

Attitudes Towards Coronavirus (COVID-19) Vaccine and Sources of Information Across Diverse Ethnic Groups in the UK: a Qualitative Study

Authorship and Affiliations

1. Eirwen Sides (Lead and Corresponding Author)
 - a. BSc, Research Assistant
 - b. Primary Care and Interventions Unit, Public Health England, Twyver House, Bruton Way, Gloucester, GL1 1PB
 - c. Eirwen.Sides@phe.gov.uk
 - d. Telephone/ fax: +442084953257
 - e. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9414-5037>
2. Leah Ffion Jones, PhD, Behavioural Science Team Leader, Behavioural Science and Insights Unit, Public Health England <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0448-3471>
3. Atiya Kamal, PhD, Senior Lecturer in Health Psychology, School of Social Sciences, Birmingham City University <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6651-6400>
4. Amy Thomas, MSc, Research Assistant, Primary Care and Interventions Unit, Public Health England <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2425-0699>
5. Rowshonara B Syeda, MSc, Research Assistant, Primary Care and Interventions Unit, Public Health England
6. Awatif Kaissi, MSc, Research Assistant, Primary Care and Interventions Unit, Public Health England
7. Donna M Lecky, PhD, Head of Unit, Primary Care and Interventions Unit, Public Health England <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1223-9356>
8. Mahendra G Patel, PhD FRPharmS FHEA, Alumni Fellow NICE, Honorary Visiting Professor, University of Bradford
9. Laura B Nellums, PhD, Assistant Professor in Global Health, Faculty of Medicine & Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2534-6951>
10. Jane Greenway, Health Practitioner, Public Health England
11. Ines Campos-Matos, Consultant Epidemiologist and Head of Inclusion Health, Public Health England <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6480-4310>
12. Rashmi Shukla, Director for Midlands and East Region, Public Health England
13. Colin Stewart Brown, Head of Healthcare Associated Infections and Antimicrobial Resistance Division, National Infection Service, Public Health England
14. Manish Pareek, Associate Clinical Professor in Infectious Diseases, Department of Respiratory Sciences, University of Leicester
15. Loretta Sollars, Head of Health Inequalities & Deputy Head Children, Young People and Families, Public Health England <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4751-029X>
16. Emma Pawson, Head of Regional Engagement and Strategy, Public Health England
17. Clíodna AM McNulty, FRCPathol, Head of Unit to December 2020, (now retired) Primary Care and Interventions Unit, Public Health England <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4969-5360>

Word Count

TBC

Key Words

Qualitative, minority ethnic, COVID-19, vaccine, SARS-CoV-2, coronavirus, attitudes

Abstract 291 words

Objectives

To explore attitudes and intentions towards COVID-19 vaccination, and influences and sources of information about COVID-19 across diverse ethnic groups (EGs) in the UK.

Design

Remote qualitative interviews and focus groups (FGs) conducted June-October 2020 before UK COVID-19 vaccine approval. Data were transcribed and analysed through inductive thematic analysis.

Setting

General public in the community across England and Wales.

Participants

100 participants from 19 self-identified EGs with spoken English or Punjabi.

Results

Mistrust and doubt were common themes across all EGs including white British and minority EGs, but more pronounced amongst Bangladeshi, Pakistani, Black ethnicities and Travellers. Many participants shared concerns about perceived lack of information about COVID-19 vaccine safety, efficacy and potential unknown adverse effects. Across EGs participants stated occupations with public contact, older adults and vulnerable groups should be prioritised for vaccination. Perceived risk, social influences, occupation, age, co-morbidities and engagement with healthcare influenced participants' intentions to accept vaccination once available; all Jewish FG participants intended to accept, while all Traveller FG participants indicated they probably would not.

Facilitators to COVID-19 vaccine uptake across all EGs included: desire to return to normality and protect health and wellbeing; perceived higher risk of infection; evidence of vaccine safety and efficacy; vaccine availability and accessibility.

COVID-19 information sources were influenced by social factors, culture and religion and included: friends, family; media and news outlets; and research literature. Participants across most different EGs were concerned about misinformation or had negative attitudes towards the media.

Conclusions

During vaccination programme roll-out, including boosters, commissioners and vaccine providers should provide accurate information, authentic community outreach, and use appropriate channels to disseminate information and counter misinformation. Adopting a context-specific approach to vaccine resources, interventions and policies and empowering communities has potential to increase trust in the programme.

Article summary: strengths and limitations

- This is amongst the largest qualitative studies on attitudes to the COVID-19 pandemic in the UK general public across ethnic groups (EGs), ages and religions, adding insights from a broader range of participants.
- Qualitative methodology enabled discussion of participants' responses around COVID-19 vaccination, probing to collect rich data to inform recommendations across EGs.
- Most data collection was undertaken in English, possibly excluding sectors of the population who may access COVID-19 information through different sources due to language.
- Data collection was June-October 2020 before COVID-19 vaccines were licensed. Attitudes are highly responsive to current information around a COVID-19 vaccine, as well as the state of the pandemic and perceived risk. Data were collected prior to much of the intervention work, putting the attitudes and intentions expressed in this study in a context of minimal community engagement and support. This provides a baseline snapshot of attitudes, providing the option to explore and assess the impact of such interventions.
- Socioeconomic data and index of multiple deprivation were not collected, limiting the ability to determine a possible accumulative effect of factors such as socioeconomic status, ethnicity and age.

Introduction 274 words

The coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic has had a striking impact on global health with five million reported deaths worldwide by December 2021[1]. The UK has seen more COVID-19 cases per capita than many other countries with over 13 million cumulative cases up to January 2022, over 172,000 deaths and much associated morbidity including 'long COVID-19'[2]. Increased COVID-19 morbidity and mortality have been associated with increasing age, gender, comorbidities, deprivation, occupations with greater face to face contact, and certain minority ethnic groups (EGs)[3-5]. Vaccination programmes are one of the key strategies used to limit the societal impact of infections[6] so vaccine acceptability and uptake is crucial to COVID-19 control[7]. Public vaccine safety concerns and doubts have contributed to reductions in uptake of non-COVID-19 vaccines which has led in increase in these infections[8, 9].

Modelling suggests 10,400 deaths and much long-term morbidity had been avoided by March 2021 through the English COVID-19 vaccination programme introduced in December 2020 [10]. Positive COVID-19 vaccine attitudes reportedly increased from 78% in December 2020 to 96% in May to June 2021[11, 12].

Evidence indicates there were differences in COVID-19 vaccine uptake based on demographic and socioeconomic factors. Black or Black British adults and those living in the most deprived areas were more likely to report COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy[11-14]. However, there is a lack of in-depth qualitative literature exploring attitudes towards the COVID-19 vaccine across a broad cross-section of the UK population with balanced representation of ethnicities, ages, genders and religions. This qualitative study aims to explore the general public's acceptability and uptake of a COVID-19 vaccine prior to its roll out and attitudes towards sources of COVID-19 information, with representation across EGs.

Methods 826 words

This paper forms part of a wider qualitative study that explored the attitudes, behaviours and needs of diverse EGs in Wales and England during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Focus group and interview topic guide development

The interview guide (Supplementary 1) was informed by Public Health England's (PHE) 2020 review of disparities in risks and outcomes for COVID-19[4] and the Theoretical Domains Framework (TDF)[15]. Eight of the fourteen TDF domains were mapped to the following topics explored in the interviews and FGs: knowledge, beliefs about consequences of COVID-19 infection and vaccination; optimism that a vaccine would help solve the pandemic (optimism); feelings about being offered a COVID-19 vaccine (emotion, memory, attention and decision-making); reasons for or against accepting a COVID-19 vaccine (intentions, reinforcement); influences on decision-making (memory, attention and decision making); groups to be prioritised (professional role and identity); and where to receive the vaccine if willing (environmental context and resources).

Recruitment

Individuals were recruited between June and October 2020 with the aim of selecting a diverse cross-section of the UK population across regions, including minority EGs, religions, and occupations. Ethnic minority varies by country and context and is defined as "a group of people who differ in race or colour or national, religious, or cultural origin from the majority population of the country in which they live"[16]. Around 80.5% of the population of Wales and England belongs to the White British EG[17]. Minority EGs include: Asian EGs 7.5% (including 2.5% Indian, 2.0% Pakistani, 0.8% Bangladeshi and 0.7% Chinese), Black EGs 3.3% (including 1.8% Black African and 1.1% Black Caribbean), Mixed/Multiple EGs (2.2%), White 4.4% other, White Irish (0.9%) White Traveller (0.1%) and other EGs (1.0%)[17].

Participants were recruited via a range of methods including: adverts posted on Facebook groups related to COVID-19 support for minority EGs; Twitter; PHE's People's Panel; charities who aim to empower and advocate for minority ethnic communities and improve their access to services); and snowball sampling, a method whereby existing study participants refer further participants[18]. The advert (Supplementary 2) requested individuals from diverse ethnic backgrounds, with a reasonable level of spoken English or Punjabi(South Asian language) to participate in 60-minute remote focus groups (FGs) about their experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic. Participants were offered a £25 contribution to thank them for their time.

Data Collection

Data were collected between 15 June–1 October 2020, prior to first Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) COVID-19 vaccine approval in the United Kingdom and start of the rollout of the vaccination programme in December 2020[19]. FGs were conducted in English and

3 interviews in Punjabi, all via Skype (some participants dialled in over the telephone and video function was optional). FGs were led by one researcher (LJ), supported by a research assistant (ES or RBS). Field notes made during the FGs by research assistants (RBS and ES) were reflected upon with the facilitator (LJ). Interviews in Punjabi were led by one researcher (AK). Only participants and researchers were present at data collection. During the data collection, the topic guide was used flexibly. Participants had the option to join FGs with or without video and discussions lasted approximately 60 minutes, were recorded, transcribed verbatim by an external agency, checked for accuracy by the research team and translated from Punjabi to English where necessary. Findings were discussed weekly by researchers and four times with the study steering group. Data collection stopped once it was agreed by the steering group that a range of ethnic and religious groups had been recruited and data saturation had been reached.

Data analysis

Transcripts were analysed inductively using thematic analysis in QSR NVivo[20] by three researchers (LJ, AK and ES). A fourth researcher (AT), double coded 12 of 27 transcripts to check consistency. A coding consensus was reached between the four researchers through meetings and discussions. Themes were identified from the data in two internal meetings, one halfway through analysis and another at the end of analysis. Themes were presented, discussed three times with the steering group and finalised in a steering group workshop. Representative quotes were chosen to demonstrate the themes.

Research Team

The research team, consisted of two researchers (LJ and AK), supported by four research assistants (ES, RBS, AT and AWK), led by two senior researchers DL and CAMM. Researchers and steering group included Arab, British Bangladeshi, British Pakistani, White British and White Irish EGs. The research team was advised by the steering group (including public and healthcare professional (HCP) representatives, MGP, LN, JG, ICM, RBS, CB, MP, LS, EP. Researchers and steering group members were experienced in qualitative research, behavioural science, intervention development, public health, health psychology, and minority ethnic health.

Patient and Public Involvement

A member of the public was involved in the study steering group from the conception of the study. They also inputted into the design and methodology, as well as data collection tools and recruitment strategy.

Ethics

The study was internally reviewed by the PHE Research Ethics and Governance Group (REGG) (Reference: NR0215). All participants involved in the study provided informed consent, including the use of anonymised transcript quotes in reporting and publications.

Results 1142

Initially data from different EGs were analysed separately, however as there were few differences between ethnicities, data are reported for all participants together. Any differences are highlighted.

Participant Characteristics

141 participants were approached, 100 of whom participated in the study. A total of 24 FGs were conducted in English and 3 interviews in Punjabi, all via Skype.

Participants represented a mix of self-reported ethnicities, ages, religions, genders and UK regions, as shown in Table 1, [Supplementary Material 3](#).

Table 1. Participant characteristics (n=100)

Self-reported ethnicity	%
Asian	58
Bangladeshi	16
Chinese	10
Indian	14
Pakistani	13
Asian (detail not given)	2
Sri Lankan	2
Vietnamese	1
Black	15
Black African	9
Black Caribbean	3
Black (detail not given)	2
Black British	1
Mixed	2
Indian/ Mauritian	2
White	20
White British	14
Traveller	4
Lithuanian	1
Polish	1
Other	5
Arab	2
Latin American	2
Unknown	1
<hr/>	
Religion	%
Buddhist	1
Christian	17
Hindu	7
Jewish	8
Muslim	33
None	17
Sikh	5
Unknown	12
<hr/>	
Gender	%
Female	49
Male	50
Unknown	1
<hr/>	
Age category	%
18-29	21
30-39	30
40-49	10
50-59	13
60-69	10
70-79	3

80+	2
Unknown	11
UK Region	%
East Midlands	12
London	21
N/A	4
North East	16
North West	6
South East	5
South West	8
Unknown	10
Wales	6
West Midlands	12

COVID-19 vaccination uptake

Three main themes were identified relating to vaccine uptake included: (1) attitudes and beliefs towards COVID-19 and a COVID-19 vaccine; (2) facilitators; and (3) barriers. Subthemes and relationship to the TDF[15] can be viewed in [Table 2](#).

Within all EGs participants stated mixed intentions about the likely future uptake of COVID-19 vaccine, ranging from full intention to vaccinate to no intention at all to vaccinate. All participants in the Jewish FG intended to accept a vaccine while all Traveller FG participants reported that they probably would not.

Attitudes and beliefs towards COVID-19 and a COVID-19 vaccine

Across EGs most people (even some of the vaccine hesitant) held similar beliefs on priority groups for vaccination, including occupations with public contact, older adults and vulnerable groups. Another view shared across EGs was that they would not want to be the first to have the vaccine due to concerns about vaccine safety, efficacy and unknown side effects. Beliefs and concerns about COVID-19 vaccine safety and efficacy were raised. One participant wanted reassurance that a vaccine had been trialled amongst ethnic minorities.

There were some differences of opinion on whether children should be prioritised; some thought children should be prioritised as they were carriers of the virus, while others raised concerns about possible unknown side effects on developing immune systems. More detailed findings by ethnic group are reported in [Table 3](#).

There were also differences within EGs, with factors such as frontline occupation and perceived health status influencing their intention to accept a vaccine once made available. Having a health condition led to higher risk perception while positive health status caused lower risk perception, thus influencing intention to accept a vaccine. There was a belief amongst some that alternative methods of prevention such as practicing good hygiene, maintaining a good diet and exercise, were equally, if not more, important to vaccination. Some believed that there were other ways to build immunity rather than vaccination or had a belief that vaccination was unnecessary due to their perception that they were healthy.

Some participants were optimistic that a working vaccine would become available while others were aware it might take time. Some believed a vaccine to be important and recognised its role in herd immunity.

Barriers to vaccination

Mistrust and doubt were common themes across EGs and many shared concerns about perceived lack of information about COVID-19 vaccine safety, efficacy and potential unknown adverse effects. Mistrust in government advice and recommendations were identified as the greatest potential barriers to vaccine acceptability. This was due to perceptions of the government's handling of the pandemic, perceived unclear messaging and frequently changing guidance at various stages of the pandemic which resulted in confusion. Disengagement with pharmaceuticals, medicine and healthcare services was a barrier to vaccine uptake which was mainly due to mistrust. Some participants raised concerns about their friends and family being susceptible to misinformation, for example that the vaccine included chemicals or microchips. A few participants had negative views around vaccination imposed by their relatives. A minority of participants stated that they would definitely not accept the vaccine, which was primarily due to being opposed to vaccines in general.

Facilitators for vaccination

There was general agreement across EGs on places to receive the vaccine, including community healthcare settings and settings perceived as low risk, e.g. a space with less people. Many participants stated that they would accept the vaccine either to enable return to normal life, to continue working, or to protect themselves and others due to existing health conditions. However, several of these participants stated that they would wait until others in the population received the vaccine first in order to observe potential side effects.

Table 2. COVID-19 vaccination uptake: attitudes, beliefs, facilitators and barriers

Subtheme (Relationship to Theoretical Domains Framework (TDF)[15])	Quote [Gender, Female (F), Male (M); Focus Group (FG)*]
Attitudes and beliefs towards COVID-19 and a COVID-19 vaccine	
Low degree of optimism that COVID-19 vaccine would become available while some were aware it might take time. (Optimism)	"I'm fairly optimistic that at the end we will have at least one viable vaccine." [M, FG3] "it's going to take a long time for a fully functional vaccine... To be available to everyone." [F, FG1]
Understanding of the importance of COVID-19 vaccine, belief it would become part of standard immunisations. (Environmental context)	"it would become part of whatever the standard practice of immunisation is for kids moving forward." [M, FG10]
Beliefs surrounding who should receive the vaccine: Would wait as perceived themselves to be healthy. Vulnerable people or older adults should be prioritised. Equal opportunity rather than prioritising minority EGs. Children. People should have the choice. (Beliefs about consequences; environmental context)	"I'm quite healthy so I'd hold back, I wouldn't go straight away." [M, FG14] "those people who were shielding and those people who have a higher chance of being affected by it, should get it first... So those people over 50 should get it first." [M, FG3] "there is no medical evidence [regarding minority EGs]...then I think we should be equal opportunity for everyone." [M, FG15] "there's something in children as well...they keep saying that children can be carriers..." [M, FG14] "As long as it's not mandatory to take the vaccine, which they never have been, you can always opt out. I have it because I want it." [M, FG20]
Belief that other health behaviours were equally, or more important. (Beliefs about consequences; environmental context)	"The key thing... is...managing your risk factors, asthma, diabetes, obesity, whatever, but importantly, making sure that we are being scrupulous with hand hygiene and wiping down our surfaces." [M, FG1]
Recognition of importance of clinical trials. (Role)	"we do need some people to test stuff, and I've done a few clinical trials in the past..." [M, FG10]
Would wait until others had tried the vaccine until accepting it themselves. (Beliefs about consequences).	"Unless my life is really, really at risk, I will wait a long time before I take that vaccine because I'm not really a fan of vaccines per se." [M, FG16]
Beliefs and concerns about vaccine safety and efficacy: Lack of minority ethnic participants in trials. Need more information. Ethical concerns about trials. Perception that development was rushed. Lowers risk perception and need for other measures. (Beliefs about consequences; knowledge, social influences).	"how do we know it's not going to cause cancer or something ... in 20 years' time." [Unknown, FG20] "...reassurance that any vaccines and trials have been completed on BAME individuals...health is set up with perhaps white British people in mind" [Unknown, FG2] "the first thing is...if its ingredients, like fat and other things, are allowed in Islam. Then, I will research to see how long it would keep me safe..." [F, Interview 3] "...they inject live vaccine to volunteers, to induce antibodies against the virus...is this ethical?" [M, FG19] "...everyone would get a vaccine and then just go around doing whatever they wanted to feeling like they were, there was no way anything bad was ever going to happen to them." [F, FG20]
Perception of health and risk meant that some may not accept a vaccine immediately: Perceived lower risk of infection. Perceived higher health status. Belief that accessing the vaccine would be a risk. (Beliefs about consequences).	"I work from my bedroom...I'm not really in contact with anyone else, so I won't be too fussed." [M, FG1] "I'm quite healthy so I'd hold back, I wouldn't go straight away." [M, FG19] "I just think that the body learns to fight things." [F, FG1] "I don't think I'd go to a hospital [to get a vaccine]...they wouldn't want to run the risk of putting me in the hospital because I'd be even more exposed to actually getting the illness." [M, FG1]
Belief that culture and religion influenced the attitudes of certain groups towards vaccines. (Social influences).	"...conspiracy theories from religious and cultural belief...surrounding this there is a lot of media work that needs to be done" [M, FG8]
Facilitators	
Desire to return to 'normality'. (Reinforcement).	"Without a vaccine, I think we're going to struggle to do these things that we enjoy..." [M, FG21]
Occupation influenced intentions of accepting a vaccine: Working with children. Feeling pressured into accepting as a healthcare worker. (Role and	"I will definitely take it [COVID-19 vaccine] because I would then feel more confident to work with the children in the school and be in close contact..." [F, FG1,] "...it's not about you it's about the people you might come into contact with, I was still kind of pressured into taking it" [M, FG22]

identity, environmental context).	
Protecting the health and wellbeing of themselves and others: Those with health conditions. Perception of risk attributed to a combination of factors e.g. age and ethnicity. (Reinforcement, belief about consequences).	<p>“...my wife, she had too many problems, and obviously I’m diabetic as well. I think I’d go for it.” [M, FG14, Indian]</p> <p>“...because of the age that I am and the fact that I’m of South Asian heritage, I won’t be comfortable ... until I’m confident that this vaccine is out...” [F, FG4]</p>
Evidence of vaccine safety and efficacy: Intention to accept if passed trials. If media demonstrated it to be effective. Confirmation of others receiving a vaccine. (Reinforcement, knowledge, belief about consequences, social influences).	<p>“...as long as it’s passed its trials, for me usually the vaccines don’t really <i>go ahead</i> until they’re at a good safety, got a good point in terms of safety and efficacy.” [M, FG9]</p> <p>“...if I, it’s on the media that this is really working and, then I’ll be so glad to have one, I don’t mind.” [M, FG14]</p> <p>“After a few people have confirmed, yeah, that is working. Yeah I’ll be glad to go in then.” [M, FG16]</p>
Environmental context and resources: Availability. Willingness to receive in any type of setting. Community healthcare settings. Perceived low risk setting e.g. a space with less people. Convenience of booking vaccination appointments. (Environmental context and resources).	<p>“my optimism about actually having that available within the next 18 months is quite low.” [F, FG8]</p> <p>“I have to take from GP or anything, if they make any <i>boat</i> or any station, in a field...I’m ready to go.” [M, FG15]</p> <p>“pharmacy’s quite a good place because then it could be more easily accessed, otherwise there’s a lot of pressure on the GP ...” [Female, FG1]</p> <p>“...where there are less people, there is more protection [from catching COVID-19] ...” [F, Interview 2]</p> <p>“surgery is near and there won’t be much hassle. [Just] book an appointment and go there.” [F, Interview 3]</p>
Some would encourage others to accept vaccine. (Role and identity).	“I would be generally positive and encourage my parents to get a vaccination as well” [M, FG9]
Barriers	
Low trust and doubt: Government advice on the safety of the vaccine. Changing, conflicting COVID-19 messaging. Belief that COVID-19 statistics had been exaggerated. Mistrust of pharmaceuticals or pharmaceutical companies. (Knowledge; Memory, attention, and decision processes, beliefs about consequences).	<p>“I wouldn’t take the government’s advice that it’s safe to do so straight away.” [F, FG4]</p> <p>“...You don’t know what [it] is, if anything you’re being told about it is true because everything changes so frequently. One minute the vaccine might be the best thing, the next minute it might not.” [F, FG24]</p> <p>“there’s a genuine belief that, in order to then push this vaccination through, for God knows what, it’s been escalated or it’s been, it, the numbers have been almost manipulated, yes...” [F, FG5]</p>
Concerned about spread of misinformation e.g. vaccine has a microchip to monitor people. (Knowledge; Memory, attention, and decision processes).	“Some people say they might have included some chemicals in the vaccine (laughs)...It’s like rumours circling around. I am not sure about it, because I have never got vaccinated.” [F, Interview 3]
Disengagement with medicine and healthcare services. (Environmental context and resources).	“you’d have to tie me down and strap me down to put a vaccine in me...I don’t do medicine, I don’t do doctors, I don’t do clinics anyway.” [F, FG24]
Family influences. (Social influences, memory, attention and decision processes).	<p>“my husband is completely anti vac so...I’d be in a bit of a difficult position to try and get my children vaccinated” [F, FG5]</p> <p>“elderly individuals...they have nothing to lose...I will ask or request my mother to have it, considering by balancing or weighing the risks and the advantages. But not for the young individuals, not for the children.” [M, FG10]</p>
Opposition to vaccines in general in a minority of participants. (Intentions)	“the flu vaccine, which has been out for years and has been tested, I wouldn’t get [it]” [F, FG24]

*FG Ethnicities: FG1-4, Mixed; FG4, South East Asian; FG5, Mixed; FG6, Pakistani; FG7, Chinese; FG8, Black ethnicities; FG9, Indian; FG10, Bangladeshi; FG11, European; FG12, Chinese; FG13, Arabic; FG14, Indian; FG15, Bangladeshi; FG16, Black ethnicities; FG17, Chinese; FG18, Indian; FG19, Pakistani; FG20, White British; FG21, Jewish; FG22, White British; FG23, Black African; FG24, Travellers; Interviews 1-3, Pakistani.

Attitudes and intentions by ethnic group

Caution and wariness to accept a COVID-19 vaccine, including concerns about vaccine safety was reported amongst all EGs including White and non-White groups. Although themes of mistrust and doubt arose across most EGs, they were more pronounced amongst the following: Bangladeshi (mistrust of government guidance surrounding vaccines); Pakistani (mistrust of COVID-19 vaccine due to government and Public Health England handling of pandemic); Black ethnicities and Travellers (mistrust of authorities, pharmaceuticals or pharmaceutical companies developing vaccines). Arabic and Traveller FG participants suggested that vaccines might not be necessary for those with a strong enough immune system. Some participants in all EGs indicated they probably would accept a vaccine once it became available. There were no other notable differences between EGs.

Table 3. COVID-19 vaccination attitudes and intentions by ethnic group

FG ethnicity	Finding	Quote [Gender, Female (F), Male (M), Focus Group (FG)]	
Arabic	Would wait until proven to be safe.	"if it's choice...I'm going to wait. But if it is proven that it's safe, there's no side effects...definitely." [F, FG13]	
	Belief that the vaccine would be less important for healthy people with strong immune systems.	"if they have strong immune system or they are, have like general good health, they would not expect it... [F, FG13]	
Bangladeshi	Contrasting views: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some happy to accept once made available. Some concerned and wary of vaccine safety. 	"I would accept straight away...but nothing is coming across my way." [M, FG15] "trials, it can take more than a year to do it, so I would never trust anything that's just come out in a couple of months' time." [F, FG10]	
	Belief that people should be given equal opportunity instead of prioritising minority EGs for vaccination.	"there is no medical evidence...then I think we should be equal opportunity for everyone." [M, FG15]	
	Mistrust of government guidance surrounding vaccines.	"I wouldn't take the government's advice that it's safe straight away." [F, FG4]	
	Intentions were mixed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some probably would accept once made available. Some probably would not accept e.g. due to being against vaccines in general. 	"I have the flu, the winter, the regular winter flu vaccine. I'd probably be up for having the COVID Corona virus one..." [F, FG8] "I will wait a long time before I take that vaccine...I'm not really fan of vaccines" [M, FG16]	
Black ethnicities	Belief that some vaccination conspiracies stemmed from religious and cultural views.	"the conspiracies particularly from religious point of view, so we need to do a lot of media corrections, a lot of publicity surrounding it and let people understand." [M, FG8]	
	Belief a vaccine would be tested in Africa.	"there was this report, I don't know how true it was, where the vaccines were coming out, they wanted to test them in Africa..." [M, FG16]	
	Mistrust of authorities and pharmaceutical companies developing vaccines.	"a lot of people distrust the authorities and the pharmaceutical companies and whatever...examples of when injections and things went wrong" [F, FG16]	
	Chinese	Cautious, wanted to wait.	"I probably wouldn't be the first one to take it...I don't want to be that human guinea pig..." [M, FG7]
Chinese	Would accept if proven to be safe and effective.	"whether it's been tested, and it works. I think that's the main thing..." [F, FG12]	
	Belief that family might not accept due to superstition.	"my family...they're fairly superstitious and they might not be happy to have a foreign injection..." [F, FG12]	
	Would accept if symptomatic or considered themselves high risk.	"I would only take it if I was in the high risk and if I had symptoms." [M, FG7]	
	Belief that the vaccine would enable return to 'normal' life.	"anything that would allow me to get back to some sort of normality" [M, FG14]	
	Happy to accept vaccine if it passed safety and efficacy trials.	"as long as it's passed its clinical trial and has a good safety profile" [M, FG9]	
	Would wait until more information on the virus and vaccine.	"later on when there is more information regarding the virus itself ... I will [accept the vaccine]" [F, FG9]	
	Would accept due to their health condition e.g. diabetes.	"I'm diabetic as well. So, I think I'd go for it." [M, FG14]	
Indian	Views on different groups to prioritise: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vulnerable groups. Belief that children could be prioritised as they can be carriers. Belief that children should not be prioritised as unknown side effects could impact their developing immune systems. 	"vulnerable should be given this vaccine first" [M, FG14] "they keep saying that children can be carriers, and I think there's an opportunity [to prioritise them for vaccination]" [M, FG14] "it takes two to 14 years they [children] can develop fully the immune system ... I think we are just basically playing a risky game" [M, FG9]	
	Did not feel a priority due to age and perceived good health.	"despite being an ethnic minority I'm quite young...I generally have quite good health" [F, FG9]	
	Jewish	All intended to accept a vaccine once available.	"as soon as there's a vaccine, providing it's credible, I'll have it." [M, FG21]

	Contrasting perceptions of the views of different Jewish sects on vaccination.	“protection of life is paramount, and overall religious groups are pro vaccination...” [F, FG21] “it is a fact that some religious groups will not have any vaccinations...” [M,FG21]
Pakistani	Reassurance of vaccine safety and benefits cited as a facilitator to uptake.	“the government should sort of start tackling [vaccine concerns] now...it’s for your benefit, it’s for your health” [Unknown, FG19]
	Cautious, wanted to wait.	“before we know enough about that [coronavirus], I wouldn’t feel comfortable enough with the vaccine...it would be a case of just waiting” [F, FG6]
	Awareness of misinformation circulating.	“Some people say they might have included some chemicals in the vaccine (laughs). I don’t know. It’s like rumours circling around.” [F, Interview 3]
	Mistrust of COVID-19 vaccine due to government or Public Health England handling of pandemic.	“the way they’ve managed this whole pandemic, my trust levels are exceptionally low.” [M, FG19]
Traveller	None intended to accept the vaccine.	“we would probably all agree that even if it was compulsory we would definitely not have it.” [F, FG24]
	Strong views against vaccination.	“you’d have to tie me down and strap me down to put a vaccine in me” [F, FG24]
	Belief that have strong enough immune systems due to lifestyle.	“we’re outside people...in mid-winter we’re outside chopping, lighting...” [M, FG24]
	Mistrust of pharmaceuticals.	“Don’t trust the pharmaceutical, what’s in it, and don’t need it.” [F, FG24]
White British	Contrasting views: • Caution and concern about vaccine safety. • Confidence in vaccine and would accept straight away.	“concerned about the long term unknown implications of having a vaccine” [F, FG20] “I completely have trust in these kind of things” [M, FG22]
White Eastern European	Belief that vaccination was not the only solution to the pandemic.	“I have a bit more faith in other sorts of alternatives that are not necessarily vaccines but things that work with our antibodies in other ways...” [M, FG11]
	Probably would accept the vaccine if proven to be safe.	“I haven’t quite made up my mind yet, but I think if it would be tested and shown to be effective and safe then I would be willing to take the vaccine...” [F, FG11]

*FG Ethnicities: FG1-4, Mixed; FG4, South East Asian; FG5, Mixed; FG6, Pakistani; FG7, Chinese; FG8, Black ethnicities; FG9, Indian; FG10, Bangladeshi; FG11, European; FG12, Chinese; FG13, Arabic; FG14, Indian; FG15, Bangladeshi; FG16, Black ethnicities; FG17, Chinese; FG18, Indian; FG19, Pakistani; FG20, White British; FG21, Jewish; FG22, White British; FG23, Black African; FG24, Travellers; Interviews 1-3, Pakistani.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.04.22270456>; this version posted February 6, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/).

Sources of COVID-19 information

Themes around COVID-19 information included: (1) sourcing information from friends, family and social media, media and news outlets and the research literature (2) concerns about misinformation; and (3) cultural and religious influences (Table 4).

Many participants across all EGs reported comparing stories with friends and family, often via WhatsApp and other social media channels. A number of participants stated that they received information from traditional UK media channels such as British Broadcasting Company (BBC) news and their websites. Some participants reported watching the BBC government daily COVID-19 briefings while others used websites to obtain information and reported that they were aware of the minority ethnic COVID-19 statistics through the news. A small number reported that some relatives obtained information through non-UK based news outlets (e.g. American and Asian), which may have promoted different information, behaviours, and attitudes.

In most focus groups or interviews across a range of EGs, one or more participants had negative attitudes towards the media. Such attitudes included a belief that media: had its own agenda; should present more balanced stories; caused confusion; gave inconsistent messaging, and participants reported wariness or uncertainty surrounding the credibility of the information. It was reported that media coverage had negative implications on the mental health and wellbeing of some participants, sometimes causing fear and distress.

A minority reported directly using government guidance. Some had public facing roles and they therefore followed the guidance from their workplace. A minority reported researching the topic themselves through research literature.

Concerns around misinformation were mentioned across all EGs. Some raised their concerns surrounding the spread of misinformation amongst their WhatsApp and social media networks, for example that the vaccine contained a microchip to monitor people. As a result, some reported taking on the role of dispelling misinformation circulating among friends and family, particularly for older family and community members.

Some cultural and religious sources of information were identified. A participant suggested that their parents believed in traditional remedies (Bangladeshi FG) while another reported obtaining information from the mosque (South East Asian FG).

Table 4. Sources of COVID-19 information

56247121-file00.14

Theme	Subtheme	Quote [Gender, Female (F), Male (M); Focus Group (FG) *]
Friends and family, social media	Family a source of information rather than media outlets.	"I have been hearing about it from my family, but as I don't have Sky, I have not been watching TV a lot, but I did hear about the number of cases in various countries each day." [F, Interview 2]
	People reported that negative WhatsApp messages spread rapidly amongst their networks.	"...So every time you had a WhatsApp in the morning, people were scared, who's passed away, and things like that. So I think that actually did not help. Too much negative WhatsApp calls going around, messages, and I said to people, try to stay positive..." [Unknown, FG18]
Media and news outlets	Traditional media a source of information e.g. news, BBC, newspaper.	"...at the end of the day like come to 5 to 6 o'clock, I just go onto the BBC news website and quickly just have a look at what's, what they've published..." [Unknown, FG2]
	Participants or their family watched news from non-UK based media outlets.	"...I mean most of the information I've had on it has come from America... I learnt first from listening to the American news and speaking to my cousin who works for the government in Washington..." [M, FG3]
	Government daily COVID-19 press conferences or briefings were a source of information.	"...because I have a degree in Applied Biology, I understood a lot of the briefings and how these things spread..." [Unknown, FG16]
	Websites such as BBC a source of information.	"...from websites mainly, like the BBC website, what's been on the internet...I don't really follow closely let's say, but it's, from time to time or when there is a major change..." [F, FG13]
	Awareness of the minority ethnic COVID-19 statistics through the news.	"...Then that started hitting the news, the headlines, I think that's when it started, how would I put it, that's when it started affecting a lot of people in our background..." [M, FG5]
	Perception that the media had its own agenda.	"...To me, you should be trying to find out, more informative for the public rather than their media outlets and to score points against the government and, that's how I saw it..." [M, FG18]
	Belief that the media should show more balanced stories.	"...They have to think of presenting a true reflection of what is happening. So good and bad, both..." [M, FG9]
	Media and news caused fear among some participants.	"...I was watching ITV this morning and it's like the arguments are still ongoing about all of the negative news that's out there, which is really scaremongering and really starting to affect people's mental health..." [F, FG20]
	Confusion at inconsistent messaging and policies.	"...Some of the things he told were confusing, but others were not. They did one thing wrong. Look they know that corona is spread [everywhere], [but] they opened the restaurants, introduced offers at restaurants. They should not have done that...People should be careful not to listen everything (laughs), like what the government is saying. You should be careful [and] think deeply." [F, Interview 3]
	Negative impact of inconsistent messaging on mental health.	"scary statement or maybe I've been targeted with this vaccination, whatever, it has got a mental health impact..." [M, FG23]
	Accessing guidance directly via government website.	"I don't watch TV, I don't watch the news, but I read in the gov.co.uk, so that's my resource, so that's the only place, I read the guidelines and stuff from there." [F, FG13]
Research literature	Seeking information on the COVID-19 vaccine and trials themselves.	"...I work in scientific research, and I work with clinicians who sort of organise things like clinical trials..." [M, FG22]
	Reading academic or scientific literature.	"I reviewed all the potential [COVID-19] treatment available..." [M, FG19]
Concerns about misinformation	Participants concerned about the spread of misinformation through WhatsApp and social media.	"The funeral one was massive because ... there was all these groups being started, different Facebook, WhatsApp type groups, talking about whatever and it was actually quite upsetting, I think to be honest, because I think people were somewhat misinformed..." [F, FG5]
	Taking on the role of dispelling misinformation amongst network.	"The amount of viral things that were going around in and amongst my extended family and friends and, I've just got this thing where I'm like, guys, it's fake news..." [F, FG5]
	Volunteering for a local community radio station to help dispel misinformation.	"I also sort of voluntarily basis, oversee a local community radio station...So getting those messages out was important, and try and dispel those conspiracy theories. It was quite difficult, but we eventually got there ..." [M, FG19]

	Use of websites to identify 'fake news'.	"...there are a few really good websites that tell you whether it's fake news or not, like reputable ..." [F, FG5]
Cultural and religious influences	Perception that some people believe in natural remedies.	"...I might tell them stuff and they would just be like, they will just talk about some kind of folk cures to take or drink and you'll be fine..." [M, FG10]
	Information from the mosque.	"I think we are doing everything OK now from our point of view, we've got the radio and the messages going on a regular basis. Also, from the Mosque and from community..." [Unknown, FG19]

*FG Ethnicities: FG1-4, Mixed; FG4, South East Asian; FG5, Mixed; FG6, Pakistani; FG7, Chinese; FG8, Black ethnicities; FG9, Indian; FG10, Bangladeshi; FG11, European; FG12, Chinese; FG13, Arabic; FG14, Indian; FG15, Bangladeshi; FG16, Black ethnicities; FG17, Chinese; FG18, Indian; FG19, Pakistani; FG20, White British; FG21, Jewish; FG22, White British; FG23, Black African; FG24, Travellers; Interviews 1-3, Pakistani.

Discussion 2069 words

Statement of principal findings

This study adds findings about COVID-19 vaccinations, some of which differ from attitudes towards other vaccinations. Mistrust and doubt surrounding COVID-19 vaccination were common themes that arose across white British and minority EGs but they were more pronounced in Bangladeshi, Pakistani, Black ethnicities and Travellers. Across EGs, many were cautious and shared concerns about COVID-19 vaccine safety and efficacy. There were differences within EGs, with factors such as occupation and perceived health status influencing their intention to accept a vaccine once made available. Attitudes and intentions sometimes differed between EGs, for example all participants in the Jewish FG reported that they probably would accept a vaccine while all participants in the Traveller FG probably would not accept one. Although many received their information from trusted sources such as mainstream television, many also reported negative attitudes towards the government, media and news outlets. **Table 5** provides an overview of practical intervention and policy recommendations based on the findings of this study.

Comparison with existing literature

Low trust in government advice and recommendations due to its perceived handling of the pandemic and changing COVID-19 messaging was identified as a potential barrier to vaccine acceptability and uptake in our study and others [21] [22]. The link between mistrust in a COVID-19 vaccine and mistrust in government was found to be more pronounced among some minority ethnic participants in a small qualitative study amongst UK HCPs, particularly Black African, Black Caribbean and other Black groups[23]. Such differences were observed to an extent in our study, where mistrust was reported in not only Black ethnicities (authorities and pharmaceutical companies developing vaccines), but Bangladeshi (mistrust of government guidance surrounding vaccines) and Pakistani (mistrust of COVID-19 vaccine due to government and Public Health England handling of pandemic) groups too. It is important to recognise that mistrust can stem from wider inequalities beyond COVID-19[23]. In our study, similar barriers and facilitators towards the COVID-19 vaccination were often reported across EGs. However, surveillance data demonstrates that COVID-19 vaccination rates in the UK and Israel were lowest amongst certain minority EGs[24] [25]. For UK healthcare workers between December 2020 and February 2021, studies found that some minority EGs were more likely to be COVID-19 vaccine hesitant in comparison to White British groups[13], and that COVID-19 vaccine uptake was lower amongst some ethnic minority groups compared to White[26]. In a US youth survey, Black participants were less likely and Asian participants more likely to accept a COVID-19 vaccine compared to White participants[27]. A UK survey found that certain demographic characteristics (age, sex, ethnicity, religion, qualifications, employment status, key worker, extremely clinically vulnerable, extremely clinical vulnerable household member) explained only 4% of the variance in vaccination intention, beliefs about the value of vaccines explained 35% of the variance, and positive COVID-19 vaccination beliefs and attitudes explained 28%[28]. This suggests, in line with our findings, that being from a minority EG alone is unlikely to account for vaccine uptake differences and implies that attitudes and intentions vary depending on an interaction between multiple factors such as location, time and socioeconomic, cultural and political context. Locally appropriate outreach settings are needed with flexible appointments to overcome vaccine access issues. Migrants with precarious immigration status suggested walk-in centres in trusted locations such as foodbanks, community centres and charities would facilitate vaccine access and uptake[29]. Additionally, allowing vaccination without documentation or general practice registration should be considered and publicised to facilitate equitable access, for example for the estimated 600,000 undocumented migrants living in the UK,[30] the homeless and other vulnerable populations.

In most focus groups or interviews across a range of EGs, one or more participants had negative attitudes towards the media and its impact on them. In our study, participants raised concerns about the impact of social media misinformation and stress the importance of disseminating clear, consistent vaccination messages covering safety, effectiveness, as well as empowering the public to address misinformation in their networks and being active on social media to combat misinformation (**Table 5**). Negative attitudes towards the media, government, medicine and healthcare could be overcome by messaging and vaccine delivery from trusted figures [31]. Other studies have found a strong correlation between a trusted healthcare professional or physician's recommendation of a vaccine and higher uptake[32] [33]. However, this may not be adequate for those who are disengaged with medicine and healthcare. Many participants expressed concerns about receiving a COVID-19 vaccine or wanted more information, particularly around safety and efficacy. Large UK questionnaire surveys support this, demonstrating a significant positive association between confidence in the importance, safety and effectiveness of a COVID-19 vaccine, and vaccine acceptance [21, 34]. A small qualitative UK parental study and larger survey completed in May 2020 found that COVID-19 vaccine safety and efficacy concerns were the greatest barrier to definite vaccine acceptance, which in the larger parallel survey was 56% [21]. There was a belief that COVID-19 vaccine development had been rushed amongst most participants in our study and other small qualitative studies amongst UK HCPs[23]. Some of our participants stated that they would wait until "it is deemed safe and effective," or others in the population received the vaccine first before accepting it themselves. This was echoed in UK qualitative studies exploring COVID-19 vaccination in pregnant women[35] and recent migrants [29], a Canadian qualitative study in a diverse sample of the population [36] and a US quantitative study of attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination in 14 to 24 year olds[27]. Previous research indicates that people deem older vaccines safer than newer ones [37, 38]. Main reasons for hesitancy were concerns about unforeseen future side effects of vaccines, and general mistrust in the benefits and safety of vaccines[34], and a few thought that they should rely on their own strong immune systems. A large UK parental survey found that lower income, or ethnic minority participants were at least twice as likely to reject COVID vaccination[34] and although we found no apparent differences by minority ethnicity, our sample size of 100 and its

qualitative methodology were not designed to determine this. In a qualitative study on experiences of participation in COVID-19 vaccine trials, minority ethnic participants highlighted the importance of diverse representativeness in trials[39], which was also mentioned by one of our participants. Similar barriers and facilitators to ours were found in a systematic review exploring parents' acceptance of childhood vaccinations in general [40].

We found that participants' perception of risk of COVID-19 infection and severe illness to themselves, and their family, through occupation, age or comorbidity, and protection through vaccination were strong facilitators for COVID-19 vaccination acceptance. This has been found in several other studies of the general population, healthcare workers, immunocompromised and parents[7, 21] [32]. In contrast, Travellers in our study and others perceived themselves at lower risk of infection through their lower contact with other population groups.[32] Easy access will be important to facilitate vaccination uptake for those with risk due to occupation or comorbidity[24]. Our study and others certainly indicated that many would prefer a local, low risk community healthcare setting with convenience of booking appointments[29, 41, 42]. However, a key difference to note is that at the time of data collection, access to vaccines was not a tangible issue as they had not yet been approved. The importance of differentiating between vaccine hesitancy, which has less variation in different EGs[43], and under-vaccination related to environmental context and access have been raised by others[29, 44]. In Israel, low uptake in certain groups has been increased by well-tailored outreach efforts[25, 45].

Many participants across EGs reported comparing stories with friends and family, often via channels such as WhatsApp and other social media. Concerns about misinformation were raised across all groups. People with more of a reliance on social media and social networks for COVID-19 information are more likely to trust it [46], and be exposed to misinformation [47]; these tend to be those of younger age, lower education levels, and lower income. [48] There is evidence of social media outlets circulating COVID-19 misinformation.[46, 49-51] [52]. COVID-19 vaccine messaging must be appropriate for both the 'influencers' and the 'influenced' to facilitate the dissemination of trusted information amongst networks.

Strengths and limitations of the study

This is amongst the largest qualitative studies on attitudes to vaccination in the UK general public and, importantly in contrast to others, incorporates most UK minority EGs, the COVID-19 pandemic and perceived risk.[7, 21, 24, 25, 28, 34, 43, 48, 53-55] Although intention does not necessarily directly translate to actual vaccine uptake in the future it is a good predictor and surveys demonstrate a steady increase in vaccine acceptance since 2020[53].

Most data collection was undertaken in English, possibly excluding sectors of the population who may access COVID-19 information through different sources due to language. Similar themes were identified from the English FGs and Punjabi interviews, with exception of some religious views, indicating consistency of results. Much of the data collection and analysis was conducted by White British researchers which could have impacted interpretation of findings, however FGs and interviews were held remotely which may have reduced this and also acquiescence bias. The first five FGs included a range of ethnicities while others mainly comprised participants of the same ethnicity; the latter allowed greater reflexivity between participants. Both focus group type yielded similar data.

Data collection was June-October 2020 before COVID-19 vaccines were licensed. Attitudes to vaccine are not static and are highly responsive to current information around a COVID-19 vaccine, as well as the state of the pandemic and perceived risk. Data were also collected prior to much of the intervention work, putting the attitudes and intentions expressed in this study in a context of minimal community engagement and support. This is a strength as it provides a baseline snapshot of attitudes, providing the option to explore and assess the impact of such interventions.

To avoid exclusion of typically underrepresented groups, recruitment involved approaching charities that aim to empower and advocate for minority ethnic communities and improve their access to services. The data may be subject to selection bias, as those with a greater interest in COVID-19 may have volunteered and we did not reach every minority EG in the UK. Socioeconomic data and index of multiple deprivation were not collected, limiting the ability to determine a possible accumulative effect of factors such as socioeconomic status, ethnicity and age. Attitudes and intentions by EG were presented for the FGs and interviews that included participants of the same or similar ethnicities i.e. FGs 4, 6-24 and Interviews 1-3, as transcription did not allow for differentiation between ethnicities of each participant (Table 3). Table 1 and Supplementary 3 demonstrate FG characteristics.

Implications for clinicians and policymakers

Interventions and policies must be appropriate and effective for diverse populations where vaccine acceptability and uptake are low, to reduce inequalities and increase vaccine equity. This study's findings have local and national implications for clinicians and policymakers, as presented in Table 5, which fall under three overarching areas: providing information that addresses specific concerns of communities; authentic community outreach; and using the right channels to disseminate credible information and counteract misinformation.

Unanswered questions, future research and implications

Since this work was completed the results and recommendations have been presented to government bodies. Faith-based and EG communities are now more actively involved in local and more tailored COVID-19 communications in the UK[56]. There are efforts to locate vaccination clinics in more accepted local assets, such as places of worship, including mosques and churches[56]. Local COVID-19 vaccine community champions and influencers in minority groups are being identified and encouraged[56-58]. Further detailed guidance from the UK Race Disparities Unit encourages targeted local action and engagement with support from community champions and other local leadership[59, 60].

Nonetheless, more high-quality research and evaluation is needed to demonstrate the effects of different interventions on COVID-19 vaccine uptake[5]. Future locally led outreach should engage marginalised groups and explore the attitudes and behaviours where there is low vaccine uptake to mitigate barriers[14]. Future research must gain further understanding of similarities and differences within groups to adopt a context-specific approach to vaccine resources, interventions and policies, and proactively involve diverse patient and public groups. Such interventions should provide access, equity, and knowledge, and empower and engage local communities. Surveillance should continue to monitor vaccine uptake, with both quantitative and qualitative studies to explore any ongoing disparities in uptake and whether they continue to be related to concerns in vaccine safety or low perception of COVID-19 risk.

Table 5. COVID-19 vaccination attitudes and COVID-19 sources of information: implications and recommendations for clinicians and policymakers

Topic	Subtheme	Implication/ Recommendation
Attitudes towards COVID-19 and a COVID-19 vaccine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A degree of optimism that a COVID-19 vaccine would become available while some were aware it might take time. • Some understood the importance of a COVID-19 vaccine. • Different beliefs surrounding who should receive the vaccine. • Belief that people should have the choice. • Some believed that other health behaviours were equally, if not more important to maintain. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public health messages should continue to inform the public about vaccines and how to access them. • Rationale for and order of priority groups for COVID-19 vaccination should be clearly stated • Public health messaging should continue to encourage positive health behaviours in addition to getting vaccinated. • More research is needed to explore the attitude towards compulsory vaccination in different groups or settings.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition of importance of clinical trials. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to quote the emerging evidence from vaccine trials. • Actively recruit more diverse participants to clinical trials.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many would wait until others had tried the vaccine until accepting it themselves. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive 'success' stories of vaccination should be developed and disseminated to individuals and organisations authentically representing diverse groups in terms of age, gender, ethnicity, region, occupations.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People were concerned about COVID-19 vaccine safety and efficacy, which linked closely to concerns about vaccine development. • Perception of health and risk meant that some may not accept a vaccine immediately. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns should be addressed by providing clear, accessible information about COVID-19 vaccine development and safety. • Vaccine information should be presented and disseminated in a relatable and understandable manner, including efficacy against deaths, hospital admission, value in protecting family, long COVID, and side effects. • The development of vaccine messaging should involve collaboration with diverse groups.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Belief that culture and religion had influences on the attitudes of certain groups towards vaccines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involve local community and religious groups to understand and address the population's concerns and needs for accessing vaccination.
COVID-19 vaccine acceptability facilitators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desire to return to 'normality' identified as a motivator. • Occupation influenced some participants' intentions of accepting a vaccine. • Protecting the health and wellbeing of themselves and others was a motivator. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stress the value of vaccination in returning life back to normal e.g. ability to celebrate festivals and to protect vulnerable family members and friends. • Evidence-based, appropriately targeted, context specific COVID-19 vaccine messaging for occupations at risk. • Provision of vaccine in occupational settings or practical support such as paid time off to get vaccinated
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental context and resources were identified as facilitators e.g. availability and accessibility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policymakers should ensure that vaccines are available at accessible times and locations.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some would encourage others to accept a vaccine. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Messaging should emphasise the benefits of vaccination in also protecting close family (including those under 18 years) and friends, including those with co-morbidity.
COVID-19 vaccine barriers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low trust and doubt were identified as barriers to vaccine acceptability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public trust should be rebuilt by local and national government by providing consistent, clear, evidence-based messaging and actions and by working with the community as partners, co-designing messages.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disengagement with medicine and healthcare services was a barrier to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invest in community groups to help build engagement with formal services, e.g.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.04.22270456>; this version posted February 6, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license.

	vaccine acceptability.	Community Champions working with healthcare providers and grassroots organisations to increase engagement.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misinformation was a concern amongst some participants. • Social influences were identified as a barrier. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications should preferably be disseminated via trusted and respected channels and figures on both a local and national level, rather than from the government or politicians.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was opposition to vaccines in general amongst a minority of participants. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveillance, surveys and qualitative work on vaccine uptake and acceptability should continue to inform and understand attitudes, beliefs and behaviours.
Friends and family, social media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family was a source of information for some participants, rather than media outlets. • People reported that negative WhatsApp messages spread rapidly amongst their networks. • Information was received via social media amongst some participants. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive trustworthy vaccine messages disseminated via social media could be advantageous for rapid dissemination of information and increase vaccine uptake in young people. • Public health messages should be disseminated via multiple channels. • Ensure that community outreach includes range of representatives of different ages and genders to facilitate family conversations.
Media, news and guidance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traditional media were cited as a source of information e.g. news, BBC, newspaper. • A participant reported directly using government guidance rather than through the media. • Some participants or their family watched news from non-UK based media outlets. • Government daily COVID-19 press conferences or briefings were a source of information. • Websites such as BBC a source of information. • Awareness of minority ethnic COVID-19 statistics through the news. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both traditional and alternative communication channels should be used to communicate clear messaging and guidance based on behavioural science.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception that the media had its own agenda. • Belief that the media should show more balanced stories. • Media and news caused fear among some participants. • Confusion at the media due to inconsistent messaging. • Negative impact of media and news on mental health. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid using fear and instead share positive, supportive communications.
Research literature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seeking information on the COVID-19 vaccine and trials themselves. • Reading academic or scientific literature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is positive for those who have access to these sources, however could increase disparities for those with limited access to such sources of information. • Increase capacity for science in schools and adult education to improve understanding of science underpinning vaccines.
Concerns about misinformation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants concerned about the spread of misinformation through WhatsApp and social media. • Some participants took on the role of dispelling misinformation amongst their network. • Volunteering for a local community radio station to help dispel misinformation. • Use of websites to identify 'fake news'. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public health messages surrounding vaccines should be tailored depending on socio-cultural context. • 'Influencers' should be empowered and provided with the necessary skills and resources to address misinformation amongst their networks. • Different community leaders have different impact, value and reach in different contexts. • Accessibility and equity of correct information is key. Translation of messages is only one aspect of this.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.04.22270456>; this version posted February 6, 2022. 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-ND 4.0 International license](#).

Acknowledgements

We would like to extend our thanks to all public representatives, healthcare professionals, researchers and expert advisors who contributed to this study. Thank you to all participants for providing their time and sharing their views and experiences for FGs and interviews.

Conflicts of Interest

ATK participates in the UK's Scientific Advisory Group for Emergencies (SAGE) behavioural science sub-group SPI-B. The views expressed are those of the author. LJ and CAMM have been involved in the review of Public Health England/UK Health Security Agency COVID-19 guidance. All other authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Funding

Public Health England (now UK Health Security Agency), Pump Priming Fund.

Contributors

- ES: assisted with data collection; had substantial contributions to the analysis and interpretation of the qualitative data; drafted all versions of the manuscript and critically revised it; gave final approval of the version to be published; and has agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.
- LJ: project managed from study start to close; led the analysis and interpretation of the qualitative data; had substantial contributions to the design of the study (led on development of protocol, gained ethics approval, drafted interview questions, recruited participants); led the collection of data; had substantial contributions to the analysis and interpretation of the qualitative data; critically commented on versions of the manuscript; gave final approval of the version to be published; and has agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.
- AK: had substantial contributions to the design of the study (commented on interview questions, recruited participants); collected data; had substantial contributions to the analysis and interpretation of the qualitative data; critically commented on versions of the manuscript; gave final approval of the version to be published; and has agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.
- AT: had substantial contributions to the analysis and interpretation of the qualitative data; critically commented on versions of the manuscript; gave final approval of the version to be published; and has agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.
- RBS: had substantial contributions to the design of the study (development of protocol, drafted interview questions); collected data; critically commented on versions of the manuscript; gave final approval of the version to be published; and has agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.
- AWK: quality checked data; had contributions to the interpretation of the qualitative data; critically commented on versions of the manuscript; gave final approval of the version to be published; and has agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.
- DML: had substantial contributions to the design of the work (helped develop protocol and interview questions); reviewed analysis; critically commented on versions of the manuscript; gave final approval of the version to be published; and has agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.
- MGP: had substantial contributions to the design of the study (recruited participants); reviewed analysis; critically commented on versions of the manuscript; gave final approval of the version to be published; and has agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.
- LN: had substantial contributions to the design of the work (reviewed interview questions); reviewed analysis; critically commented on versions of the manuscript; gave final approval of the version to be published; and has agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.
- JG: had substantial contributions to the design of the work (reviewed interview questions); reviewed analysis; critically commented on versions of the manuscript; gave final approval of the version to be published; and has agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.
- ICM had substantial contributions to the design of the work (reviewed interview questions); reviewed analysis; critically commented on versions of the manuscript; gave final approval of the version to be published; and has agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

- RS: had substantial contributions to the design of the work (reviewed interview questions); reviewed analysis; critically commented on versions of the manuscript; gave final approval of the version to be published; and has agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.
 - CB: had substantial contributions to the design of the work (reviewed interview questions); reviewed analysis; critically commented on versions of the manuscript; gave final approval of the version to be published; and has agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.
 - MP: contributed to the design of the work (reviewed interview questions); reviewed analysis; critically commented on versions of the manuscript; gave final approval of the version to be published; and has agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.
 - LS: contributed to the design of the work (reviewed interview questions); reviewed analysis; critically commented on versions of the manuscript; gave final approval of the version to be published; and has agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.
 - EP: contributed to the design of the work (reviewed interview questions); reviewed analysis; critically commented on versions of the manuscript; gave final approval of the version to be published; and has agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.
- CAMM: had substantial contributions to the design of the work (helped develop protocol, data collection schedules); reviewed analysis; contributed to drafting the manuscript; commented on versions of the manuscript; gave final approval of the version to be published; and has agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

[Data Sharing Statement](#)

Data available upon reasonable request.

References

1. World Health Organisation. *Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard*. 2021 [cited 2021 2021.07.06]; Available from: <https://covid19.who.int/>
2. Public Health England. *UK Coronavirus Dashboard*. 2021 25 August 2021]; Available from: <https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk/details/cases>.
3. Marmot, M., Allen, J., Goldblatt, P., Herd, E., Morrison, J. *Build Back Fairer: The COVID-19 Marmot Review*. 2020; Available from: <https://www.health.org.uk/sites/default/files/upload/publications/2020/Build-back-fairer-the-COVID-19-Marmot-review.pdf>.
4. Public Health England. *COVID-19: review of disparities in risks and outcomes*. 2020; Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-review-of-disparities-in-risks-and-outcomes>.
5. Clark, A., et al., *Global, regional, and national estimates of the population at increased risk of severe COVID-19 due to underlying health conditions in 2020: a modelling study*. The Lancet Global health, 2020. **8**(8): p. e1003-e1017.
6. England, P.H. *UK immunisation schedule: the green book, chapter 11*. 2020 20 July 2021]; Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/immunisation-schedule-the-green-book-chapter-11>.
7. Ruiz, J.B. and R.A. Bell, *Predictors of intention to vaccinate against COVID-19: Results of a nationwide survey*. Vaccine, 2021. **39**(7): p. 1080-1086.
8. Larson, H.J., et al., *Tracking the global spread of vaccine sentiments: the global response to Japan's suspension of its HPV vaccine recommendation*. Hum Vaccin Immunother, 2014. **10**(9): p. 2543-50.
9. Jansen, V.A., et al., *Measles outbreaks in a population with declining vaccine uptake*. Science, 2003. **301**(5634): p. 804.
10. Public Health England. *Impact of COVID-19 vaccines on mortality in England: December 2020 to February 2021*. . 2021; Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/phe-monitoring-of-the-effectiveness-of-covid-19-vaccination>.
11. Statistics, O.f.N. *Coronavirus and vaccine hesitancy, Great Britain: 17 February to 14 March 2021*. 2021 13 July 2021]; Available from: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandvaccinehesitancygreatbritain/17februaryto14march2021>.
12. Statistics, O.f.N. *Coronavirus and vaccine hesitancy, Great Britain: 26 May to 20 June 2021*. 2021; Available from: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandvaccinehesitancygreatbritain/26mayto20june2021>.
13. Woolf, K., et al., *Ethnic differences in SARS-CoV-2 vaccine hesitancy in United Kingdom healthcare workers: Results from the UK-REACH prospective nationwide cohort study*. Lancet Reg Health Eur, 2021: p. 100180.
14. Kamal, A., A. Hodson, and J.M. Pearce, *A Rapid Systematic Review of Factors Influencing COVID-19 Vaccination Uptake in Minority Ethnic Groups in the UK*. Vaccines (Basel), 2021. **9**(10).
15. Atkins, L., et al., *A guide to using the Theoretical Domains Framework of behaviour change to investigate implementation problems*. Implementation Science, 2017. **12**(1): p. 77.
16. Harris C. *Ethnic Minorities Maryland Scholastic*. 2021; Available from: www.scholastic.com/teachers/articles/teaching-content/ethnic-minorities/.
17. Office for National Statistics. *Population of England and Wales*. 2020; Available from: <https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/uk-population-by-ethnicity/national-and-regional-populations/population-of-england-and-wales/latest>.
18. Allen, M., *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods: Snowball Subject Recruitment*. 2017.
19. products, M.H. and R. Agency. *Summary of Product Characteristics for COVID-19 Vaccine Pfizer/BioNTech*. 2020 9 July 2021 20 July 2021]; Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/regulatory-approval-of-pfizer-biontech-vaccine-for-covid-19/summary-of-product-characteristics-for-covid-19-vaccine-pfizerbiontech#date-of-first-authorisationrenewal-of-the-authorisation>.
20. NVivo qualitative data analysis Software, c.p. 2012.
21. Bell, S., et al., *Parents' and guardians' views on the acceptability of a future COVID-19 vaccine: A multi-methods study in England*. Vaccine, 2020. **38**(49): p. 7789-7798.

22. Kalichman, S.C., et al., *Trust in health information sources and its associations with COVID-19 disruptions to social relationships and health services among people living with HIV*. BMC public health, 2021. **21**(1): p. 817.
23. Woodhead, C., et al., *Race, ethnicity and COVID-19 vaccination: a qualitative study of UK healthcare staff*. Ethn Health, 2021: p. 1-20.
24. The OpenSAFELY Collaborative: Helen J Curtis, P.I., Caroline E Morton, Brian MacKenna , Alex J Walker, Jessica Morley, Amir Mehrkar., et al., *Trends and clinical characteristics of COVID-19 vaccine recipients: a federated analysis of 57.9 million patients' primary care records in situ using OpenSAFELY*. b2021. medRxiv preprint, 2021. **01**:(25): p. 2125035.
25. Green MS, A.R., Vered S., *A study of ethnic, gender and educational differences in attitudes toward COVID-19 vaccines in Israel – implications for vaccination implementation policies*. Isr J Health Policy Res, 2021. **10**(26).
26. Hall, V.J., et al., *COVID-19 vaccine coverage in health-care workers in England and effectiveness of BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine against infection (SIREN): a prospective, multicentre, cohort study*. Lancet, 2021. **397**(10286): p. 1725-1735.
27. Brandt, E.J., et al., *National Study of Youth Opinions on Vaccination for COVID-19 in the U.S.* J Adolesc Health, 2021. **68**(5): p. 869-872.
28. Sherman, S.M., et al., *COVID-19 vaccination intention in the UK: results from the COVID-19 vaccination acceptability study (CoVAccS), a nationally representative cross-sectional survey*. Hum Vaccin Immunother, 2021. **17**(6): p. 1612-1621.
29. Deal, A., et al., *Strategies and action points to ensure equitable uptake of COVID-19 vaccinations: A national qualitative interview study to explore the views of undocumented migrants, asylum seekers, and refugees*. J Migr Health, 2021. **4**: p. 100050.
30. Sigona, N. and V. Hughes, *No Way Out, No Way In. Irregular Migrant Children and Families in the UK*. 2012.
31. Kamal, A., Rubin, J., Rogers, MB., *Using behavioural science to develop public health messages for racial and ethnic minority communities during COVID-19 [Preprint]*. PsyArXiv, 2021.
32. Doornekamp, L., et al., *Determinants of Vaccination Uptake in Risk Populations: A Comprehensive Literature Review*. Vaccines (Basel), 2020. **8**(3).
33. Marban-Castro, E., et al., *Acceptability of a Hypothetical Zika Vaccine among Women from Colombia and Spain Exposed to ZIKV: A Qualitative Study*. Vaccines, 2020. **8**(4).
34. Paul, E., A. Steptoe, and D. Fancourt, *Attitudes towards vaccines and intention to vaccinate against COVID-19: Implications for public health communications*. Lancet Reg Health Eur, 2021. **1**: p. 100012.
35. Anderson, E., et al., *Maternal vaccines during the Covid-19 pandemic: A qualitative interview study with UK pregnant women*. Midwifery, 2021. **100**: p. 103062.
36. Benham, J.L., et al., *Attitudes, current behaviours and barriers to public health measures that reduce COVID-19 transmission: A qualitative study to inform public health messaging*. PLoS One, 2021. **16**(2): p. e0246941.
37. Bedford, H. and M. Lansley, *More vaccines for children? Parents' views*. Vaccine, 2007. **25**(45): p. 7818-23.
38. Gust, D.A., et al., *Parents with doubts about vaccines: Which vaccines and reasons why*. Pediatrics, 2008. **122**(4): p. 718-725.
39. Wentzell, E. and A.M. Racila, *The social experience of participation in a COVID-19 vaccine trial: Subjects' motivations, others' concerns, and insights for vaccine promotion*. Vaccine, 2021. **39**(17): p. 2445-2451.
40. Smith, L.E., et al., *A systematic review of factors affecting vaccine uptake in young children*. Vaccine, 2017. **35**(45): p. 6059-6069.
41. McPhedran, R. and B. Toombs, *Efficacy or delivery? An online Discrete Choice Experiment to explore preferences for COVID-19 vaccines in the UK*. Econ Lett, 2021. **200**: p. 109747.
42. Craig, B.M., *United States COVID-19 Vaccination Preferences (CVP): 2020 Hindsight*. Patient, 2021. **14**(3): p. 309-318.
43. Han, K., et al., *Confidence, Acceptance and Willingness to Pay for the COVID-19 Vaccine among Migrants in Shanghai, China: A Cross-Sectional Study*. Vaccines, 2021. **9**(5).
44. Bedford, H., et al., *Vaccine hesitancy, refusal and access barriers: The need for clarity in terminology*. Vaccine, 2018. **36**(44): p. 6556-6558.
45. Rosen B, W.R., Israeli A. , *Israel's rapid rollout of vaccinations for COVID-19*, . Isr J Health Policy Res., 2021. **10**(6.).

46. USA Today, *Three months in: A timeline of how COVID-19 has unfolded in the US 2020*. 2020.
47. Lee, J.J., et al., *Associations Between COVID-19 Misinformation Exposure and Belief With COVID-19 Knowledge and Preventive Behaviors: Cross-Sectional Online Study*. Journal of medical Internet research, 2020. **22**(11): p. e22205.
48. Loomba, S., et al., *Measuring the impact of COVID-19 vaccine misinformation on vaccination intent in the UK and USA*. Nat Hum Behav, 2021. **5**(3): p. 337-348.
49. Gottlieb, M. and S. Dyer, *Information and Disinformation: Social Media in the COVID-19 Crisis*. Academic emergency medicine : official journal of the Society for Academic Emergency Medicine, 2020. **27**(7): p. 640-641.
50. Ahmed Siddiqui, M.Y., et al., "Social Media Misinformation"-An Epidemic within the COVID-19 Pandemic. The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene, 2020. **103**(2): p. 920-921.
51. Bastani, P. and M.A. Bahrami, *COVID-19 Related Misinformation on Social Media: A Qualitative Study from Iran*. J Med Internet Res, 2020.
52. Islam, M.S., et al., *COVID-19 vaccine rumors and conspiracy theories: The need for cognitive inoculation against misinformation to improve vaccine adherence*. PLoS One, 2021. **16**(5): p. e0251605.
53. Imperial College London's Institute of Global Health Innovation and YouGov. *Covid-19: Global attitudes towards a COVID-19 vaccine*. 2021; Available from: https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/institute-of-global-health-innovation/EMBARGOED-0502.-Feb-21-GlobalVaccineInsights_ICL-YouGov-Covid-19-Behaviour-Tracker_20210301.pdf.
54. Clover B. *Exclusive: Fewer black and Filipino NHS staff vaccinated amid 'hesitancy' concern*. 2021; Available from: <https://www.hsj.co.uk/acute-care/exclusive-fewer-black-and-filipino-nhs-staff-vaccinated-amid-hesitancy-concern/7029397.article>.
55. Jarrett, C., et al., *Strategies for addressing vaccine hesitancy - A systematic review*. Vaccine, 2015. **33**(34): p. 4180-90.
56. Ministry of Housing, C.L.G., Department of Health and Social Care, Nadhim Zahawi MP, The Rt Hon Matt Hancock MP, and The Rt Hon Robert Jenrick MP. *Community Champions to give COVID-19 vaccine advice and boost take up*. 2021 [25 August 2021]; Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/community-champions-to-give-covid-19-vaccine-advice-and-boost-take-up>.
57. Scientific Pandemic Insights Group on Behaviour subgroup of UK Scientific Advisory Group for Emergencies. *The role of Community Champion networks to increase engagement in the context of COVID19: Evidence and best practice*. 2020; Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/933231/S0830_SPI-B_-_Community_Champions_evidence_and_best_practice.pdf.
58. Group, S.A.G.f.E.S.E. *Factors influencing COVID-19 vaccine uptake among minority ethnic groups - 17 December 2020*. 2021; Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/factors-influencing-covid-19-vaccine-uptake-among-minority-ethnic-groups-17-december-2020>.
59. UK Government Vaccines Taskforce. *2020 achievements and future strategy London: UKVTF*. 2020 Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-government-vaccines-taskforce-vtf-2020-achievements-and-future-strategy>.
60. Government Equalities Office and Race Disparity Unit. *Second quarterly report on progress to address COVID-19 health inequalities*. 2021; Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/second-quarterly-report-on-progress-to-address-covid-19-health-inequalities/second-quarterly-report-on-progress-to-address-covid-19-health-inequalities>.