

Not Our Kind of Crowd!

How Partisan Bias Distorts Perceptions of Political Twitter Bots

--- Online Appendix ---

A) Supplementary Analyses for Study 1

A.1)

Table 1a (Supp.): Results based on pre-registered analytical strategy

Item	Mean and Standard Deviation				ANCOVA	Tukey HSD		
	Full Sample	Dem.	Rep.	Indep.		Omnibus Difference	Dem. (-) Rep.	Indep. (-) Rep.
<i>To what extent would you say that social Bots <u>are created to influence political viewpoints</u> of...</i>								
Democrats	<i>M</i> = 3.45 <i>SD</i> = 1.09	<i>M</i> = 3.19 <i>SD</i> = 1.07	<i>M</i> = 3.88 <i>SD</i> = 1.04	<i>M</i> = 3.56 <i>SD</i> = .95	<i>F</i> (2, 440) = 20.22 <i>p</i> < .001, <i>f</i> = .30	-.67 95% CI [-.94, -.41] <i>p</i> < .001	-.33 95% CI [-.70, .45] <i>p</i> = .097	.35 95% CI [-.01, .69] <i>p</i> = .051
Republicans	<i>M</i> = 3.81 <i>SD</i> = 1.10	<i>M</i> = 4.01 <i>SD</i> = 1.05	<i>M</i> = 3.43 <i>SD</i> = 1.12	<i>M</i> = 3.83 <i>SD</i> = 1.06	<i>F</i> (2, 440) = 12.88 <i>p</i> < .001, <i>f</i> = .24	.57 95% CI [.29, .84] <i>p</i> < .001	.39 95% CI [.01, .78] <i>p</i> = .045	-.18 95% CI [-.53, .18] <i>p</i> = .473
Independents	<i>M</i> = 3.06 <i>SD</i> = 1.06	<i>M</i> = 3.12 <i>SD</i> = 1.05	<i>M</i> = 3.05 <i>SD</i> = 1.05	<i>M</i> = 2.87 <i>SD</i> = 1.10	<i>F</i> (2, 440) = 1.43, <i>p</i> = .241, <i>f</i> = .08	-	-	-
<i>To what extent would you say that social Bots <u>are created to support political goals</u> of...</i>								
Democrats	<i>M</i> = 3.41 <i>SD</i> = 1.20	<i>M</i> = 3.02 <i>SD</i> = 1.19	<i>M</i> = 4.06 <i>SD</i> = .98	<i>M</i> = 3.54 <i>SD</i> = 1.06	<i>F</i> (2, 440) = 39.39 <i>p</i> < .001, <i>f</i> = .42	-1.03 95% CI [-1.31, -.74] <i>p</i> < .001	-.54 95% CI [-.94, -.14] <i>p</i> = .005	.49 95% CI [.12, .86] <i>p</i> = .005
Republicans	<i>M</i> = 3.79 <i>SD</i> = 1.12	<i>M</i> = 4.06 <i>SD</i> = 1.05	<i>M</i> = 3.26 <i>SD</i> = 1.12	<i>M</i> = 3.89 <i>SD</i> = 1.06	<i>F</i> (2, 440) = 26.21 <i>p</i> < .001, <i>f</i> = .35	.79 95% CI [.52, 1.06] <i>p</i> < .001	.63 95% CI [.25, 1.01] <i>p</i> < .001	-.16 95% CI [-.51, .19] <i>p</i> = .538
Independents	<i>M</i> = 2.89 <i>SD</i> = 1.04	<i>M</i> = 2.94 <i>SD</i> = 1.03	<i>M</i> = 2.95 <i>SD</i> = 1.03	<i>M</i> = 2.65 <i>SD</i> = 1.08	<i>F</i> (2, 440) = 2.15, <i>p</i> = .118, <i>f</i> = .10	-	-	-
<i>Which users would you expect to be <u>most vulnerable to Bot influence</u>? (i.e., not knowing that they are dealing with Bots)</i>								
Democrats	<i>M</i> = 3.23 <i>SD</i> = 1.11	<i>M</i> = 2.83 <i>SD</i> = 1.00	<i>M</i> = 3.86 <i>SD</i> = 1.04	<i>M</i> = 3.44 <i>SD</i> = 1.01	<i>F</i> (2, 440) = 46.15 <i>p</i> < .001, <i>f</i> = .46	-.99 95% CI [-1.25, -.72] <i>p</i> < .001	-.39 95% CI [-.76, -.03] <i>p</i> = .032	.59 95% CI [.25, .93] <i>p</i> < .001
Republicans	<i>M</i> = 4.05 <i>SD</i> = 1.06	<i>M</i> = 4.42 <i>SD</i> = .84	<i>M</i> = 3.31 <i>SD</i> = 1.11	<i>M</i> = 4.21 <i>SD</i> = .90	<i>F</i> (2, 440) = 63.05 <i>p</i> < .001, <i>f</i> = .54	1.06 95% CI [.82, 1.30] <i>p</i> < .001	.88 95% CI [.55, 1.22] <i>p</i> < .001	-.18 95% CI [-.49, .14] <i>p</i> = .382

Independents	$M = 3.09$ $SD = .98$	$M = 3.13$ $SD = .96$	$M = 3.13$ $SD = .99$	$M = 2.84$ $SD = 1.03$	$F(2, 440) = 2.41,$ $p = .091, f = .10$	-	-	-
<i>Which users would you expect to be most willing to help social Bots spread through social media? (i.e., knowing that they are dealing with Bots)</i>								
Democrats	$M = 3.22$ $SD = 1.22$	$M = 2.73$ $SD = 1.10$	$M = 4.05$ $SD = .99$	$M = 3.30$ $SD = 1.14$	$F(2, 440) = 69.37$ $p < .001, f = .56$	-1.36 95% CI [-1.64, -1.09] $p < .001$	-.79 95% CI [-1.17, -.40] $p < .001$.58 95% CI [.23, .93] $p < .001$
Republicans	$M = 3.82$ $SD = 1.17$	$M = 4.12$ $SD = 1.02$	$M = 3.13$ $SD = 1.19$	$M = 4.14$ $SD = 1.06$	$F(2, 440) = 42.89$ $p < .001, f = .44$.89 95% CI [.62, 1.16] $p < .001$.95 95% CI [.57, 1.33] $p < .001$.06 95% CI [-.29, .42] $p = .904$
Independents	$M = 2.82$ $SD = .89$	$M = 2.86$ $SD = .88$	$M = 2.82$ $SD = .91$	$M = 2.62$ $SD = .85$	$F(2, 440) = 1.93,$ $p = .146, f = .09$	-	-	-

Table 1b (Supp.): Results for survey items not reported in the main manuscript.

Item	Mean and Standard Deviation			ANCOVA	Tukey HSD			
	Full Sample	Democrat Participants	Republican Participants		Independent Participants	Omnibus Difference	Dem. (-) Rep.	Dem. (-) Indep.
<i>How concerned are you about the presence of social bots in social media?</i>								
	$M = 3.36$ $SD = .97$	$M = 3.35$ $SD = 1.01$	$M = 3.36$ $SD = .95$	$M = 3.41$ $SD = .891$	$F(2, 440) = .119$ $p = .888, f = .02$	-	-	-
<i>How likely would you say is it that you have unwillingly followed social bots in the past?</i>								
	$M = 2.59$ $SD = 1.27$	$M = 2.51$ $SD = 1.27$	$M = 2.54$ $SD = 1.16$	$M = 3.54$ $SD = 1.06$	$F(2, 440) = 2.006$ $p = .136, f = .10$	-	-	-
<i>How likely would you say is it that you have unwillingly liked or shared information from social bots in the past?</i>								
	$M = 2.75$ $SD = 1.24$	$M = 2.71$ $SD = 1.19$	$M = 2.82$ $SD = 1.32$	$M = 2.76$ $SD = 1.27$	$F(2, 440) = .348$ $p = .706, f = .04$	-	-	-
<i>To what extent would it bother you knowing that you may unwillingly be following social bots?</i>								
	$M = 3.55$ $SD = 1.12$	$M = 3.55$ $SD = 1.13$	$M = 3.50$ $SD = 1.14$	$M = 3.67$ $SD = 1.08$	$F(2, 440) = .50$ $p = .607, f = .05$	-	-	-
<i>To what extent would it bother you knowing that you may unwillingly be liking or sharing information from social bots?</i>								
	$M = 3.65$ $SD = 1.08$	$M = 3.68$ $SD = 1.08$	$M = 3.59$ $SD = 1.07$	$M = 3.71$ $SD = 1.11$	$F(2, 440) = .437$ $p = .646, f = .04$	-	-	-
<i>How often have you willingly followed social bots in the past?</i>								
	$M = 1.46$ $SD = .87$	$M = 1.45$ $SD = 1.08$	$M = 1.49$ $SD = 1.07$	$M = 1.41$ $SD = 1.11$	$F(2, 440) = .222$ $p = .801, f = .03$	-	-	-

Item	Mean and Standard Deviation			ANCOVA	Tukey HSD			
	Full Sample	Democrat Participants	Republican Participants		Independent Participants	Omnibus Difference	Dem. (-) Rep.	Dem. (-) Indep.
Conditional Item if other response than "never": What motivates you to follow social bots? (n = 118)								
<i>Stay up to date with political matters.</i>	M = 2.74 SD = 1.26	M = 2.57 SD = 1.28	M = 3.07 SD = 1.23	M = 2.58 SD = 1.17	F(2, 114) = 2.212 p = .114, f = .20	-	-	-
<i>Stay up to date with activities of my preferred political group.</i>	M = 2.53 SD = 1.24	M = 2.40 SD = 1.20	M = 2.93 SD = 1.25	M = 2.11 SD = 1.15	F(2, 114) = 3.799 p = .025, f = .26	-.504 p = .116	.271 p = .675	.775 p = .065
<i>Stay up to date with activities of political opponents.</i>	M = 2.42 SD = 1.23	M = 2.16 SD = 1.10	M = 2.95 SD = 1.28	M = 2.16 SD = 1.26	F(2, 114) = 6.122 p = .003, f = .33	-.789 p = .005	-.073 p = .97	.716 p = .088
<i>Join other people who were already following the same bot.</i>	M = 2.33 SD = 1.03	M = 2.33 SD = 1.09	M = 2.44 SD = 1.05	M = 2.05 SD = .71	F(2, 114) = .961 p = .386, f = .13	-	-	-
<i>Other*</i>	M = 2.83 SD = 1.42	M = 2.87 SD = 1.41	M = 2.51 SD = 1.38	M = 3.37 SD = 1.42	F(2, 114) = 2.447 p = .091, f = .13	-	-	-
How often have you willingly liked or shared information from social bots in the past?								
	M = 1.48 SD = .84	M = 1.47 SD = .853	M = 1.49 SD = .89	M = 1.38 SD = .71	F(2, 440) = .41 p = .664, f = .04	-	-	-
Conditional Item if other response than "never": What motivates you to like or share information from social bots? (n = 131)								
<i>Share important political information with others.</i>	M = 2.73 SD = 1.23	M = 2.82 SD = 1.23	M = 2.68 SD = 1.21	M = 2.47 SD = 1.33	F(2, 122) = .625 p = .537, f = .10	-	-	-
<i>Express my political views.</i>	M = 2.54 SD = 1.27	M = 2.71 SD = 1.22	M = 2.49 SD = 1.38	M = 1.94 SD = 1.03	F(2, 122) = 2.655 p = .074, f = .21	-	-	-
<i>Support my political group.</i>	M = 2.63 SD = 1.27	M = 2.71 SD = 1.27	M = 2.76 SD = 1.32	M = 2.00 SD = .94	F(2, 122) = 2.5 p = .086, f = .20	-	-	-

<i>"Hurt"</i> <i>political</i> <i>opponents.</i>	<i>M</i> = 1.82 <i>SD</i> = .98	<i>M</i> = 1.96 <i>SD</i> = .95	<i>M</i> = 1.76 <i>SD</i> = 1.09	<i>M</i> = 1.41 <i>SD</i> = .62	<i>F</i> (2, 122) = 2.399 <i>p</i> = .095, <i>f</i> = .20	-	-	-
<i>Motivate others</i> <i>to follow the</i> <i>same bot.</i>	<i>M</i> = 1.86 <i>SD</i> = 1.01	<i>M</i> = 1.9 <i>SD</i> = .95	<i>M</i> = 2.05 <i>SD</i> = 1.20	<i>M</i> = 1.24 <i>SD</i> = .44	<i>F</i> (2, 122) = 4.358 <i>p</i> = .015 , <i>f</i> = .27	- .247 <i>p</i> = .423	.736 <i>p</i> = .019	.983 <i>p</i> = .003
<i>Other*</i>	<i>M</i> = 2.72 <i>SD</i> = 1.4	<i>M</i> = 2.62 <i>SD</i> = 1.39	<i>M</i> = 2.80 <i>SD</i> = 1.45	<i>M</i> = 2.94 <i>SD</i> = 1.39	<i>F</i> (2, 122) = .479 <i>p</i> = .621, <i>f</i> = .09	-	-	-

*Participants who provided qualitative (i.e. textual) information about conscious bot engagement mainly indicated entertainment-related purposes.

A.2) Additional Survey Items in Study 1 (not analysed)

Survey 1 included three additional items that assessed affective representations of democrats, republicans, and independents, respectively via feeling-thermometer scales.

B) Supplementary Material for Experiment 2

B1.) List of models corresponding to the results in the main manuscript

Table 2a (Supp.): Misidentifying Bots as Humans (H1)

<i>Predictors</i>	<i>Log-Odds</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>p value</i>
(Intercept)	.69	[.29; 1.1]	3.39	.001
Participant Partisanship (Democrats)	-.52	[-.81; -.23]	-3.47	.001
Stimuli Partisanship (Pro-Democrat)	.05	[-.43; .54]	.21	.833
Participant x Stimuli Interaction	1.10	[1.01; 1.2]	22.92	< .001
Random Effects				
σ^2	3.29			
$\tau_{00 \text{ id}}$	3.23			
$\tau_{00 \text{ stimuli}}$.10			
ICC	.50			
<i>N</i> _{id}	619			
<i>N</i> _{stimuli}	6			
Observations	41016			
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	.026 / .516			

Table 2b (Supp.): Misidentifying Bots as Humans (H1) - Model with covariates

<i>Predictors</i>	<i>Log-Odds</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>p value</i>
(Intercept)	.47	[-.64; 1.58]	.82	.411
Participant Partisanship (Democrats)	-.63	[-.94; -.33]	-4.1	< .001
Stimuli Partisanship (Pro-Democrat)	.05	[-.45; .56]	.2	.839
Twitter Use	.08	[-.13; .30]	.76	.445
Gender (female)	.05	[-.27; .38]	.33	.742
Gender (non-binary)	1.41	[.03; 2.80]	2.00	.046
Age	-.01	[-.02; .01]	-1.21	.226
Race	.34	[-.05; .73]	1.71	.087
SES	.03	[-.07; 0.13]	.52	.601
Participant x Stimuli Interaction	1.10	[1.01; 1.20]	22.91	< .001
Random Effects				
σ^2	3.29			
$\tau_{00 \text{ id}}$	3.17			
$\tau_{00 \text{ stimuli}}$.10			
ICC	.50			
N_{id}	619			
N_{stimuli}	6			
Observations	41016			
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	.036 / .516			

Note: Race was dummy coded with 0 = “white”, 1 = “else”.

Table 3a (Supp.): Misidentifying Humans as Bots (H2)

<i>Predictors</i>	<i>Log-Odds</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>p value</i>
(Intercept)	-1.25	[-1.84; -.65]	-4.1	< .001
Participant Partisanship (Democrat)	.55	[.28; .82]	3.99	< .001
Stimuli Partisanship (Pro-Democrat)	.18	[-.61; .96]	.44	.661
Participant x Stimuli Interaction	-1.23	[-1.33; -1.14]	-24.95	< .001
Random Effects				
σ^2	3.29			
$\tau_{00 \text{ id}}$	2.66			
$\tau_{00 \text{ stimuli}}$.26			
ICC	.47			
N_{id}	618			
N_{stimuli}	6			
Observations	41700			
Marginal R^2 / Conditional R^2	.025 / .483			

Table 3b (Supp.): Misidentifying Humans as Bots (H2) – Model with covariates

<i>Predictors</i>	<i>Log-Odds</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>p value</i>
(Intercept)	-1.38	-2.48; -.27	-2.44	.015
Participant Partisanship (Democrat)	.53	.25; .81	3.72	< .001
Stimuli Partisanship (Pro-Democrat)	.18	-.65; 1.0	.42	.676
Twitter Use	-.03	-.23; .16	-.31	.755
Gender (female)	.05	-.24; .35	.36	.721
Gender (non-binary)	.29	-.9; 1.49	.48	.629
Age	.01	-.01; .01	.26	.795
Race	.09	-.27; .44	.47	.641
SES	.02	-.07; 0.12	.48	.628
Participant x Stimuli Interaction	-1.24	-1.33; -1.14	-24.92	< .001
Random Effects				
σ^2	3.29			
$\tau_{00 \text{ id}}$	2.65			
$\tau_{00 \text{ stimuli}}$.26			
ICC	.47			
N_{id}	618			
N_{stimuli}	6			
Observations	41700			
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	.025 / .483			

Note: Race was dummy coded with 0 = “white”, 1 = “else”.

Table 4 (Supp.): Profile Engagement (H3 & H4)

<i>Predictors</i>	<i>Log-Odds</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>p value</i>
(Intercept)	-5.88	[-6.78; -4.98]	-12.81	< .001
Participant Partisanship (Democrat)	-6.60	[-7.79; -5.41]	-10.90	< .001
Stimuli Partisanship (Pro-Democrat)	-3.84	[-4.33; -3.34]	-15.28	< .001
Stimuli Evaluation (Human)	3.00	[2.84; 3.15]	37.76	< .001
Participant x Stimuli Partisanship	9.49	[8.89; 10.09]	30.95	< .001
Participant x Stimuli Evaluation	-.33	[-.87; .21]	-1.20	.232
Stimuli Partisanship x Stimuli Evaluation	-1.24	[-1.54; -.94]	-8.08	< .001
Participant x Stimuli Partisanship x Stimuli Evaluation	1.27	[.65 ; 1.89]	4.03	< .001
Random Effects				
σ^2	3.29			
$\tau_{00 \text{ id}}$	31.53			
$\tau_{00 \text{ stimuli}}$.13			
ICC	.91			
N_{id}	619			
N_{stimuli}	12			
Observations	82716			
Marginal R^2 / Conditional R^2	.219 / .926			

Table 4 (Supp.): Profile Engagement (H3 & H4) – Model with Covariates

<i>Predictors</i>	<i>Log-Odds</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>p value</i>
(Intercept)	-16.08	[-19.58; -12.59]	-9.02	< .001
Participant Partisanship (Democrat)	-6.48	[-7.56; -5.38]	-11.49	< .001
Stimuli Partisanship (pro-Democrat)	-3.85	[-4.34; -3.36]	-15.41	< .001
Stimuli Evaluation (Human)	3.00	[2.85; 3.16]	37.76	< .001
Twitter Use	3.56	[2.86; 4.26]	9.97	< .001
Gender (female)	-1.24	[-2.29; -.19]	-2.32	.020
Gender (non-binary)	-1.97	[-6.25; 2.31]	-.90	.368
Age	.04	[-.01; .08]	1.67	.096
Race	.87	[-.38; 2.11]	1.37	.171
SES	-.24	[-.57; .09]	-1.44	.151
Participant x Stimuli Partisanship	9.52	[8.92; 10.13]	30.90	< .001
Participant x Stimuli Evaluation	-.33	[-.87; .22]	-1.17	.243
Stimuli Partisanship x Stimuli Evaluation	-1.24	[-1.54; -.94]	-8.04	< .001
Participant x Stimuli Partisanship x Stimuli Evaluation	1.26	[.64; 1.88]	3.97	< .001
Random Effects				
σ^2	3.29			
$\tau_{00 \text{ id}}$	27.18			
$\tau_{00 \text{ stimuli}}$.13			
ICC	.89			
N_{id}	619			
N_{stimuli}	12			
Observations	82716			
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	.353 / .930			

Note: Race was dummy coded with 0 = “white”, 1 = “else”.

Table 5 (Supp.): Profile Engagement → Alternative Model with (objective) Stimuli Category

<i>Predictors</i>	<i>Log-Odds</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>p value</i>
(Intercept)	-3.69	[-4.53; -2.85]	-8.61	< .001
Participant Partisanship (Democrat)	-6.40	[-7.41; -5.40]	-12.47	< .001
Stimuli Partisanship (Pro-Democrat)	-4.15	[-4.67; -3.64]	-15.84	< .001
Stimuli Category (Bot)	.36	[-.14; .86]	1.42	.155
Participant x Stimuli Partisanship	10.07	[9.74; 10.40]	59.74	< .001
Participant x Stimuli Category	.01	[-.32; .33]	.03	.979
Stimuli Partisanship x Stimuli Category	-.43	[-1.15; .29]	-1.18	.238
Participant x Stimuli Partisanship x Stimuli Category	-.29	[-.67 ; .09]	-1.49	.136
Random Effects				
σ^2	3.29			
$\tau_{00 \text{ id}}$	26.98			
$\tau_{00 \text{ stimuli}}$.09			
ICC	.80			
N_{id}	619			
N_{stimuli}	12			
Observations	82716			
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	.185 / .912			

Table 6 (Supp.): Profile Engagement → Alternative Model with (objective) Stimuli Category + Covariates

<i>Predictors</i>	<i>Log-Odds</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>Statistic</i>	<i>p value</i>
(Intercept)	-12.90	[-16.12; -9.67]	-7.84	< .001
Participant Partisanship (Democrat)	-6.32	[-7.26; -5.38]	-13.23	< .001
Stimuli Partisanship (pro-Democrat)	-4.16	[-4.67; -3.65]	-15.99	< .001
Stimuli Evaluation (Bot)	.36	[-.13; .85]	1.44	.151
Twitter Use	3.25	[2.60; 3.90]	9.79	< .001
Gender (female)	-1.12	[-2.08; -.15]	-2.27	.023
Gender (non-binary)	-1.60	[-5.55; 2.34]	-.80	.426
Age	.03	[-.01; .07]	1.69	.091
Race	.77	[-.37; 1.91]	1.33	.184
SES	-.24	[-.55; .06]	-1.55	.120
Participant x Stimuli Partisanship	10.09	[9.76; 10.42]	59.72	< .001
Participant x Stimuli Evaluation	.01	[-.32; .33]	.04	.968
Stimuli Partisanship x Stimuli Evaluation	-.43	[-1.14; .28]	-1.19	< .232
Participant x Stimuli Partisanship x Stimuli Evaluation	-.29	[-.67; .09]	-1.49	< .135
Random Effects				
σ^2	3.29			
$\tau_{00 \text{ id}}$	23.12			
$\tau_{00 \text{ stimuli}}$.09			
ICC	.88			
N_{id}	619			
N_{stimuli}	12			
Observations	82716			
Marginal R ² / Conditional R ²	.321 / .916			

Note: Race was dummy coded with 0 = “white”, 1 = “else”.

