**Supplementary File**

**Measurements**

**Independent Variables**

***Author attribution***

Author attribution is a between-subjects variable. Participants were randomly assigned to read articles either purportedly written by humans or algorithms.

***Story topic***

Two topics are respectively gun issue and abortion issue. Story topic is a within-subjects variable. Participants were asked to read three articles for each topic.

***Participants’ issue attitude***

Participants were asked for their opinion regarding gun control and abortion. Two measures were adopted. The first measure was adapted from Barnidge, Gunther, Kim, Hong, Perryman, Tay and Knisely (2017). For gun control, this study used “would you say you are in favor of relaxing gun control regulations, leaving regulations as they are, or creating stricter gun control regulations?” on a 7- point scale where 1 indicated “strongly in favor of relaxing gun control regulations”; 4 indicated “leaving regulations as they are”; and 7 indicated “strongly in favor of creating stricter gun control regulations”. For abortion, participants needed to rate “would you say you are opposed, neutral, or in favor of abortion?” on a 7-point scale from 1 (strongly support pro-life) to 7 (strongly support pro-choice).This study also used a measure from Wojcieszak (2019). For two issues, participants were asked to answer “with respect to the gun control/abortion issue, would you consider yourself to support gun rights/oppose abortion or gun control/in favor of abortion?” (1-strongly support gun rights/oppose abortion to 7-strongly support gun rights/in favor of abortion). For both gun control and abortion issues, two measures were highly correlated (gun control: *Cronbach’s α* = .88; abortion: *Cronbach’s α* = .91) and can be averaged. After averaging into one measure, participants’ gun issue attitude (*M =* 4.79, *SD =*1.93) and abortion issue attitude (*M =* 4.44, *SD =*2.11) indicated a sample with overall diverse issue attitudes, not biased towards one side.

**Covariates**

***Source credibility***

Source credibility was measured as a multidimensional construct consisting of believability, fairness, accuracy, and depth of information, authenticity (Adapted from Author YYYY; Gaziano and McGrath, 1986; Metzger et al., 2003; Newhagen and Nass, 1989) on five 7-point scales. Participants were asked to rate the credibility of both human-written and automated news based on their expectations or previous experiences. This study reverse coded the authenticity item (“story written by human/algorithms is not authentic”). Five items were highly corrected and can be averaged into one measure (*Cronbach’s α* = .87, *M* = 4.25, *SD* = .86).

**Dependent Variables**

***Selective exposure***

Selective exposure was assessed by a question after participant read each article, “on a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 indicating ‘not at all likely’ to 7 indicating ‘extremely likely’ how likely are you to purposely click on or connect to this article in the future?” (Adapted from Author YYYY; Metzger et al., 2015).

***Selective avoidance***

Selective avoidance was measured by the question, “on a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 indicating ‘not at all likely’ to 7 indicating ‘extremely likely’ how likely are you to purposely avoid clicking on or connect to this article in the future?” (Adapted from Author YYYY)

***Message Credibility***

Message credibility was also measured as an index consisting of believability, fairness, accuracy, and depth of information, authenticity (Adapted from Author YYYY; Gaziano and McGrath, 1986; Metzger et al., 2003; Newhagen and Nass, 1989) on five 7-point scales with authenticity item recoded. Five items were highly corrected, *Cronbach’s α* = .88. After averaging five items into one index, the message credibility index has *M* = 4.78 and *SD* = .69.

***Bias***

Bias was measured in both pre-test and the main experiment by asking “how biased do you think this story is?” (1- Strongly in favor of gun rights/pro-life; 4- Neutral; 7- Strongly in favor of gun control/abortion rights).

***Source Anthropomorphism***

Source anthropomorphism measure was used to test whether the manipulation of this experiment was successful or not. After reading six articles, participants were asked to rate their perceptions of the listed author(s) on four 7-point scales. In order to measure the perceived source anthropomorphism, four semantic differential items “fake/natural”, “unconscious/ conscious”, “artificial/life-like,” and “mechanical/organic” were adapted from prior research (Bartneck, Kulić, Croft, and Zoghbi, 2007). The four items were highly correlated and can be averaged to form a reliable index (*M* = 4.99, *SD* = 1.58, *Cronbach’s α* = .94).

**Other Measured Variables**

***Demographics***

Participants were asked to self-report their race, age, gender, education, party affiliation, party strength, and political attitude.

***Recall***

After all dependent measures, participants were asked in the post-test if they could recall the author listed on the byline with options “Automated Insights” “Staff Reporter Jim Richard” and “I don’t remember” (Adapted from Waddell, 2019). In the human author group, more than 93.65% participants (*n*=177) successfully recalled the staff reporter Jim Richard as an author. In the algorithms author group, more than 82.10% people (*n*=133) successfully recalled the “Automated Insights” as an author.
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