California’s June 7th primary set the political matchups for the 2022 general election, but how will November’s results be shaped by the national political battle over reproductive rights, by our state’s rising crime rates, and by the dynamics of the top two primary? And after low turnout in June, who is likely to participate in November? To answer these questions, we fielded a UC San Diego Yankelovich Center Survey from June 11-17th, 2022. We asked 2,979 Californians about whether they planned to vote in November’s election and who they preferred in the statewide contests. Because some of these matchups have yet to be finalized as ballots are still being counted, we provided alternate matchups in the Attorney General and Insurance Commissioner races that demonstrate how those races will be shaped by which candidate makes it through to the top two in the general election. To see how state trends and national controversies may impact November’s elections, we conducted two “survey experiments” in which respondents read different pieces of factual information before answering questions about the election. Finally, we follow up on the September 2021 Yankelovich Survey by asking whether Californians want to change the state’s recall process and how they view some of the reform ideas currently being discussed by state leaders. As the sections below explore in greater detail, our key findings are that:

- Californians who definitely plan to vote in November are much more likely to be affluent, older, white, and partisan, compared to those who are not planning to vote
- After independents read a news article about a potential national ban on abortion, they become more likely to say they will vote in November. This impact is not strong among Republicans or Democrats
- Californians’ approval of the Attorney General and views on repealing Proposition 47 depend on whether they focus on recent increases in crime rates or the long-term drop in crime over decades
- Democrats look set to retain their dominance over statewide offices, with each Democrat who will advance to November holding a strong lead over their Republican opponent
- No matter which Republican opponent he faces, Attorney General Rob Bonta holds a sizeable lead today, as does Equalization Board member Malia Cohen over Lanhee Chen in the race for Controller
• The “top two” rules could make the Insurance Commissioner contest close. If Democratic Assemblymember Marc Levine advances to the general election, he poses a significant challenge to incumbent Ricardo Lara, while Republican Robert Howell does not

• Californians are still open to reforming the state’s recall process and they strongly support some of the specific proposals that have been discussed by policymakers

ABOUT THIS SURVEY

This report details the key findings from the survey that we conducted on a diverse sample of Californians, just after the June 7, 2022 primary, from June 11th-17th. Based on a surveying technique that is now common and well-vetted, it includes a sample of 2,979 respondents, drawn to reflect California’s voting age population along the lines of race, ethnicity, age, and gender, using the online Luc.id Marketplace platform. We used two attention-check questions to ensure that online respondents were reading the survey carefully, removing those who were not from our sample. This sample was targeted based on the characteristics of the state’s citizen voting age population from the 2020 American Community Survey, and we applied post-stratification survey weights. The margin of error on this survey is plus or minus 1.8 percentage points for respondents overall. For smaller subsets of voters, such as members of a particular party or demographic group, the margin of error is larger.

AFTER A LOW-TURNOUT PRIMARY, WHO IS MOST LIKELY TO VOTE IN NOVEMBER?

Though the final vote count has not yet been completed, it appears clear that turnout levels in the June 2022 primary will be much closer to those in June of 2014, in which a historic low of 25.2% of registered voters participated, than it will be to June of 2018, in which 37.5% turned out. On June 17th of this year, reported turnout stood at 28% of registered voters. Analyses of the low level of engagement with this election focused on voter apathy and dissatisfaction with public safety in the wake of mass shootings and noted that turnout appeared particularly low among Latinos.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Definitely will vote</th>
<th>Probably will vote</th>
<th>May or may not vote</th>
<th>Probably will not vote</th>
<th>Definitely will not vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Party</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $25,000</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $149,999</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $150,000</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Californians</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Will this pattern be repeated in November, or will the election laws that California has passed in recent years to increase turnout by making voting more convenient – and especially to ensure that California’s electorate better reflects its population’s diversity – lead to higher, more representative participation? To investigate this, we began our survey by asking respondents whether or not they planned to vote in November. Our first table shows that, overall, 65.7% of respondents reported that they will definitely vote in the general election, 15.7% will probably vote, 8.4% may or may not, 3.2% probably will not, and 6.7% definitely will not cast a ballot.

Yet beneath this overall high level of self-reported intent to vote are stark differences across demographic groups that reveal potential participation gaps in November. There is a powerful correlation between income levels and plans to vote, with only 51.5% of Californians who make less than $25,000 per year definitely intending to vote while fully 93.3% of those who make above $150,000 plan to participate in November. Age is strongly linked to vote intention as well, with 46.6% of young adults but 79.8% of seniors definitely planning to vote. Though the differences across racial and ethnic groups is not as stark, non-Hispanic white Californians are more likely than members of other groups to plan to turn out. Partisanship is also a factor: 77.6% of Republicans, 73.4% of Democrats, but only 45.9% of no party preference or minor party registrants say that they definitely intend to cast a ballot.

Nothing in these differences across groups is new in state or national politics. But by identifying which types of voters are on the fence about turning out this November, they show just how much marginal differences in turnout will affect the composition of the electorate. If the types of voters who “probably” or “may or may not” plan to vote in the general election do indeed participate, turnout will be more like the 64.5% rate recorded in November of 2018 and the electorate will be much more reflective of the state’s eligible voters. But if they stay home and turnout resembles the 42.2% of registered voters who cast a ballot in November of 2014, the electorate will be further skewed. Non-partisan outreach by elections officials, mobilization by nonprofit groups, and get-out-the-vote efforts by campaigns on both sides will be vital to making turnout in November high and, just as important, representative of California.

**November Matchups Show a Blue Bulwark against Red Wave**

Next, we asked respondents whom they planned to vote for, in matchups that narrowed the field down to the top two candidates who led in initial vote counts. We set the matchups based on preliminary results available at noon on June 9th, rotated the order of the two candidates shown to each respondent, and provided the same occupational labels and party preference designations that voters saw on their official ballots. Because we did not force respondents to pick a candidate, the percentages in the next table do not add up to 100%.

These results show that, even during what is expected to be a strong year for Republicans across the nation, Democrats remain in a strong position to capture every statewide office just as they have since 2010. The party registration edge that Democrats hold in California – currently at 46.8% to 23.9% – appears wide enough to insulate their candidates from an expected red wave. In the governor’s race, our survey shows incumbent Democrat Gavin Newsom supported by 58.6% of respondents, compared with Republican state senator Brian Dahle at 39.8%. Newsom adds just a few points to the vote share that he captured in the primary (55.9%), while Dahle is able to consolidate nearly all of the support that was spread across the other GOP challengers to dramatically improve upon his vote share in the primary, 17.7%. Still, Gov. Newsom’s lead of nearly 19 points puts him in a position to win by the same wide margin that he did when he first captured the office in 2018 and when he defended himself against a recall attempt in 2021.
This pattern is repeated in races up and down the statewide ballot. Although Mark Meuser, the Republican challenger for US Senate, has consolidated support that went to other members of his party in the primary, he still trails appointed Senator Alex Padilla by nearly 22 points. Appointed Sec. of State Shirley Webber holds an even more commanding lead over her challenger, Rob Bernosky. Treasurer Fiona Ma was also supported by a supermajority of respondents, and, in the nonpartisan Supt. of Public Instruction contest, incumbent Tony Thurmond's margin over public school teacher Ainye E. Long is 11 points. In our survey, the Democratic incumbent who holds the narrowest lead is Lt. Governor Eleni Kounalakis, who is favored over Republican businesswoman and deputy mayor Angela E. Underwood Jacobs by only a 51.8% to 46% margin. This mirrors the provisional results of the primary, in which Kounalakis captured the lowest vote percentage, 52.6%, of any statewide incumbent running in a partisan office, other than Insurance Commissioner Ricardo Lara.

The open-seat contest for Controller has drawn close attention. Moderate Republican Lanhee Chen has been termed “either the great Republican hope to win statewide in California, or he’s ‘fools gold.’” In the primary, fiscal advisor and Stanford educator Chen was the top vote getter with 37.3%. Yet our survey suggests that this may be close to the ceiling for his candidacy, unless he can draw strong public attention that allows him to overcome the challenge of running with a Republican party label. Chen attracted the support of 43.1% of our respondents, while Democratic Board of Equalization member Malia Cohen consolidated support from other candidates in her party to rise from 22.5% in the primary to be favored by 54.6% in our survey.

In two races where second place was too close to call in the days after the primary, but where the outcome of the fight to get into the top two might reshape the race – the Attorney General and Insurance Commissioner contests – we surveyed two potential matchups. We did this by conducting “survey experiments” in which half of the respondents (randomly selected) were asked about one potential matchup and the other half asked about the other potential general election battle. This allows us to see, with similar groups of respondents, how the different potential matchups might shape the November contest.
An independent expenditure campaign backing appointed Attorney General Rob Bonta employed a strategy that some Democrats across the state have been using: run advertisements in the primary that appear to elevate your most conservative Republican opponent, possibly hoping for a more favorable general election matchup. These ads seemingly boosted conservative Republican Eric Early, rather than the more moderate GOP challenger, Nathan Hochman. Our findings show that, at least at this point in the election cycle, it matters little who Bonta faces. Hochman captured only 33.6% of the support from respondents who were shown this matchup, while Early actually performed marginally better, winning the favor of 34.8% of respondents who saw this alternate matchup. Bonta dominated both matchups against his potential Republican opponents, likely because it is difficult for most Californians to discern the differences between members of the same party in this highly polarized era.

Finally, the race for Insurance Commissioner could become the most competitive statewide contest, but only if Democratic Assemblymember Marc Levine makes it into the top two. He currently trails Republican cybersecurity equipment manufacturer Robert Howell by 0.5% in the primary vote count so far. Our alternative matchups, broken down by partisan and demographic groups in the table below, show that this race will change dramatically based on who is on the ballot in November. If this becomes a Democrat vs. Republican contest, it will look much like the other races at the statewide level. Among our respondents who saw this alternative, incumbent Ricardo Lara holds a commanding advantage of over thirty points overall, winning the support of nine out of ten Democrats and winning independents by almost a ten-point margin. Republican Robert Howell would run nearly even among white (non-Hispanic) Californians and strongly among seniors, but far behind among other racial and ethnic groups and anyone under 65.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Support in Potential Matchups in the Race for CA Insurance Commissioner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Matchup 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo Lara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Party</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $49,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $149,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race and Ethnicity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (non-Hispanic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Californians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yankelovich Center Survey
Yet if Lara has to face Democrat Levine in November, these results indicate that his advantage would narrow to ten percentage points. Lara holds a 2-1 edge among Latinos and a strong lead among Democrats in our survey, but Levine runs more strongly with members of other racial and ethnic groups and among independents and Republicans. Because California’s top two system allows this sort of Democrat vs. Democrat contest in November, it could create competition in the general election that would be absent in a traditional matchup between the parties. Only rarely has the top two had this anticipated impact in statewide races; this is the only race where it might happen this year, and only if Levine advances to November.

**WILL NATIONAL CONTROVERSIES AND INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT STIMULATE PARTICIPATION IN NOVEMBER?**

Though turnout was low in June's primary, a number of national and global issues could stimulate much higher rates of participation in November. In order to test how priming respondents to think about these issues may stimulate them to turn out, we conducted a survey experiment in which half of them read the first few paragraphs of an article published recently in Newsweek about reproductive rights and the other half – randomly selected, to ensure that it would be demographically and ideologically comparable to the first half of our sample – read the opening of another Newsweek article about the conflict with Russia. The first article, “National Abortion Ban Possible if Roe v. Wade Overturned: Mitch McConnell,” began by reporting that, “Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell said a national abortion ban could be ‘possible’ if the Supreme Court overturns Roe v. Wade.” The other article, “Matt Gaetz Wants Congress to Decide if U.S. Should Go to War With Russia,” began with “Republican Representative Matt Gaetz of Florida on Wednesday criticized government support of Ukraine, stating that if members of Congress ‘recklessly’ assert that the U.S. is at war with Russia then it should be officially declared.”

How did these two groups of voters react? Recall from our first table that, when we asked them about their intent to vote at the beginning of our survey, 65.7% of respondents reported that they would definitely vote in November. When we asked them this question again, immediately after reading the articles, 67.3% of those reading the article on a possible abortion ban said they would definitely vote, as did 67.1% of those who read about the potential for war with Russia. Overall, there was less than a two-percentage point increase. But for independents, effect of reading about reproductive rights was strong on their intention to vote. The percentage of independents definitely planning to vote when asked at the beginning of the survey was 45.9%; this rose to 57.1% among those who read about a potential abortion ban but still registered only 46% among those who read the Russia article. Independents who read either story (69.5% and 69%) said that they considered November’s election very important to the future of our nation. Convincing these voters that the 2022 election has vital policy consequences could be pivotal to turning them out.

For Democrats and Republicans, we did not see these strong shifts in their stated intention to turn out, depending on which article they read. The percentage of Democrats definitely planning to vote when asked at the beginning of the survey was 73.4%; after reading an article, this registered at 71.5% among those who read about a potential abortion ban and 77.7% among those who read the Russia article. When asked whether November’s election is very important to the future of our nation, 76.6% of Democrats who read about abortion agreed, compared with 80.7% of Democrats who read about Russia. Republicans also did not see significant changes dependent on which article they read. The percentage of Republicans definitely planning to vote when asked at the beginning of the survey was already high at 77.6%; this rose to 80% among those who read about a potential abortion ban and to 78.4% for those who read the Russia article. When asked whether November’s election is very important to the future of our nation, 79.5% of Republicans who read about abortion rights agreed, as did 74.8% who read about Russia.
The last survey experiment that we conducted addressed an issue that has gained much attention this year, rising crime rates. The most recent statewide crime statistics that are available from California’s Department of Justice are from 2020, showing a 31% increase in the homicide rate between 2019 and 2020. Much of the media narrative about criminal justice in the state today has focused on this recent trend. Putting this rise into a longer-term perspective reveals that homicide rates had fallen dramatically from their high in 1993 to a historic low in 2019, a 59% decline. We provided one group of respondents with a description and graph focused only on the recent rise. For the other randomly-selected half of our sample, we showed both the recent rise and the long-term decline. Both descriptions were truthful, with the second adding additional historical context.

**Reading About Abortion or Russia Increase Civic Engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Percent Saying that They Will Definitely Vote in the November General Election</th>
<th>Percent Saying November’s Election is Very Important to the Future of our Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposed to a Newspaper Article Discussing the Possibility of War With Russia</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposed to a Newspaper Article Discussing a Possible National Ban on Abortion if Roe V Wade is Overturned</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Democrats**

| Exposed to a Newspaper Article Discussing the Possibility of War With Russia | 77.7%                                                                            | 80.7%                                                                            |
| Exposed to a Newspaper Article Discussing a Possible National Ban on Abortion if Roe V Wade is Overturned | 71.5%                                                                            | 76.6%                                                                            |

**Republicans**

| Exposed to a Newspaper Article Discussing the Possibility of War With Russia | 78.4%                                                                            | 74.8%                                                                            |
| Exposed to a Newspaper Article Discussing a Possible National Ban on Abortion if Roe V Wade is Overturned | 80%                                                                                | 79.5%                                                                            |

**Independents**

| Exposed to a Newspaper Article Discussing the Possibility of War With Russia | 46%                                                                                | 69.5%                                                                            |
| Exposed to a Newspaper Article Discussing a Possible National Ban on Abortion if Roe V Wade is Overturned | 57.1%                                                                            | 69%                                                                             |

**Yankelovich Center Survey**

**HOW DO LONG-TERM VS. SHORT-TERM PERSPECTIVES ON CRIME RATES INFLUENCE OPINION?**
**Short-Term Crime Trend Information**

There has been a lot of discussion about crime recently. As you can see in the graph below, based on data from the California Department of Justice, the homicide rate in California increased by 31% between 2019 and 2020.

![Homicides Per Year in California](image1)

**Long-Term Crime Trend Information**

There has been a lot of discussion about crime recently. As you can see in the graph below, based on data from the California Department of Justice, the homicide rate in California increased by 31% between 2019 and 2020. However, this comes after homicide rates dropped to a historic low in California in 2019, falling by 59% from the peak in 1993.

![Homicides Per Year in California](image2)

After respondents saw one of the graphs and descriptions, we then asked them for their opinions about California’s Attorney General and about a recent ballot measure, Proposition 47, which has come under criticism recently as a potential contributor to rising crime rates. As the table below shows, taking a short- versus a long-term view of homicide rates led to dramatically different views on criminal justice policymakers and policies. Only 50.9% of those who saw the recent rise in crime approved of Attorney General Rob Bonta’s performance, compared with 70.3% of those who saw both the short- and long-term trends. The impact of this information was strong across all partisan groups, but especially sharp among Republicans. When we asked again about whether respondents planned to vote for Bonta in November, he performed 8.7 percentage points better among those who saw both the short- and long-term trends. When asked whether they favored repealing Prof. 47, after reading its original ballot description, 67.3% of those looking at recent trends and 59.5% of those exposed to a longer historical perspective wanted to repeal it. Californians’ views on criminal justice today clearly depend on how far back into our state’s history of crime rates they look.
Californians Remain Open to Reforming the Recall Process

In the 2021 Yankelovich Center Survey, “Reforming the Recall?”, registered voters surveyed during the week of the governor’s recall election demonstrated strong support for making changes to the recall process overall and for many potential reform ideas. At that time, 68% wanted to see either “major” or “minor” changes to the recall process. Nine months later, even though recall reform has become much less prominent in the popular conversation, respondents remain very open to constitutional changes. Overall, nearly 75% of respondents in this survey favored making major or minor changes to the recall, with strong support for reform coming from Democrats (74.6%), Republicans (77%), and independents (70.6%).

Looking at specific reforms, two of the proposals had broad support across party lines, while the other two brought a sharp party split, winning the support of Democrats but not independents and Republicans. There was strong bipartisan support for the proposal to specify “the reasons – such as concerns about corruption or criminal acts – that would be required to justify any recall,” with 72.7% overall favoring this idea. The other idea that won supermajority support (67.6%) overall and backing from every partisan group was one proposed by the Little Hoover Commission: “whenever a recall gathers enough signatures to qualify for the ballot, a ‘snap election’ is called in which the official targeted by the recall would be placed on the ballot with all challengers, and the person who receives the most votes would complete the term.”
The two other proposals split the major parties, but still gained narrow majority support overall. One, with 56.7% support, was another idea advanced by the *Little Hoover Commission* to change the signature threshold to qualify a recall. We explained it as follows: “California’s constitution now requires recall organizers to collect signatures equal to 12% of the votes cast in the last governor’s election (requiring 1.5 million signatures to be collected). Would you support a constitutional amendment to increase this signature threshold to 10% of the total number of registered voters (requiring 2.2 million signatures to be collected), to hold a recall election?” Finally, 50.6% of respondents supported a proposal that would automatically replace a recalled governor with the Lt. Governor, to fill out the remainder of the term. Though time is running out to place a constitutional amendment on the November 2022 ballot, these findings suggest that Californians would be open to considering reforms this year or potentially in 2024.

### Support for Recall Process Reform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Supporting Minor or Major Changes to the Recall Process</th>
<th>Percent in Favor of a Constitutional Amendment that Outlines Justifiable Reasons for a Recall</th>
<th>Percent in Favor of a Constitutional Amendment that Increases the Number of Signatures Required for a Recall</th>
<th>Percent in Favor of a Constitutional Amendment that Creates a &quot;Snap Election&quot; if Recall Signature Count is Met</th>
<th>Percent in Favor of a Constitutional Amendment that Replaces a Recalled Governor with the Lt. Governor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Yankelovich Center Survey*

### About the Yankelovich Center

UC San Diego’s Yankelovich Center for Social Science Research is dedicated to crafting practical solutions to the nation’s most pressing social problems. The Center supports research partnerships and activities that spur public engagement and civic improvements – including addressing racial and ethnic inequities in our society and in our democracy. The Center’s goal is to be an incubator for pioneering ideas that can be translated into tangible solutions for a diverse San Diego and nation. Learn more at yankelovichcenter.ucsd.edu.
Appendix: Full Text of All Survey Questions

This November, California’s voters will elect statewide officials such as the governor and a US senator as well as members of Congress and the State Legislature. How likely is it that you will vote in the election this November?

- Definitely will vote
- Probably will vote
- May or may not vote
- Probably will not vote
- Definitely will not vote

GOVERNOR

Brian Dahle  
Senator/Farmer  
Party Preference: REP

Gavin Newsom  
Governor of California  
Party Preference: DEM

US SENATOR

Alex Padilla  
Appointed United States Senator  
Party Preference: DEM

Mark P. Meuser  
Constitutional Attorney  
Party Preference: REP

SURVEY EXPERIMENT:

ATTORNEY GENERAL

Rob Bonta  
Appointed Attorney General of the State of California  
Party Preference: DEM

Nathan Hochman  
General Counsel  
Party Preference: REP

ATTORNEY GENERAL

Rob Bonta  
Appointed Attorney General of the State of California  
Party Preference: DEM

Eric Early  
Attorney/Business Owner  
Party Preference: REP

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Eleni Kounalakis  
Lieutenant Governor  
Party Preference: DEM

Angela E. Underwood Jacobs  
Businesswoman/Deputy Mayor  
Party Preference: REP

SECRETARY OF STATE

Rob Bernosky  
Chief Financial Officer  
Party Preference: REP

Shirley N. Weber  
Appointed California Secretary of State  
Party Preference: DEM

CONTROLLER

Malia M. Cohen  
California State Board of Equalization Member  
Party Preference: DEM

Lanhee Chen  
Fiscal Advisor/Educator  
Party Preference: REP

TREASURER

Jack M. Guerrero  
Councilmember/CPA/Economist  
Party Preference: REP

Fiona Ma  
State Treasurer/CPA  
Party Preference: DEM
In the Presidential election held in November 2020, did you vote for Joe Biden and Kamala Harris with the Democrats or Donald Trump and Mike Pence with the Republicans? (rotate order of first two responses)

Biden/Harris - Democrats
Trump/Pence - Republicans
Another candidate
Did not vote for president

In the California governor’s recall election last year, how did you vote? (rotate order of first two responses)

Yes, to recall Governor Newsom
No, to keep Governor Newsom
I did not participate in the recall election

Regardless of what you think about the outcome of the governor’s recall election held last year, how satisfied are you with the way the recall process works in California?

Very satisfied
Somewhat satisfied
Not too satisfied
Not at all satisfied

Generally speaking, and regardless of how you feel about this year’s election, do you think the recall election process in California needs major changes, minor changes, or is it basically okay the way it is?

Needs major changes
Needs minor changes
Okay the way it is
Don’t know
California’s constitution states that “Recall is the power of the electors to remove an elective officer,” but does not specify the reasons for removal. Would you support a constitutional amendment specifying the reasons – such as concerns about corruption or criminal acts – that would be required to justify any recall?

Yes, I’d support specifying the reasons required to justify any recall
No, I would keep the constitution as it is
Don’t know

California’s constitution now requires recall organizers to collect signatures equal to 12% of the votes cast in the last governor’s election (requiring 1.5 million signatures to be collected). Would you support a constitutional amendment to increase this signature threshold to 10% of the total number of registered voters (requiring 2.2 million signatures to be collected), to hold a recall election?

Yes, I’d support increasing the signatures required to hold a recall election to 10% of the total number of registered voters
No, I would keep the constitution as it is
Don’t know

Would you support a constitutional amendment requiring that whenever a recall gathers enough signatures to qualify for the ballot, a “snap election” is called in which the official targeted by the recall would be placed on the ballot with all challengers, and the person who receives the most votes would complete the term.

Yes, I’d support a recall election in which the official targeted by the recall would be placed on the ballot with all challengers.
No, I would keep the constitution as it is
Don’t know

Would you support a constitutional amendment requiring that whenever a recall of a governor is successful, that the lieutenant governor would automatically become the next governor?

Yes, I’d support replacing any governor who is recalled with the lieutenant governor
No, I would keep the constitution as it is
Don’t know

Do you trust that California election results accurately reflect the vote, or do you think there is significant vote fraud in our state’s elections these days?

I trust that California election results accurately reflect the vote
I think there is significant vote fraud in California elections these days
Don’t know

During this year’s June primary election, did you see any posts on social media that you feel were intended to deceive you about the election, how to vote in it, or about any of the candidates?

Yes
No
During this year’s June primary election, did you hear about any of your family members or friends being targeted by posts on social media that you feel were intended to deceive them about the election, how to vote in it, or about any of the candidates?

Yes
No

During this year’s June primary election, do you think any of your family members or friends made voting decisions or took actions that were influenced by posts on social media intended to deceive them?

Yes
No

**Now we’d like to ask you some questions about the state of California.**

When children today in California grow up, do you think the state will be a better place to live or a worse place to live, overall, than it has been over the past decade?

- A better place to live
- A worse place to live
- Don’t know

Some people have a great attachment to California, while others don’t like it at all. Taking everything into account, how would you describe California as a place to live?

- One of the best places to live
- Nice but not an outstanding place
- About an average place to live
- Rather poor place to live

Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: “The California Dream still works for people like me and my family”?

- Completely agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Completely disagree

Have you given any consideration recently to moving out of California?

- Yes, am giving serious consideration to moving out of California
- Yes, am giving some consideration to moving out of California
- No, but am considering moving to another location within California
- No, am not considered a move

What county do you live in?

[Newsweek Articles]
**How important would you this November’s election is to the future of our nation?**

- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not important

**Thinking again about this November’s election, in which California’s voters will elect statewide officials such as the governor and a US senator as well as members of Congress and the State Legislature, how likely is it that you will vote in the election this November?**

- Definitely will vote
- Probably will vote
- May or may not vote
- Probably will not vote
- Definitely will not vote

[Crime Rate Information]

**Do you approve of the job California Attorney General Rob Bonta is doing?**

- Strongly approve
- Approve
- Disapprove
- Strongly disapprove
- I don’t know

**Thinking again about the election for Attorney General this November, if you had to make a decision today, who would you vote for?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Party Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rob Bonta</td>
<td>Appointed Attorney General of the State of California</td>
<td>DEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Hochman</td>
<td>General Counsel</td>
<td>REP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Marie Schubert</td>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Early</td>
<td>Attorney/Business Owner</td>
<td>REP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In 2014, California voters voted in favor of Proposition 47.**

Proposition 47 classified certain crimes as misdemeanors instead of felonies unless the defendant had prior convictions for murder, rape, certain sex offenses or certain gun crimes; allowing resentencing for those currently serving a prison sentence for any of the offenses that the initiative reduced to misdemeanors; and creating the Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Fund to receive appropriations based on savings from the initiative.

**Do you favor REPEALING Proposition 47?**

A. Yes, I favor repealing Proposition 47
B. No, I favor keeping the law the way it is
C. I don’t know