

Title: Codebooks for the analysis of EFCSN correction policies and published corrections, appendix for “Beyond compliance: How European fact checkers correct their own errors”

Authors: Mato Brautović (1), Ivana Grkeš Tošović (2), Romana John (3)

Date: July 7<sup>th</sup>, 2026

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 C: Codebooks for the analysis of EFCSN correction policies and published corrections

The first codebook is used to assess commitment to EFCSN’s Code of Standards in Article 3.3, mainly the provisions on corrections policies, requesting corrections, and submitting complaints to the EFCSN.

Provisions B, I, and J from the Code of Standards, Article 3.3, were excluded from the analysis because it was difficult to determine whether corrections were disseminated in the same format and through the same channel as the original article, or if fact checkers were only encouraged to adopt them.

**Table C1.** Codebook for the analysis of compliance with the EFCSN Code of Standards (Article 3.3 Honest Corrections).

Variable	Coding	EFCSN reference
1. Channel for submitting correction requests	1 = yes 2 = no	G
2. Information on the right to appeal to EFCSN	1 = yes (with link) 2 = yes (without link) 3 = no	H
3. Correction policy published online	1 = public 2 = hidden 3 = absent	E
4. The content of the corrections policy is detailed	1 = yes 2 = partially 3 = no 4 = no information	F
5. Register of published corrections	1 = yes 2 = partial 3 = no	E
6. Distinction correction and updates	1 = yes 2 = no	D

The second codebook assesses EFCSN’s Code of Standards in Article 3.3, covering provisions not addressed by the previous codebook, and examines the manifestation of accountability in corrections by acting ethically beyond professional obligations by Kampf and Daskal (2014).

**Table C2.** Codebook for the analysis of the corrections.

Variable	Coding	EFCSN reference
a.1 Locus (place of publication)	1 = within the same article 2 = in a separate article 3 = unclear / not specified	A
a.2 Chronos (time span)	1 = less than 24 hours 2 = less than 3 days 3 = less than 7 days 4 = more than 7 days 5 = cannot be determined	A
a.3 Type of correction	1 = substantial (fundamental change to conclusions) 2 = minor (update or factual addition) 3 = typographical/stylistic 4 = difficult to determine	A
a.4 Visibility and accessibility of correction	1 = clearly marked on multiple positions 2 = at the top of the page (headline, sub-headline, or lead) 3 = at the bottom of the page 4 = not marked / no visible indication 5 = at the top and the bottom of the page	A, C
b.1 Identification of the responsible party	1 = organization 2 = journalist 3 = external source 4 = unclear	C
b.2 Explanation of the cause of the error	1 = yes 2 = partially 3 = no	C
c.1 Clarity of information	1 = yes, both clearly stated 2 = only correct information stated 3 = unclear 4 = not applicable (N/A)	C
c.2 Type of error source	1 = methodological error 2 = factual error 3 = contextual error 4 = technical error 5 = difficult to determine	C
d.1 Identity of the affected party	1 = organization 2 = individual 3 = both organization and individual 4 = unclear / not specified	C

*Note: Numbering follows the categories of accountability values in corrections from Kampf and Daskal (2014).*