

Reporting Summary

Nature Portfolio wishes to improve the reproducibility of the work that we publish. This form provides structure for consistency and transparency in reporting. For further information on Nature Portfolio policies, see our [Editorial Policies](#) and the [Editorial Policy Checklist](#).

Statistics

For all statistical analyses, confirm that the following items are present in the figure legend, table legend, main text, or Methods section.

n/a	Confirmed
☐	☒ The exact sample size (<i>n</i>) for each experimental group/condition, given as a discrete number and unit of measurement
☐	☒ A statement on whether measurements were taken from distinct samples or whether the same sample was measured repeatedly
☐	☒ The statistical test(s) used AND whether they are one- or two-sided <i>Only common tests should be described solely by name; describe more complex techniques in the Methods section.</i>
☐	☒ A description of all covariates tested
☐	☒ A description of any assumptions or corrections, such as tests of normality and adjustment for multiple comparisons
☐	☒ A full description of the statistical parameters including central tendency (e.g. means) or other basic estimates (e.g. regression coefficient) AND variation (e.g. standard deviation) or associated estimates of uncertainty (e.g. confidence intervals)
☐	☒ For null hypothesis testing, the test statistic (e.g. <i>F</i> , <i>t</i> , <i>r</i>) with confidence intervals, effect sizes, degrees of freedom and <i>P</i> value noted <i>Give P values as exact values whenever suitable.</i>
☒	☐ For Bayesian analysis, information on the choice of priors and Markov chain Monte Carlo settings
☐	☒ For hierarchical and complex designs, identification of the appropriate level for tests and full reporting of outcomes
☐	☒ Estimates of effect sizes (e.g. Cohen's <i>d</i> , Pearson's <i>r</i>), indicating how they were calculated

Our web collection on [statistics for biologists](#) contains articles on many of the points above.

Software and code

Policy information about [availability of computer code](#)

Data collection	Data were gathered with an online questionnaire administered using the Qualtrics platform.
Data analysis	Data analysis were conducted with R software version 4.0.3 and SPSS version 27. The multilevel analysis was conducted with the R-package "lme4" version 1.1.27.1. Multigroup Confirmatory Factorial Analysis and equivalence testing was conducted with "lavaan" version 0.6.9 and "semTools" version 0.5.5. The analysis script is available on the project OSF repository: https://osf.io/36zqr/

For manuscripts utilizing custom algorithms or software that are central to the research but not yet described in published literature, software must be made available to editors and reviewers. We strongly encourage code deposition in a community repository (e.g. GitHub). See the Nature Portfolio [guidelines for submitting code & software](#) for further information.

Data

Policy information about [availability of data](#)

- All manuscripts must include a [data availability statement](#). This statement should provide the following information, where applicable:
- Accession codes, unique identifiers, or web links for publicly available datasets
 - A description of any restrictions on data availability
 - For clinical datasets or third party data, please ensure that the statement adheres to our [policy](#)

Data underlying the results presented in this paper are available at the Open Science Framework (OSF; <https://osf.io/36zqr/>).

Human research participants

Policy information about [studies involving human research participants and Sex and Gender in Research.](#)

Reporting on sex and gender

Gender was included as a covariate in the analyses reported in this study. We measured gender identity by asking people to self-identify through a question in the survey. The wording of the question was: "What is your gender?" Response options were: "Woman", "Man", "Other (please specify)" and "Prefer not to say". In our analysis, the gender variable was recoded as a dichotomous factor with "Woman" being the indicator category, and other options aggregated to create the reference group.

Population characteristics

See below

Recruitment

Participants were recruited by Qualtrics Research services, under a commercial contract, from a series of double opt-in aggregated panels. The study was advertised as a survey of climate change perceptions meaning that people with a particular interest in the topic of climate change may have been more likely to participate. Self-selection into the study by people with a high interest in climate change may potentially cause an inflation in the rates of climate justice awareness and knowledge in the sample relative to the general population. This does not however compromise the validity of our conclusions regarding the significance of climate justice beliefs for climate action and policy support.

Ethics oversight

Ethics approval for the study was granted by the University of Nottingham School of Psychology Research Ethics Committee (Ref F1344).

Note that full information on the approval of the study protocol must also be provided in the manuscript.

Field-specific reporting

Please select the one below that is the best fit for your research. If you are not sure, read the appropriate sections before making your selection.

☐ Life sciences

☒ Behavioural & social sciences

☐ Ecological, evolutionary & environmental sciences

For a reference copy of the document with all sections, see [nature.com/documents/nr-reporting-summary-flat.pdf](https://www.nature.com/documents/nr-reporting-summary-flat.pdf)

Behavioural & social sciences study design

All studies must disclose on these points even when the disclosure is negative.

Study description

Quantitative questionnaire-based international study

Research sample

A quota sample of adults aged 18 years or over in Australia, Brazil, Germany, India, Japan, Netherlands, Nigeria, Philippines, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom and the United States. The countries were selected to reflect populations with a diverse range of cultures, income, climate change vulnerabilities, and responsibilities for global greenhouse gas emissions. Sampling was stratified by age and gender. A minimum target of 500 complete responses was set for each location based on the available budget. Being online samples, the samples recruited for this study are considered appropriate for preliminary academic research but cannot be considered to be fully representative of the general population of the countries from which they were drawn.

Sampling strategy

Sampling was stratified by age and gender to ensure a match with the distribution of those characteristics in the population. Age quotas were relaxed in Nigeria and UAE during data collection due to difficulty with recruiting sufficient numbers of males aged 55 years+. The target sample size was ultimately determined by available budget but we aimed to recruit within each country an adequate number of participants to allow detection of associations between climate justice beliefs and the behavioural/policy support outcomes, even if these associations might be of a small effect size ($r \leq .20$). Using the SPSS power analysis module, we estimated that a minimum sample of 462 cases is required to detect a small effect ($r = .15$) using a Pearson correlation analysis with a power of .90. Therefore, the country-wise samples recruited in this study were sufficient for the purpose of the research.

Data collection

Data were collected online with a questionnaire hosted on the Qualtrics platform. Participants were recruited by Qualtrics Research services, under a commercial contract, from a series of double opt-in aggregated panels. Participants completed the online survey remotely at a time and location of their choosing. We are unable to determine if participants were alone or in the company of others when completing the questionnaire. Furthermore as this was an exploratory study, we had no specific hypotheses about the relationship between climate justice beliefs and the outcomes variables.

Timing

Data collection began on 26 May 2022 and ended on 30 June 2022

Data exclusions

The survey included an attention check and respondents who failed this were automatically screened out of the study. We also screened out respondents who completed the survey in less than half the median completion time. Respondents who provided poor-quality responses (e.g., irrelevant answers, straight-lining, etc) were scrubbed and replaced by the survey company. We do not have an exact estimate of how many respondents were screened from the study as this process takes place automatically once the survey software was programmed with these criteria. Screened responses do not appear on the final dataset received at the end of data collection.

Non-participation

There were no participant dropouts

Randomization

Our analysis controlled for age, gender, education, political orientation, self-rated climate change knowledge, perceived personal experience with climate change, and information sources when assessing the association of climate justice with the behavioural and climate policy support indices.

Reporting for specific materials, systems and methods

We require information from authors about some types of materials, experimental systems and methods used in many studies. Here, indicate whether each material, system or method listed is relevant to your study. If you are not sure if a list item applies to your research, read the appropriate section before selecting a response.

Materials & experimental systems

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| n/a | Involved in the study |
| ☒ | ☐ Antibodies |
| ☒ | ☐ Eukaryotic cell lines |
| ☒ | ☐ Palaeontology and archaeology |
| ☒ | ☐ Animals and other organisms |
| ☒ | ☐ Clinical data |
| ☒ | ☐ Dual use research of concern |

Methods

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| n/a | Involved in the study |
| ☒ | ☐ ChIP-seq |
| ☒ | ☐ Flow cytometry |
| ☒ | ☐ MRI-based neuroimaging |