THE STATE OF ANTISEMITISM IN AMERICA 2021 SURVEY

METHODOLOGY REPORT

Prepared for the American Jewish Committee

Prepared by:

Robyn Rapoport, Margie Engle-Bauer, Christian Kline, Elizabeth Sciupac

OCTOBER 2021

AJC American Jewish Committee

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW

In the fall of 2021, the American Jewish Committee (AJC) contracted with SSRS to conduct two surveys of American Attitudes about Antisemitism. The primary survey interviewed Jewish Americans about their attitudes towards and experiences of antisemitism. A companion survey asked American adults related questions regarding about their attitudes and knowledge of antisemitism. This is the second year that surveys of Jewish Americans and American adults have been jointly conducted for AJC.

Each of the surveys included a mix of new questions and previously asked questions. For example, in both 2021 and 2020 Jewish American and American adults were asked for opinions on the current state of antisemitism in the United States. A new topic for 2021 was awareness of conflict between Israel and Hamas in May. While some questions were the same for both sets of respondents, others were tailored to the specific populations. For example, whereas respondents in the general population survey were asked about *awareness of* antisemitic incidents, respondents in the Jewish survey were asked if they had personal experiences being the *target of* antisemitism. Additionally, other topics included the interplay of negative statements about Israel and antisemitism and awareness of the Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions (BDS) movement.

The **Jewish American** study collected data from a nationally representative sample of 1,433 adults (ages 18 or older) of Jewish religion or background. The survey was conducted from September 1-October 3, 2021, online and via phone. In 2021 the survey of Jewish Americans shifted from a fully interviewer-conducted telephone survey to a mixed-mode survey; approximately half of the respondents (n=760) were interviewed on the phone,[1] and half (n=673) participated via a self-administered web survey.[2] As points of comparison, the 2020 and 2019 studies collected data via telephone from nationally representative samples of n=1,334 and n=1,283 adults of Jewish religion or background. Both surveys were completed in a similar time frame as the 2021 survey.[3]

The **U.S. adult** study collected data from a nationally representative sample of 1,214 adults (ages 18 or older). Data for this companion survey were collected from September 8-22, 2021, through the SSRS Opinion Panel.[4] The survey of U.S. adults shifted from an interviewer-conducted telephone survey in 2020[5] to a fully self-administered web survey in 2021.

---

[1] The phone interviews included n=319 who were reached on a landline and n=441 who were reached on a cell phone.

[2] Analysis of the mode differences in the Jewish survey show few mode effects, and the summary report discusses questions and results that are safe to compare, as well as those that can be compared with caution. For more information regarding transitions from telephone to self-administered web surveys, including possible mode effects to consider when analyzing data, please see here.

[3] The 2020 survey was conducted from September 9-October 4, 2020, on the telephone and consisted of a landline component (n=519) and a cell phone component (n=815). Similarly, the 2019 survey was conducted from September 11-October 6, 2019, on the telephone and consisted of a landline component (n=598) and a cell phone component (n=685).

[4] SSRS Opinion Panel members are recruited randomly based on nationally representative ABS (Address Based Sample) design (including Hawaii and Alaska). Additionally, we recruit hard-to-reach demographic groups via the SSRS Omnibus survey platform. For more information: https://ssrs.com/opinion-panel/

[5] The 2020 telephone study of U.S. adults was conducted using the SSRS Omnibus, which is a national, weekly dual-frame bilingual telephone survey designed to meet standards of quality associated with custom research studies. For more information: https://ssrs.com/ssrs-omnibus-survey/.

Data from each survey were weighted to correct for known biases due to sampling and non-response. This report provides additional information about the methods used to collect the data and report the survey results.

JEWISH AMERICAN STUDY

Sample Design

The Jewish population is a very low incidence population. To obtain the number of interviews needed, a combination of three sample sources was used. For one source, SSRS used recontact sample from the SSRS Omnibus survey, which is a national, weekly dual-frame bilingual telephone survey designed to meet standards of quality associated with custom research studies. For this study, SSRS utilized sample where someone in the household had been identified as Jewish in a previous Omnibus survey. The participant was asked a series of screener questions to confirm that they – or someone in the household – still identified as Jewish. If there was no longer anyone Jewish in the household, the interview was terminated.

The other two sources were the SSRS Opinion Panel and the Ipsos KnowledgePanel. For each of these probability-based panels, respondents who had previously indicated being Jewish by religion, or Jewish aside from religion were invited to participate. They were also asked screener questions to confirm their Jewish identity; if they no longer identified as Jewish by religion or aside from religion, the interview was terminated. In addition, a portion of those having no religion (identifying as atheist, agnostic, or no particular religion) in either panel were asked the screener questions to identify any additional panelists who identified as Jewish aside from religion. Participants only qualified to complete the full survey if they indicated in the screener that they identified as Jewish.

Questionnaire Development and Field Procedures

The Jewish American questionnaire was initially developed by the staff of the American Jewish Committee. SSRS provided feedback regarding new question wording, order, clarity, and other issues pertaining to questionnaire quality. In addition, the survey was reviewed closely to ensure a smooth transition from an interviewer administered phone survey exclusively to a mixed mode – including a self-administered web survey. SSRS reviewed the survey instrument and provided feedback. Together, the SSRS and AJC teams worked to finalize the questionnaire.

Upon final approval, SSRS formatted and programmed the survey for completion via telephone and online administration. Additional steps were employed to ensure a quality experience in survey administration regardless of the device or browser utilized by respondents. Tests were conducted using desktop/laptop computers, tablets, and phones, as well as various web browsers - Chrome, Safari, Firefox, Internet Explorer, and Microsoft Edge.

Prior to the field period, SSRS programmed the study into Confirmit web/Computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) software that integrates both modes. Extensive checking of the program was conducted to assure that skip patterns followed the design of the questionnaire.

The field period for the study was September 1 through October 3, 2021. All interviews were done through the Confirmit web/CATI system. This system ensured that questions followed logical skip patterns, and the CATI system ensured that complete dispositions of all call attempts were recorded.

CATI Field Procedures

CATI interviewers received both written materials on the survey and formal training. The written materials were provided prior to the beginning of the field period and included an annotated questionnaire that contained information about the goals of the study as well as detailed explanations of why questions were being asked, the meaning and pronunciation of key terms, potential obstacles to be overcome in getting good answers to questions, and respondent problems that could be anticipated ahead of time as well as strategies for addressing the potential problems.

Interviewer training was conducted immediately before the survey was officially launched. Call center supervisors and interviewers were walked through each question from the questionnaire. Interviewers were given instructions to help them maximize response rates and ensure accurate data collection.

Web Field Procedures

Panelists were sent an email invitation to take the survey online, as well as up to 4 reminder emails throughout the field period. The survey program was optimized so that respondents could complete using a desktop or laptop computer, as well as a mobile device.

Weighting Procedures

The data from this project were weighted to reflect nationally representative estimates of the adult Jewish population. The weighting process takes into account the three different sample sources used for data collection; each source was base weighted separately, with the base weight being computed differently depending on whether the panelist was recruited from the Omnibus, the SSRS Probability Panel, or the Ipsos Knowledge Panel.

SSRS Omnibus Recontact Sample

The base weight for the Omnibus recontacts (OMNI_BW) was their original base weight. This base weight accounts for selection probability of telephone numbers along with the overlapping landline and cell frames, the overlap of the frames based on respondent's phone use patterns, and the number of adults in each household.[6]

SSRS Probability Panel

Respondents from the SSRS Probability Panel were assigned a base weight associated with their recruitment into the panel. Those who were recruited from the SSRS Omnibus receive their original base weight, as noted above. For those who were recruited via Address-Based Sample (ABS) the base weight (ABS_BW) was the product of a sampling weight (ABS_SAMPWT) and a household size adjustment (ADULTS). The sampling

[6] Buskirk, T. D., & Best, J. (2012). Venn Diagrams, Probability 101 and Sampling Weights Computed for Dual Frame Telephone RDD Designs. Journal of Statistics and Mathematics, 15, 3696-3710.

weight corrected for the disproportionate sample design by adjusting the distribution of ABS sample across the strata to match the distribution of the ABS frame across strata. Then any non-completed interviews were removed.

The sampling weight for the ABS recruits was expressed as

$$ABS\_SAMPWT_i = P_i / p_i$$

where P_i is the proportion of the sample frame from in stratum i and p_i is the proportion of sample from in stratum i.

The household size adjustment (ADULTS) is simply the number of adults in the household, capped at 3.

The base weight for the ABS recruits was the product of the sampling weight and the household size adjustment.

$$ABS\_BW = ABS\_SAMPWT \times ADULTS$$

The unadjusted base weight (UBW) was

$$UBW = \begin{cases} OMNI\_BW, & cases\ recruited\ from\ SSRS\ Omnibus \\ ABS\_BW, & cases\ recruited\ from\ ABS\ sample \end{cases}$$

The base weights were standardized by recruitment source to produce the standardized base weight (SBW).

$$SBW = \begin{cases} UBW \times n_{OMNI} / \sum_{i \in OMNI} UBW_i, & cases\ recruited\ from\ SSRS\ Omnibus \\ UBW \times n_{ABS} / \sum_{i \in ABS} UBW_i, & cases\ recruited\ from\ ABS\ sample \end{cases}$$

Ipsos KnowledgePanel

Respondents recruited from the Ipsos KnowledgePanel were assigned base weights provided by Ipsos upon completion of data collection. [7] Base weights were standardized by sample source so the that weights within each sample source sum to the number of interviews by sample source.

Ipsos' KnowledgePanel is an online research panel that is representative of the entire U.S. population. Panel members are randomly recruited through probability-based sampling, and households are provided with access to the Internet and hardware if needed. Ipsos recruits panel members by using address-based sampling (ABS) methods.

[7] https://www.ipsos.com/sites/default/files/kpsamplingandweighting.pdf

Post-stratification Weighting

The second stage of the weighting balanced the demographic profile of the sample to target population parameters.

To handle missing data among some of the demographic variables we employ a technique called hot decking. Hot deck imputation replaces the missing values of a respondent randomly with another similar respondent without missing data. These are further determined by variables predictive of non-response that are present in the entire file. We use an SPSS macro detailed in 'Goodbye, Listwise Deletion: Presenting Hot Deck Imputation as an Easy and Effective Tool for Handing Missing Data' (Myers, 2011).

Weighting was accomplished using SPSSINC RAKE, an SPSS extension module that simultaneously balances the distributions of all variables using the GENLOG procedure. The sample was balanced to match estimates of the Jewish population along the following dimensions: age (18-29, 30-49, 50-64, 65+); gender (male, female); Census region (Northeast, North-Central, South, West); Education (high school graduate or less, some college, four-year college or more); race/ethnicity (White non-Hispanic or Other non-Hispanic, Black non-Hispanic, Hispanic); marital status (married, all other); denomination (Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, or other); and internet use (yes, no). Benchmark distributions were derived from three data sources; the SSRS Omnibus, a previous American Jewish Survey from May 2021, and estimates from Pew Research Center's 2020 study of U.S. Jews.[8]

Weights were trimmed to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results. The use of these weights in statistical analysis ensures that the demographic characteristics of the sample closely approximate the demographic characteristics of the target population. The following table provides the population parameters, and we added the unweighted and weighted sample distributions after weighting.

[8] https://www.pewforum.org/2021/05/11/jewish-americans-in-2020/

Table 1. Weighted and Unweighted Sample Distributions

		Parameter (%)	Unweighted (%)	Weighted (%)
Gender	Male	53.2%	54.8%	53.1%
	Female	46.8%	45.2%	46.9%
Age	18-29	23.1%	13.5%	21.6%
	30-49	29.9%	24.8%	30.1%
	50-64	20.6%	22.0%	20.9%
	65+	26.0%	39.6%	27.4%
Education	High School Graduate or less	23.1%	6.4%	20.5%
	Some college/Assoc Degree	20.3%	13.2%	20.5%
	College Graduate	56.7%	80.5%	59.0%
Denomination	Orthodox	10.1%	8.2%	9.1%
	Conservative	13.8%	23.2%	14.2%
	Reform	27.9%	38.7%	28.8%
	Other	48.2%	29.8%	47.9%
Region	Northeast	35.3%	38.4%	34.8%
	North Central	12.9%	14.4%	12.8%
	South	27.7%	25.4%	27.6%
	West	24.2%	21.8%	24.8%
Marital Status	Single/Other	47.3%	48.8%	47.6%
	Married	52.7%	51.2%	52.4%
Race	Whites and Other	87.8%	96.0%	88.9%
	Black	3.6%	0.7%	2.9%
	Hispanic	8.7%	3.3%	8.2%
Internet Use	Yes	92.3%	97.3%	93.4%
	No	7.7%	2.7%	6.6%

Effects of Sample Design on Statistical Inference

Specialized sampling designs and post-data collection statistical adjustments require analysis procedures that reflect departures from simple random sampling. SSRS calculates the effects of these design features so that an appropriate adjustment can be incorporated into tests of statistical significance when using these data. The so-called "design effect" or *deff* represents the loss in statistical efficiency that results from a disproportionate sample design and systematic non-response.

The total sample design effect for this survey was 2.24.

SSRS calculates the composite design effect for a sample of size *n*, with each case having a weight, *w* as:[9]

$$deff = \frac{n \sum w^2}{(\sum w)^2}$$

[9] Kish, L. (1992). Weighting for Unequal Pi. Journal of Official Statistics, Vol. 8, No.2, 1992, pp. 183-200.

In a wide range of situations, the adjusted standard error of a statistic should be calculated by multiplying the usual formula by the square root of the design effect ($\sqrt{deff}$). Thus, the formula for computing the 95% confidence interval around a percentage is:

$$\hat{p} \pm 1.96 \sqrt{\frac{deff \times \hat{p}(1-\hat{p})}{n}}$$

where $\hat{p}$ is the sample estimate and *n* is the unweighted number cases in the group being considered.

The formula for computing the 95 percent confidence interval around the difference between two percentages, p_1 and p_2, of sizes n_1 and n_2, is:

$$(\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2) \pm 1.96 \sqrt{\frac{deff_1 \times \hat{p}_1(1-\hat{p}_1)}{n_1} + \frac{deff_2 \times \hat{p}_2(1-\hat{p}_2)}{n_2}}$$

where $\hat{p}_1$ is the estimate of p_1, $\hat{p}_2$ is the estimate of p_2, and $deff_1$ and $deff_2$ are the design effects for each group.

The survey's margin of error is the largest 95% confidence interval for any estimated proportion based on the total sample — the one around 50%. For example, the margin of error for the entire sample is ±3.9 percentage points. This means that in 95 out of every 100 samples drawn using the same methodology, estimated proportions based on the entire sample will be no more than 3.9 percentage points away from their true values in the population. Margins of error for subgroups will be larger. It is important to remember that sampling fluctuations are only one possible source of error in a survey estimate. Other sources, such as respondent selection bias, questionnaire wording, and reporting inaccuracy, may contribute additional error of greater or lesser magnitude.

Response Rate

The response rates for this study were calculated using AAPOR's Response Rate 3 formula. This calculation divides the number of completed interviews in each sampling frame, by the estimated number of eligible phone numbers in the frame. For the phone component, the response rate was calculated to be 22%.

For the SSRS Opinion Panel, the completion rate was 42% and the response rate was calculated to be 2% accounting for response rates to the SSRS Omnibus and ABS recruitment. For the Ipsos panel, the completion rate was 67% and the response rate was calculated to be 5%.

U.S. ADULT SURVEY

This U.S. adult study was conducted for the American Jewish Committee through the SSRS Opinion Panel.[10] Data for this survey were collected from September 8-22, 2021, among a sample of 1,214 respondents. The margin of error for total respondents is +/-3.9% at the 95% confidence level. All data were weighted to represent the target population and to correct for known biases due to sampling and non-response.

Sample Design

The companion study was designed to be able to draw comparisons with the Jewish study, as well as to explore the general public's understanding of antisemitism. To this end, SSRS invited members of its probability-based online panel (SSRS Opinion Panel) to participate in the study. For the study of U.S. adults, Hispanic and Black respondents were oversampled.

The SSRS Opinion Panel is a nationally representative probability-based web panel. Given that this is a probability-based web panel, findings are statistically projectable to the adult general population. SSRS Probability Panel members are recruited randomly in one of two ways: (a) Through invitations mailed to respondents randomly sampled from an Address-Based Sample (ABS). ABS respondents are randomly sampled by MSG through the U.S. Postal Service's Computerized Delivery Sequence (CDS), a regularly-updated listing of all known addresses in the U.S. For the Opinion Panel, known business addresses are excluded from the sample frame; (b) from a dual-frame random digit dial (RDD) sample, through the SSRS Omnibus survey platform. From this base, SSRS screens for Internet access and then recruits those who have Internet access to be part of the SSRS Probability Panel. Sample for the SSRS Omnibus is obtained through Marketing System Groups (MSG).

Field Procedures

Prior to the field period, SSRS programmed the U.S. Adult study into Confirmit Computer Assisted Web Interviewing (CAWI) software. Extensive checking of the program was conducted to assure that skip patterns followed the design of the questionnaire.

Data were collected from September 8-22, 2021, on the SSRS Opinion Panel. All interviews were done through the CAWI system, which ensured that questions followed logical skip patterns.

Panelists were sent an email invitation to take the survey online, as well as up to 3 reminder emails throughout the field period. The survey program was optimized so that respondents could complete using a desktop or laptop computer, as well as a mobile device.

[10] SSRS Opinion Panel members are recruited randomly based on nationally representative ABS (Address Based Sample) design (including Hawaii and Alaska). Additionally, we recruit hard-to-reach demographic groups via our Omnibus survey platform. For more information: https://ssrs.com/opinion-panel/.

Weighting Procedures

The data from this project were weighted to reflect nationally representative estimates of U.S. adults ages 18 and older using the SSRS Opinion Panel. The base weight for the probability panel is computed differently depending on whether the panelist was recruited for the panel from the SSRS Omnibus or from Address-Based Sample (ABS).

Omnibus Recruits

The base weight for the Omnibus recruits (OMNI_BW) was their original base weight. This base weight accounts for selection probability of telephone numbers along with the overlapping landline and cell frames, the overlap of the frames based on respondent's phone use patterns, and the number of adults in each household.[11]

ABS Recruits

For those who were recruited via Address-Based Sample (ABS) the base weight (ABS_BW) was the product of a sampling weight (ABS_SAMPWT) and a household size adjustment (ADULTS). The sampling weight corrected for the disproportionate sample design by adjusting the distribution of ABS sample across strata to match the distribution of the ABS frame across strata. Then any non-completed interviews were removed.

The sampling weight for the ABS recruits was expressed as

$$ABS\_SAMPWT_i = P_i / p_i$$

where P_i is the proportion of the sample frame from in stratum i and p_i is the proportion of sample from in stratum i.

The household size adjustment (ADULTS) was simply the number of adults in the household, capped at 3.

The base weight for the ABS recruits was the product of the sampling weight and the household size adjustment.

$$ABS\_BW = ABS\_SAMPWT \times ADULTS$$

The unadjusted base weight (UBW) was

$$UBW = \begin{cases} OMNI\_BW, & cases\ recruited\ from\ SSRS\ Omnibus \\ ABS\_BW, & cases\ recruited\ from\ ABS\ sample \end{cases}$$

[11] Buskirk, T. D., & Best, J. (2012). Venn Diagrams, Probability 101 and Sampling Weights Computed for Dual Frame Telephone RDD Designs. Journal of Statistics and Mathematics, 15, 3696-3710.

The base weights were standardized by recruitment source to produce the standardized base weight (SBW).

$$SBW = \begin{cases} UBW \times n_{OMNI} / \sum_{i \in OMNI} UBW_i, & cases\ recruited\ from\ SSRS\ Omnibus \\ UBW \times n_{ABS} / \sum_{i \in ABS} UBW_i, & cases\ recruited\ from\ ABS\ sample \end{cases}$$

Non-Internet Adjustment (NIA)

This was a propensity score adjustment to model households with internet access to be representative of all households (regardless of whether or not they have internet access). Propensity scores were estimated by modeling panel response mode on a range of demographic and attitudinal covariates. The model is a CART[12] (Classification and Regression Trees) decision tree built in SPSS by using its scoring wizard available with the decision tree license. Adjustments for each panel participant are then calculated as the reciprocal of the model estimated propensity to be an internet user.

The final base weight (FBW) was the product of the standardized base weight and the non-internet adjustment.

$$FBW = \begin{cases} SBW \times NIA, & if\ project\ has\ no\ phone\ component \\ SWB, & if\ project\ has\ phone\ component \end{cases}$$

The final standardized base weight (FSBW) should be standardized by recruitment source.

$$FSBW = \begin{cases} FBW \times n_{OMNI} / \sum_{i \in OMNI} FBW_i, & cases\ recruited\ from\ SSRS\ Omnibus \\ FBW \times n_{ABS} / \sum_{i \in ABS} FBW_i, & cases\ recruited\ from\ ABS\ sample \end{cases}$$

Post-stratification Weighting

The second stage of the weighting balanced the demographic profile of the sample to target population parameters.

To handle missing data among some of the demographic variables we employ a technique called hot decking. Hot deck imputation replaces the missing values of a respondent randomly with another similar respondent without missing data. These are further determined by variables predictive of non-response that are present in the entire file. We use an SPSS macro detailed in 'Goodbye, Listwise Deletion: Presenting Hot Deck Imputation as an Easy and Effective Tool for Handing Missing Data' (Myers, 2011).

[12] Practical Tools for Designing and Weighting Survey Samples (2nd ed.) by Richard Valliant, Jill A. Dever, and Frauke Kreuter. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2018.

Weighting was accomplished using SPSSINC RAKE, an SPSS extension module that simultaneously balances the distributions of all variables using the GENLOG procedure.

Data were first weighted within race groups as detailed in the following table. The main demographic benchmarks were obtained from the 2020 Current Population Survey (CPS).[13] The civic engagement benchmark was derived from September 2017 CPS Volunteering and Civic Life Supplement data. [14] The population density came from Census Planning Database 2020.[15] The party ID, party lean, and religion benchmarks came from NPORS annual dataset released by Pew Research.[16]

Table 3. Weighting Within Race Groups, by Weighting Variables

Black, non-Hispanic	Hispanic	White/Other non-Hispanic
Gender (2)	Gender (2)	Gender (2)
Age (4)	Age (4)	Age (4)
Education (3)	Education (3)	Education (3)
Region (4)	Region (4)	Region (4)
Marital status (2)	Marital status (2)	Marital status (2)
Civic Engagement (2)	Civic Engagement (2)	Civic Engagement (2)
Internet frequency of use (2)	Internet frequency of use (2)	Internet frequency of use (5)
		Race/ethnicity (2)
		Population density (5)

After the race group samples were weighted, they were combined, and the total sample was weighted by race/ethnicity and education. The following tables compare unweighted and weighted sample distributions to target population benchmarks.

[13] Sarah Flood, Miriam King, Renae Rodgers, Steven Ruggles and J. Robert Warren. Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, Current Population Survey: Version 8.0 [dataset]. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS, 2020. https://doi.org/10.18128/D030.V8.0.
[14] Civically engaged respondents are defined as those who have volunteered in the past 12 months or who talk to their neighbors daily. https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/about/supplemental-surveys.html
[15] https://www.census.gov/topics/research/guidance/planning-databases/2020.html
[16] https://www.pewresearch.org/methods/fact-sheet/national-public-opinion-reference-survey-npors/

Table 4. Weighted and Unweighted Sample Distributions – Black, non-Hispanic

		Parameter (%)	Unweighted (%)	Weighted (%)
Sex	Male	45.7%	31.6%	44.3%
	Female	54.3%	68.4%	55.7%
Age	18-29	24.1%	13.3%	21.2%
	30-49	34.9%	44.4%	35.4%
	50-64	24.2%	27.6%	25.8%
	65+	16.8%	14.7%	17.6%
Education	High School or less	44.5%	18.7%	41.1%
	Some college/ Associates Degree	30.0%	41.3%	32.0%
	College grad +	25.5%	40.0%	26.9%
Census Region	Northeast	15.7%	15.1%	15.5%
	Midwest	16.9%	12.9%	16.7%
	South	58.4%	60.4%	58.1%
	West	9.0%	11.6%	9.6%
Civic Engagement	Not engaged	69.3%	60.9%	68.3%
	Civically engaged	30.7%	39.1%	31.7%
Internet frequency	Almost constantly	42.1%	58.7%	40.4%
	Several times a day or less often	57.9%	41.3%	40.4%
Marital status	Married	33.2%	32.9%	32.1%
	Not married	66.8%	67.1%	67.9%

Table 5. Weighted and Unweighted Sample Distributions – Hispanic

		Parameter (%)	Unweighted (%)	Weighted (%)
Sex	Male	49.8%	48.3%	49.2%
	Female	50.2%	51.7%	50.8%
Age	18-29	28.1%	28.8%	28.4%
	30-49	40.3%	46.5%	40.1%
	50-64	20.2%	15.1%	20.2%
	65+	11.4%	9.6%	11.4%
Education	High School or less	56.1%	24.0%	55.2%
	Some college/Associates Degree	25.2%	36.9%	25.8%
	College grad +	18.6%	39.1%	19.1%
Census Region	Northeast	13.5%	15.5%	13.8%
	Midwest	8.8%	11.4%	9.0%
	South	38.6%	38.4%	38.7%
	West	39.1%	34.7%	38.5%
Civic Engagement	Not engaged	77.3%	66.4%	76.8%
	Civically engaged	22.7%	33.6%	23.2%
Internet Frequency	Almost constantly	54.3%	56.1%	53.8%
	Several times a day or less often	45.7%	43.9%	53.8%

Table 6. Weighted and Unweighted Sample Distributions – White/Other, non-Hispanic

		Parameter (%)	Unweighted (%)	Weighted (%)
Sex	Male	48.6%	51.9%	49.2%
	Female	51.4%	48.1%	50.8%
Age	18-29	18.4%	10.3%	17.3%
	30-49	31.0%	31.2%	31.0%
	50-64	25.7%	26.2%	26.0%
	65+	24.9%	32.3%	25.7%
Education	High School or less	32.1%	23.4%	31.1%
	Some college/Associates Degree	27.7%	29.4%	27.9%
	College grad +	40.1%	47.2%	41.0%
Census Region	Northeast	18.5%	19.4%	18.7%
	Midwest	24.1%	25.3%	24.5%
	South	34.5%	32.3%	34.4%
	West	22.9%	23.0%	22.4%
Civic Engagement	Not engaged	62.2%	57.7%	62.3%
	Civically engaged	37.8%	42.3%	37.7%
Internet frequency	Almost constantly	37.8%	38.0%	38.3%
	Several times a day	49.5%	54.7%	50.9%
	About once a day	6.0%	5.3%	6.0%
	Several times a week	3.6%	1.4%	2.9%
	Less often	3.0%	0.6%	1.8%
Marital status	Married	57.5%	53.8%	57.7%
	Not married	42.5%	46.2%	42.3%
Race/Ethnicity	White	87.9%	89.6%	88.4%
	Other	12.1%	10.4%	11.6%
Population Density	1 Lowest 20%	22.6%	20.1%	22.4%
	2	22.4%	18.9%	22.9%
	3	20.6%	21.6%	20.3%
	4	19.4%	19.1%	19.2%
	5 Highest 20%	15.0%	20.3%	15.2%

Table 7. Weighted and Unweighted Sample Distributions – Total

		Parameter (%)	Unweighted (%)	Weighted (%)
Race/Ethnicity	Black non-Hispanic	11.9%	18.5%	11.9%
	Hispanic	16.7%	22.3%	16.7%
	White/Other non-Hispanic	71.4%	59.1%	71.4%

Weights for Hispanic, as well as White and other, non-Hispanic groups were trimmed at the 3rd and 97th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results. For the Black sample, weights were trimmed at the 5th and 95th percentiles. The use of these weights in statistical analysis ensures that the demographic characteristics of the sample closely approximate the demographic characteristics of the target population. The following table provides the population parameters, and we added the unweighted and weighted sample distributions after weighting.

Effects of Sample Design on Statistical Inference

Post-data collection statistical adjustments require analysis procedures that reflect departures from simple random sampling. SSRS calculates the effects of these design features so that an appropriate adjustment can be incorporated into tests of statistical significance when using these data. The so-called "design effect" or *deff* represents the loss in statistical efficiency that results from a disproportionate sample design and systematic non-response.

The total sample design effect for this survey was 1.91.

SSRS calculates the composite design effect for a sample of size *n*, with each case having a weight, *w* as:[17]

$$deff = \frac{n\sum w^2}{(\sum w)^2}$$

In a wide range of situations, the adjusted standard error of a statistic should be calculated by multiplying the usual formula by the square root of the design effect ($\sqrt{deff}$). Thus, the formula for computing the 95% confidence interval around a percentage is:

$$\hat{p} \pm 1.96\sqrt{\frac{deff \times \hat{p}(1-\hat{p})}{n}}$$

where $\hat{p}$ is the sample estimate and *n* is the unweighted number cases in the group being considered.

[17] Kish, L. (1992). Weighting for Unequal Pi. Journal of Official Statistics, Vol. 8, No.2, 1992, pp. 183-200.

The formula for computing the 95 percent confidence interval around the difference between two percentages, p_1 and p_2, of sizes n_1 and n_2, is:

$$(\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2) \pm 1.96 \sqrt{\frac{deff_1 \times \hat{p}_1(1-\hat{p}_1)}{n_1} + \frac{deff_2 \times \hat{p}_2(1-\hat{p}_2)}{n_2}}$$

where $\hat{p}_1$ is the estimate of p_1, $\hat{p}_2$ is the estimate of p_2, and $deff_1$ and $deff_2$ are the design effects for each group.

The survey's margin of error is the largest 95% confidence interval for any estimated proportion based on the total sample — the one around 50%. For example, the margin of error for the entire sample is ±3.9 percentage points. This means that in 95 out of every 100 samples drawn using the same methodology, estimated proportions based on the entire sample will be no more than 3.9 percentage points away from their true values in the population. Margins of error for subgroups will be larger. It is important to remember that sampling fluctuations are only one possible source of error in a survey estimate. Other sources, such as respondent selection bias, questionnaire wording, and reporting inaccuracy, may contribute additional error of greater or lesser magnitude. The following table shows sample sizes, design effects and maximum margins of sampling error for the total sample and key subgroups.

Table 8: SSRS Opinion Panel Design Effect and Margin of Error

	N	Margin of Error	Design Effect
Total	1,214	+/- 3.9 percentage points	1.42
Black, non-Hispanic	225	+/-9.4 percentage points	2.07
Hispanic	271	+/-8.7 percentage points	2.11
White/Other, non-Hispanic	718	+/-4.8 percentage points	1.72

Response Rate

For the U.S. adults survey on the SSRS Opinion Panel, the completion rate was 40% and the response rate was calculated to be 2% accounting for response rates to the SSRS Omnibus and ABS recruitment.