



National Study of Learning, Voting, and Engagement (NSLVE)

Student Voting Rates for

Amarillo College

OPEID # 003540.00

Thank you for participating in the National Study of Learning, Voting, and Engagement conducted by CIRCLE at the Jonathan M. Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service. Since NSLVE’s launch in January 2013, more than 260 campuses signed up to receive their student voting rates for 2012, providing CIRCLE with a solid foundation for growth and for national research on college and university student voting. The voting rate below reflects the proportion of your eligible students (US citizens age 18 and older) who actually voted in the 2012 election. These data are based on enrollment records your institution submitted to the National Student Clearinghouse ("Clearinghouse") on the date closest to the November 6, 2012 election and publicly available voting records collected by a company called Catalyst.

I. Your Institution’s Student Voter Registration and Voting Rates

Total student enrollment	9,016
Ineligible to vote because too young	89
Number of nonresident aliens	30
Number of students who registered	4,756
Number of students who voted	2,652
Registration rate	53%
Voting rate	30%
Rate of registered voters who voted	56%

For additional information about how data was collected and analyzed, see: [Campus Reports FAQ](#)

How precise are the estimates?


Catalist collects actual registration and voting records nationally. This data collection removes the usual sources of error that can arise from most other efforts to calculate voting rates: random sampling and reliance on people’s reports of whether they voted. However, several sources of error are still possible:

- 1) A number of your students blocked their records from being used for any purpose, including research. If those students voted at a much lower or higher rate than your other students, that affects the voting rate. The number of records blocked for your campus was: **22**


- 2) We assume students who are not found at all in the Catalist database are non-voters unless they are not US citizens. It is possible these students voted yet Catalist simply failed to identify them using the name and address combinations supplied by the Clearinghouse. This outcome is considered a matching error. This type of error can result in your real voting rate being higher than we report. We are not able to estimate how many students might be missed in this way, but there is no reason to think that the no-match rate varies from campus to campus.
- 3) We cannot adjust for resident aliens (non-US citizens living permanently in the US). If your campus serves a large population of non-US citizens and you know this number, you can recalculate your voting rate.

II. Student Attributes


Your students, broken down by undergraduate and graduate levels, voted at the following rates:




Your students, broken down in age groups, voted at the following rates:



Your students, broken down by gender, voted at the following rates:



Your students, broken down by race/ethnicity, voted at the following rates:




III. Field of study

Combined Fields of Study “Families”	Enrolled	Voted	Turnout
Business, Management, Marketing, and Related Support	836	270	32.3%
Liberal Arts and Sciences, General Studies and Humanities	982	344	35.0%
Health Professions and Related Sciences, Knowledge and Skills	3160	837	26.5%
Biological and Biomedical Sciences	228	68	29.8%
Social Sciences	15	4	26.7%
Education	491	171	34.8%
Engineering	306	92	30.1%
Psychology, Personal Awareness and Self-Improvement	187	65	34.8%
Visual and Performing Arts	255	83	32.5%
Communication, Journalism, and Related Programs	93	28	30.1%
Multi/Interdisciplinary Studies	0	0	n/a
Humanities	96	32	33.3%
Computer and Information and Library Sciences	206	62	30.1%
Physical Sciences	54	14	25.9%
Professions	282	75	26.6%
Trades	680	221	32.5%
Mathematics and Statistics	19	4	21.1%
Parks and Recreation	50	14	28.0%
Agriculture, Agriculture Operations, and Related Sciences	0	0	n/a
Technologies/Technicians	626	148	23.6%

IV. Voting method

Of your students who voted, they used the following methods:



*Note: If your campus has a high percentage of unknown voting method, this information is not reported by local officials.


V. Peer Comparison

We promised you comparison data, but because the comparisons are likely to change as more campuses participate, we’ve opted to post the information on the NSLVE web page rather than include multiple comparisons in each report. You can access this page here: [Comparison Group Resource](#).

On this page, you will find the range and average voting rate broken down by Carnegie Classification and affiliation with existing associations or consortia. Check the page periodically for updated information.

VI. Placing your numbers in context

Before NSLVE, college student voting could only be studied through student surveys, including the US Bureau of the Census' Current Population Survey (CPS). Relying on CPS data has some limitations. First, Census' measures of voting are self-reported: some people say that they voted when they did not. Second, the Census is a sample of the US population, and sampling always introduces some random error. Third, the Census does not ask individuals 25 and older whether they are currently enrolled in college. Bearing those caveats in mind, these are the voting and registration trends for current college students under age 25 since 1984, according to CPS:



Other relevant voting facts (CIRCLE Staff, 2013):

- Age matters, and young people vote at far lower rates than older cohorts
- Young women have consistently been more likely to vote than young men. In 2012, the gender gap in voting was 7 percentage points (with women ahead).
- In 2012, youth voter voting was highest in battleground states, showing that youth respond to increased political activity and being asked to vote.
- Participation in the 2012 Presidential Election differed by race & ethnicity. Young African Americans voted at the highest rate among any racial or ethnic group in 2012, at a rate of
- Level of education matters; people with college degrees and some college vote at higher rates than their non-college peers.

VII. What you can do with these numbers

Some campuses have asked what they might do to increase student political learning and engagement. We will be publishing more detailed recommendations and will notify all participating campuses when additional resources become available. In the meantime, however, you can take a closer look at a few specific activities on your campuses. Our recommendations are:

- Get political, not partisan. One challenge to political learning and engagement is fear on the part of the institution or individual faculty/staff members of claims of bias or indoctrination. Educators can provide students with a clear definition of "politics," citing it as an activity that can be deliberative, open, and nonpartisan (Dalton & Crosby, 2008).

- Increase political learning and engagement across the curriculum for all majors. Students are more likely to be politically engaged if they feel a personal connection to what's at stake. The best programs provide students with opportunities to engage in discussions about controversial public issues and opportunities to practice civil discourse and collaborative
- Ask. If you ask students to vote (or volunteer or any other form of civic and political engagement), they are more likely to participate (Graduate School of Political Management, 2006)
- Support experiential learning with political placements such as community organizing, working with candidates, and working on public issues.
- Increase student participation in diversity initiatives. Intergroup, cross-cultural interaction can foster lasting commitment to political participation (Kim, Anderson & Yamamura, 2008; Hurtado, S., 2005).
- Organize issue forums and other opportunities for political discourse and discussion to raise interest and commitment among students.
- Use residential halls as sites for teaching democracy (Weinberg, 2004).
- Students who are registered to vote are likely to vote (82%). Improving voter registration efforts on campus may help to increase voter turnout. Under the Higher Education Act (reauthorized 1998), colleges and universities are required to make a good faith effort to make voter registration materials widely available to students.

VIII. Looking Ahead: NSLVE 2014 and 2016

We continue to recruit campuses to build a national database and provide more robust comparison groups. Please reach out to your peer institutions and request that they participate in NSLVE. We will continue to measure voting rates for 2012, and look forward to 2014 data.

We will be working with specific campuses, conducting case studies and site visits to explore (for those with unpredicted high rates) what works and (for those with unpredicted low rates) barriers to voting.

As the number of participating campuses grows, we will analyze voting based on geography, institutional mission, student populations served, and more. We'll be looking for additional comparison and publishing findings.

We are aware that this round took a long time, from the date campuses signed up to the date of this report. We are working to streamline and even automate some of the analytics. Long term, we hope that the time between signing up and receiving reports will be weeks, not months.

We welcome your suggestions for improving NSLVE and for using the data. Please send comments to [Nancy Thomas](#).

References

CIRCLE Staff (2013) "The Youth Vote in 2012," CIRCLE Fact Sheet (Medford, MA: Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, 2013), at: <http://www.civicyouth.org/?p=5603>.

Dalton, J.C., and Crosby, P. (2008). "Student Voting and Political Engagement in College: Should Higher Education Be Doing More to Promote Civic Agency?" *Journal of College and Character*, 10(1):1940-

Graduate School of Political Management, George Washington University (2006) *Young Voter Mobilization Tactics*. Accessed on December 10, 2013 at: http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/Young_Voters_Guide.pdf.

Hurtado, S. (2005). "The Next Generation of Diversity and Intergroup Relations Research," *Journal of Social Issue*, 61(3): 595–610.

Kim, M., Anderson, J., and Yamamura E. (2005). "The Lasting Impact of College on Young Adults' Civic and Political Engagement." Paper presented at the *2005 Association for the Study of Higher Education Annual Conference*, Philadelphia, PA. Accessed on December 10, 2013 at:

<http://www.heri.ucla.edu/PDFs/Lasting%20Impact%20of%20College%20-%20ASHE05.pdf>

National Student Clearinghouse Research Center (2013) *Current Term Enrollment Estimates Fall 2012*. Accessed on December 10, 2013 at:

<http://research.studentclearinghouse.org/files/TermEnrollmentEstimate-Fall2012.pdf>.

Weinberg, A. (2004) "Residential Education for Democracy." Paper presented to the *American Democracy Conference*, Phoenix, AZ. Accessed on December 10, 2013 at:

<http://www.bowdoin.edu/mckeen-center/pdf/weinberg-civic-education.pdf>.