

Disagreement as a Way to Study Misinformation and its Effects

Damian Hodel¹ and Jevin D. West¹

¹Center for an Informed Public, Information School, University of Washington
hodeld@uw.edu, jevinw@uw.edu

August 16, 2024

1 Article’s lead

Misinformation is considered a significant societal concern due to its associated problems like political polarization, erosion of trust, and public health challenges. However, these broad effects can occur independently of misinformation, illustrating a misalignment with the narrow focus of the prevailing misinformation concept. We propose using disagreement—conflicting attitudes and beliefs—as a more effective framework for studying these effects. This approach, for example, reveals the limitations of current misinformation interventions and offers a method to empirically test whether we are living in a post-truth era.

2 Research questions

- What are the key problems attributed to misinformation (i.e. “misinformation effects”)?
- What are the limitations of the prevailing misinformation framework in analyzing, mitigating, and quantifying these effects?
- Can disagreement serve as a more appropriate framework for studying misinformation effects?

3 Essay summary

- We identify key limitations of the prevailing misinformation concept and propose disagreement as a more appropriate framework, drawing on literature from related

disciplines.

- While misinformation concerns factual information at the individual level, its effects are often shaped by normative factors like identity, values, and social epistemologies, and can manifest at the societal level.
- Identifying misinformation is subjective, complicating automatic measurement and introducing a conflict of interest due to its negative connotation.
- In alignment with misinformation effects, disagreement is driven by normative factors and can occur at both individual and societal levels
- Disagreement is necessary for misinformation effects, but misinformation is not.
- Disagreement framework reveals limitations of current intervention strategies.
- Disagreement can be identified without human judgment, enabling automated measurement of misinformation effects.
- Measurement of disagreement in New York Times letters to the editor from 1950 to 2022 reveals a rise of disagreement since 2006, indicating that misinformation effects may have increased in recent years.
- Disagreement offers better explanations for misinformation effects, improves the development of targeted interventions, and provides a quantifiable method for evaluating them.

4 Implications

Misinformation is considered a significant societal concern [74, 68, 84], yet it remains a vague concept with inconsistent definitions [65, 67, 63, 39] and a weak relationship with the societal or individual problems studied [67]. These problems include polarization, erosion of institutions, problematic behavior, and individual and public health issues [65, 76, 89]. Using these problems as starting point, we propose disagreement as a more productive framework for studying misinformation and its effects.

Given the variety of definitions for misinformation [60, 65], we focus on the prevailing conceptualization: **false and misleading information** about factual matters that—whether intentionally or unintentionally—leads to or reinforces **false beliefs** [e.g. 68, 28, 63, 58, 36], serving as both a cause and effect of the aforementioned problems¹ (Figure 1). We refer to these problems as **misinformation effects** to indicate that they are

¹Therefore, we exclude research that examines inherently harmful information such as toxic or discriminatory language.

assumed to be the effects of the spread of misinformation². While misinformation focuses on factual matters consumed at the individual level, the misinformation effects involve and are shaped by normative and societal factors beyond misinformation itself, such as opinions, values, epistemic positions, social norms, and ingroup and outgroup identity³ (Figure 2). In particular, the inclusion of misleading information makes identifying misinformation a highly context-sensitive and subjective task [79, 60]. This subjectivity, combined with the conceptual misalignment, results in four key limitations for the analysis of misinformation effects [67], the development of intervention strategies [66], and the quantification of effects as a way to evaluate interventions [63].


First, since misinformation is only one of many **interdependent factors** influencing beliefs and other misinformation effects [89, 67], the current analytical framework provides a limited explanation for these effects: someone can hold false beliefs without consuming misinformation [67], and the prevalence of misinformation does not necessarily indicate the prevalence of its effects [63]. Second, this weak relationship with misinformation limits the development of effective intervention strategies to counter misinformation effects and their associated harm [66], with experts sceptical about the efficacy of interventions to misinformation as a way to mitigate its effects [68, 75, 50]. Third, the subjectivity in identifying misinformation, along with its negative connotation, creates a conflict of interest for the researcher and renders misinformation a highly value-laden concept [92, 87, 81, 79]. Fourth, due to the subjectivity in identifying misinformation (and limitations in data), there is no reliable method to quantify misinformation, false beliefs, and misinformation effects [63]. This limitation means we cannot answer straightforward questions such as “Are we seeing less or more misinformation or misinformation effects over time?” For example, many misinformation experts believe we live in a post-truth era [68], but we do not have a method to verify it. The lack of a comprehensive measure contrasts sharply with the widespread concern about misinformation and significantly limits the evaluation of interventions.

Given the limitations of the prevailing misinformation concept, developing a more aligned framework for understanding how misinformation effects emerge, evolve, and can be mitigated is essential. Here, we propose using **disagreement, characterized by conflicting attitudes among individuals and communities**, as an alternative way to study misinformation effects. First, disagreement is a holistic concept that aligns better with misinformation effects. As a consequence, disagreement is necessary for these effects, while the prevalence of misinformation itself or false beliefs is not. Second, disagreement is shaped by **disagreement factors**, such as values, beliefs, and epistemologies, which are

²Based on our analysis, we should refer to these as *disagreement effects*. However, for readability, we will use misinformation effects throughout the paper.

³We are aware that recent studies sometimes use broader analytical frameworks, as we discuss in Section 5.1. However, the primary focus in misinformation research remains on mitigating the spread of false and misleading information [e.g. 88, 66]. Therefore, this is the standard against which we compare our proposed approach.

Proposed framework:



Prevailing framework:




Figure 1: **Disagreement vs. Misinformation**: When studying misinformation effects like vaccine hesitancy and ideological polarization, the presumed causal pathway is that false and misleading information about factual matters consumed at the individual level negatively influences beliefs, leading to these effects. However, the formation of false beliefs and the associated effects are complex, involving a range of interdependent factors beyond just misinformation, including normative and societal elements. The prevailing concept, which focuses on the spread of misinformation, overlooks these broader elements, despite recent research highlighting their significance. In contrast, disagreement is a more holistic concept that explicitly includes these normative and societal factors, offering better explanations for misinformation effects and guiding the development of more effective mitigation strategies.

consistent with factors recent misinformation research has identified as significant contributors to misinformation effects, but they are inherently excluded by the prevailing concept. Third, disagreement acknowledges that individuals with differing values and epistemologies may reach different conclusions about the truth, requiring researchers to assess when disagreement causes harm. Like parents who may not focus on who is right or wrong when their children argue, a disagreement researcher can ignore the topic and still study the social dynamics and effects. Fourth, due to its conceptual alignment and because its identification does not require context analysis, disagreement enables automatic measuring (the risk of) misinformation effects.

Conceptual framework matters. A new concept can reshape how we approach problems and conduct research [55]. Like other bridging concepts, researchers studying misinformation effects can benefit from insights on disagreement from disciplines such as philosophy, computational linguistics, psychology, and political science [e.g. 4, 14, 44, 49]. The disagreement framework adds nuance to analyzing misinformation effects, expands intervention strategies, and offers a method for evaluating them, as detailed in the next three sections.

Misinformation effects




Figure 2: Misinformation effects: Social, political, and psychological phenomena and issues associated with misinformation. These effects involve both factual and normative matters and occur at both individual and societal levels.

Additionally, in Section 5, we demonstrate how this framework addresses three key research questions: Why Republicans are more susceptible to misinformation than Democrats, how to counteract effects like vaccine hesitancy and ideological polarization, and whether we live in a post-truth era.

4.1 Disagreement provides better explanations for misinformation effects

By elevating the conceptual focus from the content of information at the individual level (misinformation) to the overarching epistemic tensions between different communities (disagreement), the analytical framework aligns more effectively with the misinformation ef-

Disagreement factors




Figure 3: Disagreement factors: Reflected in its factors, disagreement inherently incorporates normative and societal elements that prior work have identified as direct or indirect contributors to misinformation effects but overlooked in the prevailing misinformation concept.

fects, see Figure 2. Because disagreement inherently recognizes the significance of normative and societal elements (see Figure 3) and of conflicting attitudes when studying the misinformation effects, it provides distinct explanations when compared to the concept of misinformation, see Table 1. For example, if one is interested in analyzing the influence of (fake) experts on vaccine hesitancy, the misinformation concept requires researchers to explicitly include such interdependent factors [86]. In contrast, the holistic disagreement framework inherently incorporates these elements, compelling researchers to compare and evaluate the significance of individual factors for the misinformation effects under study. Taking its factors such as values, identity, and social epistemologies into consideration, it becomes less surprising why individuals may arrive at conclusions about given data and believe certain ideas that scientists deem misinformation [5, 70]. For instance, misogynists may believe stories that target women, racists may believe stories that target immigrants, or Republicans may be more susceptible to misinformation than Democrats due to their stronger disagreement with science as an institution and its members, see Section 5.5. Understanding the strength, nature, and subject matter of disagreement can help analyze these problems and develop intervention strategies.

4.2 Developing Interventions against Misinformation Effects

Being one of many drivers, addressing misinformation alone will not eliminate the misinformation effects. Despite the significance of other factors, there are relatively fewer studies that focus on interventions at the societal or normative level, such as leveraging social norms and their perception to address collective action problems [66, 18, 41] or increasing trust in institutions [50].

Because the disagreement framework asks distinct questions (see Table 1), it can help identify new interventions for addressing misinformation effects. Additionally, as a holistic framework, it facilitates the balancing of a combination of interdependent strategies, recognizing that individual interventions may have limited impact [68, 54]. To illustrate, we first reevaluate nine well-studied intervention strategies [88] using the disagreement framework Section 5.6). We find that four of these strategies may be less effective because simply being aware of a disagreement does not necessarily change one’s belief [3]. Second, we demonstrate how the questions from Table 1 can be used to develop and balance (new) intervention strategies (Section 5.7). For vaccine hesitancy the proposed framework prompts questions such as ‘What are the reasons for individuals to disagree with governmental recommendations to get vaccinated?’, ‘How can individuals be motivated to get vaccinated while accepting their disagreement with governmental recommendations?’ At times, calling out misinformation can help align beliefs or actions. However, considering disagreement factors, strategies like focusing on shared goals may be more effective [31].

	Misinformation	Disagreement
Conceptualization		
Scope	Factual matters often at individual level, inherently topic-specific.	Broad spectrum: Factual and normative matters, at individual and societal levels, topic-specific and topic-agnostic.
Relationship with effects and associated harm	Misinformation as a cause of misinformation effects. For example, assumption that misinformation about vaccines makes individuals reject vaccines.	Associated harm depends on the matter, nature, and strength of the disagreement. Disagreement strength as a risk indicator for misinformation effects. Disagreement factors as cause of disagreement.
Connotation of concept	Inherently negative which creates conflict of interest for researchers.	Neutral.
Role of researcher	Debater and judge, often required to make (normative) judgments regarding <i>misleadingness</i> or <i>truth</i> .	Can take an independent role studying the phenomenon in a topic-agnostic manner.
Guiding questions and approaches		
Analyzing effects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is considered misinformation? • What is the spread of misinformation? • Why do people share and believe misinformation? • What factors increase/decrease the spread of misinformation? • (Underlying assumption that misinformation is inherently negative) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What communities are disagreeing about what matter (specific/unspecific)? • Why are they disagreeing? • What is the strength of disagreement? (numbers, confidence levels, epistemic positions) • Which disagreement factors are most relevant for the studied effects? • To what extent will disagreement about the topic raise the potential for individual, social, and institutional harm?
Countering effects	How to prevent the spread of misinformation?	What is the healthy extent of disagreement about the given matter? What disagreement factors can be modified to achieve ideal disagreement? How to disagree better?
Measuring effects	Counting instances of misinformation and surveys on false beliefs	Disagreement in text data (e.g. sentiment analysis) or surveys, either directly or by analyzing attitudes (beliefs, values) for conflicts.

Table 1: Comparison of misinformation and disagreement concepts along guiding questions. Unlike misinformation, disagreement is not considered inherently negative and compels the researcher to evaluate when disagreement about a given topic results in associated harm.

4.3 Measuring Misinformation Effects

In January of 2024, the World Economic Forum (WEF) identified misinformation and its effects as one of the top risks faced in this year [85]. How can we determine the long-term effectiveness of intervention strategies, assess whether emergent technologies like artificial intelligence (AI) or social media have increased the problem, or compare its progression between countries [32]?

Due to its subjectivity and context dependency, identifying misinformation requires human judgment and topic analysis (see Section 5.2). As a consequence, measuring misinformation can only be done for known narratives and requires significant effort [63]. Even approaches leveraging AI rely on human-labeled datasets used for pretraining such models. These limitations contrast sharply with the considered concern and rapid dissemination. Moreover, when viewing misinformation as a general, unspecific problem—for example, the concern that we live in a post-truth era [68]—there is currently no approach to track its change over time other than relying on the opinions of experts [68].

Quantifying the (risk of) misinformation effects through disagreement strength instead of counting misinformation comes with two key advantages: First, its independence of context allows to automate measurements across topics and times, in particular, it enables capturing misinformation effects as a general problem, including effects stemming from unknown or emerging narratives (e.g. polarization). Second, if the misinformation effects are more strongly linked to disagreement than to misinformation, as we argue here, it serves as better indicator.

To demonstrate the first advantage, we conduct a longitudinal disagreement measurement in text in letters to the editors of the New York Times (NYT) from 1950 to 2022 [12] based on a lexicon-induced (negative) sentiment analysis approach (Section 5.8). We find increase in disagreement since 2006 which aligns with the prevailing assumption that we live in the post-truth era [68]. While our disagreement measurement did not require any human labeling, the authors of the book *American Conspiracy Theories* [12] manually classified each letter to determine whether it contains misinformation (engagement with conspiracy theories).

Due to the lack of ground truth data for misinformation effects, we can only provide preliminary quantitative evidence that disagreement serves as a better indicator. In the Appendix B.3, we include a comparison between disagreement and misinformation measurements for two longitudinal text datasets (letters to the editors of the NYT and vaccine-related tweets on Twitter). Our analysis reveals a significant correlation, suggesting that both disagreement and misinformation approximate the same effects. Furthermore, we find vaccine-related disagreements aligns with vaccine hesitancy over time [46, 83]. Likely, the ideal measure depends on the research endeavour and might even be a combination of various approaches, whereas disagreement offers a method for longitudinal, cross-national, and topic-agnostic analyses of misinformation effects, addressing a need identified by experts

[68].

4.4 Recommendations for Misinformation Researchers

Identifying and studying misinformation is complex, subjective, and context-sensitive. Some scholars argue that misinformation should not be studied at all [92], while others call for clear, context-free definitions [90]. We propose a different approach: incorporating context by replacing the misinformation framework with the disagreement framework. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is neither to challenge misinformation research nor discourage researchers from adopting a normative stance [5]. Studying disagreement is like studying the climate (e.g. earth temperature). Both are inherently neutral phenomena, but they can become problematic when they change or reach certain levels, making it crucial for researchers to understand how their intensity relates to potential harm. Furthermore, it allows to distinguish between beliefs conflicting with scientific consensus (e.g. 'vaccines cause autism'), actions deemed unreasonable by science (e.g. vaccine hesitancy), and social issues arising from conflicting viewpoints independent of science (e.g. rumors, polarization). This framework acknowledges that today's misinformation may become accepted knowledge in the future and vice versa, as history has shown.

Social crises drive social resistance inevitably resulting in disagreement, but often also leading to rumors, false beliefs, and misinformation [23]. Whether disagreement drives positive change (e.g., women's rights, Black Lives Matter) or negative outcomes (e.g., vaccine opposition, distrust in democracy) depends on the researcher's epistemology and values — analogous to the evaluation whether a specific belief is right or wrong. When using the disagreement framework, we recommend that researchers explicitly define the claims and topics they are studying, as well as the potential harmful consequences of disagreement at both individual and societal levels.

5 Findings

5.1 Qualitative Finding 1: Conceptual misalignment between the narrow focus of misinformation and the broad spectrum of misinformation effects.

The focus on misinformation and its underlying causal pathway (misinformation-individuals holding false beliefs-misinformation effects) does not account for the temporal and positional relativity of *truth* and fails to capture the normative and societal contributors to misinformation effects. For certain misinformation effects such as polarization or rumors, the current concept is not merely narrow, but also misdirected. Most obviously, excluding the individuals holding *true* beliefs, overlooks the impact that conflicting viewpoints (from experts and peers) have on our understanding of knowledge and belief. Adopting

an attitude in favor of specific (mis)information not only positions oneself *for* a particular community but also *against* the opposing one [47].

Figure 2 categorizes misinformation effects based on their matter (factual and normative) and level of occurrence (individual and societal). For example, ideological polarization is defined as “a situation under which opinions on an issue are opposed to some theoretical maximum” [53]. By definition, this corresponds to an effect involving normative matters (opinions) at the societal level, which does not necessarily require the presence of misinformation or false beliefs. While effects like problematic behavior due to false beliefs can occur at the individual level, effects like polarization, rumors, and environmental issues only manifest when a large number of people are involved. Moreover, many effects, such as rumors, polarization, distrust, and psychological effects such as distress and discomfort [76, 78, 7], do not primarily hinge on individuals holding *false* beliefs but rather on individuals or communities holding *conflicting* attitudes. These misinformation effects become problematic only when associated activities cause harm. For instance, polarization or distrust in institutions can be beneficial to a certain extent. The concept of misinformation, often seen as inherently negative, fails to acknowledge these nuances.

Given the broad range of social, political, and psychological phenomena representing misinformation effects, it becomes evident that **interdependent factors beyond misinformation** significantly influence these effects [38]. For example, a survey among misinformation experts highlight partisanship, identity, confirmation bias, motivated reasoning, and distrust in institutions as major contributors [68]. While sometimes acknowledged as context, they are often only peripherally considered as contributors to the spread of misinformation rather than directly to its effects. Our literature review suggests that these factors are as crucial as misinformation itself and should be directly incorporated into analyses. Figure 3 categorizes these factors by their nature and level of occurrence. They include opinions [51, 30, 61, 59], the epistemic position of individuals who hold true or false belief such as experts [43], fake-experts, [71, 62, 22], and influencers in general [37], dispositional beliefs [67], the framing of information and experiences [93, 77, 1], ingroup and outgroup identity [91, 68, 47], number of people involved in disagreement related to social norms and perceived norms [82, 52, 41], shared and conflicting values and aesthetics [66], attitudes [78, 80], social epistemologies [90, 42, 70, 24, 33], trust in institutions [72], disagreeing views [79, 73] and so on.

5.2 Qualitative Finding 2: Identifying misinformation relies on human judgment.

The conceptual misalignment has expanded the focus from scientifically false information to misleading information. However, whether information is misleading or not, is not self-evident but context-dependent and subject to researchers’ judgment. Information is categorized as false only when assessed within a community that holds the *true* belief, and vice versa. Consequently, there is no reliable procedure to identify misinformation [79],

limits the approaches to automate quantification of misinformation and its effects [63]. Furthermore, in combination with the negative connotation of misinformation, it creates a conflict of interest for researchers [79, 92], tempting them to classify only ideas they disbelieve as misinformation.

5.3 Qualitative Finding 3: Disagreement aligns with misinformation effects.

In alignment with misinformation effects, disagreement is shaped by disagreement factors, involving both factual and normative matters like opinions, values, and beliefs [27, 11, 70] and can occur at both individual and societal levels. Unlike misinformation, it acknowledges the significance of conflicting attitudes in studying and mitigating misinformation effects [73], making it a necessary condition for these effects.

Disagreement occurs when at least two individuals adopt conflicting doxastic (belief-related)⁴ attitudes toward the same content [40]. These attitudes—belief, disbelief, and suspension of judgment—can vary in confidence. The strength of disagreement depends on the disparity in attitudes, confidence levels, and the number of people involved, serving as a risk indicator for misinformation effects, as discussed in Section 4.3. **Disagreement factors**, which create and influence disagreements, correspond with contributors to misinformation effects, see Figure 3. Misinformation can be seen as a disagreement factor that corresponds to *evidence* [27].

Unlike misinformation, disagreement does not inherently carry a negative connotation⁵, making it less value-laden and allowing for analysis without normative judgment. This neutral perspective accommodates the temporal and positional relativity of *truth*, offering a neutral definition of misinformation and false beliefs as conflicting information and opposing attitudes. This is particularly relevant for misinformation effects that do not fit a simple true/false dichotomy, such as polarization, rumors, and negative psychological effects.

5.4 Qualitative Finding 4: Disagreement is necessary for misinformation effects while misinformation itself is not.

In the concept of misinformation, individuals holding false beliefs link misinformation to its effects. However, *false* beliefs cannot exist without *true* beliefs held by others, leading to a disagreement between those who believe the misinformation and those who do not—forming two disagreeing communities. Typically, researchers align with the true-belief community. Instead of dividing by false/true beliefs, communities can also be split

⁴Other types of conflicting attitudes can be converted to a doxastic disagreement [40]

⁵Important to note: Not all misinformation has a negative impact, despite its negative connotation. For example, falsely claiming a sports event like the Olympics occurred in a different location may not cause harm.

between those benefiting from and those harmed by the misinformation. For example, the claim that vaccines cause autism aligns with the views of those who believe vaccines are unsafe. These divided communities are crucial; misinformation only matters if some believe it, while new ideas accepted by everyone and in particular the scientific community are considered knowledge gain, not false belief. Hence, disagreement is necessary (but not sufficient) for false belief and the misinformation effects⁶.

5.5 Qualitative Finding 5: Republicans are more susceptible to misinformation due their disagreement with science

Studies indicate that Republicans are more susceptible to misinformation than Democrats [e.g. 47, 33]. The disagreement framework helps explain this difference. Republicans tend to disagree more with the scientific community, which defines what is considered true or misleading information [45, 35]. Differences in values, beliefs, and epistemic methods lead to varying conclusions about which information is relevant, which questions to ask, and how to interpret data [2, 5, 70], explaining why Republicans often differ from scientists in assessing information veracity. Conversely, if individuals with values and epistemologies more aligned with Republicans were responsible for distinguishing between true and false information, Democrats could be perceived as more susceptible to misinformation. However, we do not argue that misinformation or false beliefs are arbitrary or unworthy of study, as discussed in Section 4.4.

5.6 Qualitative Finding 6: Disagreement framework reveals limitations of current intervention strategies.

We reevaluate nine main intervention strategies from a recent high-profile paper [88] viewed within the disagreement framework. Four of these strategies (row 3 in Table 2) may be less effective because they merely inform individuals that other individuals, communities and institutions (e.g. science, media, government) disagree with their beliefs. However, simply being aware of a disagreement does not necessarily change an individual’s belief [3, 34]; it largely depends on their epistemic relationship with the disagreeing community [10]. If individuals do not perceive peers, fact-checkers, scientists, or the majority (social norm) as epistemically superior (better positioned for judgment), it is reasonable for them to remain steadfast in their beliefs. Thus, if individuals disagree with science, such as on the safety of vaccines, there are broadly three possible explanations: they are not aware of the scientific consensus on vaccine safety, they do not perceive scientists as epistemic superior, or they do not respond to disagreement in a reasonable way—unreasonable from a scientific perspective. Regardless of someone’s relationship with the disagreeing community, intervention strategies like media literacy tips can help reduce disagreement by aligning individual epistemologies with scientific epistemology.

⁶False belief is necessary but not sufficient for misinformation

Misinformation intervention type	Disagreement framework (disagreement factors in bold)
Accuracy prompts, Friction, Lateral reading and verification strategies	Providing additional time and nudging individuals to collect more evidence
Media literacy tips	Alignment of epistemology , increase in ability to make a judgment
Inoculation, Warning and fact-checking labels, Source-credibility labels, Debunking and rebuttals, e.g., stating the truth, Social norms	These strategies largely make individuals aware of a disagreement, which does not necessarily change one’s beliefs.
Debunking and rebuttals, e.g., offering explanation to the data	Providing additional evidence .

Table 2: Nine main misinformation interventions [88] recast and reevaluated applying the disagreement framework. Similar interventions are grouped together, while the “Debunking and rebuttals” intervention is split into two rows, as its evaluation with the disagreement framework depends on the specific execution.

5.7 Qualitative Finding 7: Disagreement offers new intervention strategies exemplified for vaccine hesitancy and ideological polarization

Mitigating the spread of misinformation about vaccines and other factual matters *can* help decrease effects such as vaccine hesitancy or ideological polarization. However, there are many other reasons beyond false beliefs why individuals might disagree with governmental recommendations to get vaccinated or why societies might develop strongly opposed opinions [53]. In the appendix A, we demonstrate how the guiding questions related to disagreement (Table 1) can help identifying and balancing intervention tactics.

5.8 Quantitative Finding 1: Disagreement increased since 2006

Disagreement offers a way to measure the risk of misinformation effects. Based on the widely-accepted idea that we live in the age of misinformation [68], we expect general, unspecific disagreement to be higher in the current decade compared to previous times. Figure 4 shows the time series of yearly disagreement scores from 1950 to 2022 in letters to the editors of the NYT [12]. The disagreement increased since 2006 providing preliminary evidence for the idea that effects of misinformation have increased in the past years.

To further test the hypothesis of a post-truth era, a similar disagreement measurement




Figure 4: Normalized disagreement score in the letters to the editor of the NYT from 1950 to 2022 for about 1,000 letters per year. Disagreement increased since 2006.

could be conducted using newspapers from countries where misinformation is assumed to be less problematic, such as Germany [32]. Additionally, general disagreement can be analyzed through surveys, either by directly assessing perceived disagreement or indirectly through questions about values, beliefs, and interests.

6 Methods

6.1 Qualitative findings

Our starting question was how to measure the scale of the misinformation problem. In reviewing the literature on this topic, we identified a conceptual misalignment between misinformation (cause) and the problems under study (effects). Furthermore, we realized that the unspecific “misinformation problem,” as it is often conceptualized, cannot be measured through misinformation alone due to its topic-dependency and subjectivity. Subsequent literature review on the interdependent factors contributing to the spread of misinformation and its effects, along with literature on belief formation and epistemology,

helped us to identify disagreement as a more appropriate framework.

6.2 Disagreement measurement

Computer linguistics offer a range of approaches to measure disagreement in texts [14, 9, 17, 21, 44]. We use an automatic and scalable approach based on lexicon-induced (negative) sentiment analysis to measure disagreement in text of the letters to the editors of the NYT. For the years 1950-2007, we use letters from [12] to compare with their manually derived yearly misinformation score and expand the dataset with letters accessed through ProQuest⁷ to extend the coverage to 2022. Disagreement is measured by averaging the negative sentiment scores of about 1,000 letters per year, normalized to a scale between 0 and 1 across all years. The approach is detailed in the Appendix B along a longitudinal disagreement measurement of vaccine-related tweets.

7 Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

Our argument for using disagreement over the misinformation concept is based on a fundamental comparison of common notions of both concepts. We define disagreement in a basic, intuitive way [40], where at least two individuals hold different attitudes or confidence levels toward a specific proposition. We do not explore other notions of disagreement [40], leaving the ideal definition for studying misinformation effects to future research.

We also introduce disagreement measurement as a risk indicator for misinformation effects. The outcome and interpretation depend heavily on the method and the social ecosystem analyzed. Our approach measures expressed disagreement in aggregated text data, which majority attitudes and neglects minority perspectives in society. Using negative sentiment analysis provides a rough estimate suitable for longitudinal comparison, but more accurate and nuanced measures should be developed in future research. Therefore, we view our empirical results as a demonstration rather than a benchmark for disagreement measurement.

References

- [1] Erving Goffman. *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Harvard University Press, 1974.
- [2] Helen E Longino. *The fate of knowledge*. Princeton University Press, 2002.
- [3] Thomas Kelly. “7. The Epistemic Significance of Disagreement”. en. In: *Oxford Studies in Epistemology Volume 1* (2005).

⁷<https://www.proquest.com/>

- [4] David Christensen. “Epistemology of Disagreement: The Good News”. In: *The Philosophical Review* 116.2 (Apr. 1, 2007), pp. 187–217. ISSN: 0031-8108, 1558-1470. DOI: 10.1215/00318108-2006-035.
- [5] Heather Douglas. *Science, policy, and the value-free ideal*. University of Pittsburgh Pre, 2009.
- [6] Stefano Baccianella, Andrea Esuli, Fabrizio Sebastiani, et al. “Sentiwordnet 3.0: an enhanced lexical resource for sentiment analysis and opinion mining.” In: *Lrec*. Vol. 10. 2010. 2010, pp. 2200–2204.
- [7] Remus Ilies et al. “A within-individual study of interpersonal conflict as a work stressor: Dispositional and situational moderators”. en. In: *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 32.1 (Jan. 2011), pp. 44–64. ISSN: 0894-3796, 1099-1379. DOI: 10.1002/job.677.
- [8] Andrew Maas et al. “Learning word vectors for sentiment analysis”. In: *Proceedings of the 49th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics: Human language technologies*. 2011, pp. 142–150.
- [9] Amita Misra and Marilyn Walker. *Topic Independent Identification of Agreement and Disagreement in Social Media Dialogue*. Aug. 22, 2013. arXiv: 1709.00661 [cs].
- [10] Bryan Frances. *Disagreement*. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
- [11] Cathrine Holst. “Expertise and Democracy”. In: (2014).
- [12] Joseph E. Uscinski and Joseph M. Parent. *American Conspiracy Theories*. Oxford University Press, 2014. 235 pp. ISBN: 978-0-19-935180-0.
- [13] Xiang Ji et al. “Twitter sentiment classification for measuring public health concerns”. In: *Social Network Analysis and Mining* 5.1 (Dec. 2015), p. 13. ISSN: 1869-5450, 1869-5469. DOI: 10.1007/s13278-015-0253-5.
- [14] Sara Rosenthal and Kathy McKeown. “I Couldn’t Agree More: The Role of Conversational Structure in Agreement and Disagreement Detection in Online Discussions”. In: *Proceedings of the 16th Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue*. Proceedings of the 16th Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue. Prague, Czech Republic: Association for Computational Linguistics, 2015, pp. 168–177. DOI: 10.18653/v1/W15-4625.
- [15] Gayane Shalunts and Gerhard Backfried. “SentiSAIL: sentiment analysis in English, German and Russian”. In: *Machine Learning and Data Mining in Pattern Recognition: 11th International Conference, MLDM 2015, Hamburg, Germany, July 20-21, 2015, Proceedings 11*. Springer. 2015, pp. 87–97.
- [16] Fabiana Zollo et al. “Emotional Dynamics in the Age of Misinformation”. In: *PLOS ONE* 10.9 (Sept. 30, 2015). Ed. by Tobias Preis, e0138740. ISSN: 1932-6203. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0138740.

- [17] Isabelle Augenstein et al. “Stance Detection with Bidirectional Conditional Encoding”. In: *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. Austin, Texas: Association for Computational Linguistics, 2016, pp. 876–885. DOI: 10.18653/v1/D16-1084.
- [18] Karine Nyborg et al. “Social norms as solutions”. en. In: *Science* 354.6308 (Oct. 2016), pp. 42–43. ISSN: 0036-8075, 1095-9203. DOI: 10.1126/science.aaf8317.
- [19] Alaettin Ucan et al. “SentiWordNet for new language: automatic translation approach”. In: *2016 12th International Conference on Signal-Image Technology & Internet-Based Systems (SITIS)*. IEEE. 2016, pp. 308–315.
- [20] Lu Wang and Claire Cardie. *Improving Agreement and Disagreement Identification in Online Discussions with A Socially-Tuned Sentiment Lexicon*. June 17, 2016. arXiv: 1606.05706 [cs].
- [21] Hareesh Bahuleyan and Olga Vechtomova. “UWaterloo at SemEval-2017 Task 8: Detecting Stance towards Rumours with Topic Independent Features”. In: *Proceedings of the 11th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2017)*. Proceedings of the 11th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2017). Vancouver, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics, 2017, pp. 461–464. DOI: 10.18653/v1/S17-2080.
- [22] Stephan Lewandowsky, Ullrich K. H. Ecker, and John Cook. “Beyond misinformation: Understanding and coping with the “post-truth” era.” In: *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition* 6.4 (Dec. 2017), pp. 353–369. ISSN: 2211-369X, 2211-3681. DOI: 10.1016/j.jarmac.2017.07.008.
- [23] Jan-Willem van Prooijen and Karen M Douglas. “Conspiracy theories as part of history: The role of societal crisis situations”. In: *Memory Studies* 10.3 (July 1, 2017). Publisher: SAGE Publications, pp. 323–333. ISSN: 1750-6980. DOI: 10.1177/1750698017701615.
- [24] Joshua Wakeham. “Bullshit as a Problem of Social Epistemology”. en. In: *Sociological Theory* 35.1 (Mar. 2017), pp. 15–38. ISSN: 0735-2751, 1467-9558. DOI: 10.1177/0735275117692835.
- [25] Xiaodong Cao et al. “Using Twitter to Better Understand the Spatiotemporal Patterns of Public Sentiment: A Case Study in Massachusetts, USA”. In: *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 15.2 (Feb. 2, 2018), p. 250. ISSN: 1660-4601. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph15020250.
- [26] Jacob Devlin et al. “BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding”. In: *CoRR* abs/1810.04805 (2018). arXiv: 1810.04805.
- [27] Bryan Frances and Jonathan Matheson. “Disagreement (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)”. In: (Feb. 23, 2018). Last Modified: 2018-02-23.

- [28] David M. J. Lazer et al. “The science of fake news”. In: *Science* 359.6380 (Mar. 9, 2018). Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science, pp. 1094–1096. DOI: 10.1126/science.aao2998.
- [29] Cameron Musco, Christopher Musco, and Charalampos E. Tsourakakis. “Minimizing Polarization and Disagreement in Social Networks”. In: *Proceedings of the 2018 World Wide Web Conference on World Wide Web - WWW '18*. the 2018 World Wide Web Conference. Lyon, France: ACM Press, 2018, pp. 369–378. ISBN: 978-1-4503-5639-8. DOI: 10.1145/3178876.3186103.
- [30] Alessio Facciola et al. “Vaccine Hesitancy: An Overview on Parents’ Opinions about Vaccination and Possible Reasons of Vaccine Refusal”. In: *Journal of Public Health Research* 8.1 (Mar. 11, 2019), jphr.2019.1436. ISSN: 2279-9036, 2279-9036. DOI: 10.4081/jphr.2019.1436.
- [31] Batya Friedman and David G Hendry. *Value sensitive design: Shaping technology with moral imagination*. Mit Press, 2019.
- [32] Edda Humprecht. “Where ‘fake news’ flourishes: a comparison across four Western democracies”. In: *Information, Communication & Society* 22.13 (Nov. 10, 2019), pp. 1973–1988. ISSN: 1369-118X, 1468-4462. DOI: 10.1080/1369118X.2018.1474241.
- [33] Gordon Pennycook and David G. Rand. “Lazy, not biased: Susceptibility to partisan fake news is better explained by lack of reasoning than by motivated reasoning”. en. In: *Cognition* 188 (July 2019), pp. 39–50. ISSN: 00100277. DOI: 10.1016/j.cognition.2018.06.011.
- [34] Brian G. Southwell et al. “Misinformation as a Misunderstood Challenge to Public Health”. en. In: *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 57.2 (Aug. 2019), pp. 282–285. ISSN: 07493797. DOI: 10.1016/j.amepre.2019.03.009.
- [35] John H. Evans and Eszter Hargittai. “Who Doesn’t Trust Fauci? The Public’s Belief in the Expertise and Shared Values of Scientists in the COVID-19 Pandemic”. en. In: *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World* 6 (Jan. 2020), p. 237802312094733. ISSN: 2378-0231, 2378-0231. DOI: 10.1177/2378023120947337.
- [36] Edda Humprecht, Frank Esser, and Peter Van Aelst. “Resilience to Online Disinformation: A Framework for Cross-National Comparative Research”. In: *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 25.3 (July 2020), pp. 493–516. ISSN: 1940-1612, 1940-1620. DOI: 10.1177/1940161219900126.
- [37] Zoe Lofft. “When social media met nutrition: How influencers spread misinformation, and why we believe them”. In: *Health Science Inquiry* 11.1 (Aug. 10, 2020), pp. 56–61. ISSN: 2562-7791. DOI: 10.29173/hsi319.

- [38] Brian G. Southwell, Jamie L. Wood, and Ann Marie Navar. “Roles for Health Care Professionals in Addressing Patient-Held Misinformation Beyond Fact Correction”. en. In: *American Journal of Public Health* 110.S3 (Oct. 2020), S288–S289. ISSN: 0090-0036, 1541-0048. DOI: 10.2105/AJPH.2020.305729.
- [39] Emily K. Vraga and Leticia Bode. “Defining Misinformation and Understanding its Bounded Nature: Using Expertise and Evidence for Describing Misinformation”. In: *Political Communication* 37.1 (Jan. 2, 2020), pp. 136–144. ISSN: 1058-4609, 1091-7675. DOI: 10.1080/10584609.2020.1716500.
- [40] Dan Zeman. “Minimal Disagreement”. In: *Philosophia* 48.4 (Sept. 2020), pp. 1649–1670. ISSN: 0048-3893, 1574-9274. DOI: 10.1007/s11406-020-00184-8.
- [41] Simge Andi and Jesper Akesson. “Nudging Away False News: Evidence from a Social Norms Experiment”. en. In: *Digital Journalism* 9.1 (Jan. 2021), pp. 106–125. ISSN: 2167-0811, 2167-082X. DOI: 10.1080/21670811.2020.1847674.
- [42] Sven Bernecker, Amy K Flowerree, and Thomas Grundmann. *The epistemology of fake news*. Oxford University Press, 2021.
- [43] Alexandra Bongiorno. “The Battle Between Expertise and Misinformation to Influence Public Opinion: A Focus on the Anti-Vaccination Movement”. en. In: (2021).
- [44] Wout S Lamers et al. “Investigating disagreement in the scientific literature”. In: *eLife* 10 (Dec. 24, 2021). Ed. by Peter Rodgers. Publisher: eLife Sciences Publications, Ltd, e72737. ISSN: 2050-084X. DOI: 10.7554/eLife.72737.
- [45] John J Lee. “Party Polarization and Trust in Science: What about Democrats?” en. In: (2021).
- [46] Ran Liu and Gabriel Miao Li. “Hesitancy in the time of coronavirus: Temporal, spatial, and sociodemographic variations in COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy”. In: *SSM - Population Health* 15 (Sept. 2021), p. 100896. ISSN: 23528273. DOI: 10.1016/j.ssmph.2021.100896.
- [47] Andrea Pereira, Elizabeth Harris, and Jay J Van Bavel. “Identity concerns drive belief: The impact of partisan identity on the belief and dissemination of true and false news”. en. In: *Group Processes* (June 2021).
- [48] Myrthe Reuver et al. *Is Stance Detection Topic-Independent and Cross-topic Generalizable? – A Reproduction Study*. Oct. 14, 2021. arXiv: 2110.07693[cs].
- [49] Maxwell Weinzierl, Suellen Hopfer, and Sanda M. Harabagiu. “Misinformation Adoption or Rejection in the Era of COVID-19”. In: *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media* 15 (May 22, 2021), pp. 787–795. ISSN: 2334-0770, 2162-3449. DOI: 10.1609/icwsm.v15i1.18103.
- [50] Alberto Acerbi, Sacha Altay, and Hugo Mercier. “Research note: Fighting misinformation or fighting for information?” en. In: *Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review* (Jan. 2022). DOI: 10.37016/mr-2020-87.

- [51] Camilla Ancona et al. “A model-based opinion dynamics approach to tackle vaccine hesitancy”. In: *Scientific Reports* 12.1 (July 12, 2022), p. 11835. ISSN: 2045-2322. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-022-15082-0.
- [52] Giulia Andrighetto and Eva Vriens. “A research agenda for the study of social norm change”. en. In: *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* 380.2227 (July 2022), p. 20200411. ISSN: 1364-503X, 1471-2962. DOI: 10.1098/rsta.2020.0411.
- [53] Cheuk Hang Au, Kevin K. W. Ho, and Dickson K.W. Chiu. “The Role of Online Misinformation and Fake News in Ideological Polarization: Barriers, Catalysts, and Implications”. en. In: *Information Systems Frontiers* 24.4 (Aug. 2022), pp. 1331–1354. ISSN: 1387-3326, 1572-9419. DOI: 10.1007/s10796-021-10133-9.
- [54] Joseph B. Bak-Coleman et al. “Combining interventions to reduce the spread of viral misinformation”. In: *Nature Human Behaviour* 6.10 (June 23, 2022), pp. 1372–1380. ISSN: 2397-3374. DOI: 10.1038/s41562-022-01388-6.
- [55] Andrew Chadwick and James Stanyer. “Deception as a Bridging Concept in the Study of Disinformation, Misinformation, and Misperceptions: Toward a Holistic Framework”. en. In: *Communication Theory* 32.1 (Jan. 2022), pp. 1–24. ISSN: 1050-3293, 1468-2885. DOI: 10.1093/ct/qtab019.
- [56] Momchil Hardalov et al. *A Survey on Stance Detection for Mis- and Disinformation Identification*. May 8, 2022. arXiv: 2103.00242[cs].
- [57] K. Hayawi et al. “ANTi-Vax: a novel Twitter dataset for COVID-19 vaccine misinformation detection”. In: *Public Health* 203 (Feb. 2022), pp. 23–30. ISSN: 00333506. DOI: 10.1016/j.puhe.2021.11.022.
- [58] Ian Kennedy et al. *Repeat Spreaders and Election Delegitimization: A Comprehensive Dataset of Misinformation Tweets from the 2020 U.S. Election*. preprint. SocArXiv, June 2, 2022. DOI: 10.31235/osf.io/pgv2x.
- [59] Namkje Koudenburg and Yoshihisa Kashima. “A Polarized Discourse: Effects of Opinion Differentiation and Structural Differentiation on Communication”. In: *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 48.7 (July 2022), pp. 1068–1086. ISSN: 0146-1672, 1552-7433. DOI: 10.1177/01461672211030816.
- [60] Nicole M. Krause, Isabelle Freiling, and Dietram A. Scheufele. “The “Infodemic” Infodemic: Toward a More Nuanced Understanding of Truth-Claims and the Need for (Not) Combatting Misinformation”. en. In: *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 700.1 (Mar. 2022), pp. 112–123. ISSN: 0002-7162, 1552-3349. DOI: 10.1177/00027162221086263.
- [61] Qian Niu et al. “Public Opinion and Sentiment Before and at the Beginning of COVID-19 Vaccinations in Japan: Twitter Analysis”. In: *JMIR Infodemiology* 2.1 (May 9, 2022), e32335. ISSN: 2564-1891. DOI: 10.2196/32335.

- [62] Hannah Schmid-Petri and Moritz Bürger. “The effect of misinformation and inoculation: Replication of an experiment on the effect of false experts in the context of climate change communication”. In: *Public Understanding of Science* 31.2 (Feb. 2022), pp. 152–167. ISSN: 0963-6625, 1361-6609. DOI: 10.1177/09636625211024550.
- [63] Brian G. Southwell et al. “Defining and Measuring Scientific Misinformation”. In: *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 700.1 (Mar. 1, 2022). Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc, pp. 98–111. ISSN: 0002-7162. DOI: 10.1177/00027162221084709.
- [64] Joseph Uscinski et al. “Have beliefs in conspiracy theories increased over time?” In: *PLOS ONE* 17.7 (July 20, 2022). Ed. by Sean Eric Richey, e0270429. ISSN: 1932-6203. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0270429.
- [65] Zoë Adams et al. “(Why) Is Misinformation a Problem?” In: (2023).
- [66] Zhila Aghajari, Eric P. S. Baumer, and Dominic DiFranzo. “Reviewing Interventions to Address Misinformation: The Need to Expand Our Vision Beyond an Individualistic Focus”. In: *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 7 (CSCW1 Apr. 14, 2023), pp. 1–34. ISSN: 2573-0142. DOI: 10.1145/3579520.
- [67] Sacha Altay, Manon Berriche, and Alberto Acerbi. “Misinformation on Misinformation: Conceptual and Methodological Challenges”. In: *Social Media* (2023).
- [68] Sacha Altay et al. “A survey of expert views on misinformation: Definitions, determinants, solutions, and future of the field”. In: *Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review* (July 27, 2023). DOI: 10.37016/mr-2020-119.
- [69] Rosario Catelli et al. “Lexicon-based sentiment analysis to detect opinions and attitude towards COVID-19 vaccines on Twitter in Italy”. In: *Computers in Biology and Medicine* 158 (May 2023), p. 106876. ISSN: 00104825. DOI: 10.1016/j.combiomed.2023.106876.
- [70] Katherine Furman. “Epistemic Bunkers”. en. In: *Social Epistemology* 37.2 (Mar. 2023), pp. 197–207. ISSN: 0269-1728, 1464-5297. DOI: 10.1080/02691728.2022.2122756.
- [71] Mallory J. Harris et al. *The role and influence of perceived experts in an anti-vaccine misinformation community*. preprint. Public and Global Health, July 13, 2023. DOI: 10.1101/2023.07.12.23292568.
- [72] Edda Humprrecht. “The Role of Trust and Attitudes toward Democracy in the Dissemination of Disinformation—a Comparative Analysis of Six Democracies”. en. In: *Digital Journalism* (May 2023), pp. 1–18. ISSN: 2167-0811, 2167-082X. DOI: 10.1080/21670811.2023.2200196.

- [73] Honorata Mazepus et al. “Information battleground: Conflict perceptions motivate the belief in and sharing of misinformation about the adversary”. In: *PLOS ONE* 18.3 (Mar. 22, 2023). Ed. by Sara Rubinelli, e0282308. ISSN: 1932-6203. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0282308.
- [74] Tina McCorkindale. *2023 IPR-Leger Disinformation in Society Report — Institute for Public Relations*. Nov. 1, 2023. URL: <https://instituteforpr.org/2023-ipr-leger-disinformation/> (visited on 11/20/2023).
- [75] Gillian Murphy et al. “What do we study when we study misinformation? A scoping review of experimental research (2016-2022)”. In: *Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review* (Nov. 15, 2023). DOI: 10.37016/mr-2020-130.
- [76] Yasmim Mendes Rocha et al. “The impact of fake news on social media and its influence on health during the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review”. en. In: *Journal of Public Health* 31.7 (July 2023), pp. 1007–1016. ISSN: 2198-1833, 1613-2238. DOI: 10.1007/s10389-021-01658-z.
- [77] Kate Starbird. “The solution to pervasive misinformation is not better facts, but better frames.” en. In: (2023).
- [78] Mark W. Susmann and Duane T. Wegener. “How Attitudes Impact the Continued Influence Effect of Misinformation: The Mediating Role of Discomfort”. en. In: *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 49.5 (May 2023), pp. 744–757. ISSN: 0146-1672, 1552-7433. DOI: 10.1177/01461672221077519.
- [79] Joseph E Uscinski. “What Are We Doing When We Research Misinformation?” In: 2 (2023).
- [80] Shan Xu et al. “Exposure Effects or Confirmation Bias? Examining Reciprocal Dynamics of Misinformation, Misperceptions, and Attitudes Toward COVID-19 Vaccines”. en. In: *Health Communication* 38.10 (Aug. 2023), pp. 2210–2220. ISSN: 1041-0236, 1532-7027. DOI: 10.1080/10410236.2022.2059802.
- [81] Adrian K. Yee. “Information Deprivation and Democratic Engagement”. en. In: *Philosophy of Science* 90.5 (Dec. 2023), pp. 1110–1119. ISSN: 0031-8248, 1539-767X. DOI: 10.1017/psa.2023.9.
- [82] Zhila Aghajari et al. “Investigating the Mechanisms by which Prevalent Online Community Behaviors Influence Responses to Misinformation: Do Perceived Norms Really Act as a Mediator?” en. In: *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. Honolulu HI USA: ACM, May 2024, pp. 1–14. ISBN: 9798400703300. DOI: 10.1145/3613904.3641939.
- [83] Serina Chang, Adam Fourney, and Eric Horvitz. “Measuring vaccination coverage and concerns of vaccine holdouts from web search logs”. en. In: *Nature Communications* 15.1 (Aug. 2024), p. 6496. ISSN: 2041-1723. DOI: 10.1038/s41467-024-50614-4.

- [84] Ullrich Ecker, Jon Roozenbeek, and Stephan Lewandowsky. “Misinformation remains a threat to democracy”. en. In: (June 2024).
- [85] *Global Risks Report 2024*. en. Jan. 2024.
- [86] Mallory J Harris et al. “Perceived experts are prevalent and influential within an antivaccine community on Twitter”. en. In: *PNAS Nexus* 3.2 (Feb. 2024). Ed. by Katherine Ognyanova, pgae007. ISSN: 2752-6542. DOI: 10.1093/pnasnexus/pgae007.
- [87] Zarine Kharazian, Madeline Jalbert, and Saloni Dash. *Our field was built on decades-old bodies of research across a range of disciplines. It wasn’t invented by a ‘class of misinformation experts’ in 2016*. en-US. Jan. 2024.
- [88] Anastasia Kozyreva et al. “Toolbox of individual-level interventions against online misinformation”. en. In: *Nature Human Behaviour* (May 2024). ISSN: 2397-3374. DOI: 10.1038/s41562-024-01881-0.
- [89] Li Qian Tay et al. “Thinking clearly about misinformation”. In: *Communications Psychology* 2.1 (Jan. 5, 2024), p. 4. ISSN: 2731-9121. DOI: 10.1038/s44271-023-00054-5.
- [90] Joseph Uscinski, Shane Littrell, and Casey Klofstad. “The Importance of Epistemology for the Study of Misinformation”. In: *Current Opinion in Psychology* (Jan. 2024), p. 101789. ISSN: 2352250X. DOI: 10.1016/j.copsyc.2024.101789.
- [91] Jay J. Van Bavel et al. “Updating the identity-based model of belief: From false belief to the spread of misinformation”. In: *Current Opinion in Psychology* 56 (Apr. 2024), p. 101787. ISSN: 2352250X. DOI: 10.1016/j.copsyc.2023.101787.
- [92] Dan Williams. *Misinformation researchers are wrong: There can’t be a science of misleading content*. en. Feb. 2024.
- [93] Himanshu Zade et al. “To Reply or to Quote: Comparing Conversational Framing Strategies on Twitter”. In: *ACM Journal on Computing and Sustainable Societies* 2.1 (Mar. 31, 2024), pp. 1–27. ISSN: 2834-5533. DOI: 10.1145/3625680.

Appendix

A Intervening in vaccine hesitancy and ideological polarization

A.1 Qualitative Finding: Intervening in vaccine hesitancy

In case of vaccine hesitancy, there is strong scientific consensus on the safety and efficacy of vaccines. Misinformation conceptualizes vaccine hesitancy as a result of misinformation about vaccines. In contrast, our proposed framework reframes it as a disagreement about whether one should get vaccinated, between the majority who follow governmental recommendations based on scientific findings and individuals who disagree, for a range of possible reasons, see Table 3. Consequently, If a government strongly advocates for universal vaccination as being in the best interest of both individuals and society, the main focus should be on minimizing disagreements on this issue. Viewing vaccine hesitancy as an issue of disagreement, prompts a variety of analysis questions that allow to test new intervention tactics.

Table 3 lists potential questions for the analysis. Examples include: ‘What are the reasons for individuals to disagree with governmental recommendations to get vaccinated?’, ‘How can individuals be motivated to get vaccinated while accepting their disagreement with governmental recommendations?’, and ‘What are the common values and shared goals among both communities?’ Addressing and correcting misinformation on the individual level is just one of several potential strategies. If individuals hesitate to get vaccinated due to distrust in science and government, publicly calling out misinformation is unlikely to decrease disagreement. Conversely, if hesitation is due to misinterpretation of data (epistemology), media literacy tips may be the right tool. If the primary issue is access to scientific information about vaccines, information campaigns could be the most effective approach. In cases of false dissensus, bolstering the credibility of scientists by showcasing consensus within the scientific community and informing about social norms may be beneficial.

Regardless of individuals’ reasons for refraining from vaccination, fostering agreement between different groups by highlighting shared values and objectives, such as saving lives, can be a useful strategy. For example, social media platforms could append conflicting posts (identified using the disagreement measurement approach) with notes emphasizing shared health goals and values among users [31]. An example message could be: “We observe the circulation of rumors about vaccines. Be aware that we all want to save lives.” There is no definitive answer to the optimal strategy. The key point is that a variety of strategies must be carefully balanced, with a disagreement measurement as shown the next section could assist in evaluating newly identified interventions against vaccine hesitancy.

In case of vaccine hesitancy, there is strong scientific consensus on the safety and efficacy of vaccines. Misinformation conceptualizes vaccine hesitancy as a result of misinformation

	Applying Disagreement to Ideological Polarization	Applying Disagreement to Vaccine Hesitancy
Conceptualization	Polarization is an extreme form of disagreement.	Vaccine hesitancy corresponds to the disagreement about whether one should get vaccinated, while the government, scientific community, and the majority endorse vaccination.
Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At what strength does disagreement become harmful? • Between which communities do we see extreme disagreement? • About what matter do they disagree the most? • What disagreement factors are the main drivers of extreme disagreement? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who are the communities that disagree with the majority backed by science and government? • Why do they disagree? (e.g., distrust in mainstream institutions, agreement with alternative medicine, fear, identity, misinformation) • What is the strength of disagreement? (numbers, confidence levels, experts, fake experts) • Who are the communities that agree with scientific recommendations and why do they agree? (trust, obedience, etc.) • Is it acceptable to disagree with recommendations from science and government (from scientific, moral, and political perspectives)?
Intervention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can the main disagreement factors be controlled? • What policies and social media designs can promote agreement? • How to disagree better? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can individuals be encouraged to get vaccinated despite disagreement with government and science? • How to increase trust in government and science? • What are the agreements among different medical approaches? • What are the shared goals and values among disagreeing communities? (e.g., preventing deaths) • What other factors drive disagreement and how can they be controlled? (e.g., preventing the spread of misinformation)

Table 3: Disagreement framework applied to ideological polarization and vaccine hesitancy

about vaccines. In contrast, our proposed framework reframes it as a disagreement about whether one should get vaccinated, between the majority who follow governmental recommendations based on scientific findings and individuals who disagree, for a range of possible reasons, see Table 3. Consequently, If a government strongly advocates for universal vaccination as being in the best interest of both individuals and society, the main focus should be on minimizing disagreements on this issue. Viewing vaccine hesitancy as an issue of disagreement, prompts a variety of analysis questions that allow to test new intervention tactics.

Table 3 lists potential questions for the analysis. Examples include: ‘What are the reasons for individuals to disagree with governmental recommendations to get vaccinated?’, ‘How can individuals be motivated to get vaccinated while accepting their disagreement with governmental recommendations?’, and ‘What are the common values and shared goals among both communities?’ Addressing and correcting misinformation on the individual level is just one of several potential strategies. If individuals hesitate to get vaccinated due to distrust in science and government, publicly calling out misinformation is unlikely to decrease disagreement. Conversely, if hesitation is due to misinterpretation of data (epistemology), media literacy tips may be the right tool. If the primary issue is access to scientific information about vaccines, information campaigns could be the most effective approach. In cases of false dissensus, bolstering the credibility of scientists by showcasing consensus within the scientific community and informing about social norms may be beneficial.

Regardless of individuals’ reasons for refraining from vaccination, fostering agreement between different groups by highlighting shared values and objectives, such as saving lives, can be a useful strategy. For example, social media platforms could append conflicting posts (identified using the disagreement measurement approach) with notes emphasizing shared health goals and values among users [31]. An example message could be: “We observe the circulation of rumors about vaccines. Be aware that we all want to save lives.” There is no definitive answer to the optimal strategy. The key point is that a variety of strategies must be carefully balanced, with a disagreement measurement as shown in Figure ?? could assist in evaluating newly identified interventions against vaccine hesitancy.

A.2 Qualitative Finding: Intervening ideological polarization

Analogous to vaccine hesitancy, the misinformation framework conceptualizes polarization as a cause of misinformation, hence misleading information about factual matters. However, this concept is somewhat misguided, since polarization is defined as strongly opposed opinions [53]. In contrast, disagreement views ideological polarization as an extreme form of disagreement about any type of matter, as shown in Table 3.

The main goal of decreasing polarization is to ease tensions between opposing groups. Topic analysis, both online and offline, can help identify the matters of disagreement and the involved communities. One approach to counter online polarization could involve modifying the structure of platforms to decrease disagreement [29]. Alternatively, posting notes

stating, “We observe conflicting information on this topic, suggesting the circulation of rumors and misleading content,” may slow down the propagation of conflicting information and decrease polarization. The evaluation of such disagreement-based interventions is left for future research.

B Disagreement Measurements

To illustrate how disagreement measurement can estimate the risk of misinformation effects, we conduct two longitudinal analyses: one on disagreement in letters to the editors of the NYT from 1950 to 2022 [12], and another on disagreement in vaccine-related posts on Twitter from 2020 to 2023. To demonstrate the advantages of measuring disagreement compared to misinformation quantification, we use an automatic and scalable approach based on lexicon-induced negative sentiment analysis.

To determine the negative sentiment of a given text, we calculate the average negative scores of words using SentiWordNet [6]. The rationale for using negative sentiment as a proxy for disagreement is detailed in Section B.1. The method, including its validation against human-labeled sentiment scores, is explained in Section B.2. Finally, in Section z, we validate the disagreement measurement approach as a method to estimate misinformation effects. This section also includes the details of the disagreement measurement results presented in the main body of the paper.

B.1 Negative Sentiment To Automate Disagreement Measurement

To automate misinformation detection and quantification, current approaches rely on machine learning systems trained on manually labeled texts containing misinformation [63]. Similar approaches exist for detecting and counting disagreement [17]. However, such approaches are somewhat context-specific [48] and cannot directly applied to other languages, platforms, and text types. Therefore, we use a simple, lexicon-based approach measuring negative sentiment [20, 69] as a proxy for disagreement. We validate our approach on two datasets, see Appendix.

Although negative sentiment is not the most accurate approach for quantifying disagreement, it is most suitable for our purpose. Here is why: First, because we are not interested in detecting disagreement but tracking changes in a given population over time, it is sufficient when our method converges to stable values in aggregated texts [16]. If the numbers of texts is large enough, even minimal precision is sufficient.

Second and related to the first point, although negative sentiment does only capture expressed negative attitudes (semantics of perspectival expressions) and thus, neglects many other forms of disagreement (e.g. between an individual who holds false belief and a person who suspends judgement), it especially captures disagreement about a matter of high stakes for both interlocutors which generates conflict [40]. We assume that such

disagreements are also more significant for problems studied in misinformation. When a matter is at stake, members of both opposing groups make claims that lead to negative attitudes and expressions from the other group. Let us provide an example in the context of vaccines. People holding a false belief adopt a negative attitude towards propositions such as “Vaccines are dangerous!” while individuals holding true belief disagree with claims such as “No, that’s a lie!” or similar.

Third, although there are many other sociocultural factors than disagreement that affect negative sentiment, it is a suitable proxy for our purpose because many of them relate to the formation of disagreement and misinformation effects. Examples include polarization and the generation of so-called echo chambers [36], economic, cultural, and political crisis [23], public concern [13], well-being [25], etc.

And last, our lexicon-based approach measuring negative sentiment is unlike deep learning approaches explainable [56] and generalizable as such sentiment lexica already exist for various languages [19, 15] or could be created with relatively little effort. We leave the development of better approaches measuring disagreement to future research.

B.2 Negative Sentiment Method

To estimate disagreement, we use negative sentiment scores based on SentiWordNet. SentiWordNet is a lexicon of more than 200,000 words along with their positive, negative, and “objective” scores, explicitly created for sentiment analyses. SentiWordNet assigns each word in its corpus three values corresponding to negative, positive, and objective sentiment. These values range between 0 and 1 and collectively sum to 1. To determine the negative sentiment score of a given text, we use SentiWordNet to calculate the average score. This is done by summing all the negative scores of the words in the text and then dividing by the total number of words. Equation 1 shows the formula for calculating disagreement score d for a given text with N words contained in SentiWordNet. Neg corresponds to the negative sentiment score of the text and neg_i the negative sentiment score for a given word obtained from SentiWordNet.

$$d = Neg = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^N neg_i}{N} \quad (1)$$

We validate our method for both negative sentiment classification and disagreement classification. For negative sentiment classification, we use the IMDB review dataset [50,000 movie reviews 8] and achieve an F1-score and accuracy of 0.65. For disagreement classification, we use the UKP corpus, which contains more than 25,000 sentences along with their corresponding categories (‘no argument,’ ‘support argument,’ ‘oppose argument’), and achieve an F1-score of 0.58 and an accuracy of 0.53. In both experiments, we convert the scores obtained through our method to binary labels by splitting the scores at the median. Correspondingly, we convert UKP categories to binary labels (‘oppose argument’

versus ‘no argument’ or ‘support argument’). This approach allows us to compare the results with those of a random classifier, which would achieve an F1 score of 0.5.

B.2.1 Disagreement in letters to the editors of the NYT

For disagreement in a unspecific context we use the data from [12] on letters to the editor of the NYT. The dataset comprises about 1,000 letters each year. The authors generously provided the scans of the letters analyzed, with one PDF file for each year. Due to the low quality of the PDF scans prior to 1950, we only use data from the subsequent years (1950 to 2007). We expand the dataset with letters accessible through ProQuest⁸ to finally cover the years 1950 to 2022. To determine the yearly disagreement score, we average over a complete year because for the years prior to 2008 only yearly data are available.

B.2.2 Disagreement in Twitter post related to vaccines

For the vaccine-related disagreement measurement, we use posts from Twitter (renamed X in 2023). Each month, between 2020 and 2023, we sample 10,000 posts containing at least one of the keywords listed below. To determine the monthly disagreement scores, we calculate the score for each post using the method introduced above and then average the scores over the 10,000 sampled posts per month.

Vaccine Keywords %vacc%, %vax%, antivax, antivaxxer, c0v1d, c0vid, coronavaccine, coronavirusvaccine, covid passport, covid-19 passport, covid19vaccine, covidvaccine, ex-vaxxer, fauciouchie, gardasil, gardasil, hearthiswell, mandate, mandates, medical racism, new apartheid, novaccine, va((ine, va**ine, vaccinate, vaccinated, vaccination, vaccine, vaccine injury, vaccineinjury, vaccines, vaccinescauseautism, vaccinesharm, vax, vaxx, vaxxed, vaxxedII

B.3 Quantitative Finding: Significant correlation between disagreement and misinformation

We introduced disagreement measurement as an approach to estimate the risk of misinformation effects. Validating such an approach is a non-trivial task due the lack of ground-truth data, i.e. continuous, long-term analysis on misinformation effects. Therefore, we approximate them through misinformation. For misinformation in a unspecific context we use the data from [12]. For each year, the authors manually determined the proportion of letters engaging with conspiracy theories [12, p. 110] which serves as yearly misinformation score. The second dataset consists of Twitter posts containing vaccine-related misinformation on Twitter from 2020 to 2022. To classify the posts in misinformation/non-misinformation we use BERT⁹ [26] fine-tuned on a vaccine misinformation dataset [57] with

⁸<https://www.proquest.com/>

⁹Uncased: <https://huggingface.co/bert-base-uncased>

the training parameters shown in Table 4. The proportion of 10,000 monthly sampled posts classified as misinformation serves as monthly misinformation score.

Parameter	Value
output_dir	model_dir
learning_rate	2e-5
per_device_train_batch_size	16
per_device_eval_batch_size	16
num_train_epochs	3
weight_decay	0.01
evaluation_strategy	“steps”
eval_steps	500
load_best_model_at_end	True
save_total_limit	2

Table 4: Training parameters for fine-tuning on vaccine misinformation dataset [57].

To measure disagreement, we use the approach based on negative sentiment as introduced above.

In both cases, we find a significant correlation of disagreement with misinformation, as indicated by Spearman’s ρ . Figure 5 shows the time series of the engagement in conspiracy theories and aggregated disagreement scores of letters to the editors of the NYT. We find a significant Spearman correlation between the measures ($p < 0.05$). Figure 6 shows vaccine-related misinformation and disagreement in Twitter posts for a period of three years. The correlation is strong indicated by Spearman’s ρ ($p < 0.001$).

Discussion of the Empirical Results For both validation experiments we obtain a significant correlation between disagreement and misinformation with $p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.001$, respectively. These results provide a preliminary validation of our approach measuring (the risk of) misinformation effects with disagreement.

In our approach, we operationalized disagreement through negative sentiment as introduced above. Given that vaccine-related misinformation typically consists of negative sentiments against vaccines, this correlation is not surprising. Therefore, we also compare our analysis with survey data related to false beliefs about vaccines. Uscinski et al. [64] analyzes various claims and find in general a drop in vaccine-related false beliefs between June 2020 and May 2021. Liu and Li [46] and Chang, Fourney, and Horvitz [83] calculate vaccine hesitancy in U.S. context and find a descent between January and March 2021 and an increase between April and September 2021, respectively. In all three cases, our measured disagreement (obtained through negative sentiment) aligns with the rates of false beliefs and vaccine hesitancy over time. Unfortunately, there is limited temporal data on vaccine hesitancy or false beliefs available for comparison with our disagreement mea-




Figure 5: Time series of yearly disagreement scores (blue) and engagement in conspiracy theories (orange) in the letters to the editor of the NYT. The two measures show a significant Spearman correlation ($p < 0.05$). The disagreement reaches a global maximum in 2022. The engagement in conspiracy theory (1950-2007) corresponds to the proportion of letters containing such engagement; we use the data published by Uscinski and Parent [12]. We use the exact same letters for the disagreement analysis between 1950 and 2007. For the subsequent years (2008-2022), we use letters from the historical newspaper database ProQuest. The scores reflect an average of about 1,000 letters a year.

sure. This limited data availability highlights the challenge in obtaining such information and illustrates why measuring disagreement offers a valuable alternative for estimating the risk of misinformation effects. As demonstrated by the analysis of the letters to the editors, we also obtain a significant correlation between disagreement and the engagement in conspiracy theories. Unlike vaccine misinformation, the conspiracy dataset covers a wide spectrum of false beliefs over a time span of more than half a century.



Figure 6: Time series of the monthly aggregated disagreement scores (blue) in vaccine-related posts on Twitter and proportion of posts containing misinformation (orange) from 2020 to 2023 (36 months). The two series show a strong positive correlation indicated by Spearman’s ρ ($p < 0.001$). The scores reflect an average of 10,000 posts a month.