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# Broad Public Support for Coronavirus Aid Package; Just a Third Say It Spends Too Much 

More Americans say the Biden administration made a 'good faith' effort working with opposition than say the same of GOP leaders

## About Pew Research Center

Pew Research Center is a nonpartisan fact tank that informs the public about the issues, attitudes and trends shaping the world. It does not take policy positions. The Center conducts public opinion polling, demographic research, content analysis and other data-driven social science research. It studies U.S. politics and policy; journalism and media; internet, science and technology; religion and public life; Hispanic trends; global attitudes and trends; and U.S. social and demographic trends. All of the Center's reports are available at www.pewresearch.org. Pew Research Center is a subsidiary of The Pew Charitable Trusts, its primary funder.
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## How we did this

Pew Research Center conducted this study to understand the public's views of the economic aid package proposed by the Biden administration in response to the coronavirus outbreak. For this analysis, we surveyed 12,055 U.S. adults in March 2021. Everyone who took part in this survey is a member of Pew Research Center's American Trends Panel (ATP), an online survey panel that is recruited through national, random sampling of residential addresses. This way nearly all U.S. adults have a chance of selection. The survey is weighted to be representative of the U.S. adult population by gender, race, ethnicity, partisan affiliation, education and other categories. Read more about the ATP's methodology.

Here are the questions used for the report, along with responses, and its methodology.

# Broad Public Support for Coronavirus Aid Package; Just a Third Say It Spends Too Much More Americans say the Biden administration made a 'good faith' effort working with opposition than say the same of GOP leaders 

As the House of Representatives prepares to give final approval to the Biden administration's $\$ 1.9$ trillion coronavirus relief package, a sizable majority of U.S. adults (70\%) say they favor the legislation. Only about three-in-ten (28\%) oppose the bill, which provides economic aid to businesses, individuals and state and local governments.

While congressional votes on the legislation have been deeply divided along partisan lines, 41\% of Republicans and Republican-leaning independents support the measure. The bill draws overwhelming support from Democrats and Democratic leaners (94\% favor).

## Sizable majority of public favors Biden's \$1.9 trillion COVID-19 economic aid bill

$\%$ who say they ___ the $\$ 1.9$ trillion COVID-19 economic aid package proposed by the Biden administration

|  | Oppose | Favor |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 28 | 70 |
| Rep/Lean Rep | 57 | 41 |
| Dem/Lean Dem | 6 | 94 |

Note: No answer responses not shown.
Source: Survey of U.S. adults conducted March 1-7, 2021.
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In assessing the proposed spending in the aid package, $41 \%$ of Americans view it as about right, while another $25 \%$ say it spends too little; only a third of Americans say the legislation spends too much money. Republicans are far more likely than Democrats to view the spending in the bill as excessive ( $61 \%$ of Republicans vs. $\mathbf{1 1 \%}$ of Democrats).

The new national survey by Pew Research Center, conducted on the Center's nationally representative American Trends Panel March 1-7, 2021, among 12,055 adults, finds that a majority of the public (57\%) says the Biden administration made a good faith effort working with Republican congressional leaders on the coronavirus aid package.

By comparison, $42 \%$ say GOP leaders made a good faith effort to work with the White House on the pandemic relief bill, with a $55 \%$ majority saying they did not work in good faith.

## More say the Biden administration than GOP leaders made 'good faith' effort to work with opponents on COVID-19 aid

Do you think the Biden administration is making a good faith effort to work with Republican congressional
leaders on the coronavirus economic aid package?

| Total | No | Yes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 40 | 57 |
| Rep/Lean Rep | 75 | 23 |
| Dem/Lean Dem |  | 87 |
| Do you think the Republican congressional leaders are making a good faith effort to work with the Biden administration on the coronavirus economic aid package? |  |  |
|  | No | Yes |
| Total | 55 | 42 |
| Rep/Lean Rep | 29 | 68 |
| Dem/Lean Dem | 79 | 20 |
| Note: No answer responses not shown. <br> Source: Survey of U.S. adults conducted March 1-7, 2021. |  |  |
| PEW RESEARCH CENTER |  |  |

## Across demographic groups, large shares of the public support the federal aid package

While most Americans favor the coronavirus aid package, there are demographic differences in the levels of support.

Three-quarters of women say they favor the aid package, while a smaller majority of men (66\%) say the same.

While overwhelming majorities of Black (91\%), Hispanic (80\%) and Asian American adults (76\%) say they favor the economic package, that compares with a smaller majority of White adults (63\%).

There are also substantial differences in views of the economic stimulus package by household income. About eight-in-ten Americans in lowerincome households ( $82 \%$ ) favor the bill, compared with two-thirds of middle-income and $60 \%$ of upper-income Americans.

Although a $57 \%$ majority of Republicans say they oppose the proposed stimulus bill, there is a substantial ideological divide within the GOP: Roughly seven-in-ten conservative Republicans (69\%) say they oppose the economic package, while the balance of opinion is reversed among moderate and liberal Republicans, 61\% of whom say they favor the aid bill.

By contrast, there is near-universal support for the economic bill among Democrats: More than nine-in-ten (94\%) say they favor the COVID-19 economic aid package.

## Public largely supports $\mathbf{\$ 1 . 9}$ trillion COVID-19 aid package

$\%$ who say they ___ the $\$ 1.9$ trillion COVID-19 economic aid package proposed by the Biden administration


* Asian adults were interviewed in English only.

Notes: White, Black and Asian adults include those who report being only one race and are not Hispanic. Hispanics are of any race. Family income tiers based on adjusted 2019 earnings. No answer responses not shown.
Source: Survey of U.S. adults conducted March 1-7, 2021.
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Among Republicans, there are wide differences in support for the economic package by household income. A 63\% majority of lower-income Republicans and Republican leaners (who make up 25\% of all Republicans and Republican leaners) say they favor the proposed economic package. By comparison, $37 \%$ of Republicans in middle-income households (50\% of Republicans) and just $25 \%$ of upper-income Republicans ( $21 \%$ of all Republicans) favor the bill.

There are no substantial differences by income among Democrats.

## COVID-19 economic aid bill favored by majority of lower-income Republicans

$\%$ who say they favor the $\$ 1.9$ trillion COVID-19 economic aid package proposed by the Biden administration


Note: Family income tiers based on adjusted 2019 earnings.
Source: Survey of U.S. adults conducted March 1-7, 2021.
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About four-in-ten Americans (41\%) say the proposed spending on the bill is about right, while a third say the proposed spending in the bill is too much and a quarter say the amount of allocated money is too little.

While about four-in-ten of those in all income groups say the spending in the aid package is "about right," Americans with lower incomes are more likely than others to say the amount of spending in the COVID-19 economic package is "too little" (and less likely to say it is "too much").

About four-in-ten lowerincome Americans (37\%) say the bill spends too little, compared with $22 \%$ of middleincome and $13 \%$ of upperincome Americans. Conversely, $46 \%$ of upper-income Americans say the bill spends too much; just $20 \%$ of lowerincome Americans say this.

Partisans also differ in these views: A majority of Democrats (56\%) say spending for the bill is about right, with a third saying it is too little and just $11 \%$ saying it is too much. In contrast, most Republicans (61\%) say the bill is spending too much.

Reflecting the income pattern among all Americans, within both partisan groups, those with lower incomes are more likely than those with higher incomes to say the proposed spending on the economic bill is not enough.

For example, while more than a quarter of lower-income Republicans (27\%) say the proposed spending in the aid package is too little, just $11 \%$ of middle-income and $6 \%$ of upper-income Republicans say the same. Fully $81 \%$ of upper-income Republicans say the proposed spending in the economic aid package is too much, a view held by $42 \%$ of lower income Republicans.

Similarly, lower-income Democrats (42\%) are more than twice as likely as upper-income Democrats (20\%) to say that spending is too little. Still, half or more Democrats across income levels say the level of spending is about right.
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## Appendix: Defining income tiers

To create upper-, middle- and lower-income tiers, respondents' 2019 family incomes were adjusted for differences in purchasing power by geographic region and for household size. "Middle-income" adults live in families with annual incomes that are two-thirds to double the median family income in the panel (after incomes have been adjusted for the local cost of living and for household size). The middle-income range for the American Trends Panel is about $\$ 38,900$ to $\$ 116,800$ annually for an average family of three. Lower-income families have incomes less than roughly $\$ 38,900$, and upper-income families have incomes greater than roughly $\$ 116,800$ (all figures expressed in 2019 dollars).

Based on these adjustments, $31 \%$ are lower income, $45 \%$ are middle income and $19 \%$ fall into the upper-income tier. An additional $4 \%$ either didn't offer a response to the income question or the household size question.

For more information about how the income tiers were determined, please see here.

## Methodology

## The American Trends Panel survey methodology

## Overview

The American Trends Panel (ATP), created by Pew Research Center, is a nationally representative panel of randomly selected U.S. adults. Panelists participate via self-administered web surveys. Panelists who do not have internet access at home are provided with a tablet and wireless internet connection. Interviews are conducted in both English and Spanish. The panel is being managed by Ipsos.

Data in this report is drawn from the panel wave conducted March 1 to March 7, 2021. A total of 12,055 panelists responded out of 13,545 who were sampled, for a response rate of $89 \%$. This does not include two panelists who were removed from the data due to extremely high rates of refusal or straightlining. The cumulative response rate accounting for nonresponse to the recruitment surveys and attrition is $4 \%$. The break-off rate among panelists who logged on to the survey and completed at least one item is $1 \%$. The margin of sampling error for the full sample of 12,055 respondents is plus or minus 1.5 percentage points.

## Panel recruitment

The ATP was created in 2014, with the first cohort of panelists invited to join the panel at the end of a large, national, landline and cellphone random-digit-dial survey that was conducted in both English and Spanish. Two additional recruitments were conducted using the same method in 2015 and 2017, respectively. Across these three surveys, a total of 19,718 adults were invited to join the ATP, of whom 9,942 (50\%) agreed to participate.

In August 2018, the ATP switched from telephone to address-based recruitment. Invitations were sent to a random, address-based sample of households selected

## American Trends Panel recruitment surveys

| Recruitment dates | Mode <br> Landline/ | Invited | Joined | Active <br> panelists <br> remaining |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jan. 23 to March 16, 2014 | cell RDD | 9,809 | 5,338 | 2,183 |
| Aug. 27 to Oct. 4, 2015 | Landline/ <br> cell RDD | 6,004 | 2,976 | 1,243 |
| April 25 to June 4, 2017 | Landline/ <br> cell RDD | 3,905 | 1,628 | 621 |
| Aug. 8 to Oct. 31, 2018 | ABS/web | 9,396 | 8,778 | 5,900 |
| Aug. 19 to Nov. 30, 2019 | ABS/web | 5,900 | 4,720 | 2,329 |
| June 1 to July 19, 2020 | ABS/web | 1,865 | 1,636 | 1,269 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{3 6 , 8 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 , 0 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 , 5 4 5}$ |

Note: Approximately once per year, panelists who have not participated in multiple consecutive waves or who did not complete an annual profiling survey are removed from the panel. Panelists also become inactive if they ask to be removed from the panel.
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from the U.S. Postal Service's Delivery Sequence File. Two additional recruitments were conducted using the same method in 2019 and 2020, respectively. Across these three address-based recruitments, a total of 17,161 adults were invited to join the ATP, of whom 15,134 ( $88 \%$ ) agreed to join the panel and completed an initial profile survey. In each household, the adult with the next birthday was asked to go online to complete a survey, at the end of which they were invited to join the panel. Of the 25,076 individuals who have ever joined the ATP, 13,545 remained active panelists and continued to receive survey invitations at the time this survey was conducted.

The U.S. Postal Service's Delivery Sequence File has been estimated to cover as much as $98 \%$ of the population, although some studies suggest that the coverage could be in the low $90 \%$ range. ${ }^{1}$ The American Trends Panel never uses breakout routers or chains that direct respondents to additional surveys.

## Sample design

The overall target population for this survey was non-institutionalized persons ages 18 and older, living in the U.S., including Alaska and Hawaii.

## Questionnaire development and testing

The questionnaire was developed by Pew Research Center in consultation with Ipsos. The web program was rigorously tested on both PC and mobile devices by the Ipsos project management team and Pew Research Center researchers. The Ipsos project management team also populated test data which was analyzed in SPSS to ensure the logic and randomizations were working as intended before launching the survey.

## Incentives

All respondents were offered a post-paid incentive for their participation. Respondents could choose to receive the post-paid incentive in the form of a check or a gift code to Amazon.com or could choose to decline the incentive. Incentive amounts ranged from $\$ 5$ to $\$ 20$ depending on whether the respondent belongs to a part of the population that is harder or easier to reach. Differential incentive amounts were designed to increase panel survey participation among groups that traditionally have low survey response propensities.

[^0]
## Data collection protocol

The data collection field period for this survey was March 1 to March 7, 2021. Postcard notifications were mailed to all ATP panelists with a known residential address on March 1, 2021.

On March 1 and March 2, invitations were sent out in two separate launches: Soft Launch and Full Launch. Sixty panelists were included in the soft launch, which began with an initial invitation sent on March 1, 2021. The ATP panelists chosen for the initial soft launch were known responders who had completed previous ATP surveys within one day of receiving their invitation. All remaining English- and Spanish-speaking panelists were included in the full launch and were sent an invitation on March 2, 2021.

All panelists with an email address received an email invitation and up to two email reminders if they did not respond to the survey. All ATP panelists that consented to SMS messages received an SMS invitation and up to two SMS reminders.

Invitation and reminder dates

|  | Soft Launch | Full Launch |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Initial invitation | March 1, 2021 | March 2, 2021 |
| First reminder | March 4, 2021 | March 4, 2021 |
| Final reminder | March 6, 2021 | March 6, 2021 |

## Data quality checks

To ensure high-quality data, the Center's researchers performed data quality checks to identify any respondents showing clear patterns of satisficing. This includes checking for very high rates of leaving questions blank, as well as always selecting the first or last answer presented. As a result of this checking, two ATP respondents were removed from the survey dataset prior to weighting and analysis.

## Weighting

The ATP data was weighted in a multistep process that accounts for multiple stages of sampling and nonresponse that occur at different points in the survey process. First, each panelist begins with a base weight that reflects their probability of selection for their initial recruitment survey (and the probability of being invited to participate in the panel in cases where only a subsample of respondents were invited). The base weights for panelists recruited in different years are scaled to be proportionate to the effective sample size for all active panelists in their cohort. To correct for nonresponse to the initial recruitment surveys and gradual panel attrition, the base weights for all
active panelists are calibrated to align with the population benchmarks identified in the accompanying table to create a full-panel weight.

For ATP waves in which only a subsample of panelists are invited to participate, a wavespecific base weight is created by adjusting the full-panel weights for subsampled panelists to account for any differential probabilities of selection for the particular panel wave. For waves in which all active panelists are invited to participate, the wave-specific base weight is identical to the full-panel weight.

## Weighting dimensions

| Variable | Benchmark source |
| :---: | :---: |
| Age x Gender | 2019 American Community Survey |
| Education x Gender |  |
| Education x Age |  |
| Race/Ethnicity x Education |  |
| Born inside vs. outside the U.S. among Hispanics and Asian Americans |  |
| Years lived in the U.S. |  |
| Census region x Metro/Non-metro | 2019 CPS March Supplement |
| Volunteerism | 2017 CPS Volunteering \& Civic Life Supplement |
| Voter registration | 2016 CPS Voting and Registration Supplement |
| Party affiliation | 2020 National Public Opinion |
| Frequency of internet use | Reference Survey |
| Religious affiliation |  |

Note: Estimates from the ACS are based on non-institutionalized adults. The 2016 CPS was used for voter registration targets for this wave in order to obtain voter registration numbers from a presidential election year. Voter registration is calculated using procedures from Hur, Achen (2013) and rescaled to include the total U.S. adult population. The 2020 National Public Opinion Reference Survey featured 1,862 online completions and 2,247 mail survey completions.
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In the final weighting step, the wave-specific base weights for panelists who completed the survey are again calibrated to match the population benchmarks specified above. These weights are trimmed (typically at about the 1st and 99th percentiles) to reduce the loss in precision stemming from variance in the weights. Sampling errors and test of statistical significance take into account the effect of weighting.

The following table shows the unweighted sample sizes and the error attributable to sampling that would be expected at the $95 \%$ level of confidence for different groups in the survey.

| Group | Unweighted <br> sample size <br> 12,055 | Weighted \% | Plus or minus ... <br> Total sample |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| At least 6,011 |  | 2.5 percentage points |  |
| Half sample | 4,796 | 43 | 2.3 percentage points |
| Rep/Lean Rep | At least 2,390 |  | 3.2 percentage points |
| Half sample | 6,988 | 52 | 2.1 percentage points |
| Dem/Lean Dem | At least 3,488 |  | 3.0 percentage points |
| Half sample |  |  |  |

Sample sizes and sampling errors for other subgroups are available upon request. In addition to sampling error, one should bear in mind that question wording and practical difficulties in conducting surveys can introduce error or bias into the findings of opinion polls.

## Dispositions and response rates

| Final dispositions | AAPOR code | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Completed interview | 1.1 | 12,055 |
| Logged onto survey; broke-off | 2.12 | 119 |
| Logged onto survey; did not complete any items | 2.1121 | 72 |
| Never logged on (implicit refusal) | 2.11 | 1,297 |
| Survey completed after close of the field period | 2.27 | 0 |
| Completed interview but was removed for data quality |  | 2 |
| Screened out | N | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| Total panelists in the survey | P | $\mathbf{1 3 , 5 4 5}$ |
| Completed interviews | R | $\mathbf{1 2 , 0 5 5}$ |
| Partial interviews | NC | 0 |
| Refusals | UH | $\mathbf{1 , 4 9 0}$ |
| Non-contact | UO | 0 |
| Other | NE | 0 |
| Unknown household |  | 0 |
| Unknown other |  | 0 |
| Not eligible |  | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 3 , 5 4 5}$ |  |
| AAPOR RR1 $=\mathrm{I} /(\mathrm{I}+\mathrm{P}+\mathrm{R}+\mathrm{NC}+\mathrm{O}+\mathrm{UH}+\mathrm{UO})$ | $89 \%$ |  |


| Cumulative response rate | Total |
| :--- | :---: |
| Weighted response rate to recruitment surveys <br> \% of recruitment survey respondents who agreed to <br> join the panel, among those invited <br> \% of those agreeing to join who were active panelists <br> at start of Wave 84 | $11 \%$ |
| Response rate to Wave 84 survey | $73 \%$ |
| Cumulative response rate | $57 \%$ |

(C) Pew Research Center, 2021

# 2021 PEW RESEARCH CENTER'S AMERICAN TRENDS PANEL WAVE 84 MARCH 2021 <br> FINAL TOPLINE <br> MARCH 1-7, 2021 <br> $\mathrm{N}=12,055$ 

## ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS HELD FOR FUTURE RELEASE

## ASK ALL:

COVID_ASSIST21
As you may know, in response to the coronavirus outbreak Congress is currently considering a bill proposed by the Biden administration that would provide $\$ 1.9$ trillion in economic aid to businesses, individuals and state and local governments.

All in all, do you favor or oppose this bill?
Mar 1-7
$\underline{2021}$
70 Favor

28 Oppose
1 No answer

## ASK FORM 1 [ $\mathrm{N}=6,044$ ]:

COVIDLEG21A
Do you think the proposed spending in the coronavirus economic aid package is...

| Mar 1-7 <br> $\frac{2021}{33}$ |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| 25 | Too much |
| 41 | Too little |
| 1 | About right |
|  | No answer |

## [RANDOMIZE ORDER OF BIDEN_GOODFAITHC AND REPS_GOODFAITHC AND SHOW ON SAME SCREEN]

ASK FORM 2 [ $\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{6 , 0 1 1}$ ]:
BIDEN_GOODFAITHC Thinking about the proposed coronavirus economic aid package, do you think the Biden administration is making a good faith effort to work with Republican Congressional leaders?

Mar 1-7
$\underline{2021}$
57 Yes, the Biden administration is making a good faith effort to work with Republican congressional leaders
40 No, the Biden administration is not making a good faith effort to work with Republican congressional leaders
2 No answer

## ASK FORM 2 [N=6,011]:

REPS_GOODFAITHC Thinking about the proposed coronavirus economic aid package, do you think the Republican congressional leaders are making a good faith effort to work with the Biden administration?

Mar 1-7
$\underline{2021}$
42 Yes, Republican congressional leaders are making a good faith effort to work with the Biden administration
55 No, Republican congressional leaders are not making a good faith effort to work with the Biden administration
3 No answer

## ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS HELD FOR FUTURE RELEASE

## ASK ALL:

PARTY In politics today, do you consider yourself a:
ASK IF INDEP/SOMETHING ELSE (PARTY=3 or 4) OR MISSING [N=4,808]:
PARTYLN As of today do you lean more to...

| Republican | Democrat | Independent | Something else | No answer | Lean Rep | Lean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24 | 31 | 29 | 15 | 2 | 19 | 21 |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ AAPOR Task Force on Address-based Sampling. 2016. "AAPOR Report: Address-based Sampling."

