Partisanship and Perceptions of Inflation over 2019-2024: Evidence from a 2024 Michigan Survey

Ye-Rim Lee
Michigan State University

Erika Rosebrook
Michigan State University

Fernanda Alfaro
Michigan State University

Scott Loveridge
Michigan State University

Dusan Paredes
Universidad Católica del Norte, Chile

Mark Skidmore
Michigan State University

Received: 03/04/2026
Accepted: 05/06/2026

Abstract

This article analyzes determinants of inflation perceptions among 1,000 Michigan residents surveyed in 2024, in the run-up to the U.S. presidential election. Ordered logistic regressions show that political leaning is the strongest predictor: Republicans and Independents perceive significantly higher inflation than Democrats, and Trump supporters and Biden administration disapprovers report sharply higher inflation than Harris supporters or those with positive approval. Gender differences are also robust, with women more likely than men to report higher inflation across all domains. By contrast, age, income, education, and rural–urban location have weaker or inconsistent effects, while home ownership consistently dampens perceptions of inflation, particularly in housing and gasoline. These findings highlight that perceptions of inflation are politicized and gendered and are closely associated with partisan and leadership evaluations in this survey context.

1 Introduction

Inflation is a visible household experience shaping how citizens evaluate governments and political parties. People encounter prices nearly every day, making inflation unusually salient in political judgment. Yet perceptions of inflation may diverge from official price measures because citizens interpret economic conditions through partisan identities, leadership evaluations, media narratives, and personal exposure to specific costs.

These dynamics are especially important in Michigan. As a competitive Midwestern battleground state, Michigan combines political significance with substantial geographic heterogeneity. Industrial and logistics corridors in the south differ from tourism- and service-oriented counties in the north, while metropolitan, small-town, and rural places have different prices and consumption patterns. This makes Michigan a useful case for examining whether inflation perceptions are shaped primarily by local economic context and household characteristics, or by partisan and leadership evaluations.

We address this question using a 2024 survey of 1,000 Michigan residents on perceived price changes over the previous five years. We examine perceived inflation overall and across four consumption domains: restaurants, groceries, housing, and gasoline. The analysis focuses on political affiliation, presidential job approval, intended 2024 vote choice, gender, homeownership, and rural–urban context. We find that inflation perceptions are strongly politicized and gendered. Political variables, especially presidential approval and vote intention, are the strongest predictors of perceived inflation, while women consistently report higher perceived inflation. By contrast, income, education, and rural–urban location show weaker and less consistent associations.

2 Theory and Expectations

Economic voting and biased perceptions

Economic voting is a well-established phenomenon: voters reward or punish incumbents based on economic conditions (Campbell et al., 1980). Empirical evidence supports the general premise across time and contexts, reinforcing the idea that voters value a good economy (see Lewis-Beck and Stegmaier 2007 for a review). However, this sociotropic outlook may be complicated by or contingent upon class, income, unemployment, political context, deindustrialization and other factors. Lewis-Beck and Nadeau (2011) codify these ideas into a definition of economic voting as having dimensions: valence, position, and patrimony, which describe the ways voters balance social and personal conditions, opinions on economic issues, and economic standing. The positional dimension captures the effect of policy positions on voting, such as favoring tax cuts, reducing the deficit, or expanding public assistance (e.g. Alvarez and Nagler 1998), while the patrimony dimension focuses on relative economic status and wealth, as represented by property and asset ownership (e.g. Quinlan and Okolikj 2022).

Inflation's increased salience offers a renewed opportunity to examine the dimensions of economic voting, motivated reasoning, and the tradeoffs voters make between pocketbook and sociotropic concerns. Retrospective analysis (Verstyuk, 2004) predicts support for the Republican party during periods of high inflation, particularly in presidential elections from 1944-1992. Afzal (2024) found early in the 2024 presidential election cycle that support for the incumbent was conditioned by personal economic difficulties and experience with inflation. Partisan motivated reasoning indicates that voter perceptions of inflation will be more favorable for those who identify with the incumbent party (Dickerson and Ondercin, 2017), though the severity of inflation may complicate this relationship (Dickerson, 2016). This article adds to this empirical work by examining how political preferences play a role in the formation of inflation perceptions using a large sample of voters in a battleground state.

Michigan as a strategic case in the Midwest

Michigan serves as a compelling case study for how inflation perceptions intersect with political dynamics. As a competitive Midwestern swing state, even small shifts in attitudes can tip statewide outcomes. The state's economy is diverse: industrial and logistics corridors in the south contrast with tourism and service-oriented counties in the north. Michigan was also hard hit during the Great Recession (Murphy, 2016). This variety produces different price environments, commuting patterns, and media markets, all of which shape how residents experience and interpret inflation.

Michigan's economic heterogeneity, households' lived inflation pressures, partisan political framing, and rising importance in national party strategy make it an instructive microcosm. It is a site where local economic structures, everyday struggles, and partisan identity interact, shaping both perceptions of inflation

and their potential political consequences.

Within the regional science literature, several studies examine spatial price differences. For example, Alfaro et al. (2026) examine Big Mac price differential between urban and rural areas. Prescott and Gjerde (2022) evaluated the role of state level fiscal policies on the length and depth of the Great Recession, which indirectly relates to prices. Our contribution within the regional science context is to examine the spatial dimension of price perceptions.

3 Research Design and Methods

Survey design and data

We collected data on inflation perceptions using the State of the State Survey (SOSS), a long-running public opinion survey conducted by the Institute for Public Policy and Social Research (IPPSR) at Michigan State University.[1] Since 1994, the SOSS has served scholars and policymakers to track public opinion in Michigan, providing a reliable platform for measuring political and economic attitudes. The online survey was fielded in September and October, 2024 by YouGov, resulting in 1,000 responses.

The survey addressed three questions. First, to what extent do political factors such as partisan identity, presidential approval, and 2024 vote intention shape perceptions of inflation relative to demographic and household characteristics? Second, do these political and demographic influences vary across domains of everyday consumption—restaurants, groceries, housing, and gasoline—or do they follow a consistent pattern across categories? Third, what do these results imply for democratic accountability, particularly whether citizens' inflation perceptions are tied more to partisan and leadership evaluations than to underlying economic conditions?

Measuring inflation perceptions

Our dependent variables measure perceived price changes across five domains: overall prices, restaurant meals, groceries, housing, and gasoline. Respondents were asked: "Compared with five years ago, is the price lower, the same, a little higher, or a lot higher?" with five response categories. We drop "Don't know/Not sure" responses, leaving a four-category ordered outcome where higher values correspond to higher perceived inflation.

Because the responses are naturally ordered but not continuous, we estimate ordered logistic regression models. Ordered logit is appropriate when the dependent variable reflects a ranking of outcomes, but the distance between categories cannot be assumed equal. See Williams (2016) for a discussion of ordered logit models with survey data. The model estimates the log-odds of being in a higher perception category relative to all lower categories, under the proportional odds assumption. To aid interpretation, we report exponentiated coefficients as odds ratios (OR). An OR >1 indicates that the predictor increases the likelihood of perceiving higher inflation, while an OR <1 indicates a lower likelihood. Cutpoints are reported at the bottom of the tables and capture the thresholds between categories.

Explanatory variables and controls

The primary explanatory variables capture respondents' political orientations and evaluations of political leadership. Political affiliation is measured using a three-category party identification variable. Presidential job approval is measured on a four-point scale. Vote intention in the 2024 presidential election is included as an additional indicator of partisan alignment. These variables capture related but distinct dimensions of political identity and political evaluation.

The analysis includes a standard set of sociodemographic controls. These controls include age in years entered quadratically in the regression models; gender; educational attainment; household income; and homeownership status. Education and income are measured using ordered categorical variables, reflecting

[1] https://ippsr.msu.edu/survey-research/state-state-survey-soss/soss-data

increasing levels of educational attainment and household resources. Homeownership is included to account for differential exposure to housing-related costs.

Geographic context is captured using the four-category Rural–Urban Commuting Area (RUCA) classification (metropolitan, micropolitan, small town, and rural). Descriptive statistics for all explanatory and control variables are reported in Table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Description	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Age	Respondent age in years, calculated as survey year (2024) minus birth year	51.22	17.60	20	94
Gender	Respondent gender (1 = male, 2 = female)	1.55	0.50	1	2
Household Income	Four-category household annual income measure: below \$30K; \$30K–\$59K; \$60K–\$99K; \$100K or more	2.46	1.09	1	4
Education	Four-category education measure: no high school completion; high school graduate or GED; some college or technical education; college graduate or higher	2.96	0.91	1	4
Homeownership	Homeownership status (1 = does not own, 2 = owns home)	1.38	0.49	1	2
Political Affiliation	Party identification collapsed into three categories: Independent/Other, Republican, and Democrat	1.98	0.84	1	3
Rural–Urban	Four-category Rural–Urban Commuting Area (RUCA) classification: Metropolitan, Micropolitan, Small Town, and Rural	1.32	0.79	1	4
Job Approval	Approval of President Biden's job performance (1 = excellent, 2 = good, 3 = fair, 4 = poor)	3.00	1.07	1	4
2024 Vote	Intended vote choice in the 2024 presidential election (0 = other, 1 = Kamala Harris, 2 = Donald Trump)	1.38	0.58	0	2
Observations				1,000	

Source: Authors' own creation using SOSS survey data.

4 Results

Table 2 presents four specifications using overall price perceptions as the dependent variable. Columns (1)–(3) enter the political measures separately, while column (4) includes party affiliation, presidential job approval, and intended 2024 vote choice simultaneously. Political variables dominate across the separate models. In column (1), Republicans report much higher perceived inflation than Democrats, with an OR of 7.03 ($p < 0.01$). Independents and others also report higher inflation than Democrats, with an OR of 2.40 ($p < 0.01$). In column (2), relative to respondents rating the Biden administration as "Excellent," those reporting "Poor" approval have 16.98 times the odds of perceiving higher inflation ($p < 0.01$), while those rating it "Fair" have 4.03 times the odds ($p < 0.01$). Voting intention shows a similar pattern. In column (3), Trump supporters have 10.22 times the odds of perceiving higher inflation than Harris supporters ($p < 0.01$), while other candidate supporters report 2.96 times the odds ($p < 0.01$). Column (4) accounts for the overlap

among these political measures by including them simultaneously.

Table 2: Comparing Political Predictors of Perceived Overall Inflation

	(1) Overall	(2) Overall	(3) Overall	(4) Overall
Age	1.051*	1.060**	1.050*	1.062**
	(0.027)	(0.030)	(0.029)	(0.031)
Age²	1.000*	1.000*	1.000	1.000*
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Rural–Urban (Metropolitan)				
Micropolitan	0.849	0.749	0.694	0.712
	(0.230)	(0.219)	(0.200)	(0.211)
Small Town	0.961	0.849	0.832	0.795
	(0.362)	(0.331)	(0.317)	(0.324)
Rural	1.873*	1.595	1.569	1.471
	(0.694)	(0.609)	(0.550)	(0.559)
Household Income (Below $30K)				
$30K–$59K	1.348	1.488*	1.536*	1.554**
	(0.301)	(0.331)	(0.340)	(0.344)
$60K–$99K	1.236	1.274	1.233	1.299
	(0.295)	(0.311)	(0.299)	(0.318)
$100K or more	1.328	1.447	1.405	1.519
	(0.349)	(0.394)	(0.378)	(0.418)
Education (Less than HS)				
High School Graduate/GED	1.105	0.957	1.149	0.937
	(0.548)	(0.518)	(0.598)	(0.512)
Some College/Technical	0.919	0.840	0.942	0.819
	(0.456)	(0.450)	(0.489)	(0.445)
College Graduate or Higher	0.632	0.757	0.760	0.742
	(0.312)	(0.404)	(0.392)	(0.401)
Gender (Male)				
Female	1.707***	1.722***	1.901***	1.811***
	(0.259)	(0.274)	(0.300)	(0.296)
Homeownership (No)				
Yes	0.786	0.725*	0.715*	0.714*
	(0.146)	(0.139)	(0.135)	(0.137)
Political Affiliation (Democrat)				
Independent & Others	2.401***			0.912
	(0.387)			(0.173)
Republican	7.025***			0.577
	(1.673)			(0.210)
Job Approval (Excellent)				
Good		1.257		1.261
		(0.280)		(0.282)
Fair		4.025***		3.659***
		(1.043)		(0.961)
Poor		16.980***		8.747***
		(4.474)		(3.364)
2024 Vote (Kamala Harris)				
Other			2.957***	1.315
			(1.113)	(0.550)
Donald Trump (Republican)			10.220***	3.402***
			(2.231)	(1.264)
Cut 1	0.092***	0.180*	0.093***	0.266
	(0.075)	(0.163)	(0.080)	(0.253)
Cut 2	0.270	0.532	0.272	0.786
	(0.217)	(0.479)	(0.231)	(0.739)
Cut 3	3.825*	9.280**	4.280*	13.910***
	(2.997)	(8.240)	(3.567)	(12.923)
Observations	976	976	976	976
Log-likelihood	-655.513	-590.831	-613.088	-584.710
Wald chi2	121.64	198.52	176.78	211.90
Prob > chi2	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Pseudo R^2	0.093	0.182	0.152	0.191

Note: For each categorical variable in bold, the reference group is indicated in parentheses. Reported coefficients are odds ratios with robust standard errors in parentheses. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Turning to demographic controls, women are more likely than men to report higher inflation across all specifications, with ORs ranging from 1.71 to 1.90 ($p < 0.01$). Homeownership is associated with lower perceived inflation, with ORs between 0.71 and 0.79, though the association is only marginally significant. Age is positively associated with higher perceived inflation, while the squared term is close to one, suggesting weak nonlinearity. Income has some association with perceived inflation, particularly among respondents

earning $30K–$59K, but education and rural–urban status show weaker and less consistent effects.

Model fit improves when political evaluations are included. The pseudo-R^2 rises from 0.093 in the partisan identity model to 0.182 in the job approval model, 0.152 in the vote intention model, and 0.191 in the combined model. Political measures are often correlated in state politics research, and Arceneaux and Huber (2007) caution against excluding theoretically relevant variables solely because of multicollinearity concerns. In column (4), the model remains estimable and no political variables are omitted due to collinearity. The results suggest that inflation perceptions are most closely tied to assessments of presidential performance and intended vote choice.

Tables A.1–A.3 repeat the analysis across the purchase domains. The politicization of perceptions is evident in every domain but is strongest for groceries and gasoline. In the partisan model, Republicans are nearly six times as likely as Democrats to perceive higher grocery prices (OR = 5.90, $p < 0.01$) and more than eight times as likely to perceive higher gasoline prices (OR = 8.47, $p < 0.01$). Similar gaps appear in the job approval and vote intention models. Results indicate that frequently purchased and highly visible goods are most susceptible to partisan framing.

Regarding housing, Republicans and Trump supporters report higher inflation, but home ownership strongly reduces perceived housing inflation (OR = 0.43 to 0.45, $p < 0.01$). People who own their homes are less likely to report increased housing costs, suggesting that ownership shields them from house price increases. By contrast, renters experience inflation more directly as rents adjust at lease renewal, explaining their higher sensitivity (Piccolo and Gorodnichenko, 2025).

Gender is significant across all domains. Women report higher perceived inflation in restaurants, groceries, housing, and gasoline ($p < 0.01$). This finding aligns with prior work showing that women, who are more often involved in household purchasing, systematically perceive or expect higher inflation than men, even after controlling for other factors (Corduas, 2022).

Age, income, and education have limited or inconsistent effects, with the exception that middle-income households (between $60K to $99K) perceive lower inflation for gasoline than lower-income households.

Altogether, the results indicate that inflation perceptions in Michigan are politicized and gendered. Political affiliation, leader approval, and vote choice are the most consistent predictors, while local economic fundamentals and standard demographics explain relatively little. Home ownership exerts a strong protective effect. In contrast, gasoline and groceries are categories where political divisions are most visible. The overall pattern suggests that evaluations of government performance and partisan loyalties filter how citizens interpret price changes.

5 Conclusion

We show that inflation perceptions among Michigan respondents were strongly associated with political evaluations and social characteristics. Partisan identity, presidential approval, and vote intention are powerful predictors in separate models. When all three political measures are included simultaneously, presidential approval remains the strongest political predictor, and intended Trump vote remains positively associated with higher perceived inflation. This pattern aligns with research on motivated reasoning in economic perceptions (Farhart and Struby, 2026).

Regarding the demographic variables, women report higher perceived inflation, suggesting that household purchasing roles may shape exposure to price changes. Homeownership reduces perceptions of rising housing costs, likely because owners are less directly exposed to rent increases.

These results should be interpreted as associations observed in a specific place and time, rather than as evidence that can fully separate ideological sensitivity to inflation from partisan evaluations. The consistent association between homeownership and lower perceived housing inflation highlights the patrimonial role of asset ownership in shaping political attitudes. Future work could link survey measures of perceived inflation with more detailed local price data and household exposure measures to better distinguish perceptual bias from lived economic experience.

Acknowledgments

We thank the editor and two anonymous reviewers for the very helpful comments and suggestions.

Disclosure of interest

The authors have no conflict of interest.

Data availability statement

The data are archived at Michigan State University: https://ippsr.msu.edu/survey-research/state-state-survey-soss/soss-data/soss-90-fall-2024

Funding

This work was supported by the Michigan State University Applied Public Policy Research (MAPPR) Grant Awards (2024–2025); the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture under Grant 2022-67023-37747; and the Federal USDA Hatch Project "Resilience to Fiscal, Economic, Disasters and Public Health Shocks."

References

Afzal, M. H. B. (2024). Economic hardship and voting intentions: the influence of inflation in the U.S. presidential choices. *SN Business & Economics*, 4(12):159.

Alfaro, F., Loveridge, S., Paredes, D., and Skidmore, M. (2026). Explaining the Big Mac Urban-Rural Price Gap in the United States. *Journal of Regional Science*, 66(1):124–139.

Alvarez, R. M. and Nagler, J. (1998). Economics, Entitlements, and Social Issues: Voter Choice in the 1996 Presidential Election. *American Journal of Political Science*, 42(4):1349.

Arceneaux, K. and Huber, G. A. (2007). What to Do (and Not Do) with Multicollinearity in State Politics Research. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, 7(1):81–101.

Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., Miller, W. E., and Stokes, D. E. (1980). *The American voter*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago London.

Corduas, M. (2022). Gender differences in the perception of inflation. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 90:102522.

Dickerson, B. (2016). Economic Perceptions, Presidential Approval, and Causality: The Moderating Role of the Economic Context. *American Politics Research*, 44(6):1037–1065.

Dickerson, B. T. and Ondercin, H. L. (2017). Conditional Motivated Reasoning: How the Local Economy Moderates Partisan Motivations in Economic Perceptions. *Political Research Quarterly*, 70(1):194–208.

Farhart, C. E. and Struby, E. (2026). Inflation expectations and political polarization: Evidence from the cooperative election study. *Journal of Macroeconomics*, 87:103726.

Lewis-Beck, M. S. and Nadeau, R. (2011). Economic voting theory: Testing new dimensions. *Electoral Studies*, 30(2):288–294.

Lewis-Beck, M. S. and Stegmaier, M. (2007). Economic Models of Voting. In Dalton, R. J. and Klingemann, H., editors, *The Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*, page 0. Oxford University Press.

Murphy, R. H. (2016). A Short Empirical Note on State Misery Indexes. *Journal of Regional Analysis & Policy*, 46(2).

Piccolo, J. and Gorodnichenko, Y. (2025). Homeownership and Attention to Inflation: Evidence from Information Treatments. Technical Report w33595, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA.

Prescott, P. and Gjerde, K. P. (2022). The Impact of State Fiscal Policy on States' Resilience During the Great Recession. *Journal of Regional Analysis and Policy*, 52(1):1–18. Artwork Size: 314.4 kB Medium: pdf.

Quinlan, S. and Okolikj, M. (2022). Patrimonial economic voting: a cross-national analysis of asset ownership and the vote. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties*, 32(1):193–213.

Verstyuk, S. (2004). Partisan Differences in Economic Outcomes and Corresponding Voting Behavior: Evidence from the U.S. *Public Choice*, 120-120(1-2):169–189.

Williams, R. (2016). Understanding and interpreting generalized ordered logit models. *The Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 40(1):7–20.

Appendix - Tables and Figures

Table A.1: Political Affiliation and Inflation Perceptions by Category

	(1) Restaurant	(2) Grocery	(3) Housing	(4) Gas	(5) Overall
Age	1.060**	1.037	0.968	0.986	1.051*
	(0.031)	(0.029)	(0.021)	(0.024)	(0.027)
Age^2	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000*
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Rural–Urban (Metropolitan)					
Micropolitan	0.927	0.800	0.748	0.967	0.849
	(0.267)	(0.244)	(0.209)	(0.250)	(0.230)
Small Town	0.840	0.891	0.574*	1.402	0.961
	(0.319)	(0.333)	(0.192)	(0.515)	(0.362)
Rural	0.826	1.038	2.092**	1.785*	1.873*
	(0.258)	(0.412)	(0.719)	(0.606)	(0.694)
Household Income (Below $30K)					
$30K–$59K	1.135	0.891	1.159	0.781	1.348
	(0.272)	(0.220)	(0.209)	(0.162)	(0.301)
$60K–$99K	1.204	1.110	0.992	0.655**	1.236
	(0.303)	(0.299)	(0.197)	(0.136)	(0.295)
$100K or more	0.965	0.930	0.865	0.887	1.328
	(0.267)	(0.265)	(0.190)	(0.194)	(0.349)
Education (Less than HS)					
High School Graduate/GED	1.028	1.510	1.372	0.979	1.105
	(0.518)	(0.630)	(0.475)	(0.397)	(0.548)
Some College/Technical	1.137	1.407	1.070	0.795	0.919
	(0.579)	(0.589)	(0.369)	(0.323)	(0.456)
College Graduate or Higher	0.902	0.897	1.108	0.535	0.632
	(0.455)	(0.368)	(0.384)	(0.214)	(0.312)
Gender (Male)					
Female	1.488**	2.057***	1.580***	1.524***	1.707***
	(0.237)	(0.336)	(0.204)	(0.203)	(0.259)
Homeownership (No)					
Yes	0.781	0.820	0.454***	0.741*	0.786
	(0.158)	(0.167)	(0.070)	(0.119)	(0.146)
Political Affiliation (Democrat)					
Independent & Others	2.276***	2.564***	1.674***	2.225***	2.401***
	(0.402)	(0.456)	(0.251)	(0.333)	(0.387)
Republican	3.605***	5.899***	2.887***	8.472***	7.025***
	(0.821)	(1.488)	(0.497)	(1.608)	(1.673)
Cut 1	0.135**	0.081***	0.009***	0.033***	0.092***
	(0.122)	(0.067)	(0.007)	(0.023)	(0.075)
Cut 2	0.479	0.278	0.126***	0.191**	0.270
	(0.415)	(0.217)	(0.080)	(0.132)	(0.217)
Cut 3	4.960*	2.902	0.597	1.354	3.825*
	(4.223)	(2.221)	(0.380)	(0.940)	(2.997)
Observations	951	977	943	955	976
Log-likelihood	-606.116	-590.763	-965.094	-912.239	-655.513
Wald chi2	97.16	104.95	98.11	190.77	121.64
Prob > chi2	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Pseudo R^2	0.074	0.090	0.050	0.104	0.093

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table A.2: Biden Administration Approval and Inflation Perceptions by Category

	(1) Restaurant	(2) Grocery	(3) Housing	(4) Gas	(5) Overall
Age	1.069**	1.039	0.968	0.980	1.060**
	(0.033)	(0.030)	(0.023)	(0.025)	(0.030)
Age²	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000*
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Rural–Urban (Metropolitan)					
Micropolitan	0.877	0.722	0.665	0.865	0.749
	(0.270)	(0.241)	(0.193)	(0.239)	(0.219)
Small Town	0.787	0.797	0.536**	1.358	0.849
	(0.308)	(0.318)	(0.166)	(0.531)	(0.331)
Rural	0.711	0.918	2.128**	1.667	1.595
	(0.233)	(0.373)	(0.740)	(0.654)	(0.609)
Household Income (Below $30K)					
$30K–$59K	1.218	0.930	1.199	0.791	1.488*
	(0.293)	(0.228)	(0.218)	(0.166)	(0.331)
$60K–$99K	1.236	1.123	0.990	0.624**	1.274
	(0.314)	(0.311)	(0.198)	(0.136)	(0.311)
$100K or more	1.021	0.998	0.841	0.886	1.447
	(0.285)	(0.295)	(0.186)	(0.200)	(0.394)
Education (Less than HS)					
High School Graduate/GED	1.023	1.403	1.378	0.824	0.957
	(0.545)	(0.627)	(0.499)	(0.386)	(0.518)
Some College/Technical	1.168	1.406	1.072	0.643	0.840
	(0.624)	(0.624)	(0.386)	(0.301)	(0.450)
College Graduate or Higher	1.123	1.089	1.295	0.587	0.757
	(0.597)	(0.477)	(0.468)	(0.270)	(0.404)
Gender (Male)					
Female	1.422**	2.013***	1.586***	1.519***	1.722***
	(0.231)	(0.341)	(0.207)	(0.208)	(0.274)
Homeownership (No)					
Yes	0.753	0.777	0.426***	0.705**	0.725*
	(0.158)	(0.162)	(0.066)	(0.116)	(0.139)
Job Approval (Excellent)					
Good	1.402	1.451	1.623**	2.091***	1.257
	(0.353)	(0.332)	(0.330)	(0.475)	(0.280)
Fair	2.531***	3.147***	2.578***	4.270***	4.025***
	(0.706)	(0.832)	(0.589)	(1.119)	(1.043)
Poor	7.059***	13.539***	6.491***	24.325***	16.980***
	(1.853)	(3.680)	(1.320)	(5.819)	(4.474)
Cut 1	0.264	0.140**	0.016***	0.053***	0.180*
	(0.261)	(0.128)	(0.012)	(0.044)	(0.163)
Cut 2	0.940	0.485	0.222**	0.338	0.532
	(0.904)	(0.419)	(0.152)	(0.273)	(0.479)
Cut 3	10.312**	5.607**	1.176	3.206	9.280**
	(9.847)	(4.791)	(0.802)	(2.608)	(8.240)
Observations	951	977	943	955	976
Log-likelihood	-583.335	-551.676	-928.050	-835.449	-590.831
Wald chi2	126.82	153.62	161.69	297.99	198.52
Prob > chi2	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Pseudo R^2	0.109	0.150	0.087	0.179	0.182

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table A.3: 2024 Presidential Vote Intention and Inflation Perceptions by Category

	(1) Restaurant	(2) Grocery	(3) Housing	(4) Gas	(5) Overall
Age	1.061*	1.033	0.967	0.980	1.050*
	(0.032)	(0.030)	(0.022)	(0.025)	(0.029)
Age²	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Rural–Urban (Metropolitan)					
Micropolitan	0.841	0.694	0.706	0.810	0.694
	(0.252)	(0.222)	(0.197)	(0.225)	(0.200)
Small Town	0.761	0.784	0.577*	1.171	0.832
	(0.300)	(0.322)	(0.184)	(0.444)	(0.317)
Rural	0.686	0.860	1.976**	1.613	1.569
	(0.203)	(0.335)	(0.673)	(0.588)	(0.550)
Household Income (Below $30K)					
$30K–$59K	1.293	1.005	1.203	0.836	1.536*
	(0.313)	(0.246)	(0.216)	(0.175)	(0.340)
$60K–$99K	1.260	1.117	0.973	0.602**	1.233
	(0.318)	(0.303)	(0.192)	(0.128)	(0.299)
$100K or more	1.052	0.993	0.868	0.876	1.405
	(0.294)	(0.286)	(0.188)	(0.190)	(0.378)
Education (Less than HS)					
High School Graduate/GED	1.064	1.606	1.428	1.004	1.149
	(0.512)	(0.716)	(0.515)	(0.440)	(0.598)
Some College/Technical	1.200	1.506	1.088	0.770	0.942
	(0.581)	(0.671)	(0.389)	(0.335)	(0.489)
College Graduate or Higher	1.065	1.094	1.220	0.606	0.760
	(0.513)	(0.483)	(0.440)	(0.260)	(0.392)
Gender (Male)					
Female	1.542***	2.181***	1.651***	1.707***	1.901***
	(0.251)	(0.362)	(0.213)	(0.234)	(0.300)
Homeownership (No)					
Yes	0.745	0.773	0.444***	0.684**	0.715*
	(0.153)	(0.157)	(0.069)	(0.113)	(0.135)
2024 Vote (Kamala Harris)					
Other	3.066***	3.030**	2.732***	2.413***	2.957***
	(1.249)	(1.319)	(0.933)	(0.670)	(1.113)
Donald Trump (Republican)	4.670***	7.061***	2.910***	10.051***	10.220***
	(0.946)	(1.582)	(0.418)	(1.691)	(2.231)
Cut 1	0.143**	0.077***	0.009***	0.027***	0.093***
	(0.128)	(0.066)	(0.007)	(0.020)	(0.080)
Cut 2	0.507	0.263	0.128***	0.161**	0.272
	(0.435)	(0.214)	(0.084)	(0.118)	(0.231)
Cut 3	5.470**	2.841	0.625	1.330	4.280*
	(4.639)	(2.271)	(0.412)	(0.976)	(3.567)
Observations	951	977	943	955	976
Log-likelihood	-588.591	-570.208	-953.586	-864.481	-613.088
Wald chi2	125.23	141.99	113.80	251.88	176.78
Prob > chi2	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Pseudo R^2	0.101	0.122	0.062	0.151	0.152

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$