



SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY

PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

- STATE OF TEXAS and NATIONAL -

Field Dates:

State of Texas: May 27 – June 19, 2026

National: February 11-26, 2026

Sample Sizes:

State of Texas: 630

National: 2,509

Confidence Interval:

State of Texas: +/-4.3%

National: +/- 2.9%

Samples Provided by: Multiple online opt-in panels, including Cint, Dynata and Prodege. Sample collection and quality control was managed by QuantifyAI under the direction of the University of Maryland's Program for Public Consultation.

Note: Rows may not add to 100% due to rounding

[Q1-36 withheld for future release]

As you may know, there is much talk about Artificial Intelligence (AI) these days and debates about whether and how much it should be regulated. Here are proposals for regulating AI programs. For each one, please select whether you favor or oppose it.

The first set of proposals addresses AI programs that make decisions that can have significant impacts on people (e.g. in health insurance claims, loan applications, hiring, etc.) To ensure these AI programs follow regulations, have data privacy and security protections, and do not have unintended biases, do you favor or oppose:

Q37. For new AI programs, require they first pass a government-designed test

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	78%	22%	0%
Republicans	78%	22%	0%
Democrats	82%	18%	0%
Independents	67%	32%	1%
Texas (Statewide)	77%	23%	0%
Republicans	69%	31%	0%
Democrats	65%	34%	1%

Q38. For AI programs already in use, allow the government to audit them

Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
-------	--------	--------

National	74%	25%	1%
Republicans	73%	26%	1%
Democrats	77%	21%	2%
Independents	65%	33%	2%
Texas (Statewide)	66%	33%	1%
Republicans	69%	31%	0%
Democrats	65%	34%	1%

Q39. As you may know, some AI programs can create fake images, audio, or videos, of real people or events, that look completely real. These images or videos are known as “deepfakes”.

Require that any deepfake image or video distributed publicly – e.g. posted online or shown on TV – must have a label that states that it is not real and was generated by AI.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	86%	14%	0%
Republicans	89%	11%	0%
Democrats	88%	12%	0%
Independents	76%	23%	1%
Texas (Statewide)	86%	12%	2%
Republicans	86%	11%	2%
Democrats	89%	10%	1%

Q40. Prohibit political campaigns, including PACs, from using deepfakes in their campaign advertisements.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	82%	17%	1%
Republicans	85%	14%	1%
Democrats	83%	16%	0%
Independents	73%	27%	1%
Texas (Statewide)	82%	17%	1%
Republicans	83%	16%	1%
Democrats	82%	17%	0%

Q41. Create a new federal agency dedicated to artificial intelligence, that would monitor new AI programs and try to anticipate potential problems, define best practices for developing and using AI programs, make policy recommendations, and enforce regulations.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	80%	20%	0%
Republicans	79%	21%	0%
Democrats	85%	15%	0%
Independents	70%	31%	0%
Texas (Statewide)	80%	19%	1%
Republicans	81%	18%	1%
Democrats	82%	18%	0%

Q42. The US actively working with other nations to create an international treaty to regulate large-scale AI programs.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	77%	22%	1%

Republicans	78%	22%	0%
Democrats	82%	18%	0%
Independents	63%	35%	2%
Texas (Statewide)	76%	23%	1%
Republicans	78%	21%	1%
Democrats	77%	23%	1%

Q43. The US actively working with other nations to create an international treaty that would prohibit the development and use of AI-powered weapons that can fire on targets without a direct human command.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	79%	21%	1%
Republicans	81%	18%	1%
Democrats	82%	18%	1%
Independents	66%	34%	0%
Texas (Statewide)	78%	21%	1%
Republicans	82%	17%	1%
Democrats	78%	21%	1%

[Q44-59 withheld for future release]

Fielding and Sample Size: The surveys were fielded by the Program for Public Consultation (PPC) at the University of Maryland's Civic Innovation Center, with representative non-probability samples obtained from multiple online panels, including Cint, Dynata and Prodege.

National

Field Dates: February 11-26, 2026 Total Sample Size: 2509 Response Rate: 7.6%
Four-fifth Sample Sizes: 1991 to 2020

State of Texas

Field Dates: May 27 – June 19, 2026 Sample Size: 630 Response Rate: 8.4%

Pre-Stratification and Weighting: The samples were pre-stratified and weighted by age, race, ethnicity, gender, educational attainment, household income, and home ownership. Benchmarks were obtained from the Census Bureau's 2024 and 2025 American Community Surveys, as well as the 2024 Current Population Survey's Annual Social and Economic Supplement.

The national sample was also weighted by Census region and partisan affiliation. In the Texas sample, the distribution of partisan affiliation was weighted to be within expectations, based on voter registration data for non-leaners and/or Cook's Partisan Voting Index for leaners.

National

Confidence Interval of Four-fifth Samples: +/-2.9% Min Weight: 0.25 Max Weight: 2.51 Mean Weight: 1.0

State of Texas

Confidence Interval: +/-4.3% Min Weight: 0.40 Max Weight: 3.23 Mean Weight: 1.0

Confidence Intervals were calculated using the sample variance of the weights using the following formula:

CI = Square root ((1+variance)/sample size)

Sample Collection: Sample collection was managed by Quant-E with oversight from PPC. Samples were drawn from multiple large online panels, including Cint, Prodege, and Dynata, whose members are recruited using non-probability sampling methods. The selected sample was invited to participate via email invitation, push notification, or SMS for cell phone users. Respondents were offered cash or cash-equivalent incentives to participate in the survey.

Data Collection and Privacy: Survey responses were collected directly on the Qualtrics platform. Only respondents with a provided link could take the survey, using their computer, laptop, tablet, or mobile phone.

Privacy and security measures were taken to ensure that data was collected in adherence to the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation policies for data privacy and security, as well as the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA).

Quality Control: Quality control measures in the sample collection process to disqualify duplicate respondents and survey bots included:

- checking respondents' IP addresses to determine if there are duplicate respondents
- employing an "operating system & Web browser check" to determine if there are any cross-panel duplicates
- using hCaptcha to detect and disqualify survey bots.

Quality control measures within the survey to disqualify dishonest or mischievous respondents, as well as survey bots, included:

- an attention-check question, e.g. Select the word that does not belong. [Tuesday]; [Friday]; [April]; [Wednesday]
- an honesty question, e.g. What have you done in the past week? Select all that apply. [Won a gold medal at the Olympics]; [Watched TV]; [Got a license to operate a Class SSGN submarine]; [Read a book]
- a speed limit, which disqualified respondents who moved through the first quarter of the survey at a pace roughly triple the average reading speed.

Lastly, respondents were removed from the sample who answered less than half the substantive questions, or who engaged in straight-lining.