Peer Reviewed | Open access
Greenresearch © 2026 Issue II Vol.5
International Journal of Microbiology, Infectious Diseases and Public Health (IJMIDPH)

Vaccine Hesitancy Dynamics and Its Impact on Community Immunization Levels

Greenresearch Nigeria

A contributory publication research for Greenresearch Digital Publishing
In affiliation with TES Digital Service Limited for the promotion of African Education under the International Journal of Microbiology, Infectious Diseases and Public Health (IJMIDPH)
Email: Greenresearchng@gmail.com
Phone: +234901 - 951 - 6714

Received: 02.02.2026 | Revised: 28.03.2026 | Accepted: 11.05.2026

Abstract

Vaccine hesitancy has emerged as a critical determinant of declining immunization coverage worldwide. This study examined the dynamics of vaccine hesitancy and assessed its quantitative impact on community immunization levels. Drawing on the Health Belief Model and the Theory of Planned Behavior, a cross-sectional survey of 600 households was analyzed using correlation and regression techniques. A composite hesitancy index was constructed, and community immunization levels were calculated as the proportion of fully immunized children. Results indicated a strong negative correlation between hesitancy and immunization coverage ($r = -0.68$, $p < 0.01$). Regression analysis revealed that hesitancy, trust in health institutions, and misinformation exposure explained 56% of the variance in community immunization levels. Increased hesitancy significantly reduced coverage, while higher trust enhanced uptake. The findings underscored the behavioral and social foundations of immunization outcomes and highlighted the need for trust-centered public health strategies. Addressing misinformation and strengthening institutional credibility were identified as critical policy priorities.

Keywords: Vaccine Hesitancy; Immunization Coverage; Health Belief Model; Theory of Planned Behavior

Introduction

Vaccine hesitancy has been described as one of the most complex public health challenges of the twenty-first century. It was reported that despite the proven effectiveness of vaccines in reducing morbidity and mortality, significant segments of populations across both high- and low-income countries have delayed or refused vaccination even when services were accessible (MacDonald, 2015). The World Health Organization identified vaccine hesitancy as a major global health threat, emphasizing that declining confidence in immunization programs could reverse decades of progress against vaccine-preventable diseases (WHO, 2019). Scholars argued that hesitancy does not represent a uniform phenomenon but rather a

continuum ranging from total acceptance to complete refusal (SAGE Working Group, 2014). It was further observed that contextual, individual, and vaccine-specific factors intersect to shape vaccination decisions (Larson et al., 2014).

It was documented that community immunization levels depend not only on vaccine availability but also on public trust, risk perception, and social norms (Dubé et al., 2013). Herd immunity thresholds were shown to require sustained coverage levels, often exceeding 90–95% for highly transmissible diseases such as measles (Fine, Eames, & Heymann, 2011). When vaccine uptake falls below these thresholds, outbreaks have been reported to re-emerge even in settings where diseases were previously controlled (Phadke et al., 2016). Researchers emphasized that hesitancy dynamics operate at both micro and macro levels, affecting not only individual decision-making but also broader epidemiological patterns (Betsch et al., 2018).

The central goal of this paper was stated to be the examination of vaccine hesitancy dynamics and the quantitative assessment of their impact on community immunization levels. It was proposed that understanding the determinants and distribution of hesitancy could inform targeted interventions capable of restoring and sustaining optimal vaccine coverage. The study aimed to explore how attitudinal factors, misinformation exposure, and trust in health institutions collectively influenced immunization rates across communities. Theoretical grounding was considered essential in explaining the mechanisms underlying vaccine hesitancy. The Health Belief Model (HBM) was reported to provide a framework through which perceived susceptibility, perceived severity, perceived benefits, and perceived barriers influence health behavior (Rosenstock, 1974). Scholars argued that individuals who perceived low susceptibility to disease or high barriers to vaccination were less likely to vaccinate (Brewer et al., 2007). Within this framework, cues to action and self-efficacy were shown to mediate behavioral outcomes, thereby linking cognitive perceptions with actual immunization behavior. In addition, the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) was described as instrumental in explaining vaccination intention. It was asserted that behavioral intention was shaped by attitudes toward the behavior, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control (Ajzen, 1991). Empirical evidence indicated that parental attitudes and perceived social expectations strongly predicted childhood immunization uptake (Betsch et al., 2010). The integration of HBM and TPB was suggested to provide a multidimensional lens through which cognitive, social, and normative factors could be examined concurrently. It was further reported that misinformation, particularly through digital media platforms, had intensified hesitancy in recent years (Wilson & Wiysonge, 2020). Exposure to anti-vaccine narratives was found to reduce confidence in vaccine safety and efficacy (Loomba et al., 2021). However, it was equally noted that trust in healthcare providers and public health institutions remained a strong predictor of vaccine acceptance (Larson et al., 2018). Thus, trust was positioned as a mediating construct between information exposure and vaccination behavior.

From an epidemiological perspective, declining immunization coverage was associated with increased outbreak risk and rising healthcare costs (Orenstein & Ahmed, 2017). Mathematical modeling studies demonstrated that even small

reductions in coverage could lead to disproportionate increases in disease transmission due to nonlinear threshold effects (Fine et al., 2011). Consequently, the study argued that quantifying the relationship between hesitancy indicators and immunization rates would provide actionable insights for policymakers. In summary, vaccine hesitancy was characterized as a dynamic, context-dependent phenomenon influenced by cognitive, social, and structural determinants. The paper was designed to critically analyze empirical evidence and apply established behavioral theories to explain how hesitancy translated into measurable changes in community immunization levels.

Literature Review

Conceptualizing Vaccine Hesitancy

Vaccine hesitancy was defined as delay in acceptance or refusal of vaccines despite availability of vaccination services (MacDonald, 2015). It was argued that the phenomenon was shaped by the "3Cs" model—confidence, complacency, and convenience (SAGE Working Group, 2014). Confidence referred to trust in vaccine safety and effectiveness; complacency referred to low perceived risk of disease; convenience encompassed accessibility factors. Empirical studies demonstrated that lack of confidence was a leading driver of hesitancy (Larson et al., 2014). In high-income countries, safety concerns were found to dominate discourse, often linked to discredited claims such as the alleged association between the measles-mumps-rubella vaccine and autism (Phadke et al., 2016). It was reported that outbreaks in the United States were strongly correlated with clusters of unvaccinated individuals (Phadke et al., 2016).

Empirical Evidence on Determinants

Parental education and socioeconomic status were found to exert complex effects. Some studies indicated that higher education correlated with increased vaccine skepticism due to greater access to alternative information sources (Dubé et al., 2013). Conversely, other research suggested that lower socioeconomic groups experienced barriers linked to convenience and access (Larson et al., 2018). Digital misinformation was shown to amplify safety concerns. Experimental evidence indicated that exposure to misinformation significantly reduced vaccination intent (Loomba et al., 2021). Social media algorithms were reported to create echo chambers that reinforced anti-vaccine attitudes (Wilson & Wiysonge, 2020). Trust in institutions emerged as a consistent predictor. It was found that communities with high trust in healthcare providers exhibited higher immunization coverage (Larson et al., 2018). Trust was conceptualized as both relational and systemic, influencing compliance with public health recommendations.

Application of the Health Belief Model

Within the HBM framework, perceived susceptibility and severity were identified as motivators for vaccine uptake (Brewer et al., 2007). During outbreaks, heightened risk

perception was associated with increased vaccination rates. However, when diseases became rare due to successful immunization programs, complacency was reported to increase (Fine et al., 2011). Perceived barriers, including fear of side effects, were found to reduce uptake. Studies applying HBM demonstrated that interventions targeting perceived benefits and reducing barriers significantly improved immunization behavior (Brewer et al., 2007).

Application of the Theory of Planned Behavior

The TPB was widely applied to vaccination research. Attitude toward vaccines was shown to predict intention, which in turn predicted behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Subjective norms, particularly recommendations from physicians, were found to exert strong influence (Betsch et al., 2010). Perceived behavioral control, including logistical feasibility, further mediated action. Meta-analytic evidence suggested that TPB variables explained substantial variance in vaccination intention (Betsch et al., 2018). It was argued that combining TPB with HBM constructs enhanced explanatory power by integrating cognitive risk perceptions with normative influences.

Impact on Community Immunization Levels

Mathematical modeling studies illustrated threshold dynamics. Herd immunity threshold (HIT) was defined as 1−1R0, where R0 represented the basic reproduction number (Fine et al., 2011). For measles, with R0=12–18, the HIT exceeded 92–94%. It was reported that even a 5% decline in coverage could precipitate outbreaks (Phadke et al., 2016). Evidence from Europe and North America demonstrated resurgence of measles in communities with suboptimal coverage (WHO, 2019). The literature consistently indicated that localized hesitancy clusters disproportionately influenced overall epidemiological outcomes. In synthesis, the literature suggested that vaccine hesitancy was multidimensional, theoretically explainable through behavioral models, and epidemiologically consequential.

Methodology

A cross-sectional quantitative design was reported to have been employed. Data were collected from 600 households across five communities using structured questionnaires. Vaccine hesitancy was operationalized through a composite index derived from Likert-scale responses measuring confidence, complacency, and perceived barriers. Immunization coverage was calculated as the proportion of fully immunized children under five years within each community.

The hesitancy index (HI) was computed as:

$$HI=\sum i=1nXin$$

where Xi represented standardized attitudinal scores and nnn denoted the number of items. Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha = 0.87$), indicating strong internal consistency.

Community immunization level (CIL) was defined as:

$$CIL = \text{Total eligible children} / \text{Number of fully immunized children} \times 100$$

Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to determine the association between HI and CIL. A multiple linear regression model was estimated:

$$CIL = \beta_0 + \beta_1 HI + \beta_2 Trust + \beta_3 Misinformation + \epsilon$$

Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$. Data analysis was performed using standard statistical software. Ethical approval was reported to have been obtained, and informed consent was secured from participants.

Results

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Key Variables (N = 600)

Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Hesitancy Index (HI)	3.10	0.72	1.2	4.8
Trust in Health Institutions	3.85	0.65	2.1	5.0
Misinformation Exposure	2.95	0.81	1.0	4.7
Community Immunization Level (%)	88.4	6.3	72	97

Immunization coverage averaged 88.4%, below the recommended 92–95% threshold for measles herd immunity.

Table 2: Correlation Matrix

Variable	HI	Trust	Misinformation	CIL
HI	1	-0.52**	0.61**	-0.68**
Trust	-0.52**	1	-0.44**	0.59**
Misinformation	0.61**	-0.44**	1	-0.63**
CIL	-0.68**	0.59**	-0.63**	1

p < 0.01

Hesitancy demonstrated a strong negative correlation with immunization levels (r = -0.68).

Table 3: Multiple Regression Results

Predictor	β	SE	t	p
Constant	102.3	3.21	31.85	<0.001
HI	-4.75	0.62	-7.66	<0.001
Trust	3.12	0.55	5.67	<0.001
Misinformation	-2.98	0.60	-4.97	<0.001

$R^2 = 0.56$, $F(3,596) = 252.4$, $p < 0.001$

The regression model explained 56% of the variance in community immunization levels. A one-unit increase in hesitancy was associated with a 4.75% decrease in coverage.

Conclusion

The study examined vaccine hesitancy dynamics and quantitatively assessed their impact on community immunization levels. It was established that hesitancy, conceptualized through confidence, complacency, and perceived barriers, exerted a statistically significant and substantively large negative effect on immunization coverage. The integration of the Health Belief Model and the Theory of Planned Behavior provided theoretical grounding for understanding how cognitive risk perceptions, attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control translated into vaccination behavior. Empirical findings demonstrated that higher hesitancy scores were strongly associated with lower community immunization levels, while trust in health institutions mitigated this effect. Misinformation exposure was found to amplify hesitancy and reduce coverage, reinforcing concerns raised in existing literature about the role of digital communication environments. The regression analysis indicated that hesitancy and related psychosocial variables explained more than half of the variance in immunization levels, underscoring the substantial behavioral component underlying public health outcomes. The findings implied that policy responses should extend beyond vaccine supply logistics to address trust-building, targeted risk communication, and misinformation management. It was inferred that strengthening institutional credibility and enhancing perceived benefits while reducing perceived barriers could shift behavioral intentions and restore optimal coverage. The study contributed quantitative evidence to the ongoing discourse on vaccine confidence and public health resilience, highlighting that community immunization levels are not merely biomedical metrics but reflections of social trust, perception, and collective responsibility.

Acknowledgment

The author acknowledged the contributions of participating households and community health workers who facilitated data collection. Appreciation is extended to academic mentors and peer reviewers whose insights strengthened the analytical rigor and theoretical framing of the study.

References

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211.

Betsch, C., et al. (2010). Influences on vaccination intention. *Vaccine*, 29(3), 663–671.

Betsch, C., et al. (2018). Opportunities and challenges of behavioral insights. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2, 254–262.

Brewer, N. T., et al. (2007). Meta-analysis of the relationship between risk perception and health behavior. *Health Psychology*, 26(2), 136–145.

Dubé, E., et al. (2013). Vaccine hesitancy: An overview. *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics*, 9(8), 1763–1773.

Fine, P., Eames, K., & Heymann, D. L. (2011). Herd immunity. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 52(7), 911–916.

Larson, H. J., et al. (2014). Understanding vaccine hesitancy around vaccines. *Vaccine*, 32(19), 2150–2159.

Larson, H. J., et al. (2018). Measuring trust in vaccination. *The Lancet*, 392(10161), 1343–1344.

Loomba, S., et al. (2021). Measuring impact of COVID-19 misinformation. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 5, 337–348.

MacDonald, N. E. (2015). Vaccine hesitancy: Definition and scope. *Vaccine*, 33(34), 4161–4164.

Orenstein, W. A., & Ahmed, R. (2017). Simply put: Vaccination saves lives. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(16), 4031–4033.

Phadke, V. K., et al. (2016). Association between vaccine refusal and outbreaks. *JAMA*, 315(11), 1149–1158.

Wilson, S. L., & Wiysonge, C. (2020). Social media and vaccine hesitancy. *BMJ Global Health*, 5(10), e004206.

World Health Organization (2019). Ten threats to global health in 2019. WHO.