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# Public Opinion on Transgender Related Legislation \& Policies in Blue California, Red Texas \& Purple Arizona 

This report examines the attitudes and opinions of Arizona, California and Texas residents regarding restrictive legislation and policies related to the transgender population.

The report finds an absolute majority of the public in Arizona and Texas, and a simple majority of the public in California, to be in opposed to transgender people being allowed to:

- Choose which bathroom to use.
- Arizona (54\% oppose, $27 \%$ support, \& $19 \%$ are unsure).
- California ( $45 \%$ oppose, $35 \%$ support, $\& 20 \%$ are unsure).
- Texas ( $61 \%$ oppose, $25 \%$ support, $\& 14 \%$ are unsure).
- Participate in women's sports.
- Arizona ( $63 \%$ oppose, $20 \%$ support, \& $17 \%$ are unsure).
- California ( $53 \%$ oppose, $26 \%$ support, $\& 21 \%$ are unsure).
- Texas ( $68 \%$ oppose, $16 \%$ support, $\& 16 \%$ are unsure).
- Receive gender-affirming medical treatment while under the age of 18.
- Arizona ( $51 \%$ oppose, $30 \%$ support, \& $19 \%$ are unsure)
- California ( $41 \%$ oppose, $35 \%$ support, \& $24 \%$ are unsure)
- Texas ( $53 \%$ oppose, $32 \%$ support, $\& 15 \%$ are unsure).

Across the three states opposition is highest to transgender people participating in women's sports and lowest to transgender children receiving gender-affirming medical treatment.

Variance in support for and opposition to these three policies among the residents in these three states is best explained by an individual's partisan identification and their level of religiosity. These two factors are examined first in this report in Sections 1 and 2.

Following the discussion focused on partisanship and religiosity is a detailed review of the relationship between gender, ethnicity/race, age, and educational attainment, in addition to partisanship and religiosity, and a person's opinions vis-à-vis these transgender related policies in blue California, red Texas and purple Arizona:

- Section 3. Choosing Which Bathroom to Use.
- Section 4. Participating in Women's Sports.
- Section 5. Receiving Gender-Affirming Medical Treatment While Under the Age of 18.

The survey upon which this report is based was conducted between May 31 and June 6, 2023 among a representative sample of Arizona, California and Texas residents age 18 and older. In all, 3163 respondents were surveyed across the three states: Arizona (1,051), California ( 1,045 ), and Texas $(1,067)$, with the margin of error for each state $+/-3.0 \%$. Socio-demographic data on the survey population is contained in Section 6.

## 1. Explaining Republican Elite Zeal for Restrictive Transgender Legislation

Republicans across the United States, especially in red and purple states, have during recent legislative sessions advocated for a wide range of restrictive legislation and policies related to their state's transgender population. The Republican focus on this specific topic is driven by three principal factors. First, the proposals enjoy majority, or at least plurality, support among the state's general population. Second, the proposals enjoy overwhelming support among the state's residents who identify as Republicans. Third, the proposals divide the state's residents who identify as Democrats, a significant proportion of whom both support and oppose these policy initiatives.

These patterns are present in the politically diverse states of Texas (red), Arizona (purple) and California (blue). They thus provide strong incentives for Republicans to author and advocate for transgender related policies, even in purple Arizona and blue California, where their eventual prospects for being passed into law are generally modest to nonexistent, unlike the case in Texas, where this legislation has more often than not been passed into law. In 2021 and 2023 Texas passed bans on the participation of transgender girls and women participating in public school and in public college and university sporting events, and in 2023 Texas also passed a ban on the provision of gender affirming medical treatment to transgender children.

A survey of adults in Arizona, California and Texas queried residents about their position regarding three distinct policies related to the state's transgender population. First, should transgender people be allowed to choose which bathroom to use. Second, should transgender girls or women be allowed to play in women's sport events. Third, should legislation be passed by the state legislature that bans the provision of gender-affirming medical treatment to transgender children with the purpose of altering the child's biological characteristics to align with their gender identity.

### 1.1. The General Population

By a more than two to one margin, an absolute majority of Texans ( $61 \%$ to $25 \%$ ) and Arizonans ( $54 \%$ to $27 \%$ ) believe transgender people should not, rather than should, be allowed to choose which bathroom to use. The California population is more evenly divided ( $45 \%$ to $35 \%$ ), but a significant plurality believes transgender people should not be allowed to choose which bathroom to use.

Four times as many Texans ( $68 \%$ to $16 \%$ ), three times as many Arizonans ( $63 \%$ to $20 \%$ ) and two times as many Californians ( $53 \%$ to $26 \%$ ) believe that transgender girls and women should not, rather than should, be allowed to play in women's sporting events. That is, in red Texas more than two-thirds, in purple Arizona more than three-fifths, and, even in blue California, more than one-half of residents oppose transgender girls or women participating in women's sporting events.

An absolute majority of Texans (53\% to 32\%) and Arizonans ( $51 \%$ to $30 \%$ ) support, rather than oppose, legislation that would ban the provision of gender-affirming medical care to transgender children. A narrow plurality of Californians ( $41 \%$ to $35 \%$ ) also support legislation which would ban gender-affirming care for transgender children.

### 1.2. Republicans

Republicans constitute the largest partisan group in both Texas and Arizona, where 40\% and 38\% of the respondents indicated that they identify as Republican, compared to $28 \%$ of California respondents.

Republicans across all three states overwhelmingly believe that transgender people should not be allowed to choose which bathroom to use. In Texas (88\%) and Arizona (86\%) close to nine out of ten Republicans believe transgender people should not be able to choose which bathroom to use, compared to fewer than one in ten ( $7 \%$ and $4 \%$ respectively) who believe they should. In California, three out of four Republicans (76\%) also believe transgender people should not be able to choose which bathroom to use, compared to $20 \%$ who believe they should. Also noteworthy is the considerable certainty among Republicans regarding this issue, with only 4\% (in California), 5\% (in Texas) and 10\% (in Arizona) responding that they were unsure of their position on this issue.

Republicans across all three states also overwhelmingly believe that transgender girls and women should not be allowed to participate in women's sporting events. In Texas (93\%) and Arizona (89\%) nine out of ten Republicans believe transgender girls and women should not be allowed to play in women's sporting events, compared to fewer than one in ten ( $6 \%$ and $8 \%$ respectively) who believe they should be able to. More than three out of four (76\%) California Republicans also oppose transgender participation in women's sports events, compared to $14 \%$ who support this participation. Once again, only a very small proportion of Republicans are unsure of their position regarding this issue, with the proportion of not sure respondents being $1 \%$ in Texas, $3 \%$ in Arizona and 9\% in California.

By substantial margins, although not as substantial as for the previous two issues, Republicans in all three states support, rather than oppose, legislation that would ban the provision of genderaffirming medical treatment to transgender children. More than two-thirds of Republicans support the legislation compared to one-quarter or less who oppose it. The margin of support versus opposition is greatest among Arizona Republicans ( $76 \%$ to $16 \%$ ), followed by Texas Republicans ( $71 \%$ to $24 \%$ ) and California Republicans ( $69 \%$ to $25 \%$ ). As was the case for the previous two issues, fewer than one in ten Republicans (ranging from 5\% to 8\%) in these three states are unsure about their position on this issue.

### 1.3. Democrats

Democrats constitute the largest partisan group in California, accounting for $45 \%$ of the respondents, compared to 33\% in Arizona and 32\% in Texas.

Significantly more Democrats in all three states (55\% in Arizona, 51\% in California, and 49\% in Texas) believe that transgender people should be allowed to choose which bathroom to use than believe they should not be able to choose ( $25 \%, 25 \%$ and $29 \%$ respectively). However, between six and four times as many Democrats as Republicans in Arizona (25\% vs. 4\%) and Texas (29\% vs. $7 \%$ ) hold the minority opinion within their party. Also, a significantly larger proportion of Democrats than Republicans in Arizona and Texas are uncertain about their position on this issue ( $20 \%$ to $10 \%$ in Arizona and $22 \%$ to $5 \%$ in Texas). In California the proportion of Democrats holding the intra-party minority position (against) is only modestly greater than the proportion of Republicans holding the intra-party minority position (for), $25 \%$ to $20 \%$, although the proportion of unsure California Democrats (24\%) is significantly greater than the proportion of unsure California Republicans (4\%).

Democrats in all three states are relatively evenly divided among those who believe transgender girls or women should be able to participate in women's sporting events, who believe they should not be able to participate, and who are unsure. A narrow plurality of Arizona (38\%) and California (38\%) Democrats believe transgender girls and women should be able to participate in women's sporting events, followed by $33 \%$ and $36 \%$ who believe they should not be able to participate, with $29 \%$ and $26 \%$ unsure. In Texas, a narrow plurality of Democrats (39\%) believes transgender girls and women should not be allowed to participate in women's sporting events compared to $30 \%$ who believe they should be able to participate and $31 \%$ who are unsure.

A plurality, but not a majority, of Democrats in all three states opposes, rather than supports, legislation that would ban the provision of gender-affirming care by medical professionals to transgender children. In Texas, 48\% of Democrats oppose this legislation and 33\% support it, with the proportions for Arizona ( $47 \%$ vs. $27 \%$ ) and California ( $41 \%$ vs. $25 \%$ ) relatively similar. As was previously the case, significantly more Democrats than Republicans are unsure about their position on this issue in Arizona ( $26 \%$ vs. $8 \%$ ), California ( $34 \%$ vs. $6 \%$ ), and Texas ( $19 \%$ vs. $5 \%$ ).

## 2. Religiosity and Support for Restrictive Transgender Policies

There exists a profound religion-related cleavage regarding support for and opposition to restrictive transgender related public policies. Across the red, purple and blue states of Texas, Arizona and California, residents who regularly attend religious services are significantly more likely than those residents who never attend religious services to support policies that restrict the ability of transgender people to choose which bathroom to use, participate in women's sporting events, and (for children) receive gender-affirming medical treatment.

### 2.1. The Key Sub-Populations Broken Down by Religiosity, Religion and Partisanship.

Survey respondents from Arizona, California and Texas were divided into three groups based on the frequency of their attendance at religious services (other than weddings and funerals). The first is a high frequency group composed of those who reported on average attending religious services on average more than once a week, once a week or one or two times a month. The second is a low frequency group that consists of those who report attending religious services seldom or a few times a year. Finally, the third group consists of those individuals who report that they never attend religious services.

One-third of Texans (33\%), 29\% of Californians and 25\% of Arizonans fall into high frequency religious service attendance group. Conversely, $30 \%$ of Texans, $36 \%$ of Californians and $39 \%$ of Arizonans report that they never attend religious services. In between these two extremes are $34 \%$ of Texans, $33 \%$ of Californians and $32 \%$ of Arizonans who infrequently attend religious services.

Among Texans who frequently attend religious services, 30\% identify as Protestant, 28\% as Catholic, $5 \%$ as Muslim, 3\% as Eastern Orthodox, $7 \%$ as nothing in particular and $22 \%$ as something else. Among Californians who frequently attend religious services, $31 \%$ identify as Protestant, $40 \%$ as Catholic, $4 \%$ as Mormon, $3 \%$ as Jewish, $4 \%$ as nothing in particular and 13\% as something else. Among Arizonans who frequently attend religious services, $30 \%$ identify as Protestant, $26 \%$ as Catholic, $5 \%$ as Mormon, $3 \%$ as Jewish, $7 \%$ as nothing in particular and $23 \%$ as something else.

Arizonans, Californians and Texans who frequently attend religious services are significantly more likely to identify as Republicans and significantly less likely to identify as Democrats than are their neighbors who never attend religious services. In Texas, Republicans enjoy a $49 \%$ to $30 \%$ advantage over Democrats among Texans who regularly attend religious services, just as Democrats enjoy a $38 \%$ to $24 \%$ advantage over Republicans among Texans who never attend religious services. In Arizona, Republicans enjoy a 49\% to 30\% advantage over Democrats among Arizonans who regularly attend religious services, just as Democrats enjoy a $38 \%$ to $24 \%$ advantage over Republicans among Arizonans who never attend religious services. In California, Democrats enjoy an advantage over Republicans among both groups, $43 \%$ to $37 \%$ and $52 \%$ to $17 \%$ respectively, although the Democratic advantage among those who never attend services is
more than five times greater than the Democratic advantage among those who frequently attend religious services ( $35 \%$ to $6 \%$ ).

### 2.2. Religiosity and Support for Restrictive Transgender Policies

In Arizona, Texas and California significantly higher proportions of frequent attenders of religious services believe that transgender people should not, rather than should, be allowed to choose which bathroom to use, $79 \%$ to 10\% (Arizona), $70 \%$ to 20\% (California), and $60 \%$ to $22 \%$ (Texas). Conversely, comparatively narrow pluralities of residents who never attend religious services in Arizona and California believe transgender people should, rather than should not, be allowed to choose which bathroom to use, $42 \%$ to $36 \%$ and $44 \%$ to $32 \%$ respectively. In Texas, an equally narrow plurality of those who never attend religious services, $46 \%$ to $38 \%$, is of the position that transgender people should not be allowed to choose which bathroom to use.

There also exists a substantial, albeit less so than in regard to transgender bathroom use, gap between residents of the three states who frequently attend and who never attend religious services in regard to their opposition to transgender girls or women being allowed to play in women's sports events. Those Arizonans, Californians and Texans who frequently attend religious services are significantly more likely to oppose than support transgender female sports participation, as are those Arizonans, Californians and Texans who never attend religious services. The main distinction is the scope of the difference is greater among the former, rather than the latter, group.

In Arizona, 73\% of frequent attenders of religious services oppose (and 17\% support) transgender participation in women's sports, compared to $54 \%$ and $24 \%$ of those who never attend religious services. In California, $61 \%$ of frequent attenders of religious services oppose (and $21 \%$ support) transgender participation in women's sports, compared to $45 \%$ and $28 \%$ of those who never attend religious services. In Texas, $70 \%$ of frequent attenders of religious services oppose (and $13 \%$ support) transgender participation in women's sports, compared to $59 \%$ and $26 \%$ of those who never attend religious services.

Significantly more frequent attenders of religious services than those who never attend religious services support legislation that would ban the provision of gender-affirming treatment by medical professionals to transgender children in all three states. In Arizona, 65\% of frequent attenders of religious services support (and 29\% oppose) a legislative ban on the provision of gender-affirming treatment to transgender children, compared to $45 \%$ and $34 \%$ of those who never attend religious services. In California, 53\% of frequent attenders of religious services support (and $30 \%$ oppose) a legislative ban on the provision of gender-affirming treatment to transgender children, compared to $31 \%$ and $38 \%$ of those who never attend religious services. In Texas, 60\% of frequent attenders of religious services support (and $30 \%$ oppose) a legislative ban on the provision of gender-affirming treatment to transgender children, compared to 45\% and $40 \%$ of those who never attend religious services.

## 3. Transgender Bathroom Access

The respondents were asked if transgender people should be allowed to choose which bathroom to use. The response options were yes, no, and not sure.

In all three states more people believe transgender people should not be allowed to choose which bathroom to use than believe transgender people should be allowed to choose which bathroom to use (see Table 1). However, the gap dividing the proportion of opponents and proponents of open-access bathroom use for transgender people is much greater in Texas, and to a slightly lesser extent in Arizona, than in California. More than twice as many Texans ( $61 \%$ to $25 \%$ ) and Arizonans ( $54 \%$ to $27 \%$ ) believe that transgender people should not be allowed to choose which bathroom to use as believe transgender people should be allowed to choose which bathroom to use. This compares to a narrower plurality of Californians ( $45 \%$ to $35 \%$ ) who believe transgender people should not and should be able to choose which bathroom to use.

Table 1. Should Transgender People Be Allowed to Choose Which Bathroom to Use? (\%)

| State | Yes | No | Not Sure |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | 27 | 54 | 19 |
| California | 35 | 45 | 20 |
| Texas | 25 | 61 | 14 |

### 3.1. Gender and Transgender Bathroom Access

Across all three states women are more likely than men to be positively pre-disposed to transgender people choosing which bathroom to use, and men more likely than women to be negatively pre-disposed to transgender people choosing which bathroom to use (see Table 2). The differences are however only statistically significant in California (39\% vs. 30\%) and Arizona (31\% vs. 22\%).

Table 2. Gender \&
Should Transgender People Be Able to Choose Which Bathroom to Use? (\%)

| State | Gender | Yes | No | Not Sure |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | Women | 31 | 51 | 18 |
|  | Men | 22 | 58 | 20 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| California | Women | 39 | 41 | 20 |
|  | Men | 30 | 49 | 21 |
|  |  | 27 | 60 | 13 |
| Texas | Women | 22 | 63 | 15 |
|  | Men |  |  |  |

### 3.2. Ethnicity/Race and Transgender Bathroom Access

White and Latino residents of Arizona and Texas do not differ notably in regard to the proportion who believe transgender people should and should not be allowed to choose which bathroom to use (see Table 3). However, in California, white residents are significantly more likely than Latino residents ( $41 \%$ to $24 \%$ ) to believe transgender people should be allowed to choose which bathroom to use.

Table 3. Ethnicity/Race \&
Should Transgender People Be Able to Choose Which Bathroom to Use? (\%)

| State | Ethnicity/Race | Yes | No | Not Sure |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | White | 28 | 55 | 17 |
|  | Latino | 24 | 57 | 19 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| California | White | 41 | 44 | 15 |
|  | Latino | 24 | 52 | 24 |
|  | Asian | 49 | 30 | 21 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Texas | White | 26 | 64 | 10 |
|  | Latino | 23 | 60 | 17 |
|  | Black | 31 | 54 | 15 |

### 3.3. Age and Transgender Bathroom Access

In Arizona and Texas, both older and younger residents believe, by an approximately two/three to one margin, that transgender people should not, rather than should, be allowed to choose which bathroom to use; with two exceptions in Texas (see Table 4). The margin among those ages 18 to 29 is notably narrower ( $49 \%$ to $35 \%$ ) than two/three to one, while that among those age 65 and older is notably broader than two/three to one ( $71 \%$ to $17 \%$ ).

Table 4. Age \&
Should Transgender People Be Able to Choose Which Bathroom to Use? (\%)

| State | Age Cohort | Yes | No | Not Sure |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Arizona | $18-29$ | 22 | 55 | 23 |
|  | $30-44$ | 23 | 53 | 24 |
|  | $45-64$ | 30 | 56 | 14 |
|  | $65+$ | 32 | 53 | 15 |
|  |  |  |  | 35 |
| California | $18-29$ | 34 | 38 | 31 |
|  | $30-44$ | 41 | 56 | 21 |
|  | $45-64$ | 28 | 50 | 16 |
|  | $65+$ | 37 |  | 13 |
|  |  | 35 | 49 | 16 |
| Texas | $18-29$ | 26 | 60 | 14 |
|  | $30-44$ | 20 | 67 | 13 |
|  | $45-64$ | 17 | 71 | 12 |
|  | $65+$ |  |  |  |

In California, those ages 45 to 64 ( $56 \%$ to $28 \%$ ) and 65 plus ( $50 \%$ to $37 \%$ ) are notably more likely to believe transgender people should not, rather than should, be able to choose which bathroom to use, those under the age of 45 , who are evenly split between an affirmative and negative answer to this question.

### 3.4. Education and Transgender Bathroom Access

In Arizona, while members of all three educational attainment groupings are significantly more likely to believe transgender people should not, rather than should, be allowed to choose which bathroom to use, the ratio for those with a high school education or less is notably greater than that for their peers with higher levels of educational attainment (see Table 5). In Texas and California the same general pattern holds true, with two exceptions. First, the salient education related split in these latter two states is between those whose highest level of education is either a high school degree or less ( $66 \%$ vs. $20 \%$; $51 \%$ vs. $28 \%$ ) or some college or a two-year degree ( $61 \%$ vs. $22 \%$; $50 \%$ vs. $30 \%$ ) and those whose highest level of educational attainment is a fouryear college degree or postgraduate degree ( $56 \%$ vs. $34 \%$; $36 \%$ vs. $44 \%$ ). Second, a narrow plurality ( $44 \%$ vs. $36 \%$ ) of Californians with a four-year college degree or postgraduate degree believe that transgender people should, rather than should not, be able to choose which bathroom to use.

Table 5. Education \&
Should Transgender People Be Able to Choose Which Bathroom to Use? (\%)

| State | Educational <br> Attainment | Yes | No | Not Sure |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | High School or Less | 20 | 57 | 23 |
|  | Some College/2 Year | 32 | 53 | 15 |
|  | $4-$ Year/Post-Grad | 31 | 52 | 17 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| California | High School or Less | 28 | 51 | 21 |
|  | Some College/2 Year | 30 | 50 | 20 |
|  | $4-Y e a r / P o s t-G r a d ~$ | 44 | 36 | 20 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Texas | High School or Less | 20 | 66 | 14 |
|  | Some College/2 Year | 22 | 61 | 17 |
|  | $4-Y e a r / P o s t-G r a d ~$ | 34 | 56 | 10 |

### 3.5. Religiosity and Transgender Bathroom Access

Across all three states there is profound divide among residents in their position vis-à-vis transgender bathroom use based on their level of religiosity (see Table 6). Those residents who attend religious services (other than funerals or weddings) on average between at least two times a month to multiple times during a week overwhelmingly believe that transgender people should not, rather than should, be allowed to choose which bathroom to use: Arizona ( $79 \%$ vs. $10 \%$ ), Texas ( $70 \%$ vs. 20\%), and California ( $60 \%$ vs. 22\%). In contrast, individuals who never attend
religious services are split relatively evening between those who believe that transgender people should be able to choose which bathroom to use and those who believe transgender people should not be able to choose which bathroom to use, with modest pluralities supporting the former position in California (44\% vs. 32\%) and Arizona ( $42 \%$ vs. $36 \%$ ) and supporting the latter position in Texas (39\% vs. 46\%).

Table 6. Religiosity \&
Should Transgender People Be Able to Choose Which Bathroom to Use? (\%)

| State | Frequency of <br> Church Attendance | Yes | No | Not Sure |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | High/Medium | 10 | 79 | 11 |
|  | Low | 24 | 59 | 17 |
|  | Never | 42 | 36 | 22 |
|  |  |  |  | 18 |
| California | High/Medium | 22 | 60 | 15 |
|  | Low | 35 | 50 | 24 |
|  | Never | 44 | 32 |  |
|  |  | 20 | 70 | 10 |
| Texas | High/Medium | 17 | 68 | 15 |
|  | Low | 39 | 46 | 15 |
|  | Never |  |  |  |

### 3.6. Partisanship and Transgender Bathroom Access

Republicans in Arizona ( $86 \%$ to $4 \%$ ) and Texas ( $88 \%$ to $7 \%$ ) overwhelmingly believe that transgender people should not, rather than should, be able to choose which bathroom to use (see Table 7). A super-majority of California Republicans ( $76 \%$ vs. $20 \%$ ) share this opinion of their co-partisans in Arizona and Texas, albeit with a gap that is not as large. Also noteworthy is the relatively small proportion of Republicans answering "not sure" to this question (between 4\% and $10 \%$ ), a response which in some cases reflects a true lack of opinion or certainty on an issue and in others a reluctance to voice an opinion that is considered socially undesirable within their social and professional network.

Table 7. Partisanship \&
Should Transgender People Be Able to Choose Which Bathroom to Use? (\%)

| State | Partisan ID | Yes | No | Not Sure |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | Democrat | 55 | 25 | 20 |
|  | Independent | 27 | 48 | 25 |
|  | Republican | 4 | 86 | 10 |
|  |  |  |  | 24 |
| California | Democrat | 51 | 59 | 22 |
|  | Independent | 19 | 76 | 4 |
|  | Republican | 20 |  | 22 |
|  |  | 49 | 29 | 15 |
| Texas | Democrat | 23 | 62 | 5 |
|  | Independent | 7 | 88 |  |
|  | Republican |  |  | 2 |

Significant majorities of Democrats in all three states believe that transgender people should, rather than should not, be allowed to choose which bathroom to use. The margins of these majorities are however notably smaller than those among Republicans in all three states: Arizona ( $55 \%$ vs. $25 \%$ ), Texas ( $49 \%$ vs. $29 \%$ ), and California ( $51 \%$ vs. $25 \%$ ). Also, significantly more Democrats than Republicans indicated that they were not sure about their opinion on this issue in California ( $24 \%$ vs. $4 \%$ ), Texas ( $22 \%$ vs. $5 \%$ ), and Arizona ( $20 \%$ vs. $10 \%$ ).

In all three states Independents are significantly more likely to believe transgender people should not, rather than should, be able to choose which bathroom to use, by margins of $48 \%$ to $27 \%$ in Arizona, 59\% to $19 \%$ in California, and $62 \%$ to $23 \%$ in Texas.

## 4. Transgender Girl or Woman Participation in Women's Sports Events

The respondents were asked if they thought a transgender girl or woman (someone whose sex was classified as male at birth, but who now identifies as a woman) should be allowed to play in women's sports events. The response options were yes, no, and not sure.

By a margin of two to one in California ( $53 \%$ to 26\%), three to one in Arizona ( $63 \%$ to 20\%) and four to one in Texas ( $68 \%$ to 16\%), significantly more residents do not believe a transgender girl or woman should be allowed to play in women's sports events (see Table 8). This opposition is not as great in California as in Arizona and Texas, but is nonetheless the opinion of an absolute majority of the population, compared to three-fifths of the population in Arizona and two-thirds in Texas.

Table 8. Should a Transgender Girl/Woman Participate in Women's Sports Events?

| State | Yes | No | Not Sure |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | 20 | 63 | 17 |
| California | 26 | 53 | 21 |
| Texas | 16 | 68 | 16 |

### 4.1. Gender and Transgender Sports

While majorities of both women and men in Arizona and California do not believe that a transgender girl or woman should be allowed to play in women's sports events, significantly more men ( $70 \%$ and $59 \%$ respectively) than women ( $56 \%$ and $49 \%$ ) hold this position, just as significantly more women ( $24 \%$ and $32 \%$ ) than men ( $19 \%$ and $15 \%$ ) believe that transgender girls or women should be able to participate in women's sporting events (see Table 9). In sharp contrast, there do not exist any salient differences in Texas between women and men, with 67\% and $69 \%$ opposing the participation of transgender girls and women in women's sporting events and $17 \%$ and $15 \%$ in support of this participation.

Table 9. Gender \&
Should a Transgender Girl/Woman Participate in Women's Sports Events? (\%)

| State | Gender | Yes | No | Not Sure |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | Women | 24 | 56 | 20 |
|  | Men | 16 | 70 | 14 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| California | Women | 32 | 59 | 19 |
|  | Men | 19 | 59 | 22 |
|  |  | 17 | 67 | 16 |
| Texas | Women | 15 | 69 | 16 |
|  | Men |  |  |  |

### 4.2. Ethnicity/Race and Transgender Sports

Absolute majorities of white and Latino residents of Arizona ( $66 \%$ and $58 \%$ respectively), California ( $53 \%$ and $51 \%$ ), and Texas ( $69 \%$ and $62 \%$ ) oppose transgender girls or women participating in women's sporting events (see Table 10). The greatest opposition among any ethnic/racial group is found among Black Texans (77\%) and the lowest level of opposition is found among Asian American Californians (42\%), with nearly half of California Asian Americans responding "not sure" to this question.

Table 10. Ethnicity/Race \&
Should a Transgender Girl/Woman Participate in Women's Sports Events? (\%)

| State | Ethnicity/Race | Yes | No | Not Sure |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | White | 17 | 66 | 17 |
|  | Latino | 28 | 58 | 14 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| California | White | 24 | 53 | 23 |
|  | Latino | 33 | 51 | 16 |
|  | Asian | 22 | 32 | 46 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Texas | White | 15 | 69 | 16 |
|  | Latino | 15 | 62 | 19 |
|  | Black | 15 | 77 | 9 |

### 4.3. Age and Transgender Sports

In Arizona and Texas absolute majorities of all age groups are opposed to a transgender girl or woman being allowed to play in women's sports events, with though older Arizonans and Texans registering higher proportions of opposition than younger Arizonans and Texans (see Table 11). The same pattern of greater opposition among older residents is also present in California, although only a plurality, rather than an absolute majority, of Californians under the age of 45 oppose transgender girls or women playing in women's sporting events.

Table 11. Age \&
Should a Transgender Girl/Woman Participate in Women's Sports Events? (\%)

| State | Age Cohort | Yes | No | Not Sure |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | $18-29$ | 28 | 60 | 12 |
|  | $30-44$ | 26 | 52 | 22 |
|  | $45-64$ | 15 | 69 | 16 |
|  | $65+$ | 15 | 69 | 16 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| California | $18-29$ | 29 | 46 | 25 |
|  | $30-44$ | 34 | 42 | 24 |
|  | $45-64$ | 16 | 66 | 18 |
|  | $65+$ | 25 | 58 | 17 |
|  |  | 21 | 59 | 20 |
| Texas | $18-29$ | 20 | 63 | 17 |
|  | $30-44$ | 13 | 73 | 14 |
|  | $45-64$ | 11 | 77 | 12 |

### 4.4. Education and Transgender Sports

There do not exist any noteworthy education-related differences in support for or opposition to transgender girls or women participating in women's sports events across the three states, with one partial exception (see Table 12). Californians whose highest level of educational attainment is some college or a two-year degree are significantly more likely than Californians with either higher and lower levels of educational attainment to be against transgender girls or women participation in women's sports.

Table 12. Education \&
Should a Transgender Girl/Woman Participate in Women's Sports Events? (\%)

| State | Educational <br> Attainment | Yes | No | Not Sure |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | High School or Less | 19 | 65 | 16 |
|  | Some College/2 Year | 23 | 61 | 16 |
|  | $4-$ Year/Post-Grad | 17 | 63 | 20 |
|  |  |  | 51 | 23 |
| California | High School or Less | 26 | 62 | 16 |
|  | Some College/2 Year | 22 | 49 | 22 |
|  | $4-$ Year/Post-Grad | 28 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 63 | 20 |
| Texas | High School or Less | 17 | 73 | 12 |
|  | Some College/2 Year | 15 | 69 | 13 |
|  | $4-Y e a r / P o s t-G r a d ~$ | 18 |  |  |

### 4.5. Religiosity and Transgender Sports

Arizonans, Californians and Texans who frequently attend religious services are significantly more likely to believe that transgender girls or women should not be allowed to play in women's
sporting events than are their fellow residents who never attend religious services, by a $73 \%$ to $54 \%, 61 \%$ to $45 \%$ and $70 \%$ to $59 \%$ margin respectively (see Table 13). The same finding is true for those Arizonans ( $67 \%$ vs. $54 \%$ ), Californians ( $58 \%$ vs. $45 \%$ ) and Texans ( $75 \%$ vs. $59 \%$ ) who infrequently attend religious services compared to those who never attend religious services.

Table 13. Religiosity \&
Should a Transgender Girl/Woman Participate in Women's Sports Events? (\%)

| State | Frequency of <br> Church Attendance | Yes | No | Not Sure |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | High/Medium | 17 | 73 | 10 |
|  | Low | 19 | 67 | 14 |
|  | Never | 24 | 54 | 22 |
|  |  |  |  | 18 |
| California | High/Medium | 21 | 51 | 15 |
|  | Low | 27 | 45 | 27 |
|  | Never | 28 |  | 17 |
|  |  | 13 | 70 | 15 |
| Texas | High/Medium | 10 | 59 | 15 |
|  | Low | 26 |  | 15 |
|  | Never |  |  |  |

### 4.6. Partisanship and Transgender Sports

Republicans in all three states overwhelmingly believe that transgender girls and woman should not be allowed to participate in women's sporting events (see Table 14). Nine out of ten Texas ( $93 \%$ ) and Arizona ( $89 \%$ ) Republicans oppose transgender participation in women's sports, compared to only 7\% and $8 \%$ who are supportive. In California, eight out of ten Republicans ( $77 \%$ ) are in opposition, compared to $14 \%$ who are supportive. A mere $3 \%$ of Arizona Republicans, $9 \%$ of California Republicans and 1\% of Texas Republicans indicated they were not sure about what their position was on this issue.

Table 14. Partisanship \&
Should a Transgender Girl/Woman Participate in Women's Sports Events? (\%)

| State | Partisan ID | Yes | No | Not Sure |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | Democrat | 38 | 33 | 29 |
|  | Independent | 16 | 65 | 19 |
|  | Republican | 8 | 89 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| California | Democrat | 38 | 36 | 26 |
|  | Independent | 18 | 62 | 20 |
|  | Republican | 14 | 77 | 9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Texas | Democrat | 30 | 39 | 31 |
|  | Independent | 17 | 69 | 14 |
|  | Republican | 6 | 93 | 1 |

In sharp contrast to Republicans, Democrats in Arizona, California and Texas are relatively evenly divided among those who supportive of transgender women and girls participating in women's sports ( $38 \%, 38 \%, 30 \%$ ), those who oppose this participation ( $33 \%, 36 \%, 39 \%$ ), and those who responded they were not sure ( $29 \%, 26 \%, 31 \%$ ).

Independents in Arizona, California and Texas oppose rather than support transgender participation in women's sporting events by similar margins, $65 \%$ vs. $16 \%, 62 \%$ vs. $18 \%$, and $69 \%$ vs. $17 \%$.

## 5. Legislative Ban on Gender-Affirming Treatment for Transgender Children

The respondents were asked if they support or oppose legislation that oppose medical professionals from providing puberty-inhibiting drugs, cross-sex hormones and surgical interventions to children under 18 for the purpose of altering the child's biological characteristics to align with their perceived gender identity. The response options were support, oppose, and not sure.

Slightly more than one-half of Texas (53\%) and Arizona (51\%) residents support legislation that would ban the provision of puberty-enhancing drugs, cross-sex hormones and surgical interventions to transgender children, compared to the slightly less than a third of the state residents that oppose this legislation (32\% and 30\%) (see Table 15). In California, this legislative ban is supported (41\%) and opposed (35\%) by relatively equal shares of the population.

Table 15. Support For Ban on Gender-Affirming Treatment for Transgender Children (\%)

| State | Support | Oppose | Not Sure |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | 51 | 30 | 19 |
| California | 41 | 35 | 24 |
| Texas | 53 | 32 | 15 |

### 5.1. Gender and a Legislative Ban on Gender-Affirming Treatment

In California, men (47\%) are significantly more likely than women (35\%) to support legislation banning gender-affirming care for transgender children (see Table 16). In Arizona (54\% vs. 47\%) and Texas ( $51 \%$ vs. $55 \%$ ) the gender differences are not significant, with men slightly more likely to be in favor of a ban in Arizona and women slightly more likely to be in favor of a ban in Texas.

Table 16. Gender \&
Support For Ban on Gender-Affirming Treatment for Transgender Children (\%)

| State | Gender | Support | Oppose | Not Sure |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | Women | 47 | 31 | 22 |
|  | Men | 54 | 30 | 16 |
|  |  |  |  | 29 |
| California | Women | 35 | 36 | 19 |
|  | Men | 47 | 34 |  |
|  |  | 55 | 30 | 15 |
| Texas | Women | 51 | 35 | 14 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

### 5.2. Ethnicity/Race and a Legislative Ban on Gender-Affirming Treatment

In Arizona and California white (55\% and 46\%) and Latino (52\% and 39\%) residents do not differ significantly in their support for a ban on gender-affirming treatment for transgender children (see Table 17). In Texas however, white (64\%) residents are significantly more likely than Latino (43\%) residents to support a ban. The two ethnic/racial groups registering the lowest support for a legislative ban on gender-affirming care for transgender children are Asian Americans (26\%) in California and African Americans (35\%) in Texas.

Table 17. Ethnicity/Race \&
Support For Ban on Gender-Affirming Treatment for Transgender Children (\%)

| State | Ethnicity/Race | Support | Oppose | Not Sure |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | White | 55 | 28 | 17 |  |
|  | Latino | 52 | 24 | 24 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | White | 46 | 33 | 21 |  |
|  | Latino | 39 | 33 | 28 |  |
|  | Asian | 26 | 49 | 25 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Texas | White | 64 | 26 | 10 |  |
|  | Latino | 33 | 36 | 21 |  |
|  | Black |  |  |  |  |

### 5.3. Age and a Legislative Ban on Gender-Affirming Treatment

With two exceptions, there do not exist any significant age-related differences in support for a legislative ban on gender-affirming care for transgender children across these three states (see Table 18). One exception is in Texas, where Texans 30 years of age and older are significantly more likely to support a legislative ban than Texans under the age of 30. The other exception is in California, where Californians 45 and older are significantly more likely to support a ban than Californians under the age of 30 .

Table 18. Age \&
Support For Ban on Gender-Affirming Treatment for Transgender Children (\%)

| State | Age Cohort | Support | Oppose | Not Sure |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Arizona | $18-29$ | 59 | 33 | 8 |
|  | $30-44$ | 50 | 18 | 32 |
|  | $45-64$ | 48 | 36 | 16 |
|  | $65+$ | 51 | 32 | 17 |
|  |  |  |  | 29 |
| California | $18-29$ | 32 | 38 | 24 |
|  | $30-44$ | 38 | 27 | 26 |
|  | $45-64$ | 47 | 39 | 18 |
|  | $65+$ | 43 |  | 22 |
|  |  | 52 | 33 | 11 |
| Texas | $18-29$ | 57 | 29 | 14 |
|  | $30-44$ | 56 | 33 | 11 |
|  | $45-64$ |  |  | 29 |

### 5.4. Education and a Legislative Ban on Gender-Affirming Treatment

There do not exist any significant differences in support for a legislative ban on gender-affirming care for transgender children in any of the three states (see Table 19).

Table 19. Education \&
Support For Ban on Gender-Affirming Treatment for Transgender Children (\%)

| State | Educational <br> Attainment | Support | Oppose | Not Sure |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | High School or Less | 47 | 34 | 25 |
|  | Some College/2 Year | 50 | 32 | 18 |
|  | $4-$ Year/Post-Grad | 56 | 25 | 19 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| California | High School or Less | 37 | 38 | 25 |
|  | Some College/2 Year | 43 | 29 | 28 |
|  | $4-$ Year/Post-Grad | 43 | 37 | 20 |
|  |  |  | 32 | 18 |
| Texas | High School or Less | 50 | 34 | 12 |
|  | Some College/2 Year | 54 | 35 | 12 |
|  | $4-Y e a r / P o s t-G r a d ~$ | 55 |  |  |

### 5.5. Religiosity and a Legislative Ban on Gender-Affirming Treatment

In Arizona, California and Texas, residents who frequently attend religious services are significantly more likely than residents who never attend religious services to support a ban on the provision of puberty-inhibiting drugs, cross-sex hormones, and surgical interventions to transgender children with the goal of altering their biological characteristics to make them more in line with their gender identity (see Table 20). In Arizona, 65\% of frequent church attenders support the ban compared to $45 \%$ of those who never attend religious services. In Texas, $60 \%$ of
frequent church attenders support the ban compared to $45 \%$ of those who never attend religious services. In California, 53\% of frequent church attenders support the ban compared to $31 \%$ of those who never attend religious services. Furthermore, whereas very few frequent church attenders are unsure about their position on this proposed ban (6\% in Arizona, 7\% in California, $10 \%$ in Texas), substantially more of those who never attend religious services are not sure about their position in Arizona (21\%) and California (31\%); but not in Texas (15\%).

Table 20. Religiosity \&
Support For Ban on Gender-Affirming Treatment for Transgender Children (\%)

| State | Frequency of <br> Church Attendance | Support | Oppose | Not Sure |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | High/Medium | 65 | 29 | 6 |
|  | Low | 49 | 29 | 22 |
|  | Never | 45 | 34 | 21 |
|  |  |  |  | 7 |
| California | High/Medium | 53 | 30 | 7 |
|  | Low | 42 | 36 | 22 |
|  | Never | 31 | 38 | 31 |
|  |  | 60 | 30 | 10 |
| Texas | High/Medium | 53 | 30 | 17 |
|  | Low | 45 | 40 | 15 |
|  | Never |  |  |  |

### 5.6. Partisanship and Legislative Ban on Gender-Affirming Treatment

Republicans in Arizona (76\%), Texas (71\%) and California (69\%) overwhelming favor a legislative ban on gender-affirming treatment for transgender children (see Table 21). Only 16\%, 24\% and $25 \%$ of Republicans in these three respective states oppose a legislative ban, with fewer than one in ten unsure of their position vis-à-vis a ban ( $8 \%, 5 \%$, and $6 \%$ respectively).

Table 21. Partisanship \&
Support For Ban on Gender-Affirming Treatment for Transgender Children (\%)

| State | Partisan ID | Support | Oppose | Not Sure |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | Democrat | 27 | 47 | 26 |
|  | Independent | 46 | 36 | 18 |
|  | Republican | 76 | 16 | 8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| California | Democrat | 25 | 41 | 34 |
|  | Independent | 43 | 26 | 21 |
|  | Republican | 69 |  | 6 |
|  |  | 33 | 48 | 19 |
| Texas | Democrat | 54 | 28 | 18 |
|  | Independent | 71 | 24 | 5 |
|  | Republican |  |  |  |

In contrast, while a plurality of Democrats oppose a ban in all three states, in no instance does this proportion rise above $50 \%$. The opposition ranges from highs of $48 \%$ among Texas

Democrats and 47\% among Arizona Democrats, to a low of 41\% among California Democrats. Furthermore, 34\% of California Democrats, 26\% of Arizona Democrats and 19\% of Texas Democrats are unsure if they support or oppose a legislative ban on gender-affirming care for transgender children, between six and three times the proportion of Republicans in the respective states who are unsure.

Furthermore, in all three states the gap separating Democrats who oppose a ban and Democrats who support a ban is substantially smaller than the gap separating Republicans who support a ban and Republicans who oppose a ban. The gap for Arizona Democrats is 20\% ( $47 \%$ vs. 27\%) while the gap for Arizona Republicans is $60 \%$ ( $76 \%$ vs. $16 \%$ ). The gap for Texas Democrats is $15 \%$ ( $48 \%$ vs. $33 \%$ ) while the gap for Texas Republicans is $47 \%$ ( $71 \%$ vs. $24 \%$ ). The gap for California Democrats is $16 \%$ ( $41 \%$ vs. $25 \%$ ) while the gap for California Republicans is $44 \%$ ( $69 \%$ vs. $25 \%$ ).

## 6. Socio-Demographic Groups Represented in the Survey Population

Table 22 provides the distribution of the survey population in Arizona, California and Texas by gender, ethnicity/race, and age.

Table 22. Survey Population Demographics: Gender, Ethnicity/Race \& Age

| State | Category | Sub-Group | Proportion (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | Gender | Women | 51 |
|  |  | Men | 49 |
| California | Gender | Women | 52 |
|  |  | Men | 48 |
| Texas | Gender | Women | 51.5 |
|  |  | Men | 48.5 |
| Arizona | Ethnicity/Race | White | 58 |
|  |  | Latino | 28 |
|  |  | Black | 5 |
|  |  | Asian | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |
| California | Ethnicity/Race | White | 40 |
|  |  | Latino | 36 |
|  |  | Black | 6 |
|  |  | Asian | 12 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Texas | Ethnicity/Race | White | 45 |
|  |  | Latino | 37 |
|  |  | Black | 12 |
|  |  | Asian | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Arizona | Age | Under 30 | 19 |
|  |  | 30 to 44 | 24 |
|  |  | 45 to 64 | 33 |
|  |  | 65+ | 24 |
|  |  |  |  |
| California | Age | Under 30 | 22 |
|  |  | 30 to 44 | 27 |
|  |  | 45 to 64 | 31 |
|  |  | 65+ | 20 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Texas | Age | Under 30 | 22 |
|  |  | 30 to 44 | 29 |
|  |  | 45 to 64 | 32 |
|  |  | 65+ | 17 |

All three state populations have a relatively equal proportion of women and men, with women representing a narrow majority ranging from 51\% in Arizona to 52\% in California.

Whites account for the largest share of the survey population in all three states, ranging from a low of $40 \%$ in California to a high of $58 \%$ in Arizona, with Texas in between at $45 \%$. Latinos account for the second largest share of the survey population in all three states, ranging from a low of $28 \%$ in Arizona to highs of $36 \%$ in California and $37 \%$ in Texas. In only two other instances does the proportion of a third ethnic/racial group surpass $10 \%$ in these three states. Asian Americans account for $12 \%$ of the California survey population and Blacks account for $12 \%$ of the Texas survey population.

The states have relatively similar shares of the survey population under 30 ( $19 \%$ to $22 \%$ ), between the ages of 30 and 44 ( $24 \%$ to $29 \%$ ), between the ages of 45 and 64 ( $31 \%$ to $33 \%$ ), and 65 and older ( $17 \%$ to $24 \%$ ).

Table 23 provides information on the distribution of each state's survey population by church attendance, partisan identification and educational attainment.

Table 23. Survey Population Demographics: Education, Church Attendance \& Partisanship

| State | Category | Sub-Group | Proportion (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona | Church Attendance | Frequent | 25 |
|  |  | Infrequent | 32 |
|  |  | Never | 39 |
| California | Church Attendance | Frequent | 29 |
|  |  | Infrequent | 33 |
|  |  | Never | 36 |
| Texas | Church Attendance | Frequent | 33 |
|  |  | Infrequent | 34 |
|  |  | Never | 30 |
| Arizona | Partisanship | Democrat | 33 |
|  |  | Republican | 38 |
|  |  | Independent | 21 |
| California | Partisanship | Democrat | 45 |
|  |  | Republican | 28 |
|  |  | Independent | 17 |
| Texas | Partisanship | Democrat | 32 |
|  |  | Republican | 40 |
|  |  | Independent | 19 |
| Arizona | Education | High School/Less | 37 |
|  |  | Some College/2 Yr | 32 |
|  |  | $4 \mathrm{Yr} /$ Post-Grad | 31 |
| California | Education | High School/Less | 36 |
|  |  | Some College/2 Yr | 29 |
|  |  | $4 \mathrm{Yr} /$ Post-Grad | 35 |


|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Texas | Education | High School/Less | 40 |
|  |  | Some College/2 Yr | 29 |
|  |  | 4 Yr/Post-Grad | 31 |

The population is divided into three categories based on the degree of attendance at religious services (other than weddings and funerals): more than once a week, once a week and once or twice a month (or frequent); a few times a year and seldom (infrequent); and never (never). The proportion of the survey population that frequently attends religious services ranges from a high of $33 \%$ in Texas to a low of $25 \%$ in Arizona, with California in between at $29 \%$. The proportion of the survey population that infrequently attends religious services ranges from a high of $34 \%$ in Texas to a low of $32 \%$ in Arizona, with California in between at $33 \%$. Finally, the proportion of the survey population that never attends religious services ranges from a high of $39 \%$ in Arizona to a low of $30 \%$ in Texas, with California in between at $36 \%$.

The proportion of state residents who identify as Republican ranges from highs of $40 \%$ in Texas and $38 \%$ in Arizona to a low of $28 \%$ in California. The proportion of state residents who identify as Democrat ranges from a high of $45 \%$ in California to lows of $33 \%$ in Arizona and $32 \%$ in Texas. The proportion of independents ranges narrowly across the three states from a low of 17 in California to a high of $21 \%$ in Arizona, with Texas in between at $19 \%$.

The population is divided into three educational attainment categories based on the highest level of educational attainment: high school or less, some college or a two-year degree, a four-year degree or a postgraduate degree. The proportion of the survey population whose highest level of educational attainment is a high school degree or less ranges from lows of $36 \%$ in California and $37 \%$ in Arizona to a high of $40 \%$ in Texas. The proportion of the survey population whose highest level of educational attainment is some college or a two-year degree ranges from a low of $29 \%$ in California and Texas to a high of $32 \%$ in Arizona. The proportion of the survey population whose highest level of educational attainment is a four-year degree or a postgraduate degree ranges from a low of $31 \%$ in Arizona and Texas to a high of $35 \%$ in California.
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