

JAN 21 1979

Suite C
643 South 2nd Avenue
Covina, CA 91723
(213) 967-0050

Michael D. Meyers
Company Inc.

TO: Jack Kelly

January 17, 1980

FR: Mike Meyers

RE: Summary of Findings to Date

SUPPORTERS AND OPPONENTS

The most noteworthy success of this study to date has been the identification of distinct voter blocs that can be categorized as either strong supporters or strong opponents of Proposition 5. It should be emphasized that strong supporters are those who voted Yes on Proposition 5 and strong opponents are those who voted No.

In a nutshell, the strong opponents of Proposition 5 were:

Blacks
Mexican-Americans
Blue Collar Democrats

Of these three groups, the Blacks were the most unified against the initiative. As a community, Mexican-Americans were strongly opposed to Proposition 5 although the level of opposition declined as demographic status (income, education, occupation) increased. In other words, middle class, middle income Mexican-Americans were not as strongly opposed to Proposition 5 as were the Mexican-Americans in the Barrio or other lower income neighborhoods.

Finally, the most important variable separating the blue collar Democrats who were strong opponents of the initiative and other neighborhoods not as strongly opposed to Prop 5 is income. The data indicates that the lower income blue collar precincts were more likely to vote against Prop 5 than were the middle income blue collar precincts.

TCAL0477121

The strong supporters identified in the study are:

Jews
College Students
Senior Citizens
Upper SES Voters

The most startling finding in Los Angeles County is that nearly half of the strong supporters of the initiative are located in the predominantly Jewish areas of West Los Angeles although West Los Angeles comprises only 11% of the County. The second and third groups, college students and senior citizens, were relatively easy to locate and the data is most conclusive.

The final bloc of identified strong supporters is the upper SES (socio-economic status) bloc. Income, education and occupational status of this group are all well above the respective county averages. The other interesting feature of this group is that it has historically supported environmental protection measures to a far greater degree than the electorate as a whole.

ISSUE ALLIGNMENT

The precinct vote totals for Proposition 5 were plotted against other recent statewide propositions in an attempt to measure the response to certain themes employed in the campaign against the initiative.

Frankly, the scattergram facet of the study poses far more questions than it answers. Listed below are some subjective observations regarding the saliency of several of the key campaign themes.

1. The No on 5 campaign was unsuccessful in persuading the strong supporters of Proposition 13 to vote against Proposition 5. In fact, the strongest precincts against Proposition 5 were also the strongest precincts against Proposition 13.
2. The No on 5 campaign was also unsuccessful in persuading Jews and other social liberals to vote against Proposition 5 on the civil liberties issue. Again, Jews and upper SES social liberals were among the strongest supporters of the initiative.
3. The No on 5 campaign was uniquely successful in persuading Blacks and Mexican-Americans to vote against the initiative. Qualitative data analysis, however, is unable to distinguish between the efficacy of the arrest and private office themes and the fact the political leadership of each community lined up against Proposition 5.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SURVEY RESEARCH

My first question relative to the proposed survey is whether or not you should consider a weighted-average study in order to further investigate the motivations of Blacks, Mexican-Americans, Jews and upper SES voters. If you conduct a standard Benchmark, the cell sizes of each of these groups, with the possible exception of the upper SES bloc, would be too small to generate statistically significant results.

If a weighted-average study is conducted, the following questions should be explored.

1. Do Jews and other social liberals consider Proposition

TO: Jack Kelly

Page 4

5-type proposals to be a violation of civil liberties?
If not, why not?

2. Do Blacks and Mexican-Americans oppose smoking regulations on principle or were they responding to the arrest and discrimination themes?
3. Are upper SES voters willing to increase their taxes to cover the cost of complying with smoking regulations on government property? If so, isn't this in conflict with their pattern of voting against any new government expenditures?

MDM:pw

TCAL0477124