medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Tracking WhatsApp behaviours during a crisis:

A longitudinal observation of messaging activities during the COVID-19 pandemic

Edina YQ Tan[1,2], Russell RE Wee[3], Saw Young Ern[1], Kylie JQ Heng [1], Joseph WE Chin[1], Eddie M.W. Tong[3], Jean CJ Liu[1,2,4*]

[1]Division of Social Sciences, Yale-NUS College, 16 College Avenue West, Singapore 138527, Singapore

[2]Centre for Sleep and Cognition, Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore, 12 Science Drive 2, Singapore 117549, Singapore

[3]Department of Psychology, National University of Singapore, 9 Arts Link, Singapore 117572, Singapore

[4]Neuroscience and Behavioural Disorders Programme, Duke-NUS Medical School, 8 College Road, Singapore 169857, Singapore

*Address correspondence to:

Jean Liu

16 College Avenue West #02-221

Singapore 138527

Email: jeanliu@yale-nus.edu.sg

Phone: (+65) 6601 3694

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Highlights

- WhatsApp is used for information-sharing during crises.
- In the COVID-19 crisis, nearly all participants used WhatsApp to receive or send crisis-related content during one week of monitoring.
- Users who engaged with more COVID-19 content reported higher levels of COVID-19 thoughts throughout the day.
- 1 in 10 participants shared a high number of forwarded COVID-19 messages, and may represent ‘super-spreaders’ of crisis-related information.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Abstract

During a crisis, the messaging platform WhatsApp allows crisis-related information to be disseminated quickly. Although case studies have documented how WhatsApp has shaped crisis outcomes in both beneficial and harmful ways, little is known about: (i) how crisis-related content is spread; (ii) characteristics of users based on usage patterns; or (iii) how usage patterns link to well-being. During the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) crisis, this study used the experience sampling method to track the daily WhatsApp usage of 151 adults throughout one week (capturing a total of 924 days of crisis-related communication). Each day, participants reported the extent to which they had received, forwarded, or discussed COVID-19-related content. During the week-long monitoring, most participants (94.7%) reported at least one COVID-19 related use of WhatsApp. Those who engaged with more COVID-19 content in personal chats were more likely to report having COVID-19 thoughts throughout the day. We further observed that around 1 in 10 individuals (14%) were chronic users who received and shared forwarded COVID-19 messages at a high volume; this group may represent everyday 'super spreaders' of crisis-related content. Together, these findings provide an empirical base for policy makers to manage risk communication during large-scale crises.

Keywords: Social Media; WhatsApp; Emergency management; Misinformation; COVID-19

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

1. Introduction

In April 2020, the messenger platform WhatsApp imposed new restrictions on message forwarding (Newton, 2020). Whereas users could previously forward content to multiple contacts, they could now forward only to single recipients if a message had already been shared by five users (Newton, 2020). According to WhatsApp, this was implemented to curb the spread of misinformation, following steep increases in forwarding activity during the coronavirus disease 2019 crisis (COVID-19) (Singh, 2020a).

Crises refer to situations where social, institutional, and organizational affairs are endangered, requiring rapid action from all levels of society (Rosenthal et al., 1991). Traditional examples include terrorist attacks, civil unrest, natural disasters, and epidemics (Pan & Meng, 2016). In these situations, individuals tend to seek out and share information, allowing them to learn about the crisis, resolve uncertainties, and regain personal agency over an unpredictable situation (Lin et al, 2016).

Despite this quest, a rapidly changing crisis situation makes information difficult to attain. As such, members of the public typically rely on multiple sources, with social media increasingly turned to as the medium of choice (Malecki et al., 2020). Social media's peer-to-peer nature allows information to be exchanged quickly (Gutteling & de Vries, 2017; Lambert, 2020), and high usage has been observed during emergencies (Guetteling & de Vries, 2017). For example, when Hurricane Sandy struck in 2012, the platform Twitter recorded 12.5 posts per second (Lachlan et al., 2014; Lachlan & Spence, 2014) – a remarkable rate that highlights the sheer volume of content shared during this period.

Nonetheless, this fast-paced exchange of information can cause harm (Clark Ginsberg & Sayers, 2020). As a case in point, the 2013 Boston Marathon was targeted in a terrorist attack. When two bombs exploded close to the finish line, misinformation about the bombers' identity spread rapidly on Twitter, resulting in the inaccurate identification of suspects (Cassa et al., 2013; Starbird et al., 2014). Similarly, social media discussions generated widespread panic when a shooter entered the YouTube headquarters in 2018. Within minutes of the shooting,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

false information was spread about the identity of the shooter, the reasons for the shooting, and the total death toll (Agence France-Presse, 2018).

Together, these accounts highlight how risk communication during crises needs to factor both the prevalence and potential harm of social media usage. In turn, this benefits from an understanding of how crisis-related content is spread from person to person. Although content-sharing has been documented extensively for social networking platforms with public posts (e.g., Twitter, Facebook) (Brandtzæg et al., 2010; Shi et al., 2014), private messaging platforms (e.g., WhatsApp, Telegram) remain understudied. This is important to address because publicly available metrics (e.g. Facebook likes, re-tweets) largely capture passive social media usage – that is, how individuals consume crisis-related content. On the other hand, the study of private messaging platforms may allow for proactive information-sharing to be captured as well (e.g., the production and discussion of content), providing a more veridical picture of user engagement (Yu, 2016; Chen et al, 2020). Correspondingly, we report for the first time a naturalistic study tracking how WhatsApp users sent and received crisis-related content during the global COVID-19 pandemic.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Use of WhatsApp for information sharing

With 1.5 billion users across 180 countries, WhatsApp is the most commonly used messaging application worldwide (Singh, 2020b). The platform allows users to exchange encrypted texts, various multi-media, and calls with each other. Additionally, group chat features provide an avenue to reach up to 256 members at a time (WhatsApp, 2020a). Given these features, WhatsApp is used increasingly for information exchange (Bhuvana & Arul Aram, 2019). One recent global survey reported that 1 in 5 respondents turned to the platform as a source of news, with the number reaching 50% in countries with higher WhatsApp penetration (e.g. Brazil, Malaysia, and South Africa; Boczek & Koppers, 2020; Reuters, 2018).

WhatsApp facilitates information exchange through several means. First, formal organisations can send announcements through the platform's business application

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

programming interface (WhatsApp, 2020b). Introduced in 2018, the interface supports messaging capacities on a larger, automated scale, allowing organizations to reach 100,000 subscribers each day (Facebook for Developers, 2020). Correspondingly, WhatsApp has been adopted by authorities to disseminate official information (Reuter et al., 2016; Lindsay, 2011) – as in the case of Israel's WhatsApp accounts to share local- and national-level updates from emergency services (Simon et al, 2016).

Apart from one-sided information flow from authorities, WhatsApp has also been used for more dynamic sharing of unofficial information amongst peers (Simon et al, 2016). Outside the crisis setting, several papers have documented how WhatsApp groups in laboratory and hospital teams facilitated the provision of instructions, quick updates, and the asking and answering of questions (Kamel Boulos et al., 2016). In one study, WhatsApp support groups also proved more successful than Facebook groups or information booklets in preventing relapse after smoking cessation; this effect was attributed to the richer discussions and stronger social support afforded by WhatsApp (Cheung et al., 2015).

2.2 WhatsApp use during crises

Returning to the crisis setting, the use of WhatsApp to disseminate information has been described in several case studies and retrospective surveys. For example, one survey of 400 residents affected by the 2015 Chennai floods found that WhatsApp had been quickly deployed to: provide updates on the weather, rescue stranded families, and allocate resources (Bhuvana & Arul Aram, 2019). Similarly, when terrorist attacks occurred in Tripoli, 43 interviewees described how they had used WhatsApp to request for help, report on the incident, or connect with family and friends (Baytiyeh, 2018).

While these examples highlight WhatsApp's key role in organizing efforts during a crisis, the ease of information-sharing means that WhatsApp has also been implicated in the spread of misinformation (Resende et al., 2019; Rossini et al., 2020). Notably, following the 2018 flood of Kerala, WhatsApp was the primary channel through which misinformation spread amongst citizens (Kumar et al., 2019). Likewise, when official information was scarce after 3 boys were kidnapped from an Israeli bus stop, the public demonstrated a clear preference for information-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

sharing on WhatsApp. This led to the increased spread of rumours as members of the public, believing WhatsApp to be private, were less discerning of the information they received and shared (Simon et al, 2016).

Taken together, the extant literature describes various roles that WhatsApp can take on during a crisis. What remains unclear, nonetheless, is *how* exactly WhatsApp comes to adopt those roles. In the midst of a crisis, who sends crisis-related messages, to whom, and in what manner? This finer-grain level of understanding is missing from the current literature, but is necessary to encourage beneficial WhatsApp use amidst crisis settings.

2.3 WhatsApp use during the COVID-19 crisis

The ongoing COVID-19 crisis provides novel opportunities to understand WhatsApp usage on a fine-grained level. Just 6 months following the declaration of the COVID-19 outbreak as a pandemic (in March 2020), 27 million people have been infected worldwide with 800,000 deaths (World Health Organization, 2020). The scale of the crisis has been met with a proliferation of COVID-19 content (Depoux et al., 2020), and in line with this volume WhatsApp experienced a 40% surge in usage rates – the largest pandemic-related increase amongst social media platforms (Kantar, 2020).

The expansion of WhatsApp's user base has been accompanied by more message-forwarding activities during the pandemic (Porter, 2020). Correspondingly, WhatsApp has been linked to the spread of COVID-19 rumours (Jha, 2020), and the platform introduced message-forwarding limits to curb the spread (as described in the opening paragraph) (Singh, 2020). Nonetheless, as in previous crises, WhatsApp user behaviours have received little research attention, with COVID-19 social media research focusing on publicly-available metrics such as Facebook likes and shares (Chen et al., 2020).

2.4 The current study

Addressing gaps in the literature, we sought in this study to document day-to-day WhatsApp usage patterns during the COVID-19 crisis. We applied the experience sampling method to track usage amidst everyday routines (Csikszentmihalyi & Larson, 2014; Hektner et al., 2007), contacting participants daily for week to capture their frequency of receiving,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

forwarding, or discussing COVID-19-related content on WhatsApp. By tracking usage patterns in real time, this method: (i) minimized recollection biases (as compared to traditional recall surveys; Hektner et al., 2007); (ii) allowed day-to-day variations to be captured (Depoux et al, 2020); and (iii) had high ecological validity, meeting the call for research documenting the spread of COVID-19 information under naturalistic online contexts (Pennycook et al., 2020).

As a secondary aim, we sought to profile participants based on their WhatsApp usage patterns. Outside the crisis context, individual differences have been observed in how people forward messages on social media. For example, Lottridge & Bentley (2018) identified 3 categories of information-sharers: (i) those who shared information in publicly-accessible posts, private messages, and social network platforms; (ii) those who shared information in only private and social channels; and (iii) those who did not share information at all. Extending this finding to the crisis context, we likewise sought to taxonomize WhatsApp users based on their crisis-related usage behaviours.

2.4.1 Linking WhatsApp usage patterns to well-being

Finally, taking advantage of the experience sampling method, we also investigated whether day-to-day variations in well-being during the crisis (in terms of pandemic-related fear and intrusive thoughts) tracked day-to-day variations in WhatsApp usage. Although several surveys have linked excessive social media exposure to crisis-related fear (Gao et al, 2020; Lin et al., 2020) no study has tracked the role of specific social media activities in an intensive longitudinal design.

2.4.2 Study context

Our study took place in Singapore, a city state in Asia with 70% WhatsApp penetration (Steup, 2020). During the study period (March-May 2020), Singapore had a surge of daily COVID-19 cases – from 23 at the start of the survey (or 4 cases per million population; 17 March), to a peak of 1426 in mid-April (243 per million population; 20 April), before tapering off to 741 by the end of the study (126 per million population; 7 May) (World Health Organization, 2020). Throughout the second half of the study period (7 April to 7 May), participants experienced a nation-wide lockdown with movement restrictions, and business and school

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

closures (Baker, 2020). (The resident population's behavioural and emotional responses to COVID-19 during this period have been documented elsewhere; see Liu & Tong (2020); Long & Liu (2020); Saw et al. (2020)).

3. Methods

3.1 Participants

Between 17 March to 7 May 2020, 151 participants were recruited from the general community (104 females; mean age 36.35 ± 14.70 years; see Table 1). Participants responded to advertisements placed in Facebook and WhatsApp community groups (e.g., residential groups, workplace groups, university groups), posts on popular online forums, and paid Facebook advertisements targeting Singapore-based users. All participants fit the study inclusion criteria, and (1) were 21 years or older, (2) had lived in Singapore for at least 2 years, and (3) had a WhatsApp account.

The study protocol was approved by the Yale-NUS College Ethics Review Committee and was pre-registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT04367363).

3.2 Measures

At the start of the study, participants provided informed consent through an online link. They then completed: (i) a baseline questionnaire; (ii) experience sampling responses daily for 7 days; and (iii) a final questionnaire. All study activities took place online via the survey platform Qualtrics, and participants were reimbursed SGD $5 upon study completion.

3.2.1 Baseline questionnaire

The baseline and final questionnaires were designed to characterise participants, allowing them to be profiled based on their WhatsApp usage patterns observed during the week.

In the baseline questionnaire, participants first reported demographic information: their age, years in Singapore, gender, religion, ethnicity, marital status, education, house type (a proxy of socioeconomic status), household size, country of birth, and citizenship. Next, participants used 4-point scales to indicate their pandemic-related concerns: (1) how confident they were that the government could control the nationwide spread of COVID-19 (1 = "Not

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

confident at all, 4 = ”Very confident”); (2) how likely they judged that they (or someone in their immediate household) would be infected with COVID-19 (1 = “Not at all likely”, 4 = “Very likely”); and (3) how fearful they were about the situation in the country (1 = “Not scared at all”, 4 = “Very scared”) (Liu & Tong, 2020; Mesch & Schwirian, 2019).

Finally, participants completed the Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scale (DASS-21; Lovibond & Lovibond, 1995) – a 21-item measure of well-being that has been repeatedly administered during the current pandemic (Wang et al., 2020; Tan, 2020; Hao, 2020). The scale asks participants about how they felt during the past week, with 7 items for each of the 3 dimensions: depression (e.g., “I couldn’t seem to experience any positive feeling at all”; Cronbach’s α = 0.90); anxiety (e.g., “I experienced breathing difficulty”; Cronbach’s α = 0.81); and stress (e.g., “I found it hard to wind down”; Cronbach’s α = 0.89).

3.2.2 Experience sampling

The experience sampling protocol started one day after the baseline questionnaire was completed. Across 7 days, participants received a WhatsApp message each evening (2130 hrs) directing them to an online Qualtrics link. The timing was chosen to capture WhatsApp usage during the day, with a single prompt selected to reduce triggers for pandemic thoughts and fears (Fiorillo & Gorwood, 2020).

At each prompt, participants first indicated their well-being: (i) how afraid they felt (“Today, to what extent are you fearful about the COVID-19 situation”, answered using a 4-point scale with 1=”Not scared at all” and 4=”Very scared”); and (ii) how intrusive COVID-19 thoughts had been (“Today, I thought about the COVID-19 situation all the time”, answered using a 5-point scale with 1=”Not at all true” and 5=”Very true”).

Next, participants addressed the primary outcome measures on WhatsApp usage. Items were designed to capture “COVID-19 chatter” – the extent to which individuals forwarded COVID-19 content, received forwarded content, or generated novel COVID-19 messages (e.g., in a discussion). Participants responded based on the day’s usage (starting from the time they woke up) and were encouraged to verify responses by referring to the application.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Following pilot testing for clarity, questions were organized in terms of message-forwarding, personal chat, and group chat behaviours. For forwarding behaviours, participants were first asked if they had forwarded any message related to COVID-19 (yes/no) – whether copied and pasted into a chat or shared via WhatsApp's 'forward' button. If participants responded 'yes', they were then asked: (i) how many unique COVID-19 messages they had forwarded (regardless of the number of recipients), and (ii) how many unique groups and individuals they had forwarded to (regardless of the number of messages sent).

Personal chat behaviours involved participants' one-to-one WhatsApp chats. For this category, participants first indicated whether they had received any COVID-19 messages forwarded to their personal chats (yes/no). If they responded 'yes', they were then asked: (i) how many unique messages they had received, and (ii) how many different people they had received messages from. Thereafter, participants were asked whether they had discussed COVID-19 in personal chats – defined as conversations where either they or the other person generated their own message(s) related to COVID-19 (yes/no). For participants who indicated 'yes', they were then asked how many unique chats were involved.

Finally, for group chats, participants were asked if COVID-19 had been mentioned in any of their WhatsApp groups by at least one other person (not including themselves). This could have occurred either through others forwarding messages, or through others writing their own comments (yes/no). Affirmative responses were followed with a question on how many WhatsApp groups had done so.

Participants were instructed to complete the experience sampling measures within one hour of contact. Through this protocol, we collected 924 data points across 151 participants (compliance rate: 86.2%).

3.2.3 Final questionnaire

A day after the experience sampling protocol ended, a final questionnaire was administered. Participants indicated which of 13 possible sources they had obtained COVID-19 news from (e.g., printed newspapers, radio, WhatsApp, YouTube), then repeated the 3

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

pandemic-related questions and the DASS-21 (from the baseline questionnaire). The reported sources of COVID-19 news are illustrated in Figure 2.

Finally, to ensure we had captured a representative sample of WhatsApp chatter (given the cut-off time we had set for experience sampling prompts), we asked participants to indicate the primary time of day they had read and sent COVID-19 messages over the previous 7 days (mostly in the morning, afternoon, evening, late night, or throughout the day). Only 20 participants (13.2 %) responded that their WhatsApp activity had occurred mostly in the night (after 9.30pm). As our primary conclusions did not change when we removed these participants, subsequent analyses utilised the full dataset. A schematic of the study procedures is presented in Figure 1.



Figure 1. Schematic of study procedures. All participants completed a baseline questionnaire, followed by 7 days of experience sampling where participants addressed questions about well-being and WhatsApp usage daily. Participants completed a final questionnaire one day after the experience sampling protocol ended.

3.3 Statistical analyses

First, to characterise "COVID-19" chatter on WhatsApp, we summarized participants' experience sampling responses with counts (%) or means (standard deviations). Subsequent analyses focused on the 7 quantitative WhatsApp usage variables: the number of (1) COVID-19 messages forwarded; (2) groups forwarded to; (3) individuals forwarded to; (4) forwarded

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

messages received; (5) individuals messages were received from; (6) personal chats with COVID-19 conversations; and (7) group chats discussing COVID-19.

Next, we sought to profile participants based on their WhatsApp usage. We first applied Latent Profile Analysis (through the R package 'mclust'; Scrucca et al, 2016) to cluster participants based on their responses to the 7 quantitative variables, with values obtained by aggregating the reported frequency of each variable over the week. Latent profile analysis is based on conditional independence, where classes are created such that within each class, indicator variables are statistically uncorrelated (Wade et al., 2006). To uncover clusters of individuals, we used Gaussian Mixture Models (GMM) and assigned cluster membership using Bayesian probabilities. The final number of clusters was determined using the Bayesian Information Criterion, Integrated Likelihood Criterion, and a Bootstrap Likelihood Test. We then ran exploratory analyses to compare the characteristics of participants in each cluster (as described below).

Finally, we examined whether day-to-day variations in well-being tracked variations in WhatsApp usage. Given prior findings that the link between WhatsApp and well-being differed as a function of individual versus group chat activities (Blabst & Diefenbach, 2017), we created two predictor variables along this dimension. For the first predictor (daily personal chats), the following variables were summed within each day and for each participant: the number of (i) individuals COVID-19 messages were forwarded to; (ii) individuals from whom forwarded messages were received; and (iii) personal conversations discussing COVID-19. For the second predictor (daily group chats), the following variables were summed: the number of (i) groups participants forwarded COVID-19 messages to; and (ii) groups where COVID-19 messages were mentioned (Appendix A.1 shows the pattern of correlations across these variables).

To facilitate interpretation of the intercept in the analyses, we grand-mean centred scores on the daily personal chats and daily group chats variable by subtracting the mean number of chats across subjects and time points (M = 2.47 and M = 1.29 respectively) from each score. In addition, because daily personal chats/daily group chats vary both between- and within-subjects, we created between-subjects and within-subjects versions of both predictors to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

tease these effects apart (Bolger & Laurenceau, 2013). For each outcome measure (fear and thoughts about COVID-19), we ran a linear mixed-effects model with time (centred such that 0 referred to the middle of the week), daily personal chats (between-subjects), daily personal chats (within-subjects), daily group chats (between-subjects) and daily group chats (within-subjects) entered as fixed effects. Random intercepts accounted for correlated data due to repeated measures.

Across all analyses, the type 1 decision-wise error rate was controlled at $\alpha = 0.05$ (where applicable). All statistical analyses were conducted in R 3.5.0 (R Core Team, Vienna, Austria) and SPSS 25 (IMB Corp, Armonk, NY).

4. Results

4.1 Base rate of COVID-19 WhatsApp usage

As shown in Figure 2, participants' self-reports revealed that WhatsApp was the second-most likely source of COVID-19 news. Quantifying this through one week of experience sampling, we found that the large majority of participants (94.7%; 95% CI: 89.0% - 97.2%) reported at least one COVID-19 related use of WhatsApp. 52.3% of participants (95% CI: 43.3% - 59.9%) forwarded at least one COVID-19 message (either to individuals or groups), 78.1% (95% CI: 69.9% - 83.9%) received at least one forwarded message in personal chats, 66.2% (95% CI: 57.4% - 73.1%) engaged in personal chat conversations about COVID-19, and 88.1% (95% CI: 81.8% - 92.8%) had been in groups where COVID-19 was mentioned.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 2. Sources of COVID-19 news. In a questionnaire, participants self-reported where they received COVID-19 news from.

Figure 3 shows the extent to which participants engaged in each of these activities, as captured by the quantitative variables (summed across the week). On average, participants received around two times (2.27) more messages than they forwarded on and were more likely to forward to individuals (average of 5.26 messages a week) than to groups (average of 2.68 messages a week). Beyond passive engagement, participants also took part in an average of 3.84 (SD = 5.58) one-to-one conversations about COVID-19 during the week; however, these interactions occurred 2.06 times less frequently than the sending or receiving of forwarded messages in group chats.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 3. In a week-long experience sampling procedure, participants reported the extent to which they engaged in COVID-19 WhatsApp behaviours (either by forwarding or receiving messages, or in conversations). Horizontal bars represent the total amount of each activity captured, averaged across all participants. Horizontal lines represent the 95% confidence interval for the mean.

4.2 Characterising participants based on COVID-19 WhatsApp usage

4.2.1 Towards a taxonomy of WhatsApp usage (latent profile analysis)

Although most participants did receive and/or share COVID-19 content on WhatsApp over the week monitored, there were individual differences in the quantity and manner of usage (Figure 3). Correspondingly, we conducted a latent profile analysis to understand how usage patterns clustered.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Applying the Bayesian Information Criterion, 4 clusters provided the optimal fit of the GMM to the data; any further increase in the number of clusters did not result in significant likelihood increases. For sensitivity analyses, we used the Integrated Likelihood Criterion and obtained similar results. Finally, we performed a Bootstrap Likelihood Ratio Test comparing model fit between the *k*-1 and *k* cluster models and found again that 4 clusters provided the best model fit.



Figure 4. Using latent profile analysis, participants were classified based on how they had used WhatsApp for COVID-19 content during a week of monitoring. The figure depicts WhatsApp usage activities for the chronic user (top left), receiving user (top right), discursive user (bottom left), and minimal user (bottom right). Horizontal lines represent the 95% confidence interval for the mean.

Based on our analysis, the following taxonomy emerged (Figure 4): (i) 14% of participants were “chronic users” with high counts on each of the WhatsApp usage variables; (ii) 31% were “receiving users” who were recipients of forwarded messages and who had relatively high counts of group chat discussions; (iii) 30.5% were “discursive users” with relatively high

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

engagement in group and personal chat discussions; and (iv) 24.5% were "minimal users" with low counts across all WhatsApp usage variables.

4.2.2 Understanding profile characteristics

As an exploratory analysis, we performed a classification tree analysis to predict participant's classification based on: their demographics, COVID-19 concerns, depression and anxiety scores (DASS-21), and the time of day for WhatsApp usage (from the baseline questionnaire; see Table 1). For this analysis, we applied recursive partitioning ("rpart"), a machine learning technique that allows multiple variables to be analysed simultaneously while permitting complex, non-linear relations between predictors (Therneau et al., 2019). To avoid overfitting, the final tree was pruned by selecting the tree size with the lowest cross-validation error (minimized with a tree size of 8 for our dataset).

As shown in Figure 5, chronic users were more likely to be married / divorced, and to send messages either throughout the day or in the afternoon. In terms of crisis-related responses, they either had: (i) extreme fears of the COVID-19 situation (low or high), or (ii) had moderate fears paired with lower confidence in the government's response (low or moderate).

On the other hand, discursive users were more likely to be single / dating, and had either: (i) extreme levels of COVID-19 fears (either high or low), or (ii) moderate fear levels alongside Christian or Taoist affiliations. A sub-group of discursive users were – like chronic users – married / divorced, with moderate levels of COVID-19 fears. However, they were distinguished from chronic users by their high confidence in government (as compared to chronic users' lower confidence).

Finally, receiving and minimal users had similar profiles. If single / dating, both sets of users tended to have moderate levels of COVID-19 fears, had a wide range of religious backgrounds, and were distinguished by the time of day that COVID-19 related messages were received (receiving users: morning, evening, and throughout the day; minimal users: afternoon and night). If married / divorced, both sets of users tended to send messages at only one time of the day (morning, evening, or night), and were distinguished by age (receiving users: 51 years and above; minimal users: below 51 years).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 5. Recursive partitioning was used to predict which of 4 WhatsApp usage profiles (chronic, receiving, discursive, or minimal) participants belonged to, based on baseline questionnaire measures (demographics, COVID-19 concerns, scores on the Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scale, and time of WhatsApp usage). The final tree model is presented as a flow chart, with factors chosen at each level to categorise the maximal number of participants. Marital status, time of WhatsApp usage, and age emerged as the primary predictors (model classification accuracy: 64.2%, above the chance level of 25%).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 1. Participant characteristics as a function of COVID-19 WhatsApp usage patterns.

Characteristic	Chronic (n = 21)	Receiving (n = 47)	Discursive (n = 46)	Minimal (n = 37)	(%) or M (SD)
Age in years	44.1 (14.5)	41.0 (15.5)	29.7 (10.7)	34.4 (14.5)	36.35 (14.70)
Gender					
· Female	13	34	29	28	(68.8)
· Male	8	13	17	9	(31.2)
Ethnicity					
· Chinese	20	42	42	36	(92.7)
· Indian	0	2	3	0	(3.3)
· Malay	0	2	1	0	(2.0)
· Others	1	1	0	1	(2.0)
Religion					
· Christianity (Protestant)	8	17	16	13	(35.8)
· No religion	3	14	11	10	(25.2)
· Buddhism	4	9	8	11	(21.2)
· Roman Catholicism	4	4	6	2	(10.6)
· Taoism / Chinese traditional beliefs	1	0	2	1	(2.6)
· Islam	1	3	1	0	(3.3)
· Hinduism	0	0	2	0	(1.3)
Marital status					
· Married	13	24	8	15	(39.7)
· Single	6	15	25	12	(38.4)
· Dating	1	7	12	9	(19.2)
· Widowed / separated / divorced	1	1	0	1	(2.0)
· Did not answer	0	0	1	0	(0.7)
Educational level					
· 1: O Level	1	4	1	6	(7.9)
· 2: Junior College	2	5	9	9	(16.6)
· 3: ITE	1	1	1	0	(2.0)
· 4: Polytechnic/diploma	2	13	7	4	(17.2)
· 5: University (undergraduate)	11	21	21	16	(45.7)
· 6: University (postgraduate)	4	1	3	2	(6.6)
· 7: Others	0	2	3	0	(3.3)
· Did not answer	0	0	1	0	(0.7)
House type					
· 1: HDB flat: 1-2 rooms	0	0	0	1	(0.7)
· 2: HDB flat: 3 rooms	0	2	2	2	(4.0)
· 3: HDB flat: 4 rooms	2	9	10	10	(20.5)
· 4: HDB flat: 5 rooms	3	19	14	11	(31.1)
· 5: Condominium	12	12	11	10	(29.8)
· 6: Landed property	4	4	7	2	(11.3)
· Did not answer	0	1	2	1	(2.6)
Household size					
· 1	2	1	3	0	(4.0)
· 2	0	5	3	3	(7.3)
· 3	7	8	5	8	(18.5)
· 4	7	18	21	15	(40.4)
· 5+	5	15	13	11	(29.1)
·Did not answer	0	0	1	0	(0.7)
Citizenship					
· Singapore	18	46	42	36	(94.0)
· Others	3	1	4	1	(6.0)
Country of birth					
· Singapore	17	45	38	33	(88.1)
· Other	4	2	8	4	(11.9)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Years in Singapore	39.67 (15.22)	39.60 (16.69)	26.43 (10.83)	31.65 (14.47)	33.65 (15.32)
DASS-21					
Stress	9.52 (7.12)	8.61 (7.08)	9.56 (10.13)	10.81 (8.72)	9.57 (8.47)
Anxiety	4.38 (5.28)	5.13 (5.44)	5.33 (6.59)	5.89 (7.71)	5.28 (6.36)
Depression	8.10 (6.52)	7.22 (6.86)	9.47 (9.73)	10.76 (9.54)	8.90 (8.50)
Pandemic-related concerns					
Fear of COVID-19 situation	2.29 (0.46)	2.53 (0.65)	2.22 (0.74)	2.27 (0.69)	2.34 (0.67)
Confidence in government	3.33 (0.58)	3.23 (0.63)	3.29 (0.66)	3.24 (0.72)	3.27 (0.65)
Perceived likelihood of contracting COVID-19	2.71 (0.64)	2.74 (0.53)	2.78 (0.56)	2.76 (0.60)	2.75 (0.57)

4.3 Does COVID-19 WhatsApp usage relate to well-being?

As the final thrust of the study, we ran linear mixed effects models to examine whether WhatsApp usage related to COVID-19 fears and thoughts (see Table 2 for parameter estimates, and Figure 6 for day-to-day variations in thoughts and fears for each of the four WhatsApp user types.). As shown Figure 6, although participants' COVID-19 related concerns and DASS-21 scores were fairly stable throughout the week (range of Spearman's r = 0.41 to 0.72; see Appendix B), day-to-day COVID-19 fears and thoughts fluctuated ($t(249.13) = -3.72$, $p = 0.00$; $t(297.02) = -2.36$, $p = 0.02$).

For COVID-19 thoughts, there was a significant effect of WhatsApp personal chat usage at a between-subjects level; $t(164.81) = 2.36$, $p = 0.019$). That is, participants who handled higher levels of COVID-19 content in their personal chats reported more COVID-19 thoughts (relative to participants who handled lower levels of COVID-19 content). However, the corresponding effect for group chats was not significant; $t(141.17) = 0.89$, $p = 0.37$. At the level of each participant, neither day-to-day fluctuations in personal nor group chat activities significantly predicted COVID-19 thoughts; smallest $p = 0.68$). The parameter estimates for the multi-level model are presented in Table 2.

For COVID-19 fears, we found no significant effect of any WhatsApp usage variable (smallest $p = 0.17$). For sensitivity analyses, we repeated the model with group membership as a fixed factor in place of personal and group chat usage, and our primary conclusions did not change (see Appendix C).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2. Parameter estimates for the multi-level model of thoughts about COVID-19 (Model 1) and fear of COVID-19 (Model 2) as a function of participants' daily WhatsApp use (personal-chat and group-chat)

[*Model 1] Outcome: Thoughts about COVID-19*						
Fixed effects	Estimate	SE	*t*	*P*	CI_{95} lower	CI_{95} upper
Intercept	2.18	0.07	32.81	<0.001	2.05	2.31
Time (centred)	-0.03	0.01	-2.36	0.02	-0.05	-0.00
Daily personal chat usage (between)	0.04	0.02	2.36	0.02	0.00	0.07
Daily personal chat usage (within)	0.00	0.01	0.42	0.68	-0.01	0.02
Daily group chat usage (between)	0.05	0.06	0.89	0.37	-0.06	0.17
Daily group chat usage (within)	-0.00	0.03	-0.08	0.93	-0.06	0.05
Random effects	Estimate	SE	Z	*P*	CI_{95} lower	CI_{95} upper
Level 2 (between-person) Intercept	0.56	0.08	6.89	<0.001	0.42	0.75
Level 1 (within-person)						
Residual	0.37	0.02	14.90	<0.001	0.33	0.43
Autocorrelation	0.24	0.05	4.97	<0.001	0.14	0.33
[*Model 2] Outcome: Fear of COVID-19*						
Fixed effects	Estimate	SE	*t*	*P*	CI_{95} lower	CI_{95} upper
Intercept	2.10	0.06	36.37	<0.001	1.98	2.21
Time (centred)	-0.03	0.01	-3.72	<0.001	-0.05	-0.02
Daily personal chat usage (between)	0.01	0.01	0.85	0.39	-0.02	0.04
Daily personal chat usage (within)	0.01	0.01	1.22	0.24	-0.01	0.02
Daily group chat usage (between)	0.02	0.05	0.49	0.62	-0.07	0.12
Daily group chat usage (within)	-0.03	0.02	-1.42	0.17	-0.06	0.01
Random effects	Estimate	SE	Z	*P*	CI_{95} lower	CI_{95} upper
Level 2 (between-person) Intercept	0.44	0.06	7.47	<0.001	0.34	0.58
Level 1 (within-person)						
Residual	0.21	0.01	13.83	<0.001	0.18	0.23
Autocorrelation	0.26	0.05	5.16	<0.001	0.16	0.35

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 6. Day-to-day variations in COVID-19 thought (top) and fear levels (bottom), as a function of WhatsApp user profiles. The shaded grey areas represent 95% confidence intervals.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

5. Discussion

In recent crises, messaging platforms have been used increasingly by members of the public (Bucher, 2020). Whether to mobilise responses, share information, or spread rumours, public use of these platforms have been found to influence crisis outcomes (Parmer et al, 2016; Guidry et al., 2017). Despite this influence, the private nature of messages means that very little research has investigated crisis communication through these platforms. Correspondingly, we report the first observational study documenting how messages are sent and received through the platform WhatsApp. Using the experience sampling method, we tracked one week of WhatsApp usage *in situ* – as they occurred in the naturalistic settings of participants experiencing the global COVID-19 crisis.

As our first finding, we observed that almost every participant engaged in "COVID-19 chatter" through WhatsApp – a finding that reinforces the central place of messenger applications during a crisis. Further, echoing WhatsApp's own concerns that message forwarding can problematic (e.g., contributing to an overwhelming volume of content shared; Singh, 2020a), we observed that participants were more likely to send or receive forwarded messages than they were to engage in conversation about COVID-19. Nonetheless, the spread of forwarded messages was capped in two ways: first, participants only forwarded half the messages they received; and second, participants were more likely to forward messages to individuals than to groups.

5.1 Is vulnerability during a crisis linked to WhatsApp usage?

5.1.1 Socio-emotional vulnerability

Moving beyond group-level analyses, we found two possible ways by which individual differences in WhatsApp usage may be associated with vulnerability during a crisis. In terms of socio-emotional vulnerability, WhatsApp users who engaged with more COVID-19 content in personal chats were more likely to think about COVID-19 throughout the day. As similar forms of rumination (involving frequent and persistent thoughts) have been linked to clinical depression (Moulds et al., 2007), this finding implicates COVID-19 chatter as a potential risk factor for poor mental health. Outside the crisis setting, a prior cross-sectional survey similarly

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

observed that individuals with greater use of WhatsApp personal chats experienced more stress (Blabst and Diefenbach, 2017); thus, our study extended this finding to the crisis context.

One reason for our observed association may be that personal chats offer intimate and private connections (Blabst & Diefenbach, 2017; Karapanos, 2020). Amidst a crisis, this feature could encourage self-disclosure about crisis-related thoughts that a person already has (Knop et al., 2016). In turn, this may promote further exchange and internalisation of thoughts between two parties in a personal chat. In other words, we tentatively suggest a bi-directional and mutually reinforcing association between WhatsApp chat activity and COVID-19 thoughts. This is currently speculative, however, and further research is needed to establish causality.

More broadly, our findings align with a large body of literature that has linked social media usage with adverse mental health (Karim et al., 2020; Schønning et al., 2020; Sharma et al., 2020). This pattern has been observed both outside and inside the crisis context: for example, even in the current COVID-19 crisis, the frequency of social media usage has been found to predict depression symptoms (Ni et al., 2020). Our study extends the existing research by demonstrating that specific messaging activities (day-to-day exchanges on WhatsApp) is linked to well-being.

5.1.2 Cognitive vulnerability

Aside from the socio-emotional domain, we also identified potential cognitive vulnerability owing to WhatsApp usage during a crisis. Namely, the spread of online misinformation is currently recognized as one of the most pressing risks in the 21st century (World Economic Forum, 2018), with an estimated cost of $78 billion to the global economy each year (CHEQ, 2019). Given that specific patterns of WhatsApp usage has been linked to either the exposure or spread of misinformation (e.g., receiving and dissemination of forwarded messages, citation), we were thus able to address – albeit indirectly – the question of ‘who is vulnerable’. Using latent profile analysis, we identified four categories of WhatsApp users based on their usage patterns: the ‘chronic user’, the ‘receiving user’, the ‘discursive user’, and the ‘minimal user’.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

First, if sheer volume of WhatsApp usage accrues vulnerability (since this could increase both exposure to and the sharing of falsehood; Arun, 2019), then approximately 1 in 10 participants (14%) were particularly vulnerable – chronic users with high levels of activity in all seven metrics assessed. Our identification of the WhatsApp 'chronic user' is reminiscent of "supersharers" and "superconsumers" on Twitter (Grinberg et al, 2019) – a small sub-set of users that were linked to 80% of the misinformation read and shared during the 2016 U.S. presidential election (Grinberg et al, 2019). Given the potential influence that these users may have in times of crisis, it may prove prudent to identify chronic users in risk communication strategies. We thus urge further research examining characteristics that may set this group apart, and a better understanding of reasons for their high WhatsApp usage.

A second vulnerability may lie in the receipt of forwarded messages. To the extent that forwarded messages are more likely to contain misinformation than user-generated content (Melo et al., 2019; Grinberg et al, 2019), 1 in 3 of our participants were 'receiving users' who were vulnerable in this manner. This group did not spread forwarded messages, and generally presented a moderate profile – whether in terms of fear of contracting COVID-19 (moderate levels reported), or in religion (coming from a diverse religious background). Nonetheless, receiving users had high exposure to forwarded COVID-19 content.

One notable feature of receiving users is that they tended to be older. In our study, receiving participants had a mean age of 41 years – compared to the mean ages of discursive and minimal users (30 and 34, respectively). Accordingly, the tree-based model identified older age – and in particular, a cut-off of 51 years – as a predictor that WhatsApp users would fall into this category. This finding is analogous to previous research examining how false news is disseminated on Facebook during an election year (Guess et al., 2019). In this study, older Americans were found to have shared three to four times as many false articles compared to those in the youngest age bracket, with this relationship holding even when covariates such as education and overall posting activity were controlled for. Extrapolating to the current context, it seems reasonable that older adults would likewise be on the receiving end of forwarded COVID-19 messages. Correspondingly, risk communication strategies may again benefit from targeted

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

messages to this group, this time emphasising how to discern the veracity of received messages.

5.1.3. Understanding individual differences in crisis-related WhatsApp usage

On a theoretical level, it is unclear at this stage why individuals differ in crisis-related WhatsApp usage. Without pre-crisis data, it is difficult to know whether our observed differences apply only to crises situations, or whether they describe WhatsApp usage patterns more generally. In the former case, differences may arise from how individuals cope with stress. For example, some may 'tend and befriend' in crises (Taylor, 2012), seeking to affiliate with others through WhatsApp conversations (discursive users). Others, susceptible to information overload, may distance themselves from social media in the face of overwhelming crisis information (minimal users; Austin et al. (2012); Rathore & Farooq (2020)). Alternatively, our taxonomy may simply reflect personality traits more broadly – regardless of the crisis context. In a study of 180,000 participants, Bachrach et al. (2012) found that individuals more open to experiences published and 'liked' Facebook posts more often, whereas conscientious individuals published many photos but 'liked' fewer posts. Similar dynamics may predispose individuals to the four different types of WhatsApp usage we documented. Although we did not assess factors such as personality measures or coping styles, future research could examine whether and how the WhatsApp usage patterns differ according to these variables.

5.2 Limitations

At this juncture, we note the preliminary nature of our findings and highlight several study limitations. First, although the experience sampling method affords more careful documentation of WhatsApp usage than what is typical in the literature (once-off surveys asking about usage; Hektner et al., 2007), our methodology still relied on participants' self-reports. Correspondingly, future studies may profit from objective metrics of WhatsApp usage, or from measures to verify accuracy. Second, we opted to study WhatsApp, the most widely used messenger application. However, it is unclear whether our results generalise to other messenger applications (e.g., Facebook Messenger, Telegram).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

5.3 Policy Implications

If supported by further studies, our results have implications for crisis management strategies. In terms of risk communication, the observation that nearly all participants (%) engaged in COVID-19 chatter highlights how WhatsApp has become a major source of crisis-related information. This lends credence to official WhatsApp accounts that disseminate crisis content (e.g., that of the World Health Organization's during the COVID-19 crisis) (Liu & Tong, 2020), providing a clear voice alongside personal and group WhatsApp chats.

For public health agencies, our findings provide a proof-of-concept for how WhatsApp usage patterns can categorize individuals and predict their well-being during crises. In the field of digital phenotyping, similar smartphone usage metrics (e.g., calls placed and received) have been used to flag out persons at risk of poor mental health (Huckvale et al., 2019). Extending these efforts to WhatsApp, it may prove profitable to personalize mental health messages based on WhatsApp usage patterns – akin to how Facebook sends prompts for suicide helplines based on Facebook post analyses (Card, 2018).

5.4 Conclusions

In conclusion, we conducted the first week-long observation of how WhatsApp is used during a crisis. Using the experience sampling method, we captured 924 days of WhatsApp usage *in situ* (across 151 participants), tracked daily as usage occurred in participants' natural environments. This snapshot of "COVID-19 chatter" revealed: (i) the sheer prevalence of WhatsApp usage; (ii) a typology of WhatsApp users; and (iii) the possible link between WhatsApp patterns and well-being. These findings, we hope, will spur on further research on how messenger applications steer outcomes during a crisis.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

6. Acknowledgements

This research was funded by a grant awarded to JCJL from the JY Pillay Global Asia Programme (Grant number: IG20-SG002). The first author's (EYQT) involvement was funded by a centre grant awarded to the Centre for Sleep and Cognition.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References

Aalbers, G., McNally, R. J., Heeren, A., de Wit, S., & Fried, E. I. (2019). Social media and depression symptoms: A network perspective. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, General*, 148(8), 1454–1462. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000528

Agence France-Presse. (2018). How fake news spread soon after YouTube shooting. Retrieved September 15, 2020, from https://www.ndtv.com/world-news/how-fake-news-spread-soon-after-youtube-shooting-1833030

Ahmad, A. R., & Murad, H. R. (2020). The Impact of social media on panic during the COVID-19 pandemic in Iraqi Kurdistan: Online Questionnaire Study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *22*(5), e19556.

Arun, C. (2019). On WhatsApp, rumours, and lynchings*. Economic & Political Weekly*, 6, 30–35.

Austin, L., Liu, B. F., & Jin, Y. (2012). How audiences seek out crisis information: Exploring the social-mediated crisis communication model. *Journal of Applied Communication Research* (Vol. 40, Issue 2, pp. 188–207). https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2012.654498

Bachrach, Y., Kosinski, M., Graepel, T., Kohli, P., & Stillwell, D. (2012). Personality and patterns of Facebook usage. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Annual ACM Web Science Conference on - WebSci '12*. https://doi.org/10.1145/2380718.2380722

Baker, J. A. (2020). Singapore's circuit breaker and beyond: Timeline of the COVID-19 reality. *Channel NewsAsia*. https://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/singapore/covid-19-circuit-breaker-chronicles-charting-evolution-12779048

Baytiyeh, H. (2018). The uses of mobile technologies in the aftermath of terrorist attacks among low socioeconomic populations. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 28, 739–747. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2018.02.001

Bhuvana, N., & Arul Aram, I. (2019). Facebook and Whatsapp as disaster management tools during the Chennai (India) floods of 2015. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* (Vol. 39, p. 101135). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2019.101135

Blabst, N., & Diefenbach, S. (2017, July). WhatsApp and wellbeing: A study on WhatsApp

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

usage, communication quality and stress. In *Proceedings of the 31st International BCS Human Computer Interaction Conference (HCI 2017)* 31 (pp. 1-6).

Boczek, K., & Koppers, L. (2020). What's new about Whatsapp for news? A mixed-method study on news outlets' strategies for using WhatsApp. *Digital Journalism* (Vol. 8, Issue 1, pp. 126–144). https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2019.1692685

Bolger, N., & Laurenceau, J. P. (2013). *Intensive longitudinal methods: An introduction to diary and experience sampling research*. Guilford Press.

Brandtzæg, P. B., Lüders, M., & Skjetne, J. H. (2010). Too many Facebook "friends"? content sharing and sociability versus the need for privacy in social network sites. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, 26(11–12), 1006–1030. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2010.516719

Brown, T. A., Chorpita, B. F., Korotitsch, W., & Barlow, D. H. (1997). Psychometric properties of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS) in clinical samples. *Behaviour research and therapy*, *35*(1), 79–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0005-7967(96)00068-x

Bucher, B. (2020). Messaging app usage statistics around the world. Retrieved September 18, 2020, from https://www.messengerpeople.com/global-messenger-usage-statistics/

Card, C. (2018). How Facebook AI helps suicide prevention. *About Facebook.* https://about.fb.com/news/2018/09/inside-feed-suicide-prevention-and-ai/

Cassa, C. A., Chunara, R., Mandl, K., & Brownstein, J. S. (2013). Twitter as a sentinel in emergency situations: lessons from the boston marathon explosions. *PLoS Currents*, 5. https://doi.org/10.1371/currents.dis.ad70cd1c8bc585e9470046cde334ee4b

Chakraborty, K., & Chatterjee, M. (2020). Psychological impact of COVID-19 pandemic on general population in west Bengal: a cross-sectional study. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry* (Vol. 62, Issue 3, p. 266). https://doi.org/10.4103/psychiatry.indianjpsychiatry_276_20

Chan, A. K. M., Nickson, C. P., Rudolph, J. W., Lee, A., & Joynt, G. M. (2020). Social media for rapid knowledge dissemination: early experience from the COVID-19 pandemic. *Anaesthesia*. https://doi.org/10.1111/anae.15057

Chen, Q., Min, C., Zhang, W., Wang, G., Ma, X., & Evans, R. (2020). Unpacking the black box:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

How to promote citizen engagement through government social media during the COVID-19 crisis. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 106380.

CHEQ. (2019). The economic cost of bad actors on the internet: Fake news | 2019. https://s3.amazonaws.com/media.mediapost.com/uploads/EconomicCostOfFakeNews.pdf

Cheung, Y. T. D., Chan, C. H. H., Lai, C.-K. J., Chan, W. F. V., Wang, M. P., Li, H. C. W., Chan, S. S. C., & Lam, T.-H. (2015). Using WhatsApp and Facebook online social groups for smoking relapse prevention for recent quitters: a pilot pragmatic cluster randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 17(10), e238. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.4829

Clark□Ginsberg, A., & Sayers, E. L. P. (2020). Communication missteps during COVID-19 hurt those already most at risk. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management.* https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12304

Corp, I. B. M. (2013). IBM SPSS statistics for windows, version 22.0. *Armonk, NY: IBM Corp*.

Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Larson, R. (2014). Validity and Reliability of the Experience-Sampling Method. *Flow and the Foundations of Positive Psychology: The Collected Works of Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi* (pp. 35–54). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9088-8_3

Depoux, A., Martin, S., Karafillakis, E., Preet, R., Wilder-Smith, A., & Larson, H. (2020). The pandemic of social media panic travels faster than the COVID-19 outbreak. *Journal of Travel Medicine*, *27*(3). https://doi.org/10.1093/jtm/taaa031

Elías, C., & Catalan-Matamoros, D. (2020). Coronavirus in Spain: fear of “official” fake news boosts WhatsApp and alternative sources. *Media and Communication* (Vol. 8, Issue 2, pp. 462–466). https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.v8i2.3217

Facebook for Developers. (2020). WhatsApp Business API: Overview. Retrieved September 17, 2020, from https://developers.facebook.com/docs/whatsapp/overview

Fiorillo, A., & Gorwood, P. (2020). The consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic on mental health and implications for clinical practice. *European Psychiatry: The Journal of the Association of European Psychiatrists*, *63*(1), e32.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Gao, J., Zheng, P., Jia, Y., Chen, H., Mao, Y., Chen, S., Wang, Y., Fu, H., & Dai, J. (2020). Mental health problems and social media exposure during COVID-19 outbreak. *PloS One*, *15*(4), e0231924.

Guess, A., Nagler, J., & Tucker, J. (2019). Less than you think: Prevalence and predictors of fake news dissemination on Facebook. *Science Advances*, *5*(1), eaau4586.

Grinberg, N., Joseph, K., Friedland, L., Swire-Thompson, B., & Lazer, D. (2019). Fake news on Twitter during the 2016 US presidential election. *Science*, *363*(6425), 374-378.

Guidry, J. P., Jin, Y., Orr, C. A., Messner, M., & Meganck, S. (2017). Ebola on Instagram and Twitter: How health organizations address the health crisis in their social media engagement. *Public Relations Review*, *43*(3), 477-486.

Gutteling, J. M., & de Vries, P. W. (2017). Determinants of seeking and avoiding risk-related information in times of crisis. *Risk Analysis: An Official Publication of the Society for Risk Analysis*, *37*(1), 27–39.

Hao, F., Tan, W., Jiang, L., Zhang, L., Zhao, X., Zou, Y., ... & Tran, B. (2020). Do psychiatric patients experience more psychiatric symptoms during COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown? A case-control study with service and research implications for immunopsychiatry. *Brain, Behavior, and Immunity*.

Hektner, J. M., Schmidt, J. A., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2007). Experience Sampling Method: measuring the quality of everyday life. Sage.

Huckvale, K., Venkatesh, S., & Christensen, H. (2019). Toward clinical digital phenotyping: A timely opportunity to consider purpose, quality, and safety. *NPJ Digital Medicine*, 2(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-019-0166-1

Jelenchick, L. A., Eickhoff, J. C., & Moreno, M. A. (2013). “Facebook Depression?” social networking site use and depression in older adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 52(1), 128–130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2012.05.008

Jha, N. (2020). Fighting with boomers about coronavirus misinformation on WhatsApp won't make any of us less afraid. Retrieved September 17, 2020, from

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/nishitajha/coronavirus-india-whatsapp-rumors

Karapanos, E., Teixeira, P., & Gouveia, R. (2016). Need fulfillment and experiences on social media: a case on Facebook and WhatsApp. *Computers in Human Behavior* (Vol. 55, pp. 888–897). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.10.015

Kantar. (2020). COVID-19 Barometer: Consumer Attitudes, Media Habits and Expectations. [online] Available at: <https://www.kantar.com/Inspiration/Coronavirus/COVID-19-Barometer-Consumer-attitudes-media-habits-and-expectations> [Accessed 28 September 2020].

Karim, F., Oyewande, A. A., Abdalla, L. F., Chaudhry Ehsanullah, R., & Khan, S. (2020). Social media use and its connection to mental health: a systematic review. *Cureus*, 12(6). https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.8627

Kamel Boulos, M. N., Giustini, D. M., & Wheeler, S. (2016). Instagram and WhatsApp in health and healthcare: an overview. *Future Internet*, 8(3), 37. https://doi.org/10.3390/fi8030037

Knop, K., Öncü, J. S., Penzel, J., Abele, T. S., Brunner, T., Vorderer, P., & Wessler, H. (2016). Offline time is quality time: comparing within-group self-disclosure in mobile messaging applications and face-to-face interactions. *Computers in Human Behavior* (Vol. 55, pp. 1076–1084). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.11.004

Krause, N. M., Freiling, I., Beets, B., & Brossard, D. (2020). Fact-checking as risk communication: the multi-layered risk of misinformation in times of COVID-19. *Journal of Risk Research* (pp. 1–8). https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2020.1756385

Kumar, V. G., Gireesh Kumar, V., & Koovakkai, D. (2019). Social media misinformation in disaster situations: a case of 2018 Kerala flood. *Library Progress (International)* (Vol. 39, Issue 2, p. 289). https://doi.org/10.5958/2320-317x.2019.00032.1

Lachlan, K. A., Spence, P. R., Edwards, A., Reno, K. M., & Edwards, C. (2014). If you are quick enough, I will think about it: information speed and trust in public health organizations. *Computers in Human Behavior* (Vol. 33, pp. 377–380). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2013.08.014

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Lachlan, K., & Spence, P. R. (2014). Does message placement influence risk perception and affect? *Journal of Communication Management* (Vol. 18, Issue 2, pp. 122–130). https://doi.org/10.1108/jcom-12-2012-0097

Lambert, C. E. (2020). Earthquake country: A qualitative analysis of risk communication via Facebook. *Environmental Communication* (Vol. 14, Issue 6, pp. 744–757). https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2020.1719176

Lee, N. M. (2018). Fake news, phishing, and fraud: a call for research on digital media literacy education beyond the classroom. *Communication Education* (Vol. 67, Issue 4, pp. 460–466). https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2018.1503313

Lin, X., Spence, P. R., Sellnow, T. L., & Lachlan, K. A. (2016). Crisis communication, learning and responding: Best practices in social media. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *65*, 601-605.

Lin, Y., Hu, Z., Alias, H., & Wong, L. P. (2020). Influence of mass and social media on psycho-behavioral responses among medical students during the downward trend of COVID-19 in Fujian, China: cross-sectional study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 22(7), e19982. https://doi.org/10.2196/19982

Lindsay, B.R. (2011). Social media and disasters: Current uses, future options, and policy considerations. *CRS Report for Congress*. Retrieved from: <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/homesec/R41987.pdf>.

Liu, J. C., Tong, E. M. (2020). COVID-19 news exposure as a modifiable risk factor of psychological symptoms: Can an official WhatsApp channel help?. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*.

Long, V. J., & Liu, J. C. (2020). Behavioral changes during the COVID-19 pandemic: Results of a national survey in Singapore. *medRxiv*.

Lottridge, D., & Bentley, F. R. (2018). Let's Hate Together. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - CHI '18* https://doi.org/10.1145/3173574.3173634

Lovibond, P. F., & Lovibond, S. H. (1995). The structure of negative emotional states:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

comparison of the depression anxiety stress scales (DASS) with the Beck depression and anxiety inventories. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 33(3), 335–343. https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967(94)00075-U

Malecki, K. M. C., Keating, J. A., & Safdar, N. (2020). Crisis communication and public perception of COVID-19 risk in the era of social media. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa758

Mesch, G. S., & Schwirian, K. P. (2019). Vaccination hesitancy: Fear, trust, and exposure expectancy of an Ebola outbreak. *Heliyon*, 5(7). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2019.e02016

de Freitas Melo, P., Vieira, C. C., Garimella, K., de Melo, P. O. V., & Benevenuto, F. (2019). Can WhatsApp counter misinformation by limiting message forwarding? In *International Conference on Complex Networks and Their Applications* (pp. 372-384). Springer, Cham.

Moulds, M. L., Kandris, E., Starr, S., & Wong, A. C. M. (2007). The relationship between rumination, avoidance and depression in a non-clinical sample. *Behaviour Research and Therapy* (Vol. 45, Issue 2, pp. 251–261). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2006.03.003

Newton, C. (2020). WhatsApp puts new limits on the forwarding of viral messages. Retrieved September 15, 2020, from https://www.theverge.com/2020/4/7/21211371/whatsapp-message-forwarding-limits-misinformation-coronavirus-india

Ni, M. Y., Yang, L., Leung, C. M., Li, N., Yao, X. I., Wang, Y., ... & Liao, Q. (2020). Mental health, risk factors, and social media use during the COVID-19 epidemic and cordon sanitaire among the community and health professionals in Wuhan, China: Cross-sectional survey. *JMIR Mental Health*, *7*(5), e19009.

Palen, L., & Liu, S. B. (2007). Citizen communications in crisis. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - CHI '07*. https://doi.org/10.1145/1240624.1240736

Pan, P.-L., & Meng, J. (2016). Media frames across stages of health crisis: A crisis

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

management approach to news coverage of flu pandemic. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management* (Vol. 24, Issue 2, pp. 95–106). https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12105

Parmer, J., Baur, C., Eroglu, D., Lubell, K., Prue, C., Reynolds, B., & Weaver, J. (2016). Crisis and emergency risk messaging in mass media news stories: is the public getting the information they need to protect their health?. *Health Communication*, *31*(10), 1215-1222.

Patel, M., Kute, V., & Agarwal, S. (2020). "Infodemic" of COVID 19: More pandemic than the virus. *Indian Journal of Nephrology* (Vol. 30, Issue 3, p. 188). https://doi.org/10.4103/ijn.ijn_216_20

Pennycook, G., McPhetres, J., Zhang, Y., Lu, J. G., & Rand, D. G. (2020). Fighting COVID-19 misinformation on social media: Experimental evidence for a scalable accuracy-nudge intervention. *Psychological Science*, *31*(7), 770–780.

Petzold, M. B., Bendau, A., Plag, J., Pyrkosch, L., Maricic, L. M., Betzler, F., Rogoll, J., Große, J., & Ströhle, A. (2020). Risk, resilience, psychological distress, and anxiety at the beginning of the COVID□19 pandemic in Germany. *Brain and Behavior*. https://doi.org/10.1002/brb3.1745

Pew/Internet: Pew Internet & American Life Project. (2006). *Choice Reviews Online* (Vol. 44, Issue 01, pp. 44–0384). https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.44-0384

Porter, J. (2020). WhatsApp says its forwarding limits have cut the spread of viral messages by 70 percent. Retrieved September 17, 2020, from https://www.theverge.com/2020/4/27/21238082/whatsapp-forward-message-limits-viral-misinformation-decline

Rathore, F. A., & Farooq, F. (2020). Information overload and infodemic in the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of the Pakistan Medical Association*, 70 (Supplementary 3)(5), S162–S165.

Reuter, C., Ludwig, T., Kaufhold, M.-A., & Spielhofer, T. (2016). Emergency services' attitudes towards social media: A quantitative and qualitative survey across Europe. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* (Vol. 95, pp. 96–111).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2016.03.005

Reuters. (2018). *Reuters Institute Digital News Report 2018*.

Resende, G., Melo, P., C. S. Reis, J., Vasconcelos, M., Almeida, J. M., & Benevenuto, F. (2019). Analyzing textual (mis)information shared in WhatsApp groups. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM Conference on Web Science - WebSci '19*, 225–234. https://doi.org/10.1145/3292522.3326029

Ronk, F. R., Korman, J. R., Hooke, G. R., & Page, A. C. (2013). Assessing clinical significance of treatment outcomes using the DASS-21. *Psychological Assessment*, *25*(4), 1103–1110.

Rosenthal, U., Hart, P. 't, & Kouzmin, A. (1991). The bureau-politics of crisis management. *Public Administration* (Vol. 69, Issue 2, pp. 211–233). https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.1991.tb00791.x

Rosnow, R. L., Yost, J. H., & Esposito, J. L. (1986). Belief in rumor and likelihood of rumor transmission. *Language & Communication* (Vol. 6, Issue 3, pp. 189–194). https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-5309(86)90022-4

Rossini, P., Stromer-Galley, J., Baptista, E. A., & Veiga de Oliveira, V. (2020). Dysfunctional information sharing on WhatsApp and Facebook: The role of political talk, cross-cutting exposure and social corrections. *New Media & Society*, 1461444820928059. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444820928059

Saw, Y. E., Tan, E. Y.-Q., Liu, J. S., & Liu, J. C. (2020). Towards a digital solution: Predicting public take-up of Singapore's contact tracing application during the COVID-19 crisis. *MedRxiv*, 2020.08.26.20182386. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.26.20182386

Schønning, V., Hjetland, G. J., Aarø, L. E., & Skogen, J. C. (2020). Social media use and mental health and well-being among adolescents – a scoping review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01949

Scrucca, L., Fop, M., Murphy, T. B., & Raftery, A. E. (2016). Mclust 5: clustering, classification and density estimation using gaussian finite mixture models. *The R journal*, *8*(1), 289.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Sharma, K., Seo, S., Meng, C., Rambhatla, S., & Liu, Y. (2020). COVID-19 on social media: Analyzing misinformation in twitter Conversations. *ArXiv:2003*.12309 [Cs]. http://arxiv.org/abs/2003.12309

Shi, Z., Rui, H., & Whinston, A. B. (2014). Content sharing in a social broadcasting environment: evidence from twitter. *MIS Quarterly*, *38*(1), 123-142.

Singh, M. (2020a). WhatsApp's new limit cuts virality of 'highly forwarded' messages by 70%. Retrieved September 15, 2020, from https://techcrunch.com/2020/04/27/whatsapps-new-limit-cuts-virality-of-highly-forwarded-messages-by-70/

Singh, M. (2020b). WhatsApp hits 2 billion users, up from 1.5 billion 2 years ago. Retrieved September 17, 2020, from https://techcrunch.com/2020/02/12/whatsapp-hits-2-billion-users-up-from-1-5-billion-2-years-ago/

Singh, S. (2020). WhatsApp In Covid-19: Curbing Fake News, Easing Video Chat, Delivering Direct Info. *[online] Entrepreneur*. Available at: <https://www.entrepreneur.com/article/348935> [Accessed 4 August 2020].

Simon, T., Goldberg, A., Leykin, D., & Adini, B. (2016). Kidnapping WhatsApp – rumors during the search and rescue operation of three kidnapped youth. *Computers in Human Behavior* (Vol. 64, pp. 183–190). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.06.058

Starbird, K., Maddock, J., Orand, M., Achterman, P., & Mason, R. M. (2014). Rumors, false flags, and digital Vigilantes: Misinformation on Twitter after the 2013 boston marathon bombing. *iConference 2014 Proceedings: Breaking Down Walls. Culture - Context - Computing*. https://doi.org/10.9776/14308

Steup, M. (2019). 4 million Singaporeans say WhatsApp is their most-used app. Retrieved September 17, 2020, from https://www.messengerpeople.com/whatsapp-is-singaporeans-most-used-app/

Stiegler, R., Tilley, S., & Parveen, T. (2011). Finding family and friends in the aftermath of a disaster using federated queries on social networks and websites. In *2011 13th IEEE*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

International Symposium on Web Systems Evolution (WSE). https://doi.org/10.1109/wse.2011.6081815

Stieger, S., Lewetz, D., & Swami, V. (2020). Psychological well-being under conditions of lockdown: An experience sampling study in Austria during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Taylor, S. E. (2012). Tend and befriend theory. In *Handbook of theories of social psychology*, Vol. 1 (pp. 32–49). Sage Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446249215.n3

Vahia, V. N., & Shah, A. B. (2020). COVID-19 pandemic and mental health care of older adults in India. *International Psychogeriatrics / IPA*, 1–3.

Tan, B. Y., Chew, N. W., Lee, G. K., Jing, M., Goh, Y., Yeo, L. L., ... & Shanmugam, G. N. (2020). Psychological impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on health care workers in Singapore. *Annals of Internal Medicine*.

Team, R. C. (2017). R: a language and environment for statistical computing. *R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna*. https://www. R-project.org.

Therneau, T., Atkinson, B., & Ripley, B. (2019). rpart: Recursive Partitioning and Regression Trees. *R package version 4.1–13*. 2018.

Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. *Science*, 359(6380), 1146–1151. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap9559

Wang, C., Pan, R., Wan, X., Tan, Y., Xu, L., McIntyre, R. S., ... & Ho, C. (2020). A longitudinal study on the mental health of general population during the COVID-19 epidemic in China. *Brain, behavior, and immunity*.

Wade, T. D., Crosby, R. D., & Martin, N. G. (2006). Use of latent profile analysis to identify eating disorder phenotypes in an adult australian twin cohort. *Archives of General Psychiatry* (Vol. 63, Issue 12). https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.63.12.1377

WhatsApp. (2020a). WhatsApp FAQ - How to add and remove group participants. Retrieved September 17, 2020, from https://faq.whatsapp.com/iphone/chats/how-to-add-and-remove-group-participants

WhatsApp. (2020b). Business API. Retrieved September 17, 2020, from

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.29.20203646; this version posted September 29, 2020. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

https://www.whatsapp.com/business/api/?lang=fb

World Economic Forum. (2018). The global risks report 2018: Insight report (13th ed.). Retrieved September 18, 2020, from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Global_Risks_Report_2019.pdf

World Health Organization. (2020). WHO coronavirus disease (COVID-19) dashboard. Retrieved September 17, 2020, from https://covid19.who.int/.

Yu, R. P. (2016). The relationship between passive and active non-political social media use and political expression on Facebook and Twitter. *Computers in Human Behaviour, 58*, 413-420. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2016.01.019