

## Memo

To: League of Conservation Voters Education Fund (LCVEF)

Cc:

From: Jeff Hayes, Stratalys Research  
Anna Greenberg, Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research

Subject: SmarTargeting Labor Model for Midwest

Date: June 4, 2004

This document provides an overview of an LCVEF SmarTargeting model designed to target anti-NAFTA (i.e., pro-labor) voters.

### Project Overview

Beginning in December 2003, GQR/Stratalys began conducting large sample surveys of three geographic areas: Southwest (AZ/NM/NV), Northwest (OR/WA), and Midwest (WI/MN). The primary goal was to produce targeting information for the LCVEF to find potential environmental activists. Using SmarTargeting techniques, we employed enhanced voter files that included information such as voting frequency, census data, and consumer data to conduct a large sample survey gauging attitudes about the environment and various other attitudes. Using these data sets, we created a variety of targeting models. While the Primary model was designed to identify and locate environmental activists, a number of Secondary models were also estimated, including one to locate potential pro-labor activists in the Midwest. This labor model attempted to predict respondents' affect toward NAFTA ("dependent variable") with the help of over two-dozen independent variables from the enhanced voter files. The modeling results were then applied back to the enhanced voter files, allowing us to assign a performance score to every voter in Wisconsin and Minnesota indicating how likely that voter is to be anti-NAFTA. Using this approach, we can identify potential labor activists specifically by name and address. LCVEF and affiliated groups now have access to lists of potential activists around which they can design a range of different issue and advocacy campaigns.

### Labor Model Design

Because of the short survey instrument used for SmarTargeting projects, we are limited in our choice of measures of pro-labor attitudes. The most direct measure evaluated opposition to free trade agreements such as NAFTA. The wording of that question is as follows: "Now I am going to read several statements, and for each one, I'd like you to rate how well it describes you on a one-to-seven scale, on which a seven means that the statement describes you perfectly, and a one means the

statement does not describe you at all. You may use any number from one to seven depending on how much you think that statement describes you ... I oppose free trade agreements like NAFTA because they hurt the economy and send American jobs overseas.” Ideally, we would create a composite measure of pro-labor disposition, but to keep the project cost effective, reliance on this one question in our targeting model is our best option.

A multi-stage modeling process resulted in over two-dozen variables demonstrating power in predicting anti-NAFTA attitudes. These variables included consumer database and voter file demographic flags. The following is an unordered list of those predictive factors: county, state, percent of workforce in blockgroup employed in white collar occupations, median age of population in blockgroup, gender, likelihood of female age 18-44 in household, truck ownership, likelihood of call waiting on phone service, number of domestic long distance calls in the last 30 days, percent of blockgroup who are military veterans, ratio of number of children age 0-5 years to the total household count, marriage status, likelihood of three-way calling on phone service, single/multi family dwelling, occupancy count in household, number of vehicles purchased in model year, percent of population age 25+ with a college degree, percent of households with unmarried partners of the same sex, percent of population age 25+ with a graduate or professional degree, percent of population age 25 to 34, percent of workforce employed in service sector occupations and percent of workforce employed in blue collar occupations.

## Project Results

The goal of the project was to enhance our ability to find pro-labor activists. We define activists as respondents who placed themselves in the top 2 box categories (i.e., a 6 or 7 on the above scale). According to this definition, 31% of respondents in the combined sample can be categorized as anti-NAFTA. Free trade policies are less popular in Wisconsin than Minnesota. Thirty-five percent of Wisconsin registered voters are anti-NAFTA as compared to 25% of Minnesotans. The SmarTargeting model provides solid efficiencies over and above an uninformed voter file pull. In the top decile of the labor activist scale, we were able to find 54 percent of the electorate who are activists. We also display results for each state. Note the model efficiencies gained in Minnesota are greater than for Wisconsin largely because of the higher baseline opposition to NAFTA in Wisconsin.

In order to demonstrate the relative utility of the SmarTargeting approach in this case, it will be useful to validate the results against an informed voter file pull.

TOTAL MIDWEST			
Segment	Total Registered	% Labor Activists	# Labor Activists
1	689,464	54%	371,650
2	689,464	39%	266,000
3	689,464	40%	276,166
4	689,464	33%	229,517
5	689,464	32%	219,301
6	689,464	29%	201,896
7	689,464	26%	177,308
8	689,464	23%	156,193
9	689,464	22%	150,765
10	689,464	17%	117,003
<i>MIDWEST</i>	6,894,645	31%	2,165,594

MINNESOTA			
Segment	Total Registered	% Labor Activists	# Labor Activists
1	274,460	44%	120,557
2	274,460	39%	106,075
3	274,460	42%	115,812
4	274,460	24%	65,264
5	274,460	29%	79,219
6	274,460	29%	80,592
7	274,460	24%	66,691
8	274,460	22%	59,925
9	274,460	22%	61,252
10	274,460	18%	48,638
<i>MINNESOTA</i>	2,744,600	25%	695,919

WISCONSIN			
Segment	Total Registered	% Labor Activists	# Labor Activists
1	415,005	54%	224,377
2	415,005	39%	160,092
3	415,005	39%	163,337
4	415,005	41%	168,397
5	415,005	35%	144,326
6	415,005	29%	121,125
7	415,005	27%	112,869
8	415,005	24%	97,998
9	415,005	21%	88,427
10	415,005	16%	66,081
<i>WISCONSIN</i>	4,150,045	35%	1,470,645