

## **ONLINE APPENDIX**

**Appendix A. Sample Comparison**

**Appendix B. Additional Analyses and Descriptive Statistics**

**Appendix C. Full Tables**

**Appendix D. Stimulus Material**

**Appendix E. Scales**

## Appendix A

### Sample Comparison

Using chi-square tests and Cramer's V, we compared the two samples on various variables that were captured before the attention check. Results reveal that the samples do not significantly differ in regard to age ( $p = .214$ ; Cramer's  $V = .04$ ), gender ( $p = .233$ ; Cramer's  $V = .037$ ) and political interest ( $p = .796$ ; Cramer's  $V = .023$ ). Conversely, the sample that passed the IMC is more left-wing ( $p = .001$ ; Cramer's  $V = .102$ ), more educated ( $p = .001$ ; Cramer's  $V = .068$ ) and politically more knowledgeable ( $p = .000$ ; Cramer's  $V = .169$ ). The effect sizes of the Cramer's V indicate, however, that these associations are weak to negligible (Rea & Parker, 1992). Table D1- D6 further reveal, that the frequency distribution across answer categories is comparable between the pre- and the post IMC sample.

**Table A.1**

#### *Age Distribution in Percentage*

Sample	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69
Failed	26.3	24	21	18	10.7
Passed	28	20.8	19.7	19.6	11.9

**Table A.2**

#### *Gender Distribution in Percentage*

Sample	Male	Female	Non-binary	no answer
Failed	48.2	50.7	0.7	0.4
Passed	44.9	53.9	0.5	0.6

**Table A.3***Political Interest Distribution in Percentage*

Sample	1 = Not at all	2	3	4	5 = Very interested
Failed	4	14.6	43.1	27.8	10.4
Passed	3.6	13.3	43.1	28.9	11.1

**Table A.4***Ideology Distribution in Percentage*

Sample	0 = extremely left	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 = extremely right
Failed	4.2	3.6	8.5	11.3	9.8	20.4	12.6	12.4	9.1	4.1	4.2
Passed	2.5	5.4	10.3	13.3	13.5	18.2	11.7	10.8	7.4	4.2	2.6

**Table A.5***Education Distribution in Percentage*

Sample	Obligatory	Secondary	Tertiary
Failed	12.1	57	30.9
Passed	8.6	54.8	36.6

**Table A.6**

*Political Knowledge Distribution in Percentage*

---

Sample	0	1	2	3	4
Failed	23.6	30.1	25.9	17.7	2.7
Passed	13.2	25.1	28.2	29	4.5

---

## Appendix B

### Additional Analyses and Descriptive Statistics

Considering that the model has never been specified before, it reveals a satisfactory global fit: Although the model's chi-square is statistically significant at the 0.001 level ( $\chi^2_M(94) = 545.280$ ), the CFI (= 0.93) and the TLI (= 0.91) score only little below the threshold of  $\geq 0.95$ . Similarly, the RMSEA (=0.07) lies above the suggested cut-off point of  $<0.05$ , with the lower bound of the 90% confidence interval (CI) of [0.07, 0.08] being slightly above the threshold of  $>0.05$ .

**Table B.1**

*Goodness of Fit Index Second-Order Model Resistance Strategies*

Model Fit Indices	Estimates
Chi-Square	545.280
Degrees of freedom	94
Probability level	0.000
Comparative Fit Index (CFI)	0.93
Tucker-Lewis Fit Index (TLI)	0.91
Root Mean Square Error Approximation (RMSEA)	0.07
Observations	935

**Table B.2***Descriptive Statistics*

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Resistance index	898	51.90	12.87	0.00	93.75
Contesting	896	53.41	18.66	0.00	100.00
Avoidance	894	56.26	21.94	0.00	100.00
Empowering	893	52.31	16.87	0.00	100.00
Negative affect	896	42.28	23.54	0.00	100.00
Age	934	2.67	1.37	1.00	5.00
Female	925	0.54	0.50	0.00	1.00
Education	935	2.28	0.61	1.00	3.00
Religiosity	933	4.22	3.13	0.00	10.00
Thermometer					
Muslims	914	47.45	27.82	0.00	100.00
Muslim	936	0.02	0.14	0.00	1.00
Interest in politics	936	3.31	0.96	1.00	5.00
Left-right scale	878	4.81	2.37	0.00	10.00
Issue importance	906	4.47	3.64	0.00	10.00
Initial opinion	902	5.05	3.59	0.00	10.00
Opinion extremity	902	3.14	1.72	0.00	5.00
Political					
Knowledge	936	3.67	1.81	0.00	9.00
Neosexism	916	3.21	1.43	1.00	7.00
Extraversion	922	4.07	1.25	1.00	7.00
Agreeableness	922	5.30	0.95	2.00	7.00
Conscientiousness	922	5.74	0.92	2.00	7.00
Neuroticism	922	2.87	1.14	1.00	7.00
Openness	922	5.20	1.02	1.50	7.00
Stability <sup>a</sup>	922	5.39	0.71	2.83	7.00
Plasticity <sup>b</sup>	922	4.63	0.95	1.25	7.00

<sup>a</sup> Average score of agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism (reversed).

<sup>b</sup> Average score of extraversion and openness.

## Appendix C

### Full Tables

**Table C.1**

*Resistance Strategies; Subtypes*

	Contesting			Avoidance <sup>c</sup>			Empowering			Negative affect		
	M1		<i>p</i>	M2		<i>p</i>	M3		<i>p</i>	M4		<i>p</i>
coef	SE	coef		SE	coef		SE	coef		SE	coef	
Age	1.76	(0.45)	***	-1.67	(0.61)	**	0.60	(0.43)		-0.40	(0.61)	
Female	1.12	(1.31)		0.51	(1.79)		3.41	(1.26)	**	3.40	(1.78)	†
Education	0.12	(0.98)		-1.13	(1.33)		-1.73	(0.94)	†	2.62	(1.33)	*
Religiosity	-0.12	(0.19)		0.06	(0.26)		0.31	(0.19)	†	0.37	(0.26)	
Ther. Muslims	0.01	(0.02)		-0.04	(0.03)		0.00	(0.02)		0.04	(0.03)	
Muslim	14.10	(4.14)	***	-7.83	(5.64)		6.89	(3.96)	†	2.70	(5.63)	
Interest in politics	3.06	(0.70)	***	0.97	(0.95)		1.62	(0.67)	*	2.08	(0.95)	*
Left-right scale	-0.42	(0.31)		-0.06	(0.43)		-0.34	(0.30)		-0.68	(0.42)	
Issue importance	-0.99	(0.25)	***	-0.24	(0.34)		0.81	(0.24)	***	-0.25	(0.34)	
Initial opinion <sup>a</sup>	-0.46	(0.26)	†	-0.09	(0.36)		-0.11	(0.25)		-0.33	(0.36)	
Opin. extremity <sup>b</sup>	3.63	(0.34)	***	2.20	(0.47)	***	2.38	(0.33)	***	3.86	(0.47)	***
Pol. Knowledge	1.33	(0.36)	***	-0.25	(0.49)		-0.08	(0.34)		-0.08	(0.49)	
Neosexism	0.40	(0.47)		-0.37	(0.64)		0.07	(0.45)		0.15	(0.64)	
Openness	-0.36	(0.66)		0.54	(0.90)		-0.73	(0.63)		-0.72	(0.90)	
Conscientiousness	-1.75	(0.69)	*	-0.42	(0.94)		-2.02	(0.66)	**	-2.51	(0.93)	**
Extraversion	0.41	(0.51)		-0.20	(0.70)		1.08	(0.49)	*	1.01	(0.70)	
Agreeableness	0.07	(0.66)		2.13	(0.90)	*	1.80	(0.63)	**	-0.90	(0.90)	
Neuroticism	1.07	(0.57)	†	-0.06	(0.77)		-0.93	(0.54)	†	3.46	(0.77)	***
Constant	35.13	(7.44)	***	48.27	(10.15)	***	41.26	(7.13)	***	27.61	(10.11)	**
Observations	827			825			824			827		
R <sup>2</sup>	0.28			0.05			0.16			0.18		

*Note.* The dependent variable in all models is the extent to which respondents used the resistance strategy from 0 “minimum” to 100 “maximum”. Models are OLS regressions.

<sup>a</sup> Varies between 0 “very against the veiling ban” and 10 “very in favour of the veiling ban.”

<sup>b</sup> Varies between 0 “very moderated” and 5 “very extreme”

<sup>c</sup> The variable only takes three values: 0 “minimum”, 50 “average” and 100 “maximum;” We use a 0-100 scale, instead of a simpler categorical one (e.g., 1-3) to ensure comparability of coefficients across models.

\*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*  $p < 0.05$ , †  $p < 0.1$

**Table C.2***Resistance Strategies; General Index*

	M1			M2		
	coef	SE	<i>p</i>	coef	SE	<i>p</i>
Age	0.37	(0.31)		0.67	(0.31)	*
Female	2.50	(0.89)	**	2.45	(0.91)	**
Education	-0.92	(0.68)		-0.49	(0.68)	
Religiosity	0.14	(0.13)		0.08	(0.13)	
Thermometer Muslims	0.01	(0.02)		0.01	(0.02)	
Muslim	6.45	(2.89)	*	7.48	(2.87)	**
Interest in politics	2.09	(0.48)	***	2.25	(0.48)	***
Left-right scale	-0.42	(0.22)	†	-0.36	(0.22)	†
Issue importance	-0.13	(0.17)		-0.13	(0.17)	
Initial opinion <sup>a</sup>	-0.27	(0.18)		-0.26	(0.18)	
Opinion extremity <sup>b</sup>	2.94	(0.24)	***	3.00	(0.24)	***
Political Knowledge	0.47	(0.25)	†	0.40	(0.25)	
Neosexism	0.17	(0.33)		0.13	(0.32)	
Openness				-0.49	(0.46)	
Conscientiousness				-1.84	(0.48)	***
Extraversion				0.69	(0.36)	†
Agreeableness				0.79	(0.46)	†
Neuroticism				0.40	(0.39)	
Constant	36.19	(3.07)	***	38.84	(5.15)	***
Observations	829			829		
R <sup>2</sup>	0.25			0.27		

*Note.* The dependent variable in all models is the extent to which respondents used the resistance strategy from 0 “minimum” to 100 “maximum”. Models are OLS regressions.

<sup>a</sup> Varies between 0 “very against the face veil” and 10 “very in favour the face veil”

<sup>b</sup> Varies between 0 “very moderated” and 5 “very extreme”

\*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*  $p < 0.05$ , †  $p < 0.1$



**Table C.3***Resistance Strategies; Subtypes (meta-traits)*

	Contesting			Avoidance <sup>c</sup>			Empowering			Negative affect		
	M1		<i>p</i>	M2		<i>p</i>	M3		<i>p</i>	M4		<i>p</i>
coef	SE	coef		SE	coef		SE	coef		SE	coef	
Age	1.62	(0.44)	***	-1.82	(0.60)	**	0.35	(0.43)		-0.64	(0.60)	
Female	1.22	(1.28)		0.79	(1.74)		3.06	(1.24)	*	4.08	(1.74)	*
Education	-0.08	(0.97)		-1.40	(1.33)		-2.09	(0.94)	*	2.32	(1.32)	†
Religiosity	-0.08	(0.19)		0.12	(0.26)		0.36	(0.19)	†	0.46	(0.26)	†
Ther. Muslims	0.01	(0.02)		-0.04	(0.03)		0.00	(0.02)		0.04	(0.03)	
Muslim	13.75	(4.13)	***	-7.85	(5.64)		5.92	(4.00)		2.33	(5.62)	
Interest in politics	2.89	(0.69)	***	0.70	(0.94)		1.36	(0.67)	*	1.83	(0.94)	†
Left-right scale	-0.45	(0.31)		-0.17	(0.42)		-0.39	(0.30)		-0.68	(0.42)	
Issue importance	-1.01	(0.25)	***	-0.28	(0.34)		0.76	(0.24)	**	-0.25	(0.34)	
Initial opinion <sup>a</sup>	-0.43	(0.26)	†	-0.02	(0.35)		-0.10	(0.25)		-0.26	(0.35)	
Opin. extremity <sup>b</sup>	3.63	(0.34)	***	2.23	(0.47)	***	2.35	(0.33)	***	3.86	(0.47)	***
Pol. Knowledge	1.34	(0.36)	***	-0.22	(0.49)		-0.06	(0.35)		-0.09	(0.49)	
Neosexism	0.41	(0.47)		-0.40	(0.64)		0.14	(0.45)		0.10	(0.64)	
Stability	-2.92	(0.85)	***	1.82	(1.16)		0.61	(0.82)		-7.48	(1.15)	***
Plasticity	0.12	(0.65)		0.02	(0.89)		0.74	(0.63)		0.35	(0.89)	
Constant	44.75	(5.92)	***	50.79	(8.08)	***	32.87	(5.73)	***	58.71	(8.05)	***
Observations	827			825			824			827		
R <sup>2</sup>	0.28			0.05			0.14			0.18		

*Note.* The dependent variable in all models is the extent to which respondents used the resistance strategy from 0 “minimum” to 100 “maximum”. Models are OLS regressions.

<sup>a</sup> Varies between 0 “very against the veiling ban” and 10 “very in favour of the veiling ban.”

<sup>b</sup> Varies between 0 “very moderated” and 5 “very extreme”

<sup>c</sup> The variable only takes three values: 0 “minimum”, 50 “average” and 100 “maximum;” We use a 0-100 scale, instead of a simpler categorical one (e.g., 1-3) to ensure comparability of coefficients across models.

\*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*  $p < 0.05$ , †  $p < 0.1$

**Table C.4***Resistance Strategies; General Index (meta-traits)*

	M1 coef	SE	<i>p</i>
Age	0.48	(0.31)	
Female	2.42	(0.89)	**
Education	-0.76	(0.68)	
Religiosity	0.13	(0.13)	
Thermometer Muslims	0.01	(0.02)	
Muslim	6.90	(2.89)	*
Interest in politics	2.04	(0.48)	***
Left-right scale	-0.40	(0.22)	†
Issue importance	-0.16	(0.17)	
Initial opinion <sup>a</sup>	-0.23	(0.18)	
Opinion extremity <sup>b</sup>	2.99	(0.24)	***
Political Knowledge	0.41	(0.25)	
Neosexism	0.16	(0.33)	
Stability	-1.61	(0.59)	**
Plasticity	0.37	(0.46)	
Constant	42.60	(4.13)	***
Observations	829		
R <sup>2</sup>	0.25		

*Note.* The dependent variable in all models is the extent to which respondents used the resistance strategy from 0 “minimum” to 100 “maximum”. Models are OLS regressions.

<sup>a</sup> Varies between 0 “very against the face veil” and 10 “very in favour the face veil”

<sup>b</sup> Varies between 0 “very moderated” and 5 “very extreme”

\*\*\* p<0.001, \*\* p<0.01, \* p<0.05, † p<0.1

## Appendix D

### Stimulus materials

The persuasive arguments were based on the initiative for the so-called “burqa ban” that proposed to forbid face coverings in public spaces. The referendum, that was launched by the radical right-wing party Swiss people’s party SVP was accepted with a slim majority of 51.2% in March 2021. The arguments for the stimuli were inspired by the arguments published the websites of the parties that either supported or rejected the initiative.

To control for the content and strength of the argument, as well as potential recency effects, this study created eight experimental conditions (see Table D1). Half of the participants were randomly assigned to read a statement of approximately 100 words that either argued based on gender equality (e.g., “a state ban on burqas prevents women's self-determination”) or political Islam (e.g., “fundamentalist Islam could get out of control in Switzerland”). The remaining 50% of the respondents read a combination of both arguments, whereby the sequence of the statements was alternated. In general, the respondents perceived the arguments as moderately convincing ( $M = 3.48/7$ ,  $SD = 1.56$ ). Although the statements with both arguments were rated as slightly more convincing, there was no significant difference between the strong and the weak version of stimuli ( $p = 0.1$ ).

**Table D.1***Stimulus Material (Translated from German)*

	Pro	Contra
Argument «gender equality»	<p>This is why our committee is for a ban on the face veil:</p> <p>Only in rare cases is the burqa worn voluntarily and a minority of Muslim women wear it as a profession of faith. The majority of women is forced by political Islam to cover themselves against their will.</p> <p>The burqa is part of Islamic patriarchy and prevents women's self-determination. Every woman should be able to decide for herself how she wants to dress. Anything else is a paternalism by political Islam and thus an oppression of freedom.</p> <p>According to the Swiss Criminal Code, forcing a woman to cover her face can be punished under the offence of coercion. However, an explicit provision of law is missing. Consequently, the enforced laws in Switzerland are not sufficient to protect Muslim women from having to cover their faces. An explicit ban is therefore urgently needed.</p> <p>A burqa ban is an effective instrument to improve equality between men and women and to put a stop to political Islam.</p>	<p>This is why our committee is against a ban on the face veil:</p> <p>In Switzerland, the burqa is mostly worn voluntarily and is a profession of faith for the majority of Muslim women. Only a minority is forced by political Islam to cover themselves against their will.</p> <p>Free choice of dress is part of a liberal state. A state ban on burqas, on the other hand, prevents women's self-determination. Every woman should be able to decide for herself how she wants to dress. Anything else is paternalism by the state and thus an oppression of freedom.</p> <p>According to the Swiss Criminal Code, forcing a woman to cover her face can be punished under the offence of coercion, even if there is no explicit provision of law. Consequently, the enforced laws in Switzerland are sufficient to protect Muslim women from having to cover their faces. An explicit ban is therefore not necessary.</p> <p>A burqa ban is not an effective instrument to improve equality between women and men and cannot put political Islam to a stop.</p>
Argument «political Islam»	<p>This is why our committee is <b>for</b> a ban on the face veil:</p> <p>As in other Western countries, the problem with fundamentalist Islam could also get out of control in Switzerland. The veiling of women is a symbol of political Islam. By banning the burqa, political Islam with its misogynistic traditions can be stopped.</p>	<p>This is why our committee is <b>against</b> a ban on the face veil:</p> <p>Compared to other Western countries, we have the problem with fundamentalist Islam under control in Switzerland. Nevertheless, the veiling of women can be a symbol of political Islam. A burqa-ban is unsuitable to stop political Islam and its misogynist traditions, however.</p>

---

Instead of enacting individual integration measures, as the Federal Council's indirect counter-proposal suggests, the burqa must be banned. Only a ban offers affected women the possibility to actively integrate into Swiss society and prevents the formation of a Muslim parallel society.

A burqa ban is an effective instrument to improve equality between men and women and to put a stop to political Islam.

Instead of banning the burqa, more targeted integration measures must be enacted, as the Federal Council's indirect counter-proposal suggested. A general ban will discourage the affected women from actively integrating into Swiss society and will encourage the formation of a Muslim parallel society.

A burqa ban is not an effective instrument to improve equality between women and men and cannot put political Islam to a stop

---

*Note.* The strong version of the counter-attitudinal message contained both arguments (i.e., gender equality & political Islam), whereby the order of the arguments was randomized.

## Appendix E

### Questionnaire

The following items are translated from German.

#### *Personality Traits*

I see myself as:

- Extraverted, enthusiastic.
- Critical, quarrelsome.
- Dependable, self-disciplined.
- Anxious, easily upset.
- Open to new experiences, complex.
- Reserved, quiet.
- Sympathetic, warm.
- Disorganized, careless.
- Calm, emotionally stable.
- Conventional, uncreative.

#### *Resistance Strategies*

##### *Counterarguing*

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements. While reading, I

- disputed the arguments
- doubted the arguments

##### *Source derogation*

Now we would like to know what you think about the committee that issued this statement.

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. The committee...

- is trustworthy.
- is credible.
- has a high level of expertise on the subject.

#### *Derogation of the persuasive tactic*

Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements.

- The way the committee tried to convince people seems acceptable to me.
- The committee tried to manipulate readers in a way that I don't like.
- I was not bothered by the committee's statement. It tried to persuade without being overly manipulative.

#### *Selective avoidance*

If you had to read more about the initiative, what kind of information would you want?

- More information from the Yes Committee
- More information from the No Committee
- All of the above options
- None of the above options

#### *Attitude bolstering*

To what extent do you agree with the following statements? While reading the arguments ...

- I mentally made a list of arguments in favor of my opinion.
- I thought about why my views are right for me personally.

### *Social validation*

To what extent do you agree with the following statements? While reading the arguments ...

- I have thought about people who share my views, which has strengthened my opinion.

### *Self-assertion*

To what extent do you agree with the following statements? While reading the arguments ...

- I thought that no argument would change my mind on this issue.
- I thought that I would not change my mind because I am convinced of it.

### *Negative Affect*

While reading the arguments, I felt ...

- angry
- irritated

### *Covariates*

#### *Religiosity*

Regardless of whether you belong to a particular faith community or not, how religious/faithful/spiritual are you?

(1 = 'absolutely not', 10 = 'a lot')

#### *Feelings thermometer*

How would you describe your personal feelings towards the following groups in general?

Please move the slider on a scale from 0 (= cold) to 100 (= warm) to the point that corresponds to your personal feelings.

- Foreigners
- Muslims



- Refugees
- Non-believers
- Strictly religious, fundamentalist people
- Moderately religious people

### *Neosexism*

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

- Inequality between men and women is no longer a problem in Switzerland.
- Women's demands for equality are simply exaggerated.
- It is understandable why women's groups are still concerned about societal limitations on women's opportunities.

### *Issue importance*

In the following, we are specifically concerned with the ban on Muslim women covering their faces in Switzerland. How important is such a ban for you personally? (0 = 'absolutely not important', 10 = 'very important').

### *Political knowledge*

How many parties are currently represented in the Federal Council?

- 2 parties
- 3 parties
- 4 parties
- 5 parties
- 6 parties
- I don't know

Which party currently has the most seats in the National Council?

- SVP - Swiss People's Party
- CVP - Christian Democratic People's Party / Die Mitte
- FDP - The Liberals / Free Democratic Party
- SPS - Social Democratic Party
- GPS - Green Party / Green Party Switzerland
- Don't know

By whom are federal councillors (i.e. members of the national government) elected in Switzerland?

- The people
- National Council (200 members)
- Council of States (46 deputies)
- United Federal Assembly (National Council and Council of States)
- Delegates of political parties
- Don't know

*Issue knowledge*

Do you know to which citizenship most Muslims in Switzerland belong?

- Switzerland
- Balkan states
- Turkey
- EU & EFTA
- Middle East

- Don't know

What is the percentage of Muslims in the total Swiss population?

- Under 3%
- Between 3-6%
- Between 6-10%
- Over 10%
- Don't know

Please rate the following statements as true or false.

- Cantons do not have the legal means to implement a veiling ban.
- Forcing someone to cover their face against their will is now a punishable offense.
- The terms Islam and Islamism are to be treated synonymously.

Which of these forms of veiling corresponds to a burqa? Multiple answers are allowed.

