

1 **A national survey of attitudes towards and intentions to vaccinate**
2 **against COVID-19: implications for communications**

3

4 Martine Stead^{a*}

5 Curtis Jessop^b

6 Kathryn Angus^a

7 Helen Bedford^c

8 Michael Ussher^{a,d}

9 Allison Ford^a

10 Douglas Eadie^a

11 Andy MacGregor^b

12 Kate Hunt^a

13 Anne Marie MacKintosh^a

^aInstitute for Social Marketing and Health, University of Stirling, Stirling, FK9 4LA, UK.

kathryn.angus@stir.ac.uk, a.j.ford@stir.ac.uk, douglas.eadie@stir.ac.uk, kate.hunt@stir.ac.uk,
a.m.mackintosh@stir.ac.uk, musser@sgul.ac.uk

14 ^bNatCen The National Centre for Social Research, 35 Northampton Square, London, EC1V 0AX,
15 UK. Andy.MacGregor@scotcen.org.uk, curtis.jessop@natcen.ac.uk

16 ^cGreat Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, University College London, 30 Guilford Street,
17 London, UK. h.bedford@ucl.ac.uk

18 ^dPopulation Health Research Institute, St George's University of London, Cranmer Terrace
19 London, SW17 0RE, UK. musser@sgul.ac.uk

20

21 *Corresponding author: martine.stead@stir.ac.uk, +44(0)1786 467390, Institute for Social Marketing
22 and Health, University of Stirling, Stirling, FK9 4LA, UK

23

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

24 **Abstract**

25 **Background**

26 Hesitancy about COVID-19 vaccination threatens comprehensive vaccination. It is important to
27 examine vaccination acceptance when people are making real rather than hypothetical decisions, to
28 identify whether targeted support is needed, and to identify implications for communications.

29 **Methods**

30 Cross-sectional online and telephone survey with probability-based sample (n=4,978) of British
31 adults, conducted January-February 2021. Measures: socio-demographic characteristics (age,
32 gender, ethnicity, education, financial status), COVID-19 status, vaccine acceptance, trust in
33 COVID-19 vaccination information sources, perceptions of vaccination priority groups, and
34 perceptions of importance of second dose.

35 **Findings**

36 Among 5,931 individuals invited, survey response rate was 84%. COVID-19 vaccine acceptance
37 (83%) was associated with increasing age, higher level of education and having been invited for
38 vaccination. Acceptance decreased with unconfirmed past COVID-19, greater financial hardship,
39 and non-White British ethnicity; Black/Black British participants had lowest acceptance. Overall,
40 healthcare and scientific sources of information were most trusted. Compared with White British
41 participants, other ethnicities had lower trust in healthcare and scientific sources. Those with lower
42 educational attainment or financial hardship had lower trust in healthcare and scientific sources.
43 Those with no qualifications had higher trust in media and family/friends. While trust was low overall
44 in community or faith leaders it was higher among those with Asian/Asian British and Black/Black
45 British ethnicity compared with White British participants. Views of vaccine prioritisation were mostly
46 consistent with UK official policy but there was support for prioritising additional groups. There was
47 high support for having the second vaccine dose.

48 **Conclusions**

49 Targeted engagement is needed to address COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in non-White British
50 ethnic groups, in younger adults, and among those with lower education, greater financial hardship

51 and unconfirmed past infection. Healthcare professionals and scientific advisors should play a
52 central role in communications and tailored messaging is needed for hesitant groups. Careful
53 communication around vaccination prioritisation continues to be required.

54

55

56 **Key words**

57 COVID-19, Vaccine, Acceptance, Probability sampling, Adults, Great Britain

58

59 **1. Introduction**

60 Widespread vaccination is likely to be one of the most effective ways of controlling the COVID-19
61 pandemic, and is central to the UK government's recovery strategy. The UK vaccine programme
62 began in December 2020, prioritising older adults in care homes and their carers, those aged over
63 80, and frontline health and social-care workers [1]. Administration of first doses of vaccination to
64 the adult population, by decade of age, is to be completed by July 2021. Uncertainty or
65 unwillingness to accept vaccination – 'vaccine hesitancy' [2] – threatens comprehensive vaccination
66 [3,4]. Before the introduction of a COVID-19 vaccine, UK surveys reported that 64% to 82% of
67 adults were willing to be vaccinated [5-12]. Most of these studies used non-probability samples,
68 introducing selection bias and limiting generalisability. Increased vaccine confidence has been
69 reported since vaccination commenced [13]; possibly due to increased COVID-19 cases and
70 deaths, a further UK lockdown in early 2021, and, increasingly, vaccination becoming the social
71 norm. It is important to examine vaccine acceptance when people are making *active*, rather than
72 *hypothetical*, decisions about vaccination. This also provides insight into potential acceptance of
73 repeat COVID-19 vaccination [14].

74
75 UK uptake has been high (94% of adults surveyed in April reported uptake or intention to accept
76 vaccination) [13], but there remain concerns about uptake in subpopulations, such as younger
77 adults and some ethnic minorities [15], giving rise to initiatives such as social media campaigns
78 featuring non-White celebrities [16]. Robust, timely data are needed to identify the characteristics of
79 groups with lower acceptance and the information sources they trust, to inform targeted
80 interventions. It is also important to assess whether attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination have
81 been affected by specific events and media coverage. Two issues in the UK merit particular
82 attention. First, the government followed recommendations to offer the vaccine to priority groups [1].
83 If this approach is continued, it is important to examine its acceptability and any implications for
84 communications. Secondly, the government decided, on 30th December 2020, to deviate from
85 recommended protocols for the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine by extending the interval between doses to

86 up to 12 weeks [1]; this precipitated concerns that it may lead to reduced willingness to be
87 vaccinated or to have a second dose [17].

88

89 We conducted a survey in early 2021, using probability sampling, to examine public views on
90 COVID-19 vaccination and consider the implications for communications. During this period most
91 people aged over 80 had been invited to have a vaccine and invitations were being extended to
92 those aged over 70, with other age groups advised they would be invited in the coming months.

93

94 **2. Methods**

95 We administered a cross-sectional survey with adults (aged 18+) in Great Britain (GB) in January
96 and February 2021. This paper follows the STROBE Statement for reporting cross-sectional studies
97 (see checklist in Supplementary Material).

98

99 **2.1 Questionnaire development and testing**

100 The questionnaire was informed by a review of studies on public attitudes towards and experiences
101 of vaccines and COVID-19. Existing measures were adapted [5,18,19] and new questions
102 developed.

103

104 The questionnaire was cognitively tested to ensure understandability [20]. Interviews were
105 conducted with 20 individuals with a mix of genders, ages, parental status, likelihood of accepting a
106 COVID-19 vaccination, and experiences of shielding. The questionnaire was subsequently revised
107 based on these interviews. Final revisions reflected changes in the UK's vaccine rollout. The
108 questionnaire covered: vaccine acceptance, trust in vaccine information sources, perception of
109 priority groups, COVID-19 status, and perceived importance of a second dose.

110

111

112 **2.2 Sample and data collection**

113 The survey was administered to the probability-based NatCen Panel [21], recruited from the 2018,
114 2019, and 2020 waves of the British Social Attitudes survey, with participants randomly selected
115 from England, Wales and Scotland. Data were collected through online and telephone interviews
116 (conducted January 14th to February 7th 2021). Panellists were sent reminders and offered a small
117 financial sum in recognition of their contribution. Among 5,931 panellists invited, the survey
118 response rate was 84%, with 4,978 completing it (4,776 online, 202 by telephone). Supplementary
119 Material, Table S1 details overall response rate, accounting for non-response at the panel
120 recruitment stage and panel attrition. Data were weighted for non-response and to be representative
121 of the GB adult population.

122

123 **2.3 Measures**

124 *Sociodemographic and other characteristics*

125 Data on age, gender, ethnicity, education, country, urban/rural status, and financial status were
126 obtained from existing information on NatCen panellists. Full details of sub-groups of each variable
127 are provided in Tables 1 and 2. Age was categorised into bands from 18-29 years then ten-year
128 bands up to 80+. Self-assigned ethnicity was recorded in six categories, and education in five
129 categories according to highest qualification. As indices of multiple deprivation were not available,
130 self-reported financial status was used. COVID-19 status was derived from two items: 1) "*Have you*
131 *officially been diagnosed with the coronavirus (COVID-19)?*" (yes/no/don't know); those answering
132 other than 'yes' were asked: 2) "*Do you think you have ever had the coronavirus (COVID-19)?*"
133 (yes-definitely/yes-probably/no-probably not/no-definitely not/don't know).

134

135 *Vaccine measures*

136 Vaccine acceptance was derived from five items: 1) "*Have you been offered a vaccine for COVID-*
137 *19?*" (yes/no). Those answering 'yes' were asked: 2) "*And have you had that vaccine?*" (yes/no).
138 Participants who had been offered but not yet had the vaccine were then asked: 3) "*And do you*
139 *intend to have that vaccine?*" (yes/no/not sure). Participants who had not yet been offered the

140 vaccine were asked: 4) “*Would you accept the vaccine for yourself if it is offered to you?*”
141 (*yes/no/not sure*). Those answering ‘*not sure*’ were asked: 5) “*If you had to choose, if a COVID-19*
142 *vaccine became publicly available and you were offered it, would you accept the vaccine for*
143 *yourself?*” (*yes/no/I’m really not sure*). Participants were classed as: ‘Accepted/accepting’ if they
144 answered ‘yes’ to any of items 2, 3, 4, or 5; ‘Uncertain’ if they answered ‘*not sure*’ to item 3 or ‘*I’m*
145 *really not sure*’ to item 5; and ‘Refused/refusing’ if they answered ‘no’ to items 3, 4, or 5.

146 Trust in information sources was assessed for 13 sources: “*To what extent, if at all, would you trust*
147 *information about a COVID-19 vaccine from each of the following sources?*” (see Table 3):
148 *completely* (1); *a great deal* (2); *somewhat* (3); *very little* (4); *not at all* (5).

149

150 Perceptions of vaccine priority groups were assessed across 11 groups (see Table 4): “*Below are*
151 *some groups that some people say should be the first to be offered a COVID-19 vaccine. For each*
152 *one, how high a priority do you think it is that they get a COVID-19 vaccine, or do you not think they*
153 *should be offered the vaccine at all?*”: 1 ‘*One of the first*’, 5 ‘*One of the last*’, with an additional
154 option “*They should not be offered a vaccine*”.

155

156 Perceived importance of receiving the second dose of the vaccine was assessed with: “*How*
157 *important, if at all, do you think it is for people to get the second injection of the COVID-19*
158 *vaccine?*”: *very important* (1); *fairly important* (2); *not very important* (3); *not at all important* (4).

159

160 **2.4 Data analysis**

161 Descriptive data, including bivariate analyses, were weighted to be representative of British adult
162 population. Initial bivariate analyses, using chi-square tests, examined correlates of vaccine
163 acceptance and trust in sources of information about COVID-19 vaccination. Multivariate logistic
164 regression was conducted to examine differences in vaccine acceptance controlling for socio-
165 demographic variables, vaccine offer, and COVID-19 status. The dependent variable dichotomised
166 those classed as *accepted/intending to accept* vs *uncertain/refused/intend to refuse*. Age was
167 entered as a categorical variable and the ‘difference’ contrast within SPSS logistic regression was

168 used to test influence of each increasing age group, relative to younger ages (e.g. 30-39 vs 18-29;
169 80+ vs 18-79) (see Table 2). Sociodemographic variation in trust in information sources was
170 examined using multivariate logistic regressions. For each information source, the dependent
171 variable dichotomised the 5-point scale into trusting *completely or a great deal vs somewhat/very*
172 *little/not at all*. Cases were excluded from the logistic regressions if they had missing data on the
173 dependent or any independent variables. All logistic regressions were conducted on unweighted
174 data as sociodemographic variables were included as control variables. For each information
175 source, logistic regression analysis examined likelihood of trust (completely/a great deal v
176 somewhat/very little/not at all) by sociodemographic characteristics (Supplementary Material, Tables
177 S2-S14). Data were analysed using SPSS v27.

178

179 **3. Findings**

180 **3.1 Sample characteristics**

181 The weighted sample comprised adults aged 18 and over (see Table 1). Over half (52%) were
182 female and 81% were White British. Around two-thirds reported 'living comfortably'/'doing alright',
183 while one in ten rated their financial status as 'quite' or 'very difficult'. Just over two-fifths were
184 educated to degree level or above, while for almost a quarter their highest qualification was A level
185 or equivalent. A minority (12%) had no qualifications. A minority indicated having been diagnosed
186 with COVID-19 (6%); nearly two-thirds thought they probably or definitely had not had COVID-19;
187 11% were unsure.

188

189 **3.2 Vaccine offer and acceptance**

190 At the time of the survey, 14% (n=716) had been offered the vaccine. Of these, 92% (n=658) had
191 accepted or intended to, 4% (n=29) were uncertain, and 4% (n=29) had refused or intended to
192 refuse.

193

194 Among those not yet offered the vaccine, 82% (n=3479) intended to accept, while 11% (n=471)
195 were uncertain and 7% (n=311) indicated they would refuse. Overall, the acceptance level was 83%
196 (n=4137), with 10% (n=502) uncertain and 7% (n=340) refusing.

197

198 Multivariate logistic regression, with vaccine acceptance as the outcome variable
199 (accepted/accepting v refused/refusing/uncertain), indicated likelihood of acceptance increased with
200 age (Table 2). For example, those aged 40-49 were more likely than 18-39-year-olds to indicate
201 acceptance (AOR=1.43, 95%CI (1.12, 1.83, p=0.004) as were 70-79-year-olds compared with 18-
202 69-year-olds (AOR=3.31, 95%CI (2.22, 4.95), p<0.001). Acceptance was also positively associated
203 with education. Those with at least a degree were three times as likely to indicate acceptance
204 (AOR=3.03, 95%CI (2.17, 4.23), p<0.001) and those educated to A level or equivalent nearly twice
205 as likely (AOR=1.80, 95%CI (1.27, 2.55), p<0.001), compared with people without qualifications.
206 Lower acceptance was also associated with financial hardship and ethnicity. For example,
207 compared with those 'living comfortably', people 'finding it very difficult' were much less likely to
208 accept the vaccine (AOR=0.35, 95%CI (0.22, 0.55), p<0.001). Compared with White British
209 participants, those from other ethnic groups were less likely to accept the vaccine. Black/Black
210 British participants had the lowest likelihood of accepting (AOR=0.25, 95%CI (0.14, 0.43), p<0.001).
211 This is illustrated in the descriptive data too, with 87% of White British participants indicating vaccine
212 acceptance compared with 58% among Black/Black British, 61% among mixed/multiple ethnic
213 groups and 61% among Asian/Asian British.

214

215 After controlling for demographic variables, vaccine acceptance was positively associated with
216 having been invited for vaccination (AOR=1.73, 95%CI (1.24, 2.43), p=0.001), but negatively
217 associated with COVID-19 status. Compared with those who had 'probably not' or 'definitely not'
218 had COVID-19, those who thought they had 'definitely' or 'probably' had COVID-19 were less likely
219 to indicate acceptance (AOR = 0.40, 95%CI (0.26, 0.60), p<0.001 and AOR=0.71, 95%CI (0.56,
220 0.91), p=0.006 respectively). Confirmed diagnosis with COVID-19 was not significantly associated
221 with vaccine acceptance, after controlling for demographic variables.

222

223 **3.3 Trust in information sources**

224 The three most trusted information sources were: the NHS; doctors/nurses/other healthcare
225 professionals; and scientific and medical advisers. These groups were trusted 'completely/a great
226 deal' by around 80% of participants (Table 3). Only 44% trusted the UK government 'completely/a
227 great deal'. The three least trusted sources were celebrities and social media influencers, social
228 media, and faith or community leaders; around two-thirds indicated they would have no trust in
229 each. A majority (61%) indicated they had very little/no trust in the media (e.g.
230 newspapers/magazines/television/radio).

231

232 Trust did not differ by gender except for drug companies and the WHO, with females more likely to
233 indicate trust in these sources (Tables S5 and S9 respectively).

234

235 Trust was higher among older participants for five sources (doctors/nurses/other healthcare
236 professionals, NHS, UK government, media, and family/friends; Tables S2, S4, S6, S10, S13). For
237 example, trust in the UK government was higher among those aged 50-59 than 18-49-year-olds
238 (Table S6).

239

240 Trust varied by education. Compared with those without qualifications, other participants were more
241 likely to trust five sources (doctors/nurses/other healthcare professionals, pharmacists, NHS,
242 scientists, WHO; Tables S2-S4, S8, S9) and less likely to trust another five (drug companies, media,
243 social media, celebrities/social media influencers, family/friends; Tables S5, S10-S13). Compared
244 with those 'living comfortably' participants in more difficult financial situations were less likely to trust
245 the seven sources most closely aligned with scientific or clinical expertise (doctors/nurses/other
246 healthcare professionals, pharmacists, NHS, drug companies, UK government, scientists, WHO;
247 Tables S2-S6, S8, S9). Similarly, participants from minority ethnic groups were less likely to trust
248 scientific or clinical sources than White British participants (Tables S2-S4, S8, S9). Whilst lack of
249 trust in faith or community leaders was low overall, Asian/Asian British participants were more likely

250 than White British to trust faith/community leaders (AOR=4.82, 95%CI (2.76, 8.42), p<0.001) as
251 were Black/Black British participants (AOR=4.52, 95%CI (2.04, 9.99), p<0.001).

252

253 **3.4 Views on prioritisation**

254 Nine in ten participants rated healthcare professionals as highest priority for vaccination. Over 70%
255 indicated those with serious health conditions/heightened vulnerability to COVID-19, care home
256 workers and residents, and over 80s should be 'one of the first' to be vaccinated (Table 4). Priority
257 was also given to social care workers, schoolteachers, and those directly working with the public.
258 Over a third considered each of these groups should be 'one of the first' to be vaccinated, and 70%
259 or more rated them in the top two priority levels. People aged under 18 were rated as lowest priority,
260 and 6% considered the vaccine should not be offered to this group.

261

262 **3.5 Importance of second dose**

263 Nearly all participants (96%, n=4,761) considered it 'very' or 'fairly important' to receive the second
264 vaccine dose. This increased to 99% (n=4,096) amongst those who intended to accept the vaccine.

265

266 **4. Discussion**

267 **4.1 Principal findings**

268 Overall, acceptance was high, with 83% having received or intending to have the vaccine.
269 While this suggests acceptance will be high in future vaccination programmes, it may change if
270 perceived vulnerability to or severity of infection, vaccine efficacy, or side-effects alters. Acceptance
271 increased with age and education, and if invited for vaccination. It decreased with financial hardship,
272 and among non-White British ethnicities and those with unconfirmed past COVID-19. Clinical and
273 scientific information was most trusted, with sociodemographic differences for different sources.
274 Policy on a second dose and vaccination priority groups [1] was supported.

275

276 **4.2 Comparison with other studies**

277 We confirmed lower acceptance in younger groups [6-8,10,11]; acceptance was higher if invited for
278 vaccination, a finding observed in other populations [22]. Confirmation of lower acceptance in non-
279 White British ethnicities [5,6,9,23] is concerning given increased risk of infection and poorer
280 outcomes [24]. We confirmed lower acceptance in those with lower educational attainment and
281 greater financial hardship [6,8-10,12,25], leaving these groups at risk of infection and increasing
282 likelihood of emergence of variants [26].

283

284 Those with unconfirmed but suspected COVID-19 had lower acceptance. This suggests infection is
285 thought to confer immunity, or recovery fosters a perception of decreased severity. However, past
286 infection does not guarantee protection and people may still be infectious [27,28]. Messaging should
287 target those with prior infection.

288

289 There are other implications for communications. While high acceptance suggests communications
290 are effective, identifying barriers in hesitant groups is a priority for developing interventions [3, 15,
291 18, 29]. Trusted information sources are needed. The most trusted were the NHS, healthcare
292 professionals, and scientific and medical advisers. This suggests that healthcare professionals have
293 a central role in promoting vaccination in initiatives and during consultations. That government and
294 media are less trusted has implications for acceptance [7,8,25,30]. Without sophisticated tailoring
295 and evaluation, social media and celebrities may fail to promote vaccination; initiatives using ethnic
296 minority celebrities and opinion leaders show promise [16].

297

298 Differences in trust varied by socio-demographics. Compared with White British participants, other
299 ethnicities had lower trust in healthcare and scientific sources. Although trust in faith/community
300 leaders was low, it was higher in Asian and Black British participants, suggesting a role for these
301 leaders [15]. Those with lower educational attainment or financial hardship had lower trust in
302 healthcare and scientific sources. Those with no qualifications had higher trust in media and

303 family/friends. This suggests a need for a mix of sources for these groups. Mainstream media may
304 have a role to play, despite lower trust [25].

305

306 Reassuringly for further campaigns, prioritisation was considered acceptable and there was support
307 for additional prioritisation of schoolteachers and others in direct contact with the public. As planning
308 begins for further vaccination, careful communication regarding prioritisation should continue. We
309 found high support for a second dose, suggesting the UK's decision to extend the period between
310 doses has not dented public confidence.

311

312 **4.3 Strengths and limitations**

313 Strengths include the large probability-based nationally representative sample, ability to analyse by
314 ethnicity and surveying during vaccine roll-out. Our findings can be generalised to GB's adult
315 population, however global contexts for COVID-19 and vaccination vary. Although not generalisable
316 to them, the findings are still informative for other countries. The study has limitations. As it is cross-
317 sectional, we cannot infer causality; although we included variables likely to be important in vaccine
318 acceptance, these results are exploratory. Our qualitative studies will deepen understanding of
319 associations. A survey repeated when COVID-19 cases and deaths are low, and without lockdown,
320 might yield different responses. We did not survey individuals who are institutionalised (e.g.
321 prisoners), notably difficult to reach (e.g. homeless), or those not speaking English (therefore, our
322 ethnic minority sample may underrepresent certain views); specific surveys are needed for these
323 groups. We investigated vaccination intention. Actual uptake may be lower, although it is likely that
324 factors associated with intention will influence uptake.

325

326 **5. Conclusions**

327 COVID-19 vaccination acceptance is high in GB. Targeted engagement is needed to address
328 hesitancy in non-White British ethnic groups, those with lower education, those younger, those with
329 greater financial hardship and those with unconfirmed but suspected past infection. Healthcare

330 professionals and scientific advisors should lead communications and tailoring is needed. Work is
331 needed to rebuild trust in government information. There is high support for having the second
332 vaccine dose. Views of vaccine prioritisation are mostly consistent with UK official policy but there
333 was support for prioritising additional groups and careful communication around vaccination
334 prioritisation should continue.

335

336

337

Table 1 Sample characteristics

	Unweighted		Weighted	
	n	%	n	%
Age				
18-29	464	9.4%	824	16.7%
30-39	772	15.6%	852	17.3%
40-49	848	17.1%	806	16.3%
50-59	904	18.3%	867	17.6%
60-69	1011	20.4%	711	14.4%
70-79	773	15.6%	657	13.3%
80+	178	3.6%	218	4.4%
Gender				
Male	2136	42.9%	2402	48.3%
Female	2830	56.9%	2567	51.6%
Other	10	0.2%	7	0.1%
Ethnicity				
White British	4261	86.3%	3999	81.2%
Any other White background	319	6.5%	335	6.8%
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	64	1.3%	100	2.0%
Asian or Asian British	164	3.3%	306	6.2%
Black or Black British	67	1.4%	101	2.1%
Other	62	1.3%	81	1.6%
Country				
England	4369	87.9%	4291	86.3%
Scotland	390	7.8%	442	8.9%
Wales	212	4.3%	237	4.8%
Urban/rural status[#]				
Urban	3789	76.2%	4006	80.6%
Rural	1182	23.8%	965	19.4%
Highest educational qualification				
Degree or equivalent, and above	2503	50.4%	2077	41.8%
A levels or vocational level 3 or equivalent and above, but below degree	1005	20.2%	1131	22.8%
Other qualifications below A levels or vocational level 3 or equivalent	788	15.9%	838	16.9%
Other qualification	256	5.2%	304	6.1%
No qualifications	416	8.4%	618	12.4%
Subjective Financial Status				
Living comfortably	1552	31.2%	1289	26.0%
Doing alright	2028	40.8%	2035	40.9%
Just about getting by	975	19.6%	1132	22.8%
Finding it quite difficult	271	5.5%	337	6.8%
Finding it very difficult	142	2.9%	175	3.5%
COVID-19 Status				
Diagnosed with COVID-19	241	4.8%	294	5.9%

Think definitely had COVID-19	140	2.8%	172	3.5%
Think probably had COVID-19	710	14.3%	755	15.2%
Think probably not had COVID-19	1945	39.1%	1880	37.8%
Think definitely not had COVID-19	1393	28.0%	1305	26.2%
Don't know if had COVID-19	547	11.0%	566	11.4%

England and Wales, based on Office for National Statistics (ONS) definition of urban as population greater than 10,000. Scotland based on Scottish Government definition of urban as population greater than 3,000.

Table 2 Association between vaccine acceptance and sociodemographic variables – (a) bivariate results and (b) multivariate logistic regression

	(a) Bivariate associations between vaccine acceptance and socio-demographics				(b) Logistic regression of vaccine acceptance				
	n	%	χ^2 (df)	P	N	AOR*	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper	P
Gender			2.154 (2)	.341					0.085
Male	2012	83.8			2097	ref			
Female	2117	82.5			2788	0.82	0.67	0.99	0.036
Other	5	71.4			9	0.47	0.09	2.45	0.369
Age			274.733 (6)	<.001					<.001
18-29	613	74.4			459	ref			
30-39 v 18-29	618	72.5			761	0.89	0.66	1.20	.448
40-49 v 18-39	640	79.3			835	1.43	1.12	1.83	.004
50-59 v 18-49	745	85.9			896	1.92	1.49	2.46	<.001
60-69 v 18-59	659	92.7			1003	3.21	2.37	4.34	<.001
70-79 v 18-69	629	95.7			763	3.31	2.22	4.95	<.001
80+ v 18-79	209	95.9			177	2.19	0.92	5.21	.078
Education/Highest qualification			56.056 (4)	<.001					<.001
No qualifications	495	80.1			411	ref			
Degree or equivalent and above	1811	87.2			2454	3.03	2.17	4.23	<.001
A levels / Vocational level 3 or equivalent	909	80.4			990	1.80	1.27	2.55	<.001
Other qual'ns below A level / Voc level 3	694	82.7			784	1.50	1.05	2.15	.026
Other qualification	223	73.4			255	0.90	0.58	1.39	.632
Financial Status			168.660 (4)	<.001					<.001
Living comfortably	1162	90.1			1533	ref			
Doing alright	1749	86.0			1998	0.89	0.69	1.15	.383
Just about getting by	848	74.9			959	0.52	0.39	0.69	<.001
Finding it quite difficult	261	77.2			266	0.74	0.50	1.10	.139
Finding it very difficult	111	63.4			138	0.35	0.22	0.55	<.001
Country			3.171 (2)	.205					.326
England	3581	83.5			4302	ref			
Scotland	356	80.5			384	0.82	0.59	1.13	.220
Wales	192	81.0			208	0.80	0.51	1.26	.345
Urban/rural			34.517 (1)	<.001					<.001
Urban	3266	81.5			3729	ref			
Rural	863	89.4			1165	1.28	1.00	1.65	.051
Ethnicity			246.434 (5)	<.001					<.001
White British	3482	87.1			4226	ref			
Any other white background	254	75.8			318	0.55	0.40	0.76	<.001
Mixed or multiple ethnic groups	62	61.4			62	0.39	0.21	0.71	.002
Asian or Asian British	188	61.4			161	0.41	0.28	0.61	<.001
Black or Black British	59	58.4			67	0.25	0.14	0.43	<.001
Other	59	72.8			60	0.42	0.23	0.79	.007
Whether been offered vaccine			45.924 (1)	<.001					<.001
No	3479	81.6			4227	ref			
Yes	658	91.9			667	1.73	1.24	2.43	.001
COVID-19 Status			72.865 (4)	<.001					<.001
Think probably or definitely <u>not</u> had COVID-19	2741	86.1			3288	ref			

Diagnosed with COVID-19	218	74.4	240	0.89	0.60	1.33	.575
Think definitely had COVID-19	118	68.2	140	0.40	0.26	0.60	<.001
Think probably had COVID-19	598	79.1	691	0.71	0.56	0.91	.006
Don't Know if had COVID-19	462	81.5	535	0.73	0.55	0.97	.031

Hosmer & Lemeshow $\chi^2= 7.444$, df=8, p=0.490.
 Final model $\chi^2=497.429$, df=29, p<0.001
 Nagelkerke = 0.184
 Cases correctly classified: 88.1%.
 84 cases excluded due to missing data on one or more independent variables.

* adjusted for all other variables in the model, AOR, adjusted odds ratio; ref, reference category; 95%CI, 95% confidence interval

Table 3 Trust in potential sources of information on COVID-19 vaccine

Source:	Level of Trust (trust completely [1]...not at all [5])										Mean	Std Dev
	Completely (1)		A great deal (2)		Somewhat (3)		Very little (4)		Not at all (5)			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
The NHS	2084	41.9%	1902	38.3%	701	14.1%	155	3.1%	127	2.5%	1.86	0.95
Doctors, nurses or other healthcare professionals	1918	38.6%	2092	42.1%	714	14.4%	154	3.1%	90	1.8%	1.87	0.90
Scientific and medical advisers	1798	36.2%	2101	42.3%	792	15.9%	160	3.2%	121	2.4%	1.94	0.93
The World Health Organisation (WHO)	1313	26.4%	2016	40.6%	1070	21.6%	310	6.2%	256	5.1%	2.23	1.07
Pharmacists	999	20.1%	1973	39.7%	1434	28.8%	341	6.9%	226	4.5%	2.36	1.02
The UK Government	654	13.2%	1542	31.1%	1739	35.1%	614	12.4%	402	8.1%	2.71	1.10
Scottish Govt/Welsh Assembly ^a	118	17.4%	189	27.9%	207	30.5%	88	13.1%	75	11.1%	2.72	1.21
Drug companies who manufacture vaccines	406	8.2%	1064	21.4%	2065	41.6%	771	15.5%	661	13.3%	3.04	1.11
Family and friends	343	6.9%	876	17.6%	2230	44.9%	977	19.7%	542	10.9%	3.10	1.04
The media (e.g. newspapers, magazines, television, radio)	86	1.7%	302	6.1%	1567	31.5%	1433	28.9%	1580	31.8%	3.83	1.00
Faith or community leaders	131	2.6%	124	2.5%	619	12.5%	827	16.7%	3264	65.7%	4.40	0.98
Social media (e.g. Twitter, Facebook, Instagram etc)	65	1.3%	69	1.4%	506	10.2%	1267	25.5%	3056	61.6%	4.45	0.83
Celebrities and social media influencers	60	1.2%	71	1.4%	493	9.9%	1175	23.6%	3170	63.8%	4.47	0.82

Base: All participants (weighted). Missing cases range from n=3 to n=27. ^aBase: all participants in Scotland or Wales, n=679 (weighted). List order was randomised for each participant.

Table 4 Views on priority groups for vaccination: who should be first and last groups vaccinated

	Priority of being offered ^a													
	Should not be offered		One of the first (1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		One of the last (5)		Mean ^b	Std Dev
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Doctors, nurses and other healthcare professionals	33	0.7%	4472	90.0%	280	5.6%	83	1.7%	15	0.3%	83	1.7%	1.17	0.63
People with serious health conditions which mean they are vulnerable to COVID-19	35	0.7%	4017	80.9%	671	13.5%	129	2.6%	35	0.7%	77	1.6%	1.27	0.69
Care home workers	36	0.7%	3926	79.0%	683	13.8%	197	4.0%	58	1.2%	66	1.3%	1.31	0.72
Residents in a care home	47	0.9%	3593	72.4%	734	14.8%	337	6.8%	123	2.5%	131	2.6%	1.47	0.93
People aged 80 or over	49	1.0%	3613	72.9%	706	14.2%	304	6.1%	118	2.4%	168	3.4%	1.48	0.96
Social care workers	33	0.7%	2683	54.0%	1348	27.2%	683	13.8%	143	2.9%	75	1.5%	1.70	0.92
Schoolteachers	47	0.9%	2098	42.2%	1621	32.6%	886	17.8%	223	4.5%	94	1.9%	1.90	0.97
People with jobs that involve direct contact with members of the public	45	0.9%	1864	37.5%	1603	32.3%	1157	23.3%	228	4.6%	70	1.4%	1.99	0.96
People aged 31-50	43	0.9%	154	3.1%	614	12.4%	2096	42.2%	1486	30.0%	568	11.4%	3.35	0.95
People aged 18-30	102	2.0%	123	2.5%	289	5.8%	943	19.0%	1375	27.7%	2130	42.9%	4.05	1.05
People aged under 18	282	5.7%	148	3.0%	253	5.1%	657	13.3%	831	16.8%	2788	56.2%	4.25	1.08

Base: All participants (weighted). ^a Missing cases range from n=11 to n=21. ^b Excludes 'should not be offered', missing cases range from n=45 to n=301. List order was randomised for each participant.

Author contributions

MS, CJ, HB, KH, and AMM conceived the study, supported by AF, DE, and AM. MS, CJ, KA, HB, and AMM designed the questionnaire, supported by MU, AF, DE, AM, and KH. CJ and AMM acquired and analysed the data, which was interpreted by MS, CJ, HB, MU, KH and AMM. MS and AMM drafted the manuscript supported by CJ, HB, MU, and KH. KA, HB, MU, and KH critically revised the article, supported by MS, CJ, AF, DE, AM, and AMM. All authors read the final version of the manuscript and gave approval for it to be published. AMM, CJ, and MS had access to the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted. MS is the guarantor.

Data availability

After completion of the study, the survey dataset will be deposited in the UK Data Archive.

Ethical approval

The study received ethical approval from NatCen's Research Ethics Committee (ID P14307).

Participants gave informed consent before taking part.

Declaration of competing interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgments

We thank the questionnaire development and testing and survey and data delivery teams at NatGen for their work on the survey, and Professor Mark Petticrew at the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine for acting as adviser to the study.

Funding

This work was supported by a UK Research & Innovation (UKRI) Ideas to Address COVID-19 award [grant number ES/V012851/1]. UKRI had no role in study design; in the collection, analysis or interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; or in the decision to submit the article for publication. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of UKRI.

References

- 338 [1] UK Government Department of Health and Social Care. Joint Committee on Vaccination and
339 Immunisation: advice on priority groups for COVID-19 vaccination, 30 December 2020. Jan 6, 2021.
340 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/priority-groups-for-coronavirus-covid-19-vaccination-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/priority-groups-for-coronavirus-covid-19-vaccination-advice-from-the-jcvi-30-december-2020/joint-committee-on-vaccination-and-immunisation-advice-on-priority-groups-for-covid-19-vaccination-30-december-2020)
341 [advice-from-the-jcvi-30-december-2020/joint-committee-on-vaccination-and-immunisation-advice-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/priority-groups-for-coronavirus-covid-19-vaccination-advice-from-the-jcvi-30-december-2020/joint-committee-on-vaccination-and-immunisation-advice-on-priority-groups-for-covid-19-vaccination-30-december-2020)
342 [on-priority-groups-for-covid-19-vaccination-30-december-2020](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/priority-groups-for-coronavirus-covid-19-vaccination-advice-from-the-jcvi-30-december-2020/joint-committee-on-vaccination-and-immunisation-advice-on-priority-groups-for-covid-19-vaccination-30-december-2020).
- 343 [2] MacDonald NE, SAGE Working Group on Vaccine Hesitancy. Vaccine hesitancy: definition,
344 scope and determinants. *Vaccine* 2015;33:4161-4.
- 345 [3] Larson HJ, Jarrett C, Eckersberger E, Smith DMD, Paterson P. Understanding vaccine hesitancy
346 around vaccines and vaccination from a global perspective: a systematic review of published
347 literature, 2007-2012. *Vaccine* 2014;32:2150-9.
- 348 [4] Lane S, MacDonald NE, Marti M, Dumolard L. Vaccine hesitancy around the globe: analysis of
349 three years of WHO/UNICEF Joint Reporting Form data—2015–2017. *Vaccine* 2018;36:3861-7.
- 350 [5] Bell S, Clarke R, Mounier-Jack S, Walker JL, Paterson P. Parents' and guardians' views on the
351 acceptability of a future COVID-19 vaccine: A multi-methods study in England. *Vaccine*
352 2020;38:7789-98.
- 353 [6] Freeman D, Loe BS, Chadwick A, Vaccari C, Waite F, Rosebrock L, et al. COVID-19 vaccine
354 hesitancy in the UK: the Oxford coronavirus explanations, attitudes, and narratives survey (Oceans)
355 II. *Psychol Med* 2020; published online Dec 11. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0033291720005188>.
- 356 [7] Lazarus JV, Ratzan SC, Palayew A, Gostin LO, Larson HJ, Rabin K, et al. Extended data fig. 1:
357 'If a COVID-19 vaccine is proven safe and effective and is available, I will take it'. In: A global survey
358 of potential acceptance of a COVID-19 vaccine. *Nat Med* 2021;27:225-8.
359 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-1124-9>.
- 360 [8] Murphy J, Vallières F, Bentall RP, Shevlin M, McBride O, Hartman TK, et al. Psychological
361 characteristics associated with COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and resistance in Ireland and the
362 United Kingdom. *Nat Commun* 2021;12:29.

- 363 [9] Robertson E, Reeve KS, Niedzwiedz CL, Moore J, Blake M, Green M, et al. Predictors of
364 COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in the UK household longitudinal study. *Brain Behav Immun*
365 2021;94:41-50.
- 366 [10] Paul E, Steptoe A, Fancourt D. Attitudes towards vaccines and intention to vaccinate against
367 COVID-19: Implications for public health communications. *Lancet Reg Health Eur* 2021;1:100012.
368 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanepe.2020.100012>
- 369 [11] Sherman SM, Smith LE, Sim J, Amlôt R, Cutts M, Dasch H, et al. COVID-19 vaccination
370 intention in the UK: results from the COVID-19 Vaccination Acceptability Study (CoVAccS), a
371 nationally representative cross-sectional survey. *Hum Vaccin Immunother* 2020;26:1-10.
- 372 [12] Williams L, Flowers P, McLeod J, Young D, Rollins L. The Catalyst Project Team. Social
373 patterning and stability of intention to accept a COVID-19 vaccine in Scotland: will those most at risk
374 accept a vaccine? *Vaccines (Basel)* 2021;9:17.
- 375 [13] Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus (COVID-19) latest insights. Apr 16, 2021.
376 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/articles/coronaviruscovid19/latestinsights#vaccinations)
377 [/articles/coronaviruscovid19/latestinsights#vaccinations](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/articles/coronaviruscovid19/latestinsights#vaccinations).
- 378 [14] Mahase E. Covid-19: Booster vaccine to be rolled out in autumn as UK secures 60m more
379 Pfizer doses. *BMJ* 2021;373:n1116.
- 380 [15] Razai MS, Chaudhry UAR, Doerholt K, Bauld L, Majeed A. Covid-19 vaccination hesitancy.
381 *BMJ* 2021;373:n1138.
- 382 [16] Mohdin A. BAME groups urged to have Covid vaccine in UK TV ad campaign. *The Guardian*,
383 Feb 18, 2021. [https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/feb/18/bame-groups-urged-to-have-covid-](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/feb/18/bame-groups-urged-to-have-covid-vaccine-in-uk-tv-ad-campaign)
384 [vaccine-in-uk-tv-ad-campaign](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/feb/18/bame-groups-urged-to-have-covid-vaccine-in-uk-tv-ad-campaign).
- 385 [17] Sewell HF, Robertson JFR, Stewart M, Kendrick D, Bird SM. Revisiting the UK's strategy for
386 delaying the second dose of the Pfizer covid-19 vaccine. Jan 20, 2021.
387 [https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2021/01/20/revisiting-the-uks-strategy-for-delaying-the-second-dose-of-](https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2021/01/20/revisiting-the-uks-strategy-for-delaying-the-second-dose-of-the-pfizer-covid-19-vaccine/)
388 [the-pfizer-covid-19-vaccine/](https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2021/01/20/revisiting-the-uks-strategy-for-delaying-the-second-dose-of-the-pfizer-covid-19-vaccine/).
- 389 [18] World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe. Survey Tool and Guidance. Rapid,
390 simple, flexible behavioural insights on COVID-19. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe;

- 391 2020. [https://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/436705/COVID-19-survey-tool-and-](https://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/436705/COVID-19-survey-tool-and-guidance.pdf?ua=1)
392 [guidance.pdf?ua=1](https://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/436705/COVID-19-survey-tool-and-guidance.pdf?ua=1).
- 393 [19] Gallup. Ch 5 Attitudes to vaccines. In: Gallup. Wellcome Global Monitor. How does the world
394 feel about science and health? London: Wellcome Trust, 2019: 104-25.
395 <https://cms.wellcome.org/sites/default/files/wellcome-global-monitor-2018.pdf>.
- 396 [20] Collins D. Cognitive Interviewing Practice. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2014.
- 397 [21] Jessop C. The NatCen Panel: developing an open probability-based mixed-mode panel in
398 Great Britain. *Soc Res Pract* 2018;6:2-14. [https://the-](https://the-sra.org.uk/Common/Uploaded%20files/Social%20Research%20Practice%20Journal/social-research-practice-journal-issue-06-summer-2018.pdf)
399 [sra.org.uk/Common/Uploaded%20files/Social%20Research%20Practice%20Journal/social-](https://the-sra.org.uk/Common/Uploaded%20files/Social%20Research%20Practice%20Journal/social-research-practice-journal-issue-06-summer-2018.pdf)
400 [research-practice-journal-issue-06-summer-2018.pdf](https://the-sra.org.uk/Common/Uploaded%20files/Social%20Research%20Practice%20Journal/social-research-practice-journal-issue-06-summer-2018.pdf).
- 401 [22] Jacobson Vann JC, Jacobson RM, Coyne-Beasley T, Asafu-Adjei JK, Szilagyi PG. Patient
402 reminder and recall interventions to improve immunization rates. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*
403 2018;1:CD003941.
- 404 [23] Thorneloe R, Wilcockson H, Lamb M, Jordan CH, Arden M. Willingness to receive a COVID-19
405 vaccine among adults at high-risk of COVID-19: a UK-wide survey. *PsyArXiv* 2020; published online
406 Jul 20. <https://psyarxiv.com/fs9wk> (preprint).
- 407 [24] Mathur R, Rentsch CT, Morton CE, Hulme WJ, Schultze A, MacKenna B, et al. Ethnic
408 differences in SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19-related hospitalisation, intensive care unit
409 admission, and death in 17 million adults in England: an observational cohort study using the
410 OpenSAFELY platform. *Lancet*. 2021;397:1711-24.
- 411 [25] Allington D, McAndrew S, Moxham-Hall V, Duffy B. Coronavirus conspiracy suspicions, general
412 vaccine attitudes, trust and coronavirus information source as predictors of vaccine hesitancy
413 among UK residents during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Psychol Med* 2021; published online April 12.
414 <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0033291721001434>
- 415 [26] Sah P, Vilches TN, Moghadas SM, Fitzpatrick MC, Singer BH, Hotez PJ, et al. Accelerated
416 vaccine rollout is imperative to mitigate highly transmissible COVID-19 variants. *EClinicalMedicine*
417 2021;35:100865.

- 418 [27] Hansen CH, Michlmayr D, Gubbels SM, Mølbak K, Ethelberg S. Assessment of protection
419 against reinfection with SARS-CoV-2 among 4 million PCR-tested individuals in Denmark in 2020: a
420 population-level observational study. *Lancet* 2021;397:1204-12.
- 421 [28] Hall VJ, Foulkes S, Charlett A, Atti A, Monk EJM, Simmons R, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection
422 rates of antibody-positive compared with antibody-negative health-care workers in England: a large,
423 multicentre, prospective cohort study (SIREN). *Lancet* 2021;397:1459-69.
- 424 [29] Lockyer B, Islam S, Rahman A, Dickerson J, Pickett K, Sheldon T, et al. Understanding COVID-
425 19 misinformation and vaccine hesitancy in context: Findings from a qualitative study involving
426 citizens in Bradford, UK. *Health Expect* 2021; published online May 4.
427 <https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/hex.13240>
- 428 [30] Williams L, Gallant AJ, Rasmussen S, Brown Nicholls LA, Cogan N, et al. Towards intervention
429 development to increase the uptake of COVID-19 vaccination among those at high risk: Outlining
430 evidence-based and theoretically informed future intervention content. *Br J Health Psychol*
431 2020;25:1039-54.