Who Wants to be Legible? Digitalization and Intergroup Inequality in Kenya

Garbe, Lisa; McMurry, Nina; Scacco, Alexandra; Zhang, Kelly

Garbe, Lisa; McMurry, Nina; Scacco, Alexandra; Zhang, Kelly

Working Paper

Who Wants to be Legible? Digitalization and Intergroup Inequality in Kenya

WZB Discussion Paper, No. SP VII 2023-101

Provided in Cooperation with:
WZB Berlin Social Science Center

Suggested Citation: Garbe, Lisa; McMurry, Nina; Scacco, Alexandra; Zhang, Kelly (2023) : Who Wants to be Legible? Digitalization and Intergroup Inequality in Kenya, WZB Discussion Paper, No. SP VII 2023-101, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (WZB), Berlin

This Version is available at:
http://hdl.handle.net/10419/274672

WZB
Berlin Social Science Center

Lisa Garbe
Nina McMurry
Alexandra Scacco
Kelly Zhang

Who Wants to be Legible? Digitalization and Intergroup Inequality in Kenya

Discussion Paper

SP VII 2023-101

June 2023

Research Area

Political Economy of Development

Research Unit

Institutions and Political Inequality

WZB Berlin Social Science Center
Reichpietschufer 50
10785 Berlin
Germany
www.wzb.eu

Lisa Garbe, Nina McMurry, Alexandra Scacco, Kelly Zhang
Who Wants to be Legible? Digitalization and Intergroup Inequality in Kenya
Discussion Paper SP VII 2023-101
Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (2023)

Affiliation of the authors other than WZB:

Kelly Zhang
MIT GOV/LAB
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
30 Wadsworth Street
Cambridge, MA 02142
United States

Abstract

Who Wants to be Legible? Digitalization and Intergroup Inequality in Kenya

by Lisa Garbe, Nina McMurry, Alexandra Scacco, Kelly Zhang*

Governments across the Global South have begun introducing biometric IDs (eIDs) in an attempt to improve citizen-state legibility. While such initiatives can improve government efficiency, they also raise important questions about citizen privacy, especially for groups with a history of mistrust in the state. If concerns about increased legibility produce differential eID uptake or changes in political behavior, eID initiatives may exacerbate societal inequalities. In a conjoint experiment with 2,073 respondents from four Kenyan regions, we examine how perceptions of and willingness to register for eID under different policy conditions vary across politically dominant, opposition, and "securitized" (heavily policed) ethnic groups. Our results indicate broad support for expanded legibility, with respondents across groups preferring policies that link eIDs with a range of government functions. However, we find meaningful group-level variation in support for specific policy features, and suggestive evidence that policies facilitating greater surveillance may discourage opposition political participation.

Keywords: Legibility, Surveillance, Digitalization, Kenya, Political Inequality, Ethnic Politics

*This research was registered as a pre-analysis plan with OSF Registries (Scacco et al. 2022), available at: https://osf.io/w8jcz. We obtained ethics approval from WZB Research Ethics Review No. 2022/1/141. We are grateful to Elena Kromark, Mathew Boswell, and Abigail Peña Alejos for excellent research assistance, to TIFA Research for their superb work in survey implementation in Kenya, to the WZB Berlin Social Science Center and MIT GOV/LAB for funding the research, and to Bernd Beber, Manuel Boscancianu, Jonah Foong, John Gerring, Macartan Humphreys, Wendy Hunter, Nahomi Ichino, Georgiy Syunayev, and Minh Trinh for thoughtful comments and feedback on the design of this study.

1 Introduction

In recent years, governments across the Global South have begun to introduce digital or biometric identity cards (eIDs), in an attempt to improve citizen legibility to the state (Gelb and Clark 2013). Expanding and deepening legibility can, in principle, help states govern more efficiently and fairly, and expand citizen access to public services (Lee and Zhang 2017). But eID initiatives also represent a significant expansion of state surveillance capacity, and may raise particular concerns for groups with a history of mistrust in or conflict with the state. If these concerns lead to differentially lower eID adoption among historically marginalized groups, the introduction of eIDs may ultimately exacerbate, rather than reduce, intergroup inequality in access to public goods and services. Members of certain social groups may also modify their behavior in response to expanded citizen-state legibility in ways that meaningfully affect the outcomes of political processes. Understanding these potential consequences is crucial to gain a fuller picture of the likely effects of legibility expansion in unequal societies.

In this paper, we explore the implications of eID policies for intergroup inequality by examining citizens' perceptions of different state policies connected to the expansion of legibility, and how these perceptions vary across salient social groups. We use the example of the legally contested (and ultimately halted) roll-out of an eID system in Kenya – the Huduma Namba card program – as an entry point to help understand perceived costs and benefits of increasing citizen legibility to the state, and implications for citizen behavior. In a conjoint experiment with 2,073 respondents drawn from four regions across Kenya, we examine how features of potential policies governing the eID

program – including the integration of eIDs with state security services, voting systems, taxation, public goods, and welfare benefits – affect general support for the program, intended eID uptake, beliefs about the implications of eIDs for data privacy, perceived ease of access to services, and considerations surrounding political participation. We examine differential responses to specific eID policy features among historically dominant, opposition, and "securitized" (intensively policed) ethnic groups in Kenya.

Our findings suggest broad support for the expansion of legibility via eIDs, even among members of historically marginalized groups, and even when legibility imposes costs on citizens, such as enhanced surveillance and tax collection. We hypothesized that certain eID policy features, including data-sharing to improve the quality of public services and the use of eIDs to deliver social welfare benefits, would increase support and willingness to register for eIDs, while others, including the provision of biometric data to security services to improve video surveillance, automatic tax registration, and mandatory use of eID for voter registration, would decrease support and willingness to register, particularly among opposition and securitized groups. Contrary to these expectations, we find positive or null effects for all of these potential "uses" of eID on support and willingness to register, within the full sample and among the sub-groups we examined. Kenyans appear to prefer digitalization initiatives that connect eIDs to a larger set of government functions, compared to initiatives that are more limited in scope. Despite the controversy surrounding the Huduma Namba card program, a more digitalized government appears to be seen by most as preferable to the status quo.

We do, however, find meaningful between-group variation in the effects of specific policy features on support for and willingness to register for eIDs. As

expected, members of politically dominant ethnic groups were, relative to other groups, more supportive of policies that would utilize data from eIDs to improve the quality of public services (compared to eID policies not explicitly linked to public service provision). Members of these groups may be more confident they will benefit from further state investment in public goods provision. Contrary to our expectations, respondents in all sub-groups preferred policies that involve automatic data sharing with security services over policies that limit information sharing, a finding suggestive of widespread demand for more effective security provision. However, this preference was significantly weaker for the "securitized" minority group (Somali Kenyans in our sample), who may feel the need to balance their demand for security against concerns about discriminatory policing.

Finally, we find suggestive evidence that policy choices in the implementation of eIDs may have important implications for political behavior. Opposition group respondents were relatively more likely to express concern about data privacy and punishment for political speech under policies that involve automatic data sharing with security services. Even if concerns about the expansion of legibility do not produce differential uptake between dominant and marginalized groups, eIDs may contribute to political inequality if they disproportionately discourage opposition political participation. Overall, our findings highlight the need to better understand how different groups perceive expansions of state-citizen legibility, in order to prevent such initiatives from exacerbating existing inequalities.

The rest of the paper proceeds as follows: in the next section, we connect the adoption of digital and biometric identification systems to broader literatures on state-building and citizen-state legibility. Next, we motivate and

list our primary hypotheses about the effects of different eID policy features on citizen attitudes and behaviors and provide more detail on the Kenyan context. We then describe our survey and research design, present results from pre-registered analyses, and conclude with a discussion of the implication of our findings.

2 Digital IDs, Legibility, and Intergroup Inequality

The proliferation of digital and biometric identification initiatives in recent decades is the latest in a series of state-led initiatives to increase the *legibility* of their populations. Biometric identification uses a person's unique physiological characteristics (biometric identifiers), such as fingerprints or facial images, to recognize this person's identity (Jain, Hong, and Pankanti 2000). Worldwide, around 120 countries have thus far introduced passports using biometric recognition and about 70 countries have introduced eID cards.[1]

Citizen-state legibility – defined by Scott (1998) as the aggregation of local practices in such a way that renders them accessible, standardized, and understandable to state administrators – is a prerequisite for many forms of state intervention (Lee and Zhang 2017). By making it easier to track populations within their borders, verify individuals' identities, and share data across government agencies, eIDs have the potential to make states more effective at fulfilling key functions, such as the funding, planning, and provision of public goods, the delivery of social assistance, and the maintenance of public security.

[1] Biometric IDs are here." 26 March 2022, Thales. https://www.thalesgroup.com/en/markets/digital-identity-and-security/government/identity/2016-national-id-card-trends

Recent studies highlight the potential for biometric identification systems to improve welfare, including by reducing "leakage" in the delivery of employment and pension benefits (Muralidharan, Niehaus, and Sukhtankar 2016), and improving patient care at government healthcare facilities (Bossuroy, Delavallade, and Pons 2019). The use of eIDs for voter registration also has been touted as a means of improving the integrity of democratic elections (Piccolino 2015). In contexts with low state capacity, eID systems can "help link citizens to the government directly," making it easier for them to access public goods and services to which they are entitled (Suri and Bhogale 2019). The ability to easily prove one's identity using biometrics can also open up access to credit and the formal economy. These individual-level benefits may be particularly important for members of historically marginalized populations who have previously been excluded due to a lack of identity documentation (Hunter and Brill 2016).

Given the potential benefits of eIDs, particularly for citizens, critiques of digital and biometric ID programs have (rightly) focused on the risks of excluding marginalized group members. Registration for digital IDs typically requires pre-existing identity documents such as birth certificates; thus, citizens who already face marginalization due to a lack of primary identity documentation may be further excluded if this prevents them from enrolling in an eID program (Gelb and Clark 2013). Logistical barriers to enrollment, such as insufficient biometric data quality (e.g. due to physical disability or damage to fingerprints from manual labor), poor electricity, limited internet access, and low levels of digital literacy may also lead to the disproportionate exclusion of already-marginalized groups (Khera 2017; Rao 2019). As governments increasingly integrate eIDs into basic state functions, exclusion from digital ID systems could further limit access to public services and benefits. Thus, if measures to prevent exclusion errors are left unaddressed, the digital transition

may have the effect of exacerbating, rather than ameliorating, societal inequality.

Less well-studied to date are the potential *costs* to citizens of inclusion in eID schemes and of being made more legible to the state. In less democratic regimes, citizens may be concerned about the use of their data for targeted surveillance, which may ultimately discourage political participation (Eck et al. 2021). They may also be concerned about the security of their data, particularly where trust in institutions is low. Some costs to individuals are by design. Indeed, one of the most important ways in which legibility underpins the state's "infrastructural power" (Mann 1984) and facilitates the provision of public goods is by increasing its extractive capacity and ability to limit fiscal free-riding (Lee and Zhang 2017). Citizens may resist what they see as an effort to increase their individual tax burdens, particularly if they do not expect to benefit from state expenditures (Scott 1998).

Such costs – real or perceived – may in turn affect citizens' willingness to register for eIDs in the first place. As Szreter and Breckenridge (2012) write, taking a historical perspective, "[state] registration systems frequently fail to persist without the voluntary cooperation of those being registered" (p. 19). Digital IDs are no exception. Indeed, limited uptake by citizens has proven a barrier to the success of eID initiatives, including in relatively high-capacity states in the Global North (Domeyer et al. 2020). Not only does the potential for citizen reluctance present a challenge to state capacity-building efforts, but it may also have important implications for societal inequality, if perceptions of the costs and benefits of legibility differ across societal groups. Understanding how citizens view these potential costs, and weigh them against potential benefits in deciding whether to take-up new eID systems, is crucial for

understanding the prospects for their success in improving public goods provision and access, and implications for inequality.

Even absent differential uptake, digital identification may exacerbate political inequality if concerns about privacy and surveillance disproportionately reduce political participation among opposition or otherwise marginalized groups. Recent work by (Allie 2022) highlights this concern, finding that the use of facial recognition technology at polling stations in Telangana, India reduced voter turnout in areas with larger shares of Muslim residents. Our study complements existing work by focusing squarely on the potential for and implications of differential uptake of and support for a contentious digital identification (eID) program in contemporary Kenya. The next section presents our theoretical argument on how citizens react to an expansion of legibility as well as the resulting hypotheses.

3 Hypotheses

Theories of identity registration have emphasized both benefits and costs to individuals of being made legible to the state. On one hand, identity documentation provides a form of recognition, empowering citizens to exercise rights, make material claims on the state, and participate in the formal economy (Hunter and Brill 2016; Szreter and Breckenridge 2012). Greater legibility can also enable the state to provide public goods more effectively (Lee and Zhang 2017). On the other hand, (Scott 1998) and (Foucault 1991) emphasize the coercive nature and extractive motivations of previous state attempts to extend and deepen legibility.

Following these competing theoretical accounts, we hypothesize that support for and willingness to opt into eID will vary according to different

policy features that carry costs and benefits of enhanced legibility resulting from digitalization. Further, drawing on theories of ethnic politics, we expect different groups of citizens to react differently to these policy features, depending upon their pre-existing orientations toward state power, with potentially stark implications for intergroup inequality.

We use variation in the design of hypothetical but realistic eID policies to understand citizen attitudes toward eIDs for two primary reasons. First, doing so allows us to isolate specific concerns and expectations citizens may have about the effects of eIDs. As the contrasting perspectives in the literature on legibility highlight, greater legibility can facilitate a range of actions by the state, some of which may be considered beneficial to citizens (e.g., easier delivery of government benefits) and some of which may be considered costly (e.g., easier surveillance). Asking explicitly about potential actions the state may take as it pursues digitalization, rather than merely soliciting opinions about digitalization efforts in general, can help us better understand the drivers of public opinion and behavior.

Second, there is active debate among policymakers – in Kenya, the context we study here, and more broadly – about the appropriate uses of eIDs and the regulations that should accompany their roll-out. Understanding the likely consequences of particular policy options for eID uptake and citizen attitudes toward eIDs is important in and of itself. For example, if we expect citizens to oppose or opt out of eIDs due to data privacy concerns, it is important to know whether policies intended to mitigate these concerns (such as requiring permission from individuals to share their data for specific purposes) will in fact do so, and for whom.

Below, we present pre-registered hypotheses about the effects of different policy features on support and willingness to register for eIDs in general, and for specific groups.

3.1 Costs and Benefits of Legibility

Theories emphasizing potential benefits of eIDs for citizens mostly point to more efficient access to social transfers and improving the ability of government to deliver higher-quality public services. Hunter and Brill (2016) argue that citizen legibility leads to inclusive social protection by the state. Studying the drivers that lead countries to improve state legibility, and in particular birth registration, they argue that "state development occurs as a result of the state's own understanding of its imminent needs." Hunter and Brill offer evidence that political incentives for governments to implement social welfare programs, such as conditional cash transfers (CCTs), create a practical need and increase citizen demand for birth registration. Citizen-state legibility improves as birth registrations allow citizens to access government transfers and create benefits for governments in the form of electoral approval. Following this line of argument, we expect that citizens will be more positive towards eID initiatives if they are linked to social protection transfers.

H1: Citizens will be more likely to prefer, support, and register for policies that link digital IDs with social protection transfers than policies that do not.

Lee and Zhang (2017) argue that increased citizen-state legibility—which they define as "the breadth and depth of the state's knowledge of its citizens and their activities" (p. 118)—improves the efficiency of tax collection (by curbing fiscal free-riding) and, consequently, leads to improvements in public goods provision. They offer cross national evidence linking more accurate census data

(their measure of legibility) with higher tax revenues, lower mortality and higher literacy rates. Overall, this argument highlights that a state can improve the quality of services the more information it has on its citizens. We therefore expect that citizens will be more supportive of eID initiatives if they are linked to improved quality of public services.

H2: Citizens will be more likely to prefer, support, and register for policies that link digital IDs with improved quality of public services than policies that do not.

Scott (1998)'s (1998) more pessimistic account of legibility emphasizes state attempts to increase central control and monitoring capabilities at the expense of local and individual freedoms. Shirk (2019) claims that the modern state has responded to violent uprisings by enhancing capacity for surveillance, for instance, by creating centralized biometric databases. While citizens may be willing to accept some surveillance in return for welfare and security (Weller 2012), general trust in the "security of centralized repositories of information" (p. 63) has declined, especially in less democratic regimes. We therefore expect that citizens will be less favorable toward eID initiatives if they are linked to security and surveillance:

H3: Citizens will be less likely to prefer, support, and register for policies that link digital IDs with security and surveillance than policies that do not.

While citizens value state efforts to improve social welfare, they often fear state attempts to put tax burdens on them (Scott 1998, 65). Especially in those states where trust in public institutions is low, people are less willing to entrust the state with matters of income redistribution (Garcia and Von Haldenwang 2016; Habibov, Cheung, and Auchynnikava 2018). We therefore expect that citizens will be be less inclined to support eID initiatives if they are linked to taxation.

H4: Citizens will be less likely to prefer, support, and register for policies that link digital IDs with automatic tax registration than policies that do not.

Any state requires a reliable list of citizens eligible to vote in order to hold elections (Piccolino 2015). In many developing countries, a lack of state capacity is associated with incomplete voter rolls and biometric technology has been "heralded as a possible solution" (Piccolino 2016, 498). However, the technology itself may not prevent vote rigging, and may even facilitate centralized electoral fraud. For instance, Kenya's 2017 elections were annulled by the Supreme Court due to flaws in the electronic voting transmission system. In many countries where technology is introduced to improve electoral processes, the technology itself remains a "black box" and may decrease voters' confidence in the integrity of elections (Odote and Kanyinga 2021). We therefore expect that citizens will be less supportive of eID initiatives if they are linked to voter registration.

H5: Citizens will be less likely to prefer, support, and register for policies that link digital IDs with voter registration than policies that do not.

3.2 Group heterogeneity

We expect preferences, support, and willingness to register for eID to vary across different societal groups. Specifically, we expect that historically dominant ethnic groups will vary in their attitudes toward different policy features compared to historically marginalized groups. We consider two distinct types of marginalized groups' relations with the state: (1) "opposition groups" and (2) "securitized groups," and compare their responses to those of politically dominant ethnic group relations with the state. We conceptualize opposition groups as those that have attempted but failed to secure control of the

government at the national level and securitized groups as those disproportionately policed by the state, e.g. for (stated) reasons of national security.[2] In general, while we expect dominant groups to be more supportive of those policies promising direct and indirect benefits, we expect members of opposition and securitized groups to be more skeptical that they will receive promised benefits.

(Scott 1998) argues that any society is likely to create legibility in a way that mostly benefits "those ... who have the knowledge and access to easily decipher the new state-created format" (p. 78). Indeed, social and political ties to those in government appear to be an important factor explaining whether people benefit from state initiatives (Burgess et al. 2015; Ferrali et al. 2022; Kramon and Posner 2016). Citizens from historically dominant ethnic groups may therefore be more confident that they, or their communities, will benefit from state efforts to improve public goods and social welfare provision through digitalization. As such, we should expect dominant ethnic groups to more strongly prefer policies that explicitly link digital IDs with social protection transfers or improved quality of public services than citizens belonging to other groups.

H6a: Members of historically dominant ethnic groups will be more supportive of policies that link digital IDs with social protection transfers than members of other groups.

H6b: Members of historically dominant ethnic groups will be more supportive of policies that link digital IDs with higher–quality public services than members of other groups.

[2] We discuss these group classifications further in the paper's next section.

Following Scott (1998), we argue that states simplify complex social realities in their attempt to make citizens legible in ways that might harm political minorities. Especially when the state considers particular minority groups to be a threat, legibility is designed in ways that allow for central monitoring and control (Kam and Clarke 2021). We therefore expect that securitized ethnic groups will be particularly wary of state usage of digital IDs for purposes of security and surveillance.

H7: Members of historically securitized ethnic groups will be less supportive of policies that link digital IDs with state surveillance than members of other groups.

The registration of voters can be used as an instrument to alter political outcomes, if designed in a way that allows for centralized control of small units such that the state can intervene in opposition-leaning areas (Slater 2008). In turn, Slater and Fenner (2011) point out that the "threat of targeted coercion against oppositionists will be especially credible if a regime has a history of consistent interaction with citizens made legible on the state's rolls" (p. 22). We therefore expect that opposition ethnic groups will be less favorable toward policies that link digital IDs with voting.

H8: Members of historically opposition ethnic groups will be less supportive of policies that link digital IDs with voter registration than members of other groups.

We now turn to a discussion of our study's research setting and the design of a policy conjoint experiment that highlights potential costs and benefits of biometric identification to a diverse sample of Kenyan respondents drawn from social groups with very different historical experiences in their interactions with the state.

4 Research Context

In 2019, the Kenyan government introduced a new biometric National Integrated Identity Management System (NIIMS) known as Huduma Namba ("service number" in Swahili), with the goal of centralizing and digitizing identity documents. The initial roll-out began without a clear legal framework for data protection in place, however, leading to a ruling by the Kenyan High Court in January 2020 that ordered a halt to the program until these were established (Privacy International 2020). In November 2020, the government resumed its registration drive for Huduma Namba. These efforts were again stopped by the High Court, which ruled in October 2021 that data collection under NIIMS violates the Data Protection Act (Privacy International 2022). Huduma Namba registration has not resumed since.

A newly proposed version of the Huduma bill would make Huduma Namba the only valid proof of identity in Kenya, impose fines for citizens who fail to sign up, direct Kenya's electoral commission (the IEBC) to base the national voting register on Huduma Namba, and enable the Kenya Revenue Authority to access the NIIMS database to facilitate tax collection (Macdonald 2022). This proposal has been criticized in the media and by civil society organizations, who raise concerns that the NIIMS will exclude those who do not register for Huduma Namba from services and even risks inducing statelessness among some non-registrants. The main critique is that identity documents, such as a birth certificate or national identity card, are needed for registration, but are difficult to obtain for marginalized communities in Kenya. Mutung'u and Rutenberg (2020) warn of particular risks of statelessness for Nubian and Somali communities. Although the bill proposes vetting committees to help these communities to obtain legal documentation, the criteria for recognizing a person as a citizen remain unclear (Manby 2021).

As such, there is currently no national biometric identification system in place in Kenya, proposals to institute one have been contentious, at least in elite circles, and specific concerns about the potential for exclusion of already marginalized groups have been raised in the public discourse. We know relatively little about the attitudes of ordinary Kenyans toward digital or biometric identity initiatives. What we do know is that the attempted roll-out of Huduma Namba has taken place during a period of highly charged political competition along ethnic lines.

In this paper, we examine politically dominant, opposition, and securitized group reactions to state attempts to expand citizen legibility through the attitudes and beliefs of Kikuyu and Kalenjin (dominant), Luo (opposition), and Kenyan Somali (securitized) survey respondents. These are geographically concentrated ethnic groups whose access to public goods and services has historically depended on their relationships with political leaders (Bates 1974). We leverage the Kikuyu, Kalenjin, Luo, and Kenyan Somali group identities to examine how citizen support for different eID policy features may vary with dominant, opposition, and securitized group histories.

The Kikuyu and Kalenjin are classified as dominant because these ethnic groups have held the presidency since Kenya's independence, have been dominant in Kenyan national politics more generally, and have historically benefited the most from state patronage (Burgess et al. 2015; Kramon and Posner 2016). The Luo are classified as an opposition group because they have repeatedly attempted but failed to secure the presidency, or form part of the dominant political coalition during this period. Somali Kenyans are classified as securitized because the government has disproportionately targeted them for

surveillance and policing, particularly in the past decade.[3] Refer to A.1 for further details on this historical context.

5 Design

5.1 Sample

We conducted a face-to-face survey of Kenyan citizens aged 18+ years that contains an embedded policy conjoint experiment. To understand the potential effects of eID systems on intergroup inequality, it was crucial that we reached respondents from historically dominant, opposition, and securitized groups. To ensure sufficient heterogeneity of respondents along this dimension, we recruited a representative sample of 1,009 respondents from Nairobi, and randomly sampled an additional 1,064 respondents from the Mt. Kenya, Nyanza and Garissa regions, for a total sample of 2,073 respondents. These three locations outside Nairobi are predominantly inhabited by Kikuyu (dominant), Luo (opposition) and Somali (securitized) ethnic groups, respectively. Our sample includes respondents from a total of 14 ethnic groups. Survey enumeration took place between June 27 and July 29, 2022.

Enumeration areas within each region were selected using probability-proportional-to-population-size (PPPS) sampling. Within each enumeration area, households were sampled using a random walk procedure, and respondents within each household were randomly selected from the full set of household

[3] Our classifications are consistent with those in the Ethnic Power Relations (EPR) dataset. For 2020, EPR classifies the Kikuyu and Kalenjin as "included in the executive," and more specifically as "senior partners." The Luo are classified as "powerless," meaning that "elite representatives hold no political power at either the national or the regional level, *without* being explicitly discriminated against" (emphasis added), while Somalis are classified as "discriminated," where "group members are subjected to active, intentional, and targeted discrimination, with the intent of excluding them from both regional and national power" (Vogt et al. 2015). In section 1.6 of the online appendix, we repeat our analysis using EPR classifications for all respondents in the sample.

members aged 18+ at the time of the interview. At the end of the interview, respondents received an incentive of 150 KSh (1.25 USD at the time of enumeration) worth of phone credit for their participation in the survey, which took approximately 20 to 30 minutes to complete.

5.2 Experimental design

We test our hypotheses using a policy conjoint experiment embedded in the survey. Conjoint analysis is a tool used to study preferences about complex, multidimensional phenomena, such as government policies, commercial products, or candidates for public office (Hainmueller, Hopkins, and Yamamoto 2014). An important advantage of conjoint analysis is that it allows researchers to isolate the effects of many different features or dimensions of an object (e.g. a policy) on attitudes about that object. In a typical conjoint experiment, research subjects are presented with multiple "profiles" randomly generated from different possible combinations of attributes, and asked to evaluate these profiles, either individually or in comparison to one another.

In this study, survey respondents were presented with multiple hypothetical policies governing digital ID in Kenya. Each hypothetical policy varied along several dimensions that reflect ongoing debates about the use and regulation of eIDs and that represent distinct potential consequences of greater legibility gained through the roll-out of eIDs. After a short set of pre-treatment questions, each respondent was presented with three (3) pairs of hypothetical digital ID policies. The policies were introduced with the following text:

The Kenyan government is considering new initiatives to introduce digital IDs – ID cards linked to biometric data about citizens that the government will collect and store – as a part of a broader initiative to make the government more effective

in many areas. Next, you will be asked to consider several policy proposals for a new digital ID program that would be accessible to all Kenyans. Please note that these exact policies have not necessarily been proposed by anyone, but they may be similar to real proposals that are being considered.

Each hypothetical eID policy varies along the following five (5) dimensions:

- **Social protection transfers (Z1):** whether the digital ID is used to distribute pensions, social protection payments, and other financial assistance (1) or not (0)
- **Public services (Z2):** whether the government would share data from digital IDs across agencies to improve the quality of public services (1) or not (0)
- **Surveillance (Z3):** whether government security agencies would have unrestricted access to biometric photos stored in a single database (1) or would require either individual consent or a court order to gain access to biometric photos (0)
- **Tax Registration (Z4):** whether digital IDs would be automatically linked to tax identification numbers at birth (1) or not (0)
- **Voting (Z5):** whether a digital ID would be required to register to vote (1) or not (0)

The exact wording of the attribute values as they appeared on a showcard provided to each respondent, with accompanying images, is included in Figure 1 below. All attribute values were assigned independently and with equal probability using simple random assignment. With five (5) binary attributes, this yields $2^5 = 32$ possible attribute combinations for a single policy. Each

respondent was shown three (3) policy pairs, or six (6) profiles in total, meaning a total of 12,300 profiles are evaluated across the sample. Only pairs with identical profiles were excluded. The order in which attributes appeared was randomized between respondents, but fixed across rounds for a single respondent. We collected data on three primary outcomes for each round:

- A forced choice between two digital ID policies, for each policy pair ("Which of the following two policy proposals for a new Digital ID would you prefer?")
- Two individual policy evaluation questions:
  - Willingness to register for a digital ID under a given policy (Scale from 1-4, "Not at all likely" to "Very likely")
  - Level of support for a given digital ID policy (Scale from 1-4, "Not at all supportive" to "Very supportive")

Attribute Label	A	B
Social Protection Transfers	The digital ID would be used for **social protection transfers**, including pensions, social protection, and other assistance for Kenyans. People eligible for government benefits would apply online using their digital ID and receive payments directly. 	Digital IDs would NOT be linked directly to social protection transfers from the government. 
Public Services	The government would share data from digital IDs with relevant ministries in order to help **improve the quality of public services** like schools and health clinics in your local community. 	The government would NOT share data from digital IDs with ministries in order to improve the quality of services. 
Security	Government agencies, for example **the police**, would have automatic access to biometric photos stored in a single database. This would make video surveillance easier, because information from this photo database can be linked to video footage from surveillance cameras. 	Government agencies, for example the police, would NOT have direct access to biometric photos of citizens from the digital ID. To gain access to this data they need consent from the individual concerned or a court. This would make video surveillance more difficult. 
Tax Registration	Digital IDs would be linked to **tax identification numbers** at birth. This tax identification would be automatically activated when a person turns 18. 	Digital IDs would NOT automatically be linked to a tax identification number at birth. Instead, individuals separately apply for a tax number when a person turns 18. 
Voting	A digital ID card would be required if you want to register to vote. Alternative forms of ID would no longer be accepted. 	A digital ID card would not be required to register to vote. Alternative forms of identification would continue to be accepted. 

Figure 1. *Conjoint attributes*

We also collected data on the following secondary outcomes for both policies shown in the first round. These outcomes are included to help us understand both the mechanisms underpinning variation in support for eID and potential implications of different eID policies for political behavior:

- Belief that the digital ID policy would make it easier to access government services (Scale from 1-4, “Strongly disagree” to “Strongly agree”)

- Belief that the privacy of data would be adequately protected under the digital ID policy (Scale from 1-4, “Strongly disagree” to “Strongly agree”)

- Concern about being punished for expressing political views under the digital ID policy (Scale from 1-4, “Strongly disagree” to “Strongly agree”)

- Concern about one’s vote being counted under the digital ID policy (Scale from 1-4, “Strongly disagree” to “Strongly agree”)

- Concern about the police using one’s personal information under the digital ID policy (Scale from 1-4, “Strongly disagree” to “Strongly agree”)

After the first two rounds of the conjoint experiments, we included manipulation checks, asking respondents whether the policy proposal they had just seen included one of the following policy profiles:

- **Round 1:** In the Digital ID proposal you just read, the Digital ID would be connected to voter registration ("Yes" or "No")

- **Round 2:** In the Digital ID policy proposal you read, the government would take a biometric photo that could be linked to government surveillance ("Yes" or "No").

5.3 Estimands and Analysis

In our main analysis, we estimate average marginal effects of each conjoint attribute using the following OLS specification, regressing each outcome on the five dimensions of experimental variation interacted with indicators for membership in each of the following groups: *dominant*, *opposition*, and

securitized.[4] Policy profiles are indexed by i and respondents by r.[5] Standard errors are clustered at the level of the respondent.

$$Y_{ir} = \alpha + \beta_1 Z1_{ir} + \beta_2 Z2_{ir} + \beta_3 Z3_{ir} + \beta_4 Z4_{ir} + \beta_5 Z5_{ir} + \beta_6 group_r + \beta_7 Z1_{ir} \times group_r + \beta_8 Z2_{ir} \times group_r + \beta_9 Z3_{ir} \times group_r + \beta_{10} Z4_{ir} \times group_r + \beta_{11} Z5_{ir} \times group_r + \epsilon_{ir}$$

Treatment and group indicator variables are demeaned to allow for the attribute base terms ($\beta_1 - \beta_5$) to be interpreted as the average marginal effects for each attribute within the entire sample. These coefficients correspond to Hypotheses 1-5 above. Hypotheses 6a, 6b, 7, and 8 are tested using the corresponding group-indicator interaction terms.

6 Results

Before presenting our findings on the effects of different policy features on attitudes about hypothetical eID policies, we examine overall attitudes toward eIDs among the whole survey sample and within our subgroups of interest. Figure 2 shows the distribution of support for and willingness to register for hypothetical eID policies, averaged across all combinations of policy features presented in the conjoint experiment. In the full sample, respondents said they would be "somewhat likely" or "very likely" to register under the

4 The dominant category includes respondents who list their mother tongue as Kikuyu or Kalenjin, the opposition category includes respondents who list their mother tongue as Luo, and the securitized category includes respondents who list their mother tongue as Somali. For each outcome, we estimate three separate models, each including an indicator for membership in one of the three subgroups. The interaction coefficients therefore represent a comparison between a particular group and the rest of the sample.

5 In our pre-analysis plan, we include an additional specification estimating all possible two-way interactions between conjoint attributes, within each of the three subgroups. Results from this analysis and all other pre-registered analyses are included in Online Appendix 3.

hypothetical eID policy in a majority (66.8%) of conjoint tasks. Similarly, for 67.3% of policy profiles, respondents were “somewhat" or “very" supportive.



Figure 2. *Support for and willingness to register under hypothetical eID policies, averaged across all combinations of policy features.*

Overall, respondents in the securitized group were more likely than respondents in other groups to state that they were “somewhat supportive" of and “somewhat likely" to register under a hypothetical policy. They were the least likely to provide answers on either extreme (“not at all [supportive/likely]" or “very [supportive/likely]"). By contrast, dominant group respondents were more likely than other respondents to provide answers on both extremes. Opposition group respondents answered similarly to dominant group respondents, but were relatively more likely to answer that they were “not very [supportive/likely]" as opposed to “not at all [supportive/likely]".

6.1 Primary Outcomes

We analyze the effects of the five conjoint attributes on our three primary outcomes: forced choice, policy proposal support, and willingness to register for a digital ID under the hypothetical policy. We include group-attribute interactions to test whether respondents from three dominant, opposition, and securitized ethnic groups react differently to each attribute, relative to the rest of the sample. Results from this analysis appear in Figure 3 below and in Table 4 in the appendix.[6] We first present our findings for the full sample, and then turn to the findings from our analysis of group-level heterogeneity.

6.1.1 Full sample

The coefficients in Figure 3 represent the average marginal component effects of each policy attribute on our primary outcomes. These can be interpreted as the effect of a hypothetical policy feature, compared to its alternative, on choice of a policy, support for eID under that policy, or willingness to register for eID under that policy.[7] The coefficients in the first row represent the difference in the probability of preferring a hypothetical policy (Panel 1), level of support for that policy (Panel 2), and willingness to register under that policy (Panel 3) when the policy includes data sharing across government agencies for the purpose of improving public services, compared to when it does not, averaged across all other possible combinations of policy features.

[6] Table 4 shows results from estimating Equation 1, including group-attribute interaction terms. For ease of interpretation, we instead present sub-group average marginal component effects in Figure 3.

[7] More precisely, the average difference in the outcome for the policy feature coded as '1' compared to the policy feature coded as '0'.

Turning first to results for the full sample, we find that, on average, respondents prefer policies linking eID with social protection transfers and improved quality of public services, in line with Hypotheses 1 and 2. However, contrary to Hypotheses 3 and 5, respondents *also* prefer policy proposals in which biometric data is made automatically available to security services (compared to policy proposals that restrict this data sharing), and in which eIDs are required for voter registration (compared to policies where alternatives forms of ID would be accepted). These relationships are statistically significant ($p < 0.001$) and suggest overall optimism about the integration of eIDs with a variety of government functions. Counter to hypothesis 4, respondents also express greater willingness to register for eIDs under policies that automatically link eID to tax registration ($p < 0.05$) compared to policies that that do not; however, tax registration has no significant effect on choice and only a marginally significant positive effect on support ($p < 0.1$).



***Figure 3**. Average marginal component effects of policy features on policy choice, policy support, and likelihood of registering for eID under the hypothetical policy, for the whole sample, and within sub-groups. Support and willingness to register are measured on a scale from 1 (Not at all supportive/Not at all likely) to 4 (Very supportive/Very likely). Bars represent 95% confidence intervals, with standard errors clustered at the respondent level.*

6.1.2 Group heterogeneity

We next turn to the analysis of heterogeneous effects for our three pre-specified subgroups. As in the full sample, the coefficients for most attributes are positively signed within all three subgroups, suggesting that, on average, respondents in each of these groups are more positively inclined toward policies that integrate data from digital IDs with a larger range of government functions, compared to those that limit its use. However, we do find meaningful differences between groups in the magnitudes of these effects.

Consistent with Hypothesis 6b, we find that politically dominant group respondents react more positively to data sharing across government agencies

to improve public services, compared to respondents from other groups. As shown in Columns 1-3 of Table 4, which include interactions between each attribute and an indicator for membership in the dominant group, the interaction terms are positive and statistically significant across all three outcomes. We also find suggestive evidence in support of Hypothesis 6a: the positive effect of linking eIDs with social protection payments on policy support was significantly greater for dominant group respondents compared to other groups. The interaction terms for the forced choice and willingness to register outcomes are positive, but fall short of statistical significance at the $p < 0.05$ level.[8]

Contrary to Hypothesis 8, we find no statistically significant differences in the effect of the voting attribute for opposition group respondents (see columns 4-6 in Table 4). We do find evidence in support of Hypothesis 7. Compared to other groups, respondents from the securitized group are significantly less likely to prefer policies that allow automatic data sharing with security agencies compared to policies that do not. The coefficients on the interaction between securitized group membership and the surveillance attribute are negative and statistically significant across all three outcomes (see columns 7-9 of Table 4). As is apparent in Figure 4, respondents in the securitized group still (weakly) prefer hypothetical policies that involve automatic sharing of biometric data with security services over hypothetical policies that restrict data sharing.[9] In general, it appears that securitized respondents' preference for, support for, and willingness to register under hypothetical eID policies is less

[8] The interaction for the forced choice outcome is significant at the $p < 0.1$ level.

[9] We note, however, that the effect of the security attribute is statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level only for the support outcome.

influenced by the specific features of the policy compared to other groups. We explore potential explanations for this pattern below.

6.2 Alternative explanations and Threats to Inference

Our findings point to significant differences between ethnic groups in the effects of specific policy features on attitudes toward hypothetical digital ID policies. However, the group-level heterogeneity we observe may be driven by other factors correlated with group membership, such as education levels or socio-economic status, rather than the group-specific relations to the state motivating our research design. While we cannot definitively rule this out, we implement additional analyses to probe potential alternative explanations.

First, respondents from the securitized group were less responsive to specific policy features in their support for eID policy proposals, compared to other respondents. This was not only true for surveillance-related attribute about which we hypothesized, but for most other attributes as well. One potential explanation for this difference is that respondents in this group were less likely to understand the conjoint task. To address this possibility, we first examined manipulation check failure rates across groups. As shown in Figure O1 in the online appendix, we do not find that securitized group respondents were significantly more likely than other groups to fail conjoint manipulation checks. Next, we drop respondents who failed manipulation checks in the first round and analyze only the second- and third-round responses of the remaining sample. As shown in Table O14 in the online appendix, our results remain

largely unchanged.[10] These findings suggest that the group-level differences in effects of the attributes were not driven by differences in comprehension.

Second, the fact that we did not find differential effects on our primary outcomes for the opposition group could reflect unusual features of the ethnic coalitions that arose ahead of the 2022 election, held shortly after we fielded our survey. The 2022 campaign differed from previous contests in that the political elite of the dominant group (specifically the Kikuyu) were divided between the two candidates: Raila Odinga (the opposition candidate and a Luo) and William Ruto (the dominant candidate and a Kikuyu).[11] Under these circumstances, support for the opposition candidate, rather than membership in an ethnic group that has historically been in opposition, may have been a more important predictor of views about the digitalization of voter registration. We assess this in a pre-registered analysis that interacts an indicator for support of the opposition candidate (Odinga) with the conjoint attributes. As shown in Table O22, consistent with our main analysis, we do not find that opposition supporters differ significantly from others in their views on linking digital ID with voting.

Third, we systematically compare the importance of ethnic group category to that of other observable respondent characteristics as predictors of heterogeneity in the effects of the conjoint attributes. Following Robinson and Duch (2022), we use a machine learning approach to estimate and compare the importance of different individual-level covariates for partitioning estimated

[10] We repeat this dropping respondents who failed in either the first or the second round and analyzing only the third-round responses of the remaining sample. See Table O15. Again, our results remain consistent.

[11] We discuss the political landscape and implications for our study in greater detail in the Section A1 of the appendix.

individual-level marginal component effects.[12] Results from this analysis appear in the online appendix. Group membership indicators consistently outperform other variables we might expect to matter, such as income, wealth, and education. For the public service attribute, membership in the dominant group is the single most important among all candidate predictors.[13] We additionally estimate our main specifications controlling for socioeconomic characteristics, including income, asset ownership, and education. Our results remain robust to the inclusion of these control variables.[14]

6.3 Robustness

We implement a range of additional specifications to further examine the robustness of our results. First, we re-estimate all models including a dummy variable for whether respondents were based in Nairobi or another location. Our main results remain robust, suggesting that the group-level differences we observe are not driven by the greater representation of certain groups in the Nairobi sample (see Table 9). The results are also robust to models including enumerator and round fixed effects (see Tables O2 and O3 in the Online Appendix).

Second, we drop all "unclassified" respondents, i.e. those not coded as dominant (Kikuyu and Kalenjin), opposition (Luo), or securitized (Somali) (see Tables O4 to O7 in the Online Appendix). In these specifications, we compare each group to the other two groups only (for example, we only compare the dominant group to the opposition and the securitized group). Effect sizes and directions remain close to those in the original analyses except for respondents

12 We use the cjbart package in R: https://github.com/tsrobinson/cjbart
13 See Figure O5 in the online appendix.
14 See Table O1 in the online appendix.

in the opposition group. However, when comparing the opposition to the dominant group only (by excluding the securitized group from the sample), effect size and direction of the interaction effects are close to those in the original analyses and even more pronounced (see Tables O8 and O9 in the Online Appendix).

Third, we recode group membership for each respondent using the classifications in the Ethnics Power Relations (EPR) dataset that correspond most closely to our pre-specified ethnic group categories (Vogt et al. 2015).[15] The results are consistent with our findings (see Tables O10 to O13 in the Online Appendix)

6.4 Mechanisms

We now examine the effects of different policy features on respondents' beliefs about the implications of hypothetical eID policies. These additional analyses help shed light on potential mechanisms underlying the findings for our primary outcomes, and provide suggestive evidence about the possible effects of eID programs on political behavior. Figure 4 presents results from these analyses, showing the average marginal component effects for each attribute on responses to a series of statements about the hypothetical eID policies, by subgroup.[16]

15 See Online Appendix Section 1.6 for further details.
16 We estimate the same specification used with the primary outcomes, replacing the dependent variable in Equation 1 with each secondary outcome in turn. See Appendix Tables 5-7 for a more detailed representation of the results.



Figure 4. *Average marginal effects of policy attributes on agreement with the following statements about hypothetical eID policies: "If this policy were enacted...the program would make it easier for people like me to access government services", "the privacy of my data would be adequately protected", "I would be worried about the police using my personal information", "I would be worried about being punished for expressing my political views", and "I would be worried about my vote being counted". Agreement is measured on scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree). Bars represent 95% confidence intervals, with standard errors clustered at the respondent level.*

On average, respondents from all three groups who were shown policies that made an explicit link between eID and improved public service provision

were more likely to agree that the policies would make it easier for people like themselves to access government services (as shown in Figure 4, upper left panel, first column). When we examine the three types of ethnic groups separately, however, it is clear that the securitized group's beliefs about access to government services are significantly less affected by government policy surrounding the use of eID data, compared to the dominant and opposition groups.[17] We see smaller but still significant positive effects for respondents who were shown policies making an explicit link between eID and social protection transfers, but here we do not observe significant differences across ethnic groups.

Next, we turn to the effects of different eID policy features on concerns about one's vote being fairly counted. Interestingly, we find that opposition group respondents were *less* worried about their vote being counted under policies that would require a digital ID for voter registration, both compared to policies that would not require a digital ID ($p < 0.05$) and relative to other groups ($p < 0.1$). This finding may reflect low levels of trust in the existing electoral process on the part of opposition group members (particularly during what had been a highly contentious electoral season). A voter registration process based on a new eID system may simply be seen as an improvement over a dissatisfying status quo.

Finally, we examine the effects of eID policy features on concerns about the security of one's personal information, data privacy more generally, and concerns about open political speech. Respondents in all subgroups become more worried, on average, about their personal information being used by the

17 As shown in Figure 5, depicting marginal means for each attribute value for this outcome, securitized group respondents were slightly more confident overall about their ability to access government services.

police and about being punished for expressing their political views under hypothetical eID policies that would facilitate greater state surveillance. This effect is particularly strong for members of the opposition group (see Figures 7 and 9 in the appendix). Opposition respondents are also significantly less likely to express confidence in the privacy of their data under these conditions.

By contrast, the effects of the surveillance attribute on these concerns were significantly less pronounced for securitized group respondents, compared to the rest of the sample. Importantly, however, as shown in Figures 7 and 9 in the appendix, securitized group respondents were more concerned on average about use of their personal information by the police and about expressing their political views.[18]

7 Discussion

In the following, we discuss our core results in greater detail. First, contrary to our expectations, but perhaps encouragingly for digitalization efforts, we do not find evidence that concerns about government use of eIDs in ways that are potentially costly (such as enhanced state surveillance capacity) reduce support for and likely uptake of eIDs. Second, however, and in line with our expectations, dominant, opposition, and securitized groups respond differently to potential uses of eID by the state. Finally, we find suggestive evidence that the introduction of eIDs might indirectly contribute to intergroup inequality by affecting political behavior across groups in different ways.

While respondents generally support policies linking eIDs with potential benefits, respondents are *also* more supportive of policies that use eIDs in ways that are potentially costly (compared to policies that limit the use of eID data in

[18] The fact that the securitized group's beliefs are affected by the specific attributes to a lesser extent does not mean they are less concerned than respondents from other groups *in general*.

these domains). In particular, respondents are more supportive of policies that require eIDs for voter registration (compared to those that do not) and of policies that allow unrestricted sharing of biometric data with security agencies to improve surveillance capabilities (compared to those that limit this access). The positive effects of surveillance-enhancing features suggest a demand for better security provision by the state, perhaps in response to numerous deadly terrorist attacks in the past decade. The results for voter registration may reflect widespread (and widely documented) mistrust in Kenya's current electoral system (Brechenmacher and Sambuli 2022). Respondents might welcome any initiative that attempts to reform the current electoral system.

Even though respondents generally prefer greater integration of eIDs with various government functions, group-level heterogeneous effects reveal differences in support across dominant, opposition, and securitized groups. Dominant group members are relatively more supportive of eID policies featuring more efficient access to public services and enhanced surveillance capacity. A likely explanation is that the dominant group has historically been favored in its access to public services such as education (Kramon and Posner 2016). This is also supported by our finding that respondents from the dominant group who were shown policies that made an explicit link between eID and improved public service provision were more likely than other groups to agree that eIDs would make it easier for people like themselves to access government services (as shown in Table 5, column 1). For the surveillance attribute, a plausible explanation is that dominant group members anticipate that any increase in the effectiveness of the state security apparatus caused by eID will on average benefit rather than harm them. The executive branch responsible for implementing video surveillance during the past decade was led by

members of dominant ethnic groups that felt particularly affected by the terrorist attacks committed by Al-Shabaab (Lind, Mutahi, and Oosterom 2017).

Turning to what we initially conceptualized as costs of eIDs, we find that members of both opposition (Luo) and securitized (Somali) groups are relatively less supportive of eID policies that involve sharing biometric data with state security services. While members of the dominant groups might perceive surveillance as a benefit for public security, members of marginalized groups may be more ambivalent. As indicated by our mechanisms analyses, members of opposition groups become more worried about their personal information being used by the police and that they will be punished for expressing their political views if digital IDs are connected to surveillance (Table 6, column 3 and 5). These results point to the risk that eIDs may lead to differential effects on political behavior across groups – if these concerns curb participation by members of opposition groups in routine political behavior, such as peaceful protest, or choosing to stand for office, the push for digitalization may exacerbate rather than reduce political inequality.

In contrast, our mechanisms analysis suggests that members of the securitized group are actually less worried about sharing their personal information with the government and about being punished for expressing their political views than the rest of the sample when they are shown eID policy proposals that contain a link to surveillance. This seemingly counter-intuitive finding may simply reflect the fact that they are already significantly more worried than members of other groups about these issues in general, and, as such, the surveillance priming has less of an effect on this group. It may also indicate that the idea of establishing an eID program that would *not* be used for

surveillance is simply not credible to a group that has already been the subject of such severe policing.

Finally, and contrary to our initial expectations, we find that members of the opposition group are not less supportive of eID policies linked to voter registration than other respondents. Our mechanisms analyses show that when respondents are shown hypothetical policies that would require an eID to vote, members of the opposition group are *less* worried about their vote being counted than the rest of the population (Table 6, column 4). This finding may reflect low levels of trust in the existing electoral process on the part of opposition group members (particularly during what had been a highly contentious electoral season). In light of the outcome of recent national elections in Kenya, where opposition groups are repeatedly excluded from office by a narrow margin, they may simply believe that a new, digitized identification system can only be an improvement over the status quo.

8 Conclusions

The push to introduce eID systems has myriad potential benefits for government efficiency and offers the promise of significant expansion in access to government services across social groups. But early initiatives in India, South Africa, and elsewhere have raised concerns that logistical barriers to registration in digital ID programs in poor or otherwise marginalized communities may actually wind up exacerbating, rather than reducing, inequalities in access to a range of public goods and services, particularly in settings where eIDs become necessary to access these benefits.

Although existing studies have highlighted these (important) logistical hurdles, little existing research has focused on another potential source of intergroup

inequality in the impact of eIDs – differential *willingness* to take up eID among different social groups as well as their unqueal impact on political participation. Our study explores this question and suggests there may be reason for concern, as group histories shape individual expectations of the potential benefits and costs of digital ID policies.

In a conjoint experiment with 2,073 respondents drawn from four regions across Kenya – where the roll-out of an eID program was halted by court order in 2021 amid controversies about data privacy – we investigate how hypothetical policies emphasizing potential costs and benefits of eIDs for citizens affect support and willingness to register for eIDs as well as potential mechanisms through which they do. On average, we find that citizens are more supportive of hypothetical eID programs that link eIDs to government benefits and improved public services. Perhaps surprisingly, policies leveraging eIDs to increase government extraction and surveillance capacity do *not* reduce support or willingness to register for eIDs. If anything, these policies make citizens more positively inclined toward eIDs.

These findings weigh against the idea that differential concerns about costs of increased legibility through eIDs are likely to lead to inequalities in uptake. On the other hand, we do find meaningful group differences in the effects of these hypothetical policy features on support. Importantly, we find that members of "securitized" groups, with a history of policing by the state, were less positively persuaded than other groups when presented with details linking eID to a range of potential costs (surveillance, taxation) and even potential benefits (improved public goods provision). This finding may reflect greater ambivalence about the potential security benefits of eIDs within this community, or even a lack of trust in measures the state may take to *limit* use of biometric data for surveillance.

Finally, our findings highlight the need for further investigation into the consequences of legibility for political behavior. We find suggestive evidence that opposition groups in particular become more concerned about data privacy and the consequences of political speech under policies that use eIDs to enhance surveillance capacity. While concerns about eIDs and surveillance among opposition groups may not exacerbate inequality through differential uptake, they may contribute to political inequality if they disproportionately discourage opposition political participation.

References

Allie, Feyaad. 2022. "Facial Recognition Technology and Voter Turnout." *The Journal of Politics* forthcoming. https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/722039

Bates, Robert H. 1974. "Ethnic Competition and Modernization in Contemporary Africa." *Comparative Political Studies* 6(4): 457–84. https://doi.org/10.1177/001041407400600403.

Bossuroy, Thomas, Clara Delavallade, and Vincent Pons. 2019. "Biometric Tracking, Healthcare Provision, and Data Quality: Experimental Evidence from Tuberculosis Control." http://www.nber.org/papers/w26388.

Brechenmacher, Saskia, and Nanjira Sambuli. 2022. "The Specter of Politics as Usual in Kenya's 2022 Election." https://carnegieendowment.org/2022/07/27/specter-of-politics-as-usual-in-kenya-s-2022-election-pub-87578.

Burgess, Robin et al. 2015. "The Value of Democracy: Evidence from Road Building in Kenya." *American Economic Review* 105(6): 1817–51.

Domeyer, Axel, Mike McCarthy, Simon Pfeiffer, and Gundbert Scherf. 2020. *How Governments Can Deliver on the Promise of Digital ID*. McKinsey & Company. https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/public-sector/our-insights/how-governments-can-deliver-on-the-promise-of-digital-id#/ (June 16, 2023)

Eck, Kristine, Sophia Hatz, Charles Crabtree, and Atsushi Tago. 2021. "Evade and Deceive? Citizen Responses to Surveillance." *The Journal of Politics* 83(4): 1545–58. https://doi.org/10.1086/715073

Ferrali, Romain, Guy Grossman, Melina R. Platas, and Jonathan Rodden. 2022. "Who Registers? Village Networks, Household Dynamics, and Voter Registration in Rural Uganda." *Comparative Political Studies* 55(6): 899–932. https://doi.org/10.1177/00104140211036048

Foucault, Michel. 1991. "Governmentality." In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, eds. Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, Peter Miller, and and an Interview with Michel Foucault. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/F/bo3684463.html (April 21, 2023).

Garcia, Maria Melody, and Christian Von Haldenwang. 2016. "Do Democracies Tax More? Political Regime Type and Taxation." *Journal of International Development* 28(4): 485–506

Gelb, Alan, and Julia Clark. 2013. "Identification for Development: The Biometrics Revolution." *SSRN Electronic Journal*. http://www.ssrn.com/abstract=2226594

Gibson, Clark C., and James D. Long. 2009. "The presidential and parliamentary elections in Kenya, December 2007." *Electoral Studies* 28(3): 497–502. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2009.01.005

Habibov, Nazim, Alex Cheung, and Alena Auchynnikava. 2018. "Does Institutional Trust Increase Willingness to Pay More Taxes to Support the Welfare State?" *Sociological Spectrum* 38(1): 51–68. https://doi.org/10.1080/02732173.2017.1409146

Hainmueller, Jens, Daniel J. Hopkins, and Teppei Yamamoto. 2014. "Causal Inference in Conjoint Analysis: Understanding Multidimensional Choices via Stated Preference Experiments." *Political Analysis* 22(1): 1–30. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/political-analysis/article/causal-inference-in-conjoint-analysis-understanding-multidimensional-choices-via-stated-preference-experiments/414DA03BAA2ACE060FFE005F53EFF8C8 (September 17, 2018)

Hunter, Wendy, and Robert Brill. 2016. "'Documents, Please': Advances in Social Protection and Birth Certification in the Developing World." *World Politics* 68(2): 191–228. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0043887115000465

Jain, Anil, Lin Hong, and Sharath Pankanti. 2000. "Biometric Identification." *Communications of the ACM* 43(2): 90–98.

Kam, Stefanie, and Michael Clarke. 2021. "Securitization, Surveillance and 'de-Extremization' in Xinjiang." *International Affairs* 97(3): 625–42. https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iiab038

Khera, Reetika. 2017. "Impact of Aadhaar in Welfare Programmes." *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://www.ssrn.com/abstract=3045235

Kramon, Eric, and Daniel N. Posner. 2016. "Ethnic Favoritism in Education in Kenya." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 11(1): 1–58.

Lee, Melissa M., and Nan Zhang. 2017. "Legibility and the Informational Foundations of State Capacity." *The Journal of Politics* 79(1): 118–32.

Lind, Jeremy, Patrick Mutahi, and Marjoke Oosterom. 2017. "'Killing a Mosquito with a Hammer': Al-Shabaab Violence and State Security Responses in Kenya." *Peacebuilding* 5(2): 118–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/21647259.2016.1277010

Macdonald, Ayang. 2022. "Kenya Pushes on with Huduma Namba as Compulsory Digital ID Amid Controversy." https://www.biometricupdate.com/202201/kenya-pushes-on-with-huduma-namba-as-compulsory-digital-id-amid-controversy

Manby, Bronwen. 2021. "The Sustainable Development Goals and 'Legal Identity for All':'first, Do No Harm'." *World Development* 139: 105343

Mann, Michael. 1984. "The Autonomous Power of the State : Its Origins, Mechanisms and Results." *European Journal of Sociology* 25(2): 185–213. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23999270 (April 11, 2023).

Muralidharan, Karthik, Paul Niehaus, and Sandip Sukhtankar. 2016. "Building State Capacity: Evidence from Biometric Smartcards in India." *American Economic Review* 106(10): 2895–2929. https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/10.1257/aer.20141346

Mutung'u, G., and I. Rutenberg. 2020. "Digital ID and Risk of Statelessness." *Statelessness & Citizenship Review* 2: 348–54. https://statelessnessandcitizenshipreview.com/index.php/journal/article/view/101

Mwangi, Oscar Gakuo, and Catherine Waithera Mwangi. 2019. "The Securitization of Political Discourse in Reinforcing Regimes of Power in Kenya." *Language, Discourse & Society* 7(2): 55–73

Odote, Collins, and Karuti Kanyinga. 2021. "Election Technology, Disputes, and Political Violence in Kenya." *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 56(3): 558–71.

Piccolino, Giulia. 2015. "Making Democracy Legible? Voter Registration and the Permanent Electronic Electoral List in Benin." *Development and Change* 46(2): 269–92. https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.12148

———. 2016. "Infrastructural State Capacity for Democratization? Voter Registration and Identification in Côte d'ivoire and Ghana Compared." *Democratization* 23(3): 498–519. https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2014.983906

Privacy International. 2020. "Kenyan Court Ruling on Huduma Namba Identity System: The Good, the Bad and the Lessons." https://privacyinternational.org/long-read/3373/kenyan-court-ruling-huduma-namba-identity-system-good-bad-and-lessons

———. 2022. "Data Protection Impact Assessments and ID Systems: The 2021 Kenyan Ruling on Huduma Namba." https://privacyinternational.org/news-analysis/4778/data-protection-impact-assessments-and-id-systems-2021-kenyan-ruling-huduma

Rao, Ursula. 2019. "Biometric IDs and the Remaking of the Indian (Welfare) State." *Economic Sociology – the European Electronic Newsletter* 21(1): 13–21. http://hdl.handle.net/10419/223108

Robinson, Thomas S., and Raymond M. Duch. 2022. "How to Detect Heterogeneity in Cjoint Experiments." *Working Paper*

Scacco, Alexandra, Lisa Garbe, Kelly Zhang, and Nina McMurry. 2022. "Digitalization, Legibility, and Intergroup Inequality: The Case of eIDs in Kenya." https://osf.io/w8jcz

Scott, James C. 1998. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Shirk, Mark. 2019. "The Universal Eye: Anarchist 'Propaganda of the Deed' and Development of the Modern Surveillance State." *International Studies Quarterly* 63(2): 334–45. https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqy062

Slater, Dan. 2008. "Can Leviathan Be Democratic? Competitive Elections, Robust Mass Politics, and State Infrastructural Power." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 43(3): 252–72. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12116-008-9026-8

Slater, Dan, and Sofia Fenner. 2011. "State Power and Staying Power: Infrastructural Mechanisms and Authoritarian Durability." *Journal of International Affairs* 65(1): 15–29. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24388179 (December 19, 2022)

Suri, Tavneet, and Shweta Bhogale. 2019. "Digital Identification & Finance Initiative Africa: An Overview of Research Opportunities." https://www.povertyactionlab.org/sites/default/files/review-paper/DigiFI_framing-paper_june-2019.pdf (June 16, 2023)

Szreter, Simon, and Keith Breckenridge. 2012. "Recognition and Registration: The Infrastructure of Personhood in World History." In *Registration and Recognition: Documenting the Person in World History*, Proceedings of the British Academy, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1–36

Vogt, Manuel et al. 2015. "Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327–42. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022002715591215

Weller, Toni. 2012. "The Information State: An Historical Perspective on Surveillance." In *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies*, Routledge, 57–63

Appendix

Table A1: *Descriptive statistics*

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Panel A: Sample Characteristics					
Heard Huduma Namba	2073	0.980	0.141	0	1
Voted in 2017 Election	2073	0.724	0.447	0	1
Female	2047	0.470	0.499	0	1
Age	2047	30.646	10.148	18	90
Panel B: Region					
Garissa	2073	0.139	0.346	0	1
Homa Bay	2073	0.0439	0.205	0	1
Kirinyaga	2073	0.0478	0.213	0	1
Kisumu	2073	0.0434	0.204	0	1
Migori	2073	0.0449	0.207	0	1
Murang'a	2073	0.0492	0.216	0	1
Nairobi	2073	0.513	0.500	0	1
Nyandarua	2073	0.0328	0.178	0	1
Nyeri	2073	0.0478	0.213	0	1
Siaya	2073	0.0381	0.192	0	1
Panel C: Language					
Kalenjin	2073	0.0106	0.102	0	1
Kikuyu	2073	0.293	0.455	0	1
Luo	2073	0.250	0.433	0	1
Somali	2073	0.158	0.365	0	1
Other Language	2073	0.284	0.451	0	1
Refused to answer	2073	0.00434	0.0658	0	1
Panel D: Education					
No formal schooling	2073	0.0145	0.119	0	1
Some primary school	2073	0.0299	0.170	0	1
Primary school completed	2073	0.185	0.389	0	1
Secondary school completed	2073	0.407	0.491	0	1
Post-secondary qualifications other than university	2073	0.202	0.401	0	1
At least some university	2073	0.157	0.364	0	1
Refused to answer	2073	0.00482	0.0693	0	1
Panel E: Religion					
Christian	2073	0.807	0.395	0	1
Muslim	2073	0.178	0.383	0	1
No Religion	2073	0.0106	0.102	0	1
Refused to answer	2073	0.00193	0.0439	0	1

Table A2: *Regions and Ethnicity*

	Garissa	Homa Bay	Kirinyaga	Kisumu	Migori	Murang'a	Nairobi	Nyandarua	Nyeri	Siaya	Total
Kamba	4					2	156	2	1		165
Somali	278						50				328
Swahili	6				1	1	10				18
Kisii		1		4	2	2	85	3	1	1	99
Luhya		3		6	2	2	201	6	1	6	227
Luo		87		74	84	1	200	1	1	71	519
Kikuyu			95			91	277	50	94		607
Meru			2			1	36	1	1		41
Pokot			1				1				2
Refused			1	2			4	1		1	9
Kalenjin				3			16	3			22
Other				1	4	2	16	1			24
Maasai							2				2
Mijikenda							3				3
Taita							6				6
Turkana							1				1
Total	288	91	99	90	93	102	1064	68	99	79	2073

Table A3: *Balances*

	Public Service	Social Protection	Surveillance	Tax Registration	Voting
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Heard Huduma Namba	0.024	−0.011	0.004	−0.019	−0.008
	(0.031)	(0.035)	(0.029)	(0.033)	(0.028)
Voted in 2017 Election	0.007	0.001	−0.020+	0.007	−0.006
	(0.012)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)
Female	−0.003	0.0003	0.002	0.024**	−0.0004
	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)
Age	−0.001	0.0005	0.001	0.001	0.001
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.0005)	(0.001)
Region: Homa Bay	0.008	−0.031	−0.026	−0.020	−0.036
	(0.039)	(0.041)	(0.045)	(0.036)	(0.035)
Region: Kirinyaga	−0.030	−0.061	−0.014	−0.048	0.023
	(0.039)	(0.039)	(0.043)	(0.034)	(0.034)
Region: Kisumu	0.024	−0.055	0.003	0.005	0.003
	(0.038)	(0.043)	(0.045)	(0.034)	(0.034)
Region: Migori	−0.007	−0.027	0.014	−0.027	0.022
	(0.039)	(0.042)	(0.045)	(0.034)	(0.034)
Region: Murang'a	−0.030	−0.061	−0.008	−0.018	0.037
	(0.039)	(0.042)	(0.044)	(0.034)	(0.034)
Region: Nairobi	−0.004	−0.033	0.003	−0.034	−0.008
	(0.031)	(0.033)	(0.037)	(0.024)	(0.025)
Region: Nyandarua	−0.018	−0.059	0.025	−0.045	0.014
	(0.039)	(0.042)	(0.047)	(0.037)	(0.037)
Region: Nyeri	−0.021	−0.090*	−0.0001	−0.010	−0.011
	(0.039)	(0.041)	(0.044)	(0.033)	(0.035)
Region: Siaya	0.012	0.008	0.009	−0.017	0.018
	(0.041)	(0.042)	(0.046)	(0.034)	(0.034)
Language: Kalenjin	−0.033	0.002	0.005	0.016	0.053+
	(0.043)	(0.042)	(0.039)	(0.048)	(0.031)
Language: Kikuyu	0.013	0.032*	−0.001	−0.004	−0.004
	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.015)
Language: Luo	−0.018	0.011	−0.010	−0.008	0.003
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.014)
Language: Somali	−0.062	0.026	−0.005	−0.029	−0.028
	(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.043)	(0.032)	(0.035)
Education: Some primary school	0.021	−0.011	−0.061	−0.008	0.039
	(0.052)	(0.041)	(0.043)	(0.042)	(0.041)
Education: Primary school completed	0.035	−0.030	−0.083*	−0.010	0.050
	(0.047)	(0.032)	(0.037)	(0.038)	(0.034)
Education: Secondary school completed	0.026	−0.021	−0.070+	−0.0001	0.043
	(0.046)	(0.031)	(0.036)	(0.037)	(0.034)
Education: Post-secondary qualifications other than university	0.039	−0.022	−0.069+	−0.008	0.035
	(0.047)	(0.032)	(0.037)	(0.038)	(0.034)
Education: At least some university	0.023	−0.030	-0.050	0.0002	0.038
	(0.047)	(0.033)	(0.037)	(0.038)	(0.035)
Religion: Christian	0.027	0.002	−0.151**	−0.028	−0.045
	(0.054)	(0.079)	(0.057)	(0.081)	(0.072)
Religion: Muslim	0.071	−0.043	−0.128*	−0.033	−0.017
	(0.056)	(0.085)	(0.060)	(0.082)	(0.073)
Religion: No Religion	0.057	−0.013	−0.178*	−0.050	−0.070
	(0.074)	(0.088)	(0.071)	(0.092)	(0.080)
Constant	0.450***	0.538***	0.710***	0.546***	0.503***
	(0.083)	(0.098)	(0.084)	(0.096)	(0.088)
CRSE at respondent level					
Observations	12,180	12,180	12,180	12,180	12,180
R^2	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.001
Adjusted R^2	−0.001	−0.001	−0.0002	−0.0005	−0.001

Table A4: *Main Effects Analysis*

	Choice	Support	Register	Choice	Support	Register	Choice	Support	Register
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Public Service	0.116***	0.338***	0.343***	0.116***	0.338***	0.343***	0.116***	0.339***	0.343***
	(0.009)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.009)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.009)	(0.019)	(0.019)
Social Protection	0.138***	0.361***	0.344***	0.138***	0.362***	0.345***	0.138***	0.360***	0.343***
	(0.009)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.009)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.009)	(0.019)	(0.019)
Surveillance	0.090***	0.285***	0.263***	0.090***	0.286***	0.264***	0.090***	0.283***	0.262***
	(0.010)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.010)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.010)	(0.019)	(0.019)
Tax Registration	0.007	0.035+	0.043*	0.007	0.034+	0.042*	0.007	0.038*	0.045*
	(0.010)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.010)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.010)	(0.019)	(0.020)
Voting	0.077***	0.248***	0.220***	0.077***	0.249***	0.220***	0.077***	0.246***	0.217***
	(0.009)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.009)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.009)	(0.019)	(0.019)
Dominant	−0.002	−0.051*	−0.042						
	(0.002)	(0.025)	(0.027)						
Pub. Service x Dom.	0.061**	0.148***	0.146***						
	(0.020)	(0.041)	(0.043)						
Soc. Prot. x Dom.	0.039+	0.085*	0.060						
	(0.020)	(0.040)	(0.041)						
Surveillance x Dom.	0.057**	0.117**	0.095*						
	(0.021)	(0.042)	(0.043)						
Tax Reg. x Dom.	0.044*	0.059	0.034						
	(0.021)	(0.043)	(0.045)						
Voting x Dom.	0.005	0.081+	0.120**						
	(0.020)	(0.042)	(0.042)						
Opposition				0.001	−0.007	0.006			
				(0.002)	(0.025)	(0.028)			
Pub. Service x Opp.				0.034	−0.072	−0.093*			
				(0.022)	(0.045)	(0.047)			
Soc. Prot. x Opp.				0.014	0.018	0.060			
				(0.021)	(0.045)	(0.044)			
Surveillance x Opp.				−0.024	−0.100*	−0.093*			
				(0.022)	(0.043)	(0.043)			
Tax Reg. x Opp.				−0.016	−0.038	−0.038			
				(0.022)	(0.045)	(0.046)			
Voting x Opp.				0.031	−0.008	−0.047			
				(0.021)	(0.045)	(0.045)			
Securitized							−0.0002	0.129***	0.057+
							(0.002)	(0.035)	(0.034)
Pub. Service x Sec.							−0.065**	−0.224***	−0.221***
							(0.025)	(0.046)	(0.047)
Soc. Prot. x Sec.							−0.058*	−0.268***	−0.240***
							(0.027)	(0.049)	(0.048)
Surveillance x Sec.							−0.062*	−0.218**	−0.222***
							(0.025)	(0.050)	(0.047)
Tax Reg. x Sec.							−0.054*	0.035	0.023
							(0.026)	(0.048)	(0.048)
Voting x Sec.							−0.081**	−0.110*	−0.158**
							(0.025)	(0.051)	(0.048)
Constant	0.500***	2.908***	2.901***	0.500***	2.908***	2.901***	0.500***	2.908***	2.901***
	(0.001)	(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.001)	(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.001)	(0.012)	(0.012)
CRSE at respondent level									
Observations	12,358	12,343	12,319	12,358	12,343	12,319	12,358	12,343	12,319
R^2	0.048	0.096	0.087	0.047	0.094	0.085	0.049	0.101	0.090
Adjusted R^2	0.047	0.095	0.086	0.046	0.093	0.084	0.048	0.100	0.089

Table A5: *Main Effects Mechanisms: Dominant*

	Access Services	Data Privacy	Worry Punished View	Worry Vote Counted	Worry Personal Info
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Public Service	0.945***	0.189***	0.055	0.020	0.076*
	(0.036)	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.037)	(0.036)
Social Protection	0.342***	0.131***	0.017	0.012	−0.029
	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.038)	(0.036)
Surveillance	0.183***	−0.042	0.492***	−0.003	0.702***
	(0.033)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.040)
Tax Registration	0.086**	0.092**	−0.005	−0.038	0.006
	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.037)	(0.036)
Voting	0.152***	0.131***	0.068+	−0.087*	0.013
	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.040)	(0.036)
Dominant	−0.009	−0.001	−0.097*	−0.041	−0.041
	(0.039)	(0.041)	(0.043)	(0.045)	(0.046)
Pub. Service x Dom.	0.112	−0.001	−0.051	−0.042	0.053
	(0.076)	(0.076)	(0.076)	(0.082)	(0.080)
Soc. Prot. x Dom.	0.167*	0.130+	0.002	−0.165*	−0.134+
	(0.074)	(0.077)	(0.078)	(0.083)	(0.081)
Surveillance x Dom.	0.110	0.046	−0.072	−0.106	−0.025
	(0.072)	(0.083)	(0.083)	(0.082)	(0.088)
Tax Reg. x Dom.	−0.024	−0.073	0.093	−0.033	−0.177*
	(0.072)	(0.075)	(0.076)	(0.080)	(0.080)
Voting x Dom.	0.172*	0.048	0.060	0.041	−0.015
	(0.073)	(0.079)	(0.079)	(0.090)	(0.081)
Constant	2.857***	2.738***	2.383***	2.360***	2.470***
	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.021)
CRSE at respondent level					
Observations	4,113	4,102	4,098	4,095	4,094
R^2	0.192	0.017	0.048	0.004	0.086
Adjusted R^2	0.190	0.015	0.045	0.001	0.084

Table A6: *Main Effects Mechanisms: Opposition*

	Access Services	Data Privacy	Worry Punished View	Worry Vote Counted	Worry Personal Info
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Public Service	0.945***	0.189***	0.053	0.016	0.075*
	(0.036)	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.037)	(0.036)
Social Protection	0.344***	0.128***	0.021	0.014	−0.026
	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.038)	(0.036)
Surveillance	0.179***	−0.045	0.489***	−0.005	0.701***
	(0.033)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.038)	(0.040)
Tax Registration	0.085*	0.090**	−0.005	−0.037	0.008
	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.037)	(0.036)
Voting	0.158***	0.136***	0.067+	−0.091*	0.011
	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.039)	(0.036)
Opposition	−0.078+	−0.031	0.009	−0.060	−0.009
	(0.042)	(0.043)	(0.045)	(0.047)	(0.047)
Pub. Service x Opp.	−0.014	0.018	0.034	0.029	−0.106
	(0.084)	(0.078)	(0.081)	(0.084)	(0.085)
Soc. Prot. x Opp.	−0.100	−0.132	0.013	0.127	0.115
	(0.080)	(0.081)	(0.081)	(0.089)	(0.083)
Surveillance x Opp.	−0.142+	−0.291***	0.176*	0.017	0.248**
	(0.077)	(0.084)	(0.086)	(0.087)	(0.090)
Tax Reg. x Opp.	−0.061	−0.059	−0.048	0.037	−0.002
	(0.077)	(0.079)	(0.081)	(0.085)	(0.083)
Voting x Opp.	0.050	0.002	0.028	−0.181+	−0.050
	(0.078)	(0.080)	(0.080)	(0.094)	(0.085)
Constant	2.857***	2.736***	2.384***	2.359***	2.472***
	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.021)
CRSE at respondent level					
Observations	4,113	4,102	4,098	4,095	4,094
R^2	0.191	0.020	0.047	0.004	0.087
Adjusted R^2	0.189	0.017	0.044	0.001	0.084

Table A7: *Main Effects Mechanisms: Securitized*

	Access Services	Data Privacy	Worry Punished View	Worry Vote Counted	Worry Personal Info
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Public Service	0.946***	0.189***	0.060+	0.024	0.078*
	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.037)	(0.036)
Social Protection	0.346***	0.131***	0.019	0.014	−0.030
	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.038)	(0.036)
Surveillance	0.183***	−0.041	0.486***	−0.007	0.698***
	(0.033)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.039)
Tax Registration	0.079*	0.091**	−0.001	−0.036	0.012
	(0.033)	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.036)	(0.036)
Voting	0.158***	0.133***	0.070*	−0.086*	0.010
	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.039)	(0.036)
Securitized	0.080+	−0.030	0.263***	0.235***	0.079
	(0.046)	(0.047)	(0.050)	(0.051)	(0.051)
Pub. Service x Sec.	−0.841***	−0.008	0.076	0.001	0.102
	(0.086)	(0.086)	(0.090)	(0.091)	(0.091)
Soc. Prot. x Sec.	0.198*	−0.015	0.101	−0.007	0.031
	(0.092)	(0.087)	(0.090)	(0.093)	(0.090)
Surveillance x Sec.	−0.072	0.066	−0.197*	−0.020	−0.653***
	(0.083)	(0.088)	(0.095)	(0.092)	(0.098)
Tax Reg. x Sec.	0.098	0.080	0.056	−0.004	0.027
	(0.089)	(0.080)	(0.082)	(0.079)	(0.086)
Voting x Sec.	−0.049	0.056	0.010	0.052	0.127
	(0.090)	(0.082)	(0.084)	(0.085)	(0.086)
Constant	2.853***	2.738***	2.383***	2.360***	2.473***
	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)
CRSE at respondent level					
Observations	4,113	4,102	4,098	4,095	4,094
R^2	0.209	0.017	0.054	0.007	0.095
Adjusted R^2	0.207	0.014	0.051	0.004	0.092

Figure A1. *Marginal Means: Belief that the digital ID policy would make it easier to access government service*



Figure A2. *Marginal Means: Belief that the privacy of data would be adequately protected under the digital ID policy*



Figure A3. *Marginal Means: Concern about the police using one's personal information under the digital ID policy*



Figure A4. *Marginal Means: Concern about one's vote being counted under the digital ID policy*



Figure A5. *Marginal Means: Concern about being punished for expressing political views under the digital ID policy*



A.1 Political Analysis

A.1.1 Historical Context

We classify the Kikuyu and Kalenjin as dominant because these are the two ethnic groups who have held the presidency since Kenya's independence, who have been dominant in Kenyan national politics more generally, and have historically benefited the most from state patronage (Burgess et al. 2015; Kramon and Posner 2016) over the past few decades. Kenya was a one-party state under Kenyan African National Union (KANU) during the presidencies of Jomo Kenyatta (a Kikuyu) from 1964–1978 and Daniel Arap Moi (a Kalenjin) from 1978–2002. Kenya transitioned to multi-party politics in 1991 and KANU retained party dominance until 2002, when Mwai Kibaki (a Kikuyu) defeated KANU with the National Rainbow Coalition (NARC) and held office from 2002 to 2013. Kibaki was succeeded by Uhuru Kenyatta (also Kikuyu), who held office from 2013 to 2022.[19]

We classify the Luo as an opposition group because this group has been marginalized in Kenyan politics since independence, as no Luo has yet held the presidency. Jaramogi Oginga Odinga (a Luo) was vice president to Jomo Kenyatta and was a prominent opposition leader during Kenyatta's presidency. During the 2007 elections, claims of vote rigging incited serious unrest in the country, as Raila Odinga (his son) had taken an early lead on the first day of ballot counting, but incumbent President Mwai Kibaki erased that margin and went on to win by 2% of the vote (Gibson and Long 2009). During the 2013 elections, Odinga lost to

[19] Note that Uhuru Kenyatta is the son of Jomo Kenyatta. He was also the appointed successor to Moi, who represented KANU and who lost to Kibaki during the 2002 elections.

Uhuru Kenyatta under similar conditions.[20] During the 2017 elections, Raila Odinga successfully petitioned the Supreme Court to nullify the presidential election results, due to allegations that the vote had been electronically manipulated to assure a victory for Kenyatta.[21] Another presidential election was held subsequently in October 2017, with Uhuru Kenyatta re-elected as president.

We classify Somali Kenyans as a securitized group because the government has launched a series of security operations specifically targeting "Somalis residing in Kenya [who were] constructed as existential threats to national security" (Mwangi and Mwangi (2019), p. 1). The northeastern region of Kenya shares a border with Somalia, which has become a stronghold for al Shabab, an Islamic insurgent group active in East Africa. On September 2013, al Shabab militants carried out a multi-day attack on Westgate, a popular Nairobi mall frequented by families during the weekend, executing hostages and killing more than 60 people.[22] On April 2015, four Somali Kenyan militants entered Kenya's Garissa University College and killed 148 people, targeting those identified as Christians.[23] Other attacks include the killing in 2014 of 28 passengers on a bus in Mandera, in the northeastern region of Kenya.[24] In

---

[20] "Kenya's Odinga to file Supreme Court election petition on Friday," 14 March 2013, Reuters. https://www.reuters.com/article/us-kenya-elections-petition/kenyas-odinga-to-file-supreme-court-election-petition-on-friday-idUSBRE92D0TJ20130314

[21] "Kenya Supreme Court Nullifies Presidential Election," 1 September 2017, The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/01/world/africa/kenya-election-kenyatta-odinga.html

[22] "Gunmen Kill Dozens in Terror Attack at Kenyan Mall," 21 September 2013, The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/22/world/africa/nairobi-mall-shooting.html

[23] "Garissa University College attack in Kenya: What happened?" 19 June 2019, BBC News. ht{}tps://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-48621924

[24] "Kenya bus attack survivor tells how gunmen selected their victims," 23 November 2014, The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/nov/23/kenya-bus-attack-survivor-tells-how-gunmen-selected-their-victims

response, Somali Kenyans have been broadly targeted for surveillance by the government, with frequent raids of Nairobi's heavily Somali Eastleigh neighborhood by the police, who regularly sweep the neighborhood searching for al Shabab supporters.[25]

A.1.2 2022 Election Context

During the 2022 elections, the main contenders were Raila Odinga (opposition, Luo) and William Ruto (dominant, Kalenjin). The dominant group, the Kikuyu, were split between the two presidential aspirants, as both presidential candidates had running mates from the dominant group of the Kikuyu, as Raila Odinga (Luo) ran with Martha Karua (Kikuyu) and William Ruto (Kalenjin) ran with Rigathi Gachagua (Kikuyu).

During this election, opposition voters were more likely to believe that the opposition candidate would win than for previous elections, as the incumbent President Uhuru Kenyatta endorsed the opposition candidate (Odinga) rather than the dominant candidate (Ruto). We leverage this to compare how differing expectations of an opposition win influences our mechanisms analysis. This exploratory analysis was pre-specified and leverages the 2022 election context to better understand how dominant and marginalized groups may react differently to digital ID policies based on expectations of political dominance.

Those who believed that the opposition would win are significantly more likely to believe that they would benefit from digital ID in accessing services with the public service attribute and less likely believe that they would be punished for their view with the policy attributes of taxation and voting. Those

[25] "Somalis In Kenya Are Used To Raids, But Say This Was Different," 18 April 2014, NPR. https://www.npr.org/2014/04/18/304574122/somalis-in-kenya-are-used-to-raids-but-say-this-was-different

who are optimistic about an opposition win are also less worried that their vote would be counted with the policy attribute of voting being linked to digital IDs. This suggests that regardless of ethnic group affiliation, support for digital ID policies is linked heavily with expectations about which political candidate will hold office, likely due to expectations of benefits and costs from a history of political favoritism.

Table A8: *Mechanisms Subgroup Analysis: 2022 Opposition Likely to Win*

	Access Services	Data Privacy	Worry Punished View	Worry Vote Counted	Worry Personal Info
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Public Service	−6.489	−6.052	−5.719	−0.762	0.898
	(4.022)	(5.186)	(4.892)	(5.534)	(4.711)
Social Protection	1.607	−0.049	−2.413	3.149	8.407+
	(3.435)	(3.626)	(4.491)	(5.014)	(4.301)
Surveillance	8.069**	0.434	2.768	1.652	1.193
	(2.886)	(4.780)	(4.482)	(4.040)	(4.300)
Tax Registration	2.270	1.313	7.699+	0.453	5.854
	(3.375)	(3.708)	(4.354)	(4.690)	(4.120)
Voting	1.586	6.898	2.721	7.745+	4.588
	(3.571)	(5.308)	(4.038)	(4.696)	(4.341)
Opp. Win	2.378	4.577	2.083	3.990	1.029
	(2.412)	(3.063)	(3.398)	(3.398)	(3.505)
Pub. Service x Opp. Win	10.894*	7.557	4.117	4.355	9.119
	(4.763)	(5.871)	(6.204)	(6.304)	(6.085)
Soc. Prot. x Opp. Win	−6.853	3.317	3.039	−6.058	−9.001
	(4.251)	(4.555)	(5.876)	(6.184)	(6.054)
Surveillance x Opp. Win	−4.228	−2.050	−0.963	4.949	1.796
	(3.820)	(5.521)	(5.863)	(5.418)	(6.057)
Tax Reg. x Opp. Win	−1.549	−2.400	−11.537*	−5.755	−6.123
	(4.247)	(4.606)	(5.784)	(6.103)	(5.452)
Voting x Opp. Win	−3.090	−6.703	−8.706+	−12.159*	−6.172
	(4.342)	(5.993)	(5.219)	(5.626)	(5.798)
Constant	−3.062	−6.949**	−7.127**	−8.957**	−7.167*
	(2.062)	(2.606)	(2.683)	(2.762)	(2.809)
CRSE at respondent level					
Observations	4,150	4,150	4,150	4,150	4,150
R^2	0.005	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.003
Adjusted R^2	0.002	−0.0003	−0.00004	0.0004	0.001

A1. Robustness Checks

Table A9: *Main Effects Analysis: Nairobi Dummy*

	Choice (1)	Support (2)	Register (3)	Choice (4)	Support (5)	Register (6)	Choice (7)	Support (8)	Register (9)
Public Service	0.116***	0.340***	0.344***	0.116***	0.340***	0.344***	0.116***	0.340***	0.344***
	(0.009)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.009)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.009)	(0.019)	(0.019)
Social Protection	0.138***	0.362***	0.345***	0.139***	0.363***	0.347***	0.138***	0.361***	0.344***
	(0.009)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.009)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.009)	(0.018)	(0.019)
Surveillance	0.090***	0.285***	0.263***	0.090***	0.286***	0.264***	0.090***	0.284***	0.262***
	(0.009)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.009)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.010)	(0.019)	(0.019)
Tax Registration	0.007	0.033+	0.041*	0.006	0.032+	0.040*	0.007	0.036+	0.043*
	(0.010)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.010)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.010)	(0.019)	(0.020)
Voting	0.077***	0.247***	0.218***	0.077***	0.247***	0.219***	0.077***	0.245***	0.216***
	(0.009)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.009)	(0.019)	(0.019)	(0.009)	(0.019)	(0.019)
Dominant	−0.002	−0.061*	−0.049+						
	(0.002)	(0.025)	(0.027)						
Pub. Service x Dom.	0.063**	0.160***	0.158***						
	(0.020)	(0.041)	(0.043)						
Soc. Prot. x Dom.	0.039+	0.103*	0.070+						
	(0.020)	(0.040)	(0.041)						
Surveillance x Dom.	0.062**	0.133**	0.112**						
	(0.021)	(0.042)	(0.042)						
Tax Reg. x Dom.	0.045*	0.062	0.039						
	(0.021)	(0.043)	(0.044)						
Voting x Dom.	0.004	0.072+	0.114**						
	(0.020)	(0.042)	(0.042)						
Opposition				0.0005	−0.025	−0.006			
				(0.002)	(0.026)	(0.028)			
Pub. Service x Opp.				0.038+	−0.049	−0.068			
				(0.022)	(0.045)	(0.047)			
Soc. Prot. x Opp.				0.012	0.037	0.070			
				(0.021)	(0.045)	(0.044)			
Surveillance x Opp.				−0.012	−0.067	−0.061			
				(0.023)	(0.043)	(0.043)			
Tax Reg. x Opp.				−0.013	−0.032	−0.027			
				(0.022)	(0.045)	(0.046)			
Voting x Opp.				0.030	−0.015	−0.050			
				(0.021)	(0.046)	(0.045)			
Securitized							−0.0001	0.095*	0.030
							(0.002)	(0.037)	(0.038)
Pub. Service x Sec.							−0.063*	−0.177***	−0.169**
							(0.027)	(0.049)	(0.052)
Soc. Prot. x Sec.							−0.069*	−0.240***	−0.234***
							(0.029)	(0.052)	(0.052)
Surveillance x Sec.							−0.035	−0.147**	−0.151**
							(0.027)	(0.053)	(0.050)
Tax Reg. x Sec.							−0.051+	0.064	0.064
							(0.027)	(0.053)	(0.054)
Voting x Sec.							−0.090***	−0.145**	−0.186***
							(0.027)	(0.055)	(0.053)
Constant	0.500***	2.907***	2.900***	0.500***	2.907***	2.901***	0.500***	2.908***	2.901***
	(0.001)	(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.001)	(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.001)	(0.011)	(0.012)
CRSE at respondent level									
Nairobi Dummy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	12,358	12,343	12,319	12,358	12,343	12,319	12,358	12,343	12,319
R^2	0.050	0.105	0.093	0.048	0.101	0.091	0.050	0.106	0.094
Adjusted R^2	0.049	0.104	0.092	0.047	0.100	0.089	0.049	0.104	0.093

Kenya eID Survey

Consent form

(Enumerator should read in full and provide for the respondent to read themselves)

Thank you for your interest in this survey, which is funded and conducted by a team of social science researcher at WZB Berlin Social Center, a research institution in Germany. Any information we collect is ONLY for academic research. We are interested in your honest opinions and your living situation in order to understand the views of people in Kenya.

This survey should take around 30 minutes and is designed to help us learn more about citizens preferences for different policies concerning digital identification. We are also interested in better understanding social and political issues in Kenya. Please note that you can withdraw from the study at any stage, if it makes you feel uncomfortable.

All the answers you are providing will be fully anonymous. When the results of this research are published, we will always report general results which cannot be used to identify individual participants and we will never use a participant's name or personal information.

As a token of thanks for your participation, you will receive 150 KSh worth of mobile phone credit.

If you would like to receive an overview of the final results of the study or if you have any concerns or questions about the study or your rights as a participant, please contact Lisa Garbe via the email: lisa.garbe@wzb.eu

Do you agree to participate in this survey?

❍Yes ❍No

IF NO, END THE SURVEY

Date (YYYY/MM/DD)
Location (County, Sub-county, Sub-location)
Start time
End time

1. What is your age? (Numeric field ranging from 18 years and up.)

2. What is your gender?

❍ Male ❍ Female ❍ Other

3. Which of the following online messaging services or apps do you use, if any?

(Please read answer choices out loud and select all that apply.)

❍ WhatsApp
❍ Facebook Messenger
❍ Signal
❍ Telegram
❍ Other (please specify): _____
❍ None
❍ Don't know
❍ Refused to answer

4. In general, how concerned are you about the privacy of your personal data?
(Please read the answer options out loud.)

❍ Very concerned ❍ Somewhat concerned ❍ Not very concerned
❍ Not at all concerned ❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

5. Have you heard of Huduma Namba, the Kenyan government's national identity program?

❍ Yes (go to q6) ❍ No (skip to q14) ❍ Don't know (skip to q14)
❍ Refused to answer (skip to q14)

6. IF YES, how did you FIRST hear about the Huduma Namba program?
(Do NOT read out answer options.)

❍ Family or friends ❍ The radio ❍ Television
❍ Social media ❍ Local government officials ❍ Other (please specify): _____
❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

7. Have you personally registered for a Huduma Namba card?

❍ Yes (go to q8) ❍ No (go to q10) ❍ Don't know (skip to q14)
❍ Refused to answer (skip to q14)

8. IF YES, why did you decide to register?

(Do NOT read out answer options. Select all answers that apply.)

❍ To make it easier to access government services
❍ To make it easier for access to private services
❍ Friends or family recommended it
❍ Someone in the government recommended it
❍ There was a registration drive in my area
❍ Registration is mandatory
❍ Other (please specify)

9. Have you already received your Huduma Namba card?

❍ Yes ❍ No ❍ Don't know

10. (If answer is NO to question 7): Were you unable to register or did you choose not to register?

❍ I was unable to register (go to q11) ❍ I chose not to register (go to q12)

11. (If answer is "unable to register" to question 10): Why were you unable to register?

(Do NOT read response options. Select all answers that apply.)

❍ The line was too long at the registration center ❍ I did not have the needed documentation ❍ Another reason (please specify): _____

12. (If answer is "chose not to register" to question 11): Why have you not tried to register?
(Do NOT read response options. Select all answers that apply.)

❍ I had not heard of the program
❍ I knew about the program but did not know how to register
❍ The program was suspended before I was able to register
❍ I do not have the needed documentation
❍ I did not see the need to get it
❍ I do not want to share information with the government
❍ Another reason (please specify): _____
❍ Don't know
❍ Refused to answer

13. (If answer is NO to question 7): Based on your current understanding of the program, do you plan to register in the future?

❍ Yes ❍ No ❍ Don't know
❍ Refused to answer

How **much do you trust** each of the following, or haven't you heard enough to say.... *(Please read answer options out loud.)*		
14. …The President		
❍ Not at all	❍ Just a little	❍ Somewhat
❍ A lot	❍ Don't know/haven't heard	❍ Refused to answer
15. …the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission [or IEBC]		
❍ Not at all	❍ Just a little	❍ Somewhat
❍ A lot	❍ Don't know/haven't heard	❍ Refused to answer
16. …the police		
❍ Not at all	❍ Just a little	❍ Somewhat
❍ A lot	❍ Don't know/haven't heard	❍ Refused to answer
17. …courts of law		
❍ Not at all	❍ Just a little	❍ Somewhat
❍ A lot	❍ Don't know/haven't heard	❍ Refused to answer

18. …the Kenya Revenue Authority [or KRA]		
❍ Not at all	❍ Just a little	❍ Somewhat
❍ A lot	❍ Don't know/haven't heard	❍ Refused to answer
19. …religious leaders		
❍ Not at all	❍ Just a little	❍ Somewhat
❍ A lot	❍ Don't know/haven't heard	❍ Refused to answer

20. In the past five years, have you participated in a political protest or demonstration?

❍ Yes ❍ No ❍ Don't know
❍ Refused to answer

21. Which presidential party did you support during the 2017 national elections?

❍ I did not vote
❍ Amani National Congress (ANC)
❍ Chama cha Kazi
❍ Democratic Party (DP)
❍ FORD-K
❍ Jubilee Alliance Party (JAP)
❍ KANU
❍ Maendeleo Chap Chap
❍ NARC - Kenya
❍ National Rainbow Coalition
❍ Orange Democratic Movement (ODM)
❍ Pamoja Africa Alliance (PAA)
❍ Restore and Build Kenya (RBK)
❍ SAFINA
❍ United Democratic Alliance (UDA)
❍ Wiper Democratic Movement (WDM-K)
❍ Other (please specify): _____

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

(Please read answer options out loud.)

22. "I feel well represented by the ruling party, that is, the Jubilee Party."

❍ Strongly agree ❍ Somewhat agree ❍ Somewhat disagree ❍ Strongly disagree

❍ No response/ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

23. "I feel well represented by one of the opposition parties"

❍ Strongly agree ❍ Somewhat agree ❍ Somewhat disagree ❍ Strongly disagree

❍ No response/ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

24. "I do not feel well represented by any of the political parties."

❍ Strongly agree ❍ Somewhat agree ❍ Somewhat disagree ❍ Strongly disagree

❍ No response/ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

25. How likely are you to vote in the next national elections coming up this year?

(Please read answer choices out loud.)

❍ Very likely ❍ Somewhat likely ❍ Not very likely
❍ Not at all likely ❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

26. If elections were to be held today, whom would you vote for as President of Kenya?

❍ William Ruto ❍ Raila Odinga ❍ David Mwaure Waihiga ❍ Prof George Wajackoyah
❍ Other (please specify): _____ ❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

27. Who do you think is most likely to win the upcoming presidential election?

❍ William Ruto ❍ Raila Odinga ❍ David Mwaure Waihiga ❍ Prof George Wajackoyah

❍ Other (please specify): _____ ❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

Conjoint Experiment

Introduction

The Kenyan government is considering new initiatives to **introduce digital IDs** – ID cards linked to electronic and sometimes biometric (for example, fingerprints and facial recognition) data about citizens that the government will collect and store – as a part of a broader initiative to make the government more effective in many areas.

Next, you will be asked to consider several policy proposals for a new digital ID program that **would be accessible to all Kenyans**. Please note that these exact policies have not necessarily been proposed by anyone, but they may be similar to real proposals that are being considered.

(Enumerator read out loud:) I will be showing you a few pieces of information about each policy, using these showcards with pictures. First, I will describe what each picture means. Then I will show you several different policies and ask you some questions about each of them.

Conjoint Attributes

[The table below appears on a showcard, which is read out loud before the different profiles are shown, and is available for reference throughout all conjoint rounds.]

Attribute Label	**A**	**B**

Social Protection Transfers	The digital ID would be used for **social protection transfers**, including pensions, social protection, and other assistance for Kenyans. People eligible for government benefits would apply online using their digital ID and receive payments directly. 	Digital IDs would NOT be linked directly to social protection transfers from the government. 
Public Services	The government would share data from digital IDs with relevant ministries in order to help **improve the quality of public services** like schools and health clinics in your local community. 	The government would NOT share data from digital IDs with ministries in order to improve the quality of services. 
Security	Government agencies, for example **the police**, would have automatic access to biometric photos stored in a single database. This would make video surveillance easier, because information from this photo database can be linked to video footage from surveillance cameras. 	Government agencies, for example the police, would NOT have direct access to biometric photos of citizens from the digital ID. To gain access to this data they need consent from the individual concerned or a court. This would make video surveillance more difficult. 

Tax Registration	Digital IDs would be linked to **tax identification numbers** at birth. This tax identification would be automatically activated when a person turns 18. 	Digital IDs would NOT automatically be linked to a tax identification number at birth. Instead, individuals separately apply for a tax number when a person turns 18. 
Voting	A digital ID card would be required if you want to register to vote. Alternative forms of ID would no longer be accepted. 	A digital ID card would not be required to register to vote. Alternative forms of identification would continue to be accepted. 

[Respondents will now be shown THREE (3) PAIRS of randomly generated policy proposals in a row using randomly assigned combinations of the attributes. For each pair, they will first be asked which of the two they would prefer. Then they will be asked a series of questions about each of the two policies separately, to gauge their reaction.]

ROUND 1 - EXAMPLE

	Policy #1	**Policy #2**
Social Protection Transfers		
Public Services		

Security		
Tax Registration		
Voting		

28_1. Which of the following two policy proposals for a new Digital ID would you **prefer**? *(If respondent says they are not in favor of either proposal, please explain that even if the respondent dislikes both proposals, we want to know which one they least dislike)*

❍ Policy #1 ❍ Policy #2 ❍ Refused to answer

Now, let's consider Policy #1 in further detail.

	Policy #1
Social Protection Transfers	
Public Services	
Security	
Tax Registration	
Voting	

29_1. If this policy were enacted, how supportive would you be of the digital ID program?
(Please read answer choices out loud.)

❍ Very supportive ❍ Somewhat supportive ❍ Not very supportive ❍ Not at all supportive
❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

30_1. If this policy were enacted, how likely would you be to register for the digital ID program?
(Please read answer choices out loud.)

❍ Very likely ❍ Somewhat likely ❍ Not very likely ❍ Not at all likely
❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements **about this particular policy:** If this policy were enacted,…

(Please read answer choices out loud.)

31_1. …the program would make it easier for people like me to access government services

❍ Strongly agree ❍ Somewhat agree ❍ Somewhat disagree ❍ Strongly disagree
❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

32_1. …the privacy of my data would be adequately protected

❍ Strongly agree ❍ Somewhat agree ❍ Somewhat disagree ❍ Strongly disagree
❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

33_1. … I would be worried about being punished for expressing my political views

❍ Strongly agree ❍ Somewhat agree ❍ Somewhat disagree ❍ Strongly disagree
❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

34_1. … I would be worried about my vote being counted

❍ Strongly agree ❍ Somewhat agree ❍ Somewhat disagree ❍ Strongly disagree
❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

35_1. … I would be worried about the police using my personal information

❍ Strongly agree	❍ Somewhat agree	❍ Somewhat disagree	❍ Strongly disagree
❍ Don't know	❍ Refused to answer		

Please indicate whether the following statement is TRUE or FALSE …

(Please read answer options out loud)

36_1. ...In the Digital ID proposal you just read, the Digital ID would be connected to **voter registration.**

❍ TRUE ❍ FALSE

Now, let's consider Policy #2 in further detail.

	Policy #2
Social Protection Transfers	
Public Services	
Security	
Tax Registration	
Voting	

37_1. If this policy were enacted, how supportive would you be of the digital ID program?
(Please read answer options out loud)

❍ Very supportive ❍ Somewhat supportive ❍ Not very supportive ❍ Not at all supportive
❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

38_1. If this policy were enacted, how likely would you be to register for the digital ID program?
(Please read answer options out loud)

❍ Very likely ❍ Somewhat likely ❍ Not very likely ❍ Not at all likely
❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements **about this particular policy:** If this policy were enacted,…

(Please read answer choices out loud.)

39_1. …the program would make it easier for people like me to access government services

❍ Strongly agree ❍ Somewhat agree ❍ Somewhat disagree ❍ Strongly disagree
❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

40_1. …the privacy of my data would be adequately protected

❍ Strongly agree ❍ Somewhat agree ❍ Somewhat disagree ❍ Strongly disagree
❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

41_1. … I would be worried about being punished for expressing my political views

❍ Strongly agree ❍ Somewhat agree ❍ Somewhat disagree ❍ Strongly disagree
❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

42_1. … I would be worried about my vote being counted

❍ Strongly agree ❍ Somewhat agree ❍ Somewhat disagree ❍ Strongly disagree
❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

43_1. … I would be worried about the police using my personal information

❍ Strongly agree ❍ Somewhat agree ❍ Somewhat disagree ❍ Strongly disagree
❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

Please indicate whether the following statement is TRUE or FALSE …

(Please read answer choices out loud)

44_1. ...In the Digital ID proposal you just read, the Digital ID would be connected to **voter registration.**

❍ TRUE ❍ FALSE

ROUND 2 - EXAMPLE

(Enumerator read out loud:) Now I am going to ask you about two more sets of policies. However, I will ask you only a small number of questions about each policy, not as many questions as I asked about the first two policies.

	Policy #1	**Policy #2**
Social Protection Transfers		
Public Services		
Security		
Tax Registration		
Voting		

28_2. Which of the following two policy proposals for a new Digital ID would you **prefer**? *(If respondent says they are not in favor of either proposal, please explain that even if the respondent dislikes both proposals, we want to know which one they least dislike)*

❍ Policy #1 ❍ Policy #2 ❍ Refused to answer

Now, let's consider Policy #1 in further detail.

	Policy #1
Social Protection Transfers	
Public Services	
Security	
Tax Registration	
Voting	

29_2. If this policy were enacted, how supportive would you be of the digital ID program?
(Please read answer choices out loud.)

❍ Very supportive ❍ Somewhat supportive ❍ Not very supportive ❍ Not at all supportive
❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

30_2. If this policy were enacted, how likely would you be to register for the digital ID program?
(Please read answer choices out loud.)

❍ Very likely ❍ Somewhat likely ❍ Not very likely ❍ Not at all likely
❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

Please indicate whether the following statement is TRUE or FALSE … *(Please read answer choices out loud)*
36_2. ...In the Digital ID policy proposal you read, the government would take a biometric photo that could be linked to **government surveillance**
❍ TRUE ❍ FALSE

Now, let's consider Policy #2 in further detail.

	Policy #2
Social Protection Transfers	
Public Services	
Security	
Tax Registration	
Voting	

37_2. If this policy were enacted, how supportive would you be of the digital ID program? *(Please read answer options out loud)*

❍ Very supportive ❍ Somewhat supportive ❍ Not very supportive ❍ Not at all supportive
❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

38_2. If this policy were enacted, how likely would you be to register for the digital ID program?

(Please read answer options out loud)

❍ Very likely ❍ Somewhat likely ❍ Not very likely ❍ Not at all likely
❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

Please indicate whether the following statement is TRUE or FALSE … *(Please read answer choices out loud)*
44_2. ...In the Digital ID policy proposal you read, the government would take a biometric photo that could be linked to **government surveillance** ❍ TRUE ❍ FALSE

ROUND 3 - EXAMPLE

	Policy #1	**Policy #2**
Social Protection Transfers		
Public Services		
Security		
Tax Registration		
Voting		

28_3. Which of the following two policy proposals for a new Digital ID would you **prefer**?
(If respondent says they are not in favor of either proposal, please explain that even if the respondent dislikes both proposals, we want to know which one they least dislike)

❍ Policy #1 ❍ Policy #2 ❍ Refused to answer

Now, let's consider Policy #1 in further detail.

	Policy #1
Social Protection Transfers	
Public Services	
Security	
Tax Registration	
Voting	

29_3. If this policy were enacted, how supportive would you be of the digital ID program?
(Please read answer choices out loud.)

❍ Very supportive ❍ Somewhat supportive ❍ Not very supportive ❍ Not at all supportive
❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

30_3. If this policy were enacted, how likely would you be to register for the digital ID program?
(Please read answer choices out loud.)

❍ Very likely ❍ Somewhat likely ❍ Not very likely ❍ Not at all likely
❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

Please indicate whether the following statement is TRUE or FALSE … *(Please read answer choices out loud)*
36_3. ...In the Digital ID proposal just you read, the Digital ID would be connected to **social protection transfers.** ❍ TRUE ❍ FALSE

Now, let's consider Policy #2 in further detail.

	Policy #2
Social Protection Transfers	
Public Services	
Security	
Tax Registration	
Voting	

37_3. If this policy were enacted, how supportive would you be of the digital ID program?
(Please read answer options out loud)

❍ Very supportive ❍ Somewhat supportive ❍ Not very supportive ❍ Not at all supportive
❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

38_3. If this policy were enacted, how likely would you be to register for the digital ID program?
(Please read answer options out loud)

❍ Very likely ❍ Somewhat likely ❍ Not very likely ❍ Not at all likely
❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

Please indicate whether the following statement is TRUE or FALSE … *(Please read answer options out loud)*
44_3. ...In the Digital ID proposal you read, the Digital ID would be connected to **social protection transfers.**
❍ TRUE ❍ FALSE

END OF CONJOINT PORTION OF THE SURVEY

45. *In general*, how positively or negatively would you feel toward a Digital ID policy where the digital ID was linked directly to government transfers, including pensions, social protection, and other public assistance for Kenyans, allowing people eligible for benefits to apply online and use their digital ID to receive payments directly?

(Please show the scale below to the respondent and type a number between 1 and 10. Please type "-998" if don't know and "-999" if refuse to answer)

❍ 1 (Very negative)	❍ 2	❍ 3	❍ 4	❍ 5	❍ 6	❍ 7	❍ 8	❍ 9	❍ 10 (Very positive)

46. *In general*, how positively or negatively would you feel toward a Digital ID policy where the government shared data from digital IDs with ministries such as the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Education in order to improve the quality of services like schools and health clinics in your local community?

❍ 1 (Very negative)	❍ 2	❍ 3	❍ 4	❍ 5	❍ 6	❍ 7	❍ 8	❍ 9	❍ 10 (Very positive)

47. *In general*, how positively or negatively would you feel toward a Digital ID policy where all government agencies, including security services and the police, had automatic access to biometric data from the digital ID that could be linked to video footage from surveillance cameras?

❍ 1 (Very negative)	❍ 2	❍ 3	❍ 4	❍ 5	❍ 6	❍ 7	❍ 8	❍ 9	❍ 10 (Very positive)

48. *In general*, how positively or negatively would you feel toward a Digital ID policy where digital IDs are assigned at birth and automatically linked to tax registration numbers?

❍ 1 (Very negative)	❍ 2	❍ 3	❍ 4	❍ 5	❍ 6	❍ 7	❍ 8	❍ 9	❍ 10 (Very positive)

49. *In general*, how positively or negatively would you feel toward a Digital ID policy where digital ID cards are the only forms of ID accepted for voter registration?

❍ 1 (Very negative)	❍ 2	❍ 3	❍ 4	❍ 5	❍ 6	❍ 7	❍ 8	❍ 9	❍ 10 (Very positive)

Which of these things does your household own?...

(*Please read answer options out loud)*

50. …Radio

❍ Yes, someone in the household owns

❍ No one in the household owns

❍ Don't know

❍ Refused to answer

51. …Television

❍ Yes, someone in the household owns

❍ No one in the household owns

❍ Don't know

❍ Refused to answer

52. …motor vehicle or motorcycle (boda boda)

❍ Yes, someone in the household owns

❍ No one in the household owns

❍ Don't know

❍ Refused to answer

53. …computer

❍ Yes, someone in the household owns

❍ No one in the household owns

❍ Don't know

❍ Refused to answer

54. …bank account

❍ Yes, someone in the household owns

❍ No one in the household owns

❍ Don't know

❍ Refused to answer

55. …mobile phone

❍ Yes, someone in the household owns

❍ No one in the household owns

❍ Don't know

❍ Refused to answer

56. IF YES, does your phone have access to the internet?

❍ Yes ❍ No ❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

57. How often do you use a mobile phone?
(Please read answer choices out loud)

❍ Every day ❍ A few times a week ❍ A few times a month
❍ Less than once a month ❍ Never ❍ Don't know
❍ Refused to answer

58. How often do you use the internet?
(Please read answer choices out loud)

❍ Every day ❍ A few times a week ❍ A few times a month
❍ Less than once a month ❍ Never ❍ Don’t know
❍ Refused to answer

59. Do you have a job or a source of paid income?

❍ Yes (go to Q70) ❍ No (go to Q72) ❍ Don't know

60. IF YES, is it full time or part time?

❍ Full-time ❍ Part-time

61. IF YES, If you have paid employment, that is, regular employment for which you receive something like an hourly wage or regular salary, are you required to pay an income tax, that is, a tax deducted from your wages by your employer?

❍ Yes ❍ No ❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

62. What is your highest level of education?
(Do NOT read answer choices out loud)

❍ No formal schooling
❍ Informal schooling only (including Koranic schooling)
❍ Some primary schooling
❍ Primary school completed
❍ Intermediate school or some secondary school / high school
❍ Secondary school / high school completed
❍ Post-secondary qualifications other than university, e.g. a diploma or degree from a polytechnic college
❍ Some university
❍ University completed
❍ Post-graduate
❍ Don’t know
❍ Refused to answer

63. What is your mother tongue?
(Do NOT read answer choices out loud.)

❍ English	❍ Swahili	❍ Kikuyu
❍ Luo	❍ Luhya	❍ Kamba
❍ Kalenjin	❍ Kisii	❍ Meru/Embu
❍ Maasai/Samburu	❍ Mijikenda	❍ Taita
❍ Somali	❍ Pokot	❍ Turkana
❍ Other (please specify): _____	❍ Don't know	❍ Refused to answer

64. How often, if ever, are people from your ethnic group treated unfairly by the government?
(Please read answer choices out loud)

❍ Never	❍ Sometimes	❍ Often
❍ Always	❍ Don’t know	❍ Refused to answer

65. What is your religion, if any

❍ Christian	❍ Muslim	❍ Traditional/ethnic religion
❍ Other (please specify): _____	❍ No religion	❍ Refused to answer

66. How often, if ever, are people from your religious group treated unfairly by the government?

(Please read answer choices out loud)

❍ Never	❍ Sometimes	❍ Often
❍ Always	❍ Don’t know	❍ Refused to answer

67. Are you aware of a court case involving Huduma Namba from last year (2021)?

❍ Yes ❍ No ❍ Don't know ❍ Refused to answer

(If respondent answers yes to q67, else skip to q71): Please answer the following questions:

68. Who was the party being sued in this case?
(Please read answer choices out loud, except for 'don't know')

❍ Information and Communication Technology Authority (ICTA)
❍ The Interior Ministry
❍ The President of Kenya
❍ Don't know
❍ Refused to answer

69. Who was the group who brought the lawsuit in this case?
(Please read answer choices out loud, except for 'don't know')

❍ The Katiba Institute
❍ Amnesty International
❍ The Kenyan Human Rights Commission
❍ Don't know
❍ Refused to answer

70. In this case, the High Court ruled that the government should have done which ***one*** of the following before rolling out Huduma Namba?
(Please read answer choices out loud, except for 'don't know')

❍ Conducted a data protection assessment
❍ Consulted with civil society stakeholders
❍ Asked for public comment
❍ Don't know
❍ Refused to answer

71. Would you be willing to be contacted for a future survey?

❍ Yes
❍ No