Supplement

Composition of Focus Groups:

In the pre-survey, all responds (N = 197) were asked to what extent they agreed with the following climate related statements:

General	Flying	Meat-eating/taxes
1) Climate change is happening and is caused by humans. 2) I have already thought a lot about climate change. 3) I often worry about the possible negative consequences of climate change. 4) My life, health, and general well-being are seriously threatened as a result of climate change. 5) I feel personally responsible for combating climate change.	6) It would be better if people fly less. 7) Flying should be banned. 8) Plane tickets should become more expensive. 9) People should not fly more than once a year. 10) People should only fly if they offset their CO2 emissions. 11) Short flights (<2 hours) should be banned. 12) Everyone has the right to decide for themselves whether to fly (reverse coded).	13) It would be better if people ate less meat. 14) Eating meat should be banned. 15) Meat should be heavily taxed. 16) People should not eat meat more than three times a week. 17) Intensive livestock farming should be stopped. 18) The campus of the UvA should be meat-free. 19) Everyone has the right to eat meat 7 days a week (reverse coded).

Note. Scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Based on these 19 questions, we created three composites, and we calculated their means and variation: (a) *General* (M = 5.2, min. = 1.4, max = 7), (b) *Flying* (M = 3.5, min. = 1, max = 6.4), and (3) *Meat* (M = 3.8, min. = 1, max = 6.6).

Based on these three composites, we created a ranking-list, with respondents with the most "extreme opinions" (relative to these three means) on top of the list and with respondents with the least "extreme opinions" on the bottom of the list.

We invited the respondents with the most extreme opinions to participate in the focus group, and in cases where they did not respond, we selected respondents with less extreme opinions.

We then created 7 focus-groups (total N = 23), making sure that in each of these there were, at the very least, two individuals on both side of the (relative) extremes. This provided the following range for the three composites: (a) *General* (M = 5, min. = 3, max = 6.8), (b) *Flying* (M = 3.6, min. = 1.4, max = 5), and (3) Meat (M = 3.6, min. = 1.7, max = 6.1).

Table S1. Describing the Focus Groups and Relative Differences in Framing Categories.

	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**
Participants (*N*)	3	3	3	5	3	2	4
Sequences	11	11	12	8	9	12	10
Actions	217	212	223	170	255	229	200
Framing Categories							
Issue	214	209	223	169	251	227	197
Identity and Relationships	58	34	48	34	37	47	42
Process	61	26	12	29	16	20	19

Note. The actions and framing categories include the comments made by the moderator. Importantly, the same action can contain multiple framing categories.

Table S2. Frequency counts of framing-interaction strategies across the focus-groups

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Weighted %
Thematic								
Co-optation	0	3	1	0	2	0	1	0.4%
Integration	46	51	65	30	83	64	56	**24.77%**
Yielding	1	0	4	4	5	0	2	1.04%
Alignment	29	26	35	18	46	26	26	**12.90%**
Devaluation	6	2	1	2	5	0	0	0.97%
Ignorance	3	5	16	13	7	3	6	3.56%
Contradiction	17	16	18	10	21	5	6	**5.83%**
Escalation	5	3	7	1	1	0	2	1.20%
Reconciliation	15	9	9	4	2	3	8	3.19%
Nuancing	13	8	15	11	15	8	12	**5.25%**
Support	0	3	2	0	0	2	1	0.51%
Understanding	3	5	0	4	3	2	0	1.11%
Problematizing	9	1	2	8	17	9	20	**4.22%**
Solving	3	1	1	6	8	4	4	**1.79%**
Process								
Questioning	26	17	10	17	15	37	20	9.23%
Answering	20	21	17	20	13	38	15	9.29%
Summarizing	13	5	3	1	1	4	0	**1.63%**
Explaining	14	12	11	9	14	6	10	**4.75%**
Processing	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0.28%
Non-contributory	3	7	0	1	1	5	0	1.07%
Bridging	25	24	11	13	6	20	12	7.13%
Total	251	219	228	171	265	236	205	

Note. Table provides the count, and the percentages are weighted to adjust for length of conversations.

Table S3. Highlight of the Frequencies of Interaction Strategies.

Framing Interaction strategy	Weighted Percentage (%)	Cumulative Percentage (%)
Integration	24.77%	
Alignment	12.90%	
Building		37.7%
Contradiction	5.83%	
Escalation	1.20%	
Devaluation	0.97%	
Polarizing		8%
Reconciliation	3.19%	
Nuancing	5.25%	
Understanding	1.11%	
De-polarizing		9.6%
Problematizing	4.22%	
Solving	1.79%	
Summarizing	1.63%	
Explaining	4.75%	
Constructive		12.4%

Note. Percentages are weighted to adjust for length of conversations.

Extract S1. Consensus without Resolution.

Comments	**Framing strategies:** Interaction (*categories*)
P502: (..) if you choose to eat everything in its pure form, you really have to pay attention to taking extra B12, for instance. If you pay less attention, it's still good for you to get those things inside, for example, through substitutes. (..)	Contradiction (*issue and identity*)
P503: I don't really do that. I've never really bought those substitutes. (..)	Contradiction (*issue and identity*)
P502: I do think that you have to consider for yourself: what am I getting? And I think it's great that you eat everything in its pure form, but I couldn't do that. (..) I don't pay enough attention to my vitamins or iron intake. (..)	Nuancing (*issue and identity*)
P503: But I notice a lot, that's really personal, when you eat very purely for a while, at some point, your body naturally craves certain things (..) your body is really perfectly made.	Nuancing (*issue and identity*)
P502: I do think that you are fortunate that you can feel that. I had a severe iron deficiency for two years, and I didn't realize it until I actually experienced problems. I did not know what I should eat, it did not occur to me: "now I need to eat spinach". (..)	Nuancing (*issue and identity*)
P501: I really would not be able to feel that. (..)	Alignment (*issue and identity*)
P503: Well, that's just my opinion. I really don't know if it's true.	Nuancing (*issue)*
P502: Yeah, that is it though. I don't know if your body can actually do that. (..) So, I'm actually very happy that we live in a society where we have much more knowledge about what our bodies need. (..)	Escalation (*issue*)
P503: Because initially, it worked in a certain way. You could provide everyone with everything they needed that way, but not anymore. We just don't have that fertile ground anymore.	Ignorance (*issue*)
P502: I also think that people eat much more than they actually need.	Ignorance (*issue*)
P503: Definitely. It's really a consumer society.	Alignment (*issue*)

Extract S2. Slowly Changing Minds?

Comments	**Framing strategies:** Interaction (*categories*)
Facilitator: But making it more exclusive, isn't that a form of deprivation or prohibition?	Contradiction & Question (*issue*)
P301: No, I don't think so. So, if you really want it, if you have enough motivation, if someone really wants it, they will work for it.	Contradiction (*issue*)
P302: But I don't think everyone has the privilege to just start working more.	Problematizing (*issue*)
P301: That is indeed true.	Yielding (*issue*)
P302: For example, if you are studying and have a part-time job, then you can't just take on four part-time jobs.	Explaining (*issue*)
(...)	
P301: Yeah, I find it interesting to think about what you're saying, like if you make something more expensive or more exclusive, whether that automatically excludes people. I don't have a very good answer or argument for that right now, but I still think (..) you shouldn't forbid things to people (...) but I don't know yet what a good solution would be.	Understanding (*issue & identity*)

Note. Young adults discuss flying policies and debate potential effects of higher taxes. The facilitator's question was a reformulation of a statement already made by one of the participants before.