

**Voting Behavior of Naturalized Citizens: 1996-2010**

Sarah R. Crissey  
Thom File

U.S. Census Bureau  
Social, Economic and Housing Statistics Division  
4600 Silver Hill Rd  
Washington, DC 20233

Please direct all correspondence to:  
Thom File  
Thomas.a.file@census.gov  
301.763.5124

Keywords  
Voting, citizenship, naturalization, immigration

*This report is released to inform interested parties of (ongoing) research and to encourage discussion (of work in progress). The views expressed on (statistical, methodological, technical, or operational) issues are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the U.S. Census Bureau. A previous version of this paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America New Orleans, LA April 16-19, 2008.*

**Voting Behavior of Naturalized Citizens: 1996-2010**

## ABSTRACT

In 2010, 35.8 million foreign-born adults lived in the United States, including 16.9 million naturalized citizens. Research documents that naturalized citizens are less likely to register and vote than native citizens. Since Bass and Casper's (2001) baseline national estimates from the 1996 Current Population Survey (CPS), the number of naturalized citizens has doubled. Given population changes and the increasing political debate over immigration, we explore how nativity influenced voting behavior from 1996 to 2010. Using the Voting and Registration Supplement to the CPS, which surveys about 80,000 adults every other November, we address whether naturalized citizens continue to be less likely to register and vote, and whether the nativity status effect is consistent across time and in both presidential and congressional elections. Our regression results suggest that, net of social and demographic factors, naturalized citizens are less likely to register and vote than native citizens across all years. We find evidence that the magnitude of the nativity association has increased over the course of the fourteen-year period – particularly for presidential elections. Furthermore, we find tentative evidence that nativity may have a stronger effect on voting behavior in congressional versus presidential elections.

## INTRODUCTION

According to the 2010 Current Population Survey, approximately 38.7 million foreign-born persons live in the United States, with 17.5 million naturalized citizens. Naturalized citizens age 18 and over can participate in the political process, but research

suggests that they are less likely to register and vote than native citizens (Bass & Casper 2001; Casper & Bass 1998; Cassel 2002; Cho 1999; Day & Holder 2004; DiSipio, Masouka, & Stout 2006; Garcia 2003; File 2008; File & Crissey 2010; Holder 2006; Hero 1992; Jamieson, Shin, & Day 2002; Manza & Brooks 1999). Explanations for the nativity gap vary, but a broad theoretical framework of political participation suggests that citizens who are connected to and invested in society are more likely to participate in political endeavors such as voting (Brady, Cogan, & Fiorina 2000; Campbell, Gurin, & Miller 1960; Cho 2006; Lazarfeld, Berelson, & Gaudet 1948; Lipset 1980; Putman 2000), while groups such as immigrants – who are potentially less connected and invested – are less likely to participate (Alba & Nee 1997; Cain, Kiewet & Uhlaner 1991; DeSipio 1996). Political scholarship highlights the consistent importance of social predictors of voting behavior, despite year-to-year variability in registration and voting rates (Jackson & Carsey 1999; Manza & Brooks 1999). Researchers cite socioeconomic characteristics, emerging cultural factors, and institutional barriers to participation – such as language differences – as reasons for the nativity gap in voting behaviors (Fraga & Segura 2006; Jackson & Carsey 1999; Jones-Correa 2005; Manza & Brooks 1999; Miller & Shanks 1996; Segura, Barreto, & Woods 2004; Segura, Nicholson, & Pantoja 2007; Xu 2005).

This research builds on the work of Bass and Casper (2001), which assessed naturalized citizens' registration and voting using the 1996 Current Population Survey,<sup>1</sup> and found that net of other factors, naturalized citizens were less likely to register and to vote than native citizens. Since the production of these baseline estimates, the U.S. population has added over 5 million new naturalized citizens (Rytina & Saeger 2005), while little scholarly work has been produced to assess the continued impact or size of

---

<sup>1</sup> In 1996 naturalization status was first available in the CPS during a presidential election year.

the nativity gap. Furthermore, the political debate about immigration has become increasingly heated, as have academic debates regarding whether hot-button ideological issues matter more than social factors in terms of predicting voting behavior. Given these changes in the population, the centrality of the immigration issue, and the continued debate concerning the causal impact of social factors as voting predictors, our research seeks to extend Bass and Casper's (2001) findings through the most recent election data from the CPS.

### RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

Our analyses address three research questions. First, net of other predictors of voting behavior, are naturalized citizens less likely to register and to vote in elections held in the last decade? Second, has the magnitude of the nativity status effect changed over this time span? Finally, does nativity status have the same effect in different types of elections, namely between presidential and congressional election? We hypothesize that, due to factors such as societal investment and barriers to voting, nativity will influence voting behavior across all years. For our second question, we speculate that as the naturalized citizen population increases and diversifies, the magnitude of the nativity effect will increase across election years. Finally, we hypothesize that nativity status will exert a stronger effect on participation in congressional elections since voter turnout is generally lower than in presidential elections, and is especially low for groups with large naturalized citizen populations (File, 2008; Holder, 2006).

## DATA AND METHODS

Data and Measures

*Data:* To explore these questions, we use data from the Current Population Survey (CPS) – a nationally representative survey of the civilian, non-institutionalized population administered monthly to a sample of approximately 72,000 housing units. Since 1964, the November CPS has included a bi-annual supplement on voting and registration to coincide with national congressional and presidential elections. This includes questions about voting, registration, mode and timing of voting, and reasons for not voting, and is asked of all household members who are U.S. citizens aged 18 and over, although the CPS has only gathered citizenship data in a consistent way since 1994. Our analyses use data from the eight November Voting Supplements collected from 1996 to 2010, with sample sizes ranging from about 77,000 to 89,000 unweighted cases (see Tables 2 and 3 for sample sizes for each year).<sup>2</sup>

*Dependent Variables:* We focus on two dependent variables: voter registration and voting. The first question in the supplement refers to voting in the most recent election and asks; “In any election some people are not able to vote because they are sick or busy or have some other reason, and others do not want to vote. Did (you/name) vote in the election held on Tuesday, November (date), (year)?” Respondents who say “no” are then asked the registration question: “(Were you/Was name) registered to vote in the November (day), (year) election?” We constructed a dichotomous variable for each

---

<sup>2</sup> The data in this report are from the 1996, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2004, 2006, 2008, and 2010 Voting supplements to the November Current Population Survey, and the estimates in it are based on responses from a sample of the population and may differ from actual values because of sampling variability or other factors. Further information about the source and accuracy of the estimates is available in Attachment 16 of [www.census.gov/apcd/techdoc/cps/cpsnov06.pdf](http://www.census.gov/apcd/techdoc/cps/cpsnov06.pdf). Full documentation can be found in the complete document.

outcome (1=yes, 0=no). Respondents who report “yes” for the voting question are coded as “yes” for registering to vote<sup>3</sup>. Table 1 shows the number and percentage of the adult citizen population who registered to vote and voted across each year.

*Independent Variables:* The focal independent variable is nativity status, which we operationalized as a dichotomous variable for whether the respondent was native or was foreign born and became a citizen via naturalization (1=naturalized, 0=ative). Table 1 displays the distribution of the native and naturalized citizens for the adult U.S. citizen population across survey years, as well as the distribution across the dependent variables. Apart from the nativity status variable, we also include a series of categorical independent variables long established for being related to voting behavior (Bass & Casper 2001). These include sex, race and Hispanic origin, marital status, educational attainment, employment status, occupation type, home ownership, duration of residence, and region of residence.<sup>4</sup> We also include continuous measurements for both age and income (as well as a dichotomous flag identifying imputed income values).

### Analytical Plan

We estimate multivariate models predicting the effect of nativity status on the two outcomes for each survey year. Due to the complex sampling design of the CPS, a normalized person weight and design-effects are used to adjust estimates and standard errors. Models for individual years address the first research question of whether, net of the control variables, nativity status is statistically significantly associated with the voting behavior outcomes. We address the second research question about variation in this association across time by testing whether the nativity status coefficients vary from each

---

<sup>3</sup> For all voting and registration questions in the CPS, respondents are able to offer proxy responses for other members of their household.

<sup>4</sup> See Tables 2 and 3 for omitted categories.

other across years within the same type of election. Finally, we address the third research question about the pattern of association between nativity status and voting across type of election, by comparing the results from the presidential elections to congressional election in proximate years.

## RESULTS

The descriptive statistics presented in Table 1 show the size of the total U.S. citizen population age 18 and over, by nativity status and year. Over this 14-year period, the population eligible to vote has increased from 180 million to 211 million as the number of naturalized citizens increased from around 8 million to 17 million<sup>5</sup>. While naturalized citizens comprised a small percentage of the population overall, the proportion of naturalized citizens in the voting population grew over this decade. In 1996, naturalized citizens represented about 5 percent of the adult citizen population. By 2010, this percentage had risen to about 8 percent. In each election year, a larger percentage of native citizens reported registering to vote and voting compared to naturalized citizens. For instance, in the most recent election of 2010, 66 percent of native citizens registered to vote, compared to 54 percent of naturalized citizens. In the same year, 46 percent of native citizens reported voting versus 37 percent of naturalized citizens. Naturalized citizens have also been growing as part of the voting population. They were four-percent of those who voted in 1998 and 7 percent in 2010.

The difference between turnout rates between natives and naturalized citizens expanded from 6 percent in 1996 to 12 points in 2006, before receding to 9 points in

---

<sup>5</sup> The estimates in this paper are based on responses from a sample of the population. As with all surveys, estimates may vary from the actual values because of sampling variation or other factors. All comparisons made in this paper have undergone statistical testing and are significant at the 95-percent confidence level unless otherwise noted.

2010. In sum, although naturalized citizens have grown as a part of the overall population and eligible electorate, they have not kept pace with the rest of the nation in terms of turnout.

Table 2 displays results from logistic regression analyses predicting voter registration across survey year.<sup>6</sup> In each year, naturalized citizens are less likely to vote than native citizens. For instance, in 1996 the odds that a naturalized citizen registered to vote were 36 percent less than the odds that a native citizen registered. In 2010, naturalized citizens were about half as likely to vote as native citizens. Table 3 displays these same analyses predicting reported voting. Similar to the findings for registration, net of control variables, naturalized citizens were less likely to vote across all years relative to native citizens. In 1996, naturalized citizens were about 25 percent less likely to vote than native citizens. In 2010, the odds that a naturalized citizen voted were only 59 percent of the odds that a native citizen voted.

Tables 4 and 5 display results of the statistical tests used to compare logistic regression coefficients across years. In these tables, cells marked with an asterisk indicate a statistical difference between the coefficients at the 95-percent confidence level. Our second research question asks about differences in the nativity effect over time and by election year. We address this question by comparing the magnitude of the naturalized citizen coefficient across years, but only within the same election type. The solid shaded cells in Tables 4 and 5 represent comparisons of presidential years, while the striped cells represent congressional years.

For registration models (Table 4), the magnitude (in terms of absolute values) of

---

<sup>6</sup> Results are displayed as odds ratios, with values above 1 indicating higher odds of registering to vote compared to the reference group and values below 1 indicating lower odds. An asterisk indicates that the odds ratio is statistically different from 1 at the 95-percent confidence level.



the 1996 presidential year coefficient was statistically smaller than only one other presidential year, 2008. This represented the only statistically significant difference in registration across presidential years. While there was a nominal increase in the magnitude of the coefficients across congressional elections, none of these differences reached statistical significance.

For voting models (Table 5), there were only two statistically significant differences between presidential years (1996 compared to 2008 and 2000 compared to 2008, respectively). For congressional years, meanwhile, there was only one statistically significant difference (between 1998 and 2006). For presidential elections, these results suggest that although there is not a strong voting or registration pattern emerging from one single election to another, over time there has been a cumulative increase in the magnitude of the citizenship status effect. This increased magnitude applies to both registration and voting, as significant differences occur between the earliest and most recent presidential elections on both outcomes. At the congressional level, evidence of this effect increase is not present for registration but does exist for voting.

The final research question addresses variation in the nativity effect by election type. In Tables 4 and 5, this research question is addressed in the top diagonal line of boxes (outlined in bold), by comparing across election type within proximate years. In the voter registration coefficients presented in Table 4, two comparisons in the diagonal are statistically different: 1996-1998 and 2004-2006. In these pairings, the absolute value of the congressional year coefficient is larger than the presidential year. This suggests that in these two comparisons, the effect of nativity on voter registration was stronger in congressional elections than presidential elections. The pattern of stronger effects in

congressional years was present in two comparisons in the models predicting voting (Table 5): 2000 – 2002 and 2004 – 2006. This suggests that the effect of nativity is generally stronger in congressional compared to presidential elections, although the effect was not consistently statistically significant.

### CONCLUSIONS

These results provide support for our first hypothesis that naturalized citizens are less likely to register and to vote compared to native citizens. This suggests that Bass and Casper's (2001) findings for nativity status and voting behaviors were not isolated to the 1996 election and that the effect of nativity status remains a relevant predictor of voting behavior across all elections since then. In the most recent election (2010), we found that naturalized citizens are about half as likely to register to vote, and about 40 percent less likely to vote compared to native citizens.

We also find support for our second hypothesis about the increasing importance of nativity over time. For presidential elections, in particular, there has been an overall increase in the magnitude of the nativity status effect for both voting and registration. Although a similar increase did not occur for congressional election registration, the same overall magnitude increase exists for congressional level voting. At a minimum, this suggests that the effect of nativity has increased for voting in both types of elections since 1996.

For our third hypothesis, we found tentative evidence of differences across election type. The magnitude of the nativity effect was at least as strong, if not more so, in congressional versus presidential years. However, established election research

suggests that congressional and presidential elections are not directly comparable, so these results should be interpreted with extreme caution.

Taken together, this research suggests that nativity status is an important determinant of voting behavior. Despite growth in the foreign-born population and the increased attention paid to immigration in American politics, naturalized citizens are not capitalizing on their rights as citizens to participate in the electoral process. In fact, they were less likely to do so in the most recent election than a decade ago. This finding correlates strongly with the recent literature that identifies social factors as consistently relevant predictors of electoral behavior.

## REFERENCES

- Alba, R. D. & Nee, V. (1997). Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration. *International Migration Review*, 31, 826-74.
- Bass, L. E. & Casper, L. M. (2001). Difference in the registration and voting between native-born and naturalized Americans. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 20, 483-511.
- Brady, D. W., Cogan, J. F. & Fiorina, M. P. (2000). *Continuity and change in house elections*. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.
- Cain, B. E., Kiewiet, R., & Uhlaner, C.J. (1991). The Acquisition of Partisanship Among Latinos and Asian Americans. *American Journal of Political Science*, 35 (2), 390-422.
- Campbell, A., Gurin, G. & Miller, W. E. (1960). *The American voter*. New York: Wiley.
- Casper, L. M. and Bass, L. E. (1998). *Voting and registration in the election of November 1996* (P20-504). Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- Cassel, C. A. (2002). Hispanic turnouts: Estimates from validated voting data. *Political Research Quarterly*, 55, 391-408.
- Cho, W.K. (1999). Naturalization, Socialization, Participation: Immigrants and (Non-) Voting. *The Journal of Politics*, 61 (4), 1140-1155.
- Cho, W.K. (2006). Residential Concentration, Political Socialization, and Voter Turnout. *The Journal of Politics*, 68 (1), 156-167.
- Day, J. & Holder, K. (2004). *Voting and registration in the election of November 2002*. (P20-552). Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- DeSipio, L. (1996). Making citizens or good citizens? Naturalization as a predictor of organizational and electoral behavior among Latino immigrants. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 18(2), 194-213.
- File, T. A. (2008). *Voting and registration in the election of November 2006*. (P20-557). Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- File, T. A. and Crissey, S. R. (2010). *Voting and registration in the election of November 2008*. (P20-562). Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- Fraga, L. R. & Segura, G. (2006). Culture clash? Contesting notions of American identity and the effects of Latin American immigration. *Perspectives on Politics*, 4(2), 279-287.

- Garcia, J. A. (2003). *Latino politics in America: Community, culture, and interests*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, Inc.
- Hero, R. (1992). *Latinos and the U.S. political system: Two-tiered pluralism*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Holder, K. (2006). *Voting and registration in the election of November 2004*. (P20-556). Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- Jackson, R. A. and Carsey, T. M. (1999). Group components of U.S. presidential voting across the states. *Political Behavior*, 21 (2), 123-151.
- Jacobson, G. C. (1990). *The electoral origins of divided government: Competition in U.S. house elections, 1946-1988*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Jamieson, A., Shin, H. B., & Day, J. (2002). *Voting and registration in the election of November 2000*. (P20-542). Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- Jones-Correa, M. (2005). Language provisions under the Voting Rights Act: How effective are they? *Social Science Quarterly*, 86, 549-564.
- Lazarfeld, P. F., Berelson, B. R. & Gaudet, H. (1948). *The people's choice*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lipset, S. M. 1980 [1960]. *Political man*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Manza, J. & Brooks, C. (1999). *Social cleavages and political change*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, W. E. & Shanks, J. M. (1996). *The new American voter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Putman, R.D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Rytina, N. F. & Saeger, C. (2005). *Naturalizations in the United States: 2004*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Office of Immigration Statistics.
- Segura, G., Barreto, M. & Woods, N. D. (2004). The mobilizing effect of majority-minority districts on Latino turnout. *American Political Science Review*, 98, 65-76.

Segura, G., Nicholson, S. P. & Pantoja, A. D. (2006). Explaining the Latino vote: Issue voting among Latinos in the 2000 presidential election. *Political Research Quarterly*, 59, 259-271.

Xu, J. (2005). Why do minorities participate less? The effects of immigration, education, and electoral process on Asian American voter registration and turnout. *Social Science Research*, 34, 682-702.

**Table 1. Voter Registration and Voting, by Nativity Status and Year**  
 (Numbers in  
 Thousands)

| Year |         | U.S. Citizen Population 18+ |         |             | Registered |         |             | Voting  |         |             |
|------|---------|-----------------------------|---------|-------------|------------|---------|-------------|---------|---------|-------------|
|      |         | Total                       | Native  | Naturalized | Total      | Native  | Naturalized | Total   | Native  | Naturalized |
| 1996 | Number  | 179,936                     | 171,713 | 8,223       | 127,611    | 122,431 | 5,180       | 105,017 | 100,623 | 4,334       |
|      | Percent |                             | 95.4    | 4.6         | 70.9       | 71.3    | 63.0        | 58.4    | 58.6    | 52.7        |
| 1998 | Number  | 183,451                     | 173,862 | 9,588       | 123,104    | 117,847 | 5,257       | 83,098  | 79,453  | 3,645       |
|      | Percent |                             | 94.8    | 5.2         | 67.1       | 67.8    | 54.8        | 45.3    | 45.7    | 38.0        |
| 2000 | Number  | 186,366                     | 175,679 | 10,687      | 129,549    | 123,337 | 6,212       | 110,826 | 105,420 | 5,406       |
|      | Percent |                             | 94.3    | 5.7         | 69.5       | 70.2    | 58.1        | 59.5    | 60.0    | 50.6        |
| 2002 | Number  | 192,656                     | 180,473 | 12,183      | 128,154    | 121,526 | 6,628       | 88,903  | 84,490  | 4,413       |
|      | Percent |                             | 93.7    | 6.3         | 66.5       | 67.3    | 54.4        | 46.1    | 46.8    | 36.2        |
| 2004 | Number  | 197,005                     | 183,880 | 13,125      | 142,070    | 134,039 | 8,030       | 125,736 | 118,693 | 7,042       |
|      | Percent |                             | 93.3    | 6.7         | 72.1       | 72.9    | 61.2        | 63.8    | 64.5    | 53.7        |
| 2006 | Number  | 201,073                     | 187,132 | 13,941      | 135,847    | 128,282 | 7,565       | 96,119  | 91,010  | 5,109       |
|      | Percent |                             | 93.1    | 6.9         | 67.6       | 68.6    | 54.3        | 47.8    | 48.6    | 36.6        |
| 2008 | Number  | 206,072                     | 190,683 | 15,390      | 146,311    | 137,001 | 9,310       | 131,144 | 122,839 | 8,305       |
|      | Percent |                             | 92.5    | 7.5         | 71.0       | 71.8    | 60.5        | 63.6    | 64.4    | 54.0        |
| 2010 | Number  | 210,800                     | 193,897 | 16,903      | 137,263    | 128,098 | 9,165       | 95,987  | 89,740  | 6,247       |
|      | Percent |                             | 92.0    | 8.0         | 65.1       | 66.1    | 54.2        | 45.5    | 46.3    | 37.0        |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, November Voting Supplements: 1996-2010.  
 Technical documentation for CPS is available at [www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cps-main.html](http://www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cps-main.html)

Voting Behavior of Naturalized Citizens 15

Table 2: Odds Ratios from Logistic Regressions Predicting Reported Voter Registration, by Year

|                                  | 1996    | 1998    | 2000    | 2002    | 2004    | 2006    | 2008    | 2010    |
|----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| <b>Nativity status</b>           |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Native born                      | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     |
| Naturalized                      | 0.64 ** | 0.53 ** | 0.56 ** | 0.50 ** | 0.56 ** | 0.48 ** | 0.50 ** | 0.46 ** |
| <b>Sex</b>                       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Female                           | 1.22 ** | 1.19 ** | 1.23 ** | 1.23 ** | 1.26 ** | 1.22 ** | 1.38 ** | 1.21 ** |
| <b>Age</b>                       | 1.03 ** | 1.03 ** | 1.03 ** | 1.03 ** | 1.03 ** | 1.03 ** | 1.03 ** | 1.03 ** |
| <b>Race</b>                      |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| White, non-Hispanic              | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     |
| Black, non-Hispanic              | 1.50 ** | 1.49 ** | 1.65 ** | 1.46 ** | 1.77 ** | 1.42 ** | 2.17 ** | 1.79 ** |
| Hispanic                         | 0.98    | 1.00    | 0.87 ** | 0.89 ** | 0.81 ** | 0.86 ** | 0.90 ** | 0.84 ** |
| Other, non-Hispanic              | 0.64 ** | 0.61 ** | 0.59 ** | 0.66 ** | 0.55 ** | 0.67 ** | 0.66 ** | 0.66 ** |
| <b>Marital status</b>            |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Never married                    | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     |
| Married                          | 1.20 ** | 1.43 ** | 1.41 ** | 1.42 ** | 1.19 ** | 1.28 ** | 1.24 ** | 1.47 ** |
| Widowed, divorced, separated     | 0.87 ** | 0.99    | 0.86 ** | 0.88 ** | 0.84 ** | 0.83 ** | 0.86 ** | 0.97    |
| <b>Education</b>                 |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| High school or less              | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     |
| Some college or more             | 2.92 ** | 2.61 ** | 2.86 ** | 2.69 ** | 3.00 ** | 2.65 ** | 3.17 ** | 2.83 ** |
| <b>Employment status</b>         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Employed                         | 1.18 ** | 1.25 ** | 1.19 ** | 1.30 ** | 1.26 ** | 1.32 ** | 1.29 ** | 1.44 ** |
| Not employed                     | 1.12 *  | 1.23 ** | 0.86 *  | 1.20 ** | 1.09    | 1.06    | 1.08    | 1.37 ** |
| Not in labor force               | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     |
| <b>Occupation</b>                |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Professional                     | 1.51 ** | 1.36 ** | 1.60 ** | 1.46 ** | 1.49 ** | 1.48 ** | 1.56 ** | 1.44 ** |
| Other                            | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     |
| <b>Income</b>                    | 1.12 ** | 1.09 ** | 1.11 ** | 1.08 ** | 1.12 ** | 1.09 ** | 1.14 ** | 1.09 ** |
| <b>Missing income</b>            | 0.94    | 0.86 ** | 0.90 ** | 0.92 ** | 0.92 *  | 0.88 ** | 0.88 ** | 0.92 ** |
| <b>Tenure</b>                    |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Owns                             | 1.31 ** | 1.36 ** | 1.24 ** | 1.29 ** | 1.32 ** | 1.30 ** | 1.20 ** | 1.29 ** |
| Rents                            | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     |
| <b>Length of time at address</b> |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Less than 1 year                 | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     |
| 1 to 4 years                     | 1.30 ** | 1.49 ** | 1.32 ** | 1.45 ** | 1.28 ** | 1.54 ** | 1.18 ** | 1.47 ** |
| 5 or more years                  | 1.96 ** | 2.31 ** | 1.85 ** | 2.19 ** | 1.73 ** | 2.31 ** | 1.68 ** | 2.16 ** |
| <b>Region of residence</b>       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| South                            | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     |
| Northeast                        | 0.99    | 1.00    | 1.02    | 0.97    | 1.06 +  | 0.91 ** | 0.99    | 0.96    |
| Midwest                          | 1.20 ** | 1.12 ** | 1.14 ** | 1.13 ** | 1.31 ** | 1.18 ** | 1.20 ** | 1.15 ** |
| West                             | 1.08 *  | 0.97    | 0.92 *  | 0.85 ** | 1.08 *  | 0.83 ** | 0.94 ** | 1.04    |
| N                                | 78,195  | 77,263  | 88,341  | 88,724  | 86,310  | 83,236  | 80,229  | 79,249  |
| Adjustment for design effect     | 1.44    | 1.65    | 1.66    | 1.73    | 1.66    | 1.61    | 1.61    | 1.58    |

Notes: \*\* p < .01, \* p < .05, + p < .10

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, November Voting Supplements: 1996-2010.

Technical documentation for CPS is available at [www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cps-main.html](http://www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cps-main.html)



Voting Behavior of Naturalized Citizens 16

Table 3: Odds Ratios from Logistic Regressions Predicting Reported Voting, by Year

|                                  | 1996    | 1998    | 2000    | 2002    | 2004    | 2006    | 2008    | 2010    |
|----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| <b>Nativity status</b>           |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Native born                      | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     |
| Naturalized                      | 0.74 ** | 0.69 ** | 0.71 ** | 0.62 ** | 0.66 ** | 0.58 ** | 0.61 ** | 0.59 ** |
| <b>Sex</b>                       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Female                           | 1.21 ** | 1.07 ** | 1.20 ** | 1.07 ** | 1.27 ** | 1.10 ** | 1.36 ** | 1.05 *  |
| <b>Age</b>                       | 1.03 ** | 1.04 ** | 1.03 ** | 1.04 ** | 1.03 ** | 1.04 ** | 1.03 ** | 1.04 ** |
| <b>Race</b>                      |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| White, non-Hispanic              | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     |
| Black, non-Hispanic              | 1.54 ** | 1.65 ** | 1.66 ** | 1.60 ** | 1.74 ** | 1.48 ** | 2.59 ** | 1.91 ** |
| Hispanic                         | 0.92 +  | 0.92 +  | 0.82 ** | 0.83 ** | 0.75 ** | 0.79 ** | 0.83 ** | 0.82 ** |
| Other, non-Hispanic              | 0.61 ** | 0.60 ** | 0.56 ** | 0.63 ** | 0.53 ** | 0.64 ** | 0.60 ** | 0.64 ** |
| <b>Marital status</b>            |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Never married                    | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     |
| Married                          | 1.21 ** | 1.30 ** | 1.40 ** | 1.31 ** | 1.19 ** | 1.20 ** | 1.21 ** | 1.34 ** |
| Widowed, divorced, separated     | 0.76 ** | 0.79 ** | 0.81 ** | 0.75 ** | 0.74 ** | 0.74 ** | 0.75 ** | 0.80 ** |
| <b>Education</b>                 |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| High school or less              | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     |
| Some college or more             | 2.73 ** | 2.40 ** | 2.80 ** | 2.47 ** | 2.97 ** | 2.43 ** | 3.05 ** | 2.39 ** |
| <b>Employment status</b>         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Employed                         | 1.16 ** | 1.17 ** | 1.18 ** | 1.20 ** | 1.25 ** | 1.24 ** | 1.26 ** | 1.20 ** |
| Not employed                     | 1.02    | 1.25 ** | 0.89 +  | 1.08    | 1.11 +  | 1.05    | 1.10 +  | 1.20 +  |
| Not in labor force               | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     |
| <b>Occupation</b>                |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Professional                     | 1.44 ** | 1.29 ** | 1.56 ** | 1.40 ** | 1.50 ** | 1.36 ** | 1.59 ** | 1.38 ** |
| Other                            | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     |
| <b>Income</b>                    | 1.14 ** | 1.10 ** | 1.15 ** | 1.09 ** | 1.14 ** | 1.10 ** | 1.14 ** | 1.11 ** |
| <b>Missing income</b>            | 0.95    | 0.94 +  | 0.95 +  | 0.97    | 0.88 ** | 0.93 ** | 0.92 ** | 1.02    |
| <b>Tenure</b>                    |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Owns                             | 1.34 ** | 1.36 ** | 1.26 ** | 1.41 ** | 1.38 ** | 1.41 ** | 1.21 ** | 1.35 ** |
| Rents                            | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     |
| <b>Length of time at address</b> |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Less than 1 year                 | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     |
| 1 to 4 years                     | 1.41 ** | 1.62 ** | 1.44 ** | 1.58 ** | 1.41 ** | 1.60 ** | 1.29 ** | 1.52 ** |
| 5 or more years                  | 1.91 ** | 2.42 ** | 2.00 ** | 2.27 ** | 1.81 ** | 2.29 ** | 1.76 ** | 2.22 ** |
| <b>Region of residence</b>       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| South                            | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     | REF     |
| Northeast                        | 1.15 ** | 1.18 ** | 1.12 ** | 0.97    | 1.19 ** | 1.13 ** | 1.07 *  | 1.06 +  |
| Midwest                          | 1.26 ** | 1.41 ** | 1.23 ** | 1.17 ** | 1.39 ** | 1.50 ** | 1.24 ** | 1.18 ** |
| West                             | 1.32 ** | 1.64 ** | 1.14 ** | 1.10 ** | 1.30 ** | 1.42 ** | 1.19 ** | 1.64 ** |
| N                                | 78,309  | 77,553  | 88,829  | 89,184  | 86,782  | 83,929  | 80,667  | 79,819  |
| Adjustment for design effect     | 1.44    | 1.65    | 1.66    | 1.73    | 1.66    | 1.61    | 1.61    | 1.58    |

Notes: \*\* p < .01, \* p < .05, + p < .10

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, November Voting Supplements: 1996-2010.

Technical documentation for CPS is available at [www.census.gov/apcd/techdoc/cps/cps-main.html](http://www.census.gov/apcd/techdoc/cps/cps-main.html)

**Table 4: Comparison of Logistic Regression Coefficients Predicting Reported Voter Registration, by Year**

| Year | Coefficient | 1996    | 1998    | 2000    | 2002    | 2004    | 2006    | 2008    | 2010    |
|------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|      |             | -0.4405 | -0.6439 | -0.5796 | -0.6892 | -0.5782 | -0.7352 | -0.6953 | -0.7772 |
| 1996 | -0.4405     |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 1998 | -0.6439     | *       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 2000 | -0.5796     |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 2002 | -0.6892     | *       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 2004 | -0.5782     |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 2006 | -0.7352     | *       |         | *       |         | *       |         |         |         |
| 2008 | -0.6953     | *       |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 2010 | -0.7772     | *       |         | *       |         | *       |         |         |         |

\*Coefficients are statistically different from each other at the 95-percent confidence level

Boxes shaded in solid reflect pairs of presidential election years, while those shaded in stripes are pairs of congressional election years. Boxes with no shading are pairs across election year type. The measures of error for these coefficients are roughly equivalent to those of the analogous odds ratios in Table 2.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, November Voting Supplements: 1996-2010.

Technical documentation for CPS is available at [www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cps-main.html](http://www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cps-main.html)

**Table 5: Comparison of Logistic Regression Coefficients Predicting Reported Voting, by Year**

| Year | Coefficient | 1996    | 1998    | 2000    | 2002    | 2004    | 2006    | 2008    | 2010    |
|------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|      |             | -0.2989 | -0.3740 | -0.3432 | -0.4790 | -0.4168 | -0.5525 | -0.4936 | -0.5338 |
| 1996 | -0.2989     |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 1998 | -0.3740     |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 2000 | -0.3432     |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 2002 | -0.4790     | *       |         | *       |         |         |         |         |         |
| 2004 | -0.4168     |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 2006 | -0.5525     | *       | *       | *       |         | *       |         |         |         |
| 2008 | -0.4936     | *       |         | *       |         | *       |         |         |         |
| 2010 | -0.5338     | *       |         | *       |         | *       |         |         |         |

\* Coefficients are statistically different from each other at the 95-percent confidence level

Boxes shaded in solid reflect pairs of presidential election years, while those shaded in stripes are pairs of congressional election years. Boxes with no shading are pairs across election year type. The measures of error for these coefficients are roughly equivalent to those of the analogous odds ratios in Table 3.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, November Voting Supplements: 1996-2006.

Technical documentation for CPS is available at [www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cps-main.html](http://www.census.gov/aprd/techdoc/cps/cps-main.html)