Kaine [35], with respondents rating two  
308 statements on each of the five components of involvement (functional, experiential, identity-  
309 based, risk-based, and consequence-based).

310

311 The ordering of the statements in the involvement, attitude, and belief scales was randomised  
312 to avoid bias in responses. Respondents indicated their agreement with statements in all the  
313 involvement, attitude, and belief scales using a five-point rating, ranging from strongly  
314 disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The strength of respondents' attitudes, which were  
315 expected to vary depending on the strength of their involvement, was also measured using an  
316 ipsative scale based on Olsen [36]. Information was sought on the demographic  
317 characteristics of respondents, including age, education, and ethnicity, and whether they were  
318 willing to be vaccinated for Covid-19. The ethnicity categories were Māori (the indigenous  
319 people of New Zealand), European New Zealander, Pacific Islander, Asian, and Other. The  
320 questionnaire is reproduced in S1.

321

322 Participation in the survey was voluntary, respondents could leave the survey at any time, and  
323 all survey questions were optional and could be skipped. The research approach was  
324 reviewed and approved by Manaaki Whenua – Landcare Research's social ethics process  
325 (application no. 2021/27), which is based on the New Zealand Association of Social Science  
326 Research code of ethics.

327

328 The questionnaire, stratified by regional population, was distributed to a random sample of  
329 New Zealanders who were members of an online consumer panel. Panel members receive  
330 reward points (which are redeemable for products and services) for completing surveys. A  
331 total of 1,002 completed responses was obtained, of which 53% were from women and 47%  
332 from men.

333

334 The age distribution aligned closely with the 2018 Census distribution, but Māori and Pacific  
335 Island residents were under-represented in the sample while 'other' ethnicities were over-

336 represented. The household income distribution of the sample approximated the distribution  
337 from the 2018 Census. Residents with secondary or certificate qualifications were  
338 substantially under-represented in the sample, while residents with graduate and postgraduate  
339 qualifications were substantially over-represented (see Appendix A).

340

341 The survey was conducted over 2 weeks from 4 March to 15 March 2021. Most of this time  
342 Auckland residents were under Alert Level 2, which meant they were expected to maintain  
343 social distancing when outside their homes and to wear masks in public places. They were  
344 also expected to keep track of their movements and to self-isolate and seek testing for Covid-  
345 19 if they felt unwell and experienced symptoms associated with Covid-19. The rest of the  
346 country was at Alert level 1 during this time. At Alert Level 1 social distancing and the  
347 wearing of face masks in public places is not expected. People are encouraged to keep track  
348 of their movements and to self-isolate and seek testing for Covid-19 if they feel unwell and  
349 experience symptoms associated with Covid-19.

350

351 Given these circumstances and given that the pandemic had been receiving widespread  
352 coverage by traditional and social media in New Zealand since February 2020, it seems  
353 reasonable to suppose that virtually all respondents were aware of Covid-19 at the time we  
354 conducted our survey, and that most, if not all, were also aware of the government intention  
355 to institute a mass vaccination programme. While awareness of the existence of Covid-19 is a  
356 prerequisite for involvement with it, awareness does not necessarily entail involvement.  
357 Widespread awareness of Covid-19 simply creates the potential for widespread involvement.  
358 The extent to which that potential is realised depends on respondents' beliefs about how  
359 Covid-19 could affect the achievement of their functional, experiential, and self-identity  
360 needs.

361

362 Public awareness of the widely promoted social desirability of getting vaccinated for Covid-  
363 19 creates the possibility that self-reported behaviour regarding willingness to be vaccinated  
364 may be biased simply because it is socially desirable. Daoust et al. [37] found that this was  
365 the case with respect to self-reported behaviour such as mask wearing and social distancing in  
366 the context of Covid-19. However, the degree of bias with respect to vaccine hesitancy is  
367 likely to be small given that vaccination hesitancy is a widespread phenomenon, which  
368 implies hesitancy has a degree of social acceptability. The rate at which the acceptability of  
369 vaccine hesitancy has diminished recently, in nations like Australia, for example, also  
370 suggests that it is not regarded as an extreme, albeit starting, attitude to adopt [53].

371

372 The potential for systematic bias in self-reporting of socially desirable behaviours (or  
373 opinions) in the context of the I<sub>3</sub> Framework is unclear. On the one hand, those with low  
374 involvement in, say, eliminating Covid-19 and getting vaccinated might be expected to  
375 exhibit (downward) social desirability bias in self-reporting this behaviour because they are  
376 less motivated to actually engage in the behaviour. However, their very lack of interest means  
377 they may be quite insensitive to the opinions of others about the behaviour and so are less  
378 susceptible to social desirability bias.

379

380 On the other hand, those with high involvement in eliminating Covid-19 and getting  
381 vaccinated might be expected to exhibit (upward or downward) social desirability bias in  
382 self-reporting behaviours, depending on their attitude, because they are motivated to actually  
383 engage in the behaviour. Their strong interest may mean they are quite sensitive to the  
384 opinions of others about the behaviour (especially if expressing self-identity is an important  
385 source of involvement), so they may be more susceptible to social desirability bias. Through



386 this argument, self-reporting of socially desirable behaviours like getting vaccinated might  
387 mean the actual association between involvement and engagement in such behaviours could  
388 be over-estimated or under-estimated. Clearly, the interaction between involvement and  
389 social desirability bias remains an important area for further investigation.

390

391 Involvement scores were computed for each respondent as the simple arithmetic average of  
392 their agreement ratings for the 10 statements in the involvement scales. Attitudes scores were  
393 computed as the simple arithmetic average of their agreement ratings for the five statements  
394 in the attitude scales. Respondents were classified into belief segments based on their  
395 agreement ratings with the set of relevant belief statements using Ward's method, with  
396 squared Euclidean distance as the measure of dissimilarity [38]. Note that, for all belief,  
397 involvement, and evaluative attitudinal statements, respondents were instructed to indicate  
398 their agreement with a statement using a five-point rating scale, from strongly disagree (1) to  
399 strongly agree (5). Statistical analyses were conducted using the 'cluster' and 'regression'  
400 commands in SPSS [39].

401

402

## 403 **Results**

### 404 **General**

405 As shown in Table 1, all of the involvement and attitudinal scales exhibited satisfactory  
406 reliabilities [40]. Most respondents had moderate-to-high involvement with eliminating  
407 Covid-19 from New Zealand and with getting vaccinated and so were placed in quadrant 3  
408 (Table 2).<sup>2</sup> However, a substantial minority of respondents had low-to-mild involvement with  
409 getting vaccinated for Covid-19 and so were placed in quadrants 1 and 2.

410

411 A majority of respondents exhibited a strongly favourable attitude, as measured by the  
412 ipsative attitude scale, towards being vaccinated for Covid-19 (Table 3). These results  
413 suggest only a small proportion of respondents would deliberately choose not to be  
414 vaccinated to protect themselves and help prevent the spread of Covid-19 in the community.

415

416 Consistent with involvement theory, a relatively high proportion of respondents in quadrant 1  
417 and quadrant 2 were unsure whether getting vaccinated was the right thing to do.

418 Consequently, a relatively low proportion of these respondents indicated they were likely to  
419 be willing to be vaccinated (Table 4), and those that were willing were less sure of being  
420 vaccinated immediately once vaccines were available (Table 5) or to be vaccinated if  
421 vaccines only offered a few months' protection (Table 6). By contrast, and consistent with  
422 theory, a high proportion of the respondents in quadrant 3 were sure that being vaccinated  
423 was the right thing to do (Table 3), were willing to be vaccinated (Table 4), and as quickly as  
424 possible, once vaccines were available (Table 5). A high proportion of these respondents

425

---

<sup>2</sup> For convenience degrees of involvement were categorised as low (score less than 2), mild (score greater than 2 but less than 3), moderate (score greater than 3 but less than 4) and high (score greater than 4).

426 **Table 1. Reliability of involvement and attitude scales**

427

	<b>Reliability</b>
Involvement with eliminating Covid-19	0.847
Involvement with being vaccinated for Covid-19	0.852
Attitude towards being vaccinated for Covid-19	0.854

428

429 Notes: Values are Cronbach's alpha [40].

430

431 **Table 2. I<sub>3</sub> classification for being vaccinated for Covid-19**

	<b>Percentage of respondents</b>
Quadrant 1	4.8
Quadrant 2	7.4
Quadrant 3	86.7
Quadrant 4	1.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

432

433

434 **Table 3. I<sub>3</sub> vaccine classification and attitude towards being vaccinated**

<b>Attitude</b>	<b>Quadrant 1</b>	<b>Quadrant 2</b>	<b>Quadrant 3</b>	<b>Quadrant 4</b>	<b>Total</b>
Right thing to do	12.5	21.6	74.0	54.5	67.0
Doesn't matter to me	8.3	9.5	5.3	9.1	5.8
Not sure	35.4	44.6	16.7	9.1	19.6
Haven't given it much thought	12.5	4.1	3.0	9.1	3.6
Bad thing to do	31.3	20.3	1.0	18.2	4.1

435 Notes: Values are percentages of respondents in each quadrant. Test for differences in percentages across  
 436 quadrants ( $\chi^2 = 259.1, P < 0.01$ ).

437

438

439 **Table 1. I<sub>3</sub> vaccine classification and willingness to be vaccinated**

	Quadrant 1	Quadrant 2	Quadrant 3	Quadrant 4	Sample
Definitely	12.5	9.5	56.7	36.4	50.9
Probably	6.3	16.2	20.0	18.2	19.1
Maybe	16.7	24.3	16.7	18.2	17.3
Probably not	16.7	23.0	4.9	9.1	6.9
Definitely not	47.9	27.0	1.6	18.2	5.9

440 Notes: Values are percentages of respondents in each quadrant or total sample. Test for differences in percentages  
 441 across quadrants ( $\chi^2 = 321.6, P < 0.01$ )

442

443

444

445 **Table 2. I<sub>3</sub> vaccine classification and willingness to be vaccinated as soon as possible**

	Quadrant 1	Quadrant 2	Quadrant 3	Quadrant 4	Sample
Yes	41.2	18.9	68.2	75.0	65.7
Not sure	29.4	29.7	21.6	25.0	22.1
No	29.4	51.4	10.2	0.0	12.2

446 Notes: Values are percentages of respondents in each quadrant (or the total sample) who indicated they definitely  
 447 or probably would, or might, get vaccinated. Test for differences in percentages across quadrants ( $\chi^2 = 70.3,$   
 448  $P < 0.01$ )

449

450

451

452

453 **Table 3. I<sub>3</sub> vaccine classification and willingness to be vaccinated even if it only offers a few months'**  
 454 **protection**

	Quadrant 1	Quadrant 2	Quadrant 3	Quadrant 4	Sample
Yes	33.3	27.8	61.2	50.0	59.8
Not sure	25.0	33.3	26.3	37.5	26.6
No	41.7	38.9	12.5	12.5	13.6

455 Notes: Values are percentages of respondents in each quadrant (or the total sample) who indicated they definitely  
 456 or probably would, or might, get vaccinated and excludes those who indicated they would not get vaccinated  
 457 as a soon as possible. Test for differences in percentages across quadrants ( $\chi^2 = 21.7, P < 0.01$ ).

458

459

460

461

462 were willing to be vaccinated if vaccines only offered a few months' protection (Table 6).

463 These results and their implications for government policy are discussed in detail by Kaine

464 [41].

465

466 The predominantly moderate-to-high involvement with, and favourable attitudes of most

467 respondents towards, being vaccinated to help eliminate Covid-19 from New Zealand is

468 consistent with the high level of community endorsement of the New Zealand government's

469 approach to managing Covid-19 [42] and the cumulative proportion of the population that has

470 been vaccinated or is booked to be vaccinated [49].

471

472 Although this study was not designed to investigate relationships between the I<sub>3</sub> Framework

473 and models of vaccine hesitancy such as the 5C model, and bearing in mind that we were not

474 using the standard scales that have been developed for that model [5], we were able to

475 examine some of the suggestions made earlier about these relationships. We found

476 differences in beliefs broadly in line with our expectations about differences in confidence,

477 complacency, constraints, and collective responsibility across the quadrants (Tables 7 and 8).

478 We also found differences across the quadrants in media use that aligned with our

479 expectations about differences in calculation.

480

481 For example, compared to respondents in quadrant 3, respondents in quadrant 1 appeared:

- 482 • less confident about the safety of Covid-19 vaccines (confidence);
- 483 • to regard Covid-19 as less threatening (complacency);
- 484 • to believe being vaccinated was impractical and not worthwhile (constraints);

485 **Table 7. I<sub>3</sub> vaccine classification, confidence, complacency, and constraints**

	Quadrant 1	Quadrant 2	Quadrant 3	Quadrant 4
<u>Confidence:</u>				
It isn't worth getting vaccinated against Covid-19 yet as there are too many unknowns about the vaccines	4.00	3.54	2.61 <sup>a</sup>	3.09
Children shouldn't be vaccinated against Covid-19	3.52	3.14	2.45 <sup>a</sup>	2.64
I think we should wait and see if the Covid-19 vaccination works overseas before trying it here	3.50	3.61	2.83 <sup>a,b</sup>	3.36
Getting vaccinated against Covid-19 is unsafe because of the potential side-effects	3.48	3.39	2.51 <sup>a,b</sup>	2.82
<u>Complacency:</u>				
I think Covid-19 is a hoax	2.38	1.95	1.57 <sup>a,b</sup>	2.18
Fears about Covid-19 are exaggerated	3.83	2.73 <sup>a</sup>	2.15 <sup>a,b</sup>	3.36 <sup>c</sup>
Covid-19 is no worse than the seasonal flu	3.10	2.47 <sup>a</sup>	1.99 <sup>a,b</sup>	2.18
<u>Constraints:</u>				
Getting vaccinated against Covid-19 is just not practical	2.98	2.27	2.14 <sup>a,b</sup>	2.73
Getting vaccinated against Covid-19 isn't worthwhile if you are only protected for a few months	3.77	3.43	2.71 <sup>a,b</sup>	3.18
Getting vaccinated against Covid-19 is a waste of time and effort	3.10	2.81	1.99 <sup>a,b</sup>	2.64

486 Notes: Agreement with a statement was rated on a five-point scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

487 Differences in mean agreement ratings between segments tested using Tukey's HSD [43], ( $P < 0.01$ ).

488 <sup>a</sup> Mean agreement rating significantly different from mean for quadrant 1.

489 <sup>b</sup> Mean agreement rating significantly different from mean for quadrant 2.

490 <sup>c</sup> Mean agreement rating significantly different from mean for quadrant 3.

491

492 **Table 8. I<sub>3</sub> vaccine classification, calculation, and collective responsibility**

	Quadrant 1	Quadrant 2	Quadrant 3	Quadrant 4
<u>Calculation:</u>				
Respondents who did not watch, read, or listen for news about Covid-19 on traditional media (%) <sup>a</sup>	33.3	20.3	10.2	27.3
Respondents who did not watch, read, or listen for news about Covid-19 on social media (%) <sup>b</sup>	70.8	51.4	50.3	54.5
Respondents who did not chat about Covid-19 with family, friends, or co-workers in the past week (%) <sup>c</sup>	45.8	31.1	22.1	45.5
Number of modes of traditional media (e.g., television, radio, magazines) viewed	0.88	1.27	1.53 <sup>d</sup>	1.09
Number of social media sources (e.g., Facebook, Instagram) viewed	0.37	0.72	0.85 <sup>d</sup>	0.64
<u>Collective responsibility:</u>				
We need to eliminate Covid-19 from New Zealand to save lives	2.54	3.89	4.22 <sup>d,e</sup>	2.55 <sup>e,f</sup>
We should just live with Covid-19 until we have a vaccine	3.42	2.74 <sup>d</sup>	2.53 <sup>d</sup>	3.36
It would be better to let Covid-19 spread and build herd immunity	3.54	2.43 <sup>d</sup>	1.99 <sup>d,e</sup>	3.09 <sup>f</sup>
You should only have to get vaccinated if you are old or have a health problem	2.79	2.53	2.18 <sup>d,e</sup>	2.45

493 Notes: Agreement with a statement was rated on a five-point scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

494 Differences in mean agreement ratings between segments tested using Tukey's HSD [43], ( $P < 0.01$ ).

495 <sup>a</sup> Test for differences in percentages across quadrants ( $\chi^2 = 29.8, P < 0.01$ ).

496 <sup>b</sup> Test for differences in percentages across quadrants ( $\chi^2 = 7.7, P < 0.05$ ).

497 <sup>c</sup> Test for differences in percentages across quadrants ( $\chi^2 = 19.0, P < 0.01$ ).

498 <sup>d</sup> Mean agreement rating significantly different from mean for quadrant 1.

499 <sup>e</sup> Mean agreement rating significantly different from mean for quadrant 2.

500 <sup>f</sup> Mean agreement rating significantly different from mean for quadrant 3.

- 501       • to consult fewer traditional and social media (calculation); and
- 502       • less sure that healthier and younger people needed to be vaccinated (collective
- 503       responsibility)

504

## 505 **Belief segments**

506 Respondents' beliefs were investigated because they can provide insights to guide the design

507 of policies that, by modifying the beliefs and attitudes that underlie compliance, seek to

508 influence compliance. Using respondent agreement ratings for the relevant set of belief

509 statements, respondents were classified into belief segments with respect to the nature of

510 Covid-19, and the advantages and disadvantages of Covid-19 vaccines.

511

512 Respondents were classified into segments using Ward's method, with squared Euclidean

513 distance as the measure of dissimilarity [38]. The number of segments was chosen based on

514 the relative change in fusion coefficients, ease of interpreting the segments, and a desire to

515 keep the number of segments as small as possible [38]. The segments, and their belief

516 characteristics, are summarised below.

517

518 Beliefs about Covid-19, eliminating Covid-19, and getting vaccinated for Covid-19 were

519 associated, to some extent, with demographic characteristics such as age, education, income,

520 and ethnicity (see [41] for details).

521

## 522 **Belief segments for Covid-19**

523 Respondents were classified into five belief segments with respect to Covid-19 (Appendix B:

524 Table B1). Most respondents had beliefs that align with accepted scientific facts. These



525 respondents were classified as ‘Covid-19 convinced’ (37%) and ‘Covid-19 moderates’  
526 (40%), the difference between these two segments being the intensity of their beliefs. The  
527 ‘Covid-19 asymptomatics’ (9%) had beliefs that mostly align with accepted scientific facts,  
528 but these respondents either disagreed that Covid-19 was spread by people coughing and  
529 sneezing or by contact with surfaces touched by infected people. This may reflect an  
530 awareness that Covid-19 can be transmitted by people with Covid-19 who are asymptomatic,  
531 and an awareness that the likelihood of infection by contact with contaminated surfaces is  
532 low.<sup>3</sup> A fourth segment, the ‘Covid-19 ambivalents’ (12%), consisted of respondents who  
533 were unsure about what to believe about Covid-19. A small segment of respondents, the  
534 ‘Covid-19 sceptics’ (6%), believed that Covid-19 is a hoax, is no worse than the seasonal flu,  
535 and fears about Covid-19 are exaggerated.

536

### 537 **Belief segments for eliminating Covid-19**

538 Respondents were classified into four belief segments with respect to eliminating Covid-19  
539 (Appendix B: Table B2). Most respondents have beliefs that align with seeking to eliminate  
540 Covid-19 from New Zealand. These respondents were classified as ‘elimination enthusiasts’  
541 (26%) and ‘elimination moderates’ (18%), the difference between these two segments being  
542 the intensity of their beliefs. Another segment of respondents, the ‘vaccination hopefuls’  
543 (34%), agreed with trying to eliminate Covid-19 but were less sure that Covid-19 could be  
544 kept out of New Zealand indefinitely. They believe we must live with Covid-19 until a  
545 vaccine is available.<sup>4</sup> A fourth segment, the ‘elimination sceptics’ (22%), consisted of

---

<sup>3</sup> Bearing in mind the survey was conducted before the widespread emergence of the delta variant of Covid-19.

<sup>4</sup> We did not define what the characteristics of a vaccine, once available, would be.

546 respondents who believe we cannot eliminate Covid-19 indefinitely and we should try to  
547 build herd immunity.

548

### 549 **Belief segments for Covid-19 vaccination**

550 Respondents were classified into five belief segments with respect to being vaccinated  
551 against Covid-19 (Appendix B: Table B3). Approximately half the sample was classified as  
552 ‘vaccine enthusiasts’ (24%) and ‘vaccine moderates’ (33%), the difference between these two  
553 segments being the intensity of their beliefs. These respondents believe you will recover  
554 faster from Covid-19, and have weaker symptoms, if you are vaccinated. They are unsure  
555 whether being vaccinated stops you catching or spreading Covid-19 or gives you lifelong  
556 protection. They believe everyone should be vaccinated, and it should be compulsory and  
557 free. They do not believe Covid-19 vaccines are unsafe or that vaccinations should wait until  
558 experience overseas demonstrates that they work.

559

560 A third segment of respondents, the ‘vaccination cautious’ (7%), fundamentally favour being  
561 vaccinated but are concerned about side-effects. These respondents believe vaccination offers  
562 lifelong protection from contracting Covid-19, weakens symptoms, aids recovery, and  
563 prevents transmission. However, it appears they believe vaccination should be limited at  
564 present to those who are at risk (the elderly and people with health problems), that children  
565 should not be vaccinated, and that vaccination should be free and compulsory once vaccines  
566 have been shown to be safe. This is because they believe that, at present, Covid-19 vaccines  
567 are unsafe, not enough is known about them, and vaccinations should wait until experience  
568 overseas demonstrates they work.

569

570 Another segment of respondents, the ‘vaccination ambivalent’ (28%), are fundamentally  
571 unsure whether vaccination offers protection from contracting Covid-19, weakens symptoms  
572 or aids recovery. They are unsure who should be vaccinated and whether vaccination should  
573 be compulsory, though they believe it should be free. They are unsure if Covid-19 vaccines  
574 are safe or whether vaccinations should wait until experience overseas demonstrates they  
575 work.

576

577 The fifth segment consisted of the ‘vaccination sceptics’ (8%), who were not convinced  
578 vaccinations are beneficial. These respondents do not believe you would recover faster from  
579 Covid-19, or have weaker symptoms, if you were vaccinated. They do not believe being  
580 vaccinated stops you catching or spreading Covid-19 or gives you lifelong protection.  
581 Consequently, they think vaccinations are a waste of time and effort and should not be  
582 compulsory. They believe that children should not be vaccinated, which is consistent with  
583 believing that Covid-19 vaccines are unsafe and too little is known about them. They believe  
584 vaccinations should wait until experience overseas demonstrates they work.

585

### 586 **Vaccine belief segments and being vaccinated**

587 The respondents in the ‘vaccine enthusiasts’ and ‘vaccine moderates’ segments had a strongly  
588 favourable attitude towards being vaccinated (Appendix B: Table B4). They were willing to  
589 be vaccinated, and as quickly as possible once a vaccine is available (Appendix B: Tables B5  
590 and B6). They were also willing to be vaccinated even if vaccination only offers protection  
591 for a few months (Appendix B: Table B7).

592

593 When compared to the ‘vaccination enthusiasts’ and the ‘vaccination moderates’, a lower  
594 proportion of respondents in the ‘vaccine cautious’ segment had a strongly favourable

595 attitude towards being vaccinated. Those in this segment who did think being vaccinated is  
596 the right thing to do were likely to be vaccinated as quickly as possible once a vaccine  
597 (presumably one that is proven to be safe) is available. They are willing to be vaccinated even  
598 if vaccination only offers protection for a few months.

599

600 Most respondents in the 'vaccine ambivalent' segment are unsure about their attitude towards  
601 being vaccinated. As a result, they are unsure about being vaccinated, and are less likely to be  
602 vaccinated as quickly as possible once a vaccine is available. They are unwilling to be  
603 vaccinated if vaccination only offers protection for a few months.

604

605 Lastly, the respondents in the 'vaccine sceptics' segment had a strongly unfavourable attitude  
606 towards being vaccinated. Most were unwilling to be vaccinated, and those in this segment  
607 who would consider it would delay being vaccinated once a vaccine was available. They  
608 were generally unwilling to be vaccinated if the vaccine only offered protection for a few  
609 months.

610

611 A relatively high proportion of respondents in the 'vaccine cautious' and 'vaccine sceptics'  
612 segments reported having had a bad experience with vaccinations in the past and knowing  
613 someone else who had had a bad experience with vaccinations (Appendix B: Tables B8 and  
614 B9).

615

## 616 **Involvement, beliefs, attitudes, and willingness to be vaccinated**

617 The purpose of this analysis was to quantify the effect of beliefs, attitudes, and involvement  
618 on respondents' propensity to be vaccinated for Covid-19. In other words, we wanted to  
619 estimate, separately, the influence of involvement (as a measure of the strength of

620 individuals' motivation) and the influence of beliefs and attitudes on willingness to be  
621 vaccinated in the context of Covid-19 in New Zealand.

622

623 Following Kaine et al. [13] we hypothesised that:

- 624 • respondents' attitudes towards eliminating Covid-19 are a function of beliefs about  
625 Covid-19 (as these condition the merit of having a policy response to Covid-19),  
626 beliefs about the worthiness of eliminating Covid-19 as a policy outcome, and beliefs  
627 about Covid-19 vaccinations as a long-term response to Covid-19;
- 628 • respondents' feelings of responsibility, willingness to change their normal behaviour,  
629 work with others and make sacrifices to eliminate Covid-19 are a function of their  
630 involvement with, and attitude towards, eliminating Covid-19, and their beliefs about  
631 Covid-19;
- 632 • respondents' attitudes towards being vaccinated for Covid-19 are a function of beliefs  
633 about Covid-19 and beliefs about Covid-19 vaccinations;
- 634 • the intensity of respondents' attitudes towards being vaccinated is a function of  
635 involvement with being vaccinated and beliefs about Covid-19;
- 636 • respondents' involvement with being vaccinated is a function of their involvement  
637 with eliminating Covid-19 and their beliefs about Covid-19;
- 638 • the willingness of respondents to act in support of eliminating Covid-19 from New  
639 Zealand is a function of involvement with, and attitude towards, being vaccinated  
640 (and beliefs about Covid-19);
- 641 • the willingness of respondents to be vaccinated for Covid-19 is a function of  
642 involvement with, and attitude towards, being vaccinated (and beliefs about Covid-  
643 19).

644 Respondents' propensity to be vaccinated was obtained by asking them, 'Once a vaccine for  
645 Covid-19 is available, will you get vaccinated?' Respondents answered the question using a  
646 five-point scale ranging from 'definitely' to 'definitely not'. They were also asked 'Once a  
647 vaccine is available would you get vaccinated as soon as you could?' and 'Would you get  
648 vaccinated if the vaccine only offered protection for a few months? Both questions were  
649 answered as 'yes', 'no' or 'not sure', which were coded as binary variables (1 = yes, 2 = no  
650 or not sure) for the regression analysis.

651

652 Attitude toward eliminating Covid-19 as a strategy was measured as agreement with the  
653 statement 'Eliminating Covid-19 from New Zealand is the right thing to do' using a five-  
654 point scale from 'strongly disagree' (1) to 'strongly agree' (5). Feelings of responsibility,  
655 willingness to change normal behaviour, willingness to work with others, and willingness to  
656 make sacrifices to eliminate Covid-19 were measured as agreement with the relevant  
657 statement (see Table 11) using a five-point scale from 'strongly disagree' (1) to 'strongly  
658 agree' (5).

659

660 Attitude towards being vaccinated was measured by respondents' average score on the four-  
661 item attitudinal scale (see S1). Respondents' agreement with the statements in the attitudinal  
662 scale was rated using a five-point scale from 'strongly disagree' (1) to 'strongly agree' (5).

663 The intensity or strength of attitudes was measured as the absolute value of respondents'  
664 attitude score after subtracting three (3), as this score signified 'unsure' in the rating scale for  
665 attitudes.

666

667 Dummy variables were created representing respondents' membership of belief segments  
668 with respect to Covid-19, eliminating Covid-19, and getting vaccinated. In each instance, the  
669 relevant 'sceptics' segment was treated as the benchmark.

670

671 The explanatory power of the regressions, and the resulting parameter estimates, are reported  
672 in Tables 9, 10, 11, and 12. The attitudinal regressions were statistically significant and, for  
673 cross-sectional data, a substantial proportion of the variance in the attitudes of respondents  
674 was explained by their beliefs. In all instances the signs on the estimated parameters were  
675 consistent with expectations, with attitudes becoming more and more unfavourable as  
676 respondents' beliefs shifted towards scepticism, as has been found in other studies [6, 8, 44,  
677 45].

678

679 Respondents' attitude towards eliminating Covid-19 was strongly influenced by beliefs about  
680 the effectiveness of an elimination strategy and confidence in vaccination (Table 9).

681 Respondents with ambivalent beliefs about vaccination (the 'vaccine cautious') were even  
682 more favourably disposed towards elimination than respondents who were more enthusiastic  
683 about vaccination, perhaps because elimination might reduce the necessity for vaccination.

684 Beliefs about Covid-19 did not appear to influence attitudes towards elimination except that  
685 respondents with ambivalent beliefs about Covid-19 had a less favourable attitude towards  
686 elimination than respondents with other beliefs about Covid-19.

687

688 Respondents' attitude towards being vaccinated for Covid-19 was strongly influenced by  
689 beliefs about Covid-19 and beliefs about vaccination (Table 9). Respondents expressed  
690 increasingly unfavourable attitudes towards being vaccinated the more sceptical their beliefs  
691 about Covid-19 and the more ambivalent their beliefs about vaccination.

692

693 **Table 9. Parameter estimates for attitudes towards eliminating Covid-19 and Covid-19**  
 694 **vaccination**

Variable	Attitude towards eliminating Covid-19 (n = 1002)	Attitude towards getting vaccinated (n = 1002)
Covid-19 confident	0.199 ( <i>P</i> = 0.138)	0.457 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Covid-19 moderate	-0.015 ( <i>P</i> = 0.108)	0.364 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Covid-19 ambivalent	-0.486 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.053 ( <i>P</i> = 0.610)
Covid-19 asymptomatic	-0.221 ( <i>P</i> = 0.150)	0.406 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Elimination enthusiast	0.763 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)	
Elimination moderate	0.290 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)	
Elimination hopeful	0.530 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)	
Vaccination enthusiast	0.473 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)	2.504 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Vaccination moderate	0.354 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)	2.037 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Vaccination cautious	0.773 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)	1.461 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Vaccination ambivalent	0.286 ( <i>P</i> = 0.001)	1.101 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Intercept	3.467 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)	1.996 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.31	0.68
F-test significance	<0.001	<0.001

695

696

697



698 The regressions for intensity or strength of attitudes were statistically significant. A  
699 reasonable proportion of the variance in attitude strength of respondents was explained by  
700 their beliefs about Covid-19, their involvement with eliminating Covid-19, and their  
701 involvement with being vaccinated (Table 10). With respect to feelings of responsibility,  
702 willingness to change normal behaviour, willingness to work with others, and willingness to  
703 make sacrifices to eliminate Covid-19, involvement with, as well as attitude towards,  
704 elimination were significant in each regression, as were beliefs about Covid-19 (see Table  
705 11).

706

707 As hypothesised, variations in respondents' involvement with being vaccinated depended on  
708 their involvement with eliminating Covid-19 and their beliefs about Covid-19 (Table 12).

709 While increasing scepticism about Covid-19 was associated with a more unfavourable  
710 attitude towards being vaccinated (Table 9), increasing scepticism about Covid-19 was  
711 associated with higher involvement with being vaccinated (Table 12). The greater  
712 involvement with vaccination associated with increasing scepticism reflects, perhaps,  
713 decreasing confidence in the benefits of vaccination, which translates into higher risk and  
714 consequence involvement, therefore higher overall involvement with Covid-19 vaccination as  
715 scepticism increases.<sup>5</sup>

716

717

---

<sup>5</sup> Mean consequence and risk involvement were statistically significantly higher ( $P < 0.01$ ) for respondents in the 'covid sceptics' segment compared to respondents in other segments.

718 **Table 10. Parameter estimates for strength of attitudes towards eliminating Covid-19 and Covid-**  
 719 **19 vaccination**

Variable	Strength of attitude towards eliminating Covid-19 (n = 1002)	Strength of attitude towards getting vaccinated (n = 1002)
Covid-19 confident	0.389 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)	2.303 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Covid-19 moderate	0.123 ( <i>P</i> = 0.106)	1.460 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Covid-19 ambivalent	0.017 ( <i>P</i> = 0.846)	0.958 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Covid-19 asymptomatic	0.154 ( <i>P</i> = 0.150)	1.831 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Elimination involvement	0.465 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)	
Vaccination involvement		0.681 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Intercept	-0.657 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)	-.071 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.29	0.21
F-test significance	<0.001	<0.001

720

721

722

723

724 **Table 11. Parameter estimates for sense of responsibility, willingness to change behaviour, willingness to make sacrifices, and willingness to work with**  
 725 **others to eliminate Covid-19**

Variable	I feel some responsibility for eliminating Covid-19 from New Zealand	I am prepared to change my normal behaviour to eliminate Covid-19 from New Zealand	I am prepared to make sacrifices to eliminate Covid-19 from New Zealand	It is important to work together to eliminate Covid-19 from New Zealand
Covid-19 confident	0.092 ( <i>P</i> = 0.330)	0.410 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.148 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.550 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Covid-19 moderate	-0.052 ( <i>P</i> = 0.579)	0.244 ( <i>P</i> = 0.002)	0.005 ( <i>P</i> = 0.947)	0.377 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Covid-19 ambivalent	-0.271 ( <i>P</i> = 0.014)	-0.009 ( <i>P</i> = 0.924)	-0.232 ( <i>P</i> = 0.013)	0.158 ( <i>P</i> = 0.050)
Covid-19 asymptomatic	-0.177 ( <i>P</i> = 0.176)	0.227 ( <i>P</i> = 0.043)	0.155 ( <i>P</i> = 0.161)	0.267 ( <i>P</i> = 0.013)
Elimination involvement	0.545 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.517 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.535 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.281 ( <i>P</i> = 0.003)
Elimination attitude	0.310 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.354 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.368 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.406 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Intercept	0.571 ( <i>P</i> = 0.002)	0.373 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)	0.442 ( <i>P</i> = 0.005)	0.843 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.43	0.53	0.54	0.57
F-test significance	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

726

727 **Table 12. Parameter estimates for involvement with Covid-19 vaccination**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Involvement with getting vaccinated (n = 1002)</b>
Covid-19 confident	-0.450 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Covid-19 moderate	-0.442 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Covid-19 ambivalent	-0.488 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Covid-19 asymptomatic	-0.431 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Elimination involvement	0.653 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Intercept	1.404 ( <i>P</i> < 0.001)
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.47
F-test significance	<0.001

728

729

730 The regressions concerning willingness to be vaccinated were also statistically significant  
731 (Table 13). They show that involvement with being vaccinated, in addition to attitude  
732 towards being vaccinated, explains a substantial proportion of the variance in respondents'  
733 willingness to be vaccinated. Respondents' desire to be vaccinated as quickly as possible  
734 once vaccines are available depended on their beliefs about Covid-19 as well as their  
735 involvement with, and attitude towards, being vaccinated. Similarly, willingness to be  
736 vaccinated, even though the effect might be temporary, was influenced by beliefs about  
737 Covid-19 as well as involvement with, and attitude towards, being vaccinated.

738

739

740

741 **Table 13. Parameter estimates for willingness to be vaccinated for Covid-19**

Variable	Willingness to be vaccinated (n = 1002)	Wanting to be vaccinated as quickly as possible <sup>a</sup> (n = 874) <sup>b</sup>	Willing to be vaccinated even if benefits are temporary <sup>a</sup> (n = 767) <sup>c</sup>
Covid-19 confident		2.733 (P<0.001)	2.733 (P<0.001)
Covid-19 moderate		2.322 (p<0.001)	2.680 (p<0.001)
Covid-19 ambivalent		1.856 (p<0.001)	2.217 (p<0.001)
Covid-19 asymptomatic		1.810 (P=0.010)	1.810 (P=0.006)
Involvement with being vaccinated	0.287 (p<0.001)	0.534 (p=0.010)	0.579 (p=0.003)
Attitude towards being vaccinated	0.950 (p<0.001)	2.120 (p<0.001)	1.415 (p<0.001)
Intercept	4.715 (p<0.001)	-16.298 (p<0.001)	-14.762 (p<0.001)
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.70	0.44 <sup>d</sup>	0.29 <sup>d</sup>
F-test significance	<0.001	<0.01	<0.01

- 742 Notes: Involvement scored as a rating from 1 to 5 (low to high involvement).  
 743 Attitude scored as a rating from 1 to 5 (unfavourable to favourable).  
 744 Willingness to be vaccinated scored as a rating from 1 to 5 (always to never).  
 745 Willing to be vaccinated as quickly as possible scored as a binary (1 = yes, 0 = no or not sure).  
 746 Willing to be vaccinated even if protection is temporary scored as a binary (1 = yes, 0 = no or not sure).  
 747 <sup>a</sup> Estimated as binary logistic regressions.  
 748 <sup>b</sup> Respondents who indicated they probably or definitely would not get vaccinated did not answer this  
 749 question  
 750 <sup>c</sup> Respondents who indicated they probably or definitely would not get vaccinated, or who indicated they  
 751 would delay getting vaccinated, did not answer this question.  
 752 <sup>d</sup> Nagelkerke R Square.  
 753  
 754

755

## 756 **Discussion**

757 Our results clearly indicate that involvement with eliminating Covid-19, as well as beliefs  
758 about Covid-19, significantly influence feelings of responsibility, willingness to change  
759 normal behaviour, willingness to work with others, and willingness to make sacrifices to  
760 eliminate Covid-19. Our results show that involvement, a measure of motivational strength,  
761 contributes significantly to predictions of people's willingness to be vaccinated as well as  
762 their attitude towards being vaccinated. Also, our results show that involvement contributes  
763 significantly to predictions of the strength of people's attitude towards being vaccinated. The  
764 simple but important conclusion that follows from these results is that people may hold  
765 similar opinions or attitudes towards a protocol such as being vaccinated, but their propensity  
766 to do so may vary markedly depending on how involved they are with – how strongly they  
767 care about – preventing the spread of Covid-19 and getting vaccinated.

768

769 This conclusion has important implications for promoting community participation in mass  
770 vaccination programmes for Covid-19 to overcome the five components of vaccine hesitancy:  
771 confidence, complacency, constraints, calculation, and collective responsibility [6]. The first  
772 is related to the possibility that people may fail to comply with a measure even though they  
773 may have favourable attitudes towards the policy outcome, simply because they are not  
774 paying attention. In circumstances where involvement is low, compliance (or non-  
775 compliance) is not a matter of deliberate choice. This means people who have low  
776 involvement with eliminating Covid-19 and with being vaccinated (quadrant 1) may fail to be  
777 vaccinated simply because it is inconvenient, not because they may have an unfavourable  
778 attitude towards being vaccinated. In terms of the 5C model, they are constrained.

779

780 Maximising vaccinations among people with low involvement requires ensuring that getting  
781 vaccinated requires as little effort and thought as is practical, and the experience is as stress-  
782 free as possible [46]. This means offering vaccinations at as many sites as possible, and at  
783 venues that are routinely visited such as shopping malls, churches, fast food outlets,  
784 workplaces, and sporting facilities. The aim is to minimise time spent travelling and queuing,  
785 and to create opportunities to be vaccinated on impulse. People with low involvement are  
786 likely to respond favourably to relatively small financial incentives if the process of being  
787 vaccinated is convenient and quick.

788

789 Relatedly, authorities should carefully consider the imposition of blanket penalties for non-  
790 compliance because they run the risk of incidentally alienating people with low involvement.  
791 For example, mandating workplace vaccinations for Covid-19 or the wearing of full personal  
792 protection equipment by the unvaccinated may generate resentment, and possibly resistance,  
793 among those with low involvement (quadrant 1) irrespective of their attitude, albeit weak,  
794 towards Covid-19. Ensuring vaccinations can be obtained quickly and conveniently would be  
795 essential to alleviating feelings of resentment among those with low involvement.

796

797 In circumstances where involvement is high, compliance (or non-compliance) is most likely  
798 to be a deliberate choice, depending on one's attitude. With respect to being vaccinated for  
799 Covid-19, if attitudes towards vaccination are strongly unfavourable, then severe penalties or  
800 substantial inducements may be required to secure compliance. For example, in the  
801 workplace this may mean compelling staff either to be vaccinated or to wear full personal  
802 protection and submit to a rigorous testing regime; and similarly, requiring international



803 travellers to self-isolate in quarantine for a lengthy period (at their cost) if they are  
804 unvaccinated.

805

806 In relation to people with an unfavourable attitude towards being vaccinated, it is important  
807 to distinguish people who have high involvement with being vaccinated and with eliminating  
808 Covid-19 (quadrant 3) from people who have high involvement with being vaccinated but  
809 low involvement with eliminating Covid-19 (quadrant 4). In terms of the 5C model, the  
810 former (quadrant 3) may be encouraged to seek vaccination using promotional messages  
811 aimed at reducing their complacency, building their confidence in Covid-19 vaccines, and  
812 appealing to their sense of collective responsibility. The latter (quadrant 4) are unlikely to  
813 respond favourably to such promotional messages because they have little interest in  
814 preventing the spread of Covid-19. Consequently, they are unlikely to respond to an appeal to  
815 their sense of collective responsibility.

816

817 Theoretically, people who have high involvement with being vaccinated but low involvement  
818 with eliminating Covid-19, and an unfavourable attitude towards being vaccinated (quadrant  
819 4), are likely to be most confrontational in their opposition to being vaccinated. As they have  
820 little, if any, interest in the policy outcome of eliminating Covid-19, there is no justification,  
821 in their view, for forcing them to be vaccinated. Clearly, differences in the level of  
822 involvement people have with the outcome of eliminating Covid-19 and with being  
823 vaccinated to prevent the spread of Covid-19 create an additional complication for  
824 authorities.

825

826 Another implication concerns the possibility that people who have low involvement with the  
827 policy outcome and the policy measures may miss important promotional messages simply

828 because they are not paying attention. In circumstances where involvement with a subject is  
829 low, exposure and sensitivity to promotional messages about the subject is low. Messages are  
830 not necessarily deliberately ignored; they simply fail to catch the attention of those with low  
831 involvement (they are just not noticed). This means, in circumstances where involvement is  
832 low, promotional efforts intended to increase the rate of vaccinations are unlikely to succeed  
833 because these efforts will, largely, be ignored. The lack of interest in eliminating Covid-19  
834 and in being vaccinated (quadrant 1) means those with low-to-mild involvement will, from a  
835 5C model perspective, not be attentive to promotional messages intended to build their  
836 confidence in vaccines, lessen their complacency, encourage them to greater calculation, or  
837 engender a sense of collective responsibility.

838

839 The attention of people with low involvement in a subject can be captured if messages about  
840 the subject can be linked to another matter that is involving for them. This requires  
841 identifying, for those not interested in Covid-19, themes that are involving for them and that  
842 can be meaningfully linked to containing the spread of Covid-19. Examples include framing  
843 messages about being vaccinated for Covid-19 in the context of protecting families and jobs,  
844 avoiding lockdowns, and being able to travel freely overseas [42].

845

846 A further implication concerns the intrinsic malleability of the beliefs and attitudes of people  
847 who have low involvement with a subject. Such people devote little time and effort to  
848 gathering information about the subject, evaluating that information, and forming beliefs  
849 about and attitudes towards the subject. Their search for information is particularly limited.<sup>6</sup>  
850 This means their beliefs and attitudes may be unstable and can change rapidly.

851

---

<sup>6</sup> Calculation in the 5C model.

852 With respect to preventing the spread of Covid-19, this raises the possibility that, on the one  
853 hand, the distribution of misinformation about Covid-19 vaccinations through social media  
854 may provoke changes in the beliefs and attitudes of people with low involvement in Covid-19  
855 that are undesirable because they undermine willingness to be vaccinated [12, 47, 48]. Such  
856 misinformation may provide a self-serving rationale for failing to seek vaccination should  
857 that require an investment of time and effort. On the other hand, people with low involvement  
858 are unlikely to strongly endorse misinformation (unless it is framed within a context they find  
859 highly involving) and so are unlikely to be provoked into engaging in non-compliant  
860 behaviours that require an investment of time and effort (such as attending protest rallies).  
861 However, in the context of vaccinating for infectious diseases like Covid-19, even inaction  
862 (failing to be vaccinated) can be damaging to the community.

863

864 The last implication we will consider concerns the intrinsic fixedness of the attitudes of  
865 people who have high involvement with a subject once their attitudes are established. In  
866 principle, these people have devoted substantial time and effort to gathering information  
867 about the subject, evaluating that information, and then forming beliefs about and,  
868 subsequently, formulating an attitude towards the subject. In other words, they have engaged  
869 in an extensive search for information.<sup>7</sup> Consequently, their attitudes are stable and resistant  
870 to change. These people may well engage in motivated reasoning [10, 11, 12]. Hence, those  
871 who have high involvement with, and a favourable attitude towards, being vaccinated will  
872 resist misinformation about Covid-19. Those who have high involvement with, but an  
873 unfavourable attitude towards, being vaccinated will be more likely to embrace  
874 misinformation.

875

---

<sup>7</sup> Calculation in the 5C model.

876 People with high involvement who are ambivalent about vaccination may be influenced by  
877 misinformation. However, these people are not uninformed. From a 5C model perspective,  
878 their ambivalence is likely to be a product of tension between the threat of infection  
879 (complacency) and fears about the safety of vaccines (confidence). Consequently, they will  
880 probably be responsive to promotional messages reminding them of the dangers posed by  
881 Covid-19 (complacency) while reassuring them about the safety of vaccines (confidence) and  
882 appealing to their sense of collective responsibility. The emergence of more dangerous  
883 variants of Covid-19 such as delta is likely to increase the receptivity of people in this  
884 quadrant to messaging and diminish their hesitancy.<sup>8</sup> These considerations suggest that  
885 government authorities must be careful to discriminate between audiences on social media in  
886 terms of involvement when it comes to investing resources in combating misinformation  
887 about Covid-19.

888

889 The willingness of people to adopt behaviours such as being vaccinated for infectious  
890 diseases like Covid-19 has been the subject of numerous studies [1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8]. These  
891 studies have shown that willingness to be vaccinated does depend on people's attitudes,  
892 which in turn depend on their beliefs about the advantages and disadvantages of vaccinations.  
893 Consequently, many of these studies recommend that the adoption of preventive behaviours  
894 can be improved through promotional efforts intended to change beliefs and attitudes. Our  
895 results have two important implications for such recommendations.

896

897 First, while it is undoubtedly true that changing attitudes can change behaviour, promotional  
898 efforts intended to change beliefs and attitudes about vaccination are unlikely to meet with  
899 complete success unless most people have moderate-to-high involvement both with

---

<sup>8</sup> <https://melbourneinstitute.unimelb.edu.au/publications/research-insights/ttfn/vaccination-report>.

900 preventing the spread of Covid-19 and with being vaccinated. Fortunately, this is the case in  
901 New Zealand.

902

903 Second, the greater the proportion of people with low-to-mild involvement with preventing  
904 the spread of Covid-19 and with getting vaccinated, the more likely efforts to improve the  
905 ease and convenience of getting vaccinated will be effective in changing behaviour compared  
906 to promotional efforts aimed at doing so by changing people's beliefs and attitudes.

907

908 Our findings are subject to several qualifications. First, beliefs, attitudes, and behaviours  
909 regarding preventing the spread of Covid-19 and getting vaccinated for Covid-19 may have  
910 changed over time with the emergence of the delta variant as the pandemic has progressed.  
911 Second, the survey sample was drawn from an internet panel, so there may be selection bias.  
912 While the nature and severity of this bias in relation to the beliefs, attitudes, and involvement  
913 we investigated is unknown, it does seem reasonable to suppose, *ceteris paribus*, that people  
914 with low-to-mild involvement may be under-represented in the sample. If so, this would  
915 reinforce the importance of our cautions with respect to choosing actions to increase the  
916 uptake of vaccination.

917

918 Third, as the scales measuring willingness to be vaccinated for Covid-19 were self-reported,  
919 our measurements may have been affected by social desirability bias [37], though the degree  
920 of bias is likely to be small given that vaccination hesitancy is a widespread phenomenon,  
921 which implies it has a degree of social acceptability. Also, the deliberate, non-leading design  
922 of our questionnaire, by offering various degrees of compliance with relevant social norms,  
923 may be less likely to trigger guilt about breaching them. (Further work will clarify the impact  
924 of the bias on the I<sub>3</sub> Framework.)

925

926 Fourth, the adoption of behaviours such as being vaccinated has been associated with a range  
927 of variables, including those relating to complacency, such as the perceived risk of infection,  
928 the local incidence rate of Covid-19, and feelings of stress in relation to Covid-19 (see [46]  
929 for example). We did not include these variables in our analysis, and, while the correlation  
930 between these variables and involvement is unknown, it is likely to be positive.

931

## 932 **Conclusions**

933 Governments around the world are seeking to slow the spread of Covid-19 by implementing  
934 mass vaccination programmes. The success of these programmes depends on the commitment  
935 of individuals to respond and participate. Hence, understanding and predicting the motivation  
936 of individuals to participate is critical for designing measures to maximise participation and  
937 ensure the effectiveness of these measures in slowing the spread of the virus.

938

939 Kaine et al. [13] hypothesised that the propensity of individuals to change their behaviour and  
940 comply with policy measures depends on the intensity of their involvement with, and their  
941 attitude towards, the measure. This is because cognitive effort is required to form a strongly  
942 held attitude, and such effort is only invested when the matter at hand is sufficiently  
943 important to the individual. They also hypothesised that the propensity of individuals to  
944 comply with policy measures also depends on their involvement with the policy outcome the  
945 measure addresses. An implication of these hypotheses is that individuals with similar  
946 attitudes will display varying degrees of compliance with policy measures depending on the  
947 intensity of their involvement with the policy outcome and the policy measure.

948

949 We tested these hypotheses, and their implications, with respect to public willingness to be  
950 vaccinated to prevent the spread of Covid-19 in New Zealand. Broadly speaking, the  
951 hypotheses and their implications were supported by the results. The finding that willingness  
952 to be vaccinated depends on involvement (motivation) as well as attitude has important  
953 implications for the design of policy measures intended to promote high vaccination rates.  
954 This finding also has important implications for the design of promotional programmes  
955 intended to encourage the participation of the community in mass vaccination programmes.  
956

957 With respect to preventing the spread of Covid-19 in New Zealand, the results highlight the  
958 importance of distinguishing between those with a lack of interest in getting vaccinated from  
959 those who strongly oppose vaccination, and therefore deliberately choose not to be  
960 vaccinated, and tailoring incentive and enforcement strategies appropriately. The results also  
961 highlight the difficulty of communicating effectively through mass media with those who  
962 have low involvement with preventing the spread of Covid-19, and the importance of  
963 distinguishing between those with low and high involvement in considering the possible  
964 effects on vaccination beliefs, and rates, of the dissemination of misinformation about Covid-  
965 19 through social media.  
966

## 967 **Acknowledgements**

968 We would sincerely like to thank the panellists throughout New Zealand who completed the  
969 questionnaire. Thanks also to our two anonymous referees for their constructive advice and  
970 suggestions.

971

## 972 **References**

- 973 1. Larson HJ, Jarrett C, Eckersberger E, Smith DMD, Paterson P. Understanding vaccine  
974 hesitancy around vaccines and vaccination from a global perspective: a systematic  
975 review of published literature, 2007–2012. *Vaccine*. 2014; 32(19): 2150-2159.  
976 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2014.01.081>
- 977 2. Yaqub O, Castle-Clarke S, Sevdalis N, Chataway J. Attitudes to vaccination: a critical  
978 review. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2014; 112 : 1-11. Available from:  
979 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.04.018>
- 980 3. Jarrett C, Wilson R, O’Leary M, Eckersberger E, Larson HJ. Strategies for addressing  
981 vaccine hesitancy: a systematic review. *Vaccine*. 2015; 33(34): 4180-4190. Available  
982 from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.04.040>
- 983 4. Dyda A, King C, Dey A, Leask J, Dunn AG. A systematic review of studies that measure  
984 parental vaccine attitudes and beliefs in childhood vaccination. *BMC Public Health*  
985 2020; 20: 1253. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-09327-8>
- 986 5. Betsch C, Schmid P, Heinemeier D, Korn L, Holtmann C, Böhm R. Beyond confidence:  
987 development of a measure assessing the 5C psychological antecedents of vaccination.  
988 *PLoS ONE*. 2018; 13(12): e0208601. Available from:  
989 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0208601>



- 990 6. Wismans A, Thurik R, Baptista R, DeJardin M, Janssen F, Franken I. Psychological  
991 characteristics and the mediating role of the 5C Model in explaining students' COVID-  
992 19 vaccination intention. PLoS ONE. 2021; 16(8): e0255382. Available from:  
993 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0255382>
- 994 7. Pogue K, Jensen JL, Stancil CK, Ferguson DG, Hughes SJ, Mello EJ, et al. Influences on  
995 attitudes regarding potential COVID-19 vaccination in the United States. Vaccines  
996 (Basel). 2020; 8(4): 582. doi: 10.3390/vaccines8040582.
- 997 8. Freeman D, Loe BS, Chadwick A, Vaccari C, Waite F, Rosebrock L, et al. COVID-19  
998 vaccine hesitancy in the UK: the Oxford coronavirus explanations, attitudes, and  
999 narratives survey (Oceans) II. Psychological Medicine. 2021; 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1>
- 1000 9. Huynh HP, Senger AR. A little shot of humility: intellectual humility predicts vaccination  
1001 attitudes and intention to vaccinate against COVID-19. J Appl Soc Psychol. 2021; 51:  
1002 449-460. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12747>
- 1003 10. Kunda Z. The case for motivated reasoning. Psychological Bulletin. 1990 ; 108(3) : 480-  
1004 498. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.108.3.480>
- 1005 11. Hornsey MJ, Harris EA, Fielding KS. The psychological roots of anti-vaccination  
1006 attitudes: a 24-nation investigation. Health Psychol. 2018; 37(4): 307-315. doi:  
1007 10.1037/hea0000586. Epub 2018 Feb 1. PMID: 29389158
- 1008 12. Stasiuk K, Maciuszek J, Polak M, Doliński, D. Profiles of vaccine hesitancy: the relation  
1009 between personal experience with vaccines, attitude towards mandatory vaccination,  
1010 and support for anti-vaccine arguments among vaccine hesitant individuals. Social  
1011 Psychological Bulletin. 2012; 16(2): 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.32872/spb.6525>.
- 1012 13. Kaine G, Murdoch H, Lourey R, Bewsell D. A framework for understanding individual  
1013 response to regulation. Food Policy. 2010; 35: 531-537.

- 1014 14. Kim Y. Conceptualizing health campaign strategies through the level of involvement.  
1015 Corp Commun Int J. 2003; 8: 255-267.
- 1016 15. Zaichkowsky JL, Measuring the involvement construct. J Consum Res. 1985; 12: 341-  
1017 352.
- 1018 16. Ajzen I, Fishbein M. Attitude-behaviour relations: a theoretical analysis and review of  
1019 empirical research. Psychol Bull. 1977; 84: 888-918.
- 1020 17. Kassirjian HH. Low involvement: a second look. In: Monroe KB, editor. Advances in  
1021 Consumer Research: Association for Consumer Research; 1981. pp. 31-34.
- 1022 18. Chaffee SH, Roser C. Involvement and the consistency of knowledge, attitudes, and  
1023 behaviours. Commun Res. 1986; 13: 373-399.
- 1024 19. Murdoch H, Bewsell D, Lourey R, Kaine G. Understanding people's response to  
1025 biosecurity regulation. Decision Making in Uncertain Times, 3rd National Conference  
1026 on Risk Management. The New Zealand Society for Risk Management Inc, Auckland,  
1027 2006.
- 1028 20. Petty RE, Cacioppo JT. The effects of involvement on responses to argument quantity  
1029 and quality: central and peripheral routes to persuasion. J Pers Soc Psychol. 1984; 46:  
1030 69-81.
- 1031 21. Thaler R.H, Sunstein CR. Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and  
1032 happiness. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press; 2008.
- 1033 22. Gunningham N, Grabosky P, Sinclair D. Smart regulation: Designing environmental  
1034 policy. New York: Oxford University Press; 1998.
- 1035 23. Davies A, Kaine G, Lourey R. Understanding factors leading to non-compliance with  
1036 effluent regulations by dairy farmers. Environment Waikato Technical Report 2007/37.  
1037 Hamilton: Environment Waikato; 2007.

- 1038 24. Carlough L. General deterrence of environmental violation: a peek into the mind of the  
1039 regulated public. Oregon Department of Environmental Quality; 2003. Available from:  
1040 <http://www.deq.state.or.us/programs/enforcement>.
- 1041 25. Kaine G, Tostovrsnik N. Landholders and the management of weeds: Blackberry and  
1042 serrated tussock. Service Design Research Working Paper 03-11. Tatura, Victoria:  
1043 Department of Primary Industries; 2011.
- 1044 26. Lourey R, Kaine G, Davies A, Young J. Landholder responses to incentives for wild dog  
1045 control. Service Design Research Working Paper 07-11. Tatura, Victoria: Department  
1046 of Primary Industries; 2011.
- 1047 27. Kaine G. An application of the I<sub>3</sub> framework to rat control in Hawke’s Bay. Manaaki  
1048 Whenua – Landcare Research Contract Report LC3646; Hamilton, New Zealand: 2019.
- 1049 28. Kaine G, Kirk N, Kannemeyer R, Stronge D, Wiercinski B. Predicting people’s  
1050 motivation to engage in urban possum control. Conservation. 2021; 1: 196-215.  
1051 <https://doi.org/10.3390/conservation1030016>
- 1052 29. Kaine G, Stronge D. An application of the I<sub>3</sub> framework to rat control in New Plymouth.  
1053 Manaaki Whenua – Landcare Research Contract Report LC3734; Hamilton, New  
1054 Zealand: 2020.
- 1055 30. Kaine G, Kannemeyer R, Stronge D. Using 1080 to control possums and rats: an  
1056 application of the I<sub>3</sub> framework. Manaaki Whenua – Landcare Research Contract  
1057 Report LC3747; Hamilton, New Zealand: 2020.
- 1058 31. New Zealand Government. History of the COVID-19 alert system; 2021. Available from:  
1059 <https://covid19.govt.nz/alert-system/history-of-the-covid-19-alert-system/>
- 1060 32. Travica B. Containment strategies for COVID-19 pandemic; 2020. Available from:  
1061 <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3604519> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3604519>

- 1062 33. Ministry of Health. COVID-19: Elimination strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand; 2021.  
1063 Available from: [https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/diseases-and-conditions/covid-](https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/diseases-and-conditions/covid-19-novel-coronavirus/covid-19-response-planning/covid-19-elimination-strategy-aotearoa-new-zealand)  
1064 [19-novel-coronavirus/covid-19-response-planning/covid-19-elimination-strategy-](https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/diseases-and-conditions/covid-19-novel-coronavirus/covid-19-response-planning/covid-19-elimination-strategy-aotearoa-new-zealand)  
1065 [aotearoa-new-zealand](https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/diseases-and-conditions/covid-19-novel-coronavirus/covid-19-response-planning/covid-19-elimination-strategy-aotearoa-new-zealand)
- 1066 34. Laurent G, Kapferer J.-N. Measuring consumer involvement profiles. *J Mark Res.* 1985;  
1067 22: 41-53.
- 1068 35. Kaine G. A pilot application of the I<sub>3</sub> framework to compliance behaviour in farming.  
1069 Manaaki Whenua – Landcare Research Contract Report LC3513; Hamilton, New  
1070 Zealand: 2019.
- 1071 36. Olsen SO. Strength and conflicting valence in measurement of food attitudes and  
1072 preferences. *Food Quality and Preferences.* 1999; 10: 483-494.
- 1073 37. Daoust JF, Bélanger É, Dassonneville R, Lachapelle E, Nadeau R, Becher M, et al. A  
1074 guilt-free strategy increases self-reported noncompliance with COVID-19 preventive  
1075 measures: experimental evidence from 12 countries. *PLoS ONE.* 2021; 16(4):  
1076 e0249914. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0249914>.
- 1077 38. Aldenderfer MS, Blashfield RK. Cluster analysis. Newbury Park, California: Sage; 1984.
- 1078 39. IBM Corp. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 27.0. 2020. Armonk, NY: IBM  
1079 Corporation.
- 1080 40. Carmines EG, Zeller RA. Reliability and validity assessment. Newbury Park, CA: Sage;  
1081 1979.
- 1082 41. Kaine G, Wright V. Involvement and willingness to be vaccinated against Covid-19.  
1083 Manaaki Whenua – Landcare Research Contract Report LC3958; Hamilton, New  
1084 Zealand: 2021.
- 1085 42. Wilson S. Pandemic leadership: lessons from New Zealand’s approach to COVID-19.  
1086 *Leadership.* 2020; 16: 279-293. doi:10.1177/1742715020929151

- 1087 43. Tukey J. Comparing individual means in the analysis of variance. *Biometrics*. 1949; 5(2):  
1088 99-114. doi:10.2307/3001913
- 1089 44. Allington D, Duffy B, Wessely S, Dhavan N, Rubin J. Health-protective behaviour, social  
1090 media usage, and conspiracy belief during the COVID-19 public health emergency.  
1091 *Psychological Medicine*. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S003329172000224X>
- 1092 45. Imhoff R, Lamberty P. A bioweapon or a hoax? The link between distinct conspiracy  
1093 beliefs about the Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak and pandemic behaviour;  
1094 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550620934692>
- 1095 46. Lieberoth A, Lin S-Y, Stöckli S, Han H, Kowal M, Gelpi R, et al. Stress and worry in the  
1096 2020 coronavirus pandemic: relationships to trust and compliance with preventive  
1097 measures across 48 countries in the COVIDiSTRESS global survey, 2021, *R Soc Open*  
1098 *Sci*. 2021; 8200589200589. <http://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.200589>
- 1099 47. Bridgman A, Merkley E, Loewen PJ, Owen T, Ruths D, Teichmann L, et al. The causes  
1100 and consequences of COVID-19 misperceptions: understanding the role of news and  
1101 social media. *The Harvard Kennedy School (HKS) Misinformation Review*. 2020; 1:  
1102 Special Issue on COVID-19 and Misinformation.
- 1103 48. Allington D, Duffy B, Wessely S, Dhavan N, Rubin J. Health-protective behaviour, social  
1104 media usage and conspiracy belief during the COVID-19 public health emergency.  
1105 *Psychological Medicine*. 2020; 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S003329172000224X>
- 1106 49. Ministry of Health, COVID-19 Vaccine data, (2020). [https://www.health.govt.nz/our-](https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/diseases-and-conditions/covid-19-novel-coronavirus/covid-19-data-and-statistics/covid-19-vaccine-data)  
1107 [work/diseases-and-conditions/covid-19-novel-coronavirus/covid-19-data-and-](https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/diseases-and-conditions/covid-19-novel-coronavirus/covid-19-data-and-statistics/covid-19-vaccine-data)  
1108 [statistics/covid-19-vaccine-data](https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/diseases-and-conditions/covid-19-novel-coronavirus/covid-19-data-and-statistics/covid-19-vaccine-data)
- 1109 50. Stats NZ. Estimated resident population (ERP), subnational population by ethnic group,  
1110 age, and sex, at 30 June 1996, 2001, 2006, 2013, and 2018 (2020).  
1111 <http://nzdotstat.stats.govt.nz/WBOS/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=TABLECODE7512#>

1112 51. Stats NZ. Highest qualification and ethnic group (grouped total responses) by age group  
1113 and sex, for the census usually resident population count aged 15 years and over, 2006,  
1114 2013, and 2018 Censuses (2020).

1115 [http://nzdotstat.stats.govt.nz/wbos/Index.aspx?\\_ga=2.69061078.636843804.160211775](http://nzdotstat.stats.govt.nz/wbos/Index.aspx?_ga=2.69061078.636843804.1602117753761746062.1551927941#)  
1116 [3761746062.1551927941#](http://nzdotstat.stats.govt.nz/wbos/Index.aspx?_ga=2.69061078.636843804.1602117753761746062.1551927941#)

1117 52. Stats NZ. Household income and housing-cost statistics: Year ended June 2018 (2020).

1118 <https://figure.nz/table/IWZNb5JQwzPrnOLD/download-source-dataset>

1119 53. Melbourne Institute. Vaccine Hesitancy Tracker (2020).

1120 [https://melbourneinstitute.unimelb.edu.au/publications/research-insights/ttpn/vaccination-](https://melbourneinstitute.unimelb.edu.au/publications/research-insights/ttpn/vaccination-report)  
1121 [report](https://melbourneinstitute.unimelb.edu.au/publications/research-insights/ttpn/vaccination-report)

1122

1123

1124

1125

## 1126 **Supporting information**

1127 **S1 File. Questionnaire**

1128 **S2 File. Data**

1129 **S3 File. Appendix A**

1130 **S4 File. Appendix B**

1131

