



Americans on AI — 12 October 2026

Athena Insights surveyed 1,057 US adults from October 8-12, 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 ± 4.1 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	49 %	37 %	6 %	3 %	4 %
Inflation	71 %	20 %	2 %	1 %	4 %
AI harms	39 %	39 %	11 %	5 %	5 %
Immigration	36 %	37 %	16 %	7 %	4 %
Health care	62 %	28 %	5 %	2 %	3 %
Crime	44 %	40 %	9 %	3 %	3 %
Climate change	32 %	35 %	15 %	13 %	4 %

Affect

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

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

Response	%
Very excited	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	16 %
AI is coming into our lives whether we want it or not	67 %
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	22 %	29 %	15 %	14 %	19 %
Pressured to do more	25 %	26 %	19 %	9 %	19 %
Losing connections	35 %	25 %	14 %	10 %	15 %
Real vs. fake	53 %	27 %	7 %	3 %	9 %
Better health care	7 %	12 %	17 %	32 %	31 %

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	4 %	12 %	36 %	36 %	9 %	2 %
Future	7 %	24 %	29 %	27 %	11 %	2 %
Children	4 %	17 %	30 %	33 %	14 %	2 %
Finances	6 %	23 %	23 %	17 %	28 %	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 %	12 %	12 %	18 %	28 %	16 %
Environment	15 %	10 %	13 %	13 %	31 %	17 %
Workers	10 %	12 %	16 %	16 %	28 %	16 %
Competitiveness	9 %	12 %	20 %	16 %	15 %	27 %

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 %	9 %	4 %	13 %
Loss-of-control	43 %	34 %	7 %	2 %	13 %
Breakthroughs	21 %	45 %	11 %	3 %	18 %
WMDs	22 %	48 %	9 %	2 %	17 %

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)		1057	543	514
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	87 %	88 %	86 %
	TOTAL lower priority	9 %	6 %	11 %
	NET priority	78 pp	81 pp	75 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	92 %	91 %	92 %
	TOTAL lower priority	4 %	3 %	5 %
	NET priority	88 pp	88 pp	88 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	78 %	79 %	76 %
	TOTAL lower priority	16 %	13 %	20 %
	NET priority	61 pp	65 pp	56 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	72 %	73 %	71 %
	TOTAL lower priority	23 %	21 %	26 %
	NET priority	49 pp	53 pp	45 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	90 %	91 %	88 %
	TOTAL lower priority	6 %	4 %	9 %
	NET priority	83 pp	87 pp	79 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	84 %	86 %	83 %
	TOTAL lower priority	11 %	9 %	14 %
	NET priority	73 pp	77 pp	68 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	67 %	69 %	65 %
	TOTAL lower priority	28 %	24 %	32 %
	NET priority	39 pp	44 pp	33 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		1057	490	382	183
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	87 %	92 %	85 %	79 %
	TOTAL lower priority	9 %	5 %	12 %	9 %
	NET priority	78 pp	87 pp	73 pp	70 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	92 %	96 %	91 %	86 %
	TOTAL lower priority	4 %	3 %	5 %	4 %
	NET priority	88 pp	93 pp	86 pp	82 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	78 %	81 %	78 %	71 %
	TOTAL lower priority	16 %	14 %	19 %	17 %
	NET priority	61 pp	66 pp	59 pp	55 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	72 %	63 %	86 %	64 %
	TOTAL lower priority	23 %	35 %	12 %	22 %
	NET priority	49 pp	29 pp	75 pp	43 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	90 %	94 %	89 %	83 %
	TOTAL lower priority	6 %	4 %	8 %	9 %
	NET priority	83 pp	90 pp	81 pp	74 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	84 %	82 %	89 %	80 %
	TOTAL lower priority	11 %	15 %	8 %	11 %
	NET priority	73 pp	66 pp	82 pp	69 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	67 %	88 %	44 %	68 %
	TOTAL lower priority	28 %	10 %	53 %	17 %
	NET priority	39 pp	78 pp	-10 pp	51 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Base (n)		1057	236	228	248	345
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	87 %	82 %	87 %	91 %	88 %
	TOTAL lower priority	9 %	8 %	10 %	7 %	10 %
	NET priority	78 pp	75 pp	77 pp	84 pp	78 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	92 %	86 %	94 %	95 %	94 %
	TOTAL lower priority	4 %	5 %	3 %	4 %	3 %
	NET priority	88 pp	80 pp	91 pp	90 pp	91 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	78 %	68 %	82 %	81 %	81 %
	TOTAL lower priority	16 %	20 %	14 %	17 %	15 %
	NET priority	61 pp	48 pp	68 pp	65 pp	65 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	72 %	59 %	71 %	79 %	83 %
	TOTAL lower priority	23 %	30 %	27 %	19 %	14 %
	NET priority	49 pp	29 pp	44 pp	60 pp	68 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	90 %	81 %	90 %	94 %	95 %
	TOTAL lower priority	6 %	9 %	8 %	5 %	3 %
	NET priority	83 pp	72 pp	82 pp	90 pp	92 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	84 %	72 %	84 %	93 %	91 %
	TOTAL lower priority	11 %	17 %	14 %	7 %	7 %
	NET priority	73 pp	55 pp	70 pp	86 pp	84 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	67 %	70 %	71 %	62 %	64 %
	TOTAL lower priority	28 %	18 %	26 %	36 %	34 %
	NET priority	39 pp	52 pp	45 pp	25 pp	30 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)		1057	685	117	133
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	87 %	87 %	76 %	95 %
	TOTAL lower priority	9 %	10 %	9 %	5 %
	NET priority	78 pp	77 pp	67 pp	91 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	92 %	92 %	83 %	94 %
	TOTAL lower priority	4 %	4 %	1 %	6 %
	NET priority	88 pp	88 pp	83 pp	88 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	78 %	81 %	66 %	72 %
	TOTAL lower priority	16 %	15 %	15 %	25 %
	NET priority	61 pp	66 pp	51 pp	48 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	72 %	76 %	57 %	69 %
	TOTAL lower priority	23 %	21 %	26 %	29 %
	NET priority	49 pp	56 pp	32 pp	40 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	90 %	92 %	77 %	89 %
	TOTAL lower priority	6 %	5 %	9 %	10 %
	NET priority	83 pp	88 pp	67 pp	79 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	84 %	87 %	75 %	85 %
	TOTAL lower priority	11 %	10 %	11 %	15 %
	NET priority	73 pp	77 pp	64 pp	70 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	67 %	63 %	71 %	72 %
	TOTAL lower priority	28 %	34 %	15 %	24 %
	NET priority	39 pp	29 pp	56 pp	48 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		1057	275	367	415
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	87 %	84 %	89 %	88 %
	TOTAL lower priority	9 %	7 %	8 %	10 %
	NET priority	78 pp	76 pp	81 pp	78 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	92 %	86 %	94 %	96 %
	TOTAL lower priority	4 %	6 %	3 %	3 %
	NET priority	88 pp	80 pp	91 pp	93 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	78 %	71 %	79 %	83 %
	TOTAL lower priority	16 %	19 %	15 %	15 %
	NET priority	61 pp	51 pp	64 pp	69 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	72 %	69 %	75 %	73 %
	TOTAL lower priority	23 %	22 %	21 %	25 %
	NET priority	49 pp	47 pp	54 pp	48 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	90 %	86 %	90 %	94 %
	TOTAL lower priority	6 %	7 %	7 %	6 %
	NET priority	83 pp	79 pp	83 pp	87 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	84 %	81 %	87 %	86 %
	TOTAL lower priority	11 %	11 %	9 %	14 %
	NET priority	73 pp	70 pp	78 pp	72 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	67 %	64 %	65 %	71 %
	TOTAL lower priority	28 %	26 %	31 %	28 %
	NET priority	39 pp	38 pp	35 pp	44 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		1057	355	339	363
Jobs	TOTAL high priority	87 %	85 %	89 %	87 %
	TOTAL lower priority	9 %	9 %	7 %	10 %
	NET priority	78 pp	76 pp	83 pp	77 pp
Inflation	TOTAL high priority	92 %	90 %	93 %	93 %
	TOTAL lower priority	4 %	4 %	2 %	5 %
	NET priority	88 pp	86 pp	90 pp	88 pp
AI harms	TOTAL high priority	78 %	70 %	83 %	82 %
	TOTAL lower priority	16 %	21 %	12 %	15 %
	NET priority	61 pp	50 pp	71 pp	67 pp
Immigration	TOTAL high priority	72 %	70 %	79 %	68 %
	TOTAL lower priority	23 %	23 %	16 %	29 %
	NET priority	49 pp	47 pp	63 pp	39 pp
Health care	TOTAL high priority	90 %	87 %	92 %	92 %
	TOTAL lower priority	6 %	8 %	4 %	6 %
	NET priority	83 pp	78 pp	87 pp	86 pp
Crime	TOTAL high priority	84 %	84 %	87 %	83 %
	TOTAL lower priority	11 %	11 %	8 %	15 %
	NET priority	73 pp	72 pp	79 pp	68 pp
Climate change	TOTAL high priority	67 %	66 %	67 %	68 %
	TOTAL lower priority	28 %	26 %	29 %	29 %
	NET priority	39 pp	41 pp	37 pp	39 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)	1057	543	514
TOTAL excited	21 %	18 %	24 %
TOTAL concerned	69 %	69 %	69 %
None of these	9 %	12 %	6 %
No answer	1 %	1 %	1 %
NET concerned	48 pp	51 pp	45 pp

By Party

Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)	1057	490	382	183
TOTAL excited	21 %	15 %	27 %	22 %
TOTAL concerned	69 %	79 %	65 %	57 %
None of these	9 %	5 %	7 %	21 %
No answer	1 %	1 %	1 %	1 %
NET concerned	48 pp	64 pp	38 pp	35 pp

By Age

Metric	Total	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Base (n)	1057	236	228	248	345
TOTAL excited	21 %	19 %	26 %	19 %	21 %
TOTAL concerned	69 %	65 %	65 %	73 %	74 %
None of these	9 %	14 %	9 %	7 %	5 %
No answer	1 %	3 %	0 %	<1 %	<1 %
NET concerned	48 pp	46 pp	39 pp	54 pp	54 pp

By Ethnicity

Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)	1057	685	117	133
TOTAL excited	21 %	20 %	17 %	24 %
TOTAL concerned	69 %	72 %	58 %	68 %
None of these	9 %	7 %	22 %	8 %
No answer	1 %	<1 %	3 %	0 %
NET concerned	48 pp	52 pp	41 pp	44 pp

By Education

Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)	1057	275	367	415
TOTAL excited	21 %	18 %	18 %	26 %
TOTAL concerned	69 %	65 %	73 %	70 %
None of these	9 %	15 %	8 %	4 %
No answer	1 %	2 %	<1 %	<1 %
NET concerned	48 pp	48 pp	55 pp	43 pp

By Household income

Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)	1057	355	339	363
TOTAL excited	21 %	23 %	16 %	23 %
TOTAL concerned	69 %	62 %	75 %	72 %
None of these	9 %	13 %	8 %	5 %
No answer	1 %	2 %	1 %	<1 %
NET concerned	48 pp	40 pp	59 pp	49 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)	1057	543	514
TOTAL can shape	16 %	12 %	21 %
TOTAL inevitable	67 %	69 %	66 %
Neither of these	15 %	18 %	12 %
No answer	1 %	1 %	2 %
NET inevitable	51 pp	57 pp	45 pp

By Party

Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)	1057	490	382	183
TOTAL can shape	16 %	19 %	15 %	13 %
TOTAL inevitable	67 %	65 %	73 %	63 %
Neither of these	15 %	14 %	11 %	23 %
No answer	1 %	2 %	1 %	1 %
NET inevitable	51 pp	46 pp	57 pp	50 pp

By Age

Metric	Total	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Base (n)	1057	236	228	248	345
TOTAL can shape	16 %	20 %	19 %	16 %	9 %
TOTAL inevitable	67 %	56 %	65 %	76 %	76 %
Neither of these	15 %	22 %	14 %	7 %	14 %
No answer	1 %	3 %	1 %	1 %	1 %
NET inevitable	51 pp	36 pp	46 pp	60 pp	67 pp

By Ethnicity

Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)	1057	685	117	133
TOTAL can shape	16 %	13 %	15 %	25 %
TOTAL inevitable	67 %	74 %	54 %	52 %
Neither of these	15 %	12 %	27 %	21 %
No answer	1 %	1 %	4 %	2 %
NET inevitable	51 pp	61 pp	39 pp	27 pp

By Education

Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)	1057	275	367	415
TOTAL can shape	16 %	15 %	17 %	17 %
TOTAL inevitable	67 %	62 %	67 %	73 %
Neither of these	15 %	19 %	16 %	10 %
No answer	1 %	4 %	<1 %	0 %
NET inevitable	51 pp	48 pp	50 pp	56 pp

By Household income

Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)	1057	355	339	363
TOTAL can shape	16 %	15 %	16 %	17 %
TOTAL inevitable	67 %	62 %	68 %	74 %
Neither of these	15 %	20 %	15 %	8 %
No answer	1 %	2 %	1 %	1 %
NET inevitable	51 pp	46 pp	52 pp	57 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)		1057	543	514
Saving time	TOTAL realized	51 %	51 %	51 %
	TOTAL not yet	28 %	23 %	34 %
	NET realized	23 pp	28 pp	17 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	51 %	54 %	47 %
	TOTAL not yet	29 %	24 %	34 %
	NET realized	22 pp	30 pp	13 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	60 %	61 %	59 %
	TOTAL not yet	24 %	20 %	27 %
	NET realized	37 pp	41 pp	32 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	80 %	80 %	81 %
	TOTAL not yet	10 %	9 %	12 %
	NET realized	70 pp	71 pp	69 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	19 %	18 %	20 %
	TOTAL not yet	49 %	46 %	52 %
	NET realized	-30 pp	-28 pp	-32 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		1057	490	382	183
Saving time	TOTAL realized	51 %	48 %	56 %	47 %
	TOTAL not yet	28 %	35 %	24 %	23 %
	NET realized	23 pp	13 pp	32 pp	24 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	51 %	52 %	50 %	51 %
	TOTAL not yet	29 %	32 %	28 %	23 %
	NET realized	22 pp	20 pp	22 pp	28 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	60 %	58 %	63 %	60 %
	TOTAL not yet	24 %	26 %	23 %	20 %
	NET realized	37 pp	32 pp	40 pp	40 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	80 %	81 %	83 %	74 %
	TOTAL not yet	10 %	10 %	10 %	12 %
	NET realized	70 pp	70 pp	73 pp	61 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	19 %	14 %	23 %	21 %
	TOTAL not yet	49 %	59 %	43 %	41 %
	NET realized	-30 pp	-44 pp	-20 pp	-21 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Base (n)		1057	236	228	248	345
Saving time	TOTAL realized	51 %	53 %	57 %	54 %	39 %
	TOTAL not yet	28 %	24 %	28 %	28 %	34 %
	NET realized	23 pp	28 pp	29 pp	26 pp	6 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	51 %	61 %	56 %	52 %	33 %
	TOTAL not yet	29 %	20 %	28 %	29 %	40 %
	NET realized	22 pp	41 pp	28 pp	23 pp	-7 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	60 %	60 %	70 %	61 %	49 %
	TOTAL not yet	24 %	21 %	21 %	23 %	31 %
	NET realized	37 pp	39 pp	50 pp	38 pp	19 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	80 %	79 %	84 %	82 %	76 %
	TOTAL not yet	10 %	6 %	13 %	10 %	13 %
	NET realized	70 pp	73 pp	71 pp	73 pp	62 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	19 %	17 %	21 %	16 %	22 %
	TOTAL not yet	49 %	51 %	52 %	44 %	48 %
	NET realized	-30 pp	-34 pp	-31 pp	-28 pp	-26 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)		1057	685	117	133
Saving time	TOTAL realized	51 %	49 %	44 %	54 %
	TOTAL not yet	28 %	29 %	28 %	30 %
	NET realized	23 pp	20 pp	16 pp	25 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	51 %	49 %	47 %	52 %
	TOTAL not yet	29 %	30 %	27 %	31 %
	NET realized	22 pp	19 pp	20 pp	21 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	60 %	62 %	48 %	53 %
	TOTAL not yet	24 %	22 %	23 %	33 %
	NET realized	37 pp	40 pp	25 pp	20 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	80 %	83 %	69 %	74 %
	TOTAL not yet	10 %	10 %	9 %	15 %
	NET realized	70 pp	73 pp	60 pp	59 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	19 %	17 %	24 %	24 %
	TOTAL not yet	49 %	51 %	35 %	51 %
	NET realized	-30 pp	-34 pp	-11 pp	-27 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		1057	275	367	415
Saving time	TOTAL realized	51 %	44 %	44 %	62 %
	TOTAL not yet	28 %	26 %	35 %	26 %
	NET realized	23 pp	18 pp	9 pp	36 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	51 %	50 %	48 %	53 %
	TOTAL not yet	29 %	23 %	28 %	35 %
	NET realized	22 pp	27 pp	20 pp	18 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	60 %	58 %	64 %	60 %
	TOTAL not yet	24 %	20 %	23 %	27 %
	NET realized	37 pp	37 pp	41 pp	33 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	80 %	72 %	79 %	88 %
	TOTAL not yet	10 %	10 %	12 %	10 %
	NET realized	70 pp	63 pp	67 pp	79 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	19 %	22 %	19 %	15 %
	TOTAL not yet	49 %	41 %	48 %	57 %
	NET realized	-30 pp	-19 pp	-29 pp	-42 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		1057	355	339	363
Saving time	TOTAL realized	51 %	46 %	51 %	57 %
	TOTAL not yet	28 %	31 %	25 %	27 %
	NET realized	23 pp	14 pp	26 pp	30 pp
Pressured to do more	TOTAL realized	51 %	50 %	53 %	50 %
	TOTAL not yet	29 %	27 %	27 %	32 %
	NET realized	22 pp	22 pp	26 pp	18 pp
Losing connections	TOTAL realized	60 %	55 %	70 %	58 %
	TOTAL not yet	24 %	27 %	15 %	27 %
	NET realized	37 pp	28 pp	55 pp	31 pp
Real vs. fake	TOTAL realized	80 %	72 %	85 %	86 %
	TOTAL not yet	10 %	14 %	8 %	8 %
	NET realized	70 pp	58 pp	78 pp	78 pp
Better health care	TOTAL realized	19 %	26 %	13 %	16 %
	TOTAL not yet	49 %	42 %	55 %	53 %
	NET realized	-30 pp	-16 pp	-42 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)		1057	543	514
Jobs	TOTAL better	16 %	14 %	18 %
	TOTAL worse	72 %	74 %	71 %
	NET worse	57 pp	60 pp	53 pp
Future	TOTAL better	31 %	27 %	35 %
	TOTAL worse	56 %	59 %	53 %
	NET worse	25 pp	32 pp	18 pp
Children	TOTAL better	21 %	16 %	26 %
	TOTAL worse	63 %	69 %	57 %
	NET worse	42 pp	53 pp	31 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	29 %	28 %	31 %
	TOTAL worse	40 %	41 %	39 %
	NET worse	11 pp	13 pp	8 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		1057	490	382	183
Jobs	TOTAL better	16 %	13 %	19 %	16 %
	TOTAL worse	72 %	77 %	69 %	69 %
	NET worse	57 pp	65 pp	50 pp	54 pp
Future	TOTAL better	31 %	24 %	39 %	27 %
	TOTAL worse	56 %	65 %	47 %	54 %
	NET worse	25 pp	41 pp	8 pp	27 pp
Children	TOTAL better	21 %	18 %	24 %	21 %
	TOTAL worse	63 %	69 %	59 %	60 %
	NET worse	42 pp	50 pp	35 pp	39 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	29 %	23 %	36 %	28 %
	TOTAL worse	40 %	49 %	33 %	35 %
	NET worse	11 pp	25 pp	-3 pp	7 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Base (n)		1057	236	228	248	345
Jobs	TOTAL better	16 %	14 %	16 %	15 %	17 %
	TOTAL worse	72 %	74 %	74 %	74 %	68 %
	NET worse	57 pp	59 pp	58 pp	58 pp	51 pp
Future	TOTAL better	31 %	21 %	29 %	35 %	40 %
	TOTAL worse	56 %	61 %	61 %	53 %	48 %
	NET worse	25 pp	40 pp	32 pp	18 pp	8 pp
Children	TOTAL better	21 %	14 %	21 %	24 %	26 %
	TOTAL worse	63 %	69 %	66 %	61 %	55 %
	NET worse	42 pp	54 pp	45 pp	37 pp	29 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	29 %	28 %	27 %	31 %	30 %
	TOTAL worse	40 %	41 %	46 %	38 %	34 %
	NET worse	11 pp	13 pp	19 pp	7 pp	4 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)		1057	685	117	133
Jobs	TOTAL better	16 %	12 %	24 %	23 %
	TOTAL worse	72 %	78 %	57 %	64 %
	NET worse	57 pp	66 pp	33 pp	41 pp
Future	TOTAL better	31 %	28 %	36 %	33 %
	TOTAL worse	56 %	59 %	43 %	55 %
	NET worse	25 pp	30 pp	7 pp	22 pp
Children	TOTAL better	21 %	16 %	30 %	26 %
	TOTAL worse	63 %	67 %	47 %	60 %
	NET worse	42 pp	51 pp	17 pp	34 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	29 %	26 %	27 %	32 %
	TOTAL worse	40 %	40 %	36 %	43 %
	NET worse	11 pp	14 pp	9 pp	11 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		1057	275	367	415
Jobs	TOTAL better	16 %	16 %	18 %	13 %
	TOTAL worse	72 %	69 %	66 %	81 %
	NET worse	57 pp	53 pp	48 pp	67 pp
Future	TOTAL better	31 %	30 %	31 %	32 %
	TOTAL worse	56 %	53 %	52 %	62 %
	NET worse	25 pp	24 pp	21 pp	30 pp
Children	TOTAL better	21 %	20 %	22 %	22 %
	TOTAL worse	63 %	59 %	61 %	69 %
	NET worse	42 pp	39 pp	40 pp	48 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	29 %	25 %	29 %	33 %
	TOTAL worse	40 %	41 %	35 %	42 %
	NET worse	11 pp	15 pp	6 pp	10 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		1057	355	339	363
Jobs	TOTAL better	16 %	18 %	15 %	14 %
	TOTAL worse	72 %	68 %	75 %	76 %
	NET worse	57 pp	51 pp	60 pp	62 pp
Future	TOTAL better	31 %	31 %	30 %	31 %
	TOTAL worse	56 %	53 %	58 %	59 %
	NET worse	25 pp	22 pp	28 pp	27 pp
Children	TOTAL better	21 %	21 %	21 %	21 %
	TOTAL worse	63 %	58 %	66 %	67 %
	NET worse	42 pp	37 pp	45 pp	47 pp
Finances	TOTAL better	29 %	31 %	26 %	29 %
	TOTAL worse	40 %	42 %	39 %	38 %
	NET worse	11 pp	10 pp	13 pp	10 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)		1057	543	514
Children	TOTAL too much	24 %	26 %	21 %
	TOTAL too little	47 %	44 %	49 %
	NET too little	23 pp	18 pp	28 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	24 %	24 %	25 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	42 %	46 %
	NET too little	20 pp	19 pp	21 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	23 %	25 %	20 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	43 %	45 %
	NET too little	22 pp	19 pp	25 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	21 %	23 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	31 %	28 %	34 %
	NET too little	10 pp	6 pp	15 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		1057	490	382	183
Children	TOTAL too much	24 %	22 %	24 %	28 %
	TOTAL too little	47 %	56 %	41 %	37 %
	NET too little	23 pp	35 pp	18 pp	9 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	24 %	23 %	25 %	28 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	57 %	36 %	35 %
	NET too little	20 pp	34 pp	11 pp	7 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	23 %	22 %	20 %	27 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	57 %	35 %	35 %
	NET too little	22 pp	35 pp	15 pp	8 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	21 %	26 %	17 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	31 %	36 %	28 %	28 %
	NET too little	10 pp	10 pp	11 pp	9 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Base (n)		1057	236	228	248	345
Children	TOTAL too much	24 %	24 %	31 %	18 %	21 %
	TOTAL too little	47 %	50 %	41 %	52 %	44 %
	NET too little	23 pp	26 pp	9 pp	33 pp	23 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	24 %	17 %	30 %	27 %	25 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	55 %	36 %	43 %	41 %
	NET too little	20 pp	38 pp	5 pp	16 pp	16 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	23 %	24 %	28 %	19 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	50 %	41 %	44 %	40 %
	NET too little	22 pp	26 pp	13 pp	26 pp	22 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	21 %	22 %	29 %	18 %	14 %
	TOTAL too little	31 %	31 %	29 %	29 %	35 %
	NET too little	10 pp	9 pp	0 pp	11 pp	21 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)		1057	685	117	133
Children	TOTAL too much	24 %	20 %	28 %	28 %
	TOTAL too little	47 %	50 %	34 %	43 %
	NET too little	23 pp	30 pp	6 pp	15 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	24 %	22 %	29 %	24 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	45 %	34 %	44 %
	NET too little	20 pp	24 pp	5 pp	19 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	23 %	19 %	36 %	24 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	44 %	35 %	46 %
	NET too little	22 pp	25 pp	0 pp	22 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	21 %	18 %	29 %	23 %
	TOTAL too little	31 %	30 %	26 %	38 %
	NET too little	10 pp	13 pp	-3 pp	15 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		1057	275	367	415
Children	TOTAL too much	24 %	26 %	28 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	47 %	36 %	47 %	56 %
	NET too little	23 pp	11 pp	20 pp	37 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	24 %	25 %	23 %	25 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	38 %	46 %	49 %
	NET too little	20 pp	12 pp	23 pp	24 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	23 %	27 %	23 %	17 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	38 %	44 %	51 %
	NET too little	22 pp	11 pp	20 pp	33 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	21 %	25 %	17 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	31 %	26 %	33 %	34 %
	NET too little	10 pp	1 pp	16 pp	15 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		1057	355	339	363
Children	TOTAL too much	24 %	28 %	22 %	19 %
	TOTAL too little	47 %	37 %	50 %	57 %
	NET too little	23 pp	9 pp	28 pp	37 pp
Environment	TOTAL too much	24 %	28 %	22 %	22 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	33 %	51 %	52 %
	NET too little	20 pp	5 pp	30 pp	30 pp
Workers	TOTAL too much	23 %	31 %	21 %	13 %
	TOTAL too little	44 %	36 %	48 %	51 %
	NET too little	22 pp	6 pp	27 pp	38 pp
Competitiveness	TOTAL too much	21 %	28 %	19 %	14 %
	TOTAL too little	31 %	25 %	36 %	34 %
	NET too little	10 pp	-3 pp	17 pp	21 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)		1057	543	514
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	72 %	69 %	75 %
	TOTAL unlikely	14 %	12 %	15 %
	NET likely	58 pp	57 pp	60 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	77 %	75 %	78 %
	TOTAL unlikely	9 %	7 %	11 %
	NET likely	67 pp	68 pp	67 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	66 %	64 %	69 %
	TOTAL unlikely	14 %	12 %	17 %
	NET likely	52 pp	52 pp	52 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	70 %	70 %	69 %
	TOTAL unlikely	11 %	8 %	15 %
	NET likely	58 pp	63 pp	54 pp

By Party

Item	Metric	Total	Dem	Rep	Ind
Base (n)		1057	490	382	183
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	72 %	75 %	73 %	64 %
	TOTAL unlikely	14 %	13 %	15 %	12 %
	NET likely	58 pp	62 pp	58 pp	52 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	77 %	83 %	75 %	68 %
	TOTAL unlikely	9 %	7 %	11 %	11 %
	NET likely	67 pp	76 pp	64 pp	56 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	66 %	71 %	67 %	56 %
	TOTAL unlikely	14 %	13 %	16 %	14 %
	NET likely	52 pp	57 pp	52 pp	42 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	70 %	76 %	67 %	62 %
	TOTAL unlikely	11 %	9 %	15 %	8 %
	NET likely	58 pp	67 pp	51 pp	54 pp

By Age

Item	Metric	Total	18-34	35-49	50-64	65+
Base (n)		1057	236	228	248	345
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	72 %	66 %	73 %	76 %	74 %
	TOTAL unlikely	14 %	13 %	16 %	10 %	15 %
	NET likely	58 pp	53 pp	58 pp	66 pp	58 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	77 %	67 %	80 %	82 %	81 %
	TOTAL unlikely	9 %	10 %	11 %	7 %	9 %
	NET likely	67 pp	57 pp	68 pp	75 pp	71 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	66 %	53 %	64 %	73 %	78 %
	TOTAL unlikely	14 %	20 %	12 %	13 %	12 %
	NET likely	52 pp	34 pp	52 pp	60 pp	66 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	70 %	65 %	70 %	75 %	70 %
	TOTAL unlikely	11 %	12 %	12 %	9 %	11 %
	NET likely	58 pp	53 pp	58 pp	66 pp	59 pp

By Ethnicity

Item	Metric	Total	White	Black	Hispanic
Base (n)		1057	685	117	133
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	72 %	70 %	62 %	81 %
	TOTAL unlikely	14 %	16 %	11 %	7 %
	NET likely	58 pp	53 pp	51 pp	73 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	77 %	80 %	65 %	73 %
	TOTAL unlikely	9 %	9 %	9 %	12 %
	NET likely	67 pp	71 pp	56 pp	62 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	66 %	65 %	57 %	69 %
	TOTAL unlikely	14 %	15 %	10 %	16 %
	NET likely	52 pp	50 pp	48 pp	53 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	70 %	71 %	60 %	65 %
	TOTAL unlikely	11 %	12 %	10 %	13 %
	NET likely	58 pp	59 pp	50 pp	52 pp

By Education

Item	Metric	Total	HS or less	Some college	BA+
Base (n)		1057	275	367	415
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	72 %	70 %	74 %	72 %
	TOTAL unlikely	14 %	11 %	11 %	17 %
	NET likely	58 pp	59 pp	63 pp	54 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	77 %	69 %	75 %	85 %
	TOTAL unlikely	9 %	10 %	9 %	8 %
	NET likely	67 pp	59 pp	66 pp	76 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	66 %	57 %	67 %	75 %
	TOTAL unlikely	14 %	16 %	12 %	14 %
	NET likely	52 pp	41 pp	55 pp	61 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	70 %	63 %	72 %	75 %
	TOTAL unlikely	11 %	13 %	9 %	11 %
	NET likely	58 pp	49 pp	63 pp	64 pp

By Household income

Item	Metric	Total	<50k	50k-<100k	100k+
Base (n)		1057	355	339	363
Superintelligence	TOTAL likely	72 %	68 %	74 %	75 %
	TOTAL unlikely	14 %	12 %	13 %	16 %
	NET likely	58 pp	56 pp	61 pp	59 pp
Loss-of-control	TOTAL likely	77 %	67 %	82 %	85 %
	TOTAL unlikely	9 %	13 %	7 %	6 %
	NET likely	67 pp	53 pp	75 pp	78 pp
Breakthroughs	TOTAL likely	66 %	61 %	64 %	76 %
	TOTAL unlikely	14 %	12 %	17 %	15 %
	NET likely	52 pp	49 pp	46 pp	62 pp
WMDs	TOTAL likely	70 %	64 %	74 %	74 %
	TOTAL unlikely	11 %	13 %	8 %	12 %
	NET likely	58 pp	51 pp	66 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 eighth tracking wave of the **Americans on AI** survey, a project of Athena Insights.

Respondents were interviewed between October 8 and 12, 2026 as part of NORC's AmeriSpeak Omnibus. AmeriSpeak is a probability-based household panel recruited by address-based sampling from the NORC National Frame, designed to be representative of the US household population. Interviews were conducted online (96%) and by phone (4%), in English; 1,057 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 1.86 and an effective sample size of 567. 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 ± 4.1 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=1,057).

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	543	51
	Male	514	49
Party	Dem	490	46
	Rep	382	36
	Ind	183	17
	Unknown	2	0
Age	18-34	236	22
	35-49	228	22
	50-64	248	23
	65+	345	33
Ethnicity	White	685	65
	Black	117	11
	Hispanic	133	13
	Asian/PI	74	7
	Two or more	34	3
	Other	14	1
Education	HS or less	275	26
	Some college	367	35
	BA+	415	39
Household income	<50k	355	34
	50k-<100k	339	32
	100k+	363	34