Title: Statistical analyses appendix for "A survey of expert views on misinformation: Definitions, determinants, solutions, and future of the field"
Authors: Sacha Altay (1), Manon Berriche (2), Hendrik Heuer (3), Johan Farkas (4), Steven Rathje (5)
Date: July 27th, 2023
Note: The material contained herein is supplementary to the article named in the title and published in the Harvard Kennedy School (HKS) Misinformation Review.

Appendix E: Statistical analyses

In all the statistical analyses reported on OSF, we exclude the "Other" categories because the number of observations was small to allow meaningful statistical comparisons (N=9 for methods, and N=12 for disciplines). We conducted chi-2 tests to investigate the differences in definition of misinformation (e.g., false information) across disciplines and methods. For all the other statistical comparisons, we transformed the data from wide to long, such that one line corresponds to one response. The responses on the 7-point Likert scale were treated as continuous. We conducted linear mixed-effect models with participants as random effects using the Lme4 R package. The R syntax of our models had the following structure:

```
lmer(Response ~ Methods * Question + (1|ResponseId), data = Data_Block_1)
lmer(Response ~ Disciplines * Question + (1|ResponseId), data = Data_Block_1)
```

The interaction between Methods and Question, and the interaction between Disciplines and Question, allowed us to estimate differences in survey responses across disciplines and methods for each question of the survey. We ran such models for each block (e.g., for belief in misinformation, for sharing misinformation, etc.).

Given our small sample size, the high number of comparisons across groups, and the lack of correction for multiple comparisons, we invite readers to take these statistical analyses with a grain of salt. Our survey was not designed to test differences across subgroups. We mainly relied on these statistical analyses to guide our descriptive understanding of the data and to identify the strongest and most reliable differences between subgroups.