THE STATE OF ANTISEMITISM IN AMERICA 2022 SURVEY

METHODOLOGY REPORT

Prepared for the American Jewish Committee

Prepared by:

Robyn Rapoport and Elizabeth Sciupac

JANUARY 2023

AJC American Jewish Committee

Table of Contents

Overview

In the fall of 2022, 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 third year that surveys of Jewish Americans and American adults have been jointly conducted for AJC.

The Jewish American study collected data from a nationally representative sample of 1,507 adults (ages 18 and older) and of Jewish religion or background. The survey was conducted from September 28-November 3, 2022. For the second year in a row, the survey was completed as a mixed-mode survey; most respondents (n=1,020) participated via a self-administered web survey, and about a third (n=487) were interviewed on the phone.[1] As points of comparison, the 2021 survey was also a mixed-mode survey; approximately half of the respondents (n=760) were interviewed on the phone, and half (n=673) participated via a self-administered web survey. 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. The three previous surveys were completed in a similar time frame as the 2022 survey.[2]

The U.S. adult study collected data from a nationally representative sample of 1,004 adults (ages 18 or older). Data for this companion survey were collected from October 10-18, 2022, through the SSRS Opinion Panel.[3] For the second year in a row, the survey of U.S. adults was a fully self-administered web survey, after transition from an interviewer-conducted telephone survey in 2020[4] to a fully self-administered web survey in 2021.[5]

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, SSRS used its probability-based Opinion Panel, as well as recontact sample.[6] Respondents who had previously indicated being Jewish by religion or Jewish aside from religion were invited to participate. They were then 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) were asked the screener questions to identify any

[1] The phone interviews included n=253 who were reached on a cell phone and n=234 who were reached on a landline.
[2] The 2021 survey was conducted from September 1-October 3, 2021. 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).
[3] SSRS Opinion Panel members are recruited randomly based on nationally representative ABS (Address Based Sample) design (including Hawaii and Alaska). Additionally, the SSRS Opinion Panel has recruited hard-to-reach demographic groups via the SSRS Omnibus survey platform. Prior to July 2019, the SSRS Opinion Panel was recruited entirely from the SSRS Omnibus. For more information: https://ssrs.com/opinion-panel/
[4] The 2020 telephone study of U.S. adults was conducted using the SSRS Telephone Omnibus, which was a national, weekly dual-frame bilingual telephone survey designed to meet standards of quality associated with custom research studies.
[5] For more information regarding transitions from telephone to self-administered web surveys, including possible mode effects to consider when analyzing data, please see here.
[6] The recontact sample came from the SSRS Telephone Omnibus survey, which was a national, weekly dual-frame bilingual telephone survey designed to meet standards of quality associated with custom research studies.

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.

Additional interviews were completed from our partner probability panel, the Ipsos KnowledgePanel. Panelists from KnowledgePanel[7] are recruited randomly based on a nationally representative ABS design (including Hawaii and Alaska).

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. Together, the SSRS and AJC teams worked to finalize the questionnaire.

The two surveys – Jewish American and general population – were designed in concert, to allow for a more cohesive comparative analysis. Each of the surveys included a mix of new questions and previously asked questions. For example, the 2022 surveys asked Jewish Americans and the general population for opinions on the current state of antisemitism in the United States, repeating questions that were asked in 2021 and 2020. A new topic for 2022 was awareness of the Colleyville hostage situation in January 2022. 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.

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 28 through November 3, 2022. 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.

Web Field Procedures

Panelists were sent an email invitation to take the survey online, as well as up to four 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.

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.

[7] For additional information, please see: https://www.ipsos.com/sites/default/files/ipsosknowledgepanelmethodology.pdf

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.

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 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 SSRS Probability Panel, the Omnibus, or the partner probability panel.

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 RDD Telephone 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 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

$$ABS\_SAMPWT_i = \frac{P_i}{p_i}$$

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

$$UBW = \{OMNI\_BW, \ \ cases\ recruited\ from\ SSRS\ Omnibus\ ABS\_BW, \ \ cases\ recruited\ from\ ABS\ sample$$

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

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

SSRS Omnibus Recontact Sample

The base weight for the SSRS RDD Telephone Omnibus recontacts (OMNI_BW) was their original base weight. This base weight accounted 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.[8]

[8] 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.

Partner Probability Panel

Interviews from our partner panel were assigned the base weight provided by our partner panel upon completion of data collection. [9] Base weights were standardized by sample source so the weights within each sample source sum to the number of interviews by sample source.

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, the 2021 AJC Survey on antisemitism, and estimates from Pew Research Center's 2020 study of U.S. Jews.[10]

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.

[9] https://www.ipsos.com/sites/default/files/kpsamplingandweighting.pdf
[10] 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%	51.4%	53.5%
	Female	46.8%	48.6%	46.5%
Age	18-29	23.1%	12.3%	22.1%
	30-49	29.9%	27.1%	30.2%
	50-64	20.6%	20.8%	20.7%
	65+	26.0%	39.7%	27.0%
Education	High School Graduate or less	23.1%	8.0%	19.5%
	Some college/Assoc Degree	20.3%	14.7%	21.1%
	College Graduate	56.7%	77.4%	59.4%
Denomination	Orthodox	10.1%	9.0%	9.4%
	Conservative	13.8%	20.0%	14.4%
	Reform	27.9%	35.4%	29.2%
	Other	48.2%	35.5%	47.0%
Region	Northeast	35.3%	35.8%	34.2%
	North Central	12.9%	13.9%	13.4%
	South	27.7%	28.3%	27.5%
	West	24.2%	22.0%	24.9%
Marital Status	Single/Other	47.3%	47.7%	46.6%
	Married	52.7%	52.3%	53.4%
Race	Whites and Other	87.8%	92.5%	88.3%
	Black	3.6%	1.3%	2.8%
	Hispanic	8.7%	6.2%	9.0%
Internet Use	Yes	92.3%	98.4%	94.8%
	No	7.7%	1.6%	5.2%

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 1.77.

SSRS calculates the composite design effect for a sample of size *n*, with each case having a weight, *w* as:[11]

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

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:

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

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

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:

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

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 margin of error for total respondents is ±3.4 percentage points at the 95% confidence level. 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 ±3.4 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 3.4 percentage points away from their true values in the population. For estimates smaller or larger than 50%, the margin of sampling error will be smaller. 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.

Cooperation Rate

For the web component of this study, the combined cooperation rate is calculated to be 40%.[12] For the phone component, the cooperation rate is calculated to be 20%.[13]

[12] This calculation combines the cooperation rates from the SSRS Probability Panel and our partner probability panel. It divides the sum of the number of completed interviews and the number of terminates by the total number invited to participate. The cumulative combined response rate is calculated to be 3%, using AAPOR's Response Rate 3 formula, which accounts for response rates to initial recruitment.

[13] The cumulative response rate for the phone component is calculated to be 1%.

U.S. Adult Survey

This U.S. adult study was conducted for the American Jewish Committee through the SSRS Opinion Panel.[14] Data for this survey were collected from October 10-18, 2022, among a sample of 1,004 respondents. The margin of error for total respondents is +/-3.8% 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.

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 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.

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 October 10-18, 2022, 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 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 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 Address-Based Sample (ABS) or from the SSRS RDD telephone Omnibus.

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.

[14] SSRS Opinion Panel members are recruited randomly based on nationally representative ABS (Address Based Sample) design (including Hawaii and Alaska). Additionally, the SSRS Opinion Panel has recruited hard-to-reach demographic groups via the SSRS Telephone Omnibus survey platform. Prior to July 2019, the SSRS Opinion Panel was recruited entirely from the SSRS Telephone Omnibus. For more information: https://ssrs.com/opinion-panel/

ABS recruits come from a variety of sample sources, some of which employ different stratification schemes. ABS base weights are computed based on one of two stratifications. One stratification is geo-demographic. The unit of the stratification is Census Block Group and the strata are based on region, incidence of African American residents and incidence of Hispanic residents. The second stratification includes substrata based on modeled party identification.

After applying the base weight for the ABS recruits, a household size adjustment corrects for the sampling of one adult in each sampled household.

The sampling weight for the ABS recruits was expressed as

$$ABS\_SAMPWT_i = \frac{P_i}{p_i}$$

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

$$UBW = \{OMNI\_BW, \quad cases\ recruited\ from\ SSRS\ Omnibus\ ABS\_BW, \quad cases\ recruited\ from\ ABS\ sample$$

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

$$SBW = \{\frac{UBW \times n_{OMNI}}{\sum_{i \in OMNI} UBW_i}, \quad cases\ recruited\ from\ SSRS\ Omnibus\ \frac{UBW \times n_{ABS}}{\sum_{i \in ABS} UBW_i}, \quad cases\ recruited\ from\ ABS\ sample$$

Omnibus Recruits

The base weight for the telephone Omnibus recruits (OMNI_BW) was their original base weight computed at the time of the original omnibus interview. This base weight accounts for selection probabilities 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.[15]

Non-Internet Adjustment (NIA)

For projects that collect data entirely online, people who do not use the Internet are necessarily not included in the sample. To account for this non-coverage and make the results more representative of the entire target population, we make a non-internet adjustment to the base weight.

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 CART2[16] (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.

[15] 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.
[16] Practical Tools for Designing and Weighting Survey Samples (2nd ed.) by Richard Valliant, Jill A. Dever, and Frauke Kreuter. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2018.

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.

Data were weighted to distributions of: sex by age; sex by education; age by education; detailed education; race/ethnicity; census region; civic engagement; population density; party ID; voter registration; religious affiliation; and internet use frequency. The benchmarks for sex, age, education, race, Hispanic nativity, and census region were obtained from the 2020 Current Population Survey (CPS).[17] The civic engagement benchmark was derived from September 2019 CPS Volunteering and Civic Life Supplement data.[18] The population density came from 2021 Census Planning Database.[19] The party ID, internet frequency, and religion benchmarks came from NPORS annual dataset released by Pew Research.[20] The voter registration benchmark came from the U.S. Census Bureau's 2022 Aristotle Voter Data 2022.[21]

Weights were trimmed at the 2nd and 98th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results. The following tables provide the population parameters, and we added the unweighted and weighted sample distributions after weighting.

Table 2. Weighted and Unweighted Sample Distributions: Sex, Age, and Education

		Parameter (%)	Unweighted (%)	Weighted (%)
Sex by Age	Male 18-24	5.7%	2.2%	4.0%
	Male 25-34	8.7%	7.5%	9.0%
	Male 35-44	8.5%	9.1%	8.9%
	Male 45-54	7.8%	8.8%	8.1%
	Male 55-64	8.1%	7.6%	8.3%
	Male 65+	10.0%	12.2%	10.4%
	Female 18-24	5.6%	3.6%	5.7%
	Female 25-34	8.7%	12.5%	9.0%
	Female 35-44	8.5%	11.1%	8.9%
	Female 45-54	7.9%	7.7%	8.1%
	Female 55-64	8.5%	8.4%	8.9%
	Female 65+	12.0%	9.7%	10.6%
Education	Less than high school	9.6%	5.2%	7.4%
	High school graduate	29.2%	27.6%	29.6%
	Some college/Associates Degree	26.4%	31.2%	27.0%

[17] 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.
[18] 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
[19] https://www.census.gov/topics/research/guidance/planning-databases/2021.html
[20] https://www.pewresearch.org/methods/fact-sheet/national-public-opinion-reference-survey-npors/
[21] https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/popest/2020s-national-detail.html

	College grad +	34.8%	36.1%	35.9%
Sex by Education	Male High school grad or less	20.1%	14.8%	19.3%
	Male Some college	12.5%	12.8%	12.5%
	Male College grad +	16.2%	19.5%	17.0%
	Female High school grad or less	18.6%	17.9%	17.7%
	Female Some college	14.0%	18.3%	14.5%
	Female College grad +	18.6%	16.5%	18.9%
Age by Education	18-34 High school grad or less	11.5%	7.6%	10.3%
	18-34 Some college	8.7%	8.1%	8.7%
	18-34 College grad +	8.6%	10.1%	8.8%
	35-54 High school grad or less	11.3%	12.1%	11.6%
	35-54 Some college	7.8%	11.1%	8.2%
	35-54 College grad +	13.6%	13.4%	14.3%
	55+ High school grad or less	16.0%	13.1%	15.2%
	55+ Some college	9.9%	12.1%	10.2%
	55+ College grad +	12.6%	12.5%	12.8%

Table 3. Weighted and Unweighted Sample Distributions: Race/Ethnicity, Region, Civic Engagement, Internet Frequency, Party ID, Voter Registration, Religion, and Population Density

		Parameter (%)	Unweighted (%)	Weighted (%)
Race/Ethnicity	White, non-Hispanic	62.0%	63.9%	62.4%
	Black, non-Hispanic	12.0%	12.7%	11.8%
	Hispanic, US Born	8.2%	9.5%	8.6%
	Hispanic, Foreign Born	8.9%	6.2%	8.4%
	Asian, non-Hispanic	6.3%	6.3%	6.4%
	Other, non-Hispanic	2.5%	1.4%	2.3%
Census Region	Northeast	17.4%	18.4%	18.0%
	Midwest	20.6%	20.3%	20.2%
	South	38.3%	37.4%	38.5%
	West	23.7%	23.9%	23.4%
Civic Engagement	Not engaged	67.3%	58.2%	67.7%
	Civically engaged	32.7%	41.8%	32.3%
Internet frequency	Almost constantly	44.2%	50.7%	45.5%
	Several times a day	44.4%	43.4%	45.5%
	About once a day	5.3%	4.3%	5.3%
	Several times a week	3.7%	1.4%	3.1%
	Less often	2.3%	0.2%	0.7%
Party ID	Republican	30.1%	27.9%	29.0%
	Democrat	29.2%	33.5%	30.4%
	Independent/Other	40.8%	38.6%	40.7%
Voter Registration	Registered to vote	76.9%	86.5%	78.2%
	Not registered	23.1%	13.5%	21.8%
Religion	Affiliated	68.6%	77.1%	69.7%
	Not affiliated	31.4%	22.9%	30.3%
Population Density	1 Lowest 20%	20.0%	20.0%	19.5%
	2	20.0%	18.5%	20.0%
	3	20.0%	20.2%	20.2%
	4	20.0%	19.3%	19.4%
	5 Highest 20%	20.0%	21.9%	20.8%

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 1.48.

SSRS calculates the composite design effect for a sample of size n, with each case having a weight, w as:[22]

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

[22] 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:

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

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:

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

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 margin of error for total respondents is ±3.8 percentage points at the 95% confidence level. 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 ±3.8 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 3.8 percentage points away from their true values in the population. For estimates smaller or larger than 50%, the margin of sampling error will be smaller. 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.

Cooperation Rate

For the U.S. adults survey on the SSRS Opinion Panel, the cooperation rate was 46%.[23]

[23] The calculation for the cooperation rate divides the sum of the number of completed interviews and the number of terminates by the total number invited to participate. The cumulative response rate is calculated to be 2%, using AAPOR's Response Rate 3 formula, which accounts for response rates to initial recruitment.