Title
The IGS Survey: California Politics and Policy

Authors
Bernhard, Rachel
Citrin, Jack
Lenz, Gabe
et al.

Publication Date
2016-08-01

BERKELEY IGS Research Brief

The IGS Survey: California Politics and Policy

Rachel Bernhard
Jack Citrin
Gabe Lenz
Ethan Rarick

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

IGS Poll Finds Support for Extending Taxes on Wealthy, Legalizing Marijuana, and Toughening Gun Control

In a measure of public opinion about major issues that will go before voters this fall, the IGS Poll found that California voters are supportive of extending temporary income tax surcharges on the wealthy, increasing the cigarette tax, legalizing recreational marijuana, and toughening the state's gun control laws. However, in a departure from their generally liberal views, voters also favor retaining capital punishment and speeding up the process of imposing the death penalty on condemned prisoners.

The survey, conducted from June 29 to July 18 among registered voters, also found more conservative attitudes on certain related questions that will not be on the ballot this fall. Most Californians, for example, think they generally pay too much in taxes, while also disapproving of so-called "sanctuary city" policies.

The poll also provided a focused examination of Asian-American voters, producing an especially rich description of one of the state's fastest-growing and most independent voting blocs. Beginning in 2008, "No Party Preference" (NPP) became the second most-popular registration choice for Asian-American voters in California, and by the 2014 general election, as many Asian Americans registered NPP as Democrats.

"It's important that we better understand the emerging political power of Asian-American voters, who frequently do not fall into traditional partisan frames," said IGS Director Jack Citrin, one of the researchers who designed the survey.

The survey found that Asian-American respondents were more likely than other voters to support raising the cigarette tax, but less likely to back legalizing marijuana or abolishing the death penalty. Asked about extending the additional income taxes on the wealthy, Asian Americans were more likely to be supportive when simply asked about the issue, although less likely when asked a version of the question that noted the state's budget surplus.

"Overall, the responses from Asian-American voters suggest a voting bloc whose views do not always fall along traditional lines," said Citrin. "This is precisely why this kind of research is critical as we work to understand this emerging component of the California electorate."

Taxes

Respondents were asked whether the state should extend higher temporary income tax rates imposed by Proposition 30, which voters approved in 2012. That measure imposed higher rates on people who earn more than $250,000 a year, but the surcharges are scheduled to expire by the end of 2018. A measure on the November ballot would extend the higher rates.

The survey included three slightly different versions of the question, one simply asking about the extension, one noting that the state has a "healthy budget surplus," and one noting that the extension is being proposed "because of the

need for funding of state programs." Among those asked the basic question, support for extending the higher rates was 68.5 percent. Support fell slightly among respondents who were told of the budget surplus, although it remained a strong majority at 62.7 percent. A majority (64.8 percent) also favored the extension when the need for program funding was mentioned. A divide emerged only along partisan lines, with Democrats and independents favoring the extension and Republicans opposing it.

Support was even stronger—74.2 percent for all respondents—for a November measure that would increase the state's cigarette tax by $2 per pack. Support for this proposal again cut across all groups within the survey, and in this case even crossed partisan lines, with a strong majority of 64.6 percent of Republican respondents supporting the increase.

When asked about the general level of income taxes, however, Californians were far more skeptical of how much they pay. Asked whether "the amount of federal and state income taxes that you and your family have to pay is too high, about right or too low," 59.8 percent said it was "too high," 37.6 percent said it was "about right," and only 2.6 percent said it was "too low."

Marijuana

Respondents strongly supported legalizing marijuana for recreational use, while imposing government regulation on the drug "similar to the regulation of alcohol." Overall, 63.8 percent of respondents were in favor of that idea. Democrats and independents both had strong majorities in support, and while Republicans were opposed, the GOP results were much closer than those for an identical question on the IGS Poll in August 2015. During the intervening year, Republican opposition to legalizing marijuana fell from 61.6 percent to 53 percent, while support increased from 38.4 percent to 47 percent.

Gun Control

Strong bipartisan majorities supported a November ballot measure that would require a background check for ammunition purchases, require ammunition sales to occur through licensed dealers, and prohibit large-capacity magazines. Support among Democrats was an extraordinary 92.8 percent, but even among Republicans support was 64.9 percent. Support for the proposal cut across all groups within the survey.

Bilingual education

Voters will face a ballot measure in November that would, according to the Legislative Analyst's Office, repeal key provisions of Proposition 227, which was approved by voters in 1998 and which generally requires English learner students to have a maximum of one-year of intensive English instruction before transitioning into mainstream English-only classes. The November ballot measure would generally give schools and parents more flexibility to broaden opportunities for bilingual education. The poll showed that a plurality of respondents think that English learner students should transition over several years into English-only classes, while another large group of respondents prefers immediate English immersion. Few voters support allowing these students to continue to take some classes in their native languages all the way through high school. When the question specifically references the earlier voter decision in Proposition 227 and asks about repealing or retaining the one-year transition into mainstream English-only classes, voters generally say they favor retaining the one-year limit. It is important to note that neither of these questions reflects the exact ballot language that will go before voters in November. Another question shows that most voters think California students should learn a second language fluently before finishing high school.

Death Penalty

The survey asked respondents about two competing November measures on the death penalty, one that would abolish capital punishment, and another that would streamline procedures in capital cases to speed up resolution. Although the measures conflict, voters may support or oppose both if they wish. If both measures pass, the one with more votes would be enacted. A majority of respondents (54.9 percent) opposed the death penalty abolition measure and a majority (75.7 percent) supported the streamlining effort. On this issue, independents were more like Republicans, with both NPP and GOP voters opposing the abolition and supporting the streamlining (with majorities ranging from 60.6 to 85 percent). The Democratic responses may hint at the confusion some voters may feel when confronting two measures on the same topic: a majority of Democratic respondents supported both initiatives—55.1 percent on the abolition and 69.7 percent on the streamlining.

Sanctuary Cities

Majorities in both parties and among independent voters opposed "Sanctuary City" policies, under which local authorities may ignore federal requests to detain undocumented immigrants who have been arrested but are about to be released. Opposition to such policies was overwhelming among Republicans and independents, and still strong (67.4 percent) among Democrats. Majority opposition cut across all groups, including among Latinos, perhaps the group most likely to be affected by issues of illegal immigration and deportation.

Technical Details

The poll was conducted for IGS by Survey Sampling International using online questionnaires between June 29 and July 18, 2016. Questionnaires were presented only in English, and all respondents identified themselves as registered voters. The sample sizes vary for the California politics and policy questions described in this brief. Sample size was 3,044 for the overall survey and ranged from 1,005 to 3,020 for specific questions. Please see the Appendix for sample size for specific questions. Responses were weighted to reflect the statewide distribution of the California population by gender, race/ethnicity, education and age.

IGS Poll Finds Support for Extending Taxes on Wealthy, Legalizing Marijuana, and Toughening Gun Control

Introduction

The IGS Poll serves a dual purpose: to take a snapshot of California public opinion on important political and policy matters, and to generate new data for more extensive subsequent analysis by researchers. This brief describes the results of the 2016 poll in measuring public opinion among registered voters on several statewide measures that will be on the ballot this November, and on related public issues. Additionally, the poll sought to provide an in-depth examination of the political attitudes of Asian-American voters, a group that is growing rapidly, but which displays some differences from other voters, including a greater likelihood to register as independents. The results of further analysis of the poll data will be released at a later date by the Institute.

Among the questions on pending November ballot measures, a uniform ideological leaning is difficult to discern. On many of those questions, the majority took "liberal" positions, such as strong support for extending high income tax rates for the rich, increasing the cigarette tax, legalizing marijuana for recreational use, and stiffening gun control laws. On the two pending ballot measures related to the death penalty, however, voters were more conservative, strongly supporting the measure that would streamline the process for resolving capital cases more quickly, and more narrowly opposing the measure that would abolish capital punishment and replace it with a sentence of life in prison without the possibility of parole.

Asian-American respondents generally rated their own ideology as being somewhat more moderate than other respondents.

Voters were also more conservative on the two questions not directly related to pending ballot measures, saying that their general level of income taxes is too high and disapproving of "Sanctuary City" policies. Some of these responses echoed the findings of the 2015 IGS Poll, which produced almost identical results regarding "Sanctuary Cities," and which found that while people were willing to extend higher tax rates for the rich, they were unwilling to broaden the base of the sales tax so that it would apply to services, or to pay more in fees to drive or register their cars.

In general, these mixed results may reflect a long tradition among California voters of using the initiative process to enact policies that in some cases would be considered liberal—mandated K-12 spending, a rollback of insurance rates, and higher taxes on the rich, for example—and in other cases conservative, such as requiring a legislative supermajority to raise taxes, dismantling affirmative action, and denying public services to illegal immigrants.

Issues before Voters in November

Taxes

To test voters' reaction to various arguments, the survey included three versions of a question on the pending ballot measure that would extend the income tax surcharge implemented in Prop. 30. That measure, which was passed by voters in 2012, imposed the higher rates on people who earn more than $250,000 a year, but the surcharges are scheduled to expire by the end of 2018. (Prop. 30 also temporarily increased the sales tax for all Californians, but the pending ballot measure makes no effort to extend the higher sales tax.) One form of the question simply described the proposed extension. The second form noted that the ballot measure would extend the higher taxes, "even though the state has a healthy budget surplus." The third form noted that the extension was being proposed "because of the need for funding of state programs."

All three versions of the question produced majority support for extending the taxes. Perhaps not surprisingly, support was lowest (62.7 percent) when people were told about the surplus, and higher when they were simply asked the basic question (68.5 percent), or when the need for programmatic funding was mentioned (64.8 percent).

Considering all respondents together—regardless of the version of the question that was used—support for extending the Prop. 30 taxes was overwhelming among Democrats (78 percent) and moderate among independents (54.7 percent). Republicans opposed an extension, 53.8 percent to 46.2 percent. Support for the tax extension included a majority of respondents in every ethnic, age, and educational category. Even among relatively high-income earners, there was support for the extension. Support was highest (69.9 percent) among respondents with a household income of less than $40,000 per year, but even among those with incomes of more than $100,000 a year, 58.7 percent supported retaining the higher rates.

A pending measure to raise the cigarette tax by $2 per pack (from its current rate of 87 cents per pack), was supported by 74.3 percent of respondents, including strong majorities in both parties and among independents. All demographic groups supported the increase, but there were clear

differences along educational lines, as support increased steadily with a higher level of education, from 58.1 percent from those with less than a high school diploma to 85.6 percent for those with a graduate degree. Support for the measure was also strongest among those earning more than $100,000 a year, among respondents in their late teens, 20s, and 30s, and among ethnic minorities.

The more generic question about state and federal income taxes—asking respondents whether their level of taxation is "too high, about right, or too low," revealed partisan differences. Among Democrats, 50.8 percent answered "too high," while 46 percent said "about right." This contrasted with Republicans, among whom 73.4 percent said "too high" and only 25 percent said "about right." Very few respondents in either party thought they paid too little in income tax.

Although California's income tax is extremely progressive, collecting a large share of the revenue from high-income earners, objections to the overall level of taxation did not rise dramatically with income. Among those earning less than $40,000 a year, 54.6 percent of respondents said their taxes are "too high." Among those earning more than $100,000, 62.2 percent answered "too high." The belief that taxes are too high was most common among those with a college degree or less education, and was lower among those with a graduate degree.

Marijuana

Support for legalizing recreational marijuana remained strong, with 63.8 percent of respondents supporting legalization and government regulation "similar to the regulation of alcohol." Overall, that level of support was extremely similar to last year, when the IGS Poll asked the identical question, although this year's poll showed less opposition among Republicans. Only 53 percent of GOP respondents opposed legalization, down from 61.6 percent last year, while Republican support for legalization increased from 38.4 percent to 47 percent.

Support for legalization was highest among African Americans (71.9 percent) and Latinos (69.3 percent) and lowest among Asian Americans (57.7 percent). Support for legalization was also highest among 18- to 24-year-olds, and lowest among those over 65.

Gun Control

Stronger gun control was widely supported by respondents. Asked about a November ballot measure that would require a background check for ammunition purchases, require ammunition sales to occur through licensed dealers, and prohibit large-capacity magazines, respondents overwhelmingly supported the measure: 92.8 percent among Democrats, 79.3 percent among independents, and 64.9 percent among Republicans. Strong majorities supported the measure across all ethnic groups, educational and income levels, and age groups. Women (88.5 percent) were more likely than men to support the measure, but even among men, 74.1 percent were in favor.

Bilingual Education

The poll also asked a series of questions about language policy and bilingual education. These topics have been an ongoing research concern for IGS scholars for many years, and bilingual education policy will once again go before voters this fall.

These issues have a long electoral history in California. In 1986, California voters passed an initiative making English the state's official language, an action that had symbolic rather than practical meaning. Then in 1998, Californians voted for Proposition 227, a measure that favored English immersion over other modes of bilingual education. The core of Proposition 227 required that most "English learner"[1] students "be educated through sheltered English immersion during a temporary transition period not normally intended to exceed one year," after which they would be transferred to "English language mainstream classrooms."[2] The 1998 "Official Title and Summary" of Proposition 227 identified five key provisions of the measure: a requirement that all public school instruction be in English, a requirement that children not fluent in English be placed in intensive sheltered English immersion programs for a period not normally exceeding a year, a provision for the waiver of that requirement for children who meet specific conditions, an annual appropriation for 10 years for the instruction of English tutors, and a provision allowing enforcement suits by parents and guardians.[3]

The state's demographic and political makeup have changed since 1998, and in 2014 the legislature passed and Gov. Brown signed Senate Bill 1174, which refers to the

[1] The text of the proposition defined an "English learner" as "a child who does not speak English or whose native language is not English and who is not currently able to perform ordinary classroom work in English," http://vigarchive.sos.ca.gov/1998/primary/propositions/227text.htm, accessed on 8-22-16.

[2] Article 2, Proposition 227, http://vigarchive.sos.ca.gov/1998/primary/propositions/227text.htm, accessed on 8-22-16.

[3] Of the five policy changes identified in the title and summary of Proposition 227, one—the 10-year annual appropriation—is now moot. None of the other four would remain in effect if Proposition 58 were to be enacted. The text of the 1998 title and summary is at http://vigarchive.sos.ca.gov/1998/primary/propositions/227.htm, accessed on 8-22-16.

ballot a measure that would both repeal key provisions of Proposition 227 and broaden opportunities for bilingual education and learning foreign languages. That proposal will appear on the November ballot as Proposition 58.

The Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) analysis of Proposition 58 that will appear in the state's Voter Information Guide notes that the measure "repeals key provisions of Proposition 227 and adds a few new provisions regarding English language instruction."[4] The analysis goes on to note that under the proposal, "schools would no longer be required to teach English learners in English-only programs" and could instead "teach their English learners using a variety of programs, including bilingual programs." Additionally, the analysis notes that, "While schools generally could design their English learner programs however they wanted, they still would have to provide intensive English instruction to English learners if parents requested it," and "would be required to offer any specific English learner program requested by enough parents." [5]

In summarizing the impact of Proposition 227 and the potential impact of Proposition 58, the LAO noted that Proposition 227 "generally requires public schools to provide English learners with one year of special, intensive English instruction before transitioning those students into other English-only classes." The effect of Proposition 58, the LAO noted, would depend on how parents and school districts respond to it, but, "Over time, bilingual programs could become more common, with some English learners taught in bilingual programs who otherwise would have been taught in English-only programs."[6]

The IGS Poll first asked a standard general question about bilingual education that assessed support for the three main approaches: English immersion, transition to English, and cultural maintenance (allowing bilingual classes throughout high school). The poll also asked a question about whether it was important for California students to learn more than one language. Additionally, the poll asked whether voters supported the repeal of a voter-approved law requiring the state's public schools to educate most English learner students in a sheltered English immersion program for a maximum of one year, one of the key provisions of Proposition 227 that would be repealed by Proposition 58.[7]

Instead of using the ballot label and title and summary for Proposition 58, which were not yet available when our questions were finalized, and which, unlike SB 1174 and the LAO analysis, make no reference to repealing provisions of Proposition 227, we employed an experimental approach that examined whether opinions about the repeal of the sheltered English immersion requirement and waiver provisions varied in response to opposing frames of this issue. The results, therefore, do not speak directly to the distribution of opinion on Proposition 58 as it will be presented to voters in the ballot label. Instead, our study directly gauges what voters think about one of Proposition 227's key provisions; how support varies by race, education, age, and partisanship; whether voters differentiate between dual-immersion programs for English Language Learners and foreign-language instruction; and how much opinions about bilingual education vary depending upon the arguments voters hear for and against it.

One-third of the overall poll sample was asked which mode of bilingual education they preferred—English immersion "right from the start," transition to English "for a transitional period of several years" followed by English-only, and dual-language classes "all the way through high school in order to maintain their native language." [See the appendix for full text of all questions.] We term these three options, respectively, "English only," "transition," and "maintenance." This question showed that a plurality of 43.7 percent of respondents prefers a transitional program, 37.2 percent prefer an English only approach, and only 14.2 percent support allowing dual-language programs all the way through high school. Compared to other ethnic groups, white respondents were clearly more supportive of English only. Forty-four percent of whites preferred English only and 41.2 percent preferred transition to English, while among all other ethnic groups a clear plurality preferred transition to English only.

[4] In language similar to, though not identical to, the LAO analysis, the Legislative Counsel's Digest in SB 1174 notes that "This bill would amend and repeal various provisions of Proposition 227," http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/13-14/bill/sen/sb_1151-1200/sb_1174_bill_20140928_chaptered.pdf, accessed on 8-22-16.

[5] The LAO analysis is at http://www.lao.ca.gov/ballot/2016/Prop58-110816.pdf, accessed on 8-22-16.

[6] http://www.lao.ca.gov/ballot/2016/Prop58-110816.pdf, accessed on 8-22-16.

[7] The Legislative Counsel's Digest of SB 1174 notes that, "The bill would, among other things, delete the sheltered English immersion requirement and waiver provisions," which include the one-year limit referenced in the poll question. The digest goes on to note that the deleted "sheltered English immersion requirement" would be replaced by a requirement that at a minimum schools provide a structured English immersion program and an authorization for parents to choose a "language acquisition program" that best suits their child. "Language acquisition programs" are defined in the bill as including English immersion programs, transitional programs, or dual-language programs, http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/13-14/bill/sen/sb_1151-1200/sb_1174_bill_20140928_chaptered.pdf, accessed on 8-22-16.

Republicans were also far more supportive than Democrats of the English only option, while Democrats were far more supportive of a maintenance program that would potentially allow for dual-language programs throughout high school.

The poll also asked about respondents' beliefs as to the importance of learning a second language fluently before finishing high school. (The question asked about learning a second language "in addition to English," so it is difficult to know if respondents interpreted the question to refer only to native speakers of English or if they also interpreted it to include native speakers of other languages who are seeking to learn English.) Almost two out of three respondents (66.1 percent) agreed that children should learn a second language, while only 17.4 percent disagreed. Almost one in six (15.9 percent) said they neither agreed nor disagreed. Interestingly, partisan differences were relatively muted, with strong majorities of both parties and independents agreeing that students should learn a second language. Majority support also crossed all ethnic groups in the survey.

The third question on bilingual education—explicitly referencing the voters' prior decision in 1998 and asking about the repeal of the requirement and one-year limit for sheltered English immersion programs for English learners—showed a strong preference among voters to "keep the law (continue to require English-only education)." Almost two out of three respondents (64.3 percent) favored retaining the voter-approved provision, though Republicans (84.7 percent) were far stronger in their support of that position than were Democrats (51.3 percent).

Among 18- to 24-year-olds, a minority of only 35.7 percent supported a retention of the sheltered English immersion requirement, while a narrow majority of 50.5 percent favored overturning it. Support for retaining the Prop. 227 provision increased steadily with age, and was highest (79.4 percent) among respondents who were at least 65 years old. A majority of all ethnic groups supported the retention of the limit, although the levels of that support varied from just 51.7 percent among Latinos to 70.5 percent among whites, and generally reflected a lower level of support for the Prop. 227 provision among ethnic minorities than among whites.

The poll also included an experiment in which the precise wording of the question was varied to test the effectiveness of various arguments on both sides of the issue. Support for repeal of the sheltered English immersion requirement was strongest when the question referenced the economic benefits of speaking multiple languages in a globalized economy, although this was offset to a large degree when the question also referenced an antirepeal argument emphasizing the economic value of English fluency.

From this summary, it appears that voters in California both prioritize the learning of English and recognize the value of speaking more than one language. As to the outcome of Proposition 58, the results of this poll suggest that voters' knowledge of the impact on Proposition 227's sheltered English immersion requirement would influence the level of support.

Death Penalty

This fall, California voters will face two competing ballot measures on the death penalty, one that would abolish capital punishment and replace it with a sentence of life without the possibility of parole, and another that would streamline procedures in capital cases to speed up the resolution of those cases.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Rachel Bernhard is a graduate fellow at IGS and a Ph.D. candidate in political science at Berkeley, where she studies the relationship between voter attitudes and the gender gap in politics. Her work focuses in particular on women running for office in California and Oregon. She graduated from Dartmouth College in 2009 with B.A.s in Government and Classical Studies and received her M.A. in Political Science from Berkeley in 2014.

Jack Citrin is the director of IGS. He is also Heller Professor of Political Science at the University, where he has taught since 1969. His writings include *California and the American Tax Revolt* and *American Identity and the Politics of Multiculturalism*. He has written frequently on trust in government, the initiative process in California, immigration and language politics, and the future of national identity in the U.S. and Europe.

Gabriel Lenz is an associate professor of political science at Berkeley and an affiliated faculty member at IGS. His research primarily focuses on voters' ability to control their elected officials. His aim is to further our understanding of when voters succeed in holding politicians accountable, when they fail, and how to help them avoid failures.

Ethan Rarick is the associate director of IGS and the director of the Institute's Robert T. Matsui Center for Politics and Public Service. He is the author of *California Rising: The Life and Times of Pat Brown* and the editor of several books on California, including *Governing California: Politics, Government, and Public Policy in the Golden State*.

Although the measures conflict, voters may support or oppose both if they wish. If both measures pass, the one with more votes would be enacted.

A stark partisan difference emerged on the abolition measure, with 55.1 percent of Democrats supporting it, but only 39.4 percent of independents taking that view, and just 29.8 percent of Republicans. By contrast, there was support across partisan lines for the measure that seeks to speed up resolution of capital cases, with 69.7 percent of Democrats, 81.1 percent of independents, and 85 percent of Republicans.

A majority (60 percent) of African Americans favored abolishing the death penalty, but among all other ethnic groups, most respondents opposed that measure. Support for the death penalty was stronger among older people.

Interestingly, religious differences were reflected in views about abolishing the death penalty, but mostly that difference was related to whether the respondent was or was not religious, rather than to differences among various religious denominations. Among all religious groups there was majority opposition to eliminating the death penalty; only among the self-identified atheists and agnostics did most voters support abolition of capital punishment.

Other Issues

Sanctuary Cities

Responses regarding the Sanctuary Cities policy showed little change from the previous year's IGS Poll, when the same question was asked. Overall, 73.2 percent of respondents opposed the policies, under which local authorities ignore federal requests to detain undocumented immigrants who have been arrested but are about to be released. That majority included 67.4 percent of Democrats, 77.8 percent of independents, and 81.9 percent of Republicans.

Opposition crossed all ethnic categories, and included 63.6 percent of Latino respondents, who might be more likely than other groups to have friends or family members directly affected by such issues. However, it is important to note that the survey was conducted only in English, and that it involved only registered voters, and thus only citizens. Noncitizens or those who cannot speak English could not have been surveyed.

Compared to Latino voters, opposition was even stronger among other ethnic groups, including at least three out of four Asian Americans, African Americans, and whites.

All age groups opposed Sanctuary City policies, although opposition was significantly stronger among older voters, and opposition was also strong among all income and education levels.

Asian-American Voters

The poll intentionally oversampled Asian-American voters, producing an in-depth examination of this crucial California voter segment. The survey's Asian-American sample size of 492 respondents is far larger than is normally included in statewide polls. As a result, Asian Americans represented 16.2 percent of the overall sample size, although in 2014 they constituted only 8.5 percent of California's registered voters.

"We wanted to ensure robust results for the Asian-American population, given its role as an emerging heavyweight of California politics," said IGS Director Jack Citrin.

The proportion of Asian Americans among both registered and actual voters has been increasing steadily for years, and the California Civic Engagement Project has estimated that by 2040, Asian Americans and Latinos will constitute a majority of the state's eligible voters.[8]

Furthermore, Asian Americans are less likely than other groups to register with one of the two major parties, lessening the ability of scholars, campaigns, and policymakers to use partisan affiliation as a reliable guide to likely attitudes. By the 2014 election cycle, for example, 37 percent of Asian-American registered voters were registered as No Party Preference (NPP), the same percentage registered as Democrats and far higher than the share for Republicans. By contrast, Democratic registration far outpaced NPP registration among Latino voters.

In the current poll, Asian-American respondents generally rated their own ideology as being somewhat more moderate than other respondents. Compared to Latino and white respondents, fewer Asian Americans described themselves as having views that are either "extremely conservative" or "extremely liberal." Almost one in three Asian Americans (31.1 percent) described themselves as "moderate," which was slightly lower than Latinos (36.4 percent) and higher than whites (26.8 percent). Similarly, fewer Asian Americans described themselves as "strong Democrats" or "strong Republicans," when compared to Latinos and whites, while slightly more described themselves as "neutral." Asked about their feelings toward President Obama, Asian-American respondents were generally more approving than white respondents, and very similar to Latinos. Among Asian Americans, 72.8 percent said they either "strongly approved" or "somewhat approved" of the president's job performance, compared to 72.6 percent for Latinos and only 53.4 percent for whites. Disapproval of Obama's job performance was 27.1 percent among Asian Americans, 27.4 percent among Latinos, and 46.6 percent among whites. African-American voters, though a relatively small sample size, were more like-

[8] "California's Latino and Asian American Vote," *Policy Brief,* Issue 10, July 2015, California Civic Engagement Project, UC Davis.

ly than the other three groups to describe themselves as liberals or as "strong Democrats," and were significantly more approving of President Obama.

On the issues that will go before voters in November, Asian-American voters expressed views that often were slightly different than other ethnic groups, although not radically so. For example, they were somewhat more skeptical of legalizing marijuana but more supportive of stronger gun control and the least likely to favor abolition of the death penalty.

Two out of three Asian-American voters (66.1 percent) expressed support for the idea of extending the higher income tax rates on the wealthy, a lower share than for black (71.5 percent) and Latino voters, but higher than for whites (62.1 percent). Similarly, Asian Americans (63.6 percent) were less likely than black voters (69.7 percent) to say that their overall level of income taxes is too high, but they were more likely than whites (58.6 percent) or Latinos (58.4 percent) to take that view. Asian Americans were much more supportive of increasing the cigarette tax (84.1 percent) than was any other group (white voters were least likely, at 68.7 percent). Support for the cigarette tax may reflect low rates of smoking among Asian Americans. According to the American Lung Association, only 9.6 percent of Asian-American adults smoke, a rate lower than those of whites, Latinos, or African Americans.[9]

Asian Americans were the most skeptical of legalizing marijuana, although a majority still favored that measure. Support for legalization among Asian Americans was 57.7 percent, compared to 62.1 percent among whites, 69.3 percent among Latinos, and 71.9 percent among black voters.

On the pending gun control measure, Asian Americans were among the most enthusiastic respondents, with 88.6 percent saying they favored the limits. Only African Americans were higher at 91.2 percent. Whites were the least supportive group on this question, although there was still very strong majority support at 77.8 percent.

Abolishing the death penalty was especially unpopular among Asian-American voters. Only about one in three supported the abolition, compared to 44.4 percent of Latinos and 46.5 percent of whites. African Americans were the only group for which a majority supported abolishing the death penalty. Not surprisingly, Asian Americans were strongly supportive of a separate initiative to streamline legal procedures in capital cases; slightly more than three in four Asian-American respondents expressed support.

On a question not related to a pending ballot measure, three out of four Asian-American respondents disapproved of so-called "Sanctuary City" policies, roughly the same percentage as white respondents.

"These results suggest that California's Asian-American voters do not fit into an easily defined ideological box," said IGS Director Jack Citrin. "We need to continue researching Asian-American attitudes and experiences so that we can flesh out this preliminary picture with more data."

Technical Details

The poll was conducted for IGS by Survey Sampling International using online questionnaires between June 29 and July 18, 2016. Questionnaires were presented only in English, and all respondents identified themselves as registered voters. The sample sizes vary for the California politics and policy questions described in this brief. Sample size was 3,044 for the overall survey and ranged from 1,005 to 3,020 for specific questions. Please see the appendix for sample size for specific questions. Responses were weighted to reflect the statewide distribution of the California population by gender, race/ethnicity, education and age.

[9] http://www.lung.org/stop-smoking/smoking-facts/tobacco-use-racial-and-ethnic.html?referrer=https://www.google.com/, accessed on 8-2-16.

Appendix

Prop. 30 Tax Extension

(Each of the following versions of the question was seen by one-third of the total respondents.)

Question version 1:

In 2012 voters increased state income taxes for people earning more than $250,000 a year and sales taxes for everyone. These increases will expire by the end of 2018. A proposed ballot measure would extend the higher state income tax rates but not the higher sales taxes. Would you favor or oppose such a measure?

Question version 2:

In 2012 voters increased state income taxes for people earning more than $250,000 a year and sales taxes for everyone. These increases will expire by the end of 2018. Even though the state has a healthy budget surplus, a proposed ballot measure would extend the higher state income tax rates but not the higher sales taxes. Would you favor or oppose such a measure?

Question version 3:

In 2012 voters increased state income taxes for people earning more than $250,000 a year and sales taxes for everyone. These increases will expire by the end of 2018. Because of the need for funding of state programs, a proposed ballot measure would extend the higher state income tax rates but not the higher sales taxes. Would you favor or oppose such a measure?

Sample Sizes: Version 1: 1,005; Version 2: 1,008; Version 3: 1,007; All Respondents-3,020.

	Question Version 1	Question Version 2	Question Version 3	All Respondents
Favor	68.5%	62.7%	64.8%	65.2%
Oppose	31.5%	37.3%	35.2%	34.8%

By Partisanship – All Respondents

	Democrats	Independents	Republicans
Favor	78%	54.7%	46.2%
Oppose	22%	45.3%	53.8%

By Income – All Respondents

	Less than $40,000	$40,000-$99,999	$100,000+
Favor	69.9%	67.3%	58.7%
Oppose	30.1%	32.7%	41.3%

By Age – All Respondents

	Age 18-24	Age 25-34	Age 35-44	Age 45-64	Age 65+
Favor	71.5%	69.5%	69.8%	62.9%	60%
Oppose	28.5%	30.5%	30.2%	37.1%	40%

By Race/Ethnicity – All Respondents

	Asian	Black	Latino	White
Favor	66.1%	71.5%	70.3%	62.1%
Oppose	33.9%	28.5%	29.7%	37.9%

By Education – All Respondents

	Less than high school	High school degree or equivalent	Some college	Bachelor's degree	Graduate school or degree
Favor	58.2%	60.5%	65.7%	65.4%	68.7%
Oppose	41.8%	39.5%	34.3%	34.6%	31.3%

By Gender – All Respondents

	Female	Male
Favor	65.8%	64.4%
Oppose	34.2%	35.6%

Cigarette Tax Increase

A proposed ballot measure would increase California's cigarette tax by $2 per pack to fund healthcare, anti-smoking, and other programs. The current tax is 87 cents per pack. Would you favor or oppose increasing the tax?

Sample size: 3,020

	Percent
Favor	74.3%
Oppose	25.7%

By Partisanship

	Democrats	Independents	Republicans
Favor	80.5%	70.3%	64.6%
Oppose	19.5%	29.7%	35.4%

By Income

	Less than $40,000	$40,000-$99,999	$100,000+
Favor	70.2%	72.9%	78.5%
Oppose	29.8%	27.1%	21.5%

By Age

	Age 18-24	Age 25-34	Age 35-44	Age 45-64	Age 65+
Favor	84.4%	80.8%	78%	69.2%	70.8%
Oppose	15.6%	19.2%	22%	30.8%	29.2%

By Race/Ethnicity

	Asian	Black	Latino	White
Favor	84.1%	80.4%	80.1%	68.7%
Oppose	15.9%	19.6%	19.9%	31.3%

By Education

	Less than high school	High school degree or equivalent	Some college	Bachelor's degree	Graduate school or degree
Favor	58.1%	68.4%	70.1%	78.8%	80.9%
Oppose	41.9%	31.6%	29.9%	21.2%	19.1%

By Gender

	Female	Male
Favor	76.7%	71.3%
Oppose	23.3%	28.7%

Level of Taxation

Do you consider the amount of federal and state income taxes that you and your family have to pay is too high, about right or too low?

Sample size: 3,020

	Percent
Too High	59.8%
About Right	37.6%
Too Low	2.6%

By Partisanship

	Democrats	Independents	Republicans
Too High	50.8%	66.7%	73.4%
About Right	46%	30.3%	25.0%
Too Low	3.1%	3.1%	1.5%

By Income

	Less than $40,000	$40,000-$99,999	$100,000+
Too High	54.6%	61.2%	62.2%
About Right	43.0%	36.6%	35.0%
Too Low	2.4%	2.2%	2.8%

By Age

	Age 18-24	Age 25-34	Age 35-44	Age 45-64	Age 65+
Too High	49%	56.2%	55.6%	66.1%	60.6%
About Right	49.3%	40.6%	41.2%	31.4%	37.2%
Too Low	1.7%	3.2%	3.2%	2.5%	2.2%

By Race/Ethnicity

	Asian	Black	Latino	White
Too High	63.6%	69.7%	58.4%	58.6%
About Right	34.5%	28.2%	38.6%	38.9%
Too Low	2.0%	2.2%	3.0%	2.4%

By Education

	Less than high school	High school degree or equivalent	Some college	Bachelor's degree	Graduate school or degree
Too High	65.8%	59.4%	61.9%	62.5%	56.3%
About Right	34.2%	36.5%	36.4%	35.5%	40.5%
Too Low	0%	4.1%	1.7%	2.0%	3.2%

By Gender

	Female	Male
Too High	63.2%	56.6%
About Right	34.4%	40.7%
Too Low	2.5%	2.6%

Marijuana Legalization

Do you support or oppose the following statement about politics and public policy? "Marijuana should be legal for adults to purchase and use recreationally, with government regulation similar to the regulation of alcohol."

Sample size: 3,020

	Percent
Support	63.8%
Oppose	36.2%

By Partisanship

	Democrats	Independents	Republicans
Support	73.8%	62.2%	47%
Oppose	26.2%	37.8%	53%

By Income

	Less than $40,000	$40,000-$99,999	$100,000+
Support	67.9%	63.3%	62.2%
Oppose	32.1%	36.7%	37.8%

By Age

	Age 18-24	Age 25-34	Age 35-44	Age 45-64	Age 65+
Support	74.5%	71.3%	65.4%	61.7%	57.8%
Oppose	25.5%	28.7%	34.6%	38.3%	42.2%

By Race/Ethnicity

	Asian	Black	Latino	White
Support	57.7%	71.9%	69.3%	62.1%
Oppose	42.3%	28.1%	30.7%	37.9%

By Education

	Less than high school	High school degree or equivalent	Some college	Bachelor's degree	Graduate school or degree
Support	79.7%	66.2%	65.6%	59.2%	61.2%
Oppose	20.3%	33.8%	34.4%	40.8%	38.8%

By Gender

	Female	Male
Support	63.3%	65.1%
Oppose	36.7%	34.9%

Gun Control

A proposed ballot measure would require people to pass a background check to buy ammunition, require ammunition sales to occur through licensed dealers, and would prohibit large-capacity magazines. Would you favor or oppose such a measure?

Sample size: 3,020

	Percent
Favor	82.2%
Oppose	17.8%

By Partisanship

	Democrats	Independents	Republicans
Favor	92.8%	79.3%	64.9%
Oppose	7.2%	20.7%	35.1%

By Income

	Less than $40,000	$40,000-$99,999	$100,000+
Favor	82.5%	80.6%	82.4%
Oppose	17.5%	19.4%	17.6%

By Age

	Age 18-24	Age 25-34	Age 35-44	Age 45-64	Age 65+
Favor	89.5%	80.5%	82.2%	80.6%	80.6%
Oppose	10.5%	19.5%	17.8%	19.4%	19.4%

By Race/Ethnicity

	Asian	Black	Latino	White
Favor	88.6%	91.2%	85.1%	77.8%
Oppose	11.4%	8.8%	14.9%	22.2%

By Education

	Less than high school	High school degree or equivalent	Some college	Bachelor's degree	Graduate school or degree
Favor	81%	79.1%	79.5%	82.4%	86%
Oppose	19%	20.9%	20.5%	17.6%	14%

By Gender

	Female	Male
Favor	88.5%	74.1%
Oppose	11.5%	25.9%

Bilingual Education – Immersion, Transition, Maintenance

With the country's population changing, there is a lot of talk in the U.S. as a whole and in California about language policy. We'd like you to answer a few questions about these issues. In your opinion, should children who don't speak English when they enter our public schools …

- Have to take their classes only in English so that they have to learn English right from the start
- Be able to take classes in their native language for a transitional period of several years until they learn English and then have to take classes in English only
- Be able to take classes in their native language as well as English all the way through high school in order to maintain their native language
- Not sure

Sample size: 1,018

	Percent
English only	37.2%
Transition	43.7%
Maintenance	14.2%
Not sure	4.9%

By Partisanship

	Democrats	Independents	Republicans
English only	24.9%	49.2%	55.3%
Transition	49.1%	32.9%	37.0%
Maintenance	18.9%	15.1%	5.9%
Not sure	7.0%	2.7%	1.8%

By Income

	Less than $40,000	$40,000-$99,000	$100,000+
English only	34.5%	36.6%	39.7%
Transition	39.2%	43.4%	48.6%
Maintenance	17.5%	15.4%	7.5%
Not sure	8.8%	4.6%	4.2%

By Age

	Age 18-24	Age 25-34	Age 35-44	Age 45-64	Age 65+
English only	15.8%	30.9%	34.6%	46.8%	35.7%
Transition	47.1%	45.2%	43.7%	38.3%	47.4%
Maintenance	33.1%	17.6%	15.7%	9.8%	11.4%
Not sure	4.0%	6.4%	5.9%	5.1%	5.4%

By Race/Ethnicity

	Asian	Black	Latino	White
English only	34.9%	23.0%	23.9%	44.0%
Transition	44.3%	44.3%	46.3%	41.2%
Maintenance	14.7%	14.7%	23.5%	11.4%
Not sure	6.1%	18.1%	6.3%	3.4%

By Education

	Less than high school	High school degree or equivalent	Some college	Bachelor's degree	Graduate school or degree
English only	14.8%	39.5%	36.9%	38.1%	36.1%
Transition	50.4%	37.6%	45%	45%	44.5%
Maintenance	22.7%	17.4%	12.8%	12.7%	14%
Not sure	12.2%	5.5%	5.3%	4.2%	5.4%

By Gender

	Female	Male
English only	34.5%	39.1%
Transition	40.7%	45.9%
Maintenance	17.8%	11.3%
Not sure	7.0%	3.7%

Bilingual Education – Importance of Second Language

Do you agree or disagree? Children in the U.S. should learn a second language, in addition to English, fluently before they finish high school.

Sample size: 2,032

	Percent
Agree strongly	35.2%
Agree somewhat	30.9%
Neither agree nor disagree	15.9%
Disagree somewhat	9.1%
Disagree strongly	8.3%
Not sure	0.6%

By Partisanship

	Democrats	Independents	Republicans
Agree strongly	33%	41.5%	37.6%
Agree somewhat	31.6%	26%	30.7%
Neither agree nor disagree	15.2%	16%	17.1%
Disagree somewhat	10.5%	9%	6.6%
Disagree strongly	9.1%	7.6%	7.1%
Not sure	0.5%	0%	1%

By Income

	Less than $40,000	$40,000-$99,999	$100,000+
Agree strongly	36.1%	33.0%	40.6%
Agree somewhat	27.3%	32.7%	34.0%
Neither agree nor disagree	15.4%	18.4%	12.0%
Disagree somewhat	9.7%	7.7%	8.3%
Disagree strongly	10.5%	7.9%	4.8%
Not sure	1.0%	0.2%	0.3%

By Age

	Age 18-24	Age 25-34	Age 35-44	Age 45-64	Age 65+
Agree strongly	20.4%	29.6%	37.7%	40.0%	36.1%
Agree somewhat	25.4%	35.1%	32.0%	29.5%	33.6%
Neither agree nor disagree	14.4%	17.9%	15.5%	14.9%	16.7%
Disagree somewhat	17.5%	8.8%	6.3%	8.0%	8.4%
Disagree strongly	21.8%	7.9%	7.8%	6.6%	5.1%
Not sure	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%	0.9%	0%

By Race/Ethnicity

	Asian	Black	Latino	White
Agree strongly	29.2%	30%	33.2%	37.7%
Agree somewhat	32.7%	26.7%	30.8%	32.2%
Neither agree nor disagree	18.5%	20.6%	14.0%	15.5%
Disagree somewhat	10.9%	15.2%	9.8%	7.0%
Disagree strongly	7.9%	7.5%	11.9%	6.9%
Not sure	0.7%	0%	0.4%	0.6%

By Education

	Less than high school	High school degree or equivalent	Some college	Bachelor's degree	Graduate school or degree
Agree strongly	23.4%	30.6%	39.8%	35.9%	32.6%
Agree somewhat	27.1%	25.7%	28.9%	32.3%	37.7%
Neither agree nor disagree	13.2%	13.7%	16.4%	19.0%	14.9%
Disagree somewhat	4.5%	16.4%	7.5%	7.5%	8.3%
Disagree strongly	31.8%	11.9%	6.7%	4.9%	6.3%
Not sure	0%	1.7%	0.6%	0.4%	0.1%

By Gender

	Female	Male
Agree strongly	35.9%	34.4%
Agree somewhat	28.5%	34.4%
Neither agree nor disagree	15.1%	16.7%
Disagree somewhat	10.2%	7.5%
Disagree strongly	9.7%	6.5%
Not sure	0.6%	0.6%

Bilingual Education – Sheltered Immersion Requirement

(Each of the following versions of the question was seen by a portion of the sample.)

Version #1

In 1998, California voters approved a law requiring the state's public schools to move students who do not speak English into classes taught only in English after one year. In this November's election, there is a proposal to repeal that law. Some people feel that students who are not English speakers should be able to take some classes in their native language through high school so they can maintain their own culture and language. Others feel that students who are not English speakers should take classes only in English so that we can preserve a common American culture and language. With this in mind, would you favor keeping or repealing the 1998 law that requires English-only education?

- ❍ Repeal the law (do NOT require English-only education)
- ❍ Keep the law (continue to require English-only education)
- ❍ Not Sure

Version #2

In 1998, California voters approved a law requiring the state's public schools to move students who do not speak English into classes taught only in English after one year. In this November's election, there is a proposal to repeal that law. Some people feel that students who are not English speakers should take classes only in English so that we can preserve a common American culture and language. Others feel that students who are not English speakers should be able to take some classes in their native language through high school so they can maintain their own culture and language. With this in mind, would you favor keeping or repealing the 1998 law that requires English-only education?

- ❍ Repeal the law (do NOT require English-only education)
- ❍ Keep the law (continue to require English-only education)
- ❍ Not Sure

Version #3

In 1998, California voters approved a law requiring the state's public schools to move students who do not speak English into classes taught only in English after one year. In this November's election, there is a proposal to repeal that law. Some people feel that students who are not English speakers should be able to take some classes in their native language through high school because speaking multiple languages is a valuable skill in a globalized economy. Others feel that students who are not English speakers should take classes only in English so that we can preserve a common American culture and language. With this in mind, would you favor keeping or repealing the 1998 law that requires English-only education?

- ❍ Repeal the law (do NOT require English-only education)
- ❍ Keep the law (continue to require English-only education)
- ❍ Not Sure

Version #4

In 1998, California voters approved a law requiring the state's public schools to move students who do not speak English into classes taught only in English after one year. In this November's election, there is a proposal to repeal that law. Some people feel that students who are not English speakers should take classes only in English so that we can preserve a common American culture and language. Others feel that students who are not English speakers should be able to take some classes in their native language through high school because speaking multiple languages is a valuable skill in a globalized economy. With this in mind, would you favor keeping or repealing the 1998 law that requires English-only education?

- ❍ Repeal the law (do NOT require English-only education)
- ❍ Keep the law (continue to require English-only education)
- ❍ Not Sure

Version #5

In 1998, California voters approved a law requiring the state's public schools to move students who do not speak English into classes taught only in English after one year. In this November's election, there is a proposal to repeal that law. Some people feel that students who are not English speakers should be able to take some classes in their native language through high school because speaking multiple languages is a valuable skill in a globalized economy. Others feel that students who are not English speakers should take classes only in English because being fluent in English is necessary to get good jobs and get ahead. With this in mind, would you favor keeping or repealing the 1998 law that requires English-only education?

- ❍ Repeal the law (do NOT require English-only education)
- ❍ Keep the law (continue to require English-only education)
- ❍ Not Sure

Version #6

In 1998, California voters approved a law requiring the state's public schools to move students who do not speak English into classes taught only in English after one year. In this November's election, there is a proposal to repeal that law. Some people feel that students who are not English speakers should take classes only in English because being fluent in English is necessary to get good jobs and get ahead. Others feel that students who are not English speakers should be able to take some classes in their native language through high school because speaking multiple languages is a valuable skill in a globalized economy. With this in mind, would you favor keeping or repealing the 1998 law that requires English-only education?

- ❍ Repeal the law (do NOT require English-only education)
- ❍ Keep the law (continue to require English-only education)
- ❍ Not Sure

Version #7

In 1998, California voters approved a law requiring the state's public schools to move students who do not speak English into classes taught only in English after one year. In this November's election, there is a proposal to repeal that law. Some people feel that students who are not English speakers should be able to take some classes in their native language through high school so they can maintain their own culture and language. Others feel that students who are not English speakers should take classes only in English because being fluent in English is necessary to get good jobs and get ahead. With this in mind, would you favor keeping or repealing the 1998 law that requires English-only education?

- ❍ Repeal the law (do NOT require English-only education)
- ❍ Keep the law (continue to require English-only education)
- ❍ Not Sure

Version #8

In 1998, California voters approved a law requiring the state's public schools to move students who do not speak English into classes taught only in English after one year. In this November's election, there is a proposal to repeal that law. Some people feel that students who are not English speakers should take classes only in English because being fluent in English is necessary to get good jobs and get ahead. Others feel that students who are not English speakers should be able to take some classes in their native language through high school so they can maintain their own culture and language. With this in mind, would you favor keeping or repealing the 1998 law that requires English-only education?

- ❍ Repeal the law (do NOT require English-only education)
- ❍ Keep the law (continue to require English-only education)
- ❍ Not Sure

Sample size for each version of the question ranged from 208 to 276. Total sample – 2,056.

Question Version									
	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	All
Repeal	15.5%	20%	32.1%	31.7%	18.9%	23.1%	18.7%	20.2%	22.2%
Keep law	69.5%	69.7%	53.7%	50.3%	67.2%	63.0%	67.1%	66.9%	64.3%
Not sure	15.1%	10.4%	14.3%	18%	13.9%	13.9%	14.2%	12.9%	13.5%

By Partisanship – All Respondents

	Democrats	Independents	Republicans
Repeal	31.2%	13.9%	8.7%
Keep law	51.3%	72.1%	84.7%
Not sure	17.5%	14.0%	6.6%

By Income – All Respondents

	<$40,000	$40,000-$99,999	$100,000+
Repeal the law	23.1%	22.9%	19.1%
Keep the law	59.8%	65.2%	69.6%
Not sure	17.0%	11.9%	11.3%

By Age – All Respondents

	Age 18-24	Age 25-34	Age 35-44	Age 45-64	Age 65+
Repeal	50.5%	29.9%	25.3%	15.3%	13.4%
Keep law	35.7%	54.3%	56.9%	69.2%	79.4%
Not sure	13.8%	15.8%	17.9%	15.5%	7.3%

By Race/Ethnicity – All Respondents

	Asian	Black	Latino	White
Repeal	23.3%	20.1%	32.3%	17.6%
Keep law	61.7%	61.3%	51.7%	70.5%
Not sure	14.9%	18.6%	16.1%	11.8%

By Education – All Respondents

	Less than high school	High school degree or equivalent	Some college	Bachelor's degree	Graduate school or degree
Repeal	20.2%	26.5%	20.1%	21.2%	22.2%
Keep law	74.9%	55.4%	65.7%	64.7%	64.7%
Not sure	4.8%	18.0%	14.2%	14.1%	13.1%

By Gender – All Respondents

	Female	Male
Repeal	25.1%	18.6%
Keep law	60.7%	67.7%
Not sure	14.2%	13.6%

Death Penalty – Abolition

A proposed ballot measure would repeal the death penalty and replace it with a sentence of life in prison without parole. Would you favor or oppose such a measure?

Sample size: 1,506

	Percent
Favor	45.1%
Oppose	54.9%

By Partisanship

	Democrats	Independents	Republicans
Favor	55.1%	39.4%	29.8%
Oppose	44.9%	60.6%	70.2%

By Income

	Less than $40,000	$40,000-$99,999	$100,000+
Favor	49.4%	44.8%	45.4%
Oppose	50.6%	55.2%	54.6%

By Age

	Age 18-24	Age 25-34	Age 35-44	Age 45-64	Age 65+
Favor	49.1%	50.2%	47.8%	41.4%	46.9%
Oppose	50.9%	49.8%	52.2%	58.6%	53.1%

By Race/Ethnicity

	Asian	Black	Latino	White
Favor	36.5%	60%	44.4%	46.5%
Oppose	63.5%	40%	55.6%	53.5%

By Education

	Less than high school	High school degree or equivalent	Some college	Bachelor's degree	Graduate school or degree
Favor	44.9%	41.6%	42.9%	44.7%	53.3%
Oppose	55.1%	58.4%	57.1%	55.3%	46.7%

By Gender

	Female	Male
Favor	47.2%	44.1%
Oppose	52.8%	55.9%

By Religion

	Evangelical Protestant	Non-Evangelical Protestant	Catholic	Jewish	Other Religions	Atheist, Agnostic, None
Favor	35.9%	42.9%	46.8%	45.7%	44.2%	50.8%
Oppose	64.1%	57.1%	53.2%	54.3%	55.8%	49.2%

Death Penalty – Streamlining

A proposed ballot measure would streamline procedures in death-penalty cases to speed up resolution of the cases. Would you favor or oppose such a measure?

Sample size: 1,512

	Percent
Favor	75.7%
Oppose	24.3%

By Partisanship

	Democrats	Independents	Republicans
Favor	69.7%	81.1%	85%
Oppose	30.3%	18.9%	15%

By Income

	Less than $40,000	$40,000-$99,999	$100,000+
Favor	74.1%	75.3%	78.1%
Oppose	25.9%	24.7%	21.9%

By Age

	Age 18-24	Age 25-34	Age 35-44	Age 45-64	Age 65+
Favor	55%	70.1%	75.7%	79%	83.3%
Oppose	45%	29.9%	24.3%	21%	16.7%

By Race/Ethnicity

	Asian	Black	Latino	White
Favor	76.6%	74.1%	72.5%	76.9%
Oppose	23.4%	25.9%	27.5%	23.1%

By Education

	Less than high school	High school degree or equivalent	Some college	Bachelor's degree	Graduate school or degree
Favor	76.9%	71.8%	77.9%	75.5%	73.4%
Oppose	23.1%	28.2%	22.1%	24.5%	26.6%

By Gender

	Female	Male
Favor	74%	77.4%
Oppose	26%	22.6%

By Religion

	Evangelical Protestant	Non-Evangelical Protestant	Catholic	Jewish	Other Religions	Atheist, Agnostic, None
Favor	82.0%	82.4%	76.3%	83.7%	74.6%	70.1%
Oppose	18.0%	17.6%	23.7%	16.3%	25.4%	29.9%

Sanctuary Cities

Under California law, local jurisdictions like cities and counties can ignore requests from federal authorities to detain illegal immigrants who have been arrested and are about to be released. Do you believe that local authorities should be able to ignore a federal request to hold an illegal immigrant who has been detained?

1. Yes, local authorities should be able to ignore these federal requests.
2. No, local authorities should not be able to ignore these federal requests.

Sample size: 3,020

	Total
Yes	26.8%
No	73.2%

By Partisanship

	Democrats	Independents	Republicans
Yes	32.6%	22.2%	18.1%
No	67.4%	77.8%	81.9%

By Income

	Less than $40,000	$40,000-$99,999	$100,000+
Yes	26.7%	28.9%	24.1%
No	73.3%	71.1%	75.9%

By Age

	Age 18-24	Age 25-34	Age 35-44	Age 45-64	Age 65+
Yes	38%	40.3%	36.1%	20.1%	17.7%
No	62%	59.7%	63.9%	79.9%	82.3%

By Race/Ethnicity

	Asian	Black	Latino	White
Yes	25.2%	19.8%	36.4%	24.1%
No	74.8%	80.2%	63.6%	75.9%

By Education

	Less than high school	High school degree or equivalent	Some college	Bachelor's degree	Graduate school or degree
Yes	27.5%	29.9%	24.9%	26.4%	26.1%
No	72.5%	70.1%	75.1%	73.6%	73.9%

By Gender

	Female	Male
Yes	24.6%	29.3%
No	75.4%	70.7%

Ideological Scale

People often talk about politics in the terms "Liberal" and "Conservative." Where would you place yourself on this scale?

Sample size: 3,015

	Asian	Black	Latino	White
Extremely Conservative	1.0%	1.1%	2.7%	6.6%
Conservative	9.4%	4.2%	7.7%	16.2%
Slightly Conservative	14.7%	15.4%	10.6%	11.8%
Moderate	31.1%	27.6%	36.4%	26.8%
Slightly Liberal	14.7%	13.3%	12.0%	10.6%
Liberal	21.8%	26.0%	20.6%	19.8%
Extremely Liberal	7.3%	12.4%	10.1%	8.2%

Partisan Scale

Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Democrat, a Republican, an independent, or something else?

1. [If Democrat is selected] Would you consider yourself a strong Democrat or a not very strong Democrat?
2. [If Republican is selected] Would you consider yourself a strong Republican or a not very strong Republican?
3. [If independent is selected] Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican Party or to the Democratic Party?

Sample size: 2,877

	Asian	Black	Latino	White
Strong Democrat	24.0%	50.4%	35.0%	24.1%
Slightly Democratic	27.7%	22.5%	26.0%	16.6%
Lean Democratic	10.5%	9.3%	7.0%	9.0%
Neutral	8.9%	10.5%	7.9%	7.1%
Lean Republican	7.2%	2.6%	6.3%	8.7%
Slightly Republican	14.8%	3.9%	9.7%	15.7%
Strong Republican	7.0%	0.8%	8.2%	18.9%

Presidential Approval

Do you approve or disapprove of the way Barack Obama is handling his job as president?

Sample size: 1,645

	Asian	Black	Latino	White
Strongly approve	24.4%	53.0%	31.9%	23.4%
Somewhat approve	48.4%	31.1%	40.7%	30.0%
Somewhat disapprove	12.8%	11.8%	11.9%	14.2%
Strongly disapprove	14.3%	4.1%	15.5%	32.4%