# **Texas Statewide Survey**

Field Dates: April 16-22, 2021 N=1200 Registered Voters Margin of error: +/- 2.83% (3.7% adjusted for weighting) unless otherwise noted<sup>1</sup>

Q15. Is Texas's increasing racial and ethnic diversity a cause for optimism or a cause for concern?

	A cause for optimism	A cause for concern	Don't know/No opinion
Apr. 2021	39	29	32
Feb. 2021	40	31	29
Oct. 2020	44	28	28
June 2020	48	31	21
Feb. 2020	49	28	24
Oct. 2019	44	32	24
June 2019	44	33	23

#### **Policy Questions**

Q30A. Do you think gun control laws should be made more strict, less strict, or left as they are now?

	More strict	Left as they are now	Less strict	Don't know/No opinion
Apr. 2021	46	30	20	5
Oct. 2019	51	28	13	8
Feb. 2019	49	30	17	4
June 2018	51	31	13	5
Oct. 2017	52	31	13	5
Nov. 2015	41	36	18	6
Feb. 2015	36	36	22	5

Q30B. Do you think that laws restricting abortion here in Texas should be made more strict, less strict, or left as they are now?

	More strict	Left as they are now	Less strict	Don't know/No opinion
Apr. 2021	33	22	33	11
Feb. 2021	32	18	37	13
Feb. 2019	41	20	32	8
June 2013	38	21	26	14

# **Texas Statewide Survey**

Q31. Below are some proposals being considered in the Texas Legislature this year. Please tell us whether you would support or oppose each of the following proposals for new laws: **[RANDOMIZE A-G, H-K, L-N, O-R]** 

supportsupportsupportopposeopposeknowSUPPORTOPPOSEBanning the use of chokeholds by police5017149106723Requiring police officers to intervene if another officer is violating state law, federal law, or their own police6422329865department's policy in their use of force against a civilian6422329865Allowing civilians to sue a police officer who has violated state law or police47221111106922Requiring local governments to hold an election before reducing or redirecting funds from their police budgets4618911166420Making abortion illegal after 6 weeks of pregnancy except in the case of a medical emergency34151031104941Allowing any individual in Texas the right to sue an abortion provider they believe has violated state law3014829194437
Banning the use of chokeholds by police5017149106723Requiring police officers to intervene if another officer is violating state law, federal law, or their own police6422329865department's policy in their use of force against a civilian6422329865Allowing civilians to sue a police officer who has violated state law or police department policy in their use of force47221111106922Requiring local governments to hold an election before reducing or redirecting funds from their police budgets4618911166420Making abortion illegal after 6 weeks of pregnancy except in the case of a medical emergency34151031104941Allowing any individual in Texas the right to sue an abortion provider they believe has violated state law3014829194437
Requiring police officers to intervene if another officer is violating state law, federal law, or their own police6422329865department's policy in their use of force against a civilian6422329865Allowing civilians to sue a police officer who has violated state law or police department policy in their use of force47221111106922Requiring local governments to hold an election before reducing or redirecting funds from their police budgets4618911166420Making abortion illegal after 6 weeks of pregnancy except in the case of a medical emergency34151031104941Allowing any individual in Texas the right to sue an abortion provider they believe has violated state law3014829194437
another officer is violating state law, federal law, or their own police6422329865department's policy in their use of force against a civilian6422329865Allowing civilians to sue a police officer who has violated state law or police department policy in their use of force47221111106922Requiring local governments to hold an election before reducing or redirecting funds from their police budgets4618911166420Making abortion illegal after 6 weeks of pregnancy except in the case of a medical emergency34151031104941Allowing any individual in Texas the right to sue an abortion provider they believe has violated state law3014829194437
federal law, or their own police department's policy in their use of force against a civilian6422329865Allowing civilians to sue a police officer who has violated state law or police department policy in their use of force47221111106922Requiring local governments to hold an election before reducing or redirecting funds from their police budgets4618911166420Making abortion illegal after 6 weeks of pregnancy except in the case of a medical emergency34151031104941Allowing any individual in Texas the right to sue an abortion provider they believe has violated state law3014829194437
department's policy in their use of force against a civilianImage: Constraint of the sector of the
against a civilianImage: Constraint of the constraint of th
Allowing civilians to sue a police officer who has violated state law or police department policy in their use of force47221111106922Requiring local governments to hold an election before reducing or redirecting funds from their police budgets4618911166420Making abortion illegal after 6 weeks of pregnancy except in the case of a medical emergency34151031104941Allowing any individual in Texas the right to sue an abortion provider they believe has violated state law3014829194437
who has violated state law or police department policy in their use of force47221111106922Requiring local governments to hold an election before reducing or redirecting funds from their police budgets4618911166420Making abortion illegal after 6 weeks of pregnancy except in the case of a medical emergency34151031104941Allowing any individual in Texas the right to sue an abortion provider they believe has violated state law3014829194437
department policy in their use of forceImage: constraint of the sector of t
Requiring local governments to hold an election before reducing or redirecting funds from their police budgets4618911166420Making abortion illegal after 6 weeks of pregnancy except in the case of a medical emergency34151031104941Allowing any individual in Texas the right to sue an abortion provider they believe3014829194437
election before reducing or redirecting funds from their police budgets4618911166420Making abortion illegal after 6 weeks of pregnancy except in the case of a medical emergency34151031104941Allowing any individual in Texas the right to sue an abortion provider they believe has violated state law3014829194437
funds from their police budgetsImage: Constraint of the case of a medical pregnancy except in the case of a medical 34151031104941Allowing any individual in Texas the right to sue an abortion provider they believe has violated state law3014829194437
Making abortion illegal after 6 weeks of pregnancy except in the case of a medical emergency34151031104941Allowing any individual in Texas the right to sue an abortion provider they believe3014829194437
pregnancy except in the case of a medical emergency34151031104941Allowing any individual in Texas the right to sue an abortion provider they believe has violated state law3014829194437
emergencyImage: second sec
Allowing any individual in Texas the rightImage: state lawImage: state lawImag
to sue an abortion provider they believe3014829194437has violated state law3014829194437
has violated state law
Automatically banning all abortions in
Texas if the U.S. Supreme Court overturns22121242123454
Roe v. Wade
Limiting the emergency powers of the
I exas Governor during a pandemic or23222018184538similar mathing a pandemic or23222018184538
Similar public nearth emergency
Prohibiting local governments from using
public money to pay lobbyists of 55 14 7 8 16 69 15
before the Texas Legislature
Allowing legal gup owners over the age of
21 to carry handguns in most public
places in Texas without licenses or 22 12 11 48 6 34 59
training
Allowing restaurants with valid licenses
the ability to sell alcoholic beverages for 42 28 10 9 10 70 19
delivery or pick-up

# University of Texas / Texas Tribune Poll Texas Statewide Survey

Q34. Thinking about police departments in your area, do you think that spending on policing should be...

	Be increased a lot	Be increased a little	Stay about the same	Be decreased a little	Be decreased a lot	Don't know/No opinion	TOTAL INCREASE	TOTAL DECREASE
Apr. 2021	20	22	30	7	10	11	42	17
Feb. 2021	15	25	36	8	9	7	40	17
Oct. 2020	18	24	32	11	8	8	42	19

Q35. Do you think the deaths of Black people during encounters with police in recent years are... [RANDOMIZE 1-2]

	Isolated incidents	A sign of broader problems in the treatment of Black people by police	Don't know/No opinion
Apr. 2021	45	47	9
Feb. 2021	45	45	10
Oct. 2020	44	48	8
June 2020	43	49	7

Q38A. How much have you heard about Texas' decision not to expand eligibility for Medicaid, the government health insurance and long-term care program for certain low-income adults and children?

Q38A	Percent
A lot	10
Some	23
A little	22
Nothing at all	46

Q38B. Based on what you know, do you support or oppose Texas expanding eligibility for its Medicaid program?

Q38B	Percent
Strongly support	37
Somewhat support	18
Somewhat oppose	14
Strongly oppose	12
Don't know/No opinion	20

Q41. Do you support or oppose requiring criminal and mental health background checks on all gun purchases in the United States, including at gun shows and for private sales?

	Strongly support	Somewhat support	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	Don't know/No opinion	TOTAL SUPPORT	TOTAL OPPOSE
Apr. 2021	57	17	7	11	7	74	18
Feb. 2020	61	18	8	7	6	79	15
Oct. 2019	61	20	7	6	5	81	13
Feb. 2016	54	24	8	9	4	78	17
June 2013	57	17	10	14	3	74	24
Feb. 2013	61	17	9	8	3	78	17

# University of Texas / Texas Tribune Poll Texas Statewide Survey

Q42. If more people carried guns, do you think the United States would be safer, less safe, or would it have no impact on safety?

	More safe	Less safe	No impact on safety	Don't know/No opinion
Apr. 2021	34	39	16	10
Feb. 2020	37	39	16	8
June 2018	37	39	15	9
Oct. 2017	38	41	14	7

Q43. Which of the following best characterizes your opinion on the death penalty for those convicted of violent crimes?

	Strongly support	Somewhat support	Somewhat oppose	Strongly oppose	Don't know/No opinion	TOTAL SUPPORT	TOTAL OPPOSE
Apr. 2020	40	23	12	13	12	63	26
June 2018	38	27	13	12	10	65	24
Feb. 2015	49	26	10	9	6	75	18
Oct. 2013	46	28	10	10	6	74	20
Oct. 2011	49	25	9	12	5	74	24
Feb. 2011	54	24	9	8	5	78	16
Feb. 2010	53	25	10	8	4	78	16

### **Texas Statewide Survey**

#### Sampling and Weighting Methodology for the April 2021 Texas Statewide Study

For the survey, YouGov interviewed 1392 Texas registered voters between April 16 and April 22, 2021, who were then matched down to a sample of 1200 to produce the final dataset. The respondents were matched on gender, age, race, and education. YouGov then weighted the matched set of survey respondents to known characteristics of registered voters of Texas from the 2018 Current Population survey and 2014 Pew Religious Landscape Survey.

The respondents were matched to a sampling frame on gender, age, race, and education. The frame was constructed by stratified sampling from the full 2018 Current Population Survey (CPS) voter registration supplement with selection within strata by weighted sampling with replacements (using the person weights on the public use file). For the main sample, the matched cases were weighted to the sampling frame using propensity scores. The matched cases and the frame were combined and a logistic regression was estimated for inclusion in the frame. The propensity score function included age, gender, race/ethnicity, and years of education. The propensity scores were grouped into deciles of the estimated propensity score in the frame and post-stratified according to these deciles. These weights were then post-stratified on baseline party identification, the 2020 and 2016 presidential vote, ideology, and a full stratification of four-category age, four-category race, gender, and four-category education. The weights were trimmed at 7 and normalized to sum to the sample size.

The margin of error of the weighted data for registered voters is 2.8% for registered voters (if adjusted for weighting, the margin of error for registered voters is 3.7%).

#### Survey Panel Data

The YouGov panel, a proprietary opt-in survey panel, is comprised of 1.5 million U.S. residents who have agreed to participate in YouGov Web surveys. At anyt given time, YouGov maintains a minimum of five recruitment campaigns based on salient current events.

Panel members are recruited by a number of methods and on a variety of topics to help ensure diversity in the panel population. Recruiting methods include Web advertising campaigns (public surveys), permission-based email campaigns, partner sponsored solicitations, telephone-to-Web recruitment (RDD based sampling), and mail-to-Web recruitment (Voter Registration Based Sampling).

The primary method of recruitment for the YouGov Panel is Web advertising campaigns that appear based on keyword searches. In practice, a search in Google may prompt an active YouGov advertisement soliciting opinion on the search topic. At the conclusion of the short survey respondents are invited to join the YouGov panel in order to receive and participate in additional surveys. After a double opt-in procedure, where respondents must confirm their consent by responding to an email, the database checks to ensure the newly recruited panelist is in fact new and that the address information provided is valid.

The YouGov panel currently has over 20,000 active panelists who are residents of Texas. These panelists cover a wide range of demographic characteristics.

#### Sampling and Sample Matching

Sample matching is a methodology for selection of "representative" samples from non-randomly selected pools of respondents. It is ideally suited for Web access panels, but could also be used for other types of surveys, such as phone surveys. Sample matching starts with an enumeration of the target population. For general population studies, the target population is all adults, and can be enumerated through the use of the decennial Census or a high-quality survey, such as the American Community Survey. In other contexts, this is known as the sampling frame, though, unlike conventional sampling, the sample is not drawn from the frame. Traditional sampling, then, selects individuals

#### **Texas Statewide Survey**

from the sampling frame at random for participation in the study. This may not be feasible or economical as the contact information, especially email addresses, is not available for all individuals in the frame and refusals to participate increase the costs of sampling in this way.

Sample selection using the matching methodology is a two-stage process. First, a random sample is drawn from the target population. We call this sample the target sample. Details on how the target sample is drawn are provided below, but the essential idea is that this sample is a true probability sample and thus representative of the frame from which it was drawn.

Second, for each member of the target sample, we select one or more matching members from our pool of opt-in respondents. This is called the matched sample. Matching is accomplished using a large set of variables that are available in consumer and voter databases for both the target population and the opt-in panel.

The purpose of matching is to find an available respondent who is as similar as possible to the selected member of the target sample. The result is a sample of respondents who have the same measured characteristics as the target sample. Under certain conditions, described below, the matched sample will have similar properties to a true random sample. That is, the matched sample mimics the characteristics of the target sample.

When choosing the matched sample, it is necessary to find the closest matching respondent in the panel of opt-ins to each member of the target sample. YouGov employs the proximity matching method to find the closest matching respondent. For each variable used for matching, we define a distance function, d(x,y), which describes how "close" the values x and y are on a particular attribute. The overall distance between a member of the target sample and a member of the panel is a weighted sum of the individual distance functions on each attribute. The weights can be adjusted for each study based upon which variables are thought to be important for that study, though, for the most part, we have not found the matching procedure to be sensitive to small adjustments of the weights. A large weight, on the other hand, forces the algorithm toward an exact match on that dimension.