

# The State of Antisemitism in America 2024 Surveys

Methodology Report  
Prepared for the American  
Jewish Committee



February 2025

Prepared by:  
Robyn Rapoport, Elizabeth Sciupac and Paula Armendariz  
SSRS

## Table of Contents

<b>Study Overview</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Jewish American Survey</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Sample Design.....	1
Questionnaire Development and Field Procedure.....	2
Web Field Procedures .....	3
CATI Field Procedures.....	4
Weighting Procedures .....	4
Base weight.....	5
Composite Adjustment – Combining Hillel and Probability Panel Samples .....	6
Calibration .....	6
Effects of Sample Design on Statistical Inference.....	8
Cooperation Rate .....	9
<b>U.S. Adult Survey</b> .....	<b>10</b>
Sample Design.....	10
Field Procedures.....	10
Weighting Procedures .....	11
Design Weight.....	11
Non-Response Adjustments .....	12
Non-Internet Adjustment .....	12
Oversample Composite Adjustment.....	12
Calibration .....	13
Effects of Sample Design on Statistical Inference.....	29
Cooperation Rate .....	30
<b>Deliverables</b> .....	<b>30</b>
<b>Appendix A: Sample Comparisons</b> .....	<b>32</b>
Table 27 to Table 32: Comparing Full Sample and Sample Without Hillel .....	32
Table 31 to Table 34: Among Young Adults (18-29), Comparing Full Sample and Sample Without Hillel.....	34
Table 35 to Table 37: Comparing Full Sample, Sample Without Hillel, and Hillel Sample on Unweighted Demographics .....	35
<b>Appendix B: About SSRS</b> .....	<b>37</b>

## Study Overview

In the fall of 2024, the American Jewish Committee contracted with SSRS to conduct two surveys of American Attitudes about Antisemitism. The primary survey interviewed Jewish Americans about their attitudes, knowledge, and experiences with antisemitism. For the fifth year in a row, a companion survey was conducted asking American adults related questions regarding their attitudes and knowledge of antisemitism. While the surveys were designed to build on existing trends, the anniversary of the Hamas attacks on Israel on October 7, 2023, and the 2024 U.S. presidential election make this survey field period somewhat unique.

The Jewish American survey collected data from a nationally representative sample of 1,732 adults (ages 18 and older) of Jewish religion or background. The survey was conducted from October 8, 2024 to November, 29 2024. For the third year in a row, the survey was completed as a mixed-mode survey; most respondents (n=1,468) participated via a self-administered web survey, and n=264 were interviewed on the phone.

The U.S. adult survey collected data from a nationally representative sample of 2,056 adults (ages 18 or older). Data for this companion survey were collected from October 10, 2024 to November 25, 2024, through the [SSRS Opinion Panel](#).<sup>1</sup>

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 Survey

### Sample Design

The Jewish population is a very low incidence population. Best efforts were made to complete interviews with the most representative sample possible. The majority of the interviews were completed via online probability panels. Specifically, almost half of the interviews (n=769) were completed via the SSRS Opinion Panel, with additional sample provided by Ipsos Knowledge Panel – a partner probability panel (n=501).<sup>2</sup> Additional interviews (n=264) were completed via recontact telephone sample.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, in an effort to maximize the number of interviews with

---

<sup>1</sup> The SSRS Opinion Panel is a nationally representative probability-based panel of U.S. adults, aged 18 and older. For more information: <https://ssrs.com/ssrs-solutions/ssrs-opinion-panel/>

<sup>2</sup> Ipsos Knowledge Panel is also a nationally representative probability-based panel of U.S. adults. For more information about this panel see: <https://www.ipsos.com/en-us/solutions/public-affairs/knowledgepanel>

<sup>3</sup> The recontact sample included landline and cell records identified as belonging to Jewish respondents, based on previously conducted telephone surveys.

Jewish adults ages 18 to 29 – more specifically, those who are current or recent college or university students – AJC partnered with Hillel International to provide additional sample to be included. From this sample, n=198 interviews were completed. Table 1 below details the sample sources used for this survey.

Hillel assembles their sample from college students who sign up for Hillel-hosted or Hillel-sponsored events or for the Hillel communications list. In addition, the list includes students who self-identify as Jewish in their College Board demographic profile.

**Table 1. Interviews by Sample Source**

SAMPLE SOURCE	INTERVIEWS
SSRS Opinion Panel	769
Ipsos	501
SSRS Omni Callbacks	264
Hillel List	198
TOTAL	1,732

Respondents from the probability-based panel samples 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 additional panelists who identified as Jewish aside from religion. All respondents who were invited from the Hillel list were also asked the screener questions to ensure eligibility. Participants only qualified to complete the full survey if they indicated in the screener that they identified as Jewish.

The 2024 survey also included a question for all respondents to facilitate the blending of the Hillel sample with the other samples during the weighting process. Respondents were asked, “Have you ever received or signed up to receive emails or other communications from Hillel?” Response options included: 1) Yes, I signed up to receive emails or other communications; 2) I have received emails or other communications, but I don’t recall signing up; 3) No, I have not received emails or other communications from Hillel. This question was used to define Hillel membership for the purposes of weighting. See “Composite Adjustment – Combining Hillel and Probability Panel Samples” for more details about blending the samples and how that question was used.

## Questionnaire Development and Field Procedure

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 2024 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 previous years. Some new questions in 2024 were introduced to gauge opinions on acceptable locations for protests against the Israeli government, the acceptability of boycotts, and the state of U.S. democracy.

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, Jewish respondents were asked platform-specific questions about whether they had encountered antisemitism online or on social media, and if they reported any such incidents, while respondents in the general population were asked a broader question about witnessing antisemitism online and whether they had reported it.

Upon final approval, SSRS formatted and programmed the survey for completion via online and telephone administration, using Conformat web/Computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) software that integrates both modes. Additional steps were employed to ensure a quality user experience in survey administration regardless of the device or browser utilized by respondents. The online program was tested using desktop/laptop computers, tablets, and phones, as well as various web browsers - Chrome, Safari, Firefox, Internet Explorer, and Microsoft Edge. In addition to testing the program for user experience, the online and telephone programs were tested and checked to assure that skip patterns followed the design of the questionnaire.

The field period for the Jewish survey was October 8, 2024-November 29, 2024. All interviews were done through the Conformat 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. For the Hillel list, Hillel managed the survey outreach and sent the email invitation to take the survey online. Members of the Hillel list received one email

invitation, without any reminder emails. 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 survey 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 issues that could be anticipated ahead of time as well as strategies for addressing the potential challenges.

Interviewer training was conducted immediately before the survey was officially launched. The SSRS team reviewed each question from the questionnaire with call center supervisors and interviewers. Interviewers were given instructions to help them maximize response rates and ensure accurate data collection.

### **Weighting Procedures**

Data from this project were weighted to represent the adult Jewish population of the United States. The first step in the weighting was to apply base weights to account for sampling probabilities within each of the sample sources. The samples were then combined using a compositing adjustment. The final step in the weighting was to calibrate sample demographic distributions to target population benchmarks.

Noted above, the 2024 survey included sample from Hillel in addition to the probability panel samples. This sample was included in 2024 to increase the number of interviews with younger Jews (ages 18 to 29), a group that has been routinely under-represented in past surveys. The samples were blended and weighted together to ensure the final sample is representative and overall estimates are unbiased.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> All listed samples carry the potential for bias, both because lists are not created randomly and people who are on a list may differ from similar people who are not on the list. For this project, we addressed the oversampling of young Hillel students that resulted from the inclusion of the Hillel list and made additional weighting-based adjustments aimed at minimizing other potential contributors to bias. The latter adjustments were informed by our close analysis of other potential sample-based differences. That said, there may be an impact on the survey results among younger Jews, showing differences between 2024 and previous years. While this may be an artifact of the sample, the 2024 survey data suggest that these changes are consistent with the broader picture and experiences of U.S. Jews. See Appendix A in the Methodology Report for a closer look at the sample-based differences.

## *Base weight*

Below is a brief description of how the base weights were computed by sample source.

### **SSRS Omnibus Callback Sample**

The SSRS Telephone Omnibus was a weekly omnibus fielded using probability samples of RDD landline and cell phone samples. The SSRS Telephone Omnibus ran until March 2022 when it was replaced by the SSRS Opinion Panel Omnibus.

The base weights for the SSRS Omni Callbacks were their original base weight from the Omnibus survey. This base weight accounts for selection probability of telephone numbers from the RDD frames along with the frame overlap. The base weight also accounts for sampling of one adult within a household.

### **SSRS Opinion Panel Sample**

The SSRS Opinion Panel is a nationally representative probability-based panel of U.S. adults aged 18 or older. Panelists are recruited randomly based on a nationally representative address-based sample (ABS) design with a supplement random digit dial (RDD) telephone sample of prepaid cell phones.

The base weights for SSRS Opinion Panelists were their standard final base weights from the Panel, which account for differential probabilities of selection during the recruitment process. Beginning with the design weights for the SSRS Opinion Panel, these were computed differently depending on whether the panelist was recruited from the ABS, a prepaid cell sample, or the SSRS dual-frame RDD telephone Omnibus. Final base weights for SSRS Opinion Panelists were computed by applying non-Internet, non-response, and attrition adjustments to the design weights.

### **Ipsos Probability Panel**

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 ABS methods.

Respondents recruited from the Ipsos KnowledgePanel were assigned base weights provided by Ipsos upon completion of data collection.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.ipsos.com/sites/default/files/kpsamplingandweighting.pdf>

### Hillel List

Sample from the Hillel List received a base weight of 1 as the sample was drawn using simple random sampling. The Hillel sample was then combined with the other samples using a composite adjustment to account for the oversampling of younger students who are members of Hillel.

### Composite Adjustment – Combining Hillel and Probability Panel Samples

The next step in the weighting was a composite adjustment to account for the overlap of the Hillel sample with the other samples.

The composite adjustment was made by first dividing the samples into eight strata based on age, studenthood and Hillel membership. The composite adjustment ensures that the proportions of these groups in the final sample equals the proportions in the samples excluding the Hillel list. Table 2 shows the eight strata and their distributions across the probability-based samples and the total sample of completed interviews. For each of the eight composite adjustment strata,  $i$ , the composite adjustment is  $p1_i/p2_i$  where  $p1_i$  is the proportion of sample excluding the Hillel list in stratum  $i$  and  $p2_i$  is the proportion of sample including the Hillel list in stratum  $i$ .

**Table 2. Stratification for Composite Adjustment**

Compositing Strata	Sample Distribution	Total Sample Distribution
	Excluding Hillel list	Including Hillel list
18-29, not a student, not a Hillel member	2.3%	2.0%
18-29, not a student, Hillel member	1.1%	1.0%
18-29, student, not a Hillel member	1.7%	1.6%
18-29, student, Hillel member	1.0%	12.0%
30+, not a student, not a Hillel member	61.5%	54.5%
30+, not a student, Hillel member	27.0%	24.0%
30+, student, not a Hillel member	3.4%	3.1%
30+, student, Hillel member	2.0%	1.8%

### Calibration

With the final base weights applied, the sample was calibrated to target population parameters.<sup>6</sup> Table 3 lists the variables that were used in the calibration and their sources.

<sup>6</sup> 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 Handling Missing Data' (Myers, 2011).



**Table 3. Calibration Variables and Source**

DIMENSIONS	SOURCE
Age	Modeled distributions using data from the 2023 wave of the AJC Antisemitism Jewish Survey, the SSRS Opinion Panel (September 2024), the SSRS Omnibus Survey (August 2019 – July 2021), and the Pew Research Center (2020).
Gender	
Education	
Race/Ethnicity	
Marital Status	
Census Region	
Denomination	
Jewish Identity	
Internet Frequency	

Weighting was accomplished by raking sample distributions to target population distributions using iterative proportional fitting. This procedure balances each calibration variable to target benchmarks, individually and iteratively. The entire set of calibration variables is cycled through until the weights converge across all dimensions.

Weights were trimmed at the 2nd and 98th percentiles 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.

Table 4 compares unweighted and weighted sample distributions to target population benchmark distributions.

**Table 4. Weighted and Unweighted Distributions**

CATEGORY	VALUES	PARAMETER	UNWEIGHTED	WEIGHTED
Age	18-29	18.1%	16.7%	17.2%
	30-49	32.0%	23.7%	31.2%
	50-64	20.9%	20.3%	21.6%
	65+	29.1%	39.4%	30.0%
Gender	Male	51.1%	49.1%	51.2%
	Female	48.9%	50.9%	48.8%
Education	HS or less	20.5%	10.6%	18.5%
	Some college	22.0%	18.2%	22.2%
	College+	57.4%	71.2%	59.3%
Denomination	Orthodox	8.9%	7.2%	8.1%
	Conservative	14.3%	21.8%	14.6%
	Reform	29.6%	31.7%	30.1%
	Another denomination	47.2%	39.3%	47.2%
Jewish Identity	Jewish by religion	70.1%	83.2%	71.0%
	Jewish aside from religion	29.9%	16.8%	29.0%
Census Region	North	36.2%	35.8%	35.4%
	Midwest	11.7%	13.4%	11.6%
	South	27.3%	29.4%	28.1%
	West	24.8%	21.4%	24.9%
Marital Status	Married	55.5%	49.2%	55.8%
	Other	44.5%	50.8%	44.2%
Race/Ethnicity	White/Another race	90.7%	94.2%	90.6%
	African American	2.4%	1.0%	2.3%
	Hispanic	6.9%	4.8%	7.0%
Internet Frequency	Several times a day or more	89.1%	92.6%	89.8%
	Less often	10.9%	7.4%	10.2%

### 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. SSRS calculates the composite design effect for a sample of size  $n$ , with each case having a weight,  $w$  as<sup>7</sup>:

<sup>7</sup> Kish, L. (1992). Weighting for Unequal Pi. *Journal of Official Statistics*, Vol. 8, No.2, 1992, pp. 183-200.

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

The survey’s margin of error is the largest 95% confidence interval for any estimated proportion based on the total sample—one around 50%. For example, the margin of error for the total sample is ±3.3 percentage points. This means that in 95 out of every 100 samples using the same methodology, estimated proportions based on the entire sample will be no more than 3.3 percentage points away from their true values in the population. Margins of error for sub-groups 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 measurement error, may contribute additional error of greater or lesser magnitude. Table 5 shows the design effects, sample sizes, and margins of sampling error for the sample overall and for key target subgroups.

**Table 5. Sample Sizes, Design Effects and Margins of Sampling Error**

	N=	DESIGN EFFECT	MARGIN OF ERROR
Total Sample	<b>1,732</b>	<b>1.93</b>	<b>+/- 3.3 percentage points</b>
Students (including recent students)	320	2.66	+/- 8.9 percentage points
Non-students	1,412	1.82	+/- 3.5 percentage points
18 to 29 year-olds	288	2.78	+/- 9.6 percentage points
30 to 49 year-olds	411	1.60	+/- 6.1 percentage points
50 to 64 year-olds	352	1.56	+/- 6.5 percentage points
65+ year-olds	680	1.87	+/- 5.1 percentage points

## Cooperation Rate<sup>8</sup>

For the web component of this survey, the combined cooperation rate is calculated to be 68%. For the phone component, the cooperation rate is calculated to be 14%. For the Hillel list, the cooperation rate is calculated to be 78%.

<sup>8</sup> The cooperation rate is calculated by dividing the number of completed interviews by the total amount of eligible sample. The cumulative combined response rate for the Jewish survey is 4%, using AAPOR’s Response Rate 3 formula, which accounts for response rates to initial panelist recruitment.

## U.S. Adult Survey

This U.S. adult survey was conducted for the American Jewish Committee through the [SSRS Opinion Panel](#).<sup>9</sup> Data for this companion survey were collected from October 10 to November 25, 2024, among a sample of 2,056 respondents. The data were weighted to represent the US residential adult population.

### Sample Design

There were three independent samples pulled from the SSRS Opinion Panel for the U.S. adult survey. There was a main sample which was pulled to standard general population sample specifications. Additionally, there was an oversample targeted to key subgroups that we wanted to ensure were properly represented in the sample. These groups included Hispanic, Black, and Asian adults, and young adults ages 18-29. The third sample was an oversample of Muslim adults.

The SSRS Opinion Panel is a nationally representative probability-based web panel. SSRS Opinion Panel members are recruited mainly 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. Additional panel recruitment also takes place from prepaid cell phone sample and from Omnibus telephone sample.

### Field Procedures

Prior to the field period, SSRS programmed the U.S. adult survey into Conformat Computer Assisted Web Interviewing (CAWI) software. Extensive checking of the program was conducted to assure that skip patterns followed the design of the questionnaire. Finally, the survey program was translated into Spanish.

Data were collected from October 10 to November 25, 2024, on the SSRS Opinion Panel. All interviews were done through the CAWI system, which ensured that questions followed logical skip patterns.

---

<sup>9</sup> 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/>

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

Data were weighted to represent the residential adult population of the United States. The data were weighted by applying a base weight, making adjustments for the oversampling of target subgroups, and calibrating the sample to target population benchmark distributions.

The weighting starts with applying a base weight, which is the product of a design weight, a non-response adjustment, and a non-internet adjustment.

### *Design Weight*

The design weight for SSRS Opinion Panelists accounts for differential probabilities of selection during the recruitment process. The design weight is computed differently depending on whether the panelist was recruited from address-based sample (ABS), a prepaid cell sample, or the SSRS dual-frame RDD telephone Omnibus.

#### **ABS Recruits Design Weight**

The design weight for ABS recruits corrects for the disproportionate ABS design by adjusting the distribution of sample across the ABS strata to match the distribution of the ABS frame across strata.

ABS recruits come from a variety of sample sources, some of which employ different stratification schemes. The design weight for ABS recruits is tailored to the stratification scheme used for the sample from which the panelist was recruited. Currently, ABS recruitment waves for the SSRS Opinion Panel are stratified on a combination of geographic region and model-based indicators of the presence of key sub-populations.

#### **Prepaid Cell Recruits Design Weight**

The design weight for prepaid cell recruits accounts for any disproportionate sampling of prepaid cell phone numbers from the cell phone RDD frame.

#### **Telephone Omnibus Recruits Design Weight**

The design weight for the telephone Omnibus recruits is their original base weight computed at the time of the original omnibus interview. This base weight accounts for selection probabilities

associated with the overlapping dual-frame Omnibus sample design.<sup>10</sup> This base weight is a function of the landline and cell frame and sample sizes as well as each respondent's telephone usage and number of adults in the household.

### **Non-Response Adjustments**

Two adjustments are applied to the design weight to create the final base weight:

- A nonresponse adjustment correcting for variability in the recruitment response rate.
- An attrition adjustment correcting for variability in the rate at which originally recruited panelists are retained on the Panel.

Both steps use a weighting class adjustment in which adjustment cells are defined by a cross of the recruitment channel and geographic strata.

For ABS recruits, a household size adjustment is also applied to correct for the sampling of one adult within each sampled address.

### **Non-Internet Adjustment**

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 is a propensity score adjustment that models adults with internet access to be representative of all adults (regardless of whether or not they have internet access). Propensity scores are estimated by modeling panel response mode on a range of demographic, attitudinal and behavioral covariates. The model is a CART<sup>11</sup> (Classification and Regression Trees) decision tree built in SPSS by using its scoring wizard available with the decision tree license.

### **Oversample Composite Adjustment**

After the base weights were applied, we made a weighting adjustment to combine the main sample and the oversample of key subgroups. This was done by creating targeted subgroup strata and making a composite adjustment to ensure that the proportion of these groups in the combined sample match the proportion of the groups in the main sample.

---

<sup>10</sup> 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*. Vol. 15: 3696–3710.

<sup>11</sup> Practical Tools for Designing and Weighting Survey Samples (2nd ed.) by Richard Valliant, Jill A. Dever, and Frauke Kreuter. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2018.

Table 6 shows the targeted subgroup strata and their distributions across the main sample and the general population sample.

**Table 6. Sample Stratification for Oversample Adjustment on the GP Sample**

Compositing Strata	Main Sample Distribution	GP Sample Distribution
Asian, 18-29	2.2%	2.8%
Foreign-born Hispanic, 18-29	1.9%	1.9%
All Others, 18-29	17.0%	21.9%
Asian, not 18-29	4.8%	8.1%
Foreign-born Hispanic, not 18-29	4.9%	7.2%
All Others, not 18-29	69.2%	58.2%

### Calibration

With the appropriate base weights applied, the data were calibrated to balance the demographic profile of the sample to the target population benchmark distributions.

Two calibrated weights were computed. The general population sample was calibrated to benchmark distributions of the US adult 18+ population. All Muslims (the Muslim oversample plus the Muslims from the general population sample) were calibrated to benchmark distributions of the US Muslim population. The two calibrated weights were combined to create a total sample weight. A final adjustment was made to put Muslims into their proper proportion.

Weighting was accomplished by raking sample distributions to target population benchmark distributions using iterative proportional fitting. This procedure balances each calibration variable to target benchmarks, individually and iteratively. The entire set of calibration variables is cycled through until the weights converge across all dimensions.

### GP Calibration

The GP sample's data were weighted, within race/ethnicity sub-group, to variables detailed in Table 7. The population benchmark distributions for the calibrations were derived from the sources listed in Table 8.

Missing data in the raking variables were imputed using hot decking. Hot deck imputation replaces the missing values of a respondent randomly with another similar respondent without missing data. Hot decking was done using an SPSS macro detailed in 'Goodbye, Listwise Deletion: Presenting Hot Deck Imputation as an Easy and Effective Tool for Handling Missing Data' (Myers, 2011).

**Table 7. GP Calibration Variables**

White/Another Race	Black	Hispanic	Asian
Gender by Age (M, F by 18-29, 30+)	Gender by Age (M, F by 18-29, 30+)	Gender by Age (M, F by 18-29, 30+)	Gender by Age (M, F by 18-29, 30+)
Age (18-24, 25-29, 30-49, 50-64, 65+)	Age (18-24, 25-29, 30-49, 50+)	Age (18-24, 25-29, 30-49, 50+)	Age (18-24, 25-29, 30-49, 50+)
Education (HS grad. or less, some college, college grad+)	Education (HS grad. or less, some college, college grad+)	Education (HS grad. or less, some college, college grad+)	Education (HS grad. or less, some college, college grad+)
Education by Age (18-29, 30+ by Some college or less, College+)	Education by Age (18-29, 30+ by Some college or less, College+)	Education by Age (18-29, 30+ by Some college or less, College+)	Education by Age (18-29, 30+ by Some college or less, College+)
Region (North, Midwest South, West)	Region (North, Midwest South, West)	Region (North, Midwest South, West)	Region (North, Midwest South, West)
Age by Marital Status (18-29, 30+ by Married, Not married)	Age by Marital Status (18-29, 30+ by Married, Not married)	Age by Marital Status (18-29, 30+ by Married, Not married)	Age by Marital Status (18-29, 30+ by Married, Not married)
Civic Engagement (Y, N)	Civic Engagement (Y, N)	Civic Engagement (Y, N)	Civic Engagement (Y, N)
Internet Frequency (Almost constantly, Less often)	Internet Frequency (Almost constantly, Less often)	Internet Frequency (Almost constantly, Less often)	Internet Frequency (Almost constantly, Less often)
--	--	Nativity (US-born, foreign-born)	--
Race/Ethnicity (White, Another/Mixed race)	--	--	--
Party ID (Rep., Dem., Ind./Other)	Party ID (Rep., Dem., Ind./Other)	Party ID (Rep., Dem., Ind./Other)	Party ID (Rep., Dem., Ind./Other)
Voter Registration (Y, N)	Voter Registration (Y, N)	Voter Registration (Y, N)	Voter Registration (Y, N)
Religious Affiliation (Affiliated, Not)	Religious Affiliation (Affiliated, Not)	Religious Affiliation (Affiliated, Not)	Religious Affiliation (Affiliated, Not)
Population Density (Total population quintiles)	Population Density (Total population quintiles)	Population Density (Total population quintiles)	Population Density (Total population quintiles)



**Table 8. GP Calibration Variable Sources**

Dimensions	Source
Sex	2024 Current Population Survey <sup>12</sup>
Age	
Education	
Race/Ethnicity	
Hispanic nativity	
Census region	
Marital status	
Population density	Census Planning Database <sup>13</sup> and Claritas Pop-Facts Premier 2023 <sup>14</sup>
Religion affiliation	Pew Research Center’s National Public Opinion Reference Survey (NPORS) <sup>15</sup>
Internet frequency	
Party ID <sup>16</sup>	
Civic engagement	September 2021 CPS Volunteering and Civic Life Supplement <sup>17</sup>
Voter registration	CPS 2022 Voting and Registration Supplement <sup>18</sup>

The calibrated weights were each trimmed at the 5<sup>th</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> percentiles. The trimmed weights were combined and the sample was rebalanced to the US adult 18+ population distribution of race/ethnicity.

<sup>12</sup> Sarah Flood, Miriam King, Renae Rodgers, Steven Ruggles, J. Robert Warren, Daniel Backman, Annie Chen, Grace Cooper, Stephanie Richards, Megan Schouweiler, and Michael Westberry. IPUMS CPS: Version 12.0 [dataset]. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS, 2024.

<https://doi.org/10.18128/D030.V12.0>

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.census.gov/topics/research/guidance/planning-databases/2022.html>

<sup>14</sup> <https://environicsanalytics.com/data/demographic/pop-facts-premier>

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.pewresearch.org/methods/fact-sheet/national-public-opinion-reference-survey-npors/> - Feb 1 to Jun 10, 2024.

<sup>16</sup> The party ID used in weighting is measured at a time matching the NPORS data release, not at the time of this survey.

<sup>17</sup> Sarah Flood, Miriam King, Renae Rodgers, Steven Ruggles, J. Robert Warren and Michael Westberry. Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, Current Population Survey: Version 10.0 [dataset]. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS, 2022.

<https://doi.org/10.18128/D030.V10.0>

<sup>18</sup> Sarah Flood, Miriam King, Renae Rodgers, Steven Ruggles, J. Robert Warren, Daniel Backman, Annie Chen, Grace Cooper, Stephanie Richards, Megan Schouweiler and Michael Westberry. IPUMS CPS: Version 11.0 [dataset]. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.18128/D030.V11.0>

### Muslim Calibration

All Muslims, those from the Muslim oversample as well as those from the GP sample, were calibrated to variables detailed in Table 9. The population benchmark distributions were derived from the sources listed in Table 10.

**Table 9. Muslim Calibration Variables**

Muslim
Gender (M, F)
Age (18-24, 25-29, 30-49, 50-64, 65+)
Education (HS grad. or less, some college, college+)
Region (North, Midwest South, West)
Marital Status (married, not married)
Civic Engagement (yes, no)
Internet frequency of use (almost constantly, several times/day, less often)
Race/ethnicity (White/Other, Black, Hispanic, Asian)
Voter Registration (yes, no)

**Table 10. Muslim Calibration Variable Sources**

DIMENSIONS	SOURCE
Sex	Modeled distributions calculated from the SSRS Opinion Panel (September 2024), a previous American Muslim Survey conducted by SSRS (2023), estimates from a Pew Research study from 2017 including American Muslims, and Pew Research Center’s National Public Opinion Reference Survey (NPORS).
Age	
Education	
Race/Ethnicity	
Marital status	
Census region	
Internet frequency	
Civic engagement	
Voter registration	

The Muslim raked weights were trimmed at the 5th and 95<sup>th</sup> percentiles.

### Combined Total Sample Weight

A combined weight for the total sample was computed using the GP and Muslim weights. Non-Muslims were assigned the weight from the GP calibration and Muslims were assigned the weight

from the Muslim calibration. After the weights were combined, a final adjustment was made to put Muslims in their proper proportion.

Table 11 to Table 22 compare unweighted and weighted sample distributions to target population benchmark distributions.

**Table 11. Sample Demographics - White/Another Race, non-Hispanic**

CATEGORY	VALUES	PARAMETER	UNWEIGHTED	WEIGHTED
Age	18-24	10.0%	7.0%	9.4%
	25-29	7.5%	15.2%	8.1%
	30-49	30.8%	26.6%	29.2%
	50-64	24.7%	24.4%	25.6%
	65+	27.1%	26.9%	27.8%
Gender by Age	Male, 18-29	8.9%	8.3%	8.8%
	Male, 30+	40.2%	42.4%	40.7%
	Female, 18-29	8.6%	13.8%	8.7%
	Female, 30+	42.3%	35.4%	41.8%
Education	HS or less	32.8%	37.5%	33.7%
	Some college	27.7%	24.7%	27.7%
	College+	39.5%	37.7%	38.6%
Age by Education	18-29, Some college or less	12.7%	13.6%	12.5%
	18-29, College+	4.8%	8.6%	4.9%
	30+, Some college or less	47.8%	48.7%	48.9%
	30+, College+	34.7%	29.1%	33.6%
Age by Marital Status	18-29, Married	3.2%	6.7%	3.5%
	18-29, Not married	14.3%	15.5%	14.0%
	30+, Married	52.0%	45.4%	52.0%
	30+, Not married	30.6%	32.4%	30.5%
Census Region	North	18.2%	17.9%	18.9%
	Midwest	25.4%	27.1%	24.9%
	South	36.0%	35.3%	36.0%
	West	20.3%	19.6%	20.3%
Civic Engagement	Engaged	31.3%	50.7%	33.4%
	Not engaged	68.7%	49.3%	66.6%
Race/Ethnicity	White	95.8%	94.0%	95.8%
	Another race	4.2%	6.0%	4.2%
Internet Frequency	Almost constantly	36.6%	43.0%	36.6%
	Several times a day or less	63.4%	57.0%	63.4%

Table 12. Sample Demographics - White/Another Race, non-Hispanic (cont.)

CATEGORY	VALUES	PARAMETER	UNWEIGHTED	WEIGHTED
Party ID	Republican	36.5%	41.8%	37.9%
	Democrat	23.5%	21.5%	23.5%
	Independent/ Other	39.9%	36.6%	38.6%
Voter Registration	Registered	84.3%	89.0%	86.0%
	Not registered	15.7%	11.0%	14.0%
Religious Affiliation	Affiliated	70.8%	69.6%	70.5%
	Not affiliated	29.2%	30.4%	29.5%
Population Density Quintiles	Lowest	24.4%	21.9%	24.2%
	2	23.0%	23.8%	23.5%
	3	20.6%	22.4%	21.1%
	4	18.0%	16.1%	17.0%
	Highest	14.0%	15.8%	14.2%

**Table 13. Sample Demographics - Black, non-Hispanic**

CATEGORY	VALUES	PARAMETER	UNWEIGHTED	WEIGHTED
Age	18-24	13.0%	13.9%	11.3%
	25-29	9.3%	16.3%	9.9%
	30-49	36.5%	41.5%	37.7%
	50+	41.2%	28.2%	41.1%
Gender by Age	Male, 18-29	10.6%	8.8%	8.0%
	Male, 30+	35.4%	23.1%	33.8%
	Female, 18-29	11.6%	21.4%	13.1%
	Female, 30+	42.4%	46.6%	45.0%
Education	HS or less	43.2%	47.3%	43.6%
	Some college	29.3%	29.3%	27.4%
	College+	27.5%	23.5%	29.0%
Age by Education	18-29, Some college or less	18.1%	26.2%	16.9%
	18-29, College+	4.2%	4.1%	4.2%
	30+, Some college or less	54.4%	50.3%	54.1%
	30+, College+	23.3%	19.4%	24.8%
Age by Marital Status	18-29, Married	1.7%	3.7%	2.1%
	18-29, Not married	20.5%	26.5%	19.1%
	30+, Married	32.2%	20.7%	33.6%
	30+, Not married	45.6%	49.0%	45.3%
Census Region	North	15.3%	16.7%	16.7%
	Midwest	16.7%	19.0%	16.9%
	South	59.4%	56.8%	59.7%
	West	8.7%	7.5%	6.8%
Civic Engagement	Engaged	22.5%	48.0%	23.7%
	Not engaged	77.5%	52.0%	76.3%
Internet Frequency	Almost constantly	42.9%	59.2%	46.2%
	Several times a day or less	57.1%	40.8%	53.8%
Party ID	Republican	6.7%	8.2%	7.6%
	Democrat	56.3%	51.0%	56.1%
	Independent/Other	36.9%	40.8%	36.4%

Table 14. Sample Demographics - Black, non-Hispanic (cont.)

CATEGORY	VALUES	PARAMETER	UNWEIGHTED	WEIGHTED
Voter Registration	Registered	77.3%	92.2%	81.5%
	Not registered	22.7%	7.8%	18.5%
Religious Affiliation	Affiliated	79.9%	69.0%	77.7%
	Not affiliated	20.1%	31.0%	22.3%
Population Density Quintiles	Lowest	11.9%	9.5%	11.2%
	2	15.1%	17.0%	16.1%
	3	16.5%	15.0%	17.3%
	4	24.8%	26.2%	24.5%
	Highest	31.7%	32.3%	30.9%

**Table 15. Sample Demographics – Hispanic**

CATEGORY	VALUES	PARAMETER	UNWEIGHTED	WEIGHTED
Age	18-24	16.1%	13.4%	14.7%
	25-29	10.6%	22.1%	11.6%
	30-49	39.8%	37.9%	38.8%
	50+	33.5%	26.6%	34.9%
Gender by Age	Male, 18-29	13.7%	13.4%	12.3%
	Male, 30+	36.5%	27.0%	35.7%
	Female, 18-29	13.1%	22.1%	14.0%
	Female, 30+	36.7%	37.5%	38.0%
Education	HS or less	57.4%	42.4%	54.9%
	Some college	22.8%	33.7%	24.0%
	College+	19.8%	23.9%	21.1%
Age by Education	18-29, Some college or less	22.8%	28.1%	22.0%
	18-29, College+	3.9%	7.4%	4.3%
	30+, Some college or less	57.3%	48.0%	56.9%
	30+, College+	15.9%	16.5%	16.8%
Age by Marital Status	18-29, Married	4.3%	9.6%	4.7%
	18-29, Not married	22.4%	25.9%	21.6%
	30+, Married	42.5%	35.0%	42.8%
	30+, Not married	30.8%	29.5%	30.9%



Table 16. Sample Demographics – Hispanic (cont.)

CATEGORY	VALUES	PARAMETER	UNWEIGHTED	WEIGHTED
Census Region	North	13.3%	14.3%	11.9%
	Midwest	9.1%	8.3%	8.9%
	South	39.3%	38.8%	40.0%
	West	38.2%	38.6%	39.3%
Civic Engagement	Engaged	16.3%	40.4%	17.9%
	Not engaged	83.7%	59.6%	82.1%
US Nativity	US-born	47.4%	52.7%	48.4%
	Foreign-born	52.6%	47.3%	51.6%
Internet Frequency	Almost constantly	52.1%	65.0%	53.9%
	Several times a day or less	47.9%	35.0%	46.1%
Party ID	Republican	18.9%	25.2%	20.8%
	Democrat	33.9%	31.3%	34.1%
	Independent/Other	47.2%	43.5%	45.1%
Voter Registration	Registered	47.2%	71.9%	50.9%
	Not registered	52.8%	28.1%	49.1%
Religious Affiliation	Affiliated	70.6%	71.0%	68.8%
	Not affiliated	29.4%	29.0%	31.2%
Population Density Quintiles	Lowest	15.7%	18.5%	16.4%
	2	14.5%	11.4%	13.7%
	3	19.3%	22.8%	20.7%
	4	19.9%	21.2%	20.9%
	Highest	30.6%	26.1%	28.3%

Table 17. Sample Demographics – Asian, non-Hispanic

CATEGORY	VALUES	PARAMETER	UNWEIGHTED	WEIGHTED
Age	18-24	10.7%	11.3%	11.7%
	25-29	8.6%	12.6%	9.2%
	30-49	39.8%	46.4%	39.1%
	50+	40.9%	29.7%	40.0%
Gender by Age	Male, 18-29	9.7%	12.6%	10.4%
	Male, 30+	38.2%	43.2%	39.3%
	Female, 18-29	9.7%	11.3%	10.5%
	Female, 30+	42.4%	32.9%	39.8%
Education	HS or less	25.1%	10.8%	24.5%
	Some college	16.7%	17.6%	16.9%
	College+	58.2%	71.6%	58.5%
Age by Education	18-29, Some college or less	9.9%	10.8%	10.5%
	18-29, College+	9.5%	13.1%	10.4%
	30+, Some college or less	31.9%	17.6%	31.0%
	30+, College+	48.7%	58.6%	48.1%
Age by Marital Status	18-29, Married	2.9%	4.1%	2.8%
	18-29, Not married	16.4%	19.8%	18.1%
	30+, Married	60.3%	53.2%	58.3%
	30+, Not married	20.4%	23.0%	20.8%
Census Region	North	21.4%	19.8%	21.6%
	Midwest	10.0%	12.6%	11.4%
	South	25.2%	30.6%	23.3%
	West	43.5%	36.9%	43.7%
Civic Engagement	Engaged	19.0%	50.5%	19.7%
	Not engaged	81.0%	49.5%	80.3%
Internet Frequency	Almost constantly	69.9%	66.2%	70.0%
	Several times a day or less	30.1%	33.8%	30.0%
Party ID	Republican	16.1%	19.4%	16.2%
	Democrat	29.7%	40.1%	31.4%
	Independent/Other	54.3%	40.5%	52.4%

Table 18. Sample Demographics – Asian, non-Hispanic (cont.)

CATEGORY	VALUES	PARAMETER	UNWEIGHTED	WEIGHTED
Voter Registration	Registered	51.0%	76.6%	54.7%
	Not registered	49.0%	23.4%	45.3%
Religious Affiliation	Affiliated	57.4%	66.2%	60.2%
	Not affiliated	42.6%	33.8%	39.8%
Population Density Quintiles	Lowest	4.7%	5.9%	5.1%
	2	10.7%	13.1%	10.0%
	3	14.7%	16.2%	15.2%
	4	29.7%	27.5%	30.8%
	Highest	40.3%	37.4%	38.9%

Table 19. Sample Demographics – Muslim

CATEGORY	VALUES	PARAMETER	UNWEIGHTED	WEIGHTED
Age	18-24	22.9%	14.6%	22.5%
	25-29	14.3%	12.3%	15.1%
	30-49	42.9%	49.2%	43.0%
	50-64	14.5%	17.7%	13.6%
	65+	5.5%	6.2%	5.8%
Gender	Male	54.9%	46.9%	55.5%
	Female	45.1%	53.1%	44.5%
Education	HS or less	34.3%	14.6%	30.2%
	Some college	25.8%	27.7%	27.4%
	College+	39.9%	57.7%	42.3%
Census Region	North	27.9%	29.2%	29.5%
	Midwest	22.1%	17.7%	19.1%
	South	32.6%	39.2%	32.9%
	West	17.4%	13.8%	18.5%
Civic Engagement	Engaged	30.3%	52.3%	32.3%
	Not engaged	69.7%	47.7%	67.7%
Internet Frequency	Almost constantly	58.9%	60.8%	57.2%
	Several times a day or less	41.1%	39.2%	42.8%
Marital Status	Married	49.9%	53.1%	50.6%
	Not married	50.1%	46.9%	49.4%
Voter Registration	Registered	68.4%	76.2%	69.8%
	Not registered	31.6%	23.8%	30.2%
Race/Ethnicity	White/Another race	43.6%	43.8%	42.9%
	Black	22.7%	26.9%	21.3%
	Hispanic	7.5%	5.4%	8.0%
	Asian	26.2%	23.8%	27.8%

Table 20. Sample Demographics - Non-Muslim

CATEGORY	VALUES	PARAMETER	UNWEIGHTED	WEIGHTED
Age	18-24	11.4%	9.5%	10.6%
	25-29	8.3%	16.9%	8.9%
	30-49	33.6%	32.2%	32.5%
	50-64	23.8%	22.1%	26.0%
	65+	23.0%	19.3%	22.0%
Gender	Male	48.8%	46.3%	48.3%
	Female	51.2%	53.7%	51.7%
Education	HS or less	38.0%	38.6%	38.1%
	Some college	26.3%	26.5%	26.3%
	College+	35.7%	34.9%	35.6%
Census Region	North	17.1%	16.4%	17.4%
	Midwest	20.4%	20.5%	20.2%
	South	38.8%	38.6%	38.7%
	West	23.7%	24.6%	23.7%
Civic Engagement	Engaged	26.9%	47.8%	28.5%
	Not engaged	73.1%	52.2%	71.5%
Internet Frequency	Almost constantly	41.6%	52.1%	42.9%
	Several times a day or less	58.4%	47.9%	57.1%
Marital Status	Married	51.6%	46.7%	52.1%
	Not married	48.4%	53.3%	47.9%
Voter Registration	Registered	74.9%	84.9%	77.2%
	Not registered	25.1%	15.1%	22.8%
Race/Ethnicity	White/Another race	63.7%	53.7%	63.7%
	Black	12.0%	13.4%	11.9%
	Hispanic	18.0%	22.9%	18.0%
	Asian	6.4%	9.9%	6.5%
Religious Affiliation	Affiliated	70.7%	67.4%	70.0%
	Not affiliated	29.3%	32.6%	30.0%

Table 21. Sample Demographics - Total Sample

CATEGORY	VALUES	PARAMETER	UNWEIGHTED	WEIGHTED
Gender	Male	48.9%	46.5%	48.3%
	Female	51.1%	53.5%	51.7%
Age	18-24	11.5%	9.8%	10.7%
	25-29	8.3%	16.9%	9.0%
	30-49	33.7%	32.0%	32.6%
	50-64	23.7%	22.0%	25.8%
	65+	22.8%	19.3%	21.9%
Gender by Age	Male, 18-29	10.0%	10.0%	9.4%
	Male, 30+	38.8%	36.4%	38.9%
	Female, 18-29	9.8%	16.6%	10.3%
	Female, 30+	41.3%	36.9%	41.4%
Education	HS or less	37.9%	38.8%	38.1%
	Some college	26.3%	26.5%	26.3%
	College+	35.8%	34.7%	35.6%
Age by Education	18-29, Some college or less	14.9%	18.7%	14.6%
	18-29, College+	4.9%	8.0%	5.1%
	30+, Some college or less	49.3%	46.6%	49.8%
	30+, College+	30.9%	26.7%	30.5%
Marital Status	Married	51.6%	46.5%	52.1%
	Not married	48.4%	53.5%	47.9%
Age by Marital Status	18-29, Married	3.2%	6.5%	3.5%
	18-29, Not married	16.6%	20.2%	16.2%
	30+, Married	48.4%	39.9%	48.6%
	30+, Not married	31.8%	33.4%	31.7%
Census Region	North	17.2%	16.4%	17.5%
	Midwest	20.5%	20.3%	20.2%
	South	38.7%	38.8%	38.7%
	West	23.7%	24.5%	23.6%
Civic Engagement	Engaged	27.0%	47.6%	28.6%
	Not engaged	73.0%	52.4%	71.4%

**Table 22. Sample Demographics - Total Sample (cont.)**

CATEGORY	VALUES	PARAMETER	UNWEIGHTED	WEIGHTED
Race/Ethnicity	White/Another race	63.4%	53.1%	63.5%
	Black	12.1%	13.7%	12.0%
	Hispanic	17.9%	22.8%	17.9%
	Asian	6.6%	10.3%	6.7%
Internet Frequency	Almost constantly	41.8%	52.0%	43.1%
	Several times a day or less	58.2%	48.0%	56.9%
Party ID	Republican	29.1%	32.0%	29.8%
	Democrat	29.3%	29.5%	29.8%
	Independent/Other	41.7%	38.5%	40.4%
Voter Registration	Registered	74.8%	84.8%	77.1%
	Not registered	25.2%	15.2%	22.9%
Religious Affiliation	Affiliated	71.0%	68.1%	70.3%
	Not affiliated	29.0%	31.9%	29.7%
Muslim Religious Affiliation	Muslim	1.0%	6.3%	1.0%
	Non-Muslim	99.0%	93.7%	99.0%
Population Density Quintiles	Lowest	20.2%	18.5%	20.0%
	2	19.8%	19.7%	20.0%
	3	19.5%	21.2%	20.2%
	4	19.8%	19.3%	19.5%
	Highest	20.7%	21.3%	20.3%

### 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. SSRS calculates the composite design effect for a sample of size *n*, with each case having a weight, *w*, as:<sup>19</sup>

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

<sup>19</sup> Kish, L. (1992). Weighting for Unequal Pi. *Journal of Official Statistics*, Vol. 8, No.2, 1992, pp. 183-200.

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  $\pm 3.0$  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 3.0 percentage points away from their true values in the population. Margins of error for sub-groups 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 measurement error, may contribute additional error of greater or lesser magnitude. Table 23 shows the design effects, sample sizes, and margins of sampling error for the sample overall and for key target sub-groups.

**Table 23 Sample Sizes, Design Effects and Margins of Sampling Error**

	N =	DESIGN EFFECT	MARGIN OF ERROR
Total Sample	<b>2,056</b>	<b>1.99</b>	<b>+/- 3.0 percentage points</b>
White/Another race	1,092	1.70	+/- 3.9 percentage points
Black	294	2.65	+/- 9.3 percentage points
Hispanic	448	2.10	+/- 6.7 percentage points
Asian	222	3.02	+/- 11.4 percentage points
Muslim	130	1.88	+/- 11.8 percentage points
Non-Muslim	1,926	1.90	+/- 3.1 percentage points

## Cooperation Rate<sup>20</sup>

For the U.S. adults survey on the SSRS Opinion Panel, the cooperation rate was 45%.

## Deliverables

In the course of fielding the surveys, SSRS met with and provided a progress report to the AJC team every other week with the number of completed surveys by key parameters of interests. Additionally, a few survey questions were included in these progress updates to see how unweighted data came in. Furthermore, SSRS continued to have ad hoc meetings with AJC and their partners (e.g., Hillel International, Blue Raster) to address any questions and provide guidance in working with the data.

<sup>20</sup> The cooperation rate is calculated by dividing the number of completed interviews by the total number of eligible sample. The cumulative combined response rate is 3%, using AAPOR’s Response Rate 3 formula, which accounts for response rates to initial recruitment.



Final deliverables for this study included:

- Final, formatted questionnaires
- Final topline results
- Eight banner books of cross-tabulated data, including:
  - Five banners from the Survey of Jewish Americans
  - Three banners from the General Population Comparison Survey
- Two custom banner books of cross-tabulated data for report-writing:
  - Trending Banner with data from previous surveys
  - Comparison Banner with questions from both the Survey of Jewish Americans and the General Population Comparison Survey
- Final methodology report
- Final substantive reports
  - Core report on Survey of Jewish Americans, sub-group analysis, and trends
  - Comparison report on findings between the Survey of Jewish Americans and the General Population Comparison Survey

## Appendix A: Sample Comparisons

As noted above, the 2024 survey of U.S. Jews included sample from the Hillel list, in addition to probability panel samples. The weighting adjustments made when combining the samples were informed by a close analysis of sample-based differences across key questions, a subset of which is presented in this appendix. Overall, these tables present differences in results with and without the Hillel sample. The purpose of these tables is to show what effect, if any, the addition of the Hillel list has on survey-derived estimates and the demographic composition of the sample.

### *Table 24 to Table 27: Comparing Full Sample and Sample Without Hillel*

Table 24 to Table 27 compare weighted distributions of key questions for the full sample and the sample without the Hillel list. These tables show minimal differences in key questions when the Hillel sample is included (see: Full Sample) compared with when it is not included (see: Sample w/o Hillel).

For example, 54% of respondents in the full sample think antisemitism in the United States is a very serious problem. If we remove the Hillel sample, the proportion changes only slightly (53.8%).

**Table 24: Q1. How much of a problem, if at all, do you think antisemitism is in the United States today?**

	Full Sample	Sample w/o Hillel
	<b>n = 1,732</b>	<b>n = 1,534</b>
1 A very serious problem	54.0%	53.8%
2 Somewhat of a problem	38.6%	38.7%
3 Not much of a problem	6.6%	6.5%
4 Not a problem at all	0.8%	1.0%
99 Refused/Web blank	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 25: Q2. Over the past five years, do you think that antisemitism in the United States has?**

	<b>Full Sample</b>	<b>Sample w/o Hillel</b>
	<b>n = 1,732</b>	<b>n = 1,534</b>
1 Increased a lot	59.7%	59.4%
2 Increased somewhat	31.7%	31.7%
3 Stayed the same	7.5%	7.7%
4 Decreased somewhat	0.8%	1.0%
5 Decreased a lot	0.2%	0.2%
98 Don't know	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 26: Q3. Since the Hamas terrorist attacks on Israel on October 7, 2023, do you think that antisemitism in the U.S. has:**

	<b>Full Sample</b>	<b>Sample w/o Hillel</b>
	<b>n = 1,732</b>	<b>n = 1,534</b>
1 Increased a lot	61.0%	60.4%
2 Increased somewhat	29.4%	29.8%
3 Stayed the same	8.3%	8.6%
4 Decreased somewhat	0.9%	0.8%
5 Decreased a lot	0.4%	0.4%
98 Don't know	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 27: Q5. Compared to a year ago, do you think Jews in the United States are:**

	<b>Full Sample</b>	<b>Sample w/o Hillel</b>
	<b>n = 1,732</b>	<b>n = 1,534</b>
1 More secure than a year ago	2.0%	2.0%
2 Less secure than a year ago	72.8%	72.3%
3 About as secure as a year ago	25.2%	25.6%
98 Don't know	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 28 to Table 31: Among Young Adults (18-29), Comparing Full Sample and Sample Without Hillel**

Table 28 to Table 31 compare weighted distributions among respondents 18 to 29 years old. These tables show some differences in key questions among respondents ages 18 to 29 when the Hillel sample is included (see: Full Sample) compared with when it is not included (see: Sample w/o Hillel). The Hillel list has a larger effect on this subgroup because respondents from the list make up a large portion of all of these respondents. Importantly, however, these are relatively small samples and the margin of error around the full sample is +/- 9.6 percentage points, and the differences noted are well within this margin of error.

For example, 52.4% of respondents in the full sample of Jewish young adults think antisemitism in the United States is a very serious problem. If we remove the Hillel sample, the proportion is 46.8%.

**Table 28: Q1. How much of a problem, if at all, do you think antisemitism is in the United States today?**

	Full Sample	Sample w/o Hillel
	<b>n = 288</b>	<b>n = 94</b>
1 A very serious problem	52.4%	46.8%
2 Somewhat of a problem	43.8%	48.0%
3 Not much of a problem	2.5%	2.5%
4 Not a problem at all	1.3%	2.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 29: Q2. Over the past five years, do you think that antisemitism in the United States has?**

	Full Sample	Sample w/o Hillel
	<b>n = 288</b>	<b>n = 94</b>
1 Increased a lot	59.1%	53.4%
2 Increased somewhat	34.1%	35.0%
3 Stayed the same	5.3%	8.7%
4 Decreased somewhat	0.8%	2.1%
5 Decreased a lot	0.8%	0.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 30: Q3. Since the Hamas terrorist attacks on Israel on October 7, 2023, do you think that antisemitism in the U.S. has:**

	Full Sample	Sample w/o Hillel
	n = 288	n = 94
1 Increased a lot	60.4%	53.5%
2 Increased somewhat	28.8%	31.6%
3 Stayed the same	9.6%	13.7%
4 Decreased somewhat	0.4%	0.4%
5 Decreased a lot	0.9%	0.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 31: Q5. Compared to a year ago, do you think Jews in the United States are:**

	Full Sample	Sample w/o Hillel
	n = 288	n = 94
1 More secure than a year ago	3.1%	3.6%
2 Less secure than a year ago	64.5%	58.5%
3 About as secure as a year ago	32.4%	37.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 32 to Table 34: Comparing Full Sample, Sample Without Hillel, and Hillel Sample on Unweighted Demographics**

Finally, Table 32 to Table 34 show unweighted distributions for the full sample, the sample without the Hillel list, and only the Hillel list sample for key demographic characteristics (i.e., age, sex/gender, and education). As seen below, the inclusion of the Hillel sample was critical in reaching young adults, women, high school graduates and those in college or university.

**Table 32: Age categories**

	Full Sample	Sample w/o Hillel	Hillel Sample
	n = 1,732	n = 1,534	n = 198
1 18-29	16.6%	6.1%	98.0%
2 30-49	23.7%	26.7%	0.5%
3 50-64	20.3%	22.8%	1.0%
4 65+	39.3%	44.3%	0.0%
99 REF	0.1%	0.0%	0.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 33: Sex/gender**

	<b>Full Sample</b>	<b>Sample w/o Hillel</b>	<b>Hillel Sample</b>
	<b>n = 1,732</b>	<b>n = 1,534</b>	<b>n = 198</b>
1 Male	48.4%	51.0%	27.8%
2 Female	50.3%	47.8%	69.2%
3 Non-binary	1.2%	1.0%	2.5%
4 I use a different term	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%
99 Unknown	0.1%	0.0%	0.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Table 34: Education levels**

	<b>Full Sample</b>	<b>Sample w/o Hillel</b>	<b>Hillel Sample</b>
	<b>n = 1,732</b>	<b>n = 1,534</b>	<b>n = 198</b>
1 High school incomplete	0.8%	0.7%	2.0%
2 High school graduate	8.3%	5.1%	32.8%
3 Some college - no degree or Associate degree	19.6%	15.8%	49.0%
4 Four-year college or university/Bachelor's degree	30.5%	33.0%	11.6%
5 Some postgraduate or professional schooling, no postgraduate degree	4.1%	4.4%	2.0%
6 Postgraduate or professional degree, including master's, doctorate, medical, or law degree	36.6%	41.0%	2.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

## **Appendix B: About SSRS**

SSRS is a division of AUS, a Mt. Laurel, New Jersey-based global market research and consulting firm. Through its affiliation with AUS, SSRS shares resources and experience with Marketing Systems Group (MSG).

SSRS is a full-service social science and market research firm managed by a core of dedicated professionals with advanced degrees in the social sciences. SSRS designs and implements solutions to complex strategic, tactical, public opinion, and policy issues in the U.S. and worldwide. We partner with clients interested in conducting high-quality research. In the industry, SSRS is renowned for its sophisticated sample designs and its experience with all facets of data collection, including qualitative research, mixed methods, and multimodal formats.

The SSRS team specializes in creative problem-solving and informed analysis to meet its clients' research goals. SSRS provides the complete set of analytical, administrative and management capabilities needed for successful project execution.

SSRS is proud to be a Charter Member of the American Association of Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) Transparency Initiative ([www.aapor.org](http://www.aapor.org)). The Transparency Initiative's goal is to encourage broader and more effective disclosure of research methods through proactively and routinely disclosing the critical research methods associated with publicly-released studies.

SSRS is also a member of the Insights Association. Officially launched in January 2017, the Insights Association was formed through the merger of two organizations with long, respected histories of servicing the market research industry: CASRO and MRA. The result is a new, larger and more connected association with a unified, coordinated and higher profile voice, aligned in mission and message, and ultimately more effective at advancing the industry and profession in which we all share an abiding passion. The Insights Association strives to effectively represent, advance, and grow the research profession and industry.