

2016

Who Supports Voter Identification?

Michael Roderick Jackson
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jackson, Michael Roderick, "Who Supports Voter Identification?" (2016). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 15938.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd/15938>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

Who supports voter identification?

by

Michael R. Jackson

A thesis submitted to the graduate faculty
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

Major: Political Science

Program of Study Committee:
David Peterson, Major Professor
David Andersen
Daniel Spikes

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2016

Copyright © Michael R. Jackson, 2016. All rights reserved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
ABSTRACT	vi
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW	3
CHAPTER 3. METHODS	21
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS	28
CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSION	30
REFERENCES CITED	32

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Restrictive Voter ID Bills Introduced and Enacted by Year	16
Table 2.	Opposition to Voter Identification Laws	29

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of this thesis would not have been possible without the insurmountable support of God, family members, colleagues, professors, and friends. Many people deserve recognition and honor for their continuous encouragement as I fulfilled the requirements of this degree. I would like to thank my partner and spouse Dr. Christa “Babe” Jackson for her unfailing love and support throughout the process of completing my thesis. I am grateful and appreciative to my parents Ray (Papa) and Marian (Gege) Jackson for their love, guidance, and direction throughout my life in various aspects. I would like to extend my appreciation to my family, Ray, Todd, Matt, Kenny, Mia, and James (siblings), Cherita, Regina, Angela, Tonja, Karena, Amy, Kathy (sister-in-laws), Sister Ora, Sister Ann, and Thomas Maben (in-laws) for their love and motivation. I appreciate my Program of Study Committee: Dr. David Peterson (Major Professor), Dr. Daniel Spikes, and Dr. David Andersen for their assistance, guidance, time, and efforts at Iowa State University.

Thank you family and friends!

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to compare and contrast the differences in attitudes from the perspective of African Americans and Caucasian voters in the U.S. In addition, this study examined conscience or unconscious bias toward voter identification laws. In particular, were the effects of voter identification laws viewed through different lens depending on a voter's ethnic background, social economic status, gender, age, or a voter's political ideology? I approach this research by examining the results of research conducted by Michael Dawson, Lawrence Bobo, David Wilson, and Paul Brewer. These experts examined both ends of the political spectrum consisting of data from pro-voter id supporters and anti-voter identification supporters. The first hypothesis was the African American community and the cohesiveness race plays a vital role with a focus encompassing civil rights and the perseverance and enhancement of economic equality. The second hypothesis stated that a much higher percentage of Caucasian voters were supportive of voter identification laws. Many of these voters stated that voter identification laws must be implemented in an effort of preventing voter fraud. The third hypothesis was that African American voters should respond to voter identification laws with that of repugnance. Brewer and Wilson's findings revealed that an overwhelming percentage of voters supported identification laws (78%), 21% opposed identification laws, 48% of voters stated that voter fraud was a major concern, while 43% expressed concern of denying eligible voters the right to vote.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

“I believe we all know how Dr. King would have reacted to the new I.D. requirements to exclude certain voters, especially African Americans...[and] how Dr. King would have reacted to the Supreme Court striking down a crucial part of the Voting Rights Act just recently passed overwhelmingly by Congress. ...There’s a tremendous agenda ahead of us, and I’m thankful to Martin Luther King Jr. that his dream is still alive.” – President Jimmy Carter

Who supports Photo Voter Identification? The research for this thesis examines voter photo identification (ID) laws, and who supports voter identification laws. What are the implications that voter identification laws have on some voters? Individuals representing the elderly population, under-represented ethnic groups, and low socio-economic groups are disproportionately impacted compared to voters in higher socio-economic groups or the political party with the majority of representatives. Are Americans being denied their 15th amendment right with the implementation of voter id laws? Are voter id laws discriminate towards minorities, elderly, youth, poor, and those with minimal political clout? These are the reasons I believe it is of vital importance to conduct this research, and if necessary, revise voter id laws.

Many conservative leaning voters or Americans that identify as Republicans, overwhelmingly support the implementation of recent voter identification laws. Some conservative voters’ stance is that voter fraud will be drastically reduced or eliminated if these measures are put into place. The belief of some liberals or voters who identify with the Democratic Party perspective is that voter identification laws are biased towards the elderly community, minorities, and young voters who may not have government issued identification.

This thesis makes an argument for why some voters support voter identification laws and why some voters oppose such laws. The third argument discusses why race is an overwhelming factor with the implementation of voter identification laws.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Voter Identification Timeline

- 1906: The Primary Election Law enumerates certain state, county, and municipal offices, which are to be filled by candidates, nominated by conventions selected and held under the provisions of an act at the time specified therein.
- 1950: South Carolina became the first state to request voter identification at the polls.
- 2002: President Bush signed the *Help America Vote Act* requiring all first-time voters in federal elections to show photo or non-photo identification upon either registration or arrival at voting precinct.
- 2004: Arizona passed an ID Law requiring state-issued photo ID at polling place.
- 2013: U.S Supreme Court ruled 5-4 in *Shelby v. Holder* that section 4(b) of Voting Act of 1965 was unconstitutional.

Race and Voter Identification

A poll conducted by the Brennan Center in 2006 revealed that 11 percent of eligible American voters state that they do not possess any form government-issued photo identification. Twenty-five percent of these individuals are African Americans, sixteen percent are Hispanics, and eighteen percent are seniors that are sixty-five years of age and older (Brennan Center for Justice, 2006).

Johnson (2015) cited Michael Dawson's research revealing that race is the predominant factor in blacks American experience, and the manner in which a large percentage of the African American community cast their ballots. For African Americans linked fate is the recognition that individual life chances are extricably connected to

race as a whole. From 2000-2004 Dawson and Lawrence Bobo conducted six public opinion studies on the racial divide in the United States. Some recent examples are the “Black lives matter movement and efforts of removing the confederate flag in public settings (Johnson, 2015).

Michael Dawson recently authored *Not in Our Lifetimes, The Future of Black Politics, The Roots of Contemporary African American Political Ideologies, Behind the Mule*, and *Race and Class in African American Politics*. Dawson’s research widely focused on quantitative models of African American political behavior, political effects of urban poverty, public opinion, political ideology, and political opinion of African Americans in the last decade, and he contrasts the results with attitudes of Caucasian voters.

Dawson’s research revealed that race has been the predominant factor in Black Americans’ experience, and he attributes this cohesiveness to a shared historic experience of (and is in some instances) subjugation, inequalities, and discrimination. This trend plagues many African American communities throughout the United States. It has been much more effective for them to use the status of the group, both relative and absolute, as a proxy for individual utility. In practical terms, black voters prioritize the well being of the group over their individual interests, and consider what is best for the group as a whole because history has shown them that we are in this together. The most commonly cited explanation for linked fate has been defined as “black utility heuristic,” a framework developed by Dawson (Dawson, 1994). Dawson argues that race has been the predominant factor in Black American experience when voting, he revealed race to be much more reliable and efficient to use as the status of the African American ethnic group both relative and absolute as a proxy for individual utility. In

everyday terminology, black voters prioritize the well being of the group over their individual interests. A large number of African American voters are most interested in the needs, concerns, and inequalities of the group overall (Johnson, 2015).

The extraordinary manner in which blacks have supported and relied on identifying the issues and concerns of the African American community as a collective group has been phenomenal in spite of the demonstrable fact that many African Americans' political stances do not completely align with the Democratic Party's platform. Dawson's research revealed that many African Americans are not quite as concerned with the role of the military in global conflicts, abortion, free market economics, immigration, or the national debt, but are most concerned with protecting civil rights in every capacity and equal access to economic opportunity. For this reason, results to linked fate and the behavior of African American voting is an unparalleled occurrence when comparing other ethnicities, gender, or a particular geographic location is taken into account during the modern political landscape (Johnson, 2015). Dawson's research revealed a significant factor that has set African Americans apart from other ethnic groups "is the magnitude and uniformity to which they utilized the racial heuristic in their political behavior, rising to a level not observed in any other similar symbolic trend of this nature or in any other voting bloc" (Johnson, 2015).

Public Opinion About Voter Id

David C. Wilson and Paul R. Brewer (2013) examined the foundations of public opinion on voter id laws. Wilson and Brewer's study interviewed 906 subjects; the focus was to investigate what underlies opinion on voter identification laws. Wilson and Brewer found that some states voter id laws required voters to produce government-

endorsed identification prior to casting a ballot on election days. Some voters see these laws as necessary to prevent fraud, while those that oppose such laws view them as discriminatory or another avenue of suppressing voters fifteenth amendment right. Wilson and Brewer say that the recent implementation of voter id laws implies to a degree that voters possess a limited amount of information regarding voter identification laws. The news sources, group partiality, and political partisan pandering form many opinions of which voters possess. Wilson and Brewer show that voter id laws are influenced by racial attitudes, ideology, party identifications, and political predilection. Additionally, Wilson and Brewer tested the effectiveness of several arguments for and against voter identification laws and found little evidence that these frames mattered.

Some individuals are concerned with voter identification laws because they believe that a large segment of the population are being denied their fifteenth amendment right to vote and not given the opportunity of having their concerns addressed (Johnson, 2015). The linked fate phenomenon is in part the result of voter suppression in the African American community... asking the question which candidate has an interest in preserving and improving equality for underrepresented populations, protecting civil rights, and supporting equal economic opportunities for minority communities (Johnson, 2015).

The Washington Post conducted a survey in 2012 and highlighted that 73% of U.S. adults said that government-issued identification should be required to cast individual ballots. The study also found that 52% of respondents said that support for voter identification laws is based on giving one political party an advantage over the

opposing party. The results also revealed stark differences when race, ideology, and party affiliation are taken into account. African Americans, liberals, and voters hailing from the Democratic Party offered the least amount of support for voter identification laws. Some Caucasians, conservatives, and Republicans respectively in a similar poll conducted during the same month as *Rasmussen* reported that over 70% of individuals polled did not believe that id laws supported racial discrimination or voter suppression (Brewer & Wilson, 2013).

Some Caucasian voters' attitudes following the research results revealed they believe (1) they are receiving impartial treatment and are at a disadvantage with special programs designed to support African Americans, (2) African Americans use the race card in an effort of justifying failure, and (3) they harbor a degree of resentment because they were not personally responsible for unfair treatment of African Americans. A large number of African Americans adhere to the political context "linked fate," which in essence means, what policies or candidates will be most effective for the African American community particularly in economic equality and protection of civil rights (Johnson, 2015).

Effects of Voter Identification Laws

The United States Census Bureau revealed that White Americans are the racial majority in the U.S. (Wikipedia; United States Census Bureau, 2016). Nate Silver, author, statistician, and founder of the *New York Times* political blog *FiveThirtyEight.com*, stated that onerous voter photo identification laws have an adverse effect on African Americans and young voters (Silver, 2012). Silver said that photo voter ID laws have a

greater impact not only on Democratic-leaning groups, but also on disenfranchised Republican voters (Silver, 2012).

Voter photo identification laws are measures designed to ensure that voters are who they say they are. Most of these laws require voters to produce a form of identification at their polling place, although this requirement varies across states. Some state laws require a government-issued photo ID or driver's license, while other states accept a utility statement, phone bill, or bank statement with the voter's name and address as acceptable proof of identity. Voter photo ID laws have become a critical turning point for political parties in all aspects of the political process. Silver's (2012) concern is that voter identification laws will continue to negatively affect Democratic Party and supporters, minority voters, and Generation Z voters (Silver, 2012). To counter this trend, Silver asserted politicians need to be proactive and get voters to register with acceptable forms of identification and implement plans to ensure adequate transportation to polls (if needed) prior to election day (Silver, 2012).

In addition, Silver stated that even though many individuals think that voter ID laws are detrimental to voter turnout, they are unlikely to have the negative impact that news sources imply. For instance, he suggested that Democrats could combat any deficiency in turnout with increased voter conscientiousness about their registration status (Silver, 2012).

Voter photo ID laws are commonly challenged in the courts to determine if state laws are just, or if access to or the integrity of the voting process has restricted or prevented individuals from voting. Those who have challenged the new voter photo ID laws argue that these new requirements place an undue burden on some voters and

have potential discriminatory outcomes. However, those who support new, more restrictive measures for voter photo IDs argue that these laws are essential to prevent voter fraud (Ansolabehere, 2009). Forrest Wickman (2012) found that Republicans generally support new voter ID laws as a means of preventing voter fraud, while Democrats maintain that increased restrictions present additional roadblocks for minorities. The most common form of photo id is a driver license, and the results revealed that 92% of white voters had a driver's license, 84% of Latino voters obtained a driver's license, and only 81% of other voters had a driver's license (Wickman, 2012). The controversy voter photo ID laws are generally forged between the options of certain access as well as maintaining integrity throughout the process. Wickman (2012) argued that minorities are less likely to obtain a driver's license due to living in urban areas, being disproportionately poor, and merely possessing only the basic resources. Therefore, this is a barrier to their voting privileges. However, the effort to deter such fraud has also restricted younger, elderly, racial minority voters, and especially those of a low socio-economic status, from voting. In many states, poll workers use individual discretion when determining which voters are required to produce photo identification (Ansolabehere, 2009).

Impact of State Voter ID Laws

Several states took steps to strengthen or enhance voter photo ID laws in 2011. Many southern states have a history of voter discrimination, which is recorded in the *Voting Rights Act: Major Dates in History*. South Carolina passed a restrictive voter ID law requesting photo identification that would keep 180,000 African Americans from casting a ballot and reduces their early voting period by seven days (ACLU, n.d). In a

2014 Kansas election, approximately 22,000 individuals were turned away prior to casting their ballot at the voting booth (Gabriel & Fernandez, 2014). These restrictive voter photo ID laws contributed to the lowest voter turnout in 72 years (Gabriel & Fernandez, 2014).

Voter photo ID laws have been shown to disproportionately affect elderly, minorities, and young voters. Since 2011, twelve states with a high percentage of Republican (or predominate right-wing) supporters have passed and supported stricter voter photo ID laws in order to suppress Democratic turnout, resulting in an unprecedented number of Republican victories across the country (Gabriel & Fernandez, 2014).

Additional voter ID laws are likely to continue to negatively affect Democratic constituents in the 2016 elections unless the laws are amended. Democratic officials in Texas sounded the alarm following Representative Pete Gallegos's defeat during a Federal House election (Gabriel & Fernandez, 2014). Wendy Weiser, director of the Democracy Program at the Brennan Center for Justice, stated that the newly implemented voter photo identification laws played a vital role in Gallegos's loss by only 2% (or just 2,400 votes)(Gabriel & Fernandez, 2014). Approximately 600,000 potential voters were turned away for not providing the new documentation required to cast their votes (Gabriel & Fernandez, 2014).

The State of Missouri struck down laws requesting each voter to present a photo ID because the law was too restrictive. However, the federal courts allowed similar laws in Arizona and Indiana to stand (Ansolabehere, 2009). These decisions leave the possibility of further challenges to voters to arise in the future. Individuals opposing

such laws have indicated that the government and the public must take a look at actual instances in which voter fraud occurred, and consider the potentially corrosive effects of corruption on the electoral process. The signature case of *Buckley v. Valeo* raised the following questions:

- Are poll workers in compliance with their own state laws?
- Are voter ID requests equitably applied across groups?
- Do voter identification procedures affect the turnout of legal voters?
- Do they prevent or deter people from voting?
- Do identification procedures improve confidence in the election?
- Do those asked to show ID or in states with more stringent ID laws express less belief in the incidence of voter fraud (Ansolabehere, 2009)?

The response to these questions appears to be ‘no’, which should pressure state legislators, other government officials, legal scholars, jurists, and policymakers on various levels to revisit and carefully analyze voter ID laws and registration requirements across the country.

In midterm elections, voter identification laws had an extraordinary impact on the Democratic Party the six highly contested races for a seat in the U.S. Senate in Louisiana, Kansas, Florida, Wisconsin, Kentucky, and North Carolina. Weiser (2010) voiced concerns regarding the new voting requirements stating that the Republican Party was victorious in several races that were close to the “margin of disenfranchisement (p. A-13).” Weiser said that a race in North Carolina in 2010 received 200,000 ballots for votes cast during the seven days of early voting. Minority voters, particularly African Americans, have commonly used this timeframe to vote. The

governor's race in Kansas was decided by fewer than 33,000 votes, or 2.8%.

Approximately 22,000 known potential voters were denied an opportunity to cast their vote in the governor's race, due to not having the ability of providing acceptable documentation to prove their citizenship. Kansas recently implemented strict voter ID laws, which suppressed previous turnout by about 2%. Weiser said that the new voter ID laws should cause Americans to pause and reflect on the effects they are having on elections in the United States. Weiser stated that these laws result in disenfranchisement and that there is an adequate amount of information to gauge what the results are and it is close to the margins of victory. Kansas Secretary of State Kris W. Kobach wrote the law requiring proof of citizenship and a photo ID, but denied that the new voter requirements disenfranchised voters or reduced turnout. Kobach stated that the 2010 and 2014 elections resulted in a consistent 50% turnout for both. Weiser reiterated that she was not implying that victories in the highly contested races in these states were not honest or lacked integrity, rather that the new voter ID requirements were deciding elections prior to officially being put into place (Gabriel & Fernandez, 2014).

This debate further divides political parties, with strict identification requirements impacting poor, racial minority, elderly, and Generation Z to the highest degree. Often these individuals support the Democratic Party (Ansolabehere, 2009). Some experts have revealed data that support of strict voter ID laws are not uniform across all facets of the Republican Party. Hicks, McKee, Sellers, and Smith (2015) stated that some Republican- controlled legislatures have pushed for more restrictive voter ID laws. Hick's findings affirm that there is a combination of partisan control and the

electoral context drives enactment of such measures (Hicks, McKee, Sellers, & Smith, 2015). Hicks et al. stated that the question remains as to why considerable variation exists across the states with regard to legislation introduced by lawmakers and policies adopted by state governments. Over the past decade, Hicks' research indicated that several Republican-controlled legislatures have introduced relatively few restrictive voter ID bills and adopted less severe laws (Hicks, McKee, Sellers, & Smith, 2015). Hicks' claims that after examining the comprehensive data compiled by the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) from 2001- 2012 out of 26,000 related to elections and political related data only one thousand honed in on voter ID matters.

In 2006 a national research sample of voters, 49%, said they were asked to show a photo ID when they cast their ballot. However, in 2008 the sample of voters in a similar poll rose to 56% (Ansolabehere, 2009). Taking into account that only two states Arizona and Indiana are required by law to request a photo ID, poll workers may be using their own discretion when deciding which voters should produce photo ID, which is somewhat problematic. This study also revealed that the incidence of photo ID requests varied across regions. In the Northeast, poll workers requested photo identification 22% of the time during general elections, whereas in the South, poll workers requested that voters produce photo identification 65% of the time. Roughly 45% of voters were asked to show photo identification in the West and Midwest (Ansolabehere, 2009).

During the 2006 and 2008 elections, survey polls showed a sharp variation in ethnic groups being requested to produce photo identification. In the 2006 election, Caucasians reported being asked to show photo identification at the polls less than 30%

of the time compared with Hispanics who were asked to show it 54% of the time and African Americans 55% of the time. In the 2008 election on Super Tuesday, 53% of Caucasians were asked to produce photo identification compared to 58% of Hispanics and 73% of African Americans. These trends related to the voter having a constant income, education, party identification, age, region, and state laws. These results revealed that poll workers were not consistent when requesting identification among the voters surveyed (Ansolabehere, 2009).

Cobb, Greiner, and Quinn conducted a study on whether voter ID laws can be administered in a race-neutral manner (Cobb, Greiner, & Quinn, 2012). The methodology used included rigorous methods and state-of-the-art statistical techniques to account for sources of uncertainty. The research design also included a survey non-response questionnaire, a sensitivity analysis (to account for voters who were legally required to ask for identification under state and federal law), and clustering research methods. Cobb et al. found evidence that African American and Hispanic voters were asked to provide photo identification at much higher rates than Caucasian voters, even after adjusting for other factors. The magnitude of the differences was substantial. In addition, their findings revealed that poll workers' assumptions and practices stereotyped minorities at alarming rates (Cobb et al., 2012). Congress passed the *Help America Vote Act* in 2002. One year prior to this law being implemented, four states took measures to pass new voter ID laws. These states were Arkansas, Georgia, Michigan, and North Dakota. The political leadership was composed of a bipartisan make-up consisting of officials from the Republican and Democratic parties. When these voter ID laws were implemented Republicans were in control in Michigan and North

Dakota and the Democrats held legislative control in Arkansas and Georgia.

Surprisingly, none of these states took steps toward requiring photo ID as a condition to voting.

Voter ID Opposition

“This morning, we affirm that this struggle must, and will, go on in the cause of our nation’s quest for justice – until every eligible American has the chance to exercise his or her right to vote, unencumbered by discriminatory or unneeded procedures, rules, or practices.” – Attorney General Eric Holder

Voter rights advocates argue that the test of new voter ID laws and requirements should not be measured simply by whether an election was swayed in one direction or another, but more importantly by examining the voting process to determine if voters were disenfranchised (Gabriel & Fernandez, 2014). Silver (2012) argued that new voter ID laws disenfranchise a small percentage of Republican voters as well other voters. He reported that John Sides compiled a list of the impacts of voter ID laws and procured data in support of and opposing new photo ID requirements. Overall, the study results are not consistent. However, the disagreements seem much more semantic than substantive, according to Silver. He noted that whether or not results have statistical significance varies from study to study. He claimed statistical significance is determined by the sampling size and the particular design used by researchers conducting the study, and most statistically significant tests begin with the testing of a null hypothesis to determine the relationship among and impact of variables. In his study, the null hypothesis was voter identification laws would have no effect on turnout. Researchers who use the Bayesian theory claim the hypothesis that voter ID laws have an impact on voter turnout (Silver, 2012).

Ansola (2009) found that two variables of vital importance must be present, that is, that all individuals involved in the political process must be provided with reasonable access and integrity throughout the process. Some who oppose voter photo ID laws pose questions such as (1) why are inconsistent methods used to track voting fraud? and (2) Why are some individuals required to produce identification and others not? To date, there is no evidence of substantial voting fraud either systematic or extensive (Mycoff, Wagner, & Wilson, 2009).

One consequence of voter photo ID laws that is often overlooked is that their very existence could possibly prevent and discourage some voters from attempting to vote in order to avoid contention. Shortly after the enactment of the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) in 2002 opposing parties rallied to implement state election laws (Davidson, 2009). Table 1 reflects restrictive voter ID bills introduced and enacted by year.

Table 1. Restrictive Voter ID Bills Introduced and Enacted by Year

Year	Bill Introductions	Adopted (any)	Adopted (Photo-based)
2001	51	0	0
2002	50	0	0
2003	93	6	3
2004	59	0	0
2005	98	2	2
2006	80	3	0
2007	90	0	0
2008	101	0	0
2009	122	2	1
2010	93	1	1
2011	47	3	6
2012	26	2	2
Total	910	19	15

Writer, Meagan Hatcher-Mays, examined the effects of voter identification fraud, and the findings revealed that only 31 instances in one billion were identified (Mays, 2014). Mays results discredits any significant validity to many voters that identify with conservative ideology that voter fraud is occurring on a regular basis in the United States government. Mays states that new voter identification laws disproportionately affect individuals of color, women, and the poor. These laws are most effective in alienating underrepresented populations and individuals that have faced an astronomical amount of hurdles surrounding the political process. In 2013 when the Supreme Court struck down provisions that would have played a key role in sustaining the voter identification law, Texas and several other southern states took similar roles making provisions in support of voter identification laws that increased the probability of continued obstruction of the political process.

Support for Voter Photo ID Laws

Republican caucuses have argued that new voter ID laws were put in place to decrease voter fraud, although some question this reasoning since nationwide voter fraud cases were fewer than five percent. Observable effects of the implementation of voter ID laws include drastic cuts in early voting opportunities, proof of citizenship rules, and newly implemented ID requirements (Gabriel & Fernandez, 2014). Silver (2012) noted that the vast majority of adults possess a form of identification. Those who do not are not registered to vote, or in a few instances are unlikely to turn out. Some election polls report that thousands of individuals are not eligible to cast a ballot, which is often misleading. The news media in Pennsylvania reported that in some instances obtaining new, acceptable identification, and completing the new voting

process were cumbersome and inaccurate at best. A Pennsylvania news network reported that approximately 750,000 Pennsylvanians, or 9% of the state's registered voter's did not possess an acceptable form of identification issued by the Department of Transportation (Silver, 2012). Stricter identification laws and procedures, including photographic identification or proof of citizenship, provide high levels of assurance that those casting a ballot are eligible to vote (Ansolabehere, 2009).

Jason Mycoff, Michael Wagner, and David Wilson (2009) found that socio-demographic and political motivational factors are far more determinative of voting than the new voter ID laws, which is often corroborated by news sources and other experts. They stated that education remains a major factor in active political roles. A voter's political interest still remains a key factor as well, that is, the level of interest that some voters have for supporting a particular candidate or becoming involved in a campaign. The personal expense of voting will affect some voters' ability to exercise their right to actively participate in the political process. These costs may be relatively low or high depending on a voter's level of sophistication, flexibility with work schedule, salary, and means of transportation. Voters with a higher interest in politics are more likely to be unaffected by voter identification laws. The voters most affected by new registration requirements are those who are unaware, have, or do not possess acceptable identification. This population may consist of first-time voters, individuals who are not interested in interacting with the government on any level, and those whose identification has recently expired (Mycoff et al., 2009).

A number of individuals who support the new, strict voter ID laws stated that they prevented a small percentage of voters from casting their ballot in the 2006 and

2008 elections. Out of 22,211 voters, only 25 said that they were asked to produce photo identification at the polls in 2006. During the 2008 election, 3 out of 2,564 respondents said that they tried to vote and were denied. The results from this study and the perspective of these researchers would suggest that new photo identification laws prevented less than one percent from voting. Some supporters of the photo ID laws believe that stricter laws shore up confidence in the process and, hence, the overall turnout of voters. However, this claim is not supported by empirical research. Some individuals who support new, strict voter registration laws have stated that news networks embellish the horror of current voter guidelines and requirements. Almost half of all voters are asked to produce photo identification, but almost no one reports being denied the opportunity to cast a ballot. A large percentage of the population believes that voter fraud is common, but newly implemented voter identification laws fail to prevent fraudulent activity from occurring (Ansolabehere, 2009). The questions that some ask include (1) How are denied voters tracked? (2) What methods are used to track voters who choose not to go to the polls at all?

There is presently very limited data to show actual exclusion from the voting process. This is not to say that implementing new, stringent voting laws is not discriminatory, because it apparently is, and these laws deserve to be scrutinized. The question remains as to whether photo identification laws deter voters from exercising their privilege. Mycoff et al.'s research results suggested that they do.

In the national Cooperative Congressional Election Study (CCES) in 2006, the respondents answered questions about whether they were asked to produce a form of identification at the polls and if it prevented them from taking part in the election

process (Ansolabehere, 2007). The results revealed that 22 out of 36,421 respondents indicated that they were victims of voter obstruction, as a result of voter ID laws. Ansolabehere's findings revealed that the voter identification laws prevented less than 0.2% from voting. However, he believes that a survey ten times larger would supply ample data to start the process of gauging who was excluded from voting and why. Until there is more systematic, empirical evidence of injustice in the government administration or that required forms are inaccessible, there is little reason to suspect or imply that voter obstruction has occurred (Mycoff et al., 2009). According to political science scholars, David C. Wilson and Paul R. Brewer over the past decade more than half of the states in the U.S. have taken steps to enact more stringent laws requiring voters to produce government issued identification.

CHAPTER 3. METHODS

Silver (2012) suggested that Democrats could combat new voter restrictions by engaging the voter base with increased voter conscientiousness regarding proper registration status. To guarantee voters the opportunity to cast their ballot, the polls must be accessible to all who wish to vote. All votes must be tabulated accurately. The values have various implications, ranging from administration procedures, technological voting equipment, and registration policies, as well as charging individuals with the task of upholding integrity in positions associated with the voting process. State laws are in place to provide guidelines for poll workers to verify that an individual is a legitimate voter, and is indeed who he/she claims to be. Only two states have voter registration laws requiring voters to present a government-issued photo ID at the polls. However, another nearly two dozen has the option of requesting government-issued photo identification from voters. The other 25 states employ less stringent voter identification and registration laws Ansolabehere (2009).

Additional geographical locations throughout the United States must implement outreach programs designed to inform voters (similar to the action taken by the State of Indiana) of the new identification requirements. In addition to this initiative, Indiana's voter identification law was written to make acquiring acceptable voter identification effortless (Mycoff et al., 2009).

Education and additional training for poll workers to assist with language barriers, diversity training, ID requirements, provisional ballot qualifications, special assistance needs, and other aspects associated with the voting system are a place to begin the process of educating and revising (Cobb et al., 2012).

Hypotheses

Assessing the differences between African American and Caucasian attitudes, political perspectives, and historic patterns are important factors to consider when exploring the impact of voter identification laws. Other notable factors that must be considered are how closely connected are African American and Caucasian voters to a particular political ideology, level of social economic status, degree of importance when social equality, racial attitudes are factors. How often do African Americans and Caucasian voters act based on their racial allegiances? What role does the phenomenon “linked fate “ have between these two groups? The implications of voter identification laws are that they restrict elderly, poor, minority, and young voters from participating in the election process. African Americans have a reliance on race, heuristics, shortcuts, a problem-solving aid to assist them in determining the most beneficial decision to make when determining which political candidate will support civil rights and economic equality for the African American community overall. Wilson and Brewer’s (2013) findings revealed the Caucasian voters harbor feelings of racial resentment and animosity towards the African American community because of being partially held responsible for the bias and unfair treatment of African Americans (since they were not personally responsible for actions carried out), and they believe that they were at an unfair disadvantage due to the various programs specifically designed for blacks and are resentful that perspective some individuals from the African American population make excuses for personal failures. Extraordinary life experiences among African American and Caucasian voters contribute to stark political perspectives in various

aspects, which contributed to Wilson and Brewer (2013) and Dawson's (Johnson, 2015) three hypothesis.

H1: For African American voters race and the cohesiveness of an underrepresented ethnic group subsides above secondary issues such as renewable energy, free market economics, abortion, or immigration. The most important question will be which candidate or political party will most likely protect civil rights of African Americans and which representative will support and enhance economic equality.

H2: A much higher percentage of Caucasian voters will be more supportive of new and enhanced voter identification laws. The argument will be that voter identification laws must be implemented in an effort of preventing voter fraud and prevent voters from casting multiple ballots.

H3: The African American community should respond in opposition to voter identification laws to a much greater magnitude, hence since voter identification laws disproportionately affect their communities.

Data, Variables, and Methods

The secondary data and methods used from David C. Wilson and Paul R. Brewer 2013 results consists of: data formulated at the University of Delaware Center for Political Communication (CPC) National Agenda Poll, a random-digit-dial (RDD) telephone survey of a representative sample of 906 adults living in the continental United States. The survey was administered by Princeton Survey Associates International (PSRAI), and data were collected by Princeton Data Source in May-June 2012 using a dual sampling frame consisting of both landline (n= 551) and (n= 355) respondents; interviews were conducted in English.⁴ The response rate was 12.5

percent (calculated using the American Association for Public Opinion Research's RR4, reflecting refusals as well as non-contacts). The contact and cooperation rates were 19 and 67 percent, respectively. The data are weighted to correct known demographic discrepancies related to sex, age, race/ethnicity, region, education, count population density, and household size and phone lines. The sampling error for the full sample is + - 3.9 percentage points.

Respondents were asked how familiar they were with "the issue of voter ID laws." Responses were coded as 1 for "not familiar at all," 2 for "somewhat familiar," and 3 for "very familiar." Forty-three percent of the respondents said they were "somewhat familiar," 34% said "not at all," and only 23% said that they were "very familiar."

Wilson and Brewer's (2013) findings for support for voter id laws and the framing experiment are as follows: After respondents reported their level of familiarity with voter ID laws, they were told that such laws "require individuals to show a form of government -issued identification when they attempt to vote." Respondents were then asked how much they favored or opposed voter ID laws (opinion was coded to range from 1 for "strong opposition" to 4 for "strong support"). Results showed that a sizeable majority (78 percent) of the public favors or strongly favors voter ID laws, with fewer opposing the laws (21 percent). In fact, respondents answered this question under one of five randomized conditions. A baseline condition asked for opinions on voter ID free of any context (version 1), whereas the other four conditions presented a pro-voter or anti-ID argument before asking about opinions. The pro-voter ID law arguments said that these laws "are necessary to keep people from voting multiple times"(version 3).

Anti-voter law arguments said that voter ID laws “can actually prevent people who are eligible to vote from voting”(version 4) or “are unnecessary because voter fraud is very rare”(version 5). Randomization of the conditions was successful ($\chi^2(4)=.61$, n.s.), and Wilson and Brewer found no significant demographic differences across the treatments. Additionally, there are no significant differences in levels of familiarity across party identification ($\chi^2(4)= 5.7$, n.s.) or political ideology ($\chi^2(4)=2.4$,n.s.). If respondents said they were “very familiar” with voter ID laws, the description was preceded by the statement “As you know...” They provided the results from the experiment in the section below, which I used as secondary data for my study.

FAMILIARITY WITH VOTER ID LAWS

Q18. How familiar are you with the issue of voter ID laws? Are you not at all familiar, somewhat familiar, or very familiar?

OPINIONS ON VOTER ID LAWS

Q19. READ TO ALL: [if high familiarity, READ: AS YOU KNOW] Voter ID laws require individuals to show a form of government-issued identification when they attempted to vote.

Q19a. Baseline (version 1): What is your opinion? Do you strongly favor, favor, oppose, or strongly oppose voter ID laws?

Q19b. Pro-argument #1 (version 2): Supporters of voter ID laws argue that they are necessary to keep people who aren’t eligible to vote from voting. What is your opinion? Do you strongly favor, favor, oppose, or strongly oppose voter ID laws?

Q19c. Pro-argument #2 (version 3): Supporters of voter ID laws argue that they are necessary to keep people from voting multiple times. What is your opinion? Do you strongly favor, favor, oppose, or strongly oppose voter ID laws?

Q19d. Anti-argument #1 (version 4) Opponents of voter ID laws argue that they can actually prevent people who are eligible to vote from voting. What is your opinion? Do you strongly favor, favor, oppose, or strongly oppose voter ID laws?

Q19e. Anti-argument #2 (version 5): Opponents of voter ID laws argue that they are unnecessary because voter fraud is very rare. What is your opinion? Do you strongly favor, favor, oppose, or strongly oppose voter ID laws?

I explain the experiment test results in detail that Wilson and Brewer findings revealed: I am only interested in significant findings meaning when the P value is < (less than) 0.05 the findings are significant and when the P value is > (greater than) 0.05 the findings are not significant. The Bayesian theory also provides a mathematical framework for performing inference or reasoning using probability. The Bayesian theory is nothing more than using the manipulation of conditional probabilities stating that the joint probability of two events A & B can be expressed as: $P(AB) = P(A|B)P(B)$ or $P(B|A)P(A)$. The term $P(D|H)$ is called the likelihood function. Probability in mathematical terminology is the likelihood of something occurring in the future. It is expressed as a number between zero (can never happen) to 1 (which will always happen). Probability can be expressed as a fraction, a decimal, a percent, or as odds.

Brewer and Wilson results reveal four sets of observations. As new variables (party identification, ideology, age, and sex) were added the results become more significant. Older and liberal voters were more opposed to voter identification laws and

Republicans and more conservative voters were less opposed to voter identification laws.

CHAPTER 4. Results

The hypotheses were tested by a series of models, all estimated as regressions. The first model contained only indicators of the four conditions of the framing experiment. The second model added the indicator of race. This was coded as a 1 for African Americans and a 0 for Caucasian Americans. All other respondents were dropped from the analysis. The third model added interactions between the race and the indicators of the treatments. The final model added several control variables. The discussion of the results walks through each of these models.

The results from the first model were essentially what Wilson and Brewer found. Three of the four conditions had no difference in the level of support for voter id than the control condition. Only the first of the anti-voter id arguments, the one that informed respondents that these laws might prevent eligible voters from voting, had a significant effect on respondents' attitudes about voter id laws. The variable was coded as higher values of the dependent variable mean more opposition, so this argument increased opposition to the laws.

Model 2 added the race indicator to the model. Not surprisingly, African Americans were more opposed to these laws than Caucasian Americans. None of the effects of the treatments changed. The number of respondents decreased because the model drops other racial groups.

Model 3 added the key test of the hypotheses. The treatment effects in Table 2 account for what the effect of the frame was for Whites. The interactions were how this effect was different for African Americans. In this model, the frame about denying eligible voters remained significant for Whites. There was no evidence that the effect

was any different for African Americans. While the theory outlined expected there to be different responses, the data does not support this hypothesis.

Model 4 added several additional controls to the model. The controls added to model 4 were partisanship, ideology, age, education, and gender. This did not change the results from model 3. There was no evidence that the frame mattered differently for Whites or African Americans. Partisanship and ideology predicted attitudes about voter id laws (liberals and Democrats were more opposed), but that did not change the main hypothesis tests.

Table 2. Opposition to Voter Identification Laws

Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Pro Argument 1	-0.03 (0.11)	-0.06 (0.11)	-0.07 (0.12)	-0.09 (0.12)
Pro Argument 2	0.08 (0.11)	0.01 (0.11)	0.06 (0.11)	0.06 (0.11)
Anti Argument 1	0.32 (0.11)*	0.31 (0.11)*	0.32 (0.12)*	0.25 (0.11)*
Anti Argument 2	-0.03 (0.11)	-0.07 (0.11)	-0.01 (0.12)	0.02 (0.11)
Race (0 = white, 1 = black)	-	0.53 (0.10)*	0.68 (0.24)*	0.30 (0.23)
Race* Pro 1	-	-	0.08 (0.33)	0.12 (0.31)
Race* Pro 2	-	-	-0.31 (0.31)	-0.18 (0.30)
Race* Anti 1	-	-	-0.09 (0.34)	0.07 (0.33)
Race* Anti 2	-	-	-0.48 (0.35)	-0.38 (0.33)
Partisanship	-	-	-	-0.28 (0.05)*
Ideology	-	-	-	0.25 (0.04)*
Age	-	-	-	0.003 (0.002)
Education	-	-	-	0.01 (0.02)
Gender	-	-	-	-0.04 (0.07)
Intercept	1.83(0.08)	1.77 (0.08)	1.75 (0.09)	1.24 (0.23)
N	871	801	801	761
R ²	0.02	0.05	0.05	0.21

CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSION

Some researchers have stated and implied that voter identification laws and requirements have and will continue to disproportionately affect Democratic-prone organizations across many states. Caucasian voters without a college education and predominantly from southern locations often support the Republican Party and could also be impacted by new voter ID requirements (Silver, 2012). However, it is clear that new, strict voter identification laws will have the most drastic impact on Democratic candidates and supporters. Silver says that new voter restrictions won't negatively affect Democratic turnout as news media sources imply or as Democratic supporters fear. In the majority of states where the voter ID controversy exists, the Republican base has fought in support of new policies, while the Democratic-based organizations have fought against new voter identification laws and policies (Silver, 2012).

The ongoing debate over voter registration is often framed as the tradeoff between the goals of ensuring access and integrity (Ansolabehere, 2009). Although new mandatory ongoing training policies would not solve all of the concerns associated with voter identification laws, training must be implemented for poll workers, lawmakers, and the public to begin addressing consequences associated with voter ID laws. Some individuals believe that voter identification laws are justified and fair to all voters who choose to become involved in the voting and political process.

For African Americans linked fate is the recognition that individual life chances are extricably tied to race as a whole. From the 2000-2004 Dawson and Lawrence Bobo conducted six public opinion studies on the racial divide in the United States. Dawson's research efforts include the development of quantitative models of African Americans

political behavior, public opinion, and the political effects of urban poverty and African American political ideology (Johnson, 2015).

REFERENCES

- Ansolabehere, S. (2009). Effects of identification requirements on voting: Evidence from the experiences of voters on Election Day. Symposium: Voter ID Issues in Politics and Political Science. Retrieved from <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=3260876&fileId=S1049096509090313>
- Cobb, V. R., Greiner, D. J., & Quinn, K. M. (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, 1-33. Retrieved from https://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/VoterIDLaw_Rachael-Cobb-Greiner.pdf
- Dawson, M. C. (1994). *Behind the Mule: Race and Class in African- American Politics*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press
- Gabriel, T., & Fernandez, M. (2014). Voter ID laws scrutinized for impact on midterms. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/19/us/voter-id-laws-midterm-elections.html>
- Johnson, T., R. (2015). Can the Democratic Party Retain Its Hold on Black Voters? Decades of overwhelming support could be evaporating as new generations of African Americans grapple with novel choices. *The Atlantic*. September 7, 2015. Retrieved from <http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/09/the-changing-outlook-for-black-voters/403975/>
- Mays, M. H. (2014). Media Matters for America. 31 In A Billion: Election's Experts Report Shatters Right- Wing Media Voter ID Myths. Retrieved from

- <http://mediamatters.org/blog/2014/08/07/31-in-a-billion-election-experts-report-shatter/200359>
- Mycott, J. D., Wagner, M. W., & Wilson, D. C. (2009). The empirical effects of voter ID laws: Present or absent? Symposium: Voter ID Issues in Politics and Political Science. Retrieved from http://brennan.3cdn.net/3f58c112ca4e1abbca_x84mvy44c.pdf
- Silver, N. (2012). *Measuring the effects of voter identification laws*. FiveThirtyEight. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/07/15/measuring-the-effects-of-voter-identification-laws/>
- Wickman, F. (2012). Why do many minorities lack id? Investigating one of The big factors in the debate over those new voter-ID laws. Retrieved From http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/explainer/2012/08/voter_id_laws_why_do_minorities_lack_id_to_show_at_the_polls_.html
- Voting Rights Act. Major dates in history. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.aclu.org/files/VRATimeline.html?redirect=timeline-history-voting-rights-act>
- Race and ethnicity in the United States. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Race_and_ethnicity_in_the_United_States
- Wilson, D. C., & Brewer, P. R. (2013) The Foundations of Public Opinion on Voter ID Laws. Political Predispositions, Racial Resentment, and Information Effects. Retrieved from <http://poq.oxfordjournals.org/content/77/4/962.abstract>