

8-31-2022

Editorial: Promising Strategies for Vaccine Messages: The Message and the Source

Bridget J. Kelly
RTI International

Amy E. Leader
Thomas Jefferson University

Nora B. Henrikson
Kaiser Permanente Washington Health Research Institute

Follow this and additional works at: <https://jdc.jefferson.edu/medoncfp>



Part of the [Oncology Commons](#), and the [Public Health Commons](#)

[Let us know how access to this document benefits you](#)

Recommended Citation

Kelly, Bridget J.; Leader, Amy E.; and Henrikson, Nora B., "Editorial: Promising Strategies for Vaccine Messages: The Message and the Source" (2022). *Department of Medical Oncology Faculty Papers*. Paper 209.

<https://jdc.jefferson.edu/medoncfp/209>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Jefferson Digital Commons. The Jefferson Digital Commons is a service of Thomas Jefferson University's [Center for Teaching and Learning \(CTL\)](#). The Commons is a showcase for Jefferson books and journals, peer-reviewed scholarly publications, unique historical collections from the University archives, and teaching tools. The Jefferson Digital Commons allows researchers and interested readers anywhere in the world to learn about and keep up to date with Jefferson scholarship. This article has been accepted for inclusion in Department of Medical Oncology Faculty Papers by an authorized administrator of the Jefferson Digital Commons. For more information, please contact: JeffersonDigitalCommons@jefferson.edu.



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED AND REVIEWED BY
Yoshihiko Kadoya,
Hiroshima University, Japan

*CORRESPONDENCE
Bridget J. Kelly
bkelly@arti.org

SPECIALTY SECTION
This article was submitted to
Public Health Education and
Promotion,
a section of the journal
Frontiers in Public Health

RECEIVED 16 June 2022
ACCEPTED 08 August 2022
PUBLISHED 31 August 2022

CITATION
Kelly BJ, Leader AE and Henrikson NB
(2022) Editorial: Promising strategies
for vaccine messages: The message
and the source.
Front. Public Health 10:971283.
doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2022.971283

COPYRIGHT
© 2022 Kelly, Leader and Henrikson.
This is an open-access article
distributed under the terms of the
[Creative Commons Attribution License
\(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). The use, distribution or
reproduction in other forums is
permitted, provided the original
author(s) and the copyright owner(s)
are credited and that the original
publication in this journal is cited, in
accordance with accepted academic
practice. No use, distribution or
reproduction is permitted which does
not comply with these terms.

Editorial: Promising strategies for vaccine messages: The message and the source

Bridget J. Kelly^{1*}, Amy E. Leader² and Nora B. Henrikson³

¹Science in the Public Sphere Program, Center for Communication Science, RTI International, Durham, NC, United States, ²Division of Population Science, Department of Medical Oncology, Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia, PA, United States, ³Kaiser Permanente Washington Health Research Institute, Seattle, WA, United States

KEYWORDS

vaccine hesitancy, message tailoring, trusted information source, outbreak communication, immunization

Editorial on the Research Topic

Promising strategies for vaccine messages: The message and the source

Two years into the COVID-19 pandemic, countries around the world continue to struggle with low vaccination rates. As of June 13, 2022, only 68% of the world's population had received at least one dose of the COVID-19 vaccine (1). While access and other structural barriers explain part of the gap, vaccine hesitancy also plays a role. Vaccine hesitancy has been an important public health issue in recent decades, but has never received as much attention as it has since the spring of 2020 with the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. Despite countless research studies on the topic, questions remain about how best to design vaccine messages and health communication campaigns that will be influential in promoting behavioral intentions.

The literature is clear that one-size-fits-all messaging approaches are not effective (2). The numerous systematic reviews on vaccination published since the start of the pandemic have identified common themes like the importance of trusted sources and context-specific barriers and facilitators (3, 4). These papers are consistent with longstanding public health theory and literature suggesting message strategies should be tailored to the population of interest to address the beliefs, norms, barriers and other factors most likely to influence behavioral intentions (5–7). The papers in this special issue underscore these findings.

The objective of this special collection entitled, “Promising strategies for vaccine promotion: The message and the source,” was to bring together recent research studies from around the world that have explored questions related to health communication and vaccine promotion. The resulting collection of five papers includes four observational studies and one case study. Specifically, the collection includes a retrospective piece on collaborating with two nutrition-focused, U.S.-based community organizations to deliver vaccine messaging (Rauh et al.); a qualitative interview study of students in China on COVID-19 vaccination (Luo and Song); a survey of medical students in China related to HPV vaccine hesitancy (Zhou et al.); a survey of college students in India to assess COVID-19 vaccination intentions (Jain et al.); and a social

network and sentiment analysis of social media posts (Gao et al.). As diverse in methods as these five papers are, several overlapping themes emerged among them.

The first was specific to the content of the messages themselves: vaccine safety and efficacy were top of mind in all study populations. In the survey of more than 700 medical students by Zhou et al., a large percentage were concerned about the safety of HPV vaccines. Interestingly, a majority of the students were unsure where to obtain reliable information about the HPV vaccine, despite their daily immersion in medical literature and frequent engagement with scientific sources. In 55 interviews with young Chinese students, Luo and Song found that vaccine information insufficiency augmented other barriers to vaccine intention. Some of the interview participants shared that more detailed information comparing the Chinese domestic vaccines to vaccines available internationally might have alleviated their concerns and shifted their intentions to vaccinate. Both studies illustrate that the public is often uncertain about the ingredients in vaccines and how people react to them. Findings that safety, efficacy (8) and information insufficiency more broadly (9), are important predictors are consistent with other recent research. In an era in which transparency is paramount, the public health community is wise to continue to educate its constituents about vaccine creation, production, distribution, and outcomes to reduce vaccine hesitancy.

A second theme that emerged was the need to tailor messaging to the specific population and context. Luo and Song identified barriers specific to Chinese young adults—Ti Zhi (the individual constitution) and beliefs that vaccines' advantages are weak related to non-medical prevention measures. These beliefs have not been frequently cited elsewhere. Jain et al. found that in India, trust in the domestic vaccine was high, which they contrasted with research from other parts of the world. Both findings highlight the importance of assessing motivators to vaccinate in specific populations (5).

The third theme was the importance of trust in the message source. The analysis by Gao et al. revealed more positive sentiment and less focus on concerns about vaccine safety following official announcement by the Chinese government, suggesting that once officials had endorsed the vaccines, people were more willing to be vaccinated. Zhou et al. found those who obtained information from a doctor (as opposed to another source) had lower rates of vaccine hesitancy. Similarly, Jain et al. found that trust in the healthcare system was a significant predictor of vaccine uptake among college students in India. Prior research has shown countries with higher trust in government have lower infection rates and higher vaccine acceptance (10, 11). For countries like the U.S., where survey research shows trust in government has declined over time

(12), future work should consider strategies for increasing that trust.

Rauh et al. put the idea of trusted source into practice. The authors, like, Jain et al., identified the potential for peer-to-peer communication via vaccine ambassadors as a promising strategy in reaching pregnant and postpartum community members. Rauh et al. also demonstrated how trusted community-based organizations can become valuable vaccine messengers, even when healthcare is not their primary mission. Training trusted messengers to deliver accurate vaccine safety and efficacy information, in lay language, may be a practical way to overcome vaccine hesitancy in communities that are doubting or questioning vaccines. Partnering with community organizations and lay health workers to deliver tailored interventions is the cornerstone of public health practice.

We should mention limitations of the collection of studies. While these observational studies can provide insights into the types of messages that may be needed, without randomized trials or intervention studies, we cannot make definitive claims about the types of messages or sources that are most effective in delivering vaccine information.

Audiences are heterogeneous and have varied informational needs. As a result, formative research to determine which messages and sources resonate with a particular audience, and tailoring messages to those findings may ensure higher likelihood of success.

Author contributions

BK: collaborated on outline, wrote the first draft of the editorial, and revised based on co-authors' feedback. AL: collaborated on outline, revised multiple drafts, and provided additional feedback. NH: revised multiple drafts and provided citations and other feedback. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

References

1. Holder J. *Tracking Coronavirus vaccinations around the world*. The New York Times. Covid World Vaccination Tracker - The New York Times (nytimes.com): Covid World Vaccination Tracker. (2022).
2. Jarrett C, Wilson R, O'Leary M, Eckersberger E, Larson HJ, the SAGE Working Group on Vaccine Hesitancy. Strategies for addressing vaccine hesitancy-A systematic review. *Vaccine*. 33:4180–90. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.04.040
3. Albers AN, Thaker J, Newcomer SR. Barriers to and facilitators of early childhood immunization in rural areas of the United States: A systematic review of the literature. *Prev Med Rep*. (2022) 27. doi: 10.1016/j.pmedr.2022.101804
4. Qiu X, Bailey H, Thorne C. Barriers and facilitators associated with vaccine acceptance and uptake among pregnant women in high income countries: a mini-review. *Front Immunol*. (2021). doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2021.626717
5. Fishbein M, Yzer M. Using theory to design effective health behavior interventions. *Commun Theory*. (2003) 13:164–83. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.2003.tb00287.x
6. Becker MH. The health belief model and personal health behavior. *Health Educ Monogr*. (1974) 2:324–508.
7. Kreuter M, Wray R. Tailored and targeted health communication: strategies for enhancing information relevance. *Am J Health Behav*. (2003) 27:S227–232. doi: 10.5993/AJHB.27.1.s3.6
8. Troiano G, Nardi A. Vaccine hesitancy in the era of COVID-19. *Public Health*. (2021) 194:245–51. doi: 10.1016/j.puhe.2021.02.025
9. Roy DN, Biswas M, Islam E, Azam MS. Potential factors influencing COVID-19 vaccine acceptance and hesitancy: a systematic review. *Plos ONE*. (2022) 17:e0265496. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0265496
10. Majid U, Wasim A, Truong J, Bakshi S. Public trust in governments, health care providers, and media during pandemics: a systematic review. *J Trust Res*. (2022) 119–141. doi: 10.1080/21515581.2022.2029742
11. Pandemic preparedness and COVID-19: An exploratory analysis of infection and fatality rates, and contextual factors associated with preparedness in 177 countries, from Jan 1, 2020, to September 30, 2021. *Lancet*. (2022) 16:1489–512.
12. Pew Research Center. *Public Trust in Government: 1958–2022*. (June 6, 2022). Available online at: <https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2022/06/06/public-trust-un-government-1958-2022> (accessed June 15, 2022).