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Introduction: How Much Do We Know About Voter Turnout?

Political science researchers have been studying voter turnout for more than a century. We know more about it than almost any other aspect of American politics. The extraordinary attention devoted to turnout reflects in part the vital role of elections in any democratic state. It also stems from the ease of measurement and analysis; election results are public and votes are easy to measure, so it has generated a huge literature and a substantial amount of agreement on its findings. A very partial list of sources at the end of this report indicates the amount of research time and effort put into this area of study.

The purpose of this report is to detail the findings of turnout research relative to the following questions: Is the new law that requires all Indiana voters to present state or federally-issued photo identification prior to casting their ballot likely to affect voter turnout rates in the state? To what extent? Is such a requirement likely to affect some
groups disproportionately relative to others? And how would such findings affect representation in the state of Indiana?

Even though the law has not been implemented at this time, we have many other types of analyses on which to base solid estimates of its probable impact. In fact, in judging the effects of any measure that is not yet in force, that must inevitably be our best means of prediction.

**How Likely Is an Individual to Vote?**

No act in a democratic political system is more important than voting. It is the means by which decisions of government are linked with the “consent of the governed,” as the Declaration of Independence requires. The spread of the suffrage to groups of Americans who were not originally enfranchised was guided by a variety of considerations, including the belief that a government will be accountable to its citizens only if they have the right to remove its leaders from office. This fundamental right is the guarantor of the other basic rights in a democracy, including freedom of speech and of the press, the freedom to worship, and the right to be free from arbitrary treatment by agents of the government (“The Right to Vote,” 2005).

The degree to which citizens exercise their right to vote – voter turnout – has long been considered a measure of the effectiveness of a democracy. In the United States, declines in voter turnout are often interpreted as evidence of problems in the functioning of the political system; low-turnout elections are frequently cited as raising questions about the legitimacy of public officials elected in them. Although some have argued that low rates of voter turnout could signify widespread public satisfaction with the status quo (Berelson, 1954), this argument has been widely refuted (e.g., Walker, 1966). The United
States Congress has spent a considerable amount of time devising legislation (including constitutional amendments 15, 19, 24, and 26, the Voting Rights Acts, and the National Voter Registration Act) to ensure that the right to vote is held by the vast majority of adult citizens and is not denied to citizens on the basis of irrelevant or pernicious criteria. As Alexis de Tocqueville wrote in his celebrated work *Democracy in America* (1835), “Once a people begins to interfere with the voting qualification, one can be sure that sooner or later it will abolish it altogether. That is one of the most invariable rules of social behavior.”

When political scientists examine voter turnout rates, the predominant approach is a rational choice or economic analysis. In this framework, people are likely to vote as long as the perceived costs of voting do not outweigh the perceived benefits. A classic formulation is that of Steven Rosenstone, an expert on electoral politics: “People participate in politics when they get valuable benefits that are worth the costs of taking part” (Rosenstone and Hansen, 2003, p. 10).

What kinds of costs might be involved in casting a vote? There are a variety of individual costs that must be paid. It takes time to get to the polls, to wait in line, and to cast a ballot. That time cannot be used to achieve other goals, so there are benefits forgone. Most prospective voters need transportation to their polling place; thus they will pay costs in the form of gasoline prices or individual energy. In addition to the individual costs, there are structural barriers to voter participation. In every American state except North Dakota, people must register to vote, and in most states voter registration requires a separate trip to a different location than the one at which they will vote (and therefore information as to where that registration site is located), or an effort to locate a mail-in
form with which to register, at a time when the election may not yet be generating the high levels of media coverage and public interest that facilitate information gathering. Residence requirements, physical barriers such as difficulties of accessibility to disabled persons, insufficient parking, too few voting machines relative to the size of the turnout, confusing ballot format – all of these are structural factors that raise the cost of voting to the individual. In short, anything that makes it less convenient to vote is a cost to the individual who chooses to exercise this fundamental right.

What, then, are the benefits of voting? Most voters feel a sense of obligation, civic pride, or community cohesion in casting a ballot. But although voting is a fundamental right in a democracy, it is clear to most citizens that in any given election, because of the large size of most constituencies, the likelihood that their single vote will make a difference in the election’s outcome is very slim. There have been celebrated instances in which election results have turned on a very small number of votes; the presidential election of 2000 is an excellent example. But these have been the exceptions; most elections are won by comfortable margins (Ansolabehere and Snyder, 2002).

The result is what theorists call the “paradox of voting”: voter turnout produces collective benefits for the whole community, such as a validation of the democratic character of the city or state, and a sense of legitimacy for the election results, but the actual value received by each individual from casting a ballot is relatively small and difficult to define with precision. It is an intangible benefit, whereas the costs paid to obtain it can be quite tangible. In a large electorate, this is likely to produce what is called the “free-rider problem” (Olson, Chapter 1): if the benefits of a particular action are collective, in that they will accrue to the whole community whether or not I participate,
as opposed to an outcome that will guarantee benefits only to those who participate, and if the benefits I can personally expect from my participation will be intangible while the costs are measurable, then it is rational for me to abstain and let other members of the electorate pay those costs instead, because I will get the collective outcome anyway. As long as at least one person goes to the polls, the collective good of obtaining an election result will be met with or without my participation.

In such an activity, where the costs are perceptible though not large for many people, and the benefits are collective and intangible, “small changes in costs and benefits alter the turnout decision for many citizens” (Aldrich 1993: 261). The decision to turn out to vote is made at the margin, and the determining factor will be the relative balance of costs and benefits. Because the benefits are likely to be the same for all voters, any increase in costs, however slight, should therefore affect the individual’s likelihood of voting.

When the Costs of Voting to the Individual Are Raised, the Likelihood of Voting Goes Down.

Empirically, researchers have shown convincingly that the rules implemented to administer elections can encourage or depress voter turnout, and that where obstacles to voting are greater, turnout will be lower (see, for example, Wolfinger and Rosenstone, 1980, p. 61; Conway, 1991, Chapter. 4). As Thomas E. Patterson, director of the Vanishing Voter Project at Harvard University, writes, “Scholars are in full agreement that the more ‘costs’ placed on the potential voter, the lower the participation rate” (Patterson, 2002, p. 130). Similarly, a well-known student of comparative voter turnout
concludes that “Where institutions generate disincentives to vote, turnout suffers”
(Jackson, 1987: 419).

This has been apparent since the beginning of the American republic. In the first five American presidential elections (1788-1804), when transportation was primitive, information about where to vote was difficult to find, and getting to the polls could involve a substantial investment of time and risk, only an estimated 4 to 6 percent of those Americans who were eligible to vote made it to the polls (Teixeira, 1987, p. 9). Note that the proportion of citizens who had the right to vote was small to begin with, but only a tiny slice of that eligible electorate actually turned out to vote. These elections were the earliest in our history, after Americans had fought a long and devastating war to obtain that right, so those eligible should have had no lack of interest or motivation to exercise it. Yet the costs of travel and information were sufficiently high to keep the turnout extremely low. As transportation systems improved during the next two decades, political information became more widely disseminated, and the electoral system ran more smoothly, turnout jumped to 27 percent in 1824, 58 percent in 1828, and 80 percent in 1840 (Halperin, 1999: 74).

Another painfully clear example of the finding that an increase in costs – even a small increase – will drive down voting turnout is the impact of election administration and electoral laws in the eleven southern states during the Jim Crow period, from the mid-1870s until the late 1960s. A series of hurdles of varying severity were placed in the path of black male Americans who had been enfranchised earlier by the Civil War Amendments, and black female Americans granted the suffrage by the 19th Amendment in 1920. Some of these burdens were disqualifying in themselves, such as the “white
primary,” in which the Democratic Party was defined as a private association open only to whites, and there was no active Republican primary in which blacks could cast a vote. Others were relatively small burdens; the poll tax, for instance, was generally minimal, typically only a dollar or two, but had to be paid several months prior to Election Day and the receipt kept and shown at the polls, yet it was sufficient to keep large numbers of black Americans from voting. The combined effect of these costs of voting for blacks in the South was that throughout this period, and until the structural changes of the 1950s and 1960s began to reduce those costs, black turnout in Mississippi rose no higher than 5 percent, and in Alabama and South Carolina no higher than 13 percent.

Studies of the impact of electoral law on voting rates have shown for more than 40 years that increased costs of voting would drive down turnout. The 1963 Report of the President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation, for example, concluded that one of the major reasons for nonvoting was the restrictive voting laws under which nonvoters were more likely to live.

One example of a provision that raises the costs of voting is the requirement that citizens register before being able to exercise their right to vote. Although the photo identification requirement in the new Indiana law at issue applies only to registered voters, research on the impact of voter registration laws is relevant here because it is directly analogous to the burdens posed by the new Indiana photo ID law. In the case of the new Indiana law, prospective voters who do not possess state- or federally-issued photo identifications would be required to take an additional trip, most likely to their Bureau of Motor Vehicles office, to acquire one, and perhaps to take a second trip to obtain the necessary proof (in the form of a birth certificate) to get the state or federally-
issued identification. Similarly, in the case of voter registration laws, prospective voters are required to take an additional trip to register to vote or to find out how to obtain a mail-in registration form and then to comply with its provisions and send it. In both cases, the requirements make voting more costly.

Wolfinger and Rosenstone (1980, p. 61) confirm that "Registration raises the costs of voting. Citizens must first perform a separate task that lacks the immediate gratification characterizing other forms of political expression (such as voting). Registration is usually more difficult than voting, often involving more obscure information and a longer journey at a less convenient time, to complete a more complicated procedure. Moreover, it must usually be done before interest in the campaign has reached its peak."

As Table 1 shows, most states require voters to register to vote at least 30 days in advance of Election Day, the maximum interval permitted by federal law. Six states have much more liberal registration requirements, however, allowing voters to register when they come to vote on Election Day; a seventh state (North Dakota) does not require voter registration at all. These states’ rules minimize the inconvenience for voters by eliminating the need to make a second trip for the purpose of registering.

How did these seven states, whose registration rules impose the least cost on prospective voters, rank in voter turnout levels in the 2004 elections? Five were in the top six states in voter turnout; the other two ranked 19th and 41st. In the 2000 presidential election, turnout in these seven states was 15 percent greater than in other states (Patterson, 2002, p. 133); in 2004, it was 9 percent greater. An average of 71.5 percent of voting-age citizens cast their ballots in 2004 in the seven states with Election Day
registration or no registration at all, compared to a national average of 63.8 percent, and an average of 62.6 percent in states where registration was required at a separate time prior to Election Day.

Earlier studies also showed that the length of the interval between the close of registration and Election Day makes a difference in voting rates; Rosenstone and Hansen report (2003: 208), for instance, that “The longer before an election people must act to ensure their eligibility to vote, the more likely they will fail to do so. Compared to citizens who live in states that allow registration right up to election day, citizens who live in states with thirty-day closing dates are 3.0 percent less likely to vote....Early closing dates, by requiring people to register long before campaigns have reached their climax and mobilization efforts have entered high gear, depress voter participation in American elections.”

It might be argued that these findings occur because states with particularly civic-minded political cultures are both more likely to permit Election Day registration and also more likely to have higher voter turnouts. We can test for the possibility of spurious correlation by looking at change over time in states that have adopted Election Day registration; if their voter turnouts went up after the adoption, then it would seem that the reduced cost of voting made the difference. In fact, research shows (Fenster, 1994) that in Minnesota, Maine and Wisconsin, voter turnout rates increased after Election Day registration was permitted. Further, when national voter turnout declined in the 1976 presidential election, the two states using Election Day registration at that time, Minnesota and Wisconsin, actually experienced an increase in voter turnout (Smolka, 1977, p. 45). Because of these findings, Fenster (1994) estimates that if Election Day
registration were implemented in all states, voter turnout rates across the nation would increase by 5 percent.

The costs imposed by voter registration also play a role in driving down American voter turnouts relative to those of other western industrialized democracies. During the 1980s, G. Bingham Powell found (1986: 23), an average of 80 percent of the eligible electorate in 20 developed democracies went to the polls, at a time when the average turnout in American elections was 54 percent. More recent surveys by the most trustworthy source of such comparative turnout statistics, the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA, a nonpartisan international organization supported by contributions from 23 member nations, including Australia, the Scandinavian nations, India, and Spain; http://www.idea.int/vt/intro.cfm ), show a continuing differential between American voter turnout and that of most other industrialized democracies. The only democratic nation with lower voter turnout than that of the United States is Switzerland, and its low turnout reflects the fact that federal elections in Switzerland are not as consequential for policy decisions as are cantonal elections.

This differential cannot be explained by historical or cultural factors. The political culture in the United States has long been regarded as more supportive of political participation than the political culture of many democracies in Europe and East Asia. Political discussion is more frequent in the U.S. and campaign participation is higher than in most other democracies. So why is our voter turnout lower? Among the main reasons is that voter registration and other election laws contribute to lower turnout in the U.S. (Conway, 1991: 109). Halperin (1999: 71) argues that “the single most important reason
for the drastic decline in voter turnout during the twentieth century stems from the burdensome and outdated voter registration laws most states implemented at the turn of [twentieth] century. If the statistics about voters and elections show any one thing clearly, it is that voter registration laws are the principal reason why so few people vote.”

The election laws of many other democracies provide for automatic voter registration or government-conducted registration systems, in which, for example, people are automatically certified as eligible to vote when they come of age and obtain identity cards, or government-sponsored canvassers go from house to house before each election to enlist voters (Piven and Cloward, 2000, p. 17). The American system of voter registration, in which the citizen must take the initiative, is more difficult, complicated, and time-consuming than that of almost any other democracy. Of the 20 democracies in Powell’s study, only France and the United States leave voter registration to the citizen’s own initiative.

In short, researchers concur that the registration requirement, which is analogous to the requirement that prospective voters obtain government-issued photo identification in advance of going to the polls in the sense of having to make a separate trip or take a separate step (in the case of mail-in registration) to establish the credentials needed to exercise one’s right to vote, drives down voter turnout, most likely by raising the cost of voting to the individual.

**What Do We Know About the Magnitude of This Impact?**

With regard to the magnitude of the effect of the voter registration requirement on voter turnout, Rosenstone and Hansen find that (2003: 206), “With the adoption of registration laws [in the late 1800s and early 1900s], voter turnout in the North dropped 17 percent
between 1896 and 1916." Powell (1986), in his comparative analysis of western industrialized democracies, concludes that in the 1970s, the need for US citizens to take the initiative themselves to register to vote (as opposed to the systems of automatic voter registration maintained by most other democracies) decreased voting turnout by 16 percent compared with turnout rates in other democratic nations.

Mitchell and Wlezien (1995: 188-189) show that if the costs of voter registration were substantially reduced, by such means as eliminating the closing dates for registration, increasing the hours that registration offices remain open, and regulating the purging of voter rolls, then there would be an estimated increase in voter turnout of 8.6 percent on average, and in some states, by more than 14 percent. Mitchell and Wlezien estimate that Indiana's voter turnout would show a 9.7 percent increase. So simple a step as expanding the open hours of voter registration offices would be likely to increase Indiana's voter turnout by 1 percent. Studies of the impact of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (the "motor voter" law) have found, using survey research, that turnout increases resulting from the law ranged from 4.7 percent to 8.7 percent (Highton and Wolfinger, 1998).

To what extent are these estimates relevant to the new Indiana photo ID law? A change in the voter registration system would clearly affect a greater proportion of citizens because all but one state require all citizens to register to vote, whereas the new law would affect only those prospective voters who are already registered but do not have the type of government-issued photo identification required by the new law. Therefore the impact of the new law on voter turnout would be considerably smaller.
The impact would, however, also be considerably more targeted than that of a change in voter registration requirements. As the next section shows, citizens who lack government-issued photo identifications come disproportionately from groups that are already disadvantaged, and these groups are among those whom political science research has found to be least able to pay the costs of voting.

**Increasing the Cost of Voting Affects Some Groups More than Others.**

Some types of people are better able than others to accept increased costs of voting without being deterred from going to the polls. Rosenstone and Hansen (2003, page 209) point out that, "The legal restrictions on the exercise of the franchise adopted in the early part of the century and maintained to the present day place significant burdens on American citizens and lower the probability that they will participate in political life. Although neutral on their face, the conditions on the use of political rights burden the least advantaged much more than the most advantaged. In fact, restrictive election laws afflict minorities, the poor, and the uneducated twice over: They make it doubly difficult for the disadvantaged to participate in politics, and they make it doubly doubtful that political leaders will devote the resources to efforts to mobilize them."

It is very well established in the turnout literature that socio-economic status (SES) is more closely correlated with voter turnout than almost any other demographic variable (Wolfinger and Rosenstone, Chapter 2): people with lower SES are substantially less likely to vote than are higher-SES people. Of the three components of SES (income, education, and occupational status), the strongest influence on turnout comes from the individual’s level of education. According to the U.S. Census (*Statistical Abstract of the United States, 2004-2005*), only 23.6 percent of those who never attended high school
voted in the 2004 election, compared with 34.6 percent of those with some high school education, 52.4 percent of high school graduates, 66.1 percent of those with some college education, 72.6 percent of college graduates, and 77.4 percent of those with postgraduate degrees. The monotonic nature of the relationship between education and voter turnout increases the likelihood of a causal connection.

Empirical studies have further demonstrated that variations in the costs of voting have the greatest effect on those with the least education (Wolfinger and Rosenstone, 1980, p. 62; see also Leighley and Nagler, 1984). The nature of the causal connection is also clear. People with higher education and greater income are more likely to have discretionary income, a car to get to the polls, a flexible schedule to allow them to vote and to fulfill any other requirements pre-requisite to voting (such as obtaining the necessary photo identification), and access to the media of communication that tell them where to find their registration or identification center or polling place (Wolfinger and Rosenstone, 1980, pp. 20-22). People with more education and higher income also do not have to accept the opportunities forgone that poorer and less educated people do: going to vote (or to obtain a birth certificate or a photo identification) rather than working to pay the rent, for example. It is significant that we do not find this correlation in most other western democracies, where the costs of voting are not as high.

As Rosenstone and Hansen explain, their analysis of data from the American National Election Studies cumulative data file shows that "Early closing dates [for voter registration, which increase the costs of voting] have their greatest impact on the people who are least likely to vote anyway. Given that they lack the resources to overcome the costs of turning out, it is surely no surprise that they also lack the resources to offset the
additional burdens of registration. Sixty-day closing dates reduce the turnout of the poorest Americans by 6 percent but depress the turnout of the wealthiest Americans by only 3 percent. They diminish the turnout of the grade-school educated by 6 percent but lessen the turnout of the college educated by only 4 percent. Early closing dates, finally, inhibit African-Americans, Mexican-Americans, and Puerto Ricans slightly more than other citizens” (Rosenstone and Hansen, p. 208). They conclude (p. 208, note 90) that “little can be done to change the prospects of people who are almost certain to turn out, but much can be done to change the prospects of people who may or may not turn out.” Comparative state studies also show that laws raising the cost of voting are a far greater impediment to poor and less educated people than they are to wealthy and more educated people (Kim, Petrocik, and Enokson, 1975: 107-131). The difference in turnout between states whose laws facilitate voter turnout and states whose laws do not averages about 7 percent (Kim, Petrocik, and Enokson, 1975: 199). In short, slight increases in the costs of voting can deter those with the least resources (see Patterson, 2002: 131).

In the new Indiana photo ID law (Senate Enrolled Act 483 signed into law April 27, 2005), precinct election officials would be required to ask all registered voters for proof of identification before they can vote. There is only one form of identification allowed: a document issued by either the United States government or the State of Indiana that contains a photo of the individual, carries an expiration date, and has the same name on it as is on the individual’s voter registration record. Anyone without such identification can be given a provisional ballot, but that ballot will not be counted unless the prospective voter provides the required photo identification or executes an affidavit saying that he or she is indigent and can’t get the identification without paying a fee, or
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has religious objection to being photographed, and does so in person at the county
election board or before the circuit court clerk before noon of the second Monday
following the election. This deadline occurs long after results will be settled in nearly
every election, which of course drives down even the small benefit to the voter of being
able to believe that his or her ballot will be the deciding vote in the contest.

As is the case with the registration requirement’s closing date, these new
requirements carry costs that fall differentially on different groups of citizens. Among
these costs are:

- the time needed to get the required identification, as well as the time and
  information involved in obtaining an affidavit of indigency at yet another
  separate location, if the citizen is unable to afford the cost
- the time needed to obtain documents prerequisite to the required
  identification, such as a birth certificate, which must be obtained at a different
  office from the state- or federally-issued photo ID
- the cost of the birth certificate
- the cost of transportation to and from each of these locations
- the cost of obtaining information as to where each of these documents can be
  obtained and where they may be obtained.

Getting the necessary birth certificate, for instance, adds to the costs of voting for
an individual who lacks one, relative to an individual who already has a driver’s license
or passport. Although it is possible to avoid the monetary cost of a photo identification by
executing an affidavit of indigency, that is not possible with regard to a birth certificate,
nor is it possible with respect to the transportation costs involved in each trip and the
ability to leave work without losing pay for the trip to get the birth certificate. Further, executing the affidavit of indigency cannot be done at the polling place, so it, too, requires a separate effort, with the attendant transportation costs, to comply.

Which groups might be burdened by these increased costs and therefore at risk of losing their right to vote? People who might find it difficult to pay the costs of time, transportation, fees, and information include those who are disabled, homeless, persons with limited income, those who do not own cars and who do not have driver’s licenses but who are registered to vote, people of color and those who a part of “language minorities,” and elderly persons (especially those in retirement facilities).

Research on the impact of the “motor voter” law (see Highton and Wolfinger, 1998) also found that the greatest registration increases produced by the legislation were among students and those who had recently moved, indicating the disproportionate effect of the costs of registration on these groups. It is also problematic that college students and young adults living away from home rarely have their dorm or college address on their driver’s license; therefore their license would not be valid for voting purposes and they would have to provide other proof of residence.

A new study (Pawasarat, 2005) helps to document the extent to which such groups could be affected by the new Indiana photo ID law, in finding that approximately 23 percent of Wisconsin residents 65 years and older do not have a Wisconsin driver’s license or photo identification (of whom 70 percent are women). Pawasarat also finds that big-city residents, especially those who are African-American and Latino, are markedly less likely to have driver’s licenses than are Caucasian non-big-city residents.

These Groups Have Distinctive Viewpoints on Some Political Questions.
There are some differences in political perspectives between these targeted groups and other voters, though they do not necessarily follow conventional wisdom. It is often assumed that because non-voters are drawn disproportionately from among poor and working class people and members of minority groups, therefore most non-voters must be Democrats, so any legislation that reduces the cost of voter turnout would benefit Democratic candidates.

Systematic empirical research does not confirm this view, however. Citrin et al. (2003: 76), in a study of 91 Senate races in 1994, 1996, and 1998, find that "there is no constant, linear association between turnout and the Democratic vote." Although non-voters are somewhat more likely to identify as Democrats, this tendency varies across states and across time periods. It is perhaps most accurate to say (as DeNardo, 1980 does) that higher voter turnout brings more “peripheral” voters to the polls – those with weaker party identification – so higher turnout tends to lead to higher rates of defection from the majority party in the area. That is as likely to benefit Republicans (in areas where they are in the minority) as it is Democrats. So the partisan implications of turnout vary, depending on the state or locality in question. Overall, however, Citrin et al. find that if all non-voters were to come to the polls on Election Day, in the three years’ worth of Senate races they studied, only a very small number of races would have had a different outcome.

With regard to preferences on policy issues, research shows that there are some differences worth noting between those less likely to vote, for whom the costs of voting are felt more heavily, and those who go to the polls regularly (see Highton and Wolfinger, 2001: 179; Gant and Lyons, 1993). According to Bennett and Resnick (1990:
791-793), for example, non-voters are more likely to favor increased provision of
government services. They are more strongly in favor of government spending on
domestic policy and more positive in their attitudes toward government social programs.
This is understandable given the tendency of non-voters to be of lower socio-economic
status than voters are, and to be more likely to be of minority racial groups.

In addition to these differences in views on issues, disadvantaged people and
those for whom the costs of voting weigh more heavily tend to have different policy
agendas than advantaged groups do. In particular, they are less concerned with foreign
policy and issues such as abortion and the environment and more concerned with health
and human services and other basic human needs (Verba, Schlozman, and Brady, 1995,
pp. 220-225).

Is There Some Valid Reason to Make Voting Harder for Some Groups Than for
Others?

Although voting is a fundamental right in the United States, various states have at times
chosen to deny that right to some residents, presumably because the states’ lawmakers
felt that the dangers to the polity that would be posed by these residents’ voting
outweighed the value of universal adult suffrage. Most states, for example, deny the right
to vote to convicted felons while they are serving their sentences, and many require that
these felons petition to recover their suffrage after they have been released from
incarceration.

Do the targeted groups with regard to this legislation have any characteristics that
could make them a threat to the state of Indiana if they were to vote? Several political
scientists have used survey data to determine, for example, whether disadvantaged groups
and those less likely to vote are more anti-democratic in their attitudes than advantaged groups and other voters are. One of the most thorough of these analyses (Bennett and Resnick, 1990) finds no evidence of this. They report only weak relationships with levels of expressed patriotism and levels of alienation. Disadvantaged groups and infrequent voters are no more likely than other citizens to favor substantial change in government officials (p. 782), to oppose civil liberties (pp. 783-785), or to be hostile to business or to favor government ownership of industry or other sectors of the economy (p. 797).

What Is the Impact on the Political System if Some Groups Face Higher Burdens in Casting a Ballot Than Others?

The democratization of American elections has proceeded gradually but inexorably for more than two centuries (see Williamson, 1960). From the elimination of property or tax-paying requirements to the enfranchisement of black men, women, and those 18 to 21 years old, the American political system has been driven by the principle that universal adult suffrage is a democratic value, and that the denial of suffrage ought to be driven by a good reason why the adult in question does not deserve the right to choose his or her elected representatives. There would appear to be no good reason why the groups for whom voting would become more costly as a result of this legislation – elderly and infirm people, poor people, blacks and other racial and language minorities, college students, the homeless, and those who do not own cars – ought to be singled out for such treatment.

In summary, when we look at the decision to go to the polls as a balance of costs and benefits to the citizen, voting has been found to impose more immediate and tangible costs than benefits, and even small increases in the cost of voting have been found to
drive down turnout. Some types of citizens disproportionately bear the costs of voting, and even slight increases in those costs have particular impact on the participation of those citizens. These include people disadvantaged in education, income, mobility, place of residence, age, and race. There would appear to be no support for the notion that people with these characteristics would be more likely than more advantaged people to threaten the preservation of the political system, and so should be disproportionately burdened by voting prerequisites. And in fact, the burdening of these groups would seem to jeopardize the principle of universal adult suffrage and the need for legitimacy in democratic elections.
A Sampling of Research on Voter Turnout (including Works Cited)


Table 1. Voting Rates by State as a Proportion of Citizen Voting-age Population in
2004 Relative to Type of Voter Registration Requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Turnout</th>
<th>Prospective Voters Must Register by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>Election-day registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>Election-day registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>21 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>Election-day registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>10 days before or on Election Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>No registration required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>10 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>30 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C.</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>30 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>20 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>28 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>15 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>20 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>30 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>30 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>29 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>10 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>30 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>29 days before or on Election Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>20 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Days Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>30 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>29 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>28 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>21 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>11 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>29 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>30 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>28 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>29 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>15 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>30 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>29 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. average</strong></td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>30 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>30 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>11 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>14 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>30 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>29 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>25 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>15 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>30 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>25 days before or on Election Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>25 days before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Voter Turnout Rate</td>
<td>Deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>25 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>21 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>20 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>30 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Voter Turnout in Presidential Elections in Western Industrialized Democracies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Democracy</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Vote as a Proportion of Voting-Age Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States 2000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>49.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States 2004</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>59.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parliamentary (legislative) elections:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Democracy</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Vote as a Proportion of Voting-Age Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belgium</strong></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australia</strong></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finland 1999 65.2
France 1997 59.9
Japan 2000 59.0
Canada 2000 54.6

United States 2002 39.0***
Switzerland 1999 34.9*

* National elections in Switzerland are regarded as secondary to cantonal elections, in which turnout is higher.

** These countries have some form of compulsory voting. Austria and Italy have official sanctions against non-voting but they are not enforced or only weakly enforced.

*** The percentage refers to voting for the top office on the ballot in the midterm election (governor, U.S. senator, or U.S. House member); voting for down-ballot offices tends to drop off further (called “roll-off”).

Note: Voter turnout can be calculated in different ways, so an individual nation’s turnout figure should be compared with the turnout of other nations calculated in the same manner. Comparisons between studies need to specify the method used to calculate turnout.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Polling Place Hours</th>
<th>Election Day Holiday</th>
<th>Schools Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>7am - 7pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>7am - 7pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>6am - 7pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>7:30am - 7:30pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>VARIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>7am - 8pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>7am - 7pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>6am - 8pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>VARIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>7am - 8pm</td>
<td>YES (for state)</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C.</td>
<td>7am - 8pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>7am - 7pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>7am - 7pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>VARIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>7am - 6pm</td>
<td>YES (for state)</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>8am - 8pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>6am - 7pm</td>
<td>YES (for state)</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>6am - 6pm</td>
<td>YES (for state)</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>7am - 9pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>7am - 7pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>6am - 6pm</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>6am - 8pm</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>VARIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>6-10am - 5pm (depending on size)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>VARIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>7am - 6pm</td>
<td>YES (for state)</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>5:45/7am - 8pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>VARIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>7am - 8pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>7-10am - 8pm (depending on size)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>7am - 7pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>6am - 7pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>7am - 8pm</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>8am - 5pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>7am - 7pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>6/11am - 7/8pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>6am - 8pm</td>
<td>YES (for state)</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>7am - 7pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>6am - 9pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>6:30am - 7:30pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>VARIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>7/9am - 7/8pm (depending on size)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>6:30am - 7:30pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>7am - 7pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>7am - 8pm (hours for county clerk's office)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>7am - 8pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>6/9am - 9pm (depending on size)</td>
<td>YES (for city)</td>
<td>VARIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>7am - 7pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>7am - 7pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>7/10am - 8pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>VARIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>7am - 7pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>7am - 6pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>7/10am - 7pm (depending on size)</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>6am - 7pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>VARIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>7am - 8pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>6:30am - 7:30pm</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>7/9am - 8pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>7am - 7pm</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>