



Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect, the company's public news and information website.

Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories, such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source. These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active.



ELSEVIER

## Review

**Public policy and conspiracies: The case of mandates**Stephan Lewandowsky<sup>1,2,a</sup>, Dawn Holford<sup>1</sup> and Philipp Schmid<sup>3</sup>**Abstract**

Although conspiracy theories are only endorsed by a minority, conspiracy theories can nonetheless compromise public health measures to control the COVID-19 pandemic. Individuals who endorse conspiracy theories were less likely to wear masks, comply with social distancing, or get vaccinated. This poses a challenge to public health policy, in particular because vaccine uptake lags behind targets because of resistance from a relatively small, but highly vocal, number of people. One policy tool is to enact vaccine mandates, which, while controversial, have successfully increased vaccination uptake. In this article, we review the evidence about whether mandates can be successful, and whether they trigger increased opposition and conspiracy beliefs. We discuss the implications for using mandates in public health policy and argue that decisions about mandates need to be weighed against the consequences of alternative measures—which may also increase conspiracy beliefs albeit for different reasons.

**Addresses**<sup>1</sup> University of Bristol, UK<sup>2</sup> University of Western Australia, Australia<sup>3</sup> University of Erfurt, GermanyCorresponding author: Lewandowsky, Stephan ([stephan.lewandowsky@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:stephan.lewandowsky@bristol.ac.uk))<sup>a</sup> Personal web page: <http://www.cogsciwa.com>**Current Opinion in Psychology** 2022, **47**:101427This review comes from a themed issue on **Conspiracy Theories (2023)**Edited by **Jan-Willem van Prooijen** and **Roland Imhoff**For complete overview about the section, refer [Conspiracy Theories \(2023\)](#)

Available online 20 July 2022

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2022.101427>2352-250X/© 2022 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).**Trust and contrarians: The great bifurcation**

The COVID-19 pandemic that turned the world upside down in 2020 also had notable consequences on public attitudes towards science, scientists, and evidence-

based policy making. In numerous countries, the pandemic was accompanied by a striking increase in the public's trust in science and scientists. For example, in Germany the share of people who fully trusted science and research nearly tripled from around 11% in 2017–2019 to over 30% in April and May 2020, and the share of people who trusted science at least partially rose from around 50% to around 70% during the same period [55]. This increased trust slightly declined from that peak over time, but still remained considerably higher than before the pandemic in late 2020 [7] and late 2021 [56]. Similar trends have been observed across the globe: In a survey of the public in 113 countries, overall those who said they trust scientists “a lot” rose from 34% in 2018 to 43% by the end of 2020 [54].

However, this overall trend excluded a relatively small segment of the population which remained entrenched in conspiracy theories and opposition to public-health measures. For example, 10%–30% of the British public expressed belief in a variety of conspiracy theories relating to the virus in 2020 [18,45]. In Germany, declining trust was particularly pronounced among supporters of the extreme right AfD party, which eventually aligned itself with outright deniers of the pandemic [7]. Although the number of people who overtly believe in conspiracy theories falls far short of the majority, the overabundance of misinformation and conspiracy theories [14,36], in particular on social media [2], must not be trivialized. The “infodemic” [58] has had adverse real-world consequences—including for innocent bystanders. For example, in the U.K., the baseless claim that 5G broadband was causing the virus-borne disease led to vandalism against numerous telecommunications installations in early 2020 including attacks on telecom engineers [8,22]. The destruction of telecommunications equipment clearly endangers others, for example, when people are unable to call for help. Individuals who endorse conspiracy theories about COVID-19 are also less likely to accept public health experts' warnings about the severity of the crisis [31]; less likely to engage in social distancing [41]; less likely to vaccinate [16]; more likely to oppose mask wearing [27]; and more likely to believe in ineffective pseudo-scientific “cures” such as chloroquine [4]. As a result, others in the population face more risk from the spread of disease.

In summary, more than two years into the pandemic, a striking bifurcation of public opinion can be observed. On the one hand, a large majority trusts scientists (frequently more now than pre-pandemic) and acts in support of public health (e.g., by wearing masks, being vaccinated, and complying with social distancing). On the other hand, a small but radicalized minority endorses various conspiracy theories and refuses to get vaccinated or comply with behavioural measures.

The challenge for policy makers and public health officials is that the behaviour of the minority remains important to bringing the pandemic under control, because this requires a substantial proportion of the population to engage in a combination of non-pharmaceutical interventions (e.g., mask-wearing) and vaccinations. How can the minority that continues to resist or delay vaccination (e.g., around 20% of the eligible population in Germany as of April 23, 2022; <https://impfdashboard.de/>) be persuaded to receive the vaccination? Several communication strategies, such as providing explanations about new technologies (i.e., mRNA vaccines; [35]), have been found to be effective in increasing vaccine willingness. A particularly promising avenue involves “inoculation,” where people are informed about the rhetorical techniques that disinformers may use to spread false information. When such misleading rhetoric is subsequently encountered, people are demonstrably more resistant to it than in the absence of inoculation [24,25,37]. Inoculation has been found to be effective in the context of misinformation relating to COVID-19 vaccines [26,50]. Numerous other avenues based on current psychological knowledge have been reviewed by Habersaat et al.[20].

There are, however, reasons to suspect that mere communication will be insufficient to sway people who are still unvaccinated. For example, in October 2021, two thirds of unvaccinated Germans completely ruled out that they would get vaccinated and a further 23% considered it unlikely [47]. Actual vaccine uptake meshes well with those self reports: In the 8 months since the survey data were collected (November 2021–June 2022), only 6 million Germans received their first dose, out of 20.5 million unvaccinated but eligible people.<sup>1</sup>

An alternative tool that may therefore appear particularly attractive to policy makers involves vaccine mandates, which are relatively easy to establish by regulation. Because mandates are, by definition, coercive, they have always been politically and ethically controversial [38]. In particular, mandates may cause psychological reactance, expressed as anger and other negative emotions and the motivation to reclaim the freedom lost by a mandate [43]. It is therefore not altogether clear that mandates would be effective in

enhancing vaccine uptake, in particular in light of entrenched opposition by a minority.

### **Vaccination mandates: Another bifurcation**

Mandates can be operationalized in several ways. In the context of COVID-19, mandates usually involve the requirement for persons to show proof of vaccination (often a digital pass stored on a smartphone) to gain access to certain privileges, ranging from dining in a restaurant to plane travel or the ability to retain one’s job.

There is considerable evidence that mandates successfully increase vaccine uptake, largely irrespective of location and type of vaccine. For example, across Europe, mandates have been found to increase uptake of common childhood vaccinations [49]. In the context of COVID-19, a comparison of 6 European countries that introduced COVID-19 passes in 2021 to countries that did not showed that passes increased uptake for countries that had below-average vaccination uptake before the passes [30]. In France, COVID-19 vaccine uptake rose to 90% of the eligible population (November 2021) after the introduction of passes in the summer of that year [52]. By contrast, in April of the previous year, nearly one quarter of surveyed respondents indicated that they would not take a future vaccine [51], and before the pandemic France was considered to be a concerning hot bed of vaccine hesitancy [53].

The evidence is more mixed when it comes to other outcome measures, such as people’s attitudes and feelings. Even vaccinated individuals sometimes dislike mandates [44]. In France, even though passes were undoubtedly successful, they have also increased disgruntlement [52]. In laboratory experiments, voluntary uptake (for non-mandated vaccines) and engagement in other protective measures has been shown to be reduced by mandates [5,43]. Mandates may also be polarising in that they strengthen the intention to vaccinate among those whose attitudes towards the vaccine are already positive, while reducing intention for the minority of people who were reluctant to begin with [12]. By contrast, other research has found that mandates increase the intention to vaccinate rather than create reactance. In a series of four studies conducted in the U.S., [1] observed that mandates strengthened intentions across racial and ethnic groups and irrespective of levels of trait reactance. [1] suggest that “fears of a backlash against vaccine mandates may be unfounded and that requirements will promote COVID-19 vaccine uptake in the United States” (p. 1), a conclusion borne out by the fact that notwithstanding grave anticipatory concern in the media, very few people actually quit their jobs when a COVID-19 vaccination requirement was introduced [3].

Nonetheless, experts frequently voice fears that mandates may lead to further radicalization of vaccine hesitant people (e.g., the study by Lévy-Bruhl [23]). As we

<sup>1</sup> <https://impfdashboard.de/>.

suggest in the following, however, any observed radicalization may arise not from mandates *per se* but may reflect a pre-existing and persistent propensity towards radical or extremist views that, once triggered, will target *any* government or public health measure that requires public cooperation.

### Mandates as targets not triggers

Pandemics inevitably create anxiety and uncertainty, which may in turn fuel conspiracy theories [33]. Whereas the medieval plague gave rise to antisemitism, the COVID-19 pandemic triggered a plethora of different conspiracy theories, from outright denial (“it’s a hoax”) to a variety of baseless beliefs about its causes (e.g., “5G causes COVID”). There is evidence that those theories were spawned by a number of pre-COVID conspiracy narratives that then converged and evolved to encompass COVID-19 (e.g., anti-5G and anti-vaccination discourse combining to form a conspiratorial narrative about population control; [11]). Similarly, in Germany, a collection of contrarian individuals and groups emerged at the beginning of the pandemic, known as the “Querdenker” (“contrarian thinkers”) movement, which has consistently opposed all public health measures against COVID, starting with protests that were initially targeting social distancing measures in early 2020 [34] but that quickly expanded to include rejection of vaccinations and vaccine mandates [17].

There are political and psychological reasons for this convergence between different streams of opposition to public health measures. At a political level, most of the opposition originates on the far right, which is routinely instrumentalizing any opportunity to undermine democratic discourse. At a psychological level, conspiracy theories have long been known to form a monological belief system, in which belief in one conspiracy serves as evidence for beliefs in further conspiracies [19]. Accordingly, belief in one conspiracy theory is correlated with belief in other conspiracy theories, even if a “fictitious” theory is constructed for the purposes of the experiment [46]. In the case of COVID-19 there is evidence that conspiracy theories form such a monological belief system [29], for example when the belief that COVID-19 is a hoax is found to correlate with the belief that COVID-19 was human made [21].

Another psychological factor that may glue together different strands of opposition is reactance to any government-imposed public health measure (e.g., the study by Sprengholz et al. [43]). Reactance has long been implicated in anti-vaccination attitudes (e.g., the study by Soveri et al. [42]), and it also been identified as a driver of opposition to mask wearing [57]. Thus, while COVID-19 vaccine mandates may well be associated with disgruntlement [52] or reactance [39,43],

mandates need not be the sole trigger of such adverse reactions. Instead, mandates may be another target for opposition by people who are already radicalized, already believe in conspiracy theories that predate the pandemic, or whose reactance is triggered by any public health measures to control the pandemic.

### Implications for policy

Loud protests and media coverage do not always indicate prevailing public opinion.

When a “freedom convoy” of truckers shut down the Canadian capital Ottawa in early 2022 to express their opposition to COVID-19 vaccine mandates, they claimed to represent a broad swathe of public opinion. In actual fact, the vast majority of Canadians (around two thirds) opposed not only the “freedom convoy” but also its goals [10].

When considering uptake alone, mandates have repeatedly been shown to be effective. Mandates seemingly also reach people who initially proclaim that they will not be vaccinated and would rather quit their job—in fact, most people ultimately comply with mandates [3]. Nonetheless, we have shown that there is at least suggestive evidence that mandates can have undesirable side effects. Policy makers should thus mandate with care (for a review, see the study by Omer et al. [32]) and should examine several concrete steps before implementing mandates [28], such as ensuring they are proportionate and accompanied by transparent communication and interventions to address misinformation.

Policy makers should also not lose sight of other avenues to encourage vaccine uptake [6]. On the logistical side, it is crucial to make it easy to get vaccinated. Research has shown that setting up an appointment unannounced increases uptake even though people can opt out of the appointment. This nudging intervention has been shown to be successful for influenza shots [9] as well as COVID-19 [48]. The latter study found a 32% relative increase of vaccination uptake (3% in absolute terms) through scheduling an appointment unannounced.

### Conclusions

Even when all those measures are followed, it may well be inevitable that vaccine mandates will be opposed by a small, usually politically extremist, minority. We suggest that this opposition may, at least in part, be a manifestation of a widespread radicalization and polarization that characterizes our times [40].

Decisions about mandates must therefore carefully weigh the alternatives. For example, reactance, distrust, and polarisation are also demonstrably triggered by non-pharmaceutical efforts, such as social distancing and

mask wearing, that would be even more necessary to control the pandemic if vaccination rates remain low [15].

Reluctance to impose vaccination mandates must also be evaluated carefully against the consequences of lower vaccination uptake that may arise from withholding of mandates. Put simply, if uptake is low, more people die. And when more people die, the public will become more fearful and uncertain—fear and uncertainty, however, are known drivers of belief in conspiracy theories [13]. Avoiding vaccine mandates may therefore not only lead to additional deaths, but it may ironically also increase radicalization and belief in conspiracy theories even more than a mandate would have done.

This potential consequence of not introducing mandates is speculative. In fact, a continued realistic threat may also push people away from conspiracy theories towards taking this threat seriously. However, this alternative possibility is equally speculative, and in the absence of further evidence, even if mandates prove ineffective in reducing conspiracy beliefs, they will at least save lives.

## Funding

SL was supported by funding from the Humboldt Foundation in Germany and is a beneficiary of the ERC Advanced Grant 101020961 (PRODEMINFO). All authors were partially supported by Horizon 2020 grant 964728 (JITSUVAX).

## Author contribution

Lewandowsky: Conceptualization, Writing – original draft; Holford: Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing; Schmid: Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing.

## Conflict of interest statement

The authors declare no conflict of interest. All funding sources are acknowledged in the manuscript.

## References

Papers of particular interest, published within the period of review, have been highlighted as:

\* of special interest

\*\* of outstanding interest

1. Albarracín D, Jung H, Song W, Tan A, Fishman J: **Rather than inducing psychological reactance, requiring vaccination strengthens intentions to vaccinate in US populations.** *Sci Rep* 2021, **11**, 20796, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-00256-z>.

Reports 4 experimental studies measuring intentions to vaccinate against COVID-19 in a hypothetical scenario where it was either mandated or not, finding that intentions were higher when vaccines were mandated than a free choice, independent of participants' measured level of reactance. Participants displaying lower reactance perceived more benefits from a mandated (than un-mandated) vaccine, while the mandate did not affect perception of benefits of the vaccine

for participants displaying higher reactance. This was one of the first experimental studies on mandates in the context of COVID-19.

2. AVAAZ: **Facebook's algorithm: a major threat to public health.** 2020. Retrieved from, [https://secure.avaaz.org/campaign/en/facebook\\_threat\\_health/](https://secure.avaaz.org/campaign/en/facebook_threat_health/).
3. Barry JJ, Christiano A, Neimand A: **Half of unvaccinated workers say they'd rather quit than get a shot – but real-world data suggest few are following through.** 2021. Retrieved from, <https://theconversation.com/half-of-unvaccinated-workers-say-theyd-rather-quit-than-get-a-shot-but-real-world-data-suggest-few-are-following-through-168447>.
4. Bertin P, Nera K, Delouée S: **Conspiracy beliefs, rejection of vaccination, and support for hydroxychloroquine: a conceptual replication-extension in the COVID-19 pandemic context.** *Front Psychol* 2020, **11**, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.565128>.
5. Betsch C, Böhm R: **Detrimental effects of introducing partial compulsory vaccination: experimental evidence.** *Eur J Publ Health* 2016, **26**:378–381, <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckv154>.
6. Betsch C, Sprengholz P, Schmid P, Korn L, Eitze S, Ochel P, ... Böhm R: **Einführung einer Impfpflicht: eine politische Entscheidung.** *Dtsch Arztebl* 2021, **118**.
7. Bromme R, Mede NG, Thomm E, Kremer B, Ziegler R: **An anchor in troubled times: Trust in science before and within the COVID-19 pandemic.** *PLoS One* 2022, **17**, e0262823, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0262823>.

This article describes the change in reported trust in science and research measured as part of public opinion surveys (Science Barometer) in Germany before and after the outbreak of the pandemic, finding that the proportion of Germans trusting science and research rose from 46% to 73% between the half year before and after the initial pandemic outbreak. Trust was also influenced by beliefs, with supporters of populist parties and those with skeptical beliefs less likely to trust in science. This article shows evidence of the bifurcation with regards to trust in science.

8. Bruns A, Harrington S, Hurcombe E: **'Corona? 5G? or both?': the dynamics of COVID-19/5G conspiracy theories on Facebook.** *Media International Australia* 2020, **177**:12–29, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1329878x20946113>.
9. Chapman GB, Li M, Colby H, Yoon H: **Opting in vs opting out of influenza vaccination.** *JAMA* 2010, **304**:43–44.
10. Dale D: **Fact check: strong majority of Canadians oppose convoy protests, poll after poll finds.** 2022. Retrieved from, <https://edition.cnn.com/2022/02/15/politics/fact-check-canadian-protests-polls-trudeau-support-oppose-truckers-mandates/index.html>.
11. Darius P, Urquhart M: **Disinformed social movements: A large-scale mapping of conspiracy narratives as online harms during the COVID-19 pandemic.** *Online Social Networks and Media* 2021, **26**:100174, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.osnem.2021.100174>.
12. de Figueiredo A, Larson HJ, Reicher SD: **The potential impact of vaccine passports on inclination to accept COVID-19 vaccinations in the United Kingdom: evidence from a large cross-sectional survey and modeling study.** *EClinicalMedicine* 2021, **40**:101109, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.101109>.

Assesses the potential impact of vaccine passport introduction in the UK on acceptance of COVID-19 vaccines among those who had not yet been fully vaccinated. Suggests a “vaccine passport paradox” where given a population that is overall positive, passports may accelerate the vaccination rate to reach maximum coverage among people who would accept it, while at the same time lowering the maximum that would be reached by lowering intentions among those who would otherwise have got vaccinated—especially among minority groups, which presents a risk of societal division if these intentions indeed result in lower vaccination rates. Passports for social events are less accepted than passports for travel.

13. Douglas KM, Sutton RM, Cichočka A: **The psychology of conspiracy theories.** *Curr Dir Psychol Sci* 2017, **26**:538–542, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721417718261>.
14. Enders AM, Uscinski JE, Klofstad C, Stoler J: **The different forms of COVID-19 misinformation and their consequences.** *Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review* 2020, **1**, <https://doi.org/10.37016/mr-2020-48>.

15. Franco JVA: **Should COVID-19 vaccination be mandatory?** *BMJ Evidence-Based Med* 2021, **26**:269–270, <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjebm-2021-111813>.
16. Freeman D, Loe BS, Chadwick A, Vaccari C, Waite F, Rosebrock L, et al.: **COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in the UK: the Oxford coronavirus explanations, attitudes, and narratives survey (OCEANS) II.** *Psychol Med* 2020:1–34, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291720005188>.
17. Frei N, Schäfer R, Nachtwey O: **Die Proteste gegen die Corona-Maßnahmen: eine soziologische Annäherung.** *Forschungs-journal Soziale Bewegungen* 2021, **34**:249–258, <https://doi.org/10.1515/fjsb-2021-0021>.
18. Garry J, Ford R, Johns R: **Coronavirus conspiracy beliefs, mistrust, and compliance: taking measurement seriously.** *Psychol Med* 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291720005164>.
19. Goertzel T: **Belief in conspiracy theories.** *Polit Psychol* 1994, **15**:731–742, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3791630>.
20. Habersaat KB, Betsch C, Danchin M, Sunstein CR, Böhm R, Falk A, ... Butler R: **Ten considerations for effectively managing the COVID-19 transition.** *Nat Human Behav* 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0906-x>.
21. Imhoff R, Lamberty P: **A bioweapon or a hoax? The link between distinct conspiracy beliefs about the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak and pandemic behavior.** *Soc Psychol Personal Sci* 2020, **11**:1110–1118, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550620934692>.
- Belief in one COVID-19 conspiracy theory (COVID-19 is a hoax) is positively correlated with belief in another that should be logically distinct from another (the coronavirus is human-made), despite these simultaneous beliefs being incoherent. However, depending on which belief is stronger, the impact on behaviours differs, with stronger beliefs in the lab-made theory associated with greater self-centred containment behaviours, but stronger beliefs in the hoax theory associated with lower infection control. Importantly, this study shows that COVID-19 conspiracy beliefs, even in two logically incompatible conspiracy theories, are highly correlated and also related to a more general conspiracist mentality.
22. Jolley D, Paterson JL: **Pylons ablaze: examining the role of 5G COVID-19 conspiracy beliefs and support for violence.** *Br J Soc Psychol* 2020, **59**:628–640, <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12394>.
23. Lévy-Bruhl D, Fonteneau L, Vaux S, Barret A-S, Antona D, Bonmarin I, ... Coignard B: **Assessment of the impact of the extension of vaccination mandates on vaccine coverage after 1 year, France, 2019.** *Euro Surveill* 2019, **24**:1900301.
24. Lewandowsky S, van der Linden S: **Countering misinformation and fake news through inoculation and prebunking.** *Eur Rev Soc Psychol* 2021, **32**:348–384, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2021.1876983>.
25. Lewandowsky S, Yesilada M: **Inoculating against the spread of Islamophobic and radical-Islamist disinformation.** *Cognitive Res: Principles Implications* 2021, **6**, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41235-021-00323-z>.
26. Marques M, Douglas K, Jolley D: **Practical recommendations to communicate with patients about health-related conspiracy theories.** *Med J Aust* 2022, <https://doi.org/10.5694/mja2.51475>.
- This article sets out recommendations for what Healthcare Professionals (HCPs) can do to address conspiracy beliefs using an empathetic approach that recognises why people are drawn to conspiracy theories (i.e., addressing the needs that are associated with conspiracy theory belief) and highlights how these beliefs are not as commonplace as people might think.
27. Martin S, Vanderslott S: **Any idea how fast 'It's just a mask!' can turn into 'It's just a vaccine!': from mask mandates to vaccine mandates during the COVID-19 pandemic.** *Vaccine* 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2021.10.031>.
- This study assessed social media discourse on Twitter about masks and vaccines, showing that opposition to both measures were strongly linked with conspiratorial discourse. Mandates were also the most common topic discussed in relation to masks and vaccines.
28. Mello MM, Silverman RD, Omer SB: **Ensuring uptake of vaccines against SARS-CoV-2.** *N Engl J Med* 2020, **383**:1296–1299.
- This article discusses six “trigger” criteria that should be satisfied before implementing vaccine mandates, such that they can be effective and more accepted. Importantly, these were discussed in the context of COVID-19 and are important considerations for policy makers when deciding to use vaccine mandates as a public health measure.
29. Miller JM: **Do COVID-19 conspiracy theory beliefs form a monological belief system?** *Can J Polit Sci* 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0008423920000517>.
- This paper was one of the first to show how beliefs in different, and contradictory, COVID-19 conspiracy theories were interrelated, to the extent that they form a monological belief system. This points towards conspiracy beliefs tapping into a deeper psychological explanation than simply believing false information.
30. Mills MC, Rüttenauer T: **The effect of mandatory COVID-19 certificates on vaccine uptake: synthetic-control modelling of six countries.** *Lancet Public Health* 2022, **7**:e15–e22, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(21\)00273-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(21)00273-5).
- Reports a comparison of 6 countries that introduced COVID-19 passes in 2021 (which included vaccination but also other forms of immunity such as recent negative tests and proof of recovery) against countries that did not, finding that introduction of passes helped increase uptake under certain conditions: if vaccination rates were below average to begin with, and among younger age groups (especially if operationalised to access specific venues). This is one of the few studies that present real world impact of COVID-19 mandates.
31. Motta M, Stecula D, Farhart C: **How right-leaning media coverage of COVID-19 facilitated the spread of misinformation in the early stages of the pandemic in the U.S.** *Canadian J Political Sci/Revue canadienne de science politique* 2020, **53**:335–342, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008423920000396>.
32. Omer SB, Betsch C, Leask J: **Mandate vaccination with care.** *Nature* 2019, **571**:469–472, <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-02232-0>.
- Summarises the pros and cons of mandates and how they could best be utilised, including in conjunction with other policies and incentives. Mandates vary in how they are implemented. The paper notes which mandates work better than others and suggest ways in which they could be most effective.
33. Pertwee E, Simas C, Larson HJ: **An epidemic of uncertainty: rumors, conspiracy theories and vaccine hesitancy.** *Nat Med* 2022, **28**:456–459, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-022-01728-z>.
- This article explains, importantly, that conspiracy theories need to be understood as not just being false beliefs. Conspiracy theories help to create a narrative that help people navigate fears and anxieties in frightening situations. Vaccine-related conspiracy theories predate the pandemic and largely relate to trust in existing systems.
34. Plümper T, Neumayer E, Pfaff KG: **The strategy of protest against COVID-19 containment policies in Germany.** *Soc Sci Q* 2021, **102**:2236–2250, <https://doi.org/10.1111/ssuq.13066>.
35. Pummerer L, Winter K, Sassenberg K: **Addressing COVID-19 vaccination conspiracy theories and vaccination intentions.** *Euro J Health Commun* 2022, **3**:1–12.
- Reports an experiment in which participants were either shown a political conspiracy theory or not, and subsequently reported higher beliefs in existing conspiracy theories — which had a negative impact on institutional trust and support for COVID-19 regulations. Importantly, the paper draws on correlational, experimental, and longitudinal evidence to demonstrate the effects of conspiracy theory exposure and beliefs.
36. Roozenbeek J, Schneider CR, Dryhurst S, Kerr J, Freeman ALJ, Recchia G, ... van der Linden S: **Susceptibility to misinformation about COVID-19 around the world.** *Royal Society Open Science* 2020, **7**:201199, <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.201199>.
37. Roozenbeek J, van der Linden S, Goldberg B, Rathje S, Lewandowsky S: **Psychological inoculation improves resilience against misinformation on social media.** *Sci Adv* 2022, *in press*. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abo6254>. (publication date 24 August 2022).
38. Schachar C, Reiss DR: **When are vaccine mandates appropriate?** *AMA Journal of Ethics* 2020, **22**:E36–E42, <https://doi.org/10.1001/amajethics.2020.36>.
39. Schmelz K, Bowles S: **Opposition to voluntary and mandated COVID-19 vaccination as a dynamic process: evidence and policy implications of changing beliefs.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci*

- USA 2022, **119**, e2118721119, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2118721119>.
40. Simchon A, Brady WJ, Van Bavel JJ: **Troll and divide: the language of online polarization**. *PNAS Nexus* 2022, <https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgac019>.
  41. Soveri A, Karlsson LC, Antfolk J, Lindfelt M, Lewandowsky S: **Unwillingness to engage in behaviors that protect against COVID-19: the role of conspiracy beliefs, trust, and endorsement of complementary and alternative medicine**. *BMC Publ Health* 2021, **21**, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-10643-w>.
  42. Soveri A, Karlsson LC, Mäki O, Antfolk J, Waris O, Karlsson H, ... Lewandowsky S: **Trait reactance and trust in doctors as predictors of vaccination behavior, vaccine attitudes, and use of complementary and alternative medicine in parents of young children**. *PLoS One* 2020, **15**, e0236527, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0236527>.
  43. Sprengholz P, Betsch C, Böhm R: **Reactance revisited: consequences of mandatory and scarce vaccination in the case of COVID-19**. *Appl Psychol: Health and Well-Being* 2021, **13**: 986–995, <https://doi.org/10.1111/aphw.12285>.  
Scarcity of vaccination elicits reactance as well (the sense that one's freedom is being restricted) but with the result being that vaccination intentions are strengthened. This study is important as it shows how opposing situations can have similar psychological consequences.
  44. Sprengholz P, Korn L, Eitze S, Felgendreff L, Siegers R, Goldhahn L, ... Betsch C: **Attitude toward a mandatory covid-19 vaccination policy and its determinants: evidence from serial cross-sectional surveys conducted throughout the pandemic in Germany**. *Vaccine* 2022, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2022.01.065>.  
Explaining the public health benefits of the mandate reduces reactance to the mandate, and if mandates are supported, reactance to mandates was actually lower than reactance about a voluntary policy. Conversely, when negative attitudes towards mandates are present, reactance is higher for mandated than voluntary vaccination policies (particularly if individuals are not briefed about the importance of high vaccination rates). Reactance carried over to intentions for other vaccines as well that were not included in the mandate. This study importantly shows how reactance might affect vaccination intentions, but highlights how reactance may be mitigated when it comes to implementing mandates.
  45. Sutton RM, Douglas KM: **Agreeing to disagree: reports of the popularity of COVID-19 conspiracy theories are greatly exaggerated**. *Psychol Med* 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291720002780>.
  46. Swami V, Coles R, Stieger S, Pietschnig J, Furnham A, Rehim S, Voracek M: **Conspiracist ideation in Britain and Austria: evidence of a monological belief system and associations between individual psychological differences and real-world and fictitious conspiracy theories**. *Br J Psychol* 2011, **102**:443–463, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.2010.02004.x>.
  47. Szent-Ivanyi T: **Forsa-Studie: Ungeimpfte lassen sich nicht mehr überzeugen**. Retrieved from, <https://www.md.de/politik/corona-ungeimpfte-umstimmen-forsa-studie-zeigt-massnahmen-haben-keine-auswirkungen-auf-FX7DOX54OVFGVFDXNAJGVPG2IA.html>.
  48. Tentori K, Pighin S, Giovanazzi G, Grignolio A, Timberlake B, Ferro A: **Default change nudges COVID-19 vaccine uptake: a randomized controlled trial**. *PsyArXiv* 2021, <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/9bsjg>.
  49. Vaz OM, Ellingson MK, Weiss P, Jenness SM, Bardají A, Bednarczyk RA, Omer SB: **Mandatory vaccination in Europe**. *Pediatrics* 2020, e20190620, <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2019-0620>.
  50. Vivion M, Anassour Laouan Sidi E, Betsch C, Dionne M, Dubé E, Driedger SM, ... Yesilada M: **Prebunking messaging to inoculate against COVID-19 vaccine misinformation: an effective strategy for public health**. *J Commun Health* 2022:1–11, <https://doi.org/10.1080/17538068.2022.2044606>.
  51. Ward JK, Alleaume C, Peretti-Watel P, Peretti-Watel P, Seror V, Cortaredona S, ... Ward J: **The French public's attitudes to a future COVID-19 vaccine: the politicization of a public health issue**. *Soc Sci Med* 2020, **265**:113414, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113414>.
  52. Ward JK, Gauna F, Gagneux-Brunon A, Botelho-Nevers E, Cracowski J-L, Khouri C, ... Peretti-Watel P: **The French health pass holds lessons for mandatory COVID-19 vaccination**. *Nat Med* 2022, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01661-7>.
  53. Ward JK, Peretti-Watel P, Bocquier A, Seror V, Verger P: **Vaccine hesitancy and coercion: all eyes on France**. *Nat Immunol* 2019, **20**:1257–1259, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41590-019-0488-9>.
  54. Wellcome Trust: **Wellcome global monitor 2020: how Covid-19 affected people's lives and their views about science (Tech. Rep.)**. Wellcome Trust. Retrieved from, <https://wellcome.org/reports/wellcome-global-monitor-covid-19/2020>.
  55. Wissenschaft im Dialog: **Wissenschaftsbarometer Corona spezial**. Retrieved from, <https://www.wissenschaft-im-dialog.de/projekte/wissenschaftsbarometer/wissenschaftsbarometer-corona-spezial/>.
  56. Wissenschaft im Dialog: **Wissenschaftsbarometer 2021**. Retrieved from, <https://www.wissenschaft-im-dialog.de/projekte/wissenschaftsbarometer/wissenschaftsbarometer-2021/>.
  57. Young DG, Rasheed H, Bleakley A, Langbaum JB: **The politics of mask-wearing: political preferences, reactance, and conflict aversion during COVID**. *Soc Sci Med* 2022, **298**:114836, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2022.114836>.
  58. Zarocostas J: **How to fight an infodemic**. *Lancet* 2020, **395**:676, [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736\(20\)30461-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(20)30461-x).