Table 1. Online information-sharing behaviour in the previous year (N = 1,201)

	No	Once	More than once	Do not know	Previous month
E-mail address	14.7	29.6	52.8	2.8	71.1 (of *N* = 990)
Home address	37.4	36.1	22.5	4.1	61.1 (of *N* = 703)
Bank account number	58.8	27.7	11.1	2.4	53.7 (of *N* = 466)
Citizen service number	79.1	16.8	1.7	2.4	44.1 (of *N* = 222)
Log-in credentials	92.9	2.7	1.7	2.6	53.7 (of *N* = 54)
PIN codes / security codes	96.2	1.2	0.6	2.1	57.2 (of *N* = 21)

Note. information-sharing does not include activities such as logging in to an e-mail account or online-banking environment.

Table 2. Channels of online information-sharing behaviour (N = 1,021)

	Yes	Familiar locations	Unfamiliar locations
E-mail	62.7	75.8 (of *N* = 660)	28.5 (of *N* = 660)
Web shops	47.9	40.7 (of *N* = 489)	62.4 (of *N* = 489)
Websites	28.9	34.6 (of *N* = 295)	70.2 (of *N* = 295)
Instant messaging	26.4	94.4 (of *N* = 270)	7.4 (of *N* = 270)
Corporate websites	9.3	-	-
Social media messages	6.2	82.5 (of *N* = 63)	23.8 (of *N* = 63)
personal websites/social media profiles	5.1	-	-
Other	5.3	-	-

Note. because participants could have shared their information to both familiar and unfamiliar sources the percentages presented next do not precisely add up to 100.

Table 3. Analysis of model parameters for T1 and T2 (N = 786)

		T1					T2				
Outcome variable	Predictor variable	R^2	Beta	S.E.	t^a		R^2	Beta	S.E.	t^a	
FE	PV	0.35	0.44	0.03	14.05	***	0.47	0.56	0.03	22.05	***
	PS		0.33	0.03	10.15	***		0.30	0.03	10.75	***
PM	PV	0.57	0.04	0.03	0.84		0.58	-0.03	0.03	0.84	
	PS		0.11	0.03	3.54	***		0.03	0.03	1.23	
	FE		0.13	0.03	4.08	***		0.23	0.04	6.56	***
	RE		0.07	0.03	2.10	*		0.10	0.03	3.24	***
	SE		0.68	0.03	19.70	***		0.65	0.03	18.92	***
	RC		0.00	0.04	0.12			-0.07	0.04	1.99	*

Note. PV: perceived vulnerability. PS: perceived severity. FE: fear. PM: protection motivation. RE: response efficacy. SE: self-efficacy. RC: response costs. * $p < .05$. *** $p < .001$.

[a]Bootstrap, N = 5,000.

Table 4. Analysis of model parameters per condition (T1, N = 786)

		Strong fear appeal condition (N = 249)					Weak fear appeal condition (N = 263)					Control condition (N = 274)				
Outcome variable	Predictor variable	R^2	Beta	S.E.	t^a		R^2	Beta	S.E.	t^a		R^2	Beta	S.E.	t^a	
FE	PV	0.33	0.37	0.06	6.50	***	0.42	0.55	0.05	10.88	***	0.34	0.41	0.05	7.39	***
	PS		0.37	0.06	6.28	***		0.29	0.05	5.37	***		0.34	0.06	6.18	***
PM	PV	0.58	0.02	0.05	0.38		0.59	0.06	0.06	1.11		0.63	0.07	0.05	1.28	
	PS		0.09	0.06	1.56			0.07	0.05	1.52			0.12	0.05	2.38	*
	FE		0.14	0.06	2.45	*		0.11	0.06	1.99	*		0.16	0.05	3.00	**
	RE		0.04	0.05	0.77			0.13	0.06	2.25	*		0.02	0.05	0.30	
	SE		0.71	0.07	11.13	***		0.67	0.06	11.59	***		0.73	0.06	13.22	***
	RC		0.01	0.06	0.10			-0.03	0.06	0.47			-0.05	0.06	0.87	

Note. PV: perceived vulnerability. PS: perceived severity. FE: fear. PM: protection motivation. RE: response efficacy. SE: self-efficacy. RC: response costs. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

[a]Bootstrap, N = 5,000.

Table 5. Results from PLS-MGA analysis, comparing conditions

		Strong fear appeal vs. weak fear appeal	Strong fear appeal vs. control condition	Weak fear appeal vs. control condition
Outcome	Predictor	*t*	*t*	*t*
FE	PV	2.374*	0.603	1.780
	PS	0.907	0.344	0.582
PM	PV	0.530	0.602	0.053
	PS	0.204	0.501	0.748
	FE	0.353	0.209	0.582
	RE	1.120	0.328	1.425
	SE	0.482	0.212	0.750
	RC	0.377	0.685	0.341

*Note. PV: perceived vulnerability. PS: perceived severity. FE: fear. PM: protection motivation. RE: response efficacy. SE: self-efficacy. RC: response costs. * $p < .05$.*

Table 6. Analysis of model parameters per condition (T2, N = 786)

		Strong fear appeal condition (N = 249)					Weak fear appeal condition (N = 263)					Control condition (N = 274)				
Outcome variable	Predictor variable	R^2	Beta	S.E.	t^a		R^2	Beta	S.E.	t^a		R^2	Beta	S.E.	t^a	
FE	PV	0.50	0.57	0.05	12.01	***	0.48	0.58	0.04	13.58	***	0.44	0.55	0.04	12.18	***
	PS		0.31	0.07	6.54	***		0.26	0.05	4.93	***		0.33	0.04	7.45	***
PM	PV	0.52	-0.02	0.05	0.32		0.64	-0.04	0.06	0.58		0.62	-0.02	0.05	0.46	
	PS		0.05	0.06	0.86			0.02	0.04	0.39			0.02	0.04	0.53	
	FE		0.33	0.07	4.57	***		0.22	0.06	3.57	***		0.16	0.05	3.02	**
	RE		0.07	0.06	1.22			0.10	0.05	1.94			0.14	0.05	2.62	**
	SE		0.59	0.07	8.91	***		0.68	0.05	14.04	***		0.70	0.06	11.77	***
	RC		-0.11	0.06	1.74			-0.10	0.05	1.82			-0.02	0.07	0.33	

Note. PV: perceived vulnerability. PS: perceived severity. FE: fear. PM: protection motivation. RE: response efficacy. SE: self-efficacy. RC: response costs. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

[a]Bootstrap, N = 5,000.

Table 7. Results from PLS-MGA analysis, comparing measurements (T1 versus T2)

		Strong fear appeal	Weak fear appeal	Control condition
Outcome	Predictor	*t*	*t*	*t*
FE	PV	2.738**	0.454	1.988*
	PS	0.792	0.398	0.142
PM	PV	0.459	1.218	1.213
	PS	0.494	0.797	1.464
	FE	2.080*	1.317	0.000
	RE	0.381	0.386	1.594
	SE	1.295	0.132	0.372
	RC	1.354	0.902	0.327

*Note. PV: perceived vulnerability. PS: perceived severity. FE: fear. PM: protection motivation. RE: response efficacy. SE: self-efficacy. RC: response costs. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.*