



HOUSING

– NATIONAL AND SWING SIX QUESTIONNAIRE –

Field Dates: October 4-14, 2024

Sample Size: 4,638 adults, including 1,190 nationally and approximately 600 each in Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Nevada, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin.

Confidence Interval: National Sample: +/-3.2% State Samples: +/-4.5% - +/-4.6%

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.

[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

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](#).

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

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
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%
Arizona	21%	37%	58%	30%	12%	42%	0%
GOP	22%	35%	57%	30%	13%	43%	0%
Dem.	22%	40%	62%	31%	7%	38%	0%
Georgia	23%	36%	59%	31%	10%	41%	0%
GOP	22%	36%	57%	31%	12%	43%	0%
Dem.	25%	33%	58%	33%	8%	42%	0%
Michigan	24%	36%	59%	34%	7%	41%	0%
GOP	23%	35%	58%	34%	8%	42%	0%
Dem.	26%	37%	63%	32%	5%	37%	0%
Nevada	20%	32%	52%	31%	16%	48%	0%
GOP	21%	33%	54%	29%	17%	46%	0%
Dem.	20%	29%	49%	35%	16%	51%	0%
Pennsylvania	21%	35%	56%	33%	12%	44%	0%
GOP	23%	33%	55%	33%	10%	44%	1%
Dem.	21%	37%	58%	32%	10%	42%	0%
Wisconsin	22%	39%	61%	30%	9%	39%	0%
GOP	19%	37%	56%	34%	10%	44%	0%
Dem.	25%	41%	66%	27%	8%	34%	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.

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

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

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
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%
Arizona	19%	47%	67%	19%	12%	31%	2%
GOP	13%	43%	56%	25%	17%	41%	3%
Dem.	29%	51%	80%	11%	7%	18%	2%
Georgia	24%	46%	70%	19%	9%	29%	1%
GOP	17%	37%	54%	29%	15%	44%	2%
Dem.	33%	53%	86%	10%	4%	14%	1%
Michigan	22%	46%	68%	20%	9%	30%	3%
GOP	15%	43%	57%	27%	13%	40%	2%
Dem.	30%	51%	80%	14%	3%	17%	2%
Nevada	23%	48%	71%	17%	9%	26%	3%
GOP	16%	46%	62%	23%	13%	36%	2%
Dem.	31%	51%	82%	10%	3%	13%	5%
Pennsylvania	23%	44%	68%	22%	9%	30%	2%
GOP	18%	36%	55%	31%	13%	44%	2%
Dem.	31%	50%	81%	13%	5%	18%	2%
Wisconsin	20%	49%	69%	21%	7%	28%	3%
GOP	14%	43%	57%	28%	12%	40%	4%
Dem.	27%	53%	80%	14%	3%	17%	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.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
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%
Arizona	27%	44%	71%	21%	7%	29%	0%
GOP	33%	45%	78%	18%	4%	22%	0%
Dem.	22%	40%	62%	26%	12%	38%	0%
Georgia	34%	44%	78%	16%	6%	22%	0%
GOP	35%	45%	80%	15%	4%	20%	0%
Dem.	34%	41%	75%	16%	9%	25%	0%
Michigan	33%	42%	75%	19%	6%	25%	0%
GOP	40%	43%	83%	12%	4%	17%	0%
Dem.	30%	37%	68%	27%	6%	32%	0%
Nevada	30%	45%	74%	18%	8%	26%	0%
GOP	36%	45%	81%	12%	7%	19%	0%
Dem.	24%	47%	71%	20%	9%	29%	0%

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

Pennsylvania	35%	39%	73%	21%	6%	27%	0%
GOP	42%	39%	81%	14%	5%	19%	0%
Dem.	32%	35%	67%	26%	7%	33%	0%
Wisconsin	25%	45%	70%	23%	7%	30%	0%
GOP	34%	40%	74%	21%	6%	27%	0%
Dem.	18%	48%	66%	26%	8%	35%	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
National	15%	18%	67%	1%
GOP	22%	19%	59%	0%
Dem.	6%	14%	79%	1%
Indep.	20%	29%	50%	1%
Arizona	19%	24%	56%	0%
GOP	28%	26%	47%	0%
Dem.	7%	21%	72%	1%
Georgia	20%	18%	62%	0%
GOP	34%	18%	49%	0%
Dem.	8%	17%	74%	1%
Michigan	20%	17%	63%	0%
GOP	32%	17%	51%	0%
Dem.	7%	14%	79%	0%
Nevada	18%	19%	62%	1%
GOP	25%	20%	55%	1%
Dem.	9%	14%	76%	1%
Pennsylvania	21%	21%	58%	0%
GOP	31%	21%	49%	0%
Dem.	10%	19%	71%	0%
Wisconsin	19%	19%	61%	1%
GOP	28%	21%	51%	0%
Dem.	11%	16%	72%	2%

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

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
National	64%	36%	0%
GOP	51%	49%	0%
Dem.	80%	20%	0%
Indep.	49%	51%	1%
Arizona	55%	45%	0%
GOP	41%	59%	0%
Dem.	73%	27%	0%
Georgia	57%	43%	0%
GOP	43%	57%	0%
Dem.	71%	29%	0%
Michigan	61%	40%	0%

GOP	47%	53%	0%
Dem.	74%	26%	0%
Nevada	58%	42%	0%
GOP	48%	51%	1%
Dem.	72%	29%	0%
Pennsylvania	56%	44%	0%
GOP	42%	58%	0%
Dem.	72%	28%	0%
Wisconsin	57%	43%	0%
GOP	47%	54%	0%
Dem.	70%	29%	1%

Demographic Findings – Aggregate of Six Swing States				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
Race	White	55%	45%	0%
	Black	65%	35%	0%
	Hispanic	62%	38%	1%
Gender	Men	57%	43%	0%
	Women	58%	43%	0%
Age	18-29	64%	36%	0%
	30-49	62%	38%	0%
	50-64	56%	44%	0%
	65 or older	46%	54%	0%
Income	Less than \$50,000	57%	43%	0%
	\$50-100,000	56%	44%	0%
	\$100-150,000	57%	42%	1%
	More than \$150,000	59%	41%	0%
Education	High School or less	56%	44%	0%
	Some college	54%	46%	0%
	College degree	62%	38%	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
National	16%	12%	71%	1%
GOP	24%	13%	63%	0%
Dem.	8%	9%	83%	1%
Indep.	20%	21%	58%	1%
Arizona	21%	16%	63%	0%
GOP	31%	17%	52%	0%
Dem.	7%	12%	80%	0%
Georgia	19%	14%	67%	0%
GOP	32%	15%	53%	1%
Dem.	8%	10%	82%	0%
Michigan	17%	16%	66%	0%
GOP	26%	18%	56%	0%
Dem.	8%	13%	79%	0%
Nevada	19%	16%	65%	0%
GOP	26%	16%	58%	0%
Dem.	10%	14%	76%	0%
Pennsylvania	22%	13%	65%	0%

GOP	32%	13%	55%	0%
Dem.	10%	11%	78%	0%
Wisconsin	17%	13%	69%	0%
GOP	26%	19%	55%	0%
Dem.	8%	8%	83%	1%

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

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
National	68%	31%	0%
GOP	54%	45%	0%
Dem.	84%	16%	0%
Indep.	63%	38%	0%
Arizona	61%	39%	1%
GOP	47%	53%	0%
Dem.	80%	19%	1%
Georgia	67%	33%	0%
GOP	53%	46%	1%
Dem.	79%	21%	0%
Michigan	67%	32%	0%
GOP	53%	46%	1%
Dem.	82%	18%	0%
Nevada	67%	33%	0%
GOP	56%	44%	0%
Dem.	81%	19%	0%
Pennsylvania	65%	35%	0%
GOP	54%	47%	0%
Dem.	79%	21%	0%
Wisconsin	70%	30%	0%
GOP	55%	45%	0%
Dem.	83%	17%	0%

Demographic Findings – Aggregate of Six Swing States				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
Race	White	63%	37%	0%
	Black	73%	27%	0%
	Hispanic	72%	28%	1%
Gender	Men	66%	34%	0%
	Women	66%	33%	0%
Age	18-29	75%	25%	0%
	30-49	69%	31%	0%
	50-64	65%	35%	0%
	65 or older	56%	44%	0%
Income	Less than \$50,000	69%	31%	0%
	\$50-100,000	67%	33%	0%
	\$100-150,000	64%	35%	0%
	More than \$150,000	64%	36%	0%
Education	High School or less	68%	32%	0%
	Some college	64%	36%	0%
	College degree	66%	34%	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:

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
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%
Arizona	28%	47%	75%	17%	7%	24%	1%
GOP	25%	41%	66%	22%	10%	33%	1%
Dem.	37%	49%	85%	11%	3%	14%	1%
Georgia	35%	40%	76%	16%	7%	23%	1%
GOP	27%	37%	64%	22%	13%	35%	1%
Dem.	47%	41%	88%	9%	3%	12%	0%
Michigan	36%	40%	76%	15%	7%	22%	2%
GOP	25%	40%	65%	22%	12%	33%	2%
Dem.	48%	39%	87%	10%	2%	11%	2%
Nevada	36%	43%	78%	15%	5%	20%	2%
GOP	29%	47%	76%	15%	8%	24%	1%
Dem.	45%	38%	83%	12%	2%	14%	2%
Pennsylvania	36%	41%	78%	15%	5%	20%	2%
GOP	24%	45%	69%	20%	8%	29%	3%
Dem.	51%	38%	89%	8%	2%	10%	1%
Wisconsin	33%	42%	75%	16%	7%	23%	2%
GOP	26%	41%	67%	21%	11%	31%	2%
Dem.	42%	43%	85%	10%	2%	12%	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
National	21%	39%	60%	26%	14%	40%	0%
GOP	24%	40%	64%	23%	13%	36%	0%
Dem.	20%	38%	57%	28%	15%	43%	0%

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

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

Indep.	15%	43%	58%	25%	17%	42%	0%
Arizona	20%	36%	56%	30%	15%	44%	0%
GOP	25%	38%	63%	25%	12%	37%	0%
Dem.	18%	29%	47%	35%	18%	53%	0%
Georgia	23%	35%	58%	28%	14%	42%	0%
GOP	25%	38%	63%	25%	12%	37%	0%
Dem.	22%	31%	53%	30%	16%	47%	0%
Michigan	19%	34%	53%	33%	14%	47%	0%
GOP	24%	36%	60%	29%	11%	40%	0%
Dem.	14%	31%	45%	39%	16%	55%	0%
Nevada	18%	39%	57%	25%	18%	43%	0%
GOP	18%	40%	58%	27%	15%	42%	0%
Dem.	21%	39%	59%	20%	21%	41%	0%
Pennsylvania	21%	35%	56%	28%	15%	43%	0%
GOP	29%	38%	67%	22%	11%	33%	1%
Dem.	16%	32%	48%	32%	20%	52%	0%
Wisconsin	19%	37%	56%	31%	13%	44%	0%
GOP	27%	39%	66%	25%	9%	35%	0%
Dem.	15%	33%	48%	36%	16%	52%	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
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%
Arizona	34%	42%	76%	16%	6%	23%	2%
GOP	30%	39%	69%	22%	10%	31%	1%
Dem.	43%	43%	85%	8%	3%	12%	3%
Georgia	32%	41%	73%	16%	7%	23%	4%
GOP	25%	40%	65%	22%	11%	33%	2%
Dem.	39%	43%	82%	10%	2%	12%	6%
Michigan	34%	45%	78%	14%	7%	21%	1%
GOP	25%	43%	68%	21%	10%	32%	1%
Dem.	43%	44%	87%	9%	3%	12%	1%
Nevada	34%	41%	76%	17%	6%	23%	2%
GOP	31%	39%	69%	21%	9%	30%	1%
Dem.	39%	46%	85%	10%	2%	12%	3%
Pennsylvania	34%	40%	74%	15%	7%	22%	4%
GOP	23%	40%	63%	22%	11%	32%	5%
Dem.	46%	39%	85%	8%	3%	11%	4%
Wisconsin	30%	46%	76%	17%	6%	23%	1%
GOP	25%	39%	64%	24%	12%	35%	1%
Dem.	39%	49%	88%	10%	1%	11%	1%

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

Q11. Here is another argument against:

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
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%
Arizona	21%	40%	60%	29%	11%	39%	0%
GOP	26%	38%	64%	28%	8%	35%	1%
Dem.	15%	38%	53%	30%	17%	47%	0%
Georgia	22%	44%	66%	24%	10%	34%	0%
GOP	24%	47%	71%	22%	7%	29%	0%
Dem.	23%	39%	62%	24%	14%	38%	0%
Michigan	22%	42%	64%	27%	9%	36%	0%
GOP	27%	45%	72%	23%	5%	28%	0%
Dem.	19%	37%	56%	31%	13%	44%	0%
Nevada	22%	40%	62%	27%	11%	38%	1%
GOP	26%	42%	68%	23%	8%	31%	1%
Dem.	20%	39%	59%	26%	15%	41%	0%
Pennsylvania	23%	38%	61%	26%	12%	38%	0%
GOP	26%	41%	67%	23%	10%	32%	1%
Dem.	22%	35%	57%	28%	15%	43%	0%
Wisconsin	19%	46%	65%	28%	7%	36%	0%
GOP	25%	48%	73%	20%	7%	27%	0%
Dem.	12%	44%	57%	34%	9%	43%	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
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%
Arizona	29%	48%	77%	18%	5%	23%	0%
GOP	21%	49%	70%	21%	8%	30%	1%
Dem.	42%	46%	87%	11%	2%	13%	0%
Georgia	29%	48%	77%	16%	7%	22%	0%
GOP	23%	46%	69%	21%	11%	31%	0%
Dem.	37%	50%	87%	10%	3%	13%	0%
Michigan	24%	54%	78%	16%	5%	22%	0%
GOP	20%	52%	71%	22%	7%	29%	0%

Dem.	31%	55%	85%	12%	2%	14%	1%
Nevada	28%	50%	78%	16%	6%	22%	1%
GOP	21%	50%	71%	21%	8%	28%	1%
Dem.	36%	51%	87%	9%	4%	12%	1%
Pennsylvania	31%	45%	76%	17%	7%	24%	1%
GOP	19%	45%	64%	23%	13%	36%	0%
Dem.	45%	43%	89%	10%	1%	11%	1%
Wisconsin	26%	52%	78%	16%	6%	22%	1%
GOP	21%	45%	65%	24%	10%	34%	1%
Dem.	34%	55%	89%	10%	2%	11%	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
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%
Arizona	24%	38%	63%	26%	12%	37%	0%
GOP	30%	38%	68%	23%	8%	32%	1%
Dem.	20%	35%	55%	29%	16%	46%	0%
Georgia	26%	44%	70%	21%	10%	30%	0%
GOP	32%	40%	72%	19%	8%	28%	0%
Dem.	24%	43%	67%	21%	12%	33%	0%
Michigan	23%	41%	64%	27%	10%	36%	0%
GOP	27%	39%	65%	26%	9%	35%	0%
Dem.	20%	40%	60%	29%	11%	40%	0%
Nevada	22%	38%	61%	27%	12%	39%	0%
GOP	26%	40%	67%	25%	9%	33%	0%
Dem.	20%	35%	56%	28%	16%	44%	0%
Pennsylvania	26%	36%	62%	26%	11%	37%	0%
GOP	28%	41%	69%	20%	10%	30%	0%
Dem.	26%	32%	58%	30%	12%	42%	0%
Wisconsin	20%	42%	62%	27%	10%	38%	1%
GOP	23%	48%	71%	20%	8%	28%	1%
Dem.	17%	39%	55%	33%	11%	44%	1%

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

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

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / DK
National	14%	14%	72%	1%
GOP	20%	17%	62%	0%
Dem.	5%	8%	86%	1%
Indep.	21%	23%	57%	0%
Arizona	20%	14%	66%	0%
GOP	31%	16%	53%	0%
Dem.	8%	10%	82%	0%
Georgia	14%	13%	73%	0%
GOP	24%	13%	63%	0%
Dem.	4%	14%	82%	0%
Michigan	17%	13%	70%	0%
GOP	27%	16%	58%	0%
Dem.	7%	8%	85%	0%
Nevada	16%	17%	67%	1%
GOP	24%	17%	59%	1%
Dem.	9%	13%	79%	0%
Pennsylvania	16%	14%	70%	0%
GOP	28%	14%	58%	0%
Dem.	6%	10%	84%	1%
Wisconsin	16%	12%	72%	0%
GOP	27%	14%	59%	0%
Dem.	5%	9%	86%	0%

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

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
National	71%	29%	0%
GOP	57%	43%	0%
Dem.	88%	12%	0%
Indep.	62%	37%	1%
Arizona	66%	34%	0%
GOP	54%	46%	0%
Dem.	84%	16%	0%
Georgia	73%	26%	0%
GOP	60%	39%	1%
Dem.	85%	14%	0%
Michigan	70%	30%	0%
GOP	54%	46%	0%
Dem.	86%	14%	0%
Nevada	68%	32%	0%
GOP	58%	42%	0%
Dem.	80%	20%	0%
Pennsylvania	72%	28%	0%
GOP	60%	40%	0%
Dem.	86%	14%	0%
Wisconsin	69%	30%	0%
GOP	54%	46%	0%
Dem.	84%	15%	1%

		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
Race	White	67%	33%	0%
	Black	78%	22%	0%
	Hispanic	78%	22%	0%
Gender	Men	68%	32%	0%
	Women	72%	28%	0%
Age	18-29	76%	24%	0%
	30-49	75%	25%	0%
	50-64	69%	31%	0%
	65 or older	59%	41%	0%
Income	Less than \$50,000	73%	26%	0%
	\$50-100,000	70%	30%	0%
	\$100-150,000	67%	33%	0%
	More than \$150,000	68%	32%	0%
Education	High School or less	71%	29%	0%
	Some college	68%	32%	0%
	College degree	70%	30%	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

	(0-4)	5	(6-10)	Refused / DK
National	14%	15%	71%	0%
GOP	19%	16%	64%	0%
Dem.	6%	9%	84%	1%
Indep.	18%	32%	50%	0%
Arizona	18%	16%	65%	1%
GOP	24%	17%	59%	1%
Dem.	8%	13%	79%	0%
Georgia	15%	13%	71%	0%
GOP	24%	14%	61%	0%
Dem.	8%	10%	81%	1%
Michigan	15%	17%	68%	0%
GOP	23%	18%	59%	0%
Dem.	6%	12%	82%	0%
Nevada	16%	16%	68%	1%
GOP	21%	16%	63%	1%
Dem.	10%	14%	75%	1%
Pennsylvania	14%	16%	69%	1%
GOP	21%	16%	63%	0%
Dem.	7%	14%	78%	1%
Wisconsin	14%	15%	70%	1%

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.

GOP	20%	21%	59%	1%
Dem.	7%	9%	84%	1%

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

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
National	73%	27%	0%
GOP	63%	37%	0%
Dem.	85%	15%	0%
Indep.	64%	36%	0%
Arizona	70%	30%	1%
GOP	61%	39%	0%
Dem.	84%	16%	1%
Georgia	72%	28%	0%
GOP	64%	36%	0%
Dem.	81%	19%	0%
Michigan	69%	31%	0%
GOP	56%	44%	0%
Dem.	84%	16%	0%
Nevada	69%	31%	0%
GOP	62%	38%	0%
Dem.	79%	20%	0%
Pennsylvania	72%	28%	0%
GOP	64%	36%	0%
Dem.	82%	18%	0%
Wisconsin	73%	27%	0%
GOP	61%	39%	0%
Dem.	86%	14%	0%

Demographic Findings – Aggregate of Six Swing States				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
Race	White	69%	31%	0%
	Black	77%	23%	0%
	Hispanic	76%	24%	0%
Gender	Men	70%	29%	0%
	Women	72%	28%	0%
Age	18-29	76%	24%	0%
	30-49	74%	26%	0%
	50-64	70%	30%	0%
	65 or older	64%	36%	0%
Income	Less than \$50,000	71%	29%	0%
	\$50-100,000	72%	27%	0%
	\$100-150,000	69%	31%	0%
	More than \$150,000	71%	29%	0%
Education	High School or less	72%	28%	0%
	Some college	69%	31%	0%
	College degree	73%	27%	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
National	19%	16%	65%	1%
GOP	24%	19%	56%	1%
Dem.	13%	10%	78%	0%
Indep.	22%	28%	50%	0%
Arizona	21%	17%	62%	0%
GOP	24%	19%	57%	0%
Dem.	13%	14%	73%	0%
Georgia	21%	16%	63%	1%
GOP	27%	17%	56%	0%
Dem.	14%	14%	71%	1%
Michigan	20%	18%	61%	1%
GOP	29%	16%	52%	2%
Dem.	11%	16%	73%	1%
Nevada	20%	19%	61%	0%
GOP	23%	21%	56%	0%
Dem.	16%	14%	69%	0%
Pennsylvania	22%	16%	62%	0%
GOP	25%	17%	58%	0%
Dem.	17%	14%	69%	1%
Wisconsin	17%	17%	66%	0%
GOP	22%	18%	60%	0%
Dem.	8%	16%	76%	0%

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

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
National	67%	33%	0%
GOP	59%	40%	1%
Dem.	77%	23%	0%
Indep.	62%	38%	0%
Arizona	65%	35%	0%
GOP	56%	44%	0%
Dem.	79%	21%	0%
Georgia	64%	36%	0%
GOP	54%	46%	0%
Dem.	73%	27%	0%
Michigan	65%	35%	0%
GOP	55%	45%	0%
Dem.	77%	23%	0%
Nevada	64%	36%	0%
GOP	59%	42%	0%
Dem.	74%	26%	0%
Pennsylvania	65%	35%	0%
GOP	59%	41%	0%
Dem.	73%	27%	0%
Wisconsin	68%	31%	1%

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

	GOP	61%	38%	1%
	Dem.	78%	22%	0%

Demographic Findings – Aggregate of Six Swing States				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
Race	White	63%	37%	0%
	Black	64%	36%	0%
	Hispanic	73%	27%	0%
Gender	Men	66%	33%	0%
	Women	64%	36%	0%
Age	18-29	72%	28%	0%
	30-49	70%	30%	0%
	50-64	61%	39%	0%
	65 or older	57%	43%	0%
Income	Less than \$50,000	64%	36%	1%
	\$50-100,000	65%	35%	0%
	\$100-150,000	64%	36%	0%
	More than \$150,000	67%	33%	0%
Education	High School or less	66%	34%	0%
	Some college	62%	38%	0%
	College degree	67%	33%	0%

[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	Refused / DK
National	73%	27%	1%
GOP	63%	36%	0%
Dem.	84%	15%	0%
Indep.	64%	35%	1%
Arizona	70%	30%	1%
GOP	61%	39%	1%
Dem.	84%	16%	1%
Georgia	73%	26%	1%
GOP	62%	39%	0%
Dem.	86%	13%	1%
Michigan	72%	27%	1%
GOP	63%	37%	0%
Dem.	82%	17%	1%
Nevada	74%	26%	1%
GOP	66%	34%	0%
Dem.	85%	15%	0%
Pennsylvania	73%	27%	1%
GOP	64%	36%	0%
Dem.	82%	17%	1%
Wisconsin	72%	27%	1%
GOP	63%	37%	1%
Dem.	84%	15%	1%

Demographic Findings – Aggregate of Six Swing States				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
Race	White	69%	30%	1%

	Black	82%	18%	1%
	Hispanic	78%	21%	1%
Gender	Men	71%	29%	1%
	Women	74%	25%	1%
Age	18-29	75%	25%	0%
	30-49	75%	24%	1%
	50-64	72%	27%	1%
	65 or older	66%	33%	1%
Income	Less than \$50,000	74%	25%	1%
	\$50-100,000	73%	26%	1%
	\$100-150,000	71%	29%	0%
	More than \$150,000	72%	28%	0%
Education	High School or less	73%	27%	1%
	Some college	71%	28%	1%
	College degree	73%	26%	1%

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
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%
Arizona	37%	43%	79%	13%	6%	19%	2%
GOP	25%	47%	72%	18%	9%	27%	2%
Dem.	51%	38%	89%	7%	2%	9%	2%
Georgia	37%	41%	77%	15%	6%	21%	2%
GOP	31%	38%	69%	18%	10%	28%	3%
Dem.	44%	42%	85%	11%	3%	13%	2%
Michigan	38%	42%	80%	13%	5%	18%	2%
GOP	23%	47%	69%	21%	7%	28%	3%
Dem.	55%	36%	91%	6%	2%	8%	1%
Nevada	40%	40%	79%	14%	5%	19%	1%
GOP	33%	39%	72%	20%	7%	27%	1%
Dem.	46%	41%	87%	7%	4%	12%	2%

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](#).

Pennsylvania	35%	43%	79%	14%	6%	20%	2%
GOP	25%	45%	70%	20%	8%	29%	2%
Dem.	47%	41%	88%	7%	3%	10%	1%
Wisconsin	33%	45%	78%	16%	4%	20%	2%
GOP	25%	43%	67%	23%	7%	30%	2%
Dem.	43%	45%	88%	9%	1%	10%	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.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
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%
Arizona	21%	32%	52%	25%	23%	48%	0%
GOP	29%	34%	63%	25%	11%	36%	0%
Dem.	13%	26%	39%	22%	39%	61%	0%
Georgia	21%	37%	58%	21%	21%	42%	0%
GOP	26%	35%	61%	22%	17%	39%	0%
Dem.	19%	36%	55%	20%	25%	45%	0%
Michigan	21%	32%	53%	27%	20%	47%	0%
GOP	27%	36%	63%	25%	12%	37%	0%
Dem.	14%	27%	41%	29%	30%	59%	0%
Nevada	16%	33%	50%	27%	24%	50%	0%
GOP	21%	35%	56%	27%	17%	44%	0%
Dem.	14%	31%	45%	23%	32%	55%	0%
Pennsylvania	22%	28%	50%	27%	23%	50%	0%
GOP	32%	30%	62%	28%	10%	38%	0%
Dem.	15%	25%	41%	25%	34%	60%	0%
Wisconsin	20%	35%	55%	25%	20%	45%	0%
GOP	28%	39%	67%	19%	14%	33%	0%
Dem.	15%	28%	44%	30%	26%	56%	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
National	39%	39%	78%	13%	7%	20%	2%
GOP	30%	42%	72%	16%	9%	25%	3%

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

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

Dem.	50%	36%	86%	9%	3%	12%	2%
Indep.	33%	38%	71%	15%	12%	28%	1%
Arizona	37%	42%	79%	14%	6%	19%	2%
GOP	29%	43%	72%	19%	7%	26%	2%
Dem.	50%	40%	90%	7%	3%	10%	1%
Georgia	44%	36%	79%	13%	6%	18%	3%
GOP	35%	34%	69%	20%	9%	30%	2%
Dem.	55%	34%	89%	7%	2%	9%	3%
Michigan	40%	42%	82%	11%	5%	16%	2%
GOP	27%	47%	74%	19%	7%	26%	1%
Dem.	54%	37%	90%	4%	2%	6%	4%
Nevada	42%	35%	78%	14%	6%	20%	3%
GOP	39%	36%	74%	19%	5%	24%	2%
Dem.	47%	33%	81%	10%	5%	15%	5%
Pennsylvania	43%	40%	83%	9%	6%	15%	3%
GOP	30%	44%	75%	12%	9%	22%	4%
Dem.	58%	35%	93%	4%	3%	6%	1%
Wisconsin	36%	44%	80%	14%	5%	19%	2%
GOP	23%	48%	71%	19%	9%	27%	2%
Dem.	50%	38%	88%	9%	1%	11%	2%

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
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%
Arizona	22%	39%	61%	26%	13%	38%	1%
GOP	24%	40%	64%	24%	12%	36%	0%
Dem.	19%	39%	58%	27%	15%	41%	1%
Georgia	27%	45%	73%	18%	9%	27%	0%
GOP	30%	45%	75%	17%	8%	25%	0%
Dem.	26%	45%	70%	18%	11%	30%	0%
Michigan	26%	43%	68%	20%	11%	31%	0%
GOP	25%	42%	67%	24%	8%	32%	1%
Dem.	26%	43%	68%	18%	14%	32%	0%
Nevada	24%	43%	67%	18%	15%	33%	0%
GOP	22%	44%	66%	21%	14%	34%	0%
Dem.	28%	41%	69%	14%	16%	31%	0%
Pennsylvania	25%	40%	65%	23%	11%	34%	0%
GOP	25%	45%	71%	20%	9%	29%	1%
Dem.	27%	36%	63%	24%	12%	36%	0%
Wisconsin	23%	45%	68%	24%	7%	31%	0%

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

GOP	29%	42%	71%	21%	7%	29%	0%
Dem.	20%	46%	66%	26%	8%	34%	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:

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
National	12%	14%	73%	1%
GOP	18%	17%	63%	1%
Dem.	5%	10%	85%	1%
Indep.	16%	20%	64%	0%
Arizona	17%	14%	67%	1%
GOP	25%	16%	59%	1%
Dem.	7%	10%	82%	1%
Georgia	15%	11%	73%	0%
GOP	26%	12%	62%	0%
Dem.	6%	9%	86%	0%
Michigan	14%	15%	70%	1%
GOP	22%	21%	56%	1%
Dem.	4%	8%	88%	1%
Nevada	15%	16%	68%	1%
GOP	20%	16%	64%	1%
Dem.	11%	13%	75%	1%
Pennsylvania	16%	14%	68%	1%
GOP	25%	15%	58%	1%
Dem.	7%	11%	81%	1%
Wisconsin	17%	14%	69%	0%
GOP	28%	17%	55%	0%
Dem.	5%	9%	86%	0%

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

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
National	74%	26%	0%
GOP	63%	36%	1%
Dem.	86%	14%	0%
Indep.	67%	33%	1%
Arizona	71%	29%	1%
GOP	60%	39%	1%
Dem.	86%	13%	1%
Georgia	70%	30%	0%
GOP	59%	41%	0%

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

Dem.	81%	19%	0%
Michigan	73%	27%	0%
GOP	57%	43%	0%
Dem.	89%	10%	0%
Nevada	69%	31%	0%
GOP	63%	37%	0%
Dem.	79%	21%	0%
Pennsylvania	71%	28%	0%
GOP	62%	38%	1%
Dem.	83%	17%	0%
Wisconsin	73%	28%	0%
GOP	57%	44%	0%
Dem.	87%	13%	0%

Demographic Findings – Aggregate of Six Swing States				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
Race	White	68%	32%	0%
	Black	77%	23%	0%
	Hispanic	80%	19%	0%
Gender	Men	70%	30%	0%
	Women	72%	28%	0%
Age	18-29	78%	22%	0%
	30-49	75%	25%	0%
	50-64	70%	31%	0%
	65 or older	61%	39%	0%
Income	Less than \$50,000	74%	25%	1%
	\$50-100,000	71%	29%	0%
	\$100-150,000	69%	31%	0%
	More than \$150,000	69%	31%	0%
Education	High School or less	73%	27%	0%
	Some college	70%	29%	0%
	College degree	70%	30%	0%

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.

Right now there are more people who want and qualify for Housing Vouchers than are. 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
National	13%	14%	71%	1%
GOP	20%	17%	62%	1%

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

Dem.	5%	9%	84%	2%
Indep.	18%	22%	60%	0%
Arizona	19%	15%	64%	1%
GOP	29%	16%	54%	1%
Dem.	6%	11%	81%	2%
Georgia	16%	14%	70%	0%
GOP	27%	15%	57%	0%
Dem.	7%	12%	81%	0%
Michigan	15%	15%	70%	0%
GOP	28%	17%	56%	0%
Dem.	4%	10%	86%	1%
Nevada	16%	16%	68%	0%
GOP	21%	20%	60%	0%
Dem.	13%	9%	78%	0%
Pennsylvania	16%	16%	67%	1%
GOP	28%	17%	55%	0%
Dem.	5%	12%	82%	1%
Wisconsin	19%	14%	66%	0%
GOP	31%	17%	52%	0%
Dem.	7%	10%	82%	0%

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

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
National	74%	26%	0%
GOP	63%	37%	0%
Dem.	87%	13%	0%
Indep.	69%	31%	0%
Arizona	70%	30%	0%
GOP	58%	42%	0%
Dem.	85%	15%	0%
Georgia	72%	28%	0%
GOP	61%	39%	0%
Dem.	82%	18%	0%
Michigan	71%	29%	0%
GOP	53%	47%	0%
Dem.	88%	13%	0%
Nevada	71%	29%	0%
GOP	64%	36%	0%
Dem.	78%	21%	1%
Pennsylvania	72%	28%	0%
GOP	60%	40%	0%
Dem.	85%	15%	0%
Wisconsin	69%	31%	0%
GOP	53%	47%	0%
Dem.	85%	15%	0%

Demographic Findings – Aggregate of Six Swing States				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
Race	White	66%	34%	0%
	Black	82%	18%	0%

	Hispanic	80%	19%	1%
Gender	Men	68%	32%	0%
	Women	73%	27%	0%
Age	18-29	78%	22%	0%
	30-49	75%	25%	0%
	50-64	67%	33%	0%
	65 or older	62%	38%	0%
Income	Less than \$50,000	78%	22%	0%
	\$50-100,000	69%	30%	0%
	\$100-150,000	65%	35%	0%
	More than \$150,000	68%	32%	0%
Education	High School or less	74%	26%	0%
	Some college	69%	31%	0%
	College degree	68%	32%	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

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
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%
Arizona	33%	38%	71%	15%	13%	27%	2%
GOP	24%	32%	57%	20%	21%	42%	2%
Dem.	48%	40%	88%	9%	3%	12%	1%
Georgia	35%	40%	75%	14%	11%	24%	1%
GOP	24%	37%	61%	18%	20%	38%	1%
Dem.	47%	42%	89%	8%	3%	11%	0%
Michigan	33%	42%	75%	12%	13%	24%	1%
GOP	20%	36%	56%	19%	24%	43%	1%
Dem.	48%	44%	91%	6%	2%	8%	1%
Nevada	33%	41%	74%	16%	9%	25%	1%
GOP	23%	41%	63%	22%	15%	36%	1%

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

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.

Dem.	43%	44%	87%	9%	3%	12%	1%
Pennsylvania	34%	40%	74%	15%	11%	26%	0%
GOP	20%	41%	61%	20%	19%	39%	0%
Dem.	49%	38%	88%	8%	3%	12%	1%
Wisconsin	29%	43%	71%	16%	11%	27%	1%
GOP	19%	39%	57%	22%	20%	42%	1%
Dem.	40%	46%	85%	11%	3%	13%	2%

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
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%
Arizona	25%	33%	58%	22%	19%	42%	0%
GOP	37%	35%	72%	19%	9%	28%	0%
Dem.	13%	29%	42%	26%	32%	58%	0%
Georgia	25%	36%	61%	23%	16%	38%	0%
GOP	31%	39%	70%	18%	12%	30%	0%
Dem.	20%	33%	53%	27%	21%	47%	0%
Michigan	26%	33%	59%	22%	18%	41%	0%
GOP	33%	35%	68%	21%	11%	32%	0%
Dem.	19%	29%	48%	26%	26%	51%	1%
Nevada	20%	35%	56%	25%	20%	44%	0%
GOP	27%	37%	65%	21%	14%	35%	0%
Dem.	15%	35%	50%	24%	26%	50%	0%
Pennsylvania	30%	28%	58%	24%	18%	42%	0%
GOP	44%	31%	75%	16%	9%	25%	0%
Dem.	18%	25%	43%	30%	28%	57%	0%
Wisconsin	27%	34%	61%	23%	16%	39%	0%
GOP	41%	31%	72%	17%	11%	28%	0%
Dem.	15%	33%	49%	29%	22%	51%	0%

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
National	19%	13%	68%	1%
GOP	30%	15%	55%	1%
Dem.	5%	8%	85%	1%
Indep.	26%	22%	52%	1%
Arizona	24%	13%	63%	1%
GOP	37%	12%	51%	1%
Dem.	6%	13%	81%	1%

Georgia	20%	13%	67%	0%
GOP	35%	12%	52%	0%
Dem.	5%	11%	84%	0%
Michigan	23%	12%	64%	1%
GOP	38%	14%	48%	1%
Dem.	8%	9%	83%	1%
Nevada	21%	14%	65%	0%
GOP	30%	15%	54%	1%
Dem.	10%	11%	79%	0%
Pennsylvania	25%	11%	62%	1%
GOP	44%	11%	45%	1%
Dem.	8%	9%	81%	2%
Wisconsin	28%	11%	61%	1%
GOP	45%	11%	42%	1%
Dem.	11%	9%	79%	0%

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

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
National	67%	33%	0%
GOP	52%	48%	0%
Dem.	84%	15%	1%
Indep.	54%	46%	0%
Arizona	66%	34%	0%
GOP	49%	51%	0%
Dem.	87%	13%	0%
Georgia	68%	32%	0%
GOP	54%	46%	0%
Dem.	83%	17%	0%
Michigan	64%	36%	0%
GOP	44%	57%	0%
Dem.	84%	16%	0%
Nevada	66%	34%	0%
GOP	53%	46%	1%
Dem.	81%	19%	0%
Pennsylvania	64%	36%	0%
GOP	47%	53%	0%
Dem.	81%	18%	1%
Wisconsin	63%	37%	0%
GOP	43%	57%	0%
Dem.	83%	17%	0%

Demographic Findings – Aggregate of Six Swing States				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
Race	White	59%	41%	0%
	Black	79%	21%	0%
	Hispanic	77%	22%	1%
Gender	Men	64%	36%	0%
	Women	66%	34%	0%
Age	18-29	77%	23%	0%
	30-49	73%	27%	0%
	50-64	60%	40%	0%

	65 or older	49%	51%	0%
Income	Less than \$50,000	71%	28%	0%
	\$50-100,000	64%	36%	0%
	\$100-150,000	61%	39%	0%
	More than \$150,000	63%	37%	0%
Education	High School or less	69%	31%	0%
	Some college	62%	38%	0%
	College degree	64%	36%	0%

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.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
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%
Arizona	37%	41%	78%	15%	6%	21%	2%
GOP	29%	46%	75%	16%	7%	23%	2%
Dem.	50%	33%	82%	12%	4%	16%	2%
Georgia	42%	40%	82%	12%	5%	18%	0%
GOP	35%	39%	75%	16%	9%	25%	1%
Dem.	50%	41%	90%	7%	3%	10%	0%
Michigan	38%	39%	78%	14%	7%	21%	1%
GOP	29%	40%	69%	20%	11%	30%	1%
Dem.	49%	37%	85%	10%	4%	14%	2%
Nevada	43%	37%	79%	14%	6%	20%	1%

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](#).

Dem.	48%	38%	85%	11%	3%	14%	1%
Pennsylvania	39%	38%	77%	15%	7%	22%	1%
Dem.	52%	33%	85%	11%	3%	14%	1%
Wisconsin	40%	39%	79%	15%	6%	21%	1%
Dem.	50%	35%	85%	11%	3%	14%	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
National	20%	36%	56%	26%	18%	44%	0%
Dem.	21%	35%	56%	24%	20%	44%	1%
Arizona	15%	35%	50%	28%	22%	50%	0%
Dem.	16%	30%	47%	26%	28%	53%	0%
Georgia	18%	37%	55%	23%	22%	45%	0%
Dem.	20%	31%	51%	19%	29%	48%	1%
Michigan	18%	36%	54%	32%	14%	46%	0%
Dem.	19%	30%	49%	32%	20%	52%	0%
Nevada	14%	33%	47%	30%	23%	53%	1%
Dem.	13%	36%	49%	25%	26%	51%	0%
Pennsylvania	20%	37%	56%	26%	18%	43%	0%
Dem.	16%	33%	49%	26%	25%	51%	0%
Wisconsin	15%	39%	54%	30%	15%	46%	0%
Dem.	14%	39%	52%	30%	17%	48%	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
--	-----------------	---------------------	------------------	-----------------------	-------------------	--------------------	--------

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.

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%
Arizona	29%	47%	75%	17%	6%	23%	2%
GOP	23%	44%	67%	23%	8%	31%	2%
Dem.	36%	50%	86%	8%	4%	13%	1%
Georgia	36%	42%	77%	15%	5%	21%	2%
GOP	29%	44%	73%	20%	6%	26%	1%
Dem.	45%	39%	84%	9%	5%	14%	2%
Michigan	36%	39%	76%	17%	5%	22%	2%
GOP	26%	39%	65%	24%	9%	33%	3%
Dem.	48%	39%	88%	9%	1%	10%	2%
Nevada	37%	41%	77%	13%	7%	20%	2%
GOP	31%	42%	73%	17%	9%	26%	2%
Dem.	43%	39%	82%	10%	5%	15%	3%
Pennsylvania	33%	43%	76%	14%	7%	21%	3%
GOP	26%	42%	68%	18%	11%	29%	3%
Dem.	42%	43%	85%	9%	3%	13%	3%
Wisconsin	33%	45%	78%	16%	5%	21%	2%
GOP	24%	45%	70%	22%	7%	29%	2%
Dem.	43%	43%	85%	11%	2%	13%	2%

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.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref/DK
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%
Arizona	18%	36%	54%	27%	18%	46%	1%
GOP	21%	40%	61%	27%	11%	39%	1%
Dem.	17%	27%	44%	27%	28%	55%	1%
Georgia	22%	38%	60%	24%	15%	40%	0%
GOP	24%	39%	64%	27%	9%	37%	0%
Dem.	21%	34%	56%	23%	22%	44%	0%
Michigan	20%	35%	56%	29%	15%	44%	0%
GOP	23%	44%	67%	26%	7%	33%	0%
Dem.	19%	29%	48%	32%	20%	52%	0%
Nevada	18%	35%	53%	29%	18%	47%	0%
GOP	19%	40%	59%	28%	13%	41%	0%
Dem.	18%	35%	53%	25%	22%	48%	0%
Pennsylvania	23%	34%	58%	27%	16%	42%	0%
GOP	30%	38%	68%	24%	7%	32%	0%
Dem.	18%	30%	48%	28%	24%	52%	0%
Wisconsin	16%	41%	57%	29%	14%	43%	0%

GOP	21%	43%	63%	26%	11%	37%	0%
Dem.	13%	37%	49%	33%	17%	50%	1%

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
National	13%	17%	70%	1%
GOP	18%	20%	61%	0%
Dem.	7%	10%	82%	1%
Indep.	16%	28%	57%	0%
Arizona	14%	14%	71%	1%
GOP	20%	13%	67%	1%
Dem.	5%	12%	83%	1%
Georgia	15%	13%	72%	0%
GOP	24%	12%	64%	0%
Dem.	6%	12%	82%	1%
Michigan	17%	13%	70%	0%
GOP	26%	14%	59%	0%
Dem.	7%	9%	83%	0%
Nevada	14%	16%	69%	1%
GOP	16%	17%	66%	1%
Dem.	11%	15%	74%	0%
Pennsylvania	15%	13%	71%	0%
GOP	23%	14%	62%	1%
Dem.	9%	9%	82%	0%
Wisconsin	14%	16%	70%	0%
GOP	24%	18%	58%	1%
Dem.	5%	13%	81%	0%

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

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
National	71%	29%	0%
GOP	61%	39%	0%
Dem.	82%	17%	1%
Indep.	62%	37%	1%
Arizona	71%	29%	1%
GOP	66%	33%	1%
Dem.	80%	19%	1%

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.

Georgia	70%	30%	0%
GOP	59%	41%	0%
Dem.	81%	19%	0%
Michigan	67%	33%	0%
GOP	56%	44%	0%
Dem.	78%	22%	0%
Nevada	71%	29%	0%
GOP	66%	34%	0%
Dem.	78%	22%	0%
Pennsylvania	68%	32%	1%
GOP	58%	41%	1%
Dem.	79%	21%	0%
Wisconsin	67%	33%	0%
GOP	55%	45%	0%
Dem.	78%	21%	1%

Demographic Findings – Aggregate of Six Swing States				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
Race	White	68%	32%	0%
	Black	68%	33%	0%
	Hispanic	73%	26%	1%
Gender	Men	69%	31%	0%
	Women	69%	30%	1%
Age	18-29	72%	28%	0%
	30-49	72%	28%	1%
	50-64	66%	33%	0%
	65 or older	65%	34%	0%
Income	Less than \$50,000	65%	34%	0%
	\$50-100,000	69%	31%	0%
	\$100-150,000	69%	31%	0%
	More than \$150,000	74%	26%	0%
Education	High School or less	65%	34%	1%
	Some college	72%	28%	0%
	College degree	71%	29%	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
National	19%	13%	67%	1%
GOP	25%	16%	59%	1%
Dem.	11%	8%	79%	2%
Indep.	24%	20%	56%	1%
Arizona	20%	14%	66%	1%
GOP	26%	13%	60%	1%
Dem.	10%	13%	77%	0%
Georgia	19%	13%	68%	0%
GOP	27%	14%	59%	0%

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

Dem.	10%	10%	79%	0%
Michigan	20%	12%	68%	0%
GOP	28%	12%	59%	0%
Dem.	9%	10%	80%	0%
Nevada	16%	14%	70%	1%
GOP	22%	16%	62%	1%
Dem.	10%	11%	79%	1%
Pennsylvania	18%	15%	66%	1%
GOP	26%	17%	56%	1%
Dem.	11%	11%	76%	1%
Wisconsin	20%	14%	65%	1%
GOP	30%	18%	51%	2%
Dem.	10%	10%	80%	1%

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

	Favor	Oppose	Refused / DK
National	67%	33%	0%
GOP	55%	45%	0%
Dem.	81%	19%	1%
Indep.	60%	40%	0%
Arizona	67%	33%	1%
GOP	61%	39%	1%
Dem.	78%	22%	0%
Georgia	66%	34%	0%
GOP	57%	43%	0%
Dem.	75%	25%	0%
Michigan	68%	32%	0%
GOP	57%	43%	0%
Dem.	79%	21%	0%
Nevada	71%	29%	1%
GOP	63%	36%	1%
Dem.	78%	22%	0%
Pennsylvania	67%	32%	1%
GOP	58%	40%	1%
Dem.	77%	24%	0%
Wisconsin	66%	34%	0%
GOP	52%	48%	1%
Dem.	81%	19%	0%

Demographic Findings – Aggregate of Six Swing States				
		Favor	Oppose	DK/Ref
Race	White	67%	33%	0%
	Black	67%	33%	0%
	Hispanic	71%	27%	1%
Gender	Men	67%	32%	0%
	Women	68%	32%	0%
Age	18-29	70%	29%	0%
	30-49	72%	28%	0%
	50-64	64%	36%	1%
	65 or older	62%	37%	0%

Income	Less than \$50,000	67%	33%	1%
	\$50-100,000	67%	32%	1%
	\$100-150,000	67%	33%	0%
	More than \$150,000	69%	31%	0%
Education	High School or less	66%	33%	1%
	Some college	69%	31%	0%
	College degree	68%	32%	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.

Methodology

Fielding and Sample Size

The national and state surveys were fielded to 4,638 adults online October 4th through 14th, 2024 by the Program for Public Consultation (PPC) at the University of Maryland's School of Public Policy, with representative non-probability samples obtained from multiple online panels, including Cint, Dynata and Prodege.

The national sample is 1,190 adults, with a confidence interval of +/- 3.2% and a response rate of 6.9%.

The state samples are as follows:

- Arizona: 595
- Georgia: 626
- Michigan: 601
- Nevada: 609
- Pennsylvania: 624
- Wisconsin: 603

State samples have confidence intervals that range from +/- 4.5% to 4.6% and response rates of 2.8 to 3.9%.

Pre-Stratification and Weighting

Each sample was pre-stratified and weighted by age, race, ethnicity, gender, education, household income, and metro/non-metro status. National and state benchmarks came from the Census Bureau's 2022 American Community Survey and 2023 Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

The national sample was weighted by Census region, home ownership, and marital status. The national sample and the state samples except for Arizona were weighted by partisan affiliation to match party registration records, when available, or to ensure a roughly equal distribution of Republicans and Democrats, including leaners.

The maximum weights applied were:

- National: 3.5
- Arizona: 3.3
- Georgia: 2.8
- Michigan: 3.3
- Nevada: 4.8
- Pennsylvania: 4.7
- Wisconsin: 5.8

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.

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 to 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.