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Methodological Note: The data found in this report on the total Latino population and the total Latino electorate of the states studied are slightly different than the data reported for the state whose gateway is the Pew Research Center Hispanic Trends, 2014 State Election Facts web page found at http://www.pewhispanic.org/fact-sheets/2014-state-election-fact-sheets/ and on its “Mapping the Latino Electorate by State” web page at http://www.pewhispanic.org/interactives/mapping-the-latino-electorate-by-state/

This is because PEW researchers used the Census Bureau's-provided variable HISPAND found in the American Community Survey 2014 data set released by the University of Minnesota’s, Minnesota Population Center IPUMS project to quantify Latinos nationally and in each state.

That variable includes Europeans such as Spaniards, Canary Islanders, or other individuals born in a Spanish province and counts them as Hispanics. The variable also excludes Brazilians who CLACLS insists should be enumerated as Latinos.

CLACLS eliminated all Europeans from the HISPAND variable and then created a variable called LATINOS in its 2014 ACS data set using the birthplace of the individual and/or the parents’ birthplace data if a person did not have a known nationality. Thus, a person whose nationality was unknown but who was born in Mexico is classified as Mexican and included as a Latino. Likewise a person whose nationality is unknown but whose mother was born in Mexico is ‘turned into’ a Mexican rather than ‘Other Hispanic.’ A Brazilian nationality variable was created using birthplace and parents’ birthplace data and added to the new ‘Latino’ variable created by CLACLS.
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Executive Summary

- The southeastern states studied in this report have had the fastest growing Latino population of all of the United States between 1990 and 2014, the last year systematic census data are available.

- In 1990 there were approximately 205,000 Latinos living in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia they accounted for only 1.2% of the overall population in these states. By 2014 there were nearly 2.2 million Latinos in these three states and they made up 8.8% of the total population.

- Georgia and North Carolina’s Latino population was approaching one million in each state, and South Carolina had about 273,000 Latinos in 2014.

- However Latino influence on elections has not been commensurate with the impact on demographic structures. In 1990 Latinos comprised 1.1% of total eligible voters in the three states. This rose to 3.7% in 2014 well below the 8.8% of the total population which was of Latino origin.

- This is because when the Latino population 18 years of age and older is examined in the three states in 2014 67% of all Latinos were foreign born and 51% were not citizens of the U.S. and thus not eligible to vote. Thus, despite constituting a fairly large population, especially in North Carolina and Georgia, the Latino electorate was much smaller than overall population numbers.

- The growth of the Latino population in the Southeastern states was driven by the constant arrival of Mexicans and their extraordinary demographic increase.

- In North Carolina in 1990 there were only about 31,000 Mexicans in the state; by 2014 there were over 570,000 Mexicans and they accounted for 62% of all Latinos in North Carolina.

- Mirroring the experience of North Carolina the growth of the Latino population in South Carolina was driven by the constant arrival of Mexicans and their extraordinary demographic increase.

- In 1990 there were only about 10,000 Mexicans in South Carolina; by 2014 there were over 167,000 Mexicans and they accounted for 61% of all Latinos in the state.

- Georgia’s Latinos increased because of the constant arrival of Mexicans to the state a process similar to the one found in North and South Carolina. In 1990 there were about 49,000 Mexicans in the state; by 2014 there were over 624,000 Mexicans and they accounted for 63% of all Latinos in Georgia, about the same percentage as in North and South Carolina.

- Puerto Ricans were the second most numerous Latino nationality in the region but in each state constituted less than 13% of all Latinos.
• The Latino electorate in the North Carolina increased from a scant 38,000 eligible voters and 0.8% of the electorate to 255,000 and 3.5% of the state’s total electorate in 2014.

• North Carolina is distinguished by the fact that Latino voter registration rates, at 68% of eligible Latino voters in 2012, were significantly above the national average of 58%.

• In North Carolina voter participation rates were very low in the 1996, 2000, and 2004 presidential elections but these soared to 65% in 2008 probably because of the Obama candidacy. Although they fell to 56% in 2012, CLACLS projects that they may reach as high as 65% in 2016.

• Latinos are projected to be nearly 3% of actual voters in North Carolina in November 2016 and could be a potentially decisive swing vote in a tight election. Mitt Romney carried North Carolina by 2% points in 2012.

• Latinos have very little influence over political decision making in South Carolina because they have been less than 1% of active voters in presidential elections from 1992 through 2012.

• South Carolina Latinos eligible to vote registered at rates which were slightly lower than the national average in 2008 and 2012 (57%). CLACLS projects that this could fall to about 51% in 2016.

• In 2012 only 43% of all eligible Latino voters in South Carolina cast ballots in the presidential election and CLALCS projects this could fall to 34% in 2016.

• Georgia Latinos were a fractional 0.2% of all voters in the 1992 election and even by 2004 comprised less than 1% of all voters in the state.

• Because of demographic expansion, the achieving of 18 years of age by younger Latinos born in the U.S., and increased Latino registration rates most likely because of the Obama candidacy, by 2008 about 3% votes cast in the state were by Latinos. This fell to 2.7% in 2012.

• CLACLS projects that as many as 3.9% of all ballots to be cast in November 2016 in Georgia may be by Latinos. Still they will have little impact on the outcome in the state which voted 53% Republican to 45% Democratic in the 2012 elections.

• Georgia Latinos eligible to vote registered at rates which were very low until the 2008 election which indicates the impact that the Obama candidacy had on the state’s Latino eligible voters.

• Less than 42% of the Latino electorate was registered in 2004 and this jumped to 64% in 2008 falling back to 59% in 2012 which was the national Latino registration average.

• CLACLS predicts that the registration rate will increase back to the 64% level among the Latino electorate for the November 2016 election.
After very low overall voter participation rates because of low registration rates, about 30% in 2004, 55% of eligible Latino voters cast ballots in 2008, above the national average of 48%. There was a decline to 48% in 2012. CLACLS predicts there will be an increase to 53% in November 2016.
Introduction

The Latino population of the three southeastern states studied in this report has soared by tenfold between 1990 and 2014 according to U.S. census data. In 1990 there were approximately 205,000 Latinos living in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia they accounted for only 1.2% of the overall population. By 2014 there were nearly 2.2 million Latinos in these three states and they made up 8.8% of the total population. (See table 1).

This is part of a national-level process which has seen Latino populations grow impressively in regions which were marginally settled by Latinos prior to 1990. In major southeastern cities and small towns Latinos have had a significant impact on culture and society in ways ranging from the opening of food stores stocking food products consumed by Latino families, to the opening of restaurants serving traditional Latino fare, and to the growth of multilingualism in regions where previously only English had been spoken.

The impact on the educational system has been extraordinary and certainly will be into the future. This is because Latinos are younger than the non-Latino population. In 2014 14% of all people 18 years of age and younger in the three southeastern states were Latinos.

However, the influence on elections has not been commensurate with the impact on demographic structures and culture. Despite relatively high Latino voter registration rates in North Carolina and Georgia among Latinos which have been above national averages and will be detailed below, the percentages of eligible Latino voters in relation to the total electorate have lagged significantly behind Latino demographic expansion. In 1990 Latinos comprised 1.1% of total eligible voters in the three states. This rose to 3.7% in 2014 well below the 8.8% of the total population which was of Latino origin.

This is because when the Latino population 18 years of age and older is examined in the three states 67% of all Latinos were foreign born and 51% were not citizens of the U.S. as of 2014 and thus not eligible to vote. There is no question that this will change in the future as the Latino population ages and move into the 18 years of age and older category. About 90% of all Latinos 18 years of age and younger in the three states were born in the U.S. in 2014 and 93% were citizens of the U.S. who will be eligible to vote once they turn 18. (See table 2).

Table 1
Latino Populations of North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia, 1990 - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Populations</td>
<td>205,537</td>
<td>2,191,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Populations</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Electorate</td>
<td>141,164</td>
<td>663,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Electorate</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Population 18 Years of Age and Younger and Older by Nativity and Citizenship, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia 2014
(in percentages of total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18 and Older</th>
<th>18 and Younger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Born</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Citizens</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic Growth and the Increase of the Latino Electorate in North Carolina, 1990 - 2014

The Latino population of North Carolina rose from only about 72,000 residents and 1.1% of North Carolina’s total population in 1990 to 924,000 and 9.3% of the total population of the state in 2014. (See figure 1). Over the same period the Latino electorate in the state increased from a scant 38,000 eligible voters and 0.8% of the electorate to 255,000 and 3.5% of the state’s total electorate in 2014. (See figure 2).
The principal reason for this disparity between the total Latino population as a percentage of the total North Carolina population and the total electorate as a percentage of all potential voters is because of nativity and citizenship rates. If we examine the North Carolina Latino population 18 years of age and older in 2014 69.5% were foreign born and only 45.7% were citizens and thus eligible to vote.

The state’s Latino population was heavily concentrated around urban areas: Burlington, Durham/Chapel Hill, Raleigh, Charlotte, and Goldsboro as indicated in map 1. There were also Latinos found throughout the state in smaller towns and rural areas.

The growth of the Latino population was driven by the constant arrival of Mexicans and their extraordinary demographic increase. In 1990 there were only about 31,000 Mexicans in the state; by 2014 there were over 570,000 Mexicans and they accounted for 62% of all Latinos in North Carolina. (See figures 3 and 4).

Although about 53% of all Mexicans in the state were born in the U.S., when we examine the Mexican population 18 years of age and older 76% were foreign-born and 66% were not citizens and thus not eligible to vote. This was a major reason why Latino population expansion was at a faster rate than the Latino electorate growth in North Carolina.

Puerto Ricans were the second largest Latino national group and increased at a much slower rate, from 14,500 in 1990 to 90,700 in 2014 and 9.8% of the state’s Latinos. As citizens by birth Puerto Ricans were all eligible to vote.

(See table 3 for all Latino nationalities in North Carolina).
Map 1

Concentrations of the Latino Population of North Carolina by Census Tract, 2014
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Figure 3
Mexican and Puerto Rican Populations of North Carolina, 1990 - 2014

Figure 4
Mexicans and Puerto Ricans as Percentage of North Carolina Latinos, 1990 - 2014
The structure of the Latino electorate in the state followed demographic trends to some extent. Mexicans were the largest share of potential Latino voters and this did not change very much between 1990 when they were 40% of the Latino electorate to 2014 when they were 43%. This was, as noted previously, because of the high level of foreign-born and non-citizen Mexicans 18 years of age and older. Puerto Ricans were the second largest sector of the Latino electorate in North Carolina and their percentage did not change very much from 1990 (25%) to 2014 (23%) despite the large scale immigration into the state of other Latino national groups. (See figures 5 and 6). See table 4 for the complete Latino electorate in North Carolina by nationality.
Figure 5
Mexican and Puerto Rican Electorate of North Carolina, 1990 - 2014

1990 2000 2010 2014

Mexican

Puerto Rican

9,393 23,200 44,363 108,687

15,306 49,633 83,004 58,074

Figure 6
Mexicans and Puerto Ricans as Percentage of North Carolina Latino Electorate
1990 - 2014

1990 2000 2010 2014

Mexican

Puerto Rican

40.2% 43.7% 40.2% 42.5%

24.7% 22.8% 24.0% 22.7%
### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>15,306</td>
<td>44,363</td>
<td>83,004</td>
<td>108,687</td>
<td>610.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>9,393</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>49,633</td>
<td>58,074</td>
<td>518.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>2,916</td>
<td>5,821</td>
<td>12,746</td>
<td>12,603</td>
<td>332.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvadoran</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td>6,555</td>
<td>10,961</td>
<td>4198.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombian</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>2,578</td>
<td>8,625</td>
<td>9,868</td>
<td>989.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>2,095</td>
<td>4,638</td>
<td>8,146</td>
<td>920.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panamanian</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>2,237</td>
<td>4,586</td>
<td>7,974</td>
<td>417.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Hispanic</td>
<td>3,840</td>
<td>9,891</td>
<td>3,911</td>
<td>5,439</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemalan</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>3,654</td>
<td>4,655</td>
<td>4602.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaraguan</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>3,821</td>
<td>4,332</td>
<td>1639.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuadorian</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>5,437</td>
<td>4,151</td>
<td>632.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduran</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>3,867</td>
<td>3,651</td>
<td>1663.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuelan</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>3,455</td>
<td>1671.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>4,184</td>
<td>2,828</td>
<td>902.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rican</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>2,354</td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td>1290.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>2,495</td>
<td>357.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>2,338</td>
<td>806.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentinean</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>2,551</td>
<td>1,538</td>
<td>357.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivian</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>515.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South American</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguayan</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>449.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguayan</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>405.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central American</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>38,094</td>
<td>101,583</td>
<td>206,410</td>
<td>255,456</td>
<td>570.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Registration and Voting Patterns among Latinos in North Carolina, 1992 - 2016

The percentage of the Latino electorate that has voted in presidential elections nationally between 1992 and 2012 was the lowest among the major race/ethnic groups in the nation at approximately 48% with no change whatsoever in each presidential race. This compared with about two-thirds of all non-Hispanic whites and blacks who voted in the same election cycles. This low voter participation rate was linked to low voter registration rates which also remained stagnant between 1992 and 2012 at about 58%. Yet, there were important variations by state.

North Carolina is distinguished by the fact that Latino voter registration rates, at 68% of eligible Latino voters in 2012, are significantly above the national average of 58%. (See figure 7). CLACLS projects

---

that the voter registration rate could reach as high as 76% for the 2016 presidential election, although there are many variables which could influence this, especially voter suppression efforts by the Republican Party in the state.\textsuperscript{2}

This high voter registration rate has translated into higher voter participation rates than the national average of about 48% of eligible Latino voters who cast ballots in every presidential election between 1992 and 2012. In North Carolina voter participation rates were very low in the 1996, 2000, and 2004 presidential elections but these soared to 65% in 2008 probably because of the Obama candidacy. Although they fell to 56% in 2012, CLACLS projects that they may reach as high as 65% in 2016. (See figure 8).

This could be extremely important for the 2016 election because Mitt Romney, the Republican candidate carried North Carolina by 2% of the popular vote in 2012. In that year exit polls indicated that 68% of North Carolina Latinos voted for the reelection of President Obama and Latinos accounted for 2.1% of the state’s total vote. CLACLS projects that Latinos may comprise 2.9% of total votes in November 2016 and if the election is very close in North Carolina they could sway the election to either candidate. (See figure 9).

The higher voter registration rates for North Carolina Latinos are clearly linked to the fact that they are more educated than national averages among Latinos. In 2014, 24% of Latinos 25 years of age or older in North Carolina had achieved a B.A. degree or higher. This compared with the national average of 15%. Additionally 56% of all adult Latinos in the state had attended some college, achieved an Associates or B. A. degree. The national average was 39%.

Figure 8
Percentage of Total Latino Electorate Voting in Presidential Elections
North Carolina, 1992 - 2016

Figure 9
Latinos as Percentage of All Votes Cast in Presidential Elections
North Carolina, 1992 - 2016
Although there are no participation rates by educational attainment specifically for Latinos, among all voters there was a clear correlation between voter participation and achieved educational level as indicated in figure 10. A higher level of educational attainment in North Carolina produced higher voter participation.

![Figure 10: Percent of the Eligible Electorate in the United States which Voted in the 2012 Presidential Election by Educational Attainment Level](image)

**Demographic Growth and the Increase of the Latino Electorate in South Carolina, 1990 - 2014**

South Carolina’s Latino population, at about 273,000 in 2014 was small compared with the over 900,000 Latinos living in both North Carolina and Georgia. However, as was the case in the other two states studied here, South Carolina’s Latino population increased nearly tenfold between 1990 when it was a mere 29,000, to 2014. In 1990 Latinos were a mere 0.8% of South Carolina’s total population. This stood at 5.3% in 2014. (See figure 11).

Yet, the electorate did not keep pace with the overall demographic expansion for the same reasons found in North Carolina. In 1990 0.7% of all eligible voters in South Carolina were Latinos. This rose to 2.7% in 2014. The principal reason for this disparity between the total Latino population as a percentage of the total South Carolina population and the total electorate as a percentage of all potential voters is because of nativity and citizenship rates. If we examine the South Carolina Latino population 18 years of age and older in 2014 61.1% were foreign born and only 54.6% were citizens and thus eligible to vote.
### Figure 11
Latino Population of South Carolina, 1990 - 2014

![Graph showing the growth of Latino population and its percentage of the total population from 1990 to 2014.](image)

### Figure 12
Latino Electorate of South Carolina, 1990 - 2014

![Graph showing the growth of Latino electorate and its percentage of the total electorate from 1990 to 2014.](image)
South Carolina’s Latino population was heavily concentrated in Jasper County which is contiguous to Savannah, Georgia across the state border, and in urban areas such as Greenville, Spartanburg in the northern part of the state, and in Beaufort, Hilton Head, Charleston, and Myrtle Beach along the Atlantic Ocean. Saluda County was also a center of Latino settlement. (See map 2).

Mirroring the experience of North Carolina the growth of the Latino population in South Carolina was driven by the constant arrival of Mexicans and their extraordinary demographic increase. In 1990 there were only about 10,000 Mexicans in the state; by 2014 there were over 167,000 Mexicans and they accounted for 61% of all Latinos in South Carolina, about the same percentage as in North Carolina. (See figures 13 and 14).

Although about 54% of all Mexicans in the state were born in the U.S., when we examine the Mexican population 18 years of age and older 71% were foreign-born and 62% were not citizens and thus not eligible to vote. This was a major reason why Latino population expansion was at a faster rate than the Latino electorate growth in South Carolina.

Puerto Ricans were the second largest Latino national group, also very similar to North Carolina. There were about 7,000 Puerto Ricans in 1990 and they increased to 36,000 in 2014 and 13.3% of the state’s Latinos. As citizens by birth Puerto Ricans were all eligible to vote.

(See table 5 for all Latino nationalities in South Carolina).

![Figure 13](image-url)

*Figure 13*
Mexican and Puerto Rican Populations of South Carolina, 1990 - 2014
Map 2

Concentrations of the Latino Population of South Carolina by Census Tract, 2014
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### Table 5
Total Latino Population of South Carolina by Nationality, 1990 - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>10,332</td>
<td>58,632</td>
<td>141,256</td>
<td>167,341</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>1519.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>7,116</td>
<td>14,220</td>
<td>32,050</td>
<td>36,214</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>408.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemalan</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1,823</td>
<td>15,153</td>
<td>12,797</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4978.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombian</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>5,511</td>
<td>8,884</td>
<td>8,577</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>947.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduran</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>1,257</td>
<td>11,011</td>
<td>7,191</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2371.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvadoran</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>4,229</td>
<td>5,941</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2315.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td>3,224</td>
<td>6,135</td>
<td>5,783</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>159.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panamanian</td>
<td>1,392</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>3,018</td>
<td>3,865</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>177.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>4,276</td>
<td>3,624</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1018.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rican</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>3,476</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1119.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>2,362</td>
<td>3,070</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>289.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuadorian</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>2,948</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>712.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>2,662</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1037.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Hispanic</td>
<td>3,105</td>
<td>7,834</td>
<td>3,230</td>
<td>2,518</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>-18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>2,424</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1656.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentinean</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>711.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuelan</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>175.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaraguan</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>3,308</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>157.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivian</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>2586.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguayan</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>431.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguayan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central American</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South American</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,049</strong></td>
<td><strong>103,517</strong></td>
<td><strong>243,944</strong></td>
<td><strong>272,930</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>839.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The structure of the Latino electorate in the state followed demographic trends, again in patterns which were similar to North Carolina. Mexicans were the largest share of potential Latino voters and between 1990 when they were 32% of the Latino electorate to 2014 when they had increased to 40%, considerably lower than their percentage of the state’s overall Latinos (61%). This was, as noted previously, because of the high level of foreign-born and non-citizen Mexicans 18 years of age and older. Puerto Ricans were the second largest sector of the Latino electorate in South Carolina and their percentage did not change very much from 1990 (28%) to 2014 (27%) despite the large scale immigration into the state of other Latino national groups. (See figures 15 and 16). See table 6 for the complete Latino electorate in South Carolina by nationality.
Table 6
Total Latino Electorate of South Carolina by Nationality, 1990 - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>5,274</td>
<td>14,695</td>
<td>26,099</td>
<td>39,204</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>643.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>4,728</td>
<td>9,278</td>
<td>18,700</td>
<td>25,847</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>446.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombian</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>1,514</td>
<td>3,254</td>
<td>5,304</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>916.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>1,665</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>4,320</td>
<td>4,320</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>159.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemalan</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>2,183</td>
<td>2,945</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1282.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvadoran</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>15188.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panamanian</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td>2,711</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>287.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>542.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>1,927</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1789.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduran</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>2,622</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1166.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>1,529</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>420.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Hispanic</td>
<td>1,797</td>
<td>4,949</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>-25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuadorian</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>373.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rican</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1948.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1688.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuelan</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>162.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaraguan</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>873.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivian</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2586.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentinean</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguayan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguayan</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central American</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South American</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,731</strong></td>
<td><strong>37,975</strong></td>
<td><strong>69,214</strong></td>
<td><strong>97,193</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>480.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Registration and Voting Patterns among Latinos in South Carolina, 1992 - 2016

Latinos have very little influence over political decision making in South Carolina because they have been less than 1% of active voters in presidential elections from 1992 through 2012 and will not increase in any way in November 2016. (See figure 17). Mitt Romney won South Carolina by 11 percentage points of the popular vote in 2012 (55% to 44% for President Obama) and the state is solidly republican.

South Carolina Latinos eligible to vote registered at rates which were slightly lower than the national average in 2008 and 2012 (57%) CLALCS projects that this could fall to about 51% in 2016. In 2012 only 43% of all eligible Latino voters cast ballots in the presidential election and CLALCS projects this could fall to 34% in 2016. (See figures 18 and 19). These patterns of low levels of political participation are very unlike those found in North Carolina. This is somewhat puzzling given the fact that Latino eligible voters over 25 years of age had a 24% college graduation rate, the exact same as found in North Carolina. Additionally, 56% of the Latino electorate over 25 years of age had attended some college, the same rate prevailing in North Carolina. It may be that the absence of any political influence in the state because Latinos constitute such a small share of all voters as lead to political apathy among potential Latino voters in the state.
Figure 18
Percentage of Latinos Registered to Vote in Presidential Elections
South Carolina, 1996 - 2016

Figure 19
Percentage of Total Latino Electorate Voting in Presidential Elections
South Carolina, 1992 - 2016
Demographic Growth and the Increase of the Latino Electorate in Georgia, 1990 - 2014

Georgia’s Latino population, at nearly one million in 2014 compared with the over 900,000 Latinos living in North Carolina. As was the case in the other two states studied here, Georgia’s Latino population increased nearly tenfold between 1990 when it was a mere 105,000, to 2014 when it was 984,000. In 1990 Latinos were a small 1.6% of Georgia’s total population. This stood at nearly 10% in 2014. (See figure 20).

Yet, the electorate did not keep pace with the overall demographic expansion for the same reasons found in North Carolina and South Carolina. In 1990 1.0% of all eligible voters in Georgia were Latinos. This rose to 4.4% in 2014. (See figure 21). The principal reason for this disparity between the total Latino population as a percentage of the total Georgia population and the total electorate as a percentage of all potential voters is because of nativity and citizenship rates. If we examine the Georgia Latino population 18 years of age and older in 2014 66.9% were foreign born and only 49.7% were citizens and thus eligible to vote. This was the highest percentage of foreign born and non-citizens among the 18 years of age and older population among the three states.
Georgia’s Latino population was heavily concentrated in the Atlanta Metropolitan area as well as in Whitfield and Murray Counties in the north of the state. There was a major concentration in Telfair County and throughout the southeastern counties of the state. (See map 3).

Georgia’s Latinos increased because of the constant arrival of Mexicans to the state a process similar to the one found in North and South Carolina. In 1990 there were about 49,000 Mexicans in the state; by 2014 there were over 624,000 Mexicans and they accounted for 63% of all Latinos in Georgia, about the same percentage as in North Carolina. (See figures 22 and 23).

Although about 54% of all Mexicans in the state were born in the U.S., when we examine the Mexican population 18 years of age and older 74.4% were foreign-born and 61.4% were not citizens and thus not eligible to vote. This was a major reason why Latino population expansion was at a faster rate than the Latino electorate growth in Georgia.

Puerto Ricans were the second largest Latino national group, also very similar to North Carolina. There were about 18,500 Puerto Ricans in 1990 and they increased to 92,000 in 2014 and 9.2% of the state’s Latinos. As citizens by birth Puerto Ricans were all eligible to vote.

(See table 7 for all Latino nationalities in Georgia).
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Figure 22
Mexican and Puerto Rican Populations of Georgia, 1990 - 2014

Figure 23
Mexicans and Puerto Ricans as Percentage of Georgia Latinos, 1990 - 2014
The structure of the Latino electorate in the state followed demographic trends, again in patterns which were similar to North and South Carolina. Mexicans were the largest share of potential Latino voters and between 1990 when they were 36% of the Latino electorate to 2014 when they had increased to 46%, considerably lower than their percentage of the state’s overall Latinos (63%). This was, as noted previously, because of the high level of foreign-born and non-citizen Mexicans 18 years of age and older. Puerto Ricans were the second largest sector of the Latino electorate in Georgia although their percentage decreased from 1990 (26%) to 2014 (20%) because of the large scale immigration into the state of other Latino national groups. (See figures 24 and 25). See table 8 for the complete Latino electorate in Georgia by nationality.
Figure 24
Mexican and Puerto Rican Electorate of Georgia, 1990 - 2014

Figure 25
Mexicans and Puerto Ricans as Percentage of Georgia Latino Electorate 1990 - 2014
### Table 8
Total Latino Electorate of Georgia by Nationality, 1990 - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
<th>% Increase 1990-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>16,921</td>
<td>51,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>12,047</td>
<td>26,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombian</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>5,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>5,156</td>
<td>9,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>2,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panamanian</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>4,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvadoran</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>2,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Hispanic</td>
<td>4,075</td>
<td>12,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemalan</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>1,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>1,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuelan</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>1,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduran</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>1,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuadorian</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentinean</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>1,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaraguan</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rican</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguayan</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivian</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguayan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central American</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South American</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47,305</td>
<td>125,788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Registration and Voting Patterns among Latinos in Georgia, 1992 - 2016

Georgia Latinos were a fractional 0.2% of all voters in the 1992 election and even by 2004 comprised less than 1% of all voters in the state. Because of demographic expansion, the achieving of 18 years of age by younger Latinos born in the U.S., and increased Latino registration rates most likely because of the Obama candidacy, by 2008 about 3% votes cast in the state were by Latinos. This fell to 2.7% in 2012. CLACLS projects that as many as 3.9% of all ballots to be cast in November 2016 may be by Latinos. (See figure 26). Still they will have little impact on the outcome in the state which voted 53% Republican to 45% Democratic in the 2012 elections. Georgia is solidly Republican and in all likelihood will remain that way in the upcoming election.
Georgia Latinos eligible to vote registered at rates which were very low until the 2008 election which indicates the impact that the Obama candidacy had on the state’s Latino eligible voters. Less than 42% of the Latino electorate was registered in 2004 and this jumped to 64% in 2008 falling back to 59% in 2012 which was the national Latino registration average. CLACLS predicts that the registration rate will increase back to the 64% level among the Latino electorate for the November 2016 election. (See figure 27).

After very low overall voter participation rates because of low registration rates, about 30% in 2004, 55% of eligible Latino voters cast ballots in 2008, above the national average of 48%. There was a decline to 48% in 2012. CLACLS predicts there will be an increase to 53% in November 2016.

The profile of the Latino electorate with respect to educational attainment for the population 25 years of age and older, a factor which could influence registration and voting rates, was about the same as for North and South Carolina. In 2014 about 26% had achieved a B.A. or higher and 56% had attended some college.
Figure 27
Percentage of Latinos Registered to Vote in Presidential Elections
Georgia, 1996 - 2016

1996: 31.9%
2000: 37.7%
2004: 41.9%
2008: 64.1%
2012: 58.8%
2016: 63.8%

Figure 28
Percentage of Total Latino Electorate Voting in Presidential Elections
Georgia, 1992 - 2016

1996: 26.1%
2000: 37.7%
2004: 30.2%
2008: 54.7%
2012: 47.9%
2016: 53.3%
Conclusion

The Latino population of the southeastern states considered in this report was one of the most dynamically growing in the nation between 1990 and 2014 and this reflected the dispersion of Latinos out of the traditional areas of settlement in the southwest, California, New York and the northeast, and Florida.

This population growth was fueled principally by the migration of Mexicans from Mexico to North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, some Central Americans as well, and the internal migration of Mexicans and Central Americans to the region. There was also natural reproduction. By 2014 the Mexican-origin population was over 60% of all Latinos in the three states, approaching the two-thirds component of the total Latino population across the nation.

However, this population expansion, while contributing to an increase in the Latino electorate in all three states was not reflected in the percentage of total state electorates which were Latino or the percentage of overall voting populations. This was because when the 18 years of age and older population was examined, an overwhelming portion was foreign born and not citizens of the U.S. and thus not eligible to vote.

It is inevitable that over the long-term this will change as more Latinos are born of immigrant parents and as citizens by birth they will be eligible to vote once they turn 18 years of age. There will also be naturalizations and the acquisition of citizenship by documented foreign-born Latinos. This will be a gradual process and will lead to another major issue or question. Given the relatively low voter registration rates which have prevailed nationally, 59% of eligible Latino voters between 1992 and 2012, a fundamental will this Latino population that comes of age actually register to vote once they are eligible.

At the present time Latinos in North Carolina, projected to be possibly 3% of all voters in November 2016, may play an important role in the state’s outcome if the margin of victory by either candidate is very slim, as it was in 2012. Latinos will not impact the elections in South Carolina where they are a miniscule part of the electorate, nor in Georgia because it is solidly Republican. It is impossible to know if this will change in the future in South Carolina and Georgia. However, Latinos in North Carolina will play important roles in future presidential elections.