To:Interested PartiesFrom:Ben Deufel, Vice President of Innovation, Learning and ImpactRe:New American Majority Geographic and Demographic OpportunitiesDate:April 25, 2022

In the past year, VPC and CVI commissioned a team of social science researchers to size the gaps and opportunities in voter turnout and registration of the New American Majority, which includes people of color, young people, and unmarried women. The research team included Professor Bernard L. Fraga, Professor Zachary Peskowitz, and Caitlin Gilbert. They have provided impressive data and analysis underscoring the importance of VPC and CVI's work to engage the New American Majority (NAM) in democracy in equal proportion to their presence in society through voter registration, mobilization, and education.

These data and the research improve our understanding of three critical dimensions:

- 1. Locating where NAM voting eligible populations are largest, and where they are growing most. Fraga and team's work reveals population trends and forecasts at the state and county-level from 2010 to 2030 for the New American Majority and sub-groups using census data.
- 2. **Providing estimates of voter turnout and gaps compared to non-NAM groups.** The researchers' work examines turnout by race and age over the past decade at the state level. It is a robust analysis that not only includes the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS), but also combines census population estimates with voter file data.
- 3. **Highlighting registration opportunities for the NAM.** Along with turnout, this research allows for understanding states with low relative registration by age and race.

This memo highlights key findings from Fraga, Peskowitz, and Gilbert's study and VPC and CVI's review of their data, including trends and facts about NAM population and turnout.¹ It also highlights metrics to identify opportunities to support NAM turnout and registration across states, and it is accompanied by a spreadsheet to enable further analysis.

Key Findings Include:

- NAM share of potential voters is sizable everywhere, over half the citizen voting-age population in 39 states and D.C., and no less than 40% in the rest. Continued growth in many states in the years ahead will add to these numbers.
- The share of NAM in some counties is very large, and some counties also show especially high growth rates, making geographic targeting efforts especially effective to boosting electoral representation.

¹ In addition to Fraga and his colleagues, special thanks to colleagues from VPC/CVI: **Yi Wu** for his skilled analysis and data work that made this possible and **John Malloy** for expert guidance on voter file data. Additionally, while Fraga and team's work critically shaped our learnings, mistakes of inference or fact here are VPC/CVI's alone. Please note that some of the figures have been updated since Fraga and team's report. These differences are not substantive, and this memo and the accompanying data have the most up-to-date figures.

• Unfortunately, analysis of voter file and census figures indicates bigger turnout gaps between the NAM and non-NAM than previously thought, making VPC and CVI's missions, along with the work of allied organizations, more important than ever.

voterparticipation

CENTER

CENTER FOR

voterinformation

- Additionally, while NAM turnout has increased in recent elections, sometimes dramatically, generally non-NAM turnout has increased as much or more in recent elections. Unfortunately, higher turnout does not necessarily equal greater representation.
- A promising exception to these voting turnout trends is Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (AAPI) and young people's turnout, which has increased markedly over the past few elections, increasing their representation in the electorate.
- While some states offer greater opportunities, in all states NAM are underrepresented in ways that should greatly concern advocates of democracy. Efforts to boost electoral representation are needed in all states, even those more supportive of voting in policies and processes.
- The biggest opportunities within a state to increase NAM electoral representation varies. In some states, NAM gaps in turnout are largest among people of color, while in others young people's turnout shows larger opportunities. Additionally, while registration opportunities correlate with turnout gaps at the state-level, some states show voter registration to be a unique challenge.
- Five states–Alaska, Hawaii, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas– show especially high opportunity on all dimensions of NAM turnout and registration efforts given sizable NAM population share and large gaps in turnout and registration across both age and race and ethnicity.

Democracy works best when those who participate reflect the population as a whole. As this work underscores, the NAM are underrepresented in the share of Americans who cast ballots but make up the strong majority of Americans.² This project not only illuminates the challenge in detail, but it provides a resource for those who share VPC and CVI's critical mission of increasing NAM electoral representation.

VoterParticipation.org 202-659-9570 1707 L St NW, Washington, DC 20036

² It is also vital to note that these demographic categories are broad and have a tremendous diversity of individuals within them, including identities, views, and socioeconomic factors impacting their lives. A full understanding of these trends and efforts to boost representation requires deeper analysis, and it is important to recognize the strong limits of this kind of demographic analysis in terms of what it reveals. The reliance on these large categories reflects their social meaningfulness in politics and policy as well as the confidence we can place in the empirical findings given available modeling and data.

voterparticipation

The New American Majority: A Large, Growing Share of the Citizen Voting-Age Population

The NAM continues to be a large, growing share of the voting eligible population. Fraga and team estimate the NAM was 61% of the citizen voting-age population in 2020, and it is expected to continue to grow (increasing from 57% in 2010 to a forecast of 63% in 2030). Within this growth is an increasing share of people of color, from 49% of the NAM in 2010 to 60% in 2030.

The NAM Population varies across states, but it is sizable in every state. As Figure 1 reveals, the South and West generally have the highest shares of NAM. At the same time, NAM share is at least half the population in 39 states and D.C., and no less than 40% in the rest.

Figure 1: New American Majority Share of Citizen Voting-Age Population in 2020

				ND							ME	
WA	ID	МТ	SD	MN	WI	MI	NY		VT	MA	NH	
OR	UT	WY	NE	IA	IL	IN	ОН	PA	СТ	NJ		
СА	NV	со	ок	KS	МО	KY	WV	DE	DC	RI	N	M % Share of of Citizen
	AZ	NM	ТХ	AR	TN	VA	NC	MD			Vo	oting-Age Population
					MS	A1	GA	90				43.4 to 48.8
	1			LA	IVIO	AL	UA.	50				53.0 to 59.2
AK		HI						FL				59.3 to 64.6
	I								I			64.7 to 85.5

VoterParticipation.org 202-659-9570 1707 L St NW, Washington, DC 20036

The NAM's growth is also widespread, with 19 states expected to see increases in NAM share of the population by at least 5 percentage points between 2010 and 2030 (see Figure 2). This growth includes states with the highest NAM populations as well as those with smaller populations. For example, Figure 2 shows we can expect more than 8 percentage point growth in NAM share in already-high NAM share states of California, Florida, Nevada, New Jersey, and Texas. At the same time, Connecticut and Rhode Island have relatively lower levels of NAM but show large increases as well, and bordering states of Massachusetts and New Hampshire are not far behind.

voterparticipation

CENTER

CENTER FOR

voterinformation





Within states, looking at county level figures shows sizable NAM variation, both in terms of absolute share of NAM as well as change over time. Almost all large counties (defined as 50,000 or greater population in 2020) have sizable shares of New American Majority, and over four-fifths of large counties are expected to show growth in the NAM share from 2010 to 2030. However, these figures can be much higher. About 22% of counties are more than 65% NAM, and about 9% of counties have a NAM proportion above 75%. In terms of change, just

VoterParticipation.org 202-659-9570 1707 L St NW, Washington, DC 20036

over 12% of counties are expected to see NAM share grow 8 percentage points or higher. Figures A1 and A2 in the appendix show the distribution of large counties in greater detail.

All these data point to a significant share of NAM in all states and almost all counties, even before expected growth in several places in the years ahead. Given these sizable shares, how the NAM participates in democracy has the potential to have large impacts in the years ahead. At the same time, the geographic concentration of NAM population and NAM growth at the county-level offers clear opportunities for geographic-focused efforts to register and turn out the New American Majority to boost their representation.

Sizable Recent Turnout Increases by the NAM; Large Turnout Gap Remains

Turnout among the NAM and non-NAM in Recent Elections

Population trends are only part of understanding electoral representation. Another key metric is the gap in turnout between the NAM and its sub-groups with the non-NAM. If the electorate matched the voting eligible population, the NAM's turnout would be the same.

Fraga and his colleagues applied two different approaches to help us understand gaps and trends in turnout with the New American Majority at multiple geographic levels. First, they analyzed the census bureau's Current Population Survey Voting and Registration Supplement (CPS). As they explain, this survey has a large sample size and time series. Given these attributes, demographic analyses of turnout commonly use this resource, and VPC and CVI have used it for analysis in the past.

However, Fraga and his colleagues also cite evidence that the CPS systematically overstates turnout of people of color relative to White people and that it underestimates the NAM population as well. As a result, this popular resource to explore demographic trends in turnout may understate gaps in NAM representation, a critical measure of our democracy's health.

To address these issues and provide a robust analysis, Fraga and his team also used voter file data combined with census estimates. This approach also allows for deeper analysis of NAM trends with smaller subgroups (e.g., race and age) as well as sub-state patterns.

Demographic estimates from the voter file and census data are not without limitations. Most demographic features (including race, age, and gender, depending on the state) on voter files are the result of model-driven estimates of individual voter characteristics. Because these models rely on personally identifiable information as well as consumer data, they can have higher levels of inaccuracy among less engaged and less prominent demographic subgroups. Specifically, in this memo, trends in voting by unmarried women - a key subgroup of the NAM -

VoterParticipation.org 202-659-9570 1707 L St NW, Washington, DC 20036

are not examined because of unresolvable limits in comparison between census and voter file definitions. Additionally, in every state, race and ethnicity estimates on the voter file are partially or fully derived from modeled estimates that rely in large part on first and last names, as well as geographic location and consumer data. While these voter file models validate at the aggregate level, the comparison of individual behavior amongst subgroups with less prominent differentiation in available data can be less exact. Because several states still have race as a primary data value on some records in many voter files, we have higher confidence in these comparisons than among unmarried women, but these caveats are still important to bear in mind when interpreting this analysis. Given all this, conclusions about trends in turnout by race and ethnicity benefit from viewing *both* the CPS and voter file/census data in concert.

Across data sources, the gaps in turnout of NAM versus non-NAM audiences are quite large. In 2020, the CPS data indicate 61% of the NAM turned out to vote compared to 75% of the non-NAM, a gap of 14 percentage points (pp). In 2018, the CPS data suggest NAM turnout was 46%, 19 pp lower than the non-NAM turnout rate (65%). These findings alone underscore the importance of VPC and CVI's work.

At the same time, analysis using voter file data suggests these gaps may be considerably bigger than the CPS estimates. For example, Figure 3 compares 2018 and 2020 figures from the CPS and voter file analysis by race and ethnicity. While the CPS sizes the gaps in turnout between people of color and White people at 12.5 pp in 2018 and 12.6 pp in 2020, voter file/census estimates show a much higher gap (22.9 pp in 2018 and 29.5 pp in 2020). Appendix Table A1 details these differences by race and ethnicity, and it shows the voter file estimates have much larger gaps than the CPS for Black and Latino turnout relative to White turnout.



202-766-6575 1707 L St NW, Washington, DC 20036

Figure 3: Turnout by Race/Ethnicity

Note: Differences may not sum because of rounding

1707 L St NW, Washington, DC 20036

6

Figure 4 shows similar patterns by age. The vote file/census estimates show a much steeper difference in turnout between younger and older voters than the CPS. Compared to voter file/census figures, CPS turnout is generally higher for younger people and lower for older people. For example, in 2018 the voter file/census figures indicate 22% turnout for those ages 18-24, compared to 32% in the CPS. In the same year, the voter file/census data indicates turnout of 72% among those ages 65+, compared to 66% for the CPS.

voterparticipation

CENTER

CENTER FOR

voterinformation

Figure 4: Turnout by Age



Turnout Trends in the Past Decade

Moving beyond the most recent elections, turnout gaps are not improving. While turnout within the NAM has generally increased, sometimes dramatically, turnout within the non-NAM has increased similar amounts or more. Surprisingly, higher recent turnout has *not* reduced turnout gaps.

VoterParticipation.org 202-659-9570 1707 L St NW, Washington, DC 20036

To illustrate, Figure 5 shares turnout by race and ethnicity using voter file/census estimates in recent presidential elections. All NAM racial and ethnic groups increased turnout from 2016 to 2020, and turnout among people of color increased 6 percentage points from 2016 to 2020. At the same time, White turnout increased about twice as much over the same period. Including the 2012 election reinforces this story, although the trend is complicated by relatively high Black turnout in 2012. AAPI turnout is notable for its increase over time, increasing 13 percentage points from 2016 to 2020 (47% to 60%) and 18 points from 2012 to 2020.

CENTER FOR

voterinformation



Figure 5: Turnout by Race/Ethnicity in Most Recent Presidential Elections

voterparticipation

CENTER

Appendix Table A2 shows turnout by race and ethnicity over the last decade and includes CPS estimates and midterm elections. The story is the same; the gaps do not get any better despite increasing turnout among people of color. With the exception of AAPI, gaps with White turnout have not diminished.

CENTER

voterparticipation

Examining turnout by age, the trends are more mixed. All age groups saw increased turnout, and the evidence suggests greater increases among younger voters. For example, Figure 6 shows turnout by age in the most recent presidential elections using voter file/census estimates. From 2012 to 2020, those ages 18 to 24 saw large increases in turnout rates from 30% in 2012 to 45% in 2020. Those ages 25 to 34 also saw large increases. In contrast, those ages 45 to 64 showed more muted gains, with increases in the rate of turnout in the single digits. One exception to the trend: those 65 and older saw similar increases as younger voters, reaching 83% in 2020. Midterm election trends and CPS data reinforce this pattern of a shrinking age gap in turnout because of greater increases in turnout among young people (see Table A3 in the appendix).

CENTER FOR

voterinformation



Figure 6: Turnout by Age in Most Recent Presidential Elections

VoterParticipation.org 202-659-9570 1707 L St NW, Washington, DC 20036

Unfortunately, gains in turnout among young people were not evenly realized. To illustrate, Figure 7 shows in presidential elections that these trends were not uniform by race and ethnicity. The gains among those ages 18 to 34 were concentrated among White and AAPI voters, which each increased turnout rates by 20 percentage points or more. Latino turnout among those 18 to 34 increased 13 points over the same period, while Black turnout for the same age group showed no clear trend. Fraga and team's report shows more detail, reinforcing this trend of White and AAPI turnout increasing most among young people, including in midterm elections.

voterparticipation

CENTER

CENTER FOR

voterinformation

Figure 7: Turnout by Race/Ethnicity among Ages 18-34 in Most Recent Presidential Elections



The implication is that one should not assume greater turnout enhances representation across the board, and it makes the work of VPC and CVI even more vital. The last decade is a mixed picture for New American Majority electoral representation. While AAPI turnout trends are a bright spot for NAM representation, and those within the NAM increased their turnout across the past decade a great deal, such increases at best kept pace with turnout growth within the non-NAM.

VoterParticipation.org 202-659-9570 1707 L St NW, Washington, DC 20036

NAM Opportunities in Turnout and Registration across All States

State-level analysis reveals significant geographic opportunities to boost representation in the electorate of the New American Majority. Three factors are informed by this study:

1. Population Size. This memo has already highlighted the first key factor. At the state and county-level, we have estimates of New American Majority population and sub-groups in 2020 and growth expected by 2030. Share of NAM within a state is important because it signals absolute opportunity for engagement and potential role in political voice. Figures 1 and 2 shown earlier highlight states of interest on these dimensions. Not shown here, but state differences in NAM share of the population are strongly predictive of 2030. In other words, the states that are highest in NAM share in 2020 are similar to those forecasted to be among the highest in 2030, so Figure 1 is a very good guide to key states from that perspective.

2. Turnout. In looking at state opportunities to boost turnout, the focus should be on both *absolute* turnout of the New American Majority as well as turnout of the NAM *relative* to non-NAM. States or places with low absolute turnout of the NAM offer higher opportunity for programs to register and mobilize. In turn, *relative* rates of turnout matter in terms of opportunity to close gaps in equality of political participation. These gaps are examined on two dimensions – age (those under 35 relative to those older) and race and ethnicity (people of color relative to White people).

3. Voter Registration. Identifying states with low voter registration of the NAM can illuminate the opportunity for registration efforts in particular states. Registration is trickier to compare across states because of varying practices in removing voters from the voting rolls. To somewhat control for these differences, one can examine the composition of registered voters relative to the citizen voting-age population. Specifically, the percentage of registered voters who are people of color are compared to the proportion of the citizen voting-age population was made for those under 35 years of age.

Figure 8 provides a summary at the state level of these turnout and registration factors using 2018 and 2020 voter file/census data.³ The top part of the figure shows turnout, and the bottom charts registration. For turnout, the presentation is simplified by combining the metrics together given their correlation with one another. However, for both turnout and registration, we break out people of color and younger people separately given fairly different patterns at the state level. For maps related to representation of people of color, only states with at least 100,000 people of color are given a value to provide for more reliable estimates.

³ For details on the metrics in Figure 8, see the Methods Note in the Appendix. Some state differences may be explained by state-level data differences. While we tried to anticipate these issues, further research may be useful.

voterinformation

Figure 8: Turnout and Registration Gaps and Opportunities by State





People of Color Relative Registration



Age 18-34 Turnout Gap



Age 18-34 Relative Registration



VoterParticipation.org 202-659-9570 1707 L St NW, Washington, DC 20036

The charts also show quite clearly that age gaps or opportunities across states are not strongly correlated with gaps on race and ethnicity. Colorado and Nevada, for example, rank much lower in gaps by age, but much higher when looking at differences in turnout between people of color and White people. Alabama and Mississippi rank a lot higher in terms of age turnout gaps, but less so when looking at race and ethnicity.

In contrast, Figure 8 shows that registration and turnout gaps are strongly related across states. There is a strong correlation between turnout gaps and relative registration by race and ethnicity, and registration gaps by age also predict turnout gaps by age.⁴

Even here, though, turnout and registration gaps are not one-to-one. As Figure 8 shows, Louisiana and Washington, DC, for example, are places with higher relative gaps on registration compared to turnout. Alabama's large opportunity with younger voters shows up especially strong on relative registration.

While states show variation in relative opportunities in terms of population size, turnout, and registration, it is worth noting five states that reveal high opportunity (or gaps) on every factor: Alaska, Hawaii, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas.

Even though there are large differences in relative opportunities between states, with some deserving special focus, the NAM are significantly underrepresented *everywhere*. For example, in 2020 the *smallest* gap in turnout rates between people of color and White people was 14 percentage points in South Carolina, and the average gap was 30 percentage points. The largest gap was in Hawaii at 59 percentage points. The smallest gap between those under 35 years old versus those 35 and over in 2020 was 15 percentage points in California, while the average was 27 points. The largest gap was 52 points in New Hampshire. Every state has large opportunities for NAM voter mobilization; some just have larger opportunities.

The implication is that even in states with laws and resources that are relatively more supportive of voting, the work of VPC, CVI, and allied organizations remains crucial to reducing NAM gaps in electoral representation. These data inform a tailored approach in each state.

To assist with this, great detail and deeper dives into subgroups can be found by examining the accompanying spreadsheet. As an example of how these data can help, Figure 9 provides two cases in point among the states mentioned above.

⁴ The Pearson product moment correlations of index scores are r= 0.82 for people of color Turnout Gap and people of color Relative Registration and r=0.85 for the corresponding age metrics. For details, see the methods note in the Appendix.

Figure 9: Cases in Point of States with the Biggest Opportunities to Support NAM Electoral Representation

Texas:

Nearly three out of four Texans in the citizen voting-age population (CVAP) are a member of the New American Majority. Among states, Texas ranks fifth in relative share of NAM in 2030 (75%) and 2020 (72%). Fully 33% of the CVAP are Latino, the second highest share after New Mexico.

Texas shows very large turnout gaps for the NAM, particularly when looking at people of color compared to White people. For example, people of color turned out 39% in 2020 in Texas, 8 points less than the national average across states for people of color and 45 points lower than White people in Texas. Texas is in the bottom half with regard to turnout for younger people, too. For example, there was a 29 percentage point gap in turnout in 2020 between those under 35 years old and those 35 and older.

Texas also shows lower relative registration rates, especially for people of color. People of color are 53% of the CVAP, but only 38% of registered voters. It also has among the most sizable age gaps compared to other states. Those under 35 are 32% of the CVAP but only 27% of registered voters.

Oklahoma:

Fully 61% can be expected to be members of the New American Majority by 2030, a slight increase from 59% in 2020. This places Oklahoma in the top half of states in terms of relative NAM population size.

Oklahoma has sizable gaps in terms of turnout, especially in absolute turnout. Turnout among people of color in 2020 was only 32% and 24% in 2018. The figures for young people were also low: 37% in 2020 and 19% in 2018. In terms of relative turnout, the gaps are generally similar to the average across states. However, this means turnout among White people was 33 points higher than people of color in 2020, and those 35+ in age turned out 27 points higher than those under 35.

Oklahoma shows relatively low registration rates for people of color and younger people. People of color are 30% of the CVAP, but only 18% of registered voters. Younger people are 30% of the CVAP, but 24% of registered voters.

Note: Turnout figures from voter file/census estimates.

VoterParticipation.org 202-659-9570 1707 L St NW, Washington, DC 20036

As this state-level analysis makes clear, this memo only scratches the surface of the possibilities with these data, and the need for continued and increased efforts to register and turnout the New American Majority. These data can be a resource for partners engaged in these efforts. For deeper detail on data, data sources, methods, and findings, VPC and CVI encourage review of Professor Fraga and team's accompanying report as well as the data spreadsheet.

VPC and CVI work to engage the NAM in democracy in equal proportion to their presence in society through voter registration, mobilization, and education. The data here underscore *why* this work is so important and renew our organizations' commitment to registering and turning out the New American Majority. VPC will continue to run registration, information, and turnout programs in the many key states where we have done this work for two decades. Additionally, tese data also guide our continued and expanded efforts. Based on this analysis, VPC's first step is piloting voter registration and turnout efforts in key counties in Oklahoma and Texas, to see if we can move the needle on New American Majority registration and turnout in elections. If we see success in this pilot program, VPC will continue to identify additional important geographies to expand our voter engagement work, and we hope partner groups can use this to increase support for their work in expanded geographies.

Appendix Tables

Figure A1: Share of NAM across Counties with at least 50,000 in Population in 2020



Number of Counties

VoterParticipation.org 202-659-9570 1707 L St NW, Washington, DC 20036





Number of Counties

Table A1: Turnout by Race/Ethnicity

	2018		203	20
	CPS	Voter File/ Census	CPS	Voter File/ Census
Turnout by Race/Ethnicity:				
People of Color	45.0%	34.8%	58.4%	47.9%
AAPI	40.3%	39.7%	59.3%	59.8%
Black	51.4%	40.4%	62.8%	52.2%
Latino	40.4%	29.9%	53.7%	43.1%
White	57.5%	57.7%	70.9%	77.4%
Differences:				
POC minus White	-12.5 pp	-22.9 pp	-12.6 pp	-29.5 pp
AAPI minus White	-17.1 pp	-18.0 pp	-11.7 pp	-17.6 pp
Black minus White	-6.1 pp	-17.3 pp	-8.1 pp	-25.2 pp
Latino minus White	-17.1 pp	-27.8pp	-17.2pp	-34.3 pp

Note: Differences may not sum because of rounding.

CENTER FOR voterinformation

Turnout:	Midterm	Elections:	Presidential Elections:			
	2014	2018	2012	2016		
CPS:						
People of Color	33.1%	45.0%	56.1%	52.7%	5	
ΔΔΡΙ	27 5%	10.3%	17 1%	18.8%	도	

Table A2: Turnout by Race/Ethnicity over Time

	2014	2018	2012	2016	2020
CPS:					
People of Color	33.1%	45.0%	56.1%	52.7%	58.4%
AAPI	27.5%	40.3%	47.1%	48.8%	59.3%
Black	40.6%	51.4%	66.6%	59.6%	62.8%
Latino	27.0%	40.4%	48.0%	47.6%	53.7%
White	45.8%	57.5%	64.1%	65.3%	70.9%
Differences in CPS:					
POC minus White	-12.7 pp	-12.5 pp	-8.0 pp	-12.6 pp	-12.6 pp
AAPI minus White	-18.3 pp	-17.1 pp	-17.1 pp	-16.5 pp	-11.7 pp
Black minus White	-5.2 pp	-6.1 pp	+2.5 pp	-5.7 pp	-8.1 pp
Latino minus White	-18.8 pp	-17.1 pp	-16.1 pp	-17.7 pp	-17.2 pp
Voter File/Census:					
People of Color	22.9%	34.8%	47.2%	42.2%	47.9%
ΑΑΡΙ	23.7%	39.7%	42.1%	46.6%	59.8%
Black	29.3%	40.4%	54.4%	48.3%	52.2%
Latino	17.0%	29.9%	35.8%	37.3%	43.1%
White	42.1%	57.7%	59.7%	65.5%	77.4%
Differences in VF/C:					
POC minus White	-19.1 pp	-22.9 pp	-12.4 pp	-23.3 pp	-29.5 pp
AAPI minus White	-18.4 pp	-18.0 pp	-17.5 pp	-18.9 pp	-17.6 pp
Black minus White	-12.8 pp	-17.3 pp	-5.3 pp	-17.2 pp	-25.2 pp
Latino minus White	-25.0 pp	-27.8 pp	-23.8 pp	-28.2 pp	-34.3 pp

Note: Differences may not sum because of rounding.

VoterParticipation.org 202-659-9570 1707 L St NW, Washington, DC 20036

voterparticipation

CENTER

CENTER FOR voterinformation

Table A3: Turnout by Age over Time							
Turnout:	Midterm	Elections:	Presi	Presidential Elections:			
	2014	2018	2012	2016	2020		
CPS:							
18-24	17.1%	32.4%	41.2%	43.0%	51.4%		
25-34	27.6%	42.1%	53.5%	53.1%	60.3%		
35-44	37.8%	51.0%	61.2%	60.2%	65.1%		
45-54	45.2%	57.0%	65.3%	65.3%	69.0%		
55-64	54.0%	61.8%	70.7%	67.9%	72.7%		
65+	59.4%	66.1%	72.0%	70.9%	74.5%		
Differences in CPS:							
18-24 minus 45-54	-28.1 pp	-24.6 pp	-24.0 pp	-22.4 pp	-17.6 pp		
25-34 minus 45-54	-17.7 pp	-14.8 pp	-11.8 pp	-12.2 pp	-8.7 pp		
Voter File/Census:							
18-24	9.8%	22.2%	29.7%	33.4%	45.2%		
25-34	18.2%	33.2%	41.6%	44.3%	52.6%		
35-44	28.8%	44.1%	52.7%	54.5%	64.1%		
45-54	39.7%	52.1%	61.9%	63.4%	70.3%		
55-64	51.2%	62.8%	69.5%	70.6%	75.3%		
65+	57.8%	72.0%	69.6%	72.1%	83.2%		
Differences in VF/C:							
18-24 minus 45-54	-29.9 pp	-29.9 pp	-32.2 pp	-30.0 pp	-25.0 pp		
25-34 minus 45-54	-21.5 pp	-18.9 pp	-20.3 pp	-19.1 pp	-17.7 pp		

Note: Differences may not sum because of rounding.

VoterParticipation.org 202-659-9570 1707 L St NW, Washington, DC 20036

Methods Note: Inputs into Figure 8

- Standardized scores were calculated for each state for each input into the chart. Not shown here, but this transformation normalizes all variables relative to the mean and standard deviation across states for the particular metric. For example, a state with an average metric will have a zero score, while a state one standard deviation above the mean will have a score equal to 1.
- States with a population of at least 100,000 for people of color are included in charts related to race and ethnicity to provide for more reliable estimates.
- Voter file/census data are used. It is worth noting that for some states turnout appears implausibly high for White voters. Given this, we examined CPS figures as inputs into "People of Color Turnout Gap" and found very similar rankings (quantitatively, the Pearson product-moment correlation in the rankings by state using the two different data sources is 0.65). The accompanying spreadsheet includes a table with both CPS and voter file/census data for comparison.

Calculating the "People of Color Turnout Gap":

- Inputs include:
 - Absolute turnout in 2018 of people of color (low absolute turnout indicates higher opportunity)
 - Absolute turnout in 2020 for people of color (low absolute turnout indicates higher opportunity)
 - The percentage point difference in turnout for people of color compared to White people in 2018 (bigger differences indicates higher gaps)
 - The percentage point difference in turnout for people of color compared to White people in 2020 (bigger differences indicates higher gaps)
- These inputs were averaged together to create an overall score.
- For the chart, these average scores were sorted into 5 bins from high to low.
- This summarization is supported by moderate to strong Pearson product-moment correlations of each of the inputs on a state level:
 - r = 0.89 between absolute turnout in 2018 and absolute turnout in 2020
 - \circ r = 0.96 between turnout differences between people of color and White people in 2018 and 2020
 - r = 0.48 between absolute turnout (averaging 2018 and 2020 scores) and differences in turnout (averaging 2018 and 2020)

Calculating the "Age 18-34 Turnout Gap":

- Inputs include:
 - $\circ~$ Absolute turnout in 2018 among those ages 18 to 34 (low absolute turnout indicates higher opportunity)
 - Absolute turnout in 2020 among those ages 18 to 34 (low absolute turnout indicates higher opportunity)
 - The percentage point difference in turnout for those ages 18 to 34 compared to those who are older in 2018 (bigger differences indicates higher gaps)
 - The percentage point difference in turnout for those ages 18 to 34 compared to those who are older in 2020 (bigger differences indicates higher gaps)
- These inputs were averaged together to create an overall score.
- For the chart, these average scores were sorted into five equal bins from high to low.
- This summary is supported by strong Pearson product-moment correlations of each of the inputs on a state level:
 - \circ r = 0.90 for absolute turnout in 2018 and absolute turnout in 2020
 - $\circ~$ r = 0.83 for turnout differences between those ages 18 to 34 and those who were older 2018 and 2020
 - r = 0.63 for absolute turnout (averaging 2018 and 2020 scores) and differences in turnout (averaging 2018 and 2020)

Calculating the "People of Color Relative Registration":

- Input:
 - Percentage point difference at the state-level in 2020 of the share of citizen voting-age population who were people of color versus the share of registered voters who were people of color (higher differences indicate higher gaps/opportunity)
- For the chart, states were sorted into five equal-sized bins from high to low.

Calculating the "Ages 18-34 Relative Registration":

- Input:
 - Percentage point difference at the state-level in 2020 of the share of citizen voting-age population who were ages 18 to 34 versus the share of registered voters who were ages 18 to 34 (higher differences indicate higher gaps/opportunity)
- For the chart, states were sorted into five equal-sized bins from high to low.

VoterParticipation.org 202-659-9570 1707 L St NW, Washington, DC 20036