

<p>P3. i think that i read about a recent study that showed consensus now to be at 99.9% or thereabouts -- or maybe that was wishful thinking -:)</p>	<p>We are reluctant to cite this study as we (the Skeptical Science team) have published a paper where we suggest its methodological flaws: Skuce, A. G., Cook, J., Richardson, M., Winkler, B., Rice, K., Green, S. A., ... & Nuccitelli, D. (2017). Does It Matter if the Consensus on Anthropogenic Global Warming Is 97% or 99.99%? Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society, 0270467617702781.</p>
<p>I wonder: Do you have any indication of how respondents interpreted this question? It could be (a) literally (and correctly) about what respondents think about the level of scientists' consensus, or (b) self-interestedly about respondents' own opinion about global warming. Or maybe that is being too nit-picking? and irrelevant to your study? Is this the same as "climate perceptions in pre-survey", Fig 3, which seems to indicate interpretation b.</p>	<p>This is a common item used in surveys measuring climate perceptions/knowledge, asking participants to indicate their level of agreement with a factual statement (or a misinformation statement if measuring misperceptions). The example we use (consensus) has a "meta" aspect to it – it's not so much a fact statement but the degree of scientific agreement about a fact. Because scientific consensus is a gateway belief – belief about consensus influences belief in other climate facts – therefore a) and b) in your question are intertwined. If they believe there is consensus, then their own opinions about global warming are influenced accordingly.</p>
<p>is there a difference between accuracy and agreement ?? if they are the same, maybe use just one term? or maybe i am missing something here</p>	<p>They are the same thing with the factual statement, but not with the myth statement. Because we often collapsed the factual and myth data together, we thought it more parsimonious to use a single term to refer to the entire dataset.</p>
<p>Pls make sure that this parametric test is the appropriate one. It may be that a non-parametric equivalent, eg, M-W U, may be more appropriate, and thus less open to questioning. Some/many analysts use the t-test for Likert scale data, when a non-parametric would be more appropriate. They generally give similar results.</p>	<p>This is a good comment, turns out a parametric test wasn't appropriate so we shifted to a non-parametric test (same result but more robust approach!)</p>
<p>maybe another [reason for site visitors] is that some (probably mostly deniers) come looking for arguments to support their denial</p>	<p>That's possible but given that the majority of visitors agree with climate facts, with only a small percentage showing strong disagreement with climate facts, deniers comprise a small part of the website's visitors.</p>