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For the nonprobability surveys included in this report, sample was obtained from the vendors, but the survey was administered using the SurveyMonkey platform in order to ensure that respondents all experienced identical survey instruments. The exception is sample I, which was not able to interface with the SurveyMonkey platform and was administered using vendor I’s proprietary survey software. Panel recruitment, sampling method, weighting, and data quality measures such as incentives, monitoring and verification differ between vendors.

The field dates and sample sizes for each nonprobability survey are presented in the table below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Summary design and outcome metrics | | |  |
| Sample | Interviews | Field dates | 95%  margin of error1 |
| A | 1,022 | February 25, 2015 | 3.5 |
| B | 1,049 | February 26-March 3, 2015 | 4.2 |
| C | 1,178 | February 25-27, 2015 | 3.8 |
| D | 1,005 | February 25-27, 2015 | 3.6 |
| E | 1,022 | February 24-March 8, 2015 | 5.2 |
| F | 1,008 | February 25-26, 2015 | 4.4 |
| G | 1,010 | October 1-6, 2015 | 4.7 |
| H | 1,007 | October 2-8, 2015 | 4.3 |
| I | 1,000 | August 19-31, 2015 | 4.3 |
| 1 The benchmarking analysis in this report indicates that these 95% margins of error underestimate the actual margins of error at least for some survey estimates, such as those related to civic or political engagement.  PEW RESEARCH CENTER | | | |

### Precision estimates

Precision estimates for this study were computed using the Taylor series approximation. The estimates treat the nonprobability samples as if they were drawn as simple random samples from the population. This is not an accurate description of the sampling mechanisms, but it allows us to attempt to quantify and compare the variability observed in these samples. The precision estimates for the nonprobability samples account for the increase in variance due to weighting (design effect).

The precision estimates for the ATP reflect both the actual sample design and the raking adjustments. Specifically, the ATP weights reflect the differential probabilities of selection for the recruitment telephone survey, a propensity model to adjust for differential likelihood of joining and participation in the ATP, as well as differential nonresponse to the individual ATP wave.

The precision calculations assume that the survey estimates are approximately unbiased, which was shown in the benchmarking analysis to be a flawed assumption. It is important to bear in mind that these precision statements only reflect sampling error and do not account for other sources of error such as noncoverage, nonresponse, or measurement error.