

ISSN 1936-5349 (print)
ISSN 1936-5357 (online)

HARVARD

JOHN M. OLIN CENTER FOR LAW, ECONOMICS, AND BUSINESS

WHICH NUDGES DO PEOPLE LIKE? A NATIONAL SURVEY

Cass R. Sunstein

Discussion Paper No. 849

01/2016

Harvard Law School
Cambridge, MA 02138

This paper can be downloaded without charge from:

The Harvard John M. Olin Discussion Paper Series:
http://www.law.harvard.edu/programs/olin_center/

The Social Science Research Network Electronic Paper Collection:
<http://ssrn.com/abstract=2619899>

Which Nudges Do People Like? A National Survey

Cass R. Sunstein*

Abstract

Nudges are interventions that preserve freedom of choice but that nonetheless influence people's decisions; they might be introduced by legislatures, courts, or executive branch officials. Notwithstanding their growing international appeal, they have proved controversial in some circles. But what do citizens actually think about them? In a nationally representative survey in the United States, there is majority support for twenty-two nudges that are highly realistic examples of the kinds of nudges that have been adopted or seriously considered in democratic nations. These nudges are in sharp contrast to respondents' disapproval of twelve hypothetical nudges (seven involving default rules, five involving education campaigns or disclosure requirements).

In general, there is a remarkably broad consensus, across partisan lines, about which nudges do and do not deserve support. The best understanding of the data is that people dislike those nudges that (a) promote what people see as illicit ends or (b) are perceived as inconsistent with either the interests or values of most choosers. It follows that people do not take default rules, warnings, and even tendentious and arguably manipulative public education campaigns to be objectionable as such; the overriding concern is whether nudges are legitimately motivated and consistent with choosers' interests and values. An important qualification is that several nudges, in the domain of health and safety, attract significantly more support from Democrats than from Republicans. A ranking of the thirty-four nudges, in terms of their popularity, is provided, along with reports of differences (when they exist) among Democrats, Republicans, and independents.

I. Introduction

* Robert Walmsley University Professor, Harvard University. I am most grateful to Arevik Avedian for indispensable help and wisdom with the surveys conducted here, and also to Heidi Liu for superb comments and research assistance. Maya Bar-Hillel, Jacob Goldin, Lucia Reisch, and Richard Thaler provided valuable thoughts and suggestions. For support of multiple kinds, thanks to Harvard Law School's Program on Behavioral Economics and Public Policy, and for a wonderful working environment in which some of the work was conducted, thanks to the Russell Sage Foundation and its director, Sheldon Danziger.

Nudges are interventions that preserve freedom of choice but that nonetheless influence people's decisions. A reminder is a nudge;¹ so is a warning. A GPS nudges; a default rule nudges. Disclosure of relevant information (about the risks of smoking or the costs of borrowing) counts as a nudge. Save More Tomorrow plans, encouraging employees to sign up to give some portion of their future earnings to 401(k) programs, are nudges.² A recommendation is a nudge. A criminal penalty, a civil fine, and a subsidy are not nudges, because they impose significant material incentives on people's choices.³

Legislatures are in the business of selecting nudges, sometimes in the form of default rules,⁴ sometimes through requiring or authorizing public education campaigns.⁵ Within the executive branch, officials often opt for nudges, at least if they are authorized by statute.⁶ Of course judges frequently engage in nudging, most conspicuously in the choice of default rules in the law of contract.⁷ To the extent that the common law consists of default rules, it is pervaded by nudges.

¹ See Julia Raifman et al., *The Impact of Text Message Reminders on Adherence to Antimalarial Treatment in Northern Ghana*, 9 PLOS ONE e109032 (2014).

² See Richard A. Thaler, MISBEHAVING 309-22 (2015).

³ On some of the complexities here, see generally Cass R. Sunstein, WHY NUDGE? (2014).

⁴ See, e.g., 29 U.S.C. 218A, which, as amended by the Affordable Care Act, requires large employers (those with over 200 employees) to “automatically enroll new full-time employees in one of the plans offered (subject to any waiting period authorized by law) and to continue the enrollment of current employees in a health benefits plan offered through the employer,” with an accompanying notice of employee opt-out rights. See also Automatic: Changing the Way America Saves (William Gale et al. eds. 2009) (discussing congressional action in the context of retirement planning).

⁵ In the context of smoking, see FDA, Report to Congress: Progress and Effectiveness of the Implementation of the Family Smoking Prevention and Tobacco Control Act (2013), available at <http://www.fda.gov/downloads/TobaccoProducts/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/UCM371271.pdf> (discussing, among other measures, “public education campaigns about the dangers of regulated tobacco products”).

⁶ Executive Order 13563 expressly recognizes this point in section 4, “Flexible Approaches,” which states, “Where relevant, feasible, and consistent with regulatory objectives, and to the extent permitted by law, each agency shall identify and consider regulatory approaches that reduce burdens and maintain flexibility and freedom of choice for the public. These approaches include warnings, appropriate default rules, and disclosure requirements as well as provision of information to the public in a form that is clear and intelligible.” For numerous recent examples, see Cass R. Sunstein, *Simpler: The Future of Government* (2013).

⁷ See Richard Craswell, *Contract Law, Default Rules, and the Philosophy of Promising*, 88 Mich L Rev. 489, 516 (1989).

Notwithstanding this fact, some people have raised ethical objections to nudging, and indeed to any approach informed by behavioral science.⁸ On one view, some such approaches compromise individual dignity. Acknowledging that they might prove helpful, Jeremy Waldron writes: “I wish, though, that I could be made a better chooser rather than having someone on high take advantage (even for my own benefit) of my current thoughtlessness and my shabby intuitions.”⁹ On another view, some nudges are more coercive than they seem, precisely because of their potentially large impact; because of inertia, people might stick with default rules, which can in that sense operate like mandates.¹⁰ Some people contend that it is important to “boost” people’s own capacities, by increasing their knowledge and their agency, rather than to nudge them.¹¹ There are also pervasive questions about those who design nudges. Should they really be trusted?¹² Who will nudge, or control, them? Might they not suffer from the very behavioral biases that motivate (some) nudging?

These and other questions raise serious problems, which deserve extended treatment.¹³ Ethical issues are normative ones, of course, but there is also a positive question: Which nudges do people endorse, and which do they reject? Is it possible to develop principles by which to organize people’s judgments? If legislators and administrators are responsive to public will, they might well be keenly interested in such questions.

To be sure, people’s responses to survey questions cannot be considered authoritative. If the issue is how to resolve those questions in principle or in terms of social welfare, empirical findings about people’s answers are hardly decisive. In any case, their answers might not reflect their considered judgments. When people have time to think, and when they are informed, they might respond differently from how they do on surveys.¹⁴ Moreover, both intuitions and considered judgments might go wrong.¹⁵

⁸ See generally RICCARDO REBONATO, *TAKING LIBERTIES: A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF LIBERTARIAN PATERNALISM* (2012).

⁹ See Jeremy Waldron, *It’s All For Your Own Good*, *NEW YORK REVIEW OF BOOKS* (2014), <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2014/oct/09/cass-sunstein-its-all-your-own-good/>.

¹⁰ See generally REBONATO, *supra* note 4.

¹¹ See generally Til Grune-Yanoff and Ralph Hertwig, *Nudge Versus Boost: How Coherent Are Policy and Theory?*, 25 *MINDS & MACHINES* (2015). In my view, boosts are best understood as a subcategory of nudges, but it is certainly true that some nudges boost people’s agency, whereas other nudges do not do so. See Cass R. Sunstein, *The Ethical State* (forthcoming 2015).

¹² See *id.*

¹³ Some efforts are made in Cass R. Sunstein, *Ethical Nudging*, *YALE J. REG.* (forthcoming 2015); CASS R. SUNSTEIN, *THE ETHICAL STATE* (forthcoming 2016).

¹⁴ Consider, for example, the idea, tested in the survey here, of “green defaults.” A judgment about automatic enrollment in green energy sources should depend in large part on its costs and benefits (what is the environmental benefit? what is the additional cost?), and any simple response to a short survey question might be difficult to defend. For

Behavioral scientists would emphasize a related point: People's answers to ethical questions, or questions about moral approval or disapproval, might well depend on how such questions are framed; slight differences in framing can yield dramatically different answers.¹⁶

Notwithstanding these qualifications, surveys certainly provide important clues about what people are likely to think. In a democracy, their responses undoubtedly matter in practice, if only because public officials care about what citizens think. Such officials are likely to hesitate before proceeding with nudges that strike large numbers of citizens as troublesome, foolish, insulting, or unethical. In addition, it is unnecessary to make strong claims about the wisdom of crowds, especially on normative issues, in order to believe that an ethical judgment, on the part of those who might be subject to nudges, deserves respectful attention. Public officials should be humble and attentive to the views of others, and if strong majorities favor or oppose nudges, then their views ought to be taken into account.

The goal of this essay is to report on a nationally representative survey involving thirty-four nudges.¹⁷ I devised the survey, which was administered by Survey Sampling International and included 563 Americans, with a margin of error of plus or minus 4.1 percentage points. From their responses, two dominant principles emerge. *First*, Americans reject nudges that promote what they see as illicit ends (such as religious

discussion, see Georg Meran and Reimund Schwartz, *A Theory of Optimal Green Defaults* (2015), available at

https://www.ufz.de/export/data/global/67135_DP_06_2015_Meran_Schwarze.pdf.

Another example is disclosure of GMOs, also tested here. On a quite plausible view, mandatory disclosure would be a mistake, whatever the results of surveys. See David Zilberman, *The Logic and Consequences of Labeling Genetically Modified Organisms*, 15 *ARE Update* 55 (2012). available at http://giannini.ucop.edu/media/are-update/files/articles/V15N5_2.pdf

¹⁵ See Cass R. Sunstein, *Moral Heuristics*, 28 *BEHAVIORAL AND BRAIN SCIENCES* 542 (2005).

¹⁶ See Shane Frederick, *Measuring Intergenerational Time Preference: Are Future Lives Valued Less?*, 26 *J. Risk and Uncertainty* 39 (2003).

¹⁷ In an earlier paper, I reported on a much smaller study, with five nudges overlapping with those explored here. The results are within the margin of error of plus or minus 4.1 percent. See Cass R. Sunstein, *Do People Like Nudges?* (2015), http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2604084. Note that the automatic enrollment questions, in that essay, did not specify involvement from the government. A valuable study, with fewer nudges but results similar to those here, is William Hagman et al., *Public Views on Policies Involving Nudges*, *Review of Psychology and Philosophy* (forthcoming 2015), available at <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs13164-015-0263-2#page-1>. Also valuable, and with illuminating twists, is David Tannenbaum et al., *On the Misplaced Politics of Behavioral Policy Interventions* (unpublished manuscript 2014), available at <http://home.uchicago.edu/~davetannenbaum/documents/partisan%20nudge%20bias.pdf>

favoritism). *Second*, Americans reject nudges that they view as inconsistent with the interests or values of most choosers. By contrast, there is widespread support for nudges that are taken to have legitimate ends and to be consistent with the interests and the values of most choosers. It follows that numerous nudges – default rules, warnings, and tendentious public education campaigns – are likely to attract bipartisan support, so long as people approve of their ends, and think that they are consistent with choosers’ values and interests. Notably, Americans do not see nudges as unacceptably manipulative, with the single (and highly exotic) exceptions of subliminal advertising (which, surprisingly, receives substantial minority support in the context of efforts to combat smoking and overeating). Several of the nudges tested here can be counted as highly tendentious and as arguably manipulative. Nonetheless, they attracted majority support.

As we will see, political divisions sometimes affect the *level* of support, because Democrats tend to be somewhat more favorably disposed toward health and safety nudges than Republicans. And in cases that raise strong partisan differences, such divisions will map onto nudges as well.¹⁸ But across a wide range, clear majorities of Democrats and Republicans (and also independents) are in full agreement about what they support – and what they reject.

II. Popular Nudges

In recent years, the federal government has adopted or promoted a large number of nudges.¹⁹ Three of the most prominent include (1) mandatory calorie labels at chain restaurants;²⁰ (2) mandatory graphic warnings on cigarette packages²¹ (struck down by a federal court of appeals²²); and (3) automatic enrollment in savings plans, subject to opt out.²³ The nationally representative sample found substantial majority support for all three policies, including support for (3) regardless of whether it consists of federal “encouragement” of such enrollment or a federal mandate for automatic enrollment, imposed on large employers.

About 87 percent of Americans favored calorie labels²⁴ and 74 percent favored graphic warnings. Both policies had strong majority support from Democrats, Republicans and independents. Overall, 80 and 71 percent respectively approved of

¹⁸ See *id.*

¹⁹ For examples, see generally Cass R. Sunstein, *SIMPLER* (2013).

²⁰ 79 Fed. Reg. 71156.

²¹ 75 Fed. Reg. 69524.

²² On the FDA’s effort to require graphic warnings on packages, see *R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. v. U.S. Food & Drug Admin.*, 823 F. Supp. 2d 36 (D.D.C. 2011), *aff’d on other grounds*, 696 F.3d 1205 (D.C. Cir. 2012).

²³ For discussion of relevant laws and policies, see generally *AUTOMATIC: CHANGING THE WAY AMERICA SAVES* (William Gale et al. eds., 2009).

²⁴ Note that there were statistically significant differences with respect to calorie labels between Republicans (77 percent approval) and both Democrats (92 percent approval) and independents (88 percent approval).

encouraged and mandatory enrollment in savings plans. Here as well, all three groups showed strong majority support.²⁵

Table 1: American Attitudes Toward Prominent Recent Nudges

	Calorie labels	Graphic warnings (cigarettes)	Federal encouragement: auto-enrollment	Federal mandate: auto-enrollment
Total support (in percentages)	87/13	74/26	80/20	71/29
Democrats	92/8	77/23	88/12	78/22
Independents	88/12	74/26	75/25	67/33
Republicans	77/23	68/32	73/27	62/38

Three educational campaigns also attracted widespread approval. Respondents were overwhelmingly supportive of a public education campaign from the federal government to combat childhood obesity (82 percent approval, again with strong support from Democrats, Republicans, and independents). They were highly supportive of a public education campaign from the federal government designed to combat distracted driving, with graphic stories and images (85 percent approval). About 75 percent of people favored a federal education campaign to encourage people not to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation, though here there was a noteworthy division across party lines (85 percent of Democrats, 57 percent of Republicans, and 75 percent of independents).

Three other educational campaigns attracted majority support, but at significantly lower levels, and with only minority approval from Republicans. About 53 percent of Americans favored a federal requirement that movie theaters run public education messages to discourage people from smoking and overeating. Democrats showed higher approval ratings than Republicans (61 percent as opposed to 41 percent, with independents at 51 percent). By a very small majority (52 percent), Americans supported a public education campaign, by the federal government itself, to encourage people to give money to the Animal Welfare Society of America (a hypothetical organization) (59 percent of Democrats, 34 percent of Republicans, and 55 percent of independents; party was a statistically significant factor). This latter finding seems surprising; it could not easily be predicted that respondents would want their government to design a campaign to promote donations to an animal welfare society.

²⁵ Here as well, there were statistically significant differences between Democrats and Republicans for both policies and between Democrats and independents with respect to encouragement. (Encouraged: 88 percent of Democrats, 73 percent of Republicans, and 75 percent of independents. Mandated: 78 percent of Democrats, 62 percent of Republicans, and 67 percent of independents).

About 57 percent of people supported an aggressive public education campaign from the federal government to combat obesity, showing obese children struggling to exercise, and also showing interviews with obese adults, who are saying such things as, "My biggest regret in life is that I have not managed to control my weight," and "To me, obesity is like a terrible curse." This question was designed to test people's reactions to a tendentious and arguably manipulative campaign, which might have been expected to receive widespread disapproval, as it did not. Indeed, one of the goals of the question was to establish such disapproval – but it was not found here. Here there was a significant disparity between Democrats (61 percent approval) and independents (60 percent approval) on the one hand and Republicans on the other (47 percent approval); the difference between Democrats' and Republicans' views was statistically significant.

Table 2: American Attitudes Toward Five Educational Campaigns²⁶

	Childhood obesity	Distracted driving	Sexual orientation discrimination	Movie theaters	Animal Welfare Society	Obesity (arguably manipulative)
Total support (in percentages)	82/18	85/15	75/25	53/47	52/48	57/43
Democrats	90/11	88/12	85/15	61/39	59/41	61/40
Independents	81/19	84/16	75/25	51/49	55/45	60/40
Republicans	70/30	80/20	57/43	41/59	34/66	47/53

Most Americans were also supportive of multiple efforts to use choice architecture to promote public health and environmental protection. In recent years, there has been considerable discussion of “traffic lights” systems for food, which would use the familiar red, yellow, and green to demarcate health rankings.²⁷ In the United States, the national government has shown no official interest in these initiatives, but with respondents in the nationally representative survey, the idea attracted strong support (64 percent). There was also majority approval of automatic use of “green” energy providers, subject to opt out²⁸ – perhaps surprisingly, with support for automatic use of green energy whether it consisted of federal “encouragement” (72 percent) or instead a federal mandate on large electricity providers (67 percent).²⁹ In these cases, there were significant differences across partisan lines, but majorities of Democrats, Republicans, and independents were all supportive.

²⁶ Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

²⁷ See Anne Thorndike et al., *Traffic-Light Labels and Choice Architecture*, 46 AM J. PREVENTIVE MEDICINE 143 (2014).

²⁸ See Cass R. Sunstein and Lucia Reisch, *Automatically Green*, 38 HARV. ENV. L. REV. 128 (2014).

²⁹ On the difficulty of this question, see note supra.

Most respondents were in favor of requiring companies to disclose whether the food they sell contains genetically modified organisms (GMOs) (86 percent approval).³⁰ There was strong majority support (73 percent) for a mandatory warning label on products that have unusually high levels of salt, as in, "This product has been found to contain unusually high levels of salt, which may be harmful to your health." Perhaps surprisingly, most respondents (but not most Republicans) approved of a state requirement that grocery stores put their most healthy foods in prominent, visible locations (56 percent approval; 63 percent from Democrats, 43 percent from Republicans, 57 percent from independents). Respondents also supported a state requirement that people must say, when they obtain their drivers' license, whether they want to be organ donors (70 percent approval; 75 percent from Democrats, 62 percent from Republicans, 69 percent from independents).³¹ For all of these policies, the differences between Democrats and Republicans were statistically significant.

Five other forms of choice architecture, expected to be more controversial, also obtained majority support. The first would list the name of the incumbent politician first on every ballot. It might be expected that this pro-incumbent nudge would be widely rejected, because respondents might not want the voting process to be skewed in favor of incumbents, and because any effort to enlist order effects might be seen as manipulative (as indeed it should be³²). But a bare majority (53 percent) approved of this approach, perhaps because most people believed that it would promote clarity, perhaps because they did not see the risk of bias from order effects.

There was also majority approval (53 percent) for the approach, recently adopted in Oregon, of automatically registering eligible citizens as voters, subject to opt-out.³³ Interestingly, most Republicans (61 percent) rejected this approach. One reason might be that they believe that people who do not take the time to register to vote ought not to be counted as voters. Another reason is that they might believe that Oregon's approach would favor Democrats.

By a modest majority, most people (58 percent) also approved of an approach by which women's last names would automatically be changed to that of their husband,

³⁰ In my view, this is not a good idea. See note supra; Cass R. Sunstein, *Don't Mandate Labeling for Gene-Altered Foods* (2013), available at <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2013-05-12/don-t-mandate-labeling-for-gene-altered-foods>

³¹ Another study finds that most Americans reject a default rule to be the effect that people would be presumed to be organ donors, subject to opt out. William Hagman et al., *Public Views on Policies Involving Nudges*, REV. OF PHIL. AND PSYCHOL. (forthcoming 2015), <http://www.iei.liu.se/nek/forskning/jedi-lab/1.630217/Nudge20150417.pdf>.

³² I am grateful to Richard Thaler for suggesting that I test this example, though I expected, wrongly, that Americans would disapprove of it.

³³ See Russell Berman, "Should Voter Registration be Automatic?", *THE ATLANTIC* (2015), <http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/03/should-voter-registration-be-automatic/388258/>.

subject to opt-out. This approach obtained majority support from Democrats, Republicans, and independents. This result is especially noteworthy in view of the fact that an approach to this effect would almost certainly be unconstitutional as a form of sex discrimination, even if it tracked behavior and preferences.³⁴ We might expect a difference between men and women on this question, but notably, 58 percent of both groups approved of this approach.

Finally, there was majority support for a federal labeling requirement for products that come from companies that have repeatedly violated the nation's labor laws (such as laws requiring occupational safety or forbidding discrimination), as in, "This product is made by a company that has repeatedly violated the nation's labor laws." About 60 percent of participants supported that policy, with a significant difference between Democrats (67 percent approval) and Republicans (50 percent approval). There was also majority support for federally required labels on products that come from countries that have recently harbored terrorists, as in, "This product comes from a nation that was recently found to harbor terrorists." This approach attracted 54 percent approval – 56 percent from Democrats, 58 percent from Republicans, and 49 percent from independents.

Table 3: American Attitudes Toward Environmental and Public Health Nudges

	GMO labels	Salt labels	Healthy food placement	Traffic Lights	Organ donor choice	Encouragement: Green energy	Mandate: Green energy
Total support (in percentages)	86/14	73/27	56/44	64/36	70/30	72/28	67/33
Democrats	89/11	79/21	63/37	71/29	75/25	82/18	79/21
Independents	87/13	72/28	57/43	61/39	69/31	66/34	63/37
Republicans	80/20	61/39	43/57	57/43	62/38	61/39	51/49

Table 4: American Attitudes Toward Some Potentially Provocative Nudges³⁵

	Listing incumbent politician first	Automatic voter registration	Husband's last name	Mandatory manufacturing label: labor violations	Mandatory manufacturing label: aiding terrorists
Total support (in	53/47	53/47	58/42	60/40	54/46

³⁴ See *Craig v. Boren*, 429 U.S. 190, 200-204 (1978). For valuable discussion of the general topic, see Elizabeth F. Emens, *Changing Name Changing: Framing Rules and the Future of Marital Names*, 74 U Chi. L. Rev. 761 (2007).

³⁵ Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

percentages)					
Democrats	58/42	63/37	61/40	67/33	56/44
Independents	51/49	50/50	56/44	57/43	49/51
Republicans	47/53	39/61	57/43	50/50	58/42

III. Unpopular Nudges

By contrast, twelve nudges were widely disapproved. Of these, seven involved uses of default rules. Two of these defaults were designed so as to be not merely provocative but also highly offensive, and strong majorities took them exactly as they were designed.

Under the first, a state would assume that people want to register as Democrats, subject to opt out if people explicitly say that they want to register as Republicans or Independent. Of course a default rule of this kind should be taken as an effort to skew the political process.³⁶ The overwhelming majority of people rejected this approach (26 percent total approval; 32 percent of Democrats, 16 percent of Republicans, and 26 percent of independents, with statistically significant differences between Democrats and Republicans). The second was a state law assuming that people are Christian, for purposes of the census, unless they specifically state otherwise. Such a default rule could also be seen as an attempt to push religious affiliations in preferred directions.³⁷ Here too there was widespread disapproval (21 percent overall approval; 22 percent of Democrats, 27 percent of Republicans, 17 percent of independents).

The third unpopular default rule involved a state law assuming that upon marriage, husbands would automatically change their last names to that of their wives, subject to opt out (24 percent total approval; 28 percent of Democrats, 18 percent of Republicans and 23 percent of independents). Interestingly, there was no gender disparity here (just as with the question that involved the opposite defaults³⁸); 24 percent of both men and women approved. With the fourth, the federal government would assume, on tax returns, that people want to donate \$50 to the Red Cross, subject to opt out if people explicitly say that they do not want to make that donation (27 percent approval; 30 percent of Democrats, 20 percent of Republicans, 28 percent of independents). The fifth

³⁶ The problem would be most interesting in an area in which the default rule tracked reality. If most people are, in fact, Democrats, is it clearly objectionable if a city or state assumes that they are, for purposes of registration? The answer is almost certainly yes: Political affiliations should be actively chosen, not assumed by government. But I am aware that this brief comment does not give anything like an adequate answer to some complex questions about the use of “mass” default rules that track majority preferences and values.

³⁷ Here as well we could imagine interesting questions if the default rule tracked reality. But with respect to religion, as with respect to politics, there is a strong norm in favor of official neutrality, which would be violated even if a particular default reflected majority preferences and values.

³⁸ See supra.

was identical but substituted the Animal Welfare Society for the Red Cross. Not surprisingly, that question also produced widespread disapproval (26 percent approval; 30 percent of Democrats, 20 percent of Republicans, and 25 percent of independents).

With the sixth, state government assumed that state employees would give \$20 per month to the United Way, subject to opt out. It might be expected that because state government and state employees were involved, approval rates would grow. But they did not (24 percent approval; 26 percent of Democrats, 17 percent of Republicans, and 25 percent of independents). With the seventh, a majority (64 percent) disapproved of a federal requirement that airlines charge people, with their airline tickets, a specific amount to offset their carbon emissions (about \$10 per ticket), subject to opt out if passengers said that they did not want to pay.

Table 5: Unpopular Defaults

	Democrat registration	Christian on census	Wife's last name	Red Cross	Animal Welfare Society	United Way	Carbon emissions charge
Total support (in percentages)	26/74	21/79	24/76	27/73	26/74	24/76	36/64
Democrats	32/68	22/78	28/72	30/70	30/70	26/74	43/57
Independents	26/74	17/83	23/77	28/72	25/75	25/75	34/66
Republicans	16/84	27/73	18/82	20/80	20/80	17/83	25/75

The five other unpopular nudges involved information and education. With the first (and most extreme), a newly elected president adopted a public education campaign designed to convince people that criticism of his decisions is unpatriotic and potentially damaging to national security. There was overwhelming disapproval of this campaign (23 percent approval; 24 percent of Democrats, 21 percent of Republicans, 22 percent of independents). What is perhaps most noteworthy here is not majority disapproval, but the fact that over one-fifth of Americans, on essentially a nonpartisan basis, were in favor of this most unusual public campaign.

With the second, the federal government adopted a public education campaign designed to convince mothers to stay home to take care of their young children. Over two-thirds of respondents rejected this nudge (33 percent approval; 33 percent of Democrats, 31 percent of Republicans, 34 percent of independents). The third involved a government requirement that movie theaters run subliminal advertisements to discourage smoking and overeating. Here too, there was majority disapproval (41 percent approval; 47 percent of Democrats, 42 percent of Republicans, 35 percent of independents). It is noteworthy and surprising, however, that over two-fifths of people actually supported this requirement.

With the fourth, the federal government would require all products that come from a Communist country (such as China or Cuba) to be sold with the label, "Made in whole or in part under Communism." Slightly over half of respondents disapproved of this requirement (44 percent approval; 47 percent of Democrats, 43 percent of Republicans, 42 percent of independents). With the fifth, a majority (59 percent) also rejected a public education campaign from the federal government, informing people that it is possible for people to change their gender from male to female or from female to male, and encouraging people to consider that possibility "if that is really what they want to do." There is yet another surprise here, which is that this somewhat adventurous campaign was endorsed by 41 percent of respondents; note that approval rates differed between Democrats (49 percent) and Republicans (29 percent; independents, 38 percent).

Table 6: Unpopular Education Campaigns and Disclosure³⁹

	Unpatriotic criticism	Stay-at-home-mothers	Subliminal advertising	Mandatory manufacturing label: Communism	Transgender
Total support (in percentages)	23/77	33/67	41/59	44/56	41/59
Democrats	24/76	33/67	47/53	47/53	49/51
Independents	22/78	34/67	35/65	42/58	38/62
Republicans	21/79	31/69	42/58	43/57	29/71

IV. Why Are Some Nudges Unpopular?

A. Principles

What separates the approved nudges from the rejected ones? Two principles seem to dominate the cases. First, people *reject nudges that are taken to have illicit motivations*. In a democracy, it is illegitimate to attempt to convince people that criticism of a public official is unpatriotic. At least in the United States, nudges that favor a particular religion or political party will meet with widespread disapproval, even among people of that very religion or party.⁴⁰ This simple principle justifies a prediction: Whenever people do not like the motivations of the choice architect, they will disapprove

³⁹ Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

⁴⁰ We could, of course, imagine a nation in which favoritism on the basis of religion or party would attract widespread support, and might be seen as analogous to a default rule in which women's last name changes to that of their husband (approved, it might be recalled, by a majority of respondents here). In such a nation, a default rule in favor of the most popular party, or the dominant religion, might be taken to track people's preferences and values, and not to be a violation of neutrality at all. See notes *supra* for brief accounts of the competing view.

of the nudge. To be sure, that prediction might not exactly seem surprising, but it suggests that people will not oppose (for example) default rules and warnings as such; everything will turn on what they are nudging people *toward*.⁴¹ When there are partisan differences in judgments about nudges, it is often because of partisan disagreement about whether the relevant motivations are legitimate.

Second, people oppose nudges *that are inconsistent with the interests or values of most choosers*. The most illuminating finding here is that while most people support automatic name change for women, they reject automatic name change for men. The evident reason is that the former tracks people's interests and values (at least in general), while the latter countermands them.⁴² Any default rule, of course, is likely to harm at least some people; some people will want, for good reason, to opt out, and some people who want to opt out will not do so, perhaps because of inertia and procrastination. This point is a potential objection to default rules in general.⁴³ By itself, however, that fact is not enough to produce public opprobrium. Recall that there is majority approval for automatic enrollment in pension plans and green energy, apparently because respondents think that those nudges are in most people's interests. Recall too that most respondents are favorably disposed toward automatic voter registration and also automatic name-changing by women.

When people are deciding whether to favor default rules, the size of the group of disadvantaged people undoubtedly matters. If a default rule harms a majority, it is unlikely to have much appeal. If the disadvantaged group is large (but not a majority), people might reject a default rule and favor active choosing instead. It is relevant here that most respondents favor a state requirement that when obtaining their drivers' license, people indicate whether they want to be organ donors (and thus favor active choosing), even though other surveys find that most Americans reject a default rule in favor of being an organ donor.⁴⁴

Note as well that strong majorities of people reject automatic charitable donations of several different kinds. The apparent concern is that as a result of inertia, procrastination, or inattention, people might find themselves giving money to a charity even though they do not wish to do so. We might therefore complement the second

⁴¹ The striking findings of "partisan nudge bias" are fully consistent with this claim. See David Tannenbaum et al., *On the Misplaced Politics of Behavioral Policy Interventions* (unpublished manuscript) (2014),

<http://home.uchicago.edu/~davetannenbaum/documents/partisan%20nudge%20bias.pdf>.

⁴² We could easily imagine a population that would reverse these results. Suppose that one believes that automatically assuming that wives take their husbands' last names undermines sex equality, and the automatically assuming that husbands take their wives' last names promotes sex equality. For those who have these beliefs, and are committed to sex equality, reversing the majority's views might seem attractive.

⁴³ See Rebonato, *supra* note; Ryan Bubba and Richard Pildes, How Behavioral Economics Trims its Sails and Why, 127 Harv. L. Rev. 1593 (2014).

⁴⁴ See note *supra*.

principle with a third and narrower one, which can be seen as a corollary: *Most people reject automatic enrollment in charitable giving programs, at least if they are operated by public institutions.* Though it does not involve money, the case of carbon offsets can be understood in similar terms.⁴⁵ We do not yet know the exact boundaries of apparent public skepticism about default rules that would give away people's money without their active consent,⁴⁶ but there is no doubt that such skepticism exists.

We have seen that people generally favor disclosures that, in their view, bear on health and safety (salt content, GMOs). At the same time, the results leave open the question whether and when people will favor mandatory disclosures that involve political issues associated with production of a product rather than the health and environmental effects of product itself. Americans seem closely divided on that question. With repeated violations of the nation's labor laws, and nations that harbor terrorism, such disclosure achieved majority support – but not with products coming from Communist nations. People might well demand a certain threshold of egregiousness, in terms of the behavior of those who produce a good or service, before they will want to require disclosure of that behavior. On this question, partisan differences are to be expected, because people will disagree about whether the relevant threshold has been met, and about what it exactly is.

It is tempting, and not inconsistent with the data, to suggest that people's reactions to nudges also show the influence of a fifth principle: People reject nudges *that they regard as unambiguously manipulative.*⁴⁷ The subliminal advertising finding can be taken as support for this principle. But what counts as unambiguous manipulation? Most people are in favor of graphic warning labels on cigarettes; they like default rules (if consistent with people's values and interests); a majority favors a mandatory cafeteria design to promote healthy eating; people approve of a graphic campaign to discourage distracted driving; with respect to obesity, a majority favors a somewhat tendentious public education, one that could plausibly be characterized as manipulative. No one likes manipulation in the abstract, but there do not appear to be many cases in which people are willing to reject nudges as unacceptably manipulative, at least if they have legitimate ends and are taken to be in the interest of most choosers.

B. Partisanship

There is a final question: What is the role of partisan differences? Democrats and Republicans will sometimes disagree, of course, about whether the goals of a particular nudge are illicit, and they will also disagree, on occasion, about whether a nudge is

⁴⁵ Framing might matter here, and note that in most Sweden, citizens are supportive. See Hagman et al., *supra* note. The case of climate compensation is of course different from charitable contributions, because it is designed to ensure that people pay the social cost of their own activities.

⁴⁶ A natural question is whether people would reject an automatic donation program from private employers, subject to opt-out.

⁴⁷ In fact I hoped to provide general support for that principle, but was unable to do so.

consistent with the interests or values of choosers.⁴⁸ For example, those who disapprove of abortion will be especially likely to support nudges that are designed to discourage abortion; those who do not disapprove of abortion will be unlikely to support such nudges. With respect to a public education campaign informing people that they can change genders, the significant difference between Democrats and Republicans should not come as a big surprise.

But there is another and more general division as well. Even when majorities of Democrats, Republicans, and independents support a particular initiative, the level of support is sometimes higher within one group than within another.⁴⁹ Even if the underlying end is broadly shared – as it is, for example, in the area of public health – many Republicans sometimes seem skeptical of government nudges, taken as such, and *will therefore disapprove of them even if they do accept the legitimacy of the end and do not think that the nudge is inconsistent with choosers' interests or values*. Some Republicans, and undoubtedly some Democrats and independents, seem to support another principle: *There should be a rebuttable presumption against nudging, at least if the government can avoid it*.

It is important to see that the strength of the presumption will vary with the particular issue, with partisan affiliations, and with competing views about the role of government.⁵⁰ In some of the cases, Republicans are more skeptical of nudges than are Democrats. With calorie labels and childhood obesity campaigns, for example, there are significant differences in the levels of support within the two groups, even though majorities of both are supportive. But in some cases, Republicans are undoubtedly more enthusiastic about nudges than are Democrats.⁵¹ The fact that no such cases are found here is an artifact of the particular questions. If the issue involved automatic enrollment in programs by which high-income earners automatically receive capital gains tax benefits, for example, we can predict, with some confidence, that Republicans would be more supportive than Democrats. Evidence supports that prediction.⁵²

The potential existence of partisan differences is important, and it complicates the basic story I have presented here. But it does not conflict with the larger lesson: Across a wide range of domains, clear majorities of Democrats, Republicans, and independents are in agreement about which nudges deserve support -- and about which do not. They are also in fundamental agreement about the principles that underlie those judgments, even if those principles occasionally lead to divisions in particular cases.

⁴⁸ See the discussion of partisan nudge bias in *id.*

⁴⁹ It would of course be easy to design nudges that would show an opposite pattern, as with nudges that influence people in directions that are most favored by Republicans.

⁵⁰ Hagman, *supra* note, offers some interesting findings on this count. For example, those with an individualistic worldview, as such, were more likely to disapprove of nudges. See *id.*

⁵¹ See Tannenbaum et al., *supra* note.

⁵² *Id.*

V. Conclusion

All over the world, nations have been showing interest in behaviorally informed approaches to policy questions.⁵³ In recent years, nudges have attracted special attention.⁵⁴ A central reason is that they have the potential to address serious social problems while also maintaining freedom of choice and imposing modest costs. At the same time, a number of people have raised serious ethical concerns, and those concerns deserve to be addressed.

Public surveys cannot, of course, answer ethical objections, not least because simple survey questions may not reveal people's reflective judgments, much less tell us about what social welfare requires. But in democratic nations, public opinion matters, and surveys can provide real insights into prevailing convictions. We have seen that there is widespread support for the kinds of nudges that nations have adopted in the recent past – and that Americans would support many more of them.

The major qualifications are that people reject nudges that have illicit goals or that are taken to be inconsistent with the interests or values of many or most choosers. But outside of those categories, Americans are likely to be favorably disposed toward nudges, certainly if they see them as a way to assist people to achieve their own ends.

⁵³ See World Bank, *World Development Report: Mind, Society, and Behavior* (2015), available at <http://www.worldbank.org/content/dam/Worldbank/Publications/WDR/WDR%202015/WDR-2015-Full-Report.pdf>

⁵⁴ See David Halpern, *The Nudge Unit* (forthcoming 2015).

Appendix A

Approved and Disapproved Nudges

Nudge	All		Democrat		Republican		Independent		Significance between-party, all conditions	Pairwise significance between parties
	Approve	Disapprove	Approve	Disapprove	Approve	Disapprove	Approve	Disapprove		
1. Mandatory calorie labels	87%	13%	92%	8%	77%	23%	88%	12%	1%	D/R (p<.001); R/I (p=.01)
2. Mandatory labeling: GMOs	86%	14%	89%	11%	80%	20%	87%	13%	5%	D/R (p=.04)
3. Public education campaign: distracted driving	85%	15%	88%	12%	80%	20%	84%	16%		
4. Public education campaign: childhood obesity	82%	18%	90%	11%	70%	30%	81%	19%	1%	D/R (p<.001); R/I (p=.04)
5. Government-encouraged automatic enrollment: pension plan	80%	20%	88%	12%	73%	27%	75%	25%	1%	D/R (p=.002); D/I (p=.002)
6. Public education campaign: sexual orientation discrimination	75%	25%	85%	15%	57%	43%	75%	25%	1%	D/R (p<.001); D/I (p=.03); R/I (p<.001)
7. Mandatory graphic warnings on cigarettes	74%	26%	77%	23%	68%	32%	74%	26%		

Nudge	All		Democrat		Republican		Independent		Significance between-party, all conditions	Pairwise significance between parties
	Approve	Disapprove	Approve	Disapprove	Approve	Disapprove	Approve	Disapprove		
8. Mandatory labels for high salt content	73%	27%	79%	21%	61%	39%	72%	28%	1%	D/R (p=.002)
9. Government-encouraged automatic enrollment: green energy	72%	28%	82%	18%	61%	39%	66%	34%	1%	D/R (p<.001); D/I (p=.001)
10. Mandatory automatic enrollment: pension plan	71%	29%	78%	22%	62%	38%	67%	33%	1%	D/R (p=.01)
11. Mandatory choice: organ donors during driver's license registration	70%	30%	75%	25%	62%	38%	69%	31%	5%	D/R (p=.04)
12. Mandatory automatic enrollment: green energy	67%	33%	79%	21%	51%	49%	63%	37%	1%	D/R (p<.001); D/I (p=.001)
13. Mandatory "traffic lights"	64%	36%	71%	29%	57%	43%	61%	39%	5%	D/R (p=.03)
14. Mandatory manufacturing labels for countries that violate labor laws	60%	40%	67%	33%	50%	50%	57%	43%	1%	D/R (p=.01)

Nudge	All		Democrat		Republican		Independent		Significance between-party, all conditions	Pairwise significance between parties
	Approve	Disapprove	Approve	Disapprove	Approve	Disapprove	Approve	Disapprove		
15. Default last name change upon marriage to that of husband	58%	42%	61%	40%	57%	43%	56%	44%		
16. Public education campaign: obesity as "terrible curse"	57%	43%	61%	40%	47%	53%	60%	40%	5%	D/R (p=.04)
17. Mandatory healthy food placement	56%	44%	63%	37%	43%	57%	57%	43%	1%	D/R (p=.001); R/I (p=.03)
18. Mandatory manufacturing labels for countries that have recently harbored terrorists	54%	46%	56%	44%	58%	42%	49%	51%		
19. Mandatory public education in movie theaters for healthy eating	53%	47%	61%	39%	41%	59%	51%	49%	1%	D/R (p=.001)
20. Automatic enrollment: voting	53%	47%	63%	37%	39%	61%	50%	50%	1%	D/R (p<.001); D/I (p=.03)
21. Automatically listing the incumbent politician first on ballots	53%	47%	58%	42%	47%	53%	51%	49%		

Nudge	All		Democrat		Republican		Independent		Significance between-party, all conditions	Pairwise significance between parties
	Approve	Disapprove	Approve	Disapprove	Approve	Disapprove	Approve	Disapprove		
22. Public education campaign: Animal Welfare Society	52%	48%	59%	41%	34%	66%	55%	45%	1%	D/R (p<.001); R/I (p=.001)
23. Mandatory manufacturing Communist country labels	44%	56%	47%	53%	43%	57%	42%	58%		
24. Mandatory subliminal ads in movie theaters	41%	59%	47%	53%	42%	58%	35%	65%	5%	D/I (p=.04)
25. Public education campaign: transgender	41%	59%	49%	51%	29%	71%	38%	62%	1%	D/R (p=.001)
26. Default charge for carbon emissions on airplane tickets	36%	64%	43%	57%	25%	75%	34%	66%	1%	D/R (p=.003)
27. Public education campaign: stay-at-home mothers	33%	67%	33%	67%	31%	69%	34%	67%		
28. Default donation to Red Cross	27%	73%	30%	70%	20%	80%	28%	72%		
29. Default Democratic party registration	26%	74%	32%	68%	16%	84%	26%	74%	1%	D/R (p=.002)
30. Default donation to Animal Welfare Society	26%	74%	30%	70%	20%	80%	25%	75%		

Nudge	All		Democrat		Republican		Independent		Significance between-party, all conditions	Pairwise significance between parties
	Approve	Disapprove	Approve	Disapprove	Approve	Disapprove	Approve	Disapprove		
31. Default last name change upon marriage to that of wife	24%	76%	28%	72%	18%	82%	23%	77%		
32. Default employee donations to the United Way (majority of employees have agreed)	24%	76%	26%	74%	17%	83%	25%	75%		
33. Public education campaign: unpatriotic criticism	23%	77%	24%	76%	21%	79%	22%	78%		
34. Default assumption of Christianity for census data	21%	79%	22%	78%	27%	73%	17%	83%		

Note: Pairwise significance was obtained for those nudges with significant differences by party, using a Bonferroni correction. Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

Appendix B

Survey Questions

1. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

The federal government requires calorie labels at chain restaurants (such as McDonald's and Burger King).

2. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

The federal government requires graphic warnings on cigarette packages (where the graphic warnings include pictures of people suffering from smoking-related diseases, such as cancer).

3. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

The federal government requires a "traffic lights" system for food, by which healthy foods would be sold with a small green label, unhealthy foods with a small red label, and foods that are neither especially healthy nor especially unhealthy with a small yellow label.

4. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

The federal government encourages (without requiring) employers to adopt a system in which employees would be automatically enrolled in a pension plan, but could opt out if they wish.

5. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

The federal government encourages (without requiring) electricity providers to adopt a system in which consumers would be automatically enrolled in a "green" (environmentally friendly) energy supplier, but could opt out if they wished.

6. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

A state law saying that on the ballot, the current senator, governor, president, or mayor must always be listed first.

7. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

A state law saying that citizens of a state are automatically enrolled as voters, and do not have to register as voters.

8. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

A state law requiring people to say, when they obtain their drivers' license, whether they want to be organ donors.

9. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

A federal law requiring companies to disclose whether the food they sell contains genetically modified organisms (GMOs).

10. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

A federal law assuming that people are Christian, for purposes of the census, unless they specifically state otherwise.

11. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

The federal government assumes, on tax returns, that people want to donate \$50 to the Animal Welfare Society of America, subject to opt out if people explicitly say that they do want to make that donation.

12. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

A state law requires all large grocery stores to place their most healthy foods in a prominent, visible location.

13. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

A state law assumes that women want to take their husbands' last name upon marriage, while assuming that men want to retain their own last names; it also allows both women and men to retain or change their names if they explicitly say what they want.

14. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

A state law assumes that people want to register as Democrats, subject to opt out if people explicitly say that they want to register as Republicans or independents.

15. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

To reduce deaths and injuries associated with distracted driving, the national government adopts a public education campaign, consisting of vivid and sometimes graphic stories and images, designed to discourage people from texting, emailing, or talking on their cellphones while driving.

16. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

To reduce childhood obesity, the national government adopts a public education campaign, consisting of information that parents can use to make healthier choices for their children.

17. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

The federal government requires movie theaters to provide subliminal advertisements (that is, advertisements that go by so quickly that people are not consciously aware of them) designed to discourage people from smoking and overeating.

18. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

A newly elected President is concerned that the public, and the press, will be unduly critical of what he does. He adopts a public education campaign designed to convince people that criticism of his decisions is "unpatriotic" and potentially "damaging to national security."

19. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

The federal government requires airlines to charge people, with their airline tickets, a specific amount to offset their carbon emissions (about \$10 per ticket); under the program, people can opt out of the payment if they explicitly say that they do not want to pay it.

20. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

The federal government engages in a public education campaign to encourage people to donate to the Animal Welfare Society of America.

21. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

The federal government requires labels on products that have unusually high levels of salt, as in, "This product has been found to contain unusually high levels of salt, which may be harmful to your health."

22. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

The federal government engages in a public education campaign designed to encourage people not to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation.

23. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

The federal government engages in a public education campaign designed to encourage mothers of young children to stay home to take care of their kids.

24. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

Your state enacts a law by which husbands automatically change their last names to that of their wives upon marriage, but they can retain their names if they explicitly say that they want to do so.

25. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

The federal government assumes, on tax returns, that people want to donate \$50 to the Red Cross, subject to opt out if people explicitly say that they do not want to make that donation.

26. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

Your state government assumes that its employees want to donate money to the United Way, and it deducts \$20 per month from their paychecks for that purpose; but it allows employees to opt out of the program if they explicitly say that they do not want to participate. (Assume that at least 60 percent of state employees have said that they do, in fact, want to give this amount to the United Way.)

27. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

The federal government requires all products that come from a Communist country (such as China or Cuba) to be sold with the label, "Made in whole or in part under Communism" in the specified country. (Assume that this label would not substitute for or displace any existing labels identifying where products are made.)

28. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

The federal government requires labels on products that come from companies that have repeatedly violated the nation's labor laws (such as laws requiring occupational safety or forbidding discrimination), as in, "This product is made by a company that has repeatedly violated the nation's labor laws."

29. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

The federal government requires labels on products that come from countries that have recently harbored terrorists, as in, "This product comes from a nation that was recently found to harbor terrorists."

30. Do you approve or disapprove the following hypothetical policy?

The federal government requires movie theaters to run public education messages designed to discourage people from smoking and overeating.

31. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

The federal government engages in a public education campaign designed to combat obesity, showing obese children struggling to exercise, and also showing interviews with obese adults, who are saying such things as, "My biggest regret in life is that I have not managed to control my weight," and "To me, obesity is like a terrible curse."

32. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

The federal government requires large employers (more than 200 employees) to adopt a system in which employees would be automatically enrolled in a pension plan, but could opt out if they wish.

33. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

The federal government requires large electricity providers (serving at least 500,000 people) to adopt a system in which consumers would be automatically enrolled in a "green" (environmentally friendly) energy supplier, but could opt out if they wished.

34. Do you approve or disapprove of the following hypothetical policy?

The federal government adopts a public education campaign informing people that it is possible for people to change their gender from male to female or from female to male, and encouraging people to consider that possibility "if that is really what they want to do."

35. With which political party do you most closely identify?

36. What is your race?

37. What is your gender?

38. What is your age?

39. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

40. In which state do you currently reside?

41. What is your combined annual household income?