Original Research Article

Vaccine Hesitancy: Exploring Causes, Consequences, and Strategies to Enhance Vaccination Rates and Public Trust in Vaccines

Kumar Himanshu[1], Urmi Poddar[2], Abdur Rahman Al Adil[3], Abhay Kumar[4]

[1]Tutor, Department of Community Medicine, Government Medical College & Hospital, Purnea, Bihar, India

[2]Tutor, Department of Community Medicine, Government Medical College & Hospital, Purnea, Bihar, India

[3]Tutor, Department of Community Medicine, Government Medical College & Hospital, Purnea, Bihar, India

[4]Assistant Professor & Head, Department of Community Medicine, Government Medical College & Hospital, Purnea, Bihar, India

Abstract:

Background: Vaccine hesitancy poses a significant challenge to global health by hindering vaccination efforts against preventable diseases. Factors contributing to hesitancy include concerns about vaccine safety, misinformation, and socio-cultural influences. Addressing these factors is crucial for improving vaccination rates and achieving public health goals.

Aim: This study aimed to investigate the causes and consequences of vaccine hesitancy, and to evaluate strategies to enhance vaccination rates and public trust in vaccines among 100 participants at GMCH, Purnea.

Methods: A mixed-methods approach was employed, involving 70 members of the general public and 30 healthcare professionals. Demographic data, vaccination attitudes, and hesitancy levels were collected through surveys and interviews. Chi-square tests examined associations between demographic variables (age, gender, education, vaccination status) and vaccine hesitancy. Logistic regression analysis identified predictors of hesitancy.

Results: The study found that 28% of participants were vaccine-hesitant, with significantly higher hesitancy among the general public (36%) compared to healthcare professionals (10%). Chi-square tests revealed significant associations between vaccine hesitancy and age (p=0.049), education level (p=0.006), and vaccination status (p<0.001). Logistic regression indicated that younger age (OR=1.07, p=0.031), lower education (OR=0.23, p=0.033), and being unvaccinated or partially vaccinated (OR=0.12, p=0.002) were predictors of hesitancy.

Conclusion: Vaccine hesitancy is influenced by demographic factors and vaccination status, underscoring the need for tailored interventions. Strategies should focus on targeted educational campaigns, enhancing accessibility to vaccines, and fostering trust in healthcare providers and public health authorities.

Recommendations: The recommendation include implementation of robust educational initiatives to combat misinformation and address concerns about vaccine safety. Strengthen communication strategies to promote transparency and build public trust in vaccines. Enhance vaccine accessibility through community-based clinics and outreach programs. Engage healthcare professionals as advocates to address patient concerns and promote vaccination. Monitor and adapt strategies based on ongoing research and community feedback.

Keywords: Vaccine Hesitancy, Public Trust, Vaccination Rates, Public Health.

Introduction

Vaccine hesitancy, defined as the delay in acceptance or refusal of vaccination despite availability of vaccination services, poses a significant challenge to global public health efforts. It threatens to reverse the gains made in controlling and eliminating vaccine-preventable diseases, leading to outbreaks and increased morbidity and mortality rates. The World Health Organization (WHO) identifies vaccine hesitancy as one of the top ten global health threats of 2019, underscoring its critical impact on public health worldwide. Addressing vaccine hesitancy requires a nuanced understanding of its underlying causes, the implications of hesitancy on individual and community health, and effective strategies to build public trust in vaccines [1].

Vaccine hesitancy arises from a complex interplay of factors spanning individual beliefs, socio-

cultural influences, and misinformation. Individual beliefs often stem from concerns about vaccine safety and efficacy, influenced by perceived risks versus benefits. Socio-cultural factors encompass community norms, religious beliefs, and historical experiences that shape attitudes towards vaccines. Misinformation propagated through social media and anti-vaccine movements further fuels hesitancy by disseminating false claims about vaccine ingredients, side effects, and purported links to adverse health outcomes. Understanding these multifaceted influences is crucial for devising targeted interventions to address hesitancy [2]

The consequences of vaccine hesitancy are profound and multifactorial. Reduced vaccine uptake leads to decreased herd immunity within communities, increasing the risk of disease outbreaks even among vaccinated individuals. For instance, measles outbreaks in several countries have been attributed to declining vaccination rates due to hesitancy, resulting in increased hospitalizations and deaths [3]. Economic costs also escalate as healthcare systems bear the burden of treating preventable diseases and implementing outbreak response measures. Moreover, vaccine hesitancy erodes public trust in healthcare providers and government health agencies, undermining the credibility of immunization programs. These consequences highlight the urgent need for evidence-based strategies to mitigate hesitancy and promote vaccine acceptance [4].

To enhance vaccination rates and restore public trust in vaccines, interventions must be multifaceted and tailored to diverse populations. Educational campaigns that provide accurate information about vaccine safety and benefits have shown promise in addressing misconceptions and improving vaccine acceptance. Engaging healthcare providers as trusted sources of information is critical in addressing patient concerns and promoting informed decision-making. Community engagement strategies, such as partnering with local leaders and influencers, can effectively counter misinformation and foster a supportive environment for vaccination. Additionally, policies that ensure equitable access to vaccines and streamline vaccination processes contribute to improving coverage rates and reducing disparities [5].

This study aims to investigate the causes and consequences of vaccine hesitancy, and to evaluate strategies to enhance vaccination rates and public trust in vaccines among 100 participants at GMCH, Purnea.

Methodology

Study Design: This study employed a mixed-methods design, integrating both quantitative and qualitative approaches to comprehensively explore the causes, consequences, and strategies to address vaccine hesitancy.

Study Setting: The research was conducted in diverse settings including urban and rural communities across GMCH ,Purnea regions for the duration of 6 months to capture a wide range of perspectives and experiences.

Participants: A total of 100 participants were included in the study. These comprised 70 individuals from the general public identified as either vaccine-hesitant or compliant, and 30 healthcare professionals such as doctors, nurses, and public health officials.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria: Inclusion criteria for the general public were adults aged 18 and above who were eligible to receive vaccines under the current health guidelines. For healthcare professionals, the inclusion criteria required active involvement in vaccine administration or public health communication. Exclusion criteria included individuals who had severe allergic reactions to vaccines or had medical exemptions.

Bias: To minimize bias, the study employed stratified sampling to ensure diverse representation across demographic groups such as age, gender, socio-economic status, and geographic location. Additionally, data collectors were trained to maintain neutrality and consistency in their interactions with participants.

Variables: Independent variables included demographic factors (age, gender, socio-economic status), levels of vaccine hesitancy, sources of information, and trust in healthcare systems. Dependent variables were vaccination rates and the incidence of vaccine-preventable diseases.

Data Collection: Quantitative data were collected through structured surveys and public health records. Surveys assessed attitudes, beliefs, and behaviours related to vaccination. Qualitative data were gathered through semi-structured interviews with both the general public and healthcare professionals to gain deeper insights into personal and systemic barriers to vaccination.

Procedure: Participants were recruited through community outreach, healthcare facilities, and online platforms. Surveys were administered both in-person and electronically, while interviews were conducted face-to-face or via video calls, ensuring confidentiality and comfort for participants.

Sample size:

To calculate the sample size for this study, the following formula was used for estimating a proportion in a population:

$n = \underline{Z^2 \times p \times (1-p)}$

E^2

Where:

- n = sample size

- Z = Z-score corresponding to the desired level of confidence

- p = estimated proportion in the population

- E = margin of error

Statistical Analysis: Data were analysed using SPSS version 21.0. Descriptive statistics summarized demographic data and vaccination attitudes. Inferential statistics, including chi-square tests and logistic regression, examined associations between variables. Qualitative data were transcribed, coded, and analysed thematically to identify recurring patterns and insights.

Results

Demographic Data and Vaccination Attitudes: The study included 100 participants, consisting of 70 members of the general public and 30 healthcare professionals. The demographic breakdown and summary of vaccination attitudes are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics and Vaccination Attitudes of Participants

Demographic Variable	General Public (n=70)	Healthcare Professionals (n=30)	Total (n=100)
Age (Mean ± SD)	35.2 ± 12.4 years	42.3 ± 9.6 years	37.3 ± 11.8 years
Gender (%)			
Male	40 (57%)	18 (60%)	58 (58%)
Female	30 (43%)	12 (40%)	42 (42%)
Education (%)			
Primary School	20 (29%)	2 (7%)	22 (22%)
Secondary School	30 (43%)	8 (27%)	38 (38%)
High School	20 (29%)	20 (67%)	40 (40%)
Vaccination Status (%)			
Fully Vaccinated	45 (64%)	28 (93%)	73 (73%)
Partially Vaccinated	15 (21%)	2 (7%)	17 (17%)
Not Vaccinated	10 (14%)	0 (0%)	10 (10%)
Vaccine Hesitancy (%)			
Hesitant	25 (36%)	3 (10%)	28 (28%)
Non-hesitant	45 (64%)	27 (90%)	72 (72%)
Not Vaccinated	10 (14%)	0 (0%)	10 (10%)

Inferential Statistics

Chi-Square Test Results: Chi-square tests were performed to examine the association between demographic variables and vaccine hesitancy. The results are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Chi-Square Test Results for Association between Demographic Variables and Vaccine Hesitancy

Variable	Chi-Square Value	df	p-value
Age	3.85	1	0.049
Gender	0.56	1	0.454
Education	10.23	2	0.006
Vaccination Status	25.91	2	<0.001

Logistic Regression Analysis: Logistic regression analysis was conducted to identify significant predictors of vaccine hesitancy. The independent variables included in the model were age, gender, education level, and vaccination status. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Logistic Regression Analysis of Predictors of Vaccine Hesitancy

Predictor variable	B	SE	OR (95% CI)	p-value
Age	0.07	0.03	1.07 (1.01-1.14)	0.031
Gender (Female)	0.28	0.52	1.32 (0.48-3.59)	0.588
Education (High School)	-0.92	0.64	0.40 (0.12-1.32)	0.137
Education (>High School)	-1.45	0.67	0.23 (0.06-0.89)	0.033
Vaccination Status	-2.10	0.68	0.12 (0.03-0.46)	0.002

- **Demographics and Vaccination Attitudes:** The study population had a mean age of 37.3 years with 58% males and 42% females. Among the general public, 64% were fully vaccinated, while 93% of healthcare professionals were fully vaccinated. Vaccine hesitancy was higher among the general public (36%) compared to healthcare professionals (10%).
- **Chi-Square Tests:** Significant associations were found between vaccine hesitancy and age (p=0.049), education level (p=0.006), and vaccination status (p<0.001). Gender was not significantly associated with vaccine hesitancy (p=0.454).
- **Logistic Regression Analysis:** Age (OR=1.07, p=0.031), higher education level (OR=0.23, p=0.033), and vaccination status (OR=0.12, p=0.002) were significant predictors of vaccine hesitancy. Gender was not a significant predictor (p=0.588).

Discussion

The study, involving 100 participants, revealed notable demographic and attitudinal trends towards vaccination. The average age of participants was 37.3 years, with a male majority of 58%. Healthcare professionals had higher full vaccination rates (93%) compared to the general public (64%), and vaccine hesitancy was more prevalent among the general public (36%) than healthcare professionals (10%). Chi-square tests indicated significant associations between vaccine hesitancy and age (p=0.049), education level (p=0.006), and vaccination status (p<0.001), but not gender (p=0.454).

Logistic regression further identified age (OR=1.07, p=0.031), higher education (OR=0.23, p=0.033), and vaccination status (OR=0.12, p=0.002) as significant predictors of vaccine hesitancy, while gender remained non-significant (p=0.588). These findings suggest targeted interventions considering demographic factors may be essential to address vaccine hesitancy effectively.

A cross-sectional study was done in Puducherry, which analysed vaccine hesitancy among 776 adults, provides crucial insights into the demographic and psychological factors influencing vaccine acceptance. With a mean participant age of 43.3 years and a female majority (67%), the study highlighted significant associations between vaccine hesitancy and lower education levels, lack of trust in vaccine safety, and exposure to misinformation. Logistic regression analysis indicated that age, gender, and education were significant predictors of hesitancy, reinforcing the necessity for tailored public health interventions [5].

Similarly, a study analysed vaccine hesitancy across different states in India, focusing on demographic factors such as age, gender, and education level. It found significant regional variations, with higher hesitancy rates in rural areas and among less educated populations. This regional disparity underscores the need for localized health communication strategies to effectively address specific barriers to vaccination in different communities [6]

The role of misinformation and trust in government and healthcare systems in shaping vaccine attitudes were emphasised in a study. Their research suggested that targeted communication strategies are essential to address the specific concerns of various demographic groups, particularly those with higher levels of mistrust or misinformation. When integrating findings from these studies, several key themes emerge: the critical role of education in vaccine acceptance, the impact of trust in vaccine safety and government authorities, and the pervasive influence of misinformation. Public health campaigns must prioritize educational efforts, transparent communication, and trust-building measures, particularly targeting rural populations, women, and those with lower educational backgrounds. This multi-faceted approach is vital for increasing vaccine uptake and achieving broader public health goals [7,8].

Conclusion

This study reveals that vaccine hesitancy is significantly influenced by demographic factors such as age, education level, and vaccination status. Specifically, younger individuals, those with lower educational attainment, and those who are unvaccinated or partially vaccinated are more likely to exhibit vaccine hesitancy. The findings underscore the critical need for targeted interventions to address these disparities.

References

1. Ebrahimi OV, Johnson MS, Ebling S, Amundsen OM, Halsøy Ø, Hoffart A, Skjerdingstad N, Johnson SU. Risk, trust, and flawed assumptions: vaccine hesitancy during the COVID-19 pandemic. Frontiers in Public Health. 2021 Jul 1; 9:700213.
2. Qadrie Z, Dar MA, Maqbool M, Qadir A, Ara I. Vaccine Hesitancy Unmasked: Unraveling Its Enigmatic Threads.
3. Galagali PM, Kinikar AA, Kumar VS. Vaccine hesitancy: obstacles and challenges. Current Pediatrics Reports. 2022 Dec;10(4):241-8.
4. Habersaat KB, Jackson C. Understanding vaccine acceptance and demand—and ways to increase them. Bundesgesundheitsblatt- Gesundh disforesting- Gesundheit Schutz. 20 20 Jan; 63 (1):32-9.
5. Larson HJ, Cooper LZ, Eskola J, Katz SL, Ratzan S. Addressing the vaccine confidence

gap. The Lancet. 2011 Aug 6;378(9790):526-35.

6. Dinesh RJ, Dhanalakshmi R, Jency PJ, Srividya A, Vijayakumar B, Kumar A. Factors for hesitancy towards vaccination against COVID-19 among the adult population in Puducherry, India–a cross sectional study. BMC Public Health. 2023 Nov 10;23(1):2217.

7. Nanteer-Oteng E, Kretchy IA, Nanteer DO, Kretchy JP, Osafo J. Hesitancy towards COVID-19 vaccination: The role of personali-ty traits, anti-vaccine attitudes and illness per-ception. PLOS Global Public Health. 2022 Dec 28;2(12):e0001435.

8. Stead M, Jessop C, Angus K, Bedford H, Ussher M, Ford A, Eadie D, MacGregor A, Hunt K, MacKintosh AM. National survey of attitudes towards and intentions to vaccinate against COVID-19: implications for communi-cations. BMJ open. 2021 Oct 1;11(10):e0550 85.