



## **CALTECH/MIT VOTING TECHNOLOGY PROJECT**

A multi-disciplinary, collaborative project of  
the California Institute of Technology – Pasadena, California 91125 and  
the Massachusetts Institute of Technology – Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

**TITLE      Election Is There Racial Discrimination at the Polls?  
Voters' Experiences in the 2008 Election**

**Name          Stephen Ansolabehere  
University      Harvard University**

**Key words:**

**VTP WORKING PAPER #73**

# Is There Racial Discrimination at the Polls? Voters' Experiences in the 2008 Election<sup>1</sup>

Stephen Ansolabehere  
Harvard University

March, 2009

In 1965, the United States Congress enacted the Voting Rights Act to end discrimination against black voters at the polls in Southern states and throughout the nation. The Act prohibited the use of “tests” and other devices used to prevent people from voting. At issue was not the content of tests themselves but the wide latitude available to those charged with registering and authenticating voters. Poll workers and election officers applied literacy tests, poll taxes, and other mechanisms differentially to voters according to race, resulting in extremely low rates of voter registration and participation among blacks and Hispanics.<sup>2</sup>

Forty years after the Voting Rights Act went into effect, concerns about discriminatory treatment and differential consequences of election administration practice have returned. General polling place operations are alleged to be much worse in areas where large numbers of minorities vote, yielding long lines. Procedures for maintaining registration lists are thought to make it more likely that there will be an improper purge of minority voters, leading to more problems with registration on Election Day. And, voter identification requirements, which states have strengthened considerably since 2000, are alleged to be applied more frequently and strictly to Black and Hispanic voters than to Whites.<sup>3</sup>

This paper examines the experiences of voters expressed in two surveys, the 2008 Cooperative Congressional Election Survey and a 2008 survey conducted by the Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project with support of the Pew Foundation. Both surveys were conducted over the Internet by YouGov. The CCES has a sample of 32,800 respondents, and the VTP-Pew Survey has a sample of 12,000 respondents. In addition to the Internet component, the VTP-Pew survey contains a separate phone sample used to validate the surveys. Additional information about these surveys is available at the websites of the CCES (<http://web.mit.edu/polisci/portl/cces/index.html>) and the Voting Technology Project ([www.vote.caltech.edu](http://www.vote.caltech.edu)).

---

<sup>1</sup> Paper Prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL, April 2-5, 2009.

<sup>2</sup> Chandler Davidson and Bernard Grofman, *The Quiet Revolution in the South*.

<sup>3</sup> Elora Mukherjee, “Abolishing the Time Tax on Voting,” manuscript, March 17, 2009.

Both surveys were designed to allow measurement of racial differences in voters' experiences, including time waiting in line to vote, requests for photographic identification, and problems with registration while voting. The surveys also ascertain reasons for not voting, revealing the extent to which administrative problems actually prevented people from voting and whether the effects of those barriers differ across racial groups.

These are the first surveys that can gauge the possible presence of discrimination at the polls. Surveys by the Pew Center for People and the Press in 2004 and 2006 and the CCES in 2006 asked respondents how long they waited in line to vote. It is not enough to show that Black, White, and Hispanic voters wait in line different lengths of time or are asked to show ID at different rates. One must also ascertain whether these differences reflect differential treatment by poll workers. That is, does the race of the poll worker affect the treatment of various racial groups at the polls, and if so, how much? In addition to the novel content about voters' experiences, the surveys asked respondents the race of the person who checked them in at the polls. Interactive effects of the race of the poll worker and the race of the voter on the electoral experience provide evidence of discriminatory treatment.

In this paper, I present evidence on the magnitude of differences in experiences across racial groups, the link, if any, to the race of pollworkers, and the consequences of election experiences for rates of voting overall and across racial groups.

## **Experiences of Voters**

A first order question is whether there are any differences in electoral experiences across racial groups. Do some groups encounter greater difficulties voting than others? Such differences do not establish intentionality, which will require deeper investigation into the behavior of poll workers, as well as the experiences of voters.

Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics have significantly different experiences when voting. I will focus on three key indicators – lines at polling places, requests for identification, and registration problems. Identification requests and registration problems are of particular importance. They are integral to the procedures by which election officials authenticate voters, and poll workers have considerable discretion over the application of these procedures. And, it has recently been argued in the legal literature, that lines may be treated in the same manner as “tests.” Other problems also arise, including polling place locations and voting machine operations, but these show relatively minor differences and have not been central to ongoing debates about election administration and race.

However, on the key measures, there are important differences across racial groups.

Table 1 presents responses to questions concerning length of time waiting to vote, requests for photo identification, and registration problems for each racial group. Line lengths and requests for photo identification show substantively large and statistically significant differences across groups. Registration problems arise very infrequently and are slightly more likely to arise with racial minorities rather than whites.

Consider, first, the matter of lines. According to the CCES, fully two-thirds of whites, 68 percent, waited less than 10 minutes to vote and only one in twenty, 5 percent, waited an hour or longer. Less than half of Black voters, 45 percent, waited 10 minutes or less, and 15 percent waited at least an hour. Hispanics and those of other races waited approximately the same amount of time as whites. The long wait times for Blacks may reflect unusual enthusiasm. One respondent said he got to the polls 3 hours early to be first in line to vote for Obama. I doubt that fully 10 percent of Black voters did so; nonetheless there may have been unusual congestion at the polls in neighborhoods with large numbers of Black voters. Such congestion could have been anticipated, and election officials often say that they prepare for 100 percent turnout, so the rise in black vote should not have caused such a backlog.

Photo Identification requests show similarly large racial differences. Approximately half of all white voters in each poll said they were asked to show photographic identification when they voted. This is a remarkably high number because only a handful of states require that voters present a picture ID. The rate of such requests is higher still among minority groups. Two-thirds of Black voters were asked to show picture ID; and in excess of 60 percent of Hispanic voters were asked as well.

The incidence of registration problems also tracks with race, but in this domain Hispanics appear to face the greater difficulties. But the differences are slight. In the Pew survey, just 2 percent of white voters reported registration problems, compared with 3 percent of Hispanics. In the CCES, registration problems were reported by 4 percent of white voters and 7 percent of Hispanics.

These differences may be attributable to race, or they may reflect other factors, such as state laws, age, or even the mode of voting (in precinct or early). Table 2 presents regression results predicting each of the variables as a function of race, mode of voting, partisan identification, income, education, gender, age, and state of residence.

Racial differences in the two surveys appear even more similar after controlling for other factors. Race has no effect on the incidence of registration problems, as displayed in the last column. The coefficients on each racial group are small and statistically not distinct from 0. Race remains a strong factor, however, in explaining line lengths and requests for voter identification. Whites were significantly less likely than Hispanics

and those of Other races to wait in line, and Blacks were significantly more likely than Hispanics and others to wait in line. The overall difference between blacks and whites is quite large, about one-half of a point (category) on the scale which begins at 0 for “Not at All” and goes to 5 for “More than an Hour.” Exactly how long depends on the values used, but imputing the mid-value for the time in each category implies that Blacks waited about 12 minutes longer in line than Whites on average.

Requests for photo identification also continue to show strong racial differences after controlling for other factors, including states. The control for states is quite important as that captures state laws, which prior research finds explains most of the variation in requests for photo ID (Ansolabehere 2008, Alvarez, Bailey, Katz 2007). Specifically, in states that allow poll workers to request ID, voters are asked to show ID about 80 percent of the time, and in state that do not allow request for photo ID, poll workers request such ID about 20 percent of the time. The regression analysis in Table 2 reveals that Blacks, Hispanics, and those of Other races are asked to show picture ID at about the same frequency, controlling for demographics, party, and cross state variations, but white respondents are asked 6 percent less in the CCES and 10 to 15 percent less often in the Pew survey. The mid-range of these estimates lies at about 8 to 10 percentage point difference in the incidence of ID requests, and that is on top of the very large effect of state law.

The coefficients on several of the other factors in the model are worth noting. First, there is a marked difference between those voting early at election offices or vote centers and those voting in precincts on Election Day. Those voting in precincts, on average, waited much less time to vote and were much less likely to be asked to show picture ID. The difference between in precinct and early voters in terms of average time in line and frequency of ID requests is as large as the differences between white and black voters for each of these outcomes. These results control for the state in which each respondent voted, and thus do not reflect variations in state laws. Early voting is often argued for as a means of convenience. It may have relieved pressure at the polls on Election Day but it is in fact less convenient in terms of lines or requirements.

Second, income and education exhibit somewhat surprising effects. Higher income and better educated people report waiting longer in line than those with lower incomes and less education.<sup>4</sup> It is often conjectured that problems at the polls result in discrimination against poorer people. Setting questions of race aside, that does not appear to be the case. Higher SES voters are more likely to encounter congestion at local polling places. This might reflect the fact that higher SES people tend to vote

---

<sup>4</sup> One possible explanation is misreporting of turnout, which is more common among higher SES respondents. Looking at the valid voters in the CCES 2006 reveals that those who

more and, thus, polling places in higher SES neighborhoods have higher turnout and more congestion.

Income and education are negatively associated with requests for Voter ID. Higher SES people, given their race, age, state, and other factors, are somewhat less likely to be asked to show picture ID.

Finally, as with most aspects of voting, age matters. Older respondents are much less likely to wait in lines, to be asked to show ID, or to have registration problems than younger voters are. The effects of racial differences are larger than the age differences for time waiting in line, about the same for requests for ID, and smaller for registration problems.

There are, then, substantively large and statistically significant differences across racial groups in the amount of time spent waiting to vote and the frequency with which poll workers ask for photo ID. There is no evidence of statistically significant differences in the incidence of registration problems across racial groups in the 2008 election.

## **Poll Workers**

The observed differences in election experiences across racial groups raise the prospect of lingering discrimination against Blacks and Hispanics at the polling places. In particular, the patterns of election experiences suggest that state and federal laws may need to be more aggressive in order to ensure equal treatment of all voters at the polls and, specifically, to eradicate racial discrimination in election administration. As in other areas of law, though, evidence of differential experiences may not be enough to require direct legal action. Some evidence is required that those administering elections, especially poll workers, discriminate on the basis of race.

There are many other plausible explanations for the patterns observed. For example, counties with large numbers of racial minorities may not have the resources to staff polling places to accommodate high turnout elections. Differences in experiences of groups may reflect not differential treatment but administration capacity of local areas. It may also be the case that black and Hispanic voters are more likely to have problems with their registrations because of the ways that they were registered.<sup>5</sup>

The key to the matter, though, is the interaction between the race of the poll worker and the race of the voter. Do poll workers treat those of other races worse at the polls? Clear evidence of a problem arises if white poll workers treat black and Hispanic voters differently than they treat white voters and if black and Hispanic poll workers

---

<sup>5</sup> The CPS measures how people first registered (e.g., at town hall, at the DMV, etc.). Where one registers does not appear to create racial differences in registration problems.

do not make such distinctions. The second part of this statement is quite important. If black and Hispanic voters are more likely to encounter problems regardless of the race of the poll worker then I would suspect that the problems lie elsewhere with the system and not with racial discrimination. However, it is entirely possible that blacks are asked for ID more often simply because black poll workers ask everyone for ID and black voters are more likely to have black poll workers. Fortunately, we can measure such differences and interactions directly.

The VTP-Pew survey and the Harvard/MIT module of the CCES (HUM for short) asked respondents if they recalled the race of the poll worker who checked them in at the polls or early voting station. In the CCES-HUM, 67% reported that they had a white poll worker, 15%, a black poll worker, 3% an Hispanic poll worker, and 12% were unsure of the race. In the VTP-Pew survey, 74% reported that they had a white poll worker, 11%, a black poll worker, 2%, an Hispanic Poll worker, and 12% were unsure of the poll worker's race.

White and black voters tend to have poll workers of the same race as them. Table 3 presents the relationship between race of respondent and race of poll worker. The entries are the percentage in each row that have a poll worker of a given race. Of white voters, 75% in the CCES and 80% in the VTP-Pew survey reported having a white poll worker. While 11% and 15% of the samples reported having a black poll worker, 48% and 54% black voters reported having a black poll worker. While 3% and 2% of the samples reported having an Hispanic poll worker, 19% and 20% Hispanic voters reported having an Hispanic poll worker. Hispanic and black voters were also likely to have white poll workers. Approximately 40 to 50 percent of minority voters reported having white poll workers.

This pattern argues against a simple account of the disparities observed. Black voters are most likely to deal with black poll workers, and white voters are most likely to deal with white poll workers. Closer examination of experiences at the polls reveals a mixed story regarding potential discrimination at the polls.

Voter identification requests provide perhaps they best circumstance to test for potential discrimination by white poll workers. Voter identification requests are quite common - approximately half of all voters are asked to show ID. And, poll workers have complete discretion in the application of the procedure. In analyzing the data it is necessary to distinguish states that have ID requirements and states that do not, as nearly all voters are asked to show ID in states that allow poll workers to request it compared with roughly one in four voters in states that do not have strong voter ID provisions (see Ansolabehere and Persily 2008).

In states that have stricter ID laws, all groups of voters are asked to show identification at approximately the same high rate, regardless of the race of the poll worker. Table 4

displays the percentages of voters asked to show ID in each racial group and facing each type of poll worker. The top panel corresponds to states with stricter ID laws and the bottom panel, states with more lax ID requirements. Overall 86 percent of voters were asked to show ID in states with stricter laws. That percentage did not vary significantly with either the race of the poll worker or the race of the respondent.

Curiously, it is in the states without strict ID requirements that the poll workers appear to use their discretion more. First, it should be emphasized that white poll workers treat black voters and white voters differently. In this set of states, Black voters are nearly twice as likely to be asked for ID as white voters. White poll workers asked 37% of black voters for ID versus 20% of white voters – a 17 point difference. That is clear evidence of differential treatment of black voters by white poll workers.

But, here's the rub. Black poll workers also asked black voters for ID at much higher rates than they asked white voters for ID. Black poll workers asked white voters for ID 30% of the time, but they asked black voters for ID 46% of the time – a 16 point difference, nearly the same as for white poll workers. Owing to small cell sizes it is not possible to analyze Hispanics fully or with much statistical confidence.

A simple two-way analysis of means and variances leads to an important conclusion. Two effects capture the incidence of ID requests across racial groups. First, black voters are more likely to be asked for ID by all types of poll workers. The difference is 10 points. Second, black poll workers are more likely to ask for ID. The difference is 17 points. These two main effects capture the patterns in the sub-table of white and black voters and poll workers entirely. There is no significant interaction between race of poll worker and race of voter in the incidence of requests for voter identification.

The essential facts, though, are these. In states that do not have strict ID rules, poll workers ask black voters to show ID at much higher rates than they ask white voters to do so. That difference is consistent with racial discrimination by poll workers because white poll workers ask black voters for ID at a much higher rate than they do white voters. However, black poll workers also ask black voters for ID at a higher rate than white voters. This last fact suggests that this is not the sort of discrimination usually suggested in the literature, as all poll workers, regardless of their race appear to target black voters for ID requests.

Why this is the case is an important behavioral puzzle. This pattern might, for example, reflect local variation at a level below the discernment of these surveys. Some counties might have different administrative procedures than others or have more problems with voter registrations and authentication. These surveys can control for types of states, even states, but not county variation. The pattern might also be accounted for by stereotypes and profiles that all people hold in common, not just whites, or the social psychology of majority and minority groups in American society.



What explains the behavior of poll workers awaits closer examination. That black and white poll workers behave similarly toward black and white voters (at least where voter ID is concerned) undercuts a simple story of discrimination.

The data available from these surveys on registration problems and lines suggests that the patterns may reflect local administrative practices and problems. Registration problems and waiting times reveal patterns of problems similar to those for identification requests. Table 5 presents the incidences of registration problems and lines for various pairings of voters and poll workers. As with ID requests, black voters have much higher incidences of line lengths and registration problems. But, those problems are also more likely to arise for voters who report that their poll workers were black.

Consider first the subtable of black and white respondents and black and white poll workers and registration problems (in Table 5A). White voters who were checked in by white poll workers report registration problems 1.7% of the time. Black voters who were checked in by white poll workers reported registration problems slightly less often, 1.3% of the time. The incidence of registration problems at polling stations where black poll workers checked in the voters was much higher – 2.8% for white voters and 3.8% for black voters.

These patterns run counter to the notion that registration problems are an instrument of discrimination. When the poll worker is white, black voters encounter registration problems less often than white voters. When the poll worker is black, black voters encounter registration problems more often than white voters.

Consider next the comparable subtable for line length (in Table 5B). White voters who were checked in by white poll workers report average waiting times of approximately 12 minutes. Black voters who were checked in by white poll workers reported average waiting times of 26 minutes. The waiting times at polling stations where black poll workers checked in the voters were higher still– 23 minutes for white voters and 30 minutes for black voters.

Waiting times exhibit a pattern similar to ID requests. Black voters report much longer waiting times than white voters, regardless of the race of the poll worker. In fact the longest lines occurred for black voters who were checked in by black poll workers, a wait that I estimate to approach 30 minutes to vote.

Racial differences in ID requests and waiting times are highly suggestive of discriminatory practices at the polls.

## **Conclusions**

Black and Hispanic voters in the 2008 elections encountered very different electoral experiences than did white voters. Blacks and Hispanics waited longer in lines to vote; they were much more likely to be asked to show photo ID, especially in states where that is not clearly a requirement; and they were more likely to encounter registration problems. Such a pattern might reflect racial discrimination or it might arise from local administrative practices that have racial consequences because of where people live.

Closer examination of the interactions between poll workers and voters is instructive about how different racial groups were treated at the polls in 2008. The data do not indicate a simple story of racial discrimination. It is indeed the case that white poll workers are more likely to ask black and Hispanic voters for photographic identification in states where that is not a requirement. This indicates to me that poll workers are exerting their discretion in interpreting and applying rules concerning voter authentication. They are doing so in a manner that may go beyond state laws. And they are doing so in a manner that affects racial groups differently.

Three significant caveats temper a conclusion that this is discrimination. First, black poll workers show the same level of “discrimination.” The difference in the rate of ID requests for black and white voters is the same for black poll workers as it is for white poll workers. This suggests to me that local practices may explain the differences in ID requests rather than actual discrimination by poll workers. The difference could reflect variation in resources available to local offices. Or it could reflect voter challenges by third parties who singled out minorities. If that is the case, the rules governing challenges would be the problems, not the actions of poll workers. An alternative account is that the higher incidence of ID requests may reflect stereotypes that all people hold, a social psychology of majority and minority that affects black and white poll workers alike.

Second, the pattern of differential ID requests does not carry over to registration problems. Registration was one of the areas targeted by the Voting Rights Act and related federal actions. Southern black voter registration surged from roughly 20% of voting aged blacks in 1960 to 65% by 1975. Registration remains a potential instrument of discrimination at the polls today because poll workers have discretion over the authentication process. However, the data here are not consistent with a story of systematic discrimination. Black voters who have white poll workers are the least likely to encounter registration problems. This is a hopeful sign – a sign that in this important domain the Voting Rights Act and initiatives of the Department of Justice have succeeded.

Third, on all three indicators – ID requests, waiting times, and registration problems – black voters had the greatest problems when they had *black* poll workers. The higher incidence of problems for black voters is attributable in no small part to the fact that

the majority of black voters had black poll workers, and those circumstances exhibit the highest rates of problems.

Why this is the case is an extremely important question. I suspect that these patterns in fact reflect variations in local election procedures and practices, below the state level. There may, for instance, be more administrative problems in inner city precincts where there are both higher frequencies of non-white voters and non-white poll workers. Addressing this question ought to be a high priority for further research on election administration in the United States, and these surveys are a first step, as they indicate the scale and nature of the problems.

Setting aside the question of intentionality and discrimination, whites and non-whites have very different experiences voting in the United States. Blacks and Hispanics wait longer in line to vote, are more likely to be asked for ID, and are more likely to have problems with registration. Those problems can have powerful effects. They can prevent people from voting in the immediate election, and can discourage participation in the future.

The root causes of these racial disparities need to be better understood so they may be addressed. The problems appear quite different today than they were 50 years ago. The racial disparities observed today are quite small compared with the problems targeted by the Voting Rights Act, and the problems today are not immediately attributable to discriminatory behavior by white poll workers. Rather, the survey evidence here points more to limitations on local election administration capacity and to local administration operations. What policies can reduce the remaining racial differences in election administration is an open problem. The survey data suggest that replacing white poll workers with black poll workers will likely do little to reduce lines, ID requests, or registration problems.

## References

Alvarez, R. Michael, Delia Bailey, and Jonathan Katz. 2007. "The Effect of Voter Identification Laws on Turnout," Unpublished Manuscript. Caltech, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences.

Ansolabehere, Stephen. 2008. "Access versus Integrity in Voter Identification Requirements," *New York University Annual Survey of American Law* 63: 613-630.

Ansolabehere, Stephen, and Nathaniel Persily. 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 (May): 1738-1774.

Davidson, Chandler, and Bernard Grofman. 1994. *The Quiet Revolution in the South*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mukherjee, Elora. 2009. "Abolishing the Time Tax on Voting," Unpublished manuscript, March 17, 2009.

Table 1. Election Experiences of Racial Groups during the 2008 Election, CCES and VTP-Pew Surveys

A.  
LINES

CCES Common Survey [n=18,836]

	Not At	Minutes				Imputed Avg.
		<10	10-30	31-60	>60	
All						
White [n=14,139]	40%	28%	18%	9%	5%	11.8
Black [2,216]	22%	23%	23%	17%	15%	23.3
Hispanic [1,482]	33%	27%	22%	10%	8%	15.3
Other [999]	33%	29%	19%	12%	7%	15.1

VTP-Pew Survey [n=9,257]

	Not At	Minutes				Imputed Avg.
		<10	10-30	31-60	>60	
All						
White [n=7,758]	44%	28%	16%	8%	4%	10.2
Black [725]	30%	20%	22%	12%	16%	21.5
Hispanic [304]	41%	27%	18%	9%	5%	12.0
Other [407]	45%	28%	15%	8%	3%	9.9

B.  
AUTHENTICATION

CCES Common Survey

	Percent Requested Photo Identification	Percent With Registration Problem
White	52%	4%
Black	67%	6%
Hispanic	61%	7%
Other	59%	7%

VTP-Pew

	Percent Requested Photo Identification	Percent With Registration Problem
White	51%	2%
Black	70%	2%
Hispanic	65%	3%
Other	56%	4%

Table 2. Regression Estimates of Racial Group Differences in Election Experiences, 2008 CCES and VTP-Pew Survey.

CCES 2008

	Time in Line	Voter ID Request	Registration Problem
White	-.18 (.04)*	-.06 (.01)*	.003 (.006)
Black	.32 (.05)*	.01 (.01)	.002 (.007)
Hispanic	.09 (.05)	.02 (.02)	.010 (.008)
In Precinct	-.35 (.02)*	-.08 (.01)*	-.003 (.003)
Democrat	.03 (.02)	-.01 (.01)	.001 (.003)
Republican	-.08 (.02)*	-.01 (.01)	-.003 (.003)
Income	.022 (.003)*	-.002 (.001)	-.002 (.000)*
Education	.04 (.01)*	-.008 (.002)*	-.001 (.001)
Gender	-.01 (.02)	-.004 (.006)	.004 (.002)
Age (in 10s)	-.05 (.01)*	-.026 (.002)*	-.010 (.000)*
Constant	2.54 (.07)	.839 (.023)*	.094 (.010)*
State Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	17632	17633	17633
R-square	.14	.42	.01
Root MSE	1.128	.3794	.172

VTP-Pew 2008

	Time in Line	Voter ID Request	Registration Problem
White	-.07 (.06)	-.03(.02)	-.003 (.006)
Black	.34 (.07)*	.06 (.03)*	.002 (.007)
Hispanic	.10 (.09)	.11 (.03)*	.004 (.008)
In Precinct	-.27 (.03)*	-.09 (.01)*	-.002 (.003)
Democrat	.06 (.03)*	-.02 (.01)	-.007 (.003)
Republican	-.03 (.03)	-.02 (.01)	-.003 (.003)
Income	.02 (.004)*	-.003 (.001)*	-.000 (.000)
Education	.03 (.01)*	-.005 (.003)	-.001 (.001)
Gender	-.04 (.02)	-.02 (.01)*	.004 (.002)
Age (in 10s)	-.04 (.01)*	-.02 (.002)*	-.010 (.001)*
Constant	2.23 (.10)	.82 (.03)*	.051 (.012)*
State Effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	8286	8282	8282
R-square	.15	.46	.01
Root MSE	1.087	.3686	.1301

Note: Linear Regressions above. Conditional Logits for Registration Problems and ID Requests show substantively similar results.

Table 3. Race of Respondent and Reported Race of Poll Worker

CCES-HUM

Race of Respondent (Voters Only)	Race of Pollworker				Don't Recall	N
	White	Black	Hisp.	Other		
White	75%	9%	2%	2%	11%	1325
Black	37%	54%	NA	4%	5%	207
Hispanic	41%	17%	19%	7%	17%	125
Other	44%	11%	1%	9%	35%	100
All	67%	15%	3%	2%	12%	1758

VTP-Pew

Race of Respondent (Voters Only)	Race of Pollworker				Don't Recall	N
	White	Black	Hisp.	Other		
White	80%	8%	1%	2%	9%	6889
Black	40%	48%	2%	5%	6%	773
Hispanic	56%	8%	20%	2%	14%	327
Other	55%	7%	3%	16%	20%	429
All	74%	11%	2%	3%	9%	8464

Table 4. Percent Requested to Show Voter Identification By Race of Respondent, Reported Race of Poll Worker, and State ID Law, VTP-Pew Survey

ID STATES

Race of Respondent (Voters Only)	Race of Poll Worker				Don't Recall	All %	N
	White	Black	Hisp.	Other			
White	85%	86%	78%	92%	88%	85%	3082
Black	88%	87%	(100%)	(82%)	(100%)	88%	351
Hispanic	81%	(88%)	(95%)	(100%)	(92%)	86%	112
Other	89%	(100%)	(100%)	(81%)	(75%)	86%	189
All	% Asked	85%	87%	86%	87%	88%	86%
	N	2698	489	64	144	339	3734

Note: Cells with small numbers of cases in ( ).

NON-ID STATES

Race of Respondent (Voters Only)	Race of Poll Worker				Don't Recall	All %	N
	White	Black	Hisp.	Other			
White	20%	30%	37%	23%	24%	22%	3551
Black	37%	46%	(90%)	(49%)	(72%)	46%	238
Hispanic	46%	(77%)	(43%)	(47%)	(44%)	48%	160
	24%	(59%)	(38%)	(24%)	(35%)	28%	188
All	% Asked	22%	40%	43%	30%	29%	25%
	N	3215	349	108	83	382	4137

Note: Cells with small numbers of cases in ( ).



Table 5A. Percent of voters with registration problems, VTP-Pew Survey

Race of Respondent	Race of Poll Worker					Total
	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	Don't Know	
White	1.7%	2.8%	1.5%	1.8%	1.6%	1.8%
	5666	561	104	146	636	7113
Black	1.3%	3.8%	0%	2.1%	0%	2.4%
	261	295	11	31	33	631
Hispanic	5.0%	0%	1.2%	11.7%	0%	3.3%
	159	24	58	8	43	292
Other	1.3%	3.3%	0%	2.6%	0%	1.3%
	245	25	11	63	78	422
Total	1.8%	3.1%	1.2%	2.4%	1.3%	1.9%
	6331	905	184	248	790	8458

Table 5B. Average Number of Minutes in Line, VTP-Pew Survey  
Standard Deviations in Parentheses

Race of Respondent	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	Don't Know	Total
White	12.0	23.1	19.4	13.0	14.7	13.2
	(19.6)	(27.6)	(23.3)	(19.7)	(22.1)	(20.9)
	4382	442	77	110	489	5500
Black	25.6	29.6	44.6	34.3	35.6	28.9
	(27.9)	(30.8)	(35.7)	(32.7)	(27.8)	(29.8)
	214	244	8	25	29	520
Hispanic	16.5	23.8	13.5	3.9	12.2	15.6
	(23.5)	(27.2)	(18.9)	(9.2)	(19.9)	(22.4)
	122	18	45	4	35	224
Other	12.4	39.2	16.6	4.7	9.8	12.8
	(19.7)	(30.1)	(31.2)	(10.8)	(16.1)	(20.7)
	193	20	9	48	53	323
Total	12.8	26.2	18.7	14.3	15.4	14.8
	(20.5)	(29.2)	(24.2)	(22.7)	(22.5)	(22.4)
	4911	724	139	187	606	6567

