Within-state Income Inequality and the Presidential Vote 1992 - 2004:

A First Look at the Evidence

By

James K. Galbraith and Travis Hale

Galbraith@mail.utexas.edu   jthale@mail.utexas.edu

The University of Texas Inequality Project
Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas 78713

UTIP Working Paper 29

May 23, 2005

Abstract:

This note seeks to relate macroeconomic and sociological variables to the state-by-state election outcomes of the 1992, 1996, 2000, and 2004 presidential elections. Our main purpose is to examine the degree to which within-state income inequality is related to the results. We find that that the Democratic Party systematically performed better in *high inequality* states, after controlling for state average income, minority population share, and urbanization. Testing different inequality measures, we find that a "top-bottom ratio" emphasizing the range of incomes performs better as an electoral predictor than does the Gini coefficient measured across state taxable income.

I. Introduction

This note takes a first look at the relationship between economic inequality and the state-by-state voting outcomes of the last four presidential elections.[1] Our hypothesis is that economic inequality can serve as a proxy for some of the real and imagined differences that divide so-called "red" and "blue" states.

The impetus for this investigation was a *Salon* column James Galbraith (2004) wrote during the 2004 campaign. Galbraith postulated that the Democratic Party *is* the party of John Edwards's "Two Americas." Within the party of Roosevelt, Kennedy, and Clinton there is an uneasy–some would say unholy–alliance between rich urban professionals, racial and ethnic minorities, and urban poor. Meanwhile, there is a third America, composed of more homogeneous suburban and rural areas, which are predominantly white and solidly Republican.

If this stylized description is correct, then the statistical ramifications are clear, intriguing, and to some degree counter-intuitive at least at first glance. States with *higher* inequality should lean towards the Democrats, as high inequality indicates the presence of both legs of the Democratic base. On the other hand, states that have homogeneous income profiles should lean Republican. Initial statistical analyses indicate that this is the case. Indeed it has been the case for over a decade; we cover the elections of 1992, 1996, 2000 and 2004.

The goal of this paper is *not* to predict presidential elections, either *ex ante* or *ex post*.[2] Rather, our purpose is to explore connections between inequality and voting outcomes and to examine the ability of inequality measures that differ from each other in various ways to capture such a relationship -- if one exists.

II. Data

We consider four variables among the many that plausibly affect the proportion of voters selecting a Democratic presidential candidate. They are: racial composition, urbanization, statewide average income, and within-state income inequality. The dependent variable is the percentage of the votes cast for Clinton, Gore, or Kerry. This section first defends our choice of variables, and then provides a brief description of the data.

Because income level and income inequality are bound together, it is important to consider both in any analysis of economics and election outcomes. The presence of high income populations in America is often tempered by the corresponding presence of low-income populations, so that high average incomes and inequality are correlated. New York and California are both rich and highly unequal – and both these days are solidly Democratic. Is it the wealth, or the inequality, or some combination of the two?

But it may also be that other socioeconomic features express themselves *through* the income and income inequality variables. It is well known, for instance, that cities tend to be wealthy, compared to the countryside. Thus urbanization may–or may not—be merely a proxy for comparative wealth. Cities are also known to be generally unequal, again compared to rural areas; it is possible that economic inequality is merely a proxy for urbanization.

Likewise, minority voters tend to be low income, compared to their white counterparts. It is therefore also possible that an association between income inequality and election outcomes merely picks up an underlying association between race and political affiliation. We would therefore want to know to what extent low income influences affiliation with the Democrats, independent of minority racial and ethnic status.

Our race data come from U.S. Census Bureau population estimates (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005A). For the years 1992 and 1996, the race variable divides states' white, non-Hispanic populations by total population, using aggregated county level data from the Bureau's "Intercensal estimates by demographic characteristics" tables. For the years 2000 and 2004, the race variable divides states' voting-age, white, non-Hispanic populations by their total population using the "State by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin 6 race groups - 5 race alone groups and one multiple race group" table.[3] For 2000, this measure ranges from under 60% (Hawaii, Washington D.C., New Mexico, California, Texas) to more than 90% (Idaho, Kentucky, Wyoming, South Dakota, Montana, North Dakota, Iowa, West Virginia, New Hampshire, Vermont, Maine).

Data on urbanization come from the 2000 Census, Summary File 3 and from the table "Urban and Rural Population: 1900 to 1990" (U.S Census Bureau 2005C, 1995A). Summary File 3 provides a measure of each state's population, and its urban population – differentiated by "urbanized areas" versus "urban clusters" – and its rural population – differentiated by farm versus non-farm. The variable used here is "percentage urban", for which we sum each state's population in both urbanized areas and urban clusters and divide by total population. In 2000, states ranged from values of less than 50% urban (Vermont, Maine, West Virginia, and Mississippi) to more than 90% (Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Hawaii, Nevada, New Jersey, California, Washington D.C.) in 2000. The 1990 Census defines "urban" as "all territory, population, and housing units in urbanized areas and in places of 2,500 or more persons outside urbanized areas" (U.S. Census Bureau, 1995A). For the years 1992 and 1996 we construct an interpolation of the 1990 and 2000 measures. For 2000 and 2004, we use the 2000 Census data.

Data on per capita income come from the Bureau of Economic Analysis: Regional Economic Accounts (Bureau of Economic Analysis, 2005). This dataset defines income as Wage and Salary Disbursements; Supplements to Wages and Salaries; Proprietors' Income; Personal Dividend Income, Personal Interest Income, and Rental Income of Persons; Personal Current Transfer Receipts; Contributions for Government Social Insurance; a Residence Adjustment; and Personal Current Tax Receipts. In 2000 per capita income ranged from less than $22,000 (Mississippi, West Virginia, Arkansas) to greater than $38,000 (New Jersey, Connecticut, Washington D.C.)

The inequality measure on which we focus on is the ratio of average income in the top quintile to average income in the bottom quintile of each state. This data comes from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP) report *Pulling Apart: A State-by-State Analysis of Income Trends* (Bernstein *et al.* 2002). The CBPP researchers pool Current Population Survey records for each state over three year periods from 1978-1980, 1988-1990, and 1998-2000, yielding a point estimate for 1979, 1989, and 1999. In our models, we interpolate from the 1989 and 1999 measures to estimate values for 1992 and 1996. For 2000 and 2004, we use the 1999 figure.[4] In 1999, top to bottom ratios varied from less than 7.5 to 1 (Indiana, Utah, South Dakota) to 11 to 1 or higher (California, Texas, Louisiana, New York, and Washington D.C.).

Election outcome data come from Dave Leip's Atlas of U.S. Presidential Elections (Leip 2005). This website reports election data back to 1789 and includes data down to the county level for 2000 and 2004. For this analysis, the dependent variables are vote percentages in each state for Bill Clinton in 1992 and 1996, Al Gore in 2000, and John Kerry in 2004. For example, the percentage of the Gore vote varied from below 30% (Utah, Idaho, Alaska, Wyoming) to greater than 60% (New York, Rhode Island, Washington D.C.); the percentage of the Kerry vote ranged from below 33% (Utah, Wyoming, Idaho, Nebraska) to more than 58% (Vermont, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Washington D.C.).

Tables A1- A4 in the Appendix list the data for each year and state.

III. Priors and Correlations

Table 1 shows correlations across our variables for 2000, and also includes a Gini coefficient measure of income inequality, discussed below. Urbanization, minority status, and income inequality are all associated with a greater Democratic vote, as expected. There is also a high positive association of average income with Democratic voting. There is some association among the independent variables, but no obvious evidence of severe multicollinearity. The two inequality measures are highly correlated, as they should be.

Table 1. Correlations Among the Variables[5]

	Per Capita Income	PCT Urban	PCT White	Top / Bottom Ratio	Gini	PCT Gore
Per Capita Income	1.000					
PCT Urban	0.614	1.000				
PCT White	-0.098	-0.512	1.000			
Top / Bottom Ratio	0.112	0.277	-0.491	1.000		
Gini	0.072	0.291	-0.554	0.810	1.000	
PCT Gore	0.556	0.417	-0.270	0.393	0.368	1.000

IV. OLS Models

To investigate the link between income inequality and election outcomes, we regress the share of the Democratic vote for each year on each of the independent variables. Four separate models are run, one for each election cycle 1992 - 2004.

Equation 1; OLS Model:

$$PCTDemocratic_i = B_0 + B_1 * PCT\_Urban_i + B_2 * PCT\_White_i + \\ B_3 * Inequality_i + B_4 * PerCapitaIncome\_2000_i + e_i$$

The results of the four regressions, displayed in Table 2, show marked similarity. In each model, the coefficients associated with the urbanization and race variables are negative or near zero, but neither variable is significant, with the exception of urbanization in 1992. Thus a striking fact: although minority and urban voters are undeniably more likely to be Democrats, an increasing proportion of minority or urban voters *per se* does not improve the Democrats' vote share and consequent likelihood of carrying a state. One may speculate on the reasons for this, with a leading possibility being that racial minorities and cities are themselves intrinsically polarizing features.

Per capita income and inequality, on the other hand, are significant and positive predictors of the Democratic percentage of the vote for every election cycle. Per capita income levels are highly significant throughout, whereas income inequality becomes less significant over time. Model fit ranges from 30 to 43 percent, reasonable if not spectacular figures for cross sectional models of limited scope. Fit is best for the 2000 model, possibly because measurement error is lowest for this year – race, urbanization, and inequality data are all taken during or near 2000. Our key finding is that income inequality and income levels appear to account for the effects that would otherwise be attributed to the "softer" variables. Again, this is a statistical rather than causal – we do not predict that minority voters in the more equal states vote Republican. But it is interesting how effectively the inequality variable captures the statistical effect otherwise attributable to race and urbanization.

Table 2. Results of the OLS Models

	1992		**1996**	
	Coefficients	*Standard Error*	*Coefficients*	*Standard Error*
Intercept	15.008	14.7037	4.417	14.8751
Per Capita Income	0.001***	0.0003	0.001***	0.0003
PCT Urban	-12.292*	7.2539	-6.768	8.4414
PCT White	-2.402	8.1173	0.582	8.2428
Top / Bottom Ratio	1.928***	0.7103	2.303***	0.8501
R Square	0.3017	-	0.3402	-
Adjusted R Square	0.2397	-	0.2815	-
	2000		**2004**	
	Coefficients	*Standard Error*	*Coefficients*	*Standard Error*
Intercept	1.400	15.4414	-1.993	15.5694
Per Capita Income	0.001***	0.0003	0.001***	0.0003
PCT Urban	-2.710	10.1228	-3.287	9.4924
PCT White	-5.722	9.3135	-3.300	9.2041
Top / Bottom Ratio	2.226**	0.9690	1.745*	0.9650
R Square	0.4248	-	0.4107	-
Adjusted R Square	0.3737	-	0.3583	-
* Significant at .1 level				
** Significant at .05 level				
*** Significant at .01 level				

V. Analysis

Does the significance of the inequality variable mean that income inequality *causes* individuals to vote for Democratic Presidential candidates? Probably not. Platforms, personalities, current events, weather and many other factors certainly contribute to the outcome of a presidential contest in a given state. We can, however, infer, that the Democratic Party has engaged in campaigns that have resonated with the rich and the poor. Meanwhile, it is the Republicans who are winning the hearts and minds of Middle America.

In many ways, this story squares with the analysis of Thomas Edsall in his prescient 1984 book *New Politics of Inequality*. According to Edsall (1984):

> "American political parties, and the Democratic party in particular, have been forced to function as bargaining agents between often conflicting minority interests. The essence of Democratic party campaigning has been the struggle to forge a collection of minority interests into victory on election day. This coalition of minorities has included in its membership union members, Jews, city political organizations, most Catholic ethnic groups, blacks, southerners, and, in the most recent shift in voting patterns, women."

The current research is consistent with Edsall's framework. The Democratic Party is a catch-all for many different groups across the racial, geographic, and *economic* spectrum.

A look at the residuals – Tables B1 through B4– is revealing. In 2000 and 2004, the battleground states of Florida, Ohio, and Pennsylvania should have been where the content of the campaign mattered most. Thus, we might expect large residuals. However, as Table 4 shows, the model predictions are within a reasonable error range in each case. Thus the factors that determined the race in these key states were essentially the same as in the rest of the country. If there is a lesson for the Democrats, it is that they have *over*-performed in these battlegrounds. Turning the tide in Florida or Ohio may be even more difficult than the Democrats realize.

Table 4. Residuals from Three Key Battleground States 2000 and 2004

State	*Predicted Gore % Total*	*Actual Gore % Total*	*Residuals*	*Standard Residuals*
Florida	46.18	48.84	2.66	0.41
Ohio	45.86	46.46	0.60	0.09
Pennsylvania	45.43	50.60	5.17	0.79

State	*Predicted Kerry % Total*	*Actual Kerry % Total*	*Residuals*	*Standard Residuals*
Florida	45.33	47.08	1.75	0.27
Ohio	45.46	48.52	3.05	0.47
Pennsylvania	46.22	50.85	4.63	0.71

Where the models perform poorly, as displayed in Table 5, there are reasonable explanations. In Alaska, libertarian politics and big oil dominate, and average income is overstated because of the high cost of living, and also the oil-fund transfer to residents, which exaggerates income relative to class. Wyoming is a one-party state, but also the home of Richard Cheney, which arguably inflated Republican returns even past their normal values in 2000 and 2004.

Vermont and Rhode Island are more solidly Democratic that the models predict. It may be that in presidential politics New England works more as a region than a collection of states, so that income and inequality levels would be better measured for a multi-state region. (This argument suggests that further analysis should take spatial autocorrelation into account.)

More generally, in some states, the two party system has essentially broken down, which can have a potentially distorting effect on these types of simple models. In Utah – perhaps the most egalitarian state in the country, the GOP is the only presidential party, and in highly unequal

Washington D.C. the same is true of the Democrats. To say whether inequality dynamics helped contribute to this breakdown is a task for future research.

Table 5: Residuals from Selected Outliers 2000 and 2004

State	*Predicted Gore % Total*	*Actual Gore % Total*	*Residuals*	*Standard Residuals*
Alaska	45.40	27.67	-17.73	-2.71
Rhode Island	44.79	60.99	16.20	2.48
Wyoming	42.18	27.70	-14.48	-2.21

State	*Predicted Kerry % Total*	*Actual Kerry % Total*	*Residuals*	*Standard Residuals*
Rhode Island	46.42	59.42	13.00	2.00
Vermont	45.95	58.94	12.99	2.00
Wyoming	45.99	29.07	-16.91	-2.60

VI. Alternative Measures of Inequality

An unintended but useful outcome of this research is the reminder that when working with income inequality, the choice of measure is a critical decision. In trying to distill the income distribution of an entire population into a single figure, losses of information inevitably occur. The question is which inequality measures are most appropriate and most expedient for the purpose at hand.

The genesis of this paper was the startling finding from Galbraith's 2004 *Salon* column that, in 2000, "of the top 14 most-polarized states, only one – Virginia – voted clearly for Bush [the Florida results being anything but clear]. Of the 22 least-polarized states, only four (Iowa, Maine, Vermont and New Mexico) voted for Gore." Unfortunately, Galbraith's polarization metric is difficult to interpret.

The polarization measure in Galbraith (2004) is the standard deviation of each state's geographic inequality across counties measured by Theil's T Statistic. Theil's T Statistic is a powerful inequality measure: additive, decomposable, and easily calculated from grouped data sets, the measure generates rich estimates from very humble raw material. Given data on the average income and population of each county, one can estimate a lower bound for total inequality that correlates nicely to other inequality measures, parse country-wide inequality into between-state and within-state components, and generate a Theil element that measures each county's contribution to between-county inequality.[6]

But because states vary widely in their number of counties, summing up the Theil elements over a state's counties does not yield a value that is comparable from one state to the next. As a way around this limitation, Galbraith took the standard deviation of each state's county Theil elements. The result is a measure of geographic income-polarization across counties. States that rank high on this measure have counties that have, in most cases in practice, large differences in average income across counties. States that rank low generally have counties of similar average per-capita income. But we cannot say is that this metric is exactly an "income inequality" measure in all cases. First, it ignores within-county differentials, which in the case of large urban centers are typically very great. Moreover, if a state has two counties with equal average incomes but where one county has a much larger population, the standard deviation of the Theil elements will pick up "inequality" between these two counties where none may exist.

Nonetheless, the fact that the electoral outcomes of the 2000 election reflected the Galbraith polarization index so closely encouraged us to continue looking for an underlying relationship between income inequality and voting outcomes. The Census Bureau's Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division constructs Gini coefficients for each state every ten years using data from long-form census returns (U.S Census Bureau 2005B). From the 2000 Census data, the Gini coefficient for the entire country was calculated as .463; thus states with values below this value were more equal than the country as a whole, and that states above this value were less equal than the entire country considered as a unit. Gini values range from below .42 (Alaska, Utah, Wisconsin, New Hampshire, Iowa) to greater than .48 (Louisiana, New York, Washington D.C.).

Using weighted averages for 1992 and 1996 and using the 2000 measures to predict voting outcomes in 2000 and 2004, we ran the models described by Equation 1 using the Gini ratio as the inequality metric. The results of these regressions are reported in Appendix C. Initially, we were encouraged by our findings. As Appendix C makes clear, these models, if legitimate, would strongly support our underlying hypotheses and yield remarkable model fit for such parsimonius specifications. But we sobered up on finding that the single case of Washington D.C. was driving the results. Compared with every other state-unit, Washington D.C. has incredibly high levels of urbanization, inequality, and Democratic voting, and a very low percentage of white residents. In an effort to fit this outlying case, the model gives undue weight to the inequality variable.

Once Washington D.C. is removed, the regression results using the Gini coefficient as the inequality metric become much more humble, as the table in Appendix D shows. In fact the inequality variable becomes statistically insignificant for the 2004 election. On the other hand, once Washington D.C. is removed from the dataset, the range of Gini ratios across states becomes quite small, leading to the supposition that an alternative measure might be in order. A search of the literature led us to the top-to-bottom ratio reported in the previous sections. While this measure is highly correlated with the Gini coefficient, it has more spread. Also, whereas the Gini coefficient looks at the entire distribution, the top-to-bottom ratio focuses on the overclass and the underclass, two pillars of the Democratic Party. Because Washington D.C. is also an outlier with regards to the top-to-bottom ratio, we excluded it for the regressions reported above. Including Washington D.C. in the model once again results in much better model fit and only reinforces the interpretations we have spelled out.

Since different inequality measures look at different parts of the income distribution, it makes sense that they would give subtly – or not so subtly – different results. This research started by employing a heretofore unused metric – the standard deviation of Theil elements across counties, then moved to the most prominent measure in the literature – the Gini ratio, and finally settled on a third tool – the top-to-bottom ratio. This evolution was not arbitrary, and there are strong theoretical reasons why each subsequent measure revealed more than its predecessor. But what is most remarkable is the consistency in the findings. The first measure led us to suspect a relationship between inequality and election outcomes, the second supported the link in the 1992, 1996, and 2000 elections, and the final inequality metric confirmed that the relationship was still significant in 2004, though perhaps eroding.

VII. Next Steps

This note points toward several areas of needed research. First, there is a dearth of good within-state income inequality data. The Census only provides estimates at decennial intervals, and researchers using Current Population Survey data have either failed to construct estimates that closely parallel the Census figures or have yet to fill in the gaps in the time series. The technique we used to estimate top-to-bottom ratios could build a yearly time series from 1977 until recent years. This could aid the understanding of inequality along a number of dimensions, but it has yet to be done. Other measures, such as a Theil's T-statistic measured across industrial sectors statewide, might add additional insight into levels and changes of within-state inequality.

A second area of improvement regards method. Here we employ very simple ordinary least squares models. When better data become available, especially data that allow us to differentiate independent variable values in 2000 and 2004, then we can implement panel model estimation tools, hierarchical linear modeling, spatial autocorrelation corrections, and other techniques that would differentiate the roles of both time and space in the relationship between inequality and voting outcomes.

A third natural expansion of this analysis is to go further back in time. Initial inquiries indicate that the link between inequality and election outcomes was not as significant from the late 1960s to the 1980s. Whether this is an artifact of measurement error or a true time effect is not yet clear.

Finally, one could add inequality variables to other analyses that attempt to predict presidential election outcomes *a priori*. Would adding an inequality measure to these models significantly improve them? Does rising inequality, fostered by Republican policies, presage a return of the Democrats to national power? Inquiring minds want to know.

References

Bernstein, J., Boushey, H., McNichol, E., and R. Zahradnik (2002), *Pulling Apart: A State-by-State Analysis of Income Trends*, Report from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities and the Economic Policy Institute, April.

Bureau of Economic Analysis (2005), *Regional Economic Accounts: Annual State Personal Income*, Online, Available: http://www.bea.doc.gov/bea/regional/spi/.

Edsall, T.B. (1984), *The New Politics of Inequality*, W.W. Norton and Company, New York.

Ferguson, T. (2005), "Holy Owned Subsidiary: Globalization, Religion, and Politics in the 2004 Election" forthcoming *in A Defining Election: The Presidential Race of 2004* edited by William Crotty, Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Galbraith, J.K. (2004), "The voters Democrats can't reach," Online, Available: http://archive.salon.com/opinion/feature/2004/09/13/polarized_country/index_np.html.

Langer, Laura (1999), "Measuring Income Distribution across Space and Time in the American States," Social Science Quarterly, Volume 80, Number 1, March, 55-67.

Leip, D. (2005), *Dave Leip's Atlas of U.S. Presidential Elections*, Online, Available: http://uselectionatlas.org/USPRESIDENT/.

U.S. Census Bureau (2005A), *Population Estimates*, Online, Available: http://www.census.gov/popest/datasets.html.

U.S. Census Bureau (2005B), "Table S4. Gini Ratios by State: 1969, 1979, 1989, 1999," Online, Available: http://www.census.gov/hhes/income/histinc/state/state4.html.

U.S. Census Bureau (2005C), *United States Census 2000 Summary File 3* (2005), Online, Available: http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/2002/sumfile3.html.

U.S. Census Bureau (1995A), "Urban and Rural Definitions," Online, Available: http://www.census.gov/population/censusdata/urdef.txt.

U.S. Census Bureau (1995B), "Urban and Rural Population: 1900 to 1990," Online, Available: http://www.census.gov/population/censusdata/urpop0090.txt.

Notes

Appendix - List of Tables

Table A1 – Raw Data for 1992
Table A2 – Raw Data for 1996
Table A3 – Raw Data for 2000
Table A4 – Raw Data for 2004
Table B1 – Residuals for 1992
Table B2 – Residuals for 1996
Table B3 – Residuals for 2000
Table B4 – Residuals for 2004
Table C – Regression Results Using the Gini Ratio as the Inequality Variable and Including Washington D.C.
Table D - Regression Results Using the Gini Ratio as the Inequality Variable Excluding Washington D.C.

Table A1 – Raw Data 1992

STATE	Per Capita Income	PCT Urban	PCT White	Top / Bottom Ratio	Gini	PCT Clinton
Alabama	$ 17,327	0.5941	0.7292	9.92	0.4231	40.88
Alaska	$ 23,786	0.6714	0.7375	9.18	0.3840	30.29
Arizona	$ 17,777	0.8763	0.7019	9.44	0.4178	36.52
Arkansas	$ 16,209	0.5329	0.8202	9.06	0.4101	53.21
California	$ 22,492	0.9297	0.5517	10.16	0.4328	46.01
Colorado	$ 21,109	0.8282	0.7998	8.35	0.3991	40.13
Connecticut	$ 28,362	0.8082	0.8271	7.16	0.4145	42.21
Delaware	$ 22,670	0.7440	0.7821	7.21	0.3735	43.52
D.C.	$ 28,916	1.0000	0.2650	17.96	0.5109	84.64
Florida	$ 20,417	0.8570	0.7198	9.19	0.4289	39.00
Georgia	$ 19,075	0.6489	0.6915	9.94	0.4230	43.47
Hawaii	$ 24,089	0.8951	0.3040	9.25	0.3870	48.09
Idaho	$ 17,093	0.5920	0.9186	7.52	0.3896	28.42
Illinois	$ 22,550	0.8525	0.7370	9.54	0.4124	48.58
Indiana	$ 19,037	0.6607	0.8923	7.63	0.3762	36.79
Iowa	$ 18,834	0.6069	0.9567	6.92	0.3704	43.29
Kansas	$ 19,692	0.6956	0.8784	7.51	0.3904	33.74
Kentucky	$ 17,175	0.5258	0.9159	9.49	0.4249	44.55
Louisiana	$ 16,771	0.6901	0.6519	14.40	0.4481	45.58
Maine	$ 18,253	0.4372	0.9796	7.81	0.3799	38.77
Maryland	$ 24,139	0.8225	0.6825	8.04	0.3909	49.80
Massachusetts	$ 24,538	0.8572	0.8706	9.17	0.3984	47.54
Michigan	$ 20,338	0.7133	0.8185	8.99	0.3983	43.77
Minnesota	$ 21,443	0.7011	0.9308	7.70	0.3814	43.48
Mississippi	$ 14,559	0.4744	0.6263	10.45	0.4383	40.77
Missouri	$ 19,349	0.6883	0.8661	8.84	0.4039	44.07
Montana	$ 16,867	0.5281	0.9189	7.71	0.3850	37.63
Nebraska	$ 19,349	0.6682	0.9207	7.30	0.3777	29.40
Nevada	$ 22,084	0.8895	0.7699	7.47	0.3935	37.36
New Hampshire	$ 22,002	0.5264	0.9729	7.29	0.3539	38.91
New Jersey	$ 26,382	0.9039	0.7237	8.55	0.4055	42.95
New Mexico	$ 16,273	0.7341	0.4951	10.29	0.4331	45.90
New York	$ 24,867	0.8494	0.6794	11.12	0.4454	49.73
North Carolina	$ 18,842	0.5236	0.7441	8.88	0.4021	42.65
North Dakota	$ 17,669	0.5380	0.9406	7.25	0.3802	32.18
Ohio	$ 20,062	0.7475	0.8663	8.72	0.3942	40.18

Oklahoma	$ 17,376	0.6723	0.8034	9.52	0.4144	34.02
Oregon	$ 19,235	0.7214	0.8990	7.90	0.3954	42.48
Pennsylvania	$ 21,235	0.7053	0.8713	8.17	0.4011	45.15
Rhode Island	$ 20,867	0.8699	0.8870	7.71	0.3887	47.04
South Carolina	$ 16,953	0.5578	0.6816	8.94	0.4041	39.88
South Dakota	$ 17,799	0.5038	0.9102	7.27	0.3858	37.14
Tennessee	$ 18,577	0.6144	0.8222	10.36	0.4191	47.08
Texas	$ 18,916	0.8074	0.5913	10.51	0.4385	37.08
Utah	$ 16,115	0.8725	0.9059	6.30	0.3741	24.65
Vermont	$ 19,065	0.3340	0.9808	7.73	0.3733	46.11
Virginia	$ 21,811	0.7012	0.7509	9.16	0.4055	40.59
Washington	$ 21,709	0.7752	0.8571	7.48	0.3864	43.41
West Virginia	$ 16,112	0.3810	0.9592	8.92	0.4129	48.41
Wisconsin	$ 19,683	0.6623	0.9073	6.94	0.3671	41.13
Wyoming	$ 19,346	0.6505	0.9103	7.20	0.3902	34.10

Table A2 – Raw Data 1996

STATE	Per Capita Income	PCT Urban	PCT White	Top / Bottom Ratio	Gini	PCT Clinton
Alabama	$ 20,081	0.5742	0.7198	10.08	0.4299	43.16
Alaska	$ 25,805	0.6643	0.7239	8.62	0.3800	33.27
Arizona	$ 20,823	0.8790	0.6765	9.76	0.4242	46.52
Arkansas	$ 18,926	0.5286	0.8091	8.74	0.4169	53.74
California	$ 25,312	0.9372	0.5126	10.64	0.4472	51.10
Colorado	$ 25,570	0.8366	0.7818	8.15	0.4059	44.43
Connecticut	$ 32,424	0.8426	0.8071	8.44	0.4325	52.83
Delaware	$ 25,727	0.7721	0.7588	7.89	0.3875	51.82
District of Columbia	$ 32,786	1.0000	0.2704	20.04	0.5401	85.19
Florida	$ 23,655	0.8751	0.6919	9.31	0.4381	48.02
Georgia	$ 22,945	0.6828	0.6654	9.46	0.4310	45.84
Hawaii	$ 25,024	0.9053	0.2815	9.45	0.3950	56.93
Idaho	$ 20,248	0.6280	0.9074	8.08	0.3944	33.65
Illinois	$ 26,449	0.8655	0.7125	9.46	0.4196	54.32
Indiana	$ 22,368	0.6842	0.8813	7.27	0.3818	41.55
Iowa	$ 22,521	0.6087	0.9473	7.48	0.3736	50.26
Kansas	$ 22,845	0.7049	0.8638	8.19	0.3936	36.08
Kentucky	$ 19,854	0.5415	0.9106	10.01	0.4301	45.84
Louisiana	$ 19,786	0.7083	0.6396	12.80	0.4509	52.01
Maine	$ 21,203	0.4196	0.9773	8.09	0.3891	51.62
Maryland	$ 27,393	0.8416	0.6542	8.36	0.4001	54.25
Massachusetts	$ 28,933	0.8856	0.8537	9.93	0.4136	61.47
Michigan	$ 24,306	0.7299	0.8081	9.11	0.4027	51.69
Minnesota	$ 25,716	0.7052	0.9138	7.70	0.3846	51.10
Mississippi	$ 17,702	0.4813	0.6186	9.85	0.4427	44.08
Missouri	$ 22,548	0.6910	0.8575	8.76	0.4091	47.54
Montana	$ 19,047	0.5342	0.9156	8.39	0.3930	41.23
Nebraska	$ 23,530	0.6826	0.9029	7.70	0.3813	34.95
Nevada	$ 26,085	0.9026	0.7252	8.23	0.4035	43.93
New Hampshire	$ 26,427	0.5591	0.9669	7.81	0.3671	49.32
New Jersey	$ 30,470	0.9237	0.6965	9.15	0.4195	53.72
New Mexico	$ 19,029	0.7422	0.4825	10.01	0.4359	49.18
New York	$ 28,424	0.8621	0.6531	12.08	0.4606	59.47
North Carolina	$ 22,320	0.5629	0.7298	9.52	0.4129	44.04
North Dakota	$ 21,068	0.5480	0.9355	7.85	0.3818	40.13
Ohio	$ 23,322	0.7604	0.8570	9.28	0.3998	47.38

Oklahoma	$ 19,743	0.6628	0.7879	9.68	0.4176	40.45
Oregon	$ 23,398	0.7542	0.8776	9.10	0.4026	47.15
Pennsylvania	$ 24,344	0.7378	0.8594	8.53	0.4079	49.17
Rhode Island	$ 24,106	0.8896	0.8637	8.39	0.4043	59.71
South Carolina	$ 20,058	0.5814	0.6735	8.46	0.4149	43.85
South Dakota	$ 21,488	0.5115	0.9038	7.23	0.3922	43.03
Tennessee	$ 21,854	0.6253	0.8122	10.44	0.4259	48.00
Texas	$ 22,120	0.8162	0.5613	10.79	0.4445	43.83
Utah	$ 19,529	0.8775	0.8874	6.70	0.3809	33.30
Vermont	$ 21,964	0.3580	0.9757	8.17	0.3817	53.35
Virginia	$ 25,034	0.7155	0.7324	9.24	0.4155	45.15
Washington	$ 25,073	0.7975	0.8333	8.12	0.3976	49.84
West Virginia	$ 18,445	0.4209	0.9567	9.08	0.4221	51.51
Wisconsin	$ 23,273	0.6728	0.8941	7.66	0.3699	48.81
Wyoming	$ 21,875	0.6514	0.9090	7.60	0.3878	36.84

Table A3 – Raw Data 2000

STATE	Per Capita Income	PCT Urban	PCT White	Top / Bottom Ratio	Gini	PCT Gore
Alabama	$ 23,764	0.5544	0.7266	10.20	0.4350	0.42
Alaska	$ 29,867	0.6571	0.7173	8.20	0.3770	0.28
Arizona	$ 25,660	0.8817	0.6910	10.00	0.4290	0.45
Arkansas	$ 21,925	0.5244	0.8104	8.50	0.4220	0.46
California	$ 32,464	0.9446	0.5164	11.00	0.4580	0.53
Colorado	$ 33,370	0.8450	0.7745	8.00	0.4110	0.42
Connecticut	$ 41,489	0.8770	0.8047	9.40	0.4460	0.56
Delaware	$ 30,869	0.8002	0.7531	8.40	0.3980	0.55
District of Columbia	$ 40,456	1.0000	0.3219	21.60	0.5620	0.85
Florida	$ 28,509	0.8931	0.6853	9.40	0.4450	0.49
Georgia	$ 27,989	0.7166	0.6530	9.10	0.4370	0.43
Hawaii	$ 28,422	0.9155	0.2562	9.60	0.4010	0.56
Idaho	$ 24,075	0.6639	0.9012	8.50	0.3980	0.28
Illinois	$ 32,185	0.8785	0.7111	9.40	0.4250	0.55
Indiana	$ 27,132	0.7077	0.8738	7.00	0.3860	0.41
Iowa	$ 26,554	0.6106	0.9396	7.90	0.3760	0.49
Kansas	$ 27,694	0.7142	0.8534	8.70	0.3960	0.37
Kentucky	$ 24,412	0.5572	0.9031	10.40	0.4340	0.41
Louisiana	$ 23,078	0.7266	0.6560	11.60	0.4530	0.45
Maine	$ 25,969	0.4021	0.9722	8.30	0.3960	0.49
Maryland	$ 34,257	0.8607	0.6431	8.60	0.4070	0.57
Massachusetts	$ 37,756	0.9141	0.8475	10.50	0.4250	0.60
Michigan	$ 29,552	0.7465	0.8102	9.20	0.4060	0.51
Minnesota	$ 32,017	0.7093	0.9042	7.70	0.3870	0.48
Mississippi	$ 21,005	0.4881	0.6415	9.40	0.4460	0.41
Missouri	$ 27,241	0.6937	0.8551	8.70	0.4130	0.47
Montana	$ 22,929	0.5403	0.9158	8.90	0.3990	0.33
Nebraska	$ 27,625	0.6970	0.8937	8.00	0.3840	0.33
Nevada	$ 30,437	0.9157	0.6935	8.80	0.4110	0.46
New Hampshire	$ 33,396	0.5918	0.9584	8.20	0.3770	0.47
New Jersey	$ 38,365	0.9435	0.6862	9.60	0.4300	0.56
New Mexico	$ 22,135	0.7503	0.4967	9.80	0.4380	0.48
New York	$ 34,897	0.8748	0.6483	12.80	0.4720	0.60
North Carolina	$ 27,068	0.6022	0.7266	10.00	0.4210	0.43
North Dakota	$ 25,106	0.5581	0.9356	8.30	0.3830	0.33
Ohio	$ 28,207	0.7734	0.8577	9.70	0.4040	0.46

Oklahoma	$ 24,407	0.6534	0.7746	9.80	0.4200	0.38
Oregon	$ 28,097	0.7870	0.8616	10.00	0.4080	0.47
Pennsylvania	$ 29,695	0.7704	0.8597	8.80	0.4130	0.51
Rhode Island	$ 29,214	0.9094	0.8561	8.90	0.4160	0.61
South Carolina	$ 24,424	0.6049	0.6886	8.10	0.4230	0.41
South Dakota	$ 25,720	0.5192	0.9081	7.20	0.3970	0.38
Tennessee	$ 26,097	0.6361	0.8128	10.50	0.4310	0.47
Texas	$ 28,313	0.8251	0.5633	11.00	0.4490	0.38
Utah	$ 23,878	0.8826	0.8679	7.00	0.3860	0.26
Vermont	$ 27,680	0.3820	0.9679	8.50	0.3880	0.51
Virginia	$ 31,087	0.7299	0.7232	9.30	0.4230	0.44
Washington	$ 31,779	0.8199	0.8181	8.60	0.4060	0.50
West Virginia	$ 21,900	0.4609	0.9509	9.20	0.4290	0.46
Wisconsin	$ 28,570	0.6833	0.8969	8.20	0.3720	0.48
Wyoming	$ 28,460	0.6523	0.9053	7.90	0.3860	0.28

Table A4 – Raw Data 2004

STATE	Per Capita Income	PCT Urban	PCT White	Top / Bottom Ratio	Gini	PCT Kerry
Alabama	$ 27,795	0.5544	0.7180	10.20	0.4350	0.37
Alaska	$ 34,454	0.6571	0.7082	8.20	0.3770	0.35
Arizona	$ 28,442	0.8817	0.6644	10.00	0.4290	0.44
Arkansas	$ 25,725	0.5244	0.8000	8.50	0.4220	0.45
California	$ 35,019	0.9446	0.4939	11.00	0.4580	0.54
Colorado	$ 36,063	0.8450	0.7571	8.00	0.4110	0.46
Connecticut	$ 45,398	0.8770	0.7906	9.40	0.4460	0.54
Delaware	$ 35,861	0.8002	0.7441	8.40	0.3980	0.53
District of Columbia	$ 51,803	1.0000	0.3150	21.60	0.5620	0.89
Florida	$ 31,455	0.8931	0.6599	9.40	0.4450	0.47
Georgia	$ 30,051	0.7166	0.6437	9.10	0.4370	0.41
Hawaii	$ 32,160	0.9155	0.2525	9.60	0.4010	0.54
Idaho	$ 27,098	0.6639	0.8906	8.50	0.3980	0.30
Illinois	$ 34,351	0.8785	0.6962	9.40	0.4250	0.55
Indiana	$ 30,094	0.7077	0.8676	7.00	0.3860	0.39
Iowa	$ 30,560	0.6106	0.9319	7.90	0.3760	0.49
Kansas	$ 30,811	0.7142	0.8413	8.70	0.3960	0.36
Kentucky	$ 27,709	0.5572	0.8963	10.40	0.4340	0.40
Louisiana	$ 27,581	0.7266	0.6484	11.60	0.4530	0.42
Maine	$ 30,566	0.4021	0.9687	8.30	0.3960	0.53
Maryland	$ 39,247	0.8607	0.6354	8.60	0.4070	0.56
Massachusetts	$ 41,801	0.9141	0.8326	10.50	0.4250	0.62
Michigan	$ 31,954	0.7465	0.8039	9.20	0.4060	0.51
Minnesota	$ 35,861	0.7093	0.8937	7.70	0.3870	0.51
Mississippi	$ 24,650	0.4881	0.6311	9.40	0.4460	0.39
Missouri	$ 30,608	0.6937	0.8487	8.70	0.4130	0.46
Montana	$ 26,857	0.5403	0.9090	8.90	0.3990	0.39
Nebraska	$ 31,339	0.6970	0.8843	8.00	0.3840	0.32
Nevada	$ 33,405	0.9157	0.6739	8.80	0.4110	0.48
New Hampshire	$ 37,040	0.5918	0.9527	8.20	0.3770	0.50
New Jersey	$ 41,332	0.9435	0.6674	9.60	0.4300	0.53
New Mexico	$ 26,191	0.7503	0.4791	9.80	0.4380	0.49
New York	$ 38,228	0.8748	0.6285	12.80	0.4720	0.58
North Carolina	$ 29,246	0.6022	0.7158	10.00	0.4210	0.43
North Dakota	$ 31,398	0.5581	0.9295	8.30	0.3830	0.35
Ohio	$ 31,322	0.7734	0.8527	9.70	0.4040	0.49

Oklahoma	$ 28,089	0.6534	0.7620	9.80	0.4200	0.34
Oregon	$ 29,971	0.7870	0.8469	10.00	0.4080	0.51
Pennsylvania	$ 33,348	0.7704	0.8533	8.80	0.4130	0.51
Rhode Island	$ 33,733	0.9094	0.8414	8.90	0.4160	0.59
South Carolina	$ 27,172	0.6049	0.6773	8.10	0.4230	0.41
South Dakota	$ 30,856	0.5192	0.9026	7.20	0.3970	0.38
Tennessee	$ 30,005	0.6361	0.8048	10.50	0.4310	0.42
Texas	$ 30,222	0.8251	0.5432	11.00	0.4490	0.38
Utah	$ 26,606	0.8826	0.8569	7.00	0.3860	0.26
Vermont	$ 32,770	0.3820	0.9639	8.50	0.3880	0.59
Virginia	$ 35,477	0.7299	0.7113	9.30	0.4230	0.45
Washington	$ 35,299	0.8199	0.8040	8.60	0.4060	0.53
West Virginia	$ 25,872	0.4609	0.9479	9.20	0.4290	0.43
Wisconsin	$ 32,157	0.6833	0.8888	8.20	0.3720	0.50
Wyoming	$ 34,306	0.6523	0.8987	7.90	0.3860	0.29

Table B1 – Residuals for the 1992 Regression

Observation	*Predicted PCT Clinton*	*Actual PCT Clinton*	*Residuals*	*Standard Residuals*
Alabama	42.38	40.88	-1.50	-0.30
Alaska	46.44	30.29	-16.15	-3.21
Arizona	38.50	36.52	-1.98	-0.39
Arkansas	40.14	53.21	13.07	2.60
California	44.31	46.01	1.70	0.34
Colorado	40.09	40.13	0.04	0.01
Connecticut	45.22	42.21	-3.01	-0.60
Delaware	40.53	43.52	2.99	0.60
Florida	40.85	39	-1.85	-0.37
Georgia	43.59	43.47	-0.12	-0.02
Hawaii	45.17	48.09	2.92	0.58
Idaho	37.09	28.42	-8.67	-1.73
Illinois	43.67	48.58	4.91	0.98
Indiana	38.47	36.79	-1.68	-0.33
Iowa	37.40	43.29	5.89	1.17
Kansas	38.49	33.74	-4.75	-0.95
Kentucky	41.79	44.55	2.76	0.55
Louisiana	49.47	45.58	-3.89	-0.77
Maine	40.57	38.77	-1.80	-0.36
Maryland	42.87	49.8	6.93	1.38
Massachusetts	44.57	47.54	2.97	0.59
Michigan	41.92	43.77	1.85	0.37
Minnesota	40.42	43.48	3.06	0.61
Mississippi	42.36	40.77	-1.59	-0.32
Missouri	40.83	44.07	3.24	0.64
Montana	38.02	37.63	-0.39	-0.08
Nebraska	37.98	29.4	-8.58	-1.71
Nevada	38.68	37.36	-1.32	-0.26
New Hampshire	42.23	38.91	-3.32	-0.66
New Jersey	44.99	42.95	-2.04	-0.41
New Mexico	40.89	45.9	5.01	1.00
New York	49.21	49.73	0.52	0.10
North Carolina	42.72	42.65	-0.07	-0.01
North Dakota	37.76	32.18	-5.58	-1.11
Ohio	40.59	40.18	-0.41	-0.08
Oklahoma	40.52	34.02	-6.50	-1.29
Oregon	38.42	42.48	4.06	0.81

Pennsylvania	41.21	45.15	3.94	0.78
Rhode Island	37.89	47.04	9.15	1.82
South Carolina	40.68	39.88	-0.80	-0.16
South Dakota	38.42	37.14	-1.28	-0.25
Tennessee	44.01	47.08	3.07	0.61
Texas	42.82	37.08	-5.74	-1.14
Utah	30.35	24.65	-5.70	-1.13
Vermont	42.49	46.11	3.62	0.72
Virginia	44.03	40.59	-3.44	-0.68
Washington	39.52	43.41	3.89	0.77
West Virginia	41.31	48.41	7.10	1.41
Wisconsin	37.73	41.13	3.40	0.68
Wyoming	38.03	34.10	-3.93	-0.78

Table B2 – Residuals for the 1996 Regression

Observation	*Predicted PCT Clinton*	*Actual PCT Clinton*	*Residuals*	*Standard Residuals*
Alabama	47.19	43.16	-4.03	-0.73
Alaska	49.78	33.27	-16.51	-3.00
Arizona	45.21	46.52	1.31	0.24
Arkansas	43.14	53.74	10.60	1.93
California	51.90	51.10	-0.80	-0.14
Colorado	47.29	44.43	-2.86	-0.52
Connecticut	55.79	52.83	-2.96	-0.54
Delaware	47.30	51.82	4.52	0.82
Florida	47.46	48.02	0.56	0.10
Georgia	48.27	45.84	-2.43	-0.44
Hawaii	48.91	56.93	8.02	1.46
Idaho	42.52	33.65	-8.87	-1.61
Illinois	51.08	54.32	3.24	0.59
Indiana	42.69	41.55	-1.14	-0.21
Iowa	43.89	50.26	6.37	1.16
Kansas	45.20	36.08	-9.12	-1.66
Kentucky	47.10	45.84	-1.26	-0.23
Louisiana	52.16	52.01	-0.15	-0.03
Maine	45.08	51.62	6.54	1.19
Maryland	49.76	54.25	4.49	0.82
Massachusetts	54.96	61.47	6.51	1.18
Michigan	48.79	51.69	2.90	0.53
Minnesota	47.39	51.10	3.71	0.67
Mississippi	44.50	44.08	-0.42	-0.08
Missouri	46.26	47.54	1.28	0.23
Montana	42.49	41.23	-1.26	-0.23
Nebraska	45.03	34.95	-10.08	-1.83
Nevada	47.59	43.93	-3.66	-0.67
New Hampshire	49.48	49.32	-0.16	-0.03
New Jersey	54.57	53.72	-0.85	-0.16
New Mexico	44.54	49.18	4.64	0.84
New York	59.37	59.47	0.10	0.02
North Carolina	48.55	44.04	-4.51	-0.82
North Dakota	43.48	40.13	-3.35	-0.61
Ohio	47.88	47.38	-0.50	-0.09
Oklahoma	45.32	40.45	-4.87	-0.89
Oregon	47.60	47.15	-0.45	-0.08

Pennsylvania	47.48	49.17	1.69	0.31
Rhode Island	45.86	59.71	13.85	2.52
South Carolina	43.35	43.85	0.50	0.09
South Dakota	42.77	43.03	0.26	0.05
Tennessee	49.76	48.00	-1.76	-0.32
Texas	49.43	43.83	-5.60	-1.02
Utah	36.81	33.30	-3.51	-0.64
Vermont	46.56	53.35	6.79	1.24
Virginia	49.98	45.15	-4.83	-0.88
Washington	46.95	49.84	2.89	0.53
West Virginia	44.18	51.51	7.33	1.33
Wisconsin	44.71	48.81	4.10	0.75
Wyoming	43.12	36.84	-6.28	-1.14

Table B3 – Residuals for the 2000 Regression

Observation	*Predicted PCT Gore*	*Actual PCT Gore*	*Residuals*	*Standard Residuals*
Alabama	43.61	41.59	-2.02	-0.31
Alaska	45.40	27.67	-17.73	-2.71
Arizona	44.49	44.67	0.18	0.03
Arkansas	37.48	45.86	8.38	1.28
California	54.75	53.45	-1.30	-0.20
Colorado	47.83	42.39	-5.43	-0.83
Connecticut	59.28	55.91	-3.37	-0.52
Delaware	46.31	54.96	8.65	1.32
Florida	46.18	48.84	2.66	0.41
Georgia	45.62	42.98	-2.64	-0.40
Hawaii	48.92	55.79	6.87	1.05
Idaho	38.86	27.64	-11.22	-1.72
Illinois	49.96	54.60	4.64	0.71
Indiana	38.80	41.01	2.21	0.34
Iowa	40.08	48.54	8.46	1.29
Kansas	43.28	37.24	-6.04	-0.92
Kentucky	43.73	41.37	-2.35	-0.36
Louisiana	45.94	44.88	-1.07	-0.16
Maine	40.73	49.09	8.36	1.28
Maryland	50.81	56.57	5.76	0.88
Massachusetts	57.43	59.80	2.37	0.36
Michigan	46.52	51.28	4.76	0.73
Minnesota	45.35	47.91	2.55	0.39
Mississippi	39.58	40.70	1.13	0.17
Missouri	42.84	47.08	4.24	0.65
Montana	38.79	33.36	-5.43	-0.83
Nebraska	41.46	33.25	-8.21	-1.26
Nevada	46.77	45.98	-0.80	-0.12
New Hampshire	47.93	46.80	-1.13	-0.17
New Jersey	56.92	56.13	-0.79	-0.12
New Mexico	41.78	47.91	6.13	0.94
New York	60.77	60.21	-0.56	-0.09
North Carolina	46.54	43.20	-3.34	-0.51
North Dakota	39.60	33.05	-6.54	-1.00
Ohio	45.86	46.46	0.60	0.09
Oklahoma	42.86	38.43	-4.43	-0.68
Oregon	46.35	46.96	0.61	0.09

Pennsylvania	45.43	50.60	5.17	0.79
Rhode Island	44.79	60.99	16.20	2.48
South Carolina	39.72	40.91	1.19	0.18
South Dakota	38.06	37.56	-0.50	-0.08
Tennessee	46.04	47.28	1.25	0.19
Texas	50.41	37.98	-12.43	-1.90
Utah	34.91	26.34	-8.57	-1.31
Vermont	43.06	50.63	7.57	1.16
Virginia	48.91	44.44	-4.47	-0.68
Washington	47.30	50.13	2.84	0.43
West Virginia	38.38	45.59	7.21	1.10
Wisconsin	42.93	47.83	4.91	0.75
Wyoming	42.18	27.70	-14.48	-2.21

Table B4 – Residuals for the 2004 Regression

Observation	*Predicted PCT Kerry*	*Actual PCT Kerry*	*Residuals*	*Standard Residuals*
Alabama	43.46	36.86	-6.60	-1.02
Alaska	47.29	34.96	-12.33	-1.90
Arizona	42.95	44.08	1.13	0.17
Arkansas	37.95	44.51	6.56	1.01
California	52.59	54.37	1.78	0.27
Colorado	48.01	46.16	-1.85	-0.28
Connecticut	60.93	54.31	-6.62	-1.02
Delaware	48.67	53.33	4.67	0.72
Florida	45.33	47.08	1.75	0.27
Georgia	43.84	41.41	-2.42	-0.37
Hawaii	47.76	54.01	6.25	0.96
Idaho	38.76	30.31	-8.46	-1.30
Illinois	48.58	54.74	6.16	0.95
Indiana	39.51	39.26	-0.25	-0.04
Iowa	41.72	49.11	7.39	1.14
Kansas	43.37	36.47	-6.90	-1.06
Kentucky	43.11	39.68	-3.43	-0.53
Louisiana	45.32	42.21	-3.11	-0.48
Maine	42.99	53.04	10.05	1.55
Maryland	53.05	55.75	2.69	0.41
Massachusetts	58.47	62.11	3.65	0.56
Michigan	45.56	51.10	5.53	0.85
Minnesota	47.25	51.09	3.84	0.59
Mississippi	38.96	39.47	0.51	0.08
Missouri	43.18	46.06	2.88	0.44
Montana	39.53	38.56	-0.97	-0.15
Nebraska	42.66	32.42	-10.24	-1.58
Nevada	46.40	47.85	1.45	0.22
New Hampshire	49.66	50.25	0.58	0.09
New Jersey	56.81	52.65	-4.16	-0.64
New Mexico	41.07	48.84	7.77	1.20
New York	59.19	57.76	-1.43	-0.22
North Carolina	44.62	43.49	-1.14	-0.17
North Dakota	43.56	35.49	-8.07	-1.24
Ohio	45.46	48.52	3.05	0.47
Oklahoma	42.63	34.42	-8.20	-1.26
Oregon	44.41	51.34	6.93	1.07

Pennsylvania	46.22	50.85	4.63	0.71
Rhode Island	46.42	59.42	13.00	2.00
South Carolina	39.05	40.88	1.83	0.28
South Dakota	41.24	38.44	-2.79	-0.43
Tennessee	45.96	42.50	-3.46	-0.53
Texas	47.32	38.25	-9.07	-1.40
Utah	34.98	26.38	-8.60	-1.32
Vermont	45.95	58.94	12.99	2.00
Virginia	50.14	45.47	-4.67	-0.72
Washington	48.11	52.74	4.63	0.71
West Virginia	39.06	43.25	4.19	0.64
Wisconsin	43.98	49.79	5.81	0.89
Wyoming	45.99	29.07	-16.91	-2.60

Table C – Regression Results Using the Gini Ratio as the Inequality Variable and Including Washington D.C.

	1992		1996	
	Coefficients	*Standard Error*	*Coefficients*	*Standard Error*
Intercept	-37.4355	24.5389	-31.7955	22.6144
Per Capita Income	0.0015***	0.0003	0.0014***	0.0003
PCT Urban	-20.0965**	7.9401	-12.1605	8.6568
PCT White	-7.8900	8.3700	-3.4311	8.4206
Gini Ratio	173.4488***	43.7730	140.4634***	40.5621
R Square	0.5644	-	0.5439	-
Adjusted R Square	0.5265	-	0.5042	-
	2000		**2004**	
	Coefficients	*Standard Error*	*Coefficients*	*Standard Error*
Intercept	-35.6996	23.2372	-23.4462	23.5983
Per Capita Income	0.0012***	0.0003	0.0013***	0.0002
PCT Urban	-4.8345	9.9889	-5.9533	9.2932
PCT White	-5.1468	9.6161	-5.2628	9.6282
Gini Ratio	133.3454***	41.4814	86.7068**	42.7817
R Square	0.5860	-	0.5944	-
Adjusted R Square	0.5500	-	0.5591	-
* Significant at .1 level				
** Significant at .05 level				
*** Significant at .01 level				

Table D - Regression Results Using the Gini Ratio as the Inequality Variable Excluding Washington D.C.

	1992		1996	
	Coefficients	*Standard Error*	*Coefficients*	*Standard Error*
Intercept	-6.6752	24.1994	-12.7742	24.5365
Per Capita Income	0.0010***	0.0003	0.0012***	0.0004
PCT Urban	-15.9031	7.3282	-9.0242	8.6396
PCT White	-6.2706	7.6220	-2.4444	8.2464
Gini Ratio	107.5145**	44.5899	99.5742**	45.7883
R Square	0.2804	-	0.3055	-
Adjusted R Square	0.2164	-	0.2438	-
	2000		2004	
	Coefficients	*Standard Error*	*Coefficients*	*Standard Error*
Intercept	-24.6919	25.8675	-11.9377	26.5808
Per Capita Income	0.0011***	0.0003	0.0012***	0.0003
PCT Urban	-3.0663	10.1596	-3.4922	9.6618
PCT White	-4.5936	9.6389	-4.4476	9.6780
Gini Ratio	108.2213**	48.9101	62.8295	49.7310
R Square	0.4204	-	0.3895	-
Adjusted R Square	0.3689	-	0.3352	-
* Significant at .1 level				
** Significant at .05 level				
*** Significant at .01 level				

[1] Thomas Ferguson (2005) provides a rich and informative quantitative analysis of the 2004 election.
[2] Indeed, if one wanted to predict state-by-state voting patterns in 2004, the 2000 results would have been a good place to start. The correlation coefficient of the 2000 and 2004 percentage of the Democratic vote was .963, and the average state only saw a 2% change in the proportion of the electorate voting Democratic.
[3] 2004 estimates are not yet available, so 2003 estimates are used as a proxy.
[4] In subsequent research, we plan to expand the CBPP dataset to fill in the missing years of inequality data, which should enable more precise estimation.
[5] For reasons discussed later Table 1 refers only to the fifty states and excludes Washington D.C.
[6] For more information on Theil's T Statistic see the University of Texas Inequality Project's Tutorials and Techniques webpage and Working Paper series (http://utip.gov.utexas.edu/).