

ISPU MUSLIM POLL METHOD SUMMARY REPORT

Prepared for the Institute for Social Policy and Understanding

Prepared by SSRS:

Laura Pipes, Becki Heckman & Jordon Peugh
1 Braxton Way | Suite 125 | Glen Mills, PA | 19342

MARCH 2022

SSRS Job #U1123



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	2
Overview	3
Sample Design.....	3
Table 1. Interview Summary.....	4
Questionnaire Design	4
Field Procedures	4
Pretesting	4
Survey Administration	5
Screening Procedures.....	6
Study Completion Rates.....	6
Table 2. Study Completion Rates.....	6
Weighting Procedures.....	7
Omnibus Recruits	7
ABS Recruits.....	7
Non-probability sample.....	8
General Population Additional Adjustment.....	8
Calibration	8
Jewish and Muslim.....	8
Table 3a: Jewish Weight Summary.....	8
Table 3b: Muslim Weight Summary.....	9
General Population	10
Table 3c: Gen Pop Weight Summary.....	10
Effects of Sample Design on Statistical Inference	12
Table 4a. Margins of Sampling Errors and Design Effects	13
Table 4b. Margins of Sampling Errors and Design Effects.....	13
Deliverables	13

OVERVIEW

SSRS conducted a survey of Muslims, Jews and the general population for the Institute for Social Policy and Understanding from February 22 through March 21, 2022. The study investigated the opinions of Muslims, Jews and the general population regarding politics, important issues facing the country, faith customs, and religious discrimination.

For the survey, SSRS interviewed 807 Muslim adults, 351 Jewish adults, and 1,001 adults from the general population¹. A total of 2,159 respondents were surveyed. This report details the methodological components of the study: sample design, questionnaire design, programming, field operations, data processing, and weighting. The interviews were completed by phone and on the web. Among Muslim respondents, 214 interviews were completed over the phone and 593 were completed via web panels. Seventy-seven were completed via the SSRS probability panel and 516 were completed via a non-probability panel. Among Jewish respondents, 315 interviews were completed over the phone and 36 were completed via the SSRS probability web panel. A total of 940 interviews were completed with general population adults via the SSRS probability web panel and 61 by phone with non-Internet respondents. Non-Internet respondents are respondents who do not use the Internet and do not have access to the Internet.

SAMPLE DESIGN

The sampling procedures were designed to efficiently reach the target populations of interest. The sample sources are listed below:

- Telephone Sample:
 - Prescreened Muslim households from the SSRS weekly national telephone omnibus survey from years 2014-2022.
 - Prescreened Jewish households from the SSRS weekly national telephone omnibus survey from years 2019-2022.
 - Prescreened non-Internet households from the SSRS weekly national telephone omnibus survey from years 2021-2022 (in order to fully represent the general population, including the non-internet).
- Web Sample:
 - SSRS Opinion Panel, SSRS's probability-based panel, was used to sample Muslim, Jewish, and General Population respondents.² Among the general population sample, we also oversampled Catholics and White Evangelicals in the panel to achieve a minimum of 200 completes in each religious group.

¹ Note that the general population included a small percentage of respondents who were Jewish and Muslim. These respondents are not included in this report when present counts for Muslim and Jewish respondents.

² Additional information about the SSRS Opinion Panel can be found here: <https://ssrs.com/opinion-panel/>

- Non-probability online panel sample was used for additional Muslim respondents.

In total, 330 interviews were completed via cell phones, 260 via landline phones, and 1,569 via web survey. Table 1 summarizes the total number of interviews by sample type, religious affiliation/general population and sampling frame.

Table 1. Interview Summary

	Muslims	Jews	Gen Pop	Total
Telephone Samples				
Landline Prescreened Muslim	34	0	0	34
Cell Prescreened Muslim	177	1	0	178
Landline Prescreened Jewish	2	190	0	192
Cell Prescreened Jewish	1	124	0	125
Landline Prescreened Non-Internet General Population	0	0	34	34
Cell Prescreened Non-Internet General Population	0	0	27	27
Web Samples				
Probability-Based Web Panel Muslim	77	0	0	77
Probability-Based Web Panel Jewish	0	36	0	36
Probability-Based Web Panel General Population	0	0	940	940
Convenience (Non-Probability-Based) Web Panel Muslim	516	0	0	516
TOTAL	807	351	1,001	2,159

The General Population sample included respondents who were of Muslim or Jewish religion. These Muslim and Jewish respondents are not included in the counts shown here but are included in the final data of all Muslim and all Jewish respondents. Combined with the general population respondents, the total number of Muslim respondents is 814 and the total number of Jewish respondents is 364.

QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

The questionnaire was developed by the Institute for Social Policy and Understanding in consultation with the SSRS project team. Prior to the field period, SSRS programmed the study into our data collection platform, Conformat, for both the phone/Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) and web portions of the study. Extensive checking of the programs was conducted to ensure that skip patterns and sample splits followed the design of the questionnaire.

FIELD PROCEDURES

Pretesting

The 2022 American Muslim Poll pretest took place on February 14-15, 2022. A total of 15 interviews were collected, three with Muslim respondents, three with Jewish respondents, and nine with general population respondents. Overall, the questionnaire flowed smoothly, and respondents provided thoughtful and reasonable responses to the questions. As a result of the pretest, SSRS recommended a few changes to the instrument that were approved and implemented prior to launch on February 22.

Survey Administration

The field period for this study was February 22 through March 21, 2022. As a thank you for participating in the survey on the phone and through the probability-based web panel, respondents received approximately \$5 in the form of a check or an electronic gift card³.

For the non-probability portion of the study SSRS worked with Lucid to obtain non-probability sample for additional Muslim respondents. Lucid targeted Muslims on their panel. Participants in the non-probability panel are recruited in a variety of ways such as soliciting panel membership via a website partner, referrals, direct enrollments, etc. Lucid also uses a router system. The non-probability panel participants are provided the incentive that is standard for their panel, which is typically less than \$5.

For the phone portion of the study, CATI interviewers received written materials about the survey instrument and formal training for this project. 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 as to 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. Due to the sensitive nature of some of the questions, interviewers were given specific instructions on how to cope with respondents who seemed agitated or distressed by the questions.

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

In order to maximize survey response, SSRS enacted the following procedures during the field period:

- An average of seven follow-up attempts were made to contact non-responsive numbers (e.g., no answer, busy, answering machine).
- Each non-responsive number was contacted multiple times, varying the times of day, and the days of the week that call-backs were placed using a programmed differential call rule.
- Interviewers explained the purpose of the study and, when asked, stated as accurately as possible the expected length of the interview (approximately 15-18 minutes).
- Respondents were offered the option of scheduling a call-back at their convenience.
- Specially trained interviewers contacted respondents who had initially refused to participate in the survey and attempted to convert them into completed interviews.
- At the end of the field period (last three days), the incentive was increased to \$10 for Muslim respondents only and voicemails were left where available informing potential respondents of the study.

³ Note the incentive was increased to \$10 during the last three days of field for Muslim respondents only and approximately six number of respondents were provided a \$10 incentive.

Screening Procedures

The target population for the Muslim and Jewish portion of the study was specified as people who identify their religion as either Muslim or Jewish. For landline respondents, if the person who answered the phone was neither Muslim nor Jewish, we asked if anyone in the household considered him or herself to be a different religion than the respondent and, if so, what religion that would be. If another household member was Jewish or Muslim, we then asked to speak with that person. If no person in the household fit the religion criteria, we terminated the interview. Any cell phone respondent who was not Muslim or Jewish was immediately screened out of the survey since cell phone respondents are considered individual households for the purposes of the selection process.

The target population for the general population portion of the study was specified as all U.S. adults, age 18+. Religion was not a factor for the general population survey, other collecting this information to allow for minor oversampling of Catholic and White Evangelical respondents. For those general population completes obtained by phone, qualified respondents had to not use and not have access to the Internet.

Study Completion Rates

The study completion rates for the ISPU survey were calculated using AAPOR's Response Rate 3 formula.⁴ This percentage divides the number of completed interviews in each sampling frame by the estimated number of eligible respondents in that frame. Note that the completion rates for the prescreened sample and the SSRS probability-based web panel are based on the study response and do not include the original study recruitment.

Table 2. Study Completion Rates

	Study Completion Rates
Telephone Samples:	
Prescreened LL (Muslim and Jewish)	34% ⁵
Prescreened Cell (Muslim and Jewish)	22% ⁵
Prescreened LL (Non-Internet)	27% ⁵
Prescreened Cell (Non-Internet)	18% ⁵
Overall	26%
Web Samples	
Probability-Based Web Panel (General Population)	43%
Convenience (Non-Probability-Based) Web Panel (Muslim)	4% ⁴
Probability-Based Web Panel (Muslim)	39%
Probability-Based Web Panel (Jewish)	44%

⁴ Note that response rates are not possible for convenience web samples as there is not a known initial sample frame, so the study completion rate is provided. The completion rate is calculated as the number of completes divided by (the number of completes + the number of suspends + (the number of those invited but who have not responded * the eligibility rate)).

⁵ The prescreened sample and probability-base web panel sample response rates are specific to this study and do not take into account the original Omnibus/recruitment response rates, which are typically around 4%.

The suspend/breakoff rate for 2022, was 12% across all sample sources. The percentage of respondents removed due to quality control measures for 2022, was <1% of respondents across all sample sources.

WEIGHTING PROCEDURES

The base weight was computed differently depending on how the sample had been recruited.

Omnibus Recruits

The base weight for the Omnibus recruits was their original base weight. This base weight accounted for the selection probability of telephone numbers along with the overlapping landline and cell frames. For panelists recruited via landline sample, the base weight also adjusted for selection probabilities based on the number of adults in the household.

ABS Recruits

The base weight for ABS recruits was the product of a sampling weight and a household size adjustment. The sampling weight corrected for the disproportionate sample design by adjusting the distribution of the panel across the strata to match the distribution of the ABS frame across the strata. The panel stratification was designed to better represent racial minorities and the political party id distribution across regions in the US.

The sampling weight for the ABS recruits can be expressed as $ABS_BASEWT_i = P_i/p_i$ where ABS_BASEWT was either from original strata distribution or from using the geographic PID strata. P_i is the proportion of the ABS sample frame in stratum i and p_i is the proportion of panelists in stratum i .

The household size adjustment 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.

$$ABS_BW = ABS_BASEWT \times ADULTS$$

The unadjusted base weight (UBW) was

$$UBW = \begin{cases} OMNI_BW, & \text{cases recruited from SSRS Omnibus} \\ ABS_BW, & \text{cases recruited from ABS sample} \end{cases}$$

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

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

Non-probability sample

The base weight for the non-probability sample was equal to 1.

General Population Additional Adjustment

Finally, an oversample of Catholic and White Evangelical were included for the General Population (GP) survey. An adjustment was made to correct for this oversampling.

Calibration

Jewish and Muslim

Following application of the above base-weight, the full sample was post-stratified and balanced by key demographics such as gender, age, education, race/ethnicity, marital status, number of adults in the household, region, voter registration, and political party identification within the Jewish and Muslim portions of this study, separately, for the Jewish and Muslim U.S. adult population 18 years of age and older. The sex, age, education, race/ethnicity, marital status, number of adults, and region benchmarks were derived from data collected through the SSRS Omnibus as well as informed by PEW estimates⁶ and trends. The voter registration and party ID benchmarks were derived from SSRS Omnibus data and informed by trend.

Table 3a: Jewish Weight Summary

<u>Category</u>	<u>Values</u>	<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Unweighted</u>	<u>Weighted</u>
Sex	Male	53.1%	58.1%	55.0%
	Female	46.9%	41.9%	45.0%
Age	18-29	23.2%	7.1%	20.2%
	30-49	30.4%	16.2%	29.8%
	50-64	20.6%	23.9%	21.0%
	65+	25.5%	52.7%	29.0%
Education	HS grad or less	24.8%	10.3%	21.8%
	Some college	20.3%	15.1%	19.4%
	College+	56.5%	74.6%	58.8%
Race/Ethnicity	White/Other	88.2%	95.2%	88.5%
	African American	3.6%	1.1%	3.8%
	Hispanic	8.2%	3.7%	7.6%

⁶ <https://www.pewforum.org/2021/05/11/jewish-americans-in-2020/>

<u>Category</u>	<u>Values</u>	<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Unweighted</u>	<u>Weighted</u>
Marital status	Married	53.3%	53.8%	55.8%
	Other	46.7%	46.2%	44.2%
Adults in HH	One	21.0%	35.6%	23.4%
	Two	52.8%	51.0%	52.3%
	Three+	26.6%	13.4%	24.3%
Region	Northeast	35.4%	47.0%	34.6%
	North Central	12.8%	10.3%	13.9%
	South	27.7%	22.5%	27.7%
	West	24.1%	20.2%	23.8%
Registered to vote	Not registered	15.5%	2.3%	9.7%
	Registered	84.5%	97.7%	90.3%
Party ID	Rep	17.8%	17.1%	18.8%
	Dem	45.7%	59.8%	46.8%
	Ind/Other	36.6%	23.1%	34.4%

Table 3b: Muslim Weight Summary

<u>Category</u>	<u>Values</u>	<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Unweighted</u>	<u>Weighted</u>
Sex	Male	55.6%	61.1%	55.0%
	Female	44.4%	38.9%	45.0%
Age	18-29	39.0%	21.3%	38.2%
	30-49	39.7%	57.4%	40.4%
	50-64	13.9%	13.4%	13.9%
	65+	7.4%	7.9%	7.5%
Education	LT HS	10.0%	2.4%	9.3%
	HS grad	29.2%	16.5%	28.6%
	Some college	25.0%	18.8%	25.5%
	College+	35.8%	62.3%	36.6%
Race/Ethnicity	White/Other	63.8%	72.6%	64.3%
	African American	27.7%	21.7%	27.3%
	Hispanic	8.5%	5.7%	8.4%
Marital status	Married	48.7%	62.5%	49.4%
	Other	51.3%	37.5%	50.6%
Adults in HH	One	16.9%	20.8%	16.5%
	Two	41.4%	52.5%	42.1%

	Three+	41.7%	26.6%	41.4%
Region	Northeast	30.1%	31.8%	29.7%
	North Central	20.5%	17.2%	20.6%
	South	31.6%	31.7%	31.7%
	West	17.7%	19.2%	18.0%
Registered to vote	Not registered	33.2%	14.0%	32.0%
	Registered	66.8%	86.0%	68.0%
Party ID	Rep	10.3%	10.5%	10.4%
	Dem	46.8%	60.8%	47.1%
	Ind/Other	42.9%	28.6%	42.5%

Weight truncation ('trimming'): Weights were trimmed to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results. The Jewish sample was truncated at the 5th and 95th percentiles and the Muslim sample was truncated at the 2nd and 98th.

General Population

The second stage of the weighting balances the demographic profile of the sample to target population parameters. The sample was balanced to match estimates derived from the 2021 Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS)⁷. The civic engagement benchmark was derived from September 2017 CPS Volunteering and Civic Life Supplement data⁸. The population density came from the Census Planning Database 2020⁹. The internet frequency, party ID, and religion benchmarks came from NPORS annual dataset released by Pew Research¹⁰. The population parameters used for post-stratification are: gender, age, education, race/ethnicity, Census region, civic engagement, population density, internet frequency, voter registration, party ID, and religion.

Weights were trimmed at the 2nd and 98th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on the final results.

Table 3c: Gen Pop Weight Summary

<u>Category</u>	<u>Values</u>	<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Unweighted</u>	<u>Weighted</u>
Gender by Age	M 18-29	10.3%	5.8%	10.0%

⁷ Sarah Flood, Miriam King, Renae Rodgers, Steven Ruggles, J. Robert Warren and Michael Westberry. Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, Current Population Survey: Version 9.0 [dataset]. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.18128/D030.V9.0>

⁸ 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>

⁹ <https://www.census.gov/topics/research/guidance/planning-databases/2020.html>

¹⁰ <https://www.pewresearch.org/methods/fact-sheet/national-public-opinion-reference-survey-npors/>

	M 30-49	16.5%	14.6%	17.1%
	M 50-64	11.8%	11.6%	11.6%
	M 65+	9.9%	13.9%	9.8%
	F 18-29	10.0%	10.5%	10.5%
	F 30-49	16.7%	19.4%	17.2%
	F 50-64	12.7%	10.9%	11.8%
	F 65+	12.1%	13.4%	12.0%
Education	LT HS	9.6%	5.2%	8.2%
	HS Grad	28.3%	22.5%	27.0%
	Some college	27.1%	32.2%	28.5%
	College grad +	35.0%	40.2%	36.3%
Gender by Education	M HS grad or less	19.5%	11.5%	18.0%
	M Some college	12.7%	13.5%	13.3%
	M College +	16.3%	20.9%	17.1%
	F HS grad or less	18.4%	16.2%	17.2%
	F Some college	14.4%	18.7%	15.1%
	F College +	18.8%	19.3%	19.2%
Age by Education	18-29 HS grad or less	8.3%	4.4%	8.0%
	18-29 Some college	7.0%	5.6%	7.3%
	18-29 College +	4.9%	6.3%	5.2%
	30-49 HS grad or less	10.9%	9.2%	11.2%
	30-49 Some college	8.2%	10.2%	8.6%
	30-49 College +	14.1%	14.6%	14.5%
	50-64 HS grad or less	9.4%	5.1%	7.6%
	50-64 Some college	6.3%	8.4%	6.7%
	50-64 College +	8.8%	9.0%	9.1%
	65+ HS grad or less	9.3%	9.0%	8.4%
	65+ Some college	5.5%	8.0%	5.8%
	65+ College +	7.2%	10.3%	7.6%
Race/Ethnicity	White non-Hisp	62.5%	68.6%	62.3%
	Black non-Hisp	12.0%	10.9%	12.1%
	Hispanic	16.9%	13.3%	16.9%
	Other non-Hisp	8.6%	7.2%	8.6%
Region	Northeast	17.2%	18.0%	16.6%
	Midwest	20.6%	22.3%	21.0%
	South	38.3%	39.1%	38.4%

	West	23.9%	20.7%	23.9%
Civically Engaged	Not engaged	65.5%	55.8%	63.8%
	Civically engaged	34.5%	44.2%	36.2%
Density	1 Lowest 20%	20.0%	18.3%	20.0%
	2	20.0%	20.5%	20.5%
	3	20.0%	22.4%	20.5%
	4	20.0%	20.9%	20.1%
	5 Highest 20%	20.0%	18.0%	18.8%
Internet Frequency	Almost constantly	39.5%	50.8%	41.4%
	Several times a day	44.6%	38.9%	45.3%
	About once a day	5.5%	2.9%	5.5%
	Several x per wk / Less often	6.8%	1.3%	4.2%
	Not an internet user	3.6%	6.1%	3.6%
Voter Registration	Yes	77.3%	91.7%	79.6%
	Not regist/no response	22.7%	8.3%	20.4%
Party ID	Rep	27.1%	30.5%	27.8%
	Dem	31.6%	32.2%	31.7%
	Ind/ Other	41.3%	37.4%	40.5%
Religion	Affiliated	69.0%	74.1%	68.5%
	Not affiliated	31.0%	25.9%	31.5%

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 the Gen Pop survey is 1.81, and for the Jewish and Muslim portions of 2.47 and 2.01, respectively.

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

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

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

Margins of sampling error are calculated to provide a reasonable range for the error that may exist in an estimate due to random sampling fluctuations. Margins of sampling error are meaningful only if it can be assumed that selection into the sample is random and that each unit's probability of being sampled would remain the same if the sample were repeated many times. These assumptions are less realistic for non-probability online samples than for probability-based samples, because we cannot observe or control the factors that determine whether a given unit is included in a non-probability online sample. We provide estimated margins of error here to provide a general assessment of error ranges that may be associated with the data, given the sample size. However, margins of error for non-probability online samples should always be interpreted with caution, as the underlying assumptions cannot be verified.

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 Gen Pop sample is ± 4.2 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 4.2 percentage points away from their true values in the population. Margins of error for subgroups will be larger. The tables below outline the Margin of Error for each key survey.

Table 4a. Margins of Sampling Errors and Design Effects

	Number of Interviews	Margin of Error with Design Effect	Design Effect
Jewish	351	+/- 8.2 percentage points	2.47
Muslim	807	+/- 4.9 percentage points	2.01

Table 4b. Margins of Sampling Errors and Design Effects

	Number of Interviews	Margin of Error with Design Effect	Design Effect
Gen Pop	1001	+/- 4.2 percentage points	1.81

It is important to remember that the sampling fluctuations captured in the margin of error 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.

DELIVERABLES

At the end of the field period SSRS delivered two banners of crosstabulations in Word and Excel, and an SPSS data file. Also, delivered was a trending banner of crosstabulations in Word and Excel, as well as an SPSS data file, including six years of data. The final deliverables also included a method summary report.