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Key Findings

The world order was upended when the Russian military invaded Ukraine, an action that has caused widespread death and destruction. In response, the international community imposed harsh economic sanctions on the Russian government. Californians felt the shock waves through rising prices at the gasoline pump that added further fuel to inflation fears. In recent weeks, COVID-19 cases have plummeted and the omicron surge has given way to an easing of mask and vaccination restrictions. Meanwhile, statewide and legislative candidates for the California June primary made their plans known by the March 11 deadline.

These are the key findings of a statewide survey on state and national issues conducted by the Public Policy Institute of California from March 6 to 17, 2022:

- A majority of Californians—including majorities across partisan groups—favor imposing economic sanctions on Russia in response to the Ukraine invasion even if it means higher energy prices. Fifty-two percent approve of the way that President Joe Biden is handling the situation involving Ukraine and Russia, with partisans deeply divided in their views.

- Thirty-five percent of Californians say that recent price increases have caused serious financial hardship for themselves or others in their households. Forty-seven percent of lower-income residents say that they are experiencing serious financial hardship due to recent price increases.

- Twenty-six percent of Californians are very concerned about not having enough money to pay their rent or mortgage. Forty-one percent of lower-income residents, and 34 percent of renters, are very concerned about not having enough money to pay their housing costs.

- A solid majority of Californians, and majorities across partisan groups and regions of the state, say that homelessness is a big problem in their part of California. Forty-six percent say they are very concerned about the presence of homeless people in their local community today.

- The perception about where the US stands in the COVID outbreak is similar to a year ago, while personal concerns about getting seriously ill from the virus are down. Californians are deeply divided along partisan lines when it comes to having some restrictions to try to control the spread of the virus.

- Forty-two percent of likely voters say that voting this year is more important than in past midterm elections. Republicans are more likely than Democrats and independents to say that voting is more important this year and that they prefer to elect a representative to Congress who is new to politics.
Fifty percent of Californians approve of President Biden’s performance in office. Fifty-six percent approve of Governor Gavin Newsom, 44 percent approve of Senator Alex Padilla, and 41 percent approve of Senator Dianne Feinstein. While only 37 percent approve of Congress overall, 55 percent of Californians approve of their own representative to the US House of Representatives.

The Situation in Ukraine and Rising Prices

The Russian invasion of Ukraine has led to a humanitarian crisis, and its shockwaves have reverberated around the world. Overall, 52 percent of Californians approve of President Biden’s handling of the situation involving Ukraine and Russia—similar to his overall approval rating. Partisans are sharply divided on this issue, and approval across regions is highest in the San Francisco Bay Area and lowest in the Inland Empire. Approval of his handling of this situation increases with education levels and is similar among men and women.

A majority of Californians support the United States and European allies imposing economic sanctions on Russia even if it means higher energy prices; overall, three in four support sanctions. A majority of partisans support sanctions even if it means higher energy prices, although Democrats are much more likely than Republicans or independents to do so. Majorities of men and women—and Californians across age groups—support sanctions even if it means higher energy prices, and support increases with rising education and income levels.

Two in three Californians say that recent price increases have caused financial hardship for them and their
household, with 35 percent saying it has caused serious hardship. Republicans and independents are more likely than Democrats to say they have experienced serious hardship. Inland Empire residents are the most likely—and San Francisco Bay Area residents are the least likely—to say that recent price increases have caused serious hardship. At least three in ten men and women, as well as Californians across age groups, say they have experienced serious hardship; this perception is higher among those with children 18 and under in the household (36%) than among those with no children (22%), and it declines sharply with rising education and income levels.

Widespread majorities support sanctions on Russia even if it leads to higher energy prices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Support, even if higher energy prices</th>
<th>Support, no opinion if higher energy prices</th>
<th>Support, but oppose if higher energy prices</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All adults</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely voters</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $40,000</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** PPIC Statewide Survey, March 2022. Survey was fielded from March 6–17, 2022 (n=1,672 adults, n=1,203 likely voters).
A majority are experiencing some level of financial hardship due to recent price increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes, serious</th>
<th>Yes, not serious</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All adults</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely voters</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Empire</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange/San Diego</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Bay Area</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $40,000</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** PPIC Statewide Survey, March 2022. Survey was fielded from March 6–17, 2022 (n=1,672 adults, n=1,203 likely voters).

Housing Affordability

A solid majority of Californians say that housing affordability is a big problem in their part of California, while one in four say it is somewhat of a problem. A similar share called this a big problem in our survey last March. Today, residents in Los Angeles, the San Francisco Bay Area, and Orange/San Diego are more likely than those elsewhere to say it is a big problem. Majorities across demographic groups say housing affordability is a big problem in their part of California. Notably, similar shares of homeowners (64%) and renters (65%) call this a big problem.
Most say housing affordability is a big problem

A record-high 46 percent of Californians say the cost of their housing makes them and their family seriously consider moving out of the part of California where they currently live, with most saying they would move outside the state. Republicans (55%) and independents (56%) are far more likely than Democrats (35%) to say they have seriously considered moving out. Renters (53%) are more likely than homeowners (39%)—and younger Californians are more likely than older ones—to say that they have seriously considered moving out of the part of California where they currently live.

A majority of Californians say they are very or somewhat concerned about not having enough money to pay their rent or mortgage, with one in four saying they are very concerned. Residents in the San Francisco Bay Area are less likely than those elsewhere to be very concerned. The share saying they are very concerned is highest among those who never attended college (39%) and those with household incomes under $40,000 (41%). Notably, renters are twice as likely as homeowners to be very concerned (34% compared to 17%).

SOURCE: PPIC Statewide Survey, March 2022. Survey was fielded from March 6–17, 2022 (n=1,672 adults, n=1,203 likely voters).
### Over half of adults are concerned about not having enough money for rent or mortgage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very concerned</th>
<th>Somewhat concerned</th>
<th>Not too concerned</th>
<th>Not at all concerned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All adults</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likely voters</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Empire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange/San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Bay Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $79,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** PPIC Statewide Survey, March 2022. Survey was fielded from March 6–17, 2022 (n=1,672 adults, n=1,203 likely voters).
With $12 billion in last year’s budget to address homelessness and with state lawmakers recently unveiling a legislative package to address the issue, a solid majority of Californians (64%) say homelessness is a big problem in their part of the state (25% somewhat of a problem, 10% not much of a problem). The share saying it is a big problem is similar to last September. Today, six in ten or more across partisan and demographic groups agree that homelessness is a big problem. Majorities across regions say homelessness is a big problem, with Central Valley and Los Angeles residents the most likely to say this.

Due to housing costs, four in ten Californians have considered moving away

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes, elsewhere in California</th>
<th>Yes, outside of the state</th>
<th>Yes, other</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All adults</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely voters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Empire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange/San Diego</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Bay Area</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $40,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** PPIC Statewide Survey, March 2022. Survey was fielded from March 6–17, 2022 (n=1,672 adults, n=1,203 likely voters).
A solid majority say homelessness is a big problem in their part of California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Big problem</th>
<th>Somewhat of a problem</th>
<th>Not much of a problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All adults</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely voters</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Empire</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange/San Diego</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Bay Area</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PPIC Statewide Survey, March 2022. Survey was fielded from March 6–17, 2022 (n=1,672 adults, n=1,203 likely voters).

Asked how concerned they are about the presence of homeless people in their local community today, an overwhelming majority say they are very (46%) or somewhat (35%) concerned (13% not too concerned, 5% not at all concerned). The share saying they are very concerned has remained similar since last September (49%). Today, about half or fewer across partisan groups are very concerned (44% Democrats, 48% Republicans, 51% independents). Four in ten or more across demographic groups say they are very concerned. Notably, women (50%) are more likely than men (41%) to say this. Opinions across regions vary (41% Orange/San Diego, 44% San Francisco Bay Area, 45% Central Valley, 49% Inland Empire, 51% Los Angeles).

Sixty-three percent of adults say the presence of homeless people in their community has increased over the past year, a share that has remained similar since PPIC first asked this question in November 2019 (3% decreased, 32% stayed the same). Today, solid majorities across partisan groups say homelessness has increased. Roughly six in ten across demographic groups say this. Majorities across regions share this view, ranging from 55 percent in the Inland Empire to 69 percent in the Central Valley.
A solid majority say the presence of homeless people in their community has increased over the past year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>Stayed the same</th>
<th>Decreased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All adults</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely voters</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Empire</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange/San Diego</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Bay Area</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** PPIC Statewide Survey, March 2022. Survey was fielded from March 6–17, 2022 (n=1,672 adults, n=1,203 likely voters).
As many pandemic policies expire across the state and throughout the country, nearly eight in ten adults (79%) are optimistic that, when it comes to the coronavirus pandemic, the worst is behind us (16% worst is yet to come). Optimism was similar in March 2021 and highest in May 2021, after case numbers had decreased temporarily and state mandates relaxed. Optimism fell in February 2022, amid another surge in cases due to the omicron variant—but has risen again today. Now, overwhelming majorities across parties (85% Republicans, 80% Democrats, 76% independents), and overwhelming majorities across demographic

### Most Californians are concerned about the presence of homeless people in their local community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very concerned</th>
<th>Somewhat concerned</th>
<th>Not too concerned</th>
<th>Not at all concerned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All adults</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely voters</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Empire</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange/San Diego</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Bay Area</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $40,000</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** PPIC Statewide Survey, March 2022. Survey was fielded from March 6–17, 2022 (n=1,672 adults, n=1,203 likely voters).
and regional groups, say that the worst is behind us. Moreover, personal concerns about getting seriously ill from the coronavirus (14% very concerned, 20% somewhat concerned) are down compared to March 2021.

**Most Californians are optimistic about where the US stands with COVID-19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Worst is behind us</th>
<th>Worst is yet to come</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2022</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2022</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2021</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2021</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2021</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2020</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** PPIC Statewide Surveys, 2020–2022.

A majority of California adults say it is more important to try and control the spread of the coronavirus, even if it means having some restrictions (46% strongly favor, 18% somewhat), compared to fewer who favor having no restrictions on normal activities, even if it hurts efforts to control the spread (23% strongly favor, 9% somewhat). Democrats (65%) are most likely to strongly favor controlling the spread, and the majority of Republicans (53%) strongly favor having no restrictions, while independents are more divided on this issue. Across regions, San Francisco Bay Area residents (60%) are the most likely to strongly favor controlling the spread. Women (57%) are far more likely than men (35%) to strongly support restrictions. The share who strongly favor controlling the spread decreases as income rises, and is higher among those 55 and older (54%) than among younger Californians (45% 18 to 34, 40% 35 to 54).

A majority of Californians (57%) and half of likely voters are in favor of requiring proof of vaccination to enter large outdoor gatherings or certain indoor spaces, such as restaurants, bars, and gyms. This share has decreased slightly since last September (61% favor). Today there is wide partisan division on this issue: 71 percent of Democrats favor proof of vaccination, while 72 percent of Republicans and 52 percent of independents oppose. About half or more across demographic groups are in favor. The share in favor increases as income decreases. Half or more across regions are in favor, and support is highest in the San Francisco Bay Area (68%).
Most Californians favor requiring proof of vaccination to enter large outdoor gatherings or certain indoor spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All adults</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely voters</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Empire</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange/San Diego</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Bay Area</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** PPIC Statewide Survey, March 2022. Survey was fielded from March 6–17, 2022 (n=1,672 adults, n=1,203 likely voters).
Midterm Elections

Whether or not the balance of power will change in the US Congress is the major subplot in the 2022 election. Roughly eight months before Election Day, 54 percent of likely voters say voting this year is about as important as in past years, while 42 percent say it is more important; only 3 percent feel it is less important. More likely voters felt voting in the midterms was more important in March 2018 (51% more
important, 48% about the same, 1% less important). Today, most Democrats and independents say voting is about as important as in previous years, while 56 percent of Republicans believe it is more important. Regionally, half in Orange/San Diego say it is more important, while most residents elsewhere feel it’s about the same. Likely voters age 45 and older (48%) are much more likely than younger Californians (34% 18 to 44) to say voting is more important than in past midterms.

Likely voters are divided on their preferences for electing a representative to Congress who has experience in politics (46%) or is new to politics (43%). Before the general election in September 2020, half preferred someone with experience and more than a third preferred a candidate who was new to politics. A solid majority of Democrats prefer experience, while 57 percent of Republicans would like someone new, as would 48 percent of independents. Regionally, majorities in the San Francisco Bay Area prefer experience, while those in the Central Valley, Inland Empire, and Orange/San Diego want someone new; Los Angeles residents are divided. About half of likely voters in Republican-held districts say they want someone new (51%, 38% experience), while about half in Democratic-held districts prefer experience (49%, 41% new). In the five competitive California districts as defined by the Cook Political Report, likely voters are more divided (39% experience, 44% new).
If the 2022 election for the US House of Representatives were held today, 51 percent of likely voters would vote for or lean toward the Democratic candidate, while 42 percent would vote for or lean toward the Republican candidate. An overwhelming majority of partisans support their party’s candidate, while independents are divided (44% Republican/lean Republican, 40% Democrat/lean Democrat). Democratic candidates are preferred by a 21-point margin in Democratic-held districts, while Republican candidates are preferred by a 26-point margin in Republican-held districts. In competitive districts, the Democratic candidate is preferred by a 21-point margin (59% to 38%).
A slim majority of California likely voters would vote for a Democrat if the 2022 House election were held today

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Republican/lean Republican</th>
<th>Democrat/lean Democrat</th>
<th>Don't know (vol)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All likely voters</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Empire</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange/San Diego</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Bay Area</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $40,000</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** PPIC Statewide Survey, March 2022. Survey was fielded from March 6–17, 2022 (n=1,203 likely voters).

Elected Officials’ Approval Ratings

Six months after the gubernatorial recall attempt, 56 percent of Californians and 50 percent of likely voters approve of Gavin Newsom’s job performance as governor. Approval of Governor Newsom among all adults has remained above 50 percent since January 2020. Eighty percent of Democrats approve of Newsom, while 81 percent of Republicans and 54 percent of independents disapprove. Majorities approve in the San Francisco Bay Area, Orange/San Diego, and Los Angeles while Central Valley and Inland Empire residents are more divided in their views. The share approving of the governor is higher among women (61%) than men (51%). Forty-nine percent of adults and 41 percent of likely voters approve of the state legislature; views were similar last March.
Amid multiple domestic and foreign policy dilemmas, 50 percent of Californians and 46 percent of likely voters approve of the job Joe Biden is doing as president—much lower than a year ago when 65 percent of adults and likely voters approved. Today, 72 percent of Democrats approve of the president while most Republicans and independents disapprove. Most residents in the San Francisco Bay Area and Los Angeles approve while majorities of residents elsewhere disapprove. In a recent Gallup poll, 42 percent of adults nationwide approved of President Biden’s job performance. In California, approval of Congress remains low at 37 percent. Notably, approval fails to eclipse 50 percent across parties, regions, and demographic groups, with the exception of Latinos (52%). In a February Gallup poll, 20 percent of adults nationwide approved of Congress.

As Senator Alex Padilla faces his first election—he was appointed by Governor Newsom to fill the US Senate seat vacated by Vice President Kamala Harris—44 percent of adults and 39 percent of likely voters approve of the way he is handling his job. Given his short tenure in office since January 2021, about one in three adults (30%) and likely voters (31%) say they don’t know enough to have an opinion. US Senator Dianne Feinstein—who is not facing reelection in 2022—has the approval of 41 percent of adults and 36 percent of likely voters. Her approval rating was somewhat higher last March (47% adults, 44% likely voters). When asked about the job their own representative to the US House of Representatives is doing, 55 percent of adults and 49 percent of likely voters approve; approval was similar 12 months ago.

Most Californians approve of Governor Newsom while about half approve of President Biden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Governor Newsom</th>
<th>President Biden</th>
<th>US Congress</th>
<th>US Senator Dianne Feinstein</th>
<th>US Senator Alex Padilla</th>
<th>Own House Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All adults</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely voters</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Empire</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange/San Diego</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Bay Area</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $40,000</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: PPIC Statewide Survey. March 2022. Survey was fielded from March 6–17, 2022 (n=1,672 adults, n=1,203 likely voters).

Regional Map

This map highlights the five geographic regions for which we present results; these regions account for approximately 90 percent of the state population. Residents of other geographic areas (in gray) are included in the results reported for all adults, registered voters, and likely voters, but sample sizes for these less-populous areas are not large enough to report separately.
Methodology

The PPIC Statewide Survey is directed by Mark Baldassare, president and CEO and survey director at the Public Policy Institute of California. Coauthors of this report include associate survey director and research fellow Dean Bonner, who was the project manager for this survey; survey analyst Rachel Lawler; and survey analyst Deja Thomas. The Californians and Their Government survey is supported with funding from the Arjay and Frances F. Miller Foundation and the James Irvine Foundation. The PPIC Statewide Survey invites input, comments, and suggestions from policy and public opinion experts and from its own advisory committee, but survey methods, questions, and content are determined solely by PPIC’s survey team.

Findings in this report are based on a survey of 1,672 California adult residents, including 1,071 interviewed on cell phones and 601 interviewed on landline telephones. The sample included 781 respondents reached by
calling back respondents who had previously completed an interview in PPIC Statewide Surveys in the last six months. Interviews took an average of 20 minutes to complete. Interviewing took place on weekend days and weekday nights from March 6–17, 2022.

Cell phone interviews were conducted using a computer-generated random sample of cell phone numbers. All cell phone numbers with California area codes were eligible for selection. After a cell phone user was reached, the interviewer verified that this person was age 18 or older, a resident of California, and in a safe place to continue the survey (e.g., not driving). Cell phone respondents were offered a small reimbursement to help defray the cost of the call. Cell phone interviews were conducted with adults who have cell phone service only and with those who have both cell phone and landline service in the household.

Landline interviews were conducted using a computer-generated random sample of telephone numbers that ensured that both listed and unlisted numbers were called. All landline telephone exchanges in California were eligible for selection. After a household was reached, an adult respondent (age 18 or older) was randomly chosen for interviewing using the “last birthday method” to avoid biases in age and gender.

For both cell phones and landlines, telephone numbers were called as many as eight times. When no contact with an individual was made, calls to a number were limited to six. Also, to increase our ability to interview Asian American adults, we made up to three additional calls to phone numbers estimated by Survey Sampling International as likely to be associated with Asian American individuals.

Live landline and cell phone interviews were conducted by Abt Associates in English and Spanish, according to respondents’ preferences. Accent on Languages, Inc., translated new survey questions into Spanish, with assistance from Renatta DeFever.

Abt Associates uses the US Census Bureau’s 2015–2019 American Community Survey’s (ACS) Public Use Microdata Series for California (with regional coding information from the University of Minnesota’s Integrated Public Use Microdata Series for California) to compare certain demographic characteristics of the survey sample—region, age, gender, race/ethnicity, and education—with the characteristics of California's adult population. The survey sample was closely comparable to the ACS figures. To estimate landline and cell phone service in California, Abt Associates used 2019 state-level estimates released by the National Center for Health Statistics—which used data from the National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) and the ACS. The estimates for California were then compared against landline and cell phone service reported in this survey. We also used voter registration data from the California Secretary of State to compare the party registration of registered voters in our sample to party registration statewide. The landline and cell phone samples were then integrated using a frame integration weight, while sample balancing adjusted for differences across region, age, gender, race/ethnicity, education, telephone service, and party registration groups.

The sampling error, taking design effects from weighting into consideration, is ±4.1 percent at the 95 percent confidence level for the total unweighted sample of 1,672 adults. This means that 95 times out of 100, the results will be within 4.1 percentage points of what they would be if all adults in California were interviewed. The sampling error for unweighted subgroups is larger: for the 1,461 registered voters, the sampling error is ±4.6 percent; for the 1,203 likely voters, it is ±5.2. For the sampling errors of additional subgroups, please see the table at the end of this section. Sampling error is only one type of error to which surveys are subject. Results may also be affected by factors such as question wording, question order, and survey timing.

We present results for five geographic regions, accounting for approximately 90 percent of the state population.
“Central Valley” includes Butte, Colusa, El Dorado, Fresno, Glenn, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, Placer, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Shasta, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tehama, Tulare, Yolo, and Yuba Counties. “San Francisco Bay Area” includes Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma Counties. “Los Angeles” refers to Los Angeles County, “Inland Empire” refers to Riverside and San Bernardino Counties, and “Orange/San Diego” refers to Orange and San Diego Counties. Residents of other geographic areas are included in the results reported for all adults, registered voters, and likely voters, but sample sizes for these less populous areas are not large enough to report separately.

We present results for non-Hispanic whites, who account for 41 percent of the state’s adult population, and also for Latinos, who account for about a third of the state’s adult population and constitute one of the fastest-growing voter groups. We also present results for non-Hispanic Asian Americans, who make up about 16 percent of the state’s adult population, and non-Hispanic African Americans, who comprise about 6 percent. Results for other racial/ethnic groups—such as Native Americans—are included in the results reported for all adults, registered voters, and likely voters, but sample sizes are not large enough for separate analysis. Results for African American and Asian American adults and likely voters are combined with those of other racial/ethnic groups because sample sizes for African American and Asian American adults and likely voters are too small for separate analysis. We compare the opinions of those who report they are registered Democrats, registered Republicans, and decline-to-state or independent voters; the results for those who say they are registered to vote in other parties are not large enough for separate analysis. We also analyze the responses of likely voters—so designated per their responses to survey questions about voter registration, previous election participation, intentions to vote this year, attention to election news, and current interest in politics.

The percentages presented in the report tables and in the questionnaire may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Numerous questions were adapted from national surveys by Gallup, ABC News/Washington Post, the Kaiser Family Foundation, and the Pew Research Center. Additional details about our methodology can be found at www.ppic.org/wp-content/uploads/SurveyMethodology.pdf and are available upon request through surveys@ppic.org.
**Unweighted N-size and margin of error**

| SOURCE: | PPIC Statewide Survey, March 2022. Survey was fielded from March 6–17, 2022 (n=1,672 adults, n=1,203 likely voters). |
|Get the data • Embed|
Questions and Responses

March 6–17, 2022
1,672 California adult residents; 1,203 California likely voters:
English, Spanish

Margin of error ±4.1% at 95% confidence level for the total sample and ±5.2% for likely voters.
Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

1. Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way that Gavin Newsom is handling his job as governor of California?

56% approve
35% disapprove
9% don’t know

2. Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way that the California Legislature is handling its job?

49% approve
39% disapprove
12% don’t know

3. Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the job that state legislators representing your assembly and senate districts are doing at this time?

54% approve
37% disapprove
9% don’t know

Changing topics,

4. Have recent price increases caused any financial hardships for you or others in your household, or not? (If yes, ask: “Has that been a serious hardship, or not?”)

35% yes, serious
32% yes, not serious
33% no
– don’t know

5. How concerned are you, if at all, about not having enough money to pay your rent or mortgage: very concerned, somewhat concerned, not too concerned, or not at all concerned about this?

26% very concerned
29% somewhat concerned
22% not too concerned
23% not at all concerned
1% don’t know

Next,
6. Overall, how fair do you think our present state and local tax system is—would you say it is very fair, moderately fair, not too fair, or not at all fair?

- 6% very fair
- 34% moderately fair
- 29% not too fair
- 29% not at all fair
- 3% don’t know

7. When you combine all of the taxes you pay to state and local governments, do you feel that you pay much more than you should, somewhat more than you should, about the right amount, or less than you should?

- 35% much more
- 27% somewhat more
- 32% about the right amount
- 3% less than you should
- 3% don’t know

8. Where do you think California currently ranks in state and local tax burden per capita? Compared to other states, is California’s tax burden per capita near the top, above average, average, below average, or near the bottom?

- 51% near the top
- 26% above average
- 11% average
- 3% below average
- 2% near the bottom
- 7% don’t know

On another topic,

9. Thinking about these four areas of state spending, I’d like you to name the one you think should have the highest priority when it comes to state government spending, [rotate] [1] K-to-12 public education, [2] higher education, [3] health and human services, [or] [4] prisons and corrections.

- 43% health and human services
- 37% K–12 public education
- 10% higher education
- 7% prisons and corrections
- 3% don’t know

10. In general, which of the following statements do you agree with more—[rotate] [1] I’d rather pay higher taxes and have a state government that provides more services, [or] [2] I’d rather pay lower taxes and have a state government that provides fewer services?

- 51% higher taxes and more services
Next,

11. How much of a problem is housing affordability in your part of California? Is it a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem?

64% big problem
25% somewhat of a problem
10% not a problem
1% don’t know

12. Does the cost of your housing make you and your family seriously consider moving away from the part of California you live in now? *(If yes, ask: “Does it make you consider moving elsewhere in California, or outside of the state?”)*

8% yes, seriously considered moving elsewhere in California
37% yes, seriously considered moving outside of California
54% no, have not seriously considered moving
1% don’t know

On another topic,

13. How much of a problem is homelessness in your part of California? Is it a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not much of a problem?

64% big problem
25% somewhat of a problem
10% not a problem
– don’t know

14. How concerned are you about the presence of homeless people in your local community today? Are you very concerned, somewhat concerned, not too concerned, or not at all concerned?

46% very concerned
35% somewhat concerned
13% not too concerned
5% not at all concerned
1% don’t know

15. In the last 12 months, do you think that the presence of homeless people in your local community has increased, decreased, or stayed about the same?

63% increased
3% decreased
32% stayed the same
2% don’t know
As you may know, the bipartisan Little Hoover Commission held public hearings and has made four recommendations to change the recall election process in California that would require voter approval. If an election were held today....

[rotate questions 16 to 19]

16. [likely voters only] Would you vote yes or no on a constitutional amendment that would raise the signature requirement for triggering a recall from 12 percent of the total votes cast in the last election for that office to 10 percent of the total number of registered voters which would be 2.2 million signatures based on current voter registration?

46% yes
47% no
7% don’t know

17. [likely voters only] Would you vote yes or no on a constitutional amendment that would eliminate the two-part ballot and treat the recall as a “snap” election with the officeholder subject to a recall and the potential replacement candidates automatically placed on one ballot?

42% yes
44% no
13% don’t know

18. [likely voters only] Would you vote yes or no on a constitutional amendment extending the timeframe for conducting recall elections from 60 days to 80 days to no less than 88 days and no more than 125 days?

44% yes
45% no
11% don’t know

19. [likely voters only] Would you vote yes or no on a constitutional amendment to prohibit the initiation of recall proceedings against state office-holders during the first 90 days and the last six months of their term in office?

48% yes
44% no
8% don’t know

20. [likely voters only] Generally speaking, do you favor or oppose having the legislature refer the four constitutional amendments relating to recall reforms to the voters as separate propositions on the 2022 election ballot?

59% favor
28% oppose
14% don’t know

Changing topics,
21. Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way that Joe Biden is handling his job as president?
50% approve
47% disapprove
3% don’t know

21a. Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way that President Biden is handling the situation involving Russia and Ukraine?
52% approve
43% disapprove
5% don’t know

[rotate questions 22 and 23]

22. Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way Dianne Feinstein is handling her job as US Senator?
41% approve
44% disapprove
15% don’t know

23. Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way Alex Padilla is handling his job as US Senator?
44% approve
26% disapprove
30% don’t know

24. Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way the US Congress is handling its job?
37% approve
57% disapprove
5% don’t know

25. Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way your own representative to the US House of Representatives in Congress is handling his or her job?
55% approve
35% disapprove
10% don’t know

On another topic,

26. [likely voters only] Is voting this year more important to you than in past midterm elections, less important, or about the same?
42% more important
3% less important
54% about the same
– don’t know

27. [likely voters only] If the 2022 election for US House of Representatives were being held today, would you vote for [rotate] [1] the Republican candidate [or] [2] the Democratic candidate in your district? (ask if ‘other’ or ‘don’t know’: “As of today, do you lean more toward [read in same order as above] [1] the Republican candidate [or] [2] the Democratic candidate?”)

42% Republican/lean Republican
51% Democrat/lean Democrat
7% don’t know

28. [likely voters only] Would you prefer to elect a representative to Congress who [rotate] [1] has experience in politics, [or] [2] is new to politics?

46% has experience in politics
43% is new to politics
3% both (volunteered)
8% don’t know

Changing topics,

29. How concerned, if at all, are you that you will get the coronavirus and require hospitalization? Are you very concerned, somewhat concerned, not too concerned, or not at all concerned?

14% very concerned
20% somewhat concerned
29% not too concerned
36% not at all concerned
1% have already been hospitalized due to the coronavirus (volunteered)
– don’t know

30. Which comes closer to your view about where the US stands in the coronavirus outbreak: [rotate] [1] the worst is behind us [or] [2] the worst is yet to come?

79% the worst is behind us
16% the worst is yet to come
4% don’t know

31. Have you personally received the COVID-19 vaccine, or not? (If yes ask: “Did you receive a single-dose vaccine, the first of two doses, or have you received both doses of a two-dose vaccine?”)

8% yes, single dose vaccine [skip to q32]
7% yes, first of two doses [skip to q32]
69% yes, both doses of two doses [skip to q32]
16% no
– don’t know
31a. The coronavirus vaccine is now available to all individuals 5 and older. Will you definitely get the coronavirus vaccine, probably get it, probably not get it, or definitely not get it?

- definitely get the vaccine [skip to q33]
  2% probably get the vaccine [skip to q33]
  3% probably not get the vaccine [skip to q33]
  10% definitely not get the vaccine [skip to q33]
83% already got the vaccine (volunteered) [if q31= “yes”, code q31a= “already got the vaccine”]
  - don’t know

32. Have you personally received a booster or additional dose of the COVID-19 vaccine after you were already fully vaccinated, or not? This could include receiving a third dose of the Pfizer or Moderna vaccine or receiving another vaccine after getting the one-dose Johnson and Johnson vaccine.

  67% yes
  33% no
  - don’t know

33. What do you think is more important [rotate] [1] trying to control the spread of the coronavirus, even if it means having some restrictions on normal activities], [or] [2] having no restrictions on normal activities, even if it hurts efforts to control the spread of the coronavirus? (Get the answer, then ask: “Do you feel that way strongly or somewhat?”)

  46% control the spread— strongly
  18% control the spread— somewhat
  9% no restrictions— somewhat
  23% no restrictions— strongly
  3% don’t know

34. Do you favor or oppose requiring proof of the COVID-19 vaccine to be able to enter large outdoor gatherings or certain indoor spaces such as restaurants, bars, and gyms?

  57% favor
  41% oppose
  2% don’t know

35. What is your opinion with regard to race relations in the United States today? Would you say things are [rotate] [1] (better), [2] (worse); or about the same than they were a year ago?

  19% better
  47% about the same
  31% worse
  2% don’t know

36. When it comes to racial discrimination, which do you think is the bigger problem for the country today—[rotate] [1] People seeing racial discrimination where it really does NOT exist [or] [2] People NOT seeing racial discrimination where it really DOES exist?
38% people seeing racial discrimination where it really does not exist
57% people not seeing racial discrimination where it really does exist
6% don’t know

Changing topics,

36a. Given Russian military action involving Ukraine, do you support or oppose the United States and its European allies imposing economic sanctions on Russia? (If support, ask: “Do you support or oppose economic sanctions against Russia if they result in higher energy prices in the United States?”)

56% support, even if higher energy prices
16% support, but not if higher energy prices
4% support, but don’t know
19% oppose
5% don’t know

37. Next, some people are registered to vote and others are not. Are you absolutely certain that you are registered to vote in California?

76% yes [ask q37a]
24% no [skip to q37b]

37a. Are you registered as a Democrat, a Republican, another party, or are you registered as a decline-to-state or independent voter?

46% Democrat [ask q38]
24% Republican [ask q38a]
6% another party (specify) [skip to q40]
24% decline-to-state/independent [skip to 38b]

[likely voters only]

46% Democrat [ask q38]
26% Republican [ask q38a]
6% another party (specify) [skip to q40]
21% decline-to-state/independent [skip to 38b]

38. Would you call yourself a strong Democrat or not a very strong Democrat?

56% strong
43% not very strong
1% don’t know

[skip to q39]

38a. Would you call yourself a strong Republican or not a very strong Republican?

60% strong
37% not very strong
3% don’t know

[skip to q39]

38b. Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican Party or Democratic Party?

25% Republican Party
52% Democratic Party
15% neither (volunteered)
8% don’t know

39. Next, would you consider yourself to be politically: [read list, rotate order top to bottom]

15% very liberal
20% somewhat liberal
30% middle-of-the-road
20% somewhat conservative
13% very conservative
2% don’t know

40. Generally speaking, how much interest would you say you have in politics—a great deal, a fair amount, only a little, or none?

27% great deal
38% fair amount
27% only a little
7% none
– don’t know

[d1–d15 demographic questions]
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