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## 1. COMPLETE BEFORE AND AFTER RESPONSES, WITH MEANS
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Attitude Change Results (** $p<.01,{ }^{*} p<.05,+p<.10$; Valid percentages are reported for valid responses. Raw percentages are reported for DK/NA responses.)

|  | T2 | T3 | T3-T2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. To begin with, all in all, on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "extremely poorly", 10 is "extremely well," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how well or poorly would you say the system of democracy in California works these days? | 0.406 | 0.475 | 0.069** |
| 0-4 | 61.3 | 47.0 |  |
| , | 17.9 | 14.4 |  |
| 6-10 | 20.8 | 38.7 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (16) | (12.1) |  |
| 2. On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "extremely undesirable", 10 is "extremely desirable," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how desirable or undesirable would you say each of the following is? <br> a. Creating a formal review process to allow an initiative's proponents to amend an initiative following public input | 0.609 | 0.692 | 0.084** |
| 0-4 | 21.6 | 15.8 |  |
| 5 | 19.0 | 8.6 |  |
| 6-10 | 59.3 | 75.7 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (9.2) | (1.5) |  |
| b. Allowing the Legislature to remove an initiative from the ballot by enacting it into law | 0.442 | 0.449 | 0.012 |
| 0-4 | 49.5 | 48.6 |  |
| 5 | 13.4 | 16.8 |  |
| 6-10 | 37.2 | 34.6 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (9.7) | (3.4) |  |
| c. Allowing a simple majority of the State Legislature to place a countermeasure to an already qualified initiative on the ballot next to that initiative | 0.423 | 0.389 | -0.035* |
| 0-4 | 50.1 | 56.9 |  |
| 5 | 17.2 | 12.9 |  |
| 6-10 | 32.6 | 30.2 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (8.5) | (1.9) |  |
| d. Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a public review and the agreement of the initiative's proponents | 0.467 | 0.421 | -0.049* |
| 0-4 | 44.0 | 50.6 |  |
| 5 | 13.5 | 12.5 |  |
| 6-10 | 42.6 | 36.8 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (8.3) | (1.2) |  |
| e. Allowing the Legislature to amend an initiative that has already passed, subject to a two-thirds vote, even if an initiative's proponents do not agree with the amendment | 0.346 | 0.283 | -0.065** |
| 0-4 | 61.2 | 72.6 |  |
| 5 | 14.7 | 9.2 |  |
| 6-10 | 24.2 | 18.2 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (7.5) | (2.7) |  |
| f. Allowing an initiative's proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot | 0.556 | 0.613 | 0.059** |
| 0-4 | 31.6 | 26.1 |  |
| 5 | 21.0 | 16.8 |  |
| 6-10 | 47.3 | 56.9 |  |


| (DK/NA) | (8.7) | (3.4) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| g. Requiring all ballot measures that require new expenditures to indicate how they will be paid for | 0.843 | 0.806 | -0.034** |
| 0-4 | 5.2 | 8.7 |  |
| 5 | 6.3 | 6.8 |  |
| 6-10 | 88.6 | 84.5 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (6.8) | (3.9) |  |
| h. Requiring the ballot pamphlet to provide an analysis by the Legislative Analyst of how new initiative programs will likely be paid for | 0.826 | 0.857 | 0.031* |
| 0-4 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |
| 5 | 7.2 | 4.5 |  |
| 6-10 | 86.6 | 91.4 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (6.1) | (2.2) |  |
| i. Making the vote threshold needed to pass an initiative the same as any vote threshold that the initiative itself requires of the public in the future | 0.677 | 0.697 | 0.018 |
| 0-4 | 13.2 | 13.8 |  |
| 5 | 20.7 | 19.0 |  |
| 6-10 | 66.3 | 67.2 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (18.9) | (8.3) |  |
| j. Publishing the top five contributors for and against each ballot measure in the ballot pamphlet | 0.815 | 0.885 | $0.072^{* *}$ |
| 0-4 | 8.4 | 4.7 |  |
| 5 | 9.2 | 4.0 |  |
| 6-10 | 82.4 | 91.3 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (7.3) | (2.2) |  |
| k. Increasing the number of Assembly districts from 80 to 120 | 0.622 | 0.653 | 0.031+ |
| 0-4 | 22.8 | 21.0 |  |
| 5 | 16.7 | 16.4 |  |
| 6-10 | 60.5 | 62.6 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (12.9) | (3.9) |  |
| I. electing more than one representative from each assembly and senate district with the winners receiving seats proportional to votes | 0.528 | 0.537 | 0.007 |
| 0-4 | 33.8 | 34.6 |  |
| 5 | 18.2 | 16.6 |  |
| 6-10 | 48.0 | 48.9 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (14.8) | (6.6) |  |
| m. Replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house of 120 members | 0.439 | 0.469 | 0.030 |
| 0-4 | 42.7 | 43.0 |  |
| 5 | 25.3 | 14.2 |  |
| 6-10 | 32.0 | 42.7 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (13.6) | (2.7) |  |
| n. Making the State Legislature part-time and paying legislators parttime salaries | 0.505 | 0.353 | $-0.154^{*}$ |
| 0-4 | 41.8 | 63.9 |  |
| 5 | 12.9 | 9.1 |  |
| 6-10 | 45.3 | 26.9 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (11.7) | (1.7) |  |
| o. Reducing the length of the state legislative session and requiring legislators to spend more time in their districts | 0.620 | 0.538 | -0.083** |
| 0-4 | 24.0 | 35.6 |  |
| 5 | 18.7 | 18.2 |  |
| 6-10 | 57.4 | 46.2 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (9.0) | (1.2) |  |
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| p. Allowing voters to rank the candidates in order of preference, so that the winner can be decided without a second election | 0.614 | 0.583 | -0.031+ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0-4 | 26.2 | 30.1 |  |
| 5 | 12.7 | 12.5 |  |
| 6-10 | 61.0 | 57.6 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (8.3) | (4.6) |  |
| q. Lengthening Assembly terms from 2 years to 4, and Senate terms from 4 years to 6 | 0.501 | 0.774 | $0.277^{* *}$ |
| 0-4 | 40.4 | 10.9 |  |
| 5 | 14.2 | 8.4 |  |
| 6-10 | 45.5 | 80.7 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (9.2) | (1.9) |  |
| r. Requiring economic impact analyses of major legislation before passage | 0.824 | 0.837 | 0.012 |
| 0-4 | 3.5 | 4.8 |  |
| 5 | 8.2 | 5.3 |  |
| 6-10 | 88.5 | 89.8 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (7.8) | (2.2) |  |
| s. Establishing clear goals for each government program and assessing whether progress is being made toward these goals at least once every ten years | 0.806 | 0.847 | 0.040** |
| 0-4 | 5.6 | 4.4 |  |
| 5 | 8.8 | 5.9 |  |
| 6-10 | 85.7 | 89.7 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (6.6) | (1.2) |  |
| t. Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to adopt two-year instead of one-year budgets | 0.617 | 0.717 | 0.100** |
| 0-4 | 18.8 | 13.3 |  |
| 5 | 25.3 | 14.8 |  |
| 6-10 | 56.0 | 72.1 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (11.9) | (2.9) |  |
| u. Requiring the Governor and the Legislature to publish three and five year budget projections prior to the budget vote each year | 0.736 | 0.777 | 0.042** |
| 0-4 | 7.5 | 7.7 |  |
| 5 | 12.1 | 10.0 |  |
| 6-10 | 80.3 | 82.7 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (10.0) | (2.9) |  |
| v. Transferring from the state to local governments control and financing of services provided at the local level and requiring minimum standards for delivering them | 0.635 | 0.697 | 0.066** |
| 0-4 | 17.1 | 13.1 |  |
| 5 | 16.1 | 13.7 |  |
| 6-10 | 66.7 | 73.2 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (9.5) | (2.4) |  |
| w. Allowing local governments to raise taxes for local services in exchange for increased coordination of service delivery and public reporting of performance | 0.542 | 0.621 | 0.080** |
| 0-4 | 30.7 | 21.6 |  |
| 5 | 15.2 | 15.3 |  |
| 6-10 | 54.2 | 63.1 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (9.0) | (3.4) |  |
| x. Creating a stable source of funds for regional priorities by dedicating a portion of tax revenue from economic growth to those priorities | 0.659 | 0.667 | 0.010 |
| 0-4 | 11.6 | 11.0 |  |


| 5 | 21.6 | 21.1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6-10 | 66.7 | 67.9 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (14.6) | (7.0) |  |
| y. Direct any savings resulting from successful local management of state resources to those local governments, in exchange for monitoring their own performance and being accountable and innovative in their operations | 0.718 | 0.721 | 0.003 |
| 0-4 | 12.7 | 11.9 |  |
| 5 | 12.8 | 11.5 |  |
| 6-10 | 74.4 | 76.7 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (9.0) | (3.2) |  |
| z. Requiring state and local governments to identify policy goals and publish their progress toward meeting them | 0.811 | 0.841 | 0.028** |
| 0-4 | 4.5 | 2.9 |  |
| 5 | 6.8 | 5.0 |  |
| 6-10 | 88.8 | 92.0 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (6.8) | (1.9) |  |
| aa. Requiring legislation creating new programs that cost $\$ 25$ million or more to indicate how they will be paid for | 0.850 | 0.851 | -0.001 |
| 0-4 | 4.2 | 4.7 |  |
| 5 | 5.2 | 5.2 |  |
| 6-10 | 90.7 | 90.0 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (6.3) | (1.9) |  |
| ab. Requiring legislation creating tax cuts that cost $\$ 25$ million or more to indicate how they will be paid for | 0.800 | 0.812 | 0.009 |
| 0-4 | 10.1 | 7.9 |  |
| 5 | 6.3 | 7.6 |  |
| 6-10 | 83.5 | 84.6 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (7.0) | (3.6) |  |
| ac. Requiring legislation creating new programs or tax cuts that cost $\$ 25$ million or more to indicate how they will be paid for | 0.800 | 0.830 | 0.029* |
| 0-4 | 7.8 | 5.6 |  |
| 5 | 8.1 | 6.5 |  |
| 6-10 | 84.2 | 87.8 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (6.8) | (2.7) |  |
| ad. Requiring that one-time revenue spikes only be spent on one-time projects, paying off debt, and filling the state rainy-day fund | 0.777 | 0.803 | 0.020+ |
| 0-4 | 8.0 | 9.3 |  |
| 5 | 11.9 | 6.8 |  |
| 6-10 | 79.9 | 84.1 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (12.6) | (2.9) |  |
| ae. Increasing the size of the State's rainy-day fund from $5 \%$ to $10 \%$ of the State budget | 0.692 | 0.710 | 0.014 |
| 0-4 | 13.8 | 14.3 |  |
| 5 | 20.8 | 18.1 |  |
| 6-10 | 65.4 | 67.7 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (12.4) | (4.9) |  |
| af. Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while reducing the sales tax rate | 0.447 | 0.497 | 0.049* |
| 0-4 | 44.8 | 40.3 |  |
| 5 | 17.2 | 14.3 |  |
| 6-10 | 38.1 | 45.4 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (9.5) | (1.7) |  |
| ag. Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while keeping the current sales tax rate | 0.332 | 0.312 | -0.022 |
| 0-4 | 60.7 | 69.6 |  |
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| 5 | 15.3 | 10.0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6-10 | 24.0 | 20.6 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (9.7) | (2.9) |  |
| ah. Limiting the current California state income tax deduction for home mortgage interest payments to $\$ 25,000$ per year | 0.494 | 0.507 | 0.012 |
| 0-4 | 37.1 | 39.9 |  |
| 5 | 20.5 | 16.3 |  |
| 6-10 | 42.4 | 43.8 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (18.2) | (7.5) |  |
| ai. Reassessing non-residential property more frequently than now | 0.558 | 0.697 | 0.139** |
| 0-4 | 27.2 | 15.7 |  |
| 5 | 20.6 | 12.4 |  |
| 6-10 | 52.4 | 71.9 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (15.0) | (2.2) |  |
| aj. Reassessing all property values more frequently while adjusting the current property tax exemption for inflation to about $\$ 28,000$ and allowing the exemption to rise with property values going forward | 0.433 | 0.404 | -0.030 |
| 0-4 | 40.0 | 47.8 |  |
| 5 | 25.4 | 19.3 |  |
| 6-10 | 34.6 | 32.9 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (23.5) | (12.1) |  |
| ak. Allowing local electorates to raise the property tax rate above the current $1 \%$ rate cap | 0.345 | 0.352 | 0.007 |
| 0-4 | 61.9 | 58.8 |  |
| 5 | 10.6 | 12.6 |  |
| 6-10 | 27.6 | 28.6 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (12.6) | (3.4) |  |
| al. Lowering local vote requirement to adopt taxes dedicated to specific purposes, to a simple majority so that it is the same as the vote requirement to adopt taxes for general purposes | 0.486 | 0.483 | -0.001 |
| 0-4 | 38.1 | 40.8 |  |
| 5 | 16.3 | 16.3 |  |
| 6-10 | 45.8 | 42.9 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (11.9) | (3.2) |  |
| am. Decreasing the super-majority vote required in the Legislature to raise taxes (about 67\%) to 55\% | 0.385 | 0.489 | $0.106^{* *}$ |
| 0-4 | 59.1 | 42.5 |  |
| 5 | 9.4 | 7.8 |  |
| 6-10 | 31.6 | 49.9 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (9.5) | (2.9) |  |
| 3. If the Legislature is allowed to amend an initiative that has already passed, by what sort of majority should it be able to do so? | 0.774 | 0.782 | 0.008 |
| A simple majority (50\% plus 1) | 13.2 | 8.9 |  |
| 55\% | 17.8 | 26.4 |  |
| A two-thirds majority | 69.1 | 64.7 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (26.1) | (19.1) |  |
| 4. Some people think that the Legislature should contain fewer Legislators, even if that means that each Legislator represents more people. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that each Legislator should represent fewer people, even if that means that the Legislature contains more Legislators. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4, and of | 0.659 | 0.764 | 0.059** |


| course other people have opinions at other points between 1 and 7 . Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that? |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fewer legislators (1-3) | 19.2 | 9.6 |  |
| Exactly in the middle (4) | 23.2 | 19.5 |  |
| More legislators (5-7) | 57.6 | 70.9 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (10.2) | (3.2) |  |
| 5. On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "as much as could reasonably be expected," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much or little would you say the California State Legislature is able to get important things done? | 0.346 | 0.354 | 0.008 |
| 0-4 | 67.5 | 69.2 |  |
| 5 | 15.9 | 10.3 |  |
| 6-10 | 16.6 | 20.4 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (6.8) | (1.5) |  |
| 6. On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "completely", and 5 is exactly in the middle, to what extent is the ability of the State Legislature to get things done affected by tensions between the political parties? | 0.646 | 0.683 | 0.031* |
| 0-4 | 27.7 | 21.7 |  |
| 5 | 8.5 | 5.9 |  |
| 6-10 | 63.7 | 72.5 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (6.3) | (1.5) |  |
| 7. And, on another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is completely at the local level, 10 is completely at the State level, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much decision-making authority should there be at the local level versus the State level? | 0.467 | 0.471 | 0.005 |
| 0-4 | 42.2 | 43.3 |  |
| 5 | 31.3 | 29.7 |  |
| 6-10 | 26.5 | 27.0 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (6.8) | (1.9) |  |
| 8. And, on the same scale, how much taxation power should there be at the local level versus State level? | 0.498 | 0.508 | 0.010 |
| 0-4 | 33.7 | 33.2 |  |
| 5 | 39.1 | 32.5 |  |
| 6-10 | 27.2 | 34.6 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (8.7) | (2.9) |  |
| 9. On the same scale, where would you say the most important public policy decisions should be made? | 0.554 | 0.570 | 0.016 |
| 0-4 | 26.1 | 25.8 |  |
| 5 | 29.7 | 26.3 |  |
| 6-10 | 44.3 | 48.0 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (6.8) | (1.2) |  |
| 10. On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "completely by voters in referendums", 10 is "completely by the State Legislature", and 5 is exactly in the middle, how many of the State's major decisions should be made by voters in referendums versus by the State Legislature? | 0.547 | 0.547 | 0.000 |
| 0-4 | 31.1 | 28.9 |  |
| 5 | 24.3 | 26.5 |  |
| 6-10 | 44.6 | 44.8 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (10.2) | (2.9) |  |
| 11. Some people think that decisions made at the local level reflect the will of the local community more closely than decisions made at the state level. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1.Other people think that decisions made at the local level are more dominated by powerful special interests than decisions made at | 0.465 | 0.408 | -0.027** |
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the state level. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4 , and of course other people have opinions at other points between 1 and 7 . Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that?

| Reflect local community (1-3) |
| ---: |
| Exactly in the middle (4) |
| Dominated by special interests (5-7) |
| 12 (DK/NA) | many dollars would you say are wasted? Please write a number between 0 and 100.

13. How strongly would you agree or disagree that replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house would...
a. make it easier to pass important legislation

| Agree strongly (1) | 17.3 | 24.6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agree somewhat | 34.8 | 38.1 |  |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 19.7 | 15.3 |  |
| Disagree somewhat | 16.7 | 13.6 |  |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 11.5 | 8.4 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (11.4) | (5.1) |  |
| b. deprive the system of important checks and balances | 0.647 | 0.637 | -0.010 |
| Agree strongly (1) | 31.4 | 29.1 |  |
| Agree somewhat | 27.0 | 29.1 |  |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 19.4 | 13.8 |  |
| Disagree somewhat | 13.1 | 18.4 |  |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 9.0 | 9.7 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (11.2) | (4.9) |  |
| 14. And, how strongly would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about making the State Legislature part-time and paying State Legislators part-time salaries? <br> a. Part-time legislators will tend to represent their districts more closely. | 0.498 | 0.402 | -0.098** |
| Agree strongly (1) | 15.9 | 9.9 |  |
| Agree somewhat | 27.0 | 22.1 |  |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 17.5 | 16.1 |  |
| Disagree somewhat | 20.6 | 25.3 |  |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 19.0 | 26.6 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (8.3) | (2.2) |  |
| b. Part-time legislators will be less likely to be career politicians. | 0.696 | 0.659 | -0.037* |
| Agree strongly (1) | 30.4 | 25.4 |  |
| Agree somewhat | 41.0 | 41.7 |  |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 11.6 | 11.9 |  |
| Disagree somewhat | 9.5 | 11.4 |  |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 7.4 | 9.6 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (8.3) | (1.7) |  |
| c. Part-time legislators will tend to be more open to corruption. | 0.448 | 0.494 | $0.047^{* *}$ |
| Agree strongly (1) | 9.7 | 11.3 |  |
| Agree somewhat | 17.2 | 20.4 |  |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 33.8 | 34.0 |  |


| Disagree somewhat | 21.9 | 21.2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 17.5 | 13.1 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (12.4) | (3.6) |  |
| d. Part-time legislators will tend to be less well informed about policy issues. | 0.525 | 0.615 | 0.090** |
| Agree strongly (1) | 14.9 | 24.3 |  |
| Agree somewhat | 30.1 | 29.8 |  |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 19.5 | 19.9 |  |
| Disagree somewhat | 20.5 | 15.6 |  |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 14.9 | 10.4 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (9.0) | (2.2) |  |
| 15. And how strongly would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the length of legislative terms? <br> a. Increasing State Legislators' terms will make them less responsive to their districts. | 0.502 | 0.324 | -0.175** |
| Agree strongly (1) | 11.4 | 3.7 |  |
| Agree somewhat | 29.2 | 13.8 |  |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 20.7 | 16.8 |  |
| Disagree somewhat | 26.3 | 38.8 |  |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 12.5 | 26.9 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (8.5) | (1.7) |  |
| b. Increasing State Legislators' terms will let them spend less time fundraising and campaigning and more time legislating. | 0.667 | 0.786 | 0.119** |
| Agree strongly (1) | 25.4 | 42.6 |  |
| Agree somewhat | 42.3 | 39.4 |  |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 13.2 | 9.2 |  |
| Disagree somewhat | 11.1 | 5.2 |  |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 7.9 | 3.5 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (8.3) | (2.7) |  |
| 16. Next we'd like to get your ratings of performance of some California political leaders and institutions. On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is completely dissatisfied, 10 is completely satisfied, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with each of the following in office? <br> a. Arnold Schwarzenegger | 0.276 | 0.268 | -0.008 |
| 0-4 | 75.0 | 74.5 |  |
| 5 | 12.0 | 13.5 |  |
| 6-10 | 13.0 | 12.2 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (6.8) | (3.2) |  |
| b. Jerry Brown | 0.528 | 0.567 | 0.039** |
| 0-4 | 31.2 | 25.5 |  |
| 5 | 19.8 | 20.8 |  |
| 6-10 | 48.9 | 53.7 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (11.7) | (7.8) |  |
| c. California State Senate | 0.325 | 0.331 | 0.005 |
| 0-4 | 69.2 | 68.4 |  |
| 5 | 18.9 | 18.4 |  |
| 6-10 | 11.9 | 13.2 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (16.5) | (7.5) |  |
| d. California State Assembly | 0.326 | 0.332 | 0.005 |
| 0-4 | 67.9 | 70.9 |  |
| 5 | 19.7 | 16.1 |  |
| 6-10 | 12.4 | 13.0 |  |
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| (DK/NA) | (13.8) | (6.8) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| e. California State Legislature | 0.308 | 0.322 | 0.014 |
| 0-4 | 71.2 | 70.5 |  |
| 5 | 18.9 | 17.6 |  |
| 6-10 | 9.9 | 11.9 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (13.8) | (6.3) |  |
| f. California's initiative/referendum process | 0.422 | 0.501 | 0.078** |
| 0-4 | 50.1 | 37.4 |  |
| 5 | 20.9 | 18.6 |  |
| 6-10 | 29.0 | 44.0 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (11.9) | (3.4) |  |
| g. California's State government | 0.320 | 0.356 | 0.037** |
| 0-4 | 71.9 | 64.5 |  |
| 5 | 15.6 | 18.8 |  |
| 6-10 | 12.5 | 16.8 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (8.5) | (1.9) |  |
| h. Your city/town and county's government | 0.502 | 0.549 | 0.047** |
| 0-4 | 37.3 | 28.6 |  |
| 5 | 19.3 | 19.4 |  |
| 6-10 | 43.4 | 52.0 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (8.3) | (2.4) |  |
| i. California's local governments generally | 0.463 | 0.511 | 0.049** |
| 0-4 | 39.0 | 30.3 |  |
| 5 | 29.2 | 32.4 |  |
| 6-10 | 31.9 | 37.4 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (15.3) | (10.2) |  |
| 17. Next, we'd like to get your feelings toward some of California political parties, offices, and institutions, using what is sometimes called a "feeling thermometer." Ratings between 50 degrees and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorable or warm toward a party, person, or institution. Ratings between 0 degrees and 50 degrees mean that you feel unfavorable or cold toward it. Ratings at exactly 50 degrees mean you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward it. If you don't know the party, person, or institution well enough to rate it, just bubble in "can't say." <br> a. Democratic party | 51.58 | 51.08 | -0.505 |
| (DK/NA) |  |  |  |
| b. Republican party | 38.38 | 38.34 | -0.040 |
| (DK/NA) |  |  |  |
| 18. Some people think that local communities should be able to decide their own taxes and services, even if that means big differences between communities. Suppose these people are at one end of a 1 -to7 scale, at point 1.Other people think that taxes and services should be the same throughout the state, even if that means less local control. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, at point 7 . People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4 . Where would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any opinion about that? | 0.514 | 0.508 | 0.036 |


| Local communities (1-3) | 39.9 | 42.3 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Exactly in the middle (4) | 20.4 | 20.0 |  |
| Same throughout the state (5-7) | 39.8 | 37.7 |  |
| 19. Some people think that government should provide certain benefits <br> and services, even if that means higher taxes. Suppose these people <br> are at one end of a 1-to-7 scale, at point 1. Other people think that <br> government should lower taxes, even if that means reduced benefits <br> and services. Suppose these people are at the other end of the scale, <br> at point 7. People who are exactly in the middle are at point 4. Where <br> would you place yourself on this scale, or wouldn't you have any <br> opinion about that? | 0.474 | 0.409 | $-0.084^{* *}$ |
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23. Here are some things that people find more or less important for themselves or society to have. On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is extremely unimportant, 10 is extremely important, and 5 is exactly in the middle, how important or unimportant would you say each of the following is to you?
a. Seeing to it that everyone has equal opportunities

| 0-4 | 10.5 | 11.5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | 8.5 | 6.1 |  |
| 6-10 | 80.9 | 82.5 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (5.8) | (0.5) |  |
| b. Leaving people and companies free to compete economically | 0.677 | 0.687 | 0.009 |
| 0-4 | 19.9 | 17.2 |  |
| 5 | 16.0 | 14.0 |  |
| 6-10 | 64.1 | 68.8 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (7.3) | (1.5) |  |
| c. Making one's own choices | 0.808 | 0.826 | 0.016+ |
| 0-4 | 4.3 | 3.2 |  |
| 5 | 10.8 | 5.0 |  |
| 6-10 | 84.8 | 91.9 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (5.6) | (1.9) |  |
| d. Not having to worry about being fired | 0.537 | 0.562 | 0.026* |
| 0-4 | 37.9 | 36.4 |  |
| 5 | 19.3 | 16.5 |  |
| 6-10 | 43.0 | 47.2 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (6.8) | (2.9) |  |
| e. Making sure that nobody suffers from lack of food or shelter | 0.750 | 0.808 | 0.059** |
| 0-4 | 14.5 | 11.2 |  |
| 5 | 12.0 | 6.3 |  |
| 6-10 | 73.6 | 82.5 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (4.6) | (0.5) |  |
| f. Earning as much money as possible | 0.594 | 0.612 | 0.018+ |
| 0-4 | 26.5 | 30.2 |  |
| 5 | 21.6 | 12.7 |  |
| 6-10 | 51.9 | 56.9 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (4.6) | (0.7) |  |
| g. Getting to decide exactly what to do with everything I earn | 0.696 | 0.699 | 0.001 |
| 0-4 | 19.3 | 19.5 |  |
| 5 | 12.8 | 11.5 |  |
| 6-10 | 68.0 | 69.0 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (5.1) | (0.5) |  |
| h, Making sure that government does what the people want | 0.795 | 0.844 | 0.050** |
| 0-4 | 5.9 | 2.6 |  |
| 5 | 10.2 | 4.9 |  |
| 6-10 | 83.8 | 92.5 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (4.9) | (0.5) |  |
| i. Minimizing the gap between rich and poor | 0.645 | 0.638 | -0.006 |


| j. Promoting economic growth | 0.824 | 0.840 | $0.016+$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |
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| d. I have opinions about politics that are worth listening to. | 0.806 | 0.798 | -0.008 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agree strongly (1) | 46.8 | 48.0 |  |
| Agree somewhat | 37.1 | 34.0 |  |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 9.9 | 9.9 |  |
| Disagree somewhat | 3.1 | 3.7 |  |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 3.1 | 4.4 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (6.6) | (1.5) |  |
| 25. Now we'd like you to think about the people who disagree strongly with you about issues like those we've been asking you about. How strongly would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about those people? <br> a. They just don't know enough | 0.570 | 0.537 | -0.035* |
| 0-4 | 25.5 | 29.6 |  |
| 5 | 25.5 | 23.4 |  |
| 6-10 | 49.0 | 46.8 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (8.7) | (2.7) |  |
| b. They believe some things that aren't true | 0.670 | 0.651 | -0.021 |
| 0-4 | 12.2 | 16.4 |  |
| 5 | 19.6 | 15.4 |  |
| 6-10 | 68.2 | 68.3 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (8.3) | (2.2) |  |
| c. They are not thinking clearly | 0.534 | 0.489 | $-0.044^{* *}$ |
| 0-4 | 28.3 | 38.7 |  |
| 5 | 32.9 | 25.0 |  |
| 6-10 | 38.8 | 36.4 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (10.0) | (5.8) |  |
| d. They have good reasons; there just are better ones on the other side | 0.604 | 0.609 | 0.004 |
| 0-4 | 18.2 | 18.8 |  |
| 5 | 26.3 | 24.9 |  |
| 6-10 | 55.5 | 56.3 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (9.5) | (4.4) |  |
| e. They are looking out for their own interests | 0.728 | 0.708 | -0.021 |
| 0-4 | 7.4 | 12.9 |  |
| 5 | 17.6 | 13.2 |  |
| 6-10 | 75.0 | 73.8 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (7.5) | (2.4) |  |
| 26. And how strongly would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements, also referring to people who disagree strongly with you about issues like those we've been asking you about? <br> a. I respect their point of view, even though it is different from mine. | 0.190 | 0.172 | $-0.018^{* *}$ |
| Agree strongly (1) | 41.3 | 48.5 |  |
| Agree somewhat | 39.0 | 39.2 |  |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 9.7 | 5.4 |  |
| Disagree somewhat | 8.4 | 4.9 |  |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 1.5 | 2.0 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (4.9) | (1.0) |  |
| b. It is hopeless to reach agreement with them. | 0.321 | 0.331 | 0.009 |
| Agree strongly (1) | 4.4 | 5.4 |  |


| Neither agree nor disagree | 32.1 | 23.1 |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Disagree somewhat | 30.1 | 31.2 |  |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 11.3 | 15.7 |  |
| (DK/NA) | $(5.6)$ | $(1.2)$ |  |
| c. I would be willing to compromise to find a solution we both can <br> support. | 0.193 | 0.187 | -0.006 |
| Agree strongly (1) | 37.3 | 40.3 |  |
| Agree somewhat | 43.3 | 44.0 |  |
|  | Neither agree nor disagree | 10.9 | 8.1 |
| Disagree somewhat | 6.5 | 5.2 |  |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 2.1 | 2.5 |  |
| (DK/NA) | $(6.3)$ | $(1.2)$ |  |

## 2. INITIAL PHONE SURVEY WITH PRE AND POST DELIBERATION RESULTS

Attitude Change Results (** $p<.01,{ }^{*} p<.05,+p<.10$; Valid percentages are reported for valid responses. Raw percentages are reported for DK/NA responses.) *The following analyses are conducted for questions that were asked at T1 (telephone survey), T2 (upon arrival), and T3 (upon departure). The analyses include only participants who answered these questions at all three time points.

|  | T1 | T2 | T3 | T2-T1 | T3-T1 | T3-T2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. To begin with, all in all, on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "extremely poorly", 10 is "extremely well," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how well or poorly would you say the system of democracy in California works these days? | 0.471 | 0.403 | 0.473 | -0.067** | 0.002 | 0.070** |
| 0-4 | 43.2 | 61.4 | 47.6 |  |  |  |
| 5 | 22.8 | 17.8 | 14.2 |  |  |  |
| 6-10 | 34.0 | 20.7 | 38.4 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "extremely undesirable", 10 is "extremely desirable," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how desirable or undesirable would you say each of the following is? <br> f. Allowing an initiative's proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot | 0.562 | 0.557 | 0.611 | -0.005 | 0.050** | 0.054** |
| 0-4 | 34.3 | 31.7 | 26.6 |  |  |  |
| 5 | 15.6 | 20.5 | 16.2 |  |  |  |
| 6-10 | 50.1 | 47.6 | 57.2 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| q. Lengthening Assembly terms from 2 years to 4, and Senate terms from 4 years to 6 | 0.417 | 0.498 | 0.770 | 0.081** | 0.353** | 0.272** |
| 0-4 | 50.7 | 41.0 | 10.4 |  |  |  |
| 5 | 16.5 | 13.6 | 9.1 |  |  |  |
| 6-10 | 32.7 | 45.5 | 80.5 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| aa. Requiring legislation creating new programs that cost $\$ 25$ million or more to indicate how they will be paid for | 0.795 | 0.849 | 0.847 | 0.054** | 0.052** | -0.002 |
| 0-4 | 11.0 | 4.4 | 4.8 |  |  |  |
| 5 | 6.8 | 5.1 | 5.4 |  |  |  |
| 6-10 | 82.2 | 90.5 | 89.8 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "not at all", 10 is "as much as could reasonably be expected," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how much or little would you say the California State Legislature is able to get important things done? | 0.341 | 0.345 | 0.355 | 0.004 | 0.014 | 0.010 |
| 0-4 | 69.0 | 67.2 | 68.0 |  |  |  |
| 5 | 16.3 | 16.0 | 10.9 |  |  |  |
| 6-10 | 14.7 | 16.9 | 21.2 |  |  |  |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 6. On another 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is <br> "not at all", 10 is "completely", and 5 is <br> exactly in the middle, to what extent is <br> the ability of the State Legislature to <br> get things done affected by tensions <br> between the political parties? | 0.656 | 0.653 | 0.690 | -0.003 | $0.034^{*}$ |
|  |  |  |  | $0.037^{*}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| institution well enough to rate it, just bubble in "can't say." |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Democratic party | 50.410 | 51.590 | 51.010 | 1.180 | 0.599 | -0.580 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. Republican party | 38.630 | 38.000 | 38.100 | -0.629 | -0.524 | 0.105 |
| 24. And how strongly would you agree or disagree with the following statements? <br> a. Public officials care a lot about what people like me think. | 0.366 | 0.363 | 0.458 | -0.003 | 0.092** | 0.096** |
| Agree strongly (1) | 7.8 | 2.4 | 4.6 |  |  |  |
| Agree somewhat | 22.9 | 22.6 | 33.4 |  |  |  |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 10.5 | 14.6 | 15.1 |  |  |  |
| Disagree somewhat | 25.3 | 38.3 | 34.5 |  |  |  |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 33.4 | 22.1 | 12.4 |  |  |  |
| (DK/NA) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. Most public policy issues are so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on. | 0.522 | 0.439 | 0.454 | -0.083** | -0.068** | 0.015 |
| Agree strongly (1) | 25.9 | 13.4 | 13.9 |  |  |  |
| Agree somewhat | 25.1 | 24.6 | 28.3 |  |  |  |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 5.1 | 13.4 | 10.4 |  |  |  |
| Disagree somewhat | 19.5 | 21.7 | 20.1 |  |  |  |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 24.3 | 27.0 | 27.3 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

What's Next California
Report: Summary Results
3. REPRESENTATIVENESS ANALYSIS:

PARTICIPANTS VS. COMPARISON GROUP (NON-PARTICIPANTS)

Note: Percentages shown with cell frequencies in parentheses. All significance tests are twosample t-tests unless otherwise noted. ${ }^{*} \mathrm{p}<.05^{* *} \mathrm{p}<.01^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<.001$.

## Gender

Participants ( $N$ ) Non-Participants ( $N$ )
Age in years

| Female | $55.4 \%$ | $49.3 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | $(222)$ | $(148)$ |
| Male | $44.6 \%$ | $50.7 \%$ |
|  | $(179)$ | $(152)$ |
|  | 49.07 years | 46.75 years |
|  | $(401)$ | $(300)$ |

## Education

| Less than high school | $0.5 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | $(2)$ | $(4)$ |
| High school | $6.0 \%$ | $8.3 \%$ |
|  | $(24)$ | $(25)$ |
| Some university/college | $25.4 \%$ | $32.7 \%$ |
|  | $(102)$ | $(98)$ |
| University/college graduate | $33.9 \%$ | $29.7 \%$ |
|  | $136)$ | $(89)$ |
| Some graduate work | $6.7 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ |
|  | $(27)$ | $(18)$ |
| Graduate degree | $27.2 \%$ | $20.7 \%$ |
|  | $109)$ | $(62)$ |
| No answer/ Missing | $0.2 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ |

(1)
(4)

## Employment Status

| Employed full-time | $43.1 \%$ | $45.3 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | $(173)$ | $(136)$ |
| Employed part-time | $15.7 \%$ | $10.7 \%$ |
|  | $(63)$ | $(32)$ |

Not employed, but actively looking for work 11.7\%
8.7\%
(47)
(26)

Student 5.2\%
7.3\%
(21)

Not actively looking for work 22.2\%
(89)
(22)
25.7\%
(77)

No Answer/ Missing 2.0\%
(8)
2.3\%
(7)

## Religious Service Attendance **

Every week 22.9\%
(92)
25.0\%
(75)

Almost every week 7.5\%
2.7\%
(30)

Once or twice a month 13.0\%
(52)
(8)
12.0\%
(36)
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| A few times a year | $28.9 \%$ | $25.7 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | $(116)$ | $(77)$ |
| Never | $26.9 \%$ | $30.3 \%$ |
|  | $(108)$ | $(91)$ |
| No answer | $0.7 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ |
|  | $(3)$ | $(13)$ |

## Married and living with spouse

| Yes | $58.6 \%$ | $61.3 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $(235)$ | $(184)$ |
| No | $40.6 \%$ | $36.7 \%$ |
|  | $(163)$ | $(110)$ |

No answer 0.7\%
(3)
12.0\%
(48)
14.0\%
(56)
\$50,000 to $\$ 74,999$ 23.9\%
(96)
\$75,000 to \$99,999 15.2\%
(61)
\$100,000 to $\$ 124,999 \quad 11.7 \%$
(47)
\$125,000 to \$149,999 4.2\%
(17)
10.2\%
(41)

No answer/ don't know 8.7\%
(35)

## Ethnicity

| White | $69.6 \%$ | $65.7 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | $(279)$ | $(197)$ |
| Black | $7.0 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ |
|  | $(28)$ | $(11)$ |
| Hispanic | $14.0 \%$ | $22.0 \%$ |
|  | $(56)$ | $(66)$ |
| Asian/ Pacific islander | $5.2 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ |
|  | $(21)$ | $(16)$ |
| Native American | $1.2 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ |
|  | $(5)$ | $(5)$ |
| Other | $2.5 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ |
|  | $(10)$ | $(5)$ |
| No answer | $0.5 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
|  | $(2)$ | $(0)$ |

[^0]| Liberal-leaning (0-4) | $36.7 \%$ | $37.7 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | $(147)$ | $(113)$ |
| Exactly in the middle (5) | $17.0 \%$ | $20.7 \%$ |
|  | $(68)$ | $(62)$ |
| Conservative-leaning (6-10) | $41.9 \%$ | $35.7 \%$ |
|  | $(168)$ | $(107)$ |
| No Opinion/ Missing | $4.5 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ |
|  | $(18)$ | $(18)$ |

## Party Affiliation

| Republican | $28.9 \%$ | $28.3 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | $(116)$ | $(85)$ |
| Democrat | $47.1 \%$ | $48.0 \%$ |
|  | $(189)$ | $(144)$ |
| Other | $4.7 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ |
|  | $(19)$ | $(9)$ |
| Independent | $19.2 \%$ | $20.7 \%$ |
|  | $(77)$ | $(62)$ |

## Region

| LA County | $25.4 \%$ | $20.7 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | $(102)$ | $(62)$ |
| Orange County | $10.0 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ |
|  | $(40)$ | $(24)$ |
| Inland Empire | $9.7 \%$ | $11.7 \%$ |
|  | $(39)$ | $(35)$ |
| San Diego County | $10.2 \%$ | $8.7 \%$ |
|  | $(41)$ | $(26)$ |
| Central Coast | $7.0 \%$ | $7.7 \%$ |
|  | $(28)$ | $(23)$ |
| Central/ Fresno | $6.0 \%$ | $7.0 \%$ |
|  | $(24)$ | $(21)$ |
| Greater Sacramento | $9.0 \%$ | $14.3 \%$ |
|  | $(36)$ | $(43)$ |
| Bay Area | $19.2 \%$ | $18.0 \%$ |
|  | $(77)$ | $(54)$ |
| North | $3.5 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ |
|  | $(14)$ | $(12)$ |
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Attitude Comparison Results (*** $p<.001$, ${ }^{* *} p<.01,{ }^{*} p<.05$; Valid percentages are reported for valid responses. Raw percentages are reported for DK/NA responses.)

|  | Participants | Non- <br> Participants | t-Test |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1. To begin with, all in all, on a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is "extremely <br> poorly", 10 is "extremely well," and 5 is exactly in the middle, how well <br> or poorly would you say the system of democracy in California works <br> these days? |  | 0.460 |  | 0.434 |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| (DK/NA) | (8.5) | (9.3) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8. Putting all initiative dealing with the same subject next to one another on the ballot | 0.790 | 0.771 |  |
| 0-4 | 8.3 | 8.3 |  |
| 5 | 8.0 | 14.1 |  |
| 6-10 | 83.7 | 77.6 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (3.7) | (3.3) |  |
| 9. Allowing signatures for initiatives to be gathered electronically | 0.496 | 0.440 | * |
| 0-4 | 42.4 | 47.1 |  |
| 5 | 15.0 | 14.1 |  |
| 6-10 | 42.6 | 38.8 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (5.2) | (3.0) |  |
| 10. Requiring that initiatives say how they will be paid for if they would cost taxpayers more than $\$ 25$ million to implement | 0.799 | 0.719 | *** |
| 0-4 | 10.9 | 18.1 |  |
| 5 | 6.8 | 10.9 |  |
| 6-10 | 82.3 | 71.0 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (4.0) | (8.0) |  |
| 11. Prohibiting initiatives that require the State to spend a substantial portion of its budget for a specific purpose | 0.558 | 0.478 | ** |
| 0-4 | 32.8 | 40.1 |  |
| 5 | 20.1 | 27.3 |  |
| 6-10 | 47.2 | 32.6 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (8.0) | (11.0) |  |
| 12. Requiring election campaign contributions to be disclosed more frequently | 0.844 | 0.822 |  |
| 0-4 | 5.4 | 7.2 |  |
| 5 | 6.9 | 10.0 |  |
| 6-10 | 87.7 | 82.8 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (2.5) | (3.3) |  |
| 13. Allowing voters to rank their top three candidates, so that the winner can be decided in a single election without a second election | 0.661 | 0.607 | * |
| 0-4 | 20.6 | 30.6 |  |
| 5 | 13.5 | 11.0 |  |
| 6-10 | 66.0 | 58.4 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (5.5) | (6.3) |  |
| 14. Permitting petitions for ballot initiatives to be distributed electronically, then printed and signed | 0.638 | 0.594 |  |
| 0-4 | 22.4 | 28.5 |  |
| 5 | 15.8 | 14.6 |  |
| 6-10 | 61.8 | 56.9 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (5.2) | (6.3) |  |
| 15. Reducing the number of bills a legislator can introduce during a two-year session | 0.477 | 0.508 |  |
| 0-4 | 43.0 | 38.6 |  |
| 5 | 23.2 | 22.4 |  |
| 6-10 | 33.8 | 39.0 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (10.7) | (9.3) |  |
| 16. Reducing the length of the state legislative session and making the job of State Legislator a part-time position | 0.492 | 0.495 |  |
| 0-4 | 44.0 | 44.2 |  |
| 5 | 16.2 | 17.5 |  |
| 6-10 | 39.8 | 38.3 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (9.2) | (10.3) |  |
| 17. Appointing all California judges for lifetime terms, subject only to | 0.349 | 0.338 |  |
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| recall election |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0-4 | 62.6 | 61.6 |  |
| 5 | 15.0 | 12.7 |  |
| 6-10 | 22.4 | 25.7 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (8.7) | (5.3) |  |
| 18. Applying the sales tax to services in addition to goods | 0.345 | 0.295 | * |
| 0-4 | 60.3 | 64.5 |  |
| 5 | 15.3 | 15.8 |  |
| 6-10 | 24.5 | 19.8 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (5.2) | (9.0) |  |
| 19. Flattening the state income tax rates, so that everyone pays closer to the same rate (while continuing to exempt low income individuals) | 0.549 | 0.541 |  |
| 0-4 | 35.2 | 38.0 |  |
| 5 | 13.1 | 12.2 |  |
| 6-10 | 51.7 | 49.8 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (5.0) | (7.0) |  |
| 20. Taxing non-residential property at a higher rate than residential property | 0.529 | 0.457 | ** |
| 0-4 | 33.6 | 41.8 |  |
| 5 | 17.3 | 21.4 |  |
| 6-10 | 49.1 | 36.8 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (6.5) | (6.7) |  |
| 21. Increasing the vehicle license fee from $0.65 \%$ to $2 \%$ and distribute that additional revenue locally for local purposes | 0.423 | 0.378 |  |
| 0-4 | 49.2 | 59.4 |  |
| 5 | 13.9 | 9.9 |  |
| 6-10 | 36.9 | 30.7 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (3.2) | (2.3) |  |
| 22. Requiring that changes in commercial ownership trigger tax reassessments on the same way they do for residential property | 0.688 | 0.616 | ** |
| 0-4 | 13.6 | 25.4 |  |
| 5 | 15.8 | 20.1 |  |
| 6-10 | 70.6 | 54.5 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (10.3) | (12.0) |  |
| 23. Requiring the same 55 percent majority for all local tax proposals | 0.653 | 0.629 |  |
| 0-4 | 19.5 | 21.5 |  |
| 5 | 16.5 | 16.3 |  |
| 6-10 | 64.0 | 62.2 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (8.0) | (10.0) |  |
| 24. Assign responsibility for service delivery to the level of government that is best suited to carry it out | 0.737 | 0.679 | ** |
| 0-4 | 8.0 | 14.0 |  |
| 5 | 13.9 | 18.1 |  |
| 6-10 | 78.1 | 67.9 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (6.5) | (9.7) |  |
| 25. Giving control of the funding for a service to the level of government that is responsible for delivering it | 0.659 | 0.613 | * |
| - 0-4 | 16.2 | 18.6 |  |
| 5 | 14.9 | 22.7 |  |
| 6-10 | 68.9 | 58.7 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (7.7) | (10.3) |  |
| 26. Making it easier for local governments to levy taxes for services | 0.530 | 0.498 |  |


| 26. Making it easier for local governments to levy taxes for services <br> they are responsible for providing | 0.530 |  | 0.498 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |

## What's Next California

## Report: Summary Results

| 0-4 | 35.6 | 42.4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | 22.0 | 25.7 |  |
| 6-10 | 42.4 | 31.9 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (4.7) | (4.0) |  |
| 34. People with views very different from mine often have good reasons for their views even when they are wrong. Would you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree? | 0.750 | 0.666 | *** |
| Agree strongly (1) | 33.5 | 39.9 |  |
| Agree somewhat | 38.1 | 34.9 |  |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 9.5 | 8.7 |  |
| Disagree somewhat | 9.0 | 11.4 |  |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 10.0 | 5.0 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (2.5) | (0.7) |  |
| 35. Public officials care a lot about what people like me think. Would you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree? | 0.376 | 0.349 |  |
| Agree strongly (1) | 7.3 | 8.1 |  |
| Agree somewhat | 21.6 | 23.9 |  |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 9.0 | 12.5 |  |
| Disagree somewhat | 26.6 | 23.2 |  |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 35.6 | 32.3 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (0.5) | (1.0) |  |
| 36. Most public policy issues are so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on. Would you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree? | 0.520 | 0.510 |  |
| Agree strongly (1) | 27.5 | 25.8 |  |
| Agree somewhat | 24.0 | 25.4 |  |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 5.0 | 5.7 |  |
| Disagree somewhat | 16.8 | 18.7 |  |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 26.8 | 24.4 |  |
| (DK/NA) | (0.2) | (0.3) |  |

## 4. KNOWLEDGE GAINS

## What's Next California <br> Report: Summary Results

NOTE: Entries are percentages answering correctly. The correct answers are given in parentheses.
*significant at the .05 level; ${ }^{* *}$ significant at the .01 level, ${ }^{* * *}$ significant at the .001 level.

| Item | Before | After | Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Deliberation | Deliberation |  |
| 27. Which political party holds the majority in | 75.8\% | 85.1\% | +9.3\%* |
| the California State Senate? (Democratic) | (316) | (355) |  |
| 28. How about the California State Assembly? | 69.5\% | 80.1\% | +10.6\% |
| (Democratic) | (290) | (334) |  |
| 29. How large a majority of the State | 61.9\% | 81.3\% | +19.4\%** |
| Legislature is needed to approve a proposed constitutional amendment? (two-thirds of both houses) | (258) | (339) |  |
| 30. How large a majority of the State | 60.7\% | 86.8\% | +26.1\%** |
| Legislature is needed to increase taxes? (twothirds of both houses) | (253) | (362) |  |
| 31. Ballot measures can be signed by...(anyone | 63.1\% | 70.0\% | +6.9\% |
| who is registered to vote in California) | (263) | (292) |  |
| 32. Which state has the most residents per | 62.1\% | 79.1\% | +17.-\% |
| member of the state legislature? (California) | (259) | (330) |  |
| 33. On average, which state has the highest | 30.7\% | 49.4\% | +18.7\%*** |
| total tax burden? (New York) | (128) | (206) |  |
| 34. In Governor Brown's most recent budget | 36.0\% | 73.6\% | +37.6\%*** |
| proposal, the largest single share of spending goes to which of the following? (K-12 education) | (150) | (307) |  |
| Knowledge Index | 57.5\% | 75.7 | +18.2\% ${ }^{* * *}$ |

## 5. EVALUATIONS

## What's Next California Report: Summary Results

| Questions | Percent (\%) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 43. On a scale of 0 to 10 , where 0 is "a waste of time", 10 is "extremely valuable" and 5 is exactly in the middle, how valuable was each of the following in helping you clarify your positions on the issues? <br> a. The overall process |  |
| 0-4 | 3.6 |
| 5 | 7.1 |
| 6-10 | 89.1 |
| (DK/NA) | (13.8) |
| b. Participating in the small group discussions |  |
| 0-4 | 4.4 |
| 5 | 2.9 |
| 6-10 | 92.6 |
| (DK/NA) | (13.6) |
| c. Meeting and talking to other delegates outside of the group discussions |  |
| 0-4 | 6.8 |
| 5 | 10.2 |
| 6-10 | 82.9 |
| (DK/NA) | (15.0) |
| d. The large group plenary sessions |  |
| 0-4 | 9.2 |
| 5 | 6.6 |
| 6-10 | 84.1 |
| (DK/NA) | (13.3) |


| Questions | Percent (\%) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 44. How strongly would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? <br> a. My group moderator provided the opportunity for everyone to participate in the discussion. |  |
| Agree strongly (1) | 75.3 |
| Agree somewhat | 15.4 |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 3.9 |
| Disagree somewhat | 3.2 |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 2.2 |
| b. The members of my group participated relatively equally in the discussions. |  |
| Agree strongly (1) | 26.7 |
| Agree somewhat | 36.2 |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 5.9 |


| Disagree somewhat | 21.8 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 9.5 |
| c. My group moderator sometimes tried to influence the group with his or her own views. |  |
| Agree strongly (1) | 1.5 |
| Agree somewhat | 0.7 |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 1.7 |
| Disagree somewhat | 3 |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 93.1 |
| d. My group moderator tried to make sure that opposing arguments were considered. |  |
| Agree strongly (1) | 40.7 |
| Agree somewhat | 20.9 |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 19.6 |
| Disagree somewhat | 5.4 |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 13.4 |
| e. The important aspects of the issues were covered in the group discussions. |  |
| Agree strongly (1) | 45.8 |
| Agree somewhat | 38.6 |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 4.7 |
| Disagree somewhat | 7.2 |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 3.7 |
| f. I learned a lot about people very different from me - about what they and their lives are like. |  |
| Agree strongly (1) | 50 |
| Agree somewhat | 38.1 |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 8.2 |
| Disagree somewhat | 2.5 |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 1.2 |
| g. Few members dominated discussions. |  |
| Agree strongly (1) | 16 |
| Agree somewhat | 36.9 |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 17.5 |
| Disagree somewhat | 18 |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 11.7 |
| h. The members of my small group respected each other's views |  |
| Agree strongly (1) | 65.7 |
| Agree somewhat | 27.7 |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 3.4 |
| Disagree somewhat | 1.7 |
| Disagree strongly (0) | 1.5 |
| 45. How much time would you say you spent reading the briefing material before today's event? |  |
| None | 3.7 |
| About a half hour | 15.1 |
| About an hour | 16.6 |
| About an hour and a half | 14.6 |
| About two hours | 19.8 |
| More than two hours | 30.2 |
| 46. Before the discussions started, how much of the assigned briefing material would you say you had read, on average? |  |


| Just glanced at the materials | 13.2 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Read less than half of the materials | 11 |
| Read about half of the materials | 17.8 |
| Read more than half of the materials | 17.6 |
| Read most or all of the materials | 40.3 |
| 47. And by the end of the last discussion, how much of the briefing materials would you say you had read? |  |
| Just glanced at the materials | 3.9 |
| Read less than half of the materials | 3.9 |
| Read about half of the materials | 8.8 |
| Read more than half of the materials | 18.1 |
| Read most or all of the materials | 65.3 |
| 48. Would you say that the briefing material was mostly balanced, or that it clearly favored some positions over others? |  |
| Completely balanced | 23.3 |
| Mostly balanced | 59 |
| Favored some position over others | 17.7 |
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