Supplementary information A of the paper: Public opinion about solar radiation management: A cross-cultural study in 20 countries around the world

Additional information on the country selection, the country clusters, the data collection procedure, samples, sensitivity analyses, and participants

Content of Supplementary information A:

Table A1. Overview of countries from which researchers were invited for collaboration, countries included in the final sample, reasons for drop out, as well as climate change vulnerability per country

Continent	Country	Contact[1]	Part of final sample	Reason for drop out	Climate change vulnerability[2]
North America	Canada	Direct	No	Sample size not achieved	Very low
	Mexico	Direct	Yes	--	Medium
	USA	Direct	Yes	--	Low to very low
South America	Argentina	Indirect	Yes	--	Low
	Brazil	Indirect	Yes	--	Low
	Chile	Indirect	No	Sample size not achieved	Low
Africa	Ethiopia	Direct	No	Invitation declined	Very high
	Kenya	Indirect	No	Sample size not achieved	Very high
	Malawi	Indirect	No	Invitation declined	Very high
	Nigeria	Indirect	Yes	--	Very high
	South-Africa	Direct	No	Invitation declined	High to medium
Australia/Oceania	Australia	Direct	Yes	--	Very low
	New Zealand	Direct	No	Invitation declined	Very low
Asia	China	Direct	Yes	--	Medium
	India	Direct	No	Invitation declined	High
	Iran	Indirect	Yes	--	Medium
	Japan	Direct	No	Invitation declined	Very low
	Kazakhstan	Indirect	Yes	--	Very low to low
	Lebanon	Indirect	No	Data quality issues	High to very high
	Singapore	Direct	No	Invitation declined	Very low
	Taiwan	Direct	Yes	--	Medium
Eurasia	Russia	Direct	Yes	--	Low
	Turkey	Indirect	Yes	--	Medium
Europe	Ireland	Direct	Yes	--	Very low
	Italy	Direct	Yes	--	Very low
	Netherlands	Core team	Yes	--	Very low
	Norway	Direct	Yes	--	Very low
	Portugal	Direct	Yes	--	Very low
	Spain	Direct	Yes	--	Very low
	Switzerland	Direct	Yes	--	Very low
	UK	Direct	Yes	--	Very low

Note. [1] Contacted teams where either direct contacts of the Dutch core team (direct) or indirect contacts (indirect), that is, the teams were proposed by direct contacts of the Dutch core team. [2] Based on Figure 7.2. of the IPCC report 'Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability' (IPCC, 2022).

Supplementary note A1: Information on country clusters

We grouped the countries along two dimensions: (a) Global North versus Global South (Solarz, 2019) and (b) 'WEIRD' versus 'non-WEIRD' (Henrich et al., 2010). Following conventions of the United Nations, we considered all member states of the Group of 77 + China as part of the Global South and all others as part of the Global North (The Group of 77, n.a.). It is worth noting that Mexico was a founding member of the Group of 77 in 1964 (The Group of 77, 1964) but left the group in 1994 when joining the OECD (Fonseca, 2023). While in 2023, Mexico voiced its aim to re-joining the Group of 77 + China (Fonseca, 2023), at the time of publication, it was not (yet) relisted as a member state (The Group of 77, n.a.). More importantly, when data were collected, it was not a member state of the Group of 77 + China. When assigning countries to the 'WEIRD' versus 'non-WEIRD' group of countries, we could not follow any such conventions but had to decide on an assignment rule. We followed a very strict rule and assigned only those countries to the group of 'WEIRD' countries that meet all of the 'WEIRD' criteria, that is, countries that are Western *and* Educated *and* Industrialised *and* Rich *and* Democratic. Any country that does not meet at least one of these criteria was assigned to the group of 'non-WEIRD' countries.

The combination of the two dimensions resulted in three clusters (see Table A2): (a) 'WEIRD' countries from the Global North (hereinafter referred to as the 'WEIRD' Global North), (b) 'non-WEIRD' countries from the Global North (hereinafter referred to as the 'non-WEIRD' Global North), and (c) 'non-WEIRD' countries from the Global South (hereinafter referred to as the Global South). The fourth theoretically possible cluster of 'WEIRD' countries from the Global South does not emerge as all countries from the Global South, both in our sample and beyond, can be considered 'non-WEIRD'.

Table A2. Overview of clustering dimensions, resulting clusters, and countries per cluster

Dimension 2: 'WEIRD' vs. 'non-WEIRD'	Dimension 1: Global North versus Global South			
	Global North		Global South	
'WEIRD'	'WEIRD' Global North		n.a.	
	Countries:	Australia		
		Ireland		
		Italy		
		Netherlands		
		Norway		
		Portugal		
		Spain		
		Switzerland		
		UK		
		USA		
'Non-WEIRD'	'Non-WEIRD' Global North		Global South	
	Countries:	Kazakhstan	Countries:	Argentina
		Mexico		Brazil
		Russia		China
		Taiwan		Iran
		Turkey		Nigeria

Note. n.a. = not applicable: All countries from the Global South, within our sample and beyond, are 'non-WEIRD'.

Table A3. Overview of sampling approaches per sample

Cluster	Country	Data collection time	Students		General public	
			Recruitment	Reward	Recruitment	Reward
Global South	Argentina	Spring	Email lists, social media	None	--	--
	Brazil	Spring/autumn	Email lists	None	--	--
	China	Spring	Ads in lectures	None	--	--
	Iran	Spring/autumn	Ads in lectures	None	Snowball	None
	Nigeria	Spring	Social media	Internet credit	--	--
'Non-WEIRD' Global North	Kazakhstan	Spring/autumn	Ads in lectures	None	Flyers	None
	Mexico	Spring	Ads in lectures	None	--	--
	Russia	Spring/autumn	Ads in lectures	None	--	--
	Taiwan	Spring	Student panel	Course credit	Social media	Lottery
	Turkey	Spring	Student panel	Course credit	--	--
'WEIRD' Global North	Australia	Spring/autumn	Student panel	Course credit	--	--
	Ireland	Spring/autumn	External panel service	Cash token	External panel service	Cash
	Italy	Spring	Ads in lectures	None	Snowball	None
	Netherlands	Spring/autumn	Ads in lectures, flyers, and student panel	Lottery or course credits	External panel service	Lottery
	Norway	Spring	Ads in lectures and social media	Lottery	External panel service	Lottery
	Portugal	Spring	--	--	External panel service	Cash
	Spain	Spring	Ads in lectures	None	Snowball	None
	Switzerland	Spring	Email lists, student panel	Lottery	Internal panel and online ads	Lottery
	UK	Spring	Student panel and external panel service	Course credits and voucher	External panel service	Voucher
	USA	Spring/autumn	Ads in lectures and email lists	None	External panel service	Cash

Supplementary note A2: Information on data exclusion

A total of 5,025 students and 2,597 members of the general public completed the questionnaire. We excluded 387 student participants (8%) and 282 participants from the general public (11%) because of unreliable data (i.e. very short response times, straightlining, and random answers to open questions). Responses of another 55 student participants (1%) and 67 participants from the general public (2%) were removed because of incomplete data.

Table A4. Sample sizes before and after data cleaning

Cluster	Sample	Initial sample size	Unreliable data[1]	Incomplete data	Final sample Sample size	Final sample Percentage of initial sample
	Students					
Global South	Argentina	212	1	1	210	99%
	Brazil	216	3	3	210	97%
	China	236	46	3	187	79%
	Iran	223	22	8	193	87%
	Nigeria	217	33	9	175	81%
'Non-WEIRD' Global North	Kazakhstan	238	67	11	160	67%
	Mexico	220	10	2	208	95%
	Russia	223	1	5	217	97%
	Taiwan	301	38	3	260	86%
	Turkey	422	10	2	410	97%
'WEIRD' Global North	Australia	120	6	0	114	95%
	Ireland	140	1	0	139	99%
	Italy	213	37	3	173	81%
	Netherlands	214	3	0	211	99%
	Norway	449	6	2	441	98%
	Spain	208	9	1	198	95%
	Switzerland	226	4	0	222	98%
	UK	208	13	1	194	93%
	USA	739	77	1	661	89%
Full sample		5,025	387	55	4,583	91%
	General public					
Global South	Iran	211	28	13	170	81%
'Non-WEIRD' Global North	Kazakhstan	204	42	21	141	69%
	Taiwan	266	30	4	232	87%
'WEIRD' Global North	Ireland	192	1	0	191	99%
	Italy	216	34	14	168	78%
	Netherlands	269	6	1	262	97%
	Norway	211	2	2	207	98%
	Portugal	205	38	0	167	81%
	Spain	208	8	5	195	94%
	Switzerland	99	2	1	96	97%
	UK	210	21	2	187	89%
	USA	306	70	4	232	76%
Full sample		2,597	282	67	2,248	87%

Note. [1] Very short response times, straightlining, and random answers to open questions.

Table A5. Demographics of the student samples

| Cluster | Sample | N | Gender | | | Age | | Study subject (students could be enrolled in multiple subjects) | | | | |
			Female	Male	Not specified	M	SD	Social sciences & humanities	Engineering & natural sciences	Medical & health sciences	Agricultural sciences	Other
Global South	Argentina	210	83.3%	15.3%	1.4%	23.94	5.55	81.3%	12.9%	8.6%	1.0%	1.4%
	Brazil	210	63.8%	36.2%	0.0%	27.34	7.69	44.0%	19.1%	41.1%	0.0%	0.5%
	China	187	70.4%	26.3%	3.2%	21.46	1.55	80.1%	11.8%	1.1%	6.5%	0.0%
	Iran	193	64.2%	35.8%	0.0%	23.57	10.64	16.1%	63.2%	17.6%	0.0%	5.2%
	Nigeria	175	62.6%	30.5%	6.9%	21.42	3.74	94.8%	4.6%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%
'Non-WEIRD' Global North	Kazakhstan	160	70.6%	27.5%	1.9%	20.91	4.33	62.5%	45.0%	4.4%	4.4%	1.9%
	Mexico	208	76.9%	22.6%	0.5%	21.52	2.90	98.1%	0.5%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%
	Russia	217	72.4%	24.4%	3.2%	21.80	4.52	77.6%	23.3%	12.9%	0.5%	0.5%
	Taiwan	260	59.2%	40.4%	0.4%	23.24	7.08	55.0%	44.2%	6.2%	1.5%	1.5%
	Turkey	410	56.6%	42.2%	1.2%	21.41	2.22	75.1%	24.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
'WEIRD' Global North	Australia	114	68.4%	29.8%	1.8%	19.72	2.58	55.3%	21.9%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
	Ireland	139	55.4%	40.3%	4.3%	24.04	7.33	43.7%	40.8%	13.6%	3.9%	4.9%
	Italy	173	52.6%	45.1%	2.3%	24.11	6.34	52.9%	30.8%	5.8%	6.4%	6.4%
	Netherlands	211	72.5%	27.5%	0.0%	20.65	2.89	90.0%	9.0%	1.9%	0.0%	1.4%
	Norway	441	65.1%	34.9%	0.0%	24.87	5.92	66.2%	29.0%	8.4%	0.5%	0.7%
	Spain	198	80.8%	19.2%	0.0%	21.32	3.59	86.4%	3.0%	12.6%	0.5%	0.0%
	Switzerland	222	73.0%	27.0%	0.0%	24.87	5.73	16.3%	45.7%	28.1%	17.2%	3.6%
	UK	194	74.2%	23.7%	2.1%	20.89	3.95	64.8%	25.4%	10.9%	2.6%	3.6%
	USA	661	50.2%	48.7%	1.1%	19.19	3.92	42.5%	43.4%	15.9%	4.8%	2.3%
Full sample		4,583	64.9%	33.8%	1.3%	22.26	5.60	62.2%	28.0%	11.4%	2.6%	1.7%

Table A6. Demographics of the general public samples and the respective population

Cluster	Country		Gender			Age						Level of education		
			Female	Male	Not specified	16-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	≥ 70	Low	Medium	High
Global South	Iran	Sample (*N*=170)	62.4%	36.5%	1.2%	71.1%	15.1%	7.2%	4.2%	0.6%	1.8%	3.5%	45.9%	50.6%
		Population	49.3%	50.7%	n.a.	29.2%	27.2%	18.0%	12.7%	7.4%	5.5%	58.8%	28.2%	13.0%
		Bias	13.1%	-14.2%		41.9%	-12.1%	-10.8%	-8.5%	-6.8%	-3.7%	-55.3%	17.7%	37.6%
'Non-WEIRD' Global North	Kazakhstan	Sample (*N*=141)	73.0%	24.1%	2.8%	97.8%				2.2%		2.1%	14.9%	83.0%
		Population	52.8%	47.2%	n.a.	84.3%				15.7%		n.a.		
		Bias	20.2%	-23.1%		13.5%				-13.5%				
	Taiwan	Sample (*N*=232)	53.9%	44.4%	1.7%	29.6%	22.6%	22.2%	21.3%	4.3%	0%	1.3%	22.9%	75.8%
		Population	50.9%	49.1%	n.a.	16.2%	18.4%	19.4%	18.8%	15.7%	11.5%	27.9%	41.3%	30.8%
		Bias	3.0%	-4.7%		13.4%	4.2%	2.8%	2.5%	-11.4%	-11.5%	-26.6%	-18.4%	45.0%
'WEIRD' Global North	Ireland	Sample (*N*=191)	52.9%	46.1%	1.0%	28.8%	39.8%	17.8%	8.4%	5.2%	0%	4.7%	25.7%	69.6%
		Population	49.5%	50.5%	n.a.	16.4%	20.3%	20.3%	16.6%	13.2%	13.2%	23.4%	47.0%	29.6%
		Bias	3.4%	-4.4%		12.4%	19.5%	-2.5%	-8.2%	-8.0%	-13.2%	-18.7%	-21.3%	40.0%
	Italy	Sample (*N*=168)	50.9%	49.1%	0.0%	12.6%	33.5%	18.6%	19.2%	12.6%	3.6%	20.5%	29.5%	50.0%
		Population	51.8%	48.2%	n.a.	14.6%	13.9%	18.2%	18.5%	14.5%	20.3%	54.8%	41.1%	4.16%
		Bias	-0.9%	0.9%		-2.0%	19.6%	0.4%	0.7%	-1.9%	-16.7%	-34.3%	-11.6%	45.8%
	Netherlands	Sample (*N*=262)	51.1%	47.7%	1.1%	21.4%	16.8%	17.2%	15.3%	18.7%	10.7%	15.3%	46.2%	38.5%
		Population	49.3%	50.7%	n.a.	19.0%	15.1%	16.2%	18.0%	15.0%	16.7%	32%	39%	29%
		Bias	1.8%	-3.0%		2.4%	1.7%	1.0%	-2.7%	3.7%	-6.0%	-16.7%	7.2%	9.5%

(continued on next page)

Table A6 (continued). Socio-demographic characteristics of the general public samples and the respective population

Cluster	Country		Gender			Age						Level of education		
			Female	Male	Not specified	16-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	≥ 70	Low	Me-dium	High
'WEIRD' Global North	Norway	Sample (*N*=207)	48.8%	50.2%	1.0%	44.2%	30.6%	11.7%	9.7%	3.4%	0.5%	0.5%	21.3%	78.3%
		Population	49.9%	50.2%	n.a.	20.1%	17.1%	17.3%	16.4%	13.7%	15.4%	22.8%	40.9%	36.2%
		Bias	-1.1%	0.0%		24.1%	13.5%	-5.6%	-6.7%	-10.3%	-14.9%	-22.3%	-19.6%	42.1%
	Portugal	Sample (*N*=167)	55.1%	44.9%	0.0%	13.2%	18.6%	24.0%	22.8%	14.4%	7.2%	9.0%	38.9%	52.1%
		Population	53.3%	46.7%	n.a.	15.3%	14.6%	18.3%	17.2%	15.2%	19.4%	50.8%	27.3%	21.9%
		Bias	1.8%	-1.8%		-2.1%	4.0%	5.7%	5.6%	-0.8%	-12.2%	-41.8%	11.6%	30.2%
	Spain	Sample (*N*=195)	52.3%	47.2%	0.5%	23.1%	15.9%	26.2%	25.1%	7.7%	2.1%	21.5%	30.3%	48.2%
		Population	51.5%	48.5%	n.a.	14.9%	16.1%	20.2%	17.9%	13.6%	17.3%	38.7%	22.7%	38.6%
		Bias	0.8%	-1.3%		8.2%	-0.2%	6.0%	7.2%	-5.9%	-15.2%	-17.2%	7.6%	9.6%
	Switzerland	Sample (*N*=96)	66.7%	30.2%	3.1%	6.3%	33.3%	27.1%	21.9%	6.3%	5.2%	4.2%	32.3%	63.5%
		Population	50.8%	49.2%	n.a.	17.3%	17.4%	17.0%	18.3%	13.4%	16.6%	15.8%	50.9%	33.4%
		Bias	15.9%	-19.0%		-11.0%	15.9%	10.1%	3.6%	-7.1%	-11.4%	-11.6%	-18.6%	30.1%
	UK	Sample (*N*=187)	51.9%	48.1%	0.0%	22.5%	12.8%	16.6%	17.1%	17.1%	13.9%	16.0%	51.3%	32.6%
		Population	51.1%	48.9%	n.a.	19.3%	16.9%	16.0%	17.2%	13.5%	17.1%	42.6%	30.5%	26.9%
		Bias	0.8%	-0.8%		3.2%	-4.1%	0.6%	-0.1%	3.6%	-3.2%	-26.6%	20.8%	5.7%
	USA	Sample (*N*=232)	56.5%	43.1%	0.4%	19.4%	15.5%	15.1%	19.0%	19.0%	12.1%	9.5%	53.4%	37.1%
		Population	50.8%	49.2%	n.a.	18.1%	17.9%	16.5%	17.0%	15.6%	14.9%	5.2%	59.4%	35.5%
		Bias	5.7%	-6.1%		1.3%	-2.4%	-1.4%	2.0%	3.4%	-2.8%	4.3%	-6.0%	1.6%
Full sample		Sample (*N*=2,248)	55.2%	43.8%	1.0%	27.5%	22.0%	19.0%	16.4%	9.9%	5.0%	9.3%	35.2%	55.5%

Note. n.a. = not available.

Table A7. Self-reported prior knowledge about SRM among students and the general public

| Cluster | Country | Students | | | | | | General public | | | | | |
		N	0=Nothing at all	1=A little	2=A moderate amount	3=A lot	4=I am an expert on SRM	N	0=Nothing at all	1=A little	2=A moderate amount	3=A lot	4=I am an expert on SRM
Global South	Argentina	210	66.2%	22.4%	11.4%	0.0%	0.0%	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Brazil	210	54.3%	34.3%	11.4%	0.0%	0.0%	--	--	--	--	--	--
	China	187	73.8%	22.5%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Iran	193	49.2%	31.6%	18.7%	0.5%	0.0%	170	53.5%	28.2%	17.1%	1.2%	0.0%
	Nigeria	175	47.4%	28.0%	16.6%	6.3%	1.7%	--	--	--	--	--	--
'Non-WEIRD' Global North	Kazakhstan	160	28.8%	32.5%	34.4%	3.1%	1.3%	141	42.6%	34.8%	19.9%	2.8%	0.0%
	Mexico	208	37.5%	40.4%	21.2%	1.0%	0.0%	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Russia	217	66.4%	24.4%	9.2%	0.0%	0.0%	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Taiwan	260	76.5%	19.6%	2.7%	0.8%	0.4%	232	67.7%	25.0%	6.5%	0.9%	0.0%
	Turkey	410	81.2%	13.9%	4.4%	0.5%	0.0%	--	--	--	--	--	--
'WEIRD' Global North	Australia	114	53.5%	40.4%	5.3%	0.9%	0.0%	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Ireland	139	62.6%	29.5%	6.5%	0.7%	0.7%	191	69.1%	22.0%	6.3%	2.1%	0.5%
	Italy	173	72.3%	20.8%	5.8%	1.2%	0.0%	168	70.2%	23.8%	4.8%	1.2%	0.0%
	Netherlands	211	73.9%	23.2%	1.9%	0.5%	0.5%	262	80.9%	17.2%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%
	Norway	441	79.6%	15.6%	4.5%	0.2%	0.0%	207	79.2%	17.4%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%
	Portugal	--	--	--	--	--	--	167	29.3%	28.7%	33.5%	7.8%	0.6%
	Spain	198	50.5%	33.3%	15.7%	0.5%	0.0%	195	40.5%	36.4%	21.5%	1.0%	0.5%
	Switzerland	222	53.6%	32.9%	11.7%	1.8%	0.0%	96	68.8%	24.0%	6.3%	1.0%	0.0%
	UK	194	67.0%	20.6%	7.7%	4.1%	0.5%	187	60.4%	21.9%	9.6%	7.5%	0.5%
	USA	661	62.5%	25.7%	10.6%	1.1%	0.2%	232	54.3%	21.6%	12.9%	9.9%	1.3%
Full samples		4,583	63.5%	25.3%	9.9%	1.1%	0.2%	2,248	60.8%	24.5%	11.3%	3.1%	0.3%

Note. Participants were asked "How much do you know about Solar Radiation Management (SRM)?" and could respond on a scale ranging from 0=*Nothing at all* to 4=*I am an expert*.

Supplementary note A3: Information on sensitivity analyses

We ran sensitivity power analyses (Faul et al., 2009) with G*Power 3.1.9.7 to specify the effect size we were able to detect with the achieved sample sizes, given a power of 0.80 and analysis-specific α-levels. For tests applying the full samples (i.e. part of the ANCOVAs and generalised estimating equations [GEE]; see SI-C), an α-level of .05 was applied. When comparing between country clusters, in the regression analyses per subsample, and when comparing coefficients between subsamples and the respective full sample, we applied Bonferroni corrected α-levels (see SI-C). As sample sizes differed between countries, we ran the sensitivity power analyses per country and for the full samples. We report here the results for the most demanding type of analysis we applied, the omnibus F-test of the multiple regression analyses testing whether belief in global warming and the six perceptions about SRM explain acceptability per country (Bonferroni corrected α-levels of .00278 for the student and .0045 for the general public samples). The smallest effect sizes we were able to detect ranged from f^2=.04 to f^2=.23 among the student samples and from f^2=.09 to f^2=.26 among the general public samples (see Table A6). That is, the achieved sample sizes allowed us to detect small to medium effects (Cohen, 1992), which is satisfactory as research found large effects in the omnibus F-test when analysing the predictors of public acceptability of SRM (Visschers et al., 2017).

Table A8. Overview of sample sizes and results from sensitivity power analysis

Cluster	Country	Students		General public	
		N	f^2	N	f^2
Global South	Argentina	210	.12	--	--
	Brazil	210	.12	--	--
	China	187	.13	--	--
	Iran	193	.13	170	.14
	Nigeria	175	.14	--	--
'Non-WEIRD' Global North	Kazakhstan	160	.16	141	.17
	Mexico	208	.12	--	--
	Russia	217	.11	--	--
	Taiwan	260	.09	232	.10
	Turkey	410	.06	--	--
'WEIRD' Global North	Australia	114	.23	--	--
	Ireland	139	.18	191	.12
	Italy	173	.15	168	.14
	Netherlands	211	.11	262	.09
	Norway	441	.05	207	.11
	Portugal	--	--	167	.14
	Spain	198	.13	195	.12
	Switzerland	222	.11	96	.26
	UK	194	.13	187	.13
	USA	661	.04	232	.10
Full samples		4,583	<.01	2,248	.01

Note. f^2= Effect size of the squared multiple correlations (R^2) tested in the omnibus F-test of a multiple regression analysis (Cohen, 1992; Faul et al., 2009).

Reference list of Supplementary information A

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, *112*(1), 155–159. https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-2909.112.1.155

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, *41*(4), 1149–1160. https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149

Fonseca, I. (2023, September 15). Mexico eyes return to G77+China Group. *The Rio Times*. https://www.riotimesonline.com/mexico-eyes-return-to-g77china-group/

Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). Most people are not WEIRD. *Nature*, *466*(7302), 29–29. https://doi.org/10.1038/466029a

IPCC. (2022). *Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability*. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

Solarz, M. W. (2019). *The Global North-South Atlas: Mapping Global Change* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429492037

The Group of 77. (1964). *Joint declaration of the seventy-seven developing countries made at the conclusion of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development*. United Nations. Retrieved February 2 2024 from https://www.g77.org/doc/Joint%20Declaration.html

The Group of 77. (n.a.). *The members states of the group of 77*. United Nations. Retrieved February 2 2024 from https://www.g77.org/doc/members.html

Visschers, V. H. M., Shi, J., Siegrist, M., & Arvai, J. (2017). Beliefs and values explain international differences in perception of solar radiation management: Insights from a cross-country survey. *Climatic Change*, *142*(3–4), 531–544. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-017-1970-8