Appendix A

Additional Figures and Tables

Table A1 Distribution of DVs per country

	CH		*NL*		*PL*		*UK*		*US*		*Overall*	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Desire for transparency	5.06	1.55	5.37	1.54	5.10	1.46	5.05	1.49	5.11	1.54	5.14	1.52
Desire for user control	5.15	1.37	5.80	1.21	5.38	1.21	5.31	1.31	5.43	1.31	5.42	1.30

Table A2 Cronbach's α per index and country

	CH	*NL*	*PL*	*UK*	*US*	*Overall*
Desire for transparency	0.88	0.91	0.89	0.87	0.89	0.89
Desire for user control	0.86	0.86	0.90	0.87	0.88	0.87
Privacy concerns	0.88	0.89	0.88	0.90	0.91	0.90
Algorithmic awareness	0.80	0.77	0.87	0.85	0.87	0.84
NRS concerns	0.90	0.92	0.92	0.94	0.94	0.93
General news media trust	0.84	0.90	0.84	0.85	0.91	0.87
Perceived NRS use	0.90	0.94	0.92	0.91	0.95	0.94

Note. Cronbach's α scores for all used indices per country. For the operationalization of the variables, see the pre-registration on OSF, available here: https://osf.io/w5m8c/?view_only=781c984e152542d5bc91de53a3ac281f.

Table A3 Distribution of IVs and CVs per country

	CH		NL		PL		UK		US	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Privacy concerns	4.50	1.75	5.43	1.52	4.25	1.66	4.87	1.78	4.33	1.96
Algorithmic awareness	4.58	1.24	4.21	1.29	4.44	1.46	4.25	1.45	4.70	1.55
NRS concerns	4.80	1.29	5.41	1.32	4.78	1.30	4.92	1.35	5.06	1.39
General news media trust	3.99	1.28	4.09	1.32	3.79	1.42	3.91	1.39	4.02	1.80
Gender	male = 48.49% female = 50.44% nonbinary/ else = 0.78% prefer not to disclose = 0.29%		male = 49.22% female = 49.71% nonbinary/ else = 0.19% prefer not to disclose =0.88%		male = 49.80% female = 49.80% nonbinary/ else = 0.20% prefer not to disclose = 0.20%		male = 48.22% female = 51.19% nonbinary/ else = 0.50% prefer not to disclose = 0.1%		male = 47.71% female = 51.49% nonbinary/ else =0.60% prefer not to disclose = 0.20%	
Age[1]	43.30	15.58	53.03	17.45	42.16	13.68	47.07	17.28	48.12	18.82
Education	2.10	0.51	2.44	0.79	2.36	0.66	2.10	0.82	2.53	0.58
News consumption	26.35	6.78	23.31	5.86	26.87	7.22	24.21	7.82	25.69	8.78
Perceived NRS use	4.29	1.15	4.23	1.23	4.45	1.18	4.35	1.20	4.68	1.36

[1]Post-stratification sampling weights were provided to ensure representativity on age, gender, and region in each country, thereby accounting for the observed differences in mean age across countries. Weighted regression results did not differ notably; therefore, we report unweighted regressions. Weighted regressions are reported here: https://osf.io/mnws9/?view_only=b3f9e336f08349ba9cfe5b6b07858175 (Main Analysis.html; see sections: Weighted Results)

Appendix B

Appendix B Deviations from Preregistration[1]

Element	Deviation	Reason
Independent Variables (Hypothesis 3 & 4)	NRS-related concerns were also considered as IV.	The theoretical importance and relevance of NRS concerns was reassessed in view of the pre-analysis plan for other planed papers in the preregistration, in which NRS concerns constitute a central IV.
Independent Variable: Algorithmic Awareness	In the preregistration, algorithmic awareness was referred to as perceived algorithmic skills (see Q12). For this paper, we use the term algorithmic awareness instead.	Following Hargittai et al. (2020), the term algorithmic awareness better captures our operationalization of the concept. Algorithmic skills capture more than being aware that algorithms are at work, but also understanding certain aspects of algorithms, such as how they process information to provide content recommendations (Hargittai et al., 2020, p. 771). As the items used in this analysis do not consider true or false assessments and do not measure if respondents understand how algorithms, e.g., process information, the term algorithmic awareness is more appropriate than skills.
Dependent Variables	Preferences for exposure diversity in NRS was not considered as a third DV. The main dependent variables were further slightly renamed from the original nomenclature in the preregistration.	The third DV was not considered due to space limitations. The DVs were further renamed for consistency, for example we use the term user control instead of user voice as the former is easier to understand intuitively.
Control Variables	Instead of political orientation and reliance on specific news outlets, we included perceived NRS use and news consumption across media types as CV.	The theoretical importance of the control variables was reassessed in view of the pre-analysis plans for other planed papers reported in the preregistration (see e.g., Papers 1 and 2).
Research Questions 2 and 3	*RQ* regarding country-level differences was split into two.	This was done to account for differences in levels of desire for transparency and user control across

		countries on the one hand and differences in the strength and direction of proposed relationships across countries on the other hand. This distinction was alluded to in the pre-analysis plan, but the *RQ* was not formulated explicitly.
Index Construction	For self-developed scales, confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were conducted, instead of EFA. For transparency, a reliability test using Cronbach's Alpha is conducted.	As specified in the preregistration, for scales developed by other authors, we only compute Cronbach's alpha. For self-developed scales, as we already expected the presence of one factor, we computed CFA. Explanatory factor analyses are reported in the R Script on OSF and corroborate the findings of the CFA. As desire for transparency was measured with three items, neither the EFA nor the CFA provided meaningful solutions, thus we only report Cronbach's alpha values for this index.
Analysis Strategy: Multi-level models	Following substantial diagnostics, we concluded that multilevel models are not appropriate, therefore we ran linear regression models for each country separately to examine *RQ3*.	Additional tests showed that despite having a nested structure, i.e., individuals nested in countries, multi-level models are not appropriate for several reasons. First, the AIC/BIC and log likelihood values suggested that the goodness of fit were very similar for both the respective baseline linear models and the multi-level ones without control variables (e.g., $AIC_{multilevelusercontrol}$ = 13829.05; $AIC_{linearusercontrol}$ = 13833.23; $LogLik_{multileveltransparency}$ = -7614.88 (*df* = 7); $LogLik_{lineartransparency}$ = - 7599. 39 (*df* = 6)). Additionally, the interclass-correlation coefficients for the multi-level baseline models, i.e., models without covariates, indicated that the country as a grouping structure explained very little variance (ICC $_{transparencymodel}$ = .002; ICC $_{usercontrolmodel}$ = .014). More details can be found in the R Script on OSF[2].

Note. [1]The preregistration can be found on https://osf.io/w5m8c/?view_only=781c984e152542d5bc91de53a3ac281f (see Preregistration). [2]The R Script with all analyses can be found on https://osf.io/mnws9/?view_only=b3f9e336f08349ba9cfe5b6b07858175 (see Main Analysis.html).