

1 **COVID-19 vaccination beliefs, attitudes, and behaviours among health and** 2 **social care workers in the UK: a mixed-methods study**

3 Sadie Bell^{1§*}, Richard M Clarke^{2*}, Sharif A Ismail¹, Oyinkansola Ojo-Aromokudu¹, Habib Naqvi³,
4 Yvonne Coghill³, Helen Donovan⁴, Louise Letley⁵, Pauline Paterson^{6**}, Sandra Mounier-Jack^{1**}

5

6 1) Department of Global Health and Development, Faculty of Public Health and Policy, London
7 School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, 15-17 Tavistock Place, London, WC1H 9SH, UK

8 2) University of Southampton, University Road, Southampton, SO17 1BJ, UK

9 3) NHS Race and Health Observatory, 18 Smith Square, Westminster, London, SW1P 3HZ, UK

10 4) Royal College of Nursing, 20 Cavendish Square, Marylebone, London, W1G 0RN, UK

11 5) Immunisation, Hepatitis & Blood Safety Department, National Infection Service, Public Health
12 England, Wellington House, 133-155 Waterloo Road, London, SE1 8UG, UK

13 6) Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, Faculty of Epidemiology and Population Health,
14 London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, Keppel Street, London, WC1E 7HT, UK

15

16 *Joint first authors

17 ** Joint last authors

18

19 [§] Corresponding author: Sadie Bell, 15-17 Tavistock Place, London School of Hygiene & Tropical
20 Medicine, London, WC1H 9SH, UK

21 *Email: sadie.bell@lshtm.ac.uk*

22 Abstract

23 Background: The UK began delivering its COVID-19 vaccination programme on 8 December 2020,
24 with health and social care workers (H&SCWs) given high priority for vaccination. Despite well-
25 documented occupational exposure risks, however, there is evidence of lower uptake among some
26 H&SCW groups.

27 Methods: We used a mixed-methods approach - involving an online cross-sectional survey and semi-
28 structured interviews – to gain insight into COVID-19 vaccination beliefs, attitudes, and behaviours
29 amongst H&SCWs in the UK by socio-demographic and employment variables. 1917 people were
30 surveyed – 1658 healthcare workers (HCWs) and 261 social care workers (SCWs). Twenty
31 participants were interviewed.

32 Findings: Workplace factors contributed to vaccination access and uptake. SCWs were more likely to
33 not be offered COVID-19 vaccination than HCWs (OR:1.453, 95%CI: 1.244 – 1.696). SCWs specifically
34 reported uncertainties around how to access COVID-19 vaccination. Participants who indicated
35 stronger agreement with the statement '*I would recommend my organisation as a place to work*'
36 were more likely to have been offered COVID-19 vaccination (OR:1.28, 95%CI: 1.06 – 1.56). Those
37 who agreed more strongly with the statement '*I feel/felt under pressure from my employer to get a*
38 *COVID-19 vaccine*' were more likely to have declined vaccination (OR:1.75, 95%CI: 1.27– 2.41).
39 Interviewees that experienced employer pressure to get vaccinated felt this exacerbated their
40 vaccine concerns and increased distrust.

41 In comparison to White British and White Irish participants, Black African and Mixed Black African
42 participants were more likely to not be offered (OR:2.011, 95%CI: 1.026 – 3.943) and more likely to
43 have declined COVID-19 vaccination (OR:5.55, 95%CI: 2.29 – 13.43). Reasons for declining
44 vaccination among Black African participants included distrust in COVID-19 vaccination, healthcare
45 providers, and policymakers.

46 Conclusion: H&SCW employers are in a pivotal position to facilitate COVID-19 vaccination access, by
47 ensuring staff are aware of how to get vaccinated and promoting a workplace environment in which
48 vaccination decisions are informed and voluntary.

49 **Keywords:** COVID-19; COVID-19 vaccination; healthcare workers; social care workers; UK

50 1 Background

51 The UK began delivering its COVID-19 vaccination programme on 8 December 2020, prioritising
52 allocation by age and to frontline health and social care workers (H&SCWs), as advised by the Joint
53 Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation (1). Frontline H&SCWs (i.e. those involved in direct
54 service user care or who may have contact with service users) (2) were prioritised in the first phase
55 of the vaccination programme due to their increased personal risk of COVID-19 exposure and of
56 transmitting COVID-19 to vulnerable service users (1). The UK healthcare workforce is made up of
57 around 1.9 million people (68% in the publicly funded National Health Service (NHS), 32% in the
58 private sector) (3) and social care employs approximately 1.52 million people (4).

59 As of 11 April 2021, COVID-19 vaccine uptake (first dose) in England was estimated at 86.2% in NHS
60 Trust healthcare workers (HCWs) who appear in the NHS Electronic Staff Record and 70.3% in social
61 care workers (SCWs) (5) – highlighting large differences in uptake between the sectors, which are
62 not fully understood. Emerging data for England also indicates that COVID-19 vaccination uptake
63 amongst H&SCWs varies by geographical area (5). Patterns of seasonal influenza vaccine uptake in
64 HCWs suggest that COVID-19 vaccination uptake may also vary markedly by workplace and job role
65 (6).

66 People from certain ethnic minority backgrounds, including those in H&SC roles, are at elevated risk
67 of contracting COVID-19 and at increased risk of adverse outcomes (7-10). A disproportionately high
68 number of Black and Asian H&SCWs have died during the COVID-19 pandemic, representing 21% of
69 the NHS workforce but accounting for 63% of deaths in H&SCWs in the first wave of the pandemic
70 (up until 22 April 2020) (11). Despite this risk, early reports of COVID-19 vaccination uptake amongst
71 HCWs have identified lower levels of uptake amongst certain ethnic minority groups (12), which
72 mirror trends in the general population (13).

73 Our study aimed to identify and gain insight into factors influencing COVID-19 vaccination amongst
74 H&SCWs in the UK, with a focus on understanding variations in vaccination beliefs, attitudes, and
75 behaviours by socio-demographic factors, including ethnicity. In this paper, we use the term ethnic
76 minority to refer to all ethnic groups except the White British & White Irish grouping.

77 2 Methods

78 We used a mixed-methods approach involving a cross-sectional online survey, which included fixed
79 and free-text questions, and follow-up semi-structured interviews. Ethical approval for this study
80 was granted by the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine Observational Research Ethics
81 Committee (Reference: 22923).

82 Cross-sectional survey

83 2.1.1 *Survey design and recruitment*

84 We performed an online survey of UK frontline H&SCWs between January 22nd and February 8th
85 2021. The survey was advertised through the communication streams of organisations with high
86 levels of H&SCW membership/followers (e.g. via social media platforms, email, and staff
87 newsletters). Recruitment aimed to reach H&SCWs from across job roles and ethnic minority groups
88 by approaching organisations targeted at different occupational groups and ethnicities.

89 The survey (Appendix 1) included four main sections, comprised of questions relating to:

- 90 1) Demographics: Age, gender, religion, long-term disability, country of birth and ethnicity. The
91 ethnicity question was followed by a 5-item ethnic identity scale, the Multigroup Ethnic
92 Identity Measure - Revised (MEIM-R) (14). The MEIM-R scale gives an indication of the level
93 to which individuals feel a close sense of belongingness and attachment towards their
94 ethnicity.
- 95 2) Employment: Job sector, occupational group, role and grade; level of service user contact;
96 job satisfaction, workplace discrimination (from colleagues or service users); experience of
97 working in the pandemic (i.e. contact with service users at high risk of COVID-19 or
98 diagnosed with COVID-19, and times asked to self-isolate); and the participant's COVID-19
99 status.
- 100 3) COVID-19 vaccination beliefs and COVID-19 risk perceptions: Beliefs around COVID-19
101 vaccine safety, effectiveness, importance, compatibility with participant's religion, and social
102 norms related to COVID-19 vaccination were measured on 4-point Likert scales from (1)
103 strongly disagree to (4) strongly agree; COVID-19 vaccination intentions (if not yet offered
104 vaccination) and behaviours (decision to accept or decline vaccination); seasonal influenza
105 vaccination history (for 2019/20 and 2020/21); and workplace pressure to accept COVID-19
106 vaccination.
- 107 4) Sources of COVID-19 vaccination information: Rating of trust in COVID-19 vaccination
108 information sources were measured using the root statement '*I trust the advice on COVID-19*
109 *vaccination given by...*' followed by a range of information sources (e.g. the NHS, the
110 government, friends and family members). Participants responded to each statement using
111 a 5-point Likert scale from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree, with the mid-point
112 labelled '*no opinion*'.

113 Free-text boxes were included for participants to provide their main reason(s) for accepting or
114 declining COVID-19 vaccination and a text box was included at the end of the survey for further
115 comments on views and experiences of COVID-19 vaccination.

116 We developed the survey in consultation with Public Health England, Royal College of Nursing and
117 NHS Race and Health Observatory representatives, who were also involved in sharing the survey.
118 Feedback on survey design was also obtained from a number of H&SCWs.

119 2.1.2 *Data recording and missing data*

120 Recruitment to the study led to 2307 survey link click-throughs. Of these, 388 cases were removed
121 due to the participants not responding to questions beyond the 50% survey progress mark. Two
122 further cases were removed due to ineligibility (i.e. participants were not frontline H&SCWs
123 currently working in the UK), leaving 1917 included participants.

124 In order to run the logistic regressions with an appropriate number of participants in each of the
125 subcategories of the categorical variables, the variables *Ethnicity* and *Job role* were recoded from 20
126 categories and 16 categories, respectively, into an *Ethnicity* variable with 7 categories and a *Job role*
127 variable with 6 categories. In addition, we performed a factor analysis on the *Vaccine belief* and
128 *Trust in information source* items to reduce the number of variables in the regression models. Details
129 related to the combining of the ethnicity and job role categories and the factor analysis can be found
130 in Appendix 2.

131 Participants were not required to answer every question in the survey. Missing data were assessed
132 to be low and missing at random. Multiple imputation was used to replace missing data in
133 continuous variables for use in each logistic regression model and comparisons.

134 2.1.3 *Survey analysis*

135 We conducted a forward stepwise logistic regression to examine the association between
136 demographic and employment variables, and seasonal influenza vaccination history, with being
137 offered COVID-19 vaccination. To examine factors associated with vaccine uptake, we conducted a
138 similar forward stepwise logistic regression to that of being offered vaccination, with the addition of
139 the COVID-19 vaccine belief and trust in information sources variables. Finally, we assessed the
140 differences across ethnicity with respect to COVID-19 related beliefs and trust in sources of
141 information through a series of comparisons. Comparisons between White British & White Irish
142 participants and each ethnic minority group were assessed through multiple ANOVA tests and
143 Turkey post hoc analysis. All statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS V.27.

144 Free-text responses were analysed thematically in Microsoft Excel by SB, PP and SM-J. Coding
145 schemes were produced based on the content of the free-text comments.

146 Semi-structured interviews

147 *2.1.4 Recruitment*

148 On survey completion, participants were asked to provide their contact details if they were
149 interested in taking part in a 30-45-minute follow-up interview. In selecting interested participants
150 to interview, we aimed to maximise participant diversity in ethnicity, gender, job sector,
151 occupational group, and geographical location. We prioritised contacting H&SCWs that had declined
152 COVID-19 vaccination.

153 *2.1.5 Interview design and conduct*

154 Participants were emailed an information sheet containing the interview aims and participation
155 details, including the right to withdraw from the research. Written informed consent was obtained
156 from each participant. Interviews were conducted remotely (i.e. via phone, Zoom or Microsoft
157 Teams). Interviews were audio-recorded and reflective notes were taken during interviews.
158 Interview participants received a £10 gift voucher as a thank you for their time and contribution.

159 Interviews followed a topic guide designed to explore participants' views, intentions and experiences
160 of vaccinating against COVID-19, COVID-19 vaccine decision-making, sources of COVID-19 vaccine
161 information, and recommendations on how to improve COVID-19 vaccination programme
162 communication and delivery to H&SCWs.

163 Interviews were conducted by SB, PP, OOA, and SI between 10th February and 19th March 2021.

164 *2.1.6 Interview analysis*

165 Interviews were transcribed verbatim and analysed thematically by SB using the stages of data
166 familiarization, coding, and theme identification and refinement (15). To enhance the rigour of the
167 analysis, coding approaches and subsequent theme generation were discussed by SB, PP, OOA, SI,
168 RC, and SM-J. NVivo 12.0 software was used to manage the data and aid analysis.

169 3 Findings

170 Participants

171 Of the 1917 participants, 1656 (86.4%) were HCWs and 261 (13.6%) were SCWs. Most participants
172 were female (n=1446, 75.4%) and aged 35-64 years (n=1494, 77.9%). The largest occupational
173 groups among HCWs were registered nurses and midwives (n=572; 34.5% of HCWs) and medical
174 professionals (n=430, 30.0% of HCWs). The highest proportions of SCWs were employed in

175 domiciliary (i.e. home care) (n=89, 34.1% of SCWs), community (n=76, 29.1% of SCWs), or residential
176 (n=48, 18.4%) sectors.

177 1102 participants (57.4%) were White British or White Irish, 94 (4.9%) were from other White
178 backgrounds, 168 (8.8%) were Black African or Mixed Black African, 66 (3.4%) were Black Caribbean
179 or Mixed Black Caribbean, 264 (13.8%) were from an Indian background, 109 (5.7%) were from a
180 South-East Asian (including Pakistani and Bangladeshi) or Mixed Asian background and 90 (4.7%)
181 were not categorised into any of the six ethnicity categories. Each occupation varied by ethnicity
182 (see Table 1).

183

184 **Table 1. Frequency and percentage of sample within occupation group by ethnic minority grouping.**

	White British and White Irish N (% of occupation group)	White other	Black or Black British African or Mixed Black African N (% of occupation group)	Black or Black British Caribbean or Mixed Black Caribbean N (% of occupation group)	Asian or Asian British: Indian	South East Asian or Mixed Asian N (% of occupation group)	Other minority ethnic groups N (% of occupation group)	Prefer not to say
Health care								
Allied Health Professionals*	152 (63.1%)	16 (6.6%)	17 (7.1%)	8 (3.3%)	23 (9.5%)	10 (4.1%)	11 (4.6%)	4(1.7%)
Medical	94 (21.9%)	14 (3.3%)	53 (12.3%)	4 (0.9%)	189 (44.0%)	43 (10.0%)	28 (6.5%)	5 (1.2%)
Ambulance (operational)	9 (90.0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Public Health	19 (63.3%)	1 (3.3%)	3 (10.0%)	2 (6.7%)	1 (3.3%)	2 (6.7%)	2 (6.7%)	0 (0%)
Commissioning	4 (50.0%)	0 (0%)	1 (12.5%)	2 (25.0%)	0 (0%)	1 (12.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Registered Nurses and Midwives	385 (67.3%)	33 (5.8%)	55 (9.6%)	20 (3.5%)	25 (4.4%)	25 (4.4%)	23 (4.0%)	6 (1.0%)
Nursing or Healthcare Assistants	135 (68.9%)	12 (6.1%)	10 (5.1%)	9 (4.6%)	9 (4.6%)	11 (5.6%)	9 (4.6%)	1 (0.5%)
Wider Healthcare Team	44 (62.0%)	2 (2.8%)	5 (7.0%)	7 (9.9%)	1 (1.4%)	6 (8.5%)	5 (7.0%)	1 (1.4%)
General Management	49 (52.1%)	3 (3.2%)	11 (11.7%)	8 (8.5%)	11 (11.7%)	5 (5.3%)	6 (6.4%)	1 (1.1%)
Do not know/Did not answer	4 (80.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Health care Total	895 (54.3%)	81 (4.9%)	156 (9.4%)	60 (3.6%)	259 (15.7%)	103 (6.2%)	84 (5.1%)	18 (1.1%)
Social care								
Residential	36 (75.0%)	1 (2.1%)	2 (4.2%)	2 (4.2%)	2 (4.2%)	2 (4.2%)	1 (2.1%)	2 (4.2%)
Domiciliary	79 (88.8%)	3 (3.4%)	4 (4.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	2 (2.2%)
Day	6 (35.3%)	3 (17.6%)	2 (11.8%)	2 (11.8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (17.6%)	1 (5.9%)
Community	63 (82.9%) (%)	4 (5.3%)	3 (3.9%)	1 (1.3%)	2 (2.6%)	2 (2.6%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0%)
Regulated Professionals	6 (85.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14.3%)	0 (0%)
Other	16 (69.6%)	2 (8.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4.3%)	1 (4.3%)	0 (0%)	3 (13.0%)
Do not know/Did not answer	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (%)
Social care Total	207 (79.1%)	13 (5.0%)	11 (4.2%)	5 (1.9%)	5 (1.9%)	6 (2.3%)	6 (2.3%)	8 (3.1%)

185 *Allied Health Professionals are health care professionals distinct from medicine and nursing. These professionals involve providing diagnostic, technical,
 186 therapeutic and support services in connection with health care.

188

189 1762 (91.9%) participants had been offered COVID-19 vaccination and, of those, 116 (6.6%) had
 190 declined the offer. See Tables 2 & 3 for a summary of COVID-19 vaccination offer and uptake by key
 191 demographic factors.

192 **Table 2. Participants demographic characteristics by being offered a vaccine and vaccine uptake**

Variable	N	Have you been offered a COVID-19 vaccine?			
		No response	No	Yes	
				Have you had, or are you intending to have the COVID-19 vaccine?	
				Accepted or will accept	Declined or will decline
Full sample	1917	48 (2.5%)	107 (5.6%)	1646 (85.9%)	116 (6.1%)
Gender					
Male	443	1 (0.2%)	28 (6.3%)	386 (87.1%)	18 (4.1%)
Female	1446	5 (0.3%)	75 (5.2%)	1240 (85.8%)	96 (6.6%)
Prefer to describe self	12	0 (0%)	1 (8.3)	10 (83.3%)	1 (8.3%)
No response	16	2 (12.5%)	3 (18.8)	10 (62.5)	1 (6.3%)
Ethnicity					
White British and White Irish	1102	26 (2.4%)	61 (5.5%)	959 (87.0%)	56 (5.1%)
White other	94	3 (3.2%)	6 (6.4%)	76 (81.9%)	8 (8.5%)
Black or Black British African or Mixed Black African	168	6 (3.6%)	15 (8.9%)	131 (78.0%)	16 (9.5%)
Black or Black British Caribbean or Mixed Black Caribbean	66	1 (1.5%)	2 (3.0%)	48 (72.7%)	15 (22.7%)
Asian or Asian British: Indian	264	5 (1.9%)	14 (4.3%)	239 (90.0%)	6 (2.3%)
Other South East Asian or Mixed Asian	109	1 (0.9%)	2 (1.8%)	101 (92.7%)	5 (4.6%)
Other ethnic minority groups	90	2 (2.2%)	2 (2.2%)	81 (90.0%)	5 (5.6%)
No response	24	0 (0%)	4 (16.7%)	7 (29.2%)	4 (16.7%)
Age					
Under 25 Years	56	1 (1.8%)	5 (8.9%)	48 (85.7%)	2 (3.6%)
25 to 35 Years	299	1 (0.3%)	12 (4.0%)	261 (87.3%)	25 (8.4%)
35 to 44 Years	425	13 (3.1%)	21 (4.9%)	362 (85.2%)	29 (6.8%)
45 to 54 Years	636	16 (2.5%)	34 (5.3%)	550 (86.5%)	36 (5.7%)
55 to 64 years	433	12 (2.8%)	30 (6.9%)	370 (85.5%)	21 (4.8%)
65 years and over	64	4 (6.3%)	4 (6.3%)	53 (82.8%)	3 (4.7%)
No response	4	1 (25.0%)	1 (25.0%)	2 (50.0%)	0 (0%)
Religion					
Atheist/No Religion	635	17 (2.7%)	30 (4.7%)	553 (87.1%)	35 (5.5%)
Christian and all other Christian denominations	900	22 (2.4%)	56 (6.2%)	762 (84.7%)	60 (6.7%)
Hindu	173	4 (2.3%)	10 (5.8%)	154 (89.0%)	5 (2.9%)
Muslim	93	1 (1.1%)	3 (3.2%)	85 (91.4%)	4 (4.3%)

Other	77	1 (1.3%)	6 (7.8%)	62 (80.5%)	8 (10.4%)	193
No response	39	3 (7.7%)	2 (5.1%)	30 (76.9%)	4 (10.3%)	194
Long term health problem or disability						
Yes, limited a little	215	6 (2.8%)	19 (8.8%)	177 (82.3%)	13 (6.0%)	195
Yes, limited a lot	45	1 (2.2%)	4 (8.9%)	38 (84.4%)	2 (4.4%)	
No	1625	8 (0.5)	78 (4.8%)	1411 (86.8%)	98 (6.0%)	196
No response	32	3 (9.4%)	6 (18.8%)	20 (62.5%)	3 (9.4%)	

197

198 **Table 3. Participants location and occupation by being offered a vaccine and vaccine uptake**

Variable	N	Have you been offered a COVID-19 vaccine?			
		No response	No	Yes	
				Accepted or will accept	Declined or will decline
Full sample	1917	48 (2.5%)	107 (5.6%)	1646 (85.9%)	116 (5.5%)
Location					
England	1790	40 (2.2%)	99 (5.5%)	1548 (86.5%)	103 (5.8%)
South East	358	9 (2.5%)	13 (3.6%)	311 (86.9%)	25 (7.0%)
Greater London	414	8 (1.9%)	21 (5.2%)	363 (87.7%)	22 (5.3%)
North West	231	10 (4.3%)	8 (3.5%)	200 (86.6%)	13 (5.6%)
East of England	88	3 (3.4%)	8 (9.1%)	73 (83.0%)	4 (4.5%)
West Midlands	196	3 (1.5%)	12 (6.1%)	167 (85.2%)	14 (7.1%)
South West	106	1 (0.9%)	7 (6.6%)	87 (82.1%)	11 (10.4%)
Yorkshire and the Humber	127	5 (3.9%)	12 (9.4%)	105 (82.7%)	5 (3.9%)
East Midlands	191	2 (1.0%)	11 (5.8%)	173 (90.6%)	5 (2.6%)
North East	79	4 (5.1%)	6 (7.6%)	66 (83.5%)	3 (3.8%)
Scotland	59	0 (0%)	6 (10.2%)	45 (76.3%)	8 (13.6%)
Wales	45	1 (2.2%)	1 (2.2%)	39 (86.7%)	4 (8.9%)
Northern Ireland	15	1 (6.7%)	0 (0%)	13 (86.7%)	1 (6.7%)
No response	8	6 (75.0%)	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)	0 (0%)
Health Care Sector					
Allied Health Professionals	241	7 (2.9%)	12 (5.0%)	205 (85.1%)	17 (7.1%)
Medical	430	10 (2.3%)	12 (2.8%)	395 (91.9%)	13 (3.0%)
Ambulance (operational)	10	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (100%)	0 (0%)
Public Health	30	2 (6.7%)	7 (23.3%)	20 (66.7%)	1 (3.3%)
Commissioning	8	0 (0%)	2 (25.0%)	5 (62.5%)	1 (12.5%)
Registered Nurses and Midwives	572	11 (1.9%)	17 (3.0%)	502 (87.8%)	42 (7.3%)
Nursing or Healthcare Assistants	196	6 (3.1%)	17 (8.7%)	160 (81.6%)	13 (6.6%)
Wider Healthcare Team	71	1 (1.4%)	5 (7.0%)	63 (88.7%)	2 (2.8%)
General Management	94	8 (8.5%)	3 (3.2%)	79 (84.0%)	4 (4.3%)
Other	4	1 (25.0%)	0 (0%)	3 (75.0%)	0 (0%)
Health Care Sector Total	1656	46 (2.8%)	75 (4.5%)	1442 (87.1%)	93 (5.6%)
Social Care Sector					

Residential	48	1 (2.1%)	4 (8.3%)	36 (75.0%)	7 (14.6%)
Domiciliary	89	0 (0%)	7 (7.9%)	78 (87.6%)	4 (4.5%)
Day	17	0 (0%)	3 (17.6%)	12 (70.6%)	2 (11.8%)
Community	76	1 (1.3%)	9 (11.8%)	58 (76.3%)	8 (10.5%)
Regulated Professionals	7	0 (0%)	1 (14.3%)	5 (71.4%)	1 (14.3%)
Other	23	0 (0%)	8 (34.8%)	14 (60.9%)	1 (4.3%)
No response	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Social Care Sector Total	261	2 (0.8%)	32 (12.3%)	204 (78.2%)	23 (8.8%)

200 A third of survey participants (n=640; 33.5%) provided their details to be contacted for interview.
201 Most of these indicated in the survey that they had been vaccinated (n=534; 83.4%) and were HCWs
202 (n=563; 88.0%). All participants that reported declining COVID-19 vaccination and left their contact
203 details were contacted (n=28). We also contacted 34 H&SCWs that reported they had been or
204 planned to get vaccinated, 16 H&SCWs who had not yet been offered the vaccine, and 1 H&SCW
205 who did not provide their vaccination status. In total, 81 participants were contacted, of these 16
206 HCWs and 4 SCWS were interviewed.

207 Participants were recruited from across ethnic groups, age categories, job roles, and geographical
208 areas (see Table 4). In the period between the survey and the interview, three participants had
209 changed their decision from declining to accepting COVID-19 vaccination. At interview all
210 participants had been offered vaccination, 13 had been vaccinated, 1 participant had booked in to
211 receive their vaccine, and 7 had declined vaccination.

212

213 **Table 4. Interview participant characteristics**

ID	Gender	Age (years)	Ethnicity	Religion	Job sector	Time spent in direct contact with service users	Covid-19 vaccination status
1	Male	45-54	Asian or Asian British: Indian	Hindu	Health care	Almost all	Vaccinated
2	Female	45-54	White: British	No religion	Social care	Almost all	Unvaccinated
3	Male	45-54	White: British	Christian	Social care	Almost all	Vaccinated
4	Female	25-34	Mixed: Other mixed background	Christian	Health care	Around half	Vaccinated
5	Female	35-44	White: British	Atheist	Health care	None	Unvaccinated
6	Female	55-64	Asian or Asian British: Other Asian background	Christian	Health care	None	Unvaccinated but booked in to get vaccination (Had declined at time of survey)
7	Female	45-54	White: British	No religion	Health care	Around half	Vaccinated* (Had declined at time of survey)
8	Female	25-34	White: Other White background	Christian	Social care	Almost all	Unvaccinated
9	Male	35-44	White: Other White background	Christian	Social care	Less than half	Unvaccinated
10	Female	35-44	Asian or Asian British: Indian	Hindu	Health care	Less than half	Vaccinated
11	Female	45-54	White: British	No religion	Social care	Less than half	Unvaccinated
12	Female	25-34	White: British	No religion	Health care	Around half	Unvaccinated
13	Female	45-54	Black or Black British: African	Christian	Health care	Less than half	Vaccinated
14	Female	45-54	Black or Black British: Caribbean	Christian	Health care	Less than half	Vaccinated
15	Female	25-34	White: British	No religion	Health care	None	Unvaccinated
16	Female	55-64	White: British	Christian	Health care	Around half	Vaccinated
17	Female	35-44	Mixed: White and Black Caribbean	Christian	Health care	Around half	Vaccinated
18	Female	55-64	Asian or Asian British: Indian	No religion	Health care	Almost all	Vaccinated
19	Female	35-44	Black or Black British: African	Muslim	Health care	None	Vaccinated
20	Male	55-64	Asian or Asian British: Indian	Hindu	Health care	Around half	Vaccinated* (Had declined at time of survey)

214 Quantitative findings: associations with COVID-19 vaccination offer

215 107 participants (5.6%) had not been offered COVID-19 vaccination at the time of survey.

216 When controlling for other demographic and situational factors, Black African or Mixed Black African
 217 participants were approximately twice as likely not to be offered the vaccine than White British or
 218 White Irish participants (OR: 2.011, 95%CI: 1.026 – 3.943). Similarly, SCWs were also 50% more likely
 219 to not be offered vaccination than HCWs (OR: 1.453, 95%CI: 1.244 – 1.696).

220 In addition to these demographic findings, we found perception of the workplace environment to be
 221 associated with vaccine offer, with each extra point of agreement (out of 5) with the statement '*I*
 222 *would recommend my organisation as a place to work*' participants were approximately 30% (OR:
 223 0.78; 95%CI: 0.64 – 0.95) more likely to be offered the vaccine. Participants that indicated a health
 224 issue or disability were also more likely to be offered the vaccine than those that did not indicate
 225 such issues (OR: 2.311; 95%CI: 1.232 – 4.334).

226 Finally, we also found an association between past seasonal influenza vaccination and being offered
 227 COVID-19 vaccination, with participants that reported receiving seasonal influenza vaccination in
 228 both 2019/20 and 2020/21 over twice as likely (OR: 0.371; 95%CI: 0.218 - 0.633) to have been
 229 offered COVID-19 vaccination than those that had not received the influenza vaccine in the last two
 230 years.

231 **Table 5. A logistic regression analysis of not being offered a COVID-19 vaccination**

	Univariable analysis. Original data			Multivariable analysis (all listed variables) Imputed continuous variables		
Variable						
Basic demographics				Included in analysis: N=1583 (Forward Likelihood Ratio)		
	Sig (p)	OR	95% CI	Sig (p)	OR	95% CI
Ethnicity						
White British or White Irish †	-	-	-	-	-	-
White other	0.690	1.193	0.501 - 2.841	.92	1.057	.358 – 3.119
Black or Black British African or Mixed Black African	0.077	1.705	0.944 – 3.077	.042	2.011	1.026 – 3.943
Black or Black British Caribbean or Mixed Black Caribbean	0.385	0.530	0.127 – 2.219	.09	.174	.023 – 1.317
Asian or Asian British: Indian	0.879	0.955	0.525 – 1.735	.339	1.432	.686 – 2.988
Other South East Asian or Mixed Asian	0.112	0.315	0.076 – 1.307	.268	.440	.103 – 1.881
Other Minority	0.194	0.388	0.093 – 1.616	.602	.678	.158 – 2.918
Sector						

Health Care	-	-	-	-	-	-
Social Care					<.001	1.453 1.244 – 1.696
I would recommend my organisation as a place of work	<.0001	.72	.61 - .851		.012	.778 .64 - .947
Are your day-to-day activities limited because of health problems or disabilities?						
Yes, limited a little	.014	1.927	1.142 – 3.253		.009	2.311 1.232 – 4.334
Yes, limited a lot	.218	1.937	.676 – 5.551		.338	1.774 .549 – 5.731
No †	-	-	-		-	-
Flu vaccine uptake						
No flu vaccine uptake †	-	-	-		-	-
One out of two flu vaccines taken	.068	.6	.346 – 1.038		.169	.641 .34 – 1.208
Flu vaccine taken both years	<.0001	.323	.208 - .502		<.001	.371 .218 - .633

232 † Comparison group

233 Quantitative findings: associations with declining COVID-19 vaccination

234 116 participants (6.1%) declined COVID-19 vaccination when offered. Among the demographic
 235 variables, only ethnicity was a predictor of declining COVID-19 vaccination. After controlling for
 236 other variables in a multivariate model, Black African or Mixed Black African participants (OR: 5.55,
 237 95%CI: 2.294 – 13.428) were significantly more likely to decline vaccination than those of White
 238 British or White Irish ethnicity. All other comparisons across ethnicity were non-significant within the
 239 model, however, Black Caribbean or Mixed Black Caribbean was significant at the univariate level.

240 Greater agreement with the statements '*I feel/felt under pressure from my employer to get a COVID-*
 241 *19 vaccine*' and '*I was/am worried about getting side-effects from a COVID-19 vaccine*' were
 242 associated with declining vaccination (OR: 1.751, 95%CI: 1.271 – 2.413 and OR: 1.68, 95%CI: 1.151 –
 243 2.45 respectively), while indications that participants felt that COVID-19 vaccination was important,
 244 safe and effective were associated with participants being more likely to accept vaccination (OR:
 245 .515, 95%CI: 0.329 - 0.805). Previous influenza vaccine uptake over the last two years appears
 246 predictive of vaccine uptake within the model (OR: 0.227, 95%CI: 0.108 - 0.478).

247 **Table 6. A logistic regression analysis of declining or intending to decline COVID-19 vaccination**

Variable	Univariable analysis. Original data			Multivariable analysis (all variables) Imputed continuous variables		
	Sig (p)	OR	95% CI	Sig (p)	OR	95% CI
Basic demographics				Included in analysis: N=1495 (Forward Likelihood Ratio)		
Ethnicity						
White British and White Irish †						

White other	.0136	1.805	.830 -3.924		.984	1.015	.243 – 4.235
Black or Black British African or Mixed Black African	.013	2.094	1.167 – 3.758		<.001	5.550	2.294 – 13.428
Black or Black British Caribbean or Mixed Black Caribbean	<.001	5.357	2.827 – 10.153		.260	1.880	.627 – 5.637
Asian or Asian British:- Indian	.053	.43	.183 – 1.011		.202	2.449	.619 – 9.695
Other South East Asian or Mixed Asian	.732	.849	.332 – 2.167		.921	.929	.217 – 3.98
Other Minority	.906	1.058	.412 – 2.716		.344	1.940	.492 – 7.659
Flu vaccine uptake							
No flu vaccine uptake							
One out of two flu vaccines taken	<.001	.226	1.32 - .388		.093	.493	.216 – 1.124
Flu vaccine taken both years	<.001	.06	.036 - .1		<.001	.227	.108 - .478
Combined COVID-19 vaccine beliefs (important, safe, and effective)	<.001	.054	.036 - .083		.004	.515	.329 - .805
I felt under pressure from my employer to get a COVID-19 vaccine	<.001	2.872	2.347 – 3.515		.001	1.751	1.271 – 2.413
I am worried about getting side-effects from a COVID-19 vaccine	<.001	.518	.416 - .644		.007	1.68	1.152 – 2.45

248

249 Quantitative findings: differences in beliefs by ethnicity

250 Table 7 indicates the differences in beliefs and trust in sources of information across the ethnic
 251 minority groups as compared to White British or White Irish participants.

252

253 **Table 7. COVID-19 belief and trust in information sources compared across ethnicity**

Statement	White British and White Irish	White other		Black or Black British African or Mixed Black African		Black or Black British Caribbean or Mixed Black Caribbean		Asian or Asian British: Indian		South East Asian or Mixed Asian		Other Ethnic Groups	
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	(p)	Mean (SD)	(p)	Mean (SD)	(p)	Mean (SD)	(p)	Mean (SD)	(p)	Mean (SD)	(p)
Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:													
<i>"I think COVID-19 is deadlier than seasonal flu"</i>	3.70 (.589)	3.59 (.789)	.7	3.77 (.545)	.784	3.68 (.636)	1.0	3.82 (.480)	.035	3.84 (.455)	.189	3.81 (.423)	.662
<i>"I think it's important for social/health care workers to get a COVID-19 vaccine to protect themselves"</i>	3.79 (.583)	3.67 (.777)	.497	3.78 (.512)	1.0	3.47 (.826)	.001	3.93 (.304)	.015	3.83 (.468)	.999	3.82 (.445)	1.0
<i>"I think it's important for social/health care workers to get a COVID-19 vaccine to protect their families"</i>	3.76 (.630)	3.65 (.803)	.692	3.80 (.476)	.998	3.43 (.871)	.001	3.92 (.315)	.004	3.81 (.516)	.992	3.79 (.461)	1.0
<i>"I think it's important for social/health care workers to get a COVID-19 vaccine to protect their patients"</i>	3.79 (.595)	3.73 (.714)	.970	3.81 (.468)	1.0	3.61 (.652)	.212	3.92 (.285)	.021	3.82 (.508)	.999	3.83 (.411)	1.0
<i>"I think that COVID-19 vaccines are safe"</i>	3.48 (.689)	3.33 (.839)	.468	3.38 (.653)	.656	3.07 (.959)	.004	3.67 (.538)	.005	3.56 (.632)	.961	3.42 (.635)	.995
<i>"I think that COVID-19 vaccines are effective"</i>	3.32 (.691)	3.18 (.816)	.743	3.20 (.662)	.523	3.08 (.818)	.390	3.48 (.548)	.015	3.41 (.629)	.874	3.35 (.537)	1.0
<i>"I think it is important for people to get vaccinated against COVID-19 to get life back to 'normal'"</i>	3.64 (.688)	3.42 (.864)	.099	3.52 (.649)	.462	3.21 (.967)	<.001	3.70 (.555)	.938	3.61 (.698)	1.0	3.54 (.646)	.909
<i>"I think that COVID-19 vaccines are compatible with my religious beliefs**"</i>	3.74 (.640)	3.52 (.839)	.301	3.47 (.817)	<.001	3.27 (.917)	<.001	3.87 (.435)	.19	3.74 (.594)	1.0	3.58 (.766)	.01
<i>"I feel well informed about COVID-19 vaccination"</i>	3.47 (.745)	3.19 (.965)	.017	3.36 (.778)	.678	2.86 (1.021)	<.001	3.64 (.614)	.023	3.41 (.772)	.997	3.35 (.785)	.847
<i>"My family and friends expect me to accept a COVID-19 vaccine"</i>	3.57 (.711)	3.21 (.984)	.003	3.03 (1.020)	<.001	2.60 (1.213)	<.001	3.72 (.593)	.117	3.32 (.915)	.049	3.35 (.797)	.260
<i>"My colleagues expect me to accept a COVID-19 vaccine"</i>	3.52 (.682)	3.33 (.763)	.236	3.45 (.765)	.937	3.39 (.802)	.865	3.66 (.646)	.118	3.61 (.632)	.921	3.52 (.685)	1.0
<i>"I felt under pressure from my employer to get a COVID-19 vaccine"</i>	1.93 (.984)	2.19 (1.063)	.279	2.03 (1.072)	.943	2.32 (1.238)	.061	1.61 (.879)	<.001	1.97 (1.057)	1.0	1.99 (1.006)	1.0
<i>"I am worried about getting side-effects from a COVID-19 vaccine"</i>	2.32 (1.003)	2.52 (1.068)	.681	2.59 (1.076)	.036	2.92 (1.168)	<.001	2.07 (.988)	.006	2.54 (1.093)	.417	2.54 (1.067)	.555
I trust the advice on Covid-19 vaccination given by...													
<i>My work colleagues</i>	3.69 (1.005)	3.31 (1.180)	.012	3.69 (1.028)	1.0	3.36 (1.032)	.173	4.03 (.902)	<.001	3.82 (.964)	.911	3.69 (1.029)	1.0
<i>Social media</i>	2.30 (.960)	2.28 (1.072)	1.0	2.28 (1.011)	1.0	2.37 (1.025)	1.0	2.64 (1.054)	<.001	2.49 (1.055)	.548	2.40 (1.147)	.989
<i>Community leaders</i>	3.11 (.952)	2.84 (.969)	.170	3.03 (.959)	.978	2.90 (.933)	.702	2.90 (.974)	.033	3.01 (.931)	.965	3.15 (.963)	1.0
<i>Religious leaders</i>	2.69 (.882)	2.28 (.958)	.003	2.92 (1.084)	.110	2.88 (.892)	.808	2.67 (1.036)	1.0	2.84 (1.102)	.801	2.83 (1.004)	.911
<i>NHS</i>	4.38 (.879)	4.17 (.920)	.368	4.23 (.836)	.470	3.92 (1.085)	.002	4.30 (.854)	.916	4.35 (.825)	1.0	4.23 (.762)	.815
<i>News media (e.g. print or online newspapers, radio, and television news broadcasts)</i>	2.92 (1.030)	2.87 (1.129)	1.0	3.25 (1.002)	.006	2.88 (1.075)	1.0	3.30 (.948)	<.001	2.84 (1.097)	.994	3.12 (.986)	.681
<i>Government</i>	3.40 (1.163)	2.95 (1.242)	.010	3.50 (1.166)	.960	2.80 (1.166)	.002	3.43 (1.150)	1.0	3.14 (1.251)	.344	3.36 (1.131)	1.0
<i>Family</i>	3.34 (.915)	3.26 (.983)	.994	3.45 (1.037)	.873	3.21 (1.018)	.972	3.69 (.908)	<.001	3.20 (1.074)	.850	3.20 (.907)	.917
<i>Friends</i>	3.26 (.869)	3.24 (.964)	1.0	3.38 (1.015)	.782	3.15 (.980)	.978	3.67 (.829)	<.001	3.30 (.987)	1.0	3.25 (.879)	1.0
<i>Scientists involved in COVID-19 vaccine development</i>	4.48 (.803)	4.52 (.913)	1.0	4.28 (.896)	.108	3.95 (1.175)	<.001	4.50 (.762)	1.0	4.43 (.731)	.999	4.37 (.822)	.952
<i>Public Health England</i>	4.21 (.995)	3.98 (1.164)	.416	4.12 (.910)	.962	3.82 (1.124)	.062	4.00 (1.080)	.065	4.23 (.959)	1.0	4.21 (.865)	1.0
<i>Health Professionals</i>	4.31 (.802)	4.02 (1.114)	.030	4.22 (.801)	.881	3.97 (.894)	.028	4.41 (.699)	.576	4.38 (.624)	.982	4.25 (.713)	.999

254 * This statement was only presented to those participants that stated an option other than atheism or no religion (N=1225)

255

256 Black Caribbean and Mixed Black Caribbean participants were significantly less likely to perceive
257 COVID-19 vaccines as safe ($p=.004$), as important for H&SCWs to get to protect themselves ($p=.001$)
258 and their families ($p=.001$), and as important to get back to normal ($p<.001$). Black Caribbean and
259 Black African participants were significantly less likely to agree that their family/friends expect them
260 to accept a vaccine ($p<.001$, $p<.001$ respectively) and were more likely to worry about side-effects
261 ($p<.001$, $p=.036$ respectively).

262 Asian H&SCWs tended to hold more beliefs predictive of vaccine uptake (i.e. believing the vaccine is
263 safe, effective, important etc.) than other ethnicities.


264 Agreement that health system information sources could be trusted for advice on COVID-19
265 vaccination was high among all participants surveyed (NHS = 87.4%, Public Health England = 90.0%,
266 Health Professional = 80.7, and scientists involved in vaccine development = 87.5%. Selecting either
267 agree or strongly agree to the statement). Although, Black Caribbean or Mixed Black Caribbean
268 indicated less agreement that scientists ($p<.001$) and the NHS ($p=.002$) were trustworthy sources of
269 information as compared to White British and White Irish participants.

270 Survey free-text findings: reasons for accepting COVID-19 vaccination

271 Of the 1731 participants that reported that they had either received or would likely accept COVID-19
272 vaccination if offered, 1577 (91%) provided a reason(s) for vaccine acceptance.

273 Fifty-six percent of participants wanted to be vaccinated to protect themselves/avoid catching
274 COVID-19 (see Figure 1). The next most given reasons to accept vaccination were to protect family
275 and/or friends (40% of participants), to protect service users (28%), to protect others/society/the
276 community (24%), to get life back to 'normal', to control the pandemic (20%), and to protect
277 colleagues (10%).

278 **Figure 1. Reasons for vaccinating**




279

280

281 Survey free-text findings: reasons for declining COVID-19 vaccination

282 Of the 137 participants that had either declined or would likely decline COVID-19 vaccination if
283 offered, 130 (95%) provided a reason for this. Fifty-one percent of participants were concerned
284 about vaccine side effects and half of the participants expressed concerns around a lack of research.
285 Twenty-seven percent of participants were concerned about the effectiveness of the vaccine, 21%
286 did not feel at risk of severe COVID, and 21% distrusted government, the pharmaceutical industry,
287 vaccine manufacturers and/or the media (see Figure 2). Fourteen percent were concerned about the
288 vaccine development process being rushed and 11% were concerned about the change in the
289 maximum interval between first and second vaccine doses from 3 to 12 weeks. Eight percent
290 reported having had COVID-19 as one of their main reasons for declining vaccination.

291 **Figure 2. Reasons for not vaccinating**



292

293 By ethnicity, Black African or Mixed Black African participants were more likely to state concerns
294 about a lack of research (67%) and Indian participants were more likely to state concerns about side
295 effects (71%). White-other participants were more likely to state concerns about effectiveness (55%)
296 and White-British and Irish participants were more likely to not feel at risk of severe COVID-19
297 (36%). Black Caribbean or Mixed Black Caribbean participants were more likely to state distrust in
298 government, the pharmaceutical industry, vaccine manufacturers and/or the media (38%).

299 SCWs were more likely to state concerns about effectiveness (37%), not feeling at risk of severe
300 COVID-19 (37%), and a preference to build the immune system naturally (19%), as reasons for not
301 vaccinating, compared with HCWs. None of the SCWs that completed the open text reported being
302 concerned about the change in dosing schedule as their main reason for not vaccinating.

303 Qualitative findings – from interviews and free-text responses

304 Factors influencing COVID-19 vaccine uptake amongst H&SCWs are presented under ten themes: (i)
305 access; (ii) perceptions of COVID-19 risk and severity; (iii) trust; (iv) concerns about allergies; (v)
306 beliefs around vaccine effectiveness; (vi) pressure to get vaccinated; (vii) perceptions of COVID-19
307 vaccine importance; (viii) vaccination concern in women of childbearing age; (ix) vaccine
308 communication and information sources; and (x) religion.

309 We highlight where specific themes were reported more dominantly by HCWs or SCWs. We use the
310 term participants when themes emerged in interviews and survey free-text responses, and highlight
311 where themes emerged in interviews or free-text responses only.

312 3.1.1 Access

313 Most NHS HCWs reported that it was easy to organise vaccination through formal invitations via
314 their employer. For others, including SCWs and those with non-mainstream NHS employers (private,
315 bank staff, locums, pharmacists) COVID-19 vaccination was described as ‘quite a battle’ as they were
316 not given advice about how to organise vaccination by their employer(s), or received mixed
317 messages around whether they should arrange an appointment through their general practitioner or
318 employer. In trying to access COVID-19 vaccination, some of these HCWs had reached out to their
319 general practice but were not able to access the vaccine through this route. One interviewee was
320 told to wait until their age category joined the priority list to be vaccinated, and in one case was
321 advised to book vaccination through an NHS web link.

322 One interviewed HCW felt that although some were able to access vaccination appointments during
323 working hours, in practice this was not happening for all staff, noting that staff in job grades 5 and
324 below, often belonging to ethnic minority groups, were less likely to have their time freed up during
325 working hours to access vaccination.

326 3.1.2 Perceptions of COVID-19 risk and severity

327 How participants perceived their personal risk of COVID-19 was a major influence on vaccination
328 decision-making. Most vaccinated participants considered themselves at risk of COVID-19 exposure,
329 i.e. because of working in frontline roles, and/or at risk of severe COVID-19 due to one or a
330 combination of factors including older age, clinical vulnerability, and being from an ethnic minority
331 background. In interviews, participants who perceived themselves to be at higher risk of COVID-19
332 elaborated that this sense of personal risk outweighed vaccine safety concerns. Several survey
333 participants felt that family members of H&SCWs should also have been offered vaccination as a
334 priority.

335 Most unvaccinated participants considered themselves to be at low risk of COVID-19. These
336 participants included younger adults and those without underlying health conditions, H&SCWs with
337 limited/no service user contact at the time of vaccine offer, and those not living with household
338 members at higher risk of COVID-19. One interviewee considered that gaining natural immunity
339 through infection was better than vaccinating for those not in higher risk groups.

340 *‘So, for me, it’s weighing up the pros and cons for different risks, doing my own*
341 *risk assessment. I understand, you know, everybody has to do their own risk*
342 *assessments, based on their own circumstances. And, for me, there are too many*
343 *unknowns about this for somebody like me who is at very, very, little risk of*
344 *serious illness.’ (Interviewee #2 –SCW, female, White British)*

345 Vaccinated interviewees discussed COVID-19 as a severe disease and had often witnessed serious
346 and life-threatening COVID-19 symptoms and complications first-hand (e.g. through being badly
347 affected by COVID-19 themselves or seeing others with severe COVID-19).

348 Several participants that had declined vaccination considered COVID-19 severity as overplayed by
349 the government or the media (with an over-representation of cases in younger people), or
350 considered the disease severe for others (e.g. people in clinically vulnerable groups) but not for
351 themselves. These views were also based on some having had COVID-19 but only experiencing mild
352 symptoms, or not knowing people that had been affected.

353 Two interviewees (one HCW and one SCW) expressed scepticism around how COVID-19 deaths are
354 reported, questioning how many of these might be linked to non-COVID-19 causes exacerbated by
355 disruptions to NHS care.

356 3.1.3 Trust

357 Vaccination decisions were influenced by trust at multiple levels: in the vaccine, the provider, and
358 policymakers. In particular, lower levels of trust at each level were reported amongst H&SCWs from
359 Black and Asian ethnic minority groups where trust was undermined by beliefs in systemic racism
360 (e.g. racism in healthcare, in medical research, in government). SCWs also reported lower levels of
361 trust, which appeared more linked to relationships with their employer and feeling pressurised to
362 vaccinate.

363 3.1.3.1 Trust in the vaccine

364 Vaccinated and unvaccinated participants expressed concern over potential COVID-19 vaccine side
365 effects, particularly long-term effects. Many participants were concerned about the speed of vaccine
366 development and delivery, stating that COVID-19 vaccines remain in the trial phase and there is a
367 lack of long-term outcome data. Some participants reported that they or their colleagues had
368 wanted to 'wait and see' how the vaccination worked in others before getting vaccinated
369 themselves. In free-text responses, several HCWs noted that the indemnification of the Pfizer
370 vaccine (i.e. protecting Pfizer from civil lawsuits in the event of unforeseen vaccine complications)
371 also undermined trust in the vaccine.

372 Questions were raised about whether vaccines might interact with medications, how vaccination
373 might affect people who already had COVID-19, and the safety of COVID-19 vaccines and of mRNA
374 vaccines in particular. These views were expressed in interviews and free-text responses.

375 *"Because I have had Long Covid and I cannot get enough information to support*
376 *me getting this information that taking this vaccine will not exacerbate my*

377 *symptoms and ill health, to feel safe about this choice. I feel totally lost in this*
378 *situation. Information is bouncing around a 1,000- miles an hour and I feel pushed*
379 *to make an uninformed decision and it is totally overwhelming” (Survey ID387–*
380 *HCW, female and White Other)*

381 Concerns were raised that COVID-19 vaccines had not been sufficiently trialled in ethnic minority
382 groups, and therefore there was insufficient safety and effectiveness data for use in people from
383 ethnic minority backgrounds. One interviewee, of Indian ethnicity, spoke specifically about wanting
384 a particular vaccine because it had been trialled in India, and had wanted to wait for this vaccine to
385 become available before vaccinating.

386 *3.1.3.2 Trust in the provider*

387 Participants raised concerns about past medical racism (e.g. the Tuskegee syphilis study) as being
388 commonly reported amongst colleagues from Black ethnic groups. Some pointed to reports of
389 unethical medical experimentation by Pfizer in Africa in the past, and one interviewee reported that
390 staff had been given the option of accessing the AstraZeneca vaccine, which was available at a
391 different site.

392 Several participants reported that the medical racism they or others within their ethnic group had
393 experienced in the past fuelled their vaccine hesitancy, such as Black women being treated adversely
394 by health care providers. Two survey participants voiced scepticism in being asked to have data
395 recorded around ethnicity prior to vaccination, as they were concerned this might influence the
396 vaccine given to them.

397 Participants voiced their distrust in the pharmaceutical industry and scientists, drawing on examples
398 of harms caused by medicines and vaccines introduced in the past, such as swine flu vaccination
399 (linked to increased risk of narcolepsy (16, 17), which also undermined trust in COVID-19 vaccines.

400 *3.1.3.3 Trust in policymakers*

401 Several interviewees and survey participants reported that distrust in the government and its
402 handling of the pandemic had affected their own or colleagues’ trust in vaccination. Amongst
403 unvaccinated interview participants, notably SCWs, questions were raised around the length of time
404 NHS services had been restricted and reduced, the changing guidance e.g. on mask wearing, and the
405 motivation for continual lockdowns.

406 Participants shared their frustrations about changes to the interval between vaccine doses, against
407 the manufacturers recommended protocol, and for some this negatively affected COVID-19
408 vaccination confidence and left them feeling vulnerable. Several participants felt the dosing interval

409 change was not well communicated. Other aspects around COVID-19 vaccine delivery undermined
410 confidence e.g. talks about mixing COVID-19 vaccines, and differences in vaccination programme
411 delivery between countries.

412 Participants reported how the pandemic had hit ethnic minority groups hardest, and how poorly
413 vaccination and ethnicity risk had been communicated. In free-text responses, a number of Black
414 ethnicity participants voiced scepticism around the sudden drive to protect ethnic minorities from
415 COVID-19, given the ‘decades long’ health inequalities experienced by ethnic minority groups.
416 Several participants considered racism to be deeply embedded within government, leading them to
417 question why people from ethnic minority backgrounds would trust government recommendations
418 on vaccination.

419 *‘We feel that for decades, we have been on the receiving end of health and social*
420 *inequalities. Now, we are being presented with a new vaccine that has been*
421 *developed in quick time and we are now priority group number 1’ (Survey ID52 –*
422 *HCW, male, Black or Black British: - African)*

423 A small number of participants voiced some critique around the use of the collective term BAME
424 (Black, Asian, and Minority Ethnic), which does not highlight heterogeneity between or within
425 groups and may mask particular inequalities. One participant reported: *‘I’m tired of people talking*
426 *about those BAME people without understanding that they’re different groups, and without trying to*
427 *understand why.’ (Interviewee#14 – HCW, female, Black or Black British: - Caribbean).*

428 3.1.4 Beliefs around vaccine effectiveness

429 Most vaccinated participants felt confident that vaccination would reduce their risk of contracting
430 COVID-19 and, if they became infected, their likelihood of developing severe disease and/or
431 complications. One commonly reported factor influencing decision-making was the uncertainty
432 around COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness in reducing transmission. Without information on this,
433 where people felt at low personal risk, there was little impetus to get vaccinated.

434 *‘I always said if the vaccine doesn’t stop transmission, what is the point of me*
435 *having it? That was one of my early sort of arguments against it, was I’m not*
436 *injecting something into me if it’s not going to do the job that they say it’s going*
437 *to do.’ (Interviewee #7 – HCW, female, White British)*

438 Several survey participants were concerned that the effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccination may be
439 undermined by new variants of COVID-19.

440 3.1.5 *Perceptions of COVID-19 vaccine importance*

441 Vaccinated participants reported that they or their colleagues viewed vaccination as important to
442 protect themselves and others, including clinically vulnerable family members, and also as a route
443 out of the pandemic and a return to ‘normality’ (e.g. being able to travel and visit loved ones).

444 Several vaccinated participants considered vaccination necessary for them to keep being able to
445 work. One participant also considered vaccination important to protect against newer strains of
446 COVID-19.

447 Unvaccinated participants tended to consider vaccination as less important. One interview
448 participant and several survey participants felt being vaccinated would not impact on their need to
449 wear personal protective equipment or make a difference in terms of their ability to see loved ones.

450 3.1.6 *Pressure to get vaccinated*

451 Several participants, mainly SCWs, felt vaccination was not presented as a choice. Pressure was
452 mostly discussed as coming from employers; however, one participant, living with older relatives,
453 also felt pressured from family.

454 Amongst unvaccinated participants, concerns were raised about how their decision might impact
455 their freedoms (i.e. ability to access certain public spaces or travel) and most worryingly their job
456 security. For SCWs, pressure was exacerbated by hearing of care sector employers making COVID-19
457 vaccination mandatory for staff, and the vulnerability of SCW positions (e.g. employment on zero-
458 hours contracts).

459 *‘I am disgusted by the narrative that it is some sort of civic duty to take the*
460 *vaccine. It should always be the free choice of the individual based upon their own*
461 *health situation. I have deep concerns at the potential for coercion regarding*
462 *vaccination which we are already witnessing. I know care home staff who have*
463 *been threatened with dismissal should they not be vaccinated and have ended up*
464 *having the vaccine despite not wanting to as they felt they would lose their jobs.’*
465 *(Survey ID663 – Social care, female, White British)*

466 Participants were alarmed that their vaccination decisions were relayed to managers when health
467 related issues would usually be supported by occupational health or general practitioners only.
468 Several participants reported that managers had access to lists of unvaccinated staff and were
469 contacting them directly to discuss their vaccination status.

470 Feeling pressurised had damaging effects, eroding trust and negatively affecting relationships at
471 work. It cemented several participant’s stances on declining vaccination, making them more vaccine

472 hesitant, and pushed one person into having the vaccine when they would have preferred not to.
473 Participants strongly felt that vaccination should be an individual's choice, informed and voluntary.

474 *3.1.7 Concerns about allergies*

475 Several participants voiced concerns about allergies and a lack of early information on their
476 suitability for vaccination. One unvaccinated interviewee had concerns about having had a severe
477 adverse reaction to a past vaccination while another had delayed vaccination until a specific vaccine
478 became available, which they were advised was more suitable for people with allergies.

479 *3.1.8 Vaccination concern in women of childbearing age*

480 Two interviewees and several survey participants who wanted to become pregnant in the future
481 were concerned about unfounded rumours that COVID-19 vaccines cause fertility problems. Another
482 interviewee was concerned about the safety of COVID-19 vaccination and breastfeeding and had
483 decided to delay vaccination. Updated guidance on vaccinating during pregnancy enhanced
484 uncertainty amongst some pregnant women about vaccinating.

485 *3.1.9 Vaccine communication and information sources*

486 Access to information varied amongst staff, with differences reported across job roles and also by
487 ethnicity, and this affected beliefs and behaviours. Participants recommended that information
488 should be communicated regularly by employers across various platforms to reach different
489 audiences e.g. email, social media, webinars. One recommendation, voiced by several interview and
490 survey participants, was that engagement with faith groups was particularly important in
491 communicating with staff from ethnic minority backgrounds. Participants also wanted more
492 openness in communication about uncertainty, so they could make an informed decision around
493 vaccination.

494 All interviewees reported actively searching for COVID-19 vaccine information and most discussed
495 vaccination with colleagues. Participants tended to avoid social media sources, in favour of accessing
496 government or NHS sources. Many participants preferred to access research articles directly, with
497 concerns that second-hand reporting of the information (i.e. in the media) may be incomplete or
498 biased.

499 Unvaccinated participants reported that although they might receive information about vaccination,
500 they were not given the opportunity to have any discussion around vaccine questions and concerns.
501 Instead, they felt they were dismissed as being anti-vaccination and treated as stupid, something
502 they felt was exacerbated by some of the terminology around vaccination, including anti-vax and
503 myth busting. One participant voiced that Black people have historically been silenced and told not

504 to ask questions around health care, and that this was happening with COVID-19 vaccination and
505 undermining trust.

506 *'I wanted to be fully informed rather than just told to take it... I was left*
507 *frightened and with little information which was totally avoidable.'* (Survey
508 *ID350 – HCW, female, Mixed: - White and Black Caribbean)*

509 Participants said that it was difficult to keep up-to-date and understand reasons for changes to the
510 COVID-19 vaccination programme e.g. updated guidance on vaccination in pregnancy. There were
511 also reports of participants being given mixed messages about vaccination. For example, two
512 interviewees that had declined vaccination had been given different information from either
513 healthcare professionals or their employer on vaccines e.g. advised that younger people should
514 access a certain vaccine. Finally, many survey participants also suggested that more transparency
515 was needed about side effects, which they felt had been downplayed.

516 *'I would like to know more about side effects. Besides what is online there*
517 *appears to be a vagueness about the side effects that I'm sure some people have*
518 *had. I think there should be more transparency especially for Black and brown*
519 *healthcare workers.'* (Survey ID872 – HCW, female, Black or Black British: - Other)

520 3.1.10 Religion

521 For one interviewee, it was essential that vaccination was halal – permissible in Islam – and they
522 sought reassuring information about COVID-19 vaccination through Islamic medical groups and
523 journals. Views were also expressed in free-text responses about vaccinating during Ramadan.
524 Muslim faith leaders have advised that COVID-19 vaccination is permissible during Ramadan and
525 does not nullify the fast.

526 *'I have also decided to postpone having my first vaccine because my second*
527 *vaccine would fall in Ramadan and I will not miss my fasting'.* (Survey ID234 -
528 *HCW, female, Asian or Asian British: - Pakistani)*

529 4 Discussion

530 COVID-19 vaccination uptake was high amongst our participants (93.9% of HCWs and 90.0% of SCWs
531 were offered and accepted vaccination); however, we identified variations in vaccination offer and
532 uptake by job sector and ethnicity.

533

534 We found that SCWs were offered COVID-19 vaccination at a lower rate than HCWs (87.0% vs 92.7%)
535 and that SCWs were less clear about who was responsible for their COVID-19 vaccination offer;

536 whether GP or employer. This is likely to be linked to the organisational structure and nature of roles
537 within social care. Social care can be provided by local authorities, private sector companies or
538 voluntary organisations. Funding is either paid for by the individual or by local authorities where the
539 individual cannot self-fund. Care is often provided in small care home settings or in an individual's
540 own home so the workforce is more disperse. In addition, workforce vaccination as part of the
541 seasonal influenza vaccination programme is more embedded within the NHS than social care and
542 therefore NHS organisations may be better prepared for COVID-19 vaccination delivery. The
543 effectiveness of the SCW influenza vaccination programme is arguably also undermined by
544 conflicting guidance on who should provide the vaccination. Since 2017/18 the SCW workforce has
545 been able to access seasonal influenza vaccination freely through primary care but this service is
546 'intended to complement, not replace, any established occupational health schemes that employers
547 have in place' (18). Influenza vaccination is not consistently monitored amongst SCWs and uptake
548 remains low (19). In our study, in several instances, the onus appeared to be on SCWs to organise
549 vaccination, rather than on their employers. This was also reported by interviewed non-mainstream
550 NHS HCWs, suggesting that outside of the NHS greater barriers to vaccine offer and access may be
551 experienced.

552

553 Our analysis indicated that Black African or Mixed Black African participants were being offered
554 COVID-19 vaccination at a lower rate than White British and White Irish participants (87.5% vs
555 92.1%). This appeared as a significant finding in our multivariate regression analysis (OR:2.59, 95%CI:
556 1.292 – 5.177) and is difficult to explain and requires further investigation. Compared to White
557 British and White Irish participants, we also found that rates of COVID-19 vaccination decline were
558 higher amongst Black African or Mixed Black African participants and Black Caribbean or Mixed Black
559 Caribbean participants. These findings are similar to data from an NHS Trust in England, which
560 reported differential uptake by ethnicity (70.9% in White staff v 58.5% in South Asian and 36.8% in
561 Black staff; $p < .001$) (7), and are also supported by international data showing lower intention to take
562 up COVID-19 vaccination among healthcare workers from certain ethnic groups (20). Comparisons
563 by ethnicity is further demonstrated by the interaction between ethnicity and COVID-19 vaccine
564 beliefs, showing for example, less confidence in vaccine safety and importance amongst Black
565 H&SCWs.

566

567 Through free-text responses and interviews we found that factors influencing vaccination-decisions
568 were multi-layered and often involved the weighing up of perceived risks and benefits of
569 vaccination. Factors found to influence COVID-19 vaccine uptake amongst H&SCWs included

570 perceptions around COVID-19 risk and COVID-19 severity, beliefs around vaccine effectiveness,
571 safety and importance, concerns about allergies, concerns about safety in women of childbearing
572 age, and religious beliefs. Interviewees discussed that perceptions around personal COVID-19 risk
573 and the severity of COVID-19 were central to decision-making, and younger participants and/or
574 those without underlying health conditions did not necessarily see the rationale for vaccinating,
575 particularly without evidence on the link between vaccination and reducing disease transmission.
576 Concerns around safety – especially in light of the speed of development of the new vaccines – also
577 accord with findings from attitudinal work conducted internationally (21).

578
579 Distrust, reported in the vaccine, the provider and the policymaker, was also central to vaccination
580 decisions. Distrust was particularly expressed by ethnic minority groups, who emphasised how they
581 have borne the brunt of health inequalities before and during the pandemic. Black participants in
582 particular felt stigmatised and patronised, and unable to voice questions and concerns, and obtain
583 responses. This is consistent with existing evidence (22) and a recent PHE report (23). Participants
584 criticised the media characterisation of ethnic minority groups as anti-vax, which fails to recognise
585 underlying reasons for lower vaccine confidence.

586
587 Organisational factors and workplace culture played an important role in the likelihood of both being
588 offered and getting vaccinated, as described elsewhere (24). This is consistent with previous
589 research that indicates that an organisational culture framing seasonal influenza vaccination within a
590 broader staff wellbeing programme was conducive to higher uptake (24, 25). The coherence
591 between staff well-being and COVID-19 vaccination might be particularly important in a context
592 where staff have been subjected to high levels of stress over a long period (26). Importantly, the
593 survey revealed that participants that reported greater agreement with the statement '*I feel/felt*
594 *under pressure from my employer to get a COVID-19 vaccine*' were significantly more likely to decline
595 the vaccine even after demographic factors were controlled for. Interviews suggest placing staff
596 under pressure to vaccinate may increase intention to refuse the vaccine. This was particularly
597 evident in SCWs, for whom pressure was exacerbated by hearing of care sector employers making
598 COVID-19 vaccination mandatory for staff, and the vulnerability of SCW positions (e.g. employment
599 on zero-hours contracts). This is consistent with previous research that shows promoting a positive
600 choice around the seasonal influenza vaccine rather than resorting to a more coercive approach,
601 such as mandating, was supportive of fostering continuous improvement of vaccination uptake (24,
602 27).

603

604 Interviews and free-text data brought out powerfully that those who declined the vaccine, or were
605 unsure about receiving it, were calling for “conversations” where they felt safe to ask about the
606 vaccine, and not feel judged and stigmatised for having questions and/or concerns. This is consistent
607 with recent guidance issued by the NHS (28) that recommends ‘*supportive and sensitive one to one*
608 *conversation*’ with members of staff. Some participants argued that, as educated HCWs, they felt
609 disempowered and should be able to easily access and examine the evidence about the vaccine and
610 scientific information. Ethnic minority participants suggested tailoring vaccination communication to
611 promote uptake amongst HSCWs from ethnic minority backgrounds, and engaging faith leaders and
612 trusted figures who understand community member concerns. Key messages and policy
613 recommendations are provided in panel 1.
614

Panel 1: Key messages and policy recommendations

Strategy

- Build on lessons learned from the seasonal influenza vaccination programme for health and social care workers.
- Respond to information needs rather than focus on the need to vaccinate. Provide a safe space for asking questions and discussing concerns.
- Provide easy access to evidence, and acknowledge that evidence changes over time.
- Promote a positive workplace environment in which vaccination-decisions are informed and voluntary.
- Carefully consider any change in the current policy of voluntary vaccination, and the possible unintended consequences of moving to mandatory vaccination on trust and uptake.

Decliners

- Do not pressure decliners and/or set up a system that is repeatedly asking them to vaccinate. Provide space for discussing concerns.
- Be careful how vaccination status is recorded in individual staff health records.
- Do not frame specific ethnic or professional groups as “refusers”. Do not label decliners negatively or stigmatise specific groups.

Specific demographic groups

- Promote more “representative” champions of specific ethnic communities; involve clinical leaders; pilot peer to peer discussion.
- Reach out to staff with health conditions; provide relevant information and referrals. Provide regular updates on changes in scientific guidance (e.g. pregnancy).

Access

- Provide information on fail-safe referral pathways for those not supported by their employers (e.g. social care workers, those with multiple employers).

Side effects

- Communicate transparently on side effects, respond to questions, and provide further scientific evidence as it emerges.

617 Strengths and limitations

618 This is the first study to consider the role of beliefs, attitudes and other factors in COVID-19
619 vaccination uptake among H&SCWs. By using a mixed-methods approach, our study explored not
620 only the association between demographic characteristics – as other studies have done (29) - but
621 also attitudinal, organisational and cultural influences on COVID-19 vaccination that have not been
622 examined in UK H&SCWs.

623

624 Our recruitment strategy achieved a high number of H&SCW responses from across a range of job
625 roles, and intentionally high representation across broad ethnic categories. On reflection, we
626 consider that this was possible due to diverse representation among the study researchers.
627 Future research should concentrate on exploring the heterogeneity within broad ethnic groups.
628 While ethnic minority representation was good across our sample, some categories used within the
629 regression analysis still had less than ideal numbers of participants. For instance, there were 66 Black
630 or Black British Caribbean or Mixed Black Caribbean participants, 15 of whom declined the COVID-19
631 vaccine. With such numbers, it is possible that recruitment bias and other general limitations to
632 conducting survey research may limit the representativeness of the findings. In our sample, Asian
633 participants were overrepresented within highly medical roles (54% in our sample vs 26% in the NHS
634 workforce (20)), suggesting that our higher uptake findings for Asian participants should be
635 interpreted cautiously.

636 5 Conclusion

637 Our study has provided a nuanced analysis of factors influencing COVID-19 vaccination uptake
638 amongst H&SCWs, exploring variations found in vaccination offer and uptake by job sector and
639 ethnicity. To increase COVID-19 vaccine confidence requires the use of targeted communication and
640 engagement strategies for specific communities that respond to their concerns; reframing the
641 communication strategy to prioritise allowing for and responding to individual questions and
642 concerns; and not stigmatising specific ethnic or professional groups. The role of employers is central
643 to strengthening the H&SCW COVID-19 vaccination programme, given that employers are the
644 natural conduit for providing COVID-19 vaccination information and facilitating vaccine discussions.
645 As COVID-19 vaccination may become a routine vaccination for all HSCWs in the future, it is
646 important to engage HSCWs in supporting the programme and create a positive and supportive
647 environment for COVID-19 vaccination. Crucially, our findings emphasise the importance of COVID-
648 19 vaccination remaining voluntary, as a move towards mandating COVID-19 vaccination is likely to
649 harden stances and negatively affect trust in the vaccination, provider, and policymakers.

650

651

652 **Author's contributions:** SB, RC, HN, YC, HD, LL, PP, and SM-J initiated and designed the study. Survey
653 dissemination was performed by SB, RC, OO-A, HN, YC, HD, LL, PP, and SM-J. RC performed the
654 statistical analysis. SB, PP, and SM-J performed the analysis of free-text survey responses. SB and PP
655 led interview recruitment. SB, SI, OO-A, and PP conducted the interviews. SB performed the
656 qualitative interview analysis and prepared the first draft of the manuscript. All authors were
657 involved in the interpretation of findings. All authors participated in manuscript preparation and
658 approved the final manuscript.

659 **Data Availability Statement:** The full dataset is stored in a data repository: LSHTM Data compass.
660 Data are available to bona fide researchers upon request and agreement by the study team. Data
661 cannot be shared without restriction as study participants agreed that their study data could be
662 accessed by other researchers only. This level of data access was approved by the LSHTM
663 Observational Research Ethics committee (study reference: 22923).

664 Further information on the data and access conditions can be found through the LSHTM Data
665 Compass at XX. Researchers interested in accessing the data are advised to request access through
666 the LSHTM Data Compass page listed above, email the corresponding author or email
667 researchdatamanagement@lshtm.ac.uk.

668 **Declaration of Competing Interest:** The authors declare that they have no known competing
669 financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported
670 in this paper.

671 **Acknowledgements:** We would like to thank everyone who helped share the online survey with
672 potential participants. We are especially grateful for the time and contribution of all health and
673 social care workers who took part in the study.

674 We would also like to thank Professor Bob Erens at LSHTM for his support in using Qualtrics software
675 for the survey.

676 **Funding**

677 The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship,
678 and/or publication of this article: The research was funded by the National Institute for Health
679 Research Health Protection Research Unit (NIHR HPRU) in Immunisation at the London School of
680 Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (LSHTM) in partnership with Public Health England (PHE). The views

681 expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, the
682 Department of Health or Public Health England.
683 SAI is supported by a Wellcome Trust Clinical Research Training Fellowship [ref no 215654/Z/19/Z].

684 6 References

- 685 1. Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation. (2020). Joint Committee on Vaccination
686 and Immunisation: advice on priority groups for COVID-19 vaccination, 2nd December 2020.
687 Available from: [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/priority-groups-for-coronavirus-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/priority-groups-for-coronavirus-covid-19-vaccination-advice-from-the-jcvi-2-december-2020)
688 [covid-19-vaccination-advice-from-the-jcvi-2-december-2020](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/priority-groups-for-coronavirus-covid-19-vaccination-advice-from-the-jcvi-2-december-2020).
- 689 2. Public Health England. (2021). COVID-19: the green book, chapter 14a. Available from:
690 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-the-green-book-chapter-14a>.
- 691 3. Office for National Statistics. (2019). International migration and the healthcare workforce
692 Available from:
693 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/internationalmi-](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/internationalmigration/articles/internationalmigrationandthehealthcareworkforce/2019-08-15)
694 [gration/articles/internationalmigrationandthehealthcareworkforce/2019-08-15](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/internationalmigration/articles/internationalmigrationandthehealthcareworkforce/2019-08-15).
- 695 4. Skills for Care. (2020). The state of the adult social care sector and workforce in England
696 Available from: [https://www.skillsforcare.org.uk/adult-social-care-workforce-data/Workforce-](https://www.skillsforcare.org.uk/adult-social-care-workforce-data/Workforce-intelligence/publications/national-information/The-state-of-the-adult-social-care-sector-and-workforce-in-England.aspx)
697 [intelligence/publications/national-information/The-state-of-the-adult-social-care-sector-and-](https://www.skillsforcare.org.uk/adult-social-care-workforce-data/Workforce-intelligence/publications/national-information/The-state-of-the-adult-social-care-sector-and-workforce-in-England.aspx)
698 [workforce-in-England.aspx](https://www.skillsforcare.org.uk/adult-social-care-workforce-data/Workforce-intelligence/publications/national-information/The-state-of-the-adult-social-care-sector-and-workforce-in-England.aspx).
- 699 5. NHS England and NHS Improvement. (2021). COVID-19 weekly announced vaccinations 15
700 April 2021.
- 701 6. Public Health England (2021). Seasonal flu vaccine uptake in healthcare workers 2020 to
702 2021: provisional monthly data for 1 September 2020 to 31 January 2021. Available from:
703 [https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/seasonal-flu-vaccine-uptake-in-healthcare-workers-](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/seasonal-flu-vaccine-uptake-in-healthcare-workers-monthly-data-2020-to-2021)
704 [monthly-data-2020-to-2021](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/seasonal-flu-vaccine-uptake-in-healthcare-workers-monthly-data-2020-to-2021).
- 705 7. Shah ASV, Wood R, Gribben C, Caldwell D, Bishop J, Weir A, et al. (2020). Risk of hospital
706 admission with coronavirus disease 2019 in healthcare workers and their households: nationwide
707 linkage cohort study. *BMJ*. 371:m3582.
- 708 8. Public Health England. (2020). COVID-19: review of disparities in risks and outcomes.
709 Available from: [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-review-of-disparities-in-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-review-of-disparities-in-risks-and-outcomes)
710 [risks-and-outcomes](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-review-of-disparities-in-risks-and-outcomes).
- 711 9. Martin CA, Patel P, Goss C, Jenkins DR, Price A, Barton L, et al. (2020). Demographic and
712 occupational determinants of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG seropositivity in hospital staff. *J Public Health*
713 (Oxf).
- 714 10. Eyre DW, Lumley SF, O'Donnell D, Campbell M, Sims E, Lawson E, et al. (2020). Differential
715 occupational risks to healthcare workers from SARS-CoV-2 observed during a prospective
716 observational study. *Elife*. 9.
- 717 11. Cook T KE, Lennane S. (2020). Exclusive: deaths of NHS staff from covid-19 analysed. *Health*
718 *Service Journal*.
- 719 12. Martin CA et al. (2021). Association of demographic and occupational factors with SARS-CoV-
720 2 vaccine uptake in a multi-ethnic UK healthcare workforce: a rapid real world analysis. *MedRxiv*
721 [preprint].
- 722 13. The OpenSAFELY Collaborative. (2021). Trends and clinical characteristics of COVID-19
723 vaccine recipients: a federated analysis of 57.9 million patients' primary care records in situ using
724 OpenSAFELY. Preprint.
- 725 14. Phinney, J.S. & Ong, A.D. (2007). Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic identity:
726 Current status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 54:271-81.
- 727 15. Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in*
728 *Psychology*. 3(2):77-101.
- 729 16. Sarkanen TO, Alakuijala APE, Dauvilliers YA, Partinen MM. (2018). Incidence of narcolepsy
730 after H1N1 influenza and vaccinations: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sleep Med Rev*. 38:177-
731 86.
- 732 17. Stowe J, Andrews N, Kosky C, Dennis G, Eriksson S, Hall A, et al. (2016). Risk of Narcolepsy
733 after AS03 Adjuvanted Pandemic A/H1N1 2009 Influenza Vaccine in Adults: A Case-Coverage Study
734 in England. *Sleep*. 39(5):1051-7.

- 735 18. NHS England and NHS Improvement. (2020). Direct Enhanced Service Specification: Seasonal
736 influenza and pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccination programme 2020/21. 2020.
- 737 19. Burki TK. (2018). Concerns over low uptake of flu vaccination in social care. *Lancet Respir*
738 *Med.* 6(12):898.
- 739 20. Shekhar R., et al. (2021). COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance among Health Care Workers in the
740 United States. *Vaccines.* 9(2):119.
- 741 21. Verger P, Scronias D, Dauby N, Adedzi KA, Gobert C, Bergeat M, et al. (2021). Attitudes of
742 healthcare workers towards COVID-19 vaccination: a survey in France and French-speaking parts of
743 Belgium and Canada, 2020. *Euro Surveill.* 26(3).
- 744 22. Williams RAL, J.A.; Davis, B.A.; Vu, C. (2019). Understanding how discrimination can affect
745 health. *Health Services Research.* 54(2):1374-88.
- 746 23. Public Health England (PHE). Beyond the data: Understanding the impact of COVID-19 on
747 BAME groups.
748 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/8](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/892376/COVID_stakeholder_engagement_synthesis_beyond_the_datapdf)
749 [92376/COVID stakeholder engagement synthesis beyond the datapdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/892376/COVID_stakeholder_engagement_synthesis_beyond_the_datapdf). 2020;Wellington House,
750 133-155 Waterloo Road, London SE1 8UG.
- 751 24. Mounier-Jack S, Bell S, Chantler T, Edwards A, Yarwood J, Gilbert D, et al. (2020).
752 Organisational factors affecting performance in delivering influenza vaccination to staff in NHS Acute
753 Hospital Trusts in England: A qualitative study. *Vaccine.* 38(15):3079-85.
- 754 25. Cherian T, Morales KF, Mantel C, Lambach P, Independent Expert Advisory Group for Health
755 Worker Influenza V. (2019). Factors and considerations for establishing and improving seasonal
756 influenza vaccination of health workers: Report from a WHO meeting, January 16-17, Berlin,
757 Germany. *Vaccine.* 37(43):6255-61.
- 758 26. Tracy DK, Tarn M, Eldridge R, Cooke J, Calder JDF, Greenberg N. (2020). What should be
759 done to support the mental health of healthcare staff treating COVID-19 patients? *Br J Psychiatry.*
760 217(4):537-9.
- 761 27. Bell S, Chantler T, Paterson P, Mounier-Jack S. (2020). Is flu vaccination opt-out feasible?
762 Evidence from vaccination programme implementers and managers in the English National Health
763 Service. *Vaccine.* 38(26):4183-90.
- 764 28. National Health Service (NHS). Guidance to support COVID-19 vaccine uptake in frontline
765 staff - Guidance for HR Directors. Version 2. 12 March. Publications approval reference: C1195. 2021.
- 766 29. Christopher A Martin, Colette Marshall, Prashanth Patel, Charles Goss, David R. Jenkins,
767 Claire Ellwood, et al. (2021). Association of demographic and occupational factors with SARS-CoV-2
768 vaccine uptake in a multi-ethnic UK healthcare workforce: a rapid real-world analysis. medRxiv
769 preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021021121251548>.

