

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
EL PASO DIVISION**

LEAGUE OF UNITED LATIN AMERICAN  
CITIZENS, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GREG ABBOTT, et al.,

Defendants.

Civil Action

Lead Case No.:

3:21-CV-00259-DCG-JES-JVB

CECILIA GONZALES, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

JANE NELSON, et al.,

Defendants.

Consolidated Case No.:

1:21-CV-00965-DCG-JES-JVB

**DECLARATION OF STEPHEN ANSOLABEHERE**

I, Stephen Ansolabehere, am over the age of eighteen and am fully competent to make this declaration. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated herein and declare the following to be true and correct:

1. I am the Frank G. Thompson Professor of Government in the Department of Government at Harvard University in Cambridge. My areas of expertise include American government, with particular expertise in electoral politics, election administration, representation, redistricting, political geography, and public opinion, as well as statistical methods in social sciences and survey research methods.

2. I have been retained in this matter by the Gonzales Plaintiffs as an expert in demographics, election analysis, and racially polarized voting.

3. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** is a true and correct copy of my expert report analyzing House Bill 4.

4. If I am called to testify in this matter, I will testify to the conclusions contained in that report and in my prior reports in this case.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing declaration is true and correct.

Executed in Boston, Massachusetts August 23, 2025.

Stephen Ansolabehere  
Stephen Ansolabehere

# **Exhibit 1**

## Expert Report

*Stephen Ansolabehere*

---

Stephen Ansolabehere

August 23, 2025

## SUMMARY

This report supplements my prior analysis in this case to reflect and address the new congressional districts enacted by the Texas legislature in August 2025. I will refer to the prior districts enacted in 2021 by Senate Bill 6 as the Prior Map, which corresponds to Plan C2193 in the Texas Legislative Council system. I will refer to the new districts enacted in 2025 by House Bill 4 as the New Map, which corresponds to Plan C2333 in the Texas Legislative Council system.

## QUALIFICATIONS

My qualifications are described in my prior reports in this matter. An updated version of my CV is attached to this report.

The analysis in this report is my own. As with prior reports in this matter, I was aided by a research assistant, Kevin DeLuca, who was previously a graduate student at Harvard University but is now an Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yale University.

## METHODOLOGY

Population and election data used in this report come from the Census Bureau and the Texas Legislative Council. The Texas Legislative Council data is available at <https://data.capitol.texas.gov/>.

Consistent with my methodology in my initial report in this matter, my elections analysis in this report considers the three most recent statewide general elections in the State of Texas, which are the 2020, 2022, and 2024 elections. The offices considered are US President, US Senate, Governor, Lt. Governor, Attorney General, State Supreme Court, Court of Criminal Appeals, Agricultural Commissioner, Comptroller, Land Commissioner, and Railroad Commissioner. I also separately analyze endogenous elections for Congress in 2022 and 2024 for the districts in the Prior Map.

I conduct both ecological regression (ER) and ecological inference (EI) analyses, using the methodology described in my prior reports in this matter. ER is included only in the backup files to this report and is not separately discussed.

In determining the candidate preferred by voters of a particular racial or ethnic group, I provide analyses based on both a contest-by-contest approach and an average vote share approach that considers partisan preferences expressed across multiple elections.

## POPULATION OF THE STATE OF TEXAS

According to 2023 1-year ACS, Texas's total population is now 30,503,301 people, an increase of almost 1.4 million from the 29,145,505 population at the time of the 2020 Census. The 2023 ACS shows that Hispanics are now the largest racial or ethnic group in the state of Texas. Of the 30,503,301 people in Texas in 2023, 12,135,688 (39.8 percent) are Hispanic, 11,817,333 (38.7 percent) are White Non-Hispanic, 3,658,953 (12.0 percent) are Black, 1,707,260 (5.6 percent) are Asian, and 1,184,067 (3.9 percent) are other races.

Over half of the growth in population in the State of Texas from 2020 to 2023 came from Hispanics. From 2020 to 2023, the population in the State of Texas increased by 1,357,796, of whom 693,971 (51.1 percent) were Hispanic. These and other total population statistics are summarized in Tables 1 and 2 of this Report.

According to the 2019-2023 5-year ACS, the citizen voting age population, or CVAP, in the state of Texas is now 19,470,070 adult citizens. That is an increase of 891,240 from the 2016-2020 5-year ACS. The 2019-2023 ACS also shows that Texas's CVAP is majority non-White, with 9,552,370 White adult citizens (49.1 percent). 6,088,330 adult Texas citizens are Hispanic (31.3 percent), 2,674,080 adult Texas citizens are Black (13.7 percent), and 821,010 adult Texas citizens are Asian (4.2 percent). These and other CVAP statewide statistics are summarized in Tables 3 and 4 of this Report.

## **ANALYSIS OF THE PRIOR MAP (C2193)**

I analyzed various aspects of the Prior Map in earlier reports in this matter. I conduct additional analysis of the Prior Map here, however, to ensure an apples-to-apples comparison between the Prior Map and the New Map.

### **1. Characteristics of CDs in the Prior Map**

According to the 2019-2023 ACS, of the 38 CDs in the Prior Map, 22 are majority-White CVAP, 7 are majority-Hispanic CVAP, and no single racial or ethnic group comprises a majority in the remaining 9. White eligible voters, Hispanic eligible voters, and Black eligible voters each form a plurality (i.e., the largest segment of the CVAP, but not a majority) in 3 of the 9 CDs in which no racial or ethnic group forms a majority of eligible voters.

These features of the Prior Map are summarized in Table 5.

### **2. Voting Behavior and Election Analysis under the Prior Map**

I conducted ecological inference and ecological regression analysis of each of the CDs in the Prior Map. The EI results are summarized in Table 7; the ER results will be produced in the backup materials to this report. Table 9 provides the analysis of district performance in US House elections conducted under the Prior Map in 2022 and 2024. Tables 10 and 11 offer the assessment of district performance in exogenous elections. Here, I provide an overview of what the results show.

#### **A. Majority-White CDs**

In each of the 22 majority-White CDs in the Prior Map, White voters were consistently able to elect their candidates of choice. In 21 of the 22 majority-White CDs, substantial majorities of White voters supported candidates affiliated with the Republican Party in every election analyzed. In the remaining majority-White CD, CD 37, substantial majorities of White voters supported candidates affiliated with the Democratic party in every election analyzed.

Candidates preferred by White voters won the majority of votes in each of the majority-White CDs in all 31 of the elections examined.

#### **B. Majority and Plurality-Hispanic CDs**

In each of the 10 majority or plurality-Hispanic CDs in the Prior Map, Hispanic voters cohesively supported candidates affiliated with the Democratic Party. On average across the elections analyzed, more than 60 percent of Hispanic voters in each of the 10 districts favored Democratic candidates. In 9 of the 10 districts, Hispanic voters preferred the Democratic candidate in every election analyzed. In the remaining district, CD 23, Hispanic voters preferred Democratic candidates in 30 of 31 elections under the Prior Map.

In 7 of the 10 majority or plurality-Hispanic CDs under the Prior Map, candidates preferred by Hispanic voters won the majority of votes in all or nearly all of the elections examined. Hispanic voters' preferred candidates won all examined elections in 5 of these districts (CDs 16, 20, 29, 33, and 35), 94 percent of examined elections in CD 34, and 74 percent of examined elections in CD 28.

In the remaining 3 majority or plurality-Hispanic CDs (CDs 15, 23, and 27), candidates preferred by Hispanic voters did not win the majority of votes in any or many of the elections examined. In CD 15, the candidate preferred by Hispanic voters won only 4 out of 31 elections. In CD 23, the candidate preferred by Hispanic voters won the most votes in only 1 out of 31 elections—the 1 election in which Hispanic voters on that district preferred the Republican candidate. And in CD 27, the candidate preferred by Hispanic voters did not win the most votes in any of the elections analyzed.

### **C. Plurality-Black CDs**

In each of the 3 plurality-Black CDs in the Prior Map, Black voters cohesively supported candidates affiliated with the Democratic Party. In each district, an average of 94 percent of Black voters supported Democratic candidates across the elections analyzed.

All 3 plurality-Black CDs also had substantial populations of Hispanic and White voters. Hispanic voters in each of the 3 districts also cohesively supported candidates affiliated with the Democratic Party, at rates ranging from 62 percent to 74 percent on average across the elections analyzed. On average, White voters in each of the 3 districts supported candidates affiliated with the Democratic Party at rates ranging from 55 percent to 58 percent on average across the elections analyzed. In 2 of the 3 districts (CD 18 and CD 30), White voters favored Democrats in every election analyzed; in the third (CD 9), White voters favored Democrats in 30 of 31 elections.

Candidates preferred by Black voters won the majority of votes in all 3 plurality-Black CDs in all 31 of the elections examined.

### **D. Plurality-White CDs**

In 2 of the 3 majority-majority CDs in which a plurality of eligible voters are White (CD 7 and CD 32), White, Hispanic, and Black voters all cohesively supported candidates affiliated with the Democratic Party in each of the 31 elections analyzed. In both districts, the candidates preferred by all three racial and ethnic groups analyzed won the most votes in all 31 elections examined. (CD 7 also has a substantial Asian population, but I did not analyze Asian voting patterns.)

In the remaining district, CD 22, White voters cohesively supported candidates affiliated with the Republican Party, Black voters cohesively supported candidates affiliated with the Democratic Party, and Hispanic voters were not cohesive—on average, they voted 53 percent for Republican candidates, but a majority preferred the Democratic candidate in 6 of the 31 elections analyzed. In CD 22, the Republican Party-affiliated candidates preferred by White voters, and sometimes by Hispanic voters, won the most votes in all 31 elections analyzed.

## **ANALYSIS OF THE NEW MAP (C2333)**

### **1. Characteristics of CDs in the New Map**

According to the 2019 to 2023 ACS, of the 38 CDs in the New Map, 24 are majority-White CVAP, 8 are majority-Hispanic CVAP, 2 are majority-Black CVAP, and no single racial or ethnic group comprises a majority in the remaining 4. White eligible voters and Hispanic eligible voters each form

a plurality in 2 of the 4 CDs in which no racial or ethnic group forms a majority of eligible voters. These features of the New Map are summarized in Table 6.

## **2. Voting Behavior and Election Analysis under the New Map**

I also conducted ecological inference and ecological regression analysis of each of the CDs in the New Map. The EI results are summarized in Table 8; the ER results will be produced in the backup materials to this report. Tables 12 and 13 offer the assessment of district performance in exogenous elections. Here, I provide an overview of what the results show.

### **A. Majority-White CDs**

In each of the 24 majority-White CDs in the New Map, White voters would consistently be able to elect their candidates of choice. In 23 of the 24 majority-White CDs, substantial majorities of White voters supported candidates affiliated with the Republican Party in every election analyzed. In the remaining majority-White CD, CD 37, substantial majorities of White voters supported candidates affiliated with the Democratic party in every election analyzed.

Candidates preferred by White voters would have won the majority of votes in each of the majority-White CDs in all 31 of the elections examined.

The New Plan therefore increases by 2 the number of White-majority CDs in which White voters would consistently have elected their candidates of choice. It creates additional majority White CDs 22, 27 and 32, while CD 8 is no longer a majority-White CD.

### **B. Majority and Plurality-Hispanic CDs**

In each of the 10 majority or plurality-Hispanic CDs in the New Map, Hispanic voters cohesively support candidates affiliated with the Democratic Party. On average across the elections analyzed, more than 60 percent of Hispanic voters in each of the 10 districts favored Democratic candidates. In 9 of the 10 districts, Hispanic voters preferred the Democratic candidate in every election analyzed. In the remaining district, CD 23, Hispanic voters preferred Democratic candidates in 30 of 31 elections.

In 5 of 10 majority or plurality-Hispanic CDs, candidates preferred by Hispanic voters won the majority of votes in all or nearly all of the elections examined. Hispanic voters' preferred candidates won all examined elections in 4 districts (CD 16, 20, 29, and 33) and won 24 of 31 examined elections in CD 28.

In the other 5 of 10 majority or plurality-Hispanic CDs, candidates preferred by Hispanic voters did not win the majority of votes in any or many of the elections examined. The Hispanic-preferred candidate lost all 31 elections in CD 9 and CD 35; 26 of 31 elections in CD 15; 30 of 31 elections in CD 23; and 17 of 31 elections in CD 34.

The New Plan therefore reduces by 2 the number of majority or plurality-Hispanic districts in which Hispanic voters have the opportunity to elect their candidates of choice. The lost opportunity districts are CD 34 and 35.

### **C. Majority-Black CDs**

In both majority-Black CDs in the New Map, Black voters cohesively supported candidates affiliated with the Democratic Party. In each district, an average of 95 percent of Black voters supported Democratic candidates across the elections analyzed. In both CDs, a majority of Black voters voted



Democratic in every election examined. Majorities of the Hispanic voters in both CDs also supported Democratic candidates, as did White voters in CD 18 (but not, on average, in CD 30).

Candidates preferred by Black voters would have won the majority of votes in both majority-Black CDs in all 31 of the elections examined.

The New Map therefore reduces by 1 the number of majority or plurality-Black districts in which Black voters would consistently have the opportunity to elect their candidates of choice. The lost opportunity district is CD 9.

#### **D. Plurality-White CDs**

There are 2 majority-minority CDs in the New Map in which a plurality of the eligible voters are White, Enacted CD 7 and 8.

In CD 7, White, Hispanic, and Black voters all cohesively supported candidates affiliated with the Democratic Party in each of the 31 elections analyzed. Candidates preferred by all three racial and ethnic groups analyzed would have won the most votes in all 31 elections examined.

In CD 8, White voters cohesively supported candidates affiliated with the Republican Party, while Black and Hispanic voters cohesively supported Democratic candidates. The White plurality consistently outvotes the Black and Hispanic voters in CD 8, however, and the White-preferred candidate would have won 31 of 31 elections analyzed.

The New Plan therefore reduces by 1 the number of plurality-White, majority-minority districts in which minority voters have the opportunity to elect their candidates of choice. The lost district is CD 32.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

First, the New Map on net reduces Black and Hispanic electoral opportunity by at least 4 districts. It reduces by 1 the number of performing Black-majority or Black-plurality CDs; it reduces by 2 the number of performing Hispanic-majority or Hispanic-plurality CDs; and it dismantles 1 plurality-White CD in which Black and Hispanic voters were regularly able to elect their candidates of choice. This effect is dispersed across the state: 1 of the eliminated minority opportunity districts is in Harris County (CD 9), 1 is in Dallas-Fort Worth (CD 32), 1 is in Central Texas (CD 35), and 1 is in the Rio Grande Valley (CD 34).

Second, the New Map's creation of two majority-Black CVAP districts, CDs 18 and 30, does not improve Black voters' opportunities to elect their candidates of choice, because both districts replace existing plurality-Black districts in which Black voters were already consistently able to elect their candidates of choice. Rather, by reducing the number of other majority-minority districts in which Black voters would consistently have been able to elect their candidates of choice, the New Map's overall effect is to reduce Black voters' electoral opportunities.

Third, the New Map's configuration of CDs 9 and 35 as new majority-Hispanic CVAP districts does not improve Hispanic voters' opportunities to elect their candidates of choice, because in both districts, the candidates favored by a substantial majority of Hispanic voters would have lost 31 out of 31 elections analyzed.

## List of Tables

1	Total Population in the State of Texas by Race/Ethnicity, 2010–2023 . . . . .	2
2	Share of Total Population Growth in the State of Texas by Race/Ethnicity, 2010– 2023 (%) . . . . .	3
3	Citizen Voting-Age Population (CVAP) in the State of Texas by Race/Ethnicity, 2006–2023 . . . . .	4
4	Share of CVAP Growth in the State of Texas by Race/Ethnicity, 2010–2023 (%) . .	5
5	Prior Map (C2193) CVAP Demographics . . . . .	6
6	New Map (C2333) CVAP Demographics . . . . .	7
7	Prior Map (C2193) Racially Polarized Voting (RPV) Analysis . . . . .	8
8	New Map (C2333) Racially Polarized Voting (RPV) Analysis . . . . .	9
9	Prior Map (C2193) District Performance - US House Elections, 2022 and 2024 - Specific Election Preferences . . . . .	10
10	Prior Map (C2193) District Performance . . . . .	11
11	Prior Map (C2193) District Performance - Specific Election Preferences . . . . .	12
12	New Map (C2333) District Performance . . . . .	13
13	New Map (C2333) District Performance - Specific Election Preferences . . . . .	14

Table 1: Total Population in the State of Texas by Race/Ethnicity, 2010–2023

Group	2010	2020	2023	2010–2020	2020–2023	2010–2023
Hispanic	9,460,921	11,441,717	12,135,688	1,980,796	693,971	2,674,767
Other	452,044	1,112,961	1,184,067	660,917	71,106	732,023
Asian	948,426	1,561,518	1,707,260	613,092	145,742	758,834
Black	2,886,825	3,444,712	3,658,953	557,887	214,241	772,128
White	11,397,345	11,584,597	11,817,333	187,252	232,736	419,988
Total	25,145,561	29,145,505	30,503,301	3,999,944	1,357,796	5,357,740

*Notes:* Population counts for 2010 and 2020 are from the decennial census; 2023 figures are from the 2023 ACS (1-Year Estimates).

Table 2: Share of Total Population Growth in the State of Texas by Race/Ethnicity, 2010–2023 (%)

Group	2010–2020	2020–2023	2010–2023
Hispanic	49.5	51.1	49.9
Other	16.5	5.2	13.7
Asian	15.3	10.7	14.2
Black	13.9	15.8	14.4
White	4.7	17.1	7.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 3: Citizen Voting-Age Population (CVAP) in the State of Texas by Race/Ethnicity, 2006–2023

Group	2006–2010	2016–2020	2019–2023	2010–2020	2020–2023	2010–2023
Hispanic	3,889,570	5,671,640	6,088,330	1,782,070	416,690	2,198,760
Other	151,425	210,580	252,085	59,155	41,505	100,660
Asian	449,845	769,440	903,205	319,595	133,765	453,360
Black	1,965,315	2,498,165	2,674,080	532,850	175,915	708,765
White	8,820,810	9,429,005	9,552,370	608,195	123,365	731,560
Total	15,276,965	18,578,830	19,470,070	3,301,865	891,240	4,193,105

*Notes:* Data are from the 2019-2023 ACS 5-year CVAP special tabulations.

“Hispanic” row is the “Hispanic or Latino” category in ACS files (line title 13); “Black” row includes “Black or African American Alone” (5) and “Black or African American and White” (10) CVAP categories; “Asian” row includes “Asian Alone” (4) and “Asian and White” (9) CVAP categories; “White” row includes only “White Alone” CVAP category (7); “Other” row includes all other racial categories.

Table 4: Share of CVAP Growth in the State of Texas by Race/Ethnicity, 2010–2023 (%)

Group	2010–2020	2020–2023	2010–2023
Hispanic	54.0	46.8	52.4
Other	1.8	4.7	2.4
Asian	9.7	15.0	10.8
Black	16.1	19.7	16.9
White	18.4	13.8	17.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Notes:* Data are from the 2019-2023 ACS 5-year CVAP special tabulations.

Table 5: Prior Map (C2193) CVAP Demographics

District	District Type	White CVAP	Hispanic CVAP	Black CVAP	Asian CVAP
(ACS 2019-2023)					
1	White Majority	<b>68.1%</b>	10.3%	18.8%	1.0%
2	White Majority	<b>58.5%</b>	22.7%	13.6%	4.1%
3	White Majority	<b>64.8%</b>	12.6%	11.1%	10.2%
4	White Majority	<b>70.0%</b>	10.6%	10.1%	7.4%
5	White Majority	<b>58.7%</b>	19.1%	16.0%	4.5%
6	White Majority	<b>56.8%</b>	22.8%	15.8%	3.1%
7	White Plurality	<b>36.7%</b>	21.2%	<b>22.3%</b>	<b>18.7%</b>
8	White Majority	<b>55.8%</b>	23.6%	13.5%	5.7%
9	Black Plurality	17.8%	25.6%	<b>45.9%</b>	<b>9.6%</b>
10	White Majority	<b>64.8%</b>	18.3%	11.4%	4.0%
11	White Majority	<b>51.3%</b>	33.2%	12.1%	1.9%
12	White Majority	<b>64.2%</b>	18.9%	11.9%	3.6%
13	White Majority	<b>67.3%</b>	21.6%	7.2%	2.0%
14	White Majority	<b>60.0%</b>	19.5%	16.8%	2.6%
15	Hispanic Majority	21.7%	<b>74.6%</b>	1.8%	1.4%
16	Hispanic Majority	14.5%	<b>79.4%</b>	3.7%	1.4%
17	White Majority	<b>61.8%</b>	19.0%	15.7%	1.9%
18	Black Plurality	23.5%	30.3%	<b>39.3%</b>	5.7%
19	White Majority	<b>57.6%</b>	33.3%	6.4%	1.3%
20	Hispanic Majority	21.8%	<b>67.8%</b>	6.8%	2.7%
21	White Majority	<b>65.4%</b>	26.8%	4.2%	2.3%
22	White Plurality	<b>48.8%</b>	24.6%	13.6%	12.0%
23	Hispanic Majority	34.1%	<b>57.5%</b>	4.7%	2.4%
24	White Majority	<b>70.3%</b>	13.1%	8.2%	6.9%
25	White Majority	<b>66.8%</b>	16.7%	12.1%	2.8%
26	White Majority	<b>66.4%</b>	14.3%	10.1%	7.7%
27	Hispanic Plurality	43.9%	<b>48.8%</b>	4.9%	1.4%
28	Hispanic Majority	23.8%	<b>68.6%</b>	5.5%	1.3%
29	Hispanic Majority	13.9%	<b>63.4%</b>	18.8%	3.3%
30	Black Plurality	23.8%	24.5%	<b>47.0%</b>	3.4%
31	White Majority	<b>66.5%</b>	18.9%	8.7%	3.9%
32	White Plurality	<b>43.6%</b>	23.1%	24.2%	7.7%
33	Hispanic Plurality	23.5%	<b>43.5%</b>	25.9%	5.9%
34	Hispanic Majority	11.7%	<b>86.6%</b>	0.8%	0.5%
35	Hispanic Plurality	35.7%	<b>45.9%</b>	13.8%	3.2%
36	White Majority	<b>59.0%</b>	22.9%	13.2%	3.7%
37	White Majority	<b>60.4%</b>	23.0%	7.7%	7.5%
38	White Majority	<b>58.1%</b>	19.8%	11.6%	9.3%

Notes: Data are derived from the ACS 5-year (2019-2023) CVAP special tabulation data. Highlighted rows indicate majority minority districts.

Table 6: New Map (C2333) CVAP Demographics

District	District Type	White CVAP	Hispanic CVAP	Black CVAP	Asian CVAP
(ACS 2019-2023)					
1	White Majority	<b>67.6%</b>	10.4%	19.4%	1.0%
2	White Majority	<b>57.3%</b>	22.2%	13.6%	5.6%
3	White Majority	<b>64.4%</b>	13.9%	12.2%	8.1%
4	White Majority	<b>68.0%</b>	9.5%	10.2%	10.4%
5	White Majority	<b>58.1%</b>	19.5%	17.6%	2.9%
6	White Majority	<b>58.3%</b>	21.8%	14.6%	3.9%
7	White Plurality	<b>39.9%</b>	22.9%	18.6%	17.6%
8	White Plurality	<b>48.9%</b>	24.8%	19.0%	6.0%
9	Hispanic Majority	35.3%	<b>50.2%</b>	11.9%	1.8%
10	White Majority	<b>68.5%</b>	16.1%	9.7%	4.1%
11	White Majority	<b>55.0%</b>	33.8%	7.0%	2.9%
12	White Majority	<b>62.0%</b>	23.8%	9.8%	3.1%
13	White Majority	<b>67.1%</b>	21.7%	7.5%	2.0%
14	White Majority	<b>57.2%</b>	18.7%	17.9%	5.1%
15	Hispanic Majority	21.6%	<b>74.5%</b>	2.1%	1.0%
16	Hispanic Majority	14.6%	<b>79.1%</b>	3.8%	1.4%
17	White Majority	<b>64.0%</b>	19.4%	11.5%	3.8%
18	Black Majority	17.5%	23.7%	<b>51.6%</b>	6.0%
19	White Majority	<b>57.6%</b>	33.3%	6.4%	1.3%
20	Hispanic Majority	20.6%	<b>65.3%</b>	11.0%	2.0%
21	White Majority	<b>60.7%</b>	31.0%	4.5%	2.5%
22	White Majority	<b>50.5%</b>	24.9%	12.1%	11.5%
23	Hispanic Majority	36.3%	<b>54.8%</b>	4.9%	2.7%
24	White Majority	<b>69.1%</b>	13.7%	8.5%	7.2%
25	White Majority	<b>55.9%</b>	19.9%	20.2%	2.5%
26	White Majority	<b>65.4%</b>	14.9%	10.9%	7.3%
27	White Majority	<b>52.9%</b>	36.7%	7.7%	1.6%
28	Hispanic Majority	11.5%	<b>86.7%</b>	0.7%	0.7%
29	Hispanic Plurality	17.9%	<b>43.4%</b>	33.0%	4.5%
30	Black Majority	18.6%	24.8%	<b>51.3%</b>	4.1%
31	White Majority	<b>60.2%</b>	19.3%	14.8%	3.5%
32	White Majority	<b>58.8%</b>	16.0%	15.5%	8.2%
33	Hispanic Plurality	35.2%	<b>38.3%</b>	20.4%	4.9%
34	Hispanic Majority	24.1%	<b>71.9%</b>	2.1%	1.3%
35	Hispanic Majority	37.2%	<b>51.6%</b>	8.0%	2.0%
36	White Majority	<b>54.2%</b>	19.5%	18.7%	6.3%
37	White Majority	<b>53.8%</b>	28.6%	10.0%	6.0%
38	White Majority	<b>56.5%</b>	20.6%	11.9%	9.9%

Notes: Data are from Texas Capitol Data Portal reports for New Map (C2333) (r116). Highlighted rows indicate majority minority districts.



Table 7: Prior Map (C2193) Racially Polarized Voting (RPV) Analysis

District	Percent Democratic 2020-2024						Polarization	
	White	[min,max]	Black	[min,max]	Hispanic	[min,max]	B-W	H-W
1	8	[ 7, 11]	90	[ 88, 91]	78	[ 74, 83]	81	70
2	23	[ 17, 29]	82	[ 74, 87]	54	[ 43, 70]	59	31
3	22	[ 18, 31]	76	[ 69, 85]	65	[ 36, 79]	54	43
4	14	[ 12, 17]	77	[ 67, 85]	73	[ 63, 83]	64	59
5	10	[ 8, 13]	86	[ 83, 90]	86	[ 80, 89]	76	76
6	13	[ 9, 16]	83	[ 81, 86]	81	[ 75, 87]	70	68
7	60	[ 53, 68]	71	[ 61, 82]	64	[ 53, 79]	11	3
8	9	[ 6, 12]	76	[ 66, 84]	77	[ 58, 86]	68	68
9	56	[ 48, 63]	94	[ 93, 96]	71	[ 61, 81]	39	15
10	24	[ 20, 28]	74	[ 63, 80]	74	[ 60, 82]	50	50
11	9	[ 7, 12]	90	[ 87, 93]	61	[ 51, 71]	81	52
12	24	[ 19, 30]	82	[ 75, 88]	72	[ 63, 79]	58	48
13	15	[ 14, 18]	81	[ 77, 85]	58	[ 45, 68]	65	43
14	14	[ 12, 17]	90	[ 88, 92]	73	[ 67, 79]	76	58
15	12	[ 10, 15]	47	[ 31, 71]	65	[ 54, 72]	35	53
16	32	[ 23, 45]	46	[ 33, 58]	76	[ 65, 81]	15	44
17	16	[ 14, 19]	80	[ 76, 84]	85	[ 82, 88]	64	69
18	58	[ 49, 66]	94	[ 92, 96]	63	[ 46, 78]	36	4
19	13	[ 10, 18]	76	[ 70, 81]	55	[ 43, 66]	63	42
20	43	[ 30, 53]	64	[ 45, 78]	78	[ 69, 83]	21	35
21	28	[ 23, 32]	76	[ 46, 86]	68	[ 47, 79]	48	40
22	21	[ 17, 28]	81	[ 75, 86]	46	[ 34, 68]	60	25
23	25	[ 21, 33]	64	[ 51, 76]	61	[ 47, 66]	39	36
24	35	[ 31, 41]	62	[ 54, 74]	65	[ 54, 79]	28	31
25	14	[ 10, 18]	90	[ 87, 93]	77	[ 71, 82]	76	63
26	21	[ 17, 28]	81	[ 72, 89]	70	[ 55, 78]	61	50
27	12	[ 11, 15]	69	[ 61, 78]	80	[ 70, 85]	57	68
28	22	[ 16, 30]	84	[ 76, 89]	68	[ 54, 75]	63	46
29	54	[ 47, 59]	84	[ 81, 87]	67	[ 56, 74]	30	13
30	58	[ 49, 64]	94	[ 93, 96]	74	[ 57, 81]	37	16
31	25	[ 21, 29]	59	[ 49, 70]	73	[ 63, 80]	34	48
32	57	[ 52, 64]	76	[ 70, 83]	82	[ 76, 88]	19	24
33	58	[ 48, 65]	90	[ 87, 93]	81	[ 68, 87]	32	23
34	29	[ 26, 34]	54	[ 42, 79]	64	[ 51, 70]	25	34
35	72	[ 63, 80]	68	[ 57, 78]	73	[ 66, 81]	-4	1
36	12	[ 10, 15]	82	[ 77, 87]	75	[ 66, 81]	70	63
37	80	[ 76, 85]	65	[ 55, 76]	67	[ 59, 76]	-15	-13
38	27	[ 22, 36]	63	[ 45, 78]	56	[ 41, 69]	35	28

Notes: Highlighted rows indicate majority minority districts. Ecological Inference (EI) results estimated using the ei package in R. The “[min, max]” columns report the lowest and highest EI estimates of each racial group’s Democratic support across all elections analyzed. Elections used in the analysis are all elections for US President, US Senate, Governor, Lt. Governor, Attorney General, State Supreme Court, Court of Criminal Appeals, Agricultural Commissioner, Comptroller, Land Commissioner, and Railroad Commissioner, for 2020, 2022, and 2024.

Table 8: New Map (C2333) Racially Polarized Voting (RPV) Analysis

District	Percent Democratic (2020-2024)						Polarization	
	White	[min,max]	Black	[min,max]	Hispanic	[min,max]	B-W	H-W
1	9	[ 8, 11]	89	[ 88, 91]	78	[ 73, 83]	80	69
2	24	[ 20, 27]	80	[ 66, 87]	55	[ 29, 68]	56	31
3	17	[ 13, 27]	82	[ 76, 87]	74	[ 50, 80]	65	57
4	17	[ 13, 22]	74	[ 61, 82]	75	[ 65, 82]	57	58
5	18	[ 14, 21]	81	[ 75, 86]	84	[ 76, 87]	63	66
6	20	[ 16, 25]	82	[ 77, 86]	76	[ 67, 84]	62	56
7	62	[ 56, 70]	67	[ 53, 82]	65	[ 53, 78]	6	3
8	11	[ 10, 14]	81	[ 72, 87]	81	[ 67, 88]	70	70
9	11	[ 9, 13]	80	[ 73, 85]	77	[ 67, 84]	69	67
10	28	[ 25, 32]	60	[ 49, 69]	74	[ 66, 81]	31	46
11	19	[ 18, 22]	84	[ 80, 88]	50	[ 42, 60]	65	31
12	25	[ 21, 29]	82	[ 76, 87]	81	[ 73, 86]	57	56
13	16	[ 13, 17]	82	[ 77, 85]	58	[ 50, 73]	66	43
14	14	[ 11, 19]	87	[ 80, 91]	75	[ 70, 81]	73	61
15	8	[ 7, 10]	50	[ 36, 59]	67	[ 54, 73]	42	58
16	33	[ 21, 47]	49	[ 40, 59]	76	[ 63, 81]	16	43
17	24	[ 20, 27]	72	[ 67, 78]	86	[ 83, 89]	49	62
18	62	[ 55, 69]	96	[ 94, 97]	73	[ 59, 80]	34	11
19	13	[ 10, 17]	76	[ 62, 81]	55	[ 42, 66]	63	43
20	60	[ 49, 71]	66	[ 50, 82]	76	[ 67, 81]	6	16
21	23	[ 18, 30]	76	[ 58, 90]	81	[ 65, 87]	52	57
22	20	[ 16, 25]	75	[ 58, 84]	51	[ 38, 68]	56	31
23	26	[ 22, 31]	67	[ 50, 81]	61	[ 49, 68]	42	35
24	33	[ 29, 39]	66	[ 49, 80]	65	[ 49, 76]	33	32
25	13	[ 9, 16]	93	[ 91, 96]	83	[ 79, 87]	81	70
26	21	[ 18, 29]	81	[ 73, 88]	69	[ 57, 79]	60	48
27	22	[ 19, 26]	75	[ 66, 84]	81	[ 71, 86]	53	59
28	15	[ 12, 19]	36	[ 26, 50]	65	[ 51, 73]	21	50
29	51	[ 47, 60]	90	[ 87, 94]	70	[ 55, 81]	39	19
30	48	[ 41, 54]	94	[ 93, 96]	81	[ 73, 84]	47	33
31	23	[ 20, 26]	69	[ 50, 83]	78	[ 69, 83]	47	55
32	23	[ 19, 27]	79	[ 72, 84]	80	[ 57, 86]	57	58
33	65	[ 60, 72]	80	[ 73, 87]	80	[ 63, 87]	15	14
34	24	[ 20, 30]	62	[ 51, 73]	65	[ 52, 71]	38	41
35	20	[ 16, 24]	77	[ 68, 85]	79	[ 72, 86]	57	59
36	12	[ 11, 15]	86	[ 84, 89]	75	[ 66, 83]	74	63
37	85	[ 80, 90]	77	[ 66, 87]	75	[ 69, 82]	-9	-10
38	25	[ 18, 38]	62	[ 45, 79]	62	[ 38, 76]	37	38

Notes: Highlighted rows indicate majority minority districts. Ecological Inference (EI) results estimated using the ei package in R. The “[min, max]” columns report the lowest and highest EI estimates of each racial group’s Democratic support across all elections analyzed. Elections used in the analysis are all elections for US President, US Senate, Governor, Lt. Governor, Attorney General, State Supreme Court, Court of Criminal Appeals, Agricultural Commissioner, Comptroller, Land Commissioner, and Railroad Commissioner, for 2020, 2022, and 2024.

Table 9: Prior Map (C2193) District Performance - US House Elections, 2022 and 2024 - Specific Election Preferences

District	District Type	Average Vote Share of Minority Preferred Candidate	Number of Elections Minority Preferred Candidate Wins	Number of Elections Minority Preferred Candidate Loses	Number of Contested Elections
1	White Majority	22%	0	1	1
2	White Majority	34%	1	1	2
3	White Majority	38%	1	1	2
4	White Majority	32%	0	2	2
5	White Majority	35%	0	2	2
6	White Majority	34%	0	1	1
7	White Plurality	62%	2	0	2
8	White Majority	32%	0	2	2
9	Black Plurality	77%	1	0	1
10	White Majority	35%	0	2	2
11	White Majority	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
12	White Majority	36%	0	2	2
13	White Majority	25%	0	1	1
14	White Majority	31%	0	2	2
15	Hispanic Majority	44%	0	2	2
16	Hispanic Majority	61%	2	0	2
17	White Majority	34%	0	2	2
18	Black Plurality	71%	2	0	2
19	White Majority	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
20	Hispanic Majority	68%	1	0	1
21	White Majority	37%	0	2	2
22	White Plurality	37%	2	0	2
23	Hispanic Majority	39%	1	1	2
24	White Majority	40%	0	2	2
25	White Majority	n/a	n/a	n/a	0
26	White Majority	37%	0	1	1
27	Hispanic Plurality	35%	0	2	2
28	Hispanic Majority	54%	2	0	2
29	Hispanic Majority	68%	2	0	2
30	Black Plurality	77%	1	0	1
31	White Majority	36%	0	1	1
32	White Plurality	64%	2	0	2
33	Hispanic Plurality	71%	2	0	2
34	Hispanic Majority	53%	2	0	2
35	Hispanic Plurality	70%	2	0	2
36	White Majority	31%	0	2	2
37	White Majority	77%	2	0	2
38	White Majority	37%	1	1	2

Notes: Analyzes US House elections from 2022 and 2024. Highlighted rows indicate majority minority districts.

Table 10: Prior Map (C2193) District Performance

District	District Type	Average Vote Share of Minority Preferred Candidate	Number of Elections Minority Preferred Candidate Wins	Number of Elections Minority Preferred Candidate Loses
1	White Majority	24%	0	31
2	White Majority	36%	0	31
3	White Majority	39%	0	31
4	White Majority	33%	0	31
5	White Majority	36%	0	31
6	White Majority	35%	0	31
7	White Plurality	61%	31	0
8	White Majority	33%	0	31
9	Black Plurality	75%	31	0
10	White Majority	37%	0	31
11	White Majority	27%	0	31
12	White Majority	38%	0	31
13	White Majority	25%	0	31
14	White Majority	33%	0	31
15	Hispanic Majority	47%	4	27
16	Hispanic Majority	64%	31	0
17	White Majority	35%	0	31
18	Black Plurality	72%	31	0
19	White Majority	24%	0	31
20	Hispanic Majority	65%	31	0
21	White Majority	37%	0	31
22	White Plurality	39%	0	31
23	Hispanic Majority	44%	0	31
24	White Majority	40%	0	31
25	White Majority	32%	0	31
26	White Majority	37%	0	31
27	Hispanic Plurality	36%	0	31
28	Hispanic Majority	52%	23	8
29	Hispanic Majority	66%	31	0
30	Black Plurality	77%	31	0
31	White Majority	37%	0	31
32	White Plurality	63%	31	0
33	Hispanic Plurality	72%	31	0
34	Hispanic Majority	56%	29	2
35	Hispanic Plurality	71%	31	0
36	White Majority	32%	0	31
37	White Majority	76%	31	0
38	White Majority	37%	0	31

*Notes:* Analyzes all contested statewide elections from 2020 through 2024. Highlighted rows indicate majority minority districts.

Table 11: Prior Map (C2193) District Performance - Specific Election Preferences

District	District Type	Average Vote Share of Minority Preferred Candidate	Number of Elections Minority Preferred Candidate Wins	Number of Elections Minority Preferred Candidate Loses
1	White Majority	24%	0	31
2	White Majority	36%	8	23
3	White Majority	39%	3	28
4	White Majority	33%	0	31
5	White Majority	36%	0	31
6	White Majority	35%	0	31
7	White Plurality	61%	31	0
8	White Majority	33%	0	31
9	Black Plurality	75%	31	0
10	White Majority	37%	0	31
11	White Majority	27%	0	31
12	White Majority	38%	0	31
13	White Majority	25%	1	30
14	White Majority	33%	0	31
15	Hispanic Majority	47%	4	27
16	Hispanic Majority	64%	31	0
17	White Majority	35%	0	31
18	Black Plurality	72%	31	0
19	White Majority	24%	6	25
20	Hispanic Majority	65%	31	0
21	White Majority	37%	1	30
22	White Plurality	39%	24	7
23	Hispanic Majority	44%	1	30
24	White Majority	40%	0	31
25	White Majority	32%	0	31
26	White Majority	37%	0	31
27	Hispanic Plurality	36%	0	31
28	Hispanic Majority	52%	23	8
29	Hispanic Majority	66%	31	0
30	Black Plurality	77%	31	0
31	White Majority	37%	0	31
32	White Plurality	63%	31	0
33	Hispanic Plurality	72%	31	0
34	Hispanic Majority	56%	29	2
35	Hispanic Plurality	71%	31	0
36	White Majority	32%	0	31
37	White Majority	76%	31	0
38	White Majority	37%	6	25

*Notes:* Analyzes all contested statewide elections from 2020 through 2024. Highlighted rows indicate majority minority districts. Defines minority preferred candidate as the specific candidate preferred in each election, based on EI estimates.

Table 12: New Map (C2333) District Performance

District	District Type	Average Vote Share of Minority Preferred Candidate	Number of Elections Minority Preferred Candidate Wins	Number of Elections Minority Preferred Candidate Loses
1	White Majority	25%	0	31
2	White Majority	37%	0	31
3	White Majority	38%	0	31
4	White Majority	37%	0	31
5	White Majority	39%	0	31
6	White Majority	38%	0	31
7	White Plurality	62%	31	0
8	White Plurality	38%	0	31
9	Hispanic Majority	43%	0	31
10	White Majority	39%	0	31
11	White Majority	32%	0	31
12	White Majority	38%	0	31
13	White Majority	26%	0	31
14	White Majority	37%	0	31
15	Hispanic Majority	47%	5	26
16	Hispanic Majority	64%	31	0
17	White Majority	39%	0	31
18	Black Majority	80%	31	0
19	White Majority	24%	0	31
20	Hispanic Majority	68%	31	0
21	White Majority	39%	0	31
22	White Majority	37%	0	31
23	Hispanic Majority	44%	0	31
24	White Majority	40%	0	31
25	White Majority	39%	0	31
26	White Majority	37%	0	31
27	White Majority	38%	0	31
28	Hispanic Majority	55%	24	7
29	Hispanic Plurality	69%	31	0
30	Black Majority	77%	31	0
31	White Majority	38%	0	31
32	White Majority	41%	0	31
33	Hispanic Plurality	70%	31	0
34	Hispanic Majority	49%	14	17
35	Hispanic Majority	46%	0	31
36	White Majority	38%	0	31
37	White Majority	80%	31	0
38	White Majority	37%	0	31

Notes: Analyzes all contested statewide elections from 2020 through 2024. Highlighted rows indicate majority minority districts.

Table 13: New Map (C2333) District Performance - Specific Election Preferences

District	District Type	Average Vote Share of Minority Preferred Candidate	Number of Elections Minority Preferred Candidate Wins	Number of Elections Minority Preferred Candidate Loses
1	White Majority	25%	0	31
2	White Majority	37%	6	25
3	White Majority	38%	1	30
4	White Majority	37%	0	31
5	White Majority	39%	0	31
6	White Majority	38%	0	31
7	White Plurality	62%	31	0
8	White Plurality	38%	0	31
9	Hispanic Majority	43%	0	31
10	White Majority	39%	0	31
11	White Majority	32%	16	15
12	White Majority	38%	0	31
13	White Majority	26%	0	31
14	White Majority	37%	0	31
15	Hispanic Majority	47%	5	26
16	Hispanic Majority	64%	31	0
17	White Majority	39%	0	31
18	Black Majority	80%	31	0
19	White Majority	24%	7	24
20	Hispanic Majority	68%	31	0
21	White Majority	39%	0	31
22	White Majority	37%	15	16
23	Hispanic Majority	44%	2	29
24	White Majority	40%	1	30
25	White Majority	39%	0	31
26	White Majority	37%	0	31
27	White Majority	38%	0	31
28	Hispanic Majority	55%	24	7
29	Hispanic Plurality	69%	31	0
30	Black Majority	77%	31	0
31	White Majority	38%	0	31
32	White Majority	41%	0	31
33	Hispanic Plurality	70%	31	0
34	Hispanic Majority	49%	14	17
35	Hispanic Majority	46%	0	31
36	White Majority	38%	0	31
37	White Majority	80%	31	0
38	White Majority	37%	3	28

*Notes:* Analyzes all contested statewide elections from 2020 through 2024. Highlighted rows indicate majority minority districts. Defines minority preferred candidate as the specific candidate preferred in each election, based on EI estimates.

**STEPHEN DANIEL ANSOLABEHERE**

**Department of Government  
Harvard University  
1737 Cambridge Street  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
[sda@gov.harvard.edu](mailto:sda@gov.harvard.edu)**

**EDUCATION**

Harvard University	Ph.D., Political Science	1989
University of Minnesota	B.A., Political Science	1984
	B.S., Economics	

**PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE**

**ACADEMIC POSITIONS**

2016-present	Frank G. Thompson Professor of Government, Harvard University
2008-present	Professor, Department of Government, Harvard University
2015-2021	Director, Center for American Politics, Harvard University
1998-2009	Elting Morison Professor, Department of Political Science, MIT (Associate Head, 2001-2005)
1995-1998	Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, MIT
1993-1994	National Fellow, The Hoover Institution
1989-1993	Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, University of California, Los Angeles

**FELLOWSHIPS AND HONORS**

American Academy of Arts and Sciences	2007
Carnegie Scholar	2000-02
National Fellow, The Hoover Institution	1993-94
Harry S. Truman Fellowship	1982-86



## PUBLICATIONS

### *Books*

- Forthcoming     *Representation in America*. With Shiro Kuriwaki.  
University of Chicago Press.
- 2024     *American Government*, 18<sup>th</sup> edition. With Ted Lowi, Benjamin Ginsberg  
Kenneth Shepsle, and Hahrie Han. W.W. Norton.
- 2014     *Cheap and Clean: How Americans Think About Energy in the Age of Global  
Warming*. With David Konisky. MIT Press.  
Recipient of the Donald K. Price book award.
- 2008     *The End of Inequality: One Person, One Vote and the Transformation of  
American Politics*. With James M. Snyder, Jr., W. W. Norton.
- 1996     *Going Negative: How Political Advertising Divides and Shrinks the American  
Electorate*. With Shanto Iyengar. The Free Press. Recipient of the Goldsmith  
book award.
- 1993     *Media Game: American Politics in the Television Age*. With Roy Behr and  
Shanto Iyengar. Macmillan.

### *Journal Articles*

- 2025     “Collective Representation in Congress,” *Perspectives on Politics* 23 (3):  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592725101916>
- 2025     “City-defined Neighborhood Boundaries in the United States” *Nature: Scientific Data*  
12: 1031. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592725101916>
- 2024     “Forecasting Turnout” *Harvard Data Science Review* 6(4):  
<https://hdsr.mitpress.mit.edu/pub/0c5ylgo1/release/2> (with Jacob Brown, Kabir  
Khanna, Connor Philips, and Charles Stewart)
- 2023     “The Geography of Racially Polarized Voting: Calibrating Surveys at the District  
Level” *American Political Science Review* 117: 1-18. (with Shiro Kuriwaki,  
Sorichiu Yamauchi, Angelo Dagonel)  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055423000436>

- 2023 “Franchise Expansion and Legislative Representation in the Early United States” *Journal of Political Economy and Political Institutions* vol. 3 (with Jaclyn Kaslovsky and Michael Olson). Recipient of the Kenneth A. Shepsle Prize.
- 2022 “Separatism and Identity” *European Political Science Review* 15 (2023): 1-18 (with Maria Socorro Puy)  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1755773922000261>
- 2022 “Constitutions, Federalism, and National Integration,” *European Economic Review*. Vol. 148, issue C. (with Maria Socorro Puy)  
[10.1016/j.euroecorev.2022.104225](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2022.104225)
- 2021 “The CPS Voting and Registration Supplement Overstates Turnout” *Journal of Politics* 83 (2021) (with Bernard Fraga and Brian Schaffner)  
<https://doi.org/10.1086/717260>
- 2021 "Congressional Representation: Accountability from the Constituent's Perspective," *American Journal of Political Science* 65 (2021) (with Shiro Kuriwaki)  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12607>
- 2020 “Proximity, NIMBYism, and Public Support for Energy Infrastructure” *Public Opinion Quarterly* (with David Konisky and Sanya Carley)  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfaa025>
- 2020 “Understanding Exponential Growth Amid a Pandemic: An Internal Perspective,” *Harvard Data Science Review* 2 (October) (with Ray Duch, Kevin DeLuca, Alexander Podkul, Liberty Vittert)
- 2020 “Unilateral Action and Presidential Accountability,” *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 50 (March): 129-145. (with Jon Rogowski)
- 2019 “Backyard Voices: How Sense of Place Shapes Views of Large-Scale Energy Transmission Infrastructure” *Energy Research & Social Science* forthcoming (with Parrish Bergquist, Carley Sanya, and David Konisky)
- 2019 “Are All Electrons the Same? Evaluating support for local transmission lines through an experiment” *PLOS ONE* 14 (7): e0219066 (with Carley Sanya and David Konisky)  
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0219066>
- 2018 “Learning from Recounts” *Election Law Journal* 17: 100-116 (with Barry C. Burden, Kenneth R. Mayer, and Charles Stewart III)  
<https://doi.org/10.1089/elj.2017.0440>

- 2018 “Policy, Politics, and Public Attitudes Toward the Supreme Court” *American Politics Research* (with Ariel White and Nathaniel Persily).  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1532673X18765189>
- 2018 “Measuring Issue-Salience in Voters’ Preferences” *Electoral Studies* (with Maria Socorro Puy) 51 (February): 103-114.
- 2018 “Divided Government and Significant Legislation: A History of Congress,” *Social Science History* (with Maxwell Palmer and Benjamin Schneer).42 (1).
- 2017 “ADGN: An Algorithm for Record Linkage Using Address, Date of Birth Gender and Name,” *Statistics and Public Policy* (with Eitan Hersh)
- 2017 “Identity Politics” (with Socorro Puy) *Public Choice*. 168: 1-19.  
DOI 10.1007/s11127-016-0371-2
- 2016 “A 200-Year Statistical History of the Gerrymander” (with Maxwell Palmer) *The Ohio State University Law Journal*
- 2016 “Do Americans Prefer Co-Ethnic Representation? The Impact of Race on House Incumbent Evaluations” (with Bernard Fraga) *Stanford University Law Review* 68: 1553-1594
- 2016 Revisiting Public Opinion on Voter Identification and Voter Fraud in an Era of Increasing Partisan Polarization ” (with Nathaniel Persily) *Stanford Law Review* 68: 1455-1489
- 2015 “The Perils of Cherry Picking Low Frequency Events in Large Sample Surveys” (with Brian Schaffner and Samantha Luks) *Electoral Studies* 40 (December): 409-410.
- 2015 “Testing *Shaw v. Reno*: Do Majority-Minority Districts Cause Expressive Harms?” (with Nathaniel Persily) *New York University Law Review* 90
- 2015 “A Brief Yet Practical Guide to Reforming U.S. Voter Registration, *Election Law Journal*, (with Daron Shaw and Charles Stewart) 14: 26-31.
- 2015 “Waiting to Vote,” *Election Law Journal*, (with Charles Stewart) 14: 47-53.
- 2014 “Mecro-economic Voting: Local Information and Micro-Perceptions of the Macro-Economy” (With Marc Meredith and Erik Snowberg), *Economics and Politics* 26 (November): 380-410.
- 2014 “Does Survey Mode Still Matter?” *Political Analysis* (with Brian Schaffner) 22: 285-303

- 2013 “Race, Gender, Age, and Voting” *Politics and Governance*, vol. 1, issue 2. (with Eitan Hersh)  
<http://www.librelloph.com/politicsandgovernance/article/view/PaG-1.2.132>
- 2013 “Regional Differences in Racially Polarized Voting: Implications for the Constitutionality of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act” (with Nathaniel Persily and Charles Stewart) 126 *Harvard Law Review* F 205 (2013)  
[http://www.harvardlawreview.org/issues/126/april13/forum\\_1005.php](http://www.harvardlawreview.org/issues/126/april13/forum_1005.php)
- 2013 “Cooperative Survey Research” *Annual Review of Political Science* (with Douglas Rivers)
- 2013 “Social Sciences and the Alternative Energy Future” *Daedalus* (with Bob Fri)
- 2013 “The Effects of Redistricting on Incumbents,” *Election Law Journal* (with James Snyder)
- 2012 “Asking About Numbers: How and Why” *Political Analysis* (with Erik Snowberg and Marc Meredith). doi:10.1093/pan/mps031
- 2012 “Movers, Stayers, and Registration” *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* (with Eitan Hersh and Ken Shepsle)
- 2012 “Validation: What Big Data Reveals About Survey Misreporting and the Real Electorate” *Political Analysis* (with Eitan Hersh)
- 2012 “Arizona Free Enterprise v. Bennett and the Problem of Campaign Finance” *Supreme Court Review* 2011(1):39-79
- 2012 “The American Public’s Energy Choice” *Daedalus* (with David Konisky)
- 2012 “Challenges for Technology Change” *Daedalus* (with Robert Fri)
- 2011 “When Parties Are Not Teams: Party positions in single-member district and proportional representation systems” *Economic Theory* 49 (March)  
DOI: 10.1007/s00199-011-0610-1 (with James M. Snyder Jr. and William Leblanc)
- 2011 “Profiling Originalism” *Columbia Law Review* (with Jamal Greene and Nathaniel Persily).
- 2010 “Partisanship, Public Opinion, and Redistricting” *Election Law Journal* (with Joshua Fougere and Nathaniel Persily).

- 2010 “Primary Elections and Party Polarization” *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* (with Shigeo Hirano, James Snyder, and Mark Hansen)
- 2010 “Constituents’ Responses to Congressional Roll Call Voting,” *American Journal of Political Science* (with Phil Jones)
- 2010 “Race, Region, and Vote Choice in the 2008 Election: Implications for the Future of the Voting Rights Act” *Harvard Law Review* April, 2010. (with Nathaniel Persily, and Charles H. Stewart III)
- 2010 “Residential Mobility and the Cell Only Population,” *Public Opinion Quarterly* (with Brian Schaffner)
- 2009 “Explaining Attitudes Toward Power Plant Location,” *Public Opinion Quarterly* (with David Konisky)
- 2009 “Public risk perspectives on the geologic storage of carbon dioxide,” *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control* (with Gregory Singleton and Howard Herzog) 3(1): 100-107.
- 2008 “A Spatial Model of the Relationship Between Seats and Votes” (with William Leblanc) *Mathematical and Computer Modeling* (November).
- 2008 “The Strength of Issues: Using Multiple Measures to Gauge Preference Stability, Ideological Constraint, and Issue Voting” (with Jonathan Rodden and James M. Snyder, Jr.) *American Political Science Review* (May).
- 2008 “Access versus Integrity in Voter Identification Requirements.” *New York University Annual Survey of American Law*, vol 63.
- 2008 “Voter Fraud in the Eye of the Beholder” (with Nathaniel Persily) *Harvard Law Review* (May)
- 2007 “Incumbency Advantages in U. S. Primary Elections,” (with John Mark Hansen, Shigeo Hirano, and James M. Snyder, Jr.) *Electoral Studies* (September)
- 2007 “Television and the Incumbency Advantage” (with Erik C. Snowberg and James M. Snyder, Jr.) *Legislative Studies Quarterly*.
- 2006 “The Political Orientation of Newspaper Endorsements” (with Rebecca Lessem and James M. Snyder, Jr.). *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* vol. 1, issue 3.
- 2006 “Voting Cues and the Incumbency Advantage: A Critical Test” (with Shigeo Hirano, James M. Snyder, Jr., and Michiko Ueda) *Quarterly Journal of*

*Political Science* vol. 1, issue 2.

- 2006 “American Exceptionalism? Similarities and Differences in National Attitudes Toward Energy Policies and Global Warming” (with David Reiner, Howard Herzog, K. Itaoka, M. Odenberger, and Fillip Johanssen) *Environmental Science and Technology* (February 22, 2006), [http://pubs3.acs.org/acs/journals/doilookup?in\\_doi=10.1021/es052010b](http://pubs3.acs.org/acs/journals/doilookup?in_doi=10.1021/es052010b)
- 2006 “Purple America” (with Jonathan Rodden and James M. Snyder, Jr.) *Journal of Economic Perspectives* (Winter).
- 2005 “Did the Introduction of Voter Registration Decrease Turnout?” (with David Konisky). *Political Analysis*.
- 2005 “Statistical Bias in Newspaper Reporting: The Case of Campaign Finance” *Public Opinion Quarterly* (with James M. Snyder, Jr., and Erik Snowberg).
- 2005 “Studying Elections” *Policy Studies Journal* (with Charles H. Stewart III and R. Michael Alvarez).
- 2005 “Legislative Bargaining under Weighted Voting” *American Economic Review* (with James M. Snyder, Jr., and Michael Ting)
- 2005 “Voting Weights and Formateur Advantages in Coalition Formation: Evidence from Parliamentary Coalitions, 1946 to 2002” (with James M. Snyder, Jr., Aaron B. Strauss, and Michael M. Ting) *American Journal of Political Science*.
- 2005 “Reapportionment and Party Realignment in the American States” *Pennsylvania Law Review* (with James M. Snyder, Jr.)
- 2004 “Residual Votes Attributable to Voting Technologies” (with Charles Stewart) *Journal of Politics*
- 2004 “Using Term Limits to Estimate Incumbency Advantages When Office Holders Retire Strategically” (with James M. Snyder, Jr.). *Legislative Studies Quarterly* vol. 29, November 2004, pages 487-516.
- 2004 “Did Firms Profit From Soft Money?” (with James M. Snyder, Jr., and Michiko Ueda) *Election Law Journal* vol. 3, April 2004.
- 2003 “Bargaining in Bicameral Legislatures” (with James M. Snyder, Jr. and Mike Ting) *American Political Science Review*, August, 2003.
- 2003 “Why Is There So Little Money in U.S. Politics?” (with James M. Snyder, Jr.) *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Winter, 2003.

- 2002 “Equal Votes, Equal Money: Court-Ordered Redistricting and the Public Spending in the American States” (with Alan Gerber and James M. Snyder, Jr.) *American Political Science Review*, December, 2002.  
Paper awarded the Heinz Eulau award for the best paper in the American Political Science Review.
- 2002 “Are PAC Contributions and Lobbying Linked?” (with James M. Snyder, Jr. and Micky Tripathi) *Business and Politics* 4, no. 2.
- 2002 “The Incumbency Advantage in U.S. Elections: An Analysis of State and Federal Offices, 1942-2000” (with James Snyder) *Election Law Journal*, 1, no. 3.
- 2001 “Voting Machines, Race, and Equal Protection.” *Election Law Journal*, vol. 1, no. 1
- 2001 “Models, assumptions, and model checking in ecological regressions” (with Andrew Gelman, David Park, Phillip Price, and Lorraine Minnite) *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, series A, 164: 101-118.
- 2001 “The Effects of Party and Preferences on Congressional Roll Call Voting.” (with James Snyder and Charles Stewart) *Legislative Studies Quarterly* (forthcoming).  
Paper awarded the *Jewell-Lowenberg Award* for the best paper published on legislative politics in 2001. Paper awarded the *Jack Walker Award* for the best paper published on party politics in 2001.
- 2001 “Candidate Positions in Congressional Elections,” (with James Snyder and Charles Stewart). *American Journal of Political Science* 45 (November).
- 2000 “Old Voters, New Voters, and the Personal Vote,” (with James Snyder and Charles Stewart) *American Journal of Political Science* 44 (February).
- 2000 “Soft Money, Hard Money, Strong Parties,” (with James Snyder) *Columbia Law Review* 100 (April):598 - 619.
- 2000 “Campaign War Chests and Congressional Elections,” (with James Snyder) *Business and Politics*. 2 (April): 9-34.
- 1999 “Replicating Experiments Using Surveys and Aggregate Data: The Case of Negative Advertising.” (with Shanto Iyengar and Adam Simon) *American Political Science Review* 93 (December).
- 1999 “Valence Politics and Equilibrium in Spatial Models,” (with James Snyder), *Public Choice*.



- 1999 “Money and Institutional Power,” (with James Snyder), *Texas Law Review* 77 (June, 1999): 1673-1704.
- 1997 “Incumbency Advantage and the Persistence of Legislative Majorities,” (with Alan Gerber), *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 22 (May 1997).
- 1996 “The Effects of Ballot Access Rules on U.S. House Elections,” (with Alan Gerber), *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 21 (May 1996).
- 1994 “Riding the Wave and Issue Ownership: The Importance of Issues in Political Advertising and News,” (with Shanto Iyengar) *Public Opinion Quarterly* 58: 335-357.
- 1994 “Horseshoes and Horseraces: Experimental Evidence of the Effects of Polls on Campaigns,” (with Shanto Iyengar) *Political Communications* 11/4 (October-December): 413-429.
- 1994 “Does Attack Advertising Demobilize the Electorate?” (with Shanto Iyengar), *American Political Science Review* 89 (December).
- 1994 “The Mismeasure of Campaign Spending: Evidence from the 1990 U.S. House Elections,” (with Alan Gerber) *Journal of Politics* 56 (September).
- 1993 “Poll Faulting,” (with Thomas R. Belin) *Chance* 6 (Winter): 22-28.
- 1991 “The Vanishing Marginals and Electoral Responsiveness,” (with David Brady and Morris Fiorina) *British Journal of Political Science* 22 (November): 21-3.



- 1991 “Mass Media and Elections: An Overview,” (with Roy Behr and Shanto Iyengar) *American Politics Quarterly* 19/1 (January): 109-139.
- 1990 “The Limits of Unraveling in Interest Groups,” *Rationality and Society* 2: 394-400.
- 1990 “Measuring the Consequences of Delegate Selection Rules in Presidential Nominations,” (with Gary King) *Journal of Politics* 52: 609-621.
- 1989 “The Nature of Utility Functions in Mass Publics,” (with Henry Brady) *American Political Science Review* 83: 143-164.

### ***Special Reports and Policy Studies***

- 2024 *Crossed Wires: A Salata Institute-Roosevelt Project Study of the Development of High Voltage Transmission Lines in the United States.*  
[https://ceepr.mit.edu/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/Crossed-Wires\\_Full-Report.pdf](https://ceepr.mit.edu/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/Crossed-Wires_Full-Report.pdf)  
 (Lead author)
- 2024 *How Grid Projects Get Stuck: Four Case Studies of Long-Distance Transmission Line Development.*  
<https://ceepr.mit.edu/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/How-Grid-Projects-Get-Stuck.pdf>  
 (Lead author)
- 2021 *A Low Carbon Energy Transition in Southwest Pennsylvania.*  
<https://ceepr.mit.edu/case-studies/appalachian-pennsylvania/>  
 (Lead author)
- 2010 *The Future of Nuclear Power*, Revised.
- 2006 *The Future of Coal*. MIT Press. Continued reliance on coal as a primary power source will lead to very high concentrations of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, resulting in global warming. This cross-disciplinary study – drawing on faculty from Physics, Economics, Chemistry, Nuclear Engineering, and Political Science – develop a road map for technology research and development policy in order to address the challenges of carbon emissions from expanding use of coal for electricity and heating throughout the world.
- 2003 *The Future of Nuclear Power*. MIT Press. This cross-disciplinary study – drawing on faculty from Physics, Economics, Chemistry, Nuclear Engineering, and Political Science – examines the what contribution nuclear power can make to meet growing electricity demand, especially in a world with increasing carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuel power plants.

- 2002 “Election Day Registration.” A report prepared for DEMOS. This report analyzes the possible effects of Proposition 52 in California based on the experiences of 6 states with election day registration.
- 2001 *Voting: What Is, What Could Be*. A report of the Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project. This report examines the voting system, especially technologies for casting and counting votes, registration systems, and polling place operations, in the United States. It was widely used by state and national governments in formulating election reforms following the 2000 election.
- 2001 “An Assessment of the Reliability of Voting Technologies.” A report of the Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project. This report provided the first nationwide assessment of voting equipment performance in the United States. It was prepared for the Governor’s Select Task Force on Election Reform in Florida.

### *Chapters in Edited Volumes*

- 2016 “Taking the Study of Public Opinion Online” (with Brian Schaffner) *Oxford Handbook of Public Opinion*, R. Michael Alvarez, ed. Oxford University Press: New York, NY.
- 2014 “Voter Registration: The Process and Quality of Lists” *The Measure of American Elections*, Barry Burden, ed..
- 2012 “Using Recounts to Measure the Accuracy of Vote Tabulations: Evidence from New Hampshire Elections, 1946-2002” in *Confirming Elections*, R. Michael Alvarez, Lonna Atkeson, and Thad Hall, eds. New York: Palgrave, Macmillan.
- 2010 “Dyadic Representation” in *Oxford Handbook on Congress*, Eric Schickler, ed., Oxford University Press.
- 2008 “Voting Technology and Election Law” in *America Votes!*, Benjamin Griffith, editor, Washington, DC: American Bar Association.
- 2007 “What Did the Direct Primary Do to Party Loyalty in Congress” (with Shigeo Hirano and James M. Snyder Jr.) in *Process, Party and Policy Making: Further New Perspectives on the History of Congress*, David Brady and Matthew D. McCubbins (eds.), Stanford University Press, 2007.
- 2007 “Election Administration and Voting Rights” in *Renewal of the Voting Rights Act*, David Epstein and Sharyn O’Hallaran, eds. Russell Sage Foundation.
- 2006 “The Decline of Competition in Primary Elections,” (with John Mark Hansen,

Shigeo Hirano, and James M. Snyder, Jr.) *The Marketplace of Democracy*, Michael P. McDonald and John Samples, eds. Washington, DC: Brookings.

- 2005 “Voters, Candidates and Parties” in *Handbook of Political Economy*, Barry Weingast and Donald Wittman, eds. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 2003 “Baker v. Carr in Context, 1946 – 1964” (with Samuel Isaacharoff) in *Constitutional Cases in Context*, Michael Dorf, editor. New York: Foundation Press.
- 2002 “Corruption and the Growth of Campaign Spending”(with Alan Gerber and James Snyder). *A User’s Guide to Campaign Finance*, Jerry Lubenow, editor. Rowman and Littlefield.
- 2001 “The Paradox of Minimal Effects,” in Henry Brady and Richard Johnston, eds., *Do Campaigns Matter?* University of Michigan Press.
- 2001 “Campaigns as Experiments,” in Henry Brady and Richard Johnson, eds., *Do Campaigns Matter?* University of Michigan Press.
- 2000 “Money and Office,” (with James Snyder) in David Brady and John Cogan, eds., *Congressional Elections: Continuity and Change*. Stanford University Press.
- 1996 “The Science of Political Advertising,” (with Shanto Iyengar) in *Political Persuasion and Attitude Change*, Richard Brody, Diana Mutz, and Paul Sniderman, eds. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- 1995 “Evolving Perspectives on the Effects of Campaign Communication,” in Philo Warburn, ed., *Research in Political Sociology*, vol. 7, JAI.
- 1995 “The Effectiveness of Campaign Advertising: It’s All in the Context,” (with Shanto Iyengar) in *Campaigns and Elections American Style*, Candice Nelson and James A. Thurber, eds. Westview Press.
- 1993 “Information and Electoral Attitudes: A Case of Judgment Under Uncertainty,” (with Shanto Iyengar), in *Explorations in Political Psychology*, Shanto Iyengar and William McGuire, eds. Durham: Duke University Press.

### ***Working Papers***

- 2009 “Sociotropic Voting and the Media” (with Marc Meredith and Erik Snowberg), American National Election Study Pilot Study Reports, John Aldrich editor.
- 2007 “Public Attitudes Toward America’s Energy Options: Report of the 2007 MIT Energy Survey” CEEPR Working Paper 07-002 and CANES working paper.

- 2006 ["Constituents' Policy Perceptions and Approval of Members' of Congress" CCES Working Paper 06-01](#) (with Phil Jones).
- 2004 "Using Recounts to Measure the Accuracy of Vote Tabulations: Evidence from New Hampshire Elections, 1946 to 2002" (with Andrew Reeves).
- 2002 "Evidence of Virtual Representation: Reapportionment in California," (with Ruimin He and James M. Snyder).
- 1999 "Why did a majority of Californians vote to lower their own power?" (with James Snyder and Jonathan Woon). Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Atlanta, GA, September, 1999. Paper received the award for the best paper on Representation at the 1999 Annual Meeting of the APSA.
- 1999 "Has Television Increased the Cost of Campaigns?" (with Alan Gerber and James Snyder).
- 1996 "Money, Elections, and Candidate Quality," (with James Snyder).
- 1996 "Party Platform Choice - Single- Member District and Party-List Systems,"(with James Snyder).
- 1995 "Messages Forgotten" (with Shanto Iyengar).
- 1994 "Consumer Contributors and the Returns to Fundraising: A Microeconomic Analysis," (with Alan Gerber), presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, September.
- 1992 "Biases in Ecological Regression," (with R. Douglas Rivers) August, (revised February 1994). Presented at the Midwest Political Science Association Meetings, April 1994, Chicago, IL.
- 1992 "Using Aggregate Data to Correct Nonresponse and Misreporting in Surveys" (with R. Douglas Rivers). Presented at the annual meeting of the Political Methodology Group, Cambridge, Massachusetts, July.
- 1991 "The Electoral Effects of Issues and Attacks in Campaign Advertising" (with Shanto Iyengar). Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC.
- 1991 "Television Advertising as Campaign Strategy: Some Experimental Evidence" (with Shanto Iyengar). Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Phoenix.

- 1991 “Why Candidates Attack: Effects of Televised Advertising in the 1990 California Gubernatorial Campaign,” (with Shanto Iyengar). Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Political Science Association, Seattle, March.
- 1990 “Winning is Easy, But It Sure Ain’t Cheap.” Working Paper #90-4, Center for the American Politics and Public Policy, UCLA. Presented at the Political Science Departments at Rochester University and the University of Chicago.

### ***Research Grants***

- 1989-1990 Markle Foundation. “A Study of the Effects of Advertising in the 1990 California Gubernatorial Campaign.” Amount: \$50,000
- 1991-1993 Markle Foundation. “An Experimental Study of the Effects of Campaign Advertising.” Amount: \$150,000
- 1991-1993 NSF. “An Experimental Study of the Effects of Advertising in the 1992 California Senate Electoral.” Amount: \$100,000
- 1994-1995 MIT Provost Fund. “Money in Elections: A Study of the Effects of Money on Electoral Competition.” Amount: \$40,000
- 1996-1997 National Science Foundation. “Campaign Finance and Political Representation.” Amount: \$50,000
- 1997 National Science Foundation. “Party Platforms: A Theoretical Investigation of Party Competition Through Platform Choice.” Amount: \$40,000
- 1997-1998 National Science Foundation. “The Legislative Connection in Congressional Campaign Finance. Amount: \$150,000
- 1999-2000 MIT Provost Fund. “Districting and Representation.” Amount: \$20,000.
- 1999-2002 Sloan Foundation. “Congressional Staff Seminar.” Amount: \$156,000.
- 2000-2001 Carnegie Corporation. “The Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project.” Amount: \$253,000.
- 2001-2002 Carnegie Corporation. “Dissemination of Voting Technology Information.” Amount: \$200,000.
- 2003-2005 National Science Foundation. “State Elections Data Project.” Amount: \$256,000.
- 2003-2004 Carnegie Corporation. “Internet Voting.” Amount: \$279,000.

2003-2005	Knight Foundation. “Accessibility and Security of Voting Systems.” Amount: \$450,000.
2006-2008	National Science Foundation, “Primary Election Data Project,” \$186,000
2008-2009	Pew/JEHT. “Measuring Voting Problems in Primary Elections, A National Survey.” Amount: \$300,000
2008-2009	Pew/JEHT. “Comprehensive Assessment of the Quality of Voter Registration Lists in the United States: A pilot study proposal” (with Alan Gerber). Amount: \$100,000.
2010-2011	National Science Foundation, “Cooperative Congressional Election Study,” \$360,000
2010-2012	Sloan Foundation, “Precinct-Level U. S. Election Data,” \$240,000.
2012-2014	National Science Foundation, “Cooperative Congressional Election Study, 2010-2012 Panel Study” \$425,000
2012-2014	National Science Foundation, “2012 Cooperative Congressional Election Study,” \$475,000
2014-2016	National Science Foundation, “Cooperative Congressional Election Study, 2010-2014 Panel Study” \$510,000
2014-2016	National Science Foundation, “2014 Cooperative Congressional Election Study,” \$400,000
2016-2018	National Science Foundation, “2016 Cooperative Congressional Election Study,” \$485,000
2018-2020	National Science Foundation, “2018 Cooperative Congressional Election Study,” \$844,784.
2019-2022	National Science Foundation, RIDIR: “Collaborative Research: Analytic Tool for Poststratification and small-area estimation for survey data.” \$942,607
2021-2023	National Science Foundation, “2022 Cooperative Congressional Election Study,” \$900,000.
2024-2026	National Science Foundation, “2024 Cooperative Congressional Election Study,” \$900,000.
2023-2026	Salata Institute, Research Cluster on Strengthening Communities in Changing

Energy Systems, \$1,800,000.

### ***Professional Boards***

Editor, Cambridge University Press Book Series, Political Economy of Institutions and Decisions, 2006-2016  
Member, Board of the Reuters International School of Journalism, Oxford University, 2007 to present.  
Member, Advisory Board, Aguirre Lehendakari Center (Bilbao, Spain), 2025-present.  
Member, Academic Advisory Board, Electoral Integrity Project, 2012 to present.  
Contributing Editor, *Boston Review*, The State of the Nation.  
Member, Board of Overseers, American National Election Studies, 1999 - 2013.  
Associate Editor, Public Opinion Quarterly, 2012 to 2013.  
Editorial Board of Harvard Data Science Review, 2018 to present.  
Editorial Board of American Journal of Political Science, 2005 to 2009.  
Editorial Board of Legislative Studies Quarterly, 2005 to 2010.  
Editorial Board of Public Opinion Quarterly, 2006 to present.  
Editorial Board of the Election Law Journal, 2002 to present.  
Editorial Board of the Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics, 1996 to 2008.  
Editorial Board of Business and Politics, 2002 to 2008.  
Scientific Advisory Board, Polimetrix, 2004 to 2006.

### ***Special Projects and Task Forces***

Principal Investigator, Cooperative Congressional Election Study, 2005 – present.  
  
CBS News Election Decision Desk, 2006-present  
  
Co-Director, Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project, 2000-2004.  
  
Co-Organizer, MIT Seminar for Senior Congressional and Executive Staff, 1996-2007.  
  
MIT Energy Innovation Study, 2009-2010.  
MIT Energy Initiative, Steering Council, 2007-2008  
MIT Coal Study, 2004-2006.  
MIT Energy Research Council, 2005-2006.  
MIT Nuclear Study, 2002-2004.  
Harvard University Center on the Environment, Council, 2009-present  
  
Harvard University Salata Institute, Steering Committee & Chair of Research Committee, 2021-present.



**Expert Witness, Consultation, and Testimony**

2001	Testimony on Election Administration, U. S. Senate Committee on Commerce.
2001	Testimony on Voting Equipment, U.S. House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
2001	Testimony on Voting Equipment, U.S. House Committee on House Administration
2001	Testimony on Voting Equipment, Congressional Black Caucus
2002-2003	<i>McConnell v. FEC</i> , 540 U.S. 93 (2003), consultant to the Brennan Center.
2009	Amicus curiae brief with Professors Nathaniel Persily and Charles Stewart on behalf of neither party to the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of <i>Northwest Austin Municipal Utility District Number One v. Holder</i> , 557 U.S. 193 (2009).
2009	Testimony on Voter Registration, U. S. Senate Committee on Rules.
2011-2015	<i>Perez v. Perry</i> , U. S. District Court in the Western District of Texas (No. 5:11-cv-00360). Exert witness on behalf of Rodriguez intervenors.
2011-2013	<i>State of Texas v. United States</i> , the U.S. District Court in the District of Columbia (No. 1:11-cv-01303), expert witness on behalf of the Gonzales intervenors.
2012-2013	<i>State of Texas v. Holder</i> , U.S. District Court in the District of Columbia (No. 1:12-cv-00128), expert witness on behalf of the United States.
2011-2012	<i>Guy v. Miller</i> in U.S. District Court for Nevada (No. 11-OC-00042-1B), expert witness on behalf of the Guy plaintiffs.
2012	<i>In re Senate Joint Resolution of Legislative Apportionment</i> , Florida Supreme Court (Nos. 2012-CA-412, 2012-CA-490), consultant for the Florida Democratic Party.
2012-2015	<i>Romo v. Detzner</i> , Circuit Court of the Second Judicial Circuit in Florida (No. 2012 CA 412), expert witness on behalf of Romo plaintiffs.
2013-2014	<i>LULAC v. Edwards Aquifer Authority</i> , U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas, San Antonio Division (No. 5:12cv620-OLG), consultant and expert witness on behalf of the City of San Antonio and San Antonio Water District
2013-2014	<i>Veasey v. Perry</i> , U. S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Corpus Christi Division (No. 2:13-cv-00193), consultant and expert witness on behalf of the United States Department of Justice.
2013-2015	<i>Harris v. McCrory</i> , U. S. District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina (No. 1:2013cv00949), consultant and expert witness on behalf of the Harris plaintiffs. (later named <i>Cooper v. Harris</i> )
2014	Amicus curiae brief, on behalf of neither party, Supreme Court of the United States, <i>Alabama Democratic Conference v. State of Alabama</i> .
2014- 2016	<i>Bethune-Hill v. Virginia State Board of Elections</i> , U. S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia (No. 3:2014cv00852), consultant and expert on behalf of the Bethune-Hill plaintiffs.
2015	Amicus curiae brief in support of Appellees, Supreme Court of the United States, <i>Evenwell v. Abbott</i>
2016-2017	<i>Perez v. Abbott</i> , U. S. District Court in the Western District of Texas (No. 5:11-cv-00360). Exert witness on behalf of Rodriguez intervenors.



2017-2018 *Fish v. Kobach*, U. S. District Court in the District of Kansas (No. 2:16-cv-02105-JAR). Expert witness of behalf of the Fish plaintiffs.

2020 *Voto Latino, et al. v. Hobbs*, in the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona (No. 2:19-cv-05685-DWL).

2020 *Wood v. Raffensperger*, in Fulton County, Georgia, Superior Court, (No. 2020CV342959)

2021 *Billie Johnson, et al., v. Wisconsin Elections Commission, et al.*, Supreme Court of Wisconsin (No. 2021AP1450-OA). Expert witness on behalf of the Hunter Intervenors.

2021 Consulting expert to the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission.

2022 *Harkenrider v. Hochul*, New York Supreme Court (No. E2022-0116CV). Expert witness on behalf of the New York Senate Majority Leader.

2023 Amicus curiae brief in support of Appellees, Supreme Court of the United States, *Alexander v. SC State Conference of the NAACP*.