

# UC Berkeley

## IGS Poll

### Title

Two-to-one voter support for Marijuana Legalization (Prop. 64) and Gun Control (Prop. 63) initiatives.

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/51c1h00j>

### Author

DiCamillo, Mark

### Publication Date

2016-09-23

# THE FIELD POLL

**Field Research Corporation**  
601 California Street, Suite 900,  
San Francisco, CA 94108-2814  
415.392.5763 • FAX: 415.434.2541  
[field.com/fieldpollonline](http://field.com/fieldpollonline)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE  
• LOS ANGELES • MERCED •  
RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO •



SAN FRANCISCO  
• SANTA BARBARA  
• SANTA CRUZ

UCB Contact

Dr. Jack Citrin: 510-642-4692 (office)  
510-847-8306 (cell)

Release #2548

**TWO-TO-ONE VOTER SUPPORT FOR  
MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION (PROP. 64)  
AND GUN CONTROL (PROP. 63)  
INITIATIVES.**

Release Date: **Friday, September 23, 2016**

IMPORTANT: Contract for this service is subject to revocation if publication or broadcast takes place before release date or if contents are divulged to persons outside of subscriber staff prior to release time. (ISSN 0195-4520)

By Mark DiCamillo, Director, *The Field Poll*

California voters are lining up in favor of two closely watched statewide ballot propositions that would legalize the recreational use of marijuana (Proposition 64) and place further restrictions on the possession of guns (Proposition 63).

The latest *Field/IGS Poll* finds both ballot measures leading by similar two-to-one margins. Six in ten of the likely voters polled (60%) say they intend to vote Yes on Prop. 64 to legalize marijuana for adult use and tax its sale and cultivation. This compares to 31% who are on the No side. Just 9% are undecided.

By a similar 60% Yes to 30% No margin, voters are also backing Prop. 63, which among other things would require background checks for those who buy ammunition, prohibit possession of large-capacity ammunition magazines and establish procedures for taking guns away from convicted felons.

Support for both initiatives is broad-based and there is considerable overlap in the voting constituencies favoring each initiative. The voter segments most likely to be voting Yes on each measure include Democrats, liberals, and voters living in coastal counties.

### **Two-to-one support for Prop. 64 to legalize marijuana**

Likely voters in this survey were presented with the official ballot summary that they will see when voting on Prop. 64 in the November general election, and asked how they would vote if the election were held today. The results show voters favoring the marijuana legalization initiative two to one (60% to 31%). Just 9% are undecided.

**Table 1**  
**Likely voter preferences regarding Proposition 64: Marijuana Legalization after being presented with its official ballot label**

**PROPOSITION 64: MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION. INITIATIVE STATUTE.** Legalizes marijuana under state law, for use by adults 21 or older. Imposes state taxes on sales and cultivation. Provides for industry licensing and establishes standards for marijuana products. Allows local regulation and taxation. Fiscal Impact: Additional tax revenues from high hundreds of millions of dollars to over \$1 billion annually, mostly dedicated to specific purposes. Reduced criminal justice costs of tens of millions of dollars annually.

	<u>September 2016</u>
<u>Voter intentions on Prop. 64</u>	
Yes	60%
No	31
Undecided	9

### **History of marijuana ballot initiatives in California and changes in public opinion**

In 1996 California became the first state in the nation to legalize marijuana for medicinal purposes when it approved Proposition 215 by an eleven point margin, 55.6% to 44.4%. However, two previous attempts to legalize the sale of marijuana for recreational use through the initiative process have failed at the polls, the first more than forty years ago in 1972, and more recently in 2010. The 1972 initiative was soundly rejected 66.5% to 33.5%. But, the vote in 2010 was much closer, with the No side prevailing by just seven points, 53.5% to 46.5%. Since then, four states, including Colorado, Oregon, Alaska and Washington, along with the District of Columbia, have passed laws legalizing the recreational use of marijuana by adults.

*The Field Poll* has been tracking Californians' views about marijuana laws for nearly fifty years. The first poll, conducted in 1969, found just 13% of residents in favor of its legalization, while 84% were opposed. By 1983 support for legalization had grown to 30%, but 67% remained opposed. However, by 2010 half of the state's registered voters (50%) favored its legalization, and a subsequent *Field Poll* conducted in 2013 found support had grown further to 55%.

Thus, the current *Field/IGS Poll* showing 60% of likely voters in support of Prop. 64 represents the largest proportion of California voters expressing support for the legalization of the drug in the history of the poll.

<b>Table 2</b>				
<b>Trend of California public opinion about marijuana laws, as measured by <i>The Field Poll</i> (among registered voters)</b>				
	<b>2013</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>1983</b>	<b>1969*</b>
<b>Which best fits your views about marijuana laws...</b>				
Legalize it so it can be purchased by anyone	8%	4%	2%	3%
Legalize it with age and other controls, like those for alcohol	47	46	28	10
Keep present ban, but make penalties less severe	12	13	11	9
Strictly enforce current laws	17	19	24	26
Pass tougher laws	14	14	32	49
No opinion	2	4	3	3

\* 1969 survey conducted among all California adults.

### **Broad-based support for Prop. 64 (marijuana legalization) among subgroups of the likely voter population**

---

Current support for Prop. 64, the marijuana legalization initiative, is broad-based and now includes majorities across nearly all major subgroups of the likely voter population. The only major voter segments currently opposed to the initiative are Republicans and conservatives.

**Table 3**  
**Voter preferences regarding Proposition 64 (Marijuana Legalization)**  
**across subgroups of the likely voter population**

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
<b>Total likely voters</b>	60%	31	9
<b><u>Party registration</u></b>			
Democrat	70%	21	9
Republican	40%	53	7
No party preference/other	65%	25	10
<b><u>Political ideology</u></b>			
Conservative	36%	58	6
Moderate	59%	30	11
Liberal	78%	14	8
<b><u>Area</u></b>			
Coastal counties	65%	28	7
Inland counties	51%	39	10
<b><u>Region</u></b>			
Los Angeles County	71%	23	6
South Coast	57%	36	7
Other Southern CA	52%	37	11
Central Valley	50%	43	7
San Francisco Bay Area	61%	29	10
Other Northern CA*	64%	22	14
<b><u>Gender</u></b>			
Male	60%	35	5
Female	60%	28	12
<b><u>Age</u></b>			
18-29	60%	33	7
30-39	66%	27	7
40-49	69%	24	7
50-64	62%	32	6
65 or older	52%	37	11
<b><u>Race/ethnicity</u></b>			
White non-Hispanic	62%	29	9
Latino	57%	37	6
African American*	67%	26	7
Asian American/other*	52%	39	9
<b><u>Education</u></b>			
High school graduate or less	48%	44	8
Some college/trade school	57%	33	10
College graduate	66%	29	5
Post-graduate work	67%	22	11
<b><u>Marital status</u></b>			
Married/domestic partner	56%	36	8
Single/never married	71%	19	10
Widowed/separated/divorced	57%	36	7
<b><u>Parent of child under 18</u></b>			
Yes	58%	35	7
No	61%	30	9

\* Small sample base.

## **Voters also support Prop. 63, the gun control initiative, two to one**

---

California voters are also endorsing Prop 63, the initiative to place further restrictions on the possession of guns, by a two-to-one margin. When likely voters in this survey were presented with the official ballot summary that they will see when voting on Prop. 64 in the November general election and asked how they would vote if the election were held today, 60% line up on the Yes side, while 30% are intending to vote No.

If passed, the measure would impose additional gun control restrictions to those already approved by the legislature and governor earlier this year. Among other things the initiative calls for requiring background checks for those who buy ammunition, prohibiting the possession of large-capacity ammunition magazines and establishing new procedures for taking guns away from convicted felons and other not authorized to use them.

<b>Table 4</b>	
<b>Likely voter preferences regarding Proposition 63: Firearms. Ammunition Sales after being presented with its official ballot label</b>	
<b>PROPOSITION 63: FIREARMS. AMMUNITION SALES. INITIATIVE STATUTE.</b> Requires background check and Department of Justice authorization to purchase ammunition. Prohibits possession of large-capacity ammunition magazines. Establishes procedures for enforcing laws prohibiting firearm possession by specified persons. Requires Department of Justice's participation in federal National Instant Criminal Background Check System. Fiscal Impact: Increased state and local court and law enforcement costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars annually, related to a new court process for removing firearms from prohibited persons after they are convicted.	
	<b>September 2016</b>
<b><u>Voter intentions on Prop. 63</u></b>	
Yes	60%
No	30
Undecided	10

## **Voter segments supporting Prop. 63 mirror those of Prop. 64**

---

The *Field/IGS Poll* finds that the voter segments lining up in support of the Prop. 63 gun control initiative are generally the same as those supporting the Prop. 64 marijuana legalization initiative.

Support for both initiatives is broad-based and the subgroups most likely to voting Yes include Democrats, liberals, and voters living in the state's coastal counties.

<b>Table 5</b>			
<b>Voter preferences regarding Proposition 63 (Firearms. Ammunition Sales) across subgroups of the likely voter population</b>			
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Undecided</u>
<b>Total likely voters</b>	60%	30	10
<b><u>Party registration</u></b>			
Democrat	83%	7	10
Republican	28%	63	9
No party preference/other	57%	35	8
<b><u>Political ideology</u></b>			
Conservative	21%	71	8
Moderate	62%	27	11
Liberal	82%	8	10
<b><u>Area</u></b>			
Coastal counties	64%	26	10
Inland counties	51%	39	10
<b><u>Gender</u></b>			
Male	50%	41	9
Female	70%	20	10

### Information About the Survey

#### Methodological Details

The findings in this report come from a survey of California voters conducted jointly by *The Field Poll* and the Institute of Governmental Studies at the University of California, Berkeley. The survey was completed online by YouGov September 7-13, 2016 in English and Spanish. Voter preferences on Proposition 64 are based on 942 registered voters considered likely to vote in the November 2016 general election. In order to cover a broad range of issues and still minimize possible respondent fatigue, voter preferences on Proposition 63 are based on a random subsample of 483 likely voters statewide.

YouGov administered the survey among a sample of the California registered voters who were included as part of its online panel of over 1.5 million U.S. residents. Eligible panel members were asked to participate in the poll through an invitation email containing a link to the survey. YouGov selected voters using a proprietary sampling technology frame that establishes interlocking targets, so that the characteristics of the voters selected approximate the demographic and regional profile of the overall California registered voter population. To help ensure diversity among poll respondents, YouGov recruits its panelists using a variety of methods, including web-based advertising and email campaigns, partner-sponsored solicitations, and telephone-to-web recruitment or mail-to-web recruitment. Difficult-to-reach populations are supplemented through more specialized recruitment efforts, including telephone and mail surveys.

*The Field Poll* and the Institute of Governmental Studies were jointly responsible for developing all questions included in the survey. After survey administration, YouGov forwarded its data file to *The Field Poll* for processing. *The Field Poll* then took the lead in developing and applying post-stratification weights to more precisely align the sample to *Field Poll* estimates of the demographic characteristics of the California registered voter population both overall and by region. The *Field Poll* was also responsible for determining which voters in the survey were considered most likely to vote in this year's election.

*The Field Poll* was established in 1947 as *The California Poll* by Mervin Field. The Poll has operated continuously since then as an independent, non-partisan survey of California public opinion. *The Field Poll* receives financial support from leading California newspapers and television stations, which purchase the rights of first release to *Field Poll* reports in their primary viewer or readership markets. The Poll also receives funding from the University of California and California State University systems, who receive the data files from each *Field Poll* survey shortly after its completion for teaching and secondary research purposes, as well as from foundations, non-profit organizations, and others as part of the Poll's policy research sponsor program.

### **Question Asked**

---

Proposition 64: MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Legalizes marijuana under state law, for use by adults 21 or older. Imposes state taxes on sales and cultivation. Provides for industry licensing and establishes standards for marijuana products. Allows local regulation and taxation. Fiscal Impact: Additional tax revenues from high hundreds of millions of dollars to over \$1 billion annually, mostly dedicated to specific purposes. Reduced criminal justice costs of tens of millions of dollars annually. If the election were being held today, how would you vote on Proposition 64? YES; NO; UNDECIDED

Proposition 63: FIREARMS. AMMUNITION SALES. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Requires background check and Department of Justice authorization to purchase ammunition. Prohibits possession of large-capacity ammunition magazines. Establishes procedures for enforcing laws prohibiting firearm possession by specified persons. Requires Department of Justice's participation in federal National Instant Criminal Background Check System. Fiscal Impact: Increased state and local court and law enforcement costs, potentially in the tens of millions of dollars annually, related to a new court process for removing firearms from prohibited persons after they are convicted. If the election were being held today, how would you vote on Proposition 63? YES; NO; UNDECIDED (ASKED OF A RANDOM SUBSAMPLE OF LIKELY VOTERS)

### **Note about Sampling Error Estimates**

---

Polls conducted online using an opt-in panel do not easily lend themselves to the calculation of sampling error estimates as are traditionally reported for random sample telephone surveys.