UC Berkeley

IGS Poll

Title

Release #2022-16: Both sports wagering initiatives trail, while Newsom maintains a comfortable lead in his November re-election bid.

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0456d0gt

Author

DiCamillo, Mark

Publication Date

2022-10-04

Institute of Governmental Studies
126 Moses Hall
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720
Tel: 510-642-6835
Email: igs@berkeley.edu

Release #2022-16   Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Both sports wagering initiatives trail, while Newsom maintains a comfortable lead in his November re-election bid.

by Mark DiCamillo, Director, *Berkeley IGS Poll*
 (c) 415-602-5594

The latest *Berkeley IGS Poll* of Californians considered likely to vote in the November general election finds the two sports wagering initiatives, Propositions 26 and 27, trailing by significant margins six weeks before the election. The poll finds Proposition 27, the initiative to allow online sports wagering, trailing two-to-one (53% No vs. 27% Yes). Voters are also lining up against Proposition 26, a sports wagering initiative to allow in-person sports wagering on tribal lands, but by a narrower margin -- 42% No to 31% Yes.

Incumbent Governor Gavin Newsom continues to maintain a sizable 53% to 32% lead over Republican challenger Brian Dahle in the November election for governor.

A 57% to 31% majority favors Proposition 31, a referendum to uphold the state ban on flavored tobacco products, while Proposition 30, to tax millionaires to fund air pollution reduction, infrastructure, and wildfires prevention programs, leads 49% to 37%.

Observed IGS co-director Eric Schickler, "These results suggest that the sports wagering initiatives are foundering in the face of the opposition advertising campaigns. The lack of support among key demographic groups makes passage of each an uphill climb, at best."

Table 1
Preferences about 4 state propositions on the November ballot (among likely voters)

	Yes %	No %	Undecided %
Proposition 26 (*allow in-person sports wagering on tribal lands*)	31	42	27
Proposition 27 (*allow online sports wagering*)	27	53	20
Proposition 30 (*tax millionaires to fund air pollution reduction, infrastructure, and wildfire prevention programs*)	49	37	14
Proposition 31	57	31	12

Opposition to both sports wagering initiatives is broad-based

The poll finds that opposition to the two sports wagering initiatives is broad-based across major subgroups of the likely voter population.

Virtually all voter subgroups are lining up on the No side on Prop. 27. This includes both Democrats and Republicans, conservatives and liberals, men and women, whites and voters of color, as well as voters living in each of the state's eight major regions. The only subgroup currently supporting the initiative is among younger voters, and especially those under age 30, who are voting Yes 44% to 33%.

Opposition to Prop. 26 is also broad-based although not to the same extent as Prop. 27. While Republicans and conservatives oppose Prop. 26 nearly two to one, Democrats and independents are voting No by narrower margins, and liberals are divided. No voters outnumber Yes voters across most of the state's regions and ethnic subgroups, although Asians and Inland Empire voters are about evenly divided.

There is a gender gap in views about Prop 26, with women opposed nearly two to one while men are divided. Age also plays a role, with voters under age 40 supporting the initiative, while those age 65 or older are opposed nearly three to one.

A voter's exposure to advertisements about the two initiatives also appears to be a factor, with voters who say they have seen lots of ads about Props. 26 and 27 voting No by wide margins, while those who have seen little or no ads are about evenly divided.

Table 2
Voter preferences about Propositions 26 and 27, the two sports wagering initiatives, among major subgroups of the likely voter population

	Proposition 26 *(in-person sports wagering on tribal lands)*			Proposition 27 *(online sports wagering)*		
	Yes %	No %	Undecided %	Yes %	No %	Undecided %
Total likely voters	**31**	**42**	**27**	**27**	**53**	**20**
Party registration						
Democrats	32	38	30	26	54	20
Republicans	28	50	22	25	58	17
No party preference/others	35	39	36	30	46	24
Political ideology						
Strongly conservative	26	54	20	24	59	17
Somewhat conservative	29	49	22	29	55	16
Moderate	31	42	27	28	51	21
Somewhat liberal	37	34	29	25	55	20
Strongly liberal	32	33	35	26	49	25
Region						
Los Angeles County	33	40	27	28	49	23
San Diego County	31	44	25	24	57	19
Orange County	31	41	28	28	56	16
Inland Empire	36	36	28	27	51	22
Central Coast	30	42	28	22	59	19
Central Valley	30	44	26	26	56	18
San Francisco Bay Area	28	45	27	26	53	21
North Coast/Sierras	35	38	27	31	46	22
Gender						
Male	40	39	21	35	49	16
Female	24	44	32	19	57	24
Age						
18-29	43	24	33	44	33	23
30-39	46	29	25	41	37	22
40-49	34	35	31	29	51	30
50-64	29	43	28	23	55	22
65 or older	21	56	23	15	68	17
Race/ethnicity						
White	30	44	26	23	57	20
Latino	32	38	30	33	44	23
Asian/Pacific Islander	35	37	28	31	47	22
Black	30	38	32	30	53	17
Interest in pro sports						
A lot	42	41	17	38	49	13
Some	29	43	28	27	54	19
Little/none	28	42	30	22	55	23
Exposure to campaign ads						
A lot	28	51	21	23	63	14
Some	29	38	33	23	53	24
None/no opinion	38	29	33	37	36	27

3

<u>Voters hold very different views of the proponents of the two sports betting initiatives</u>
Voter views of Indian tribes that operate casinos and other forms of legalized gambling in California are generally positive, with nearly three times as many voters saying they view them favorably (53%) as unfavorably (19%). By contrast, the reverse is true with regard to opinions of the companies that operate online sports betting websites, like DraftKings and FanDuel, with only 14% of voters offering a favorable opinion and 48% viewing them unfavorably.

There are only minor differences in how Democrats and Republicans view the main proponents of the two sports betting initiatives. Majorities of both Democrats and Republicans say they view the Indian casino operators favorably, while large pluralities of voters across both major parties hold an unfavorable opinion of the companies that operate online sports betting websites.

Table 3
Likely voter impressions of the major proponents of the two
sports betting initiatives

	Total likely voters %	Democrats %	Republicans %	No Party Preference %	Other Party %
Indian tribes that operate casinos and other forms of legalized gambling in CA					
Favorable	<u>**53**</u>	<u>**55**</u>	<u>**52**</u>	<u>**47**</u>	<u>**56**</u>
Strongly	17	16	19	14	20
Somewhat	36	39	33	33	36
Unfavorable	<u>**19**</u>	<u>**16**</u>	<u>**23**</u>	<u>**19**</u>	<u>**17**</u>
Somewhat	12	11	13	13	8
Strongly	7	5	10	6	9
No opinion	**28**	**29**	**25**	**34**	**27**
Companies, like Draft-Kings and FanDuel, that operate online sports betting websites					
Favorable	<u>**14**</u>	<u>**9**</u>	<u>**17**</u>	<u>**16**</u>	<u>**28**</u>
Strongly	5	2	7	6	6
Somewhat	9	7	10	10	22
Unfavorable	<u>**48**</u>	<u>**53**</u>	<u>**45**</u>	<u>**44**</u>	<u>**35**</u>
Somewhat	17	19	13	19	9
Strongly	31	34	32	25	26
No opinion	**38**	**38**	**38**	**40**	**37**

Berkeley IGS Poll #2022-16Tuesday, October 4, 2022

Newsom remains comfortably ahead of Dahle in his bid for re-election

Incumbent Governor Gavin Newsom remains comfortably ahead of his Republican challenger, State Senator Brian Dahle, in the November election for governor. The latest poll finds Newsom preferred by 53% of likely voters while 32% support Dahle. These results are similar to a *Berkeley IGS Poll* conducted in early August which found Newsom leading Dahle 55% to 31% among the state's likely voters.

Preferences in the gubernatorial election are highly partisan and ideologically based, with Democrats and liberal voters overwhelmingly backing Newsom, while Republicans and conservatives favor Dahle by wide margins. Voters identifying themselves as political moderates favor Newsom two to one.

Newsom also bests Dahle among the relatively large segment of voters who are registered as No Party Preference, but Dahle is competitive with Newsom among voters registered with a political party other than the Democratic or Republican parties.

On a regional basis Newsom holds large leads over Dahle in the state's two major metropolitan areas, Los Angeles County and the San Francisco Bay Area, as well as among voters in the Central Coast. Dahle holds a small lead over Newsom among voters in the San Joaquin Valley, while gubernatorial preferences are about evenly divided in Orange County, the Inland Empire and the Sacramento/North Valley region.

Newsom leads Dahle among both men and women, and among voters across all age groups and racial backgrounds and holds particularly large leads among the state's Black, Latino, Asian American voters.

Table 4
Voter preferences for Governor in the November 2022
general election (among likely voters)

	Newsom %	Dahle %	Other (write-in)	Undecided %
Total likely voters - late Sept.	**53**	**32**	**2**	**13**
August	55	31	3	11
<u>Party registration</u>				
Democrats	86	3	1	10
Republicans	4	84	2	10
No Party Preference	49	28	5	18
Other party	34	37	5	24
<u>Political ideology</u>				
Strongly conservative	11	80	2	7
Somewhat conservative	16	70	2	12
Moderate	51	25	3	21
Somewhat liberal	87	1	3	9
Strongly liberal	92	**	2	6
<u>Region</u>				
Los Angeles County	60	24	2	14
San Diego County	49	34	3	42
Orange County	41	43	3	13
Inland Empire	42	42	1	15
Central Coast	61	29	2	8
San Joaquin Valley	39	47	4	10
Sacramento/North Valley	42	45	4	9
San Francisco Bay Area	65	21	2	12
North Coast/Sierras*	45	39	4	12
<u>Gender</u>				
Male	50	35	3	12
Female	55	30	2	13
<u>Age</u>				
18-29	57	23	5	15
30-39	52	32	4	12
40-49	50	29	3	18
50-64	50	37	1	12
65 or older	56	34	1	9
<u>Race/ethnicity</u>				
White	49	39	3	9
Latino	60	21	2	17
Asian/Pacific Islander	58	24	1	17
Black	73	11	2	14

* Small sample base.
**Less than ½ of 1%

<u>Dahle is largely unknown to a majority of the state's likely voters</u>
A major factor working against Dahle's candidacy is that a majority of the state's likely voters (52%) are unfamiliar with him and cannot offer an opinion when asked their overall impressions of him. This increases to 62% among Democrats and 57% among the state's No Party Preference voters.

Assessments among those who can offer an evaluation of Dahle are generally positive, with 28% reporting having a favorable opinion of him while 20% view him unfavorably.

By contrast nearly all likely voters (95%) can offer an opinion of Newsom, with 52% viewing him favorably and 43% unfavorably.

Opinions of both candidates are highly partisan, with 83% of Democrats viewing Newsom favorably, while just 7% offer a positive assessment of Dahle. Conversely just 6% of Republican voters view Newsom favorably, while 66% hold a positive opinion of Dahle.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">**Table 5**
Likely voter impressions of the gubernatorial
candidates as of late September 2022</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>**Total likely voters**
%</td><td>**Democrats**
%</td><td>**Republicans**
%</td><td>**No Party Preference**
%</td><td>**Other Party**
%</td></tr>
<tr><td>**<u>Gavin Newsom</u>**</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>**Favorable**</td><td>**<u>52</u>**</td><td>**<u>83</u>**</td><td>**<u>6</u>**</td><td>**<u>49</u>**</td><td>**<u>36</u>**</td></tr>
<tr><td>Strongly</td><td>25</td><td>45</td><td>1</td><td>16</td><td>14</td></tr>
<tr><td>Somewhat</td><td>27</td><td>38</td><td>5</td><td>33</td><td>22</td></tr>
<tr><td>**Unfavorable**</td><td>**<u>43</u>**</td><td>**<u>13</u>**</td><td>**<u>90</u>**</td><td>**<u>44</u>**</td><td>**<u>54</u>**</td></tr>
<tr><td>Somewhat</td><td>9</td><td>9</td><td>6</td><td>13</td><td>10</td></tr>
<tr><td>Strongly</td><td>34</td><td>4</td><td>84</td><td>31</td><td>44</td></tr>
<tr><td>**No opinion**</td><td>**5**</td><td>**4**</td><td>**4**</td><td>**7**</td><td>**10**</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>**<u>Brian Dahle</u>**</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>**Favorable**</td><td>**<u>28</u>**</td><td>**<u>7</u>**</td><td>**<u>66</u>**</td><td>**<u>22</u>**</td><td>**<u>34</u>**</td></tr>
<tr><td>Strongly</td><td>11</td><td>2</td><td>30</td><td>7</td><td>14</td></tr>
<tr><td>Somewhat</td><td>17</td><td>5</td><td>36</td><td>15</td><td>20</td></tr>
<tr><td>**Unfavorable**</td><td>**<u>20</u>**</td><td>**<u>31</u>**</td><td>**<u>4</u>**</td><td>**<u>21</u>**</td><td>**<u>15</u>**</td></tr>
<tr><td>Somewhat</td><td>7</td><td>9</td><td>2</td><td>8</td><td>4</td></tr>
<tr><td>Strongly</td><td>13</td><td>22</td><td>2</td><td>13</td><td>11</td></tr>
<tr><td>**No opinion**</td><td>**52**</td><td>**62**</td><td>**30**</td><td>**57**</td><td>**51**</td></tr>
</table>

Proposition 30 leads but with less than majority support

Likely voters are currently lining up 49% Yes and 37% No in favor of Prop. 30 to tax millionaires to fund air pollution reduction, infrastructure, and wildfire prevention programs. Views about the initiative differ dramatically by party and political ideology, with Democrats and liberals overwhelmingly in favor and Republicans and conservatives generally opposed. Other subgroups that display strong support for the initiative are voters under age 40, women, voters living in low-income households, and voters of color.

Table 6
Likely voter preferences on Proposition 30, a tax increase on millionaires to fund air pollution reduction, infrastructure, and wildfire prevention programs

	Yes %	No %	Undecided %
Total likely voters	**49**	**37**	**14**
Party registration			
Democrats	69	18	13
Republicans	15	72	13
No party preference/other	49	34	17
Political ideology			
Strongly conservative	21	71	8
Somewhat conservative	22	64	14
Moderate	47	33	20
Somewhat liberal	70	17	13
Strongly liberal	79	9	12
Household income			
Less than $20,000	66	20	14
$20,000-$59,999	51	33	16
$60,000-$99,999	46	38	16
$100,000-$199,999	45	40	15
$200,000 or more	47	43	10
Age			
18-29	59	28	13
30-39	56	30	13
40-49	49	36	15
50-64	44	41	15
65 or older	45	40	15
Gender			
Male	46	42	12
Female	51	32	17
Race/ethnicity			
White	46	41	19
Latino	55	28	17
Asian/Pacific Islander	55	31	14
Black	58	24	18

Support for Prop. 31 includes voters in most major subgroups

Proposition 31, the referendum to uphold a 2020 state law that banned the retail sale of flavored tobacco products, is currently enjoying majority support, with 57% inclined to vote Yes and 31% No.

Support is broad-based, with most major subgroups lining up in favor of the initiative. Prop. 31 receives its strongest backing from Democrats, liberals, and Asian American voters, where support is greater than six in ten. Republicans and political conservatives are more divided but are not currently lining up against its passage.

Table 7
Likely voter preferences on Proposition 31, a referendum to uphold the state law banning the retail sale of certain flavored tobacco products

	Yes %	No %	Undecided %
Total likely voters	**57**	**31**	**12**
Party registration			
Democrats	65	23	13
Republicans	45	43	12
No party preference/other	56	34	10
Political ideology			
Strongly conservative	47	43	10
Somewhat conservative	45	46	9
Moderate	59	30	11
Somewhat liberal	66	21	13
Strongly liberal	66	19	15
Gender			
Male	55	36	9
Female	59	27	14
Race/ethnicity			
White	59	31	10
Latino	55	31	14
Asian/Pacific Islander	61	25	14
Black	49	37	14

About the Survey

The findings in this report are based on a *Berkeley IGS Poll* completed by the Institute of Governmental Studies (IGS) at the University of California, Berkeley. The poll was administered online in English and Spanish September 22-27, 2022, among 8,725 California registered voters, including 6,939 likely voters. Funding for the poll was provided in part by the *Los Angeles Times*.

The poll was administered by distributing email invitations to stratified random samples of the state's registered voters. The latest poll also included an oversampling of registered voters in Los Angeles County, administered using the same methods, to enable the poll to examine specific issues of interest to voters in Los Angeles and to the *Times*. After the completion of data collection, the results were weighted to realign the Los Angeles County oversample to its actual share of the statewide registered voter population.

Each email invited voters to participate in a non-partisan survey conducted by the University and provided a link to the IGS website where the survey was housed. Reminder emails were distributed to non-responding voters and an opt out link was provided for voters not wishing to receive further email invitations.

Samples of registered voters with email addresses were provided to IGS by Political Data, Inc., a leading supplier of registered voter lists in California and were derived from information contained on the voter registration rolls. Prior to the distribution of emails, the overall sample was stratified by age and gender to obtain a proper balance of survey respondents across major segments of the registered voter population.

To protect the anonymity of survey respondents, voters' email addresses and all other personally identifiable information derived from the original voter listing were purged from the data file and replaced with a unique and anonymous identification number during data processing. In addition, post-stratification weights were applied to align the registered voter sample to population characteristics of the state's registered voters.

The sampling error associated with the survey results are difficult to calculate precisely because of sample stratification and the post-stratification weighting. Nevertheless, it is likely that findings based on the overall sample of likely voters are subject to a sampling error of approximately +/-2.5 percentage points at the 95% confidence level.

<u>Question wording</u>
Below are the candidates for Governor in California's November statewide election. If the election were being held today for whom would you vote? (ORDERING ROTATED)
Gavin Newsom, Governor, Democrat / Brian Dahle, Senator/Farmer, Republican

Regardless of whom you intend to vote for in the election for Governor in November, is your opinion of (NAME AND TITLE), favorable or unfavorable, or don't you know enough about him to say? (ORDERING RANDOMIZED)

California's November election ballot will also include a number of statewide propositions. The following list some of them exactly as they will appear on the ballot. For each please indicate how you would vote if the election were held today.

PROPOSITION 26: ALLOWS IN-PERSON ROULETTE, DICE GAMES, SPORTS WAGERING ON TRIBAL LANDS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Also allows sports wagering at certain horse racing tracks; private lawsuits to enforce certain gambling laws. Directs revenues to General Fund, problem-gambling programs, and enforcement. **Fiscal Impact**: Increased state revenues, possibly reaching tens of millions of dollars annually. Some of these revenues would support increased state regulatory and enforcement costs that could reach the low tens of millions of dollars annually. If the election were held today how would you vote on Proposition 26?

PROPOSITION 27: ALLOWS ONLINE AND MOBILE SPORTS WAGERING OUTSIDE TRIBAL LANDS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND STATUTE. Allows Indian tribes and affiliated businesses to operate online/mobile sports wagering outside tribal lands. Directs revenues to regulatory costs, homelessness programs, nonparticipating tribes. **Fiscal Impact**: Increased state revenues, possibly in the hundreds of millions of dollars but not likely to exceed $500 million annually. Some revenues would support state regulatory costs, possibly reaching the mid-tens of millions of dollars annually. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 27?

PROPOSITION 30: PROVIDES FUNDING FOR PROGRAMS TO REDUCE AIR POLLUTION AND PREVENT WILDFIRES BY INCREASING TAX ON PERSONAL INCOME OVER $2 MILLION. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Allocates tax revenues to zero-emission vehicle purchase incentives, vehicle charging stations, and wildfire prevention. **Fiscal Impact**: Increased state tax revenue ranging from $3.5 billion to $5 billion annually, with the new funding used to support zero-emission vehicle programs and wildfire response and prevention activities. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 30?

PROPOSITION 31: REFERENDUM ON 2020 LAW THAT WOULD PROHIBIT THE RETAIL SALE OF CERTAIN FLAVORED TOBACCO PRODUCTS. A "Yes" vote approves, and a "No" vote rejects, a 2020 law prohibiting retail sale of certain flavored tobacco products. **Fiscal Impact**: Decreased state tobacco tax revenues ranging from tens of millions of dollars annually to around $100 million annually. If the election were held today, how would you vote on Proposition 31?

Generally speaking, do you have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of (Indian tribes that operate casinos and other forms of legalized gambling in California) / (companies such as DraftKings and FanDuel that operate online sports betting websites) or don't you know enough about them to say? (ORDERING OF EACH ITEM RANDOMIZED)

About the Institute of Governmental Studies

The Institute of Governmental Studies (IGS) is an interdisciplinary organized research unit that pursues a vigorous program of research, education, publication, and public service. A component of the University of California system's flagship Berkeley campus, IGS is the oldest organized research unit in the UC system and the oldest public policy research center in the state. IGS's co-directors are Professor Eric Schickler and Associate Professor G. Cristina Mora.

IGS conducts periodic surveys of public opinion in California on matters of politics and public policy through its *Berkeley IGS Poll*. The poll seeks to provide a broad measure of contemporary public opinion and generate data for subsequent scholarly analysis. The director of the *Berkeley IGS Poll* is Mark DiCamillo. For a complete listing of stories issued by the *Berkeley IGS Poll* go to https://www.igs.berkeley.edu/research/berkeley-igs-poll.