



Deliberative Poll<sup>®</sup>  
June 24–26, 2011

Poll Results



# Table of Contents

June 24-26, 2011 Deliberative Poll Highlights	p. 01
Poll Overview	p. 02
What is a Deliberative Poll?	p. 02
The Results	
<i>Reforming the Legislature</i>	p. 03
<i>Reforming the Initiative Process</i>	p. 04
<i>State-Local Restructuring</i>	p. 05
<i>Tax and Fiscal Reforms</i>	p. 06
Participant Perceptions of the Process	p. 07
Evaluations of the Process	p. 07
Methodology	p. 08
Conclusion	p. 10
Summary of Questionnaire Responses	p. 11
Advisors, Supporters and Partners	p. 27

## Appendices (available online only)

1. Complete before and after responses, with means
2. Initial phone survey with pre/post deliberation results
3. Representativeness of sample
4. Knowledge gains
5. Evaluations
6. Responses by Party affiliation
7. Responses by Ethnicity
8. Responses by Region
9. Responses by Age
10. Responses by Education
11. Responses by Income
12. Responses by Gender

# “What’s Next California?”

## June 24–26, 2011 Deliberative Poll Highlights

California government is facing unprecedented challenges, made worse by mounting evidence that the state may be ungovernable. The list of ailments is all too familiar: The fiscal condition of the state is precarious. Democrats and Republicans in the Legislature are paralyzed by partisan gridlock. Local governments, already strained by the economy, are being put under even more pressure by dysfunction at the state level. For some time now, individual Californians and their families have been personally paying the price for these problems, with elementary schools losing teachers, higher education tuition skyrocketing, child care for low-income workers being eliminated, and local police and fire services being cut.

The crisis we face has led people across the state to consider major changes—and to search for innovative solutions that are bold enough to match our enormous challenges. Californians want state and local government to work. Californians want to help solve the state’s problems. If change is going to occur—and if it is going to withstand the test of time—their participation is essential. For California to work again, Californians of all political stripes, from every corner of the state, must be on board.

“What’s Next California?” represents an effort to produce an open and honest discussion about the pros and cons of a wide range of reforms among a truly representative microcosm of California’s registered voters. It has given Californians a way to join this conversation in a meaningful way and shows what this conversation sounds like when all views are at the table.

## Poll Overview

On June 24, 2011, a scientifically selected random sample of 412 registered voters from throughout the state participated in California's first ever statewide Deliberative Poll on governance reform, in Torrance, CA. The turnout for the "What's Next California?" Poll was unprecedented in the 17 year history of Deliberative Polling and the participants came prepared and eager to share their views and engage with fellow Californians in discussions about how our state is governed.

The Poll focused on four issue areas: The statewide initiative process, legislative representation, local government, and tax and fiscal policy. A total of 30 proposals were considered in these four areas. Over the course of the weekend's deliberations participants became more informed and in many cases changed their views significantly after deliberation with peers. What do California voters think should be done to fix the state when they focus on the substance of the issues? "What's Next California?" offers some clear answers.

## What is a Deliberative Poll?

Ordinary polls provide a momentary snap shot of the public's impressions of sound bites and headlines. Deliberative Polling shows what a scientific sample of the public thinks about policy issues if they have the opportunity to explore the issues in a setting that encourages informed discourse, including the availability of relevant facts, the opportunity to consider the critical arguments on both sides of issues through face-to-face small group discussions with peers, the opportunity to have questions answered by subject experts spanning the ideological spectrum, and an opportunity to register one's opinions in confidential questionnaires both before and after this process of deliberation. In this case, the Poll shows which reform proposals the public would support on the basis of good information and what factors influenced their views. About 70% of the policy attitude questions asked in Deliberative Polls typically change significantly after deliberation.

Deliberative Polls also test knowledge on the issues discussed. In past Deliberative Polls, the participants who learn have been the same ones who change their opinions. In “What’s Next California?”, participants were asked a series of eight knowledge questions before and after deliberation. As in other Deliberative Polls, they provided evidence of strong knowledge gains. Overall correct answers to the eight knowledge questions increased significantly, by an average of 18 points. Some changes were even larger, such as the question about the area of the budget which takes the single largest share (K-12 education). Correct answers to this question increased 38 points to 74%. This connection between knowledge gains and opinion change is important to ensuring the legitimacy of the results. The index shows the participants became significantly more informed about the public policy issues on the agenda of “What’s Next California?”.

## THE RESULTS

### Reforming the Legislature

Overall, participants were skeptical of the Legislature’s efficacy. Close to 70% questioned whether the Legislature was able “to get important things done.” However, Poll participants were optimistic about the public’s capacity to inform and engage with government, and after deliberation supported legislative and electoral reforms intended to improve the ability of legislators to represent their constituents, such as lengthening legislative terms from two to four years in the Assembly and four to six in the Senate, which rose from 46% to 80% after deliberation. When asked to choose between having fewer legislators who each represent more people vs. more legislators who each represent fewer people, support for the latter option increased from 57% to 71%. Given the low regard the participants had for the job the Legislature is doing, this support for increasing the length of terms and the size of the Legislature is noteworthy.

Participants appeared to reject changes they saw as weakening the Legislature’s ability to solve problems. Before deliberation there was majority support for “reducing the length of the state legislative session and requiring legislators to spend more time in their districts.” Support for this proposal fell from 57% to 46% after deliberation. The proposal to make the state legislature part-time and pay legislators part-time salaries fell from 45% to 27% after deliberation. Agreement that “part-time legislators will tend to represent their districts more closely” dropped 9 points from 43% to 32%. And agreement that “part-time legislators will tend to be more open to corruption” increased 9 points from 45% to 54%.

Participants overwhelmingly supported reforms that would empower the public by improving public oversight and increasing government accountability, including requiring the Legislature to establish performance goals and track and report progress (86% before deliberation and 90% after), requiring economic impact analysis of major legislation (89% before and 90% after) and requiring publication of three to five year budget projections prior to budget votes (80% before and 83% after).

## Reforming the Initiative Process

Participants trusted their own decisions through the initiative process and wanted to preserve the process as an exclusive tool of the public. However, they also strongly supported reforms that would empower voters to better understand the consequences of initiatives they are asked to evaluate and increase transparency. Support for “creating a formal review process to allow an initiative’s proponents to amend an initiative follow public input” increased 17 points from 59% to 76%. “Publishing the top five contributors for and against each ballot measure in the ballot pamphlet” increased in support from 82% to 91%. Ninety-one percent also supported requiring the Legislative Analyst to provide an analysis in the ballot pamphlet of how a proposal was likely to be paid for.

Participants had little interest in reforms that would enable the Legislature to affect initiatives' content in any way. Four proposals suggested ways in which the legislature might remove or amend an initiative, or place a counter-measure on the ballot. None of these proposals achieved support above 37% after deliberation. "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" fell to 18% after deliberation. Allowing the Legislature to place a countermeasure on the ballot to an already qualified initiative ended at 30%. Allowing the Legislature to remove an initiative from the ballot by enacting it into law ended at 35%.

## State-Local Restructuring

A number of proposals focused on restructuring the relations between state and local government. While the approval rating of state government was only 13% at the outset (17% after deliberation), approval ratings for local government in general were somewhat higher (32% rising to 37%) and "your city/town government and county's government" rose from 43% to 52%. Participants then went on to show strong support for a range of reforms that might strengthen the role of local government.

Participants supported giving local governments (primarily cities and counties) greater control over financing of local programs, in exchange for establishing performance goals, monitoring, and public reporting. "Transferring from the state to local governments control and financing of services at the local level and requiring minimum standards for delivering them" increased from 67% to 73% after deliberation. "Allowing local governments to raise taxes for local services in exchange for increased coordination of service delivery and public reporting of performance" increased from 54% to 63%. "Requiring state and local governments to identify policy goals and publish their progress toward meeting them" increased from 89% to

92%. After deliberation, 77% of participants supported allowing local governments to retain savings of state monies resulting from successful program management, in exchange for strong public accountability. After deliberation, 68% also supported specific funding for regional policy priorities extending beyond the borders of a single city or county.

At the same time, slightly more participants after deliberation thought the state should be responsible for “the most important policy decisions” (state-48%; local-26%; undecided-26%), and were evenly split on the question of how much taxation authority should be at the state vs. local level (local-33%; state-35%; undecided-33%). Yet when asked whether “decision-making authority” should be mostly at the local level or at the state level, 43% chose the local level after deliberation and only 27% chose the state level (with 29% in the middle).

## Tax and Fiscal Reforms

In the area of fiscal policy, participants indicated strong support for transparency and accountability, with greater fiscal discipline by the Legislature. Eighty-eight percent of participants supported requiring the legislature to indicate how the state will pay for any new programs or tax cuts it proposes that cost \$25 million or more (84% before deliberation), and 68% supported increasing the size of the rainy day fund (63% before). Participants also supported limiting the use of one-time revenue “spikes” to one-time expenditures, starting with paying down state debt and filling the state rainy day fund (84% after deliberation, 80% before).

Participants showed conflicting preferences on tax policy, as has been reflected in other public opinion polls. They believed after discussion that government should provide certain benefits and services, even if it means higher taxes (45% before and 57% after), yet most of the proposals for increasing revenue received little support. This view could be related to participants’ low confidence in government performance: while they showed confidence in the potential of government to improve performance, participants believed government currently is wasting 39 cents on the dollar.

Notable exceptions were the proposal for “reassessing non-residential property more frequently than now,” which rose 20 points from 52% to 72%, and the proposal to lower “the supermajority vote required in the Legislature to raise taxes” which rose 18 points from 32% to 50%. The other tax proposals fell short of majority support. “Applying the sales tax to services as well as goods while reducing the sales tax rate” rose from 38% to 45%. Proposals for limiting the home mortgage deduction, for reassessing all property more frequently (while raising the existing exemption based on inflation) and to allow local electorates to raise the property tax rate above the current 1% rate cap all received less than 45% support both before and after deliberation.

## Participant Perceptions of the Process

Before the Poll began, only 25% of participants thought “public officials care a lot about what people like me think.” This opinion increased 12 points to 37% —a significant increase, but still a low level of external political efficacy. Similarly, participants started with 42% agreeing that “people like me don’t have any say in what government does,” and 33% still held this view after deliberation. When asked about those “who disagree strongly with you about issues like those we have been asking you about,” 80% initially agreed that “I respect their point of view, even though it is different from mine.” This position rose to 88% after deliberation.

## Evaluations of the Process

At the end of the weekend the participants were asked a battery of evaluation questions. When asked to rate the Poll on a scale from “a waste of time” to “extremely valuable,”

89% rated it as “extremely valuable.” 91% agreed that “my group moderator provided the opportunity for everyone to participate in the discussions.” Sixty-two percent agreed that “my group moderator tried to make sure that opposing arguments were considered.” 82% thought the briefing materials were mostly or completely balanced. And 88% agreed that “I learned a lot about people very different from me—about what they and their lives are like.”

## Methodology

For the weekend Poll, a random sample of registered voters from throughout the state was recruited to travel to Torrance, CA. 435 were committed and 412 showed up on the day, an exceptionally high turnout compared to previous Deliberative Polls throughout the world (the average is 75%). The participants were compared to a separate sample of 300 registered voters who were never invited to Torrance. The 300-person comparison (or control) group was weighted to reflect the population of registered voters. In both groups there were up to ten call-backs to reach those initially included in the sample. Participants were paid an honorarium for the weekend participation plus all travel expenses.

There were no significant differences between the participants and the comparison group in gender, age, education, employment status, ethnicity, political party or political ideology. There were, however, small differences in income and religious attendance and some significant differences in initial attitudes toward some specific policy proposals. To ensure that any differences in specific policy attitudes did not affect the Poll results, the Center for Deliberative Democracy conducted a further matching analysis to establish weightings for the participant sample and then reanalyzed the changes in attitudes. The results remained substantially unchanged. Hence, this summary reports the unweighted results for the participants and significant changes for those questions which yielded similar results whether the sample was weighted or unweighted.

“What's Next California” was designed to be balanced and non-partisan. Reform organizations, leading academics, and numerous documents were surveyed to develop a broad list of potential topics for the organizers to consider. Then, a state-wide advisory group consisting of event sponsors and representatives of additional governance and finance reform groups spanning the political spectrum, civic and church groups, and universities was convened several times to examine those topics and create a balanced agenda of competing reforms for Poll participants to consider. An initial briefing document of nearly 100 pages was developed by the coalition of partner organizations and leading academic experts, led by the Lane Center for the Study of the American West at Stanford University. The advisory group also reviewed the briefing materials for balance and accuracy. The weekend discussions alternated between small group and plenary sessions on the four topics. Moderators were recruited by the Davenport Institute at Pepperdine University and were selected from five California graduate schools. They were trained by the Center for Deliberative Democracy to promote inclusiveness among participants without influencing their opinions.

Questionnaires were administered in three waves—Time 1 (T1) at home by telephone survey, T2 on arrival in Torrance and T3 on departure. Mobile phones were included in the sample in order to include Californians who do not have land lines. As noted above, an advisory group was established to ensure the ideological balance of the issues examined in the Deliberative Poll; since the advisory group process continued during the initial recruitment period, many of the final proposal questions could not be asked in their final form at T1. Results before and after deliberation are presented here. When a T1 measurement is available it is supplied as the before deliberation response. Otherwise, the results compare the arrival questionnaire, which was administered before the weekend deliberation, with the final questionnaire, which was administered upon departure. The full questionnaires displaying the responses to all three waves and cross tabs are posted online at <http://nextca.org> and <http://cdd.stanford.edu>. The weighted and unweighted results for participants will also be posted on both sites.

## Conclusion

No one would dispute that we are living at a time of historic change. The change has transformed everyday life, it has toppled long standing industries and it has profoundly challenged government's ability to respond to critical public needs. This change has also provided opportunities to do things differently—and perhaps better—as we make critical decisions of how to proceed in this new environment. “What’s Next California?” represents an effort to change the way we consider our options, and our choices.

In a wide ranging conversation among people with extremely different perspectives and opinions the “What’s Next California?” interactions were respectful and candid. In some cases people were surprised at what they had in common. In others, they agreed to disagree with civility. Overall, the “What’s Next California?” participants provided insight not only into what reforms are likely to have traction with voters in the coming years and why, but also in the great potential for Californians to work toward a common purpose.

Following this exercise, the groups supporting this effort will continue to pursue ways to bring increasing numbers of people into the discussion of California's future, some through education and others through engagement and advocacy, as part of building a broad, diverse constituency for change. The Poll's supporters believe meaningful public involvement in this conversation is an essential part of preparing California to meet the challenges of our future.

# Summary of Questionnaire Responses

## Questions Related to Reforming the Legislature<sup>1</sup>:

1. How desirable would you say each of the following is? (#2)

#	Reform Option	Before	After
2s	Establish clear goals for government programs, assess and report on progress toward them at least once every ten years (performance based management and budgeting).	86%	90%
2r	Require economic impact analysis of major legislation before passage.	89%	90%
2u	Require the Governor and the Legislature to publish three and five year budget projections prior to the budget vote each year.	80%	83%
2q	Lengthening Assembly terms from 2 years to 4, and Senate terms from 4 years to 6.	46%	81%
2t	Require the Governor and the Legislature to adopt two-year instead of one-year budgets.	56%	72%
2k	Increase the number of Assembly districts from 80 to 120.	61%	63%
2p	Allow voters to rank the candidates in order of preference, so that the winner can be decided without a second election.	61%	58%
2l	Elect more than one representative from each Assembly and Senate district with the winners receiving seats proportional to votes.	48%	49%
2o	Reduce the length of the state legislative session and require legislators to spend more time in their districts.	57%	46%
2m	Replace the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house of 120 members.	32%	43%
2n	Make the State Legislature part-time and pay legislators part-time salaries.	45%	27%

<sup>1</sup> The percentages listed in the tables of legislative reforms, initiative process reforms, state-local restructuring reforms, and tax and fiscal reforms represent participants' support. The data included in Appendices 1 – 11 also show participants' neutral and negative responses to these questions. Numbers in parentheses denote actual question number in participant questionnaire.

## General Policy Attitudes—

### Regarding legislative representation:

2. Should Legislatures include fewer legislators even if it means each legislator represents more people, or should legislators represent fewer people, even if it means Legislatures are larger? (#4)

	Before	After
Fewer legislators	19%	10%
In the middle	23%	20%
More legislators	58%	71%

3. To what degree is the Legislature able to get important things done? (#5)

	Before	After
Not at all	68%	69%
In the middle	16%	10%
As much as could be reasonably expected	17%	20%

4. To what extent is the ability of the Legislature to get things done affected by tension between the political parties? (#6)

	Before	After
Not at all	28%	22%
In the middle	9%	6%
Completely	64%	73%

5. 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? (#14)

Part-time legislators will tend to represent their districts more closely. (#14a)

	Before	After
Agree strongly	16%	10%
Agree somewhat	27%	22%
Neither agree nor disagree	18%	16%
Disagree somewhat	21%	26%
Disagree strongly	19%	27%

Part-time legislators will be less likely to be career politicians. (#14b)

	Before	After
Agree strongly	30%	25%
Agree somewhat	41%	41%
Neither agree nor disagree	12%	12%
Disagree somewhat	10%	12%
Disagree strongly	7%	10%

Part-time legislators will tend to be more open to corruption. (#14c)

	Before	After
Agree strongly	10%	11%
Agree somewhat	17%	21%
Neither agree nor disagree	34%	34%
Disagree somewhat	22%	21%
Disagree strongly	18%	13%

Part-time legislators will tend to be less well informed about policy issues. (#14d)

	Before	After
Agree strongly	15%	24%
Agree somewhat	30%	30%
Neither agree nor disagree	20%	20%

6. How strongly would you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the length of legislative terms? (#15)

Increasing state legislators' terms will make them less responsive to their districts. (#15a)

	Before	After
Agree strongly	11%	4%
Agree somewhat	29%	14%
Neither agree nor disagree	21%	17%
Disagree somewhat	26%	39%
Disagree strongly	13%	27%

Increasing state legislators' terms will let them spend less time fundraising and campaigning and more time legislating. (#15b)

	Before	After
Agree strongly	31%	29%
Agree somewhat	27%	29%
Neither agree nor disagree	19%	14%
Disagree somewhat	13%	18%
Disagree strongly	9%	10%

7. How strongly would you agree or disagree that replacing the current State Senate and Assembly with a single house would...

...Make it easier to pass important legislation? (#13a)

	Before	After
Agree strongly	17%	24%
Agree somewhat	35%	39%
Neither agree nor disagree	20%	15%
Disagree somewhat	17%	13%
Disagree strongly	12%	8%

...Deprive the system of important checks and balances? (#13b)

	Before	After
Agree strongly	26%	42%
Agree somewhat	42%	40%
Neither agree nor disagree	13%	9%
Disagree somewhat	11%	5%
Disagree strongly	8%	4%

## Questions related to Reforming the Initiative Process:

8. How desirable would you say each of the following is? (#2)

#	Reform Option	Before	After
2h	Require ballot pamphlet to include information on how measures likely would be paid for.	87%	91%
2j	Publicize top contributors for and against each ballot measure in the ballot pamphlet.	82%	91%
2g	Require all ballot measures that require new expenditures to indicate how they will be paid for.	89%	85%
2a	Create a formal review process to allow an initiative's proponents to amend an initiative following public input.	59%	76%
2i	Make the vote threshold needed to pass an initiative the same as any thresholds that the initiative itself requires of the public in the future.	66%	67%
2f	Allow an initiative's proponents to withdraw it after it qualifies for the ballot.	47%	57%
2d	Allow the Legislature to amend a measure that has already passed, subject to a public review and the agreement by the initiative's proponents.	43%	37%
2b	Allow the Legislature to remove initiative from the ballot by enacting it into law.	37%	35%
2c	Allow a simple majority of the Legislature to place a countermeasure to an already qualified initiative on the ballot next to that initiative.	33%	30%
2e	Allow 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.	24%	18%

9. 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? (#3)

	Before	After
Simple majority (50% +1)	13%	9%
55%	18%	26%
Two-thirds	69%	65%

## General Policy Attitudes—

10. How many of the state’s major decisions should be made by voters by referendum vs. the Legislature? (#10)

	Before	After
Voters	31%	29%
In the middle	24%	27%
Legislature	45%	45%

11. Do you think voters should enact laws directly, or rely on representatives who then vote on the laws? (#22)

	Before	After
Voters	35%	34%
In the middle	19%	16%
Representatives	46%	50%

## Questions Related to State Local Restructuring:

11. Do you think voters should enact laws directly, or rely on representatives who then vote on the laws? (#22)

#	Reform Option	Before	After
2z	Require state and local governments to identify policy goals and publish progress toward meeting them.	89%	92%
2y	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.	74%	77%
2v	Transfer from the state to local governments control and financing of services provided at the local level and require minimum standards for delivering them.	67%	73%
2x	Create a stable source of funds for regional priorities by dedicating a portion of tax revenue from economic growth to those priorities.	67%	68%
2w	Allow local governments to raise taxes for local services in exchange for increased coordination of service delivery and public reporting of performance.	54%	63%

## General Policy Attitudes—

13. How much decision making authority should there be at the state vs. local level? (#7)

	Before	After
Local	42%	43%
In the middle	31%	30%
State	27%	27%

14. How much taxation power should there be at the state vs. local level? (#8)

	Before	After
Local	34%	33%
In the middle	39%	33%
State	27%	35%

15. Who should be responsible for the most important public policy decisions? (#9)

	Before	After
Local	26%	26%
In the middle	30%	26%
State	44%	48%

16. Do decisions made at the local level reflect the will of the local community more closely than decisions made at the state level, or are decisions made at the local level more dominated by powerful special interests than decisions made at the state level? (#11)

	Before	After
Reflect local community	48%	57%
In the middle	24%	23%
Dominated by special interests	28%	21%

17. Should local communities be able to decide their own tax rates even if it means big differences among communities, or should taxes be the same statewide, even if it means less local control? (#18)

	Before	After
Local communities	40%	42%
In the middle	20%	20%
Same statewide	40%	38%

## Tax and Fiscal Reforms

18. How desirable would you say each of the following is? (#2)

	Reform Option	Before	After
2aa	Require legislation creating new programs costing \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for.	91%	90%
2ac	Require legislation creating new programs or tax cuts costing \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for.	84%	88%
2ab	Require legislation creating tax cuts costing \$25 million or more to indicate how they will be paid for.	84%	85%
2ad	Require that one time revenue spikes only be spent on one-time projects, paying off debt, and filling the state rainy-day fund.	80%	84%
2ai	Reassess non-residential property more frequently than now.	52%	72%
2ae	Increase the size of the state's rainy day fund from 5% to 10% of the state budget.	65%	68%
2am	Decrease the super-majority vote required in the Legislature to raise taxes (about 67%) to 55%.	32%	50%
2af	Apply the sales tax to services as well as goods while reducing the sales tax rate.	38%	45%
2ah	Limit the current California state income tax deduction for home mortgage interest to \$25,000/yr.	42%	44%
2al	Lower local vote requirement to adopt taxes dedicated to specific purposes, to a simple majority so it is the same as the vote requirement to adopt taxes for general purposes.	46%	43%
2aj	Reassess all property values more frequently, while adjusting current exemption for inflation to about \$28,000 and allowing the exemption to rise with property values.	35%	33%
2ak	Allow local electorates to raise the property tax rate above the current 1% rate cap.	28%	29%
2ag	Apply the sales tax to services as well as goods while keeping the current sales tax rate.	24%	21%

## General Policy Attitudes—

19. Out of every \$100 the government raises in additional taxes, how many dollars would you say are wasted? Please write a number between 0 and 100 (#12)

	Before	After
Value:	\$45	\$39

20. Should government provide certain benefits and services even if it means higher taxes? Or should it lower taxes, even if it means reduced benefits and services? (#19)

	Before	After
Provide services	45%	57%
In the middle	17%	15%
Lower taxes	37%	28%

21. Should society leave people completely free to behave as they choose even if there is a cost to others, or should the community decide what people can or can't do, even if some people object? (#21)

	Before	After
Self-determination	18%	20%
In the middle	19%	22%
Community governance	63%	58%

## Responses Related to Non-Reform-Specific Questions:

22. How well or poorly would you say the system of democracy in California works these days? (#1)

	Before	After
Extremely poorly	61%	47%
In the middle	18%	14%
Extremely well	21%	39%

23. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with each of the following in office? (#16)

Arnold Schwarzenegger (#16a)

	Before	After
Completely dissatisfied	75%	75%
In the middle	12%	14%
Completely satisfied	13%	12%

Jerry Brown (#16b)

	Before	After
Completely dissatisfied	31%	25%
In the middle	20%	21%
Completely satisfied	49%	54%

California State Senate (#16c)

	Before	After
Completely dissatisfied	69%	69%
In the middle	19%	19%
Completely satisfied	12%	13%

California State Assembly (#16d)

	Before	After
Completely dissatisfied	68%	71%
In the middle	20%	16%
Completely satisfied	12%	13%

California State Legislature (#16e)

	Before	After
Completely dissatisfied	71%	71%
In the middle	19%	18%
Completely satisfied	10%	12%

California's initiative/referendum process (#16f)

	Before	After
Completely dissatisfied	50%	37%
In the middle	21%	19%
Completely satisfied	29%	44%

California's state government (#16g)

	Before	After
Completely dissatisfied	72%	65%
In the middle	16%	18%
Completely satisfied	13%	17%

Your city/town and county's government (#16h)

	Before	After
Completely dissatisfied	37%	29%
In the middle	19%	19%
Completely satisfied	43%	52%

California's local government's generally (#16i)

	Before	After
Completely dissatisfied	39%	30%
In the middle	29%	32%
Completely satisfied	32%	37%

24. 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." (#17)

	Before	After
Democratic Party	52%	51%
Republican Party	38%	38%

25. Should majorities always have their way no matter how big the minorities are or how strongly they feel, or should minorities have their way when they are large enough or feel strongly enough? (#20)

	Before	After
Majorities have their way	35%	37%
In the middle	33%	33%
Minorities have their way	33%	31%

26. How important is each of these to you? (#23)

#	Question	Before	After
23m	Having a safe community	96%	98%
23l	Having a well-educated society	94%	96%
23k	Being able to get a good education	93%	96%
23n	Making sure everyone has clean air and water	92%	96%
23j	Promoting economic growth	89%	93%
23h	Make sure government does what the people want	84%	93%
23c	Making one's own choices	85%	92%
23e	Making sure that no one suffers from lack of food and shelter	74%	83%
23a	Seeing to it that everyone has equal opportunities	81%	83%
23b	Leaving people and companies free to compete economically	64%	69%
23g	Getting to decide exactly what to do with everything I earn	68%	69%
23i	Minimizing the gap between rich and poor	61%	62%
23f	Earning as much money as possible	52%	57%
23d	Not having to worry about being fired	43%	47%

27. How strongly would you agree or disagree with the following statements... (#24)

Public officials care a lot about what people like me think. (#24a)

	Before	After
Agree strongly	3%	4%
Agree somewhat	23%	33%
Neither agree nor disagree	15%	16%
Disagree somewhat	38%	34%
Disagree strongly	22%	13%

Most public policy issues are so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on. (#24b)

	Before	After
Agree strongly	3%	4%
Agree somewhat	23%	33%
Neither agree nor disagree	15%	16%
Disagree somewhat	38%	34%
Disagree strongly	22%	13%

People like me don't have any say about what the government does. (#24c)

	Before	After
Agree strongly	15%	6%
Agree somewhat	27%	26%
Neither agree nor disagree	18%	15%
Disagree somewhat	27%	34%
Disagree strongly	14%	19%

28. 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? (#25)

They just don't know enough. (#25a)

	Before	After
Agree	26%	30%
In the middle	26%	24%
Disagree	49%	47%

They believe some things that aren't true. (#25b)

	Before	After
Agree	12%	17%
In the middle	20%	15%
Disagree	68%	68%

They are not thinking clearly. (#25c)

	Before	After
Agree	28%	39%
In the middle	33%	25%
Disagree	39%	36%

They have good reasons; there just are better ones on the other side. (#25d)

	Before	After
Agree	18%	19%
In the middle	26%	25%
Disagree	56%	56%

29. 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? (#26)

I respect their point of view, even though it is different from mine. (#26a)

	Before	After
Agree strongly	41%	49%
Agree somewhat	39%	39%
Neither agree nor disagree	10%	5%
Disagree somewhat	8%	5%
Disagree strongly	2%	2%

It is hopeless to reach agreement with them. (#26b)

	Before	After
Agree strongly	3%	5%
Agree somewhat	22%	25%
Neither agree nor disagree	32%	23%
Disagree somewhat	30%	31%
Disagree strongly	11%	16%

I would be willing to compromise to find a solution we both can support. (#26c)

	Before	After
Agree strongly	37%	40%
Agree somewhat	43%	44%
Neither agree nor disagree	11%	8%
Disagree somewhat	7%	5%
Disagree strongly	2%	3%

# Academic Advisory Group

**David M. Kennedy**, Professor of History, Emeritus, Stanford University, and Co-Director, The Bill Lane Center for the American West

**Bruce Cain**, Professor of Political Science, UC Berkeley, and Director of the University of California Washington Center

**Kim Belshe**, Senior Policy Advisor, Public Policy Institute of California, former California Secretary of Health and Human Services

**Henry Brady**, Professor of Political Science, UC Berkeley, and Dean of the Goldman School of Public Policy

**Gary Segura**, Professor of Political Science and Chair of Chicana/o Studies, Stanford University

**Annette Nellen**, Professor, College of Business, San Jose State University

**Michael Shires**, Associate Professor of Public Policy, Pepperdine University

**Pamela S. Karlan**, Professor of Public Interest Law at Stanford Law School and Co-Director, Supreme Court Litigation Clinic

**David Brady**, Professor of Political Science, Stanford University and Deputy Director, The Hoover Institution

**Kenneth P. Miller**, Associate Professor, Claremont McKenna College and Associate Director, The Rose Institute of State and Local Government

**Roger Noll**, Professor of Economics, Emeritus, Stanford University and Senior Fellow at the Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research

**Larry Diamond**, Senior Fellow, Hoover Institution and Director of the Center for Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law, Stanford University

**Leo Estrada**, Associate Professor of Urban Planning, UCLA School of Public Affairs

**Jack Citrin**, Professor of Political Science and Director, Institute of Governmental Studies, UC Berkeley

**Mathew McCubbins**, Provost Professor of Business, Law, and Political Economy, USC

**Chair, Thad Kousser**, Associate Professor of Political Science, UC San Diego and Director of the California Constitutional Reform Project, Bill Lane Center for the American West

# Project Advisory Committee

**Orson Aguilar**, Greenlining Institute

**Kim Alexander**, California Voter Foundation

**DeDe Alpert**, Former legislator

**Nancy Berlin**, Center for Community Change

**Linda Best**, Contra Costa Council

**Christopher Chavez**, California State Student Association

**David Davenport**, California Forward, Hoover Institution

**Larry Diamond**, Stanford University

**Ann Doerr**

**Kathay Feng**, California Common Cause

**Joel Fox**, Small Business Action Committee

**Dave Garth**, San Luis Obispo Chamber of Commerce

**Janis Hirohama**, California League of Women Voters

**Denise Hunter**, First AME Church

**Loren Kaye**, California Foundation for Commerce and Education

**David Lesher**, Public Policy Institute of California

**Michele Lew**, Asian Americans for Community Involvement

**Jim Mayer**, California Forward

**Lenny Mendonca**, California Forward, New America Foundation, Common Cause,  
Bay Area Council

**Mitch Mitchell**, Little Hoover Commission

**Anu Natarajan**, Reviving California

**Eligio Nava**, Central California Hispanic Chamber

**David Pacheco**, AARP

**Pete Peterson**, Pepperdine University's Davenport Institute for Public Engagement

**Laurene Powell Jobs**, New America Foundation

**Kendra Rogers**, First 5 - Fresno

**Jean Ross**, California Budget Project

**Dan Schnur**, USC Unruh Institute of Politics

**Libby Sholes**, California Church Impact

**Jonathan Stein**, Democracy Matters

**Bob Stern**, Center for Governmental Studies

*The statewide Advisory Committee for "What's Next California?" provided input into the development of the reform proposals considered in the Deliberative Poll. Their participation in this effort should not be seen as an official endorsement of these reforms.*

## Funders

"What's Next California?" is made possible by generous contributions from The S.D. Bechtel Jr. Foundation, The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the Automobile Club of Southern California, the American Leadership Forum — Silicon Valley, California Forward, Emerson Collective, John and Ann Doerr, David Davenport and Lenny and Christine Mendonca.



## Partners



California Forward is a non-partisan, non-profit organization working to identify common sense steps Californians can take to make government work. California Forward accomplishes this through broad consultation and analysis of critical problems facing the state, and then identifies nonpartisan reforms that can make a difference.



The New America Foundation is a nonprofit, nonpartisan public policy institute that invests in new thinkers and new ideas to address the next generation of challenges facing the United States. Headquartered in Washington, DC, New America also has a significant presence in California, the nation's largest laboratory of democracy.



The Public Policy Institute of California is a nonprofit, nonpartisan think tank. PPIC is dedicated to informing and improving public policy in California through independent, objective, nonpartisan research on major economic, social, and political issues. PPIC does not take or support positions on any ballot measure or on any local, state, or federal legislation, nor does it endorse, support, or oppose any political parties or candidates for public office.



The Nicolas Berggruen Institute is an independent, non-partisan think tank and consultancy engaged in the comparative study and design of systems of governance suited to the new and complex challenges of the 21st century.



The Bill Lane Center for the American West at Stanford University is dedicated to advancing scholarly and public understanding of the past, present, and future of western North America.



The Davenport Institute for Public Engagement and Civic Leadership at Pepperdine University is dedicated to helping solve California's public problems by promoting citizens' participation in governance.



California Common Cause is a non-partisan citizens' organization whose goal is to ensure open, honest, and accountable government.



The Center for Deliberative Democracy at Stanford University is devoted to research about democracy and public opinion obtained through Deliberative Polling®. The Center has organized Deliberative Polls throughout the United States, Europe, and Asia. For more about Deliberative Polling® see <http://cdd.stanford.edu>.



MacNeil/Lehrer Production's By the People project is a civic journalism project that most recently worked with the Center for Deliberative Democracy to produce a state-wide Deliberative Poll and follow up documentary in Michigan called "Hard Times, Hard Choices."