



SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY

PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN

- STATE OF IOWA, CD1, CD2, CD3, CD4, and NATIONAL -

Field Dates:

State of Iowa, Iowa CD1, Iowa CD2, Iowa CD3, Iowa CD4: May 27 – June 23, 2026

National: February 11-26, 2026

Sample Sizes:

State of Iowa: 2000 **Iowa CD1:** 500 **Iowa CD2:** 500 **Iowa CD3:** 500 **Iowa CD4:** 500

National: 2,509

Confidence Interval:

State of Iowa: +/-2.9% **Iowa CD1, Iowa CD2, Iowa CD3, Iowa CD4:** +/-5.5-6.0%

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

[Q1-8, 13-25, 37-43 previously released]

[Q26-36, 44-59 withheld for future release]

We are now going to look at some proposals for reducing costs for families, particularly those with young children.

Q9. Here is a proposal related to preschool programs (for 3- and 4-year-olds):

The Federal government would provide \$25 billion to states or cities that want it, to help them create or expand preschool programs that would be available to all families free of cost.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	79%	21%	0%
Republicans	69%	31%	0%
Democrats	89%	11%	1%
Independents	76%	24%	0%
Iowa (Statewide)	77%	23%	1%
Republicans	67%	33%	1%

Democrats	87%	13%	0%
Iowa CD1	79%	21%	0%
Republicans	70%	29%	1%
Democrats	87%	13%	0%
Iowa CD2	74%	25%	2%
Republicans	67%	32%	1%
Democrats	84%	15%	2%
Iowa CD3	76%	24%	1%
Republicans	62%	37%	1%
Democrats	88%	12%	0%
Iowa CD4	78%	22%	0%
Republicans	67%	32%	1%
Democrats	88%	12%	0%

Q10. Here is a proposal that deals with the cost of childcare, including daycare centers, before- and after-school programs, and summer programs.

Provide funds to states to help parents cover some of the cost of childcare, so that low and middle income families spend no more than 7% of their income on childcare.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	83%	17%	0%
Republicans	77%	23%	0%
Democrats	89%	11%	0%
Independents	80%	21%	0%
Iowa (Statewide)	81%	19%	1%
Republicans	77%	23%	1%
Democrats	88%	11%	1%
Iowa CD1	81%	18%	1%
Republicans	80%	21%	0%
Democrats	89%	11%	1%
Iowa CD2	79%	21%	1%
Republicans	74%	26%	0%
Democrats	86%	14%	0%
Iowa CD3	82%	18%	1%
Republicans	78%	23%	0%
Democrats	87%	12%	1%
Iowa CD4	81%	18%	1%
Republicans	76%	22%	2%
Democrats	91%	10%	0%

Now, let's turn to a proposal about the tax credit for parents with children under age 17. A tax credit reduces the total amount of taxes a person owes. Some tax credits are also refundable, so if the tax credit is larger than the amount of taxes a person owes, they keep what is leftover.

Q11. As you may know, a law was passed in 2021, Congress passed a law to temporarily increase the Child Tax Credit from \$2,000 up to \$3,600 per child, and to make it fully refundable. That law expired in 2022, and the tax credit has gone back down to being \$2,000 and partially refundable.

Here is a proposal: Increase the child tax credit back to \$3,600 per child, and make it fully refundable again.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	78%	22%	0%
Republicans	74%	26%	0%
Democrats	84%	16%	0%
Independents	72%	28%	0%
Iowa (Statewide)	77%	22%	1%
Republicans	75%	24%	1%
Democrats	80%	19%	1%
Iowa CD1	76%	24%	0%
Republicans	71%	29%	0%
Democrats	80%	19%	1%
Iowa CD2	78%	22%	1%
Republicans	79%	19%	1%
Democrats	76%	24%	0%
Iowa CD3	77%	23%	0%
Republicans	71%	29%	0%
Democrats	83%	17%	1%
Iowa CD4	78%	21%	1%
Republicans	79%	21%	0%
Democrats	81%	17%	2%

Now, let's look at a proposal for **family and medical leave**, which includes an employee taking time off to care for a new child or a family member with a serious health condition, or to recover from a serious health condition.

Currently, some workers get paid family and medical leave from their employer, but most do not.

Q12. Here is a proposal:

- All workers would be allowed to take up to 12 weeks of family or medical leave.
- Workers on leave would receive two thirds of their wages, up to a maximum of \$4,000 a month, paid by the Federal government.

This proposal would be paid for by a new 0.2% payroll tax on both employers and employees.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	75%	25%	0%
Republicans	68%	31%	1%
Democrats	84%	17%	0%
Independents	71%	29%	0%
Iowa (Statewide)	74%	25%	1%
Republicans	69%	30%	1%
Democrats	78%	21%	1%

Iowa CD1	77%	23%	1%
Republicans	66%	34%	1%
Democrats	83%	17%	0%
Iowa CD2	74%	25%	1%
Republicans	74%	25%	1%
Democrats	78%	22%	0%
Iowa CD3	72%	27%	1%
Republicans	66%	34%	1%
Democrats	78%	21%	0%
Iowa CD4	74%	25%	1%
Republicans	70%	29%	1%
Democrats	74%	24%	2%

Methodology

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 Iowa

Field Dates: May 27 – June 23, 2026 Sample Size: 2000 Response Rate: 8.0%

Iowa CD1

Field Dates: May 28 – June 23, 2026 Sample Size: 500 Response Rate: 7.1%

Iowa CD2

Field Dates: May 28 – June 23, 2026 Sample Size: 500 Response Rate: 8.4%

Iowa CD3

Field Dates: May 28 – June 23, 2026 Sample Size: 500 Response Rate: 8.7%

Iowa CD4

Field Dates: May 27 – June 23, 2026 Sample Size: 500 Response Rate: 7.8%

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 Iowa samples, 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 Iowa

Confidence Interval: +/-2.9% Min. Weight: 0.06 Max Weight: 6.65 Mean Weight: 1.0

Iowa CD1

Confidence Interval: +/-5.9% Min. Weight: 0.12 Max Weight: 6.70 Mean Weight: 1.0

Iowa CD2

Confidence Interval: +/-5.5% Min. Weight: 0.06 Max Weight: 5.45 Mean Weight: 1.0

Iowa CD3

Confidence Interval: +/-5.6% Min. Weight: 0.13 Max Weight: 5.60 Mean Weight: 1.0

Iowa CD4

Confidence Interval: +/-6.0% Min. Weight: 0.08 Max Weight: 6.02 Mean Weight: 1.0

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

CI = Square root $((1+\text{variance})/\text{sample size})$

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.