

Article

Exposure to Misinformation, Risk Perception and Confidence towards the Government as Factors Influencing Negative Attitudes on COVID-19 Vaccination in Malaysia

Emma Mohamad ^{1,2}, Jen Sern Tham ³, Siti Zaiton Mohd Ajis ^{1,2}, Mohammad Rezal Hamzah ⁴, Suffian Hadi Ayub ⁵, Andi Muhammad Tri Sakti ^{1,2,6} and Arina Anis Azlan ^{1,2,*}

¹ Centre for Research in Media and Communication, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi 43600, Malaysia; emmamohamad@ukm.edu.my (E.M.); andi.muhammad@mercubuana.ac.id (A.M.T.S.).

² UKM x UNICEF Communication for Development Centre in Health, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi 43600, Malaysia; zaiton2007@gmail.com

³ Department of Communication, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Seri Kembangan 43400, Selangor, Malaysia; jstham@upm.edu.my

⁴ Department of Communication, Faculty of Business and Communication, Universiti Malaysia Perlis, Kangar 01000, Perlis, Malaysia; rezal@unimap.edu.my

⁵ Faculty of Communication and Media Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Shah Alam 40450, Selangor, Malaysia; suffianhadi@uitm.edu.my

⁶ Faculty of Communication Science, Mercu Buana University, Jakarta 11650, Indonesia

* Correspondence: arina@ukm.edu.my; Tel.: (+60-03-8921-5456)

Abstract: Introduction: This study explores exposure to misinformation, COVID-19 risk perception, and confidence towards the government as predictors to negative attitudes toward the COVID-19 vaccine. Methods: A cross-sectional survey was carried out from 30 June to 30 August 2021 involving 775 respondents. The survey instrument for the questionnaire is an adaptation from various different studies consisting of five main variables: 1) misinformation about vaccination; 2) risk perception toward COVID-19; 3) attitudes toward the vaccination programme; 4) intention to get vaccinated; and 5) public confidence in the government in executing the vaccination programme. Results: The results of this study indicate that higher exposure to misinformation led to higher levels of negative attitudes toward the COVID-19 vaccine. When the perceived risk of COVID-19 infection was high, mistrust of vaccine benefits was low but there were also higher worries about the future effects of the vaccine. Confidence in government was associated with lower negative attitudes toward the COVID-19 vaccine. Conclusion: The results of this study may help develop an understanding of negative attitudes toward vaccinations in Malaysia and its contributing factors.

Keywords: COVID-19; vaccination; government; cross sectional survey; perceived risk

1. Introduction

COVID-19 vaccinations have become crucial in supplementing individual preventive actions to combat the pandemic, and vaccination coverage is critical for maintaining efficient public health measures. Governments worldwide have made significant efforts to implement successful procurement and vaccination programmes for individuals since the availability of COVID-19 vaccines¹. The severity of the COVID-19 pandemic on populations worldwide would be reduced significantly only if the worldwide vaccination deployment is successful. On the other hand, a vaccination programme is not without difficulties, particularly on a global scale. While the goal is to make the COVID-19 vaccine available and accessible to everyone, persuading people to vaccinate themselves is a different issue.

Nonetheless, due to the rapid process of vaccine development, various questions concerning vaccine acceptability and safety emerged as community concerns potentially

influencing attitudes and behaviours toward vaccine hesitancy². An earlier study proved how public negative attitudes toward the COVID-19 vaccine resulted in prominent resistance toward vaccination in the first phase of its introduction, even when the health authorities made it compulsory³. Among negative attitudes surrounding COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy were concerns about vaccine safety⁴, worries about potential unforeseen side effects, a high level of mistrust of vaccine benefits⁵, concerns of commercial profiteering⁶, and preference towards natural immunity compared to the vaccine⁷. Therefore, to convince the public to agree to be vaccinated, trust must be built; information about the development of these vaccines must be made public so that people are aware and informed.

The significant growth of health information sources online has made it challenging for health authorities to ensure that accurate information reaches the public. Studies have documented the prevalence of misinformation on health-related issues such as vaccination, pandemic, non-communicable diseases, and medical treatment⁸ and its role in diverting individuals from performing correct health behaviour, including preventive behaviour during the COVID-19 pandemic. Several factors, such as poor information infrastructure, lack of proper knowledge-sharing culture, and resistance to technology adaptation, remain the main challenges in dealing with misinformation⁹. Previous studies have shown that exposure to misinformation has led people to perform misguided COVID-19 preventive behaviours while discouraging them from performing the recommended ones¹⁰. Exposure to misinformation has also increased religious misinformation beliefs and conspiracy beliefs¹¹ and negatively impacted individuals' mental health¹².

The prevalence of misinformation related to COVID-19 is high on social media and broadly delivered via online messaging services, making it an added challenge for the government to end the pandemic. Moreover, inaccurate beliefs can also be caused by the government's inability to clarify and provide trusted information to counter the misinformation¹³, which often leads to mistrust toward the government. Studies have suggested that clear messages and knowledge dissemination were positively associated with trust in the government when introducing COVID-19 preventive behaviours¹⁴. In regards to vaccination intake, several studies also revealed how the element of mistrust – mistrust toward health authorities and healthcare workers¹⁵, mistrust towards biomedical science¹⁶, and mistrust in medical information while believing conspiracy theory¹⁷ – is significantly associated with vaccine hesitancy.

Another factor associated with the decision to take the vaccine is risk perception. A previous study has shown that public intention to be vaccinated is influenced by their perceived likelihood of being infected and the potential adverse effect of contracting COVID-19^{18,19}. In turn, risk perception is influenced by factors such as incorrect beliefs spread on social media (e.g., COVID-19 is no more dangerous than influenza, and there is no need to wear a mask)²⁰, experience of COVID-19, mass media exposure, knowledge about COVID-19, and perceived mortality. Populations of low-to-middle income countries experienced higher mortality rates due to COVID-19²¹, yet showed more willingness to take the COVID-19 vaccines as compared to populations of high-income countries²².

In Malaysia, there has been a discrepancy between public confidence in national and state governments in handling vaccination programmes. It was reported that most Malaysians trust the federal government's ability to curb COVID-19 through vaccination programme²³ which resulted in a high vaccination rate. However, a study in Sabah revealed confidence and convenience as factors associated with vaccine hesitancy among Sabah populations, particularly among self-employed and unemployed²⁴. The study also showed religious belief (being a Muslim) as one of the demographic factors associated with vaccine hesitancy. Corroborating the above findings, Ruhi et al., through their study comparing vaccine hesitancy among West and East Malaysian populations, noted that religious restrictions make vaccine hesitancy more problematic in East Malaysia as compared to in West Malaysia²⁵. The lack of public confidence in the government and community disagreement over the religious permissibility of vaccines in certain parts of this country has proven the lack of proper communication messaging and a system to counter

the negative public perception towards vaccination. Even so, the opportunity to correct public misperception remains open as a study reported that many populations exposed to vaccine misinformation still want to acquire additional vaccine-related information to overcome their vaccine hesitation²⁶.

While many studies have examined the role of negative attitudes toward vaccine hesitancy^{3,4,27}, the present study aims to explore factors that influence an individual's negative attitudes toward vaccination. It is hypothesised that exposure to misinformation, COVID-19 risk perception, and confidence towards the government, are predictors to negative attitudes toward the COVID-19 vaccine. This study employed a cross-sectional survey, carried out from 30 June to 30 August 2021 during the second phase of the COVID-19 lockdowns in Malaysia and also when the COVID-19 vaccinations were initially being made available to the public. The results of this study may help develop an understanding of negative attitudes toward vaccinations in Malaysia and its contributing factors.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Study design and setting

This cross-sectional investigation was conducted from 30 June to 30 August 2021 during the first phase of the National Recovery Plan period in Malaysia. This study was funded by Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM) through a matching grant collaboration with UNICEF, to investigate exposure to misinformation, risk perception and public confidence in the government on the COVID-19 vaccination programme. The study received ethical approval from the UKM Ethics Committee which covered the aspects of protocol, procedures, information sheet and consent statement (JEP-2020-276). A total of 775 respondents were involved in the study representing the Malaysian population with a $\pm 5\%$ margin of error and a confidence level of 95%^{28,29}.

2.2. Data collection

The data was collected online using the Survey Monkey platform and the invitation to participate in this study was voluntary. To participate, respondents were required to read the information sheet and give consent by clicking the 'Continue' button prior to answering the self-administered questionnaire. Members of the Malaysian public who participated in the study were above the age of 18 and currently residing in the country. Several strategies were employed to reach the targeted number of respondents despite the MCO. Overall, the dissemination of the survey utilised various social media platforms (Whatsapp, Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram). Facebook and Whatsapp were most effective as the most popular social media platforms in Malaysia³⁰. The researchers also reached out to numerous networks through emails and personal outreach. The message to the survey link, a general description of the survey and questionnaire was prepared in English and Malay language considering the multi-ethnic demographics in Malaysia.

2.3. Survey questionnaire

The survey instrument for the questionnaire is an adaptation from various different studies. The questionnaire consisted of five main variables: 1) misinformation about vaccination; 2) risk perception toward COVID-19; 3) attitudes toward the vaccination programme; 4) intention to get vaccinated; and 5) public confidence in the government in executing the vaccination programme. Since the questionnaire was bilingual (English and Malay language), the study used a backwards-translation approach to translate the items between both languages. This was done to ensure linguistic and conceptual equivalence³¹. For validation of language constructs, bilingual arbiters were sought to consult and rectify any discrepancies on both versions.

To measure exposure to misinformation on vaccination, 10 items were adapted from previous research³² using a Likert scale (1 - 'Not at all' to 4 - 'Very frequently'). To measure risk perception toward vaccination, the respondents were asked to answer four questions adapted from previous studies³³⁻³⁵. The answer scale utilised was from 1 - 'Not at all' to 6

- 'Completely'. Negative attitudes toward the vaccination programme was measured through four sub-domains; i) mistrust of vaccine benefits (3 items); ii) worries about unforeseen future effects (3 items); iii) concerns about commercial profiteering (3 items); and iv) preference for natural immunity (3 items). The Likert scale for these items ranged from 1 - 'Strongly disagree' to 6 - 'Strongly agree'. Items for attitudes toward vaccination were adapted from past research^{36,37}. To measure the intention of the Malaysian public to get vaccinated, 1 item was adapted from previous research³⁸ with a dichotomous answer scale (Yes or No). Finally, the measurement of public confidence was adapted from previous research³⁶ with 2 items. The Likert scale employed for both items was 1 - 'No confidence' to 6 - 'Very high confidence'.

2.4. Statistical Analysis

For this study, the data collected was analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 26. Descriptive analysis focused on frequencies and percentages for demographics; for inferential tests, the statistical significance level was set at $p < 0.05$. Internal consistency of the knowledge measures was tested using a reliability test where the Cronbach alpha coefficient aided in determining the reliability of the variables. The results showed that the Cronbach alpha for misinformation (10 items) was 0.842. For risk perception (4 items), the Cronbach alpha was 0.676. For the four domains of attitudes toward the vaccination programme, i) mistrust of vaccine benefit (3 items) the Cronbach alpha was 0.878 ; ii) worries about unforeseen future effects (3 items) the Cronbach alpha was 0.769; iii) concerns about commercial profiteering (3 items) the Cronbach alpha was 0.812; and iv) preference for natural immunity (3 items) the Cronbach alpha was 0.786. The Cronbach alpha for public confidence was 0.833. This adds credence to the results as stated by Griethuijsen, Cronbach alpha values above 0.6 are considered adequate and reliable³⁹. An ordinary least squares (OLS) regression procedure was conducted to determine the relationships between selected demographics, exposure to misinformation, risk perception toward COVID-19, public confidence and attitudes toward the vaccination programme.

3. Results

3.1. Social-demographic Descriptions

The main characteristics of the study population are reported in Table 1. The pool of respondents was 69.2% female and 30.8% male, with an average age of 33.71 years (SD = 10.71). Most of the respondents were ethnic Malay (67.5%), from Selangor and Kuala Lumpur (47.5%), lived in urban areas (64.9%) and worked in private sectors (47%). Moreover, 54% of the respondents had income less than RM4360 per month or no income at all. The majority of the respondents reported good health status (84.6%), and 81.3% reported having no diseases at the time of the survey.

Table 1. Socio-demographic profiles (N = 775). ^aMean ± standard deviation (range).

	Total	
	N	%
Socio-demographic:		
Gender		
Female	536	69.2
Male	239	30.8
Age	33.71 ± 10.71 (18-75) ^a	
Ethnicity		
Malay	523	67.5
Chinese	167	21.5
Indian	20	2.6
Bumiputera (Sabah/Sarawak)	59	7.6
Others	6	0.8
Locality		
Urban	503	64.9
Rural	272	35.1
State		
Johor	60	7.7
Kedah	41	5.3
Kelantan	29	3.7
Melaka	19	2.5
Negeri Sembilan	44	5.7
Pahang	31	4.0
Perak	43	5.5
Perlis	6	0.8
Pulau Pinang	22	2.8
Terengganu	27	3.5
Sabah	30	3.9
Sarawak	41	5.3
Selangor	281	36.3
Federal Territory of Kuala Lumpur	87	11.2
Federal Territory of Putrajaya	1	0.1
Federal Territory of Labuan	13	1.7
Employment status		
Government employee	147	19.0
Private employee	364	47.0
Self-employed (registered)	35	4.5
Self-employed (not registered)	29	3.7
Unpaid family worker	4	0.5
Not employed	196	25.3

Income		
Under RM4360 per month (including no income)	416	53.7
RM4361 – RM9620 per month	210	27.1
Above RM9621 per month	149	19.2
Health status		
Very bad	10	1.3
Bad	14	1.8
Average	96	12.4
Good	381	49.2
Very good	274	35.4
Health problem		
Yes, more than one disease	39	5.0
Yes, only one disease	106	13.7
No diseases	630	81.3

3.2. Exposure to misinformation on COVID-19 vaccination

Overall, the surveyed respondents were exposed to at least one kind of misinformation about COVID-19 vaccines (Mean 1.81). Almost 60% of respondents reported that they were not exposed to misinformation related to COVID-19 vaccines affecting human DNA, COVID-19 vaccines containing pig fat (60.9%) , and that COVID-19 vaccines can cause infertility in women (64%). The survey indicated that respondents were exposed (rarely, occasionally and very frequently) to information about the COVID-19 vaccine causing severe side effects like allergic reactions (82.5%), that COVID-19 vaccines cause serious side effects like allergic reactions (62.1%), that a nurse fainted after she received the COVID-19 vaccine (58%), that COVID-19 vaccines contain live viruses that can make me sick with COVID-19 (46.7%), that once you receive the COVID-19 vaccine, you won't have to wear a mask or practice social-distancing (42.4%), that those who have recovered from COVID-19 do not need to get vaccinated (40.9%), that COVID-19 vaccines affect human DNA (40.2%), that vaccines for COVID-19 have a microchip that can track the location of the patient (40%), that COVID-19 vaccines contain pig fat (39.2%) and that the COVID-19 vaccine can cause infertility in women (36%).

Table 2. Exposure to misinformation on COVID-19 vaccination.

	Total	
	N	%
COVID-19 vaccines affect human DNA.		
Not at all	464	59.9
Rarely	181	23.4
Occasionally	88	11.4
Very frequently	42	5.4
COVID-19 vaccines contain pig fat.		
Not at all	472	60.9
Rarely	181	23.4
Occasionally	78	10.1
Very frequently	44	5.7
A nurse fainted after she received the COVID-19 vaccine.		
Not at all	326	42.1
Rarely	305	39.4
Occasionally	106	13.7
Very frequently	38	4.9
COVID-19 vaccines contain live viruses that can make me sick with COVID-19.		
Not at all	413	53.3
Rarely	213	27.5
Occasionally	107	13.8
Very frequently	42	5.4
Those who have recovered from COVID-19 do not need to get vaccinated.		
Not at all	458	59.1
Rarely	171	22.1
Occasionally	97	12.5
Very frequently	49	6.3
Vaccines for COVID-19 have a microchip that can track the location of the patient.		
Not at all	465	60.0
Rarely	129	16.6
Occasionally	79	10.2
Very frequently	102	13.2
The COVID-19 vaccines are not safe because they were developed rapidly.		
Not at all	293	37.8
Rarely	198	25.5
Occasionally	135	17.4
Very frequently	149	19.2
The COVID-19 vaccine causes serious side effects like allergic reactions.		
Not at all	136	17.5
Rarely	296	38.2

Occasionally	185	23.9
Very frequently	158	20.4
The COVID-19 vaccine can cause infertility in women.		
Not at all	496	64.0
Rarely	202	26.1
Occasionally	55	7.1
Very frequently	22	2.8
Once you receive the COVID-19 vaccine, you won't have to wear a mask or practice social-distancing.		
Not at all	446	57.5
Rarely	153	19.7
Occasionally	84	10.8
Very frequently	92	11.9

3.3. Risk perception about COVID-19

The study found that 88% of respondents believed that COVID-19 is a problem that is important to them and 80% indicated that they were worried about being infected with COVID-19 in the future (Table 3). However, only one-third of respondents (38.7%) believed they were likely to be infected with COVID-19 and felt at risk of COVID-19 infection (39.6%).

Table 3. Risk perception about COVID-19.

	Total	
	N	%
The problem of the COVID-19 pandemic is important to me.		
Not at all	6	0.8
Slightly	4	0.5
Moderately	18	2.3
Quite a bit	65	8.4
Very much	237	30.6
Completely	445	57.4
I am worried that I may be infected with COVID-19 in the future.		
Not at all	11	1.4
Slightly	16	2.1
Moderately	37	4.8
Quite a bit	91	11.7
Very much	167	21.5
Completely	453	58.5
It is likely that I will be infected with COVID-19.		
Not at all	40	5.2
Slightly	98	12.6
Moderately	141	18.2
Quite a bit	196	25.3

Very much	140	18.1
Completely	160	20.6
I have felt at risk of COVID-19 infection.		
Not at all	120	15.5
Slightly	92	11.9
Moderately	106	13.7
Quite a bit	150	19.4
Very much	159	20.5
Completely	148	19.1

3.4. Attitudes toward the vaccination programme

A total of 82.2% of respondents agreed that they felt safe after being vaccinated. The majority of respondents (72.5% and 82.7%) agreed that they could rely on COVID-19 vaccines to stop serious infections and felt protected after getting vaccinated, respectively. Even so, respondents worried about unforeseen future effects of COVID-19 vaccines; the majority (81.7%) agreed that there might be problems with the vaccines that were currently unknown, although most of the vaccines appeared to be safe at the moment. Only 51.5% agreed that COVID-19 vaccines could cause unforeseen problems in children and 61.2% personally believed that there could be unknown long-term effects of the vaccine.

More than half of respondents did not agree that vaccines make a lot of money for pharmaceutical companies but do not do much for regular people (63.7%), that authorities promote vaccination for financial gain, not for people's health (81.4%), and that vaccination programmes are a big deception (89.6%). Moreover, the majority of respondents did not prefer natural immunity against COVID-19 infection, where 67.2% disagreed that natural immunity lasts longer than vaccination, 80% that natural exposure to viruses and germs gives the safest protection, and 82.9% that being exposed to diseases naturally is safer for the immune system than being exposed through vaccination (Table 4).

Table 4. Four domains of negative attitudes towards the vaccination programme. ^aItems were reverse coded.

	Total	
	N	%
Mistrust of vaccine benefits:		
I feel safe after being vaccinated.^a		
Strongly disagree	27	3.5
Disagree	26	3.4
Slightly disagree	85	11.0
Slightly agree	186	24.0
Agree	223	28.8
Strongly agree	228	29.4
I can rely on vaccines to stop serious infectious diseases.^a		
Strongly disagree	47	6.1
Disagree	53	6.8
Slightly disagree	113	14.6
Slightly agree	207	26.7
Agree	182	23.5

Strongly agree	173	22.3
I feel protected after getting vaccinated. ^a		
Strongly disagree	22	2.8
Disagree	28	3.6
Slightly disagree	84	10.8
Slightly agree	200	25.8
Agree	229	29.5
Strongly agree	212	27.4
Worries about unforeseen future effects:		
Although most vaccines appear to be safe, there may be problems that we have not yet discovered.		
Strongly disagree	12	1.5
Disagree	25	3.2
Slightly disagree	105	13.5
Slightly agree	214	27.6
Agree	205	26.5
Strongly agree	214	27.6
Vaccines can cause unforeseen problems in children.		
Strongly disagree	64	8.3
Disagree	106	13.7
Slightly disagree	206	26.6
Slightly agree	195	25.2
Agree	122	15.7
Strongly agree	82	10.6
I worry about the unknown effects of vaccines in the future.		
Strongly disagree	59	7.6
Disagree	102	13.2
Slightly disagree	140	18.1
Slightly agree	216	27.9
Agree	130	16.8
Strongly agree	128	16.5
Concerns about commercial profiteering:		
Vaccines make a lot of money for pharmaceutical companies, but do not do much for regular people.		
Strongly disagree	160	20.6
Disagree	141	18.2
Slightly disagree	193	24.9
Slightly agree	143	18.5
Agree	67	8.6
Strongly agree	71	9.2
Authorities promote vaccination for financial gain, not for people's health.		
Strongly disagree	335	43.2

Disagree	177	22.8
Slightly disagree	119	15.4
Slightly agree	92	11.9
Agree	28	3.6
Strongly agree	24	3.1
Vaccination programs are a big deception.		
Strongly disagree	457	59.0
Disagree	131	16.9
Slightly disagree	106	13.7
Slightly agree	63	8.1
Agree	10	1.3
Strongly agree	8	1.0
Preference for natural immunity:		
Natural immunity lasts longer than vaccination.		
Strongly disagree	173	22.3
Disagree	149	19.2
Slightly disagree	199	25.7
Slightly agree	128	16.5
Agree	69	8.9
Strongly agree	57	7.4
Natural exposure to viruses and germs gives the safest protection.		
Strongly disagree	272	35.1
Disagree	165	21.3
Slightly disagree	183	23.6
Slightly agree	95	12.3
Agree	38	4.9
Strongly agree	22	2.8
Being exposed to diseases naturally is safer for the immune system than being exposed through vaccination.		
Strongly disagree	279	36.0
Disagree	173	22.3
Slightly disagree	191	24.6
Slightly agree	93	12.0
Agree	24	3.1
Strongly agree	15	1.9

3.5. Public confidence in government and willingness to get vaccinated

Slightly half of the respondents expressed their trust in the Malaysian government's ability to manage the COVID-19 vaccination programme effectively (55.6%). However, more than half of the respondents believed that the Malaysian public health service effectively managed the COVID-19 vaccination program (72.3%). Regarding intention to get vaccinated, 99% of the respondents expressed their willingness to get vaccinated against COVID-19 (Table 5 and 6).

Table 5. Public confidence in the government. ^aNumber for each item may not add up to a total number of study population due to missing values. .

	Total	
	N	%
I am confident in the Malaysian government's ability to effectively manage the COVID-19 vaccination program.^a		
1 (No confidence)	77	10.1
2	101	13.2
3	162	21.1
4	168	21.9
5	146	19.1
6 (Very high confidence)	112	14.6
I am confident in the ability of the Malaysian public health service to effectively manage the COVID-19 vaccination program.^a		
1 (No confidence)	32	4.2
2	61	8.0
3	119	15.5
4	181	23.6
5	203	26.5
6 (Very high confidence)	170	22.2

Table 6. Willingness to get vaccinated. ^aNumber for each item may not add up to the total number of study respondents due to missing values.

	Total	
	N	%
If a COVID-19 vaccine is recommended for you, would you take it?^a		
No	8	1.0
Yes	756	99.0

3.6. Ordinary regression analysis

Table 7 presents the results of regression models predicting four domains of negative attitudes towards the COVID-19 vaccine. Selected socio-demographic variables were controlled and entered in block one, while main study variables were entered in block two. Overall, demographic variables accounted for a very small amount of variance in the four domains of negative attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccines ($R^2_{\text{Mistrust}} = 7.2\%$; $R^2_{\text{Worries}} = 4.3\%$; $R^2_{\text{Concerns}} = 13.2\%$; $R^2_{\text{Preference}} = 6.1\%$). More specifically, the results showed that age was positively associated with the four domains of negative attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccines (Mistrust = .23, $p = .000$; Worries = .17, $p = .000$; Concerns = .21, $p = .000$; Preference = .22, $p = .000$). Compared to females, males were positively associated with only two domains - concerns about commercial profiteering (Concerns = .16, $p = .000$) and preference for natural immunity (Preference = .09, $p = .015$). All ethnic groups were worried about unforeseen future effects of COVID-19 vaccines (Malay = .57, $p = .003$; Chinese = .51, $p = .003$; Indian = .20, $p = .006$; Bumiputera = .32, $p = .006$). Moreover, both Indians and Chinese had mistrust of vaccine benefits (Chinese = .53, $p = .002$; Indian = .18, $p = .016$) and had concerns about commercial profiteering of COVID-19 vaccines (Chinese = .57, $p = .001$; Indian = .51, $p = .033$), respectively. The results also revealed that income had a negative association with concerns about commercial profiteering of COVID-19 vaccines ($= -.09$, $p = .022$) and preference for natural immunity ($= -.09$, $p = .042$).

After controlling the demographic variables, the main predictors accounted for 8% - 21.3% of variation for the four domains of negative attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccines ($R^2_{\text{Mistrust}} = 15\%$; $R^2_{\text{Worries}} = 8.7\%$; $R^2_{\text{Concerns}} = 21.3\%$; $R^2_{\text{Preference}} = 8.3\%$). As predicted, exposure to COVID-19 misinformation was positively associated with four domains of negative attitudes toward COVID-19 vaccines ($\text{Mistrust} = .11$, $p = .000$; $\text{Worries} = .13$, $p = .000$; $\text{Concerns} = .10$, $p = .003$; $\text{Preference} = .12$, $p = .001$). Perceived risk had a negative relationship with mistrust of vaccine benefits ($= -.07$, $p = .039$) but had a positive relationship with worries about unforeseen future effects of COVID-19 vaccines ($= .10$, $p = .005$). Moreover, people's confidence in government in managing the inoculation program was negatively associated with four domains of negative attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccine ($\text{Mistrust} = -.26$, $p = .000$; $\text{Worries} = -.12$, $p = .000$; $\text{Concerns} = -.28$, $p = .000$; $\text{Preference} = -.09$, $p = .017$).

4. Discussion

The results of our study indicate that misinformation on COVID-19 is quite common, with respondents reporting that they have seen/read at least one inaccurate claim on the vaccine. Specifically, the claim that respondents were most exposed to was that the COVID-19 vaccine causes serious side effects like allergic reactions. Corroborating the finding above, a previous study in the country suggested that public vaccination uptake is significantly influenced by the low risk of severe side effect⁴⁰. Interestingly, misperception of the side effect of COVID-19 vaccination also happened to be the top predictor of vaccine hesitancy in other countries such as Egypt⁴¹, the United States^{42,43}, and several countries in Europe⁴⁴. Another false claim that the respondents were highly exposed to was that the vaccine is unsafe because it was developed rapidly. The rapid development of the COVID-19 vaccine has raised many concerns about its safety and efficacy⁴⁵. Besides, the urge to provide the vaccine within a short period has also resulted in a major challenge for the government to ensure transparency in the process of vaccine development⁴⁶. Not only in Malaysia, but this false claim about vaccine safety is also common among unvaccinated populations in the United States, Canada, Sweden, and Italy⁴⁷.

In terms of risk perception, respondents felt that COVID-19 was an important issue for them and worries that they would be infected in the future were very high. Additionally, the majority of respondents perceived that they would likely be infected with COVID-19 and have previously felt at risk of being infected. Several studies have also linked the public COVID-19 risk perception with the willingness or hesitancy to get vaccinated. For instance, a study by Al-Qerem and Jarab suggested perceived risk of infection as a predictor of vaccination intention among the Middle Eastern Population⁴⁸.

Table 7. Results of regression models predicting four domains of negative attitudes towards the COVID-19 vaccine.

Variables	Mistrust of Vaccine Benefits				Worries about unforeseen future effects				Concerns about commercial profiteering				Preference for natural immunity			
	Block 1		Block 2		Block 1		Block 2		Block 1		Block 2		Block 1		Block 2	
	<i>t</i>		<i>t</i>		<i>t</i>		<i>t</i>		<i>t</i>		<i>t</i>		<i>t</i>		<i>t</i>	
Male (vs. female)	.02	.059	-.02	-.44	.06	1.68	.05	1.22	.16	4.52***	.14	4.09***	.09	2.44*	.08	2.17*
Age	.23	5.38***	.24	5.87***	.17	3.84**	.19	4.45**	.21	5.16***	.23	5.92***	.22	5.16***	.23	5.39***
Ethnicity (vs. Other)																
Malay	.37	1.94	.37	2.02*	.57	2.98**	.56	2.95**	.31	1.70	.31	1.77	.06	.32	.05	.26
Chinese	.53	3.13**	.47	2.87**	.51	2.95**	.49	2.90**	.53	3.23***	.47	3.00**	.18	1.05	.16	.93
Indian	.18	2.40*	.17	2.42*	.20	2.75**	.22	3.06**	.15	2.14*	.15	2.29*	.04	.56	.05	.63
Bumiputera Sabah/Sarawak	.21	1.84	.24	2.17*	.32	2.78**	.33	2.93**	.12	1.06	.14	1.38	.05	.41	.06	.49
Income	-.04	-.95	-.06	1.41	.03	-.79	-.04	-1.07	-.09	2.29*	.11	2.91**	.09	2.04*	.09	2.22*
Rural (vs. urban)	.06	1.64	.08	2.18*	.01	.12	.02	.48	-.01	-.21	.02	.43	.04	1.01	.05	1.18
Employment (vs. Private)																
Government	-.06	1.55	-.05	1.35	.01	-.19	-.01	-.21	.001	.03	.01	.33	.02	.49	.02	.48
Self-employed (registered)	.01	.39	.004	-.11	.03	.87	.02	.55	.01	.16	.01	-.39	.02	-.53	-.03	-.79
Self-employed (non-registered)	.01	.20	.001	-.02	.05	-1.24	.05	-1.43	.03	-.79	.04	1.04	.03	-.74	.03	-.91
Unpaid	-.03	-.03	-.03	-.81	-.04	-1.13	.05	-1.36	.02	-.53	.02	-.64	.01	-.34	.02	-.44
Not employed	.06	1.57	.04	1.19	.01	.18	.01	.29	.01	.17	.01	-.18	.00	-.01	.003	-.07
COVID-19 vaccine misinformation exposure	-	-	.11	3.31**	-	-	.13	3.57**	-	-	.10	2.96**	-	-	.12	3.21***
Perceived risk	-	-	-.07	.04*	-	-	.10	2.81**	-	-	.003	.08	-	-	.003	-.08
Confidence in government	-	-	-.26	7.07***	-	-	.12	3.23**	-	-	.28	7.98***	-	-	.09	2.40*
Adj R ² = .132 ΔR ² = .078 F(16, 749) = 8.26***																
Adj R ² = .068 ΔR ² = .044 F(16, 749) = 4.48***																
Adj R ² = .197 ΔR ² = .082 F(16, 749) = 12.70***																
Adj R ² = .063 ΔR ² = .022 F(16, 749) = 4.24***																

p* < .05. *p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

While among the United States population, it was proven that the vaccinated population showed a higher level of COVID-19 risk perception compared to those who are unvaccinated⁴⁹. Additionally, in Malaysia, worry about being infected was also found to be a predictor of parental intention to vaccinate their children⁵⁰. Therefore, increasing public perceived risk can be an imperative move to improve the population's vaccine intake, in which the media can play its role to shape the public perception, as well as the government in producing strategic regulations.

The study has also revealed that public confidence in the Malaysian government's ability to manage the vaccination programme was high. This finding corroborates a past study conducted in Malaysia, which explained how the public in the country had high trust in the government's ability to manage the COVID-19 crisis since the beginning of the pandemic⁵¹. Studies conducted around the world have shown that although public confidence and trust in government are important to the success of vaccination programmes⁵², many governments struggle with this. For instance, with a long history of vaccine hesitancy, the COVID-19 vaccination rate in Nigeria was reported very low due to public distrust toward the government⁵³. In addition, a review study synthesising the determinants of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in South Africa reported public distrust as one of the predictors of low vaccination intake in the country⁵⁴. Only 1% of respondents in the present study indicated that they would not take the COVID-19 vaccine. Comparatively, this rate is much lower than in other Southeast Asian Countries like Singapore (9.9%)⁵⁵, Thailand (10.2%)⁵⁶, and Indonesia (13.2%)⁵⁷.

When the COVID-19 vaccine became available to the public, there was a mix of reactions. Those who were hesitant were reported to believe that the vaccine is dangerous and useless, and COVID-19 is harmless, while those who were willing to be vaccinated were influenced by the number of COVID-19 cases and deaths in their respective locations⁵⁸. The results of this study show that Malaysians held low levels of mistrust toward vaccine benefits with many feeling safe and protected after taking the vaccine. Even so, there was a high level of worry about the unforeseen future effects of the vaccine. The same concern was common among the public in Pakistan⁵⁹ and the United States⁶⁰. This sentiment is common in new medical developments such as treatment and vaccinations. One of them is a false claim that the mRNA genetic material in several vaccines can possibly alter human DNA⁶¹. In addition, aside from safety and efficacy, the rapid development of COVID-19 vaccines has also raised concerns about long-term effects, no exception among healthcare workers⁶². Earlier studies documented a small percentage of healthcare workers who are hesitant to receive the COVID-19 vaccine^{63,64,65}.

Studies in the West have identified concerns of commercial profiteering and preference for natural immunity as prominent factors leading to vaccine hesitation. In the UK, where 16% of the public indicated a high-level mistrust of the COVID-19 vaccine, many people expressed negatively extreme attitudes relating to commercial profiteering and preference for natural immunity⁶⁶. This was not reflected in the Malaysian public. The present study found that most did not agree that pharmaceutical companies made a profit off of the vaccines as compared to regular members of the public. The majority also did not agree that natural immunity was better than vaccines in protecting individuals against COVID-19 infection.

In general, the results of this study indicate that higher exposure to misinformation led to higher levels of negative attitudes toward the COVID-19 vaccine. When the perceived risk of COVID-19 infection was high, mistrust of vaccine benefits was low but there were also higher worries about the future effects of the vaccine. In other words, the Malaysian public trust that the vaccine will keep them protected from COVID-19 but are wary of its long-term effects. Previously, it was reported that a high level of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the country was due to the high perceived benefits of the vaccine, although many are still in doubt about the risks after being vaccinated⁶⁷. In this study, Confidence in government was associated with lower negative attitudes toward the vaccine across all four domains (mistrust of vaccine benefits, worries about unforeseen future effects, commercial profiteering, and preference for natural immunity). These findings

support previous studies on the moderating effect of trust in the success of national vaccination programmes. A global survey reported most respondents from China, South Korea and Singapore who had a higher level of trust toward the government were more likely to get vaccinated⁶⁸.

5. Limitations

This study utilised a convenience sampling procedure via personal and professional networks of the researchers, disseminated through online/ short messaging services. This strategy may have introduced bias as some groups may have been excluded with this method of sampling. As a result, the sample does not accurately reflect the overall population. However, as the data collection was performed during a national lockdown, it was deemed the best way possible to collect data given the limitations. When compared to the national demographics the gender distribution of the sample does not accurately reflect the current Malaysian population. The respondents of the study consisted of 69.2% women, while the current Malaysian population estimates that only 49% of the population is female. In terms of racial distribution, the study had a similar percentage reflecting the two main races in the country; however, only 2.6% of respondents were Indian, while the current national statistics estimates 6.8% of the country's population is Indian. In terms of the income distribution, 53.7% of respondents belonged to the below 40% income bracket, only 27.1% of respondents were in the middle 40% income bracket and 19.2% of respondents came from the top 20% income bracket. This variation affects the representativeness of findings to the overall population.

Another limitation that any self-administered survey has is a social desirability bias among respondents. Respondents tend to answer questions based on what they think will make them look good or what they perceive is the answer that other people expect from them. However, this study has tried to reduce this bias by assuring anonymised data collection and utilising online platforms.

6. Conclusions

This study explored factors that influence an individual's negative attitudes toward vaccination. Findings showed that higher exposure to misinformation and perceived risk of COVID-19 infection led to higher negative attitudes toward the COVID-19 vaccine. This study also found that the public's confidence in the government was high and associated with lower negative attitudes toward the vaccine across all four domains (mistrust on vaccine benefits, worries about unforeseen future effects, commercial profiteering and preference for natural immunity).

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, E.M, A.A.A., M.R.H., J.S.T., S.H.A., and S.Z.M.A.; Data curation, S.Z.M.A.; Formal analysis, J.S.T.; Funding acquisition, E.M.; Investigation, E.M, A.A.A., M.R.H., J.S.T., S.H.A., and S.Z.M.A.; Methodology, E.M, A.A.A., M.R.H., J.S.T., S.H.A., and S.Z.M.A.; Project administration, E.M., A.A.A.; Resources, E.M., A.A.A.; Software, J.S.T.; Supervision, A.A.A. and E.M.; Validation, A.A.A. and E.M.; Visualization, J.S.T.; Writing—original draft, E.M, A.A.A., M.R.H., J.S.T., S.H.A., S.Z.M.A., and A.M.T.S.; Writing—review & editing, E.M, A.A.A., and A.M.T.S. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research was funded by a grant from Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (Grant code: DPK-2021-008) and in collaboration with UNICEF Malaysia (Grant code: SK-2020-030). The funder had no role in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Institutional Review Board Statement: The study was reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, reference number: UKM PPI/111/8/JEP-2021-286.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all respondents of this study. Respondents were informed of the purpose of the study, its risks and benefits and assured of anonymity. Those who consented to willingly participate in the survey indicated their agreement by

ticking a box on the online survey form before being directed to complete the self-administered questionnaire.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to ethical considerations.

Acknowledgements: We would like to express our appreciation to Dr. Shamsiah Abd Kadir and UNICEF Malaysia for their support in this study.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Ministry of Health M. CLINICAL GUIDELINES ON COVID-19 VACCINATION IN MALAYSIA 4th Edition. *Minist Heal Malaysia*. 2021;4(October):1-175. https://covid-19.moh.gov.my/garis-panduan/garis-panduan-kkm/ANNEX_48_CLINICAL_GUIDELINES_FOR_COVID_IN_MALAYSIA_4th_EDITION_19102021_FINALE.pdf
- Dror AA, Eisenbach N, Taiber S, et al. Vaccine hesitancy: the next challenge in the fight against COVID-19. *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2020;35(8):775-779. doi:10.1007/s10654-020-00671-y
- Danabal KGM, Magesh SS, Saravanan S, Gopichandran V. Attitude towards COVID 19 vaccines and vaccine hesitancy in urban and rural communities in Tamil Nadu, India – a community based survey. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2021;21(1):1-10. doi:10.1186/s12913-021-07037-4
- Cordina M, Lauri MA, Lauri J. Attitudes towards covid-19 vaccination, vaccine hesitancy and intention to take the vaccine. *Pharm Pract (Granada)*. 2021;19(1):1-9. doi:10.18549/PharmPract.2021.1.2317
- Paul E, Steptoe A, Fancourt D. Attitudes towards vaccines and intention to vaccinate against COVID-19: Implications for public health communications. *Lancet Reg Heal - Eur*. 2021;1. doi:10.1016/j.lanepe.2020.100012
- Iguacel I, Maldonado AL, Ruiz-Cabello AL, et al. Attitudes of healthcare professionals and general population toward vaccines and the intention to Be vaccinated against COVID-19 in Spain. *Front public Heal*. 2021;9.
- Tahir MJ, Saqlain M, Tariq W, et al. Population preferences and attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination: a cross-sectional study from Pakistan. *BMC Public Health*. 2021;21(1):1-12. doi:10.1186/s12889-021-11814-5
- Suarez-Lledo V, Alvarez-Galvez J. Prevalence of health misinformation on social media: Systematic review. *J Med Internet Res*. 2021;23(1). doi:10.2196/17187
- Ghalavand H, Panahi S, Sedghi S. Opportunities and challenges of social media for health knowledge management: A narrative review. *J Educ Health Promot*. 2020;9.
- Kim HK, Tandoc EC. Consequences of Online Misinformation on COVID-19: Two Potential Pathways and Disparity by eHealth Literacy. *Front Psychol*. 2022;13(February):1-11. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2022.783909
- Barua Z, Barua S, Aktar S, Kabir N, Li M. Effects of misinformation on COVID-19 individual responses and recommendations for resilience of disastrous consequences of misinformation. *Prog Disaster Sci*. 2020;8:100119.
- Nelson T, Kagan N, Critchlow C, Hillard A, Hsu A. The Danger of Misinformation in the COVID-19 Crisis. *Mo Med*. 2020;117(6):510-512.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, OECD, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Transparency , communication and trust : The role of public communication in responding to the wave of disinformation about the new coronavirus. *Tackling Coronavirus (COVID-19)*. Published online 2020:1-12. https://www-oecd-org.proxy.library.uu.nl/coronavirus/policy-responses/transparency-communication-and-trust-bef7ad6e/#figure-d1e97%0Ahttps://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/view/?ref=135_135220-cvba4lq3ru&title=Transparency-communication-and-trust-The-role-of-publi
- Han Q, Zheng B, Cristea M, et al. Trust in government regarding COVID-19 and its associations with preventive health behaviour and prosocial behaviour during the pandemic: A cross-sectional and longitudinal study. *Psychol Med*. Published online 2021. doi:10.1017/S0033291721001306
- Schmid P, Rauber D, Betsch C, Lidolt G, Denker ML. *Barriers of Influenza Vaccination Intention and Behavior - A Systematic Review of Influenza Vaccine Hesitancy, 2005-2016*. Vol 12.; 2017. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0170550
- Palamenghi L, Barello S, Boccia S, Graffigna G. Mistrust in biomedical research and vaccine hesitancy: the forefront challenge in the battle against COVID-19 in Italy. *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2020;35(8):785-788. doi:10.1007/s10654-020-00675-8
- Simione L, Vagni M, Gnagnarella C, Bersani G, Pajardi D. Mistrust and Beliefs in Conspiracy Theories Differently Mediate the Effects of Psychological Factors on Propensity for COVID-19 Vaccine. *Front Psychol*. 2021;12(July):1-15. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2021.683684
- Rani MDM, Mohamed NA, Solehan HM, Ithnin M, Ariffien AR, Isahak I. Assessment of acceptability of the COVID-19 vaccine based on the health belief model among Malaysians-A qualitative approach. *PLoS One*. 2022;17(6):e0269059. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0269059
- Du M, Tao L, Liu J. The Association Between Risk Perception and COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy for Children Among Reproductive Women in China: An Online Survey. *Front Med*. 2021;8(September):1-10. doi:10.3389/fmed.2021.741298
- Bhuiya T, Klares R, Conte MA, Cervia JS. Predictors of misperceptions, risk perceptions, and personal risk perceptions about COVID-19 by country, education and income. *J Investig Med*. 2021;69(8):1473-1478. doi:10.1136/jim-2021-001835

21. Arce JSS, Warren SS, Meriggi NF, et al. COVID-19 vaccine acceptance and hesitancy in low- and middle-income countries. *Nat Med*. 2021;27(August). doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01454-y
22. Wagner AL, Masters NB, Domek GJ, et al. Comparisons of Vaccine Hesitancy across Five Low- and Middle-Income Countries. Published online 2019:1-11.
23. Pek CK, Choy KY, Toh KK, Foo FE, Cham TH. Dataset of vaccination and confidence in the Malaysian government during Covid-19 pandemic. *Data Br*. 2022;42:108148. doi:10.1016/j.dib.2022.108148
24. Jafar A, Dambul R, Dollah R, Sakke N, Mapa MT, Joko EP. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in Malaysia: Exploring factors and identifying highly vulnerable groups. *PLoS One*. 2022;17(7 July):1-20. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0270868
25. Ruhi S, Nabilah P, Attalla SM, et al. Understanding the negative public perception on vaccination in west coast and east coast peninsular Malaysia. *Malaysian J Med Heal Sci*. 2021;17(1):77-82.
26. Napolitano F, D'Alessandro A, Angelillo IF. Investigating Italian parents' vaccine hesitancy: A cross-sectional survey. *Hum Vaccin Immunother*. 2018;14(7):1558-1565.
27. Phillips R, Gillespie D, Hallingberg B, et al. Perceived threat of COVID-19, attitudes towards vaccination, and vaccine hesitancy: A prospective longitudinal study in the UK. *Br J Health Psychol*. 2022;(May):1-28. doi:10.1111/bjhp.12606
28. Conroy R. Sample size: a rough guide [Internet]. Ethics (Medical Research) Committee; 2015. Available from: <http://www.beaumontethics.ie/docs/application/samplesizecalculation.pdf>.
29. Israel GD. Determining sample size. Gainesville: University of Florida; 1992. Report No. : Fact Sheet PEOD-6.
30. Malaysian Communications and Multimedia Commission. Internet users survey 2018: statistical brief number twenty-three. [internet]. Cyberjaya: MCMC; 2018 [updated 2018; cited 2020 May 10]. Available from: <https://www.mcmc.gov.my/skmmgovmy/media/General/pdf/Internet-Users-Survey-2018.pdf>
31. Brislin RW. Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *J Cross Cult Psychol*. 1970;3(1): 185-216.
32. Kim, H. K., Ahn, J., Atkinson, L., & Kahlor, L. A. (2020). Effects of COVID-19 misinformation on information seeking, avoidance, and processing: A multicountry comparative study. *Science Communication*, 42(5), 586-615.
33. Oh, S. H., Paek, H. J., & Hove, T. (2015). Cognitive and emotional dimensions of perceived risk characteristics, genre-specific media effects, and risk perceptions: The case of H1N1 influenza in South Korea. *Asian Journal of Communication*, 25(1), 14-32.
34. Han, G., Zhang, J., Chu, K., & Shen, G. (2014). Self-other differences in H1N1 flu risk perception in a global context: a comparative study between the United States and China. *Health communication*, 29(2), 109-123.
35. Lee, J., Kim, J. W., & Chock, T. M. (2020). From risk butterflies to citizens engaged in risk prevention in the Zika virus crisis: Focusing on personal, societal and global risk perceptions. *Journal of Health Communication*, 25(9), 671-680.
36. Paul, E., Steptoe, A., & Fancourt, D. (2021). Attitudes towards vaccines and intention to vaccinate against COVID-19: Implications for public health communications. *The Lancet Regional Health-Europe*, 1, 100012.
37. Martin, L. R., & Petrie, K. J. (2017). Understanding the dimensions of anti-vaccination attitudes: The vaccination attitudes examination (VAX) scale. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 51(5), 652-660.
38. Malik, A. A., McFadden, S. M., Elharake, J., & Omer, S. B. (2020). Determinants of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in the US. *EclinicalMedicine*, 26, 100495.
39. van Griethuijsen RA, van Eijck MW, Haste H, den Brok PJ, Skinner NC, Mansour Net al. Global patterns in students' views of science and interest in science. *Res Sci Educ*. 2015 Aug 1;45(4):581-603.
40. Teh HS, Woon YL, Leong CT, et al. Malaysian public preferences and decision making for COVID-19 vaccination: A discrete choice experiment. *Lancet Reg Heal - West Pacific*. 2022;27:100534. doi:10.1016/j.lanwpc.2022.100534
41. Saied SM, Saied EM, Kabbash IA, Abdo SAEF. Vaccine hesitancy: Beliefs and barriers associated with COVID-19 vaccination among Egyptian medical students. *J Med Virol*. 2021;93(7):4280-4291. doi:10.1002/jmv.26910
42. Kreps SE, Goldfarb JL, Brownstein JS, Kriner DL. The relationship between us adults' misconceptions about covid-19 vaccines and vaccination preferences. *Vaccines*. 2021;9(8):1-8. doi:10.3390/vaccines9080901
43. Neely SR, Eldredge C, Ersing R, Remington C. Vaccine Hesitancy and Exposure to Misinformation: a Survey Analysis. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2022;37(1):179-187. doi:10.1007/s11606-021-07171-z
44. Neumann-Böhme S, Varghese NE, Sabat I, et al. Once we have it, will we use it? A European survey on willingness to be vaccinated against COVID-19. *Eur J Heal Econ*. 2020;21(7):977-982. doi:10.1007/s10198-020-01208-6
45. Fadda M, Albanese E, Suggs LS. When a COVID-19 vaccine is ready, will we all be ready for it? *Int J Public Health*. 2020;65(6):711-712. doi:10.1007/s00038-020-01404-4
46. Kashte S, Gulbake A, El-Amin SF, Gupta A. COVID-19 vaccines: rapid development, implications, challenges and future prospects. *Hum Cell*. 2021;34(3):711-733. doi:10.1007/s13577-021-00512-4
47. Piltch-Loeb R, Harriman NW, Healey J, et al. COVID-19 vaccine concerns about safety, effectiveness, and policies in the United States, Canada, Sweden, and Italy among unvaccinated individuals. *Vaccines*. 2021;9(10). doi:10.3390/vaccines9101138
48. Al-Qerem WA, Jarab AS. COVID-19 Vaccination Acceptance and Its Associated Factors Among a Middle Eastern Population. *Front Public Heal*. 2021;9(February):1-11. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2021.632914
49. Tu P, Kotarba M, Bier B, Clark R, Lin C. Internal and External Motivations and Risk Perception toward COVID-19 Vaccination in Adolescents in the U.S. *Vaccines*. 2022;10(5). doi:10.3390/vaccines10050697
50. Bono, S.A.; Siau, C.S.; Chen, W.S.; Low, W.Y.; Faria de Moura Villela, E.; Pengpid, S.; Hasan, M.T.; Sessou, P.; Ditekemena, J.D.; Amodan, B.O.; et al. Adults' Acceptance of COVID-19 Vaccine for Children in Selected Lower- and Middle-Income Countries. *Vaccines* 2022, 10, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines10010011>

51. Azlan AA, Hamzah MR, Sern TJ, Ayub SH, Mohamad E (2020) Public knowledge, attitudes and practices towards COVID-19: A cross-sectional study in Malaysia. PLoS ONE 15(5): e0233668. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0233668>
52. Mohamad Imam Thariq bin Mohd Iqbal, Siti A. M. Imran, Gee Jun Tye, Wan Safwani Wan Kamarul Zaman, Fazlina Nordin. COVID-19 vaccination effectiveness: A review in early vaccine adopters in Asian Countries. European Review for Medical and Pharmacological Sciences. 2022; 26: 4902-4925
53. Sato R. COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy and Trust in Government in Nigeria. *Vaccines*. 2022;10(7). doi:10.3390/vaccines10071008
54. Cooper S, van Rooyen H, Wiysonge CS. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in South Africa: how can we maximize uptake of COVID-19 vaccines? *Expert Rev Vaccines*. 2021;20(8):921-933. doi:10.1080/14760584.2021.1949291
55. Griva K, Tan KYK, Chan FHF, et al. Evaluating rates and determinants of covid-19 vaccine hesitancy for adults and children in the singapore population: Strengthening our community's resilience against threats from emerging infections (socrates) cohort. *Vaccines*. 2021;9(12). doi:10.3390/vaccines9121415
56. Mueangpoon K, Inchan C, Kaewmunechoke P, et al. Self-Reported COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy and Willingness to Pay: A Cross-Sectional Survey in Thailand. *Vaccines*. 2022;10(4):1-16. doi:10.3390/vaccines10040627
57. Yanto TA, Octavius GS, Heriyanto RS, Ienawi C, Nisa H, Pasai HE. Psychological factors affecting COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in Indonesia. *Egypt J Neurol Psychiatry Neurosurg*. 2021;57(1). doi:10.1186/s41983-021-00436-8
58. Kukreti S, Rifai A, Padmalatha S, et al. Willingness to obtain COVID-19 vaccination in general population: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Glob Health*. 2022;12. doi:10.7189/jogh.12.05006
59. Khattak S, Idrees M, Iqbal HI, Khan M, Assad N. Assessment of Attitudes and Intentions towards COVID-19 Vaccines and Associated Factors among General Populations of Pakistan : A Cross-Sectional Study. Published online 2022.
60. Callaghan T, Moghtaderi A, Lueck JA, et al. Correlates and disparities of intention to vaccinate against COVID-19. *Soc Sci Med*. 2021;272(January). doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113638
61. Reuters. False claim: A COVID-19 vaccine will genetically modify humans [Internet]. 2020. [cited 2020 Dec 13]. Available from: <https://www.reuters.com/article/uk-factcheck-covid-19-vaccine-modify-idUSKBN22U2BZ>
62. Dror AA, Eisenbach N, Taiber S, et al. Vaccine hesitancy: the next challenge in the fight against COVID-19. *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2020;35(8):775-779. doi:10.1007/s10654-020-00671-y
63. Gagneux-Brunon A, Detoc M, Bruel S, et al. Intention to get vaccinations against COVID-19 in French healthcare workers during the first pandemic wave: a cross-sectional survey. *J Hosp Infect*. 2021;108:168-173. doi:10.1016/j.jhin.2020.11.020
64. Shekhar R, Sheikh AB, Upadhyay S, et al. COVID-19 vaccine acceptance among health care workers in the United States. *Vaccines*. 2021;9(2):119.
65. Nailul Muna AM, and Karniza Khalid, and Siti Noriani AW, and Irma Liyana M, and Siti Zulaiha CH, and Mohamad Zamri K, and Othman W, (2022) COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy : mobile education initiatives to improve vaccination uptake among healthcare workers. *Medicine & Health*, 17 (1). pp. 260-266. ISSN 2289-5728
66. Paul E, Steptoe A, Fancourt D. Attitudes towards vaccines and intention to vaccinate against COVID-19: Implications for public health communications. *Lancet Reg Heal - Eur*. 2021;1. doi:10.1016/j.lanepe.2020.100012
67. Azirul Hanif Sri, (2021). Public Awareness, Knowledge, and Attitude towards Conventional and Modern Biotechnology Based Vaccines in Malaysia. *MALIM: Jurnal Pengajian Umum Asia Tenggara*, 22 . pp. 198-214. ISSN 1511-8393
68. Lazarus J V., Ratzan SC, Palayew A, et al. A global survey of potential acceptance of a COVID-19 vaccine. *Nat Med*. 2021;27(2):225-228. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-1124-9