As a pharmaceutical industry, we have a pressing reality to face. If we do not live up to our core purpose, we cannot unlock the opportunities of exponentially improved healthcare in the future.
Yet these can only be delivered through constructive partnerships with healthcare professionals, the scientific community, wider industry, policy makers and regulators, and – most importantly – with patients themselves.

This collaborative working towards new advanced therapies is dependent upon trusted and transparent relationships. More personalised solutions in areas such as genomic research, and innovations that require population-level data sharing and Artificial Intelligence, can only be realised if the public have confidence that their information is being handled with the highest of ethical standard and with their interests at the heart of decision making.

A lack of clearly demonstrated purpose can erode progress. The Cumberlege Review into Medicines and Medical Devices Safety found that the UK healthcare system – from NHS, Government, industry and regulators – is siloed, disjointed and has lost touch with its central purpose of serving patients. For industry in particular, patient centricity must go beyond lip service if we are to deliver on our promises.

The COVID-19 pandemic has nurtured a genuine spirit of collaboration, which has provided fertile ground in which as a country, and as an industry, we have collectively delivered medical, technical and logistical innovations at an unprecedented pace and scale. It has also placed the sector under greater media and public scrutiny which means that the industry needs to be seen as acting in accordance with a greater purpose. However, this increased focus also presents an opportunity to familiarise the public with the good work that the pharmaceutical industry undertakes every day, including in developing treatments and cures for some of the most debilitating of diseases.

Against this backdrop, the purpose of Takeda remains the same: to improve the lives of the patients we serve. From Takeda’s inception, our purpose has been clear and enduring. Our decisions have been, and will always be, guided by putting the patient at the centre and earning trust of society. We need to ensure that we consistently ‘walk the talk’ and demonstrate this unequivocally to the public, the healthcare professionals who partner with us and, most of all, the patients who lend us their trust.

As a pharmaceutical industry, we have a pressing reality to face. If we do not live up to our core purpose, we cannot unlock the opportunities of exponentially improved healthcare in the future. The more that we strive towards purposeful business, the more we will see the real and measured impact upon our ability to improve – and save – patient lives.

We hope that this report can open further discussion, and welcome opportunities to work with others from across the life sciences ecosystem to join us in continuing the conversation and building positive strategies for the sector.

JON NEAL
Healthcare is a fast moving and challenging sector, but one ripe with potential for socially revolutionising breakthroughs.
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Institutions of all kinds have been under pressure to deliver in 2020 and maintain trust, and the healthcare and pharmaceutical sectors are no exception. The results of this survey reveal that, among British adults, trust in healthcare charities and healthcare professionals to act in the best interests of society is very strong.

In contrast under half (42%) of UK adults agree that pharmaceutical companies work to high ethical standards. The public perception of healthcare professionals and healthcare charities – who have historically clearly and consistently communicated their contribution to society – is far stronger – 61% and 75% respectively. This is entirely consistent with previous data, and is a reminder that where commerce or politics is involved, professionals get trusted less – government scientists are less trusted than academic scientists for example.

As always, greater familiarity tends to increase trust. Comparing the public and healthcare professionals’ views, the greater interaction and understanding of the pharmaceutical industry that healthcare professionals have results in a more positive perception of the industry across almost all questions. Proactive demonstration of best practice and purposeful behaviour with the wider public may see these more positive perceptions replicated with the general public – but it will take a concerted effort.

Healthcare is a fast moving and complex sector, ripe with potential for revolutionary advances in science which benefit wider society. The companies who commit to ensuring that purpose permeates throughout their businesses will ultimately put themselves in the best position to succeed.

2020 has been a year in which “purpose” mattered more. More people than ever say they want to buy from a brand that reflects their values (72% – up from 56% in 2019), and 68% say they want bosses to speak out on social and political issues. Most British businesses say they plan to do more both on inclusion and diversity (68%), and on supporting local communities (48%) in 2021. Purposeful companies working across broad and varied sectors have demonstrated how often it has enabled them to excel in their field, retain talent and innovate fastest.
PART 1
DEFINING CORPORATE PURPOSE

Purpose-led business speaks towards an ambition to operate in a way that goes beyond profit alone. Activity is rooted in the common principle of acting in the best interests of society, and creating value for multiple stakeholders, not only shareholders.

Although not a new concept, now more than ever, the public increasingly demand that businesses integrate purpose into their corporate strategies – and consumers react poorly to those who fail to live up to expectations. A study from Accenture found that consumers are no longer making decisions based solely on product selection or price, they are assessing what the brand says, what it does and what it stands for.2

DEFINING PURPOSE

The main objective of a purposeful activity is to have a positive and sustainable impact on society. Purposeful activity is developed and executed in the best interests of the communities it serves.

THE RESURGENCE OF PURPOSE IN BUSINESS

A number of trends have influenced the widespread recognition of the value of purposeful business:

• Trust deficit – The 2008 financial crash operated as a catalyst that drove a deep chasm between consumers, governments, regulators and businesses. Businesses in the UK recognising this ‘trust deficit’ began to better communicate their value and purpose to society.3

• Instant and overwhelming visibility – Through social media, brands have a platform to stand up for what they believe in and consumers have a voice to hold their brands to account in a way that they could not before. An increasingly empowered and informed civil society has also extended its influence, and international institutions, such as the World Health Organisation, are making concerted efforts to include the civil society’s voice in their decision making. Businesses are no longer solely accountable to those involved in their operations – customers, suppliers, clients, regulators, employees and shareholders – but to a far wider audience.

• Global sustainability – The climate emergency has forced consumers, governments, regulators and businesses beyond ‘the usual suspects’ to consider major global challenges and look introspectively to understand their contribution and to deliver innovative solutions.4
WHY PURPOSE MATTERS

As well as realising societal benefits, purpose brings positives to businesses who embrace it:

- **Organisational Success** – Businesses operate more efficiently when all employees understand the ultimate vision and goal and can pull together in the same positive direction.5

- **Partnerships** – Collaborative approaches can breed well-informed business decisions that better meet the needs of those served by a company’s products and services. Forging positive and long-lasting third-party relationships needs transparency and authenticity on both sides. In public sector healthcare this is critical, as more than ever public bodies need to trust that pharmaceutical companies are making well-rounded purposeful decisions before pursuing formal public-private partnerships.

- **Conscious Consumerism** – According to research by Accenture the majority of consumers want to interact with businesses whose values and purpose reflect their own personal beliefs.6 This level of identification can translate into a ‘purpose premium’, where consumers demonstrate increased levels of brand loyalty. Conversely, more than half of consumers who are disappointed by a brand’s words or actions on social issues will complain about it.7

- **Retention and attraction of employees** – Separate research suggested that purposeful companies could expect to see 30% higher levels of innovation and 40% higher levels of workforce retention than competitors.8 Employees, regardless of industry, appear more dedicated to those employers who aim to make a difference.
THE CRITICAL ROLE OF PURPOSE WITHIN THE PHARMACEUTICAL SECTOR

The pharmaceutical industry has one of the most important roles within the private sector: advancing medical science, improving and extending the lives of the global population, and ensuring that patients benefit from these advancements.

At times, the pharmaceutical industry has failed to deliver this to the full extent during decision making. Falling short has the potential to directly impact the lives of patients, and significantly erode public and government trust.

Confidence in pharmaceutical companies is fundamental to an industry that relies upon large clinical trials and the trusteeship of medical data to innovate and progress to support better outcomes for patients.

While it is true that other industries have faced reputational challenges, few have been as deep seated as those which have faced the pharmaceutical industry. The need for a revised and refreshed purpose has never been greater. Healthcare has entered its next revolution; genomic medicine, AI supported healthcare and big data are quickly transforming the way we understand, interpret and act in the healthcare space.

HEALTHCARE DATA AND AI

Current innovations are moving at an unprecedented pace, and redefining medical advancement Many are already beginning to have results which are improving the lives of countless patients.9

Health data has always been a core concept of the medical world. However, recent developments in digitalisation, analytics and subsequent storage of data will require the sector to demonstrate its trustworthiness far more than ever. Appropriate use of health data could improve preventative healthcare interventions, enabling faster and more cost-effective provision of care.

The British public are somewhat sceptical of the use of data in healthcare, with patients raising concerns over the commodification of their records.10 Recent data has shown that while the public were confident that the NHS would use their data ethically, patients tend to be against sharing health data with the private sector given perceptions of use for commercial gain.11

The UK has an immense opportunity to lead the field of health data and AI and reap the benefits within our healthcare system. However, this transformation hinges upon collaboration and transparency in the use of patient data. With patients uncertain of the intentions of private industry handling their data, positive reassurance must be given. Without genuine collaboration, built on a clearly defined corporate purpose, we may fail to reap the rewards of our innovation.
It is without doubt that the pharmaceutical industry has had a complex, and at times difficult reputation. While overall perception of the industry does ebb and flow, there has been something of a reputational crisis in recent years.\textsuperscript{12}

Often, this reputational challenge comes from a possible misunderstanding between industry and its key stakeholders. To help further this understanding an online survey carried out among a representative sample of 1,104 adults 18 – 75 across the UK,\textsuperscript{13} and a survey of healthcare professionals based in the UK and who chose to take part in the research from across multiple specialisms, conducted online, was commissioned to gauge the perceptions of the pharmaceutical industry.\textsuperscript{14}

**PERCEPTIONS OF ROLES WITHIN THE HEALTHCARE SECTOR**

Participants in the survey among British adults were initially asked to express their opinion or impression of a range of organisations and roles within the sector, based upon their knowledge of each. These included pharmaceutical companies, scientists employed within the pharmaceutical industry, healthcare charities, healthcare professionals, Government ministers and other politicians.

**UK adults survey: Q. Taking into consideration all that you have heard or know, how favourable or unfavourable is your opinion or impression of each of the following?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Total favourable (very/mainly)</th>
<th>Neither favourable nor unfavourable</th>
<th>Total unfavourable (very/mainly)</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare professionals</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare charities</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientists employed within the pharmaceutical industry</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceutical companies</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other politicians</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government ministers</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base Online survey, 100 healthcare professionals (from a mix of speciality areas) 16-25 October 2020
The survey among UK adults revealed a high total favourable result for healthcare professionals (74%), and a positive view of both healthcare charities (58%) and scientists within the pharmaceutical industry (53%). The view of political decision makers was notably different, with total unfavourable views of Ministers at 55% and other politicians at 54%.

In comparison, the total favourable score for pharmaceutical companies was 38%, with 22% unfavourable. Over a third of respondents (36%) have neither a favourable nor unfavourable view of the pharmaceutical sector, which perhaps reflects a lack of understanding and engagement with the industries role and activity. This ‘neutral middle’ will be important as we approach a new frontier of innovation in healthcare.

With trends pointing towards much more personal approaches such as cell and gene therapy, and interactions with healthcare pathways switching ‘beyond the pill’ and into less traditional and wraparound services, the public’s interaction with pharmaceutical companies may shift significantly. These changes – which, if done right, will help to meaningfully improve the patient experience and health outcomes – can only be delivered if trust levels are improved.

Amongst the healthcare professionals surveyed, most respondents were favourable towards pharmaceutical companies (68%), compared to 38% for the general public. The relationship and linkages between the pharmaceutical industry and healthcare professionals are naturally closer than those with the public. This may nonetheless suggest that greater understanding and visibility of the sector, and the value it brings to the practice of medicine, breeds higher levels of favourability. This more positive perception among HCPs was also reflected in their views of scientists within the pharmaceutical industry, where a substantial 81% of healthcare professionals surveyed were favourable.
REGIONAL IMPACT ON PUBLIC PERCEPTION OF THE PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY

The survey results among UK adults suggested that regions with poorer health outcomes, also have poorer perceptions of the pharmaceutical industry.

Respondents from the South East, where healthy life expectancy continues to rise, provided the highest level of favourability towards the pharmaceutical industry in England (48%)\(^{10}\). The lowest levels of favourability were seen in Yorkshire and the Humber, the North East and North West of England (Northern Ireland is actually the lowest at 23% if taking all UK regions into account); all three (four if Northern Ireland included) regions with high levels of health inequality— with the North East experiencing the lowest regional life expectancy for males, and Blackpool (in the North West) recording the lowest healthy life expectancy at 57.1 years.

The role of pharmaceutical companies in helping to support work to address health inequalities, and in raising overall education in public health, is vital to ensuring the lives of patients are improved across the UK.

Note: please recognise small sample size at individual regional levels means that care should be exercised when using analytical data

Base: Online survey, 1,104 UK adults (16-75) 9-12 October 2020
For a business to operate with purpose it must tangibly deliver on its commitment to a sustained positive impact on society, in order to build public trust. This purposeful activity must also be visibly developed and executed to high ethical standards and in the best interests of the communities the business serves.

The survey among UK adults revealed that, at present, under half of respondents (48%) trust the pharmaceutical companies to ‘act in the best interests of society as whole’. Indeed 42% of respondents said they do not trust them to do so. A far greater and more publicly visible demonstration of commitment to purpose is therefore needed. By comparison 70% of HCPs surveyed trusted that the pharmaceutical companies are acting in the best interests of society – with only 1% stating that they did not trust these companies in this respect at all – underlining the need to seek ways to raise awareness and visibly demonstrate purpose to patients and the wider public.
**Health care professional survey:** Q. To what extent, if at all, do you trust each of the following to act in the best interests of society as a whole?

- **Healthcare professionals:**
  - Trust a great deal: 56%
  - Trust a fair amount: 43%
  - Do not trust very much: 9%
  - Do not trust at all: 3%
  - Don’t know: 6%

- **Healthcare charities:**
  - Trust a great deal: 30%
  - Trust a fair amount: 51%
  - Do not trust very much: 14%
  - Do not trust at all: 4%
  - Don’t know: 10%

- **Scientists employed within the pharmaceutical industry:**
  - Trust a great deal: 21%
  - Trust a fair amount: 51%
  - Do not trust very much: 18%
  - Do not trust at all: 5%
  - Don’t know: 11%

- **Pharmaceutical companies:**
  - Trust a great deal: 6%
  - Trust a fair amount: 40%
  - Do not trust very much: 30%
  - Do not trust at all: 13%
  - Don’t know: 10%

- **Other politicians:**
  - Trust a great deal: 23%
  - Trust a fair amount: 35%
  - Do not trust very much: 34%
  - Do not trust at all: 7%
  - Don’t know: 7%

- **Government ministers:**
  - Trust a great deal: 18%
  - Trust a fair amount: 43%
  - Do not trust very much: 31%
  - Do not trust at all: 7%
  - Don’t know: 7%

**UK adults survey:** Q. To what extent, if at all, do you trust each of the following to act in the best interests of society as a whole?

- **Healthcare professionals:**
  - Trust a great deal: 39%
  - Trust a fair amount: 43%
  - Do not trust very much: 9%
  - Do not trust at all: 3%
  - Don’t know: 6%

- **Healthcare charities:**
  - Trust a great deal: 21%
  - Trust a fair amount: 51%
  - Do not trust very much: 14%
  - Do not trust at all: 4%
  - Don’t know: 10%

- **Scientists employed within the pharmaceutical industry:**
  - Trust a great deal: 15%
  - Trust a fair amount: 51%
  - Do not trust very much: 18%
  - Do not trust at all: 5%
  - Don’t know: 11%

- **Pharmaceutical companies:**
  - Trust a great deal: 8%
  - Trust a fair amount: 40%
  - Do not trust very much: 30%
  - Do not trust at all: 13%
  - Don’t know: 10%

- **Other politicians:**
  - Trust a great deal: 4%
  - Trust a fair amount: 20%
  - Do not trust very much: 35%
  - Do not trust at all: 34%
  - Don’t know: 7%

- **Government ministers:**
  - Trust a great deal: 5%
  - Trust a fair amount: 16%
  - Do not trust very much: 43%
  - Do not trust at all: 31%
  - Don’t know: 7%

**Base:** Online survey, 100 healthcare professionals (from a mix of speciality areas) 16-25 October 2020

**Base:** Online survey, 1,104 UK adults (16-75) 9-12 October 2020
Linked to this are the ethical concerns held by some around the introduction of population-level data partnerships and technology such as CRISPR and Artificial Intelligence into patient populations. The sector is at an important fork in the road and both the public and healthcare professionals will need further reassurance that pharmaceutical companies are progressing these developments for the good of patients and the public, not just for business gain.

At their core, ethical standards incorporate patient autonomy, justice, and crucially the principles of beneficence and no malfeasance. However, truthfulness, transparency, and showing respect for patients, families and the patients’ values are also important.

Within the survey among UK adults, 42% of respondents agreed that pharmaceutical companies work to high ethical standards – but these scores are substantially lower than for healthcare charities (61%) and healthcare professionals (75%).

This pattern was mirrored among UK adults when they were asked to consider levels of responsibility with regards to use of financial resources (e.g. from funding, profit or donations) across the three organisation types.

General public: To what extent to you agree or disagree that each of the following work to high ethical standards?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Disagreement</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceutical companies</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare charities</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare professionals</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General public: Taking into consideration all that you have heard or know, do you feel that the following use their financial resources (e.g. from funding, profit or donations) responsibly or not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Type</th>
<th>Responsible Use</th>
<th>Not Responsible Use</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceutical companies</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare charities</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare professionals</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Online survey, 1,104 UK adults (16-75) 9-12 October 2020
Amongst healthcare professionals, the perception of observance of high ethical standards within pharmaceutical companies was much higher (71%) – 29 percentage points higher than the view of UK adults. The position of responsible use of financial resources was also markedly higher amongst healthcare professionals surveyed at 76% (a positive difference of 30 percentage points versus UK adults). Once again it appears from the two surveys that stakeholders who have more regular and direct interaction with the pharmaceutical industry have a more positive perception. More work is therefore needed to communicate and clearly demonstrate to the wider public and stakeholders (beyond the immediate healthcare community) that pharmaceutical companies are committed to delivering best practice.

When asked about willingness to work with pharmaceutical companies (e.g. in clinical trials or joint working partnerships), 83% of healthcare professionals responded positively. This increased by 4 percentage points to 87% when asked if they would be willing to work with the industry if they demonstrated they were strongly involved in “purposeful activity”.

The link between purpose and increased trust and engagement was most clearly underlined by the proportion of healthcare professionals who said that they would be ‘very willing’ to work with the industry with the introduction of purpose. A strong willingness to work with pharmaceutical companies increased from 34% answering “very willing” to 46% with the introduction of purpose, reiterating its critical role in driving better collaboration within the sector.

**THE ROLE OF SCIENTISTS: A TRUSTED VOICE**

Charts: UK adults survey: Perceptions and trust levels in pharmaceutical companies and scientists within pharmaceutical companies

The survey among UK adults revealed a common view of favourability and trust towards pharmaceutical companies in general and the scientists employed by them, i.e. similar levels of favourability and trust, but higher levels of unfavourability and distrust for pharmaceutical companies compared to the scientists working within them.

The healthcare professionals surveyed also had a similarly positive view of scientists within the pharmaceutical sector. 81% for example were favourable – 13 percentage points higher than the favourability for pharmaceutical companies overall. Trust levels were similarly higher for scientists (by 20 percentage points).

Greater visibility of scientists engaged by the pharmaceutical industry within communications on purposeful activity – including education on how and why certain activity is undertaken by the sector – could play a powerful role in improving broader perceptions. Scientists could therefore have a vital role to play in unlocking patient trust in innovative approaches and therapies, and the role of the industry more broadly.

**Charts:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientists employed within the pharmaceutical industry</th>
<th>Pharmaceutical companies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total unfavourable (Very/mainly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither favourable nor unfavourable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total favourable (Very/mainly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Online survey, 1,104 UK adults (16-75) 9-12 October 2020
Understanding and responding to the needs and goals of the patients that the pharmaceutical industry is aiming to serve is critical if purpose is to be realised.

**WHAT STAKEHOLDERS VALUE MOST**

Within the survey among UK adults, participants were asked to rate the importance of a number of priorities. The results show that collaboration with scientists and researchers to support the development of innovative medicines is rated highest on importance, re-emphasising the need to break silos to drive progress. Collaboration with wider stakeholders, responsible use of patents and IP and investment in programmes to provide less expensive drugs in developing countries also all ranked highly.

As would be expected, the surveyed healthcare professionals were more certain in their areas of priority. As in the survey among UK adults, scientific collaboration for innovative medicine development also rated highest on importance on priorities for pharmaceutical companies. Healthcare professionals also rated collaboration with wider stakeholders, responsible use of patents and IP and investment in programmes to provide less expensive drugs in developing countries highly on importance.

Given that these will be critical for the development of the next generation of treatments, it is heartening to see the public and healthcare professionals survey broadly align. However, continuing dialogue and demonstration of purposeful activity will be required by pharmaceutical companies to embed the patient trust that this innovation will hinge upon.

**UK adults survey: How important, or not, is it for pharmaceutical companies in general to do the following?**

![Bar chart showing the importance of various actions to pharmaceutical companies.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Fairly important</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use patients and intellectual property protections responsibly</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest in assistance programmes that provide less expensive drugs in developing countries</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce their carbon footprint to help with sustainable working practices</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with scientists and researchers to support the development of innovative medicines</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest in digital technology to support the management of remote healthcare</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work collaboratively with other stakeholders (such as politicians, medical industry, etc.) to prioritise areas of focus and share more information about what is being done across the industry to develop healthcare products that will benefit society</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base:** Online survey, 1104 UK adults (16-75) 9-12 October 2020
Healthcare professional survey: How important, or not, is it for pharmaceutical companies in general to do the following?

- **Use patients and intellectual property protections responsibly:**
  - Very important: 5%
  - Fairly important: 32%
  - Not very important: 63%
  - Not at all important: 1%
  - Don’t know: 1%

- **Invest in assistance programmes that provide less expensive drugs in developing countries:**
  - Very important: 2%
  - Fairly important: 6%
  - Not very important: 42%
  - Not at all important: 1%
  - Don’t know: 3%

- **Reduce their carbon footprint to help with sustainable working practices:**
  - Very important: 1%
  - Fairly important: 29%
  - Not very important: 68%
  - Not at all important: 11%
  - Don’t know: 42%

- **Collaborate with scientists and researchers to support the development of innovative medicines:**
  - Very important: 1%
  - Fairly important: 46%
  - Not very important: 42%
  - Not at all important: 1%
  - Don’t know: 46%

- **Invest in digital technology to support the management of remote healthcare:**
  - Very important: 1%
  - Fairly important: 42%
  - Not very important: 46%
  - Not at all important: 11%
  - Don’t know: 8%

- **Work collaboratively with other stakeholders (such as politicians, medical industry, etc.) to prioritise areas of focus and share more information about what is being done across the industry to develop healthcare products that will benefit society:**
  - Very important: 5%
  - Fairly important: 32%
  - Not very important: 63%
  - Not at all important: 6%
  - Don’t know: 3%

**Base:** Online survey, 100 healthcare professionals (from a mix of speciality areas) 16-25 October 2020

**FINDING THE BALANCE**

Meeting the expectations of the public and patients that the pharmaceutical industry work to support is not always easy. Participants were asked which of the two statements come closest to their own opinion:

A: “Pharmaceutical companies should invest more in medical research, even if it means increasing the price of medication”;

B: “Pharmaceutical companies should reduce the price of medication, even if it means investing less in medical research”

**UNDERSTANDING AND RESPONDING TO THE NEEDS AND GOALS OF THE PATIENTS THAT THE PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY IS AIMING TO SERVE IS CRITICAL IF PURPOSE IS TO BE REALISED.**
Charts: Q. Which comes closest to your own opinion:
A: “Pharmaceutical companies should invest more in medical research, even if it means increasing the price of medication”;
B: “Pharmaceutical companies should reduce the price of medication, even if it means investing less in medical research”

UK Adult survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net: Prefer A</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither prefer A nor B</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer B</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Healthcare professional survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net: Prefer A</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither prefer A nor B</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer B</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: please recognise small sample size at individual regional levels means that care should be exercised when using analytical data

Base: Online survey, 1,104 UK adults (16-75) 9-12 October 2020

The results demonstrated that a larger proportion prefer A than B, but that a large proportion of respondents also opted for ‘neither prefer A or B’. The variation in results was not markedly different between the adult survey and the healthcare professionals.

Within the survey among UK adults, around a third of participants preferred statement A, while 31% held a neutral position and a further 28% preferred statement B. This broad split was reflected in the 55-75 age category, although there was a clear difference in preference amongst the under 44 categories with a higher proportion preferring statement A.
UK Adults survey: Q. Which comes closest to your own opinion:

A: “Pharmaceutical companies should invest more in medical research, even if it means increasing the price of medication”;

B: “Pharmaceutical companies should reduce the price of medication, even if it means investing less in medical research”

Greater transparency around decision making processes on complex issues such as these, where multiple considerations and demands need to be balanced, can be a helpful collaborative tool and may help to garner trust in the sector. Similarly, continued dialogue to better understand the priorities of those interacting with and depending upon your business – and how these may shift or evolve – is critical for any organisation committed to purpose.
ENGAGING THE PUBLIC: UNDERSTANDING THE AUDIENCE

Companies contemplating broader education programmes or public engagement will need to ensure that their communication of purpose takes demographic differences into account.

One interesting difference within the general public survey results was around age. While the overall total favourability for pharmaceutical companies was 38%, the 16–24 age category results were ten percentage points higher at 48%. This group also had the lowest net unfavourable scoring.

The 45 years and above categories had much lower favourability scores at just over 30%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favourable</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavourable</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further targeted research into the driving factors behind these perceptions could help unlock meaningful dialogue with patient groups, healthcare charities and public of all ages.
**ARTICULATING PURPOSE**

When questioned on organisations’ prioritisation of improving patients’ lives, 32% of participants felt that pharmaceutical companies (and healthcare charities) treat it highly but not as their top priority.

**UK Adults survey:** Q. Taking in to consideration all that you have heard or know, to what extent, if at all, is improving the lives of patients a priority for each of the following?

Base: Online survey, 1,104 UK adults (16-75) 9-12 October 2020

**Healthcare professional survey:** Q. Taking in to consideration all that you have heard or know, to what extent, if at all, is improving the lives of patients a priority for each of the following?

Base: Online survey, 100 healthcare professionals (from a mix of speciality areas) 16-25 October 2020

- They treat it as their top priority
- They treat it as a high priority, but it is not their top priority
- They treat it as a priority, but not a high priority
- They do not treat it as a priority
- Don’t know
Given the core purpose of the sector is guided by placing the patient at the centre of decision making and earning the trust of society, it is critical that more work is done to both articulate purpose in the industry and to demonstrate clear tangible action – highlighting positive activity, acknowledging where outcomes and delivery are below best practice, and seeking to improve with clearly communicated steps.

The healthcare professionals surveyed were more likely to see healthcare charities (52%) and other healthcare professionals (71%) as treating improving the lives of patients as their top priority. While healthcare professionals’ views align with the public on whether pharmaceutical companies’ top priority is improving the lives of patients (both 10%), healthcare professionals were more likely to take the view that pharmaceutical companies treat it as a high priority (53% compared to 32% of the public).

COVID-19 – SHIFTING PERCEPTIONS?

Responding to the COVID-19 pandemic has necessitated a collective national and global effort. Organisations across the private, public and third sectors have pulled together to find innovative means to positively support the communities they serve.

In August 2020 there were 167 vaccines being developed globally, with 29 in clinical trials. 72% of these vaccine projects were being driven by the pharmaceutical sector, with the remainder led by academic, non-profit organisations and the public sector.

Extensive work is also underway on developing an effective and clinically safe treatment. The pharmaceutical industry has shared clinical expertise, with many empowered employees who are trained healthcare professionals in medicine, laboratory technology and nursing to volunteer to support the NHS in the fight against COVID-19.

The pandemic has prompted many businesses – including the pharmaceutical industry – to reflect upon and begin to incorporate wider, more sustainable changes to help support the improvement of patient health.

Despite this, UK adults did not reveal a notable shift in public perception of pharmaceutical companies (nor scientists within them) since the pandemic, although there has been a positive response to the view of healthcare professionals. Amongst the healthcare professionals surveyed, the results were a little stronger (with over a quarter of respondents noting improved impressions); however the majority of respondents (two thirds) noted that their view of pharmaceutical companies and scientists within the sector had remained the same.
As the life sciences sector races towards developing treatments and vaccines, the public and media attention will continue to intensify, adding a greater level of sustained scrutiny as to how each pharmaceutical company is contributing towards a solution. The way in which the pharmaceutical industry responds during and beyond the initial outbreak, and through the NHS’s recovery will be critical in not only shaping the outcome of the pandemic, but the reputation of the whole industry in the future.

The pharmaceutical industry has historically had moments where it has struck positive chords with the public and core stakeholders but has also dealt with issues that have led to negative perception challenges. These challenges pre-date the pandemic but will in many cases persist after it has passed.

Therefore, while the COVID-19 pandemic may have underlined the necessity of purpose, this need arose long before and encompasses wider and longer-term structural trends that pharmaceutical companies need to work towards collaboratively to deliver better patient outcomes.
PART 3
WHAT NEXT? DEFINING AND ACTING ON YOUR COMPANY PURPOSE

The survey results clearly underline the need for the pharmaceutical industry to act to raise public trust; fortunately the more positive views evident within the survey of healthcare professionals do tend to reinforce the idea that greater levels of interaction and observation of purpose within the industry drive greater favourability.

Achieving this will require companies across the whole pharmaceutical sector to make concerted efforts to broaden engagement, heighten visible demonstration of purposeful activity, and increase education.

PUTTING PURPOSE FIRST

From a governance perspective there are some broad first steps towards defining and communicating a company’s purpose.

- **Building purpose into commercial decision-making criteria** – if the pharmaceutical industry is to genuinely act upon its purpose, this proposition must be embedded into all decisions, commercial and non-commercial. Critical to gaining public trust, purpose must be acted and communicated authentically.

- **Cross-sector learning** – in an increasingly collaborative wider business community, there is strong opportunity for the pharmaceutical industry to draw upon networks and learn from other sectors who have successfully embedded purpose into their businesses model and acted altruistically upon it.

- **Board reporting, internal programmes and education** – transparency emerged as a key recommendation from the survey and is vital to building trust. More openness about activity, outcomes and decision making will help foster this.
At a tangible level, demonstration of purpose may be centred around a range of approaches:

- Communicating and dedicating funding, resource and expertise of global teams of researchers and scientists to driving innovation in areas of unmet need through collaborations with cross-industry partners and internal R&D. This will need to incorporate patient voices, researchers and public health professionals to explore funding methods for research in new areas.
- Formalising partnerships with support for centres of excellence and partnership offices in innovation. In particular, forging partnerships in areas with known regional health inequalities to support smaller biotechnology and academic institutions in addressing these challenges.
- Providing sustained and meaningful investment in collaborations with research institutions, technology innovators, patient groups and the health service to support the development of novel solutions and treatments that will make a real difference to patients’ lives.
- Agreeing a transparent and measurable plan to accelerate the development of, and improve access to, breakthrough scientific innovations that can redefine the standard of patient care.
- Greater educational outreach on how the pharmaceutical industry operates, particularly the ‘molecule to medicine’ journey of innovation, to help increase public understanding and that of decision-makers outside of the main healthcare community.
- Leading sector-wide conversations on the issues that matter to stakeholders (as identified in the surveys) such as access in the developing world, the responsible use of patents and ensuring environmental sustainability in the development of medicines.

If the building blocks of purpose are in place and embedded in the decision making and processes of our businesses, then stakeholders and the public can begin to place greater confidence in the pharmaceutical industry operating with purpose at its core. It is this growing trust that will dictate the success or failure of the innovative programmes which will set the tone for the future of healthcare.
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