

Zogby Analytics Online Survey of Likely Voters in Michigan
6/10/20 - 6/11/20 MOE +/- 4.0 Percentage Points

State

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Michigan	603	100.0	100.0	100.0

2002. How likely are you to vote in national elections?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Definitely	471	78.1	78.1	78.1
	Very likely	87	14.4	14.4	92.5
	Somewhat likely	45	7.5	7.5	100.0
	Total	603	100.0	100.0	

Party

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Democratic	241	40.0	40.0	40.0
	Republican	187	31.0	31.0	71.0
	Independent	175	29.0	29.0	100.0
	Total	603	100.0	100.0	

As many as 40 million American workers lost jobs as a result of the COVID-19 crisis. Do you support or oppose reductions in the admission of new immigrants and foreign guest workers while unemployment rates remain at historic highs?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support reductions in immigration and guest worker admissions	186	30.8	30.8	30.8
	Somewhat support reductions in immigration and guest worker admissions	165	27.3	27.3	58.1
	Somewhat oppose reductions in immigration and guest worker admissions	105	17.5	17.5	75.6
	Strongly oppose reductions in immigration and guest worker admissions	89	14.8	14.8	90.4
	Don't know/Not sure	58	9.6	9.6	100.0
	Total	603	100.0	100.0	

Subsets have a larger margin of error than the whole data set. As a rule we do not rely on the validity of very small subsets of the data, especially sets smaller than 50-75 respondents. At that size subset we can make generalizations, but in these cases the data is more qualitative than quantitative

Zogby Analytics Online Survey of Likely Voters in Michigan
6/10/20 - 6/11/20 MOE +/- 4.0 Percentage Points

Some argue that as the U.S. economy reopens, limiting the admission of new immigrants and foreign guest workers would help laid-off American workers reclaim lost jobs. Others argue that foreign workers are essential to restarting the economy. Which of these claims most closely reflect your views?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Limiting admission of new immigrants and guest workers will improve the chances of laid-off American workers being rehired.	280	46.5	46.5	46.5
	Maintaining high levels of immigration and guest worker admissions will help the economy recover more quickly.	220	36.5	36.5	82.9
	Don't know/Not sure	103	17.1	17.1	100.0
	Total	603	100.0	100.0	

The United States, like many other nations, has slowed the admission of foreign nationals - visitors and new immigrants - in response to the COVID-19 crisis. Do you support or oppose continuing the policy that has slowed the admission of foreign nationals until we can provide thorough health screening for everyone entering the country?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly support	267	44.2	44.2	44.2
	Somewhat support	200	33.1	33.1	77.3
	Somewhat oppose	63	10.5	10.5	87.8
	Strongly oppose	30	4.9	4.9	92.7
	Don't know/Not sure	44	7.3	7.3	100.0
	Total	603	100.0	100.0	

When it comes to immigration policy, which of the following do you believe should be the federal government's top priority right now?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Reducing overall immigration levels and admission of foreign guest workers	161	26.7	26.7	26.7
	Increasing overall immigration levels and admission of foreign guest workers	56	9.2	9.2	35.9
	Securing our borders	125	20.8	20.8	56.7
	Deporting illegal immigrants	69	11.5	11.5	68.2
	Putting illegal immigrants including DACA recipients on a pathway to citizenship	155	25.7	25.7	93.9
	Decriminalizing illegal immigration	37	6.1	6.1	100.0
	Total	603	100.0	100.0	

Subsets have a larger margin of error than the whole data set. As a rule we do not rely on the validity of very small subsets of the data, especially sets smaller than 50-75 respondents. At that size subset we can make generalizations, but in these cases the data is more qualitative than quantitative

Zogby Analytics Online Survey of Likely Voters in Michigan
6/10/20 - 6/11/20 MOE +/- 4.0 Percentage Points

AgeGroup

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18-29	125	20.7	21.0	21.0
	30-49	179	29.6	30.0	51.0
	50-64	178	29.6	30.0	81.0
	65+	113	18.7	19.0	100.0
	Total	595	98.7	100.0	
Missing	.00	8	1.3		
Total		603	100.0		

AgeGroup-B

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18-24	81	13.4	13.6	13.6
	25-34	89	14.8	15.0	28.6
	35-54	186	30.9	31.3	59.9
	55-69	182	30.1	30.6	90.4
	70+	57	9.5	9.6	100.0
	Total	595	98.7	100.0	
Missing	.00	8	1.3		
Total		603	100.0		

Generation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Gen Z (1996-2010)	81	13.4	13.6	13.6
	Millennials (1980-1995)	153	25.5	25.8	39.4
	Gen X (1965-1979)	136	22.5	22.9	62.2
	Baby Boomers (1946-1964)	208	34.4	34.9	97.1
	Silent Generation (Pre 1946)	17	2.8	2.9	100.0
	Total	595	98.7	100.0	
Missing	.00	8	1.3		
Total		603	100.0		

Subsets have a larger margin of error than the whole data set. As a rule we do not rely on the validity of very small subsets of the data, especially sets smaller than 50-75 respondents. At that size subset we can make generalizations, but in these cases the data is more qualitative than quantitative

Zogby Analytics Online Survey of Likely Voters in Michigan
6/10/20 - 6/11/20 MOE +/- 4.0 Percentage Points

Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No College Degree	323	53.6	53.7	53.7
	College Degree+	278	46.2	46.3	100.0
	Total	602	99.8	100.0	
Missing	.00	1	.2		
Total		603	100.0		

Race

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	White	449	74.4	75.0	75.0
	Hisp	30	5.0	5.0	80.0
	AfrAmer	90	14.9	15.0	95.0
	Asian	12	2.0	2.0	97.0
	Other	18	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	598	99.2	100.0	
Missing	.00	5	.8		
Total		603	100.0		

Marital Status

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Married	289	47.9	48.1	48.1
	Single, never married	174	28.8	28.9	77.0
	Divorced/separated/widowed	105	17.5	17.5	94.5
	Civil union or domestic partnership	33	5.5	5.5	100.0
	Total	601	99.6	100.0	
Missing	0	2	.4		
Total		603	100.0		

Subsets have a larger margin of error than the whole data set. As a rule we do not rely on the validity of very small subsets of the data, especially sets smaller than 50-75 respondents. At that size subset we can make generalizations, but in these cases the data is more qualitative than quantitative

Zogby Analytics Online Survey of Likely Voters in Michigan
6/10/20 - 6/11/20 MOE +/- 4.0 Percentage Points

Live

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Large city (greater than 500,000 residents)	74	12.3	12.4	12.4
	Medium city (100,000-500,000 residents)	110	18.3	18.4	30.8
	Small city (less than 100,000 residents)	117	19.4	19.5	50.3
	Suburbs	176	29.1	29.3	79.5
	Rural area	123	20.3	20.5	100.0
	Total	599	99.4	100.0	
Missing	0	4	.6		
Total		603	100.0		

Ideology Recoded

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Liberal	161	26.8	27.5	27.5
	Moderate	196	32.5	33.4	60.9
	Conservative	226	37.4	38.5	99.4
	Populist	4	.6	.6	100.0
	Total	586	97.3	100.0	
Missing	.00	17	2.7		
Total		603	100.0		

Religion

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Catholic	125	20.7	20.7	20.7
	Protestant	213	35.3	35.3	56.0
	Jewish	12	2.1	2.1	58.1
	Other/None	253	41.9	41.9	100.0
	Total	603	100.0	100.0	

Subsets have a larger margin of error than the whole data set. As a rule we do not rely on the validity of very small subsets of the data, especially sets smaller than 50-75 respondents. At that size subset we can make generalizations, but in these cases the data is more qualitative than quantitative

Zogby Analytics Online Survey of Likely Voters in Michigan
6/10/20 - 6/11/20 MOE +/- 4.0 Percentage Points

Born Again

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	100	16.6	47.2	47.2
	No/NS	112	18.6	52.8	100.0
	Total	213	35.3	100.0	
Missing	0	390	64.7		
Total		603	100.0		

Union

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	110	18.3	18.6	18.6
	No	484	80.2	81.4	100.0
	Total	594	98.5	100.0	
Missing	0	9	1.5		
Total		603	100.0		

Child<17

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	179	29.6	30.0	30.0
	No	417	69.1	70.0	100.0
	Total	596	98.8	100.0	
Missing	0	7	1.2		
Total		603	100.0		

Subsets have a larger margin of error than the whole data set. As a rule we do not rely on the validity of very small subsets of the data, especially sets smaller than 50-75 respondents. At that size subset we can make generalizations, but in these cases the data is more qualitative than quantitative

Zogby Analytics Online Survey of Likely Voters in Michigan
6/10/20 - 6/11/20 MOE +/- 4.0 Percentage Points

Employment Status

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Working full time	237	39.2	39.6	39.6
	Working part time	77	12.7	12.9	52.4
	Temporarily unemployed and looking for work	40	6.6	6.7	59.1
	Temporarily unemployed and not looking for work	36	6.0	6.1	65.2
	Student	30	5.0	5.0	70.3
	Stay at home parent/spouse	32	5.3	5.3	75.6
	Retired	146	24.2	24.4	100.0
	Total	598	99.1	100.0	
Missing	0	5	.9		
Total		603	100.0		

Veteran/Armed Forces?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	114	18.9	18.9	18.9
	No	489	81.1	81.1	100.0
	Total	603	100.0	100.0	

Resident

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	My city or town	165	27.4	28.0	28.0
	America	277	45.9	46.8	74.8
	The planet Earth	149	24.7	25.2	100.0
	Total	591	98.0	100.0	
Missing	0	12	2.0		
Total		603	100.0		

Subsets have a larger margin of error than the whole data set. As a rule we do not rely on the validity of very small subsets of the data, especially sets smaller than 50-75 respondents. At that size subset we can make generalizations, but in these cases the data is more qualitative than quantitative

Zogby Analytics Online Survey of Likely Voters in Michigan
6/10/20 - 6/11/20 MOE +/- 4.0 Percentage Points

Income

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than \$25,000	89	14.8	15.4	15.4
	\$25001 - 35000	56	9.2	9.6	25.0
	\$35001 - 50000	116	19.2	20.0	45.0
	\$50001 - 75000	115	19.0	19.8	64.8
	\$75001 - 100000	88	14.6	15.2	80.0
	\$100001 - 150000	81	13.5	14.0	94.0
	Greater than \$150000	35	5.7	6.0	100.0
	Total	580	96.2	100.0	
Missing	0	23	3.8		
Total		603	100.0		

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	289	48.0	48.0	48.0
	Female	314	52.0	52.0	100.0
	Total	603	100.0	100.0	

Region

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SE	242	40.1	40.4	40.4
	Flint/Bay Area	35	5.8	5.8	46.2
	Mid MI	85	14.0	14.1	60.4
	Thumb	28	4.7	4.7	65.1
	Northern Lower Peninsula	60	10.0	10.1	75.2
	Upper Peninsula	22	3.7	3.7	78.9
	West	70	11.6	11.7	90.6
	Southwest	56	9.3	9.4	100.0
	Total	599	99.3	100.0	
Missing	.00	4	.7		
Total		603	100.0		

Subsets have a larger margin of error than the whole data set. As a rule we do not rely on the validity of very small subsets of the data, especially sets smaller than 50-75 respondents. At that size subset we can make generalizations, but in these cases the data is more qualitative than quantitative