

Appendix B: Statistical precision and detection limits

Sample size was determined by feasibility rather than by a priori power calculation: no comprehensive sampling frame exists for French counter-disinformation practitioners, and recruitment depended on institutional authorization, security clearance, and willingness to participate. The analytic sample of $N = 106$ was the maximum achievable under these constraints. We report minimum detectable effect sizes (MDEs) and precision limits to help readers gauge what the study can and cannot resolve.

At $\alpha = .05$ (two-tailed) and 80% power, the minimum detectable effect sizes (MDEs) are as follows:

- Aggregate analyses ($N = 106$): MDE $d = 0.27$ for one-sample comparisons against scale midpoints. The study can reliably detect small-to-medium deviations from neutrality in the full sample, but effects below $d = 0.27$ may go undetected.
- Practitioner–scientist comparison ($n \approx 100$ practitioners, 143 scientists): MDE $d = 0.37$. Three of the four divergences that remain after correction (absolute $d = 0.46$ to 0.89) exceed this threshold; the fourth ($d = 0.35$) falls slightly below it and should be read with corresponding caution. Subgroup comparisons between the three largest groups (military/intelligence $n = 35$, regulatory $n = 31$, government $n = 22$): MDE $d \approx 0.69$ to 0.78 , depending on the pair. Because the MDE for a two-group comparison is approximately $2.8 \times \sqrt{(1/n_1 + 1/n_2)}$ at these error rates, each pairwise contrast has its own detection limit: $d \approx 0.69$ for military/intelligence versus regulatory (35 vs. 31), $d \approx 0.76$ for military/intelligence versus government (35 vs. 22), and $d \approx 0.78$ for regulatory versus government (31 vs. 22). In other words, even between the best-represented sectors, only large differences (roughly three-quarters of a standard deviation) were reliably detectable; the comparisons involving the government group are the least sensitive. For the smallest subgroups (for-profit $n = 7$, non-profit $n = 6$, cybersecurity $n = 6$): MDE $d \approx 1.56$, meaning that only very large differences could have been detected. The 59 non-significant heterogeneity tests (of 60) should therefore be interpreted as reflecting insufficient precision to detect moderate heterogeneity, not as evidence of its absence. Accordingly, where the main text describes respondents as “converging,” convergence is a descriptive statement: uniformly high endorsement and low dispersion of subgroup means (Appendix D2), not statistically demonstrated homogeneity.

These detection limits confirm that the study has adequate precision for aggregate-level comparisons and the practitioner–scientist contrast, but limited precision for subgroup heterogeneity, consistent with the descriptive framing of the scientist comparison (Appendix C) and the exploratory framing adopted in Finding 6 and Appendix D.