Americans on AI — 26 October 2026

Athena Insights surveyed 1,985 US adults from October 22-26, 2026, via NORC's AmeriSpeak Panel, a probability-based panel designed to be representative of the US household population.

This release includes the results of that survey as a whole-sample topline, then as crosstabs broken out by subgroup, followed by appendices covering the questionnaire, methodology, and unweighted sample composition.

Results are weighted to US population benchmarks; the full-sample margin of error is ±3.2 percentage points at 95% confidence, accounting for the design effect of weighting.

In general subgroup estimates carry wider margins of error than the full sample's; but the subgroups presented in this release are oversampled to give more and balanced precision than implied by their population shares.

Percentages are out of all respondents, with "Not sure" and "None" answers included, along with skipped and refused responses. The topline shows "No answer" only for questions where its share exceeds 2% on at least one item; elsewhere it is omitted from the table but stays in the base.

You can find the underlying data and live visuals for this and other surveys at americanson.ai.

Contents

Topline 2
Crosstabs 7
Appendix — Questionnaire 43
Appendix — Methodology 46
Appendix — Sample composition 47

Topline

These are the whole-sample results: for each question, the distribution table gives the share choosing each option, with "No answer" broken out only for questions where its share exceeds 2%.

Totals that group those options (e.g. total excited, total concerned) and the nets between them appear in the crosstabs that follow.

Priorities

> *We are faced with many problems in this country, and resources are often limited. Given these constraints, how much of a priority should the government place on each of the following?*

Each label stands for a full item:

Label	Item
Jobs	Improving the job situation
Inflation	Reducing inflation
AI harms	Dealing with harms from artificial intelligence (AI)
Immigration	Dealing with immigration
Health care	Improving health care
Crime	Reducing crime
Climate change	Dealing with climate change

Response distribution (weighted) — % of all respondents. "No answer" (2% or less) is not shown.

Item	Top priority	Important but lower priority	Not too important	Not a priority at all	Not sure
Jobs	47 %	38 %	8 %	2 %	4 %
Inflation	70 %	20 %	4 %	2 %	4 %
AI harms	41 %	40 %	9 %	4 %	6 %
Immigration	35 %	33 %	18 %	8 %	5 %
Health care	64 %	24 %	6 %	1 %	4 %
Crime	52 %	32 %	9 %	2 %	4 %
Climate change	34 %	31 %	16 %	13 %	4 %

Affect

Thinking about AI's growing role in society, which of these options comes closest to how you feel, even if none are exactly right?

Response distribution (weighted) — % of all respondents. "No answer" (2% or less) is not shown.

Response	%
Very excited	6 %
Somewhat excited	14 %
Somewhat concerned	39 %
Very concerned	31 %
None of these are close to how I feel	9 %

Agency

Again, thinking about AI, which statement comes closer to your view, even if neither is exactly right?

Response distribution (weighted) — % of all respondents. "No answer" (2% or less) is not shown.

Response	%
People like me can shape how much AI is part of our lives	16 %
AI is coming into our lives whether we want it or not	67 %
Neither of these are close to how I feel	16 %

Community

Thinking about your local community, how much are you seeing each of the following changes because of AI?

Each label stands for a full item:

Label	Item
Saving time	People are saving time on everyday tasks
Pressured to do more	People are pressured to do more, faster
Losing connections	People are losing connections to others
Real vs. fake	People are struggling to tell what's real from what's fake
Better health care	People are getting better health care

Response distribution (weighted) — % of all respondents. "No answer" (2% or less) is not shown.

Item	Have seen	Starting to see	Expect to see soon	Don't expect to see	Not sure
Saving time	20 %	29 %	16 %	13 %	21 %
Pressured to do more	21 %	28 %	20 %	9 %	22 %
Losing connections	30 %	27 %	17 %	8 %	16 %
Real vs. fake	55 %	24 %	8 %	3 %	9 %
Better health care	5 %	11 %	21 %	33 %	29 %

Families

Thinking about families in America today, how is AI affecting each of the following?

Each label stands for a full item:

Label	Item
Jobs	Job security
Future	Outlook on the future
Children	Children's well-being
Finances	Household finances

Response distribution (weighted) — % of all respondents. "No answer" (2% or less) is not shown.

Item	Making it much better	Making it somewhat better	Making it somewhat worse	Making it much worse	Having no effect
Jobs	3 %	10 %	41 %	32 %	12 %
Future	5 %	23 %	34 %	24 %	11 %
Children	4 %	15 %	34 %	28 %	17 %
Finances	4 %	24 %	28 %	14 %	27 %

Government

When it comes to each of the following issues, is the government doing too much, too little, or about the right amount in response?

Each label stands for a full item:

Label	Item
Children	AI's effects on children and young people
Environment	AI's environmental footprint, including from data centers
Workers	AI's effects on workers and jobs
Competitiveness	AI's effect on American competitiveness

Response distribution (weighted) — % of all respondents. "No answer" (2% or less) is not shown.

Item	Way too much	Somewhat too much	About the right amount	Somewhat too little	Way too little	Not sure
Children	10 %	13 %	12 %	20 %	29 %	16 %
Environment	14 %	10 %	13 %	15 %	32 %	16 %
Workers	9 %	13 %	14 %	21 %	26 %	16 %
Competitiveness	8 %	14 %	22 %	17 %	16 %	23 %

Futures

Thinking about the next 20 years, how likely is each of the following to happen?

Each label stands for a full item:

Label	Item
Superintelligence	AI becoming smarter than humans at most tasks
Loss-of-control	AI systems behaving in ways their developers did not intend
Breakthroughs	AI making major scientific and medical breakthroughs
WMDs	AI being used to create weapons of mass destruction

Response distribution (weighted) — % of all respondents. "No answer" (2% or less) is not shown.

Item	Already happening	Likely to happen	Unlikely to happen	Not at all likely to happen	Not sure
Superintelligence	31 %	40 %	10 %	6 %	12 %
Loss-of-control	43 %	37 %	6 %	2 %	12 %
Breakthroughs	18 %	45 %	12 %	4 %	19 %
WMDs	19 %	51 %	8 %	3 %	18 %

Crosstabs

Here we are reporting totals and nets for response options, shown for the whole sample and then broken out by sex, party, age, race / ethnicity, education, and household income (the *banner*).

- A total is a combination of response options which indicate a common lean, for example: the total excited includes "very excited" and "somewhat excited" responses.
- A net is the gap, in percentage points, between the two leans of a question, for example: the total concerned minus the total excited.

In general subgroup estimates carry wider margins of error than the full sample's; but certain subgroups presented in this release are oversampled to give more and balanced precision than implied by their population shares.

One table per banner dimension (Total repeated as the first column). The base row is each subgroup's full size; columns with n<100 are marked †.

Priorities

> *We are faced with many problems in this country, and resources are often limited. Given these constraints, how much of a priority should the government place on each of the following?*

Each label stands for a full item:

Label	Item
Jobs	Improving the job situation
Inflation	Reducing inflation
AI harms	Dealing with harms from artificial intelligence (AI)
Immigration	Dealing with immigration
Health care	Improving health care
Crime	Reducing crime
Climate change	Dealing with climate change

Each total combines multiple responses:

Total	Responses
TOTAL high priority	"Top priority" or "Important but lower priority"
TOTAL lower priority	"Not too important" or "Not a priority at all"

Cells (weighted): totals (%) and net (percentage points).

By Sex

Item	Metric	Total	Female	Male
Base (n)		1985	1110	875
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	85 %	84 %	86 %
	TOTAL lower priority	10 %	9 %	11 %
	NET priority	75 pp	76 pp	75 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	90 %	89 %	91 %
	TOTAL lower priority	6 %	5 %	7 %
	NET priority	84 pp	84 pp	84 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	80 %	84 %	77 %
	TOTAL lower priority	13 %	9 %	18 %
	NET priority	67 pp	75 pp	58 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	68 %	70 %	66 %
	TOTAL lower priority	26 %	23 %	30 %
	NET priority	42 pp	47 pp	37 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	88 %	89 %	87 %
	TOTAL lower priority	7 %	4 %	9 %
	NET priority	81 pp	84 pp	78 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	84 %	86 %	82 %
	TOTAL lower priority	11 %	8 %	14 %
	NET priority	73 pp	78 pp	68 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	65 %	71 %	60 %
	TOTAL lower priority	29 %	23 %	36 %
	NET priority	36 pp	48 pp	23 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		1985	1010	512	450
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	85 %	94 %	81 %	78 %
	TOTAL lower priority	10 %	4 %	17 %	8 %
	NET priority	75 pp	91 pp	64 pp	70 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	90 %	96 %	90 %	80 %
	TOTAL lower priority	6 %	3 %	9 %	5 %
	NET priority	84 pp	93 pp	81 pp	75 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	80 %	91 %	80 %	66 %
	TOTAL lower priority	13 %	7 %	16 %	18 %
	NET priority	67 pp	83 pp	64 pp	48 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	68 %	56 %	85 %	60 %
	TOTAL lower priority	26 %	41 %	13 %	23 %
	NET priority	42 pp	15 pp	72 pp	36 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	88 %	96 %	86 %	79 %
	TOTAL lower priority	7 %	2 %	12 %	7 %
	NET priority	81 pp	95 pp	74 pp	72 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	84 %	87 %	89 %	73 %
	TOTAL lower priority	11 %	12 %	8 %	14 %
	NET priority	73 pp	75 pp	80 pp	59 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	65 %	89 %	43 %	62 %
	TOTAL lower priority	29 %	9 %	54 %	24 %
	NET priority	36 pp	81 pp	−11 pp	38 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18–34	35–49	50–64	65+
Base (n)		1985	554	551	436	444
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	85 %	80 %	84 %	88 %	90 %
	TOTAL lower priority	10 %	12 %	11 %	8 %	7 %
	NET priority	75 pp	68 pp	73 pp	80 pp	82 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	90 %	84 %	87 %	94 %	96 %
	TOTAL lower priority	6 %	8 %	8 %	4 %	2 %
	NET priority	84 pp	75 pp	79 pp	90 pp	94 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	80 %	72 %	78 %	86 %	87 %
	TOTAL lower priority	13 %	18 %	16 %	10 %	8 %
	NET priority	67 pp	54 pp	62 pp	76 pp	79 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	68 %	54 %	60 %	79 %	82 %
	TOTAL lower priority	26 %	36 %	33 %	18 %	15 %
	NET priority	42 pp	19 pp	27 pp	61 pp	67 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	88 %	80 %	84 %	95 %	95 %
	TOTAL lower priority	7 %	12 %	9 %	3 %	1 %
	NET priority	81 pp	68 pp	74 pp	92 pp	94 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	84 %	74 %	79 %	91 %	94 %
	TOTAL lower priority	11 %	18 %	13 %	7 %	4 %
	NET priority	73 pp	57 pp	66 pp	85 pp	90 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	65 %	68 %	61 %	61 %	70 %
	TOTAL lower priority	29 %	24 %	32 %	35 %	27 %
	NET priority	36 pp	44 pp	29 pp	26 pp	43 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)		1985	754	632	441
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	85 %	85 %	84 %	85 %
	TOTAL lower priority	10 %	10 %	9 %	9 %
	NET priority	75 pp	75 pp	75 pp	76 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	90 %	94 %	83 %	85 %
	TOTAL lower priority	6 %	3 %	7 %	9 %
	NET priority	84 pp	90 pp	76 pp	76 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	80 %	82 %	75 %	77 %
	TOTAL lower priority	13 %	13 %	16 %	16 %
	NET priority	67 pp	69 pp	58 pp	62 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	68 %	73 %	60 %	63 %
	TOTAL lower priority	26 %	23 %	31 %	29 %
	NET priority	42 pp	49 pp	28 pp	34 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	88 %	89 %	86 %	86 %
	TOTAL lower priority	7 %	6 %	5 %	9 %
	NET priority	81 pp	83 pp	81 pp	77 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	84 %	87 %	84 %	79 %
	TOTAL lower priority	11 %	10 %	11 %	12 %
	NET priority	73 pp	77 pp	73 pp	66 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	65 %	63 %	71 %	68 %
	TOTAL lower priority	29 %	33 %	20 %	26 %
	NET priority	36 pp	30 pp	51 pp	43 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		1985	534	741	710
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	85 %	79 %	88 %	88 %
	TOTAL lower priority	10 %	11 %	8 %	9 %
	NET priority	75 pp	68 pp	80 pp	79 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	90 %	82 %	95 %	94 %
	TOTAL lower priority	6 %	9 %	3 %	5 %
	NET priority	84 pp	73 pp	92 pp	90 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	80 %	73 %	86 %	83 %
	TOTAL lower priority	13 %	16 %	9 %	14 %
	NET priority	67 pp	57 pp	77 pp	69 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	68 %	65 %	75 %	66 %
	TOTAL lower priority	26 %	24 %	20 %	32 %
	NET priority	42 pp	41 pp	55 pp	34 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	88 %	81 %	90 %	93 %
	TOTAL lower priority	7 %	10 %	6 %	5 %
	NET priority	81 pp	72 pp	85 pp	88 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	84 %	79 %	89 %	85 %
	TOTAL lower priority	11 %	11 %	8 %	13 %
	NET priority	73 pp	68 pp	82 pp	72 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	65 %	60 %	70 %	67 %
	TOTAL lower priority	29 %	31 %	25 %	30 %
	NET priority	36 pp	29 pp	45 pp	36 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		1985	797	605	583
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	85 %	80 %	87 %	89 %
	TOTAL lower priority	10 %	11 %	8 %	10 %
	NET priority	75 pp	69 pp	78 pp	79 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	90 %	85 %	91 %	94 %
	TOTAL lower priority	6 %	8 %	4 %	5 %
	NET priority	84 pp	77 pp	87 pp	89 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	80 %	75 %	82 %	84 %
	TOTAL lower priority	13 %	14 %	12 %	14 %
	NET priority	67 pp	61 pp	71 pp	70 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	68 %	67 %	70 %	66 %
	TOTAL lower priority	26 %	22 %	23 %	33 %
	NET priority	42 pp	45 pp	47 pp	33 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	88 %	83 %	88 %	93 %
	TOTAL lower priority	7 %	8 %	6 %	6 %
	NET priority	81 pp	75 pp	82 pp	87 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	84 %	82 %	87 %	84 %
	TOTAL lower priority	11 %	10 %	8 %	14 %
	NET priority	73 pp	71 pp	79 pp	69 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	65 %	64 %	63 %	69 %
	TOTAL lower priority	29 %	27 %	32 %	29 %
	NET priority	36 pp	37 pp	31 pp	40 pp

Affect

Thinking about AI's growing role in society, which of these options comes closest to how you feel, even if none are exactly right?

Each total combines multiple responses:

Total	Responses
TOTAL excited	"Very excited" or "Somewhat excited"
TOTAL concerned	"Somewhat concerned" or "Very concerned"

Cells (weighted): totals (%) and net (percentage points).

By Sex

Metric	Total	Female	Male
Base (n)	1985	1110	875
TOTAL excited	21 %	17 %	25 %
TOTAL concerned	70 %	73 %	67 %
None of these	9 %	9 %	8 %
No answer	1 %	1 %	<1 %
NET concerned	49 pp	56 pp	42 pp

By Party

Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)	1985	1010	512	450
TOTAL excited	21 %	17 %	23 %	23 %
TOTAL concerned	70 %	79 %	72 %	54 %
None of these	9 %	4 %	5 %	20 %
No answer	1 %	<1 %	<1 %	2 %
NET concerned	49 pp	62 pp	49 pp	30 pp

By Age

Metric	Total	18–34	35–49	50–64	65+
Base (n)	1985	554	551	436	444
TOTAL excited	21 %	26 %	22 %	20 %	14 %
TOTAL concerned	70 %	63 %	68 %	74 %	77 %
None of these	9 %	10 %	10 %	6 %	8 %
No answer	1 %	1 %	<1 %	0 %	1 %
NET concerned	49 pp	37 pp	46 pp	54 pp	63 pp

By Ethnicity

Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)	1985	754	632	441
TOTAL excited	21 %	18 %	26 %	27 %
TOTAL concerned	70 %	74 %	58 %	63 %
None of these	9 %	8 %	15 %	10 %
No answer	1 %	<1 %	2 %	<1 %
NET concerned	49 pp	56 pp	33 pp	36 pp

By Education

Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)	1985	534	741	710
TOTAL excited	21 %	20 %	16 %	25 %
TOTAL concerned	70 %	64 %	77 %	71 %
None of these	9 %	14 %	7 %	4 %
No answer	1 %	2 %	0 %	0 %
NET concerned	49 pp	45 pp	60 pp	46 pp

By Household income

Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)	1985	797	605	583
TOTAL excited	21 %	20 %	18 %	25 %
TOTAL concerned	70 %	66 %	76 %	70 %
None of these	9 %	13 %	7 %	5 %
No answer	1 %	2 %	0 %	0 %
NET concerned	49 pp	46 pp	58 pp	45 pp

Agency

Again, thinking about AI, which statement comes closer to your view, even if neither is exactly right?

Cells (weighted): totals (%) and net (percentage points).

By Sex

Metric	Total	Female	Male
Base (n)	1985	1110	875
TOTAL can shape	16 %	16 %	15 %
TOTAL inevitable	67 %	65 %	69 %
Neither of these	16 %	18 %	14 %
No answer	1 %	2 %	1 %
NET inevitable	51 pp	49 pp	54 pp

By Party

Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)	1985	1010	512	450
TOTAL can shape	16 %	14 %	17 %	16 %
TOTAL inevitable	67 %	72 %	70 %	56 %
Neither of these	16 %	13 %	12 %	24 %
No answer	1 %	<1 %	<1 %	5 %
NET inevitable	51 pp	58 pp	53 pp	40 pp

By Age

Metric	Total	18–34	35–49	50–64	65+
Base (n)	1985	554	551	436	444
TOTAL can shape	16 %	15 %	19 %	19 %	10 %
TOTAL inevitable	67 %	62 %	62 %	69 %	76 %
Neither of these	16 %	20 %	17 %	12 %	14 %
No answer	1 %	3 %	2 %	<1 %	1 %
NET inevitable	51 pp	47 pp	43 pp	50 pp	66 pp

By Ethnicity

Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)	1985	754	632	441
TOTAL can shape	16 %	15 %	14 %	17 %
TOTAL inevitable	67 %	70 %	61 %	59 %
Neither of these	16 %	14 %	22 %	22 %
No answer	1 %	1 %	3 %	2 %
NET inevitable	51 pp	55 pp	47 pp	42 pp

By Education

Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)	1985	534	741	710
TOTAL can shape	16 %	14 %	12 %	20 %
TOTAL inevitable	67 %	60 %	73 %	70 %
Neither of these	16 %	23 %	14 %	11 %
No answer	1 %	3 %	<1 %	<1 %
NET inevitable	51 pp	46 pp	61 pp	50 pp

By Household income

Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)	1985	797	605	583
TOTAL can shape	16 %	13 %	17 %	17 %
TOTAL inevitable	67 %	62 %	68 %	72 %
Neither of these	16 %	23 %	14 %	10 %
No answer	1 %	2 %	1 %	1 %
NET inevitable	51 pp	49 pp	51 pp	55 pp

Community

Thinking about your local community, how much are you seeing each of the following changes because of AI?

Each label stands for a full item:

Label	Item
Saving time	People are saving time on everyday tasks
Pressured to do more	People are pressured to do more, faster
Losing connections	People are losing connections to others
Real vs. fake	People are struggling to tell what's real from what's fake
Better health care	People are getting better health care

Each total combines multiple responses:

Total	Responses
TOTAL realized	"Have seen" or "Starting to see"
TOTAL not yet	"Expect to see soon" or "Don't expect to see"

Cells (weighted): totals (%) and net (percentage points).

By Sex

Item	Metric	Total	Female	Male
Base (n)		1985	1110	875
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	49 %	50 %
	TOTAL not yet	29 %	26 %	31 %
	NET realized	21 pp	23 pp	18 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	49 %	49 %	48 %
	TOTAL not yet	29 %	25 %	32 %
	NET realized	20 pp	24 pp	15 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	56 %	59 %	54 %
	TOTAL not yet	26 %	22 %	30 %
	NET realized	31 pp	37 pp	24 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	80 %	79 %	80 %
	TOTAL not yet	11 %	9 %	13 %
	NET realized	69 pp	70 pp	67 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	16 %	16 %	17 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	50 %	57 %
	NET realized	−37 pp	−35 pp	−40 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		1985	1010	512	450
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	49 %	48 %	52 %
	TOTAL not yet	29 %	30 %	32 %	21 %
	NET realized	21 pp	19 pp	15 pp	31 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	49 %	52 %	45 %	49 %
	TOTAL not yet	29 %	30 %	32 %	21 %
	NET realized	20 pp	22 pp	13 pp	28 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	56 %	59 %	56 %	54 %
	TOTAL not yet	26 %	28 %	27 %	21 %
	NET realized	31 pp	31 pp	29 pp	33 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	80 %	86 %	79 %	71 %
	TOTAL not yet	11 %	9 %	13 %	11 %
	NET realized	69 pp	77 pp	67 pp	60 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	16 %	14 %	17 %	17 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	59 %	51 %	48 %
	NET realized	−37 pp	−45 pp	−34 pp	−31 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18–34	35–49	50–64	65+
Base (n)		1985	554	551	436	444
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	53 %	57 %	44 %	42 %
	TOTAL not yet	29 %	30 %	26 %	30 %	28 %
	NET realized	21 pp	23 pp	31 pp	13 pp	13 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	49 %	56 %	54 %	41 %	40 %
	TOTAL not yet	29 %	26 %	28 %	31 %	30 %
	NET realized	20 pp	31 pp	27 pp	10 pp	10 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	56 %	56 %	63 %	56 %	50 %
	TOTAL not yet	26 %	29 %	21 %	26 %	27 %
	NET realized	31 pp	27 pp	43 pp	30 pp	24 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	80 %	75 %	83 %	84 %	78 %
	TOTAL not yet	11 %	16 %	7 %	9 %	11 %
	NET realized	69 pp	59 pp	75 pp	75 pp	68 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	16 %	17 %	17 %	13 %	18 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	56 %	56 %	57 %	44 %
	NET realized	−37 pp	−40 pp	−39 pp	−44 pp	−26 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)		1985	754	632	441
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	48 %	47 %	52 %
	TOTAL not yet	29 %	29 %	28 %	29 %
	NET realized	21 pp	19 pp	19 pp	23 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	49 %	47 %	50 %	49 %
	TOTAL not yet	29 %	29 %	29 %	29 %
	NET realized	20 pp	18 pp	21 pp	20 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	56 %	57 %	55 %	58 %
	TOTAL not yet	26 %	25 %	24 %	29 %
	NET realized	31 pp	32 pp	31 pp	29 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	80 %	82 %	69 %	78 %
	TOTAL not yet	11 %	9 %	18 %	14 %
	NET realized	69 pp	74 pp	51 pp	64 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	16 %	15 %	23 %	16 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	54 %	46 %	54 %
	NET realized	–37 pp	–39 pp	–23 pp	–38 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		1985	534	741	710
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	43 %	46 %	57 %
	TOTAL not yet	29 %	28 %	32 %	27 %
	NET realized	21 pp	16 pp	14 pp	30 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	49 %	39 %	52 %	56 %
	TOTAL not yet	29 %	30 %	27 %	28 %
	NET realized	20 pp	9 pp	24 pp	28 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	56 %	52 %	59 %	59 %
	TOTAL not yet	26 %	26 %	26 %	25 %
	NET realized	31 pp	26 pp	33 pp	34 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	80 %	71 %	83 %	86 %
	TOTAL not yet	11 %	16 %	8 %	8 %
	NET realized	69 pp	55 pp	75 pp	78 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	16 %	18 %	15 %	15 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	46 %	54 %	61 %
	NET realized	−37 pp	−27 pp	−39 pp	−46 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		1985	797	605	583
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	42 %	52 %	54 %
	TOTAL not yet	29 %	29 %	29 %	28 %
	NET realized	21 pp	14 pp	23 pp	26 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	49 %	46 %	50 %	50 %
	TOTAL not yet	29 %	26 %	28 %	32 %
	NET realized	20 pp	20 pp	22 pp	18 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	56 %	53 %	62 %	56 %
	TOTAL not yet	26 %	25 %	23 %	29 %
	NET realized	31 pp	28 pp	38 pp	27 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	80 %	73 %	83 %	83 %
	TOTAL not yet	11 %	13 %	8 %	11 %
	NET realized	69 pp	60 pp	75 pp	73 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	16 %	20 %	13 %	15 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	46 %	58 %	58 %
	NET realized	−37 pp	−26 pp	−45 pp	−43 pp

Families

Thinking about families in America today, how is AI affecting each of the following?

Each label stands for a full item:

Label	Item
Jobs	Job security
Future	Outlook on the future
Children	Children's well-being
Finances	Household finances

Each total combines multiple responses:

Total	Responses
TOTAL better	"Making it much better" or "Making it somewhat better"
TOTAL worse	"Making it somewhat worse" or "Making it much worse"

Cells (weighted): totals (%) and net (percentage points).

By Sex

Item	Metric	Total	Female	Male
Base (n)		1985	1110	875
Jobs	TOTAL better	13 %	12 %	14 %
	TOTAL worse	73 %	72 %	74 %
	NET worse	60 pp	59 pp	60 pp
Future	TOTAL better	28 %	26 %	31 %
	TOTAL worse	58 %	58 %	57 %
	NET worse	30 pp	32 pp	27 pp
Children	TOTAL better	19 %	18 %	20 %
	TOTAL worse	62 %	63 %	61 %
	NET worse	43 pp	45 pp	41 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	28 %	26 %	30 %
	TOTAL worse	43 %	41 %	45 %
	NET worse	15 pp	15 pp	15 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		1985	1010	512	450
Jobs	TOTAL better	13 %	11 %	13 %	16 %
	TOTAL worse	73 %	81 %	70 %	65 %
	NET worse	60 pp	70 pp	57 pp	49 pp
Future	TOTAL better	28 %	26 %	31 %	29 %
	TOTAL worse	58 %	65 %	55 %	52 %
	NET worse	30 pp	39 pp	24 pp	23 pp
Children	TOTAL better	19 %	16 %	20 %	22 %
	TOTAL worse	62 %	72 %	57 %	55 %
	NET worse	43 pp	56 pp	37 pp	33 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	28 %	24 %	32 %	27 %
	TOTAL worse	43 %	49 %	37 %	43 %
	NET worse	15 pp	25 pp	5 pp	16 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18–34	35–49	50–64	65+
Base (n)		1985	554	551	436	444
Jobs	TOTAL better	13 %	16 %	16 %	8 %	12 %
	TOTAL worse	73 %	70 %	73 %	78 %	71 %
	NET worse	60 pp	55 pp	56 pp	70 pp	60 pp
Future	TOTAL better	28 %	26 %	25 %	28 %	34 %
	TOTAL worse	58 %	61 %	63 %	57 %	49 %
	NET worse	30 pp	35 pp	38 pp	30 pp	15 pp
Children	TOTAL better	19 %	21 %	17 %	16 %	21 %
	TOTAL worse	62 %	63 %	65 %	63 %	57 %
	NET worse	43 pp	42 pp	47 pp	47 pp	36 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	28 %	30 %	29 %	25 %	27 %
	TOTAL worse	43 %	44 %	44 %	44 %	39 %
	NET worse	15 pp	14 pp	15 pp	20 pp	12 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)		1985	754	632	441
Jobs	TOTAL better	13 %	9 %	25 %	22 %
	TOTAL worse	73 %	76 %	60 %	67 %
	NET worse	60 pp	67 pp	35 pp	45 pp
Future	TOTAL better	28 %	24 %	39 %	33 %
	TOTAL worse	58 %	62 %	44 %	53 %
	NET worse	30 pp	38 pp	6 pp	20 pp
Children	TOTAL better	19 %	15 %	31 %	21 %
	TOTAL worse	62 %	67 %	48 %	57 %
	NET worse	43 pp	52 pp	17 pp	36 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	28 %	25 %	41 %	30 %
	TOTAL worse	43 %	44 %	34 %	43 %
	NET worse	15 pp	19 pp	−6 pp	13 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		1985	534	741	710
Jobs	TOTAL better	13 %	18 %	10 %	10 %
	TOTAL worse	73 %	63 %	77 %	80 %
	NET worse	60 pp	45 pp	67 pp	69 pp
Future	TOTAL better	28 %	25 %	28 %	31 %
	TOTAL worse	58 %	55 %	61 %	59 %
	NET worse	30 pp	29 pp	32 pp	28 pp
Children	TOTAL better	19 %	22 %	20 %	15 %
	TOTAL worse	62 %	54 %	62 %	70 %
	NET worse	43 pp	32 pp	42 pp	54 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	28 %	27 %	27 %	30 %
	TOTAL worse	43 %	40 %	47 %	43 %
	NET worse	15 pp	13 pp	20 pp	14 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		1985	797	605	583
Jobs	TOTAL better	13 %	14 %	14 %	12 %
	TOTAL worse	73 %	69 %	73 %	77 %
	NET worse	60 pp	55 pp	60 pp	65 pp
Future	TOTAL better	28 %	26 %	29 %	30 %
	TOTAL worse	58 %	56 %	59 %	60 %
	NET worse	30 pp	29 pp	30 pp	30 pp
Children	TOTAL better	19 %	23 %	17 %	16 %
	TOTAL worse	62 %	57 %	64 %	66 %
	NET worse	43 pp	34 pp	47 pp	49 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	28 %	26 %	26 %	32 %
	TOTAL worse	43 %	45 %	42 %	41 %
	NET worse	15 pp	19 pp	16 pp	9 pp

Government

When it comes to each of the following issues, is the government doing too much, too little, or about the right amount in response?

Each label stands for a full item:

Label	Item
Children	AI's effects on children and young people
Environment	AI's environmental footprint, including from data centers
Workers	AI's effects on workers and jobs
Competitiveness	AI's effect on American competitiveness

Each total combines multiple responses:

Total	Responses
TOTAL too much	"Way too much" or "Somewhat too much"
TOTAL too little	"Somewhat too little" or "Way too little"

Cells (weighted): totals (%) and net (percentage points).

By Sex

Item	Metric	Total	Female	Male
Base (n)		1985	1110	875
Children	TOTAL too much	23 %	25 %	21 %
	TOTAL too little	48 %	48 %	49 %
	NET too little	26 pp	23 pp	28 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	24 %	26 %	22 %
	TOTAL too little	46 %	46 %	47 %
	NET too little	22 pp	20 pp	25 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	22 %	23 %	22 %
	TOTAL too little	47 %	46 %	48 %
	NET too little	24 pp	23 pp	26 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	22 %	22 %	21 %
	TOTAL too little	32 %	33 %	31 %
	NET too little	11 pp	11 pp	10 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		1985	1010	512	450
Children	TOTAL too much	23 %	23 %	21 %	26 %
	TOTAL too little	48 %	58 %	47 %	37 %
	NET too little	26 pp	35 pp	26 pp	11 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	24 %	23 %	26 %	22 %
	TOTAL too little	46 %	58 %	39 %	40 %
	NET too little	22 pp	35 pp	13 pp	18 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	22 %	24 %	18 %	25 %
	TOTAL too little	47 %	57 %	44 %	36 %
	NET too little	24 pp	33 pp	25 pp	11 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	22 %	24 %	19 %	21 %
	TOTAL too little	32 %	40 %	30 %	26 %
	NET too little	11 pp	16 pp	11 pp	5 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18–34	35–49	50–64	65+
Base (n)		1985	554	551	436	444
Children	TOTAL too much	23 %	22 %	24 %	26 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	48 %	45 %	51 %	47 %	52 %
	NET too little	26 pp	23 pp	26 pp	20 pp	32 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	24 %	21 %	25 %	28 %	23 %
	TOTAL too little	46 %	46 %	43 %	49 %	47 %
	NET too little	22 pp	25 pp	19 pp	21 pp	24 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	22 %	20 %	25 %	28 %	18 %
	TOTAL too little	47 %	47 %	46 %	41 %	53 %
	NET too little	24 pp	26 pp	22 pp	13 pp	34 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	22 %	24 %	22 %	25 %	16 %
	TOTAL too little	32 %	29 %	28 %	35 %	39 %
	NET too little	11 pp	5 pp	6 pp	10 pp	23 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)		1985	754	632	441
Children	TOTAL too much	23 %	18 %	35 %	30 %
	TOTAL too little	48 %	53 %	31 %	45 %
	NET too little	26 pp	35 pp	−4 pp	15 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	24 %	19 %	33 %	29 %
	TOTAL too little	46 %	51 %	29 %	43 %
	NET too little	22 pp	33 pp	−4 pp	14 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	22 %	18 %	31 %	26 %
	TOTAL too little	47 %	52 %	29 %	43 %
	NET too little	24 pp	33 pp	−3 pp	17 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	22 %	17 %	29 %	30 %
	TOTAL too little	32 %	35 %	24 %	29 %
	NET too little	11 pp	19 pp	−5 pp	−1 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		1985	534	741	710
Children	TOTAL too much	23 %	28 %	25 %	16 %
	TOTAL too little	48 %	37 %	52 %	57 %
	NET too little	26 pp	9 pp	27 pp	41 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	24 %	28 %	25 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	46 %	34 %	51 %	55 %
	NET too little	22 pp	6 pp	26 pp	36 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	22 %	26 %	23 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	47 %	38 %	50 %	54 %
	NET too little	24 pp	12 pp	26 pp	35 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	22 %	24 %	21 %	20 %
	TOTAL too little	32 %	25 %	38 %	36 %
	NET too little	11 pp	2 pp	17 pp	16 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		1985	797	605	583
Children	TOTAL too much	23 %	28 %	24 %	15 %
	TOTAL too little	48 %	39 %	52 %	56 %
	NET too little	26 pp	11 pp	27 pp	41 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	24 %	27 %	25 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	46 %	37 %	46 %	57 %
	NET too little	22 pp	10 pp	22 pp	38 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	22 %	27 %	24 %	15 %
	TOTAL too little	47 %	39 %	45 %	57 %
	NET too little	24 pp	12 pp	21 pp	42 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	22 %	24 %	23 %	17 %
	TOTAL too little	32 %	29 %	30 %	38 %
	NET too little	11 pp	5 pp	6 pp	22 pp

Futures

Thinking about the next 20 years, how likely is each of the following to happen?

Each label stands for a full item:

Label	Item
Superintelligence	AI becoming smarter than humans at most tasks
Loss-of-control	AI systems behaving in ways their developers did not intend
Breakthroughs	AI making major scientific and medical breakthroughs
WMDs	AI being used to create weapons of mass destruction

Each total combines multiple responses:

Total	Responses
TOTAL likely	"Already happening" or "Likely to happen"
TOTAL unlikely	"Unlikely to happen" or "Not at all likely to happen"

Cells (weighted): totals (%) and net (percentage points).

By Sex

Item	Metric	Total	Female	Male
Base (n)		1985	1110	875
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	71 %	69 %	74 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	15 %	17 %
	NET likely	55 pp	54 pp	56 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	79 %	78 %	81 %
	TOTAL unlikely	8 %	7 %	9 %
	NET likely	71 pp	71 pp	72 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	64 %	60 %	67 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	14 %	18 %
	NET likely	48 pp	45 pp	50 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	69 %	68 %	71 %
	TOTAL unlikely	12 %	8 %	15 %
	NET likely	58 pp	60 pp	55 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		1985	1010	512	450
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	71 %	73 %	74 %	63 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	17 %	16 %	15 %
	NET likely	55 pp	56 pp	59 pp	48 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	79 %	85 %	83 %	66 %
	TOTAL unlikely	8 %	6 %	8 %	12 %
	NET likely	71 pp	80 pp	75 pp	54 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	64 %	66 %	69 %	54 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	17 %	16 %	15 %
	NET likely	48 pp	49 pp	53 pp	38 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	69 %	73 %	73 %	59 %
	TOTAL unlikely	12 %	9 %	12 %	15 %
	NET likely	58 pp	64 pp	60 pp	44 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18–34	35–49	50–64	65+
Base (n)		1985	554	551	436	444
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	71 %	61 %	71 %	78 %	77 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	22 %	16 %	13 %	10 %
	NET likely	55 pp	38 pp	55 pp	64 pp	66 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	79 %	71 %	78 %	84 %	86 %
	TOTAL unlikely	8 %	12 %	8 %	6 %	4 %
	NET likely	71 pp	59 pp	70 pp	78 pp	81 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	64 %	53 %	60 %	71 %	73 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	23 %	18 %	13 %	9 %
	NET likely	48 pp	30 pp	42 pp	58 pp	64 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	69 %	59 %	68 %	74 %	78 %
	TOTAL unlikely	12 %	18 %	12 %	9 %	7 %
	NET likely	58 pp	42 pp	56 pp	65 pp	71 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)		1985	754	632	441
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	71 %	72 %	66 %	69 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	16 %	16 %	17 %
	NET likely	55 pp	57 pp	50 pp	51 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	79 %	85 %	66 %	70 %
	TOTAL unlikely	8 %	5 %	13 %	14 %
	NET likely	71 pp	80 pp	53 pp	56 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	64 %	67 %	56 %	56 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	15 %	17 %	21 %
	NET likely	48 pp	52 pp	39 pp	35 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	69 %	73 %	58 %	65 %
	TOTAL unlikely	12 %	10 %	17 %	14 %
	NET likely	58 pp	63 pp	41 pp	51 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		1985	534	741	710
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	71 %	62 %	77 %	75 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	18 %	13 %	16 %
	NET likely	55 pp	44 pp	64 pp	59 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	79 %	69 %	85 %	86 %
	TOTAL unlikely	8 %	11 %	7 %	6 %
	NET likely	71 pp	58 pp	79 pp	79 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	64 %	55 %	67 %	69 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	17 %	15 %	16 %
	NET likely	48 pp	39 pp	52 pp	53 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	69 %	62 %	78 %	71 %
	TOTAL unlikely	12 %	14 %	7 %	13 %
	NET likely	58 pp	48 pp	71 pp	58 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		1985	797	605	583
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	71 %	63 %	75 %	77 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	18 %	15 %	15 %
	NET likely	55 pp	45 pp	60 pp	62 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	79 %	70 %	84 %	85 %
	TOTAL unlikely	8 %	12 %	5 %	7 %
	NET likely	71 pp	59 pp	80 pp	78 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	64 %	58 %	64 %	70 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	14 %	18 %	16 %
	NET likely	48 pp	44 pp	46 pp	54 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	69 %	66 %	72 %	71 %
	TOTAL unlikely	12 %	11 %	10 %	14 %
	NET likely	58 pp	55 pp	62 pp	56 pp

Appendix — Questionnaire

Here are the questions, items, and response options for the results of this release. Some additional instructions may be omitted for brevity and clarity.

Priorities

> *We are faced with many problems in this country, and resources are often limited. Given these constraints, how much of a priority should the government place on each of the following?*

Items

- Improving the job situation
- Reducing inflation
- Dealing with harms from artificial intelligence (AI)
- Dealing with immigration
- Improving health care
- Reducing crime
- Dealing with climate change

Response options

1. Top priority
2. Important but lower priority
3. Not too important
4. Not a priority at all
5. Not sure

Affect

> *Thinking about AI's growing role in society, which of these options comes closest to how you feel, even if none are exactly right?*

Response options

1. Very excited
2. Somewhat excited
3. Somewhat concerned
4. Very concerned
5. None of these are close to how I feel

Agency

Again, thinking about AI, which statement comes closer to your view, even if neither is exactly right?

Response options

1. People like me can shape how much AI is part of our lives
2. AI is coming into our lives whether we want it or not
3. Neither of these are close to how I feel

Community

Thinking about your local community, how much are you seeing each of the following changes because of AI?

Items

- People are saving time on everyday tasks
- People are pressured to do more, faster
- People are losing connections to others
- People are struggling to tell what's real from what's fake
- People are getting better health care

Response options

1. Have seen
2. Starting to see
3. Expect to see soon
4. Don't expect to see
5. Not sure

Families

Thinking about families in America today, how is AI affecting each of the following?

Items

- Job security
- Outlook on the future
- Children's well-being
- Household finances

Response options

1. Making it much better
2. Making it somewhat better
3. Making it somewhat worse
4. Making it much worse
5. Having no effect

Government

When it comes to each of the following issues, is the government doing too much, too little, or about the right amount in response?

Items

- AI's effects on children and young people
- AI's environmental footprint, including from data centers
- AI's effects on workers and jobs
- AI's effect on American competitiveness

Response options

1. Way too much
2. Somewhat too much
3. About the right amount
4. Somewhat too little
5. Way too little
6. Not sure

Futures

Thinking about the next 20 years, how likely is each of the following to happen?

Items

- AI becoming smarter than humans at most tasks
- AI systems behaving in ways their developers did not intend
- AI making major scientific and medical breakthroughs
- AI being used to create weapons of mass destruction

Response options

1. Already happening
2. Likely to happen
3. Unlikely to happen
4. Not at all likely to happen
5. Not sure

Appendix — Methodology

This is the ninth tracking wave of the **Americans on AI** survey, a project of Athena Insights.

Respondents were interviewed between October 22 and 26, 2026 as part of NORC's AmeriSpeak Omnibus. AmeriSpeak is a probability-based household panel recruited by address-based sampling from the NORC National Frame, designed to be representative of the US household population. Interviews were conducted online (96%) and by phone (4%), in English; 1,985 adults completed the module.

Results are weighted with NORC's vote-choice study weights. NORC first adjusts the panel base weights for sample selection and nonresponse and rakes to Current Population Survey benchmarks on age, sex, census division, race/ethnicity, and education; a second round of raking then adds 2024 presidential vote choice. The voter shares are benchmarked to the 2024 election results. This yields a design effect of 2.10 and an effective sample size of 943. The subgroups reported in this release were oversampled by design: the weights restore population proportions, while the additional interviews improve the precision of those subgroup estimates. Standard errors are design-based (Taylor linearization over NORC's variance strata and units).

The full-sample margin of error is ±3.2 percentage points at 95% confidence. Margins of error for subgroup estimates are larger, though improved and balanced through the oversampling design. The achieved (unweighted) composition is disclosed in full (**Appendix — Sample composition**) per AAPOR disclosure standards.

For the questionnaire, item order within blocks was randomized and response options were rotated (forward/reverse), holding don't know answers last. The median completion time was about 3 minutes. Respondents who skipped an item on the web or declined to answer on the phone remain in the base for every percentage, shown as their own response category.

Results are reported as response distributions, totals, and nets. Every percentage is out of all respondents, with "Not sure" and "None" answers included along with the above "no answer responses". Totals combine related response options, and a net is the percentage-point gap between two totals.

Appendix — Sample composition

Unweighted demographic composition of the achieved sample (n=1,985).

Several subgroups were oversampled by design, so their unweighted shares exceed their population shares; the report's figures are weighted to NORC's Current Population Survey benchmarks (see the methodology), which restores population proportions. **Party** is profiled by NORC, not a weighting dimension of this module's design.

Dimension	Group	n	%
Sex	Female	1110	56
	Male	875	44
Party	Dem	1010	51
	Rep	512	26
	Ind	450	23
	Unknown	13	1
Age	18–34	554	28
	35–49	551	28
	50–64	436	22
	65+	444	22
Ethnicity	White	754	38
	Black	632	32
	Hispanic	441	22
	Asian/PI	96	5
	Two or more	51	3
	Other	11	1
Education	HS or less	534	27
	Some college	741	37
	BA+	710	36
Household income	<50k	797	40
	50k-<100k	605	30
	100k+	583	29