

This is a pre-copyedited, author-produced PDF of an article accepted for publication in *Annals of Behavioral Medicine* following peer review. The version of record Wood L, Smith M, Miller C & O'Carroll R (2019) The internal consistency and validity of the Vaccination Attitudes Examination (VAX) Scale: A replication study. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 53 (1), pp. 109-114 is available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/abm/kay043>

# Annals of Behavioral Medicine

## The internal consistency and validity of the Vaccination Attitudes Examination (VAX) Scale: A replication study --Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	ANBM-D-17-00453R2	
<b>Full Title:</b>	The internal consistency and validity of the Vaccination Attitudes Examination (VAX) Scale: A replication study	
<b>Article Type:</b>	Brief Report	
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>	Christopher Miller, PhD University of Stirling UNITED KINGDOM	
<b>Corresponding Author Secondary Information:</b>		
<b>Corresponding Author's Institution:</b>	University of Stirling	
<b>Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:</b>		
<b>First Author:</b>	Louise Wood	
<b>First Author Secondary Information:</b>		
<b>Order of Authors:</b>	Louise Wood	
	Michael Smith	
	Christopher B Miller, PhD	
	Ronan E O'Carroll	
<b>Order of Authors Secondary Information:</b>		
<b>Funding Information:</b>	University of Stirling	Dr Christopher B Miller
<b>Abstract:</b>	<p>Background: Vaccinations are important preventative health behaviors. The recently developed Vaccination Attitudes Examination Scale (VAX) aims to measure the reasons behind refusal/hesitancy regarding vaccinations.</p> <p>Purpose: The aim of this replication study is to conduct an independent test of the newly developed VAX scale in the U.K. We tested: (a) internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha); (b) convergent validity by assessing its relationships with beliefs about medication, medical mistrust and perceived sensitivity to medicines; and (c) construct validity by testing how well the VAX scale discriminated between vaccinators and non-vaccinators.</p> <p>Methods: A sample of 243 UK adults completed the VAX scale, the Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire (BMQ), the Perceived Sensitivity to Medicines Scale (PSM) and the Medical Mistrust Index (MMI), in addition to demographics of age, gender, education levels and social deprivation. Participants were asked: (a) if they received an influenza vaccination in the past year; and (b) if they had a young child, had they vaccinated their young child against influenza in the past year.</p> <p>Results: The VAX: (a) demonstrated high internal consistency (<math>\alpha=0.92</math>); (b) was positively correlated with medical mistrust, beliefs about medicines and less strongly correlated with perceived sensitivity to medicines; and (c) successfully differentiated parental influenza vaccinators from non-vaccinators.</p> <p>Conclusion: The VAX demonstrated good internal consistency, convergent and construct validity in an independent UK sample. It appears to be a useful measure to help us understand the health beliefs that promote or deter vaccination behavior.</p>	

**Running head: Assessment of the Vaccination Attitudes Examination scale**

**Title: The internal consistency and validity of the Vaccination Attitudes Examination (VAX) Scale: A replication study**

Louise Wood <sup>1</sup>  
Michael Smith <sup>1</sup>  
Christopher B. Miller, PhD <sup>1</sup>  
\*Ronan E. O'Carroll, PhD <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Division of Psychology, University of Stirling, Stirling FK9 4LA, UK

**\*Corresponding Author:**

Professor Ronan E. O'Carroll,  
Division of Psychology, School of Natural Sciences,  
University of Stirling,  
Stirling FK9 4LA, UK  
E-mail: [ronan.ocarroll@stir.ac.uk](mailto:ronan.ocarroll@stir.ac.uk)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

**Title: The internal consistency and validity of the Vaccination Attitudes Examination (VAX) Scale: A replication study**

**Running head: Assessment of the Vaccination Attitudes Examination Scale**

**Reviewer Information**

Page count: <15 + supplementary material

Abstract Word Count: <250

Word Count: 1652

Numbers of Tables: 4

Numbers of Figures: 0

Number of references: 13

**Key Words:**

Vaccination Behavior, Vaccine, Vaccination Attitudes.

1  
2  
3  
4 **Abstract (word count: <250)**  
5

6 **Background:** Vaccinations are important preventative health behaviors. The recently  
7 developed Vaccination Attitudes Examination Scale (VAX) aims to measure the reasons  
8 behind refusal/hesitancy regarding vaccinations.  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14 **Purpose:** The aim of this replication study is to conduct an independent test of the  
15 newly developed VAX scale in the U.K. We tested: (a) internal consistency (Cronbach's  
16 alpha); (b) convergent validity by assessing its relationships with beliefs about  
17 medication, medical mistrust and perceived sensitivity to medicines; and (c) construct  
18 validity by testing how well the VAX scale discriminated between vaccinators and non-  
19 vaccinators.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 **Methods:** A sample of 243 UK adults completed the VAX scale, the Beliefs about  
29 Medicines Questionnaire (BMQ), the Perceived Sensitivity to Medicines Scale (PSM)  
30 and the Medical Mistrust Index (MMI), in addition to demographics of age, gender,  
31 education levels and social deprivation. Participants were asked: (a) if they received an  
32 influenza vaccination in the past year; and (b) if they had a young child, had they  
33 vaccinated their young child against influenza in the past year.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 **Results:** The VAX: (a) demonstrated high internal consistency ( $\alpha=0.92$ ); (b) was  
44 positively correlated with medical mistrust, beliefs about medicines and less strongly  
45 correlated with perceived sensitivity to medicines; and (c) successfully differentiated  
46 parental influenza vaccinators from non-vaccinators.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 **Conclusion:** The VAX demonstrated good internal consistency, convergent and  
53 construct validity in an independent UK sample. It appears to be a useful measure to  
54 help us understand the health beliefs that promote or deter vaccination behavior.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62

## Introduction

Vaccinations are important for the maintenance of health. They help control the spread of infectious disease and evidence suggests they are safer and more effective than therapeutics (1). In 2008, The World Health Organization (WHO) proposed a population immunity target of >95% as key to the eradication of infectious diseases like influenza (1). Despite this, data from March 2017 indicated that parental uptake of booster vaccinations to protect against *Haemophilus influenzae* type band meningitis C for children at 2 years old was only 91.8% in the U.K. (2). This failure to vaccinate has caused the resurgence of other preventable diseases such as whooping cough and measles (1, 3), increasing the risk of serious health consequences for young children. Investigating the determinants of vaccination behavior is, therefore, an important area of behavioral medicine.

Vaccination rates for communicable diseases are on the decline across the world and this has led to a proportionate increase of disease thought to be either eradicated or at least controlled. Anti-vaccination attitudes also appear to be increasing and may be somewhat responsible for vaccination failure (4-8). Positive attitudes towards vaccinations are also thought to be important predictors of vaccination behavior. The Vaccination Attitudes Examination (VAX) scale is a recently developed brief 12-item questionnaire created to better understand general vaccination attitudes (3). Higher total VAX scores suggest stronger anti-vaccination attitudes and four more specific subscales evaluate: 1) *mistrust of vaccine benefit (higher scores indicate more mistrust)*, 2) *worries about unforeseen future effects (higher scores indicate more worry)*, 3) *concerns about commercial profiteering (higher scores indicate more*

1  
2  
3  
4 *concern*) and 4) *preference for natural immunity* (higher scores indicate more of a  
5  
6 *preference*) (3). The questionnaire demonstrated high internal consistency across the  
7  
8 four subscales in a U.S. population (3). The developers of the VAX scale found total  
9  
10 scores to differentiate vaccinators from non-vaccinators and higher scores were  
11  
12 positively correlated with increased perceived sensitivity to medicines and the tendency  
13  
14 to obtain health information online (3).  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 The aim of this replication study is to assess the VAX in an independent UK  
21  
22 sample and determine: (a) internal consistency; (b) convergent validity by testing the  
23  
24 association between total VAX scores and beliefs about medication, measures of  
25  
26 medical mistrust and perceived sensitivity to medicines, and (c) construct validity in  
27  
28 differentiating vaccinators from non-vaccinators.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

### 34 ***Hypotheses***

35  
36 VAX scores will; (a) demonstrate high internal consistency, (b) VAX scores will  
37  
38 positively correlate with increased medical mistrust, negative beliefs about medicines  
39  
40 and perceived sensitivity to medicines and (c) influenza non-vaccinators will display  
41  
42 increased total VAX scores compared to influenza vaccinators.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 **Methods**  
5  
6

7 ***Participants***  
8  
9

10 243 U.K. residents (218 females and 25 males) aged 18 and over voluntarily completed  
11 an online questionnaire. Participants were recruited through the university by posting  
12 links on social media such as Facebook and twitter to take part in the survey. Table 1  
13 shows demographic characteristics including mean Scottish Index of Multiple  
14 Deprivation (SIMD) (9) decile ranking scores, an indicator of socio-economic status,  
15 ranking from 1 (high deprivation) to 10 (low deprivation). The median age was between  
16 35-44, and the median education level was an undergraduate university degree for the  
17 total sample and for the parents. Ethical approval was granted by the University of  
18 Stirling Psychology Department Ethics Committee prior to study commencement.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 ***Measures***  
33  
34

35 All data were captured electronically by Qualtrics online questionnaires including the 12-  
36 item VAX (3), the Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire (BMQ) (10); the Perceived  
37 Sensitivity to Medicines Scale (PSM) (11); and the Medical Mistrust Index (MMI) (12):  
38 see supplementary material for further scale information. Participants were also asked  
39 their gender, postcode (for SIMD socio-economic status scores (9)), age, education  
40 level, if they (a) received an influenza vaccination in the past year, and (b) if they were  
41 parents to a young child, if they vaccinated their child against influenza or not in the past  
42 year (both free in the UK National Health Service). Self-reported influenza vaccine  
43 status has been found to be a sensitive and fairly specific indicator of actual vaccine  
44 status (13).  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4 **Procedure**  
5

6  
7 The online questionnaire was constructed using Qualtrics software, then distributed to  
8  
9 the University of Stirling Online Portal, Facebook and Twitter. Informed consent was  
10  
11 obtained and anonymity was assured.  
12  
13

14  
15 **Data Analysis**  
16

17 Cronbach's  $\alpha$  was used to test internal consistency of the VAX scale. For the full  
18  
19 sample, logistic regression was used to predict vaccination status from VAX, BMQ,  
20  
21 PSM and MMI mean scores. In a subsample, independent samples *t*-tests were  
22  
23 conducted to compare parents who vaccinated their child to those who do not for VAX  
24  
25 total and subscale scores, BMQ, PSM and MMI mean scores. Pairwise correlations  
26  
27 between VAX, BMQ, PSM and MMI mean scores and between the 4 VAX subscales  
28  
29 were also assessed. Multiple regression assessed the predictive effect of BMQ, MMI,  
30  
31 PSM, gender, age, education and socio-economic status on mean VAX scores for the  
32  
33 total sample. Statistical significance was set at .05. Statistical analyses were conducted  
34  
35 using SPSS for Windows (v23). R 3.4.3 for Windows was employed for confirmatory  
36  
37 factor analysis (CFA) using the Lavaan package: see supplementary material.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Results

### *Questionnaire Data*

*Internal consistency* For the 12 item VAX, a Cronbach's  $\alpha$  value of 0.92 was obtained, demonstrating excellent internal consistency in the sample ( $n = 243$ ). Subscale internal consistency was: 1) *trust of vaccine benefits*, Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.89$ ; 2) *worries over unforeseen future effects*, Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.79$ ; 3) *concerns about commercial profiteering*, Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.91$ ; and 4) *preference for natural immunity*, Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.86$ , all demonstrated good-excellent internal consistency. Internal consistency of the other scales were; BMQ, Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.84$ , PSM, Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.86$ , MMI, Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.89$ .

### *Convergent Validity*

#### *Correlations between Scale Scores*

Table 2 shows correlations measuring the associations between the BMQ, VAX, PSM and MMI means for the total sample ( $n = 243$ ). Mean VAX scores correlated positively with medical mistrust and beliefs about medicines and less strongly with perceived sensitivity to medicines.

### *Construct Validity*

A multiple regression analysis with forced entry methodology was used to predict mean total VAX scores from BMQ, MMI, PSM, gender, age, socio-economic status, and education for the total sample ( $n = 243$ ). The final model was statistically significant  $F(3, 242) = 63.5$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , *Adjusted R*<sup>2</sup> = 0.44 and retained BMQ ( $p < 0.001$ ), MMI ( $p < 0.001$ ), and education levels ( $p = .007$ ). All added significantly to the predication (see Table 3).

1  
2  
3  
4 *Vaccinators and Non-Vaccinators*  
5

6  
7 Logistic regression was performed to ascertain whether total VAX, BMQ, PSM, and MMI  
8  
9 questionnaire scores were associated with the likelihood that participants did not  
10  
11 receive the flu vaccination. In the first univariate model, a 1 point increase in the total  
12  
13 VAX scale score was associated with a 1.69 increased likelihood of non-vaccination  
14  
15 status. In the second multivariate model, total BMQ, PSM, & MMI scores were added  
16  
17 and although the overall model was significant, none of the individual scales emerged  
18  
19 as significant univariate predictors of non-vaccination status (see Table 4a).  
20  
21  
22

23  
24  
25 *Child Vaccinators and Non-Vaccinators*  
26

27 Table 4b shows *t*-test comparisons for parents who did or did not vaccinate their  
28  
29 children for influenza in the last 12 months (total  $n = 85$ ). Parents of non-vaccinators  
30  
31 had significantly higher total VAX scale scores and significantly higher mean scores for  
32  
33 VAX subscale 2): worries over unforeseen future effects ( $p < 0.05$ ).  
34  
35  
36

37  
38 *Confirmatory factor analysis*  
39

40 Replicating previous findings (3), CFA was run on all 12 VAX items grouped into the 4  
41  
42 predetermined subscales (3 items for each subscale). The Tucker-Lewis Index was  
43  
44 greater than 1 and the Normed Fit Index (0.998) suggested a good model fit (see  
45  
46 supplementary material).  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Discussion

This replication study investigated the internal consistency and validity of the newly developed VAX scale in an independent U.K. sample. The VAX: (a) proved to have high internal consistency; (b) demonstrated convergent validity with the hypothesized positive relationships with medical mistrust, beliefs about medicines and perceived sensitivity to medicines; and (c) successfully differentiated parental vaccinators/non-vaccinators.

The four VAX subscales may be important for furthering our understanding of vaccination attitudes. We provided confirmatory independent evidence that the four subscales of the VAX correlated significantly with one another (3). Furthermore, confirmatory factor analysis verified the use of four subscales from the 12-item VAX in this U.K. participant sample. This supports the conclusions by the VAX developers, who suggest that the four subscales are distinct but correlated. When comparing participants who vaccinated themselves in the past year to non-vaccinators, in univariate analysis, the VAX clearly differentiated vaccinators from non-vaccinators. Critically, only the VAX differentiated parents who vaccinated their child in the past year to non-vaccinators. This suggests the VAX may be a particularly useful measure of potential psychological determinants of vaccination behavior for parents of young children.

Limitations of the study include the low number of male participants, particularly amongst the parents of young children. We also had twice as many influenza non-vaccinators as vaccinators. The use of influenza vaccination questioning to establish participants as either vaccinators or non-vaccinators should be interpreted with caution

1  
2  
3  
4 as not all participants were medically indicated to receive this vaccination annually.  
5  
6 Looking at the sample age characteristics, most participants were aged less than 65  
7  
8 years and would not have been eligible for free vaccination in the UK. However, many  
9  
10 younger people in the UK do opt to pay a small fee (£10 ≈ \$14) for annual flu  
11  
12 vaccination. Further studies should now evaluate the use of the VAX in a more  
13  
14 homogenous sample of participants who are medically indicated to receive this  
15  
16 vaccination (including: parents of young children, expectant mothers and older  
17  
18 individuals). In addition, more comprehensive psychometric evaluations of the VAX  
19  
20 would be welcome.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 **Conclusion and Implications**  
5

6  
7 In an independent U.K. sample, the VAX scale exhibited high internal  
8 consistency and successfully differentiated parents who vaccinated their children from  
9 those who did not. Higher VAX scores were associated with higher medical mistrust and  
10 general concerns about medication. Finally, increased education predicted lower VAX  
11 scores. The VAX appears to be a useful new measure to help us understand the health  
12 beliefs that promote and deter vaccination behavior.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 **Tables**  
5  
6

7 **Table 1:** Demographic characteristics and descriptive information for the total sample  
8 (n=243).  
9

Demographics		Overall sample (N, %)		
Age				
	18-24	60 (25%)		
	25-34	56 (23%)		
	35-44	65 (27%)		
	45-54	43 (18%)		
	55+	19 (8%)		
Sex				
	Male	25 (10%)		
	Female	218 (90%)		
Education				
	High School	37 (15%)		
	College	67 (28%)		
	University	105 (43%)		
	Postgraduate	34 (14%)		
Mean (SD) SIMD Decile Ranking		5.7 (2.7)		
		Yes	No	Maybe
	Take medication regularly	129 (53%)	114 (47%)	.
	Got flu vaccination this year	80 (33%)	163 (67%)	.
	Child got flu vaccination this year <sup>a</sup>	48 (20%)	37 (15%)	.
	Will get flu vaccination next year	78 (32%)	165 (68%)	.
	Child will get flu vaccination next year	54 (22%)	19 (8%)	19 (8%)

53  
54 **Note:** SD = Standard Deviation; SIMD = Scottish Index of multiple deprivation:  
55 an indicator of socio-economic status 2012, ranking from 1 (high deprivation) to  
56 10 (low deprivation). <sup>a</sup> sub-sample of 85 participants who were parents of a  
57 young child.  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62

**Table 2:** Correlation matrix showing associations between mean VAX scale scores and relevant questionnaires (n = 243).

Measure	VAX Mean	BMQ Mean	PSM Mean	MMI Mean
VAX	-	-	-	-
BMQ	.602***	-	-	-
PSM	.157*	.209**	-	-
MMI	.509***	.479***	.122	-

**Note:** VAX: Vaccination Attitudes Examination Scale; BMQ: Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire; PSM: Perceived Sensitivity to Medicines Scale; MMI: Medical Mistrust Index. \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p = < .01$ . \*\*\*  $p = < .001$ .

**Table 3:** Summary of the regression analysis for the total sample (n = 243) predicting overall Vaccination Attitudes Examination Scale score.

Variable	B	SE <sup>B</sup>	$\beta$	95%CI for B	
				Lower	Upper
Intercept	0.89	0.19	-	0.53	1.26
BMQ	0.47	0.06	0.47***	0.36	0.59
MMI	0.23	0.05	0.26***	0.14	0.33
Education	-0.10	0.04	-0.13**	-0.18	-0.03

**Note:** *Adjusted R*<sup>2</sup> = .44. BMQ: Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire; MMI: Medical Mistrust Index; VAX: Vaccination Attitudes Examination Scale. \*\*  $p = < .01$ . \*\*\*  $p = < .001$ .



**Table 4 (a):** Summary of logistic regression analysis for the total sample (n = 243) to predict non-vaccination status.

Measure	Model 1				Model 2			
	B	Exp(B)	95%CI for Exp(B)		B	Exp(B)	95%CI for Exp(B)	
			Lower	Upper			Lower	Upper
Intercept	-0.56	0.57	-	-	-1.36	0.26	-	-
<b>VAX</b>	<b>0.52*</b>	<b>1.69</b>	<b>1.12</b>	<b>2.54</b>	0.24	1.27	0.75	2.15
BMQ	-				0.15	1.16	0.68	1.99
PSM	-				0.11	1.11	0.77	1.60
MMI	-				0.33	1.38	0.90	2.12
Nagelkerke $r^2$	3.7%				5.8%			
$\chi^2$	6.61, df = 1, p=0.010				10.32, df = 4, p=0.035			

**Table 4 (b):** *t*-test results showing means (SD), *t*-values, *p*-values and effect size scores for parents who did/did not vaccinate their children for influenza in the last 12 months (total n = 85).

Measure	Child Vaccinator n=48	Child Non-Vaccinator n=37	<i>t</i> -Value	<i>p</i> -Value	Cohen's <i>d</i>
<b>VAX</b>	<b>2.51(0.46)</b>	<b>2.78(0.72)</b>	<b>-2.025</b>	<b>.040*</b>	<b>0.48</b>
VAX SUB 1	2.08(0.61)	2.36(0.94)	-1.643	.104	0.36
<b>VAX SUB 2</b>	<b>3.05(0.61)</b>	<b>3.38(0.82)</b>	<b>-2.129</b>	<b>.036*</b>	<b>0.47</b>
VAX SUB 3	2.35(0.62)	2.59(0.90)	-1.462	.147	0.32
VAX SUB 4	2.56(0.75)	2.78(0.80)	-1.373	.173	0.28
BMQ	2.48(0.59)	2.69(0.60)	-1.642	.104	0.35
PSM	2.33(0.73)	2.48(1.02)	-0.821	.414	0.17
MMI	2.87(0.71)	2.80(0.73)	0.442	.659	0.10

**Note:** BMQ: Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire; MMI: Medical Mistrust Index; PSM: the Perceived Sensitivity to Medicines Scale; VAX: Vaccination

1  
2  
3  
4 Attitudes Examination Scale; VAX SUB 1: trust of vaccine benefits; VAX SUB 2:  
5 worries over unforeseen future effects; VAX SUB 3: concerns about commercial  
6 profiteering; and, VAX SUB 4: preference for natural immunity. \*  $p < .05$ .  
7  
8  
9

## 10 References

- 11 1. Andre FE, Booy R, Bock HL, et al.: Vaccination greatly reduces disease, disability, death  
12 and inequity worldwide. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2008, 86:140-146.
- 13 2. Quarterly vaccination coverage statistics for children aged up to five years in the UK  
14 (COVER programme) : April to June 2017: *Health Protection Report*: Public Health England,  
15 2017.
- 16 3. Martin LR, Petrie KJ: Understanding the Dimensions of Anti-Vaccination Attitudes: the  
17 Vaccination Attitudes Examination (VAX) Scale. *Ann Behav Med*. 2017.
- 18 4. Pearce A, Law C, Elliman D, Cole TJ, Bedford H: Factors associated with uptake of  
19 measles, mumps, and rubella vaccine (MMR) and use of single antigen vaccines in a  
20 contemporary UK cohort: prospective cohort study. *Bmj*. 2008, 336:754-757.
- 21 5. Palache A, Oriol-Mathieu V, Abelin A, Music T: Seasonal influenza vaccine dose  
22 distribution in 157 countries (2004-2011). *Vaccine*. 2014, 32:6369-6376.
- 23 6. Jansen VA, Stollenwerk N, Jensen HJ, et al.: Measles outbreaks in a population with  
24 declining vaccine uptake. *Science*. 2003, 301:804.
- 25 7. Phadke VK, Bednarczyk RA, Salmon DA, Omer SB: Association Between Vaccine  
26 Refusal and Vaccine-Preventable Diseases in the United States: A Review of Measles and  
27 Pertussis. *Jama*. 2016, 315:1149-1158.
- 28 8. Cherry JD: Epidemic pertussis in 2012--the resurgence of a vaccine-preventable  
29 disease. *N Engl J Med*. 2012, 367:785-787.
- 30 9. Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation 2012 Technical Report: *Scottish Index of Multiple*  
31 *Deprivation 2012 Technical Report*,. Edinburgh: Scottish Government, 2012.
- 32 10. Horne R, Weinman J, Hankins M: The beliefs about medicines questionnaire: The  
33 development and evaluation of a new method for assessing the cognitive representation of  
34 medication. *PSYCHOL HEALTH*. 1999, 14:1-24.
- 35 11. Horne R, Faasse K, Cooper V, et al.: The perceived sensitivity to medicines (PSM)  
36 scale: an evaluation of validity and reliability. *Br J Health Psychol*. 2013, 18:18-30.
- 37 12. LaVeist TA, Isaac LA, Williams KP: Mistrust of health care organizations is associated  
38 with underutilization of health services. *Health Serv Res*. 2009, 44:2093-2105.
- 39 13. Irving SA, Donahue JG, Shay DK, Ellis-Coyle TL, Belongia EA: Evaluation of self-  
40 reported and registry-based influenza vaccination status in a Wisconsin cohort. *Vaccine*. 2009,  
41 27:6546-6549.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Supplementary material

### Further scale information

For the convergent validity, we included the following scales: Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire (BMQ) by Horne et al., (1999) (10) the Perceived Sensitivity to Medicines Scale (PSM) by Horne et al., (2013) (11) and the Medical Mistrust Index (MMI) by LaVeist et al., (2009) (12).

The 8-item general version of the BMQ was included and asks participants about their personal views, beliefs and worries about taking medicines (e.g., “Doctors use too many medicines”). Responses are indicated on a 5-point Likert answer option, which varies from 1 ‘strongly disagree’ to 5 ‘strongly agree’. Higher scores indicate stronger and more negative beliefs about the use of medicines (10). This scale was selected to probe perceptions about medicines in general and evaluate similarities to vaccination attitudes.

The short 5-item PSM scale was included to understand in what way participants generally respond when they take prescribed medication (e.g., “My body is very sensitive to medicines”). Responses are captured on a 5-item Likert-type scale and range from 1 ‘strongly disagree’ to 5 ‘strongly agree’. Higher scores indicate more perceived sensitivity to medicines and someone with a high score may less willing to take as much medication to either avoid a potential adverse effect or because they believe they require less medication compared to others with lower PSM scores (11).

1  
2  
3  
4 Here, we wanted to see if these perceptions about medicines were similar to attitudes  
5  
6 about vaccination.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 The 7-item MMI asks participants about their feelings and trust with regards to the  
12  
13 National Health Service (the publicly funded national healthcare system in the U.K.) in  
14  
15 their local area including a hospital, clinic or the general health care system (e.g.,  
16  
17 “mistakes are common in the NHS”). Responses are captured on a 5-item Likert-type  
18  
19 scale and range from 1 ‘strongly disagree’ to 5 ‘strongly agree’. Higher scores indicate  
20  
21 more perceived mistrust in the health service (12) and these negative believes may be  
22  
23 similar in those with anti-vaccination attitudes.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

### 31 **Confirmatory factor analysis**

32  
33 Confirmatory factor analysis of the four previously determined VAX subscale factors  
34  
35 was achieved using the Lavaan package for R version 3.4.3. A diagonally weighted  
36  
37 least squares algorithm specifying ordinal data was employed using all 12 VAX items in  
38  
39 the following model and fit\*:  
40  
41  
42

```
43     model: <- ‘  
44  
45     subscale1 =~ vax1r + vax2r + vax3r  
46  
47     subscale2 =~ vax4 + vax5 + vax6  
48  
49     subscale3 =~ vax7 + vax8 + vax9  
50  
51     subscale4 =~ vax10 + vax11 + vax12  
52  
53  
54  
55     ‘
```

```
1
2
3
4     fit <- cfa(model, data = vaxdata,
5
6         ordered=c("vax1r", "vax2r", "vax3r",
7
8             "vax4", "vax5", "vax6",
9
10            "vax7", "vax8", "vax9",
11
12            "vax10", "vax11", "vax12"))
13
14
15
16
17
18
```

19 \* Note: subscale1 = trust of benefits, subscale2 = worries over future effects, subscale3  
20 = concerns about commercial profiteering and subscale4 = preference for natural  
21 immunity, reverse item scoring is indicated by (r).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Results of confirmatory factor analysis suggest a good model fit with  $\chi^2$  (48,  $N = 243$ ) =  
29 33.898,  $p = 0.938$ , Comparative Fit Index = 1.00, Normed Fit Index = 0.998, Tucker-  
30 Lewis Index = 1.001, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation 0.000, and 90%  
31 confidence interval = 0.000 – 0.010.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65