

An Analysis on the Effects of Voter ID Laws and Minnesota's Decision to Vote Against It

Amy Asell

Bemidji State University

Political Science Senior Thesis

Bemidji State University

Dr. Patrick Donnay, Advisor

May 2013

Contents

Abstract	3
Introduction.....	4
Literature Review.....	5
Revising of Research Question.....	10
Methodology.....	10
Analysis.....	11
Conclusion.....	17
Appendix.....	19
Bibliography.....	25

Abstract

In recent years, the topic of voter identification has been a hotly contested issue in state legislatures around the country. Since 2003, nearly 1,000 bills concerning voter ID have been introduced in a total of forty-six states. In 2012 alone, voter ID legislation was pending in thirty-three states. On November 6, 2012, the citizens of the state of Minnesota voted on whether they supported an amendment to the state Constitution that would require all voters to present a valid photo ID in order to vote. Despite poll numbers indicating that a majority of Minnesotans supported the amendment the voter ID measure failed to pass with only 46.16% of the vote, making Minnesota the first state to reject a voter ID amendment. In this study, I analyzed the voting results of the voter ID amendment for each of Minnesota's eighty-seven counties. I used data from the United States Census Bureau and the Office of the Minnesota Secretary of State to examine the demographics (age, income, education, and race) of each county to help understand why they either voted for or against the amendment. Preliminary analysis shows that counties with a higher percentage of people who would most likely be affected by the law (low income, the elderly, and some minorities) had less support for the voter ID amendment.

Introduction

The 2000 presidential election involving the *Bush v. Gore* Florida recount fiasco launched a number of commissions and task forces to address and reform the multiple failures of the voting process. At the national level, Congress passed the Help America Voter Act of 2002 (HAVA), which created mandatory minimum standards for states to follow in several areas of election administration. The law provided funding to help states meet the new standards, replace voting systems, and improve election administration, but the specifics of implementation were left up to each state which has allowed for varying interpretations of the federal law. Since HAVA was enacted, voter ID legislation has been a high-profile issue in many state legislatures. Since 2003, nearly 1,000 bills concerning voter ID have been introduced in a total of forty-six states. In 2012 alone, voter ID legislation was pending in thirty-three states. This includes new voter ID proposals in fourteen states, proposals to strengthen existing voter ID laws in ten states, and bills in nine to amend recently passed voter ID laws.

In 2011, voter ID legislation was passed by the Minnesota State Legislature but vetoed by Governor Mark Dayton, which led to a proposed constitutional amendment to be voted on by the people on November 6th, 2012. Coalitions formed on both sides of the issue, with one side claiming there to be rampant voter fraud taking place, while the other claimed that the proposed amendment would end up disenfranchising certain groups of legal voters. Largely missing from the debate was how much it would cost to put such a policy in place and how many incidents of fraud would be stopped by the policy. Therefore, I focus on the various aspects of voter identification legislation and will analyze how the policies were perceived to affect the voting process by voters. I review articles relating to voter fraud, the effects of voter ID laws on turnout,

whether these laws disproportionately affect certain minority groups, and accessibility to obtaining the proper identification needed in order to vote.

Literature Review

Voter Fraud

John Fund (2008), political journalist and author of the book *Stealing Elections: How Voter Fraud Threatens Our Democracy*, describes some states as having election systems “so flawed that you can’t tell where incompetence ends and possible fraud begins”. But upon further reading, his book contains very little data on how this fraud is taking place. Instead, Fund relies on public opinion polls relating to how prevalent they believed voter fraud to be. According to a February 2008 survey conducted for the Congressional Cooperative Election Study group, 62 percent of voters thought vote fraud to be very common or somewhat common, versus 28 percent who thought it occurred infrequently or almost never (Fund, 2008). While public opinion polls may not be the best gauge for whether or not voting fraud is actually taking place, a study by Ansolabehere and Persily (2008) suggests that public opinion does play a significant role in the debate on voter ID laws. One of the justifications for voter ID laws is that they counteract a widespread fear of voter fraud that leads citizens to disengage from the democracy. Results from their survey show that perceptions of fraud have no relationship to an individual’s likelihood of turning out to vote. They also found that voters who were subject to stricter ID requirements believed fraud to be just as widespread as the voters who were subject to less restrictive ID requirements (Ansolabehere & Persily, 2008). But what exactly is voter fraud? In Dr. Lorraine Minnite’s (2007) article, *The Politics of Voter Fraud*, she defines the term *voter fraud* as the intentional corruption of the electoral process by voters. This differs from fraud that results from

voter mistakes, although these acts are sometimes prosecuted as voter fraud. All other forms of corruption of the electoral process and corruption committed by elected or election officials, candidates, party organizations, advocacy groups, or campaign workers fall under the wider definition of election fraud. Minnite argues that when analyzing allegations of “voter fraud”, one should look at who is alleged to have committed the fraud and in which stage of the electoral process. The types of voter fraud should be categorized so that one can analyze whether presenting a photo ID on election day will even prevent the kinds of voting fraud that are taking place. The American Civil Liberties Union of Minnesota (ACLU) believes that the only type of fraud an ID requirement would prevent would be voter impersonation, and has issued a challenge to all citizens by offering a \$1,000 reward to anyone who can prove that a case of voter impersonation has taken place in Minnesota within the last ten years (Ragsdale, 2010).

Effects on Turnout

Current research gives conflicting reports on whether voter turnout is affected by voter ID legislation. In a survey used in Ansolabehere’s (2009) article, *Effects of Identification Requirements on Voting: Evidence from the Experiences of Voters on Election Day*, out of 1,113 non-voters, only four cited “I did not have proper identification” as a reason, and also cited other reasons as well – “bad weather” and “forgot to vote”. The results of Ansolabehere’s work suggest that maybe an ID requirement would not decrease voter turnout as much as some believe. De Alth (2008) studied the change in nationwide voter turnout between 2002 and 2006. The results showed that photo and non-photo ID laws decreased turnout by between 1.6 and 2.2 percentage points. Conversely, states that amended their ID laws more recently experienced increased voter turnout, whereas states that changed their voting laws prior to 2004 showed a decline in turnout (De Alth, 2008). This could tie into the hypothesis put forth by Vercellotti and

Andersen (2009) that a “learning curve” exists and can potentially reduce turnout, at least initially. Legitimate voters who are unaware of the new law and fail to bring the newly required identification and those who may be aware yet fail to obtain the necessary documentation could reduce turnout initially. There will also be those who might otherwise seek to vote fraudulently but are barred from the ballot by the new law, furthering a decrease in turnout. The authors believe it is possible to mitigate the effects with education and preparation, alleviating the disenfranchising impact among those who are able to obtain the necessary identification (Vercellotti & Andersen, 2009). What wasn’t explored was how costly this education can be. The state of Indiana, which has one of the nation’s most rigorous voter ID laws, spent \$2.2 million on an outreach program to inform voters of the change in identification requirements. Also there was an undisclosed amount of monetary and time costs for the Indiana Bureau of Motor Vehicles, as they were now required to issue any voting eligible citizens a free voter-ID card upon request, valid for six years (Mycoff, Wagner, & Wilson, 2009). The costs associated with putting these laws into action are rarely a part of the discussions on voter ID legislation, and they must be considered by both the legislature and the public before making any decisions.

The state of Minnesota has historically been a leader in voter turnout rates. In the last fifteen elections, Minnesota has had the highest voter turnout in the nation eleven times (Ostermeier, 2008). This has been somewhat of a proud achievement for the state, as it signifies to some that there is a strong sense of civic duty and a high interest in politics among its citizens. Others believe that Minnesota’s high voter turnout rate is due to having lenient voting laws and same-day registration. If implementing these new laws meant that voting turnout would decrease, would Minnesotans be as supportive? Is the law only stopping voter fraud from occurring, or are

legitimate voters now being barred from the voting process? Who is affected by voter ID laws needs to be analyzed more thoroughly before legislation is passed.

Exclusion of Minorities

The United States has had a checkered past when it comes to voting rights. Alexander Keyssar (2009) highlights the gap between the image of the United States as a democratic nation and the reality that it took nearly two centuries for universal suffrage to be achieved. With laws being put in place to prevent portions of our population from voting being not that far in the past, extra care should be taken to assure that disenfranchisement is not taking place today (Keyssar, 2009). Political science research has shown that the more barriers placed in front of potential voters, the less likely they are to vote. De Alth cited evidence that eleven to twelve percent of voting-age Americans nationwide do not possess the kind of photo ID required by the strictest voter ID laws. The percentage is higher for seniors (eighteen percent), African Americans (twenty-five percent), and low-income Americans (fifteen percent). Additionally, seven percent of voting-age citizens do not have ready access to the documents necessary to obtain a photo ID (De Alth, 2008). Marjorie Hershey (2009) found that in the few studies that have examined the impact of voter ID laws, those using aggregate (state-level) data found no significant impact on turnout during 2000 - 2006. But at the individual level, Alvarez, Bailey, and Katz (2007) were able to show that stricter rules did depress turnout in the range of 3 – 4% (Hershey, 2009). Missing from her research was the possible effects of voter ID laws on young adults.

Costs of Implementing Voter ID Laws

Estimating the costs of the proposed voter ID amendment is difficult because much is still unknown about how the new system would operate. The Minnesota State Legislature would still

need to pass more detailed legislation that would support the amendment should it have passed. But because many other states have recently instituted similar laws, one can analyze the costs that were incurred in their state and apply it to ours. The state of Indiana has had a strict photo ID requirement since 2006. After the law was passed, Indiana focused on informing its citizens about the new changes and what would be needed in order for them to vote. Types of media used included television, radio, newspaper, billboards, and posters in public transit systems, each of which incorporated the theme, “Remember to bring your photo ID.” Since 2005, Indiana has spent \$2.2 million on voter outreach and education efforts, including \$600,000 in 2012. Up until now, the state has used money from the HAVA grant program, in which the federal government funds 95% and requires a 5% state match, making the costs to the state about \$110,000. The state’s HAVA funds are now exhausted, and the state will be responsible for all funds (Iowa State Association of County Auditors, 2011).

The proposed voter ID amendment in Minnesota would require the state to provide free ID cards to eligible voters. The voter ID legislation in Indiana also calls for the state to provide free voter ID cards and predicted that this would cost the state \$700,000. In reality, Indiana was forced to issue many more cards than previously anticipated, and has spent over \$10 million on new voter ID cards from 2007-2010. The Indiana Bureau of Motor Vehicles has calculated that it costs \$13 for each ID issued, including administrative costs (Anhut, Huntington, & Young, 2011).

A report from the Citizens for Election Integrity Minnesota used the costs in Indiana to project how much it would cost for Minnesota to provide free photo IDs and to educate the public on its new laws. They recommend that the state of Minnesota should budget for at least \$8.25 million to cover the distribution of free photo IDs over four years. They warn that the

number could be much higher because their calculations were based on eligible voters and not on voter turnout rates (Minnesota ranks highest in the country with 76% compared to Indiana who had a turnout rate of 58% in the 2012 election). The report also estimates that voter outreach to educate Minnesota's 3.8 million eligible voters would cost between \$1.7 million and \$5.3 million (Bonnifield & Schultz, 2012).

Revising of Research Question

Despite multiple polls indicating that a majority of Minnesotans were in favor of having a voter ID requirement (at one point, support reached as high as 80%), on November 6, 2012, the people of Minnesota voted against the constitutional amendment on voter ID with 53.84% of the vote. This made Minnesota the first and only state to reject a voter ID amendment. While the amount of voter fraud and the cost of instituting a voter ID law in Minnesota became less relevant, other questions emerged. How was it that within a year, support for voter ID in Minnesota dropped over 30%? What made the citizens of Minnesota change their minds? I analyze what factors may have gone into the voter's decision and whether the demographic groups that are said to be affected most by voter ID laws were the ones who voted against the amendment.

Methodology

Defining the Dependent and Independent Variables

Dependent Variable

To analyze the voting results, I created a dependent variable labeled “pervotedyesID” to measure the percentage of yes votes that were cast for the voter ID constitutional amendment for each of Minnesota’s eighty-seven counties. I used data from the Office of the Minnesota Secretary of State which provided me with the official election results for the 2012 constitutional amendment on voter ID by county.

Independent Variables

The independent variables I created relate to the demographics that have been identified in previous studies to be the ones that would be most affected by the institution of a voter ID law. I examine the relationship between the dependent variable “pervotedyesID” and various independent variables, such as age, income, race, educational attainment, and who they voted for in the 2012 presidential election. I used the 2011 American Community Survey’s 5-year estimate to find data for each of my independent variables. The American Community Survey is an ongoing statistical survey by the U.S. Census Bureau that is sent to approximately 250,000 addresses monthly. Designed to help communities, state governments, and federal programs plan investments and services, the survey gathers statistics on age, sex, race, income, education, and other characteristics.

Analysis

The first analysis I performed was to test whether voter ID was a partisan issue. The debate on the voter ID amendment has centered on the arguments made by each of the major political parties. Republicans believe that voter ID requirements need to be put in place to reduce cases of voter fraud and ensure a fair election system. Democrats see the proposed voter ID legislation as disenfranchising to those with lower incomes, less education, and to minorities.

My hypothesis was in a comparison of Minnesota counties, those with a higher percentage of votes for presidential candidate Mitt Romney will be more likely to have a higher percentage of people who voted yes for the voter ID amendment than will those who voted for Barack Obama. The variables I used were “pervotedromney” (independent variable) which measured the percentage of votes that Mitt Romney earned in the 2012 general election and “pervotedyesID” (dependent variable) which measured the percentage of yes votes that were cast for the voter ID constitutional amendment. My unit of analysis is Minnesota counties and all my variables are interval level. The results of my scatterplot show that there is a positive relationship between voting for Romney and voting yes for voter ID. The R^2 value is 0.532 which means that 53.2% of the relationship is explained by how they voted for president. My hypothesis is supported by the data.

(Figure 1 about here)

The second analysis I performed was to test whether there was a relationship between a person’s income and how they voted on the voter ID amendment. Studies suggest that those with lower incomes are more likely to be impacted by the proposed voter ID amendment. Even though a free government-issued photo ID would be provided by the state, many individuals will face other various costs in order to comply with the new regulations. My hypothesis was in a comparison of Minnesota counties, those who have a higher percentage of individuals earning low incomes will be less likely to vote yes on the voter ID amendment than those who have a lower percentage. The variables I used were “pervotedyesID” and nine variables representing varying levels of income – “per10kto15k”, “per15kto25k”, “per25kto35k”, “per35-50k”, “per50-75k”, “per75kto100k”, “per100kto150k”, “per150kto200k”, and “perover200k”. For example, “per10kto15k” is a variable that measures the percent of individuals who earned an income

between \$10,000 and \$15,000 in each county. My unit of analysis is Minnesota counties and all my variables are interval level. The results of the bivariate correlation show that there is a negative relationship between all the variables that have incomes of \$50,000 or less and voted yes on voter ID, while there is a positive relationship between all the variables that have incomes of \$50,000 or more and voted yes on voter ID. Three variables show that the correlation is significant. Percent Income 15-25k has a Pearson's R score of $-.241$ (negative relationship) and a p score of 0.25. Percent Income 75-100k and Percent Income 100-150k have Pearson R scores of $.224$ and $.211$ respectively (both positive relationships) and have p scores below or equal to $.05$. While the relationships are relatively weak, they still have statistical significance. My hypothesis was supported by the data.

(Table 1 about here)

The third analysis I performed was to test whether there was a relationship between a person's age and how they voted on the voter ID amendment. Certain age groups such as young voters and the elderly might face more obstacles than those in other age groups. College students who attend school out-of-state typically don't have a state issued ID. Critics of the voter ID amendment say that if the law were to pass, most college issued IDs would no longer be an acceptable form of ID because they lack an expiration date. The elderly, who are less likely to have a current valid driver's license, could also encounter problems in obtaining the proper ID needed to vote, such as lack of transportation or the proper documentation (such as a birth certificate) to verify who they are to get the free state-issued photo ID. For this analysis I have two hypotheses. The first is that in a comparison of Minnesota counties, those who have a higher percentage of 18 to 24-year-olds will be less likely to vote yes on the voter ID amendment than those who have a lower percentage. The second is that in a comparison of Minnesota counties,

those who have a higher percentage of 65-year-olds and older will be less likely to vote yes on the voter ID amendment than those who have a lower percentage. The variables I used were “pervotedyesID” and four variables representing specific age groups – “perage1824”, “perage2544”, “perage4564”, and “perage65older”. For example, “perage1824” is a variable that measures the percent of 18 to 24-year-olds in each county. My unit of analysis is Minnesota counties and all my variables are interval level. The results of the bivariate correlation show that there is a positive relationship between Percent Age 25-44 and Percent Voted Yes for ID but it is weak (.177) and not statistically significant (0.100). Percent Age 18-24 and Percent Age 45-64 have negative relationships with Percent Voted Yes for Voter ID but both are also weak and not statistically significant. Percent Age 65 and older also has a weak negative relationship with Percent Voted Yes for ID but unlike the other age variables, it was statistically significant (.045). While the data supports my hypothesis on 65-year-olds and older, the hypothesis for 18 to 24-year-olds is less clear. While it is a negative relationship, Percent Age 18-24 has a Pearson’s R score of -0.067. Percent Age 45-64 has a Pearson’s R score of -0.191 which means the relationship is stronger for this age group.

(Table 2 about here)

The fourth analysis I performed was to test whether there was a relationship between a person’s educational attainment and how they voted on the voter ID amendment. Studies show that those with less education are less likely to have various forms of ID and could therefore be disproportionately affected by a voter ID law. My hypothesis is that in a comparison of Minnesota counties, those who have a higher percentage of people with lower levels of educational attainment will be less likely to vote yes on the voter ID amendment than those who have a lower percentage. The variables I used were “pervotedyesID” and five variables

representing different degrees of educational attainment – “PerHSGrad”, “PerSomeCollege”, “PerAssociatesdegree”, “PerBachelorsdegree”, and “PerGraduatedegree”. For example, “PerHSGrad” is a variable that measures the percent of individuals who are high school graduates in each county. My unit of analysis is Minnesota counties and all my variables are interval level. The results of the bivariate correlation show that variables who have reached an associate’s degree or less have a positive relationship with the variable “pervotedyesID”, while the variables with at least a bachelor’s degree or higher have a negative relationship. Two of the variables, Percent Some College and Percent Associate’s Degree are statistically significant and have Pearson R scores of .238 and .216, respectively, which are both relatively weak. The data shows that my hypothesis was wrong and that the exact opposite is true. Counties with a higher percentage of people with high levels of educational attainment are less likely to vote yes on the voter ID amendment than those who have a lower percentage.

(Table 3 about here)

The fifth analysis was to test whether there was a relationship between a person’s race and how they voted on the voter ID amendment. Previous research indicates that certain racial groups, such as African-Americans, are less likely to possess an acceptable form of ID that would be required under the proposed amendment in order to vote. My hypothesis is that in a comparison of Minnesota counties, those with a higher percentage of minorities will be less likely to vote yes on the voter ID amendment than those with a lower percentage. The variables I used were “pervotedyesID” and four variables representing different racial groups – “PerBlack”, “PerHispanic”, “PerNativeAmerican”, and “PerWhite”. For example, “PerBlack” is a variable that measures the percent of individuals who are African-American in each county. My unit of analysis is Minnesota counties and all my variables are interval level. The results of the bivariate

correlation show that there is a negative relationship between “pervotedyesID” and two of the race variables. Percent Native-American has a Pearson’s R score of $-.083$ and percent African-American has a Pearson’s R score of $-.161$. While both variables have relatively weak relationships and are not statistically significant, there is value in knowing that the relationship is negative. Surprisingly, percent Hispanic has a positive relationship with voting yes on the voter ID amendment with a Pearson’s R score of $.023$. But the Pearson correlation indicates that the relationship is very weak and with a P score of $.833$, the relationship is far from being statistically significant. This data shows that my hypothesis was right in relation to two of the racial minorities (African-Americans and Native-Americans) but was not the case with Hispanics.

(Table 4 about here)

The sixth and final analysis was to test whether any of the demographics were still significant after controlling for the effects of other independent variables. I was able to do this through using a multiple regression. The dependent variable was “pervotedyesID” and the independent variables used were “pervotedobama”, “PerBlack”, “perage1824”, “perage65older”, “per25kto35k”, “per35kto50k”, “PerHSGrad”, and “PerGraduatedegree”. The results of the multiple regression show that after controlling for the other independent variables, there are only two variables that are significant at the $.10$ level – “pervotedobama” and “perage65older”. While the “pervotedobama” was an expected outcome due to earlier analysis and the fact that this issue seemed to be a partisan one, “perage65older” came as somewhat of a surprise. It is perceived that the rural counties of Minnesota were more likely to vote in favor of the voter ID amendment yet it is the rural counties that have a higher percentage of senior citizens, creating an unexpected contradiction. The adjusted R-Square of $.564$ tells us how well all the independent variables

explain the dependent variable, meaning that 56.4% of why people voted yes on voter ID can be explained by the variables that were chosen. This number would have been higher had I picked variables that have been shown to be more likely to vote yes, as opposed to the variables that were thought to be more likely to vote no.

(Table 5 about here)

Conclusion

While I was not able to analyze my initial research question due to the failing of the proposed voter ID amendment in Minnesota, I was able to provide insight on why the amendment did not pass. The results of my analysis along with the final election results show that the voters of Minnesota were impacted by the possible negative effects that could come from instituting a voter ID law. In some cases, it was the groups that stood to be most affected by the voter ID law (African-Americans, the elderly, and those with low-incomes) who were most likely to vote against the proposed amendment. In other cases, groups who were less likely to be affected by the voter ID laws, such as those with higher levels of education, were more likely to vote against the amendment. The drastic change in public opinion according to polls conducted in Minnesota on voter ID (from 80% support in May of 2011 to 51% in November of 2012) suggests that there was a significant amount of voter outreach and public education programs in place by groups that were working to defeat the amendment. The main opposition group, Our Vote, Our Future, raised more than \$2.6 million, almost double the amount the supporters of the voter ID measure raised (Protect My Vote raised \$1.4 million). Along with raising more money, Our Vote, Our Future executed an effective campaign strategy that involved gathering a coalition of people to educate individual communities that could be affected by a voter ID law. The

coalition focused on having in-person conversations and talking people through how much voter ID is going to cost our local communities. Scenarios of grandmothers in nursing homes and college students who had just left for school were given to demonstrate the hardships one might face in trying to vote, even if they themselves weren't going to encounter these obstacles. It was conversations like these - with neighbors, friends, and family members that Our Vote, Our Future and others believe to be the reason why the voter ID amendment ultimately failed.

Table 1

Percent Voted Yes for Voter ID and Income – Bivariate Correlation

		Percent Voted Yes for Voter ID
Percent Income 10-15k	Pearson Correlation	-.155
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.151
	N	87
Percent Income 15-25k	Pearson Correlation	-.241*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.025
	N	87
Percent Income 25-35k	Pearson Correlation	-.196
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.068
	N	87
Percent Income 35-50k	Pearson Correlation	-.056
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.607
	N	87
Percent Income 50-75k	Pearson Correlation	.003
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.975
	N	87
Percent Income 75-100k	Pearson Correlation	.224*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.037
	N	87
Percent Income 100-150k	Pearson Correlation	.211*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.050
	N	87
Percent Income 150-200k	Pearson Correlation	.125
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.250
	N	87
Percent Income over 200k	Pearson Correlation	.054
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.616
	N	87

Sources: American Community Survey, Office of the Minnesota Secretary of State

Significance: *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

N: Number of cases

Table 2

Percent Voted Yes for Voter ID and Age – Bivariate Correlation

		Percent Voted Yes for Voter ID
Percent Age 18-24	Pearson Correlation	-.067
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.536
	N	87
Percent Age 25-44	Pearson Correlation	.177
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.100
	N	87
Percent Age 45-64	Pearson Correlation	-.191
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.077
	N	87
Percent Age 65 and older	Pearson Correlation	-.215*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.045
	N	87

Sources: American Community Survey, Office of the Minnesota Secretary of State

Significance: *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

N: Number of cases

Table 3

Percent Voted Yes for Voter ID and Education – Bivariate Correlation

		Percent Voted Yes for Voter ID
Percent High School Graduate	Pearson Correlation	.009
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.934
	N	87
Percent Some College	Pearson Correlation	.238*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.026
	N	87
Percent Associate's Degree	Pearson Correlation	.216*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.044
	N	87
Percent Bachelor's Degree	Pearson Correlation	-.123
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.256
	N	87
Percent Graduate's Degree	Pearson Correlation	-.131
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.227
	N	87

Sources: American Community Survey, Office of the Minnesota Secretary of State

Significance: *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

N: Number of cases

Table 4

Percent Voted Yes for Voter ID and Race – Bivariate Correlation

		Percent Voted Yes for Voter ID
Percent African-American	Pearson Correlation	-.161
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.135
	N	87
Percent Hispanic	Pearson Correlation	.023
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.833
	N	87
Percent Native-American	Pearson Correlation	-.083
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.446
	N	87
Percent White	Pearson Correlation	.137
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.207
	N	87

Sources: American Community Survey, Office of the Minnesota Secretary of State

Significance: *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

N: Number of cases

Table 5

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.778	.605	.564	4.18854%

Multiple Regression on Percent Voted Yes for Voter ID

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	99.994	8.931		11.196	.000
Per Voted for Obama	-.680	.081	-.746	-8.422	.000*
Per African-American	2.544	31.196	.008	.082	.935
Per Age 18-24	-.076	.154	-.042	-.493	.623
Per Age 65 and Older	-.319	.168	-.215	-1.903	.061*
Per Income 25-35k	.084	.381	.025	.220	.826
Per Income 35-50k	-.209	.321	-.070	-.652	.516
Per HS Graduate	-.262	.198	-.214	-1.324	.189
Per Graduate's Degree	-.346	.359	-.165	-.962	.339

Dependent Variable: Percent Voted Yes for Voter ID

Sources: American Community Survey, Office of the Minnesota Secretary of State

Significance: *Correlation is significant at the 0.10 level

Bibliography

- American Community Survey. (2011). *ACS Demographic and Housing Estimates (5-Year Estimates)*. Retrieved January 21, 2013, from United States Census Bureau: http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS_11_5YR_DP05&prodType=table
- Anhut, N., Huntington, N., & Young, M. (2011). Voter Identification: The True Costs. *The Hubert H. Humphrey School of Public Affairs*, 1-57.
- Ansolabehere, S., & Persily, N. (2008). Vote Fraud in the Eye of the Beholder: The Role of Public Opinion in the Challenge to Voter Identification Requirements. *Harvard Law Review*, 121(7), 1737-1761.
- Ansolabehere, Stephen. (2009). Effects of Identification Requirements on Voting: Evidence from the Experiences of Voters on Election Day. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 42 (1), 127-130.
- Bonnifield, K., & Schultz, D. A. (2012, September). *The Cost of the Proposed Elections Amendment*. Retrieved November 30, 2012, from Citizens for Election Integrity Minnesota: http://www.ceimn.org/sites/default/files/Cost%20of%20Minnesota's%20Proposed%20Elections%20Amendment_corrected_0.pdf
- De Alth, S. (2008). ID at the Polls: Assessing the Impact of Recent State Voter ID Laws on Voter Turnout. *Harvard Law & Policy Review*, 3 (185), 185-202.
- Fund, J. H. (2008). *Stealing Elections: How Voter Fraud Threatens Our Democracy*. Encounter Books.
- Hershey, M. (2009). What We Know about Voter-ID Laws, Registration, and Turnout. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 42(1), 87-91.
- Iowa State Association of County Auditors. (2011, February 2). *A Report on Photo ID for Voting Purposes*. Retrieved November 29, 2012, from Iowa State Association of County Auditors (ISACA): http://www.iowaauditors.org/index_files/ISACAVoterIDReport020211final.pdf
- Keyssar, A. (2009). *The Right to Vote: The Contested History of Democracy in the United States*. Philadelphia: Basic Books.
- Minnite, L. (2007, March 5). *The Politics of Voter Fraud*. Retrieved February 24, 2012, from Project Vote:

http://www.projectvote.org/images/publications/Policy%20Reports%20and%20Guides/Politics_of_Voter_Fraud_Final.pdf

Mycoff, J. D., Wagner, M. W., & Wilson, D. C. (2009). The Empirical Effects of Voter-ID Laws: Present or Absent? *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 42(1), 121-126.

Office of the Minnesota Secretary of State. (2012, December 7). *Results for Constitutional Amendments*. Retrieved January 21, 2013, from Office of the Minnesota Secretary of State: <http://electionresults.sos.state.mn.us/ENR/Results/AmendmentResultsCounty/>

Ostermeier, E. (2008, December 16). *Minnesota Leads Nation in Voter Turnout for Seventh Straight Election Cycle*. Retrieved February 26, 2012, from Smart Politics: http://blog.lib.umn.edu/cspg/smartsopolitics/2008/12/minnesota_leads_nation_in_vote_1.ph

Ragsdale, J. (2010, February 13). ACLU offers \$1,000 Bounty on Voting Fraud. *Star Tribune*.

Vercellotti, T., & Andersen, D. (2009). Voter-Identification Requirements and the Learning Curve. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 42 (1), 117-120.