

Content Credibility WhatsApp Messages and Decision to Share: Psychology of Youth

Dr. Tarika Singh Sikarwar

Professor, Prestige Institute of Management Gwalior;

Dr. Monika Gupta

Post-Doctoral Student, Jiwaji University, Gwalior;

Sonam Tomar and Devender Pal Singh

Alumni, Prestige Institute of Management Gwalior

Abstract

The study explored the perceptual factors behind the Content's Credibility of WhatsApp messages and the Decision to Share that Content with others. Further, causation between the two variables amongst youth is also checked. The study has been done by carrying out a review of more than one hundred papers and using a sample of 300 youth aged between 15 to 24 years and by circulating a self-designed questionnaire on the perceptual factors behind Content's Credibility of WhatsApp messages and the Decision to Share that Content with others. The results of this study highlighted five major indicators determining the psychology behind content credibility and nine factors showing the decision to share the content among the peer group of youth. Substantial causation is seen between content credibility and decision to share. The work contributes to the growing area of research in WhatsApp as messages sharing media and youth involvement.

Keywords: Youth, Social Media, Content Credibility, Society, Decision to Share, Communication

1. INTRODUCTION

Immense technologies have proliferated human life. The category of individuals using it the most are students, the young crowd. WhatsApp is no exception to this. Youth spend plenty of their time sharing WhatsApp messages from one person to another (Buhler, Neustaedter, and Hillman, 2013). There is an unspoken competition between them always, for sharing and being the first to do so (Lee, 2018). Only a small percentage of youth are there who check and verify what they are sharing with others (Ireton and Posetti, 2018). This area of understanding what is content credibility, factors leading to it, and why youth share WhatsApp with others remained unknown.

Social media, when its use started, encouraged people to be a part of it and encouraged everyone to share information through it because social media has its credibility and thus enhanced entire communication effectiveness. The credibility of content influences the entire processing part of the information, which further influences the beliefs and attitudes of the individual (Kumkale, Albarracin, and Seignourel, 2010).

Today, the use of the social media platforms like Facebook, Twitter, and WhatsApp use SNS (Simple Notification Service) platform (Hermida, 2012; Mitchell et al., 2013 cited in Safori, Rehman, and Mohammed, 2016) is high. Introduction of usage free platforms like WhatsApp have brought drastic changes in the information-sharing practices in India (Chakrabarti, Stengel, and Solanki, 2018), bring information sharing at low cost and at real-

time. WhatsApp has been used for a variety of purposes and the level of WhatsApp usage in India is approx. 400 million and growing (Banaji and Bhatt, 2018).

Looking into the present context, content credibility needs to be investigated as it was catering to the needs of the credible information-seeking audience.

Content's Credibility: Youth and Social Media

Misinformation is a complex problem which lies at the juncture of human psychology. Though it is an old problem, in recent years it has multiplied because of Information Communication Technology and has become a challenge especially now when there is much variation in the use of social media platforms like WhatsApp by the youth who belong to the different cultural and social background (Amedie, 2015; Happer, 2013).

Credibility is the most critical factor in social media (Rieh et al., 2014). The users of social media platforms become the creator of content rather than a mere reviewer (Li and Suh, 2015). Metzger et al., (2003) has described content credibility as "the perceived credibility of the communicated message itself, such as informational quality, accuracy, or currency". Fogg (1999) defined credibility ad believability. Credible sources are considered trustworthy (Self, 1996). People are skeptical about the media credibility of the newspaper, T.V., radio, news websites, and social media (Jiang, 2017). Mehrabi et al. (2009) worked on and measured the notion of press and television credibility. Li and Suh (2015) found five factors influencing it.

The early credibility studies focused on source credibility. The perception of source credibility is affected by the information available on social media (Westerman, Spence, and Heide's, 2012 cited in Li and Suh, 2015; Hovland and Weiss 1951) and further affects audience involvement (Metzger et al., 2003 cited in Li and Suh (2015), their beliefs (Burgoon & Hale, 1984; Hovland, Janis, & Kelley, 1953 cited in Li and Suh, 2015) and their persuasiveness. Sources that match audience attitude and context are perceived to be credible (Wathen and Burkell. 2002).

In the work of Wilson and Sherrell (1993), factors affecting the perception of credibility like "expertise, attractiveness, similarity, and trustworthiness" were found. O'Hara, Netemyer, & Burton, (1991) quoted dynamism, likeability, and goodwill as factors affecting the credibility of the source.

Unfortunately, there is no gatekeeper for information on social media. When a person relies on a channel for information, it becomes credible media for him (Johnson & Kaye, 1998; Kioussis, 2001 cited in Li and Suh (2015). Youth evaluate Twitter as the most credible medium of political news (Bhutta & Ali, 2017). Entertainment (Alzahrani and Alnzi, 2019) and scoop (Safari, Rahman, Mohammed, & Choi, 2017) are the reason behind credibility and sharing WhatsApp messages. In the modern online environment, the credibility of content is challenging to measure (Sundar, 2008). Though Li and Suh (2015) and Safari, Rahman, & Mohammed (2016) tried to found aspects related to content credibility.

Earlier to WhatsApp, the content analysis of messages was done though (Rosenfeld et al., 2018), but recent researches are more focused on the psychology of people through surveys and experiments (Church and Oliveira, 2013; Pielot et. al., 2014; O'Hara et. al. 2014; Mudliar and Rangaswamy, 2015). Several studies have focused on analysis free from human bias and have developed models that can predict the age, gender, personality of the author based on the content (Argamon et al., 2009; Tangand Goldman,2002; Wang, Burke and Kraut, 2013).

Whatever be the case, content credibility is much an area of research. The elaboration likelihood model (ELM by Petty and Cacioppo, 1986) explained factors forming people's perception of information credibility. As per this model, "Medium, Message and source credibility" are three dimensions of information credibility. Medium credibility is the credibility of an information medium (Newhagen & Nass, 1989; Sundar and Nass, 2001) and message credibility refers to the credibility of messages communicated (Metzer et al., 2003).

Considering the other factors affecting the credibility of information, the believability of information (McKnight, & Kacmar, 2007, August) is one of the strongest factors affecting credibility. The information quality in terms of quality and accuracy (Metzer et al., 2003), and source credibility in terms of expertise and trustworthiness are strong determinants of content credibility. The medium of information should satisfy its user in terms of use (Grant, Guthrie, and Ball-Rokeach, 1991). The medium should be interactive (Harrin, 2006) to have a higher level of audience involvement. Further transparency of medium builds trusts (Andrews, 2003; Yang and Lim, 2009) and users feel free to express themselves. Information quality and argument strength enhance message credibility (Kim and Benbasat, 2009; Cacioppo, Petty, and Morris, 1983; Sia, Tan, and Wei, 1999; Ball-Rokeach, 1998; Kahn, Strong and Wang, 2002). How information is processed by the receiver also affects information credibility (Petty, Cacioppo, 1986).

The perceived credibility of content on WhatsApp determines its credibility. Messages sent via WhatsApp messenger are shared and re-shared many times by multiple sources which create a self-curated content collection (Domingo et al., 2008 as cited in Elhadidi, 2019) which further creates confusion about the source of the content. The users, therefore have to examine and re-examine the credibility of such messages as they are unaware of the source (Appleman and Sundar, 2016). Sharing of such content by users indicates the engagement of the user with content and indicating credibility by the user (Hermida, Fletcher and Logan, 2012; Lee and Ahn, 2013).

Determination of Message Sharing Behaviour of Youth

Youths like to remain with their friends that permit them to bring down the danger of being left alone, the sentiment of pity, stress, and desire as expressed by an ongoing report cited by Seabrook, Kern, and Rickard (2016). Social media has become a significant device for youth, encouraging the collaboration furthermore, discussion with their companions. Youth can learn essential social aptitudes through their online movement via social media (Lenhart, 2015). Aptitudes, like keeping up a relationship and improving exchange capacities, get a lift as they proceed to utilize the internet based life stage for a more extended timeframe (Anderson and Rainie, 2010). Youth has generally embraced WhatsApp application because of its unmatched properties like availability; the simplicity of correspondence, consistent availability, continuous informing administrations and interesting feeling of belongingness alongside zero costing and social association (Zhang and Cristol, 2019). Domestication word originally given by Lohan (1998) means 'taming the untamed' (used by Kiran and Shrivastava, 2018) gives an idea of how youth have fitted technology in their day to day life and synchronized knowledge with it. By and large, various investigations have shown that WhatsApp was broadly received by youth as it permitted better openness and simplicity of correspondence offering continuous informing, strengthening, feeling of belongingness and

amiability, delight, speedy data sharing and money-saving advantages (Bere, 2012; Plana et al., 2013; Church & Oliveira, 2013; Yeboah & Ewur, 2014; Soliman & Salem, 2014; Devi & Tevera, 2014; O'Hara, Massimi, Harper, Rubens & Morris, 2014 as Cited by Ahad and Lim, 2014).

But excessive use may lead to addiction (Faye et al., 2016, Kim, 2013 and Flanagan, 2015) affecting the social and mental health of youth, Problematic behavior like insomnia, behavioral issues (Flanagan, 2015, Brauser, 2015; Faye et al., 2016). Attention seeking and aggressive behavior may surface (Brauser, 2015). Proneness to the feeling of emptiness, boredom, and unstable self-image can be more results (Beranuy et al., 2009; Faye et al., 2016).

There is an association between motives of WhatsApp use and mental well being associated with the sharing of information (Faye et al., 2016). Many factors contribute to the behavior of youth, which may have a determining role in sharing social media messages to others. Youth may develop compulsive communication needs in their growing age (Valkenburg and Piotrowski, 2017). There is an essential role of family relationships and parenting practices concerning social media usage and youth violence (Garthe, Sullivan, and Smith, 2019). Even discrimination and health risk behaviors are related (Storrey and Banner, 2019). Kapetanovic, Boele, and Skoog (2019) highlighted the importance of adolescence disclosure within the family process like a parental solicitation. With the increase in the risk youth exhibit delinquent behaviors (Shen, Seo, and Walt, 2019), "depressive symptoms," "dysfunctional attitudes" and "stress generation" (Meiser and Esser, 2017) and feel low about future orientation and self-esteem (Jackman and MacPhee, 2017). Parent's school satisfaction and youth' motivation are influenced by the parent's socialization practices (Suizzo, Jackson, Pahlke, et al., 2016). The family uses social media for different purposes like for entertainment, information sharing, documentation, etc. which has a positive effect on youth (Coyne, Walker, Fraser, Fellows, and Randal, 2014) and even results in good academic growth (Ahn, 2011). There is an encouraging connection between social networking sites and social indicators, and youth's social lives are also positively related to social indicators (Antheunis, Schouten, and Kraemer, 2014).

There is a role of both old-style media and novel digital or social media (Christakis et al., 2016). The usage of social media and its effect on adolescent mental health like the higher the usage of social media is related to online provocation, low self-esteem, poor body image, etc. (Kelly, Zillanawala, Booker, and Sacker, 2018). Exploration of various theories related to study of emerging adulthood (Arnett, 2015) had concentrated on developmental psychology indicating there are many procedures by which look related messages are diffused (Kierans and Swords, 2016; Manago, Brown, and Leaper, 2009) as well as emotional, social and enhanced experiences related to adulthood are circulated (Downey and Shana, 2004). Role of body surveillance as mediating between social media use and early adolescent body image is also strong (Salomon and Brown, 2018), especially among girls.

Some researchers observed the content of social media support groups and the depression and other mental health issues in youth (Lerman et al., 2016) and even death in some cases in response to social media comments (Amanda, Williams, and Merten, 2009).

Sarna and Bhatia (2017) highlighted the cyberbullying done through sharing WhatsApp by categorizing it into direct and indirect bullying messages and also mentioned some of the solutions to check the credibility of these messages.

Given the above review work, the following proposition and hypothesis can be proposed:

- *Hypothesis Ha 1: there is a causative relation between content credibility of WhatsApp messages and decision to share with others*

II Objectives

Based on the understanding developed from the review, the purposes of the study were set.

- To plan, improve, and systematize an instrument to estimate the perceptual factors of content's credibility of WhatsApp messages as well as the decision of youth to share WhatsApp messages with others.
- To discover the underlying dynamics for perceptual factors of content's credibility of WhatsApp messages and for the decision Youth to share WhatsApp messages with others.
- To discover the causal association for content's credibility of WhatsApp messages decision Youth to share WhatsApp messages with others

III The Study

The work was first-hand in nature, and primary data was used for this work. The research was determining the perceptual factors of content credibility of WhatsApp messages and decision to share that content with others. The population of the study consisted of youth who were of age group between 15-24 years. Individual youth was the sampling element. The sample size was 300 youth. Initially, 450 questionnaires were circulated to the youths through google docs, Facebook links, and WhatsApp link, but out of those, only 300 questionnaires were found filled and usable for further analysis. Primary data was used to collect the data through questionnaire method. For data collection, self-designed questionnaires for perceptual factors of content credibility of WhatsApp messages and decision to share that content with others were developed as the instruments for measuring the same is not available. Responses were taken on *Likert type scale 1 to 5, where 1 stands for minimum agreement and five stands for maximum agreement.*

IV RESULTS & DISCUSSION

The data from youth were collected for the survey. The youth were pursuing different Programmes from various educational institutes.

Inferential Statistics

After getting a questionnaire filled from a sample of three hundred youth, the reliability of all the instruments was checked by *Chron-bach alpha* in PASW software. For the content credibility questionnaire, the standard deviation of the responses is 17.97448, and the mean

value is 93.9264. *Cronbach's Alpha* is .935, which is acceptable and indicates that the questionnaire is reliable to measure

Determinants of Content Credibility

To find out determinants of the content credibility variable, first of all, adequacy of the sample was checked through *KMO and Bartlett's Test*. The results (refer table III) indicates a value of .914, symbolizing the adequacy of the sample. Further, the *Chi-Square value* is 4838.198 at 0% significance level, indicating that the responses matrix is not an identity matrix. This indicates that factor analysis for exploring the determinants of content credibility can be proceeded for. Hence, proposition 1 stands valid.

{Insert Table I here}

Factor Description

The study resulted in five determinants of perception of Content Credibility through Exploratory Factor Analysis carried out. The detailed description of the elements is given in table IV. The third factor, fourth factor, and fifth factor has got no items merged with them with a variance of 11.686, 10.533, and 5.352 %, respectively. *Hence finally, two factors were considered*. The first factor naming "Fabricated Messages" emerged out as the most important factor explaining the total variance in the variable of 15.572 %. In total, twenty-four statements got clubbed to form the factor. The second factor naming "Reliable" explained 14.791% variance, and three questions got merged to form this common factor.

Statistics for Decision to Share that Content with Others

For Decision to Share that Content with Others, the standard deviation of the responses is 38.47244; the mean value is 189.5318. The *Cronbach's Alpha* value is .973, which is acceptable and indicates that the questionnaire is reliable.

Determinants of Decision to Share that Content with Others

First of all, the adequacy of the sample was checked through *KMO and Bartlett's Test*. The results (refer table II) indicate a value of .936, symbolizing the adequacy of the sample. Further, the *Chi-Square* value is 14421.014 at 0% significance level, indicating that the responses matrix is not an identity matrix. This indicates that factor analysis for exploring the determinants of Decision to Share that Content with Others can be proceeded for.

{Insert Table II here}

Factor Description

The study resulted in nine factors for the decision to share Information with Others. The Eighth and ninth factors have got no items merged with them with a variance of 1.694 and 1.434 %, respectively. Hence, finally, seven factors were considered. The first factor naming "Pampered and belongingness" emerged out as the most important factor explaining the total variance in the variable of 17.124%. In total, fourteen statements got clubbed to form the factor. The second important factor, "Patriotic, Authenticated, and Social," explained 15.521% variance, and sixteen questions got merged to form this common factor. The third

factor, "Messages related to Others, Scams, Scary, Conspiracies," which clubbed nine items, explained 9.426% variance. The fourth factor naming "Accuracy and Neutrality of Information" explained a 6.558% variance and emerged out as a result of the grouping of four items. Fifth factor naming "Feel good and authorized" explained 5.209% variance and four items got clubbed, the sixth factor, "Sharing Incidents and in Emergency," showing 4.665 % variance has five items clubbed together. The seventh factor, "Match to beliefs, and you feel it right," has a variance of 4.340%, has two items clubbed to it. Hence, proposition 2 stands valid.

Causality Analysis

The causality results indicate a unique relationship between perceptual factors of Content Credibility and Decision to Share with an *R square* value of 61.1%. showing content credibility is responsible for significant variance in Decision to share the content with others. The *beta* value of .782 is also significant as tested by a *t* value of 21.602@ < 0.0001 (Refer to Table III). A single unit change in content credibility will lead to a 78.2% change in the decision to share WhatsApp messages with others. Hence, hypothesis Ha1 stands valid.

{ Insert Table III here }

V CONCLUSION

The study resulted in two major determinants of perception of content credibility of WhatsApp messages namely, "Fabricated Messages" and "Reliable". The study resulted in seven factors for the decision to share information with others namely: "Pampered and belongingness", "Patriotic, Authenticated, and Social", "Messages related to Others, Scams, Scary, Conspiracies", "Accuracy and Neutrality of Information", "Feel good and authorized", "Sharing Incidents and in Emergency" and "Match to beliefs, and you feel it right". Also, a strong association is found between perceptual factors of Content Credibility of WhatsApp messages and Decision to Share with others. Youth determine the content of WhatsApp messages either as "Fabricated Messages" or "Reliable" and based on this they decide to share these messages. The reasons for sharing may be different. Whether fabricated or reliable, they may share the information messages if it is hit to any of the determinants of sharing as mentioned above.

The results highlighting WhatsApp information sharing can be attributed to the physiognomies of the young respondents, who are mainly youth and are age between 15 to 24 years. They belong to a generation who are born in the digital era and are growing with digital technology. They love to be in touch with others through various social media platforms, WhatsApp being the most preferred one. They are much confident about the use of this media. As far as the credibility of messages is concerned, they feel that the WhatsApp messages whether fabricated or reliable, have emotional expression. The respondents hence feel that though the messages have emotional expressions.

Further, when youth decide to share messages with others, they share because they want to feel loved, liked, and "wanted". They want to portray that they are part of the same reference group as other people of the same age group are. They also share messages related to the nation-ness feeling which display their patriotic feelings. They also share messages wherein

accurate information is given; sometimes, they feel safe to share, which are neutral i.e., not supporting or inclined towards one group. The other reason for sharing messages is that they feel like sharing the information, whether it is relevant or not. Sometimes the messages are shared because of emergency in the situation, emergency on others part is required, they feel motivated to share such information. As the adolescent has their world, messages related to heroic deeds are also shared.

With the growing popularity of the WhatsApp as an information-sharing platform, there are increased chances that this can be a platform from where propagation of misinformation can be done primarily from the younger generation as they cannot generally judge the credible information and more concerned about sharing the information as soon as possible. Further, there are chances that this type of behavior shown by youth may lead to the spread of rumors and similar types of hoax messages. This may have severe implications for society and the nation.

References

- Ahada, Annie Dayani, Syamimi Md Ariff Lima (2014). Convenience or Nuisance? The 'WhatsApp' Dilemma. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 155 (2014), 189 – 196. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.10.278
- Ahn, June. (2011). The effect of social network sites on Youth' social and academic development: Current theories and controversies. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 62(8), 1435-1445. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21540>
- Alzahrani, Amal., Alanzi, Turkey (2019). Social Media Use by People with Diabetes in Saudi Arabia: A Survey About Purposes, Benefits, And Risks. *Diabetes, Metabolic Syndrome, and Obesity: Targets and Therapy*, 2019(12), 2363—2372. DOI <https://doi.org/10.2147/DMSO.S208141>
- Amanda L. Williams, Michael J. Merten (2009). Adolescents' Online Social Networking Following the Death of a Peer. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 24(1), 67-90. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558408328440>
- Amjad Omar Safori, Nik Adzrieman Abdul Rahman, Rosli Mohammed (2016). Perspectives and Attitudes on the Credibility of News on Social Networking (SNSS) Sites: Urgent Need of Research Work. *Journal of New Media and Mass Communication*, 3 (1), 25-33. DOI: 10.18488/journal.91/2016.3.1/91.1.25.33
- Antheunis, Marjolijn. L., Schouten, Alexander. P., & Kraemer, Emiel. (2014). The role of social networking sites in early Youth' social lives. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 36(3), 348-371. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431614564060>
- Appelman, A., & Sundar, S. S. (2015). Measuring Message Credibility. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 93(1), 59–79. DOI: 10.1177/1077699015606057
- Argamon, S., Koppel, M., Pennebaker, J. W., & Schler, J. (2009). Automatically profiling the author of an anonymous text. *Communications of the ACM*, 52(2), 119–123. DOI: 10.1145/1461928.1461959
- Arnett, Jeffrey Jensen. (2015). Introduction to the Special Section: Reflections on Expanding the Cultural Scope of Adolescent and Emerging Adult Research.

Journal of Adolescent Research, 30 (6), 655-660.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0743558415602556>

- Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (1998). A Theory of Media Power and a Theory of Media Use: Different Stories, Questions, and Ways of Thinking. *Mass Communication Society*, 1(1&2), 5–40. DOI: 10.1207/s15327825mcs0101&2_2
- Beranuy, M., Oberst, U., Carbonell, X., & Chamarro, A. (2009). Problematic Internet and mobile phone use and clinical symptoms in college students: The role of emotional intelligence. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 25(5), 1182–1187. DOI: 10.1016/j.chb.2009.03.001
- Bere, A. (2012). A comparative study of student experiences of unquitting learning via mobile devices and learner management systems at a South African university. Proceedings of the 14th Annual Conference on World Wide Web Applications. Cape Peninsula University of Technology, Retrieved from: <http://www.zaw3.co.za/index.php/ZA-WWW/2012/paper/viewFile/537/160>
- Bethany I. Lerman, Stephen P. Lewis, Margaret Lumley, Greg J. Grogan, Chloe C. Hudson, Erin Johnson (2016). Teen Depression Groups on Facebook: A Content Analysis. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 32(6), 719-741. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558416673717>
- Bhutta, MM, and Ali, S (2017). Perception of Pakistani University Students About Credibility of Political News: An Analysis of Mainstream and New Media. *IJBPAS*, 6(11), 2120-2138. <https://ijbpas.com/pdf/2017/November/1509559558MS%20IJBPAS%202017%204307.pdf>
- Bickart, K. C., Wright, C. I., Dautoff, R. J., Dickerson, B. C. & Barrett, L. F. (2011). Amygdala Volume and Social Network Size in Humans. *Nat. Neurosci.* 14 (2), 163–164. DOI: 10.1038/nn.2724
- Buhler, Tatiana, Neustaedter, Carman, and Serena Hillman (2013). *How and Why Teenagers Use Video Chat*. Conference: Proceedings of the Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing (CSCW2013). DOI: 10.1145/2441776.2441861
- Burgoon, Judee.K., & Hale, Jeorald. L. (1984). The fundamental topoi of relational communication. *Communication Monographs*, 51(3), 193-214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637758409390195>
- Cacioppo, J. T., Petty, R. E., & Morris, K. J. (1983). Effects of need for cognition on message evaluation, recall, and persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(4), 805-818. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-3514.45.4.805>
- Chassiakos, Yolanda (Linda) Rei; Radesky, J. Jenny., Christakis, Dimitri., Moreno, Megan. A., & Cross, Corinn. (2016). Children and youth and digital media. *Pediatrics*, 138(5), e20162593. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2016-2593>
- Choon-Ling Sia, Tan, B., & Kwok-Kee Wei. (1999). Can a GSS stimulate group polarization? an empirical study. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics, Part C (Applications and Reviews)*, 29(2), 227-237. doi:10.1109/5326.760567
- Coyne, S. M., Padilla-Walker, L. M., Fraser, A. M., Fellows, K., & Day, R. D. (2014). Media Time= Family Time, Positive Media Use in Families with Youth. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 29(5), 663-688. U0026-0107201515041800. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0743558414538316>

- Devi, T. S., & Tevera, S. (2014). Use of social networking site in the University of Swaziland by the health science students: A Case study. *Journal of Information Management*, 1(1), 19-26. Retrieved from: <http://splpjim.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/Article-02.pdf>
- Domingo, D., Quandt, T., Heinonen, A., Paulussen, S., Singer, J. B., & Vujnovic, M. (2008). Participatory Journalism Practices In The Media And Beyond. *Journalism Practice*, 2(3), 326–342. DOI: 10.1080/17512780802281065
- Downey, Douglas B., and Pribesh, Shana (2004). When Race Matters: Teachers' Evaluations of Students' Classroom Behavior. *Sociology of Education*, 77(4), 267-282. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003804070407700401>
- Elhadidi MAF (2019). Facebook credibility: Evidence from Online and Offline Political Participation, Political Contribution, and Platform Efficacy. *Global Media Journal*, 17:32. Retrieved from: <http://ijamtes.org/gallery/216.oct%20ijmte%20-%201101.pdf>
- Faye, A. D., Gawande, S., Tadke, R., Kirpekar, V. C., & Bhave, S. H. (2016). WhatsApp addiction and borderline personality disorder: A new therapeutic challenge. *Indian journal of psychiatry*, 58(2), 235–237. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-5545.183790>
- Fogg, B.J., & Tseng, H. (1999). The elements of computer credibility. Paper presented at the Conference on Human Factors and Computing Systems, Pittsburgh, PA, May 15–20, 1999.
- G. Tarcan Kumkale, Dolores Albarracín, and Paul J. Seignourel. (2010). The Effects of Source Credibility in the Presence or Absence of Prior Attitudes: Implications for the Design of Persuasive Communication Campaigns. *J Appl Soc Psychol*, 40(6), 1325–1356. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2010.00620.x
- Garthe, R. C., Sullivan, T. N., & Gorman-Smith, D. (2019). The family context and adolescent dating violence: a latent class analysis of family relationships and parenting behaviors. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, 48(7), 1-15, 1418-1432. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-019-01051-w>
- Grant, A. E., Guthrie, K. K., & Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (1991). Television shopping a media system dependency perspective. *Communication Research*, 18(6), 773-798
- Happer, C., & Philo, G. (2013). The Role of the Media in the Construction of Public Belief and Social Change. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 1(1), 321–336. DOI: 10.5964/jspp.v1i1.96
- Harrin, E. (2006). ROBERT SCOBLE AND SHEL ISRAEL Naked Conversations: How Blogs are Changing the Way Businesses Talk with Customers. John Wiley & Sons (2006). ISBN 0-471-74719-X. 16.99. 251 pp. Hardcover. *The Computer Journal*, 49(6), 764–764. DOI: 10.1093/comjnl/bxl051
- Hermida, A., Fletcher, F., Korell, D., & Logan, D. (2012). Share, Like, Recommend. *Journalism Studies*, 13(5-6), 815–824. DOI: 10.1080/1461670x.2012.664430
- Hermida, A., S.C. Lewis and R. Zamith (2014). Sourcing the Arab Spring: A case study of Andy Carvin's sources on twitter during the Tunisian and Egyptian revolutions. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 19(3), 479-499. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12074>
- Hovland, C., and Weiss, W. (1951). The influence of source credibility on communication effectiveness. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 15(4), 635-650. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1086/266350>
- Hovland, C.I., Janis, I.L., & Kelley, H.H. (1953). *Communication and persuasion; psychological studies of opinion change*. Yale University Press. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1954-05952-000>

- Jackman, Danielle. M., & MacPhee, David. (2017). Self-esteem and future orientation predict youth's risk engagement. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 37(3), 339-366. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431615602756>
- Jiang, Shujum. (2017). Believe it or not? Comparing Experience of Rumor on Traditional and New Media. *Review of Journalism and Mass Communication*, 5(2), 7-15. DOI: 10.15640/rjmc.v5n2a2
- Johnson, T.Johnson., & Kaye, Barbara.K. (1998). Cruising is believing? : Comparing the internet and traditional sources on media credibility measures. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 75(2), 325-340. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107769909807500208>
- Kahn, B. K., Strong, D. M., & Wang, R. Y. (2002). Information quality benchmarks: Product and service performance. *Communications of the ACM*, 45(4ve). doi:10.1145/505999.506007
- Kapetanovic, S., Boele, S., & Skoog, T. (2019). Parent-adolescent communication and adolescent delinquency: Unraveling within-family processes from between-family differences. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, 48 (9), 1707–1723. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-019-01043-w>
- Katrin Döveling, Anu A. Harju, Denise Sommer. (2018). From Mediatized Emotion to Digital Affect Cultures: New Technologies and Global Flows of Emotion. *Social media and society*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305117743141>
- Kelly, Y., Zilanawala, A., Booker, C., & Sacker, A. (2018). Social media use and adolescent mental health: Findings from the U.K. Millennium Cohort Study. *EClinicalMedicine*, 6, 59-68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2018.12.005>
- Kierans, Joanne., & Swords, Loarrine. (2016). Exploring the appearance culture in early adolescence: A qualitative focus group approach in the Republic of Ireland (ROI). *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 31(6), 671-699. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558415604219>
- Kim, D., & Benbasat, I. (2009). Trust-assuring arguments in B2C e-commerce: impact of content, source, and price on trust. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 26(3), 175-206. <https://doi.org/10.2753/MIS0742-1222260306>
- Kim, H. (2013). Exercise rehabilitation for smartphone addiction. *Journal of Exercise Rehabilitation*, 9(6), 500–505. DOI: 10.12965/jer.130080
- Kiousis, Spiro. (2001). Public trust or mistrust? Perceptions of media credibility in the information age. *Mass Communication & Society*, 4(4), 381-403. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327825MCS0404_4
- Kiran, Prabha, and Abhishek Shrivastava (2018). Whatsapp And Its Impact On Social Life Of Youngsters: A Perspective. *Management Insight* 14(1), 57 -64 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21844/mijia.14.01.9>
- Lee, Y.-J., & Ahn, H.-Y. (A. (2013). Interaction Effects of Perceived Sponsor Motives and Facebook Credibility on Willingness to Visit Social Cause Facebook Page. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 13(1), 41–52. DOI: 10.1080/15252019.2013.768056
- Lohan, E. M. (1998). Book Reviews: Making Technology Our Own? Domesticating Technology into Everyday Life, edited by Merete Lie and Knut H. Sørensen. Oslo, Oxford, and Boston: Scandinavian University Press, 1996, vii 223 pp. \$36/£26. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 23(2), 249–251. DOI: 10.1177/016224399802300207

- Manago, Adriana. M., Spears Brown, Christia., & Leaper, Campbell. (2009). Feminist identity among Latina Youth. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 24(6), 750-776. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0743558409341079>
- Martin-Storey A, and Benner A. (2019). Externalizing Behaviors Exacerbate the Link between Discrimination and Adolescent Health Risk Behaviors. *J Youth Adolesc.*,48(9), 1724-1735. DOI: 10.1007/s10964-019-01020-3. Epub 2019 Jun 7
- Mcknight, D. H., & Kacmar, C. J. (2007). Factors and effects of information credibility. *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Electronic Commerce - ICEC 07*. DOI: 10.1145/1282100.1282180
- Mehrabi, D., H.M. Abu, and M.S. Ali (2009). News media credibility of the internet and television. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 11(1), 136-148. Retrieved from: <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/7ce3/6704ecf554069e852d775718abfc70e89ae7.pdf>
- Meiser, Susanne., & Esser, Gunter. (2017). How dysfunctional are dysfunctional attitudes? A threshold model of dysfunctional attitudes and depressive symptoms in children and youth. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 41(5), 730-744. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1007/s10608-017-9842-0>
- Metzger, Miriam. J., Flanagin, Andrew. J., Eyal, Keren., Lemus, Daisy. R., & McCann, Robert. M. (2003). Credibility for the 21st century: Integrating perspectives on source, message, and media credibility in the contemporary media environment. *Communication Yearbook*, 27, 293-336. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2003.11679029>
- Metzger, M. J., Flanagin, A. J., Eyal, K., Lemus, D. R., & Mccann, R. M. (2003). Chapter 10: Credibility for the 21st century: Integrating perspectives on source, message, and media credibility in the contemporary media environment. *Communication Yearbook*, 27(1), 293-335. doi:10.1207/s15567419cy2701_10
- Mudliar, P., & Rangaswamy, N. (2015). Offline strangers, online friends. *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - CHI '15*. doi:10.1145/2702123.2702533
- Newhagen, J., & Nass, C. (1989). Differential criteria for evaluating credibility of newspapers and TV news. *Journalism Quarterly*, 66(2), 277-284. DOI:10.1177/107769908906600202
- Newman, Nic, Richard Fletcher, Antonis Kalogeropoulos, David A. L. Levy, and Rasmus Kleis Nielsen. (2018). *Reuters Institute Digital News Report 2018*. Retrieved from: <https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/sites/default/files/digital-news-report-2018.pdf>
- O'Hara, B., Netemeyer, R., & Burton, S. (1991). An examination of the relative effects of source expertise, trustworthiness, and likability. *Social Behavior & Personality*, 19(4), 305-314. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.1991.19.4.305>
- Ohara, K. P., Massimi, M., Harper, R., Rubens, S., & Morris, J. (2014). Everyday dwelling with WhatsApp. *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing - CSCW 14*. DOI: 10.1145/2531602.2531679
- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). The Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion. *Communication and Persuasion*, 1-24. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4612-4964-1_1
- Pielot, M., Oliveira, R. D., Kwak, H., & Oliver, N. (2014). Didn't you see my message? *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - CHI 14*. DOI: 10.1145/2556288.2556973

- Plana, M. G.-C., Escofet, M. G., Figueras, I. T., Gimeno, A., Appel, C., & Hopkins, J. (2013). Improving learners' reading skills through instant short messages: A sample study using WhatsApp. (n.d.). *WorldCALL : Sustainability and Computer-Assisted Language Learning*. doi:10.5040/9781474248327.0027
- Rieh, S. Y., Morris, M. R., Metzger, M. J., Francke, H., & Jeon, G. Y. (2014). Credibility perceptions of content contributors and consumers in social media. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 51(1), 1-4. doi:10.1002/meet.2014.14505101022
- Rosenfeld, A., Sina, S., Sarne, D., Avidov, O., & Kraus, S. (2018). WhatsApp usage patterns and prediction of demographic characteristics without access to message content. *Demographic Research*, 39, 647–670. DOI: 10.4054/demres.2018.39.22
- RuohanLi and AyoungSuh (2015). Factors Influencing Information credibility on Social Media Platforms: Evidence from Facebook Pages, *Procedia Computer Science*, 72 (2015), 314-328. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2015.12.146>
- Safari, Amjad. Omar., Mohammed, Rosli., Nik. Adzrieman Abdul Rahman & Choi, Lee. Jun. (2017). How Scoop Affects the Credibility of News through Social Media? An Empirical Study. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 11(7), 57-63. Retrieved from: <http://www.ajbasweb.com/old/ajbas/2017/May/57-63.pdf>
- Safari, Amjad. Omar., Rahman, Nik. Adzrieman Abdul Rahman, & Mohammed, Rosli. (2016). Perspectives and Attitudes On the Credibility of News On Social Networking (SNSS) Sites: Urgent Need of Research Work. *Journal of New Media and Mass Communication*, 3(1), 25-33. DOI: 10.18488/journal.91/2016.3.1/91.1.25.33
- Salomon, Llyssa., & Brown, Christia. Spears. (2018). The selfie generation: examining the relationship between social media use and early adolescent body image—the *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 39 (4), 539-560. 0272431618770809
- Sarna, G., & Bhatia, M. P. S. (2017). Content based approach to find the credibility of user in social networks: an application of cyberbullying. *International Journal Of Machine Learning and Cybernetics*, 8(2), 677-689. DOI:10.4018/IJRSDA.2016100101
- Seabrook, E. M., Kern, M. L., & Rickard, N. S. (2016). Social Networking Sites, Depression, and Anxiety: A Systematic Review. *JMIR mental health*, 3(4), e50. <https://doi.org/10.2196/mental.5842> NLM Seabrook EM, Kern ML, Rickard NS
- Self, C.S. (1996). Credibility. In M. Salwen & D. Stacks (Eds.), *An integrated approach to communication theory and research*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Seufert, M., Schwind, A., Hoßfeld, T., & Tran-Gia, P. (2015). Analysis of group-based communication in WhatsApp. *Lecture Notes of the Institute for Computer Sciences, Social Informatics and Telecommunications Engineering*, 225-238. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-26925-2_17
- Shen, Yishan.; Seo, Eunjin., Walt; Dorothy. Clare., & Kim, Su. Yeong. (2019). The stress of Language Brokering and Mexican American Youth' Adjustment: The Role of Cumulative Risk. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, DOI: 10.1177/0272431619847526
- Soliman, D. A., & Salem, M. S. (2014). Investigating intention to use mobile instant messenger: The influence of socialibility, self expressiveness, and enjoyment. *The Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge*, 19(2), 286-293. Retrieved from:

https://www.academia.edu/31272853/2014_Investigating_Intention_to_Use_Mobile_Instant_Messenger-The_Influence_of_Sociability_Self-Expressiveness_and_Enjoyment

- Suizzo, Marie. Anne., Jackson, Karen. Moran., Pahlke, Erin., McClain, Shannon., Marroquin, Yesenia., Blondeau, Lauren. A., & Hong, Kyongjoo. (2016). Parents' school satisfaction and academic socialization predict Youth' autonomous motivation: A mixed-method study of low-income ethnic minority families. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 31(3), 343-374. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558415605617>
- Sundar, S. Shyam. (2008). *The MAIN Model: A Heuristic Approach to Understanding Technology Effects on Credibility*. The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Series on Digital Media and Learning. Edited by Miriam J. Metzger and Andrew J. Flanagin. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2008. 73–100. DOI: 10.1162/dmal.9780262562324.073
- Sundar, S. S., & Nass, C. (2001). Conceptualizing sources in online news. *Journal of Communication*, 51(1), 52-72. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2001.tb02872.x
- Tang, H., & Goldman, D. (2002). Myocyte Enhancer Factor 2C (MEF-2C). *Wiley Encyclopedia of Molecular Medicine*. DOI: 10.1002/0471203076.emm0743
- Wang, Y.-C., Burke, M., & Kraut, R. E. (2013). Gender, topic, and audience response. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - CHI 13*. DOI: 10.1145/2470654.2470659
- Wathen, C. Nadine, and Jacquelyn Burkell (2002). Believe It or Not: Factors Influencing Credibility on the Web. *Journal Of The American Society For Information Science And Technology*, 53(2),134–144, 2002. DOI: 10.1002/asi.10016
- Westerman, David.; Spence, Patric. R. & Van Der Heide, Brandon. (2012). A social network as information: The effect of system generated reports of connectedness on credibility on Twitter. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28(1), 199-206. DOI: 10.1016/j.chb.2011.09.001
- Wilson, E. J., & Sherrell, D. L. (1993). Source effects in communication and persuasion research: A meta-analysis of effect size. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 21(2), 101–112. DOI: 10.1007/bf02894421
- Yang, S. U., & Lim, J. S. (2009). The effects of blog-mediated public relations (BMPR) on relational trust. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 21(3), 341-359. 328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10627260802640773>
- Yeboah, J., & Ewur, G.D. (2014). The impact of WhatsApp messenger usage on students performance in Tertiary Institutions in Ghana. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 5(6), 157-164. Retrieved from: <https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JEP/article/view/11241>
- Zhang, Y., & Cristol, D. (2019). *Handbook of mobile teaching and learning*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-2766-7>

Weblinks

- Amedie, Jacob (2015). *The Impact of Social Media on Society - Scholar Commons*. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://scholarcommons.scu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1002&context=engl_176
- Andrews, P. (2003). *Is blogging journalism? Nieman Reports*. Retrieved from <https://niemanreports.org/articles/is-blogging-journalism/>
- Banaji, Shakuntala; Bhat. Ram; Agarwal, Anushi, Passanha, Nihal, and Mukti Sadhana Pravin (2018). *WhatsApp Vigilantes: An exploration of citizen reception and circulation of WhatsApp misinformation linked to mob violence in India*. Retrieved from <http://www.lse.ac.uk/media->

and-communications/assets/documents/research/projects/WhatsApp-Misinformation-Report.pdf

Brauser D. *Smartphone 'Addiction' May Affect Adolescent Development*. Retrieved from from: <http://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/804666>

Flanagan J.(2015). *Smart Phone 'Addicts' do not Need Rehab*. The Kernel. [Last cited on 2015 Dec 01]. Retrieved from: <http://www.kernelmag.com/features/report/6240/smartphone-addicts-do-not-need-rehab>

Janna Anderson And Lee Rainie (2010). The future of social relations, Pew Research Center, <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2010/07/02/the-future-of-social-relations-2/>

Lenhart, Amanda (2015). Social Media and Teenage Friendships. (n.d.). *Social Media and Personal Relationships*. DOI: 10.1057/9781137314444.0008

Mitchell, A., J. Kiley, J. Gottfried, and E. Guskin, (2013). *The role of news on Facebook*. Washington, DC: *Pew Research Center's Internet & American Life Project*. Retrieved from: <https://www.journalism.org/2013/10/24/the-role-of-news-on-facebook/>

Santanu, Chakrabarti; Lucy, Stengel, and Sapna Solanki, Duty (2018). *Identity, Credibility: Fake News and the Ordinary Citizen in India* (London, 2018), Retrieved from: <downloads.bbc.co.uk/mediacentre/duty-identity-credibility.pdf>

Annexure

Table I
KMO Statistics for Content Credibility

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.914
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity		
Approx. Chi-Square	4838.198	
df	351	
sig	. < 0.0001	

Table II
KMO Statistics for Decision to Share that Content with Others

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	.936
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	
Approx. Chi-Square	14421.014
df	1431
sig	. < 0.0001

Table III
Regression Results

<i>Dependent Variable</i>	<i>Independent Variable</i>	<i>R square Value</i>	<i>F value and Sig</i>	<i>Unstandardized Coefficient Beta</i>	<i>Standardized Coefficients</i>	<i>T value and Significance</i>
Decision to Share	Content Credibility	61.1%	466.648 @ < 0.0001	32.376	.782	21.602@ < 0.0001