



AMERICANS ON FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR CHILDCARE AND CHILDHOOD NUTRITION
-- Questionnaire --

Fielded by: Nielsen Scarborough **Sample Size:** 2,613 Registered Voters
Field Dates: July 29 - Aug 23, 2021 **Margin of Error:** +/- 1.9%

AMERICANS ON FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR CHILDCARE

Questions 1-14 previously released.

[Direct support to families to ensure that low- and middle-income families spend no more than seven percent of their income on childcare]

We are now going to look at a proposal that deals with the cost of childcare, including daycare centers, before- and after-school programs, and summer programs for school-age children.

As you may know, childcare has become more expensive over the last few decades. Families with children under age 5, in which the mother is working, spend on average about 10 percent of their income on childcare.

This varies widely depending on income. Among families that pay for childcare:

- lower income families (less than \$50,000 for a family of four) pay on average 35% of their income
- higher income families (more than \$150,000) pay on average 7%.

One proposal is for the federal government to provide funds to states that want it for them to help parents cover some of the cost of childcare, so that low- and middle-income families spend no more than 7% of their income on childcare.

The amount that the government will cover depends on the family’s income:

- Low-income families – those making about \$65,000 or less – would have all of their costs covered.
- Middle-income families – those making between \$65,000 and about \$130,000 – would have some of their costs covered so they don’t spend more than 7% of their income on daycare centers.
- High-income families would not have any of their costs covered.

The income cut-offs will also depend on which state the family is in, as states with more high-income people often charge much more for childcare. So, if they live in a state where the typical family has a higher income, the income cut-offs will also be higher.

Here is an argument in favor of the proposal:

Q15. For low- and middle-income people, the cost of childcare is so high that it makes little economic sense for both parents to work, even when they really want to. In over half of states, childcare for infants is more than college tuition. This keeps them stuck at lower income levels and more likely to need various government services. If childcare is affordable, they can get into the workforce. With time, as their income goes up, they will need fewer government services. This will also help expand the workforce, which will become increasingly necessary in the future as the American population ages.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	31.7%	39.2%	70.9%	17.3%	10.3%	27.6%	1.6%
Republicans	16.3%	38.2%	54.5%	25.9%	17.0%	42.9%	2.6%
Democrats	46.8%	39.6%	86.4%	8.4%	4.4%	12.8%	0.8%
Independents	27.1%	40.4%	67.5%	20.7%	10.3%	31.0%	1.5%

Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	31.1%	37.3%	68.4%	18.3%	9.1%	27.4%	4.3%
Somewhat red	28.5%	41.3%	69.8%	17.8%	11.9%	29.7%	0.5%
Lean red	27.1%	38.7%	65.8%	20.1%	13.7%	33.8%	0.4%
Lean blue	31.4%	38.4%	69.8%	19.3%	9.1%	28.4%	1.9%
Somewhat blue	37.1%	39.6%	76.7%	13.5%	8.0%	21.5%	1.7%
Very blue	37.8%	39.8%	77.6%	12.3%	8.5%	20.8%	1.7%

Here is an argument against:

Q16. The biggest reason that childcare costs have increased so much is actually government policy. They have over-regulated childcare centers by strictly limiting how many children any center can have per staff member, even though there is little evidence that this alone results in better childcare. Government subsidies will not solve the underlying problem of expensive childcare. The solution to high childcare costs is not subsidies but less unnecessary government regulation and red tape.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	17.5%	28.4%	45.9%	25.6%	28.1%	53.7%	0.5%
Republicans	28.6%	35.0%	63.6%	23.3%	12.1%	35.4%	1.1%
Democrats	6.6%	21.9%	28.5%	26.0%	45.4%	71.4%	0.1%
Independents	20.7%	30.2%	50.9%	29.5%	19.1%	48.6%	0.5%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	20.1%	27.9%	48.0%	24.7%	27.3%	52.0%	0.0%
Somewhat red	17.6%	31.5%	49.1%	23.4%	27.3%	50.7%	0.2%
Lean red	17.6%	25.7%	43.3%	28.8%	26.5%	55.3%	1.3%
Lean blue	17.7%	30.5%	48.2%	26.0%	25.4%	51.4%	0.5%
Somewhat blue	18.5%	25.0%	43.5%	24.3%	31.5%	55.8%	0.7%
Very blue	12.5%	29.4%	41.9%	24.5%	33.5%	58.0%	0.1%

Here is another argument in favor:

Q17. Families are the foundation of American society. It is in everybody's interest to make raising a family less demanding and more rewarding. Reducing the high costs of childcare for low- and middle-income families will improve their quality of life in many ways. It will reduce the tremendous economic pressures on young parents that have negative, long-term effects on their children. With less stress in the home, young children will thrive better in their crucial early years and throughout their lives.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	29.7%	40.8%	70.5%	17.7%	10.1%	27.8%	1.8%
Republicans	15.4%	39.1%	54.5%	26.2%	17.0%	43.2%	2.3%
Democrats	43.3%	42.8%	86.1%	8.6%	3.7%	12.3%	1.6%
Independents	26.3%	39.7%	66.0%	21.9%	11.2%	33.1%	0.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	32.0%	36.2%	68.2%	21.0%	8.6%	29.6%	2.2%
Somewhat red	26.0%	46.4%	72.4%	15.9%	11.3%	27.2%	0.4%
Lean red	26.6%	39.8%	66.4%	21.0%	11.8%	32.8%	0.9%
Lean blue	30.5%	40.0%	70.5%	17.8%	9.0%	26.8%	2.7%
Somewhat blue	31.8%	39.1%	70.9%	17.8%	9.7%	27.5%	1.7%
Very blue	34.4%	42.5%	76.9%	11.4%	8.4%	19.8%	3.2%

Here is another argument against:

Q18. Having the government subsidize childcare is one more way that the government is trying to insert itself into people's lives. It is trying to encourage women to put their children in childcare and go to work rather than to take care of their children themselves. This is government manipulation. Using money to try to influence whether parents go to work or stay at home with their children is not something the government should be doing.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	20.2%	23.9%	44.1%	22.2%	33.0%	55.2%	0.8%
Republicans	36.1%	28.9%	65.0%	22.1%	11.6%	33.7%	1.2%
Democrats	5.0%	17.9%	22.9%	20.3%	56.2%	76.5%	0.6%
Independents	23.8%	28.1%	51.9%	26.9%	20.7%	47.6%	0.5%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	21.1%	31.3%	52.4%	17.3%	28.5%	45.8%	1.8%
Somewhat red	22.1%	26.4%	48.5%	21.8%	29.4%	51.2%	0.3%
Lean red	21.4%	20.4%	41.8%	25.0%	32.8%	57.8%	0.5%
Lean blue	20.9%	23.8%	44.7%	21.4%	33.0%	54.4%	0.9%
Somewhat blue	20.4%	21.9%	42.3%	23.2%	33.3%	56.5%	1.2%
Very blue	12.3%	22.0%	34.3%	23.0%	42.3%	65.3%	0.4%

Q19. So, here again is the proposal:

The federal government would provide funds to states that want it, for them to help parents cover some of the cost of childcare, so that low- and middle-income families spend no more than 7% of their income on childcare.

How acceptable do you find this proposal, where 0=not at all acceptable, 5=just tolerable, and 10=very acceptable?

	Very Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Very Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't Know
National	36.7%	10.3%	52.8%	0.2%
Republicans	57.4%	11.8%	30.7%	0.1%
Democrats	17.7%	7.2%	74.7%	0.4%
Independents	39.2%	14.7%	46.0%	0.1%
Cook's PVI (D-R)				
Very red	38.8%	9.2%	51.7%	0.4%
Somewhat red	44.1%	11.2%	44.5%	0.2%
Lean red	39.7%	9.7%	50.5%	0.0%
Lean blue	38.1%	11.8%	49.6%	0.5%
Somewhat blue	31.0%	10.8%	58.1%	0.1%
Very blue	23.5%	6.8%	69.7%	0.0%

Q20. Now finally, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / Don't Know
National	63.3%	35.9%	0.8%
Republicans	38.5%	60.3%	1.2%
Democrats	86.4%	13.1%	0.4%
Independents	58.9%	40.2%	0.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	62.0%	38.0%	0.0%
Somewhat red	59.3%	39.4%	1.3%
Lean red	58.6%	40.2%	1.2%
Lean blue	61.1%	38.2%	0.7%
Somewhat blue	65.6%	33.1%	1.3%
Very blue	78.9%	21.1%	0.0%

AMERICANS ON CHILDHOOD NUTRITION ASSISTANCE

[Make permanent the Summer EBT program which provides nutrition assistance during the summer months to families with children who qualify for free or reduced meals at schools, by leveraging SNAP and WIC EBT technology. (\$25 billion)]

As you may know, the Federal government provides children from very low-income households free or reduced-price meals during the normal school year.

During the summer, when they are out of school, most children lose that source of meals. As a result, families of such children tend to experience hunger more often during the summer months.

In some states, the federal government has been providing those families extra support to help cover the costs of meals for children during the summer.

In 2020, in response to the job losses that occurred during the pandemic, the federal government expanded this program to the whole country, providing extra support of up to \$130 worth of food a month to low-income families with school-age children or children under age 6. This program is set to expire by the end of the year. Some people say these benefits during the summer months should be made permanent

So, there is now a proposal to always provide, during the summer months, up to \$130 worth of food a month to very low-income families with school-age children or children under age 6. It is estimated that this proposal would cost around \$2.5 billion a year.

Here is an argument in favor of this proposal:

Q21. Going without food is one of the worst things that can happen to a child. Hunger inhibits their physical and mental development and has long-lasting negative effects. Unfortunately, during the summer, when children do not get school-provided meals, it is very hard for low-income parents to cover the costs, while also having to cover the costs of childcare. This has led to millions of children experiencing hunger, which is unacceptable. Studies show that when parents get these extra benefits, there is an increase in the number of low-income children eating three meals a day during the summer, and in the nutritional value of the food they eat.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	45.7%	32.9%	78.6%	11.6%	8.4%	20.0%	1.4%
Republicans	26.4%	39.1%	65.5%	19.5%	13.1%	32.6%	1.8%
Democrats	63.9%	26.8%	90.7%	4.2%	4.3%	8.5%	0.8%
Independents	41.9%	34.5%	76.4%	12.7%	8.5%	21.2%	2.3%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	42.0%	32.9%	74.9%	11.9%	9.5%	21.4%	3.7%
Somewhat red	43.2%	34.0%	77.2%	12.6%	9.7%	22.3%	0.4%
Lean red	41.6%	37.2%	78.8%	12.6%	7.5%	20.1%	1.1%
Lean blue	44.8%	32.5%	77.3%	12.6%	9.2%	21.8%	0.8%
Somewhat blue	52.3%	25.7%	78.0%	11.5%	8.2%	19.7%	2.4%
Very blue	54.3%	32.9%	87.2%	6.0%	5.7%	11.7%	1.1%

Here is an argument against this proposal:

Q22. The government already provides low-income families with plenty of benefits. A three-person household receives on average about \$400 a month to cover the cost of food. And the government is already spending \$60 billion a year on these programs. People should not rely on government handouts to be able to feed their families. There are charities that

provide food for children-in-need during the summer. We should let local communities fill that need, not the federal government.

	Very Convincing	Somewhat Convincing	Total Convincing	Somewhat Unconvincing	Very Unconvincing	Total Unconvincing	Refused / DK
National	22.4%	27.6%	50.0%	22.2%	27.3%	49.5%	0.5%
Republicans	38.1%	34.8%	72.9%	17.6%	8.8%	26.4%	0.7%
Democrats	7.6%	21.9%	29.5%	24.6%	45.8%	70.4%	0.1%
Independents	25.3%	26.5%	51.8%	26.3%	20.9%	47.2%	0.9%
Cook's PVI (D-R)							
Very red	24.8%	28.9%	53.7%	24.7%	21.6%	46.3%	0.0%
Somewhat red	23.6%	27.9%	51.5%	23.7%	24.6%	48.3%	0.2%
Lean red	23.0%	29.7%	52.7%	21.8%	25.4%	47.2%	0.1%
Lean blue	22.8%	29.9%	52.7%	20.8%	26.3%	47.1%	0.2%
Somewhat blue	20.9%	22.3%	43.2%	23.0%	32.0%	55.0%	1.8%
Very blue	16.9%	26.0%	42.9%	20.6%	36.0%	56.6%	0.5%

Q23. So, here again is the proposal:

Always provide, during the summer months, up to \$130 worth of food a month to very low-income families with school-age children or children under age 6. It is estimated that this proposal would cost around \$2.5 billion a year.

How acceptable would you find this proposal, where 0=not at all acceptable, 5=just tolerable, and 10=very acceptable?

	Very Unacceptable (0-4)	Just Tolerable (5)	Very Acceptable (6-10)	Refused / Don't Know
National	34.0%	11.8%	54.0%	0.2%
Republicans	53.2%	14.6%	31.9%	0.3%
Democrats	16.3%	9.3%	74.2%	0.2%
Independents	36.7%	11.9%	51.4%	0.0%
Cook's PVI (D-R)				
Very red	36.2%	13.9%	49.9%	0.0%
Somewhat red	38.2%	14.9%	46.9%	0.0%
Lean red	35.4%	11.7%	52.8%	0.1%
Lean blue	36.6%	11.8%	51.1%	0.4%
Somewhat blue	28.7%	9.4%	61.8%	0.1%
Very blue	24.9%	8.4%	66.1%	0.6%

Q24. Now finally, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / Don't Know
National	66.1%	33.1%	0.8%
Republicans	43.9%	55.3%	0.8%
Democrats	85.0%	14.4%	0.6%
Independents	66.9%	31.9%	1.2%
Cook's PVI (D-R)			
Very red	65.6%	34.4%	0.0%
Somewhat red	62.8%	37.0%	0.2%
Lean red	59.3%	39.9%	0.8%
Lean blue	66.8%	32.1%	1.1%
Somewhat blue	69.7%	28.9%	1.4%
Very blue	77.5%	21.6%	0.9%

Questions 25-36 held for future release.

###