

E-government and Citizen Engagement: An Overview of State Governmental Websites

Thomas J. Greitens
Central Michigan University

J. Cherie Strachan
Central Michigan University

Abstract:

This analysis examined whether state governments in the United States use e-government to enhance citizen engagement. By assessing the availability and usability of online information about government, voting, budgetary matters, and governmental meetings, we determined the effectiveness of state governmental websites in educating and engaging their citizenry. Overall, we discovered that most state governmental websites do an inferior job of enhancing citizen engagement through governmental websites.

Introduction

Western culture has long emphasized the cultivation of citizens with the desire, as well as the capacity, for civic and political participation. Moreover, many classic and contemporary scholars have identified participation in deliberative decision-making as the key to cultivating ideal citizenship. Yet the opportunity for participation in meaningful collective decision-making in natural settings appears to be declining. Meanwhile deliberative experiences constructed by well-meaning public officials often do little to enhance participants' attitudes toward political participation and may even do more harm than good. Given the potential for bureaucratic decision-making to spread, public agencies in a democracy ought to encourage and support deliberation in natural settings to the greatest extent possible. Hence this research provides a normative assessment of state governments' efforts to include citizens in meaningful deliberative decision-making, as well as their efforts to facilitate such activities in other online venues within the public sphere.

The notion that public decisions in a democracy ought to be based on discussions among free and equal citizens traces its roots to ancient Athens. In his eulogy of Athens, Pericles claimed that Athenians looked upon such discussions not as a stumbling block to action, but as “an indispensable preliminary to any wise action at all.” This favorable take on collective problem solving took root in America. Thomas Jefferson, for instance, justified his support of public education with the claim that: "In a republican nation whose citizens are to be led by reason and persuasion and not by force, the art of reasoning becomes of first importance." Support for such sentiments, grounding democracy in citizens’ abilities to reason with one another and their government, is also readily found in contemporary political science.

With the expansion of the bureaucratic state in the 1930s and 1940s and corresponding concern over the increasing power of unelected bureaucrats, policymakers devised administrative law as a way to let citizens participate in the bureaucratic process. With the passage of the federal Administrative Procedure Act in 1946 and corresponding state acts years later, citizens could now directly participate in the crafting of bureaucratic rules (Heedy 1952).

Citizen deliberation opportunities gradually expanded in the succeeding decades as scholars and practitioners recognized the need to place bureaucracy closer to citizens (Fredrickson 1980). Continuing to the present day, these committees, also identified as citizen survey panels, serve in an advisory role to bureaucratic decision-makers and elected policymakers in government (Kathlene and Martin 1991). Citizens serve on these committees and offer input on the issue at hand, but do not actually make a policy decision. Instead, administrators and elected officials continue to make those decisions. Obstacles such as funding problems and the fact that these types of citizen committees have no real decision-making authority hampered the use of this element in citizen participation (Silverman 2003). Despite

those problems and its potential inapplicability for certain policy problems, these types of committees are often lauded as an effective type of citizen governance that can help government become more democratic (Box 1998).

In addition to these direct forms of participation, scholars also recognized budget transparency as an indirect type of citizen engagement. That is, if governments make spending decisions transparent to citizens, then decisions will probably be better, citizens will probably trust their government more, and citizens will also participate to a greater degree. In this way, much like other avenues of citizen participation, budget transparency helps to make the government accountable to citizens. However, the scholarly research indicates that the impact of budget transparency on citizens is mixed. Seemingly, citizens do not notice or care about budget transparency especially when considering measures of budgetary performance (Lynn Jr., Heinrich, and Hill 2000; Swindell and Kelly 2000). In addition, making the budget process too open and too transparent could even increase the political inefficiencies of public budgeting (Rubin 2006). Nevertheless, budget transparency remains an important topic for citizen deliberation since interested citizens need this information to understand how their government spends public monies.

E-Government and the Possibility of More Citizen Engagement

Expense is one of the major challenges confronting any government attempting to promote any type of citizen deliberation. The expense of encouraging citizen deliberation can even potentially take needed resources from policy implementation and impair programs (Irvin and Stansbury 2004). This question of cost becomes magnified when it is considered what is actually accomplished due to citizen input. Some authors show that citizen input during city

council meetings and school board meetings does not directly influence policy decisions made by the governing body (Adams 2004). Yet, these minimal citizen participation efforts seem to give citizens an opportunity to send information to officials, network with other citizens, and set future agendas. This means that many types of citizen engagement efforts, such as public meetings, function more as a political tool for citizens rather than as a tool for true citizen engagement and participation in the process.

As a result, for citizen engagement efforts to truly consider citizen input, governments may have to engage in innovative participation strategies, spend more resources, and change existing organizational cultures. Once implemented, such efforts often have immediate benefits for the community as citizens amplify their knowledge of government and increase their trust with governmental officials (Berman 1997; Bland and Rubin 1997; Kathleen and Martin 1991; Webler and Tuler 2000). As a result, while citizen engagement is often hard to implement, a case can be made that it is necessary.

To help offset these costs, citizen engagement is often incorporated onto governmental websites. Throughout the last decade, all levels of governments have used websites to communicate with citizens, offer services to their citizens, and even engage in online deliberations with their citizens. In many instances, these online activities have progressed from basic communication devices to fully interactive web-pages that allow for enhanced services. Researchers initially identified these governmental websites on a five-stage scale based on services offered. These stages included: an emerging web presence with only one-way communications; an enhanced web presence with more forms of communication such as e-mail and links to other governmental agencies; an interactive portal or gateway web presence with limited transactions; a transactional web presence that allowed for all types of secure

transactions; and a seamless web presence where a user could login into one central portal system and access multi-governmental responses (Garson 2006; Ho 2002; United Nations and American Society for Public Administration 2002). It is important to note that these stages are typically evolutionary in nature. That is, a government usually first uses their website to just offer information to citizens. Then as time progresses, technology improves and citizen demand for online governmental services increases, governments use their website to offer more and more services. The last stage of website development, which exists in a variety of forms in many governments, allows the citizen to login to one portal system and access a variety of governmental services across agencies and across levels of government.

In this initial classification of government websites, the emphasis was mainly on online services and how governments could take advantage of online transactions to become more efficient and increase citizen/customer satisfaction. Darrell West (2005) later modified this classification schema when he examined a number of governmental websites in an attempt to categorize e-government activity, defined as how governments and public organizations use online media to provide basic information, deliver public services, and help citizens engage and participate in their government. He determined that four stages of government websites existed: billboards, partial service-deliveries, portals, and interactive democracy (West 2005). In the billboard stage, governments only use their websites to communicate information to citizens. These are basic governmental websites commonly found in smaller local governments, single purpose governments, and some legislative entities. In the partial service-delivery stage, websites typically have more interactivity with advanced search functions and a limited number of online services. Expanding on the partial service-delivery stage, a portal type of website allows government to offer a variety of services online. All a citizen has to do is login into the portal

and then they can perform a variety of activities from ordering governmental publications, paying a governmental fine or fee, and communicating directly to policymakers and bureaucrats. However, while all of these latter stages make some service delivery more convenient for citizens and more efficient for government, they do not really transform the way citizens interact with their government.

Instead, the transformational power of e-government begins to take shape in the final stage of governmental website: interactive democracy. With an interactive democracy website, a citizen can directly participate in governmental decision-making and directly hold policymakers and bureaucrats accountable on a variety of decisions (West 2005). In this way, interactive democracy websites place more emphasis on public feedback and democratic deliberation instead of service delivery. Although, it should be noted that interactive democracy websites would also have a good deal of services online for citizens to access. While it is debatable if any governmental website has truly reached the final stage of interactive democracy, many websites are slowly progressing to this point. For example, many federal agencies have added an e-rulemaking component to their website allowing citizens to input comments on draft agency rules and monitor how these comments influenced the final rules promulgated by the agency (Shulman 2005). When government integrates this type of citizen input with more accountability based features such as how the promulgated rule impacted agency performance, then an interactive democracy website has occurred.

Nonetheless, there are significant downsides to e-government. Even in 2009, the digital divide remains a concern. No matter how far online technology progresses, there will always be citizens that cannot access a governmental website due to lack of computers and internet access (Norris 2001; Mossberger, Tolbert, and Stansbury 2003). But perhaps an even greater concern

for the future is that the pace of technology advancement now occurs so rapidly that incorporating new technological features on a governmental website can make e-government confusing for citizens not familiar with the new technology. Even with these known concerns, government and bureaucracy continue to push more services, more information, and more deliberations into the online environment.

Case Example: The American States

We examine the effectiveness of state governmental websites in the online structuring of citizen engagement. To conduct this examination, we constructed a citizen engagement index based on previous research (as mentioned in the preceding sections). While the index is not comprehensive, it includes the main engagement topics that should be explained or made available to the citizen. With these topics explained, the citizen can actively participate in democracy and the inner workings of bureaucracy. As explained in Table 1, these topics cover two major sub-indices of citizen engagement. First, the government has to inform the citizen about their government. Second, the bureaucracy then has to inform the citizen on how to participate in their government. If the bureaucracy provides information on all of these topics, then we argue that most citizens should be able to adequately participate in their government.

<insert Table 1 here>

There are four citizen engagement topics in the information or “becoming an informed citizen” sub-index. The first topic is “explanation of government operations.” This topic examines if the state government websites explain to citizens how their government operates.

For example, many state government websites explain to citizens the separate branches of government, how a bill becomes a law, and the job functions of elected policymakers. In order to participate in their government, citizens need to know how their government operates. As a result, this topic is often the first step for citizens in participating in their government.

The second and third topics are “budget transparency” and “procurement transparency.” In order to ensure citizen involvement in government, government has to publicize to citizens how they spend taxpayer monies. When citizens have access to this information, they can become an active partner in governance with elected policymakers. The fourth topic is “publication of state laws.” In order to participate in their government, citizens need to be able to easily find, read, and search through the laws of their state. This allows the citizen to understand the state’s legal environment as well as enabling them to hold policymakers accountable for passing state laws that the citizen might not agree with.

In the “participating” sub-index there are seven citizen engagement topics. The first three topics “voter registration,” “communication with elected officials,” and “hearing schedules and calendars,” all allow the citizen to participate in their government. With voting, citizens can participate in their government at the most basic, yet perhaps most powerful, level. And by communicating to elected officials by phone or via email, citizens can directly state to elected policymakers their concerns over proposed pieces of legislation or enacted statutes. This level of communication can become even greater if the citizen knows beforehand when legislative hearings occur. Citizens can attend these meetings and in many circumstances offer brief comments on the issues under discussion.

In the fourth topic, “rulemaking,” state websites should inform citizens that it is their right under the state’s Administrative Procedure Act to offer comments during the bureaucratic

rulemaking process. In a similar manner, citizens should be aware of the fifth topic “advisory commissions.” Many states have established some form of citizen led panel to provide advice to agencies, policymakers, and other non-governmental entities in the state. Knowing about rulemaking and the use of advisory commissions allows the citizen to enjoy greater participation in their democracy.

With the sixth topic, “direct democracy,” the citizen can directly hold policymakers accountable for their previous actions. Typically in direct democracy, citizens can recall elected officials, put new issues on the ballot for all to vote on, and even hold a referendum on laws passed by elected policymakers. While not all states have each element of direct democracy, most states have at least one (Ellis 2002). As a result, direct democracy is an important citizen engagement topic for most state governments. Finally there is “volunteering.” In volunteering, the state government encourages the citizen to become involved in communities as well as agencies throughout the state. As a result, volunteering encourages a great amount of citizen involvement with other citizens and with governmental organizations.

To analyze these topics from state to state, we developed a coding protocol for state governmental websites. Using West’s (2005) typology of websites as a starting point, we constructed an ordinal coding scale for each topic listed in Table 1. As described in Table 2, possible values for each topic range from zero to three, with zero reflecting no information about the citizen engagement topic and three indicating a searchable online database system with optional user login functionalities for the citizen engagement topic. Much as West’s (2005) ordinal ranking protocol for e-government suggests that websites ensure more citizen usability and accountability as they progress from lower stages to higher stages, we use our ranking protocol to suggest that as websites score higher on each topic it indicates a higher level of

citizen engagement elicitation from the state government. That is, states that score a three on a citizen engagement topic are taking that topic seriously and actively want citizens to understand the topic and participate in government. Whereas states that score lower on a citizen engagement topic may not be actively encouraging the citizens to use the citizen engagement topic.

Using this approach, we examined the fifty state government websites from January through February 2009 to analyze each state's performance in putting citizen engagement endeavors online. To analyze the overall performance of the states on each citizen engagement topic we used descriptive statistics and average assessment percentages. With descriptive statistics we can reveal the average and most common ranking from the states on each topic, as well as how much the states vary in their rankings. Then, by dividing the mean score by the total possible score, we can arrive at a performance assessment percentage for each topic. Based on earlier studies on e-government (West 2005; Garson 2006), states that have at least an interactive stage of citizen engagement (e.g. scoring 2 out of a possible 3 on the coding scale to reflect a 67% assessment) would be effective at incorporating that topic onto their website. As a result, scores of at least 67% would reflect a positive outcome for citizen engagement.

Results

Results generally indicate that states do an effective job of putting some types of citizen engagement online. This is especially the case for making state laws available online and putting voter registration efforts online. For both of these topics, most states had a sophisticated web presence. As evident in Table 3, almost every state had a searchable online database system for their state laws. In addition, many states allowed voter registration online and even allowed citizens to log onto a portal system to check on the status of their voter registration and locate

their polling place. These types of activities reflect the highest levels of citizen engagement online.

<Insert Table 3 here>

However, most states clearly lagged in putting other citizen engagement topics online. This is especially true when considering many of the participation topics. Most states simply did not publish on their website opportunities for citizens to participate in rulemaking, advisory commissions, or even direct democracy. The results are especially troublesome for advisory commissions and direct democracy since the most common state ranking for each of these categories was 0. This indicates that most states have no online information whatsoever about advisory commissions and direct democracy.

On average, states did a better job at publishing hearing schedules, volunteering efforts, how to communicate with elected officials, and making their budgets and procurements transparent in the online environment. But on average, these topics were expressed on governmental websites in a very simplistic manner. That is, there was usually no interactivity involved in presenting this information.

When comparing the “becoming an informed citizen” sub-index to the “participating in the process” sub-index, the results reveal that on average states do a better job of informing citizens about their government compared to informing citizens about how to participate in their government. The differences between the two sub-indices are not even that close. With four topic areas in the “becoming” sub-index, a total score of 12 is possible. Yet when added together, the average score from states on each of these topics is only 6. This results in a 50% average assessment percentage. In the “participating” sub-index there are seven topics. As a

result, a total score of 21 is possible for that sub-index. Yet when added together, the average score from states on these topics is only 8.7. This results in a 38% average assessment percentage.

In Table 4, results are presented for each state with a relaxed total assessment outcome. Since the assessments scores were generally so low, we relaxed the positive assessment outcome to scores of 60% and above (indicating that most citizen engagement topic areas still have some measure of interactivity). Even with that relaxed standard, only six states received positive outcomes on citizen engagement based on this assessment scale (Colorado, Maine, Montana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Virginia).

<Insert Table 4 here>

Conclusions

The results indicate that, on average, states are not incorporating citizen engagement topics onto their websites. When the topics are on incorporated onto governmental websites they are typically presented in a very simplistic, “billboard” type of web-page that just defines and displays information about the citizen engagement topic. For those state governments that put citizen engagement content online in this simplistic manner, perhaps it could be argued that billboard websites are good enough or that increased interactivity on a website does not always correspond to a better website. However, what those arguments miss and what many state governmental websites seem to be missing is that enhanced interactivity on these websites promotes enhanced accountability for citizens. By enhancing interactivity, citizen involvement in these citizen engagement topics becomes easier and perhaps even more intuitive.

For example, many state governments make their budget transparent by placing the entire budget document in one pdf file on a governmental website, while other state governments make their budget transparent by inputting the budget data into an online database system searchable by programmatic function. For the citizen, downloading a large pdf budget document that is often hundreds of pages long with many large graphics can become a frustrating experience. These large documents often cause browsers to crash and the download time can be as long as twenty to thirty minutes for citizens still using a dial-up internet connection. Then when the document is finally downloaded, the citizen often has a difficult time finding needed information in such a large document. In contrast, the online database system is quicker to load and easier to use. The citizen can simply type in search criteria and then sift through search results. As a result, the database system has more interactivity and is ranked with a higher score in this analysis.

This consideration results in a potentially troubling conclusion. Since most states seemingly put citizen engagement topics online in an inferior manner even though better interfaces are available, what does that say about the state government? Do the state governments truly want citizen input in the guise of these various engagement topics? The answer for most states seems to be no. Because if they truly wanted citizen engagement, then they would better structure the process in the online environment. While this lack of online structuring and presentation may be due to budgetary constraints or even lack of foresight, it may also be due to policymaker and bureaucratic resistance. As a result, now that this analysis has discovered that online citizen engagement actions by state governments are lacking, future research should examine the causes of this deficiency.

References

- Adams, Brian. 2004. Public Meetings and the Democratic Process. *Public Administration Review* 64(1): 43-54.
- Berman, Evan M. 1997. Dealing with Cynical Citizens. *Public Administration Review* 57(2): 105-112.
- Bland, Robert L. and Irene S. Rubin. 1997. *Budgeting: A Guide for Local Governments*. Washington, DC: International City/County Management Association.
- Ellis, Richard J. (2002). *Democratic Delusions: The Initiative Process in America*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Frederickson, George. (1980). *New Public Administration*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Garson, G. D.. 2006. *Public information technology and e-governance: Managing the virtual state*. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett Publishers.
- Heady, Ferrel. 1952. State Administrative Procedure Laws: An Appraisal. *Public Administration Review* 12(1): 10-20.
- Ho, A. T. 2002. Reinventing local government and the e-government initiative. *Public Administration Review* 62: 434-444.
- Irvin, Renee and John Stansbury. 2004. Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Is it Worth the Effort? *Public Administration Review* 64(1): 55-65.
- Kathlene, Lyn and John A. Martin. 1991. Enhancing Citizen Participation: Panel Designs, Perspectives, and Policy Formation. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 10(1): 46-63.
- Lynn Jr., Laurence E., Carolyn J. Heinrich, and Carolyn J. Hill. (2000). Studying Governance and Public Management: Challenges and Prospects. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10 (2): 233-261.
- Mossberger, Karen, Caroline J. Tolbert, and Mary Stansbury. 2003. *Virtual Inequality: Beyond the Digital Divide*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Norris, Pippa. 2001. *Digital Divide: Civic Engagement, Information Poverty, and the Internet Worldwide*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Rubin, I.S. 2006. *The politics of public budgeting: Getting and spending, borrowing and balancing (5th ed.)*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Schulman, S. W. 2005. E-rulemaking: Issues in current research and practice. *International Journal of Public Administration* 28: 621-641.
- Silverman, Robert. 2003. Citizens' District Councils in Detroit: The Promise and Limits of Using Planning Advisory Boards to Promote Citizen Participation. *National Civic Review* 92(4): 3-13.
- Swindell, David and Janet M. Kelly. (2000). Linking Citizen Satisfaction Data to Performance Measures: A Preliminary Evaluation. *Public Productivity and Management Review* 24(1): 30-52.
- United Nations and American Society of Public Administration. 2002. *Benchmarking e-government: A global perspective assessing the UN member states*. Washington, DC: American Society for Public Administration and the United Nations.
- Webler, Thomas and Seth Tuler. 2000. Fairness and Competence in Citizen Participation: Theoretical Reflections From a Case Study. *Administration & Society* 32(5): 566-595.
- West, D.M. 2005. *Digital government: Technology and public sector performance*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Table 1:
Citizen Engagement Index

Becoming an Informed Citizen Sub-Index

- Explanation of Government Operations
- Budget Transparency
- Procurement Transparency
- Publication of State Laws

Participating in the Process Sub-Index

- Voter Registration
 - Communication with Elected Officials
 - Hearing Schedules and Calendars
 - Rulemaking
 - Advisory Commissions
 - Avenues of Direct Democracy (if applicable)
 - Volunteering
-

Table 2:
Coding Protocol for each Topic in the Citizen Engagement Index

| | |
|-----|--|
| 0 = | No Information Stage No information on topic |
| 1 = | Billboard Stage Website just displays information about citizen engagement topic |
| 2 = | Interactive Stage Website provides interactive information about citizen engagement topic |
| 3 = | Online Database Stage Website provides searchable database with optional login features on citizen engagement topic |

Table 3: Results

| | Mean | Mode | Standard Deviation | Average Assessment % | Average Assessment Outcome |
|---|------|------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| <i>Becoming an Informed Citizen</i> | | | | | |
| Explanation of Government Operations | 0.64 | 1 | 0.63 | 21% | - |
| Budget Transparency | 1.32 | 1 | 0.77 | 44% | - |
| Procurement Transparency | 1.44 | 1 | 1.09 | 48% | - |
| Publication of State Laws | 2.60 | 3 | 0.76 | 87% | + |
| <i>“Becoming” Sub-Index Total</i> | 6.00 | 6 | 1.92 | 50% | - |
| <i>Participating in the Process</i> | | | | | |
| Voter Registration | 2.04 | 2 | 0.75 | 68% | + |
| Communication with Elected Officials | 1.62 | 2 | 0.57 | 54% | - |
| Hearing Schedules and Calendars | 1.20 | 1 | 0.86 | 40% | - |
| Rulemaking | 1.06 | 1 | 0.89 | 35% | - |
| Advisory Commissions | 0.68 | 0 | 0.98 | 23% | - |
| Avenues of Direct Democracy (if applicable) | 0.68 | 0 | 0.84 | 23% | - |
| Volunteering | 1.42 | 1 | 0.93 | 47% | - |
| <i>“Participating” Sub-Index Total</i> | 8.70 | 8 | 2.86 | 38% | - |
| Total Index | 14.7 | 14 | 4.02 | 45% | - |

Table 4: Assessments by State (with “relaxed” positive assessment outcomes)

| State | “Becoming” Sub-Index | “Participating” Sub-Index | Total Index | Total Assessment % | Total Assessment Outcome |
|-------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| AL | 5 | 3 | 8 | 24% | - |
| AK | 8 | 7 | 15 | 45% | - |
| AZ | 2 | 8 | 10 | 30% | - |
| AR | 1 | 3 | 4 | 12% | - |
| CA | 6 | 12 | 18 | 55% | - |
| CO | 8 | 16 | 24 | 73% | + |
| CT | 5 | 9 | 14 | 42% | - |
| DE | 6 | 8 | 14 | 42% | - |
| FL | 5 | 6 | 11 | 33% | - |
| GA | 6 | 4 | 10 | 30% | - |
| HI | 5 | 5 | 10 | 30% | - |
| ID | 5 | 10 | 15 | 45% | - |
| IL | 8 | 6 | 14 | 42% | - |
| IN | 5 | 12 | 17 | 52% | - |
| IA | 6 | 11 | 17 | 52% | - |
| KS | 5 | 4 | 9 | 27% | - |
| KY | 9 | 8 | 17 | 52% | - |
| LA | 3 | 7 | 10 | 30% | - |
| ME | 5 | 15 | 20 | 61% | + |
| MD | 7 | 11 | 18 | 55% | - |
| MA | 7 | 8 | 15 | 45% | - |
| MI | 8 | 11 | 19 | 58% | - |
| MN | 6 | 8 | 14 | 42% | - |
| MS | 4 | 7 | 11 | 33% | - |
| MO | 7 | 10 | 17 | 52% | - |
| MT | 7 | 14 | 21 | 64% | + |
| NE | 8 | 8 | 16 | 48% | - |
| NV | 6 | 10 | 16 | 48% | - |
| NH | 6 | 6 | 12 | 36% | - |
| NJ | 6 | 7 | 13 | 39% | - |
| NM | 5 | 7 | 12 | 36% | - |
| NY | 4 | 11 | 15 | 45% | - |
| NC | 8 | 12 | 20 | 61% | + |
| ND | 5 | 9 | 14 | 42% | - |
| OH | 7 | 12 | 19 | 58% | - |
| OK | 10 | 10 | 20 | 61% | + |
| OR | 6 | 10 | 16 | 48% | - |
| PA | 7 | 10 | 17 | 52% | - |
| RI | 8 | 8 | 16 | 48% | - |
| SC | 4 | 6 | 10 | 30% | - |
| SD | 2 | 5 | 7 | 21% | - |
| TN | 6 | 10 | 16 | 48% | - |
| TX | 7 | 8 | 15 | 45% | - |
| UT | 7 | 12 | 19 | 58% | - |
| VT | 6 | 7 | 13 | 39% | - |
| VA | 11 | 10 | 21 | 64% | + |
| WA | 7 | 9 | 16 | 48% | - |
| WV | 6 | 9 | 15 | 45% | - |
| WI | 5 | 9 | 14 | 42% | - |
| WY | 4 | 7 | 11 | 33% | - |