

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

A Qualitative Study Regarding Messages of the COVID-19 Vaccine from Vaccinated Healthcare Providers and Healthy Adults

Shuji Sano¹, Satomi Sato^{1*}, Norio Ohmagari², Osamu Takahashi¹

¹ Graduate School of Public Health, St. Luke's International University, Tokyo, Japan

² Disease Control and Prevention Center, National Center for Global Health and
Medicine, Tokyo, Japan

*Corresponding author

Email: satomisa@slcn.ac.jp

17 1. Abstract

18 **Background:** To promote the vaccination against COVID-19, person-to-person
19 communication from vaccinated people will play an important role. The objectives of this
20 study are to identify what messages were shared by vaccinated people, and the relationship
21 between these messages and their background. **Methods:** This study was an exploratory and
22 prospective basis with individual interviews. The participants were healthcare providers and
23 healthy adults who were recruited at a vaccination site in Chuo-City, Tokyo. The online
24 interviews were conducted using a semi-structured interview. Based on the Health Belief
25 Model (HBM), the participants were asked about their perspectives on vaccines and what
26 they talked about after their vaccination. The interviews were categorized into each item of
27 the HBM and analyzed using NVivo software. **Results:** During August to October 2021, five
28 healthcare providers and seven healthy adults were enrolled in the study. One healthy adult
29 could not be contacted resulting in a total of 11 participants interviewed. Both the healthcare
30 providers and the healthy adults mainly talked about side effects after their vaccination, and
31 to ease the other persons' concerns based on their experience. Meanwhile, there were
32 differences in the recommendations for vaccination between the two groups. The healthcare
33 providers were strongly aware of the severity of COVID-19 infection and recommended
34 vaccination to others as a useful measure to suppress becoming severely ill. On the other
35 hand, the healthy adults recommended the vaccine with varying degree depending on their
36 expectations and concerns about the vaccine and external factors such as living with a family
37 member. **Conclusion:** Both the healthcare providers and healthy adults shared similar
38 messages to ease the vaccination concerns of others. However, their vaccine recommendation
39 level was varied, which may be influenced not only by expectations and concerns toward the
40 vaccine, but also by external factors such as family members living together.

41 **2. INTRODUCTION**

42 **2.1. Background**

43 The spread of the COVID-19 has threatened and changed our daily lives. In such a
44 situation, vaccination plays an important role in infection control by promoting herd
45 immunity [1]. The Japanese government has promoted COVID-19 vaccination for the entire
46 population, and those who wish to be vaccinated can do so for free [2].

47 Currently, the mRNA vaccines developed by Pfizer (Comirnaty™ intramuscular
48 injection), and Moderna (Spikevax™ intramuscular injection), and the adenovirus vector
49 vaccine developed by AstraZeneca (Vaxzevria™ intramuscular injection) have been
50 approved by the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare in Japan [2], and have been
51 available for clinical use. However, some people were hesitant or unwilling to receive the
52 COVID-19 vaccine due to a lack of long-term data and concerns about the safety of the
53 vaccine influenced by information being spread by mass media or social network services
54 [3,4].

55 In order to promote the vaccination, the Japanese government has provided the public
56 with information through websites and TV commercials to aid decision-making on whether to
57 vaccinate based on a comprehensive consideration of risks and benefits [2]. The reliability of
58 information sources is a very important aspect; information from the Internet have been
59 unreliable due to insufficient or incorrect information [5], and have influenced some people
60 to not trust the information from the government or media, particularly those hesitant to
61 receive the COVID-19 vaccine [6]. On the other hand, a previous report explained that
62 person-to-person communication was more effective in influencing health behaviors [7]. In
63 addition, information from family members and close friends are very trustworthy because of
64 their strong relationship [6,8]. This can be explained by the interpersonal communication

65 theory. This theory is based on human relationships from which health behaviors emerge,
66 thereby affecting a variety of health outcomes[9,10]. Therefore, person-to-person
67 communication, especially among close persons, have a high impact on health behaviors.

68 Based on this, our assumption is that person-to-person communication with those who
69 had been vaccinated for COVID-19 was considered to have had a significant influence. If
70 vaccinated people share positive messages with the unvaccinated, then vaccination could
71 spread smoothly across the population. The effectiveness of the messaging by those who have
72 been vaccinated is influenced by how strongly they recommend vaccination to others, and by
73 their perceptions that led them to get vaccinated. These perceptions can be explained by the
74 Health Belief Model (HBM) [11], which was developed as a disease conceptual model
75 leading to health behaviors and has seven components, Perceived Susceptibility, Perceived
76 Severity, Perceived Threat, Perceived Benefits, Perceived Barriers, Self-Efficacy, and Cues
77 to Action. Recently. Several studies have reported the HBM-based analyses of factors
78 influencing the decision-making to vaccinate against COVID-19 [12–14]. In addition, it is
79 assumed that the degree of health literacy of the vaccinated person influences the nature of
80 the messaging and vaccine recommendation to others [15]. However, few studies have
81 reported on what messages were provided from vaccinated people based on their perspectives
82 of the vaccination.

83

84 **2.2. Objectives**

85 In a qualitative study utilizing semi-structured interviews, our objectives were to
86 understand the types of messages shared by healthcare providers and healthy adults receiving
87 the COVID-19 vaccine to the unvaccinated people around them, and the relationship between
88 the messages and the participant background, such as their perception and recommendation to

89 the vaccine. Additionally, we set out to assess the differences and similarities between the
90 healthcare providers and the healthy adults through these individual semi-structure
91 interviews.

92 **3. METHODS**

93 **3.1. Participants**

94 A total of 10 participants including 5 healthcare providers and 5 healthy adults were
95 targeted for recruitment in this exploratory study. The number of participants in this study
96 was set at 10 since a previous qualitative study on vaccine hesitancy reported that data
97 saturation was reached at around this number [16]. Three rounds of recruitment were pursued
98 between August 23 and October 22, 2021 at the Chuo-city (Tokyo) administered vaccination
99 site located at St. Luke's Center for Clinical Academia, St. Luke's International University.
100 Participation in this study was voluntary and written informed consents were obtained.

101 Prospective participants who met the following criteria were considered for this study: 1)
102 have completed the second dose of the COVID-19 vaccine, 2) healthcare providers,
103 physicians or nurses, who were responsible for vaccination, or apparently healthy adults aged
104 20 years or older who were from the general population, 3) ability to communicate in
105 Japanese, and 4) ability to conduct interviews via Zoom® (Zoom Video Communications,
106 Inc., San Jose, CA, USA.). Exclusion criteria including the following: 1) persons with whom
107 it was considered difficult to communicate directly, 2) those who were considered to have
108 insufficient ability to understand and judge the interview, and 3) those who were judged to be
109 difficult to conduct the interview with. These were assessed by the researcher during the
110 screening.

111 After the participants were registered, the dates for the online interviews were set

112 individually between August and November 2021. As the purpose of this research was to
113 interview participants about their conversations with close persons after their vaccination, the
114 online interview was scheduled to take place at least two weeks after the second vaccination.

115 The study was approved by the Research Ethics Board of St. Luke's University, and
116 given the approval number: 21-R076.

117

118 **3.2. Questionnaire**

119 After obtaining the participants' consent, the questionnaire was used to collect
120 information on socio-demographic characteristics and measures of health literacy. The
121 questionnaire composed the following items: name, gender, age, date of birth, number of
122 cohabiters, educational background, employment status, current health conditions, history of
123 COVID-19 infection, the dates of the 1st and 2nd vaccinations, and the 14-item Health
124 Literacy Scale for Japanese adults (HLS-14) [17]. The HLS-14 developed by Suka (2015)
125 consists of three levels: "functional health literacy," "communicative health literacy," and
126 "critical health literacy," and has been widely used to assess the health literacy of Japanese
127 adults [18–20].

128

129 **3.3. Interviews**

130 Interviews were practiced with an academic co-author and a medical colleague,
131 beforehand to assess the appropriate interview time and the validity of the questioning items.
132 The main interviews were conducted with each participant on different dates. Each interview
133 took about 30-40 minutes and was recorded. A semi-structured interview consisting of 7
134 general, open-ended, neutral, and non-guided questions was prepared by the researcher and
135 the co-author to evaluate the knowledge, attitude, behavior, and perceptions related to

136 COVID-19 or COVID-19 vaccine. The interviews were conducted by the researcher with
137 keeping in mind the components of the HBM. The HBM is a useful model for decision-
138 making on vaccination [21–23]

139

140 **3.3.1. Semi-structured interview questions following the HBM:**

- 141 1. What do you know about the COVID-19 and COVID-19 vaccines? (Perceived
142 Susceptibility, Perceived Severity, Perceived Threat)
- 143 2. What were your expectations about receiving the COVID-19 vaccine? (Perceived
144 Benefit)
- 145 3. What were your concerns about receiving the COVID-19 vaccine? (Perceived
146 Barrier)
- 147 4. Why did you decide to get the COVID-19 vaccine? (Cues to Action)
- 148 5. What is your opinion about whether to recommend the COVID-19 vaccine to
149 unvaccinated people? (Vaccine Recommendation)
- 150 6. What did you talk about with your family, friends, and colleagues after you received
151 the COVID-19 vaccine? (Messages after vaccination)
- 152 7. What is your general opinion about the COVID-19 vaccine?

153

154 **3.4. Analysis**

155 NVivo Qualitative Data Analysis Software Version 1.5.2 (QSR International,
156 Massachusetts, U.S.) was used to analyze the qualitative data. The analysis procedure
157 consists of the following steps: 1) Coding-identifying: in-vivo coding of comments relevant
158 to the research in each interview; 2) Coding-sorting: sorting of duplicate comments in the
159 code obtained in the first coding to create units; 3) Coding-condensation: enhancing the level

160 of abstraction for units obtained in second coding; 4) Categorizing: creating categories by
161 extracting from the third coding the content that matches HBM, vaccination
162 recommendations, and the content that was talked about after vaccination; 5) Generalizing:
163 generalizing multiple participant's perspectives and significance albeit single-person
164 perspectives based on the categories assigned to each item of the HBM. In order to eliminate
165 arbitrariness as much as possible, each time one interview was completed, the review and
166 analysis were carefully repeated by the researcher and the co-author.

167

168 **4. RESULTS**

169 **4.1. Participants**

170 Between August and October 2021, five healthcare providers who were engaged in
171 vaccination and seven healthy adults who were vaccinated at the site were enrolled in the
172 study (Fig 1). One of the healthy adults was not included due to scheduling difficulties and
173 loss of contact. Individual interviews were conducted with a total of 11 participants, 5 with
174 males and 6 with females (Table 1). Participant ages included two in their 20s, two in their
175 30s, five in their 40s, and two in their 50s. The mean period between the second vaccination
176 and the interview was 114 days for health care providers and 21 days for healthy adults.
177 Healthcare providers received the COVID-19 vaccine as a priority, therefore the mean period
178 to interview was longer than with the healthy adults (Fig 2). The average time to conduct the
179 interview was 35 minutes. The mean score of the HLS-14, a measure of health literacy, was
180 55.7 ± 5.4 with no difference between healthcare providers (55.6 ± 4.1) and the healthy adult
181 population (55.7 ± 6.1).

182

183 Fig 1. Flow chart of participant recruitment

184 Table 1. Characteristics of participants

No	Sex	Age('s)	HCP or HA	Number of Family Members Living with	Education	Employment Status	Infection history of COVID-19
1	Male	30	Physician	2	University	Full time	No
2	Male	40	Physician	≥ 3	Graduate school	Full time	No
3	Female	50	Nurse	1	Vocational school	Part time	No
4	Female	30	Nurse	0	Vocational school	Part time	No
5	Female	40	Nurse	≥ 3	Junior college	Part time	Yes
6	Male	40	Healthy Adult	1	Graduate school	Full time	No
7	Female	50	Healthy Adult	0	Graduate school	Self-employed	No
8	Female	50	Healthy Adult	≥ 3	University	Self-employed	Yes
9	Male	40	Healthy Adult	1	Graduate school	Full time	No
10	Male	40	Healthy Adult	0	Graduate school	Full time	No
11	Female	20	Healthy Adult	0	Vocational school	Full time	No
12	Female	20	Healthy Adult	0	University	Full time	No

185 HCP: Healthcare Provider, HA: Healthy Adult

186 Table 1. Characteristic of participants continued

No	Interview Month	Period between 2nd Vaccination and Interview	Duration of Interview (min)	HLS-14 Total Score
1	Sep. 2021	5 months	29	56
2	Sep. 2021	5 months	31	53
3	Oct. 2021	5 months	38	55
4	Oct. 2021	2 months	29	63
5	Aug. 2021	2 months	27	51
6	Sep. 2021	20 days	30	58
7	Lost to follow up			55
8	Nov. 2021	1 month	62	42
9	Oct. 2021	22 days	37	59
10	Oct. 2021	15 days	32	63
11	Nov. 2021	24 days	36	55
12	Nov. 2021	16 days	32	58

187 HLS-14: 14-item Health Literacy Scale for Japanese adults

188

189 Fig 2. Number of the new infections and cumulative 2nd vaccination rate in Tokyo, Jan.21-

190 Nov.21

191

192 **4.2. Perceptions, Cues to Action, Vaccine Recommendation, and** 193 **Messages**

194 The results of 11 interviews included 117,040 words in Japanese spoken across 383
195 minutes of total interview time. The analysis for the interviews was carefully conducted with
196 the co-author for about 10 hours. In total, 267 codes were identified among healthcare
197 providers and 355 codes were identified among healthy adults, which were relevant to the
198 purpose of the study (coding-identifying) (Table 2). By sorting the codes obtained from the
199 coding-identifying step, 146 codes and 226 codes were identified (coding-sorting). By
200 enhancing the level of abstraction for categorization, 94 codes and 140 codes were found,

201 respectively (coding-condensation), and by categorizing the codes matching the HBM, 59 categories and 68 categories were created, respectively
 202 (categorizing). Finally, the generalizability of the categories was 26 and 27 in healthcare providers and healthy adults, respectively
 203 (generalizing). The categories for vaccination recommendations were 3 and 6, and the categories for messages after vaccination were 3 and 7 for
 204 healthcare providers and healthy adults, respectively. Each category and main comments are listed (S1 and S2 Table). and S2 Table. Also,
 205 summary of the results is indicated (Fig 3).

206

207 Table 2. Analytical process for the interviews

	Participants	1st Coding: Identifying	2nd Coding: Sorting	3rd Coding: Condensation	Categorization	Generalization of Perceptions	Vaccine Recommendation	Messages
HCP	5	267	146	94	59	26	3	3
HA	6	355	226	140	68	27	6	7

208 HCP: Healthcare Provider, HA: Healthy Adult

209

210 Fig 3. Summary results based on the Health Belief Model

211 **4.2.1. Perceived susceptibility**

212 The healthcare providers were aware of the possibility that they might be infected with
213 COVID-19 at their hospital, even if they were not directly involved in the treatment because
214 the hospital where they worked treated COVID-19 infected patients. On the other hand, the
215 healthy adults began to be aware that they might also be infected when the number of
216 infections rapidly expanded in Tokyo (Fig 2) [24], or when they saw or heard that there were
217 infected people nearby. However, when there were no infected people in their immediate
218 vicinity, the sense of reality was weakened, leading them to think that they might not be
219 infected weakening their perceived susceptibility.

220 **4.2.2. Perceived Severity**

221 The healthcare providers realized that the severe cases of COVID-19 increased in their
222 daily practice and that most of the severe cases were unvaccinated patients. Furthermore,
223 even when discharged from the hospital, some patients still suffered from sequelae, and this
224 made them aware of the COVID-19 threat.

225 In addition, some participants realized that not getting vaccinated may affect their
226 interpersonal relationships; for example, by wearing a mask when meeting unvaccinated
227 people. The healthy adult #12 has had similar experiences about relationships with others and
228 realized that the conversation atmosphere deteriorated when she mentioned to others that she
229 had no intention to vaccinate. The healthy adults were concerned that not vaccinating may
230 lead to discrimination and prejudice. On the other hand, the healthy adult #8 commented that
231 since there were more people infected with the COVID-19 in Tokyo than in rural areas, she
232 did not face discrimination or prejudice from others even when she was infected. It is
233 possible that whether the number of infected people is high or low in the surrounding area
234 may influence the tendencies for discrimination and prejudice.

235

236 **4.2.3. Perceived threat**

237 Both the healthcare providers and the healthy adults were threatened by their own
238 infection with the COVID-19 which could lead to secondary infection of those around them.
239 In particular, those who lived with their families were more aware of the need for vaccination
240 to protect family members.

241

242 **4.2.4. Perceived benefits**

243 The perceived benefit was similar for both the healthcare providers and the healthy
244 adults. They hope that vaccination will suppress the transmission of the COVID-19 and
245 reduce the risk of getting severely ill if infected. At the time of the interviews, the number of
246 infected and severe cases in Tokyo were decreasing, making them realize the effect of the
247 vaccine because the vaccination had gradually spread (Fig 2) [25]. They expected to be able
248 to have dinner with friends, travel, and return to their hometowns, if the number of infected
249 and severe cases continued to remain low. Such expectations were clarified by the interviews.

250

251 **4.2.5. Perceived barriers**

252 Many comments were received related to the perceived barriers, both from the healthcare
253 providers and the healthy adults. The most common perception was concern about side
254 effects from the vaccination. People generally imaged the vaccines to resemble influenza
255 vaccines, and were not aware that influenza vaccination can cause side effects. However,
256 since the COVID-19 vaccine has a higher rate of side effects than conventional vaccines
257 [26], they realized that it was completely different experience. They felt even more anxious
258 before their vaccination after hearing about the painful side effects from the vaccinated
259 people.

260 Also, the COVID-19 vaccines were a novel type with a different development process
261 than the conventional ones, and people felt anxious about the novelty itself. Because of the
262 lack of sufficient long term clinical data, they were concerned about unexpected side effects
263 and sequelae in the future. As it was a novel type of vaccine, there was a lot of uncertain
264 information on social networking sites and the Internet, such as "the COVID-19 vaccine will
265 lead to infertility" and "the COVID-19 vaccine will affect immunity and eventually cause
266 death". These questionable information had led to a sense of barrier to vaccination.

267 The unique perception of the healthy adults was that they recognized that Spikevax™
268 causes more side effects than Comirnaty™. While the healthcare providers did not have the
269 option to vaccinate other than Comirnaty™, the healthy adults could choose amongst
270 Comirnaty™, Spikevax™, or Vaxzevria™, causing a sense of barrier due to the difference in
271 safety between the vaccines.

272 Employment status was also thought to have an impact on the sense of barrier to the
273 vaccination. Since many young people, in particular, were non-regular workers [27], they
274 were concerned about the influence of side effects of the vaccine on their work. Since there
275 was no compensation for their salary if they missed work due to side effects, they were
276 worried about decreased income. Health adult #12 had heard such opinions from her close
277 persons.

278 Furthermore, healthcare providers' vaccination schedule was set by the hospital where they
279 work, so they did not need to make their reservations for vaccination. However, the healthy
280 adults can decide to get vaccinated at their own timing. Therefore, some healthy adults were
281 aware that they did not need to be vaccinated immediately. This could be a factor that
282 enhances the sense of barrier. On the other hand, the majority of the participants felt that side
283 effects after vaccination were mild and not as painful as they had expected, and this was not a
284 barrier to recommending vaccination to others.

285 The participants recognized the importance of providing correct information, as they
286 sometimes saw or heard ambiguous information. The healthcare providers were aware from
287 their vaccination work that many people had concerns about vaccines, and believed that it
288 was necessary to have a point of contact for these people to feel free to talk about various
289 concerns and worries about the COVID-19 vaccines.

290

291 **4.2.6. Self-efficacy**

292 The healthcare providers had made the decision to vaccinate because of their sense of
293 responsibility. As healthcare providers, they tried to give correct information to their family
294 and friends, as they were often asked about vaccinations. To enhance self-efficacy, they
295 believed it is important to know about the COVID-19 vaccines first.

296 Both the healthcare providers and the healthy adults found that their concerns before
297 vaccination were alleviated by talking with others who had been vaccinated, and they felt
298 more secure after vaccination. On the other hand, those who did not originally intend to be
299 vaccinated did not have a high sense of self-efficacy even after receiving the vaccine.

300

301 **4.2.7. Cues to Action**

302 Both the healthcare providers and the healthy adults were motivated to get vaccinated by
303 recommendations from specialists of infection disease and physicians, and by the fact that the
304 people around them had also been vaccinated.

305 Even though they were not forced to be vaccinated, they felt the atmosphere in their
306 workplace that they should be vaccinated. The ease of making reservations for vaccination
307 was also a trigger for vaccination, as the healthy adults had to make their own reservations.

308

309 **4.2.8. Vaccine recommendation to others**

310 The healthcare providers were very eager to have as many people as possible vaccinated.
311 As the COVID-19 vaccines were the most promising way to reduce the risk of getting severe
312 infection, and realizing how devastating it can be, they believed that vaccines have more
313 benefits than risks.

314 On the other hand, recommendations from the healthy adults for vaccination of others
315 were varied. Some recommended vaccination to close family members, but did not actively
316 recommend vaccination to others. This is because they recognize that not getting the vaccine
317 is an option and should not be forced. Therefore, they would like to respect the unvaccinated
318 people's opinions. Differences in vaccine recommendations were found between the
319 healthcare providers and the healthy adults.

320

321 **4.2.9. Messages**

322 Both the healthcare providers and the healthy adults often talked about side effects with
323 their family, friends, and colleagues after vaccination. However, they did not try to stir up
324 concerns, but rather told others that based on their own experiences the vaccination did not
325 need to be scary and that they felt relieved after the vaccination. This was because the
326 participants in this study did not experience any strong side effects from the vaccination, and
327 that the vaccination reduced the risk of infection and becoming severely ill from the COVID-
328 19, as well as the risk of transmission to others.

329 A feature of the healthy adults was that they unconsciously checked the other person's
330 vaccination status during the conversation. The vaccination status was a common topic of
331 conversation in the COVID-19 era, and people naturally shared their vaccination experiences.
332 This shared experience eased the fear of the COVID-19 vaccine for those who had not been
333 vaccinated. By contrast, those who had no intention to be vaccinated felt stressed by having

334 their vaccination status checked and by being implicitly recommended or pressured to be
335 vaccinated.

336

337 **5. DISCUSSION**

338 This study was the first to understand what messages were shared by the vaccinated
339 healthcare providers and healthy adults after their vaccination, and the relation of the
340 individual's thoughts and social background in influencing the messages. Both of them shared
341 similar messages from their own vaccination experiences to ease others' concerns about side
342 effects of the COVID-19 vaccination. However, differences in vaccine recommendations
343 were observed between the healthcare providers and the healthy adults. The mean score of
344 the HLS-14 did not differ between the two groups. Therefore, it was not clear whether health
345 literacy affected the contents regarding what they talked about after vaccination. We
346 described here the backgrounds and relationships that influence vaccine recommendations in
347 both the healthcare providers and the healthy adults.

348

349 **5.1. Vaccine recommendations from the healthcare providers**

350 The healthcare providers who participated in this interview were unanimous in their
351 recommendation for vaccination. The strongest reason for this is that they expect that
352 vaccination will prevent getting severely ill even if infected with COVID-19. In their daily
353 clinical practice, the healthcare providers have treated patients suffering from different kinds
354 of diseases and have seen patients with significant functional disabilities, severe diseases, and
355 die from diseases. Therefore, it was believed that they were treating patients with a strong
356 motive to keep them from becoming severely ill and reduce deaths caused by diseases as

357 much as possible. According to the perceived severity, we found that the healthcare providers
358 strongly recognized the severity of COVID-19, such as the fact that unvaccinated patients
359 with COVID-19 infection could become severely ill, the sequelae of COVID-19 infection
360 could persist, and the sense that the number of the severe cases was increasing. Vaccination
361 has been recognized as a useful measure to reduce the risk of getting severely ill. The reason
362 why they recommend vaccination was not only because of its advantage, but also because of
363 the downside of not being vaccinated which would change the hospital's acceptance of an
364 infected patient who becomes severely ill. Of course, they were concerned about side effects
365 of the vaccine and the lack of long-term clinical data. However, based on the current data and
366 their experiences and those of their colleagues, few serious side effects occurred, and they
367 believed that the benefits of vaccination outweigh the risks at this point in time.

368 The interviews also clarified that the healthcare providers felt strongly about their
369 responsibility. In the initial phase of the vaccination in Japan, when the experience of
370 COVID-19 vaccination was still minimal, their sense of responsibility as healthcare providers
371 promoted vaccination. And in the conversation with their close persons after the vaccination,
372 healthcare providers mainly talked about side effects based on their own experiences, but
373 they also emphasized that there was no need to be afraid of side effects. This was because
374 many people were worried about side effects of the vaccines, so they were trying to alleviate
375 the concerns by explaining that side effects were milder than they had expected. In addition,
376 they told the others that the vaccination gave them a sense of security because it reduced the
377 risk of getting severe illness even if infected with the COVID-19.

378

379 **5.2. Vaccine recommendations from the healthy adults**

380 The level of vaccine recommendations from the healthy adults was inconsistent. While

381 some healthy adults were willing to recommend vaccination to close family members, others
382 were not actively recommending it to others. This may be affected by how much expectation
383 they had for the vaccine in advance. Those who recommended vaccination were more likely
384 to have been living with family members, and as a perceived threat, they were worried about
385 transmitting COVID-19 to others if they had been infected. The recommendation to vaccinate
386 might have been based on their desire to protect the family. In contrast, those who responded
387 that they would not actively recommend the vaccine did not live with their families, but were
388 considering getting the vaccine when the number of infected people significantly increases in
389 Tokyo (Fig 2). This tendency was observed among younger people who, besides being
390 concerned about side effects from the vaccine, were also concerned about the fact that it was
391 a novel type of vaccine. Especially for non-regular employees, they were worried about loss
392 of income if they had to take a leave due to side effects of the vaccine, which suggests that
393 their expectations of the vaccine were relatively low. Not only the expectation and insecurity
394 toward the vaccine, but also environmental factors such as living with family members and
395 employment status may affect the level of recommendation after vaccination.

396 In conversations after vaccination, the healthy adults mainly talked about side effects,
397 based on their own experiences, to close persons and people who were worried about getting
398 vaccinated, but told them that there was no need to worry. The message itself is the same for
399 the healthcare providers and the healthy adults. A feature of conversations among the healthy
400 adults was that they unintentionally checked each other's vaccination status during the
401 conversation. This may be indicating an unconscious interest in recognizing the risk of
402 infection that affects them. If the other person in the conversation was unvaccinated, they
403 might refrain from future contact or hope that the other person would be vaccinated as well.
404 On the other hand, unvaccinated people would feel that being checked about their vaccination
405 status or being recommended for vaccination itself was vaccine-related harassment. This

406 point should be taken into consideration when recommending vaccination.

407

408 **5.3. Suggestions for practice**

409 Lastly, the suggestions for practice in order to further promote vaccination are discussed
410 from a public health perspective. Removing the concerns about the vaccine may lead to
411 vaccination, which in turn may influence vaccine recommendations to others. In the
412 interviews, it was found that anxiety about vaccines can be alleviated by sharing the
413 experience of vaccination, that some unvaccinated people are not able to ask about their
414 vaccine anxiety even if they want to, and that some people are reluctant to get vaccinated
415 because they are concerned about their income loss due to side effects. To address these
416 issues, we suggest the following measures into the practice.

417

418 **5.3.1. Share the experience with people close to you after vaccination**

419 It has been reported that information from healthcare providers and people close to the
420 target patients have more influence on health behavior than information from the media or the
421 Internet [7]. And those who were hesitant to get vaccinated but did get vaccinated trusted
422 information from healthcare providers and people close to them, such as family members[6].
423 By sharing the experience after vaccination, the other person who hears about it can gain a
424 sense of security. By making their vague concerns concrete, those who are vaccinated may be
425 able to ease the distrust that unvaccinated people may have towards the vaccines.

426 However, in sharing experiences, we need to be careful in our conversations to avoid
427 unconsciously checking the other person's vaccination status and implicitly coercing them
428 into vaccination. This is because people who have decided not to vaccinate feel stressed by
429 having their status checked and being implicitly coerced to get vaccinated.

430

431 **5.3.2. Set up a point of contact at vaccination sites where people can feel** 432 **free to ask about vaccines**

433 People who have been vaccinated, those who are planning to be vaccinated, and those
434 who have no intention to be vaccinated have concerns. They are concerned about the safety
435 of vaccines, including the long-term effects, the fact that each vaccine causes different side
436 effects, and the risk of infection or becoming severely ill if they are not vaccinated. First of
437 all, knowing exactly what the vaccine is may relieve some of their concerns, and talking
438 about it can give them a sense of security. If they are still feeling insecure toward vaccination,
439 positive messages will not be shared after vaccination. Eliminating concerns before
440 vaccination is important in the dissemination of messages after vaccination.

441

442 **5.3.3. Compensation for non-regular employees**

443 In Japan, the proportion of non-regular employees is high, especially among women and
444 young people [27]. Household income has been reported to be a factor in vaccine hesitancy
445 [28]. Non-regular employees are concerned not only about side effects of the vaccine, but
446 also about the possible loss of income due to the difficulty of working as a result of side
447 effects. They have limited paid holidays compared with regular employees, and leave due to
448 side effects may be counted as absenteeism. Therefore, if non-regular employees are
449 vaccinated and have to be absent at work due to side effects, compensating them financially
450 could help promote vaccination.

451 **5.4. Limitations**

452 There were several possible limitations in this study. At the vaccination sites in Chuo
453 City, only residents of the Chuo City were eligible for vaccination. The characteristics of the

454 participants include a high percentage of those with a university or graduate school education
455 and a high level of health literacy. According to the national census in Japan [29], the
456 national average of those with a university or graduate school education was 19.9%, while the
457 participants in this study was 66.7%. The mean HLS-14 score in the national survey
458 conducted by Suga (2013) was 50.3[17], while that of the participants in this study was 55.7,
459 suggesting the possibility of selection bias and a higher level of health awareness than people
460 in general. Therefore, most participants have had the thought of recommending vaccination.

461 Furthermore, since only Comirnaty™ was provided at the vaccination site in this study,
462 comments from people who had taken other vaccines were not available. Although the side
463 effects reported for each vaccine were different, the incidence rate of side effects did not
464 differ significantly for any COVID-19 vaccines, so the influence on the results of this study
465 was considered to be minimal[26].

466 Elderly people and those under 20 years of age were not enrolled in this study.
467 Enrollment in the study did not begin until August 2021, and many elderly people had
468 already been vaccinated, so it was difficult to recruit them. Those under 20 years of age were
469 also excluded because of the possible influence of their parents on their vaccination decisions
470 [30,31]. If elderly people or young people participate in this study, it may affect the results of
471 the vaccine recommendation and the messages. Further studies may be needed for these
472 populations and the unvaccinated people.

473

474 **5.5. Conclusions**

475 In this study, the messages from the conversations between the participants and those
476 around them after vaccination were examined, as well as the relationship between the
477 messages and the individual's thoughts and social background based on the HBM. Both the

478 healthcare providers and healthy adults shared similar messages to ease the vaccination
479 concerns of others regarding side effects. However, their vaccine recommendation level was
480 varied, which may be influenced not only by expectations and concerns toward the vaccine,
481 but also by external factors such as family members living together.

482 **6. References**

483

484 1. Frederiksen LSF, Zhang Y, Foged C, Thakur A. The Long Road Toward COVID-19 Herd
485 Immunity: Vaccine Platform Technologies and Mass Immunization Strategies. *Front*
486 *Immunol.* 2020;11:1817.

487 2. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare Website.
488 https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/seisakunitsuite/bunya/vaccine_00184.html.

489 3. Yoda T, Katsuyama H. Willingness to Receive COVID-19 Vaccination in Japan. *Nato Adv*
490 *Sci Inst Se.* 2021;9(1):48.

491 4. Machida M, Nakamura I, Kojima T, Saito R, Nakaya T, Hanibuchi T, et al. Acceptance of
492 a COVID-19 Vaccine in Japan during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Nato Adv Sci Inst Se.*
493 2021;9(3):210.

494 5. Hesse BW, Moser RP, Rutten LJ. Surveys of Physicians and Electronic Health
495 Information. *New Engl J Medicine.* 2010;362(9):859–60.

496 6. Purvis RS, Hallgren E, Moore RA, Willis DE, Hall S, Gurel-Headley M, et al. Trusted
497 Sources of COVID-19 Vaccine Information among Hesitant Adopters in the United States.
498 *Nato Adv Sci Inst Se.* 2021;9(12):1418.

499 7. Okada M, Oeda S, Katsuki N, Iwane S, Kawaguchi Y, Kawamoto S, et al.
500 Recommendations from primary care physicians, family, friends and work colleagues
501 influence patients' decisions related to hepatitis screening, medical examinations and
502 antiviral treatment. *Exp Ther Med.* 2020;19(4):2973–82.

503 8. Atlas A, Milanese S, Grimmer K, Barras S, Stephens JH. Sources of information used by
504 patients prior to elective surgery: a scoping review. *Bmj Open.* 2019;9(8):e023080.

- 505 9. Duggan A. Understanding Interpersonal Communication Processes Across Health
506 Contexts: Advances in the Last Decade and Challenges for the Next Decade. *J Health*
507 *Commun.* 2006;11(1):93–108.
- 508 10. Bylund CL, Peterson EB, Cameron KA. A practitioner’s guide to interpersonal
509 communication theory: An overview and exploration of selected theories. *Patient Educ*
510 *Couns.* 2012;87(3):261–7.
- 511 11. Rosenstock IM. What Research in Motivation Suggests for Public Health. *Am J Public*
512 *Health N.* 1960;50(3_Pt_1):295–302.
- 513 12. Lai X, Zhu H, Wang J, Huang Y, Jing R, Lyu Y, et al. Public Perceptions and Acceptance
514 of COVID-19 Booster Vaccination in China: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Nato Adv Sci Inst Se.*
515 2021;9(12):1461.
- 516 13. Patwary MM, Bardhan M, Disha AS, Hasan M, Haque MdZ, Sultana R, et al.
517 Determinants of COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance among the Adult Population of Bangladesh
518 Using the Health Belief Model and the Theory of Planned Behavior Model. *Nato Adv Sci*
519 *Inst Se.* 2021;9(12):1393.
- 520 14. Bronstein MV, Kummerfeld E, MacDonald A, Vinogradov S. Willingness to Vaccinate
521 Against SARS-CoV-2: The Role of Reasoning Biases and Conspiracist Ideation. *Vaccine.*
522 2021;
- 523 15. Fukuda Y, Ando S, Fukuda K. Knowledge and preventive actions toward COVID-19,
524 vaccination intent, and health literacy among educators in Japan: An online survey. *Plos One.*
525 2021;16(9):e0257552.
- 526 16. Berrada S, Caroff N, Navas D, Moret L, Huon JF. Comment améliorer la couverture
527 vaccinale en France ? Étude qualitative auprès de professionnels de santé. *Ann Pharm*
528 *Françaises.* 2021;79(1):77–85.
- 529 17. Suka M, Odajima T, Kasai M, Igarashi A, Ishikawa H, Kusama M, et al. The 14-item
530 health literacy scale for Japanese adults (HLS-14). *Environ Health Prev.* 2013;18(5):407–15.
- 531 18. Ono S, Ogi H, Ogawa M, Nakamura D, Nakamura T, Izawa KP. Relationship between
532 parents’ health literacy and children’s sleep problems in Japan. *Bmc Public Health.*
533 2021;21(1):791.
- 534 19. Aoki T, Inoue M. Association between health literacy and patient experience of primary
535 care attributes: A cross-sectional study in Japan. *Plos One.* 2017;12(9):e0184565.

- 536 20. Suka M, Odajima T, Okamoto M, Sumitani M, Igarashi A, Ishikawa H, et al. Relationship
537 between health literacy, health information access, health behavior, and health status in
538 Japanese people. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2015;98(5):660–8.
- 539 21. Cotache-Condor C, Peterson M, Asare M. Application of theoretical frameworks on
540 human papillomavirus vaccine interventions in the United States: systematic review and
541 meta-analysis. *Cancer Cause Control*. 2021;1–10.
- 542 22. Bateman LB, Hall AG, Anderson WA, Cherrington AL, Helova A, Judd S, et al.
543 Exploring COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy Among Stakeholders in African American and
544 Latinx Communities in the Deep South Through the Lens of the Health Belief Model. *Am J*
545 *Health Promot*. 2021;089011712110450.
- 546 23. Yasuhara N, Okamoto S, Hamada M, Uehara K, Obana N, Imamura T. Evaluation of
547 Japanese people’s perception of risk information for making decisions to receive influenza
548 and rubella vaccinations. *Health Expect*. 2021;24(6):2013–22.
- 549 24. COVID-19 Information Website by Tokyo Metropolitan Government.
550 <https://stopcovid19.metro.tokyo.lg.jp/>.
- 551 25. Vaccination Record System on Government Chief Information officers’ Portal, Japan.
552 <https://cio.go.jp/vrs>.
- 553 26. Cohen SR, Gao DX, Kahn JS, Rosmarin D. Comparison of constitutional and
554 dermatologic side effects between COVID-19 and non-COVID-19 vaccines: Review of a
555 publicly available database of vaccine side effects. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. 2022;86(1):248–9.
- 556 27. Basic Survey on Employment Structure in Japan, 2009. Statistics Bureau, Ministry of
557 Internal Affairs and Communications. <https://www.stat.go.jp/data/shugyou/2017/index.html>.
- 558 28. Khan MSR, Watanapongvanich S, Kadoya Y. COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy among the
559 Younger Generation in Japan. *Int J Environ Res Pu*. 2021;18(21):11702.
- 560 29. National Census in Japan, 2010. Statistics Bureau, Ministry of Internal Affairs and
561 Communications. <https://www.stat.go.jp/data/kokusei/2010/users-g/wakatta.html#jump2>.
- 562 30. Humble RM, Sell H, Dubé E, MacDonald NE, Robinson J, Driedger SM, et al. Canadian
563 parents’ perceptions of COVID-19 vaccination and intention to vaccinate their children:
564 Results from a cross-sectional national survey. *Vaccine*. 2021;39(52):7669–76.
- 565 31. Babicki M, Pokorna-Kałowak D, Doniec Z, Mastalerz-Migas A. Attitudes of Parents with
566 Regard to Vaccination of Children against COVID-19 in Poland. A Nationwide Online
567 Survey. *Nato Adv Sci Inst Se*. 2021;9(10):1192.

568

569 **7. Supporting information**

570 S1 Table. Healthcare Providers' perceptions for each category of the Health Belief Model

571 S2 Table. Healthy adults' perceptions for each category of the Health Belief Model

572





Figure 1



This data was integrated from COVID-19 Information Website by Tokyo Metropolitan Government and Vaccination Record System on Government Chief Information officers' Portal, Japan

Figure 2




Figure 3