

1

2

3

4

5 The 8C model of vaccination readiness: A common framework to facilitate cross-study
6 comparisons.

7

8

9

10

11 Piers Howe^{1*}, Ferron Dearnley¹

12

13 ¹ Melbourne School of Psychological Sciences, University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

14

15 * Corresponding author

16 Email: pdhowe@unimelb.edu.au

17 **Abstract**

18 Several factors can potentially influence an individual's vaccination readiness. To facilitate
19 cross-study comparisons, it is essential that researchers use a shared framework to measure
20 these factors. This would not only help determine their relative importance across different
21 contexts but also would aid in tailoring interventions to enhance vaccine uptake.
22 Historically, five psychological antecedents of vaccination were identified: confidence,
23 complacency, constraints, calculation, and collective responsibility. This 5C scale was later
24 expanded to a 7C model by incorporating two additional components: compliance and
25 conspiracy. Building upon this framework, we propose an eighth component, certification,
26 defined as the person's self-report that, in the past, they have had to provide evidence of
27 vaccination. This component addresses a significant gap in the 7C model, as some
28 individuals reported taking the COVID-19 vaccine primarily to obtain proof of vaccination, a
29 motivation not captured by the 7C model. Our confirmatory factor analysis (N = 406) of a
30 bifactor model of US citizens' self-reported COVID-19 vaccination status showed that this
31 eighth component had good psychometric properties and the 8C model had slightly higher
32 criterion validity than the 7C model. We present the 8C model as a framework that provides
33 a richer and more complete descriptions of the factors that determine vaccination readiness
34 and encourage future studies of vaccination readiness to utilise it.

35

36 **Introduction**

37 Vaccines are the most effective intervention against a range of diseases, including COVID-
38 19. While they do have risks, these risks are outweighed by the benefits. Despite this, there
39 is growing hesitancy to be vaccinated, and this vaccine hesitancy has had substantial
40 detrimental consequences. For instance, as of April 2023, there were at least 232,000
41 deaths in the USA due to COVID-19 among unvaccinated adults that could have been
42 prevented by vaccinations (Jia et al., 2023). To put that number in perspective that is more
43 than the number of US military fatalities in World War 1, the Korean War, the Vietnam War,
44 the Gulf War and in the War on Terror combined (Statista, 2023).

45

46 To design effective interventions to increase vaccination uptake, the components of
47 vaccination readiness must be better understood. We use the phrase "vaccination

48 readiness” to refer to whether citizens are ready and willing to be vaccinated (Geiger et al.,
49 2022). Prior work had argued that there are five psychological antecedents of vaccination
50 and proposed a 5C scale of vaccine acceptance¹ (Betsch et al., 2018). These antecedents
51 were: *confidence* (the trust in the security and effectiveness of vaccinations), *complacency*
52 (the tendency to avoid vaccinations due to the low perceived risk of infectious diseases),
53 *constraints* (structural or psychological hurdles in daily life that make vaccination difficult or
54 costly), *calculation* (the degree to which personal costs and benefits of vaccination are
55 weighted), and *collective responsibility* (the willingness to get vaccinated to protect others).
56 These factors have been shown to be predictive of vaccine uptake. For example, all five
57 factors have been shown to be correlated with the uptake of the influenza vaccine and all
58 factors other than *calculation* have been shown to be correlated with the uptake of the
59 pneumococcal and shingles vaccines (Nicholls et al., 2021)

60

61 Subsequent work reconceptualised the scale as a bifactor model of vaccination readiness
62 and argued for the addition of two further components: *compliance* (support for societal
63 monitoring and sanctioning of people who are not vaccinated) and *conspiracy* (belief in
64 conspiracies and false information related to vaccinations), resulting in a 7C model. The 7C
65 model was shown to have greater criterion validity than the 5C model (Geiger et al., 2022).

66

67 Like the 5C model (Betsch et al., 2018), the 7C model is meant to provide a complete
68 account of all the psychological antecedents of vaccination (Geiger et al., 2022). However,
69 there is one other component of vaccination readiness that may be worth considering. Our
70 initial scoping conversations suggested that some people agreed to be vaccinated against
71 COVID-19 because they needed a vaccination certificate, either because their job required it
72 or because they required it for some other purpose, such as to travel, visit a nursing home,
73 go to a restaurant etc., and our preliminary exploratory study confirmed that that this was
74 an important predictor of vaccination readiness. This reason is not addressed by the 7C
75 model. As such it would seem sensible to consider adding to the 7C model an eighth
76 component to represent this driver of vaccination.

¹ While Betsch et al. (2018) refer to “vaccine acceptance”, Geiger et al. (2022) refer to “vaccination readiness”, to describe essentially the same construct. For the purpose of our study, we use the latter term as we employ the bi-factor model of Geiger et al. (2022).

77

78 **Current Research**

79 Our objective was to make the existing 7C model more comprehensive by adding an
80 additional component, *certification*, to create an 8C model. We defined *certification* as the
81 person's self-report that, in the past, they have had to provide evidence that they have been
82 vaccinated. The main goal behind this addition wasn't necessarily to enhance the model's fit
83 but rather to produce a more complete of vaccination readiness. This is essential as some
84 individuals reported getting vaccinated mainly to have proof of their vaccination status, a
85 reason that the 7C model overlooked. While previous research (Geiger et al., 2022)
86 advocated for the 7C model over the 5C due to the 7C model having a superior fit, our study
87 found that the criterion validity of the 8C model was only slightly better than that of the 7C
88 model. However, our model offers a more holistic understanding of vaccination readiness in
89 that it addresses a key psychological antecedent of vaccination that is ignored by the 7C
90 model. To substantiate the validity of the added component, we conducted a confirmatory
91 factor analysis to test the component's psychometric properties and its effect on the overall
92 model fit.

93

94 When Geiger et al. (2022) added the components *compliance* and *conspiracy* to the 5C scale
95 to create the 7C bifactor model, they refined the existing components of the 5C scale to
96 reduce overlap with the two new components and to improve the psychological
97 characteristics of the combined scale. Because the 7C bifactor model is already well-
98 designed and because the new component, *certification*, does not conceptually overlap with
99 any of the existing components of the 7C model, we decided not to alter the 7C model
100 beyond adding this eighth component to it.

101

102 Before settling on *certification*, we did consider other potential additions to the 7C model,
103 which we derived both from theoretical considerations and conversations with experts and
104 ordinary citizens. We identified eleven potential components and ran an exploratory study
105 to test their psychometric properties. By considering their correlations with self-reported
106 vaccination uptake, their correlations with the existing seven components of the 7C model,
107 and their factor loadings in a bifactor model equivalent to the one utilised by Geiger et al.
108 (2022), we eliminated ten of these potential components, leaving only *certification*. Details

109 of the exploratory study, including the survey items, the raw data and the analysis (in R), can
110 be found here: <https://osf.io/8dcfr/>. The exploratory study was pre-registered here:
111 https://aspredicted.org/SNG_KLH

112

113 Because of the high communality of the seven components, Geiger et al. (2022) utilised a
114 bifactor model, comprising a general factor of vaccination readiness and six specific nested
115 factors for all components except for *confidence*, which served as a reference for the
116 general factor. We adopted the same approach, except we added *certification* as a seventh
117 specific nested factor. We ran a confirmatory factor analysis to determine how well this
118 bifactor model fitted the data and compared the criterion validity of the 8C model to that of
119 the 7C model. We found that the 8C model had greater criterion validity than the 7C model.

120

121 **Methods**

122 **Sample and Procedure**

123 Participants were recruited from Amazon Mechanical Turk (mturk.com). The study was
124 approved by the University of Melbourne Office of Research Ethics and Integrity 2023-
125 23370-38505-4. Participants were presented with an plain language statement and a
126 consent form, and written consent was obtained before they were allowed to start the
127 study. A pre-screener was run to identify bots and asked whether people self-reported as
128 either fully vaccinated against COVID-19 or not. Excluding the bots, we then recruited 102
129 participants who reported not being fully vaccinated and 304 participants who reported
130 being fully vaccinated against COVID-19, post exclusions. Participants were excluded if they
131 did not finish the survey or if they “straight-lined” it. This study was pre-registered at
132 https://aspredicted.org/9T2_V7J. The confirmatory study items, the pre-screener items, the
133 confirmatory raw data and the analysis (in R) for the confirmatory study can be found here:
134 <https://osf.io/8dcfr/>. Recruitment occurred 7-8 September, 2023. The mean age was 32.7
135 years (standard deviation 8 years). Seventy-six self-reported as female, 329 as male, 1
136 preferred not to say. With respect to education, two reported less than high school, 132
137 high school diploma, 13 reported some college but no degree, nine reported an associate
138 degree (academic), four reported an associate degree (occupational), 178 reported a
139 Bachelor’s degree, 62 reported a Master’s degree, five reported a Professional degree, one
140 reported a Doctoral degree.

141

142 **Material**

143 **Vaccination Readiness Scale**

144 As a confirmatory factor analysis, we administered the full 8C scale with three items per
145 component as shown in Table 1. Each item was rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from
146 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*. In keeping with Geiger et al. (2022), we also
147 studied a short version of the 8C scale, using just one item per component (bolded items in
148 Table 1).

149

150 Please insert Table 1 about here

151

152 **Statistical Procedure**

153 The factor loadings of the 8C bifactor model are shown in Figure 1. We evaluated model fit
154 and factor saturation. As a rule of thumb, model fit is generally deemed acceptable at CFI
155 and TLI \geq .90, RMSEA $<$.08 and SRMR $<$.11, but there are circumstances where less good fits
156 might be acceptable (Bentler, 1990; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Steiger, 1990). When predicting a
157 dichotomous variable (e.g. willingness to vaccinate or self-reported vaccination status), the
158 regressions were analysed using a logit link, and pseudo R^2 . All models were fitted using
159 robust maximum likelihood estimation (MLR). The analysis was conducted in R (R Core
160 Team, 2023) and Mplus Version 8 (Muthén & Muthén, 2017) using MplusAutomation
161 Version 1.1.0 (Hallquist & Wiley, 2018) in R. The variances of the latent variables were fixed
162 to one.

163

164

165 **Results**

166 **Full Models**

167 So that our findings could be readily compared to those of Geiger et al. (2022), we used a
168 bifactor model with all items loading on the general factor of vaccination readiness. We did
169 this both for the original 7C model and for the new 8C model. For both scales, all
170 components except for confidence additionally loaded onto specific nested factors that
171 represented variations in the components not explained by the general factor. For both

172 models, confidence was chosen as the reference for the general factor, due to its high
173 correlation with the general factor.

174

175 For the full 8C model, we found the following model fit values: CFI = 0.815, TLI = 0.786,
176 RMSEA = .079, and SRMR = 0.096. The RMSEA and SRMR values are acceptable but the CFI
177 and TLI values are a bit low (Bentler, 1990; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Steiger, 1990). We think this
178 occurred because, to access sufficient numbers of unvaccinated participants, we used
179 participants that we had not previously vetted, so the data quality may have been less than
180 it otherwise would have been. Consistent with this suggestion, the fit parameters for the 7C
181 model were similar to those for the 8C model: CFI = 0.821, TLI = 0.789, RMSEA = .083, and
182 SRMR = 0.099.

183

184 Please insert Figure 1 about here

185

186 As shown in Figure 1, the general factor loadings and the specific factor loadings for the
187 three *certification* items were all positive. The factor saturation (McDonald's ω ; McDonald,
188 1999) for *certification* was of a similar magnitude to those of the other components (Table
189 1). The criterion validity for the 8C model was slightly more than that for the 7C model
190 (0.687 vs 0.656).

191

192 Model fits can also be assessed by AIC and BIC. The 7C model had slightly lower values (AIC
193 = 31449, BIC = 31746) than the 8C model (AIC = 35909, BIC = 36249). The 7C model was
194 designed to provide a common framework to facilitate comparisons between different
195 studies, by ensuring that everyone measured the same components (Geiger et al., 2022). As
196 such, it includes components that may not be relevant to every study. The 8C model
197 adopted the same philosophy. As such, we would not expect all components of the 8C
198 model to be relevant in all situations. Including unnecessary components would likely
199 increase the AIC and BIC values. To test for this, we constructed a 5C model that contained
200 the five factors in the 8C model that loaded the highest on the general factor (vaccine
201 hesitancy). These factors were *confidence*, *complacency*, *calculation*, *conspiracy* and
202 *certification*. The AIC and BIC for this model were 22924 and 23132 respectively, showing
203 that the 8C model can be reduced to a smaller model with lower AIC and BIC, if needed.

204

205 **Short Models**

206 For the convenience of researcher, Geiger et al. (2022) also created a short version of the 7C
207 scale, with one item per component. Following this lead, we created a short version of the
208 8C scale, selecting the *certification* item that loaded most onto the general factor.

209

210 For the short 8C, CFI = 0.905, TLI = 0.874, SRMR = 0.064, RMSEA = 0.085, AIC = 12287, BIC =
211 12379, and criterion validity of 0.314. For the short 7C, CFI = 0.898, TLI = 0.857, SRMR =
212 0.067, RMSEA = 0.096, AIC = 10797, BIC = 10877, and criterion validity of 0.296. For the
213 short version of the previous 5C model, CFI = 0.867, TLI = 0.778, SRMR = 0.062, RMSEA =
214 0.102, AIC = 7849, BIC = 7905, and criterion validity of 0.306.

215

216 **Correlations and Reliability Analysis**

217 A list of the correlations between the components can be found in Supplementary Table 1
218 here: <https://osf.io/8dcfr/>. *Certification* did not correlate highly with any other component
219 (r ranged from -0.08 to 0.47). The individual certification items were moderately correlated
220 with each other (r ranged from 0.45 to 0.52, Supplementary Table 2). The correlation
221 between the full 8C scale and the short 8C scale was 0.892.

222

223

224 **Discussion**

225 There are a large number of factors that can potentially affect vaccination readiness and
226 vaccine uptake, and the importance of these components likely varies across different
227 contexts (Betsch et al., 2018). It is therefore crucial that different studies use a common
228 framework to measure these different components, so that the findings from different
229 studies can be combined to determine how the relevance of the various components of
230 vaccination readiness varies across contexts. Doing this will help researchers better tailor
231 interventions for increasing vaccine uptake (WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2019).

232

233 The 7C model was designed to provide such a framework (Geiger et al., 2022). It attempted
234 to include all the components that could affect vaccination readiness and vaccine uptake in
235 different contexts. Although it is a powerful model that has been shown to have good

236 psychometric properties (Geiger et al., 2022), it is missing a crucial component. In our
237 preliminary investigations, we found that some people reported getting the COVID-19
238 vaccine to obtain proof of their vaccination status, which might need for their job, to travel,
239 to visit relatives in a nursing, or even to eat in a restaurant. The 7C scale ignored this
240 potential driver of vaccination uptake. We therefore added to the 7C scale an eighth
241 component, *certification*, which we defined as the self-report of people that, in the past,
242 they have needed to demonstrate evidence of vaccination.

243

244 During the COVID-19 pandemic, many governments required citizens to prove that they
245 were vaccinated against COVID-19 before they were allowed to perform certain acts. While
246 these restrictions were often justified as an attempt to reduce the spread of COVID-19, our
247 conversations with experts and laypeople suggest that these restrictions were the primary
248 reason why some people decided to get vaccinated. Since no existing component of the 7C
249 model captures this driver of vaccination readiness, we argued that it was essential that
250 *certification* be added to the 7C model, to create the 8C model.

251

252 To be clear, we didn't expect adding an extra component to the 7C model would increase
253 the model fit. Typically, models are constructed using the minimum number of components
254 possible. However, the 7C model was constructed to include all the components that might,
255 in different contexts, affect vaccination readiness. As such, it already contained a number of
256 components that, while conceptually distinct, were correlated with each other. Thus, adding
257 another component, especially if that component happened to be correlated with some of
258 the existing components, would be unlikely to increase model fit.

259

260 Our confirmatory factor analysis showed that the psychometric properties of this additional
261 component were very good, with all specific and general factor loadings both positive and of
262 a reasonable magnitude. The general loadings ranged from 0.27 to 0.50, and the specific
263 loadings ranged from 0.56 to 0.67. The McDonald's ω was 0.66, which was comparable to
264 the McDonald's ω for the other six components which ranged from 0.13 to 0.71. Inter-item
265 correlations ranged from 0.45-0.52. Its correlation with vaccination status (0.39) was the
266 highest of any of the components. The model fit for the 8C model was very similar to that of
267 the 7C model, except that the 8C model had slightly higher criterion validity.

268

269 Like Geiger et al. (2022), we also constructed a short version of the 8C scale by choosing the
270 certification item with the highest general factor loading. The short 8C scale had better
271 model fit than the full 8C scale. For the short 8C model, CFI = 0.91, TLI = 0.87, SRMR = 0.06
272 and RMSEA = 0.09. Conversely, for the full 8C model, CFI = 0.82, TLI = 0.79, SRMR = 0.10 and
273 RMSEA = 0.08. The short 8C model had slightly better criterion validity than the short 7C
274 model (0.31 vs 0.30). The correlation between the long and short 8C scales was 0.89.

275

276 A priori, one might be concerned that *certification* would overlap with *calculation*, which
277 was defined as the degree to which personal costs and benefits of vaccination are weighted.
278 If people were deciding to get vaccinated because they felt that they had to, you might
279 expect them to score highly for both *certification* and *calculation*. If so, one would expect
280 these two components to be highly correlated. This was not to be the case, with the
281 correlation between *certification* and *calculation* being -0.08.

282

283 Although the labels appear superficially similar, *certification* and *compliance* are
284 conceptually distinct. Whereas *certification* measures whether, in the past, a person needed
285 to demonstrate evidence of vaccination, *compliance* measures the person's support for
286 societal monitoring and sanctioning of people who are not vaccinated. As such, the former
287 refers to whether a person has previously been required to perform an action (i.e., prove
288 that they have been vaccinated) whereas the latter measures the attitude of that person
289 towards people who have not performed that action. So, while these two concepts are
290 somewhat related, they are clearly conceptually different. This is reflected by them being
291 somewhat correlated ($r = 0.47$).

292

293 There appears to be no reason to suspect that the *certification* would conceptual overlap
294 with any of the remaining components of the 7C scale. For those components, correlations
295 range from -0.08 to 0.39.

296

297 In conclusion, in this study we showed that it is necessary to add an eighth component,
298 *certification*, to the 7C model. Because it does not conceptually overlap with any of the
299 existing components, adding this component does not require us to alter the existing

300 components of the 7C model in any way. Adding this extra component leaves the model fit
301 essentially unchanged but does slightly increase the criterion validity. More importantly,
302 there are strong theoretical reasons for adding this component: many people have reported
303 that they got vaccinated because they needed vaccination certificates to partake in certain
304 activities and mandating people have vaccination certificates before being allowed to
305 partake in certain activities is one of the few ways governments can encourage vaccine
306 uptake. Given a major driver behind this series of models is to help governments increase
307 vaccine uptake (Betsch et al., 2018), not including this component would be inadvisable.
308 That said, future work will need to determine how useful this extra component is in other
309 settings. We note that in many countries children do need to prove that they have been
310 vaccinated against certain diseases before being allowed to attend school and travellers are
311 sometimes required to prove that they have been vaccinated against certain diseases before
312 being allowed to enter a particular country. As such, we expect that *certification* will be
313 predictive in other contexts as well.

314

315 **References**

316 Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*,
317 *107*(2), 238–246. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.107.2.238>

318 Betsch, C., Schmid, P., Heinemeier, D., Korn, L., Holtmann, C., & Böhm, R. (2018). Beyond
319 confidence: Development of a measure assessing the 5C psychological antecedents
320 of vaccination. *PLOS ONE*, *13*(12), e0208601.

321 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0208601>

322 Geiger, M., Rees, F., Lilleholt, L., Santana, A. P., Zettler, I., Wilhelm, O., Betsch, C., & Böhm,
323 R. (2022). Measuring the 7Cs of Vaccination Readiness. *European Journal of*
324 *Psychological Assessment*, *38*(4), 261–269. [https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-](https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000663)
325 [5759/a000663](https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000663)

- 326 Hallquist, M. N., & Wiley, J. F. (2018). MplusAutomation: An R Package for Facilitating Large-
327 Scale Latent Variable Analyses in Mplus. *Structural Equation Modeling: A*
328 *Multidisciplinary Journal*, 25(4), 621–638.
329 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2017.1402334>
- 330 Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis:
331 Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A*
332 *Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(1), 1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- 333 Jia, K. M., Hanage, W. P., Lipsitch, M., Johnson, A. G., Amin, A. B., Ali, A. R., Scobie, H. M., &
334 Swerdlow, D. L. (2023). Estimated preventable COVID-19-associated deaths due to
335 non-vaccination in the United States. *European Journal of Epidemiology*, 1–4.
336 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10654-023-01006-3>
- 337 McDonald, R. P. (1999). *Test theory: A unified treatment* (pp. xi, 485). Lawrence Erlbaum
338 Associates Publishers.
- 339 McNeish, D. (2018). Thanks coefficient alpha, we'll take it from here. *Psychological Methods*,
340 23(3), 412–433. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000144>
- 341 Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (2017). *Mplus Eighth Edition*.
- 342 Nicholls, L. A. B., Gallant, A. J., Cogan, N., Rasmussen, S., Young, D., & Williams, L. (2021).
343 Older adults' vaccine hesitancy: Psychosocial factors associated with influenza,
344 pneumococcal, and shingles vaccine uptake. *Vaccine*, 39(26), 3520–3527.
345 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2021.04.062>
- 346 R Core Team. (2023). R: A language and environment for statistical computing (4.3.0)
347 [Computer software]. *R Foundation for Statistical Computing*.

- 348 Statista. (2023). *United States: War fatalities1775-2023*. Statista.
- 349 [https://www.statista.com/statistics/1009819/total-us-military-fatalities-in-american-](https://www.statista.com/statistics/1009819/total-us-military-fatalities-in-american-wars-1775-present/)
- 350 [wars-1775-present/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/1009819/total-us-military-fatalities-in-american-wars-1775-present/)
- 351 Steiger, J. H. (1990). Structural Model Evaluation and Modification: An Interval Estimation
- 352 Approach. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 25(2), 173–180.
- 353 https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr2502_4
- 354 WHO Regional Office for Europe. (2019). *Tailoring immunization programmes*.
- 355
- 356




Figure 1