



Americans on AI — 28 September 2026

Athena Insights surveyed 2,410 US adults from September 24-28, 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 ± 2.6 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	52 %	35 %	7 %	2 %	3 %
Inflation	71 %	20 %	4 %	1 %	3 %
AI harms	43 %	38 %	11 %	3 %	4 %
Immigration	39 %	35 %	15 %	7 %	4 %
Health care	68 %	22 %	4 %	2 %	3 %
Crime	52 %	34 %	7 %	3 %	3 %
Climate change	36 %	32 %	15 %	12 %	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	5 %
Somewhat excited	15 %
Somewhat concerned	38 %
Very concerned	31 %
None of these are close to how I feel	10 %

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	13 %
AI is coming into our lives whether we want it or not	71 %
Neither of these are close to how I feel	15 %

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 %	14 %	14 %	22 %
Pressured to do more	25 %	25 %	19 %	8 %	23 %
Losing connections	35 %	24 %	16 %	9 %	16 %
Real vs. fake	55 %	23 %	8 %	4 %	9 %
Better health care	6 %	12 %	18 %	35 %	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.

Item	Making it much better	Making it somewhat better	Making it somewhat worse	Making it much worse	Having no effect	No answer
Jobs	3 %	9 %	42 %	34 %	11 %	2 %
Future	5 %	25 %	32 %	25 %	11 %	2 %
Children	3 %	13 %	34 %	33 %	15 %	3 %
Finances	4 %	20 %	28 %	17 %	29 %	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 %	11 %	12 %	17 %	28 %	18 %
Environment	13 %	10 %	15 %	14 %	29 %	16 %
Workers	10 %	12 %	16 %	20 %	23 %	17 %
Competitiveness	9 %	12 %	22 %	17 %	14 %	25 %

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 %	39 %	10 %	5 %	13 %
Loss-of-control	42 %	37 %	5 %	2 %	13 %
Breakthroughs	20 %	47 %	11 %	4 %	17 %
WMDs	19 %	50 %	9 %	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)		2410	1291	1119
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	87 %	89 %	84 %
	TOTAL lower priority	9 %	6 %	11 %
	NET priority	78 pp	83 pp	73 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	91 %	92 %	90 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	4 %	6 %
	NET priority	86 pp	88 pp	85 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	81 %	84 %	77 %
	TOTAL lower priority	14 %	11 %	18 %
	NET priority	66 pp	74 pp	59 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	73 %	74 %	72 %
	TOTAL lower priority	22 %	21 %	24 %
	NET priority	51 pp	53 pp	49 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	91 %	92 %	89 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	4 %	7 %
	NET priority	85 pp	88 pp	83 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	86 %	89 %	84 %
	TOTAL lower priority	10 %	7 %	13 %
	NET priority	77 pp	81 pp	72 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	68 %	72 %	63 %
	TOTAL lower priority	27 %	22 %	33 %
	NET priority	41 pp	50 pp	30 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		2410	1263	695	450
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	87 %	92 %	86 %	78 %
	TOTAL lower priority	9 %	6 %	10 %	11 %
	NET priority	78 pp	86 pp	76 pp	67 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	91 %	95 %	93 %	81 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	3 %	5 %	6 %
	NET priority	86 pp	91 pp	88 pp	75 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	81 %	88 %	80 %	67 %
	TOTAL lower priority	14 %	10 %	17 %	19 %
	NET priority	66 pp	79 pp	63 pp	49 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	73 %	64 %	89 %	66 %
	TOTAL lower priority	22 %	34 %	9 %	21 %
	NET priority	51 pp	30 pp	80 pp	45 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	91 %	96 %	91 %	81 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	3 %	8 %	6 %
	NET priority	85 pp	93 pp	83 pp	75 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	86 %	85 %	93 %	79 %
	TOTAL lower priority	10 %	14 %	4 %	10 %
	NET priority	77 pp	71 pp	89 pp	69 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	68 %	89 %	45 %	64 %
	TOTAL lower priority	27 %	8 %	53 %	22 %
	NET priority	41 pp	81 pp	-9 pp	41 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Base (n)		2410	555	654	579	622
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	87 %	82 %	89 %	87 %	90 %
	TOTAL lower priority	9 %	12 %	7 %	9 %	7 %
	NET priority	78 pp	70 pp	82 pp	78 pp	83 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	91 %	87 %	90 %	92 %	95 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	7 %	5 %	4 %	3 %
	NET priority	86 pp	80 pp	85 pp	88 pp	93 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	81 %	75 %	79 %	82 %	87 %
	TOTAL lower priority	14 %	18 %	14 %	14 %	10 %
	NET priority	66 pp	57 pp	66 pp	68 pp	77 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	73 %	62 %	69 %	79 %	85 %
	TOTAL lower priority	22 %	30 %	26 %	18 %	13 %
	NET priority	51 pp	32 pp	43 pp	61 pp	72 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	91 %	86 %	89 %	93 %	96 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	8 %	6 %	5 %	3 %
	NET priority	85 pp	78 pp	82 pp	88 pp	94 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	86 %	81 %	83 %	88 %	94 %
	TOTAL lower priority	10 %	14 %	11 %	8 %	5 %
	NET priority	77 pp	67 pp	72 pp	80 pp	90 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	68 %	72 %	68 %	61 %	70 %
	TOTAL lower priority	27 %	21 %	27 %	34 %	28 %
	NET priority	41 pp	51 pp	41 pp	27 pp	41 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/PI
Base (n)		2410	1218	447	478	171
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	87 %	88 %	84 %	85 %	86 %
	TOTAL lower priority	9 %	8 %	8 %	10 %	10 %
	NET priority	78 pp	80 pp	77 pp	75 pp	76 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	91 %	93 %	86 %	87 %	91 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	3 %	6 %	7 %	8 %
	NET priority	86 pp	90 pp	80 pp	80 pp	84 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	81 %	83 %	78 %	74 %	87 %
	TOTAL lower priority	14 %	13 %	13 %	17 %	10 %
	NET priority	66 pp	70 pp	64 pp	57 pp	77 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	73 %	77 %	60 %	68 %	76 %
	TOTAL lower priority	22 %	19 %	30 %	26 %	24 %
	NET priority	51 pp	58 pp	30 pp	42 pp	52 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	91 %	91 %	87 %	89 %	93 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	5 %	4 %	6 %	6 %
	NET priority	85 pp	86 pp	83 pp	84 pp	87 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	86 %	88 %	84 %	83 %	88 %
	TOTAL lower priority	10 %	10 %	9 %	11 %	10 %
	NET priority	77 pp	78 pp	75 pp	72 pp	78 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	68 %	66 %	71 %	68 %	76 %
	TOTAL lower priority	27 %	31 %	20 %	23 %	22 %
	NET priority	41 pp	35 pp	52 pp	44 pp	54 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		2410	648	851	911
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	87 %	81 %	88 %	91 %
	TOTAL lower priority	9 %	11 %	8 %	7 %
	NET priority	78 pp	71 pp	81 pp	84 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	91 %	85 %	92 %	97 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	7 %	5 %	2 %
	NET priority	86 pp	77 pp	87 pp	95 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	81 %	74 %	80 %	88 %
	TOTAL lower priority	14 %	16 %	16 %	11 %
	NET priority	66 pp	57 pp	64 pp	77 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	73 %	70 %	75 %	75 %
	TOTAL lower priority	22 %	22 %	22 %	23 %
	NET priority	51 pp	48 pp	53 pp	53 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	91 %	87 %	90 %	94 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	5 %	6 %	5 %
	NET priority	85 pp	82 pp	84 pp	89 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	86 %	83 %	91 %	87 %
	TOTAL lower priority	10 %	10 %	7 %	12 %
	NET priority	77 pp	74 pp	84 pp	75 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	68 %	64 %	63 %	75 %
	TOTAL lower priority	27 %	27 %	33 %	23 %
	NET priority	41 pp	37 pp	30 pp	51 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		2410	832	745	833
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	87 %	83 %	88 %	90 %
	TOTAL lower priority	9 %	10 %	7 %	9 %
	NET priority	78 pp	73 pp	81 pp	81 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	91 %	85 %	93 %	96 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	7 %	4 %	3 %
	NET priority	86 pp	78 pp	90 pp	93 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	81 %	75 %	81 %	86 %
	TOTAL lower priority	14 %	16 %	14 %	12 %
	NET priority	66 pp	60 pp	67 pp	73 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	73 %	69 %	76 %	75 %
	TOTAL lower priority	22 %	23 %	21 %	23 %
	NET priority	51 pp	46 pp	55 pp	53 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	91 %	87 %	92 %	93 %
	TOTAL lower priority	5 %	5 %	4 %	6 %
	NET priority	85 pp	82 pp	87 pp	87 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	86 %	83 %	89 %	88 %
	TOTAL lower priority	10 %	10 %	8 %	11 %
	NET priority	77 pp	73 pp	81 pp	77 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	68 %	67 %	65 %	71 %
	TOTAL lower priority	27 %	24 %	31 %	28 %
	NET priority	41 pp	43 pp	34 pp	43 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)	2410	1291	1119
TOTAL excited	21 %	17 %	25 %
TOTAL concerned	69 %	72 %	65 %
None of these	10 %	10 %	9 %
No answer	<1 %	1 %	<1 %
NET concerned	48 pp	55 pp	41 pp

By Party

Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)	2410	1263	695	450
TOTAL excited	21 %	18 %	27 %	17 %
TOTAL concerned	69 %	77 %	64 %	62 %
None of these	10 %	4 %	9 %	20 %
No answer	<1 %	1 %	<1 %	<1 %
NET concerned	48 pp	59 pp	37 pp	45 pp

By Age

Metric	Total	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Base (n)	2410	555	654	579	622
TOTAL excited	21 %	21 %	22 %	22 %	19 %
TOTAL concerned	69 %	67 %	66 %	72 %	72 %
None of these	10 %	12 %	10 %	7 %	9 %
No answer	<1 %	<1 %	1 %	0 %	<1 %
NET concerned	48 pp	46 pp	44 pp	50 pp	53 pp

By Ethnicity

Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/PI
Base (n)	2410	1218	447	478	171
TOTAL excited	21 %	20 %	20 %	21 %	30 %
TOTAL concerned	69 %	73 %	64 %	64 %	62 %
None of these	10 %	7 %	14 %	14 %	8 %
No answer	<1 %	<1 %	2 %	1 %	0 %
NET concerned	48 pp	53 pp	44 pp	43 pp	32 pp

By Education

Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)	2410	648	851	911
TOTAL excited	21 %	18 %	23 %	22 %
TOTAL concerned	69 %	66 %	69 %	73 %
None of these	10 %	16 %	8 %	5 %
No answer	<1 %	<1 %	<1 %	1 %
NET concerned	48 pp	47 pp	46 pp	51 pp

By Household income

Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)	2410	832	745	833
TOTAL excited	21 %	18 %	19 %	25 %
TOTAL concerned	69 %	67 %	72 %	69 %
None of these	10 %	14 %	8 %	6 %
No answer	<1 %	<1 %	1 %	<1 %
NET concerned	48 pp	49 pp	53 pp	44 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)	2410	1291	1119
TOTAL can shape	13 %	14 %	12 %
TOTAL inevitable	71 %	71 %	72 %
Neither of these	15 %	15 %	15 %
No answer	1 %	1 %	1 %
NET inevitable	58 pp	57 pp	59 pp

By Party

Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)	2410	1263	695	450
TOTAL can shape	13 %	15 %	14 %	8 %
TOTAL inevitable	71 %	71 %	75 %	66 %
Neither of these	15 %	13 %	10 %	25 %
No answer	1 %	1 %	1 %	1 %
NET inevitable	58 pp	56 pp	61 pp	58 pp

By Age

Metric	Total	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Base (n)	2410	555	654	579	622
TOTAL can shape	13 %	15 %	15 %	12 %	10 %
TOTAL inevitable	71 %	63 %	68 %	75 %	81 %
Neither of these	15 %	20 %	16 %	12 %	9 %
No answer	1 %	2 %	1 %	<1 %	<1 %
NET inevitable	58 pp	48 pp	53 pp	63 pp	71 pp

By Ethnicity

Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/PI
Base (n)	2410	1218	447	478	171
TOTAL can shape	13 %	13 %	14 %	13 %	11 %
TOTAL inevitable	71 %	74 %	64 %	66 %	80 %
Neither of these	15 %	12 %	21 %	19 %	8 %
No answer	1 %	<1 %	1 %	2 %	2 %
NET inevitable	58 pp	61 pp	49 pp	54 pp	69 pp

By Education

Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)	2410	648	851	911
TOTAL can shape	13 %	12 %	15 %	13 %
TOTAL inevitable	71 %	64 %	73 %	77 %
Neither of these	15 %	22 %	12 %	9 %
No answer	1 %	2 %	<1 %	1 %
NET inevitable	58 pp	52 pp	58 pp	64 pp

By Household income

Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)	2410	832	745	833
TOTAL can shape	13 %	13 %	13 %	14 %
TOTAL inevitable	71 %	64 %	75 %	76 %
Neither of these	15 %	22 %	11 %	9 %
No answer	1 %	1 %	1 %	<1 %
NET inevitable	58 pp	52 pp	62 pp	62 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)		2410	1291	1119
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	47 %	52 %
	TOTAL not yet	27 %	29 %	26 %
	NET realized	22 pp	18 pp	26 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	50 %	52 %	47 %
	TOTAL not yet	27 %	25 %	29 %
	NET realized	23 pp	27 pp	18 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	58 %	62 %	54 %
	TOTAL not yet	25 %	22 %	28 %
	NET realized	33 pp	40 pp	26 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	79 %	82 %	75 %
	TOTAL not yet	12 %	10 %	14 %
	NET realized	67 pp	72 pp	62 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	17 %	16 %	18 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	55 %	52 %
	NET realized	-36 pp	-39 pp	-34 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		2410	1263	695	450
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	52 %	52 %	39 %
	TOTAL not yet	27 %	28 %	24 %	31 %
	NET realized	22 pp	25 pp	28 pp	8 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	50 %	55 %	46 %	46 %
	TOTAL not yet	27 %	25 %	30 %	26 %
	NET realized	23 pp	30 pp	16 pp	20 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	58 %	63 %	57 %	51 %
	TOTAL not yet	25 %	22 %	28 %	26 %
	NET realized	33 pp	40 pp	29 pp	25 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	79 %	85 %	78 %	68 %
	TOTAL not yet	12 %	9 %	13 %	16 %
	NET realized	67 pp	76 pp	64 pp	53 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	17 %	14 %	21 %	16 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	61 %	49 %	47 %
	NET realized	-36 pp	-46 pp	-28 pp	-31 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Base (n)		2410	555	654	579	622
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	55 %	51 %	49 %	40 %
	TOTAL not yet	27 %	26 %	28 %	27 %	28 %
	NET realized	22 pp	29 pp	24 pp	22 pp	12 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	50 %	61 %	56 %	43 %	37 %
	TOTAL not yet	27 %	21 %	24 %	32 %	32 %
	NET realized	23 pp	40 pp	31 pp	11 pp	5 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	58 %	59 %	63 %	59 %	51 %
	TOTAL not yet	25 %	26 %	22 %	24 %	28 %
	NET realized	33 pp	33 pp	41 pp	35 pp	23 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	79 %	76 %	78 %	82 %	79 %
	TOTAL not yet	12 %	13 %	13 %	10 %	11 %
	NET realized	67 pp	63 pp	66 pp	72 pp	67 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	17 %	17 %	18 %	13 %	20 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	58 %	56 %	50 %	47 %
	NET realized	-36 pp	-41 pp	-39 pp	-37 pp	-27 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/PI
Base (n)		2410	1218	447	478	171
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	49 %	47 %	48 %	63 %
	TOTAL not yet	27 %	27 %	22 %	30 %	26 %
	NET realized	22 pp	22 pp	25 pp	18 pp	36 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	50 %	49 %	49 %	51 %	59 %
	TOTAL not yet	27 %	28 %	21 %	26 %	24 %
	NET realized	23 pp	21 pp	28 pp	25 pp	35 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	58 %	59 %	53 %	57 %	64 %
	TOTAL not yet	25 %	26 %	24 %	26 %	18 %
	NET realized	33 pp	33 pp	28 pp	32 pp	46 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	79 %	82 %	69 %	75 %	81 %
	TOTAL not yet	12 %	11 %	15 %	13 %	11 %
	NET realized	67 pp	71 pp	53 pp	62 pp	70 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	17 %	17 %	17 %	20 %	16 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	55 %	44 %	52 %	53 %
	NET realized	-36 pp	-39 pp	-27 pp	-32 pp	-37 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		2410	648	851	911
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	40 %	47 %	60 %
	TOTAL not yet	27 %	29 %	27 %	26 %
	NET realized	22 pp	11 pp	20 pp	34 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	50 %	45 %	44 %	58 %
	TOTAL not yet	27 %	27 %	32 %	24 %
	NET realized	23 pp	19 pp	12 pp	34 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	58 %	51 %	60 %	63 %
	TOTAL not yet	25 %	28 %	24 %	23 %
	NET realized	33 pp	24 pp	36 pp	41 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	79 %	70 %	80 %	86 %
	TOTAL not yet	12 %	16 %	11 %	9 %
	NET realized	67 pp	54 pp	69 pp	77 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	17 %	21 %	15 %	14 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	45 %	54 %	61 %
	NET realized	-36 pp	-24 pp	-38 pp	-47 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		2410	832	745	833
Saving time	TOTAL realized	49 %	40 %	47 %	61 %
	TOTAL not yet	27 %	29 %	31 %	22 %
	NET realized	22 pp	11 pp	16 pp	39 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	50 %	43 %	51 %	55 %
	TOTAL not yet	27 %	27 %	27 %	27 %
	NET realized	23 pp	17 pp	24 pp	28 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	58 %	57 %	57 %	61 %
	TOTAL not yet	25 %	24 %	26 %	25 %
	NET realized	33 pp	33 pp	30 pp	36 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	79 %	71 %	78 %	87 %
	TOTAL not yet	12 %	14 %	13 %	8 %
	NET realized	67 pp	58 pp	65 pp	78 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	17 %	19 %	14 %	17 %
	TOTAL not yet	53 %	47 %	56 %	57 %
	NET realized	-36 pp	-28 pp	-42 pp	-40 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)		2410	1291	1119
Jobs	TOTAL better	12 %	10 %	13 %
	TOTAL worse	75 %	79 %	71 %
	NET worse	64 pp	69 pp	58 pp
Future	TOTAL better	30 %	24 %	37 %
	TOTAL worse	57 %	64 %	49 %
	NET worse	26 pp	40 pp	11 pp
Children	TOTAL better	16 %	13 %	20 %
	TOTAL worse	66 %	73 %	59 %
	NET worse	50 pp	60 pp	39 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	24 %	20 %	28 %
	TOTAL worse	45 %	50 %	40 %
	NET worse	21 pp	30 pp	12 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		2410	1263	695	450
Jobs	TOTAL better	12 %	10 %	16 %	8 %
	TOTAL worse	75 %	82 %	69 %	72 %
	NET worse	64 pp	72 pp	53 pp	64 pp
Future	TOTAL better	30 %	23 %	42 %	26 %
	TOTAL worse	57 %	68 %	45 %	53 %
	NET worse	26 pp	45 pp	3 pp	27 pp
Children	TOTAL better	16 %	14 %	22 %	11 %
	TOTAL worse	66 %	73 %	60 %	64 %
	NET worse	50 pp	58 pp	38 pp	53 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	24 %	21 %	31 %	19 %
	TOTAL worse	45 %	50 %	37 %	48 %
	NET worse	21 pp	30 pp	5 pp	29 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Base (n)		2410	555	654	579	622
Jobs	TOTAL better	12 %	11 %	14 %	10 %	12 %
	TOTAL worse	75 %	79 %	72 %	78 %	71 %
	NET worse	64 pp	69 pp	58 pp	68 pp	60 pp
Future	TOTAL better	30 %	26 %	29 %	30 %	37 %
	TOTAL worse	57 %	62 %	57 %	61 %	46 %
	NET worse	26 pp	36 pp	28 pp	31 pp	9 pp
Children	TOTAL better	16 %	13 %	17 %	17 %	18 %
	TOTAL worse	66 %	73 %	64 %	69 %	58 %
	NET worse	50 pp	60 pp	47 pp	52 pp	40 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	24 %	23 %	24 %	22 %	26 %
	TOTAL worse	45 %	48 %	44 %	47 %	41 %
	NET worse	21 pp	25 pp	19 pp	25 pp	15 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/PI
Base (n)		2410	1218	447	478	171
Jobs	TOTAL better	12 %	9 %	17 %	16 %	13 %
	TOTAL worse	75 %	78 %	66 %	72 %	80 %
	NET worse	64 pp	69 pp	48 pp	56 pp	66 pp
Future	TOTAL better	30 %	30 %	31 %	30 %	35 %
	TOTAL worse	57 %	57 %	54 %	58 %	54 %
	NET worse	26 pp	27 pp	22 pp	27 pp	19 pp
Children	TOTAL better	16 %	14 %	22 %	21 %	19 %
	TOTAL worse	66 %	70 %	59 %	60 %	67 %
	NET worse	50 pp	56 pp	37 pp	39 pp	49 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	24 %	23 %	27 %	26 %	26 %
	TOTAL worse	45 %	44 %	47 %	46 %	45 %
	NET worse	21 pp	21 pp	20 pp	20 pp	19 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		2410	648	851	911
Jobs	TOTAL better	12 %	15 %	10 %	9 %
	TOTAL worse	75 %	67 %	76 %	83 %
	NET worse	64 pp	52 pp	65 pp	74 pp
Future	TOTAL better	30 %	27 %	34 %	31 %
	TOTAL worse	57 %	55 %	54 %	60 %
	NET worse	26 pp	28 pp	20 pp	29 pp
Children	TOTAL better	16 %	19 %	17 %	14 %
	TOTAL worse	66 %	60 %	64 %	74 %
	NET worse	50 pp	41 pp	48 pp	60 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	24 %	19 %	25 %	28 %
	TOTAL worse	45 %	48 %	43 %	43 %
	NET worse	21 pp	29 pp	18 pp	15 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		2410	832	745	833
Jobs	TOTAL better	12 %	13 %	10 %	11 %
	TOTAL worse	75 %	69 %	79 %	80 %
	NET worse	64 pp	55 pp	69 pp	69 pp
Future	TOTAL better	30 %	27 %	29 %	35 %
	TOTAL worse	57 %	56 %	58 %	56 %
	NET worse	26 pp	29 pp	29 pp	21 pp
Children	TOTAL better	16 %	18 %	15 %	16 %
	TOTAL worse	66 %	63 %	68 %	69 %
	NET worse	50 pp	45 pp	53 pp	53 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	24 %	21 %	22 %	29 %
	TOTAL worse	45 %	47 %	48 %	40 %
	NET worse	21 pp	26 pp	26 pp	12 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)		2410	1291	1119
Children	TOTAL too much	23 %	26 %	20 %
	TOTAL too little	45 %	46 %	45 %
	NET too little	22 pp	19 pp	25 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	23 %	25 %	20 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	44 %	43 %
	NET too little	21 pp	19 pp	23 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	22 %	24 %	20 %
	TOTAL too little	43 %	45 %	41 %
	NET too little	21 pp	20 pp	21 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	21 %	23 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	31 %	31 %	30 %
	NET too little	10 pp	8 pp	11 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		2410	1263	695	450
Children	TOTAL too much	23 %	24 %	23 %	22 %
	TOTAL too little	45 %	57 %	39 %	34 %
	NET too little	22 pp	33 pp	16 pp	11 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	23 %	22 %	24 %	23 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	60 %	31 %	34 %
	NET too little	21 pp	38 pp	7 pp	11 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	22 %	23 %	21 %	23 %
	TOTAL too little	43 %	57 %	32 %	33 %
	NET too little	21 pp	34 pp	12 pp	11 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	21 %	24 %	16 %	23 %
	TOTAL too little	31 %	37 %	28 %	24 %
	NET too little	10 pp	14 pp	11 pp	1 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Base (n)		2410	555	654	579	622
Children	TOTAL too much	23 %	23 %	28 %	22 %	20 %
	TOTAL too little	45 %	45 %	43 %	50 %	44 %
	NET too little	22 pp	22 pp	15 pp	28 pp	24 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	23 %	25 %	22 %	22 %	23 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	44 %	46 %	45 %	41 %
	NET too little	21 pp	19 pp	24 pp	23 pp	18 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	22 %	25 %	22 %	21 %	20 %
	TOTAL too little	43 %	43 %	42 %	48 %	38 %
	NET too little	21 pp	18 pp	20 pp	28 pp	18 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	21 %	24 %	23 %	20 %	17 %
	TOTAL too little	31 %	29 %	30 %	35 %	29 %
	NET too little	10 pp	5 pp	7 pp	16 pp	13 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/PI
Base (n)		2410	1218	447	478	171
Children	TOTAL too much	23 %	19 %	37 %	26 %	29 %
	TOTAL too little	45 %	50 %	31 %	39 %	44 %
	NET too little	22 pp	31 pp	−6 pp	14 pp	15 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	23 %	21 %	32 %	25 %	25 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	48 %	33 %	38 %	41 %
	NET too little	21 pp	27 pp	1 pp	13 pp	16 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	22 %	18 %	32 %	28 %	25 %
	TOTAL too little	43 %	46 %	29 %	41 %	43 %
	NET too little	21 pp	28 pp	−4 pp	14 pp	18 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	21 %	19 %	30 %	23 %	23 %
	TOTAL too little	31 %	33 %	25 %	29 %	28 %
	NET too little	10 pp	14 pp	−5 pp	6 pp	5 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		2410	648	851	911
Children	TOTAL too much	23 %	30 %	22 %	17 %
	TOTAL too little	45 %	32 %	45 %	59 %
	NET too little	22 pp	2 pp	23 pp	42 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	23 %	27 %	23 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	32 %	42 %	57 %
	NET too little	21 pp	5 pp	19 pp	38 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	22 %	29 %	22 %	16 %
	TOTAL too little	43 %	29 %	44 %	56 %
	NET too little	21 pp	0 pp	23 pp	40 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	21 %	27 %	19 %	17 %
	TOTAL too little	31 %	24 %	32 %	36 %
	NET too little	10 pp	-2 pp	13 pp	19 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		2410	832	745	833
Children	TOTAL too much	23 %	30 %	20 %	18 %
	TOTAL too little	45 %	34 %	51 %	53 %
	NET too little	22 pp	4 pp	30 pp	35 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	23 %	29 %	20 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	35 %	49 %	48 %
	NET too little	21 pp	7 pp	29 pp	29 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	22 %	30 %	18 %	18 %
	TOTAL too little	43 %	33 %	49 %	48 %
	NET too little	21 pp	4 pp	31 pp	30 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	21 %	27 %	17 %	18 %
	TOTAL too little	31 %	23 %	37 %	34 %
	NET too little	10 pp	-4 pp	19 pp	16 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)		2410	1291	1119
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	71 %	70 %	72 %
	TOTAL unlikely	15 %	15 %	14 %
	NET likely	57 pp	55 pp	59 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	79 %	81 %	76 %
	TOTAL unlikely	7 %	6 %	9 %
	NET likely	71 pp	74 pp	68 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	66 %	63 %	70 %
	TOTAL unlikely	15 %	16 %	15 %
	NET likely	51 pp	48 pp	55 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	69 %	71 %	67 %
	TOTAL unlikely	11 %	8 %	15 %
	NET likely	57 pp	62 pp	52 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		2410	1263	695	450
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	71 %	75 %	75 %	58 %
	TOTAL unlikely	15 %	15 %	13 %	17 %
	NET likely	57 pp	61 pp	61 pp	42 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	79 %	87 %	78 %	65 %
	TOTAL unlikely	7 %	6 %	8 %	10 %
	NET likely	71 pp	81 pp	70 pp	55 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	66 %	70 %	69 %	56 %
	TOTAL unlikely	15 %	15 %	15 %	17 %
	NET likely	51 pp	55 pp	54 pp	40 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	69 %	76 %	67 %	59 %
	TOTAL unlikely	11 %	10 %	11 %	16 %
	NET likely	57 pp	66 pp	56 pp	43 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Base (n)		2410	555	654	579	622
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	71 %	62 %	70 %	76 %	78 %
	TOTAL unlikely	15 %	19 %	15 %	14 %	10 %
	NET likely	57 pp	43 pp	55 pp	62 pp	69 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	79 %	73 %	75 %	83 %	84 %
	TOTAL unlikely	7 %	10 %	10 %	6 %	3 %
	NET likely	71 pp	63 pp	65 pp	77 pp	81 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	66 %	61 %	60 %	69 %	76 %
	TOTAL unlikely	15 %	18 %	19 %	15 %	8 %
	NET likely	51 pp	43 pp	41 pp	54 pp	68 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	69 %	62 %	68 %	74 %	73 %
	TOTAL unlikely	11 %	15 %	12 %	11 %	7 %
	NET likely	57 pp	47 pp	56 pp	63 pp	66 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/PI
Base (n)		2410	1218	447	478	171
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	71 %	73 %	63 %	67 %	78 %
	TOTAL unlikely	15 %	15 %	15 %	14 %	13 %
	NET likely	57 pp	58 pp	47 pp	53 pp	65 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	79 %	81 %	73 %	71 %	85 %
	TOTAL unlikely	7 %	6 %	7 %	10 %	8 %
	NET likely	71 pp	75 pp	66 pp	60 pp	77 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	66 %	68 %	60 %	59 %	75 %
	TOTAL unlikely	15 %	15 %	16 %	16 %	14 %
	NET likely	51 pp	53 pp	44 pp	43 pp	61 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	69 %	69 %	66 %	68 %	76 %
	TOTAL unlikely	11 %	13 %	9 %	9 %	11 %
	NET likely	57 pp	56 pp	57 pp	59 pp	65 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		2410	648	851	911
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	71 %	64 %	75 %	75 %
	TOTAL unlikely	15 %	15 %	12 %	16 %
	NET likely	57 pp	50 pp	63 pp	59 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	79 %	67 %	81 %	87 %
	TOTAL unlikely	7 %	11 %	7 %	5 %
	NET likely	71 pp	56 pp	75 pp	83 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	66 %	58 %	68 %	73 %
	TOTAL unlikely	15 %	16 %	14 %	15 %
	NET likely	51 pp	42 pp	54 pp	58 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	69 %	62 %	71 %	74 %
	TOTAL unlikely	11 %	12 %	12 %	10 %
	NET likely	57 pp	49 pp	59 pp	64 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		2410	832	745	833
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	71 %	66 %	74 %	74 %
	TOTAL unlikely	15 %	15 %	15 %	14 %
	NET likely	57 pp	52 pp	59 pp	60 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	79 %	71 %	82 %	84 %
	TOTAL unlikely	7 %	8 %	8 %	6 %
	NET likely	71 pp	62 pp	73 pp	78 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	66 %	61 %	69 %	70 %
	TOTAL unlikely	15 %	17 %	13 %	15 %
	NET likely	51 pp	44 pp	56 pp	55 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	69 %	64 %	71 %	72 %
	TOTAL unlikely	11 %	13 %	11 %	11 %
	NET likely	57 pp	51 pp	61 pp	61 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 seventh tracking wave of the **Americans on AI** survey, a project of Athena Insights.

Respondents were interviewed between September 24 and 28, 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 (98%) and by phone (2%), in English; 2,410 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 1.73 and an effective sample size of 1,392. 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 ± 2.6 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=2,410).

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	1291	54
	Male	1119	46
Party	Dem	1263	52
	Rep	695	29
	Ind	450	19
	Unknown	2	0
Age	18-34	555	23
	35-49	654	27
	50-64	579	24
	65+	622	26
Ethnicity	White	1218	51
	Black	447	19
	Hispanic	478	20
	Asian/PI	171	7
	Two or more	74	3
	Other	22	1
Education	HS or less	648	27
	Some college	851	35
	BA+	911	38
Household income	<50k	832	35
	50k-<100k	745	31
	100k+	833	35