Americans on AI — 8 November 2026

Athena Insights surveyed 1,098 US adults from November 5-8, 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 ±4.0 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. This wave does not include subgroup oversamples, so subgroup precision follows population shares; we oversample subgroups on alternating biweekly waves.

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	52 %	36 %	9 %	1 %	2 %
Inflation	73 %	19 %	4 %	1 %	2 %
AI harms	35 %	44 %	12 %	4 %	5 %
Immigration	38 %	32 %	19 %	8 %	3 %
Health care	69 %	21 %	6 %	2 %	2 %
Crime	51 %	37 %	8 %	1 %	2 %
Climate change	37 %	31 %	18 %	12 %	2 %

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	17 %
Somewhat concerned	40 %
Very concerned	28 %
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	18 %
AI is coming into our lives whether we want it or not	69 %
Neither of these are close to how I feel	12 %

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	21 %	28 %	16 %	14 %	20 %
Pressured to do more	26 %	23 %	20 %	11 %	19 %
Losing connections	34 %	25 %	16 %	9 %	16 %
Real vs. fake	54 %	25 %	10 %	3 %	6 %
Better health care	5 %	11 %	20 %	33 %	30 %

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.

Item	Making it much better	Making it somewhat better	Making it somewhat worse	Making it much worse	Having no effect	No answer
Jobs	2 %	11 %	43 %	33 %	10 %	2 %
Future	5 %	26 %	34 %	23 %	11 %	2 %
Children	3 %	17 %	34 %	29 %	15 %	3 %
Finances	4 %	26 %	23 %	15 %	30 %	3 %

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	11 %	11 %	12 %	17 %	30 %	17 %
Environment	13 %	12 %	14 %	15 %	31 %	14 %
Workers	9 %	14 %	14 %	21 %	25 %	16 %
Competitiveness	10 %	10 %	21 %	17 %	16 %	24 %

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	32 %	41 %	11 %	5 %	10 %
Loss-of-control	41 %	40 %	6 %	2 %	10 %
Breakthroughs	23 %	47 %	13 %	3 %	13 %
WMDs	21 %	50 %	10 %	2 %	16 %

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. This wave does not include subgroup oversamples, so subgroup precision follows 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)		1098	572	526
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	88 %	89 %	86 %
	TOTAL lower priority	10 %	8 %	12 %
	NET priority	77 pp	81 pp	73 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	92 %	93 %	90 %
	TOTAL lower priority	6 %	4 %	8 %
	NET priority	86 pp	89 pp	83 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	79 %	81 %	78 %
	TOTAL lower priority	16 %	13 %	18 %
	NET priority	63 pp	68 pp	59 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	70 %	72 %	67 %
	TOTAL lower priority	27 %	24 %	30 %
	NET priority	43 pp	48 pp	37 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	90 %	92 %	88 %
	TOTAL lower priority	7 %	5 %	10 %
	NET priority	83 pp	87 pp	79 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	88 %	90 %	87 %
	TOTAL lower priority	9 %	7 %	12 %
	NET priority	79 pp	83 pp	75 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	68 %	71 %	66 %
	TOTAL lower priority	30 %	27 %	33 %
	NET priority	38 pp	44 pp	32 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		1098	566	374	154
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	88 %	91 %	85 %	84 %
	TOTAL lower priority	10 %	7 %	12 %	13 %
	NET priority	77 pp	84 pp	73 pp	71 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	92 %	90 %	94 %	91 %
	TOTAL lower priority	6 %	8 %	4 %	5 %
	NET priority	86 pp	82 pp	90 pp	85 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	79 %	85 %	77 %	70 %
	TOTAL lower priority	16 %	10 %	18 %	23 %
	NET priority	63 pp	75 pp	58 pp	47 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	70 %	56 %	91 %	64 %
	TOTAL lower priority	27 %	39 %	8 %	31 %
	NET priority	43 pp	17 pp	83 pp	33 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	90 %	94 %	87 %	88 %
	TOTAL lower priority	7 %	5 %	10 %	8 %
	NET priority	83 pp	88 pp	77 pp	80 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	88 %	84 %	93 %	89 %
	TOTAL lower priority	9 %	14 %	5 %	7 %
	NET priority	79 pp	71 pp	89 pp	82 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	68 %	86 %	41 %	72 %
	TOTAL lower priority	30 %	12 %	57 %	24 %
	NET priority	38 pp	74 pp	–16 pp	48 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18–34	35–49	50–64	65+
Base (n)		1098	215	262	258	363
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	88 %	86 %	90 %	89 %	85 %
	TOTAL lower priority	10 %	11 %	7 %	10 %	12 %
	NET priority	77 pp	75 pp	83 pp	79 pp	73 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	92 %	83 %	94 %	96 %	95 %
	TOTAL lower priority	6 %	13 %	4 %	2 %	3 %
	NET priority	86 pp	70 pp	91 pp	94 pp	92 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	79 %	74 %	80 %	85 %	79 %
	TOTAL lower priority	16 %	22 %	17 %	11 %	11 %
	NET priority	63 pp	52 pp	63 pp	74 pp	68 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	70 %	52 %	72 %	75 %	83 %
	TOTAL lower priority	27 %	43 %	26 %	20 %	15 %
	NET priority	43 pp	9 pp	46 pp	55 pp	68 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	90 %	87 %	91 %	92 %	94 %
	TOTAL lower priority	7 %	11 %	7 %	6 %	4 %
	NET priority	83 pp	75 pp	83 pp	85 pp	90 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	88 %	80 %	90 %	94 %	91 %
	TOTAL lower priority	9 %	17 %	8 %	5 %	6 %
	NET priority	79 pp	64 pp	82 pp	89 pp	85 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	68 %	74 %	65 %	70 %	63 %
	TOTAL lower priority	30 %	23 %	34 %	28 %	35 %
	NET priority	38 pp	51 pp	30 pp	42 pp	29 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)		1098	722	119	143
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	88 %	88 %	89 %	84 %
	TOTAL lower priority	10 %	10 %	6 %	14 %
	NET priority	77 pp	78 pp	83 pp	69 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	92 %	94 %	88 %	89 %
	TOTAL lower priority	6 %	4 %	5 %	10 %
	NET priority	86 pp	89 pp	83 pp	78 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	79 %	82 %	69 %	76 %
	TOTAL lower priority	16 %	13 %	24 %	21 %
	NET priority	63 pp	69 pp	45 pp	54 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	70 %	72 %	65 %	65 %
	TOTAL lower priority	27 %	26 %	26 %	32 %
	NET priority	43 pp	46 pp	40 pp	32 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	90 %	92 %	86 %	91 %
	TOTAL lower priority	7 %	6 %	9 %	9 %
	NET priority	83 pp	86 pp	77 pp	82 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	88 %	90 %	88 %	84 %
	TOTAL lower priority	9 %	8 %	8 %	15 %
	NET priority	79 pp	82 pp	80 pp	69 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	68 %	64 %	79 %	78 %
	TOTAL lower priority	30 %	34 %	17 %	21 %
	NET priority	38 pp	31 pp	62 pp	57 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		1098	259	408	431
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	88 %	84 %	89 %	90 %
	TOTAL lower priority	10 %	13 %	8 %	9 %
	NET priority	77 pp	71 pp	81 pp	81 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	92 %	86 %	95 %	95 %
	TOTAL lower priority	6 %	9 %	3 %	4 %
	NET priority	86 pp	76 pp	92 pp	91 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	79 %	74 %	80 %	84 %
	TOTAL lower priority	16 %	19 %	13 %	14 %
	NET priority	63 pp	55 pp	67 pp	70 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	70 %	63 %	74 %	74 %
	TOTAL lower priority	27 %	31 %	24 %	25 %
	NET priority	43 pp	32 pp	50 pp	49 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	90 %	85 %	94 %	94 %
	TOTAL lower priority	7 %	12 %	4 %	5 %
	NET priority	83 pp	73 pp	89 pp	89 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	88 %	85 %	90 %	91 %
	TOTAL lower priority	9 %	11 %	8 %	8 %
	NET priority	79 pp	74 pp	82 pp	82 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	68 %	64 %	67 %	73 %
	TOTAL lower priority	30 %	33 %	30 %	26 %
	NET priority	38 pp	31 pp	37 pp	47 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		1098	366	368	364
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	88 %	85 %	88 %	90 %
	TOTAL lower priority	10 %	11 %	10 %	10 %
	NET priority	77 pp	74 pp	79 pp	80 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	92 %	89 %	91 %	94 %
	TOTAL lower priority	6 %	7 %	6 %	4 %
	NET priority	86 pp	83 pp	85 pp	90 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	79 %	75 %	79 %	84 %
	TOTAL lower priority	16 %	17 %	16 %	14 %
	NET priority	63 pp	58 pp	63 pp	70 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	70 %	70 %	68 %	71 %
	TOTAL lower priority	27 %	26 %	29 %	27 %
	NET priority	43 pp	44 pp	40 pp	45 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	90 %	87 %	93 %	92 %
	TOTAL lower priority	7 %	9 %	6 %	7 %
	NET priority	83 pp	78 pp	87 pp	85 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	88 %	86 %	90 %	89 %
	TOTAL lower priority	9 %	10 %	7 %	10 %
	NET priority	79 pp	76 pp	83 pp	79 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	68 %	69 %	67 %	68 %
	TOTAL lower priority	30 %	27 %	31 %	32 %
	NET priority	38 pp	42 pp	36 pp	37 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)	1098	572	526
TOTAL excited	22 %	17 %	28 %
TOTAL concerned	68 %	71 %	65 %
None of these	9 %	11 %	7 %
No answer	1 %	2 %	0 %
NET concerned	46 pp	54 pp	38 pp

By Party

Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)	1098	566	374	154
TOTAL excited	22 %	18 %	28 %	24 %
TOTAL concerned	68 %	73 %	64 %	63 %
None of these	9 %	8 %	8 %	13 %
No answer	1 %	1 %	1 %	0 %
NET concerned	46 pp	55 pp	36 pp	39 pp

By Age

Metric	Total	18–34	35–49	50–64	65+
Base (n)	1098	215	262	258	363
TOTAL excited	22 %	20 %	23 %	29 %	17 %
TOTAL concerned	68 %	66 %	70 %	66 %	71 %
None of these	9 %	11 %	7 %	5 %	11 %
No answer	1 %	2 %	0 %	<1 %	<1 %
NET concerned	46 pp	46 pp	47 pp	37 pp	54 pp

By Ethnicity

Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)	1098	722	119	143
TOTAL excited	22 %	21 %	24 %	22 %
TOTAL concerned	68 %	72 %	59 %	63 %
None of these	9 %	7 %	17 %	12 %
No answer	1 %	<1 %	0 %	4 %
NET concerned	46 pp	52 pp	35 pp	41 pp

By Education

Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)	1098	259	408	431
TOTAL excited	22 %	17 %	22 %	28 %
TOTAL concerned	68 %	67 %	71 %	68 %
None of these	9 %	15 %	7 %	4 %
No answer	1 %	2 %	<1 %	0 %
NET concerned	46 pp	50 pp	49 pp	41 pp

By Household income

Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)	1098	366	368	364
TOTAL excited	22 %	19 %	19 %	29 %
TOTAL concerned	68 %	67 %	71 %	67 %
None of these	9 %	12 %	9 %	4 %
No answer	1 %	2 %	<1 %	0 %
NET concerned	46 pp	47 pp	53 pp	38 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)	1098	572	526
TOTAL can shape	18 %	18 %	18 %
TOTAL inevitable	69 %	68 %	70 %
Neither of these	12 %	13 %	12 %
No answer	1 %	1 %	1 %
NET inevitable	51 pp	50 pp	52 pp

By Party

Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)	1098	566	374	154
TOTAL can shape	18 %	20 %	19 %	14 %
TOTAL inevitable	69 %	65 %	72 %	72 %
Neither of these	12 %	16 %	8 %	14 %
No answer	1 %	<1 %	1 %	<1 %
NET inevitable	51 pp	45 pp	54 pp	59 pp

By Age

Metric	Total	18–34	35–49	50–64	65+
Base (n)	1098	215	262	258	363
TOTAL can shape	18 %	25 %	15 %	18 %	13 %
TOTAL inevitable	69 %	60 %	71 %	74 %	73 %
Neither of these	12 %	15 %	13 %	8 %	13 %
No answer	1 %	<1 %	1 %	<1 %	1 %
NET inevitable	51 pp	35 pp	56 pp	56 pp	60 pp

By Ethnicity

Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)	1098	722	119	143
TOTAL can shape	18 %	19 %	16 %	18 %
TOTAL inevitable	69 %	70 %	66 %	66 %
Neither of these	12 %	10 %	18 %	15 %
No answer	1 %	1 %	0 %	1 %
NET inevitable	51 pp	51 pp	51 pp	47 pp

By Education

Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)	1098	259	408	431
TOTAL can shape	18 %	15 %	20 %	19 %
TOTAL inevitable	69 %	66 %	69 %	72 %
Neither of these	12 %	19 %	10 %	8 %
No answer	1 %	<1 %	1 %	<1 %
NET inevitable	51 pp	50 pp	49 pp	53 pp

By Household income

Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)	1098	366	368	364
TOTAL can shape	18 %	17 %	20 %	18 %
TOTAL inevitable	69 %	66 %	68 %	74 %
Neither of these	12 %	17 %	11 %	8 %
No answer	1 %	<1 %	1 %	1 %
NET inevitable	51 pp	49 pp	48 pp	56 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)		1098	572	526
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	43 %	54 %
	TOTAL not yet	30 %	29 %	31 %
	NET realized	18 pp	14 pp	23 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	49 %	49 %	48 %
	TOTAL not yet	31 %	28 %	34 %
	NET realized	17 pp	20 pp	14 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	59 %	58 %	59 %
	TOTAL not yet	25 %	23 %	27 %
	NET realized	34 pp	35 pp	32 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	79 %	79 %	80 %
	TOTAL not yet	13 %	13 %	14 %
	NET realized	66 pp	66 pp	66 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	16 %	14 %	19 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	51 %	55 %
	NET realized	−37 pp	−37 pp	−36 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		1098	566	374	154
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	51 %	46 %	48 %
	TOTAL not yet	30 %	32 %	27 %	31 %
	NET realized	18 pp	19 pp	19 pp	17 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	49 %	51 %	42 %	54 %
	TOTAL not yet	31 %	31 %	32 %	32 %
	NET realized	17 pp	20 pp	10 pp	23 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	59 %	61 %	54 %	61 %
	TOTAL not yet	25 %	24 %	26 %	25 %
	NET realized	34 pp	36 pp	29 pp	36 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	79 %	81 %	79 %	77 %
	TOTAL not yet	13 %	14 %	12 %	16 %
	NET realized	66 pp	67 pp	68 pp	62 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	16 %	11 %	19 %	25 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	57 %	47 %	55 %
	NET realized	−37 pp	−46 pp	−28 pp	−31 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18–34	35–49	50–64	65+
Base (n)		1098	215	262	258	363
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	58 %	49 %	51 %	34 %
	TOTAL not yet	30 %	27 %	34 %	23 %	37 %
	NET realized	18 pp	31 pp	15 pp	29 pp	–3 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	49 %	54 %	55 %	49 %	34 %
	TOTAL not yet	31 %	30 %	30 %	29 %	35 %
	NET realized	17 pp	24 pp	25 pp	20 pp	–1 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	59 %	61 %	72 %	58 %	43 %
	TOTAL not yet	25 %	25 %	18 %	23 %	32 %
	NET realized	34 pp	35 pp	54 pp	35 pp	11 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	79 %	75 %	86 %	84 %	75 %
	TOTAL not yet	13 %	18 %	10 %	9 %	15 %
	NET realized	66 pp	57 pp	75 pp	75 pp	60 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	16 %	15 %	16 %	16 %	17 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	56 %	56 %	49 %	50 %
	NET realized	–37 pp	–41 pp	–40 pp	–33 pp	–32 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)		1098	722	119	143
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	48 %	50 %	51 %
	TOTAL not yet	30 %	29 %	30 %	33 %
	NET realized	18 pp	19 pp	20 pp	18 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	49 %	48 %	50 %	47 %
	TOTAL not yet	31 %	30 %	34 %	34 %
	NET realized	17 pp	18 pp	16 pp	14 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	59 %	58 %	58 %	61 %
	TOTAL not yet	25 %	23 %	30 %	28 %
	NET realized	34 pp	35 pp	28 pp	32 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	79 %	82 %	62 %	79 %
	TOTAL not yet	13 %	10 %	28 %	15 %
	NET realized	66 pp	72 pp	35 pp	65 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	16 %	13 %	33 %	16 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	56 %	42 %	51 %
	NET realized	−37 pp	−42 pp	−9 pp	−35 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		1098	259	408	431
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	38 %	53 %	56 %
	TOTAL not yet	30 %	33 %	27 %	30 %
	NET realized	18 pp	5 pp	26 pp	26 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	49 %	44 %	47 %	54 %
	TOTAL not yet	31 %	32 %	30 %	32 %
	NET realized	17 pp	12 pp	18 pp	22 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	59 %	58 %	60 %	58 %
	TOTAL not yet	25 %	24 %	23 %	27 %
	NET realized	34 pp	34 pp	36 pp	32 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	79 %	69 %	87 %	84 %
	TOTAL not yet	13 %	18 %	7 %	13 %
	NET realized	66 pp	51 pp	80 pp	72 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	16 %	16 %	18 %	15 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	50 %	52 %	57 %
	NET realized	−37 pp	−33 pp	−34 pp	−42 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		1098	366	368	364
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	42 %	45 %	60 %
	TOTAL not yet	30 %	33 %	29 %	28 %
	NET realized	18 pp	9 pp	16 pp	31 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	49 %	44 %	46 %	57 %
	TOTAL not yet	31 %	34 %	31 %	29 %
	NET realized	17 pp	10 pp	15 pp	28 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	59 %	57 %	58 %	61 %
	TOTAL not yet	25 %	26 %	24 %	24 %
	NET realized	34 pp	31 pp	34 pp	37 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	79 %	70 %	84 %	86 %
	TOTAL not yet	13 %	21 %	8 %	10 %
	NET realized	66 pp	49 pp	76 pp	76 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	16 %	18 %	15 %	15 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	55 %	51 %	53 %
	NET realized	−37 pp	−37 pp	−35 pp	−38 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)		1098	572	526
Jobs	TOTAL better	12 %	12 %	13 %
	TOTAL worse	76 %	76 %	77 %
	NET worse	64 pp	64 pp	64 pp
Future	TOTAL better	30 %	26 %	35 %
	TOTAL worse	57 %	59 %	54 %
	NET worse	27 pp	33 pp	19 pp
Children	TOTAL better	20 %	16 %	23 %
	TOTAL worse	63 %	65 %	61 %
	NET worse	43 pp	48 pp	38 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	29 %	28 %	30 %
	TOTAL worse	38 %	39 %	38 %
	NET worse	9 pp	11 pp	8 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		1098	566	374	154
Jobs	TOTAL better	12 %	10 %	16 %	11 %
	TOTAL worse	76 %	81 %	70 %	79 %
	NET worse	64 pp	71 pp	55 pp	68 pp
Future	TOTAL better	30 %	27 %	35 %	29 %
	TOTAL worse	57 %	62 %	52 %	56 %
	NET worse	27 pp	35 pp	16 pp	27 pp
Children	TOTAL better	20 %	16 %	25 %	19 %
	TOTAL worse	63 %	69 %	57 %	60 %
	NET worse	43 pp	52 pp	32 pp	41 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	29 %	27 %	32 %	29 %
	TOTAL worse	38 %	43 %	31 %	42 %
	NET worse	9 pp	16 pp	–1 pp	12 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18–34	35–49	50–64	65+
Base (n)		1098	215	262	258	363
Jobs	TOTAL better	12 %	13 %	8 %	10 %	19 %
	TOTAL worse	76 %	73 %	86 %	79 %	68 %
	NET worse	64 pp	60 pp	78 pp	69 pp	49 pp
Future	TOTAL better	30 %	26 %	25 %	29 %	41 %
	TOTAL worse	57 %	59 %	63 %	61 %	45 %
	NET worse	27 pp	33 pp	37 pp	32 pp	4 pp
Children	TOTAL better	20 %	16 %	12 %	24 %	28 %
	TOTAL worse	63 %	63 %	75 %	60 %	53 %
	NET worse	43 pp	47 pp	63 pp	36 pp	25 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	29 %	31 %	28 %	26 %	32 %
	TOTAL worse	38 %	39 %	44 %	37 %	33 %
	NET worse	9 pp	9 pp	16 pp	11 pp	1 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)		1098	722	119	143
Jobs	TOTAL better	12 %	10 %	17 %	18 %
	TOTAL worse	76 %	81 %	65 %	67 %
	NET worse	64 pp	71 pp	48 pp	49 pp
Future	TOTAL better	30 %	29 %	38 %	31 %
	TOTAL worse	57 %	60 %	44 %	53 %
	NET worse	27 pp	31 pp	6 pp	21 pp
Children	TOTAL better	20 %	20 %	25 %	16 %
	TOTAL worse	63 %	66 %	51 %	63 %
	NET worse	43 pp	45 pp	27 pp	47 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	29 %	28 %	35 %	29 %
	TOTAL worse	38 %	39 %	33 %	47 %
	NET worse	9 pp	11 pp	−3 pp	18 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		1098	259	408	431
Jobs	TOTAL better	12 %	17 %	13 %	7 %
	TOTAL worse	76 %	68 %	75 %	85 %
	NET worse	64 pp	51 pp	62 pp	78 pp
Future	TOTAL better	30 %	27 %	35 %	30 %
	TOTAL worse	57 %	59 %	51 %	60 %
	NET worse	27 pp	32 pp	16 pp	30 pp
Children	TOTAL better	20 %	22 %	20 %	16 %
	TOTAL worse	63 %	55 %	62 %	70 %
	NET worse	43 pp	33 pp	42 pp	54 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	29 %	28 %	27 %	32 %
	TOTAL worse	38 %	41 %	37 %	36 %
	NET worse	9 pp	13 pp	10 pp	4 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		1098	366	368	364
Jobs	TOTAL better	12 %	18 %	10 %	8 %
	TOTAL worse	76 %	68 %	79 %	82 %
	NET worse	64 pp	50 pp	69 pp	74 pp
Future	TOTAL better	30 %	32 %	27 %	31 %
	TOTAL worse	57 %	50 %	63 %	59 %
	NET worse	27 pp	18 pp	35 pp	28 pp
Children	TOTAL better	20 %	22 %	17 %	20 %
	TOTAL worse	63 %	56 %	68 %	64 %
	NET worse	43 pp	34 pp	52 pp	44 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	29 %	33 %	26 %	29 %
	TOTAL worse	38 %	36 %	45 %	34 %
	NET worse	9 pp	3 pp	19 pp	6 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)		1098	572	526
Children	TOTAL too much	22 %	19 %	24 %
	TOTAL too little	48 %	50 %	45 %
	NET too little	26 pp	30 pp	21 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	24 %	22 %	27 %
	TOTAL too little	47 %	48 %	46 %
	NET too little	22 pp	26 pp	19 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	23 %	22 %	23 %
	TOTAL too little	46 %	48 %	43 %
	NET too little	23 pp	26 pp	20 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	20 %	17 %	23 %
	TOTAL too little	33 %	34 %	31 %
	NET too little	13 pp	17 pp	8 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		1098	566	374	154
Children	TOTAL too much	22 %	21 %	22 %	25 %
	TOTAL too little	48 %	56 %	40 %	41 %
	NET too little	26 pp	35 pp	19 pp	16 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	24 %	22 %	24 %	30 %
	TOTAL too little	47 %	59 %	36 %	38 %
	NET too little	22 pp	36 pp	12 pp	8 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	23 %	21 %	21 %	29 %
	TOTAL too little	46 %	56 %	35 %	39 %
	NET too little	23 pp	35 pp	14 pp	10 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	20 %	22 %	17 %	20 %
	TOTAL too little	33 %	36 %	28 %	34 %
	NET too little	13 pp	14 pp	11 pp	14 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18–34	35–49	50–64	65+
Base (n)		1098	215	262	258	363
Children	TOTAL too much	22 %	25 %	18 %	22 %	21 %
	TOTAL too little	48 %	43 %	53 %	51 %	45 %
	NET too little	26 pp	18 pp	34 pp	29 pp	23 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	24 %	31 %	23 %	19 %	23 %
	TOTAL too little	47 %	43 %	52 %	47 %	46 %
	NET too little	22 pp	12 pp	29 pp	28 pp	23 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	23 %	26 %	21 %	21 %	22 %
	TOTAL too little	46 %	44 %	50 %	45 %	44 %
	NET too little	23 pp	18 pp	29 pp	24 pp	22 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	20 %	20 %	25 %	16 %	18 %
	TOTAL too little	33 %	28 %	32 %	40 %	32 %
	NET too little	13 pp	8 pp	7 pp	24 pp	14 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)		1098	722	119	143
Children	TOTAL too much	22 %	18 %	28 %	27 %
	TOTAL too little	48 %	53 %	39 %	41 %
	NET too little	26 pp	34 pp	11 pp	14 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	24 %	20 %	36 %	30 %
	TOTAL too little	47 %	52 %	33 %	44 %
	NET too little	22 pp	31 pp	–2 pp	13 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	23 %	18 %	28 %	31 %
	TOTAL too little	46 %	51 %	37 %	40 %
	NET too little	23 pp	32 pp	9 pp	9 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	20 %	19 %	24 %	23 %
	TOTAL too little	33 %	33 %	33 %	32 %
	NET too little	13 pp	14 pp	9 pp	9 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		1098	259	408	431
Children	TOTAL too much	22 %	27 %	24 %	14 %
	TOTAL too little	48 %	35 %	45 %	62 %
	NET too little	26 pp	8 pp	20 pp	47 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	24 %	32 %	26 %	16 %
	TOTAL too little	47 %	34 %	44 %	62 %
	NET too little	22 pp	2 pp	18 pp	46 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	23 %	31 %	25 %	13 %
	TOTAL too little	46 %	36 %	41 %	59 %
	NET too little	23 pp	5 pp	16 pp	46 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	20 %	23 %	18 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	33 %	28 %	31 %	39 %
	NET too little	13 pp	5 pp	13 pp	20 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		1098	366	368	364
Children	TOTAL too much	22 %	27 %	19 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	48 %	37 %	54 %	53 %
	NET too little	26 pp	10 pp	35 pp	34 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	24 %	31 %	23 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	47 %	35 %	52 %	54 %
	NET too little	22 pp	5 pp	29 pp	35 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	23 %	29 %	21 %	17 %
	TOTAL too little	46 %	37 %	52 %	48 %
	NET too little	23 pp	8 pp	32 pp	31 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	20 %	22 %	18 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	33 %	30 %	36 %	32 %
	NET too little	13 pp	8 pp	18 pp	13 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)		1098	572	526
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	73 %	69 %	76 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	17 %	16 %
	NET likely	56 pp	53 pp	60 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	81 %	79 %	83 %
	TOTAL unlikely	9 %	8 %	10 %
	NET likely	72 pp	71 pp	73 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	70 %	64 %	75 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	18 %	14 %
	NET likely	53 pp	46 pp	61 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	71 %	66 %	75 %
	TOTAL unlikely	12 %	13 %	11 %
	NET likely	58 pp	53 pp	64 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		1098	566	374	154
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	73 %	70 %	77 %	73 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	19 %	13 %	18 %
	NET likely	56 pp	51 pp	64 pp	55 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	81 %	82 %	82 %	77 %
	TOTAL unlikely	9 %	9 %	6 %	13 %
	NET likely	72 pp	73 pp	76 pp	65 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	70 %	69 %	71 %	70 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	17 %	14 %	17 %
	NET likely	53 pp	52 pp	57 pp	53 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	71 %	74 %	72 %	63 %
	TOTAL unlikely	12 %	10 %	12 %	18 %
	NET likely	58 pp	63 pp	60 pp	45 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18–34	35–49	50–64	65+
Base (n)		1098	215	262	258	363
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	73 %	63 %	77 %	81 %	72 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	25 %	13 %	11 %	16 %
	NET likely	56 pp	38 pp	64 pp	70 pp	57 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	81 %	73 %	85 %	88 %	79 %
	TOTAL unlikely	9 %	14 %	5 %	5 %	9 %
	NET likely	72 pp	59 pp	80 pp	82 pp	70 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	70 %	60 %	71 %	75 %	75 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	25 %	17 %	10 %	11 %
	NET likely	53 pp	35 pp	54 pp	65 pp	64 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	71 %	64 %	74 %	76 %	70 %
	TOTAL unlikely	12 %	18 %	11 %	8 %	11 %
	NET likely	58 pp	46 pp	63 pp	68 pp	59 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)		1098	722	119	143
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	73 %	75 %	57 %	68 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	15 %	27 %	23 %
	NET likely	56 pp	60 pp	30 pp	45 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	81 %	86 %	62 %	73 %
	TOTAL unlikely	9 %	5 %	20 %	16 %
	NET likely	72 pp	81 pp	42 pp	57 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	70 %	73 %	59 %	59 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	14 %	20 %	24 %
	NET likely	53 pp	59 pp	39 pp	35 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	71 %	72 %	62 %	69 %
	TOTAL unlikely	12 %	11 %	17 %	16 %
	NET likely	58 pp	61 pp	45 pp	53 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		1098	259	408	431
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	73 %	70 %	79 %	71 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	18 %	12 %	18 %
	NET likely	56 pp	52 pp	67 pp	53 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	81 %	71 %	84 %	88 %
	TOTAL unlikely	9 %	14 %	6 %	6 %
	NET likely	72 pp	57 pp	78 pp	82 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	70 %	60 %	70 %	79 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	22 %	15 %	11 %
	NET likely	53 pp	38 pp	55 pp	68 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	71 %	66 %	74 %	73 %
	TOTAL unlikely	12 %	14 %	9 %	13 %
	NET likely	58 pp	52 pp	65 pp	60 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		1098	366	368	364
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	73 %	69 %	74 %	76 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	22 %	14 %	13 %
	NET likely	56 pp	47 pp	59 pp	63 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	81 %	74 %	82 %	88 %
	TOTAL unlikely	9 %	14 %	7 %	4 %
	NET likely	72 pp	59 pp	75 pp	84 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	70 %	62 %	71 %	76 %
	TOTAL unlikely	16 %	20 %	14 %	13 %
	NET likely	53 pp	42 pp	58 pp	63 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	71 %	65 %	70 %	77 %
	TOTAL unlikely	12 %	14 %	12 %	10 %
	NET likely	58 pp	51 pp	58 pp	67 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 tenth tracking wave of the **Americans on AI** survey, a project of Athena Insights.

Respondents were interviewed between November 5 and 8, 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 (95%) and by phone (5%), in English; 1,098 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 1.87 and an effective sample size of 586. This wave fields no oversamples: the achieved sample follows population shares. Standard errors are design-based (Taylor linearization over NORC's variance strata and units).

The full-sample margin of error is ±4.0 percentage points at 95% confidence. Margins of error for subgroup estimates are larger. 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=1,098).

This wave fields no oversamples, so unweighted shares approximate population shares; the report's figures are weighted to NORC's Current Population Survey benchmarks (see the methodology). **Party** is profiled by NORC, not a weighting dimension of this module's design.

Dimension	Group	n	%
Sex	Female	572	52
	Male	526	48
Party	Dem	566	52
	Rep	374	34
	Ind	154	14
	Unknown	4	0
Age	18–34	215	20
	35–49	262	24
	50–64	258	23
	65+	363	33
Ethnicity	White	722	66
	Black	119	11
	Hispanic	143	13
	Asian/PI	59	5
	Two or more	36	3
	Other	19	2
Education	HS or less	259	24
	Some college	408	37
	BA+	431	39
Household income	<50k	366	33
	50k-<100k	368	34
	100k+	364	33