

# 1 Associations between social network characteristics 2 and COVID-19 vaccination intention – the SaNAE 3 study

4  
5 Lisanne CJ Steijvers <sup>a,b\*\*</sup>, Céline JA van Bilsen <sup>c,d^</sup>, Stephanie Brinkhues <sup>b</sup>, Sarah E Stutterheim <sup>a</sup>, Rik  
6 Crutzen <sup>a</sup>, Robert AC Ruiter <sup>e</sup>, Christian JPA Hoebe <sup>c,d,f</sup>, Nicole HTM Dukers-Muijrs <sup>a,c</sup>

- 7  
8 1. Department of Health Promotion, Care and Public Health Research Institute (CAPHRI),  
9 Maastricht University, P. Debyeplein 1, 6229 HA Maastricht, the Netherlands  
10 2. Department of Knowledge and Innovation, Living Lab Public Health MOSA, South Limburg  
11 Public Health Service, Het Overloon 2, 6411 TE Heerlen, the Netherlands  
12 3. Department of Sexual Health, Infectious Diseases, and Environmental Health, Living Lab  
13 Public Health MOSA, South Limburg Public Health Service, Het Overloon 2, 6411 TE Heerlen,  
14 the Netherlands  
15 4. Department of Social Medicine, Care and Public Health Research Institute (CAPHRI),  
16 Maastricht University, Duboisdomein 30, 6229 GT Maastricht, the Netherlands  
17 5. Department of Work and Social Psychology, Faculty of Psychology and Neuroscience,  
18 Maastricht University, Universiteitssingel 40, 6229 ER Maastricht, the Netherlands  
19 6. Department of Medical Microbiology, Care and Public Health Research Institute (CAPHRI),  
20 Maastricht University Medical Centre (MUMC+), P. Debyelaan 25, 6229 HX Maastricht  
21 Maastricht, the Netherlands

22  
23 \* Corresponding author:

24 Lisanne CJ Steijvers, [lisanne.steijvers@ggdzl.nl](mailto:lisanne.steijvers@ggdzl.nl)

25  
26 ^ Lisanne CJ Steijvers and Céline JA van Bilsen contributed equally  
27  
28

## 29 **ABSTRACT**

### 30 **Background:**

31 Social networks, our social relationships, play a role in the spread of infectious diseases but also in  
32 infection prevention behaviors such as vaccination. Here, we aimed to assess which individual,  
33 interpersonal (social network characteristics), community and societal factors are associated with  
34 COVID-19 vaccination intention during the second wave of the COVID-19 pandemic.

### 36 **Methods:**

37 The cross-sectional study utilized online questionnaire data collected between August and  
38 November 2020 in community-dwelling adults aged 40 years and older. COVID-19 vaccination  
39 intention was measured by assessing whether respondents were willing to receive a COVID-19  
40 vaccination if the vaccines became available. At the time of data collection, vaccines were still in  
41 development. Associations between individual (sociodemographic variables, health, health  
42 concerns), interpersonal (social network characteristics including structure, function, and quality),  
43 community (social and labor participation) and societal factors (degree of urbanization), and the  
44 outcome variables COVID-19 vaccination intention (yes vs no, yes vs unsure, unsure vs no) were  
45 assessed in stepwise multivariable regression analyses.

### 47 **Results:**

48 Of all participants (N=3,396), 59% reported a positive intention to vaccinate against COVID-19, 35%  
49 were unsure, and 6% had no intention. Men, individuals of older age, those with a college or university  
50 degree, and those concerned about their personal and family health were more likely to have the  
51 intention to vaccinate. Interpersonal factors associated included having a larger network size (social  
52 network structure) and a larger proportion of informational and emotional supporters (social  
53 network function). Living outside of urban areas, a societal factor was also associated with the  
54 intention to vaccinate.

### 56 **Conclusion:**

57 In this study, we determined key characteristics of COVID-19 vaccination intention. Health  
58 promotion and vaccination communication strategies should focus not only on individual factors but  
59 also incorporate the social environment. Our findings highlight the importance of organizing social  
60 networks to mobilize social support for pandemic preparedness.

### 62 **Keywords**

63 Social networks; social relationships; social support; vaccination intention; COVID-19; pandemic  
64 preparedness; public health; health promotion.

## 65 INTRODUCTION

66 Infection prevention measures, such as washing hands frequently, wearing facemasks, or social  
67 distancing, as applied during the COVID-19 pandemic, are crucial to containing the spread of the  
68 virus.[1] Immunization is another effective public health strategy. Vaccines prevent and control  
69 infectious disease outbreaks [[2-4]. After sequencing the SARS-CoV-2 genome, rapid vaccine  
70 development started in early 2020, leading to approved vaccines by the end of the year.[5] However,  
71 vaccine effectiveness depends on uptake and individuals' willingness to be vaccinated. This behavior  
72 is influenced by individual and social environmental factors, including interpersonal, community, and  
73 societal factors, as outlined in the socio-ecological framework. [6-9]. Key individual factors affecting  
74 COVID-19 vaccination behavior include gender, age, concerns about long-term effects, and risk  
75 perception defined by perceived susceptibility and perceived severity of disease [10,11].  
76

77 The social environment includes communities and social networks, our social relationships. Social  
78 network members may influence each other's vaccination intentions and behaviors. A study in the  
79 United States demonstrated that individuals with family members and friends who did not support  
80 COVID-19 vaccinations were also less likely to be vaccinated against COVID-19.[12] Moreover,  
81 people who had no intention to vaccinate against COVID-19 were also less likely to be surrounded  
82 by network members who were performing or supporting preventive measures.[13] Social support  
83 from network members is important in stimulating vaccination intention and uptake. Perceived  
84 social support from others is associated with a higher intention to vaccinate against COVID-19.[14]  
85 Previous studies have shown that social support was also positively associated with the uptake of  
86 other vaccinations such as influenza or pneumococcal vaccines [15,16].  
87

88 Most studies examining factors associated with COVID-19 vaccination intention have  
89 focused on either individual factors or (social) environmental factors such as social support or trust  
90 in governmental institutions [13,17-21]. However, social environmental factors, including social  
91 networks, encompass more than merely social support. Social networks can be described based on  
92 their structure, function, and quality [17-19]. Structural social network characteristics include  
93 network size, i.e., the number of social relationships, and network diversity, which pertains to the  
94 variety of relationships (e.g., family, friends, neighbors, and colleagues). Network density indicates  
95 the interconnectedness between different types of relationships. Other structural aspects involve  
96 homogeneity of the network members in terms of age and gender, geographical proximity, and  
97 mode or frequency of contact. Functional social network characteristics encompass various forms  
98 of social support, including informational (advice), emotional (discussing important topics), or  
99 practical (help with jobs in or around the house) support.[17,19] Additionally, social strain, i.e.,  
100 relationships perceived as burdensome, demanding, or involving criticism, along with the varying  
101 strengths of relationships (from strong to strained) can serve as proxies for assessing the quality of  
102 social networks.[19,20]  
103

104 To the best of our knowledge, there is limited insight into the associations between COVID-19  
105 vaccination intention and social environment factors including social network structure, function,  
106 and quality. In this study, we aimed to assess which social environmental (interpersonal, community,  
107 and societal) factors are associated with COVID-19 vaccination intention in independently living  
108 adults aged 40 years and older, in combination with individual factors. Gaining insight into the  
109 factors associated with vaccination intention helps better prepare for and respond to pandemics. It

110 also highlights the importance of including the social environment in infection prevention strategies  
111 for pandemic preparedness.  
112  
113

## 114 METHODS

115

### 116 Study design and population

117 The research proposal of the current study was pre-registered [21] and relevant supportive materials  
118 are open access available. This cross-sectional study used data from the Dutch SaNAE cohort  
119 ([www.sanae-study.nl](http://www.sanae-study.nl)) and was reported according to the STROBE guidelines.[22] The SaNAE cohort  
120 includes community-dwelling adults aged 40 years and older living in Limburg, the Netherlands.  
121 Between August and November 2020, 5,001 people were invited to complete an online  
122 questionnaire, 3,505 (67%) of whom completed the questionnaire. Respondents were slightly older  
123 (mean difference 2.2 years,  $p < .001$ ), and more likely to have obtained a college or university degree  
124 ( $\chi^2 = 25,117$ ;  $df=2$ ;  $p < .001$ ), but did not differ from non-responders in gender ( $\chi^2 = 0,726$ ;  $df=1$ ;  $p = .394$ )  
125 or network size (mean difference  $-0.4$ ,  $p = .112$ ). In total, complete data were available for 3,396  
126 participants.

127

### 128 Measurements

#### 129 COVID-19 vaccination intention


130 During data collection between August and November 2020, COVID-19 vaccines were not yet  
131 available, as they were still being developed, and approval from the European Medicines Agency  
132 (EMA) was pending.[23] Hence, intention was measured by asking participants if they were planning  
133 on getting the COVID-19 vaccine if it became available. Answer categories were yes, I don't know  
134 (yet), and no.

135

#### 136 Individual factors

137 Individual factors included were sociodemographic characteristics, health, and health concerns  
138 (Figure 1).

139



140

141 **Figure 1.** Overview of determinants of COVID-19 vaccination intention in the socio-ecological  
142 framework

143

144 *Sociodemographic characteristics*

145 Sociodemographic variables included gender (men/women/other) and age. Educational attainment  
146 was categorized into three levels: less than vocational education (no education, primary education  
147 (not completed), and lower vocational education), vocational education (intermediate vocational and  
148 higher secondary education), and college or university degree (higher professional and university  
149 education).[24]

150

151 *Health*

152 Health was determined by participants reporting any chronic conditions such as cardiovascular  
153 diseases, type 2 diabetes mellitus, or asthma/COPD. Body Mass Index (BMI) was calculated by  
154 dividing weight by height squared. Suspected SARS-CoV-2 infection was assessed by asking if they  
155 (think they) had been infected with the coronavirus. Answer categories were yes, maybe, and no.

156

157 *Health concerns*

158 Several health concerns during the COVID-19 pandemic were assessed. Concerns about one's  
159 personal or family's health were assessed on a five-point Likert scale with answer categories being  
160 very unconcerned, unconcerned, neither concerned nor unconcerned, concerned, or very concerned.  
161 Knowledge of how to protect oneself from the coronavirus was assessed using a five-point Likert  
162 scale with answer categories totally agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and totally disagree.

163

164 Interpersonal factors

165 Social networks were measured using a name-generator questionnaire.[25–27] A more detailed  
166 description of the name generator questionnaire with name interpreter items is available elsewhere.  
167 [28–30] Participants were asked to provide the names of up to fifteen family members, ten friends,  
168 ten acquaintances, five other persons, and five healthcare professionals (HCP) who are important to  
169 them or provide social support, up to a maximum of 45 network members. Social network size was  
170 then calculated by tallying all listed network members. Social network size was further categorized  
171 based on quartiles and used as an indicator for social isolation (category 0–4 network members).  
172 Additional information about the network members was collected using name interpreter items  
173 which were then used to describe social network structure, function, and quality, as described below  
174 (see also Supplementary Table 1).

175

176 *Social network structure*

177 Partner status was determined by a yes/no question. Relationship types were evaluated by  
178 calculating the proportion of each type (family, friends, acquaintances, others, HCP) in the total  
179 network. Network diversity was categorized based on the presence of combinations of different  
180 relationship types. Network density was measured by how well friends and family know each other,  
181 rated on a five-point scale. The homogeneity of social networks was assessed by the proportion of  
182 members of the same gender and age. Contact with children younger than five years of age was  
183 categorized by frequency (yes, daily or weekly; yes, monthly or less often; no), and living situation  
184 was determined by a single question, identifying those living alone. Geographical proximity was  
185 calculated by the proportion of network members living in the same house, within walking distance,  
186 less than thirty minutes away by car, more than thirty minutes away by car, or further away  
187 (Supplementary Table 1).[25–27]

188

189 *Social network function*

190 The proportion of network members who provided informational support was calculated by dividing  
191 the total number of network members providing informational support by the total network size.

192 The proportion of network members who provide emotional support was calculated by dividing the  
193 total number of network members providing emotional support by the total network size. Lastly,  
194 the proportion of network members who provide practical support was calculated similarly.[25–27]

195

196 *Social network quality*

197 The proportion of network members with whom there is social strain was calculated by dividing the  
198 sum of the number of network members who are demanding, straining, or criticizing by the total  
199 network size. The proportion of network members with whom the relationship is good was  
200 calculated by dividing the number of network members with whom the relationship is good by the  
201 total network size. [25–27]

202

203 Community factors

204 *Labor participation*

205 Labor participation was assessed by asking participants if they were employed, (e.g., contract  
206 workers, freelancers), unemployed (due to incapacity, students or homemakers), or retired.

207

208 *Social participation*

209 Participation in social activities was evaluated by asking participants to report club memberships.  
210 This included sports clubs (e.g., sports or walking clubs), cultural organizations (music, dance, theater,  
211 carnival organizations), volunteer work, and other memberships.

212

213 Societal factors

214 *Degree of urbanization*

215 The 4-digit postal codes were converted into the degree of urbanization based on address density:  
216 rural areas (<500 addresses per km<sup>2</sup>), hardly urbanized areas (500 to 1000 addresses per km<sup>2</sup>),  
217 moderately urbanized areas (1000–1500 addresses per km<sup>2</sup>), strongly or extremely urbanized areas  
218 (>1500 addresses per km<sup>2</sup>).[31,32]

219

220 **Statistical analyses**

221 Descriptive analyses were performed to describe the study population. Univariable logistic  
222 regression analyses were conducted with dummy variables of COVID-19 vaccination intention as the  
223 outcome variables (yes versus no, yes versus unsure, and unsure versus no), and all individual,  
224 interpersonal, community, and societal separately as independent categorical variables (except for  
225 age, BMI, network size, and proportions concerning network members, which were included as  
226 continuous variables). Correlations between variables were assessed and no multicollinearity was  
227 observed (all correlations < 0.7, VIF<10, and tolerance >0.1). All factors were then added stepwise  
228 per level in a multivariable logistic regression model using forward selection. Individual determinants  
229 were added in the first block, as these individual factors are most proximal to intention. Then,  
230 interpersonal, community, and societal factors were included to assess associations on all different  
231 levels. A *p*-value <.05 indicated statistical significance and all analyses were performed using IBM  
232 SPSS Statistics (version 27.0).

## 233 RESULTS

### 234 Study population

235 Among the participants, 55% were men and the mean age was 67 years. 59% of the participants  
 236 reported intention to vaccinate against COVID-19, 35% were unsure, and 6% had no intention to  
 237 vaccinate against COVID-19 (Table 1).

238

239 **Table 1.** Characteristics of the SaNAE study population in 2020 (n=3,396)

	COVID-19 vaccination intention			
	Yes	Unsure	No	
	59% (2001/3396)	35% (1175/3396)	6% (220/3396)	
<b>Individual factors</b>				
<b>Background characteristics</b>				
Gender				<i>p</i> <.001
Men	63 (1259/2001)	46 (536/1175)	36 (79/220)	
Women	37 (742/2001)	54 (639/1175)	64 (141/220)	
Age	67.3 (9.4)	62.6 (9.6)	59.6 (9.1)	<i>p</i> <.001
Educational attainment				<i>p</i> <.001
Less than vocational training	26 (529/2001)	28 (323/1175)	29 (63/220)	
Vocational training	25 (504/2001)	35 (412/1175)	42 (93/220)	
College or university degree	48 (968/2001)	37 (440/1175)	29 (64/220)	
<b>Health</b>				
Chronic conditions <sup>a</sup>	32 (643/2001)	25 (290/1175)	25 (54/220)	<i>p</i> <.001
BMI	26.6 (4.4)	27.0 (4.9)	26.9 (4.5)	<i>p</i> =.101
(suspected) COVID-19 infection				<i>p</i> =.002
Yes/maybe	18 (359/2001)	22 (263/1175)	25 (54/220)	
No	82 (1642/2001)	78 (166/1175)	75 (166/220)	
<b>Health concerns</b>				
Concerns about personal health				<i>p</i> <.001
(very) Concerned	26 (515/2001)	18 (210/1175)	11 (25/220)	
Neutral	36 (713/2001)	40 (465/1175)	30 (66/220)	
(very) Concerned	39 (773/2001)	43 (500/1175)	59 (129/220)	
Concerns about family health				<i>p</i> <.001
(very) Concerned	41 (804/2001)	35 (402/1175)	27 (60/220)	
Neutral	36 (712/2001)	39 (457/1175)	32 (70/220)	
(very) Unconcerned	24 (485/2001)	27 (316/1175)	41 (90/220)	
Knowledge of how to protect oneself from the COVID-19 virus				<i>p</i> <.001
(totally) Agree	87 (1731/2001)	77 (909/1175)	76 (167/220)	
Neutral	11 (223/2001)	20 (238/1175)	21 (47/220)	
(totally) Disagree	2 (47/2001)	3 (28/1175)	3 (6/220)	
<b>Interpersonal factors</b>				
<b>Social network structure</b>				
Network size (including health care professionals)	10.3 (7.3)	10.5 (7.3)	9.7 (7.0)	<i>p</i> =.339
0-4 network members	25 (507/2001)	25 (290/1175)	26 (58/220)	<i>p</i> =.387
5-8 network members	26 (514/2001)	24 (276/1175)	29 (64/220)	
9-12 network members	20 (402/2001)	22 (253/1175)	16 (36/220)	
≥13 network members	29 (578/2001)	30 (356/1175)	28 (62/220)	



Partner				<i>p</i> =.079
Yes	80 (1604/2001)	78 (921/1175)	74 (163/220)	
No	20 (397/2001)	22 (254/1175)	26 (57/220)	
Type of relationships (proportion of network members:)				
Family members	51.1 (24.9)	51.2 (25.1)	51.9 (27.0)	<i>p</i> =.907
Friends	24.0 (18.2)	24.9 (18.3)	26.2 (21.3)	<i>p</i> =.167
Acquaintances	16.0 (15.5)	16.1 (15.3)	14.4 (14.6)	<i>p</i> =.294
Extra members	4.8 (11.5)	4.6 (10.4)	4.7 (10.5)	<i>p</i> =.853
Health care professionals	4.2 (9.4)	3.3 (8.5)	2.9 (7.9)	<i>p</i> =.011
Network diversity				
No family, but friends, acquaintances, others, or HCP	2 (38/2001)	2 (19/1175)	3 (6/220)	
Only family, no friends/acquaintances/others/HCP	12 (241/2001)	13 (147/1175)	15 (33/220)	
Family and friends, no acquaintances/others/HCP	14 (270/2001)	15 (178/1175)	16 (35/220)	
Family and friends and acquaintances/others/HCP	62 (1230/2001)	62 (730/1175)	58 (127/220)	
Family and acquaintances/others/HCP, no friends	11 (222/2001)	9 (101/1175)	9 (19/220)	
Network density (my friends know my family)				
Yes	75 (1507/2001)	75 (880/1175)	74 (162/220)	
No	25 (494/2001)	25 (295/1175)	26 (58/220)	
Proportion of network members of the same gender	52.1 (22.6)	55.8 (23.9)	55.2 (22.7)	<i>p</i> <.001
Proportion of network members of the same age	39.4 (23.9)	39.9 (23.8)	38.4 (24.1)	<i>p</i> =.674
Contact with children <5 years of age				
Yes, daily or weekly	20 (405/2001)	22 (261/1175)	27 (59/220)	
Yes, monthly or less often	20 (392/2001)	24 (279/1175)	18 (40/220)	
No	60 (1204/2001)	54 (635/1175)	55 (121/220)	
Living alone	21 (413/2001)	21 (241/1175)	25 (56/220)	<i>p</i> =.229
Geographical proximity (proportion of network members who live:)				
In the same house	15.8 (20.7)	16.3 (21.2)	18.6 (24.1)	<i>p</i> =.173
Within walking distance	29.0 (25.5)	27.5 (24.4)	28.1 (26.1)	<i>p</i> =.267
Less than 30 minutes away	35.7 (27.0)	38.4 (26.4)	38.7 (28.5)	<i>p</i> =.014
More than 30 minutes away	10.2 (16.3)	9.8 (15.9)	8.3 (14.1)	<i>p</i> =.234
Further away	9.1 (16.1)	7.8 (14.8)	6.0 (14.6)	<i>p</i> =.005
<b>Social network function</b>				
Proportion of network members who provide informational support	49.3 (33.4)	50.6 (33.5)	46.9 (34.2)	<i>p</i> =.279
Proportion of network members who provide emotional support	63.4 (31.2)	61.4 (31.4)	62.8 (31.6)	<i>p</i> =.195
Proportion of network members who provide practical support	22.3 (24.9)	21.5 (23.9)	21.5 (23.0)	<i>p</i> =.669
<b>Social network quality</b>				
Proportion of network members with whom the relationship is demanding, straining, or criticizing (social strain)	9.9 (18.5)	11.3 (19.5)	9.8 (15.7)	<i>p</i> =.102
Proportion of network members with whom there is a good relationship:	94.9 (23.0)	93.2 (17.6)	92.7 (14.0)	<i>p</i> =.038
<b>Community factors</b>				
Labor participation				
Employed	26 (515/2001)	42 (498/1175)	53 (117/220)	<i>p</i> <.001
Retired	52 (1034/2001)	34 (398/1175)	21 (47/220)	

Unemployed	23 (452/2001)	24 (279/1175)	26 (56/220)	
Social participation (club membership)				
Sports club membership	33 (625/2001)	31 (369/1175)	28 (61/220)	$p=.313$
Music organization membership	15 (306/2001)	12 (139/1175)	12 (27/220)	$p=.019$
Volunteer work	16 (323/2001)	13 (154/1175)	10 (22/220)	$p=.008$
Other (religious groups, talking groups, etc.)	25 (509/2001)	22 (259/1175)	21 (45/220)	$p=.044$
<b>Societal factors</b>				
Degree of urbanization				$p<.001$
Rural areas	28 (554/2001)	28 (334/1175)	19 (42/220)	
Hardly urbanized areas	25 (493/2001)	23 (270/1175)	21 (47/220)	
Moderately urbanized areas	19 (372/2001)	17 (204/1175)	26 (57/220)	
(Extremely) strongly urbanized areas	29 (582/2001)	31 (367/1175)	34 (74/220)	

240 Numbers are presented in % (n/N) or mean (sd)

241 <sup>a</sup> chronic conditions include self-reported cardiovascular diseases, type 2 diabetes mellitus, asthma, and COPD.

242 #  $p<.100$ , \*  $p<.05$ , \*\*  $p<.01$ , \*\*\*  $p<.001$

243

244 Among participants with the intention to vaccinate against COVID-19, 26% were concerned about  
 245 personal health, 41% were concerned about family health, and 87% indicated knowing what to do  
 246 to protect themselves. Among participants who were unsure or had no intention to get vaccinated,  
 247 77% and 76% respectively, indicated knowing what to do to protect themselves.

248

## 249 Overall social network characteristics

250 On average, participants, regardless of intention to vaccinate, had ten network members. Of these,  
 251 slightly more than half were family members, a quarter were friends, and the remainder were  
 252 acquaintances, neighbors, colleagues, informal healthcare professionals, or others (Table 1).  
 253 Participants reported receiving informational support (information or advice) from half of their  
 254 network members and emotional support (discussing important topics or health status) from just  
 255 over 60% of their network members.

256

## 257 Determinants of COVID-19 vaccination intention

### 258 COVID-19 vaccination intention: yes versus no

259 Individual factors associated with COVID-19 vaccination intention versus no intention were gender  
 260 (men), older age, having obtained a college or university degree, having chronic conditions, having  
 261 no previous (suspected) COVID-19 infection, having concerns about one's personal and family  
 262 health, and knowledge of how to protect oneself from the virus (Table 2). Interpersonal factors  
 263 associated with COVID-19 vaccination intention were having a partner and having a larger  
 264 proportion of network members who live far away. Community factors associated with COVID-19  
 265 intention were being unemployed or retired (versus employed) and doing volunteer work. Living in  
 266 rural areas was a societal factor associated with COVID-19 intention (Table 2).

267

268 **Table 2.** Univariable logistic regression analyses of individual, interpersonal, community, and societal  
 269 factors and COVID-19 vaccination intention

	COVID-19 vaccination intention		
	Yes versus no	Yes versus unsure	Unsure versus no
	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)
<b>Individual factors</b>			

<b>Background characteristics</b>			
Gender			
Men	<b>3.03 (2.27-4.05)***</b>	<b>2.02 (1.75-2.34)***</b>	<b>1.50 (1.11-2.02)**</b>
Women	Ref	Ref	Ref
Age			
	<b>1.08 (1.07-1.10)***</b>	<b>1.05 (1.04-1.06)***</b>	<b>1.03 (1.02-1.05)***</b>
Educational attainment			
Less than vocational training	Ref	Ref	Ref
Vocational training	<b>0.65 (0.46-0.91)*</b>	<b>0.75 (0.62-0.90)**</b>	0.86 (0.61-1.23)
College or university degree	<b>1.80 (1.25-2.59)**</b>	<b>1.34 (1.12-1.61)**</b>	1.34 (0.92-1.95)
<b>Health</b>			
Chronic conditions <sup>a</sup>	<b>1.46 (1.06-2.01)*</b>	<b>1.45 (1.23-1.70)***</b>	1.01 (0.72-1.41)
BMI	0.99 (0.96-1.02)	<b>0.98 (0.97-1.00)*</b>	1.00 (0.97-1.04)
(suspected) COVID-19 infection			
Yes/maybe	Ref	Ref	Ref
No	<b>1.49 (1.07-2.07)*</b>	<b>1.32 (1.10-1.58)**</b>	1.13 (0.81-1.58)
<b>Health concerns</b>			
Concerns about personal health			
(very) Concerned	<b>3.44 (2.21-5.35)***</b>	<b>1.59 (1.30-1.93)***</b>	<b>2.17 (1.37-3.43)***</b>
Neutral	<b>1.80 (1.32-2.47)***</b>	0.99 (0.84-1.17)	<b>1.82 (1.32-2.51)***</b>
(very) Unconcerned	Ref	Ref	Ref
Concerns about family health			
(very) Concerned	<b>2.49 (1.76-3.51)***</b>	<b>1.30 (1.08-1.57)**</b>	<b>1.91 (1.33-2.73)***</b>
Neutral	<b>1.89 (1.35-2.63)***</b>	1.02 (0.84-1.22)	<b>1.86 (1.32-2.62)***</b>
(very) Unconcerned	Ref	Ref	Ref
Knowledge of how to protect oneself from the COVID-19 virus			
(totally) Agree	<b>2.19 (1.54-3.11)***</b>	<b>2.03 (1.67-2.48)***</b>	1.08 (0.76-1.53)
Neutral	Ref	Ref	Ref
(totally) Disagree	1.65 (0.67-4.09)	<b>1.79 (1.08-2.96)*</b>	0.92 (0.36-2.35)
<b>Interpersonal factors <sup>b</sup></b>			
<b>Social network structure</b>			
Network size (including health care professionals)			
	1.01 (0.99-1.03)	1.00 (0.99-1.01)	1.02 (1.00-1.04)
Partner			
Yes	<b>1.41 (1.03-1.95)*</b>	1.11 (0.93-1.33)	1.27 (0.91-1.77)
No	Ref	Ref	Ref
Type of relationships (proportion of network members:)			
Family members	1.00 (0.56-1.79)	0.95 (0.69-1.29)	1.07 (0.58-1.96)
Friends	0.50 (0.24-1.02) <sup>#</sup>	0.79 (0.53-1.19)	0.63 (0.30-1.33)
Acquaintances	1.75 (0.66-4.67)	0.97 (0.59-1.58)	1.80 (0.64-5.10)
Extra members	1.02 (0.30-3.42)	1.24 (0.64-2.40)	0.77 (0.20-2.97)
Health care professionals	5.84 (0.96-35.47) <sup>#</sup>	<b>2.98 (1.29-6.87)*</b>	1.86 (0.31-11.19)
Network diversity			
No family, but friends, acquaintances, others, or HCP	0.87 (0.34-2.21)	1.22 (0.68-2.20)	0.71 (0.26-1.92)
Only family, no friends/acquaintances/others/HCP	Ref	Ref	Ref
Family and friends, no acquaintances/others/HCP	1.06 (0.64-1.75)	0.93 (0.70-1.22)	1.14 (0.68-1.93)
Family and friends and acquaintances/others/HCP	1.33 (0.88-1.99)	1.03 (0.82-1.29)	1.29 (0.85-1.97)
Family and acquaintances/others/HCP, no friends	1.60 (0.88-2.90)	1.34 (0.98-1.83) <sup>#</sup>	1.19 (0.64-2.22)
Network density (my friends know my family)			
Yes	1.09 (0.80-1.50)	1.02 (0.87-1.21)	1.07 (0.77-1.48)

No	Ref	Ref	Ref
Proportion of network members with different gender	1.88 (0.99-3.57) <sup>#</sup>	<b>2.02 (1.47-2.77)***</b>	0.90 (0.49-1.66)
Proportion of network members of the same age	1.19 (0.67-2.12)	0.92 (0.68-1.25)	1.27 (0.70-2.30)
Contact with children <5 years of age			
Yes, daily or weekly	Ref	Ref	Ref
Yes, monthly or less often	1.43 (0.93-2.18)	0.91 (0.73-1.13)	1.19 (0.84-1.67)
No	<b>1.45 (1.04-2.02)*</b>	<b>1.22 (1.02-1.47)*</b>	<b>1.58 (1.02-2.44)*</b>
Living alone	0.76 (0.55-1.05) <sup>#</sup>	1.01 (0.84-1.21)	0.76 (0.54-1.06)
Geographical proximity (proportion of network members who live:)			
In the same house	0.61 (0.31-1.19)	0.83 (0.57-1.20)	0.74 (0.37-1.46)
Within walking distance	1.11 (0.64-1.92)	1.28 (0.96-1.72) <sup>#</sup>	0.88 (0.49-1.56)
Less than 30 minutes away	0.65 (0.39-1.07)	<b>0.69 (0.53-0.91)**</b>	0.89 (0.52-1.53)
More than 30 minutes away	2.10 (0.81-5.48)	1.18 (0.75-1.86)	1.81 (0.67-4.87)
Further away	<b>3.86 (1.33-11.21)*</b>	<b>1.74 (1.09-2.79)*</b>	2.18 (0.75-6.40)
<b>Social network function</b>			
Proportion of network members who provide informational support	1.28 (0.84-1.94)	0.89 (0.72-1.10)	1.42 (0.93-2.18)
Proportion of network members who provide emotional support	1.09 (0.70-1.70)	1.23 (0.98-1.55) <sup>#</sup>	0.89 (0.56-1.40)
Proportion of network members who provide practical support	1.24 (0.69-2.22)	1.12 (0.82-1.51)	1.12 (0.61-2.09)
<b>Social network quality</b>			
Proportion of network members with whom the relationship is demanding, straining, or criticizing (social strain)	0.98 (0.45-2.10)	<b>1.47 (1.01-2.14)*</b>	0.64 (0.28-1.45)
Proportion of network members with whom there is a good relationship:	2.25 (0.95-5.33) <sup>#</sup>	<b>1.76 (1.11-2.78)*</b>	1.14 (0.50-2.62)
<b>Community factors</b>			
Labor participation			
Employed	Ref	Ref	Ref
Retired	<b>5.00 (3.51-7.13)***</b>	<b>2.51 (2.12-2.98)***</b>	<b>1.99 (1.38-2.86)***</b>
Unemployed	<b>1.83 (1.30-2.58)***</b>	<b>1.57 (1.29-1.90)***</b>	1.17 (0.82-1.66)
Social participation (club membership)			
Sports club membership	1.26 (0.92-1.72)	1.06 (0.90-1.23)	1.19 (0.87-1.64)
Music organization membership	1.29 (0.85-1.97)	<b>1.35 (1.09-1.67)**</b>	0.96 (0.62-1.49)
Volunteer work	<b>1.73 (1.10-2.73)*</b>	<b>1.28 (1.04-1.57)*</b>	1.36 (0.85-2.18)
Other (religious groups, talking groups, etc.)	1.33 (0.94-1.87)	<b>1.21 (1.02-1.43)*</b>	1.10 (0.77-1.57)
<b>Societal factors</b>			
Degree of urbanization			
Rural areas	<b>1.68 (1.13-2.49)*</b>	1.05 (0.87-1.26)	<b>1.60 (1.07-2.41)*</b>
Hardly urbanized areas	1.33 (0.91-1.96)	1.15 (0.95-1.40)	1.16 (0.78-1.72)
Moderately urbanized areas	0.83 (0.57-1.20)	1.15 (0.93-1.43)	0.72 (0.49-1.06) <sup>#</sup>
(Extremely) strongly urbanized areas	Ref	Ref	Ref

270 <sup>a</sup> chronic conditions include self-reported cardiovascular diseases, type 2 diabetes mellitus, asthma, and COPD.

271 <sup>b</sup> all proportion variables are adjusted for network size

272 OR (95% CI) = Odds Ratio (95% Confidence Interval)

273 <sup>#</sup>  $p < .100$ , \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$

274

275 COVID-19 vaccination intention: yes versus unsure

276 Individual factors associated with COVID-19 vaccination intention versus being unsure were gender  
277 (men), older age, having obtained a college or university degree, having chronic conditions, having  
278 no previous (suspected) COVID-19 infection, being concerned about personal and family health and  
279 knowledge of how to protect oneself from the virus (Table 2). A higher BMI was inversely associated  
280 with COVID-19 vaccination intention. Interpersonal factors associated were having a larger  
281 proportion of network members who were healthcare professionals, a larger proportion of network  
282 members of a different gender, no contact with children younger than five years of age, a larger  
283 proportion of network members living further away, a larger proportion of network members with  
284 whom there is no social strain, and a larger proportion with whom the relationship is good.  
285 Community factors associated with COVID-19 intention were being retired or unemployed (versus  
286 employment), having a music organization membership, doing volunteer work, or having other club  
287 memberships.  
288

289 COVID-19 vaccination intention: unsure vs no

290 Individual factors associated with being unsure about getting a COVID-19 vaccination versus no  
291 intention were gender (men), older age, and having concerns about one's personal and family health  
292 (Table 2). Not having contact with children younger than five years of age was an interpersonal  
293 factor associated with being unsure about getting a vaccination. A community factor associated  
294 with being unsure was being retired (versus employed). Living in rural areas was a societal factor  
295 associated with being unsure about getting a COVID-19 vaccination.  
296

297 Multivariable logistic regression models COVID-19 vaccination intention

298 After including all variables in the multivariable models, the individual factors gender, age, and  
299 concerns about family health remained significantly associated with COVID-19 vaccination intention  
300 compared to no intention (Table 3), intention compared to being unsure (Table 4), and being unsure  
301 compared to no intention (Table 5). Additionally, educational attainment, concerns about personal  
302 health, and knowledge of how to protect oneself from the virus remained associated with both  
303 intention versus no intention and intention versus being unsure. Interpersonal factors such as  
304 network size and proportion of informational supporters were associated with intention versus no  
305 intention, whereas the proportion of emotional supporters was associated with intention versus  
306 being unsure. Furthermore, club membership in a music organization, a community factor, was  
307 associated with intention versus being unsure. Lastly, at the societal level, living in rural areas was  
308 associated with intention or being unsure versus no intention.  
309

**Table 3.** Multivariable logistic regression analyses of individual, interpersonal, community, and societal factors and COVID-19 intention (yes versus no)

<b>Model A: COVID-19 vaccination intention – yes versus no (n=2,221)</b>				
	Block I	Block II	Block III	Block IV
	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)
<b>Individual factors</b>				
<b>Background characteristics</b>				
Gender				
Men	<b>2.36 (1.72-3.22)***</b>	<b>2.53 (1.83-3.50)***</b>	<b>2.53 (1.83-3.50)***</b>	<b>2.52 (1.82-3.49)***</b>
Women	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Age in years	<b>1.08 (1.06-1.10)***</b>	<b>1.09 (1.07-1.11)***</b>	<b>1.09 (1.07-1.11)***</b>	<b>1.09 (1.07-1.11)***</b>
Educational attainment				
Less than vocational training	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Vocational training	0.96 (0.65-1.40)	0.92 (0.63-1.36)	0.92 (0.63-1.36)	0.95 (0.64-1.39)
College or university degree	<b>2.38 (1.60-3.55)***</b>	<b>2.20 (1.46-3.31)***</b>	<b>2.20 (1.46-3.31)***</b>	<b>2.25 (1.49-3.39)***</b>
<b>Health concerns</b>				
Concerns about own health				
(very) concerned	<b>2.64 (1.52-4.57)***</b>	<b>2.81 (1.61-4.88)***</b>	<b>2.81 (1.61-4.88)***</b>	<b>2.78 (1.60-4.84)***</b>
neutral	1.52 (0.99-2.34)#	<b>1.59 (1.03-2.45)*</b>	<b>1.59 (1.03-2.45)*</b>	1.54 (1.00-2.39)#
(very) unconcerned	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Concerns about family's health				
(very) concerned	<b>2.02 (1.27-3.23)**</b>	<b>1.96 (1.22-3.13)**</b>	<b>1.96 (1.22-3.13)**</b>	<b>1.95 (1.22-3.12)**</b>
neutral	<b>1.60 (1.02-2.50)*</b>	1.55 (0.98-2.43) #	1.55 (0.98-2.43)#	1.55 (0.98-2.44) #
(very) unconcerned	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Knowledge of how to protect oneself from the COVID-19 virus				
(totally) agree	<b>2.88 (1.94-4.28)***</b>	<b>2.86 (1.92-4.27)***</b>	<b>2.86 (1.92-4.27)***</b>	<b>2.92 (1.95-4.38)***</b>
neutral	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
(totally) disagree	2.01 (0.72-5.63)	1.93 (0.69-5.41)	1.93 (0.69-5.41)	1.95 (0.69-5.53)
<b>Interpersonal factors</b>				
<b>Social network structure</b>				
Number of network members		<b>1.03 (1.01-1.06)*</b>	<b>1.03 (1.01-1.06)*</b>	<b>1.03 (1.00-1.05)*</b>
Partner		<b>1.50 (1.05-2.14)*</b>	<b>1.50 (1.05-2.14)*</b>	1.36 (0.95-1.96)#
<b>Social network function</b>				
Proportion of informational supporters		<b>1.78 (1.12-2.83)*</b>	<b>1.78 (1.12-2.83)*</b>	<b>1.81 (1.13-2.89)*</b>
<b>Community factors</b>				
No factors included				

**Societal factors**

Degree of urbanization	
Rural areas	<b>1.93 (1.25-2.99)**</b>
Hardly urbanized areas	1.52 (1.00-2.33)#
Moderately urbanized areas	0.97 (0.64-1.46)
(extremely) strongly urbanized areas	Ref

311 Block I: individual factors, Block II: individual + interpersonal factors, Block III: individual + interpersonal + community factors, Block IV: individual + interpersonal + community + societal factors

312 OR (95% CI) = Odds Ratio (95% Confidence Interval)

313 #  $p < .100$ , \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$

**Table 4.** Multivariable logistic regression analyses of individual, interpersonal, community, and societal factors and COVID-19 intention (yes versus unsure)

<b>Model B: COVID-19 vaccination intention – yes versus unsure (n=3,176)</b>				
	Block I	Block II	Block III	Block IV
	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)
<b>Individual factors</b>				
<b>Background characteristics</b>				
Gender				
Men	<b>1.75 (1.50-2.05)***</b>	<b>1.80 (1.53-2.11)***</b>	<b>1.79 (1.52-2.10)***</b>	<b>1.79 (1.52-2.10)***</b>
Female	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Age in years	<b>1.05 (1.04-1.06)***</b>	<b>1.05 (1.04-1.06)***</b>	<b>1.05 (1.04-1.06)***</b>	<b>1.05 (1.04-1.06)***</b>
Educational attainment				
Less than vocational training	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Vocational training	0.94 (0.77-1.16)	0.93 (0.75-1.14)	0.92 (0.75-1.14)	0.92 (0.75-1.14)
College or university degree	<b>1.55 (1.28-1.88)***</b>	<b>1.51 (1.24-1.84)***</b>	<b>1.50 (1.23-1.83)***</b>	<b>1.50 (1.23-1.83)***</b>
<b>Health concerns</b>				
Concerns about own health				
(very) concerned	<b>1.42 (1.10-1.83)**</b>	<b>1.41 (1.09-1.82)**</b>	<b>1.41 (1.09-1.82)**</b>	<b>1.41 (1.09-1.82)**</b>
neutral	0.99 (0.79-1.23)	0.99 (0.79-1.23)	0.98 (0.79-1.22)	0.98 (0.79-1.22)
(very) unconcerned	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Concerns about family's health				
(very) concerned	<b>1.43 (1.11-1.84)**</b>	<b>1.42 (1.11-1.83)*</b>	<b>1.42 (1.11-1.83)**</b>	<b>1.42 (1.11-1.83)**</b>
neutral	1.13 (0.89-1.45)	1.13 (0.89-1.44)	1.13 (0.89-1.45)	1.13 (0.89-1.45)
(very) unconcerned	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Knowledge of how to protect oneself from the COVID-19 virus				
(totally) agree	<b>2.40 (1.93-2.97)***</b>	<b>2.36 (1.90-2.92)***</b>	<b>2.37 (1.91-2.94)***</b>	<b>2.37 (1.91-2.94)***</b>
neutral	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
(totally) disagree	<b>1.73 (1.02-2.94)*</b>	1.66 (0.99-2.87)#	<b>1.72 (1.01-2.93)*</b>	<b>1.72 (1.01-2.93)*</b>
<b>Interpersonal factors</b>				
<b>Social network structure</b>				
Number of network members		1.01 (1.00-1.02)	1.01 (1.00-1.02)	1.01 (1.00-1.02)
Contact children <5 years of age				
No		1.10 (0.91-1.34)	1.11 (0.91-1.35)	1.11 (0.91-1.35)
Yes, daily or weekly		Ref	Ref	Ref
Yes, monthly or less often		0.85 (0.67-1.07)	0.86 (0.68-1.08)	0.86 (0.68-1.08)
<b>Social network function</b>				



Proportion of emotional supporters	<b>1.31 (1.02-1.67)*</b>	<b>1.31 (1.03-1.68)*</b>	<b>1.31 (1.03-1.68)*</b>
<b>Community factors</b>			
Social participation			
Club membership music organization		<b>1.27 (1.01-1.60)*</b>	<b>1.27 (1.01-1.60)*</b>
<b>Societal factors</b>			
No factors included			

315 Block I: individual factors, Block II: individual + interpersonal factors, Block III: individual + interpersonal + community factors, Block IV: individual + interpersonal + community + societal factors

316 OR (95% CI) = Odds Ratio (95% Confidence Interval)

317 #  $p < .100$ , \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$

318 **Table 5.** Multivariable logistic regression analyses of individual, interpersonal, community, and societal factors and COVID-19 intention (unsure vs no)

<b>Model C: COVID-19 vaccination intention – unsure versus no (n=1,395)</b>				
	Block I	Block II	Block III	Block IV
	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)
<b>Individual factors</b>				
<b>Background characteristics</b>				
Gender				
Men	<b>1.42 (1.04-1.93)*</b>	<b>1.52 (1.10-2.08)*</b>	<b>1.52 (1.10-2.08)*</b>	<b>1.58 (1.15-2.18)**</b>
Women	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Age in years	<b>1.04 (1.02-1.05)***</b>	<b>1.04 (1.02-1.05)***</b>	<b>1.04 (1.02-1.05)***</b>	<b>1.04 (1.02-1.05)***</b>
Educational attainment				
Less than vocational training	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
Vocational training	1.02 (0.71-1.48)	0.98 (0.68-1.42)	0.98 (0.68-1.42)	0.97 (0.67-1.41)
College or university degree	<b>1.65 (1.12-2.45)*</b>	<b>1.53 (1.02-2.28)*</b>	<b>1.53 (1.02-2.28)*</b>	1.47 (0.98-2.20)#
<b>Health concerns</b>				
Concerns about family's health				
(very) concerned	<b>2.26 (1.56-3.27)***</b>	<b>2.25 (1.55-3.25)***</b>	<b>2.25 (1.55-3.25)***</b>	<b>2.36 (1.62-3.43)***</b>
neutral	<b>1.97 (1.39-2.80)***</b>	<b>1.99 (1.40-2.82)***</b>	<b>1.99 (1.40-2.82)***</b>	<b>1.96 (1.38-2.80)***</b>
(very) unconcerned	Ref	Ref	Ref	Ref
<b>Interpersonal factors</b>				
<b>Social network structure</b>				
Number of network members		1.02 (1.00-1.04)#	1.02 (1.00-1.04)#	1.02 (1.00-1.04)
<b>Community factors</b>				
No factors included				
<b>Societal factors</b>				
Degree of urbanization				
Rural areas				<b>1.69 (1.11-2.57)*</b>
Hardly urbanized areas				1.17 (0.78-1.76)
Moderately urbanized areas				0.73 (0.49-1.08)
(extremely) strongly urbanized areas				Ref

319 Block I: individual factors, Block II: individual + interpersonal factors, Block III: individual + interpersonal + community factors, Block IV: individual + interpersonal + community + societal factors

320 OR (95% CI) = Odds Ratio (95% Confidence Interval)

321 #  $p < .100$ , \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$

322

## 323 DISCUSSION

324 In this study, we assessed associations between individual, interpersonal, community, and societal  
325 factors and COVID-19 vaccination intention among adults aged 40 years and older living  
326 independently in the Netherlands. Of all participants, 59% had the intention to get a COVID-19  
327 vaccination if it would become available, 35% were unsure, and 6% had no intention.

328  
329 Individual factors associated with COVID-19 vaccination intention (yes versus no) included  
330 sociodemographic characteristics such as gender, age, and educational attainment. Men, older  
331 individuals, and those who had obtained a college or university degree were more likely to have the  
332 intention to get a COVID-19 vaccination. Gender and age were also associated with having intention  
333 versus being unsure and being unsure versus no intention. Additionally, educational attainment was  
334 associated with having the intention versus being unsure. These findings align with previous studies  
335 that identified sociodemographic characteristics as significant predictors of COVID-19 vaccination  
336 intention.[33–35] However, there are some inconsistencies regarding age. Some studies indicated  
337 that younger individuals were more likely to express willingness to receive a COVID-19 vaccination,  
338 which is in contrast to our findings. The majority of the studies reported higher willingness among  
339 older individuals.[36,37] The higher levels of intention observed among men and older individuals  
340 may be explained by their increased risk of contracting the coronavirus, experiencing more severe  
341 infections, and facing higher mortality rates.[38–40]

342  
343 Moreover, concerns about personal and family health and knowledge of how to protect oneself  
344 from the coronavirus were associated with COVID-19 vaccination intention as opposed to being  
345 unsure. Previous studies have established that individuals worried about their health, those more  
346 vulnerable, and those at higher risk for COVID-19 infection were more willing to get vaccinated.[35]  
347 Additionally, concerns about family health, in terms of potential coronavirus infections, were also  
348 associated with being more willing to vaccinate against COVID-19.[41] These findings suggest that  
349 concerns about personal and family health contribute to higher vaccination intentions, highlighting  
350 the importance of achieving herd immunity to safeguard social network members [42]

351  
352 In addition to individual factors, interpersonal, community, and societal factors such as social  
353 support, club memberships, and degree of urbanization, were also associated with COVID-19  
354 vaccination intention. Individuals who had a larger network size and a larger proportion of network  
355 members who provide informational support were more likely to have the intention to vaccinate  
356 against COVID-19 (versus no intention), and those who had a larger proportion of emotional  
357 supporters within the network were also more likely to have the intention to vaccinate against  
358 COVID-19 (versus being unsure). Previous studies have already established that higher perceived  
359 social support is associated with willingness to vaccinate and higher uptake of the COVID-19  
360 vaccination.[43,44] This might be explained by the theory of strong and weak ties by  
361 Granovetter[37], which postulated that weaker social ties (e.g., acquaintances or new network  
362 members) play an important role in the provision of information. However, in the current study, it  
363 remained unknown what kind of information was exchanged and whether this was related to  
364 vaccination intention. Higher levels of social support and increased social contact may also expose  
365 individuals to diverse views on COVID-19, helping them assess their own risk and need for the  
366 vaccine.[43] The social support roles of the network members emphasize the need to strengthen or

367 expand social networks to have larger and more diverse networks in which different types of social  
368 support are provided, especially in times of a pandemic.

369

370 Lastly, participants living in rural areas versus those living in urban areas were more likely to have the  
371 intention or be unsure of getting a COVID-19 vaccination (versus no intention). These results are  
372 inconsistent with previous studies assessing COVID-19 vaccination intention and urban-rural  
373 differences. Several studies have reported that people living in rural areas are less willing to vaccinate  
374 or have lower actual vaccination rates.[46,47] An explanation for these contradicting results might  
375 be related to the network composition for middle-aged and older adults in the Southern part of the  
376 Netherlands. Individuals living in rural areas tended to have larger and more diverse social networks  
377 with more social supporters compared to those living in urban areas.[29] We suggest future research  
378 take a neighborhood-specific approach.

379

## 380 **Implications**

381 The various factors identified in this study present opportunities for health promotion. These key  
382 characteristics associated with vaccination intention can be incorporated into a practical toolkit to  
383 inform researchers, healthcare professionals, and policymakers to identify sociodemographic groups  
384 with potentially low vaccination intentions, allowing for a focused approach. One example might be  
385 a neighborhood-specific approach to promote health behaviors such as vaccination. For instance,  
386 mobile vaccination buses were introduced during the COVID-19 pandemic to increase vaccine  
387 uptake in neighborhoods with low vaccination rates.[48] Additionally, offering vaccinations at more  
388 accessible locations within communities, such as pharmacies, could contribute to increasing  
389 vaccination intention and uptake.[49,50]

390

391 In addition to individual factors, interpersonal factors such as social network size, and informational,  
392 and emotional social support were evident, emphasizing the need to strengthen and expand social  
393 networks and mobilize social support roles within the network. Strengthening and expanding social  
394 networks is particularly relevant for pandemic preparedness, as large, diverse, and supportive social  
395 networks can act as buffers during stressful times, such as pandemics.[29,51] Moreover, networks  
396 are valuable at all times, contributing to overall health, well-being, and resilience.[19] While directly  
397 modifying social networks might be challenging, we argue that they might be influenced indirectly  
398 through policy interventions. For example, policies can address other environmental factors such as  
399 important local influencers in communities [48] or implementing changes to the physical  
400 environment, thereby enhancing the social environment and creating opportunities for social  
401 interaction.

402

## 403 **Strengths and limitations**

404 The strengths of this study are the inclusion of multiple levels of the socio-ecological model. In doing  
405 so, social networks were measured using a name generator questionnaire which is a reliable method  
406 for a detailed assessment of social networks, especially in larger surveys.[25-27] With this method,  
407 a distinction in social network characteristics can be made, allowing for the inclusion of a broad range  
408 of social network aspects and differentiating between structure, function, and quality of social  
409 networks rather than just focusing on network size and social support. However, limitations should  
410 be mentioned as well. During the period of data collection, vaccines were still in development.

411 Therefore, it was not possible to include actual vaccination uptake in this study. Future studies  
412 should investigate whether the individual, interpersonal, community, and societal factors identified  
413 in this study are also associated with actual COVID-19 vaccination uptake.

414

## 415 **CONCLUSION**

416 In the present study, we aimed to assess which individual, interpersonal, community, and societal  
417 factors are associated with COVID-19 vaccination intention. Key individual determinants include  
418 various sociodemographic characteristics, concerns about one's personal and family health, and  
419 knowledge of how to protect oneself from the virus. Beyond individual factors, informational and  
420 emotional social support at the interpersonal levels also plays a significant role. These findings  
421 suggest that health promotion and vaccination communication strategies should focus on these  
422 factors and highlight the importance of organizing social networks to mobilize social support,  
423 particularly during a pandemic.

424

425

426

427 **Acknowledgments**

428 The authors would like to thank Charlotte Anraad, Haiyue Shan, David Blanco-Herrero, Mirjam  
429 Kretzschmar, Danielle Timmermans, Bas van den Putte, and Vincent Buskens for their valuable  
430 contributions to this work.

431

432 **Funding**

433 This work was funded by a governmental organization grant from the Dutch Organization for Health  
434 Research and Development (ZonMW Netherlands) (project number BePrepared: 10710022210002).  
435 The funder of the study had no role in the study design, data collection, data analysis, data  
436 interpretation, and writing of the manuscript.

437

438 **Ethics statement**

439 The Medical Ethical Committee of Maastricht University approved this study (METC 2018-0698,  
440 2019-1035, and 2020-2266). Participants gave electronic informed consent.

441

442 **Declaration of generative AI in scientific writing**

443 During the preparation of this work, the author(s) used ChatGPT to improve readability and  
444 grammar. After using this tool/service, the author(s) reviewed and edited the content as needed and  
445 take(s) full responsibility for the content of the published article.

446

447

## 448 REFERENCES

- 449 [1] Talic S, Shah S, Wild H, Gasevic D, Maharaj A, Ademi Z, et al. Effectiveness of public health  
450 measures in reducing the incidence of covid-19, SARS-CoV-2 transmission, and covid-19  
451 mortality: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Bmj* 2021;375.
- 452 [2] Greenwood B. The contribution of vaccination to global health: past, present and future.  
453 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 2014;369:20130433.
- 454 [3] Andre FE, Booy R, Bock HL, Clemens J, Datta SK, John TJ, et al. Vaccination greatly reduces  
455 disease, disability, death and inequity worldwide. *Bull World Health Organ* 2008;86:140–6.
- 456 [4] Oordt-Speets A, Spinardi J, Mendoza C, Yang J, Morales G, McLaughlin JM, et al.  
457 Effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccination on transmission: A systematic review. *COVID*  
458 2023;3:1516–27.
- 459 [5] Chakraborty C, Bhattacharya M, Dhama K. SARS-CoV-2 vaccines, vaccine development  
460 technologies, and significant efforts in vaccine development during the pandemic: the  
461 lessons learned might help to fight against the next pandemic. *Vaccines (Basel)* 2023;11:682.
- 462 [6] Lun P, Gao J, Tang B, Yu CC, Jabbar KA, Low JA, et al. A social ecological approach to identify  
463 the barriers and facilitators to COVID-19 vaccination acceptance: A scoping review. *PLoS One*  
464 2022;17:e0272642.
- 465 [7] Ruiters RAC, Crutzen R, Leeuw E De, Kok G. Changing Behavior Using Theories at the  
466 Interpersonal, Organizational, Community, and Societal Levels. In: Hagger MS, Cameron LD,  
467 Hamilton K, Hankonen N, Lintunen T, editors. *The Handbook of Behavior Change*, Cambridge:  
468 Cambridge University Press; 2020, p. 251–66. [https://doi.org/DOI:](https://doi.org/DOI:10.1017/9781108677318.018)  
469 10.1017/9781108677318.018.
- 470 [8] Bronfenbrenner U. Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American*  
471 *Psychologist* 1977;32:513–31. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.32.7.513>.
- 472 [9] McLeroy KR, Bibeau D, Steckler A, Glanz K. An ecological perspective on health promotion  
473 programs. *Health Educ Q* 1988;15:351–77.
- 474 [10] RIVM Corona Gedragsunit. Verkenning factoren van invloed op deelname aan COVID-19  
475 vaccinatie. Bilthoven: 2021.
- 476 [11] Zheng H, Jiang S, Wu Q. Factors influencing COVID-19 vaccination intention: The roles of  
477 vaccine knowledge, vaccine risk perception, and doctor-patient communication. *Patient Educ*  
478 *Couns* 2022;105:277–83.
- 479 [12] Latkin C, Dayton L, Miller J, Yi G, Balaban A, Boodram B, et al. A longitudinal study of vaccine  
480 hesitancy attitudes and social influence as predictors of COVID-19 vaccine uptake in the US.  
481 *Hum Vaccin Immunother* 2022;18:2043102.
- 482 [13] Latkin C, Dayton LA, Yi G, Konstantopoulos A, Park J, Maulsby C, et al. COVID-19 vaccine  
483 intentions in the United States, a social-ecological framework. *Vaccine* 2021;39:2288–94.
- 484 [14] Baeza-Rivera MJ, Salazar-Fernández C, Araneda-Leal L, Manríquez-Robles D. To get  
485 vaccinated or not? Social psychological factors associated with vaccination intent for COVID-  
486 19. *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology* 2021;15:18344909211051800.
- 487 [15] Gatwood J, Shuvo S, Hohmeier KC, Hagemann T, Chiu C-Y, Tong R, et al. Pneumococcal  
488 vaccination in older adults: an initial analysis of social determinants of health and vaccine  
489 uptake. *Vaccine* 2020;38:5607–17.
- 490 [16] Nowalk MP, Zimmerman RK, Shen S, Jewell IK, Raymund M. Barriers to pneumococcal and  
491 influenza vaccination in older community-dwelling adults (2000–2001). *J Am Geriatr Soc*  
492 2004;52:25–30.

- 493 [17] Berkman LF, Glass T. Social integration, social networks, social support and health. In:  
494 Berkman L, Kawachi I., eds. *Social epidemiology.*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press;  
495 2000.
- 496 [18] Seeman TE, Berkman LF. Structural characteristics of social networks and their relationship  
497 with social support in the elderly: Who provides support. *Soc Sci Med* 1988;26:737–49.  
498 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536\(88\)90065-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(88)90065-2).
- 499 [19] Holt-Lunstad J. Social connection as a public health issue: the evidence and a systemic  
500 framework for prioritizing the “social” in social determinants of health. *Annu Rev Public*  
501 *Health* 2022;43:193–213.
- 502 [20] Due P, Holstein B, Lund R, Modvig J, Avlund K. Social relations: network, support and  
503 relational strain. *Soc Sci Med* 1999;48:661–73.
- 504 [21] Steijvers LC, van Bilsen CJ, Brinkhues S, Crutzen R, Stutterheim SE, Dukers-Muijers NH. *Social*  
505 *Networks and Infection Prevention Behaviors* 2023.  
506 <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/V5DR2>.
- 507 [22] Von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The  
508 Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement:  
509 guidelines for reporting observational studies. *The Lancet* 2007;370:1453–7.
- 510 [23] European Medicines Agency. EMA recommends first COVID-19 vaccine for authorisation in  
511 the EU 2020. [https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/ema-recommends-first-covid-19-](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/ema-recommends-first-covid-19-vaccine-authorisation-eu)  
512 [vaccine-authorisation-eu](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/ema-recommends-first-covid-19-vaccine-authorisation-eu) (accessed June 26, 2024).
- 513 [24] CBS. Onderwijs - Cijfers - Maatschappij | Trends in Nederland 2018 - CBS n.d.  
514 <https://longreads.cbs.nl/trends18/maatschappij/cijfers/onderwijs/> (accessed June 26,  
515 2020).
- 516 [25] Campbell KE, Lee BA. Name generators in surveys of personal networks. *Soc Networks*  
517 1991;13:203–21. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-8733\(91\)90006-F](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-8733(91)90006-F).
- 518 [26] McCallister L, Fischer CS. A Procedure for Surveying Personal Networks. *Sociol Methods Res*  
519 1978;7:131–48. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004912417800700202>.
- 520 [27] Brinkhues S, Dukers-Muijers NHTM, Hoebe CJPA, Van Der Kallen CJH, Dagnelie PC, Koster  
521 A, et al. Socially isolated individuals are more prone to have newly diagnosed and prevalent  
522 type 2 diabetes mellitus - The Maastricht study. *BMC Public Health* 2017;17:955.  
523 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-017-4948-6>.
- 524 [28] Steijvers LCJ, Brinkhues S, Hoebe CJPA, van Tilburg TG, Claessen V, Bouwmeester-Vincken  
525 N, et al. Social networks and infectious diseases prevention behavior: A cross-sectional study  
526 in people aged 40 years and older. *PLoS One* 2021;16:e0251862.  
527 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0251862>.
- 528 [29] Steijvers LCJ, Brinkhues S, van Tilburg TG, Hoebe CJPA, Stijnen MMN, de Vries N, et al.  
529 Changes in structure and function of social networks of independently living middle-aged  
530 and older adults in diverse sociodemographic subgroups during the COVID-19 pandemic: a  
531 longitudinal study. *BMC Public Health* 2022;22:2253. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-14500-2)  
532 [14500-2](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-14500-2).
- 533 [30] Steijvers LCJ, Brinkhues S, Suanet B, Stijnen MMN, Hoebe CJPA, Dukers-Muijers NHTM. The  
534 role of social network structure and function in moderate and severe social and emotional  
535 loneliness: the Dutch SaNAE study in older adults. *MedRxiv* 2023:2023.08.23.23294457.  
536 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.08.23.23294457>.
- 537 [31] den Dulk C, van de Stadt H, Vliegen J. Een nieuwe maatstaf voor stedelijkheid: de  
538 omgevingsadressendichtheid. *Maandstatistiek van de Bevolking* 1992;40:14–27.



- 539 [32] Stedelijkheid n.d. <https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2019/44/meeste-afval-per-inwoner-in->  
540 [minst-stedelijke-gemeenten/stedelijkheid](https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2019/44/meeste-afval-per-inwoner-in-minst-stedelijke-gemeenten/stedelijkheid) (accessed June 24, 2021).
- 541 [33] Huang J, Chan SC, Ko S, Wang HHX, Yuan J, Xu W, et al. Factors associated with vaccination  
542 intention against the COVID-19 pandemic: a global population-based study. *Vaccines (Basel)*  
543 2022;10:1539.
- 544 [34] Terry E, Cartledge S, Damery S, Greenfield S. Factors associated with COVID-19 vaccine  
545 intentions during the COVID-19 pandemic; a systematic review and meta-analysis of cross-  
546 sectional studies. *BMC Public Health* 2022;22:1667.
- 547 [35] Al-Amer R, Maneze D, Everett B, Montayre J, Villarosa AR, Dwekat E, et al. COVID-19  
548 vaccination intention in the first year of the pandemic: A systematic review. *J Clin Nurs*  
549 2022;31:62–86.
- 550 [36] Guidry JPD, Laestadius LI, Vraga EK, Miller CA, Perrin PB, Burton CW, et al. Willingness to get  
551 the COVID-19 vaccine with and without emergency use authorization. *Am J Infect Control*  
552 2021;49:137–42.
- 553 [37] Kreps S, Prasad S, Brownstein JS, Hswen Y, Garibaldi BT, Zhang B, et al. Factors associated  
554 with US adults' likelihood of accepting COVID-19 vaccination. *JAMA Netw Open*  
555 2020;3:e2025594–e2025594.
- 556 [38] Ahrenfeldt LJ, Otavova M, Christensen K, Lindahl-Jacobsen R. Sex and age differences in  
557 COVID-19 mortality in Europe. *Wien Klin Wochenschr* 2021;133:393–8.  
558 <https://doi.org/10.1007/S00508-020-01793-9>.
- 559 [39] Niessen A, Teirlinck AC, McDonald SA, van der Hoek W, van Gageldonk-Lafeber R, RIVM  
560 COVID-19 Epidemiology SG, et al. Sex differences in COVID-19 mortality in the Netherlands.  
561 *Infection* 2022;50:709–17.
- 562 [40] Pouw N, van de Maat J, Veerman K, Ten Oever J, Janssen N, Abbink E, et al. Clinical  
563 characteristics and outcomes of 952 hospitalized COVID-19 patients in The Netherlands: A  
564 retrospective cohort study. *PLoS One* 2021;16:e0248713.
- 565 [41] Giuliani M, Ichino A, Bonomi A, Martoni R, Cammino S, Gorini A. Who Is Willing to Get  
566 Vaccinated? A Study into the Psychological, Socio-Demographic, and Cultural Determinants  
567 of COVID-19 Vaccination Intentions. *Vaccines (Basel)* 2021;9.  
568 <https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9080810>.
- 569 [42] Williams L, Gallant AJ, Rasmussen S, Brown Nicholls LA, Cogan N, Deakin K, et al. Towards  
570 intervention development to increase the uptake of COVID-19 vaccination among those at  
571 high risk: Outlining evidence-based and theoretically informed future intervention content.  
572 *Br J Health Psychol* 2020;25:1039–54. <https://doi.org/10.1111/BJHP.12468>.
- 573 [43] Jaspal R, Breakwell GM. The significance of ethnicity in vaccination uptake: social  
574 psychological aspects. *COVID-19: Surviving a Pandemic*, Routledge; 2022, p. 134–54.
- 575 [44] Datta BK, Jaremski JE, Ansa BE, Odhiambo LA, Islam KMM, Johnson JA. Role of perceived  
576 social support in COVID-19 vaccine uptake among US adults. *AJPM Focus* 2023;2:100104.
- 577 [45] Granovetter MS. The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology* 1973;78:1360–  
578 80. <https://doi.org/10.1086/225469>.
- 579 [46] Raciborski F, Samel-Kowalik P, Gujski M, Pinkas J, Arcimowicz M, Jankowski M. Factors  
580 associated with a lack of willingness to vaccinate against COVID-19 in Poland: a 2021  
581 nationwide cross-sectional survey. *Vaccines (Basel)* 2021;9:1000.
- 582 [47] Mann S, Christini K, Chai Y, Chang C-P, Hashibe M, Kepka D. Vaccine hesitancy and COVID-  
583 19 immunization among rural young adults. *Prev Med Rep* 2022;28:101845.

- 584 [48] Rijksinstituut voor Volksgezondheid en Milieu. Invloed van prikbusen op vaccinatiegraad  
585 2022. [https://www.rivm.nl/gedragsonderzoek/invloed-van-prikbusen-op-](https://www.rivm.nl/gedragsonderzoek/invloed-van-prikbusen-op-vaccinatiegraad#:~:text=De%20prikbusen%20zijn%20tijdens%20de,waar%20zij%20de%20busen%20inzetten)  
586 [vaccinatiegraad#:~:text=De%20prikbusen%20zijn%20tijdens%20de,waar%20zij%20de%2](https://www.rivm.nl/gedragsonderzoek/invloed-van-prikbusen-op-vaccinatiegraad#:~:text=De%20prikbusen%20zijn%20tijdens%20de,waar%20zij%20de%20busen%20inzetten)  
587 [Obussen%20inzetten](https://www.rivm.nl/gedragsonderzoek/invloed-van-prikbusen-op-vaccinatiegraad#:~:text=De%20prikbusen%20zijn%20tijdens%20de,waar%20zij%20de%20busen%20inzetten). (accessed June 27, 2024).
- 588 [49] Rothholz M, Tan L. Promoting the immunization neighborhood: benefits and challenges of  
589 pharmacies as additional locations for HPV vaccination. *Hum Vaccin Immunother*  
590 2017;13:1856–8.
- 591 [50] Fava JP, Colleran J, Bignasci F, Cha R, Kilgore PE. Adolescent human papillomavirus  
592 vaccination in the United States: opportunities for integrating pharmacies into the  
593 immunization neighborhood. *Hum Vaccin Immunother* 2017;13:1844–55.
- 594 [51] Cohen S, Wills TA. Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychol Bull*  
595 1985;98:310.
- 596
- 597

598 **SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS**

599 **Supplementary Table 1.** Overview of social network characteristics described by structure, function,  
600 and quality

<b>Social network structure</b>	
<b>Network size and social isolation</b>	Respondents could report up to fifteen family members, ten friends, ten acquaintances, five other network members, and five healthcare professionals (HCP). The sum of all network members per relationship type provided the total network size, resulting in a maximum of 45 persons. Network size was then further categorized based on quartiles: 0-4, 5-8, 9-13, and more than 13 network members. Network size was categorized to provide a quantitative measure for social isolation (0-4 network members)
<b>Partner</b>	Partner was assessed by a single question: do you have a partner? Answer categories included yes or no.
<b>Type of relationships</b>	The proportions of types of relationships were calculated by dividing the number of family members by the total network size. The same was performed for friends, acquaintances, other network members, and healthcare professionals.
<b>Network diversity</b>	Social network diversity was constructed based on the relationship types reported and included the following categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Having no family, but friends, acquaintances, others, or HCP;</li><li>• Having only family members;</li><li>• Having only family members and friends;</li><li>• Having family members, others, HCP, but no friends</li><li>• Having family members, friends, acquaintances, other network members, and HCP.</li></ul>
<b>Network density</b>	Respondents could answer a 5-scaled statement about whether their friends and family know each other.
<b>Homogeneity in gender and age</b>	The proportion of network members of the same gender was calculated by dividing the number of network members of the same gender by the total network size. The proportion of network members of the same age (~5-year age range) was calculated by dividing the number of network members of the same age by the total network size.
<b>Contact with children aged five years and younger</b>	Contact with young children aged five years and younger was assessed by a single question with answer categories: yes daily, yes weekly, yes monthly, yes less often, no. Answer categories yes daily and yes weekly were combined into yes, daily, or weekly, and categories yes monthly and yes less often were combined into yes, monthly, or less often.
<b>Living alone</b>	The living situation was assessed by a single question with several answer categories: living alone, living with a partner, living with children, living with parents, living with other adults. Living alone was constructed based on the answer category: living alone.
<b>Geographical proximity</b>	Proportions of network members who live in the same house, within walking distance, less than 30 minutes away by car, more than 30 minutes away by car, or further away were calculated by dividing the number of network members living in the same house by the total network size, and so on.
<b>Social network function</b>	

<b>Informational support</b>	The proportion of informational supporters was calculated by dividing the number of network members who advised on problems or gave information by the total network size.
<b>Emotional support</b>	The proportion of emotional supporters was calculated by dividing the number of network members who provided the opportunity to discuss important matters or health-related topics by the total network size.
<b>Practical support</b>	The proportion of practical supporters was calculated by dividing the number of network members who helped with small or larger tasks in or around the house by the total network size.
<b>Social network quality</b>	
<b>Social strain</b>	The proportion of network members with whom social strain was experienced was calculated by dividing the sum of network members who are demanding, straining, or criticizing by the total network size.
<b>Good relationships</b>	The proportion of network members with whom there is a good relationship was calculated by dividing the number of social network members with whom there is a good relationship by the total network size.