Title: Participant demographics, data collection, and limitations appendix for "Fact-checking at a crossroads: Fact checkers' perspectives on Community Notes, AI integration, and design recommendations"
Authors: Basak Bozkurt (1), Mohsen Mosleh (1,2), Helen Margetts (1)
Date: July 7th, 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: Participant demographics, data collection, and limitations

Participant demographics

***Table C1**. Participant demographics.*

ID	Gender	Age group	Highest education	Fact-checking experience	Role category	Region
P01	Woman	25–34	Master's degree	4–6 years	Editorial	Western Asia
P02	Man	>55	Master's degree	>10 years	Editorial	Western Europe
P03	Woman	25–34	Bachelor's degree	<1 year	Editorial	Eastern Europe
P04	Woman	25–34	Bachelor's degree	4–6 years	Editorial	Western Asia
P05	Man	35–44	Bachelor's degree	7–10 years	Editorial	Southern Asia
P06	Man	25–34	Bachelor's degree	7–10 years	Technical	Southern Europe
P07	Woman	45–54	Master's degree	4–6 years	Editorial	Northern Europe
P08	Woman	45–54	Bachelor's degree	<1 year	Technical	South America
P09	Man	18–24	Bachelor's degree	1–3 years	Technical	Western Africa; Middle Africa
P10	Woman	25–34	Bachelor's degree	1–3 years	Editorial	Western Asia
P11	Woman	25–34	Bachelor's degree	7–10 years	Editorial	Southeastern Asia
P12	Man	25–34	Master's degree	7–10 years	Editorial	South America
P13	Woman	35–44	Master's degree	7–10 years	Editorial	Eastern Europe
P14	Woman	35–44	Postgraduate diploma	7–10 years	Editorial	Southern Asia; Southeastern Asia
P15	Man	25–34	Master's degree	7–10 years	Editorial	Western Africa
P16	Woman	35–44	Master's degree	1–3 years	Editorial	South America
P17	Woman	45–54	Bachelor's degree	4–6 years	Editorial	North America
P18	Woman	25–34	Master's degree	4–6 years	Editorial	Western Africa; Eastern Africa; Southern Africa
P19	Woman	25–34	Master's degree	4–6 years	Editorial	Western Africa; Eastern Africa; Southern Africa
P20	Woman	35–44	Bachelor's degree	4–6 years	Editorial	Eastern Asia
P21	Woman	25–34	Master's degree	4–6 years	Editorial	Eastern Asia
P22	Man	25–34	Master's degree	1–3 years	Editorial	Central Asia; Eastern Asia
P23	Woman	35–44	Master's degree	1–3 years	Editorial	Southeastern Asia
P24	Man	25–34	Master's degree	4–6 years	Editorial	Southern Asia
P25	Man	45–54	Bachelor's degree	4–6 years	Technical	Northern Europe
P26	Man	35–44	Master's degree	4–6 years	Technical	South America
P27	Woman	35–44	Master's degree	1–3 years	Editorial	Southern Asia
P28	Man	35–44	Doctorate degree	1–3 years	Editorial	Southern Europe
P29	Man	>55	Master's degree	>10 years	Editorial	North America

Notes: Job titles were grouped into functional categories to reduce identification risk. We assigned role categories based on participants' self-reported job titles. Editorial roles include positions responsible for reporting, verification, writing, editing fact-checking content. Technical roles include positions focused on tool development, AI integration, and product design. At the same time, we recognize that, in practice, responsibilities are not always strictly divided, especially in smaller organizations where editorial staff also perform technical tasks. We did not observe different patterns between editorial and technical participants' perspectives. In many organizations, editorial staff also took on responsibilities related to technology. As a result, the distinction between editorial and technical roles was not always clear-cut in practice. Regions reflect where participants' organizations operate and are reported instead of countries to preserve anonymity.

Participant recruitment

We recruited participants by using purposive sampling, snowball sampling, and outreach through professional mailing lists (Patton, 2015). As part of a broader project on AI in fact-checking, we purposively identified organizations by reviewing grant funding records (e.g., IFCN, 2025a; JournalismAI, 2024) and conference programs such as Global Fact (IFCN, 2025b), as well as previous research and reports on AI in fact-checking (Full Fact, 2020). We contacted fact checkers by email and via LinkedIn. At the end of each interview, we asked participants to suggest additional potential participants, expanding the sample through snowball sampling. To broaden recruitment, we also used professional networks (EFCSN, 2026; Hacks/Hackers, 2025; Poynter, 2026) and distributed interview invites through their mailing lists.

Data collection

To be eligible for participation, individuals had to be at least 18 years old, employed by an IFCN signatory organization, and report using generative AI tools in their professional work. IFCN signatory status was used as a criterion because it indicates adherence to established norms of transparency, methodological rigor, and non-partisanship, and was more likely to represent well-established active organizations that conduct fact-checking as a core activity rather than an occasional project (Graves & Mantzarlis, 2020). Eligible respondents who completed the registration form were contacted to arrange an interview. Interviews followed a semi-structured format guided by a set of questions on fact-checking processes, the use of generative AI, AI-generated misinformation, and Community Notes. While the broader interview protocol covered these topics, the analysis presented in this paper focuses on participants' perspectives on two key questions: "What's your view on community-led models like Community Notes?" and "It looks like LLMs will soon be integrated into Community Notes on X. What do you think about using generative AI in this context?"

All interviews were conducted remotely using Microsoft Teams and generally lasted approximately one hour. With participants' oral consent, interviews were recorded and automatically transcribed using Microsoft Teams' transcription feature. Participants were offered a £35 digital gift card in recognition of their participation. Three participants donated the amount to the IFCN, and three donated it to a fact-checking organization of their choice.

Limitations

This study has several limitations that should be considered. First, we only conducted interviews in English, which may have discouraged participation from some fact-checking organizations and influenced the ways in which participants expressed their views. Second, as part of a broader project on generative AI in fact-checking, most participants had prior experience of using AI in their work. While this enabled informed reflections on both the opportunities and challenges associated with AI Note Writers, the findings may not fully reflect the perspectives of fact checkers without direct AI experience and may overemphasize concerns and advantages specific to more AI-experienced practitioners. Finally, focusing on IFCN signatory organizations may not fully capture practices across the broader fact-checking community.