APPENDIX B

Supplementary materials: Results

Additional descriptive statistics

Table 1

Descriptive statistics, full sample

Variable	*M*	*SD*	Cronbach's α
Party evaluation	2.83	0.92	.94
Voting intention[1]	2.03	1.08	
Ad evaluation	3.25	0.80	
Ad evaluation 1 (coal)	2.80	1.06	.88
Ad evaluation 2 (bikes vs cars)	3.12	1.14	.92
Ad evaluation 3 (afforestation)	3.84	0.95	.94
Attitude strength	3.83	1.04	
Attitude strength 1 (coal)	3.77	1.32	.88
Attitude strength 2 (bikes vs cars)	4.16	1.29	.90
Attitude strength 3 (afforestation)	3.59	1.40	.92
Extraversion	3.07	0.76	.86
Political interest[1]	3.64	1.19	

[1] one item

Table 2

Descriptive statistics group: Introverted / incongruent

Measure	*n*	*M*	*SD*
Ad evaluation	88	2.9	0.7
Party evaluation	88	2.7	0.9
Voting intention	88	2.0	1.0
Attitude strength	88	3.8	1.1
Attitude position	88	3.1	0.8
Extraversion level	88	3.1	0.8
Political interest	88	3.5	1.2

Table 3

Descriptive statistics group: Extraverted / congruent

	n	*M*	*SD*
Ad evaluation	87	3.7	0.7
Party evaluation	87	3.1	0.8
Voting intention	87	2.2	1.2
Attitude strength	87	3. 9	1.1
Attitude position	87	3.2	0.8
Extraversion level	87	3.1	0.7
Political interest	87	3.6	1.3

Table 4

Descriptive statistics group: Extraverted / incongruent

	n	*M*	*SD*
Ad evaluation	100	2.8	0.8
Party evaluation	100	2.6	0.9
Voting intention	100	1.6	0.8
Attitude strength	100	3.9	1.0
Attitude position	100	3.4	0.9
Extraversion level	100	3.0	0.8
Political interest	100	3.7	1.1

Table 5

Descriptive statistics group: Introverted / congruent

	n	*M*	*SD*
Ad evaluation	93	3.6	0.6
Party evaluation	93	3.0	0.9
Voting intention	93	2.3	1.1
Attitude strength	93	3.8	1.0
Attitude position	93	3.3	0.8
Extraversion level	93	3.1	0.8
Political interest	93	3.8	1.1

Test of preconditions for MANCOVA

1. Outliers: Visual analysis of outliers identified few critical IDs, we chose to include those into our analysis.
2. Normal distribution: Partly confirmed through non-significant Shapiro Wilk test, however not for dV party evaluation and voting intention. As MANCOVA is relatively robust, we chose to continue analysis (Finch, 2005).
3. Multicollinearity: Correlations between dependent variables were low ($r < .90$), indicating that multicollinearity was not a confounding factor in the analysis (e.g., Harlow, 2014).

References

Harlow, L. L. (2014). *The Essence of Multivariate Thinking: Basic Themes and Methods (Multivariate Applications)* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Finch, H. (2005). Comparison of the Performance of Nonparametric and Parametric MANOVA Test Statistics when Assumptions Are Violated. *Methodology, 1*(1), 27–38. https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-1881.1.1.27