



SCHOOL OF
PUBLIC POLICY
PROGRAM FOR
PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Campaign Finance & Government Reform

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

Field Dates:

State of Iowa, Iowa CD1, Iowa CD2, Iowa CD3, Iowa CD4: July 21 - Aug 3, 2026

National: February 11-26, 2026

Sample Sizes:

State of Iowa: 2000 **Iowa CD1:** 503 **Iowa CD2:** 504 **Iowa CD3:** 502 **Iowa CD4:** 507

National: 2,509

Confidence Interval:

State of Iowa: +/-2.9% **Iowa CD1:** +/-5.6% **Iowa CD2:** +/-6.0% **Iowa CD3:** +/-5.4%

Iowa CD4: +/-6.3% **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

[Q13-26 and Q52-64 withheld for future release, Q27-51 previously released]

Here are proposals to reform the financing of political campaigns for Members of Congress and the President. For each one, please say whether you favor or oppose it.

Q1. Passing a new Constitutional amendment that would allow Congress and state legislatures to restrict or prohibit corporations and private political groups (PACs) from spending money to influence elections.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	82%	18%	1%
Republicans	82%	17%	1%

Democrats	85%	14%	1%
Independents	71%	27%	2%
Iowa (statewide)	86%	13%	1%
Republicans	85%	14%	1%
Democrats	91%	9%	0%
Iowa CD1	85%	14%	0%
Republicans	84%	16%	0%
Democrats	91%	9%	0%
Iowa CD2	84%	15%	2%
Republicans	84%	13%	2%
Democrats	89%	10%	0%
Iowa CD3	87%	12%	1%
Republicans	87%	12%	1%
Democrats	91%	9%	1%
Iowa CD4	87%	13%	0%
Republicans	85%	15%	0%
Democrats	93%	7%	0%

Q2. Encouraging small campaign donors by making half of small donations to candidates by small donors refundable in the form of a tax credit.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	67%	32%	1%
Republicans	63%	36%	2%
Democrats	72%	28%	1%
Independents	64%	35%	1%
Iowa (statewide)	63%	36%	2%
Republicans	62%	37%	2%
Democrats	68%	31%	2%
Iowa CD1	63%	34%	3%
Republicans	68%	29%	3%
Democrats	63%	34%	3%
Iowa CD2	59%	39%	2%
Republicans	53%	45%	2%
Democrats	71%	28%	1%
Iowa CD3	65%	35%	0%
Republicans	62%	37%	0%
Democrats	71%	28%	1%
Iowa CD4	62%	36%	2%
Republicans	64%	36%	0%
Democrats	66%	34%	1%

Q3. Continuing to prohibit non-profits that receive tax-deductible donations, such as churches and universities, from endorsing and providing financial support to political candidates.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	79%	20%	1%
Republicans	80%	19%	1%
Democrats	80%	18%	1%
Independents	72%	26%	1%
Iowa (statewide)	77%	22%	1%
Republicans	77%	21%	2%
Democrats	81%	18%	1%
Iowa CD1	76%	22%	2%
Republicans	78%	20%	2%
Democrats	78%	20%	3%
Iowa CD2	72%	26%	3%
Republicans	69%	27%	4%
Democrats	81%	18%	1%
Iowa CD3	78%	21%	0%
Republicans	79%	21%	0%
Democrats	84%	16%	1%
Iowa CD4	80%	20%	1%
Republicans	83%	16%	0%
Democrats	84%	16%	0%

While many forms of campaign-related donations and spending are required to be publicly disclosed, there are donations that can be made anonymously to certain organizations that can support candidates and political causes. Here are some proposals that require greater disclosure of campaign financing.

Q4. Require corporations, unions, and other groups, when spending money on campaign-related activities, to immediately report this to their shareholders and members, to the public, and to the Federal Election Commission.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	83%	16%	1%
Republicans	85%	14%	1%
Democrats	85%	14%	1%
Independents	73%	25%	1%
Iowa (statewide)	86%	13%	1%
Republicans	86%	13%	1%
Democrats	91%	9%	0%
Iowa CD1	85%	13%	2%
Republicans	83%	13%	4%
Democrats	91%	9%	0%
Iowa CD2	84%	16%	0%

Republicans	82%	18%	0%
Democrats	94%	6%	0%
Iowa CD3	88%	12%	0%
Republicans	87%	13%	1%
Democrats	91%	9%	0%
Iowa CD4	87%	12%	0%
Republicans	93%	6%	0%
Democrats	90%	10%	0%

Q5. Require the Federal Election Commission to publicly disclose the names of significant donors paying for TV or radio ads in support of candidates or related to controversial public issues.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	81%	18%	1%
Republicans	80%	19%	1%
Democrats	85%	14%	1%
Independents	74%	24%	2%
Iowa (statewide)	81%	18%	1%
Republicans	85%	15%	1%
Democrats	84%	15%	1%
Iowa CD1	79%	20%	1%
Republicans	83%	17%	0%
Democrats	80%	18%	2%
Iowa CD2	83%	16%	1%
Republicans	84%	15%	1%
Democrats	90%	10%	0%
Iowa CD3	82%	17%	1%
Republicans	86%	12%	2%
Democrats	85%	15%	0%
Iowa CD4	80%	20%	0%
Republicans	85%	14%	0%
Democrats	81%	19%	0%

Q6. Require federal contractors to publicly disclose their donations to groups that spend money on campaign-related activities.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	81%	17%	2%
Republicans	82%	17%	1%
Democrats	83%	15%	2%
Independents	74%	25%	1%
Iowa (statewide)	83%	16%	1%

Republicans	84%	15%	1%
Democrats	88%	11%	1%
Iowa CD1	83%	16%	1%
Republicans	82%	16%	2%
Democrats	88%	12%	0%
Iowa CD2	82%	17%	1%
Republicans	80%	19%	1%
Democrats	90%	8%	2%
Iowa CD3	84%	15%	1%
Republicans	84%	15%	2%
Democrats	89%	10%	1%
Iowa CD4	83%	16%	2%
Republicans	90%	10%	1%
Democrats	84%	16%	0%

Here are proposals to reform elections for Members of Congress. For each, please say whether you favor or oppose.

Q7. Currently, when Congressional districts are redrawn in most states, this is done by state legislatures, which may be dominated by one party. There is a proposal to require that Congressional districts be redrawn instead by a commission of citizens in each state, made up of equal numbers of Republicans, Democrats and independents.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	81%	19%	0%
Republicans	81%	19%	0%
Democrats	83%	17%	0%
Independents	74%	26%	0%
Iowa (statewide)	82%	17%	2%
Republicans	82%	16%	1%
Democrats	89%	10%	1%
Iowa CD1	82%	17%	2%
Republicans	81%	17%	2%
Democrats	89%	10%	1%
Iowa CD2	81%	18%	1%
Republicans	82%	18%	1%
Democrats	89%	11%	0%
Iowa CD3	85%	14%	1%
Republicans	86%	14%	1%
Democrats	90%	9%	2%
Iowa CD4	81%	18%	2%
Republicans	80%	18%	2%
Democrats	87%	11%	2%

Q8. Here is a proposal for how to conduct elections when there are three or more candidates, called “rank choice voting.” Voters not only select their first choice but can also select their second choice. Then, if no candidate gets a majority, the one with the fewest votes is eliminated. Voters who favored the eliminated candidate then have their votes switched to their second choice. The tally is recalculated, and the candidate with a majority of votes wins.

If there are more than three candidates, the process is repeated until a candidate gets a majority.

Do you favor or oppose using ranked choice voting in all federal elections?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	66%	34%	0%
Republicans	64%	36%	0%
Democrats	70%	29%	0%
Independents	60%	40%	1%
Iowa (statewide)	62%	38%	0%
Republicans	58%	42%	0%
Democrats	69%	31%	0%
Iowa CD1	57%	43%	0%
Republicans	57%	43%	0%
Democrats	61%	39%	0%
Iowa CD2	62%	38%	1%
Republicans	58%	41%	1%
Democrats	71%	29%	0%
Iowa CD3	65%	35%	0%
Republicans	61%	39%	0%
Democrats	71%	29%	0%
Iowa CD4	64%	36%	1%
Republicans	57%	43%	1%
Democrats	75%	25%	0%

Q9. Here is another proposal: Limit how many terms a member of the House or Senate may stay in office, by passing a new Constitutional amendment that says House Members are limited to four two-year terms, and Senators are limited to three six-year terms.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	82%	17%	1%
Republicans	85%	15%	1%
Democrats	83%	17%	1%
Independents	76%	24%	1%
Iowa (statewide)	84%	15%	1%
Republicans	87%	12%	1%
Democrats	88%	12%	1%
Iowa CD1	85%	14%	2%

Republicans	88%	10%	3%
Democrats	89%	10%	1%
Iowa CD2	80%	19%	1%
Republicans	79%	20%	1%
Democrats	85%	15%	0%
Iowa CD3	88%	12%	0%
Republicans	91%	9%	0%
Democrats	89%	10%	1%
Iowa CD4	85%	15%	0%
Republicans	90%	9%	0%
Democrats	88%	12%	0%

Proposals have been put forward to prohibit high-level officials in the federal government from trading stocks in individual companies. They would still be allowed to buy or sell shares of funds that include stocks in numerous companies. For each group of federal officials, please say whether you favor or oppose prohibiting them from trading stocks in individual companies.

Q10. Members of Congress

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	76%	24%	0%
Republicans	78%	22%	0%
Democrats	75%	25%	0%
Independents	72%	28%	1%
Iowa (statewide)	78%	21%	1%
Republicans	81%	19%	1%
Democrats	82%	17%	1%
Iowa CD1	75%	23%	2%
Republicans	78%	20%	2%
Democrats	80%	19%	1%
Iowa CD2	77%	22%	1%
Republicans	80%	19%	1%
Democrats	85%	14%	1%
Iowa CD3	81%	19%	0%
Republicans	82%	17%	1%
Democrats	85%	15%	0%
Iowa CD4	77%	22%	1%
Republicans	83%	18%	0%
Democrats	79%	21%	0%

Q11. The President, Vice President, and Supreme Court Justices

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

National	71%	28%	1%
Republicans	74%	25%	1%
Democrats	70%	29%	1%
Independents	67%	31%	2%
Iowa (statewide)	72%	27%	1%
Republicans	75%	25%	0%
Democrats	76%	23%	1%
Iowa CD1	72%	27%	1%
Republicans	78%	22%	0%
Democrats	74%	25%	1%
Iowa CD2	71%	29%	1%
Republicans	68%	32%	1%
Democrats	80%	20%	0%
Iowa CD3	75%	24%	1%
Republicans	77%	23%	0%
Democrats	79%	20%	2%
Iowa CD4	72%	28%	1%
Republicans	76%	24%	0%
Democrats	72%	29%	0%

Q12. As you may know, federal judges must comply with a set of ethical standards. However, Supreme Court Justices do not have the same requirement. Do you favor or oppose Supreme Court Justices being required to comply with the same ethical standards that apply to other federal judges?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref/DK
National	85%	15%	1%
Republicans	87%	13%	0%
Democrats	86%	14%	1%
Independents	79%	20%	1%
Iowa (statewide)	85%	14%	1%
Republicans	86%	13%	1%
Democrats	92%	8%	0%
Iowa CD1	87%	12%	1%
Republicans	87%	12%	1%
Democrats	95%	5%	0%
Iowa CD2	84%	15%	0%
Republicans	83%	17%	0%
Democrats	92%	8%	0%
Iowa CD3	88%	11%	1%
Republicans	88%	11%	1%
Democrats	92%	7%	1%
Iowa CD4	82%	17%	1%

Republicans	86%	13%	1%
Democrats	87%	13%	0%

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: July 21 - Aug 3, 2026	Sample Size: 2016	Response Rate: 8.0%
------------------------------------	-------------------	---------------------

Iowa CD1

Field Dates: July 21 - 31, 2026	Sample Size: 503	Response Rate: 8.1%
---------------------------------	------------------	---------------------

Iowa CD2

Field Dates: July 21 - Aug 3, 2026	Sample Size: 504	Response Rate: 7.9%
------------------------------------	------------------	---------------------

Iowa CD3

Field Dates: July 21 - Aug 1, 2026	Sample Size: 502	Response Rate: 7.3%
------------------------------------	------------------	---------------------

Iowa CD4

Field Dates: July 21 - 30, 2026	Sample Size: 507	Response Rate: 8.1%
---------------------------------	------------------	---------------------

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: 0.12	Max Weight: 6	Mean Weight: 1.0
------------------------------	-------------------	---------------	------------------

Iowa CD1

Confidence Interval: +/-5.6%	Min. Weight: 0.14	Max Weight: 5	Mean Weight: 1.0
------------------------------	-------------------	---------------	------------------

Iowa CD2

Confidence Interval: +/-6.0%

Min. Weight: 0.12

Max Weight: 6 Mean Weight: 1.0

Iowa CD3

Confidence Interval: +/-5.4%

Min. Weight: 0.19

Max Weight: 4.17

Mean

Weight: 1.0

Iowa CD4

Confidence Interval: +/-6.3%

Min. Weight: 0.14

Max Weight: 6 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.