medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Racial discrimination and covid-19 vaccine uptake: is mistrust of the health service behind vaccine refusal?

Elise Paul [a,1*], Daisy Fancourt [a,2], Mohammad Razai [b,3]

[a] Research Department of Behavioural Science and Health, Institute of Epidemiology & Health, University College London, 1-19 Torrington Place, London, WC1E 7HB

[b] Population Health Research Institute, St George's University of London, London, UK

[1] Senior Research Fellow in Epidemiology and Statistics

[2] Associate Professor of Psychobiology and Epidemiology

[3] NIHR In-Practice Fellow

* Corresponding author. Research Department of Behavioural Science and Health, Institute of Epidemiology & Health, University College London, 1-19 Torrington Place, London, WC1E 7HB. Email: e.paul@ucl.ac.uk.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Objectives To assess the role of racial and ethnic discrimination in determining covid-19 vaccine refusal in ethnic minority groups.

Design Population based cohort study.

Setting Survey data from the University College London COVID-19 Social Study.

Participants Data from 633 adults belonging to ethnic minority groups who took part in the study from 23 July 2020 to 14 June 2021 were included. Experiences of racial/ethnic discrimination occurring since the start of the first lockdown were collected in the last week of July 2020. Structural equation modelling was used to model the direct effect of racial/ethnic discrimination on covid-19 vaccine refusal, as well as the indirect effects through low trust in the central UK government and the UK health service to handle the pandemic. The model adjusted for a range of demographic and covid-19-related covariates.

Main outcome measures Data on covid-19 vaccination status was collected from 23 December 2020 to 14 June 2021 and operationalised as having had or agreed to have at least one dose versus having been offered but turned it down (refusal).

Results Nearly one in ten (6.7%) who had refused a covid-19 vaccine reported having experienced racial/ethnic discrimination in a medical setting since the start of the pandemic and had experienced twice as many incidents of racial/ethnic discrimination than those who had accepted the vaccine. The total effect of racial/ethnic discrimination on refusing a covid-19 vaccine was nearly 4-fold (odds ratio [OR] = 3.9, 95% confidence interval [CI] = 1.4 to 10.9) and was mediated by low trust in the health system to handle the pandemic (indirect effect: OR = 2.5, 95% CI = 1.1 to 5.4).

Conclusions Findings underscore the importance of addressing racial/ethnic discrimination in order to increase covid-19 vaccine uptake amongst ethnic minority adults. The results also highlight the crucial role the National Health Service must play in regaining trust from ethnic minority groups in order to overcome vaccine hesitancy.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

What is already known on this topic

Covid-19 vaccine refusal is higher in ethnic minority groups than in white British adults in the UK. Prior research suggests experiences of racial/ethnic discrimination and mistrust of government and the health system are barriers to uptake. However, longitudinal research examining whether the influence of racial/ethnic discrimination on covid-19 vaccine refusal is mediated by government and health system trust is lacking.

What this study adds

Experiences of racial/ethnic discrimination increased the likelihood of subsequent covid-19 vaccine refusal nearly 4-fold. This effect was mediated by low trust in the healthcare system, but not the government, to handle the pandemic.

Findings support addressing issues of mistrust in the healthcare system and discrimination in order to increase vaccine uptake in ethnic minority adults in the UK.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Despite the relative overall success of the UK's vaccination programme, the differential uptake of covid-19 vaccines is a cause for concern. As of 15 May 2021, data from the Office of National Statistics (ONS) showed that uptake in eligible adults was lower in some ethnic minority groups compared to White British (92.6%), particularly in people self-identifying as Black African and Black Caribbean (67.8% and 63.6%, respectively), Bangladeshi (78.6%), and Pakistani (70.3%).[1] Covid-19 vaccine hesitancy (a delay in acceptance or refusal of safe vaccines despite availability of vaccine services)[2] was also much higher in ethnic minority groups (9%) compared to White British adults (4%).[3] This is concerning as ethnic minorities have been disproportionately and severely impacted by covid-19 with higher rates of infection, hospitalisation and death rates compared to White ethnicities.[4] Further, a refusal rate of more than 10% could also undermine control of the current pandemic and achieving population immunity.[5]

Racial discrimination is likely to be a key upstream cause influencing vaccine uptake in ethnic minority groups.[6] Racial discrimination, in its various forms including systemic racism, is also a fundamental cause and driver of ethnic differences in socio-economic status, poorer health outcomes and longstanding ethnic inequities in health.[7] For example, in the UK and US, ethnic minorities have inferior access to healthcare, poorer experience of care and treatment related to experiences of marginalisation, and experience ethnic residential segregation.[7–9] Specifically in relation to vaccination, a cross-sectional study in the US conducted in December 2020 found lifetime experiences of racial discrimination - but not discrimination due to religion, gender, or sexual orientation - was associated with 21% increased odds of covid-19 vaccine hesitancy.[10]

Mistrust is also a particularly important factor to consider. Longitudinal and cross-sectional studies have highlighted that the main reasons for covid-19 hesitancy among ethnic minorities centre around trust, with Black ethnicities substantially more likely to state that they "don't trust vaccines" compared with White people (29.2% vs 5.7%).[11] This lack of trust can be self-perpetuating as it can lead to lower participation in research amongst ethnic minority groups, in particular covid-19 research, which may in turn lead to a paucity of data on covid-19 vaccines amongst ethnic minority groups and exacerbate low confidence in the vaccines amongst ethnic minorities.[12] When considering the types of trust that influence vaccine uptake, one study found that the two most common reasons given were concerns about vaccine side effects and future unknown effects on health.[13] It has also been proposed that mistrust of government and the health system are barriers to vaccination. Indeed, studies have suggested that once trust in government and the health system are accounted for, ethnic minority group status no longer associates with covid-19 vaccine unwillingness.[14,15]

To try and address differential uptake of the vaccine amongst ethnic groups, in the first 6 months of the vaccine programme in the UK, covid-19 vaccination public health messaging aimed at ethnic minorities emphasised the importance of vaccines.[16] Additionally, places of worship were used as 'pop up' vaccination sites and high-profile ethnic minority celebrities issued an open letter to raise confidence in covid-19 vaccines.[17,18] However, these efforts have been insufficient to prevent inequalities in vaccine uptake. Therefore, more work is

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

urgently needed to mitigate the unequal and severe effects of the pandemic on ethnic minority populations. This is especially important in the context of new and emerging SARSCov2 variants that are more transmissible. Given the important role already proposed both for racial discrimination and mistrust in affecting vaccine uptake, the objective of this study is therefore to examine the longitudinal associations between experiences of racial/ethnic discrimination and covid-19 vaccine refusal and explore whether low trust in government and the health system help explain this association. This work could help to guide future interventions to support vaccine uptake amongst ethnic minority groups.

Methods

Participants

We used data from the COVID-19 Social Study; a large ongoing panel study of the psychological and social experiences of over 70,000 adults (aged 18+) in the UK during the covid-19 pandemic. The study commenced on 21 March 2020 and involves online weekly (to August 2020) then monthly (four-weekly) data collection for the duration of the pandemic. Sampling is not random and therefore is not representative of the UK population, but the study does contain a heterogeneous sample. The sample was recruited using three primary approaches. First, convenience sampling was used, including promoting the study through existing networks and mailing lists (such as large databases of adults who had previously consented to be involved in health research across the UK), print, and digital media coverage. Second, more targeted recruitment was undertaken focusing on (i) individuals from a low-income background, (ii) individuals with no or few educational qualifications, and (iii) individuals who were unemployed. Third, the study was promoted via partnerships with third sector organisations to vulnerable groups, including adults with pre-existing mental health conditions, older adults, carers, and people experiencing domestic violence or abuse.

Participants who took part in the study between 23 July 2020 to 14 June 2021 (n = 46,991) were eligible for inclusion. We excluded participants if they had missing data on any study variables. A total of 36,883 had non-missing vaccination status data collected from 23 December 2020 onwards. Of these, 22,212 also had non-missing data on the discrimination module, which was administered the week of 23 to 30 July 2020, and 21,636 also had non-missing data on all other study variables. Of these, 712 responded at the baseline interview that they belonged to an ethnic minority group (Asian/Asian British - Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, other; Black/Black British - Caribbean, Africa; Mixed race - White and Black/Black British; mixed race-other; Chinese/Chinese British; Middle Eastern/Middle Eastern British – Arab, Turkish, other; or other ethnic group]). As our focus was on covid-19 vaccine refusal versus acceptance, we eliminated the 79 ethnic minority group adults who met all other inclusion criteria but who had not yet been offered the vaccine, leaving a final sample of 633. See Table 1 for descriptive characteristics of the final sample by covid-19 vaccination status and Supplemental Table S1 for a comparison of excluded and included participants.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Outcome

Covid-19 vaccination status was measured starting on 23 December 2020 with two questions. First, a response ("I have already had one") was added to our previously published[14] study-developed item enquiring about covid-19 vaccine intentions ("How likely do you think you are to get a covid-19 vaccine when one is approved?"). Second, starting 8 January 2021, a second item was added: "Have you ever been offered a vaccine for covid-19?" Response options were i) yes, twice, ii) yes, once, iii) yes, but waiting, iv) yes, but turned it down, and v) no, haven't been offered. Our vaccination status outcome variable was constructed by classifying participants into one of two groups based on their most recent answers to these two questions: vaccinated (received at least one does or waiting) vs offered but declined.

Potential mediators

Two variables hypothesised to mediate the association between racial/ethnic discrimination and covid-19 vaccine refusal were considered: confidence in the central UK government and confidence in UK health service to handle the pandemic. The exact wording of the questions is presented in Supplemental Table S2. Response options for both ranged from 1 (none at all) to 7 (lots). Two binary variables were created to compare individuals who had a lot of (5-7) versus low (1-4) confidence in the government and health system.

Exposure

Data on experiences of racial/ethnic discrimination were collected in the last week of July 2020 with items adapted from the Everyday Discrimination Scale (EDS).[19] The EDS is designed to measure routine and relatively subtle experiences of unfair treatment in everyday situations. The scale is widely used and has shown expected associations with internalising and externalising symptoms.[20] In the current study, we used seven items in total: three items from the EDS (being threatened or harassed; treated as if you are dishonest; people acting as if they were afraid of you) and added four questions from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing.[21] Participants were prompted to answer based on experiences they had had since the (first) lockdown came into effect in March 2020. We made subtle changes to some of the phrasing to account of the unique social situation of covid-19. See Supplemental Table S2 for a full listing of item wording. Participants who said they had had each experience were asked to give one of four possible reasons (gender, race/ethnicity, age, or for another reason) for the discrimination. In the current study, the seven racial/ethnic discrimination experiences variables were summed to create a total racial/ethnic discrimination scale (0-7) with higher scores indicating more discrimination.

Covariates

Demographic variables were measured at baseline interview: gender (male, female), education level (university degree (bachelors or higher), A-levels/equivalent or vocational, up to GCSE/O levels), and age (18-29, 30-44, 45-59, 60+). Long-term physical health condition (yes, no) using a multiple-choice question on medical conditions, also at the baseline interview. Included conditions were high blood pressure, diabetes, heart disease, lung disease, cancer, any other clinically diagnosed chronic physical health conditions, or any disability.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Having been infected with covid-19 was categorised as a binary variable (yes, diagnosed and recovered, or yes, diagnosed and still ill, or not formally diagnosed but suspected, versus no, not that I know of or no). The presence or absence of worry about either contracting covid-19 or becoming seriously ill from it were captured from two multiple choice questions asked during each wave of the pandemic. A binary variable was created to indicate not having endorsed either as a source of stress. See Supplemental Table S2 for exact wording of study-developed items.

Statistical analysis

Structural equation modelling with logistic regression was used to simultaneously test the direct and indirect effects of racial/ethnic discrimination on covid-19 vaccine refusal through low confidence in the central UK government and in the UK health service to handle the pandemic. The reference group comprised individuals who had already received at least one dose of the vaccine or had accepted and were waiting for their first dose. The model controlled for all covariates. To account for the non-random nature of the sample and increase representativeness of the UK general population, data were weighted to the proportions of gender, age, ethnicity, country, and education obtained from the Office for National Statistics (ONS).[22] Weights were constructed using a multivariate reweighting method using the Stata user written command 'ebalance'. Analyses were conducted using Stata version 16.[23] Coefficients were exponentiated and presented as odds ratios with 95% confidence intervals.

Sensitivity analyses were conducted with the total number of age (range 0-7), gender (range 0-7), and other (range 0-7) discrimination experiences and discrimination in medical and service settings (due to gender, race/ethnicity, age, or another reason, range 0-5) as the predictor variables.

Participant and public involvement

The research questions in the UCL COVID-19 Social Study built on patient and public involvement as part of the UKRI MARCH Mental Health Research Network, which focuses on social, cultural and community engagement and mental health. This highlighted priority research questions and measures for this study. Patients and the public were additionally involved in the recruitment of participants to the study and are actively involved in plans for the dissemination of findings from the study.

Ethics statement

The authors assert that all procedures contributing to this work comply with the ethical standards of the relevant national and institutional committees on human experimentation and with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2008. The study was approved by the UCL Research Ethics Committee [12467/005] and all participants gave informed consent.

Transparency statement

The lead author affirms that this manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

any discrepancies from the study as planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been explained.

Data availability

The study protocol and user guide (which includes full details on recruitment, retention, data cleaning, and sample demographics) are available at https://github.com/UCL-BSH/CSSUserGuide.

Role of the funding source

This work was supported by the Nuffield Foundation [DF, WEL/FR-000022583], the MARCH Mental Health Network funded by the Cross-Disciplinary Mental Health Network Plus initiative supported by UK Research and Innovation [DF, ES/S002588/1], and the Wellcome Trust [DF, 221400/Z/20/Z and DF, 205407/Z/16/Z]. MSR is funded by the NIHR. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the funders.

Results

Descriptive characteristics of the total sample and by covid-19 vaccination status are presented in Table 1. The most common ethnic minority group in participants who had accepted the vaccine was Asian/Asian British (29.6%), but 13.9% of the vaccine refusal group was still comprised of this ethnic group. Those who had declined the vaccine were over twice as likely (63.0% vs 23.9%) as those who had accepted to have a low level of education (up to GCSE/O levels) and less likely to have a university degree (bachelors or higher) (37.1% vs 51.4%). Participants in the vaccine refusal group were also more likely to be older adults (48.1% vs 35.2%), had not been infected with covid-19 (100% vs 98.2%) and had not stated that contracting or becoming seriously unwell with covid-19 was a source of stress (76.2% vs 67.0%). They were also more likely to express low confidence in the central UK government (78.9% vs 63.6%) and in the UK health service (63.8% vs 23.9%) to handle the pandemic.

Those who had refused the vaccine reported having experienced twice as much racial/ethnic discrimination since the start of the pandemic (M = 0.7, SD = 1.4) as those who had accepted the vaccine (M = 0.4, SD = 1.0). Nearly one in four (23.7%) in the vaccine refusal group said they had been treated with less courtesy or respect than other people because of their race/ethnicity, whilst 10.5% who had accepted the vaccine said they had. The vaccine refusal group was also twice as likely than the acceptance group to say they had been treated as if others were afraid of them (17.0% vs 7.8%) and as if others thought they were dishonest (11.7% vs 5.6%). The proportion having experienced racial/ethnic discrimination in a medical setting was nearly seven times higher in the vaccine refusal than in the vaccine acceptance group (6.7% vs 0.98%).

Results from the structural equation model adjusting for covariates indicated a direct effect of racial/ethnic discrimination on low confidence in the health system to handle the pandemic (OR = 1.6, 95% CI = 1.0 to 2.0) (Table 2). Low confidence in the health system to handle the pandemic in turn predicted vaccine refusal (OR = 7.5, 95% CI = 2.1 to 27.4). There was a significant indirect effect of racial/ethnic discrimination on COVID-19 vaccine refusal via

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

low trust in the health system (OR = 2.5, 95% CI = 1.1 to 5.4), but not low trust in government to handle the pandemic (OR = 1.0, 95% CI = 0.6 to 1.7) (Table 3). The total effect (direct and indirect via the two mediators) of racial/ethnic discrimination on COVID-19 vaccine refusal was 3.9 (95% CI = 1.4 to 10.9). The only covariate associated with vaccine refusal was low education attainment (up to GCSE/O levels: OR = 4.3, 95% CI = 1.3 to 14.4).

Sensitivity analyses indicated indirect effects of age (Tables S3 and S4) and gender discrimination (Tables S5 and S6) on COVID-19 vaccine refusal through low trust in the health system. Neither discrimination taking place in medical nor service settings (due to gender, race, age, or other) had direct or indirect effects on vaccine refusal.

Discussion

This is the first study in the UK, to our knowledge, that finds longitudinal associations between racial/ethnic discrimination and covid-19 vaccine refusal. The total effect of racial/ethnic discrimination on vaccine refusal is nearly four-fold. This echoes previous research showing associations between lifetime experiences of racial discrimination and covid-19 vaccine hesitancy.[10] Previous studies have suggested that the primary reasons for covid-19 vaccine hesitancy in ethnic minority groups are concerns about vaccine side effects and unknown future effects on health[11,13], and identified general mistrust of covid-19 (e.g., dishonesty or withholding of information by the government).[24] However, our study expands on these previous findings by showing that low trust in the health system mediates the relationship between racial/ethnic discrimination and vaccine refusal. This echoes some pre-pandemic research, which found associations between experiences of racial discrimination and distrust of the health care system[25,26] and physicians[27] among ethnic minority adults and highlights a key role for the UK National Health Service in rebuilding trust with ethnic minority groups.

In this study, 6.7% of participants who had refused the vaccine reported they had experienced poorer service or treatment than other people in a medical setting because of their race or ethnicity. This type of discrimination was the least common form reported in participants who had accepted the covid-19 vaccine, in whom only around 1% reported this. Research conducted before and during the pandemic also suggests that lifetime experiences of racial/ethnic discrimination in health care settings is commonplace. In June 2019, nearly 1 in 3 (30%) of non-Hispanic Black and over 1 in 10 (11%) Hispanic adults had ever been treated differently by a health care provider because of their race or ethnicity.[28] Mistreatment by a doctor or nurse due to race was also reported by nearly one in ten (9%) of respondents in a US study conducted at the end of December 2020.[10] Small studies of ethnic minority adults suggest that not feeling listened to by medical professionals may be a particularly common experience of discrimination in medical settings.[26,29,30] Future studies should seek to identify specific situations and settings in which this type of discrimination is most likely to take place in the context of the covid-19 pandemic.

We examined the total number of racial/ethnic discrimination experiences in relation to vaccine refusal and it was low trust in the health system, and not the central UK government, to handle the pandemic that mediated the association between discrimination and vaccine

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

refusal. Other research in mostly White participants has also found associations between low trust in the health system, not the central government, to handle the pandemic with covid-19 vaccine hesitancy and negative attitudes towards vaccines generally.[14] Mistrust of health authorities is also related to coronavirus conspiracy beliefs, which in turn associate with lower compliance behaviours and greater covid-19 vaccine hesitancy.[31] Therefore, building trust in the healthcare system will be key for effective management of future pandemics as well as public health campaigns. Focusing exclusively on vaccine misinformation may also disregard concerns about mistrust that is largely due to past experiences of racial and ethnic discrimination.

Strengths of this study include a longitudinal design and a large sample size that includes a diverse group of UK ethnic minority adults from different age, gender, socioeconomic status, and geographical locations. Although data were weighted to increase representativeness of the general UK population, sampling was not random, and caution should therefore be used in generalising results. Notably, the proportion of ethnic minority adults in our study who had refused the covid-19 vaccine was less than half that reported by the ONS (4.1% vs 9%).[32] Due to the small number of participants within specific ethnic minority groups in our sample, we examined ethnic minority groups as a whole in our analyses, which may not account for the variation in the current and historical experiences of discrimination across these diverse groups. Further, due limitations in question phrasing (i.e., 'White- British, Irish, other'), we were unable to examine associations between study variables and vaccine refusal in White subgroups, some of whom have also had lower COVID-19 vaccine uptake.[1] The most common ethnic group in those who had refused the vaccine was the 'other ethnic group'. Similarly, nearly one in ten (7.4%) in the total sample said they had experienced some 'other' form of discrimination related to their race or ethnicity. We also did not collect data on the frequency or severity of each type of racial/ethnic discrimination experience. Future research should therefore provide participants with opportunities to write in their identified ethnic group and specify other types of racial discrimination experienced. Additionally, future studies should collect information on how often experiences of racial/ethnic discrimination occur.

The adverse effects of racial/ethnic discrimination on health and health outcomes in marginalised ethnic groups are well-established in the literature.[7] Structural racism in particular ethnic residential segregation, which is increasing in the UK and Europe,[33,34] create conditions that amplify mistrust in government and the health system.[7,33] Our study builds upon recent reports that racial discrimination increases covid-19 vaccine hesitancy[10] by demonstrating that a nearly four-fold effect of racial discrimination on vaccine refusal is mediated by low trust in the health system. These findings indicate that it is vital that the National Health Service works to gain the confidence and trust of ethnic minority groups over coming months and that public health campaigns to increase covid-19 uptake in ethnic minorities should include not only trust-building in vaccines, but also strategies to prevent and help ethnic minorities recover from racial/ethnic discrimination they have experienced.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1. Descriptive characteristics of the sample by COVID-19 vaccination status (N = 633), weighted

Variable	Total sample	At least one dose or accepted/ waiting	Declined
		%	
Total sample	-	95.92	4.08
Ethnicity			
Asian/Asian British - Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, other	28.98	29.62	13.85
Black/Black British - Caribbean, Africa	15.17	15.03	18.36
Mixed race - White and Black/Black British	9.42	9.76	1.40
Mixed race - other	25.75	25.83	23.88
Chinese/Chinese British	3.47	3.56	1.40
Middle Eastern/Middle Eastern British – Arab, Turkish, other	3.05	3.11	1.77
Other ethnic group	14.15	13.08	39.34
Gender			
Male	47.11	47.43	39.53
Female	52.89	52.57	60.47
Education			
University degree or higher	50.82	51.40	37.05
A-levels/equivalent or vocational	23.70	24.70	0.00
Up to GCSE/O levels	25.49	23.89	62.95
Age			
60+	35.76	35.24	48.10
45-59	31.26	31.47	26.36
30-44	23.87	24.22	15.68
18-29	9.11	9.08	9.87
Long-term physical health condition			
Have	52.85	52.54	60.26
Do not have	47.15	47.46	39.74
COVID-19 illness			
Have not been infected w/COVID-19	98.29	98.21	100.00
Have been infected w/COVID-19	1.71	1.79	0.00
Catching or becoming seriously ill from COVID-19 a source of stress			
Yes	32.58	32.96	23.76
No	67.42	67.04	76.24
Confidence in the central UK government to handle the pandemic			
High	35.79	36.42	21.14
Low	64.21	63.58	78.86
Confidence in the UK health service to handle the pandemic			
High	75.52	76.15	36.19
Low	25.48	23.85	63.81

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1 (continued). Descriptive characteristics of the sample by COVID-19 vaccination status (N = 633), weighted

	Total sample	At least one dose or accepted/ waiting	Declined
Variable		%	
Racial/ethnic discrimination experiences			
You have been treated with less courtesy or respect than other people	11.02	10.48	23.67
You have received poorer service than other people (e.g., for deliveries or in stores).	3.43	3.45	3.18
People have acted as if they were afraid of you	8.16	7.78	16.95
People have acted as if they think you are dishonest	5.87	5.62	11.65
You have been threatened or harassed	2.94	2.91	3.55
You have received poorer service or treatment than other people from doctors or hospitals	1.22	0.98	6.69
You have experienced some other kind of discrimination	7.38	7.41	6.74
Racial/ethnic discrimination total, M (SD)	0.40 (1.05)	0.39 (1.03)	0.72 (1.41)

Table 2. Direct effects of racial/ethnic discrimination, confidence in government and the health system to handle the pandemic, and COVID-19 vaccine refusal from the structural equation model (N = 633)

	Low confidence in the central UK government			Low confidence in the UK health system			COVID-19 vaccine refusal		
	OR	95% CI	95% CI	OR	95% CI	95% CI	OR	95% CI	95% CI
Low confidence in the central UK government to handle the pandemic (ref high)	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.94	0.16	5.45
Low confidence in the UK health service to handle the pandemic (ref high)	-	-	-	-	-	-	**7.51**	**2.05**	**27.43**
Racial/ethnic discrimination	1.35	0.94	1.93	**1.56**	**1.20**	**2.04**	1.62	0.96	2.73
Have been infected w/COVID-19 (ref have not been infected)	0.70	0.22	2.24	0.68	0.19	2.47	0.00	0.00	0.00
Catching or becoming seriously ill from COVID-19 *not* a source of stress (ref yes)	0.60	0.33	1.09	**0.53**	**0.29**	**0.98**	2.43	0.48	12.27
Female (ref male)	1.04	0.62	1.76	0.74	0.42	1.31	1.70	0.46	6.25
Age (ref 60+)									
45-59	1.31	0.72	2.37	1.30	0.59	2.89	0.57	0.12	2.78
30-44	**2.65**	**1.33**	**5.29**	1.57	0.71	3.49	0.54	0.08	3.51
18-29	2.41	0.80	7.23	2.76	0.98	7.72	0.78	0.04	15.72
Education (ref university degree or higher)									
A-levels/equivalent or vocational	0.66	0.33	1.29	0.72	0.33	1.58	0.00	0.00	0.00
Up to GCSE/O levels	**0.44**	**0.23**	**0.83**	1.53	0.72	3.25	**4.32**	**1.30**	**14.37**
Do not have a long-term physical health condition (ref have)	0.94	0.56	1.57	0.60	0.32	1.13	1.18	0.40	3.51
Model fit									
Akaike's information criteria (AIC)				2701.58					
Schwarz's Bayesian information criteria (BIC)				2857.35					
Log pseudolikelihood				-1315.79					

Note. Bold indicates $p < 0.05$.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Table 3. Indirect effects of racial/ethnic discrimination, confidence in government and the health system to handle the pandemic, and COVID-19 vaccine refusal from the structural equation model (N = 633)

	OR	95% CI	95% CI
Indirect effect of racial/ethnic discrimination on COVID-19 vaccine refusal through low confidence in the central UK government to handle the pandemic	0.98	0.58	1.67
Indirect effect of racial/ethnic discrimination on COVID-19 vaccine refusal through low confidence in the UK health service to handle the pandemic	**2.46**	**1.12**	**5.39**
Total effect of racial/ethnic discrimination on COVID-19 vaccine refusal (direct effect of racial/ethnic discrimination plus indirect effects of low confidence in government and the health system)	**3.91**	**1.40**	**10.92**

Note. Bold indicates $p < 0.05$.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Supplemental Materials

Table S1. Characteristics of included and excluded participants, unweighted

Variable	Excluded	Included
	%	
Ethnicity		
Asian/Asian British - Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, other	30.36	27.49
Black/Black British - Caribbean, Africa	11.69	13.43
Mixed race - White and Black/Black British	10.60	8.21
Mixed race - other	25.18	27.96
Chinese/Chinese British	7.71	6.32
Middle Eastern/Middle Eastern British – Arab, Turkish, other	3.37	2.53
Other ethnic group	11.08	14.06
Gender		
Male	20.48	23.70
Female	79.52	76.30
Education		
University degree or higher	78.43	80.73
A-levels/equivalent or vocational	13.73	10.74
Up to GCSE/ O levels	7.83	8.53
Age		
60+	12.65	28.12
45-59	31.93	37.76
30-44	38.55	28.59
18-29	16.87	5.53
Long-term physical health condition		
Have	35.18	46.29
Do not have	64.82	53.71
COVID-19 illness		
Have not been infected w/COVID-19	96.02	97.47
Have been infected w/COVID-19	3.98	2.53
Catching or becoming seriously ill from COVID-19 a source of stress		
Yes	28.43	33.02
No	71.57	66.98
Confidence in the central UK government to handle the pandemic		
High	35.78	30.81
Low	64.22	69.19
Confidence in the UK health service to handle the pandemic		
High	72.77	76.30
Low	27.23	23.70

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table S1 (continued). Characteristics of included and excluded participants, unweighted

	Excluded	Included
Variable	%	
Racial/ethnic discrimination experiences		
You have been treated with less courtesy or respect than other people	12.50	11.22
You have received poorer service than other people (e.g., for deliveries or in stores).	5.21	3.79
People have acted as if they were afraid of you	7.29	7.11
People have acted as if they think you are dishonest	2.08	3.48
You have been threatened or harassed	5.21	2.21
You have received poorer service or treatment than other people from doctors or hospitals	0.00	1.11
You have experienced some other kind of discrimination	7.29	6.48
Racial/ethnic discrimination total, M (SD)	0.40 (0.89)	0.35 (0.92)

Table S2. Wording of study-developed and modified items

Variable	Question wording	Response options	Dates of collection
Confidence in government to handle pandemic	To what extent do you have confidence in the central UK Government that they can handle COVID-19 well? [Please answer this question about the government in Westminster, even if you live in a devolved nation]	1. None at all 7. Lots	21 March 2020-
Confidence in health system to handle pandemic	How much confidence do you have that the UK health service can cope during Covid-19? If you live in a devolved nation, we ask you to focus on the health service within your country (e.g., NHS Health Scotland / NHS Wales / HSCNI)?	1. None at all 7. Lots	21 March 2020-
Racial discrimination	Since lockdown came in, have any of the following things happened to you? 1. You have been treated with less courtesy or respect than other people. 2. You have received poorer service than other people (e.g., for deliveries or in stores). 3. People have acted as if they were afraid of you 4. People have acted as if they think you are dishonest 5. You have been threatened or harassed 6. You have received poorer service or treatment than other people from doctors or hospitals 7. You have experienced some other kind of discrimination	1. No 2. Yes, because of my gender 3. Yes, because of my race/ethnicity 4. Yes, because of my age 5. Yes, for another reason	23 to 30 July 2020

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table S2 (continued). Wording of study-developed and modified items

Variable	Question wording	Response options	Dates of collection
	Over the past week, have any of the following been worrying you at all, even if only in a minor way?		
Not stressed about catching or becoming seriously ill from COVID-19	Have any of these things been causing you SIGNIFICANT stress? (e.g., they have been constantly on your mind or have been keeping you awake at night)	Catching COVID-19 Becoming seriously ill from COVID-19	21 March 2020-
	Have you ever been offered a vaccine for COVID-19?	1. Yes, I have been vaccinated twice 2. Yes, I have been vaccinated once 3. Yes, but I am waiting to be vaccinated 4. Yes, but I have turned it down 5. No, I have not yet been offered a vaccine for COVID-19	8 January 2021-
COVID-19 vaccination status	How likely to do you think you are to get a COVID-19 vaccine when one is approved?	1. Very unlikely 6. Very likely 7. I have already had one	23 December 2020 - 25 February 2021

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table S3. Sensitivity analysis: Direct effects of age discrimination, confidence in government and the health system to handle the pandemic, and COVID-19 vaccine refusal from the structural equation model (N = 633)

	Low confidence in the central UK government			Low confidence in the UK health system			COVID-19 vaccine refusal		
	OR	95% CI	95% CI	OR	95% CI	95% CI	OR	95% CI	95% CI
Low confidence in the central UK government to handle the pandemic (ref high)	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.10	0.19	6.49
Low confidence in the UK health service to handle the pandemic (ref high)	-	-	-	-	-	-	**7.68**	**2.13**	**27.74**
Age discrimination	1.49	0.72	3.10	**2.07**	**1.28**	**3.33**	0.81	0.30	2.21
Have been infected w/COVID-19 (ref have not been infected)	0.68	0.22	2.15	0.68	0.18	2.53	0.00	0.00	0.00
Catching or becoming seriously ill from COVID-19 *not* a source of stress (ref yes)	0.61	0.34	1.12	0.55	0.30	1.02	2.61	0.53	12.96
Female (ref male)	1.03	0.61	1.74	0.72	0.40	1.29	2.12	0.54	8.36
Age (ref 60+)									
45-59	1.32	0.73	2.39	1.33	0.61	2.89	0.54	0.11	2.74
30-44	**2.92**	**1.44**	**5.91**	1.85	0.82	4.16	0.46	0.07	2.92
18-29	2.65	0.89	7.92	**3.08**	**1.02**	**9.30**	1.06	0.06	17.76
Education (ref university degree or higher)									
A-levels/equivalent or vocational	0.68	0.35	1.32	0.79	0.32	1.98	0.00	0.00	0.00
Up to GCSE/ O levels	**0.43**	**0.23**	**0.83**	1.47	0.70	3.09	**3.96**	**1.21**	**12.92**
Do not have a long-term physical health condition (ref have)	0.93	0.56	1.56	0.59	0.31	1.13	1.20	0.41	3.53
Model fit									
Akaike's information criteria (AIC)				2726.40					
Schwarz's Bayesian information criteria (BIC)				2882.16					
Log pseudolikelihood				-1328.20					

Note. Bold indicates $p < 0.05$.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Table S4. Sensitivity analysis: Indirect effects of age discrimination, confidence in government and the health system to handle the pandemic, and COVID-19 vaccine refusal from the structural equation model (N = 633)

	OR	95% CI	95% CI
Indirect effect of age discrimination on COVID-19 vaccine refusal through low confidence in the central UK government to handle the pandemic	1.04	0.51	2.11
Indirect effect of age discrimination on COVID-19 vaccine refusal through low confidence in the UK health service to handle the pandemic	**4.41**	**1.16**	**16.74**
Total effect of age discrimination on COVID-19 vaccine refusal (direct effect of age discrimination plus indirect effects of low confidence in government and the health system)	3.73	0.71	19.65

Note. Bold indicates $p < 0.05$.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table S5. Sensitivity analysis: Direct effects of gender discrimination, confidence in government and the health system to handle the pandemic, and COVID-19 vaccine refusal from the structural equation model (N = 633)

	Low confidence in the central UK government			Low confidence in the UK health system			COVID-19 vaccine refusal		
	OR	95% CI	95% CI	OR	95% CI	95% CI	OR	95% CI	95% CI
Low confidence in the central UK government to handle the pandemic (ref high)	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.07	0.18	6.42
Low confidence in the UK health service to handle the pandemic (ref high)	-	-	-	-	-	-	**6.89**	**1.96**	**24.16**
Gender discrimination	1.85	0.83	4.15	**2.84**	**1.43**	**5.65**	1.61	0.90	2.89
Have been infected w/COVID-19 (ref have not been infected)	0.69	0.22	2.20	0.73	0.18	2.97	0.00	0.00	0.00
Catching or becoming seriously ill from COVID-19 *not* a source of stress (ref yes)	0.60	0.33	1.10	**0.52**	**0.28**	**0.96**	2.54	0.53	12.20
Female (ref male)	1.02	0.61	1.72	0.66	0.37	1.17	1.86	0.45	7.69
Age (ref 60+)									
45-59	1.31	0.72	2.39	1.31	0.59	2.91	0.58	0.12	2.85
30-44	**2.80**	**1.39**	**5.62**	1.68	0.77	3.68	0.49	0.08	3.04
18-29	**3.28**	**1.05**	**10.25**	**4.75**	**1.58**	**14.31**	1.02	0.06	17.29
Education (ref university degree or higher)									
A-levels/equivalent or vocational	0.66	0.34	1.30	0.75	0.35	1.63	0.00	0.00	0.00
Up to GCSE/ O levels	**0.44**	**0.23**	**0.85**	1.59	0.76	3.32	**4.03**	**1.30**	**12.48**
Do not have a long-term physical health condition (ref have)	0.90	0.54	1.52	0.54	0.28	1.03	1.18	0.40	3.49
Model fit									
Akaike's information criteria (AIC)				2715.932					
Schwarz's Bayesian information criteria (BIC)				2871.699					
Log pseudolikelihood				-1322.97					

Note. Bold indicates $p < 0.05$.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Table S6. Sensitivity analysis: Indirect effects of gender discrimination, confidence in government and the health system to handle the pandemic, and COVID-19 vaccine refusal from the structural equation model (N = 633)

	OR	95% CI	95% CI
Indirect effect of gender discrimination on COVID-19 vaccine refusal through low confidence in the central UK government to handle the pandemic	1.04	0.35	2.15
Indirect effect of gender discrimination on COVID-19 vaccine refusal through low confidence in the UK health service to handle the pandemic	**7.49**	**1.11**	**50.50**
Total effect of gender discrimination on COVID-19 vaccine refusal (direct effect of gender discrimination plus indirect effects of low confidence in government and the health system)	**12.57**	**1.37**	**115.58**

Note. Bold indicates $p < 0.05$.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table S7. Sensitivity analysis: Direct effects of other discrimination, confidence in government and the health system to handle the pandemic, and COVID-19 vaccine refusal from the structural equation model (N = 633)

	Low confidence in the central UK government			Low confidence in the UK health system			COVID-19 vaccine refusal		
	OR	95% CI	95% CI	OR	95% CI	95% CI	OR	95% CI	95% CI
Low confidence in the central UK government to handle the pandemic (ref high)	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.08	0.18	6.69
Low confidence in the UK health service to handle the pandemic (ref high)	-	-	-	-	-	-	**6.76**	**1.89**	**24.18**
Other discrimination	1.27	0.98	1.64	1.18	0.87	1.60	**1.59**	**1.11**	**2.26**
Have been infected w/COVID-19 (ref have not been infected)	0.87	0.25	3.08	0.73	0.23	2.28	0.00	0.00	0.00
Catching or becoming seriously ill from COVID-19 *not* a source of stress (ref yes)	0.54	0.30	0.99	0.61	0.33	1.11	2.67	0.59	12.03
Female (ref male)	0.72	0.40	1.29	1.05	0.62	1.78	2.02	0.51	8.05
Age (ref 60+)									
45-59	1.26	0.58	2.75	1.29	0.71	2.34	0.57	0.12	2.71
30-44	1.75	0.76	4.02	**2.81**	**1.38**	**5.74**	0.39	0.08	1.79
18-29	**4.67**	**1.69**	**12.91**	**3.26**	**1.06**	**10.05**	1.06	0.06	18.41
Education (ref university degree or higher)									
A-levels/equivalent or vocational	0.83	0.35	1.97	0.68	0.35	1.33	0.00	0.00	0.00
Up to GCSE/ O levels	1.53	0.73	3.19	**0.44**	**0.23**	**0.84**	**4.41**	**1.34**	**14.48**
Do not have a long-term physical health condition (ref have)	0.61	0.32	1.16	0.95	0.56	1.60	1.39	0.47	4.12
Model fit									
Akaike's information criteria (AIC)				2737.81					
Schwarz's Bayesian information criteria (BIC)				2893.57					
Log pseudolikelihood				-1333.90					

Note. Bold indicates $p < 0.05$.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Table S8. Sensitivity analysis: Indirect effects of other discrimination, confidence in government and the health system to handle the pandemic, and COVID-19 vaccine refusal from the structural equation model (N = 633)

	OR	95% CI	95% CI
Indirect effect of other discrimination on COVID-19 vaccine refusal through low confidence in the central UK government to handle the pandemic	1.01	0.75	1.36
Indirect effect of other discrimination on COVID-19 vaccine refusal through low confidence in the UK health service to handle the pandemic	1.58	0.86	2.90
Total effect of other discrimination on COVID-19 vaccine refusal (direct effect of other discrimination plus indirect effects of low confidence in government and the health system)	**2.54**	**1.09**	**5.89**

Note. Bold indicates $p < 0.05$.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table S9. Sensitivity analysis: Direct effects of discrimination in medical settings, confidence in government and the health system to handle the pandemic, and COVID-19 vaccine refusal from the structural equation model (N = 633)

	Low confidence in the central UK government			Low confidence in the UK health system			COVID-19 vaccine refusal		
	OR	95% CI	95% CI	OR	95% CI	95% CI	OR	95% CI	95% CI
Low confidence in the central UK government to handle the pandemic (ref high)	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.11	0.19	6.57
Low confidence in the UK health service to handle the pandemic (ref high)	-	-	-	-	-	-	**8.06**	**2.22**	**29.22**
Discrimination in medical settings	0.55	0.21	1.44	0.91	0.33	2.45	3.05	0.90	10.27
Have been infected w/COVID-19 (ref have not been infected)	0.69	0.22	2.18	0.81	0.22	2.94	0.00	0.00	0.00
Catching or becoming seriously ill from COVID-19 *not* a source of stress (ref yes)	0.61	0.34	1.11	**0.54**	**0.30**	**0.99**	2.66	0.50	14.08
Female (ref male)	1.04	0.62	1.75	0.72	0.40	1.29	1.96	0.49	7.82
Age (ref 60+)									
45-59	1.33	0.74	2.40	1.29	0.59	2.83	0.49	0.10	2.39
30-44	**3.08**	**1.58**	**5.99**	1.91	0.85	4.32	0.44	0.07	2.84
18-29	**3.79**	**1.14**	**12.58**	**5.12**	**1.77**	**14.84**	1.01	0.06	16.18
Education (ref university degree or higher)									
A-levels/equivalent or vocational	0.72	0.38	1.37	0.87	0.37	2.05	0.00	0.00	0.00
Up to GCSE/ O levels	**0.45**	**0.24**	**0.85**	1.52	0.72	3.22	**4.03**	**1.22**	**13.29**
Do not have a long-term physical health condition (ref have)	0.89	0.53	1.49	0.56	0.29	1.07	1.28	0.45	3.62
Model fit									
Akaike's information criteria (AIC)				2748.78					
Schwarz's Bayesian information criteria (BIC)				2904.55					
Log pseudolikelihood				-1339.39					

Note. Bold indicates $p < 0.05$.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Table S10. Sensitivity analysis: Indirect effects of discrimination in medical settings, confidence in government and the health system to handle the pandemic, and COVID-19 vaccine refusal from the structural equation model (N = 633)

	OR	95% CI	95% CI
Indirect effect of discrimination in medical settings on COVID-19 vaccine refusal through low confidence in the central UK government to handle the pandemic	0.94	0.32	2.77
Indirect effect of discrimination in medical settings on COVID-19 vaccine refusal through low confidence in the UK health service to handle the pandemic	0.81	0.10	6.54
Total effect of discrimination in medical settings on COVID-19 vaccine refusal (direct effect of discrimination in medical settings plus indirect effects of low confidence in government and the health system)	2.33	0.15	35.27

Note. Bold indicates $p < 0.05$.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table S11. Sensitivity analysis: Direct effects of discrimination in service settings, confidence in government and the health system to handle the pandemic, and COVID-19 vaccine refusal from the structural equation model (N = 633)

	Low confidence in the central UK government			Low confidence in the UK health system			COVID-19 vaccine refusal		
	OR	95% CI	95% CI	OR	95% CI	95% CI	OR	95% CI	95% CI
Low confidence in the central UK government to handle the pandemic (ref high)	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.11	0.19	6.57
Low confidence in the UK health service to handle the pandemic (ref high)	-	-	-	-	-	-	**8.06**	**2.22**	**29.22**
Discrimination in service settings	0.91	0.33	2.45	0.55	0.21	1.44	3.05	0.90	10.27
Have been infected w/COVID-19 (ref have not been infected)	0.81	0.22	2.94	0.69	0.22	2.18	0.00	0.00	0.00
Catching or becoming seriously ill from COVID-19 *not* a source of stress (ref yes)	**0.54**	**0.30**	**0.99**	0.61	0.34	1.11	2.66	0.50	14.08
Female (ref male)	0.72	0.40	1.29	1.04	0.62	1.75	1.96	0.49	7.82
Age (ref 60+)									
45-59	1.29	0.59	2.83	1.33	0.74	2.40	0.49	0.10	2.39
30-44	1.91	0.85	4.32	**3.08**	**1.58**	**5.99**	0.44	0.07	2.84
18-29	**5.12**	**1.77**	**14.84**	**3.79**	**1.14**	**12.58**	1.01	0.06	16.18
Education (ref university degree or higher)									
A-levels/equivalent or vocational	0.87	0.37	2.05	0.72	0.38	1.37	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**
Up to GCSE/ O levels	1.52	0.72	3.22	**0.45**	**0.24**	**0.85**	**4.03**	**1.22**	**13.29**
Do not have a long-term physical health condition (ref have)	0.56	0.29	1.07	0.89	0.53	1.49	1.28	0.45	3.62
Model fit									
Akaike's information criteria (AIC)				2704.42					
Schwarz's Bayesian information criteria (BIC)				2860.19					
Log pseudolikelihood				-1317.21					

Note. Bold indicates $p < 0.05$.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Table S12. Sensitivity analysis: Indirect effects of discrimination in service settings, confidence in government and the health system to handle the pandemic, and COVID-19 vaccine refusal from the structural equation model (N = 633)

	OR	95% CI	95% CI
Indirect effect of discrimination in service settings on COVID-19 vaccine refusal through low confidence in the central UK government to handle the pandemic	0.97	0.44	2.13
Indirect effect of discrimination in service settings on COVID-19 vaccine refusal through low confidence in the UK health service to handle the pandemic	5.09	0.68	38.32
Total effect of discrimination in service settings on COVID-19 vaccine refusal (direct effect of discrimination in service settings plus indirect effects of low confidence in government and the health system)	**35.69**	**2.93**	**434.85**

Note. Bold indicates $p < 0.05$.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

1. Office for National Statistics. COVID-19 vaccination rates and odds ratios by socio-demographic group [Internet]. 2021. Available from: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthinequalities/datasets/covid19vaccinationratesandoddsratiosbysociodemographicgroup

2. MacDonald NE, SAGE Working Group on Vaccine Hesitancy. Vaccine hesitancy: Definition, scope and determinants. Vaccine. 2015 Aug 14;33(34):4161–4.

3. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and vaccine hesitancy, Great Britain- 9 August 2021 [Internet]. 2021. Available from: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandvaccinehesitancygreatbritain/9august2021

4. Office for National Statistics. Updating ethnic contrasts in deaths involving the coronavirus (COVID-19), England: 24 January 2020 to 31 March 2021 [Internet]. 2021. Available from: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/articles/updatingethniccontrastsindeathsinvolvingthecoronaviruscovid19englandandwales/24january2020to31march2021

5. Schaffer DeRoo S, Pudalov NJ, Fu LY. Planning for a COVID-19 Vaccination Program. JAMA. 2020 Jun 23;323(24):2458–9.

6. Razai MS, Osama T, McKechnie DGJ, Majeed A. Covid-19 vaccine hesitancy among ethnic minority groups. BMJ. 2021 Feb 26;372:n513.

7. Razai MS, Kankam HK, Majeed A, Esmail A, Williams DR. Mitigating ethnic disparities in covid-19 and beyond. BMJ. 2021;372.

8. Public Health England. Local action on health inequalities: Understanding and reducing ethnic inequalities in health. 2018 p. 81.

9. Paradies Y, Ben J, Denson N, Elias A, Priest N, Pieterse A, et al. Racism as a Determinant of Health: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. PLoS ONE. 2015;10(9):e0138511.

10. Savoia E, Piltch-Loeb R, Goldberg B, Miller-Idriss C, Hughes B, Montrond A, et al. Predictors of COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy: Socio-Demographics, Co-Morbidity, and Past Experience of Racial Discrimination. Vaccines. 2021;9(7):767.

11. Robertson E, Reeve KS, Niedzwiedz CL, Moore J, Blake M, Green M, et al. Predictors of COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in the UK household longitudinal study. Brain Behav Immun. 2021 May 1;94:41–50.

12. Etti M, Fofie H, Razai M, Crawshaw AF, Hargreaves S, Goldsmith LP. Ethnic minority and migrant underrepresentation in Covid-19 research: Causes and solutions. EClinicalMedicine [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Jul 15];36. Available from: https://www.thelancet.com/journals/eclinm/article/PIIS2589-5370(21)00183-8/abstract

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

13. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and the social impacts on Great Britain: 29 January 2021 [Internet]. 2021. Available from: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandthesocialimpactsongreatbritain/29january2021

14. Paul E, Steptoe A, Fancourt D. Attitudes towards vaccines and intention to vaccinate against COVID-19: Implications for public health communications. Lancet Reg Health - Eur [Internet]. 2021 Feb 1 [cited 2021 Feb 22];1(100012). Available from: https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanepe/article/PIIS2666-7762(20)30012-0/abstract

15. Allington D, McAndrew S, Moxham-Hall V, Duffy B. Coronavirus conspiracy suspicions, general vaccine attitudes, trust and coronavirus information source as predictors of vaccine hesitancy among UK residents during the COVID-19 pandemic. Psychol Med. 2021;1–12.

16. UK Government. Government report shows improving vaccine confidence among ethnic minority groups. GOVUK [Internet]. 2021; Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-report-shows-improving-vaccine-confidence-among-ethnic-minority-groups

17. The Guardian. UK faith leaders join to counter fears over vaccine in BAME communities. The Guardian [Internet]. 2021; Available from: http://www.theguardian.com/society/2021/feb/07/faith-leaders-join-to-counter-fears-over-vaccine-among-bame-communities

18. Department of Health and Social Care. Sir Lenny Henry urges Black Britons to take COVID-19 vaccine [Internet]. GOV.UK. 2021. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/news/sir-lenny-henry-urges-black-britons-to-take-covid-19-vaccine

19. Williams DR, Yu Y, Jackson JS, Anderson NB. Racial differences in physical and mental health: Socio-economic status, stress and discrimination. J Health Psychol. 1997;2(3):335–51.

20. Clark R, Coleman AP, Novak JD. Brief report: Initial psychometric properties of the everyday discrimination scale in black adolescents. J Adolesc. 2004 Jun 1;27(3):363–8.

21. Banks J, Phelps A, Oskala A, Steptoe A, Blake M, Oldfield Z, et al. English Longitudinal Study of Ageing: Waves 0-9, 1998-2019 [Internet]. UK Data Service; 2021 [cited 2021 Jul 15]. Available from: https://beta.ukdataservice.ac.uk/datacatalogue/doi/?id=5050#21

22. Office for National Statistics. Population estimates for the UK, England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland [Internet]. 2020 May [cited 2020 Sep 30]. Available from: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/bulletins/annualmidyearpopulationestimates/mid2018

23. Stata Corp. Stata Statistical Software: Release 16. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC; 2019.

24. Bogart LM, Ojikutu BO, Tyagi K, Klein DJ, Mutchler MG, Dong L, et al. COVID-19 Related Medical Mistrust, Health Impacts, and Potential Vaccine Hesitancy Among

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.26.21262655; this version posted August 28, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Black Americans Living With HIV. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr 1999. 2021 Feb 1;86(2):200–7.

25. Armstrong K, Putt M, Halbert CH, Grande D, Schwartz JS, Liao K, et al. Prior experiences of racial discrimination and racial differences in health care system distrust. Med Care. 2013;51(2):144.

26. Peek ME, Nunez-Smith M, Drum M, Lewis TT. Adapting the Everyday Discrimination Scale to Medical Settings: Reliability and Validity Testing in a Sample of African American Patients. Ethn Dis. 2011;21(4):502–9.

27. Cuffee YL, Hargraves JL, Rosal M, Briesacher BA, Schoenthaler A, Person S, et al. Reported racial discrimination, trust in physicians, and medication adherence among inner-city African Americans with hypertension. Am J Public Health. 2013;103(11):e55–62.

28. Bazargan M, Cobb S, Assari S. Discrimination and Medical Mistrust in a Racially and Ethnically Diverse Sample of California Adults. Ann Fam Med. 2021 Jan 1;19(1):4–15.

29. López-Cevallos DF, Harvey SM. Psychometric Properties of a Healthcare Discrimination Scale Among Young-Adult Latinos. J Racial Ethn Health Disparities. 2019 Jun;6(3):618–24.

30. Hausmann LR, Kressin NR, Hanusa BH, Ibrahim SA. Perceived racial discrimination in health care and its association with patients' healthcare experiences: does the measure matter? Ethn Dis. 2010;20(1):40.

31. Freeman D, Waite F, Rosebrock L, Petit A, Causier C, East A, et al. Coronavirus conspiracy beliefs, mistrust, and compliance with government guidelines in England. Psychol Med. :1–13.

32. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus and vaccine hesitancy, Great Britain [Internet]. 2021. Available from: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandvaccinehesitancygreatbritain/26mayto20june2021

33. Brady D, Burton L. The Oxford Handbook of the Social Science of Poverty. Oxford University Press; 2016.

34. UK Government. Ethnicity facts and figures [Internet]. 2020. Available from: https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/