The State of Antisemitism in America 2025 Surveys

Methodology Report

Prepared for the American Jewish Committee

February 2026

Prepared by:
Robyn Rapoport and Elizabeth Sciupac
SSRS

ssrs
redefining research

ssrs redefining research

Table of Contents

Study Overview

In the fall of 2025, 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, knowledge, and experiences with antisemitism. For the sixth year in a row, a companion survey was conducted asking American adults related questions regarding their attitudes and knowledge of antisemitism. The surveys were designed to build on existing trends, while also including new questions regarding artificial intelligence and protest chants and rhetoric.

The Jewish American survey collected data from a nationally representative sample of 1,222 adults (ages 18 and older) of Jewish religion or background. The survey was conducted from September 26-October 29, 2025. The survey was completed as a mixed-mode survey; most respondents (n=1,080) participated via a self-administered web survey, and n=142 were interviewed on the phone. Following fieldwork, two questions were re-asked due to an error in the initial program. Recontact interviews were conducted from December 11-22, 2025, among respondents who had previously completed the survey; n=907 Jewish adults responded. See "Recontact Questions" section for more information about how these respondents were reached and weighted.

This U.S. adult survey was conducted for the American Jewish Committee through the SSRS Opinion Panel Omnibus. Data for this companion survey were collected from October 3 to October 5, 2025, among a sample of 1,033 respondents. The survey was conducted via web (n=1,002) and telephone (n=31) and administered in English (n=1,007) and Spanish (n=26). The data were weighted to represent the US residential adult population.

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 for the survey of American Jews.

Jewish Survey

Sample Design: Jewish Survey

The Jewish population is a very low incidence population. Best efforts were made to complete interviews with the most representative sample possible. Similar to the 2024 Survey of Jewish Americans about Antisemitism, the design included a blend of probability-based sample and listed sample. Most of the interviews were completed via the probability-based SSRS Opinion Panel (n=872). Additional interviews (n=142) were completed via pre-identified telephone sample. Furthermore, in an effort to maximize the number of interviews with Jewish adults ages 18 to 29 – more specifically, those who are current or recent college or university students – AJC continued

its partnership with Hillel International, who provided additional listed sample to be included. From this listed sample, n=208 interviews were completed.

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. Because the Hillel sample is drawn from a predefined list, rather than randomly representing the full population of Jewish adults, ages 18 to 29, this sample is considered a non-probability sample.

Table 1 below details the sample sources used for this survey.

Table 1. Interviews by Sample Source

SAMPLE SOURCE	INTERVIEWS
SSRS Opinion Panel	872
SSRS Pre-identified Telephone Sample[1]	142
Hillel List	208
TOTAL	1,222

Respondents from the probability-based panel sample and the phone sample 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. All respondents who were invited from the Hillel list were also asked 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 2025 survey also included calibration questions for all respondents to facilitate the blending of the listed Hillel sample with the probability samples during the weighting process, using SSRS' proprietary Encipher® weighting method. See "Encipher® Weighting" for more details about blending the samples and how the calibration questions were used.

Questionnaire Development and Field Procedure: Jewish Survey

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.

[1] In previous years, this sample was referred to as, "SSRS Omni Callbacks."

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 2025 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 2025 were introduced to gauge opinions on the use of AI, protest chants and rhetoric, and feelings of safety.

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, while respondents in the general population were asked a broader question about witnessing antisemitism online.

Upon final approval, SSRS formatted and programmed the survey for completion via online and telephone administration, using Confirmit 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 September 26-October 29, 2025. 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. 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, with one reminder email a week after the initial invitation. 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.

Quality Control Checks

For web surveys, quality checks were incorporated into the survey. Respondents who failed the quality checks were not included in the final data set. These quality control measures include checks for speeders, high item non-response, and the administration of up to two trap questions. In addition, in the Jewish survey respondents who indicate being Messianic Jewish are removed from the final data.

For telephone surveys, interviews are closely monitored by interviewing staff for quality control. In addition, select recordings are reviewed by supervisors to monitor quality and interviewer procedures.

In total, n=11 online interviews were deleted; no phone interviews were removed.

Weighting Procedures: Jewish Survey

Weighting is generally used in survey analysis to account for sample designs and patterns of non-response that might bias results. The data from this project were weighted to represent the adult Jewish population of the United States. Hybrid designs that blend probability and non-probability samples, such as the Hillel sample, require special weighting procedures as these non-probability samples differ from the target population in ways that cannot be corrected by weighting only on demographics. Correcting for non-demographic differences between probability and non-probability completed interviews can therefore help minimize the risk of selection bias in study outcomes.

The sample was weighted using SSRS's Hybrid Encipher® calibration solution, which controls selection bias by weighting on both demographic and non-demographic characteristics that explain selection into the non-probability sample. The steps for this procedure are as follows:

- Weight the probability sample interviews using standard base weight adjustments and raking to external demographic benchmarks.
- Assign "pseudo-base weights" to the non-probability sample interviews using a propensity adjustment.
- Identify optimal internal calibration dimensions for weighting the hybrid sample.
- Calibrate the hybrid sample (probability and non-probability) to obtain the final hybrid weights.

Note that the hybrid weight is calculated from the full sample, including both probability and non-probability interviews, and therefore cannot be used to produce separate probability-only and non-probability-only estimates.

Panel-Wide Base Weight

The Panel-wide base weight adjusts for the SSRS Opinion Panel recruitment and retention process—specifically, differential probabilities of being selected for the recruitment sample, completing the registration survey, joining the Panel, and remaining on the Panel.

Recruitment Design Weight

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 design weight accounts for differential probabilities of selection for the recruitment sample. The design weight for the SSRS Opinion Panel was 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.

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 subpopulations.

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

The design weight for panelists initially recruited through the SSRS telephone Omnibus[2] 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.[3] This base weight is a function of the landline and cell frame sample sizes as well as each respondent's telephone usage and number of adults in the household.

Recruitment: Non-Response and Attrition Adjustments

Two adjustments are applied to the recruitment design 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 from the SSRS Opinion Panel 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 uses a model-based propensity score adjustment to make adults with Internet access 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 conditional inference tree built in R using the *partykit* package.

Panel-Wide Calibration

To create the final Panel-wide base weight, the full Panel is calibrated to target parameters for the population of U.S. adults (ages 18+). Panel-wide calibration parameters include gender, age, educational attainment, race/ethnicity, Census division, civic engagement, population density,

[2] As of 2022, data were no longer collected using a dual-frame RDD telephone Omnibus. Rather, in 2022, the SSRS Opinion Panel Omnibus launched as a multi-mode (web and phone), probability-based Omnibus, using sample drawn from the SSRS Opinion Panel.

[3] 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.

Internet use frequency, voter registration status, party identification, religion, household size, and home tenure. This calibration step uses panelist profile variables; missing data in these variables is filled in using hot decking.

Study-Level Base Weight

The study-level base weight adjusts for differential probabilities of selection from the SSRS Opinion Panel into the sample for this specific study. The study-level base weight is calculated as:

$$PABW * \frac{N_h}{n_h}$$

where *PABW* is the Panel-wide base weight calculated as described above; and, for each stratum *h*, N_h is the number of panelists available and n_h is the number invited into the study.
Study-level sampling strata were formed from quantiles of *PABW*, with higher-weight panelists being given a higher probability of selection. These weight-based strata were crossed with religion and Jewish identity to meet the required sample size targets for each group. In alignment with the study's target population, English-speaking web panelists that identify as Jewish were eligible for selection into the sample.

SSRS Pre-identified Telephone Sample

Similar to the design weight for panelists recruited through the telephone Omnibus, the base weights for the pre-identified telephone sample are 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.

The base weights for the SSRS Opinion Panel and pre-identified telephone sample were combined and standardized to their respective effective sample-size by frame.

Encipher® Weighting

Calibration of Probability Sample

With the combined probability sample's base weight applied, the data were weighted to balance the demographic profile of the sample to target population parameters. The calibration parameters were age, gender, education, race/ethnicity, marital status, census region, denomination, Jewish identity, and Internet frequency of use. Benchmarks for these parameters were modeled distributions using data from the 2024 wave of the AJC Antisemitism Jewish Survey, the SSRS Opinion Panel (October 2025), the Pew Forum on Religion (2020), and the Pew Religious Landscape Survey (2023-2024).

Missing data in the calibration variables were imputed using hot decking. Hot deck imputation replaces the missing values of a respondent randomly with another similar respondent without missing data.

Weighting was accomplished using the R package ANESRAKE.[4]

Pseudo Base Weights for Non-probability Sample

A propensity adjustment was used to assign pseudo base weights to the non-probability interviews prior to running the hybrid calibration. The resulting weights are called "pseudo" base weights because they are based on a model rather than known selection probabilities.
Using the full set of cases, we ran a random forest model in which the dependent variable was coded as 1 for non-probability interviews and 0 for probability interviews. The predictors included demographics, calibration dimensions, and other items considered to be key outcomes of the study. We used this model to assign each case a predicted probability of having been sourced from the non-probability sample. We then sorted the sample by this predicted probability and divided it into 5 approximately equal-sized cells.

For each non-probability complete in cell *c*, we assigned the pseudo-base weight as:

$$PBW = \frac{1 - \left(\frac{N_{n,c}}{N_{n,c} + N^{*}_{p,c}}\right)}{\left(\frac{N_{n,d}}{N_{n,c} + N^{*}_{p,c}}\right)}$$

where:

- $N_{n,c}$ is the unweighted count of non-probability interviews within cell *c*
- $N^{*}_{p,c}$ is the sum of the probability base weights within cell *c*

Identification of Internal Calibration Margins

"Internal calibration margins" refers to a set of non-demographic characteristics that lack external benchmarks but are important in explaining differences between probability and non-probability interviews, and therefore should be incorporated into the final weighting of the hybrid sample.
We used SSRS's *stepwise calibration* methodology to identify the set of internal calibration margins that best balances the reduction of selection bias with the minimization of the design effect. Stepwise calibration begins with a calibration model that includes only demographics, and then adds non-demographic dimensions one at a time. At each step, the additional dimension is selected using an optimization criterion that balances the observed selection bias across selected study outcomes, including:

- Q1. How much of a problem antisemitism is in the United States today, crossed with age-group (18-29 vs. 30+)
- Q28. Affiliated Jewish institutions been the targets of antisemitic graffiti, attacks, or threats
- Q52. Experienced antisemitism at a college/university

[4] https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/anesrake/anesrake.pdf

Selection bias in each outcome is calculated as the difference between the hybrid estimate (combining the probability and non-probability interviews and weighted using the calibration model under consideration at that step) and the probability-only estimate (using the probability-only weight calculated as described above).

SSRS statisticians reviewed the change in bias and the design effect at each step and selected the model that best balanced these metrics. The selected model included the following dimensions:

- CIVICENG by AGE. Volunteered or talked with neighbors basically everyday in the past year, crossed with age-group (18-29 vs. 30+)
- POLQ2 by AGE. Frequency of political discussion with family members and friends, crossed with age-group (18-29 vs. 30+)
- SOCI5. Community attachment rating

Benchmarks for these margins were estimated using the weighted probability sample of interviews.

Hybrid Calibration

To calculate the final hybrid weights, we combined the probability and non-probability interviews and raked the full sample to (1) the same demographic benchmarks used for the probability sample; (2) the internal benchmark for community attachment, which was selected from the stepwise calibration and produced from the weighted probability sample; and, (3) two additional internal benchmarks selected from the stepwise calibration, civic engagement by age and political discussion by age, which were produced from the untrimmed weighted probability sample.[5]

After raking, the weights were trimmed to the 4th and 96th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on survey-derived estimates. The following table compares unweighted and weighted sample distributions to target population benchmark distributions.

[5] The untrimmed probability-only weight was used to derive the internal benchmarks for these two dimensions in order to balance their distributions with the marginal population benchmark distribution for age.

Table 2. Sample Demographics

CATEGORY	VALUES	PARAMETER	UNWEIGHTED	WEIGHTED
Age	18-29	16.9%	21.1%	14.4%
	30-49	33.6%	27.2%	34.3%
	50-64	20.2%	18.7%	20.8%
	65+	29.3%	33.1%	30.4%
Gender	Male	51.7%	46.2%	52.5%
	Female	48.3%	53.8%	47.5%
Education	HS or less	18.3%	10.1%	13.7%
	Some college	22.4%	20.0%	22.5%
	College+	59.3%	69.9%	63.8%
Race/Ethnicity	White/Another race	91.4%	92.5%	92.1%
	African American	2.2%	1.6%	1.7%
	Hispanic	6.4%	5.9%	6.2%
Marital Status	Married	55.9%	44.6%	57.3%
	Else	44.1%	55.4%	42.7%
Census Region	Northeast	35.7%	34.0%	34.9%
	Midwest	11.6%	14.6%	12.1%
	South	27.8%	30.6%	28.1%
	West	24.9%	20.9%	24.9%
Denomination	Orthodox	8.2%	9.6%	7.7%
	Conservative	15.1%	20.9%	15.2%
	Reform	31.7%	31.5%	32.1%
	Another denomination	45.0%	38.0%	45.0%
Jewish Identity	Jewish by religion	65.6%	82.0%	67.9%
	Jewish aside from religion	34.4%	18.0%	32.1%
Internet Frequency	Several times a day or more	89.9%	93.4%	91.2%
	Less often	10.1%	6.6%	8.8%

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 is 1.77.

SSRS calculates the composite design effect for a sample of size n, with each case having a weight, w, as:[6]

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

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. The margins of sampling error reported here are based on the hybrid sample, which includes 1,014 probability interviews and 208 non-probability interviews. 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 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 sample. We supply the total sample margins of error to provide a general assessment of error ranges that may be associated with the hybrid data, given the total sample size. However, margins of error for samples that include interviews from non-probability sources 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 entire sample is ± 3.7 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 3.7 percentage points away from the currently reported estimate. Margins of error for sub-groups will be larger.

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.

Table 3 shows the design effects, sample sizes, and margins of sampling error for the sample overall and for key target subgroups.

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

Table 3. Sample Sizes, Design Effects and Margins of Sampling Error

	N=	DESIGN EFFECT	MARGIN OF ERROR
Total Sample	**1,222**	**1.77**	**+/- 3.7 percentage points**
Students (including recent students)	299	3.43	+/- 10.5 percentage points
Non-students	923	1.53	+/- 4.0 percentage points
18 to 29 year-olds	259	3.85	+/- 12.0 percentage points
30 to 49 year-olds	331	1.43	+/- 6.5 percentage points
50 to 64 year-olds	225	1.49	+/- 8.0 percentage points
65+ year-olds	398	1.5	+/- 6.0 percentage points

Assessing Potential Bias

As noted, there is always a risk of bias associated with data collected from non-probability samples because a portion of the target population typically is not represented in the non-probability or listed sample, and the magnitude of the under-coverage is unknown. For that reason, we use the data collected from the probability sample to estimate the potential bias in survey estimates resulting from the addition of the non-probability-based data.

For this study, we compared the weighted distributions of nine substantive, trended survey items from the probability sample[7] with both the unweighted distributions of the Hillel sample as well as the weighted distributions of the hybrid sample. Table 4 shows the average absolute bias between the non-probability and hybrid samples compared to the probability sample. The table also shows the minimum and maximum absolute bias across the survey items analyzed.

Table 4. Bias Assessment

	HILLEL SAMPLE[8]	HYBRID SAMPLE[9]
Sample-size	208	1,222
Min. Absolute Bias	0.01 percentage point	0.01 percentage point
Average Absolute Bias	7.08 percentage points	0.54 percentage point
Max. Absolute Bias	29.13 percentage points	1.94 percentage points

[7] The weight applied to the probability sample for this analysis is the probability-only (demographics) weight.

[8] This column compares the magnitudes of differences between the Hillel and probability samples, filtered among Hillel members. The sample-size of the probability interviews used in this part of the analysis is n=318.

[9] This column compares the magnitudes of differences between the total hybrid and total probability samples. The total n-size of the probability sample is n=1,014.

Recontact Questions: Jewish Survey

Following fieldwork, two questions were re-asked due to an error in the initial program – INTIF_1 and Q28.[10] Once the two questions were re-programmed and tested, the SSRS team began outreach to the n=1,222 respondents who had initially completed the survey. The program was open from December 11-22, 2025. Upon closing field, respondents who answered the re-asked questions were re-weighted (see details in the "Recontact Weighting Procedures" section below). When analyzing the two re-asked questions, one should use the recontact weight. For all other questions, analysts should use the main weight. (See Appendix A for details on recontact interviews by sample source, outreach protocols, and demographic tables.)

Recontact Weighting Procedures

The base weight for the recontacted sample of interviews is the base weight from the original survey[11] multiplied by a response propensity adjustment. Response propensity, itself, was modeled through logistic regression to correct for potential bias stemming from differences between respondents we were able to recontact for this study and all respondents who were eligible to be recontacted.

The response propensity model ran on all cases that completed the survey during the main fieldwork's data-collection (N=1,222), as all of these respondents received recontact efforts. The dependent variable in the propensity model's regression identifies respondents who completed the recontact questions (n=907). The table below lists the independent variables included in the regression, as measured in the original survey.

[10] INTIF_1: If you saw or heard the phrase, "Globalize the intifada," how unsafe, if at all, would it make you feel as a Jewish person in the United States? Q28: Over the past five years, have any Jewish institutions with which you are affiliated been targets of: antisemitic graffiti, antisemitic attacks, antisemitic threats? (See topline for full question wording and response options.)

[11] The final base weight for the original survey is the combined per-frame weight that calibrates the probability and non-probability interviews to external benchmarks for major demographics. The weighting write-up for the main fieldwork's sample contains further details on this weight.

Table 5. Independent Variables for Propensity Model's Logistic Regression

Dimensions
Hillel Membership (QHILLEL)
Hillel Membership by Studenthood by Age-group (QHILLEL, Q44, Q44b, Q73, Q73b)
Voter Registration (Q80)
Party Identification (Q63)
Income (Q75, Q75a)
Number of Adults per Household (Q77)
Closeness of Following News About Israel (Q59)
Number of Personal Internet Use Hours per Week (CALI1)
Number of Television Watching Hours per Week (CALI2)
Online Purchasing Frequency (CONS8)
Personal Target of Antisemitism in the Past Year (Q8)
Local Community Business Targets of Antisemitism in the Past Year (Q33)
Consent for Follow-up In-depth Questions (REPORTER)
Mode of Original Survey's Completion (XCHANNEL)
Sample-frame (SAMPSOURCE)

The response propensity adjustment factor for the recontacted sample of interviews is the reciprocal of the predicted probability from the model's logistic regression. The final base weights for the recontacted sample were standardized to the effective sample-size.

With the final base weight applied, the data were weighted to balance the profile of the recontacted sample of interviews to external benchmarks[12] for age, gender, education, race/ethnicity, marital status, census region, denomination, Jewish identity, and Internet frequency of use as well as internal benchmarks[13] for community attachment, civic engagement by age, and political discussion by age.

The recontacted sample's weights were trimmed to the 4th and 96th percentiles to prevent individual interviews from having too much influence on survey-derived estimates. See Appendix A for tables comparing unweighted and weighted sample distributions to target population benchmark distributions for the recontact sample.

Design Effect and Margin of Sampling Error - Recontact

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

[12] Benchmarks for these parameters were modeled distributions using data from the 2024 wave of the AJC Antisemitism Jewish Survey, the SSRS Opinion Panel (October 2025), the Pew Forum on Religion (2020), and the Pew Religious Landscape Survey (2023-2024).

[13] Benchmarks for these margins were estimated using the main fieldwork's weighted probability sample of interviews.

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 recontacted sample's design effect for this survey is 1.63.

SSRS calculates the composite design effect for a sample of size n, with each case having a weight, w, as:[14]

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

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. The margins of sampling error reported here are based on the hybrid sample of recontacted respondents, which includes 873 probability interviews and 34 non-probability interviews. 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 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 sample. We supply the total sample margins of error to provide a general assessment of error ranges that may be associated with the hybrid data, given the total sample size. However, margins of error for samples that include interviews from non-probability sources 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 recontacted 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 recontacted sample will be no more than 4.2 percentage points away from the currently reported estimate. Margins of error for sub-groups will be larger.

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.

Table 6 shows a summary of the design effects, sample sizes, and margins of sampling error for the sample overall and for the recontact sample who received the re-asked questions.

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

Table 6. Sample Sizes, Design Effects and Margins of Sampling Error

	N=	DESIGN EFFECT	MARGIN OF ERROR
Total Sample	**1,222**	**1.77**	**+/- 3.7 percentage points**
Recontact Sample (INTIF_1, Q28)	**907**	**1.63**	**+/- 4.2 percentage points**

Response Rates: Jewish Survey

Given the three different sample sources for this project, cooperation rates are presented separately for each.[15] See the table below for cooperation rate per sample source.

Table 7. Cooperation Rates by Sample Source

SAMPLE SOURCE	COOPERATION RATE
SSRS Opinion Panel	74%
SSRS Pre-identified Telephone Sample[16]	9%
Hillel List	73%

General Public Survey

Sample Design: General Public Survey

The SSRS Opinion Panel Omnibus is conducted on the SSRS Opinion Panel. SSRS Opinion Panel members are recruited randomly based primarily on nationally representative ABS (Address Based Sample) design (including Hawaii and Alaska). ABS respondents are randomly sampled by Marketing Systems Group (MSG) through the U.S. Postal Service's Computerized Delivery Sequence File (CDS), a regularly-updated listing of all known addresses in the U.S. For the SSRS Opinion Panel, known business addresses are excluded from the sample frame. Additional panelists are recruited via random digit dial (RDD) telephone sample of cell phone numbers connected to a prepaid cell phone. This sample is selected by MSG from the cell phone RDD frame using a flag that identifies prepaid numbers. Prepaid cell numbers are associated with cell phones that are "pay as you go" and do not require a contract.

The SSRS Opinion Panel is a multi-mode panel (web and phone). Most panelists take self-administered web surveys; however, the option to take surveys conducted by a live telephone interviewer is available to those who do not use the internet as well as those who use the internet but are reluctant to take surveys online.

[15] The cooperation rate is calculated by dividing the number of completed interviews by the total amount of eligible sample.

[16] In previous years, this sample was referred to as, "SSRS Omni Callbacks."

All sample drawn for this study were SSRS Opinion Panelists who are U.S. adults ages 18 or older. Sample was drawn using a probability proportional to size (PPS) methodology to ensure adequate representation of each demographic group while minimizing the variability of the final weights. The sample was additionally stratified by preferred survey language and mode to meet the sample size targets for each group.

Questionnaire Development: General Public Survey

The Jewish survey and the survey of the general population were designed to complement each other, in many cases asking the same or similar questions of both populations, to allow for a more cohesive comparative analysis. The general population survey was more limited in scope this year as compared with previous years, so the AJC and SSRS teams worked together to maximize the number of included questions that could be compared across populations, while still exploring topics asked only of the general public. In the process of finalizing the questionnaire, SSRS provided feedback regarding new question wording, order, clarity, and other issues pertaining to questionnaire quality.

Programming: General Public Survey

Prior to the field period, SSRS programmed the study into its Forsta Plus (formerly known as Confirmit) Web/CATI platform for administration in English or Spanish. Extensive checking of the program was conducted to ensure that skip patterns and sample splits followed the design of the questionnaire.

Additional steps were employed to ensure a quality experience in survey administration regardless of the device utilized by respondents, whether a desktop computer, tablet, or mobile phone. The web program was optimized for administration via smartphone or other mobile handheld devices. The web program was also checked on multiple devices, including desktop computers and handheld mobile devices, and different web browsers to ensure consistent and optimized visualization across devices and web browsers. The web survey was accessed directly by respondents, using their unique survey links with embedded passwords. This also gave them the ability to return to their survey later if they chose to suspend their survey.

Data Collection: General Public Survey

Web Contact Procedures

A "soft launch" inviting a limited number of panelists to participate was conducted on Friday, October 3, 2025. After checking soft launch data to ensure that all questionnaire content and skip patterns were correct, additional sample was released to ensure the final sample met the study goals.

Web panelists were emailed an invitation to complete the survey online. The email for each respondent included a unique password-embedded link. All panelists who did not respond to the email invitation received up to three reminder emails, and panelists who had opted into receiving text messages from the SSRS Opinion Panel received up to three text message reminders.

In appreciation for their participation online, panelists received post-paid compensation in the form of an electronic gift card, sent via email immediately after completion of the survey. Panelists with less than a high school education or who completed the survey in Spanish were offered a larger compensation to encourage participation.

Phone Contact Procedures

Interviewers asked to speak with the person at that number who is a member of the SSRS Opinion Panel by name. Interviewers verified that the person was on the phone and in a safe place before administering the survey.

All telephone interviews were completed in English using the Forsta Plus (formerly known as Confirmit) CATI system. The CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) system ensured that complete dispositions of all call attempts were recorded.

CATI interviewers received written materials about the survey instrument and received formal training for this particular project. The written materials were provided prior to commencement of data collection and included an annotated questionnaire that contained information about the goals of the study, detailed explanations about why questions were being asked, the meaning and pronunciation of key terms or names, potential obstacles to 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.

All respondents who completed the survey via telephone were offered post-paid compensation via a mailed check.

Quality Control Checks: General Public Survey

For web surveys, quality checks were incorporated into the survey. Respondents who failed the quality checks were not included in the final data set. These quality control measures include checks for speeders, high item non-response, and the administration of up to two trap questions. For telephone surveys, interviews are closely monitored by interviewing staff for quality control. In addition, select recordings are reviewed by supervisors to monitor quality and interviewer procedures. In total, n=8 interviews were deleted based on quality control checks.

Weighting Procedures: General Public Survey

Data were weighted to represent the residential adult population of the United States. The data were weighted by first applying a base weight then balancing the demographic profile of the sample to target population parameters.

Base Weight

The base weight for the SSRS Opinion Panel Omnibus accounts for the panelists' probability of selection into the current week's Omnibus sample using the following formula:

$$BW = W_{hi} \times (N_h / n_h)$$

...where W_{hi} is the panelist weight, N_h is the size of stratum h and n_h is the number of panelists selected from stratum h.

Calibration

With the base weight applied, the data were weighted to balance the demographic profile of the sample to the target population parameters.

Data were weighted to distributions of: sex by age, sex by education, age by education, race/ethnicity, census region, home tenure, number of adults per household, civic engagement, population density, frequency of internet use, voter status, religious affiliation, and party ID. The following table shows the data sources used for calibration totals.

Table 8. Calibration Variable Sources

DIMENSIONS	SOURCE
Sex	2024 Current Population Survey[17]
Age	
Education	
Race	
Hispanic Nativity	
Census Region	
Home Tenure	
Number of adults per household	
Population Density	Claritas Pop-Facts Premier 2023[18]
Religion Affiliation	Pew Research Center's National Public Opinion Reference Survey (NPORS)[19]
Internet Frequency	
Party ID	
Civic Engagement[20]	September 2023 CPS Volunteering and Civic Life Supplement[21]
Voter Registration	CPS 2024 Voting and Registration Supplement[22]

Panelist demographics used for weighting are those collected on the most recent Opinion Panel registration survey with the exceptions of education and voter registration, which are included on the Omnibus questionnaire each week.

Final calibrated weights are trimmed at the 2nd and 98th percentiles to prevent individual surveys from having too much influence.

[17] 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

[18] https://environicsanalytics.com/data/demographic/pop-facts-premier

[19] https://www.pewresearch.org/methods/fact-sheet/national-public-opinion-reference-survey-npors/-Feb 5 to Jun 18, 2025.

[20] Civically engaged respondents are defined as those who have volunteered in the past 12 months or who talk to /spend time with their neighbors daily.

[21] Sarah Flood, Miriam King, Renae Rodgers, Steven Ruggles, J. Robert Warren, Daniel Backman, Annie Chen, Grace Cooper, Stephanie Richards, Megan Schouweiler, and Michael Westberry (2024). Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, Current Population Survey: Version 12.0 [dataset]. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS, 2024. https://doi.org/10.18128/D030.V12.0

[22] Current Population Survey, November 2024: Voting and Registration Supplement [machine-readable data file] conducted by the Bureau of the Census for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. - Washington: Bureau of the Census [producer and distributor], 2024.

Table 9. Sample Demographics

CATEGORY	VALUES	PARAMETER	UNWEIGHTED	WEIGHTED
Gender by Age	Male, 18-24	5.8%	2.4%	5.5%
	Male, 25-34	8.7%	7.8%	8.9%
	Male, 35-44	8.6%	9.0%	8.7%
	Male, 45-54	7.6%	8.9%	7.5%
	Male, 55-64	7.7%	7.5%	7.5%
	Male, 65+	10.4%	8.6%	10.3%
	Female, 18-24	5.7%	5.1%	5.8%
	Female, 25-34	8.6%	10.1%	8.8%
	Female, 35-44	8.5%	9.5%	8.6%
	Female, 45-54	7.8%	10.1%	8.0%
	Female, 55-64	8.1%	10.1%	8.4%
	Female, 65+	12.4%	10.9%	12.0%
Education	Less than HS	9.3%	6.2%	9.3%
	HS grad	28.7%	24.0%	27.7%
	Some college	26.3%	28.5%	26.9%
	College+	35.8%	41.3%	36.1%
Gender by Education	Male, HS grad or less	19.9%	12.9%	19.0%
	Male, Some college	12.3%	12.3%	12.5%
	Male, College grad +	16.6%	19.0%	16.9%
	Female, HS grad or less	18.0%	17.3%	17.9%
	Female, Some college	14.0%	16.2%	14.4%
	Female, College grad +	19.2%	22.3%	19.3%
Age by Education	18-34, HS grad or less	11.5%	8.2%	11.0%
	18-34, Some college	8.5%	7.5%	8.9%
	18-34, College grad +	8.8%	9.7%	9.1%
	35-54, HS grad or less	11.0%	10.0%	10.8%
	35-54, Some college	7.8%	10.1%	8.0%
	35-54, College grad +	13.8%	17.4%	14.0%
	55+, HS grad or less	15.5%	12.0%	15.1%
	55+, Some college	10.0%	10.9%	10.0%
	55+, College grad +	13.2%	14.1%	13.1%
Race/Ethnicity	White, non-Hispanic	60.8%	64.4%	62.0%
	Black, non-Hispanic	12.1%	10.2%	12.1%
	Hispanic, US born	8.5%	11.4%	8.6%
	Hispanic, foreign born	9.4%	5.0%	8.5%
	Asian, non-Hispanic	6.6%	6.8%	6.2%
	Other, non-Hispanic	2.7%	2.1%	2.7%

Table 9. Sample Demographics (continued)

CATEGORY	VALUES	PARAMETER	UNWEIGHTED	WEIGHTED
Census Region	North	17.2%	17.9%	17.3%
	Midwest	20.5%	20.6%	20.5%
	South	38.7%	39.3%	38.6%
	West	23.7%	22.1%	23.5%
Civic Engagement	Engaged	34.8%	36.9%	27.5%
	Not engaged	65.2%	63.1%	72.5%
Population Density Quintiles	Lowest	20.0%	18.1%	20.0%
	2	20.0%	21.4%	20.0%
	3	20.0%	19.2%	19.5%
	4	20.0%	22.2%	20.2%
	Highest	20.0%	19.1%	20.3%
Internet Frequency	Almost constantly	41.6%	46.1%	42.2%
	Several times a day	43.1%	46.8%	44.5%
	Total Less often	15.3%	7.1%	13.3%
Party ID	Republican	32.2%	31.2%	28.9%
	Democrat	28.5%	30.4%	30.9%
	Independent/ Other	39.3%	38.4%	40.2%
Voter Registration	Registered	76.9%	84.4%	77.6%
	Not registered	23.1%	15.6%	22.4%
Religious Affiliation	Affiliated	71.5%	70.9%	71.1%
	Not affiliated	28.5%	29.1%	28.9%
Number of Adults in Household	1 Adult	16.9%	17.0%	17.0%
	2 Adults	51.8%	55.5%	53.0%
	3 or more Adults	31.3%	27.5%	30.0%
Home Tenure	Own	69.3%	64.5%	69.3%
	Rent	30.7%	35.5%	30.7%

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 is 1.28.

SSRS calculates the composite design effect for a sample of size n, with each case having a weight, w, as:[23]

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

The survey's margin of error is the largest 95% confidence interval for any estimated proportion based on the total sample — 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. 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.

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.

Response Rates: General Public Survey

For the U.S. adults survey, the cooperation rate was 49%. The cooperation rate is calculated by dividing the number of completed interviews by the total number of eligible sample.

The cumulative response rate is 2%. The cumulative response rate takes into consideration the response rate for the panel recruitment survey, percent of recruitment survey respondents that agree to join the panel, and the Omnibus survey response rate.

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 to address any questions and provide guidance in working with the data.

Final deliverables for this study included:

- Final, formatted questionnaires
- Final topline results
- Eight banner books of cross-tabulated data, including:

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

  - Four banners from the Survey of Jewish Americans
  - Two 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 reports
- 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: Recontact Details – Jewish Survey

As noted above, two questions were re-asked due to an error in the initial program – INTIF_1 and Q28. Once the two questions were re-programmed and tested, the SSRS team began outreach to the n=1,222 respondents who had initially completed the survey. The program was open from December 11-22, 2025.

Notably, the recontact questions were in the field when the Bondi Beach shooting occurred, which may have impacted recontact rates. See Table 10 for the number of completed recontact interviews by sample source.

Table 10. Recontact Interviews by Sample Source

SAMPLE SOURCE	RECONTACT INTERVIEWS	INITIAL INTERVIEWS
SSRS Opinion Panel	775	872
SSRS Pre-identified Telephone Sample	98	142
Hillel List	34	208
TOTAL	907	1,222

Outreach Procedures

Outreach protocols for the recontact questions followed the same protocol as the initial survey. Panelists were sent an email invitation to take the survey online, as well as up to three reminder emails while the program stayed open. Respondents who had completed the survey via telephone were recontacted by SSRS interviewers.

For the Hillel list, Hillel managed the recontact procedure and sent the email invitation to respondents asking them to complete the two re-asked questions online. Members of the Hillel list received one email invitation, with one reminder email a week after the initial invitation.

Recontact Sample Demographics

As referenced above in the Recontact Weighting Procedures section, this appendix includes tables comparing unweighted and weighted sample distributions to target population benchmark distributions for the recontact sample (see Table 11).

Table 11. Recontact Sample Demographics

CATEGORY	VALUES	PARAMETER	UNWEIGHTED	WEIGHTED
Age	18-29	16.9%	8.4%	14.1%
	30-49	33.6%	32.1%	34.8%
	50-64	20.2%	20.6%	20.4%
	65+	29.3%	38.9%	30.7%
Gender	Male	51.7%	50.8%	53.3%
	Female	48.3%	49.2%	46.7%
Education	HS or less	18.3%	6.7%	14.3%
	Some college	22.4%	16.0%	22.4%
	College+	59.3%	77.3%	63.2%
Race/ Ethnicity	White/Another race	91.4%	92.6%	91.6%
	African American	2.2%	1.8%	2.0%
	Hispanic	6.4%	5.6%	6.4%
Marital Status	Married	55.9%	51.6%	56.9%
	Else	44.1%	48.4%	43.1%
Census Region	Northeast	35.7%	32.5%	35.1%
	Midwest	11.6%	14.2%	11.6%
	South	27.8%	30.8%	28.2%
	West	24.9%	22.5%	25.1%
Denomination	Orthodox	8.2%	8.3%	7.6%
	Conservative	15.1%	19.6%	15.6%
	Reform	31.7%	31.3%	31.9%
	Another denomination	45.0%	40.8%	44.8%
Jewish Identity	Jewish by religion	65.6%	79.5%	67.0%
	Jewish aside from religion	34.4%	20.5%	33.0%
Internet Frequency	Several times a day or more	89.9%	93.5%	91.0%
	Less often	10.1%	6.5%	9.0%

Table 11. Recontact Sample Demographics (continued)

CATEGORY	VALUES	PARAMETER	UNWEIGHTED	WEIGHTED
Political Discussion by Age	More than once a week, 18-29	9.6%	4.0%	7.9%
	More than once a week, 30+	42.3%	50.4%	44.5%
	About once a week, 18-29	2.9%	2.2%	2.7%
	About once a week, 30+	19.4%	19.5%	19.1%
	Once/twice a month, 18-29	1.3%	1.4%	1.5%
	Once/twice a month, 30+	8.5%	10.7%	9.0%
	A few times a year, 18-29	1.4%	0.3%	0.8%
	A few times a year, 30+	8.2%	7.8%	8.5%
	Never, 18-29	1.6%	0.4%	1.2%
	Never, 30+	4.7%	3.2%	4.8%
Civic Engagement by Age	Engaged, 18-29	8.2%	5.6%	7.7%
	Engaged, 30+	46.8%	54.6%	48.1%
	Not engaged, 18-29	8.7%	2.8%	6.3%
	Not engaged, 30+	36.3%	37.0%	37.8%
Community Attachment	Very attached	24.3%	27.0%	24.2%
	Somewhat attached	46.8%	47.0%	47.5%
	Not too attached	21.9%	21.2%	22.3%
	Not at all attached	7.0%	4.9%	6.1%

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). 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.