

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

The importance of mothers: The social transmission of COVID-19 vaccination attitudes and uptake

Oscar Thompson¹, Mioara Cristea^{2#}, Monica Tamariz^{*2&}

¹ Independent scholar

² Department of Psychology, Heriot-Watt University, Riccarton Campus, Edinburgh, UK

* Corresponding author

Email: M.Tamariz@hw.ac.uk

¹ Conceptualisation, Formal Analysis, Methodology, Project Administration, Software, Supervision, Writing – Original Draft Preparation

^{2#} Conceptualisation, Methodology, Project Administration, Supervision, Writing – Original Draft Preparation

^{2#} Conceptualisation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Project Administration, Software, Writing – Original Draft Preparation

21 **Abstract**

22 The global fight against the COVID-19 pandemic has underscored the critical importance of
23 widespread vaccination to mitigate the impact of the virus on public health. The current study
24 aimed to investigate which social influences might be most important for predicting attitudes
25 towards COVID-19 vaccination and vaccine uptake among young students in the UK. We
26 focused on the cultural evolution and social transmission aspects, i.e., parent-to-child versus
27 peer-to-peer, of attitudes and vaccine uptake during the COVID-19 pandemic. A sample of 192
28 UK students (aged 18 to 35 years old) filled in an online survey including measures for attitudes
29 towards COVID-19 vaccination and vaccine uptake and/or intention, age, and gender.
30 Participants were also asked about their mother's, father's, and best friend's attitudes towards
31 COVID-19 vaccination and vaccine uptake. Finally, they provided a subjective measure of the
32 quality relationship with their parents. Overall, our results suggest that both parents and very
33 close friends are important agents in understanding the students' attitudes towards COVID-19
34 vaccination and vaccine uptake. More specifically, our findings suggest the mother's vaccine
35 uptake as the most salient predictor of students' attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination and
36 vaccine uptake, particularly when the students disclose having a positive relationship with their
37 parents. In cases where students' experience negative relationship with their parents, the best
38 friend's vaccine uptake may supersede the mother's influence. Despite these nuances, a
39 general trend emerges from our data suggesting that vaccine uptake could be primarily guided
40 by vertical transmission (i.e., parent to child). Our results have the potential to influence public
41 health strategies, communication campaigns, and targeted interventions to enhance vaccination
42 uptake. Identifying key social predictors can enable policymakers and health authorities to tailor
43 vaccination promotion efforts towards mothers' and peers' vaccine uptake to increase overall
44 positive attitudes and vaccine uptake among young people.

45

46 **Keyword:** social transmission, vertical and horizontal transmission, vaccination uptake,
47 attitudes.

48

49

50 1 Introduction

51 High rates of non-vaccination pose serious risks. During COVID-19, those unvaccinated
52 increased the strain on the NHS and may have increased the likelihood of more lethal variants
53 emerging (1). Given looming health threats like the Avian Flu (2), understanding why some
54 remain unvaccinated is critical. A plethora of research has explored how psychological and
55 sociodemographic factors relate to vaccine intentions and uptake (3,4). However, the precise
56 influence of an individual's immediate relationships on vaccination behaviour remains under-
57 investigated. Existing work often aggregates the association of parents and peers' norms on
58 vaccination intentions and uptake (5,6). By not separating the individual contribution of parents
59 and peers, interventions are limited to a general approach focusing on changing overall norm
60 perceptions. Delineating whether parents or peers are more salient influences for young people
61 could focus interventions on the most important agents shaping young people's vaccine
62 behaviour. The present study aims to fill this gap by comparing the association of parents and
63 peers' norms in predicting the COVID-19 vaccination attitudes and uptake of a young UK
64 student population. We hope to provide a more nuanced understanding of how vaccination
65 attitudes and uptake spread within one's social circle to inform more targeted public health
66 interventions.

67 1.1 Social psychological models

68 The Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) (7) posits that attitudes, social norms, and perceived
69 behavioural control predict behavioural intention, and behavioural intentions can predict
70 behaviours (8,9). Attitudes, social norms (both injunctive and descriptive), and perceived
71 behavioural control moderate the relationship between intention and behaviour (10,11). TPB
72 has been used to predict various health intentions but less often fully explains behavioural
73 change (12). Meta-analyses suggest that TPB accounts for only 19.3% to 27% of variance in
74 health behaviours (13,14). Regarding COVID-19 vaccination, a meta-analysis indicated that
75 attitudes ($r = 0.48$) and social norms ($r = 0.43$) are reliable predictors of intention and are hence
76 important during vaccination (15).

77 However, the TPB may have limitations when used in isolation given it cannot fully explain
78 behaviour (16). Interventions only utilising TPB factors may not be comprehensive enough to
79 fully address behaviours, and factors outside the model need considered. For example, within
80 the social norm's component, the TPB assumes family and friends equally influence an
81 individual's intentions. In contrast, cultural transmission psychology suggests people are biased
82 towards certain individuals within their social circle, i.e., family and friends can play different
83 roles of importance (17,18). Understanding the dynamics between parents, peers, and
84 behaviour could provide more targeted social interventions for improving vaccination rates.

85 1.2 Cultural evolutionary theory

86 Cultural evolutionary theory is concerned with the factors that shape the spread and
87 transmission of information such as behaviours, attitudes, beliefs, values, etc in populations
88 over time. Cultural transmission, the social transfer of information between individuals, is
89 seldom random; in most cases, it is biased (18,19). An Individual will usually observe several

90 attitudes and behavioural variants for the same cultural trait (e.g., different strategies to solve a
91 problem, different opinions, or habits). The choice of which variant they will adopt is guided by
92 several types of biases. The most relevant for this study is model-based bias (18), favouring
93 variants that are produced by: first, people (models) who are perceived to have higher skill or
94 success (or their proxy, social prestige) (20) and second, models who are similar to us
95 (homophily) (21). Model-based bias is present in adults (22–24) and children (25,26) and
96 across cultures (27). This implies individuals may be biased to copy some social information
97 from specific models, rather than from all models equally.

98 Another fundamental distinction in cultural transmission, made by Cavalli-Sforza and Feldman is
99 between three cultural transmission modes: vertical transmission, from parents to children;
100 oblique transmission, from other adults to younger individuals, and horizontal transmission,
101 among similar-age relatives, friends and peers (17). Much cultural information and skills are
102 passed on vertically, from parents to children in hunter-gatherers (28,29), in farming
103 communities (27,30,31) as well as in industrialised societies (32). Vertical transmission
104 predominates in early infancy and pre-school age, but parental influence then decreases in
105 favour of peer influence, which peaks in adolescence (27,33–36).

106
107 The mode of transmission employed by a particular cultural variant has long-term cultural-
108 evolutionary consequences. Variants that are transmitted vertically and obliquely can persist for
109 many generations. Oblique and horizontal transmission support spread across families and
110 populations thus accelerating the rate of cultural evolution (37,38). Variants that are transmitted
111 exclusively horizontally will disappear once everyone in the relevant age-cohort has died out.

112
113 Moreover, the context in which we learn and transmit modulate the spread of cultural variants.
114 We tend to transmit to peers' information that we have learned from peers, and when we are in

115 a position of expertise, we transmit to novices the information that we learned from experts (39).
116 These context-congruence effects may therefore lock a behaviour in a transmission mode.
117 Given these effects, to design effective interventions to promote desired behaviours and
118 discourage undesirable ones it is essential that we understand the transmission modes they
119 employ. Parental, vertical transmission may be affected by model-based biases favouring older,
120 expert or prestigious individuals (mother and father). In contrast, horizontal transmission from
121 friends may be biased in favour of variants learned from those like us (homophily).

122 1.3 Social transmission

123
124 Cavalli-Sforza and Feldma (32) suggested that deep-rooted traits like political ideology and
125 religious beliefs are more likely be socially inherited from parents than peers. However, young
126 people may rely on peers and online sources, more than on parents for gathering health-related
127 information (40). Looking at other health behaviours, the exercise habits of peers longitudinally
128 predict those of young adults (41,42), whereas parents' exercise does not (43). Health-positive
129 behaviours may be more influenced by peers, suggesting that pro-health actions like
130 vaccination could be determined more by peer behaviour than by parents. Regarding health-risk
131 behaviours, alcohol consumption in adolescents (44,45) and young adults (42) is again better
132 predicted by peer consumption than by parent consumption, at least in cross-sectional studies
133 (46). Smoking in early adolescents is also best predicted by peers' smoking behaviour (47). As
134 such, social context and age matters. Young students are surrounded by new influences,
135 different from their parents, which may render peer behaviour a more important model during
136 COVID-19 vaccination.
137

138 Longitudinally, however, parents predict maladaptive health behaviour such as alcohol
139 consumption (48,49), smoking (49) and resistance to wearing seatbelts (42) better than peers.
140 Despite peer influence increasing in adolescence, parent-child conflicts may diminish into young
141 adulthood (50), making parental influence salient again, later in life. Maladaptive health
142 behaviours of young people could, in the long run, be better predicted by parents. Vaccine
143 attitudes and uptake in young people might follow a similar maladaptive behavioural pattern,
144 being more influenced over time by parents than peers.

145
146 Both parents' and peers' behaviours are therefore important predictors of a young student's
147 health behaviours. Parental behaviour may continue to be a significant predictor for young
148 adults, even when exposed to new social landscapes such as a university setting (42).
149 However, the importance of either influence can vary across different behaviours and contexts.
150 Consequently, COVID-19 vaccination uptake among students could equally be biased more by
151 either parents or peers' behaviour and attitudes. To alter COVID-19 vaccination attitudes and
152 increase uptake among students, it is crucial to discern the most important social influences
153 biasing vaccine hesitancy.

154 1.4 COVID-19 Vaccination

155 Much COVID-19 vaccination research has focused on the extent to which attitudes regarding
156 the vaccine's safety, efficacy, and perceived importance are consistent predictors of vaccination
157 intention and uptake (5,51). With this importance of attitudes, understanding how parents and
158 peers may individually predict a student's attitudes is imperative for trying to indirectly influence
159 their vaccination uptake.

160 Research on factors predicting vaccine intentions and uptake either combines family and friends
161 as a single normative influence or deals with only family or only friends. Specifically, among
162 students, vaccine intentions (52) and uptake (53) have been associated with a perception of
163 peers' willingness to receive the vaccine. Similarly, having an unvaccinated family member or
164 friend has been associated with an increased likelihood of the student being unvaccinated (54).

165

166 Importantly, however, the influence of parents versus peer norms has not been directly
167 compared, leaving it unclear whether one might be more impactful than the other. This is
168 especially relevant for interventions using peers as vaccine models, e.g., (2). If parental
169 association prevails, such peer-focused interventions could be undermined, preferring to bias
170 their vaccine attitudes and uptake through observing their parents.

171 In one study that compared parents and peers' influence on young adolescents, the authors
172 found that parent and peer COVID-19 vaccination attitudes and intentions both predicted US
173 adolescent vaccination intentions, but parents norms explained twice the variance of intention
174 over peer norms (56). These effects, however, could be different in an older sample of students,
175 who are more exposed by peer influence, and parental influence could decline (27,35). The role
176 of parents on COVID-19 vaccination in a young student population, at an age and in a context
177 where peer influence is at a peak, has not been examined. It's therefore crucial to investigate
178 the comparative association of parents and peers within this population.

179 Within parents, fathers and mothers may indeed play different roles. During the COVID-19
180 lockdowns in the UK, lower maternal compliance with guidelines was a stronger predictor than
181 paternal behaviour of reduced compliance among young adults, suggesting a predominant
182 influence of mothers during COVID-19 (57). Thus, separating mothers' and fathers' behaviour
183 will permit interventions to focus on the most salient parental influence. Furthermore, the

184 association was moderated by relationship quality, with increased family arguments weakening
185 the mother-child compliance association (57). Parental behaviour was also not significantly
186 related to young adults who were living away from home during lockdowns. As such, parents
187 could be less important for students, whom may live with peers, with an effect of both one's
188 household and parental relationship quality in determining the social influences on attitudes and
189 uptake of COVID-19 vaccination.

190 1.5 Research questions and objectives

191 This study aims to address the gap in the literature identified above, focusing on the cultural
192 evolution and social transmission aspects of attitudes towards and uptake of COVID-19
193 vaccines during the COVID-19 pandemic. We aim to identify which social agent—a mother,
194 father, or best-friend—is the strongest predictor of students' vaccination attitudes and uptake.
195 Directional hypotheses were not made given the scant literature of parents and peers during
196 COVID-19 vaccination. Instead, we explored the data to suggest where relationships might
197 emerge.

198 An individual's COVID-19 vaccination attitudes are consistent predictors of vaccination
199 intentions and uptake (6,51). Therefore, we first investigated who the strongest predictors of
200 student's attitudes were to understand how to change young people's COVID-19 beliefs via
201 more indirect social modelling interventions. Next, we predicted student vaccine uptake (i.e.,
202 whether the student is vaccinated or not) to explore who could be the largest risk factor for
203 young people rejecting a COVID-19 vaccine. We included relationship quality of students and
204 their parents as covariance to investigate if it moderated parents' association with the student.
205 Lastly, using a heritability analysis, we explored how COVID-19 vaccine attitudes and uptake
206 are transmitted across one's whole circle.

207 2 Methods

208 2.1 Participants

209 We conducted a UK-wide survey on vaccination attitudes and uptake. A total of 346 participants
210 accessed the survey, of which 192 met our criteria (18-35 years of age, UK students). Gender
211 distributions showed a higher proportion of females than males (females = 126, males = 57,
212 other = 7), with a Mean age = 21.0 years. Convenience sampling was used to gather
213 participants. Advertisements were placed on Reddit, Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, and
214 Instagram - inviting participants to join a study requesting UK students to give their opinion and
215 behaviours surrounding on COVID-19 vaccination.

216 In the UK, COVID-19 vaccines were first offered to residents and staff of older adult care homes
217 In December 2020. It wasn't until June 2021 that it was offered to 21- and 22-year-olds, and 18
218 July to 18–20-year-olds. Booster doses were offered to all adults 6 months after the first dose,
219 meaning by January 2022 all adults 18 or over had been offered a second or booster dose.
220 Participant recruitment took place between 19th July 2021 and 27th January 2023. Recruitment
221 advertisements were placed online and through social media at two-time windows: (1) June-
222 August 2021 and (2) November 2022-January 2023. Participants were able to access links
223 between the two windows, but most responses were received during the two advertisement
224 periods.

225 2.2 Instruments

226 Participants were asked how many vaccines they had received (0, 1 or 2 or more). Vaccination
227 intention for unvaccinated participants was measured using one item on a 10-point Likert scale,

228 i.e., “Now that a coronavirus vaccination is available, how likely is it that you will have one?” (0 -
229 ‘extremely unlikely’ and 10 ‘extremely likely’). Attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination were
230 measured using four bi-polar adjectives (on 10-point Likert scales, i.e. 0- very ineffective to 10-
231 very effective; 0 - very unsafe to 10-very safe; 0 - very unimportant to 10 - very important, and 0-
232 very negative to 10-very positive). Similarly, they stated how many vaccines they thought each
233 of the agents had (their mother, father and best friend), and finally, they were asked to rate their
234 perceptions of each agent’s attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination on the same bipolar
235 adjective scales (e.g., “What is your impression on what the following people THINK about a
236 COVID-19 vaccination...?”). Agents were presented in randomised order for each participant.
237 Attitude components were all highly correlated, and so a composite COVID-19 vaccination
238 attitude variable was made with high reliability for the student ($\alpha = .95$), mother ($\alpha = .97$), father
239 ($\alpha = .97$), friend ($\alpha = .95$). Finally, participants provided a subjective measure of their parents’
240 relationship quality, using a measure “how positive is your relationship with your mother/father?”
241 with 1 being very negative and 5 being very positive. We asked some additional questions that
242 were not used in analysis. The full survey is available in the Supplementary Information.

243 2.3 Procedure

244 An advertisement online presented participants with a link that took them to a Qualtrics survey.
245 In the survey, they first were asked to provide informed consent to participate. Participants who
246 consented proceeded to complete the survey described above. Finally, they were fully
247 debriefed.

248

249 2.4 Ethics statement

250 The study was granted ethical approval by the School of Social Sciences Ethics Committee,
251 Heriot-Watt University (2021-1268-4512). Participant consent was obtained electronically at the
252 start of the survey. Participants read a sheet informing them of the project aims, the task and
253 their rights, and were asked to select “I agree” or “I do not agree”. Only those who agreed were
254 directed to the rest of the survey described above.

255

256 2.5 Analytical Procedure

257 R was used to conduct all statistical analyses. Data was imported from excel and cleaned and
258 analysed through R. The data and code is available at
259 <https://github.com/oscarthompsoncodes/TCT-Vaccine-2024>. Details of the exact analytical
260 procedures for handling the data is found in the results section “Testing Linearity Assumptions”
261 as procedure was decided upon after testing various data assumptions. Our sample size was N
262 =192, but full data was not available for all variables for each participant. As such, some
263 analyses had less participants used in the model due to data incompleteness, and the number
264 of observations used in each analysis is stated throughout the tables.

265 3 Results

266 All the data were analysed together, given that separate analyses of the early and later datasets
267 showed similar distributions of vaccination intentions, uptake, and attitudes.

268 3.1 Descriptive statistics and correlations

269 Table 1 presents descriptive statistics. Most respondents were vaccinated and had positive
 270 attitudes towards the COVID-19 vaccination. Vaccine intention was very low, indicating most of
 271 those unvaccinated had no intention of being vaccinated. Students' relationships with their
 272 mother and father were also positive overall.

273 **Table 1**

274 Means, standard deviations, and correlations between students' attitudes towards COVID-19
 275 vaccination and intentions and each agents attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination.

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Student's Vaccination Attitude	8.19	2.45						
2. Student's Vaccination Intention	2.04	3.54	0.80***					
3. Mother's Vaccination Attitude	8.33	2.51	0.74***	0.42				
4. Father's Vaccination Attitude	8.46	2.44	0.64***	0.45	0.76***			
5. Friend's Vaccination Attitude	8.59	2.04	0.62***	0.28	0.59***	0.55***		
6. Mother Relationship Quality	4.48	0.85	0.00	0.09	0.07	0.12	0.17*	
7. Father Relationship Quality	4.34	0.91	0.08	0.15	0.06	0.00	0.14	0.52***

276

277 *Note.*

278 * *M* and *SD* are used to represent mean and standard deviation, respectively. Spearman
 279 correlations were used given variables were non-normally distributed. Student COVID-19
 280 Vaccine Intention refers to the intention to receive a COVID-19 vaccination for those who were
 281 unvaccinated. Mother and Father Relationship Quality refers to how positive the student
 282 perceived their relationship with their mother and father.

283 ** Indicates $p < .05$. * indicates $p < .01$. *** indicates $p < .001$.

284 Of the 27 respondents who were not vaccinated; 21 had no or little intention of getting a vaccine
 285 (vaccine intention scores 0, 1 or 2), 1 was neutral (vaccine intention score of 5); and 4 had a

286 strong intention of getting a vaccine (vaccine intention scores 9 or 10).

287

288 **Table 2.** COVID-19 Vaccine Uptake of the student and agents and their similarities (n = 137).

289 Only complete cases are included, so participants who did not provide data for the vaccination
290 uptake of their mother, father and friend were removed.

291

	Student's COVID-19 Vaccine Uptake		
	Overall	Unvaccinated,	Vaccinated,
Agents COVID-19 Vaccine Uptake		n = 19 (13.9%)	n = 118 (86.1%)
Mothers' Vaccine Uptake, n (%)			
Unvaccinated	10 (7.3%)	7 (37%)	3 (2.5%)
Vaccinated	127 (93%)	12 (63%)	115 (97.5%)
Fathers' Vaccine Uptake, n (%)			
Unvaccinated	10 (7.3%)	5 (26%)	5 (4.2%)
Vaccinated	127 (93%)	14 (74%)	113 (96%)
Friends' Vaccine Uptake, n (%)			
Unvaccinated	10 (7.3%)	4 (21%)	6 (5.1%)
Vaccinated	127 (93%)	15 (79%)	112 (95%)

292

293 Table 3 includes the correlations between each agent's vaccination uptake. Here the highest
294 correlation was observed was between the mother and the student, followed by the mother and
295 the father.

296 **Table 3.** Correlations between agents' vaccination uptake. * Indicates $p < .05$. ** indicates $p <$
297 $.01$.

298

Variable	1	2	3
1. Student Vaccine Uptake			
2. Mother Vaccine uptake	.48**		
3. Father Vaccine uptake	.33**	.48**	
4. Friend Vaccine Uptake	.36**	.10	.25**

299

300

301 To complement our correlation analysis, we calculated social heritability between the agents. In
302 biology, a trait (such as height, skin colour, intelligence) is heritable when offspring resemble
303 their parent more than another random individual from the population regarding that trait. In
304 culture, a socially learned trait such as a behaviour or attitude is heritable if an agent (e.g.,
305 students) resemble a cultural model (e.g., their mothers) more than random individuals for the
306 relevant behaviour or attitude.

307 We conducted Monte-Carlo analyses to quantify the social heritability of vaccination attitude and
308 behaviour scores as the z-score of the veridical correlation between two agents (e.g. students
309 and their mothers) in a distribution of 10,000 scrambled correlations (e.g., each student paired
310 with a random mother from the sample). Heritability results (Fig 1), despite being dependent on
311 the composition of the population, nevertheless contribute evidence of transmission between
312 the agents as the causal process supporting similarity. However, our analysis is agnostic
313 regarding the precise mechanisms for transmission, which could be biological (genetic or
314 epigenetic inheritance), social (learning, imitation, teaching, and uni- or bi-directional, e.g. from
315 father to student, but also from student to father), or a combination of both.

316

317 **Figure 1.** Heritability of attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination (left) and COVID-19
318 vaccination uptake (right) for all pairs of agents in our sample. Only z-scores > 3.1,
319 corresponding to $p < 0.001$ are shown.

320

321 Results suggest that the population is clustered into homogeneous groups including family and
322 friends who share the same COVID-19 vaccination attitudes, but when it comes to vaccination
323 uptake, clusters are not as homogeneous, but students nevertheless resemble their friend's,
324 their father's, and particularly their mother's behaviour.

325 3.2 Regressions

326 3.2.1 Testing linearity assumptions

327 To ensure robust analysis, we used box plots, QQ plots, and residual plots for outlier detection.
328 Although potential outliers were initially identified, these corresponded having a lower number of
329 participants with very negative vaccination attitudes. We determined the dataset did not contain
330 any meaningful outliers. We therefore decided to retain the complete dataset for subsequent
331 regression analyses.

332 Normality plots and QQ plots revealed non-normal data distribution, attributed to COVID-19
333 vaccination attitudes being polarized as very negative or very positive. The data failed to meet
334 the assumption for linear models, and log transformations did not normalise the data. COVID-19
335 vaccination attitudes were highly collinear (see Table 2). Dormann and colleagues (58)
336 advocates a correlation coefficient threshold of 0.7 for predictor variables to preserve accurate
337 coefficient estimation. Given attitudes approached this threshold, results were interpreted
338 cautiously for attitudes. GLMs were preferred for handling collinearity and nonlinearity (58).

339 Vaccine uptake data was unaffected by self-report bias and only have low to moderate
340 correlations between each agent (see Table 3). For these reasons, uptake data may be more
341 informative than attitude data, alongside using the quality of relationship between students and
342 parents as covariates, which are largely unrelated to all agents' attitudes (see Table 1).

343 Furthermore, a p-value was not pre-determined nor adjusted for multiple comparisons. Rather
344 the study aims to explore the data fully and point to where meaningful relationships could exist.
345 Consequently, the significance, regression coefficient and powers of model predictors will be
346 considered in interpretation.

347 3.2.2 Predictors for Students' Attitudes towards Vaccination

348 To investigate predictors of students' COVID-19 vaccination attitudes, three GLM models with
349 Poisson links were executed, as outlined in Table 6. Model 1 assessed the influence of other
350 agents' attitudes; model 2 examined the association with other agents' vaccine uptake; and
351 model 3 combined both. Analyses were restricted to complete data sets containing information
352 for students and their three specified agents (mother, father, friend).

353 GLM with Poisson link was used in these models by treating the attitude variables as count
354 data. As Poisson link requires a positive skew, student and others' attitudes were transformed to
355 a positive skew. Each variable was taken away from 11 to reverse the distribution. Lower
356 attitude values therefore indicate a positive vaccination attitude, and vice versa.

357

358 **Table 4.** Student’s attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination predicted by the agents’ attitude
 359 towards COVID-19 vaccination and their vaccine uptake. Each column represents a separate
 360 Poisson regression where the outcome variable was the student’s attitudes towards COVID-19
 361 vaccination. CI indicate 95% CIs. R² Nagelkerke was the goodness of fit test used for the
 362 Poisson regressions. The coefficients used are incidence rate ratios because a Poisson GLM
 363 was used. These were converted from their log form for easier interpretation.

<i>Predictors</i>	Model 1: Others' Attitudes			Model 2: Others' Uptake			Model 3: Attitudes & Uptake Combined		
	<i>IRR</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>IRR</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>IRR</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	1.38	1.14 – 1.67	0.001	11.39	7.34 – 16.88	<0.001	0.76	0.39 – 1.52	0.440
Mother's Attitude	1.05	0.98 – 1.12	0.169				1.06	0.95 – 1.18	0.255
Father's Attitude	1.12	1.04 – 1.20	0.002				1.15	1.04 – 1.28	0.010
Friend's Attitude	1.06	1.00 – 1.13	0.039				1.06	0.99 – 1.13	0.086
Mother's Uptake				0.43	0.28 – 0.69	<0.001	1.41	0.54 – 3.55	0.473
Father's Uptake				1.00	0.60 – 1.72	0.994	1.67	0.64 – 4.70	0.312
Friend's Uptake				0.50	0.35 – 0.75	<0.001	0.71	0.42 – 1.20	0.191
Observations	106			128			105		
R ² Nagelkerke	0.828			0.450			0.860		

364

365 In model 1 (Table 4), the students’ attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination were modelled by
 366 each agent’s attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination. A quasi-poisson model was conducted to
 367 check for dispersion. At 0.6, the data was not over-dispersed. The father and the best-friend
 368 attitudes were the only significant predictors, and the father’s attitudes was the strongest
 369 predictor. A 10% change in fathers’ attitudes was associated with an 11.2% change in students’
 370 attitudes, while a 10% change in the friends’ attitudes was associated with a 10.6% change. The
 371 difference between the fathers’ and friends’ attitudes is thus negligible in meaningful predictive
 372 strength.

373 Fig 2 shows a high clustering of data points in the bottom left, indicative of the larger amount of
374 very positive attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination. Moreover, the regression lines are very
375 similar. The association of each agent's attitudes with the student's attitudes are very similar,
376 suggesting that attitudinal variables are interrelated and collectively contribute to the predictive
377 power of the model. Consequently, it becomes challenging to discern the individual association
378 of each agent's attitude.

379

380 **Figure 2.** Plot of the Poisson regression of the student's COVID-19 vaccination attitudes
381 modelled by other's COVID-19 vaccination attitudes. Each line indicates a separate Poisson
382 regression run, with each agent's attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination predicting the
383 student's attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination. Attitude values reversed: 1 = very positive
384 attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination, and 10 = very negative attitude towards COVID-19
385 vaccination.

386

387 In model 2 (Table 4) students' attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination were modelled by other
388 agents' COVID-19 vaccine uptake. The model was over-dispersed (dispersion = 1.62, with a
389 dispersion criterion of ≤ 1). The Quasi-Poisson model was used to account for this
390 overdispersion.

391 The mother's vaccine uptake was the strongest predictor for student's attitude towards COVID-
392 19 vaccination, followed by the friend's uptake. The father's uptake was non-significant. The
393 mother's vaccine uptake predicted student attitudes with an IRR = 0.43. This means having a
394 vaccinated mother was associated with the student having 57% more positive attitudes
395 compared to students who had an unvaccinated mother. Conversely, having a vaccinated friend

396 was associated with a student having 50% more positive vaccination attitudes, compared to
397 students with an unvaccinated friend. The mothers' vaccine uptake therefore accounts for 7%
398 more variance in predicting student attitudes than the friends' vaccine uptake.

399 Fig 3 illustrates these findings. The student's attitudes are universally positive towards
400 vaccination when the mother (M = 8.40, CI = 8.05-8.75), father (M = 8.32, CI = 7.92-8.72), and
401 friend (M = 8.51, CI = 8.16-8.85) are vaccinated. Conversely, the student has the lowest
402 vaccination attitudes when their mother is unvaccinated (M = 3.88, CI = 0.77-6.98), followed by
403 their friend (M = 4.40, CI = 2.21-6.58), and attitudes are highest when the father is unvaccinated
404 (M = 5.19, CI = 1.82-8.55).

405

406 **Figure 3.** Means and 95% CI of the student's COVID-19 vaccination attitudes when each
407 person is either vaccinated or unvaccinated. Vaccination uptake refers to the COVID-19
408 vaccination uptake of others. Attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination variable scaled went from:
409 1 = a very negative attitude towards vaccination to 10 = a very positive attitude towards
410 vaccination.

411

412 The large confidence intervals suggest that the precise estimates of the mother or friends'
413 coefficients may be unreliable. But still they suggest the direction that the mother's uptake is a
414 stronger predictor than the father's or friend's uptake: having an unvaccinated mother was
415 associated with the lowest vaccination attitudes, followed by having an unvaccinated friend.

416 Model 3 summarises how others' attitudes and uptake together predict student attitudes. Note,
417 the goodness of fit is highest in this model. Only the father's attitudes towards COVID-19
418 vaccination were a significant predictor of student attitudes. None of the agents' vaccine uptake

419 was significant predictors of student attitudes. However, with attitudes being highly collinear, it is
420 unlikely the fathers' attitude accounted for much unique variance, and this finding is interpreted
421 more cautiously.

422

423 3.2.3 Predictors of students' vaccination uptake

424

425 It may be of greater interest to understand the predictors of vaccine uptake. Utilising the same
426 predictors as in Table 4, three new regression models were constructed to explore how others'
427 attitudes and uptake best predicted student vaccine uptake. The results are outlined in Table 5.

428 **Table 5.** Student's uptake of COVID-19 vaccination predicted by the COVID-19 vaccination
429 attitudes and uptake of parents and their friend. Each model here was a binomial logistic
430 regression. R^2 Tjur was the goodness of fit measure used for the logistic regression models.
431 The model originally produced log OR but we transformed these to OR for easier interpretation.
432 Note that some confidence intervals were very high (e.g., model 6, Mothers' Uptake.) However,
433 this was not due to modelling or formatting issues, but was the real values obtained from the
434 models. With highly collinear variables, it's expected there would be some unusual CIs for GLM
435 models, especially given the combined model was more underpowered with a lower observation
436 to variable ratio. Given we are exploring the data, we left these values in as is. We follow this
437 procedure for the full article.

<i>Predictors</i>	Model 4: Others' and Student's Attitudes			Model 5: Others' Uptake			Model 6: Attitudes and Uptake Combined		
	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	0.52	0.04 – 6.89	0.606	0.09	0.01 – 0.76	0.037	0.03	0.00 – 1.72	0.181
Mother's Attitude	0.74	0.33 – 1.27	0.382				0.36	0.08 – 0.99	0.105
Father's Attitude	1.47	0.84 – 3.03	0.239				1.44	0.67 – 3.64	0.386
Friend's Attitude	0.94	0.60 – 1.35	0.739				0.79	0.33 – 1.46	0.513
Student's Attitude	1.48	0.97 – 2.31	0.060				2.52	1.34 – 6.00	0.013
Mother's Uptake				16.64	3.34 – 99.83	0.001	3087.93	1.05 – 2.33e8	0.083
Father's Uptake				1.90	0.25 – 11.23	0.499	5.99	0.01 – 505.12	0.472
Friend's Uptake				3.88	0.65 – 18.78	0.105	0.04	0.00 – 5.88	0.245
Observations	106			137			105		
R ² Tjur	0.319			0.238			0.459		

438

439

440 Vaccine uptake was not significantly predicted by the student's own or other's attitudes towards
441 COVID-19 vaccination (model 4, Table 5). Fig 4 shows the students and others' attitudes when
442 the student was either vaccinated, or unvaccinated. When the student was vaccinated, their
443 mothers' (M = 8.85, CI = 8.55 - 9.16), fathers' (M = 8.90, CI = 8.57 - 9.23), friends' (M = 8.90, CI
444 = 8.57 - 9.23, SD = 1.77), and own attitudes (M = 8.72, CI = 8.45 - 8.99) were all similarly high.
445 When the student was unvaccinated, the student's attitude seemed lowest (M = 3.57, CI = 1.89
446 - 5.26), which would be expected given attitudes would be in correspondence to their own
447 behaviour. But the mother (M = 5.18, CI = 3.41 - 6.94), father (M = 5.79, CI = 3.92 - 7.66), and
448 friends' (M = 7.08, CI = 5.61 - 8.55) attitudes did not seem to differ substantially, perhaps
449 explaining why there was no significant predictors. When a student is unvaccinated, no agents'
450 attitudes are uniquely predictive of student uptake.

451

452 **Figure 4.** Mean and 95% CIs of the COVID-19 vaccination attitude values of others and the
453 student when the student is either vaccinated or unvaccinated. Attitude towards COVID-19

454 vaccination variable scaled went from: 1 = a very negative attitude towards vaccination to 10 = a
455 very positive attitude towards vaccination

456 As was the case with predicting students' attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination, investigating
457 the relationships between other's uptake and student's uptake may be more informative for
458 understanding how vaccination uptake is predicted, because it does not rely on self-reports.
459 Model 5 in Table 5 summarises the findings. The mother's vaccine status was the only
460 significant predictor of whether a student was vaccinated. Having an unvaccinated mother was
461 associated with a 16 times increased likelihood of the student being unvaccinated themselves.
462 However, the large confidence intervals indicate the precision of this OR is uncertain.

463 Table 2 explores these findings. Vaccinated students' vaccine uptake was equally like all the
464 other agents' vaccine uptake, ranging from 95-97%. The results were different for unvaccinated
465 students. Here, 37% of the time the mother was also unvaccinated, versus 26% for father, 21%
466 for friend, supporting the potential importance of mother's uptake for student uptake, especially
467 when the mother is unvaccinated.

468 Combined model 6 included both the attitudes and uptake of other agents in predicting students'
469 vaccine uptake. The log binomial model indicated the student's attitude was the sole predictor.
470 While this model better controls for the covariance across variables, this model was again less
471 powered, with only 108 observations across 8 variables. We suggest this model is thus not
472 powered enough to dismiss the importance of the mothers' uptake observed in model 5.

473 3.2.4 Relationship quality as a covariate

474 Aksoy found the transmission of lockdown compliance norms during the pandemic was higher
475 from mothers to their children in families that argued less (54). Thus, the strength of association

476 from parents to their children might depend on relationship quality. We re-ran the models
477 including the positivity of mother and father relationships as covariates (see Methods section).

478 **3.2.4.1 Predicting student's attitudes.**

479 We first explored how others' attitudes and uptake predicted a students' COVID-19 vaccination
480 attitudes when controlling for the quality of the relationship between students and their parents'
481 as covariance. Table 6 outlines the outcomes of these models. The same structure of models
482 was used as in Tables 4 and 5.

483 **Table 6.** Student's attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination predicted by the agents' COVID-19
484 vaccination attitudes and uptake, including parental relationship quality as covariance. Rel Qual
485 refers to relationship quality. In the original combined model with all agents' attitudes and
486 behaviours for predicting students' attitudes (model 3, Table 4), only the father's attitudes were
487 a significant predictor. Hence, relationship quality was included as a covariate only for the
488 mother's and father's attitudes, not their vaccination uptake.

489

490

<i>Predictors</i>	Model 7: Others' Attitudes			Model 8: Others' Uptake			Model 9: Attitudes and Uptake Combined		
	<i>Incidence Rate Ratios</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Incidence Rate Ratios</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Incidence Rate Ratios</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	2.07	0.72 – 5.75	0.169	0.66	0.02 – 12.43	0.792	4.96	1.27 – 18.91	0.020
Mother's Attitude	1.14	0.70 – 1.85	0.598				0.85	0.52 – 1.38	0.522
Father's Attitude	0.92	0.60 – 1.42	0.691				0.88	0.59 – 1.32	0.533
Friend's Attitude	1.07	1.01 – 1.14	0.015				0.99	0.92 – 1.06	0.794
Mother's Attitude x Rel Qual	0.99	0.90 – 1.09	0.851				1.06	0.96 – 1.18	0.259
Father's Attitude x Rel Qual	1.04	0.95 – 1.13	0.395				1.06	0.97 – 1.15	0.202
Mother's Rel Qual	1.00	0.75 – 1.34	0.982	1.42	1.01 – 2.14	0.061	0.86	0.65 – 1.13	0.272
Father's Rel Qual	0.91	0.71 – 1.18	0.470	1.37	0.78 – 2.66	0.312	0.85	0.68 – 1.07	0.154
Mother's Uptake				2.84	0.52 – 20.22	0.257	1.66	0.76 – 3.52	0.195
Father's Uptake				2.27	0.14 – 60.08	0.591	1.53	0.71 – 3.55	0.302
Friend's Uptake				0.48	0.35 – 0.67	<0.001	0.45	0.28 – 0.73	0.001
Mother's Uptake x Rel Qual				0.64	0.42 – 0.93	0.028			
Father's Uptake x Rel Qual				0.84	0.42 – 1.51	0.579			
Observations	99			120			98		
R ² Nagelkerke	0.822			0.437			0.867		

491

492

493 Model 7 (Table 6) summarises the findings. The model's dispersion was in range D = 0.66.

494 When considering the quality of the parents' relationships, the friend's attitude was the only

495 significant predictor of student attitudes.

496 In model 8 (Table 6) we next examined how vaccine uptake of the student was predicted by the

497 agents' vaccine uptake when the quality of the relationships with parents was a covariate. An

498 unvaccinated friend now emerged as the strongest predictor of student attitudes, followed by an

499 interaction effect between the mother's vaccination uptake and relationship quality (Fig 5).

500 Students with vaccinated mothers exhibited positive vaccination attitudes irrespective of

501 relationship quality. In contrast, students with unvaccinated mothers showed diverging attitudes

502 based on the quality of the relationship; positive relationships led to lower vaccination attitudes,

503 whereas negative relationships led to higher attitudes. A student's attitude towards vaccination

504 is more likely to align with the vaccine uptake of their mother only if they get on well with her.
505 Student's attitudes are not universally predicted by maternal vaccination uptake. As such,
506 friends' vaccination uptake may be the better predictor of student's vaccine attitudes when
507 controlling for student-parent relationship quality.

508

509 **Figure 5.** Student attitudes for those with a vaccinated and unvaccinated mother, with positivity
510 of the mother's relationship as an interaction effect. Error bars show 95% CIs. Students'
511 attitude values reversed: 1 = very positive attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination, and 10 =
512 very negative attitude towards COVID-19 vaccination. Mother relationship quality was
513 continuous, but here split as an interaction term, using the minimum (1 – very negative
514 relationship) and maximum (5 – very positive relationship) as factor levels for a simpler
515 interpretation.

516 In the combined model 9 (Table 6), when the quality of the father's relationship was included as
517 a covariate, the father's attitude was no longer significant, and the vaccine uptake of the friend
518 was the sole predictor. Thus, the father's attitude emerging as a significant predictor may have
519 depended on the student having a positive relationship with them. This might suggest that
520 friends' attitudes and uptake are more informative than the father's attitudes. Thus, having an
521 unvaccinated friend may be the most important predictor of student's vaccination attitudes.

522 **3.2.4.2. Students' vaccine uptake**

523 Secondly, we modelled how others' attitudes and vaccine uptake predicted a students' COVID-
524 19 vaccination uptake when including parental relationship quality as a covariate (Table 7).

525

526 **Table 7.** Student attitudes modelled by the attitudes and behaviours of others, including
 527 parental relationship quality as covariance. We did not re-run a combined model including
 528 relationship quality as a covariate because in model 6 (Table 5), the combined model predicting
 529 vaccine uptake, neither parents' attitudes or uptake were significant predictors.

<i>Predictors</i>	Model 10: Others' Attitudes			Model 11: Others' Uptake		
	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratios</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	18.34	0.00 – 1.34e11	0.794	3351.63	0.00 – 3.19e14	0.476
Mother's Attitude	2.43	0.12 – 98.35	0.593			
Father's Attitude	0.48	0.02 – 6.32	0.597			
Friend's Attitude	0.89	0.51 – 1.36	0.635			
Mother's Attitude x Rel Qual	0.80	0.36 – 1.51	0.528			
Father's Attitude x Rel Qual	1.32	0.79 – 2.46	0.333			
Mother's Rel Qual	6.85	0.03 – 5795.47	0.533	0.24	0.01 – 1.51	0.172
Father's Rel Qual	0.08	0.00 – 7.40	0.338	0.34	0.00 – 6.74	0.608
Mother's Vaccine Uptake				0.02	0.00 – 171.89	0.428
Father's Vaccine Uptake				1.87	0.00 – 1.62e7	0.953
Friend's Vaccine Uptake				3.70	0.50 – 21.05	0.155
Mother's Uptake x Rel Qual				5.47	0.65 – 118.35	0.151
Father's Uptake x Rel Qual				0.99	0.03 – 121.23	0.996
Observations	102			128		
R ² Tjur	0.274			0.276		

530
 531
 532 In model 10 (Table 7), when predicting student vaccine attitudes, the attitudes of agents were
 533 non-significant (without the covariate, the father's attitudes were the sole significant predictor).
 534 Similarly, in model 11 (Table 7), none of the agents' uptake variables were significant predictors
 535 of student uptake (whereas the mother's uptake was without the covariate). Therefore, when

536 controlling for the quality of parent-student relationship, not one agent accounts for unique
537 vaccine uptake.

538 3.3 Gender interactions

539 As the sample was mostly female (N = 66.3% females) maternal importance may have existed
540 because females displayed a bias towards the same-gender parents. Female adolescents
541 copied their mother's COVID-19 compliance behaviours more than male adolescents (57). Each
542 model was re-run with gender as a covariate. The pattern of the findings did not change across
543 any of the models. As such the greater percentage of females in the sample did not bias the
544 findings. Importantly, the salience of the mother does not depend on student gender.

545 4 Discussion

546 As COVID-19 vaccination has rolled out, young people have remained some of the most
547 hesitant age-group within the UK (59). Much research has suggested how family's and friends'
548 COVID-19 vaccination norms are important in predicting COVID-19 vaccination intention and
549 uptake. However, social interventions may be made more effective by targeting the specific
550 social connection – namely, parents or peers – which is more important in shaping the young
551 person's vaccine uptake. Therefore, this paper's objective was to examine how three agents' –
552 mothers, fathers and best friends-- attitudes and uptake predict students' COVID-19 vaccination
553 attitudes and uptake. These findings could be used to infer which agent might have the greatest
554 influence on young people's vaccine uptake to inform interventions.

555 4.1 Predicting student's attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination

556 Our first model predicted students' COVID-19 vaccination attitudes by others' COVID-19
557 vaccination attitudes. The mother's, father's and friend's COVID-19 vaccine attitudes predict the
558 student attitudes to the same degree (Fig 2). However, we observe that all agents' attitudes,
559 including the student's, were highly collinear. This collinearity means that the significant
560 coefficient of the father and friend's attitudes on student' attitudes are not to be overemphasised
561 with no one agent being more important than the others.

562
563 This collinearity may be partly due to mothers, fathers and friends' attitudes being reported by
564 the students, who may be biased to perceiving those who are most close to them as having the
565 same evaluations as each other regarding vaccine importance, safety, effectiveness, and
566 positivity. Moreover, they may be biased to believe these three agents have similar attitudes to
567 themselves (60). Besides these biases, collinearity of attitudes among all four agents (student,
568 their mothers, fathers, and friends) indicates that our population may be polarised into
569 homogeneous groups. Here, students surrounded by parents with positive attitudes would have
570 access to or choose to befriend or marry people with positive attitudes, and the same for
571 negative attitudes.

572
573 Our second model included other agents' vaccine uptake, a more objective measure, as
574 predictors. Having an unvaccinated mother was associated with the most negative COVID-19
575 vaccination attitudes, followed by having an unvaccinated friend. The mother's vaccine uptake
576 accounted for 7% more variance in student attitudes than the friend's vaccine uptake. The
577 father's vaccine uptake was not significant. When developing intervention campaigns to improve
578 student's attitudes towards vaccination, the focus should therefore be prioritising the vaccination
579 of mothers as well as friends, but less so fathers.

580

581 Our third combined model including the COVID-19 vaccination attitudes and uptake of the
582 mother, father, and friend showed only the father's attitude predicted the student's attitudes.
583 However, given findings from the previous models, issues with collinearity and the lower power
584 of the larger combined model, this result should not be overstated. Overall, these models
585 suggest that a student's attitude towards vaccine is most influenced by their whole close social
586 circle with the mothers and friends' vaccination uptake being most important.

587

588 Most COVID-19 vaccine research has not separated out the individual contribution of parents
589 and peers (5,15) Instead, participants are asked about their perception of both their family and
590 friends' attitudes and intentions towards COVID-19 vaccination as a single overall variable. This
591 overall perception has found to be consistently important for predicting people's vaccine
592 intentions and attitudes, e.g., (5,51). Yet, our separation of mother versus father versus friend
593 nuances these results to underline specific biases towards individual agents, namely mothers.

594

595 4.2 Predicting student's COVID-19 vaccine uptake

596 Our fourth model indicated that individual attitudes, including those of the students themselves,
597 were not unique predictors of students' COVID-19 vaccine uptake. In our fifth model, including
598 only other agents' vaccine uptake, the mother's uptake was the only significant predictor of
599 student uptake. An unvaccinated mother may therefore be the most important social predictor of
600 a young person's failure to get vaccinated.

601

602 Our sixth, combined model, however, found the student's own attitudes as the sole predictor of
603 their vaccine uptake, challenging the mother's importance. This is in line with some studies (6),

604 but not with others (56), which indicate that our close social agents can have a stronger
605 association in predicting vaccine intention than our own attitudes.

606
607 Once again, the lower power of the combined model and the collinearity issue suggests the
608 importance of mothers' uptake on student's uptake should not be discounted. Combined with
609 the importance of the mothers' non-vaccination in predicting negative vaccination attitudes,
610 maternal influence remains as a potentially crucial risk factor for vaccine attitudes and uptake.

611
612 This is in line with Kecojevic and colleagues' findings (54) who showed that students who
613 reported having an unvaccinated family member or friend were more likely to be unvaccinated.
614 Other studies focusing on peers' norms suggest peers may influence young people's attitudes
615 and uptake of COVID-19 vaccination (52,53). Our findings suggest while peer norms may be
616 important, interventions relying solely on peers may be insufficient, as maternal influence could
617 prevail over peer norms in shaping the student's vaccine uptake.

618
619 Our results also align with those of Rogers and colleagues (56) who showed that parent norms
620 accounted for twice the variance in adolescents' COVID-19 vaccine intention than peer norms.
621 Their sample was younger than ours (Mean age = 14.69 years). At this age parents are likely
622 the main deciders regarding vaccination. Our findings, in a slightly older sample (Mean age =
623 21.0 years) suggest that parents may continue to shape COVID-19 vaccination uptake into
624 young adulthood despite being surrounded by peer influence in a student context. Note, we did
625 not record the living circumstances of students, yet findings have previously suggested young
626 adults' association with parental COVID-19 guideline compliance increases when living at home
627 (54). As such our findings cannot determine whether the association was due to living around
628 parents versus peers.

629 Additionally, the perceived influence of peers may be confounded by students merely selecting
630 friends with similar vaccination uptake. Given our young sample, and the age-based rollout of
631 the vaccination in the UK, participants were likely offered the vaccine after they had already
632 observed their parents reject or accept the vaccine. There was therefore a greater opportunity to
633 observe parental vaccine decisions and imitate their behaviour compared to peers.

634 We extended Rogers and colleagues' findings (56) by showing that, among parents, the
635 mother's uptake was a singularly important predictor of student uptake. Similarly, Aksoy (57)
636 showed a mother's lockdown compliance behaviour predicted UK young adults' compliance
637 behaviour, whereas a father's behaviour was less or non-significant. The importance of mothers
638 might be expected, given children spend more time with their mother growing up in social
639 activities and educational events (61), have more communication with their children than fathers
640 (62). Thus, the mother may be of central importance during unfamiliar situations like pandemics,
641 both acting as models for young people through health regulation compliance and making
642 important vaccination decisions.

643 4.3 Social transmission research

644 Health risk behaviours are sometimes more likely to be predicted by parental behaviour than
645 peer behaviour in young adults, e.g., alcohol consumption (48,63), or smoking (49), although
646 these results are not always supported, e.g. for alcohol consumption (42). In opposition, peer
647 behaviour is a better predictor for exercise habits (41–43) and health searching (64) Thus,
648 research must continue to investigate the effects of parents versus peers and indeed of mothers
649 versus fathers, to understand which social agents shape behaviour and attitudes.

650 4.4 Cultural evolutionary Psychology

651 An explanation for the importance of mother's vaccine uptake on student's uptake may be that
652 important, deep-rooted traits like politics and religion tend to be transmitted vertically, from
653 parents to children, rather than horizontally, among peers (65). COVID-19 vaccination
654 hesitancy is related to right-wing political views (66,67) and increased religiosity (68). Amid the
655 uncertainty of vaccination decisions, young people may have looked towards modelling the
656 behaviour of their parents, for whom they've previously followed similar fundamental ideologies.
657 Consequently, vertical transmission could be the more important transmission modality for
658 COVID-19 vaccination.

659 Moreover, vertically transmitted behaviours and attitudes –unlike horizontally transmitted ones–
660 can persist for many generations (39). This means that the influence of unvaccinated mothers
661 may be transmitted down the generations. Therefore, addressing vaccine hesitancy especially
662 among mothers may be crucial to stop the transmission of anti-vaccination attitudes and
663 behaviours.

664 4.5 Heritability analyses

665 Heritability analysis generally aligns with the regression results. In addition, they offer a view of
666 the distribution of attitudes and behaviours across our sample. For attitudes, all agents are very
667 similar to each other, indicating the existence of homogeneous groups within which all agents
668 have similar attitudes towards the COVID-19 vaccine. This is reflected in the fact that friends are
669 very similar to parents, although they are not directly related. Friends are less like parents in
670 terms of vaccine uptake, suggesting uptake is not as polarised as attitudes. Therefore,
671 interventions should still consider one's whole circle for most effectively shaping vaccine uptake,
672 and not singularly focus on one social agent.

673 4.6 Relationship as Covariance

674 When controlling for parental relationship quality (how positive or negative the student reported
675 their mother and father relationships were), the friend's predictive power increased. When
676 predicting student vaccination attitudes, an unvaccinated friend was associated with the most
677 negative attitudes. Having an unvaccinated mother was only associated with more negative
678 student vaccination attitudes for those who had a positive relationship with their mother.
679 Furthermore, the friend's uptake was the sole predictor for student attitudes in the combined
680 model. But no agent's attitude or uptake were significant predictors of student uptake when
681 controlling for relationship quality.

682 The importance of parents' behaviour may therefore be dependent on how well the child and
683 parents get on. In COVID-19, a mother's compliance with lockdown guidelines predicted their
684 young adult children's compliance only if the children lived with them and they argued less (57).
685 Our sample reported very positive relationships with their mother ($M = 4.48/5$) and father
686 ($4.34/5$), suggesting the importance of parents could be overestimated in our results. This
687 implies that findings by Rogers and colleagues (56), who suggested parent norms were more
688 important than peer norms for vaccination, may have been different if they had included
689 relationship quality in their design. Their adolescent participants may have been biased in
690 favour of parents simply because they had a positive relationship with them. Consequently,
691 research must consider how well a young person gets on with other social agents to most
692 accurately determine why a social agent might appear to be of greatest importance.

693 4.7 Practical applications of findings

694 If our results are verified by further studies, interventions aimed at improving vaccine uptake
695 could target the agents who are found to be most important. For instance, leveraging

696 vaccination of mothers to act as behavioural models could be a more specific approach for
697 changing attitudes and increasing uptake in young adults. In situations where children do not
698 get along with their mothers, friends could play a more important role in influencing uptake.
699 Therefore, parent-based interventions and friend-based interventions complement each other,
700 and neither should be ruled out.

701 4.8 Limitations

702 There are limitations to the current study that need to be acknowledged. Firstly, we used a
703 correlational design, which does not allow to infer causality. We obtained merely measures of
704 similarity, so we cannot say whether an agent directly influenced the uptake and attitudes of the
705 student. For instance, it is possible that similarity between mother and student is caused by the
706 student influencing the mother. For the friend, inferring directionality is even less plausible, since
707 friendship can involve both people influencing each other equally.

708 This study's aim was to establish patterns of social transmission of information in a small social
709 network. However, we relied on similarity metrics between different agents. Similarity of
710 attitudes and behaviours can be caused by factors other than transmission including sharing a
711 social environment; for parents and children, sharing genes; and, for friends, assortative mating
712 whereby we select friends who are like us. Future studies can tease out these confounds to
713 understand the unique contribution of social transmission in attitudes and behaviours towards
714 vaccination.

715 We relied on student's perception of their parents' and friend's COVID-19 vaccination attitudes
716 and uptake. Even if they do not accurately reflect the real attitudes and behaviours, perceptions
717 may be what leads to someone changing their own attitudes and behaviours. Furthermore,
718 within the complete vaccine uptake data we had, (N =137) we had only 27 unvaccinated

719 participants (19.7% unvaccinated). Although unbalanced, this proportion is representative of the
720 rate of non-vaccination in the UK.

721 5. Conclusion

722 This study aimed to compare the predictive power of parents and peers on COVID-19
723 vaccination attitudes and uptake among students to determine who could be the greatest source
724 of influence for vaccination uptake. Our results support the view that both one's close family and
725 friends are important. Moreover, findings point to the mother's vaccine uptake as the most
726 salient predictor of student's uptake and attitudes, particularly when the students get on well
727 with their parents. In cases of poorer parent-child relationships, friend's vaccine uptake may
728 supersede the mother's influence. Despite these nuances, a general trend emerges suggesting
729 that vaccine uptake could be primarily guided by vertical transmission (i.e., parent to child). In
730 vaccination, the influence of young people's mothers and fathers is understudied yet may be
731 potentially more important than studying solely peer influence. Therefore, interventions should
732 be finely tuned to utilising students' mothers to increase vaccine uptake, whereas peers could
733 be more important for those with poorer maternal relationships. Future research confirming the
734 importance of mothers could be pivotal for optimising strategies to mitigate the continual vaccine
735 hesitancy across pandemics in this vulnerable demographic.

736

737

738 Acknowledgements

739 OT thanks the Carnegie Trust for funding through a Sumer Internship.

740

741

742 References

- 743 1. Stanley D. 80% of patients admitted to Intensive Care Units in north east London in
744 December not fully vaccinated [Internet]. NHS North East London. 2022 [cited 2024 Feb
745 12]. Available from: [https://northeastlondon.icb.nhs.uk/news/almost-90-of-patients-admitted-](https://northeastlondon.icb.nhs.uk/news/almost-90-of-patients-admitted-to-intensive-care-units-in-north-east-london-are-not-fully-vaccinated/)
746 [to-intensive-care-units-in-north-east-london-are-not-fully-vaccinated/](https://northeastlondon.icb.nhs.uk/news/almost-90-of-patients-admitted-to-intensive-care-units-in-north-east-london-are-not-fully-vaccinated/)
- 747 2. Avian influenza [Internet]. [cited 2024 Feb 12]. Available from:
748 <https://www.who.int/westernpacific/emergencies/surveillance/avian-influenza>
- 749 3. Brown E, Gray R, Lo Monaco S, O'Donoghue B, Nelson B, Thompson A, et al. The potential
750 impact of COVID-19 on psychosis: A rapid review of contemporary epidemic and pandemic
751 research. *Schizophr Res*. 2020 Aug 1;222:79–87.
- 752 4. Lee J, Jeong HJ, Kim S. Stress, Anxiety, and Depression Among Undergraduate Students
753 during the COVID-19 Pandemic and their Use of Mental Health Services. *Innov High Educ*.
754 2021 Oct 1;46(5):519–38.
- 755 5. Sherman SM, Sim J, Cutts M, Dasch H, Amlôt R, Rubin GJ, et al. COVID-19 vaccination
756 acceptability in the UK at the start of the vaccination programme: a nationally representative
757 cross-sectional survey (CoVAccS – wave 2). *Public Health*. 2022 Jan 1;202:1–9.
- 758 6. Latkin C, Dayton L, Miller J, Yi G, Balaban A, Boodram B, et al. A longitudinal study of
759 vaccine hesitancy attitudes and social influence as predictors of COVID-19 vaccine uptake
760 in the US. *Hum Vaccines Immunother*. 2022 Nov 30;18(5):2043102.
- 761 7. Ajzen I. From Intentions to Actions: A Theory of Planned Behavior. In: Kuhl J, Beckmann J,
762 editors. *Action Control: From Cognition to Behavior* [Internet]. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer
763 Berlin Heidelberg; 1985. p. 11–39. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-69746-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-69746-3_2)
764 [3_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-69746-3_2)
- 765 8. Abraham C, Sheeran P, Johnston M. From health beliefs to self-regulation: Theoretical
766 advances in the psychology of action control. *Psychol Health*. 1998;13(4):569–91.
- 767 9. Gollwitzer PM, Moskowitz GB. Goal effects on action and cognition. In: *Social psychology:*
768 *Handbook of basic principles*. New York, NY, US: The Guilford Press; 1996. p. 361–99.


- 769 10. Ajzen I, Madden TJ. Prediction of goal-directed behavior: Attitudes, intentions, and
770 perceived behavioral control. *J Exp Soc Psychol.* 1986;22(5):453–74.
- 771 11. Sheeran P, Trafimow D, Armitage CJ. Predicting behaviour from perceived behavioural
772 control: Tests of the accuracy assumption of the theory of planned behaviour. *Br J Soc*
773 *Psychol.* 2003 Sep 1;42(3):393–410.
- 774 12. Hagger MS, Chatzisarantis NLD. Integrating the theory of planned behaviour and self-
775 determination theory in health behaviour: A meta-analysis. *Br J Health Psychol.*
776 2009;14(2):275–302.
- 777 13. Armitage CJ, Conner M. Efficacy of the Theory of Planned Behaviour: A meta-analytic
778 review. *Br J Soc Psychol.* 2001 Dec 1;40(4):471–99.
- 779 14. McEachan RRC, Conner M, Taylor NJ, Lawton RJ. Prospective prediction of health-related
780 behaviours with the Theory of Planned Behaviour: A meta-analysis. *Health Psychol Rev.*
781 2011;5(2):97–144.
- 782 15. Limbu YB, Gautam RK, Zhou W. Predicting Vaccination Intention against COVID-19 Using
783 Theory of Planned Behavior: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Vaccines.* 2022 Nov
784 26;10(12):2026.
- 785 16. Sniehotta FF, Pesseau J, Araújo-Soares V. Time to retire the theory of planned behaviour.
786 *Health Psychol Rev.* 2014 Jan 2;8(1):1–7.
- 787 17. Cavalli-Sforza LL, Feldman MW. *Cultural Transmission and Evolution: A Quantitative*
788 *Approach.* Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press; 1981. (Monographs in Population
789 *Biology).*
- 790 18. Boyd R, Richerson PJ. *Culture and the Evolutionary Process.* University of Chicago Press;
791 1985.
- 792 19. Henrich J, McElreath R. The evolution of cultural evolution. *Evol Anthropol Issues News*
793 *Rev.* 2003;12(3):123–35.
- 794 20. Henrich J, Gil-White F. The Evolution of Prestige: Freely Conferred Deference as a
795 Mechanism for Enhancing the Benefits of Cultural Transmission. *Evol Hum Behav.*
796 2001;22(3):165–96.
- 797 21. Buttelmann D, Zmyj N, Daum M, Carpenter M. Selective Imitation of In-Group Over Out-
798 Group Members in 14-Month-Old Infants. *Child Dev.* 2013 Mar 1;84(2):422–8.
- 799 22. Arnocky S, Bozek E, Dufort C, Rybka S, Hebert R. Celebrity Opinion Influences Public
800 Acceptance of Human Evolution. *Evol Psychol.* 2018 Jul 1;16(3):147470491880065.
- 801 23. Atkisson C, O'Brien MJ, Mesoudi A. Adult Learners in a Novel Environment Use Prestige-
802 Biased Social Learning. *Evol Psychol.* 2012;10(3).
- 803 24. Jackson DJ, Darrow TIA. The Influence of Celebrity Endorsements on Young Adults'
804 Political Opinions. *Harv Int J Press.* 2005 Jul;10(3):80–98.

- 805 25. Chudek M, Heller S, Birch S, Henrich J. Prestige-biased cultural learning: bystander's
806 differential attention to potential models influences children's learning. *Evol Hum Behav.*
807 2012;33(1):46–56.
- 808 26. McGuigan N. The influence of model status on the tendency of young children to over-
809 imitate. *J Exp Child Psychol.* 2013;116(4):962–9.
- 810 27. Hewlett BS, Fouts HN, Boyette AH, Hewlett BL. Social learning among Congo Basin hunter-
811 gatherers. *Philos Trans Biol Sci.* 2011;366(1567):1168–78.
- 812 28. Hewlett BS, Cavalli-Sforza LL. Cultural Transmission among Aka Pygmies. *Am Anthropol.*
813 1986;88(4):922–34.
- 814 29. Ohmagari K, Berkes F. Transmission of Indigenous Knowledge and Bush Skills Among the
815 Western James Bay Cree Women of Subarctic Canada. *Hum Ecol.* 1997;25(2):197–222.
- 816 30. Tehrani JJ, Collard M. On the relationship between interindividual cultural transmission and
817 population-level cultural diversity: a case study of weaving in Iranian tribal populations. *Evol*
818 *Hum Behav.* 2009 Jul;30(4):286-300.e2.
- 819 31. Shennan S, Steele J. Cultural learning in hominids: a behavioural ecological approach. In: H
820 O Box KRG, editor. *Mammalian Social Learning: Comparative and Ecological Perspectives.*
821 Cambridge University Press; 1999. p. 367–88.
- 822 32. Cavalli-Sforza LL, Feldman MW, Chen KH, Dornbusch SM. Theory and Observation in
823 Cultural Transmission. *Science.* 1982;218(4567):19–27.
- 824 33. Berndt TJ. Developmental changes in conformity to peers and parents. *Dev Psychol.* 1979
825 Nov;15(6):608–16.
- 826 34. Bowerman CE, Kinch JW. Changes in Family and Peer Orientation of Children Between the
827 Fourth and Tenth Grades. *Soc Forces.* 1959 Mar 1;37(3):206–11.
- 828 35. Lew-Levy S, Reckin R, Lavi N, Cristóbal-Azkarate J, Ellis-Davies K. How Do Hunter-
829 Gatherer Children Learn Subsistence Skills? *Hum Nat.* 2017 Dec 1;28(4):367–94.
- 830 36. Corriveau KH, Harris PL, Meins E, Fernyhough C, Arnott B, Elliott L, et al. Young Children's
831 Trust in Their Mother's Claims: Longitudinal Links With Attachment Security in Infancy. *Child*
832 *Dev.* 2009 May;80(3):750–61.
- 833 37. Lycett SJ, Gowlett JAJ. On questions surrounding the Acheulean 'tradition'. *World Archaeol.*
834 2008 Sep;40(3):295–315.
- 835 38. Bergstrom TC. Evolution of Social Behavior: Individual and Group Selection. *J Econ*
836 *Perspect.* 2002 May 1;16(2):67–88.
- 837 39. Tamariz M, Papa A, Cristea M, McGuigan N. Context congruence: How associative learning
838 modulates cultural evolution. Morin O, editor. *PLOS ONE.* 2023 Apr 4;18(4):e0282776.
- 839 40. Bleakley A, Hennessy M, Fishbein M, Jordan A. How Sources of Sexual Information Relate
840 to Adolescents' Beliefs About Sex. *Am J Health Behav.* 2009 Jan 1;33(1):37–48.

- 841 41. Fitzgerald A, Fitzgerald N, Aherne C. Do peers matter? A review of peer and/or friends'
842 influence on physical activity among American adolescents. *J Adolesc.* 2012 Aug
843 1;35(4):941–58.
- 844 42. Lau RR, Quadrel MJ, Hartman KA. Development and Change of Young Adults' Preventive
845 Health Beliefs and Behavior: Influence from Parents and Peers. *J Health Soc Behav.*
846 1990;31(3):240–59.
- 847 43. Anderssen N, Wold B, Torsheim T. Are parental health habits transmitted to their children?
848 An eight year longitudinal study of physical activity in adolescents and their parents. *J*
849 *Adolesc.* 2006 Aug;29(4):513–24.
- 850 44. Windle M. Parental, sibling, and peer influences on adolescent substance use and alcohol
851 problems. *Appl Dev Sci.* 2000;4(2):98–110.
- 852 45. Yurasek AM, Brick L, Nestor B, Hernandez L, Graves H, Spirito A. The Effects of Parent,
853 Sibling and Peer Substance Use on Adolescent Drinking Behaviors. *J Child Fam Stud.* 2019
854 Jan 1;28(1):73–83.
- 855 46. Scholte RHJ, Poelen EAP, Willemsen G, Boomsma DI, Engels RCME. Relative risks of
856 adolescent and young adult alcohol use: The role of drinking fathers, mothers, siblings, and
857 friends. *Addict Behav.* 2008 Jan 1;33(1):1–14.
- 858 47. Scalici F, Schulz PJ. Parents' and peers' normative influence on adolescents' smoking:
859 results from a Swiss-Italian sample of middle schools students. *Subst Abuse Treat Prev*
860 *Policy.* 2017 Dec;12(1):5.
- 861 48. Poelen EAP, Engels RCME, Scholte RHJ, Boomsma DI, Willemsen G. Predictors of
862 problem drinking in adolescence and young adulthood: A longitudinal twin-family study. *Eur*
863 *Child Adolesc Psychiatry.* 2009 Jun;18(6):345–52.
- 864 49. Engels RCME, Knibbe RA, Vries HD, Drop MJ, Van Breukelen GJP. Influences of Parental
865 and Best Friends' Smoking and Drinking on Adolescent Use: A Longitudinal Study ¹. *J Appl*
866 *Soc Psychol.* 1999 Feb;29(2):337–61.
- 867 50. Laursen B, Coy KC, Collins WA. Reconsidering Changes in Parent-Child Conflict across
868 Adolescence: A Meta-Analysis. *Child Dev.* 1998 Jun;69(3):817–32.
- 869 51. Sherman SM, Smith LE, Sim J, Amlôt R, Cutts M, Dasch H, et al. COVID-19 vaccination
870 intention in the UK: results from the COVID-19 vaccination acceptability study (CoVAccs), a
871 nationally representative cross-sectional survey. *Hum Vaccines Immunother.* 2021 Jun
872 3;17(6):1612–21.
- 873 52. Graupensperger S, Abdallah DA, Lee CM. Social norms and vaccine uptake: College
874 students' COVID vaccination intentions, attitudes, and estimated peer norms and
875 comparisons with influenza vaccine. *Vaccine.* 2021 Apr 8;39(15):2060–7.
- 876 53. Jaffe AE, Graupensperger S, Blayney JA, Duckworth JC, Stappenbeck CA. The role of
877 perceived social norms in college student vaccine hesitancy: Implications for COVID-19
878 prevention strategies. *Vaccine.* 2022 Mar 15;40(12):1888–95.


- 879 54. Kecojevic A, Basch CH, Sullivan M, Chen YT, Davi NK. COVID-19 Vaccination and
880 Intention to Vaccinate Among a Sample of College Students in New Jersey. *J Community*
881 *Health*. 2021 Dec 1;46(6):1059–68.
- 882 55. Ugarte DA, Lin J, Qian T, Young SD. An online community peer support intervention to
883 promote COVID-19 vaccine information among essential workers: a randomized trial. *Ann*
884 *Med*. 2022 Dec 31;54(1):3078–83.
- 885 56. Rogers AA, Cook RE, Button JA. Parent and Peer Norms are Unique Correlates of COVID-
886 19 Vaccine Intentions in a Diverse Sample of U.S. Adolescents. *J Adolesc Health*. 2021 Dec
887 1;69(6):910–6.
- 888 57. Aksoy O. Within-family influences on compliance with social-distancing measures during
889 COVID-19 lockdowns in the United Kingdom. *Nat Hum Behav*. 2022 Dec 1;6(12):1660–8.
- 890 58. Dormann CF, Elith J, Bacher S, Buchmann C, Carl G, Carré G, et al. Collinearity: a review
891 of methods to deal with it and a simulation study evaluating their performance. *Ecography*.
892 2013 Jan 1;36(1):27–46.
- 893 59. Robertson E, Reeve KS, Niedzwiedz CL, Moore J, Blake M, Green M, et al. Predictors of
894 COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in the UK household longitudinal study. *Brain Behav Immun*.
895 2021 May;94:41–50.
- 896 60. Baron RA, Byrne D, Watson G. *Exploring Social Psychology*. Prentice Hall PTR; 1997. 472
897 p.
- 898 61. Guo X, He S, Du Z, Bi T, Luo L. Gender Differences in the Intergenerational Transmission
899 Process of Educational Aspirations in Late Childhood. *Sex Roles*. 2021 Jul 1;85(1):100–12.
- 900 62. Acock AC, Bengtson VL. On the Relative Influence of Mothers and Fathers: A Covariance
901 Analysis of Political and Religious Socialization. *J Marriage Fam*. 1978;40(3):519–30.
- 902 63. Engels RCME, Knibbe RA, Drop MJ. Visiting Public Drinking Places: An Explorative Study
903 into the Functions of Pub-Going for Late Adolescents. *Subst Use Misuse*. 1999 Jan
904 1;34(9):1261–80.
- 905 64. Buhi ER, Daley EM, Fuhrmann HJ, Smith SA. An observational study of how young people
906 search for online sexual health information. *J Am Coll Health J ACH*. 2009;58(2):101–11.
- 907 65. Cavalli-Sforza LL, Feldman MW. Cultural transmission and evolution: a quantitative
908 approach. *Monogr Popul Biol*. 1981;16:1–388.
- 909 66. Bolsen T, Palm R. Politicization and COVID-19 vaccine resistance in the U.S. *Prog Mol Biol*
910 *Transl Sci*. 2022;188(1):81–100.
- 911 67. Albrecht D. Vaccination, politics and COVID-19 impacts. *BMC Public Health*. 2022 Jan
912 14;22(1):96.
- 913 68. Chu J, Pink SL, Willer R. Religious identity cues increase vaccination intentions and trust in
914 medical experts among American Christians. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2021 Dec
915 7;118(49):e2106481118.

Heritability of Attitude towards COVID-19 Vaccine



Z-scores obtained with Monte Carlo analysis with N=10K randomisations

Heritability of COVID-19 Vaccination Status





Z-scores obtained with Monte Carlo analysis with N=10K randomisations


Figure

Students' Mean COVID-19 Vaccination Attitude (Reversed)


medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.06.24303875>; this version posted March 7, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



Figure




Figure



Figure

Students' Mean COVID-19 Vaccination Attitude (Reversed)

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.06.24303875>; this version posted March 7, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



Figure