|  |
| --- |
| Appendix AData extraction sheet excerpt*Table A1: Data extraction sheet excerpt.* |
| Author, year | Topic | Field of study | Location | Theory/concept | Study design | Research instrument | Sample | Key measures | Result |
| Adam-Troian et al., 2021 | Correlation between culture and CT belief | Psychology | United Arab Emirates, Switzerland, USA, France, Germany, Belgium, Poland, Croatia, Slovakia, UK, Turkey, Norway, Macedonia, Czech Republic, Spain, Netherlands, Italy, Hungary, Brazil, Iceland | Cultural dimensions | Quantitative, survey, partly interviews, partly online | Conspiracy Mentality Questionnaire (CMQ),Generic Conspiracist Beliefs Scale,Hofstede Cultural Values Scale | Study 1: *N*=25 (average scores from each national sample), not representative, sample size too smallStudy 2a: *N*=12,255, 18 countries, representative Study 2b: *N*=30,994, 18 countriesStudy 3: *N*=350, USA, Amazon Mturk, convenience sample | Study 1: CT belief: 1–5 item, dis/agreeCulture: Hofstede culture scoreStudy 2a:Data from 2008 World Public Opinion PollCT belief: 1 item only, belief in 9/11 CT, open-ended questionCulture: Hofstede culture scoreStudy 2b: CT belief: 5 items, 1–11, un/likelyCulture: Hofstede culture scoreStudy 3: Conspiracy mentality: 5 items, 1–11, un/likelyGeneric conspiracist belief scale: 15 items, 1–5, un/trueSpecific CT belief: 8 item, 1–7, un/likelyCulture: Hofstede scalePolitical ideology: 2 items, 1–7, conservative/liberal | Masculinity and Collectivism correlated with CT belief. |
| Author, year | Topic | Field of study | Location | Theory/concept | Study Design | Research Instrument | Sample | Key measures | Result |
| Ahmed, 2021 | Correlation between cognitive reflection and belief in deepfakes | Communication | Singapore | – | Quantitative, survey, experiment | CRT (cognitive reflection) | *N*=440, USA, Qualtrics, non-representative | Stimulus: deepfake of Kim Kardashian, one with original caption, stating it as artwork, one withoutPerceived accuracy of deepfake: 1 item, 1–4, not/accurateSharing intention: 1 item, 1–4, not/likelyCognitive reflection: 3 itemsDemographics | 1. Deepfake without caption was more believed by all2. Instagram caption had influence on accuracy ratings of high (making them more skeptical) but not low CRT individuals |
| Allington et al., 2021 | Covid-19: Correlation between social media use (for Covid information) and belief in Covid CT belief | Digital Humanities Psychology | UK | – | Quantitative, survey, online | – | Study 2: *N*=2250, UK, Ipsos-Mori, representativeStudy 3: *N*=2254, UK, Ipsos-Mori, representative | Study 2Covid conspiracy belief: 1 item, lab theory, true/falseHealth protective behaviors: 5 items, yes/noSocial media use for Covid information: 1 item, 1–7, frequencyStudy 3Covid conspiracy belief: 5 items, yes/noSocial media use for information: 7 items, 1–7, nothing/much | 1. Small negative correlation between legacy media use for Covid info & Covid CT belief2. Strong positive correlation between social media use & Covid CT belief 3. Small positive correlation between use of friends and family for information & Covid CT belief4. Younger respondents more likely to hold Covid CT belief but most likely mediated by social media use |
| Author, year | Topic | Field of study | Location | Theory/concept | Study design | Research instrument | Sample | Key measures | Result |
| Amazeen and Bucy, 2019 | Political disinformation: Correlation between news knowledge and belief in political disinformation | Communication | USA | Persuasion knowledge model,Inoculation theory | Quantitative, survey, online | – | Study 1: *N*=770, USA, Survey Sampling InternationalStudy 2: *N*=1067, ProdegeMR | Stimulus: native ad, 1 political, 1 non-political taken from NYTimesProcedural news knowledge: multiple choice test, 10 questionsRecognition of native advertising: 2 items, one closed, one open question.Perceived accuracy of news headlines: 10 items (5 true,5 false political headlines), 1–4, not/accuratePerceived threat: 1 item, 'idea of encountering native ads in future', 6 bipolar adjective pairs (most negative), 1–7.Counterarguing: open-ended, listing up five questions of what participants were thinking while viewing native ad. Persuasion: different items (unclear) regarding share of article on social media and purchase intentions, 1–7, un/likelyDemographics, Frequency of news consumptionPerceived credibility of NYTimes | Validity questionable.1. Greater levels of Procedural news knowledge correlated with better discernment of false political headlines and recognizing native ads |
| Author, year | Topic | Field of study | Location | Theory/concept | Study design | Research instrument | Sample | Key measures | Result |
| Anspach and Carlson, 2020 | Influence of social media comments on belief in disinformation | Political Science | USA | – | Quantitative, survey, experiment |   | *N*=954, USA, Amazon Mturk, non-representative | Stimulus: headline about Trump's approval ratingTrustworthiness of source and informationBelief in disinformationMotivated reasoning(Items not described in detail) | When exposed to opposing pieces of information, social media audiences are much more likely to cite the (mis)information communicated in the comments as more accurate than the information contained within the article previews |
| Anthony and Moulding, 2019 | Political disinformation: Correlation between different factors and belief in political disinformation | Psychology | Australia | – | Quantitative, survey, online | World Assumptions Scale (WAS),Dean's Alienation Scale (DAS),Dangerous Worldview Scale (DWS),Belief in Conspiracy Theories Inventory (BCTI),Oxford-Liverpool Inventory of Feelings and Experiences(OLIFE),Belief in News Inventory (BNI),Political Identity Scale (PIS),Left–Right Scale (LRS),Libertarian- Authoritarian Scale (LAS) | *N*=125, USA, Prolific, non-representative | World assumptions: not further specifiedAlienation: 24 itemsDangerous worldview: 10 itemsCT belief: 15 items (specific CTs)Unusual experiences: 12 items (magic thinking, odd beliefs), 1–5, dis/agreeDisinformation belief: 30 items, (pro Trump/pro Clinton, fictitious CT, 1–9, false/truePolitical identity: 4 items, 0–100, negative/positive (Democrat/Republican, Clinton/Trump)General political orientation: left/right, liberal/conservativeDemographics | 1. Conspiratorial views correlated with belief in conspiratorial disinformation2. Political identity correlated with belief in (conspiratorial) disinformation that is congruent with own viewpoint - motivated reasoning3. Randomness not correlated with CT belief4. Normlessness positively related with belief in disinformation |

**Appendix B**

**Identified factors and corresponding studies**

*Table B1: Micro level: identified factors and corresponding studies*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliberation | Pathology | Political ideology | Worldview | Knowledge | Emotions | Media use | Demographics | Perceived control |
| Bago et al., 2020Barron et al., 2018Bronstein et al., 2019Buchanan and Kempley, 2021Calvillo et al., 2020Enders and Smallpage, 2019Garrett and Weeks, 2017Georgiou et al., 2019Hart and Graether, 2018Marques et al., 2022Martel et al., 2020Martire et al., 2020Nurse et al., 2022Pennycook and Rand, 2019, 2020Pennycook et al., 2018, 2020Sanchez and Dunning, 2021Ståhl and van Prooijen, 2018Stanley et al., 2021Tandoc et al., 2021van Prooijen et al., 2018 | Anthony and Moulding, 2019Barron et al., 2018Bronstein et al., 2019Buchanan and Kempley, 2021Cichocka et al., 2016Georgiou et al., 2019Hart and Graether, 2018Hollander, 2018Imhoff and Lamberty, 2018Kuhn et al., 2021van der Linden et al., 2020van Prooijen et al., 2015 | Anthony and Moulding, 2019Bae, 2020Blom, 2021Calvillo et al., 2020Faragó et al., 2020Furnham, 2021Green and Douglas, 2018Hollander, 2018Hopp et al., 2020Lawson and Kakkar, 2021Lobato et al., 2020Pantazi et al., 2021Rossini et al., 2021Ståhl and van Prooijen, 2018Tandoc et al., 2021Traberg and van der Linden, 2022van der Linden et al., 2020van Prooijen et al., 2015Vegetti and Mancosu, 2020 | Anthony and Moulding, 2019Douglas et al., 2016Enders and Smallpage, 2019Garrett and Weeks, 2017Georgiou et al., 2020Jasinskaja-Lahti and Jetten, 2019Lobato et al., 2020MacFarlane et al., 2021Marchlewska et al., 2019Marques et al., 2022Na et al., 2018Šrol et al., 2021Ståhl and van Prooijen, 2018Su, 2021Swami et al., 2016 | Amazeen and Bucy, 2019Blom, 2021Bowyer and Kahne, 2019Buchanan, 2020Calvillo et al., 2020Gerosa et al., 2021Grebe and Nattrass, 2012Oh and Lee, 2019Pennycook et al., 2020Pickles et al., 2021Rossini et al., 2021Vegetti and Mancosu, 2020Wang et al.,2020Weeks, 2015Zimmermann and Kohring, 2020 | Federico et al., 2018Georgiou et al., 2020Graeupner and Coman, 2017Grebe and Nattrass, 2012Jolley et al., 2018Kofta et al., 2020Na et al., 2018Oh and Lee, 2019Poon et al., 2020Sanchez and Dunning, 2021Šrol et al., 2021Swami et al., 2016van Prooijen et al., 2022Weeks, 2015Yu et al., 2021 | Ahmed, 2021Allington et al., 2021Bae, 2020Buchanan and Kempley, 2021Effron and Raj, 2020Enders et al., 2021Hollander, 2018MacFarlane et al., 2021Neyazi and Muhtadi, 2021Nisbet and Kamenchuk, 2021Rossini et al., 2021Su, 2021Tandoc et al., 2021 | Allington et al., 2020Douglas et al., 2016Georgiou et al., 2020Gerosa et al., 2021Grebe and Nattrass, 2012Kuhn et al., 2021Marchlewska et al., 2019Marques et al., 2022Pickles et al., 2021Rossini et al., 2021Swami et al., 2016van Prooijen, 2017 | Hart and Graether, 2018Imhoff and Lamberty, 2018Kofta et al., 2020Šrol et al., 2021van Prooijen, 2017 |

Table B2: Meso and macro level: identified factors and corresponding studies.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Trust & social environment | Culture & collective narcissism | Socio-political & informational environment |
| Anspach and Carlson, 2020Colliander, 2019Green and Douglas, 2018Hollander, 2018Hopp et al., 2020Jasinskaja-Lahti and Jetten, 2019Marques et al., 2022Pickles et al., 2021Šrol et al., 2021Wang et al., 2020Zimmermann and Kohring, 2020 | Adam-Troian et al., 2021Cichocka et al., 2016Lin et al., 2021Marchlewska et al., 2019van Prooijen and Song, 2021 | Humprecht et al., 2020Humprecht et al., 2021 |

**Appendix C**

**Study design overview of included articles**

Table C1: Study designs of included articles.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number of articles | Percentages |
| Using existing theories | 33 | 35% |
| Not theory based | 62 | 65% |
|  |  |  |
| Quantitative method | 94 | 99% |
| Mixed/qualitative method | 1 | 1% |
|  |  |  |
| Experimental design | 30 | 32% |
| Non-experimental design | 65 | 68% |
|  |  |  |
| Crowdsourced sample | 71 | 75% |
| Other sampling methods | 24 | 25% |
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