

## **Vulnerability to rumors during the COVID-19 pandemic:**

### **Results of a national survey**

Victoria Jane En Long<sup>1</sup>, *MPH*, Medical student

Wei Shien Koh<sup>1</sup>, *BSocSc*, Medical student

Young Ern Saw<sup>2</sup>, *BA*

\*Jean CJ Liu<sup>1,2</sup>, *PhD*, Assistant Professor

<sup>1</sup>Duke-NUS Medical School, Singapore

<sup>2</sup>Division of Social Sciences, Yale-NUS College, Singapore

Victoria Jane En Long: [victoria.long@u.duke.nus.edu](mailto:victoria.long@u.duke.nus.edu)

Wei Shien Koh: [weishienkoh@u.duke.nus.edu](mailto:weishienkoh@u.duke.nus.edu)

Young Ern Saw: [sawyoungern@u.yale-nus.edu.sg](mailto:sawyoungern@u.yale-nus.edu.sg)

Jean CJ Liu: [jeanliu@yale-nus.edu.sg](mailto:jeanliu@yale-nus.edu.sg)

Affiliation addresses:

Duke-NUS Medical School

8 College Rd, Singapore 169857

Yale-NUS College

28 College Ave West

Running head: COVID-19 rumors

\*Please address correspondence to:

Jean CJ Liu

Yale-NUS College

28 College Ave West

#01-501

Singapore 138533

Email: [jeanliu@yale-nus.edu.sg](mailto:jeanliu@yale-nus.edu.sg)

1 Funding

2 This research was funded by a grant awarded to JCJL from the JY Pillay  
3 Global Asia Programme [grant number: IG20-SG002].

4

5

6 Highlights

- 7 • Prior studies linked exposure to COVID-19 rumors with poor mental health.
- 8 • In a community sample, most participants reported having heard rumors.
- 9 • Few participants shared or believed rumors.
- 10 • Sharing sometimes occurred in the absence of belief.
- 11 • More educated individuals believed and shared fewer rumors.

12 Abstract

13           Amidst the COVID-19 pandemic, many rumors have emerged. Given prior  
14 research linking rumor exposure to mental well-being, we conducted a nation-wide  
15 survey to document the base rate of rumor exposure and factors associated with  
16 rumor vulnerability. Between March to July 2020, 1237 participants were surveyed on  
17 5 widely-disseminated COVID-19 rumors (that drinking water frequently could be  
18 preventive, that eating garlic could be preventive, that the outbreak arose because of  
19 bat soup consumption, that the virus was created in an American lab, and that the  
20 virus was created in a Chinese lab). For each rumor, participants reported whether  
21 they had heard, shared or believed each rumor. Although most participants had been  
22 exposed to COVID-19 rumors, few shared or believed these. Sharing behaviors  
23 sometimes occurred in the absence of belief; however, education emerged as a  
24 protective factor for both sharing and belief. Together, our results suggest that  
25 campaigns targeting skills associated with higher education (e.g. epistemology) may  
26 prove more effective than counter-rumor messages.

27

28 **KEYWORDS:** Infectious diseases; public health; COVID-19; misinformation; social  
29 media; infodemic; fake news

30 **Vulnerability to rumors during the COVID-19 pandemic:**

31 **Results of a national survey**

32 1. Introduction

33 The global outbreak of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) has come with  
34 increased psychological burden. In several meta-analyses, depression and anxiety  
35 symptoms have been found to be elevated amongst healthcare workers and the  
36 general population since the start of the pandemic (da Silva and Neto, 2021; Pappa  
37 et al., 2020; Salari et al., 2020). Others have reported a higher incidence of stress-  
38 related symptoms or post-traumatic stress disorder (Cooke et al., 2020; Torales et al.,  
39 2020). These findings highlight the urgent need to understand factors these  
40 predicting anxiety and mood outcomes, allowing vulnerable individuals to be  
41 identified and interventions to be developed.

42 In terms of predictors, exposure to COVID-19 rumors has emerged as a risk  
43 factor for poor mental health (Gao et al., 2020; Liu and Tong, 2020; Vardanjani et al.,  
44 2020; Xiong et al., 2020). This negative mental health impact has occurred against  
45 the backdrop of an “infodemic” – a surge of COVID-19 misinformation created and  
46 shared primarily via social media (World Health Organization, 2020). In particular, the  
47 fast-changing nature of the pandemic means that accurate information has not  
48 always been accessible (Cuan-Baltazar et al., 2020; Hou et al., 2020), resulting in  
49 many uncertainties. This has given rise to a large number of rumors (Depoux et al.,  
50 2020; Larson, 2018; Vosoughi et al., 2018).

51 To date, several publications have used publicly available data to analyze  
52 and document the spread of rumors. For example, during the early stage of the  
53 pandemic (December 2019 to April 2020), search engine keywords reflected popular  
54 myths (Rovetta and Bhagavathula, 2020; Singh et al., 2020), with a large number of  
55 searches pertaining to alternative medicines that had been speculated to prevent  
56 COVID-19 (e.g., garlic, Chinese medicinal herbs, or the malaria medication  
57 chloroquine; Hou et al., 2020). On the social media platform Twitter, conspiratorial

58 theories were posted regarding disease origins – suggesting, for example, that the  
59 virus had been developed as a bioweapon or had resulted from the introduction of  
60 5G mobile networks (Abd-Alrazaq et al., 2020; Ahmed et al., 2020).

61 In turn, the spread of COVID-19 rumors has led to deleterious consequences.  
62 In Iran for example, a myth that alcohol consumption could prevent or treat COVID-  
63 19 resulted in over 700 deaths related to methanol poisoning, with deaths attributed  
64 to methanol poisoning exceeding those attributed to COVID-19 in some provinces  
65 (Aghababaeian et al., 2020). Returning to mental health outcomes, the extent to  
66 which an individual has been exposed to, has shared, or believed in COVID-19  
67 rumors has also been found to predict anxiety symptoms (Liu and Tong, 2020).

68 While demographic predictors of pandemic-related mental health are difficult  
69 to address (e.g., age, gender, pre-existing medical conditions; (Torales et al., 2020),  
70 a person's exposure to rumors may constitute a modifiable risk factor (Abdoli, 2020;  
71 Ebrahim et al., 2020; Holmes et al., 2020). Correspondingly, efforts to develop  
72 interventions would benefit from an understanding of rumor vulnerability: (i) the base  
73 rates by which individuals are exposed to, believe in, or share rumors; and (ii) factors  
74 predicting these rumor-related experiences (Chua and Banerjee, 2018).

75 At present, little is known about individual vulnerability to COVID-19 rumors.  
76 While a handful of studies have surveyed individuals on their social media usage and  
77 enquired about rumor dissemination via these platforms (Banakar et al., 2020), we  
78 are not aware of any study that has identified persons most likely to encounter,  
79 believe in, or to share COVID-19 rumors. To address this gap in the literature, we  
80 thus conducted a nationwide survey examining rumor vulnerability during the COVID-  
81 19 pandemic.

## 82 2. Methods

### 83 2.1 Study design and population

84 Our study was conducted across five months in Singapore (7 March to 27  
85 July 2020), a city-state in Asia that experienced a high number of COVID-19 cases in

86 the early stage of the pandemic. During this time, we recruited 1237 participants who  
87 met the following eligibility criteria: (1) aged  $\geq 21$  years old, and (2) had lived in  
88 Singapore for  $\geq 2$  years. All participants were recruited via social media  
89 advertisements within community groups (e.g., groups for residential estates,  
90 universities, and workplaces), or through paid Facebook advertisements targeting  
91 Singapore-based users.

92 Upon study enrolment, participants provided informed consent and completed  
93 a 20-minute online survey via Qualtrics. As part of a larger study, participants  
94 reported their: (i) demographics, (ii) responses to the pandemic; (iii) sources of  
95 COVID-19 news; and (as we report in this paper) (iv) familiarity with rumors (Liu and  
96 Tong, 2020; Long and Liu, 2020; Saw et al., 2020). The study protocol was approved  
97 by the Yale-NUS College Ethics Review Committee (#2020-CERC-001) and was  
98 pre-registered on ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT04305574).

## 99 *2.2 Outcome variables*

100 As the primary outcome variables, we assessed participants' familiarity with  
101 five rumors that had been widely spread during the COVID-19 pandemic: that (1)  
102 drinking water frequently will help prevent infection (COVID-19 prevention); (2) eating  
103 garlic can help prevent infection (COVID-19 prevention); (3) the outbreak arose from  
104 people eating bat soup (COVID-19 origins); (4) the virus was created in a US lab to  
105 affect China's economy (COVID-19 origins); and (5) the virus was created in a  
106 Chinese lab as a bioweapon (COVID-19 origins). These rumors were presented in  
107 the survey as claims, rather than rumors to avoid influencing participants' response.  
108 Rumors were selected for their widespread distribution both internationally and within  
109 the local context (Taylor, 2020; World Health Organisation, 2020).

110 For each rumor, participants indicated whether they: (1) had heard the claim  
111 before (yes/no); (2) thought the claim was true (yes/no); or (3) had shared the claim  
112 on social media (e.g., Facebook, WhatsApp) (yes/no). We assigned a score of 1 for  
113 "yes" responses, and summed across the rumors to create three scores: the total

114 number of claims heard, the total number of claims believed, and the total number of  
115 claims shared. Finally, participants also indicated which of 13 possible sources they  
116 had encountered the rumors (e.g., Facebook, WhatsApp, online forums, television).

### 117 *2.3 Predictor variables*

118 As predictor variables, participants reported the following demographic  
119 details: age, gender, ethnicity, religion, country of birth, marital status, education,  
120 house type (a proxy of socio-economic status), and household size. Using the survey  
121 timestamp, we also recorded two situation-related variables: the total number of local  
122 cases reported to date, and whether the country had been in a lock-down when  
123 participants completed the survey.

### 124 *2.4 Statistical analysis*

125 Using counts (%), we first summarized the baseline rates of rumor familiarity  
126 and rumor sources. As further exploratory analyses, we conducted Fisher's exact  
127 test exploring the relationship between believing and sharing each rumor.

128 We then ran linear regression models to predict the following outcome  
129 measures: the total number of claims heard [Model 1], the total number of claims  
130 believed [Model 2], and the total number of claims shared [Model 3]. Each model  
131 involved the full set of predictor variables (described in 2.3), with the number of  
132 COVID-19 cases log-transformed for linearity.

133 For each model, we applied Bonferroni correction to control the type 1 family-  
134 wise error rate at 0.05 (Bonferroni-adjusted alpha level of  $0.05/22$  predictors = 0.002).  
135 All statistical analyses were conducted using R (Version 4.0).

## 136 3. Results

### 137 *3.1 Response rate*

138 Out of 1751 individuals who accessed the survey link, 1446 (82.6%) provided  
139 informed consent and participated in the survey. However, 209 (14.5%) participants  
140 did not complete the primary outcome measures (on COVID-19 rumors) and were  
141 excluded from statistical analyses.

142 The final sample of 1237 participants is comparable to the resident population  
143 with regards to: the proportion of participants born in Singapore, ethnicity, and  
144 household size ( $\leq 10\%$  difference) and age. However, our sample had more  
145 participants who were female (63.9% vs. 51.1%), single (41.9% vs 18.8%), and  
146 university graduates (70.7% vs. 32.4%); and fewer participants who lived in 1-3 room  
147 public housing flats (8.2% vs. 23.7%) or who had Buddhist beliefs (14.6% vs 33.2%)  
148 (Table 1).

149 [Table 1 about here.]

### 150 3.2 Base rates of familiarity with COVID-19 rumors

151 Out of 5 widely-disseminated rumors, the average participant had heard of  
152 3.34 ( $SD = 1.33$ ) rumors. The most commonly-heard rumor – reported by 8 in 10  
153 participants (84.6%) – was that the outbreak had arisen from individuals eating bat  
154 soup. Despite high exposure to COVID-19 rumors, however, participants only  
155 believed an average of 0.27 claims ( $SD = 0.59$ ) and shared 0.18 ( $SD = 0.63$ ). The  
156 most commonly-believed rumor was that drinking water could prevent infection  
157 (11.4%), whereas the most commonly-shared rumor was again that the disease had  
158 arisen from bat soup consumption (7.1%) (Figure 1).

159 [Figures 1 and 2 about here.]

160 In other words, most participants who had heard each of the 5 rumors neither  
161 believed in nor shared the claims. Using Fisher's exact test, we conducted  
162 exploratory analyses to examine how belief and sharing behaviors were related. First,  
163 for the claim about the United States manufacturing the coronavirus to affect China's  
164 economy, none who shared this rumor believed that it was true ( $p$ -value of 1 for  
165 Fisher's exact test). In the case of the other 4 rumors, however, there was a  
166 significant association between belief and sharing ( $p < 0.001$  for the rumors on  
167 drinking water and bat soup;  $p = 0.001$  for the rumor on garlic, and  $p = 0.02$  for the  
168 rumor on China creating the virus). Nonetheless, even with these 4 rumors, not all  
169 who propagated the rumors believed that they were true (Figure 2).

170 Finally, Figure 3 depicts how participants had encountered COVID-19 rumors.  
171 As has been previously reported (Ippolito et al., 2020; Pew Research Center, 2018),  
172 social media platforms emerged as the leading sources, with 1 in 2 individuals  
173 reporting exposure through Facebook (55.5%) or WhatsApp (53.6%).

174 [Figure 3 about here.]

### 175 *3.3 Predicting rumor hearing, sharing, and believing*

176 Model 1 examined if any demographic or situational factors predicted the  
177 number of rumors heard. As shown in Table 2, participants reported hearing more  
178 rumors when confirmed local cases were few (early in the pandemic) ( $b = -0.621$ ,  
179  $t(1190) = -3.588$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) or as lockdown restrictions were lifted ( $b = 1.129$ ,  $t(1190)$   
180  $= 4.289$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Additionally, there was a trend for education to predict rumor  
181 exposure, with those with higher education hearing more rumors, ( $b = 0.077$ ,  $t(1190)$   
182  $= 2.625$ ,  $p = 0.009$ ). (However, this association was not observed with Bonferroni  
183 correction.)

184 In Models 2 and 3, the same set of predictors were used to predict the  
185 number of rumors shared and believed, respectively. For both these models, those  
186 who were more educated shared or believed fewer rumors (Model 2:  $b = -0.046$ ,  
187  $t(1190) = -3.289$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ; Model 3:  $b = -0.046$ ,  $t(1190) = -3.488$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ).

188 [Table 2 about here.]

## 189 4. Discussion

190 During times of crisis, rumors have the potential to transmit misinformation  
191 and induce anxiety (Jin et al., 2014; Tran et al., 2020). Against the backdrop of the  
192 COVID-19 pandemic, we thus documented how individuals in the community were  
193 vulnerable to receive, believe in, or share specific COVID-19 rumors.

194 First, we observed that rumor exposure was endemic. Nearly all participants  
195 had heard at least one rumor and were familiar with an average of 3 out of 5 popular  
196 claims assessed. Additionally, most rumor transmission occurred via social media

197 channels (e.g., Facebook and WhatsApp), as others have noted (Islam et al., 2020;  
198 Wang et al., 2019).

199         Extending previous research, we further described how the base rate of  
200 believing or sharing rumors was far lower than the rate of exposure (with an average  
201 of <1 rumor believed or shared). Notably, belief and sharing behaviors did not always  
202 co-occur. In the extreme case of one rumor in particular (that the COVID-19 crisis  
203 had been manufactured by the United States), not a single participant who reported  
204 forwarding the rumor actually believed in it. Although belief and sharing were linked  
205 for the other rumors we assessed, there continued to be – in each case – individuals  
206 who shared rumors without believing their veracity.

207         Our finding that COVID-19 rumors were disseminated even when disbelieved  
208 highlights the sheer difficulty of managing the so-called ‘infodemic’. Although similar  
209 findings had been reported outside the COVID-19 context (Chua and Banerjee,  
210 2017), the World Health Organization and individual governments continue to issue –  
211 as the prevailing strategy – fact-checking statements to debunk rumors (Wong et al.,  
212 2020; World Health Organisation, 2020; Zarocostas, 2020). Our results bring to  
213 question the utility of such statements, since individuals continue to share claims  
214 despite perceiving them to be untrue.

215         Based on our findings, an alternative strategy might be to target individual  
216 vulnerabilities instead of rumor content. Given that rumor exposure changed with  
217 pandemic severity (e.g., the number of cases) and most individuals had encountered  
218 COVID-19 rumors, the ensuing question is why only certain individuals fell prey to  
219 either belief in or the sharing of these rumors. In our analyses, we found that  
220 educational level was a consistent predictor of vulnerability: although higher  
221 education predicted that an individual would hear more rumors, higher education was  
222 nonetheless protective, associated with fewer rumors shared or believed in.  
223 Consequently, it may be profitable to increase public awareness of knowledge and  
224 skillsets associated with higher education – for example, epistemology or scientific

225 thinking (Chong et al., 2020; Chua and Banerjee, 2017) . We note, however, that the  
226 correlational nature of our dataset precludes causal inferences, and further research  
227 will need to examine the efficacy of such strategies in curbing pandemic-related  
228 rumors.

#### 229 *4.1 Limitations*

230 In describing these findings, we highlight several limitations of our research  
231 methods. First, we relied on participants' self-reports regarding rumor exposure and  
232 behaviors. Although this strategy provided individual-level information (e.g., beliefs,  
233 demographics) not available in studies of actual rumor posts (e.g., when Twitter  
234 posts are mined), the survey method is vulnerable to recollection and reporting  
235 biases. Moving forward, future studies may opt to integrate digital documentation of  
236 rumor posts alongside self-reported measures.

237 As a second limitation, we only sampled rumors that were not time-sensitive.  
238 Given the limitations of the survey methodology, we could not track rumors that  
239 arose from fast-changing events on the ground – for example, rumors about the first  
240 COVID-19-related death in Singapore, or rumors about the availability of face masks  
241 (Asokan, 2020; Ministry of Communications and Information, 2020). It thus remains  
242 to be seen whether our findings can generalize to these forms of rumors.

#### 243 *4.2 Strengths*

244 These study limitations need to be viewed alongside the putative strengths of  
245 our research methodology. To the best of our knowledge, our study represents the  
246 first attempt to identify individual vulnerabilities in the spread of COVID-19 rumors.  
247 The research involved a large sample size (1237 participants), captured pandemic-  
248 related dynamics over a long duration (5 months), and examined specific rumors that  
249 had been widely disseminated.

#### 250 *4.3 Conclusions*

251 In conclusion, our study revealed that educational level was a protective  
252 factor amidst an onslaught of COVID-19 rumors. At a time when information

253 regulation is crucial to resilience and well-being (Abdoli, 2020; Garfin et al., 2020),  
254 our findings provide a basis to manage the spread of rumors. In other words, it is not  
255 apparent veracity that makes a rumor 'have it'. Instead, COVID-19 rumors are shared  
256 even when disbelieved, but may be stemmed through higher education.

257 References

- 258 Abd-Alrazaq, A., Alhuwail, D., Househ, M., Hamdi, M., Shah, Z., 2020. Top Concerns  
259 of Tweeters During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Infoveillance Study. *J. Med.*  
260 *Internet Res.* 22, e19016. <https://doi.org/10.2196/19016>
- 261 Abdoli, A., 2020. Gossip, Rumors, and the COVID-19 Crisis. *Disaster Med. Public*  
262 *Health Prep.* 1–2. <https://doi.org/10.1017/dmp.2020.272>
- 263 Aghababaeian, H., Hamdanieh, L., Ostadtaghizadeh, A., 2020. Alcohol intake in an  
264 attempt to fight COVID-19: A medical myth in Iran. *Alcohol* 88, 29–32.  
265 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcohol.2020.07.006>
- 266 Ahmed, W., Vidal-Alaball, J., Downing, J., Seguí, F.L., 2020. COVID-19 and the 5G  
267 Conspiracy Theory: Social Network Analysis of Twitter Data. *J. Med. Internet*  
268 *Res.* 22, e19458. <https://doi.org/10.2196/19458>
- 269 Asokan, A., 2020. MOH debunks rumour about COVID-19 death in Singapore - CNA.  
270 Channel News Asia. URL  
271 [https://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/singapore/covid19-coronavirus-](https://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/singapore/covid19-coronavirus-death-singapore-rumour-moh-12481200)  
272 [death-singapore-rumour-moh-12481200](https://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/singapore/covid19-coronavirus-death-singapore-rumour-moh-12481200) (accessed 9.30.20).
- 273 Banakar, M., Sadati, A.K., Zarei, L., Shahabi, S., Heydari, S.T., Lankarani, K.B., 2020.  
274 Public sphere attitudes toward rumor sources on COVID-19 epidemics:  
275 Evidence from community perceptions in Iran (preprint). In Review.  
276 <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-30297/v1>
- 277 Chong, Y.Y., Cheng, H.Y., Chan, H.Y.L., Chien, W.T., Wong, S.Y.S., 2020. COVID-  
278 19 pandemic, infodemic and the role of eHealth literacy. *Int. J. Nurs. Stud.*  
279 108, 103644. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2020.103644>
- 280 Chua, A.Y.K., Banerjee, S., 2018. Intentions to trust and share online health rumors:  
281 An experiment with medical professionals. *Comput. Hum. Behav.* 87, 1–9.  
282 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.05.021>

- 283 Chua, A.Y.K., Banerjee, S., 2017. To share or not to share: The role of epistemic  
284 belief in online health rumors. *Int. J. Med. Inf.* 108, 36–41.  
285 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2017.08.010>
- 286 Cooke, J.E., Eirich, R., Racine, N., Madigan, S., 2020. Prevalence of posttraumatic  
287 and general psychological stress during COVID-19: A rapid review and meta-  
288 analysis. *Psychiatry Res.* 292, 113347.  
289 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113347>
- 290 Cuan-Baltazar, J.Y., Muñoz-Perez, M.J., Robledo-Vega, C., Pérez-Zepeda, M.F.,  
291 Soto-Vega, E., 2020. Misinformation of COVID-19 on the internet:  
292 Infodemiology study. *JMIR Public Health Surveill.* 6, e18444.  
293 <https://doi.org/10.2196/18444>
- 294 da Silva, F.C.T., Neto, M.L.R., 2021. Psychological effects caused by the COVID-19  
295 pandemic in health professionals: A systematic review with meta-analysis.  
296 *Prog. Neuropsychopharmacol. Biol. Psychiatry* 104, 110062.  
297 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnpbp.2020.110062>
- 298 Depoux, A., Martin, S., Karafillakis, E., Preet, R., Wilder-Smith, A., Larson, H., 2020.  
299 The pandemic of social media panic travels faster than the COVID-19  
300 outbreak. *J. Travel Med.* 27. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jtm/taaa031>
- 301 Ebrahim, S.H., Ahmed, Q.A., Gozzer, E., Schlagenhaut, P., Memish, Z.A., 2020.  
302 Covid-19 and community mitigation strategies in a pandemic. *BMJ* m1066.  
303 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1066>
- 304 Gao, J., Zheng, P., Jia, Y., Chen, H., Mao, Y., Chen, S., Wang, Y., Fu, H., Dai, J.,  
305 2020. Mental health problems and social media exposure during COVID-19  
306 outbreak. *PLoS ONE* 15. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0231924>
- 307 Garfin, D.R., Silver, R.C., Holman, E.A., 2020. The novel coronavirus (COVID-2019)  
308 outbreak: Amplification of public health consequences by media exposure.  
309 *Health Psychol. Off. J. Div. Health Psychol. Am. Psychol. Assoc.* 39, 355–357.  
310 <https://doi.org/10.1037/hea0000875>

- 311 Holmes, E.A., O'Connor, R.C., Perry, V.H., Tracey, I., Wessely, S., Arseneault, L.,  
312 Ballard, C., Christensen, H., Cohen Silver, R., Everall, I., Ford, T., John, A.,  
313 Kabir, T., King, K., Madan, I., Michie, S., Przybylski, A.K., Shafran, R.,  
314 Sweeney, A., Worthman, C.M., Yardley, L., Cowan, K., Cope, C., Hotopf, M.,  
315 Bullmore, E., 2020. Multidisciplinary research priorities for the COVID-19  
316 pandemic: a call for action for mental health science. *Lancet Psychiatry* 7,  
317 547–560. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366\(20\)30168-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30168-1)
- 318 Hou, Z., Du, F., Zhou, X., Jiang, H., Martin, S., Larson, H., Lin, L., 2020. Cross-  
319 country comparison of public awareness, rumors, and behavioral responses  
320 to the COVID-19 epidemic: Infodemiology study. *J. Med. Internet Res.* 22,  
321 e21143. <https://doi.org/10.2196/21143>
- 322 Ippolito, G., Hui, D.S., Ntoumi, F., Maeurer, M., Zumla, A., 2020. Toning down the  
323 2019-nCoV media hype—and restoring hope. *Lancet Respir. Med.* 8, 230–  
324 231. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600\(20\)30070-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30070-9)
- 325 Islam, M.S., Sarkar, T., Khan, S.H., Mostofa Kamal, A.-H., Hasan, S.M.M., Kabir, A.,  
326 Yeasmin, D., Islam, M.A., Amin Chowdhury, K.I., Anwar, K.S., Chughtai, A.A.,  
327 Seale, H., 2020. COVID-19-Related Infodemic and Its Impact on Public  
328 Health: A Global Social Media Analysis. *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg.*  
329 <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.20-0812>
- 330 Jin, F., Wang, W., Zhao, L., Dougherty, E., Cao, Y., Lu, C.-T., Ramakrishnan, N.,  
331 2014. Misinformation propagation in the age of twitter. *Computer* 47, 90–94.  
332 <https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2014.361>
- 333 Larson, H.J., 2018. The biggest pandemic risk? Viral misinformation. *Nature* 562,  
334 309–309. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-018-07034-4>
- 335 Liu, J.C., Tong, E.M., 2020. COVID-19 news exposure as a modifiable risk factor of  
336 psychological symptoms: Can an official WhatsApp channel help? (Preprint).  
337 *J. Med. Internet Res.* 22, e22142. <https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.22142>

- 338 Long, V.J., Liu, J.C., 2020. Behavioural changes during the COVID-19 pandemic:  
339 Results of a national survey in Singapore. medRxiv 2020.08.06.20169870.  
340 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.06.20169870>
- 341 Ministry of Communications and Information, 2020. Corrections and clarifications  
342 regarding falsehoods published by States Times Review on availability of face  
343 masks. gov.sg. URL [https://www.gov.sg/article/factually-clarifications-on-](https://www.gov.sg/article/factually-clarifications-on-falsehoods-posted-by-str-on-availability-of-face-masks)  
344 [falsehoods-posted-by-str-on-availability-of-face-masks](https://www.gov.sg/article/factually-clarifications-on-falsehoods-posted-by-str-on-availability-of-face-masks) (accessed 9.30.20).
- 345 Pappa, S., Ntella, V., Giannakas, T., Giannakoulis, V.G., Papoutsis, E., Katsaounou,  
346 P., 2020. Prevalence of depression, anxiety, and insomnia among healthcare  
347 workers during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review and meta-  
348 analysis. *Brain. Behav. Immun.* 88, 901–907.  
349 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi.2020.05.026>
- 350 Pew Research Center, 2018. News use across social media platforms 2018. Pew  
351 Research Center.
- 352 Rovetta, A., Bhagavathula, A.S., 2020. COVID-19-related web search behaviors and  
353 infodemic attitudes in Italy: Infodemiological study. *JMIR Public Health*  
354 *Surveill.* 6, e19374. <https://doi.org/10.2196/19374>
- 355 Salari, N., Hosseinian-Far, A., Jalali, R., Vaisi-Raygani, A., Rasoulpoor, Shna,  
356 Mohammadi, M., Rasoulpoor, Shabnam, Khaledi-Paveh, B., 2020.  
357 Prevalence of stress, anxiety, depression among the general population  
358 during the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Glob.*  
359 *Health* 16, 57. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-020-00589-w>
- 360 Saw, Y.E., Tan, E.Y.-Q., Liu, J.S., Liu, J.C., 2020. Towards a digital solution:  
361 Predicting public take-up of Singapore’s contact tracing application during the  
362 COVID-19 crisis. medRxiv 2020.08.26.20182386.  
363 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.26.20182386>

- 364 Singh, L., Bansal, S., Bode, L., Budak, C., Chi, G., Kawintiranon, K., Padden, C.,  
365 Vanarsdall, R., Vraga, E., Wang, Y., 2020. A first look at COVID-19  
366 information and misinformation sharing on Twitter. ArXiv200313907 Cs.
- 367 Taylor, J., 2020. Bat soup, dodgy cures and “diseasology”: the spread of coronavirus  
368 misinformation. The Guardian. URL  
369 [https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/jan/31/bat-soup-dodgy-cures-and-](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/jan/31/bat-soup-dodgy-cures-and-diseasology-the-spread-of-coronavirus-bunkum)  
370 [diseasology-the-spread-of-coronavirus-bunkum](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/jan/31/bat-soup-dodgy-cures-and-diseasology-the-spread-of-coronavirus-bunkum)
- 371 Torales, J., O’Higgins, M., Castaldelli-Maia, J.M., Ventriglio, A., 2020. The outbreak  
372 of COVID-19 coronavirus and its impact on global mental health. *Int. J. Soc.*  
373 *Psychiatry* 66, 317–320. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020764020915212>
- 374 Tran, T., Valecha, R., Rad, P., Rao, H.R., 2020. An Investigation of Misinformation  
375 Harms Related to Social Media During Humanitarian Crises, in: Sahay, S.K.,  
376 Goel, N., Patil, V., Jadliwala, M. (Eds.), *Secure Knowledge Management In*  
377 *Artificial Intelligence Era, Communications in Computer and Information*  
378 *Science*. Springer, Singapore, pp. 167–181. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-3817-9_10)  
379 [15-3817-9\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-3817-9_10)
- 380 Vardanjani, H.M., Heydari, S.T., Dowran, B., Pasalar, M., 2020. A cross-sectional  
381 study of Persian medicine and the COVID-19 pandemic in Iran: Rumors and  
382 recommendations. *Integr. Med. Res., Integrative Medicine for COVID-19:*  
383 *Researches and Evidence* 9, 100482.  
384 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.imr.2020.100482>
- 385 Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., Aral, S., 2018. The spread of true and false news online.  
386 *Science* 359, 1146–1151. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap9559>
- 387 Wang, Y., McKee, M., Torbica, A., Stuckler, D., 2019. Systematic Literature Review  
388 on the Spread of Health-related Misinformation on Social Media. *Soc. Sci.*  
389 *Med.* 240, 112552. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112552>

- 390 Wong, J.E.L., Leo, Y.S., Tan, C.C., 2020. COVID-19 in Singapore—Current  
391 Experience: Critical Global Issues That Require Attention and Action. *JAMA*  
392 323, 1243. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.2467>
- 393 World Health Organisation, 2020. COVID-19 mythbusters. World Health Organ. URL  
394 [https://www.who.int/westernpacific/emergencies/covid-](https://www.who.int/westernpacific/emergencies/covid-19/information/mythbusters)  
395 [19/information/mythbusters](https://www.who.int/westernpacific/emergencies/covid-19/information/mythbusters)
- 396 World Health Organization, 2020. Novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV): Situation report -  
397 13. World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.
- 398 Xiong, J., Lipsitz, O., Nasri, F., Lui, L.M.W., Gill, H., Phan, L., Chen-Li, D., Iacobucci,  
399 M., Ho, R., Majeed, A., McIntyre, R.S., 2020. Impact of COVID-19 pandemic  
400 on mental health in the general population: A systematic review. *J. Affect.*  
401 *Disord.* 277, 55–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.08.001>
- 402 Zarocostas, J., 2020. How to fight an infodemic. *The Lancet* 395, 676.  
403 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)30461-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30461-X)

Table 1. Baseline demographics of participants

Characteristic	N	(%)
<b>Age</b> (Mean = 39.3, SD = 12.7)		
<b>Gender</b>		
Female	791	(63.9)
Male	445	(36.0)
Did not answer	1	(0.1)
<b>Ethnicity</b>		
Chinese	1047	(84.6)
Indian	55	(4.4)
Malay	71	(5.7)
Others	63	(5.1)
Did not answer	1	(0.1)
<b>Religion</b>		
Buddhism	181	(14.6)
Taoism/ Chinese traditional beliefs	51	(4.1)
Islam	71	(5.7)
Hinduism	41	(3.3)
Roman Catholicism	125	(10.1)
Christianity (Protestant)	405	(32.7)
No religion	331	(26.7)
Others	30	(2.4)
Did not answer	2	(0.2)
<b>Married status</b>		
Single	518	(41.9)
Married	667	(53.9)
Widowed/ separated/ divorced	47	(3.8)
Did not answer	5	(0.4)
<b>Educational level</b>		
Primary school	4	(0.3)
Secondary school	65	(5.3)
Junior college	91	(7.4)
Vocational training	22	(1.8)
Polytechnic/ diploma	154	(12.4)
University (undergraduate)	623	(50.3)
University (postgraduate)	252	(20.4)
Did not answer	26	(2.1)
<b>House type</b>		
HDB flat: 1-2 rooms	12	(1.0)
HDB flat: 3 rooms	89	(7.2)
HDB flat: 4 rooms	305	(24.6)
HDB flat: 5 rooms or executive flats	358	(28.9)
Condominium or private apartments	321	(25.9)
Landed property	131	(10.6)
Did not answer	21	(1.7)

**Household size**

1	55	(4.4)
2	178	(14.4)
3	279	(22.6)
4	359	(29.0)
5+	364	(29.4)
Did not answer	2	(0.2)

**Country of birth**

Singapore	1004	(81.1)
Other	232	(18.8)
Did not answer	1	(0.1)

---


Table 2. Predicting the number of rumors, heard, shared, and believed during the COVID-19 outbreak

	Outcome Measure <sup>a</sup>					
	Model 1: Number of rumors heard		Model 2: Number of rumors shared		Model 3: Number of rumors believed	
<b>Age</b>	0.003	(0.004)	0.005	(0.002)	0.002	(0.002)
<b>Gender (base = Female)</b>						
Male	-0.084	(0.080)	-0.025	(0.038)	0.017	(0.036)
<b>Ethnicity (base = Chinese)</b>						
Indian	-0.456	(0.353)	-0.060	(0.169)	0.152	(0.159)
Malay	-0.537	(0.279)	0.349	(0.133)	0.184	(0.125)
Others	-0.234	(0.206)	0.022	(0.098)	-0.059	(0.092)
<b>Religion (base = No religion)</b>						
Christianity (Protestant)	0.093	(0.101)	-0.018	(0.048)	0.012	(0.045)
Buddhism	0.159	(0.125)	0.115	(0.060)	-0.025	(0.056)
Roman Catholicism	0.115	(0.144)	0.036	(0.069)	0.135	(0.065)
Taoism/ Chinese traditional beliefs	0.171	(0.207)	0.018	(0.099)	0.078	(0.093)
Islam	0.330	(0.325)	0.006	(0.155)	-0.104	(0.146)
Hinduism	0.215	(0.351)	-0.259	(0.167)	0.122	(0.157)
Others	0.560	(0.281)	0.047	(0.134)	0.072	(0.126)
<b>Marital status (base = Single)</b>						
Married	-0.041	(0.093)	-0.021	(0.045)	-0.036	(0.042)
Widowed/ separated/ divorced	0.002	(0.217)	0.037	(0.104)	-0.170	(0.098)
<b>Education level</b>	0.077	(0.029)	-0.046	(0.014)*	-0.046	(0.013)*
<b>House type</b>	0.092	(0.036)	-0.030	(0.017)	-0.042	(0.016)
<b>Household size</b>	-0.018	(0.036)	0.011	(0.017)	0.013	(0.016)
<b>Country of birth (base = Singapore)</b>						
Other	0.271	(0.108)	0.071	(0.051)	0.072	(0.048)
<b>Lockdown (base = Lockdown period)</b>						
Before lockdown	-0.437	(0.206)	-0.017	(0.098)	0.075	(0.092)
After lockdown	1.129	(0.263)*	0.011	(0.126)	-0.151	(0.118)
<b>Number of local COVID-19 cases (log transformed)</b>	-0.621	(0.173)*	-0.052	(0.083)	0.079	(0.078)
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	0.474		0.435		0.388	


<sup>a</sup>Data reported as beta estimates (standard error)

\*Indicates significance at  $p < .002$  (following Bonferroni corrections).


## Figures and captions



*Figure 1: Proportion of participants hearing, sharing, and believe each COVID-19 rumor (that the virus originated from the consumption of bat soup, from an American lab, or from a Chinese lab; or that the virus can be cured by eating garlic or drinking water). Vertical lines represent the 95% confidence interval.*



*Figure 2: For each rumor, the vertical bar depicts the quantity of participants who shared each rumor, represented as a percentage of participants who believed or disbelieved each rumor. Vertical lines represent the 95% confidence interval.*



*Figure 3: Sources of where participants heard COVID-19 rumors. Horizontal lines represent 95% confidence interval.*