



## 2005 SPECIAL ELECTION VOTER PROFILES

November 2005

### ➤ **Special election voters were mostly white, older, and college-educated.**

The November 8<sup>th</sup> special election included about 7.9 million voters—50 percent of California’s registered voters. The demographic profile of the special election voters was similar to the profile of voters who frequently participate in statewide elections, with the exception of under-representing younger voters under age 35. Voters were predominantly older, white, college-educated, affluent, and homeowners. Men and women voted in equal proportions. Thirty percent of the voters were either union members or lived in a household with a union member.

### ➤ **Political profile was similar to the California “blue state” electorate.**

The special election, which featured four propositions endorsed by the governor, attracted an electorate that was comparable to the political profile of frequent voters in state elections. Significantly more Democrats than Republicans participated in the election; 15 percent of the voters were “decline to state” or independents. Voters were roughly equally divided across the ideological spectrum. A majority of voters disapproved of the governor’s job performance, considered the special election a bad idea, and believed that the state is headed in the wrong direction. The political composition of the electorate contributed to the defeat of the governor’s four propositions.

### ➤ **Proposition 74 (teacher tenure).**

Proposition 74, which would have changed the time it takes for a public school teacher to be granted tenure, lost by a 10-point margin (55% no, 45% yes). The measure failed to receive majority support in any demographic group. The “no” vote was higher among women than men, among younger and less-affluent residents than older and more-affluent residents, among Latinos than whites, renters than homeowners, and union than non-union households. Democrats, independents, liberals, and moderates opposed Proposition 74, as did those who express disapproval of the governor’s job performance, his calling of the special election, and the direction of the state.

### ➤ **Proposition 75 (public union dues).**

Proposition 75, which would have required public employee unions to get permission from members before using dues for political purposes, lost by a 8-point margin (54% no, 46% yes). The vote on this measure was also strongly divided across partisan lines and political ideology and highly dependent on attitudes toward Governor Schwarzenegger. Union households opposed this measure, while non-union households were divided. Women, younger voters, less affluent voters, renters, and Latinos were among the voter groups most opposed to Proposition 75.

### ➤ **Proposition 76 (state spending limits).**

Voters rejected Proposition 76, which would have limited state spending, by a 24-point margin (62% no, 38% yes). The “no” vote for this ballot measure was also divided along ideological and party lines and was highly correlated with the governor’s job approval ratings. Opposition was especially high among women, younger voters, less-affluent voters, renters, Latinos, and union households.

### ➤ **Proposition 77 (redistricting).**

Proposition 77, which would have shifted the drawing of political districts to a panel of retired judges, was rejected by a 20-point margin (40% yes, 60% no). Once again, the strongest opposition was among Democrats, independents, liberals, moderates, and those who disapprove of the governor. Majorities in all demographic groups voted no on Proposition 77.

## 2005 Special Election Voter Profiles

		% of Special Election Voters	<u>Proposition</u>			
			74	75	76	77
<b>Percentage Voting "No" on a Proposition</b>			55%	54%	62%	60%
<b>Gender</b>	<b>Men</b>	49%	51	50	57	54
	<b>Women</b>	51	60	58	66	66
<b>Age</b>	<b>18-34 years old</b>	12	65	63	70	75
	<b>35-54 years old</b>	42	56	55	64	59
	<b>55 years or older</b>	46	53	51	57	57
<b>Education</b>	<b>High school only</b>	19	54	55	60	65
	<b>Some college</b>	28	52	51	57	57
	<b>College graduate</b>	53	58	55	65	59
<b>Household income</b>	<b>Under \$40,000</b>	28	61	61	67	69
	<b>\$40,000 to under \$80,000</b>	37	59	55	64	61
	<b>\$80,000 or higher</b>	35	52	51	60	55
<b>Race/ ethnicity</b>	<b>White</b>	71	50	49	57	54
	<b>Latino</b>	15	69	68	75	76
<b>Own/rent</b>	<b>Own</b>	78	51	50	58	55
	<b>Rent</b>	22	70	71	76	76
<b>Union household</b>	<b>Yes</b>	30	64	62	69	65
	<b>No</b>	70	51	50	58	57
<b>Party</b>	<b>Democrat</b>	43	82	83	87	84
	<b>Republican</b>	36	22	22	29	30
	<b>Independent</b>	15	53	52	63	59
<b>Ideology</b>	<b>Liberal</b>	32	84	84	90	84
	<b>Middle-of-the road</b>	31	60	59	67	63
	<b>Conservative</b>	37	29	28	33	36
<b>Governor's job approval</b>	<b>Approve</b>	39	13	13	16	21
	<b>Disapprove</b>	56	86	88	92	88
<b>Special election opinion</b>	<b>Good Idea</b>	36	19	18	23	27
	<b>Bad Idea</b>	60	79	80	86	80
<b>Direction of California</b>	<b>Right direction</b>	23	48	46	54	57
	<b>Wrong direction</b>	68	58	56	65	62

**Sources:** (1) PPIC Statewide Survey of 2,002 November election voters conducted from November 9<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> with a +/- 2% margin of error for the total sample. The sample sizes for African Americans, Asian Americans, multiracial subgroups, other political parties, and the undecided responses for governor's job approval, special election opinion, and direction of California are not large enough for separate statistical analysis; (2) California Secretary of State, November 2005, for "no" vote returns through December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2005.