



Americans on AI — 14 September 2026

Athena Insights surveyed 1,083 US adults from September 10-14, 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	48 %	39 %	9 %	2 %	2 %
Inflation	68 %	24 %	4 %	1 %	2 %
AI harms	43 %	37 %	13 %	4 %	3 %
Immigration	36 %	34 %	18 %	8 %	3 %
Health care	70 %	22 %	4 %	1 %	1 %
Crime	51 %	38 %	6 %	2 %	2 %
Climate change	36 %	32 %	17 %	13 %	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	5 %
Somewhat excited	17 %
Somewhat concerned	35 %
Very concerned	34 %
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	17 %
AI is coming into our lives whether we want it or not	68 %
Neither of these are close to how I feel	14 %

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 %	15 %	15 %	19 %
Pressured to do more	23 %	26 %	22 %	9 %	19 %
Losing connections	33 %	28 %	15 %	9 %	15 %
Real vs. fake	57 %	24 %	9 %	2 %	7 %
Better health care	5 %	14 %	20 %	33 %	28 %

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 %	12 %	40 %	35 %	9 %	2 %
Future	4 %	26 %	35 %	24 %	8 %	2 %
Children	4 %	17 %	33 %	31 %	12 %	3 %
Finances	4 %	24 %	27 %	14 %	27 %	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	12 %	13 %	11 %	19 %	30 %	13 %
Environment	13 %	12 %	14 %	16 %	33 %	12 %
Workers	12 %	12 %	17 %	19 %	26 %	13 %
Competitiveness	10 %	14 %	19 %	18 %	17 %	21 %

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 %	40 %	13 %	4 %	10 %
Loss-of-control	39 %	40 %	7 %	2 %	10 %
Breakthroughs	23 %	47 %	11 %	3 %	14 %
WMDs	20 %	51 %	8 %	3 %	15 %

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)		1083	558	525
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	86 %	88 %	85 %
	TOTAL lower priority	11 %	9 %	12 %
	NET priority	76 pp	79 pp	73 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	92 %	95 %	89 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	3 %	7 %
	NET priority	87 pp	91 pp	83 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	80 %	84 %	76 %
	TOTAL lower priority	16 %	13 %	20 %
	NET priority	64 pp	71 pp	57 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	70 %	70 %	69 %
	TOTAL lower priority	26 %	26 %	26 %
	NET priority	44 pp	45 pp	43 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	92 %	94 %	90 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	3 %	7 %
	NET priority	87 pp	91 pp	83 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	89 %	90 %	88 %
	TOTAL lower priority	8 %	7 %	9 %
	NET priority	81 pp	83 pp	78 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	67 %	73 %	61 %
	TOTAL lower priority	29 %	23 %	36 %
	NET priority	38 pp	51 pp	25 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		1083	529	356	193
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	86 %	91 %	84 %	84 %
	TOTAL lower priority	11 %	8 %	14 %	10 %
	NET priority	76 pp	82 pp	70 pp	75 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	92 %	95 %	91 %	91 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	4 %	7 %	3 %
	NET priority	87 pp	91 pp	83 pp	87 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	80 %	87 %	75 %	76 %
	TOTAL lower priority	16 %	12 %	22 %	16 %
	NET priority	64 pp	75 pp	53 pp	60 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	70 %	57 %	85 %	67 %
	TOTAL lower priority	26 %	41 %	11 %	23 %
	NET priority	44 pp	16 pp	74 pp	44 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	92 %	99 %	89 %	85 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	<1 %	9 %	6 %
	NET priority	87 pp	98 pp	80 pp	79 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	89 %	90 %	89 %	89 %
	TOTAL lower priority	8 %	10 %	8 %	6 %
	NET priority	81 pp	80 pp	81 pp	83 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	67 %	91 %	39 %	73 %
	TOTAL lower priority	29 %	9 %	57 %	20 %
	NET priority	38 pp	82 pp	-18 pp	53 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Base (n)		1083	203	274	266	340
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	86 %	87 %	83 %	90 %	86 %
	TOTAL lower priority	11 %	10 %	11 %	9 %	13 %
	NET priority	76 pp	77 pp	72 pp	81 pp	73 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	92 %	85 %	94 %	96 %	96 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	11 %	1 %	3 %	4 %
	NET priority	87 pp	74 pp	92 pp	93 pp	92 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	80 %	77 %	75 %	86 %	84 %
	TOTAL lower priority	16 %	20 %	20 %	12 %	12 %
	NET priority	64 pp	57 pp	55 pp	75 pp	71 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	70 %	62 %	63 %	81 %	77 %
	TOTAL lower priority	26 %	33 %	32 %	18 %	19 %
	NET priority	44 pp	29 pp	31 pp	63 pp	58 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	92 %	87 %	89 %	95 %	98 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	7 %	6 %	4 %	2 %
	NET priority	87 pp	79 pp	83 pp	91 pp	96 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	89 %	82 %	85 %	95 %	96 %
	TOTAL lower priority	8 %	14 %	11 %	4 %	3 %
	NET priority	81 pp	69 pp	74 pp	91 pp	92 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	67 %	72 %	66 %	62 %	69 %
	TOTAL lower priority	29 %	24 %	29 %	38 %	28 %
	NET priority	38 pp	48 pp	37 pp	24 pp	41 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)		1083	682	122	147
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	86 %	87 %	85 %	84 %
	TOTAL lower priority	11 %	11 %	7 %	13 %
	NET priority	76 pp	77 pp	78 pp	71 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	92 %	94 %	85 %	94 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	5 %	5 %	6 %
	NET priority	87 pp	89 pp	79 pp	88 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	80 %	80 %	76 %	84 %
	TOTAL lower priority	16 %	18 %	13 %	12 %
	NET priority	64 pp	62 pp	63 pp	72 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	70 %	69 %	63 %	74 %
	TOTAL lower priority	26 %	28 %	23 %	23 %
	NET priority	44 pp	41 pp	41 pp	52 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	92 %	94 %	86 %	91 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	5 %	7 %	4 %
	NET priority	87 pp	89 pp	79 pp	87 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	89 %	90 %	87 %	90 %
	TOTAL lower priority	8 %	8 %	7 %	6 %
	NET priority	81 pp	82 pp	80 pp	83 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	67 %	63 %	70 %	75 %
	TOTAL lower priority	29 %	35 %	21 %	23 %
	NET priority	38 pp	28 pp	50 pp	52 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		1083	235	394	454
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	86 %	88 %	85 %	86 %
	TOTAL lower priority	11 %	9 %	11 %	12 %
	NET priority	76 pp	78 pp	74 pp	74 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	92 %	90 %	92 %	95 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	6 %	5 %	4 %
	NET priority	87 pp	84 pp	87 pp	91 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	80 %	76 %	83 %	83 %
	TOTAL lower priority	16 %	21 %	11 %	15 %
	NET priority	64 pp	55 pp	71 pp	67 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	70 %	70 %	73 %	68 %
	TOTAL lower priority	26 %	23 %	22 %	31 %
	NET priority	44 pp	47 pp	51 pp	37 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	92 %	90 %	93 %	93 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	5 %	4 %	6 %
	NET priority	87 pp	85 pp	89 pp	88 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	89 %	87 %	91 %	89 %
	TOTAL lower priority	8 %	10 %	4 %	9 %
	NET priority	81 pp	77 pp	87 pp	80 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	67 %	63 %	63 %	75 %
	TOTAL lower priority	29 %	33 %	32 %	24 %
	NET priority	38 pp	30 pp	31 pp	51 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		1083	345	339	399
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	86 %	86 %	88 %	86 %
	TOTAL lower priority	11 %	10 %	9 %	12 %
	NET priority	76 pp	75 pp	79 pp	74 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	92 %	91 %	92 %	93 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	5 %	6 %	4 %
	NET priority	87 pp	86 pp	87 pp	89 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	80 %	78 %	83 %	80 %
	TOTAL lower priority	16 %	18 %	14 %	16 %
	NET priority	64 pp	60 pp	69 pp	64 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	70 %	71 %	70 %	69 %
	TOTAL lower priority	26 %	24 %	26 %	28 %
	NET priority	44 pp	47 pp	44 pp	41 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	92 %	93 %	92 %	91 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	4 %	7 %	5 %
	NET priority	87 pp	89 pp	85 pp	87 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	89 %	89 %	91 %	87 %
	TOTAL lower priority	8 %	7 %	6 %	12 %
	NET priority	81 pp	83 pp	85 pp	75 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	67 %	67 %	69 %	66 %
	TOTAL lower priority	29 %	29 %	27 %	31 %
	NET priority	38 pp	39 pp	42 pp	35 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)	1083	558	525
TOTAL excited	21 %	14 %	30 %
TOTAL concerned	69 %	76 %	62 %
None of these	9 %	11 %	7 %
No answer	1 %	0 %	1 %
NET concerned	47 pp	62 pp	32 pp

By Party

Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)	1083	529	356	193
TOTAL excited	21 %	13 %	29 %	22 %
TOTAL concerned	69 %	80 %	63 %	57 %
None of these	9 %	6 %	7 %	20 %
No answer	1 %	<1 %	1 %	1 %
NET concerned	47 pp	67 pp	34 pp	35 pp

By Age

Metric	Total	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Base (n)	1083	203	274	266	340
TOTAL excited	21 %	25 %	26 %	17 %	16 %
TOTAL concerned	69 %	61 %	66 %	74 %	76 %
None of these	9 %	12 %	7 %	9 %	7 %
No answer	1 %	2 %	1 %	0 %	<1 %
NET concerned	47 pp	35 pp	39 pp	58 pp	60 pp

By Ethnicity

Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)	1083	682	122	147
TOTAL excited	21 %	18 %	28 %	22 %
TOTAL concerned	69 %	74 %	62 %	64 %
None of these	9 %	9 %	8 %	14 %
No answer	1 %	0 %	2 %	0 %
NET concerned	47 pp	56 pp	34 pp	41 pp

By Education

Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)	1083	235	394	454
TOTAL excited	21 %	20 %	20 %	24 %
TOTAL concerned	69 %	63 %	71 %	73 %
None of these	9 %	15 %	10 %	3 %
No answer	1 %	1 %	<1 %	<1 %
NET concerned	47 pp	42 pp	51 pp	50 pp

By Household income

Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)	1083	345	339	399
TOTAL excited	21 %	20 %	20 %	24 %
TOTAL concerned	69 %	65 %	72 %	70 %
None of these	9 %	15 %	7 %	5 %
No answer	1 %	1 %	0 %	1 %
NET concerned	47 pp	46 pp	52 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)	1083	558	525
TOTAL can shape	17 %	16 %	19 %
TOTAL inevitable	68 %	69 %	66 %
Neither of these	14 %	15 %	13 %
No answer	1 %	1 %	1 %
NET inevitable	50 pp	53 pp	47 pp

By Party

Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)	1083	529	356	193
TOTAL can shape	17 %	17 %	18 %	17 %
TOTAL inevitable	68 %	70 %	69 %	61 %
Neither of these	14 %	12 %	12 %	21 %
No answer	1 %	1 %	1 %	1 %
NET inevitable	50 pp	53 pp	51 pp	43 pp

By Age

Metric	Total	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Base (n)	1083	203	274	266	340
TOTAL can shape	17 %	27 %	23 %	10 %	8 %
TOTAL inevitable	68 %	58 %	63 %	77 %	74 %
Neither of these	14 %	13 %	13 %	12 %	18 %
No answer	1 %	2 %	1 %	0 %	<1 %
NET inevitable	50 pp	32 pp	40 pp	67 pp	65 pp

By Ethnicity

Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)	1083	682	122	147
TOTAL can shape	17 %	15 %	24 %	18 %
TOTAL inevitable	68 %	71 %	52 %	69 %
Neither of these	14 %	14 %	21 %	13 %
No answer	1 %	<1 %	3 %	0 %
NET inevitable	50 pp	55 pp	28 pp	52 pp

By Education

Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)	1083	235	394	454
TOTAL can shape	17 %	20 %	12 %	19 %
TOTAL inevitable	68 %	56 %	73 %	75 %
Neither of these	14 %	22 %	14 %	6 %
No answer	1 %	2 %	1 %	<1 %
NET inevitable	50 pp	37 pp	61 pp	56 pp

By Household income

Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)	1083	345	339	399
TOTAL can shape	17 %	15 %	16 %	21 %
TOTAL inevitable	68 %	65 %	66 %	71 %
Neither of these	14 %	19 %	17 %	6 %
No answer	1 %	1 %	0 %	2 %
NET inevitable	50 pp	50 pp	50 pp	50 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)		1083	558	525
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	46 %	52 %
	TOTAL not yet	30 %	29 %	30 %
	NET realized	19 pp	16 pp	22 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	49 %	53 %	45 %
	TOTAL not yet	30 %	26 %	35 %
	NET realized	19 pp	27 pp	10 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	61 %	66 %	55 %
	TOTAL not yet	23 %	19 %	28 %
	NET realized	37 pp	47 pp	27 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	82 %	84 %	79 %
	TOTAL not yet	11 %	9 %	12 %
	NET realized	71 pp	75 pp	67 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	18 %	19 %	18 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	51 %	56 %
	NET realized	-35 pp	-32 pp	-38 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		1083	529	356	193
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	50 %	49 %	49 %
	TOTAL not yet	30 %	31 %	30 %	26 %
	NET realized	19 pp	19 pp	19 pp	22 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	49 %	56 %	46 %	42 %
	TOTAL not yet	30 %	28 %	34 %	30 %
	NET realized	19 pp	29 pp	12 pp	13 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	61 %	62 %	59 %	59 %
	TOTAL not yet	23 %	24 %	27 %	17 %
	NET realized	37 pp	39 pp	32 pp	43 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	82 %	87 %	82 %	70 %
	TOTAL not yet	11 %	11 %	10 %	13 %
	NET realized	71 pp	76 pp	73 pp	58 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	18 %	18 %	23 %	12 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	58 %	52 %	47 %
	NET realized	-35 pp	-40 pp	-29 pp	-36 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Base (n)		1083	203	274	266	340
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	59 %	51 %	49 %	34 %
	TOTAL not yet	30 %	26 %	30 %	27 %	37 %
	NET realized	19 pp	33 pp	21 pp	23 pp	-3 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	49 %	52 %	55 %	45 %	43 %
	TOTAL not yet	30 %	31 %	31 %	27 %	31 %
	NET realized	19 pp	20 pp	24 pp	18 pp	12 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	61 %	62 %	63 %	60 %	56 %
	TOTAL not yet	23 %	24 %	22 %	20 %	27 %
	NET realized	37 pp	39 pp	42 pp	40 pp	29 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	82 %	82 %	79 %	84 %	81 %
	TOTAL not yet	11 %	12 %	12 %	7 %	12 %
	NET realized	71 pp	70 pp	67 pp	78 pp	69 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	18 %	18 %	17 %	19 %	20 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	58 %	58 %	47 %	47 %
	NET realized	-35 pp	-41 pp	-41 pp	-28 pp	-27 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)		1083	682	122	147
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	46 %	45 %	49 %
	TOTAL not yet	30 %	32 %	33 %	26 %
	NET realized	19 pp	14 pp	12 pp	23 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	49 %	47 %	44 %	56 %
	TOTAL not yet	30 %	32 %	25 %	28 %
	NET realized	19 pp	15 pp	19 pp	28 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	61 %	61 %	47 %	65 %
	TOTAL not yet	23 %	23 %	26 %	22 %
	NET realized	37 pp	38 pp	21 pp	43 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	82 %	85 %	65 %	81 %
	TOTAL not yet	11 %	9 %	18 %	11 %
	NET realized	71 pp	77 pp	47 pp	70 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	18 %	17 %	27 %	17 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	54 %	42 %	58 %
	NET realized	-35 pp	-37 pp	-14 pp	-40 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		1083	235	394	454
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	42 %	41 %	61 %
	TOTAL not yet	30 %	30 %	30 %	29 %
	NET realized	19 pp	12 pp	11 pp	32 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	49 %	45 %	44 %	57 %
	TOTAL not yet	30 %	33 %	30 %	28 %
	NET realized	19 pp	12 pp	14 pp	29 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	61 %	55 %	62 %	65 %
	TOTAL not yet	23 %	28 %	17 %	23 %
	NET realized	37 pp	27 pp	45 pp	42 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	82 %	73 %	81 %	90 %
	TOTAL not yet	11 %	16 %	9 %	6 %
	NET realized	71 pp	57 pp	71 pp	84 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	18 %	19 %	18 %	18 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	50 %	53 %	56 %
	NET realized	-35 pp	-32 pp	-34 pp	-38 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		1083	345	339	399
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	37 %	49 %	61 %
	TOTAL not yet	30 %	33 %	31 %	25 %
	NET realized	19 pp	4 pp	18 pp	36 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	49 %	41 %	51 %	56 %
	TOTAL not yet	30 %	30 %	34 %	28 %
	NET realized	19 pp	11 pp	17 pp	28 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	61 %	55 %	62 %	65 %
	TOTAL not yet	23 %	24 %	25 %	21 %
	NET realized	37 pp	31 pp	37 pp	44 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	82 %	73 %	83 %	89 %
	TOTAL not yet	11 %	14 %	11 %	6 %
	NET realized	71 pp	59 pp	72 pp	83 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	18 %	19 %	16 %	20 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	47 %	56 %	57 %
	NET realized	-35 pp	-27 pp	-40 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)		1083	558	525
Jobs	TOTAL better	14 %	11 %	17 %
	TOTAL worse	75 %	80 %	71 %
	NET worse	61 pp	68 pp	54 pp
Future	TOTAL better	30 %	24 %	37 %
	TOTAL worse	59 %	67 %	50 %
	NET worse	29 pp	43 pp	13 pp
Children	TOTAL better	21 %	17 %	26 %
	TOTAL worse	64 %	68 %	59 %
	NET worse	42 pp	51 pp	33 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	28 %	24 %	33 %
	TOTAL worse	42 %	47 %	36 %
	NET worse	14 pp	23 pp	3 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		1083	529	356	193
Jobs	TOTAL better	14 %	10 %	18 %	14 %
	TOTAL worse	75 %	85 %	69 %	69 %
	NET worse	61 pp	75 pp	51 pp	54 pp
Future	TOTAL better	30 %	28 %	38 %	22 %
	TOTAL worse	59 %	66 %	53 %	56 %
	NET worse	29 pp	38 pp	15 pp	34 pp
Children	TOTAL better	21 %	20 %	25 %	18 %
	TOTAL worse	64 %	72 %	59 %	57 %
	NET worse	42 pp	52 pp	33 pp	39 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	28 %	29 %	32 %	21 %
	TOTAL worse	42 %	45 %	36 %	45 %
	NET worse	14 pp	16 pp	5 pp	23 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Base (n)		1083	203	274	266	340
Jobs	TOTAL better	14 %	12 %	17 %	12 %	16 %
	TOTAL worse	75 %	73 %	72 %	80 %	77 %
	NET worse	61 pp	61 pp	56 pp	68 pp	61 pp
Future	TOTAL better	30 %	23 %	30 %	35 %	36 %
	TOTAL worse	59 %	64 %	57 %	56 %	57 %
	NET worse	29 pp	41 pp	27 pp	21 pp	21 pp
Children	TOTAL better	21 %	17 %	18 %	24 %	27 %
	TOTAL worse	64 %	64 %	65 %	66 %	60 %
	NET worse	42 pp	47 pp	47 pp	42 pp	33 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	28 %	24 %	26 %	35 %	28 %
	TOTAL worse	42 %	44 %	41 %	34 %	46 %
	NET worse	14 pp	20 pp	15 pp	-1 pp	18 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)		1083	682	122	147
Jobs	TOTAL better	14 %	12 %	28 %	14 %
	TOTAL worse	75 %	78 %	52 %	76 %
	NET worse	61 pp	66 pp	24 pp	62 pp
Future	TOTAL better	30 %	29 %	32 %	28 %
	TOTAL worse	59 %	61 %	49 %	64 %
	NET worse	29 pp	31 pp	17 pp	36 pp
Children	TOTAL better	21 %	20 %	32 %	21 %
	TOTAL worse	64 %	66 %	50 %	60 %
	NET worse	42 pp	46 pp	18 pp	39 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	28 %	27 %	30 %	25 %
	TOTAL worse	42 %	43 %	41 %	42 %
	NET worse	14 pp	16 pp	11 pp	17 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		1083	235	394	454
Jobs	TOTAL better	14 %	20 %	11 %	11 %
	TOTAL worse	75 %	66 %	76 %	84 %
	NET worse	61 pp	46 pp	66 pp	73 pp
Future	TOTAL better	30 %	31 %	28 %	31 %
	TOTAL worse	59 %	56 %	61 %	61 %
	NET worse	29 pp	24 pp	34 pp	29 pp
Children	TOTAL better	21 %	27 %	17 %	18 %
	TOTAL worse	64 %	56 %	66 %	69 %
	NET worse	42 pp	29 pp	49 pp	51 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	28 %	27 %	22 %	34 %
	TOTAL worse	42 %	46 %	43 %	37 %
	NET worse	14 pp	19 pp	21 pp	3 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		1083	345	339	399
Jobs	TOTAL better	14 %	22 %	7 %	11 %
	TOTAL worse	75 %	63 %	85 %	80 %
	NET worse	61 pp	41 pp	78 pp	69 pp
Future	TOTAL better	30 %	30 %	23 %	36 %
	TOTAL worse	59 %	56 %	68 %	55 %
	NET worse	29 pp	26 pp	45 pp	18 pp
Children	TOTAL better	21 %	24 %	15 %	23 %
	TOTAL worse	64 %	57 %	71 %	64 %
	NET worse	42 pp	33 pp	56 pp	41 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	28 %	26 %	20 %	37 %
	TOTAL worse	42 %	48 %	44 %	33 %
	NET worse	14 pp	22 pp	24 pp	-4 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)		1083	558	525
Children	TOTAL too much	25 %	27 %	22 %
	TOTAL too little	50 %	50 %	49 %
	NET too little	25 pp	23 pp	27 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	25 %	28 %	21 %
	TOTAL too little	48 %	49 %	48 %
	NET too little	24 pp	21 pp	27 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	24 %	27 %	22 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	47 %	42 %
	NET too little	20 pp	20 pp	20 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	24 %	28 %	20 %
	TOTAL too little	35 %	33 %	37 %
	NET too little	11 pp	5 pp	17 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		1083	529	356	193
Children	TOTAL too much	25 %	24 %	25 %	27 %
	TOTAL too little	50 %	61 %	42 %	41 %
	NET too little	25 pp	38 pp	16 pp	14 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	25 %	24 %	27 %	21 %
	TOTAL too little	48 %	63 %	38 %	40 %
	NET too little	24 pp	38 pp	10 pp	19 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	24 %	25 %	26 %	22 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	58 %	35 %	36 %
	NET too little	20 pp	33 pp	9 pp	14 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	24 %	26 %	23 %	22 %
	TOTAL too little	35 %	46 %	27 %	28 %
	NET too little	11 pp	20 pp	4 pp	6 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Base (n)		1083	203	274	266	340
Children	TOTAL too much	25 %	29 %	26 %	19 %	24 %
	TOTAL too little	50 %	52 %	45 %	50 %	52 %
	NET too little	25 pp	22 pp	19 pp	31 pp	28 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	25 %	28 %	22 %	20 %	28 %
	TOTAL too little	48 %	47 %	47 %	52 %	48 %
	NET too little	24 pp	19 pp	25 pp	32 pp	20 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	24 %	29 %	26 %	18 %	23 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	37 %	43 %	49 %	51 %
	NET too little	20 pp	8 pp	17 pp	31 pp	28 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	24 %	29 %	27 %	19 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	35 %	31 %	27 %	40 %	42 %
	NET too little	11 pp	1 pp	0 pp	22 pp	23 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)		1083	682	122	147
Children	TOTAL too much	25 %	22 %	35 %	30 %
	TOTAL too little	50 %	52 %	30 %	49 %
	NET too little	25 pp	30 pp	-5 pp	19 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	25 %	23 %	28 %	32 %
	TOTAL too little	48 %	54 %	24 %	43 %
	NET too little	24 pp	31 pp	-4 pp	10 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	24 %	21 %	36 %	29 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	50 %	22 %	40 %
	NET too little	20 pp	29 pp	-13 pp	11 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	24 %	22 %	28 %	27 %
	TOTAL too little	35 %	36 %	28 %	36 %
	NET too little	11 pp	13 pp	0 pp	9 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		1083	235	394	454
Children	TOTAL too much	25 %	29 %	27 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	50 %	42 %	44 %	62 %
	NET too little	25 pp	13 pp	17 pp	43 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	25 %	28 %	28 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	48 %	41 %	42 %	61 %
	NET too little	24 pp	13 pp	14 pp	41 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	24 %	30 %	27 %	17 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	36 %	42 %	55 %
	NET too little	20 pp	6 pp	15 pp	38 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	24 %	28 %	26 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	35 %	32 %	32 %	40 %
	NET too little	11 pp	4 pp	6 pp	21 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		1083	345	339	399
Children	TOTAL too much	25 %	33 %	22 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	50 %	36 %	57 %	58 %
	NET too little	25 pp	4 pp	35 pp	39 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	25 %	31 %	23 %	20 %
	TOTAL too little	48 %	37 %	52 %	57 %
	NET too little	24 pp	6 pp	29 pp	38 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	24 %	31 %	25 %	16 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	36 %	49 %	50 %
	NET too little	20 pp	5 pp	23 pp	34 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	24 %	30 %	22 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	35 %	28 %	40 %	38 %
	NET too little	11 pp	-2 pp	18 pp	19 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)		1083	558	525
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	72 %	70 %	74 %
	TOTAL unlikely	17 %	17 %	17 %
	NET likely	55 pp	53 pp	57 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	78 %	79 %	78 %
	TOTAL unlikely	10 %	9 %	10 %
	NET likely	69 pp	70 pp	67 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	70 %	63 %	77 %
	TOTAL unlikely	14 %	17 %	11 %
	NET likely	55 pp	46 pp	65 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	71 %	72 %	70 %
	TOTAL unlikely	12 %	10 %	14 %
	NET likely	60 pp	62 pp	57 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		1083	529	356	193
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	72 %	75 %	78 %	57 %
	TOTAL unlikely	17 %	18 %	13 %	20 %
	NET likely	55 pp	56 pp	64 pp	37 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	78 %	87 %	76 %	66 %
	TOTAL unlikely	10 %	7 %	11 %	13 %
	NET likely	69 pp	81 pp	65 pp	53 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	70 %	75 %	74 %	53 %
	TOTAL unlikely	14 %	11 %	14 %	22 %
	NET likely	55 pp	63 pp	60 pp	31 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	71 %	78 %	74 %	54 %
	TOTAL unlikely	12 %	9 %	12 %	16 %
	NET likely	60 pp	68 pp	62 pp	38 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Base (n)		1083	203	274	266	340
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	72 %	59 %	70 %	79 %	83 %
	TOTAL unlikely	17 %	27 %	17 %	10 %	11 %
	NET likely	55 pp	32 pp	53 pp	68 pp	72 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	78 %	68 %	78 %	84 %	86 %
	TOTAL unlikely	10 %	17 %	9 %	7 %	4 %
	NET likely	69 pp	51 pp	69 pp	77 pp	82 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	70 %	60 %	65 %	80 %	76 %
	TOTAL unlikely	14 %	21 %	14 %	10 %	11 %
	NET likely	55 pp	39 pp	51 pp	70 pp	65 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	71 %	60 %	70 %	77 %	80 %
	TOTAL unlikely	12 %	19 %	13 %	8 %	5 %
	NET likely	60 pp	41 pp	57 pp	69 pp	75 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)		1083	682	122	147
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	72 %	74 %	60 %	72 %
	TOTAL unlikely	17 %	17 %	17 %	17 %
	NET likely	55 pp	57 pp	43 pp	55 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	78 %	83 %	55 %	77 %
	TOTAL unlikely	10 %	7 %	18 %	12 %
	NET likely	69 pp	76 pp	37 pp	65 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	70 %	71 %	62 %	67 %
	TOTAL unlikely	14 %	16 %	12 %	16 %
	NET likely	55 pp	55 pp	51 pp	51 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	71 %	74 %	60 %	68 %
	TOTAL unlikely	12 %	11 %	9 %	15 %
	NET likely	60 pp	62 pp	51 pp	53 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		1083	235	394	454
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	72 %	66 %	75 %	75 %
	TOTAL unlikely	17 %	20 %	10 %	18 %
	NET likely	55 pp	46 pp	65 pp	57 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	78 %	71 %	79 %	84 %
	TOTAL unlikely	10 %	15 %	6 %	7 %
	NET likely	69 pp	56 pp	74 pp	77 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	70 %	65 %	67 %	77 %
	TOTAL unlikely	14 %	17 %	12 %	14 %
	NET likely	55 pp	48 pp	55 pp	63 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	71 %	65 %	74 %	75 %
	TOTAL unlikely	12 %	16 %	8 %	10 %
	NET likely	60 pp	50 pp	66 pp	65 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		1083	345	339	399
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	72 %	69 %	71 %	75 %
	TOTAL unlikely	17 %	13 %	21 %	17 %
	NET likely	55 pp	56 pp	51 pp	58 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	78 %	76 %	78 %	82 %
	TOTAL unlikely	10 %	9 %	12 %	9 %
	NET likely	69 pp	67 pp	66 pp	73 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	70 %	67 %	66 %	76 %
	TOTAL unlikely	14 %	12 %	18 %	14 %
	NET likely	55 pp	55 pp	48 pp	61 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	71 %	69 %	73 %	72 %
	TOTAL unlikely	12 %	11 %	10 %	13 %
	NET likely	60 pp	58 pp	63 pp	59 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 sixth tracking wave of the **Americans on AI** survey, a project of Athena Insights.

Respondents were interviewed between September 10 and 14, 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; 1,083 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 1.85 and an effective sample size of 585. 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=1,083).

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	558	52
	Male	525	48
Party	Dem	529	49
	Rep	356	33
	Ind	193	18
	Unknown	5	0
Age	18-34	203	19
	35-49	274	25
	50-64	266	25
	65+	340	31
Ethnicity	White	682	63
	Black	122	11
	Hispanic	147	14
	Asian/PI	94	9
	Two or more	29	3
	Other	9	1
Education	HS or less	235	22
	Some college	394	36
	BA+	454	42
Household income	<50k	345	32
	50k-<100k	339	31
	100k+	399	37