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Key Findings

Jobs and the economy are a top concern as Californians set a future course in the November election. Although job growth has been relatively strong as the state and nation recover from the COVID-19 crisis, residents are dealing with rising prices on consumer goods and high gasoline costs. Lower-income Californians are also facing high housing costs, while upper-income Californians have recently experienced setbacks in the financial markets. Meanwhile, state and federal governments have made substantial investments in services and programs to expand economic opportunity over the past year.

These are among the key findings of a statewide survey on economic well-being that was conducted from October 7 to October 21 by the Public Policy Institute of California.

- **Strong majorities of Californians say the gap between the rich and the poor is getting larger (71%) and children growing up in California today will be worse off than their parents (67%).** Seven in ten say the state government should do more to reduce the gap between the rich and poor.

- **Most Californians are predicting bad times for the state economy in the next 12 months (69%).** Twenty-four percent of Californians say the lack of well-paying jobs in their region is a big problem, with lower-income residents making less than $40,000 somewhat more likely to hold this view. Twenty-three percent of Californians say the lack of well-paying jobs is making them seriously consider moving out of the state.

- **Most Californians say they are satisfied with their household’s financial situation, while about four in ten or more lower-income residents are not satisfied.** About half of Californians are upset about rising prices and a similar proportion say the cost of gasoline or other transportation is causing hardships. Many lower-income residents say it would be difficult to cover a $1,000 emergency expense.

- **Half or more Californians across income groups report having driven less due to the cost of gasoline in the past 12 months.** One-third report having reduced meals or cut back on food to save money, including half of lower-income residents. Twenty-one percent report having work hours reduced or pay cut this past year, including about one-third of lower-income residents.

- **Forty-three percent of Californians—including half of lower-income residents—worry every day or almost every day about the cost of gasoline and other transportation.** Nearly three in ten adults, and about four in ten lower-income residents, are similarly worried about the cost of housing. About a quarter or more worry every day or almost every day about the debt they have and saving for retirement. Four in ten lower-income Californians worry every day or almost every day about paying their bills.
California Economy

The share of Californians expecting good times in the next 12 months continued to decline last month, after rebounding in 2021. Just three in ten Californians are optimistic today, while seven in ten are pessimistic. Findings today are much closer to December 2020 (31% good times, 68% bad times) than November 2021 (47% good times, 52% bad times). Majorities across parties, regions, and demographic groups are pessimistic, although pessimism is far lower among Democrats (57%) than independents (77%) or Republicans (89%). Additionally, African Americans (54%) are the least likely across racial/ethnic groups to be pessimistic (64% Latinos, 72% whites, 73% Asian Americans). Pessimism is lowest in Los Angeles (60%) and highest in the Central Valley (75%). When asked a similar question about economic conditions during the next five years, Californians are only slightly more optimistic, with 37 percent expecting good times and 62 percent expecting periods of depression or unemployment.
Eight in ten Californians view the availability of well-paying jobs as a problem (24% big, 55% somewhat), while just one in five say it is not a problem. Findings were nearly identical last November (22% big problem, 57% somewhat of a problem, 21% not a problem), while slightly more viewed this lack of well-paying jobs as a problem in December 2020 (27% big problem, 61% somewhat of a problem, 12% not a problem). Today, residents in the Inland Empire are the most likely—and those in the San Francisco Bay Area the least likely—to say the availability of well-paying jobs is a problem. More than three in four across parties view it as a problem. While more than seven in ten across demographic groups view the availability of well-paying jobs as a problem, it is notable that the share declines with rising income. Among Californians with incomes of less than $40,000, younger Californians are much more likely than older adults to say the lack of well-paying jobs is a big problem.
Most Californians view the availability of well-paying jobs as a problem

When asked if the lack of well-paying jobs has made them seriously consider moving away from their part of California, 28 percent of Californians say yes. Findings have been similar each time we have asked this question (26% November 2021, 32% December 2020). Today, Republicans, residents in Orange/San Diego and the Central Valley, non–college graduates, renters, and lower-income Californians are more likely than others to report considering moving from their part of California. Among those who have considered moving, most would leave the state rather than go somewhere else in California. Among Californians with incomes of less than $40,000, younger Californians are much more likely than older adults to say they have seriously considered moving out of their part of California.

SOURCE: PPIC Statewide Survey, November 2022. Survey was fielded from October 7–21, 2022 (n=2,307 adults, n=1,342 likely voters).
Nearly three in ten Californians say the lack of well-paying jobs has made them consider moving out of their part of the state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes, elsewhere in California</th>
<th>Yes, outside of California</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All adults</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely voters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Empire</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange/San Diego</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Bay Area</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: PPIC Statewide Survey, November 2022. Survey was fielded from October 7–21, 2022 (n=2,307 adults, n=1,342 likely voters).

Personal Finances

When asked about their household’s financial situation, nearly three in four Californians say they are satisfied—but only one in five are very satisfied. Views were similar last November (21% very satisfied, 57% somewhat satisfied, 22% not satisfied). Today, satisfaction rises along with income. Notably, nearly half of those with incomes of $20,000 or less are not satisfied. Strong majorities across regions and across age,
education, gender, and racial/ethnic groups say they are at least somewhat satisfied, but it is noteworthy that residents in the Central Valley and Inland Empire, African Americans, and those without a college degree are the least likely to be very satisfied.

Most Californians are satisfied with their financial situation, but there are differences across income groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All adults</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: PPIC Statewide Survey, November 2022. Survey was fielded from October 7–21, 2022 (n=2,307 adults, n=1,342 likely voters).

When asked how difficult it would be to handle an emergency expense of $1,000, a majority of Californians (55%) say this would be not too difficult, while fewer say it would be somewhat difficult (25%), very difficult (12%), or nearly impossible (7%). About half or more across regions and parties say this expense would not be too difficult. The perception that this expense would not be too difficult is far more common among those making $80,000 or more (76%) than among those making under $20,000 (12% less than $20,000, 33% $20,000 to $39,999); it is also much more common among whites (67%) and Asian Americans (65%) than among African Americans (40%) and Latinos (37%). This perception also rises sharply with increasing age and education.

While gas prices have seemingly decreased somewhat in recent weeks, they remain higher than they have been in recent years, and this is causing hardship for many Californians. A majority of residents say that the cost of gasoline or other transportation is causing them hardship, while 48 percent say these costs are not causing hardship. Across regions, hardship is experienced most often among those in the Central Valley (64%) and the Inland Empire (63%), followed by those in Orange/San Diego (51%), Los Angeles (49%), and the San Francisco Bay Area (37%). Across racial/ethnic groups, Latinos are the most likely to report hardship. The share of Californians reporting hardship declines as household income increases. The share experiencing hardship decreases with higher educational attainment. Republicans (64%) and independents
(55%) are much more likely to report hardship than Democrats (42%). Among Californians earning less than $40,000, those without a college degree are much more likely to say they have experienced hardship.

The cost of gas and other transportation is impacting many Californians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes, severe hardship</th>
<th>Yes, moderate hardship</th>
<th>No hardship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All adults</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Yes, severe hardship</th>
<th>Yes, moderate hardship</th>
<th>No hardship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** PPIC Statewide Survey, November 2022. Survey was fielded from October 7–21, 2022 (n=2,307 adults, n=1,342 likely voters).

When asked about the current rate of inflation, 49 percent of Californians say they are upset and another 48 percent say they are concerned but not upset, while very few (3%) say they are not concerned. More than half of residents in the Inland Empire, the Central Valley, and Orange/San Diego say they are upset, compared to fewer in Los Angeles and the San Francisco Bay Area. Across demographic groups, whites, younger Californians age 18 to 34, and those with incomes higher than $40,000 are the most likely to be upset. Those with some college education (58%) are much more likely to be upset than those with a high school diploma or less (44%) and those with a college degree (44%). Among Californians earning less than $40,000, women are more likely than men to say they are upset about the current rate of inflation.
Economic Security

A majority of Californians report that they or someone in their household have had to drive less due to the cost of gasoline (57%) over the past year. One in three have had to reduce meals or cut back on food to
save money, and about two in ten say they have had to put off seeing a doctor (21%), were unable to pay a monthly bill (20%), or had difficulty paying their rent or mortgage (18%) over the past year. Findings are similar to a year ago for all except the share driving less, as this is a new question.

Roughly three in ten or more among households earning less than $40,000 report experiencing these types of difficulties. Two in ten or fewer among households making more than $80,000 report cutting back on food, putting off doctor visits, having difficulty paying rent/mortgage, or being unable to pay a monthly bill, but half of higher-income adults say they have driven less due to the cost of gas. Renters are more likely than homeowners to report experiencing most of these hardships—but the shares reporting driving less are similar among homeowners and renters. Across racial/ethnic groups, Latinos are the most likely to report any of these difficulties. Residents in the Central Valley and Inland Empire are more likely to report any of these hardships than those in other regions.

Majorities of adults have driven less due to the cost of gas, while fewer have faced other types of financial difficulties

% happened to me or someone in my household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Driven less</th>
<th>Cut back on food</th>
<th>Put off doctor visit</th>
<th>Unable to pay monthly bill</th>
<th>Difficulty paying rent or mortgage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All adults</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: PPIC Statewide Survey, November 2022. Survey was fielded from October 7–21, 2022 (n=2,307 adults, n=1,342 likely voters).

About two in ten or fewer Californians say they or someone in their household has received food stamps (18%), food from a food bank or pantry (16%), or unemployment benefits (13%) in the past year. The shares saying they have received food stamps or assistance from a food bank were similar a year ago, while the share saying they have received unemployment benefits has declined by 14 percentage points (from 27% in November 2021). Today, there are significant differences across income groups: households earning less than $20,000 are the most likely to report receiving these types of economic assistance. Renters more often report receiving these types of economic assistance than homeowners do. Across racial/ethnic
groups, African Americans and Latinos are the most likely to report receiving food stamps, Asian Americans and Latinos are the most likely to say they have received unemployment benefits, and Latinos are the most likely to say they have received food from a food bank.

The shares of Californians who have received economic assistance vary across racial/ethnic and income groups

% happened to me or someone in my household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Received food stamps</th>
<th>Received food from a food bank or pantry</th>
<th>Received unemployment benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All adults</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** PPIC Statewide Survey, November 2022. Survey was fielded from October 7–21, 2022 (n=2,307 adults, n=1,342 likely voters).

About two in ten adults report that they or someone in their household had their work hours reduced or pay cut and 14 percent say they or someone in their household was laid off or lost their job in the past 12 months. Latinos, adults with incomes less than $40,000, and renters are the most likely to say they have been laid off or lost their job. Across demographic groups, Latinos and adults with incomes of less than $40,000 are the most likely to report either of these difficulties—and, notably, women are more likely than men to say they have had work hours or pay reduced. Across the state’s regions, residents in Los Angeles are the most likely to report either of these difficulties.
Financial Worries

More than four in ten Californians worry every day or almost every day about the cost of gasoline and other transportation (43%), about three in ten worry about the cost of housing (28%), and two in ten worry about

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Had work hours reduced or pay cut</th>
<th>Been laid off or lost their job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All adults</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely voters</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Empire</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange/San Diego</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Bay Area</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: PPIC Statewide Survey, November 2022. Survey was fielded from October 7–21, 2022 (n=2,307 adults, n=1,342 likely voters).
Similar shares expressed concern about the cost of housing and health care a year ago. Today, these concerns are more common in lower-income households—about three in ten or more Californians earning less than $20,000 worry about these financial issues every day or almost every day. Across racial/ethnic groups, Latinos are the most likely to worry. Women (49%) are more likely than men (37%) to say they are worried about the cost of gas and other transportation. Four in ten or more across regions worry about fuel costs, with the exception of the San Francisco Bay Area (31%). The share worried about these three financial issues decreases as education level increases. Notably, renters (40%) are about twice as likely as homeowners (19%) to worry about the cost of housing almost every day.

### Shares of adults worried about health care and housing costs vary across racial/ethnic and income groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% worry every day or almost every day</th>
<th>Cost of gasoline and other transportation</th>
<th>Cost of housing for you and your family</th>
<th>Cost of health care for you and your family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All adults</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** PPIC Statewide Survey, November 2022. Survey was fielded from October 7–21, 2022 (n=2,307 adults, n=1,342 likely voters).

Three in ten Californians worry every day or almost every day about being able to save enough for retirement (29%), and about a quarter worry about the amount of debt they have (24%)—these shares are similar to a year ago. Across racial/ethnic groups, one in three Latinos worry about being able to save for retirement and about debt, compared to somewhat fewer African Americans, Asian Americans, and whites. Across income groups, Californians earning less than $20,000 are the most likely to worry, with 42 percent worrying every day or almost every day about being able to save for retirement and 34 percent worrying about the amount of debt they have. About one in three or fewer across the state’s regions worry about these issues.
About a quarter of Californians worry every day or almost every day about paying their bills (23%), and 15 percent worry about they or someone in their family losing their job. The share worrying about these issues decreases as income rises, with Californians earning less than $20,000 most likely to report being worried. Women are somewhat more likely than men to worry about these issues. Across racial/ethnic groups, Latinos are the most likely to worry about both of these concerns. Concern about job loss is highest in Los Angeles, while concern about paying bills is highest in the Inland Empire. Renters are nearly twice as likely as homeowners to worry about paying bills.

### Table: % worry every day or almost every day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Being able to save enough for your retirement</th>
<th>Amount of debt you have</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** PPIC Statewide Survey, November 2022. Survey was fielded from October 7–21, 2022 (n=2,307 adults, n=1,342 likely voters).
When asked about job satisfaction, 36 percent of employed adults say they are very satisfied and 55 percent are somewhat satisfied, while 9 percent are not satisfied with their current job. Satisfaction levels were similar last November (37% very satisfied, 53% somewhat satisfied). Across regions, Central Valley
residents (43%) are the most likely to say they are very satisfied with their current job, while San Francisco residents (30%) are the least likely to say this. Across demographic groups, men (41%) are more likely than women (30%) to be very satisfied and Asian Americans are less likely than other racial/ethnic groups to say this. The shares saying they are very satisfied increases with rising income and age (29% 18 to 34, 37% 35 to 54, 45% 55 and older). Employed adults earning less than $20,000 are the least likely across all demographic groups to be very or somewhat satisfied with their current job.

### Most employed adults are at least somewhat satisfied with their job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All employed adults</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans*</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** PPIC Statewide Survey, November 2022. Survey was fielded from October 7–21, 2022 (n=2,307 adults, n=1,153 employed adults).

**NOTES:** Among employed adults only. *Small sample size for African Americans.

Fifty-eight percent of employed Californians say their jobs offer opportunities for growth. About half (51%) say they are provided with educational or training assistance, and 81 percent say they have at least a fair amount of job security. Shares reporting opportunities for growth and educational or training assistance were similar in November 2021.

Similar shares of men and women say they are offered educational or training assistance and have a fair amount of job security, but men (62%) are more likely than women (52%) to say they have opportunities for growth and advancement. Majorities across racial/ethnic groups report having access to educational or training assistance, advancement opportunities, and at least a fair amount of job security, with the exception of Latinos—only 43 percent say their current job provides educational or training assistance. The shares reporting growth opportunities, educational or training assistance, and job security increase with rising educational attainment. The shares who say they have growth opportunities and at least a fair amount of job security rises as income levels increase, while the share reporting educational or training assistance varies across income groups, but is higher among those making $40,000 or more. Employed adults with an income of less than $40,000 are the least likely across all demographic groups to say their current job offers any of these benefits.
About eight in ten adults completely (42%) or somewhat agree (40%) that it is important for workers to organize so that employers do not take advantage of them, and a similar share agree at least somewhat that voting gives people like them a say in what the government does (38% completely, 43% somewhat). Views were similar last November. There is agreement among partisan groups on both issues, although Democrats are more likely than Republicans and independents to completely agree. Overwhelming majorities across regions and demographic groups agree with both statements, but Asian Americans and whites are much less likely than African Americans and Latinos to completely agree that it is important for workers to organize, while African Americans are somewhat more likely than members of other racial/ethnic groups to completely agree that voting gives people a say in government. The share completely agreeing that it is important for workers to organize declines as age increases.

### Table: Percent Agreeing with Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job offers at least a fair amount of job security</th>
<th>Job offers opportunities for growth and advancement</th>
<th>Job offers educational or training assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All employed adults</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans*</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** PPIC Statewide Survey, November 2022. Survey was fielded from October 7–21, 2022 (n=2,307 adults, n=1,153 employed adults).

**NOTES:** Among employed adults only. *Small sample size for African Americans.
Overwhelming majorities agree that it is important for workers to organize, and that voting gives people a say in government decisions

% completely or somewhat agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>It is important for workers to organize</th>
<th>Voting gives people a say in government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All adults</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely voters</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Empire</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange/San Diego</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Bay Area</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $39,000</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: PPIC Statewide Survey, November 2022. Survey was fielded from October 7–21, 2022 (n=2,307 adults, n=1,342 likely voters).

Policies to Increase Economic Well-Being

With California among the top five states with the highest average home prices, strong majorities of adults
(73%) and likely voters (68%) favor government policies that would ease permit requirements and allow more housing to be built so that lower- and middle-income Californians could afford to purchase a home. Similar shares (76% adults, 71% likely voters) support government policies intended to increase the amount of affordable rental housing for lower- and middle-income Californians. Most adults across regions support these policies, as do majorities across all partisan and demographic groups.

### Overwhelming majorities favor government policies that would make housing more accessible and affordable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% favor</th>
<th>Increasing the amount of affordable rental housing for lower- and middle-income Californians</th>
<th>Increasing housing production so more lower- and middle-income Californians could afford to purchase a home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All adults</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely voters</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** PPIC Statewide Survey, November 2022. Survey was fielded from October 7–21, 2022 (n=2,307 adults, n=1,342 likely voters).

California currently has the highest gasoline prices in the country, averaging $5.56 per gallon as of October 31, 2022. Majorities of adults (61%) and likely voters (53%) favor increasing government funding so that more Californians could afford to purchase an electric or hybrid vehicle. Most across regions as well as most partisan and demographic groups are supportive—the exceptions are Republicans (22% favor, 78% oppose), those with some college education (50% favor, 50% oppose), and whites (47% favor, 53% oppose).

When asked about policy proposals to address the cost of higher education, majorities of Californians (68% adults, 57% likely voters) support a government policy to make college tuition free at both public two-year and four-year colleges, and about half or more (60% adults, 51% likely voters) support a government policy that would eliminate college debt. Similar shares held these views 12 months ago. Overwhelming majorities of Democrats support these policies, while most Republicans oppose them; a solid majority of independents support free tuition at public universities but are divided on eliminating college debt. Majorities across
regions and demographic groups favor free college tuition, while half or more support eliminating college
debt. Support for these policies is lowest among whites and adults ages 55 and older.

Majorities favor government policies to reduce higher education costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Making college tuition free at both public two-year and four-year colleges</th>
<th>Eliminating college debt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All adults</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely voters</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: PPIC Statewide Survey, November 2022. Survey was fielded from October 7–21, 2022 (n=2,307 adults, n=1,342 likely voters).

Most adults (73%) and likely voters (68%) are in favor of expanding earned income tax credits for lower-income working Californians. When asked about increasing government funding so that child care programs are available for more lower-income working parents, overwhelming majorities of adults (78%) and likely voters (74%) express support. Overwhelming majorities of Democrats and independents support increased funding for child care programs and the expansion of earned income tax credits; a slim majority of Republicans oppose both. Strong majorities across regions and demographic groups favor both these policies, although whites are less likely than adults in other racial/ethnic groups to support more funding for child care programs. Adults earning more than $40,000 annually are less likely than lower-income Californians to favor these policies.
About half of adults (48%) and four in ten likely voters favor the federal government providing a guaranteed income or “universal basic income” of about $1,000 a month for all citizens, whether they work or not. A slim majority of adults (52%) and six in ten likely voters oppose this policy. Views were similar last November. Support is much higher among those earning less than $40,000 (72% less than $20,000, 61% $20,000 to $39,999) than those with higher incomes (46% $40,000 to $79,999, 41% $80,000 or more). Democrats (62%) are much more likely than independents (45%) and Republicans (13%) to support this policy. There is majority support among 18- to 34-year-olds (62%) and those with a high school diploma or less (53%) compared to other age and education groups. African Americans (60%), Latinos (60%), and Asian Americans (54%) are much more likely than whites (36%) to support a universal basic income policy. Californians across regions are closely divided on this idea.

Eight in ten adults (82%) and likely voters (80%) are in favor of increasing government funding for job training programs. More than seven in ten (80% adults, 73% likely voters) support the government offering a health insurance plan similar to Medicare that Americans could purchase instead of private insurance. Similar shares favored these policies last November. Majorities across partisan groups favor increasing funding for job training programs, and half or more support a government health insurance plan. Overwhelming majorities across the regions and demographic groups support these policies, though whites are much less likely than adults in other racial/ethnic groups to favor a public health insurance option.

### Overwhelming majorities favor increasing government funding for child care programs and expanding the earned income tax credit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Increasing government funding for child care programs</th>
<th>Expansion of earned income tax credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All adults</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely voters</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** PPIC Statewide Survey, November 2022. Survey was fielded from October 7–21, 2022 (n=2,307 adults, n=1,342 likely voters).
Overwhelming majorities favor increased funding for job training and a public health care option

% favor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Increasing government funding for job training programs</th>
<th>Government offering a public health care option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All adults</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely voters</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independents</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Empire</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange/San Diego</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Bay Area</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinos</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $79,999</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 or more</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** PPIC Statewide Survey, November 2022. Survey was fielded October 7–21 (n=2,307 adults, n=1,342 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 project manager for this survey, and survey analysts Rachel Lawler and Deja Thomas. The Californians and Their Economic Well-Being survey is supported with funding from 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 2,307 California adult residents. The median time to complete the survey was 17 minutes. Interviews were conducted from October 7–21, 2022.

The survey was conducted by Ipsos, using its online KnowledgePanel, in English, Spanish, Chinese (simplified or traditional), Vietnamese, and Korean according to respondents’ preferences. We chose these languages because Spanish is the dominant language among non-English-speaking adults in California, followed in prevalence by the three Asian languages. KnowledgePanel members are recruited through probability-based sampling and include both those with internet access and those without. KnowledgePanel provides internet access for those who do not have it and, if needed, a device to access the internet when they join the panel. KnowledgePanel members are primarily recruited using address based sampling (ABS) methodology, which improves population coverage, particularly for hard-to-reach populations such as young adults and minority groups. ABS-recruited Latinos are supplemented with a dual-frame random digit dialing (RDD) sampling methodology that targets telephone exchanges associated with areas with a higher concentration of Latinos to provide the capability to conduct representative online surveys with Latinos, including those who speak only Spanish. KnowledgePanel’s recruitment was originally based on a national RDD frame and switched to the primarily ABS-based methodology in 2009. KnowledgePanel includes households with landlines and cell phones, including those with cellphones only and those without phones. ABS allows probability-based sampling of addresses from the US Postal Service’s Delivery Sequence File (DSF). The DSF-based sampling frame used for address selection is enhanced with a series of refinements—such as the appendage of various ancillary data to each address from commercial and government data sources—to facilitate complex stratification plans. Taking advantage of such refinements, quarterly samples are selected using a stratified sampling methodology that aims to retain the representativeness of the panel. KnowledgePanel recruits new panel members throughout the year to offset panel attrition.

To qualify for the survey, a panel member must be age 18 or older and reside in California. A general population sample of Californians was selected using Ipsos’s PPS (probability proportional to size) sampling procedure to select study-specific samples. Briefly, to select such samples, the panel is first weighted to population benchmarks and those panel weights are used as the measure of size for a PPS sample selection that yields a fully representative sample. An oversample of panelists with household income under $40,000 augmented the general population sample. A total of 2,383 respondents completed the survey out of 7,008 panelists who were sampled, for a response rate of 34 percent. To ensure the highest data quality, we flagged respondents who sped through the survey, which we defined as completing the survey in one-fourth of the overall median time (less than 4 minutes). We also flagged respondents if their self-reported age or gender did not match the data stored in their profile. A total of 76 cases were removed after this review process, resulting in 2,307 total qualified and valid cases.
Accent on Languages, Inc., translated new survey questions into Spanish, with assistance from Renatta DeFever. Ipsos translated all survey questions into Chinese, Vietnamese, and Korean.

Ipsos uses the US Census Bureau’s 2016–2020 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. 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 sample of Californians is first weighted using an initial sampling or base weight that corrects for any differences in the probability of selecting various segments of the KnowledgePanel sample. This base weight is further adjusted using an iterative proportional fitting (raking) procedure that aligns sample demographics to population benchmarks from the 2016–2020 ACS data as well as party registration benchmarks from the California Secretary of State’s voter registration file.

The sampling error, taking design effects from weighting into consideration, is ±3.3 percent at the 95 percent confidence level for the total unweighted sample of 2,307 adults. This means that 95 times out of 100, the results will be within 3.3 percentage points of what they would be if all adults in California were interviewed. The sampling error for unweighted subgroups is larger: for the 1,910 registered voters, the sampling error is ±3.7 percent; for the 1,342 likely voters, it is ±4.3 percent. The sampling error for the oversample of 1,036 lower-income Californians is ±5.2 percent. 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 likely voters are combined with those of other racial/ethnic groups because sample sizes for African American and Asian American 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.
Sample sizes and margins of error for each subgroup are presented in the table below.

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

We compare current PPIC Statewide Survey results to those in our earlier online surveys. Numerous questions were adapted from the Public Religion Research Institute's (PRRI) California Workers Survey dated August 2018 and national surveys by 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, November 2022. Survey was fielded from October 7–21, 2022 (n=2,307 adults, n=1,342 likely voters).

NOTES: "Lower income adults" includes only respondents with annual household incomes lower than $40,000.
Questions and Responses

October 7–October 21, 2022
2,307 California adult residents
English, Spanish, Chinese (simplified and traditional), Vietnamese, and Korean

Margin of error ±3.3% at 95% confidence level for total sample
Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding

1. Do you approve or disapprove of the way that Governor Newsom is handling the issues of jobs and the economy?

55% approve
42% disapprove
3% don’t know

2. Do you approve or disapprove of the way that the California Legislature is handling the issue of jobs and the economy?

49% approve
48% disapprove
3% don’t know

3. How much of the time can you trust the state government to do what is right when it comes to handling the issue of jobs and the economy? [rotate order top to bottom]

5% just about always
41% most of the time
54% only some of the time
1% don’t know

4. Turning to economic conditions in California, do you think that during the next 12 months we will have good times financially or bad times?

30% good times
69% bad times
1% don’t know

5. Looking ahead, in California will we have mostly good times during the next five years or will we have mostly periods of widespread unemployment or depression?

37% good times
62% periods of depression or unemployment
2% don’t know

6. How much of a problem is the availability of well-paying jobs in your part of California today? Is it a big problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem?

24% big problem
55% somewhat of a problem
20% not a problem
1% don’t know

7. Does the lack of well-paying jobs make you and your family seriously consider moving away from the part of California you live in now? (if yes, ask: “Are you considering moving elsewhere in California or outside of the state?”)

5% yes, seriously considered moving to another part of California
23% yes, seriously considered moving outside of California
71% no, have not seriously considered moving
– don’t know

8. Now thinking about your own personal finances, would you say you and your family are financially better off, worse off, or just about the same as you were a year ago?

16% better off
29% worse off
54% about the same
– don’t know

9. Now looking ahead, do you think a year from now that you and your family will be better off, worse off, or just about the same as now?

22% better off
21% worse off
56% about the same
1% don’t know

10. How would you describe your household’s financial situation today? Would you say you are very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, or not satisfied with your situation?

19% very satisfied
54% somewhat satisfied
26% not satisfied
1% don’t know

11. Suppose that you have an emergency expense that costs $1,000. Based on your current financial situation, how difficult would it be for you to pay this expense? [rotate responses top to bottom]

55% not too difficult
25% somewhat difficult
12% very difficult
7% nearly impossible
– don’t know
12. Thinking about the current rate of inflation, meaning rising prices, is this something you are upset about, concerned about but not upset, or not concerned about?

49% upset
48% concerned but not upset
3% not concerned about
– don’t know

13. Has the cost of gasoline or other transportation caused any financial hardship for you or your household? (if Yes, caused a hardship ask: “is that a severe hardship that affects your ability to maintain your current standard of living, or is it a moderate hardship that affects you somewhat but does not jeopardize your standard of living?”)

15% yes, caused severe hardship
38% yes, caused moderate hardship
48% No, has not caused hardship
– don’t know

14. When children today in California grow up, do you think they will be better off or worse off financially than their parents?

31% better off
67% worse off
2% don’t know

15. Do you think the gap between the rich and the poor in your part of California is getting larger, getting smaller, or has it stayed the same?

71% getting larger
5% getting smaller
23% stayed the same
1% don’t know

16. Looking ahead to the year 2030, do you think the gap between the rich and the poor in your part of California will be larger, be smaller, or will be the same?

66% be larger
7% be smaller
25% will be the same
2% don’t know

16a. Should the state government be doing more to reduce the gap between the rich and the poor in California, or is this something that the state government should not be doing?

71% should do more
27% should not do more
1% don’t know
Now, please indicate whether you or anyone in your household has done or experienced any of the following in the last 12 months...

[rotate questions 17 to 26]

17. Been laid off or lost their job?

6% yes, happened to me
6% yes, happened to someone in my household
2% yes, happened to me and someone in my household
85% did not happen to anyone in my household
– don’t know

18. Had work hours reduced or pay cut?

9% yes, happened to me
7% yes, happened to someone in my household
5% yes, happened to me and someone in my household
79% did not happen to anyone in my household
– don’t know

19. Put off seeing a doctor or purchasing medication for financial reasons?

10% yes, happened to me
6% yes, happened to someone in my household
5% yes, happened to me and someone in my household
79% did not happen to anyone in my household
– don’t know

20. Was not able to pay a monthly bill?

11% yes, happened to me
5% yes, happened to someone in my household
4% yes, happened to me and someone in my household
81% did not happen to anyone in my household
– don’t know

21. Received food stamps?

10% yes, happened to me
5% yes, happened to someone in my household
3% yes, happened to me and someone in my household
82% did not happen to anyone in my household
– don’t know

22. Reduced meals or cut back on food to save money?

17% yes, happened to me
3% yes, happened to someone in my household
13% yes, happened to me and someone in my household
66% did not happen to anyone in my household
– don’t know

23. Received unemployment benefits?

5% yes, happened to me
6% yes, happened to someone in my household
2% yes, happened to me and someone in my household
87% did not happen to anyone in my household
– don’t know

24. Received food from a food bank or pantry?

8% yes, happened to me
4% yes, happened to someone in my household
4% yes, happened to me and someone in my household
85% did not happen to anyone in my household
– don’t know

25. Driven less because of the cost of gasoline?

29% yes, happened to me
8% yes, happened to someone in my household
20% yes, happened to me and someone in my household
43% did not happen to anyone in my household
– don’t know

26. Had difficulty paying rent or mortgage?

9% yes, happened to me
5% yes, happened to someone in my household
4% yes, happened to me and someone in my household
82% did not happen to anyone in my household
– don’t know

Next, how often, if ever, do you worry about each of the following?

[rotate questions 27 to 34]

27. You or someone in your family losing their job?

9% every day
6% almost every day
30% sometimes
25% rarely
31% never
– don’t know
28. The cost of health care for you and your family?
12% every day
9% almost every day
36% sometimes
22% rarely
21% never
– don’t know

29. The cost of housing for you and your family?
15% every day
13% almost every day
32% sometimes
18% rarely
22% never
– don’t know

30. Paying your bills?
12% every day
11% almost every day
31% sometimes
23% rarely
23% never
– don’t know

31. [parents of children 18 or younger only] The cost of child care?
10% every day
9% almost every day
24% sometimes
14% rarely
44% never
– don’t know

32. The amount of debt you have?
13% every day
11% almost every day
27% sometimes
22% rarely
27% never
– don’t know

33. The cost of gasoline and other transportation?
24% every day
19% almost every day
33% sometimes
14% rarely
10% never
– don’t know

34. Being able to save enough for your retirement?

16% every day
13% almost every day
38% sometimes
15% rarely
18% never
– don’t know

35. [employed adults only] Overall, would you say you are very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, or not satisfied with your job?

36% very satisfied
55% somewhat satisfied
9% not satisfied
– don’t know

35a. [employed adults only] How long have you been with your current employer?

9% less than 6 months
10% 6 months to less than 1 year
32% 1 year to less than 5 years
18% 5 years to less than 10 years
32% 10 years or more
– don’t know

Please answer yes or no about each of the following in regards to your current job...

[rotate questions 36 to 41]

36. [employed adults only] Would you say that you have stable and predictable pay at work?

87% yes
13% no
– don’t know

37. [employed adults only] Would you say that you have stable and predictable hours at work?

78% yes
22% no
– don’t know

38. [employed adults only] Would you say that your job offers opportunities for growth and advancement?
58% yes
42% no
– don’t know

39. [employed adults only] Would you say that you have at least a fair amount of job security?

81% yes
19% no
– don’t know

40. [employed adults only] Would you say that you can voice your concerns at work without fear of negative consequences?

71% yes
29% no
– don’t know

41. [employed adults only] Would you say that the decisions made at work take into account your views and concerns?

60% yes
40% no
– don’t know

42. [employed adults only] Which describes your current employment or work situation?

63% working outside the home [skip to q44]
16% working from home/remote [ask q43]
19% mix of some work from home, and some outside home/at workplace [ask q43]
1% something else [skip to q44]
– don’t know

43. [those working remotely some or all of the time only] Did you start working from home as a result of the coronavirus pandemic and lockdowns?

65% yes
35% no
– don’t know

44. [employed adults only] If you had the choice, for the next year, would you prefer to:

39% work outside the home/at your workplace full-time
29% work from home or remotely full time
32% mix some days working remotely, some days at the workplace
– don’t know

44a. [employed adults only] Regardless of your current work arrangement, would you say that, for the most part, the responsibilities of your job:
41% can be done from home
59% cannot be done from home
– don’t know

44b. [employed adults only] Would you be open to changing jobs if it meant that you could work from home more often?
51% yes
49% no
– don’t know

44c. [employed adults only] Would you be open to changing the type of work you do if it meant that you could work from home more often?
49% yes
50% no
1% don’t know

Are each of the following a reason that you want to telecommute or work from home, at least some of the time?

[rotate questions 44d to 44g]

44d. [employed adults who want to work from home at least some of the time only] Less time commuting?
91% yes
9% no
– don’t know

44e. [employed adults who want to work from home at least some of the time only] More productive working at home?
67% yes
33% no
– don’t know

44f. [employed adults who want to work from home at least some of the time only] Work-life balance?
92% yes
8% no
– don’t know

44g. [employed adults who want to work from home at least some of the time only] Able to live in a different area?
53% yes
47% no
– don’t know
45. [employed adults only] How likely do you think it is that you will look for a new job in the next six months? [rotate order top to bottom]

13% very likely
12% somewhat likely
15% neither likely nor unlikely
16% somewhat unlikely
43% very unlikely
– don’t know

45a. [employed adults only] If you were to look for a new job today, how easy or difficult do you think it would be for you to get the kind of job you want?

7% very easy
14% somewhat easy
29% neither easy nor difficult
33% somewhat difficult
16% very difficult
– don’t know

45b. Thinking about the job situation in America today, would you say that it is now a good time or a bad time to find a quality job?

49% good time
49% bad time
2% don’t know

45c. And thinking about opportunities for career advancement, would you say that having a family and raising children has an impact on a person’s ability to advance in their career?

71% yes
28% no
1% don’t know

46. [employed adults only] Next, does your workplace offer a membership in or affiliation with a union, occupation association, worker center, or other type of group that represents workers?

31% yes
69% no
1% don’t know

46a. [employed adults only] Are you or is anyone in your immediate family a member of a labor union? (If yes, ask: “Is that person you or someone else in your family?”)

16% yes, myself
14% yes, another person in my family
3% yes, myself and another person in my family
66% no
– don’t know
And thinking about the benefits offered at your current job...

47. [employed adults only] Does your current job provide health coverage?

74% yes
26% no
– don’t know

48. [employed adults only] Does your current job provide paid sick leave?

81% yes
19% no
– don’t know

49. [employed adults only] Does your current job provide retirement savings?

71% yes
29% no
– don’t know

50. [employed adults only] Does your current job provide educational or training assistance?

51% yes
49% no
– don’t know

Next, please read these two statements and say if you completely agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or completely disagree with each one.

[rotate questions 51 and 52]

51. It is important for workers to organize so that employers do not take advantage of them.

42% completely agree
40% somewhat agree
13% somewhat disagree
4% completely disagree
– don’t know

52. Voting gives people like me some say in what the government does.

38% completely agree
43% somewhat agree
12% somewhat disagree
7% completely disagree
– don’t know

On another topic,

Do you favor or oppose each of these policies that could improve the economic wellbeing of Californians?
53. Do you favor or oppose a government policy to make college tuition free at both public two-year and four-year colleges?

68% favor
32% oppose
– don’t know

54. Would you favor or oppose a government policy to eliminate college debt?

60% favor
40% oppose
– don’t know

55. Do you favor or oppose increasing government funding so that child care programs are available for more lower-income working parents?

78% favor
22% oppose
– don’t know

56. Do you favor or oppose increasing government funding or job training programs so that more workers have the skills they need for today's jobs?

82% favor
18% oppose
– don’t know

57. Would you favor or oppose the government offering a health insurance plan, similar to Medicare, that Americans can choose to purchase instead of private insurance?

80% favor
20% oppose
– don’t know

58. Do you favor or oppose the government expanding the eligibility and payments of the earned income tax credit for lower-income working families and individuals?

73% favor
27% oppose
– don’t know

59. Would you favor or oppose the federal government providing a guaranteed income, sometimes called a “Universal Basic Income,” of about $1,000 a month for all adult citizens, whether or not they work?

48% favor
52% oppose
– don’t know
60. Do you favor or oppose government policies that would ease permit requirements and allow more housing to be built so that more lower and middle income Californians could afford to purchase a home?

73% favor
27% oppose
– don’t know

61. Do you favor or oppose government policies intended to increase the amount of affordable rental housing for lower and middle income Californians?

76% favor
24% oppose
– don’t know

62. Do you favor or oppose increasing government funding so that more Californians could afford to purchase an electric or hybrid vehicle?

61% favor
39% oppose
– don’t know

On another topic,

63. How big of a problem is racism in the US today? Is it a big problem, somewhat of a problem, a small problem, or not a problem at all?

39% big problem
40% somewhat of a problem
15% small problem
5% not a problem at all
1% don’t know

64. Was there a time in the last twelve months when you felt you were treated unfairly at your place of work because of your racial or ethnic background?

9% yes
90% no
– don’t know

65. How much do you think that racial and ethnic discrimination contributes to economic inequality in this country?

29% a great deal
41% a fair amount
22% not too much
8% not at all
1% don’t know

On another topic, California has a citizens’ initiative process which enables voters to have issues put on the
ballot—as state propositions—for voter approval or rejection ...

66. [likely voters only] What do you think is the best way to address the most important problems facing California today? [rotate] [1] the Governor and State Legislature should decide what to do and pass state laws, [or] [2] California voters should decide what to do by bringing citizens' initiatives to the state ballot and passing them?

33% governor and legislature
66% citizens' initiatives
1% don't know

67. [likely voters only] Generally speaking, would you say you are very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, or not satisfied with the information that is available to voters about citizens' initiatives on the state ballot?

11% very satisfied
58% somewhat satisfied
30% not satisfied
1% don't know

[rotate questions 68 and 69]

68. [likely voters only] Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statement: Citizens' initiatives on the state ballot usually reflect the concerns of organized special interests.

32% strongly agree
54% somewhat agree
12% somewhat disagree
1% strongly disagree
1% don't know

69. [likely voters only] Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statement: The wording of citizens' initiatives on the state ballot is often too complicated and confusing for voters to understand what happens if the initiative passes.

37% strongly agree
50% somewhat agree
9% somewhat disagree
3% strongly disagree
1% don't know

Reforms have been suggested to address issues in California's initiative process.

70. [likely voters only] Would you favor or oppose having an independent citizens' initiative commission that would hold public hearings on initiatives then make ballot recommendations in the Secretary of State's voter information guide?
76% favor
23% oppose
1% don’t know

71. [likely voters only] Would you favor or oppose having the yes and no sides of the citizens’ initiative campaigns participate in a series of televised debates?

82% favor
16% oppose
2% don’t know

72. 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 q72a]
24% no [skip to 73b]

72a. 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 q73]
24% Republican [skip to q73a]
1% another party (specify) [skip to q74]
28% decline-to-state/independent [skip to 73b]

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

50% strong
49% not very strong
– don’t know

73a. Would you call yourself a strong Republican or not a very strong Republican?

55% strong
45% not very strong
-% don’t know

73b. Do you think of yourself as closer to the Republican Party or Democratic Party?

16% Republican Party
35% Democratic Party
40% neither (volunteered)
9% don’t know

74. Would you consider yourself to be politically: [read list, rotate order top to bottom]
10% very liberal
21% somewhat liberal
43% middle-of-the-road
16% somewhat conservative
8% very conservative
1% don’t know

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

14% great deal
34% fair amount
36% only a little
16% none
– don’t know

[d1-d18 demographic questions]
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