I'll Register to Vote if You Teach Me How:
A Classroom-Based Registration Experiment

Elizabeth A. Bennion ▪ Indiana University South Bend

A 1998 federal law requires colleges and universities to make registration information and forms available to the study body. While tabling is the most common registration tactic, busy students often walk by registration tables. E-mail is cheap and easy, but also impersonal and seemingly ineffective.[1] In contrast, the classroom presents instructors or trained peers with a captive audience and an opportunity to educate students about the importance of registering to vote. This article explores the effectiveness of a classroom-based registration campaign. Using random assignment, this study measures and compares the impact of professor-led and peer-led registration on an Indiana University campus, and contrasts the success of a classroom-based registration campaign to the failure of an e-mail based approach to voter registration.

In the United States, even the most minimal level of involvement in the electoral process requires that citizens register to vote. The *Higher Education Act* requires all colleges and universities receiving federal funds to make registration information and forms available to the student body.[2] Colleges and universities across the nation are working to comply with this legal requirement. Many also support the underlying goal of civic engagement and political participation. However, there is currently no published scientific study documenting the relative success of different approaches to campus-based voter registration. Mail is expensive. E-mail is likely to be deleted. Tables are easy to ignore. Classroom presentations require extensive planning and scheduling, but also provide greater opportunities for education and face-to-face persuasion. This paper evaluates the effectiveness of class presentations and registration campaigns by conducting a randomized field experiment at a midsize public regional comprehensive university. It contrasts the success of the classroom campaign to the failure of e-mail to boost registration rates among college students. It provides scientific evidence that adding a classroom component to a campus registration drive produces a measurable increase in registration rates.

BACKGROUND

Young people are less likely than older individuals to follow political news stories, read a daily newspaper, or watch an evening news broadcast. Although many young people have turned to the Internet for information, they often do not read online newspapers or news magazines. As a result, young people are less likely than older individuals to demonstrate a strong knowledge of public affairs. Young people are also less likely than older age cohorts to vote or to believe that voting is a civic duty (Wattenberg, 2008).

TABLE 1. Voter Turnout among College Citizens, 2000-2004

Election	Ages 18-24	Ages 25+	Ages 18-29	Ages 30+
2000	47.4	72.8	51.8	74.8
2002 (midterm)	26.1	59.0	29.8	61.8
2004	59.0	76.1	61.1	77.5

NOTES: Figures represent the percent of each group voting. Data source: CIRCLE fact sheet, "Electoral Engagement among Non-College Attending Youth" by Mark Hugo Lopez, Emily Kirby, Jared Sagoff, and Jason P. Kolaczkowski, June 2005.

TABLE 2. Voter Turnout among Non-College Citizens, 2000-2004

Election	Ages 18-24	Ages 25+	Ages 18-29	Ages 30+
2000	24.7	52.0	26.7	53.7
2002 (midterm)	12.8	39.9	13.9	41.8
2004	33.7	54.3	33.7	56.1

NOTES: Figures represent the percent of each group voting. Data source: CIRCLE fact sheet, "Electoral Engagement among Non-College Attending Youth" by Mark Hugo Lopez, Emily Kirby, Jared Sagoff, and Jason P. Kolaczkowski, June 2005.

As Table 1 and Table 2 demonstrate, college students and graduates are more likely to vote than citizens who did not attend college. However, young people in both groups are much less likely to vote than their older counterparts.

The difference in voting rates between college students and non-college students reflects, in part, the different demographics of the two groups. Those without a college education are diverse, but are more likely to be members of low-turnout groups. They are disproportionately male, African-American and Latino (Lopez, et al., 2005). Differences in turnout also reflect differences in the registration rates of young people with different levels of educational attainment. As Table 3 demonstrates, young people's turnout rates increase as their education levels increase.

TABLE 3. Registration Rates of 18-29 year old Citizens by Education Attainment

Election	< high school	high school	some college	B.A. or more
2000	36.4	54.0	70.5	85.5
2002	31.6	47.0	64.0	75.6
2004	41.8	60.4	78.9	86.6

NOTES: Figures represent the percent of each group voting. Data source: CIRCLE fact sheet, "Electoral Engagement among Non-College Attending Youth" by Mark Hugo Lopez, Emily Kirby, Jared Sagoff, and Jason P. Kolaczkowski, June 2005.

Educational differences in both registration and turnout may also reflect differences in the value that a person places on both civic engagement and education. It is well documented that individuals with higher levels of education tend to be more civically engaged. However, a recent study suggests that civic engagement might also promote educational attainment: civically-engaged teenagers make greater scholastic progress during high school and subsequently acquire higher levels of education than similar peers (Davila & Mora, 2007). Finally, the relatively high voter turnout rate among college students, compared to their non-college peers, may reflect the fact that colleges and universities are working hard to engage students in the political process. Until recently, however, researchers have found little support for this hypothesis.[3]

Despite the relatively high registration rate of college students, colleges and universities are seeking to insure that *all* American students are eligible to take part in the electoral process. The fact that one-in-four college graduates fails to *register* during midterm elections, and three-out-of-four traditional-aged students fail to *vote* in these elections demonstrates the continued need for civic education.

Although a focus on *non-college* youth might yield higher returns given their low registration rates, this project fills an important gap in the literature. As the first randomized experiment on classroom-based voter registration, it provides evidence to support the work of colleges and universities as they seek to find effective ways to register and mobilize student voters.

Many colleges and universities have begun to develop peer-based voter registration programs based on the assumption that students will be more responsive to their peers than they will to professors. There is a common perception that peer presenters are most effective in registering and mobilizing student voters. However, the political psychology literature provides limited and mixed support for this assumption. The political psychology literature demonstrates that trusted sources affect political attitudes (e.g., Lupia & McCubbins, 1998; Druckman, 2001). If trusted, media sources can raise the perceived importance of various issues and personality traits in candidate evaluation (Miller & Krosnick, 2000), it is possible that communication from a trusted source can similarly raise the perceived importance of voting and thereby boost registration rates. If demographic similarity is sufficient to constitute a trusted source (e.g., Kuklinski & Hurley, 1994), the peer presentations may be expected to be particularly effective in boosting student registration rates. On the other hand, if authority figures inspire greater trust (or obedience), we would expect that professor-led registration efforts would boost registration rates more than similar invitations from peers. This study is the first to test the relative effectiveness of professors versus peers in registering student voters. It proceeds with two hypotheses: (1) classroom registration will be more effective than e-mail registration efforts, and (2) peer presenters will be more effective than professors in registering students to vote.

THE SETTING

This case study was carried out at Indiana University South Bend, the third largest of the eight campuses of the Indiana University system. Located 90 miles from Chicago and 30 miles from Lake Michigan, the South Bend metropolitan area includes an increasingly diverse population in excess of 250,000 and a wide range of cultural facilities, including six colleges and universities. The campus draws students from South Bend's 108,000 residents, and from five neighboring counties. The campus enrolls approximately 7,500 students: 60 percent full time and 40 percent part time. Half of the students are recent high school graduates, the other half are age 24 and older. Women outnumber men (36 percent), and Caucasians outnumber racial minorities (11 percent). Most of the students (80 percent) are undergraduates, and the vast majority (95 percent) are Indiana residents. The student body is primarily first-generation college students. The campus shares AASCU's mission of expanding access to higher education. Admission standards are generous, with unprepared students frequently admitted on academic probation. With programs in liberal arts and sciences, business and economics, fine arts, education, nursing

and dental hygiene, the campus awards approximately 200 associate's degrees, 500 bachelor's degrees, and 200 master's degrees each year.

Indiana University South Bend is a participant in The American Democracy Project for Civic Engagement—a national, multi-campus initiative that seeks to foster informed civic engagement in the United States. The project is focused on undergraduates at public colleges and universities and sponsored by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities in collaboration with *The New York Times*. Participating campuses pledge to provide students with multiple opportunities to engage in activities and projects designed to increase the number of undergraduate students committed to meaningful civic action. The Project stresses the importance of civic engagement that moves beyond voluntarism into the political realm. Participating campuses embrace the principle that public colleges and universities should be in the business of educating for citizenship—including life as active participants in the political process.[4]

This study took place during the 2006 congressional elections. Republican incumbent, Chris Chocola, faced a serious challenge from Democratic challenger, Joe Donnelly. Riding a wave of anti-Bush sentiment, and capitalizing on the unpopularity of Republican governor Mitch Daniels, Donnelly narrowly defeated the one-term incumbent. Turnout rates in St. Joseph County where Indiana University South Bend is located, reflected the competitiveness of the race with 45 percent of the district's registered voters heading to the polls on Election Day. Despite the excitement of a close election, student participation in electoral politics was minimal, with a dozen students total participating actively in the Political Science Club, College Democrats, or College Republicans.

On campus, the American Democracy Project (ADP) coordinated a series of voter registration efforts including registration tables, e-mail messages (which were sent to a randomly selected quarter of the student population), and classroom presentations. Registration activities were tightly controlled by the ADP campus director who incorporated all of the registration activities into the experimental design for the campus. Classroom presentations were limited to participating classes and no outside groups or unconnected student groups conducted campus registration campaigns. The effort netted a total of 500 registration forms—a record for the South Bend campus. While two-weeks of tabling in highly visible locations brought in a large number of registration forms, approximately 75 percent of the forms were collected in the classroom. E-mail yielded very limited results, with only 38 of 1,755 recipients downloading the online registration form.[5]

THE METHODOLOGY

This study is a randomized field experiment. Randomized experiments overcome both the problem of self-reporting bias and concerns about unobserved heterogeneity. In an experiment, the variable of interest (the treatment) is manipulated by the researcher and applied to particular subjects. Subjects are randomly assigned to the treatment or control group. Because of this random assignment, the groups are roughly similar to one another with regards to all factors except the administered treatment. Respondents in the treatment group and the control group should be similar in terms of educational level, political ideology, political interest, racial and ethnic background, age, gender, and other politically-relevant variables. The random assignment of the treatment protects against selection bias and unobserved heterogeneity. Self-reporting bias is also avoided because the experimental researcher knows exactly which respondents received the presentations or other contacts and uses official state voter files to compare the registration rates of subjects in the control and treatment groups.

This study utilizes a randomized field experiment to test the effectiveness of a classroom-based voter registration campaign. One alternative method would be to use surveys. We could simply ask students what type of registration opportunities were available on campus, which opportunities they participated in, and whether or not they registered to vote. However, this method is ill-suited to answering the question this article addresses. By relying on self-reports, the survey methodology introduces bias into the estimates of the effect of the class presentations on respondents' behavior. Those students most likely to report contact with campus-based registration volunteers are probably the same students who are most likely to report registering to vote, regardless of their actual registration status. A second alternative would be simply giving classroom presentations and counting the number of registration cards collected in each classroom. This approach would overcome the problem of biased self-reports, but would not allow us to compare the registration rates of students in these classrooms to students in other (non-registration) classrooms. It would be impossible for us to know how many of those students would have registered anyway, without the classroom registration campaign. Only by randomly assigning classrooms to treatment and control groups can we compare the registration rates of students who received the in-class registration appeal to *similar* students who received no such appeal. While all students received an opportunity to register to vote at registration tables in the major classroom buildings, only the students in the treatment classrooms received the opportunity to register to vote in the classroom.

THE DESIGN

The project director/author recruited professors at Indiana University South Bend to volunteer for the registration experiment. A total of 50 professors agreed to participate. Each instructor sent a list of classes to

include in the experiment. Combined, these lists included 113 classes across a wide range of subject areas and course levels. The participating courses were then assigned to one of three conditions: peer presentation, professor presentation, or control. Roughly one-third of the classes were assigned to each condition.[6] The treatment classrooms received a brief presentation on the importance of voting, followed by an opportunity to register in the classroom.[7] All professors and peer volunteers were given a recommended script for training purposes, though individual presenters were welcome to modify the script. (A copy of the script is found in Appendix A). Control classrooms received no information about voter registration.

Because a person is enrolled in a course does not mean that he or she necessarily attends every class session. While the project director was able to track which classes received the assigned presentations, this does not guarantee that every student in the treated classes actually heard the presentations. Due to the uncertainly regarding which of the enrolled students actually attended the class session at which the registration drive was conducted, the effect of *hearing* the presentation is not estimated. Rather, the effectiveness of the overall classroom campaign is evaluated, measuring the registration increase promoted by the act of *presenting* registration information and opportunities in the classroom. This method recognizes the fact that class absences are an ordinary occurrence. This measurement strategy makes sense. After all, it is the return on scheduling and giving such presentations that actually interests campus administrators, student groups, and political campaigns.

As a point of comparison, this study also examined the effectiveness of e-mail to register student voters. The author sent three messages to a randomly selected quarter of the total student body. Each message encouraged students to register to vote and included a link to the online *Rock the Vote* registration tool. Students could simply click the link, complete the registration form, print it, and mail it using a pre-printed address. The script for these messages is provided in Appendix B.

THE RESULTS

Table 4 reports the results for both the professor-led and peer-led presentations. A total of 39 classes received professor presentations, while 36 received peer-led presentations. The assignments were calculated in three batches and were stratified by instructor and size, accounting for the slight discrepancy in the number of professor (39), peer (36), and control (38) classes. Peer volunteers collected an average of four registration forms per class, while professors collected an average of five forms per class session.

TABLE 4. Effect of Classroom Presentations on Voter Registration

Treatment % Registered	Control % Registered	Treatment Effect
68.2	61.7	6.5%* (2.1)

NOTES: Standard error is in parenthesis. *p<.01

The data in Table 4 indicates that classroom presentations are an effective way to increase voter registration on college campuses.[8] Students in the treatment classes were more likely to register to vote than their counterparts in control classes.[9] This is the case even on campuses on which students are provided with other opportunities to register to vote. For example, at IU South Bend, the Political Science Club staffed voter registration tables and worked diligently to register a record number of new voters. Students in the treatment classes and those in the control classes were both exposed to these hallway registration efforts.

Next, we turn to the question of what type of presenter is the most effective in registering students: professors or peers. Table 5 compares the results of the student-led versus professor-led registration appeals.

TABLE 5. Effect of Classroom Presentations by Presenter

	Treat. % Registered	Control % Registered	Treatment Effect
Professor	70.6	61.7	8.9%** (2.5)
Peer	66.3	61.7	4.6%* (2.4)

NOTES: Standard error is in parenthesis. **p<.001 *p<.05

Contrary to the hypothesis that peer presenters would be most effective in registering students to vote, students who received a professor-led registration appeal were more likely to register than their peers who received peer-led presentations. However, this difference is not statistically significant. Although these results are suggestive, they are not definitive. In order to construct a 95 percent confidence interval, one must multiply the standard error by 1.96. According to this calculation, we are 95 percent confident that the true effect of a professor-presentation on students is an increase of between 4.0 percentage points and 13.8 percentage points. For peer presentations, we are 95 percent confident that the true effect (if all students on campus were treated) would be between - 0.1 percentage points and 9.3 percentage points. While professor-led presentations appear to be more effective at registering students than peer-led appeals, the estimates overlap rendering such a judgment premature. More studies are necessary to determine the overall

effect of classroom presentations across campuses and to determine whether or not the type of presenter actually determines the effectiveness of the registration appeal. It appears that the presenter is less important than the method of registration. [10]

When comparing the effectiveness of the classroom registration campaign to e-mail based registration appeals, it seems clear that more personalized, face-to-face registration appeals generate more new registrations than less personal technology-based appeals. The American Democracy Project director (and author) sent a series of three messages to a randomly-selected group of students equal to 25 percent of the total student body. (The content of these messages is found in Appendix B). Table 6 reports the results of the e-mail based registration campaign.

TABLE 6. Effect of Email Invitations on Voter Registration (by sender)

	Peer Sender	Admin. sender	Control group*
% registered	63.2	64.1	63.7
% unregistered	36.8	35.9	36.3

NOTE: *The control group did not receive an e-mail message.

Students receiving the messages were no more likely than other students to register to vote. This supports the hypothesis that class presentations are more effective than e-mail at registering student voters. Indeed, only 38 of the 1755 students receiving the message even downloaded a registration form. These (null) results are consistent with Bennion and Nickerson's (2008) findings for other campuses using e-mail to register student voters. E-mail is an ineffective way for colleges and universities to register students to vote.

CONCLUSIONS

This study provides evidence that classroom-based voter registration increases registration rates. Professors can successfully register voters in the classroom. Because students in both the treatment and the control groups are exposed to other outside-of-class registration appeals, the increased registration rates of students in the treatment classrooms suggests that these student would not have registered unless their professor took time to register them in the classroom. This is important information for campuses as they contemplate whether or not to add a classroom component to their registration efforts.

Previous experimental research has found that the effectiveness of voter mobilization efforts is directly proportional to their personalized nature. High-cost (high effort) face-to-face contact and volunteer phone calls are more effective than professional phone banks, leaflets, direct mail, or automated calls (Green & Gerber, 2004; Nickerson, 2007a). A recent study on the effectiveness of e-mail based voter registration on 26 college campuses confirms the hypotheses that low-cost, impersonal mobilization tactics will not inspire political action (Bennion & Nickerson, 2008). This study, in contrast, suggests that face-to-face appeals in the classroom are effective at bringing new voters into the electoral process.

Colleges and universities hoping to comply with the federal law requiring that they distribute registration forms to all registered students may be able to avoid problems obtaining forms from local clerks by e-mailing students registration forms or links. This would be a low-cost effort that might allow a campus to avoid federal penalties such as lost financial aid. However, this approach is unlikely to increase voter registration. Campuses committed to expanding participation in the electoral process should focus, instead, on campus-wide registration campaigns that maximize face-to-face interaction. Although classroom presentations require more volunteers and coordination than other, less personal approaches, they are likely to be far more effective at actually achieving the goal of increased political participation.

_____

NOTES

[1] See Bennion, Elizabeth A., and David W. Nickerson, "Email is Cheap, but is it Effective?" – a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Indiana Political Science Association, Purdue University North Central, Westville, IN, March 28, 2008.

[2] An 1998 amendment to the *Higher Education Act*, which governs most federal student-aid programs, requires colleges to obtain voter registration forms 120 days before the local registration deadline and distribute them to students enrolled in all degree or certificate programs. Colleges that fail to comply with the provision could jeopardize their federal student-aid funds.

[3] For a discussion of the academy's reluctance to promote political activity see *Educating for Democracy: Preparing Undergraduates for Responsible Political Engagement* (2007) by Anne Colby, Elizabeth Beaumont, Thomas Ehrlich, and Josh Corngold (Jossey-Bass, 2007).

[4] For suggestions on preparing students' political understanding, skill, motivation, and involvement, see *Educating for Democracy: Preparing Undergraduates for Responsible Political Engagement* (2007) by Anne Colby, Elizabeth Beaumont, Thomas Ehrlich, and Josh Corngold (Jossey-Bass, 2007).

[5] Only 25 percent of the student body received the online invitation to register to vote. A total of 1755

students received a series of three e-mail messages, each containing a link to a *Rock the Voter* registration tool. It is not known whether or not students downloading the form actually used the form to register to vote.

[6] Courses were stratified by instructor and size before being randomized. For this reason, and because courses were added after the first randomization, the number of classes receiving each treatment is not *exactly* the same.

[7] Presenters were encouraged to place a voter registration form on every desk before beginning the presentation. The goal of this approach was to involve all students in the presentation and to shift the social stigma toward those who returned a blank form rather than to those who requested a form. This also gave the presenter an opportunity to remind people that changes of address can also be taken care of in the classroom. Project coordinators on each campus, including the author, noticed a significant drop in the number of registration forms completed when presenters failed to follow this protocol.

[8] The author did not find any evidence that the success of the registration campaign varied by student age or gender. However, the dataset is relatively small. This is a fruitful area for future research into which students respond most to specific registration appeals.

[9] The 2006 Indiana statewide voter files do not include registration date. Future researchers should work with county clerks and secretaries of state to obtain date of registration information. Alternatively, they might get a copy of the voter file before and after the registration campaign to compare students' registration status. This information is not necessary to demonstrate post-treatment differences between the randomly assigned treatment and control groups. However, it could provide some baseline data about student registration rates and could be used to document the comparability of the treatment and control groups in terms of their pre-treatment registration rates.

[10] The author is currently analyzing the results of a 26-campus classroom registration experiment. Preliminary analysis suggests that both peer-led and professor-led presentations are successful at boosting registration rates.

REFERENCES

Bennion E. A., & Nickerson, D.W. (2008). *Email is Cheap, but is it Effective?* A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Indiana Political Science Association, Purdue University North Central, Westville, Indiana.

Colby, A. (2007). *Educating for Democracy: Preparing Undergraduates for Responsible Political Engagement.* Washington DC: Jossey-Bass.

Davila, A., and M.T. Mora. (2007, January). An assessment of civic engagement and educational attainment. *CIRCLE Fact Sheet.* Maryland: Center for Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.

Druckman J.N. (2001). On the limits of framing effects: who can frame. *Journal of Politics* 63, 1041-1066.

Gerber, A.S., & Green, D.P. (2000). The effects of canvassing, direct mail, and telephone contact on voter turnout: a field experiment. *American Political Science Review,* 94, 653-663.

Gerber, A. S., Green, D. P., & Green, M.N. (2003). The effects of partisan direct mail on voter turnout. *Electoral Studies,* 22, 563-579.

Green, D. P., & Gerber, A.S. (2004). *Get Out the Vote: How to Increase Voter Turnout.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Green, D.P., Gerber A.S., & Nickerson, D.W. (2003). Getting out the vote in local elections: results from six door-to-door canvassing experiments. *Journal of Politics*, 65, 1083-1096.

Kuklinski, J.H., and Hurley, N.L. (1994). On hearing and interpreting political messages: a cautionary tale of citizen cue-taking. *Journal of Politics,* 56, 729-751.

Lupia, A., & McCubbins, M.D. (1998). *The Democratic Dilemma: Can Citizens Learn what They Need to Know?* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Marcelo, K.B. (2007, September). Voter registration among young people. *CIRCLE Fact Sheet.* Maryland: Center for Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.

Miller, J.M., & Krosnick, J.A. (2000). News media impact on the ingredients of presidential evaluations: politically knowledgeable citizens are guided by a trusted source. *American Journal of Political Science,* 44, 301-315.

Nickerson, D.W. (2007). Quality is job one: professional and volunteer phone calls. *American Journal of Political Science* 51, 269-281.

Wattenberg, M. P. (2008). *Is Voting for Young People?* New York: Pearson Longman.

APPENDIX A. Script for Classroom Presentations (Peer)

- **This script may be shortened and adapted if necessary.**
- **No partisan opinions or bias may be introduced.**

- **No partisan t-shirts or buttons may be worn.**
- **Volunteers should MEMORIZE the presentation.**

✓ Practice the presentation out loud before presenting in a classroom.
✓ Concentrate on delivery.
✓ Speak slowly so that people can fully digest what you're staying.
✓ Speak clearly so that everyone can hear you.
✓ Vary your tone and pace for emphasis.

Hi. My name is _____, and I am a student at [campus name]. [Campus name] is a working with a coalition of public colleges and universities across the nation to make sure that students and young people are heard in the fall 2006 elections.

I am here to make sure that young people turn out to vote this November so that we can get attention paid to students and to the issues that matter to us.

So let me tell you about what's going on in the elections right now, and what we are doing.

First, I think most of us see some of what is going on with the elections: The ads, the news about this candidate and that candidate. But mostly it seems pretty much like the whole thing is going on without us. Especially here in (X STATE) it seems like the election is everywhere you turn, but often has little to do with us.

It's not surprising really. Even though there are 24 million people between 18 and 24 in this country, older people – like over 65 - they vote at twice the rate that we do. Campaigns just know those people are going to vote. That is why the ads are talking about prescription drugs and Medicare. That's why they spend so much money making phone calls and sending pieces of mail to older people trying to get them to vote for this candidate or that candidate.

How many people here are on Medicare? C'mon don't be shy now. Raise your hands if you are on Medicare.

Right.

Now how about those of you who could use more financial aid to help pay for college?

We don't hear a lot of talk about that. Go ahead, raise your hands.

Right.

There are a lot of important things going on right now that affect students' lives. Getting a good job, paying for college or deciding what happens with the war in Iraq. It's not like we all have the same opinion on this stuff just because we are young people or students, but we do need politicians to pay attention to these issues and to pay attention to us.

But a lot of it comes down to voting and what we do on Election Day this November.

Our coalition is all about getting young people registered and out to vote. Of course, we want non-traditional students to register to vote too. As students, they understand many of the issues confronting young people today. But our primary goal is to get at least 40,000 college students (under the age of 30) registered to vote, including 400 here at [campus name]. And we are one of more than 80 colleges that is doing this all across the country—and that's just counting schools in our coalition.

Each of you has a voter registration form on your desk. I'm asking you take just a couple of minutes to complete them now. I'll collect them now and be sure that they are turned in to the proper voter registration office. It's important that you register NOW, before you forget. [School name] will even send the form in for you!

Personal story . . . Rap Up . . . *(optional)*

_____

APPENDIX B: E-mail Scripts

MESSAGE #1 (sent Monday September 18, 2006)
Subject line: Why do politicians ignore you?

Do you have an issue you care about? Maybe it's the environment, or terrorism or healthcare or the availability of jobs. Some issues are so large that they seem impossible to address as just one individual, but you can make a contribution and have a voice in these issues. You just have to get someone to listen to you.

Politicians tend to ignore the issues college students care about because too many college students do not vote. I urge you to vote in the national election on Tuesday November 7. But you can't vote if you are not registered.

It's easy to register to vote. Just click on this link CAMPUS LINK HERE and you can register right now. However, if you don't register by early October (as early as October 6 in many states), you can't vote this year.

Let the politicians hear your voice. Please vote. Register NOW so you can.

MESSAGE #2 (sent Monday September 25, 2006)
Subject line: Educated citizens vote. How about you?

Politicians pay attention to those citizens who vote. They are not likely to care much about the issues of college students who do not vote. Part of the purpose of a college education is to prepare you to be active, engaged citizens in our democracy. At a very minimum, that means being able to vote.

Our democracy depends on voters. Our democracy depends on you voting. Are you registered to vote? You can register right now. Just click on this link CAMPUS

<u>LINK HERE</u> and you can register to vote. If you don't register by early October (as early as October 6 in many states), you can't vote this year.

Get engaged, get registered to vote and then make your voice heard by voting in the national election on Tuesday, November 7th.

MESSAGE #3 (sent Monday October 2, 2006)
Subject line: Time is running out to register to vote

Have you registered to vote yet? If you don't register to vote by early October (as early as October 6 in many states), you can't vote in this year's national election on Tuesday, November 7th.

Register to vote before it's too late. You can register right now. Just click on this link <u>CAMPUS LINK HERE</u>.

Take an active role in our democracy. Help ensure that the issues you care about are addressed by elected officials.