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# <H2> *Questionnaires (English Translation)*

*<*H3*> Face-to-Face Interviewing*

*Hi, I am [name], volunteer of Milieudefensie. I don't want to ask you for a donation, but can I have 5 minutes of your time to ask your opinion about climate change?*

* Are you worried about climate change? If yes, what are you particularly worried about? If no, why not?

Yes – Slightly – No

* If we want to stop further climate change, we must invest in green solutions. That costs money. Who do you think should pay for this? Why or why not?
* Oil, coal, and gas cause climate change. That is why the Netherlands must switch to sustainable energy. Nevertheless, the Netherlands gives a subsidy of 7.6 billion euros to oil, coal, and gas. Did you know? What do you think of that?
* Several statements will follow. We want to learn to what extent you agree with these statements.

Completely disagree (1) - Completely agree (5) - I do not know

* + I think it is more important that the government puts money in good public transport than in motorways.
	+ The government can tackle the nitrogen crisis by helping farmers to switch to circular agriculture. (A lot of money is needed for that).
	+ New investments in oil, coal, and gas projects must be prevented.
	+ There is currently no law that prohibits greenhouse gas emissions. It is time for this law to come. Even if this means that the Dutch economy will temporarily grow less as a result.
	+ All major polluting companies in the Netherlands must take their responsibility and also contribute to climate policy.
	+ Climate measures cost money. The government must ensure that low-income households do not lose out as a result of these measures.
	+ Jungle has been cut down for palm oil in our daily shopping. This causes the earth to heat up faster. I think that products with this type of ingredients should no longer be for sale.
* Finally, how do you think climate policy can be fairer?

*Thank you for answering these statements and questions! With this we are going to draw up a plan that we will present to politicians.*

* We visit as many Dutch people as possible. Do you want to be kept informed of our work?
* Would you like to help with going from door to door and having conversations yourself?
* How engaged was the person with the climate? Not engaged → engaged

## <H3> Online Survey 2019

* What is your first name?
* Hi [name], nice that you want to think along with us. We will present a number of statements.
	+ I find it important that low incomes do not decrease due to climate measures.
	+ If it were up to me, the government would put more money in cars than in public transport and bicycles.
	+ If it were up to me, the government would no longer subsidise oil, coal and gas industries.
	+ I think it is important that farmers receive a fair price for their products from now on, so that they can become more sustainable.
	+ If it were up to me, large companies would not have to contribute to climate solutions.
	+ If it were up to me, soon, there would only be climate-friendly products in the store.
* How do you think climate policy can become fairer?
* Can we keep you informed by email?
	+ What is your email address?

## <H3> Online Survey 2020

* What is your first name?
* Hi [name], nice that you want to think along with us. We will present a number of statements. Let’s start.
	+ I find it important that low incomes do not decrease due to climate measures.
	+ I think it is important that farmers receive a fair price for their products, so that they can become more sustainable.
	+ If it were up to me, the government would put more money in cars than in public transport and bicycles.
	+ If it were up to me, soon, there would only be climate-friendly products in the store.
	+ Big companies do not have to pay for climate solutions.
	+ Per year, 7.6 billion euros of governmental support goes to the oil, coal, and gas industry. This should continue.
	+ Importing wood to be burned in Dutch power plants is a bad idea.
* How do you think climate policy can become fairer?
* Can we keep you informed by email?
	+ What is your email address?
	+ One more thing: could we get your telephone number (optional)?

# <H2> *Questionnaires (Original Dutch)*

## <H3> Face-to-Face Interviewing

*Hoi, ik ben [naam], vrijwilliger van Milieudefensie. Ik wil je niet vragen om een donatie maar mag ik 5 minuten van je tijd om je mening te vragen over klimaatverandering?*

* Maak je je zorgen over klimaatverandering? Zo ja, waarover maak je je vooral zorgen? Zo nee, waarom niet?

Ja – Een beetje – Nee

* Als we verdere klimaatverandering willen tegenhouden, moeten we investeren in groene oplossingen. Dat kost geld. Wie vind je dat dit moet betalen?
* Olie, kolen en gas veroorzaken klimaatverandering. Daarom moet Nederland overstappen op duurzame energie. Toch geeft Nederland 7,6 miljard euro subsidie aan olie, kolen en gas. Wist je dat? Wat vind je daarvan?

Ja – Nee

* Hierna volgen een aantal stellingen. Graag willen we weten in welke mate je het met deze stellingen eens bent.

1: helemaal oneens - 5: helemaal eens - ?: weet ik niet

* + Ik vind het belangrijker dat de overheid geld steekt in goed openbaar vervoer dan in autowegen.
	+ De overheid kan de stikstof crisis aanpakken door boeren te helpen om te schakelen op kringlooplandbouw. (landbouw waarbij de kringloop van stoffen gesloten is). De overheid moet daarvoor veel geld beschikbaar maken.
	+ Nieuwe investeringen in olie-, kolen- en gas projecten moeten voorkomen worden.
	+ Er is nu nog geen wet die de uitstoot van broeikasgassen verbiedt. Het is tijd dat deze wet er komt. Ook als dit betekent dat de Nederlandse economie daardoor tijdelijk minder groeit.
	+ Alle grote vervuilende bedrijven in Nederland moeten hun verantwoordelijkheid nemen en ook mee gaan betalen aan klimaatbeleid
	+ Klimaatmaatregelen kosten geld. De overheid moet ervoor zorgen dat huishoudens met lage inkomens er niet op achteruitgaan door deze maatregelen.
	+ Voor de palmolie in onze dagelijkse boodschappen is oerwoud gekapt. Hierdoor warmt de aarde sneller op. Ik vind dat producten met dit soort klimaat schadelijke ingrediënten niet meer in de supermarkt mogen liggen.
* Tot slot, heb je zelf nog suggesties voor de politiek over eerlijker klimaatbeleid? *Bedankt voor het beantwoorden van deze stellingen en vragen! Hiermee gaan wij een plan opstellen waarmee we naar de politiek gaan.*
* We gaan bij zoveel mogelijk Nederlanders langs. Wil je op de hoogte gehouden worden van ons werk?
* Zou je mee willen helpen met van deur-tot-deur gaan en zelf gesprekken voeren?
* Hoe begaan met het klimaat was de persoon die je sprak? Minder begaan – begaan

## <H3> Online Survey (2019)

* Wat is je voornaam?
* Hoi [naam], leuk dat je met ons mee wilt denken. We leggen je een aantal stellingen voor.
	+ Ik vind het belangrijk dat lage inkomens er niet op achteruit gaan door klimaatmaatregelen.
	+ Als het aan mij ligt, steekt de overheid meer geld in de auto dan in openbaar vervoer en de fiets.
	+ Als het aan mij ligt, geeft de overheid geen subsidie meer aan olie, kolen en gas.
	+ Ik vind het belangrijk dat boeren voortaan een eerlijke prijs voor hun producten krijgen, zodat ze kunnen verduurzamen.
	+ Als het aan mij ligt, hoeven grote bedrijven niet mee te betalen aan klimaatoplossingen.
	+ Als het aan mij ligt, liggen er binnenkort alleen nog klimaatvriendelijke producten in de winkel.
* Hoe denk jij dat het klimaatbeleid eerlijker kan?
* Wat is je e-mailadres?
	+ Mogen we je op de hoogte houden via e-mail?

## <H3> Online Survey (2020)

* Wat is je voornaam?
* Hoi [naam], leuk dat je met ons mee wilt denken. We leggen je een aantal stellingen voor. We gaan beginnen:
	+ Ik vind het belangrijk dat lage inkomens er niet op achteruit gaan door klimaatmaatregelen.
* Ik vind het belangrijk dat boeren een eerlijke prijs voor hun producten krijgen, zodat ze kunnen verduurzamen.
* De overheid moet meer geld in de auto steken dan in openbaar vervoer en de fiets.
* Als het aan mij ligt, liggen er binnenkort alleen nog klimaatvriendelijke producten in de winkel.
* Grote bedrijven hoeven niet mee te betalen aan klimaatoplossingen.
* Er gaat jaarlijks in totaal €7,6 miljard aan overheidssteun naar olie, kolen en gas. Dat moet zo doorgaan.
* Hout importeren om in Nederlandse energiecentrales te verbranden is een slecht idee.
* Hoe denk jij dat het klimaatbeleid eerlijker kan?
* Mogen we je op de hoogte houden via e-mail?
	+ Wat is je e-mailadres?
* En dan nog dit: Mogen we je telefoonnummer? (optioneel)

# <H2> *Codebook*

<H3> *Scripts and Data*

Interviews.xslx

Face-to-face interviewing data, includes previous cleaning steps (e.g.,

translation, anonymization).

Online.xslx Online survey data, includes previous cleaning steps (e.g., translation, anonymization).

Milieudefensie.r Analysis script in R

Robustness.r Robustness checks script in R

<H3> *Face-to-Face Interviewing Data*

year Year 2019, 2020

concern Levels of concern about climate change

yes (1), slightly (0), no (–1)

qual\_concern Contents of climate concern Qualitative

qual\_solutions Who should pay for solutions

and why (not)

Qualitative

fossil

Knowledge about subsidies to yes (1), no (0)

fossil fuel industry

qual\_fossil Beliefs about subsidies to fossil fuel industry

Qualitative

pub\_trans

Fund public transport than

motorways

completely agree (5) to completely

disagree (1), I don't know (1)

cir\_agri Fund costly transition to circular agriculture

completely agree (5) to completely disagree (1), I don't know (–1)

new\_inv

Prevent new investments in

oil, coal, and gas

completely agree (5) to completely

disagree (1), I don't know (–1)

ghg\_law Prohibit greenhouse gas emissions

completely agree (5) to completely disagree (1), I don't know (–1)

corp\_resp

Polluting companies must

take responsibility

completely agree (5) to completely

disagree (1), I don't know (–1)

low\_inc Prevent losses for low income households, completely agree (5) to completely disagree (1), I don't know (–1)

palm\_oil

No more products with palm completely agree (5) to completely

oil in shops disagree (1), I don't know (–1)

fair\_policy ? ?

qual\_fairer\_policy

How can climate policy

become fairer?

Qualitative

int\_engagement Interviewer-rated levels of

engagement with climate change

not engaged (0) to highly engaged (4)

urbanity Urbanity ratings very urban (1) to not urban (5)

<H3> *Online Data*

year Year 2019, 2020

low\_inc Prevent losses for low income households

completely agree (5) to completely disagree (1), I don't know (–1)

imp\_car (r)

Fund cars rather than public

transport and biking infrastructure

completely agree (5) to completely

disagree (1), I don't know (–1)

stop\_subsidy Stop subsidising fossil fuel industry

completely agree (5) to completely disagree (1), I don't know (–1)

farmers\_fair

Farmers should receives fair completely agree (5) to completely

prices to become sustainable disagree (1), I don't know (-1)

companies\_exempt (r)

Large companies don’t have to contribute to climate solutions

completely agree (5) to completely disagree (1), I don't know (–1)

climate\_products

Only climate-friendly

products in stores

completely agree (5) to completely

disagree (1), I don't know (–1)

keep subsidy (r) Keep subsidising fossil fuel

industry

completely agree (5) to completely disagree (1), I don't know (–1)

wood\_bad

Don’t burn imported wood

completely agree (5) to completely

disagree (1), I don't know (–1)

qual\_fairer\_policy How can climate policy become fairer?

Qualitative

email\_provision Provide e-mail adress Yes (1), No (0)

email Sign-up for email newsletter Yes (1), No (0)

phone Provide phone number Yes (1), No (0)

<H2> ***Data Cleaning and Anonymization Steps***

<H3> *Face-to-Face Sample*

1. We deleted empty columns (Coronalessen, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, Toelichting, Tot slot, 28) and invalid columns (standwerk: not correctly used during data collection) columns.
2. We translated (Dutch to English) and named variables.
3. We recoded non-responses (empty) to ‘NA’.
4. We calculated urbanity scores based on postal codes.
	1. 530 entries were coded as 9999 indicating missing data. Note that 9999 is also the postal code of a Dutch area, so some entries may wrongly indicate missing data.
	2. We made a new column ‘urbanity’ in which we manually inserted the respective averaged urbanity score per area using ‘[Gebieden in Nederland](https://opendata.cbs.nl/statline/%23/CBS/nl/dataset/84378NED/table?ts=1619363457602)’ (CBS, 2019). CBS (2019) uses a five-point scale to measure urbanity ranging from 1 (high urbanity) to 5 (low urbanity). Many postcodes had different urbanity scores and their averages often resulted in decimal numbers. If a postal code was not recorded or did not exist, we coded it as missing data ‘NA’ which resulted in 542 missing postal codes in total.
	3. We deleted the postal code and area columns for anonymization.
5. We recoded dates into years for anonymization.

<H3> *Online data (2019, 2020)*

1. We translated (Dutch to English) and named variables.
2. Per dataset, we created the variable year and assigned the respective year (2019, 2020) to all cases.
3. In both datasets, we deleted the following columns: id, name, start date, end date, network id for anonymization.
4. We merged the datasets 2019 and 2020.
	1. Identical variables: imp\_car, low\_inc, farmers\_fair, companies\_exempt, climate\_products, email, email\_permission, qual\_how\_fairer, year.
	2. Unique variables: stop\_subsidy (only for 2019 data), keep\_subsidy (2020), wood\_bad (2020), telephone (2020).
5. Missing data: we recoded non-responses (empty) as missing data (NA).

# <H2> *EFA preference for climate policy*

Exploratory factor analyses (EFA) using the psych package were implemented to analyze the underlying factors of the two scales (face-to-face and online data) measuring preference for climate policy. Model adequacy was based on theory, factor loadings, internal consistency of the scales (α > .6), and the fit indices displayed in Table S1[[1]](#footnote-1).

**<Insert Table S1 Here>**

<H3> *Round 1*

*Assumptions.*In the face-to-face and online sample, sample sizes were five times higher than the number of items, and therefore deemed adequate (MacCallum et al., 1999). In the face-to-face data, 73 multivariate outliers were detected through Mahalanobis distance, χ2(7) = 24.32. In the online data, 1119 multivariate outliers were detected, χ2(5) = 20.52.

None of these outliers seemed to deviate markedly from the other observations, so all were kept for further analysis. Data were screened for multivariate assumptions (normality, linearity, homoscedasticity), which were met with problems of heteroscedasticity (both samples) and non-linearity (online sample). For the face-to-face data, Bartlett’s test indicated correlation adequacy, χ2(21) = 2555.15, *p* < .001, and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test indicated sampling adequacy, Kaiser's Measure of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) = .8 (Hair et al., 2007). For the online data, Bartlett’s test indicated correlation adequacy, χ2(10) = 21286.73, *p* < .001, and the KMO test indicated sampling adequacy, MSA = .69 (Hair et al., 2007).

*Analyses.* For the face-to-face data, scree plot examination suggested a one-factor solution. Maximum likelihood estimation was used with direct oblimin rotation.

When testing the seven items, a one-factor solution was found (all loadings > .3; Table S2a). Fit indices indicated excellent model fit, Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) = .97, root mean square of residuals (RMSR) = .02, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .03, comparative fit index (CFI) = .98). Internal consistency was acceptable (α = .67).

**<Insert Table S2a Here>**

For the online data, scree plot examination suggested a one or two-factor solution.

When testing a one-factor solution, all items apart from item 6 (prevent losses for low-income households) loaded on one factor. Factor loadings are presented in Table S2b. The CFI (.89) indicated excellent model fit, while the TLI (.84) and RMSR (.06) indicated moderate fit, and the RMSEA (.11) indicated poor fit. Internal consistency was acceptable (α = .62).

**<Insert Table 2b Here>**

When testing a two-factor solution, simple structure was achieved with three items loading on the first factor and two items loading on the second factor. Factor loadings are presented in Table S2c. Fit indices indicated excellent fit of the model (TLI = .96, CFI = 1, RMSR = .01, RMSEA = .05). Internal consistency was acceptable (α = .62).

**<Insert Table S2c Here>**

*Interpretation.*Based on the respective fit indices, factor loadings and reliability scores, a one-factor solution for the face-to-face sample and a two factor-solution for the online sample seem adequate. However, there was an inconsistency regarding the item ‘prevent losses for low-income households’. While it was present in both datasets, it was part of the one-factor solution in the face-to-face sample, while loading on a second factor in the online sample. Moreover, its factor loading in the face-to-face sample was relatively low (.30). These observations are intuitive based on theory. Rather than measuring policy support for climate change mitigation like ‘fund public transport than motorways’, ‘prevent losses for low-income households’ might assess attitudes towards social justice more generally.

Therefore, we removed it from both scales and performed another round of EFA.

<H3> *Round 2*

*Assumptions.*For both datasets, sample sizes were five times higher than the item number, and therefore deemed adequate (MacCallum et al., 1999). In the face-to-face data, 77 multivariate outliers were detected through Mahalanobis distance, χ2(6) = 22.46. In the online data, 1108 multivariate outliers were detected, χ2(4) = 18.47. None of these outliers seemed to deviate markedly from the other observations, so they were kept for further analysis. Next, data were screened for multivariate assumptions (normality, linearity, homoscedasticity), which were acceptable with problems of heteroscedasticity and non-linearity (both samples). For the face-to-face data, Bartlett’s test indicated correlation adequacy, χ2(15) = 2318.021, *p* < .001, and the KMO test indicated sampling adequacy, MSA = .79 (Hair et al., 2007). For the online data, Bartlett’s test indicated correlation adequacy, χ2(6) = 19615.29, *p* < .001, and the KMO test indicated sampling adequacy, MSA = .69 (Hair et al., 2007).

*Analyses.*In the second round, scree plot examination suggested one-factor solutions for both samples. Maximum likelihood estimation was used with direct oblimin rotation. For both datasets, a one-factor solution was yielded with six items loading on one factor in the face-to-face sample and four items loading on one factor in the online sample.

Factor loadings of the face-to-face data are presented in Table S3a. All fit indices indicated excellent mode fit (TLI = .99, CFI = .99, RMSEA = .03, RMSR = .02). Internal consistency was acceptable (α = .67). Factor loadings of the online data are presented in Table S3b. Fit indices indicated excellent model fit (TLI = .93, CFI = .97, RMSEA = .09, RMSR = .04). Internal consistency was acceptable (α = .67). Factor loadings of the online data are presented in Table S3b.

**<Insert Table S3a Here>**

**<Insert Table S3b Here>**

*Interpretation.*Based on the fit indices, factor loadings, and reliability scores, one-factor solutions seem adequate for the ‘preference for climate policy’-scales in the face-to-face and online sample, which aligns with the theoretical predictions.

<H3> *References*

<REFJ> Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Pearson. University Press.

<REFJ> MacCallum, R. C., Widaman, K. F., Zhang, S., & Hong, S. (1999). Sample size in factor analysis. *Psychological methods*, *4*(1), 84. [https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.4.1.84](https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/1082-989X.4.1.84)

<H2> ***Formulas***

To determine effect sizes for Kendall’s tau (Cohen, 1988), *τb* was transformed to Pearson R (*r*) (Kendall, 1970, p. 126).

𝑟 = 𝑠𝑖(π \* τ𝑏 \* . 5) (1)

For the Wilcoxon rank sum tests, effect sizes were calculated using Equation (2) (Rosenthal, 1991).

𝑟 = 𝑍/√𝑁1 + 𝑁2 (2)

# <H2> *Robustness checks*

In our analyses, we removed one item (‘prevent losses for low income households’) from the preference for climate policy-scale because this led to reliable single-factor solutions for both scales (face-to-face and online), which increases comparability between the samples. Moreover, we did not impute missing data. To explore whether these analytic decisions (Model 1) influenced our results, we performed three robustness checks. All models showed highly similar results (see Tables S5a,b and S6). More climate concern and preference for climate policy predicted interviewer-rated engagement (strong association), email sign-up (moderate association), and phone number provision (weak association). Urbanity was not related to concern, policy preferences, and interviewer-rated engagement. Exploratory analyses suggest no difference in policy preferences between the face-to-face and online samples.

*Model 2:* we kept ‘prevent losses for low income households’ on the preference for climate policy-scale.

 *Model 3:* we removed ‘prevent losses for low income households’ from the preference for climate policy-scale and imputed missing data for relevant items through multiple imputation.

 *Model 4:* we kept ‘prevent losses for low income households’ on the preference for climate policy-scale and imputed missing data for relevant items through multiple imputation.

See Table S4a, b for an overview on the items and respondents included in the multiple imputation of missing data for models 3 and 4.

**<Insert Table S4a Here>**

**<Insert Table S4b Here>**

Kendall's tau-b correlations (*τb*) were run to assess the relationships between climate concern/preference for climate policy and interviewer-rated engagement with climate change (face-to-face sample, *Hypothesis 1a,b*), email sign-up, and phone number provision (online sample, *Hypothesis 2*) as well as between urbanity and preference for climate policy/interviewer-rated engagement with climate change (face-to-face sample) (*Hypothesis 3a,b*). Correlation coefficients of Model 1 and the three alternative models were highly similar in strength and direction (see Table S5a and Table S5b).

**<Insert Table S5a here>**

**<Insert Table S5b here>**

Wilcoxon rank sum tests were run to explore differences in preference for climate policy between the face-to-face and online sample. Results of Model 1 and the three alternative models were highly similar regarding mean differences (see Table S6).

**<Insert Table S6 here>**

<H2> ***Qualitative Data***

Key themes extracted from open-ended responses (*n* = 553) are presented in Table S7. A non-random sample of respondents was coded due to limited time. Because respondents were sorted by postal code, the subset consisted of respondents who lived in and around Amsterdam.

**<Insert Table S7 Here>**

**Table S1**

 *Goodness of Fit and Residual Fit Statistics*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Fit | Name | Excellent | Acceptable | Poor |
| TLI | Tucker-Lewis Index | > .95 | > .90 | < .90 |
| CFI | Comparative fit index | > .95 | >.90 | < .90 |
| RMSEA | Root mean square error of approximation | < .06 | .06–.08 | > .10 |
| RMSR | Root mean square of the residual | < .06 | .06–.08 | > .10 |

**Table S2a**

*Factor Loadings (One-Factor Solution) ‘Preference for Climate Policy’ Face-to-Face Sample* *(Round 1)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item  | Factor loadings |
| 1 (Fund public transport than motorways) | .45 |
| 2 (Fund costly transition to circular agriculture) | .42 |
| 3 (Prevent new investments in oil, coal, and gas) | .50 |
| 4 (Prohibit greenhouse gas emissions) | .68 |
| 5 (Polluting companies must take responsibility) | .57 |
| 6 (Prevent losses for low income households) | .30 |
| 7 (No more products with palm oil in shops) | .47 |

**Table S2b**

*Factor Loadings (One-Factor Solution) ‘Preference for Climate Policy’ Online Sample (Round 1)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item  | Factor loadings |
| 1 (Fund public transport than motorways) | .45 |
| 2 (Fund costly transition to circular agriculture) | .42 |
| 3 (Prevent new investments in oil, coal, and gas) | .50 |
| 4 (Prohibit greenhouse gas emissions) | .68 |
| 5 (Polluting companies must take responsibility) | .57 |
| 6 (Prevent losses for low income households) | .30 |
| 7 (No more products with palm oil in shops) | .47 |

**Table S2c**

*Factor Loadings (Two-Factor Solution) ‘Preference for Climate Policy’ Online Sample (Round 1)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Items | Factor loadings 1 | Factor loadings 2 |
| 1 (Prevent losses for low income households) | –.12 | .48 |
| 2 (Farmers should receives fair prices to become sustainable) | .17 | .45 |
| 3 (Only climate-friendly products in stores) | .75 | .03 |
| 4 (Keep subsidising fossil fuel industry, reversed) | .71 | –.06 |
| 5 (Large companies don’t have to contribute to climate solutions, reversed) | .40 | .27 |

**Table S3a**

*Factor Loadings (One-Factor Solution) in the Face-to-Face Data (Round 2)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Items | Factor loadings 1 | Factor loadings 2 |
| 1 (Prevent losses for low income households) | –.12 | .48 |
| 2 (Farmers should receives fair prices to become sustainable) | .17 | .45 |
| 3 (Only climate-friendly products in stores) | .75 | .03 |
| 4 (Keep subsidising fossil fuel industry, reversed) | .71 | –.06 |
| 5 (Large companies don’t have to contribute to climate solutions, reversed) | .40 | .27 |

**Table S3b**

*Factor Loadings (One-Factor Solution) Policy Preferences of the Online Data (Round 2)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item | Factor loadings |
| 1 (Farmers should receives fair prices to become sustainable) | .39 |
| 3 (Only climate-friendly products in stores) | .78 |
| 4 (Keep subsidising fossil fuel industry, reversed) | .65 |
| 5 (Large companies don’t have to contribute to climate solutions, reversed) | .53 |

**Table S4a**

*Multiple Imputation (Face-To-Face Data)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 3 | Model 4 |
| Imputed items |
|  Climate concern (‘levels of concern about climate change’) | x | x |
|  ‘Fund public transport than motorways’ | x | x |
|  ‘Fund costly transition to circular agriculture’ | x | x |
|  ‘Prevent new investments in oil, coal, and gas’ | x | x |
|  ‘Prohibit greenhouse gas emissions’ | x | x |
|  ‘Polluting companies must take responsibility’ | x | x |
|  ‘Prevent losses for low income households’ |  | x |
|  ‘No more products with palm oil in shops’ | x | x |
|  ‘Interviewer ratings of engagement with climate change’ | x | x |
|  Urbanity ratings | x | x |
| Imputed respondents | at least 6/9 items recorded | at least 7/10 items recorded |

**Table S4b**

*Multiple Imputation (Online Data)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 3 | Model 4 |
| Imputed items |
|  ‘Prevent losses for low income households’ |  | x |
|  ‘Farmers should receives fair prices to become sustainable’ | x | x |
|  ‘Only climate-friendly products in stores’ | x | x |
|  ‘Fund cars rather than public transport and biking infrastructure’ (reversed) | x | x |
|  ‘Large companies don’t have to contribute to climate solutions’ (reversed) | x | x |
|  ‘Sign-up for email newsletter’ | x | x |
|  ‘Provide phone number’ |  |  |
| Imputed respondents | at least 4/6 items recorded | at least 5/7 items recorded |

**Table S5a**

*Correlation Coefficients (Face-To-Face Sample; Model Ns: 1,932 to 3,078)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 |
| *τb* (climate concern, interviewer-rated engagement with climate change) | .36\*\*\* | .36\*\*\* | .36\*\*\* | .36\*\*\* |
| *τb* (preference for climate policy,  interviewer-rated engagement with climate change) | .34\*\*\* | .32\*\*\* | .32\*\*\* | .31\*\*\* |
| *τb* (climate concern,  urbanity) | –.04\* | –.04\* | –.05\*\*\* | –.06\*\* |
| *τb* (preference for climate policy,  urbanity) | .04\* | .05\*\* | .04\* | .01 |
| *τb* (interviewer-rated engagement with climate change, urbanity) | –.03\* | –.03\* | –.04\*\* | –.06\*\*\* |

*Note*. All Pearson's correlations were 2-tailed. \* *p* < .05 \*\* *p* < .01 \*\*\* *p* < .001 .

**Table S5b**

*Correlation Coefficients (Online Sample; Model Ns: 12158 To 30225)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| *τb* (preference for climate policy, providing email) | .29\*\*\* | .28\*\*\* | .29\*\*\* | .28\*\*\* |
| *τb* (preference for climate policy, providing phone) | .09\*\*\* | .1\*\*\* | .1\*\*\* | .1\*\*\* |

*Note*. All Pearson's correlations were 2-tailed. \* *p* < .05 \*\* *p* < .01 \*\*\* *p* < .001 .

**Table S6**

*Wilcoxon Rank Sum Tests: Preference for Climate Policy (Face-To-Face Versus Online Sample)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 |
| *M (SD)* preference for climate policy (face-to-face) | 4.35 (0.60) | 4.35 (0.57) | 4.33 (0.61) | 4.33 (0.58) |
| *n* (preference for climate policy, face-to-face) | 2,389 | 2,359 | 3,001 | 2,993 |
| *M (SD)* preference for climate policy (online) | 4.14 (0.84) | 4.17 (0.74) | 4.14 (0.84) | 4.17 (0.74) |
| *n* (preference for climate policy, online) | 29,796 | 29,481 | 30,227 | 30,264 |
| Wilcoxon *W* | 39201774 | 39328702 | 49100864 | 50273296 |
| *z* | 8.34 | 10.7 | 7.54 | 9.99 |
| *p* | < .001 | < .001 | < .001 | < .001 |
| *r* | .05 | .06 | .04 | .05 |

Qualitative data

Key themes extracted from open-ended responses (*n* = 553) are presented in Table S7.

A non-random sample of respondents was coded due to limited time. Because respondents were sorted by postal code, the subset consisted of respondents who lived in and around Amsterdam.

Table S7

*Climate Concern: Key Themes*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Themes | *N* | % | Content |
| **Consequences** | **323** | **58.41** | **Concerns about negative consequences** |
|  *General* | 192 | 59.5 | Sea-level rise, extreme weather events, ice-melting, war, and migration |
|  *External* | 56 | 17.3 | Consequences for others like (their own) children and grandchildren, future generations, and other countries |
|  *Natural* | 53 | 16.4 | Ecological devastation, biodiversity loss, and threats to animals |
|  *Personal* | 22 | 6.8 | Own health and finances |
| **Problem (solving)** | **135** | **24.41** | **Answers directed towards underlying problems and solutions** |
|  *Urgency and power problem* | 80 | 59.3 | Urgency of solving the issue: not acting in time/not aware enough, or mentioning where responsibility lies or the problem of power. Mostly related to industry, multinationals, and government |
|  *Consumerism and resource use* | 55 | 40.7 | Consumerism, anti-consumerism, and resource use (plastic, food, energy, waste). |
| **Feeling** | **71** | **12.84** | **Emotional responses** |
|  *Hopeless* | 19 | 22.1 | Worry, helplessness (“I don’t feel we can do anything”), and doubts about (partial) mitigation |
|  *Hopeful* | 12 | 14.0 | “We will make it”, “We are on track with finding solutions”, and belief in technology |
|  *Denial* | 10 | 11.6 | Climate change does not exist, climate has always changed, it’s just a hype”, and science skepticism |
|  *No specific reason* | 30 | 34.9 | One-word answers like “disastrous’’, “definitely worried”, or “everything” |
| **Don’t know** | **15** | **2.71** | “Don’t know what to say”, “never considered the matter”, “too old to care”, or no answer |
| **Other** | **9** | **0.16** | Unrelated or no answer |
| **Total**  | **553** | **100** |  |

*Note*. The entries are sorted by frequency with the most common major categories listed first, and again by frequency within each category.

1. See [https://osf.io/7aysb/](https://osf.io/7aysb/%20) (Buchanan) for a step-by-step guide to EFA that we used as a guideline for the analyses. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)