

# Journal of Election Administration, Research & Practice



blending theory and practice  
to advance the field

April 2025

Reflections on Practice  
Research & Policy Briefs  
Book and Product Reflections

# Editorial Team

**Mitchell Brown, PhD**

Auburn University

**Kathleen Hale, JD, PhD**

Auburn University

**David Stafford, CERA**

Supervisor of Elections  
Escambia County, FL

**Terri Stroud, JD, CERA**

General Counsel  
District of Columbia  
Board of Elections

**Ryan Williamson, PhD**

Auburn University

**Jamie Remes, CERV**

EViD Solutions  
VR Systems, Inc.

ISSN 2835-5962

Election Center

21946 Royal Montreal Drive, Suite 100

Katy, TX 77450

281.396.4309

services@electioncenter.org

Cover Design: Anne Schroeder

A Partnership of the Institute for Election  
Administration, Research & Practice  
at the  
National Association of Election Officials

---

## Editorial Board

---

Natalie Adona	Martha Kropf
Aaron Ammons	Jan Leighley
Brian Amos	Brianna Lennon
Marci Andino	Pete Lichtenheld
Joseph Anthony	Dean Logan
Lonna Atkeson	James Long
Michelle Bishop	Gretchen Macht
Kurt Bahr	Chris Mann
Frank Barger	Christy McCormick
David Bjerke	Alysoun McLaughlin
Kim Brace	Lia Merivaki
Lisa Bryant	Alice Miller
Barry Burden	Robert Montjoy
Michelle Carew	Pippa Norris
Jamie Carson	Maria Pangelinan
Chris Chambless	Tammy Patrick
Judd Choate	Noah Praetz
Chris Cooper	Jamie Remes
Todd Davidson	Tonya Rice
Avery Davis-Roberts	Kathy Rogers
Lori Edwards	Bob Stein
Holly Ann Garnett	Enrijeta Shino
Paul Gronke	Dan Smith
Lisa Harris-Moorehead	Charles Stewart
Paul Herrnson	Kay Stimson
Ben Hovland	Tim Tsujii
Bridgett King	Michelle Wilcox
Howard Knapp	Julie Wise
	Meagan Wolfe

## Table of Contents

Guest Editor's Introduction . . . . .	1
<b>Research &amp; Practitioner Responses</b>	
Ensuring Voting Access Across the Electorate . . . . .	3
Lisa Schur, Mason Ameri, Joseph Dietrich, Michael Herron, Douglas Kruse, Whitney Quesenbery, Melissa Rogers, Jean Schroedel, Daniel A. Smith, and Cameron Wimpy	
Practitioner Response from Amanda Gonzalez . . . . .	11
Practitioner Response from Jenni Scutchfield. . . . .	12
Election Auditing: Mapping Election Administration and Election Science . . . . .	13
R. Michael Alvarez, Lonna Rae Atkeson, Jennifer Morrell, and Maggie Toulouse Oliver	
Practitioner Response from Katie Smith . . . . .	19
Practitioner Response from Bailey Kelley . . . . .	21
Ballots and Booths: Best Practices for In-Person Voting . . . . .	22
Anita Manion, Lisa A. Bryant, David C. Kimball, Gretchen A. Macht, Mindy Romero, and Robert M. Stein	
Practitioner Response from Howard M. Knapp . . . . .	32
Practitioner Response from Alex Stanton . . . . .	34
Vote-by-Mail in the United States . . . . .	35
Paul Gronke, Mindy S. Romero, Enrijeta Shino, and Daniel M. Thompson	
Practitioner Response from Julia Saenz . . . . .	45
Practitioner Response from Shelby Miller . . . . .	46
The State of Voter Registration Research . . . . .	47
Seo-young Silvia Kim, Marc Meredith, Michael Morse, and Stephen Pettigrew	
Practitioner Response from Scott Brown . . . . .	54
Practitioner Response from Ben Schler . . . . .	56
Communicating with Voters to Build Trust in the U.S. Election System . . . . .	57
Olivier Bergeron-Boutin, Katherine Clayton, Thad Kousser, Brendan Nyhan, and Lauren Prather	
Practitioner Response from Brianna Lennon . . . . .	63
Practitioner Response from Dana Lewis . . . . .	65
State of the Field in Election Official and Poll Worker Recruitment, Training, and Retention. . . . .	67
Kathleen Hale, Mitchell Brown, Duha Altindag, Joseph Anthony, Brandon Fincher, Shelley Gruendler, Bridgett King, Dean Logan, McKenzie Messenger-Cooper, Hilary Rudy, Alan Seals, and Xuan Wang	
Practitioner Response from Rachel Harris . . . . .	75
Practitioner Response from Diane Mullins and Edmund Michalowski . . . . .	76

## Guest Editor's Introduction

This special issue of the *Journal of Election Administration, Research, and Practice* contains seven white papers originally published as part of the Mapping Election Administration and Election Science project led by the MIT Election Data and Science Lab (MEDSL)<sup>1</sup> with support from the Election Trust Initiative.<sup>2</sup> This project began during a summit at MIT in late September 2023 where the current state of the field's research was assessed, and priorities were discussed about building robust partnerships of researchers and practitioners who would work together to encourage evidence-based improvements to election administration. These white papers surveyed what is known about research-based best practices in seven areas of election administration:

- Accessibility in voting
- Auditing and validating election results
- Voting in person
- Voting by mail
- Voting registration accuracy and security
- Communicating with voters to build trust in the system
- Poll worker and election official recruitment, training, and retention

Knowledge accumulated over the past two decades, revealing varying levels of research depth and engagement across the researcher-practitioner divide, are presented in these papers. Abridged versions of the white papers are printed in this issue; however, the complete versions are available for viewing on the MEDSL website.<sup>3</sup> Also included in this issue of *JEARP* are election practitioner responses to the white papers as election administrators across the country provided their thoughts on where researchers should be focusing their future efforts on these vital topics to the election field.

The aftermath of the 2000 election saw academic researchers flood into the field of election administration. Some of this research has had a positive influence on how elections are conducted, though not as much as many have hoped. Of course, the political environment in which election policy is developed is one barrier to the adoption of research-based best practices, but a bigger barrier is the misalignment of the interests of academic researchers and election officials. Academic researchers, motivated by curiosity and national news, often lack direct engagement with election officials. Election officials, under pressures to perform perfectly with limited resources, may find little to be gained by collaborating with researchers.

Election administration is not the only important area of public policy where a misalignment of interests, perspectives, and time horizons form a barrier to improving public service using the best scientific evidence. Health care, education, community development, criminal justice, and law enforcement are other areas where similar dynamics occur. These areas have benefitted from a new way of aligning the interests of researchers and practitioners, called research-practitioner partnerships (RPPs).<sup>4</sup> Election administration should benefit, too.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://electionlab.mit.edu/>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.electioninitiative.org/>

<sup>3</sup> <https://electionlab.mit.edu/research/projects/mapping-election-science>

<sup>4</sup> Cynthia E. Coburn, William R. Penuel, and Kimberly E. Geil, "Practice partnerships: A strategy for leveraging research for educational improvement in school districts," William T. Grant Foundation (2013), <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED568396>.

Unlike traditional demand-driven academic research or one-off consulting, RPPs are long-term partnerships designed to solve problems of practice while contributing to generalized scientific knowledge. RPPs are designed to be collaborative from the beginning. When they succeed, it is because of a shared commitment to mutual respect.

As what has been learned over the past two decades in the field of election administration is digested, there is an opportunity to explore a bold new approach that aligns the needs and experiences of academics, voters, and election officials. The goal is to make evidence-based improvements in election administration more commonplace and effective.

Charles Stewart III<sup>5</sup>  
Guest Editor

---

<sup>5</sup> Charles Stewart III is the Kenan Sahin Distinguished Professor of Political Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and the founding director of the MIT Election Data and Science Lab.

# Ensuring Voting Access Across the Electorate

Lisa Schur, *Rutgers University*<sup>1</sup>

Mason Ameri, *Rutgers University*<sup>2</sup>

Joseph Dietrich, *Towson University*<sup>3</sup>

Michael Herron, *Dartmouth College*<sup>4</sup>

Douglas Kruse, *Rutgers University*<sup>5</sup>

Whitney Quesenbery, *The Center for Civic Design*<sup>6</sup>

Melissa Rogers, *Claremont Graduate University*<sup>7</sup>

Jean Schroedel, *Claremont Graduate University*<sup>8</sup>

Daniel A. Smith, *University of Florida*<sup>9</sup>

Cameron Wimpy, *Arkansas State University*<sup>10</sup>

---

## ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes evidence on barriers that can limit access to voting faced by several key groups: people with disabilities, senior citizens, Native Americans, rural citizens, and young citizens. The barriers faced by these groups shed light on many common issues that limit access more generally. Common barriers include polling places that are hard to reach and navigate, difficulties in voting by mail, and insufficient access to voting information. Difficulties specific to particular groups include inaccessible voting systems and not being allowed to vote among some people with disabilities, intimidation and harassment of Native Americans, declining rural populations leading to fewer resources for voting systems, and high mobility among young voters. We review best practices, suggest improvements to election systems, and identify fruitful areas for new research. Partnerships with key organizations and individuals can facilitate efforts to make voting information and opportunities more readily available and accessible.

---

Democracy requires that all citizens have equal and easy access to the voting process to ensure that everyone's views are represented. "Democracy's dilemma" is the recurrent theme of unequal participation and unequal engagement of groups with misunderstood political needs, or worse, silenced political voices (Lijphart 1997). Unequal participation and representation can result from

---

<sup>1</sup> Lisa Schur is a professor in the School of Management and Labor Relations at Rutgers University.

<sup>2</sup> Mason Ameri is an associate professor of professional practice at Rutgers Business School, Newark and New Brunswick.

<sup>3</sup> Joseph Dietrich is an assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at Towson University.

<sup>4</sup> Michael Herron is Remsen 1943 Professor of Quantitative Social Science at Dartmouth College.

<sup>5</sup> Douglas Kruse is a distinguished professor in the School of Management and Labor Relations at Rutgers University and a research associate at the National Bureau of Economic Research.

<sup>6</sup> Whitney Quesenbery is executive director of the Center for Civic Design.

<sup>7</sup> Melissa Rogers is an associate professor of political science and co-director of the Inequality and Policy Research Center at Claremont Graduate University.

<sup>8</sup> Jean Schroedel is a professor emerita of political science and the former Thornton F. Bradshaw Professor of Public Policy at Claremont Graduate University.

<sup>9</sup> Daniel A. Smith is professor and chair of the Department of Political Science at the University of Florida.

<sup>10</sup> Cameron Wimpy is an associate professor and chair of the Department of Political Science at Arkansas State University.

higher barriers to voting faced by some groups, and electoral systems should be designed and administered to reduce these barriers.

This paper focuses on several key groups that face different types of voting barriers: people with disabilities, senior citizens, Native Americans, rural citizens, and young citizens. While many other groups also face voting barriers – particularly voters of color (Fraga 2018) – the experiences of these groups can shed light on many common issues that limit access more generally. For these groups we a) review existing evidence on voting barriers, b) summarize best practices to reduce or remove these barriers, and c) identify promising new research that can be done in partnership with practitioners in the election field.

## People with Disabilities and Senior Citizens

The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA)<sup>11</sup> granted specific rights to voters with disabilities for the first time, requiring that voting systems provide an opportunity to vote independently and privately. We combine our discussion of people with disabilities and senior citizens since they often face similar issues and have considerable overlap given the high rate of disability among senior citizens.

People with disabilities overall were 10.0 to 11.7 percentage points less likely to vote in presidential elections over the 2008-2022 period, and the gaps remain after controlling for other personal characteristics. There is recent progress, however, as relative turnout of people with disabilities increased in 2020 and 2022 compared to four years earlier (U.S. Election Assistance Commission 2024).

Some of the disability gap is tied to voting difficulties. In national post-election surveys sponsored by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, the number of voters with disabilities who experienced difficulty voting dropped from 26 percent in 2012 to 14 percent in 2022, but this is still considerably higher than the 4-7 percent reported by other voters (U.S. Election Assistance Commission 2021, 2023).

Some of the most important barriers facing voters with disabilities and senior citizens are:

- *Obstacles in accessing voting information*, in particular the lower internet access among people with disabilities and senior citizens, inaccessible formats, and hard-to-read information (U.S. Election Assistance Commission 2022).
- *Transportation and physical access to polling places*, including difficulties in getting to a polling place, getting inside the polling place, standing in line, and (particularly for people with intellectual disabilities) being permitted to vote.
- *Accessibility of voting systems and materials*, including physical difficulties in voting, the need for extra features or devices to be set up and working when the voter arrives, and confusing ballot layouts or instructions.
- *Receiving, completing, and returning mail ballots* – voting by mail is more common among people with disabilities in general but can pose problems, especially for people with visual impairments.

---

<sup>11</sup> Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA), Pub. L. No. 107-252, 116 Stat. 1666- 1730.  
<https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/PLAW-107publ252/pdf/PLAW-107publ252.pdf>

Many of these difficulties can be addressed by the following practices or actions:

- Recognizing the digital divide in internet access, voting information should not be provided mainly or exclusively on websites but should be available in a wide variety of formats. Digital information should be optimized to be responsive to a variety of mobile devices and assistive technology.
- New channels for voter registration such as automatic, same-day, and online registration can especially help people with disabilities who are registered to vote.
- All forms and communications from the election office should be available in accessible formats.
- For ongoing improvement in polling place accessibility, disability groups should be involved in decisions on polling place location, design, and evaluation.
- To decrease voting costs and make the voter experience more uniform and accessible, poll workers should be given training and disability checklists for in-person voting.
- For full accessibility of voting equipment and ballots, a universal design approach can decrease the need for specialized equipment and training, and make the voting experience more uniform across all voters.
- Efforts should be continued to ensure that ballots and voting instructions are written in plain language easily understood by all voters (following guidelines at [plainlanguage.gov](https://www.plainlanguage.gov)).
- Policies to make it easier to vote by mail are helpful to many people with disabilities, such as all-vote-by-mail, no-excuse, and permanent absentee ballot systems, along with systems allowing voters to track their mail ballots.

Further research in partnership with practitioners would be valuable on the following topics:

- New technologies that follow accessible, universal design principles to make the voting experience easier and more uniform across all voters.
- Analysis of the impact of specific policies and election administration procedures on seniors and voters with disabilities that reduce independent voting.
- The number of accessible polling places needed to serve voters and the impact of how jurisdictions offer access to accessible voting systems.
- Guidance for setting up polling places and training for election officials and poll workers that focuses on how to support voters with disabilities to maximize independence and privacy.
- Policies and practices on signature matching and curing rejected ballots, particularly given that aging and disability can affect manual dexterity and signatures.
- Access to voting information and the voting process for those in institutions such as nursing homes, assisted living facilities, and jails.
- State policies that expand or restrict voting access, including registration requirements, early in-person voting, and voting by mail, including how those policies are administered.

## **Native Americans**

Native American political engagement is affected by their history and unique civic status (Herrick and Mendez 2019; Wilkins and Stark 2017). Many encounter racial animus in off-reservation border towns (United States Commission on Civil Rights 2011) where they go to register and vote. Native

registration and voting rates are low (Herrick and Mendez 2019; Huyser, Sanchez, and Vargas 2017; Peterson 1997). Political trust in local government officials is very low, as is trust that votes in non-tribal elections are counted, especially when votes are cast by mail (Schroedel et al. 2020; 2022).

Native Americans, who are a “resource poor” population (Ferguson-Bohnee and Tucker 2020: 28; Benzow et al. 2023: 33), face many barriers that impact electoral participation. Much of the evidence detailing barriers has come from voting rights litigation (Schroedel and Hart 2015; Tucker, De León, and McCool 2020), as well as from groups, such as the Native American Voting Rights Coalition and the Native American Rights Fund.<sup>12</sup> Academic researchers have identified nine barriers:

1. Intimidation and harassment of Native voters.
2. Shortage of poll workers able to provide culturally appropriate assistance and assist voters with limited English proficiency.
3. Insufficient information due to the digital divide and failure to provide information in American Indian/Alaska Native languages.
4. Unequal registration access.
5. Voter ID laws that require traditional addresses.
6. Purging of voters.
7. Unequal access to polling places, drop boxes, and early voting sites.
8. Extreme travel distances, road impediments, lack of public transit/high cost of gasoline and border town harassment.
9. Problems with voting by mail on reservations, including no residential mail delivery, few post offices, slow delivery times and delivery failures, and ballot rejection rates. Also, voters cannot get assistance in filling out ballots.

Local election officials could build trust by working with tribal leaders to address problems. State governments could assist by providing funding for improved electoral access, accept ID with non-traditional addresses, and allow mail-in ballots to be counted if postmarked by election day. Inequities in mail service are a federal issue.

There is a need for systematic mapping of county level data on locations of drop boxes, early voting sites, polling places, and post offices on and off tribal lands in addition to research on the purging of voter rolls, the lack of Native poll workers, and issues affecting urban Native populations. It is important that research be carried out in collaboration with the affected populations.

## **Rural Residents**

Although there is much discussion of the political divide that exists between urban and rural voters, there is far less focus on administering elections in rural areas and the implications that has for the voter experience. Studies of economics (Irwin et al. 2010), public health (Hartley 2004), and sociology (Tickamyer and Duncan 1990), for example, often include some measure of rurality as a predictor of worsening outcomes for the lived experience of citizens in those areas deemed to be rural. Taking a crude definition of rural from the U.S. Census Bureau, between 14 percent and 20 percent of Americans live in rural areas. Despite this relative minority of citizens, nearly two thirds

---

<sup>12</sup> See Native American Voting Rights Coalition (2018), *Voting Barriers Encountered by Native Americans, in Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada and Arizona*.

of U.S. counties can be classified as rural.<sup>13</sup> Given that elections are administered at the local level, this means more than two thirds of election officials serve predominantly rural jurisdictions. The population of these areas, in general, continues to decline. This has implications for tax revenue, but it also yields fewer workers and diminishing returns on access points for government services. These trends have significant impacts on election administration in rural areas.

Data on the voter experience in rural areas is scarce. Surveys are challenging as rural voters are often the hardest citizens to reach. Even the best available data typically generalize at the state level, and thus we know no more about those voters in rural areas than their urban counterparts. It is not controversial to assume that rural voters have distinct challenges when it comes to public transit, infrastructure, technological connectivity, literacy, and most other measures related to quality of life and service delivery. Although state laws dictate that voters have the same experience during an election, this is far from guaranteed in environments where poll workers and/or election judges are harder to find, and most polling places are significant distances away from home. It is also less likely that rural jurisdictions have translation and multilingual options available. Many rural jurisdictions have limited accommodations for aging populations, including well-documented issues surrounding Americans with Disabilities Act compliance. Rural jurisdictions also have limited options for communicating with voters and historically spend more on print media buys (U.S. Election Assistance Commission 2013).

### **College Students and Young Adults**

The older a registered voter, the more likely the person is to turn out to vote (Leighley and Nagler 2014; Wattenberg 2015; Juelich and Coll 2020). Even in the 2020 general election, with its historically high turnout (McDonald 2022), there was a 25-percentage point gap between the voter turnout rates of 18-29-year-olds compared to those over 60, according to the U.S. Census Bureau.

Theoretically, the adoption of election reforms should enhance young voter turnout. No-excuse, or all-mail voting, should particularly assist young college students, who often live away from permanent residences. However, because students are highly mobile, if they do not update the mailing addresses on their registration records, they may not receive requested vote-by-mail ballots, which are generally non-forwardable. Moreover, younger voters are disproportionately likely to have their mail ballots rejected for lack of timeliness or deficiencies with return envelopes (Baringer, Herron, and Smith 2020; Shino, Suttman-Lea, and Smith 2022). Since young voters are sensitive to changes in polling locations (Amos, Smith, and Claire 2017), the presence of on-campus, early in-person voting can facilitate college student voting (Shino and Smith 2020), and Herron and Smith (2014) observe that reduced early voting days in Florida adversely affected young voter turnout.

Younger individuals are more mobile than other age groups, and election administrative rules, including registration requirements and ease of registering, vary across states. With this in mind, many reforms aimed at young voters have focused on reducing barriers to portable and pre-registration laws (McDonald 2008; McDonald and Thornburg 2012; Holbein and Hillygus 2016) and same day voter registration (Hanmer 2009; Shino and Smith 2020; Grumbach and Hill 2022). Wolfinger, Highton, and Mullin (2005) find that providing sample ballots and information about polling locations and offering extended voting hours reduced the costs of voting for young voters.

Young voters are less likely to utilize convenience voting reforms (Stein 1998; Southwell and Burchett 2000; Hanmer and Traugott 2004; Neeley and Richardson 2001), and one hypothesis for

---

<sup>13</sup> There exists significant disagreement across academic disciplines, government agencies, and policy researchers for defining “rural.” If we take the Census designation of rural being anything “not urban,” we end up with about 1,976 rural counties. See here for that number: <https://www.ers.usda.gov/webdocs/publications/102576/eib-230.pdf>

this is that young individuals have less political knowledge, lower political efficacy, and fewer socio-economic resources than their older counterparts (Plutzer 2002; Juelich and Coll 2020). Even with expanded opportunities, young voters casting vote-by-mail ballots suffer from an “inexperience penalty” (Cottrell, Herron, and Smith 2021), resulting in a disproportionate number of rejected ballots and thus reduced political representation.

Young voters' mobility and varying election rules across states complicate tasks like determining where to vote and how to get there and what forms of identification are necessary (Arceneaux and Nickerson 2009; Dyck and Gimpel 2005; Stein and Vonnahme 2008; Brady and McNulty 2011; Biggers 2021). Moreover, younger voters are disproportionately likely to cast provisional ballots (Merivaki and Smith 2020). Beyond election administration matters, surveys reveal that young non-voters, regardless of college experience, often cite dissatisfaction with candidates or scheduling conflicts as reasons for not voting.

## Conclusion

The groups covered in this paper face a variety of voting barriers. Some of the common ones include polling places that are hard to reach and navigate, difficulties in voting by mail, and insufficient access to voting information. Some of the difficulties that are specific to particular groups include inaccessible voting systems and being prohibited from voting among some people with disabilities, intimidation and harassment of Native Americans, declining rural populations leading to fewer resources for voting systems, and high mobility among young voters.

This paper outlines several best practices for improving voting outcomes among these groups. Many of these practices may also increase the ease of voting among the overall electorate. Beyond the practices backed by current evidence, this paper describes a number of topics that are ripe for partnerships between researchers and election practitioners. Such research partnerships can facilitate outreach efforts to make voting information and opportunities more readily available and accessible. These ideas represent a broad challenge to researchers and policymakers in identifying, devising, and implementing solutions for the variety of barriers that lead to difficulties and inequalities in voting access.

## References

- Amos, Brian, Daniel A. Smith, and Case Ste. Claire. 2017. “Reprecincting and Voting Behavior.” *Political Behavior* 39 (1): 133–56.
- Arceneaux, Kevin, and David W. Nickerson. 2009. “Who Is Mobilized to Vote? A Re-Analysis of 11 Field Experiments.” *American Journal of Political Science* 53: 1–16.
- Baringer, Anna, Michael C Herron, and Daniel A Smith. 2020. “Voting by Mail and Ballot Rejection: Lessons from Florida for Elections in the Age of the Coronavirus.” *Election Law Journal: Rules, Politics, and Policy* 19 (3): 289–320.
- Benzow, August, Kenan Fikri, Joanne Kim, and Daniel Newman. 2023. “Advancing Economic Development in Persistent Poverty Communities.” Economic Innovation Group.
- Biggers, Daniel R. 2021. “Can the Backlash against Voter ID Laws Activate Minority Voters? Experimental Evidence Examining Voter Mobilization through Psychological Reactance.” *Political Behavior* 43 (3): 1161–79.
- Brady, Henry E., and John E. McNulty. 2011. “Turning out to Vote: The Costs of Finding and Getting to the Polling Place.” *American Political Science Review* 105 (1): 1125–34.
- Cottrell, David, Michael C. Herron, and Daniel A. Smith. 2021. “Vote-by-Mail Ballot Rejection and Experience with Mail-in Voting.” *American Politics Research* 49 (6): 577–90.

- Dyck, Joshua J., and James G. Gimpel. 2005. "Distance, Turnout, and the Convenience of Voting\*." *Social Science Quarterly* 86 (3): 531–48.
- Ferguson-Bohnee, Patty, and James T. Tucker. 2020. "Voting During a Pandemic: Vote-By-Mail Challenges for Native Voters." *Arizona Attorney*, 24–36.
- Fraga, Bernard L. 2018. *The Turnout Gap: Race, Ethnicity, and Political Inequality in a Diversifying America*. Cambridge University Press.
- Grumbach, Jacob M, and Charlotte Hill. 2022. "Rock the Registration: Same Day Registration Increases Turnout of Young Voters." *The Journal of Politics* 84 (1): 405–17.
- Hanmer, Michael J. 2009. *Discount Voting: Voter Registration Reforms and Their Effects*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hanmer, Michael J., and Michael W. Traugott. 2004. "The Impact of Voting by Mail on Voter Behavior." *American Politics Research* 32 (4): 375–405.
- Hartley, David. 2004. "Rural Health Disparities, Population Health, and Rural Culture." *American Journal of Public Health* 94 (10): 1675–78.
- Herrick, Rebekah, and Jeanette Morehouse Mendez. 2019. "One Model Does Not Fit All: Group Consciousness and the Political Participation and Attitudes of American Indians \*." *Social Science Quarterly*, May, ssqu.12657.
- Herron, Michael C., and Daniel A. Smith. 2014. "Race, Party, and the Consequences of Restricting Early Voting in Florida in the 2012 General Election." *Political Research Quarterly* 67 (3): 646–65.
- Holbein, John B., and D. Sunshine Hillygus. 2016. "Making Young Voters: The Impact of Preregistration on Youth Turnout." *American Journal of Political Science* 60 (2): 364–82.
- Huyser, Kimberly R., Gabriel R. Sanchez, and Edward D. Vargas. 2017. "Civic Engagement and Political Participation among American Indians and Alaska Natives in the US." *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 5 (4): 642–59.
- Irwin, Elena G., Andrew M. Isserman, Maureen Kilkenny, and Mark D. Partridge. 2010. "A Century of Research on Rural Development and Regional Issues." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 92 (2): 522–53.
- Juelich, Courtney L., and Joseph A. Coll. 2020. "Rock the Vote or Block the Vote? How the Cost of Voting Affects the Voting Behavior of American Youth: Part of Special Symposium on Election Sciences." *American Politics Research* 48 (6): 719–24.
- Leighley, Jan E., and Jonathan Nagler. 2014. *Who Votes Now? Demographics, Issues, Inequality and Turnout in the United States*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lijphart, A. 1997. "Unequal Participation: Democracy's Unresolved Dilemma." *American Political Science Review*, 1–14.
- McDonald, Michael P. 2008. "Portable Voter Registration." *Political Behavior* 30 (4): 491–501.
- McDonald, Michael P. 2022. *From Pandemic to Insurrection: Voting in the 2020 US Presidential Election*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.
- McDonald, Michael P., and Matthew Thornburg. 2012. "Registering the Youth through Voter Preregistration." *New York University Journal of Legislation and Public Policy* 13: 551–72.
- Merivaki, Thessalia, and Daniel A. Smith. 2020. "A Failsafe for Voters? Cast and Rejected Provisional Ballots in North Carolina." *Political Research Quarterly* 73 (1): 65–78.
- Neeley, Grant W., and Lilliard E. Jr Richardson. 2001. "Who Is Early Voting? An Individual Level Examination." *The Social Science Journal* 38 (3): 381–92.
- Peterson, Geoff. 1997. "Native American Turnout in the 1990 and 1992 Elections." *American Indian Quarterly* 21 (2): 321.
- Plutzer, Eric. 2002. "Becoming a Habitual Voter: Inertia, Resources, and Growth in Young Adulthood." *American Political Science Review* 96 (1): 41–56.

- Schroedel, Jean, Aaron Berg, Joseph Dietrich, and Javier M. Rodriguez. 2020. "Political Trust and Native American Electoral Participation: An Analysis of Survey Data from Nevada and South Dakota." *Social Science Quarterly* 101 (5): 1885–1904.
- Schroedel, Jean, and Ryan Hart. 2015. "Vote Dilution and Suppression in Indian Country." *Studies in American Political Development* 29 (1): 40–67.
- Schroedel, Jean, Melissa Rogers, Joseph Dietrich, Savannah Johnston, and Aaron Berg. 2022. "Assessing the Efficacy of Early Voting Access on Indian Reservations: Evidence from a Natural Experiment in Nevada." *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 10 (1): 81–99.
- Shino, Enrijeta, and Daniel A. Smith. 2020. "Mobilizing the Youth Vote? Early Voting on College Campuses." *Election Law Journal: Rules, Politics, and Policy* 19 (4): 524–41.
- Shino, Enrijeta, Mara Suttman-Lea, and Daniel A. Smith. 2022. "Determinants of Rejected Mail Ballots in Georgia's 2018 General Election." *Political Research Quarterly* 75 (1): 231–43.
- Southwell, Priscilla, and Justin Burchett. 2000. "Does Changing the Rules Change the Players? The Effect of All-Mail Elections on the Composition of the Electorate." *Social Science Quarterly* 81 (3): 837–45.
- Stein, Robert M. 1998. "Introduction: Early Voting." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 62 (1): 57–69.
- Stein, Robert M., and Greg Vonnahme. 2008. "Engaging the Unengaged Voter: Vote Centers and Voter Turnout." *The Journal of Politics* 70 (2): 487–97.
- Tickamyer, Ann R., and Cynthia M. Duncan. 1990. "Poverty and Opportunity Structure in Rural America." *Annual Review of Sociology* 16 (1): 67–86.
- Tucker, James T., Jacqueline De León, and Dan McCool. 2020. "Obstacles at Every Turn: Barriers to Political Participation Faced by Native American Voters." NARF Comprehensive Field Hearing Report 2020. Boulder, CO: Native American Rights Fund.  
[https://vote.narf.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/obstacles\\_at\\_every\\_turn.pdf](https://vote.narf.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/obstacles_at_every_turn.pdf).
- United States Commission on Civil Rights. 2011. "Discrimination Against Native Americans in Border Towns: A Briefing Before the United States Commission on Civil Rights Held in Washington, D.C." Briefing Report. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.  
[https://www.usccr.gov/files/pubs/docs/BorderTowns\\_03-22-11.pdf](https://www.usccr.gov/files/pubs/docs/BorderTowns_03-22-11.pdf).
- U.S. Election Assistance Commission. 2013. "U.S. Election Assistance Commission Urban-Rural Study."  
[https://www.eac.gov/sites/default/files/eac\\_assets/1/28/EAC%20Urban\\_Rural%20Study%20Final%20Report%205\\_17\\_13.pdf](https://www.eac.gov/sites/default/files/eac_assets/1/28/EAC%20Urban_Rural%20Study%20Final%20Report%205_17_13.pdf).
- . 2021. "Disability and Voting Accessibility in the 2020 Elections: Final Report on Survey Results." U.S. Election Assistance Commission.  
[https://www.eac.gov/sites/default/files/voters/Disability\\_and\\_voting\\_accessibility\\_in\\_the\\_2020\\_elections\\_final\\_report\\_on\\_survey\\_results.pdf](https://www.eac.gov/sites/default/files/voters/Disability_and_voting_accessibility_in_the_2020_elections_final_report_on_survey_results.pdf).
- . 2022. "Disability, the Voting Process, and the Digital Divide." 2022.  
<https://www.eac.gov/election-officials/disability-voting-process-and-digital-divide>.
- . 2023. "Disability and Voting Accessibility in the 2022 Elections." U.S. Election Assistance Commission. [https://www.eac.gov/sites/default/files/2023-07/EAC\\_2023\\_Rutgers\\_Report\\_FINAL.pdf](https://www.eac.gov/sites/default/files/2023-07/EAC_2023_Rutgers_Report_FINAL.pdf).
- . 2024. "Voting Experiences Since HAVA: Perspectives of People with Disabilities."  
[https://www.eac.gov/sites/default/files/2024-04/EAC\\_2024\\_Rutgers\\_Report\\_PDF.pdf](https://www.eac.gov/sites/default/files/2024-04/EAC_2024_Rutgers_Report_PDF.pdf)
- Wattenberg, Martin P. 2015. *Is Voting for Young People?* Routledge.
- Wilkins, David E, and Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiiik Stark. 2017. *American Indian Politics and the American Political System*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Wolfinger, Raymond E, Benjamin Highton, and Megan Mullin. 2005. "How Postregistration Laws Affect the Turnout of Citizens Registered to Vote." *State Politics & Policy Quarterly* 5 (1): 1–23.

## Response to “Ensuring Voting Access Across the Electorate”

Amanda Gonzalez, *Jefferson County, Colorado*<sup>1</sup>

The paper “Ensuring Voting Access Across the Electorate” provides a thoughtful introduction to the myriad barriers different groups face when voting or generally participating in elections. By highlighting obstacles for people with disabilities, senior citizens, Native Americans, rural residents, and young voters, the authors establish a broad schema for understanding and addressing these challenges. As election administrators, we owe it to our voters to ensure inclusivity and equity, and this paper serves as a useful springboard for such efforts.

One of the strengths of the American election system — its decentralized, state-based administration — also poses a challenge for universal recommendations. For example, while the authors highlight voter registration as a potential barrier “because it relies on paper forms that are not accessible,” this generalization does not hold true across the country. For example, in Colorado, only a minority of voters register using paper forms due to robust online and automated voter registration systems. Acknowledging regional differences and innovations in election administration would strengthen the paper’s practical applicability.

The paper’s approach to merging groups also misses important nuances. For example, combining seniors with people with disabilities overlooks the unique experiences and needs of these populations. While it is true that aging can bring changes to vision, hearing, or mobility, these physical changes do not always parallel the various barriers faced by people with disabilities across their lifetimes. Grouping them together risks oversimplifying the challenges and implications for election access. Moreover, none of the populations covered in the paper are monoliths. For example, young voters include college students, young professionals, and those navigating economic instability, each with distinct barriers to voting. These complexities are understandably difficult to explore in limited space, but their absence underscores the challenge of fully addressing inclusivity in such a broad framework.

The section on Native Americans illustrates this tension. While it addresses critical barriers — such as exclusionary voter ID laws and limited access to polling locations — it does not explicitly clarify that it focuses on those living on reservations. This distinction is significant, as the majority of Native Americans in the United States live outside reservations and may face different barriers such as navigating urban voting systems. The lack of specificity here could lead to misconceptions or overly narrow applications of the recommendations.

Despite these critiques, the paper succeeds as a starting point for practitioners who are beginning to explore inclusive practices. Its framework for identifying and addressing barriers is a useful conceptual tool, and its emphasis on equity aligns with the ongoing need to ensure all voters can participate fully in our democracy. Future work should strive to incorporate more regional nuance, acknowledge the diversity within voter groups, and provide actionable recommendations tailored to specific contexts.

As election administrators, we must remain committed to identifying solutions that reflect the diversity and complexity of our electorate. Papers like this one, while not exhaustive, provide important contributions to that ongoing effort.

---

<sup>1</sup> Amanda Gonzalez is clerk and recorder for Jefferson County, Colorado.

## **Response to “Ensuring Voting Access Across the Electorate”**

Jenni Scutchfield, *Kentucky Secretary of State’s Office*<sup>1</sup>

In this paper the authors highlight an important and often-overlooked aspect of election administration – access. Too often, election administrators view access from the 30,000-foot level. What Schur, et al. highlight is that election access issues are not one-size-fits-all but rather pose unique challenges to various groups of voters.

This paper examines access issues of four specific groups: elderly and disabled, Native Americans, rural residents, and college students. Relying on statistics and academic findings, the article highlights specific obstacles to voting experienced by each group.

As an election administrator with eight years of experience, I find this work to be very informative. Most election administrators are aware of such issues in an experiential sense. In many regards, practitioners react to legal requirements more than the actual experiences of these voters. However, Schur et al. provide practitioners with a data-driven understanding of what different groups face in accessing the polls. Those obstacles are different. Highlighting this may provide greater clarity to administrators to help us focus on solutions that will not only meet the letter of the law but also be more effective with access interventions.

However, I found the article wanting in a few regards. In many states, elections are actually administered at the local level. In much the same way as access cannot be generalized, improving access cannot be uniformly applied. More importantly, election administrators must deal with limited resources in terms of money, time, and personnel. Matching the availability of resources to access interventions may result in tradeoffs and certainly will look different in different jurisdictions.

Further, while I found the groups identified in the article to be interesting and worth consideration, there are likely more groups not identified here. Hourly workers, for example, likely face different access challenges than salaried workers. Other groups could include low-income individuals, non-English speakers, homeless individuals, people of color, formerly incarcerated individuals, transgender voters, and nonbinary voters. While election officials continually work to improve access to voting, we cannot do it alone.

Nonetheless, this work is an important contribution to the understanding of the nuanced difficulty of election access that many voters face.

---

<sup>1</sup> Jenni Scutchfield is assistant secretary of state for the Kentucky Secretary of State’s Office.