



SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY

PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

IMMIGRATION

- 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

[Q1-25, 31-43 released previously]

[Q44-59 withheld for future release]

Proposals have been put forward to address the problem of illegal immigration. For each, please say whether you are in favor or opposed.

First, here are proposals to address people who are in the US illegally:

Q26. The federal government deporting immigrants in the US illegally who have been convicted of a crime.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	85%	14%	0%
Republicans	94%	6%	0%
Democrats	79%	21%	0%
Independents	80%	20%	1%
Iowa (Statewide)	86%	13%	1%
Republicans	92%	7%	1%
Democrats	80%	19%	1%

Iowa CD1	88%	12%	0%
Republicans	95%	4%	0%
Democrats	80%	20%	0%
Iowa CD2	84%	15%	2%
Republicans	90%	8%	2%
Democrats	81%	18%	1%
Iowa CD3	87%	13%	0%
Republicans	93%	7%	1%
Democrats	80%	20%	0%
Iowa CD4	85%	14%	1%
Republicans	91%	8%	1%
Democrats	80%	18%	2%

Q27. To address immigrants in the US illegally who have not committed a crime, and who have been in the US for some years, the following proposal has been put forward:

Offer them a long-term visa, provided they pay a penalty and any taxes they may owe, and remain crime-free.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	77%	23%	0%
Republicans	69%	32%	0%
Democrats	87%	13%	0%
Independents	77%	23%	0%
Iowa (Statewide)	75%	24%	1%
Republicans	68%	31%	1%
Democrats	85%	14%	1%
Iowa CD1	79%	21%	1%
Republicans	73%	26%	1%
Democrats	87%	13%	0%
Iowa CD2	75%	23%	2%
Republicans	65%	32%	3%
Democrats	87%	11%	2%
Iowa CD3	75%	25%	1%
Republicans	69%	29%	1%
Democrats	83%	17%	0%
Iowa CD4	73%	26%	1%
Republicans	63%	36%	0%
Democrats	84%	14%	2%

Q28. To address people who were brought to the US illegally as children, the following proposal has been put forward:

Offer them a long-term visa and a path to citizenship, provided they have not committed a significant crime and remain crime-free, and are employed, in higher education, or serving in the military.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	83%	17%	0%
Republicans	76%	24%	0%
Democrats	90%	10%	0%
Independents	81%	19%	1%
Iowa (Statewide)	81%	18%	1%
Republicans	76%	23%	1%
Democrats	87%	12%	1%
Iowa CD1	83%	16%	1%
Republicans	79%	20%	1%
Democrats	86%	14%	0%
Iowa CD2	81%	18%	1%
Republicans	74%	25%	2%
Democrats	90%	10%	0%
Iowa CD3	84%	15%	1%
Republicans	80%	20%	1%
Democrats	89%	9%	2%
Iowa CD4	77%	22%	1%
Republicans	73%	27%	0%
Democrats	83%	15%	2%

One of the main reasons that people enter the US illegally, or overstay their visas, is for work.

Q29. To reduce the number of workers in the US illegally, a proposal has been put forward, which has two parts:

1. Require employers to use a government system called E-Verify to ensure that their workers are in the US legally
2. Increase the number of work visas given out each year, provided there is a demand for workers

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	83%	17%	0%
Republicans	82%	18%	0%
Democrats	84%	16%	0%
Independents	80%	20%	0%
Iowa (Statewide)	80%	18%	2%
Republicans	80%	19%	2%
Democrats	85%	13%	2%
Iowa CD1	79%	21%	1%
Republicans	79%	20%	1%
Democrats	84%	16%	0%
Iowa CD2	81%	17%	2%
Republicans	79%	18%	4%
Democrats	88%	11%	1%
Iowa CD3	79%	20%	1%
Republicans	79%	20%	2%

Democrats	80%	18%	2%
Iowa CD4	83%	15%	2%
Republicans	81%	19%	0%
Democrats	89%	7%	4%

Another issue in the immigration system is that there is a large backlog of court cases for people who have entered the US claiming asylum (escaping political persecution or violence in their own country). Due to the backlog, many people wait in the US for years while their asylum case is being decided. A proposal has been put forward to address this:

Q30. Hire several hundred more asylum judges and staff to significantly speed up the process of evaluating claims for asylum.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	76%	24%	0%
Republicans	73%	27%	0%
Democrats	83%	16%	0%
Independents	67%	33%	0%
Iowa (Statewide)	76%	23%	1%
Republicans	73%	26%	1%
Democrats	82%	17%	1%
Iowa CD1	77%	23%	0%
Republicans	72%	27%	1%
Democrats	81%	19%	0%
Iowa CD2	75%	24%	1%
Republicans	73%	26%	2%
Democrats	81%	19%	0%
Iowa CD3	78%	20%	2%
Republicans	77%	23%	1%
Democrats	85%	14%	1%
Iowa CD4	73%	25%	2%
Republicans	70%	29%	1%
Democrats	81%	17%	3%

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.