

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

4
5 Authors: Kerri-Ann Anderson^{a,b} and Nicole Creanza^{a,b}

6
7 Affiliations:

8 ^a Department of Biological Sciences, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, USA 37212

9 ^b Evolutionary Studies Initiative, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, USA 37212

10
11 Correspondence: nicole.creanza@vanderbilt.edu

12

13 **Abstract**

14

15 Health perceptions and health-related behaviors can change at the population level as
16 cultures evolve. In the last decade, despite the proven efficacy of vaccines, the developed world
17 has seen a resurgence of vaccine-preventable diseases (VPDs) such as measles, pertussis, and
18 polio. Vaccine hesitancy, an individual attitude influenced by historical, political, and socio-
19 cultural forces, is believed to be a primary factor responsible for decreasing vaccine coverage,
20 thereby increasing the risk and occurrence of VPD outbreaks. In recent years, mathematical
21 models of disease dynamics have begun to incorporate aspects of human behavior, however they
22 do not address how beliefs and motivations influence these health behaviors. Here, using a
23 mathematical modeling framework, we explore the effects of cultural evolution on vaccine
24 hesitancy and vaccination behavior. With this model, we shed light on facets of cultural evolution
25 (vertical and oblique transmission, homophily, etc.) that promote the spread of vaccine
26 hesitancy, ultimately affecting levels of vaccination coverage and VPD outbreak risk in a
27 population. In addition, we present our model as a generalizable framework for exploring cultural
28 evolution when humans' beliefs influence, but do not strictly dictate, their behaviors. This model
29 offers a means of exploring how parents' potentially conflicting beliefs and cultural traits could
30 affect their children's health and fitness. We show that vaccine confidence and vaccine-conferred
31 benefits can both be driving forces of vaccine coverage. We also demonstrate that an assortative
32 preference among vaccine-hesitant individuals can lead to increased vaccine hesitancy and lower
33 vaccine coverage.

34 **1. Introduction**

35
36 Niche construction is a process in which organisms modify their local environment, thus
37 altering selection pressures on themselves and the other organisms in that environment [1,2]. In
38 *cultural* niche construction, humans modify their cultural environments—such as their beliefs,
39 behaviors, preferences, and social contacts—in ways that subsequently alter evolutionary
40 pressures on themselves and/or their culture [2]. Mathematical models of niche construction
41 have traditionally been used in a biological and ecological context. More recently, this type of
42 model has been expanded to explain the evolution of cultural behaviors, with applications to
43 religion, fertility, and the evolution of large-scale human conflict [2–7]. Cultural niche
44 construction theory recognizes that human evolution is in part directed by human behaviors. As
45 such, using a niche construction framework allows for the exploration of a broader range of
46 complex feedback scenarios resulting from selection pressures that may be caused by—or act
47 upon—non-genetic traits. It may also provide insight into how otherwise deleterious traits
48 become beneficial in certain environments and thus spread in a population [1]. Here, we propose
49 a cultural niche construction model of the interactions between beliefs and behaviors, in which
50 an individual’s beliefs influence their behaviors, and these belief-behavior interactions can be
51 affected by and shape the broader cultural landscape. We apply this model to the interactions
52 between vaccine-related beliefs, such as vaccine hesitancy of individual parents, and vaccination
53 behaviors, such as a pair of parents vaccinating their offspring. Modeling the belief-behavior
54 interactions underlying vaccination coverage using a cultural niche construction framework
55 allows us to better understand how vaccination “cultures” are formed and how they can be
56 transformed to promote public health.

57 Understanding vaccination behaviors is a crucial aspect of preventing infectious disease
58 outbreaks. The implementation of childhood vaccination policies has led to the eradication of
59 smallpox and the elimination of poliomyelitis (polio) in the United States [8–10]. The high efficacy
60 of the measles vaccine, combined with wide vaccine acceptance in developed countries, had
61 resulted in measles previously being targeted for elimination by 2020 [11]. However, over the
62 past decade, there has been a resurgence of vaccine-preventable diseases (VPDs) in developed
63 countries despite the safety and efficacy of vaccines and high overall childhood vaccination rates
64 [12–15]. Vaccine hesitancy, named one of the World Health Organization’s ten threats to global
65 health in 2019 [16], is believed to be responsible for decreasing vaccination coverage and thus

66 increasing the risk of vaccine-preventable disease outbreaks worldwide [17]. Vaccine hesitancy is
67 a complex and context-specific individual attitude influenced by multiple factors, such as
68 complacency (the belief that vaccination is unnecessary when the perceived risk of VPDs is low),
69 convenience (the accessibility and affordability of vaccines), and confidence (the level of trust in
70 the efficacy and safety of the vaccine, and in the healthcare system) [15,18]. Additionally, anti-
71 vaccine sentiments are still on the rise despite well-documented vaccine efficacy and safety,
72 including numerous studies debunking the spurious connection between vaccines and autism
73 [19] and other anti-vaccination arguments [20]. The spread of these sentiments and disease
74 outbreak risk are further exacerbated by homophily—the tendency of individuals to choose social
75 contacts and mates who are similar to themselves [6,7,21,22]. Network-based simulations
76 suggest that individuals with similar vaccine-hesitant opinions form groups that are more
77 susceptible to vaccine-preventable diseases, impeding the attainment of herd immunity and
78 substantially increasing the likelihood of disease outbreak in these clusters [23].

79 Even though some epidemiological models have begun to include aspects of human behavior
80 (e.g [24–26]), these models do not typically incorporate the effects of population beliefs and
81 changing cultural landscapes on disease transmission. For example, established epidemiological
82 models such as the Susceptible-Infected-Recovered (SIR) model have been modified to include a
83 vaccination component that can be useful in determining the intensity of intervention needed to
84 address an epidemic [27]; however these models do not generally address fluctuations in
85 vaccination rates or lower-than-expected rates of adoption based on cultural factors. One
86 notable exception is a recent study in which an SIR model of a contagious disease was paired with
87 another SIR model in which vaccine hesitancy is treated as a “cultural contagion”; this model
88 showed that the spread of anti-vaccine sentiment could cause epidemics that would otherwise
89 not have occurred [28]. However, it is still important that we understand how parents’ beliefs,
90 which may differ from one another, interact with their perceptions of the relative risks of disease
91 and vaccines to shape the decision to vaccinate their children, which in turn affects the future risk
92 of vaccine-preventable disease outbreaks. Indeed, belief systems can act as the main barrier to
93 vaccination, as opposed to lack of vaccine access, particularly in wealthier countries [23,29]. For
94 example, increasing rates of non-medical exemption from vaccines (exemption on the basis of
95 religious, philosophical, and personal beliefs), have been observed in the United States [30,31].
96 Without these considerations, models commonly used in public health may be misleading; thus,
97 understanding and incorporating the underlying health cultures and their evolution, including the

98 interplay between beliefs and behaviors, will allow us to build more comprehensive and
99 representative models of vaccination dynamics and better support public health efforts.

100 In this study, we model the development and spread of vaccine hesitancy and childhood
101 vaccination through a cultural evolution framework, incorporating the transmission of vaccine
102 attitudes both from parents and from the community. We aim to assess the dynamic interactions
103 between beliefs (shaped by social interactions) and behaviors (influenced by these beliefs). Using
104 vaccine hesitancy and vaccination behaviors as a focal example of belief-behavior interactions,
105 we explore the situations in which vaccine hesitancy is most likely to spread, potentially reducing
106 childhood vaccination rates and leading to an increase in vaccine-preventable disease outbreaks.
107 In addition, we consider that the perception of the relative risks of a disease and its preventive
108 vaccine can fluctuate based on the prevalence of vaccination [26], such that the population's
109 vaccination coverage can influence the decision to vaccinate one's children. Finally, we take into
110 account that the decision to vaccinate a child is often the joint consideration of two individuals
111 who might have different vaccine attitudes, and we further incorporate homophily (assortative
112 mating) to understand how social subcultures might influence parental behaviors. Overall, we
113 propose that a generalizable modeling framework for belief-behavior interactions can help
114 inform public health strategies by improving our understanding of the cultural dynamics of
115 vaccine hesitancy.

116

117 **2. Methods**

118

119 To model the evolution of vaccine beliefs and behaviors, we build on the cultural niche
120 construction framework of [6] to assess the effects of vaccine attitudes on vaccination behaviors
121 and on the resulting vaccination culture. We use this adapted model to explore how vaccination
122 patterns evolve in a population when a cultural trait, such as vaccine hesitancy, can influence but
123 not perfectly predict a behavior, such as vaccinating one's children.

124 We consider two cultural traits: **V**, a vaccination trait, and **A**, a vaccine attitude trait. Each
125 trait has two possible states, V^+ (vaccinated) or V^- (unvaccinated) and A^+ (vaccine confident) or A^-
126 (vaccine hesitant), respectively. Thus, there are four possible phenotypes: V^+A^+ (type 1:
127 vaccinated and confident), V^+A^- (type 2: vaccinated and hesitant), V^-A^+ (type 3: unvaccinated and
128 confident), and V^-A^- (type 4: unvaccinated and hesitant), whose population frequencies are
129 denoted by x_1, x_2, x_3 , and x_4 , respectively, with $\sum_{i=1}^4 x_i = 1$.

130
131
132

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 1) | σ_{\max} | The highest additional benefit that can be conferred by vaccination Default: $\sigma_{\max} = 0.1$ |
| Initial Phenotype Frequencies | | $x_1(V^+A^+) = 0.81, x_2(V^+A^-) = 0.1, x_3(V^-A^+) = 0.07, x_4(V^-A^-) = 0.02$ | |

133
134 The attitude trait (**A**) can influence the dynamics of the vaccination trait (**V**) in two ways:
135 by affecting the likelihood that couples vaccinate their offspring, and by determining with whom
136 each adult will preferentially pair in assortative interactions. The state of the vaccine attitude trait
137 (**A**) informs the value of an assortative mating parameter (α_k), which measures the departure
138 from random mating. We define a 'choosing parent', arbitrarily, as the first member of each
139 mating pair. The choosing parent's **A** state dictates the level of assortative mating, that is, the
140 degree to which an individual of a given **A** state will preferentially mate with another individual of
141 the same state, expressed by parameters α_k where $k = \{1, 2\}$ and $0 \leq \alpha_k \leq 1$ (**Table S1**). If the
142 choosing parent is A^+ , this individual mates preferentially with other A^+ individuals with
143 probability α_1 , and mates randomly with probability $1 - \alpha_1$, whereas if the choosing parent is A^- ,

144 this individual mates preferentially with other A^- individuals with probability α_2 , and mates
145 randomly with probability $1-\alpha_2$. There are sixteen possible mating pairs from the four
146 phenotypes described, and we use the notation $m_{i,j}$ to indicate the frequency of a mating
147 between a choosing parent of type i and the second parent of type j where $i, j = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ (**Table**
148 **S1**); for example, $m_{1,3}$ represents the mating frequency of V^+A^+ (x_1) and V^-A^+ (x_3).

149 Since the two traits (**A** and **V**) are transmitted vertically, for each phenotype we must specify
150 the probability that the mating produces an offspring of that phenotype. The vaccine confidence
151 trait (A^+) is transmitted with probability C_n , and the vaccine hesitancy trait (A^-) is transmitted with
152 probability $1-C_n$ (for $n = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$) as shown in **Tables 2** and **Table S2**). If $C_0 = 0$, two A^- parents
153 will always produce A^- offspring, and if $C_3 = 1$, two A^+ parents will always produce A^+ offspring.
154 However, if $C_0 > 0$, two A^- parents can produce A^+ offspring at some probability, and similarly if C_3
155 < 1 , two A^+ parents can produce A^- offspring with some probability.

156 Transmission of vaccination (V^+ with probability $B_{m,n}$ for $m, n = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$; **Table 1**) is more
157 complex, since parents' vaccine attitudes (**A**), in addition to their own vaccination states (**V**), can
158 influence their behavior in vaccinating their offspring via a set of "influence parameters" that
159 inform vaccination probabilities. The probability that each mating pair produces an offspring with
160 the V^+ trait (i.e. vaccinates their offspring) is a scaled product of the influence of parental
161 attitudes (c_n for $n = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$) and the influence of parental vaccination states (b_m for $m = \{0, 1, 2,$
162 $3\}$) (**Tables 2** and **Table S2**). For example, for mating pair $V^+A^+ \times V^+A^-$, the combined vaccination
163 states ($V^+ \times V^+$) will influence vaccination behavior by b_3 , and the combined attitude states, ($A^+ \times$
164 A^-), will influence vaccination behavior by c_2 . Therefore, a $V^+A^+ \times V^+A^-$ mating will produce a V^+
165 offspring with probability $B_{3,2} = c_2 \left(\frac{1+b_3}{2} \right)$; this pair will also produce an A^+ offspring with
166 probability C_2 based on their combined attitude states. Thus, according to the model, this pairing
167 will produce a V^+A^+ offspring with probability $B_{3,2}C_2$ and a V^+A^- offspring with probability
168 $B_{3,2}(1-C_2)$. We note that assortative mating ($\alpha_k > 0$) will increase the frequency of matings between
169 individuals that share an attitude trait, with these non-random interactions in turn skewing
170 vaccination outcomes toward those of same-state couples (via c_0 and c_3).

171 Transmission and influence probabilities are constant throughout a single simulation, with
172 values ranging from 0 to 1. At default settings, the influence parameters b_m and c_n , and the
173 transmission parameter C_n would take the following values: $C_0, b_0, c_0 = 0.01$; $C_1, C_2, b_1, b_2, c_1,$
174 $c_2 = 0.5$; and $C_3, b_3, c_3 = 0.99$. In our model, the influence of parental vaccine beliefs (c_n) is greater

175 than the influence of their own vaccination status (b_n) on their likelihood of vaccinating their
 176 offspring, so offspring vaccination is guaranteed at some probability only if $c_n > 0$.


177
 178 **Table 2: Presence (+) and absence (-) subscript assignments.** Demonstrating the trait presence (+) and
 179 absence (-) combinations associated with m , n subscripts. For example, the $+ \times -$ combinations is
 180 associated with m and n subscript value 2: an $A^+ \times A^-$ pairing transmits A^+ at probability C_2 . This rule applies
 181 to parameters $C_n, b_m, B_{m,n}, c_n$, as shown in **Table S2**.

| 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 | $+ \times +$ |

183
 184 Transmission and influence probabilities are constant throughout a single simulation, with
 185 values ranging from 0 to 1. At default settings, the influence parameters b_m and c_n , and the
 186 transmission parameter C_n would take the following values: $C_0, b_0, c_0 = 0.01$; $C_1, C_2, b_1, b_2, c_1,$
 187 $c_2 = 0.5$; and $C_3, b_3, c_3 = 0.99$. In our model, the influence of parental vaccine beliefs (c_n) is greater
 188 than the influence of their own vaccination status (b_n) on their likelihood of vaccinating their
 189 offspring, so offspring vaccination is guaranteed at some probability only if $c_n > 0$.

190 The cultural selection pressure on vaccination is given by the parameter σ , such that the
 191 frequency of the V^+A^+ and V^+A^- phenotypes are multiplied by $1+\sigma$ after vertical cultural
 192 transmission has occurred. At the end of each timestep, the frequency of each phenotype is
 193 divided by the sum of all four frequencies, ensuring that the frequencies sum to 1. This cultural
 194 selection coefficient is implemented in the same way as a selection coefficient in a population-
 195 genetic model, but unlike the latter, it is structured to encompass both biological fitness and
 196 cultural selection pressures, including perceived risks or benefits of the vaccine itself, personal
 197 cost-benefit analyses of preventative health behaviors, and the structural or societal-level factors
 198 influencing vaccination rates [32,33]. This parameter modulates whether there are more or fewer
 199 vaccinated individuals than expected: in other words, when $\sigma > 0$, vaccinated individuals are more
 200 common in a set of offspring than would be expected strictly based on the beliefs and vaccination
 201 statuses of their parents. We calculate σ in each timestep as a function of the current vaccination


202 coverage (frequency of V^+ , i.e. $x_1 + x_2$), and in each simulation we specify σ_{max} as the maximum
 203 cultural selection pressure of getting vaccinated ($-1 \leq \sigma_{max} \leq 1$) (see the cultural selection coefficient
 204 function in **Figure 1**). This function was constructed by fitting a curve to pre-specified conditions
 205 that incorporate assumptions from evolutionary game theory (e.g. that herd immunity decreases
 206 the incentive to vaccinate [34]): we assume that when vaccination coverage is low, the real and
 207 perceived benefits of vaccination are highest, and thus, the cultural selection pressure is near
 208 σ_{max} , however, as vaccination coverage increases, the perceived benefits of vaccination decrease
 209 and the cultural selection pressure is reduced (**Figure 1**).
 210



211
 212 **Figure 1: Cultural selection coefficient function.** The cultural selection coefficient function was
 213 constructed by fitting a curve to specified conditions, and considers both health and non-health related
 214 effects. The selection coefficient (σ ; vertical axis) is dependent on the frequency of vaccinated individuals
 215 (V^+) in the population (horizontal axis). σ_{max} is the maximum cultural selection coefficient associated with
 216 being vaccinated. Perceived vaccine benefit is reduced as vaccination coverage increases, since the
 217 negative effects of the disease will be less apparent. Note: Of the σ_{max} values shown, only $\sigma_{max} = 0.1$ allows
 218 the cultural selection pressure to be either positive or negative at a given timepoint depending on the
 219 frequency of vaccination.
 220

221 Thus far, we have described vertical cultural transmission from parent to offspring. The
 222 model also incorporates a second phase with oblique cultural transmission (i.e. influence from

223 non-parental adults), in which individuals can change their inherited vaccine attitudes (**A**) due to
 224 influence from other adults in the population. There are two probabilities associated with
 225 attitude modulation: the probability that a vaccine hesitant (A^-) individual adopts the vaccine
 226 confident (A^+) state (A^- to A^+ transition probability, given by $A_{\rightarrow Confident}$ in **Figure 2**), and the
 227 probability that an A^+ individual adopts the A^- state (A^+ to A^- transition probability, given by
 228 $A_{\rightarrow Hesitant}$ in **Figure 2**). As with the strength of cultural selection (σ) described previously (**Figure**
 229 **1**), the probability that offspring change their vaccine attitude is a function of the V^+ frequency in
 230 the population, constructed according to similar assumptions given in **Figure 2**. As the frequency
 231 of vaccinated individuals (V^+) increases in the population, vaccine-confident individuals (A^+) are
 232 more likely to become hesitant ($A_{\rightarrow Hesitant}$ probability increases) and vaccine-hesitant individuals
 233 (A^-) are less likely to become confident ($A_{\rightarrow Confident}$ probability decreases).
 234



235
 236 **Figure 2: Attitude Transition Probability Function.** Attitude transition probability functions were
 237 constructed by fitting a curve to specified values based on the assumptions pictured. Attitude transition
 238 probability (vertical axis) is a function of the vaccination frequency in the population (V^+ ; horizontal axis).
 239 The probability that a vaccine hesitant individual adopts vaccine confidence (A^- to A^+ transition probability,
 240 shown in black) is determined by the function $A_{\rightarrow Confident}$, and the probability that a vaccine confident
 241 individual adopts vaccine hesitancy (A^+ to A^- transition probability, shown with a blue dashed line) is
 242 determined by the function $A_{\rightarrow Hesitant}$.
 243

244 To compute the frequency of a given phenotype in the next iteration, we sum the
 245 probability that each mating pair produces offspring of that phenotype over each of the sixteen

246 possible mating pairs. Cultural selection (σ), described above, then operates on offspring with the
247 V^+ trait. The full recursions, giving x_i' phenotype frequencies in the next iteration in terms of x_i in
248 the current iteration, are given in **Text S1**. If x_i' is equal to x_i , the system is at equilibrium. As we
249 do not incorporate a birth-death process or population asynchrony in this model, iterations in the
250 discrete-time format of our model should not be strictly interpreted as years or generations. We
251 instead interpret each iteration broadly as a timeframe in which the specified cultural
252 interactions could occur, which varies among individuals, populations, and cultures. Unless
253 otherwise stated, the model is initialized with phenotypic frequencies based on United States
254 data: x_1 (frequency of V^+A^+) = 0.81, x_2 (V^+A^-) = 0.1, x_3 (V^-A^+) = 0.07, x_4 (V^-A^-) = 0.02. These
255 frequencies were estimated using reports of Measles-Mumps-Rubella (MMR) vaccination rates
256 and estimates of vaccine attitude frequencies obtained from various sources in the literature
257 [35,36] and the Centers of Disease Control ChildVax database [37,38].

258

259 **3. Results**

260


261 To test our model, we first initialized a population with a set of phenotype frequencies
262 and examined the changes in these frequencies over time with a given set of parameters (**3.1**).
263 Then, we evaluated the effects of each parameter by running simulations at multiple parameter
264 combinations and recording the population frequencies of each phenotype once the system
265 approached an equilibrium (**3.2–3.4**). In our first set of simulations (**3.1–3.3**), we include only
266 vertical transmission dynamics, i.e. only parent-to-offspring transmission, varying parameter
267 values in turn to test their effects on population vaccination behavior and attitudes. In the
268 vertical transmission phase of the model, parents choose whether to vaccinate their offspring
269 (i.e., transmit V^+) or to not vaccinate (V^-), and parents also transmit a vaccine attitude
270 (confidence, A^+ , or hesitancy, A^-), each with a specified probability given the phenotypes of the
271 parents. The parental attitude state, vaccination status, assortative mating levels, and cultural
272 selection parameters interact to affect vaccination coverage (frequency of V^+ in the population)
273 and vaccine confidence (frequency of A^+).

274

275 **3.1. Temporal dynamics of vaccine-related beliefs and behaviors**

276

277 To test whether the equilibrium phenotype frequencies were sensitive to starting
 278 frequencies, we plotted the dynamics of each phenotype over time at default parameters (given
 279 in **Table 1**). For each set of initial phenotype proportions tested, the phenotype frequencies in
 280 the population quickly adjusted to approach equilibrium values and then gradually plateaued to a
 281 stable equilibrium (vertical transmission: **Figure 3 and Figure S1**, vertical+oblique transmission:
 282 **Figure S2**. This demonstrates that equilibrium frequencies of vaccination coverage and vaccine
 283 confidence are determined by the parameter conditions rather than by the initial frequencies
 284 themselves.




285
 286
 287 **Figure 3: Equilibrium frequencies are determined by the parameter space, not by initial frequencies.** The
 288 change in each of the four phenotype frequencies and the total V^+ and A^+ frequencies (vertical axis) over
 289 100 iterations of the model **with vertical transmission only** (horizontal axis). **Top Row:** Initial frequencies
 290 are varied, such that we begin each simulation with a different phenotype at an initial high frequency
 291 (0.81): V^+A^+ in panel **A**, V^-A^+ in panel **B**, V^+A^- in panel **C**, V^-A^- in panel **D**; the remaining phenotypes are set
 292 to lower frequencies (0.1, 0.07, 0.02). See **Figure S1** for a full listing of these initial frequencies. **Bottom**
 293 **Row:** The maximum cultural selection coefficient (σ_{max}) is varied: **E.** $\sigma_{max} = -0.1$; **F.** $\sigma_{max} = 0$; **G.** $\sigma_{max} = 0.1$; **H.**
 294 $\sigma_{max} = 0.5$. Cultural selection against vaccinated individuals increases the frequency of V^-A^- , decreasing the
 295 other frequencies (**E**), whereas increased cultural selection favoring vaccinated individuals increases V^+A^+
 296 frequencies while decreasing the other frequencies (**F, G, H**). In all panels, the remaining parameters are
 297 held at default values (**Table 1**).

298
 299 When two parameters in particular are varied—maximum cultural selection (σ_{max}) or
 300 confidence transmission ($C_1 = C_2$)—we observe a trade-off between the V^-A^- phenotype, which
 301 dominates at lower values of these parameters, and the V^+A^+ phenotype, which dominates at

302 higher values (**Figures 3-4**). Interestingly, the “conflicting” phenotypes (when an individual’s
303 attitude toward vaccinating their children does not match their own vaccination state: V^-A^+ and
304 V^+A^-) are present at their highest frequencies at neutral cultural selection ($\sigma_{\max} = 0$, **Figure 3F**)
305 and/or neutral confidence transmission ($C_1 = C_2 = 0.5$, **Figure 4B**). Vaccinated individuals have the
306 same fitness regardless of their attitude (i.e. V^+A^+ bears the same selection pressure as V^+A^-), so it
307 is worth noting that at higher levels of confidence transmission and cultural selection, V^+A^+
308 increases in frequency but V^+A^- decreases in frequency (compare **Figure 3F-G**, **Figure 4B-C**). This
309 pattern seems to reflect their differing likelihoods of vaccinating their offspring: across all
310 possible partners, vaccinated but vaccine-hesitant parents (V^+A^-) are less likely to vaccinate their
311 offspring than vaccinated and vaccine-confident parents (V^+A^+), resulting in more V^- offspring.
312 Thus, when V^+ is favored by cultural selection, there is indirect selection against the vaccinated
313 but vaccine-hesitant (V^+A^-) phenotype (**Figure 3E-H**). Similarly, indirect selection against V^-A^+
314 occurs when V^- is favored by cultural selection (**Figure 3E**): compared to **Figure 3F**, we observe an
315 increase in V^-A^- individuals but a decrease in V^-A^+ individuals, who because of their vaccine
316 confidence have more V^+ offspring, which are culturally disfavored in this environment. When
317 cultural transmission from non-parental adults (oblique transmission) was included, described in
318 following sections, we observed similar patterns, but the final equilibria were more likely to be
319 polymorphic, with vaccinated, unvaccinated, confident, and hesitant phenotypes stabilizing at
320 more moderate frequencies than they would have with only vertical transmission (Compare
321 **Figures 3-4 to Figures S3-S4**).

322 Low confidence transmission ($C_1 = C_2 = 0.1$, **Figure 4A**) increases the frequency of vaccine
323 hesitancy (A^-) in the population over time, increasing the probability that more couples choose
324 not to vaccinate their offspring. However, the increase in vaccine hesitancy does not occur
325 equally in vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals: A^- frequency may increase overall in this
326 environment, but V^+A^- frequencies are lower and V^-A^- frequencies are higher (compared to
327 **Figure 4B-C** and **Figure S4**). At neutral confidence transmission probabilities (i.e. when couples
328 with one confident and one hesitant parent are equally likely to transmit either attitude), there is
329 a higher chance that the vaccinated but vaccine-hesitant (V^+A^-) phenotype is replenished.
330 However, if vaccine confidence is highly transmitted ($C_1 = C_2 = 0.8$), the V^+A^- frequency will be
331 reduced, as this phenotype is more likely to produce A^+ offspring than A^- , thus increasing V^+A^+
332 phenotype frequencies in the population (**Figure 4** and **Figure S4**). If we turn to the other
333 conflicting phenotype, unvaccinated but vaccine-confident (V^-A^+) individuals become more

334 common when A^+ increases in frequency in the population as $C_1 = C_2$ increases from 0.1 to 0.5
 335 (**Figure 4** and **Figure S4**). In contrast, higher vaccine confidence transmission ($C_1 = C_2 = 0.8$) can
 336 lead to a vaccination-promoting environment in which V^- frequencies are reduced over time; thus
 337 the V^-A^+ phenotype becomes rare and V^+A^+ predominates (**Figure 4** and **Figure S4**).




338
 339 **Figure 4: Temporal Effects of Confidence Transmission.** The change in phenotype frequencies over 50
 340 iterations as vaccine confidence transmission in mixed-attitude couples ($C_1 = C_2$) is varied (**A.** $C_1 = C_2 = 0.1$;
 341 **B.** $C_1 = C_2 = 0.5$; **C.** $C_1 = C_2 = 0.8$) with vertical transmission only, while other parameters are held at default
 342 values (**Table 1**). The population equilibrates at over 90% A^-V^- at low confidence transmission (A).
 343 Increasing the probability of confidence transmission results in less vaccine hesitancy and, in turn, higher
 344 vaccination frequencies (V^+A^+).

345 3.2. Parent-to-Offspring Interactions (Simulations with vertical transmission only)

347
 348 Since our assessment of the temporal dynamics (**3.1**) demonstrated that our simulations
 349 approach stable equilibria, we then modulated different sets of parameters and recorded the
 350 phenotype frequencies at equilibrium, generating heat maps showing the results across a range
 351 of parameters. In the first of these, we tested the relationship between vaccination probability
 352 and vaccine confidence transmission. To directly alter vaccination probabilities while still
 353 accounting for the couple's vaccine attitudes, we set ranges of values for $B_{m,n}$ that vary along the
 354 horizontal axis of **Figure 5**, with the vaccination probability for two hesitant parents (e.g. $B_{0,0}$) on
 355 the lower end of the range and the vaccination probability for two confident parents (e.g. $B_{3,3}$) on
 356 the higher end of the range (**Table S3**). Confidence transmission probabilities are also structured
 357 in this "range shift" manner (**Figure 5A-B, Table S3**). If we vary both confidence transmission
 358 parameters and vaccination probability parameters by implementing range shifts in both C_n and
 359 $B_{m,n}$, we observe a positive interaction between confidence transmission and vaccination
 360 probability: vaccination coverage increases as either of these parameters are increased (**Figure**
 361 **5A**).

362



363

364 **Figure 5: Vaccination coverage levels are determined by an interaction between confidence**
 365 **transmission and vaccination probability.** Heatmaps showing final vaccination coverage (A, C) and
 366 corresponding vaccine confidence (B, D) after 100 time-steps with **no oblique transmission**. In A and B,
 367 confidence transmission probabilities (C_n) are set within the range indicated on the vertical axis, and
 368 vaccination probabilities ($B_{m,n}$) are set within the range indicated on the horizontal axis with $B_{0,0}$, $B_{1,0}$, $B_{2,0}$
 369 and $B_{3,0}$ taking the lowest value and $B_{3,3}$ taking the highest value (Table S3). In C and D, confidence
 370 transmission in mixed-attitude couples ($C_1 = C_2$) is varied along the vertical axis, while the vaccination
 371 probabilities ($B_{m,n}$) are set within the range indicated on the horizontal axis as in A and B. (Table S3). We
 372 show increased equilibrium vaccination coverage with increasing vaccination probability and confidence
 373 transmission probability ranges, while confidence levels are primarily dictated by proportion of the
 374 population transmitting confidence or hesitancy.


375 However, couples with mixed vaccination and/or attitude states ($V^+ \times V^-$, $A^+ \times A^-$) are
376 assumed to be more variable in their decision to vaccinate their offspring than parents who share
377 the same state. Thus, in the simulations that follow, we primarily modulated the specific
378 probabilities associated with these mixed-state pairings. In **Figure 5C-D**, we varied vaccination
379 probabilities ($B_{m,n}$) across the full range of individuals but modulated confidence transmission
380 probabilities only for mixed-attitude couples ($C_1 = C_2$), i.e. those with one vaccine-hesitant parent
381 and one vaccine-confident parent. In these tests, we observe increasing equilibrium vaccination
382 coverage as $B_{m,n}$ probabilities increase, with higher coverage in high-confidence transmission
383 environments (**Figure 5C-D**).

384 In both aforementioned simulations (**Figure 5**), we confirm vaccination coverage levels are
385 determined by an interaction between confidence transmission and vaccination probability,
386 whereas confidence levels are dictated primarily by levels of confidence transmission. In sum, the
387 degree to which parents with mixed vaccine-hesitant and vaccine-confident attitudes transmit
388 vaccine confidence instead of vaccine hesitancy to their offspring is a key factor in determining
389 population trait majorities which can drastically shift population dynamics.

390 We compared the effects of varying the confidence transmission probabilities for mixed-
391 attitude couples (C_1 and C_2) in combination with multiple factors: 1) the maximum cultural
392 selection coefficient (σ_{\max}) (**Figure 6A-B**), 2) the vaccination influence parameters b_1 and b_2
393 (**Figure 6C-D**), 3) the attitude influence parameters c_1 and c_2 (**Figure 6E-F**), and 4) the vaccination
394 probabilities of couples with mixed states, $B_{1,1}$, $B_{1,2}$, $B_{2,1}$, $B_{2,2}$ (**Figure 6G-H**). In each examination,
395 we observed a C_n threshold: there is a mid-range value of C_n at which vaccination coverage and
396 vaccine confidence traits are polymorphic (i.e. both forms of each trait coexist in the population),
397 separating definitive high ($\gtrsim 80\%$) and low ($\lesssim 30\%$) levels of vaccination coverage and confidence.
398 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
399 lowered as σ_{\max} increases (diagonal line in **Figure 6A-B**). Although vaccination probability ($B_{m,n}$) is
400 dependent on both c_n , the influence of parental vaccine attitude, and b_m , the influence of
401 parental vaccination state (**Table S2**), modulating either type of influence of mixed-state parents
402 has little effect on the level of vaccination coverage and negligible effects on confidence levels at
403 each non-threshold C_n (**Figure 6C-F**).


404 Interestingly, direct modulation of the mixed-state couple vaccination probability ($B_{1,1} =$
405 $B_{1,2} = B_{2,1} = B_{2,2}$) also has little power in affecting coverage and confidence levels at equilibrium
406 (**Figure 6G-H**). We hypothesize that predominantly high or predominantly low confidence

407 transmission within a population reduces the occurrence of “mixed-state” pairings, i.e. if the
 408 majority of the population becomes confident or hesitant, there are fewer confident-hesitant and
 409 vaccinated-unvaccinated pairings. Thus, the effect of modulating mixed-state vaccination
 410 probabilities ($B_{1,1}$, $B_{1,2}$, $B_{2,1}$, $B_{2,2}$) is significantly minimized as these couples approach low
 411 frequencies in the population, and confidence transmission dominates the vaccination patterns.
 412



413
 414 **Figure 6: Vaccine Confidence Transmission Dictates Vaccination Coverage and Confidence Levels**
 415 Heatmaps showing final vaccination coverage and vaccine confidence after 100 time-steps with **no**
 416 **oblique transmission**, only parent-to-offspring transmission. The top row (A, C, E, G) shows vaccination
 417 coverage (i.e. frequency of V^+ in the population) with low coverage in blue and high coverage in yellow;
 418 the bottom row (B, D, F, H) shows the corresponding final vaccine confidence (i.e. frequency of A^+), with
 419 low confidence in red and high confidence in yellow. Unless varied on the horizontal or vertical axis, other
 420 parameters are set to the default values given in **Table 1**. In our model, parents’ likelihood of vaccinating
 421 their children depends on both their vaccination state and their attitude state. This figure shows that the
 422 strength of parental transmission of vaccine confidence (C_n) has a much stronger effect on the equilibrium
 423 levels of both vaccine coverage (V^+) and confidence (A^+) than other parameters: the maximum cultural
 424 selection coefficient, σ_{max} (A,B), the influence of parental vaccination state, b_m (C, D), the level of influence
 425 of parental vaccine attitudes on their vaccination behaviors, c_n (E,F), and the probability that mixed-state
 426 parents vaccinate their offspring $B_{m,n}$ (G,H).
 427

428 Next, we hold vaccine confidence transmission (C_n) at default probabilities, reminiscent of
 429 Mendelian transmission, such that two vaccine confident or two vaccine hesitant parents
 430 predictably transmit their vaccine attitude, and parents with differing vaccine attitudes each have
 431 a ~50% chance of transmitting their own state, e.g. C_0 near 0, C_1 and C_2 at 0.5, C_3 near 1 (**Table 1**).



432
 433 **Figure 7: Cultural Selection Influences Vaccination Coverage and Vaccine Confidence.** Heatmaps showing
 434 final vaccination coverage (A, C, E) and final vaccination confidence (B, D, F) after 100 time-steps with **no**
 435 **oblique transmission**, only parent-to-offspring transmission. As in previous figures, parameters not varied
 436 here are given in **Table 1**. Parents' likelihood of vaccinating their children depends on both their
 437 vaccination state and their attitude state. At default probabilities of vaccine confidence transmission (C_n
 438 values in **Table 1**), these figures show that modulating the maximum cultural selection coefficient affects
 439 the equilibrium levels of vaccination coverage and vaccine confidence across the range of specified
 440 parameters: parental vaccination state influence, b_m (A, B), parental attitude state influence, c_n (C,D), and
 441 offspring vaccination probability, $B_{m,n}$ (E,F). Unless directly modulated (as in panels E-F), $B_{m,n}$ varies with b_m
 442 and c_n : $B_{m,n} = c_n \left(\frac{1+b_m}{2} \right)$.
 443
 444 We then varied cultural selection in combination with vaccination-associated probabilities (b_m , c_n ,
 445 $B_{m,n}$). With C_n held constant, cultural selection (σ_{max}) is the primary factor determining vaccination
 446 coverage and confidence levels (**Figure 7**). Raising the maximum cultural selection coefficient
 447 increases the equilibrium level of vaccination coverage and vaccine confidence across various
 448 levels of vaccination state influence (b_m) (**Figure 7A-B**), vaccination attitude influence (c_n) (**Figure**
 449 **7C-D**), and vaccination probability ($B_{m,n}$) (**Figure 7E-F**). Unlike in **Figure 6**, vaccine confidence does


450 not always mirror vaccination coverage across all levels of attitude influence (c_n) or vaccination
451 probabilities. Instead, vaccine confidence levels decline with increased c_n and increased $B_{m,n}$ for
452 $\sigma_{\max} \lesssim 0.3$ (**Figure 7D, F**), as well as for both increased c_n and increased b_m (**Figure S5**). This
453 dynamic is interesting as these parameters inform vaccination behavior, hinting that high
454 vaccination rates could reduce a populations' expected vaccine confidence. Vaccination coverage
455 and vaccine confidence remain low when cultural selection does not favor vaccination ($\sigma_{\max} \lesssim 0$),
456 i.e. parents vaccinate their children at or below the levels expected based on cultural
457 transmission rates.

458 **3.3. Offspring can Change their Inherited Hesitancy State (Vertical and Oblique Dynamics)**

460
461 Increased exposure to the attitudes of the broader community (i.e. oblique cultural
462 transmission from non-parental adults in the population) could influence and change vaccination
463 beliefs inherited in childhood. Therefore, we next included these oblique effects in our model to
464 understand how they might modulate vaccine confidence and vaccination coverage levels. In the
465 oblique transmission phase of the model, offspring can change their vaccine attitude with some
466 probability based on the frequency of vaccination in the population (**Figure 2**). Thus, in addition
467 to the vertical transmission of attitudes and behaviors, phenotype frequencies are further
468 affected by the probability that adult offspring change their attitude (i.e. transition from vaccine
469 confident (A^+) to hesitant (A^-) and vice versa). By modulating the attitude transition probabilities
470 according to the vaccination coverage, we assume that when vaccine coverage (V^+ frequency, $x_1 +$
471 x_2) is low, disease occurrence is high and the negative effects of the disease are experienced
472 widely, thus the benefits of being vaccinated (and the costs of not being vaccinated) are more
473 evident [39,40]. As vaccination coverage (V^+) increases in the population, and thus disease
474 occurrence is low, the benefits to being vaccinated are less obvious, while low-probability costs
475 such as adverse reactions become more apparent and could be perceived as being riskier than
476 the disease itself.

477 The addition of oblique dynamics produces a pattern of vaccination coverage and vaccine
478 confidence similar to that of simulations run with solely vertical transmission (**Figure 6 and Figure**
479 **7 compared to Figure 8 and Figure 9, and Figures 3-4 compared to Figures S2-4**)—the level of
480 (vertical) vaccine confidence transmission still largely determines the level of vaccination
481 coverage and vaccine confidence (**Figure 8**). However, oblique cultural influences expanded the
482 polymorphic space, resulting in a wider range of intermediate C_n in which the different states of


483 each trait (vaccinated, unvaccinated, confident, and hesitant) are present in the population in
 484 roughly equal proportions. In other words, there is a wider horizontal stripe of moderate values
 485 between the definitively high and definitively low equilibrium frequencies in **Figure 8** than in
 486 **Figure 6**). The addition of oblique transmission appears to lead to less polarized results overall,
 487 moving the equilibrium levels of vaccination coverage and vaccine confidence away from extreme
 488 values.
 489




490
 491 **Figure 8: Vaccine confidence transmission dictates vaccination coverage and confidence levels (with**
 492 **oblique transmission).** Heatmaps showing final vaccination coverage (i.e. frequency of V^+ in the
 493 population, with low coverage in blue and high coverage in yellow (**A, C, E, G**)) and final vaccine
 494 confidence (i.e. frequency of A^+ , with low confidence in red and high confidence in yellow (**B, D, F, H**))
 495 after 100 time-steps in which oblique transmission of vaccine attitude can occur after parent-to-offspring
 496 transmission. The likelihood that individuals change their vaccine beliefs depends on the current
 497 vaccination coverage of the population (**Figure 2**). Unless varied on the horizontal or vertical axes, other
 498 parameters are set to the default values given in **Table 1**. Parents' likelihood of vaccinating their children
 499 depends on both their vaccination state and their attitude state; these figures show that the strength of
 500 parental transmission of vaccine confidence (C_n) has a much stronger effect on the equilibrium levels of
 501 both vaccine coverage (V^+) and confidence (A^+) than other tested parameters do: the maximum cultural
 502 selection coefficient, σ_{max} , (**A,B**), the influence of parental vaccination state, b_m , (**C, D**), the level of
 503 influence of parental attitudes on their vaccination behaviors, c_n , (**E,F**), and offspring vaccination
 504 probability, $B_{m,n}$ (**G,H**).
 505

506 With neutral confidence transmission ($C_1 = C_2 = 0.5$), we also observe an expansion of the
 507 polymorphic space when we modulate cultural selection (σ_{max}) alongside the influence and
 508 transmission parameters (**Figure 9**). Interestingly, in the cultural environment defined by this

509 parameter space, we observe a pattern that deviates from the expected association between
 510 high vaccine confidence and high vaccination coverage: as the influence of vaccine attitudes (c_n)
 511 and vaccination probabilities ($B_{m,n}$) increase (**Figure 9C-F**), the population's equilibrium
 512 vaccination coverage increases while its vaccine confidence decreases. This pattern persisted
 513 across all tested levels of maximum cultural selection (σ_{\max}) (**Figure 9C-F**). In other words, we
 514 observe higher levels of confidence when the influence of vaccine attitude is low (**Figure 9D**) and
 515 vaccination probabilities are low (**Figure 9F**) than we do at higher values.
 516



517 **Figure 9: Cultural selection influences vaccination coverage and vaccine confidence (with oblique**
 518 **transmission).** Heatmaps showing final vaccination coverage (**A, C, E**) and final vaccination confidence (**B,**
 519 **D, F**) after 100 time-steps **with oblique transmission**. As in previous figures, parameters not varied are
 520 given in **Table 1**. Parents' likelihood of vaccinating their children depends on both their vaccination state
 521 and their attitude state. At default probabilities of vaccine confidence transmission (C_n), these figures
 522 show that modulating the maximum cultural selection coefficient affects the equilibrium levels of
 523 vaccination coverage and vaccine confidence across the range of specified parameters: parental
 524 vaccination state influence, b_m (**A, B**), parental attitude state influence, c_n (**C, D**), and offspring vaccination
 525 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
 526 in **Table 1**.
 527
 528



529
 530 **Figure 10: The influence of parental traits on vaccination coverage and vaccine confidence at different**
 531 **levels of cultural selection.** Heatmaps showing final vaccination coverage (A, C) and final vaccination
 532 confidence (B, D) after 100 timesteps **with oblique transmission**. We modulate the interaction between
 533 vaccination state influence (b_m ; vertical axis) and attitude influence (c_n ; horizontal axis) at various
 534 maximum cultural selection coefficients: $\sigma_{\max} = 0$ (A, B) and $\sigma_{\max} = 0.1$ (C, D). As in previous figures,
 535 unvaried parameters are given in **Table 1**. Vaccination frequency increases as both influence probabilities
 536 increase and vaccine confidence decreases as both influence probabilities increase.

537
 538 We explored the interaction between the influence parameters, b_m and c_n , at various
 539 maximum cultural selection coefficients (σ_{\max}) (**Figure 10**). Vaccination coverage and vaccine
 540 confidence equilibrate at mid-range frequencies (between 0.3 and 0.8) across the range of b_m and

541 c_n , indicating that these trait frequencies are not particularly sensitive to either parameter.
542 Cultural selection favoring vaccination increases the equilibrium level of vaccination coverage and
543 vaccine confidence (**Figure 10 and Figure S6**). The most notable deviation between equilibrium
544 confidence and vaccination frequencies occurs at the intersection of the highest influence
545 parameter values (b_m and c_n), circumstances in which the parents' vaccination states and vaccine
546 attitudes overwhelmingly support offspring vaccination. In this top right section of the heat maps,
547 vaccination coverage is high while vaccine confidence is lower, indicating a behavioral pattern in
548 which mixed-trait couples are more inclined to vaccinate their offspring than transmit vaccine
549 confidence. Overall, the addition of oblique transmission to a population that would otherwise
550 equilibrate at high vaccination coverage (**Figure S5**) leads to increased attitude transition to
551 vaccine hesitancy and subsequently lower vaccine coverage.


552

553 **3.4. Mating Preferences**

554

555 We hypothesized that mating preference (assortative mating) could modulate belief and
556 behavior dynamics and thus the vaccination coverage and confidence levels in the population. If
557 individuals are more likely to pair with individuals of the same vaccine attitude, such that same-
558 attitude couples become more common and mixed-attitude couples are less common, the
559 parameter values for mixed-attitude couples may have less impact on vaccination coverage and
560 confidence dynamics. Therefore, we analyzed the interaction between A⁺ homophily (with α_1
561 indicating the preference of A⁺ individuals for other A⁺ individuals) and A⁻ homophily (with α_2
562 indicating the preference of A⁻ individuals for other A⁻ individuals) at various σ_{\max} levels. When
563 vaccine attitudes are transmitted both from parent to offspring and between unrelated
564 individuals (vertical and oblique transmission) and there is neither cultural selection for nor
565 against being vaccinated ($\sigma_{\max} = 0$), we observe a threshold region at roughly equal mating
566 preferences ($\alpha_1 \approx \alpha_2$; diagonal lines in **Figure 11C-D**); above this boundary (when $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2$)
567 vaccination coverage and confidence are much higher than below this boundary (when $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$).
568 When cultural selection explicitly does not favor vaccination (e.g. $\sigma_{\max} = -0.1$, **Figure 11A-B**), low
569 vaccination coverage and confidence can occur even when there are more vaccine confident
570 couples in the population than hesitant couples ($\alpha_1 > \alpha_2$). Likewise, if cultural selection favors
571 being vaccinated ($\sigma_{\max} > 0$, **Figure 11E-H**), the threshold between high and low equilibrium values
572 is shifted, such that high coverage and high confidence levels can potentially be attained even

573 when vaccine hesitant individuals preferentially pair with each other more than vaccine confident
 574 individuals do ($\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$). We observe qualitatively similar patterns when vaccine attitudes are only
 575 transmitted from parent to offspring (**Figure S7**); as we have previously observed in **Figures 8-10**,
 576 the addition of oblique transmission leads to a broader polymorphic region than vertical
 577 transmission alone. These patterns illustrate two overarching themes: 1) preferential interactions
 578 between individuals with similar vaccine beliefs can dramatically shift the equilibrium levels of
 579 vaccination coverage and confidence with all other parameters remaining equal, and 2) the actual
 580 and perceived quality and efficacy of the vaccine are important to determining vaccine
 581 acceptance.
 582



583
 584 **Figure 11: Homophily between individuals with similar vaccine beliefs can shift equilibrium frequencies**
 585 **of both vaccination coverage (A, C, E, G) and final vaccine confidence (B, D, F, H) after 100 timesteps with oblique transmission.** As in previous
 586 figures, unspecified parameters are given in **Table 1**. As vaccine-hesitant individuals (A^-) increasingly
 587 prefer to pair with one another (α_2 ; horizontal axis), vaccine-confident individuals (A^+) must also
 588 preferentially interact to maintain high vaccine coverage (α_1 ; vertical axis); this tradeoff is modulated by
 589 the cultural selection pressures on vaccination ($\sigma_{\max} = -0.1$ (A, B), $\sigma_{\max} = 0$ (C, D) and $\sigma_{\max} = 0.1$ (E, F), $\sigma_{\max} =$
 590 0.5 (G, H)).
 591

592 593 **4. Discussion**

594
 595 In this manuscript, we present a simplified model of a complex process: the spread of vaccine
 596 attitudes and their effects on childhood vaccination frequency in a population. Increasing and

597 maintaining sufficient vaccination coverage to combat disease is more complex than simply
598 increasing vaccine availability or providing accurate information. A number of factors affect a
599 person’s vaccine-related beliefs and parents’ decision to vaccinate their children, including their
600 history with vaccinations and perception of the disease and vaccine effects. As such, it is
601 important that we understand how these personal factors can shape vaccination cultures and
602 thus affect public health. Using a cultural niche construction framework, we modeled the
603 transmission of vaccine attitudes and vaccination behavior in a variety of circumstances and
604 measured the resulting levels of vaccination coverage and vaccine confidence in the population.
605 Using this novel approach of modeling dynamically interacting beliefs and behaviors, we are able
606 to explore the interplay of cultural factors that drive vaccine attitudes and vaccination behavior,
607 providing insight into how vaccination cultures are formed, maintained, and evolve.

608 Our model demonstrates that the cultural landscape—current policies, transmission patterns
609 of beliefs and behaviors, etc.—can be more predictive of future levels of vaccine coverage and
610 confidence than current coverage and confidence levels in the population. Our simulations each
611 approached a stable equilibrium, and in general we could infer that a population with high
612 vaccination coverage will have low rates of vaccine hesitancy and vice versa. Further, our model
613 shows vaccine confidence transmission (C_n) to be the parameter that most strongly determines
614 vaccination coverage and confidence levels. That is, even though parents’ decision to vaccinate
615 their children is based on both their level of confidence in vaccines and a consideration of their
616 own vaccination status, the probability of transmitting vaccine-positive attitudes is a stronger
617 predictor of future vaccination coverage than the probability of vaccination itself (**Figures 6 and**
618 **8**). Finally, our simulations also suggest that a pro-vaccination health culture can be undermined
619 by a vaccine hesitancy “echo chamber”, possibly formed by a higher degree of preferential
620 assortment (homophily) among vaccine-hesitant individuals, who then form pairs more likely to
621 transmit vaccine-hesitancy to their children. Taken together, our results support the importance
622 of considering the cultural factors that have shaped current health-related beliefs and behaviors
623 if health policies aim to maintain or change the current conditions.

624 This model also shows that the perceived value and efficacy of a vaccine are important to
625 maintaining sufficient levels of vaccination coverage, especially if vaccine confidence is not being
626 robustly transmitted (or maintained in adulthood). Individuals essentially perform an internal
627 cost-benefit analysis based on their circumstances and interpretation of accessible information
628 when deciding to vaccinate. We aimed to be inclusive of their various considerations via our

629 comprehensive cultural selection coefficient. Increasing positive public perception through
630 honest and effective communication and reducing public concern about vaccines and increasing
631 vaccine safety could together drive increased vaccination trust and acceptance. Achieving the
632 optimal vaccination coverage lies not only in the hands of the public by vaccinating themselves
633 and their children, but also in the efforts of health officials and leaders in creating an
634 environment that fosters confidence by assuring the public of vaccine efficacy, safety, and value,
635 while providing convenient avenues to attain vaccines.

636 As with any model, we cannot fully capture the complex reality of the relationship
637 between vaccine hesitancy and vaccination behavior. First, though vaccination frequency data is
638 available for numerous vaccines, frequency data for vaccine attitudes are much less common,
639 with the two traditionally not surveyed together. Thus, there is no dataset that exactly estimates
640 the phenotypes presented here, for example, the number of vaccinated but hesitant (V^+A^-)
641 individuals in a population. The goals of vaccination attitude surveys have been primarily to
642 identify themes of vaccine hesitancy, and to a lesser degree, the themes of vaccination. However,
643 they do not report parent vaccination states or whether the child was actually vaccinated (on
644 schedule). With data presenting parent vaccination states alongside their vaccine attitudes and
645 vaccination decisions, we would be able to more accurately inform phenotype frequencies,
646 possibly extending the model to incorporate various types of hesitancy. We note, however, that
647 our results did not depend on the initial proportions of vaccination status or vaccine hesitancy, so
648 these data would primarily be for comparison to our equilibrium outcomes.

649 We were also constrained by limited data to inform our cultural transmission and
650 transition probabilities. In our model, baseline confidence transmission and influence
651 probabilities are structured according to a simple pattern of inheritance, such that each parent is
652 equally likely to influence an offspring's phenotype. However, cultural traits and vaccination
653 attitudes may not strictly follow this pattern: one parent might have more influence, or one
654 variant of a trait might be more likely to be transmitted. In addition, transmission probabilities
655 are constant in our model, remaining unaffected by changing cultural conditions throughout each
656 simulation, but in reality, these probabilities may fluctuate in response to a variety of factors
657 including vaccine type or family structure. Future developments of the model could include
658 modulating the probability of vaccine confidence transmission according to other aspects of the
659 cultural environment, such as the attitude frequencies in the population. We could also use the
660 current frequency of these cultural traits across different populations to generate more specific

661 hypotheses about their underlying cultural transmission processes [41,42] Our cultural selection
662 coefficient and attitude transition probabilities did vary with the frequency of vaccination
663 coverage, but the exact relationships could not be informed by existing data. Modulating both
664 the attitude transition probabilities and the cultural selection coefficient according to the level of
665 vaccination coverage in a population, however, reflects that perceptions about the vaccine and
666 its associated effects on health could be meaningfully different in a population with high
667 vaccination coverage than in one with low coverage.

668 Though vaccination coverage and vaccine confidence stabilized in our simulations, in
669 reality vaccination rates fluctuate over time in response to changing population dynamics,
670 perhaps never arriving at a stable equilibrium. For example, the increasingly rapid spread of
671 information [43] may cause attitudes and behaviors to change frequently over short periods of
672 time. In our model, most of the phenotype frequency fluctuations occur in the first few iterations
673 before quickly adjusting to an equilibrium. Unlike some models of population dynamics, this
674 model has a discrete-time format and does not consider asynchrony in population turnover.
675 Thus, the timescale of our model might not translate directly to years or generations, and we
676 avoid interpreting the number of iterations in literal terms. It is possible that if more realistic
677 birth and death processes were incorporated, the cultural dynamics would occur at different
678 timescales and would continue to fluctuate instead of approaching a stable equilibrium. In
679 addition, the grandparents of the children to be vaccinated also influence the parents'
680 vaccination decisions [44]. A restructuring of the timescale or the incorporation of population
681 asynchrony in our model could allow for consideration of these influences.

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

692 Finally, future developments of this model could include homophily of oblique
693 interactions, that is, if vaccine-related beliefs influenced not only one's mate choice but also
694 one's choice of social groups or information sources. On one hand, individuals who
695 disproportionately interact with vaccine-hesitant contacts would have a biased perspective that
696 vaccine hesitancy is more prevalent in the population than it actually is, which can reduce their
697 likelihood of vaccinating their children [45]; on the other hand, a high degree of homophily in
698 oblique interactions has been hypothesized to hinder the transmission of vaccine hesitancy to
699 vaccine confident individuals, reducing the spread of the belief overall [28]. Another potential
700 further exploration of the model includes modeling preferential assortment based on vaccination
701 status rather than vaccine attitude, which has been shown to occur in an empirical contact-
702 network study of high school students [46].

703 Our findings suggest that broad efforts to encourage and inform the public about vaccine
704 safety and efficacy will foster higher vaccine coverage, and thus points toward several
705 recommendations for public health policy and outreach. We recommend that accurate
706 information about vaccines be readily accessible through a variety of means, be easily
707 understood, and be supported by personal anecdotes since individuals who are skeptical about
708 vaccines might invest more time in seeking out information about them [47–49], and that
709 dialogue between people with different beliefs and attitudes be encouraged as it can help to
710 break the “echo chambers” of homophily, encouraging individuals to communicate and
711 empathize with one another. Therefore, to address vaccine hesitancy, our results underscore the
712 importance of considering the cultural beliefs and influences that underpin health behaviors.

713

714 **5. Acknowledgements**

715

716 We are grateful for feedback on this model from Glenn Webb, Ann Tate, Tony Capra,
717 Kathy Friedman, Buddy Creech, and members of the Creanza lab. We thank the John Templeton
718 Foundation for funding this work.

719

720

721 References:

- 722 1. Laland K, Matthews B, Feldman MW. An introduction to niche construction theory. *Evol Ecol.*
723 2016;30: 191–202.
- 724 2. John Odling-Smee F, Laland KN, Feldman MW. *Niche Construction: The Neglected Process in*
725 *Evolution (MPB-37)*. Princeton University Press; 2013.
- 726 3. Fogarty L, Creanza N. The niche construction of cultural complexity: interactions between
727 innovations, population size and the environment. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci.* 2017;372.
728 doi:10.1098/rstb.2016.0428
- 729 4. O'Brien MJ, Laland KN, Broughton JM, Cannon MD, Fuentes A, Gerbault P, et al. Genes, culture, and
730 agriculture: An example of human niche construction. *Curr Anthropol.* 2012;53: 000–000.
- 731 5. Fuentes A. Cooperation, conflict, and niche construction in the genus homo. *War, peace, and human*
732 *nature.* 2013; 78–94.
- 733 6. Creanza N, Fogarty L, Feldman MW. Models of cultural niche construction with selection and
734 assortative mating. *PLoS One.* 2012;7: e42744.
- 735 7. Creanza N, Feldman MW. Complexity in models of cultural niche construction with selection and
736 homophily. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2014;111 Suppl 3: 10830–10837.
- 737 8. Fenner F. A successful eradication campaign. *Global eradication of smallpox. Rev Infect Dis.* 1982;4:
738 916–930.
- 739 9. Kim-Farley R, Schonberger L, Nkowane B, Kew O, Bart K, Orenstein W, et al. POLIOMYELITIS IN THE
740 USA: VIRTUAL ELIMINATION OF DISEASE CAUSED BY WILD VIRUS. *The Lancet.* 1984. pp. 1315–1317.
741 doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(84)90829-8
- 742 10. Salk D. Eradication of Poliomyelitis in the United States. I. Live Virus Vaccine-Associated and Wild
743 Poliovirus Disease. *Clinical Infectious Diseases.* 1980. pp. 228–242. doi:10.1093/clinids/2.2.228
- 744 11. Thompson KM, Strebel PM, Dabbagh A, Cherian T, Cochi SL. Enabling implementation of the Global
745 Vaccine Action Plan: developing investment cases to achieve targets for measles and rubella
746 prevention. *Vaccine.* 2013;31 Suppl 2: B149–56.
- 747 12. Atwell JE, Salmon DA. Pertussis resurgence and vaccine uptake: implications for reducing vaccine
748 hesitancy. *Pediatrics.* 2014. pp. 602–604.
- 749 13. Kubin L. Is There a Resurgence of Vaccine Preventable Diseases in the U.S.? *Journal of Pediatric*
750 *Nursing.* 2019. pp. 115–118. doi:10.1016/j.pedn.2018.11.011
- 751 14. Falagas ME, Zarkadoulia E. Factors associated with suboptimal compliance to vaccinations in children
752 in developed countries: a systematic review. *Curr Med Res Opin.* 2008;24: 1719–1741.
- 753 15. Dubé E, Laberge C, Guay M, Bramadat P, Roy R, Bettinger J. Vaccine hesitancy: an overview. *Hum*
754 *Vaccin Immunother.* 2013;9: 1763–1773.
- 755 16. Scheres J, Kuszewski K. The Ten Threats to Global Health in 2018 and 2019. A welcome and
756 informative communication of WHO to everybody. *Zdrowie Publiczne i Zarządzanie.* 2019. pp. 2–8.
757 doi:10.4467/20842627oz.19.001.11297
- 758 17. Glanz JM, McClure DL, Magid DJ, Daley MF, France EK, Salmon DA, et al. Parental refusal of pertussis
759 vaccination is associated with an increased risk of pertussis infection in children. *Pediatrics.* 2009;123:
760 1446–1451.
- 761 18. MacDonald NE, SAGE Working Group on Vaccine Hesitancy. *Vaccine hesitancy: Definition, scope and*

- 762 determinants. *Vaccine*. 2015;33: 4161–4164.
- 763 19. Eggertson L. Lancet retracts 12-year-old article linking autism to MMR vaccines. *CMAJ*. 2010;182:
764 E199–200.
- 765 20. Rao TSS, Andrade C. The MMR vaccine and autism: Sensation, refutation, retraction, and fraud.
766 *Indian J Psychiatry*. 2011;53: 95–96.
- 767 21. Burley N. The meaning of assortative mating. *Ethol Sociobiol*. 1983;4: 191–203.
- 768 22. Gimelfarb A. Processes of Pair Formation Leading to Assortative Mating in Biological Populations:
769 Encounter-Mating Model. *The American Naturalist*. 1988. pp. 865–884. doi:10.1086/284827
- 770 23. Salathé M, Bonhoeffer S. The effect of opinion clustering on disease outbreaks. *J R Soc Interface*.
771 2008;5: 1505–1508.
- 772 24. Perra N, Balcan D, Gonçalves B, Vespignani A. Towards a characterization of behavior-disease models.
773 *PLoS One*. 2011;6: e23084.
- 774 25. Mao L, Yang Y. Coupling infectious diseases, human preventive behavior, and networks—a conceptual
775 framework for epidemic modeling. *Soc Sci Med*. 2012;74: 167–175.
- 776 26. Bauch CT. Imitation dynamics predict vaccinating behaviour. *Proc Biol Sci*. 2005;272: 1669–1675.
- 777 27. Chauhan S, Misra OP, Dhar J. Stability analysis of SIR model with vaccination. *American journal of*
778 *computational and applied mathematics*. 2014;4: 17–23.
- 779 28. Mehta RS, Rosenberg NA. Modelling anti-vaccine sentiment as a cultural pathogen. *Evolutionary*
780 *Human Sciences*. 2020;2: e21.
- 781 29. May T, Silverman RD. “Clustering of exemptions” as a collective action threat to herd immunity.
782 *Vaccine*. 2003;21: 1048–1051.
- 783 30. Wang E, Clymer J, Davis-Hayes C, Bутtenheim A. Nonmedical exemptions from school immunization
784 requirements: a systematic review. *Am J Public Health*. 2014;104: e62–84.
- 785 31. Phadke VK, Bednarczyk RA, Salmon DA, Omer SB. Association Between Vaccine Refusal and Vaccine-
786 Preventable Diseases in the United States: A Review of Measles and Pertussis. *JAMA*. 2016;315:
787 1149–1158.
- 788 32. Pruitt RH, Kline PM, Kovaz RB. Perceived Barriers to Childhood Immunization Among Rural
789 Populations. *Journal of Community Health Nursing*. 1995. pp. 65–72.
790 doi:10.1207/s15327655jchn1202_1
- 791 33. Cavalli-Sforza LL, Feldman MW. Cultural transmission and evolution: a quantitative approach. *Monogr*
792 *Popul Biol*. 1981;16: 1–388.
- 793 34. Bauch CT, Bhattacharyya S. Evolutionary game theory and social learning can determine how vaccine
794 scares unfold. *PLoS Comput Biol*. 2012;8: e1002452.
- 795 35. Kennedy AM, Brown CJ, Gust DA. Vaccine beliefs of parents who oppose compulsory vaccination.
796 *Public Health Rep*. 2005;120: 252–258.
- 797 36. Leask J. Target the fence-sitters. *Nature*. 2011;473: 443–445.
- 798 37. Hill HA, Singleton JA, Yankey D, Elam-Evans LD, Cassandra Pingali S, Kang Y. Vaccination Coverage by
799 Age 24 Months Among Children Born in 2015 and 2016 — National Immunization Survey-Child,
800 United States, 2016–2018. *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. 2019. pp. 913–918.
801 doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6841e2
- 802 38. Hill HA, Elam-Evans LD, Yankey D, Singleton JA, Kang Y. Vaccination Coverage Among Children Aged

- 803 19–35 Months — United States, 2016. *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. 2017. pp.
804 1171–1177. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6643a3
- 805 39. Gangarosa EJ, Galazka AM, Wolfe CR, Phillips LM, Gangarosa RE, Miller E, et al. Impact of anti-vaccine
806 movements on pertussis control: the untold story. *Lancet*. 1998;351: 356–361.
- 807 40. Ozawa S, Mirelman A, Stack ML, Walker DG, Levine OS. Cost-effectiveness and economic benefits of
808 vaccines in low- and middle-income countries: a systematic review. *Vaccine*. 2012;31: 96–108.
- 809 41. Kandler A, Powell A. Generative inference for cultural evolution. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*.
810 2018;373. doi:10.1098/rstb.2017.0056
- 811 42. Kandler A, Wilder B, Fortunato L. Inferring individual-level processes from population-level patterns
812 in cultural evolution. *R Soc Open Sci*. 2017;4: 170949.
- 813 43. Hornik J, Satchi RS, Cesareo L, Pastore A. Information dissemination via electronic word-of-mouth:
814 Good news travels fast, bad news travels faster! *Computers in Human Behavior*. 2015. pp. 273–280.
815 doi:10.1016/j.chb.2014.11.008
- 816 44. Karthigesu SP, Chisholm JS, Coall DA. Do grandparents influence parents’ decision to vaccinate their
817 children? A systematic review. *Vaccine*. 2018;36: 7456–7462.
- 818 45. Brunson EK. The Impact of Social Networks on Parents’ Vaccination Decisions. *Immunization*
819 *Strategies and Practices*. 2018. pp. 123–133. doi:10.1542/9781610022774-the_impact
- 820 46. Barclay VC, Smieszek T, He J, Cao G, Rainey JJ, Gao H, et al. Positive network assortativity of influenza
821 vaccination at a high school: implications for outbreak risk and herd immunity. *PLoS One*. 2014;9:
822 e87042.
- 823 47. Gowda C, Dempsey AF. The rise (and fall?) of parental vaccine hesitancy. *Hum Vaccin Immunother*.
824 2013;9: 1755–1762.
- 825 48. Ellithorpe ME, Adams R, Aladé F. Parents’ Behaviors and Experiences Associated with Four
826 Vaccination Behavior Groups for Childhood Vaccine Hesitancy. *Matern Child Health J*. 2022;26: 280–
827 288.
- 828 49. Benin AL, Wisler-Scher DJ, Colson E, Shapiro ED, Holmboe ES. Qualitative Analysis of Mothers’
829 Decision-Making About Vaccines for Infants: The Importance of Trust. *Pediatrics*. 2006. pp. 1532–
830 1541. doi:10.1542/peds.2005-1728
- 831