**BEHAVIORAL CHANGES DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC:
RESULTS OF A NATIONAL SURVEY IN SINGAPORE**

Victoria JE Long¹, *MPH*, Medical student

*Jean CJ Liu^{1,2}, *PhD*, Assistant Professor

¹Duke-NUS Medical School, Singapore

²Division of Social Sciences, Yale-NUS College, Singapore

Running head: COVID-19 behavioral changes

*Please address correspondence to:

Jean CJ Liu

Yale-NUS College

28 College Ave West

#01-501

Singapore 138533

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.
Email: jeanliu@yale-nus.edu.sg

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by a grant awarded to JCJL from the JY Pillay Global Asia Programme (grant number: IG20-SG002). The authors gratefully acknowledge Saw Young Ern and Edina Tan for assisting with manuscript preparation.

Abstract

Introduction: As part of infection control measures for COVID-19, individuals have been encouraged to adopt both preventive (e.g., handwashing) and avoidant behavioural changes (e.g., avoiding crowds). In this study, we examined whether demographics predicted the likelihood that a person would adopt these behaviours in Singapore.

Materials and Methods: 1145 participants responded to an online survey conducted between 7 March - 21 April 2020. As part of the survey, we collected demographic information and asked participants to report which of 17 behaviour changes they had undertaken because of the outbreak. We ran regression models to predict, using demographic information: (1) the total number of behavioural changes undertaken, (2) the number of preventive changes undertaken, and (3) the number of avoidant changes undertaken. Finally, we sought to identify predictors of persons who: (4) declared that they had not undertaken any of these measures following the outbreak.

Results: Females and those who were younger adopted more preventive behaviours: whereas females were more likely to increase handwashing frequency, younger individuals were more likely to wear face masks prior to legislation. Females and those who were married adopted more avoidant behaviours, with both groups avoiding crowded areas and staying home more than usual. Females also voluntarily reduced physical contact, whereas those who were married chose outdoor venues and relied on online shopping.

Conclusion: Our characterisation of behavioural changes provides a baseline for public health advisories. Moving forward, local health authorities can focus their efforts to encourage segments of the population who do not readily adopt infection control measures against COVID-19.

KEYWORDS: Infectious diseases; public health; COVID-19; epidemic; pandemic

BEHAVIORAL CHANGES DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC:

RESULTS OF A NATIONAL SURVEY IN SINGAPORE

Amidst the global outbreak of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), Singapore reported its first case on 23 January 2020¹. Subsequently, the local 'Disease Outbreak Response System Condition' level was raised to Orange on 7 February 2020 when community transmission began. At this juncture, the government started to emphasise the role that individuals had to play by adopting health-protective behaviours².

In an infectious disease outbreak such as the COVID-19 pandemic, individual-level health-protective behaviours can be classified into: (i) preventive behaviours – measures that can prevent transmission (e.g., hand-washing), and (ii) avoidant behaviours – measures that decrease contact with other individuals (e.g., avoiding crowded areas)³. As COVID-19 is believed to be transmitted primarily through contact or droplet transmission⁴, these measures can be effective in reducing the spread of the virus – particularly when pharmacological interventions are limited^{5,6}.

For risk communication, it is useful to understand what characteristics predict whether an individual adopts health-protective behaviours. This allows public health messaging to be targeted, improving compliance in groups that may not do so as readily. For example, in the previous outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), preventive and avoidant behaviours were more likely to be adopted by: women, older individuals, and those with higher education levels³. In the current COVID-19 outbreak, health-protective behaviours have been observed amongst individuals who perceive a higher risk of infection, higher disease severity, or who are afraid of getting infected⁷⁻⁹. However, demographic predictors have differed between populations studied: whereas age and gender were linked to behavioural changes in South Korea, these associations were not found in the United Kingdom^{8,9}. Further, no demographic predictors were identified in a study in the United States,

while gender – but not age – predicted behavioural changes in a cross-country survey^{10,11}. This heterogeneity suggests that the uptake of health-protective behaviours may be context-specific during the COVID-19 pandemic, owing – perhaps – to heterogeneity in the risks of infection or risk of severe illness between countries.

In light of this context-specificity of demographic studies, we conducted a large-scale survey to examine how demographics predict the uptake of health-protective behaviours in Singapore to characterise our local population. Our study was conducted across March-April 2020, a period when the country saw a rapid increase in COVID-19 cases (from 138 cases at the start of the study, to 9125 cases at the end of the survey period).

Methods

Study design and population

From 7 March-21 April 2020, 1145 participants responded to an online survey on COVID-19. As the inclusion criteria, participants: (1) were aged ≥ 21 years old, and (2) had lived in Singapore for ≥ 2 years. Given public health concerns, participants were recruited online – via advertisements placed in community chat-groups (e.g., Facebook and WhatsApp groups for residential estates, universities, and workplaces) or via paid Facebook advertisements targeting Singapore-based users. The study was approved by the Yale-NUS College Ethics Review Committee (#2020-CERC-001), and participants gave written consent in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. The questions reported in this study were part of a larger 20-minute survey exploring: behavioural and psychological responses to COVID-19, sources from which participants received COVID-19 news, and psychological well-being (<https://osf.io/pv3bj>)¹².

Predictor variables

As predictors, participants reported the following demographic details: gender, ethnicity, religion, country of birth, marital status, education, house type, and

household size. As behavioural changes may be influenced by the local COVID-19 situation, we also recorded the total number of local cases reported to date, and whether the country was locked down when the survey was done (computed based on the survey time-stamp).

Outcome variables

As the key outcome variables, participants indicated which of 17 health-protective behaviours they had voluntarily undertaken because of the pandemic (by indicating 'yes' or 'no' for each behaviour). Based on prior research³, we investigated 3 preventive behaviours, asking participants whether they had: (1) washed their hands more frequently, (2) used hand sanitisers and/or (3) wore a mask in public (prior to legislation). Additionally, we investigated 14 possible avoidant behaviours, whether participants had: (1) avoided crowded areas, (2) reduced physical contact, (3) stayed home more than usual, (4) distanced from people with flu symptoms, (5) voluntarily changed travel plans, (6) missed or postponed social events, (7) avoided visiting hospitals and/or healthcare settings, (8) chose outdoor over indoor venues, (9) distanced from people with recent travel to outbreak countries, (10) distanced from people with possible contact with COVID-19 cases, (11) avoided places where COVID-19 cases were reported, (12) stored up more household and/or food supplies, (13) relied more on online shopping (prior to shop closures), and/or (14) avoided public transport. Across the 17 items, we assigned a score of '1' for 'yes' responses, and these were summed to create three scores: the total number of behavioural changes adopted (out of 17), the total number of preventive behaviours adopted (subscale score out of 3), and the total number of avoidant behaviours adopted (subscale score out of 14).

Finally, we included as a separate item the following statement: "I did not take any additional measures" (yes/no response). This question allowed us to identify participants who had not made any behavioural changes as a function of COVID-19 – a group that may be of higher risk for transmission.

Statistical analyses

To describe participants' demographic characteristics, survey responses were summarized with counts. As the primary analysis, we then ran a linear regression model with the total number of behavioural changes as the outcome measure, and participant demographics as predictors (age, gender, ethnicity, religion, country of birth, marital status, education, house type, household size, the total number of local cases reported to date, and whether the country was locked down at the time of survey completion) [Model 1]. Given that prior research distinguished preventive and avoidant behaviours^{3,13}, we repeated the linear regression model with the total number of preventive behaviours [Model 2], and the total number of avoidant behaviours as outcomes [Model 3]. Finally, we ran a logistic regression model to identify – using the same demographic predictors – individuals who had made no behavioural changes [Model 4].

For linearity, the number of local COVID-19 cases was log-transformed prior to regression analyses. For each regression model, the type 1 family-wise error rate was controlled at 0.05 through Bonferroni correction (Bonferroni-adjusted alpha level of $0.05/23 \text{ predictors} = 0.002$). All statistical analyses were conducted using R (Version 4.0) and STATA (Version 12.0).

Results

Response rate

Of 1390 individuals who clicked the survey link, 1145 (82.4%) provided informed consent and participated in the survey. A further 192 (16.77%) participants were excluded from statistical analyses as they did not complete the primary outcome measures (on behavioural changes).

As shown in Table 1, the final sample of 953 participants was comparable to the resident Singapore population in: the proportion of Singapore citizens, marital status, and household size ($\leq 10\%$ difference). However, the pool of respondents had a greater representation of females (65.1% vs. 51.1%), university graduates (72.7%

vs. 32.4%), and persons of no religion (28.0% vs. 18.5%) or Christian belief (36.2% vs. 18.8%). Conversely, there was a reduced representation of participants who lived in 1-3 room public housing flats (6.7% vs. 23.7%). Survey respondents were also more likely to be of Chinese ethnicity than persons in the general population (87.0% vs. 74.3%) (14).

[Table 1 about here.]

An overview of COVID-19 behaviour changes

On the whole, participants adopted a mean of 8.01 (SD=3.78) behavioural changes owing to the COVID-19 pandemic. This corresponded to a mean of 2.14 (SD=0.81) preventive measures, and 5.87 (SD=3.44) avoidant measures. Only 29 participants (3.04%) reported that they had not changed their behaviours at all.

Predicting behavioural change: regression models

In our first regression model, we sought to predict the total number of behaviour changes based on participant demographics (Table 2). We first observed that behavioural changes tracked the local COVID-19 situation: namely, as the number of local cases increased, individuals adapted their behaviours in response ($b=3.03$, $t(913)=3.96$, $p<0.001$). Having controlled for local transmission, gender emerged as a significant predictor, with females adopting an average of 0.14 more changes than males ($t(913)=-4.49$, $p<0.001$). Being married was also associated with a higher number of health-protective behaviours than being single ($b=1.09$, $t(913)=3.52$, $p<0.001$).

In our second and third models, we examined whether demographic predictors differed for preventive vs. avoidant behaviours. In terms of demographics, while the adoption of preventive behaviours was predicted by gender ($b=-0.241$, $t(913)=-4.33$, $p<0.001$) and age ($b=-0.008$, $t(913)=-3.11$, $p=0.001$), the adoption of avoidant behaviours was predicted by gender ($b=-0.902$, $t(913)=-3.90$, $p<0.001$) and marital status (being married vs. being single; $b=0.973$, $t(913)=3.45$, $p<0.001$).

Finally, in our fourth model, we found that no demographic predictor significantly identified the small proportion of individuals who had not undertaken any measures on account of COVID-19 (all $p > \text{Bonferroni-adjusted alpha of } 0.002$).

[Table 2 about here.]

Follow-up exploratory analyses: Understanding which behavioural changes differed as a function of gender, marital status, and age

To better understand the pattern of results, we conducted post-hoc chi-square tests to identify which behavioural changes differed as a function of gender and marital status (for all behaviours), and as a function of age (for preventive behaviours). As these were exploratory analyses, the type 1 decision-wise error rate was controlled at 0.05 (uncorrected).

Gender. As shown in Figure 1, females were more likely than males to: 1) wash their hands more frequently, $\chi^2(1, N=953)=22.17, p<0.001$; 2) avoid crowded areas, $\chi^2(1, N=953) = 11.83, p=0.001$; 3) reduce physical contact, $\chi^2(1, N=953)=9.28, p=0.002$, and 4) stay home more than usual, $\chi^2(1, N=953)=9.79, p=0.002$.

Marital status. As shown in Figure 2, marital status was significantly associated with: avoiding crowded areas, $\chi^2(2, N=952)=26.29, p<0.001$; 2) staying home more than usual, $\chi^2(2, N=952)=28.09, p<0.001$; 3) choosing outdoor over indoor areas, $\chi^2(2, N=952)=33.04, p<0.001$; and 4) relying more on online shopping, $\chi^2(2, N=952)=26.37, p<0.001$. In each case, single participants were least likely to adopt these behaviours than those who were not single (married, widowed, separated, or divorced).

Age. Finally, wearing a mask in public differed between age groups, $\chi^2(4, N=953)=33.32, p<0.001$, with participants aged 21-30 most likely to adopt this behaviour (Figure 3).

Sensitivity analyses. As the chi-square analyses examined behavioural changes as a function of one predictor at a time (either gender, marital status, or age), we repeated our analyses by regressing each behavioural change against the

full set of demographics (per Models 1-4 previously). Our conclusions did not change, and the full table of chi-square analyses and regression results are reported in the Appendix.

[Table 3 and Figures 1-3 about here.]

Discussion

In this study, we documented for the first time how residents in Singapore have adapted their behaviours to minimize COVID-19 transmission. The large majority of participants (97%) have undertaken at least one infection control measure, with participants reporting an average of 8 lifestyle changes owing to the pandemic. As might be expected, behavioural changes increased with the number of COVID-19 cases reported locally.

In terms of demographic predictors, health-preventive measures were most likely to be adopted by females and those who were married. When we distinguished between preventive (e.g. hand washing) and avoidant (e.g. avoiding crowded areas) behaviours, age emerged as an additional predictor for avoidant behaviours, with youths most likely to adopt mask-wearing.

Collectively, our results on gender and marital status replicate findings from previous infectious disease outbreaks^{3,15} and the current COVID-19 pandemic (based on both an international and a South Korean sample^{8,10}). These findings echo a broader pattern of risk that has emerged in epidemiological research, whereby being female and being married has been linked to the reduced risk of disease and of all-cause mortality¹⁶. Adding to this body of research, our findings highlight how being willing to adopt health-promoting behaviours during a pandemic may contribute to the resilience of these demographic groups.

Departing from prior research and popular belief, however, we found that age was inversely related to the take-up of preventive behaviours. In particular, younger adults in our survey were more likely to wear masks than older adults, even before legislation stipulating that masks had to be worn in public. This finding is remarkable

for several reasons. First, during SARS, older adults had been more likely to perform a range of preventive behaviours including mask-wearing, handwashing, respiratory hygiene, the using of utensils, and washing after touching contaminated surfaces (3). Second, during the current outbreak, several high-profiled events (e.g., coronavirus parties hosted by students) have resulted in the belief that youths are least likely to care about the outbreak, and thereby most likely to ignore infection control measures^{17,18}. Indeed, the Director-General of the World Health Organization released a statement telling youths that they were “not invincible”, that “the virus could put (them) in hospital for weeks, or even kill (them)”¹⁹⁻²¹.

Rather than finding young persons to take on risky behaviours, however, we observed instead that this demographic group was most associated with mask-wearing. While this finding is counter-intuitive, it is in line with recent Hong Kong research whereby elderly participants – rather than the young – were least likely to worry about getting infected, and thus least likely to adopt protective behaviours²². Additionally, young persons’ ready adoption of mask-wearing may reflect a general willingness to embrace change and innovation, since mask-wearing had not previously been a norm in Singapore (as it had in countries like Japan²³).

Policy implications

Moving forward, our findings may contribute to the public health strategy in several ways. First, throughout the pandemic, government agencies have repeatedly noted how individuals have ignored official advisories^{24,25}. This phenomenon has been so widespread that the individuals have been nick-named ‘covidiot’ in the popular press – a portmanteau of coronavirus and idiot^{26,27}. Beyond ‘naming and shaming’, however, our research highlights characteristics that may predict non-compliance. This, in turn, will allow risk communication to be targeted.

On the other hand, our findings also highlight which demographic groups may be most likely to respond when the government launches a new infection control measure (for example, SafeEntry or TraceTogether for contact tracing). Extrapolating

from our research, these initiatives – if perceived to be health-protective – may be adopted first by females and those who are married. Correspondingly, the two demographic groups may be ideal for pilot trials or as advocates for the behaviours.

Limitations

In making these recommendations, we note that our study has several limitations. First, we relied on participants' self-reports, which may be vulnerable to recollection biases. Future research will need to explore whether our findings translate to actual behavioural changes during the pandemic. Second, although our survey methodology captured behavioural changes at one particular time-point, the recommendation of infection control measures is a moving target. In the case of mask-wearing, for example, official advisories changed from masks not being needed, to being encouraged, to finally being mandated (as of 14 April 2020)²⁸. Correspondingly, further research is needed to examine whether our findings continue to hold even as official advisories change.

Conclusions

In conclusion, we conducted the first Singapore-based study of behavioural changes during the COVID-19 pandemic. Although the scale of this crisis has been unprecedented and many uncertainties remain, many of our findings reinforce long-standing patterns of how demographic characteristics can pre-dispose an individual to disease – in this case, via the uptake of measures that can minimize COVID-19 infection. Moving forward, our findings provide a template by which official messaging can be tailored for health promotion.

References

1. Ministry of Health, Singapore. CONFIRMED IMPORTED CASE OF NOVEL CORONAVIRUS INFECTION IN SINGAPORE; MULTI-MINISTRY TASKFORCE RAMPS UP PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Jul 25]. Available from: <https://www.moh.gov.sg/news-highlights/details/confirmed-imported-case-of-novel-coronavirus-infection-in-singapore-multi-ministry-taskforce-ramps-up-precautionary-measures>
2. Ministry of Health, Singapore. RISK ASSESSMENT RAISED TO DORSCON ORANGE [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Jul 25]. Available from: <https://www.moh.gov.sg/news-highlights/details/risk-assessment-raised-to-dorscon-orange>
3. Bish A, Michie S. Demographic and attitudinal determinants of protective behaviours during a pandemic: A review. *Br J Health Psychol*. 2010;15(4):797–824.
4. World Health Organisation. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: implications for infection prevention precautions [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Jul 25]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/transmission-of-sars-cov-2-implications-for-infection-prevention-precautions>
5. Ferguson N, Laydon D, Nedjati Gilani G, Imai N, Ainslie K, Baguelin M, et al. Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID19 mortality and healthcare demand [Internet]. Imperial College London; 2020 Mar [cited 2020 Jul 25]. Available from: <http://spiral.imperial.ac.uk/handle/10044/1/77482>

6. Aledort JE, Lurie N, Wasserman J, Bozzette SA. Non-pharmaceutical public health interventions for pandemic influenza: an evaluation of the evidence base. BMC Public Health. 2007 Aug 15;7(1):208.
7. Yıldırım M, Geçer E, Akgül Ö. The impacts of vulnerability, perceived risk, and fear on preventive behaviours against COVID-19. Psychol Health Med. 2020 Jun 3;1–9.
8. Lee M, You M. Psychological and Behavioral Responses in South Korea During the Early Stages of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020 Jan;17(9):2977.
9. Harper CA, Satchell LP, Fido D, Latzman RD. Functional Fear Predicts Public Health Compliance in the COVID-19 Pandemic. Int J Ment Health Addict [Internet]. 2020 Apr 27 [cited 2020 Jul 23]; Available from: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11469-020-00281-5>
10. Clark C, Davila A, Regis M, Kraus S. Predictors of COVID-19 voluntary compliance behaviors: An international investigation. Glob Transit. 2020 Jan 1;2:76–82.
11. Bogg T, Milad E. Slowing the Spread of COVID-19: Demographic, Personality, and Social Cognition Predictors of Guideline Adherence in a Representative U.S. Sample [Internet]. PsyArXiv; 2020 Apr [cited 2020 Jul 23]. Available from: <https://osf.io/yc2gq>
12. Liu JC, Tong EM. COVID-19 News Exposure as a Modifiable Risk Factor of Psychological Symptoms: Can an Official WhatsApp Channel Help? (Preprint) [Internet]. Journal of Medical Internet Research; 2020 Jul [cited 2020 Jul 29]. Available from: <http://preprints.jmir.org/preprint/22142>

13. Zickfeld J, Schubert TW, Herting AK, Grahe JE, Faasse K. Correlates of Health-Protective Behavior During the Initial Days of the COVID-19 Outbreak in Norway [Internet]. PsyArXiv; 2020 Apr [cited 2020 Jul 23]. Available from: <https://osf.io/6vgf4>
14. Department of Statistics Singapore. Population and Population Structure - Latest Data [Internet]. Base. 2019 [cited 2020 Jul 25]. Available from: <http://www.singstat.gov.sg/find-data/search-by-theme/population/population-and-population-structure/latest-data>
15. Moran KR, Valle SYD. A Meta-Analysis of the Association between Gender and Protective Behaviors in Response to Respiratory Epidemics and Pandemics. PLOS ONE. 2016 Oct 21;11(10):e0164541.
16. Wang Y, Jiao Y, Nie J, O'Neil A, Huang W, Zhang L, et al. Sex differences in the association between marital status and the risk of cardiovascular, cancer, and all-cause mortality: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 7,881,040 individuals. Glob Health Res Policy. 2020 Feb 28;5(1):4.
17. Waldrop T, Gallman S. A group of young adults held a coronavirus party in Kentucky to defy orders to socially distance. Now one of them has coronavirus. CNN [Internet]. 2020 Mar 25 [cited 2020 Aug 6]; Available from: <https://www.cnn.com/2020/03/24/health/kentucky-coronavirus-party-infection/index.html>
18. Lipsitch M. Opinion | Who Is Immune to the Coronavirus? The New York Times [Internet]. 2020 Apr 13 [cited 2020 Aug 6]; Available from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/13/opinion/coronavirus-immunity.html>
19. World Health Organisation. WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 20 March 2020 [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Jul

- 25]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---20-march-2020>
20. Gharzai LA, Beeler WH, Jagsi R. Playing Into Stereotypes: Engaging Millennials and Generation Z in the COVID-19 Pandemic Response. *Adv Radiat Oncol* [Internet]. 2020 Apr 21 [cited 2020 Jul 25]; Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7194602/>
21. Jørgensen FJ, Bor A, Petersen MB. Compliance Without Fear: Predictors of Protective Behavior During the First Wave of the COVID-19 Pandemic [Internet]. *PsyArXiv*; 2020 May [cited 2020 Jul 23]. Available from: <https://osf.io/uzwgf>
22. Chan EYY, Huang Z, Lo ESK, Hung KKC, Wong ELY, Wong SYS. Sociodemographic Predictors of Health Risk Perception, Attitude and Behavior Practices Associated with Health-Emergency Disaster Risk Management for Biological Hazards: The Case of COVID-19 Pandemic in Hong Kong, SAR China. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020 Jan;17(11):3869.
23. Wada K, Oka-Ezoe K, Smith DR. Wearing face masks in public during the influenza season may reflect other positive hygiene practices in Japan. *BMC Public Health*. 2012 Dec 10;12(1):1065.
24. Reuters. "A recipe for disaster," US health official says of Americans ignoring coronavirus advice [Internet]. *The Straits Times*. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 6]. Available from: <https://www.straitstimes.com/world/united-states/a-recipe-for-disaster-us-health-official-says-of-americans-ignoring-coronavirus>
25. Choo YT. Coronavirus: Singapore mindful of need to calibrate social distancing measures, says Lawrence Wong [Internet]. *The Straits Times*. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 6]. Available from: <https://www.straitstimes.com/singapore/spore-mindful-of-need-to-calibrate-social-distancing-measures>

26. Ro C. Why we've created new language for coronavirus [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 6]. Available from: <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20200522-why-weve-created-new-language-for-coronavirus>
27. Mahmud AH. COVID-19 social media vigilantes: A valid or harmful way of dealing with rule breakers? [Internet]. CNA. 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 6]. Available from: <https://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/singapore/covid-19-online-social-media-vigilante-expose-viral-covidiot-12814476>
28. Ministry of Health, Singapore. CONTINUED STRINGENT IMPLEMENTATION & ENFORCEMENT OF CIRCUIT BREAKER MEASURES [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Jul 30]. Available from: <https://www.moh.gov.sg/news-highlights/details/continued-stringent-implementation-enforcement-of-circuit-breaker-measures>

Tables and Figures

Table 1. Baseline demographics of participants

Characteristic	N	(%)
Age group (Mean = 39.5, SD = 12.6)		
21-30 years old	245	(25.7)
31-40 years old	349	(36.6)
41-50 years old	156	(16.4)
51-60 years old	126	(13.2)
>60 years old	77	(8.1)
Gender		
Female	620	(65.1)
Male	333	(34.9)
Did not answer	0	
Ethnicity		
Chinese	829	(87.0)
Indian	46	(4.8)
Malay	25	(2.6)
Filipino	15	(1.5)
Caucasian	13	(1.3)
Others	1	(0.1)
Did not answer	24	(2.5)
Religion		
Christianity (Protestant)	345	(36.2)
No religion	267	(28.0)
Buddhism	138	(14.5)
Roman Catholicism	98	(10.2)
Taoism/ Chinese traditional beliefs	38	(4.0)
Islam	33	(3.4)
Hinduism	27	(2.8)
Others	6	(0.6)
Did not answer	1	(0.1)
Marital status		
Married	534	(56.0)
Single	391	(41.0)
Widowed/ separated/ divorced	27	(2.8)
Did not answer	1	(0.1)
Education level		
1: Primary school	3	(0.3)
2: Secondary school	44	(4.6)
3: Junior college	82	(8.6)
4: Vocational training	14	(1.4)
5: Polytechnic/ diploma	114	(11.9)
6: University (undergraduate)	486	(51.0)
7: University (postgraduate)	207	(21.7)
Did not answer	3	(0.3)

House type			
	1: HDB flat: 1-2 rooms	8	(0.8)
	2: HDB flat: 3 rooms	64	(6.7)
	3: HDB flat: 4 rooms	233	(24.4)
	4: HDB flat: 5 rooms or executive flats	265	(27.8)
	5: Condominium or private apartments	260	(27.2)
	6: Landed property	111	(11.6)
	Did not answer	12	(1.2)
Household size			
	1	44	(4.6)
	2	124	(13.0)
	3	210	(22.0)
	4	292	(30.6)
	5+	282	(29.5)
	Did not answer	1	(0.1)
Country of birth			
	Singapore	757	(79.4)
	Other	196	(20.5)

Table 2. Predicting behavioural changes during the COVID-19 outbreak

	Outcome ^a			
	(1) Total number of behaviours	(2) Preventive behaviours	(3) Avoidant behaviours	(4) No behaviour changes adopted
Age	-0.002 (0.011)	-0.008 (0.002)*	0.005 (0.010)	0.041 (0.018)
Gender (base = female)				
Male	-1.14 (0.254)*	-0.241 (0.055)*	-0.902 (0.231)*	0.757 (0.411)
Ethnicity (base = Chinese)				
Indian	-1.20 (1.39)	-0.743 (0.304)	-0.463 (1.26)	-31.4 (268)
Malay	-1.01 (0.949)	-0.397 (0.208)	-0.620 (0.863)	-13.4 (172)
Filipino	1.04 (1.10)	0.430 (0.242)	0.617 (1.00)	-29.4 (327)
Caucasian	-0.004 (1.05)	-0.318 (0.796)	0.313 (0.962)	-15.6 (292)
Others	1.42 (3.63)	-2.21 (0.085)	3.64 (3.30)	-14.6 (1080)
Religion (base = no religion)				
Christianity (Protestant)	0.795 (0.390)	0.172 (0.085)	0.623 (0.354)	-0.542 (0.518)
Buddhism	0.291 (0.632)	0.037 (0.138)	0.254 (0.574)	-1.20 (0.816)
Roman Catholicism	0.800 (1.34)	0.360 (0.294)	0.440 (1.21)	-13.7 (1.10)
Taoism/ Chinese traditional beliefs	1.63 (1.18)	-0.034 (0.259)	1.32 (1.07)	-0.555 (1.10)
Islam	0.647 (0.463)	-0.034 (0.101)	0.681 (0.421)	15.5 (172)
Hinduism	0.209 (0.310)	-0.014 (0.400)	0.223 (0.282)	31.3 (268)
Others	-4.07 (1.82)	-0.629 (0.400)	-3.44 (1.65)	2.08 (1.26)
Marital status (base = single)				
Married	1.09 (0.309)*	0.117 (0.067)	0.973 (0.281)*	-0.739 (0.552)
Widowed/ separated/ divorced	-0.495 (0.433)	0.009 (0.094)	-0.504 (0.393)	-0.750 (0.850)
Education level	0.003 (0.093)	-0.005 (0.020)	0.009 (0.084)	-0.342 (0.126)
House type	0.141 (0.113)	0.014 (0.024)	0.126 (0.102)	-0.064 (0.185)
Household size	-0.013 (0.114)	0.047 (0.025)	-0.060 (0.103)	0.124 (0.208)
Country of birth (base = Singapore)				
Other	-0.730 (0.338)	-0.152 (0.074)	-0.578 (0.307)	-0.169 (0.589)
Lockdown (base = yes)				
No lockdown	-1.76 (0.017)	-0.621 (0.161)*	-1.138 (0.670)	-0.043 (1.21)

Number of local COVID-19 cases (log transformed)	3.03 (0.612)*	0.531 (0.134)*	2.50 (0.556)*	-0.151 (0.986)
R^2	0.123	0.091	0.124	0.144

^aData reported as beta estimates (standard error)

*Indicates significance at $p < 0.002$ (following Bonferroni corrections).

Figures

Figure 1. Uptake of COVID-19 infection control measures as a function of gender. Asterisks indicate significance at $p < 0.002$ (following Bonferroni corrections), and horizontal lines represent the 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 2. Uptake of COVID-19 infection control measures as a function of marital status. Asterisks indicate significance at $p < 0.002$ (following Bonferroni corrections), and horizontal lines represent the 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 3. Uptake of COVID-19 infection control measures as a function of age group. Asterisks indicate significance at $p < 0.002$ (following Bonferroni corrections), and horizontal lines represent the 95% confidence intervals.

Appendix

Appendix 1: Proportion of respondents who adopted each behaviour change, and chi-square results for each behaviour change by gender, marital status and age group

	Total % (SE)	Chi-square		
		Gender	Marital status	Age group ¹
Preventive				
Washed hands more frequently	91.18 (0.91)	22.17*	4.75	4.67
Used hand sanitisers	80.90 (1.27)	7.08	2.17	2.30
Wore a mask in public (prior to legislation)	42.49 (1.60)	3.98	3.08	33.32*
Avoidant				
Avoided crowded areas	69.46 (1.49)	11.83*	26.29*	-
Reduced physical contact (e.g. avoided shaking hands)	62.95 (1.56)	9.28*	13.39	-
Stayed home more than usual	58.76 (1.59)	9.79*	28.09*	-
Distanced from people with flu symptoms	57.39 (1.60)	3.77	8.85	-
Voluntarily changed travel plans	53.41 (1.61)	1.14	2.00	-
Missed or postponed social events	49.42 (1.62)	6.37	2.65	-
Avoided visiting hospitals and/or healthcare settings	40.81 (1.59)	1.52	6.28	-
Chose outdoor over indoor venues	34.52 (1.54)	4.57	33.04*	-
Distanced from people with recent travel to outbreak countries	34.41 (1.53)	0.06	7.29	-
Distanced from people with possible contact with COVID-19 cases	33.26 (1.52)	0.43	6.10	-
Avoided places where COVID-19 cases were reported	32.42 (1.51)	3.01	3.68	-
Stored up more household and/or food supplies than usual	21.51 (1.33)	1.59	6.87	-
Relied more on online shopping (prior to shop closures)	19.93 (1.29)	3.12	26.37*	-
Avoided public transport	19.09 (1.27)	4.73	4.49	-

*Indicates significance at $p < 0.002$ (following Bonferroni corrections).

¹Age groups were separated as: 21-30 years old, 31-40 years old, 41-50 years old, 51-60 years old and above 60 years old.

Appendix 2: Predicting each of the 17 behaviour changes

	Outcome^a			
	Washed hands more frequently	Use hand sanitizer	Wore mask in public	Avoid public transport
Age	0.020 (0.013)	-0.021 (0.008)	-0.031 (0.007)*	-0.017 (0.009)
Gender^b				
Male	-1.22 (0.252)*	-0.480 (0.179)	-0.320 (0.151)	-0.329 (0.193)
Ethnicity^b				
Malay	-0.938 (1.23)	-0.926 (0.929)	-2.80 (1.13)	1.63 (1.06)
Indian	-0.957 (0.755)	1.17 (0.585)	-0.529 (0.608)	0.592 (0.630)
Filipino	13.60 (1054)	1.43 (65.60)	1.76 (0.825)	0.602 (0.70)
Caucasian	14.30 (1021)	0.831 (1.09)	-15.30 (367)	0.917 (0.619)
Others	-20.22 (3956)	-1.80 (2400)	-15.68 (1455)	-13.22 (882)
Religion^b				
Buddhism	0.491 (0.418)	0.762 (0.293)	0.131 (0.223)	0.450 (0.282)
Taoism	-0.011 (0.602)	0.233 (0.428)	0.012 (0.363)	-0.505 (0.566)
Islam	0.676 (1.23)	0.868 (0.933)	1.00 (1.04)	-1.76 (1.14)
Hinduism	0.752 (1.07)	2.03 (0.862)	-0.294 (0.753)	-0.101 (0.787)
Roman Catholicism	1.17 (0.761)	0.210 (0.332)	-0.560 (0.280)	0.318 (0.328)
Christianity	-0.240 (0.303)	0.650 (0.224)	-0.392 (0.181)	0.360 (0.229)
Others	-1.78 (1.27)	-1.18 (1.07)	-0.920 (1.22)	-12.44 (439)
Marital status^b				
Married	-0.082 (0.324)	0.287 (0.219)	0.341 (0.184)	0.495 (0.234)
Widowed/ separated/ divorced	-0.138 (0.398)	0.049 (0.319)	0.039 (0.255)	0.138 (0.324)
Education level	0.279 (0.087)*	-0.061 (0.068)	-0.087 (0.055)	0.013 (0.070)
House type	0.034 (0.113)	0.071 (0.082)	0.017 (0.067)	0.227 (0.083)
Household size	0.156 (0.119)	0.189 (0.083)	0.025 (0.068)	-0.036 (0.081)
Country of birth^b				
Other	-0.380 (0.393)	-0.504 (0.267)	-0.292 (0.198)	-0.300 (0.236)
Lockdown^b				
No lockdown	-2.37 (0.898)	-2.18 (0.647)*	-0.839 (0.445)	0.065 (0.503)
Number of local COVID-19 cases (log transformed)	-2.37 (0.898)	1.62 (0.556)	1.10 (0.371)*	0.521 (0.417)
R²	0.129	0.074	0.079	0.051

^aData reported as beta estimates (standard error)

*Indicates significance at $p < 0.002$ (following Bonferroni corrections).

^bBase for categorical variables were female for gender, Chinese for ethnicity, no religion for religion, single for marital status, Singapore for country of birth and yes for lockdown

Appendix 2: Predicting each of the 17 behaviour changes (continued)

	Outcome^a			
	Changed travel plans	Reduced physical contact	Avoided COVID case location	Distance from COVID case contacts
Age	0.011 (0.007)	0.016 (0.007)	0.001 (0.007)	0.002 (0.007)
Gender^b				
Male	-0.163 (0.144)	-0.422 (0.150)	-0.344 (0.160)	-0.092 (0.154)
Ethnicity^b				
Malay	0.005 (0.786)	-0.347 (0.829)	0.648 (0.797)	0.314 (0.841/
Indian	-0.530 (0.545)	0.826 (0.568)	0.277 (0.562)	0.389 (0.553)
Filipino	-0.752 (0.626)	0.688 (0.732)	0.503 (0.633)	-0.142 (0.665)
Caucasian	-0.354 (0.610)	-0.234 (0.646)	-0.981 (0.804)	0.178 (0.610)
Others	12.43 (324)	13.42 (535)	16.12 (882)	16.19 (882)
Religion^b				
Buddhism	0.344 (0.222)	0.515 (0.232)	-0.116 (0.242)	0.134 (0.235)
Taoism	0.168 (0.356)	0.078 (0.363)	-0.235 (0.398)	0.320 (0.368)
Islam	0.155 (0.761)	0.421 (0.808)	0.631 (0.767)	-0.280 (0.811)
Hinduism	0.380 (0.677)	0.632 (0.699)	0.762 (0.692)	0.361 (0.682)
Roman Catholicism	0.325 (0.265)	0.372 (0.280)	0.390 (0.277)	0.152 (0.276)
Christianity	0.081 (0.175)	0.467 (0.183)	-0.065 (0.195)	0.141 (0.189)
Others	-1.08 (1.17)	-0.462 (1.03)	-13.75 (436)	-13.72 (434)
Marital status^b				
Married	-0.185 (0.176)	0.171 (0.183)	0.327 (0.191)	0.263 (0.187)
Widowed/ separated/ divorced	0.142 (0.245)	0.012 (0.250)	-0.219 (0.285)	-0.362 (0.281)
Education level	0.063 (0.053)	0.125 (0.055)	-0.043 (0.057)	-0.128 (0.054)
House type	0.117 (0.064)	0.129 (0.068)	-0.110 (0.070)	-0.010 (0.068)
Household size	0.004 (0.065)	0.036 (0.069)	-0.094 (0.070)	0.040 (0.069)
Country of birth^b				
Other	-0.497 (0.196)	-0.011 (0.203)	-0.076 (0.208)	-0.224 (0.199)
Lockdown^b				
No lockdown	-0.231 (0.426)	-1.15 (0.477)	-0.485 (0.439)	-0.537 (0.429)
Number of local COVID-19 cases (log transformed)	0.584 (0.356)	1.32 (0.407)*	1.00 (0.364)	0.847 (0.355)
R²	0.027	0.056	0.057	0.031

^aData reported as beta estimates (standard error)

*Indicates significance at $p < 0.002$ (following Bonferroni corrections).

^bBase for categorical variables were female for gender, Chinese for ethnicity, no religion for religion, single for marital status, Singapore for country of birth and yes for lockdown

Appendix 2: Predicting each of the 17 behaviour changes (continued)

	Outcome^a			
	Distance from those with travel to countries with outbreaks	Distance from those with flu-like symptoms	More online shopping	More household/food supplies
Age	0.001 (0.007)	-0.002 (0.007)	-0.025 (0.009)	-0.002 (0.008)
Gender^b				
Male	-0.103 (0.153)	-0.314 (0.145)	-0.380 (0.192)	-0.293 (0.187)
Ethnicity^b				
Malay	0.939 (0.829)	1.25 (0.909)	-1.52 (1.17)	-1.38 (1.38)
Indian	0.538 (0.550)	-0.487 (0.561)	0.188 (0.666)	-1.76 (1.15)
Filipino	0.019 (0.666)	0.089 (0.659)	0.221 (0.793)	0.144 (0.788)
Caucasian	0.129 (0.612)	0.307 (0.642)	0.228 (0.725)	0.168 (0.647)
Others	-13.29 (882)	13.05 (324)	-12.48 (882)	-12.39 (882)
Religion^b				
Buddhism	0.229 (0.229)	0.270 (0.223)	0.687 (0.273)	0.695 (0.270)
Taoism	-0.257 (0.385)	0.130 (0.363)	0.186 (0.459)	0.603 (0.419)
Islam	-0.750 (0.814)	-1.33 (0.886)	1.27 (1.01)	1.01 (1.27)
Hinduism	0.025 (0.680)	1.00 (0.703)	1.46 (0.789)	0.975 (1.28)
Roman Catholicism	0.223 (0.271)	0.382 (0.270)	0.110 (0.346)	0.177 (0.343)
Christianity	-0.122 (0.188)	0.254 (0.177)	0.270 (0.235)	0.464 (0.228)
Others	-13.81 (437)	-0.117 (1.02)	-12.40 (435)	12.66 (435)
Marital status^b				
Married	0.181 (0.185)	0.361 (0.177)	1.211 (0.244)*	0.423 (0.220)
Widowed/ separated/ divorced	-0.326 (0.272)	-0.192 (0.246)	-0.017 (0.373)	-0.070 (0.341)
Education level	-0.076 (0.055)	-0.055 (0.054)	-0.040 (0.070)	0.005 (0.069)
House type	0.023 (0.068)	-0.058 (0.065)	0.048 (0.084)	0.098 (0.081)
Household size	-0.044 (0.068)	-0.002 (0.066)	0.060 (0.082)	-0.084 (0.079)
Country of birth^b				
Other	-0.054 (0.201)	-0.336 (0.197)	-0.051 (0.240)	-0.667 (0.227)
Lockdown^b				
No lockdown	-0.057 (0.426)	-0.732 (0.443)	0.373 (0.528)	-0.183 (0.470)
Number of local COVID-19 cases (log transformed)	0.711 (0.355)	1.03 (0.379)	0.381 (0.440)	1.37 (0.396)*
R²	0.036	0.033	0.081	0.100

^aData reported as beta estimates (standard error)

*Indicates significance at $p < 0.002$ (following Bonferroni corrections).

^bBase for categorical variables were female for gender, Chinese for ethnicity, no religion for religion, single for marital status, Singapore for country of birth and yes for lockdown

Appendix 2: Predicting each of the 17 behaviour changes (continued)

	Outcome^a				
	Stayed home more	Avoided crowded areas	Chose outdoor over indoor areas	Missed social events	Avoided visiting healthcare settings
Age	-0.003 (0.007)	0.003 (0.007)	0.016 (0.007)	0.001 (0.007)	-0.021 (0.001)
Gender^b					
Male	-0.461 (0.149)*	-0.558 (0.155)*	-0.357 (0.157)	-0.402 (0.146)	-0.480 (0.179)
Ethnicity^b					
Malay	-0.677 (0.889)	-0.652 (0.861)	-1.47 (1.09)	-2.15 (1.01)	0.925 (0.929)
Indian	-0.499 (0.574)	-0.467 (0.574)	-0.502 (0.653)	-0.916 (0.618)	1.17 (0.585)
Filipino	1.89 (1.08)	1.42 (1.08)	0.313 (0.646)	0.395 (0.651)	1.43 (65.5)
Caucasian	-0.071 (0.648)	-0.078 (0.702)	0.575 (0.612)	0.236 (0.609)	8.31 (1.08)
Others	15.02 (882)	13.40 (535)	-12.90 (882)	14.38 (882)	-1.79 (2400)
Religion^b					
Buddhism	-0.074 (0.229)	0.164 (0.242)	-0.028 (0.239)	0.149 (0.223)	0.761 (0.293)
Taoism	0.372 (0.390)	0.412 (0.419)	0.095 (0.373)	-0.077 (0.358)	0.233 (0.428)
Islam	0.505 (0.874)	0.461 (0.855)	0.290 (0.961)	1.81 (0.964)	0.862 (0.933)
Hinduism	-0.125 (0.706)	1.09 (0.771)	-0.276 (0.800)	0.542 (0.741)	2.03 (0.862)
Roman Catholicism	0.341 (0.288)	0.361 (0.308)	0.088 (0.237)	0.096 (0.266)	0.210 (0.332)
Christianity	-0.076 (0.182)	-0.025 (0.190)	-0.041 (0.188)	-0.173 (0.178)	0.650 (0.224)
Others	-14.92 (436)	-0.756 (1.03)	-14.07 (428)	-14.59 (433)	-1.18 (1.07)
Marital status^b					
Married	0.620 (0.182)*	0.627 (0.192)*	0.363 (0.187)	0.155 (0.177)	0.286 (0.218)
Widowed/ separated/ divorced	-0.450 (0.253)	-0.271 (0.249)	-0.762 (0.327)	0.044 (0.249)	0.049 (0.319)
Education level	0.066 (0.055)	0.034 (0.057)	0.107 (0.058)	0.073 (0.054)	-0.061 (0.068)
House type	0.032 (0.067)	0.020 (0.070)	0.090 (0.070)	0.153 (0.064)	0.071 (0.082)
Household size	0.031 (0.068)	-0.053 (0.073)	0.096 (0.069)	-0.001 (0.065)	0.188 (0.083)
Country of birth²					
Other	-0.225 (0.202)	-0.208 (0.217)	-0.160 (0.201)	0.134 (0.193)	-0.503 (0.266)
Lockdown^b					
No lockdown	-0.698 (0.463)	-0.611 (0.488)	-0.568 (0.451)	-0.557 (0.433)	2.175 (0.647)

**Number of
local COVID-19**

cases (log transformed)	1.29 (0.394)*	0.961 (0.413)	0.594 (0.370)	1.05 (0.364)*	1.62 (0.556)
R²	0.076	0.058	0.063	0.045	0.074

^aData reported as beta estimates (standard error)

*Indicates significance at $p < 0.002$ (following Bonferroni corrections).

^bBase for categorical variables were female for gender, Chinese for ethnicity, no religion for religion, single for marital status, Singapore for country of birth and yes for lockdown