

NATIONAL POLL TOPLINE ▪ JULY 2026

Americans and Global Childhood Immunization Programs

Topline Results: National poll of 16,131 U.S. adults, fielded June 26 to July 22, 2026

Conducted by Fraym in partnership with the Kyle House Group ▪ fraym.io

Results are weighted national percentages. The 95% credible interval for the full sample is plus or minus 1.1 percentage points (weighting design effect 2.0; effective sample size approximately 8,060); intervals are wider for subgroups and split samples. Percentages are rounded and may not sum to 100%. Questions are presented in the order in which they were administered; classification questions were asked at the end of the survey. A full survey methodology statement appears at the end of this document.

Support for the Three Program Areas

Global health programs: baseline support (n = 16,131)

In general, do you think the U.S. government should increase or decrease the amount of money it spends on global health programs in developing countries, or keep it about the same?

Increase a great deal	16%
Increase somewhat	23%
Stay the same	28%
Decrease somewhat	15%
Decrease a great deal	11%
Do not know	7%

Global childhood immunization: baseline support (n = 16,131)

Now, do you think the U.S. government should increase or decrease the amount of money it spends on global health programs that provide routine immunizations for children in developing countries, or keep it about the same?

Increase a great deal	20%
Increase somewhat	27%
Stay the same	32%
Decrease somewhat	9%
Decrease a great deal	7%
Do not know	6%

Global malaria programs: baseline support (n = 16,131)

Now, do you think the U.S. government should increase or decrease the amount of money it spends on global health programs to control and prevent malaria in developing countries, or keep it about the same?

Increase a great deal	14%
Increase somewhat	24%
Stay the same	37%
Decrease somewhat	10%
Decrease a great deal	7%
Do not know	8%

Global health programs: informed support (n = 16,131)

The U.S. government spends approximately two-tenths of one percent (0.2%) of the overall budget on global health programs. These programs have prevented over 90 million deaths since 2000. Knowing this, do you think the government should increase or decrease the amount it spends on global health programs?

Increase a great deal	18%
Increase somewhat	28%
Stay the same	34%
Decrease somewhat	8%
Decrease a great deal	6%
Do not know	5%

Global childhood immunization: informed support (n = 16,131)

Out of the 0.2% of the federal budget that goes to global health, the U.S. government allocates approximately \$550 million annually to childhood immunization programs. These programs have helped vaccinate hundreds of millions of children and saved over 21 million lives since 2000. Knowing this, do you think the government should increase or decrease the amount it spends on global child immunization programs?

Increase a great deal	19%
Increase somewhat	28%
Stay the same	36%
Decrease somewhat	7%
Decrease a great deal	6%
Do not know	5%

Global malaria programs: informed support (n = 16,131)

Out of the 0.2% of the federal budget that goes to global health, the U.S. government allocates approximately \$800 million annually to combat malaria worldwide. Over the past twenty years, this funding has helped prevent over 640 million malaria cases and save nearly 13 million lives. Knowing this, do you think the government should increase or decrease the amount it spends on global malaria prevention and treatment programs?

Increase a great deal	15%
Increase somewhat	25%
Stay the same	39%
Decrease somewhat	9%
Decrease a great deal	6%
Do not know	6%

Motivations for Support

Main reason to support global health programs (n = 16,131)

If you had to choose one main reason for the U.S. to support global health programs, which comes closest to your view?

The U.S. must stop disease outbreaks abroad before they reach our borders	31%
The U.S. has a moral duty to save lives and combat diseases globally	22%
It contributes to economic growth, reducing countries' dependence on foreign aid	16%
It makes countries more stable, reducing the likelihood they will harbor terrorists or threats to the U.S.	13%
It protects deployed U.S. military troops from dangerous health threats	12%
The U.S. should not fund global health programs for any reason	6%

Main reason to support global malaria programs (n = 16,131)

If you had to choose one main reason for the U.S. to support global health programs to control and prevent malaria more specifically, which comes closest to your view?

The U.S. must stop disease outbreaks abroad before they reach our borders	31%
The U.S. has a moral duty to save lives from preventable diseases like malaria	23%
It contributes to economic growth, reducing countries' dependence on foreign aid	14%
These programs protect deployed U.S. military troops from contracting the disease	13%
It makes countries more stable, reducing the likelihood they will harbor terrorists or threats to the U.S.	13%
The U.S. should not fund these programs for any reason	6%

Main reason to support global childhood immunization programs (n = 16,131)

If you had to choose one main reason for the U.S. to support global immunization programs more specifically, which comes closest to your view?

The U.S. must stop disease outbreaks abroad before they reach our borders	33%
The U.S. has a moral duty to help protect children and adults from preventable diseases	29%
It contributes to economic growth, reducing countries' dependence on foreign aid	16%
It makes countries more stable, reducing the likelihood they will harbor terrorists or threats to the U.S.	14%
The U.S. should not fund these programs for any of these reasons	8%

Delivery Model

Preferred delivery model for global childhood immunization funding (n = 16,131)

Over time, the U.S. has provided roughly 13% of total funding for international immunization alliances. This means that every dollar provided has been matched by nearly \$8 from other countries, which has significantly increased the number of lives saved. Knowing this, which approach do you think is better for the United States?

Pooling money through international health alliances so other wealthy nations contribute their fair share	50%
Distributing funds directly through U.S. agencies so the U.S. controls the programs and gets direct credit	28%
Do not know	21%

Reservations and Concerns

Reservations about global childhood immunization programs (multiple responses accepted) (n = 16,131)

When you think about the U.S. government funding childhood immunization programs in developing countries, which of the following, if any, are concerns you have?

The funding could be lost to waste or corruption	33%
These programs can create dependency rather than long-term solutions	25%
The money would be better spent on domestic priorities	22%
I have concerns about vaccine safety and side effects generally	21%
There's no guarantee these programs are actually effective	20%
It's not America's responsibility to fund health programs in other countries	19%
It adds too much to the national debt	19%
None of these	22%

Concerns if the U.S. reduced or ended global health program funding (multiple responses accepted) (n = 16,131)

Which of the following, if any, would concern you if the U.S. government reduced or ended funding for global health programs?

More disease outbreaks globally that could spread to the U.S.	48%
An increase in preventable deaths, especially among children abroad.	41%
Greater exposure of deployed U.S. military troops to dangerous health threats.	29%
Damage to U.S. alliances and international relationships.	28%
Increased poverty abroad, making countries more dependent on foreign aid.	27%
Increased global instability, putting the U.S. at greater risk of terrorism and other threats.	23%
Other global powers (like China or Russia) gaining more influence in developing nations.	21%
Financial harm to U.S. businesses and jobs that support these programs.	19%
I would not be concerned about the U.S. reducing or ending this funding.	12%

Concerns if the U.S. reduced or ended global malaria funding (multiple responses accepted) (n = 16,131)

Which of the following, if any, would concern you if the U.S. government reduced or ended funding for global malaria control and prevention programs more specifically?

Worsening malaria outbreaks that threaten global health stability	45%
An increase in preventable malaria deaths, especially among young children abroad	43%
Increased danger to deployed U.S. military troops operating in malaria zones	33%
Damage to U.S. alliances and international relationships	27%
Increased poverty abroad, making countries more dependent on foreign aid	27%
Increased global instability, putting the U.S. at greater risk of terrorism and other threats.	24%
Other global powers (like China or Russia) gaining more influence in developing nations	21%
Financial harm to U.S. businesses and jobs that support these programs	20%
I would not be concerned about the U.S. reducing or ending this funding	13%

Concerns if the U.S. reduced or ended global childhood immunization funding (multiple responses accepted) (n = 16,131)

Which of the following, if any, would concern you if the U.S. government reduced or ended funding for global immunization programs more specifically?

More vaccine-preventable disease outbreaks that could spread to the U.S.	47%
An increase in preventable child deaths abroad.	42%
Greater exposure of deployed U.S. military troops to vaccine-preventable outbreaks.	31%
Damage to U.S. alliances and international relationships.	28%
Increased poverty abroad, making countries more dependent on foreign aid.	28%
Increased global instability, putting the U.S. at greater risk of terrorism and other threats.	24%
Other global powers (like China or Russia) gaining more influence in developing nations.	22%
Financial harm to U.S. businesses and jobs that support these programs.	20%
I would not be concerned about the U.S. reducing or ending this funding.	13%

View of Political Candidates and Accountability

Candidate supporting cuts: national-security framing (n = 16,131)

Some national security experts argue that if the United States cuts funding for global immunization programs in developing countries, China and Russia could step in to supply those vaccines instead, growing their power and influence at America's expense. If a candidate running for U.S. Congress supported cutting U.S. funding for these global immunization alliances, would that make you more or less likely to vote for them?

Much more likely to vote for them	12%
Somewhat more likely to vote for them	15%
Somewhat less likely to vote for them	19%
Much less likely to vote for them	24%
It would make no difference to my vote	15%
Do not know	15%

Member who cut funding before an outbreak: accountability framing (n = 16,131)

Imagine a member of Congress voted to cut U.S. funding for global immunization programs. If a major disease outbreak later occurred and spread to the United States, would that make you more or less likely to support that member for re-election?

Much more likely to support them	9%
Somewhat more likely to support them	13%
Somewhat less likely to support them	19%
Much less likely to support them	36%
It would make no difference to my vote	23%

Candidate advocating cuts to reduce the deficit: fiscal framing (n = 16,131)

As a reminder, the U.S. government allocates roughly \$550 million annually for global childhood immunization programs. If a candidate running for Congress advocates for cutting this specific funding to reduce the federal deficit, which statement comes closer to your view of that candidate?

A smart fiscal choice: They are cutting foreign spending to focus on priorities at home	29%
A short-sighted choice: Cutting programs that prevent global disease outbreaks could cost America much more long-term.	53%
Do not know	18%

Likelihood of voting in the 2026 congressional election (n = 16,131)

On November 3, 2026, the United States will hold its general elections to choose candidates for federal, state, and local offices. How likely or unlikely are you to vote in the upcoming general elections?

Definitely will vote	55%
Probably will vote	21%
Probably will not vote	9%
Definitely will not vote	8%
Do not know	7%

Generic congressional ballot (baseline) (n = 16,131)

If the election for U.S. Congress were held today, would you vote for the Republican candidate or the Democratic candidate in your congressional district?

Definitely the Republican candidate	22%
Lean Republican candidate	13%
Lean Democratic candidate	14%
Definitely the Democratic candidate	28%
An Independent or third-party candidate	8%
Do not know	15%

Generic ballot if the Republican candidate voted to eliminate global childhood immunization funding (split sample) (n = 7,930)

Suppose the Republican candidate for Congress in your district voted to completely eliminate all U.S. funding for international health alliances that support childhood immunizations in developing nations. Knowing this, if the election for U.S. Congress were held today, would you vote for the Republican candidate or the Democratic candidate in your congressional district?

Definitely the Republican candidate	18%
Lean Republican candidate	12%
Lean Democratic candidate	14%
Definitely the Democratic candidate	33%
An Independent or third-party candidate	7%
Do not know	16%

Generic ballot if the Democratic candidate voted to eliminate global childhood immunization funding (split sample) (n = 8,203)

Suppose the Democratic candidate for Congress in your district voted to completely eliminate all U.S. funding for international health alliances that support childhood immunizations in developing nations. Knowing this, if the election for U.S. Congress were held today, would you vote for the Democratic candidate or the Republican candidate in your congressional district?

Definitely the Republican candidate	23%
Lean Republican candidate	14%
Lean Democratic candidate	12%
Definitely the Democratic candidate	17%
An Independent or third-party candidate	13%
Do not know	19%

Classification Questions

Evangelical or born-again identification (asked of Christian respondents) (n = 4,447)

Would you describe yourself as a born-again or evangelical Christian, or not?

Yes, born-again or evangelical	55%
No, not born-again or evangelical	45%

Party identification (n = 16,131)

In politics today, do you consider yourself a...

Democrat	35%
Republican	31%
Independent	27%
Something else	7%

Progressive identification (asked of Democrats) (n = 7,391)

Would you consider yourself to be more of a progressive Democrat who supports far-reaching political and economic change, or a mainstream or traditional Democrat who supports gradual, practical political change?

Progressive Democrat who supports far-reaching change	28%
Mainstream or traditional Democrat who supports gradual, practical change	33%
Both equally	28%
Neither	5%
Do not know	6%

MAGA identification (asked of Republicans) (n = 5,842)

Would you consider yourself to be more of a supporter of the Make America Great Again or MAGA movement, or more of a supporter of the traditional Republican Party?

Supporter of the MAGA movement	32%
Supporter of the traditional Republican party	34%
Both equally	22%
Neither	8%
Do not know	4%

MAHA movement support (n = 16,131)

Do you consider yourself a supporter of the Make America Healthy Again movement, also known as the MAHA movement?

Yes, a strong supporter	21%
Yes, a somewhat supporter	26%
No, not a supporter	31%
Do not know	22%

Survey Methodology

The poll was conducted by Fraym in partnership with the Kyle House Group. Interviews were completed online between June 26 and July 22, 2026, by 16,131 U.S. adults (age 18 and older). Respondents were recruited through multiple professionally managed national online survey panels, with quotas on age, gender, race/ethnicity, education, household income, and geography set to match the profile of the U.S. adult population. Responses passed automated quality controls, including duplicate detection, multiple attention checks, straightlining, and completion-time screening. The survey was administered in English.

The completed sample was weighted to national population parameters for age, gender, race/ethnicity, education, household income, and geography (benchmark source: U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey). Since respondents were recruited through opt-in online panels rather than through probability sampling, a conventional margin of sampling error does not strictly apply. Fraym instead reports a 95% credible interval: results for the full sample are accurate to within plus or minus 1.1 percentage points, reflecting a weighting design effect of 2.0 and an effective sample size of approximately 8,060. Intervals are wider for subgroups and for split-sample questions. The design effect primarily reflects a deliberate feature of the sample design: the survey set minimum sample sizes in every state and the District of Columbia and oversampled selected congressional districts to support state- and district-level estimation. Weighting these intentional oversamples back to their proportional national population shares increases the variability of the weights, and with it the design effect, relative to a strictly proportional national sample. As with all surveys, results are also subject to sources of error that cannot be directly quantified, including coverage error, nonresponse, and effects of question wording and order.

Certain questions employed a randomized split-sample design: the Republican program-cutter ballot question was asked of 7,930 respondents and the Democratic program-cutter version of 8,203 respondents. All political and movement classifications used in this document, including party identification, MAGA Republican, Progressive Democrat, and MAHA supporter, are based on respondent self-identification. Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number; due to rounding, response categories may not sum to 100% and displayed differences may not exactly match differences computed from rounded values.

This topline presents national results only. Fraym utilizes this socio-demographically representative and geo-referenced data, in combination with over 2,000 additional data covariates available at the census-tract level (or more granularly), to produce modeled congressional district- and state-level estimates with a synthetic margin of error between plus or minus 2-4 percentage points. Full results are reported separately.