PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

– MICHIGAN QUESTIONNAIRE –

Field Dates:	September 9-22, 2024	
Sample Size:	Michigan: 597 Adults	National: 1,260 Adults
Confidence Interval:	Michigan: +/- 4.6%	National: +/- 3.1%
Sample Provided by:	Multiple online opt-in panels, including Cint, Dynata and Prodege. Sample collection and quality control was managed by QuantifyAI under the direction of the University of Maryland's Program for Public Consultation.	

[Language — Respondents are allowed to change the language of the survey by clicking the "en español" button on the far upper left part of the screen]

To take the survey in English, please click Next.
Para realizar la encuesta en español, haga clic en el botón de idioma de la esquina superior derecha.

[Note: Headings in [brackets] were not presented to respondents. They simply indicate topics and provide programming instructions. Single lines indicate respondents were presented questions/text on a new screen. Footnotes denote sources, but were not presented to the respondent]

[Introduction]
This survey is going to address policies about international trade and America's role in that system.

You will be provided with background information, as well as arguments for and against each policy. This survey will take about 20 minutes to answer. Your answers will remain completely anonymous.

[Briefing]
As you may know, after World War II, the United States together with most of the major countries in the world set up a number of international agreements and institutions. One of the key goals was to promote greater international trade by agreeing on a set of rules that seek to lower barriers to trade and ensure trade is done fairly.

To this end they created what is called the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (or GATT).

One type of barrier to trade is tariffs. Tariffs are like a tax that is charged to businesses that import goods. For example, if a US company imports shoes for $50 and the US government imposes a 10% tariff, the US company would pay a fee of $5.

When tariffs are high, countries are less apt to trade with each other because it makes imported goods more expensive. When tariffs are low it makes imported goods more attractive. Thus, the GATT agreement encouraged countries to negotiate to lower their tariffs on a mutual basis.

The GATT also established rules to ensure that trade was done fairly. For example, the GATT established that no product should be discriminated against due to the country it came from – that is, a country can not have more favorable regulations on goods produced domestically than for goods imported from abroad.

It also prohibits countries from trying to dominate a market by selling products below their cost of production, widely known as 'dumping.'

As a result of the GATT and the other agreements it spawned, average tariff rates have come down from around 22% to about 2% today.[1] Partly as a result of these trade agreements there has been a substantial growth in international trade.

Q1. How familiar are you with the idea of the US, together with other countries, promoting international trade by having agreements to have low tariffs on a mutual basis and to abide by agreed-upon rules?

[1] NBER. (2015) The GATT's Starting Point: Tariff Levels Circa 1947; World Trade Organization. (2023) United States of America, Tariffs and Imports: Duties and Ranges

	Very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Total Familiar	Only a Little Familiar	Not at All Familiar	Total Unfamiliar	Ref/DK
Michigan	16%	47%	**63%**	25%	12%	**37%**	0%
GOP	17%	45%	**62%**	27%	11%	**38%**	0%
Dem.	16%	51%	**67%**	24%	9%	**33%**	0%
National	20%	45%	**65%**	24%	12%	**35%**	0%
GOP	17%	50%	**67%**	22%	11%	**33%**	0%
Dem.	24%	41%	**65%**	25%	10%	**35%**	0%
Indep.	10%	43%	**53%**	27%	20%	**47%**	0%

As you may know, there is some discussion these days about what the US should do in regard to international trade. Some people think the US should continue to seek to promote international trade through international agreements. Others think that trade has many negative effects and oppose the growth of trade.

Here is an argument in favor of the US continuing to seek to promote international trade through international agreements.

Q2. International trade has played a key role in the growth of the American economy and the world economy. It has been a major factor in the unprecedented rise in the standard of living over the last 70 years. With foreign markets more open, US producers can increase their production to sell to them. When markets are more open to imported goods, consumers benefit from lower prices. Putting up tariffs to keep out these goods is not fair to consumers who have to pay higher prices. It is really a hidden tax on consumers which is especially tough for low-income people.

How convincing or unconvincing do you find this argument?

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
Michigan	26%	52%	**78%**	17%	4%	**21%**	2%
GOP	16%	53%	**69%**	23%	6%	**29%**	2%
Dem.	36%	53%	**88%**	9%	1%	**9%**	2%
National	29%	52%	**81%**	14%	4%	**18%**	1%
GOP	24%	51%	**74%**	19%	6%	**24%**	2%
Dem.	38%	52%	**90%**	7%	2%	**9%**	1%
Indep.	17%	58%	**75%**	21%	4%	**25%**	0%

Here is a counter argument.

Q3. While trade may be good for investors and high skilled workers, and can lower consumer prices, it comes at a great cost for many American workers and businesses. As the US market has been opened up to cheap imports from low-wage countries, this has undercut American companies producing the same products, driving them out of business and throwing employees out of work. This also encourages American companies to move to other countries to access low-wage workers, putting more Americans out of work.

How convincing or unconvincing do you find this argument?

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
Michigan	30%	49%	**78%**	18%	4%	**22%**	0%
GOP	37%	49%	**85%**	11%	4%	**15%**	0%
Dem.	26%	48%	**74%**	21%	5%	**26%**	0%
National	32%	47%	**80%**	15%	5%	**20%**	0%
GOP	39%	45%	**83%**	12%	5%	**17%**	0%
Dem.	30%	50%	**80%**	15%	5%	**20%**	0%
Indep.	19%	48%	**67%**	27%	6%	**33%**	0%

Here is another argument in favor.

Q4. When trade barriers are lower, this makes it more possible for American companies to sell their products in foreign markets. International trade has been a major growth area for the US economy and has boosted US output by more than a trillion dollars a year. Many of the products that the US sells abroad--like hi tech or heavy industrial goods—are ones that the US is particularly good at making. If US companies were more restricted to the US, these strong US companies would be producing much less and hiring fewer workers.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
Michigan	25%	53%	**77%**	15%	4%	**18%**	4%
GOP	22%	51%	**74%**	18%	6%	**23%**	3%
Dem.	30%	53%	**83%**	10%	1%	**11%**	6%
National	27%	48%	**75%**	17%	4%	**21%**	5%
GOP	22%	47%	**68%**	20%	5%	**26%**	6%
Dem.	36%	48%	**83%**	11%	3%	**13%**	4%
Indep.	11%	53%	**65%**	26%	3%	**29%**	6%

Here is a counter argument.

Q5. When other countries have access to US markets their companies can undercut our domestic companies because some of these companies are from countries with lower costs because they have weak labor and environmental standards. As a result, some US companies cannot compete and end up going out of business. These companies are often smaller, local ones and, when they close, this can devastate a community.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
Michigan	28%	43%	**71%**	24%	5%	**29%**	0%
GOP	39%	39%	**78%**	19%	4%	**23%**	0%
Dem.	21%	47%	**68%**	25%	6%	**32%**	1%
National	29%	48%	**77%**	19%	4%	**23%**	0%
GOP	35%	46%	**80%**	15%	4%	**19%**	1%
Dem.	26%	50%	**76%**	21%	3%	**25%**	0%
Indep.	15%	52%	**67%**	27%	7%	**33%**	0%

Here is another argument in favor.

Q6. When the US can sell products abroad this creates many jobs for Americans. In 2022, exports of goods and services supported an estimated 10.2 million US jobs all across the country.[2] And these are good jobs because our exports tend to focus on products that command a high price abroad. Research shows that export-oriented industries pay 10-16% more than other jobs and this is especially true for blue-collar jobs. If we were to slow down trade, many people would be thrown out of work.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
Michigan	30%	50%	**80%**	16%	3%	**19%**	1%
GOP	24%	50%	**74%**	22%	4%	**26%**	1%
Dem.	38%	51%	**89%**	8%	2%	**10%**	1%
National	33%	47%	**80%**	16%	3%	**18%**	1%
GOP	30%	48%	**78%**	18%	4%	**21%**	1%
Dem.	39%	47%	**87%**	10%	2%	**12%**	2%
Indep.	22%	46%	**68%**	27%	4%	**31%**	1%

Here is a counter argument.

Q7. If our economy becomes very dependent on international trade we have the potential to lose our independence and sovereignty. When we buy a lot of our products from other countries and stop producing those goods here, those countries can threaten to withhold the products we need. Furthermore, we should not be part of an international system in which foreigners judge whether we are following the rules or not. We need to maintain our independence to pursue our interests as we see fit.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
Michigan	30%	38%	**68%**	25%	7%	**32%**	0%
GOP	39%	37%	**76%**	22%	3%	**24%**	0%
Dem.	25%	36%	**61%**	26%	12%	**39%**	1%

[2] ITA. (2024) OTEA Publications: Jobs Supported by Exports 2022

National	32%	41%	**72%**	22%	6%	**28%**	0%
GOP	38%	40%	**78%**	17%	5%	**22%**	0%
Dem.	30%	38%	**68%**	25%	7%	**33%**	0%
Indep.	17%	52%	**69%**	24%	7%	**31%**	0%

Here is another argument in favor.

Q8. Trade has been essential to growing economies around the world, and this growth has in turn helped lift hundreds of millions of people out of poverty. When a country opens up its economy, it expands the amount of markets available to its businesses which gives them more customers to sell to, allowing them to grow and hire more people. Also, more imports lowers the price of common products, which means a person's wages will go farther. Studies have found that reductions in tariffs have decreased poverty rates.[3]

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
Michigan	25%	51%	**75%**	17%	3%	**21%**	4%
GOP	21%	51%	**71%**	20%	5%	**25%**	4%
Dem.	30%	51%	**81%**	12%	2%	**14%**	5%
National	31%	49%	**80%**	13%	4%	**17%**	3%
GOP	30%	46%	**75%**	16%	6%	**21%**	4%
Dem.	37%	50%	**87%**	9%	2%	**11%**	2%
Indep.	17%	58%	**74%**	19%	6%	**24%**	1%

Here is a counter argument.

Q9. Free trade policies pushed by the US have allowed international corporations to go into developing countries and exploit them. They seek out countries where labor standards are low or nonexistent, and they may even use children or forced labor. International corporations also seek out countries that will let them pollute the environment so as to keep their production costs low.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
Michigan	26%	43%	**69%**	24%	6%	**30%**	1%
GOP	28%	40%	**68%**	26%	5%	**32%**	1%
Dem.	26%	48%	**73%**	22%	5%	**26%**	1%
National	26%	45%	**71%**	23%	6%	**29%**	0%
GOP	24%	46%	**70%**	24%	6%	**30%**	0%
Dem.	30%	43%	**73%**	22%	5%	**27%**	0%
Indep.	21%	48%	**68%**	25%	7%	**32%**	0%

Q10. So now do you approve or disapprove of the US, together with other countries, promoting international trade by having agreements to have low tariffs on a mutual basis and to abide by agreed-upon rules?

	Strongly Approve	Somewhat Approve	Total Approve	Somewhat Disapprove	Strongly Disapprove	Total Disapprove	Ref/DK
Michigan	26%	55%	**80%**	16%	4%	**20%**	0%
GOP	19%	54%	**73%**	22%	5%	**27%**	0%
Dem.	36%	54%	**89%**	9%	2%	**11%**	0%
National	29%	52%	**81%**	15%	4%	**19%**	0%
GOP	27%	48%	**74%**	20%	5%	**25%**	0%
Dem.	35%	53%	**88%**	9%	4%	**12%**	0%
Indep.	13%	65%	**78%**	18%	5%	**22%**	0%

Demographic Findings for Michigan								
		Strongly Approve	Somewhat Approve	Total Approve	Somewhat Disapprove	Strongly Disapprove	Total Disapprove	DK/ Ref
Gender	Men	28%	54%	**82%**	15%	3%	**18%**	0%
	Women	24%	55%	**79%**	17%	4%	**21%**	0%
Age	18-29	31%	53%	**84%**	12%	5%	**16%**	0%

[3] World Trade Organization and World Bank Group. (2018) Trade and Poverty Reduction: New Evidence of Impacts in Developing Countries.

	30-49	26%	55%	**81%**	15%	4%	**19%**	0%
	50-64	21%	56%	**76%**	20%	3%	**23%**	1%
	65 or older	27%	54%	**81%**	17%	2%	**19%**	0%
Income	Less than $50,000	32%	43%	**76%**	18%	6%	**24%**	0%
	$50-100,000	18%	63%	**81%**	17%	2%	**19%**	0%
	$100-150,000	28%	52%	**80%**	16%	4%	**20%**	0%
	More than $150,000	26%	59%	**85%**	13%	1%	**14%**	1%
Education	High School or less	21%	55%	**76%**	19%	5%	**24%**	0%
	Some college	27%	55%	**82%**	16%	2%	**18%**	0%
	College degree	30%	54%	**84%**	12%	3%	**15%**	1%

[LABOR AND ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS]

As was discussed above, one possible negative effect from international trade is that lowering trade barriers can weaken labor standards or environmental standards. There are two ways that this can occur.

- Companies in countries with lower labor and environmental standards may have lower production costs and are thus able to charge lower prices. This makes their products more competitive in international trade. It may also encourage other countries to lower their standards so they can compete.
- Companies in countries with higher labor and environmental standards may move their factories to countries with lower standards, to lower their production costs. Here too, this may encourage countries to lower their standards so that they are attractive to companies when they decide where to have their factories.

To discourage these things from happening, and to generally raise labor and environmental standards, there have been efforts through the UN to establish international labor and environmental standards. The UN has held a number of conferences on these issues and most countries of the world have agreed to certain international standards.

Sometimes, however, countries have signed the UN agreement and established such laws, but have not enforced them or later lowered the standards. In other cases they have not even established the laws. As mentioned, in cases where a country is not abiding by the standards it has agreed to, they may get an advantage because it becomes cheaper to produce certain products.

The US has made agreements with its major trading partners which include requirements to meet labor and environmental standards. This includes Canada, Mexico, South Korea and most Central American countries. Another major trade partner, the countries of the European Union already have high labor and environmental standards, though a couple of countries do not fully meet them. These partners cover the majority of American trade.

But for other trade partners the US does not have an agreement to meet labor and environmental standards.

There is some debate about whether the US should actively work to make agreements with other countries to meet labor and environmental standards, and to make them more enforceable.

[LABOR STANDARDS]

We will first look at international labor standards. The main labor standards that have been agreed to are:

- No child labor that is likely to harm the health, safety, or morals of children or prevent them from attending school
- No forced labor where a person is coerced to work through the use of violence, intimidation, or threats of harm
- Right to form and join unions
- The elimination of discrimination in employment, for example based on gender, religion, ethnicity.

There is some debate about whether the US should actively work to make agreements with other countries to require that they:

- abide by the labor standards they have committed to
- do not lower their standards to attract business or to get a competitive edge
- have an effective system for enforcing these requirements

Here is an argument in favor.

Q11. Making sure that each country has a minimum level of labor standards that are actually being enforced, levels the playing field. We need to make sure that workers are treated with more dignity. No country should be able to get an economic advantage by mistreating their workers. Because of how international trade laws work, this is the best way of making sure that countries who have committed themselves to these labor standards actually enforce them.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
Michigan	42%	44%	**86%**	11%	3%	**14%**	1%
GOP	34%	49%	**83%**	12%	5%	**17%**	0%

Dem.	52%	40%	**93%**	5%	1%	**6%**	1%
National	43%	42%	**84%**	11%	4%	**14%**	1%
GOP	38%	40%	**78%**	16%	5%	**21%**	1%
Dem.	49%	42%	**91%**	5%	2%	**7%**	2%
Indep.	34%	47%	**81%**	14%	5%	**18%**	1%

Here is a counter argument.

Q12. Attaching labor standards to international trade agreements is inappropriate and can hurt the economic growth that developing countries need to lift their people out of poverty. First of all, not all countries have the same priorities as the US. In the trade-off between labor standards and growing their economy they may want to prioritize economic growth until most people have jobs--since without jobs there can be no labor standards.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
Michigan	16%	38%	**54%**	33%	13%	**46%**	0%
GOP	20%	37%	**57%**	34%	9%	**43%**	0%
Dem.	13%	37%	**50%**	34%	15%	**50%**	0%
National	18%	41%	**59%**	31%	10%	**40%**	0%
GOP	16%	44%	**61%**	29%	10%	**39%**	0%
Dem.	21%	39%	**60%**	29%	10%	**39%**	1%
Indep.	17%	33%	**50%**	42%	8%	**50%**	0%

So, here again is the proposal:

The US actively working to make agreements with other countries that require they:

- abide by the labor standards they have committed to
- do not lower their standards to attract business or to get a competitive edge
- have an effective system for enforcing these requirements

Q13. How acceptable do you find this proposal on a scale of 0-10, where 0=Not at all acceptable, 5=Just tolerable and 10=very acceptable?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / DK
Michigan	5%	14%	80%	0%
GOP	8%	15%	78%	0%
Dem.	2%	12%	85%	1%
National	6%	14%	79%	1%
GOP	9%	15%	75%	1%
Dem.	3%	12%	85%	1%
Indep.	9%	24%	67%	0%

Q14. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose the proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
Michigan	82%	18%	0%
GOP	79%	21%	0%
Dem.	89%	11%	0%
National	82%	18%	0%
GOP	77%	23%	0%
Dem.	90%	10%	0%
Indep.	69%	31%	0%

Demographic Findings for Michigan				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
Gender	Men	82%	18%	0%
	Women	81%	19%	0%
Age	18-29	83%	17%	0%
	30-49	80%	20%	0%
	50-64	81%	19%	0%

	65 or older	83%	17%	0%
Income	Less than $50,000	76%	25%	0%
	$50-100,000	83%	17%	0%
	$100-150,000	86%	14%	0%
	More than $150,000	83%	17%	0%
Education	High School or less	75%	25%	0%
	Some college	84%	16%	0%
	College degree	87%	13%	0%

[ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS]
We will now look at environmental standards.

As mentioned, there have been a number of international conferences attended by UN member countries where the countries agreed to pursue certain environmental standards or goals related to such areas as air and water pollution, endangered species, greenhouse gas emissions, deforestation and others. Each country has agreed to bring their own laws in line with those standards or goals.

There is some debate about whether the US should actively work to make agreements with other countries that require they:
- abide by the environmental standards they have committed to
- do not lower their standards to attract business or to get a competitive edge
- have an effective system for enforcing these requirements

Here is an argument in favor.

Q15. Having an actual system of enforcement for environmental standards that countries have agreed to is necessary to both protect the environment, and make sure countries don't get a competitive edge from the lower costs that come from ignoring environmental standards. Trade should benefit everybody, but when the environment is destroyed to produce and transport more goods, it is the average citizen that suffers. Requiring countries to uphold environmental standards is not only good for the planet, it is good for America.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
Michigan	38%	47%	**84%**	10%	4%	**14%**	2%
GOP	30%	50%	**80%**	11%	7%	**18%**	2%
Dem.	48%	42%	**90%**	7%	1%	**8%**	2%
National	35%	47%	**82%**	12%	5%	**17%**	2%
GOP	29%	45%	**73%**	19%	6%	**25%**	2%
Dem.	44%	48%	**91%**	5%	3%	**8%**	1%
Indep.	26%	51%	**77%**	17%	5%	**22%**	1%

Here is a counter argument.

Q16. The environment is a different issue from trade and should be dealt with separately. Adding too many rules to an agreement can overburden it and slow down the growth of trade. If countries signed on to an environmental agreement, then it should be up to them whether they want to live up to it or how. They should not be threatened with economic attacks if they want to go in another direction.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
Michigan	18%	34%	**51%**	31%	17%	**48%**	1%
GOP	20%	39%	**59%**	29%	12%	**41%**	0%
Dem.	15%	29%	**44%**	34%	22%	**56%**	0%
National	19%	40%	**59%**	28%	13%	**41%**	0%
GOP	21%	42%	**63%**	27%	10%	**37%**	0%
Dem.	19%	39%	**57%**	26%	17%	**43%**	0%
Indep.	11%	37%	**48%**	37%	15%	**51%**	1%

So, here again is the proposal:

The US actively working to make agreements with other countries that require they:
- abide by the environmental standards they have committed to
- do not lower their standards to attract business or to get a competitive edge

- have an effective system for enforcing these requirements

Q17. How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / DK
Michigan	8%	12%	79%	0%
GOP	11%	14%	75%	0%
Dem.	3%	10%	87%	0%
National	8%	13%	78%	1%
GOP	13%	12%	74%	1%
Dem.	4%	12%	84%	1%
Indep.	10%	18%	70%	2%

Q18. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose the proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
Michigan	76%	24%	0%
GOP	70%	30%	0%
Dem.	85%	15%	0%
National	78%	22%	1%
GOP	72%	27%	1%
Dem.	86%	14%	0%
Indep.	70%	29%	1%

Demographic Findings for Michigan				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
Gender	Men	76%	24%	0%
	Women	77%	23%	0%
Age	18-29	74%	26%	0%
	30-49	76%	24%	0%
	50-64	77%	23%	1%
	65 or older	78%	22%	0%
Income	Less than $50,000	69%	30%	1%
	$50-100,000	78%	22%	0%
	$100-150,000	84%	16%	0%
	More than $150,000	76%	24%	0%
Education	High School or less	69%	31%	0%
	Some college	84%	16%	0%
	College degree	77%	23%	0%

[EXISTING TARIFFS ON CHINA]

Now we are going to turn to the issue of US tariffs on China.

As you may know, in the 2010's, the US alleged that China had been violating rules of international trade that China, the US, and other countries have agreed to, by:

- failing to stop Chinese companies from stealing intellectual property of US companies (e.g. software and engineering designs) to make products that compete directly with US companies
- requiring that US companies, in order to work in China, share their intellectual property with Chinese companies
- selling exports for significantly less than the price they are sold for in China, and/or less than what they cost to make (known as "dumping"), as a strategy to undercut foreign competitors and gain more control in the market.[4]

When China did not change its practices, consistent with the terms of international trade agreements, the US significantly raised tariffs on imports from China, from an average of about 4%, to about 20%. In comparison, US tariffs on other trade partners is about 2% on average.

[4] USTR. (2024) Four-Year Review of Actions Taken in the Section 301 Investigation; White House. (May 2024) FACT SHEET: President Biden Takes Action to Protect American Workers and Businesses from China's Unfair Trade Practices

China has responded by increasing its tariffs on US products to about 20%.[5]

There is some debate about whether the US should continue to impose these high tariffs on China.

Here is an argument in favor:

Q19. China has been blatantly violating international trade rules, and the US has been correct to take action against them, consistent with international rules for trade.[6] These tariffs have also helped to counter Chinese dumping by effectively raising the price of Chinese imports, thus helping boost US manufacturing.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
Michigan	44%	40%	**83%**	11%	5%	**16%**	0%
GOP	50%	34%	**83%**	10%	7%	**17%**	0%
Dem.	42%	44%	**86%**	10%	4%	**14%**	0%
National	42%	42%	**84%**	11%	4%	**16%**	1%
GOP	47%	36%	**83%**	12%	4%	**16%**	1%
Dem.	40%	46%	**86%**	10%	3%	**13%**	1%
Indep.	28%	48%	**76%**	14%	10%	**24%**	0%

Here is an argument against:

Q20. These tariffs have been completely ineffective at changing China's behavior. All they have done is raise prices for US consumers. US businesses have also been hurt by China raising tariffs in retaliation. We need to pursue other ways of changing China's behavior that don't also hurt the US economy.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
Michigan	26%	39%	**66%**	23%	11%	**34%**	0%
GOP	26%	34%	**60%**	25%	15%	**40%**	0%
Dem.	27%	45%	**72%**	21%	7%	**28%**	1%
National	26%	39%	**65%**	24%	11%	**35%**	0%
GOP	22%	38%	**60%**	25%	15%	**40%**	0%
Dem.	31%	41%	**72%**	21%	8%	**28%**	0%
Indep.	20%	39%	**59%**	29%	12%	**41%**	0%

Q21. So, how acceptable do you find the following proposal:

The US continuing to impose tariffs of about 20%, on average, on Chinese imports?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / DK
Michigan	13%	18%	69%	0%
GOP	9%	15%	76%	0%
Dem.	14%	20%	66%	0%
National	13%	17%	70%	0%
GOP	14%	12%	74%	0%
Dem.	12%	18%	69%	1%
Indep.	16%	29%	55%	0%

Q22. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose the proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
Michigan	69%	30%	1%
GOP	78%	22%	0%
Dem.	67%	32%	1%

[5] Peterson Institute. (2023) US-China Trade War Tariffs: An Up-to-Date Chart

[6] USTR. (2024) Four-Year Review of Actions Taken in the Section 301 Investigation; USTR (2024) U.S. Trade Representative Katherine Tai to Take Further Action on China Tariffs After Releasing Statutory Four-Year Review. In the very short-term: Federal Reserve Bank of Boston. (2019) Tariff Passthrough at the Border and at the Store: Evidence from US Trade Policy; Journal of Economic Perspectives. (2019) The Impact of the 2018 Tariffs on Prices and Welfare; and no statistically significant net effects on GDP were found by NBER Working Paper Series. (2019) The Return to Protectionism.

National	71%	29%	0%
GOP	73%	27%	0%
Dem.	72%	28%	1%
Indep.	62%	38%	0%

Demographic Findings for Michigan				
		Favor	**Oppose**	**DK/Ref**
Gender	Men	72%	28%	0%
	Women	67%	32%	1%
Age	18-29	58%	41%	1%
	30-49	69%	31%	1%
	50-64	76%	24%	0%
	65 or older	72%	27%	1%
Income	Less than $50,000	59%	41%	0%
	$50-100,000	69%	30%	1%
	$100-150,000	80%	20%	0%
	More than $150,000	72%	27%	1%
Education	High School or less	62%	38%	0%
	Some college	72%	27%	1%
	College degree	74%	24%	1%

[10% TARIFF ACROSS-THE-BOARD]
Let us now turn to a proposal related to our tariffs with all countries.

As discussed previously, the US has trade arrangements with almost all countries – through free trade agreements or through the World Trade Organization – in which each country has agreed to keep tariffs low on a mutual basis and abide by agreed-upon rules. As a result, US tariffs on imports, on average, are about 2%. Also, as discussed, when countries violate the rules the US can raise tariffs, as it has with China.

A proposal has been put forward for the US to raise tariffs on imports from all countries to 10-20%. So, US businesses that import products would go from paying an average fee of 2% on imports, to paying a fee of 10-20%.

This would be a violation of the trade arrangements that the US currently has with nearly all countries, including its main trading partners (Canada, Mexico and the European Union).

Here is an argument in favor of raising tariffs on imports from all countries:

Q23. Raising tariffs across the board will protect US businesses from cheap foreign goods and bring back good paying jobs. The US had high tariffs for most of its history, and that is what enabled us to become a manufacturing powerhouse. But politicians let countries with cheap labor take over these industries, because they cared more about low consumer prices and free trade than the American working class. It is time for a change.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
Michigan	24%	39%	**63%**	26%	10%	**35%**	1%
GOP	31%	41%	**72%**	20%	7%	**27%**	1%
Dem.	22%	36%	**57%**	28%	14%	**42%**	1%
National	25%	42%	**66%**	24%	9%	**32%**	1%
GOP	30%	40%	**70%**	22%	6%	**28%**	2%
Dem.	23%	41%	**63%**	25%	11%	**36%**	1%
Indep.	13%	52%	**65%**	26%	9%	**35%**	0%

Here is argument against:

Q24. Increasing our tariffs at least five-fold is a direct attack on our allies and biggest trading partners, who have not violated any trade rules. It will undermine the international system of trade. Other countries will surely retaliate and raise their tariffs on our products, harming US companies that export, a major driver of the US economy. This will lead to massive layoffs. After the stock market crash in 1929, tariffs were raised by 20%, which most economists say was a major contributor to the Great Depression. Let's not make that mistake again.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
Michigan	32%	41%	**73%**	20%	7%	**27%**	0%
GOP	28%	41%	**69%**	22%	9%	**31%**	0%
Dem.	41%	37%	**78%**	17%	5%	**22%**	0%
National	35%	42%	**76%**	18%	6%	**24%**	0%
GOP	31%	39%	**71%**	22%	8%	**30%**	0%
Dem.	41%	43%	**84%**	13%	3%	**16%**	0%
Indep.	21%	47%	**68%**	24%	7%	**31%**	0%

Here is another argument in favor:

Q25. Raising all tariffs to 10-20% will generate hundreds of billions in new revenues for the Federal government.[7] This will be a boon to Americans. It will make it possible to reduce income taxes significantly, giving Americans more money to spend. This will help American businesses to sell more products, creating more jobs, and growing the economy.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
Michigan	23%	39%	**62%**	24%	11%	**35%**	4%
GOP	27%	44%	**71%**	18%	8%	**26%**	3%
Dem.	22%	34%	**55%**	26%	14%	**41%**	4%
National	25%	40%	**65%**	22%	10%	**32%**	4%
GOP	27%	38%	**64%**	22%	9%	**31%**	4%
Dem.	25%	42%	**67%**	20%	11%	**31%**	2%
Indep.	16%	41%	**57%**	27%	10%	**37%**	6%

Here is another argument against:

Q26. It is important to remember that all of that extra revenue does not come from other countries. Tariffs are taxes paid entirely by US businesses that import products. Those extra costs will be passed on to American consumers. Economists estimate that raising tariffs by so much would increase costs for families substantially, by $1,000 to $2,000 a year.[8] This will hurt low- and middle-income households the most. It is magical thinking to assume that tariffs are a free lunch.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
Michigan	34%	42%	**75%**	18%	7%	**25%**	0%
GOP	27%	43%	**70%**	19%	11%	**29%**	0%
Dem.	44%	37%	**81%**	16%	4%	**19%**	0%
National	35%	41%	**76%**	18%	6%	**23%**	0%
GOP	33%	42%	**75%**	19%	6%	**25%**	0%
Dem.	40%	40%	**80%**	15%	4%	**19%**	0%
Indep.	23%	44%	**67%**	24%	10%	**34%**	0%

Q27. In conclusion, which do you prefer:

- The US raising tariffs on imports from all countries to 10-20%
- The US continuing to have low tariffs on a mutual basis with other countries, provided the other countries abide by agreed-upon rules

	US Raising Tariffs on Imports from all countries to 10-20%	US Continuing to have low tariffs on a mutual basis with other countries, provided the other countries abide by agreed-upon rules	DK/Ref
Michigan	28%	71%	1%
GOP	34%	65%	1%
Dem.	23%	76%	0%

[7] Using 2023 tariff revenues of $80 billion, and existing average tariffs of 2.2% (simple average of 3.3%), using White House. (2024) Tariffs as a Major Revenue Source: Implications for Distribution and Growth. An alternative calculation could use total value of imports in 2023, which was $3.8 billion, per Bureau of Economic Analysis. (2024) U.S. International Trade in Goods and Services, December and Annual 2023

[8] White House. (2024) Tariffs as a Major Revenue Source: Implications for Distribution and Growth estimates about $1,000, applying their estimated cost increases of 1.5 percent of middle quintile after-tax income, to the median household after-Tax income; Clausing, K. A., & Lovely, M. E. (2024). Why Trump's tariff proposals would harm working Americans. *Peterson Institute for International Economics Policy Brief*, 24-1 estimates $1,700, but that also includes 60 percent tariffs on Chinese imports.

National	31%	68%	1%
GOP	39%	60%	1%
Dem.	22%	77%	1%
Indep.	32%	67%	1%

Demographic Findings for Michigan				
		US Raising Tariffs on Imports from all countries to 10-20%	**US Continuing to have low tariffs on a mutual basis with other countries, provided the other countries abide by agreed-upon rules**	**DK/Ref**
Gender	Men	31%	68%	1%
	Women	25%	73%	1%
Age	18-29	38%	58%	3%
	30-49	31%	68%	1%
	50-64	26%	75%	0%
	65 or older	19%	81%	1%
Income	Less than $50,000	33%	64%	3%
	$50-100,000	26%	74%	1%
	$100-150,000	28%	71%	2%
	More than $150,000	26%	74%	0%
Education	High School or less	33%	65%	3%
	Some college	27%	73%	0%
	College degree	24%	75%	1%

Thank you for taking this policymaking simulation. We greatly appreciate the time and thought you have put into this survey, and we hope you found it both enjoyable and informative.

Methodology

Fielding and Sample Size
The Michigan survey was fielded online September 9th through 22nd, 2024 by the Program for Public Consultation (PPC) at the University of Maryland's School of Public Policy, with a representative non-probability sample of 597 adults in Michigan. Sample was obtained from multiple online opt-in panels, including Cint, Prodege and Dynata. The confidence interval is +/- 4.6%. The overall response rate was 3.3%.

Pre-Stratification and Weighting
The sample was pre-stratified and weighted by age, race, ethnicity, gender, education, household income, metro/non-metro status, marital status and home ownership using benchmarks from the Census Bureau's 2022 American Community Survey and 2023 Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement. The sample was also weighted by partisan affiliation to ensure a roughly equivalent distribution of Republicans and Democrats. The maximum weight applied was 2.7.

Sample Collection
Sample collection was managed by QuantifyAI with oversight from PPC. Samples were drawn from multiple large online panels, including Cint, Prodege, and Dynata, whose members are recruited using non-probability sampling methods. The selected sample was invited to participate via email invitation, push notification, or SMS for cell phone users. Respondents were offered cash or cash-equivalent incentives to participate in the survey.

Data Collection and Privacy
Survey responses were collected directly on the Qualtrics platform. Only respondents with a provided link could take the survey, using their computer or mobile phone.

Privacy and security measures were taken to ensure that data was collected in adherence to the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation policies for data privacy and security, as well as the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA).

Quality Control
Quality control measures in the sample collection process to disqualify duplicate respondents and survey bots included:

- checking respondents' IP addresses to determine if there are duplicate respondents
- employing an "operating system & Web browser check" to determine if there are any cross-panel duplicates
- using hCaptcha to detect and disqualify survey bots.

Quality control measures within the survey disqualify dishonest or mischievous respondents, as well as survey bots, included:

- an attention-check question, e.g. Select the word that does not belong. [Tuesday]; [Friday]; [April]; [Wednesday]
- an honesty question, e.g. What have you done in the past week? Select all that apply. [Won a gold medal at the Olympics]; [Watched TV]; [Got a license to operate a Class SSGN submarine]; [Read a book]
- a speed limit, which disqualified respondents who moved through the first quarter of the survey at a pace roughly triple the average reading speed.

Lastly, respondents were removed from the sample who answered less than half the substantive questions, or who engaged in straight-lining.