

1 COVID-19 Beliefs, Behaviors, and Perceptions Among Students on a College Campus During
2 the Global Coronavirus Pandemic
3
4
5
6

7 Avian White, MSEH, DrPH^{1*}, Guy Iverson, MS, PhD¹, LaNika Wright, PhD WHNP-BC^{3,4}, John
8 T. Fallon III, MD, PhD², Charles Humphrey, MS, PhD¹
9
10
11
12

13 ¹Department of Health Education and Promotion,

14 ²Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine

15 ³Executive Director Student Health Services

16 ⁴Associate Vice Chancellor of Health and Wellbeing, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC

17 *Corresponding Author

18 whiteav15@ecu.edu (AW)
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **Abstract**

31 Objectives:

32 Elucidating how people think and behave during a disease outbreak may provide valuable insight
33 and help direct programs or surveillance to combat the spread of disease. As universities
34 welcomed students back to their campuses following COVID-19 shutdowns, it became important
35 to know students' beliefs on COVID-19 and how these beliefs guided behaviors?

36 The objective of this study was to determine how students at East Carolina University felt about
37 COVID-19, which behaviors they exhibited during the pandemic, and whether their feelings and
38 behaviors differed significantly between the Spring and Fall 2021 semesters.

39 Methods:

40 Surveys (N= 408) were distributed to students who were currently enrolled in Environmental
41 Health Science classes during the Spring and Fall semesters of 2021. Questions were developed
42 using a Likert scale and were analyzed to determine significant differences ($p < 0.05$) between
43 semesters. Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS (SPSS Institute, Chicago, Ill).

44 Results:

45 Results showed most students felt “somewhat concerned” about the COVID-19 pandemic during
46 both semesters. Significant differences in student concern regarding COVID-19 between Spring
47 and Fall semesters, were not observed $p = 0.598$. Student behaviors regarding weekly gatherings
48 significant differed between semesters with a reported increase in gatherings of 5+ during the
49 Fall semester, $p < 0.001$. Interestingly, we found more students indicated during the Spring
50 semester in comparison to the Fall that they believed the vaccine was not safe and they would
51 not take it ($p < 0.001$).

52 Conclusion:

53 Our findings suggest that as the pandemic went on, behavior changes were observed in students
54 between the semesters. This information may be important to officials as cases may fluctuate
55 over time. Knowledge of attitudes and/or behaviors and awareness may help explain these
56 fluctuations, allowing public health professionals to adjust recommendations and focus more
57 intently on populations at risk.

58 Keywords: COVID-19; student beliefs; public health; survey research, university student health

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67 **Introduction**

68 Surveys can be a useful tool in gathering population information if they are properly
69 developed, administered, and analyzed. Surveys with questions that solicit information such as
70 private behaviors, mental health, and attitudes from persons may result in more reliable and valid
71 data.^{1,2} Generally, surveys should be administered to a representative sample of the population of
72 interest, thus allowing for generalization of results to the entire population.^{3,4,5} This collection of
73 information may be of particular importance during times of disease outbreaks. Because infectious
74 diseases have the capacity to rapidly expand across populations, the ability to collect efficacious
75 data quickly may have a profound effect on public health policy development.⁶ The ease in which
76 some surveys can be delivered may provide a cost-effective means of gathering necessary data.⁷
77 Additionally, responses from surveys may help public health agencies determine populations most
78 at risk, as used during the height of the HIV/AIDS epidemic. This may help when determining and
79 rolling out prevention and disease mitigation programs. Thus, surveys have been useful in
80 healthcare epidemiology.

81 Recently, surveys have been used to gather information from specific populations during
82 the COVID-19 outbreak.^{8,9,10} One such study in Guangdong, Province in China sought to
83 determine the mental effects and awareness in college students regarding the disease and their
84 association with future health behaviors. Researchers found older students had greater levels of
85 awareness and higher-level changes in future behaviors.¹¹ Other surveys have shown an increased
86 prevalence of psychological health problems and a negative association with COVID-19
87 awareness levels in students.¹² Increased levels of disease awareness may have an impact on
88 behaviors that could contribute to the spread of disease and affect public health.^{13,14,15} Research
89 conducted on COVID-19 awareness has shown that those with increased awareness were more
90 likely to adopt strategies such as mask-wearing, social distancing, and handwashing.^{16,17,18,19} This
91 suggests that information gleaned from these surveys may be used to develop specific cost-
92 effective prevention strategies for targeted populations based on their needs.^{20,21}

93 Students on the campus of ECU were surveyed to determine their beliefs, attitudes, and
94 practices during the COVID-19 outbreak. It was hypothesized that there would be significant
95 differences with student attitudes and beliefs concerning COVID-19 between the Spring and Fall
96 semesters, with students becoming less concerned as vaccines become available and pandemic
97 fatigue grew. Additionally, we sought to determine whether behavioral changes occurred between
98 semesters with students becoming more relaxed with their manners (i.e., handwashing,
99 congregating in large groups, etc.) after the rollout of vaccines.

100 **Methods**

101 *Participants*

102 Surveys were distributed to students who were currently enrolled in Environmental
103 Health Science classes during the Spring and Fall semesters of 2021. Environmental Health
104 Science 2110 qualifies as is a natural science, general education requirement, thus students may
105 be representative of any undergraduate degree program at ECU since each student must complete
106 these foundational requirements. from multiple majors (e.g., psychology, pre-health, elementary
107 education, etc.) enroll in this class. Students had to be at least 18 years of age and actively
108 enrolled to participate in the survey. Student participants in these classes ranged from freshmen
109 to seniors. Additionally, master's students enrolled in Environmental Health Science 6210, a
110 graduate writing series class, were also invited to complete the survey. Data were collected from

111 students using an online anonymous survey created in and distributed through Research
112 Electronic Data Capture (RED Cap) survey system hosted at ECU.

113 *Ethics Statement*

114 This project was reviewed the East Carolina University and Medical Center Institutional Review
115 Board and was classified as exempt as it did not collect personal identifiers (UMCIRB# 21-
116 00186). A formal statement of consent was obtained via the through Research Electronic Data
117 Capture (RED Cap) survey system prior to starting the survey.

118 *Survey*

119 The survey included demographic questions regarding gender, race and ethnicity in
120 addition to information concerning housing status (e.g., on- or off-campus) and education levels.
121 Demographic data were compiled from the annual census completed by university administration
122 in Fall 2021 to compare the sample population to the broader student population. To determine
123 student beliefs and behaviors, participants were asked questions about virus perceptions, hand
124 washing and mask wearing. Additionally, students answered questions about their social and
125 learning experiences during the semester. Students in the Fall semester were given an additional
126 question concerning the impact of university transitions from different class types (e.g., online to
127 face-to-face) (Supplemental figure 1).

128 *Statistical Analysis*

129 Cross tabulations were performed to compare responses by different groups. Questions
130 were developed using a Likert scale and were analyzed to determine significant differences ($p <$
131 0.05) between the Spring and Fall 2021 semesters. For nonparametric data, a Kruskal-Wallis test
132 was used to determine significance between data consisting of more than 2 samples, while Mann-
133 Whitney testing was used to analyze significance between 2 samples. Statistical analyses were
134 performed using SPSS (SPSS Institute, Chicago, Ill). SPSS analysis also included a post-hoc
135 pairwise Mann-Whitney with Bonferroni adjustments.

136 *Results*

137 Surveys ($n = 408$) were disseminated to students enrolled in environmental health classes
138 during the Spring 2021 semester, with 102 responses received (25.2% response rate). During the
139 Fall, 243 surveys were administered with 99 responses received (40.7% response rate). The sample
140 population for the surveys exhibited similar racial percentages as the greater ECU student
141 population (Table 1). More specifically, the racial percentage of surveyed students were within 5%
142 of the general population for the two largest groups (African American and Caucasian). Males and
143 Hispanic ethnicity were both underrepresented in the survey relative to the broader student
144 population. The percentage of female respondents were approximately 17% greater than the
145 percentage of females at ECU, while the percentage of male respondents was approximately 19%
146 lower than the percentage of ECU's general population that identifies as male.

147
148 Table 1. Demographic data of student respondents and the Fall 2021 university census.
149 Demographic data for survey respondents were summarized by semester and pooled. Asterisks (*)
150 indicate data was not available.

	Spring 2021	Fall 2021	Overall	ECU Fall 2021
Gender	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)	%	%
Male	22 (21.6)	23 (23.2)	22.4	41
Female	79 (77.5)	74 (74.7)	76.1	59
Prefer not to answer	1 (1)	2 (2)	1.5	*
Race				
African-American	15 (14.7)	17 (17.2)	16	16.7
Caucasian	66 (64.7)	68 (68.7)	66.7	63.8
Asian	8 (7.8)	3 (3)	5.5	2.8
Native American	0 (0)	1 (1)	*	*
2 or More	6 (5.9)	1 (1)	*	*
Other	7 (6.9)	9 (9.1)	8.5	8.7
Ethnicity				
Hispanic or Latino	6 (5.9)	15 (15.2)	10.5	8
Not Hispanic or Latino	96 (94.1)	84 (84.8)	89.5	92

151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167

Student Attitudes and Beliefs Concerning COVID-19

Overall, it was shown that many students were somewhat concerned (46.5%) about the pandemic and believed it to be very transmissible (59.2%). Further analysis showed there was no significant difference in those feeling somewhat concerned between the Spring and Fall semesters, $X^2(3, N=200) = 1.877, p = 0.598$. The number of those who felt the virus was “very transmissible” slightly decreased from Spring (5.9%) to Fall (5.1%) semesters, however this difference was not statistically significant $X^2(2, N=201) = 0.921, p = 0.631$. Interestingly, 5.5% of the population felt the virus was very transmissible but were not concerned at all about the pandemic. It is possible these persons felt that while transmissible, the virus did not cause significant sickness and thus were not concerned.

168 While most classes during the Spring semester 2021 were online, dorms were open at
 169 limited capacity and students had the option to live in dormitories. Of the students who planned to
 170 live on campus, most (67.8%) felt safe with the housing arrangements. When analyzed by semester,
 171 61.5% of persons felt safe on campus during the Spring semester with the number rising to 72.7%
 172 for the Fall semester. This perception of safety may have affected a student’s decision to stay on
 173 campus, in addition to capacity limitations. When students who lived off campus were queried,
 174 31.6% said the COVID-19 pandemic affected their campus stay during the Spring semester, while
 175 47.8% of those during the Fall semester said the pandemic affected their stay. It is also possible
 176 that online classes and the ability to go to school from home may have contributed to the Spring
 177 semester having a lower percentage of students on campus being affected by COVID-19.

178 Overall, there was some concern about COVID-19 vaccine with only 45.8% responding
 179 they felt “very safe taking it” and 69.7% felt the vaccine was at least a little safe and would take it
 180 (Table 2). These concerns may have impacted the overall student vaccination rate, 74%, observed
 181 by ECU by the end of the fall semester (During the Spring semester, prior to full roll out of the
 182 vaccines, 30% of the student population felt the vaccine was “not safe and would not take it”, while
 183 only 7.1% of students felt this way during the Fall semester. There was an almost 23% increase in
 184 the percentage of students surveyed that perceived the vaccine as being safe from Spring to Fall.
 185 Chi-square analysis showed significant differences between the semesters $X^2(3, N= 201) = 18.418$,
 186 $p < 0.001$. For those who did not feel safe taking the vaccine, the predominant reason was
 187 “untrusting of medical professionals”. Others noted “fear of long-term side effects in a vaccine
 188 that had a very short study time” and “too politicized” as reasons for not wanting the vaccine.
 189

190 Table 2. Responses to questions regarding vaccine safety stratified by race and pooled between the
 191 Spring and Fall 2021 semesters.

	Yes, very safe taking it	A little safe, but would still take it	Not safe, but would still take it	Not safe, and would not take it	
Race					Total
African American	14 (15.2)	8 (16.7)	5 (21.7)	5 (13.2)	32 (15.9)
Caucasian	60 (65.2)	33 (68.8)	16 (69.6)	25 (65.8)	134 (66.7)
Asian	7 (7.6)	2 (4.2)	1 (4.3)	1 (2.6)	11 (5.5)
Native American	0	1 (2.1)	0	0	1 (0.5)
2 or More	3 (3.3)	2 (4.2)	0	2 (5.3)	7 (3.5)
Other	8 (8.7)	2 (4.2)	1 (4.3)	5 (13.2)	16 (8.0)
Total	92	48	23	38	

192
 193
 194 When reviewing vaccine perception data, those feeling very safe taking the vaccine did not differ
 195 much based-on gender. However, slightly more males, 24% responded as “not safe and would not
 196 take it” compared to 17% of females, a 7% difference. Overall, the percentage of students who
 197 would take the vaccine was 81.1%, regardless of the varying feelings of safety.

198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243

Student Behaviors During Spring and Fall 2021 Semesters

To help mitigate the spread of COVID-19 among persons, the CDC gave advice on preventative behaviors such as hand washing, visiting, and mask wearing. The CDC promoted hand hygiene as a mitigation measure for COVID-19.²² Observations of student responses in this survey showed frequency in daily handwashing behavior was almost evenly split between 4-6 times (24.9%), 7-8 times (21.8%), and 9+ times (22.7%). Additionally, the pandemic may have affected how students visited others or allowed visitors. Overall, 39.0% of students reported having visitors at least 1-2 times during the week, 28.5% of respondents reported not having any visitors. To help reduce the likelihood of spreading the virus, off campus students were discouraged from visiting dorms and students were cautioned against congregating in large groups whether on or off campus during the Spring semester. Significant differences were observed between the semesters ($p= 0.005$). Notably, an increase in visitor frequency during the Fall semester and less students reported not having visitors during the Fall was observed among respondents.

Although mask wearing was strongly encouraged, only 5.7% reported always wearing a mask when having visitors and 39.9% reported never wearing a mask. A higher percentage of students reported wearing masks during the Spring relative to Fall semesters, and the differences were statistically significant ($p = 0.042$). When analyzing mask wearing between genders, we found no statistical difference ($p = 0.161$). It's possible that COVID perceptions may have influenced mask wearing when campus students were entertaining visitors. Visitation may have also been influenced by the type of visitor (e.g., family, close friend), however we were not able to gather that information from this survey. Chi-square testing showed a significantly significant ($p = 0.001$) association between transmissibility perception and mask wearing. Notably, almost all persons who perceived the virus as not very transmissible, reported never wearing a mask (87.5%) (Figure 1).

[Insert Figure 1.]

Large gatherings were often discouraged during the COVID-19 outbreak. Survey responses showed 33.5% of students gathered in groups (e.g., parties, study groups, group hangouts) of 5+ on a weekly basis. There was an increase of persons reporting daily and weekly gatherings of 5+ in the Fall semester relative to the Spring and the differences were statistically significant ($p < 0.001$). No significant differences were observed between genders ($p = 0.220$). When comparing responses to perception of virus transmission, the majority of those that felt the virus was not very transmissible reported gatherings of 5+ at least weekly. The majority of those who reported not congregating in groups in 5+ also responded as viewing the virus as very transmissible (70.7%) (Figure 2.).

[Insert Figure 2.]

Student Perceptions of ECU and COVID During Fall and Spring 2021 Semesters

244 The full return to campus may have been intimidating for some students. The University
245 often worked to make sure COVID-19 information was disseminated and that students were able
246 to access the information. Students were asked questions on whether they felt ECU gave them
247 proper instructions to follow during the COVID-19 pandemic. The majority of students (87%) felt
248 they received proper guidance and chi-square analysis showed the responses were between
249 semesters were not significant ($p = 0.157$). One of the ways in which students were able to
250 determine if it was okay to come to campus or class was by using a COVID Daily Screening Tool.
251 Students were asked to use this checklist prior to coming to campus. Over half the students
252 surveyed (52.5%) reported never using the daily screening tool, while only 11% reported always
253 using it. There were no significant differences in tool usage when comparing Fall and Spring
254 semesters ($p = 0.601$). The COVID daily screening tool was sent out via text message and email.
255 Students were polled to find their preferred medium, with most students preferring texts (46.5%)
256 followed by email (37.5%).

257 Universities were also tasked with ensuring that student learning was not greatly affected
258 by shutdowns or transitions to remote learning during times of outbreak. Interestingly, 67% of
259 ECU students felt their overall learning experience during COVID-19 was either greatly reduced
260 or somewhat reduced (Figure 3). While most classes during the Spring semester were online, Fall
261 saw the pivot to more traditional face-to-face learning for most classes; however, larger classes,
262 50+, continued utilization of online learning. Results showed that the differences between Fall and
263 Spring semesters with regards to perceptions of learning experience were not significant ($p =$
264 0.780). Of note, most students who are recognized as upperclassmen reported a greatly reduced or
265 somewhat reduced learning experience. Another objective was to determine whether students had
266 difficulty transitioning from online learning to face-to-face during Fall semester. All students
267 reported some difficulties in the transition, with 62.5% reporting the transition was extremely
268 difficult.

269
270 *[Insert Figure 3.]*
271

272 Learning is a crucial part of student experience on college campuses, however social
273 interactions and experience also play a role in student collegiate life. Overall, student responses
274 showed most (80.8%) felt COVID-19 either greatly or somewhat affected their social activity.
275 Students indicated that their overall social experience was better during the Fall relative to Spring
276 semesters and the differences were statistically significant ($p = 0.005$), with 27.3% of Fall students
277 compared to 50.6% of Spring semester students reporting “greatly reduced social activity”. Hence,
278 students felt better socially (i.e., visiting, going out, being around people, etc.) during the Fall
279 semester.

280

281 **Discussion**

282 Viral outbreaks often have effects on daily activities. Thus, routine activities may be
283 influenced by perceptions and beliefs. Most students were concerned about the COVID-19
284 pandemic, while also feeling it to be very transmissible. The pandemic did not have a large overall
285 effect on student’s perception of safety on campus as most students felt safe throughout both
286 semesters. Overall, most students felt the vaccine had some level of safety and would take it.
287 However, 30% of respondents during the Spring semester reported they felt the vaccine was “not
288 safe and would not take it”. This may have been due to the origination of the vaccine during the
289 Spring and the confusion over vaccine information (e.g., number of doses, potential side effects,

290 etc.,). Additionally, students may have been concerned with the quickness in which the vaccine
291 was developed, accepted, and dispersed to the general population. Indeed, a 2020 study by Lucia
292 et al., highlighted a survey showing vaccine hesitancy among medical students.²² Another recent
293 study on vaccine hesitancy highlighted vaccine acceptance rates of 77.6% for COVID-19 vaccine
294 among general population along compared with an acceptance rate of 69% for the influenza
295 vaccine among the general population.²⁴ Interestingly, respondents noted some of the same reasons
296 for hesitancy as students in our study such as safety, vaccine produced to quickly, and lack of trust.

297 As universities sought to help students with these changes and perceived impacts on
298 learning, there was an emphasis on reopening and resuming normal (face-to-face) classes. Part of
299 this road to “normalcy” was an emphasis on students receiving vaccinations. Significant
300 differences between semesters on the perceived safety of vaccines was observed. Students during
301 the Fall semester had more positive perceptions and were more willing to take the vaccine. This
302 may have been attributed to the fact that by the Fall semester, vaccination rollouts had been going
303 on for numerous months and students were able to observe vaccine effects. Another reason that
304 the perception of the vaccine may have changed could be that students were ready to return to
305 campus. This change in perception and the addition of university vaccine encouragement may have
306 aided in the University’s 74% achieved vaccination rate among on-campus students. As vaccines
307 were heavily suggested, students may have felt they were safer. Universities, such as ECU,
308 implemented tools such as COVID daily screening tools to help students determine the safety of
309 coming to campus and/or to class. While these tools were disseminated via the preferred platforms
310 of use by students: texts (46.5%) and emails (37.5%), over half of students surveyed reported never
311 using the tool. Usage of the tool was low during each semester. It is possible that students did not
312 use the tool because they felt they had been given proper guidance on protocols to take to help
313 stem the virus. Students reported they felt ECU had given them proper guidance during the
314 pandemic. Thus, it’s possible students felt that if they followed this guidance there was no reason
315 to use the daily screening tool and that the tool was functioning as a redundancy.

316
317 Another objective was to determine if student behaviors differed between semesters as the
318 pandemic continued. Behavioral guidance was issued to help stem virus spread which included
319 mask wearing and discouraging large gatherings. Differences in mask wearing were observed
320 between Spring and Fall semesters with more persons reporting never wearing a mask during the
321 Fall semester when having visitors or when out visiting. Significant differences between semesters
322 were observed as more students reported gathering in groups of 5+ persons during the Fall. This
323 may have been attributed to multiple factors. By the Fall semester, vaccines were readily available
324 and at the beginning of the semester many students, faculty, and staff had obtained vaccinations.
325 Thus, students may have felt a sense of “herd immunity” and safer being in large groups.
326 Additionally, many persons began to feel COVID burnout or fatigue as the pandemic continued
327 on. Many people tired of restrictions and the feeling of helplessness.²⁵ It has been observed many
328 persons, particularly those in healthcare experienced fatigue and burnout.²⁶ It is also possible
329 students suffered from feelings of lost youth. Feelings such as these may have impacted behaviors,
330 resulting in reduced caution among students.

331 332 *Learning Quality*

333
334 The COVID-19 pandemic caused many schools and businesses to shut down and limit
335 occupancy and activity in their buildings. Many campuses switched to online learning to help stem

336 the spread of the virus while still allowing students to take needed classes. While this solution
337 allowed students to continue their educational goals, it was important for universities to determine
338 whether these changes had any effects on their student populations. Changes in educational
339 delivery mechanisms attributed to COVID-19 may have affected students learning. Results from
340 this survey showed 67% of students felt their learning was either somewhat or greatly reduced due
341 to COVID-19. A survey conducted among 800 Polish medical students, showed while many felt
342 online learning was enjoyable, they felt e-learning or online learning was statistically ($p < 0.001$)
343 less effective than traditional learning.²⁷ This may be attributed to classes increasing in rigor and
344 intensity. Additionally, students may have felt a disconnect with their instructor. It is possible not
345 being a classroom may have impacted their ability to form a comfortable bond with their instructor,
346 thus impacting their comfort level in asking follow-up or clarifying questions. Students here also
347 reported difficulty in the transition to online learning. This falls in line with other studies that saw
348 difficulties in transitioning to online platforms. One such study cited students as having increased
349 stress and anxiety, difficulties concentrating along with technological and instructional challenges
350 in the transition to online learning.²⁸ These challenges may indeed have impacted students here,
351 particularly technological as East Carolina University has a large population from rural areas. This
352 appeared to be similar to students surveyed here, feeling they experienced a reduction in learning
353 while using the online platform.

354

355 **Conclusion**

356 Surveys may be instrumental in helping colleges and universities learn of student
357 perceptions of important issues. This may have a profound effect on compliance with mitigation
358 strategies such as vaccines, mask wearing, and social behavior adjustments. This knowledge of
359 how students perceive the severity of a pandemic or public health emergency may also play a
360 role in policy development aimed at helping to ensure safety and continuity of education for
361 students. Information gathered from a representative sample of the population may inform public
362 health officials of concerning behaviors that may exacerbate outbreaks and thus allow a more
363 targeted approach. If universities are aware of student perceptions, they may be able to develop
364 guidance based on these perceptions perhaps influencing students' acceptance and compliance of
365 mitigation protocols.

366

367 **Acknowledgments**

368 The authors would like to thank Will Bullock and East Carolina Student Affairs for their help in
369 providing student housing data.

370 **Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

371 The authors declared no potential conflicts of interests.

372 **Funding**

373 The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this
374 article.

375

376 **References**

- 377 1. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on a National Surveillance System for
378 Cardiovascular and Select Chronic Diseases. A Nationwide Framework for Surveillance
379 of Cardiovascular and Chronic Lung Diseases. Washington (DC): National Academies
380 Press (US). 2011. Accessed at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK83157>
- 381 2. Jones TL, Baxter MAJ, Khanduja V. A quick guide to survey research. *Ann R Coll Surg*
382 *Engl.* 2013. 95(1): 5-7
- 383 3. (CDC) Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Public Health Surveillance:
384 Identifying or Collecting Data for Surveillance. 2012. Accessed at:
385 https://www.cdc.gov/csels/dsepd/ss1978/Lesson5/Section4.html#_ref15
- 386 4. World Health Organization (WHO). Protocol for the evaluation of epidemiological
387 surveillance systems. 1997. Accessed at
388 http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/1997/WHO_EMCDIS_97.2.pdf
- 389 5. Hopkins RS. Design and operation of state and local infectious disease surveillance
390 systems.. *J Public Health Pract Manag.* 2005. 11(3): 184-190
- 391 6. Geldsetzer P. Use of Rapid Online Surveys to Assess People's Perceptions During
392 Infectious Disease Outbreaks: A Cross-sectional Survey on COVID-19. *J Med Int*
393 *Res.*2020. 22(4): doi: [10.2196/18790](https://doi.org/10.2196/18790)
- 394 7. Safdar N, Abbo LM, Knobloch MJ, Seo SK. Research methods in healthcare
395 epidemiology: Survey and Qualitative research. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 2016.
396 37(11): 1272-1277
- 397 8. Alsoufi A, Alsuyihili A, Msherghi A, Elhadi, A, Atiyah H, Ashini A, Ashwieb A, Ghula
398 M, Ben Hasan H, Abudabuos S, Alameen H, Abokhdhir T, Anaiba M, Nagib T,
399 Shuwayyah A, Benothman R, Arrefae G, Alkhwayildi A, Alhadi A, Zaid A, Elhadi M.
400 Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on medical education: Medical students' knowledge,
401 attitudes, and practices regarding electronic learning. *PloS One.* 2020 15(11), e0242905.
402 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0242905>
- 403 9. Gambhir RS, Dhaliwal JS, Aggarwal A, Anand S, Anand V, Bhangu AK. Covid-19: a
404 survey on knowledge, awareness and hygiene practices among dental health professionals
405 in an Indian scenario. *Roczniki Panstwowego Zakladu Higieny.* 2020. 7(12): 223-229
- 406 10. Siddiquea BN, Shetty A, Bhattacharya O, Afroz A, Billah B. Global epidemiology of
407 COVID-19 knowledge, attitude and practice: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*
408 *Open.* 2021. 11(9): e051447. Doi: [10.1136/bmjopen-2021051447](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021051447)
- 409 11. Chang J, Yuan Y, Wang D. Mental health status and its influencing factors among
410 college students during the epidemic of COVID-19. *J South Med Univer.* 2020. 40(2):
411 171-176
- 412 12. Zhou SJ, Zhang LG, Wang LL, Guo ZC, Wang JQ, Chen JC, Liu M, Chen X, Chen JX.
413 Prevalence and socio-demographic correlates of psychological health problems in
414 Chinese adolescents during outbreak if COVID-19. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry.* 2020.
415 3: 1-10

- 416 13. Glanz K, Rimer BK, Viswanath K. 2008. Health behavior and health education: Theory,
417 research and practice (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass
- 418 14. Moon JS. (1990). A study of instrument development for health belief of Korean adults
419 [dissertation]. Yonsei University.
- 420 15. Becker SW, Ronen, J, Sorter, GH. Opportunity costs - an experimental approach. *J*
421 *Account Res.* 1974. 12: 317– 329.
- 422 16. Teslya A, Pham TM, Godijk NG, Kretschmar ME, Bootsma MC, Rozhnova. 2020.
423 Impact of self-imposed prevention measures and short-term government-imposed social
424 distancing on mitigating and delaying a COVID-19 epidemic: a modelling study. *PLoS*
425 *Med.* 17(7): doi [10.1371/journal.pmed.1003166](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003166)
- 426 17. Funk S, Gilad E, Watkins C, Jansen VAA. The spread of awareness and its impact on
427 epidemic outbreaks. *Proc Natl Acad of Sci U S A.* 2009. 106(16):6872–6877
- 428 18. Perra N, Balcan D, Gonçalves B, Vespignani A. Towards a characterization of behavior-
429 disease models. . *PLoS ONE.* 2011. 6(8):1–15
- 430 19. He D, Dushoff J, Day T, Ma J, Earn DJD. Inferring the causes of the three waves of the
431 1918 influenza pandemic in England and Wales. *Proc R Soc Biol Sci.* 2013.
432 280(1766):20131345
- 433 20. Okoroiwu HU, Okafor IM, Echieh CP, Ogar CO, Abunimye DA, Uchendu IK.
434 Assessment of knowledge, perception, preventive practices and effects of COVID-19
435 among Nigerians: a cross-sectional study. *Pan Afr Med J.* 2022. 41: 102
- 436 21. Kim HK, Ahn J, Atkinson L, Kahlor LA. Effects of COVID-19 Misinformation on
437 Information Seeking, Avoidance, and Processing: A Multicountry Comparative Study.
438 *Sci Communic.* 2020. 42(5): <https://doi.org/10.1177/1075547020959670>
- 439 22. (CDC) Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Demographic Characteristics,
440 Experiences, and Beliefs Associated with Hand Hygiene Among Adults During the
441 COVID-19 Pandemic — United States, June 24–30, 2020. *Morbidity and Mortality*
442 *Weekly Report (MMWR).* 69(41): 1485-1491
- 443 23. Lucia VC, Kelekar A, Afonso NM. 2020. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among medical
444 students. *J Public Health.* 2020. 43(3): 445-449
- 445 24. Troiano G, Nardi A. Vaccine hesitancy in the era of COVID-19. *Public Health.* 2021.
446 194: 245-251
- 447 25. Anthony M. Pandemic fatigue. *Home Healthcare Now.* 2021. 39(4): 184
- 448 26. Blake H, Bermingham F, Johnson G, Tabner A. Mitigating the psychological impact of
449 COVID-19 on healthcare workers: A digital learning package. *International J Environ*
450 *Res Public Health.* 2020. 17(9): 2997. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17092997
- 451 27. Baczek M, Zagańczyk-Baczek M, Szpringer M, Jaroszyński A, Wożakowska-Kaplon B.
452 Students' perception of online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic: A survey study
453 of Polish medical students. *Medicine (Baltimore).* 2021. 100(7): e24821

454 28. Lemay DJ, Bazalais P, Doleck. 2021. Transition to online learning during the COVID-19
455 pandemic. Computers in Human Behaviors Reports. doi: 10.1016/j.chbr.2021.100130
456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483





Figure 1. Reported Mask Wearing Among Students When Having Visitors Compared to their Perceptions on Virus Transmissibility by semester.



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.23.24319584>; this version posted December 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Figure 2. Reported Frequency of Group Gatherings Among Students Compared to their Perceptions on Virus Transmissibility by semester.




Figure 3. Overall learning experience during COVID-19 pandemic by education year.