Appendices

Appendix 1: Question wording

US question wording

Political campaigners sometimes try to target their adverts and messages to different groups of voters during an election. Could you tell us which of the following types of personal information or characteristics you think political campaigns _currently use_ to target their ads and messages at voters? Please check all that apply.

Age
- Gender
- Ethnicity
- Relationship status (e.g., married, single, divorced)
- Sexual orientation
- Religious views
- Political views
- Personality profiles (e.g. if you are cautious or outgoing)
- Major life events (e.g. getting married, having a baby, a bereavement, retirement)

And looking at the same list, how acceptable do you think it is for political campaigners to use these different types of personal information to target their ads and messages at voters?

[Answer options: Not at all acceptable; Not very acceptable; Fairly acceptable; Very acceptable; Don't know]

German question wording (in English, as above for US)

Politische Kampagnen sprechen mit ihrer Werbung und ihren Botschaften während des Wahlkampfs manchmal gezielt verschiedene Wählergruppen an. Würden Sie uns bitte mitteilen, welche der folgenden Arten von persönlichen Informationen und Eigenschaften politische Kampagnen Ihrer Meinung nach _derzeit_ verwenden, um mit ihren Werbungen und Botschaften Wählerinnen und Wähler gezielt anzusprechen? Bitte wählen Sie alle zutreffenden Antworten aus.

- Alter
- Geschlecht/Gender
- Ethnische Zugehörigkeit
- Beziehungsstatus (z. B. verheiratet, alleinstehend, geschieden)
- Sexuelle Orientierung
- Religiöse Ansichten
- Politische Ansichten
- Persönlichkeitsprofile (z. B. ob jemand vorsichtig oder aufgeschlossen ist)
- Wichtige Lebensereignisse (z. B. Heirat, Geburt eines Kindes, Trauerfall, Ruhestand)
- Keines der oben Genannten
- Weiß nicht

Und wenn Sie sich diese Liste erneut ansehen, **wie akzeptabel** ist es Ihrer Meinung nach, dass politische Kampagnen diese unterschiedlichen Arten von persönlichen Informationen verwenden, um Wähler mit ihren Werbungen und Botschaften gezielt anzusprechen?

[Answer options: Überhaupt nicht akzeptabel; Eher nicht akzeptabel; Eher akzeptabel; Sehr akzeptabel; Weiß nicht]

Dutch question wording

[Translation from Dutch] Political parties and campaigning organizations sometimes try to tailor their political ads and messages to different groups of voters during an election. Can you tell us what personal information or characteristics you believe are currently used by political parties and organizations campaigning to tailor their ads and messages to voters.

- Age
- Gender
- Ethnicity
- Marital status, married, single, divorced
- Sexual orientation
- Religious views
- Political views
- Personality profiles (e.g., Whether you are cautious or extroverted)
- Major life events (e.g., Getting married, having a child, a death, retiring.

Only for the variables that were clicked: And looking at the same list, how acceptable do you find it when Political parties and campaigning organizations use these different types of personal information to tailor their political ads and messages to voters.

[Answer options: Not at all acceptable; Not very acceptable; Fairly acceptable; Very acceptable; Don't know]

Original Dutch

Politieke partijen en organisaties die campagne voeren proberen tijdens een verkiezing soms hun politieke advertenties en berichten af te stemmen op verschillende groepen kiezers. Kunt u ons vertellen welke persoonlijke informatie of kenmerken volgens u momenteel door Politieke partijen en organisaties die campagne voeren worden om hun advertenties en berichten op kiezers af te stemmen.

- Leeftijd
- Geslacht
- Etniciteit
- Burgerlijke staat, getrouwd, alleenstaand, gescheiden
- Seksuele geaardheid
- Religieuze opvattingen
- Politieke opvattingen
- Persoonlijkheidsprofielen (bijv. Of je voorzichtig bent of extravert)
- Belangrijke gebeurtenissen in het leven (bijv. Trouwen, een kind krijgen, een sterfgeval, met pensioen gaan.

Alleen voor de variabelen die zijn aangeklikt: En als u naar dezelfde lijst kijkt, hoe acceptabel vindt u het als Politieke partijen en organisaties die campagne voeren deze verschillende soorten persoonlijke informatie gebruiken om hun politieke advertenties en berichten op kiezers af te stemmen.

[Answer options: Helemaal niet acceptabel; Niet heel acceptabel; Een beetje acceptabel; Heel acceptabel; Weet ik niet]

Appendix 2: Acceptability frequencies

US Acceptability Frequencies

Table 1: How acceptable is it for political campaigners to use... for this purpose?

	Age		Gender		Ethnicity		Relationship Status		Sexual Orientation		Religious views		Political views		Personality profiles		Major life events	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not at all acceptable	666	16.8	850	21.5	1,012	25.6	912	23.1	1,231	31.1	1,077	27.2	469	11.9	909	23.0	1,034	26.1
Not very acceptable	453	11.5	588	14.9	688	17.4	659	16.7	746	18.9	675	17.1	290	7.3	675	17.1	742	18.8
Fairly acceptable	1,410	35.6	1,201	30.4	1,057	26.7	1,152	29.1	828	20.9	1,017	25.7	1,276	32.3	1,089	27.5	1,012	25.6
Very acceptable	805	20.3	699	17.7	568	14.4	531	13.4	456	11.5	553	14.0	1,346	34.0	471	11.9	449	11.3
Don’t know	622	15.7	618	15.6	631	16.0	702	17.7	695	17.6	634	16.0	575	14.5	812	20.5	719	18.2
Total	3,956	100	3,956	100	3,956	100	3,956	100	3,956	100	3,956	100	3,956	100	3,956	100	3,956	100

German Acceptability Frequencies

Table 2: How acceptable is it for political campaigners to use... for this purpose?

	Age		Gender		Ethnicity		Relationship Status		Sexual Orientation		Religious views		Political views		Personality profiles		Major life events	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not at all acceptable	882	17.9	1,465	29.8	1,530	31.1	1,339	27.2	2,138	43.5	1,762	35.8	729	14.8	1,307	26.6	1,451	29.5
Not very acceptable	593	12.1	861	17.5	1,043	21.2	960	19.5	928	18.9	1,057	21.5	483	9.8	965	19.6	1,010	20.5
Fairly acceptable	1,933	39.3	1,332	27.1	1,151	23.4	1,424	28.9	763	15.5	1,019	20.7	1,763	35.8	1,403	28.5	1,267	25.8
Very acceptable	824	16.7	501	10.2	395	8.0	449	9.1	347	7.1	331	6.7	1,223	24.9	390	7.9	392	8.0
Don't know	688	14.0	761	15.5	801	16.3	748	15.2	744	15.1	751	15.3	722	14.7	855	17.4	800	16.3
Total	4,920	100	4,920	100	4,920	100	4,920	100	4,920	100	4,920	100	4,920	100	4,920	100	4,920	100

The Netherlands Acceptability Frequencies

Table 3: How acceptable is it for political campaigners to use... for this purpose?

	Age		Gender		Ethnicity		Relationship Status		Sexual Orientation		Religious views		Political views		Personality profiles		Major life events	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not at all acceptable	163	20.1	161	30.0	268	46.6	122	30.9	155	56.4	199	32.4	144	19.8	99	42.7	98	32.2
Not very acceptable	126	15.5	127	23.7	143	24.9	95	24.1	53	19.3	130	21.2	90	12.4	59	25.4	69	22.7
Fairly acceptable	331	40.8	163	30.4	102	17.7	108	27.3	33	12.0	186	30.3	254	35.0	45	19.4	87	28.6
Very acceptable	171	21.1	76	14.2	47	8.2	57	14.4	23	8.4	84	13.7	217	29.9	18	7.8	36	11.8
Don’t know	20	2.5	10	1.9	15	2.6	13	3.3	11	4.0	15	2.4	21	2.8	11	4.7	14	4.6
Total	811	100	537	100	575	100	395	100	275	100	614	100	726	100	232	100	304	100

Appendix 3: Regression Analyses – Variable operationalisation (US, Germany and Netherlands)

Table 1: US ordinal regression predictor variable operationalisation

Age	Treated as a discrete variable referring to age in years.
Gender	Male = 1; Female = 0
Education	Nominal variable with three categories: "Did not finish high school" (=0), a combined category comprised of "Finished high school" and "some college" (=1), and "College qualification", which includes the following categories: "2-year", "4-year", and "post-grad".
Political leaning	An 11-point scale ranging from very liberal (=0) to very conservative (=10)
Political interest	An 10-point scale ranging from "pay no attention to politics" (= 0) to "pay a great deal of attention to politics" (= 10)
Ethnicity	A nominal variable with four categories: "White" (=1); "Black" (=2); "Hispanic" (=3); and "Other" (=4), for which dummies are used in the regression. Included under the category "Other" are the collapsed, additional categories: "Asian", "Native American", "Two or more races", "Middle Eastern" and "Other".

Table 2: German ordinal regression predictor variable operationalisation

Age	Treated as a discrete variable referring to age in years.
Gender	Male = 1; Female = 0
Education	Nominal variable with three categories: "Did not finish lower secondary school" (= 0); "Finished lower secondary school" (=1); "Finished upper secondary school" (=2). These condensed categories are based on the following: - Did not finish lower secondary school: "Ohne schulabschluss"; "Noch in schulischer Ausbildung"; "Haupt-(Volks-)schulabschluss - Finished lower secondary school: Realschul- oder gleichwertiger Abschluss (POS, Mittlere Reife) - Finished high school: Abitur, Fachhochschulreife
Political leaning	An 11-point scale ranging from left (=0) to right (=10)
Political interest	A 5-point scale ranging from "not interested in politics at all" (=1) to "a very strong interest in politics" (=5)

Ethnicity/migration background	A binary variable with the categories “no migration background” (=0) and “migration background” (=1), based on whether the respondent indicates to have migrated from any country other than Germany.

Table 3: Dutch ordinal regression predictor variable operationalisation

Age	Treated as a discrete variable referring to age in years.
Gender	Male = 1; Female = 0,
Education	Nominal variable with three categories: “low” (= 1); “Middle (=2); “high” (=3), based on CBS categories.
Political leaning	An 11-point scale ranging from left (=1) to right (=11)
Political interest	A 7-point scale ranging from “not interested in politics at all” (=1) to “a very strong interest in politics” (=7)
Ethnicity/migration background	A binary variable with the categories “no migration background” (=1) and “migration background” (=2). No migration background indicates that both parents of the respondents are born in the Netherlands. A migration background indicates that at least one parent is not born in the Netherlands.

Appendix 4 Ordinal regression tables by individual types of data (US, Germany and Netherlands)

US ordinal regression tables

Table 1: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by age

	b	(se)	O.R.
Age	-.007***	.002	.993
Male (ref: Female)	.231**	.067	1.260
Education (ref: No high school)			
Up to high school/Some college	-.111	.171	.895
College qualification	-.018	.177	.982
Ideology (liberal to conservative)	-.012	.011	.988
Interest in politics	.081***	.014	1.084
Ethnicity (ref: White)			
Black	.507***	.110	1.660
Hispanic	.077	.096	1.080
Other	-.061	.128	.941
Cut 1	.-1.211	.223	
Cut 2	-.466	.221	
Cut 3	1.425	.223	
Pseudo R^2	.010		
N	3,110		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 2: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by gender

	b	(se)	O.R.
Age	-.005*	.002	.995
Male (ref: Female)	.241***	.066	1.273
Education (ref: No high school)			
Up to high school/Some college	-.089	.164	.915
College qualification	.113	.170	1.120
Ideology (liberal to conservative)	.010	.011	1.010

Interest in politics	.068***	.014	1.071
Ethnicity (ref: White)			
Black	.791***	.108	2.205
Hispanic	.353***	.096	1.423
Other	.011	.124	1.011
Cut 1	-.575	.215	
Cut 2	.246	.215	
Cut 3	1.927	.218	
Pseudo R^2	.014		
N	3,113		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 3: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by ethnicity

	b	**(se)**	**O.R.**
Age	-.009***	.002	.991
Male (ref: Female)	.299***	.066	1.349
Education (ref: No high school)			
Up to high school/Some college	-.175	.163	.839
College qualification	.051	.169	1.053
Ideology (liberal to conservative)	.009	.011	1.009
Interest in politics	.046**	.014	1.047
Ethnicity (ref: White)			
Black	.696***	.107	2.006
Hispanic	.443***	.095	1.558
Other	.018	.127	1.018
Cut 1	-.743	.215	
Cut 2	.160	.214	
Cut 3	1.765	.217	
Pseudo R^2	.015		
N	3,100		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 4: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by relationship status

	b	(se)	O.R.
Age	-.009***	.002	.991
Male (ref: Female)	.298***	.090	1.347
Education (ref: No high school)			
Up to high school/Some college	-.202	.138	.818
College qualification	-.028	.170	.973
Ideology (liberal to conservative)	.049***	.012	1.050
Interest in politics	.041**	.015	1.041
Ethnicity (ref: White)			
Black	.441***	.168	1.554
Hispanic	.271**	.127	1.311
Other	-.053	.119	.948
Cut 1	-.787	.221	
Cut 2	.128	.221	
Cut 3	1.887	.224	
Pseudo R^2	.013		
N	3,033		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 5: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by sexual orientation

	b	(se)	O.R.
Age	-.017***	.002	.984
Male (ref: Female)	.359***	.067	1.431
Education (ref: No high school)			
Up to high school/Some college	-.139	.162	.870
College qualification	.077	.168	1.080
Ideology (liberal to conservative)	.005	.011	1.005
Interest in politics	.053***	.014	1.054
Ethnicity (ref: White)			

Black	.558***	.108	1.748
Hispanic	.211*	.098	1.234
Other	-.005	.125	.995
Cut 1	-.752	.215	
Cut 2	.227	.215	
Cut 3	1.676	.218	
Pseudo R^2	.020		
N	3,044		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 6: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by religious views

	b	**(se)**	**O.R.**
Age	-.013***	.002	.987
Male (ref: Female)	.315***	.066	1.371
Education (ref: No high school)			
Up to high school/Some college	-.242	.164	.785
College qualification	.002	.169	1.002
Ideology (liberal to conservative)	.072***	.011	1.074
Interest in politics	.048**	.014	1.049
Ethnicity (ref: White)			
Black	.468***	.106	1.597
Hispanic	.149	.095	1.161
Other	-.103	.125	.902
Cut 1	-.618	.216	
Cut 2	.275	.215	
Cut 3	1.826	.218	
Pseudo R^2	.019		
N	3,095		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 7: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by political views

	b	(se)	O.R.
Age	-.009***	.002	.991
Male (ref: Female)	.129	.067	1.137
Education (ref: No high school)			
Up to high school/Some college	.185	.169	1.204
College qualification	.382*	.175	1.465
Ideology (liberal to conservative)	-.016	.011	.984
Interest in politics	.099***	.014	1.104
Ethnicity (ref: White)			
Black	.007	.108	1.008
Hispanic	-.236*	.096	.790
Other	-.395**	.129	.673
Cut 1	-1.535	.224	
Cut 2	-.918	.222	
Cut 3	.804	.222	
Pseudo R^2	.013		
N	3,147		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 8: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by personality profiles

	b	(se)	O.R.
Age	-.010***	.002	.990
Male (ref: Female)	.317***	.068	1.373
Education (ref: No high school)			
Up to high school/Some college	-.121	.167	.886
College qualification	-.056	.173	.946
Ideology (liberal to conservative)	.034**	.011	1.035
Interest in politics	.033*	.014	1.033
Ethnicity (ref: White)			
Black	.586***	.110	1.796

Hispanic	.222*	.099	1.249
Other	.051	.127	1.052
Cut 1	-.873	.219	
Cut 2	.084	.218	
Cut 3	1.859	.222	
Pseudo R^2	.013		
N	2,932		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 9: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by major life events

	b	**(se)**	**O.R.**
Age	-.013***	.002	.987
Male (ref: Female)	.214**	.067	1.238
Education (ref: No high school)			
Up to high school/Some college	-.054	.165	.948
College qualification	.022	.171	1.022
Ideology (liberal to conservative)	.053***	.011	1.054
Interest in politics	.035*	.014	1.036
Ethnicity (ref: White)			
Black	.389***	.110	1.476
Hispanic	.200*	.096	1.222
Other	-.025	.127	.976
Cut 1	-.782	.219	
Cut 2	.224	.218	
Cut 3	1.895	.222	
Pseudo R^2	.013		
N	3,014		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

German ordinal regression tables

Table 10: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by age

	b	(se)	O.R.
Age	-.023***	.002	.978
Male (ref: Female)	.199**	.061	1.220
Education (ref: No high school)			
Finished lower secondary school	-.225**	.084	.798
Finished upper secondary school	-.184*	.085	.832
Ideology (left to right)	.014	.015	1.014
Interest in politics	.098**	.031	1.102
Migration background	.289**	.095	1.334
Cut 1	-2.183	1.729	
Cut 2	-1.444	1.711	
Cut 3	.681	1.701	
Pseudo R^2	.018		
N	4,003		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 11: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by gender

	b	(se)	O.R.
Age	-.021***	.002	.979
Male (ref: Female)	.071	.061	1.074
Education (ref: No high school)			
Finished lower secondary school	-.209*	.083	.811
Finished upper secondary school	-.258**	.084	.773
Ideology (left to right)	-.013	.015	.987
Interest in politics	.022	.031	1.023
Migration background	.306**	.094	1.357
Cut 1	-1.808	.170	
Cut 2	-.933	.169	
Cut 3	.860	.170	

Pseudo R^2	.015		
N	3,935		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 12: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by ethnicity

	b	**(se)**	**O.R.**
Age	-.019***	.002	.981
Male (ref: Female)	.143*	.061	1.154
Education (ref: No high school)			
Finished lower secondary school	-.278**	.084	.757
Finished upper secondary school	-.493***	.085	.611
Ideology (left to right)	.057***	.015	1.059
Interest in politics	.030	.031	1.030
Migration background	.401***	.094	1.500
Cut 1	-1.368	.172	
Cut 2	-.289	.170	
Cut 3	1.490	.175	
Pseudo R^2	.017		
N	3,915		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 13: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by relationship status

	b	**(se)**	**O.R.**
Age	-.020***	.002	.980
Male (ref: Female)	.222***	.061	1.249
Education (ref: No high school)			
Finished lower secondary school	-.361***	.084	.700
Finished upper secondary school	-.460***	.085	.631
Ideology (left to right)	.030*	.015	1.031
Interest in politics	.037	.031	1.038
Migration background	.312**	.094	1.366

Cut 1	-1.733	.171	
Cut 2	-.741	.169	
Cut 3	1.224	.171	
Pseudo R^2	.016		
N	3,950		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 14: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by sexual orientation

	b	**(se)**	**O.R.**
Age	-.031***	.002	.970
Male (ref: Female)	.261***	.064	1.299
Education (ref: No high school)			
Finished lower secondary school	-.377***	.087	.686
Finished upper secondary school	-.482***	.088	.618
Ideology (left to right)	.033*	.015	1.034
Interest in politics	-.029	.032	.971
Migration background	.382***	.095	1.466
Cut 1	-1.619	.177	
Cut 2	-.581	.175	
Cut 3	.845	.178	
Pseudo R^2	.034		
N	3,953		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 15: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by religious views

	b	**(se)**	**O.R.**
Age	-.022***	.002	.980
Male (ref: Female)	.176**	.062	1.192
Education (ref: No high school)			
Finished lower secondary school	-.257**	.084	.773
Finished upper secondary school	-.359***	.085	.698

Ideology (left to right)	.090***	.015	1.094
Interest in politics	.032	.031	1.033
Migration background	.367***	.094	1.444
Cut 1	-1.048	.172	
Cut 2	.051	.171	
Cut 3	1.825	.177	
Pseudo R^2	.023		
N	3,952		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 16: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by political views

	b	**(se)**	**O.R.**
Age	-.015***	.002	.985
Male (ref: Female)	.113	.061	1.120
Education (ref: No high school)			
Finished lower secondary school	-.083	.083	.920
Finished upper secondary school	-.008	.084	.992
Ideology (left to right)	-.015	.015	.985
Interest in politics	.193***	.031	1.212
Migration background	.158	.094	1.171
Cut 1	-1.775	.173	
Cut 2	-1.100	.171	
Cut 3	.746	.171	
Pseudo R^2	.011		
N	3,984		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 17: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by personality profiles

	b	**(se)**	**O.R.**
Age	-.022***	.002	.978
Male (ref: Female)	.183**	.062	1.201

Education (ref: No high school)			
Finished lower secondary school	-.251**	.084	.780
Finished upper secondary school	-.421***	.085	.656
Ideology (left to right)	.014	.015	1.014
Interest in politics	.027	.031	1.028
Migration background	.335***	.096	1.400
Cut 1	-1.872	.174	
Cut 2	-.844	.172	
Cut 3	1.228	.175	
Pseudo R^2	.017		
N	3,849		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 18: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by major life events

	b	**(se)**	**O.R.**
Age	-.021***	.002	.980
Male (ref: Female)	.099	.062	1.104
Education (ref: No high school)			
Finished lower secondary school	-.246**	.084	.782
Finished upper secondary school	-.389***	.085	.678
Ideology (left to right)	.036*	.015	1.036
Interest in politics	.010	.031	1.010
Migration background	.341***	.096	1.406
Cut 1	-1.649	.172	
Cut 2	-.604	.170	
Cut 3	1.295	.174	
Pseudo R^2	.016		
N	3,894		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Dutch ordinal regression tables

Table 19: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by age

	b	(se)	O.R.
Age	-.03***	.004	.973
Male (ref: Female)	.23	.143	1.260
Education (ref: low)			
Medium	-.51*	.196	.598
High	-.07	.201	.933
Ideology (left to right)	.01	.027	1.001
Interest in politics	.12	.060	1.122
Migration background	-.13	.261	.879
Cut 1	-2.245	.432	
Cut 2	-1.397	.427	
Cut 3	.564	.425	
Pseudo R^2	.03		
N	764		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 20: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by gender

	B	(se)	O.R.
Age	-.02***	.005	.982
Male (ref: Female)	.40*	.174	1.494
Education (ref: low)			
Medium	-.14	.264	.867
High	.02	.265	1.020
Ideology (left to right)	.06	.034	1.061
Interest in politics	.10	.074	1.101
Migration background	-.25	.295	.775
Cut 1	-.749	.519	
Cut 2	.320	.517	
Cut 3	2.019	.526	

Pseudo R^2	.02		
N	508		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 21: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by ethnicity

	b	**(se)**	**O.R.**
Age	-.01*	.005	.987
Male (ref: Female)	.49**	.175	1.630
Education (ref: low)			
Medium	.06	.248	1.057
High	-.01	.259	.982
Ideology (left to right)	.16***	.034	1.176
Interest in politics	-.04	.070	.958
Migration background	.06	.271	1.067
Cut 1	.226	.508	
Cut 2	1.429	.511	
Cut 3	2.866	.527	
Pseudo R^2	.03		
N	545		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 22: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by relationship status

	b	**(se)**	**O.R.**
Age	-.02**	.007	.979
Male (ref: Female)	.58**	.205	1.790
Education (ref: low)			
Medium	-.92**	.278	.398
High	-.62*	.283	.538
Ideology (left to right)	.07	.041	1.073
Interest in politics	.02	.084	1.027
Migration background	-.14	.352	.873

Cut 1	-1.647	.650	
Cut 2	-.545	.643	
Cut 3	1.024	.651	
Pseudo R^2	.03		
N	374		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 23: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by sexual orientation

	b	**(se)**	**O.R.**
Age	-.01	.008	.988
Male (ref: Female)	.42	.276	1.527
Education (ref: low)			
Medium	-.03	.411	.972
High	.01	.428	1.012
Ideology (left to right)	.10	.055	1.102
Interest in politics	.00	.111	1.000
Migration background	.28	.431	1.317
Cut 1	.616	.801	
Cut 2	1.632	.804	
Cut 3	2.699	.822	
Pseudo R^2	.02		
N	255		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 24: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by religious views

	b	**(se)**	**O.R.**
Age	-.01*	.005	.990
Male (ref: Female)	.21	.161	1.230
Education (ref: low)			
Medium	-.02	.226	.983
High	-.19	.234	.823

Ideology (left to right)	.08**	.032	1.086
Interest in politics	.05	.066	1.051
Migration background	-.40	.269	.670
Cut 1	-.534	.481	
Cut 2	.403	.480	
Cut 3	2.087	.490	
Pseudo R^2	.01		
N	584		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 25: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by political views

	b	**(se)**	**O.R.**
Age	-.02***	.005	.984
Male (ref: Female)	.20	.151	1.221
Education (ref: low)			
Medium	-.23	.202	.793
High	.14	.214	1.149
Ideology (left to right)	.07*	.029	1.071
Interest in politics	.10	.062	1.111
Migration background	-.17	.251	.844
Cut 1	-1.212	.443	
Cut 2	-.528	.441	
Cut 3	1.024	.442	
Pseudo R^2	.04		
N	683		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 26: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by personality profiles

	b	**(se)**	**O.R.**
Age	-.01	.009	.989
Male (ref: Female)	.53	.282	1.704

Education (ref: low)			
Medium	.08	.449	1.079
High	-.54	.450	.581
Ideology (left to right)	-.02	.056	.984
Interest in politics	.04	.126	1.043
Migration background	-.21	.419	.808
Cut 1	-.475	.893	
Cut 2	.720	.892	
Cut 3	2.289	.919	
Pseudo R^2	.02		
N	212		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.

Table 27: Ordinal regression results of acceptability of targeting by major life events

	b	**(se)**	**O.R.**
Age	.00	.007	1.001
Male (ref: Female)	-.06	.241	.946
Education (ref: low)			
Medium	-.28	.368	.753
High	-.37	.369	.690
Ideology (left to right)	.03	.048	1.027
Interest in politics	-.08	.093	.928
Migration background	-.42	.336	.655
Cut 1	-1.177	.669	
Cut 2	-.191	.664	
Cut 3	1.483	.676	
Pseudo R^2	.01		
N	279		

***Significant at $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$, two-tailed.