



HOUSING

– MICHIGAN QUESTIONNAIRE –

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--|------------------------|
| Field Dates: | October 4-14, 2024 | |
| Sample Size: | Michigan: 601 Adults | National: 1,190 Adults |
| Confidence Interval: | Michigan: +/- 4.5% | National: +/- 3.2% |
| 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.

This survey is about policy proposals that aim to reduce the cost of renting or purchasing a home. You will be provided background information and arguments for and against the policies.

In this survey, “home” is used to describe the full range of housing, including houses, duplexes and apartments. This survey will take about 25 minutes. Your answers will remain completely anonymous.

First, here is some information about housing affordability in the US, including both renting and purchasing.

As you may know, housing has become more expensive over the last several decades, causing low- and middle-income families to spend a greater portion of their income on housing.¹

According to the government, a home is considered affordable for a family or a person living alone when it costs them less than 30% of their income.

This is based on the assumption that spending more than 30% of income on housing can leave families without enough money for other basic needs (food, healthcare, and transportation).

An increasing number of households are spending more than 30% of their income on housing, especially those who rent.²

Lower-income households spend a much larger portion of their income on housing than other groups, and are more likely to rent: On average, low-income households spend over half of their income on housing. In contrast, high-income households, on average, spend less than a fifth of their income on housing.³

Also, the cost of buying a home has been increasing at a much faster rate than household incomes.⁴

¹ BLS CEX: [1972-2010, 2015, 2020-2022](#); [BLS Expenditure Tables, Shelter](#); Federal Reserve. [Employed full time: Median usual weekly real earnings: Wage and salary workers: 16 years and over](#); Department of the Treasury. (2024) [Rent, House Prices, and Demographics](#); Albouy, D., Ehrlich, G., & Liu, Y. (2016). [Housing demand, cost-of-living inequality, and the affordability crisis](#) (No. w22816). National Bureau of Economic Research.

² Harvard University, Joint Center for Housing Studies. (2024) [More Than 42 Million US Households Were Cost Burdened in 2022](#); US Census Bureau. (2023) [Share of Income Needed to Pay Rent Increased the Most for Low-Income Households From 2019 to 2021](#).

³ BLS. (2023) [Consumer Expenditure Survey, Table 1101](#); US Census Bureau. (2023, February 28). [Share of income needed to pay rent increased the most for Low-Income families from 2019 to 2021](#).

⁴ BLS. Consumer Expenditures Survey, [Table 1101](#)

Q1. Thinking about your household's ability to afford your current housing, would you say it is:

| | Very Easy | Somewhat Easy | Total Easy | Somewhat Hard | Very Hard | Total Hard | Ref/DK |
|-----------------|-----------|---------------|------------|---------------|-----------|------------|--------|
| Michigan | 24% | 36% | 59% | 34% | 7% | 41% | 0% |
| GOP | 23% | 35% | 58% | 34% | 8% | 42% | 0% |
| Dem. | 26% | 37% | 63% | 32% | 5% | 37% | 0% |
| National | 23% | 34% | 57% | 29% | 14% | 43% | 0% |
| GOP | 23% | 34% | 57% | 30% | 13% | 43% | 0% |
| Dem. | 26% | 36% | 62% | 26% | 12% | 38% | 0% |
| Indep. | 13% | 29% | 42% | 36% | 23% | 58% | 0% |

According to most experts, the main reason that the cost of housing has been increasing faster than people's incomes – especially for low- and middle-income households – is because there is not enough supply of housing, especially housing that is affordable to low- and middle-income people.

Experts agree that one of the reasons the supply of housing has not kept up with demand is because of long-standing local regulations that prevent building more dense housing – that is, more multi-family houses (e.g. duplexes, apartment buildings) and more mixed-use housing (such as apartments above stores).

The Federal government cannot directly tell local governments what housing policies to have, but they can try to influence them. Here is something that the Federal government is doing right now:

Congress recently passed a bill to provide local governments with money to build and repair their roads, bridges, utilities and other infrastructure. To encourage them to allow more dense housing, **when deciding how to distribute funding for infrastructure, the Federal government is giving priority to local governments that are making efforts to change their housing regulations so that more multi-family and mixed-use housing can be built.**⁵

Q2. Here is an argument in favor of this policy:

Local regulations that restrict building more dense housing have been the main reason there is a housing shortage. Local politicians have been pressured by higher income homeowners who don't want to live near dense multi-family houses. The Federal government should work to get cities to change these laws, which only benefit some people, especially wealthy homeowners, and hold back progress on affordable housing for everybody else.

| | Very convincing | Somewhat convincing | Total convincing | Somewhat unconvincing | Very unconvincing | Total unconvincing | Ref/DK |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------|
| Michigan | 22% | 46% | 68% | 20% | 9% | 30% | 3% |
| GOP | 15% | 43% | 57% | 27% | 13% | 40% | 2% |
| Dem. | 30% | 51% | 80% | 14% | 3% | 17% | 2% |
| National | 27% | 44% | 71% | 18% | 9% | 26% | 3% |
| GOP | 18% | 41% | 59% | 25% | 13% | 38% | 3% |
| Dem. | 38% | 47% | 85% | 9% | 4% | 13% | 3% |
| Indep. | 20% | 42% | 62% | 24% | 11% | 35% | 3% |

Q3. Here is an argument against:⁶

The Federal government should not threaten to withhold funds if they don't comply with the way the Federal government thinks the community should be developed. Cities and towns should be allowed to decide the character of the housing in their communities. The Federal government should not try to bribe communities by withholding infrastructure funding.

⁵ White House. (2023) [Biden-Harris Administration Announces Actions to Lower Housing Costs and Boost Supply](#)

⁶ Donald Trump and Ben Carson. (2020) [We'll Protect America's Suburbs](#). Wall Street Journal

| | Very convincing | Somewhat convincing | Total convincing | Somewhat unconvincing | Very unconvincing | Total unconvincing | Ref/DK |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------|
| Michigan | 33% | 42% | 75% | 19% | 6% | 25% | 0% |
| GOP | 40% | 43% | 83% | 12% | 4% | 17% | 0% |
| Dem. | 30% | 37% | 68% | 27% | 6% | 32% | 0% |
| National | 31% | 42% | 73% | 21% | 6% | 27% | 0% |
| GOP | 34% | 41% | 75% | 20% | 5% | 25% | 0% |
| Dem. | 31% | 41% | 72% | 22% | 6% | 28% | 1% |
| Indep. | 23% | 47% | 70% | 19% | 11% | 31% | 0% |

Q4. So, here again is the current policy:

When deciding how to distribute funding for infrastructure, the Federal government is giving priority to local governments that are making efforts to change their housing regulations, such as zoning requirements, so that more dense multi-family and mixed-use housing can be built.

How acceptable do you find this policy, using the scale below where 0=Not at all acceptable, 5=Just tolerable, and 10=Very acceptable?

| | (0-4) | 5 | (6-10) | Refused / DK |
|-----------------|-------|-----|--------|--------------|
| Michigan | 20% | 17% | 63% | 0% |
| GOP | 32% | 17% | 51% | 0% |
| Dem. | 7% | 14% | 79% | 0% |
| National | 15% | 18% | 67% | 1% |
| GOP | 22% | 19% | 59% | 0% |
| Dem. | 6% | 14% | 79% | 1% |
| Indep. | 20% | 29% | 50% | 1% |

Q5. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose the government continuing this policy?

| | Favor | Oppose | DK/Ref |
|-----------------|-------|--------|--------|
| Michigan | 61% | 40% | 0% |
| GOP | 47% | 53% | 0% |
| Dem. | 74% | 26% | 0% |
| National | 64% | 36% | 0% |
| GOP | 51% | 49% | 0% |
| Dem. | 80% | 20% | 0% |
| Indep. | 49% | 51% | 1% |

| Demographic Findings for Michigan | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | | Favor | Oppose | DK/Ref |
| Gender | Men | 60% | 40% | 0% |
| | Women | 61% | 39% | 0% |
| Age | 18-29 | 73% | 27% | 0% |
| | 30-49 | 61% | 39% | 0% |
| | 50-64 | 59% | 41% | 0% |
| | 65 or older | 50% | 50% | 0% |
| Income | Less than \$50,000 | 65% | 35% | 0% |
| | \$50-100,000 | 57% | 43% | 0% |
| | \$100-150,000 | 57% | 43% | 0% |
| | More than \$150,000 | 62% | 38% | 0% |
| Education | High School or less | 61% | 40% | 0% |
| | Some college | 60% | 40% | 0% |
| | College degree | 61% | 39% | 0% |

Q6. How acceptable would it be for you if your own local government allowed for the construction of more dense multi-family and mixed-use housing?

| | (0-4) | 5 | (6-10) | Refused / DK |
|-----------------|-------|-----|--------|--------------|
| Michigan | 17% | 16% | 66% | 0% |
| GOP | 26% | 18% | 56% | 0% |
| Dem. | 8% | 13% | 79% | 0% |
| National | 16% | 12% | 71% | 1% |
| GOP | 24% | 13% | 63% | 0% |
| Dem. | 8% | 9% | 83% | 1% |
| Indep. | 20% | 21% | 58% | 1% |

Q7. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

| | Favor | Oppose | DK/Ref |
|-----------------|-------|--------|--------|
| Michigan | 67% | 32% | 0% |
| GOP | 53% | 46% | 1% |
| Dem. | 82% | 18% | 0% |
| National | 68% | 31% | 0% |
| GOP | 54% | 45% | 0% |
| Dem. | 84% | 16% | 0% |
| Indep. | 63% | 38% | 0% |

| Demographic Findings for Michigan | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | | Favor | Oppose | DK/Ref |
| Gender | Men | 66% | 34% | 0% |
| | Women | 69% | 31% | 0% |
| Age | 18-29 | 75% | 25% | 0% |
| | 30-49 | 67% | 33% | 0% |
| | 50-64 | 70% | 30% | 0% |
| | 65 or older | 58% | 41% | 1% |
| Income | Less than \$50,000 | 73% | 28% | 0% |
| | \$50-100,000 | 68% | 31% | 1% |
| | \$100-150,000 | 60% | 40% | 0% |
| | More than \$150,000 | 66% | 34% | 0% |
| Education | High School or less | 69% | 30% | 1% |
| | Some college | 68% | 32% | 0% |
| | College degree | 64% | 36% | 0% |

The Federal government has been making efforts, for many years, to encourage the building and repair of housing that is affordable to low- and middle-income households, through a mix of funding to cities and states, and tax incentives to home builders.⁷

However, most experts agree that there is still a shortage of housing that is affordable to low- and middle-income households.

There is debate over **whether the Federal government should be doing more than it currently is to increase the availability of housing that is affordable to low- and middle-income households.**

Q8. Here is an argument in favor of the Federal government doing more:

⁷ HOME Investment Partnership Program, the Housing Trust Fund, Community Development Block Grant, Low-Income Housing Tax Credit

The cost of low- and middle-income housing keeps growing faster than income because there is not enough supply.⁸ Clearly the government is not doing enough. If the supply of affordable housing is not increased, prices will stay high, and tens of millions of Americans will continue to live paycheck-to-paycheck.

| | Very convincing | Somewhat convincing | Total convincing | Somewhat unconvincing | Very unconvincing | Total unconvincing | Ref/DK |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------|
| Michigan | 36% | 40% | 76% | 15% | 7% | 22% | 2% |
| GOP | 25% | 40% | 65% | 22% | 12% | 33% | 2% |
| Dem. | 48% | 39% | 87% | 10% | 2% | 11% | 2% |
| National | 34% | 42% | 77% | 13% | 8% | 21% | 2% |
| GOP | 26% | 42% | 68% | 18% | 12% | 30% | 2% |
| Dem. | 44% | 42% | 86% | 8% | 3% | 11% | 3% |
| Indep. | 28% | 45% | 73% | 14% | 10% | 24% | 3% |

Q9. Here is an argument against:

The government is already doing a lot to help people with low and medium incomes to afford housing. The reason things have gotten worse lately is because of the financial crash of 2007 and the labor shortage during the recent Covid pandemic. But the housing market has been correcting itself. Construction of new housing has been steadily increasing. We shouldn't call for more government intervention every time there's a problem.

| | Very convincing | Somewhat convincing | Total convincing | Somewhat unconvincing | Very unconvincing | Total unconvincing | Ref/DK |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------|
| Michigan | 19% | 34% | 53% | 33% | 14% | 47% | 0% |
| GOP | 24% | 36% | 60% | 29% | 11% | 40% | 0% |
| Dem. | 14% | 31% | 45% | 39% | 16% | 55% | 0% |
| National | 21% | 39% | 60% | 26% | 14% | 40% | 0% |
| GOP | 24% | 40% | 64% | 23% | 13% | 36% | 0% |
| Dem. | 20% | 38% | 57% | 28% | 15% | 43% | 0% |
| Indep. | 15% | 43% | 58% | 25% | 17% | 42% | 0% |

Q10. Here is another argument in favor:

One of the reasons that home builders do not build more affordable homes is that they can make more money building homes that are targeted at the luxury market.⁹ The government needs to do more to create incentives for builders to build homes affordable to low- and middle-income people.

| | Very convincing | Somewhat convincing | Total convincing | Somewhat unconvincing | Very unconvincing | Total unconvincing | Ref/DK |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------|
| Michigan | 34% | 45% | 78% | 14% | 7% | 21% | 1% |
| GOP | 25% | 43% | 68% | 21% | 10% | 32% | 1% |
| Dem. | 43% | 44% | 87% | 9% | 3% | 12% | 1% |
| National | 34% | 41% | 75% | 14% | 7% | 21% | 4% |
| GOP | 29% | 40% | 69% | 20% | 8% | 28% | 3% |
| Dem. | 44% | 41% | 85% | 8% | 3% | 11% | 4% |
| Indep. | 22% | 44% | 66% | 18% | 12% | 31% | 3% |

Q11. Here is another argument against:

⁸ Freddie Mac. (2021) [Housing Supply: A Growing Deficit](#); NLIHC. (2023) [The Gap: A Shortage of Affordable Rental Homes](#).

⁹ Upjohn Institute. (2019) [New construction makes homes more affordable—even for those who can't afford the new units](#).

Government involvement has always distorted the housing market, through a mess of tax credits and financial aid. Some experts say the 2007 housing crash was a direct result of government involvement. The best long-term solution is for local governments to reduce their regulations, such as zoning requirements, that stop builders from building more dense housing.

| | Very convincing | Somewhat convincing | Total convincing | Somewhat unconvincing | Very unconvincing | Total unconvincing | Ref/DK |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------|
| Michigan | 22% | 42% | 64% | 27% | 9% | 36% | 0% |
| GOP | 27% | 45% | 72% | 23% | 5% | 28% | 0% |
| Dem. | 19% | 37% | 56% | 31% | 13% | 44% | 0% |
| National | 22% | 42% | 65% | 24% | 11% | 35% | 0% |
| GOP | 24% | 43% | 67% | 24% | 9% | 33% | 0% |
| Dem. | 22% | 42% | 64% | 24% | 13% | 37% | 0% |
| Indep. | 18% | 44% | 62% | 27% | 11% | 38% | 0% |

Q12. Here is another argument in favor:

The Federal government cannot directly change local housing regulations. However, if it starts providing funding and incentives for building new affordable housing, this will encourage cities to change their housing regulations to allow them and builders in their community to access these benefits and build more affordable housing.

| | Very convincing | Somewhat convincing | Total convincing | Somewhat unconvincing | Very unconvincing | Total unconvincing | Ref/DK |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------|
| Michigan | 24% | 54% | 78% | 16% | 5% | 22% | 0% |
| GOP | 20% | 52% | 71% | 22% | 7% | 29% | 0% |
| Dem. | 31% | 55% | 85% | 12% | 2% | 14% | 1% |
| National | 29% | 49% | 77% | 16% | 6% | 22% | 0% |
| GOP | 21% | 47% | 68% | 24% | 8% | 32% | 0% |
| Dem. | 38% | 50% | 88% | 8% | 3% | 11% | 1% |
| Indep. | 21% | 50% | 71% | 18% | 11% | 29% | 0% |

Q13. Here is another argument against:

Giving out money and tax breaks to home builders is just bribing them to build cheaper houses. Putting more money into the housing market will encourage corrupt home builders to build terrible homes that fall apart quickly. It will also increase the costs of labor and construction, which will increase the cost of building homes for everyone else.

| | Very convincing | Somewhat convincing | Total convincing | Somewhat unconvincing | Very unconvincing | Total unconvincing | Ref/DK |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------|
| Michigan | 23% | 41% | 64% | 27% | 10% | 36% | 0% |
| GOP | 27% | 39% | 65% | 26% | 9% | 35% | 0% |
| Dem. | 20% | 40% | 60% | 29% | 11% | 40% | 0% |
| National | 24% | 40% | 63% | 26% | 10% | 37% | 0% |
| GOP | 26% | 41% | 67% | 24% | 9% | 33% | 0% |
| Dem. | 25% | 37% | 62% | 26% | 12% | 38% | 0% |
| Indep. | 14% | 41% | 55% | 35% | 10% | 45% | 0% |

Now you will have the chance to evaluate specific proposals for the Federal government to try to increase the availability of housing that is affordable to low- and middle-income households.

Here is one proposal:

Q14. The Federal government would provide \$25 billion to city and state governments that want it, for them to increase the construction or repair of dense housing (townhomes, apartments and duplexes) that are affordable to low- and middle-income people to rent or buy.

The Federal government estimates that this could result in the construction or repair of about 500,000 houses.¹⁰

| | (0-4) | 5 | (6-10) | Refused / DK |
|-----------------|-------|-----|--------|--------------|
| Michigan | 17% | 13% | 70% | 0% |
| GOP | 27% | 16% | 58% | 0% |
| Dem. | 7% | 8% | 85% | 0% |
| National | 14% | 14% | 72% | 1% |
| GOP | 20% | 17% | 62% | 0% |
| Dem. | 5% | 8% | 86% | 1% |
| Indep. | 21% | 23% | 57% | 0% |

Q15. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

| | Favor | Oppose | DK/Ref |
|-----------------|-------|--------|--------|
| Michigan | 70% | 30% | 0% |
| GOP | 54% | 46% | 0% |
| Dem. | 86% | 14% | 0% |
| National | 71% | 29% | 0% |
| GOP | 57% | 43% | 0% |
| Dem. | 88% | 12% | 0% |
| Indep. | 62% | 37% | 1% |

| Demographic Findings for Michigan | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | | Favor | Oppose | DK/Ref |
| Gender | Men | 68% | 32% | 0% |
| | Women | 72% | 28% | 0% |
| Age | 18-29 | 73% | 27% | 0% |
| | 30-49 | 75% | 25% | 0% |
| | 50-64 | 71% | 29% | 0% |
| | 65 or older | 61% | 39% | 0% |
| Income | Less than \$50,000 | 75% | 25% | 1% |
| | \$50-100,000 | 76% | 24% | 0% |
| | \$100-150,000 | 60% | 40% | 0% |
| | More than \$150,000 | 65% | 35% | 0% |
| Education | High School or less | 73% | 27% | 0% |
| | Some college | 69% | 31% | 0% |
| | College degree | 68% | 32% | 0% |

Now let's look at a proposal to increase the availability of affordable housing to rent.

Currently, the Federal government offers a tax incentive to home builders to include in their housing developments more housing that is affordable to households with income of less than about \$40,000 a year.

A proposal has been put forward to provide a similar tax incentive for building more housing affordable to middle-income households.

Here is the full proposal:

Q16. The Federal government would provide a tax credit to home builders to build or repair homes to be rented, on the condition that 60% of the homes are affordable to households with incomes of about \$40,000 to \$80,000 a year, adjusted for the cost of living in the area.¹¹

¹⁰ White House. (2023) [Housing Supply Action Plan](#)

¹¹ [Workforce Housing Tax Credit Act](#) by Sens. Sullivan and Wyden; and Reps. Carey and Panetta. Nationally individual median income is about \$40,000, and so the \$40,000 to \$80,000 range is for households with one and two median income earners, respectively.

| | (0-4) | 5 | (6-10) | Refused / DK |
|-----------------|-------|-----|--------|--------------|
| Michigan | 15% | 17% | 68% | 0% |
| GOP | 23% | 18% | 59% | 0% |
| Dem. | 6% | 12% | 82% | 0% |
| National | 14% | 15% | 71% | 0% |
| GOP | 19% | 16% | 64% | 0% |
| Dem. | 6% | 9% | 84% | 1% |
| Indep. | 18% | 32% | 50% | 0% |

Q17. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

| | Favor | Oppose | DK/Ref |
|-----------------|-------|--------|--------|
| Michigan | 69% | 31% | 0% |
| GOP | 56% | 44% | 0% |
| Dem. | 84% | 16% | 0% |
| National | 73% | 27% | 0% |
| GOP | 63% | 37% | 0% |
| Dem. | 85% | 15% | 0% |
| Indep. | 64% | 36% | 0% |

| Demographic Findings for Michigan | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | | Favor | Oppose | DK/Ref |
| Gender | Men | 67% | 33% | 0% |
| | Women | 71% | 29% | 0% |
| Age | 18-29 | 74% | 27% | 0% |
| | 30-49 | 69% | 31% | 0% |
| | 50-64 | 69% | 31% | 0% |
| | 65 or older | 65% | 35% | 0% |
| Income | Less than \$50,000 | 64% | 36% | 0% |
| | \$50-100,000 | 77% | 23% | 0% |
| | \$100-150,000 | 63% | 37% | 0% |
| | More than \$150,000 | 69% | 31% | 0% |
| Education | High School or less | 68% | 32% | 0% |
| | Some college | 72% | 28% | 0% |
| | College degree | 67% | 33% | 0% |

Here is a proposal to increase the availability of homes that are affordable for low- and middle-income households to purchase in low-income areas:

Q18. The Federal government would provide tax incentives to:

- Companies that build or repair houses in low-income areas that are affordable for low- and middle-income people to purchase
- Homeowners in low-income areas to repair their home.

This tax credit would not be available in large urban cities.¹²

| | (0-4) | 5 | (6-10) | Refused / DK |
|-----------------|-------|-----|--------|--------------|
| Michigan | 20% | 18% | 61% | 1% |
| GOP | 29% | 16% | 52% | 2% |
| Dem. | 11% | 16% | 73% | 1% |
| National | 19% | 16% | 65% | 1% |
| GOP | 24% | 19% | 56% | 1% |
| Dem. | 13% | 10% | 78% | 0% |
| Indep. | 22% | 28% | 50% | 0% |

¹² [Neighborhood Homes Investment Act](#) by Rep. Kelly and Sen. Cardin

Q19. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

| | Favor | Oppose | DK/Ref |
|-----------------|-------|--------|--------|
| Michigan | 65% | 35% | 0% |
| GOP | 55% | 45% | 0% |
| Dem. | 77% | 23% | 0% |
| National | 67% | 33% | 0% |
| GOP | 59% | 40% | 1% |
| Dem. | 77% | 23% | 0% |
| Indep. | 62% | 38% | 0% |

| Demographic Findings for Michigan | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | | Favor | Oppose | DK/Ref |
| Gender | Men | 66% | 33% | 0% |
| | Women | 63% | 37% | 0% |
| Age | 18-29 | 72% | 28% | 0% |
| | 30-49 | 67% | 33% | 0% |
| | 50-64 | 63% | 37% | 0% |
| | 65 or older | 58% | 42% | 1% |
| Income | Less than \$50,000 | 57% | 43% | 0% |
| | \$50-100,000 | 71% | 29% | 1% |
| | \$100-150,000 | 60% | 40% | 0% |
| | More than \$150,000 | 70% | 30% | 0% |
| Education | High School or less | 65% | 35% | 0% |
| | Some college | 64% | 36% | 0% |
| | College degree | 66% | 34% | 1% |

[Follow-on for proposal allowing credit to be available in large urban cities]:

Q20. Would you favor or oppose that tax incentive if it was also made available to use for housing in large urban cities?

| | Favor | Oppose | DK/Ref |
|-----------------|-------|--------|--------|
| Michigan | 72% | 27% | 1% |
| GOP | 63% | 37% | 0% |
| Dem. | 82% | 17% | 1% |
| National | 73% | 27% | 1% |
| GOP | 63% | 36% | 0% |
| Dem. | 84% | 15% | 0% |
| Indep. | 64% | 35% | 1% |

| Demographic Findings for Michigan | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | | Favor | Oppose | DK/Ref |
| Gender | Men | 72% | 27% | 1% |
| | Women | 73% | 27% | 1% |
| Age | 18-29 | 77% | 23% | 0% |
| | 30-49 | 78% | 21% | 1% |
| | 50-64 | 72% | 27% | 1% |
| | 65 or older | 62% | 38% | 0% |
| Income | Less than \$50,000 | 71% | 28% | 2% |
| | \$50-100,000 | 76% | 23% | 0% |
| | \$100-150,000 | 71% | 29% | 0% |
| | More than \$150,000 | 71% | 29% | 0% |
| Education | High School or less | 74% | 25% | 1% |
| | Some college | 70% | 30% | 1% |
| | College degree | 73% | 27% | 0% |

Now let's turn to policies to reduce the cost of housing specifically for low- and very low-income households.

The Federal government currently has some programs to reduce the cost of housing for very low-income households – those making up to about \$20,000 a year. However, most very low-income households still spend around two-thirds of their income on housing.¹³

There is debate over **whether the Federal government should do more to increase the availability of homes that are affordable to low- and very low-income households**.

Q21. Here is an argument in favor:

The housing crisis impacts the poorest members of our society the most, especially single working parents and those with disabilities. Many of them have to spend over half of their income on housing, which leaves them without money to invest in themselves or their families to move up the economic ladder. Hard-working people get stuck in poverty, often for generations. Helping them afford housing is a first step to giving them that chance.

| | Very convincing | Somewhat convincing | Total convincing | Somewhat unconvincing | Very unconvincing | Total unconvincing | Ref/DK |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------|
| Michigan | 38% | 42% | 80% | 13% | 5% | 18% | 2% |
| GOP | 23% | 47% | 69% | 21% | 7% | 28% | 3% |
| Dem. | 55% | 36% | 91% | 6% | 2% | 8% | 1% |
| National | 38% | 40% | 78% | 13% | 7% | 20% | 3% |
| GOP | 29% | 42% | 71% | 19% | 8% | 27% | 2% |
| Dem. | 50% | 39% | 89% | 6% | 3% | 9% | 3% |
| Indep. | 31% | 36% | 67% | 17% | 14% | 31% | 2% |

Q22. Here is an argument against:¹⁴

We already spend tens of billions of taxpayer dollars on low-income housing, and much more on healthcare and food stamps for low-income people. People can always choose to live with family or friends to reduce costs, and save money for job training or to buy a small home. It should not be the government's or other taxpayer's responsibility to make sure people can afford their homes. It must come from personal financial responsibility.

¹³ BLS. (2023) [Consumer Expenditure Survey, Table 1101](#); US Census Bureau. (2023, February 28). [Share of income needed to pay rent increased the most for Low-Income families from 2019 to 2021](#).

¹⁴ Valdez, Roger. (2019) [Changing The Housing Debate Part 1: Housing Is Not A Right](#). Forbes Magazine

| | Very convincing | Somewhat convincing | Total convincing | Somewhat unconvincing | Very unconvincing | Total unconvincing | Ref/DK |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------|
| Michigan | 21% | 32% | 53% | 27% | 20% | 47% | 0% |
| GOP | 27% | 36% | 63% | 25% | 12% | 37% | 0% |
| Dem. | 14% | 27% | 41% | 29% | 30% | 59% | 0% |
| National | 20% | 37% | 56% | 24% | 20% | 44% | 0% |
| GOP | 23% | 38% | 61% | 23% | 16% | 39% | 0% |
| Dem. | 18% | 33% | 52% | 25% | 24% | 48% | 0% |
| Indep. | 14% | 42% | 56% | 23% | 22% | 44% | 0% |

Q23. Here is another argument in favor:

Reducing the cost of low-income housing will substantially reduce homelessness, especially for families with children.¹⁵ When parents have to spend over half their income on housing, then any crisis – like a health emergency – will leave them unable to pay rent. Homelessness causes public health problems and results in children suffering development issues. Reducing homelessness benefits everyone.

| | Very convincing | Somewhat convincing | Total convincing | Somewhat unconvincing | Very unconvincing | Total unconvincing | Ref/DK |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------|
| Michigan | 40% | 42% | 82% | 11% | 5% | 16% | 2% |
| GOP | 27% | 47% | 74% | 19% | 7% | 26% | 1% |
| Dem. | 54% | 37% | 90% | 4% | 2% | 6% | 4% |
| National | 39% | 39% | 78% | 13% | 7% | 20% | 2% |
| GOP | 30% | 42% | 72% | 16% | 9% | 25% | 3% |
| Dem. | 50% | 36% | 86% | 9% | 3% | 12% | 2% |
| Indep. | 33% | 38% | 71% | 15% | 12% | 28% | 1% |

Q24. Here is another argument against:¹⁶

The root of the housing affordability problem for lower income people is really how low their wages are. Until that problem is addressed, focusing on housing will only be a temporary solution. What is considered affordable housing now will eventually become unaffordable if wages don't rise as well. The government will just end up spending more and more money to subsidize housing, because it did not address the underlying problem.

| | Very convincing | Somewhat convincing | Total convincing | Somewhat unconvincing | Very unconvincing | Total unconvincing | Ref/DK |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------|
| Michigan | 26% | 43% | 68% | 20% | 11% | 31% | 0% |
| GOP | 25% | 42% | 67% | 24% | 8% | 32% | 1% |
| Dem. | 26% | 43% | 68% | 18% | 14% | 32% | 0% |
| National | 26% | 43% | 69% | 20% | 11% | 31% | 0% |
| GOP | 25% | 43% | 69% | 22% | 10% | 31% | 0% |
| Dem. | 27% | 42% | 70% | 20% | 11% | 30% | 0% |
| Indep. | 22% | 46% | 68% | 16% | 16% | 32% | 0% |

Now you will have the chance to evaluate specific proposals for the Federal government to try to increase the availability of housing that is affordable to low- and very low-income households.

[Increase Affordable Renting]

Here is one proposal:

¹⁵ Glynn, C., Byrne, T. H., & Culhane, D. P. (2021). [Inflection points in community-level homeless rates](#). The Annals of Applied Statistics, 15(2), 1037-1053; Heston, TF. [The Cost of Living Index as a Primary Driver of Homelessness in the United States: A Cross-State Analysis](#). Cureus. 2023 Oct 13

¹⁶ Kenan Institute of Private Enterprise. (2020) [Why Affordable Housing Is Not Really About Housing](#)

The Federal government spending up to \$40 billion to increase the building and repair of housing that is affordable to people with low- and very low-incomes.¹⁷

Q25. These funds would be given to cities and states that want it to enact their own plans to increase the availability of affordable housing, and to help provide more low-interest loans to home builders to build affordable housing.

| | (0-4) | 5 | (6-10) | Refused / DK |
|-----------------|-------|-----|--------|--------------|
| Michigan | 14% | 15% | 70% | 1% |
| GOP | 22% | 21% | 56% | 1% |
| Dem. | 4% | 8% | 88% | 1% |
| National | 12% | 14% | 73% | 1% |
| GOP | 18% | 17% | 63% | 1% |
| Dem. | 5% | 10% | 85% | 1% |
| Indep. | 16% | 20% | 64% | 0% |

Q26. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

| | Favor | Oppose | DK/Ref |
|-----------------|-------|--------|--------|
| Michigan | 73% | 27% | 0% |
| GOP | 57% | 43% | 0% |
| Dem. | 89% | 10% | 0% |
| National | 74% | 26% | 0% |
| GOP | 63% | 36% | 1% |
| Dem. | 86% | 14% | 0% |
| Indep. | 67% | 33% | 1% |

| Demographic Findings for Michigan | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | | Favor | Oppose | DK/Ref |
| Gender | Men | 70% | 30% | 0% |
| | Women | 75% | 24% | 0% |
| Age | 18-29 | 82% | 18% | 0% |
| | 30-49 | 76% | 24% | 1% |
| | 50-64 | 70% | 30% | 0% |
| | 65 or older | 62% | 37% | 1% |
| Income | Less than \$50,000 | 74% | 26% | 1% |
| | \$50-100,000 | 75% | 25% | 0% |
| | \$100-150,000 | 66% | 34% | 0% |
| | More than \$150,000 | 74% | 25% | 1% |
| Education | High School or less | 74% | 25% | 1% |
| | Some college | 72% | 28% | 0% |
| | College degree | 71% | 28% | 1% |

A proposal to increase the availability of housing that is affordable to very low-income households is to increase the availability of public housing.

Public housing is government-funded housing for people that are very low-income, the elderly and the disabled, in which they are required to pay around 30% of their income on rent.

Q27. People who are eligible for public housing can choose between living in public housing that is owned by the government, or getting money in the form of Housing Vouchers to help them pay rent in private housing.

¹⁷ [Housing for All Act](#) by Rep. Lieu and Sen. Padilla; [Housing Crisis Response Act](#) by Rep. Waters would spend \$28 billion

Right now there are more people who want and qualify for Housing Vouchers than are available. There are also fewer landlords participating in public housing programs than are needed to meet the demand for public housing.

A proposal has been put forward to **spend \$24 billion to provide more people with Housing Vouchers.** ¹⁸

| | (0-4) | 5 | (6-10) | Refused / DK |
|-----------------|-------|-----|--------|--------------|
| Michigan | 15% | 15% | 70% | 0% |
| GOP | 28% | 17% | 56% | 0% |
| Dem. | 4% | 10% | 86% | 1% |
| National | 13% | 14% | 71% | 1% |
| GOP | 20% | 17% | 62% | 1% |
| Dem. | 5% | 9% | 84% | 2% |
| Indep. | 18% | 22% | 60% | 0% |

Q28. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

| | Favor | Oppose | DK/Ref |
|-----------------|-------|--------|--------|
| Michigan | 71% | 29% | 0% |
| GOP | 53% | 47% | 0% |
| Dem. | 88% | 13% | 0% |
| National | 74% | 26% | 0% |
| GOP | 63% | 37% | 0% |
| Dem. | 87% | 13% | 0% |
| Indep. | 69% | 31% | 0% |

| Demographic Findings for Michigan | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | | Favor | Oppose | DK/Ref |
| Gender | Men | 68% | 32% | 0% |
| | Women | 74% | 26% | 0% |
| Age | 18-29 | 76% | 24% | 0% |
| | 30-49 | 73% | 27% | 0% |
| | 50-64 | 69% | 31% | 0% |
| | 65 or older | 66% | 34% | 0% |
| Income | Less than \$50,000 | 78% | 22% | 0% |
| | \$50-100,000 | 73% | 28% | 0% |
| | \$100-150,000 | 59% | 41% | 0% |
| | More than \$150,000 | 71% | 29% | 0% |
| Education | High School or less | 76% | 24% | 0% |
| | Some college | 66% | 34% | 0% |
| | College degree | 70% | 30% | 0% |

Now let's turn to a proposal to help low- and middle-income people who have never owned a home, to purchase a home. These people are known as first-time homebuyers.

People who own their home are much more likely to build up wealth because when they sell their house they usually make back at least some of the money they put into the house. As a result, households that own a home have about 40 times more wealth than households that rent.¹⁹

¹⁸ [Housing Crisis Response Act](#) by Rep. Waters

¹⁹ Urban Institute. (2023) [First-Generation Homebuyers Face Significant Obstacles to Homeownership. To Help, Programs Can Define What "First-Generation" Means.](#)

A proposal has been put forward for the Federal government to **provide low- and middle-income people who are purchasing a home for the first time with up to \$25,000 to help cover their downpayment, with more assistance for people whose parents never owned a home.**²⁰

Q29. Here is an argument in favor:

Millions of hard-working people are completely locked out of buying a home and building long-term wealth, which they will need for retirement or to pass on to their children. Giving these people a helping hand will give more people a shot at the American Dream and help families who have been stuck in poverty for generations.

| | Very convincing | Somewhat convincing | Total convincing | Somewhat unconvincing | Very unconvincing | Total unconvincing | Ref/DK |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------|
| Michigan | 33% | 42% | 75% | 12% | 13% | 24% | 1% |
| GOP | 20% | 36% | 56% | 19% | 24% | 43% | 1% |
| Dem. | 48% | 44% | 91% | 6% | 2% | 8% | 1% |
| National | 35% | 39% | 73% | 16% | 10% | 26% | 1% |
| GOP | 23% | 38% | 61% | 21% | 17% | 38% | 1% |
| Dem. | 48% | 41% | 89% | 8% | 2% | 10% | 1% |
| Indep. | 28% | 32% | 60% | 24% | 12% | 37% | 3% |

Q30. Here is an argument against:

People need to take financial responsibility and stop relying on the government for handouts. Plus, giving tax breaks to buy homes will increase the demand for housing, further increasing the cost of buying a house for everyone else. That is the opposite of what we should be doing.

| | Very convincing | Somewhat convincing | Total convincing | Somewhat unconvincing | Very unconvincing | Total unconvincing | Ref/DK |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------|
| Michigan | 26% | 33% | 59% | 22% | 18% | 41% | 0% |
| GOP | 33% | 35% | 68% | 21% | 11% | 32% | 0% |
| Dem. | 19% | 29% | 48% | 26% | 26% | 51% | 1% |
| National | 24% | 37% | 61% | 23% | 16% | 39% | 0% |
| GOP | 30% | 37% | 67% | 20% | 13% | 33% | 0% |
| Dem. | 21% | 35% | 55% | 26% | 19% | 45% | 0% |
| Indep. | 17% | 43% | 59% | 20% | 20% | 40% | 1% |

So, here again is the proposal:

Q31. The Federal government providing low- and middle-income people who are purchasing a home for the first time with up to \$25,000 to help cover their downpayment, with more assistance for people whose parents never owned a home.

| | (0-4) | 5 | (6-10) | Refused / DK |
|-----------------|-------|-----|--------|--------------|
| Michigan | 23% | 12% | 64% | 1% |
| GOP | 38% | 14% | 48% | 1% |
| Dem. | 8% | 9% | 83% | 1% |
| National | 19% | 13% | 68% | 1% |
| GOP | 30% | 15% | 55% | 1% |
| Dem. | 5% | 8% | 85% | 1% |
| Indep. | 26% | 22% | 52% | 1% |

²⁰ Harris Campaign. (2024) [A New Way Forward For The Middle Class, Chapter 7, III](#). Similar proposals in: White House. (2023) [FACT SHEET: President Biden Announces Plan to Lower Housing Costs for Working Families; Downpayment Toward Equity Act](#) by Sen. Warnock and Rep. Waters.

Q32. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

| | Favor | Oppose | DK/Ref |
|-----------------|-------|--------|--------|
| Michigan | 64% | 36% | 0% |
| GOP | 44% | 57% | 0% |
| Dem. | 84% | 16% | 0% |
| National | 67% | 33% | 0% |
| GOP | 52% | 48% | 0% |
| Dem. | 84% | 15% | 1% |
| Indep. | 54% | 46% | 0% |

| Demographic Findings for Michigan | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | | Favor | Oppose | DK/Ref |
| Gender | Men | 62% | 38% | 0% |
| | Women | 66% | 34% | 0% |
| Age | 18-29 | 76% | 24% | 0% |
| | 30-49 | 69% | 31% | 0% |
| | 50-64 | 61% | 39% | 0% |
| | 65 or older | 49% | 51% | 1% |
| Income | Less than \$50,000 | 71% | 29% | 0% |
| | \$50-100,000 | 62% | 37% | 1% |
| | \$100-150,000 | 53% | 47% | 0% |
| | More than \$150,000 | 66% | 34% | 0% |
| Education | High School or less | 71% | 29% | 0% |
| | Some college | 56% | 44% | 0% |
| | College degree | 63% | 37% | 1% |

Now let's turn to policies that aim to reduce the price of single-family homes, townhomes and duplexes.

Some experts say that one reason that home prices have been increasing at a faster rate than incomes is that large corporations have been increasingly buying single-family homes, townhomes and duplexes.²¹

This can cause prices of these homes to increase, because:

- Corporations can place a higher bid on a house than most people, because they have much more cash and access to mortgages with low interest rates.
- When homeowners know that a corporation will pay more than people, they raise the price of their house when trying to sell it, above what it would be if corporations were not in that market buying homes.

Over the last couple decades, corporations have purchased around one quarter of all single-family homes for sale.²² Currently, they own about two to three percent of all single-family homes. Other experts don't agree that large corporations have contributed to the increasing price of homes.

There is debate over **whether the Federal government should try to reduce the number of homes that are owned by large corporations**.

Q33. Here is an argument in favor:

If the trend of large corporations buying single-family homes continues, many people will be locked out of buying a house and will be stuck paying rent to large corporations. Owning a home is necessary for most families to build wealth for retirement. The wellbeing of families is more important than corporate profit.

²¹ Fields, D., & Vergerio, M. (2022). [Corporate landlords and market power: What does the single-family rental boom mean for our housing future?](#) UC Berkeley.

²² Vox (2021, June 11). [BlackRock buying houses isn't to blame for the chaotic housing market](#); and Stateline. (2023, May 16). [Investors bought a quarter of homes sold last year, driving up rents](#).

| | Very convincing | Somewhat convincing | Total convincing | Somewhat unconvincing | Very unconvincing | Total unconvincing | Ref/DK |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------|
| Michigan | 38% | 39% | 78% | 14% | 7% | 21% | 1% |
| GOP | 29% | 40% | 69% | 20% | 11% | 30% | 1% |
| Dem. | 49% | 37% | 85% | 10% | 4% | 14% | 2% |
| National | 40% | 38% | 78% | 13% | 8% | 21% | 1% |
| GOP | 29% | 41% | 69% | 16% | 13% | 29% | 2% |
| Dem. | 51% | 36% | 86% | 10% | 3% | 13% | 1% |
| Indep. | 39% | 37% | 76% | 13% | 11% | 24% | 1% |

Q34. Here is an argument against:

Large corporations are an easy scapegoat for all our problems, but they are not actually at fault here. Studies found that corporations often buy houses in areas where there is little demand to buy houses, so they are just buying homes that others don't want.²³ They also play a vital role in increasing the housing supply. They have the funding to convert single-family houses into multi-family houses, and repair run-down houses.

| | Very convincing | Somewhat convincing | Total convincing | Somewhat unconvincing | Very unconvincing | Total unconvincing | Ref/DK |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------|
| Michigan | 18% | 36% | 54% | 32% | 14% | 46% | 0% |
| GOP | 19% | 43% | 62% | 30% | 7% | 38% | 0% |
| Dem. | 19% | 30% | 49% | 32% | 20% | 52% | 0% |
| National | 20% | 36% | 56% | 26% | 18% | 44% | 0% |
| GOP | 21% | 38% | 58% | 27% | 15% | 42% | 0% |
| Dem. | 21% | 35% | 56% | 24% | 20% | 44% | 1% |
| Indep. | 14% | 33% | 46% | 33% | 21% | 54% | 0% |

Q35. Here is another argument in favor:

Studies show that corporate-owned houses are much more neglected than houses owned by individuals.²⁴ If the house becomes run-down and loses its value, the corporation can actually deduct that loss from their taxes. Corporate purchasing is turning once-vibrant neighborhoods into eyesores filled with health and safety hazards.

| | Very convincing | Somewhat convincing | Total convincing | Somewhat unconvincing | Very unconvincing | Total unconvincing | Ref/DK |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------|
| Michigan | 36% | 39% | 76% | 17% | 5% | 22% | 2% |
| GOP | 26% | 39% | 65% | 24% | 9% | 33% | 3% |
| Dem. | 48% | 39% | 88% | 9% | 1% | 10% | 2% |
| National | 35% | 42% | 77% | 14% | 7% | 21% | 3% |
| GOP | 24% | 44% | 68% | 18% | 10% | 28% | 5% |
| Dem. | 46% | 40% | 85% | 10% | 3% | 13% | 2% |
| Indep. | 32% | 43% | 76% | 14% | 10% | 23% | 1% |

Q36. Here is another argument against:

The government should not be trying to influence what private businesses can own, any more than it influences what individuals can own. After all, businesses are just groups of people who have come together to make investments. The housing supply crisis has been caused by government regulations which restrict building more houses. The solution is not more government restrictions.

²³ Vox (2021, June 11). [BlackRock buying houses isn't to blame for the chaotic housing market](#)

²⁴ Fields, D., & Vergerio, M. (2022). [Corporate landlords and market power: What does the single-family rental boom mean for our housing future?](#) UC Berkeley.

| | Very convincing | Somewhat convincing | Total convincing | Somewhat unconvincing | Very unconvincing | Total unconvincing | Ref/DK |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------|
| Michigan | 20% | 35% | 56% | 29% | 15% | 44% | 0% |
| GOP | 23% | 44% | 67% | 26% | 7% | 33% | 0% |
| Dem. | 19% | 29% | 48% | 32% | 20% | 52% | 0% |
| National | 22% | 37% | 60% | 25% | 15% | 40% | 1% |
| GOP | 24% | 41% | 64% | 23% | 12% | 35% | 1% |
| Dem. | 22% | 34% | 55% | 26% | 18% | 44% | 1% |
| Indep. | 20% | 38% | 58% | 25% | 15% | 41% | 2% |

You will now have the chance to evaluate proposals that aim to reduce the number of single-family homes, including townhomes and duplexes, owned by large corporations.

As you may know, when a person takes out a loan to purchase a home, they can deduct from their taxes some or all of the amount they pay on the interest on that loan.

Corporations can also get the tax deduction on the interest on their home loans. In addition, corporations get a tax deduction if the value of the houses they own goes down (known as depreciation). A proposal has been put forward to discourage corporations from buying single-family homes, townhome by:

Q37. Denying large corporations that own more than 50 homes the right to any tax deductions related to owning those homes.²⁵

| | (0-4) | 5 | (6-10) | Refused / DK |
|-----------------|-------|-----|--------|--------------|
| Michigan | 17% | 13% | 70% | 0% |
| GOP | 26% | 14% | 59% | 0% |
| Dem. | 7% | 9% | 83% | 0% |
| National | 13% | 17% | 70% | 1% |
| GOP | 18% | 20% | 61% | 0% |
| Dem. | 7% | 10% | 82% | 1% |
| Indep. | 16% | 28% | 57% | 0% |

Q38. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

| | Favor | Oppose | DK/Ref |
|-----------------|-------|--------|--------|
| Michigan | 67% | 33% | 0% |
| GOP | 56% | 44% | 0% |
| Dem. | 78% | 22% | 0% |
| National | 71% | 29% | 0% |
| GOP | 61% | 39% | 0% |
| Dem. | 82% | 17% | 1% |
| Indep. | 62% | 37% | 1% |

| Demographic Findings for Michigan | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| | | Favor | Oppose | DK/Ref |
| Gender | Men | 67% | 33% | 0% |
| | Women | 67% | 32% | 0% |
| Age | 18-29 | 78% | 22% | 0% |
| | 30-49 | 70% | 29% | 1% |
| | 50-64 | 55% | 45% | 0% |

²⁵ If the corporation owns 50 or more single-family homes: [Stop Predatory Investing Act](#) by Sen. Brown, cosponsors 8D; if the corporation has over \$100 million in assets: [Stop Wall Street Landlords Act](#) (117th) by Rep. Khanna (D), cosponsors 2D.

| | | | | |
|------------------|---------------------|-----|-----|----|
| | 65 or older | 68% | 32% | 0% |
| Income | Less than \$50,000 | 62% | 37% | 1% |
| | \$50-100,000 | 69% | 31% | 0% |
| | \$100-150,000 | 67% | 33% | 0% |
| | More than \$150,000 | 71% | 29% | 0% |
| Education | High School or less | 63% | 37% | 0% |
| | Some college | 68% | 32% | 0% |
| | College degree | 72% | 28% | 0% |

Here is a proposal that goes further:

Q39. Prohibiting large corporations (more than \$50 million in assets) from buying new homes, and requiring those that own such homes to sell them within the next ten years. Failure to comply would result in a substantial financial penalty.²⁶

| | (0-4) | 5 | (6-10) | Refused / DK |
|-----------------|-------|-----|--------|--------------|
| Michigan | 20% | 12% | 68% | 0% |
| GOP | 28% | 12% | 59% | 0% |
| Dem. | 9% | 10% | 80% | 0% |
| National | 19% | 13% | 67% | 1% |
| GOP | 25% | 16% | 59% | 1% |
| Dem. | 11% | 8% | 79% | 2% |
| Indep. | 24% | 20% | 56% | 1% |

Q40. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

| | Favor | Oppose | DK/Ref |
|-----------------|-------|--------|--------|
| Michigan | 68% | 32% | 0% |
| GOP | 57% | 43% | 0% |
| Dem. | 79% | 21% | 0% |
| National | 67% | 33% | 0% |
| GOP | 55% | 45% | 0% |
| Dem. | 81% | 19% | 1% |
| Indep. | 60% | 40% | 0% |

| Demographic Findings for Michigan | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | | Favor | Oppose | DK/Ref |
| Gender | Men | 65% | 35% | 0% |
| | Women | 70% | 30% | 0% |
| Age | 18-29 | 75% | 25% | 0% |
| | 30-49 | 73% | 27% | 0% |
| | 50-64 | 58% | 42% | 0% |
| | 65 or older | 65% | 35% | 0% |
| Income | Less than \$50,000 | 68% | 32% | 0% |
| | \$50-100,000 | 67% | 33% | 0% |
| | \$100-150,000 | 67% | 33% | 0% |
| | More than \$150,000 | 69% | 31% | 0% |
| Education | High School or less | 71% | 29% | 0% |
| | Some college | 65% | 35% | 0% |
| | College degree | 67% | 33% | 0% |

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.

²⁶ [End Hedge Fund Control of American Homes Act of 2023](#) by Sen. Merkley

Methodology

Fielding and Sample Size

The Michigan survey was fielded online October 4th through 14th, 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 601 adults in Michigan. Sample was obtained from multiple online opt-in panels, including Cint, Prodege and Dynata. The confidence interval is +/- 4.5%. The response rate was 3.3%.

Pre-Stratification and Weighting

The sample was pre-stratified and weighted by age, race, ethnicity, gender, education, household income, and metro/non-metro status using benchmarks from the Census Bureau's 2022 American Community Survey and 2023 Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement. The sample was further weighted by partisan affiliation to ensure a roughly equal distribution of Democrats and Republicans, including leaners. The maximum weight applied was 3.3.

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.