

Institute for Advanced Technology & Public Policy Survey

Below are the weighted toplines of responses from a survey of 800 likely November 2016 California voters. The interviews were conducted in English and Spanish from March 29 to April 2, 2015. The sampling error is +/- 3.5% for this sample size.

q1. Right track/Wrong direction: Would you say things in California are going in the right direction, or would you say that things are pretty seriously off on the wrong track?

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Right track	44.1%
2	Wrong direction	43.8%
3	Undecided	12.0%

Name ID & Impression

Now, I'm going to read you some names of individuals and organizations. For each, please tell me if you approve or disapprove of how they are handling their job. (READ A, B, AND C FIRST IN ORDER, THEN ROTATE ALL THE OTHERS)

Do you approve or disapprove of how that person is handling their job? (IF APPROVE/ DISAPPROVE, ASK:) Is that strongly (APPROVE/ DISAPPROVE) or somewhat (APPROVE/ DISAPPROVE)?

q2a. Federal government: The federal government

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Strongly approve	10.1%
2	Somewhat approve	23.8%
3	Somewhat disapprove	19.6%
4	Strongly disapprove	37.6%
5	Undecided/refused	8.8%

q2b. State government: The state government

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Strongly approve	14.5%
2	Somewhat approve	30.9%
3	Somewhat disapprove	18.6%
4	Strongly disapprove	28.4%
5	Undecided/refused	7.5%

q2c. Your city government: Your city government

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Strongly approve	24.0%
2	Somewhat approve	38.8%
3	Somewhat disapprove	13.0%
4	Strongly disapprove	12.0%
5	Undecided/refused	12.1%

q2d. CA legislature: The State Legislature

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Strongly approve	9.1%
2	Somewhat approve	33.6%
3	Somewhat disapprove	18.9%
4	Strongly disapprove	24.7%
5	Undecided/refused	13.6%

q3. State better/worse: Compared to a few years ago, would you say our state government is working better, worse or about the same?

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Much better	14.2%
2	Somewhat better	19.5%
3	Somewhat worse	7.4%
4	Much worse	13.6%
5	About the same	42.7%
6	Undecided	2.4%

Transparency & Accountability

q4. Transparency need: Compared to a few years ago, would you say our state government is working better, worse or about the same? (IF BETTER/ WORSE, ASK:) Is that much (BETTER/ WORSE) or somewhat (BETTER/ WORSE)?

Value	Label	Frequency
1	A great need	45.3%
2	Some need	32.4%
3	A little need	14.1%
4	No need	5.8%
5	Undecided	2.3%

q5. Accountability need: In your opinion, how much need is there to reform state government to make it easier to hold lawmakers accountable? Is that a great need, some need, a little or no need?

Value	Label	Frequency
1	A great need	58.2%
2	Some need	24.4%
3	A little need	9.4%
4	No need	5.7%
5	Undecided	2.1%

Reform Importance

In your opinion, how important is it for the State Legislature to provide the following - extremely important, very important, somewhat important, not too important or not at all important?

q6a. Bill tracker: Making it easy to follow how a proposed law gets voted on and drafted

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Extremely important	32.5%
2	Very important	38.7%
3	Somewhat important	23.7%
4	Not too important	1.9%
5	Not at all important	1.9%
6	Undecided/refused	1.2%

q6b. Interest groups: Making it easy to know which interest groups are behind a proposed law

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Extremely important	44.5%
2	Very important	37.3%
3	Somewhat important	14.4%
4	Not too important	1.0%
5	Not at all important	1.5%
6	Undecided/refused	1.1%

q6c. Campaign contributions: Making it easy to know how much money interest groups donate to elected officials

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Extremely important	42.8%
2	Very important	35.2%
3	Somewhat important	17.5%
4	Not too important	1.3%
5	Not at all important	2.1%
6	Undecided/refused	0.9%

Reform Support

A number of specific changes for the California State Legislature have been proposed. Please listen to a brief description of each and tell me if you support or oppose that change.

q7a. 72 hour-wait: Requiring proposed new laws to be made available to the public in writing at least 72 hours before a final vote is taken

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Strongly support	60.9%
2	Somewhat support	28.3%
3	Somewhat oppose	5.4%
4	Strongly oppose	2.5%
5	Undecided	2.7%

q7b. Video recording: Requiring all public hearings in the Legislature to be video recorded and made available to the public on the Internet within 24 hours after the hearing

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Strongly support	56.7%
2	Somewhat support	29.3%
3	Somewhat oppose	7.3%
4	Strongly oppose	3.3%
5	Undecided	3.4%

q7c. Leg spending: Providing a detailed quarterly report of all legislative spending, including travel, staff, perks, mailings and committees

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Strongly support	63.5%
2	Somewhat support	26.2%
3	Somewhat oppose	4.9%
4	Strongly oppose	2.4%
5	Undecided	2.8%

q7d. LAO analysis: Requiring that the official analysis of proposed new laws be done by the Legislative Analyst’s Office who provides non-partisan analysis, instead of legislative staff

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Strongly support	44.7%
2	Somewhat support	37.1%
3	Somewhat oppose	7.0%
4	Strongly oppose	2.3%
5	Undecided	8.7%

q7e. Searchable docs: Requiring all documents, including the state budget, be available online with their content easily searchable with a search engine similar Google

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Strongly support	63.7%
2	Somewhat support	27.0%
3	Somewhat oppose	4.2%
4	Strongly oppose	2.6%
5	Undecided	2.3%

Reform Debate

Now I would like you to listen to a little more detail on each proposal for the State Legislature I just read as well as both sides of the debate on each proposal. After hearing arguments from both sides, please tell me if you agree with the supporters or the opponents.

q8a. 72-hour wait: One idea would require that proposed new laws be made available in writing for the public at least 72 hours before the final vote. Supporters say that controversial bills are often quickly changed to please special interests, then put up for a vote with little or no time for the press, the public, and even other legislators to properly review what the bill says.

Opponents say that it’s important that legislators be able to debate and work out reasonable compromises right up until the final vote, and that freezing the language 3 days before a vote will just increase gridlock.

Do you tend to agree with supporters or opponents of this proposal?

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Agree w/supporters	70.5%
2	Agree w/opponents	22.2%
3	Agree w/both	1.2%
4	Agree w/neither	0.5%
5	Undecided	5.5%

q8b. Video recording: One proposal would require that all public hearings in the California Legislature be video recorded and made available to the public on the Internet within 24 hours after the hearing. Supporters say that, currently, many hearings are not recorded, and that they don't even keep minutes of these meetings. Recording these hearings keeps government more open, and the public informed.

Opponents say that the Legislature already records many of the hearings which can be seen on a public website. A legal requirement to record all hearings, many of which will never be watched, just creates more unnecessary and costly bureaucracy.

Do you tend to agree with supporters or opponents of this proposal?

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Agree w/supporters	68.4%
2	Agree w/opponents	27.0%
3	Agree w/both	1.0%
4	Agree w/neither	0.8%
5	Undecided	2.7%

q8c. Leg spending: One proposal would require a detailed quarterly report of all legislative spending, including for travel, office staff, perks, mailings and committees. Supporters say that the California Legislature ranks last in budget transparency, and spends 250 million dollars a year on its own activities with little public disclosure or accountability.

Opponents say that this is an unnecessary requirement. Both the Senate and Assembly leadership already provide spending reports that are available to the public. Requiring yet another report would cost taxpayers money and provide little additional benefit.

Do you tend to agree with supporters or opponents of this proposal?

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Agree w/supporters	67.5%
2	Agree w/opponents	25.8%
3	Agree w/both	0.1%
4	Agree w/neither	0.9%
5	Undecided	5.5%

q8d. LAO analysis: One idea would require that the official analysis of proposed new laws be done by the Legislative Analyst’s Office, instead of legislative staff. Supporters say that currently these analyses are performed by partisan staff members who work for politicians whereas the Legislative Analyst is non-partisan and has a proven record of being independent.

Opponents say that the staff who analyze proposed laws have long years of experience doing this work. It is better to have staff who are responsible to legislators elected by the people than have unelected bureaucrats doing it. This measure is seeking to solve a problem that doesn’t exist.

Do you tend to agree with supporters or opponents of this proposal?

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Agree w/supporters	63.6%
2	Agree w/opponents	26.2%
3	Agree w/both	0.7%
4	Agree w/neither	1.5%
5	Undecided	7.8%

q8e. Searchable docs: One proposal would require that all documents, including the state budget, be made available online. Supporters say it is time for California state government to enter the 21st century and make available all documents online so that the contents may be easily searchable by the public through an online search engine similar to Google. This would make government more transparent, allow the public to know more about what is going on and hold politicians more accountable.

Opponents say most important documents such as the state budget are already available online. This proposal would require an unnecessary amount of bureaucratic work, at a high cost, and may not even be feasible.

Do you tend to agree with supporters or opponents of this proposal?

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Agree w/supporters	71.5%
2	Agree w/opponents	22.0%
3	Agree w/both	1.3%
4	Agree w/neither	0.9%
5	Undecided	4.2%

Demographics

Facebook:

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Every day	33.5%
2	Use it regularly	16.1%
3	Use less often	31.0%
4	Undecided	19.3%

Twitter:

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Every day	6.2%
2	Use it regularly	5.8%
3	Use less often	52.0%
4	Undecided	35.9%

LinkedIn:

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Every day	4.8%
2	Use it regularly	10.8%
3	Use less often	53.9%
4	Undecided	30.4%

Google plus:

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Every day	19.8%
2	Use it regularly	14.2%
3	Use less often	44.3%
4	Undecided	21.6%

YouTube:

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Every day	17.4%
2	Use it regularly	25.6%
3	Use less often	42.4%
4	Undecided	14.5%

Ideology: How would you describe yourself politically: Are you (ROTATE LIBERAL AND CONSERVATIVE, KEEPING MODERATE IN THE MIDDLE) liberal, moderate, or conservative?(IF LIBERAL/CONSERVATIVE) Is that very (liberal/conservative) or somewhat (liberal/conservative)?

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Very liberal	11.2%
2	Somewhat liberal	17.0%
3	Moderate	32.1%
4	Somewhat conservative	18.1%
5	Very conservative	12.3%
6	Undecided	9.1%

Education: What was the last year of school you completed?

Value	Label	Frequency
2	K-12/HS grad	14.3%
3	Some college	27.8%
4	College grad	30.9%
5	Post grad	23.1%
6	Undecided	3.7%

Affluence: Do you consider your family to be wealthy, upper middle-class, middle class, lower middle-class, or poor?

Value	Label	Frequency
2	Wealthy/upper middle class	17.7%
3	Middle class	15.6%
4	Lower middle class/poor	12.1%
7	Undecided	54.4%

Religion: On the topic of religion, would you describe yourself as very religious, somewhat religious, spiritual but not a member of a typical faith, or not religious?

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Religious	26.3%
2	Somewhat religious	29.5%
3	Spiritual	16.8%
4	Not religious	27.2%

Ethnicity: What is your race?

Value	Label	Frequency
1	White	63.8%
2	African American	4.7%
3	Latino	22.0%
4	Asian	6.6%
6	Other	2.8%

Latino: ASK ONLY IF NOT HISPANIC/LATINO IN ETH1) Do you consider yourself to be of Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin or descent?

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Latino	4.4%
2	Non-Latino	95.5%

Age: From sample

Value	Label	Frequency
2	18-34	21.8%
3	35-44	13.2%
4	45-54	16.3%
5	55-64	20.7%
6	65-74	14.7%
7	75+	13.3%

Party registration: From sample

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Registered Dem	43.9%
2	Registered Rep	30.0%
3	Registered DTS/Other	26.0%

Party loyalty: Thinking about how you vote, do you usually vote (ROTATE) mainly Republican, mainly Democratic, or about the same for each party?

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Loyal Rep	28.4%
2	Switch voter	19.0%
3	Loyal Dem	52.4%

Vote location: From sample

Value	Label	Frequency
1	VBM	55.9%
2	Poll voter	44.0%

Region: From sample

Value	Label	Frequency
1	LA county	25.0%
2	LA area	22.0%
3	Bay area	22.0%
4	San Diego	9.0%
5	Sacramento/North	10.0%
6	Central Valley	12.0%

DMA: From sample

Value	Label	Frequency
1	LA	45.2%
2	SF	21.8%
3	SD	8.3%
4	SAC	10.6%
5	Other DMA	14.1%

Phone type: From sample

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Cell phone	16.9%
2	Land line	83.0%

Resident type: From sample

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Home owner	68.6%
2	Renter	31.3%

sjrpi_16p. Propensity: From sample

Value	Label	Frequency
1	40-49	5.3%
2	50-59	9.7%
3	60-69	13.1%
4	70-79	5.6%
5	80-89	12.1%
6	90+	54.2%

Median income: From sample

Value	Label	Frequency
1	1st quintile	19.1%
2	2nd quintile	19.4%
3	3rd quintile	19.9%
4	4th quintile	20.7%
5	5th quintile	20.7%

Sex: By observation

Value	Label	Frequency
1	Male	46.9%
2	Female	52.9%