

1 **The Cultural Evolution of Vaccine Hesitancy: Modeling the Interaction between Beliefs and** 2 **Behaviors**

3 Kerri-Ann Anderson and Nicole Creanza

4 Department of Biological Sciences and Evolutionary Studies Initiative, Vanderbilt University,
5 Nashville, TN 37212

6

7 **Abstract:**

8 In the last decade, despite the proven efficacy of vaccines, the developed world has seen a
9 resurgence of vaccine-preventable diseases (VPDs) such as measles, pertussis, and polio. Vaccine
10 hesitancy, an individual behavior influenced by historical, political, and socio-cultural factors, is
11 believed to be a primary factor responsible for decreasing vaccine coverage, thereby increasing
12 the risk and occurrence of VPD outbreaks. Society, culture, and individual motivations affect
13 human decisions regarding health behavior and preventative care, and health perceptions and
14 health-related behaviors can change at the population level as cultures evolve. In recent years,
15 mathematical models of disease dynamics have begun to incorporate aspects of human behavior,
16 however they do not address how evolving cultures influence these health behaviors. Here, using
17 a mathematical modeling framework, we explore the effects of cultural evolution on vaccine
18 hesitancy and vaccination behavior. With this model, we shed light on the facets of cultural
19 evolution (vertical and oblique transmission, homophily, etc.) that promote the spread of vaccine
20 hesitancy, ultimately affecting levels of vaccination coverage and VPD outbreak risk in a
21 population. In addition, we present our model as a generalizable framework for exploring cultural
22 evolution when beliefs influence, but do not strictly dictate, human behaviors. We show vaccine
23 confidence and vaccine-conferred benefits can be driving forces of vaccine coverage, and we
24 demonstrate that an assortative preference among vaccine-hesitant individuals can lead to
25 increased vaccine hesitancy and lower vaccine coverage. Further, we show that vaccine mandates
26 can lead to a phenomenon in which high vaccine hesitancy co-occurs with high vaccination
27 coverage, and that high vaccine confidence can be maintained even in areas where access to
28 vaccines is limited.

29

30 Introduction:

31 In conjunction with genetics, variations in human behaviors such as diet, hand-washing,
32 and vaccination result in differential susceptibility to a range of diseases. Improvements in
33 sanitation and healthcare practices have reduced the mortality and morbidity of many infectious
34 diseases [1]. For example, the implementation of childhood vaccination policies has led to the
35 eradication of smallpox and the elimination of poliomyelitis (polio) in the United States [2–4], and
36 the high efficacy of the measles vaccine, combined with wide vaccine acceptance in developed
37 countries, had resulted in measles previously being targeted for elimination by 2020 [5]. Recent
38 infectious disease trends, however, have illustrated how easily efforts to eradicate diseases can
39 be undermined: over the past decade, there has been a resurgence of vaccine-preventable
40 diseases (VPDs) in developed countries despite the safety and efficacy of vaccines and high
41 overall childhood vaccination rates [6–9]. Outbreaks of VPDs such as measles, pertussis, and polio
42 have been linked to pockets of under-vaccinated or unvaccinated individuals, which often go
43 relatively unnoticed by the public due to high national estimates of vaccination coverage and the
44 assumption of associated herd immunity [8].

45 Human decisions regarding health-related behaviors, including preventative care, are
46 influenced by both internal and external motivations. The term “local vaccination cultures”
47 describes the shared beliefs among individuals within a community or region about disease
48 etiology, prevention, and treatment, as well as the experiences with health services and
49 vaccination settings that influence individual vaccine decisions [10]. In areas where there exists a
50 pro-vaccination culture, there may nonetheless be individuals who are vaccine hesitant (as
51 defined by [11]), delaying or refusing to use vaccines despite their availability. Vaccine hesitancy
52 is a complex and context-specific individual behavior influenced by factors that shape vaccination
53 culture such as complacency (the belief that vaccination is unnecessary when the perceived risk
54 of VPDs is low), convenience (the accessibility and affordability of vaccines), and confidence (the
55 level of trust in the efficacy and safety of the vaccine, and in the healthcare system) [9,11].
56 Vaccine hesitancy was named one of the World Health Organization’s ten threats to global health
57 in 2019 [12], as it is believed to be responsible for decreasing vaccination coverage and thus
58 increasing the risk of vaccine-preventable disease outbreaks worldwide.

59 Vaccine hesitancy and vaccination opposition are, however, not recent phenomena: since
60 the creation of vaccines in the 18th century, public opposition to vaccinations has been based in
61 theology, politics, law, and general skepticism [13–16]. Two persistent themes of vaccine

62 hesitancy include the idea that vaccinations are more harmful than the diseases they intend to
63 prevent (usually occurring at the introduction of new vaccines), and the idea that vaccines may
64 not be necessary during a decline in disease (usually after compulsory vaccination mandates)
65 [13]. With the introduction of compulsory vaccination in the 19th century came the precursors of
66 contemporary vaccination exemptions [17,18]. The Anti-Vaccination League, founded in mid-19th-
67 century London, argued that compulsory vaccination invaded the people’s liberties [19]. A 1969
68 review of mandatory vaccination in the United States revealed a similar objection—“infringement
69 on personal liberty”—along with an aversion to government intrusion on religious beliefs and a
70 general distrust of medical science [20]. Thus, since the advent of vaccinations, cultural context
71 has interacted with vaccine-related beliefs and in turn influenced vaccination behaviors,
72 ultimately affecting population-level immunity and public health.

73 Due to developments in media and communication, including widespread engagement with
74 social media platforms, all types of information are more accessible and faster spreading than
75 ever before. Unfortunately, negative information (such as anecdotes about adverse drug
76 reactions), misinformation (such as the discredited link between vaccines and autism), and
77 maladaptive practices (such as delayed vaccination schedules [21,22]) can spread more quickly
78 through these digital channels than by traditional word-of-mouth [23], resulting in the increased
79 adoption of harmful beliefs and practices. In particular, a small but very vocal community,
80 sometimes dubbed “Anti-Vaxxers,” stoke the fears and emotions that contribute to vaccine
81 hesitancy, and their reach is aided by social media [9,24]. Anti-vaccine sentiments are still on the
82 rise despite numerous studies countering, discrediting, and debunking the spurious connection
83 between vaccines and autism [25] and other anti-vaccination arguments [26]. Additionally,
84 individuals are typically more trusting of those with whom they have a personal connection and
85 more skeptical of health providers and scientists [27], therefore anti-vaccine attitudes from one’s
86 social network are more likely to be internalized than pro-vaccine information from healthcare
87 professionals.

88 Health-related behaviors are also affected by homophily—the tendency of individuals to
89 choose social contacts and mates who are similar to themselves [28–31]. For example, individuals
90 with online social contacts who share similar demographic characteristics had significantly higher
91 adoption of new health-related behaviors introduced in that online environment [32]. In addition,
92 network-based simulations suggest that individuals with similar vaccine-hesitant opinions form
93 groups that are more susceptible to vaccine-preventable diseases, impeding the attainment of

94 herd immunity and substantially increasing the likelihood of disease outbreak in these clusters
95 [33]. Some of the predictions of these simulations have been observed in the real world: for
96 example, a number of recent VPD outbreaks have been linked to tight-knit cultural groups, such
97 as the Ohio Amish community, which has specific teachings on health practices [34,35], and the
98 Minnesota Somali immigrant community, which was vulnerable to anti-vaccination rhetoric
99 [36,37]. If individuals have a tendency toward homophily on the basis of vaccine-related beliefs,
100 preferentially partnering with others who have similar beliefs and mindsets, children might be
101 increasingly likely to have two vaccine-hesitant or two vaccine-confident parents and to inherit
102 their beliefs. When vaccine-related beliefs are clustered on a social network, homophily could
103 further expand and reinforce these clusters as vaccine-hesitant individuals seek out interactions
104 with one another, exacerbating the risk of disease outbreak. Thus, a particular health culture—
105 collective beliefs and behaviors regarding health—could be seen as a cultural “niche” in the sense
106 that it influences an individual’s beliefs, behaviors, and social network connections.

107 Niche construction is a process in which organisms modify their local environment, thus
108 altering selection pressures on themselves and the other organisms that share that environment
109 [38,39]. In *cultural* niche construction, humans modify their cultural environments—for example,
110 their beliefs, behaviors, preferences, and social contacts—in ways that subsequently alter
111 evolutionary pressures on themselves and/or their culture [39]. Within various human-
112 constructed cultural niches, for example in agricultural niches, there exist niche-specific
113 differential effects on health and health-related behaviors (for example, the link between dairy
114 farming and lactose tolerance in adulthood [40]). Mathematical models of niche construction have
115 been used to help understand biological evolution, and this type of model has been recently
116 expanded to explain the evolution of cultural behaviors, with applications to religion, fertility, and
117 the evolution of large-scale human conflict [29,30,39,41–43]. The cultural niche framing of health
118 cultures allows us to apply these modeling frameworks to the evolution of human disease
119 response. Modeling the belief-behavior interactions underlying vaccination coverage allows us to
120 better understand how vaccination cultures are formed and how they can be transformed to
121 promote public health.

122 Compartmental models, such as the Susceptible-Infected-Recovered (SIR) model and its
123 various extensions, are the most established set of epidemiological models used to predict the
124 spread of infectious disease. Even though more epidemiological models have begun to
125 incorporate aspects of human behavior (e.g [44,45]), these models do not typically incorporate

126 the effects of population beliefs and changing cultural landscapes on disease transmission. For
127 example, they do not consider social preferences or early-life influences on adult behaviors, and
128 how these affect the health beliefs that drive specific behaviors. SIR models with a vaccination
129 component (e.g. [46,47]) demonstrate that the introduction of vaccination decreases the
130 susceptible and infected populations proportional to vaccination rate [46]. Though these models
131 are very useful in determining the intensity of intervention needed to address an epidemic [46],
132 they do not explain fluctuations in vaccination rates or lower-than-expected rates of adoption
133 based on cultural factors. In wealthier countries, belief systems act as the main barrier to
134 vaccination, as opposed to lack of vaccine access [33,48]. The perception of vaccine importance
135 and disease risk is a driving factor in vaccine behavior, even for vaccinated individuals [27,49–53].
136 The rates of non-medical exemption from vaccines (exemption on the basis of religious,
137 philosophical, and personal beliefs), have been increasing in the United States, with some
138 believing the “negative consequences of exemption are not sufficient to justify violating parental
139 autonomy” [54,55]. Thus, understanding and incorporating the underlying health cultures and
140 their evolution, including the interplay between beliefs and behaviors, will allow us to build more
141 comprehensive and representative models of vaccinations dynamics and better support public
142 health efforts.

143 In this study, we model the development of vaccine hesitancy through a cultural evolution
144 framework, incorporating the transmission of vaccine culture both from parents and from the
145 community. We shed light on the situations in which vaccine hesitancy is most likely to spread
146 and potentially lead to an increase in vaccine-preventable diseases. By modeling the evolution of
147 vaccination behaviors through the lens of cultural niche construction, we aim to assess the
148 dynamic interactions between vaccine beliefs (shaped by social interactions) and behaviors
149 (influenced by these beliefs). With this framework, we can also model the effects of vaccine
150 mandates and of vaccine accessibility on both beliefs and behaviors. In addition, we consider that
151 the perception of the relative risks of a disease and its preventive vaccine can fluctuate based on
152 the prevalence of vaccination, such that the population’s vaccination coverage can influence
153 individual decision-making. We further incorporate homophily, here represented as the
154 likelihood that people with similar vaccine-related beliefs will preferentially mate with one
155 another, to understand how social subcultures influence behaviors.

156 Beliefs influence but do not dictate an individual’s behaviors, and these belief-behavior
157 interactions are influenced by the broader cultural landscape. We propose that scientific research


158 can better address how to mitigate VPD outbreaks by understanding the cultural dynamics of
159 vaccine hesitancy. In this manuscript, we aim to take a cultural approach to understanding the
160 evolution of vaccine hesitancy and its interactions with vaccination coverage and vaccine-
161 preventable disease using a generalizable modeling framework for belief-behavior interactions.

162

163 **Methods:**

164 To model the cultural niche construction of vaccine beliefs and behaviors, we build on the
165 framework of [30] to assess the effects of vaccine attitudes on vaccination behaviors and on the
166 resulting vaccination culture. We explore how vaccination patterns evolve in a population when a
167 cultural trait, such as vaccine hesitancy, can influence but not perfectly predict a behavior, such
168 as vaccinating one's children.

169



170

171 **Figure 1. Workflow of a single iteration of the model:** The schematic shows the processes within a single
172 model iteration. The model is initialized with the phenotypic frequencies (V^+A^+ , V^+A^- , V^-A^+ , V^-A^-) in the
173 population. After mate selection, individuals reproduce; they then vertically transmit vaccination and
174 attitude traits to their offspring. Vaccination trait frequencies are further modulated by cultural selection.
175 Oblique transmission (cultural transmission from non-parental adults in the population) follows, in which
176 offspring may alter their attitude state. (Parameters, their definitions, and default values are listed in
177 **Table 1.**)

178

179

180

181 **Table 1: List of parameters, their definitions, and default or initial values**

| Parameter | Meaning | Parameter | Meaning |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| V | Vaccination state (V^+ vaccinated, V^- unvaccinated) | A | Vaccine attitude (A^+ confident, A^- hesitant) |
| m_{ij} | Mating frequencies (given in Table S1) | α_k | Assortative mating parameter (homophily) Default: $\alpha_1 = 0, \alpha_2 = 0$ |
| $B_{m,n}$ | Probability that parental pairs vaccinate their children, which depends upon the parents' vaccination states (b_m) and vaccine attitude (c_n) (given in Table S2) | C_n | Probability that parental pairs transmit vaccine confidence to their children Default: $C_0 = 0.01, C_1 = C_2 = 0.5, C_3 = 0.99$ |
| b_m | Probability that parental pairs support offspring vaccination given their vaccination states Default: $b_0 = 0.01, b_1 = b_2 = 0.5, b_3 = 0.99$ | c_n | Probability that parental pairs support offspring vaccination given their vaccine attitude Default: $c_0 = 0.01, c_1 = c_2 = 0.5, c_3 = 0.99$ |
| σ | Comprehensive selection coefficient for V^+ , dependent on the population-wide vaccination rate (see Figure 2) | σ_{\max} | The highest additional benefit that can be conferred by vaccination Default: $\sigma_{\max} = 0.1$ |
| Initial Phenotype Frequencies | | $x_1(V^+A^+) = 0.81, x_2(V^+A^-) = 0.1, x_3(V^-A^+) = 0.07, x_4(V^-A^-) = 0.02$ | |

182
 183 We consider two cultural traits: **V**, a vaccination trait, and **A**, a vaccine attitude trait. Each
 184 trait has two possible states, V^+ or V^- and A^+ or A^- , respectively. V^+ individuals are vaccinated and
 185 V^- individuals are unvaccinated, and A^+ individuals are vaccine confident and A^- individuals are
 186 vaccine hesitant; thus, there are four possible phenotypes: V^+A^+ (type 1: vaccinated and
 187 confident), V^+A^- (type 2: vaccinated and hesitant), V^-A^+ (type 3: unvaccinated and confident), and
 188 V^-A^- (type 4: unvaccinated and hesitant), whose population frequencies are denoted by $x_1, x_2, x_3,$
 189 and x_4 , respectively, with $\sum_{i=1}^4 x_i = 1$.

190 The attitude trait (**A**) can influence the dynamics of the vaccination trait (**V**) in two ways:
 191 by affecting the likelihood that couples vaccinate their offspring, and by determining with whom
 192 each adult will preferentially pair in assortative interactions. The state of the vaccine attitude trait
 193 (**A**) informs the value of an assortative mating parameter (α_k), which measures the departure
 194 from random mating. We define a 'choosing parent,' arbitrarily assigned as the first member of

195 each mating pair. The choosing parent's **A** state dictates the level of assortative mating, that is,
196 the degree to which an individual of a given **A** state will preferentially mate with another
197 individual of the same state, expressed by parameters α_k where $k = \{1, 2\}$ and $0 \leq \alpha_k \leq 1$ (**Table S1**).
198 If the choosing parent is A^+ , this individual mates preferentially with other A^+ individuals with
199 probability α_1 , and mates randomly with probability $1 - \alpha_1$, whereas if the choosing parent is A^- ,
200 this individual mates preferentially with other A^- individuals with probability α_2 , and mates
201 randomly with probability $1 - \alpha_2$. There are sixteen possible mating pairs from the four
202 phenotypes described, and we use the notation m_{ij} to indicate the frequency of a mating
203 between a choosing parent of type i and the second parent of type j where $i, j = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ (**Table**
204 **S1**); in other words, $m_{1,3}$ represents the mating frequency of $V^+A^+(x_1)$ and $V^-A^+(x_3)$.

205 Since the two traits in question (**A** and **V**) are transmitted vertically, for each phenotype we
206 must specify the probability that the mating produces an offspring of that phenotype. The
207 vaccine confidence trait (A^+) is transmitted with probability C_n , and the vaccine hesitancy trait (A^-)
208 is transmitted with probability $1 - C_n$ (for $n = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$) as shown in **Tables 2** and **S2**. If $C_0 = 0$, two
209 A^- parents will always produce A^- offspring, and if $C_3 = 1$, two A^+ parents will always produce A^+
210 offspring. However, if $C_0 > 0$, two A^- parents can produce A^+ offspring at some probability, and
211 similarly if $C_3 < 1$, two A^+ parents can produce A^- offspring with some probability.

212 Transmission of vaccination (V^+ with probability $B_{m,n}$ for $m, n = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$; **Table 1**) is more
213 complex, since parents' vaccine attitudes (**A**), in addition to their own vaccination states (**V**), can
214 influence their behavior in vaccinating their offspring via a set of "influence parameters" that
215 inform vaccination probabilities. The probability that each mating pair produces an offspring with
216 the V^+ trait (i.e. vaccinates their offspring) is a scaled product of the influence of parental
217 attitudes (c_n for $n = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$) and the influence of parental vaccination states (b_m for $m = \{0, 1, 2,$
218 $3\}$) (**Tables 2** and **S2**). For example, for mating pair $V^+A^+ \times V^+A^-$, their combined vaccination states
219 ($V^+ \times V^+$) will influence vaccination behavior by b_3 , and their combined attitude states, ($A^+ \times A^-$),
220 will influence vaccination behavior by c_2 . Therefore, a $V^+A^+ \times V^+A^-$ mating will produce a V^+
221 offspring with probability $B_{3,2} = c_2 \left(\frac{1+b_3}{2} \right)$; this pair will also produce an A^+ offspring with
222 probability C_2 based on their combined attitude states. Thus, according to the model, this pairing
223 will produce a V^+A^+ offspring with probability $B_{3,2}C_2$ and a V^+A^- offspring with probability
224 $B_{3,2}(1 - C_2)$. We note that assortative mating ($\alpha_k > 0$) will increase the frequency of matings between
225 individuals that share an attitude trait, with these non-random interactions in turn skewing
226 vaccination outcomes in line with those of same-state couples (via c_0 and c_3).

227

228 **Table 2: Presence (+) and absence (–) subscript assignments.** Demonstrating the trait presence (+) and
 229 absence (–) combinations associated with m, n subscripts. For example, the $+ \times -$ combinations is
 230 associated with m and n subscript value 2: an $A^+ \times A^-$ pairing transmits A^+ at probability C_2 . This rule applies
 231 to parameters $C_n, b_m, B_{m,n}, c_n$, as shown in **Table S2**.

232


| Subscript Value (m, n ; e.g. b_m, C_n) | Associated Pairing (e.g. $V \times V, A \times A$) |
|--|---|
| 0 | $- \times -$ |
| 1 | $- \times +$ |
| 2 | $+ \times -$ |
| 3 | $+ \times +$ |

233

234 Transmission and influence probabilities are constant throughout a single simulation, with
 235 values ranging from 0 to 1. At default settings, the influence parameters b_m and c_n , and the
 236 transmission parameter C_n would take the following values: $C_0, b_0, c_0 = 0.01$; $C_1, C_2, b_1, b_2, c_1,$
 237 $c_2 = 0.5$; and $C_3, b_3, c_3 = 0.99$. In our model, parental vaccine beliefs (c_n) have a greater influence
 238 than their own vaccination status (b_n) on their likelihood of vaccinating their offspring, so
 239 offspring vaccination is guaranteed at some probability only if $c_n > 0$.

240 The cultural selection pressure on vaccination is given by the parameter σ , such that the
 241 frequency of the V^+A^+ and V^+A^- phenotypes are multiplied by $1+\sigma$ after vertical cultural
 242 transmission has occurred. At the end of each timestep, the frequency of each phenotype is
 243 divided by the sum of all four frequencies, ensuring that the frequencies sum to 1. This cultural
 244 selection coefficient is implemented in the same way as a selection coefficient in a population-
 245 genetic model, but unlike the latter, it is structured to encompass both biological fitness and
 246 cultural selection pressures, including perceived risks or benefits of the vaccine itself, personal
 247 cost-benefit analyses of preventative health behaviors, and the structural or societal-level factors
 248 influencing vaccination rates [56,57]. Since the frequencies of V^+ phenotypes are multiplied by
 249 $1+\sigma$, this parameter modulates whether there are more or fewer vaccinated individuals than
 250 expected: in other words, when $\sigma > 0$, vaccinated individuals are more common in a set of
 251 offspring than would be expected strictly by parental beliefs and vaccination statuses. We
 252 calculate σ in each timestep as a function of the current vaccination coverage (frequency of V^+ ,
 253 i.e. $x_1 + x_2$), and in each simulation we specify σ_{max} as the maximum cultural selection pressure of

254 getting vaccinated ($-1 \leq \sigma_{max} \leq 1$) (see the cultural selection coefficient function in **Figure 2**). This
 255 function was constructed by fitting a curve to pre-specified conditions: we assume that when
 256 vaccination coverage is low, the real and perceived benefits of vaccination are highest and thus
 257 the cultural selection pressure is near σ_{max} , however, as vaccination coverage increases, the
 258 perceived benefits of vaccination decrease and the cultural selection pressure is reduced (**Figure**
 259 **2**).
 260




261
 262 **Figure 2: Cultural selection coefficient function.** The cultural selection coefficient function was
 263 constructed by fitting a curve to specified conditions, and considers both health and non-health related
 264 effects. The selection coefficient (σ ; vertical-axis) is dependent on the frequency of vaccinated individuals
 265 (V^+) in the population (horizontal-axis). σ_{max} is the maximum cultural selection coefficient associated with
 266 being vaccinated. Perceived vaccine benefit is reduced as vaccination coverage increases, since the
 267 negative effects of the disease will be less apparent. Note: Of the σ_{max} values shown, only $\sigma_{max} = 0.1$ allows
 268 the cultural selection pressure to be either positive or negative at a given timepoint depending on the
 269 frequency of vaccination.
 270

271 Thus far, we have described vertical cultural transmission from parent to offspring. The
 272 model incorporates a second phase with oblique cultural transmission (i.e. influence from non-
 273 parental adults), in which individuals can change their inherited vaccine attitudes (**A**) due to
 274 influence from other adults in the population. There are two probabilities associated with

275 attitude modulation: the probability that an vaccine hesitant (A^-) individual adopts the vaccine
276 confident (A^+) state (A^- to A^+ transition probability, given by $A_{\rightarrow Confident}$ in **Figure 3**), and the
277 probability that an A^+ individual adopts the A^- state (A^+ to A^- transition probability, given by
278 $A_{\rightarrow Hesitant}$ in **Figure 3**). As with the strength of cultural selection (σ) described previously, the
279 probability that offspring change their vaccine attitude is a function of the V^+ frequency in the
280 population. As the frequency of vaccinated individuals (V^+) increases in the population, vaccine-
281 confident individuals (A^+) are more likely to become hesitant ($A_{\rightarrow Hesitant}$ probability increases)
282 and vaccine-hesitant individuals (A^-) are less likely to become confident ($A_{\rightarrow Confident}$ probability
283 decreases). By modulating the attitude transition probabilities according to the vaccination
284 coverage in this manner, we assume that when vaccine coverage (V^+ frequency, $x_1 + x_2$) is low,
285 disease occurrence is high and the negative effects of the disease are experienced widely, thus
286 the benefits of being vaccinated (and the costs of not being vaccinated) are more evident [58,59].
287 As vaccination coverage (V^+) increases in the population, and thus disease occurrence is low, the
288 benefits to being vaccinated are less obvious, while low-probability costs such as adverse
289 reactions become more apparent and could be perceived as being riskier than the disease itself.
290 Modulating both the attitude transition probabilities and the cultural selection coefficient
291 according to the level of vaccination coverage in a population reflects that perceptions about the
292 vaccine and its associated effects on health could be meaningfully different in a population with
293 high vaccination coverage than in one with low coverage.

294

295



296

297 **Figure 3: Attitude Transition Probability Function.** Attitude transition probability functions were
 298 constructed by fitting a curve to specified values. Attitude transition probability (vertical axis) is a function
 299 of the vaccination frequency in the population (V^+ ; horizontal axis). The probability that a vaccine hesitant
 300 individual adopts vaccine confidence (A^- to A^+ transition probability, shown in black) is determined by the
 301 function $A_{\rightarrow\text{Confident}}$, and the probability that a vaccine confident individual adopts vaccine hesitancy (A^+
 302 to A^- transition probability, shown with a blue dashed line) is determined by the function $A_{\rightarrow\text{Hesitant}}$.

303

304 To compute the frequency of a given phenotype in the next iteration, we sum the
 305 probability that each mating pair produces offspring of that phenotype over each of the sixteen
 306 possible mating pairs. Cultural selection (σ), described above, then operates on offspring with the
 307 V^+ trait. The full recursions, giving x'_i phenotype frequencies in the next iteration in terms of x_i in
 308 the current iteration, are given in **Text S1**. If x'_i is equal to x_i , the system is at equilibrium. Unless
 309 otherwise stated, the model is initialized with phenotypic frequencies structured to represent
 310 those of the United States: x_1 (frequency of V^+A^+) = 0.81, x_2 (V^+A^-) = 0.1, x_3 (V^-A^+) = 0.07, x_4 (V^-A^-) =
 311 0.02. These frequencies were estimated using reports of Measles-Mumps-Rubella (MMR)
 312 vaccination rates and estimates of vaccine attitude frequencies obtained from various sources in
 313 the literature [60,61] and the Centers of Disease Control ChildVax database [62,63].

314

315

316 **Results:**

317


318 *Parent-to-Offspring Interactions (Simulations with vertical transmission only)*

319 We began by testing this model with only vertical transmission dynamics, i.e. only parent-
320 to-offspring transmission, varying parameter values in turn to test their effects on population
321 vaccination behavior and attitudes. In the vertical transmission phase of the model, parents
322 choose whether to vaccinate their offspring (i.e., transmit V^+) or to not vaccinate (V^-), and
323 parents also transmit a vaccine attitude (confidence, A^+ , or hesitancy, A^-), each with a specified
324 probability given the phenotypes of the parents. The parental attitude state, vaccination status,
325 assortative mating levels, and cultural selection parameters interact to affect vaccination
326 coverage (frequency of V^+) and vaccine confidence (frequency of A^+). Couples with mixed
327 vaccination and/or attitude states ($V^+ \times V^-$, $A^+ \times A^-$) are assumed to be more variable in their
328 decision to vaccinate their offspring than parents who share the same state. Hence, we primarily
329 modulated probabilities associated with these mixed-phenotype pairings for the purposes of
330 testing our model.

331 First, we compared the effects of varying the confidence transmission probabilities for
332 mixed-attitude couples (C_1 and C_2), i.e. those with one vaccine-hesitant individual and one
333 vaccine-confident individual, in combination with multiple factors: 1) the maximum cultural
334 selection coefficient (σ_{\max}) (**Figure 4A-B**), 2) the vaccination influence parameters b_1 and b_2
335 (**Figure 4C-D**), 3) the attitude influence parameters c_1 and c_2 (**Figure 4E-F**), and 4) the vaccination
336 probabilities of couples with mixed traits, $B_{1,1}$, $B_{1,2}$, $B_{2,1}$, $B_{2,2}$ (**Figure 4G-H**). In each examination,
337 we observed a C_n threshold: there is a mid-range value of C_n at which vaccination coverage and
338 vaccine confidence traits are polymorphic (i.e. both forms of each trait coexist in the population),
339 separating definitive high ($\gtrsim 80\%$) and low ($\lesssim 30\%$) levels of vaccination coverage and confidence.
340 This C_n threshold value is more sensitive to σ_{\max} than to b_m , c_n , or $B_{m,n}$: the threshold value is
341 lowered as σ_{\max} increases (diagonal line in **Figure 4A-B**). Although vaccination probability ($B_{m,n}$) is
342 dependent on both c_n , the influence of parental vaccine attitude, and b_m , the influence of
343 parental vaccination state (**Table S2**), modulating either type of influence of mixed-state parents
344 has little effect on the level of vaccination coverage and negligible effects on confidence levels at
345 each non-threshold C_n (**Figure 4C-F**).

346 Interestingly, direct modulation of the mixed-trait couple vaccination probability ($B_{1,1} =$
347 $B_{1,2} = B_{2,1} = B_{2,2}$) also has little power in affecting coverage and confidence levels at equilibrium

348 **(Figure 4G-H)**. We hypothesize that predominantly high or predominantly low confidence
349 transmission within a population reduces the occurrence of “mixed-trait” pairings, i.e. if the
350 majority of the population becomes confident or hesitant, there are fewer confident-hesitant and
351 vaccinated-unvaccinated pairings. Thus, the effect of modulating mixed-trait vaccination
352 probabilities ($B_{1,1}$, $B_{1,2}$, $B_{2,1}$, $B_{2,2}$) is significantly minimized as these couples approach low
353 frequencies in the population, and confidence transmission dominates the vaccination patterns.
354 To further explore this relationship, we varied all vaccination probabilities ($B_{m,n}$), not just those of
355 mixed couples, while modulating mixed trait confidence transmission probabilities ($C_1 = C_2$) as
356 before. To directly alter vaccination probabilities while still accounting for the couple’s vaccine
357 attitudes, we set ranges of values for $B_{m,n}$ that vary along the horizontal axis of **Figure 5**, with the
358 vaccination probability for two hesitant parents (e.g. $B_{0,0}$) on the lower end of the range and the
359 vaccination probability for two confident parents (e.g. $B_{3,3}$) on the higher end of the range (**Table**
360 **S3**). In these tests, we observe increasing equilibrium vaccination coverage as $B_{m,n}$ probabilities
361 increase, with higher coverage in high-confidence transmission environments (**Figure 5**). If we
362 vary both confidence transmission parameters and vaccination probability parameters by
363 implementing range shifts in both C_n and $B_{m,n}$, we observe an interaction between confidence
364 transmission and vaccination probability that determines vaccination coverage (**Figure S1**). In
365 both, we confirm vaccination coverage levels are determined by an interaction between
366 confidence transmission and vaccination probability, whereas confidence levels are dictated
367 primarily by levels of confidence transmission. In sum, the degree to which parents with mixed
368 vaccine-hesitant and vaccine-confident attitudes transmit vaccine confidence instead of vaccine
369 hesitancy to their offspring is a key factor in determining population trait majorities which can
370 drastically shift population dynamics.
371




372

373 **Figure 4: Vaccine Confidence Transmission Dictates Vaccination Coverage and Confidence Levels**

374 Heatmaps showing final vaccination coverage and vaccine confidence after 100 time-steps with no oblique
 375 transmission, only parent-to-offspring transmission. The top row (**A, C, E, G**) shows vaccination coverage
 376 (i.e. frequency of V^+ in the population) with low coverage in blue and high coverage in yellow; the bottom
 377 row (**B, D, F, H**) shows the corresponding final vaccine confidence (i.e. frequency of A^+), with low
 378 confidence in red and high confidence in yellow. Unless varied on the horizontal or vertical axis, other
 379 parameters are set to the default values given in **Table 1**. In our model, parents' likelihood of vaccinating
 380 their children depends on both their vaccination state and their attitude state. This figure shows that the
 381 strength of parental transmission of vaccine confidence (C_n) has a much stronger effect on the equilibrium
 382 levels of both vaccine coverage (V^+) and confidence (A^+) than other parameters: the maximum cultural
 383 selection coefficient, σ_{max} (**A,B**), the influence of parental vaccination state, b_m (**C, D**), the level of influence
 384 of parental vaccine attitudes on their vaccination behaviors, c_n (**E,F**), and the probability that mixed-state
 385 parents vaccinate their offspring $B_{m,n}$ (**G,H**).

386




387

388 **Figure 5: Vaccination coverage levels are determined by an interaction between confidence**
 389 **transmission and vaccination probability.** Heatmaps showing final vaccination coverage (A) and
 390 corresponding vaccine confidence (B) after 100 time-steps with no oblique transmission. Confidence
 391 transmission in mixed-attitude couples ($C_1 = C_2$) is varied along the vertical axis, while the vaccination
 392 probabilities ($B_{m,n}$) are set within the range indicated on the horizontal axis, with $B_{0,0}$, $B_{1,0}$, $B_{2,0}$ and $B_{3,0}$
 393 taking the lowest value and $B_{3,3}$ taking the highest value (Table S3). We show increased equilibrium
 394 vaccination coverage with increasing vaccination probability ranges, while confidence levels are primarily
 395 dictated by proportion of the population transmitting confidence or hesitancy.
 396

397 Next, we hold vaccine confidence transmission (C_n) at default probabilities, reminiscent of
 398 Mendelian transmission, such that two vaccine confident or two vaccine hesitant parents
 399 predictably transmit their vaccine attitude, and parents with differing vaccine attitudes each have
 400 a ~50% chance of transmitting their phenotype, e.g. C_0 near 0, C_1 and C_2 at 0.5, C_3 near 1 (Table
 401 1). We then varied cultural selection in combination with vaccination-associated probabilities (b_m ,
 402 c_n , $B_{m,n}$). With C_n held constant, cultural selection (σ_{max}) is the primary factor determining
 403 vaccination coverage and confidence levels (Figure 6. Raising the maximum cultural selection
 404 coefficient increases the equilibrium level of vaccination coverage and vaccine confidence across
 405 various levels of vaccination state influence (b_m) (Figure 6A-B), vaccination attitude influence (c_n)
 406 (Figure 6C-D), and vaccination probability ($B_{m,n}$) (Figure 6E-F). Unlike in Figure 4, vaccine
 407 confidence does not always mirror vaccination coverage across all levels of attitude influence (c_n)
 408 or vaccination probabilities. Instead, vaccine confidence levels decline with increased c_n and
 409 increased $B_{m,n}$ for $\sigma_{max} \lesssim 0.3$ (Figure 6D, F), as well as for both increased c_n and increased b_m
 410 (Figure S2. This dynamic is interesting as these parameters influence vaccination behavior,

411 hinting that high vaccination rates could reduce a populations' expected vaccine confidence.
 412 Vaccination coverage and vaccine confidence remain low when cultural selection does not favor
 413 vaccination ($\sigma_{\max} \lesssim 0$), i.e. parents vaccinate their children at or below the levels expected based
 414 on cultural transmission rates.
 415




416 **Figure 6: Cultural Selection Influences Vaccination Coverage and Vaccine Confidence.** Heatmaps showing
 417 final vaccination coverage (A, C, E) and final vaccination confidence (B, D, F) after 100 time-steps with no
 418 oblique transmission, only parent-to-offspring transmission. As in Figure 4, parameters not varied here are
 419 given in Table 1. Parents' likelihood of vaccinating their children depends on both their vaccination state
 420 and their attitude state. At default probabilities of vaccine confidence transmission (C_n values in Table 1),
 421 these figures show that modulating the maximum cultural selection coefficient affects the equilibrium
 422 levels of vaccination coverage and vaccine confidence across the range of specified parameters: parental
 423 vaccination state influence, b_m (A, B), parental attitude state influence, c_n (C, D), and offspring vaccination
 424 probability, $B_{m,n}$ (E, F). Unless directly modulated (as in panels E-F), $B_{m,n}$ varies with b_m and c_n ($B_{m,n} =$
 425 $c_n((1+b_m)/2)$).
 426
 427

428 Temporal dynamics of vaccine-related beliefs and behaviors

429 To test whether the equilibrium phenotype frequencies were sensitive to starting
 430 frequencies, we plotted the dynamics of each phenotype over time at default parameters (given
 431 in Table 1). For each set of initial phenotype proportions tested, each phenotypic frequency

432 quickly adjusted to approach equilibrium values and then gradually plateaued to a stable
 433 equilibrium (vertical transmission: **Figure 7** and **Figure S3**, vertical+oblique transmission: **Figure**
 434 **S4**). This demonstrates that equilibrium frequencies of vaccination coverage and vaccine
 435 confidence are determined by the parameter conditions rather than by the initial frequencies
 436 themselves.




437
 438 **Figure 7: Equilibrium frequencies are determined by the parameter space, not by initial frequencies.** The
 439 change in each of the four phenotype frequencies and the total V^+ and A^+ frequencies (vertical axis) over
 440 100 iterations of the model (horizontal axis). Initial frequencies are varied, such that we begin each
 441 simulation with a different phenotype at an initial high frequency (0.81): V^+A^+ in panel **A**, V^+A^- in panel **B**,
 442 V^-A^+ in panel **C**, V^-A^- in panel **D**; the remaining phenotypes are set to lower frequencies (0.1, 0.07, 0.02).
 443 See **Figure S3** for a full listing of these initial frequencies. The remaining parameters are held at default
 444 values (**Table 1**).


445 When two parameters in particular are varied—maximum cultural selection (σ_{\max}) or
446 confidence transmission ($C_1 = C_2$)—we observe a trade-off between the V^-A^- phenotype, which
447 dominates at lower values of these parameters, and the V^+A^+ phenotype, which dominates at
448 higher values (**Figures 8-9**). Interestingly, the “conflicting” phenotypes (when an individual’s
449 attitude toward vaccinating their children does not match their own vaccination state: V^-A^+ and
450 V^+A^-) are present at their highest frequencies at neutral cultural selection ($\sigma_{\max} = 0$, **Figure 8B**)
451 and/or neutral confidence transmission ($C_1 = C_2 = 0.5$, **Figure 9B**). Vaccinated individuals have the
452 same fitness regardless of their attitude (V^+A^+ bears the same selection pressure as V^+A^-), so it is
453 worth noting that at higher levels of confidence transmission and cultural selection, V^+A^+
454 increases in frequency but V^+A^- decreases in frequency (compare **Figure 8B-C**, **Figure 9B-C**). This
455 pattern seems to reflect their differing likelihoods of vaccinating their offspring: across all
456 possible partners, vaccinated but vaccine-hesitant parents (V^+A^-) are less likely to vaccinate their
457 offspring than vaccinated and vaccine-confident parents (V^+A^+), resulting in more V^- offspring.
458 Thus, when V^+ is favored by cultural selection, there is indirect selection against the V^+A^-
459 phenotype (**Figure 8**). Similarly, indirect selection against V^-A^+ occurs when V^- is favored by
460 cultural selection (**Figure 8A**): compared to **Figure 8B**, we observe an increase in V^-A^- individuals
461 but a decrease in V^-A^+ individuals, who because of their vaccine confidence have more V^+
462 offspring, which are culturally disfavored in this environment. When cultural transmission from
463 non-parental adults (oblique transmission) was included, described in following sections, we
464 observed similar patterns, but the final equilibria were more likely to be polymorphic, with
465 vaccinated, unvaccinated, confident, and hesitant phenotypes stabilizing at more moderate
466 frequencies than they would have with only vertical transmission (Compare **Figures 8-9 to Figures**
467 **S5-S6**).

468 Low confidence transmission ($C_1 = C_2 = 0.1$, **Figure 9A**) increases the frequency of vaccine
469 hesitancy (A^-) in the population over time, increasing the probability that more couples choose
470 not to vaccinate their offspring. However, the increase in vaccine hesitancy does not occur
471 equally in vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals: A^- frequency may increase overall in this
472 environment, but V^+A^- frequencies are lower and V^-A^- frequencies are higher (compared to
473 **Figure 9B-C** and **Figure S6**). At neutral confidence transmission probabilities (i.e. when couples
474 with one confident and one hesitant parent are equally likely to transmit either attitude), there is
475 a higher chance that the vaccinated but vaccine-hesitant (V^+A^-) phenotype is replenished.
476 However, if confidence is highly transmitted ($C_1 = C_2 = 0.8$), the V^+A^- frequency will be reduced, as

477 this phenotype is more likely to produce A^+ offspring than A^- , thus increasing V^+A^+ phenotype
 478 frequencies in the population (**Figure 9** and **Figure S6**). If we turn to the other conflicting
 479 phenotype, unvaccinated but vaccine-confident (V^-A^+) individuals become more common when
 480 A^+ increases in frequency in the population as $C_1 = C_2$ increases from 0.1 to 0.5 (**Figure 9** and
 481 **Figure S6**). In contrast, higher vaccine confidence transmission ($C_1 = C_2 = 0.8$) can lead to a
 482 vaccination-promoting environment in which V^- frequencies are reduced over time; thus the V^-A^+
 483 phenotype becomes rare and V^+A^+ predominates (**Figure 9** and **Figure S6**).



484
 485 **Figure 8: Temporal Effects of Cultural Selection.** The change in equilibrium phenotype frequencies as the
 486 maximum cultural selection coefficient (σ_{\max}) is varied: **A.** $\sigma_{\max} = -0.1$; **B.** $\sigma_{\max} = 0$; **C.** $\sigma_{\max} = 0.1$; **D.** $\sigma_{\max} =$
 487 0.5 , while other parameters are held at default values (**Table 1**). Cultural selection against vaccinated
 488 individuals increases the frequency of V^-A^- , decreasing the other frequencies (**A**), whereas increased
 489 cultural selection favoring vaccinated individuals increases V^+A^+ frequencies while decreasing the other
 490 frequencies (**B, C, D**).




491
492 **Figure 9: Temporal Effects of Confidence Transmission.** The change in phenotype frequencies over 50
493 iterations as vaccine confidence transmission in mixed couples ($C_1 = C_2$) is varied (**A.** $C_1 = C_2 = 0.1$; **B.** $C_1 = C_2$
494 $= 0.5$; **C.** $C_1 = C_2 = 0.8$) while other parameters are held at default values (**Table 1**). The population
495 equilibrates at over 90% A^-V^- at low confidence transmission (**A**). Increasing the probability of confidence
496 transmission results in less vaccine hesitancy and, in turn, higher vaccination frequencies (V^+A^+).
497

498 Offspring can Change their Inherited Hesitancy State (Vertical and Oblique Dynamics)

499 Increased exposure to the attitudes of the broader community (i.e. oblique cultural
500 transmission from non-parental adults in the population) could influence and change vaccination
501 beliefs inherited in childhood. Therefore, we next included these oblique effects in our model to
502 understand how they might modulate vaccine confidence and vaccination coverage levels. In the
503 oblique transmission phase of the model, offspring can change their vaccine attitude with some
504 probability based on the frequency of vaccination in the population (**Figure 3**). Thus, in addition
505 to the vertical transmission of attitudes and behaviors, phenotype frequencies are further
506 affected by the probability that adult offspring change their attitude (i.e. transition from vaccine
507 confident (A^+) to hesitant (A^-) and vice versa).

508 The addition of oblique dynamics produces a pattern of vaccination coverage and vaccine
509 confidence similar to that of simulations run with solely vertical transmission (**Figure 4 and Figure**
510 **6 compared to Figure 10 and Figure 11, and Figures 7-9 compared to Figures S4-6**)—the level of
511 (vertical) vaccine confidence transmission still largely determines the level of vaccination
512 coverage and vaccine confidence (**Figure 10**). However, oblique cultural influences expanded the
513 polymorphic space, resulting in a wider range of intermediate C_n in which the different
514 phenotypes (vaccinated, unvaccinated, confident, and hesitant) are present in the population in
515 roughly equal proportions. In other words, there is a wider horizontal stripe of moderate values
516 between the definitively high and definitively low equilibrium frequencies in **Figure 10** than in
517 **Figure 4**). Overall, the addition of oblique transmission appears to lead to less polarized results,


518 moving the equilibrium levels of vaccination coverage and vaccine confidence away from extreme
 519 values.



520
 521 **Figure 10: Vaccine confidence transmission dictates vaccination coverage and confidence levels (with**
 522 **oblique transmission).** Heatmaps showing final vaccination coverage (i.e. frequency of V^+ in the
 523 population, with low coverage in blue and high coverage in yellow (**A, C, E, G**)) and final vaccine
 524 confidence (i.e. frequency of A^+ , with low confidence in red and high confidence in yellow (**B, D, F, H**))
 525 after 100 time-steps in which oblique transmission of vaccine attitude can occur after parent-to-offspring
 526 transmission. The likelihood that individuals change their vaccine beliefs depends on the current
 527 vaccination coverage of the population (**Figure 2**). Unless varied on the horizontal or vertical axes, other
 528 parameters are set to the default values given in **Table 1**. Parents' likelihood of vaccinating their children
 529 depends on both their vaccination state and their attitude state; these figures show that the strength of
 530 parental transmission of vaccine confidence (C_n) has a much stronger effect on the equilibrium levels of
 531 both vaccine coverage (V^+) and confidence (A^+) than other tested parameters do: the maximum cultural
 532 selection coefficient, σ_{max} , (**A,B**), the influence of parental vaccination state, b_m , (**C, D**), the level of
 533 influence of parental attitudes on their vaccination behaviors, c_n , (**E,F**), and offspring vaccination
 534 probability, $B_{m,n}$ (**G,H**).

535
 536 With neutral confidence transmission ($C_1 = C_2 = 0.5$), we also observe an expansion of the
 537 polymorphic space when we modulate cultural selection (σ_{max}) alongside the influence and
 538 transmission parameters (**Figure 11**). Interestingly, in the cultural environment defined by this
 539 parameter space, we observe a pattern that deviates from the expected association between
 540 high vaccine confidence and high vaccination coverage: as the influence of vaccine attitudes (c_n)
 541 and vaccination probabilities ($B_{m,n}$) increase (**Figure 11**, horizontal axes), the population's
 542 equilibrium vaccination coverage increases while its vaccine confidence decreases. This pattern
 543 persisted across all tested levels of maximum cultural selection (σ_{max}) (**Figure 11**, vertical axes). In


544 other words, we observe higher levels of confidence at low influence and transmission
 545 probabilities than we do at higher probabilities (**Figure 11D, F**).
 546



547
 548 **Figure 11: Cultural selection influences vaccination coverage and vaccine confidence (with oblique**
 549 **transmission).** Heatmaps showing final vaccination coverage (**A, C, E**) and final vaccination confidence (**B,**
 550 **D, F**) after 100 time-steps with oblique transmission. As in previous figures, parameters not varied are
 551 given in Table 1. Parents' likelihood of vaccinating their children depends on both their vaccination state
 552 and their attitude state. At default probabilities of vaccine confidence transmission (C_n), these figures
 553 show that modulating the maximum cultural selection coefficient affects the equilibrium levels of
 554 vaccination coverage and vaccine confidence across the range of specified parameters: parental
 555 vaccination state influence, b_m (**A, B**), parental attitude state influence, c_n (**C, D**), and offspring vaccination
 556 probability, $B_{m,n}$ (**E, F**). Unless directly varied (as in panels **E-F**), $B_{m,n}$ varies as b_m and c_n are varied, as shown
 557 in **Table 1**.
 558

559 We explored the interaction between the influence parameters, b_m and c_n , at various
 560 maximum cultural selection coefficients (σ_{max}) (**Figure 12**). Vaccination coverage and vaccine
 561 confidence equilibrate at mid-range frequencies (between 0.3 and 0.8) across the range of b_m and
 562 c_n , indicating that these trait frequencies are not particularly sensitive to either parameter.
 563 Cultural selection favoring vaccination increases the equilibrium level of vaccination coverage and
 564 vaccine confidence (**Figure 12 and Figure S7**). The most notable deviation between equilibrium


565 confidence and vaccination frequencies occurs at the intersection of the highest influence
 566 parameter values (b_m and c_n), circumstances in which the parents' vaccination states and vaccine
 567 attitudes overwhelmingly support offspring vaccination; in this top right section of the heat maps,
 568 vaccination coverage is high while vaccine confidence is lower, indicating a behavioral pattern in
 569 which mixed-trait couples are more inclined to vaccinate their offspring than transmit vaccine
 570 confidence. Overall, the addition of oblique transmission to a population that would otherwise
 571 equilibrate at high vaccination coverage (**Figure S2**) leads to increased attitude transition to
 572 vaccine hesitancy and subsequently lower vaccine coverage.



573
 574 **Figure 12: The influence of parental traits on vaccination coverage and vaccine confidence at different**
 575 **levels of cultural selection.** Heatmaps showing final vaccination coverage (**A, C**) and final vaccination
 576 confidence (**B, D**) after 100 timesteps with oblique transmission. We modulate the interaction between
 577 vaccination state influence (b_m ; vertical axis) and attitude influence (c_n ; horizontal axis) at various
 578 maximum cultural selection coefficients: $\sigma_{\max} = 0$ (**A, B**) and $\sigma_{\max} = 0.1$ (**C, D**). As in previous figures,
 579 unvaried parameters are given in **Table 1**. Vaccination frequency increases as both influence probabilities
 580 increase and vaccination confidence decreases as both influence probabilities increase.

581 **Mating Preferences:**

582 We hypothesized that mating preference (assortative mating) could modulate belief and
583 behavior dynamics and thus the vaccination coverage and confidence levels in the population. If
584 individuals are more likely to pair with individuals of the same vaccine attitude, such that same-
585 attitude couples become more common and mixed-attitude couples are less common, the
586 parameter values for mixed-attitude couples may have less impact on vaccination coverage and
587 confidence dynamics. Therefore, we analyzed the interaction between A^+ homophily (with α_1
588 indicating the preference of A^+ individuals for other A^+ individuals) and A^- homophily (with α_2
589 indicating the preference of A^- individuals for other A^- individuals) at various σ_{\max} levels. When
590 vaccine attitudes are transmitted both from parent to offspring and between unrelated
591 individuals (vertical and oblique transmission) and there is neither cultural selection for nor
592 against being vaccinated ($\sigma_{\max} = 0$), we observe a threshold region at roughly equal mating
593 preferences ($\alpha_1 \approx \alpha_2$; diagonal lines in **Figure 13A-B**); above this boundary (when $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2$)
594 vaccination coverage and confidence are much higher than below this boundary (when $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$).
595 When cultural selection favors being vaccinated ($\sigma_{\max} > 0$, **Figure 13C-D**, **Figure S8C-D**), the
596 threshold between high and low equilibrium values is shifted, such that high coverage and high
597 confidence levels can potentially be attained even when vaccine hesitant individuals
598 preferentially pair with each other more than vaccine confident individuals do ($\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$). Likewise,
599 if cultural selection explicitly does not favor vaccination (e.g. $\sigma_{\max} = -0.1$, **Figure S8**), low
600 vaccination coverage and confidence can occur even when there are more vaccine confident
601 couples in the population than hesitant couples ($\alpha_1 > \alpha_2$). We observe qualitatively similar
602 patterns when vaccine attitudes are only transmitted from parent to offspring (**Figure S9**); as we
603 have previously observed, the addition of oblique transmission leads to a broader polymorphic
604 region than vertical transmission alone. These patterns illustrate two overarching themes: 1)
605 preferential interactions between individuals with similar vaccine beliefs can dramatically shift
606 the equilibrium levels of vaccination coverage and confidence with all other parameters
607 remaining equal, and 2) the actual and perceived quality and efficacy of the vaccine are
608 important to determining vaccine acceptance.



609

610 **Figure 13: Homophily between individuals with similar vaccine beliefs can shift equilibrium frequencies**
 611 **of both vaccination coverage and confidence.** Heatmaps showing final vaccination coverage (A, C) and
 612 final vaccine confidence (B, D) after 100 timesteps with oblique transmission. As in previous figures,
 613 unspecified parameters are given in **Table 1**. As vaccine-hesitant individuals (A^-) increasingly prefer to pair
 614 with one another (α_2 ; horizontal axis), vaccine-confident individuals (A^+) must also preferentially interact
 615 to maintain high vaccine coverage (α_1 ; vertical axis); this tradeoff is modulated by the cultural selection
 616 pressures on vaccination ($\sigma_{\max} = 0$ (A, B) and $\sigma_{\max} = 0.1$ (C, D)).

617

618

619

620

621

622 Mandatory Vaccines and Vaccine Inaccessibility:

623

624 *Compulsory Vaccination*

625 The implementation of mandatory childhood vaccinations has resulted in almost 100%
626 vaccination coverage in the United States [9,61]. Allowing non-medical exemptions such as those
627 based on philosophical or religious beliefs, however, has contributed to the recent decrease in
628 vaccination rates [64]. We suspect that parental vaccine attitudes also influence their use of
629 exemptions and thus levels of non-vaccination under a mandated vaccination system. Therefore,
630 we simulate the effects of varying levels of compulsory vaccine mandate strictness (i.e. the ease
631 of obtaining an exemption) by modulating the influence of vaccine attitude on offspring
632 vaccination for each pairing. We assume the implementation of strict mandates (difficulty in
633 obtaining exemptions) would increase vaccination in all couple types. If vaccination exemptions
634 are permitted, we expect that $A^- \times A^-$ couples (those with two vaccine-hesitant individuals) would
635 be most likely to obtain exemptions, followed by mixed attitude ($A^- \times A^+$ or $A^+ \times A^-$) couples, with
636 vaccine confident couples ($A^+ \times A^+$) being least likely. Hence, to model the effects of implementing
637 a strict mandate, we increase attitude influence parameters from baseline values (**Table 1**) to $c_0 =$
638 0.5 , $c_1 = c_2 = 0.9$, $c_3 = 0.99$, then examined the effect of cultural selection coefficient and
639 confidence transmission probability (**Figure 14A-B**); we then compare the results of this strict
640 mandate both to our baseline parameters and to a more lenient mandate represented by $c_0 =$
641 0.3 , $c_1 = c_2 = 0.7$, $c_3 = 0.99$ (**Figure S10**).


642 Our previous simulations consistently showed a positive correlation between population-
643 level frequencies of vaccination coverage and vaccine confidence (**Figures 8-10, 13**). However,
644 modeling a cultural environment under strict mandates reveals a decoupling of vaccination
645 coverage and vaccine confidence at low confidence transmission probabilities (**Figure 14A-B**).
646 Even when vaccine confidence is very low (specifically at mixed-trait couple confidence
647 transmission probabilities below 0.5; red region in **Figure 14B**), vaccination coverage is much
648 higher than without the mandate (compare **Figure 14A-B** to **Figure 10A-B**, see also **Figure S10**).
649 This suggests that an external pressure to vaccinate is able to overcome the opposing cultural
650 pressure imposed by hesitancy in the population. If we lower the barrier to acquiring an
651 exemption (using more lenient mandate parameters), vaccination coverage and vaccine
652 confidence dynamics begin to mirror one another, as they do in simulations without vaccine
653 mandates (**Figure S10**).

654

655 ***Vaccine Inaccessibility***

656 We next modeled the dynamics of vaccination behaviors and attitudes when a population
657 has limited access to vaccines. To represent this scenario, we reduced the influence of parental
658 vaccine attitudes on vaccination behaviors for couples with at least one confident individual (i.e.
659 reducing c_1 , c_2 , c_3 from default values). In this simple representation of a vaccine-scarce
660 environment, we assume that parents' confidence in vaccines would have reduced influence on
661 their ability to vaccinate their offspring, that is, their vaccine confidence does not ensure their
662 ability to overcome vaccine inaccessibility. Hesitant couples are least likely to vaccinate their
663 offspring regardless of vaccine availability, but couples who would likely vaccinate their offspring
664 given the chance would have difficulty doing so due to the lack of resources. This scenario can be
665 contrasted with the strict vaccination mandate scenario described above, in which a couple
666 would often vaccinate their children despite their hesitancy. Attitude influence parameters were
667 set to $c_0 = 0.01$; $c_1 = c_2 = 0.1$, and $c_3 = 0.5$, and as before, we modulated the maximum cultural
668 selection coefficient of vaccination (σ_{\max}) and confidence transmission (C_1 and C_2) (**Figure 14C-D**).
669 Vaccination coverage was noticeably reduced overall, while vaccine confidence increased slightly
670 across the parameter space. Juxtaposed with the strict mandate (**Figure 14A-B**), our vaccine
671 scarcity models produce an opposite deviation of vaccination coverage from vaccine confidence
672 levels: when vaccines are mandated, we observe increased vaccination coverage in low-
673 confidence environments, and when vaccines are inaccessible, we observe lower than expected
674 vaccination coverage (<50%) in a predominantly vaccine-confident environment (>90%) (**Figure**
675 **14**).

676



677

678 **Figure 14: External factors (vaccine mandates and vaccine scarcity) disconnect levels of vaccine**
 679 **confidence from vaccination coverage.** Equilibrium vaccine coverage and vaccine confidence levels for
 680 varying values of confidence transmission (C_n ; vertical axis) and maximum selection coefficient (σ_{\max} ;
 681 horizontal axis). A strict vaccine mandate (**A, B**) is simulated by $c_0 = 0.5$, $c_1 = c_2 = 0.9$, $c_3 = 0.99$; Vaccine
 682 scarcity (**C, D**) is simulated by $c_0 = 0.01$; $c_1 = c_2 = 0.1$, and $c_3 = 0.5$. As in previous figures, unspecified
 683 parameters are given in **Table 1**. These simulations show an inverse correlation between vaccination
 684 coverage and vaccine confidence at $C_n < 0.5$ under a strict mandate, and $C_n > 0.5$ when vaccine access is
 685 severely limited.

686

687

688

689

690 **Discussion:**

691 In this manuscript, we present a simplified model of a complex process: the spread of vaccine
692 attitudes and their effects on vaccination behavior in a population. Increasing and maintaining
693 sufficient vaccination coverage to combat disease is more complex than simply increasing vaccine
694 availability or providing accurate information. A number of factors affect a person's vaccine-
695 related beliefs and a family's decision to vaccinate their children, including their history with
696 vaccinations and their perception of the disease and vaccine effects. As such, it is important that
697 we understand how these personal factors can shape vaccination cultures and thus affect public
698 health. Using a cultural niche construction framework, we modeled the spread of vaccine
699 attitudes and vaccination behavior in a variety of circumstances and measured the resulting
700 levels of vaccination coverage and vaccine confidence in the modeled population. Using this
701 novel approach of modeling dynamically interacting beliefs and behaviors, we are able to explore
702 the interplay of cultural factors that drive vaccine attitudes and vaccination behavior, providing
703 insight into how vaccination cultures are formed, maintained, and evolve.

704 Our model shows vaccine confidence transmission (C_n) to be the parameter that most
705 strongly determines vaccination coverage and confidence levels. That is, the probability of
706 transmitting vaccine-positive attitudes is a strong predictor of future vaccination coverage
707 (**Figures 4 and 10**). We note, however, that the vaccine confidence transmission of mixed-trait
708 couples (those with one hesitant parent and one confident parent, $C_1 = C_2$) has a much larger
709 effect on the levels of vaccination coverage than mixed-trait couple vaccination probability itself,
710 likely because the spread of vaccine confidence or hesitancy makes mixed-trait couples relatively
711 rare in the population. By modulating the vaccination probabilities of all individuals directly
712 (varying all $B_{m,n}$), while modulating mixed-trait confidence transmission ($C_1 = C_2$) (**Figure 5**) or all
713 confidence transmission parameters (C_n) (**Figure S1**), we show that vaccination probabilities work
714 alongside vaccine confidence transmission to determine vaccination coverage equilibria, while
715 confidence equilibria are dictated primarily by confidence transmission probabilities.

716 It is important to note that even though this model demonstrates the powerful effects of
717 beliefs on vaccination behaviors, it also shows that vaccine efficacy and perceived value are
718 important to maintaining sufficient levels of vaccination coverage, especially if vaccine confidence
719 is not being robustly transmitted (or maintained in adulthood). Further, we show that a culture in
720 which vaccine-hesitant individuals preferentially assort with one another more so than vaccine-
721 confident individuals ($\alpha_2 > \alpha_1$) can allow vaccine hesitancy to more easily gain a foothold,

722 lowering vaccination coverage unless vaccines have a high perceived value (i.e. high σ_{\max} , **Figure**
723 **13, Figure S9**). Thus, our simulations suggest that a pro-vaccination health culture can be
724 undermined by a vaccine-hesitancy “echo chamber”. This phenomenon would likely be amplified
725 if we modeled homophily of oblique interactions as well, for example if individuals preferentially
726 interacted with friend groups or news sources that shared similar beliefs and values to their own.

727 Further, our model demonstrates that the equilibrium frequencies of vaccination coverage
728 and vaccine confidence are determined by the cultural context rather than by the initial
729 frequencies. In other words, the current cultural landscape—beliefs, behaviors, policies, etc.—are
730 more predictive of future levels of vaccine coverage and confidence than current coverage and
731 confidence levels in the population. This result further supports the importance of considering
732 the cultural factors that have shaped current health-related beliefs and behaviors if health
733 policies aim to maintain or change the current conditions.

734 In the absence of external pressures, populations reach an equilibrium at which vaccination
735 coverage and vaccine confidence mirror each other across the tested parameters: high
736 vaccination coverage coincides with high levels of confidence in vaccines, and low coverage
737 coincides with low confidence levels. This result suggests, intuitively, that when population traits
738 are at or near an equilibrium, we can infer that a population with high vaccination coverage will
739 have low rates of vaccine hesitancy and vice versa. We then model two possible exceptions to
740 this pattern—vaccine mandates and a lack of access to vaccines. When there is increased
741 pressure to vaccinate or difficulty in acquiring vaccination exemptions, an undercurrent of
742 vaccine hesitancy can persist in a relatively well-vaccinated population, potentially limiting the
743 adoption of newly introduced vaccines. This possibly contributes to the unexpected lag in uptake
744 of newer vaccines, such as the COVID or HPV vaccines, in communities with otherwise high
745 vaccination rates [65–67]. The perceived increase in hesitancy surrounding new vaccines may
746 actually be existing vaccine hesitancy becoming evident. In addition, “fence sitters”, those who
747 have not made a firm stance regarding vaccines and thus could be more influenced by targeted
748 campaigns [61], may develop higher levels of uncertainty about new vaccines than their parents
749 had about existing ones.

750 In contrast to the effect of vaccine mandates, by modeling vaccine inaccessibility we
751 illustrate another important pattern: reduced vaccination coverage in a vaccine confident culture.
752 In a vaccine-scarce environment, an individual’s attitude regarding vaccines has less influence on
753 vaccination behavior due to the barrier imposed by resource availability. As a result, a population

754 may be undervaccinated despite holding vaccine-affirming beliefs. In addition, a health culture
755 previously shaped by vaccine inaccessibility could potentially ingrain specific behavioral practices
756 (for example, visiting the doctor only when a child is sick and not for a regular vaccine schedule)
757 that are not easily modified even if vaccines become more readily available. These vaccine
758 scarcity scenarios are most likely to exist in low- and middle-income countries in which vaccine
759 acquisition, storage and/or distribution resources are insufficient [68–70] whereas the opposite
760 scenario (low confidence/high vaccination) after vaccine mandates is most common in developed
761 nations [71]. In summary, we find that vaccine mandates can result in high vaccination coverage
762 even in a culture of hesitancy, and that lack of access to vaccines can produce the inverse: low
763 vaccination coverage in a culture of confidence.

764 Individuals consider multiple factors alongside vaccine efficacy when deciding whether to
765 vaccinate themselves or their children, essentially performing an internal cost-benefit analysis
766 based on their circumstances and interpretation of accessible information. We aimed to be
767 inclusive of these considerations via our comprehensive cultural selection coefficient; this
768 parameter allows the frequency of vaccination to deviate from the level that is expected given
769 the cultural transmission probabilities. Increasing positive public perception through honest and
770 effective communication, while reducing public concern about vaccines and increasing vaccine
771 safety, together could drive increased vaccination trust and acceptance. Achieving the optimal
772 vaccination coverage lies not only in the hands of the public by vaccinating themselves and their
773 children, but also in the efforts of health officials and leaders in creating an environment that
774 fosters confidence by assuring the public of vaccine efficacy, safety, and value, while providing
775 convenient avenues to attain vaccines.

776 As with any model, we cannot fully capture the complex reality of vaccine hesitancy and
777 vaccination behavior. First, though vaccination frequency data is available for numerous vaccines,
778 frequency data for vaccine attitudes are much less common, with the two traditionally not
779 surveyed together. Thus, there is no dataset that exactly estimates the phenotypes presented
780 here, for example, the number of vaccinated but hesitant (V^+A^-) individuals in a population. The
781 goals of vaccination attitude surveys have been primarily to identify themes of vaccine hesitancy,
782 and to a lesser degree, the themes of vaccination. However, they do not report parent
783 vaccination states or whether the child was actually vaccinated (on schedule). With data
784 presenting parent vaccination states alongside their vaccine attitudes and vaccination decisions,
785 we would be able to more accurately inform phenotype frequencies, possibly extending the

786 model to incorporate various types of hesitancy. We note, however, that our results did not
787 depend on the initial proportions of vaccination status or vaccine hesitancy, so these data would
788 primarily be for comparison to our equilibrium outcomes. We were also constrained by limited
789 data to inform the cultural transmission and transition probabilities. In our model, baseline
790 confidence transmission and influence probabilities are structured according to a simple pattern
791 of inheritance, such that each parent is equally likely to influence an offspring's phenotype.
792 However, cultural traits and vaccination attitudes may not strictly follow this pattern: one parent
793 might have more influence, or one variant of a trait might be more likely to be transmitted. In
794 addition, transmission probabilities are constant in our model, remaining unaffected by changing
795 cultural conditions throughout each simulation, but in reality, these probabilities may fluctuate in
796 response to a variety of factors including vaccine type or family structure. Future developments
797 of the model could include modulating the probability of transmission of vaccine confidence
798 dependent on aspects of the cultural environment, such as the attitude frequencies in the
799 population. Our cultural selection coefficient and attitude transition probabilities did vary with
800 the frequency of vaccination coverage, but the exact relationships could not be informed by
801 existing data. As a result, we generated frequency-dependent functions to fit a set of
802 assumptions: for example, that the transition to vaccine hesitancy might be most common when
803 the vaccination coverage is low and the benefits of vaccination are more apparent.

804 Though vaccination coverage and vaccine confidence stabilized (reached equilibria) in our
805 simulations, in reality vaccination rates fluctuate over time in response to changing population
806 dynamics, perhaps never arriving at a stable equilibrium. For example, the increasingly rapid
807 spread of information [23] may cause attitudes and behaviors to change frequently over short
808 periods of time. In our model, most of the phenotype frequency fluctuations occur in the first few
809 iterations before quickly adjusting to an equilibrium. Unlike many models of population
810 dynamics, this model has a discrete-time format and does not consider a birth-death cycle or
811 asynchrony in population turnover. Thus, the timescale of our model might not translate directly
812 to years or generations, and we avoid interpreting the number of iterations in literal terms. It is
813 possible that if more realistic birth and death processes were incorporated, the cultural dynamics
814 would occur at different timescales and would continue to fluctuate instead of approaching a
815 stable equilibrium. In addition, parents' vaccination decisions are also influenced by the
816 grandparents of the children to be vaccinated [72]. A restructuring of the timescale or the

817 incorporation of population asynchrony in our model could allow for consideration of these
818 influences.

819 Finally, we constructed the offspring vaccination probability to be informed primarily by
820 parents' vaccine attitudes and secondarily by their own vaccination status. Though it is
821 understood that there is an interaction between parents' beliefs and their own experiences with
822 vaccines regarding their decision to vaccinate their children, accurately modeling the relative
823 contribution of these two factors could benefit from empirical studies on parental willingness to
824 vaccinate based on their beliefs and vaccination status. With our current formula ($B_{m,n}$, **Table S2**),
825 vaccine-confident parents who did not themselves receive childhood vaccines have a reduced
826 likelihood of vaccinating their offspring than vaccinated parents. In reality, parental vaccine
827 attitudes might even further outweigh their own vaccination status in their decision making than
828 we model here.

829 Our findings, which are based on cultural evolutionary modeling in a public-health
830 context, suggest several avenues for policy and outreach recommendations. First, we note that
831 vaccine mandates with limited exemptions will increase the vaccination coverage but may mask
832 the spread of vaccine hesitancy. In addition to vaccine policy, our results suggest that a broad
833 effort to encourage and inform the public about vaccine safety and efficacy will foster higher
834 vaccine coverage. In this vein, we note that individuals who are skeptical about vaccines might
835 invest more time in seeking out information about them [73–75], thus we recommend that
836 accurate information about vaccines should be readily accessible through a variety of means, be
837 easily understood, and be supported by personal anecdotes. If misinformation is easier to
838 encounter and digest than accurate information, it could have an outsized impact on individuals
839 who are “on the fence” [61]. Relatedly, we note that research suggests transparency and trust go
840 hand in hand: if individuals perceive the healthcare system is concealing information to make
841 vaccines appear more safe, trust in that system will decrease and people will be more susceptible
842 to vaccine hesitancy [73–76]. Finally, dialogue between people with different beliefs and
843 attitudes can help to break the “echo chambers” of homophily, encouraging individuals to
844 communicate and empathize with one another. Therefore, to address vaccine hesitancy, our
845 results underscore the importance of considering the cultural beliefs that underpin health
846 behaviors.

847

848

849 **References:**

- 850 1. Institute of Medicine, Division of Health Care Services, Committee for the Study of the Future of
851 Public Health. The Future of Public Health. National Academies Press; 1988.
- 852 2. Fenner F. A successful eradication campaign. Global eradication of smallpox. *Rev Infect Dis.* 1982;4:
853 916–930.
- 854 3. Kim-Farley R, Schonberger L, Nkowane B, Kew O, Bart K, Orenstein W, et al. POLIOMYELITIS IN THE
855 USA: VIRTUAL ELIMINATION OF DISEASE CAUSED BY WILD VIRUS. *The Lancet.* 1984. pp. 1315–1317.
856 doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(84)90829-8
- 857 4. Salk D. Eradication of Poliomyelitis in the United States. I. Live Virus Vaccine-Associated and Wild
858 Poliovirus Disease. *Clinical Infectious Diseases.* 1980. pp. 228–242. doi:10.1093/clinids/2.2.228
- 859 5. Thompson KM, Strebel PM, Dabbagh A, Cherian T, Cochi SL. Enabling implementation of the Global
860 Vaccine Action Plan: developing investment cases to achieve targets for measles and rubella
861 prevention. *Vaccine.* 2013;31 Suppl 2: B149–56.
- 862 6. Atwell JE, Salmon DA. Pertussis resurgence and vaccine uptake: implications for reducing vaccine
863 hesitancy. *Pediatrics.* 2014. pp. 602–604.
- 864 7. Kubin L. Is There a Resurgence of Vaccine Preventable Diseases in the U.S.? *Journal of Pediatric*
865 *Nursing.* 2019. pp. 115–118. doi:10.1016/j.pedn.2018.11.011
- 866 8. Falagas ME, Zarkadoulia E. Factors associated with suboptimal compliance to vaccinations in children
867 in developed countries: a systematic review. *Curr Med Res Opin.* 2008;24: 1719–1741.
- 868 9. Dubé E, Laberge C, Guay M, Bramadat P, Roy R, Bettinger J. Vaccine hesitancy: an overview. *Hum*
869 *Vaccin Immunother.* 2013;9: 1763–1773.
- 870 10. Streefland P, Chowdhury AMR, Ramos-Jimenez P. Patterns of vaccination acceptance. *Social Science*
871 *& Medicine.* 1999. pp. 1705–1716. doi:10.1016/s0277-9536(99)00239-7
- 872 11. MacDonald NE, SAGE Working Group on Vaccine Hesitancy. Vaccine hesitancy: Definition, scope and
873 determinants. *Vaccine.* 2015;33: 4161–4164.
- 874 12. Scheres J, Kuszewski K. The Ten Threats to Global Health in 2018 and 2019. A welcome and
875 informative communication of WHO to everybody. *Zdrowie Publiczne i Zarządzanie.* 2019. pp. 2–8.
876 doi:10.4467/20842627oz.19.001.11297
- 877 13. Schwartz JL. New media, old messages: themes in the history of vaccine hesitancy and refusal. *Virtual*
878 *Mentor.* 2012;14: 50–55.
- 879 14. Koslap-Petraco M. Vaccine hesitancy: Not a new phenomenon, but a new threat. *J Am Assoc Nurse*
880 *Pract.* 2019;31: 624–626.
- 881 15. Siddiqui M, Salmon DA, Omer SB. Epidemiology of vaccine hesitancy in the United States. *Hum Vaccin*
882 *Immunother.* 2013;9: 2643–2648.

- 883 16. Callender D. Vaccine hesitancy: More than a movement. *Hum Vaccin Immunother.* 2016;12: 2464–
884 2468.
- 885 17. Durbach N. *Bodily Matters: The Anti-Vaccination Movement in England, 1853–1907.* Duke University
886 Press; 2005.
- 887 18. Swales JD. The Leicester anti-vaccination movement. *The Lancet.* 1992. pp. 1019–1021.
888 doi:10.1016/0140-6736(92)93021-e
- 889 19. Wolfe RM, Sharp LK. Anti-vaccinationists past and present. *BMJ.* 2002;325: 430–432.
- 890 20. Jackson CL. State laws on compulsory immunization in the United States. *Public Health Rep.* 1969;84:
891 787–795.
- 892 21. Feikin DR. Individual and Community Risks of Measles and Pertussis Associated With Personal
893 Exemptions to Immunization. *JAMA.* 2000. p. 3145. doi:10.1001/jama.284.24.3145
- 894 22. Salmon DA, Haber M, Gangarosa EJ, Phillips L, Smith NJ, Chen RT. Health Consequences of Religious
895 and Philosophical Exemptions From Immunization Laws. *JAMA.* 1999. p. 47.
896 doi:10.1001/jama.282.1.47
- 897 23. Hornik J, Satchi RS, Cesareo L, Pastore A. Information dissemination via electronic word-of-mouth:
898 Good news travels fast, bad news travels faster! *Computers in Human Behavior.* 2015. pp. 273–280.
899 doi:10.1016/j.chb.2014.11.008
- 900 24. Spier RE. Perception of risk of vaccine adverse events: a historical perspective. *Vaccine.* 2001;20 Suppl
901 1: S78–84; discussion S75–7.
- 902 25. Eggertson L. Lancet retracts 12-year-old article linking autism to MMR vaccines. *CMAJ.* 2010;182:
903 E199–200.
- 904 26. Rao TSS, Andrade C. The MMR vaccine and autism: Sensation, refutation, retraction, and fraud. *Indian
905 J Psychiatry.* 2011;53: 95–96.
- 906 27. Yaqub O, Castle-Clarke S, Sevdalis N, Chataway J. Attitudes to vaccination: A critical review. *Social
907 Science & Medicine.* 2014. pp. 1–11. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.04.018
- 908 28. Burley N. The meaning of assortative mating. *Ethol Sociobiol.* 1983;4: 191–203.
- 909 29. Creanza N, Feldman MW. Complexity in models of cultural niche construction with selection and
910 homophily. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2014;111 Suppl 3: 10830–10837.
- 911 30. Creanza N, Fogarty L, Feldman MW. Models of cultural niche construction with selection and
912 assortative mating. *PLoS One.* 2012;7: e42744.
- 913 31. Gimelfarb A. Processes of Pair Formation Leading to Assortative Mating in Biological Populations:
914 Encounter-Mating Model. *The American Naturalist.* 1988. pp. 865–884. doi:10.1086/284827
- 915 32. Centola D. An experimental study of homophily in the adoption of health behavior. *Science.*
916 2011;334: 1269–1272.

- 917 33. Salathé M, Bonhoeffer S. The effect of opinion clustering on disease outbreaks. *J R Soc Interface*.
918 2008;5: 1505–1508.
- 919 34. Yoder JS, Dworkin MS. Vaccination usage among an old-order Amish community in Illinois. *Pediatr*
920 *Infect Dis J*. 2006;25: 1182–1183.
- 921 35. Gastañaduy PA, Budd J, Fisher N, Redd SB, Fletcher J, Miller J, et al. A Measles Outbreak in an
922 Underimmunized Amish Community in Ohio. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;375: 1343–1354.
- 923 36. Bahta L, Ashkir A. Addressing MMR Vaccine Resistance in Minnesota’s Somali Community. *Minn Med*.
924 2015;98: 33–36.
- 925 37. Wolff ER, Madlon-Kay DJ. Childhood vaccine beliefs reported by Somali and non-Somali parents. *J Am*
926 *Board Fam Med*. 2014;27: 458–464.
- 927 38. Laland K, Matthews B, Feldman MW. An introduction to niche construction theory. *Evol Ecol*.
928 2016;30: 191–202.
- 929 39. John Odling-Smee F, Laland KN, Feldman MW. *Niche Construction: The Neglected Process in*
930 *Evolution (MPB-37)*. Princeton University Press; 2013.
- 931 40. O’Brien MJ, Laland KN. Genes, Culture, and Agriculture: An Example of Human Niche Construction.
932 *Curr Anthropol*. 2012;53: 434–470.
- 933 41. Fogarty L, Creanza N. The niche construction of cultural complexity: interactions between
934 innovations, population size and the environment. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 2017;372.
935 doi:10.1098/rstb.2016.0428
- 936 42. O’Brien MJ, Laland KN, Broughton JM, Cannon MD, Fuentes A, Gerbault P, et al. Genes, culture, and
937 agriculture: An example of human niche construction. *Curr Anthropol*. 2012;53: 000–000.
- 938 43. Fuentes A. Cooperation, conflict, and niche construction in the genus homo. *War, peace, and human*
939 *nature*. 2013; 78–94.
- 940 44. Perra N, Balcan D, Gonçalves B, Vespignani A. Towards a characterization of behavior-disease models.
941 *PLoS One*. 2011;6: e23084.
- 942 45. Mao L, Yang Y. Coupling infectious diseases, human preventive behavior, and networks--a conceptual
943 framework for epidemic modeling. *Soc Sci Med*. 2012;74: 167–175.
- 944 46. Chauhan S, Misra OP, Dhar J. Stability analysis of SIR model with vaccination. *American journal of*
945 *computational and applied mathematics*. 2014;4: 17–23.
- 946 47. Church KEM, Liu X. Analysis of a SIR model with pulse vaccination and temporary immunity: Stability,
947 bifurcation and a cylindrical attractor. *Nonlinear Anal Real World Appl*. 2019;50: 240–266.
- 948 48. May T, Silverman RD. “Clustering of exemptions” as a collective action threat to herd immunity.
949 *Vaccine*. 2003;21: 1048–1051.
- 950 49. Coe AB, Gatewood SBS, Moczygemba LR, Goode J-VKR, Beckner JO. The use of the health belief

- 951 model to assess predictors of intent to receive the novel (2009) H1N1 influenza vaccine. *Innov Pharm.*
952 2012;3: 1–11.
- 953 50. Reiter PL, Brewer NT, Gottlieb SL, McRee A-L, Smith JS. Parents' health beliefs and HPV vaccination of
954 their adolescent daughters. *Soc Sci Med.* 2009;69: 475–480.
- 955 51. Janz NK, Becker MH. The Health Belief Model: a decade later. *Health Educ Q.* 1984;11: 1–47.
- 956 52. Rosenstock IM. The Health Belief Model and Preventive Health Behavior. *Health Educ Monogr.*
957 1974;2: 354–386.
- 958 53. Jones CL, Jensen JD, Scherr CL, Brown NR, Christy K, Weaver J. The Health Belief Model as an
959 explanatory framework in communication research: exploring parallel, serial, and moderated
960 mediation. *Health Commun.* 2015;30: 566–576.
- 961 54. Wang E, Clymer J, Davis-Hayes C, Bутtenheim A. Nonmedical exemptions from school immunization
962 requirements: a systematic review. *Am J Public Health.* 2014;104: e62–84.
- 963 55. Phadke VK, Bednarczyk RA, Salmon DA, Omer SB. Association Between Vaccine Refusal and Vaccine-
964 Preventable Diseases in the United States: A Review of Measles and Pertussis. *JAMA.* 2016;315:
965 1149–1158.
- 966 56. Pruitt RH, Kline PM, Kovaz RB. Perceived Barriers to Childhood Immunization Among Rural
967 Populations. *Journal of Community Health Nursing.* 1995. pp. 65–72.
968 doi:10.1207/s15327655jchn1202_1
- 969 57. Cavalli-Sforza LL, Feldman MW. Cultural transmission and evolution: a quantitative approach. *Monogr*
970 *Popul Biol.* 1981;16: 1–388.
- 971 58. Gangarosa EJ, Galazka AM, Wolfe CR, Phillips LM, Gangarosa RE, Miller E, et al. Impact of anti-vaccine
972 movements on pertussis control: the untold story. *Lancet.* 1998;351: 356–361.
- 973 59. Ozawa S, Mirelman A, Stack ML, Walker DG, Levine OS. Cost-effectiveness and economic benefits of
974 vaccines in low- and middle-income countries: a systematic review. *Vaccine.* 2012;31: 96–108.
- 975 60. Kennedy AM, Brown CJ, Gust DA. Vaccine beliefs of parents who oppose compulsory vaccination.
976 *Public Health Rep.* 2005;120: 252–258.
- 977 61. Leask J. Target the fence-sitters. *Nature.* 2011;473: 443–445.
- 978 62. Hill HA, Singleton JA, Yankey D, Elam-Evans LD, Cassandra Pingali S, Kang Y. Vaccination Coverage by
979 Age 24 Months Among Children Born in 2015 and 2016 — National Immunization Survey-Child,
980 United States, 2016–2018. *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report.* 2019. pp. 913–918.
981 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6841e2
- 982 63. Hill HA, Elam-Evans LD, Yankey D, Singleton JA, Kang Y. Vaccination Coverage Among Children Aged
983 19–35 Months — United States, 2016. *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report.* 2017. pp.
984 1171–1177. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6643a3
- 985 64. Omer SB, Salmon DA, Orenstein WA, Patricia deHart M, Halsey N. Vaccine Refusal, Mandatory

- 986 Immunization, and the Risks of Vaccine-Preventable Diseases. *New England Journal of Medicine*.
987 2009. pp. 1981–1988. doi:10.1056/nejmsa0806477
- 988 65. Gilkey MB, Calo WA, Marciniak MW, Brewer NT. Parents who refuse or delay HPV vaccine:
989 Differences in vaccination behavior, beliefs, and clinical communication preferences. *Hum Vaccin*
990 *Immunother*. 2017;13: 680–686.
- 991 66. Hanson KE, Koch B, Bonner K, McRee A-L, Basta NE. National Trends in Parental Human
992 Papillomavirus Vaccination Intentions and Reasons for Hesitancy, 2010–2015. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2018;67:
993 1018–1026.
- 994 67. Wong MCS, Wong ELY, Huang J, Cheung AWL, Law K, Chong MKC, et al. Acceptance of the COVID-19
995 vaccine based on the health belief model: A population-based survey in Hong Kong. *Vaccine*. 2021;39:
996 1148–1156.
- 997 68. Smith J, Lipsitch M, Almond JW. Vaccine production, distribution, access, and uptake. *Lancet*.
998 2011;378: 428–438.
- 999 69. Mathieu E, Ritchie H, Ortiz-Ospina E, Roser M, Hasell J, Appel C, et al. A global database of COVID-19
1000 vaccinations. *Nat Hum Behav*. 2021;5: 947–953.
- 1001 70. Burki T. Global COVID-19 vaccine inequity. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2021;21: 922–923.
- 1002 71. Solís Arce JS, Warren SS, Meriggi NF, Scacco A, McMurry N, Voors M, et al. COVID-19 vaccine
1003 acceptance and hesitancy in low- and middle-income countries. *Nat Med*. 2021;27: 1385–1394.
- 1004 72. Karthigesu SP, Chisholm JS, Coall DA. Do grandparents influence parents’ decision to vaccinate their
1005 children? A systematic review. *Vaccine*. 2018;36: 7456–7462.
- 1006 73. Gowda C, Dempsey AF. The rise (and fall?) of parental vaccine hesitancy. *Hum Vaccin Immunother*.
1007 2013;9: 1755–1762.
- 1008 74. Ellithorpe ME, Adams R, Aladé F. Parents’ Behaviors and Experiences Associated with Four
1009 Vaccination Behavior Groups for Childhood Vaccine Hesitancy. *Matern Child Health J*. 2022;26: 280–
1010 288.
- 1011 75. Benin AL, Wisler-Scher DJ, Colson E, Shapiro ED, Holmboe ES. Qualitative Analysis of Mothers’
1012 Decision-Making About Vaccines for Infants: The Importance of Trust. *Pediatrics*. 2006. pp. 1532–
1013 1541. doi:10.1542/peds.2005-1728
- 1014 76. Montgomery T, Berns JS, Braddock CH 3rd. Transparency as a Trust-Building Practice in Physician
1015 Relationships With Patients. *JAMA*. 2020;324: 2365–2366.
- 1016