

**Voter Identification Laws and the Suppression of Minority Votes**

**Provisionally Accepted, *The Journal of Politics***

Zoltan Hajnal, University of California, San Diego

Department of Political Science, University of California, San Diego, 9500 Gilman Drive,

La Jolla, CA 92093, 0521, [zhajnal@ucsd.edu](mailto:zhajnal@ucsd.edu) 858-822-5015

Nazita Lajevardi, University of California San Diego

Department of Political Science, University of California, San Diego, 9500 Gilman Drive,

La Jolla, CA 92093, 0521, [nlajevar@ucsd.edu](mailto:nlajevar@ucsd.edu)

Lindsay Nielson, Bucknell University

Department of Political Science, Bucknell University, 1 Dent Drive, Lewisburg, PA 17837

[ln009@bucknell.edu](mailto:ln009@bucknell.edu)

**Voter Identification Laws and the Suppression of Minority Votes<sup>12</sup>**

**Zoltan Hajnal, University of California, San Diego**

**Nazita Lajevardi, University of California San Diego**

**Lindsay Nielson, Bucknell University**

**Abstract**

The proliferation of increasingly strict voter identification laws around the country has raised concerns about voter suppression. Although there are many reasons to suspect that these laws could harm groups like racial minorities and the poor, existing studies have generally failed to demonstrate a link between voter ID laws and voter turnout among these groups. We question these null effects. We argue that because most of the studies occurred before states enacted strict identification requirements, they uncover few effects. By using validated voting data from the Cooperative Congressional Election Study for several recent elections, we are able to offer a more definitive test. The analysis shows that strict identification laws have a differentially negative impact on the turnout of racial and ethnic minorities in primaries and general elections. We also find that voter ID laws skew democracy toward those on the political right.

**KEYWORDS:** Voter Identification Laws, Voting Rights, Turnout, African Americans, Latinos

<sup>1</sup> Supplementary material for this article is available in an online appendix. Replication files are available in the JOP Data Archive on Dataverse. (<http://thedata.harvard.edu/dvn/dv/jop>)

<sup>2</sup> The authors would like to thank the Russel Sage Foundation and the UCSD Academic Senate for their generous support of this project.

Voting is the bedrock of democracy. Through the vote, citizens choose leaders, sway policy, and generally influence democracy. By contrast, citizens who don't vote can be ignored. It is, thus, not surprising to see that the laws that shape turnout and determine who can and who cannot vote generate enormous attention and controversy. The latest front in this debate concerns voter identification laws.

Voter identification laws have been a topic of discussion since 1950 when South Carolina became the first state to request some form of identification at the polls (NCSL 2015). Since then, more and more states have instituted some form of voter ID law. But it is only within the last decade that the strictest forms of voter ID have proliferated and voter ID laws have received widespread attention.

Today these voter ID laws take several distinct forms. Strict voter ID laws *require* identification in order to cast a regular ballot. Other more lenient laws, *request but do not require* voters to show some kind of identification document at the polls. These laws can also be distinguished by whether or not they allow or consider non-photo identification.

All told, 34 states currently enforce some form of a voter identification law (NCSL 2015). Of these, 11 are strict ID laws state that require a person to show identification in order to vote.<sup>1</sup> More states appear to be waiting on the wings. New Mexico, Nevada, Iowa, and others are all considering new stricter voter identification laws (NCSL 2015).

The consequences of all of this could be enormous. Given that more than half of the nation's population is currently subject to these laws, that stricter laws are being considered in

---

<sup>1</sup> Current strict ID states: Arizona, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Mississippi, North Dakota, Ohio, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

multiple states, and that the courts are actively evaluating the merits of these laws in a series of landmark cases, there is a compelling need to know exactly what the true impact of these laws is.

There is no shortage of opinions about these laws. On one side, the proliferation of these laws raises real concerns for critics who believe that they are unnecessary and ultimately detrimental to democracy. Activist groups like the Brennan Center for Justice claim that voter ID laws serve as effective barriers that limit the legitimate participation of racial and ethnic minorities and other disadvantaged groups (Weiser 2014). The right to vote, according to these detractors, should not only be afforded to people of a certain means. Using this line of reasoning, former U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder has equated voter ID laws to poll taxes. Likewise, U.S. Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg has called the laws “purposely discriminatory” (Lowry 2014). Indeed for some, the growth of voter ID laws represents one of the most pressing civil rights issues of our time. Critics also believe that there is almost no voter fraud and thus little reason to enact these laws in the first place.<sup>2</sup> The Voting Rights Institute, for example, bemoans these laws as “an unnecessary, expensive, and intrusive voter restriction” (Voting Rights Institute 2015). Within this framework, the only winners are Republican leaders who employ these laws to hijack the democratic process and bias outcomes in their favor. If these critics are correct, voter identification laws are having widespread consequences not only for who wins and who loses, but also for the representativeness and fairness of our democracy.

However, this debate is far from one-sided. Proponents, including most prominently Kris Kobach, Kansas’ Secretary of State, claim that they are warranted and that they do not reduce the participation of citizens (Kobach 2011). They are warranted, according to supporters of the law,

---

<sup>2</sup> Research has uncovered little documented evidence of significant voter fraud (Ahlquist et al 2014) but see Richman et al 2014).

because fraud is a real and potentially widespread phenomenon that could alter electoral outcomes and erode faith in democracy. Advocates also argue that voter identification laws do not reduce the participation of citizens because they do not prevent legitimate voters from entering the voting booth. For the Americans who have identification, the laws raise no new barriers. For the tiny subset of Americans who do not, the requirement represents a small hurdle that is easily overcome. Moreover, the American public strongly favors these laws (Coren 2014). From this perspective, the passage of these laws ensures that only eligible Americans participate and restores trust in the democratic process.

Who is right? Are these laws simply minor alterations that serve only to reduce fraud or are they major barriers that substantially alter who votes and who wins in the American political arena? The key to answering this question and to determining the benefits or drawbacks of voter identification is to provide hard empirical evidence of the actual *consequences* of voter identification laws.

### **Evaluating Voter ID Laws**

Unfortunately, despite all of the partisan and political debate, we have relatively little empirical data on the *consequences* of these laws. Several studies have identified areas of concern that *could* ultimately lead to large, negative consequences for American elections. Although the findings have been disputed, several studies appear to have uncovered a relatively large number of Americans without proper identification (GAO 2014, Barreto and Sanchez 2014, Pastor et al 2010). Others have shown that a lack of identification is particularly acute among the minority population, the poor, and the young (Barreto and Sanchez 2014, Ansolabehere 2014, Pastor et al 2010, Barreto et al 2009 but see Alvarez et al 2011).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Supporters of these laws counter that most of the citizens without ID are not voting anyway.

A different set of researchers has attempted to assess whether the existing laws are applied evenly and have found that poll workers disproportionately ask minorities for identification (White et al 2015, Rogowski and Cohen 2014, Atkeson et al 2014, Cobb et al 2012, Ansolabehere 2009). There is even some evidence that in a small set of cases provisional ballots that should have been counted have ultimately not been included in vote tallies (Pitts 2013). Finally, there is at least tangential evidence of the political motivations behind the passage of these laws. These laws are generally passed by Republicans and tend to emerge in states with larger minority populations and greater partisan competition (Bentele and O'Brien 2013, Hicks et al 2014 ). All of this evidence suggests that the consequences of voter identification could be severe.

There are, in short, many reasons to suspect problems with these laws. Yet none of these studies assesses the actual consequences of these laws. The core question is not who *could* be affected but is instead who *is* affected. At the end of the day, do voter ID laws reduce participation and skew the electorate in favor of one set of interests and against another set of interests?

On this core question, the results seem to point to limited effects. The main published studies find little to no effect on overall turnout (Ansolabehere 2009, Mycoff et al 2009).<sup>4</sup> More

---

<sup>4</sup> There are, however, a series of non-refereed manuscripts that reach more negative conclusions about voter ID laws. This includes studies by the General Accounting Office (2014), Dropp (2013), Vercellotti and Anderson (2006), and Alvarez et al (2008). Given that the methodology and research design employed in these studies has not been vetted, it is often difficult to reach firm conclusions about the impact of voter ID laws. Dropp (2013), for example, examines an impressive array of individual voting records but has no controls for context - a critical omission given that factors like competition, spending, and mobilization both matter a lot for turnout and vary widely across states and electoral years. Likewise, the GAO study (2014) only analyzes the effect of ID

importantly, on the question of who votes and who does not, the research is almost unequivocal.

The few published studies that have looked for differential effects by race have found none (Hood and Bullock 2012, Alvarez et al 2008, Mycoff et al 2009, Alvarez et al 2010, Milyo 2007). In the end few scholars have been able to effectively counter the literature's core conclusion that "voter ID does not appear to present a significant barrier to voting" (Ansolabehere 2009: 129).

### **Limitations of the Existing Research**

Can it be that voter identification laws actually have minimal effects on American democracy? We believe that there are three fundamental problems with the tests to date. The first problem is that scholars have almost exclusively analyzed elections that occurred before the strictest voter identification laws were put in the place. States that have non-strict laws still allow people to vote if they do not have ID, so these laws might have little impact. If the major effects of voter ID laws only occur when states require voters to present identification before voting, then existing studies generally are not actually assessing the impact of these laws.<sup>5</sup> The rapid and very recent proliferation of these laws means that any research that examines the vote in anything but the last election cycle or two will miss most of the effects of these laws. As a result, most existing studies are likely to understate the significance of these laws. Arguably then, we do not yet know if strict forms of voter identification matter.

---

laws in two states and fails to include controls for electoral environment. Alvarez et al (2008) and Vercellotti and Anderson (2006) both examine turnout before strict photo ID laws were enforced.

<sup>5</sup> All but one of the existing published studies assessing differential turnout look at data from 2006 or earlier, when there were no strict photo ID states. Hood and Bullock (2012) include 2008 data but only look at one election in one state with strict voter ID laws in place.

Another core problem with much of the existing analysis is that it focuses on self-reported rather than validated turnout. Self-reported turnout is much higher than actual turnout (Ansolabehere and Hersh 2012, Silver et al 1986). More critically, those who over-report turnout differ by race and class from those who do not over-report turnout. Racial minorities, in particular, are particularly prone to over-report their participation in elections (Shaw et al 2000, Abramson and Clagget 1991). All of this makes it extremely difficult to assess the racial and class effects of voter ID laws using self-reported turnout.

Finally, despite all of the discussion about how these laws benefit Republicans and hurt Democrats, there has been little empirical analysis of the political consequences of strict voter ID laws. Several studies have assessed the political and partisan motivations for adopting these laws but more work needs to be done on how these laws ultimately affect the mix of partisan and ideological voters (Hicks et al 2014, Bentele and O'Brien 2013). We do not yet know if those on the political left – Democrats and liberals – are hurt by these laws. Given that these laws have been instituted almost entirely by Republican legislatures and given critics' strong assertions that these laws are enacted to enhance Republican electoral fortunes, this is a major omission.

### **A More Definitive Test**

Fortunately, we are able to rectify each of the problems that we believe are largely responsible for the null findings in the literature. First, in order to capture the effects of the recent arrival and proliferation of strict identification laws, we concentrate our analysis on turnout in the five most recent election cycles. Specifically we examine data on individual voter turnout from 2006 to 2014 using the Cooperative Congressional Election Study (CCES). Since the study has large samples from every state in each election cycle, we can compare turnout by different sub-groups in every state to see if strict voter ID laws alter turnout. In our sample, we have data on turnout in a large number of elections with strict voter ID laws in place. Specifically, we can



incorporate into our analysis turnout patterns in 51 elections (26 general election contests and 25 primary contests) across 10 states with strict voter identification laws in place.<sup>6</sup> Further information about the coding of the all of the states and their voter ID laws in effect in from 2006 to 2014 is available in the online appendix.

Another benefit of this newer dataset is that we are able to single out states with strict identification requirements. Unlike previous studies that have tried to assess voter ID laws through a scale that orders laws from weakest to strongest, we begin by focusing exclusively on states that require identification to see if these relatively new, strict laws have an impact.

Second, in order to get around issues related to the over-reporting of voting by different groups, we focus exclusively on the validated vote. In the CCES data that we analyze, each reported vote is checked against official voting records to determine if each respondent who claimed to vote actually did.<sup>7</sup>

Finally, using the CCES we can begin to examine shifts in turnout across party identification and political ideology. Specifically, we can assess whether or not Democrats and liberals are more burdened by voter ID laws than Republicans and conservatives.

The analysis itself is fairly straightforward. We compare turnout of individuals in states with strict identification laws to turnout of individuals in all other states after controlling for other state-level electoral laws that encourage or discourage participation, the context of each election in

---

<sup>6</sup> Strict voter ID elections in our data set: 2014 (AZ, GA, IN, KS, MS, ND, OH, TN, TX, VA): 2012 (AZ, GA, IN, KS, OH, TN, VA): 2010 (AZ, GA, IN, OH): 2008 (AZ, GA, IN, OH): 2006 (AZ). The primary vote is not available in 2006.

<sup>7</sup> This check uncovered widespread over-reporting and a pattern of over-reporting that differed significantly across race and ethnicity.

each state and congressional district, and the entire array of individual demographic characteristics that have been shown to be linked to turnout. The key test is not whether turnout is lower in strict voter ID states but instead whether there is a differential impact of these laws on racial and ethnic minorities, *ceteris paribus*. Thus, the key variables in these regression models are the interactions between race and the presence of strict voter ID laws.

With this new data we believe that we have been able to rectify the core problems of existing studies and can thus offer a more definitive test of voter identification laws. In doing so, we find that strict voter identification laws substantially alter the makeup of who votes and ultimately skew democracy in favor of whites and those on the political right. These laws significantly impact the representativeness of the vote and the fairness of democracy.

### **A Theory and Potential Mechanisms**

Before proceeding, it is important to think through exactly why and how voter identification laws might differentially impact voter turnout. There may be two distinct potential mechanisms which might exacerbate racial, class, age, and/or partisan gaps in turnout.<sup>8</sup> The first is direct.

---

<sup>8</sup> A third potential mechanism is that campaigns, candidates, and parties may behave differently after voter ID laws are passed. If Democratic leaders believe that the passage of voter identification laws signals increased Republican dominance in these states, the Democratic Party might reduce its campaign expenditures and mobilization efforts. In alternate tests we do find that respondents report significantly less mobilization by campaigns after strict ID laws are passed but minorities, the poor, and Democrats do not report greater decreases in contact than whites, the well-off, or Republicans. Moreover, our results below hold after controlling for both campaign contact and campaign

Individual citizens who do not have the required identification will learn about the identification requirements and will decide not to vote or will try to vote and will be turned away at the polls.<sup>9</sup>

Eligible voters who lack valid identification could, of course, choose to acquire the necessary identification but past research clearly demonstrates that any additional hurdle to voting, however small or large, can have a substantial impact on the likelihood of voting – especially among low-propensity voters (Leighley and Nagler 2014, Verba et al 1995). The fact that other small state level institutional barriers like registration deadlines have been shown to impact turnout further implies

---

\_\_\_\_\_ spending. All of this suggests demobilization – or mobilization - by the Democratic Party and its candidates is not a major part of the voter ID law story.

<sup>9</sup> The best, most recent data suggest that about half of all voters without proper ID are aware of that fact. Barreto and Sanchez (2014) report that 50.2 percent of Texans who do not have proper identification are aware that they do not have a valid ID. If we assume that about 10 percent of eligible Latinos lack proper photo identification, the Texas data roughly match a 2012 PEW national survey data which found that 5 percent of Latino registered voters in strict photo ID states were aware that they do not have the proper identification (PEW 2012). As such, many voters without ID could simply choose not to go to the polls. But it is also quite possible that many voters are being turned away at the polls. Data on polling place refusals is still in its infancy. Ansolabhere (2009) reports exceptionally low rates of refusals at the polls – well under 1 percent of all voters – but does not directly assess the rate for voters without proper identification or breakdown the refusal rate by race and the presence of a voter ID law. In our CCES data, a significantly higher share of minority voters in strict ID states report a problem with voter identification but since that question is only asked for a small share of our CCES respondents, we are not confident in the results. Clearly, more work needs to be done to assess each of these two different factors.

that voter ID could matter (Burden et al 2013, Larocca and Kleminski 2011). Since a lack of identification is particularly pronounced among racial minorities, the socioeconomically disadvantaged, younger voters, and those on the political left, the law should disproportionately reduce the turnout of these groups. This direct mechanism is the one that critics typically focus on.

But there is a second, more diffuse mechanism that could also differentially impact turnout. Even if they have the proper identification, some citizens might feel targeted by these laws and might therefore choose not to participate (Carpenter and Foos 2016).<sup>10</sup> Where and when these laws are passed, members of certain groups might feel unwelcome at the polls. This is especially true for racial minorities who have been the subject of election related violence at different points in American history but could also impact those on the political left and potentially even younger, socioeconomically disadvantaged voters (Kousser 1999, Parker 1990).

Unfortunately, while we suspect that each of these mechanisms is likely to contribute to differential declines in turnout, we cannot directly test each mechanism or distinguish between them with our data. The CCES, our main survey, does not include ask respondents if they have identification and includes no questions about feelings of threat or alienation.<sup>11</sup> We can test to see if voter ID laws differentially lower turnout but we cannot show how they do so.

---

<sup>10</sup> Of course, the opposite is also possible: the threat of voter identification laws could mobilize voters into action.

<sup>11</sup> There is, unfortunately, also limited evidence on these two different mechanisms outside of our data. We do know that there is widespread knowledge of these laws. Pew reports that 92 percent of registered voters in states with strict photo ID requirements are aware of these laws (Pew 2012). But that knowledge could impact the voting behavior both of those without proper identification as well

## Data

To assess the impact of voter identification laws on turnout, we utilize data from the 2006-2014 Cooperative Congressional Election Studies (CCES). The CCES is a national stratified sample survey administered over the internet of over 50,000 respondents by YouGov/Polimetrix. The CCES is the ideal tool for examining voter identification laws for three reasons. First, it provides a measure of the validated vote. Because each respondent who claims to have voted is checked against actual state voter files, the problem of over-reporting by members of different groups is eliminated. Second, it covers recent years, including the years in which the first strict photo ID laws were passed. Given the relatively recent proliferation of strict voter identification laws, it is vital to include data up to the 2014 election. The third advantage of the CCES is its size and breadth. It includes a large and representative sample of respondents from every state.

Data on the strictness of voter identification laws in place in each state come from the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL). The NCSL maintains a database of all voter identification laws in effect in each state and in each election year. Scholars have typically measured the strictness of voter identification laws by distinguishing between states with 1) no document required to vote, 2) an ID requested, 3) a non-photo ID required, 4) a photo ID requested, and 5) a photo ID required. We follow this convention for alternate tests. But for our main analysis, we single out strict identification laws – those that prevent the voter from casting a regular ballot if they cannot present appropriate identification – because we believe these stricter laws have the greatest potential to dramatically impact turnout. These stricter laws make it easy for election administrators to prevent many voters from casting a regular ballot. Given estimates of the large

---

as those with it. There is also anecdotal evidence that minority voters feel disempowered by these laws but no study that tests the effects of those attitudes on turnout (Carpenter and Foos 2016).

number of Americans that do not have ready access to proper identification, the possibility of widespread effects is real. Moreover, it is these stricter laws that have garnered the lion's share of attention from voting rights activists and the media. That attention alone could be instrumental in dissuading large shares of the public from going to the polls. We begin by singling out strict identification laws – those that require an ID (coded as a 1 for all states that have these laws in place).<sup>12</sup> We then assess if there is a significant difference between strict ID laws that require a photo ID and those that allow some forms of non-photo identification.<sup>13</sup>

The main goal in the analysis is to assess the *differential* effects of voter identification laws on the participation of distinct groups. In particular, we examine if these laws have a more pronounced effect on racial and ethnic minorities and those on the political left.

We focus on turnout in both general and primary elections. The main dependent variables – general and primary votes - are coded as 1 for a validated vote in that contest and 0 otherwise.<sup>14</sup>

In terms of race and ethnicity, we single out respondents who self-identified as white, Black, Latino, Asian American, or indicated that they were multi-racial. To assess the political

---

<sup>12</sup> For transparency and consistency we code all states ID laws according to the NCSL. However, in contrast to the NCSL coding we believe that Alabama should be viewed as a strict ID state in 2014. In alternate analysis, when we recode Alabama as a strict ID state, our results are essentially identical. Moreover, when we also find that black turnout drops disproportionately in Alabama from 2010 to 2014.

<sup>13</sup> Given the claim that the initial passage of these laws can temporarily fuel anger and voter mobilization, we add a dummy variable to test for this temporary mobilization (Valentino et al 2015; Citrin et al 2014).

<sup>14</sup> Respondents who could not be matched to voter files are dropped from the analysis.

consequences of ID laws, respondents are asked their partisanship and liberal-conservative ideology. We employ a standard 7 point party identification scale and a standard 5 point ideology scale. In each case, the key test is whether each of these individual characteristics *interacts* with voter identification laws and leads to especially large declines in turnout.

We also control for individual demographic characteristics that help to drive voter participation in previous research (Verba et al 1995). These include age (measured in years), education level (a 6 point scale), family income (a 16 point scale), nativity (foreign born, first generation American, or other), gender, marital status (married or not), having children, being a union member, owning a home, being unemployed, and religion (Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Atheist, or other).<sup>15</sup>

To isolate the effects of voter identification laws, we also have to incorporate other state-level electoral laws that encourage or discourage participation. Research assessing the permissiveness of a state's election laws typically assess if the state 1) allows early voting (Burden et al 2013, Giammo and Box 2010), 2) has all-mail elections (Karp and Banducci 2000), and 3) allows no excuse absentee voting (Larocca and Klemanski 2011). Generally, the most important institutional factor driving state turnout is, however, the limit on the number of days before the election that residents can register to vote (coded in days) (Burden et al 2013, Larocca and Klemanski 2011). All are included here.

Finally, to help identify the independent effect of ID laws, our analysis has to include the electoral context surrounding each particular election. For our analysis, this includes the political competitiveness of each state (measured as the margin of victory in the most recent Presidential

---

<sup>15</sup> Since we expect the effects to be most pronounced for registered voters, we drop non-registered respondents from our main analysis. The pattern of effects is similar either way.

contest), the presence of different electoral contests (Presidential election year, the presence of Senatorial, and Gubernatorial elections), whether the Senatorial and Gubernatorial contests are open-seats or not, and whether the Senatorial and Gubernatorial contests are uncontested or not.

Given that our main dependent variables are coded 1 for voters and 0 for non-voters we employ logistic regressions.<sup>16</sup> To incorporate the non-independence of respondents within each state, we cluster errors by state.

### **ID Laws and Minority Turnout**


The critical question is not whether the average American is affected by voter identification laws. Rather, it is whether these laws have a negative impact on minorities and other disadvantaged groups. To begin to assess this possibility, in Figure One we simply compare turnout by race in strict voter ID states with turnout by race in non-strict ID states without controlling for any other factors. The pattern in both primary and general election is clear. There are substantial drops in minority turnout in strict voter ID states and no real changes in white turnout. Hispanic turnout is 7.1 points lower in strict voter ID states than it is in other states in general elections and 5.3 points lower in primary elections. For Blacks, the gap is negligible in general elections but a full 4.6 points in primaries. For Asian Americans the difference is 5.4 points and 6.2 points. And for multi-racial Americans turnout is 5.3 points lower in strict voter ID states in general elections and 6.7 points lower in primary contests. White turnout is relatively flat and, if anything, increases slightly

---

<sup>16</sup> We also re-ran our analysis using hierarchical linear models. The basic pattern of results did not change appreciably across multiple HLM specifications.



in strict identification states. The increase for white turnout in strict ID states is 0.2 points in general elections and 0.4 points in primary elections.<sup>17</sup>



The end result is, in most cases, a substantial increase in the gap between white and non-turnout in strict voter ID states. Latinos, for example, generally vote less frequently than whites but in strict voter ID states the gap between Hispanics and whites increases by a full 7.3 points in general elections and a similarly large 5.7 points in primary contests. The Black-white, Asian American-white and multi-racial American-white gaps grow almost as much. In strict voter ID states minorities are lagging further and further behind whites.

Of course, the pattern in Figure 1 is only suggestive. The differential decline in minority turnout in strict voter ID states could have little to do with voter ID laws themselves and could instead be a factor of any number of different and unique features of states that pass strict voter ID laws or of the minorities who live in them. Strict voter ID states tend, for example, to also have more rigid registration deadlines and more limited vote-by-mail options.

<sup>17</sup> Our sample includes 32,064 whites, 6429 African Americans, 1897 Latinos, 459 Asian Americans, and 632 Mixed Race Americans respondents residing in strict voter ID states.

To see if the sharp drop in minority turnout in strict voter ID states is, in fact, related to voter ID laws, we assess the effects of voter ID laws after controlling for a range of state level electoral laws, campaign dynamics, and individual characteristics. To examine if Latino, Black, Asian American, and multi-racial American turnout is differentially and negatively impacted by the presence of these laws, we add interactions between strict ID laws and each racial group.


The results, which are presented in the first two columns of Table 1, suggest that minorities are being disproportionately and negatively impacted. The effects are perhaps most consistent for Latinos but across the different types of contests, there are strong signs that strict identification laws decrease turnout for Latinos, Blacks, Asian Americans, and some indications that they also do so for multi-racial Americans. In general elections, Latinos are significantly more burdened by these laws than are whites and members of other groups. For Blacks and Asian Americans the interaction coefficient is negative but beyond the .05 significance level. In primary elections, Latinos, Blacks, and Asian Americans are all significantly more impacted and multi-racial Americans are almost significantly more impacted. [INSERT TABLE ONE HERE]

In all cases, the significant effects are politically meaningful. The models reveal substantial drops in turnout for minorities under strict voter ID laws. In the general elections, the model predicts that Latinos are 10 percent less likely to turn out in states with strict ID laws than in states without strict ID regulations, all else equal. These effects are almost as large in primary elections. Here, a strict ID law could be expected to depress Latino turnout by 9.3 points, Black turnout by 8.6 points, and Asian American turnout by 12.5 points.<sup>18</sup> Given the already low turnout of most of these groups across the country, these declines are all the more noteworthy.

---

<sup>18</sup> For multi-racial race Americans the drop is 6.6 points but it is not quite statistically significant.

Importantly, as illustrated by Figure 2, these laws serve not only to diminish minority participation, they also increase the gap in the participation rate between whites and non-whites. For Latinos in the general election, the predicted gap more than doubles from 4.9 points in states without strict ID laws to 13.5 points in states with strict photo ID laws. The predicted Latino-white gap more than triples from 3.4 points to 13.2 in primaries. Likewise, for African Americans the predicted gap in general contests increases from 2.9 points to 5.1 points and in primaries more than quintuples from 2.5 points to 11.6 points. For Asian Americans the predicted gap grows from 6.5 percent to 11.5 points in general elections and from 5.8 points to 18.8 points. In the case of multi-racial Americans, strict ID laws may be creating a racial disadvantage where there typically was none. Multi-racial Americans voted at almost the exact same predicted rate as whites (a 0.1 point gap) in primaries in non-strict ID states but were 7.1 percent less likely than whites to participate in primaries in strict ID states, all else equal.



Note: Race specific effect for white vs Asian and white vs black in general elections and multi-racial effect in primaries are not significant at  $p < .05$ .

Another, perhaps simpler way to demonstrate the anti-minority nature of these laws is to focus on whites and include an interaction between strict voter ID laws and white identity. That is exactly

what we do in the last two columns of Table 1. Here we find that in primaries white Americans - compared to all other racial and ethnic groups – are significantly advantaged by strict voter IDs. In general elections, we see the same pattern but it is only significant at the  $p < .10$  level. White Americans already generally participate at higher rates than others, but when states institute strict voter ID laws that advantage grows measurably.

Skeptics might at this point contend that the patterns we see in Table 1 and Figure 2 are driven less by strict voter identification laws themselves and more by the political conditions in the states that pass implement these laws. One could plausibly argue that some of the factors that lead states to enact voter identification laws in the first place are also impacting the relative turnout of different groups. To begin to address this concern, in an alternate analysis we incorporated a range of political and demographic factors that have been shown to be linked to the proposal or passage of voter identification laws (Bentele and O'Brien 2013).<sup>19</sup> Few of these variables had a significant impact on the likelihood that any individual would vote (after controlling for individual characteristics) and none substantially altered the main findings relating to the impact of voter ID on minority turnout.

Nevertheless, skeptics might still contend that we cannot control for all of the relevant state-level and campaign specific factors that affect turnout. We can address this broader concern by focusing our analysis only on self-identified Democrats. If minority turnout is especially low in certain states because Republicans are dominant in these states, then we should find that all Democrats –white and non-white alike – turnout at especially low rates in these states. On the other

---

<sup>19</sup> Specifically, we added a series of different measures of: a) the partisanship of the state political leadership, b) the partisanship and ideology of the public, c) the level of partisan competition in the state, and d) racial demographics (see Online Appendix).

hand, if we find that voter ID laws depress the participation of racial and ethnic minority Democrats more than they impact the turnout of white Democrats, then the effects cannot be due to the dominance of Republicans in voter ID states. If the racialized pattern persists when we only look at Democrats, we can conclude that there is a clear racial effect of voter ID laws.

This is exactly what we find. Re-running the analysis with Democrats only, we still find that Latino, Asian American, and multi-racial American turnout is significantly more likely to be depressed by voter ID laws than white turnout (analysis in Table 1 of the Online Appendix).

### **The Political Consequences of Voter Identification**


Opponents of these strict voter ID laws also regularly claim that one of the main motivations behind the laws is to limit the participation of democratic leaning groups in order to benefit the Republican Party. Yet scholars have not directly tested this assertion.

In Table 2 we examine the political consequences of voter ID laws by adding interaction terms between partisanship, political ideology, and strict photo ID laws. The political effects are not as consistent across general and primary elections as the racial effects but there are clear ties between strict voter identification laws and turnout of different political groups. In primaries, the effects of voter identification laws are more pronounced and more negative for those on the political left. The positive and significant interactions between voter ID laws and both party identification and ideology indicate that Republicans and conservatives are significantly less likely than Democrats and liberals to experience declines in turnout in primary contests when strict voter ID laws are in place. [TABLE TWO HERE]

These effects turn out to be substantial. Democratic turnout drops by an estimated 8.8 percentage points in primary elections when strict photo identification laws are in place. By comparison, the predicted drop for Republicans is only 3.6 points. The skew for political ideology is even more severe. For strong liberals the estimated drop in turnout in strict photo identification

states is an alarming 7.9 percentage points. By contrast, strong conservatives actually vote at a slightly higher rate – 4.8 points - in strict ID states, all else equal.

All of this has major political consequences. As Figure 3 illustrates the rate at which Republicans and conservatives outvote Democrats and liberals is much higher when strict photo laws are in place. All else equal, Republicans and conservatives tend to vote at slightly higher rates than Democrats and liberals but that gap grows considerably in strict ID states. In particular, in primary elections, the model predicts that the turnout gap between Republicans and Democrats more than doubles from 4.3 points to 9.8 points when strict ID laws are instituted. Likewise the predicted gap between conservatives and liberals more than doubles from 7.7 to 20.4 points. These results suggest that by instituting strict photo ID laws, states can minimize the influence of voters on the left and can substantially alter the political leaning of the electorate.<sup>20</sup>



<sup>20</sup> It appears that the political effects of strict ID laws are not driven entirely by lower turnout among racial and ethnic minorities. When we add racial interactions to the regression models in Table 3, the political interactions are reduced in size but remain significant (see Table 7 in online appendix)

However, when we shift the focus to general elections, there is much less evidence of a partisan or ideological impact. Returning to models 1 and 2 in Table 2, we see that neither of the interactions is significant. This suggests that at least during general elections, Democrats and liberals are not more impacted than Republicans or conservatives by the presence of strict voter ID laws. But that conclusion may be premature for two reasons. First, if we limit our analysis to the South, strict voter ID laws significantly impact the political skew of turnout in general elections (see Table 5 Online Appendix). Second, the two general elections included in our dataset – 2008 and 2012 – are unique in that Barack Obama was on the ballot in both contests. Third, when we single out the strictest voter ID laws – those that require photo identification, there are some signs those on the left are most negatively affected – even in general elections (see Table 3 in Online Appendix).

Another way to assess the political effects of voter ID laws is to look at how they effects the mix of views on race and immigration that are present at the polls. We did exactly that in alternate tests where we found that the share of voters with anti-immigrant and anti-minority views grows substantially when strict voter identification laws are in place (see Table 2 of the Online Appendix).

### **Which Identification Laws Matter**

Up to this point, we have been focusing on strict identification laws – those laws that require identification in order for their vote to count. But there are other ways of distinguishing between different types of voter identification laws. One possibility is to single out strict voter identification laws that require photo identification. These strict photo identification laws garner a lot of attention and have received some of the greatest criticism. When we test to see if these strict photo identification laws have more pronounced effects than strict non-photo identification laws, we find that for the most part the effects are statistically indistinguishable. Both negatively impact minority turnout at roughly the same rate.

It is also possible that state laws that *request* but do not *require* identification also matter.<sup>21</sup> However, we could find no effects for state laws that merely requested that voters provide identification. Turnout was not noticeably higher or lower in states that requested identification (whether it was a photo identification or not) and we find no significant interactions between race and the presence of a law that requested voter identification. Put simply, there was no discernable difference between states that have no voter identification laws and those that request some form of identification (photo or otherwise). While we are not certain why these kinds of laws had little impact, we surmise it could be one of two things. First, it could be that residents know that they can ultimately vote without an ID and thus are not deterred. Second, it could be that minorities and others do not feel as threatened by these more lenient laws.

### **Robustness**

To help ensure that the relationships we have identified are accurate, we performed a series of robustness checks.<sup>22</sup> First, we added a range of different independent variables to the model that might be related to turnout. In particular, to further control for the competitiveness of the election and different aspects of mobilization, we tested several different measures of state and district campaign spending, whether or not there was an open seat in the respondent's house district,

---

<sup>21</sup> In these states, voters typically only need to sign a form in order to vote.

<sup>22</sup> Given the South's history of racially discriminatory voter disenfranchisement, we repeated all of the analysis separately on Southern and non-Southern states (see Table 5 online appendix).

Interesting, the effects of voter ID laws in the South were often similar to their effects in the non-South. There were, however, some signs that the political consequences of voter ID laws were more pronounced in the South (voter ID laws skewed turnout toward the political right in both general elections and primaries in the South)



whether or not there was an open seat in the Senate contest in the state, whether or not there was an open seat in the gubernatorial election, and finally whether or not each respondent indicated they had been contacted or mobilized by one of the campaigns. Likewise, to ensure we had not missed individual characteristics that might impact turnout, in alternate tests, we augmented the basic regression model with measures for years living in the current residence, church attendance, religiosity, being born again, and several different variants of education and income. None of these variables altered the basic conclusions of our analysis (see Table 4 in online appendix)

In another critical test, we shifted to an analysis that incorporated both state and year fixed effects. By adding dummy variables for every state and every year, we essentially control away all of the features that are unique to each state and each election year. If a state was more Republican or more anti-minority in ways that we did not measure or in ways that are not measurable at all, that difference was soaked up with the fixed effects. In the end, the fixed effects model should tell us how turnout differs from the norm in each individual state when voter ID laws are enacted and thus should get us closer to an estimate of the change due specifically to implementation of voter identification laws. This “difference-in-differences” design is among the most rigorous ways to examine panel data.

The fixed effects analysis which is displayed in the online appendix (Table 6) tells essentially the story as our other analysis. Racial and ethnic minorities and liberals and Democrats are especially hurt by strict voter identification laws.


Finally, we attempted to drill down into the data even further by looking at changes in turnout in individual states when they first enact new voter ID laws. Following GAO 2014, Keele and Minozzi 2013, and Hood and Bullock 2012, we undertook a series of simple, bi-variate difference-in-difference tests where we compared changes in turnout in states with newly enacted strict voter identification laws to changes in turnout in comparable states that did not enact new

strict voter identification laws over the same time period. In particular, with our data we focused on changes in turnout in Mississippi, North Dakota, and Texas between 2010 and 2014 (all of those states implemented strict ID laws in 2014), changes in turnout in Tennessee and Kansas between 2008 and 2012 (both states implemented strict photo ID laws in 2012), and changes in turnout Georgia and Indiana between 2006 and 2010 (both states implemented strict photo ID laws in 2008).

The overall pattern generally fits the story we have told here. As Figure 4 shows, the Black-white, the Latino-white, the Asian-white, and the Multiracial-white turnout gaps all tended to grow substantially more in Mississippi, North Dakota, and Texas and when strict voter ID laws were introduced in those states than in other states over the same years. Specifically the Black-white gap increased by 1.4 points more in general elections and 7.7 points more in primary elections in these states than elsewhere over the same period. The extra gap between Latino and white turnout in these states was 2.5 points in the general election and 7.3 points in the primary. The figures for the Asian-white and Multi-racial-white gap growth are 2.4 and 1.5 points respectively in general elections and 16.9 and 8.7 points respectively in primaries.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> The racial gap in turnout also grew substantially in Alabama in 2014 when that state implemented an ID law that we consider as a strict ID law but is coded otherwise by the NCSL. Between 2010 and 2014, the Black-white gap in turnout increased by 9.6 points more in the general election (and 1.1 points more in the primaries) in Alabama than in the rest of the nation over the same time period.



The pattern in earlier years is similar.<sup>24</sup> The gap between minority and white turnout generally grew more in Tennessee and Kansas between 2008 and 2012 when those two states enacted strict voter ID laws for the first time than it did in other states. Likewise, the Latino-white gap grew more in Indiana and Georgia from 2006 to 2008 when strict ID laws were instituted than the average across other states over the same two years.

But we view these tests with considerable skepticism for two reasons. First, although we have a large dataset, when we focus on the turnout of a particular minority group in a particular state in a particular year, our Ns get quite small, samples are less likely to be representative, and presumably the errors in our estimates get very large.<sup>25</sup> This is less of a problem when looking at overall aggregate turnout but it becomes severe when focusing on differential changes in turnout for minority groups like Latinos and African Americans. The problem is even worse for multi-racial

<sup>24</sup> We also find some of the same patterns for politics. For example between 2010 and 2014 the Democrat-Republican turnout gap declined by 4.3 points less in states that enacted strict ID laws than it did in other states.

<sup>25</sup> Thus, although the pattern was often the same, the differences were less likely to be significant.

Americans and Asian Americans who make up even smaller shares of the electorate in these state sub-samples. Second, it is extraordinarily difficult when focusing on one or two states in one particular year to be confident that other changes in the state were not responsible for changes in turnout or to be able to generate comparison states that are even roughly identical on the range of factors that could impact turnout or minority relations.<sup>26</sup> Given these concerns, we have chosen to highlight the time-series cross section analysis that both compares across all states and incorporates changes within states over time. By incorporating more state-years and thus more variation in state laws and by controlling for the main factors that we think drive turnout or lead to the passage of voter identification laws, we should arrive at a more accurate estimate (Alvarez et al 2008).

Despite all of these tests, we readily admit that our analysis cannot definitively show a causal connection between voter ID laws and turnout (Erikson and Minnite 2009, Keele and Minozzi 2013). States that pass voter ID laws are likely to be different from states that don't pass these laws on a number of different dimensions that we cannot yet identify.

### **Implications**

Voter ID laws may represent one of the nation's most important civil rights issues. Voter ID laws have the potential to impact who votes and who does not and in doing so these laws could substantially effect who governs and ultimately who wins and who loses in American democracy. What's more, these voter ID laws are becoming stricter and more common. Prior to 2006, no state required identification to vote. Today, eleven states have a strict ID requirement. In 2013 alone, legislators in six states moved to strengthen their voter ID laws. The stakes for American democracy are high and growing higher by the year.

---

<sup>26</sup> Georgia, for example, instituted expanded early voting hours at the same time it enacted strict voter ID.

Moreover, the fate of these laws is far from certain. Opponents of these laws have repeatedly challenged these laws in the courts and are likely to continue to do so in the future. As such, there is every chance that the courts will determine whether these laws endure or not. The final decision may well rest with the Supreme Court which has yet to come down firmly on either side of the debate.

All of this means that there is a desperate need for hard, empirical evidence. Given upcoming legal challenges and the rapidly changing nature of the laws across the states, there is a chance that clear, objective, and empirical answers to the core voter identification debates could actually sway outcomes.

For the courts and for American democracy *the* core question should be – are these laws fair? Do they limit the access and participation of the nation’s most disadvantaged? Are these laws racially discriminatory? The findings presented here strongly suggest that these laws do, in fact, have real consequences for the makeup of the voting population. Where they are enacted, racial and ethnic minorities are less apt to vote. The voices of Latinos and to a slightly lesser extent those of Blacks, Asian Americans, and multi-racial Americans all become more muted and the relatively influence of white America grows. An already significant racial skew in American democracy becomes more pronounced.

All of this also has partisan and political consequences. Strict voter ID laws appear to diminish the participation of Democrats and those on the left, while doing little to deter the vote of Republicans and those on the right. They produce a clear partisan distortion.

The effects of voter ID laws are concerning in isolation. But they are perhaps even more alarming when viewed across the longer arc of American history. The effects of voter ID laws that we see here are in some ways similar to the impact of measures like poll taxes, literacy tests, residency requirements, and at-large elections which were used by the white majority decades and

centuries ago to help deny Blacks many basic rights (Keyssar 2009, Kousser 1999, Parker 1990, Filer, Kenny and Morton 1991). Both sets of measures – new and old – were instituted by advocates who claimed they would help to ensure the integrity and legitimacy of democracy. Both sets of measures also serve to distort democracy and reduce the influence of racial minorities. The racially biased measures of old have since been condemned and revoked but they were allowed to stand for long periods of American electoral history. What will happen with voter ID today?

For others, what makes voter ID laws more disturbing is that they are just one of the many different ways in which the electoral system is being altered today. Shortened early voting periods, repeal of same-day voter registration, reduced polling hours, a decrease in poll locations, and increased restrictions on voting by felons are all being regularly implemented at the state or local level and all have been cited as having the potential to skew the electorate and American democracy (Brennan Center 2014, Larocca and Klemanski 2011, Giammo and Box 2010, Manza and Uggen 2004). Findings to date on these other electoral reforms are decidedly mixed (Gronke et al 2008, Gronke et al 2007) but the patterns presented in our article suggest the need for further research about this broad suite of voter access legislation. All of this coupled with the Supreme Court's skepticism about the necessity of the Voting Rights Act in its 2013 *Shelby v. Holder* (557 U.S. 193) ruling could dramatically alter the nature of American elections moving forward.

It is important to recognize that this article is far from the last word on voter identification. These laws are relatively new and have had only a brief period of time to take effect. As a result, the impact of these laws may change over time. In addition, we remain uncertain as to exactly how these laws work to skew turnout. We have shown that voter ID laws suppress minority turnout but not how they do so. It could be that more minorities don't have the requisite ID, that the costs of obtaining an ID are too high for minorities to bear, that passing these laws sends a signal to

minorities that they are not wanted at the ballot box, or some combination of the above. We simply don't know. And we need to know.

We also don't know why strict voter ID laws tend to have a more pronounced impact in primary elections. It may be that in lower salience contests like primaries, any additional costs to voting disproportionately affects lower propensity Black, Hispanic, and Asian American voters. But more work needs to be done on this front before we have firm answers.

Finally, there is a plethora of follow up questions about all of the other changes that legislators have made to voter access. There are already a multitude of studies of how factors such as poll hours and locations affect turnout but seldom do these studies directly test to see if the impact of these laws is more severe for minorities and the most disadvantaged Americans (Burden et al 2013, Larocca and Klemanski 2011, Giammo and Box 2010 but see Manza and Uggen 2004). For example, does the recent reduction in early voting in the states mean that the gap between white turnout and minority turnout is expanding even more? Are shorter polling hours, as some suspect, further skewing American democracy? The more we answer these kinds of questions, the more we will be able to offer accurate assessments of the fairness of American democracy and the more we will be able to recommend a clear path forward.

### **Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to thank Gary Jacobson, Thad Kousser, Theda Skocpol, Paul Gronke, Ben Highton, Peyton McCrary, Mike Alvarez, Steve Ansolabehere, Mike McDonald, Bernard Fraga, and Myrna Perez for their advice and support on the project. We also thank our anonymous reviewers for their feedback. Previous versions of the manuscript were presented at the American Political Science Association and the Midwest Political Science Association.

## Bibliography

Abramson, Paul R., and William Claggett. "Racial differences in self-reported and validated turnout in the 1988 presidential election." *The Journal of Politics* 53.01 (1991): 186-197.

Alvarez, Michael, Delia Bailey, and Jonathan Katz. 2008. "The Effect of Voter Identification Laws on Turnout." *SSRN Working Paper*.

Alvarez, Michael, Delia Bailey, and Jonathan Katz. 2011. "An Empirical Bayes Approach to Estimating Ordinal Treatment Effects" *Political Analysis* 19:20-31

Ansolabehere, Stephen, and Eitan Hersh. "Validation: What big data reveal about survey misreporting and the real electorate." *Political Analysis* (2012): mps023.

Ansolabehere, Stephen. 2009. "Effects of Identification Requirements on Voting: Evidence from the Experiences of Voters on Election Day." *PS* (1):127-30.

Ansolabehere, Stephen. 2014. "Declaration in Marc Veasey et al v. Rick Perty et al: United States District Court, TX."

Atkeson, L. R., Bryant, L. A., Hall, T. E., Saunders, K., & Alvarez, M. (2010). A new barrier to participation: Heterogeneous application of voter id policies. *Electoral Studies*, 29(1), 66-73.

Atkeson, Lonna Rae, Yann P. Kerevel, R. Michael Alvarez, and Thad E. Hall. 2014. "Who Asks For Voter Identification? Explaining Poll-Worker Discretion." *Journal of Politics* 76 (4):944-57.

Barreto, Matt, and Gabriel Sanchez. 2014. "Accepted Photo Identification and Different Subgroups in the Electorate" Expert Report

Barreto, Matt, Stephen Nuno, and Gabriel Sanchez. 2009. "The disproportionate Impact of Voter ID Requirements on the Electorate: New Evidence from Indiana." *PS* 42(1): 111-116

Bentele, Keith G., and Erin E. O'Brien. 2013. "Jim Crow 2.0? Why states consider and adopt restrictive voter access policies." *Perspectives on Politics* 11(04): 1088-1116.



Burden, B. C., Canon, D. T., Mayer, K. R., & Moynihan, D. P. (2014). Election Laws, Mobilization, and Turnout: The Unanticipated Consequences of Election Reform. *American Journal of Political Science*, 58(1), 95–109. doi:10.1111/ajps.12063

Josh Carpenter and Florian Foos. 2016 “Beyond the Submerged State: Exploring the Limits of Policy-Based Mobilization” Presented at the MPSA, Chicago, April 7<sup>th</sup>.

Citrin, Jack, Donald P Green, Levy Morris. 2014. The Effects of Voter ID Notification on Voter Turnout: Results from a Large-Scale Field Experiment. *Election Law Journal* 13(2):228-242

Cobb, Rachael, James Greiner, and Kevin Quinn. 2012. "Can Voter ID Laws be Administered in a Race-Neutral Manner? Evidence from the City of Boston in 2008." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 7 (1):1-33.

Coren, Courtney. 2014. "Rasmussen Poll: 78 Percent of Voters Support Voter ID Laws." Newsmax.

Decisions, Latino. 2014. "Latino Decisions Election Eve 2014 Poll." Latino Decisions.

Erikson, Robert S., and Lorraine Minnite. 2009. "Modeling Problems in the Voter Identification - Voter Turnout Debate." *Election Law Journal* 8 (2):85-101.

Filer, John E., Lawrence W. Kenny, and Rebecca B. Morton. 1991. “Voting Laws, Educational Policies, and Minority Turnout.” *Journal of Law and Economics* 34 (October): 371–93.

Giammo, Joseph D., and Brian J. Box. 2010. "Reducing the Costs of Participation: Are States Getting a Return on Early Voting." *Political Research Quarterly* 63 (2):295-303.

Gronke, Paul, Eva Galanes-Rosenbaum, and Peter A. Miller. 2007. "Early Voting and Turnout." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 40 (4 (Oct)):639-45.

Hicks, William D., Seth C. McKee, Mitchell D. Sellers, and Daniel A. Smith. "A principle or a strategy? Voter identification laws and partisan competition in the American States." *Political Research Quarterly* (2014): 1065912914554039.

Hood, M. V., and Charles Bullock. 2012. "Much Ado About Nothing? An Empirical Assessment of the Georgia Voter Identification Statute." *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 12 (4):394-414.

Karp, Jeffrey A., and Susan A. Banducci. "Going postal: How all-mail elections influence turnout." *Political Behavior* 22.3 (2000): 223-239.

Keele, Luke, and William Minozzi. 2013. "How Much is Minnesota like Wisconsin? Assumptions and Counterfactuals in Causal Inference with Observational Data" *Political Analysis* 13:1-24.

Keyssar, Alexander. 2009. *The Right to Vote: The Contested History of Democracy in the United States* Basic Books: New York

Kinder, Donald R., and Lynn M. Sanders. *Divided by color: Racial politics and democratic ideals.* University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Kobach, Kris. 2011. "The Case for Voter ID." *The Wall Street Journal*, May 23.

Kousser, J. Morgan. 1999. *Colorblind injustice: minority voting rights and the undoing of the Second Reconstruction.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Larocca, Roger, and John S. Klemanski. 2011. "US State Election Reform and Turnout in Presidential Elections." *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 11(1)76 (1):76-.

Leighley, Jan E., and Jonathan Nagler. *Who Votes Now?: Demographics, Issues, Inequality, and Turnout in the United States.* Princeton University Press, 2013.

Lott, John. 2006. "Evidence of Voter Fraud and the Impact that Regulations to Reduce Fraud have on Voter Participation Rates." *report.*

Lowry, Rich. 2014. "The Poll Tax That Wasn't." *Politico.*

Manza, Jeff, and Christopher Uggen. "Punishment and democracy: Disenfranchisement of nonincarcerated felons in the United States." *Perspectives on Politics* 2.03 (2004): 491-505.

- Milyo, Jeffrey. 2007. "The Effects of Photographic Identification on Voter Turnout in Indiana." *Institute of Public Policy*.
- Mycoff, Jason, Michael Wagner, and David Wilson. 2009. "The Empirical Effects of Voter-ID Laws: Present or Absent." *PS* (January).
- Parker, Frank R. 1990. *Black Votes Count: Political Empowerment in Mississippi after 1965*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Pitts, Michael J. 2013. "Photo ID, Provisional Balloting, and Indiana's 2012 Primary Election." *University of Richmond Law Review* 47 (3):939-57.
- Rogowski, Jon C., and Cathy J. Cohen. 2014. "Black and Latino Youth Disproportionately Affected by Voter Identification Laws in the 2012 Election." In *Black Youth Project*.
- Shaw, Daron, Rodolfo O. de la Garza, and Jongho Lee. 2000. "Examining Latino Turnout in 1996: A Three-State, Validated Survey Approach." *American Journal of Political Science* 44 (2 (April)):332-40.
- Silver, Brian D., Barbara A. Anderson, and Paul R. Abramson. 1986. "Who Overreports Voting?" *The American Political Science Review* 80:613-24.
- Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vercellotti, Timothy, and David Anderson. 2006. "Protecting the Franchise or Restricting It? The Effects of Voter Identification Requirements on Turnout." *American Political Science Association Conference*.
- Voting Rights Institute. 2015. "The Real Costs of Voter ID Laws." Voting Rights Institute.
- Weiser, Wendy. 2014. "Voter Suppression: How Bad? (Pretty Bad)." New York: Brennan Center for Justice.
- White, Ariel R., Noah L. Nathan, and Julie K. Faller. 2015. "What Do I Need to Vote? Bureaucratic Discretion and Discrimination by Local Election Officials." *American Political Science Review* (1):1-14.



Author Biographical Sketches

Zoltan Hajnal is Professor of Political Science at the University of California, San Diego. A scholar of racial and ethnic politics, urban politics, immigration, and political behavior, Dr. Hajnal is the author of *White Backlash: Immigration, Race, and American Politics* (Princeton 2015- Choice Outstanding Academic Title; Winner APSA Bunche Award), *Why Americans Don't Join the Party: Race, Immigration, and the Failure of Political Parties to Engage the Electorate* (Princeton 2011 – Winner of the APSA's Best Book on Race/Ethnicity), *America's Uneven Democracy: Race, Turnout, and Representation in City Politics* (Cambridge 2010 – Winner of APSA's Best Book on Urban Politics) and *Changing White Attitudes toward Black Political Leadership* (Cambridge 2006) and has published in the *American Political Science Review*, the *American Journal of Political Science*, the *Journal of Politics*, *Perspective on Politics* and numerous other journals, edited volumes, and newspaper editorial pages.

Nazita Lajevardi is a Ph.D. Candidate at the University of California, San Diego examining race in American politics. As an attorney and political scientist, her research bridges the gap between political science and legal questions of interest and covers disenfranchisement laws, media coverage, and representation.

Lindsay Nielson is a visiting assistant professor of political science at Bucknell University. Her current research examines issues of political behavior, voter turnout and participation, and election administration. Her research has been funded by the National Science Foundation and has also appeared in the journals *Public Opinion Quarterly* and *Political Science Research and Methods*.

# Voter ID Laws Suppress Minority Votes

**Table 1: The Impact of Strict Voter ID Laws on Minority Turnout**

	(1) General Election Turnout	(2) Primary Election Turnout	(3) General Election Turnout	(4) Primary Election Turnout
<b>VOTER ID LAW</b>				
Strict Voter ID Required	-0.102 (0.148)	0.0215 (0.132)	-0.246 (0.169)	-0.331* (0.138)
Strict Voter ID * Black	-0.112 (0.102)	-0.397** (0.116)		
Strict Voter ID * Latino	-0.391** (0.119)	-0.448** (0.121)		
Strict Voter ID * Asian	-0.219 (0.210)	-0.637* (0.250)		
Strict Voter ID * Mixed Race	-0.225 (0.144)	-0.309+ (0.181)		
Strict Voter ID * White			0.146+ (0.0768)	0.357** (0.0627)
<b>DEMOGRAPHICS</b>				
Black	-0.174** (0.0537)	-0.104 (0.0653)		
Latino	-0.289** (0.0810)	-0.143+ (0.0861)		
Asian	-0.370** (0.108)	-0.251* (0.117)		
Mixed Race	0.0391 (0.0652)	0.00679 (0.101)		
White			0.147** (0.0392)	0.0583 (0.0404)
Foreign Born	-0.427** (0.0590)	-0.297** (0.0788)	-0.493** (0.0552)	-0.342** (0.0780)
First Generation	-0.0661* (0.0323)	-0.0284 (0.0487)	-0.119** (0.0339)	-0.0531 (0.0519)
Age	0.0297** (0.00140)	0.0338** (0.00138)	0.0300** (0.00140)	0.0340** (0.00138)
Education	0.163** (0.0118)	0.146** (0.00788)	0.163** (0.0116)	0.147** (0.00792)
Income	0.0420** (0.00469)	0.0263** (0.00496)	0.0422** (0.00462)	0.0265** (0.00492)
Gender: Male	0.177** (0.0256)	0.194** (0.0244)	0.178** (0.0255)	0.196** (0.0245)
Married	0.0740** (0.0198)	0.0265 (0.0223)	0.0743** (0.0191)	0.0300 (0.0222)
Have Children	-0.199** (0.0266)	-0.178** (0.0285)	-0.201** (0.0263)	-0.181** (0.0285)
Union Member	0.243** (0.0306)	0.141** (0.0337)	0.244** (0.0305)	0.141** (0.0338)
Unemployed	-0.0988* (0.0487)	-0.137** (0.0500)	-0.100* (0.0486)	-0.138** (0.0501)
Own Home	0.347** (0.0321)	0.335** (0.0404)	0.347** (0.0326)	0.338** (0.0403)
Protestant	0.194** (0.0285)	0.239** (0.0353)	0.196** (0.0290)	0.238** (0.0358)
Catholic	0.123* (0.0480)	0.0933 (0.0579)	0.107* (0.0428)	0.0903+ (0.0528)
Jewish	0.130 (0.0910)	0.0497 (0.0855)	0.145 (0.0929)	0.0595 (0.0849)
Atheist	0.402** (0.0992)	0.180** (0.0491)	0.405** (0.0974)	0.185** (0.0493)
<b>STATE ELECTORAL LAWS</b>				
Registration Deadline	-0.00877 (0.00727)	0.00259 (0.00825)	-0.00884 (0.00719)	0.00251 (0.00819)
Early Voting	-0.201 (0.168)	0.170 (0.194)	-0.213 (0.174)	0.166 (0.196)
Vote by Mail	0.0742 (0.259)	0.854** (0.209)	0.0741 (0.261)	0.857** (0.208)
No Excuse Absentee Voting	0.390** (0.150)	0.246* (0.107)	0.395* (0.155)	0.248* (0.108)
<b>ELECTORAL COMPETITION</b>				
First Year of Strict Law	0.216 (0.187)	0.313* (0.144)	0.187 (0.183)	0.304* (0.145)
Presidential Election Year	0.924** (0.111)	0.341** (0.120)	0.921** (0.111)	0.342** (0.120)
Gubernatorial Election Year	0.308** (0.115)	0.330* (0.128)	0.305** (0.116)	0.330* (0.129)
Senate Election Year	0.117 (0.0954)	-0.0573 (0.0700)	0.116 (0.0953)	-0.0577 (0.0702)
State Margin of Victory	-1.114* (0.520)	0.262 (0.888)	-1.122* (0.519)	0.254 (0.886)
Constant	-1.546** (0.288)	-3.996** (0.272)	-1.698** (0.266)	-4.075** (0.271)
<i>N</i>	167396	146548	167396	146548
Pseudo <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.1234	0.1065	0.1224	0.1060

Standard errors in parentheses

+  $p < 0.10$ , \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$

Note: Models include year fixed effects.

Table 2: The Political Impact of Strict Voter ID Laws

	(1) General Election Turnout	(2) Primary Election Turnout	(3) General Election Turnout	(4) Primary Election Turnout
<b>VOTER ID LAW</b>				
Strict Voter ID Required	-0.146 (0.214)	-0.495* (0.260)	-0.134 (0.174)	-0.268 (0.188)
Strict Voter ID * Party ID			-0.000337 (0.00773)	0.0564** (0.0190)
Strict Voter ID * Ideology	0.000827 (0.0257)	0.137** (0.0470)		
<b>POLITICAL LEANING</b>				
Party ID (High = Rep)			0.0252** (0.00586)	0.0289* (0.0118)
Ideology (High = Con)	0.0656** (0.0129)	0.0831** (0.0266)		
<b>DEMOGRAPHICS</b>				
Black	-0.173** (0.0479)	-0.143* (0.0575)	-0.154** (0.0547)	-0.0957 (0.0612)
Latino	-0.326** (0.0822)	-0.186* (0.0873)	-0.325** (0.0892)	-0.170+ (0.0889)
Asian	-0.389** (0.103)	-0.295** (0.112)	-0.370** (0.0999)	-0.295* (0.122)
Mixed Race	0.0146 (0.0609)	-0.0331 (0.0952)	0.0173 (0.0604)	-0.0358 (0.0906)
Foreign Born	-0.418** (0.0601)	-0.288** (0.0801)	-0.419** (0.0632)	-0.277** (0.0788)
First Generation	-0.0643* (0.0324)	-0.0286 (0.0498)	-0.0557 (0.0364)	-0.0289 (0.0515)
Age	0.0294** (0.00139)	0.0334** (0.00140)	0.0292** (0.00147)	0.0334** (0.00138)
Education	0.168** (0.0117)	0.153** (0.00823)	0.157** (0.0121)	0.143** (0.00775)
Income	0.0414** (0.00466)	0.0256** (0.00506)	0.0403** (0.00485)	0.0242** (0.00525)
Gender: Male	0.165** (0.0254)	0.172** (0.0230)	0.148** (0.0249)	0.166** (0.0232)
Married	0.0602** (0.0193)	0.00403 (0.0215)	0.0633** (0.0204)	0.0111 (0.0227)
Have Children	-0.207** (0.0260)	-0.189** (0.0282)	-0.193** (0.0254)	-0.180** (0.0284)
Union Member	0.253** (0.0294)	0.157** (0.0316)	0.246** (0.0302)	0.161** (0.0313)
Unemployed	-0.0966* (0.0479)	-0.139** (0.0494)	-0.0784 (0.0477)	-0.131** (0.0488)
Own Home	0.341** (0.0323)	0.329** (0.0411)	0.336** (0.0321)	0.333** (0.0415)
Protestant	0.168** (0.0284)	0.188** (0.0327)	0.166** (0.0295)	0.195** (0.0334)
Catholic	0.106* (0.0476)	0.0626 (0.0563)	0.109* (0.0490)	0.0715 (0.0580)
Jewish	0.148* (0.0854)	0.0644 (0.0852)	0.125 (0.0886)	0.0684 (0.0838)
Atheist	0.451** (0.104)	0.254** (0.0535)	0.421** (0.106)	0.215** (0.0506)
<b>STATE ELECTORAL LAWS</b>				
Registration Deadline	-0.00904 (0.00732)	0.00244 (0.00832)	-0.00922 (0.00754)	0.00264 (0.00830)
Early Voting	-0.199 (0.168)	0.167 (0.195)	-0.201 (0.169)	0.177 (0.197)
Vote by Mail	0.0759 (0.257)	0.847** (0.209)	0.0622 (0.257)	0.857** (0.209)
No Excuse Absentee Voting	0.390** (0.149)	0.248* (0.110)	0.387* (0.151)	0.236* (0.113)
<b>ELECTORAL COMPETITION</b>				
First Year of Strict Law	0.180 (0.182)	0.272+ (0.153)	0.181 (0.189)	0.270+ (0.156)
Presidential Election Year	0.924** (0.110)	0.346** (0.119)	0.903** (0.110)	0.331** (0.118)
Gubernatorial Election Year	0.305** (0.114)	0.330* (0.128)	0.303** (0.114)	0.327* (0.128)
Senate Election Year	0.116 (0.0946)	-0.0623 (0.0699)	0.111 (0.0975)	-0.0671 (0.0695)
State Margin of Victory	-1.099* (0.519)	0.262 (0.891)	-1.120* (0.532)	0.274 (0.892)
Constant	-1.713** (0.289)	-4.198** (0.293)	-1.514** (0.304)	-4.008** (0.279)
N	166856	146483	163874	143297
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.1234	0.1078	0.1173	0.1047

Standard errors in parentheses  
+ p < 0.10, \* p < 0.05, \*\* p < 0.01  
Note: Models include year fixed effects.