


Cursory Analysis of Voting Trends: November 2003 Mayoral Election: Prop M, H, and L and their associated candidates


This is just a look at some correlations and trends in the San Francisco electorate, gleaned from the results of the 2003 November 4 general election. Data are taken from the preliminary Statement of Vote from the San Francisco Department of Elections, and are at the precinct level unless otherwise noted. Furthermore, the precinct vote totals are the combined absentee and voter totals.¹

First, here is a district map so you can see where the divisions are. The gray lines are precincts.



The most interesting thing to me is to see how Mayoral candidates line up with certain issues, or, how the voters associate the two together. The currently most contentious issue in San Francisco politics is homelessness/panhandling. This issue, for better or worse, is partly associated with Newsom's Care not Cash and the recent Anti-Panhandling Initiative. The first chart is extremely telling: how precincts that supported Prop M (anti-panhandling) supported Newsom. It is broken into districts as well, so you can see which parts of the city voted where.


¹ For these charts, n=571. This is because a few of the precincts reported by DOE are doubled up. For purposes of mapping, they were split into equal values, and those splits are represented here. For example, DOE reports Precinct 2215/2216. These are split into 2215 and 2216, with the same values. This splitting does not affect the overall results. Also, percentages are in terms of ballots cast, so this includes abstentions from any one candidate or issue.




The correlation (R^2) for the whole data set is 0.82. Thus, there is a very clear relationship between Newsom voters and their views on panhandling. Because the precincts changed from last year, it is difficult to easily compile a chart with Care Not Cash, but I suspect we'd see similar results. Not surprisingly, D2 is at the high end of the plotted results on Yes on M and Newsom, while D5 and D9 are at the low end.

By the way, I've made the Yes on M the independent variable, but with this kind of correlation it's tough to say. I tend to think that people have stronger natural opinions about homeless and panhandling (and other issues), then look for the matching candidate. On the other hand, a candidate can put an item on the agenda that resonates with the public. Still, I think voter's views on issues are more entrenched than their opinion of a candidate. For consistency, I am putting the Props as the x-axis. I also move the scales around to make the charted results clearer.

Apparently, Prop M was actually more a Newsom issue than a conservative/liberal issue, because when we look at the Ribera (Republican) vs. Yes on M the correlation isn't nearly as clear. The following isn't broken by district, just all precincts put together.



There is a positive trend, but it isn't strong². Examining the contrapositive, how the more liberal candidates correlated with No on M, we see a clear correlation, but not nearly as strong as Newsom and Yes on M.




Voters of No on M correlated most strongly with Ammiano precincts. Somewhat surprisingly, the correlation wasn't as strong with Gonzalez. Considering the varied political base that Alioto enjoyed, the low correlation of her voters with No on M is not as unexpected. However, the correlation between Alioto and No on M was still weakly


² One outlier (18% Ribera) omitted.

positive. Below is the R^2 table of No on M and other candidates. For the record, Leal (not featured) and No on M had an R^2 of 0.0078 (Yes on M was even lower). Newsom is also shown for comparison; it is interesting to note the negative correlation with No on M and his voters is stronger than the positive correlations of Yes on M and the other candidates.

Correlation of No on M precincts with various candidates	
Candidate	R^2
Gonzalez	0.15
Alioto	0.006
Ammiano	0.54
Leal	0.0078
Newsom	-0.73


Another divisive issue in San Francisco is Police Reform. Voters had strong opinions about Prop H, on both sides of the issue. Although it is conventional wisdom that voters for and against Prop H had their representative candidates, below we see numerical evidence of it. Precincts that voted for Prop H somewhat strongly supported Gonzalez ($R^2 = 0.13$) and Ammiano ($R^2 = 0.59$), while those opposed to Prop H were strongly correlated with Newsom. These are similar figures as we saw in No on M.






To contrast with precincts that voted Yes on H, we look at No on H and Newsom. Again, the correlation is quite high ($R^2 = 0.85$), indicating that for many voters, Newsom is certainly associated with an issue that voters feel strongly about. I feel this is somewhat more likely than Newsom supporting issues that his supporters will vote for, lockstep, although it is possible this is the case. In any event, one can again see the close correlation between Newsom and certain issues. The District breakdown is similar to Prop M, though here D6 figures more negatively towards Newsom and Prop H.

Prop L (minimum wage increase) was another highly publicized issue this past election. Traditionally, this is considered a progressive issue, although it did gain wide support from other portions of the electorate. The next chart correlates precincts voting Yes on L and four of the candidates. R^2 values are listed below the chart.



Correlation of Yes on L precincts with various candidates					
	R^2		R^2		R^2
Gonzalez	0.07	Ammiano	0.41	Leal (not pictured)	(inverse) 0.02
Alioto	0.24	Newsom	(inverse) 0.74		

The positive correlations with Gonzalez, Ammiano, and Alioto are clear, while even more evident is the negative correlation with Newsom. Interestingly, the correlation with No on L and Newsom is slightly positive, but not nearly as strong ($R^2 = 0.04$).






I interpret this to mean that for voting precincts that supported Prop L, they decided they were *not* going to vote for Newsom. Meanwhile, for the precincts that did not support the minimum wage increase, they were more likely going to vote Newsom, but not necessarily. Newsom did support Prop L, but it was not a cornerstone of his campaign. It was a cornerstone of Gonzalez's.




Looking at the charts above, it is possible to conclude that Newsom is strongly associated with certain issues; anti-panhandling, for example. Newsom is perhaps more strongly associated with certain issues than the more liberal candidates are with theirs. It is interesting to note that Ammiano's precincts correlated more strongly with Yes on H, No on M, and Yes on L than did Gonzalez's, who is considered more liberal than Ammiano. Newsom and Ammiano clearly defined what they stood for in the election vis-à-vis the various ballot initiatives. Gonzalez and Alioto appealed to a slightly more diverse base of voters, or perhaps voters who instead of putting the issues first, put the candidate first.

Finally, it is easy to surmise that Newsom's base is 'more conservative' ideologically than Gonzalez's or Ammiano's. The latter are usually considered the liberals or progressives in the race, while Newsom is moderate to conservative, at least by San Francisco standards. In order to see how consistently people (precincts) vote, below are 6 correlations: Yes on L vs. Yes on H (liberal); Yes on H vs. No on M (liberal); Yes on L vs. No on M (liberal); No on M vs. No on H (moderate or conservative); No on H vs. No on L (moderate or conservative); and No on L vs. Yes on M (moderate or conservative). In this case, the independent variable doesn't matter.

'Progressive/Liberal'



‘Moderate/Conservative’



As one may expect, the progressive/liberal voting patterns correlated quite well. People voted similarly on ‘progressive’ issues. One of the ‘moderate’ correlations was strong (Yes on M vs. No on H), but the other two were not as strong. I think this is because of the relatively wide support Prop L received, where it appealed to liberals and some moderates. It is noteworthy that ‘Yes on L’ correlated more strongly that ‘No on L’. One can conclude, to a certain extent, some moderates do not vote the same on all issues. It needs to be pointed out, however, these are just a few issues. In order to make this case more definitively, one must examine many issue correlations, for this election and over time. However, when it comes to candidates, especially moderate ones, there is a much more consistent correlation with the candidates and the issues. As with most things, more research is required.