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## Executive Summary

Representational Bias in the 2008 Electorate reviews the story of who was eligible to vote, who was registered to vote, and who did vote in the 2008 general election. By comparing this data with those from other recent elections, the report presents a picture of the changing electorate in the United States, and identifies the changes in the extent to which participation in our federal elections is-and is not-representative of the population that is eligible to vote in America. These findings are based on the authors' analysis of the November Voting and Registration Supplements of the U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey, a biennial nationwide survey of approximately 90,000 adult citizens.

In 2008, the adult citizen population-U.S. citizens 18 years of age and older-numbered approximately 206 million. Sixty-four percent of this population voted in the general election of 2008. This overall participation rate is not substantially different compared to 2004, but was 4 percentage points higher than in 2000 . However, even without an increase in rate, continued rapid growth in the U.S. population caused the number of citizens that voted in 2008 to be noticeably larger than in 2004: there were 131 million voters in 2008 compared to 126 million voters in 2004.

## Gains by Underrepresented Groups in the 2008 Election

Continuing historic trends, the registered and voting populations were disproportionately composed of older, wealthier, and White Americans. (See Table I, on page v.) However, the population that voted in 2008-while still unrepresentative of the American population in many ways-was more diverse than in previous years. This is attributable to the increasing diversity of the population eligible to vote, a significant increase in turnout among minority voters in 2008, and a slight decline in turnout among White non-Latino voters.

This report finds that the 2008 election saw some significant gains in participation among historically underrepresented groups:

- Increasing diversity in the adult citizen population contributed to diversification in the makeup of those registered and voting in presidential elections. While non-Whites (which in this report includes Latinos of any race) constituted only slightly more than one-quarter of the adult citizen population in 2008, non-Whites accounted for nearly two-thirds of the growth of the adult citizen population since the previous presidential election.
iii
- Moreover, the number of additional non-Whites registered to vote since 2004 equaled the entire increase in the registered population since 2004.
- A surge in voting among non-Whites in 2008 made up approximately 91 percent of the increase in the total number of voters since 2004.
- The increase in non-White voting was disproportionately driven by an increase in minority voters under the age of 30 . In fact, because of this increase in participation by young minority voters, 2008 was the only election in recent memory where the voting rate by youth increased while the rate for those 30 and over did not.
- Reported voter registration rates among Black women under 30, the highest rate among citizens under 30 of any race or gender, grew negligibly since 2004, but registration rates increased remarkably among young Black men (8 percentage points), young Latinos of both genders (6 percentage points), and Asians ( 5 percentage points for young men and I3 points for young women).'
- Among these younger populations, Black women voted at the highest rate ( 64 percent), followed by White women ( 56 percent) and Black men ( 52 percent). All minority groups under 30 saw increases in their turnout rates compared to 2004.


## Continuing Disparities in the Registered and Voting Populations

Some 75 million Americans- 36 percent of the adult citizen population-did not cast a ballot in the 2008 election. Overall, 90 percent of those who were registered voted in 2008.Thus, of the 75 million non-voters, I 5 million were registered voters who did not vote. The remaining 60 million non-voters were not registered to vote in 2008.

While some representational gains were evident in the population that was registered and voted in 2008, this report finds that some notable inequalities still remain. The unregistered and non-voting populations remain disproportionately composed of low-income and minority Americans. (See Table I and Figure I.) Because of the high rate of voting in presidential elections among those registered, the nationwide composition of those who are unregistered and those who are not voting are often similar, as can be seen in Table I.

Had citizens from underrepresented populations voted at the rate of those in other groups, tens of millions of more citizens would have participated in the 2008 election. (See Table 2). Some notable observations from these tables and the report:

- Overall, non-Whites made up 27 percent of the adult citizen population, but only 24 percent of the voters. Put another way, non-Whites made up a disproportionate 33 percent of the unregistered population.

Table I: Composition of Adult Citizen Population,Voters, Unregistered, and Non-Voters, 2008

| Demographic Category | Adult Citizens | Voters | Unregistered | Non-Voters* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Race |  |  |  |  |
| White | 73\% | 76\% | 67\% | 68\% |
| Black | 12\% | 12\% | 12\% | II\% |
| Asian /Pacific Islander | 4\% | 3\% | 6\% | 5\% |
| Latino | 9\% | 7\% | 13\% | 13\% |
| Native American | 1\% | <1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Multi-racial | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Age Group |  |  |  |  |
| Under 30 | 21\% | 17\% | 29\% | 29\% |
| 30 and Over | 79\% | 83\% | 71\% | 71\% |
| Annual Household Income |  |  |  |  |
| Less than \$25,000 | 20\% | 16\% | 29\% | 29\% |
| More then \$100,000 | 20\% | 24\% | 13\% | 13\% |
| Education |  |  |  |  |
| High School Degree or Less | 43\% | 34\% | 58\% | 58\% |
| Some College or More | 57\% | 66\% | 42\% | 42\% |
| Marital Status |  |  |  |  |
| Married | 55\% | 60\% | 46\% | 46\% |
| Unmarried | 45\% | 40\% | 54\% | 54\% |
| Disability ** |  |  |  |  |
| Disability Reported | 12\% | 11\% | 14\% | 15\% |
| No Disability Reported | 88\% | 89\% | 86\% | 85\% |
| Time At Present Residence |  |  |  |  |
| Less than 5 Years | 49\% | 37\% | 54\% | 52\% |
| 5 Years or More | 51\% | 63\% | 46\% | 48\% |

[^0]
## Executive Summary

- Altogether, nearly 24 million non-Whites did not vote in 2008 . Had minorities voted at the same rate as Whites, approximately 5 million more votes would have been cast.
- Citizens under the age of 30 made up 21 percent of the adult citizen population, but only 17 percent of the voters. They made up 29 percent of the unregistered population.
- Approximately 21 million citizens under the age of 30 did not vote in 2008. Had younger citizens voted at the same rate as those aged 30 and over, 7 million more votes would have been cast.

Figure I: Demographic Groups as Percent of Adult Citizen Population and as Percent of Unregistered Population, 2008


- Citizens from households with annual incomes below $\$ 25,000$ make up 20 percent of the adult citizen population reporting income, but only 16 percent of the voters reporting income. This income group constitutes 29 percent of those unregistered reporting income in 2008. Approximately 15 million adults in this reported income bracket did not vote in 2008.
- Meanwhile, citizens with annual household incomes of $\$ 100,000$ or more, who also made up approximately 20 percent of the adult citizen population, were 24 percent of the voting population reporting income. Yet, they made up only 13 percent of the unregistered population.
- Had citizens from the lower quintile of the household income measure voted at the rate of those from the top quintile, roughly 8.4 million additional low-income citizens would have voted.

Table 2: Additional Voters Had Parity in Turnout Been Achieved, 2008

| Comparison Groups | Voted as \% of Adult Citizens | Additional Voters with Turnout Parity* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Race |  |  |
| White | 66\% |  |
| Non-White | 57\% | 5,034 |
| Annual Household Income |  |  |
| \$100,000 or More | 79\% |  |
| \$25,000 or Less | 54\% | 8,357 |
| Education |  |  |
| Some College or More | 73\% |  |
| High School or Less | 51\% | 19,856 |
| Age Group |  |  |
| 30 and Over | 67\% |  |
| Under 30 | 51\% | 7,008 |
| Marital Status of Women |  |  |
| Married | 71\% |  |
| Unmarried | 60\% | 5,665 |
| Disability |  |  |
| No Disability Reported | 65\% |  |
| Disability Reported | 57\% | 1,852 |

[^1]* The number of additional citizens that would have voted, had this group turned out to vote in 2008 at the rate of the other group.


## Executive Summary

Unfortunately, if historical patterns persist, the registration and turnout rates for the upcoming 2010 mid-term election will markedly decline compared to 2008, and some of the disparities found in this report may expand: ${ }^{2}$

- For the past seven election cycles, the national turnout rate in mid-term elections averaged I5 percentage points lower than the preceding presidential election.
- The steep decline in voting between presidential and mid-term elections for younger voters is consistently several points greater than that for the general population.
- The decline in turnout between presidential and mid-term elections is often nearly the same for both Whites and Blacks. However, the nationwide drop in the voter turnout rate for Whites between the 2004 presidential election and the 2006 mid-term election was about 16 percentage points, whereas the decline for Blacks was about 19 points.

It remains to be seen if the increases in turnout for various groups in 2008 came from populations that will turnout in significantly lower rates come 2010. ${ }^{3}$ However, this strong possibility, coupled with the remarkably steady and rapid growth in the population of the United States, means both government officials and civic organizations will need to redouble their efforts in assisting populations that are underrepresented in elections in the coming year. This includes enforcement of current registration and election laws, improvements or additional reforms to voter registration policies, and recognition of the importance of voter registration drives in reaching underrepresented populations.

## Introduction

Historically, the proportion of the U.S. population that registers to vote and that does vote has been skewed towards White, educated, and wealthier citizens. Furthermore, young Americans and those who have recently moved have been disproportionately represented among those who do not participate in U.S. elections. While many of these trends remained the same in 2008, a surge in voting by minorities, particularly youth, made the 2008 election more representative of the adult citizen population than past elections.

Research on who does and does not vote can come from either administrative data (i.e., election files kept by local or state officials), or from survey data. One of the largest ongoing surveys on voting behavior is the Current Population Survey's (CPS) Voting and Registration Supplement. The CPS, conducted by the Bureau of the Census for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, is a monthly survey of over 60,000 households and is designed to be representative of the non-institutionalized population of the United States. In November of even-numbered years for the past several decades the CPS has included a short battery of questions related to voter registration and voting.

This report reviews how responses to some questions in the CPS's November Voting and Registration Supplements have changed over the past few presidential elections, as well as how responses vary across some important demographic categories such as race, gender, and income. Data on voter registration and voter turnout for each state and the District of Columbia are also provided.

The report finds that those who are registered and who vote are not representative of the U.S. population that is eligible to vote.Age, race, income, education, residential mobility, gender, and marital status are categories reviewed in this report. These categories all identify lines across which voter registration and turnout can vary enormously. In addition, for the first time, the 2008 CPS also asked respondents questions about various disabilities, so this report briefly reviews the registration and turnout rates of those reporting one or more disabilities.

Table $I$ in the Executive Summary presents a snapshot of the under-representation of some of the categories explored in greater detail in the sections that follow. Even though the 2008 election was more diverse than other recent elections, Figure I (also in the Executive Summary) demonstrates that many demographic groups remain disproportionately unregistered. Table 2 in the Executive Summary shows, for some populations, how many additional voters would have voted in 2008 had underrepresented populations participated at the rate of over-represented groups.

Not explored in this report are the non-demographic factors that contribute to the skewed nature of electoral participation in the United States. A wide variety of state policies and election laws - ranging from voter registration policies, to the voting rights of formerly incarcerated persons, to identification requirements - appear to have disparate impacts on the registration and turnout rates of various subpopulations. Other writings by Project Vote, advocacy groups, and academics detail research on institutional barriers such as the policies mentioned. ${ }^{4}$ Regardless of the causes, however, nearly 60 million adult citizens- 29 percent of the total-reported that they were not registered to vote, and a total of 75 million adult citizens- 36 percent of the total—did not vote in 2008.

Altogether, this review of the survey data strongly points to the need for civic organizations and government officials (at all levels of government) to redouble their efforts to expand access to voter registration services and facilitate access to the ballot box. Civic organizations, in addition to advocating for better enforcement of existing laws, have begun to call for additional reforms to further expand citizen access to voter registration. Arguably, the disparities in the voter registration rates between various populations that are identified in this report pose a far more serious problem for representative democracy than a less than perfect overall registration rate. Under-representation potentially skews our national agenda and excludes from major public policy decisions the voices of our least powerful and most vulnerable citizens. Thus, the major objective of any reforms should be to reduce the disparities found in this report.

State and local election officials should view under-representation in elections as a call to embrace voter registration as an affirmative responsibility of government. Better implementation of laws relating to the registration of young, low-income, and minority voters, starting with much-needed enforcement of the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA), should be a priority for local and state officials. ${ }^{5}$

In addition, despite the recent spate of attacks on voter registration drives, election officials and civic groups should continue to recognize the importance of drives as a vital tool for increasing civic participation. According to the 2008 CPS, nearly 9 million citizens reported having registered "at a voter registration drive." (See Table 3 on the next page.) This equals 8 percent of the total responding to the question and who remembered where they registered. ${ }^{6}$ This likely seriously undercounts the total impact of voter registration drives, however, as 9.4 million citizens (another 8 percent) reported that they registered "at a school, hospital, or on campus"-all locations where voter registration drives are often conducted by civic organizations and student groups. Moreover, it is likely that some portion of the 19.7 million citizens that registered to vote through mail-in voter registration applications received these applications from voter drives or from organizations that distributed these forms through the postal or electronic mail.

As documented in this report, the United States population continues to grow rapidly. Thus, even if additional voter registration reforms markedly increase the overall registration rate, it is likely that voter registration drives will continue to play an important role in facilitating the electoral participation of millions of citizens. As shown in Table 3 below, when compared to Whites, non-Whites are twice as likely to report having registered through a voter registration drive, and roughly fifty percent
more likely to report having registered at a school or on campus. Minorities are also more likely to register to vote via mail-in voter registration forms and at public assistance agencies.

Therefore, in addition to expanding their own efforts to register additional voters and ensure full and fair implementation of the NVRA, state and local election officials should work with civic organizations to improve the quality and scope of registration drives, which serve as an important tool for registering millions of citizens, particularly in communities with historically low registration rates.

Table 3: How Citizens Registered to Vote*

|  | Whites |  | Non-Whites |  |  | Total |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Department of motor vehicles | 23,877 | $27 \%$ | 7,079 | $25 \%$ | 30,956 | $26 \%$ |  |
| Public assistance agency | 746 | $1 \%$ | 716 | $3 \%$ | 1,462 | $1 \%$ |  |
| Registered by mail | 14,200 | $16 \%$ | 5,503 | $19 \%$ | 19,703 | $17 \%$ |  |
| School, hospital, or on campus | 6,327 | $7 \%$ | 3,103 | $11 \%$ | 9,430 | $8 \%$ |  |
| Town hall or county registration office | 26,278 | $29 \%$ | 5,268 | $18 \%$ | 31,546 | $27 \%$ |  |
| Registration drive | 5,566 | $6 \%$ | 3,409 | $12 \%$ | 8,975 | $8 \%$ |  |
| On election or primary day | 7,456 | $8 \%$ | 1,695 | $6 \%$ | 9,151 | $8 \%$ |  |
| Other | 4,675 | $5 \%$ | 1,745 | $6 \%$ | 6,421 | $5 \%$ |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{8 9 , 1 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 , 5 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 7 , 6 4 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |  |

[^2]* Percents are of those who recalled how they registered to vote.


## National and State Registration and Voting Data

Table 4a: Adult Citizen Population, Registration, and Voting by State, 2008

| State | Adult Citizens | Registered | Registered as \% of Adult Citizens | Rank | Voted | Voted as $\%$ of Adult Citizens | Rank | Voted as \% of Registered |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alabama | 3,404 | 2,438 | 72\% | 29 | 2,126 | 62\% | 38 | 87\% |
| Alaska | 468 | 345 | 74\% | 20 | 304 | 65\% | 27 | 88\% |
| Arizona | 4,169 | 2,874 | 69\% | 40 | 2,497 | 60\% | 42 | 87\% |
| Arkansas | 2,030 | 1,317 | 65\% | 48 | 1,092 | 54\% | 48 | 83\% |
| California | 21,816 | 4,885 | 68\% | 42 | 13,828 | 63\% | 33 | 93\% |
| Colorado | 3,374 | 2,437 | 72\% | 27 | 2,308 | 68\% | 10 | 95\% |
| Connecticut | 2,396 | 1,761 | 74\% | 21 | 1,610 | 67\% | 20 | 91\% |
| Delaware | 606 | 447 | 74\% | 19 | 408 | 67\% | 18 | 91\% |
| District of Columbia | 413 | 324 | 78\% | 4 | 306 | 74\% | 2 | 95\% |
| Florida | 12,462 | 8,774 | 70\% | 34 | 7,95 I | 64\% | 32 | 91\% |
| Georgia | 6,515 | 4,624 | 71\% | 31 | 4,183 | 64\% | 30 | 90\% |
| Hawaii | 883 | 522 | 59\% | 51 | 457 | 52\% | 51 | 88\% |
| Idaho | 1,049 | 723 | 69\% | 40 | 644 | 61\% | 40 | 89\% |
| Illinois | 8,681 | 6,151 | $71 \%$ | 32 | 5,436 | 63\% | 36 | 88\% |
| Indiana | 4,562 | 3,105 | 68\% | 43 | 2,758 | 61\% | 41 | 89\% |
| lowa | 2,137 | 1,630 | 76\% | 10 | 1,501 | 70\% | 7 | 92\% |
| Kansas | 1,926 | 1,343 | 70\% | 37 | 1,219 | 63\% | 34 | 91\% |
| Kentucky | 3,094 | 2,259 | 73\% | 22 | 1,952 | 63\% | 35 | 86\% |
| Louisiana | 3,056 | 2,393 | 78\% | 4 | 2,149 | 70\% | 6 | 90\% |
| Maine | 1,005 | 801 | 80\% | 2 | 716 | 71\% | 3 | 89\% |
| Maryland | 3,824 | 2,828 | 74\% | 18 | 2,611 | 68\% | 11 | 92\% |
| Massachusetts | 4,533 | 3,293 | 73\% | 25 | 3,044 | 67\% | 21 | 92\% |
| Michigan | 7,176 | 5,531 | 77\% | 6 | 4,865 | 68\% | 12 | 88\% |
| Minnesota | 3,678 | 2,931 | 80\% | 2 | 2,759 | 75\% | 1 | 94\% |
| Mississippi | 2,064 | 1,589 | 77\% | 7 | 1,439 | 70\% | 8 | 91\% |
| Missouri | 4,326 | 3,224 | 75\% | 15 | 2,846 | 66\% | 23 | 88\% |
| Montana | 724 | 516 | 71\% | 30 | 473 | 65\% | 26 | 92\% |
| Nebraska | 1,253 | 939 | 75\% | 14 | 844 | 67\% | 18 | 90\% |
| Nevada | 1,714 | 1,147 | 67\% | 45 | 1,027 | 60\% | 42 | 90\% |
| New Hampshire | 994 | 756 | 76\% | 11 | 708 | 71\% | 3 | 94\% |
| New Jersey | 5,675 | 4,022 | 71\% | 32 | 3,637 | 64\% | 31 | 90\% |
| New Mexico | 1,352 | 937 | 69\% | 38 | 846 | 63\% | 36 | 90\% |
| New York | 12,849 | 8,458 | 66\% | 47 | 7,559 | 59\% | 44 | 89\% |
| North Carolina | 6,477 | 4,902 | 76\% | 12 | 4,370 | 68\% | 15 | 89\% |
| North Dakota | 476 | 399 | 84\% | 1 | 321 | 68\% | 15 | 81\% |
| Ohio | 8,367 | 6,108 | 73\% | 22 | 5,483 | 66\% | 25 | 90\% |

(Table 4a continued)
$\left.\begin{array}{lrrrrrrrr}\text { State } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Adult } \\ \text { Citizens }\end{array} & \text { Registered } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Registered } \\ \text { as \% of } \\ \text { Adult Citizens }\end{array} & \text { Rank } & \text { Voted } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Voted as } \\ \text { \% of } \\ \text { Adult Citizens }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Rank }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Voted as } \\ \text { \% of }\end{array} \\ \text { Registered }\end{array}\right]$

Source: November 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote; numbers are in 1000's

Table 4a provides, for each state, estimates of the total number of adult citizens, and of the number of citizens registered and voting in 2008. The table also provides the voter registration and turnout rates as a percentage of the adult population, as well as the turnout rate for those registered. Each state is ranked based on estimated voter registration and turnout rates. ${ }^{7}$

- In 2008, out of 206.1 million adult citizens, 146.3 million reported that they were registered, and 131.1 million reported voting.
- The national registration rate of the adult citizen population was 71 percent, the national turnout rate was nearly 64 percent, and the national rate of turnout for those registered was approximately 90 percent.

Interestingly, even though it is well known that people tend to over-report certain behaviors on surveys -including voting-the number of ballots cast in 2008, approximately 132 million, is very close to the CPS estimate of 131 million voters. ${ }^{8}$

National and State Registration and Voting Data
Figure 2: States Ranked by Voter Registration Rates, 2008

| Rank | State | Registered as \% of Adult Citizens | Margin of error* |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | ND |  | 83.72 .0 |  |
| 2 | ME | 79.7 | 2.3 |  |
| 2 | MN | 79.7 | 1.9 |  |
| 4 | DC | 78.3 | 2.3 |  |
| 4 | LA | 78.3 | 2.2 |  |
| 6 | MI | 77.1 | 1.5 |  |
| 7 | MS | 77.0 | 2.2 |  |
| 8 | SD | 76.9 | 2.1 |  |
| 9 | WI | 76.4 | 2.0 |  |
| 10 | IA | 76.3 | 2.3 |  |
| 11 | NH | 76.0 | 2.3 |  |
| 12 | NC | 75.7 | 1.6 |  |
| 13 | RI | 75.5 | 2.3 |  |
| 14 | NE | 74.9 | 2.3 |  |
| 15 | MO | 74.5 | 2.0 |  |
| 15 | SC | 74.5 | 2.2 |  |
| 17 | VA | 74.3 | 1.7 |  |
| 18 | MD | 73.9 | 2.1 |  |
| 19 | DE | 73.8 | 2.3 |  |
| 20 | AK | 73.7 | 2.4 |  |
| 21 | CT | 73.5 | 2.3 |  |
| 22 | KY | 73.0 | 2.3 |  |
| 22 | OH | 73.0 | 1.4 |  |
| 22 | OR | 73.0 | 2.3 |  |
| 25 | MA | 72.6 | 1.9 |  |
| 26 | VT | 72.5 | 2.5 |  |
| 27 | CO | 72.2 | 2.2 |  |
| 28 | WA | 71.7 | 1.9 |  |
| 29 | AL | 71.6 | 2.2 |  |
| 30 | MT | 71.3 | 2.4 |  |
| 31 | GA | 71.0 | 1.6 |  |
|  | United States | 71.0 | 0.3 |  |
| 32 | IL | 70.9 | 1.4 | * Rankings are |
| 32 | NJ | 70.9 | 1.7 | approximations |
| 34 | FL | 70.4 | 1.1 | made on the point |
| 35 | OK | 70.1 | 2.4 | estimates and are for |
| 35 | PA | 70.1 | 1.4 | broad comparisons |
| 37 | KS | 69.7 | 2.5 | only. Comparisons |
| 38 | NM | 69.3 | 2.4 | between states |
| 38 | WY | 69.3 | 2.5 | ranked closely |
| 40 | AZ | 68.9 | 2.0 | be made with a |
| 40 | ID | 68.9 | 2.3 | separate calculation, |
| 42 | CA | 68.2 | 0.9 | not provided here: |
| 43 | IN | 68.1 | 2.0 | the margin of error |
| 44 | TX | 67.3 | 1.1 | of difference. The |
| 45 | NV | 66.9 | 2.4 | margins of error |
| 46 | WV | 66.1 | 2.3 | presented here |
| 47 | NY | 65.8 | 1.2 | are for the point |
| 48 | AR | 164.9 | 2.5 | estimates of individual |
| 49 | TN | 64.5 | 2.1 | states (margins are |
| 50 | UT | $\square 59.7$ | 2.4 | at a 90 percent |
| 51 | HI | 59.1 | 2.5 | confidence interval). |

Source: November 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote.

Table 4b: Adult Citizen Population and Registration by State, 2000, 2004, and 2008

State \begin{tabular}{ccc}
Adult 2000 <br>
Citizens

 

Registered | Registered |
| :---: |
| as \% of |
| Adult Citizens |

\end{tabular}

2004
Adult Registered Registered Citizens as \% of Adult Citizens

2008
Adult Registered Registered Citizens
as \% of
Adult Citizens

| Alabama | 3,233 | 2,4II | 75\% | 3,257 | 2,418 | 74\% | 3,404 | 2,438 | 72\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alaska | 399 | 299 | 75\% | 434 | 334 | 77\% | 468 | 345 | 74\% |
| Arizona | 3,129 | 1,879 | 60\% | 3,508 | 2,485 | 71\% | 4,169 | 2,874 | 69\% |
| Arkansas | I,851 | 1,125 | 61\% | 1,942 | 1,328 | 68\% | 2,030 | 1,317 | 65\% |
| California | 19,837 | 13,061 | 66\% | 20,693 | 14,193 | 69\% | 21,816 | 14,885 | 68\% |
| Colorado | 2,854 | 1,954 | 69\% | 3,109 | 2,307 | 74\% | 3,374 | 2,437 | 72\% |
| Connecticut | 2,239 | 1,510 | 67\% | 2,409 | 1,695 | 70\% | 2,396 | 1,761 | 74\% |
| Delaware | 543 | 385 | 71\% | 579 | 415 | 72\% | 606 | 447 | 74\% |
| District of Columbia | 373 | 295 | 79\% | 390 | 293 | 75\% | 413 | 324 | 78\% |
| Florida | 10,081 | 7,043 | 70\% | 11,469 | 8,219 | 72\% | 12,462 | 8,774 | 70\% |
| Georgia | 5,553 | 3,528 | 64\% | 5,866 | 3,948 | 67\% | 6,515 | 4,624 | 71\% |
| Hawaii | 771 | 402 | 52\% | 852 | 497 | 58\% | 883 | 522 | 59\% |
| Idaho | 892 | 569 | 64\% | 948 | 663 | 70\% | 1,049 | 723 | 69\% |
| Illinois | 8,118 | 5,911 | 73\% | 8,640 | 6,437 | 75\% | 8,681 | 6,151 | $71 \%$ |
| Indiana | 4,303 | 3,000 | 70\% | 4,435 | 3,031 | 68\% | 4,562 | 3,105 | 68\% |
| lowa | 2,008 | 1,524 | 76\% | 2,136 | 1,674 | 78\% | 2,137 | 1,630 | 76\% |
| Kansas | 1,861 | 1,293 | 69\% | 1,851 | 1,338 | 72\% | 1,926 | 1,343 | 70\% |
| Kentucky | 2,918 | 2,087 | 72\% | 2,969 | 2,231 | 75\% | 3,094 | 2,259 | 73\% |
| Louisiana | 3,091 | 2,369 | 77\% | 3,218 | 2,413 | 75\% | 3,056 | 2,393 | 78\% |
| Maine | 966 | 786 | 81\% | 1,007 | 824 | 82\% | 1,005 | 801 | 80\% |
| Maryland | 3,565 | 2,499 | 70\% | 3,678 | 2,676 | 73\% | 3,824 | 2,828 | 74\% |
| Massachusetts | 4,246 | 3,244 | 76\% | 4,497 | 3,483 | 78\% | 4,533 | 3,293 | 73\% |
| Michigan | 6,963 | 4,996 | 72\% | 7,177 | 5,364 | 75\% | 7,176 | 5,531 | 77\% |
| Minnesota | 3,407 | 2,688 | 79\% | 3,645 | 3,080 | 85\% | 3,678 | 2,931 | 80\% |
| Mississippi | 2,001 | 1,465 | 73\% | 2,049 | 1,510 | 74\% | 2,064 | 1,589 | 77\% |
| Missouri | 3,987 | 3,023 | 76\% | 4,106 | 3,336 | 81\% | 4,326 | 3,224 | 75\% |
| Montana | 650 | 461 | 71\% | 687 | 519 | 76\% | 724 | 516 | $71 \%$ |
| Nebraska | 1,176 | 865 | 74\% | 1,215 | 918 | 76\% | 1,253 | 939 | 75\% |
| Nevada | 1,229 | 720 | 59\% | 1,477 | 965 | 65\% | 1,714 | 1,147 | 67\% |
| New Hampshire | 857 | 628 | 73\% | 948 | 716 | 76\% | 994 | 756 | 76\% |
| New Jersey | 5,458 | 3,859 | 71\% | 5,591 | 4,085 | 73\% | 5,675 | 4,022 | 71\% |
| New Mexico | 1,188 | 750 | 63\% | 1,301 | 936 | 72\% | 1,352 | 937 | 69\% |
| New York | 11,877 | 8,047 | 68\% | 12,779 | 8,624 | 68\% | 12,849 | 8,458 | 66\% |
| North Carolina | 5,335 | 3,720 | 70\% | 5,923 | 4,292 | 73\% | 6,477 | 4,902 | 76\% |
| North Dakota | 445 | 409 | 92\% | 462 | 412 | 89\% | 476 | 399 | 84\% |
| Ohio | 8,143 | 5,561 | 68\% | 8,305 | 6,003 | 72\% | 8,367 | 6,108 | 73\% |

## National and State Registration and Voting Data

(Table 4b continued)

| State | Adult Citizens | $2000$ <br> Registered | Registered as \% of Adult Citizens | Adult Citizens | $2004$ <br> Registered | Registered as \% of Adult Citizens | Adult Citizens | $2008$ <br> Registered | Registered as \% of Adult Citizens |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Oklahoma | 2,400 | 1,679 | 70\% | 2,476 | I,78। | 72\% | 2,566 | 1,798 | 70\% |
| Oregon | 2,295 | 1,714 | 75\% | 2,600 | 2,049 | 79\% | 2,687 | 1,961 | 73\% |
| Pennsylvania | 8,687 | 5,847 | 67\% | 9,055 | 6,481 | 72\% | 9,206 | 6,451 | 70\% |
| Rhode Island | 690 | 508 | 74\% | 732 | 522 | $71 \%$ | 752 | 568 | 76\% |
| South Carolina | 2,897 | 1,993 | 69\% | 3,002 | 2,238 | 75\% | 3,202 | 2,385 | 75\% |
| South Dakota | 525 | 376 | 72\% | 554 | 425 | 77\% | 575 | 442 | 77\% |
| Tennessee | 4,067 | 2,590 | 64\% | 4,250 | 2,739 | 64\% | 4,529 | 2,921 | 65\% |
| Texas | 12,937 | 8,929 | 69\% | 13,925 | 9,681 | 70\% | 15,040 | 10,123 | 67\% |
| Utah | 1,378 | 953 | 69\% | 1,508 | 1,141 | 76\% | 1,768 | 1,056 | 60\% |
| Vermont | 451 | 330 | 73\% | 469 | 354 | 76\% | 476 | 345 | 73\% |
| Virginia | 4,912 | 3,317 | 68\% | 4,971 | 3,441 | 69\% | 5,316 | 3,950 | 74\% |
| Washington | 4,078 | 2,852 | 70\% | 4,220 | 3,133 | 74\% | 4,600 | 3,299 | 72\% |
| West Virginia | 1,397 | 886 | 63\% | 1,394 | 935 | 67\% | 1,387 | 917 | 66\% |
| Wisconsin | 3,755 | 2,970 | 79\% | 3,928 | 3,225 | 82\% | 4,053 | 3,095 | 76\% |
| Wyoming | 348 | 240 | 69\% | 370 | 265 | 72\% | 389 | 270 | 69\% |
| Totals | 186,366 | 129,549 | 70\% | 197,005 | 142,070 | 72\% | 206,072 1 | 146,3 I I | 71\% |

Source: November 2000, 2004, and 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote; numbers are in I000's

Table $4 b$ provides the total number of adult citizens and registration data for all states for the last three presidential elections: 2000, 2004, and 2008. Table 4c provides voting data for all states for the same three years.

- The national registration rate has remained fairly consistent across the three presidential elections, ranging from 70 to 72 percent of the adult population, even as the demographic composition of electorate changed.
- While turnout increased from 60 percent in 2000 to 64 percent in 2004 , it did not change markedly between 2004 and 2008.
- In no state in 2008 did the number voting as a rate of the number registered drop below 80 percent. For more than half of the states this rate surpassed over 90 percent. The percent of those registered who voted in 2008 was four points higher than in 2000 ( 90 percent and 86 percent, respectively), but was essentially unchanged compared to 2004 (89 percent).

National and State Registration and Voting Data
Table 4c: Voter Turnout by State, 2000, 2004, \& 2008

| State | 2000 |  |  | 2004 |  |  | 2008 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Voted | Voted as \% of Adult Citizens | Voted as \% of Registered | Voted | Voted as \% of Adult Citizens | Voted as \% of Registered | Voted | Voted as \% of Adult Citizens | Voted as \% of Registered |
| Alabama | 1,953 | 60\% | 81\% | 2,060 | 63\% | 85\% | 2,126 | 62\% | 87\% |
| Alaska | 270 | 68\% | 90\% | 293 | 68\% | 88\% | 304 | 65\% | 88\% |
| Arizona | 1,644 | 53\% | 88\% | 2,239 | 64\% | 90\% | 2,497 | 60\% | 87\% |
| Arkansas | 936 | 51\% | 83\% | 1,140 | 59\% | 86\% | 1,092 | 54\% | 83\% |
| California | 11,489 | 58\% | 88\% | 12,807 | 62\% | 90\% | 13,828 | 63\% | 93\% |
| Colorado | 1,633 | 57\% | 84\% | 2,097 | 68\% | 91\% | 2,308 | 68\% | 95\% |
| Connecticut | 1,332 | 60\% | 88\% | 1,524 | 63\% | 90\% | 1,610 | 67\% | 91\% |
| Delaware | 352 | 65\% | 92\% | 385 | 66\% | 93\% | 408 | 67\% | 91\% |
| District of Columbia | 267 | 72\% | 91\% | 270 | 69\% | 92\% | 306 | 74\% | 95\% |
| Florida | 6,006 | 60\% | 85\% | 7,372 | 64\% | 90\% | 7,951 | 64\% | 91\% |
| Georgia | 2,827 | 51\% | 80\% | 3,332 | 57\% | 84\% | 4,183 | 64\% | 90\% |
| Hawaii | 340 | 44\% | 84\% | 433 | 51\% | 87\% | 457 | 52\% | 88\% |
| Idaho | 500 | 56\% | 88\% | 585 | 62\% | 88\% | 644 | 61\% | 89\% |
| Illinois | 5,030 | 62\% | 85\% | 5,672 | 66\% | 88\% | 5,436 | 63\% | 88\% |
| Indiana | 2,564 | 60\% | 85\% | 2,598 | 59\% | 86\% | 2,758 | 61\% | 89\% |
| lowa | 1,353 | 67\% | 89\% | 1,522 | 71\% | 91\% | 1,501 | 70\% | 92\% |
| Kansas | 1,148 | 62\% | 89\% | 1,188 | 64\% | 89\% | 1,219 | 63\% | 91\% |
| Kentucky | 1,645 | 56\% | 79\% | 1,930 | 65\% | 87\% | 1,952 | 63\% | 86\% |
| Louisiana | 2,030 | 66\% | 86\% | 2,067 | 64\% | 86\% | 2,149 | 70\% | 90\% |
| Maine | 677 | 70\% | 86\% | 736 | 73\% | 89\% | 716 | 71\% | 89\% |
| Maryland | 2,178 | 61\% | 87\% | 2,413 | 66\% | 90\% | 2,611 | 68\% | 92\% |
| Massachusetts | 2,772 | 65\% | 85\% | 3,085 | 69\% | 89\% | 3,044 | 67\% | 92\% |
| Michigan | 4,343 | 62\% | 87\% | 4,818 | 67\% | 90\% | 4,865 | 68\% | 88\% |
| Minnesota | 2,376 | 70\% | 88\% | 2,887 | 79\% | 94\% | 2,759 | 75\% | 94\% |
| Mississippi | 1,213 | 61\% | 83\% | 1,263 | 62\% | 84\% | 1,439 | 70\% | 91\% |
| Missouri | 2,659 | 67\% | 88\% | 2,815 | 69\% | 84\% | 2,846 | 66\% | 88\% |
| Montana | 409 | 63\% | 89\% | 482 | 70\% | 93\% | 473 | 65\% | 92\% |
| Nebraska | 710 | 60\% | 82\% | 793 | 65\% | 86\% | 844 | 67\% | 90\% |
| Nevada | 641 | 52\% | 89\% | 871 | 59\% | 90\% | 1,027 | 60\% | 90\% |
| New Hampshire | 571 | 67\% | 91\% | 677 | 72\% | 95\% | 708 | 71\% | 94\% |
| New Jersey | 3,374 | 62\% | 87\% | 3,693 | 66\% | 90\% | 3,637 | 64\% | 90\% |
| New Mexico | 647 | 54\% | 86\% | 837 | 64\% | 89\% | 846 | 63\% | 90\% |
| New York | 7,004 | 59\% | 87\% | 7,698 | 60\% | 89\% | 7,559 | 59\% | 89\% |
| North Carolina | 2,995 | 56\% | 81\% | 3,639 | 61\% | 85\% | 4,370 | 68\% | 89\% |
| North Dakota | 313 | 70\% | 77\% | 330 | 72\% | 80\% | 321 | 68\% | 81\% |
| Ohio | 4,823 | 59\% | 87\% | 5,485 | 66\% | 91\% | 5,483 | 66\% | 90\% |

## National and State Registration and Voting Data

(Table 4c continued)

| State | 2000 |  |  | 2004 |  |  | 2008 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Voted | Voted as \% of Adult Citizens | Voted as \% of Registered | Voted | Voted as \% of Adult Citizens | Voted as \% of Registered | Voted | Voted as \% of Adult Citizens | Voted as \% of Registered |
| Oklahoma | 1,431 | 60\% | 85\% | I,54। | 62\% | 87\% | 1,507 | 59\% | 84\% |
| Oregon | 1,529 | 67\% | 89\% | 1,924 | 74\% | 94\% | 1,818 | 68\% | 93\% |
| Pennsylvania | 4,988 | 57\% | 85\% | 5,845 | 65\% | 90\% | 5,747 | 62\% | 89\% |
| Rhode Island | 438 | 64\% | 86\% | 467 | 64\% | 89\% | 507 | 67\% | 89\% |
| South Carolina | I,725 | 60\% | 87\% | 1,899 | 63\% | 85\% | 2,100 | 66\% | 88\% |
| South Dakota | 311 | 59\% | 83\% | 378 | 68\% | 89\% | 390 | 68\% | 88\% |
| Tennessee | 2,183 | 54\% | 84\% | 2,319 | 55\% | 85\% | 2,516 | 56\% | 86\% |
| Texas | 7,005 | 54\% | 78\% | 7,950 | 57\% | 82\% | 8,435 | 56\% | 83\% |
| Utah | 829 | 60\% | 87\% | 1,022 | 68\% | 90\% | 939 | 53\% | 89\% |
| Vermont | 290 | 64\% | 88\% | 316 | 67\% | 89\% | 308 | 65\% | 89\% |
| Virginia | 2,962 | 60\% | 89\% | 3,134 | 63\% | 91\% | 3,650 | 69\% | 92\% |
| Washington | 2,527 | 62\% | 89\% | 2,851 | 68\% | 91\% | 3,073 | 67\% | 93\% |
| West Virginia | 732 | 52\% | 83\% | 798 | 57\% | 85\% | 741 | 53\% | 81\% |
| Wisconsin | 2,632 | 70\% | 89\% | 3,010 | 77\% | 93\% | 2,887 | 71\% | 93\% |
| Wyoming | 219 | 63\% | 91\% | 247 | 67\% | 93\% | 250 | 64\% | 93\% |
| Totals | 1 10,826 | 60\% | 86\% | 125,736 | 64\% | 89\% | 131,144 | 64\% | 90\% |

Source: November 2000, 2004, and 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote; numbers are in 1000's

Dramatic variations exist in state registration and voting rates.

- Table 4a shows, for 2008, a range of 20 percentage points between the states with the highest (Maine and Minnesota) and lowest (Hawaii and Utah) registration rates. ${ }^{9}$
- A 23-point range exists in voting rates, with 75 percent of the eligible population voting in 2008 in Minnesota (the highest rate) compared to only 53 percent in Utah and 52 percent in Hawaii (the lowest rate).

For the District of Columbia, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia-all southern states with large Black populations-turnout in 2008 was the highest it has been since I984. ${ }^{10}$

It is worth noting that the size of the adult citizen population is growing rapidly. Between 2000 and 2004, the U.S. gained nearly II million adult citizens. Between 2004 and 2008, approximately 9 million adult citizens were added. In short, the population eligible to register and vote increased by roughly 5 percent between each of the last two presidential elections.

Hence, despite the lack of substantial change in registration and turnout rates between 2004 and 2008, the number of people registered increased over that period by approximately 4.2 million (or 3 percent), and the number that voted increased by approximately 5.4 million (or 4 percent). This rapid expansion of the adult citizen population has important ramifications for civic engagement work.

Overall, the population growth highlights the need for increased capacity of both local officials and civic organizations to involve the ever growing public in the electoral process. It also clearly stresses the need for increasing the reach of voter registration efforts, perhaps through the development of reforms which advocates believe will increase the percentage of citizens that are registered. This would include paperless registration, greater use of government transactions with the public as opportunities for voter registration, registration records that better track our nation's highly mobile population, and offering registration during voting periods. As mentioned in the Introduction, the importance of voter registration drives should not be overlooked.

However, even if voter registration systems are modernized in ways that increase the registration rate, it is likely that a significant number of people will remain unregistered simply due to the nation's rapid population growth, decentralized election administration procedures, and residential mobility. Finally, the size and continued growth in population mean that even seemingly small errors or inequalities in registration and balloting can affect hundreds of thousands, or even millions, of voters. For instance, it may sound trivial if 2 percent of the population experiences problems registering or voting, but 2 percent of the registered population in 2008 equals nearly 3 million citizens. ${ }^{11}$

## Race and Ethnicity

Table 5 shows registration and voting broken down by race and ethnicity for the last three presidential elections. ${ }^{12}$

Until November 2004, respondents to the Voting and Registration Supplement were not allowed to select more than one race. Thus, comparisons of 2000 to more recent years are complicated by the fact that some people in 2000 would have been included in the Multi-racial category used in this report if the option to select more than one race had existed. (See note 12 on page 3 for information on the definitions for race and ethnicity categories used in this report, and how this relates to those used in other reports.)

Table 5: Adult Citizen Population, Registration, and Voting by Race/Ethnicity, 2000, 2004, and 2008

|  | Adult Citizens | $\begin{gathered} \text { Column } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Registered | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Registered } \\ & \text { as \% of } \\ & \text { Adult Citizens } \end{aligned}$ | Voted | $\begin{gathered} \text { Voted } \\ \text { as \% of } \\ \text { Adult Citizens } \end{gathered}$ | Voted as \% of Registered |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 144,731 | 78\% | 103,588 | 72\% | 89,469 | 62\% | 86\% |
| Black | 22,409 | 12\% | 15,156 | 68\% | 12,749 | 57\% | 84\% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 4,631 | 3\% | 2,414 | 52\% | 2,003 | 43\% | 83\% |
| Latino | 13,159 | 7\% | 7,546 | 57\% | 5,934 | 45\% | 79\% |
| Native American | 1,436 | 1\% | 844 | 59\% | 671 | 47\% | 79\% |
| Multi-racial* | N/A |  | N/A |  | N/A |  |  |
| Total | 186,366 | 100\% | 129,549 | 70\% | 1 10,826 | 60\% | 86\% |
| 2004 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 148,159 | 75\% | 111,318 | 75\% | 99,567 | 67\% | 89\% |
| Black | 22,866 | 12\% | 15,773 | 69\% | 13,799 | 60\% | 87\% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 6,580 | 3\% | 3,438 | 52\% | 2,943 | 45\% | 86\% |
| Latino | 16,088 | 8\% | 9,308 | 58\% | 7,587 | 47\% | 82\% |
| Native American | 1,136 | 1\% | 692 | 61\% | 553 | 49\% | 80\% |
| Multi-racial | 2,177 | 1\% | 1,540 | 71\% | 1,287 | 59\% | 84\% |
| Total | 197,005 | 100\% | 142,070 | 72\% | 125,736 | 64\% | 89\% |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 151,321 | 73\% | 111,215 | 74\% | 100,042 | 66\% | 90\% |
| Black | 24,322 | 12\% | 17,059 | 70\% | 15,857 | 65\% | 93\% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 7,415 | 4\% | 4,076 | 55\% | 3,502 | 47\% | 86\% |
| Latino | 19,537 | 9\% | 11,608 | 59\% | 9,745 | 50\% | 84\% |
| Native American | 1,206 | 1\% | 743 | 62\% | 589 | 49\% | 79\% |
| Multi-racial | 2,271 | 1\% | 1,610 | 71\% | 1,409 | 62\% | 88\% |
| Total | 206,072 | 100\% | 146,3 I I | 71\% | 131,144 | 64\% | 90\% |

[^3]Nonetheless, given that only about one percent of the adult population selected more than one race in 2008 we provide data for all three presidential election cycles to demonstrate two general trends.

First, the percent of the population that is non-White is increasing. In 2000, 78 percent of all adult citizens reported that they were White and that they were not Latino. By 2008, this group declined to 75 percent of the total adult citizen population. Some of this difference is from respondents, presumably less than I percent of the total, who selected White in 2000 but now select more than one race. The larger portion of this difference is due to the growth in the Latino population, from 7 percent of the total number of adult citizens in 2000 to 9 percent in 2008, and of the Asian or Pacific Islander populations, from approximately 3 percent in 2000 to 4 percent in 2008.

Second, while the voter registration rates for all non-Whites have been increasing moderately since 2000, the turnout rates have been increasing more dramatically. Thus, it remains unclear what portion of the increased turnout by non-Whites in 2008 was the result of the historic nature of the 2008 election-that is, the first presidential election in which a minority candidate headed the ticket of a major party-or was the result of trends in increasing minority turnout that predate 2008.

Ultimately, non-Whites (including Latinos of any race) accounted for nearly two-thirds of the increase in the number of adult citizens since the previous presidential election. Moreover, minorities equaled the entire increase since 2004 in the number of registered voters, and 91 percent of the increase in the total

Figure 3: Composition of the Adult Citizen, Registered, and Voting Populations by Race and Ethnicity, 2008


Source: November 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote

## Race and Ethnicity

number of votes cast between 2004 and 2008. Nonetheless, as seen in Figure 3, while Black participation in 2008 overall was proportionate to their share of the adult citizen population, this was not true of other minorities. (See also Tables I and 2 and the section below on Gender, Age, and Race.)

It is important to keep in mind the impact that mid-term election cycles have on voter registration and turnout. For the past seven election cycles, the turnout rate in mid-term elections averaged I5 percentage points lower than the preceding presidential election. ${ }^{13}$ The steep decline in turnout in midterm elections is often nearly the same for both Whites and Blacks. However, the nationwide drop in the voter turnout rate for Whites between the 2004 presidential election and the 2006 mid-term election was about 16 percentage points, whereas the decline for Blacks was much greater: about 19 points. It remains to be seen if the increases in turnout for various groups in 2008 came from populations that will turnout in significantly lower rates come 2010. ${ }^{14}$

## Gender and Marital Status

Continuing a trend that began in the 1980 s, women register and vote at a higher rate than men. ${ }^{15}$ (See Table 6.) The 2008 registration rate for women, who make up 52 percent of the population, was 73 percent-four percentage points higher than the registration rate of men. The 2008 voting rate for women was 66 percent, also four percentage points higher than that of men. Overall, nearly 10 million more ballots were cast by women in 2008 than by men.

Over the three presidential elections examined, unmarried men and women have played an increasingly larger role. (See Table 7.) Whereas the number of married men and women who voted increased from 2000 to 2008 by 3.4 million and 4.1 million, respectively, the number of unmarried men and women who voted increased for the same period by 5.8 million and 7 million, respectively. Thus, of the 20.3 million additional voters in 2008 compared to 2000, unmarried women composed approximately 35 percent of the increase and unmarried men approximately 29 percent.

The turnout gap between married and unmarried adult citizens has declined approximately 4 percentage points from 2000 to 2008 , with unmarried women making slightly more progress than unmarried men.

Table 6: Adult Citizen Population, Registration, and Voting by Gender, 2000, 2004, and 2008

|  | Adult Citizens | $\underset{\%}{\text { Column }}$ | Registered | Registered as \% of <br> Adult Citizens | Voted | Voted as \% of Adult Citizens | Voted as \% of Registered |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Men | 88,758 | 48\% | 60,356 | 68\% | 51,542 | 58\% | 85\% |
| Women | 97,608 | 52\% | 69,193 | 71\% | 59,284 | 61\% | 86\% |
| Total | 186,366 | 100\% | 129,549 | 70\% | 1 10,826 | 60\% | 86\% |
| 2004 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Men | 94,147 | 48\% | 66,406 | $71 \%$ | 58,455 | 62\% | 88\% |
| Women | 102,858 | 52\% | 75,663 | 74\% | 67,281 | 65\% | 89\% |
| Total | 197,005 | 100\% | 142,070 | 72\% | 125,736 | 64\% | 89\% |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Men | 98,818 | 48\% | 68,242 | 69\% | 60,729 | 62\% | 89\% |
| Women | 107,255 | 52\% | 78,069 | 73\% | 70,415 | 66\%* | 90\% |
| Total | 206,072 | 100\% | 146,3 I I | $71 \%$ | 131,144 | 64\% | 90\% |

[^4]
## Gender and Marital Status

Nonetheless, unmarried citizens are underrepresented in elections. The gap in the voting rate between married and unmarried adult citizens was still sizable: I8 points for men and II points for women in 2008. (See also Figure 4.) Had unmarried women voted at the rate as married women in 2008, an additional 5.6 million voters would have participated. (See Table 2.)

Table 7: Adult Citizen Population, Registration, and Voting by Gender and Marital Status, 2000, 2004, 2008

|  | Gender | Adult Citizens | Registered | Registered as \% of Adult Citizens | Voted | ```Voted as % of Adult Citizens``` | Voted as \% of of Registered |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Married | Men | 53,817 | 40,706 | 76\% | 35,999 | 67\% | 88\% |
|  | Women | 52,826 | 40,285 | 76\% | 35,868 | 68\% | 89\% |
|  | Total | 106,644 | 80,99 I | 76\% | 71,867 | 67\% | 89\% |
| Unmarried | Men | 34,941 | 19,650 | 56\% | 15,543 | 44\% | 79\% |
|  | Women | 44,782 | 28,908 | 65\% | 23,415 | 52\% | 81\% |
|  | Total | 79,723 | 48,558 | 61\% | 38,959 | 49\% | 80\% |
| 2004 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Married | Men | 56,469 | 43,577 | 77\% | 39,561 | 70\% | 91\% |
|  | Women | 55,284 | 43,060 | 78\% | 39,423 | 71\% | 92\% |
|  | Total | I I I,753 | 86,636 | 78\% | 78,984 | 71\% | 91\% |
| Unmarried | Men | 37,678 | 22,830 | 61\% | 18,894 | 50\% | 83\% |
|  | Women | 47,574 | 32,604 | 69\% | 27,858 | 59\% | 85\% |
|  | Total | 85,252 | 55,433 | 65\% | 46,752 | 55\% | 84\% |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Married | Men | 57,192 | 43,061 | 75\% | 39,369 | 69\% | 91\% |
|  | Women | 56,335 | 43,172 | 77\% | 39,960 | 71\% | 93\% |
|  | Total | I \\| 3,527 | 86,233 | 76\% | 79,329 | 70\% | 92\% |
| Unmarried | Men | 41,625 | 25,181 | 60\% | 21,361 | 51\% | 85\% |
|  | Women | 50,920 | 34,897 | 69\% | 30,454 | 60\% | 87\% |
|  | Total | 92,545 | 60,078 | 65\% | 51,815 | 56\% | 86\% |

[^5]Figure 4: Composition of the Adult Citizen, Registered, and Voting Populations by Gender and Marital Status, 2008


Source: November 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote

## Age and Gender

This report categorizes respondents' ages into three groups: Under 30, 30 to 64, and 65 and Over.As shown in Figure 5, these age groups composed 21 percent, 61 percent, and 18 percent of the adult citizen population in 2008, respectively. However, the population voting in 2008 was skewed away from youth: the three age groups represented 17 percent, 64 percent, and 18 percent of the total population that voted. Had citizens between the ages of 18 and 29 voted at the same rate as those over 30 , an additional 7 million people would have voted in 2008.

Nonetheless, youth turnout was up in 2008. In fact, the 2008 election represents the first time in the history of the CPS that youth turnout has markedly increased while overall turnout did not. ${ }^{16}$

Table 8 presents the gender breakdown and totals for these three age groups for the past three presidential elections. Several observations stand out:

- Compared to 2000, turnout among voters under the age of 30 increased in each of the past two presidential cycles, although the increase from 2000 to 2004 ( 9 points) was greater than that of 2004 to 2008 (2 points).
- This increase in turnout, coupled with population growth, resulted in 6.5 million more votes from the Under 30 age group in 2008 than in 2000.
- The increase in turnout among younger citizens is more pronounced among women than men: the turnout rate increased by 12 percentage points for young women since 2000 and 9 points for young men.
- Of the three elections examined, the turnout rates for the remaining two age categories were highest in 2004, which was only slightly higher for seniors than in 2000 and 4 points higher for citizens between 30 and 64 years of age than in 2000. Comparing 2008 to 2004, these groups appeared to have held even in their turnout rates or even experienced a slight decline.
- Women, as noted above, generally have a higher turnout rate than men. However, this does not hold true in the 65 and Over age group. The voting rate for senior men was 3 percentage points higher than that of senior women in 2008, although this gap has shrunk by a percentage point or two in each of the presidential elections since 2000.

Table 8: Adult Citizen Population, Registration, and Voting by Gender and Age, 2000, 2004, 2008

| Gender | Adult <br> Citizens | Registered | Registered <br> as $\%$ of <br> Adult Citizens | Voted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | | Voted |
| :---: |
| as \% of |
| Adult Citizens |$\quad$| Voted |
| :---: |
| as \% of |
| Registered |

2000

| Under 30 | Men | 19,250 | 10,026 | 52\% | 7,266 | 38\% | 72\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | 20,082 | II,554 | 58\% | 8,597 | 43\% | 74\% |
|  | Total | 39,332 | 21,581 | 55\% | 15,864 | 40\% | 74\% |
| 30 to 64 | Men | 55,902 | 39,334 | 70\% | 34,315 | 61\% | 87\% |
|  | Women | 59,317 | 43,686 | 74\% | 38,495 | 65\% | 88\% |
|  | Total | 115,219 | 83,020 | 72\% | 72,810 | 63\% | 88\% |
| 65 and Over | Men | 13,607 | 10,996 | 81\% | 9,961 | 73\% | 91\% |
|  | Women | 18,209 | 13,953 | 77\% | 12,192 | 67\% | 87\% |
|  | Total | 31,816 | 24,949 | 78\% | 22,153 | 70\% | 89\% |

2004

| Under 30 | Men | 20,324 | 11,535 | 57\% | 9,242 | 45\% | 80\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | 20,760 | 13,128 | 63\% | 10,882 | 52\% | 83\% |
|  | Total | 41,084 | 24,663 | 60\% | 20,125 | 49\% | 82\% |
| 30 to 64 | Men | 59,485 | 43,276 | 73\% | 38,606 | 65\% | 89\% |
|  | Women | 62,744 | 47,426 | 76\% | 43,081 | 69\% | 91\% |
|  | Total | 122,229 | 90,701 | 74\% | 81,686 | 67\% | 90\% |
| 65 and Over | Men | 14,338 | 11,596 | 81\% | 10,608 | 74\% | 91\% |
|  | Women | 19,354 | 15,109 | 78\% | 13,317 | 69\% | 88\% |
|  | Total | 33,692 | 26,706 | 79\% | 23,925 | $71 \%$ | 90\% |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 30 | Men | 21,886 | 12,620 | 58\% | 10,323 | 47\% | 82\% |
|  | Women | 21,959 | 14,174 | 65\% | 12,062 | 55\% | 85\% |
|  | Total | 43,844 | 26,794 | 61\% | 22,385 | 51\% | 84\% |
| 30 to 64 | Men | 61,233 | 43,324 | 71\% | 39,071 | 64\% | 90\% |
|  | Women | 64,701 | 48,093 | 74\% | 44,168 | 68\% | 92\% |
|  | Total | 125,934 | 91,417 | 73\% | 83,239 | 66\% | 91\% |
| 65 and Over | Men | 15,699 | 12,297 | 78\% | 11,335 | 72\% | 92\% |
|  | Women | 20,596 | 15,803 | 77\% | 14,184 | 69\% | 90\% |
|  | Total | 36,294 | 28,100 | 77\% | 25,519 | 70\% | 91\% |

Source: November 2000, 2004, and 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote; numbers are in 1000's

Figure 5: Composition of the Adult Citizen, Registered, and Voting Populations by Age Group, 2008


Source: November 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote

## Gender, Age, and Race

Tables $9 a$ and $9 b$ are more complex than the other tables, but they allow for important elaboration on the makeup of the population that went to the polls in 2008. ${ }^{17}$ The main story of the change in the composition of the 2008 voting population is the phenomenal increase in turnout among minority youth, particularly Black youth. Comparable data for 2004 are included in Appendix Tables $3 a$ and 3b. Figure 6 also shows turnout rates for both 2004 and 2008 for some groups. (Standard errors of difference for the comparisons in Figure 6 are available on the page for this report on Project Vote's website.)

Comparing 2004 to 2008, the most significant story for voter registration is the increase in rates among non-White youth (defined here as those under 30 years of age):

- The registration rate increased remarkably between the two elections for young Black men (by about 8 percentage points), young Latinos (about 6 points for both genders), and Asians (approximately 5 points for men and 14 points for women). (However, see notes $I$ and 18 on page 31.)
- Despite these increases, Black women under 30 are the only minority group that had a voter registration rate higher than that of their age cohorts who are White. (While Black women between 30 and 64 had a higher registration rate than White men between 30 and 64, White women between 30 and 64 had an even higher registration rate. Regarding Multi-racial citizens, see note 17 on page 31 .)
- Interestingly, there was a decline of roughly two percentage points in registration across all three age groups for White men between 2004 and 2008.

Regarding voter turnout in 2008, White senior men (i.e., those aged 65 and over) had the highest rate in 2008: 75 percent. White and Black women 30 and over fell between 4 to 6 percentage points behind White senior men in 2008, depending on the specific age and race category of women. However, White and Black women 30 and over did vote at a rate several points higher than that of White men between 30 and 64 . Some other observations:

- Among youth,White, Black,Asian, and Latino women have higher voting rates than their male counterparts. This gender gap declines with age, however, and reverses among the elderly for Whites, Asians and Latinos, but not for Blacks.
- Among youth, Black women (64 percent) voted at the highest rate. White women had the second highest turnout (56 percent) and Black men the third highest rate ( 52 percent). Less than half of Asians and Latinos under 30 voted.
- The gender difference in turnout among young voters-particularly young minority voters-is an area in need of additional study. For instance, the 12 point gap in turnout between Black women and men in the Under 30 age group is remarkable.

When comparing turnout in 2004 to that in 2008, the following observations stand out:

- As previously mentioned, there was no substantial change in the national turnout rate of 64 percent between 2004 and 2008. However, there was a decline of I percentage point in turnout among Whites overall, coming almost entirely from declines in turnout among White men.


## Gender, Age, and Race

Table 9a: Adult Citizen Population and Registration by Gender, Age, and Race, 2008
Adult

Citizens $\quad$\begin{tabular}{c}
Men <br>
Registered

 

Registered <br>
as\% of <br>
Adult Citizens
\end{tabular}

Adult

Citizens \begin{tabular}{c}
Women <br>
Registered

 

Registered <br>
as \% of <br>
Adult Citizens
\end{tabular}

White

|  | Under 30 | 14,734 | 8,734 | 59\% | 14,447 | 9,523 | 66\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 30 to 64 | 45,563 | 33,38I | 73\% | 46,974 | 35,969 | 77\% |
|  | 65 and Over | 12,917 | 10,445 | 81\% | 16,687 | 13,162 | 79\% |
|  | Total | 73,214 | 52,56 I | 72\% | 78,107 | 58,654 | 75\% |
| Black |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Under 30 | 2,964 | 1,766 | 60\% | 3,320 | 2,252 | 68\% |
|  | 30 to 64 | 6,661 | 4,555 | 68\% | 8,332 | 6,211 | 75\% |
|  | 65 and Over | 1,187 | 874 | 74\% | 1,857 | 1,401 | 75\% |
|  | Total | 10,812 | 7,195 | 67\% | 13,510 | 9,864 | 73\% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Under 30 | 714 | 323 | 45\% | 738 | 425 | 58\% |
|  | 30 to 64 | 2,310 | 1,362 | 59\% | 2,554 | 1,427 | 56\% |
|  | 65 and Over | 484 | 245 | 51\% | 615 | 296 | 48\% |
|  | Total | 3,508 | 1,929 | 55\% | 3,907 | 2,148 | 55\% |
| Latino |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Under 30 | 2,939 | 1,487 | 51\% | 2,935 | 1,648 | 56\% |
|  | 30 to 64 | 5,753 | 3,397 | 59\% | 5,765 | 3,690 | 64\% |
|  | 65 and Over | 928 | 601 | 65\% | 1,217 | 785 | 64\% |
|  | Total | 9,620 | 5,486 | 57\% | 9,917 | 6,122 | 62\% |
| Native American |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Under 30 | 124 | 63 | 51\% | 165 | 80 | 48\% |
|  | 30 to 64 | 354 | 190 | 54\% | 410 | 290 | 71\% |
|  | 65 and Over | 60 | 47 | 79\% | 92 | 73 | 79\% |
|  | Total | 539 | 301 | 56\% | 667 | 443 | 66\% |
| Multi-racial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Under 30 | 410 | 247 | 60\% | 353 | 246 | 70\% |
|  | 30 to 64 | 592 | 439 | 74\% | 666 | 507 | 76\% |
|  | 65 and Over | 123 | 85 | 69\% | 127 | 86 | 68\% |
|  | Total | 1,124 | 771 | 69\% | I,147 | 839 | 73\% |

[^6]Table 9b: Adult Citizen Voting by Gender,Age, and Race, 2008

Voted \begin{tabular}{c}
Men <br>
Voted <br>
as \% of <br>
Adult Citizens

 

Voted <br>
as $\%$ of <br>
Registration
\end{tabular}

| Voted | Women <br> Voted <br> as \% of <br> Adult Citizens | Voted <br> as \% of <br> Registration |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |

White

|  | Under 30 | 7,158 | 49\% | 82\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 30 to 64 | 30,186 | 66\% | 90\% |
|  | 65 and Over | 9,644 | 75\% | 92\% |
|  | Total | 46,988 | 64\% | 89\% |
| Black |  |  |  |  |
|  | Under 30 | 1,548 | 52\% | 88\% |
|  | 30 to 64 | 4,216 | 63\% | 93\% |
|  | 65 and Over | 800 | 67\% | 92\% |
|  | Total | 6,565 | 61\% | 91\% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander |  |  |  |  |
|  | Under 30 | 255 | 36\% | 79\% |
|  | 30 to 64 | 1,172 | 51\% | 86\% |
|  | 65 and Over | 232 | 48\% | 95\% |
|  | Total | 1,659 | 47\% | 86\% |


| 8,057 | $56 \%$ | $85 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 33,160 | $71 \%$ | $92 \%$ |
| 11,837 | $71 \%$ | $90 \%$ |
| 53,055 | $\mathbf{6 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ |
|  |  |  |

Black

Latino

| Under 30 | 1,112 | $38 \%$ | $75 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| 30 to 64 | 2,956 | $51 \%$ | $87 \%$ |
| 65 and Over | 542 | $58 \%$ | $90 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 , 6 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 4 \%}$ |


| 1,281 | $44 \%$ | $78 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | :--- |
| 3,195 | $55 \%$ | $87 \%$ |
| 659 | $54 \%$ | $84 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{5 , 1 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 4 \%}$ |

## Native American

| Under 30 | 38 | $31 \%$ | $61 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| 30 to 64 | 148 | $42 \%$ | $78 \%$ |
| 65 and Over | 40 | $68 \%$ | $86 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 \%}$ |


| 44 | $27 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 252 | $61 \%$ | $87 \%$ |
| 65 | $71 \%$ | $90 \%$ |
| 361 | $54 \%$ | $82 \%$ |

Multi-racial

| Under 30 | 212 | $52 \%$ | $86 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| 30 to 64 | 393 | $66 \%$ | $90 \%$ |
| 65 and Over | 76 | $62 \%$ | $89 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{6 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 8 \%}$ |


| 220 | $62 \%$ | $89 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | :--- |
| 440 | $66 \%$ | $87 \%$ |
| 69 | $54 \%$ | $80 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{7 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 7 \%}$ |

Source: November 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote; numbers are in 1000's

## Gender, Age, and Race

- Asians and Pacific Islanders over the age of 30 also appear to show a decline in turnout. However, this variation over time may be due to how samples in the CPS were taken. ${ }^{18}$
- However, the gains in turnout between 2004 and 2008 among non-White youth are remarkable. Black men and Asian women under 30 had II point increases in turnout. Meanwhile, Black women and Asian men under 30 exhibited a 7 point increase. Finally, both Latino men and women under 30 had a 5 point increase.

Of course, it remains to be seen if these changes persist over time. If non-White youth return to the voting rates of prior periods, or show significantly larger declines compared to Whites in upcoming midterm elections, much of the recent gains in representation of traditionally underrepresented populations will disappear.

Figure 6: Turnout by Gender, Age, and Race, 2004 and 2008


[^7]
## Income and Education

Tables 10 and II display the income and education skew in the population that votes. The income question in the CPS, while not particularly precise, is meant to capture the total annual income of all members sharing a household. Instead of providing continuous data on income, the CPS places respondents into one of over a dozen household income categories. In Table 10 we collapse these income categories into five broader categories that roughly divide the adult citizen population into income quintiles. ${ }^{19}$

In 2008, citizens in the top income category (households with annual incomes of $\$ 100,000$ or more) had a registration rate 20 percentage points higher than those in the lowest income category (households with incomes below $\$ 25,000$ a year) and a turnout rate that was 25 points higher.

Table IO: Adult Citizen Population, Registration, and Voting by Annual Household Income, 2008

| Household Income, Approximate Quintiles | Adult Citizens | $\underset{\%}{\text { Column }}$ | Registered | Registered as \% of Adult Citizens | Voted | Voted as \% of Adult Citizens | Voted as \% of Registered |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than \$25,000/year | 32,982 | 20\% | 21,520 | 65\% | 17,831 | 54\% | 83\% |
| \$25,000 to \$39,999 | 28,060 | 17\% | 20,130 | 72\% | 17,412 | 62\% | 86\% |
| \$40,000 to \$59,999 | 29,795 | 18\% | 22,445 | 75\% | 20,058 | 67\% | 89\% |
| \$60,000 to \$99,999 | 39,548 | 24\% | 31,836 | 81\% | 29,377 | 74\% | 92\% |
| \$100,000 and over | 33,245 | 20\% | 28,112 | 85\% | 26,391 | 79\% | 94\% |
| Total Reporting | 163,63 I | 100\% | 124,044 | 76\% | I I I,069 | 68\% | 90\% |

Source: November 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote; numbers are in 1000's

Figure 7: Composition of the Adult Citizen, Registered, and Voting Populations by Annual Household Income


As shown in Figure 7, citizens from households with incomes below $\$ 25,000$ a year made up 20 percent of the adult citizen population in 2008 reporting income, yet they made up only 16 percent of the voters reporting income. Meanwhile, citizens from households with annual incomes of $\$ 100,000$ or more also made up 20 percent of the population, but made up 24 percent of the vote. If the 33 million citizens in the lowest income quintile had voted at the same rate as those in the highest quintile, approximately 8.4 million more people would have participated in the election. (Since nearly one-fifth of households did not report their income, this likely undercounts the number of voters that could be gained if turnout reached parity.)

Table I I: Adult Citizen Population, Registration, and Voting by Education, 2000, 2004, 2008

|  | Adult Citizens | Column \% | Registered | Registered as \% of Adult Citizens | Voted | $\begin{gathered} \text { Voted as } \\ \text { \% of } \\ \text { Adult Citizens } \end{gathered}$ | Voted as \% of Registered |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less Than a High School Diploma | 26,586 | 14\% | 13,890 | 52\% | 10,213 | 38\% | 74\% |
| High School Graduates, No College | e 62,426 | 34\% | 39,869 | 64\% | 32,749 | 53\% | 82\% |
| Some College or Associate Degree | 52,800 | 28\% | 38,700 | 73\% | 33,339 | 63\% | 86\% |
| Bachelor's Degree or Higher | 44,554 | 24\% | 37,090 | 83\% | 34,526 | 78\% | 93\% |
| Total | 186,366 | 100\% | 129,549 | 70\% | 110,826 | 60\% | 86\% |
| 2004 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less Than a High School Diploma | 25,669 | 13\% | 13,569 | 53\% | 10,131 | 40\% | 75\% |
| High School Graduates, No College | 63,690 | 32\% | 42,180 | 66\% | 35,894 | 56\% | 85\% |
| Some College or Associate Degree | 56,494 | 29\% | 43,434 | 77\% | 38,922 | 69\% | 90\% |
| Bachelor's Degree or Higher | 51,152 | 26\% | 42,888 | 84\% | 40,789 | 80\% | 95\% |
| Total | 197,005 | 100\% | 142,070 | 72\% | 125,736 | 64\% | 89\% |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less Than a High School Diploma | 22,981 | 11\% | 11,602 | 51\% | 9,046 | 39\% | 78\% |
| High School Graduates, No College | e 65,378 | 32\% | 41,880 | 64\% | 35,866 | 55\% | 86\% |
| Some College or Associate Degree | 60,974 | 30\% | 45,904 | 75\% | 41,477 | 68\% | 90\% |
| Bachelor's Degree or Higher | 56,739 | 28\% | 46,924 | 83\% | 44,755 | 79\% | 95\% |
| Total | 206,072 | 100\% | 146,311 | 71\% | 131,144 | 64\% | 90\% |

Source: November 2000, 2004, and 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote; numbers are in 1000's

Table I I condenses into four categories respondents' highest completed level of education. Although the educational composition of the adult citizen population is not changing rapidly, it is clearly becoming more educated. In 2000, 52 percent of the adult citizen population had completed "some college" or more. By 2008, 57 percent had completed the same level of education or higher. The difference in the voting rate between the least- and most-educated categories is startling: those with a four-year college degree or higher vote at a rate 40 percentage points higher than those with less than a high school diploma or equivalent. ${ }^{20}$ As a result, while those with less than a high school education make up II percent of the adult citizen population, they make up only 7 percent of the vote. (See Figure 8.)

Figure 8: Composition of the Adult Citizen, Registered, and Voting Populations by Education, 2008


[^8]
## Residential Mobility

It has long been known that the "big three" predictors of turnout are age, education, and length of time at current address. Tables $I 2 a$ and $I 2 b$ indicate the remarkable residential mobility of the U.S. population. Approximately one in eight adult citizens had moved in the year prior to the November survey.Although age is closely associated with residential mobility, multivariate analyses (not shown here) indicate that length of time at one's residence is still a powerful predictor of registration and turnout even after controlling for age and other factors. ${ }^{21}$

Table $12 a$ shows, for those reporting time at current address, the large gap in registration and turnout between those who were at their current address for less than one year compared to those with greater residential stability. ${ }^{22}$ Only 69 percent of those at their address for less than one year in 2008 were registered and only 57 percent voted. Meanwhile, for those at their address for five or more years, 85 percent reported that they were registered and 78 percent reported having voted.

Non-Whites, particularly Blacks and Multi-racial citizens, are less likely to have remained at their current address for five years or more (see Table $12 b$ ). Eighteen percent of Black and 19 percent of Multi-racial adult citizens reported in November 2008 that they were at their current address for less than I year.

Table I 2a: Adult Citizen Population, Registration, and Voting by Residency Length, 2008

| Length of Time at Current Address | Adult Citizens | $\underset{\%}{\text { Column }}$ | Registered | Registered as \% of Adult Citizens | Voted | Voted as \% of Adult Citizens | Voted as \% of Registered |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than I year | 23,804 | 13\% | 16,497 | 69\% | 13,580 | 57\% | 82\% |
| 1 to 4 years | 48,990 | 28\% | 38,005 | 78\% | 33,762 | 69\% | 89\% |
| 5 years or longer | 105,339 | 59\% | 89,805 | 85\% | 81,979 | 78\% | 91\% |
| Total Reporting | 178,132 | 100\% | 144,308 | 81\% | 129,320 | 73\% | 90\% |

Source: November 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote; numbers are in I000's

Table I2b: Residency Length and Race/Ethnicity, 2008

| Length of Time at Current Address | White | Column \% | Black | Column \% | Asian/PI | Column \% | Latino | Column \% | Native American | Column \% | Multiracial | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Column } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than I year | 16,366 | 12\% | 3,604 | 18\% | 713 | 12\% | 2,589 | 16\% | 162 | 15\% | 371 | 19\% |
| 1 to 4 years | 34,415 | 26\% | 6,445 | 33\% | 1,875 | 32\% | 5,358 | 32\% | 274 | 26\% | 623 | 31\% |
| 5 years or longer | 82,066 | 62\% | 9,762 | 49\% | 3,324 | 56\% | 8,566 | 52\% | 625 | 59\% | 996 | 50\% |
| Total Reporting | 132,846 | 100\% | 19,8 I I | 100\% | 5,912 | 100\% | 16,513 | 100\% | 1,060 | 100\% | 1,989 | 100\% |

Source: November 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote; numbers are in I000’s

## Disability

For the first time, the 2008 November CPS included a number of questions related to disability status. Six questions in the CPS now ask respondents if they have a disability related to hearing, sight, mental/ cognitive impairment, or various physical mobility limitations. While these questions likely undercount the prevalence of disability in the United States (as the survey does not cover all disability types and the CPS does not survey residents of group homes or other institutionalized housing), the questions do give us a glimpse into how disability relates to other demographic characteristics and to registration and voting.

As shown in Table 13, approximately one in eight adult citizens responded affirmatively to one or more of the six questions about disability status. This represents approximately 26 million adult citizens. ${ }^{23}$ While those reporting a disability on the CPS had only a slightly lower registration rate than those not reporting a disability ( 68 percent compared to 7 I percent), they were much less likely to vote ( 57 percent compared to 65 percent). A recent Government Accountability Office report found that 27 percent of polling places visited had potential impediments yet did not offer curbside voting for persons with disabilities. ${ }^{24}$

Had citizens reporting a disability voted at the same rate in 2008 as those not reporting a disability, approximately I .9 million additional voters would have participated.

Some additional preliminary findings (not shown in the table):

- Of those respondents reporting a disability who were not registered to vote, 26 percent said that their illness or disability was the main reason they were not registered. Only I percent of those not reporting a disability responded that an illness or disability was the main reason they were not registered.
- Of those reporting a disability that were registered to vote but did not vote, 44 percent stated that their illness or disability (or that of a family member) was the main reason they did not vote. Only 10 percent of the registered population that did not report a disability gave this as the main reason for not voting.
- While disability status increases markedly with age, approximately 4 percent of those in the Under 30 age group reported a disability and 10 percent of those in the 30 to 64 age group reported a disability.

Table I 3: Disability Status and Voting Behavior, 2008

| Disability <br> Status | Adult <br> Citizens | Column <br> $\%$ | Registered | Registered <br> as $\%$ of <br> Adult Citizens | Voted | Voted <br> as $\%$ of <br> Adult Citizens | Voted <br> as \% of <br> Registered |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disability | 25,654 | $12 \%$ | 17,479 | $68 \%$ | 14,704 | $57 \%$ | $84 \%$ |
| No Disability | 180,419 | $88 \%$ | 128,832 | $71 \%$ | 116,440 | $65 \%$ | $90 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 6 , 0 7 2}$ | $100 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 4 6 , 3 1 I}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 1 , 1 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ |

Source: November 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote; numbers are in I000's

## Conclusion

Using data from the Current Population Survey, Representational Bias in the 2008 Electorate has demonstrated important differences in the electoral participation rates of various social groups in 2008. While there have been some noticeable changes in recent election cycles-particularly increases in participation among minority youth and the unmarried-representation in registration and turnout is still skewed towards Whites and citizens with greater income, education, and residential stability. Moreover, citizens that are married, older, or that do not report a disability remain overrepresented among those registered and those voting.

It is worth noting that many non-Whites are present in disproportionate numbers in several of the groups we have examined. Table 14 presents the percent of adult citizens from each race and ethnic group that is included in the three categories mostly strongly associated with participation rates: education, age, and residential mobility. With a few exceptions, Table 14 reveals that the disadvantages that low educational attainment, youth, and residential mobility have on participation accrue more often to non-Whites than Whites.

The report has also shown that millions of additional Americans would have participated in the 2008 elections if citizens from various groups had registered and voted at the rates of those whose electoral participation is currently overrepresented. Moreover, looking towards 2010 , it remains to be seen if the recent increases in turnout for youth and non-Whites in presidential elections will be disproportionately erased by the declines usually seen in mid-term elections.

However, awareness of this possibility, and of the continuing growth in the size of the population eligible to register, means that both government officials and civic organizations will need to renew their commitment to assisting underrepresented populations in the coming year. Such efforts should include enforcing current registration and election laws (especially the National Voter Registration Act), reforming voter registration policies to increase registration access for these populations, and recognition of the vital importance of voter registration drives in reaching these underrepresented populations.

Table 14: Percent of Race/Ethnicity in Demographic Groups with Low Electoral Participation, 2008

| Race/Ethnicity | Highest Educational Attainment: <br> High School or Less | Age Group: <br> $\mathbf{1 8}$ to 29 Year Olds | Residency: <br> Less than 5 Years <br> at Current Address |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White | $40 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $46 \%$ |
| Black | $53 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $60 \%$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $30 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| Latino | $57 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $56 \%$ |
| Native American | $57 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $48 \%$ |
| Multi-racial | $37 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $56 \%$ |

## Notes

' Estimates of change for smaller populations, especially when further divided into genders, and changes that are small need to be read with caution as we do not present in this report the margins of errors of difference for comparing change across time. Moreover, changes in how the survey was administered between 2004 and 2008 may have affected the estimates for some groups. (See notes 17 and I8.) Standard errors of difference for some comparisons are provided on the page for this report on Project Vote's website.
${ }^{2}$ See Table A-I on the voting and registration page of the Census Bureau's website, available at: http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/ socdemo/voting/publications/historical/index.html
${ }^{3}$ See also this analysis by Women's Voices. Women Vote.: http://www. wvwv.org/assets/2009/I0/7/drop-off-voters.pdf.
${ }^{4}$ See http://www.projectvote.org for more information and resources on issues in election administration that present barriers to voter registration or otherwise disenfranchise eligible Americans from voting.
${ }^{5}$ See Rogers, Estelle. (2009). The NVRA at Fifteen:A Report to Congress, http://projectvote.org/images/publications/NVRA/THE\ NVRA\% 20at\%20FIFTEEN--A\%20Report\%20to\%20Congress.pdf by Estelle Rogers, and other resources and reports at www.projectvote.org.
${ }^{6}$ These drives did not all necessarily occur in 2008. Respondents presumably give the last method (which may have occurred in any year) for registering to vote or updating their registration.
${ }^{7}$ Rank ordering is based on rates rounded to the nearest decimal (not shown in the tables). Rankings are for broad comparisons only. Comparisons between states ranked closely together should be made with a separate calculation, not provided here: the margin of error of difference. The margins of error (using a 90 confidence interval) presented in Figure 2 are for the point estimates of individual states' voter registration rates.
${ }^{8}$ Ballot data from McDonald, Michael. (2009). "2008 General Elections Turnout Rate." Accessed on September 24, 2009. Available at http://elections.gmu.edu. For interesting thoughts on why reports of voting on the CPS and ballot totals nearly converged see Prof. McDonald's website.
${ }^{9}$ North Dakota has the highest registration rate, but it also has no voter registration requirement. It is likely that respondents recorded as unregistered did not complete the survey or did not understand registration laws in the state (and assumed they were not registered).
${ }^{10}$ See Table A5-a on the voting and registration page of the Census Bureau's website, available at: http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/ socdemo/voting/publications/historical/index.html.
" For examples of problems in how elections are administrated that affected millions of people when attempting to register or to vote see Ansolabehere, Stephen. (March II, 2009). "Testimony Before the Senate Rules Committee." Available at: http://rules.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Files. View\&FileStore_id=536048b6-2e97-4 I 93-8IIO-dI8d2e95e20I
${ }^{12}$ In this report, Latino includes respondents of any race that identified as Hispanic in the CPS. Thus, all other categories include nonLatinos. The category Asian and Pacific Islander includes Hawaiians, and the category Native American includes American Indians and Native Alaskans. How CPS respondents are categorized in this report differs from some previous reports by Project Vote and may differ from how other organizations or the Census Bureau categorizes respondents. This method is an attempt to place all respondents into our tables and is not meant to indicate that it is
the only or even preferred method. As the nation becomes more diverse, it will become increasingly difficult for analysts to simplify for presentation the self-selected identities of respondents.
${ }^{13}$ See note 2.
${ }^{14}$ See note 3.
${ }^{15}$ An exception to this gender difference is that elderly women participate at lower rates then elderly men (see the next section).
${ }^{16}$ See Table AI on the voting and registration page of the Census Bureau's website which uses 18 to 24 as the youngest age group instead of 18 to 30 as used in this report. Available at: http://www. census.gov/hhes/www/socdemo/voting/publications/historical/index. html
${ }^{17}$ Due to the unfortunately small sample sizes, which make estimates very unreliable, for the Multi-racial and Native American populations when looking at gender by race within age groups, we do not review those groups in this brief section (although data for all groups are reported in the tables).
${ }^{18}$ Specifically, the majority of Asians, Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders, and American Indians and Native Alaskans, live in a small number states and changes in CPS's sample frame (i.e., the areas within states from which samples are drawn) between 2004 and 2008 may influence results enough that comparisons over time for these groups should be made with caution (even if they were found to be statistically significant). See http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/ socdemo/voting/publications/p20/2006/sa2006.pdf.
${ }^{19}$ Due to non-reporting, nearly one-fifth of the records in the CPS do not contain income data; thus, the number of adult citizens in Table 6 is less than the number in other tables.
${ }^{20}$ Because education is closely related to age and many people without a high school education may be young, Project Vote also ran versions of this table (not shown here) for only adult citizens over various ages. While the voting rates rise for all groups, as expected, when younger citizens are excluded, the size of the voter turnout gap between those with less than a high school education and those with a four-year college degree remained very large (i.e., well over 30 points).
${ }^{21}$ See, for instance, Table 7 of the Census Bureau's "Voting and Registration in the Election of November 2006" at http://www.census. gov/prod/2008pubs/p20-557.pdf.
${ }^{22}$ Approximately one-eighth of the respondents in 2008 did not report information on residential mobility. Since the registration and turnout rates of those reporting time at current address are roughly 9 points higher than the registration and turnout rates for the total survey, the actual registration and turnout rates are likely lower than what is shown in these tables for some or all of the categories.
${ }^{23}$ See also Schur, Lisa and Kruse, Douglas. (2009). "Fact Sheet: Disability and Voter Turnout in the 2008 Election." Available at www. dmd-aapd.org/DVP/Full_9pg_2008_Voter_Turnout_Rutgers.doc.
${ }^{24}$ General Accountability Office. (September 2009). "Voters with Disabilities." Available at: http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d0994I.pdf

## Appendix

Appendix Table I:Adult Citizen Population and Registration by State, 2002, 2006

| State | Adult <br> Citizens | $2002$ <br> Registered | $\begin{gathered} \text { Registered } \\ \text { as \% of } \\ \text { Adult Citizens } \end{gathered}$ | Adult Citizens | 2006 <br> Registered | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Registered } \\ & \text { as \% of } \end{aligned}$ Adult Citizens |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alabama | 3,215 | 2,347 | 73\% | 3,353 | 2,480 | 74\% |
| Alaska | 418 | 303 | 73\% | 452 | 333 | 74\% |
| Arizona | 3,293 | 1,930 | 59\% | 3,828 | 2,378 | 62\% |
| Arkansas | 1,919 | 1,222 | 64\% | 2,004 | 1,316 | 66\% |
| California | 19,642 | 12,025 | 61\% | 21,250 | 13,239 | 62\% |
| Colorado | 2,959 | 1,976 | 67\% | 3,187 | 2,275 | 71\% |
| Connecticut | 2,385 | 1,679 | 70\% | 2,454 | 1,650 | 67\% |
| Delaware | 559 | 385 | 69\% | 603 | 408 | 68\% |
| District of Columbia | 389 | 295 | 76\% | 374 | 275 | 74\% |
| Florida | 11,043 | 7,290 | 66\% | 12,098 | 7,855 | 65\% |
| Georgia | 5,749 | 3,737 | 65\% | 6,086 | 3,950 | 65\% |
| Hawaii | 801 | 425 | 53\% | 893 | 492 | 55\% |
| Idaho | 916 | 567 | 62\% | 1,007 | 660 | 66\% |
| Illinois | 8,575 | 5,781 | 67\% | 8,383 | 5,779 | 69\% |
| Indiana | 4,593 | 2,829 | 62\% | 4,506 | 2,946 | 65\% |
| lowa | 2,071 | 1,495 | 72\% | 2,162 | 1,663 | 77\% |
| Kansas | 1,938 | 1,298 | 67\% | 1,938 | 1,274 | 66\% |
| Kentucky | 2,984 | 2,017 | 68\% | 3,052 | 2,240 | 73\% |
| Louisiana | 3,034 | 2,276 | 75\% | 3,006 | 2,179 | 73\% |
| Maine | 1,028 | 831 | 81\% | 1,023 | 811 | 79\% |
| Maryland | 3,583 | 2,377 | 66\% | 3,806 | 2,720 | 72\% |
| Massachusetts | 4,459 | 3,198 | 72\% | 4,395 | 3,180 | 72\% |
| Michigan | 7,323 | 5,291 | 72\% | 7,163 | 5,256 | 73\% |
| Minnesota | 3,634 | 2,888 | 80\% | 3,632 | 2,862 | 79\% |
| Mississippi | 1,982 | 1,400 | 71\% | 2,054 | 1,437 | 70\% |
| Missouri | 4,058 | 2,981 | 74\% | 4,276 | 3,170 | 74\% |
| Montana | 673 | 468 | 70\% | 729 | 512 | 70\% |
| Nebraska | 1,185 | 838 | 71\% | 1,239 | 852 | 69\% |
| Nevada | 1,371 | 775 | 57\% | 1,610 | 905 | 56\% |
| New Hampshire | 952 | 629 | 66\% | 985 | 687 | 70\% |
| New Jersey | 5,853 | 3,802 | 65\% | 5,563 | 3,487 | 63\% |
| New Mexico | 1,232 | 727 | 59\% | 1,346 | 951 | 71\% |
| New York | 12,417 | 8,261 | 67\% | 12,701 | 8,143 | 64\% |
| North Carolina | 5,675 | 3,662 | 65\% | 6,013 | 4,160 | 69\% |
| North Dakota | 484 | 405 | 84\% | 475 | 397 | 84\% |
| Ohio | 8,382 | 5,488 | 66\% | 8,319 | 5,919 | 71\% |
| Oklahoma | 2,452 | 1,656 | 68\% | 2,539 | 1,776 | 70\% |

(Appendix Table I continued)

| State | Adult Citizens | $2002$ <br> Registered | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Registered } \\ & \text { as \% of } \\ & \text { Adult Citizens } \end{aligned}$ | Adult Citizens | $2006$ <br> Registered | Registered as \% of Adult Citizens |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Oregon | 2,451 | 1,718 | 70\% | 2,680 | 1,924 | 72\% |
| Pennsylvania | 9,093 | 5,762 | 63\% | 9,234 | 5,991 | 65\% |
| Rhode Island | 735 | 495 | 67\% | 733 | 536 | 73\% |
| South Carolina | 2,900 | 1,972 | 68\% | 3,043 | 1,986 | 65\% |
| South Dakota | 567 | 428 | 76\% | 569 | 445 | 78\% |
| Tennessee | 4,078 | 2,587 | 63\% | 4,414 | 2,828 | 64\% |
| Texas | 12,976 | 8,591 | 66\% | 14,406 | 9,676 | 67\% |
| Utah | 1,442 | 928 | 64\% | 1,641 | 932 | 57\% |
| Vermont | 483 | 341 | 71\% | 479 | 345 | 72\% |
| Virginia | 4,858 | 3,063 | 63\% | 5,123 | 3,402 | 66\% |
| Washington | 4,134 | 2,901 | 70\% | 4,405 | 3,090 | 70\% |
| West Virginia | 1,372 | 827 | 60\% | 1,389 | 873 | 63\% |
| Wisconsin | 3,975 | 2,744 | 69\% | 4,071 | 2,948 | 72\% |
| Wyoming | 368 | 240 | 65\% | 383 | 253 | 66\% |
| Totals | 192,656 | 128,154 | 67\% | 201,073 | 135,847 | 68\% |

Source: November 2002 and 2006 CPS; analysis by Project Vote; numbers are in I000's

## Appendix

Appendix Table 2: Voter Turnout by State, 2002, 2006

|  |  | 2002 |  |  | 2006 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| State | Voted | $\begin{gathered} \text { Voted } \\ \text { as \% of } \\ \text { Adult Citizens } \end{gathered}$ | Voted as \% of Registered | Voted | Voted as \% of Adult Citizens | Voted as \% of Registered |
| Alabama | 1,585 | 49\% | 68\% | 1,667 | 50\% | 67\% |
| Alaska | 230 | 55\% | 76\% | 248 | 55\% | 75\% |
| Arizona | 1,397 | 42\% | 72\% | 1,777 | 46\% | 75\% |
| Arkansas | 888 | 46\% | 73\% | 911 | 45\% | 69\% |
| California | 8,355 | 43\% | 69\% | 10,104 | 48\% | 76\% |
| Colorado | 1,483 | 50\% | 75\% | 1,730 | 54\% | 76\% |
| Connecticut | I, 134 | 48\% | 68\% | 1,220 | 50\% | 74\% |
| Delaware | 253 | 45\% | 66\% | 275 | 46\% | 68\% |
| District of Columbia | 207 | 53\% | 70\% | 187 | 50\% | 68\% |
| Florida | 5,334 | 48\% | 73\% | 5,343 | 44\% | 68\% |
| Georgia | 2,431 | 42\% | 65\% | 2,672 | 44\% | 68\% |
| Hawaii | 63 | 45\% | 85\% | 388 | 43\% | 79\% |
| Idaho | 425 | 46\% | 75\% | 523 | 52\% | 79\% |
| Illinois | 4,014 | 47\% | 69\% | 3,968 | 47\% | 69\% |
| Indiana | 1,856 | 40\% | 66\% | 2,053 | 46\% | 70\% |
| lowa | 1,053 | 51\% | 70\% | 1,180 | 55\% | $71 \%$ |
| Kansas | 944 | 49\% | 73\% | 901 | 47\% | $71 \%$ |
| Kentucky | 1,367 | 46\% | 68\% | 1,508 | 49\% | 67\% |
| Louisiana | 1,527 | 50\% | 67\% | 1,201 | 40\% | 55\% |
| Maine | 594 | 58\% | 72\% | 595 | 58\% | 73\% |
| Maryland | 1,826 | 51\% | 77\% | 2,145 | 56\% | 79\% |
| Massachusetts | 2,340 | 53\% | 73\% | 2,434 | 55\% | 77\% |
| Michigan | 3,684 | 50\% | 70\% | 4,088 | 57\% | 78\% |
| Minnesota | 2,450 | 67\% | 85\% | 2,375 | 65\% | 83\% |
| Mississippi | 855 | 43\% | 61\% | 879 | 43\% | 61\% |
| Missouri | 2,134 | 53\% | 72\% | 2,310 | 54\% | 73\% |
| Montana | 363 | 54\% | 78\% | 435 | 60\% | 85\% |
| Nebraska | 546 | 46\% | 65\% | 634 | 51\% | 74\% |
| Nevada | 585 | 43\% | 75\% | 686 | 43\% | 76\% |
| New Hampshire | 485 | 51\% | 77\% | 477 | 48\% | 69\% |
| New Jersey | 2,504 | 43\% | 66\% | 2,406 | 43\% | 69\% |
| New Mexico | 547 | 44\% | 75\% | 731 | 54\% | 77\% |
| New York | 5,417 | 44\% | 66\% | 5,402 | 43\% | 66\% |
| North Carolina | 2,537 | 45\% | 69\% | 2,422 | 40\% | 58\% |
| North Dakota | 279 | 58\% | 69\% | 259 | 54\% | 65\% |
| Ohio | 3,652 | 44\% | 67\% | 4,408 | 53\% | 74\% |
| Oklahoma | 1,201 | 49\% | 73\% | 1,174 | 46\% | 66\% |

(Appendix Table 2 continued)

| State | 2002 |  |  | 2006 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Voted | $\begin{gathered} \text { Voted } \\ \text { as \% of } \\ \text { Adult Citizens } \end{gathered}$ | Voted as \% of Registered | Voted | Voted as \% of Adult Citizens | Voted as \% of Registered |
| Oregon | 1,359 | 56\% | 79\% | 1,601 | 60\% | 83\% |
| Pennsylvania | 3,925 | 43\% | 68\% | 4,394 | 48\% | 73\% |
| Rhode Island | 372 | 51\% | 75\% | 431 | 59\% | 80\% |
| South Carolina | 1,353 | 47\% | 69\% | 1,376 | 45\% | 69\% |
| South Dakota | 375 | 66\% | 87\% | 358 | 63\% | 80\% |
| Tennessee | 1,897 | 47\% | 73\% | 2,003 | 45\% | $71 \%$ |
| Texas | 5,283 | 41\% | 61\% | 5,526 | 38\% | 57\% |
| Utah | 631 | 44\% | 68\% | 603 | 37\% | 65\% |
| Vermont | 256 | 53\% | 75\% | 273 | 57\% | 79\% |
| Virginia | 1,808 | 37\% | 59\% | 2,431 | 48\% | $71 \%$ |
| Washington | 2,097 | 51\% | 72\% | 2,346 | 53\% | 76\% |
| West Virginia | 507 | 37\% | 61\% | 513 | 37\% | 59\% |
| Wisconsin | 1,999 | 50\% | 73\% | 2,352 | 58\% | 80\% |
| Wyoming | 198 | 54\% | 83\% | 199 | 52\% | 79\% |
| Totals | 88,903 | 46\% | 69\% | 96,119 | 48\% | $71 \%$ |

Source: November 2002 and 2006 CPS; analysis by Project Vote; numbers are in I000's

## Appendix

Appendix Table 3a: Adult Citizen Population and Registration by Gender, Age, and Race, 2004

|  |  | Adult Citizens | Men <br> Registered | $\begin{gathered} \text { Registered } \\ \text { as \% of } \\ \text { Adult Citizens } \end{gathered}$ | Adult Citizens | Women <br> Registered | Registered as \% of Adult Citizens |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| White |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Under 30 | 13,860 | 8,465 | 61\% | 13,982 | 9,159 | 66\% |
|  | 30 to 64 | 45,58। | 34,469 | 76\% | 46,803 | 36,593 | 78\% |
|  | 65 and Over | 12,007 | 9,937 | 83\% | 15,925 | 12,696 | 80\% |
|  | Total | 71,448 | 52,870 | 74\% | 76,7II | 58,448 | 75\% |
| Black |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Under 30 | 2,722 | 1,399 | 51\% | 3,134 | 2,105 | 67\% |
|  | 30 to 64 | 6,287 | 4,311 | 69\% | 7,924 | 5,829 | 74\% |
|  | 65 and Over | 1,070 | 825 | 77\% | 1,730 | 1,304 | 75\% |
|  | Total | 10,079 | 6,536 | 65\% | 12,788 | 9,237 | 72\% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Under 30 | 724 | 291 | 40\% | 722 | 318 | 44\% |
|  | 30 to 64 | 2,092 | 1,107 | 53\% | 2,175 | 1,250 | 57\% |
|  | 65 and Over | 375 | 214 | 57\% | 493 | 259 | 52\% |
|  | Total | 3,190 | 1,612 | 51\% | 3,390 | 1,827 | 54\% |
| Latino |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Under 30 | 2,510 | 1,125 | 45\% | 2,426 | 1,221 | 50\% |
|  | 30 to 64 | 4,596 | 2,739 | 60\% | 4,823 | 3,039 | 63\% |
|  | 65 and Over | 734 | 495 | 67\% | 999 | 689 | 69\% |
|  | Total | 7,840 | 4,359 | 56\% | 8,248 | 4,949 | 60\% |
| Native American |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Under 30 | 121 | 43 | 35\% | 162 | 100 | 62\% |
|  | 30 to 64 | 329 | 208 | 63\% | 396 | 246 | 62\% |
|  | 65 and Over | 55 | 45 | 81\% | 72 | 50 | 69\% |
|  | Total | 505 | 296 | 59\% | 630 | 396 | 63\% |
| Multi-racial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Under 30 | 387 | 211 | 54\% | 334 | 225 | 67\% |
|  | 30 to 64 | 601 | 441 | 73\% | 622 | 470 | 75\% |
|  | 65 and Over | 98 | 81 | 83\% | 135 | 112 | 83\% |
|  | Total | 1,086 | 733 | 68\% | 1,091 | 807 | 74\% |

[^9]Appendix Table 3b:Voter Turnout by Gender, Age, and Race, 2004
Voted \(\left.\begin{array}{ccc}Men \& <br>
Voted <br>
as \% of \& Voted <br>
as \% of <br>

Adult Citizens\end{array}\right]\)| Registered |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

Voted \begin{tabular}{ccc}
Women \& <br>
Voted <br>
as \% of <br>
Adult Citizens

$\quad$

Voted <br>
as \% of <br>
Registered
\end{tabular}

White

|  | Under 30 | 6,895 | 50\% | 81\% | 7,676 | 55\% | 84\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 30 to 64 | 31,065 | 68\% | 90\% | 33,509 | 72\% | 92\% |
|  | 65 and Over | 9,140 | 76\% | 92\% | 11,281 | 71\% | 89\% |
|  | Total | 47,101 | 66\% | 89\% | 52,466 | 67\% | 89\% |
| Black |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Under 30 | 1,127 | 41\% | 81\% | 1,770 | 56\% | 84\% |
|  | 30 to 64 | 3,794 | 60\% | 88\% | 5,255 | 66\% | 90\% |
|  | 65 and Over | 732 | 68\% | 89\% | 1,120 | 65\% | 86\% |
|  | Total | 5,654 | 56\% | 86\% | 8,145 | 64\% | 88\% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Under 30 | 210 | 29\% | 72\% | 259 | 36\% | 81\% |
|  | 30 to 64 | 948 | 45\% | 86\% | 1,112 | 51\% | 89\% |
|  | 65 and Over | 188 | 50\% | 88\% | 227 | 46\% | 88\% |
|  | Total | 1,346 | 42\% | 84\% | 1,598 | 47\% | 87\% |
| Latino |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Under 30 | 824 | 33\% | 73\% | 928 | 38\% | 76\% |
|  | 30 to 64 | 2,259 | 49\% | 82\% | 2,588 | 54\% | 85\% |
|  | 65 and Over | 427 | 58\% | 86\% | 561 | 56\% | 81\% |
|  | Total | 3,510 | 45\% | 64\% | 4,077 | 49\% | 82\% |
| Native American |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Under 30 | 28 | 23\% | 65\% | 72 | 45\% | 72\% |
|  | 30 to 64 | 175 | 53\% | 84\% | 198 | 50\% | 81\% |
|  | 65 and Over | 41 | 74\% | 92\% | 39 | 54\% | 78\% |
|  | Total | 244 | 48\% | 82\% | 309 | 49\% | 78\% |
| Multi-racial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Under 30 | 158 | 41\% | 75\% | 177 | 53\% | 79\% |
|  | 30 to 64 | 364 | 61\% | 82\% | 420 | 67\% | 89\% |
|  | 65 and Over | 79 | 81\% | 98\% | 89 | 66\% | 80\% |
|  | Total | 601 | 55\% | 82\% | 686 | 63\% | 85\% |

[^10]
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[^0]:    Source: November 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote

    * Because 90 percent or more of those registered vote in presidential elections, the nationwide composition of those who are not registered and those who are not voting are often approximately equal.
    ** This new measure in the CPS may undercount the disabled population. (See page 29.)

[^1]:    Source: November 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote

[^2]:    Source: November 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote; numbers are in I000's

[^3]:    Source: November 2000, 2004, and 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote; numbers are in 1000's

    * Respondents were not able to select more than one race in 2000.

[^4]:    Source: November 2000, 2004, and 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote; numbers are in I000's
    *Due to rounding, the difference between 2004 and 2008 for women appears larger than it actually is, while the difference for men appears smaller than it actually is. For greater detail and standard errors of difference, see this report's page on http://www.projectvote.org.

[^5]:    Source: November 2000, 2004, and 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote; numbers are in 1000's

[^6]:    Source: November 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote; numbers are in 1000's

[^7]:    Source: November 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote

[^8]:    Source: November 2008 CPS; analysis by Project Vote

[^9]:    Source: November 2004 CPS; analysis by Project Vote; numbers are in 1000's

[^10]:    Source: November 2004 CPS; analysis by Project Vote; numbers are in I000's

