

1 Cross-Sectional Study of University students' attitudes to 'on campus' delivery of COVID-19 vaccines and future-proofing MenACWY and

2 MMR vaccination rates by adopting COVID-19 vaccine roll-out strategies

3 Adam Webb<sup>1</sup>, Mayuri Gogoi<sup>2</sup>, Sarah Weidman<sup>1</sup>, Katherine Woolf<sup>3</sup>, Maria Zavala<sup>4</sup>, Shamez N Ladhani<sup>4</sup>, Manish Pareek<sup>2,5</sup>, Lieve Gies<sup>5</sup>, Christopher D

4 Bayliss<sup>1\*</sup>

5

6 <sup>1</sup>Department of Genetics and Genome Biology, University of Leicester, UK

7 <sup>2</sup>Department of Respiratory Sciences, University of Leicester, UK

8 <sup>3</sup>University College London Medical School, London, UK

9 <sup>4</sup>Immunisation and Countermeasures Division, Public Health England Colindale, London, UK

10 <sup>5</sup>Department of Infection and HIV Medicine, University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust, UK

11 <sup>5</sup>School of Media, Communication and Sociology, University of Leicester, UK

12

13 \*Corresponding author. Email: [cdb12@le.ac.uk](mailto:cdb12@le.ac.uk)

14

15 Short title. University student attitudes to COVID-19, MMR and MenACWY vaccines

16

17 **Abstract**

18 **Background**

19 University students are a critical group for vaccination programmes against COVID-19, meningococcal disease (MenACWY), and measles, mumps and  
20 rubella (MMR). We aimed to evaluate risk factors for vaccine hesitancy (refusal or intention to refuse a vaccine) and views of university students about on-  
21 campus vaccine delivery.

22 **Methods**

23 Cross-sectional anonymous online questionnaire study of undergraduate students at a British university in June 2021. Chi-squared, Fisher's exact, univariate  
24 and multivariate tests were applied to detect associations.

25 **Results**

26 Complete data were obtained from 827 participants (7.6% response-rate). Two-thirds (64%; 527/827) reported having been vaccinated against COVID-19 and  
27 a further 23% (194/827) agreed to be vaccinated. Other responses were either unclear (66) or indicated an intention to refuse vaccination (40). Hesitancy for  
28 COVID-19 vaccines was 5% (40/761). COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy was associated with black ethnicity (aOR, 7.01, 95% CI, 1.8-27.3) and concerns about  
29 vaccine side-effects (aOR, 1.72; 95% CI, 1.23-2.39). Lower levels of vaccine hesitancy were detected amongst students living in private accommodation  
30 (aOR, 0.13; 95% CI, 0.04-0.38) compared to those living at home. Uncertainty about their personal vaccine status was frequently observed for MMR (11%)  
31 and MenACWY (26%) vaccines. Campus-associated COVID-19 vaccine campaigns were definitely (45%) or somewhat (16%) favoured by UK-based  
32 students and more so among UK-based international students (62% and 12%, respectively).

33 **Conclusions**

34 Vaccine hesitancy among students of black ethnicity and those living at home requires further exploration because attitudes in these groups may affect  
35 COVID-19 vaccine uptake. High levels of uncertainty among students about their MMR and MenACWY vaccine status are also a concern for the  
36 effectiveness of these vaccine programmes. This issue could be tackled by extending the capabilities of digital platforms for accessing vaccine information,  
37 such as the NHSapp in the UK. Sector-wide implementation of on-campus vaccine delivery may also improve vaccine uptake, especially for international  
38 students.

## 39 Introduction

40 Young people are an important risk group for vaccination programmes due to their high mobility, inexperience of accessing medical systems and relatively  
41 higher levels of vaccine hesitancy compared to older populations [1,2]. Within this group, university students are particularly at risk of contracting and  
42 transmitting infectious diseases because of their high levels of transmission-associated behaviours at university and mixing of geographically-diverse intakes  
43 [3-5]. These risks have been exemplified by recent outbreaks of COVID-19 on United Kingdom (UK) university campuses as students returned to campus-  
44 based activities after initial lockdown [6]. Facilitating access of university students to vaccines is a key mechanism for enhancing vaccine uptake and  
45 preventing infectious diseases outbreaks while minimising the need for highly restrictive measures such as lockdown measures, including social distancing  
46 and online learning.

47

48 Multiple previous studies have been conducted to determine the reasons for COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in the general population. Vaccine hesitancy or  
49 acceptance has been assessed by a range of measures including use of the SAGE guidelines, Likert scaled-acceptance questions, attitudinal measures and  
50 actual uptake or intention to uptake (as utilised herein) [7-10]. A recent meta-analysis of vaccine acceptance in higher income countries reported vaccine  
51 hesitancy rates of at least 30% in half the studies (n=97) with lower socio-economic status being the most impactful contributory factor in lower-middle  
52 income countries/regions and perceived vaccine safety in more affluent countries/regions [7]. Common demographics for COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in the  
53 reported literature include females, younger age groups, being from a minority ethnic group and lower education or income levels. Studies of student  
54 populations have yielded a range of findings. Factors associated with higher vaccine acceptance are knowledge of COVID-19 vaccines, trust in authorities and  
55 high perceived vaccine effectiveness [9-14] while perceived accessibility barriers (physical or financial) have been associated with vaccine hesitancy [10, 14].  
56 A potentially important issue is whether concerns about the rare but serious side-effects of the licensed COVID-19 vaccines might have affected uptake  
57 among students [15, 16].

58

59 Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, a major concern for student populations was the prevention of cases and outbreaks of meningococcal disease, measles and  
60 mumps. Rising levels of infections due to a MenW cc11-lineage strains led to introduction of the MenACWY vaccine into the UK school-age vaccination  
61 programme and new university entrants from August 2015 [17, 18]. Outbreaks of mumps among students were also observed in 2019 leading to student-  
62 focussed information campaigns to encourage uptake of the MMR vaccine [19]. The MenACWY and MMR vaccines are currently offered free-of-charge to

63 all university students in the UK, including overseas students. National lockdowns to contain the rapid spread of SARS-CoV-2 in 2020 led to major  
64 reductions in cases of meningococcal disease, measles and mumps but there is now a concern that ending lockdowns and increased social mixing could lead  
65 to rises in these serious vaccine-preventable diseases [20, 21]. These effects may be compounded by disruption of school-based immunisation programmes  
66 during the pandemic, which may have resulted in a serious risk of long-term weakening of individual and herd (population) protection.

67  
68 Studies prior to the COVID-19 pandemic reported uptake rates of the MenACWY vaccines among students at 68-71% [8, 18, 22]. In general, students are  
69 expected to obtain their vaccines prior to arrival at university. However, uptake can be enhanced by ‘on campus’ vaccine campaigns as exemplified by the  
70 University of Nottingham’s highly effective delivery of the MenACWY vaccine for incoming university entrants [18]. Vaccine hesitancy has been examined  
71 for the MenACWY vaccine. Blagden et al. [8] reported that vaccine uptake was strongly associated with a high perceived effectiveness of the vaccine but did  
72 not find any barriers, such as vaccine side-effects or inconvenience. A meta-study by Wishnant *et al.* [23] found that the only factors strongly associated with  
73 uptake of meningococcal vaccines among students were perceived risks of contracting meningococcal disease and the severity of meningococcal infections.  
74 Overall, these studies indicate that vaccine hesitancy is not a major barrier to meningococcal vaccine uptake but are equivocal about how vaccine uptake can  
75 be increased.

76  
77 To evaluate the barriers to uptake of vaccines among students and to inform university vaccination policies, we assessed the attitudes, knowledge, perceived  
78 vaccine status and willingness for uptake of COVID-19, MMR and MenACWY vaccines among university students during the roll-out of COVID-19  
79 vaccines to 18-year olds in the UK.

80

## 81 **Material and methods**

### 82 **Ethics**

83 Ethical approval was given by the University of Leicester (UoL) Medicine and Biological Sciences Research Ethics Committee (reference number 29522).

84 All study participants provided written informed consent.

85

86 Context of questionnaire delivery and derivation

87 The questionnaire was emailed to students on three occasions between the 1<sup>st</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> of June 2021. Access to COVID-19 vaccines in the UK was extended to  
88 the 25-29, 23-24, 21-22 and 18-20 age brackets on the 7<sup>th</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> June 2021, respectively (<https://www.england.nhs.uk/2021/06/21-and-22-year-olds-to-be-offered-covid-19-jab-from-today/> and <https://www.england.nhs.uk/2021/06/nhs-invites-all-adults-to-get-a-covid-jab-in-final-push/>). Prior to these  
89 dates, only healthcare workers and medical students as well as individuals in vulnerable categories were eligible for COVID-19 vaccines <30 year-olds. At  
90 the time the questionnaire was designed, we assumed most students would be unvaccinated when they completed the questionnaire.

92

93 Questionnaire delivery, structure and content

94 The questionnaire was administered via Online Surveys. Between 1<sup>st</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> June 2021, the research team sent an invitation email, and two reminder  
95 emails, to all 10,869 campus-based University of Leicester undergraduate students (S1 Figure). Each invitation email contained a unique link to the  
96 questionnaire that could not be re-used. Completed questionnaires were de-identified by automatic assignment of another unique identifier by the software,  
97 thereby uncoupling the questionnaires from the original email address. The initial email included an invitation to voluntarily participate in follow-up  
98 interviews and a prize draw with five prizes of £200 being offered and subsequently delivered.

99

100 The questionnaire consisted of a participant information sheet followed by three consent questions. Other parts of the questionnaire were only accessible if  
101 consent to all three consent questions was provided. The questionnaire consisted of 29 questions split into four sections: demographics; vaccines; experiences  
102 of COVID-19 disease; and other pandemic experiences (e.g. harassment). Questions were multiple choice or scaled answers with one free text box and three  
103 questions with answer-dependent questions (S1 Table). Questions 2, 6, 7, 10, 12, 17, 19, 20 and 26 were identical to or modifications of questions utilised in  
104 UK-REACH questionnaire 2\_ver\_1.2 (23 Mar 2021). Questions 13-16 were written by the authors and piloted with University of Leicester students prior to  
105 the pandemic as part of another study [22]. Questions 3-5, 8, 9, 11, 21-25, 27-29 were written by the authors for this study. Question 26 is the self-  
106 determination scale. Question 17 utilised four statements from the VAX scale of Martin and Petrie [24]. A VAX score was derived for each participant by  
107 reversing the scores for statements 17.2, 17.3 and 17.5 followed by re-scaling the sum of all four scores on a 0 to 1 scale that represents maximum to  
108 minimum hesitancy, respectively.

109

## 110 Definitions of primary endpoints

111 Primary endpoints in our analyses were vaccine hesitancy, VAX scores and willingness for on-campus vaccination programmes. Vaccine hesitancy was  
112 defined as providing a response to question 10 that included the phrase ‘have decided not to have the vaccine’. Vaccine willing students were those whose  
113 response included either ‘I have already had’ or ‘intend to have the vaccine’. VAX scores have been utilised as predictors of vaccine hesitancy [24]. VAX  
114 scores were derived for all students and analysed for differences between ethnic groups and term time residence locations as an alternate measure of vaccine  
115 hesitancy. The potential utilisation of on-campus vaccination programmes was defined based on responses to question 15 split between those in favour  
116 (definitely increase, somewhat increase) and those who were ambivalent (neither, somewhat decrease, definitely decrease).

117

## 118 Statistical analysis

119 De-identified survey responses were analysed using R version 4.0.3 with the tidyverse (data handling), jsonlite 1.7.1 (data extraction), ggplot2 3.32 (general  
120 graphing), gtsummary 1.4.2 (tabulation), UpSetR 1.4.0 (graphing of sets) and likert 1.3.5 (graphing of likert-style responses) packages [25-31]. In order to  
121 determine if the demographics of our study participants were similar to those of other UK universities and for weighting of the multivariable analyses, we  
122 obtained demographic data from HESA (Higher Education Statistics Agency; <https://hesa.ac.uk>). Similarly, we compared vaccination rates in our study with  
123 local, regional and national vaccination rates obtained from the UK Coronavirus Dashboard (<https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk>).

124

125 Univariable analyses were performed on unweighted survey results using chi-squared, Fisher’s exact or Wilcoxon’s rank sum tests. False discovery rate  
126 (FDR) correction was used to adjust p-values for multiple testing. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and preference for on-campus vaccinations (COVID-19 and  
127 MMR) were dichotomized and used as dependent variables. Multivariable analysis was performed using logistic regression on weighted survey results, with  
128 vaccine hesitancy and preference for on-campus vaccinations (COVID-19 and MMR) as dependent variables. Predictors included gender, ethnic group, age  
129 group, course studied, year of study, experience of harassment, experience of COVID-19 related death, concern over side-effects from the  
130 Oxford/AstraZeneca vaccine, concern over hospitalization from COVID-19, concern over spreading COVID-19, home area (local, national, international),  
131 residence while studying (home, halls of residence, private accommodation, other) and a psychometric score on self-determination/fatalism. Home area was

132 derived using information on post-codes and international status with students being classified as local if they came from either Leicester or the wider county  
133 of Leicestershire, ‘national’ for students from the rest of the UK and ‘international’ for students ordinarily living overseas. Experiences of COVID-19 related  
134 deaths were classified into a Yes or No category according to responses to question 21 (S1 Table) with the Yes responses including family member(s),  
135 friend(s) or someone else. Survey data were weighted using the raking method in the survey package 4.0 for R based on national student distributions for  
136 ethnic group (White, Asian, Black and Other) and gender (S2, S3 and S4 Tables). Constraints in the national data made it necessary to remove students of  
137 unknown gender (n = 6).

138

139 Statistical differences between the distributions of VAX scores for different groups were determined using a Games-Howell pairwise test with FDR  
140 correction.

141

## 142 **Results**

### 143 **Response rate, sample characteristics and COVID-19 vaccination uptake**

144 In June 2021, all University of Leicester (UoL) undergraduate students were invited to participate in a study of the uptake and attitudes to COVID-19  
145 vaccines. Complete answers were provided by 7.6% (827/10,869) of participants. Respondents were young (94% 18-25 year olds), ethnically diverse (25%  
146 Asian, 8% Black, 58% White, 9% Other) and included 10% (n=86) international students. Response rates were higher among females (11% above the level  
147 for UK universities and 14% above the UoL level) and an ethnicity profile intermediate between UoL and UK university undergraduate populations (S3 and  
148 S4 Tables). The distribution among year of study was however strongly representative of the UoL population (S5 Table). Two thirds (64%) of students  
149 (527/827) reported having had a COVID-19 vaccine at the time of questionnaire completion [74% (390/527) had Pfizer/BioNTech, 23% (121/527)  
150 AstraZeneca, 3% (16/527) another vaccine]. A further 194 students (23%) expressed a willingness to become vaccinated, giving a total of 85% who had been  
151 or were willing to be vaccinated. Results for 66 students were excluded from further analysis of vaccine hesitancy due to uncertainty about their intention to  
152 vaccinate (the selected response was ‘I have not had a vaccination but have been told that I will be offered a vaccination in the near future’). Removing these  
153 students from the denominator gave an overall willingness rate of 95% (721/761). There were 40 students (5%) who indicated that they had refused or would  
154 refuse a COVID-19 vaccine.

155

## 156 **Univariable analysis of vaccine hesitancy**

157 The results of the univariable analysis for vaccine hesitancy are shown in 40 students (5%) who indicated that they had refused or would refuse a COVID-19  
158 vaccine.

159

160 . Ethnicity, course studied, concerns around side-effects (particularly the AstraZeneca vaccine), concerns around spreading COVID-19 to others, place of  
161 residence while studying and VAX score were all found to be significantly associated with hesitancy after correcting for multiple testing. There was a weak  
162 trend for an association of age with vaccine hesitancy; this could not, however be explored further due to banded collection of age data and the narrow age  
163 range of this cohort.

164

165 Analysis of the individual VAX scale questions (see S2 Figure) showed that only 29% of hesitant students disagreed that natural exposure to a disease was  
166 safer than vaccination compared to 80% of vaccine-willing students. By contrast, 70% of hesitant students, but also 54% of willing students, had concerns  
167 about the safety of vaccines (the statement was ‘Although most vaccines appear to be safe, there may be problems that we have not yet discovered’).  
168 Approximately half (49%) the hesitant students and 82% of willing students agreed that >95% vaccine coverage was required to prevent the spread of  
169 infectious diseases.

170

171 A surprising observation was that high proportions of both vaccine-willing (42%, 299/721) and vaccine-hesitant (48%, 19/40) students had experienced a  
172 COVID-19 death among relatives or other acquaintances (S3 Figure). This outcome was, however, not associated with differences in hesitancy (Table 1).

173

174 **Table 1. Demographic characteristics of study participants and results of an unweighted univariate analysis of vaccine hesitancy**

Characteristic	All Respondents (n = 827) <sup>1</sup>	Hesitancy Group		p-value <sup>2</sup>	q- value <sup>3</sup>
		Willing (n = 721) <sup>1</sup>	Hesitant (n = 40) <sup>1</sup>		
Ethnic group				<0.001	<0.001



Characteristic	All Respondents (n = 827) <sup>1</sup>	Hesitancy Group		p-value <sup>2</sup>	q-value <sup>3</sup>
		Willing (n = 721) <sup>1</sup>	Hesitant (n = 40) <sup>1</sup>		
White	479 (58%)	428 (59%)	16 (40%)		
Asian	203 (25%)	180 (25%)	6 (15%)		
Black	69 (8.3%)	48 (6.7%)	12 (30%)		
Prefer not to say	11 (1.3%)	7 (1.0%)	3 (7.5%)		
Other	65 (7.9%)	58 (8.0%)	3 (7.5%)		
Gender				0.4	0.4
Female	548 (66%)	477 (66%)	25 (62%)		
Male	255 (31%)	222 (31%)	14 (35%)		
Unknown	6 (0.7%)	5 (0.7%)	1 (2.5%)		
Other	18 (2.2%)	17 (2.4%)	0 (0%)		
Course studied				<b>0.026</b>	0.060
Humanities, Law and Social Science	349 (42%)	288 (40%)	23 (57%)		
Natural and Life Sciences	302 (37%)	261 (36%)	14 (35%)		
Medicine and allied	176 (21%)	172 (24%)	3 (7.5%)		
Home/international student				0.13	0.2
UK student	734 (90%)	643 (90%)	31 (84%)		
UK-based international student	48 (5.9%)	41 (5.7%)	5 (14%)		
Non-UK international student	38 (4.6%)	34 (4.7%)	1 (2.7%)		
Unknown	7	3	3		
Non-term residence				0.10	0.14
Local	160 (21%)	135 (20%)	10 (30%)		
National	534 (68%)	473 (69%)	17 (52%)		
International	86 (11%)	75 (11%)	6 (18%)		
Unknown <sup>4</sup>	47	38	7		
Age group				<b>0.030</b>	0.060
22+	297 (36%)	266 (37%)	8 (20%)		
<= 21	529 (64%)	454 (63%)	32 (80%)		
Unknown <sup>4</sup>	1	1	0		
Experience of harassment				0.8	0.8
No	752 (92%)	659 (93%)	35 (92%)		
Yes	62 (7.6%)	53 (7.4%)	3 (7.9%)		
Unknown <sup>4</sup>	13	9	2		
COVID-19 related death in known contact				0.5	0.5
No	475 (58%)	418 (58%)	21 (52%)		
Yes	346 (42%)	299 (42%)	19 (48%)		
Unknown <sup>4</sup>	6	4	0		

Characteristic	All Respondents (n = 827) <sup>1</sup>	Hesitancy Group		p-value <sup>2</sup>	q-value <sup>3</sup>
		Willing (n = 721) <sup>1</sup>	Hesitant (n = 40) <sup>1</sup>		
Concern of vaccine side-effects (Oxford/AstraZeneca)				<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
1 (Strongly disagree)	171 (21%)	154 (22%)	4 (10%)		
2	153 (19%)	141 (20%)	1 (2.6%)		
3	99 (12%)	91 (13%)	2 (5.1%)		
4	105 (13%)	88 (13%)	8 (21%)		
5	104 (13%)	92 (13%)	3 (7.7%)		
6	75 (9.4%)	65 (9.3%)	4 (10%)		
7 (Strongly agree)	94 (12%)	67 (9.6%)	17 (44%)		
Unknown <sup>4</sup>	26	23	1		
Concern over hospitalisation				<b>0.038</b>	0.068
0	392 (48%)	337 (47%)	25 (66%)		
1	339 (41%)	305 (42%)	8 (21%)		
2	60 (7.3%)	50 (6.9%)	3 (7.9%)		
3	33 (4.0%)	28 (3.9%)	2 (5.3%)		
Unknown <sup>4</sup>	3	1	2		
Concern over spreading COVID-19 to others				<b>0.003</b>	<b>0.007</b>
0	82 (10.0%)	63 (8.8%)	11 (29%)		
1	226 (28%)	203 (28%)	10 (26%)		
2	297 (36%)	264 (37%)	12 (32%)		
3	216 (26%)	189 (26%)	5 (13%)		
Unknown <sup>4</sup>	6	2	2		
VAX score				<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Unknown <sup>4</sup>	0.61 (0.50, 0.71)	0.61 (0.50, 0.71)	0.39 (0.25, 0.53)		
Unknown <sup>4</sup>	29	19	6		
Year of study				0.050	0.081
Foundation	16 (1.9%)	15 (2.1%)	1 (2.5%)		
1	269 (33%)	228 (32%)	18 (45%)		
2	217 (26%)	188 (26%)	11 (28%)		
3	234 (28%)	201 (28%)	10 (25%)		
4	91 (11%)	89 (12%)	0 (0%)		
Term-time residence				<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Home	171 (21%)	134 (19%)	14 (35%)		
Halls	152 (18%)	137 (19%)	8 (20%)		
Private	333 (40%)	301 (42%)	10 (25%)		
Prefer not to answer	6 (0.7%)	2 (0.3%)	4 (10%)		
Other	165 (20%)	147 (20%)	4 (10%)		

Characteristic	All Respondents (n = 827) <sup>1</sup>	Hesitancy Group		p-value <sup>2</sup>	q-value <sup>3</sup>
		Willing (n = 721) <sup>1</sup>	Hesitant (n = 40) <sup>1</sup>		
Self-determination score	79 (71, 88)	80 (72, 88)	76 (68, 84)	0.3	0.4
Unknown <sup>4</sup>	86	71	5		

<sup>1</sup> 0, vaccine willing; 1, vaccine hesitant; N, number of participants (%); Median (IQR)

<sup>2</sup>Fisher's exact test; Pearson's Chi-squared test; Wilcoxon rank sum test

<sup>3</sup>False discovery rate correction for multiple testing

<sup>4</sup>Unknown, number participants with incomplete answers or Prefer not to answer responses

175

176

### 177 **Multivariable analysis of vaccine hesitancy**

178 The multivariable analysis identified associations between vaccine hesitancy and ethnicity, course of study, side-effects and place of term-time residence, as  
 179 found in the univariate analysis, and additionally with experiences of death among contacts (Table 2). For course studied, studying medicine and allied  
 180 professions (e.g. midwifery, nursing and physiotherapy) had a significantly lower likelihood of being vaccine hesitant (OR 0.1, 95% CI 0.02-0.5, adjusted P =  
 181 0.021) compared to humanities, law and social sciences. For ethnicity, hesitancy among black students had a high odds ratio (OR 7.01, 95% CI 1.81-27.3,  
 182 adjusted P value = 0.021) as compared to white students (Table 2). Students living in private accommodation (OR 0.13, 95% CI 0.04-0.38, adjusted P=0.004)  
 183 were less vaccine hesitant than students living at home.

184

185 Hesitancy was strongly associated with concerns over side-effects from the Astra-Zeneca (Table 2) and Pfizer/BioNTech vaccines (OR 2.1, 95%CI 1.5-3.0,  
 186 adjusted P<0.001; data not shown). Concerns about side-effects were, however, lower for the Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine (S4 Figure). Surprisingly, the  
 187 multivariate analysis detected a positive association between experiences of a COVID-19-related death in a family member, friend or other contact with  
 188 vaccine hesitancy (Table 2). This association remained even when only close contacts (friends; family) were considered (odds ratio 6.4, 95% CI 1.9-21.6,  
 189 adjusted P = 0.02; data not shown).

190

191 **Table 2. Multivariate analysis of vaccine hesitancy**

Characteristic	Hesitancy (unweighted)					Hesitancy (weighted)				
	N	OR <sup>1</sup>	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value	q-value <sup>2</sup>	N	OR <sup>1</sup>	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value	q-value <sup>2</sup>
<b>Gender</b>										
Female	419	—	—			299	—	—		
Male	193	0.84	0.22, 2.89	0.8	>0.9	147	0.63	0.21, 1.85	0.4	0.6
Unknown	5	0.00		>0.9	>0.9					
<b>Ethnic group</b>										
White	377	—	—			271	—	—		
Asian	145	0.23	0.04, 1.03	0.072	0.2	97	0.24	0.04, 1.52	0.13	0.2
Black	43	6.17	1.48, 26.7	<b>0.012</b>	0.082	33	7.01	1.81, 27.3	<b>0.005</b>	<b>0.021</b>
Other	52	1.40	0.17, 8.22	0.7	>0.9	39	1.37	0.12, 15.4	0.8	>0.9
<b>Age group</b>										
22+	230	—	—			169	—	—		
<= 21	387	2.92	0.78, 12.6	0.13	0.3	276	3.25	0.73, 14.4	0.12	0.2
<b>Course studied<sup>3</sup></b>										
H, Law, Soc	240	—	—			175	—	—		
Nat/Life Sci	229	1.04	0.31, 3.44	>0.9	>0.9	158	0.93	0.32, 2.70	0.9	>0.9
Med/Allied	148	0.16	0.02, 0.91	0.061	0.2	110	0.10	0.02, 0.50	<b>0.005</b>	<b>0.021</b>
<b>Non-term residence</b>										
Local	120	—	—			92	—	—		
National	429	0.61	0.13, 2.79	0.5	0.8	305	0.71	0.20, 2.46	0.6	0.7
International	68	1.19	0.19, 7.23	0.8	>0.9	49	1.76	0.44, 7.15	0.4	0.6
<b>Experience of harassment</b>										
No	570	—	—			413	—	—		
Yes	47	2.42	0.34, 13.1	0.3	0.5	31	3.61	0.51, 25.8	0.2	0.3
<b>COVID-19 related death in known contact</b>										
No	351	—	—			267	—	—		
Yes	266	5.05	1.65, 17.8	<b>0.007</b>	0.068	197	7.49	2.06, 27.2	<b>0.002</b>	<b>0.014</b>
<b>Concern of vaccine side-effects (Oxford/AstraZeneca)</b>										
	593	1.71	1.29, 2.37	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.010</b>	610	1.72	1.23, 2.39	<b>0.001</b>	<b>0.013</b>
<b>Concern over hospitalisation</b>										
	593	0.56	0.22, 1.25	0.2	0.3	610	0.68	0.24, 1.89	0.5	0.6

Characteristic	Hesitancy (unweighted)					Hesitancy (weighted)				
	N	OR <sup>1</sup>	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value	q-value <sup>2</sup>	N	OR <sup>1</sup>	95% CI <sup>1</sup>	p-value	q-value <sup>2</sup>
Concern over spreading COVID-19 to others	593	0.52	0.27, 0.96	<b>0.041</b>	0.14	610	0.45	0.25, 0.81	<b>0.008</b>	<b>0.024</b>
Year of study	593	0.81	0.39, 1.59	0.6	0.8	610	0.94	0.49, 1.81	0.9	>0.9
Term-time residence										
Home	124	—	—			93	—	—		
Halls	119	0.23	0.04, 1.24	0.093	0.2	96	0.20	0.04, 1.03	0.054	0.13
Private	257	0.17	0.03, 0.83	<b>0.032</b>	0.14	186	0.13	0.04, 0.38	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.004</b>
Other	117	0.09	0.00, 0.62	<b>0.036</b>	0.14	78	0.07	0.01, 0.67	<b>0.021</b>	0.057
Self-determination score	593	1.01	0.96, 1.06	0.7	0.9	610	1.00	0.96, 1.04	>0.9	>0.9

<sup>1</sup>OR = Odds Ratio, CI = Confidence Interval; <sup>2</sup>False discovery rate correction for multiple testing; <sup>3</sup>Abbreviations are:- H, Humanities; Soc, Social Sciences; Nat/Life Sci, Natural and Life Sciences; Med/Allied, Medicine and Allied courses.


192

193

#### 194 **Analysis of VAX scores**

195 Both Asian and Black ethnic groups had significantly lower VAX scores than White ethnicity, indicating a higher level of vaccine hesitancy in the former  
 196 groups (Figure 1). Similarly, we observed that home students had significantly lower VAX scores than students living in private or other accommodation  
 197 (Figure 1). The mean VAX score for students living in halls was higher but not significantly different to those living at home, indicating a trend for home  
 198 students to be more vaccine hesitant than those who lived in other locations during this academic year.

199



200

201 **Figure 1. VAX scores for a range of ethnic groups and study residences.** The VAX score was determined for each student from responses to four  
 202 statements about vaccines (statements 17.1, 17.2, 17.3 and 17.5 in Question 17; see S1 Table and S2 Figure). VAX scores range from 0 to 1 representing high  
 203 to low vaccine hesitancy. The VAX scores were determined for all individuals in four broad ethnic groups (A) or places of residence during the university  
 204 term (B). Graphs show violin plots with the mean scores indicated by a red circle. Box, IQR; line, IQR + 1.5 times IQR; line within box, median. P values  
 205 were derived using pairwise tests with FDR correction.

206

207 **Knowledge of MMR and MenACWY vaccine status among students**

208 Views on MMR and MenACWY vaccines are shown in Table 3. Very few students (2-4%) self-reported not having had the MMR or MenACWY vaccines,  
 209 but an additional 8% did not know if they had had their MMR vaccine and 23% did not know if they had had their MenACWY vaccine (Table 3).  
 210 International students were more likely not to know their vaccination status compared to local students (Table 3). Additionally, 15% of UK students did not  
 211 know that the MMR and MenACWY were available free of charge in the UK and 6% reported not knowing that COVID-19 vaccines were also available free

212 of charge. Again, these proportions were significantly higher among international students. More than half (57% and 61%, respectively) of students favoured  
 213 on-campus MMR/MenACWY and COVID-19 vaccine provision, respectively. UK-based international students were also highly supportive of this provision  
 214 with 52-62% selecting a “definitely increase” response for these vaccines (**Error! Reference source not found.**).  
 215

216 Table 3. Comparative knowledge and attitudes to on campus delivery of COVID-19, MMR and MenACWY vaccines

Question	Vaccine Types	Possible Answers	UK students (N = 734)	UK-based international students (N = 48)	Non-UK international student (N = 38)	p-value
Qu. 13. Have you received the following vaccines either as a child or adult	13.1.a. MMR (measles, mumps and rubella)	Yes	659 (90%)	28 (58%)	23 (61%)	<0.001
		Don't Know	58 (7.9%)	19 (40%)	12 (32%)	
		No	17 (2.3%)	1 (2.1%)	3 (7.9%)	
	13.2.a. MenACWY (meningitis)	Yes	538 (73%)	17 (35%)	18 (47%)	<0.001
		Don't Know	170 (23%)	25 (52%)	17 (45%)	
		No	26 (3.5%)	6 (12%)	3 (7.9%)	
Qu. 14. Are you aware that all of these vaccines are free in the UK for students?	14.1.a. MMR/MenACWY	Yes	623 (85%)	23 (48%)	15 (39%)	<0.001
		No	111 (15%)	25 (52%)	23 (61%)	
	14.2.b. COVID-19	Yes	693 (94%)	43 (90%)	23 (61%)	<0.001
		No	41 (5.6%)	5 (10%)	15 (39%)	
Qu. 15. If vaccines were offered on campus, would this affect your decision to be vaccinated?	15.1.a. MenACWY/MMR	Definitely increase	313 (43%)	25 (52%)	10 (26%)	n/a <sup>1</sup>
		Somewhat increase	103 (14%)	8 (17%)	9 (24%)	
		Neither	290 (40%)	13 (27%)	18 (47%)	
		Somewhat decrease	2 (0.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	
		Definitely decrease	2 (0.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.6%)	
		Don't know	24 (3.3%)	2 (4.2%)	0 (0%)	
	15.2.a. COVID-19	Definitely increase	331 (45%)	30 (62%)	11 (29%)	n/a
		Somewhat increase	116 (16%)	6 (12%)	9 (24%)	
		Neither	264 (36%)	10 (21%)	17 (45%)	
		Somewhat decrease	3 (0.4%)	2 (4.2%)	0 (0%)	

Definitely decrease	2 (0.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.6%)
Don't know	18 (2.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

---

217

218

## 219 **Univariable and multivariable analyses of attitudes to on-campus vaccinations**

220 The univariable analysis of on-campus MMR/MenACWY vaccine programmes identified a significant association with MMR vaccine status indicating that  
221 those who responded with either a 'Yes' or 'Don't Know' response for their vaccine status were in favour of these programmes (S7 Table). However, these  
222 responses were not significant in the multivariate analysis after correction for multiple testing (S8 Table). The univariable analysis of on-campus COVID-19  
223 vaccine provision found significant associations with COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and term-time residence (S7 Table). In the multivariable analysis, vaccine  
224 hesitancy was negatively correlated with on-campus provision (S8 Table). Multivariable logistic regression of term-time residence indicated that students  
225 studying in halls (OR 3.5 95% CI 1.6-7.6, adjusted P = 0.021) or private accommodation (OR 2.6, 95% CI 1.3-4.99, adjusted P = 0.03) were in favour of this  
226 provision.

227

## 228 **Discussion**

229 University students are a critical group for illness and spread of infectious diseases and hence are an important target for vaccination programmes. Our survey  
230 of University of Leicester students was unique in that we evaluated both attitudes to and mechanisms for uptake of the three major vaccines targeted to this  
231 population group in the UK. Our study indicates that ethnicity, concerns over side-effects and place of residence are key determinants of COVID-19 vaccine  
232 hesitancy. We also found high levels of uncertainty among students about their MenACWY and MMR vaccine status. As an approach to facilitating vaccine  
233 uptake, students were asked about on-campus provision of vaccines and reported to favour this approach. Based on our findings we elaborate key  
234 recommendations for improved vaccine delivery to this population sector.

235

236 Our observed high uptake (64%) of COVID-19 vaccines was surprising given that this age group only became eligible for COVID-19 vaccines during the  
237 course of our data collection. These uptake levels were significantly higher than the wider young adult population at that time (P<0.0001 as compared to



238 Leicester 18-24 year olds; S1 Figure), suggesting that these students were more proactive about accessing COVID-19 vaccines than their peers. This high  
239 uptake may also have been partially attributable to high participation in the study by pro-vaccine students and/or to surge vaccinations in the Leicester  
240 COVID-19 hotspot, including a pop-up vaccination centre in De Montfort Hall, adjacent to the UoL campus, that took place just prior to initiation of the  
241 survey. We also observed a high willingness for uptake of COVID-19 vaccines (95%) among the University of Leicester survey respondents. These findings  
242 may reflect the effectiveness of both the delivery of vaccines to students and the information campaign on the benefits of these vaccines. The subsequent  
243 evidence of uptake rates of >90% in an ONS study of UK university students [32] indicates that, despite the caveats (see below), our study was a reasonable  
244 predictor of student attitudes to vaccines. Intriguingly, we also found that 93% (37/40) of the COVID-19 vaccine hesitant individuals reported having had at  
245 least one of the MMR and MenACWY vaccines with 50% (20/40) having had both; this would suggest that these individuals are specifically concerned about  
246 the COVID-19 vaccines or that vaccine hesitancy has developed during their transition to adulthood.

247

#### 248 Determinants of vaccine hesitancy among university students

249 A key concern for vaccination programmes has been to identify groups of individuals with lower levels of vaccine uptake. Our univariable analysis indicated  
250 that ethnicity was strongly linked to vaccine hesitancy, with the multivariable analysis further linking this hesitancy to the black ethnic group within the wider  
251 university student population. As these findings were based on small numbers of vaccine-hesitant individuals, we examined the VAX scores for all  
252 individuals of each ethnic group and found that both the Asian and Black ethnic groups had significantly lower average scores than the White ethnic group  
253 indicating a general trend towards hesitancy among the minority ethnic groups (Figure 1). Other studies have also found evidence of vaccine hesitancy  
254 associated with ethnicity [33-36] and specifically with students of black ethnicity [36]. Hesitancy in these groups has been linked to discrimination, mistrust  
255 of healthcare organisations, misinformation, lower perceived vaccine efficacy/safety. A substantial proportion of vaccine hesitant individuals (37.5%; 15/40)  
256 in our study agreed with a statement that COVID-19 vaccines had not been thoroughly tested in different ethnic groups (S9 Table).

257

258 Our study also identified some evidence that students registered in medical courses were significantly less likely to be vaccine hesitant than students  
259 registered for other courses. Other studies have also observed higher uptake of vaccines among medical students [8]. Medical students may be more  
260 knowledgeable about vaccines and interested in preventing illnesses, as inculcated in the duty of care for healthcare professionals, and hence are likely to be  
261 more in favour of vaccination programmes than other groups.

262

263 A novel finding was of an association between vaccine hesitancy and students who lived at home. This association may be part of a general trend as the  
264 average VAX scores for all students living at home was significantly lower than those living in private accommodation or other, mainly mixed,  
265 accommodation types (Figure 1). Despite lockdowns and extensive online teaching, the home student group was small as only 7% of national and 19% of  
266 international students reported remaining at home for the 2019/2020 academic year. Higher vaccine hesitancy in students living at home may be explained by  
267 a consideration of the concerns around spreading of COVID-19. While their risk of hospitalization (and hence personal safety) was not a significant predictor  
268 of vaccine hesitancy in our multivariate regression ( $P = 0.6$ ), we found that there were lower levels of vaccine hesitancy among students concerned about  
269 spreading COVID-19 (OR 0.5, 95%CI 0.3-0.81,  $P=0.024$ ). Students living at home were less concerned about spreading COVID-19 than those living away  
270 from home (50% and 62%, respectively). We postulate that this attitude may be driven by a lower perceived risk of the potential for spreading the disease due  
271 to reduced day-to-day social interactions compared to students living in halls or private accommodation.

272

273 A concern raised by our study is of an association between potential side effects of COVID-19 vaccines and vaccine hesitancy. Our study was performed a  
274 few months after concerns about side-effects of the AstraZeneca vaccine became apparent, leading to recommendations for young people to receive the  
275 Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine instead. Concerns over side-effects were associated with vaccine hesitancy in both our univariate and multivariate models,  
276 indicating that this important factor could reduce vaccine uptake. Unfortunately, we did not query which side-effects in particular the students were concerned  
277 about and hence it is possible that common but mild side-effects may be enough to dissuade ambivalent students from receiving vaccinations. However, we  
278 also note that many students still obtained COVID-19 vaccines despite these concerns suggesting that other factors may over-ride the perceived risks of side-  
279 effects. It will be interesting to observe whether this effect has dissipated over time with more information on the low occurrence of severe reactions and  
280 improved strategies for preventing occurrences.

281

282 MMR and MenACWY vaccine status

283 An important strategy for increasing MMR and MenACWY vaccine uptake among young adults is making them aware of their vaccination status [37]. This is  
284 now demonstrably possible via digital applications such as the NHSapp and EU Digital COVID certificate. Our survey found high levels of uncertainty  
285 among students about their MMR (11% didn't know) and MenACWY (26% didn't know) vaccine status and 3-4% who reported no uptake (**Error!**)

286 **Reference source not found.**) In a 2019/2020 questionnaire performed just prior to the pandemic, 16% and 54% of University of Leicester students reported  
287 not knowing their MMR and MenACWY vaccine status, respectively [22]. That study also found that 37% of students were unaware that these vaccines were  
288 free and accessible through GP practices.

289 Other estimates of vaccine uptake in England have indicated that 86% of eligible individuals have had both doses of the MMR vaccine (in July 2019) and the  
290 single-dose of the MenACWY vaccine (in 2017/2018) with the MMR vaccination level being below the >95% coverage recommend by the World Health  
291 Organisation for preventing measles and mumps outbreaks [19, 21, 38]. It is likely that many of the students who are uncertain about their vaccine status have  
292 not had these vaccines. A particularly concerning feature of our study was that a higher proportion of international students had not had the MMR and  
293 MenACWY or did not know their status for these vaccines; these students will be at a higher potential risk of contracting and/or spreading the diseases  
294 targeted by these vaccines. In England, Public Health England recommends that anyone who is uncertain about their vaccine status or has missed a vaccine  
295 dose should be offered these vaccines [39]. Most students will be unaware of this recommendation, indeed 20% of UoL students did not know that these  
296 vaccines are free (**Error! Reference source not found.**). Addressing these issues is important for maintaining both direct protection and herd protection  
297 across the population for measles, mumps and four of the five major serogroups responsible for invasive meningococcal disease in the UK.

298

#### 299 On campus provision of vaccines

300 A high proportion of students were in favour of on campus provision of MenACWY, MMR and COVID-19 vaccines. These proportions were even higher  
301 among international students who were based in the UK, which may reflect difficulties in understanding how to access the UK medical system. The  
302 statistically significant evidence of support for provision of on-campus COVID-19 vaccinations by students who are not studying at home is an indication that  
303 students value easy access to vaccinations. The success of COVID-19 vaccine pop-ups and the University of Nottingham's programme for delivery of the  
304 MenACWY vaccine in the pre-pandemic era indicate that students value and will access these services [9].

305

#### 306 Recommendations

307 Harnessing new approaches developed during the UK COVID-19 vaccine roll-out is a potential positive legacy of the pandemic to build-back-better for future  
308 generations. Empowering digitally-aware young people to take responsibility for their own health and to engage in community health policies is an

309 achievable, cost-efficient outcome with far-reaching personal and population benefits. A key recommendation is for provision of vaccine status information  
310 for all vaccines on digital platforms, such as the NHSapp in the UK. Promoting digital platforms with vaccine status and information about accessing any  
311 missed vaccinations should help increase vaccine coverage particular among individuals who are uncertain about their vaccine status. Benefits could include  
312 protection of more individuals and improved population protection through reduced transmission. Specific delivery of vaccine information and simple access  
313 to vaccines by international students should be a gold-standard for the university sector as the financial gains accrued from these students must be allied to  
314 high welfare provision. On-campus vaccination programmes should be widely adopted for all relevant vaccines as the preferred strategy of getting vaccinated  
315 prior to attending university has never been optimal.

316

### 317 Strengths and limitations

318 A strength of this study is that it is the first to simultaneously evaluate uptake, knowledge and attitudes to COVID-19, MMR and MenACWY vaccines among  
319 university students. A further strength is the high number and ethnic diversity of the participant population. The use of multivariable regression was a strength  
320 that allowed for adjustment for confounders and for identification of significant associations between variables and vaccination parameters with the potential  
321 to inform vaccination policies.

322

323 Findings from this study may, however, be affected by the inherent limitations of cross-sectional studies. The response rate of 8% indicates that there may  
324 have been a response bias due to demographics. The strengths and limitations arising from a range of demographics were considered above but it is possible  
325 that biases from other unaccounted demographics (e.g. socioeconomic status) may confound generalisability of our data to the wider UK student population.  
326 A significant potential limitation of our study, and inherent in many studies of vaccination, is enhanced participation by individuals with pro-vaccine attitudes  
327 and reduced participation by vaccine hesitant individuals. Our fully anonymised survey system and inducements to participate was designed to minimise this  
328 bias. Our level of vaccine hesitancy as determined by vaccine uptake is similar to other studies. However, this strict determination of vaccine hesitancy may  
329 have missed the full range of hesitancy and excluded students who obtained the vaccine despite having a degree of vaccine hesitancy.

330

### 331 Conclusions

332 The findings from this study indicate that there may be differences in uptake and access to the COVID-19, MenACWY and MMR vaccines among university  
333 students. Students of Black ethnicity and those residing at home were less likely to be vaccinated with COVID-19 vaccines. Further research on the reasons  
334 for hesitancy may be required in order to delivery more effective, ‘tailored’ vaccine information and to develop methods for enhancing trust and acceptance of  
335 vaccines in these groups. High levels of uncertainty about personal vaccine status and availability of the MMR and MenACWY vaccines were observed and  
336 are likely to impact on vaccine uptake. On campus vaccination delivery was found to be widely favoured particularly by on-campus and international  
337 students. These knowledge gaps and delivery approaches should be considered in future student-focussed vaccination campaigns and explored through  
338 additional research. Our findings indicate that adopting ‘best-practices’ of easy access and digital vaccine information within the university-sector may  
339 breakdown barriers and future-proof uptake of all required vaccines among students.

340

#### 341 **Acknowledgements**

342 The authors would like to thank Dan Smith and Tamara Vivian for help with setting up and circulation of the questionnaire to University of Leicester  
343 students. The authors would also like to thank all the students who participated in this questionnaire.

344

#### 345 **Authors Contributions**

346 The study was conceived and designed by CDB, LG and MP. Data collection was overseen by CDB. Data collation and analysis was performed by AW and  
347 CDB. All authors were equally involved in data interpretation and writing of the manuscript.

348

#### 349 **Funding**

350 This work was supported by a Time Critical COVID-19 grant (ES/W00299X/1) from the Economic and Social Research Council (to CB, LG,  
351 and MP), by a MRC-UK Research and Innovation and NIHR, entitled UK-REACH, (MR/V027549/1) award (to MP) and an NIHR  
352 Development and Skills Enhancement Award (to MP).

353

354 Role of the Funding Source

355 The funders of this study had no role in the study design, with collection, analysis or interpretation of the data, in writing of the report and in the  
356 decision to submit this article for publication.

357

358 Declarations of Competing Interests

359 MZ and SNL are employed by Public Health England. All other authors declare that they have no known financial interests or personal  
360 relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

361

## 362 **References**

- 363 1. Abrams EM, Shaker M, Sinha I, Greenhawt M. COVID-19 vaccines: addressing hesitancy in young people with allergies. *Lancet*: 2021; 9:1090-  
364 1091. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600\(21\)00370-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(21)00370-2)
- 365 2. Ainslie D, Ogwuru C, Sinclair. Coronavirus and vaccine hesitancy, Great Britain, 9 August 2021. ONS Study. Release date 9<sup>th</sup> August 2021.  
366 <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandvaccinehesitancygreatbritain/9august2021>  
367
- 368 3. Mandal S, Campbell H, Ribeiro S, Gray S, Carr T, White J, et al. Risk of invasive meningococcal disease in university students in England and  
369 optimal strategies for protection using MenACWY vaccine. *Vaccine* 2017; 35: 5814-5818. [10.1016/j.vaccine.2017.09.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2017.09.024)
- 370 4. Vusirikala A, Whitaker H, Jones S, Tessier E, Borrow R, Linley E, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in university students: cross-  
371 sectional study, December 2020, England. *J Infect* 2021; 83: 104-111. [doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2021.04.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2021.04.028)
- 372 5. Lu H, Weintz C, Pace J, et al. Are college campuses superspreaders? A data-driven modelling study. *Computer Methods in Biomechanics and*  
373 *Biomedical Engineering* 2021; :1-11. Published online at DOI: [10.1080/10255842.2020.1869221](https://doi.org/10.1080/10255842.2020.1869221)
- 374 6. Yapp R and Pereira E. Coronavirus (COVID-19) infection survey, UK:30 July 2021, Office for National Statistics. Published online on 30<sup>th</sup> July 2021  
375 at  
376 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/coronaviruscovid19infectionsurveypilot](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/coronaviruscovid19infectionsurveypilot/latest#age-analysis-of-the-number-of-people-who-had-covid-19)  
377 [/latest#age-analysis-of-the-number-of-people-who-had-covid-19](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/coronaviruscovid19infectionsurveypilot/latest#age-analysis-of-the-number-of-people-who-had-covid-19)

- 378 7. Aw J, Seng JJB, Seah SSY, Low LL. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy – a scoping review of literature in high-income countries. *Vaccines* 2021; 9: 900.  
379 [https:// doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9080900](https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9080900)
- 380 8. Blagden S, Seddon D, Hungerford D., Stanistreet D. Uptake of a new meningitis vaccination programme amongst first-year undergraduate students in  
381 the United Kingdom: a cross sectional study. *PLoS ONE* 2017; 12: e0181817.
- 382 9. Kecojevic A, Basch CH, Sullivan M, Chen YT, Davi NK. COVID-19 Vaccination and Intention to Vaccinate Among a Sample of College Students in  
383 New Jersey. *J. Community Health*:2021; <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10900-021-00992-3>
- 384 10. Saied SM, Saied EM, Kabbash IA, Abdo SAEF. Vaccine hesitancy: Beliefs and barriers associated with COVID-19 vaccination among Egyptian  
385 medical students. *J. Med. Virol.* 2021; 93: 4280-4291. doi: 10.1002/jmv.26910
- 386 11. Bai W, Cai H, Liu S, Liu H, Qi H, Chen X, et al. Attitudes toward COVID-19 vaccines in Chinese. *Int. J. Biol. Sci.* 2021; 17: 1469-1475. doi:  
387 10.7150/ijbs.58835
- 388 12. Jiang N, Wei B, Lin H, Wang S, Chai S, Liu W. Nursing students’ attitudes, knowledge, and willingness to receive the COVID-19 vaccine: A cross-  
389 sectional study. *medRxiv.* 2021: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.05.24.21257710v1>
- 390 13. Walker AN, Zhang T, Peng XQ, Ge JJ, Gu H, You H. Vaccine Acceptance and Its Influencing Factors: An Online Cross-Sectional Study among  
391 International College Students Studying in China. *Vaccines.* 2021; 9: 585. <https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9060585>
- 392 14. Silva J, Bratberg J, Lemay V. COVID-19 and Influenza Vaccine Hesitancy Among College Students. *Journal of the American Pharmacists*  
393 *Association.* 2021; :1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.japh.2021.05.009>
- 394 15. European Medicines Agency. AstraZeneca’s COVID-19 vaccine: EMA finds possible link to very rare cases of unusual blood clots with low blood  
395 platelets. Released 07/04/2021. [https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/astrazenecas-covid-19-vaccine-ema-finds-possible-link-very-rare-cases-unusual-](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/astrazenecas-covid-19-vaccine-ema-finds-possible-link-very-rare-cases-unusual-blood-clots-low-blood)  
396 [blood-clots-low-blood](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/astrazenecas-covid-19-vaccine-ema-finds-possible-link-very-rare-cases-unusual-blood-clots-low-blood)
- 397 16. Fragkou PC and Dimopoulou D. Serious complications of COVID-19 vaccines: a mini-review. *Metabolism Open* 2021; 12: 100145.  
398 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.metop.2021.100145>
- 399 17. Ladhani SN, Beebeejaun K, Lucidarme J, Campbell H, Gray S, Kaczmarek E, *et al.* Increase in endemic *Neisseria meningitidis* capsular group W  
400 ST-11 complex associated with severe invasive disease in England and Wales. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2014; 60: 578-585.  
401 <https://academic.oup.com/cid/article/60/4/578/2895792>

- 402 18. Turner DPJ, Oldfield NJ, Bayliss CD. University vaccine campaign increases meningococcal ACWY vaccine coverage. *Public Health* 2017; 145: 1-3.  
403 doi:10.1016/j.puhe.2016.12.010
- 404 19. Investigation into pre-school vaccinations. National Audit Office, Press Release, 25<sup>th</sup> October 2019. [https://www.nao.org.uk/press-](https://www.nao.org.uk/press-release/investigation-into-pre-school-vaccinations/)  
405 [release/investigation-into-pre-school-vaccinations/](https://www.nao.org.uk/press-release/investigation-into-pre-school-vaccinations/)
- 406 20. Subbarao S, Campbell H, Ribeiro S, Clark SA, Lucidarme J, Ramsey M, et al. Invasive meningococcal disease, 2011-2020, and impact of the  
407 COVID-19 pandemic, England. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2021; 27: 2495-2497. 10.3201/eid2709.204866
- 408 21. Durrheim DN, Andrus JK, Tabassum S, Bashour H, Githanga D, Pfaff G. A dangerous measles future looms beyond the COVID-19 pandemic.  
409 *Nature Medicine* 2021; 27: 360-362. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01237-5>
- 410 22. Ramjee A, Ogilvie C, Couto A, Matini T, Anaele CC, Oldfield NJ, et al. How effective are governmental and university campaigns for increasing  
411 meningitis vaccine uptake? A commentary. *Bioarchive*, 2021.
- 412 23. Whisnant J, Martin-Kerry J, Flett L, Knapp P. Predictors of meningococcal vaccine uptake in university and college students: a systematic review and  
413 meta-analysis. *J American College Health* 2020; 1-13. DOI: 10.1080/07448481.2020.1819292
- 414 24. Martin LR and Petrie KJ. Understanding the dimensions of anti-vaccination attitudes: the vaccination attitudes examination (VAX) scale. *Ann Behav*  
415 *Med* 2017; 51: 652-660. doi: 10.1007/s12160-017-9888-y.
- 416 25. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. 2020.  
417 <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 418 26. Wickham H, Averick M, Bryan J, Chang W, McGowan LD, Francois R, et al. Welcome to the tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software* 2020; 4:  
419 1686. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686>
- 420 27. Ooms J. The jsonlite Package: A Practical and Consistent Mapping Between JSON Data and R Objects. 2014. arXiv:1403.2805.  
421 <https://arxiv.org/abs/1403.2805>.
- 422 28. Wickham H. *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*. Springer-Verlag New York, 2016.
- 423 29. Sjoberg DD, Curry M, Hannum M, Whiting K, Zabor EC. *gtsummary: Presentation-Ready Data Summary and Analytic Result Tables*. R package  
424 version 1.3.5. 2020. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=gtsummary>



- 425 30. Gehlenborg N. UpSetR: A More Scalable Alternative to Venn and Euler Diagrams for Visualizing Intersecting Sets. R package version 1.4.0. 2019.  
426 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=UpSetR>
- 427 31. Bryer J, Speerschneider K. likert: Analysis and Visualization Likert Items. R package version 1.3.5. 2016. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=likert>
- 428 32. Gibbs T. Coronavirus and higher education students: 22 October to 1 November 2021. Release date 10 November 2021. Available at:  
429 <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandhighereducationstudents/2>  
430 [2octoberto1november2021](https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/healthandwellbeing/bulletins/coronavirusandhighereducationstudents/2)
- 431 33. Woolf K, McManus C, Martin CA, Nellums LB, Guyatt AL, Melbourne C, et al. Ethnic differences in SARS-CoV-2 vaccine hesitancy in United  
432 Kingdom healthcare workers: results from the UK-REACH prospective nationwide cohort study. *Lancet Reg. Health – Eur.* 2021; 100180.  
433 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanpe.2021.100180>
- 434 34. Bogart LM, Dong L, Gandhi P, Ryan S, Smith TL, Klein DJ, et al. What Contributes to COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy in Black Communities, and  
435 How Can It Be Addressed? RAND Corporation: Santa Monica, CA, USA, 2021.
- 436 35. Shekhar R, Sheikh AB, Upadhyay S, Singh M, Kottewar S, Mir H, et al. COVID-19 Vaccine Acceptance among Health Care Workers in the United  
437 States. *Vaccines* 2021; 9: 119. <https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9020119>
- 438 36. Siani A, Driscoll M, Hurst T, Coker T, Grantham AG, Bunet A. Investigating the determinants of vaccine hesitancy within undergraduate students’  
439 social sphere. *J Pub Health: From Theory to Practice.* 2020; Apr 9: 1-9. DOI 10.1007/s10389-021-01538-6
- 440 37. Bayliss CD, Gies L, Pareek M. UniCoVac Position Paper: Considerations for University Campus-Based Vaccination Programmes for COVID-19 and  
441 Other Infectious Disease Vaccines. Available online at: <https://journals.le.ac.uk/ojs1/index.php/lias/article/view/3849>
- 442 38. Public Health England. Vaccine coverage estimates for the school based meningococcal ACWY (MenACWY) adolescent vaccination programme in  
443 England, to 31 August 2018. Available at  
444 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/773539/hpr0319\\_vc-menACWY.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/773539/hpr0319_vc-menACWY.pdf)
- 445 39. Public Health England. Vaccination of individuals with uncertain or incomplete immunisation status. Updated 26 August 2021.  
446 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/vaccination-of-individuals-with-uncertain-or-incomplete-immunisation-status/vaccination-of->  
447 [individuals-with-uncertain-or-incomplete-immunisation-status](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/vaccination-of-individuals-with-uncertain-or-incomplete-immunisation-status/vaccination-of-)
- 448

449

450 **Supporting information**

451 **S1 Table. UniCoVac Questionnaire.**

452 **S2 Table. Weighting values for the weighted multivariate analysis.**

453 **S3 Table. Comparison of ethnicity demographics of UniCoVac questionnaire participants to University of Leicester and UK universities**

454 **S4 Table. Comparison of gender demographics of UniCoVac questionnaire participants to University of Leicester and UK universities**

455 **S5 Table. Comparison of demographics for Year groups between UniCoVac questionnaire participants and University of Leicester undergraduate population**

457 **S6 Table. Classification of questionnaire respondents for vaccine hesitancy (dichotomous)<sup>1</sup>.**

458 **S7 Table. Univariable analysis of attitudes to on campus delivery of MMR and MenACWY vaccines**

459 **S8 Table. Multivariate analysis of attitudes to on campus delivery of MMR and MenACWY vaccines**

460 **S9 Table. Reasons for hesitancy of vaccine hesitant individuals.**

461 **S1 Figure. Comparison of the vaccination levels of UniCoVac participants to comparator populations.** A total of 527 participants (63.7%)  
462 indicated that they had had ‘at least one dose of a COVID-19 vaccine’ in response to question 10 of the UniCoVac questionnaire. This data was analysed  
463 relative to the time of submission of the questionnaire to determine whether the proportion of immunised individuals increased during the study and in  
464 comparisons to local and countrywide rates for an age-matched population (note that 94% of UniCoVac participants were in the 18-25 age bracket). We note  
465 that surge vaccinations were performed in Leicester between 25/05/2021 and 6/06/2021 with 21,500 vaccinations being administered in multiple locations  
466 including De Montfort Hall which is adjacent to the University of Leicester campus. Graph **a** shows the accumulated submissions (solid line) for the three  
467 weeks that the survey was open and the accumulated number of submissions from vaccinated individuals (dashed line). The submission spikes on the 1<sup>st</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>  
468 and 16<sup>th</sup> June equate to days when the questionnaire was sent out to students (indicating that most students answer the survey within a few hours of receipt of  
469 the email). There is no substantial difference during the collection period indicating that any effect of the surge vaccinations on uptake occurred prior to but  
470 not during the study period. Graph **b** shows the % of vaccinated individuals for the UniCoVac participants (solid black line) and 18-24 year olds in Leicester  
471 (dashed blue line), East Midlands (dashed red line) and England (dashed green line). A statistical comparison was performed relative to the Leicester cohort

472 as this cohort has the highest uptake and because a high proportion of University of Leicester students would have been able to take advantage of surge  
473 vaccinations in Leicester.

474 **S2 Figure. Comparison of vaccine confidence scores for vaccine hesitant and non-hesitant participants.** Participants were asked to rank five statements  
475 on attitudes to vaccines (the full text of survey question 17 is provided in supplementary information). Ranking was from 1, strongly disagree, to 7, strongly  
476 agree. The range of responses for each statement is presented for the hesitant and non-hesitant groups as separate bar graphs with percentages on the left and  
477 right indicating disagree (1-3) and agree (5-7) responses, respectively. Note that responses 17.1, 17.2, 17.3 and 17.5 were combined to generate a VAX score.

478 **S3 Figure. Experiences of deaths among friends, family or others.** Question 21 of the survey asked students: “Do you personally know anyone who  
479 has died from COVID-19?” Students were allowed to make multiple selections, but in most cases selected one category. Horizontal columns, selection  
480 frequency for each individual option; vertical bars, selection frequency for combinations of options.

481 **S4 Figure. Concerns about the side-effects of COVID-19 vaccines.** Question 12 asked participants to indicate the extent to which they agreed with a  
482 statement on side-effects (i.e. “I am concerned about the side-effects of COVID-19 vaccines?”) for the Oxford AstraZeneca, Pfizer-BioNTech and all  
483 COVID-19 vaccines. The extent of agreement was indicated by selecting numbers from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) or Don’t know.  
484 Percentages for each score are shown in a bar graph with combined percentage values for scores of 1-3, 4 and 5-7 being shown on the left, middle and right,  
485 respectively.