



# PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

## FAMILIES & CHILDREN

- ARIZONA QUESTIONNAIRE -

**Field Dates:** August 17 - 29, 2024

**Sample Size:** Arizona: 617 Adults      National: 1,197 Adults

**Confidence Interval:** Arizona: +/- 4.5%      National: +/- 3.2%

**Samples 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.

This survey is going to address policies aimed at reducing costs for families with children.

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

### [Universal Preschool]

First, we are going to look at a proposal related to preschool. As you may know, preschool is for 3- and 4-year-olds. Preschools provide a service to both children and their parents. For children, preschools provide education and social skills. For parents, preschools provide childcare.

About half of three- and four-year-olds are enrolled in a preschool program.<sup>1</sup> Children from low-income families are much less likely to be in preschool.<sup>2</sup>

Most states offer preschool programs for free to some but not all children because they have put caps on the amount of funding that can be used for free preschool. Just three states (Florida, Oklahoma and Vermont) and Washington, DC, offer it free to all children.<sup>3</sup>

For parents who are unable to get a spot in one of the free programs, they have to pay for preschool themselves. The average cost of preschool is about \$8,000 a year.<sup>4</sup>

**A proposal has been put forward for the Federal government to provide \$25 billion to states or cities that want it, to help them create or expand preschool programs that are available to all families free of cost.**<sup>5</sup> The federal funding would go to establishing or expanding preschool programs located in public schools.

Here is how the proposal would work:

Any state that wants to create or expand an existing preschool program could apply for a grant from the federal government. As long as the state's program is available free-of-charge to all families, regardless of income, the state will receive money to help cover most of the additional costs of providing universal preschool. If a state does not want to participate, cities within that state can apply for funding.

<sup>1</sup> NCES. (2024) [School Enrollment Rates of Young Children](#)

<sup>2</sup> [Kids Count Data Center. \(2020\) Young children not in school by poverty status in the United States; US Dept of Education: National Center for Education Statistics. \(2020\) Digest of Education Statistics. table 202.20](#)

<sup>3</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Department of Labor. (2023) [New Childcare Data Shows Prices Are Untenable for Families; Brookings. \(2018\) What is the market price of daycare and preschool?](#)

<sup>5</sup> [Child Care for Working Families Act](#) by Sen. Murray (S. 1354) and Rep. Scott (H.R. 2976)

The proposal would also require an increase in the qualifications for preschool teachers. Eventually, all preschool teachers who are part of this preschool program would need to have the same level of qualifications as elementary school teachers. Currently, most preschool teachers are required to have a 2-year degree, while most elementary teachers need a 4-year degree.<sup>6</sup>

Research indicates that children who go through pre-K are more likely to graduate from high school, as well as attend and graduate from college. This leads them to have higher incomes. They are also less likely to be arrested or have problems with drug abuse.<sup>7</sup>

However, there is also evidence that shows some negative long-term effects from early schooling, with some children developing more aggression, anxiety, or problems paying attention.<sup>8</sup>

In terms of the effects on parents, research has shown that when free preschool is provided, mothers are more likely to enter or re-enter the workforce,<sup>9</sup> which reduces the poverty rate of families.

However, research has also shown that this increase in employment among mothers can have negative effects on their parenting. This is because working can lead to increases in stress and anxiety.<sup>10</sup>

Here is an argument in favor of the proposal:

Q1. Preschool has proven to be effective in preparing children by giving them social and academic skills that provide lasting benefits, so they are more likely to be better socially adjusted and more educated. This leads to more successful and rewarding lives. This is especially true for children from very low-income families, because it helps put them on a path out of poverty. It benefits Americans in the current world economy, where it has become increasingly necessary to be well educated.

How convincing or unconvincing do you find this argument?

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	41%	45%	<b>86%</b>	6%	4%	<b>9%</b>	5%
<b>GOP</b>	35%	50%	<b>85%</b>	6%	3%	<b>9%</b>	6%
<b>Dem.</b>	52%	40%	<b>92%</b>	4%	2%	<b>6%</b>	2%
<b>National</b>	44%	44%	<b>88%</b>	6%	2%	<b>8%</b>	4%
<b>GOP</b>	36%	51%	<b>87%</b>	7%	4%	<b>11%</b>	3%
<b>Dem.</b>	54%	37%	<b>91%</b>	2%	2%	<b>4%</b>	5%
<b>Indep.</b>	35%	44%	<b>79%</b>	13%	2%	<b>15%</b>	7%

Here is an argument against:

Q2. Providing free preschool might be good for the economy, but it's not necessarily what's best for families and parent-child relationships. As the evidence shows, preschool increases the number of working mothers, which leads to an increase in poor parenting. Instead of the government encouraging parents to send their 3- and 4-year-olds off to a public school by making it totally free, we should be encouraging parents to spend more time with their children during those crucial years.

How convincing or unconvincing do you find this argument?

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	21%	38%	<b>59%</b>	28%	13%	<b>41%</b>	0%
<b>GOP</b>	22%	46%	<b>68%</b>	25%	8%	<b>33%</b>	0%
<b>Dem.</b>	20%	32%	<b>52%</b>	30%	18%	<b>48%</b>	0%

<sup>6</sup> BLS. (2021) Occupational Outlook Handbook: Education, Training, and Library Occupations

<sup>7</sup> RAND Corporation. (2017) Decades of Evidence Demonstrate That Early Childhood Programs Can Benefit Children and Provide Economic Returns.; Learning Policy Institute. (2019) Untangling the Evidence on Preschool Effectiveness: Insights for Policymakers; NBER. (2021) The Long-Term Effects of Universal Preschool in Boston NIH. (2015) Small investment in children's education yields big results; NBER. (2005) Does Head Start Improve Children's Life Chances? Evidence from a Regression Discontinuity Design; Journal of Economic Perspectives. (2013) Investing in Preschool Programs Brookings. (2013) New Evidence Raises Doubts on Obama's Preschool for All; Journal of Public Economics. (2018) Does early child care affect children's development?; Journal of Human Capital. (2012) The Effects of Participation in Public Child Care Centers: Evidence from Chile;

<sup>8</sup> NBER. (2008) Universal Childcare, Maternal Labor Supply and Family Well-Being; NBER. (2015) Non-Cognitive Deficits and Young Adult Outcomes: The Long-Run Impacts of a Universal Child Care Program; Child Development. (2003) Does amount of time spent in child care predict socioemotional adjustment during the transition to kindergarten?; NICHD. (2006) The NICHD Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development.

<sup>9</sup> Study of DC universal program, plus summary of studies on other countries: Center for American Progress. (2018) The Effects of Universal Preschool in Washington, D.C.

<sup>10</sup> NBER. (2012) Child Care Subsidies, Maternal Well-Being, and Child-Parent Interactions: Evidence from Three Nationally Representative Datasets; Journal of Public Economics. (2018) Does early child care affect children's development?; NBER. (2008) Universal Childcare, Maternal Labor Supply and Family Well-Being

<b>National</b>	23%	37%	<b>60%</b>	28%	12%	<b>40%</b>	0%
<b>GOP</b>	25%	39%	<b>65%</b>	27%	8%	<b>35%</b>	0%
<b>Dem.</b>	22%	33%	<b>55%</b>	29%	16%	<b>45%</b>	0%
<b>Indep.</b>	20%	41%	<b>60%</b>	26%	14%	<b>40%</b>	0%

Here is another argument in favor:

Q3. Federal support for pre-school is a good investment. Studies have shown that quality preschool can result in around \$3 in economic gains for every \$1 invested.<sup>11</sup> It has also resulted in less government spending. This is because the students who attend preschool earn more money when they get older, and thus rely less on government assistance or get in trouble with the law. Universal preschool also allows more parents to work full-time, earn more, and thus use less government services.

	<b>Very convincing</b>	<b>Somewhat convincing</b>	<b>Total convincing</b>	<b>Somewhat unconvincing</b>	<b>Very unconvincing</b>	<b>Total unconvincing</b>	<b>Ref/DK</b>
<b>Arizona</b>	35%	42%	<b>77%</b>	13%	4%	<b>17%</b>	6%
<b>GOP</b>	33%	40%	<b>74%</b>	17%	4%	<b>20%</b>	6%
<b>Dem.</b>	45%	40%	<b>85%</b>	7%	2%	<b>9%</b>	6%
<b>National</b>	36%	44%	<b>81%</b>	12%	3%	<b>15%</b>	4%
<b>GOP</b>	31%	44%	<b>76%</b>	17%	4%	<b>21%</b>	4%
<b>Dem.</b>	44%	43%	<b>87%</b>	6%	3%	<b>9%</b>	4%
<b>Indep.</b>	27%	50%	<b>76%</b>	16%	4%	<b>20%</b>	4%

Here is another argument against:

Q4. Studies show that preschool is most beneficial for low-income families. Nearly all states already have programs targeted to low-income families. We do not need to be providing free preschool to higher income families who could afford it. Plus, there's only a handful of universal preschool programs in the country and just not enough solid evidence yet that making preschool free for everyone is better than targeting it to low-income families.

	<b>Very convincing</b>	<b>Somewhat convincing</b>	<b>Total convincing</b>	<b>Somewhat unconvincing</b>	<b>Very unconvincing</b>	<b>Total unconvincing</b>	<b>Ref/DK</b>
<b>Arizona</b>	24%	43%	<b>68%</b>	22%	10%	<b>32%</b>	1%
<b>GOP</b>	30%	44%	<b>75%</b>	22%	4%	<b>25%</b>	0%
<b>Dem.</b>	23%	38%	<b>61%</b>	24%	15%	<b>39%</b>	1%
<b>National</b>	24%	41%	<b>65%</b>	23%	11%	<b>35%</b>	0%
<b>GOP</b>	26%	42%	<b>67%</b>	24%	9%	<b>33%</b>	0%
<b>Dem.</b>	24%	41%	<b>65%</b>	21%	14%	<b>35%</b>	0%
<b>Indep.</b>	22%	40%	<b>62%</b>	27%	11%	<b>38%</b>	0%

Here is another argument in favor:

Q5. The evidence that does exist about making preschool free for all shows that it results in more low-income children participating.<sup>12</sup> This is because, when programs have an income cut-off, families that make just slightly above that income are shut out, even though they still can't afford to pay the full cost. Plus, targeting any program to just one income group requires creating a bureaucracy to constantly check people's incomes. Not only does this cost money, but low-income parents often don't have the time or resources to navigate a complicated bureaucracy. Universal preschool is both simpler and more effective.

	<b>Very convincing</b>	<b>Somewhat convincing</b>	<b>Total convincing</b>	<b>Somewhat unconvincing</b>	<b>Very unconvincing</b>	<b>Total unconvincing</b>	<b>Ref/DK</b>
<b>Arizona</b>	34%	47%	<b>81%</b>	12%	5%	<b>17%</b>	1%
<b>GOP</b>	29%	50%	<b>79%</b>	15%	5%	<b>19%</b>	2%

<sup>11</sup> RAND Corporation. (2017) Decades of Evidence Demonstrate That Early Childhood Programs Can Benefit Children and Provide Economic Returns.

<sup>12</sup> NBER. (2017) DOES UNIVERSAL PRESCHOOL HIT THE TARGET? PROGRAM ACCESS AND PRESCHOOL IMPACTS

Dem.	45%	45%	<b>90%</b>	6%	2%	<b>8%</b>	2%
<b>National</b>	38%	44%	<b>81%</b>	13%	4%	<b>17%</b>	2%
GOP	31%	46%	<b>77%</b>	17%	6%	<b>22%</b>	1%
Dem.	47%	40%	<b>86%</b>	8%	2%	<b>11%</b>	3%
Indep.	28%	48%	<b>76%</b>	17%	5%	<b>22%</b>	2%

Here is another argument against:

Q6. The federal government should not be getting even more involved in education. Whenever the federal government provides funding to states, there are strings attached. Once states start relying on the federal government to fund their preschools, then the federal government can start imposing their own standards for early education. This takes power away from the states and the voters in that state who may not agree with the federal government on what young children should be taught.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	26%	34%	<b>60%</b>	26%	13%	<b>39%</b>	0%
GOP	38%	38%	<b>76%</b>	20%	5%	<b>24%</b>	0%
Dem.	19%	25%	<b>44%</b>	33%	23%	<b>56%</b>	0%
<b>National</b>	26%	36%	<b>62%</b>	24%	14%	<b>38%</b>	0%
GOP	31%	40%	<b>70%</b>	22%	8%	<b>30%</b>	0%
Dem.	22%	32%	<b>54%</b>	27%	19%	<b>46%</b>	0%
Indep.	25%	39%	<b>64%</b>	23%	13%	<b>36%</b>	1%

Q7. So, here again is the proposal:

**Provide \$25 billion to states or cities that want it, to help them create or expand preschool programs that are available to all families free of cost.**

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

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
<b>Arizona</b>	15%	11%	74%	0%
GOP	21%	13%	67%	0%
Dem.	5%	6%	89%	0%
<b>National</b>	9%	13%	78%	1%
GOP	15%	15%	70%	1%
Dem.	2%	8%	90%	0%
Indep.	12%	23%	65%	0%

Q8. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref./DK
<b>Arizona</b>	78%	22%	0%
GOP	66%	34%	0%
Dem.	93%	7%	0%
<b>National</b>	82%	18%	0%
GOP	74%	26%	0%
Dem.	92%	8%	0%
Indep.	76%	24%	0%

Demographic Findings for Arizona			
	Favor	Oppose	Ref. / DK
White	75%	25%	0%

Hispanic	85%	15%	0%
Men	76%	24%	0%
Women	79%	21%	0%
18-29	90%	11%	0%
30-49	83%	17%	0%
50-64	70%	29%	0%
65 or older	66%	34%	0%
Less than \$50,000	85%	15%	0%
\$50-100,000	74%	26%	0%
\$100-150,000	76%	25%	0%
More than \$150,000	76%	24%	0%
High School or less	78%	22%	0%
Some college	77%	22%	0%
College degree	77%	23%	0%

### [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 for young children, and**
- **summer programs for young 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 \$60,000 for a family of four) pay on average 35% of their income
- higher income families (more than \$150,000) pay on average 7%.<sup>13</sup>

A proposal has been put forward 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.**<sup>14</sup>

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.
- Higher 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:

Q9. For many low- and middle-income families, 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.

<sup>13</sup> Analysis of US Census Bureau's Survey on Income and Program Participation, income groups adjusted for inflation, by Center for American Progress. (2019) [Working Families Are Spending Big Money on Child Care](#); Department of Labor. (2023) [Childcare Prices in Local Areas: Initial Findings from the National Database for Childcare Prices](#) found that median prices of childcare range from 8% to 19.3% of income, with higher prices for infants and toddlers; Department of Treasury (2021) [The economics of child care supply in the United States](#) found that families with children under age 5 that paid for child care spent 13% of their income on childcare in 2017.

<sup>14</sup> [Child Care for Every Community Act](#) by Sen. Warren (S. 388) and Rep. Sherrill (H.R. 953); [Child Care for Working Families Act](#) by Sen. Murray (S. 1354) and Rep. Scott (H.R. 2976)

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	42%	39%	<b>81%</b>	13%	4%	<b>16%</b>	2%
GOP	37%	41%	<b>78%</b>	15%	4%	<b>19%</b>	3%
Dem.	54%	35%	<b>89%</b>	8%	1%	<b>9%</b>	2%
<b>National</b>	42%	43%	<b>85%</b>	9%	4%	<b>12%</b>	3%
GOP	34%	46%	<b>81%</b>	12%	5%	<b>18%</b>	2%
Dem.	53%	39%	<b>92%</b>	4%	2%	<b>6%</b>	3%
Indep.	31%	46%	<b>76%</b>	13%	5%	<b>18%</b>	6%

Here is an argument against:

Q10. The biggest reason that childcare costs have increased so much is actually government policy. They have overregulated 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	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	22%	38%	<b>60%</b>	27%	13%	<b>40%</b>	0%
GOP	33%	38%	<b>70%</b>	26%	4%	<b>30%</b>	0%
Dem.	14%	37%	<b>50%</b>	26%	23%	<b>50%</b>	0%
<b>National</b>	24%	36%	<b>60%</b>	26%	14%	<b>40%</b>	0%
GOP	29%	39%	<b>68%</b>	25%	7%	<b>32%</b>	0%
Dem.	22%	32%	<b>53%</b>	27%	20%	<b>47%</b>	0%
Indep.	19%	39%	<b>58%</b>	27%	15%	<b>43%</b>	0%

Here is another argument in favor:

Q11. 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	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	39%	42%	<b>80%</b>	12%	4%	<b>16%</b>	4%
GOP	34%	40%	<b>74%</b>	15%	5%	<b>20%</b>	7%
Dem.	50%	41%	<b>91%</b>	6%	2%	<b>8%</b>	2%
<b>National</b>	43%	40%	<b>83%</b>	10%	3%	<b>14%</b>	4%
GOP	38%	40%	<b>77%</b>	14%	5%	<b>19%</b>	4%
Dem.	51%	39%	<b>90%</b>	5%	1%	<b>7%</b>	3%
Indep.	35%	41%	<b>77%</b>	15%	5%	<b>20%</b>	4%

Here is another argument against:

Q12. 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	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	24%	29%	<b>53%</b>	27%	19%	<b>46%</b>	0%

GOP	33%	32%	<b>65%</b>	25%	10%	<b>35%</b>	1%
Dem.	17%	22%	<b>39%</b>	29%	32%	<b>61%</b>	0%
<b>National</b>	25%	32%	<b>57%</b>	26%	18%	<b>43%</b>	0%
GOP	32%	34%	<b>65%</b>	25%	10%	<b>35%</b>	0%
Dem.	21%	26%	<b>47%</b>	28%	25%	<b>53%</b>	0%
Indep.	19%	44%	<b>63%</b>	22%	15%	<b>37%</b>	0%

Q13. 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?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
<b>Arizona</b>	13%	13%	74%	0%
GOP	20%	16%	64%	0%
Dem.	4%	6%	90%	0%
<b>National</b>	11%	12%	76%	1%
GOP	18%	13%	68%	0%
Dem.	4%	8%	87%	1%
Indep.	14%	22%	63%	1%

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

	Favor	Oppose	Ref./DK
<b>Arizona</b>	76%	23%	1%
GOP	65%	34%	1%
Dem.	91%	9%	0%
<b>National</b>	76%	24%	0%
GOP	66%	34%	0%
Dem.	88%	12%	0%
Indep.	68%	31%	1%

Demographic Findings for Arizona			
	Favor	Oppose	Ref. / DK
White	76%	24%	1%
Hispanic	79%	21%	0%
Men	76%	24%	0%
Women	76%	23%	1%
18-29	79%	21%	0%
30-49	85%	15%	0%
50-64	71%	29%	0%
65 or older	67%	32%	2%
Less than \$50,000	81%	19%	1%
\$50-100,000	72%	28%	0%
\$100-150,000	70%	28%	2%
More than \$150,000	80%	21%	0%
High School or less	76%	23%	1%
Some college	72%	28%	0%
College degree	81%	19%	0%

## [\[Increase Child Tax Credit\]](#)

Now let's turn to a proposal related to tax credits.

As you may know, a tax credit reduces the total amount of taxes a person owes. For example, if a person owes \$5,000 in taxes and gets a \$1,000 tax credit, then they will only owe \$4,000.

Some tax credits are also refundable, so if the tax credit is larger than the amount of taxes a person owes, they keep what is leftover.

One tax credit that people can receive is the Child Tax Credit, if they are a parent of a child under 17 that is living with them.

In 2018, Congress passed a law so that parents can receive a Child Tax Credit up to \$2,000 per child under 17, every year. The amount of the tax credit is smaller for very high-income parents, and lower for low-income parents. Parents who have not earned any income during the year generally cannot receive any tax credit.

The tax credit is also partially refundable, up to \$1,600. The amount that is refundable is smaller for lower income parents.

During the Covid pandemic, Congress passed a law to temporarily increase the Child Tax Credit up to \$3,600 per child, and to make it fully refundable no matter the parents' income. According to federal data, this change:

- reduced tax revenue by \$80 billion a year.<sup>15</sup>
- reduced the rate of child poverty by about a third.<sup>16</sup>

That law expired in 2022, and the tax credit has gone back down to being \$2,000 and partially refundable.

A proposal has been put forward to increase the tax credit back to \$3,600, and to make it fully refundable again.<sup>17</sup>

Here is the full proposal:

- 1) **Increase the maximum Child Tax Credit to \$3,600 a year for each child under age 6, and \$3,000 for each child aged 6-17.**  
Very high-income parents would receive a smaller credit.
- 2) **Make it fully refundable for all parents who receive it, no matter their income.**

It is estimated that, as before, this proposed change would both reduce federal revenues and reduce child poverty.<sup>18</sup>

Here is an argument in favor:

Q15. The higher Child Tax Credit during the pandemic lifted three million children out of poverty, and millions more low- and middle-income families were helped – all just from making a couple changes to a tax credit.<sup>19</sup> When Congress let that law expire, millions of children fell back into poverty. That is unacceptable. Parents are dealing with rising costs of childcare, and so they need a higher child tax credit. Making it fully refundable no matter the parent's income is necessary to get the full benefits to the poorest families. This is an easy and effective way to improve the well-being of children.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	41%	40%	<b>80%</b>	11%	7%	<b>18%</b>	2%
<b>GOP</b>	34%	39%	<b>73%</b>	16%	8%	<b>24%</b>	4%
<b>Dem.</b>	52%	37%	<b>89%</b>	6%	4%	<b>10%</b>	1%
<b>National</b>	43%	38%	<b>81%</b>	11%	5%	<b>16%</b>	3%
<b>  GOP</b>	37%	41%	<b>78%</b>	13%	8%	<b>20%</b>	2%
<b>  Dem.</b>	50%	35%	<b>85%</b>	8%	4%	<b>11%</b>	4%
<b>  Indep.</b>	36%	42%	<b>78%</b>	16%	5%	<b>21%</b>	2%

<sup>15</sup> Tax expenditures for CTC were \$118 billion in 2019, \$199 billion in 2021 and \$198 billion in 2022: Congressional Budget Office. (2021) [The Distribution of Major Tax Expenditures in 2019, Table 1](#); Congressional Budget Office, (2021) [Estimated Budgetary Effects of H.R. 1319, American Rescue Plan Act of 2021, Table 9](#).

<sup>16</sup> [Expansions to Child Tax Credit Contributed to 46% Decline in Child Poverty Since 2020](#);

<sup>17</sup> [Working Families Tax Relief Act of 2023](#) by Sen. Brown (D), cosponsors 41D, 2I; and in the Biden Administration's [Proposed Budget for FY2025](#)

<sup>18</sup> Yale University, The Budget Lab (2024) [Child Tax Credit: Conventional Budget Scores](#), difference between "Current policy" and "2021 law" over ten years.

<sup>19</sup> US Census Bureau. (2022) [Expansions to Child Tax Credit Contributed to 46% Decline in Child Poverty Since 2020](#); Columbia University. (2023) [What Would 2022 Child Poverty Rates Have Looked Like if an Expanded Child Tax Credit Had Still Been in Place?](#)

Here is an argument against:

Q16. The Child Tax Credit goes to many middle- and high-income parents who don't need it. Increasing this tax credit will just put more money in the pockets of those well-off parents, who will just spend it on themselves, or save it for retirement. The higher tax credit was only meant to be a response to the widespread job losses caused by the pandemic, as a way to keep everyone afloat and stimulate the economy. But now, most people are back at work, and wages are up, so we don't need to be giving out more money, especially not to middle- and high-income parents, and further increase the national debt.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	22%	37%	<b>59%</b>	28%	13%	<b>41%</b>	0%
<b>GOP</b>	29%	39%	<b>68%</b>	23%	10%	<b>32%</b>	0%
<b>Dem.</b>	20%	34%	<b>54%</b>	32%	14%	<b>46%</b>	0%
<b>National</b>	24%	37%	<b>61%</b>	24%	15%	<b>38%</b>	0%
<b>GOP</b>	27%	38%	<b>65%</b>	24%	11%	<b>35%</b>	0%
<b>Dem.</b>	23%	35%	<b>59%</b>	23%	18%	<b>41%</b>	1%
<b>Indep.</b>	21%	38%	<b>59%</b>	27%	13%	<b>41%</b>	1%

Here is another argument against:

Q17. The Child Tax Credit was originally created as a way to give working parents a break, to help offset some of the costs of raising kids. It was never meant to be a full-on cash handout. Having the tax credit be fully refundable for everyone – even those who are able to work but don't – just turns it into another entitlement program. Low income and unemployed parents already get many government benefits, such as Medicaid and food stamps. Even more welfare will discourage them from working. Every study on this proposal has found that it will likely lead hundreds of thousands of parents to decide to leave the workforce, which hurts the economy for everyone.<sup>20</sup>

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	26%	40%	<b>66%</b>	20%	12%	<b>32%</b>	3%
<b>GOP</b>	33%	41%	<b>74%</b>	18%	7%	<b>24%</b>	2%
<b>Dem.</b>	22%	36%	<b>58%</b>	23%	17%	<b>40%</b>	3%
<b>National</b>	32%	38%	<b>70%</b>	18%	10%	<b>28%</b>	2%
<b>GOP</b>	35%	40%	<b>75%</b>	16%	7%	<b>23%</b>	2%
<b>Dem.</b>	32%	34%	<b>66%</b>	19%	13%	<b>32%</b>	2%
<b>Indep.</b>	22%	44%	<b>67%</b>	23%	10%	<b>33%</b>	1%

Here is another argument in favor:

Q18. Even if some parents decide to leave their jobs to take care of their children, it's estimated it would reduce the workforce by less than 1%.<sup>21</sup> The long-term benefits of helping families with children and greatly reducing child poverty are much more significant. Poverty has terrible effects on children, and society as a whole. Studies show that increasing the living standards of children results in them doing better in school and earning more when they are adults, as well as reducing their likelihood of getting involved with drugs or crime. Increasing this tax credit is a smart, long-term investment to support families, improve communities, and grow the economy.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	30%	43%	<b>74%</b>	19%	7%	<b>26%</b>	0%
<b>GOP</b>	26%	45%	<b>70%</b>	22%	8%	<b>30%</b>	0%
<b>Dem.</b>	37%	43%	<b>80%</b>	15%	4%	<b>19%</b>	0%
<b>National</b>	32%	44%	<b>76%</b>	18%	6%	<b>24%</b>	0%
<b>GOP</b>	24%	44%	<b>69%</b>	24%	8%	<b>31%</b>	0%

<sup>20</sup> Bipartisan Policy Center. (2023) [Assessing the Potential Employment and Poverty-Reduction Effects of an Expanded Child Tax Credit](#)

<sup>21</sup> Author's calculation applying estimates of employment impact to total labor force participation: Bipartisan Policy Center. (2023) [Assessing the Potential Employment and Poverty-Reduction Effects of an Expanded Child Tax Credit](#).

Dem.	41%	41%	<b>82%</b>	13%	5%	<b>18%</b>	0%
Indep.	27%	50%	<b>77%</b>	17%	7%	<b>23%</b>	0%

Q19. So, here again is the proposal:

- 1) **Increase the maximum Child Tax Credit to \$3,600 a year for each child under age 6, and \$3,000 for each child aged 6-17.**  
Very high-income parents would receive a smaller credit. Parents who have not earned income in the past year would also receive it.
- 2) **Make it fully refundable for all parents who receive it, no matter their income.**

How acceptable do you find this proposal?

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
<b>Arizona</b>	16%	12%	72%	0%
GOP	21%	10%	68%	0%
Dem.	9%	11%	81%	0%
<b>National</b>	16%	11%	72%	0%
GOP	25%	12%	63%	0%
Dem.	9%	9%	82%	0%
Indep.	16%	15%	68%	1%

Q20. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref./DK
<b>Arizona</b>	75%	25%	0%
GOP	69%	31%	0%
Dem.	83%	17%	0%
<b>National</b>	74%	26%	0%
GOP	64%	36%	0%
Dem.	83%	17%	0%
Indep.	74%	25%	1%

Demographic Findings for Arizona			
	Favor	Oppose	Ref. / DK
White	72%	28%	0%
Hispanic	80%	20%	0%
Men	79%	21%	0%
Women	71%	29%	0%
18-29	89%	11%	0%
30-49	84%	16%	0%
50-64	64%	36%	0%
65 or older	61%	39%	0%
Less than \$50,000	78%	22%	0%
\$50-100,000	75%	25%	0%
\$100-150,000	67%	33%	0%
More than \$150,000	78%	22%	0%
High School or less	78%	22%	0%
Some college	72%	28%	0%
College degree	75%	25%	0%

[If Oppose or skipped, Present Q20a]

Q20a. Would you favor this proposal if the tax credit were limited to low-income parents?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref./DK	Favor Q20a+Q20
<b>Arizona</b>	10%	15%	0%	85%
GOP	12%	19%	0%	80%
Dem.	9%	8%	0%	92%
<b>National</b>	10%	16%	0%	84%
GOP	14%	22%	0%	78%
Dem.	7%	10%	0%	90%
Indep.	10%	16%	1%	84%

Demographic Findings for Arizona				
	Favor	Oppose	Ref. / DK	Favor Q20a+Q20
White	12%	15%	1%	85%
Hispanic	6%	14%	0%	85%
Men	9%	13%	0%	88%
Women	11%	17%	1%	82%
18-29	5%	7%	0%	93%
30-49	7%	9%	0%	91%
50-64	15%	20%	1%	79%
65 or older	14%	25%	0%	75%
Less than \$50,000	9%	13%	0%	87%
\$50-100,000	9%	16%	0%	84%
\$100-150,000	11%	20%	2%	78%
More than \$150,000	10%	12%	0%	88%
High School or less	10%	12%	0%	88%
Some college	9%	18%	1%	81%
College degree	11%	14%	0%	86%

**[Full Sample]**

Q20b. Another proposal has been put forward to provide a \$6,000 tax credit to parents with infants under the age of 1. Do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref./DK
<b>Arizona</b>	65%	34%	1%
GOP	66%	35%	0%
Dem.	68%	31%	1%
<b>National</b>	65%	34%	1%
GOP	55%	45%	0%
Dem.	75%	24%	1%
Indep.	63%	37%	1%

Demographic Findings for Arizona			
	Favor	Oppose	Ref. / DK
White	64%	36%	1%
Hispanic	70%	29%	0%
Men	71%	28%	1%
Women	60%	40%	0%
18-29	78%	21%	1%
30-49	80%	19%	1%
50-64	55%	46%	0%
65 or older	44%	55%	1%

Less than \$50,000	72%	27%	0%
\$50-100,000	58%	42%	1%
\$100-150,000	50%	50%	0%
More than \$150,000	77%	22%	1%
High School or less	66%	34%	0%
Some college	63%	37%	0%
College degree	67%	31%	1%

## [Family & Medical Leave]

Now let's shift gears and turn to an issue that affects workers, including those with children: family and medical leave.

As you may know, there is currently some discussion about:

- Whether all employers should be required to allow their employees to take time off for family or medical reasons. (This is known as family and medical leave.)
- Whether employees should keep being paid their salaries—at least partially—while they are on leave. (When employees get some or all of their salaries paid, this is called 'paid leave.')

**Family leave** means an employee taking a certain amount of time off from work to:

- take care of a newly born or newly adopted child (this is sometimes called 'parental leave')
- take care of a family member—a spouse, parent, or child—who has a serious health condition

**Medical leave** means an employee taking a certain amount of time off to recover from a serious health condition. A serious health condition means that it requires professional treatment and makes a person unable to leave the hospital or their home for a period.

This is different from ordinary sick leave, when a person may take a few days off for something like a cold.

Here is some historical background:

In 1993, the Family and Medical Leave Act was passed that requires employers to allow employees to take up to 12 weeks of family or medical leave. It does not require employers to cover any of the employee's salary, but it ensures that the employee cannot be fired as long as they have a legitimate family or medical reasons for taking leave.

However, this law does not apply to about 40% of workers, including:

- workers in businesses that have less than 50 employees,
- workers who have worked less than one year for the employer, and
- workers who work less than about 25 hours per week.

This has stimulated discussion on two key questions.

One key question is whether all employers should be required to allow all workers to take family and medical leave. As mentioned, about 40% of workers do not have a legal guarantee that they can take family and medical leave, meaning that they can be fired if they take time off for family or medical reasons.

Another key question is whether all workers should be paid some or all of their salary when they are on leave. Currently:<sup>22</sup>

- Only 45% of all workers are offered **paid medical leave**
- Only 25% of all workers are offered **paid family leave**

A proposal has been put forward that would extend paid family and medical leave to all workers.<sup>23</sup> Here is how it would work:

- **All workers would be allowed to take up to 12 weeks of family or medical leave.** The employer would not be legally allowed to fire those workers, if they took leave for valid family or medical reasons.

<sup>22</sup> Department of Labor. (2024) [Paid Family and Medical Leave Fact Sheet](#)

<sup>23</sup> [FAMILY Act](#) by Sen. Gillibrand (S. 1714) and Rep. DeLauro (H.R. 3481)

- **Workers on leave would receive two thirds of their wages for up to 12 weeks**, up to a maximum of \$4,000 a month, paid by the Federal government.
- **In order to receive payment while on leave, workers would need to submit an application to the government**, which must include official documents from a healthcare professional.

This proposal would be paid for by a new 0.2% payroll tax on employers and employees.

So, for a person making \$50,000 a year, this would be a tax of \$100 a year, and their employer would also be taxed \$100.

Here are two arguments in favor of this proposal:

Q21. People need to be able to take leave to care for their new child. Without a program for covering at least a part of their salaries, many simply cannot afford it. The bonds that form between newborn children and their parents in the first weeks of life have a critical effect on the child’s healthy development. Failing to provide every child with this care not only hurts the child but leads to greater costs to society later. Such children are more likely to grow up and have various social and health problems. Every child deserves to get this care, no matter their parents’ income.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	43%	37%	<b>80%</b>	12%	5%	<b>16%</b>	4%
<b>GOP</b>	32%	42%	<b>74%</b>	16%	5%	<b>21%</b>	5%
<b>Dem.</b>	55%	32%	<b>87%</b>	7%	3%	<b>10%</b>	3%
<b>National</b>	41%	39%	<b>80%</b>	12%	5%	<b>17%</b>	3%
<b>GOP</b>	31%	43%	<b>74%</b>	15%	8%	<b>23%</b>	3%
<b>Dem.</b>	51%	36%	<b>87%</b>	8%	2%	<b>10%</b>	3%
<b>Indep.</b>	35%	40%	<b>75%</b>	17%	6%	<b>22%</b>	3%

Q22. Unexpected illnesses happen to everybody, but most workers do not have access to paid medical leave. There needs to be a system in place so that they can recover from a serious illness or take care of a family member, without losing their savings or going into debt. Four in ten American adults earn so little at their jobs that they cannot cover a \$400 emergency expense.<sup>24</sup> Yet it is the high-income workers who are most likely to have access to paid leave, even though they can already afford to take leave. We need a new policy that benefits all workers, of all income levels.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	40%	40%	<b>80%</b>	12%	8%	<b>20%</b>	0%
<b>GOP</b>	32%	45%	<b>77%</b>	14%	8%	<b>22%</b>	0%
<b>Dem.</b>	50%	36%	<b>86%</b>	7%	7%	<b>14%</b>	1%
<b>National</b>	41%	40%	<b>81%</b>	13%	6%	<b>19%</b>	0%
<b>GOP</b>	32%	46%	<b>78%</b>	16%	7%	<b>22%</b>	0%
<b>Dem.</b>	48%	37%	<b>85%</b>	10%	5%	<b>15%</b>	0%
<b>Indep.</b>	41%	36%	<b>77%</b>	16%	6%	<b>22%</b>	1%

Here are two arguments against this proposal:

Q23. Let’s be clear about this plan—it is a tax that would mean lower take home pay for workers. New taxes will be hard on low-income people who are already living on the edge. Employers are taxed too so they are going to have to get the money from somewhere and so they may cut back on pay raises or cut other benefits—which will hurt workers. Furthermore, because the benefits are just two thirds of a person’s income, people with lower incomes will get smaller benefits and the amount will not be enough for them to make ends meet. Many of them will not end up taking the leave, though they still have to pay the tax.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Federal Reserve. (2024) [Report on the Economic Well-Being of U.S. Households in 2023 - May 2024](#)

<sup>25</sup> California Budget and Policy Center. (2020) [California’s Paid Family Leave Program is Out of Reach for Workers With Very Low Wages](#)

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	25%	40%	<b>65%</b>	22%	10%	<b>31%</b>	4%
GOP	32%	40%	<b>71%</b>	18%	7%	<b>25%</b>	4%
Dem.	22%	37%	<b>59%</b>	25%	13%	<b>38%</b>	3%
<b>National</b>	26%	41%	<b>67%</b>	22%	8%	<b>29%</b>	4%
GOP	27%	44%	<b>71%</b>	20%	6%	<b>27%</b>	2%
Dem.	28%	38%	<b>66%</b>	21%	8%	<b>29%</b>	5%
Indep.	21%	41%	<b>61%</b>	27%	9%	<b>36%</b>	3%

Q24. America does not need another entitlement program that is likely to be wasteful. It is really better for private employers to offer their own leave programs rather than having a one-size fits all government program. Many workers would prefer to request paid time off directly from their employer, rather than deal with the government, which would require filing a bunch of paperwork, and possibly waiting weeks or more to see if they are eligible for benefits.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	26%	35%	<b>60%</b>	25%	14%	<b>39%</b>	0%
GOP	34%	37%	<b>72%</b>	20%	8%	<b>28%</b>	0%
Dem.	21%	29%	<b>50%</b>	29%	22%	<b>51%</b>	0%
<b>National</b>	28%	38%	<b>66%</b>	21%	13%	<b>34%</b>	0%
GOP	33%	40%	<b>73%</b>	19%	8%	<b>27%</b>	0%
Dem.	23%	36%	<b>60%</b>	23%	17%	<b>40%</b>	0%
Indep.	26%	38%	<b>64%</b>	21%	15%	<b>36%</b>	1%

Here is a pair of arguments for and against this proposal:

Q25. We cannot assume businesses will offer paid leave to all workers. If they have not done it by now, they probably won't. Saying it's too complicated to have a government program doesn't make sense—every other developed country has a national paid leave program, and it works great. All of their workers are treated with dignity and respect, while many of ours are forced to choose between caring for their newborn and paying rent. Over 90% of low-wage workers get no paid leave. Putting in place a national program is the only way to ensure that all workers in the U.S. will get paid family and medical leave.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	32%	43%	<b>75%</b>	15%	7%	<b>22%</b>	4%
GOP	23%	46%	<b>69%</b>	18%	8%	<b>27%</b>	5%
Dem.	43%	41%	<b>84%</b>	10%	4%	<b>13%</b>	3%
<b>National</b>	35%	41%	<b>77%</b>	14%	5%	<b>19%</b>	4%
GOP	25%	45%	<b>70%</b>	19%	7%	<b>26%</b>	4%
Dem.	45%	38%	<b>83%</b>	8%	4%	<b>12%</b>	5%
Indep.	33%	42%	<b>75%</b>	16%	5%	<b>21%</b>	4%

Q26. This system will be too easy to abuse. It will be nearly impossible for the federal government to ensure that all of the millions of workers taking leave are doing so for honest reasons. As a result, workers will take leave more often. This will hurt businesses, slow down the economy, and cost the government.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
<b>Arizona</b>	22%	37%	<b>60%</b>	27%	13%	<b>40%</b>	0%
GOP	28%	40%	<b>69%</b>	25%	7%	<b>31%</b>	0%
Dem.	19%	33%	<b>52%</b>	29%	20%	<b>49%</b>	0%
<b>National</b>	28%	38%	<b>66%</b>	22%	13%	<b>34%</b>	0%
GOP	35%	41%	<b>76%</b>	18%	7%	<b>25%</b>	0%

Dem.	25%	32%	56%	26%	17%	43%	0%
Indep.	18%	48%	66%	19%	14%	33%	1%

Q27. Now, here again is the proposal:

- **All workers would be allowed to take up to 12 weeks of family or medical leave.** The employer would not be legally allowed to fire those workers, if they took leave for valid family or medical reasons.
- **Workers on leave would receive two thirds of their wages for up to 12 weeks,** up to a maximum of \$4,000 a month, paid by the Federal government.
- **In order to receive payment while on leave, workers would need to submit an application to the government,** which must include official documents from a healthcare professional.

This proposal would be paid for by a new 0.2% payroll tax on employers and employees. (For a person making \$50,000, this would be about \$100 a year, and their employer would also be taxed \$100.)

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Ref./DK
<b>Arizona</b>	17%	16%	68%	0%
GOP	23%	17%	60%	0%
Dem.	8%	10%	81%	0%
<b>National</b>	15%	13%	71%	1%
GOP	24%	14%	62%	1%
Dem.	7%	11%	81%	1%
Indep.	17%	19%	62%	2%

Q28. Now finally, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref./DK
<b>Arizona</b>	74%	26%	0%
GOP	62%	38%	0%
Dem.	84%	16%	0%
<b>National</b>	72%	28%	0%
GOP	61%	39%	0%
Dem.	85%	15%	0%
Indep.	65%	35%	0%

Demographic Findings for Arizona			
	Favor	Oppose	Ref. / DK
White	71%	29%	0%
Hispanic	80%	20%	0%
Men	74%	26%	0%
Women	73%	27%	0%
18-29	82%	18%	0%
30-49	85%	15%	0%
50-64	66%	34%	0%
65 or older	59%	41%	0%
Less than \$50,000	80%	20%	0%
\$50-100,000	69%	31%	0%
\$100-150,000	69%	31%	0%
More than \$150,000	76%	24%	0%
High School or less	73%	27%	0%
Some college	72%	28%	0%
College degree	77%	24%	0%

Thank you for participating in this policymaking simulation!

# Methodology

## Fielding and Sample Size

The Arizona survey was fielded online August 17-29, 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 617 adults in Arizona. Sample was obtained from multiple online opt-in panels, including Cint, Prodege and Dynata. The confidence interval is +/- 4.5%. The response rate was 3.5%.

## 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 maximum weight applied was 2.8.

## 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.

Security and privacy measures were taken to ensure that data was collected in adherence to the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation policies, 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.